

# Translating Humour:

## A Case Study of the Subtitling and Dubbing of Wordplay in

### Animated Disney Films



Eveline Scholtes

S1158899

1 July 2016

Master Thesis for MA Linguistics: Translation in Theory and Practice

Leiden University

Supervisor: Dr. A.G. Dorst

Second Reader: Drs. Katinka Zeven

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	3
Chapter 1: Audiovisual Translation.....	6
Chapter 2: Humour .....	27
Chapter 3: Case Study .....	42
Conclusion.....	84
Works Cited.....	88
Appendix A: Pun Data .....	91
Appendix B: Humour Data.....	98

## Introduction

Since the 1930s, Disney has been well-known for its animated films, creating and adapting stories of wonder for their audiences. Even eighty years later, the company and their films are still as popular as ever. Although the stories told by these films are often vastly different, there is one element which can be found in many, if not most, of their films: humour. Popular and famous Disney films like *Aladdin* (1992), *The Lion King* (1994) and *Hercules* (1997) are full of humorous elements, both visual and verbal. Given the fact that humour plays a large part in these films, it is vital for the enjoyment of the target audiences that this humour is translated in a satisfactory way. This, however, is easier said than done. As Vandaele points out, humour frequently relies on cultural or linguistic aspects that differ between the source and target cultures and languages, which means that translator may be posed with a problem when they are required to translate humour (149-150). This is especially the case where wordplay is concerned. Wordplay is a type of humour that is almost exclusively dependent on the linguistic aspects of language, and so translating wordplay requires not only good translation skills, but also creativity and a solid understanding of how language and wordplay work. Translating humour and wordplay in audiovisual texts may prove to be even more difficult, since both subtitling and dubbing, the two most frequent forms of audiovisual translation in the world, involve additional constraints and conventions that the translators must consider when translating these types of texts.

Dubbing and subtitling are not only the two most frequently used forms of audiovisual translation in the world, but also in the Netherlands. Although the two forms may be similar in some ways, they are also vastly different. For one, subtitling retains the original audio track, whereas dubbing does not. Yuanjian adds to this that “subtitles tend to over-represent source language features, but dubbing scripts do not do this, and they consequently possess more target-language-specific features” (64). A final difference between these two forms, one that is particularly relevant in the Netherlands, is the audience for which the two forms of translation are intended. Although subtitling is used mainly for adults and teenagers, dubbing in the Netherlands is exclusively aimed at children. It is unsurprising then that The Walt Disney Company, which describes itself as a “family entertainment

[...] enterprise” always releases two versions of their films in theatres and on DVD in the Netherlands: one version with the original English audio and Dutch subtitles, and one version with a Dutch dub.

Due to the differences between these two types of translation, it is to be expected that there will also be differences between the subtitled and dubbed translations of the same texts. In this thesis, I will compare the different translations of the same animated Disney films in order to see how these differ from each other. I will take into account the nature of these two forms of translation and the audiences they are aimed at, as well as the importance of humour in these texts. Consequently, I expect that due to the suspected older target audience and the presence of the original audio, the subtitled text will show a more literal translation and as a result of this contain more retention of source text wordplay and be more humorous, whereas the dubbed text will be a more indirect translation, and therefore lose more of the original wordplay and humour.

Some research has been done on the translation of humour and wordplay in dubbing and in subtitling, just as there has been research on the differences between subtitling and dubbing. Most of these studies, however, have focussed on either Asian countries or countries that are known to use dubbing as their primary form of audiovisual translation, such as Spain and Italy. There is, however, a lack of research into the comparison of the different approaches of the two practices in translating elements of wordplay, particularly in a non-dubbing country such as the Netherlands. This thesis will then contribute to the academic fields of subtitling, dubbing and humour research.

In order to conduct this research and prove my claim, I will first discuss all the relevant theory for the subject of my thesis before performing a case study on the selected corpus. In chapter one, I will detail the different types of audiovisual translation; subtitling and dubbing in particular. Here, I will look at the restrictions and guidelines for each and see how they compare, as well as the issues they might present for the translation; for instance, the limited amount of time and space that is available for the presentation of the target text. In the second chapter, I will focus on humour. Here I will address what humour is and look into the subject of wordplay. I will also look at what is important in the translation of humour, as well as the issues that humour translation might present. In this chapter, I will also describe the two models I will be working with in the case study. The first is Nash’s typology of puns, the other Delabastita’s translation methods for puns. Finally, chapter three

will contain my case study. First, I will give a brief explanation of my methodology in carrying out this case study, such as the works included in the corpus and how I found my examples, followed by a discussion of the collected data, and the results of the case study. I will then end with a conclusion in which I discuss my thesis and either prove or disprove my hypothesis.

# Chapter 1: Audiovisual Translation

Audiovisual Translation is defined by González as “a branch of translation studies concerned with the transfer of multimodal and multimedia texts into another language and/or culture” (13). It is also known by the abbreviated form ATV and according to Chiaro includes “‘media translation’, ‘multimedia translation’, ‘multimodal translation’ and ‘screen translation’”, which at one time or another were all suggested terms for the phenomenon of AVT (“Issues in Audiovisual Translation” 141). Chiaro states that all these terms “set out to cover the interlingual transfer of verbal language when it is transmitted and accessed both visually and acoustically, usually, but not necessarily, through some kind of electronic device” (141). This type of translation notably concerns texts which feature several semiotic modes, for instance verbal language, but also visual cues, sound effects, music and others, to communicate with the audience. The biggest and most obvious examples of such texts are film and television, with film being the medium this thesis is concerned with. Munday describes seven different categories of audiovisual translation: interlingual subtitling, bilingual subtitling, intralingual subtitling, dubbing, voice-over, surtitling and audio description (271). The mainstream forms of audiovisual translation are subtitling and dubbing, and these are the two that will be discussed in this thesis. First, I will discuss the subject of subtitling, then the subject of dubbing. For both, I will look at what both practices actually entail, what the existing constraints and conventions are, and how the two relate to each other.

## 1.1. Subtitling

Subtitling is one of the most common means to transfer language in television and film, and this is especially true for The Netherlands. The practice of subtitling has a long history, however. Ivarsson states that a form of subtitles, called intertitles, has existed since the inception of film in 1903 (3). Though starting out as screens of text which were placed in between sequences of film, subtitles have evolved through time to be placed inside of the image, usually at the bottom of the screen, which is the

type of subtitling viewers today are accustomed to. However, there is more to subtitling than meets the eye, and this will be addressed in the next paragraphs.

### **1.1.1. Defining Subtitling**

Díaz Cintas and Remael define subtitling as “a translation practice that consists of presenting a written text, generally on the lower part of the screen, that endeavours to recount the original dialogue of the speakers, as well as the discursive elements that appear in the image (letters, inserts, graffiti, inscriptions, placards, and the like), and the information that is contained on the soundtrack (songs, voices off)” (8). Gambier adds to this definition that subtitles are “condensed translations” (258), which is partially to do with the constraints that subtitling is subject to, as will be discussed in section 1.1.3. This definition is of subtitling in general and is quite broad. However, in subtitling, there are many different forms and categories, not all of which involve translation, which I will discuss below.

### **1.1.2. Classification of Subtitles**

Although some forms are much more common than others, there are various kinds of subtitles. Since there are many different sorts of subtitles based on different parameters, Díaz Cintas and Remael have grouped the different forms according to five criteria: “linguistic, time available for preparation, technical, methods of projection, and distribution format” (13). It should be noted that these are not all distinct categories, but simply different ways of categorising the same set of subtitles. The most used classification is that of the linguistic criteria, and this is the one I will discuss. The rest will be briefly clarified, in defining the type of subtitles that will be examined in the case study. The linguistic category includes the following three types: intralingual subtitles, interlingual subtitles, and bilingual subtitles.

The least common form of these three are the bilingual subtitles, which are subtitles “produced in geographical areas where two languages are spoken” such as Belgium or Canada, and which show two subtitles simultaneously, both in a different language. The only time this might occur in Dutch theatres or television is if a different language from the source language is spoken in the text and the

official video track shows a translation into the main text: for example, when someone speaks Hebrew in an otherwise English text, there may be subtitles in English clarifying the Hebrew on the screen, which might then also get Dutch subtitles. This however is only if the English subtitles are hardcoded into the video track and cannot be replaced without distorting the image.

The second most common type of subtitles are intralingual subtitles and these are defined as having “a shift from oral to written but [staying] always within the same language” (14), meaning that the text presented on the screen is written in the source language. This type of subtitling does not involve translation. Within this category, Díaz Cintas and Remael distinguish five different types. The first are subtitles for people who are deaf or hard of hearing. These are referred to by Díaz Cintas and Remael as SDH and in common speech as closed captions or CC. These function as a more or less direct transcript of what would normally be heard in the audio, both including dialogue and music or any significant background noises. The second type is a subtitle made specifically for didactic purposes. It is noted that this type of subtitling is not widely used and mainly occurs in English. Another type is subtitling for the purposes of karaoke, where lyrics of songs in films are subtitled so that the audience can sing along. This is usually done for special re-releases in theatres, where the karaoke aspect is one of the main marketing points. The fourth type of intralingual subtitling is used to translate dialect or transcribe accents. When certain persons or characters speak in such a way that may be difficult to understand for viewers due to a usage of “phonetic or lexical variation” the producer can opt to add subtitles in the standard language to ensure that all audience members will be able to follow what is being said (17). The final type in this category consists of subtitles for the purposes of notices and announcements. This type of subtitling is used in public areas where audio might not be heard due to noise or is not turned on so as to not disturb anyone, for instance in underground stations, and allows for viewers to receive information despite absence of the audio track.

The most common of the three types of subtitling are interlingual subtitles, and this is also the type that will be the focus of the case study. These subtitles are not simply a representation of what is said, as is the case with the intralingual subtitles, but are also a translation from the source language to the target language. Gottlieb refers to this type of subtitling both as a form of overt translation (1997, qtd. in Fong 42) and a form of diagonal translation (“Subtitling: Diagonal Translation” 104-105). The



first is because the viewer is constantly reminded that what they are reading is a translation of what they are hearing. According to Fong, this is because in subtitling there is a “contemporaneous existence of both the source and target texts” (101), where both the original audio and the translated subtitles are presented to the viewer simultaneously. The second is because the translation is not simply one from the source language to the target language, or from the spoken to the written form, but from source language oral text into the target language written form. In this category, Díaz Cintas and Remael distinguish merely two different types of subtitles, namely for hearers and the previously mentioned SDH. The most prevalent of these by far is the subtitle track for hearers. According to Díaz Cintas and Remael, only the UK, Germany and Italy make regular use of the SDH in translating foreign films (18). This statement is corroborated by the fact that although all of the DVDs that I will be looking at in the case study feature a regular Dutch subtitle track, none of them feature a Dutch SDH. Curiously, however, although the DVDs are Dutch versions purchased in the Netherlands and with Dutch text on the cases, all of the DVDs do include an English SDH.

