

Oda Frøshaug

On Gender-Confused Wolves and Drama Kings:

The Translation of Audiovisual Humor in Shrek 2

Master's thesis in Language Studies with Teacher Education
Supervisor: Annjo Klungervik Greenall

May 2021

Oda Frøshaug

On Gender-Confused Wolves and Drama Kings:

The Translation of Audiovisual Humor in Shrek 2

Master's thesis in Language Studies with Teacher Education
Supervisor: Annjo Klungervik Greenall
May 2021

Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Humanities
Department of Language and Literature

Abstract

This study deals with the issue of interlingual translation of humor, and how humor translates in dubbing contra subtitling in audiovisual text. The movie *Shrek 2* is used as a source of data collection, where a selection of eight consecutive jokes and their dubbed and subtitled Norwegian translations are analyzed and compared with particular focus on translation strategies and priorities. In the analysis process, two humor categorization models are used for the purpose of classifying humor types before and after the translation, for discovering which elements that have been altered or changed in the translation, and for the purpose of detecting similarities and differences between the dubbed and the subtitled target texts. These models are Martínez-Sierra's taxonomy of humorous elements, which is a classification tool particularly customized for the purpose of categorizing both verbal and non-verbal humor in audiovisual texts, and Attardo's general theory of verbal humor, which divides elements of verbally expressed humor into levels in terms of importance, and is concentrated on how humor is constructed and also reconstructed in a translation process (2006, 1991). The study found that dubbed and subtitled audiovisual translations of humor seem to be translated similarly to one another and correspond closely to the source text on most occasions, looking away from the changes that are made with regard to the genre restrictions of dubbing and subtitling, such as lip synchronization and time- and space limitations. In jokes where similar translations have not been made, the source text often appear to contain some sort of cultural reference which is problematic to transfer literally at the same time as humor is conserved. Such translations may be particularly difficult to translate due to the lack of similar or corresponding expressions or references in the target language, which again makes a literal translation more difficult to grasp for an audience with a different cultural background than the one presented in the source text. On this matter, dubbed and subtitled target texts are translated differently, as the dubbed target text offers more big changes to conserve humor than the subtitled target text. Reasons for this seem to have to do with the restrictions of the target text genre, as well as priorities and the skopos of dubbed and subtitled target texts. The translation differences that can be detected here indicate a distinction in translation priorities in order for the dubbed and subtitled texts to serve their purpose intended for target audiences. Where the dubbed target text aims to replace the source text and at the same time maintain an equally humorous feeling, the subtitled target text aspires to make the source text available to the target audience by offering a more literal translation of the text.

Acknowledgements

This thesis has been a considerable part of my life for over a year, and it has required time, patience and dedication. Luckily, it has been a pleasure for me to work with it, both because the subject is engaging, amusing, thought-provoking and relevant for my line of occupation, and because I have had a fantastic network of people around me the whole way, who care about me and drive me into giving it my very best. For that I would like to thank each and every one of you.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Annjo Klungervik Greenall, for invaluable input, knowledge, endless positivity, time and dedication, and for keeping me calm for the past year. I would doubtlessly not have been able to write this thesis without you, and for all your help, I am utterly grateful.

I would also like to thank my family and friends who have motivated me, believed in me, and patiently accepted my absence during the late nights I have been unavailable working on this thesis.

In addition, to my friends, Amanda Schmitz and Marie Øyen Svendsen, who dedicated their time and energy into proofreading my thesis and helping me structuring it into what it finally became, an additional thank you is well in its place.

Lastly, if you have taken the time to sit down and read this thesis, chances are that you are important to me, and I would like you to know that it means a lot. Thank you!

Oda Frøshaug, May 2021

Abbreviations

ST - Source text

TT - Target text

GTVH - General theory of verbal humor

THE - Taxonomy of humorous elements

AVT - Audiovisual translation

VEH - Verbally expressed humor

L1 - First language/mother tongue

L2 - Second language

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Theoretical Background	4
2.1 Humor Theory	4
2.1.1 Introduction	4
2.1.2 Verbal and Referential Linguistic Humor	4
2.1.3 The Taxonomy of Humorous Elements	5
2.1.4 The General Theory of Verbal Humor	7
2.2 Translation of humor	11
2.2.1 Introduction	11
2.2.2 Typical Translation Issues	12
2.2.3 The Use of GTVH in the Analysis of Interlingual Translation	12
2.3 Audiovisual Translation Theory: Translation of Humor in Dubbing and Subtitling	13
2.3.1 Introduction	13
2.3.2 Dubbing as Audiovisual Translation	14
2.3.3 Subtitling as Audiovisual Translation	15
2.3.4 Translation of Audiovisual Humor and its Constraints	16
2.4 Previous research	16
Chapter 3: Methodology	18
3.1 Introduction	18
3.2 Material	18
3.3 Analysis: Concepts and models	19
3.3.1 Taxonomy of humorous elements	20
3.3.2 GTVH	20
3.3.3 Combining the THE and the GTVH	21
3.4 Validity and Reliability in the Humanities and in This Study	22
3.5 Generalizability	24
Chapter 4: Analysis	25
4.1 Introduction	25
4.2 Joke Analysis	25
4.2.1 Card 1	25
4.2.2 Card 2	28
4.2.3 Card 3	30
4.2.4 Card 4	33
4.2.5 Card 5	36

4.2.6 Card 6.....	41
4.2.7 Card 7.....	43
Chapter 5: Discussion	47
5.1 Discussion of the Findings	47
5.1.2 Similarities between the dubbed and subtitled TTs.....	48
5.1.3 Differences between the dubbed and subtitled TTs.....	49
5.2 An Inquiry into the Research Models and their Joined Functional Efficiency	53
Chapter 6: Conclusion	55
Bibliography.....	57
Filmography.....	61
Appendix 1: Teacher Relevance.....	62

Chapter 1: Introduction

Humor is often said to be both subjective, culturally specific and language specific, something that makes the job of the world's translators a little harder. Many dubbed audiovisual texts are accused of being rather poor translations of their source texts, and the saying 'humor does not travel well' can be understood as an expression of this notion. Using this saying as a point of departure, there have been multiple case studies on the untranslatability of humor (Jakowska, 2009, p. 1). Particularly, the case of humor in interlingual dubbing and subtitling of audiovisual texts is an interesting one, as the way humor is translated often varies considerably when the two genres are compared. In Norway, a country considered to have a high level of literacy and general proficiency in English among its citizens, it is rather popular to watch movies and series in their source language, frequently supported by subtitles in either English or Norwegian. In fact, Scandinavia has been described as a "bastion of subtitling" (Ivarsson & Carroll, 1998, p. 5). The audiovisual texts in western countries that are translated using dubbing are often animated texts that target children who are not fully literate and may have not yet obtained a stable proficiency in English (Chaume, 2012, p. 2).

The *Shrek* movies are among those animated movies that many Norwegians, both children and adults, choose to watch in Norwegian rather than in the source language, English. There may be many reasons for that, such as the fact that those who watch them grew up with the dubbed translated version, or that the Norwegian voices have been well executed, or even that the Norwegian dubbed version may be considered to be equally funny or even funnier than the English version. There are many hidden cultural references that are targeted to adults in the *Shrek* movies, which makes the series appeal to a larger target group than what one may initially anticipate. An interesting fact is that cultural references are considered to be more difficult to translate across different cultures, but in Norway, the *Shrek*-movies have received fairly little critique on the matter. This is a fascinating phenomenon, as some do not approve of the way in which humor is generally translated in dubbing. These factors make the *Shrek* movies an excellent case for data collection where humor translation is concerned. The research questions of this thesis will be as follows: How have the dubbed and subtitled translations of *Shrek 2* been constructed in Norwegian? In what ways has humor been

conserved or altered in the translation process? And finally, how do the dubbed and subtitled translations compare and differ from one another?

The DreamWorks data animated children's-movie series *Shrek*, which is known and loved by people in all corners of the world, was introduced in 2001, and has since published a total of 4 movies. The plots of the movies are fixated around a grumpy ogre who lives in a swamp and prefers solely his own company. As the series develops, we are introduced to a variety of unique and funny characters who cross paths with Shrek the ogre, and who continue to follow us throughout the movies. Among these characters we have a donkey called Donkey, a princess called Fiona, a cat that wears boots, and many well-known fairytale characters, such as Pinocchio, the wolf from Little Red Riding Hood, a little gingerbread man, a talking mirror, Prince Charming, and Fairy Godmother. The movies have become an international success, and have been both dubbed and subtitled in many languages, including Norwegian.

The study will make use of two models in the process of analyzing the translation of jokes in *Shrek 2*. These models are Martínez-Sierra's Taxonomy of Humorous elements, referred to as THE in this thesis, which is a categorization tool that can be used to label which humorous components a particular joke contains, and Attardo's General Theory of Verbal Humor, here referred to as GTVH, which takes on humor through the interpretation that jokes consist of different levels of which one can detect humor (2006, 1991). The two models clearly differ in that the GTVH is concentrated around the investigation of verbally expressed humor, here called VEH, and the THE in addition to VEH also takes non-verbal elements like sound, paralinguistics, visual input and graphic components into account. Also, where the THE will reveal possible changes in a joke by looking at changes in the way jokes have been categorized, the GTVH will investigate what happens on the various levels of a verbal joke in the process of translation.

The structure of this thesis is as follows: First, relevant theory within humor studies, translation studies and audiovisual translation studies will be presented, along with a description of the theoretical models and concepts that will be used in the analysis section of this study. A methodological chapter will follow, containing an in-depth description of the methodological motives and aims of the study, along with a description of the material that has been studied, the execution of the analysis, and a rationale for why this approach has been used. After this, the analysis section will provide a thorough examination of a section of jokes

from *Shrek 2* using Martínez-Sierra's THE, and Attardo's GTVH, before a discussion section is presented, where possible findings from the analysis will be looked into, as well as the efficiency of the combination of these two models in the analysis process. Finally, there will be a concluding chapter, summarizing the most important aspects of the study.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Background

2.1 Humor Theory

2.1.1 Introduction

Three very common interpretations of the creation of humor are hostility and superiority theories, release and liberation theories, and incongruity theories (Raskin, 2014, p. 367). Superiority jokes are mainly based on the idea that humor and laughter is derived from the misfortunes or afflictions of others. Release jokes, on the other side, are grounded in the pleasure of leaving behind the “yoke of everyday reality”, in which many (but not all) humorous aspects are sexually grounded (Raskin, 2014, p. 368). The last interpretation, incongruity jokes, revolves around the ridiculousness that is created in the abandonment of logic where an expected script is challenged by an opposing aspect or script. Humor theory has been developing in later years, and these different components now relate to new humor theory in ways that will be enlightened further in. Thus this thesis will concern itself with all of the aforementioned interpretations, depending on their place in said humor theory and place in each example in the analysis.

There are many sources of humor, some of which have nothing to do with language. Physical gestures, various types of sounds and other kinds of visual elements may all contain humorous elements, thus humor can be viewed as a result of the interplay that happens between different components on various levels (Vera, 2015, p. 124). Scholars in humor studies point out the fact that these components often overlap, given that there is no clear-cut distinction between them (Delebastita, 1997, p. 2, Vandaele, 2002). A lot of humor, however, is produced using either body language or verbal language. In this thesis, the main focus will be on the ways in which humor is composed, created and translated in verbal language.

2.1.2 Verbal and Referential Linguistic Humor

Throughout time, many distinctions have been made between linguistically based humor created through wordplay and linguistically based humor with reference to some meaning unrelated to the wording or phrasing of the actual joke (Attardo, 2017, p. 2). Ritchie introduced the two subdivisions “verbal humor” and “referential (conceptual) humor” when

referring to this distinction (2010, p. 34). The verbal humor type is crucially dependent on the linguistic form, or in other words the signifier, to work, meaning that the humor is embedded in the verbal structure and phrasing of a joke (Attardo, 2017, p. 2). Examples of such jokes are different forms of wordplays, puns, ambiguous jokes and repetition of the signifier of the humorous elements, which can be seen in alliteration for instance. The referential type of humor on the other hand, is to a much larger extent revolved around the semantic and pragmatic incongruity that can be found in a joke (Ritchie, 2010, p. 34). Most often, taxonomies which are made in order to characterize instances of humor, distinguish between verbal and referential humor in some way. One example is Martínez-Sierra's THE, which will be used in this thesis to classify humor types in the source and target texts, hereon referred to as ST and TT.

2.1.3 The Taxonomy of Humorous Elements

Martínez-Sierra's THE is an analytical tool used to differentiate between various types of jokes, and to classify them based on their particular characteristics (2005, p. 290). It has been inspired by and modified from Zabalbeascoa's classification tool, which is a model that aims at seeing jokes from the perspective of an audiovisual translator (1996, p. 251).

Zabalbeascoa's model differs slightly from Martínez-Sierra's model in the choice of categories that have been included and how they are used. The most important difference is that Martínez-Sierra has also included categories for sound, graphics and paralinguistics to make the model even more suited for audiovisual use. Martínez-Sierra's modified version of this classification tool divides both verbal and referential humor as well as non-linguistic humor into eight different categories that contain different humorous characteristics (2005, p. 190). It is, however, important to remember that if a joke situation contains the characteristics of one or more of these levels, it can be placed within all of the categories that can be found in the joke.

The first level is called "Community-and-Institutions Elements". Jokes that contain any forms of cultural or intertextual features that connect them to a particular culture can be found here. Some examples of this are people or characters that are famous within particular cultures, organizations, newspapers, books and films, etc (Martínez-Sierra, 2005, 290).

We see this in example 1, which can be found in a scene in Shrek 2.

Example 1

Donkey: And there's the bush shaped like Shirley Bassey!

Here, the Shirley Bassey-reference mainly appeals to a target audience familiar with 60's British pop culture, as this knowledge is necessary to understand it.

