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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.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, 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 ground 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 / personallite) 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 translatability 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), homograph (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 Homophonetic 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 /tæl/ in the above example although there is no etymological relationship between the homophonetic 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 /dəZəst/ (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 Finnegans 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 English is a term used to refer two literary devices in Arabic rhetoric: tawriya (توارة) and jinās (جناس).

3.1 Tawriya (توارة)

Al-Azhari (2001: 15-221) states that the term tawriya indicates to the meanings of "hiding" and "concealing" for being derived from the verb wārā (وَراَ) 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 yatāwārā (يُتَوَارَى) 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 Mandhûr, 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 wârâ (وراء) which means "blaze fire". It, thus, has the meaning of "displaying and showing" because "blazing fire" includes "displaying 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 Munqiî (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-Misîri (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 intention 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-Sakkâki (1983: 226), defines the term tawriya, by substituting it with the term 'hâm (أيهام) which means "double entendre". He states that it occurs when the expression has two uses, near muwârâ bih (مureen به) and far muwârâ anh (مروع به). 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-Qizwînî (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 Matlûb (1980: 298) mentions other names for, tawriya (توریة) such as tawgih (توجيه) and mogalta (مغاطة). But he prefers to call it tawriya (توریة) because, it is derived from the verb warâ (ورى) means to hide something and show another. Al-Halabi (1980: 249), on his part, uses the terms tawriya, 'hâm (أيهام) and takhajjul (تخجل) 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:

"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 (عالم الناس) is "giving unwillingly" whereas the far meaning is "people’s eyes". The poet intends the later meaning because he is an oculist. (Ibn Danyâl Al-Mawṣîlî, cited in Abbas, 1987: 281)

3.2 Types of tawriya

Al-Qizwînî (1998: 331) concerned with this aspect when he categorized tawriya into two types: mujarrada (مجردة) "the bare" and marashshâha (موشحة) "the nominated". His categorization built on the type of the qarîna (قرينة) "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), marashshâha (موشحة), muwârâ anh (مروع به), and muwârâ bih (مروع به). The four types will be discussed in the following:

3.2.1 Tawriya mujarrada (توریة مجردة) bare pun

This type of pun is called mujarrada (مجردة) which means "bare pun" because it does not show an adjuct that strengthens the near meaning it does not include the use of such elements that refer to the near muwârâ bih (مروع به) or the far muwârâ anh (مروع به) meaning (Al-Hamawi, 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 آكل leven  (Feud, 2007: 144).

The word "العيش آكل" has two meanings: near which is "cheese" and its reference is "I'm eating bread" and far which is "cowardice", and its reference is "they raided (Feud, 2007: 144).

3.2.2 Tawriya murashshâha (توریة موشحة) nominated pun

This type of pun is called murashshâha (موشحة) which means ‘nominated pun’ whose context contains adjuncts supporting the near meaning muwârâ bih (مروع 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-Hamawi, 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 elevating Ibrahim Hafed:

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

The poet plays on "الراحة" 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. (Tâmid Al-Dîn bin Dâbûqâ, cited in Alam, 1980: 136)

3.2.3 Tawriya mubâyana

This type of pun is called mubâyana because it context contains adjuncts which support the far meaning. The poet plays on "الراحة" which 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 murashsha (مونشة) because it aims at removing the ambiguity by mentioning a reference to the intended meaning, for example:

"أرى العقد في فؤاد مكحلا " يزينا الصلاح من الجوهر " I see the metaphor in the crown perfect as a type of punning.

The poet plays on "الراحة" 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. (Tâmid Al-Dîn bin Dâbûqâ, cited in Alam, 1980: 136)

3.2.4 Tawriya mubâyana'a

This type of pun is called mubâyana'a 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 in a way that means. It also 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 not be Tawriya. As illustrated in the following example:

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

3.3 Jināṣ

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 jināṣ that uses words of the same nature. The term jināṣ 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 jināṣ.

