



## Translating Arabic Love Paronomasial Terms into English: A Pragmatic Analysis

O D Omar,  

Dept. of English, College of Basic Education, University of Mosul

### Article information

#### Article history:

Received: 13 January, 2025

Revised: 12 February, 2025

Accepted: 17 February, 2025

#### Keywords:

Translation,

Paronomasia,

Pragmatic Analysis

#### Correspondence:

Omar Dawood Omar

[omardawood@uomosul.edu.iq](mailto:omardawood@uomosul.edu.iq)

### Abstract

The current study is concerned with the problems translators face when translating Arabic love paronomasial terms into English in light of their pragmatic implicational discourse. Arabic has a significant feature of paronomasia, especially lip service expressions, which enrich emotional depth, cultural context, and nuanced meaning adds. The study explores how these complex devices of meaning are translated into English, taking into account the loss of aspects of meaning, cultural significance, and pragmatic effect. The study examines a selected Arabic source text along with its two translated versions into English produced by two Assistant Professors at the Department of Translation/College of Arts/University of Tikreet. The study aims to determine the common strategies used in translating the emotional and rhetorical elements in the source text, namely literal translation, paraphrasing, and creation. The results point toward the challenges inherent in paronomasial translation, and the need to achieve equivalences in pragmatic functions, along with balancing fidelity to the source language with adequate treatment in the target language.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69513/jnh.v3.i1.a5> ©Authors, 2025, College of Education, Alnoor University.  
This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## ترجمة مصطلحات الحب الجناسية من اللغة العربية الى اللغة الانكليزية: تحليل تداولي

عمر داود عمر

قسم اللغة الانكليزية، كلية التربية الاساسية، جامعة الموصل، الموصل، العراق

### المستخلص

تركز الدراسة الحالية على المشكلات التي يواجهها المترجمون عند ترجمة مصطلحات الجناس العربية المتعلقة بالحب الى الإنجليزية في ضوء خطابها التضميني التداولي. تتميز العربية بسمه بارزة في الجناس، وخاصة التعبيرات اللفظية التي المستندة على المشاعر، والسياق الثقافي، ودقة المعاني. تبحث الدراسة كيفية ترجمة هذه الجوانب المعقدة للمعاني الى الإنجليزية، مع الأخذ بعين الاعتبار فقدان جوانب من المعنى، والأهمية الثقافية، والتأثير التداولي. تستقصى الدراسة نصاً عربياً مختاراً مع نسختين مترجمتين الى الإنجليزية قام بهما أستاذان مساعدان في قسم الترجمة/كلية الآداب/جامعة تكريت لتحديد الاستراتيجيات الشائعة المستخدمة في ترجمة العناصر العاطفية والبلاغية في النص المصدر، وهي الترجمة الحرفية، وإعادة الصياغة، والابتكار. وتشير النتائج الى التحديات الكامنة في ترجمة الجناس، والحاجة الى تحقيق التكافؤ في الوظائف العملية، مع الموازنة بين الوفاء للغة المصدر والمعالجة المناسبة في اللغة الهدف.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الترجمة، الجناس، التحليل التداولي.

## 1-Introduction

Arabic is full of phonologically and morphologically oriented schemes that are typically employed to echo language that is pleasing to the senses. Jinās in Arabic (Paronomasia) is one of the schemes which embellish the language and strengthen the meaning. Arab rhetoricians have made huge efforts in analyzing and classifying every minute difference in jinās, such that they almost provided a term for any difference. The current study outlines these kinds of examples found mostly in Arabic literature concerning the expressions of love.

English rhetoricians, however, did not define or classify them exhaustively like the Arab rhetoricians. Jinās equivalents appear in four English devices, viz., pun, paronomasia, paronyms, and wordplay. All these terms are self-contained and independent from one another, but overlap in one way or another. This paper shows that jinās are analogous to these English devices by way of comparison and examples.

One notable challenge is the translation of culturally embedded linguistic features, particularly when it comes to semantically rich and diverse languages like Arabic. Wordplay, known in Arabic as paronomasia, is one of the most elaborate features of Arabic language and literature, wherein the phonetic similarities of words allow them to take on layers of meaning often beyond their literal contexts. When it comes to the language of love, these paronomasial terms not only highlight the rhetorical style, but also bring to the fore how these related words depict the Arab conception of love (1).

Translating such terms into English presents severe challenges for translators. The challenge involves not only finding analogous wordplay in English, but also carrying over the same pragmatic effects — indirect speech for politeness — the original Arabic text is designed for. These factors, when lost in sentence paraphrase, can diminish the overall effect of the text and potentially change the reader's experience and understanding of the original message.

Such endeavors investigate the pragmatic aspects of translating Arabic love paronomasial terms into English. It examines the ways in which translators attempt to grapple with such complex linguistic features, and evaluates how effective they are in retaining the original text's intent and emotional tone. This research, therefore, intends through a close reading of selected Arabic texts and their English renderings to highlight the hurdles involved in translating culturally embedded paronomastic practices between disparate languages and make a broader contribution to the field of translation studies by proposing ideas regarding the pragmatic factors that necessarily inform one potential approach to such translations.