“Community-Sense-of-Humor Elements” is the second level in this model. The characteristics of this type of humor are that they are referential, concerning topics that seem to be more popular in some cultures than others, based on the values of those cultures (Martínez-Sierra, 2005, p. 290). A typical example of this is how some countries ridicule other countries and cultures that they have specific relations to. In Norway, for instance, Swedes are used as the butt of many jokes, something that may seem strange for anyone from France or Russia.

The third level in this taxonomy is “Linguistic Elements”, which is related to verbal humor (as opposed to referential humor)(Martínez-Sierra, 2005, p. 291). This category is based on linguistic features, such as wordplays and idioms.

Level four is “Visual Elements”, which contains humorous aspects that the audience is visually exposed to (Martínez-Sierra, 2005, p. 291). In audiovisual translation, this element is not likely to change, as the visual elements are rarely altered in the process of translation.

“Graphic Elements”, the fifth level, contains humor expressed through written messages inserted in the screen picture (Martínez-Sierra, 2005, p. 291). This category can be regarded as a subsection of visual elements with particular focus on linguistics. This is a category that can contain both referential and verbal types of humor, depending on what the graphic elements are. In some cases, graphic elements that are inserted into the screen picture of audiovisual STs are physically replaced with a translated version when another subtitled TT is included in the picture, although not in all cases.

Level six, “Paralinguistic Elements” revolves around the non-verbal qualities of the voices in an audiovisual text, and how these qualities add information to the plot at the same time as being humorous (Martínez-Sierra, 2005, p. 291). Here, factors such as intonation, tone, rhythm, timbre, resonance, and expression of emotions through voice are addressed. Though these elements are non-verbal, they are referential to the situation in which they are introduced.

“Non-Marked (Humorous) Elements” is the seventh level. This category contains instances of humor that are not easily categorized within any of the other levels, but still carry some form of humorous load (Martínez-Sierra, 2005, p. 291).

The last level of the taxonomy, “Sound Elements”, are sounds that are humorous either alone or in combination with other elements. They are mainly found as features in the soundtrack of the audiovisual text (Martínez-Sierra, 2005, p. 292).

2.1.4 The General Theory of Verbal Humor

In addition to Martínez-Sierra’s THE, this thesis will to a large extent base itself on the General Theory of Verbal Humor (GTVH), which was initially presented by Attardo & Raskin in 1991. Along with the Semantic-Script Theory of Humor (SSTH) (Raskin, 1985), Attardo’s model is often referred to as the most influential linguistic humor theory of the last two decades (Corduas, Attardo & Eggleston, 2008). As the model is used as a tool when comparing differences and similarities in jokes on a general basis, it can also easily be used in an interlingual manner when investigating translatability and the changes jokes undergo in a translation process (Attardo, 2002, p. 184-192).

This theory builds upon the SSTH, which Raskin and Attardo proposed in 1985. The SSTH is based on two conditions for a text to be funny:

1. *The text is compatible, fully or in part, with two different scripts.*
2. *The two scripts with which the text is compatible are opposite in a special sense.*

(Raskin, 1985, p. 99)

As can be seen in Raskin’s proposal, the SSTH is based on the idea of the incongruity theory that was presented in 2.1.1, where humor was claimed to be created by the lack of logic created from the opposition of two or more scripts. Example 2 shows this well:

Example 2:

I invented a new word! Plagiarism!¹

¹ Unknown originator (Twitter, 2020)

Here, there is a clear incongruity in the opposing scripts new words/plagiarism, which have contradicting meanings and a lack of logic when put together.

Two aspects that the SSTH did not provide for was an explicit discrimination between whether it is the semantic or the pragmatic information which causes the humor, and the fact that some jokes are viewed as more alike to one another than others (Attardo, 2017, p. 5). The first aspect means that this theory makes it difficult to interpret whether the humor found in a joke is embedded in the semantic and linguistic meaning of the utterances, or if it has something to do with the speakers' pragmatic meaning (intended message) of their utterances in the context that they are uttered. The second aspect implies that some jokes are more similar than others and should be investigated as such. The SSTH does not do this, but instead differentiates between all jokes equally as if they are all equally dissimilar. Building on these aspects, Attardo presented an approach to VEH which allows us to investigate the differences between various jokes based on different traits which the jokes are made up of. Particularly, Attardo divided these traits into six parameters, or knowledge resources, which are structured hierarchically depending on the significance the traits have in the perceived difference from one joke to another. At the bottom of this hierarchical structure, Attardo placed "language", followed by "narrative strategy", "target", "situation", "logical mechanism" and finally "script opposition" at the top (Attardo, 2002, p. 183).

In all VEH, each joke has a language component. The "language" knowledge resource is related to how the joke is semantically presented to the audience. A joke can be worded in numerous ways and still contain the same semantic concept, meaning that the essence in a joke may easily be preserved by changing the wording of a joke (Attardo, 2001, p. 22). As changing of the wording is not necessarily equivalent to changing the joke, this knowledge resource has been placed at the bottom of the hierarchical system (Attardo, 2001, p. 22). We see this in example 3 and 4.

Example 3:

It takes six Swedes to change a light bulb. One to hold the light bulb and and five to turn the ladder.

Example 4:

How many Swedes does it take to change a lightbulb? Six. One to hold it and the remaining five to turn the ladder.

We see that the resolution of the joke is the same, but the language has been altered.

The second knowledge resource, “narrative strategy”, revolves around the way in which the joke is presented, be it a monologue, a riddle, a dialogue or even a string of thought (Attardo, 2001, p. 23). Like the first knowledge resource, it is fully possible to change the narrative of a joke without changing the essence of the joke, something that places this knowledge resource on a lower hierarchical level as well. We see this in how the only difference between example 3 and example 4 are how the structure of the joke changes from a statement into a riddle.

Knowledge resource three is the “target” resource. The intention of this category is to determine the laughingstock of the joke, which is the character that the joke is made at expense of (Attardo, 2001, p. 23-24). In examples 3 and 4, the butt of the joke in both cases are the Swedes, as they are suggested to be too dumb to know how to change a light bulb. Not all jokes have a butt, in which cases this parameter is left with an empty value (Attardo, 2001, p. 24). Often, the goal is to build up around a stereotype, whether it is based on nationalistic, ideological, visual, religious, linguistic or some other form of sociological traits that can be the source of ridicule (Attardo, 2001, p. 24). In classical humor theory, this parameter would be linked to superiority humor, as the source of the joke relates to humiliation of others in order to obtain a feeling of superiority. As this is often a central part of any joke, it is only natural that it is placed on a higher level than the aforementioned parameters.

The fourth parameter, “Situation”, refers in a way to what can be called the “props of the joke” (Attardo, 2002, p. 179). These are all the things that go on in the joke related to the setting and surroundings in which the joke takes place. Here, all factors such as activities, objects, characters and other various props in the joke are referred to (Attardo, 2002, p. 179). Again, if we look at examples 3 and 4, the situation includes six Swedes, a ladder, and a light bulb.

On the next level, the “logical mechanism” is placed. This parameter is based on a logic which is somehow localized in and exclusive to everything outside the world that the joke is situated in (Attardo, 2001, p. 25). The two parameters “script opposition” and “logical mechanism” are closely intertwined and are both based on the opposing scripts that create humor in a situation. What the logical mechanism does is point out the type of humorous resolution that has been made based on the opposing scripts. Table 1 presents us with a list of

known resolutions that can be derived from script opposition. It is important to remember that this is a rather unpredictable parameter, as it revolves around the resolution of some type of incongruity in a joke, and given that a resolution is not always present in a joke, this parameter is not always applicable (Attardo, 2001, p. 25).

role reversals	role exchange	potency mapping
vacuous reversal	Juxtaposition	Chiasmus
garden-path	figure-ground reversal	faulty reasoning
almost situations	Analogy	self-undermining
inferring consequences	reasoning from false premise	missing link
Coincidence	Parallelism	implicit paralellism
Proportion	ignoring the obvious	false analogy
Exaggeration	field restriction	cratylism ²
meta-humor	vicious circle	referential ambiguity

Table 1: Known Logical Mechanisms

² Refers to the idea that two words that sound similar to one another must have the same or similar meanings (Attardo, 1994, p. 192-193).

Finally, the highest level of knowledge resources is “Script Opposition”, which is the parameter that revolves around the requirements of incongruity introduced in Raskin and Attardo’s SSTH (Attardo, 2002, p. 188). Attardo believes that any discrete cut-off point that separates jokes from one another in terms of similarity gradience can be found here (2002, p. 188). This does not necessarily mean that jokes are always easily distinguishable from one another based on the notion of script opposition, but merely that this parameter contains the essence of the incongruity that a joke is built upon, and that greater differences in this aspect are more likely to be interpreted differently by the audience. Scripts are the chunks of semantic information that are associated with a word and activated when the word is used (Raskin, 1985, p. 81). It is not enough for two scripts to overlap for a joke to be funny. In addition, there must be some sort of opposition between the two scripts, such as normal/abnormal, stupid/intelligent, cleanliness/dirtiness so that a disparate reading is triggered, causing incongruity (Raskin, 1985, p. 99). Again, this is seen in example 2 (on plagiarism) and how incongruity was created in the opposing concepts of new words and plagiarism.

In 2.2.3, we will look further into how Attardo uses this parameter model to investigate the translatability of VEH.

2.2 Translation of humor

2.2.1 Introduction

According to Chiaro, the translation of VEH is a troublesome task, and reaching a full translation with an exact formal or semantic equivalence is close to impossible (2004, p. 37). There are many who hasten to conclude that humor is in fact untranslatable, however with various degrees of translatability (Zalambeascoa, 2005, p. 188).

In the case of an interlingual translation where semantic or formal equivalence between a ST and a TT is not attainable, the goal should in Chiaro’s perspective first and foremost be to achieve an equivalent effect in the TT as is found in the ST (2004, p. 37). One claim he makes is that in the process of translation, the translator should place “the intended function or skopos of a text in pole position regardless of equivalence” (2004, p. 37). Skopos Theory explains why translations are as they are by implying how they should be influenced by the purpose of the TT and the needs of the TT audience (Reiss & Vermeer, 2014, p. 90). The

skopos of dubbing is described to be “to produce an effect in the target culture receiver that is comparable to that produced by the original text in the source culture receiver” (Martí Ferriol, 2007, p. 177), whereas the skopos of subtitling is “to serve the needs of the audience who are the end-users” (Fong & Au, 2009, p. ix). Gottlieb states that traits that are funny in a ST should also be funny in the TT (1997, p. 21). Like Gottlieb, Minutella argues that in the case of humorous texts such as *Shrek*, the translator should aim for a similar comic effect as that which can be found in the ST in order to make the audience laugh (2015, p. 143).

Zabalbeascoa goes even further by suggesting that “it would be desirable for the translation to be even funnier than the source text” (1996, p. 247).

2.2.2 Typical Translation Issues

Cultural humor can in some cases be exceptionally difficult to grasp and translate well into another target language if the socio-cultural reference is confined to the target group speaking the source language (Chiaro, 2004, p. 37). Davies identifies three different cases of humor where a translator is challenged (2005, p. 148). She presents the first cases as “transposable jokes” which are cases of humor that share similar scripts across the borders, where a translator is easily able to make the full joke available to the target audience. The second cases are the “switchable jokes”, which may not be completely similar in the source language and the target language but carry more or less an equivalent effect in both languages (Davies, 2005, p. 148). The last cases that Davies presents are the “problematic jokes”, which are the jokes and scripts that are restricted to one group. These are challenging to translate without substantial changes to the joke or in fact replacing the joke with compensatory humorous elements where the joke was found in the ST or in other places to compensate for humor loss (2005, p. 148, Chiaro, 2006, p. 200). Such elements can either be various forms of VEH or other humorous nonverbal components (Chiaro, 2006, p. 200).

2.2.3 The Use of GTVH in the Analysis of Interlingual Translation

Attardo’s GTVH can be used not only intralingually when comparing various jokes, but also interlingually in the investigation of the changes one particular joke undergoes in the transformation process from source language to target language (Attardo, 2002, p. 184).

Attardo argues that the lower levels of the language resources influence a joke to a lesser extent. Changes from a ST to a TT on the higher levels will more likely lead to less similarity between the two jokes than if the changes happened on a lower level (Attardo, 2017, p. 6).

The following joke pairs from *Shrek 2* may serve as examples of this. In example 5, Shrek, Fiona and Donkey are getting ready to travel by wagon to Far Far Away, and in 6, Donkey and Shrek are looking for directions in the middle of the woods.

Example 5:

ST - Donkey: Come on, we don't want to hit traffic!

Dubbed TT - Donkey: Hei, kom igjen a Shrek, så slipper vi rushtida!

Example 6:

ST - Donkey: And there's the bush shaped like Shirley Bassey!

Dubbed TT - Donkey: Ja, og der er jo busken som likner på Eli Hagen!

By comparing the changes that happen in the translation of joke 5, we see that the essence of the joke changes far more when the target parameter is altered than when the language parameter is altered. By rephrasing “we don't want to hit traffic” to “så slipper vi rushtida” in 5, we still get the clear script opposition between the idea of horse and wagon and highly modern freeways and cars through the linguistic alteration. In 6, through the alteration of the target from “Shirley Bassey” to “Eli Hagen”, the script opposition is affected to a greater extent, since the two targets have different associations attached to them. Because of this, we can claim that the ST and TT in 6 are more different from one another than what the ST and TT in 5 are, and can more easily be perceived as different jokes by the audience.

2.3 Audiovisual Translation Theory: Translation of Humor in Dubbing and Subtitling

2.3.1 Introduction

According to González, “audiovisual translation focuses on the practices, processes and products that are involved in or result from the transfer of multimodal and multimedial content across languages and/or cultures” (2020, p. 30). Traditionally, the main role of AVT has been to be a tool for the purpose of fully understanding an audiovisual text that was initially shot in a different language (Díaz-Cintas, 2008, p. 6).

