

The Transparency-reflection in Puns Arabic Translation

Rana A. Almaroof
Al-Buraimi University College

Received: 29/08/2018

Accepted: 09/10/2018

Abstract

The term *transparency* in the translation of puns in the holy Quran plays an important role in reflecting the text-originality. Its significance lies in the fact that puns have certain sound effects and aesthetic features that should be reflected in the translation process. Failure to reflect these features may lead to a less transparent product. A main problem that may face translators is to find the suitable vocabulary in the target language that can reflect both the intended meaning and the pun's unique characteristics. In order to deal with this problem, translators make sure to produce a text that has a high degree of transparency. It enables the original texts to shine through translation as it keeps the foreignness of the source text maintained.

Key Words

Puns, Transparency, Pun to pun, Pun to non-pun.



1. Introduction

The study aims to investigate the degree of transparency that translators can reflect based on the selected strategy in translation. It focuses on the effect of the selected strategy on the concept of transparency. Text transparency can be traced whenever the translation does not block the lights of the source text. Transparency keeps the original the text accessible. The level of the visibility of the translators and the selection of the strategy help in formulating the degree of transparency in the translation process. In the process of translation, normally use prefaces, notes, and forewords in order to achieve a transparent translation product. The transparency in the product, on the other hand, can

be reflected in the foreignness of the source text, that is to say, the translators try to reproduce the original text in their target text-translation (Salama-Carr, 2005).

As a rhetorical device, puns have the feature of *indirectness*. The indirectness shows inherently misleading nature of puns as they may obtain more than one meaning (Khanfar, 2013). Puns in English has been defined by Delabastita (1990) and cited in Dastjerdi & Jamshidian (2011), as a general concept that refers to a different textual phenomenon where the structural features are used communicatively in a distinctive way to reflect the contrastive features between two or more linguistic structures. A Following a narrower definition, Sanderson (2009) states that puns is shown when the similarities between the structures are illustrated in the spelling and the pronunciation whereas the differences are illustrated in meanings. The ambiguity is found whenever the two terms have the same sound, and differ in meaning. Delabastita (1993) as cited in Dastjerdi & Jamshidian (2011), distinguishes six types of puns in English language which are the homophonic (they sound alike but differ in spelling), homographic (they have the same spelling but different meanings), patronymic (they have difference in spelling and pronunciation), homonymic (they are identical in spelling and pronunciation but differ in meaning), syntactic (they are analyzed syntactically), and morphological (they are related morphologically).

In Arabic, the nearest concept to pun is *'jinās' or 'Jinās Lafdhi'*. It is defined by As-Safadi (1987) as the similar words that have the same letters which are pronounced the same but may be written differently" (Cited in Azaryoun & Ghabanchi (2016)). Jinās is generally divided into two main categories which are the complete and the incomplete jinās. The complete jinās is illustrated when the two words or puns are identical in type, number, vowel and quiescence, and order of letters speech sounds (Sirriyya, 2006). The Arabic poet illustrates that when he said: جُورًا، جُورًا جُورًا... جُورًا جُورًا جُورًا where the the two underlined words are nouns. However, the first word (*ghuraru-جُورًا* means brightness but the second (*ghuraru-جُورًا* refers to dignity. Another example of two verbs that have the same forms but two different meanings is illustrated in the following piece of prose جَدْرِبُوا جَدْرِبُوا جَدْرِبُوا جَدْرِبُوا (جَدْرِبُوا جَدْرِبُوا جَدْرِبُوا). The first verb (*jadribu- جَدْرِبُوا*) refers to 'travelling' whereas the second (*jadribu- جَدْرِبُوا*) refers to 'killing enemies'. The incomplete Jinās is found whenever the two words are not identical in their phonetic

pronunciation. It can be illustrated in the following ($\text{دَامِسٌ} \text{ } \text{تَامِسٌ}$) where the difference is in the letters (*Da -Ein 'Damis' and (Ta -Ġ) in 'Tamis'* (Al-Akub, 1996).

