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General introduction
**Introduction**

Lewis Carroll’s work *Alice in Wonderland* published in 1865 is one of the classical children’s literary works that has been translated into more than 100 languages; although more than a century has passed, this novel still attracts new generations of young and older readers alike, may be because it is characterized by its work on language represented in the playful use of language and the great number of humorous puns that this novel contains; besides the kaleidoscope of effects, meaning and wordplay that it produces, thereby creating a remarkable literary work., as much as it causes problems and worries for the translators who make an attempt at its translation, because the rendition of wordplay is not just of words but of effect; thus translating *Alice in wonderland* without translating the puns is only a half translation. That is why the present study examines and compares the translation of this important rhetoric device on the corpus of two Arabic translations of Lewis Carroll’s *Alice in Wonderland*, the first by Amirah Queewan, while the second by Chakir Nasreddine.

**Statement of the problem**

The playful use of language and the humorous wordplays employed by Lewis Carroll in *Alice in Wonderland* provide enjoyment for its readers, as much as it causes problems and worries for the translators who make an attempt at its translation. The novel has been translated into more than 120 languages and today translations of Carroll’s most famous pieces of writing still have their place on bookshelves around the world. Thus; the only question that this study poses is how successful Queewan and Naserddine are in providing target readers with a similar level of humor and wittiness as the source text provides.

**Aims of the study**

This study brings into focus a case study on the translation of *Alice in Wonderland*’s puns into Arabic. It will explore the wordplay which is abundantly present in Carroll’s literary works and compare it with its translation into two Arabic versions, namely Amirah Queewan (1943) and Chakir Naserddine (2012) versions; in order to see if puns have been successfully rendered as in the original, and to shed light on the translation of such an important stylistic feature, as well as to call readers’ and translators’ attention that puns should be given appropriate attention.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study has certain limitations that require further studies by other researchers:
1. The research topic is restricted to puns translation from English into Arabic.
2. The study is narrow in scope: it is limited to Lewis Carroll’s novel and its two Arabic versions; hence other works can be addressed by future studies.
3. The sources which engaged this topic are few; hence this topic needs to be studied based on the available relevant sources.
4. It focused on Delabastita’s strategies of translating puns.

**Significance of the study**

As Carroll’s book of *Alice in wonderland* was translated into many languages throughout centuries, there was also, many undertaken researches tackling the issue of wordplay translation in his novel into many languages, since the ST is full of playful expressions, including a lot of humorous puns, parodied verses and other common rhetorical devices, which made it a significant literary work still fascinates children and adults alike. Thus, the present study analyzes the translation of *Alice in wonderland’s* puns in two Arabic variants, namely Amira Queewan’s and Chakir Nasereddine versions. Our study is the first that tackles this issue in Arabic in those versions, by providing findings on how certain humorous elements and expression in Carroll’s novel is translated into Arabic, through a detailed analysis of data obtained from comparing ST with TTs, also, comparing both versions with themselves. So far, this kind of research is still rarely seen in Arabic language, in other words, our libraries are poor of such researches, which investigate wordplay translation from English into Arabic in the well-known literary works, especially in this tale. Moreover, this comparative study makes way for further attempts to handle the translation of *Alice in Wonderland* into Arabic, especially in terms of puns and humorous expressions, in order to identify the original intention of the author and transmit that intention, by trying to produce approximately the same effect felt by ST readers.

**Literature Review**

Not all languages are created equal in particular; the cultural and linguistic distance between two languages can be very different. The greater that distance is, the more genuinely untranslatable puns can became.

Weissbord (1996) points out that wordplay sets a very serious obstacle for the translator in translating it into another language, especially when that language is not one that is related to
the source language because of the arbitrariness of the linguistic symbols. Then, the translator will have to choose different and dissimilar words instead of similar ones (Weissbord, 1996; 219). This undeniable fact, that puns are challenging and create a barrier for translators, leads different scholars to deal with such phenomenon differently by suggesting some strategies and solutions as a trial to help translators in their hard mission.

Von Flotow (1997) argues that wordplay seldom translates adequately, and a surplus of "untranslatable" wordplay, accompanied by copious translator's notes, defeats the aim of readability. He accepts that wordplay adds taste to the text or discourse, and one takes pleasure in reading it because it triggers unexpected connections between concepts, sounds and words in the reader, creating a sense of connivance with the author. Nevertheless, he thinks that the translation of wordplay is risky and in places tedious, because different languages organize their concepts, sounds, and words differently.

Gottlieb (1997) lists three cases where pun translation, which can be applied to any kind of loss in translation, among them we mention Language-specific constraints which indicate the presence of untranslatable elements in the original, the homophonic pun can be a good example for the language specific constraints. It is suggested that two words that sound alike in any language will possibly sound more differently in any target language (Gottlieb, 1997; 217). He proposes the following strategies where subtitling wordplay can be possible: render verbatim with or without humorous effect, adapt to the local setting, to maintain humorous effect; replace with non wordplay; do not render, using the space for neighboring dialogue; or insert in a different textual position, where the target language allows. Gottlieb (1997; 210)

Wecksten, too, concerned with wordplay translation and mentions three translation strategies, plus compensation, and they all imply that a fully acceptable TL solution is found: wordplay → identical wordplay and wordplay→ different wordplay, the latter with subcategories; wordplay→ wordplay using the same strategy, but different words" and "wordplay→ wordplay using different strategy as well as different words "(Wecksten, 2001; 382).

Newmark (1988; 217) refers to the translation of puns as being of a marginal importance and irresistible interest considering the difficulty of translating puns in poetry. He 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 scarified." Based on the fact that puns depend on the structural features
of a language, and that different languages have different structures, some scholars believe that the task of translating them may be considered to be an impossible one. Egan (1994, as cited in Veisbergs 1997, p. 163) is more pronounced when expressing his view on the translation of puns: "being practically untranslatable puns effectively scotch the myth of universality".

A variety of strategies are employed by the translators once faced puns in the source text. In his article, Hwang (2001) offers three strategies which are providing footnotes, writing explanation into the pun.

Pisk regarded the translation of wordplay, there is often talk of its basic untranslatability, or at least its reaching the limits of translatability (…) this is the result of a source language oriented approach to the problem with emphasis on the isolated pun as the unit of translation. If we, however, adapt a more target language oriented approach that also considers the function of the text in general, various forms of translation strategies are at our disposal (…).

Offord (1997) in his study of Shakespeare’s puns in translation points out that: "Six strategies are open to the translator when dealing with Shakespeare's wordplay:

1- Ignore the pun completely.
2- Imitate Shakespeare’s technique.
3- Major explicit on the secondary, underlying meaning.
4- Mention both meanings, and
5- Create a new wordplay. (Offord, 1997; p 241).

Furthermore, Low (2011; 62 ) claims that when it comes to humorous sentences containing wordplay puns should ideally be replicated or compensated in target language. Unless information transfer is more important than witticism, in this case priority should go to the information. In other words, it is better to explain an utterance instead of focusing a literal translation of the humorous meaning.

Several scholars (e.g. von Flotow 1997, de Vries and Verheij 1997, Henry 2003) have described strategies for translating puns, but Delabastita in his book "wordplay and translation" (1996) sees that "the translation of wordplay takes one to the heart of communication", also he discusses its difficulty by arguing that it is a paradox that the only way to be faithful to the ST is to be unfaithful to it. He adds: "while it is of course true that many wordplays cannot be transposed without substantial modifications and will accordingly bring the source-oriented translator face to face with the dilemma between 'loss' and 'adaptation' of the wordplay, this is by
the no means always the case” (Delabastita, 1996; 135). Yet, he provides the most popular techniques, which are discussed above in detail.

**Methodology**

Concerning data collection, 40 patterns comprise wordplay were extracted from the mentioned novel, the analysis of the application of Delabastita’s strategies can be realized through using a mixed method in order to critic, compare, and contrast this rhetoric device between the original tale in English and its Arabic versions, and comment below the analysis of the data.

**Choice of the Method**

In our research, which investigates puns translation from English into Arabic in *Alice in wonderland*, we opted for a mixed method. In this study, both qualitative and quantitative methods are used. The ST puns have been compared and analyzed from a qualitative perspective while their frequency and accuracy have been calculated quantitatively because the aim of this study is to examine and describe the translation of *Alice in wonderland’s* puns from English into Arabic. The choice of such a method is based on the nature of the concept investigated which is puns translation from English into Arabic in Alice in wonderland based on Delabastitas’s strategies for rendering them, and on our research main question: Are puns in Alice in wonderland successfully rendered into Arabic as in the original, in terms of formal structure and aesthetic effect? Consequently, the mixed method is the appropriate method in order to test our assumption of the untranslatability *Alice in wonderland’s* puns into Arabic in two versions and to obtain the expected results.

**Theoretical Positioning**

The query of translatability of wordplay has been discussed by some scholars who have focused on the strategies applied by translators in the process of rendering cases of puns. Delabastita, one of the scholars with the most contribution to the study of wordplay in translation, has done a large number of researches on translating puns. He devoted his doctoral dissertation to the study of strategies used in translating wordplays in *Hamlet* to Dutch, French, and German languages. His doctoral dissertation, defended in 1990, was later adapted and published in 1993.

Thus in this research, Delabastita’s strategies for translating wordplay (1993 and 1996) will be used to compare and analyze the wordplay found in the corpus of Alice in wonderland and its two Arabic versions to see how they have been translated into Arabic.

**Research Questions**
The questions of this study are as follows:

**Main Question**
Are puns in *Alice in wonderland* successfully rendered into Arabic?

**Secondary Questions**
1. How do puns create lots of problems and challenges for translators?
2. What are Delabatistas’s translation strategies that have been used to translate the ST puns into Arabic?
3. Is the presumed intended effect of the ST puns maintained or lost in the TT?
4. Which is the most frequently used strategy in each variant?
5. Which is the most frequently used strategy in the whole corpus?

**Research Hypotheses**
Based on the questions of this study, the following hypotheses are developed:
1. Wordplay in *Alice in wonderland* is not successfully rendered into Arabic by Amirah Queewan and Chakir Naserddine.
2. Among Delabastita’s strategies for translating puns; the non-selective option is the most applied in both versions.

**Structure of the Study**
This piece of research is divided into two main parts theoretical, and practical.
Throughout the theoretical part we have presented a notional background about puns, discussing its origin, definition and typologies in both English and Arabic together with the mechanisms of producing puns and its main characteristics. This chapter also sheds light on dirk Delabastita’s strategies for translating puns; then it focuses on the notion of translatability and untranslatability of puns as essential issues in this process.
The second part is practical; which is devoted firstly, to explore Alice in wonderland by giving a brief summary about the nature and the content of this novel followed by Lewis Carroll’s biography. Secondly this part deals with application, where some examples of puns found in the ST and the two translations are taken under examination within the body of the research, while the complete list of examples used in this study can be found in the appendix; so, in order to compare and analyze puns and their translations, a number of tables of two or three columns are formed for easier analysis of each pun. The first column contains the original pun, the other
column contains its corresponding counterpart in the TT, together with the number of page they appear in, followed by a detailed analysis of each pun, in order to discover the strategy used from Delabastita’s list, and to see if puns have been successfully rendered as in the original. For better understanding, the revealed results are presented statistically in a table and a graph for each version, followed by a detailed discussion of the obtained findings. The paper is completed by some conclusions referring to the corpus analyzed and recommendations about the implication of this study in the future.
The Theoretical Part

(Pun in Translation Context)
I.1. Introduction

Carroll plays with language throughout the Alice books, many witty word plays that also provide ingenious insights into the very nature of language into how language enables the creation of wordplay and why it is so difficult to translate wordplay into other languages (Weissbord, 1996; p.219). As a linguistic device of humor, puns creates a great challenge to translators for rendering them successfully from the ST into the TT; it is indeed a challenging and highly creative process for translators who are usually faced with the task of having to translate seemingly untranslatable pun without reducing its effect, this difficulty of translating puns from language into another increases more between languages from different families like English and Arabic due to the difference in the nature of the linguistic system of each language. In order to be able to analyze the translation of the ST puns, the definition and classification of pun is needed. There are many different points of view about this concept; however, we will focus on the definition of Dirk Delabastita who is professor of English literature and literary theory at the Facultés Universitaires Notre-Dame de la Paix, Namur (Belgium). He edited two volumes on the translation of wordplay: Wordplay and Translation (1996, a special issue of The Translator) and Traductio, and Essays on Punning and Translation (1997) (St. Jerome Publishing, 2013).

I.2. The Origin of Pun

The origin of term pun according to Online Etymology Dictionary (n.d.), dated back to 1660s, where the first reference of its use was attested, it has Italian origin from Puntiglio "small or fine point”, the person who makes puns is generally called punster, Since the amount of information about the history of pun is limited, it is very difficult to tell whether these dates are correct or not. According to Redfern, puns were a very popular figure of speech used during the Tudors, Elizabethan as well as the Victorian period. The examples of puns can be seen in Shakespeare or Donne and many other writers (as cited in Dvořáková, 2012, p. 8).

Bates (1999), states 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.
I.3. The Definition of Pun

Every definition of puns emphasizes the similarity of form versus the difference in meaning. According to Sherzer "a pun is a form of speech play in which a word or phrase unexpectedly and simultaneously combines two unrelated meanings" (1978 336). In Heller’s words about pun" the pun represents not just one pattern but rather an entire class of different patterns which all share the following structural characteristics: namely, that a single manifesting mark signals more than one conceptual function” (1974: 271).

Sherzer’s and Heller’s definition of puns regard those pun in which one lexical item or sequence can be interpreted in two different ways, but not for those other examples which are depended on the close vicinity of two or more words or sequence that are same in form but different in meaning.

Leech defined pun as follows “[a] pun is a fore grounded lexical ambiguity, which may have its origin either in homonymy or polysemy” (1969: 209). On the other hand, leech’s definition neglects somehow those puns which are based on syntactic vagueness or on phenomenon such as homophony or homography.

