

Pun in English: Towards identifying its Equivalent Device(s) in Arabic

**” في الانكليزية: نحو تحديد ما يماثلها من فنون بلاغية في
العربية**

Dr.

**Siham Mohammed Hasan Al-Kawwaz
University of Kufa - College of Arts**

المخلص

يراد بمصطلح "pun" احد الفنون البلاغية الشائعة التي تعتمد على التلاعب بالكلمات التي تتشابه باللفظ وتختلف بالمعنى. ويعد هذا الفن ظاهرة خطاب عالمية لأنها تظهر في معظم آداب اللغات الحية كالعربية والانكليزية. وقد لوحظ في معظم دراسات الكتاب العرب لهذه الظاهرة أنهم يختلفون عند كتابتهم عنها في تحديد ما يماثلها في البلاغة العربية وتسميتها إلى الحد الذي جعلهم يعدونها تورية تارة وجناسا تارة أخرى أو كلاهما تارة ثالثة. وهو أمر يؤدي إلى الكثير من اللبس والإرباك في الفهم لأن كلا من التورية والجناس فن قائم بذاته فضلا عن استحضاره العديد من الأسئلة مثل: هل يمثل هذان الفنان مفهوم "pun" في الانكليزية؟ وكيف كونهما فنان مختلفان؟ وما هي الأسباب التي أدت إلى هذا اللبس والإرباك؟. لذلك يأتي هذا البحث بدراسة للفنون البلاغية العربية التي تشبه في آلياتها ظاهرة "pun" في الانكليزية ومن ثم تحديد ما يماثلها في العربية. ويسلط الضوء على التصنيف الشكلي لظاهرة "pun" في الانكليزية لتوضيح اللبس والإرباك الذي حدث عند الإشارة إلى نظيراتها في البلاغة العربية كما حدث في الدراسات السابقة.

Abstract

The term pun refers to a common rhetorical device that involves playing upon words which are similar in form but different in meaning. It seems to be a universal phenomenon since it appears in literatures of all

natural languages. In Arabic, it is observed that Arab authors are at odds when they write about this device. They often differ in identifying what represents it in Arabic rhetoric to the extent that they refer to distinctly different devices as its counterparts like *tawriya*, *jinās* or sometimes both. This draws a lot of confusion and raises some inquiries: Does *tawriya* equate *jinās*? if not, which one may represent pun in English? and what are the main reasons that have often caused such confusion and mismatching? Therefore, the present paper aims at investigating the rhetorical devices which are similar in their mechanism to the phenomenon of punning in English in an attempt to figure out what represents it in Arabic. It also draws attention to the formal typology of this device in English to illustrate the sense of mismatching which have appeared in previous studies when referring to its counterparts in Arabic.

Key words: pun, wordplay, rhetoric, paronomasia, *tawriya*, *jinās*.

Introduction

It is claimed that pun is one of the earliest types of wordplay that occurs in many literatures and gives rise to a universal form of rhetoric (Cuddon, 1976: 711). Pun relies for its effect on playing upon words that are alike or nearly alike in sound but differ in meaning. This indicates that the phenomenon of punning is possible in any language insofar as this language has words with more than one meaning or different words with the same spelling and pronunciation (Alexieva, 1997: 138-9). Al-Kawwaz (2011; 2012) draws attention to the study of pun in Arabic referring to it by the term *tawriya*. She claims that this phenomenon is not exclusively confined to English but it can be found in Arabic as long as this language has words of the polysemous and homonymous nature being used as a convenient medium for pun.

However, although the term pun is proposed to indicate the phenomenon of *tawriya* in Arabic it is observed that most authors are at odds when referring to the rhetorical device in Arabic that represents the concept of pun in English. For instance, Wahba (1974:453) uses the term pun to designate both devices: *tawriya* and *jinās*. Abdul-Raof (2006: 262) refers to pun when discussing *jinās* and he offers the term paronomasia for *tawriya*. Ghazāla (2000: 85), on his part, uses the term pun loosely to indicate a wide range of different concepts such as *tawriya*, *kināyya* (metonymy), *majāz* (figuration), ambiguity and deviation. Having such different points of view shows the lack of agreement among authors in

identifying the rhetorical device that represents the concept of pun in English. It also raises some inquiries: what is the concept of pun in English and which one of the Arabic devices may represent it? Does tawriya equate jinās? If not, which one is the equivalent device? and what are the main reasons that have often caused such confusion and mismatching?

