



**TRANSLATABILITY OF ARABIC LITERARY
INCONGRUITY INTO ENGLISH**

By /Tahseen Ameen Faisal

**Assist. Prof. College of Basic Education, University of
Tikrit.**

ان الهدف الاساس لهذا البحث هو استكشاف والتحقق من امكانية ترجمة التناظر (التعاور) اللغوي بين اللغتين العربية والانجليزية من خلال اجراء دراسة مقارنة لهذه الظاهرة اللغوية في كلتا هاتين اللغتين. وذلك لتمهيد الطريق أمام المترجمين , مدرسي الترجمة أو الباحثين في الدراسات الترجمة للقيام بمهامهم (والتي لن تكون باليسيرة) كل حسب اختصاصه من خلال الاستفادة من مخرجات (نتائج) هذه الدراسة البحثية اخذين بالاعتبار هذه النتائج كأدوات يمكن استعمالها وهكذا مهمة. ولقد قامت الدراسة البحثية هذه بعرض وتوضيح النتائج بشكل جداول. تضمن الجدولان الأولان تصنيفا لأنواع التناظر اللغوي التي تم عرضها بصورة وافية في سياق الدراسة البحثية هذه حسب المستويات اللغوية التالية (صوتي ومورفيمي، ومفرداتي و نحوي ودلالي وأسلوبية) لكلتا اللغتين موضوع بحث الدراسة الحالية كل على حدى. بينما تم جمع معلومات و بيانات الجدولين انفي الذكر في الجدول الثالث.

Abstract:

The aim of this research is to investigate the translatability of incongruity between Arabic and English languages through making a contrastive analysis this linguistic phenomena in these both concerned languages so as to pave the way for translators, translation teachers or researchers in performing their uneasy tasks of translation, teaching translation, or translation studies, by utilizing the outputs (results) of this research as tools that could be used by them, each for his field of practice. The outputs of the present research are presented and illustrated in the form of tables. The first two ones represent a categorization of level types of incongruity discussed sufficiently in the content of this research, such as (phonological, morphological, lexical, grammatical, semantic, and stylistic) in both concerned languages, each language alone. While the third table combined the information presented in the two mentioned above tables in one comprehensive table.

1. introduction

It is well-known that translation is the activity of replacing one linguistic item in one language (source language) by its equivalent one in the other language (target language).

In fact, this cannot be realized easily, especially when the matter is related to eloquent aspect of language, and more the matter will be if the two languages (S.L./ T.L.) are typically and genetically unrelated, as is the case with Arabic and English.

Incongruity in Arabic which is represented by all its main types: phonetic, morphological, lexical, grammatical, stylistic and semantic is one of the aspects of literary texts which can be encountered by translators, and causes real difficulties and problematic areas they face in the process of translating such texts.

The study aims at investigating this linguistic phenomenon and tries to find out if there is one-to-one equivalence between the two concerned languages (Arabic and English) or not, and if it is possible for the translator to tackle this problem, and which strategy could be the best to be followed.

It is hypothesized in this study that Arabic language is abundant with this rhetorical phenomenon, incongruity; while English is less with regard to this phenomenon. It is to be mentioned that loss of meaning is inevitable in translating such kind of texts. Yet, there is no doubt that various rhetorical devices can be employed to attain different linguistic phenomena. So, the present study initially assumes that incongruity is included. (Omar & Himood,2022:1)

This study is limited to Arabic literary discourse since this phenomenon is commonly used in this regard. The conclusion and results will be given according to the data under investigation.

2. The Problem

1. Due to cultural and linguistic differences between the two (English and Arabic), as they are genetically and culturally unrelated languages, translators are inevitably encountered untranslatability barriers; henceforth, loss of meaning is inescapable but in various degrees. Incongruity is one of expected phenomena that represent such assumption. (Ilyas, 1989: 53)

2. Lack of formal correspondence is a problematic area whereby translators face in rendering such a type of linguistic phenomena due to different factors, whether related to linguistic systems, or because of cultural specific bounds. (ibid: 53)

3. Aims of the Study

1. The main aim of this study is to search the possibility of translating incongruity between English and Arabic languages, through investigating various references in both languages to show similarities and differences between the two languages in the form of a contrastive study so as to enable the translator to be aware of the problematic areas (represented by differences).

2. Though this study is highly related to contrastive analysts, it also aims at providing translators (being bilinguals) with invaluable amount of knowledge in terms of this phenomenon in both languages to enable them to overcome such linguistic and cultural obstacles.

1. Hypothesis

1. As Arabic and English are neither genetically cognate, nor are culturally related, it is hypothesized that there is no one to one correspondence between them.
2. As Arabic is derivational, it is highly characterized by informativity than English which is inflectional.

2. Scope of the Study

This study is confined to literary discourse in both languages since incongruity is highly associated to such type of discourse.

3. The English Part

The incongruity theory

The Incongruity Theory first traces could be found in Cicero and Kant. However, this theory was not fully articulated until Schopenhauer,. Indeed, Schopenhauer is the *locus classicus*; (a passage considered to be the best known or most authoritative on a particular subject). Contemporary incongruists often invoked the following passage which states that: "The reason behind the Laughter in every case is simply represented by the sudden perception of the incongruity between a concept and its real objects that have been thought through this concept in some relation, and laughter itself is only the expression of this incongruity. It often occurs in the following way: two or more real objects are thought through just *one* concept and the identity of this concept is transferred to the objects. Therefore; it becomes strikingly clear from the entire difference of the objects in other respects, that the concept was only applicable to these objects from a one-sided point of view. (Toma Kulka,2007: 232).