For the purpose of this study, complete jinās known as *jinās Tam* is the main concern of the study. This is due to the fact that it is an important type of jinās and it is supposed to be highly transparent and eye-catching in the original text. Professional translators need to be highly skilled in order to produce the same level of transparency in the target text (henceforth TT).

Complete jinās has four sub-divisions which are: syntactically identical jinās ('al-mumāthil) where the two used utterances belong to the same part of speech, e.g., two nouns, two verbs, etc., adequate jinās ('al-mustawfī) where the two utterances belong to two different parts of speech, compound jinās (jinās 'at-tarkīb) where one of the two puns is a compound, that is, it is composed of more than one part, and finally the mis-constructed jinās ('al-muharraf) where the two words have the same number of letters, but they differ in the vowels and quiescence (Al-Akub, 1996). All the previous types of complete jinās are explained in the table below. All the examples are taken from Al-Akub (1996).

The Complete Jinās Types	Explanation
1. Syntactically identical jinās ('al-mumāthil) $(\text{دَامِسٌ} \text{ } \text{تَامِسٌ})$	The first دَامِسٌ refers to the wild cow herds, whereas the second تَامِسٌ refers to human's age.
2. Adequate jinās ('al-mustawfī) $(\text{مَاتَ} \text{ } \text{مَاتَ})$	The first مَاتَ means live but the second مَاتَ is a name for a person.
3. Compound jinās (jinās 'at-tarkīb) $(\text{مَاتَ} \text{ } \text{مَاتَ})$	The first مَاتَ refers to social ranking, but the second مَاتَ refers to the bribe action
4. Mis-constructed jinās ('al-muharraf) $(\text{مَاتَ} \text{ } \text{مَاتَ})$	The first مَاتَ refers to the poems, but the second مَاتَ refers to the hair on the head.

Table.1 Types of Complete Jinās

Focusing on complete jinās, study aims to: a) use the strategies that are suggested by both Delabastita's (1996) and Sirriyya (2006) into transparent and non-transparent to help us measure the degree of transparency in the translated texts, b) identify the effect of transparency element on the semantic, aesthetic and rhythmic value in the process of translation, c) investigate whether the transparency element in the target text is more important than other semantic factors.

Translation as a process and a product features double negotiation. Double negotiation, in turn, demands two phases, which are: a) the interpretation of a source language wordings by taking into consideration the pragmatic meaning and, b) the renderings of these wordings into a target language by focusing on the target-language expectancy norms (Emery, 2004). Based on this view, translation implies a 'transfer' not of the pure wordings only but of two cultures, languages, modes and/or sign systems to another language to produce a text in the target culture, language, mode and/or sign system. The rendering of a text requires reformulation of a product according to a set of parameters to be specified in the individual scenario (Gerzymisch-Arbogast, 2005).

2. Methodology

The methodology embraces both the steps of conducting the paper and the strategies that are adopted to measure the degree of transparency as follows:

- a) The gathering of randomly chosen 'jinās Lafdhi' in the source language which is Arabic. Thirteen extracts were chosen as examples for the practical analysis. The equivalent English renderings 'jinās' can be retrieved from the link / <https://quran.com/24/>. The translated text website are accessible from "The Noble Quran".
- b) The well-known Delabastita's (1996) strategies and Sirriyya (2006) have been adopted. The strategies are first classified into transparent and non-transparent to facilitate the process of analysis. Then the identification of the type of strategy in the selected data is a crucial element in measuring the degree of transparency.
- c) Specifying the main criteria used for deterring the degree of transparency the translator reflects. For practical and analytical reasons, both Sirriyya (2006) and Delabastita's (1996) strategies are applied as part of the analytical framework to identify which strategies have been applied in translating the puns. These

strategies are classified for the purpose of the analysis into two relevant categories: the transparently-based and non-transparently based strategies. There are four ways that have been suggested by Sirriyya (2006) to translate *jinās* which are the transliteration, literary translation without focusing on the aesthetic devices that are found in the source text, translation that uses the equivalents of the SL in an attempt to reproduce the aesthetic effect, and the decomposition of *jinās* into its constituent components of meaning, and then translating these components while keeping identical ones, to compensate for the missing sound effects.