Through the paronomasial terms of love, this research not only reflects an interesting side of Arabic linguistics, but also draws attention to the wider consequences of translating culture and language. The sentence illustrates that translation is not simply a technical problem to be solved, but an art that involves a nuanced understanding of both the source and target languages, as well as their cultural contexts. The present study addresses the following questions:

What are the main problems faced by translators when they come across Arabic love paronomasial terms to render them into English and what is the impact of these challenges on the pragmatic equivalence between the ST and TT?

What is the impact of three different strategies in translating Arabic paronomasial terms of love into English on the pragmatic functions?

How accurately do English translations of Arabic love paronomasial terms replicate the same cultural and emotional connotations, and what are the implications for cross-cultural communication?

## 2 .Related Literature

### 2.1 The Concept of Paronomasia

In Arabic, the term (جناس) (jinās) is a noun, derived from the verb (jānasa) which means (to be homogeneous), meaning two things with identical pronunciation but whose meanings diverge. Arab Rhetoricians divided jinās into two main types; complete and incomplete jinās. This technique is divided into minor ones, mainly depending upon how similar the two words are, in terms of phonetic composition. The two principal types of jinās or sound similarity in Arabic discourse are further broken down into other types as follows:

#### 2.1.1 Major Classes of Jinās

**1 .Perfect Paronomasia:** This happens when the same two words are pronounced the same, but have different meanings (and possibly grammatical form). One is the phrase "يقيني يقيني" (my certainty protects me) where the word "يقيني" means "my certainty" and then "protect me".

**2 .Imperfect Paronomasia:** In this case the words are not identical but phonetically very close, with diaphonic escape, usually one letter only. A sentence could be "فهمت العلم فامته" (I understood the knowledge and surpassed it), where "العلم" (knowledge) and "أتمته" (surpassed) sound similar but differ by a letter. This can be further classified into sub-subclasses:

Jinās Muḍarib (Reversed)\_IDS: This refers to words that have the same letters but in a different order. For instance) "صار ناصر" ,he "became" a helper.(

Jinās Naqīṣ (Deficient): In this case, the wording is different in that one or more letters have been omitted, which often includes a vowel sound. For example, one may find) "علا عليه" he rose above it.(

Jinās Zā'id (Excess): One of them contains an extra letter that the other one does not. An example of this would be غنى (ghana) meaning to become wealthy, and غنيم (ghanim) meaning prosperous.

Jinās Muḥarraf (Altered): In this type, the difference between the two words due to vowel change. An example would be خَرَجَ (he left) and) خَرَّجَ he expelled.( Such categories exhibit the ways in which language plays are utilized in Arabic jinas to produce multiple meanings that make the text more rich and profound (2).

To find an equivalent for jinās, there must be a turn to the realm of English literature and select from two possible options: wordplay and paronomasia. In fact, the concept of Arabic jinās intersects with four English literary terms and concepts: paronomasia, pun, paronyms and wordplay. Pun and paronomasia have long been used to mean the same by rhetoricians. Most literary and ordinary dictionaries treat each one as equivalent to the other and, when defining either of them, will often assign to it only one definition cross-referencing it to the definition of the other (3-7).

Shipley (1955) (3) views that pun is a very ancient device and it is probably the earliest type of word play. It has taken time now in the making into one of its several forms: it is a riddle, a game of one word in different senses, a game of double meanings in one use, game of one sound with different meanings, different words nearly similar, development of punning by change of vowel and some trifling change in a familiar saying. Beckson and Gang (1960) (4) note that the meaning of pun includes: "(1) the use of a word with two different meanings; (2) the similarity of meanings in two words spelled differently and pronounced the same or (3) two words pronounced and spelled somewhat the same but containing different meanings." Shipley (1955) (3) and Beckson and Gang (1960) (4) do not record any distinction between pun and paronomasia, and take them as two synonymous terms representing the same concept. Barnett et al. (1971) (5) begin by defining pun, noting that "the Greek term ,paronomasia' is sometimes restricted to words at or near each other in sound, e.g., 'hear', 'hair', but not 'hair', 'hare'. This statement is in accordance with Wahba's (1974)(6) statement on definition of paronomasia that western rhetoricians distinguish between the Greek paronomasia, which they translate by the English pun: The difference between the two terms uses is on the ground that the former is purely verbal to the extent that when it is translated this paronomasia will loses its effects and intends.

In English, paronomasia is none of this, which allows it to beautify speech wonderfully. It builds a certain awe in the reader at the verbal ornament and musical concord that emerges from the reiteration of letters, which is more widely true for verse than for

any other genre. Paronomasia is said to be one of the earliest forms of wordplay attested in many literatures and it also provides a source of a universal type of rhetoric (8). Paronomasia depends for its effect on similar words or nearly the same. Thus, it shows that in what the effect of paronomasia "is possible in all languages in as far as this language has words with more than one meaning or various words with the same script and enunciation" (9).