Kulka, T. (2007: 232) adds that the contemporary followers of this Theory of Incongruity consider this account or point of view to be in need of refinement and revision, in spite that the basic idea, that the object of laughter and amusement is the incongruous factor, has been accepted by all. (Toma Kulka, 2007: 232)

The incongruity theory is one of the three main theories of humor, and probably the most relevant one in relation to verbal humor. The incongruity theory focuses on the humorous effect that conflict or incongruity between what we expect to appear in a joke and what actually appears. According to Suls (1972), a laugh, could be seen as a mark which a resolution has ended and that what is understood as the joke, will come (if at all) shortly after the punch line. Yet , away from the short time of execution, it looks as if the resolution is an uneasy and a complex process. (Slavko Tkalac, 2000: 85). In fact that is just one of the three expected reactions that are recognized as a resolution of incongruity linguistic item.

Types of Incongruity:-

Slavko T.(2000: 86) states that (Morreall:1987), adopting Paulos's model, shows that the reaction created on incongruity could significantly be differentiated. On the basis of this reaction, he recognizes three main types of a reaction towards incongruity, the following are these main types.

- 1) Incongruity in which the resolution is followed by humor,
- 2) Incongruity its resolution is followed by what is so called negative emotions such as (fear, hate, disgust, aversion etc.) and lastly,
- 3) Incongruity that its resolution is followed by reality assimilation for example through explaining and memorizing the new relation between the concepts in the meantime we will assume they were incongruent.

The three types of incongruity just mentioned above will be illustrated by the following examples. The examples are constructed according to Ziv (1984).cited in Slavko Tkalac (2000:86-7). An incongruity that its resolution is followed by the phenomenon of humor (laughing), could be illustrated by the following explanation: Imagine a situation in which we believe that a very hungry tiger is waiting in our kitchen. Then, after we pluck up enough courage to open the door and we see a mouse. As the picture is absolutely different from what is expected by us, The reaction one could expect is relief

and eventually the phenomenon of humor, never we are dealing with incongruity. An example for an incongruity that has a resolution that provokes a negative emotion could be illustrated by the next example: Let's imagine that we hear a mouse squeaking in the next room. But, when we open the door we see a tiger that is ready to attack us. Emotionally, this example is absolutely opposite to the previous one. Again, we have an incongruity, but the reaction one might expect is fear. i.e. one would be frightened and would run away as fast as he could, (at least I would do that).

To illustrate the incongruity of a type that whose resolution is followed by reality assimilation, we shall employ an example which is similar to the one employed in almost every textbook which deal with an introduction to artificial intelligence. Imagine that we open the door of a bedroom and instead of bedroom, we see a donkey eating grass. Again we have another type of incongruity. How could we describe the feeling of somebody expecting to see a bedroom and, yet, he find himself looking at a donkey. No doubt that he will probably be surprised and will try to understand what has happened. Essentially that is what Morreall understood under the reality assimilation. This means that we recognize that incongruity is the case when we get the opposite of what we expect.

Incongruity and humor

The concept of incongruity is in fact quite simple. The theoretical application of this term is to a great extent parallel to the lay definition or dictionary definition of the word. The following are some definitions of incongruity:-

1. Incongruity is a property of the interpretations derived from a sentence relied on the unexpectedness on the side of the receiver of the verbal action. In order to formalize incongruity, we first describe a probabilistic model of sentence comprehension.

2. Incongruousness: refers to the fact of being incongruous.

3. Incongruity refers to something out of place. i. e. something that does not seem to be fit in with, or to be appropriate to its context.

(MSN Encarta definition of 'incongruity) could be summarized as the lacking of congruity, or being not harmonious . It gives the following illustrations with examples.

a: not harmonious: INCOMPATIBLE (incongruous colors).

b: not conforming: DISAGREEING (conduct incongruous with principle).

c: inconsistent within itself (an incongruous story).

d: lacking propriety : UNSUITABLE (incongruous manners).

While (Merriam-Webster and Cambridge Dictionaries Online definition of 'incongruous') is as an unusual thing or different from what it is surrounded by or from what is generally happening. This exemplified by the following instances.

a: 'The new computer looked incongruous in the dark book-filled library'.

b: 'It seems incongruous to have a woman as the editor of a men's magazine'.

All the above mentioned definitions involve something of the following. *a*: that is out of place or, *b*: does not fit well together and, *c*: which is in a state of incompatibility or even conflict.