Similarly, Delabastita (1996), as quoted by Dastjerdi & Jamshidian (2011), suggests a group of strategies that can be used in the translation of puns. Strategies include 8 different strategies which are the pun to pun, pun to non-pun, pun to a related rhetorical device, pun to zero, pun ST-pun TT, non-pun to pun, zero to pun and editorial pun.

The Quranic text is chosen because it is rich with examples of *jinās* and other rhetorical devices. All the verses selected are verses that have a close relation with the main topic under analysis.

3. The Transparency Criteria and Puns Strategies

Transparency has been dealt with differently by scholars. To some scholars, transparency implies that translators do not only hide behind the voice of the source text forfeiting any claim to visibility or authority but rather they also have an effect on the receivers (Ulrych, 2000). Other scholars keep the idea that transparency refers to an illusion that cannot be found in the real world of translation. This is due to the fact that the readers are in a situation where they cannot compare the source and target texts. The language of the translator is identical and coincides with the language of the original. Therefore, it turns to be as if the original had been rewritten in translator's source language (Duarte, 2012).

However, the transparency of literary texts has a special status where the visibility of translator plays a crucial factor. In this respect, Lane-Mercier (1997) states that translation of literary product is paradigmatic where translator's visibility is foregrounded within the target text; therefore, their translation requires a "visible" engagement on the part of the translator which is grounded in an ethics of translation.

The role of the poetic aesthetic features of the puns exceeds the burden on the translator. The puns have special aesthetic values that have to be translated to keep the stylistic features of the original work. Therefore, this type of translation needs a special effort from the translator and they are part of the unique qualities of that language (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014). What is required in the translation of puns is the so-called the effective translation where the translator can communicate the message successfully. It is a kind of optimally approximated translation. It is a translation that fits the purpose. To achieve effective translation, the translator needs to keep in mind seven standards which are accuracy, precision, correctness, completeness, consistency, clarity and fitness for the purpose (Darwish, 2010). This can be obtained whenever the translator reflects contextual and non-contextual aspects in his translation.

The process of puns translation requires a decomposition strategy. It is a process through which the translated pun word has to be dealt with at three different levels which are the sentential, contextual and referential. This process starts first in the translator's thinking to assign a surface meaning to the word. Then the contextual meaning has to be considered to be able to reflect the third level which is the referential level where the meaning is assigned based on the appropriateness of the context (Khanfar, 2013).

Accordingly, the puns translation process requires specific strategies that reflect different degrees of transparency. The most important strategies that reflect a high degree of transparency are:

- 1) The transliteration and the literary translation to reproduce the aesthetic device that is suggested by Sirriyya (2006) has a high degree of transparency where the visibility of the translator is high because the intervention of the translator is truly transparent (Salama-Carr, 2005).
- 2) The pun to pun, pun ST to pun TT and pun to rhetorical devices which are suggested by Delabastita (1996) have a high degree of transparency as well. The practical implication of this strategy means the translator reflects one of the distinctive features that are found in the source text. The transparency is evident whenever the terms of the source shine through the translation (Salama-Carr, 2005).

On the other hand, the most important strategies that are classified as non-transparent are:

- 1) The SL equivalent without focusing on the aesthetic device and the decomposition strategies that are suggested by Sirriyya (2006). These two strategies place more importance on the real intended meaning and the pragmatic aspects. The translator's main goal is the naturalization that is implemented through the generalization by allocating generic equivalent to specific terms (Salama-Carr, 2005).
- 2) The pun to non-pun, pun to zero, non-pun to pun and zero to pun and pun to editorial translations that are suggested by Delabastita (1996) have a low degree of transparency. These strategies emphasize the role of the translator in changing the original text-based to implement new techniques. The visibility of the translator is a core issue in creating the non-transparent process because the translator turns to be a facilitator. The number of the footnotes and its type show how the translator can word as a facilitator (Salama-Carr, 2005).

The data are analyzed qualitatively from two perspectives. First, the usage of both the transparent and non-transparent translation strategies will be looked at to reflect the degree of transparency the final product has. Secondly, the visibility or invisibility of the translator is discussed to add more information about the transparency issue as well as the aesthetic and rhythmic effects.