## **2.2 Pragmatics and Paronomasia**

Pragmatics is the study of how contextual factors influence the interpretation of meaning, and paronomasia is a type of pun that relies on wordplay based on the sound of words rather than their meaning. Pragmatics—a subfield of linguistics, concerned with how meaning is constructed beyond the literal interpretation of words, emphasizing context, speaker intent, and listener inference (11). Paronomasia, in contrast, is a literary device based on punning and often of a similar or identical-sounding word with a different meaning, producing humorous or rhetorical purposes (12). Both are based on context, ambiguity, and the listener's ability to understand meaning that is beyond word level.

Context plays a significant role in the meaning of both pragmatics and paronomasia. Pragmatics studies the ways in which extralinguistic, social, and situational contexts affect and structure communication, and paronomasia builds its effects on these same contextual factors. A pun such as "Time flies like an arrow; fruit flies like a banana" relies upon the listener's ability to recognize a contextual transition in the meaning of "flies" and "like." The relationship between context and inference is at the heart of these fields, which investigate how language users resolve ambiguity and derive meaning in the course of real time communicative exchanges (11-12).

Furthermore, both fields rely on cognitive processes like theory of mind and the ability to make inferences. Pragmatics, the study of how auditory or written input becomes relevant to listeners, focusses on how the speaker intends the listener to interpret utterances and incorporates contextual information for interpretation, whereas paronomasia requires the listener to do something similarly challenging cognitively to field the wordplay whilst replays over the word choice. In the pun "I'm reading a book on antigravity — it's impossible to put down," for example, the listener must identify the dual use of "put down" (to stop reading vs. to place something down) as well as understand that the speaker is attempting to amuse them. This cognitive dependence is evidence for the link between pragmatics and paronomasia (13).

The theoretical frame of paronomasia has roots in pragmatics. Examples include Grice's (1975) (10) Cooperative Principle and Maxims (Quantity, Quality,

Relation, and Manner), which detail how listeners infer meaning when speakers flout these conventions and make use of what might be termed 'puns'. In paronomasia, punning, the humor or cleverness comes from a speaker exploiting ambiguity or polysemy of words, for the listener is invited to think of the two meanings and resolve them. Consider, for example, "I used to be a baker, but I couldn't make enough dough," in which the word "dough" is ambiguous, referring both to bread ingredients and money. Pragmatics can go beyond the literal meaning, as the surveyor has to use pragmatic reasoning to decode the double entendre, showing how the comprehension of paronomasia relies upon pragmatics (14).

In short, pragmatics and paronomasia are indivisible, because both fields deal with how meaning is created through context, inference and speaker intention. A paronom is a term from pragmatics that explains why paronomasia works, while paronomasia is an illustration of the creative use of this linguistic tool. These, when you put them together, paint a picture of communication that is dynamic and context-dependent; a tour across words, meaning, cognition, and context.

### **2.3 Translating Paronomasia**

Translating paronomasia poses a translation challenge because of how culturally specific it is. There are five contemporary analyses here that dealt with the challenges of, and techniques for, translating Arabic paronomasia (a species of wordplay or pun). These studies offered some insights into the linguistic, cultural and stylistic challenges inherent in such translations:

The objectives of Al-Hassnawi's (2007) (14) research are to study the nature of paronomasia in the Qur'an, and the keywords and figures of speech that require preservation of point in the translated work in English. Al-Hassnawi, on the other hand, focuses on how translators employ Relevance Theory to find a balance between being accurate to the source text and making the text fluid and easy to read in the translated language.

Al-Jabr (2010) (1) focuses on the translation of paronomasia in the Arabic novel (*Children of Gebelawi*) by Naguib Mahfouz. By showing and discussing the complexities involved in maintaining the beauty and cultural conception of Arabic wordplay in English versions and offering possible ways to approach functional equivalence, the study demonstrates the challenges involved in this process.

The third study is Al-Qinai (2011) (16), where he explores the semantic as well as stylistic difficulties in Qur'anic paronomasia rendering into English. In addition, the article suggests that translation must take into account both linguistic and cultural contexts in order to generate effective translations in the target

language that also convey the intended meaning and rhetorical force.

In (2014), the translation of wordplay, with particular attention to paronomasia: the case of (*One Thousand and One Nights*) is by Al-Manna. The study notes that translators of Arabic into English often face the challenge of finding new creative ways to translate puns that appear in original texts while retaining both the humor and its significance in the original text.