The paper aims at exploring what the term pun may represent in Arabic rhetoric: tawriya or jinās? It entails elucidating the concept of pun, its scope and types in English and then defining the two rhetorical devices that involve playing upon similar words in Arabic rhetoric. The paper also involves clarifying the distinction between tawriya and jinās in order to provide a firm basis for explaining the confusion that occurs when referring to the equivalent device(s) of pun.

In this paper, it is hypothesized that the term pun is broad enough to include different types of punning. So, section (2) offers a quick look at the concept of pun in English showing its scope and its relation to paronomasia which has been regarded as one of the punning types. Section (3) sheds light on the formal typology of pun in English. In section (4), the concept of tawriya has been defined and illustrated by some prominent Arab rhetoricians. Section (5) gives a clear account about the second phenomenon that involves playing upon words called jinās categorizing it into its main types: complete and incomplete jinās. Section (6) distinguishes tawriya from jinās. In section (7), there is an attempt to identify which one of these devices may represent pun in English. Section (8) concludes that though pun in English is referred to by the term tawriya, yet, its scope includes both tawriya and jinās.

1. Pun in English: Definitions and Scope

Pun is not a very old word. It appears soon after 1660 and is of ‘undetermined origin’. It has been suggested that pun might have originally been an abbreviation of different words derived from different origins (for more details, see, Culler, 1988). Most English speakers, when they use the word pun, have in their mind a play on words, or the use of a word in such a way as to suggest two or more meanings or different associations. For them, puns are easy to make since they depend simply on finding two words which sound alike; one of these words is substituted for the other. Depending on identity of form and disparity of meaning, a pun evokes disparate meanings in contexts where each

applies differently (Culler, 1988: 4). Sherzer (1978: 336) defines pun as ‘a form of speech play in which a word or phrase unexpectedly and simultaneously combines two unrelated meanings. Alexieva (1997: 139) offers an emphasis when defining pun as “a literary form whereby a portrayal of a word or a phrase has several meanings, all of which apply”. It can be achieved by the same sound with a different spelling or the same spelling with a different meaning, and it causes the reader to consciously acknowledge the differences and the similarities of the word or words . All at once the same sentence can have totally different meanings which bring an amusing and yet ambiguous curve to the context of the text as in the following joke where the sentence ‘No change yet’ brings to the mind two different meanings:

1. A small boy swallowed some coins and was taken to a hospital.
When his grandmother called to see how he was doing,
the nurse told her, “No change yet”.

It is noticed that Sherzer’s and Alexieva’s definitions seem to be too restricted to illustrate the modern concept of pun in English and this may be due to two reasons. First, these definitions are far from most definitions of pun since they account for those puns in which one lexical item or a sequence can be interpreted in two different ways, but not for those other instances which are based on the close proximity of two or more words or sequences that are similar in form but different in meaning. Hence , puns may allow several degrees of similarity between words instead of indicating only total identity such as those which are based on homophony and near homophony (for more details see, Delabastita, 1996; Dienhart, 1999; Al-Kawwaz, 2002 and Diaz Perez, 2008). It is clear in the following example where pun is represented through playing upon homophones ‘two-tired’ and ‘too-tired’.

2. A bicycle can’t stand on its own because it is two-tired.

Second, Sherzer’s and Alexieva’s definitions do not make any reference to such play upon words that involve repeating a word in two different senses, in that, they leave out examples of the so-called paronomasia- a broad figure of classical rhetoric closely related to the modern pun. Most reference dictionaries refer to Paronomasia as a ‘a play on words’ in a way similar to pun. Cuddon (1976: 642) defines it as

‘ a punning play on words which uses similar or identical phonemes for its effect’. It entails deploying two similar words near to each other where the repeated word is the same or slightly changed (Frye et al., 1997: 282) as shown in the following dialogue:

3. - How is bread made?

- I know that ! You take some flour...Alice said .

- Where do you pick the flower? The white Queen asked

- Well, it is not picked at all. It is ground . Alice said

- How many acres of ground? The White Queen asked.

(Lewis Carroll, TLG(1),1970:322)

Given that paronomasia is one type of punning, the researcher may conceive pun exactly as Redfern (1984: 6) does, ‘a convenient tag for a whole variety of rhetorical devices which play on words’. Therefore, along the goals of this study, she summons Delabestita’s (1996: 128) definition of pun for being a more precise and at the same time general enough to cover different types of punning. For him, pun is ‘the general name for the various textual phenomena in which structural features of the language(s) used are exploited in order to bring about a communicatively significant confrontation of two (or more) linguistic structures with more or less similar forms and more or less different meanings’. This definition illuminates that the concept of pun has been developed in its scope to include playing upon identical or similar words whether it occurs once or twice as paronomastic examples of pun.