Considering the definition of the ‘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"

In OED”s definition, humorous effect seems to be required for a pun, but there is now reluctance to accept that pun or wordplay should always confines to humorous effect"

Dirk Delabastita 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 1993: 57)
Delabastita’s definition considered more precise, even if it is couched in linguistic terminology and it is more rigid version of the above dictionary definition, at the same time; it is general to suit and cover the various types of pun, that were not included in the previous definitions. In his definition Delabastita mentioned that puns are based on confrontation of linguistic forms, which are similar in form, but different in meaning (Delabastita 1993:58) this similarity appears in terms of spelling and pronunciation; therefore it is a confrontation of similar forms and different meanings between the linguistic structures that give rise to ambiguity.

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 (Delabastita 1996:131). The fact that pun is communicatively significant means that it has a communicative effect, each effect can for instance be humorous, attention-getting, often seen in newspaper headlines) or persuasive (frequent in marketing material) (Diaz Pérez 2008 :37) in that; pun need to be conveyed in especially textually created settings in order to be effective (Diaz Pérez 2008:37). As it is stated by Brown:

"A necessary condition for pun perception is a context in which multiple and disparate meanings for the pun word are acceptable; the context must concern itself with certain matters if a pun is to be made on a certain word” (Delabastita 1993:70)

Thus, we can consider a pun effective only when the context allows for a double-reading to be triggered.

The above definitions of pun are consistent with Arab authors’ definitions, called "Tawriyah" in Arabic. In his book تدرية، التوروية والبلاغة العربية، Taloub (1980:298) mentions some other names for, التوروية، التوجيه، التخيل. But it's preferable to call it التوروية because, it is derived from the verb "وري" means to hide something and show another.

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.

Although not all the authors agree on the equality of the two terms, puns is often used interchangeably with the term wordplay as Delabastita stated (1993) “I will consider pun synonymous with ‘instance’ of wordplay” (cited in Schröter, 2005: p 86), so for the sake of
clarity we choose to go along with Delabastita’s decision to employ the term *pun* and *wordplay* synonymously in this thesis too.

I.4. Classification of *Pun*

many scholars have tried to classify pun into different typologies but it is still difficult to classify wordplay. The typology of pun is different from language to another due to the difference of linguistic systems, therefore; we choose to display its classification in both English and Arabic because the nature of pun in both languages is different: they are context-bound in English whole they are related out in Arabic.

I.4.1. Pun in English

puns in English are divided by many scholars into different categories most of which are as follows:

Delabastita (1996) makes two basic classifications of puns; firstly they are classified into vertical and horizontal depending on the presence of their components parts; in the horizontal pun the lexical items are present in the text approach each other, while in vertical pun an item is missing has to be "triggered into semantic action by contextual constraints" (Delabastita 1996: 129) secondly, he divided puns into four types based on formal identity which are:

1. **The Homophonic Pun**
   This type refers to words sound alike but different in spelling "tale" and "tail" are the examples.

2. **The Homographic Pun**
   This type refers to words of same spelling but of different meaning. "Gag" (piece of cloth, joke).

3. **The Patronymic Pun**
   It refers to words that have slight difference in both spelling and pronunciation to take one example, the words "concern" and "concert" are differ only with regard to their last phoneme.

4. **The Homonymic Pun**
   It refers to lexical items which are of the same form but different meaning, "axe" (tool, to remove) is an example of homonym.

Gottieb’s classification of puns is similar to Delabastita’s one, he only adds three subcategories of homonymy:

- **Lexical Homonymy** the central feature is single-word ambiguity.
- **Colloacational Homonymy**: the central feature is the word-in-context ambiguity.
Phrasal Homonymy: the central feature is the close ambiguity.

5. Polysemic Pun
it refers to the phenomenon that one and the same word acquires different, through obviously related, meanings, often with respect to particular contexts, polysemy differs from homonymy because it is obviously that the meanings of a polysemous expression are related to each other to example of the word "bank" in three related uses. The "bank" raised its interest rates yesterday, The store is next to the newly constructed "bank". "The bank" appeared first in Italy in the Renaissance.

6. Palindrome
palindromes are spelled the same backwards and forwards, such as "mom", "race car" or "defied" (Pun and Wordplay 2001).

7. Compound Pun
It refers to two or more puns in a statement like Richard whately’s complex statement "why can’t a man starve in the great desert? Because he can eat the sand which is there, but what brought sandwiches there? Noah send ham and his descendants mustered and bred" there are many puns here which are "sand which is" with "sandwiches", "Ham" (Noah’s son) with "ham" (kind of pig meat), "mustered" with "mastered" and "bred" with "bread".

8. Recursive Pun
The second meaning of punning word depends on the understanding of an element in the first aspect. Example is the statement "infinity is not in finity", means that infinity is not in the finite range.

9. Parody Pun
Parody pun is based on the needs expressed in the form of the structure of parody well-known as aphorisms, proverbs or so on (Chengming, 2004: 89). This type of pun is an existing social, cultural knowledge-based. Here is an example from James Joyce Finnegan's Wake in which he plays on the idiomatic expression "As different as chalk from cheese": As different as York from Leeds.

10. Visual Pun
The aspects of a pun are replaced by picture, this kind is used in cartoons like "the Far side".
11. Naming or Onomastic Pun
It is used especially in Hebrew bible with names of characters reflecting their characters or destiny in Hebrew which creates a twofold meanings for instance Israel means he struggles with God and Jacob means he grasps the heel; it fulfills an important role in the scriptures, literary and semi-literary works ranging from Arterix comic stripes to Dante and dickens e.g. Oliver Twist. (Delabastita, 1997)

12. Malapropism
This type of wordplay refers to misuse of one word for another, usually with comic effect; it is named after Mrs. Malaprop a character in an eighteenth-century play who’s notorious for such unwitting utterances, as exemplified by the character line "she is headstrong as an allegory on the bank of Nile".

13. Simile
It is a figure of speech in which two unlike things are explicitly compared, as in "she is like a rose".

14. Idiom-Based Pun
It is a subtype of puns in which idioms are manipulated in such a way to a playful humorous effect, such in the idiom "to be in the doghouse".

I.4.2. Puns in Arabic
Puns in Arabic can be classified into the following categories:

1. Tam 

In this kind of pun, the words are exactly of the same forms and spellings, but of different meanings (Alsafadi, 1987). The examples are ساعة (i.e. Judgment Day) and (i.e. time). Being of the same characteristics, homonymy is this pun's counterpart in English.

2. Naqis

According to Alsafadi (1987), the term is used when the two similar words are different in the number of letters, i.e. extra letters are added to one of the two words. These extra letters can be in the beginning, middle, or at the end like البحر/البحر The addition of the extra letters to the beginning of one of the two words makes another kind of pun called مطلوب سباق and مطلوب سباق On the other hand, if this addition occurs at the end of one of the two words, it would be called منقلب and مدار are the instances of this kind of pun.
3. **Modari**

The term is used when the similar words are different just in one letter in each word. This kind of pun occurs when the place of the articulation of the two different letters is almost the same (Alsafadi, 1987), like خير and خليل. On the basis of similarity and closeness of sounds, paronomy can be equated with this kind of pun.

4. **Lahik**

In this kind of pun, the similar words are differentiated both by a single letter (in each word) and also in their place of articulation (see همزة and لمة (Alsafadi, 1987)).

5. **Moharraf**

As Alsafadi (1987) states, in this kind of pun, the difference of the similar words arises from the difference in the diacritics of the two words like البرد and البرد.

6. **Mosahhaf**

The two similar words are differentiated by dots above or below the letters يحسون and يحسنون (Alsafadi, 1987).

7. **Kalb**

In this kind of pun, according to Khaghani (1997), the reversion of the letters happens either in the whole or one part of structure of one of the two words (refer to فكية and كفية). Anagrams in English are very much close to this kind of Arabic pun.

8. **Mostawi**

This kind of pun is found in phrases or sentences which are read the same, backwards or forwards; to this extent, they are read from the end to the beginning as if they are being read from the beginning to the end, (Al-Shirazi, 1997) like الفلك في كل. Palindrome, a type of English pun, is regarded as equivalent to this Arabic pun. ‘Live not on evil’ provides a relevant example.

9. **Ishtikak**

In this kind of pun, the two different words are puns that derive from the same root (Khaghani, 1997), like سلم and مسلمون. Polyptoton, one type of homophonic puns, is the English equivalent of this pun.

10. **Shibh Ishtikak**

In this kind of pun, similar words are derived from different roots (Khaghani, 1997) (see قال and قالين). This study will mainly focus upon analyzing the first type.
I.5. Pun and Ambiguity

Pun is a figure of speech depending upon a similarity of sound and a disparity of meaning, in that they can be regarded as a special form of ambiguity which is a common phenomenon that cannot be avoidable in any natural language. Usually it is defined as expressions which have more than one meaning. Ambiguity plays both negative and positive roles. Negative ambiguity will be an obstacle to communication so it should be avoided, while intentional ambiguity can create a special effect such as irony, sarcasm, humor, etc. Ambiguity can be divided into three types. They are phonological ambiguity, morphological ambiguity, lexical ambiguity, and semantic ambiguity:

1. Phonological Ambiguity

Phonological ambiguities are produced when a set of sounds can be said in more than one way. One word might be made to sound like another word. This may be because the words sound so similar, or it may be because of the way we mark out the word when we say it involves various manipulations of words at the level of sound (See woester 2011; 74) mainly through homophony and paronymy.

2. Morphological Ambiguity

Many lexically-based ambiguities rely on morphological divisions for the realization of humor (See woester 2011: 94-96).

3. Lexical Ambiguity

It stems from the existence of homophony and polysemy. Homophony occurs when a single word has more than one meaning.

4. Semantic Ambiguity

It occurs when a single word profiles multiple senses, unlike lexical ambiguity, which its conceptual frame impose only the use of certain words, semantic ambiguity also imposes certain extra-linguistic referents in order to well understand what it is communicated.

Ambiguity is the basic principle of wordplay (Attrado, 1993, p.549), that vagueness arises when expression have different meanings, but latter; both Attrado (1994) and Ritchie (2004) stated that ambiguity is not adequate condition for punning, in that; a single word that has two meanings does not automatically make it a pun. "All words are ambiguous, vague, or unspecified if they are not taking in context" (1994: 133). Attrado suggests two elements in order to make ambiguity transformed into a pun. Firstly, the two punning expressions should have opposite meanings.
Secondly, pun should be "authored" in that, ambiguity should be pointed out by someone (cited in Partington, 2009, p.1759).

I.6. Mechanisms for Producing Pun

Partington (2009) suggested two separate linguistic mechanisms for the production of wordplay. Both of them depend on the acceptance of the idiom as the basic principle in interpretation of normal communication. The two mechanisms are "Relexicalisation" and "Reconstruction":

1. The Relexicalisation Pun
In this mechanism the block is broken up by the hearer who is presented with a (semi)-fixed expression. Something in the discourse, however, makes him break up the parts of the expression and reinterpret the utterance using the open choice principle.

2. The Reconstruction Pun
The hearer is presented with an expression which is a reworking and rewording of another preconstructed expression in which some of its parts are displayed and the hearer has to rebuild the block. In this case, the effect partly relies on the factor of surprise at the unexpected and on the challenge of recognizing the allusion (Partington, 2009, p. 1803).

I.7. Pun Usage

I.7.1. Pun Usage in English

1. Riddles, Jokes and Humor
Polysemic pun often is used in riddles while many types of homonymy is used in jokes including jokes that manipulate the elements of word structure, and that focus on the alternative meanings or applications of a word or a phrase, or that result from the similarity of sound (auditory jokes).
Here is an instance taken from Phillips (1998):
Teacher: what is an emperor?
Student: I do not know.
Teacher: An emperor is a ruler.
Student: Oh, sure. I used to carry an emperor to school with me (ibid: 78).

2. Literature
Pun is a standard rhetorical or poetic device in English literature and many other literatures. It is very often intended humorously, but not always. Pun has been used by many famous writers, such as Alexander Pope, Vladimir Nabokov, Robert Bloch, James Joyce and Shakespeare. A
famous pun by the great punster Shakespeare in his sonnet:
When forty winters shall besiege thy brow,
And dig deep trenches in thy beauty’s field.

3. Advertisement
The use of rhetorical figures plays a crucial role within the process of advertising because the main goal of it is not only to inform but also to persuade (Thornborrow, 1998:258). Ming (2005:229) adds that the goal of advertisements is to attract people for shopping. Therefore, manufacturers do their best to utilize puns in for the sake of generating new meanings. Using puns skillfully makes advertising language vivid and humorous, e.g.: Make your every hello a real good... buy.

4. Bible
Pun is used in the Bible (in both the Old and the New Testament). Bilello (1999:4) states that Bible humor is never frivolous; it is usually used to create an emphatic point. Moreover, humor is a story-telling device that makes a memorable impact on the receiver e.g.: Jesus tells the Pharisees:
"You, blind guides! You strain out a gnat (galma), but swallow a camel (gama )".Mathew 23:23.

1.7.2. Pun usage in Arabic
1. Riddles, Jokes and Humor
"Tawriyah" is used in jokes and riddles for humorous purposes. In the following famous example uses that is based on hiding the real intended meaning, once an old woman asked prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) to pray for her to enter paradise. The prophet told her ﻻ يدخل ﺍﻟﺠﻨﺔ ﻋﺠﻮز certainly the prophet doesn’t mean that this specific old woman doesn’t enter paradise. He means that the age of people in is the age of youth.