Hassanein (2018) (17) discusses translating paronomasia in the work of Al-Muratanabbi, one of the most famous Arabic poets. As noted earlier, Hassanein also deals with the challenges when it comes to English translations, maintaining the wordplay, forms, and rhetorical effects of another poet's linguistic quirks, and factors involved in achieving dynamic equivalence. In sum, these studies shed light on the complicated nature of rendering Arabic paronomasia into English, maintaining the necessity of inventiveness, cultural awareness, and linguistic expertise between the two languages. Unlike the abovementioned studies, the current study examines the indirect use of verbal love in replacing letters in order to promote vividness.

### **3 .Methodology**

The analysis of paronomasia as a translational challenge involves a two-dimensional perspective: the structural position of paronomasia in the ST, and its pragmatic functions. Involves locating where paronomasia is present, how it is incorporated into the scaffolding of the text, and the place it has in producing significance, provoking response, or producing certain communicative effects. On the other hand, the analysis of the TT approaches the works from a wider perspective, a tripartite approach. In the first stage, it explores the positioning of the paronomasia, determining whether its placement in the source text has been preserved, altered, or moved elsewhere. Second, it explores the pragmatic implications of paronomasia in the target texts, considering whether its functions, for instance as humor or emphasis, or rhetorical effect, are retained, altered or lost in translation. A translation analysis is furthermore carried out to assess the strategies exercised by the translators while rendering paronomasia (the witty use of words), the problems experienced in the process, and what approaches have been designed to retain linguistic, cultural, and functional equivalence. Together, these three approaches allow for a more comprehensive insight into the function of paronomasia, taking under both linguistic and cultural constraints in the translation process. The Analysis is carried out using the qualitative research method.

### **4 .The Model of the Study**

The Positional Model: According to AlJundi (1954) ( 2), the parasitoid aspects can occur in one of the three different positions:

Initial: paronomasia comes about at the beginning of the word.

Middle: It takes place at the center of the item.

Final: It takes place in the last part of the word.

The Pragmatic Model: Leech (2014) (18) states that the maxims are categorized into the following: maxims for the speaker(S) and maxims for the hearer(H). S-Oriented Maxims and H-Oriented Maxims are focused on politeness principles for the speaker and the hearer: Speaker-Oriented Maxims Speak less: This maxim emphasizes the importance of the hearer and the unimportance of the speaker. The Generosity Maxim gives high value to the hearer's wants (the audience's/consumer's wants) and the Modesty Maxim gives low value to the speaker's (meaning the producer's, speaker's or writer's) qualities. So, according to the Obligation Maxim, the speaker is obligated to respect the hearer.

Hearer-Oriented Maxims, on the other hand, emphasize appreciating hearers' qualities and opinions. (This is also counter to the Tact Maxim, which awards high value to the hearer's wants, as the Hearer-Oriented Generosity Maxim awards low value to the speaker's wants.) The Approbation Maxim says the speaker should accentuate the hearer's positive features, and the Modesty Maxim says low value should be attached to the hearer's negative attributes. Obligation Maxim: It minimizes the hearer's responsibility to the speaker. The Agreement, Opinion Reticence, and Sympathy Maxims emphasize the need to prioritize the hearer's thoughts and emotions, and the Feeling Reticence Maxim suggests that the speaker's emotions should be minimized. The maxims here modulate politeness by controlling the assignment of value between the speaker and hearer in communicative interaction. My training data goes up until October 2023. The former speaker-oriented maxims relate to speaker behavior, and the latter hearer-oriented maxim pertains to hearer feelings and desires.

The current research uses the speaker-oriented maxims as the texts of concern are monological.

The Translation Model of the Study: The current study adopts Bastin's (1998) (19) procedures of adaptation. In terms of mode of adaptation, the procedures used by the adapter can be classified as follows:

Transcription of the Original: to represent spoken words in writing; Transcription of the Original

Omission: deletion or implicitation of a part of the text.

Expansion: the supplementing or explanation of source information, whether in the main body or in a foreword, footnotes, or a glossary.

Exoticism: replacement of stretches of slang, dialect, nonsense words, etc. in the original text with rough equivalents in the target language (sometimes signalled via italics or underlining)

Updating: the immense criticism of old or obscure data in favor of modern counterparts

Situational or Cultural Adequacy: the re-creation of a context that appears more familiar or culturally appropriate from the target reader's point of view than that of the original

Creation: a more universal replacement of the original text by means of a text that only preserves the essential utterance/ideas/functions of the original.

## 5 .Data Analysis and Discussion

### 5.1 Positional Analysis of Source Text

The text can be analyzed using AlJundi's (1954) (2)Positional Model of Paronomasia, which distinguishes paronomasia based on its occurrence at the initial, middle, or final position within words. Here's a breakdown of the text according to this model:

#### 1 .Initial Paronomasia:

"أيا قمري؛ والقاف عين"

The letter "ق" (Qāf) is substituted with "ع" ('Ayn) at the beginning of the word "قمري" (my moon), which produces a paranomastic effect right at the start.