It has been determined that all the DVDs featured in the case study use interlingual subtitles for hearers. However, according to the classification of Díaz Cintas and Remael, the definition of these subtitles should include other features too. When considering the category of the time available for preparation, these subtitles fall under the category of pre-prepared subtitles, specifically those in complete sentences, since the subtitles were only added after the films were fully animated and voiced (19). Under the technical parameters, the subtitles are closed subtitles rather than open subtitles, since they are only visible on the screen when activated through the menu and are not burned onto the image (21). In terms of the method of projecting the subtitles, like all DVDs and generally most subtitles today, they fall under the category of electronic subtitling (22-23). The last category, the distribution format is clear; DVD (23). This very specific type of subtitling comes with its own constraints and conventions. These will be discussed in the next paragraphs. Since constraints and conventions are two sides of the same coin, one building on the other, I will discuss them in the same section, in order to provide a clearer insight.

### **1.1.3. Subtitling Constraints and Conventions**

Subtitling is always a limited medium, quite literally, and is subject to several constraints. Some of these constraints are inherent to the practice of subtitling in general, but some are applicable specifically to interlingual subtitling. Georgakopoulou recognises that the multisemiotic nature of audiovisual translation adds to the difficulty of producing good subtitles and states that they are “most successful when not noticed by the viewer.” In order to do this, he states that the subtitles “need to comply with certain levels of readability and be as concise as necessary in order not to distract the viewer’s attention from the programme” (21). To help achieve this, there are also conventions and guidelines in the practice of subtitling. Although these are perhaps not entirely universal, certainly not as universal as the constraints are, they are generally accepted in the professional industry. The two most relevant and most used theories on subtitling conventions are the “Code of Good Subtitling Practice” by Ivarsson and Carroll (1998) and “A Proposed Set of Subtitling Standards in Europe” by Karamitroglou (1998). Although these may be slightly outdated due to the rapid development of technology, they are still relevant and often used as a basis for subtitling guidelines. However, since Karamitroglou’s guidelines are much more detailed, I will use these as my focal point.

Georgakopoulou and Karamitroglou both recognise different categories of constraints and guidelines, which have slightly different names but are otherwise quite similar. Georgakopoulou distinguishes between three categories of constraints on subtitling that add to the difficulty of achieving good readability, namely technical, textual and linguistic constraints. Karamitroglou divides the guidelines in four distinct categories: the spatial parameter, the temporal parameter, punctuation and letter case, and target text editing. I will follow Georgakopoulou categories and discuss these, as well as add Karamitroglou’s suggestions for the proposed guidelines to the relevant categories.

#### **1.1.3.1. Technical Constraints & Conventions**

The technical constraints and conventions are particularly those that concern the format of the subtitles and these are all closely related to each other. The first constraint that is mentioned is the spatial constraint, which is the same category as the spatial parameter mentioned by Karamitroglou.

The subtitles can only take up a small amount of the screen, 20% according to Georgakopoulou, so as to not obscure the image (22). It is then generally accepted that the subtitles should consist no more than two lines (Karamitroglou, Carroll and Ivarsson 2, Díaz Cintas and Remael 82). There is a little less consensus on the maximum number of characters that can be used per line, though most scholars still more or less agree with a similar number. According to Karamitroglou, this number should be around 35, Díaz Cintas and Remael state that for a TV subtitle it is usually 37 characters per line, but that for DVD the norm seems to be 40 characters per line (84). This means that the subtitler only has a limited amount of space to convey their message, ranging from a maximum of 70 to 80 characters, which is “including blank spaces and typographical signs, which all take up one space” (84). This, however, is a theoretical guideline; the exact number of characters a subtitle can contain, is dependent on the next constraint.

This constraint is that of time, which dictates the length of time a subtitle should be presented on screen. Since the subtitles should correspond with what is being said and seen in the audio and visual modes, and it is important for the subtitles to be spotted correctly. Ideally, the “subtitles should keep temporal synchrony with the utterances” and appear when the person on screen starts talking and disappear when they stop (Díaz Cintas and Remael, 88). This automatically means that some subtitles will be on screen for a very short time, and others for longer, depending on the source text audio. To improve legibility, a minimum and maximum amount of exposure time for subtitles have been suggested. These optimal times ensure that the average reader will have enough time to read and comprehend the subtitle, but not enough time to read it again. According to Karamitroglou, the minimum duration of a subtitle is 1½ seconds, even if the subtitle is made up of a single word. The duration of a full single-line subtitle should be no longer than 3½ seconds. The maximum duration for a full two-line subtitle, and so the maximum for any subtitle, is 6 seconds. If the dialogue extends beyond 3½ seconds, it should be on two lines, and if it extends 6 seconds, it should be split into multiple subtitles. All of these times include both the time the brain needs to recognise and process the subtitle as well as the time that the average viewer would need to read it. The amount of time a subtitle is visible on screen then influences the length of the subtitle. The viewer needs to have enough time to read the provided subtitle, which is why the subtitle cannot exceed a certain length. As

Georgakopoulou states: “The length of a subtitle is directly related to its on-air time” (22). This is why subtitlers often work with Words Per Minute (WPM) or Characters Per Second (CPS) to ensure optimal legibility. These terms refer to the number of characters per second or words per minute the average viewer has to read in any given subtitle. If this exceeds a certain number, it means the viewer will have to read too many characters or words in the given time and they will not be able to comfortably read the subtitle. Díaz Cintas and Remael state that when WPM is used, this is “based on the English language” where it is assumed “that the average length for an English word is five letters” (95). Because CPS is more objective, this is the more favourable term.

The final technical constraint is that of presentation. This concerns matters that contribute to the legibility of the subtitles, such as font size, the position of the subtitles on the screen, and the technology that is used to project the subtitles. Although these are considered to be constraints, the DVD industry has brought more freedom to the process according to Georgakopoulou, since “the choice of any font and font size supported by Windows is possible” (22). Karamitroglou gives several suggestions for the presentation of the subtitles in his category of spatial parameter. The subtitles should ideally be presented at the bottom of the screen, only relocated to the top of the screen if there is important information presented where the subtitles would normally be. A font without serifs, “cross-strokes or finishing strokes at the end of a principal stroke of a letter” (*OED*), is preferable, since these are visually more simple and do not detract from the legibility of the text. In terms of font colour, he states that this should be a “coloured pale white” against a “grey, see-through “ghost box”” for optimal legibility. Alternatively, Díaz Cintas and Remael state that the characters can also be “shadowed or black contoured” instead of encasing the subtitles in a box (84).

### **1.1.3.2. Textual Constraints & Conventions**

Next are the textual constraints and conventions, which have to do with the actual text of the subtitles. The first point mentioned by Georgakopoulou is that in consuming subtitled media, the viewer has to process both “the action on screen, and the translation of the dialogue, that is the subtitles” (23). Since this is rather demanding and divides the attention of the viewer, Georgakopoulou lists three rules that can be used to “help minimise the potentially negative effects” (23). The first suggestion is that if there

is something important happening on screen, the subtitler should “offer only the most basic linguistic information” so that the viewer can focus on the image rather than the subtitle (23). Because of this, there may also be an omission of redundant elements, which should not affect the viewers’ understanding of the story too much (25). The second suggestion is similar yet opposite to the first; if the important information is in the audio rather than in the image, the subtitle should be the longest possible to convey all the necessary information to the viewer. The third and final suggestion is more of an observation, which states that the way in which the words of the subtitle are arranged on the screen and on the subtitle lines can help enhance the legibility of the subtitle. This refers largely to the way in which the subtitles are segmented, which, as Díaz Cintas and Remael state, “can help reinforce coherence and cohesion in subtitling” (172). Karamitroglou too has put some thought into the segmentation of subtitles. His suggestion is that subtitles “should appear segmented at the highest syntactic nodes possible” if they cannot be made to fit on a single-line subtitle. This is because “the higher the node, the greater the grouping of the semantic load and the more complete the piece of information presented to the brain”. Ideally then, a subtitle should always be broken up at the end of a word, full phrase or clause and not in the middle of it, in order to help the viewer process the information more efficiently.

Another textual constraint that Georgakopoulou mentions is the change in mode, namely the shift from oral text to written text. This refers to the difficulty of conveying typical characteristics of oral speech in a written form; think for instance of stuttering, pauses, and ungrammatical constructions, but also of dialect, idiolect, and pronunciation. Rendering these features into the subtitles will often hinder the readability and is therefore not advised. Karamitroglou states that dialects, whether regional or social, should only be rendered if they have accepted and known written forms, such as “ain’t”, but are otherwise too strenuous for the viewer. However, if the presence of these features is necessary for plot or characterisation, the subtitler will have to find an alternative way to achieve this.

### **1.1.3.3. Linguistic Constraints and Conventions**

Finally, we come to the linguistic constraints, which is again closely related to the other constraints and conventions discussed above. Georgakopoulou claims that there is an “average 30% to 40% expansion rate when translating from English into most European languages” which will then obviously lead to text reduction. According to Díaz Cintas and Remael, this can be done through condensation and reformulation, or through omission. The exact strategy and procedure a subtitler uses will of course depend on the situation, as the text should only be abbreviated if the format demands it. Both Díaz Cintas and Remael and Georgakopoulou recognise that the most important factor here is relevance or indispensableness, stating that elements that are relevant to the plot should be retained, whereas the more dispensable elements may be reduced or omitted. Georgakopoulou has listed the most likely elements to be omitted. Forms of address or names, false starts, ungrammatical constructions, and internationally known words and exclamations such as “yes”, “OK” and “wow” are often omitted or sometimes reduced because they can be easily derived from the soundtrack (27-28). Other than that, repetitions and discourse markers, elements which have no semantic meaning, are also often omitted.