4. Data Analysis

The given extracts are selected and distributed based on the adopted categorization of the two transparency strategies. A group of extracts is given under each type to measure the following:

- a) The type of strategy used in the translation as a process and a product.,
- b) The degree of transparency that a product may have,
- c) The involvement of the aesthetic and sound pattern effect,
- d) and the reflection of the change in the semantic and pragmatic meanings in the rendering texts.

4.1. Transparently-based Strategies

In this section, the extracts where the transparently based strategies are used are given to show the effect of strategy and other related issues in reflecting the level of transparency.

Extract (1)

فَلَمْ تَقْتُلُوهُمْ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ قَتَلَهُمْ وَمَا رَمَيْتَ إِذْ رَمَيْتَ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ رَمَى وَلِيُبْلِيَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ مِنْهُ بَلَاءٌ حَسَنًا إِنَّ اللَّهَ سَمِيعٌ عَلِيمٌ

And you did not kill them, but it was Allah who killed them. And you threw not, [O Muhammad] when you threw, but it was Allah who threw that He might test the believers with a good test. Indeed, Allah is Hearing and Knowing.

Translators create a high degree of transparency in translating the syntactically identical jinās (ʿal-mumāthil) where the two used utterances belong to the same part of speech. The translator uses pun to a rhetorical device in the form of repetition. Thus, the two words have the same rhyme both in the source and target texts. This strategy keeps the aesthetic device clear in the product. The translator derives the product from the equivalent of the source language to reflect the aesthetic effect. Thus, the translator uses two transparent strategies which are the pun to rhetorical and literary translation that focuses on the aesthetic effects to keep the original text shines through the translation. The translated message, therefore, is sustained.

Extract (2)

وَمِنْهُمْ الَّذِينَ يُؤْذُونَ النَّبِيَّ وَيَقُولُونَ هُوَ أُذُنٌ ۗ قُلْ أُذُنٌ خَيْرٌ لَّكُمْ يُؤْمِنُ بِاللَّهِ وَيُؤْمِنُ لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَرَحْمَةٌ لِّلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنْكُمْ ۗ وَالَّذِينَ يُؤْذُونَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ لَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ

And among them are those who abuse the Prophet and say, "He is an ear." Say, "[It is] an ear of goodness for you that believes in Allah and believes the believers and [is] a mercy to those who believe among you." And those who abuse the Messenger of Allah - for them is a painful punishment.

The second example reflects syntactically identical jinās (ʿal-mumāthil). The word 'ear' has been repeated as an indicator for the existence of puns in the original text. The highly transparent strategy (pun –to-pun) is used. However, translators prefer the literary translation to show the occurrence of puns in the original on the expense of the semantic meanings. This reflects inadequate implication to the reader. The first 'ear' has a negative implication as it refers to those who abuse the prophet, whereas the second has a positive implication as it is added to the word 'goodness' and used by Allah. Hence, the translation deviates from the pragmatic implications that the pun has to keeping literary translation. Literary translation maintains the aesthetic effect, the pun to pun

strategies and the extract- transparency. Based on the previous assumption, one can conclude that the translated message is changed because the real meanings in the source text (SI) are not reflected in the target (TI)text.

Extract (3)

هَلْ جَزَاءُ الْإِحْسَانِ إِلَّا الْإِحْسَانُ

Is the reward for good [anything] but good?

Extract (3) illustrates the syntactically identical jinās (ʿal-mumāthil). The high degree of transparency is created through the use of the pun-to rhetorical device strategy. The original text shines in the process of translation. Whenever translators use pun to pun strategy, then the extract is transparent. However, it fails to incorporate the pragmatic meaning the puns reflect. The first ‘good’ indicates the good deeds of the human kind towards Allah, whereas the second ‘good’ is given by Allah as a prize of the good deeds. Failure to reflect the two different meanings stands in contrast with the high degree of transparency the product reflects due to the use of literary translation. Therefore, the translated message is sustained.