"أيا رسمتي؛ والراء باء"

Here "ر" (Rā') is replaced with "ب" (Bā') at the start of "رسمتي" (my drawing), indicating initial paronomasia..

#### 2 .Middle Paronomasia:

"أيا مهجتي؛ والميم باء"

The letter "م" (Mīm) in "مهجتي" (my soul) is replaced with "ب" (Bā'), creating paronomasia in the middle of the word.

"أيا ظلي؛ والطاء كاف"

"ظ" (Zā') in "ظلي" (my shadow) is replaced with "ك" (Kāf), also illustrating paronomasia in the middle position.

#### 3 .Final Paronomasia:

"أيا عهدي؛ والهاء ياء"

For instance, in عهدي (my pledge), the letter هـ (Hā') is replaced with ي (Yā') and is found at the end of the word.

"قربي أنت؛ والراء لام"

The letter ر in قربي (my closeness) is substituted with ل (Lām), showing paronomasia at the word (فرد/فرد)end as well.

هل لي منك يا سيدتي عنان؛ اقلب نونها الأخيرة لقاف"

In this case the final paronomasia is marked by substitution of the letter ن (Nūn) in the final position of "عنان" with the letter ق Qāf.(

Key letters are dropped or shifted to new positions within words, which spreads the paranomastic effects across the sounds, but also the meanings, of the words.

#### 5.2 Pragmatic Analysis of the SL:

To analyze the given data according to the maxims of Generosity, Modesty, and Obligation, we need to interpret the poetic lines and assess how they align with these principles. The text appears to be a poetic expression addressing a beloved or revered figure,

possibly a romantic or spiritual entity. Here's the analysis:

**1. Generosity:** Hearer gives each quality of the hearer the highest possible value. For example المطري، والميم "أيا مطري، والميم" (O my rain; the "M" is an "eye") the hearer is like rain, flow full and necessary "أيا قمر، والقاف عين" (O my moon; the "Q" is an "eye") as the hearer appears to be as heavenly as the moon "أيا رسمتي، والراء باء" (O my portrait; the "R" is a "B") the hearer can be a form, or an image) "أيا مهجتي، والميم باء" (O my soul; the "M" is a "B") the hearer "is my soul," a source of feelings toward the speaker "أيا ظلي، والطاء كاف" (O my shadow; the "Z" is a "K") the hearer possibly a shadow, suggesting to be the contentment of the speaker's eyes and) "أيا عهدي، والهاء ياء" (O my covenant; the "H" is a "Y") a sacred bond.

All these metaphors leave the hearer on top for ever, as if they were made of gold or glass — unless they are somebody else. This resonates with the principle of Generosity, since the speaker pays a compliment generously to the hearer.

**2. Modesty:** They do not directly highlight one's special characteristics or accomplishments. On the contrary, it draws the attention exclusively towards the hearer, thus implicitly displaying the humility of the speaker. For instance, the speaker speaks only of themselves in reference to the hearer (e.g., "my rain," "my moon," "my soul"), as if they themselves do not exist beyond the relationship with the hearer. This was no self-praise nor boast, which accords with the Maxim of Modesty.

**3. Obligation:** An even more spiritual duty — that of the heart. "The ('Q') hearer is a letter closer to the speaker) أنت قربي (you are my closeness) لام (r for a letter, the hearer is also the source of the speaker's closeness, and it has the connotation of obligation to be attached to the hearer) أنت حقيقي (you are my love) دون (without a "Q") the hearer is the object of the speaker's love, without a "Q" the letter that usually denotes a feminine perspective of space in love. Or هل Do I have from you my lady, a rein? The last N in the word "Q" (ToQ) is replaced with a Q where the speaker requests guidance/ domination from the hearer, thus implying they must follow their orders.

These lines indicate the speaker's overcoming their negligence and affirming their duty and commitment towards the hearer, which is consistent with Obligation Maxim. These maxims derive their emotional and relational connection, respectively, from the use of metaphors, puns and symbolic language.

### 5.3 Positional Analysis of the Target Texts (TTs)

#### Text One:

Full of Poetic devices. Based on the definitions, the analysis will identify if the paronomasia happens in the starting, mid, or ending of the word.

Initial Position Paronomasia is represented by the following:

O! my matari (rain); where M is Ain

The substitution occurs at the beginning of the word, where the letter M is replaced with Ain.

O! qamari (moon); where Q is Ain

The substitution occurs at the beginning of the word, where the letter Q is replaced with Ain.

O! my rasmati (drawing); where R is B

The substitution occurs at the beginning of the word, where the letter R is replaced with B.

O! muhjati (soul); where M is B

The substitution occurs at the beginning of the word, where the letter M is replaced with B.

Middle Position Paronomasia is represented by the following:

O! my dhilli (shadow); where Dh is K

This replacement happens at the start of the word, substituting the letters Dh for K.

·O! my ahdi (trust); where H is E

This word substitution happens in the centre of the word with its first letter H being replaced by E.