## **1.2. Dubbing**

The other major form of AVT apart from subtitling, is dubbing. Like subtitling, dubbing has existed for a long time, and according to Chaume can be traced back to the late 1920s (1). Although this form too is often used around the world and in Europe, it is used much less in the Netherlands than subtitling is. In fact, the most prevalent use of dubbing in Dutch television and theatres is found in children’s and family films and shows. Since this is the type of film I will be looking at in my case study, a discussion of the workings of this form of translation is not only relevant but necessary. As with subtitling, there are many aspects to consider in the process of dubbing, and this will be done in the following sections.

### **1.2.1. Defining Dubbing**

Chaume defines dubbing as “a type of Audiovisual Translation” which “consists of replacing the original track of a film’s (or any audiovisual text) source language dialogues with another track on which translated dialogues have been recorded in the target language” (1). Any other audio tracks remain untouched. Luyken et al. give a more expansive definition, stating that dubbing is “the replacement of the original speech by a voice track which attempts to follow as closely as possible the timing, phrasing and lip movements of the original dialogue (qtd. in Baker and Hochel 74-75).

### **1.2.2. Dubbing Quality Standards**

Chaume states that certain texts and genres are subject to certain unwritten rules belonging to that text form or genre. This is because “the absence of an expected element may be received by the reader as a negative mechanism” (14). Having a standard then makes it easier for the viewer or reader to process and understand a text. In order to achieve this, Chaume proposes some conventions for dubbing, just as Díaz Cintas and Remael, Carroll and Ivarsson, and Karamitroglou have done for subtitling, which he refers to as quality standards. As is stated several times throughout the text, “the ultimate aim of dubbing is to create a believable final product that seems real, that tricks us as viewers into thinking we are witnessing a credible story, with easily recognized characters and realistic voices” (19). The aim of these quality standards is then to provide the viewer with a text that is coherent and easy to follow, and that they can accept as realistic. In the next few sections, I will detail and explain the quality standards Chaume has listed.

#### **1.2.2.1. Acceptable lip-sync**

Synchronisation lies at the very basis of dubbing and can sometimes be difficult to achieve. It is described as “the process of matching the target language translation to the screen actors’ body and articulatory movements in a recording made in a dubbing studio” (67). There are various aspects of synchronisation, and of these lip-syncing is the most important form. Lip synchrony is “adapting the translation to the articulatory movements of the on-screen characters, especially in close-ups and

extreme [...] close-ups” (68). Chaume also refers to this as phonetic synchrony, because this process is specifically concerned with matching certain phonemes in the source and the translation. When a character opens or closes their mouth on screen, the translation should reflect this, lest the viewer notices the discrepancies between sound and screen. “[P]articular care should be taken [...] to respect the open vowels and bilabial and labio-dental consonants pronounced on screen” states Chaume, because these are the most recognisable sounds (68). When there is an open vowel or bilabial in the source text, there should be one in the target text, although the vowel or bilabial does not necessarily have to be the same one as that of the source; as long as it has the same effect, it does not matter which particular sound is used. This means that in practice, a /p/ could be replaced by a /b/ or even an /f/ and an /æ/ with an /i:/. It should be mentioned that the practice of lip synchronisation applies largely to close-up shots. Chaume notes that “phonetic equivalence overrides semantic or even pragmatic equivalence” in close-ups, and that the focus here lies much more on finding a word that uses the same articulatory movements than one which carries the same semantic meaning (74). If there are no close-ups, it is practically the opposite, as Chaume concludes that “in real professional practice, lip-sync is only observed in close-ups and extreme or big close-ups” (74) and not, or at least to a lesser degree, in regular or wide shots.

As important as lip-synching is, there are other types of synchronisation that are also crucial to the process of dubbing. The one that is most important after lip-synching is isochrony. This refers to the equal duration of utterances, meaning that the length of the translated dialogue must be matched up exactly with that of the original dialogue. If this is not the case and viewers can still hear dialogue after the character on screen has stopped talking or when the dialogue has stopped but the character on screen is still talking, this is very noticeable and jarring to them, disturbing their sense of realism and reminding them that they are watching a translated work. Chaume notes that this element of synchronisation is also where viewers are most likely to notice a mistake in the dubbing and where most criticism on badly dubbed material stems from (69).

The final type of synchronisation that Chaume mentions as being important is kinesic synchrony or character synchrony. This refers to the synchronising of the character’s body movement on screen with the dialogue that is heard. There might be a kinesic sign together with a spoken caption,



such as the nodding of the head accompanied by a “yes” and viewers will expect these two to match up. In Western culture, seeing a character shake their head but hearing an affirmative answer can be quite jarring and even comical, breaking their sense of realism.

Having considered these elements, it should be noted that according to Chaume, when it comes to cartoons, and it can be assumed that this goes for any animation, the synchrony that is demanded in the dubbing of the material is minimal. He states that since the characters in cartoons “do not speak” in the way that humans do “but rather seem to move their lips almost randomly without actually pronouncing the words, a precise phonetic adaptation is not necessary, except in the case of extreme close-ups or detailed shots in which the character apparently utters an open vowel” (75-76). He also adds to this that child audiences are less demanding of lip synchrony and isochrony than adult audiences will be. However, the animated Disney films that I will be looking at in this thesis are of a much higher quality and were developed on a much higher budget, over a longer by period of time and by more animators than a regular cartoon such as *The Simpsons*, which is likely the type that Chaume refers to here. On top of that, these are first and foremost films made for viewing in theatres, where synchronisation is much more of a requirement than in the television industry (77). It is also the case that although the direct aim of these film may be a younger audience, Disney is well-known for being entertaining for both children and adults. It is the question then to what extent this is relevant for the films I will be analysing. I will assume that lip synchronisation will in these cases be a bigger requirement than it is in most cartoons, but the fact remains that these films are animated, and so good synchronisation will be less difficult to achieve.

### **1.2.2.2. Credible and Realistic Dialogue Lines**

This standard is relevant for every type of translation and not simply to dubbing, and concern the naturalness of the dialogue. Rather than making a translation full of structural or lexical calques, so a more literal translation, the translator should attempt to achieve “an oral register that can be defined as false spontaneous, prefabricated speech” (16). It is important for the dialogue to flow naturally and be “in line with the oral registers of the target language” (15) to keep the viewer in their bubble of

accepted realism. Chaume claims that the translator, in translating the dialogue must juggle the “adequacy in relation to the source text” with the “acceptability in the target culture” (16). The target text must then be both realistic and plausible both in relation to the story and to the oral register of the target language.

### **1.2.2.3. Coherence Between Images and Words**

This standard relates to a point that has already been somewhat discussed in the previous sections, namely the fact that “there should be *coherence* between what is heard and what is seen, i.e. between words and images, and likewise, between the internal coherence of the plot, on the other hand, and dialogue cohesion on the other” (16). This means that when making a translation, what appears on screen should always be taken into account to ensure the coherence between audio and image. Not only this, but there should also be an internal coherence in the translation itself, meaning that the translator should take care to deliver a text that is both semantically cohesive and grammatically correct. The sometimes necessary reduction of the text and the following loss of pragmatic elements, although these are often semantically void, can put a strain on this cohesion. Chaume notes that the idea of grammatical correctness sometimes leads to the normalisation and explicitation of the target text, removing or smoothing out elements that were ambiguous or obscure, and as such making the target text even more coherent than the source text, but at a possible loss of the purposeful ambiguity of the original.

### **1.2.2.4. Loyal Translation**

The next standard is that of loyalty or fidelity to the original text. This is a rather tricky standard to define, as it can refer to faithfulness in terms of to “content, form, function, source text effect, or all or any one of the aforementioned” (17). Chaume applies this fidelity quite broadly, stating that in this case it would refer to the fact that the viewers will expect to see the same film or show as the source text audience sees; “in other words, that the true story be told in terms of content, and on most occasions, of form, function and effect – and with no censorship” (17). The most important of these is

that there are no significant changes to the plot and especially no censorship, so that the viewers can still enjoy a film or show that is mostly the same, with other aspects being more open to alteration. There is a threshold of acceptability, Chaume states, with some changes being more acceptable than others. He lists four changes that according to him are tolerated by the spectator.

The first is linguistic censorship and self-censorship. Linguistic censorship refers specifically to the censoring of linguistic aspects, most often to the omission or normalisation of verbal violence, obscene speech, or simply swearing. Self-censorship is somewhat more complicated, as it generally refers to the censoring of one's own work. This can of course in a way also be done in translation, where the translator or the translation company purposefully or subconsciously omits or softens certain elements.

The second change that is mentioned by Chaume is that of mismatched registers. What he means by this is a translation that is very literal and full of both lexical and cultural calques, which results in a target text that sounds somewhat clunky and not very idiomatic. He states that this happens most often in "productions aimed at the adolescent market" (18). It is then likely that the target audience of these texts is a reason why this practice is more tolerated; if this happened in texts aimed at an adult audience, this would perhaps be more frowned upon.

The third of the accepted changes is the changes of film titles, sometimes to an extreme degree. An example of more subtle changes to film titles would be *Het Grote Verhaal van Winnie de Poeh* for *The Many Adventures of Winnie the Pooh* (1977) and an example for a more drastic change would be *Merlijn de Tovenaar* for *The Sword in the Stone* (1963). However, as with the changes mentioned in the previous paragraph, it is likely that the changing of film titles is deemed more acceptable when it concerns films aimed at a younger audience than those that are aimed at an adult audience.

The final change is "the semiotic distortions caused by the use in the translation of certain characteristic features of the target culture (*over adaptation*) in a typically foreign atmosphere and place" (18). This refers largely to cultural elements of the source culture that are translated in a minor to extremely domesticated way. Examples could be well-known cultural institutions or places from the source culture translated to match similarly well-known instances in the target culture, such as

‘Bijenkorf’ when one can clearly see ‘Harrods’ on screen, or translating ‘Santa Claus’ as ‘Sinterklaas’. Depending on the context and audience, these changes could be seen as less or more acceptable. Unsurprisingly then perhaps, Chaume refers to De Rosa, who concluded that this form of over-adaptation is found more often in cartoons than in arthouse films (18).