Incongruity and ambiguity

In the theory of incongruity, it is assumed that humor is generated by strangeness, oddity and the unexpected relation between various elements of a joke, a riddle, or some other type of humoristic expression. Almost, there is incongruity between what is expected to occur in the joke and what is actually occurred in it. Humor-generating incongruity might be resulted from a mistake or a lapse of some kind, but in many cases it is intentionally, consciously and carefully planned by the teller (i.e. the person who tells the joke) in order to mislead the tellee (i.e. the person who received the joke). This type of incongruity is typically resulted from the exploitation of units within the language which are involve ambiguity, or polysemy (i.e. linguistic lexical items that they have capacity to express more than just one meaning). What happens when incongruity produces humor is essentially that the receiver expect to encounter one usual meaning of the lexical unit, but instead of that, one other unusual and unexpected meaning is activated. By this way, the teller misleads the tellee into expecting something, and then something else is delivered, when the punch line, which is incongruous with the rest of the joke. So, there is an element of surprise or unexpectedness. According to incongruity theory, this element of surprise or unexpectedness is of more or less responsibility of generating this humorous effect.

The following is an example of the way by which polysemy is exploited so as to create incongruity:

_A: Do you believe in clubs for young people?

_B: Only when kindness fails.

(W.C. Fields)

In this example, the lexical item 'club' is the location of incongruity (a more technical term for it is linguistic trigger). The utterance of person A activates the meaning of the word 'club' that has to do with the answer produced by person B.

However, the utterance of person B, has a completely different meaning of what is activated by this lexical item— namely, that of A STICK USED FOR STRIKING OBJECTS AND/OR PEOPLE. This diversity in meaning creates incongruity, since person A was expecting the answer to his question that it is also to have to do with the associations of people, because traditionally, discourse (the term 'discourse' simply refers to any stretch of language that is longer than the sentence) is expected to be coherent. Since person A expected B to produce something which is a coherent utterance to the topic of the discourse, the result instead was that the activation of the meaning of club which has to do with sticks (and violence) has somewhat of a surprise effect. i.e. (one utterance, two meanings.)

What is happened is that instead of just expressing one meaning, the utterance, or at least what we called a linguistic trigger in the utterance, unexpectedly ends up with a lexical item that simultaneously express two meanings in a process which is sometimes called bisociation.

(Ross,A.1998: 3-5) in his book 'The Language of Humor' argues that there are three general features of incongruity-based humorous expressions, which are as follows

- Conflict between what is expected and what it is occurred in the joke.
- The conflict is resulted from some ambiguity at some level of language
- The punch line is surprising due to the fact that it activates meaning which is not expected, because it is not compatible or coherent with the rest of the joke, or discourse.

Incongruity and Tongue Twisters.

Tongue twister, hence after(TT) can be defined as a mechanism that is used for upholding the sounds people acquired when they are making a game for practice. Concerning incongruity, TT is more related to phonological incongruity. A tongue twister sentence is composed of some similar sounds of items. Yet, they most often differ in meaning.(Ziyad,2019:5)

The most challenging factor in the process of pronouncing English sounds due to the fact of making students to learn not only the way of producing their own voices in a manner which is different from their mother tongue language, but also to learn how they should produce new movements by using their organs of speech when pronouncing such sounds.(Ziyad,2019:1) . this means that there are some kind of inescapable movements that are to be made for producing some specific sounds that occupy similar or close place and/or similar manner of articulation, which usually lead to confusion in uttering them. (Ziyad, 2019:4).

The following example of English (TTs)" "**She sells sea shells by the sea shore.**"

For more details see (Orion, 1997:24; Murphy, 2003:112-114).

Nimmo & Roodenrys, 2004, (cited in Ziyad, 2019) states that the process of memorizing/ uttering lexical items that share similar phonetic features is more harder than those that do not share such similar phonetic features. (Ziyad, 2019:3)

Acheson and MacDonald (2009) lately has scrutinized the role of the activating memory as they justified that it is possible for the system used to preserve serial arrangement in the verbal working memory to be attributed to the system of producing this language. (Ziyad, 2019:3)

Attardo:1994, states that the concept of incongruity primarily depends on the attitude that there must be some specific pattern that is used for the relationships among the constituents of given ideas. Whenever this arrangement of the system is not appropriate for the supposedly expected pattern, the result will be recognized as incongruent one. It is usually supposed that the harmonious results of the incongruity reflect the comic elements. Such an opinion is seen as a double-phased model of recognition and evaluation that comprise incongruity as well as its resolution. So, Incongruity theory could be thought as a fundamental approach in its own property, due to that psychological or sociological aspect have nothing to do with it, rather than being an inclusive perspective on the case of humor (Attardo, 1994:48-9)

since this study is interested to a high degree in phonological incongruity as one of the essential types, it should highlight this type of incongruity. In order to realize phonological congruity, any linguistic item

used in any situation whether spoken or written must lack inharmonious to be eloquent sounds. In other words, any linguistic item in order to be eloquent must be articulated smoothly, i.e. it must be restfully and effortlessly uttered or pronounced. As we will see in the following example, "وقبر حرب بمكان قفر وليس"، "قبر قبر حرب قبر". It is highly noticed that as the phonological incongruity is resulted from closeness of place of articulation; this leads the tongue to accidentally slip (Al-Fairuzabadi, 1977, 3:11).