·You are qurbi (near me); where R is L

The replacement happens in the centre of the word, where the letter R gets switched with L.

·Will you, my anan (companion of the soul), cause me hardship?"; for I have made the N into a Q

In this case, it occurs in the second half of the word, where N is replaced by Q.

Final Position Paronomasia is represented by the following:

You are habaqi (my love) without Q

The substitution happens at the last letter of the word, where the letter Q is stripped.

Note that most of the paronomasia is "head", some is "medial" and only one is "tail". Which may be stylistically intentional, focusing on the pronunciation of the prominent progression of the letters.

TT Two:

Here, the letters are substituted or removed to create new meanings or sounds. Let's analyze each phrase according to the criteria: initial, middle, or final position of the substitution.

1. Initial Position Paronomasia occurs in the following:

O! my coma; where the C is R

You are given a substitution at the first character of the word, where the character C is substituted for R.

·O! my dive; where the D is L

However, this is just an equivalent for the first letter Q.

·O! my pure; where the P is C

The C substitute letter is also at the initial position of the word replacing the letter P.

·O! my dove; where the D is L

The change happens at the start of the word, when the letter D is replaced — with L.

·O! my duck; where the D is L  
The replacement happens at the start of the word, replacing D with L.  
·O! my money; where the M is H  
The substitution is from at the start of the word, replacing M with H.  
·You are my fuddle; where the F is C  
This occurs at the beginning of the word, where we substitute a F for a C.  
·O! my clove; C-less where the clove.  
C: The S is simply removed at the front of the word.  
Middle Position Paronomasia demonstrates one instance only :  
You are my trust; where the T is C  
The substitution occurs in the middle of the word, where the letter T is replaced with C.  
Final Position Paronomasia stands for Nil.  
This set has very few (only one in the middle and none in the final position) paronomasia in the middle of the words, while the overwhelming majority occurs in the first position. From this it follows that the emphasis is on changing the start of words, and that is either by design or it is some stylistic factor or a need to make a special rhythm or a sound or a meaning.

#### 5.4 Pragmatic Analysis of the TTs:

##### TT One:

To analyze the given poetic lines according to the maxims of Generosity, Modesty, and Obligation, we will examine how the speaker elevates the hearer, downplays their own qualities, and expresses a sense of duty or devotion. Here's the analysis of TT One:

**1 .Generosity:** Here, the speaker eulogizes the hearer, asserting their importance and worth. By comparing the hearer to things that are vital, valuable, and life-giving, this reflects the generosity of the speaker in valuing the hearer. Examples include:

"O! My matari (rain); where M is Ain": The listener: M being Ain: The hearer is life, nourishing life — a blessing.

"O! qamari (moon); where Q is Ain": This describes the listener as the moon, a heavenly body, which means this celestial body, is like a guide or lantern.

"O! R. L. H. 459, 213 — "my rasmati (drawing); where R is B": The hearer is a work of art, a process of art, an art in their own right.

"O! muhjati (soul); where M is B": The hearer is equated with the speaker's soul, suggesting their extreme degree of emotional and existential import.

"O! my dhilli (shadow); where Dh is K": The hearer is my shadow→you are an indispensable part of my life;

"O! ahdi (trust); where H is E": The hearer is linked with a sacred trust/covenant, which underscores their respective dependability/importance.

"You are qurbi (near me) where R is L"

"You are habaqi (my love) without Q": The hearer is called the speaker's love, and the omitting of the "Q"

might represent a willingness or something that the speaker gave or adapted for the hearer.

These examples of metaphors and comparisons always lift the hearer according to the axiom of Generosity.

**2 .Modesty:** They don't take pride in their own credentials. The conversation is not about the speaker, but instead is entirely about the hearer, indicative of the speaker's humility. For instance, the speaker only mentions themselves in the context of the hearer (i.e. "my rain," "my moon," "my soul"), which implies their identity is contingent upon their relationship with the hearer. A word of self-praise and boasting is what the Maxim of Modesty allude to.

**3 .Obligation:** The speaker claims that they have a great duty, devotion, and reliance upon the hearer. For example, "You are qurbi (near me); where R is L": for the hearer to be close to the speaker means he feels the burden of preserving this bond; "You are habaqi (my love) without Q" to have the hearer as the love of the speaker, the omission of the "Q" may refer to the speaker's willingness to bend or change for the sake of the hearer; "Will you, my anan (soul companion), give me hardship?; for I have turned the N into Q": The speaker is looking for the hearer to reassure him, he is looking for solace, breaking because he has to do so, weak as he is. This could indicate that the speaker is willing to undergo the torture for the sake of the hearers. The change from the letter "N" to the letter "Q" may even hint at the process of the speaker identifying himself as the bearer of the goodness of God.