#### **1.2.2.5. Clear Sound Quality**

Unlike is often the case with subtitlers, the translator for the dialogue in dubbing does not have the control over the full dubbing process. This standard is one of the cases that are out of the translator’s hands. It refers to the quality of the dub and the adherence to the technical and acoustic conventions that exist within dubbing, and although the translator has little to no input here, these are still important conventions in order to make a good and realistic dub. The first convention is that all the dialogue from the source text must be removed so that it can no longer be heard by the viewer. The second is that all dialogues must be recorded in soundproof studios to ensure high sound quality and eliminate any chances of background interference. The third is that the volume of the voices is higher than it is in normal speech. The final convention is that certain sound effects are used to recreate the original acoustics, such as when a character is far away or has their backs to the viewers. All these factors contribute to a greater coherence and improved understanding for the spectators.

#### **1.2.2.6. Acting**

Another standard which is largely beyond the control of the translator is the “*performance and dramatization* of the dialogue” by the voice actors (19). Naturally, a good performance by the actors is necessary for the viewer to be emerged in the story. They can fail to achieve this if they sound fake due to overacting, or monotonous due to underacting. Especially the overacting, for instance the emphasizing of intonation and pronunciation, says Chaume, can lead to the dialogue sounding unnatural and mark them as film or television dialogue rather than real conversations (19). This again disturbs the realism that dubbing should aim for.

### 1.3. Subbing vs Dubbing

In this section, I will briefly highlight some notable differences between and pros and cons of subtitling and dubbing that might be considered when examining both. Although these types of translation are very similar in some ways, both after all being types of audiovisual translation, they are very different in others. Considering these similarities and differences can give some more insight in both practices, how they work, and why one form might be favoured over the other by some audiences and by people in the industry.

A major part of dubbing, as has already been pointed out, is that the language barrier between the source language and target audience is completely removed due to the replacement of the original audio track. This, theoretically, makes the films or shows available to wider audiences, including for instance children, and others who cannot or will not use subtitles. On the other hand, it could also alienate viewers, for instance those who do not speak the target language, such as tourists or expats. Additionally, if there is a large clash between the source culture and the target language and audience, this might also cause discomfort to the viewers. Chiaro mentions that “dubbing is often condemned for spoiling the original soundtrack and denying audiences the opportunity of hearing the voices of the original actors” (“Issues in Audiovisual Translation”, 147). The replacing of the source audio track is referred to somewhat more objectively as a “loss of authenticity” by Tveit, who states that “[a]n essential part of a character’s personality is their voice, which is closely linked to facial expressions, gestures and body language” (92). Chiaro counters this idea by stating that “dubbing is the screen translation modality which is able to fulfil the greatest filmic uniformity with the original simply by virtue of the fact that there is no need to reduce or condense the source dialogues as in subtitling” (147). The dub also allows viewers to focus fully on the image and audio without distraction. However, dubbing is very complex, time-consuming and costly. From the figures mentioned in Luyken et al. it is concluded that the cost of dubbing is around fifteen times higher than that of subtitling (qtd. in Baker and Hochel 75). Although this information is over a decade old now and technology has improved, it is safe to say that although the cost gap may have slimmed, it has not gone away entirely. Tveit confirms this, saying that “dubbing remains 5 to 10 times more expensive”

even nowadays (94). This is partially because dubbing is more labour intensive; not only does the text need to be translated, but each character needs to be voiced by a different voice-actor, who needs to be coached by a director etc., whereas often only one subtitler is necessary to subtitle an entire programme or film.

Generally, according to Chiaro, subtitling has a more positive reputation than dubbing (150). Whereas in dubbing something is removed, namely the original audio track, in subtitling there is only an addition. Chiaro states that “the source language is not distorted in any way” and “the original dialogue is always present and potentially accessible” (150). Viewers who are familiar with the source language have the opportunity to use the subtitles mainly as a crutch and focus on the acoustics, or simply divide their attention between both. As Tveit points out, “the transnational qualities of the human voice” namely the tone of voice, stress, rhythm, volume and intonation “may contribute to conveying information across language barriers” (92, 87). This means that viewer gets additional non-verbal information within the verbal dialogue, which can add to their comprehension of the text even if they cannot understand the words that are being said. Although the subject might not be clear, from tone of voice and volume the viewer could for instance infer that the speaker is angry or upset. However, if the viewer does not understand the source language, they are still largely reliant on the subtitles. What might pose a problem then is the shift from oral to written form which we find in subtitling. This not only means that there is a definite loss of some language features that are characteristic of spoken language, but it also costs the viewer more time to process. Although it could be argued that subtitles can distract from the image and sound, it is also the case that viewers can get so used to them that they become virtually unaware of their presence, consuming them without even noticing it (Chiaro, 147). Subtitling often necessarily has to resort to textual reduction, in some instances more so than others, which leads to a potential loss of information and dialogue. Another con of subtitles is that they can sometimes interfere with the visual information. For instance, in close-ups, where faces take up most of the screen, placing the subtitles might be difficult or intrusive, and when there are captions of locations or names at the bottom of the screen, these might clash with the subtitles or force the translator to place them elsewhere, breaking the rhythm with which the viewer has been reading (Tveit, 90-91). Although this has little to do with the actual supremacy of subtitling

over dubbing, one major argument in favour of subtitling is the idea that it has an additional education value, and contributes to the viewers' improvement of the language. Although Ciaro states that this has never been empirically proven (150), Tveit states that he does believe in "the inherent pedagogical value of having access to the original English language soundtrack" and that a study done by him in 1987 at least somewhat supported this idea (93). Lastly, it should be mentioned that subtitling is not only much cheaper than dubbing, but for many of the same reasons that it is cheaper, it is also much quicker. According to Tveit, the subtitling of a show or film can be done within a day, whereas this would obviously take much longer in dubbing (95).

#### **1.4. Translation Issues in Audiovisual Texts**

No matter the medium that the translator is working with, be it an audiovisual text, a piece of literary fiction, or even an informative text, there will always be certain issues in translating certain aspects of the text. However, the particular nature of audiovisual texts automatically presents the translator with extra translation issues, in part due to the constraints and conventions that were discussed in sections 1.1.3. and 1.2.2. In this section I will discuss some of the most frequent issues that must be considered in the translation of audiovisual texts. The issues discussed here are not all necessarily restricted to the translation of audiovisual texts, but they do occur there frequently and sometimes prove to be a bigger issue in these types of texts than texts that are not audiovisual.

One of the most difficult subjects in translation is the translation of marked speech and language variation. This includes the translation of style, register, dialects, sociolects, idiolects, and emotionally charged language. An example would be *The Emperor's New Groove*, which makes use of office-themed jargon in the first few scenes to create a humorous effect, or the character of Zazu in *The Lion King*, who speaks in a higher, more formal register and with a British accent, which is very different from many of the other characters. These are important features of the text, because as Díaz Cintas and Remael state "[t]he way characters speak tells us something about their personality and background, through idiosyncrasies and through the socio-cultural and geographic markers in their speech, which affect grammar, syntax, lexicon, pronunciation, and intonation" (185). If the translator

fails to find a suitable solution or equivalent for these elements, it can be detrimental to the target text. Chaume states that “[i]deally, dubbing translators are expected to respect and convey the way on-screen characters speak”, but this will not always be an easy feat (134). In dubbing, Chaume notes that if a film is shot in a single dialect, it is often translated into the target culture’s standard language, since there is no language variation within the film. A similar thing happens in subtitling, where the subtitler often “relies on the images for context and local colour” rather than reflect this in the subtitles, with the exception of some lexical variation (193). The use of non-standard grammar and pronunciation or spelling is generally frowned upon in translation and is therefore not often utilised to reflect dialect, especially in subtitling. This is because correct grammar is important to improve the readability of the subtitles, as discussed under section 1.1.3.2. Chaume, as well as Díaz Cintas and Remael agree that one dialect should not be substituted for another, since this too could hinder rather than help understanding. In general, when it comes to any form of deviation from the standard in the source text, be it through dialect or sociolect or any other form of linguistic variation, it is advised that the translator use a non-standard register and simply use colloquial or obscene words to reflect this deviation, rather than do this on a syntactic or phonetic level. If this is not possible for some reason, the translator can choose to compensate for this by applying this technique somewhere else in the text. Accents are relatively easier to handle in dubbing, as an accent could be added to the new dialogue if so wished, but in subtitling this would result in the use of a phonetic script, which could pose a problem for the spectator, as mentioned above. It is then a choice between sacrificing a potentially important element from the source text or possibly alienating the viewer. Especially if there are humorous elements or jokes which rely on these linguistic elements, the translator might be faced with an issue. As an alternative to this, Díaz Cintas and Remael note that marked pronunciation often goes paired with marked vocabulary, meaning that even in the case that the actual pronunciation cannot be reflected in the subtitles, the translator could still add some foreignness to the text to indicate the speaker’s deviation from the standard language (194).

Then there is the case of small words and phrases that seem simple enough to translate, but could still present the translator with a problem. One of these is the distinction between the informal and the formal “you” that is observed in many languages, such as French and Dutch, but not in



English. The translator will then have to determine for each case which form is the more fitting in the context. Then there are the emotionally charged words, such as taboo words, swear words and interjections, which at the very least set the tone of the text even if they do not have lexical meaning. As Díaz Cintas and Remael point out “such words fulfil specific functions in the dialogic interaction and, by extension, in the film story” (196). However, translators often condense or omit them either to save space or to tone down their meaning, and this is especially common in subtitles. Díaz Cintas and Remael state that “saying such words is one thing, writing them is another matter” (196). It is noted however that it is becoming more common nowadays to include some expletives or taboo words into the subtitles, especially on DVD. Whether or not these words are included should then depend on what is deemed acceptable in the target culture and on whether or not they “contribute to characterization or when they fulfil a thematic function” (197).

Another element that can pose a problem for the translator is that of cultural references. These include geographical, historical, social, political and ethnographic references. If a text features a reference to an institution or artist or an historical event that is well-known in the source culture but not in the target culture, or if there is no equivalent item in the target culture, there may be a problem in translating this element. If the spectator is not likely to understand it, the translator might have to find another translation. As Chaume points out, cultural references are particularly an issue in audiovisual texts, since “translation professionals have to deal with cultural references that are shown on screen at the same time [as the spoken cultural reference]” (145). Due to the time and spatial constraints on these forms of translation, explicitation or glossing of a term is not possible as it would be in a non-audiovisual text. This means that the translator must decide whether or not to foreignise, possibly alienating the viewers by using a reference that is unknown to them, or domesticate, possibly alienating the viewers by using a reference that seems out of context with the source text or image. In other words, they must “try to find a balance between the audience’s shared knowledge and their threshold of tolerance to domestic culture references” (146). Chaume also mentions that this decision relies partially on the genre and audience of the proposed translation. For cartoons, “in an attempt to bring the product closer to the young audience” there is often much domestication (146).