This phenomenon of Tongue Twister (TTs). has been received little attention by Arab researchers who used the term (المعاظلة) /almuaadhalah/ to refer to this linguistic phenomenon, by which they indicate (the overlapping or twisting in speech activity). However, different Arab researchers groups viewed this topic differently. The first group regards (TTs) as errors or incongruent items depending on the fact that Arab rhetoricians regard any utterance as being non-eloquent and stylistically distasteful when its constituents are inharmonious. This certainly results from one of such linguistic mechanisms as assimilation, repetition, substitution and/or closeness of place of articulation. (Ziyad, 2019: 5)

Linguistic Levels of Incongruity in English language:-

There are several areas of language in which there are units and structures which may be exploited in order to create incongruity, most of which involve ambiguity. They are as follows:

a) Phonological Incongruity:

The essential element for the functionality of the incongruity relied on phonemic ambiguity is the possibility of multiple interpretations of the same group of sounds. Homophony is a linguistic term used for referring to the words with the same pronunciation despite they are of different spelling, such as the following pairs: 'bare' and 'bear', 'missed' and 'mist', 'throne' and 'thrown', etc. English language is full of such pairs of homophones due to the fact that the English system of spelling does not relate each phoneme with one distinct linguistic symbol. Ross (1998) states that because of the difference in spelling which could be recognized in written form, such type of ambiguity could only be occurred in spoken form of language, which is undoubtedly true in some cases, for instance, look at the following riddle:

(1) A _ What's black and white and read all over?

B _ A newspaper.

(2) On a sign: NO CHECKS ACCEPTED.

Concerning the first instance (1) which is a well-known riddle, in which the punch line of the joke is basically depends on the same pronunciation of the adjectives 'red' and 'read' which is represented by /rɛd/. So, the riddle in this case is true and works only in spoken form of English language, as the humorous effect is supposed to be occurred because of the disambiguation resulted from the listener's first assumption of the phoneme /rɛd/ as the word that refer to colour 'red', which is a logical assumption after the words 'black' and 'white'. While, in written form, the writer is forced to write the word with either the correct or incorrect spelling, which in both cases eliminates the process of false disambiguation of the lexical item.

As for the second instance (2) which work as the same exact way as the first one. The word 'checks' could also be interpreted as 'Czechs' since both words are pronounced similarly as /tʃɛks/. Even though the phrase is clearly put in the written form of language, this joke again works only if the person to whom it is told has not have a look at the written sign and he could, therefore, make a wrong assumption concerning which one of two revealed interpretations was meant by the pronounced lexical item.

b) Morphological Incongruity:

The structure and organization of individual words. The ambiguity of this type of is depended on formation of individual lexical items. The smallest part of a lexical item that has the capacity to carry the meaning is called 'morpheme'. Lexical items could be made of a single morpheme with no possibility for splitting into further smaller parts, or they could be made of multiple morphemes. This may lead to a humorous effect if, according to what Ross (1998) states, "people's distinctive knowledge of the ways that morphemes are used to form meanings can be exploited in jokes which point out the possible ambiguities" (Ross.1998: 14).

Based on the context, Ross (1998: 15) adds that the same group of letters could be either a free morpheme, a bound morpheme (prefix or suffix) or a syllable, as the following example illustrates:

_ 'What's a baby pig called?'

_ 'A piglet'

_ 'So what's a baby toy called?'

_ 'A toilet'

Ross demonstrates that the confusion produced by this kind of jokes is due to the suffix ‘-let’, which is usually used to indicate the meaning of smallness. But as the same suffix (-let) is used with the lexical item ‘toy’ it creates a vocabulary that looks like the same as ‘toilet’.

Another frequent method of producing an incongruity in English language is the employment of compound words which are made of two free morphemes set together with the meaning that could be drastically different from the original meanings of the individual words if they would stand alone, as is the case with idiomatic expressions for example,

c) **Lexical Incongruity :**

Single lexical items of a language (and the relation between their forms and their meanings) represents another very common source of ambiguity, as it is the case with English language vocabulary, where many words have been borrowed from various other language sources. That caused some words to have the same spelling and the same pronunciation but two different meanings. They are known as homonyms. Ross (1998: 17) illustrates this through the following nice example:

A fishmonger his/her name is a ‘Sole Trader’, which refers to the two meanings for the word ‘sole’: one comes from the Latin ‘solum’ that mean ‘bottom’ or ‘pavement’, so it is used to name the bottom of a shoe or a fish with a similar shape; while the other comes from the Latin word ‘solus’ that refer to ‘alone’. The humorous effect hence, could be occurred either as a result of the confusion caused by the two meanings or due to the sudden realization of the ambiguity. See the following example:

_What makes a tree noisy?

_Its bark.

In this example, the lexical item ‘Bark’ as a noun could either refer to ‘the harsh sound uttered by a dog’, or refer to ‘the tough covering of trees’. Both of these meanings make sense due to the fact that, in the set-up of this joke, the lexical items ‘tree’ and ‘noisy’ have been mentioned and could semantically be linked to both meanings. Some humour could also be caused by the linguistic phenomenon known as polysemy. It refers, again, to two lexical items with the same spelling form and pronunciation but one of them could have various related meanings. For example, the lexical item ‘ring’ could be either used to refer to ‘a wedding ring’ or to ‘a boxing ring’, where the two uses of this word shares a similar notion of being bounded or bordered. The distinction between polysemy and homonymy may not always be very clear.

d) **Grammatical Incongruity:**

The term Grammar could be simply refer to how linguistic lexical items of a given language are structured into meaningful strings of words. Humor could also occur as a result of syntactic ambiguity vagueness. It is caused by the meanings that are produced by the arrangement of words in a sentence. In this case, the humorous effect could not achieved through the double meanings of the individual words alone, but also through the fact that it is not impossible to group the words in relation to each other in more than one way. Headlines of newspaper are a very common area that could represent the occurrence of this kind of ambiguity, as these headlines are deliberately abbreviated, so they could unintentionally resulted in a double meaning, or even intentionally to catch attention. See the following example of an ambiguous headline ‘Squad Helps Dog Bite Victim’.