Extract (4)

(8) أَلَا تَطَعُوا فِي الْمِيزَانِ (وَالسَّمَاءَ رَفَعَهَا وَوَضَعَ الْمِيزَانَ

And the heaven He raised and imposed the balance that you not transgress within the balance.

Similarly, the translator uses pun to rhetorical device strategy which reflects a high degree of transparency. The original text shines in the product itself through the repetition of the same word to reflect the puns in the source. However, the meanings of the two puns in Arabic are different which implies that the translator neglects the difference in meaning. It is syntactically identical jinās (ʿal-mumāthil) that is translated literary because the first jinās word has the meaning of ‘law’, whereas the second means ‘justice’. The translated message has been distorted because the given meanings cannot reflect the intended meaning of the source text.

Extract (5)

وَلَقَدْ ضَلَّ قَبْلَهُمْ أَكْثَرُ الْأَوَّلِينَ (وَلَقَدْ أَرْسَلْنَا فِيهِمْ مُنذِرِينَ أَنْظُرْ كَيْفَ كَانَ عَاقِبَةُ الْمُنذَرِينَ

And we had already sent among them warners. Then look how was the end of those who were warned

Extract (5) shows the type of puns called the mis-constructed jinās (‘al-muharrāf). In the mis-constructed jinās (‘al-muharrāf), two utterances have the same number of letters, but they differ in the vowels and quiescence. The translator uses the pun-to-pun strategy with the focus on the semantic aspect. Pun to pun usage leads to high level of transparency. This high level of transparency leads to the fact that the translated message is sustained as the translator reflects the intended meaning in an accurate equivalent in the target text. Thus, the meaning and the distinctive features of the puns are reflected adequately.

4.2 Non-Transparently-based Strategies

The following extracts represent cases where the used strategy has classified as non-transparent. Thus, all these extracts have low degree of transparency.

Extract (6)

يَكَادُ سَنَا بَرْقِهِ يَذْهَبُ بِالْأَبْصَارِ (43) يُقَلِّبُ اللَّهُ اللَّيْلَ وَالنَّهَارَ إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَعِبْرَةً لِّأُولِي
الْأَبْصَارِ (44)

The flash of its lightning almost takes away the eyesight. Allah alternates the night and the day. Indeed in that is a lesson for those who have vision.

The type of pun in the given extract (6) is an example of the adequate jinās (‘al-mustawfi). The two underlined words in the verses (43) and (44) have the same letter and they rhymed. Apparently, there is no equivalence for such a type in the target language (English). Therefore the translator has translated it literally. The rhythmic and aesthetic value of the verse is lost. The words ‘eyesight’ and ‘vision’ have different rhythm in English in contrast with Arabic source text where the two words do rhyme. The strategy used is "pun to non-pun". The translator, in fact, erases the rhythmic factor in favor of the real or intended meaning. Thus, when the semantic and pragmatic elements are emphasized over the literary device of the puns, the translation has a low degree of transparency where the invisibility of the translator and the illusory of the

process result in a non-transparent product. In this case, the translated message is sustained but the distinctive features of the puns are lost.

Extract (7)

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ قُلْ لِمَن فِي أَيْدِيكُمْ مِنَ الْأَسْرَىٰ إِن يَعْلَمِ اللَّهُ فِي قُلُوبِكُمْ خَيْرًا يُؤْتِكُمْ خَيْرًا مِّمَّا أُخِذَ مِنْكُمْ وَيَغْفِرَ لَكُمْ وَاللَّهُ غَفُورٌ رَّحِيمٌ

O Prophet, say to whoever is in your hands of the captives, "If Allah knows [any] good in your hearts, He will give you [something] better than what was taken from you, and He will forgive you, and Allah is Forgiving and Merciful."

Extract (7) illustrates the adequate jinās (ʿal-mustawfī) in this verse. In the adequate jinās (ʿal-mustawfī), the two words are related to two different parts of speech. The first one is a noun and the second is a comparative adjective. Translators make use of the same part of speech in his translation, the adjective form. The effect of sound-use is also lost in producing the target text (TI). In this way, pun to non-pun strategy indicates the structural difference of the source text. At the same time, he applies the decomposition strategy where he analyzes the puns to give the best translation. Thus, the translated message is sustained regardless of the type of structural difference.