A similar element to the previous one, there are also intertextual references which the translator has to be on the lookout for. These are elements within the source text that in some way refer to another text, be it through quotes, literary allusions, parody or any other means. The intertextuality in audiovisual texts can appear in both the image and the audio. In the first case, the translator is not much concerned with these elements, but in the latter case, they will have to “translate it accordingly, usually by consulting the established or canonical translation in their target languages, so that the target and the source audiences enjoy the same conditions for recognising those elements and interpreting them accordingly” (Chaume, 147). Disney films contain many instances of both these forms of intertextuality, though more frequently of the first kind, and the intertextual references are mostly to their own films. In *Aladdin*, there is a sequence in which the Genie mentions “king crab” and subsequently pulls the crab Sebastian from *The Little Mermaid* out of a book, after which he mentions a “Caesar salad” and an arm with a dagger appears to stab him, at which point the Genie says “Et tu, Brute?” quoting a famous line from Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*. Similarly, in *Hercules*, the eponymous main character can be seen wearing a robe of lion skin, made from the hide of Scar from *The Lion King*, but there are also many references to characters and stories Greek mythology which characterise the film. Chaume refers to Zabalbeascoa (2000) and Martínez Sierra (2010) who state that in animated media aimed at both children and adults, like Disney films, there are certain elements, such as the cultural and intertextual references, that are aimed specially at the adults.

A final, quite interesting, translation issue is encountered in translating songs. Although I will exclude the songs from my examination, Disney films are famous for their elaborate and often amusing musical numbers. These are clearly songs which contribute to the plot and therefore should be translated. According to Díaz Cintas and Remael, in translating songs, the translator needs to consider content, rhythm, and rhyme (211). If the song functions as adding an atmospheric quality, a literal translation is not necessary, but in the case of songs such as those from Disney films, a more accurate translation will be required. However, balancing the content of the lyrics with the rhythm is also important, though mostly in subtitling, as it makes the subtitles easier to read. Finally, the rhyme scheme should be observed and, again especially in subtitles, either match that of the source as closely as possible, or be logical on its own.

## Chapter 2: Humour

Humour is a strange thing and comes in many different forms. Although scholars have often tried to define and explain it, it remains a tricky subject, especially for translators. Chiaro (“Translation and Humour, Humour and Translation”) states that “[t]here is, as yet, no universal consensus amongst scholars over the definition of the term humour itself” (13). What is understood about humour, however, is that “the term embraces concepts such as comedy, fun, the ridiculous, nonsense and scores of notions each of which, while possessing a common denominator, all significantly differ from one another too” (14). This however only gives it a broader scope and does nothing to narrow down the actual meaning of it. Vandaele gives a much more narrow definition of humour: “Humor occurs when a rule has not been followed, when an expectation is set-up and not confirmed, when the incongruity is resolved in an alternative way. Humor thereby produces superiority feelings which may be mitigated if participants agree that the humor is essentially a form of social play rather than outright aggression” (149). This is both a very concrete and abstract definition of humour and explains more about how humour supposedly works than what it is. For the purposes and scope of this thesis, a simpler definition would be suitable enough. In the simplest way, “[hu]mor is what causes amusement, mirth, a spontaneous smile and laughter” (Vandaele 147). This is corroborated by Ross, who states that a straightforward definition of humour would be “something that makes a person laugh or smile” (1). As she points out, it is true that sometimes people will not laugh at something humorous, or people will laugh at something which is not humorous at all. Attardo agrees with this, stating that “the property is incorrectly seen as symmetrical—what is funny makes you laugh and what makes you laugh as funny” (10). However, Ross counters this by stating that “[de]spite these objections, the response is an important factor in counting something as humour” (1). For the purposes of this thesis, I will then look at humour and jokes in the meaning of something which has the aim or intent, although not necessarily the result, of causing mirth or making the viewer laugh.

As stated in the previous paragraph, humour comes in many different forms, and any type of text can contain any type of humorous elements. Since I am particularly interested in the types of humour which are likely to give the translator pause or present them with certain issues, I will only be

looking at one particular type of humour, namely that of verbal humour, which encompasses the category of wordplay or puns which I will be analysing in my case study. In the next sections, I will discuss these subjects, starting with verbal humour. I will explain what it is and why it is relevant. Next, I will look at wordplay and do the same for that. Finally, I will briefly discuss the practice of translating humour.

## **2.1. Verbal Humour**

Verbal humour, also named Verbally Expressed Humour or VEH by Chiaro (“Translation and Humour, Humour and Translation”) is the type of humour that relies on linguistic factors to generate humour. One might say that this is the case of most humour, as most instances of humour will be spoken or written down. However, as Ritchie clarifies, verbal humour “relies on the particular language used to express it, so that it may use idiosyncratic features of the language (such as which words sound alike, or which sentence structures are ambiguous)” (34). This type of humour travels badly according to Chiaro. This is because VEH “often consists of the combination of linguistic play with encyclopaedic knowledge” and “cultural features” (5). In crossing geographical borders, “humour has to come to terms with linguistic and cultural elements which are often only typical of the source culture from which it was produced thereby losing its power to amuse in the new location” (1). Although the idea and enjoyment of humour can be said to be universal, the enjoyment of specific verbally expressed humour is not. Translating this type of humour requires some skill and creativity on the translator’s part then, which is why studying both theory and practical examples regarding verbally expressed humour and the translation of it are interesting and useful. The most well-known type of this particular kind of humour is that of wordplay or puns.

### **2.1.1. Wordplay**

The term wordplay, also called pun, encompasses a rather broad meaning. According to Delabastita, wordplay is “a deliberate communicative strategy, or the result thereof, used with a specific semantic or pragmatic effect in mind” (*Traductio* 2). This is quite a vague definition and still does not really

give a sense of what wordplay really is, but luckily he gives another working definition elsewhere:

“Wordplay is the general name for the various *textual* phenomena in which *structural features* of the language(s) used are exploited in order to bring about a *communicatively significant confrontation* of two (or more) linguistic structures with *more or less similar forms* and *more or less similar meanings*” (*The Translator* 128). He admits that this definition is not very elegant and in need of some explanation, which he provides in the following paragraphs, as I will do.

### **2.1.1.1 Formal Similarity**

First, he explains some more about how puns work, stating that “[t]he pun contrasts linguistic structures with [different meanings] on the basis of their [formal similarity]” (128). By this, he refers to words that either look similar or sound similar, but in fact have widely different meanings. He divides this relation between the different meanings and the similar forms into four different categories: homonyms, which have both identical sound and spelling, such as arms, referring to both limbs and weapons; homophones, which have identical sound but not spelling, such as reign and rain; homographs, which have different sound but identical spelling, such as tear, in the meaning of a tear in one’s clothes or crying a tear; and paronyms, which have both different sound and spelling but that still resemble each other in pronunciation, such as temple and temper. These words can produce a form of wordplay by clashing with each other. This can occur either by the words being “co-present in the same portion of text” which Delabastita calls vertical wordplay, or by “occurring one after another in the text” which he calls horizontal wordplay. An example he gives of the first is “come in for a faith lift” as a slogan for a church, which is a play on the noun phrase “face lift” but where “face” has been replaced with “faith”. An example of horizontal wordplay is “Counsel for Council home buyers”, in which the two similar terms follow each other rather than occurring in the same spot.

### **2.1.1.2 Textual Phenomena**

Delabastita explains that puns are textual phenomena not only because they rely on the structural characteristics of verbal language, but specifically because “they need to be employed in specially

contrived textual settings” in order to be effective (129). This is illustrated in the vertical and horizontal forms of wordplay. In both, he states, the pun only works together with the context, which allows the reader or viewer to understand or recognise it. This can be done either through verbal or situational context.

Verbal context refers to “our expectation of grammatical well-formedness” and “thematic coherence”, in which one uses the particular grammar or meaning of the text to predict what will logically follow (129). This is how we can normally understand homophones, because if we talk about several inches of rain, the context makes it clear that we are speaking of ‘rain’ rather than ‘reign’. This thematic coherence can also refer to “the conventional coherence of phrases” such as book titles or idioms, words that commonly occur together.

The situational context refers to the situation in which the dialogue takes place, such as the setting, activity, environment, etc. These influence the conversation or at least provide a framework for it. This is especially relevant in audiovisual texts, as the visual image that the viewer receives in addition to the verbal dialogue provides much of the setting and is often used for purposes of punning. Finally, puns are also textual phenomena because they function within the text in various ways and can add extra meaning or coherence, as well as humour (129).

### **2.1.1.3 Exploitation of Linguistic Structures**

Delabastita explains that puns exploit several different linguistic features and structures, sometimes in combination, in order to create their wordplay (130). First, he names phonological and graphological structures. Since the English language, as well as most other languages, is made up of a select number of phonemes and graphemes, there can only be a select number of combinations in which these occur. As such, it is only logical that there are some words which have a similar pronunciation or spelling but a different meaning. Puns make use of this restriction by playing on the similar sound or spelling of words and phrases.

Next is the lexical structure of polysemy, where the punner makes use of words with different meanings which are derived from the same semantic root and are still somewhat related, i.e. to milk in the literal sense and the figurative sense. Examples of this are metonymy, metaphor, and

specialisation. There is also the lexical structure of idioms, where the punner uses well-known idioms and plays off those, for instance by using the literal meaning rather than the figurative meaning, in order to create a surprising meaning.

Furthermore, the punner can also (ab)use the morphological structure of words to form their puns. Delabastita explains that many derivatives and compounds have lost their original meaning and are largely known as a single morpheme, rather than a combination of several. The punner can make a pun either by relying on the literal interpretation of a compound word as being made up of several morphemes or by, sometimes etymologically incorrectly, interpreting a compound or derivative in a way that is semantically effective. One example he gives of a morphological pun is “*“I can’t find the oranges”, said Tom fruitlessly*”, which is a play on the literal meaning of the word ‘fruitless’ where Tom is literally without fruit.