However, it is not only the case of just newspaper headlines, many jokes could also be constructed on such basis. Here is an example of a relatively popular saying: ‘Time flies like an arrow. Fruit flies like a banana.’ The structure of these two sentences of the above mentioned example could be analyzed and then interpreted in two possible English sentence patterns as follows:

(1) Subject + Verb + Adverbial:

Time S/ flies V/ like an arrow A.

(2) Subject + Verb + Object:

Time flies S/ like V/ an arrow O. Fruit flies S/ like V/ a banana O.

The analysis and interpretation of (1) would simply imply that time is very fast moving, thus having a similar quality as that of a flying arrow, where lexical item ‘flies’ represents a verb and the string ‘time flies’ represents a common collocation. While, the matter is different concerning the second sentence (2), where the lexical item ‘flies’ is converted into a noun and the conjunction ‘like’ is converted into a verb. Therefore; the logical semantic interpretation suggests ‘a special type of insects and what these insects prefer to eat’. So, the similarity in structure results in the second possible interpretation to be applied to the first sentence producing a very strange meaning.

e) **Stylistics:**

Unfamiliar order of word in a given proposition leads to complexity in style. A requisite to be readable, polished text is that its style its segments must be well harmonized, or be stylistically congruous. While harmony doesn't imply sameness, which makes a text to be lack-cluster, it does ensure that the segments cohere together to form a unified text. Without this, a text doesn't speak with a single voice ; something is out of place ;it doesn't sound right , to use some common metaphors. A disorderly set of styles within a text reflects poorly on the professionalism of the authors of the text (Farkas, 1985:355) and detracts from the effectiveness of the text's communication to its readers. So while stylistic congruity is not the only requisite for a high-quality text, it is crucial and, furthermore, it is a requisite that writers.

The source language stylistic means as well as its semantic associations cannot be captured by the target language. Culturally, Shakesperian times only Roman Catholics who were the enemies of the government, ate fish. So the following example from King Lear (Act. 1, scene 4):

Kent: "to fight when I cannot chase, and to eat no fish" cannot be properly reproduced by simply giving it a literal translation into Arabic since the speaker belongs to protestants, and he is a friend of the government (Ilyas, 1989:125).

f) Semantics:

Incongruity in the semantic level is a form of meaning ambiguity. Creating nonsensical or contradictory ideas is what the speaker/writer more likely aims rather than producing a humorous effect on its own. Ross (1998: 31) argues that "the strange thing is that, rather than rejecting such odd examples of language, the human mind often reacts by trying to make sense of them". These apparent contradictions could often resulted in a creative usage of language, just as is the case with poetry for example. By humor we could also point out and ridicule many clichés, fixed ideas and things with a strange and weird logic behind them that people might not have recognized in their everyday lives. This is regarded as a very common phenomenon in stand-up comedy. The term tautology, on the other hand, refers to a statement that is undeniably true, yet, the truth factor is so obvious that its mentioning does not seem pointless anymore, ('he could either win or lose'). Ross (1998: 36) also discusses another form of humor named 'surreal humor', in which, humor "pushes the boundaries of language beyond a strange but conceivable idea,". He presents the following example:

_ When do elephants paint their toenails red?

_ When they want to hide upside-down in strawberry jam.

Commenting on this example, he states that any one of these levels involves various types of English language conventions (or rules or whatever else), that might be exploited by speakers/writers in order to produce humor-generating incongruity.

The following table (1) represents the different levels of incongruity in English discussed right above.

NO.	Level type of Incongruity
1.	Phonological Incongruity.
2.	Morphological Incongruity.
3.	Lexical Incongruity.
4.	Grammatical Incongruity.
5.	Semantic Incongruity.
6.	Stylistic Incongruity.

Table (1): Linguistic Level Types of English Incongruity.

4. The Arabic Part

Incongruity in Arabic is called by the majority of linguists as (التنافر), transcribed as / tanaafur /.(Abdulraoof, 2005:77). Yet, some of them name it (التعاور), transcribed as / ta'auer /, which refers to the unfamiliarity of the usage of the linguistic item, as it will be illustrated in the following section.(Al-Samura'i, 2006: 109)

Odd usage

A linguistic item is odd stylistically when its usage is alien and unfamiliar to the linguistic and stylistic instinct of the native speaker. In other words, the employing of a word such as (جُحِيش) which means (an autocratic or arbitrary person) recognized as a non-eloquent discourse. Similarly, the word (عصبِيب) which means (very hot) is non-eloquent usage in Arabic. Thus, it is impossible to regard the sentence such as (الجو اليوم عصبِيب) meaning (the weather today is very hot) as an eliquent sentence, because of the word (عصبِيب) that has to be replaced by (حار / شديد الحر - very hot). In terms of acceptability of discourse, despite the fact that the stylistically and eloquently acceptable linguistic items that are employed in prose

could be employed in poetry as well, the reverse is not possible. i.e., eloquently unacceptable words employed in poetry are not acceptable in prose.