In Arabic rhetoric, jināṣ is used as a technical term referring to one of the lexical embellishments in ilm al-badâti (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 jināṣ refers to a sense of agreement occurring between two or more expressions in all or most of their letters (Al-Askari, 1952: 249; Ibn Rashîq, 1955: 1–331; and Al-Jundi, 1954: 3–12). Ibn Al-Mutaz (1935: 2, 25) defines Jināṣ 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. Jināṣ 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-Sakkâkî (1983: 429) claims that jināṣ occurs when there is "similarity in pronunciation between two words or expressions". This refers that jināṣ occur in the repetition of words that show similarity of form and disparity of meaning. Al-Tayyib (1955: 2-233) confirms this idea when he mentions that jināṣ is ‘a type of repetition that emphasizes the tune and strengthens it’.

Consider the following examples about jināṣ:

"أما ملا للأمل" من استوطن الراحة "The palm of the hand will not be full, for who used to like laziness."

In this verse, there is jināṣ since the poet uses the lexical item "الراحة" twice in 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 Jināṣ

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

3.4.1 Complete Jināṣ

Complete jināṣ involves using two words that share the same orthographic and phonological form but are semantically distinct.
Al-Qizwīnī (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:

"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

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-Qizwīnī (1998: 388). As in the examples:

"أن البكاء ھو الشفاء من العوجا بين الجوانح" (Al-Hamawi, cited in Naïr Al-Dîn Al-Hamamî, 2008: 246)

"Crying is an cure, from anguish among ribs."

The incomplete Jinās, hrer, is achieved by the two lexical items "جو" and "جو" which means "anguish" and "ribs". These items are different from each other in the number of letters. (Al-Khansâl, cited in Al-Hamawi, 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-Shaykhî, 1986: 194-5).

### 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 jinās and tawriya:

"أبيات شعراء كالقصور عوارف بها ولا قصور عوارف بها ولا قصور" ـ من السماج للقطف (15)

"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 "رقف" 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. (Naïr Al-Dîn Al-Hamamî, cited in Shu ayîf, 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-badî (علم البديع) '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)

"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 "مر" which occurs once and gives rise to two different meanings "bitter as a verb" and "pass". On the other hand, jimās 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 the word "done" which has the same pronunciation of the poet's name "Donne".(John Donne, A Hymn to God the Father, 1950: 177)

Therefore, jimās 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."[18]

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)

"فَدارِهمِ وَأرِضِهِمْ مَرَّتُمَا فِيهِمْ اسْتَفْرَأَتْ مَا اسْتَفْرَأَتْ دَارُهُمْ وَأرِضُهُمْ مَرْأَتُمَا فِيهِ"[19]

"Look after them in their house, and please them in their land."

Here, there are two examples of Jimās achieved by using the expressions dārihim (أرضهم) and 'arđihim (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 jimās as well. (Ibn Sharaf Al-Qayīrawānī, cited in Shu ayīb, 1987: 281)

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:

a) Pun = Pun: "The ST pun is translated by a TT pun". This strategy can be applied if both languages have puns with identical meanings

b) 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 ST 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 البنت محددة برغبة والدتها المتوفى.
2. ارادة الأب الميت قيدت ارادة البنت المتوفى.
3. وصية الأب المتوفى لم تطبق من قبل إبنته التي على قيد الحياة.
4. وصية الأب المتوفى قيدت ارادة البنت المتوفى.
5. وصية الأب المتوفى حددت وصية البنت المتوفى.
Text Analysis

The text is represented by a homonymic pun for playing on the word "will" to communicate two meanings, namely: "desire_وصية_" 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 "رغبة_وصية_" and "وصية_وصية_". 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. Therefore, 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_وصية_". 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 "وصية_" and "وصية_" into "وصية_" and "وصية_". Consequently, they accurately translate the pun word "will" to "وصية_" and "وصية_" and "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 الميت تحدد وصية ابنته الحية.