Characteristic for AVT is the combination of both verbal and non-verbal elements for the sake of expressing some form of content. Delabastita presents a set of codes or semiotic channels, to identify some of the essential elements in audiovisual translation (1989, p. 196). Among those are the acoustic-verbal elements that include dialogues, monologues, songs and voice-offs; the visual verbal elements, which include inserts, banners, letters, messages on the screens and headlines for instance; the visual nonverbal elements, which cover images, photography and gestures; and the acoustic non-verbal elements, which include musical score, sound effects and other types of non-visual noises (Delabastita, 1989, p. 196).

In dubbing, the four semiotic channels (acoustic-verbal, acoustic-nonverbal, visual-verbal and visual-nonverbal) are maintained and balanced by holding equal semantic load in the ST and the TT (Gottlieb, 1994, p. 265). In subtitles, by contrast, the balance shifts away from acoustic verbal element and towards the visual verbal channel, which is the channel that holds the lowest semantic content in TV and films with original language (Gottlieb, 1994, p. 265). According to Pedersen, subtitles should merely act supplementary in understanding an audiovisual text, and not stand in the way of the audience's attempt to read the audiovisual image they are being exposed to (Pedersen, 2010, p. 16). Usually, information that is provided in the visual aspects of the media we are exposed to is left out of the translation, mostly because the relevant information is still present in the visual aspects of the media, and that the audiovisual text contains technical constraints (Gottlieb, 1994, p. 268, Pedersen, 2010, p. 16). The translation will then hold the meaning behind what is being uttered rather than what is actually being uttered. A consequence of this may be that there becomes a substantial difference between what is being projected on screen and the way the scene has been translated in the subtitles (Gottlieb, 1994, p. 268). This is called "intersemiotic redundancy" (Gottlieb, 1994, p. 268) by Gottlieb, or "the feedback effect" (Pedersen, 2010, p. 16) by Pedersen.

2.3.2 Dubbing as Audiovisual Translation

Dubbing is one of the two most commonly used forms of audiovisual translation alongside subtitling. It is defined by Baker and Hochel as "the replacement of the original speech by a voice track which attempts to follow as closely as possible the timing, phrasing and lip movement of the original dialogue" (1998, pp. 74-75). Dubbing is usually concentrated on recreating the flow and feeling of the ST, both concerning choices of wording and semantic accuracy, and in terms of the pace, rhythm and movements of the

scenes being translated and dubbed (Luyken et al, 1991, p. 31). A challenge in the process of translating an audiovisual text through dubbing is the translator's inability to alter or change visual performances or music in any way. Because of this, one of the things the translator must consider is the synchronization of lip-movement in terms of speed and word shape (Franzon, 2008, p. 389). Such restrictions in translation through dubbing may in some cases lead to loss of humor or major changes in jokes from the target language to the source language. Having said that, the visual representation of an audiovisual text often also presents additional visual information that the audience can rely on in order to understand the context of a joke, making them less dependent on acoustic input. This visual element provides the translator with the opportunity to alter and translate humor more freely while still preserving the storyline of the audiovisual text.

2.3.3 Subtitling as Audiovisual Translation

Subtitling is mainly used as a strategy to allow the audience to get access to the ST and language it is presented in (González, 2008, p. 15). To clarify the concept 'subtitles', González presents this description: "In terms of modality, subtitling consists of the production of snippets of writing text to be superimposed on visual footage, normally near the bottom of the frame" (2020, p. 31). The subtitles should aim to recite and mirror all the verbal element, the style and the semantics of the audiovisual image within a small confined space on the screen, and at the same time manage to keep up with the rhythm and dialogues in the images (Ivarsson & Carroll, 1998; Karamitroglue, 1998, Georgakopoulou, 2006, in Kapsaskis, 2020, p. 555). The dynamics and dramatic characterizations presented in the audiovisual source may have to be compromised because of these restrictions (González, 2020, p. 32). It is expected that the subtitles are presented in synchrony with the speech it reflects (Baños & Díaz-Cintas, 2018, p. 317) Long and descriptive sentences may have to be reduced down to a maximum of 35-42 characters on each line over two lines, or even shorter depending on the duration of the oral speech unit that it needs to correspond to (Baños & Díaz-Cintas, 2018, p. 317-318). Two lines like this are believed to be read comfortably in the time span of about six seconds, meaning that source speech text that require more characters than this over the same time span need to be shortened down, adapted, and in some cases deleted in the subtitles (Baños & Díaz-Cintas, 2008, p. 317, González, 2008, p. 16). Because of this, subtitles have been claimed to bring about cultural and linguistic standardization (Baños & Díaz-Cintas, 2018, p. 319). The concept of subtitling is divided into two categories: intralingual subtitling, where the subtitles are written in the same language as the source

speech, and interlingual subtitling, which revolves around the AVT from the source language to a separate target language like we see in this case study (González, 2008, p. 14-15).

2.3.4 Translation of Audiovisual Humor and its Constraints

VEH is to a great extent present in various audiovisual texts, such as in films, tv-series, programs and video games (Chiaro, 2004, p. 35). The humor is naturally presented in a polysemiotic context, meaning that the verbal aspects of a joke interplay with both visual and extralingual acoustic variables, such as graphic humor, facial expressions, clothing, movement of any sort, written information, surrounding sound effects, breathing and background music, to create humorous moments (Chiaro, 2004, p. 40-41). Chiaro believes that the interaction between the audiovisual format and the verbal format of humor can cause difficulties in the process of translation, as multiple semiotic systems limit the translator's independence when choosing how to translate a ST (2004, p. 40-41). Not only do the translation of the verbal utterances have to be funny, but they also need to match what goes on on the screen. When translating orally articulated VEH into another kind of orally articulated VEH, like in dubbing, the inclusion of accents, varieties, sociolects and slang are commonly used strategies to enhance humorous features of audiovisual output (Chiaro, 2004, p. 41). In subtitles, it is according to Pavesi less effective to include linguistic varieties due to the fact that subtitles need to be understood by the vast majority of the population in order to serve their function in making the ST understandable in the target language (1996). A more useful way to go about this if an actor's speech is different from the others' in the ST, is to merely translate humorous moments where speech varieties are central in a way such that the target audience understands that the actor's speech is different from the others' (Pavesi, 1996).

2.4 Previous research

There are multiple studies on the translation of humor in animated movies. Particularly, Shrek has been used as a case study on the subject on several occasions. One such case is "When Humor Gets Fishy: The Translation of Humor in Animated Films" by Vera (2015). In this study, Vera investigates the translation strategies that have been used in the Spanish dubbed translation of *The Little Mermaid* (Disney) and *Shrek* (Dreamworks). She makes use of Pascua and Rey-Jouvin's translation classification tools in her analysis, and concludes by arguing that a great deal of the humor that has been lost in translation has also been

compensated for through the use of additional humorous elements presented in the TT (2015).

Another case study that has been done and that this thesis has been inspired by is Jankowska and her case study on *Shrek* (2009). Jankowska's study has investigated the translation of subtitles and dubbing from English as a source language into both Polish and Spanish as target languages by using Martínez-Sierra's THE (2005). Her findings suggest that target language texts, both dubbed and subtitled, often contain less humorous elements, and that between the two of them, subtitles tend to contain the least humorous elements as well as less of the original humorous load used in the STs (Jankowska, 2009, p. 5). Others who have done similar research on *Shrek* are Minutella (2015), in whose research the aim of the study was to explore the dubbed translation of culture dependent VEH in the *Shrek* movies from English into Italian, using Chiaro's strategies of translation as a general model. She found that in most cases, the VEH was substituted with another equivalent VEH in the TL, with the exception of some instances of omission and literal translations. Nieminen (2007) has also done a case study on the VEH in the screen translation of *Shrek* and *Shrek 2* by comparing and contrasting the screen translations in Finnish subtitling and dubbing, with a particular focus on what makes the movies appealing for both children and adults, and how the two types of TTs compare to one another. She found that translation strategies seemed to vary between the movies, but that a general trait was that consideration of a dual audience was to a greater extent present in the dubbed TTs. However, it seemed that few jokes all together were left completely untranslated.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This thesis investigates the way audiovisual humor is portrayed in *Shrek 2*, and how it has been translated into Norwegian through dubbing and subtitles. Are there any differences or similarities between the two translations, and what may be the cause of such differences? I have selected two different models that have different means of humor categorization that I intend to use in the process of analyzing the joke translations. By means of these models, I analyse qualitatively the losses, gains and shifts in humor. This will provide a better understanding of each joke translation and the shifts and changes they have undergone. By using a qualitative approach, we have the opportunity to look deeper into the interpretations the translators have made and how they have chosen to adapt this information in the target language in order to preserve humor and meaning. One model is used to categorize humor types that are found in the ST and in the TT, making potential changes apparent. The other will be used to investigate whether the jokes have undergone any changes or alterations in the translation process by looking into the various levels that can be found in verbal jokes, and in that case on which levels or areas have the alterations been done.

3.2 Material

The data in this study has been collected from the second *Shrek* movie. The first *Shrek*-movie introduced us to the love story that developed between Shrek and princess Fiona after Shrek rescued her from a tower so that a Lord named Farquaad could marry her. After a lot of fuss, Fiona and Shrek finally got to be together, and the movie ended with their marriage. This is where *Shrek 2* takes up the story. Here, Fiona is invited to visit her parents in the kingdom of Far Far Away so that she can introduce them to her new husband. Fiona's father, Harold, has formerly secretly promised Fiona to a Prince called Charming, and thereby expects Fiona to show up in human form with him. Matters get complicated, however, when Fiona's parents find out that her husband is in fact Shrek, and Shrek and herself are ogres. The story unfolds as Harold attempts to sabotage Shrek and Fiona's relationship to make her available for Prince Charming, and Shrek seeks out Prince Charming's mother for help to save their marriage.

This movie has been chosen for data collection for several reasons. First of all, it includes a broad variety of humorous elements, both non-verbal, verbal and referential, something that makes the movie an interesting source in itself. The humor in the movie is known to target not only children but also adults through cultural and sexual references which again makes the investigation of variations in translation strategies even more fascinating, as it is interesting to see in which ways such references have been managed. Shrek has been translated in many languages, and the fact that it has both a dubbed and a subtitled TT in Norwegian makes it an excellent source for the comparative analysis in this study.

A sequence of the movie lasting about 10 minutes has been selected as the source for data collection, that contains many cases that may be interesting to examine. Within this sequence, from the 23rd to the 33rd minute of the movie, there are seven jokes containing a total of 9 humorous episodes, all of which will be analyzed in this study. The reason why this particular sequence of 10 minutes was chosen relates to the fact that it contains an appropriate selection and number of jokes that would be interesting to look at. In this sequence, there is a broad variation of both verbal and referential types of humor, which makes the investigation more inclusive of humor varieties.

3.3 Analysis: Concepts and models

The two models that will be used in the analysis-section are Martínez-Sierra's THE and Attardo's GTVH (Martínez-Sierra, 2005, Attardo, 2001). The reason why these models were chosen in particular, is because the first model has been adapted for the particular use in audiovisual translations by the inclusion of nonverbal categories, which makes it an appropriate model for this study. In addition, it has been used in previous research on the interlingual translation of humor in Shrek by Jankowska (2009) as well as in the American animated series "The Simpsons" by Martínez-Sierra himself (2005). The second (GTVH) is considered a pillar in the field of humor translation, meaning that one may expect it to be broadly used and thereby also widely accepted, comprehensive, inclusive and easily applicable. These are studies that are quite similar to this, where the model served its purpose well.

3.3.1 Taxonomy of humorous elements

Like we saw in chapter 2.1.3, this model categorizes different types of jokes based on the humorous elements that they contain. The classification of the elements are as follows; Community-and-Institution, Community-Sense-of-Humor, Linguistic, Graphic, Visual, Sound, Paralinguistic and Non-Marked (Martínez-Sierra, 2005, p. 290-291). In the analysis-section, the jokes that are being investigated will be classified with either one or more of these categorizations in both the ST, the dubbed TT and the subtitled TT. Any changes in these categorizations in the translation process will indicate in what ways the translation of the joke has been altered in order to preserve humor in the TTs, both in regard to linguistic and non-linguistic forms of humor.

3.3.2 GTVH

As we saw in chapter 2.1.4, the GTVH holds six hierarchically structured parameters that cover the mechanisms that may contain important humorous aspects in a joke. All jokes contain no, one or more elements in each parameter, although where some parameters may contain the essential parts of humor in one joke, other parameters may be more important in other jokes (Attardo, 2002, p. 176). On the lowest hierarchical levels, we can find the parameters “Language”, “Narrative Strategy” and “Target”, and on the top levels, we have “Situation”, “Logical Mechanism” and “Script Opposition” (Attardo, 2002, p. 176-182). The hierarchical structure of these parameters is based on the extent to which the changes made in a parameter may cause the whole joke to change or shift (Attardo, 2002, p. 176-182). Changes in the parameters on the lowest levels will to a lesser extent affect the way the joke is perceived. In humor translation, one or more of these parameters may be altered or changed in order to preserve the humor in the joke. By using this model in the analysis of Shrek, I hope to gain some understanding of the priorities that are made in humor translation both in dubbing and subtitling.

Some of Attardo’s parameters seem to be more open to interpretation than others. The parameters that are most difficult to grasp are the linguistic parameter and the script opposition parameter. Following is a guideline as to how they have been used in this thesis in order to make a clear framework to work within.

In simple terms, the language parameter addresses the question of whether a joke has undergone any type of linguistic alteration in the process of translation. Attardo discusses what status this change should have in his text, under the heading of ‘Absolute translation’, concluding that this – absolute translation – is not possible, because there are always going to be at least connotative shifts (Attardo, 2002, p. 190-191) . However, the shifts that happen are not always the type of shifts that are relevant when investigating humor translation. By equally including all interlingual translations in the linguistic parameter, cases where changes within the language parameter are of the interesting kind are masked. This is why this particular parameter is reserved for those cases where the translated texts have some substantial form of linguistic shift, such as a replacement of a wordplay or expression with another or a clear change of syntax that affects the way the joke is presented.