2. Hiding Truth
The speaker hide the facts that he/she fears to reveal, and avoid lying, e.g. when our prophet (peace be upon him) and his companion Abu Bakr (May Allah be pleased with him) met some shepherds in their way to Medina, they have been asked ﻣﻦ ﺑﻨﻲ ﻣﺎء , the prophet said: ﻣﻦ ﺑﻨﻲ ماء ؟ since ماء is a name of an Arabic tribe, and this is the cover. What the prophet meant is that they are created of water.
3. Literature

Literary works contain Tawriyah as figure of speech that increases the beauty of the speech and creates great effect on the reader, for instance:

لا تعرضن على الرجال قصيدة
فمتى عرضت الشعر غير مهدب
ما لم تبالغ في شهدتها
عده منك وساؤتاهدي بها

4. The Holly Qur'an

Tawriyah used in The Holly Qur'an seriously as impressive figures that make the speech more eloquent, memorable and have a great effect on readers the following ayah is a very clear example:

"وَيَوْمٌ تَقُومُ السَّاعَةُ يَقْسِمُ اَلْمَجْرَمِينَ مَا لَبِثَتْ غَيْرَ السَّاعَةٌ" الروم 55

1.8. Delabastita’s Strategies for Translating Pun

The Translator faces various cases of puns in the ST and may treat them differently according to the type of translating process in his mind. However, special strategies have been determined for translating pun and wordplay as special literary forms. Delabastita (1996) believes that a wide range of methods are at the translator's disposal to translate a case of wordplay. Delabsitata (1996) offers an elaborate list of nine strategies for translating puns which are:

1. Pun-to-Pun
The ST pun is rendered by TL pun which does not necessarily have the same properties of the ST pun.

2. Pun-to-Non-Pun
In which the ST pun is represented by a non-pun in the TL. The translator may or may not perceive the pun, this strategy is divided into three subcategories which are:

2.1. Selective-Non-Pun
One of the two linguistic meanings of the source text pun has been translated more or less equivalently, while the other has been deleted. This solution is common in translations of vertical puns where an equivalent vertical pun is not available in the target language.

2.2. Non-Selective-Non-Pun
Both meanings of source language pun are conveyed but in a non-punning manner. This solution is common in translations of horizontal puns.
2.3. Diffuse Paraphrase
The original meanings have been translated 'beyond recognition due to the rather free treatment of the entire punning passage.

3. Rhetorical Related Device
The pun has evidently been perceived by the translator and has been translated by another wordplay related rhetorical device or punoid (repetition, alliteration, rhyme, referential vagueness, irony, paradox etc...) often when no satisfactory equivalent target language pun is available.

4. Pun-to-Zero
The pun in the ST is simply omitted in the TT together with its context.

5. Direct Copy
The ST pun has been copied into the TT without translation and change of its form and meaning ensuring that the text would be understood by the target text reader without any major effort.

6. Transference
like direct copy, the difference is that it imposes source language signified on a target language text by way of a word coined by translator or a using a specific source language grammatical construction that would not normally be used in the target language, while the method of direct copy brings the original signifiers into the TT without any necessary concern about its meaning.

7. Non-Pun-to Pun (Addition)
The translator inserts a new pun in the TT which does not exist in the ST in order to compensate a ST pun which is lost elsewhere.

8. Zero-to-Pun (Addition)
New textual material containing a pun has been introduced into the target text as a compensatory device.

9. Editorial Techniques
Explanatory footnotes or endnotes, comments in translator's forewords, 'anthological' presentation of different, complementary solutions etc. (Delabastita, 1996, p.134).

I.9. Translatability vs. Untranslatability of Pun
The task of translating wordplay may be, and sometimes is, considered to be an impossible because puns depend on the structural features of a language, and each language has different
structure. On the other hand, the fact that translations of texts in which puns are present or even texts that are interspersed with them exist, shows that it is indeed possible to translate such texts. There has been a huge debate between translation scholars on translatability or untranslatability of the pun. Whether it is possible to transfer the semantic and pragmatic effects of the ST puns, which are rooted in specific characteristics of the SL and for which no counterparts exists in the TT has been a point of argument for many years (Delabastita, 1994).

The voice on the untranslatability of puns seems to be loud, according to Luthe (1995, 64) there can never be a perfect translation of anything, but in relation to linguistic humor he justifies the impossibility of a perfect translation as being due to “linguistic as well as historical-cultural difference”.

Weissbrod (1996) claims that it is possible to make ‘contrived’ mistakes which are plays on words, because the nature of linguistic symbols is arbitrary; a word or words similar in form and sound may convey very different meanings. Yet simultaneously, the arbitrariness of linguistic symbols which enables wordplay sets a very serious obstacle for the translator in translating it into another language, especially when that language is not one that is related to the source language. Then, the translator will have to choose different and dissimilar words instead of similar ones.

Redfern (1984) claims that puns are untranslatable due to two reasons, "Firstly, the status of puns is never a secure one, over the centuries, puns have been struggling between acceptability and rejection, nonsense and point, decency and obscenity" (Redfern, 1984, p. 1).

Secondly, the translation of puns has always been a hard nut to crack, because the double meanings of puns are always the combined effect of phonological and semantic features, which can hardly be kept when translated into another language, especially those are of different families (Redfern, 1984, p.2).

Reiss also states that “In translation, puns and other kinds of play with language will have to be ignored to a great extent so as to keep the content invariant” (2000, p.169)

Fitts (1959:39) declares that “[a] joke can be a nuisance”, particularly when it needs to be translated, or when Boyer refers to humor as an “obstacle intercultural” (2001) they are thinking of cultural as much as of linguistic differences between receivers, yet they both illustrate their point with ‘untranslatable’ examples of jokes/humor that depend at least in part on language-play.
In relation to that, Tiersma (1985) sees that paraphrase or translation is not solution to render the linguistic humor from language into another “linguistic humor rarely allows [...] paraphrase or translation arguing that pun in English for instance cannot be translated into another, "unless by an extremely unlikely coincidence" (1985:2).

Hausmann asserts that the reason behind the untranslatability of wordplay is its meta-linguistic properties which are in relation to the linguistic structure of the language, he puts it like this: "The untranslatability [of the wordplay] is a consequence of [its] meta-linguistic character which directs the attention to the structure of the language"

The view of untranslatability of puns is clear for Egan who states that: "being practically untranslatable puns effectively scotch the myth of universality."

This is an argument of the untranslatability of poetry by Jakobson (1959) who admits that poetry over reign by puns definition is untranslatable, he states that:

"In poetry [...] any constituents of the verbal code [...] are confronted, juxtaposed, brought into contiguous relation according to the principle of similarity and contrast and carry their own autonomous signification. Phonemic similarity is sensed as semantic relationship. The pun, or to use a more erudite, and perhaps more precise term – paronomasia, reigns over poetic art, and whether its rule is absolute or limited, poetry by definition is untranslatable" (Jakobson1959:238).

But, Jakobson (1959), claims that all cognitive experience can be rendered in any language, and when there was a deficiency terminology may be qualified and amplified by loanwords or loan-translations, neologisms or semantic shifts, and finally, by circumlocutions.

Hatim (2009, 10) argues, "Sound and rhyme and double meaning are unlikely to be recreated in the TL [target language]", i.e. poetry, song, advertising, punning, are difficult to translate.

The untranslatability of puns is asserted by Catford (1964) who justified that the ambiguity of puns is a property of the ST, which seems to be “a cline rather than a clear-cut dichotomy (1965, p.93).

However, when he classifies the limits of translatability into linguistic and cultural ones, he also puts puns in the first category: "Linguistic untranslatability occurs typically in cases where an ambiguity peculiar to the SL text is a functionally relevant feature e.g. in SL puns" (1965, p. 94).

Such views discourage the research into the translation of puns and assert that any attempt to translate puns is doomed to failure, however; the balance seems to have shifted to somewhere in
between translatability and untranslatability. Davis asserts that, while texts are not totally translatable, they cannot be totally untranslatable because language systems do show similarities. She points out that “translation is always relative, and relative translation is always possible” (Davis 1997:33).

There are some literary tactics which are suggested by Weissbrod such as:

- Employing all stylistic levels and historical strata accessible in the target language, even if they have no parallel in the source text
- Changing one or more of the meanings of the original wordplay so that they can be condensed again into one word or words similar in form or sound
- Changing the type of wordplay or its location in the text (Weissbrod, 1996: 221)

Using one of these tactics or different possibilities, an imaginative translator can often replace untranslatable wordplay with another one, that conveys a similar feeling (theworld.com) when there is not such a similarity found in both languages, which is often the case. If giving up a wordplay does not merely dispense with an element of aesthetic beauty or rhetorical persuasion, but actually detracts from the very semantic cohesion or narrative logic of the complete phrase or passage, then it may reasonably be assumed that for many translators this is going to be a serious factor to be given some priority (de Vries & Verheij, 1997).

Newmark also (1988) proposed some general principles for the translation of different types of puns. For example, pun based on Graeco-Latinisms with near-equivalents in SL and TL is the easiest to be translated, especially when it only embody a contrast between the words literal and figurative meanings. He sees that pun sometimes can be compensated by another pun with different words but associated meaning if the purpose of the pun is merely to raise laughter. According to Newmark, puns in poems have to be sacrificed due to the conflict between double meanings and the metrical requirement. Puns with more emphasis on the sense rather than the witticism, e.g. a slip of the tongue or spoonerism, have to be explicated in both senses in the TL. These principles, though brief and sketchy, could be of some practical help to translators when dealing with puns. However, Newmark believes that “the translation of puns is of marginal importance”.

Crisafulli (1996) also tackles the adoption of compensation in pun translation in his justification of Cary’s avoidance policy when translating Dante’s puns in the *Divine Comedy*,
Giving consideration to the translator’s ideology.
Among the few scholars committed to the study of puns and their translation, Delabastita (1996) undoubtedly holds a prominent place. Delabastita (1996, 133-134) claims that “the significant wordplay in the original text has to be preserved rather than eliminated.” Although it is sometimes impracticable, he provides nine strategies for rendering puns and recognizes that the importance of puns lies in their intention, i.e. they are meaningful only when intended to be so. But the different strategies proposed for the translation of puns are more product-focused than process-oriented.
Delabastita (1993) offers the most profound discussion of the topic. By analyzing claims of the untranslatability of wordplay, and revealing the assumptions that must underlie them, he criticizes the entire notion at the same time and sets his own understanding of translation against it.
In particular, Delabastita (1993:182-190) makes the following points:

- Languages are not as different from each other as some proponents of the untranslatability theory seem to think; all languages share some features with other languages, and more if they are typologically, historically or otherwise related
- It is thus better, on the one hand, to specify under what circumstances (type of wordplay, relationship between SL and TL, etc.) there is reduced translatability of wordplay and, on the other hand, to stop thinking of translatability in terms of an absolute and to consider it as a cline instead
- Puns are generally part of a text and their translatability should not be judged in isolation, but rather according to their functions and the text type they appear in; a pun’s translatability thus depends also on the extent to which an exact replication would be desirable, or some other solution acceptable
- To claim the untranslatability of wordplay implies that one knows beforehand what translation is, and that one’s understanding of it is very narrow; in essence, there is a normative view behind such claims, which is problematic for many reasons, e.g. because one would have to condemn many established and accepted translations as bad or non-translations, especially if the source text contains puns.
Finally, rendering puns from language into another can be problematic if it serves a special function in the text that is not, or not only, the arousal of mirth e.g. political messages that are illustrated and strengthen by purposefully ambiguous or otherwise attention-grabbing formulations that would fall under wordplay. In other words, the search for an equivalent solution will be even less easy or rather harder, if the function of an example of wordplay or pun is special or complex.

I.10. Conclusion

To sum up, this part provides a closer look at wordplay by placing the study into its theoretical frames related to puns. Puns are first introduced and described by way of its origin, definitions, typologies, and its usage in both English and Arabic, followed by identifying two main mechanisms of producing such a linguistic device. Next, the notion of ambiguity is discussed briefly as a main principle of puns. Finally, Delabatista’s commonest strategies of translating puns together with a debate between scholars on translatability and untranslatability of puns are given some focus in this chapter.

The following part of this thesis will monitor cases in which words or expressions that constitute a pun in ST are translated into Arabic using different techniques from Delabastitas’s list, accompanied by the representation of the results of our findings through tables and charts, will be helpful in drawing conclusions and recommendations for this study, given by the end of this research.
The Practical Part
II.1. Introduction
In order to fulfill the aims of this research, we have selected a total of forty (40) puns which are analyzed; the analysis shall be preceded by the methodology used, the Author’s Biography and the novel’s summary.
Then, we have carefully compared the puns in the original ST and their translations in the two variants in Arabic language; after that, we have highlighted several strategies from Delabastita’s list, which will be presented below. Each strategy will be illustrated by examples. A comprehensive analysis of all strategies, accompanied by their representation through tables and graphs for better understanding, then; a general conclusion will be given by the end of this research, followed by a general summary of the study in Arabic.

II.2. Methodology
The material for this study is collected from Lewis Carroll’s novel *Alice in wonderland* and from its two Arabic translations by Amira Queewan and Chakir Naserddine. The data of the present study consists of altogether forty (40) English expressions comprise puns and their Arabic translation. A comparative analysis between the ST and the TTs is held in this chapter in order to determine to what extent the translators succeed or not in rendering its components effects. In addition to that, the analysis translating these patterns is based on Delabastita’s translation techniques.

II.3. Corpus
In order to examine puns translatability from English into Arabic and investigate Delabastita’s used strategies in the versions, a book titled *Alice in Wonderland* written by Lewis Carroll (1865) in English is chosen by the researchers. The materials used in this study are:

- A book of *Alice in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll (1865) written in English.
- Two Arabic translations of the source text: the first by Amirah Queewan published in 1943 by Dar Albihar and the second by Chakir Naserddine published in (2012).