3. Formal Typology of Pun

As there are many ways to define the concept of punning, there are also numerous different typologies where puns are classified into different groups and distinguished into specific types. Al-Kawwaz (2002: 39-52) mentions the most prominent typologies showing in detail both the traditional and the modern ones in a way that has spared the present paper such tiresome endeavor. Thus, the typology adopted here is that of Wagenknecht (1974) which best fits the goal of this study. Wagenknecht draws attention to Leech’s (1969: 209) definition of pun regarding it as a springboard for a formal typology that distinguishes puns into two types : vertical and horizontal. He states that

If we accept Leech’s (1969) definition of pun as ‘a foregrounded lexical ambiguity which may have its origin either in homonymy or polysemy (perhaps adding homophony to this pair), then only

one distinction is absolutely necessary for describing our specific type of pun, i.e. that between the vertical and horizontal pun.

Wagenknecht (1974: 17)

Delabastita (1996: 128) gives support to this typology when he confirms the formal distinction between vertical and horizontal puns.

3.1 Vertical Pun

According to Delabastita (1996: 128), vertical pun occurs when two formally similar linguistic structures may clash associatively by being co-present in the same portion of a text. In this type, the act of punning is packed into one occurrence of a single expression, which thus carries at least two meanings, one superimposed upon the other. The relation between the semantic components is established paradigmatically: the different meanings are introduced by one and the same portion of text and therefore simultaneously. This means that the only one component of the pun is visible while the other meaning is hidden and materially not in the text; so it has to be incited into semantic action by contextual constraints. In cases where there is no pun, one looks for contextual clues to remove 'irrelevant' associations trying to find single and coherent interpretations. However, when a vertical pun is the case, there is a double context that excludes this disambiguating mechanism and requires double reading (ibid: 129) as in,

3. And after that a lot of voices went on
'what a number of people are in the carriage!' thought Alice,
Saying 'She must go by post, as she's got a head on her-'
'She must be sent as a message by the telegraph-'
(Lewis Carroll, TLG: 219)

In this example, the vertical pun resides in the word 'head' which creates simultaneously two meanings: the first and most obvious one refers to the part of the body, while the second (stamp) comes to the reader's mind by the reference to the post.

3.2 Horizontal Pun

Horizontal pun, for Delabastita (1996: 129), occurs when the two formally similar linguistic structures be in relation of contiguity by occurring one after another in the text. It displays the punning components in a syntagmatic way: the meanings appear one after another in the syntagm in which the pun is inscribed. In this type, the mere nearness of the pun components may be enough to form a semantic

confrontation. Also grammatical and other devices are usually used to emphasize the pun (ibid). In the following, there is a horizontal pun where the word 'well' as a noun is confronted with the other one used as an adverb.

5. 'But they were in the well, ' Alice said to the Dormouse,
Not choosing to notice this last remark.

'Of course they were,' said the Dormouse: 'well in' (Lewis Carroll, AiW(2), 1970:102)

It is worthy to mention that Ullmann (1962) was the first to recognize these two types distinguishing them as implicit and explicit puns depending on the fact that whether the word occurs once or twice in the text. For him, implicit pun 'occurs when a word is mentioned only once but carries two or more meanings which the reader has to decipher for himself' (ibid: 188). On the other hand, a pun can be made explicit by repeating the same word in a different meaning.

2. Tawriya in Arabic Rhetoric

The word tawriya comes from the Arabic finite verb warra □ an meaning 'hid something through showing something else' (Ibn Mandhūr,1988: 1/193). It is assumed that tawriya was used in every day speech in a considerably earlier period than the time in which Arabic rhetorical theory began to develop. Then it has been used by rhetoricians and literary men as a technical term to denote one of the rhetorical devices that involves using a word or a phrase with two incongruous meanings, both relevant (Maṭlūb, 1980; Sultan, 1986; □Abbās, 1987; for more details see, Al-Kawwaz, 2012).

Most Arab rhetoricians characterize tawriya as a rhetorical device, more specifically a semantic embellishing device which is attributed to the discipline of □ilm al-badi □(3) (schemes)(4). They also define it as the use of an expression with double meanings: near and far in such a way that it shows the near and hides the far. It, thus, occurs when the speaker shows one of the meanings a word may have and neglects the other. However, the one he intends is the one he neglects not the one he shows (Al-Miṣ ri, 1963: 268; Al-Qizwīni, 1998: 331).