Inaccurate usage

Some words are employed wrongly in the inappropriate context, such as (فشل) when it is used in sentences such as (فشل في حل المشكلة) which are considered as non-eloquent due to the stylistic axiom that the verb (فشل) must be replaced by the eloquently and stylistically accurate expression (أخفق), so the correct sentence will be (أخفق في حل المشكلة) which mean (He failed to solve the problem). However, the verb (فشل) means (to be weak). This is supported and confirmed by (ولا تناز عوا فتفشلوا) which mean (Do not dispute and thus lose courage, Q8:46).

Types of Incongruity in Arabic language:-

a) Phonological Incongruity:

In order to realize phonetic congruity, a given word, whether it is spoken or written, used in any speech activity, requires to be free from incongruous sounds. In other words, for any lexical item to be eloquent it requires to show a smooth phonetic articulation, i.e. it should be pronounced easily. This, yet, does not mean that the letters that constitute it should be of different, i.e. far away, places of articulation. In other words, any lexical item could still be eloquent despite that some of its sounds are articulated from nearby places of articulation like (فم/شجر), where the sounds such as /ف/ and /م/ in the word (فم) and /ش/, /ج/, /ر/ in the word (شجر) are uttered from places of articulation close to each other. However, words such as (ملع – faster) are supposed to be as non-eloquent although their constituent sounds are uttered from places of articulation which are remote from each other. In addition to that, the length of the word could not be considered as a criterion for non-eloquent words. For instance, long words such as (استعمار – colonialism), (فسيكفيكهم – to be sufficient for you against them, Q2:137), and (ليستخلفنهم – to grant them succession to authority, Q24:55), are only some examples of eloquent words. While, a long word like (مستشترات – high, elevated) is an example of a non-eloquent for its difficult pronunciation. (Abdulraoof:77)

b) Morphological incongruity

This type of incongruity includes the category of non-eloquent words which are morphologically unrelated to a given lexical item. In other words, the meaning of such non-eloquent words is not discernible since we are not sure to which word or words it is morphologically related as in (مسرج) or (مُسَرَّج) which are used by the post-Islamic poet Ru'bah b. al-Ajjaj: (Abdulraoof: 84)

أزمان أبدت واضحاً مفلجاً
أغر برأفاً وطرفاً أبرجا
ومقلّة وحاجباً مزججا
وفاحماً ومرسناً مسرجاً

They were nice old times when the lass used to smile to me with her nice, blessed, bright teeth, while her two eyes-balls together with their sides are covered with the eye-liner, and the eye brows are black, plucked out, and pointed, and a straight neck.

Linguistically, words such as (مسرج) [masrij] or (مُسَرَّج) [musarrajj] are morphologically related either to:

1. The blacksmith named Sarij who is well-known for making strong and sharp swords that are unbreakable. The sword made by Sarij is therefore named (saif sariji – a Sarijan sword or a sword made by Sarij), or to
2. The noun (siraj – light) where the word (masrij) is used implicitly to the simile, where the sword is resembled to glitter and shine object, i.e. a shining sword. However, the word (musarrajj) has occurred with the word (مرسين) which mean (the nose). Therefore, the verse may have meant to describe the nose of the girl as shining and pointed like a sword. Non-eloquent lexical items may also be represented by words with inaccurate case endings such as (thaghrah) which have to be (thughrah) which mean (a gap).

Violation of Morphological System:

An eloquent lexical item should be in harmony with the morphological system of Arabic language. So, A lexical item is said to be non-eloquent if it creates a morphological incongruity like (نواكيس) which mean (men with bowed heads) which is the plural of (ناكس) which mean (a man with bowed head) as the poet al-Farazdaq employed in:

وإذا الرجال رأوا يزيد رأيتهم خضع الرقاب نواكس الأبصار

Whenever men see Yazid (bin al-Muhallab), they used to bow their heads and look down.

Despite that the word (نواكس) is on the morphological pattern (فواعل) which can only be used in Arabic language to describe human feminine nouns (النساء), we find that al-Farazdaq has employed it to describe the masculine noun (الرجال – the men). Also, words which have assimilated letters such as (الأجل – the most

exalted) which is used as an epithet of the name(Allah), could be turned into non-eloquent forms if the assimilated letters are separated. So, the word (الأجل) that involves the assimilation of the letter (ل) is an eloquent word, while its counter-part (الأجلل) is non-eloquent word because of the use of the two identical letters (ل+ل). The latter word has been employed for poetic license by the poet Abu al-Najm b. Qudamah in:

الحمد لله العلي الأجل أنت ملك الناس ربا فاقبل

All praise be to Allah the most high, most exalted, you are the Lord of the all people, so accept my supplication.(Abdulraoof :85)

c) Lexical Incongruity:

Any speech activity is said to be non-eloquent and distasteful stylistically if its constituent lexical items are incongruent. This type of Lexical incongruity resulted in non-eloquence, sluggishness or what is called (slowness) , and distasteful style. Its occurrences are due to the following linguistic and phonetic reasons:

1. When one or more lexical item/s of the speech activity is or are repeated, as in the following verse by al-Jahiz:

وقبر حرب بمكان قفر وليس قرب قبر حرب قبر
The grave of the man whose name is Harb, is in a remote place, and there is no other grave next to it.

where the lexical item (قبر – grave) occurs three times. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the words (قبر – grave), (حرب – war), and (قرب – near) are simple, short, and easy to be pronounced. However, because of having similar sounds and being situated next to each other, they have resulted in non-eloquent and stylistically unacceptable usage of Arabic. In other words, this particular speech activity of al-Jaiz has become sluggish stylistically (uslub thaqil).(Abdulraoof:87)

2. when the same sounds are repeated directly in the same speech activity because of the repetition of the same lexical item, as in the following verse by Abu Tamnam:

كريم متى أمدحه وأمدحه والورى معي واذا مالمته لمته وجدى

He is a man when I praise him, he is already being praised by all people, but when I dispraise him, it will be only me who has dispraised him.

where the immediate repetition of the same words (أمدحه أمدحه) and (لمته لمته) and the similar sounds /ح / and /و / that are of close places of articulation have resulted in non-eloquent and stylistically sluggish usage in Arabic.

d) Grammatical Incongruity:

Any proposition which is grammatically unacceptable is considered as a non-eloquent one, as in the following example:

وفي مطلع حديثه , أكد الرئيس الفرنسي على أهمية التعاون المشترك

In the outset of his speech, the French President confirmed the importance of joint cooperation.

In this example, the cataphoric reference (ه – his) in (حديثه – his speech) has made the sentence non-eloquent because the referent (الرئيس الفرنسي – the French President) has not occurred before its anaphora (ه – his) as it is the norm in Arabic language.(Abdulraoof:89)

Another instance of such grammatical incongruity that leads to non-eloquence in Arabic is the inaccurate employing of the plural form of paucity (جمع القلة) and the plural form of multitude (جمع الكثرة). For example, the lexical item (أسياف – a few swords) signifies the plural form of paucity and non-hyperbole in terms of number while the counterpart of it (سيوف – a large number of swords) indicates the plural form of multitude and the rhetorical function of hyperbole.

e) Stylistic Incongruity:

Unfamiliar words order in a given proposition results in ill-formedness, non-eloquence, and stylistic complexity. For Arab rhetoricians, linguistic processes such as foregrounding and backgrounding resulted in stylistic complexity if any one of these processes is not accompanied by grammatical clues within the same syntactic construction such as co-referential masculine/feminine pronouns, as in the following verse by al-Farazdaq:

الى ملك ما أمه من محارب أبوه ولا كانت كليب تصاهره

My speech is to a King his father's mother is not from the tribe of Mu.mrib, and the tribe of Kulaib will never allow him to marry one of their women.

the noun phrase (أبوه – his father) in this example should have been placed immediately after the noun (ملك – King), i.e. (ملك أبوه – a King his father is), and because of the backgrounding of (Hf,i- his father), stylistic incongruity has been taken place, which lead to a source of non-eloquent usage in Arabic.

f) Semantic Incongruity:

The concept of semantic incongruity refers to a form of ambiguity on the part of meaning. Thus, the semantic incongruity of a lexical item results in an incongruity in style as well. A proposition is considered as semantically ambiguous if the meaning of its surface structure is contrary to its underlying structure, i.e. implicit meaning, or contrary to the signification denoted by metonymy. Therefore; allusions and indirect declaration result in non-eloquence in Arabic. So, it is primarily concerned with lexical items and idiomatic expressions that are employed in any context such as that of metonymy. For instance, the verse below by al-Abbas bin al-Ahnaf exemplifies a case of semantic ambiguity:

سأطلب بعد الدار عنكم لتقربوا وتسكب عيناى الدموع فتجمدا

I shall be living far away from you so that I may become dear to you. Yet, I shall cry for you until all my tears will dry out from my eyes (i.e. until I run out of tears). The lexical item (فتجمدا – to be frozen) has been employed as a metonymy which signifies the state of happiness. This, however, has resulted in semantic incongruity because describing someone as being want to cry, is usually signifying sadness rather than happiness. Semantic incongruity here, results from the description of eyes being ‘frozen’ out of joy, while this expression is known in Arabic as a metonymy for grief. Thus, speech activity of al-Abbas is used in the wrong context. Since the usual meaning of metonymy has been changed by the communicator, semantic ambiguity has been emerged. The novel meaning of this metonymy is recognized only to the poet himself. Thus, the intertextuality intended by the poet which facilitates communication between the producer and the addressee of the text is not established successfully. (Abdulraoof:91)

In semantic ambiguity, any lexical item is regarded as stylistically odd one when it is semantically ambiguous. This type of semantic ambiguity that results in stylistic oddity is mainly concerned with lexical items that are semantically polysemous. For example, the word (عزّر) could be non-eloquent if it is decontextualized. Because it produces a kind of semantic ambiguity as in (عزّر المعلم الطلاب) which may either mean one of the following opposite facts .i.e. (the teacher revered the students) or (the teacher rebuked the students). However, context could disambiguate this dispute in the meaning of (عزّر) as in the following examples:

(عزّر المعلم الطلاب لانهم يقدرون جهده) – The teacher reveres the students because they appreciate his effort).