Extract (8)

مَا اتَّخَذَ اللَّهُ مِنْ وَلَدٍ وَمَا كَانَ مَعَهُ مِنْ إِلَهٍ إِذًا لَذَهَبَ كُلُّ إِلَهٍ بِمَا خَلَقَ وَلَعَلَّ بَعْضُهُمْ عَلَىٰ بَعْضٍ سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ عَمَّا يُصِفُونَ

Allah has not taken any son, nor has there ever been with Him any deity. [If there had been], then each deity would have taken what it created, and some of them would have sought to overcome others. Exalted is Allah above what they describe [concerning Him].

Extract (8) is an example of adequate jinās (ʿal-mustawfī). In adequate jinās, the difference is in the use of لام التوكيد (Lam for emphasis) in the first pun and the loss of it in the second pun. The translator chooses the zero-translation (pun to zero) where the puns are completely neglected with more impact on the pragmatic effect overcoming the form. Doing so, translators try to decompose the construction to arrive at the intended meaning ignoring the aesthetic values.

The zero-translation and decomposition strategies create a low degree of transparency where the emphasis is on the intended meaning. In this extract, the first jinās word has the meaning of ‘sought’ and the second jinās word has the meaning of ‘overcome’. These two intended meanings have no equivalent words that have the same aesthetic effect in English. Therefore, the translator is obliged to use the zero translation in the process of decomposing the intended meaning. The zero translation helps in sustaining the intended meaning found in the source text.

Extract (9)

وَإِذَا قِيلَ إِنَّ وَعْدَ اللَّهِ حَقٌّ وَالسَّاعَةُ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهَا قُلْتُمْ مَا نَدْرِي مَا السَّاعَةُ إِنْ نَظُنُّ إِلَّا ظَنًّا وَمَا نَحْنُ بِمُسْتَظْفِرِينَ

And when it was said, 'Indeed, the promise of Allah is truth and the Hour [is coming] - no doubt about it,' you said, 'We know not what is the Hour. We assume the only assumption, and we are not convinced.'

The usage of pun is not reflected in the product because the Arabic repeated puns have different usages. The first one is the negative word that is translated as ‘not’ and the second word is the relative pronoun that is translated as ‘what’. The lack of equivalent punning words in the target language leads to a low degree of transparency. The translator uses the pun to zero strategies to indicate the intended meanings at the expense of the sound effect. Still, the translated message is sustained.

Extract (10)

مَا قُلْتُ لَهُمْ إِلَّا مَا أَمَرْتَنِي بِهِ أَنْ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبَّكُمْ ۖ وَكُنْتُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيدًا مَا نُمْتُ فِيهِمْ ۖ فَلَمَّا تَوَفَّيْتَنِي كُنْتَ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ ۖ وَأَنْتَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ

I said not to them except what ‘You’ commanded me - to worship Allah, my Lord, and your Lord. And I was a witness over them as long as I was among them; but when ‘You’ took me up, ‘You’ were the Observer over them, and ‘You’ are, over all things, Witness.

In extract (10), the translator uses the ‘pun to the non-pun’ strategy where the distinctive features of puns are ignored. The main reason behind using this

type of translation is that the target language lacks the punning effect. As a result, the literal translation is used. Reliance on pun to non-pun leads to a low degree of transparency. Thus the translated message is sustained because the emphasis is on transmitting the intended meaning of the source.

Extract (11)

قَالَ لَمْ أَكُنْ لِأَسْجُدَ لِبَشَرٍ خَلَقْتَهُ مِنْ صَلْصَالٍ مِنْ حَمَإٍ مَسْنُونٍ

He said, "Never would I prostrate to a human whom You created out of clay from an altered black mud."

In extract (11), the pun to zero is clearly illustrated because the translator doesn't account for the repeated usage of the negative element (not) which is repeated twice in the source text and it is not reflected in the translation. This creates a low degree of transparency. It is the syntactically identical jinās ('al-mumāthil). Thus, the translated message is sustained as the translator focuses on the intended meaning.