Table (1): Analysis of SLT (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>SLT</th>
<th>Translation strategies</th>
<th>PDP</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>TLT</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Z=S-P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>رغبة الابنت محددة برغبة الوالد.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>رغبة الابنت حكمت ارادة ابنه الحية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>رغبة الابنت تحكم ارادة ابنه الحية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>رغبة الابنت تحكم ارادة ابنه الحية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>رغبة الابنت تحكم ارادة ابنه الحية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>رغبة الابنت تحكم ارادة ابنه الحية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>رغبة الابنت تحكم ارادة ابنه الحية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>رغبة الابنت تحكم ارادة ابنه الحية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>رغبة الابنت تحكم ارادة ابنه الحية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>رغبة الابنت تحكم ارادة ابنه الحية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>رغبة الابنت تحكم ارادة ابنه الحية.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is lost by adopting pun-to-non pun strategy.
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):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>ادبدددا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>ادبدددا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Text Analysis**

The text is represented by a homophonic pun, which is used to play on two words: "all" to indicate "كل" (whole) and "awl" to indicate "مثقاب جلد" (an 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 / òl/ but different meanings). They literally translate the puns "all" and "awl" into "كل" and "كل مثقاب سدى". 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 its adequate socio-cultural knowledge. Thus, they completely succeed in performing the PT from SL to TL. Therefore, they translate it into "كل مثقاب جلد" and "مثقاب جلد" into "كل مثقاب جلد" ("تمثالك (عسكفي)"). 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 مثقاب جلد" and "كل مثقاب جلد". 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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
<th>SLT</th>
<th>Translation strategies</th>
<th>PDP</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>TLT</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the analysis of the homophonic pun in SLT (2). The translation strategies and the PDP, PT, and TLT are indicated. The translation of the pun is successful because they inferred the sociopragmatic meaning due to their adequate knowledge or exposure to its socio-cultural context. The aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is completely preserved by using pun-to-pun strategy.
5.3 Polysemic Pun

SL Text (3):
"Drink off this potion. Is thy union here?" (Shakespeare, Hamlet: V, II)

TL Texts (3):
خذ من هذا الكأس رشفة. هل انت متماسك هنا؟
أشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل اتحادك هنا؟
أشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل وحدتك هنا؟
أشرب من هذا الكأس. هل جوهرتك (يقصد الجوهرة المسمومة داخل كأس النبيذ) داخل الكأس؟
أشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل جوهرتك داخله؟
أشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل جوهرتك (يقصد الجوهرة المسمومة داخل كأس النبيذ) داخل الكأس؟
أشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل جوهرتك (يقصد الجوهرة المسمومة داخل كأس النبيذ) داخل الكأس؟
أشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل نجومك هنا؟
أشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل جوهرتك (يقصد الجوهرة المسمومة داخل كأس النبيذ) داخل الكأس؟
أشرب من هذه الجرعة. هل جوهرتك (يقصد الجوهرة المسمومة داخل كأس النبيذ) داخل الكأس؟

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" or "the marriage that is ended by queen death _ الزواج الذي انتهى بموت الملكة _". The same aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun is totally preserved 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 "جوهرتك" or "جوهرتك _". 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 "_ وزواجك (يقصد الزواج الذي انتهى بموت الملكة _) " and "جوهرتك _ وزواجك (يقصد الزواج الذي انتهى بموت الملكة _) " and they also clarify and explain the meaning of ST puns in order to be easily and clearly recognized by TL 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 pragmatic linguistic 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLT</th>
<th>Translation strategies</th>
<th>PDP</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>TL T</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 perspective, is not an easy task for translators, since both languages are systematically, grammatically, and culturally different.
4. Translators 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 Delabstis’ strategy except Zero to Pun and Non-Pun to Pun strategy since the study only concerns with SL.
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