In this section, 40 data out of the puns under study were gathered and analyzed according to Delabastita’s (1996) strategies. Then, the frequency and percentage of each strategy were calculated. The results were presented in tables and graphs. Some more prominent examples were presented below as better illustration of the pun translation strategies. The whole examples were presented in appendix.
II.4. The Author’s Biography

Charles Lutwidge Dodgson, who was born on January 27, 1832, is better known by his pen name Lewis Carroll, was an English writer, mathematician, logician, Anglican deacon, and photographer. His most famous writings are *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and its equal *Through the Looking Glass*. He is noted for his facility at wordplay, logic and fantasy. Carroll was 30 years old when he first told the adventures of Alice to Alice Liddell, the daughter of the Dean of Christ Church College in Oxford, then the novel named so after her name. The book was first published under the title *Alice's Adventures Underground* and after amending it, Carroll later published it in 1865 under the new title *Alice's adventures in wonderland* (Caroll, 2010; 12). The success of *Alice in wonderland* encouraged Carroll to release *Through the Looking Glass* in 1871 (Cohen, 1995; 182).

II.5. Summary of Alice in Wonderland

The story is that of Alice, a little girl was sitting next to her sister who is reading a book. Alice was feeling bored because the book was free of pictures or conversations. She was sleeping and dreaming that she fell into a hole after followed a white rabbit thus, it began her adventures in a wonderland full of talking animals and wondrous creatures, where she met many strange characters, including the Cheshire cat, the Mad Hatter, the Queen of Hearts, the Mock Turtle, and other fanciful creatures, she saw a lot of crazy events like the mad party-tea, the match of croquet, the story of the Mock Turtle, the crazy trial, and many other wondrous events. At the end of story Alice wake up of sleep.
We are going here, to extract ST puns, then we will compare them with their corresponding counterparts in the previous versions in order to achieve our target.

II.2.1. Analysis of Puns ‘Translation in Naserddine’s Version

There are four different strategies for rendering puns that are applied in Naserddine’s version; the option most frequently applied in the translation of puns is non-selective-non-pun which is a subtype of pun-to-non-pun strategy; the nonselective variant maintains the two ST meanings without assembling them into a pun. The editorial techniques are among the opted choices in his version; since we found parentheses inside the main text in order to paraphrase or explain the ST pun; in addition to the pun-to-pun technique which is successfully utilized several times in this version; we found also that Naserddine opted for the strategy of pun-to-zero in one case.

Strategy 1: "Non-Selective-Non-Pun"

The strategy of pun-to-non-pun according to Delabastita’s strategies for translating puns is the one applied commonly in Naserddine’s version in which the original pun is rendered linguistically by replacing it with a non-pun in the TT thereby losing all the presumed intended effect. There are three subtypes of this translation technique which are determined by the degree of change or loss of meaning, the most used category of pun-to-non-pun in Naserddine version is non-selective-non-pun:

E.g. 01:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…you see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its <em>axis</em>’ said Alice  ‘Talking of <em>axes</em>” said the Duchess ‘chop off her head!”</td>
<td>…كما تعلمون الأرض تدور حول نفسها باستمرار على مدار أربع وعشرين ساعة...” فيما يخص الفأس جزي رأسه إذا…”  قالت الدوقة. ص66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example the ST pun is based on homophony since the words *axis* (the imaginary line through the earth) and *axes* (a tool for cutting wood) sound alike but differ in spelling, which form a sort of rhyme. The translator failed to catch the rhyme and the wordplay together in the given context, therefore he translated it just literally basing on non-selective-non-pun option without reproducing the same intended effect found in the original.
The homonymic word *poor* which has two different meanings (needy, not skillful) is translated linguistically word for word by Naserddine who used non-selective-non-pun option, thus losing the aesthetic and stylistic effect of the ST pun, transmitting loosely the superficial meaning and ignoring the implications altogether.

In this example, Alice is trying to find out what would happen after her fall through the earth and she incorrectly used the word *antipathies* - noun in plural form described in Cambridge Dictionaries Online (2013) as “feelings of strong dislike, opposition, or anger” instead of „the Antipodeans” derived from the word *the Antipodes* referring to Australia and New Zealand by people living in the northern hemisphere.”

The play on words in Alice’s passage represented in the interference between the words *antipathies* and *the Antipodes* is totally absent in translation since *antipathies* is translated literally which does not interfere with أعداء الأرجل.
“When we were little,” the Mock Turtle went on at last, more calmly, though still sobbing a little now and then, “we went to school in the sea. The master was an old (p142)

In this example the noun school may be understood in two different ways. The first and the most common meaning is "a place where children go to be educated" but there may be another explanation in this case because it is story of sea creatures, a noun "school" may be understood as (a large number of fish or other sea creatures swimming in a group) unlike in Arabic the word مدرسة denotes to one common meaning. It is not sure whether this homonymy is used intentionally, but it is completely lost in TT.

E.g. 05:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Twinkle, twinkle, little bat!</td>
<td>تلالا، تلالا أيها الخفافيش الصغير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How I wonder what you’re at! &quot;</td>
<td>ما أعجب قدمتك هنا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Up above the world you fly,</td>
<td>بعيدا في أعلاي الدنيا تطير</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like a tea-tray in the sky.</td>
<td>مثل صينية شاي في السماء</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twinkle, twinkle &quot; (p103)</td>
<td>تلالا تلالا ص 78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The play on poems is a typical feature of Alice in Wonderland, this is an example of parody poem in which the original poem is transformed by Lewis Carroll for the purpose of Alice in wonderland, The Hatter sings this very short tune to Alice as part of his story and when Alice says, “I’ve heard something like it,” she refers to the popular poem “The Star” (1806) by Jane Taylor (p146). The original version of this poem is:

Twinkle, twinkle, little star,
How I wonder what you are!
Up above the world so high, Like a diamond in the sky

E.g. 06:
“Will you walk a little faster?” said a whiting to a snail,
“There’s a porpoise close behind us and he’s treading on my tail.
See how eagerly the lobsters and the turtles all advance!
They are waiting on the shingle – will you come and join the dance?
Will you won’t you, will you, won’t you, will you join the dance?
Will you won’t you, will you, won’t you, won’t you join the dance? (p105)

This is another example of parody in the turtle’s song. As Gardner (2000) pointed out, the Mock Turtle’s song is parody on the first lines and meter of poem called “The Spider and the Fly” written by Mary Howitt. Mary Howitt’s version of this song is:

*Will you walk into my parlour?” said the spider to the fly.  
*Tis the prettiest little parlour that ever you did spy.  
The way into my parlour is up a winding stair,  
And I’ve got many curious things to show when you are there.  
Oh, no, no,” said the little fly, “to ask me is in vain,  
For who goes up your winding stair can ne’er come down again.*

In his translation, Naserddine translated the verses word for word in which the non-selective non-pun option is utilized. To make it clearer, this poem has no cultural or historical indications in Arabic, the components of its verses are translated, but their forms in the TT are not in a relationship of parody as in the original or, as a matter of fact, in any other relationship which would result in a pun.

**Strategy2: "The Editorial Techniques"**

In many cases, Naserddine added explanatory words or, descriptive phrases between brackets when he cannot reproduce a corresponding pun in the TT as in the following examples:
E.g. 07:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;of course you don’t! &quot;the hatter said, tossing his head contemptuously&quot; I dare say you never even spoke to <em>Time</em>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ظاهرة الحال&quot; صاح وهو يرجع رأسه إلى الخلف والابذلاء يذكر عليه &quot;أفترض أنك لم تحدث قط إلى الوقت!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Perhaps not,” Alice cautiously replied; “but I have to beat <em>time</em> when I learn music.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ربما لا&quot; أجاب أليس بحذر كل ما أعلم هو أن على ضرب كل الأزمان [الآلهان] حينما أتلقى درس الموسيقى &quot;أه! هذا يفسر كل شيء إن الوقت لا يتحمل الضر&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ah! That accounts for it,&quot; said the Hatter. &quot;He won’t stand beating. &quot;(p 101)</td>
<td>&quot;أه! هذا يفسر كل شيء إن الوقت لا يتحمل الضر&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the example above, the idiomatic sense of *to beat time* (i.e. to make a regular sound or movement to music) is what Alice intended, whereas the Hatter considered Time as a person and interpreted the verb literally *hitting time*, as though time were a material and animate being.

Here, the translator used one of the editorial techniques which are represented in the explanation between brackets *الآلهان* because the literal rendition of the original wordplay is not enough to clarify its meaning.

E.g. 08:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With what <em>porpoise</em>? Don’t you mean <em>purpose</em>? (p 155)</td>
<td>مع أي دلفين؟ لا تقصدي كلمة أخرى غير دلفين؟ ص 114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The homophonic pun in this dialogue is represented in the words *porpoise* and *purpose*. The first *porpoise* is a noun marking (a mammal that lives in the sea, swims in groups, and looks similar to a dolphin but has a shorter rounder nose). A noun *purpose* is homophone to *porpoise* and signifies the reason (why you do something or why something exists).

The editorial technique is represented in the second sentence; because the translator neither translates it literally nor reproduces it in the TT, but rather he changed and paraphrased the ST wording *الآلهان* in order to be clear in the TT reader’s mind.
E.g. 09:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mine is a long and a sad tale!&quot; said the mouse turning to Alice and sighing. &quot;it is a long tail, certainly&quot; said Alice, looking down with wonder to the mouse’s tail &quot; but why do you call it sad?&quot; (p36)</td>
<td>&quot;إنها قصة طويلة جدا و حزينة جدا! قال الفأر يعجب و هو ينتهي و ينظر نحو ذيله. صحيح أنها طويلة جدا&quot; قالت الأليس وهي تنظر نحو الذيل وهي الأخرى والدهشة بادية عليها &quot;لكن لماذا ترى أنها حزينة&quot;ص32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pun in this example is created by the use of two homophones tale and tail. At the beginning there is the Mouse talking about her long and sad tale. Alice, looking at its long tail, misinterprets it and talks about the tail. A noun tale means (a story about imaginary events or people or a spoken account of someone’s experiences, especially when they are made to seem more exciting or unpleasant than they really were) while tail refers to (a part at the back of an animal’s body that can move).

The translator introduced an explanation to clarify the meaning of wordplay but the inserting of this descriptive phrase diminishes the comic impact of pun, since it renders flat that which should be picked up by the reader.

**Strategy 3: "Pun-to-Pun"**

This strategy is adopted by Chakir Nasserddine only in some cases, in which puns of the original have been successfully reproduced in Arabic; although pun in the target language may be more or less different from the original pun in terms of formal structure, semantic structure, or textual function, the important thing is that the effect intended in the original can still be felt in Arabic through the combination of words chosen by Nasserddine, which constitute again a pun in the Arabic TT. Here are examples from the corpus to exemplify how this is achieved:

E.g. 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;That’s reason they’ve called lessons,&quot; the Gryphen remarked: &quot;because they lessen from day to day&quot; (p146)</td>
<td>&quot;الذلك تسمي دروسا لأنها تتدرس يوما عن يوم&quot; علقته العنقآء ص 107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The words *lesson* (course) and *lessen* (to reduce) which sound alike but are different in spelling form a homophonic pun in ST; the translator here did his best in order to recreate a pun in Arabic that resemble the ST pun in its aesthetic, formal and humorous effect by utilizing the word دروس (to reduce) and the five-letter verb إندرس (to erase) which is derived from the three-letter verb درس (to erase) through this combination of words in Arabic the ST pun is well reproduced in Arabic basing on pun-to-pun strategy.

**E.g. 11:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Did you say <em>pig</em>, or <em>fig</em>?&quot; said the cat. (p93)</td>
<td>&quot;هل قلت: خنزير... و جنزير...؟&quot; سألها القط 71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, the translator has recreated a corresponding TT pun; in both the ST and TT pun is patronymic, since there is a slight difference in both spelling and pronunciation between the words *pig, fig* and خنزير،جنزير although the word is changed from *fig* (a type of fruit) to جنزير (a fetter), this is completely justified since pun can still be felt in Arabic.

**E.g. 12:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reeling and <em>writhing</em> of course, to begin with&quot; The Mock turtle replied. (p142)</td>
<td>&quot;في البداية طبعا، تعمنا الخراطة والخياطة...&quot; ص 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mock Turtle makes malapropism puns in different English subjects while talking about them at the sea school. *Reeling* (the act of moving backwards quickly) stands for the subject called (Reading). That means (to look at and understand words in a letter, book, newspaper etc)

The subject called *Writhing* that means (to make large twisting movements with the body) stands here for the subject called (Writing) which refers to (the activity of creating pieces of written work, such as stories, poems, or articles).

When dealing with such kind of pun, which usually using homonyms, substitute a similar sounding word in the place of another, the translator should be aware in transmitting the irony and comical effect of wordplay because that is the main purpose of malapropism.
In his translation, Nasserddine did not confine to the ST pun words and context but he reproduced an equivalent pun in the TT that is formed of words خيطة and خيطة which based on patronymic but loosing again the humorous effect of the original pun.

E.g. 13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;When we were little,&quot; the Mock Turtle went on at last, more calmly, though still sobbing a little now and then, &quot;we went to school in the sea. The master was an old Turtle we used to call him Tortoise.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;عندما كنا صغارا، كنا نذهب إلى المدرسة في البحر، كانت معلمنا سلحفاة نسميه السلحفاة الإغريقية.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Why did you call him Tortoise, if he wasn’t one?&quot; Alice asked.</td>
<td>&quot;لمّاذا كنت تسمونها السلحفاة الإغريقية ما دامت سلحفاة بحرية؟ سألتها السيس&quot; لقد قرأت في مكان ما أن السلحفاة الإغريقية تعيش في مياه الآنهر &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We called him Tortoise because he taught us,&quot; said the Mock Turtle angrily. (p 142)</td>
<td>&quot;كنا نسميها السلحفاة الإغريقية لأنها كانت تتكلم اللغة الإغريقية&quot; ردت السلحفاة بغضب. ص 104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Humorous effect is in the next lines where the Mock Turtle is telling the story about their teacher in the school who was called Tortoise. As Gardner (2000) mentioned, "[I]n Alice’s day the word tortoise was usually given to land turtles to distinguish them from turtles that lived in the sea" (p. 151). Alice does not understand why they call him Tortoise if he was not one of them and she gets the explanation that it is because he taught them.