Extract (12)

يُؤْتِي الْحِكْمَةَ مَنْ يَشَاءُ ۚ وَمَنْ يُؤْتَ الْحِكْمَةَ فَقَدْ أُوتِيَ خَيْرًا كَثِيرًا ۗ وَمَا يَذَّكَّرُ إِلَّا أُولُو الْأَلْبَابِ

He gives wisdom to whom He wills, and whoever has been given wisdom has certainly been given much good. And none will remember except those of understanding.

In extract (12), the same two word puns 'من' in the source text have been translated differently which results in a low degree of transparency for two main reasons: a) the translator uses the zero strategy where the repetition of the puns in the original text has been canceled in the product, and b) the two puns in Arabic have different functions which are the relative pronouns in the first 'من' and the conditional conjunction in the second 'من'. The relative pronoun and the conditional conjunction are not evident in the product **because the** translator tends to focus on transmitting the messaging without changing the intended meaning. Thus, the translated message is sustained.

Extract (13)

وَالنَّجْمِ إِذَا هَوَىٰ (1) مَا ضَلَّ صَاحِبُكُمْ وَمَا غَوَىٰ (2) وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ (3)

By the star when it descends, 'Your' companion [Muhammad] has not strayed, nor has he erred, Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination.

The strategy used in the translation of extract (13) is the syntactically identical jinās ('al-mumāthil) where the two utterances belong to two different parts of speech. The strategy 'pun to non-pun' where the emphasis is on the literary translation. The literary translation ignores the aesthetic device which adds more to the non-transparency of the product. This is due to the fact that the intended meaning of the message is sustained at the expense of the aesthetic effect.

5. Discussion of Results

The high transparent strategies used in the analysis of the selected texts include: 'pun to pun', 'pun to rhetorical device', and 'literary translation' that focus on the aesthetic and sound effect'. On the other hand, there are other used strategies that do not keep the foreignness of the original text, thus, creating a low degree of transparency in the product. Low transparent strategies include the 'pun to no-pun', 'pun to zero' and decomposition (where the puns are deleted and reproduced based on the linguistic forms available in the target language).

The syntactically identical, the adequate and the mis-constructed are the three types of complete jinās that are analyzed in the selected text include the syntactically identical, the adequate and the mis-constructed. They have both high and low degree of transparency. The level of transparency is associated with the type of strategy used as illustrated below:

Types of Complete Jinās	Occurrences	Transparency Based Strategy
1.The Syntactically Identical	9(70%)	A/High Transparency 1.Pun to pun+ Literary Translation (2) 2.Pun to a rhetorical device + Literary Translation(2) B/Low Transparency 3.Pun to Zero(3) 4. Pun to Non-pun (2)
2.The Adequate	3(23%)	Low Transparency 1.Pun to non-Pun+ Decomposition (2) 2.Pun to Zero+ Decomposition (1)
3.The mis-constructed	1(7%)	High Transparency(1)
Total	13	HighTransparency:5(38%) Low Transparency:8(62%)

Table.2 Types of Puns and Strategies Distribution

The presence of the puns in the translated texts/products is affected by the degree of transparency. Whenever translators use transparently based strategies (such as pun-to pun, pun to a rhetorical device, and literary translation) to show the foreignness of the source text; then the puns are reflected clearly and a high degree of transparency is evident with more emphasis on aesthetic and sound effects. Statistical analysis shows that transparently-based strategies occur 5 times forming (38%). In contrast, the absence of the puns in the product is evident whenever translators use the non-transparently-based strategies (such as pun to non-pun, pun-to zero and decomposition). In this case, the product (IT) reflects a low degree of transparency with more emphasis on the real intended meaning of the verse. Statistical analysis shows that the non-transparently based strategies occur (8) times forming (62%). The low level of transparency can be justified based on the fact that puns in Arabic because they require special kind of attention. In Arabic, puns are a rule-governed in contrast with English puns that are context-bound (Khanfar, 2013).