Al-Ḥamawī (1987: 2/39) elucidates the mechanics of tawriya when he refers to the use of polysemy and homonymy. He states that when creating a tawriya the speaker uses a polysemous or homonymous lexical item that has either two literal meanings or one being literal and

the other non literal (figurative). One of the meanings is close and apparently indicated by the speaker and the second is far and underlying. Though the speaker intends the far one he intentionally manifests the near so he confuses the hearer to accept the near as the intended meaning whereas it is not. Thus, all the tawriya takes is finding two words that sound alike (Arabic is full of these) and switch them, and with a little logic added, one may create a perfect pun as in,

6.

وَلَيْسَ فِيهِ سِوَاكَ ثَانِي	يَا مَالِكاً قَلْبِي الْمُعْنَى
وَمَا التَّقَى فِيهِ سَاكِنَانِ	لَأَيِّ مَعْنَى كَسَرْتَ قَلْبِي

Oh owner of my broken heart ,
Wherein none other than you has dwelt
For what sense you broke my heart,
Wherein no two inhabitants have met. (5)

(Muhammed Al-Tilmisāni, cited in Al-Shayikh, 1986: 205)

In this verse, there are three puns. The first lies in the homonymous word *kasarta* (كسرت) whose first meaning refers to the parsing inflection related to the case of genitive in Arabic that determines the inflection *kasarah* at the end of the word *qalbi* (قلبي) 'heart'; the second meaning is 'you broke' with an indication to the poet's heart. The second lies in the polysemous word *sakinan* (ساكنان) which means both 'non vocalized sounds' and 'two inhabitants'. The third pun occurs in the phrase *li'yyī mā □ nā* (لأَيِّ مَعْنَى) which is used in Arabic to mean 'for what sense' and 'for what reason'. Through these puns the poet subtly plays upon two unrelated images: the first and unintended one is the poet's inquiry about the meaning that may have been got from inflecting the word 'heart' with an inflectional parsing called *kasarah* and the second and intended is his inquiry about the reason behind breaking his heart'.

3.Jinās in Arabic Rhetoric

It is worthy to note that tawriya is not the only rhetorical device that relies for its effect on similar sounding words (polysemy and homonymy). In Arabic rhetoric, there is another device called *jinās* that exploits words of the same nature. The word *jinās* is a nominalised 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)(6) but different meanings there will be a case of jinās. In Arabic rhetoric, jinās is used as a technical term referring to one of the lexical embellishments in the ilm al-Babī ‘schemes’. It involves using words which are either identical or similar in form but semantically distinct. It is achieved when these words occur in two different positions where they have different meanings (Abbās, 1987: 297).

7.

ما مَلَأَ الرَّاحَةَ مَنْ اسْتَوَطَنَ الرَّاحَةَ.

The palm of the hand will not be full
for who used to like laziness.
(cited in Abdul-Raof, 2006: 262)

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

Arab rhetoricians were generally in consensus that what is meant by jinās is a sense of agreement occurred between two or more expressions in all or most of their letters (Al- Askari, 1952: 249; Ibn Rashīq, 1955: 1/ 331 and Al-Jundi, 1954: 3-12). Ibn Al-Mu taz (1935: 2, 25) defines Jinās as ‘deploying identical or similar words in a certain verse or speech and being homogenous means that these words are similar in the composition of their letters. Al-Sakkāki (1983: 429) offers an emphasis to this definition when he claims that jinās occurs when there is ‘similarity in pronunciation between two words or expressions’. This indicates that jinās consists in the repetition of words that show similarity of form and disparity of meaning. Al-Ṭayyib (1955: 2/ 233) confirms this fact when he states that jinās is ‘a type of repetition that emphasizes the tune and strengthens it’ (for more details see Al-Fahām, 2010: 304-308).

4. Types of Jinās

Since the phenomenon of jinās mainly depends on the repetition Arab rhetoricians categorize jinās according to the criterion that the repeated words are identical or slightly different. On this basis, Jinās falls into two

main groups: complete jinās and incomplete jinās (Maṭlūb, 1980: 267; □Abbās, 1987: 298 and Abū Al- □Addūs, 2007: 276).

4.1 Complete Jinās

Complete jinās involves using two words which share the same orthographic and phonological form but are semantically distinct. Al-Qizwīni (1998: 388) states that in this type of jinās, words should be identical in four aspects : the type, number, form and arrangement of letters. This shows that jinās occurs whenever words agree in the pronunciation, meter and inflection but differ in meaning only (□Abbās, 1987: 297) as represented in the following glorious Qur'anic verse,

8.