Finally, he mentions the exploitation of syntactic structures. This refers to the way sentences are grammatically structured. Depending on how sentences or phrases are structured, there can sometimes be a syntactical ambiguity, for instance if it is uncertain whether a word is a noun or a verb. Ross notes that this type of ambiguity often occurs in newspaper headlines, due to their abbreviated form. An example she gives of a headline which features this type of syntactical ambiguity is “Man Eating Piranha Mistakenly Sold as Pet Fish” (20). In this case, it is of course a piranha that is man-eating which was sold as a pet, rather than a man who was eating a piranha, but structurally speaking, it could be interpreted as both meanings. The punner can then make use of syntactical structures to create a possible ambiguity which will provide him with the basis for a pun.

#### **2.1.1.4 Communicative Significance**

As was illustrated by the ambiguous headline in the previous paragraph, sometimes a text is ambiguous without meaning to. Delabastita wishes to make a distinction between texts which feature unintentional ambiguity, slips of the pen or tongue, malapropisms, and more, and texts which feature wordplay. In the case of wordplay, there is a communicative significance at work, because the author has intended to make the pun, and therefore wishes to communicate something or simply make a joke.

Sometimes this distinction can be difficult to make, but it is an important one for translators, as they should then decide how they will translate the ambiguity into the target text.

### 2.1.2. Classifying Wordplay

In order to properly recognise and label the instances of wordplay that I will be looking at in the case study, I will need to use a classification model of the different types of wordplay that exist. It should be noted however that wordplay is a very tricky subject, and that classifying it is not an easy task. This has also been mentioned by Delabastita, who states that “[t]he difficulties inherent in [...] classifications of the pun are real enough. In fact, they have led many to simply give up the search for a precise definition enabling a line to be drawn between wordplay and non-wordplay and capable of mapping the internal structure(s) of the domain of wordplay as well” (*Traductio* 2). He further points out that “the classificatory assessments must be made in a global and context-sensitive manner, that grey zones may exist between prototypically clear points of reference, and that positions may even be subject to historical variation” (5).

Selecting any model to work with is then somewhat of a necessary evil. Sadly, Delabastita himself has not attempted to make a complete overview of the different types of wordplay and only discusses some basic types. Therefore, I have chosen to use the typology of puns as set out by Nash. He himself also recognises that punning is not simple, and that “a typology of punning would occupy many pages and catalogue many variants” (137-138). This is then merely a “general commentary on some prominent types” and by no means includes all forms of wordplay, but simply some of the most common ones. Although this typology dates from 1985 and so will not be likely to take audiovisual texts into account, it is still a very useful and elaborate model for classifying puns. I will describe and clarify his model, as set out on pages 138-147, below.

- **Homophones.** This is one of the most prominent forms of puns and has already been briefly discussed in the section on wordplay. Homophones are two or more words which have the same pronunciation, but a different meaning and spelling. Examples are flour and flower, sea and see, air and heir, souls and soles, etc. The pun is often made by substituting one of the



words for another and thus creating the humorous effect. An example is “Why couldn’t the jockey speak? He was feeling a bit horse”. The word ‘hoarse’ has here been replaced with its homophone ‘horse’ and thus the humorous effect is created, since horses are associated with jockeys.

- **Homophonic Phrases.** These are similar to simple homophones, but also much rarer. In this case, instead of one word with a similar sound replacing another, we are here speaking of a phrase with a similar sound replacing another. Nash states these “are not readily available in the stock of the language” and therefore often have to be forced (139). The example he gives is “Where did Humpty Dumpty leave his hat? Humpy dumped ‘is ‘at on a wall” which sounds similar to “Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall”. However, this example shows that with the use of dialect, this type of punning sounds slightly less forced and more plausible. Another example would be the misinterpretation of “four candles” as “fork ‘andles”, which can be found in *The Two Ronnies*.
- **Mimes.** These are “phonetic similitudes, usually rhymes, with the appeal of homophones” (139), which Delabastita referred to as paronyms. Rather than being homomorphic, they are allomorphic, states Nash, meaning that they use a form that is similar enough to the usual word to be recognised, but different in both sound and spelling. They are then near homophones. Examples are news and mews, crack and quack, luck and truck, face and faith, etc. From these examples it is clear that mimes often rhyme, as Nash already mentioned, but this is not always the case. An example of a mime in a pun would be “What do you call a frog spy? A croak and dagger agent!” Here, the word ‘cloak’ in the known phrase ‘cloak and dagger’ has been replaced by the similar sounding word ‘croak’, the sound which a frog makes, to create the humorous effect.
- **Mimetic Phrases.** These are similar to simple mimes, and like the homophonic phrases, they do not occur frequently. According to Nash, they are “a staple of wit, and generally [reflect] the humorist’s reading in primary texts (the Bible, Shakespeare), his command of literary phraseology, his repertoire of slogans” (140). In a mimetic phrase, the punner keeps the reference to the original phrase but replaces several words with similar sounding ones in order

to create a humorous effect. As Nash stated, it is a bastardisation of an already existing phrase and recognising them then relies on extra-linguistic knowledge. An example given by Nash is “Hollywood, land of mink and money” for the Biblical “land of milk and honey” (140).

Another is “Your honey – or your wife?” for the well-known phrase “Your money or your life”.

- **Homonyms.** These, according to Nash, “share a spelling and split a meaning” (141). Unlike homophones, which only share the same pronunciation, homonyms share both the same spelling and pronunciation. They only have a different meaning in different contexts, but are otherwise identical. Nash notes that pun based on these forms are “common, and mostly corny” (141). Examples of homonyms are bank, as in the river bank and a bank where one can deposit there money; bow, as in a ribbon or a hair bow, a weapon to shoot projectiles with, or even the bow of ship; and fall, as in the verb to fall down and the noun to denote autumn. An example of a homonymic pun is found in Nash (141): “Where do fish learn to swim? - In a school”. Here, the pun utilises both meanings of the word, namely a group of fish, and an institution for education.
- **Homonymic Phrases.** These are similar to simple homonyms, but in this case an entire phrase is turned into a homonymic pun. Nash states this is particularly common in making tag jokes, where the added tag to the dialogue completes the joke. An example given by him is: “‘I have designs on you’, as the tattooist said to his girl” (141). In this case, the phrase ‘to have designs on someone’ is to be taken both literally and figuratively; as a tattoo artist, his designs are literally on the girl, but it also has the romantic meaning in which he wishes to make the girl his own. Another example comes from the newspaper: “Winning candidate out for the count”. Here, ‘the count’ is used both literally and figuratively; literally in the sense of counting votes and figuratively as part of the expression ‘out for the count’ which means ‘asleep’ or ‘knocked out’, referring to the fact that the candidate went home to get some sleep before all the votes were counted.
- **Contacts and Blends.** These are not entirely the same, but similar enough for Nash to group them together. They are phrases which “echo other idioms and take a colour of meaning from

them” either in a subtle way, when there is a contact between the two, or in a more obvious way, when there is a blend between the two (142). If someone has “read around in linguistics”, this invokes the idea of ‘sleeping around’, adding an extra layer of meaning to the phrase; this is a contact. A blend is “a sort of idiomatic portmanteau” where two idioms or phrases are mixed to form a new, often incorrect, one (142). An example given of this is “they decided to leave it where sleeping dogs lie”, a blend between ‘let sleeping dogs lie’ and ‘leave it where it lies’. Even though blends can be made on purpose to create a humorous effect, they are often simply a mistake, something which is also referred to as a malapropism. However, it is almost certain every blend found in the films I will be analysing will have been added deliberately, even if it might appear to be a malapropism, as otherwise the mistake would have surely been noticed.

- **Pseudomorphs.** In this case, the punner treats a word as being a compound or derivative, even if it is not. “It is a false form, a pseudomorph” explains Nash (143). The example given by him is “Samson was terribly distressed by Delilah”. This is a homonymic, pseudomorphic pun, as it makes use of both ‘distress’ in the usual meaning of the word, and ‘dis-tress’, treating the ‘dis-’ as a prefix to the noun ‘tress’ which means hair and refers to the fact that Delilah cut Samson’s hair. Prefixes such as ‘dis-’ and ‘ex-’ are often used for this.
- **Portmanteaux.** This is a form made famous by Lewis Carroll, where two words are blended together to make a new term. These are often quite nonsensical, such as ‘slithy’ and ‘mimsy’, and are often used in riddles or poetry. An example given is the riddle: “If buttercups are yellow, what colour are hiccups? – Burple” (143). However, there are also portmanteaux which are now in actual use, such as ‘spork’, a blend between ‘spoon’ and ‘fork’, and ‘cyborg’, a blend between ‘cybernetic’ and ‘organism’.
- **Etymological Puns.** This is a type of scholarly punning “that pleases itself, and any attentive observer, with sly reflections on the etymology of words” (144). These will only be funny, or be noticed, by those with a high education and “are often coldly, even angrily received, being regarded as pretentious and undemocratic” (144). An example Nash gives is “Nero made Rome the focus of his artistic attention” (144). The word ‘focus’ comes from Latin and has the

meaning of ‘fireplace’ or ‘hearth’. This is then humorous because Nero was said to play the fiddle as he watched Rome burn; Rome in this case is truly in focus then. These types of puns are often covert rather than overt, as many other puns are.

- **Bilingual Puns.** These types of puns rely on two languages, often English and another one, to make a joke. “The essence of the bilingual joke is that a foreign word is made to bear the sense of an English word, whether by homophonic accent, by homonymic/semantic contrivance [...], or by literal translation” according to Nash (145). An example, here using English and Latin, is “Here lies Willie Longbottom Aged 6 –*Ars longa, vita brevis*–”. The Latin ‘ars’ sounds like the English slang word ‘arse’, so ‘ars longa’ is similar to ‘longbottom’. This means that the Latin could be, wrongfully, interpreted as ‘long bottom, short life’ or ‘bottom is long, life is short’.
- **Pun-Metaphors.** Here, the punner uses a metaphor or idiom in order to form a pun, usually in combination with a word or phrase that relates to the literal meaning of the metaphor. “Pun-metaphors are often deliberately sloppy” states Nash (146). An example he gives is “Murky consequences of washing our hands of Europe” in which you have the idiom ‘to wash your hands of something’ in combination with ‘murky’ meaning dark or dirty. The idiom is then used in a tongue-in-cheek way in both its literal and figurative meaning and combines this with a related term to create the humorous effect.