The Script Opposition parameter can be difficult to grasp because Attardo and Raskin do not provide a simple or uncomplicated explanation to what a script really is in GTVH and SSTH. The scripts are described as representations of links in the semantic network (Attardo & Hempelmann, 2002, p. 20) They further describe scripts as sets or slot fillers, and use the word ‘incongruity’ when explaining their function as a phase in joke processing, but do not offer a clear indication of what kind of slots besides the fact that a script or set works naturally together in a particular context. An example is how the semantic agent, patient and instrument of a verb should be predictable and cause no surprising reaction. (Attardo & Hempelmann, 2002, p. 5). Here, the ‘script opposition’ term is interpreted as an incongruity in the feeling or concept that we expect to relate to an event and the feeling or concept that is in fact presented in its stead. This contrast will be listed in the analysis by pointing out the opposing factors or elements of an event that cause incongruity.

3.3.3 Combining the THE and the GTVH

The use of the THE model alone in the analysis of the jokes in *Shrek 2* will reflect which properties each joke contains before and after a translation, something that will give us an indication as to which properties on the surface level of a joke have been prioritized, altered or omitted in the translation process. The categories in this classification model broadly cover which types of humor we can find in an audiovisual text, both linguistic in terms of verbal and referential humor, and in various non-linguistic forms, but they say nothing about the changes that happen on the deeper levels of a linguistic joke in translation. Therefore, each joke will also be investigated on a deeper linguistic level using the GTVH model. The

analysis will include a classification of humor types using the THE model in the ST, dubbed TT and subtitled TT, as well as an indication on which parameter levels the dubbed TT and the subtitled TT have changed. These models will be used side by side in within so-called ‘cards’, which can be described as tables for each joke that is being analyzed, containing a transcription of the ST, the dubbed TT and the subtitled TT, along with categorizations of the texts using the two models as well as an analysis of the shifts and changes that happen in the different translations. The cards have been inspired by and modified from Jankowska’s study on Shrek, where she uses similar cards in her analysis (2009). They were, however, originally based on Martínez-Sierra’s card designs for translation analysis (2005, p. 293). By using these models side by side in analysis cards, I hope, in addition, to gain a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of each model, as well as how they complement each other when applied to humor translation research.

The THE model includes non-linguistic classification tools, thus it complements the GTVH-model in a way that makes the analysis more inclusive of all humorous aspects. For instance, omission or loss of VEH in the translation of problematic jokes due to untranslatability may be accommodated for through the paralinguistics of the voices in a dubbed TT. In the same way, the GTVH-model digs deeper into the different verbal layers of each joke in order to map all the linguistic components that constitute humor. Where verbal shifts are depicted in the THE without an explanation of what has in fact happened, the parameters in the GTVH may provide more detailed reasoning of what levels that are affected during the actual translation process. This way, the models may supplement each other well by covering each other’s weaker areas, or blind spots.

3.4 Validity and Reliability in the Humanities and in This Study

The terms “validity” and “reliability” are central parts of research and data collection across multiple fields and disciplines. Bernard defines validity as “the accuracy and trustworthiness of instruments, data and findings in research” (2000, p. 46). On the whole, this means that validity signifies whether the research evaluates what it intends to evaluate, or in other words whether it carries legitimacy and credibility. Something that makes this definition relevant to the thesis presented here is the fact that words such as “measure” are avoided, as they indicate that the collection of data and analysis need to have quantitative traits that provide validity through repetitive patterns (Guest et. al., 2014, p. 3). Reliability is to a great extent

related to replicability and reproducibility of the research material (Guest et. al., p. 4). Reliability can sometimes be confused with validity as they both seem to support or deny the legitimacy of research. However, results showing high reliability are not necessarily truly valid (Guest et. al., 2014, p. 4-5). Consistency can merely indicate that the results show particular patterns, even though these patterns may not necessarily be the patterns that we as researchers are looking for. On the other hand, it is impossible that research has a high validity if the reliability is low and there is little consistency in the results.

There are a few types of validity that are especially relevant in qualitative studies, such as face validity, which requires the researcher to rely on intuitive personal judgements in order to determine legitimacy, and external validity, which determines validity through the extent through which the data or analysis is generalizable across other populations and contexts (Guest et. al., 2014, p. 6). Face validity and external validity are essential in this study because it is important that the analysis models intuitively make sense in order for them to work well and provide us with reliable and transparent results. This is also relevant in regard to personal judgement and intuition when it comes down to what is regarded as funny and not. On this matter, it is important to be able to rely on personal judgements and those of peers, which in this case depends on clarifying and open communication with my supervisor. It needs to be made clear how the models have been understood, interpreted and applied in order to create consensus among researchers. When using these terms, it is essential to ask oneself how one can truly establish validity in qualitative research on the basis of such intuitive judgements. In order to establish some degree of validity, an important factor here is that the research process is explicitly documented and described (Guest et al., 2014, p. 7-8). As the qualitative research approach leans on intuition to a great extent, it is therefore important to provide sufficient information that can allow others to either accept or reject the results (Guest et al., 2014, p. 8). This is why transparency is key. In this thesis, I hope to have gained a high degree of validity by being consistent in the application of my models in the analysis section by using transcription protocol in my data collection, being clear and transparent when establishing and describing my methodological approach when doing research, seeking communication and guidance to confirm or develop validity, and by being consistent in depending on my theoretical framework in my analysis-section and classification of data.

3.5 Generalizability

This study is quite limited, meaning that any form of conclusion that is drawn in this thesis needs to be supported by a substantial amount of additional research. Only seven jokes out of 46 have been investigated, and despite the fact that they were chosen in a way that would contain a form of reliability and validity, it is not advantageous to generalize beyond those jokes, given that the analyzed sample is too small. Thus, the external validity is compromised. In order to really be able to see all the practical aspects of the combination of Martínez-Sierra's model and Attardo's model, one or more bigger studies need to be executed.

Chapter 4: Analysis

4.1 Introduction

In the analysis section, seven consecutive jokes will be analyzed within cards, where the ST, the dubbed TT and the subtitled TT will be presented and analyzed, first through the use of Martínez-Sierra's THE, then by using Attardo's GTVH. The ST will be marked with the type of humorous load that can be found, and the TTs will be marked with both their humorous load and with the parameters in which there have been shifts from the ST to the TT. The cards are numbered consecutively based on the order they are presented in the film.

4.2 Joke Analysis

4.2.1 Card 1

Card: 1
Film: Shrek 2
Minute of the film: 23
Context: Harold and Lilian are discussing the fact that Fiona ended up with an ogre instead of prince charming. Lilian is acting calm about it, but Harold is losing his mind.
ST: Harold: I don't think you realize that our daughter has married a monster! Lilian: Oh, stop being such a drama king .
Humorous load: linguistic
Dubbed TT: Harold: Jeg tror ikke du innser at datteren vår har giftet seg med et monster! Lilian: Åhh, du tror visst du er helt konge , du!
Humorous load: linguistic Parameter changes: language, script opposition
Subtitled TT: Harold: Forstår ikke du at vår datter er gift med et uhyre? Lilian: Ikke vær en dramakonge .
Humorous load: linguistic

Parameter changes: no change

Comment:

Humorous load:

The humorous element that can be found in the ST has been created by adding a twist to a common English expression *drama queen*. The humor that this twist creates, stems from a breach of the audience's linguistic expectations when the audience expects *queen*, and surprisingly gets *king*. The literal use of *king* (given that Harold is in fact a king) also carries some type of humorous punch, as the original use of *queen* is metaphoric and carries various associations itself, such as 'the queen of drama' or 'the expert on drama'.

In the dubbed translation, we still see a linguistic humorous load as the audience expects a metaphorical expression and gets a literal one. However, in this case the linguistic wordplay has been replaced by another Norwegian wordplay. To be *helt konge* in Norwegian is a type of praise, meaning that someone is somehow 'the best' person. In a humorous context, Lilian seems to be calling Harold self-centered for distancing himself from the marriage between his daughter and Shrek.

The wordplay that we see in the ST is kept in a literal translation in the Norwegian subtitles of the movie. In the subtitles, we thereby get *dramakonge* instead of *drama king*.

Parameter change:

The target, situation, narrative strategy and logical mechanism of the joke are similar in the dubbed Norwegian translation and the ST. In the dubbed TT, Harold remains the target of the joke in the translation, and the situation, meaning the setting, props, context and Lilian's reaction, is also intact in the dubbed and subtitled translations. In regard to the dubbed joke's narrative strategy, the joke is still presented as a conversation between Harold and Lilian, where Lilian accuses Harold of overreacting. The resolution of the joke, meaning the logical mechanism, seems to remain the same since Lilian's comment on Harold's dramatic behavior, which is an instance of role reversal/role exchange.³

³ The difference between the two types of resolutions presented here was not entirely clearly explained by Attardo (2002, p. 180), which is why they are interpreted as the same type of incongruity in this thesis.

When looking at the changes that have been undergone in the translation process, the ST has been translated in the dubbed Norwegian version by replacing the whole humorous expression with another Norwegian expression. The linguistic parameter change that happens in this translation relates to Lilian's comment, "ohh, don't be such a dramaking"/"åhh, du tror visst du er helt konge, du". The expression *drama queen* does not exist in Norwegian, meaning that a literal translation of this expression would be perceived as bizarre and lead to some loss of humor. This has led the translator to use a Norwegian expression that carries some semantic similarities to conserve some of the essential parts of the humor in the ST. However, where Lilian in the ST refers to Harold as overly dramatic, she indirectly calls him self-centered in the dubbed version by claiming that he believes himself to be *helt konge*. What is similar in the two jokes is that the royal title is used literally in both contexts, despite the fact that both expressions initially use the royal titles metaphorically. It could be discussed whether the expression used in the dubbed translation fits the situation in which it is being used, as Harold does not communicate anything that can be understood as self-centered rather than overly dramatic. In addition, the dubbed translation only contains one case of script opposition (literal/metaphorical) as opposed to the ST which both shows a contrast between the literal/metaphorical and king/queen. Thus, one can argue that this translation may have led to some loss of humor. A shift in the script opposition can be found when we look at the contrast between the associations we have to the expressions *drama queen* and *helt konge*. The 'calm/overly dramatic' contrast in the ST shifts in the dubbed translation into something more similar to 'humble/self-centered', as if Harold is only looking out for his own interests in the dubbed. One cannot, however, claim that this alteration has affected the logical mechanism to a substantial extent, as the resolution of the script opposition still seems to be Lilian's comment on Harold's role reversal.

The Norwegian subtitle translation is a literal translation of the ST, which indicates that no clear changes have been done on the parameter levels in the joke. The translation contains a literal rendering of an English expression (drama king) which again has been derived from a more common English expression (drama queen). Given that neither the expression *dramadronning* (literally translated from *drama queen*) nor *dramakonge* exist in Norwegian, the translated statement may come across as absurd to the audience, meaning that there may have been some loss of humor in the TT despite the literal translation of the

ST. Also, as the expression does not exist in Norwegian, the effect of the change from the metaphorical to the literal use of the royal title also vanishes, leading to additional humorous loss in the subtitled TT. However, one can expect a part of those who watch Shrek in the original language with Norwegian subtitles to be fairly familiar with the English expression “drama queen” and its associations through what is referred to as the feedback effect (Gottlieb, 2012, p. 57). The feedback that the audience gets from the verbal reference compensates for the losses that the dialogue has undergone in translation (Gottlieb, 2012, p. 57). Therefore, the humor in the joke is not completely lost, as the audience will most likely be able to process the humor that is embedded in “drama king” with or without a literal translation.

4.2.2 Card 2

Card: 2
Film: Shrek 2
Minute of the film: 23
Context: In the middle of the argument about Shrek and Fiona, Harold walks out on the balcony where he is surprised to find the Fairy Godmother.
<p>ST:</p> <p>Fairy Godmother: Hello, Harold.</p> <p>Harold: [gasps]</p> <p>Lilian: What happened?</p> <p>Harold: Nothing, dear! Just the old crusade wound playing up a bit!</p> <p>[chuckles]</p> <p>I'll just stretch it out here for a while.</p>
Humorous load: linguistic
<p>Dubbed TT:</p> <p>Fairy Godmother: Hallo, Harald!</p> <p>Harold: [gasps]</p> <p>Lilian: Hva skjedde nå?</p>

Harold: Jeg, ingenting, ingenting kjære! Det er bare den gamle **korstogsskaden** jeg kjenner av og til!

[chuckles]

Jeg går og strekker den ut litt!

Humorous load: linguistic

Parameter changes: no change

Subtitled TT:

Fairy Godmother: Hei, Harald!

Lilian: Hva hendte?

Harold: Ingen ting! Det bare verker i den gamle **korstogsskaden**!

Jeg strekker meg her ute en stund.

Humorous load: linguistic

Parameter changes: no change

Comment:

Humorous load:

The humorous element in the ST is mainly grounded in the word play *crusade wound*, which is derived from the cruciate injury, a common knee injury where the cruciate ligament has been torn off or rifted. The phonological similarities of the two words, along with the contextual inappropriateness of a royal fairytale character having a wound suffered in a crusade, construct the humor in this case.

The dubbed translation and the subtitle translation of this joke are very similar to the joke in the source language. Again, the wordplay used to construct *korstogsskade*, or crusade injury, may be compared to the wordplay in the very similar word *korsbåndsskade*, which means cruciate ligament injury. In other words, the humorous load in both TTs can be categorized as linguistic.

Parameter change:

In this case, the jokes in the TT and the dubbed and subtitled translations are very similar when we look at the parameters that construct them. The narrative strategy remains that of a dialogue, as the joke is presented as an excuse for why Harold needs to go out on the terrace. The situation, meaning the setting and Lilian and Harold's conversation about the mysterious sound and Harold's crusade wound, has not been altered. As the joke does not

express any form of superiority or ridicule, we can debate whether the joke ever had a target in the first place. The logical mechanism and the script opposition are also both very similar in the TT and the translations,. In both cases, the contrasting scripts are *crucade/cruciate* or *korstog/korsbånd*, and the resolution is made using cratylism, as the contrasting words are interpreted as the same concept due to the similarity between them.