{وَيَوْمَ تَقُومُ السَّاعَةُ يُقْسِمُ الْمُجْرِمُونَ مَا لَنَا بِسَاعَةٍ} الروم ٥٥\

And on the Day that the Hour (of reckoning) will be established, the Mujrimūn (criminals, disbelievers, polytheists, sinners) will swear that they stayed not but an hour- (Khān and Al-Hilālī, 1996: 535)

In this glorious verse, the complete jinās occurs when the lexical item sā □ah (ساعة) is repeated twice with two different meanings: (the day of judgment) and (the time unit that is made of sixty minutes).

Another example of complete jinās appears in the following verse where the lexical item 'amsik (امسك) has been repeated twice with two distinct meanings: 'to slow down' and 'yesterday' respectively.

9.

يا مغرور أمسك وقس يومك بأمسك

O who is snobbish, slow down
and compare your day with your day before.
(cited in Abdul-Raof, 2006, 622)

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 as in the glorious Qur'anic verse,

10.

{ رَبِّهَا نَاطِرَةٌ } (القيامة: ٢٢-٢٣) نَاضِرَةٌ - إِلَى يَوْمِئِذٍ { وَجُوه }
Some faces that Day shall be Nādhira (shinning and radiant) nādhira (Looking at) their

Lord(Allāh)

(Khān and Al-Hilālī, 1996:769)

The incomplete Jinās, here, is represented by the two words nādīra(ناضرة)and nādhira(ناظرة) which are orthographically similar except for the letters d (ض) and dh (ظ) respectively(7). Incomplete Jinās may be achieved when the two lexical items are dissimilar in the number of the letters as in,

11.

إِنَّ الْبَكَاءَ هُوَ الشِّفَاءُ مِنْ الْجَوَى بَيْنَ الْجَوَانِحِ

Crying is an cure from anguish among ribs.

(Al-Khansā', cited in Al-Ḥamawī, 1987: 71)

Here, the incomplete Jinās is achieved by the two lexical items jawā (جَوَى) which means 'anguish' and jawānih (جَوَانِحِ) meaning 'ribs'. These items are different from each other in the number of letters.

To be noticed, 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-Shayīkh, 1986: 194-5). It, thus, consists of two expressions. Each expression consists of two different words. When the two words of an expression are pronounced together, they sound exactly the same as the other two words of the other expression when it is pronounced together as in,

12.

فَلَمْ تَضَعْ الْأَعَادِي قَدْرَ شَأْنِي وَلَا قَالُوا فَلَانٌ قَدْ رَشَانِي

My enemies could not undermine my value

Neither did they say: someone had bribed me.

(Abd Al-Bāqī bin Abi Al-Ḥuqāf, cited in Al-Ḥamawī, 1987: 68)

In this verse, Jinās is created as a result of using the expressions qadra shāni (قَدْرَ شَأْنِي) which means 'the value of myself' and qad rashāni (قَدْ رَشَانِي) meaning 'has bribed me' which sound alike when their constituent words are pronounced together.

5. Distinguishing Tawriya from Jinās

After having clarified the concepts of tawriya and Jinās we can easily notice that the nature of words exploited in these two devices are

the same, that is, in both there are always words showing phonological identity and semantic disparity. This highlights the close relationship between tawriya and Jinās- especially complete Jinās. In spite of their close relationship they seem to be different in certain aspects as

□Allām (1980: 99-100) claims. First, whereas jinās is achieved by the repetition of the same word-form or construction, tawriya involves a single occurrence that conjures up two different meanings. Second, 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. Third, in tawriya, the speaker intends only one meaning while in jinās the two meanings are intended. e.g.,

13.

أَيِّاتُ شَعْرِكَ كَالْقَصُورِ عَوُفُرُ بَهَائِيٍّ وَلَا قُصُورِ
مِنَ الْعَجَائِبِ لَفْظُهَا حَرٌّ وَمَعْنَاهَا رَقِيقٌ

erses are like mansions
with no obstructions imperfections
Marvelous are their unrestricted
expressions and mild significations.

(Na□īr Al-Dīn Al-Ḥamāmī, cited incited in Shu □ayīb, 2008: 246)

In this verse, the poet offers an example of jinās and tawriya. Jinās is achieved by the word qu□ūr (قُصُور) 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 raqīq (رَقِيق) which appears once and conjures up two different meanings: slaves and mild . In tawriya the poet shows the first meaning but he 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 words used they are different in their manifestation.