Although I will look for all of these different forms in my analysis, some are much more likely to be found than others, due to the nature of the films in this study and the fact that this typology was not based on audiovisual texts. I expect to find many homophones, homonyms, and mimes, but little to no portmanteaux, etymological puns, or bilingual puns. It is also possible some types will occur in combination with each other.

## 2.2. Translating Humour

Since verbal humour travels badly according to Chiaro, the translator should then be extra careful in translating this type of humour. Since I am not concerned with the general translation of humour in

this thesis, I will only look at theory on humour translation briefly, focusing on the notion of equivalence. Following that, I will address Delabastita's model for the translation methods of puns, which I will be working with in the case study. Then, I will pause at some issues specific to the translation of humour, especially in audiovisual texts.

### **2.2.1. Equivalence**

No matter the genre of text, one of the main aspects that the translator must be aware of is that of equivalence. The term 'equivalence' means different things for different scholars but what they can often agree on is that the source text and target text must be similar, since equivalence can never be absolute. Chiaro recognises the inevitability that formal equivalence, meaning a similarity of lexis and syntax, will often be sacrificed for dynamic equivalence, meaning a similarity of function ("Translation and Humour, Humour and Translation" 8). According to her, this sacrifice of formal equivalence is justified, since "recipients of translated humour will expect to be amused by it" (7).

What is important is that the target text serves the same function as the source text, and in the case of humorous texts, this means that "the function would be to amuse the recipient" (9). In Chiaro's opinion then, the most important aspect in the translation of humorous texts is translating the funniness of the text, rather than the actual meaning. This is especially relevant in cases where the jokes might be so to speak untranslatable due to cultural and language specific elements that would be too foreign for the recipient to understand. Chaume too concludes that "[i]n comedy, making the audience laugh is the highest priority of the text, and if this is the case, translators have to manipulate the source text, since keeping the same humoristic element in the translation might be meaningless to the target audience" (148). However, Zabalbeascoa does not fully agree with this. He states that "[i]t would seem that there is often a need to strike a balance between a search for comic effect by making the translated jokes as funny as possible, on the one hand, and, on the other, finding solutions that will not put the viewer off because there is an excessive lack of synchronization; or because the plot, the structure and the coherence of the text are weakened for the sake of witty one-liners" (332). Sanderson too states that in the case of the pun also having a visual referent on the screen, "[t]he semiotic priority

would be the physical referents” that the viewer can see or which the characters act out or refer to “rather than what they are actually saying” in order to improve the coherence between the audio track and the image, even if this means losing the wordplay (128). Although the translator should then attempt to replicate the humorous nature of the source text, they should not go overboard in this, and instead find a balance between preserving both the humour, the plot, and the kinetic synchrony.

### 2.2.2. Translating Wordplay

In my case study, I will be looking at how the found and classified instances of wordplay from the source text are translated into the two target texts. In order to do this, I need an overview of the possible translation methods for the translation of puns. Delabastita, who is an expert on the subject of wordplay, has offered his own suggestions for a range of translation methods for the translation of wordplay (*The Translator* 134). According to him, there are eight possible translation methods, and I will detail these below.

- **PUN > PUN.** In this technique, there is a pun in the source text and language, which is then translated into a pun in the target text and language. It does not necessarily have to be the same type of pun. Delabastita points out that the pun in the target language “may be more or less different from the original” (134). Not only is this change possible, but Delabastita further notes that this method “as a rule involve[s] noticeable translation shifts, [which] may affect the pun’s formal structure, its linguistic make-up, or its meaning content” (135). The only thing that matters here is that the original pun was replaced by another pun, even if that pun features a completely different subject or type. This counts as retention.
- **PUN > NON-PUN.** In this second method, there is a pun in the source text and language, which is then omitted in the target text and language, resulting in a non-pun where originally there had been a pun. This does not mean that the entire segment featuring the pun is omitted, but rather that the pun is changed into something which is not a pun. This can be done in a variety of ways. The translation “may salvage both senses of the wordplay but in a non-punning conjunction, or select one of the senses at the cost of suppressing the other; of course,

it may also occur that both components of the pun are translated ‘beyond recognition’” (134).

This method can then result in a loss of humour, but this is not always the case.

- **PUN > RELATED RHETORICAL DEVICE.** In this method, there is a pun in the source text and language, which is then replaced by a rhetorical device that is not wordplay, but does often feature a play on language, such as “repetition, alliteration, rhyme, referential vagueness, irony, paradox, etc” (134). Although there is an attempt to imitate the effect of the pun found in the source text, loss of humour is possible.
- **PUN > ZERO.** Unlike PUN > NON-PUN, where the pun is simply replaced by something other than a pun, there is truly an omission in this method. The entire segment featuring the wordplay is simply omitted and not replaced by anything else. This might be done when the two languages or cultures are too far apart to find a satisfactory solution and the instance of wordplay is not relevant to the understanding of the text, but it is of course not the preferable solution. Needless to say, this method will feature a loss of humour when used.
- **PUN ST = PUN TT.** Delabastita describes this method by saying that “the translator reproduces the source-text pun and possibly its immediate environments in its original formulation” (134). The pun is not translated at all then, but simply copied into the target text.
- **NON-PUN > PUN.** Here, there is no pun in the source text, and the translator adds one in the target text and language. The original text may have already contained some humour, but this is not a necessity. This method is the opposite of PUN > NON-PUN. It might be used simply because the translator sees the perfect opportunity in the language and context to add a pun, but this method is often chosen in order to compensate for instances of PUN > NON-PUN or PUN > ZERO.
- **ZERO > PUN.** This method goes even further than the previous one in adding an instance of wordplay to the text. Rather than adapting and altering the existing text to formulate a pun, the translator adds “totally new textual material [...] which has no apparent precedent or justification in the source text” (134). A pun is created out of nothing and then added to the text for the sole purpose of compensation.

- **EDITORIAL TECHNIQUES.** In this method the translator uses editorial techniques, such as footnotes or endnotes, forewords, etc. in order to explain or address the wordplay found in the source text and language.

Delabastita notes that several of these methods may be combined and used within the same text. This is also what I expect to find in the case study, as some puns will be translated, but others will not.

Furthermore, however, it should be noted that these translation methods come from a general model, and not one that is specifically made for audiovisual texts. Because of this, it is likely that some of these methods will not be encountered in the case study. The editorial techniques, for instance, may be found in some subtitles made by non-professionals, but are generally not used by professionals.

Furthermore, ZERO > PUN and PUN > ZERO are also unlikely to occur in dubbing, although there is a possibility that they will appear in subtitling. The translator cannot simply omit the image and is therefore also unlikely to be able to omit the text. However, the other translation methods are likely to appear, so the model is still useful for this case study. As can be seen, however, the PUN > PUN option is very broad, and the only prerequisite for this method is that a pun is translated with another pun, no matter how different it might be. Because of that, I will combine Delabastita's translation methods with Nash's typology.

### 2.3. Translation Issues in Humorous Audiovisual Texts

If we consider the most important function of translation of a humorous text to be the production of an equally humorous target text, it is no surprise that the translator might not always have an easy task succeeding in this. Especially considering the translation issues that are frequent in audiovisual texts, the translation of humour in audiovisual texts is then even more difficult. It has to cope with the constraints of the medium, be it dubbing or subbing, as well the possible interference of the image, as I will explain below.

One particular issue that appears in the translation of humour in audiovisual texts is that there are instances where the humour is based on an interaction between the image and the audio. This means that the translator cannot simply omit the joke or even alter it too much, because then the image



and the audio would no longer match up in the target text. Special consideration must then be taken when the joke relies largely on the image. For example, in *Aladdin*, there is a scene in which the genie has been tricked by Aladdin. In response, he turns into a sheep and states “Well, I feel sheepish”. If the translator had chosen to translate this as “Ik voel me dom” or even “Ik voel me zo dom als het achtereind van een varken”, the viewer would have been confused by the image of the genie turning into a sheep. Similarly, if there is a laughter track, as is often the case in situational comedy, the translator must substitute the original joke with one of his own. Otherwise, the audience will hear the canned laughter, but without the presence of a joke.

Wordplay is a very particular type of humour that also brings with it its own inherent translation issues. As Delabastita questions: “if puns owe their meanings and effects to the very structure of the source language, how could they be divorced from that language and be taken across the language barrier?” (*The Translator* 127). There are many answers to this question, each of them depending on different theories and usages of puns, but no matter what the answer is, there is no question that translating puns will often present the translator with a problem that they must resolve. This, however, must be done on a case by case, as there are no universals in punning. Although there are some puns that the translator might be able to easily transpose, perhaps due to the similarity between the languages, or interlingual borrowing, or because the pun is an instance of polysemy, in any other case, the translator will have to rely on their own creativity, as there will likely always be an issue in the translation of the pun.

## Chapter 3: Case Study

This chapter will consist of the analysis of the data that I have collected during my case study, which will be used to determine whether or not the subtitles are a more literal translation, show more retention of wordplay and are funnier. First, I will briefly discuss my methodology, where I explain the research I have done in this case study, in order to clarify the process. Secondly, I will discuss the data I have gathered and then present the results.

### 3.1. Methodology

In this thesis and case study, I have looked at instances of wordplay in animated Disney films and examined the dubbing and the subbing of these forms of wordplay in order to determine whether or not my hypothesis is correct. To do this, I have watched and analysed several Disney films. All the films that were watched are the standard DVD version and were watched on VLC Media Player; only *The Many Adventures of Winnie the Pooh* was viewed on Netflix. The films watched are *The Sword in the Stone* (1963), *The Aristocats* (1970), *The Many Adventures of Winnie the Pooh* (1977), *Aladdin* (1992), *The Lion King* (1994), *The Hunchback of the Notre Dame* (1996), *Hercules* (1997), *The Princess and the Frog* (2009), and *Winnie the Pooh* (2011). I chose these films because of the forms of wordplay I found in them, and used so many films because the variety and number of puns in them vary, and I wanted to have a large and representative corpus to work with. I have chosen to omit the songs in these films from my examination, because they are subject to even more restrictions, as briefly discussed in 1.4., which might have a result on the translation process and procedures used.