The same lexical item (عزّر) has also occurred in a disambiguating context as follows:

(فالذين امنوا به وعزروه ونصروه) – Those who have believed in him, honored him, and supported him) Q7:157, where the lexical item (عزّر) in both examples is acceptable eloquently and stylistically and, then, it is semantically unambiguous as a result of the disambiguating expressions respectively (يقدر – to appreciate) and (امنوا به.نصروه) – believed him . . supported him) that have accompanied it. (Abdulraoof:80). Table (2) illustrates the explained different level types of incongruity in Arabic language.

NO.	Level type of Incongruity
1.	Phonological Incongruity.
2.	Morphological Incongruity.
3.	Lexical Incongruity.
4.	Grammatical Incongruity.
5.	Semantic Incongruity.
6.	Stylistic Incongruity.

Table (2): Linguistic Level Types of Arabic Incongruity.

Results.

The study reveals that there is almost similar categorization of Incongruity in both concerned languages .i.e. Arabic and English. As it is shown clearly in table number (3) bellow. This means that this contrastive study, as it is hypothesized, presents a reliable and valid basic ground for translators who seek for either formal correspondence or even textual equivalence concerning this linguistic phenomenon. Then, it paved the way for the translatability of incongruity. So, we could expect that translating incongruity between English and Arabic will by no means is a possible task, even if it is not an easy one. The success of

translatability depends greatly on the efficiency and experience of the translator, as well as his awareness of the rhetorical devices of both languages.

NO.	English Incongruity Level Type.	Arabic Incongruity Level Type.
1.	Phonological Incongruity.	Phonological Incongruity.
2.	Morphological Incongruity.	Morphological Incongruity.
3.	Lexical Incongruity.	Lexical Incongruity.
4.	Grammatical Incongruity.	Grammatical Incongruity.
5.	Semantic Incongruity.	Semantic Incongruity.
6.	Stylistic Incongruity.	Stylistic Incongruity.

Table (3): *Linguistic Level Types of Incongruity in Both (English & Arabic) Languages.*

References:-

1. Abdul-raof, H.(2006). *Arabic Rhetoric, (a pragmatic analysis)*: Routledge 270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016, Tylor & Francis Group, 2006.
2. Acheson D. J. and MacDonald, M.C.(2009). *Verbal working memory and phonological encoding in speech production: Common approaches to the serial ordering of verbal information*, London Longman University Press.
3. Al-Fairuzabadi, Muhammad (1977). *Al-Qamoos Al-Muheet*, Cairo: Al-Haya'ah Al-Masrriya Al-Amma Lil-Kitab.
4. Al-Samura'I, F. *Balaghatulkalima filta'abeerulqura'ni*. Al- aatik lisina'atulkitab Inc. Egypt,Qiro, 2006/ 10766.
5. Attardo, Salvatore(1994).*Linguistic theories of humor*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
6. Farkas, David.(1985). *The Concept of Consistency in Writing and Editing*. J Technical Writing and Communication, Vol. 15(4), 1985. Baywood Publishing Co., Inc.
7. Ilyas, A. I.(1989). *Theories of Translation, (theoretical Issues and Practical Implications)*: Darilkutub liltiba'ah walnashr/ University of Mosul, 1989.
8. Kulka, T.(2007).The Incongruity of Incongruity Theories of Humor. ORGANON F 14 (2007), No. 3, 320 – 333. Copyright © Filozofický ústav SAV, Bratislava.
9. Morreall, J.(1987). *Funny Ha-Ha, Funny Strange, and Other Reactions to Incongruity, in Philosophy of laughter and humor*. Ed. J. Morreall, State University of New York Press, New York, 1987.
10. Murphy, J. (2003). *Pronunciation*. In David, N (Ed.) *Practical English Language Teaching*, (111-128). Singapore: Mc-Graw Hill.
11. Nimmo, L.M. and Roodenrys, S. (2004). *Investigation the phonological similarity effect*, Cambridge: Cambridge University.
12. Omar, D.(2022). *Rhetorical Analysis and Translation of Arabic Mobile Prank Messages into English*. Journal of the College of Basic Education, 28(114), 22-44. Mustansiriyah University, Iraq.
13. Orion, G.F.(1997). *Pronouncing American English: Sounds, stress, and intonation*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publisher.
14. Ross, A.(1988) *The Language of Humour*.11 new Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE. Routledge(1998).
15. Slavko Tkalac. *The Types of Incongruity and Paulos's Model*. Zbornik radova, Volume 24, Number 1(2000).
16. Suls, J. M.(1972). *A Two Stage Model for the Appreciation of Jokes and Cartoons: An Information-Processing Analysis*. In the *Psychology of Humor*, ed.: J.H.Goldstein and P. E. McGhee, Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1972.
17. Ziv, A.(1984). *Personality and Sense of Humor*. Springer Publishing Company, NewYork, 1984.
18. Ziyad, H.(2019). *Translatability of English Tongue Twisters into Arabic*. Adab Al-rafidayn Journal. Vol.(78). 2019. College of Arts, University of Tikrit.