As it can be noticed, this ST pun is made by homophony of a noun tortoise and taught us – the past form of verb (teach) that means "to help students to learn something in a school, college, university etc. by giving lessons" Both these words have nearly the same pronunciation.

Although the translator changed completely the context of the original pun and he utilized the phrase السلحفاة الإغريقية to fill the aesthetic and the stylistic gap in this case, his attempt to recreate a corresponding pun in the TT still acceptable and it is better than the literal translation.

**Strategy 4: "Pun-to-Zero"**

Chakir Naseddine rarely adopted pun-to-zero technique in his translation in which he ignored the ST pun with its context; that is to say, he did not translate them at all. This strategy has been occurred only one time in the corpus:
In these two sentences there is a pun made on homograph of word *mine* that is. In the first example the word *mine* is used as a noun which means (a large hole or tunnel in the ground from which people take coal, gold etc) while in the second example *mine* is used as a pronoun with the meaning of (the one(s) belonging to or connected with me).

As it can be noticed; the two sentences which contain the homographic pun *mine* have not been translated at all; the translator has simply omitted that part of the text which contains it.

### II.2.2. Analysis of Puns ‘Translation in Queewan’s Version

Queewan used word for word translation of the whole novel and she mixed between two strategies of translating the same pun; the first is non-selective-non-pun which is a subcategory of pun-to-non-pun technique; this option is stands for the literal rendering of the original wordplay and it is the most adopted option in her version; in addition to the second strategy which is the direct copy of the ST pun since she inserted the punned English word in TT without translation for the sake of clarity. Moreover, she adopted the editorial technique in some cases.

She also succeeded in reproducing a TT pun only in one case.

**Strategy 1: "Non-Selective-Non-Pun"

Non-Selective-Non-Pun is the most dominant technique in Queewan’s version too. This strategy comprises all those cases in which the pun in the ST is translated literally word for word, which results a gap in transmitting all the intended effect (humor or irony or ambiguity). Here are some instances of this technique are indicated below:
E.g. 15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I’ll soon make you <em>dry</em> enough!&quot; They all sat down at once, in a large ring, with the Mouse in the middle. Alice kept her eyes anxiously fixed on it; for she felt sure she would catch a bad cold if she did not get <em>dry</em> very soon.&quot;Ahem!&quot; said the Mouse with an important air, &quot;are you all ready? This is the <em>driest</em> thing I know Silence all round, if you please!&quot; (p 30)</td>
<td>&quot;اجلسوا جميعاً وأصغروا إلى سوف أجففكم في الحال&quot; جلست الحيوانات كلها في حلقة ضخمة والفار في الوسط، أبتقت أليس عينها مثبتتين بلهفة عليه، لأنها أحست أنها ستصاب ببرد رديء بالتأكيد إذا لم تجف بسرعة كبيرة. قال الفار بكبرياء مصطبع &quot;أحم، هل أتم كلكم جاهزون؟ إن هذا هو أبسط شيء أعرفه ألمزوا الصمت جميعاً من فضلكم!&quot; ص42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the pun based on homonymous words *dry* which has two various meanings. As a verb means (to remove the water from something by wiping it, heating it, or blowing air onto it), while as an adjective; it has several meanings. The most frequently used meaning is that (something that is dry has no water in it or on it). But the second meaning is the case of this example refers to (something that is very serious and boring).

The non-selective –non-pun option is utilized here; as the ST pun is simply rendered word for word with its two connotations in which it loose all its stylistic and aesthetic value.

E.g. 16:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Now, who did that? – It was <em>Bill</em>, I fancy – Who’s to go down the chimney? – <em>Bill</em>’s got to go down – Here, <em>Bill</em>! The master says you’ve got to go down the chimney!&quot; (p 51)</td>
<td>&quot;من فعل ذلك الآن؟ أتخيل أنه بيل، من سينزل في المدخنة؟ لان لن أفعل! أفعل ذلك أنت! هذا ما لن أفعله، أعن! على بيل أن ينزل فيها - هيا يا بيل! يقول السيد إن عليك أن تنزل في المدخنة!&quot; ص 72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wordplay is based on homonymy of word *bill*, which is homograph and homophone at the same time because the White Rabbit sends little lizard called *Bill* to his house; in that, there is a significant wordplay based on lizard’s name. Likewise, a word *bill* in English is not just a name...
but it can be also understood as (a notice giving information about something, especially an event or performance).

Here, the pun is totally lost in Queewan’s translation due to the literal transmitting of the word bill بیل which does not indicate any meaning in Arabic.

E.g. 17:

| ST | TT |
| "You can draw water out of a water-well," said the Hatter; "so I should think you could draw treacle out of a treacle-well – eh, stupid?" | قال صانع القبعات "يمكنك أن ترسمي الماء من بئر ماء، لذا لا يجب أن تعتقد أن ترسمين أن ترسمين دبس السكر من بئر دبس السكر – أه، أيها الحمقاء؟" |
| "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." | "لكن هن في البئر" قالت البيس للزغبية من دون أن تختار أن تتبث لهذه الملاحظة الأخيرة. قال الزغبة "طبعاً هن في البئر." |

In this conversation, the word well made a homonymous wordplay because it has two various meanings; the noun well which is explained as (a deep hole in the ground from which you can get water, oil, or gas) and the adverb well also which means (the good or the satisfactory way).

The meaning is translated, but its form in the TT is not in a homonymous relationship or, as a matter of fact, in any other relationship which would result in a pun.

E.g. 18:

| ST | TT |
| "Reeling and Writhing, of course, to begin with," the Mock Turtle replied; "and then the different branches of Arithmetic – Ambition, Distraction, Uglification, and Derision."(p 149) | أجاب ذكر السلمحات الزائف "الانتفاض واللتيوي كيداوية طبغا، ومن ثم مختلف فروع الحساب الطموح، الالتهاء، التشيع والسخرية." |

As it is explained before reeling is stands for the subject called reading while writhing stands for the subject called writing; both words form malapropism puns in the turtle’s speech together with Ambition which is a noun means (a strong wish to achieve something) and it is replaced with
Addition as (the process of adding numbers or amounts together), while *Distraction* is (something that gets your attention and prevents you from concentrating on something else) and it represents Subtraction in daily school, which means (the process of subtracting one number or amount from another). A word *Multiplication* (the process of adding a number to itself a particular number of times) is replaced with a word *Uglification* which does not exist in English. The last subject in the sea school called *Derision*, in fact means (the situation in which someone or something is laughed at and considered stupid or of no value), whereas Division is (the calculation of how many times one number goes into another).

All the intended ironic and comical effect in the original puns is not achieved at all in Queewan’s translation because she opted for the non-selective-non-pun option which conveyed the meaning of a pun but destroyed its form and loose its effect.

**Strategy 2: *Non-Selective-Non-Pun + Direct Copy***

When dealing with puns, Queewan, mixed between the non-selective-non-pun and the Direct Copy techniques in which the English word is inserted as it is between parentheses in the TT and both meanings of the pun (literal and figurative) are translated, but they do not result in a pun in the target text in each case. To make it clearer, here is some examples:

**E.g. 19:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With what <em>porpoise</em>?</td>
<td>مع أي دلفين (porpoise)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t you mean <em>purpose</em>? (p 155)</td>
<td>ألا تقصد لأي (purpose)? ص200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a homophonic pun in this example; because Alice believed that the Mock Turtle means *purpose* and not *porpoise* when he speaks of the importance of traveling with a *porpoise*. Insulted by Alice's suggestion, the Mock Turtle assures her that he means what he says.

The non-selective-non pun option is used here since the components of the ST puns are translated literally without reproducing a pun in TT; in addition to the direct copy of the ST pun in order to make it more obvious to the TT reader.

**E.g. 20:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
There is the pun made by homophony of a noun lesson (a period of time in which students are taught about a subject in school), and a verb lessen (to become smaller in amount, level, importance etc or make something do this).

Again, Queewan mixed between the two aforementioned techniques in this case when she translated the ST pun linguistically and as well as she copied the two English words lessons and lessen assuming that the target reader will grasp the original pun somehow.

**E.g. 21:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mine is a long and a sad <em>tale</em>!&quot; said the mouse turning to Alice and sighing. &quot;it is a long <em>tail</em>, certainly&quot; said Alice, looking down with wonder to the mouse’s <em>tail</em> &quot; but why do you call it sad?&quot; (p 36)</td>
<td>قال الفأر وهو ينظر إلى اليس متهده: هي قصة طويلة وحزينة (<em>tale</em>) فقالت اليس ناظرة باستغراب إلى ذيل الفأر: &quot; إنه ذيل طويل لكن لماذا تقول أنه حزين (<em>tail</em>) بالتأكيد ص 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carroll then created a visual embodiment of the homophonic pun by arranging the Mouse’s tale typographically so that it forms the shape of a tail. He uses fantastic reversals from word to object and from verbal punning to visual punning.

The play on words in this dialogue is completely lost in the TT because Queewan adopted the non-selective-non-pun technique in rendering wordplay, which results a word for word translation of the elements of the original pun; although she inserted both words in English in order to make pun more clearer, her translation made no sense at all and prevented enjoyment of the wordplay.

**Strategy 3: "The Editorial Techniques"**

Within her translation, Queewan added descriptive words or phrases in some cases in order to clarify and explain the meaning of wordplay. She also explains ST puns in order to, as she herself points out; explain them to curious readers; that explanation is usually put between parentheses.

Consider these instances:
E.g. 22:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I beg your pardon,&quot; said Alice very humbly, &quot;you had got to the fifth bend, I think?&quot; &quot;I had not!&quot; cried the Mouse, sharply and very angrily. &quot;A knot!&quot; said Alice, always ready to make herself useful, and looking anxiously about her. &quot;Oh, do let me help to undo it!&quot;</td>
<td>قالت اليس بتواضع شديد &quot;أرجو عفوك أن تلغ في المقطع الخامس على ما أظن &quot; صاح الفأر (مستخدمة كلمة not التي تفيد معنى النف الملعوف) بحدة ألقى النسيب المستعدة أبدا للممساعدة وهي تنتظر بثيرة من حولها &quot;عقدة 1 او دعى أسعاف في حل تلك العقدة &quot; وتغطي عقدة نظانا منها أن لديه عقدة ما knot المستخدمة كلمة (وتعني عقدة ظنا أن لديه عقدة ما) ص 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, there are puns created by homophones of two different words not and knot. On the one hand, there is an adverb not is (used for making negatives) and on the other hand there is a noun knot that (describes a point where string, rope, or cloth is tied together, or twisted together and pulled tight).

For the sake of clarity and explanation; Queewan used the editorial technique by adding descriptive phrases to both words not (مستخدمة كلمة not التي تفيد معنى النف النفي) and knot (مستخدمة كلمة knot متعة عقدة ظنا منها أن لديه عقدة ما). As it is noticed, this strategy made wordplay clearer and easier to be grasped by TT reader.

E.g. 23:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;you never had fits my dear, I think&quot; he said to the Queen… &quot;then the words don’t fit you&quot; said the king looking round the court with a smile, there was a dead silence.</td>
<td>ثم قال للملكة &quot;أنت لا تحسبين بنوتي أبدا يا غريبتي على ما أظن &quot; قال الملك وهو ينظر حول قاعة المحكمة بانتباضة: &quot;أن لا تنسبك (وتعني أيضا يسبب بنوبة الكلمات ) ساد صمت معيت ص 240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There is a homographic pun in this example, since the king repeated the word *fit* twice but with two different connotations; the first is a noun refers to (a sudden loss of consciousness with movements that are not controlled and sometimes violent) while the second is a verb means (to be the right size for somebody or something).

Because she failed to recreate an equivalent TT pun; Queewan chose to use the editorial technique in order to explain that the word *fit* has two different meanings via this explanatory phrase (*و تعني أيضاً يتسبب بندوبة*).

**Strategy 4: "Pun-to-Pun"**

When she comes across a pun in the original text, Queewan tried to create a corresponding target text pun; this research shows that, she applied this technique in one case. Here is the example from the corpus to explain how this is achieved:

**E.g. 24:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Oh, as to the whiting,&quot; said the Mock Turtle, &quot;they – you’ve seen them, of course?&quot; &quot;Yes,&quot; said Alice, &quot;I’ve often seen them at <em>dinn</em> –&quot; she checked herself hastily. &quot;I don’t know where <em>Dinn</em> may be,&quot; said the Mock Turtle; &quot;but if you’ve seen them so often, of course you know what they’re like.&quot; (p 151)</td>
<td>قال ذكر السلحفاة: &quot;أوه، أ أما بالضبط إلى السمك الأبيض فهم- لقد شاهدتكم طباعا؟ &quot; قالت أيلاس &quot;نعم غالبا ما شاهدتكم عند الغذاء- لكنها تمالكت نفسها بسرعة. فقال ذكر السلحفاة: &quot;لست أدرى أين يمكن أن يكون الغذاء لكن إن كنت قد شاهدتكم طباعا تعريف كيفهم. الص 196&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wordplay in this dialogue is based on homograph because Alice said *Dinn* and she meant to say at dinner but stops in the middle of the word so she says only that she has often seen them at *dinn* and this causes the misunderstanding because the Mock Turtle thinks that *Dinn* may be some kind of place.

The pun can still be felt in Arabic language, where the noun *الغذاء* (the day after today) and the noun *الغداء* (a meal that you have in the middle of the day) both form a patronymic pun in Arabic because there is a slight difference between them.

To sum up, in the translation of puns examined in this research, the following five techniques from Delabastita’s list are used: translation by non-pun, translation by a pun and editorial
techniques, where both translators inserted explanation within the TT. Pun-to-zero technique (omission) is used by Naserddine in one case only. Likewise; direct copy technique which is applied only in Queewan’s version. As it will be described in the following section, both versions will be compared with each other in terms of the application of the aforementioned techniques from Delabastita’s list.