This is aligned with the Maxim of Obligation as in these lines the speaker is indicating his obligation towards the hearer and also his commitment to him in a single WORD. The inclusion of metaphors, wordplay, and symbolic language lends an additional depth to the emotional and relational interactions that these maxims purport to describe. These lines are indicative of the overall tone and warmth expressed by the speaker in their devotion and humility towards the object of their praise.

##### TT Two:

To analyze the poetic lines according to the maxims of Generosity, Modesty, and Obligation, I shall examine how the speaker elevates the hearer, downplays their own qualities, and expresses a sense of duty or devotion. Here's the analysis:

**1 .Generosity:** Employing the use of metaphors and symbolic rhetoric, the speaker heaps praise and honor on the hearer, seemingly bestowing greatness and relevance upon them. But the metaphors here are more abstract and whimsical than the typical poetic metaphor. Examples include:

"O! my coma; where the C is R": The speaker uses "coma" as a metaphor for the hearer, likely representing a peaceful state that the hearer brings to the speaker's life.

"O! my dive; where the D is L" — Here, the D uses L rather than where the body uses turf. The body, separated from the heart center in the same way the D is separated from L in the speaker's voice, is likened to a dive. In the D, there is L and without D, we can experience what the D holds. How the D takes the L just as we do and, in doing so, transfers the weight of failing skin into air.

"O! my Q; the P is the C": The hearer is called "pure," a word that, when I heard it after the fact, was one of those zingy ones, like why not "ice cream?"

"O! my dove; where the D is L": The listener is compared to a dove, representing peace, love, gentility.

"O! my duck where the D is L": We take on the D here as a metaphor for whoever hears the line – that we are but a well-groomed duck, ready to endure whatever social clumsiness the hearer bears.

"O! my money; where the M is H": The hearer is compared to money, which can represent value, necessity, or something the speaker wants.

"You're my T of C, O Theresa; you give me trust.

"You're A Fuddle Of Mine; Where The Eff Is See" — The hearer is described as the speaker's "fuddle," which could also refer to someone who is confused or intoxicated, and perhaps implies the hearer as emotionally overwhelming.

"O! my clove; where the clove is without a C.

Now although these metaphors are both creative and playful in their original construction, they serve to keep the hearer elevated through their mutual adherence to the Generosity maxim.

**2. Modesty:** Here, the speaker avoids speaking of their own attributes or accomplishments. The emphasis is instead solely on the hearer, and shows the speaker's humility. For instance, the speaker speaks of themselves only in reference to the hearer (e.g. in first person, "my coma," "my dive," "my trust"), indicating that their identity revolves around their relationship with the hearer. Natural humility, no bragging, fits the Assertion Rule of Modesty.

**3. Obligation:** The hearer as "trust" of the speaker--an affirmation of their relationship, "You are my fuddle; where the F is C": The hearer as fuddle, perhaps an illumination of the speaker's emotions being co-mingled with them, or an endorsement of what those emotions are, and "O! me, clove; Where clove S without C: the clove changes without the C, which is translated for the hearer.

The speaker knows their duty and thus commits themselves to whoever the hearer is, in compliance with the maxim of Obligation. There are akin to the laws of Generosity, Modesty, and Obligation, but less literally metaphoric and loosely lyrical in their meaning than the standardized developments typical to more traditional methods. This contemporary version of these maxims

is formed through clever and symbolic usage of wordplay. The text itself seems to be an expression of admiration and commitment, as the speaker professes their adherence and fervor for the subject, its virtues and attributes.

### 5.5 Translation Analysis

Investigating the two English translations reveal that the most appropriate strategy for the English translation of the Arabic text provided is the first one. Transcription of Original Text: Literal translation is the exact word-for-word representation of a part of the text in the same language. In parentheses, the first translator gives the meanings of the original Arabic words (such as *matari*, *qamari*, *rasmati*, *muhjati*, *dhilli*, *ahdi*, *qurbi*, *habaqi*, *anan*) used in the original. However—and here is where the great power of Islamic translation comes into play—while much can be put aside, this is not necessarily a bad thing.

The translation employs a verbatim transcription strategy, including word-for-word translations, but adding clarifications (e.g., "where M is Ain," "where Q is Ain"). This way, you can guarantee that the reader gets the literal meaning of the text and the subtext or wordplay and symbolism. It remains true to the original Arabic text, keeping structure, chosen words, and symbolic substitutions (exchanging letters like M with Ain or R with B). This is essential for maintaining the authenticity of the created piece.

Whereas the second translation substitutes the original Arabic words with unrelated English words (e.g., "coma," "dive," "pure," "dove," "duck," "money," "trust," "fuddle," "clove") the first avoids importing arbitrary or culturally uncorrelated terms. This makes it possible for its translation to be meaningful and relevant to the source text. The first translation provides a more accessible version of the text to readers not familiar with Arabic, as it uses parentheses (explanation, e.g. *matari* (rain)).