The translation transparency can have both positive and negative effects on the translated product (IT). The positive effects can be illustrated by bringing the reader closer to the real world of the text and offering a window to the writing of the source language. The use of transliteration, literary translation, and pun to pun translation stands paradoxically in contrast with other strategies that

reflect decomposition of original text to show the semantic (intended meaning).

The negative effects can be emphasized whenever the distinction between the real meaning and the intended meaning is raised. The focus on the semantic aesthetic and pragmatic effect may sometimes be more important than achieving transparency especially when the meaning is lost. However, a considerable level of transparency is distinctively crucial in reflecting certain cultural specific term to magnify local details because a reader may need to be able to live in the world of the writer, not in the world of translators.

Conclusion

What is clearly reflected in the translated text is that the message can be conveyed with or without focusing on the punning distinctive features. Whenever, there is a similarity between the target and the source, the ability to incorporate the distinctive features of the puns is evident. This is supported by the use of highly-based transparent strategies. However, the situation gets complicated when the differences between the target and the source are evident. The lack of the equivalent words that reflect the punning characteristics may lead to the use of low-based transparent strategies.

Thus a translator has three options in translating puns. The first one when he is able to show the intended meaning, the aesthetic and the sound effects. The translated product has an adequate type of translation and a high degree of transparency. The second one when the translator prefers to keep the level of transparency high at the expense of the semantic meaning. Thus, the translator may keep the aesthetic and sound effects. The third one is when the translator deviates from the transparency level to place more emphasis on the intended meaning of the verse. This type of translation has a low degree of transparency.

References

- Al-Akub, I. (1996) *AL-Mufasal fi Alum ALbalaga*. Alarabia. Dubai: Dar Al-Alam Publishers.
- Al- Gamrawi, M. (1953) 'The Identical Puns (Al-jinās Al-tam)'. *Al-Resala Journal*, 1022. In Wiki Source: <https://ar.wikisource.org/wiki>
- Al-Said, I. (1986) *Repetition in Effect (Altakreer bain Almutbeer wa Altatbeer)*. Beirut: Alam Alkutub.
- As-Safadi, S. (1987) *Jinās Aljinās Fi film Albadī*. Lebanon: Dar Al-Kutub.
- Azaryoun, M., & Ghabanchi, Z. (2016). 'Translation of Puns in the Holly Quran.' *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 3. Available online: www.ijeionline.com
- Darwish, A. (2010). *Elements of translation*. Melbourne: Write scope Publishers.
- Dastjerdi, H. V., & Jamshidian, E. (2011). 'A Sacramental wordplay: An investigation of pun translatability in the two English translations of the Quran.' *Asian Social Science*, 7(1), 133.
- Duarte, J. F. (2012). *Trusting translation. A GLO N*, 17. Lisbon: University of Lisbon Center for English Studies
- Emery, P. G. (2004). 'Translation, equivalence, and fidelity: A pragmatic approach.' *Babel*, 50(2), 143-167.
- Gerzymisch, A. H. (2005). 'Introducing multidimensional translation. In EU-high-level scientific conference series. Challenges of multidimensional translation'. *MuTra Conference proceedings*, pp. 1-15. Germany: Saarland University
- Khanfar, A. K. A. (2013). *The Translation of Puns A Semantic or Pragmatic Equivalent*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nablus: An-Najah University.
- Lane-Mercier, G. (1997). 'Translating the untranslatable: The translator's aesthetic, ideological and political responsibility'. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 9(1), 43-68.
- Salama-Carr, M. (2005). 'Transparency in translating from Arabic.' *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 14(4), 103.
- Sirriyya, S. (2006) 'Al-Jinās: Its English Counterparts and the Strategies Adopted in Its Rendition'. *Journal of Islamic University*, 22, pp. 30-40.
- Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie, M. (2014). *Dictionary of translation studies*. London: Routledge.
- Ulrych, M. (2000). 'Domestication and foreignification in film translation'. *SSLMIT, Università di Trieste*. Available online: <https://www.openstarts.units.it/bitstream/10077/9228/1/Ulrych.pdf>