II.3. Comparison between Translations

This section examines the level of similarity and difference between pun translations and the application of Delabastita’s techniques in both aforementioned versions. We can now proceed to a more detailed analysis of the techniques used in the corpus, including a statistical analysis of their usage by translators. These results is organized in five groups according to the applied techniques in both versions, displayed in Table (1), followed by a graph for each translation in order to quantitatively analyze and interpret data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non selective-non pun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Non selective + Direct copy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pun to pun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queewan Version (1)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naserddine Version (2)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table: Distribution of the translation strategies for puns*
It is visible from the table that the strategy most frequently applied in the two versions is the non-selective option which is a subcategory of pun-to-non-pun technique based on Delabastita’s list; since 30 puns out of 40 in Queewan’s version, and 26 puns out of 40 in Naserddine’s version; that it is to say, in 75% of the cases in the first translation, and 65% of the cases in the second one, a ST pun is chosen to be rendered literally word for word.

The pun-to-non-pun solution, with 56 instances, represents 70% of the pun translations. In most of these cases (70% = 56 examples) the meaning is non-selective, that is to say, the two meanings which are contrasted in the pun are reflected in the TT.

The pun-to-pun has been employed on one occasion only in Queewan’s version, while in Naserddine’s translation, this strategy is the second frequently used after the non-selective option; it accounts for 2.5% and 20% of the examples respectively.

The editorial techniques like paraphrasing or explanation, on the other hand, has been used in 10% of the instances (8 examples) in both versions; it is mainly when the TT offers no pun as a solution for the translation of a ST pun that editorial techniques are used.

Resorting to the direct copy strategy always occurs in combination with the non-selective option in Queewan’s translation; this choice is the second most used in her version after the non-selective option, since it represents 15% (6 examples) of the pun translation out of 40. Other minor strategy for the translation of puns adopted by Naserddine is pun-to-zero which represents 2.5% of the examples.

These data can also be represented through the following graphs 1-2 in order to distinguish better between variants, and Delabastita’s strategies used in Queewan’s and Nasseedine’s version respectively:

**Graph 1: The Distribution of Translation Techniques in Queewan’s Version**
Graph 2: The Distribution of Translation Techniques in Naserddine’s Version

Having carefully studied the puns in the original English ST and their corresponding in the two translations in Arabic language, several strategies from Delabstitat’s list were highlighted, in which there are some strategies, as seen in the table and graphs 1-2, were used by both translators which help us to compare between both versions. The graph 3 below displays the comparison in detail:

Graph 3: Frequency of Strategies Used by the Translators
The comparison indicated that pun-to-non-pun strategy (the non-selective option) is the most frequently used strategy in both versions. In other words, more than half of the original puns were lost in the translation.

II.4. Data Analysis and Discussion

Based on Delabstita's (1996) framework, the extracted data in the present study were classified according to the categorizations in the ST, and the two Arabic renderings. Then, the strategies applied by the two translators in each case were explored thoroughly. It is to be mentioned that for the limitation of space and not being able to show all the instances of puns detected in the ST, the study has restricted the discussion to the more prominent instances and checked the selected renderings against them to figure out how far many puns are (un)translatable. The complete data along with their categorizations are presented in the appendix table.

The non-selective choice is the most extensively used in all the corpus, since 30 puns out of 40 in the first version, and 26 puns out of 40 in the second one, the ST pun components are translated literally without reproducing a pun in TT; so more than half of ST puns are lost in translation.

Comparing the two variants, we may see also, that it is the translator of the second variant (Chakir Naserddine), who has reproduced the highest number of ST puns 20%, while 2.5% of ST puns are reproduced by the translator of the first variant (Amirah Queewan).

The direct copy of ST pun in TT occurs only in the first version, always in combination with the non-selective option, in which the meanings of the original pun are translated linguistically, and the panned word in English was inserted in the TT as it is, without being translated; the mix between those strategies occupies 15% of the pun translation in this version.

The editorial technique, such as paraphrasing or explication in parentheses, is mutual between both versions; it accounts for 7.5% in Queewan’s translation, whereas; in Naserddine’s translation, it represents 12.5% of translating wordplay.

The last strategy used in the corpus is pun-to-zero, in which the translator simply omits the portion of the text that contains the pun. This technique is applied only in Naserddine’s version, and it represents 2.5% of the pun translation in his version.

The fact that the great majority of ST puns have no a TT pun as a counterpart could be an indication of the complete loss of Alice in wonderland’s wordplay in Arabic. This intuitive observation could be confirmed by the extremely low occurrence of the-pun-to-pun strategy.
especially in Queewan’s version, as well as by the total absence of the pun-to-nothing strategy; and by the fact that the translations often based on the literal rendition of the ST puns, and they sometimes insert explicit editorial information in pun-to-no-pun solutions which would not only disrupt the smoothness of the TT, but also, most importantly, destroy the punning effect and fail to match the writer’s intention with the reader’s expectation.

**Conclusion**

This research was a comparative analysis based on two Arabic translations of *Alice in Wonderland*. Its purpose was to compare these translations to the original text in order to examine the strategies used by the Arab translators to render ST puns, and to see if they have been successfully rendered as in the original. In order to do so, the translation solutions to puns are categorized according to Delabastita’s division of pun translation techniques. Additionally, a detailed discussion of the notion of the pun and its various definitions is given early in the study to avoid possible misunderstandings when it comes to the meaning and use of the term. As it was mentioned before, the researchers examined 40 puns extracted from the aforementioned novel; from all 40 puns, 30 in the first variant, and 26 in the second one are translated based on pun to non-pun strategy, more specifically, their rendition is based on the non-selective option; however recreated puns appeared in the corpus, especially in the second version, where 8 puns are successfully reproduced out of 40 puns, while in the first version, the pun-to-pun technique is adopted, only in one case. Considerable cases of puns in the first translation are rendered basing on a combination between the direct copy technique and the non-selective choice; this solution is implemented in 6 cases of puns in the first variant. On the other hand, there are significant cases in the corpus, in which puns have been explained through paraphrasing or explanations in brackets; 8 out of 40 puns represent the editorial techniques in both versions. Whereas the pun-to-zero strategy has rarely been used in the corpus; that is to say, the omission of ST wordplay occurred only in the second version in 2 cases out of 40 puns have been examined.

With regard to word play, in general, the two translators of *Alice in wonderland* into Arabic did not endeavored to render the original wordplay with its impact on its readers, but their total concern was translating the plot, and ultimately neglecting any other features; in that, both translations, especially Queewan’s version, did not render the original puns faithfully, in which
many cases of loss of humorous, stylistic and aesthetic effect have marked, due to the activation of only one frame, or to a literal translation, which does not always guarantee the rendering of the word play, as translating the word play requires a shared code and shared conventions between the SL and the TL.

The fact that Alice in wonderland’s puns are untranslatable into Arabic in the aforementioned versions, did not devaluate the notion of pun translatability in general, however; the amount of literary nonsense and puns make the translation of Lewis Carroll’s Alice in Wonderland into Arabic culture and language very difficult, but; it is possible to have a more representative translated Arabic version. Lewis Carroll’s parodied verses, puns, jokes and his playful use of language, that requires the logic, nonsense words and using of twist of meaning, all those features hard the translation of his fantasy novel, but again; its translation is possible, since those difficulties could be decreased by literary translators, who are to exert more effort, in order to produce a pun which, if it is not able to reproduce the meaning of the ST pun exactly, at least provokes a similar effect, because they are well acquainted with both Arabic and English cultures and languages. Besides; the twists of meanings that Lewis Carroll used in Alice’s in Wonderland have similar equivalents in Arabic language and culture. Furthermore, if the literary translator has a comprehensive understanding of Lewis Carroll’s original work and a great knowledge of English and Arabic cultures and languages, accompanied by relentless consultation of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, encyclopedias, etc. in order to find the meaning expressed (explicitly or implicitly) in ST and transmit it to TT readers., those parodied verses, jokes, and the nonsense words could be well rendered, and with less trouble than the other two areas of difficulties. Last but not the least, the corpus covered in this study includes two Arabic translations of Alice in wonderland, and the main focus is the wordplay, only in this novel; this can be taken as a pre-study. A full study for a more comprehensive corpus on different selected translations of Carroll’s book or other English works translated into Arabic, that use wordplay bountifully, can be undertaken in the future; this comparative study also, recall literary translators to translate Lewis Carroll’s Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland into Arabic more faithfully to the original wordplay, by identifying of the original intention of the author, and transmission of that intention, by trying to produce approximately the same effect felt by ST readers.
# Appendix

## Puns, their Types and Meanings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pun</th>
<th>Its type</th>
<th>Its meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antipathies (p 5)</td>
<td>Malapropism</td>
<td>Alice wants to say “The Antipodes” but cannot remember the right word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cats eat bats- bats eat cats (p 6)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>The sentence rhymes even when the subject and the object are switched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fall (p 6)</td>
<td>Homonymy</td>
<td>The season (Alice falls upon a heap of dry leaves) and the act of falling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shut up like telescope (p 9)</td>
<td>Simile</td>
<td>To express the act of becoming shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my going out altogether, like a candle (p 11)</td>
<td>Simile</td>
<td>To express the act of shrinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiouser and curiuser! (p 15)</td>
<td>Malapropism</td>
<td>Growing so fast, Alice forgets how to speak English properly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m opening like the largest telescope</td>
<td>Simile</td>
<td>To express the act of becoming taller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By being drowned in my own tears (p 24)</td>
<td>Homonymy</td>
<td>Both figuratively and literally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the driest thing I know (p 30)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>The Mouse tells the most boring story to dry them up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tale-tail (p 36)</td>
<td>Homonymy</td>
<td>Alice thinks that the Mouse is talking about his tale being long and sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had not! A knot! (p 38)</td>
<td>Homophony</td>
<td>Alice misunderstands the response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An old crab...the patience of an oyster (p 39)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>A crab is both a sea animal and a grouchy, irritable person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow up... grown up (p46)</td>
<td>Polysemy</td>
<td>To grow up in age and literally in length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain yourself…I can’t explain myself…I am not myself, you see (p 60)</td>
<td>Polysemy</td>
<td>Two different usages of “myself”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis-axes (p 84)</td>
<td>Homograph</td>
<td>Alice is talking about the axis of the Earth but the Duchess thinks of axes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig, or fig? (p 93)</td>
<td>Homophone</td>
<td>Similarity of pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time...to beat time (p 101)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>Time is considered as a person by the Hatter and the March Hare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to draw...what did they draw… they draw the treacle (p109)</td>
<td>Polysemy</td>
<td>Draw from a well vs. Draw a picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were in the well, they were...well in. (p109)</td>
<td>Homonymy</td>
<td>Well as a noun in the first sentence and an adjective in the other one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off with their heads…are their heads off? Their heads are gone (p119)</td>
<td>Polysemy</td>
<td>Alice hides their heads in a flowerpot, so their heads were really gone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take care of the sense, and the sounds will take care of themselves (p133)</td>
<td>Idiomatic</td>
<td>Take care of the pence and the pounds will take care of themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamingoes and mustard both bite (p133)</td>
<td>Homograph</td>
<td>Flamingoes bite with their beaks whereas mustard bites in one’s mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds of a feather flock together (p133)</td>
<td>Polysemy</td>
<td>Similar people stick together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustard mine...mine...the more there is of mine the less there is of yours (p134)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>Mine as a noun first and then as a pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either you or your head must be off... (p 136)</td>
<td>polysemy</td>
<td>Cut off or leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortoise...he taught us (p 142)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>Just a non-sense reason why they called the teacher ‘tortoise’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We went to school every day...I have been to a day school too (p 142)</td>
<td>Polysemy</td>
<td>Attended school during day time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeling and Writhing (p 142)</td>
<td>Malapropism</td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition, Distraction, Uglification and Derision (p 143)</td>
<td>Malapropism</td>
<td>Addition, Subtraction, Multiplication and Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery, Seaography, Drawling, Stretching and Fainting in Coil (p 144)</td>
<td>Malapropism</td>
<td>History, Geography, Drawing, Sketching and Painting in Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old crab (p145)</td>
<td>Polysemy</td>
<td>Crab is someone with bad temper as well as a sea animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing and Grief (p 144)</td>
<td>Malapropism</td>
<td>Latin and Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons... lessen (p146)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>Lesson as a noun and to lessen the hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Dinn-…where dinn may be...(p 152)</td>
<td>Homograph</td>
<td>Alice meant to say at dinner but stops in the middle of the word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting...it does the boots and the shoes...are done with whiting (p154)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>Whiting the fish and Whiting, to make something white.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soles and eels (p 154)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>Shoes and boots are made of “Soles and Heels”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porpoise... purpose (p155)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>They mix the two words because of their paronymous similarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hadn't begun my tea-twinkling of the tea-...it began with the tea...of course twinkling begins with a T...(p 170)</td>
<td>Paronym</td>
<td>The confusion of T’s (The letter T and the drink Tea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a poor man…poor speaker (p 170-171)</td>
<td>Homograph</td>
<td>He is financially poor, also not a good speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before she had this fit... you never had fits...then the words don't fit you (p 186)</td>
<td>Homograph</td>
<td>The verb ‘to fit’ is used in two different meanings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

Through his witty style, Carroll plays with language throughout his famous novel Alice in wonderland, which fascinates children and adults alike; the play with language represented in the great number of humorous puns that this novel contains, thereby creating a remarkable literary work that has been translated into many languages over the century; therefore it attracted our attention as suitable material for this study, which aims at shedding light on the translation of puns in order to identify whether puns in two Arabic versions of Carroll’s tale namely Amira Queewan’s version (1943) and Chakir Naseddine’s version (2012) are successfully rendered as the original. To this end, the research describes the various use of pun in English and Arabic, focusing on a comparative analysis of puns, all extracted from Alice in wonderland and analyzed with their counterparts in the aforementioned versions, based on Delabastita’s translation techniques (1996), in order to discover whether the intended effect in the original is still felt in Arabic. Regarding to Delabastita’s list of translating puns, the analysis reveals that the non-selective option is the commonest in both translations, hence the results indicates that Carroll’s playful use of language is not successfully rendered as in the original, in terms of humorous, aesthetic and stylistic effect.