As the translation of the joke is very similar to the Norwegian dubbed and subtitle translations, the only parameter that may have been slightly affected is language. We can even argue that this parameter is in fact completely similar to the ST as well, The only difference that affects the meaning of the joke in some way is the associations related to the word *wound* versus *skade*. The use of the word *wound* rather than *injury* in the ST may make it harder for the audience to access and process the humor that is present in the similarities between the two traumas that are compared. When looking at the ST, the use of the word *wound* rather than *injury* makes the similarities between Harold's injury seem less similar to the more common *cruciate injury*. The use of the word *wound* in the Norwegian dubbed version and in the subtitles, *skade*, is used to label both types of injuries, something that may make the joke more cognitively accessible to the audience. As Attardo argues that absolute translation is not possible, such verbal alterations and shifts in connotations are only to be expected in the process of translation. This distinction thereby does not count as a change in the linguistic parameter, overall meaning that this joke has not undergone any form of parameter change in translation.

4.2.3 Card 3

Card: 3

Film: Shrek 2

Minute of the film: 24

Context: Fairy Godmother is raging at Harold because her son, Prince Charming, has returned from his quest to rescue and marry Princess Fiona with news that she has already been rescued and married. In Fiona's bed in the tower where he expected to find her, Prince Charming found the wolf from Little Red Riding Hood wearing Grandma's nightgown instead.

ST:

Fairy Godmother: He endures blistering winds and scorching desert!

He climbs to the highest bloody room of the tallest bloody tower...

And what does he find?

Some **gender-confused wolf** telling him that **his princess is already married**.

Humorous load: non-marked**Dubbed TT:**

Fairy Godmother: Han holder ut den iskalde vinden og ørkenheten.

Han klatrer opp til det øverste sabla rommet i det høyeste sabla tårnet.

Og hva finner han der?

En **kjønnsforvirret ulv** som forteller at **prinsessen hans allerede er gift!**

Humorous load: non-marked**Parameter changes: no change****Subtitled TT:**

Fairy Godmother: Han holdt ut piskende vind og brennende ørken!

Klatret til det øverste rom i det helsikes høyeste tårnet!

Og hva fant han?

En **kjønnsforvirret ulv** som sa at **prinsessen hans allerede var gift!**

Humorous load: non-marked**Parameter changes: no change****Comment:****Humorous load:**

The main humorous element in the ST here is the absurdity of the outcome of prince Charming's quest to save princess Fiona. Everyone familiar with the outcome of fairytales know that prince Charming is supposed to find Fiona in a room in the tallest tower and save her heroically. It is very unexpected that he would find a wolf in a nightgown who would put an abrupt end to his hopes and dreams. In addition, the reference to the wolf in Little Red Riding Hood as gender confused when he is dressed up in grandma's clothes, is also a relevant humorous aspect. Everyone who knows the tale of Little Red Riding Hood knows that the big bad wolf dresses up as her grandmother in order to trick her before eating her. By calling him gender confused, there is a mismatch between the idea of how a

big bad wolf should be perceived and how he is actually perceived by the audience and by prince Charming and the Fairy Godmother.

The Norwegian dubbed and subtitled translations of this joke are very similar to the ST. The lack of cultural elements makes it possible to translate this joke more literally into Norwegian without losing any meaning or humorous aspects, something the translators have chosen to do.

Parameter change:

The joke continues to be presented through the narrative strategy of a monologue in the Dubbed and subtitled TTs, and the target of the joke remains the wolf from Little Red Riding Hood, because the scary image that is presented of the big bad wolf in the fairytales is distorted and ridiculed by Fairy Godmother's misinterpretation of grandmother's nightgown as a way of expressing transgender tendencies. In addition, Prince Charming can also be described as a target, since he went through a tremendous amount of effort to save Fiona and his efforts turned out to be in vain since somebody else got to Fiona before him. The situation becomes clear in Fairy Godmother's description of Prince Charming's journey to Fiona's tower and what he met there. This is the retelling of a scene that was visually presented to the audience in the beginning of the movie as well, so the visual illustration provides the audience with an authentic expression of what the situation parameter represents. As this visual input cannot be altered in translation, the situation remains the same in the dubbed and subtitled translations.

There are two very clear types of script opposition in this joke. The first revolves around the idea of rescuing the princess/the princess is already rescued and married, and the second revolves around the associations the audience have to the wolf as a scary antagonist/gender confused. Because of the unexpected role the wolf is given, the logical mechanism here can in both cases be described as role exchange/role reversal, since the humor is created by the script opposition that emanates from the shift of the roles of Fiona and of the wolf.

The translations of this joke in the dubbed and subtitled TTs are both very similar to the ST. One can even go so far as to claim that this is a case of literal translation and that the

joke has not changed on any parameter level. Apart from the languages in which the jokes are presented, they carry the same narrative strategy, target, logical mechanism, script opposition, and situation. The language translation is also almost identical in the two languages. The joke has not undergone any form of humorous loss, gain or change of any kind.

4.2.4 Card 4

Card: 4
Film: Shrek 2
Minute of the film: 24-25
Context: The Fairy Godmother is still fuming with anger at Harold, and when Harold tries to defend himself, it seems as if she is going to lose her mind.
<p>ST:</p> <p>Harold: It wasn't my fault. He didn't get there in time.</p> <p>Fairy Godmother: Stop the car!! Harold. You force me to do something I really don't want to do.</p> <p>Harold: Where are we?</p> <p>Employee at Friar's Fat Boy: Hi. Welcome to Friar's Fat Boy! May I take your order?</p> <p>Fairy Godmother: My diet is ruined! I hope you're happy.</p>
Humorous load: community-sense-of-humor, sound elements, visual elements, paralinguistics, non-marked
<p>Dubbed TT:</p> <p>Harold: Jammen jammen det var ikke min feil! Han kom ikke frem i tide!</p> <p>Fairy Godmother: Stopp kjerra!! Harald, du tvinger meg til å gjøre noe jeg slett ikke har lyst til å gjøre.</p> <p>Harold: Hvor er vi?</p> <p>Employee at Friar's Fat boy: Heisann, velkommen til den fete sæter, hva skal det værre?</p> <p>Fairy Godmother: Slankekuren min. Du har spolert den.</p>
Humorous load: sound elements, visual elements, paralinguistics, non-marked
Parameter changes: language, target
Subtitled TT:

Harold: Det var ikke min feil. Han kom for sent.

Fairy Godmother: Stans bilen! Du tvinger meg til noe jeg virkelig ikke ønsker å gjøre.

Harold: Hvor er vi?

Employee at Friar's Fat Boy: Velkommen til **Fete Munk**. Vær så god?

Fairy Godmother: **Der røk slankekuren!** Håper du er fornøyd!

Humorous load: non-marked, visual elements

Parameter changes: target

Comment:

Humorous load:

The humor that constitutes the ST joke is based on the build up of the situation Harold finds himself in, which results in an unexpected turn of events. Caused by Harold's lack of will to cooperate with Fairy Godmother and Prince Charming, Fairy Godmother sets a threatening tone, insinuating that something bad is going to happen due to Harold's indifference. Her two bodyguards on each side of Harold start cracking their knuckles, alarming music plays in the background, and she claims that his lack of action leads her into doing something she wishes she did not have to do. All these factors lead the audience into believing that Fairy Godmother is going to inflict some sort of harm on Harold. When the questionable thing Fairy Godmother insinuates that she will do turns out to be ordering fast food, the ridicule created by the incongruity of the situation creates a humorous situation. In other words, both the sound effects in the background and from the knuckles of the body guards, the angry paralinguistic tone of Fairy Godmother and the frightened tone of Harold, the visually frightening appearance of the body guards, and the dialogue of the characters all create the build-up of a strong set of expectations. When the wagon stops and Fairy Godmother opens her window, Harold expects someone terrible to be on the outside. Instead, the person who speaks turns out to be a fast-food restaurant counter worker who asks for their order. When Fairy Godmother states that her diet will now be ruined, the audience realizes that the terrible thing she is going to do is to eat unhealthy food rather than to hurt Harold. When realizing that her threatening tone towards Harold was misleading, and that Fairy Godmother's coping mechanism in the situation is both more human and relatable, and not at all as threatening and dangerous, the humor is created. In this joke, the incongruity that the resolution of the joke presents, creates a form of VEH that needs to be marked. In lack of more descriptive categories covering VEH, the joke can therefore be categorized as non-marked. Another humorous element in this joke is

the name of the fast-food restaurant that they visit. The name, Friar's Fat Boy, is a reference targeting a culture of pedophilia within religious institutions, as Friar refers to Friar Tuck in *Robin Hood*, an old monk in the fairy tale, and the word *boy* in the name reflects back on him. This can be interpreted as an instance of community-sense-of-humor, since pedophilia combined with religion is a theme that is not regarded as funny in all cultures.

The dubbed TT carries the same humorous load as the ST on most occasions. The visual and paralinguistic elements and the sound elements have all been transferred into the TT, where they contribute to building the tone of the humorous situation. The main resolution of the joke, meaning the expectation of physical violence replaced by the intention to get fast food, is also maintained, creating a non-marked humorous load like in the ST.

The subtitled TT in and of itself only represents the visual and linguistic elements of the joke, meaning that the sound-based elements are left out all though they are represented in the background, where the viewer can pick up some of the prosody. However, the subtitled TT has been translated quite literally so that the main points and resolutions of the joke can still be categorized as non-marked. Also, as the subtitles are in fact presented along with audiovisual stimuli, the remaining elements that affected the humorous load in the ST and the dubbed TT are still effectful in the subtitled TT as well through the feedback effect.

Parameter change:

The dubbed TT has undergone little change in the process of translation from the ST in this joke, also from the perspective of Attardo's parameters. The narrative strategy remains the same, as it is the Fairy Godmother who creates the threatening tone of the scene and whose diet has been ruined. The situation is also similar, given that all the factors that affect the tone and contribute to the humor or effect of the joke are still intact. Fairy Godmother remains the target in big parts of the joke by craving fast food in both the ST and the dubbed TT. In the ST, the script opposition (violence/eating) caused by the alarming and threatening tone followed by the craving of fast food, and the logical mechanism/resolution, which comes to light through Fairy Godmother's exaggeration, is also maintained in the translation. The only parameter that has been slightly altered in some parts of this humorous scene is language and target. In particular, the target

presented in the name of the fast-food chain, Friar's Fat Boy, and the language in Fairy Godmother's complains about her diet being ruined have been modified. The fast-food name has undergone some humorous loss in the translation into Den Fete Sæter, since the effect of calling Tuck Friar fat causes more humor than naming a pasture fat (which in itself does not make that much sense). In addition, the word *boy* has been removed in the dubbed TT, which again eliminates the reference to pedophilia in the church (here, the church is no longer the target of the joke) and creates additional loss of humor. In short, the target of the humorous element is completely removed. The translation does, however, make up for some of the humorous loss by replacing "may I take your order" with the more relaxed informal "hva skal det værre", which in Norwegian seems to be so relaxed and informal that it borders on rude. Next, in the dubbed TT Fairy Godmother directly blames Harold for spoiling her diet. In the ST she merely insinuates that he is the cause of her failed diet. Nonetheless, these linguistic alterations have had little to no effect on the perception of the ST altogether, and it has mainly remained the same.

The subtitled TT has been translated very literally, something that has led to little change on the parameter levels in the joke. There seems to be only one change on the target parameter that has changed the joke, connected to the reference to Friar's Fat Boy. The translation here, Den Fete Munk, has, such as in the dubbed TT, undergone major loss in the omission of the word *boy*, since an accusation of pedophilia, and particularly in the church, is severe and therefore heavily loaded. Den Fete Munk is nonetheless more similar here than in the dubbed translation, as Friar Tuck, or brother Tuck as he is also referred to in the tale of Robin Hood, is in fact a hefty monk. Naming a fast-food restaurant after an overweight monk, or any overweight person for that matter, is funny in itself given that fast food is generally understood as a major cause of obesity in the world today. In short, the target (or feeling of superiority) shifts away from the church and over to obesity. The humor has to an extent been preserved despite the reference generalization.

4.2.5 Card 5

Card: 5
Film: Shrek 2
Minute of the film: 31

Context: Harold asks Shrek to join him for a hunt so that they will get the chance to get to know each other for the sake of Fiona's happiness. What Shrek doesn't know is that Harold has hired someone to deal with him so that Fiona and Prince Charming can be together. The following morning, Shrek and Donkey walk around in the woods looking for the king but think that they may have gotten lost.

ST:

Shrek: Face it, Donkey! We're lost.

Donkey: We can't be lost. We followed the King's instructions exactly.

"Head to the darkest part of the woods"

Shrek: Ay

Donkey: "**Past the sinister trees with scary-looking branches.**"

Shrek: Check

Donkey: And there's **the bush shaped like Shirley Bassey!**

Shrek: We passed that three times already!

Donkey: Ey, you were the one who **said not to stop for directions.**

Humorous load: community-and-institution, visual elements, paralinguistics, non-marked

Dubbed TT:

Shrek: Bare innrøm det, Esel. Vi har gått oss bort!

Donkey: Men er det mulig, vi har jo fulgt kongens beskrivelser til punkt og prikke vi!

Han sa "gå inn i den mørkeste delen av skogen"

Shrek: Ja

Donkey: "Og forbi **det nifse treet med de skumle grenene**"

Shrek: Jepp

Donkey: Ja, og der er jo **busken som likner på Eli Hagen!**

Shrek: Vi har passert den busken tre ganger allerede.

Donkey: Hei, det er **du som ikke ville stoppe og spørre om veien.**

Humorous load: community-and-institution, visual elements, paralinguistics, non-marked

Parameter changes: target

Subtitled TT:

Shrek: Innrøm det! Vi har gått oss bort.

Donkey: Men vi har fulgt kongens instruks.

“Den dypeste, mørkeste delen av skogen.”