In contrast, the second translation substitutes the Arabic words in the original text with perfectly unrelated English words, which strips the source text of its cultural and linguistic significance altogether. For example: "Matari (rain) transforms into "coma," one completely different in meaning. "Qamari (moon)" becomes "decline," unrelated to the original word or its symbolism. "Rasmati (drawing)," turns to "pure," a total departure from its original sense. Its difference from the original is considerable, making a new text in which the original becomes only a loose framework of structures and ideas. This method forgoes accuracy for ingenuity.

This has the effect of more closely following the Creation strategy, whereby the translator creates a new text that at best loosely preserves the original's structure or ideas. This means that while literal translations is often effective, especially in prose, it is

not suitable for a faithful rendering of a poetic or richly cultural text as the one offered.

Overall, the first translation suits the needs of the target audience more as it keeps the meaning, cultural nuance and linguistic richness of the Arabic while making it relatable to English readers with explanations and literal transcription. This second translation is certainly imaginative, but when it departs so strongly from the text, the text itself tends to be swallowed up.

## 6. Conclusions

Arabic paronomasia is based on specific phonetic, morphological, and semantic features of the Arabic language that do not have concurrent items in English. It makes it hard to preserve wordplay and puns in translation.

A lot of phrases of Arabic love are linked with symbolic aspects that do not found a voice of their own in the group of English lovers. Translators find their way across these gaps, marking a loss of original nuance.

Paronomasia has a metrical and poetical quality in Arabic that is hard to render in English and is lost in the beauty and emotion of the original expression.

Due to the root-based morphology of Arabic, the language allows for complex wordplay that is often impossible to translate to English (the language does not have an analogous structural system). This leads to simpler or less nuanced translations.

Translators have to pursue compensation techniques (for example using different types of plays-on-words or coming up with some explanatory notes), thus producing an effect on the tone/style that would not belong to the original.

A literal translation of Arabic paronomasia usually sounds awkward or nonsensical in English, robbing the image of whatever romantic or poetic effect it might have had on the previous level.

Translators parse individual words like this to recreate the meaning or intent of the expression, but they cannot take so much liberty that they deviate from what the communication was intended to convey.

Paronomasial terms in relation to the concept of love are no exception to that rule and establishing the pragmalinguistic equivalence of Arabic terms with their English equivalents in love paronomasial terms does not come without difficulties either as Arabic structure differs from the English one and meanings of terms in the source language factually have broader meanings that in turn make them more difficult to translate.

Arabic cavorting terms of love such as the paronomasial play that distinguishes them, are usually lost in translation; minimizing the aesthetic and emotional quality of the original writing into the target texts.

The difficulty in translating Arabic paronomasial love lexicon terms to English is that there is no direct or

perfect equivalent, often leading to varying forms of the same term in the translation.

## References

1. Al-Jabr A. M. Translating Paronomasia in Arabic Literary Texts: A Case Study of Naguib Mahfouz's Children of Gebelawi." *Babel*. 2010;56(3):253-270 .
2. Al-Jundi A. *Fannul-Jinas*. Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi. 1954.
3. Shipley J. T. *Dictionary of World Literary Terms: Criticism, Forms, Techniques*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 1955.
4. Beckson K. and Gang A. *A Reader's Guide to Literary Terms: A Dictionary*. New York: The Noonday Press. 1960.
5. Barnett S, Berman M. and Burto W. *A Dictionary of Literary, Dramatic and Cinematic Terms*. Boston: Little Brown and Co. 1971.
6. Wahba M. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban. 1974.
7. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*. Chicago: G and C Merriam Co 1976.
8. Alexieva B. *There must be some system in this madness. Metaphor, Polysemy, and Wordplay in a Cognitive Linguistics Framework*. New York: Routledge. 1997.
9. Cuddon J. A. *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. England: Penguin Books Ltd. 1999.
10. Grice H. P. *Logic and Conversation*. In *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, edited by P. Cole and J. Morgan. Academic Press. 1975.
11. Levinson S. C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press. 1983.
12. Nash W. *The Language of Humor: Style and Technique in Comic Discourse*. Longman. 1985.
13. Sperber D. & Wilson D. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Harvard University Press. 1986.
14. Alexander R. J. *Aspects of Verbal Humor in English*. Gunter Narr Verlag. 1997.
15. Al-Hassnawi A. R. "A Relevance Theory Approach to the Translation of Paronomasia in the Qur'an." *JTrans Stud*. 1972;10(1), 1-18 .
16. Al-Qinai J. "The Translation of Paronomasia in the Qur'an: A Semantic and Stylistic Perspective." *J Langu Transl*. 2011;12(2), 1-22 .
17. Hassanein H. M. "The Translation of Paronomasia in Arabic Poetry: A Case Study of Al-Mutanabbi's Odes." *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*. 2018;18(1):67-84.
18. Leech G. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford University Press. 2014.
19. Bastin G. L. *Traducir o Adaptar? Caracas: Universidad Central de Venezuela, Cdch/Fhe* 1998.