Keywords: Puns, Alice in Wonderland, Translatability, Untranslatability, Delabatista’s strategies
الملخص

براءة أسلوبه ومهاراته تمكن كارول (Caroll) من اللعب بجمال اللغة من خلال روايته الشهيرة "أليس في بلاد العجائب" والتي لا تزال تسحر أذهان الصغار والكبار على حد سواء، أين تجسدت هذه البراءة في الاستخدامات المتعددة للترجمة الطريقة التي تزخر بها هذه الرواية والتي خولتها لاحتلال مكانة أدبية مرفوعة جعلتها تترجم إلى العديد من اللغات العالمية على مر القرون الماضية. ولا هذا اختيار لتكون نموذجا لأطروحتنا التي تهدف إلى تسليط الضوء على ترجمة التورية إلى العربية في الرواية المذكورة من خلال الاعتماد على ترجمتين عربيتين لها ككل من أميرة كيوان 1943 و شكري نصر الدين 2012 سعياً منا لمعرفة ما إذا كانت التورية قد ترجمت بنجاح وتفسر إلى العربية كما هو الحال في النص الأصلي فيما يخص قيمتها الجمالية والأثر الطريف الذي تحدثه في نفسية القارئ. وللرغبة المشروعة بتركز البحث على عرض معلومات وافية عن اللعب بالكلمات في كلتا اللغتين للوصول إلى مقارنة دقيقة بين الترجمة والأصل رجوعا إلى الاستراتيجيات التصميم التي اقترحها الباحث دي لاباستيتا (1996) كقاعدة نظرية للدراسة الحالية، وعلى ضوء المقارنة التحليلية أتبنت الدراسة على الاستعمال الغالب للترجمة الحرشفية للتورية الأصلية في كلتا النسختين وبالتالي خسارة ملحوظة في نقل القيمة الجمالية أو أي أثر مقصود على القارئ.
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مقالة

لم يتخيل لويس كارول يومًا بأن عمله الأدبي "أليس في بلاد العجائب" 1865 سيترجم إلى أكثر من 70 لغة حول العالم، مسجلاً بذلك واحدًا من أضخم الأعمال الأدبية الخالدة على مر العصور.

إن قصة "أليس في بلاد العجائب" كانت و لا زالت تلهم الكبار مثل الصغار و تقنن عقولهم بفضل أسلوب الكاتب الفذ و براعة تلاعبه بالكلمات والأدبيات الشعرية حاملاً بذلك العديد من الرسائل والإيحاءات المترامية بين سطور الرواية، والتي تعتبر عن واقع كان يعيشه الكاتب كما الناس في تلك الحقيقة، كل هذا الإضمار المقصود والتفقد المستمر في جوف القصة لم يكن بديلاً لعقل الأطفال الصغيرة الذين اعتبروها متنفساً رائعاً و طوراً فرداً لم تسبقه إلى الروايات الأخرى.

والمعروف أن هذه الرواية العالمية حافلة بعد هائل من الترجمة بجميع أنواعها، حتى أن أغلب الدراسات الخاصة بالترجمة لا تتفاوت أن تتجز الزى لويس كارول من خلال النهل من الأمثلة التي وظفها الكاتب في عمله هذا.

ومثلاً ترجمت رواية "أليس في بلاد العجائب" نحو الكثير من اللغات، كانت هناك و لا زالت دراسات ورسائل تتخرج تتطرق إلى هذا الموضوع وتعالج ترجمتها من لغة إلى أخرى خاصة في الرواية المذكورة حيث درست ترجمتها من اللغة الأصلية التي كتبها القصة و هي الإنجليزية إلى عدد لغات منها الصينية، الروسية، الألمانية، الإسبانية، البرتغالية، الألبانية، التركية، الفرنسية والعديد من لغات أخرى لا يتسمى لنا ذكرها جميعها ها هنا.

إن دراستنا هذا تهدف إلى تسلط الضوء على ترجمة النثرية في رواية "أليس في بلاد العجائب" إلى اللغة العربية و ذلك من خلال تطبيقاتها على ترجمتين عربيتين للحصول على أفضل النتائج، الأولى لؤيرة كيوان 1943 والثانية لشكر نصر الدين 2012 وذلك من خلال استخراج أكبر عدد من أمثلة النثرية المتضمنة في الرواية ومقارنتها بالترجمة العربية المذكورة آنفاً ومن ثم مقارنة الترجمة مع بعضها البعض لبديع التطورات التي اقترحتها كلي مترجم في نقل النثرية إلى العربية وتفحص نقل الأثر النثرية والقيم الجمالية بإخلاص نحو اللغة الذين اعتماداً على أساليب ديرك دي لا بابستيا 1996 الذي يعتبر المنظر الأكثر منافسة للعب بالكلمات من خلال تصنيفه التي ستكذير لاحقاً و الاستراتيجيات للتنب ترجمة النثرية و هو بذلك يعتبر من أكبر المنظرين الذين يرون أن النثرية تترجم من لغة إلى أخرى بكل سلاسة عكس بعض المنظرين الذين يؤكدون على استحالة أو تعذر ترجمتها من لغة إلى أخرى لأنها حسبهم ملكية خاصة لكل نظام لساني. وكما أكذب سابقاً فالدراسة الحالية هي مقارنة بين الترجمة وبين الأصل أيضاً من خلال...
الاعتماد على الأسلوبين النوعي والكمي حيث جمعنا أغلب المعلومات الخاصة بالتوربة في اللغتين الإنجليزية والعربية من تعريفات وخصائص وأنواع ومعلومات أخرى، كان هذا بطريقة نوعية إضافة إلى التحليلات المتضمنة في الجانب التطبيقي، أما الأسلوب الكمي فتمثل في الإحصاءات المستخدمة في الدراسة من أجل أعبء الأمثلة وال استراتيجيات المستعملة في كل ترجمة، علاوة على ذلك فقد مثلت النتائج المحصل عليها في مخططات بيانية، دوائر نسبية، و جداول لتوضيح الصورة الوصول إلى النتائج المرمية.

وتتعلق هذه الدراسة من فرضية أن اللعب الطريف بالكلمات في رواية كارول لم ينقل بمصداقية إلى اللغة العربية وأن الأثر المقصود على القارئ من فكاهة وتهكم وقيمته جمالية لم يظهر في النسختين المذكورتين بل ظلت عليه الترجمة الحرفية لمعظم العمارات التي تحتوي على توربة.

التوربة في اللغة الإنجليزية

لترجمة التورية Delabastita كما نذكرنا انا فإن دراستنا تعمد وتركز على استراتيجيات دي لاباستينا حيث يرى بدوره أن التلاعب بالكلمات مصطلح عام يشير إلى مختلف الظواهر النصية [على مستوى الأداء] بحيث تخلق صفات معينة في بنية اللغة المستعملة [على مستوى الكفاءة] وتستغل هذه الأخيرة بطريقة قرش من خلالها تواصل مهم لمقابلين لسانيتين في أن واحد [الدليل] بمعنى ومن بين مختلفين تمامًا [الدال].

و رغم مصطلحات هذا التعريف النسائية المعقدة إلا أنه يعتبر أشمل وأدق تعريف في نفس الوقت. فضلا عن هذا التعريف، عرض دي لاباستينا أصنافًا "لعب بالكلمات" مفهومة على مستوى على مستوى، ففي التقسيم الأول نجد الأفقه والعمودي، حيث أن التورية الأفقية تتجاوز مكوناتها في النص واحدة تلو الأخرى، أما التورية العمودية فتفصل مكوناتها عن بعضها نظرا لقيود يفرضها السياق.

أنواع التورية في اللغة الإنجليزية

أما الأنواع الأخرى فهي أربعة وتمثل المستوى الثاني فهي كالتالي:
- الكلمات التي تتشابه في النطق و تختلف في الشكل.
- الكلمات التي تتشابه في الشكل و تختلف في المعنى.
- الكلمات التي تختلف قليلا في الشكل والنطق.
- كلمات نفس الشكل و بمعنى مختلف.
وهناك من الأصناف لباحثين غير دي لابستيتا منها:

- التورية المركبة بحيث تحتوي الجملة الواحدة على أكثر من تورية.
- التورية في كلمة تنطق بنفس الطريقة ذهابا و إيابا مثل: نوت و وخا.
- التورية التي يتم فيها استيعاب العنصر الأول من الجملة.
- التورية في الآيات الشعرية المأثورة وذلك من خلال استبدال كلمات البيت بأخرى قصد الفكاهة.
- تورية مرئية من خلال تجسيدها في صورة.
- التورية الحاصلة عند استعمال كلمة خارجة تماما عن السياق لأغراض تهكمية.
- التورية المتتمثة في التشبيه التام لشيء بشيء آخر يمكنه في صفة ما.
- التورية المتعلقة بالأمثال و الحكم و تستعمل بشكل طريف بعيد عن الجد.

الторية واللبس

كما هو معلوم التورية هي أن تحمل كلمة واحدة معانيين مختلفين أو أن تملك كلمتان نفس النطق و لكن بمدلولاين مختلفين أيضا، ومن هذا المنطلق ترتبط التورية ارتباطا و ثقاً بالغموض و والبس في المعنى، مما يجعل القارئ أو الساكن في نفس وغير مستوعب للمدلول المقصود في الوجهة الأولى، بل ويجعله مستمتعا بذلك اللفظ الطريف الذي إن دل على شيء فإنه يدل على مهارة الكاتب أو المتكلم و حذائه في التلاعب بالكلمات و إيصال معاني خفية مضغرة داخل طيات خطابه.

ويحدث ذلك الغموض واللبس على عدة مستويات في اللغة:

أ/ المستوى الصوتي

أي عندما تتوافق كلمتان في النطق تمام الموافقة و تختلفان في الشكل والمعنى.

ب/ المستوى الصرف

ويحدث اللبس هنا على المستوى الصرفي والناحوي للكلمة.

ج/ المستوى المعجمي

وفي هذا النوع تكون الكلمة الواحدة حاملة لعدة معاني متباينة في المعجم.
د- المستوى الدال

و هذا المستوى شبهه سابقه، ولكن المستوى المعجمي يفرض إطاراً فكرياً معيناً في استعمال الكلمة، بينما يفتح المستوى الداللي إطاراً لسانياً أوعز في سبيل التواصل الجيد.

ويقول أترادو 1993 أن الغموض هو الخاصية الأساسية للتورية، ذلك الليس الذي ينتج عن تشابه تام بين كلمتين شكلهما أو طريقة تطقيهما و اختلافهما الساعش في المعنى، ولكنه مؤخراً مع ريتشي 2004 أكد على أن الغموض ليس شرطاً كافياً لإنشاء التورية واللعب بالكلمات. فعلى كلمة ذات معنيين مختلفين لا يجل منها تورية فكل الكلمات حسبهما تكون غامضة ومهمة إذا أعيدت عن سياقيها.

وقد اقترح أترادو 1994 طريقتين لربط الليس بالتورية، الأولى هي أن تملك الكلمة معنيين مختلفين أشد اختلافاً، والثانية هي أن يكون هذا الاستعمال مقصوداً أي مفتعلًا من شخص ما.

استعمالات التورية في اللغة الإنجليزية

فما يخص استخداماتها في اللغة الإنجليزية، فالتورية تستعمل بشكل أساسي في الأعمال الأدبية من نثر وشعر ومن أكثر الكتاب استعمالاً لها نجد كاتبياً لويس كارول وكذلك ويليام شكسبير حيث تميزت كتاباتهمبتضمن هذا المحسن بطريقة حرفية ممتعة.

وتستخدم التورية أيضاً بشكل كبير في الأحتجة والنزاع والخصوص القصيرة المضحكة، بل وتعتبر المميز الوحيد والأساسي لهذا الصنف الأدبي بحيث تكون ذات أغراض مسلية ومضحكة.

يعتبر الإشعار من أكثر ما يعتمد على التورية واللعب بالكلمات بتوظيفها في شعارات تبقى راسخة مع منتجها من أجل الترويج للسلع و جلب الزبائن بتلك العبارات المتسقة الرنانة التي تلعب دوراً كبيراً في لفت انتباه الشراء.

ولقد استعمل هذا الصنف البلاغي بكثرة أيضاً في الإنجيل، ولكن ليس لغرض الفكاهة طبعاً بل من أجل التأثير في القارئ بعبارات سوية و متناسقة.

التورية في اللغة العربية

أما عنها في اللغة العربية، فالتورية من فنون البديع المعنوي ويقال لها أيضا الإيهام، التوجيه وتكييف ولكن لفظة "التورية" أولى في التسمية لقربها من مطلقة المسمى لأنها مصدر للفعل ورئي بتشديد الراء، يقال ورئيت الخبر أي جعلته ورئاي وسترته و أظهرت غيره.
أما في اصطلاح رجال البديع فهي أن يذكر المتحكِّم لفظًا مغرداً له معنيان، قريب ظاهر غير مراد و بعيد خفي مراد.

للورعية عدة أصناف في اللغة العربية اخترنا منها تصنيف الصفدى والشرازي كالتالي:

. النورية النامحة

. النورية الناجحة

. النورية الناقصة

. النورية المضارعة

. النورية المحرفة

. النورية المضجحة

. النورية المقاومة

. النورية المستوية

. النورية المتقسة

. النورية المشتقة

. النورية الشبه مشتقة

ويختلف هذا الصنف عن سابقه بحيث تتشابه كلمة مع أخرى وكأنها مشتقة منها ولكنها مأخوذة من جذر آخر.
استعمالات التوروية في اللغة العربية

التوروية استعمالات عدة في اللغة العربية، وأهداف مختلفة، ويبدو أن إخفاء الحقيقة هو الهدف الغالب في استعمالها عند العرب قديماً وذلك لإضمار حقيقة ما خفياً أو مكراً فقد ورد في السيرة العطرة أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، وهو في طريقه مهاجراً إلى يثرب مع أبي بكر الصديق رضي الله عنه، فاقتفى رجلاً في الطريق يعرف أن بكر ولا يعرف النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، فسأل عنه أبا بكر: من هذا؟ قال أبو بكر: هذا هاد يهدئي السابق، فهم الرجل أنه دليل بنده الطريق، ولكن المقصود أنه رسول الله النهاد إلى الطريق السوي، هو الدين الإسلامي الحنيف.