On this basis, most Arab rhetoricians consider tawriya and jinās two separate devices that belong to two different modes in □ilm al-badī □(schemes). They attribute tawriya to semantic embellishing devices and jinās to lexical embellishing ones 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. And this may illuminate why Al-Kawwaz (2012: 10) prefers paronomasia(8) as an equivalent term to jinās.

7. Pun 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 vertical pun (4.1.1) where a word is mentioned only once but carries two or more meanings. In both, tawriya and vertical 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 vertical pun are exactly the same as the following examples may prove:

14.

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. (John Donne, A Hymn to God the Father, 1950: 177)

Here, the vertical pun lies in the word ‘Son’ which occurs once but has two different meanings: ‘the sun’ and the ‘Christ’ as well.

15.

لي يا عاذلي فيه قل إذا بدا كيف أسـلو
يمرُّ بي كل وقت وكلما مرَّ يحلـو

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. (Badr Al-Dīn Al- ḏahabi, cited in □Abbās, 1987: 281)

In this verse, tawriya is represented by the word marra (مرَّ) which occurs once and gives rise to two different meanings ‘bitter as a verb’ and ‘pass’.

On the other hand, jinās is defined as the use of two words which are identical or similar in orthographic and phonological forms but are semantically distinct. This definition is exactly as the same as that of horizontal pun which is represented by repeating a similar or identical

form in a different meaning. In both, words seem to be in a relation of contiguity by occurring one after another in the text. Therefore, jinās evidently equates horizontal pun as shown in the following example,

16. Shall shine as he shines now and heretofore;

And having done that, Thou hast done; I fear no more.

(John Donne, A Hymn to God the Father, 1950: 177)

In this example, there is a horizontal pun represented by repeating the word ‘done’ which has the same pronunciation of the poet’s name ‘Donne’.

17.

فَدَارِهِمْ مَاذُمْتَ فِي دَارِهِمْ وَأَرْضِهِمْ مَاذُمْتَ فِي أَرْضِهِمْ

Look after them in their house

And please them in their land.

(Ibn Sharaf Al-Qayrawāni, cited in Shu ʿayīb, 2008: 250)

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

8. Conclusion

Looking back at the definitions of pun one can only agree with Redfern (1984) when he states that the term pun is ‘a convenient tag for a whole variety of rhetorical devices which play on words’. His statement emphasizes that this term seems to be general enough to include different forms of playing upon words such as paronomasia which involves repeating a word in two senses. Another emphasis for including paronomasia comes from Wagenknecht (1974) and Delabastita’s (1996) formal typology in which horizontal puns seem to be no more than paronomastic examples of punning as the researcher shows. Therefore, it is demonstrated that the term pun has been already used as a blanket term to cover more than one form of playing upon words and this definitely goes along with the hypothesis of the study.

After having endorsed the hypothesis of this paper and confirmed the scope of pun we conclude that the term pun may cover the rhetorical devices called tawriya and jinās in Arabic rhetoric in that it does not

represent one of them, whether tawriya or jinās, but the two devices together. It means that although tawriya and jinās are distinguished as two independent devices they are included within the scope of punning and regarded as its own types since they, in their essence, rely on the same mechanism of pun in English. Thus, tawriya appears as the equivalent counterpart of vertical pun and jinās stands as the equivalent one for the paronomasia or horizontal pun in Wagenknecht (1974) and Delabastita (1996) words. On this basis, the present paper asserts that tawriya and jinās are generally characterized as the equivalent devices that represent the two types of punning and then indicate the term pun in English. Moreover, the study also arrives at the conclusion that having included paronomasia or horizontal puns within the scope of punning is the main reason that raises confusion and causes different case of mismatching.

It is worthy to add here that the term pun cannot be used as an equivalent term for both tawriya and jinās since these devices are categorized as completely different ones; therefore, it is crucially important to use the term pun for tawriya and paronomasia for jinās as Al-Kawwaz (2011; 2012) mentions.