Der er **Shirley Bassey-busken.**

Shrek: Har gått forbi den 3 ganger

Donkey: **Du nektet å spørre noen om retningen.**

Humorous load: community-and-institution, visual elements, non-marked

Parameter changes: situation, language

Comment:

Humorous load:

This particular episode in the film contains several jokes within close vicinity of each other. They work independently of one another to a certain extent, however, they are not independent jokes because they depend on one another to create the context of the plot in which Shrek and Donkey get lost in the woods. Here, they will be referred to as instances of humor, in which there are three in this specific episode. The first instance is how the King's first map instructions sound quite shady, but Donkey and Shrek sound rather unaffected by them. When the king tells Donkey and Shrek to seek out the deepest and darkest part of the woods, and even pass a sinister tree, it sounds like an attempt to lure them into a dangerous place where something bad might happen (something the audience knows is the king's intention). Donkey's intonation and tone, his paralinguistics, create a mismatch/an incongruity between the instructions and the reaction to them which causes the humor. As the paralinguistics of Donkey's voice has been maintained in the dubbed translation, this is also the cause of the humorous load in the dubbed TT. The subtitled TT, however, cannot on its own represent paralinguistics, something that has caused the humorous load in this translation to diminish. Nonetheless, the audience is able to hear and interpret the tone of the voices of the characters at the same time as reading the subtitles. Therefore, the subtitles do not have to work well alone for the joke to be funny.

The second humorous instance is the mention of a bush that Donkey and Shrek pass, they think looks like Shirley Bassey. This humorous case contains elements of visual humorous load and Community-and-Institution humorous load. Shirley Bassey is a known Welsh singer, among other things known as the artist behind several James Bond theme songs. The shape of the bush may in fact look like a superstar striking a pose, something that supports Donkey's opinion that it looks like Shirley Bassey. As she is over 80 years old

today and known for songs that are over 40 years old, it is not expected that all cultures or age groups are familiar with her. Nonetheless, the fact that there exists a bush that looks like her is very strange, and thereby also funny.

In the Norwegian dubbed translation of this case, Shirley Bassey has been replaced with Eli Hagen, well known as the wife and secretary of the Norwegian Frp politician Carl I. Hagen. A reason for this may be that it is likely that a Norwegian audience is more familiar with her than with Shirley Bassey. She is particularly known for her distinctive and voluminous hair updo, which has been a typical trait of hers. Because of her hair, Eli Hagen can be claimed to be especially recognizable. This fact makes her a funny character to compare to the bush that Shrek and Donkey pass. Therefore, the humorous load in this case can also be categorized as visual and Community-and-Institution, although a different type of community-and-institution than in the ST. As the subtitled Norwegian translation of this humorous instance is literally translated by referring to Shirley Bassey, the humorous loads here are the same as in the original ST.

The last humorous instance in this joke is that Donkey suggests stopping to ask for directions, as if that is the most normal thing to do in the middle of an abandoned forest. One does not expect most people to head into the darkest place of a forest with sinister trees that have scary branches, something that means that it seems rather unexpected that Shrek and Donkey would even meet anyone to ask for directions from in the first place. The lack of cultural references here indicates that this is a case of Non-Marked humor within Martínez-Sierra's framework. Both the dubbed and the subtitled version of this joke have been translated literally, meaning that both TTs are instances of Non-Marked humor.

Parameter change:

The first humorous instance in this joke has been translated quite literally in the dubbed TT. The humor mainly depends on how Donkey imitates the king's instructions. The instructions themselves carry the same parameters in the TT as in the ST. The language, target, narrative strategy and situation are all completely similar, given that the ST has been and translated word for word. As long as there is a contrast between the alarming and frightening descriptions of the forest and Donkey's light and fearless voice, like there is in

both the ST and the dubbed TT, the logical parameter (Donkey ignoring the obvious) and the script opposition (scary/safe) have been preserved.

The subtitled TT on the other hand, has undergone some change within the parameter situation. Most of this part of the joke has been translated quite literally. However, the situational parameter which contains all the props (objects, participants, instruments etc.) of the joke has been altered for the sake of shortening the written text that the audience will have to have time to process. The king's description of a sinister tree with scary branches that Shrek and Donkey have to pass has been omitted, something that has led to some humorous loss. First of all, the description of this tree contributes to setting the scary tone of the king's description. Without this tone, one does not necessarily get the full impression of the script opposition-contrast between scary and safe, nor of the logical mechanism depicting Donkey as ignorant of the situation he is in. These parameters have not been changed in and of themselves, as the humorous aspects that are created on the different levels are preserved in the translation. Nonetheless, through the altering of the situation-parameter, they are vaguely affected. Secondly, the humor that is rooted in the concept of a tree with scary branches, is lost when omitted. The elements of the concept of a scary tree are necessary to build up to the script opposition resolution when the Shirley Bassey comment pops up and creates a contrast between scary/not scary.

The dubbed translation of the second humorous instance of this joke has been affected on the target parameter level. The translation itself is quite literal (maintaining the language, narrative strategy, situation, logical mechanism and script opposition), with the exception of the replacement of Shirley Bassey with Eli Hagen as the target of the joke. One can argue that the dubbed translation has undergone some loss, given that the bush in the ST is posed like a feminine superstar, with one "arm" in the air. However, this is not necessarily noticeable without the reference to Shirley Bassey. This humorous element is lost in the translation, as Eli Hagen is neither a superstar nor known to strike a pose. Nonetheless, with her hair, Eli Hagen is a curious character in herself. Therefore, the idea of making Eli Hagen the target by claiming that a bush looks like her is quite funny in itself (even though the bush does not seem to have tall "hair"). Thus, one can claim that humor has not been lost after all.

The subtitled TT has been linguistically altered in the translation process in order to reduce the number of words needed to describe the situation. The parameter that has been affected here is in other words language. Instead of claiming that there is a bush that is shaped as Shirley Bassey, the translation merely indicates that there is a bush that is called “Shirley Bassey-busken” without providing information as to why it is called that. However, by combining the visual element of the shape of the bush with the reference to “Shirley Bassey-busken”, the joke requires fairly little processing effort from the audience to understand why the bush is referred to this way. Thus, the linguistic alteration of the joke has not led to loss of humor in regard to the language parameter. However, since the target has not been adapted to the Norwegian target culture in the subtitles, some humor may be lost due to lack of knowledge about Shirley Bassey and her common traits with the bush.

The last humorous case in this joke has not undergone any substantial parameter changes in the TT translations. The language parameter, the narrative parameter, the target parameter and the situation parameter have all been maintained due to the literal translation of the joke, since the lines are served by the same character under the same circumstances, ridiculing the same decisions in both the ST and the TTs. In regard to the logical parameter and script opposition parameters, the humorous element of this joke lies in the incongruity of the idea of asking for directions in an abandoned forest and shaping a resolution around this as a consequence for not asking for directions. By getting this across in the translations, as the translators have managed to do by translating literally, these humor parameters have also been preserved.

4.2.6 Card 6

Card: 6
Film: Shrek 2
Minute of the film: 32
Context: Shrek and Donkey are still in the woods trying to find Harold, and Shrek points out how important it is for him to get Harold’s approval for Fiona’s sake. Donkey acts supportive, and suddenly they start hearing purring.
ST:

Shrek: Well, well, well, Donkey. **I know it was kind of a tender moment back there, but the purring?**

Donkey: What are you talkin' about? **I ain't purring.**

Shrek: Sure. **What's next? A hug?**

Humorous load: sound elements, non-marked

Dubbed TT:

Shrek: Hmhm, jajaja Esel, **jeg veit at vi hadde et ganske ømt øyeblikk i sta, men den malinga der!**

Donkey: Hva er det du snakker om a, **jeg maler ikke jeg.**

Shrek: Åneii, **hva blir det neste nå a? En klem?**

Humorous load: sound elements, non-marked

Parameter changes: no change

Subtitled TT:

Shrek: **Det var riktignok et ømt øyeblikk, men du malte!**

Donkey: Hva? **Jeg maler ikke.**

Shrek: **Hva blir det neste? En klem?**

Humorous load: non-marked

Parameter changes: no change

Comment:

Humorous load:

In the ST joke, Shrek and Donkey are walking around in the woods when Shrek hears purring nearby. Given that there is nobody else around, he claims that it is Donkey who is making the sound. This is not a logical conclusion for anyone who knows what kinds of sounds Donkeys normally make. Nonetheless, Shrek ironically understands this purring as a sign from Donkey that he cares for Shrek, and claims it comes from a sensitive conversation they had 10 seconds before. As neither Shrek nor Donkey are characters who usually tend to get emotional around each other, Shrek makes fun of what he jokingly understands as an act of affection from Donkey. The humorous load here can be found in the sound element that constitutes the purring, the paralinguistics in Donkey's offended tone after Shrek's accusation and in Shrek's ironic tone when Shrek insinuates that Donkey might like a hug, and in the non-marked ironic humor in the lines which constitute the joke.

In both TTs, the same humorous loads have been preserved through a literal translation and mimicking of the paralinguistics of the ST. Although the subtitled TT does not offer sound indications synchronically with the purring in the ST, the audience are through the feedback effect able to relate the sounds in the background with the subtitled TT, leading to no loss of humor (Gottlieb, 2012, p. 57).

Parameter change:

The dubbed TT and the subtitled TT have not undergone any substantial changes in the process of translation. Due to the literal translation of the linguistic aspects of the joke, the parameters have mainly remained the same. The narrative strategy is similar, given that the jokes is that of a dialogue in both the ST and the TTs. The linguistics have been translated almost word for word, meaning that the language parameter has remained the same. The situation, meaning the setting, props and characters, are all alike in the translated versions, and the target of the joke is Donkey in all three cases, as he is the one who Shrek claims to be purring. The script opposition of the joke revolves around the cat-purring, which represents a loving emotional reaction, contrasting to Shrek’s cynical and mocking personality. Shrek reasons from false premises by indicating that the purring comes from Donkey, something that is supported by an ironic comment indicating that Donkey is overly emotional. This reasoning composes the resolution in the logical mechanism parameter. This obvious error is maintained in the dubbed translation and in the subtitled translation, preventing any need for change on these parameters in order to maintain the humor of the joke.

4.2.7 Card 7

Card: 7
Film: Shrek 2
Minute of the film: 33
Context: Puss in Boots attacks Shrek and scratches him all over his body. Shrek tries to get rid of him, and Donkey wants to help. He ends up kicking Shrek in the crotch.
ST:

Donkey: Look out, Shrek! Hold still!

Shrek: Get it off!

Donkey: Hold still! Shrek! Hold still! **Did I miss?**

Shrek: **No. You got them.**

Humorous load: visual elements, sound elements, paralinguistics, non-marked

Dubbed TT:

Donkey: Pass deg nå, Shrek!

Shrek: Få den vekk!

Donkey: Stå stille nå, Shrek! Stå stille! **Bomma jeg eller?**

Shrek: **Nei. Du traff dem.**

Humorous load: visual elements, sound elements, paralinguistics, non-marked

Parameter changes: no change

Subtitled TT:

Donkey: Stå stille!

Shrek: Få den vekk!

Donkey: Stå stille! **Bomma jeg?**

Shrek: **Nei. Du traff dem.**

Humorous load: visual elements, non-marked

Parameter changes: no change

Comment:

Humorous load:

The humorous load of his joke is greatly dependent on nonlinguistic audiovisual elements combined with a punchline to work well. Here, a lot of humor is derived from the characters' visual and paralinguistic behavior in the situation where Puss's attacks Shrek.

The visual image of Puss attacking is a source of humor in itself, as his fierceness and dedication in the attack is very intense, and the contrast between Puss' size and Shrek's size is substantial. Given that most people are empathetic beings, we tend to put ourselves in the shoes of others at the same time as we are glad that the misfortune that the characters are subjected to is not happening to us. Combined, these feelings constitute a darker humor where we take joy in others' misfortune. Shrek's paralinguistic and visual reaction to the attack gives us a stronger relation to pain, which enhances this effect. The soundtrack in the background is an intense and dramatic Spanish tune that matches the

visual images and moves simultaneously with the turn of events, thereby supporting the humorous aspects of the situation. It is not always the case that the background music of a scene contributes to the humor of the scene, but in this case the intensity and the drama of the music enhance the humorous effect. During the attack, Donkey jumps around trying to help Shrek get rid of Puss. At one point, he asks Shrek to stand still as he does a donkey kick towards Shrek's crotch (where he believes Puss to be located) to get rid of him. At this moment, the soundtrack stops in order to lead the audience's full attention to the upcoming punchline. Next, when Donkey asks whether he missed, he is referring to if he hit Puss or not. Shrek answers that Donkey did not miss, but that he "got them", referring to his own testicles rather than to Puss. This punchline carries a lot of humor in the referential ambiguity of the fact that Donkey did not miss.

The humor that is presented in the ST joke has been preserved in both the dubbed TT and the subtitled TT. The translation of the dialogue has in both cases been transferred literally, keeping the same essential meaning in the punch line. The subtitled TT alone lacks several of the initial humorous categories in the way that sound elements besides linguistics cannot be fully represented here. Given that this is a joke that greatly depends on paralinguistics, sound and visual elements to work, the subtitles can be claimed to have undergone much loss of humorous load. However, the subtitles are accompanied by these elements on the screen that they are presented, meaning that the audience is exposed to all elements after all, unless their circumstances are unusual.

Parameter change:

This joke has been translated literally in both the dubbed TT and the subtitled TT. Given the striking similarities between both translations, they will be analyzed together with regard to parameter changes. Due to this literal translation, the joke has not undergone any substantial changes on any of the parameter levels. Linguistically, the pun that makes the joke funny, meaning Donkey's question "did I miss" and Shrek's reply "no, you got them" has been translated word for word, creating the same meaning on a linguistic level and in regard to narrative strategy. The situation, meaning the fact that Shrek is being attacked and Donkey tries to help but ends up hurting Shrek instead, remains the same. Shrek continues to be the target of the joke, as it is he who ends up being hurt when Donkey attempts to help in both the ST and the TTs. The script opposition in this joke is the

ambiguous understanding of Shrek's "no, you got them", which has been preserved when translated into "nei, du traff dem" in both the dubbed and the subtitled TT. This referential ambiguity is also the element of the logical mechanism parameter in all three texts.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Despite the fact that only seven jokes have been analyzed, it is possible to see some similarities and differences between the translations that have been made in the dubbed TT and the subtitled TT. In this chapter, predominant shifts in the THE and the GTVH will be addressed first, followed closely by a more detailed discussion of the similarities and differences between the translations. Finally, there will be a short evaluative discussion of the models that were used in this study and how well they proved to complement each other and diverge from each other in the analytical process.