وقد وظفت التوروية كثيراً في الأدب العربي قديماً وحديثاً، فكاد الفرد أن يجزم بأن جل الأعمال الأدبية بكل أشكالها عند العرب قديماً وحديثاً تحوي تضميناً للمعنى ولعباً طريقاً بالكلمات لأغراض مختلفة وقد تكون مقصودة ومفتعلة من الكاتب أو تحدث صدفة ابن نانتي بشكل طريقة رأيتها غير مقصود، وجعل أكثر المضارب استعمالاً لها هي المقدمات العربية القديمة والقصائد الطويلة المختارة، وكذا الشعر الحديث بنوعه العمودي والحر، وقد كان العرب قديماً يتبارون بينهم بأبيات مضمونة طريقة تاركة للدم وآخرين للدم، ولهجاء يقول أحدهم:

فدارهم مادمت في دارهم وأرضهم مادمت في أرضهم
يغلب الجانب المسلم الطريق على التوروية في معظم الأحيان، لذلك نجدها تستعمل في النكت والروايات الطريقة دائماً في اللغة العربية والمثال التالي أفصحك دليل:

طربت الباب حتى كل متمنى
فلم كل متمنى. كالمتمنى
فقالت يا إسماعيل صبرا
فقلت يا أسماً على صبري

أما التوروية الجادة الرصينة فنجدها تستعمل في القرآن الكريم، فهناك الكثير من الآيات الكريم التي تحوي التوروية بجميع أنواعها، بل وآخرين لم يسبق للعرب أن استعملوا قبلًا والأية الكريم مثال على ذلك:

يقول الله عز وجل: "حتى بعطوا الجزية عن يد و هم صاغرون" التوبة 29
و هنا يبرز أقوى أنواع التوروية، لأن كلمة "يد" هي المعنى الغير مقصود والذي دائماً يرتبط ب "يطعوا" ولكن المعنى القوي المضمر هو الدلالة أي أن بعوا الجزية شاءوا أم أبوا.
لاستراتيجيات دي لاباستيتا

قدم الباحث ديرك دي لاباستيتا سبع استراتيجيات تساعد المترجم في نقل التورية من لغة لأخرى، وهي كالتالي:

1. ترجمة مقابل تورية
   حيث تخلق تورية في اللغة الهدف مقابلة لكل الأصلية ولكن ليس بالضرورة أن تحتوي نفس المركبات الخاصة بالتورية الأصلية.

2. ترجمة مقابل لا تورية
   و هنا يجب المترجم على خلق تورية مكافئة للأصلية أو قد لا يلاحظها أصلاً، وتنقسم هذه الاستراتيجية إلى ثلاث طرق فرعية:
   2.1 ترجمة معنى واحد للتورية الأصلية
       حيث يقوم المترجم بترجمة المعنى الأول فقط و باقل تكافؤ مع الأصل، بينما يحذف المعنى الثاني.
   2.2 ترجمة المعنيين معاً
       وهنا يلجأ المترجم إلى الترجمة الحرفية للمعنيين معاً، ولكن ليس بطريقة تنتج تورية سوية في اللغة الهدف.
   2.3 إعادة الصياغة
       في هذه الحالة تصاغ التورية الأصلية في اللغة الهدف بطريقة تجعل الوجهين المختلفين للتورية الأصلية غير ظاهرين ولكن تبقى على بعض العناصر الدلالية الأخرى.

3. الترجمة بمحسن بلاغي متعلق بها
   عندما يحاول المترجم خلق تورية مكافئة للأصلية فهو أحياناً يلجأ إلى تعويضها بمحسن بديعٍ أخر لكي يحافظ على القيمة الجمالية ويترك أثراً على القارئ المستهدف، وتعتبر هذه الاستراتيجية نظيرتها الأولى "تورية مقابل تورية" لأن المترجم في كلتا الحالتين يسعى جاهداً لخلق تورية مقابلة للأصل.

4. حذف التورية
   وهنا يقوم المترجم ببساطة بحذف الخطاب الذي يحوي التورية في النص الأصلي.

5. النسخ المباشر
   عادة ما يفحص المترجم كلمات أو عبارات التورية بلغتها الأصلية في النص الهدف كمحاولة منه لفك اللبس عنها و أملًا منه أن يستطيع القارئ أن يستطيع المعنى الأصلي للتورية.
وهي تحويل الاستراتيجية السابقة و لكن الفرق بينهما يكمن في مصطلحات استعمالها في أصلها حيث أن الأولى تكون على مستوى الدال وتقحم الكلمة كما هي في النص الهدف أما الثانية فقد عمل على مستوى المدلول وتتطلب مكونات النص الهدف مكافأتها من النص الأصلي.

7. لا تورياً مقابل تورياً [ضافة]

يقوم المترجم من خلالها بإدخال تورية في النص الهدف لا تتواجد أصلاً في النص الأصلي رغبة منه في تعويض تورية ما قد فشل في إنجازها.

8. صفر مقابل تورية [ضافة]

وهي استراتيجيات تعويضية أيضاً وذلك بإضافة تورية في مكان لا تتوافق فيه في النص الأصلي تماماً.

9. تقنيات التعديل

وهي طرق يلجأ إليها المترجم عادة لشرح التورية الأصلية بأساليب مختلفة من خلال الشروح المتضمنة داخل النص والجمل الوصفية الشرحية وتعليقات وآخرين تضاف في آخر الترجمة أو الصفحة لشرح التورية كحاشية المترجم مثلاً.

مناقشة النتائج المحصلة عليها في الدراسة

من خلال دراستنا لترجمة التورية في رواية "اليس في بلاد العجائب" من الإنجليزية إلى العربية على ضوء ترجمتي أميرة كيوان 1943 وشكر نصر الدين 2012 ورجوعا إلى الاستراتيجيات التسع التي اقترحها الباحث ديرك دي لا ستينتا 1996 و بعد أن قمنا بتحليل قراءة 40 مثالاً عن التورية من النص الأصلي للوصول إلى أدق النتائج، هذه الأمثلة هاللت كلها و قورنت مع نظيرتها في النصين المترجمين وقد عرضت الدراسة أكثر من نصف النماذج، فيما أفرقت النماذج الأخرى في الفهرس الشرح و ذلك بعرض التورية مرفقة برقم الصفحة و نوعها ومعناها.

بداية مع ترجمة شكر نصر الدين 2012 التي غلب عليها استعمال الترجمة الحرفي من خلال ترجمة 26 مثال حرفي من أصل 40 مثالاً وهو ما يمثل 65 بالمائة من المجموع الإجمالي، فيما استعمل التقنيات المشرفة 5 مرات بنسبة 12.5 بالمائة، ونجح أيضاً في خلق 8 تورية مكافئة للأصلية أي بنسبة 20 بالمائة من المجموع الكلي، ويجدر الذكر أيضاً أنه لجأ إلى حذف تورية واحدة في النص الأصلي أي بنسبة 2.5 بالمائة.
فيما يخص ترجمة أميرة كيوان 1943 فقد اعتمدت الترجمة الحرفية بشكل كبير، حيث ترجمت قرابة 30 تورية من أصل 40 حرفياً أي بنسبة 75 بالمائة، وقد مزجت بين الترجمة الحرفية و النسخ المباشر في 6 حالات أي ما يعادل 15 بالمائة، وقد اعتمدت على التقنيات الشارحة أيضاً في 3 حالات فقط أي بنسبة 7.5 بالمائة، فيما قامت بخلق تورية مكافئة للأصل فقط في حالة واحدة أي ما يعادل 2.5 بالمائة.

و بعد المقارنة بين الترجمتين لاحظنا استعمال الترجمة الحرفية بشكل كبير في كلتاهما، رغم أن شكر نصر الدين نجح خلق الكثير من التوروية المكافئة للأصل ولكن تبقى الترجمة الحرفية هي الإستراتيجية الغالبة في كلتا الترجمتين، و بهذا نؤكد الفرضية التي بنت عليها الدراسة الحالية بأن هذه الإستراتيجية هي الأكثر استعمالاً في النسختين، ويتعلق ذكر ذلك بكون نصر الدين شكل أو حتى طريقة في النسخة الأصلية، حيث أن القارئ العربي لا يستوعب اللغة الجميل بالكلمات الحاصلة في الرواية كما يفعل الإنجليزي، ولا يتمتع بأطوارها الجميلة التي تظهر أساساً بهذا التداول العام بالكلمات، بل تبقى في نظره قصة جافة لفتاة حالية تدعى آل س.

و بذلك نستطيع أن نؤكد أن الترجمة العربية لهذه الرواية لم تنجح فقط في نقل التلاعب الجميل بالكلمات الذي تنفه لويس كارول في استعماله، و نؤكد هذا القول لأن النسختين المختارتين في هذه الدراسة هما من أفضل النسخ العربية للقصة، رغم محاولات شكر نصر الدين التي لا تذكرها والتي جعلت ترجمته أفضل الترجمات العربية للقصة "أليس في بلاد العجائب" نظراً لأنه حاول جاهداً خلق أكبر عدد مكافئ للTORIA في النص الأصلي، ولكن ترجمته تبقى ناقصة نظراً لاعتماده على الترجمة الحرفية غالباً، ومقارنة مع ترجمة عالمية أخرى لهذه القصة التي ذاب المترجمون فيها على نقل القصة بكل حرفاتها وأثرها الطريف على القارئ بل بطريقة وجدنا فيها تلاعباً في الكلمات لم يحصل في النص الأصلي كتعويض منهم عن لعب ضاع في موضع ما، وهم ينطلقون من فكرة أن التوروية يمكن ترجمتها، وأن القصة المذكورة معتادة على التوروية بل و متميزة بها، ومن هنا لا يمكن ترجمة الرواية بتجاهل التورية المضمنة فيها بأي شكل من الأشكال، فهذا يهدم كيان الحكائية ويدمر الأثر المضمر في طياتها.

وقد نجحت أغلب اللغات في ترجمة التورية في هذه القصة رغم اختلافها الشاسع عن اللغة الإنجليزية، منها ترجمات فرنسية و تركية و صينية و روسية و ألمانية و أخرى أصبحت موروثاً أدبياً خالداً في مكتبات الأمصار.
الخاتمة

على ضوء النتائج المحصلة أعلاه، بدأ لنا كما قلنا أن ترجمة رواية "أليس في بلاد العجائب" إلى العربية

في النسختين السابقتين فاشئة خاصة على مستوى ترجمة التورية نظراً لتركيز المترجمين على ترجمة أطوار الحكاية فقط، والتي انتهجت حكاية ممالة وغريبة و خالية من كل طريق كما هو معروف عنها كثرته، وتجاهل أيضاً التلاعب بالكلمات والذي يحوي في طياته مضامين ورسائل مقصودة مخاطبة لعقول الكبار، وممتعة وطريفة للصغر في نفس الوقت، ومن هذا نستطيع القول أن الترجمتين السابقتين سجلا خيانة ولا مصداقية في نقل القصة الحقيقية التي بنلّا كاتبها جهدًا كبيرًا في تأليفها.

لكن هذا لا يعني أن ترجمة التورية من لغة لأخرى مستحيلة أو متعذرة، بل يرتبط هذا بالترجمات بعد ذاته، والدليل على إمكانية ترجمتها هو تلك الحكاية التي أنتجها "شكر نصر الدين" في ترجمته، والتي تجري أكثر من ترجمة مكافئة للإصل، والدليل الأكبر منه هو الترجمة العالمية لهذه الرواية والتي تترجم معظم الجمل التي فيها لعب بالكلمات بشكل رائع حتى بدت كأنها أصلية كتبها تلك اللغة المترجم إليها.

كما ذكرنا سابقاً، فإن نتائج المحصل عليها لا تحول دون ترجمة التورية أو تلزم بعدم ترجمتها بنجاح، بل تفتح المجال أمام ترجمة عربية أخرى في المستقبل الفرصة تأخذ على عاتقها ترجمة رواية لويس كارول

الشهرة ترجمة مخصصة للنص الأصلي بكل مضامينه وقيمته الجمالية، إضافة إلى أثره المنشود على القارئ، حتى يتأثر العربي بها كما تأثر غيره، وهذا يعتبر أساساً على كفاءة المترجم ومقدرته اللغوية في كلما اللغتين خاصة العربية، إضافة إلى بحثه المتواصل واطلاعه على كل خيابا النص، فمن المستحيل أن تترجم أي تورية في قصة "أليس في بلاد العجائب" دون البحث عن أصل الكلمة وتاريخها ومقابلتها في اللغة الإنجليزية وماهية الأثر الذي تركته في نفسه القارئ أو ما يرغب الكاتب في تضمينه أصلاً، حتى يستطيع المترجم العربي خلق تورية مكافئة مكيفة مع اللغة والثقافة اللغويتين معها، يعني أن فحص الكلمات و بيدع في استخدام كل ما يؤثر في القارئ العربي، ودلاً مما يتانبم مع بينته، أضف إلى ذلك إصرار المترجم على خلق مكافئة للتورية بأي حال من الأحوال، بحيث يكون المترجم كاتباً مبدعاً لا مترجمًا مقلداً أو على الأقل يكون ذلك باستبذال أو تعويض تورية في مقام آخر في ترجمته إذا تسبعت له الفرصة.