References

- Abdul-Raof, H.(2006). Arabic Rhetoric: A Pragmatic Analysis. London and New York: Routledge Taylor& Francis Group.
- Abu Al- □Addūs, Y. (2007).Madkhal 'Ilā Al-Balāgha Al- □Arabiyya (□Ilm Al- Ma □ānī- □Ilm Al-Bayān- □Ilm Al- Badī □. □Ammān: Dār Al-Masīra Lilnashr Wa Al-Tawzī □ Wa Al-□ibā □a.
- Alexieva, B. (1997). “There Must Be Some System in This Madness. Metaphor, Polysemy and Wordplay in a Cognitive Linguistics Framework”. In: Tradictio, Essays on Punning and Translation. St. Jermo Publishing: Manchester.
- Al-Fahām, □A., (2010). Al-'Athar Al-Qur'āni Fi Nahij Al-Balāgha; Dirāsa Fi Al-Shikl Wa Al- Madmūn. Lubnān: Bayrūt .
- Al-Ḥamawī, A. (1987). Khizānat Al-'Adab Wa Ghāyat Al-'Irab. Edited by Sh □itu, □I. 1st ed., Bayrūt: Dār Wa Maktabat Al-Hilāl.
- Al-Jundi, □A. (1954). Fan Al-Jinās. Mi□r: Maṭba □t Al-I □timād.
- Al-Kawwaz, S. (2002). A Semantico-Pragmatic Study of Pun in English. (Unpublished M. A. Thesis). University of Mosul.

- (2011). Pun in English and Arabic: A Contrastive Study. An Unpublished Paper from the 6th Annual Kentucky Foreign Language Conference at University of Kentucky, 11, April, 2011.
-(2012). "Pun in Arabic: A Semantic Study". In: The Islamic College University Journal, No.18, pp. 7-56.
- Al-Miṣṣiri, I.(1963). *Tahrīr Al-Taḥbīr Fi ḥikmah al-Shi'ri Wa Al-Nathr Wa Bayān 'Iḥjāz Al-Qur'ān*. Edited by Sharaf, H. Al-Qāhira: Lajnat 'Iḥyā' Al-Turāth.
- Al-Qizwīnī, M.(1998). *Al-'Idāh Fi ḥikmah al-Balāgha*. Edited by Zarzūr, N.1st ed., Bayrūt: Dār Al-Kutub Al-ʿIlmiyya.
- Al-Sakkāki, Y. (1983). *Miftāḥ Al-ḥikmah*. Edited by Yūsūf, A. Baghdad: Maṭbaʿat al-Risāla.
- Al-Shayīkh, A. (1986). *Al-Balāgha Wa Qaḍāyyā Al-Mushtarak Al-Lafdhi. Al-'Iskandarīyya: Mu'assasat Shabāb Al-Jamīʿa*.
- Al-Ṭayyib, A. (1955). *Al-Murshid Ilā Fahim Ash-Shi'ar Al-ʿArab Wa ḥikmah al-Tiḥā*. 1st ed, Miṣr: Maṭbaʿat Muṭaḥḥa Al-Ḥalabi Wa 'Awlāduh.
- Al-ʿAskari, H.(1952). *Kitāb Al-ḥikmah al-Tayyib*. Edited by Al-Bajawi, A. and Ibrahīm, M. Al-Qāhira: Dār 'Iḥyā' Al-Kutub Al-ʿArabiyya.
- ʿAbbas, F. (1987). *Al-Balāgha Finūnuha Wa Afnānuha(ḥikmah al-Bayān Wa Al-Badīʿ)*. ʿAmmān: Dār Al-Furqān Lilnashr Wa Al-Tawzīʿ.
- ʿAllām, A.(1980). *Dirāsāt Fi Al-Balāgha Al-ʿArabiyya*. Bīnghāzi: Manshūrāt Jāmiʿat Qāz.
- Carroll, L. (1970). "Alice in Wonderland". In: Gardner, M. (ed.), *The Annotated Alice*, Harmondsworth: Penguin (cited as AiW).
-(1970). "Through the Looking Glass". In: Gardner, M. (ed.), *The Annotated Alice*, Harmondsworth: Penguin (cited as TLG).
- Cuddon, J. (1976). *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. England: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Culler, J. (1988). *On Puns: The Foundation of Letters*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Delabastita, D. (1996). *Wordplay and Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