5.1 Discussion of the Findings

5.1.1 Predominant shifts in THE and GTVH

Looking at the translations of jokes through the application of the THE model and the GTVH model, we see that there are some tendencies. The application of the THE model shows that many jokes have stayed within their categories and undergone little change regarding their humorous load. It appears that the jokes that have not changed in the translations are those that can be considered transposable jokes (Davies, 2005, p. 148). They have not required any complex translation strategies in order to preserve the essence of said jokes from the ST. They seem to be conveniently transferable as they are easy to deal with and make understandable across different cultures and linguistic and geographic borders without considerable alterations (Davies, 2005, p. 148). In some of the switchable and problematic jokes, there are shifts within the categories of the THE model and even loss of categories all together. An example of this is how the ST and the dubbed TT in card 5 both have community-and-institution references (Shirley Bassey/Eli Hagen), but the institutions differ depending on the culture. Another example can be found in card 4, where we also see loss of the category ‘community sense of humor’ in both TTs when *Friar’s Fat Boy* loses the reference to pedophilia in the church in the translations. This is an example of cultural standardization to reach out to the audience in the target culture (Banõs & Díaz-Cintas, 2018, p. 319).

From the perspective of GTVH we see, just as in the THE, that there are few substantial changes, which is in line with the traits of transposable jokes. However, we also see that most of the changes that have been made in all joke-types have happened within the language parameter and the target parameter. This is particularly the case in cards 1, 4 and 5. In some

cases, these changes have influenced the script opposition, but rarely to a considerable extent, such as can be seen in card 1, where the nuances between the wordplays *drama king* and *helt konge* in the ST and the dubbed TT causes a shift of scripts from overly dramatic to self-centered. Language is the parameter that has undergone the most changes. Changes here appear to be more connected to the creation of authentic conversations and speech in the target language, or to make the TT work well within the restrictions of the genres they are presented in. In the cases where the target of the joke has been altered, there is a connection with these changes and THE categorization of culture specific humor. It seems as if the target and language are the parameters that are most likely to change for the cultural reference to work in the target language. These are changes that will be exemplified and discussed further in 5.1.2 and 5.1.3.

5.1.2 Similarities between the dubbed and subtitled TTs

There are multiple jokes in this study with similar translations in the dubbed TT and the subtitled TT. In particular, cards 2, 3, 6 and 7 contain humorous elements that have been translated in the same manner throughout the whole jokes in both texts. Examples of this are for instance how *crusade wound* in the ST has been translated into *korstogsskade* in both TTs, and the literal translation of the quotes “some gender-confused wolf telling him that his princess is already married”, and “what’s next, a hug?”, something that has been pointed out in 4.2. A reason why the TTs are similar in these cases may be due to the fact that the jokes are transposable. A literal translation has been achieved, like we see in example 7:

Example 7:

ST

Donkey: Hold still! Shrek! Hold still! Did I miss?

Shrek: No. You got them.

Dubbed TT

Donkey: Stå stille nå, Shrek! Stå stille! Bomma jeg eller?

Shrek: Nei. Du traff dem.

Subtitled TT

Donkey: Stå stille! Bomma jeg?

Shrek: Nei. Du traff dem.

The similarities we see in this example are that both the structure and essence of the joke have easily been transferred without rearranging the syntax or the semantics. Translation have in most instances been done word for word, making the two TTs similar in manner of both content and form.

There are, however, some linguistic differences in the two TTs in these examples that are too insignificant to be registered as clear changes on the linguistic parameter. Examples of this are the addition or omission of excessive words from the ST to the TTs, and linguistic pause fillers, such as in example 7 above. In the dubbed TT, *hold still* is said twice and the filler *eller* is included at the end of the sentence, whereas in the subtitled TT, *hold still* is only said once and Shrek's name has been removed from the text. These linguistic differences seem to be mainly due to the constraints that the different TTs involve, as well as the need for authenticity in the language. In the dubbed translations, this would relate to lip sync movements and other types of visual or sound elements, and in subtitling to a greater extent to the space and time restrictions of the written translations (González, 2009, p. 17, Gonzáles, 2020, p. 32). In order for the dubbed TT to match Donkey's lines, it is essential that the dubbed TT mirrors the movements in Donkey's mouth, which is why the lines in this joke has been presented in the exact same way as in the ST. In addition, *ellers* is included as a filler for the sake of authenticity, as this is a very natural word used to end questions in Norwegian speech. However, in the subtitled TT, the goal is to express the meaning of the ST briefly and concisely due to time and space restraints, and excessive words that provide unnecessary information, such as Shrek's name and the repetition of *stå stille*, are thus de-prioritized (Gonzáles, 2020, p. 32).

5.1.3 Differences between the dubbed and subtitled TTs

Looking at what Davies (2005, p. 148) refers to as the switchable and the problematic jokes from the analysis, the translation strategies begin to vary between the two types of TTs to a greater extent. Cards 1, 4 and 5 in particular, are cases where this happens. While there are fewer differences between the TTs and the ST on the level of humorous load, the differences are greater when it comes to shifts in the parameters. On the whole, we see that the dubbed TT has more often than the subtitled TT undergone shifts in some of the GTVH parameters in order to preserve the humor from the ST. The translators of the subtitled TTs, on the other hand, seem to continue to use a literal form of translation, only compressed. This is in line with the notion that subtitles in general appear to be related with a translation strategy

requiring literal translation (Martí Ferriol, 2007, p. 178). This is apparent in the few number of shifts here compared to the dubbed TT, and in what ways the changes have affected the content of the jokes.

The GTVH shifts in the cards showed that the dubbed translation was affected on the language parameter in card 1 and 5, and the target parameter in card 4 and 5. The subtitled translation was affected on the target parameter in card 4 and the language parameter in card 5. Apart from that, there was also omission of elements in the situation parameter in card 5.

There are various possible explanations as to why the dubbed and the subtitled TTs differ in their translations in these examples, and to why the dubbed TT has undergone more parameter shifts than the subtitled TT. One explanation relates to the fact that there is a correlation between the jokes that have been marked as cultural (meaning in the community-and-institution or community-sense-of-humor categories) in the THE model and the jokes that have undergone the biggest changes on parameter level in the GTVH model in both dubbed and subtitled TTs. Thereby, it seems, such as Davies claims, that there may be a connection between the problematic aspects of translation and the cultural knowledge required to process the embedded humor in a joke (Davies, 2005, p. 148). However, it is apparent that there are greater shifts in the dubbed translations than in the subtitles in the translations of such cultural references. One explanation is connected to which translation strategies the translators of the TTs have chosen to use when dealing with them, and the skopos behind these choices. It appears that the translators of the dubbed and subtitled TTs have different ways of managing switchable and problematic jokes depending on their purpose. Referring to Reiss and Vermeer, “any action is determined by its purpose, i.e. it is a function of its purpose or skopos” (2014, p. 90), one can argue that the translators of the dubbed TT aims at providing the audience with an equivalent of the humor which is presented in the ST, whereas the translators of the subtitled TT find it more important to refer the audience to what is being said in the ST than to find alternative humorous ways of expressing the references from the ST. For this reason, fewer changes have been made on the parameters in the subtitled TT than the dubbed TT. When the humor embedded in jokes become problematic to transfer literally, the translators of the dubbed TT tend to adapt the joke to make it funny in the target culture rather than preserve the original elements of the ST joke. These adaptations may be created through modifications in the various parameters. This has for instance been done in the dubbed translation by changing the *drama king* wordplay into the *helt konge* wordplay, which the Norwegian audience can relate to more so than other

foreign cultural references. To make the joke more processable for the Norwegian audience, Shirley Bassey has also been replaced with Eli Hagen in card 5. The references presented in the subtitled TTs in these cases are more directed towards the source language culture than the target language culture. Shirley Bassey for instance, is not a well-known name who many people have associations with in Norway, which makes the associations between her and a bush harder to grasp for a Norwegian audience. Similarly, *dramakonge* is used in the subtitled TT to complement the ST despite the fact that this is not a Norwegian expression. This makes it even clearer that the skopos of the subtitled TT is to serve the needs of the audience who are simultaneously exposed to the ST, and not to make humor available and suited for the audience in the target culture (Fong & Au, 2009, p. ix). In short, the skopos of the different TTs may explain why switchable and problematic jokes are treated differently.

Another explanation of the differences we can see between the two TTs relate to the constraints of dubbing and subtitling. When creating dubbed TTs corresponding to the ST, the factors that restrict translation options involve requirements of time and phrasing coordination with the visual image to create lip synchronization. In addition, it is important to preserve language authenticity. As far as the viewing process is concerned, the audience will then in the dubbed TT have the impression that the characters they are watching do in fact speak the target language, something that may also contribute in making the TT more target culture friendly. The aim of subtitled TT is mainly to mirror all the verbal elements, the style and the semantics that are presented in the ST within a small confined space on the screen, at the same time as they aim to keep up with the rhythm and dialogues in the images (Ivarsson & Carroll, 1998; Karamitroglou, 1998, Georgakopoulou, 2006, in Kapsaskis, 2020). Constraints here are thus related to making the ST available in the target language by making it readable and easily comprehensible in the time it takes for the characters to say their lines. Thus, the subtitled TT needs to be shortened down so that the audience have time to read it in the few seconds the text is presented. These constraints appear to be related to the priorities that the translators make in the translation processes. Example 8 illustrates this well.

Example 8:

ST: Lilian - Oh, stop being such a drama king.

Dubbed TT - Lilian: Åhh, du tror visst du er helt konge, du!

Subtitled TT - Lilian: Ikke vær en dramakonge.

Here, like in example 7 in 5.1, we see the inclusion of excessive words (*visst*, which is a casual way of saying *apparently*, and the inclusion of the last *du* in the question, which is typical for Norwegian oral speech) and adaption of the wordplay in the dubbed TT in order to make the reference suitable for the target culture. This is for the sake of authenticity so it may seem for the Norwegian viewers that the characters in the movie are in fact Norwegian. In the subtitled TT, the joke has been transposed literally with the omission of some excess words that do not provide the viewer with any new information. Particularly, the words that have been removed are *such a*, equivalent to the Norwegian *en typisk/en slik en* to make the message of the ST clear shortly and concisely. We do also see an instance in card 5 where the situation parameter in the subtitled TT has been altered due to the fact that a whole line (“The sinister tree with the scary looking branches”) has been removed as excess information in the joke. One can argue that this is also due to time and space constraints in the subtitling genre.

A third explanation for the differences we can see between the two TTs relates to the feedback effect. To refer back to González, a subtitled TT is a form of translation that allows the recipients of the TT to access the ST and the language in which it is presented in the feedback effect (2008, p. 15). As we have seen earlier, translation choices in subtitling may have been derived from the fact that in interlingual subtitles, concepts have less room in which they need to be expressed, and often, cultural references that are interpreted in a TT are not easily described using less words than what was used to describe the same concepts in the ST. Pedersen, however, does suggest that the loss of information in the subtitles is compensated for through other channels, such as the visual-non verbal and the acoustic-non verbal elements, meaning that the total loss of information, in this case humorous information, “is not as dire as the quantitative figures suggest” (2011, p. 21), and is in fact picked up by the audience in the feedback-effect. In other words, loss of humor in the subtitled TT may not indicate loss of humor that has been processed by the target audience. Once again, we can examine example 8, which illustrates this well. Here, we see that the translators of the subtitled TT have chosen to ignore the cultural specificity of the expressions *drama queen/drama king*, and merely decided to translate the sentence literally by using a calque in order to reflect back on the initial expression in the ST by means of the feedback effect. This explains the case that there have been more shifts in the dubbed TT than in the subtitled TT, as it may not be necessary to alter the subtitled TT for the purpose of humor, given that the feedback effect makes the audience able to access the humor which is presented in the ST. However, the feedback effect does not support the differences in all

humorous cases. In card 5, where “the bush that looks like Shirley Bassey” has been translated into “Shirley Bassey-busken”, we may in fact question whether the Norwegian-speaking audience do in fact find the reference funny, since the younger target group may not be familiar with her. Thus, the subtitles do not always mirror the humor of the ST in the target culture. This means that if the purpose of the subtitled TT is in fact to refer back to the ST and the humor that can be found there through the means of the feedback effect, humor may be lost. An alternative translation option in the subtitled TT could have been to use Eli Hagen as a reference instead of Shirley Bassey. However, this may have create a collision of concepts inside the viewers’ heads since the viewers can hear the reference to Shirley Bassey in the ST simultaneously, making the humor more difficult to access through the feedback effect. Thus, the feedback effect alone is not a sufficient explanation as to why there are fewer shifts in the subtitled TT than in the dubbed TT.

5.2 An Inquiry into the Research Models and their Joined Functional Efficiency

The diversity of these models can be perceived as valid argumentation for why they may seem to supplement each other well. The models complement each other by filling out each other’s blind spots. The THE covers non-verbal humorous elements as well as drawing attention to culture’s role in humor, while the GTVH provides a more detailed taxonomy of verbally expressed humor types and how the different components of a joke carry humorous elements. The models combined thereby also provide an opportunity to look for a connection between detection of shifts in the parameters and potential changes in cultural references in the two TTs.

In practice, the combination of the models worked well, although it led to some repetition in the analysis section. It was, for instance, possible to see a connection between parameter changes and cultural references on the target and language level in the dubbed TT more so than in the subtitled TT, although such a small sample should not be used as an indication to the connection between these elements outside of this study. More research will be needed here in order to be able to generalize further outside of this study. In addition, the combination made it possible to see in which jokes parts of the humor was nonverbal, and how the nonverbal aspects contributed in creating script opposition and resolutions in the jokes.