- Dienhart, J. M.(1999). "A Linguistic Look at Riddle". In Journal of Semantics, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 95-125.
- Frye, N. Baker, Sh. and G. Perkins (1997). The Harper Handbook to Literature. New York: Longman Inc.
- Ghazala, H. S.(2000). A Dictionary of Stylistics and Rhetoric. Malta: ELGA Publishing.
- Ibn Al-Muṭṭaz, A. (1935). Al-Badī. Edited by: Kratshofski. London: Maṭbūʿat Jub Al-Tiḏkātiyya.
- Ibn Mandhūr, J. (1988). Lisan Al-ʿArab. Commented by Shīrī, A. 1st ed., Bayrūt: Dār 'Ihyā'ul Turāth.
- Ibn Rashīq, H. (1955). Al - Umda Fi Mahāsin Al-Shi'r Wa Ādābuh Wa Naqduh. Edited by: Abd Al-Ḥamīd, M. 2nd ed., Miṣr: Maṭba'at al Sa'āda.
- Khān, M. and M. T. Al-Hilālī (1996). Interpretation of the Meanings of The Noble Qur'ān in the English Language. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Darussalam Publishers and distributors.
- Leech, G. (1969). A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Maṭlūb, A. (1980). Al-Balāgha Al-ʿArabiyya (Al- Ma'āni Wa Al-Bayān Wa Al-Badī). Baghdad: Jāmi'at Baghdad.
- Murfin, R. and S. M. Ray. (2009). The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms. Boston Bedford/ St. Martin's.
- Redfern, W. (1984). Puns. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Sherzer, J. (1978). "Oh, That's a Pun and I Didn't Mean It". In: Semiotica 22, pp. 335-3350.
- Shu'ayb, I. (2008). Al-Muyassar Fi Al-Balāgha Al-ʿArabiyya (Durūs Wa Tamārīn). Bayrūt: Dār Ibn Ḥazm Lilṭibā'a Wa Al-Nashr Wa Al-Tawzīʿ.
- Ullmann, S. (1962). Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sulṭān, M. (1986). Al-Badī (Ta'wīl Wa Tajdīd). Al-'Iskandariyya: Munsha't Al-Ma'ārif.
- Wagenknecht, Ch. (1965). Das Worlspiel bei Karl Krams. Göttingen: Vandenhock& Ruprecht.
- Wahba, M. (1974). A Dictionary of Literary Terms. Riad Solh Square: Library Du Liban.

Appendix:

List of Arabic Symbols

Arabic Consonants:

Arabic Letter	Equevalent Symbol	Transliteration	Gloss
ء	'	'anta	You
ب	b	bayt	House
ت	t	tīn	Figs
ث	th	thamīn	valuable
ج	j	jamal	camel
ح	h	ḥadīd	iron
خ	kh	khamṣa	five
د	d	daqqa	nock
ذ	ḏ	ḏahab	gold
ر	r	rajul	man
ز	z	zā'ir	visitor
س	s	sinīn	years
ش	sh	shams	sun
ص	□	□awm	fasting
ض	ḍ	ḍid	opposite
ط	ṭ	ṭālib	student
ظ	dh	dharf	envelop
ع	□	□am	uncle
غ	gh	gharīb	strange
ف	f	fil	elephant
ق	q	qamar	moon
ك	k	kalām	speech
ل	l	layīl	night
م	m	min	from
ن	n	nām	slept
ه	h	huwa	he
و	w	waqt	time
ي	y	yawm	day

Arabic Vowels:

Arabic Letter	Equivalent Symbol	Transliteration	Gloss
ا	a	fān	art
و	u	kutub	books
من	i	min	from
باب	a:	bāb	door
و	u:	ḥuqūl	fields
سنة	I:	sinīn	years

Arabic Diphthongs:

أو	aw	'aw	or
أي	ay	'ayīna	where

Bibliography

- 1 -TLG stands for Through Looking Glasses (1970) by Carroll Lewis.
- 2 -AiW stands for Alice in Wonderland (1970) by Carroll Lewis.
- 3- Arabic rhetoric, according to Al-Qizwīni (1932; 1998), includes three major disciplines: \square ilm al-ma \square āni (علم المعاني) (word order or semantic syntax), \square ilm al-bayān (علم البيان) (tropes)and \square ilm al-badī \square (علم البديع)(schemes).
- 4 - The term ‘schemes’, according to Murfin and Ray (2009: 179), refers to the figures of speech that involve the use of words in a special way to create an unexpected effect without significantly altering the words’ meanings. They, thus, deal with word order, syntax, letters, and sounds, rather than the meaning of words. The researcher suggests the term ‘schemes’ as an equivalent term to the so called and \square ilm al-badī \square (علم البديع) taking in her account the difference between English and Arabic as far as the scope is concerned.
- 5 - This verse is translated by Dr. Mohammed Al-Mallāh- an Asst. prof. in the Dept. of Translation, College of Arts at the Universitu of Mosul.

- 6 - Words which are similar in their pronunciations are always similar in their spellings since Arabic is basically characterized by the identity between spoken and written forms.
- 7 - In Arabic, letters always represent sounds so a difference in one of the letters results in a difference in pronunciation of the word (see, note 6).
- 8 - For definitions of paronomasia, see (section 2).