Each of the models used in the analysis have flaws which make them challenging to use. For instance, if we look away from the fact that Martínez-Sierra's model also includes non-verbal aspects of humor, it only presents us with four available categories for VEH. These four categories are "Community-and-Institution", "Community-Sense-of-Humor", "Linguistic" humor and "Non-Marked" humor. They provide us with information about whether the VEH is referential or verbal, and the first two about the culture specificity of the jokes. Based on this manner of categorization, it appears as if jokes that are neither linguistic nor culture specific can all be categorized as the same type of jokes in the non-marked category. It seems as if this category is filled up with the "leftovers" of whatever does not fit well into Martínez-Sierra's model, which makes it harder to investigate what constitutes the humor in these jokes.

The GTVH model is, unlike the THE model, very detailed when it comes to VEH. The constituents of each joke are examined separately in the parameters when we investigate shifts in a joke. However, it is difficult to identify the shifts in the various parameters, specifically related to the language and script opposition parameters. The detection of changes here greatly depended on personal judgement, which makes it hard to be consistent in the categorization process, something which again may affect replicability and reproductivity of the study. In addition, the parameters are solely covering for VEH, which leaves other audiovisual elements out of the equation. As nonverbal audiovisual elements may be important humorous elements in the build-up of jokes, this taxonomy model is not sufficiently covering in regard to humor translation in audiovisual texts. In addition, the role of culture specific humor and the connection between parameter shifts in humor translation and cultural references is not enlightened clearly here.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to investigate the way that humor has been translated into Norwegian through dubbing and subtitling in *Shrek 2*. In particular, it looks into the way these two TTs differ from one another and in what ways they are similar, as well as possible reasons and explanations for these differences and similarities, and why the translators may have made the choices that they have. The study has been narrowed down to the translations of seven consecutive jokes from one section of the movie, which have all been studied using Martínez-Sierra's THE and Attardo's GTVH models.

The analysis of the jokes shows that in most cases, both the dubbed and the subtitled TTs have been easily transposable through a literal form of translation from the ST by replacing the VEH in the source language with equivalent forms of the same VEH. Thus, these translations are very similar to one another, and only vary in terms of priorities in regard to linguistic authenticity and restrictions within the translation genres. The humorous cases that have been categorized as culture specific by means of the THE are also the jokes seem to be more problematic to translate, and we see greater variation in the translation priorities and strategies between the dubbed and the subtitled TT. There are particularly three explanations to why we can see a greater variation between the two TTs here. The first explanation relates to how the skopos of the texts may be the source of varying translation strategies applied to switchable and problematic jokes. Where the translation of problematic jokes in the dubbed TT offers greater shifts in its aim to be funny, the subtitled TT expresses the meaning of the ST in a more literal form by referring the audience back to the ST, without taking the exclusion in cultural specificity into account. Explanation number two revolves around the differing constraints of the dubbing and subtitling genres, and how these restrictions affect the way the texts have been translated. While the dubbed TT may be affected by the need for lip synchronization and authenticity in the translation, the restrictions of the subtitling genre makes the translator have to compromise some humorous elements in order to be able to get the storyline of the movie across within a certain temporal and spatial frame. The third explanation is based on the idea that these constraints do not necessarily affect the way the audience of the subtitled TT interpret the audiovisual text as a whole in terms of humor, due to the feedback effect and the way the subtitled TT mirrors and refers back to the ST. In the dubbed TT, on the other hand, the function or skopos of the translation appears to be the same as in the ST, merely to produce humor

The research carried out in this thesis has been grounded in the combination of two models, Martínez-Sierra's THE and Attardo's GTVH, which have been used to detect and categorize humor in AVT. The function of these models together has provided us with comprehensive and detailed information about how humor has been created, and in what ways it has been adapted in the translation process in the dubbed and in the subtitled TTs. Many models that have both weaknesses and strengths, something that has been noticed in this study as well. In this thesis, we can see that the models have some weak points, but that the combination of the two has also provided a broader and more descriptive approach to audiovisual humor. Where the GTVH offers a detailed method of detecting and discovering shifts in VEH, the THE includes nonverbal categories to illustrate the role of other audiovisual elements and how they affect the translated humor in *Shrek 2*. In the same manner, by covering more elements of audiovisual texts, the THE has offered little space to further investigate the theory of VEH, something that the GTVH weighs up for. An interesting continuation to the research carried out in this thesis could be to use this knowledge to develop a new and efficient model more suited to the needs that are required in this particular case of humor translation and possibly others similar to it.

Bibliography

- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Attardo, S. (2001). *Humorous Texts: A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Attardo, S (2002). Translation and Humor: An Approach Based on the General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH), *The Translator*, 8(2), 173-194.
- Attardo, S (2017). Humor in Language. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.342.
- Attardo, S. & Hempelmann, C. F. (2002) Script Oppositions and Logical Mechanisms: Modeling Incongruities and their Resolutions. *HUMOR* 15(1), 3-46.
- Attardo, S. & Raskin, V. (1991). Script Theory Revis(it)ed: Joke Similarity and Joke Representation Model, *HUMOR* 4(3-4), 293-347.
- Baker, M & Hochel, B. (1998). Dubbing. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1. Ed, 74-76). London: Routledge.
- Baños, R. & Díaz-Cintaz, J (2018). Language and Translation in Film. In K. Malmkjaer (Ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies and Linguistics*. (1. Ed, 313 - 326). New York: Routledge.
- Bernard, H. R. (2000). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Black, J., & Champion, D. (1976). *Methods and Issues in Social Research*. New York: Wiley.
- Canning-Wilson, C. (2000). Practical Aspects of Using Video in the Foreign Language Classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*. 6(11). Retrieved from: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Canning-Video.html>.
- Chaume, F. (2012). *Audiovisual Translation: Dubbing*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Chiaro, D. (2004). Investigating the Perception of Translated Verbally Expressed Humor on Italian TV. *ESP Across Cultures*, 1, 35-52.
- Chiaro, D. (2006). Verbally Expressed Humor on Screen: Reflections on Translation and Reception. *The Journal of Specialized Translation*, 6, 198-208.

- Corduas, M., Attardo, S. & Eggleston, A. (2008). The Distribution of Humour in Literary Texts is not Random: A Statistical Analysis. *Language and Literature*, 17(3), 253-270.
- Davies, C. (2005). European Ethnic Scripts and the Translation and Switching of Jokes, *Humor*, 18(2), 147-160.
- Delabastita, D. (1989). Translation and Mass-Communication: Film and TV Translation as Evidence of Cultural Dynamics. *Babel*, 35(4), 193–218.
- Delabastita, D. (1997). Introduction. In D. Delabastita (Ed.) *Traducito. Essays on Punning and Translation*. (1. Ed. 1-22). Manchester: St Jerome and Presses Universitaires de Namur.
- Díaz-Cintas, J. (2008). Introduction: Audiovisual Translation Comes of Age. In D. Chiaro, C. Heiss & C. Bucaria (Eds.) *Between Text and Image: Updating Research in Screen Translation*. (1. Ed. 1-10), Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Díaz-Cintas, J. & Remael, A. (2007). *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Fong, G. C. F. & Au, K. K. L. (2009). *Dubbing and Subtitling in a World Context*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University press.
- Franzon, J. (2008). Choices in Song Translation. *The Translator*, 14(2), 373-399.
- González, L. P. (2008). Audiovisual Translation. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2. Ed, 13-15). London: Routledge.
- González, L. P. (2020). Audiovisual Translation. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (3. Ed, 30-35). London: Routledge.
- Gottlieb, H. (1994). Subtitling: People Translating People. In C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (Eds.) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting* (1. Ed., 261-274). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gottlieb, H. (1997). You Got the Picture? On the Polysemiotics of Subtitling Wordplay. In D. Delabastita (Ed.) *Traductio. Essays on Punning and Translation* (1. Ed., 207-232). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishings.

- Gottlieb, H (2012). Subtitles - Readable Dialogue? In E. Perego (Ed.) *Eye Tracking in Audiovisual Translation*, (1. Ed, 37-82). Roma: ARACNE editrice.
- Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2014). Validity and Reliability (Credibility and Dependability) in Qualitative Research and Data Analysis. In G. Guest, K. M. MacQueen & E. E. Namey (Eds.). *Applied Thematic Analysis* (1. Ed, 79-106). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Halverson, S. (2009). Elements of Doctoral Training, *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 3(1), 79-106.
- House, J. (2016) Translation and Foreign Language Learning. In J. House (Ed.) *Translation as Communication across Languages and Cultures* (1. Ed, 121-129) Oxon: Routledge.
- Ivarsson, J., & Carroll, M. (1998). *Subtitling*. Simrishamn: TransEdit.
- Jankowska, A. (2009). Translating Humor in Dubbing and Subtitling, *Translation Journal*, 13(2). URL: <http://translationjournal.net/journal/48humor.htm>
- Kapsaskis, D. (2020). Subtitling, Interlingual. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1. Ed, 554 - 560). London: Routledge.
- Luyken, G. M., & Herbst, T. (1991). *Overcoming Language Barriers in Television: Dubbing and Subtitling for the European Audience*. Manchester: European Institute for the Media.
- Martí Ferriol, J. L. (2007) An Empirical and Descriptive Study of the Translation Method for Dubbing and Subtitling, *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 6(17), 170-184.
- Martínez-Sierra, J. J. (2005). Translating Audiovisual Humor. A Case Study. *Studies in Translatology*, 13(4), 289-296.
- Minutella, V. (2015). It ain't OGRE til it's OGRE: The Dubbing of Shrek. In J. Neves & J. D. Cintas (Eds.) *Audiovisual Translation: Taking Stock* (1. Ed, 140-158). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholar Publishings.
- Nieminen, S. (2007) Sgt. Pompous and the Fancy Pants Club Band: Comparing and Contrasting the Translations of Verbal Humor in Screen Translations of Shrek. [Masters Thesis, University of Jyväskylä]

- Pavesi, M. (1996). L'allocuzione nel doppiaggio dall'inglese all'italiano [Forms of address in English to Italian Dubbing]. In C. Heiss & R. M. Bollettieri Bosinelli (Eds.), *La traduzione multimediale per il cinema, la televisione e la scena* [Multimedia Translation for Cinema, Television and the Stage], (1. Ed., 117–130). Bologna, Italy: CLUEB.
- Pavesi, M. (2020). Dubbing. In Baker, M. & Saldanha, G. (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (3. Ed., 156-161). London: Routledge.
- Pedersen, J. (2010). Audiovisual Translation - In General and in Scandinavia. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 18(1). 1-22.
- Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*, Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel.
- Raskin, V. (2014). Humor Theories. In S. Attardo (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Humor Studies*. (1. Ed., 367-371). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Reiss, K., & Vermeer, H. (2014). *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained*. London: Routledge.
- Ritchie, G. (2010). Linguistic Factors in Humor. In D. Chiaro (Ed.) *Translation, Humor and Literature*. London: Continuum, 33-48.
- Twitter (2020, 20. January) I Invented a New Word Today – Plagiarism. Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/dadsaysjokes/status/1222968093502267392>
- Vandaele, J. (2002). Introduction. (Re-)Constructing Humor: Meanings and Means. *The Translator*, 8(2), 149-172.
- Vera, M. P. G. (2015). When Humor Gets Fishy: The Translation of Humour in Animated Films. In J. Neves & J. D. Cintas (Eds.) *Audiovisual Translation: Taking Stock* (1. Ed., 123-139). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholar Publishings.
- Zabalbeascoa, P. (1996). Translating Jokes for Dubbed Television Situation Comedies. In D. Delabastita (Ed.) *Wordplay and Translation*. Special issue of *The Translator*, 2(2), 135-257.
- Zabalbeascoa, P. (2005). Humor and Translation - an Interdiscipline. *Humor*. 18(2). 185-207.

Filmography

Adamson, A. (Director), Asbury, K. (Director), & Vernon, K. (Director), (2004). *Shrek 2*
[Film] USA. Dreamworks.

Appendix 1: Teacher Relevance

In later years, an increasing number of studies have been done on the beneficial aspects of using AVT in the L2 classroom, where many pedagogical factors, including motivation, dedication, language awareness, confidence, collaborative work, and overall language skill and proficiency, seemed to be positively influenced (House, 2015, p. 123-124). In fact, many aspects of this exact study may indeed be used beneficially in the L2 classroom by triggering these elements.

In order to lower the bar for learning language, a comfortable and relaxed learning environment can be created by making use of audiovisual learning material that piques the interest of the students. This way, they are likely to be more motivated to put in an effort in the learning process. The *Shrek*-movies are funny, both culturally and age appropriate, available in many languages due to the wide selection of dubbed and subtitled TTs, and there are many interesting perceptions and translation choices that have been made in the translated texts. Additionally, research suggests that language proficiency is closely connected with exposure to authentic linguistic material, such as exposure to spontaneous speech and fluent conversations in the target language (Canning-Wilson, 2000). In the L2 classroom, it can be difficult to find material that offers a strong form of authenticity. However, by using audiovisual sources, such as *Shrek 2*, students are exposed to an excellent form of authentic-near material, which can enhance language skills and proficiency.

The *Shrek*-movies, and all other kinds of audiovisual extracts for that matter, can be regarded as very diverse sources of information that can be used in an endless number of ways. Such activities may be beneficial to the students by developing language awareness when they investigate and recognize good and bad translations, and when they create their own translations, either dubbed or subtitled. On this matter, there are many collaborative opportunities where the students may challenge their creativity together. The students will then have to reflect upon the difficulties of capturing the feeling of ST material in another language that may not have the same culture specific concepts or wordplays in their vocabulary, or that may not even be funny when literally translated into the TT. The students are then also introduced to and familiarized with target cultures and norms by working with the audiovisual material, at the same time as they are encouraged to reflect upon the differences between the source language and the target language in the same process.