In a table (see Appendix A), I listed every instance of wordplay I could find, along with the corresponding dubbed and subbed translations and the approximate timecode. I also made a note of the image if it was relevant to the pun. I then analysed and classified the types of wordplay found in the original and translated texts according to the typology of puns as detailed by Nash (2.1.2.) and looked at which translation method was adopted in order to translate the puns with the help of Delabastita's model for the translation of puns (2.2.2.). Since the aim of this thesis is to determine whether or not

there is a significant difference in the translation of wordplay in the subtitles and the dubbing, I have finally looked at the accumulated data to decide whether or not the subtitled versions of the films showed more retention of wordplay than the dubbed version, and if they did, what form the retention took. Furthermore, I have also decided whether or not the translations were successful in retaining the humour from the source text based on my understanding of humour and personal preference, or if there was a loss of humour. I have chosen to represent this by a number 1 for full loss or addition and 0,5 for slight loss and then tallied the numbers.

Some things should be noted, however. Since I have taken the English texts as my starting point and have only looked at the Dutch translations afterwards, my focus has been more on the source texts than the target texts. This means it is possible that I have missed some ZERO -> PUN and NON-PUN -> PUN instances that have occurred in the translated texts. Additionally, since the examples of wordplay were selected and classified by me, there is a likelihood I did not recognise some instances of wordplay or miscategorised them.

### 3.2. *The Sword in the Stone*

The first and oldest film I looked at was *The Sword in the Stone* (1963). The film is about the young Arthur, nicknamed Wart, who is helped and educated by the wizard Merlin, until it is finally revealed he is the mythical King Arthur. This film does not contain many instances of wordplay and relies more on anachronisms, visual gags and mostly on rhetorical devices such as rhyme and alliteration for humour. However, there are some instances of wordplay.

#### *Example 1*

<p><i>[Merlin checks his watch, Archimedes sticks his head out of his birdhouse]</i>          Merlin: He should be here in, uh, I'd say half an hour          Archimedes: Who? Who? I'd like to know who</p>	
<p>Sub: -Hij kan hier over 'n half uur zijn          -Wie? Ik wil graag weten wie.</p>	<p>Dub: -Hij kan hier zijn over een klein half uurtje.          -Wie? Wie? Nou, nou, ik wil weten wie</p>

Although this first example is not extremely funny, there is a pun hidden in there. The owl Archimedes sticks his head out of his birdhouse and repeats ‘who’ several times. This is a homophone with the hooting sound owls make, sometimes spelled as ‘who-o-o’ or just ‘hoo’. Especially since the single word is used and repeated, it is reminiscent of the birdcall, making it a clear pun. Both Dutch translations follow the same pattern and have translated this as PUN > NON-PUN. They have chosen to focus on the literally meaning, since that is the most important one here, translating the pun simply as ‘wie’. There is then a loss of humour in both translations.

*Example 2*

<i>[Wart falls through the roof, into a chair at the table]</i>	
Merlin: So, you, you did drop in for tea after all	
Sub: Zo, je komt toch maar even binnenvallen voor de thee?	Dub: Dus je komt even binnenvallen

This is an instance of wordplay that relies heavily on the image, since Merlin’s comment relates to Wart falling through the roof. This is then a homonym, since ‘drop in’ is used literally, but also figuratively in the meaning of visiting someone. Both Dutch translations translate this in a similar way, using ‘binnenvallen’ for ‘drop in’. This too has the literal reference to Wart falling from the roof, but also the figurative meaning of stopping by unexpectedly. Both translations use a PUN > PUN method and have no loss of humour, accurately mimicking the original text.

*Example 3*

Wart: He was a monster! The biggest fish I ever saw	
Sir Ector: And boy, that’s the biggest fish story I ever heard	
Sub: -Hij was ’n monster. Een enorme vis -Beter visserslatijn heb ik nog nooit gehoord	Dub: -Het was een monster! De grootste vis van de wereld -En Wart, das het beste visserslatijn van de wereld

Here, Wart is describing what happened after Merlin turned him into a fish. He was attacked by a giant pike who tried to eat him. Sir Ector questions his story, saying it is a ‘fish story’. This is then a homonym, since Wart’s story is not only figuratively a ‘fish story’, meaning an unlikely tale, but it is also literally a fish story, since he is chronicling what happened when he was a fish. However, part of

the humour relies on the rhetorical device of parallel syntax, in which Sir Ector imitates Wart's phrasing but replaces 'fish' with 'fish story' and 'saw' with 'heard'. The translation has to mimic both of these elements in order to retain the humour.

Both target texts translate 'fish story' as 'visserslatijn'. Although this is the literal translation, and still retains the allusion to fish, this is not a term that applies both literally and figuratively. As such, it cannot be said to be a homonym. None of Nash's types seem to apply to this joke, which is clearly a form of wordplay, since it relies on language, but the joke is largely formed by the word 'vissers', an allusion to Wart being a fish. It can be said, however, that the translations are PUN > PUN, even if it is unclear what type the pun is. The parallel syntax has only been maintained in the dub. Although it is not the same one as in the source text, both lines contain a superlative, namely 'grootste' and 'beste', but more importantly, there is epiphora or end repetition in both lines, mirroring the parallel syntax. The sub then has slight loss of humour, the dub none.

*Example 4*

Sir Ector: Well he's either out of his head, or there's something mighty fishy going on around here	
Sub: Of hij is niet goed snik, of ik moet dit eens uitvissen	Dub: Of hij is niet goed bij zijn hoofd, of ik moet eens uitvissen wat hier aan de hand is

This example is very similar to example 3. Here too the original pun is a homonym, using both the figurative meaning of 'fishy' as 'suspicious' or 'weird' and the literal meaning of something to do with fish to create the joke. Both the sub and the dub translate this differently, but they retain the reference to fish by using 'uitvissen'. This word is only used in the figurative meaning it normally has, but the allusion to fish is also included. Again, it cannot be said that this instance of wordplay fits into any of Nash's categories. However, it is still a PUN > PUN translation, with both the subtitle and the dubbing showing no loss of humour.

The subtitle and the dub of this film do not show large differences when it comes to translating the wordplay. Both have three instances of PUN > PUN translations and one that is PUN > NON-PUN, and these instances coincide between the texts. The subtitles show two slight instances of humour loss, and the dub shows one. Most interestingly, out of the four examples, there were two,

technically four if counting the subtitles and dub separately, instances in the translation where I could not satisfactorily type the puns. Already, it is clear that Nash's typology will present some issues in this case study.

### 3.3. *The Aristocats*

The next film I looked at was *The Aristocats* (1970). This film is about a mother cat and her three kittens, who are set to inherit a large amount of money and are catnapped by the butler, who wishes to inherit the fortune instead. With the help of street cat O'Malley, and hindrance of the two geese Abigail and Amelia Gabble, they attempt to find their way back to Paris and to their owner. The film contains a surprising number of puns, specifically puns related to animals. Perhaps this should not have been surprising, as the title of the film is already a pun. *The Aristocats* is a play on the word 'aristocrats' where the syllable '-crat' has been replaced with the word cat. This pun is a mime, since one word has been replaced with a similar sounding one. The title is translated in Dutch as *De Aristokatten*, which is also a pun, meaning there is here a PUN > PUN translation. This pun is a mime too and uses the same elements as the source text joke; the word 'aristokraten' sees '-kraten' replaced with 'katten'. The pun works slightly less well in Dutch since the two words sound less similar than they do in English, but is nevertheless effective, meaning there is only a slight loss of humour here. The term is only used in the opening sequence of the film, so this has no great effect. I will now discuss some examples and translations of wordplay I found in the film.

#### Example 5

<i>[The two geese dive, their bottoms stick up out of the water]</i>	
Geese: Bottoms up!	
Sub: Duiken	Dub: N/A

This example is particularly interesting, as it is the only one of its kind I have found. In this scene, O'Malley the cat is almost drowning in the river and he is spotted by two geese, who follow him into the water to observe his progress. When he submerges they decide to help him. They say 'bottoms up' and dive under. In English, this term is an expression that refers to downing a glass of, generally,

alcohol, and literally describes the process of drinking by lifting up the bottom of the glass. In the source text, however, it refers to the diving, where they literally put their bottoms up, by putting their heads underwater. In the subtitle, the literal meaning has been translated because of kinetic synchrony, resulting in a PUN > NON-PUN. What is striking about this example is that in the dub this entire line has been removed. There is here a PUN > ZERO translation, when a PUN > NON-PUN would also have been possible. Both translations feature a loss of humour.

*Example 6*

<p><i>[O'Malley reluctantly greets the two geese]</i>  O'Malley: Hiya, chicks  <i>[geese giggle]</i>  Goose Sister: We're not chickens, we're geese!</p>	
<p>Sub: -Hallo, Meisjes  -We zijn geen meisjes, maar ganzen</p>	<p>Dub: -Hi, meisjes  -Zijn geen meisjes, gansjes!</p>

The original text gives us an example of a homonym, where the word 'chicks' can be interpreted as O'Malley means it, namely as a slang term for 'girls', or as referring to either the abbreviated form of 'chicken' or to the young of a chicken, as the geese understand it. The sub and the dub both take the same approach, by translating the meaning of 'chicks' that O'Malley meant and removing the entire element of 'chickens' from the translation. Instead, the geese now giggle that they are not 'meisjes'. Since they are in fact girl geese, this translation only works in the very literal sense, but certainly does not have the same ambiguity of the source text. Both translations then feature PUN > NON-PUN and loss of humour.

*Example 7*

<p><i>[Drunk Uncle Waldo greets his nieces, the two geese sisters]</i>  Uncle Waldo: My favorite nooses!</p>	
<p>Sub: Mijn allerliefste nichtjes</p>	<p>Dub: Alles kits</p>

Although this is not entirely clear, it seems that 'nooses' is a portmanteau; a combination of the words 'nieces' and 'goose'. Both the subtitles and the dub remove this element, replacing it with something more recognisable and neutral. The subtitle follows the literal meaning of the source text

and simply translates ‘nieces’ into ‘nichtjes’, but the dub removes the entire element and replaces it with the general greeting ‘Alles kits’. Although the subtitle translation is more literal and logical, both the sub and the dub have used the PUN > NON-PUN method and show humour loss.

*Example 8*

<p><i>[Drunk Uncle Waldo is held up by his two nieces]</i>          Uncle Waldo: Birds of a feather must hic together!          Goose Sister: That’s stick together</p>	
<p>Sub: -Ik ga mee, dan ben ik in m’n hik          -In m’n schik, bedoelt u</p>	<p>Dub: -En we gaan nog niet naar huis          -Oja, we gaan wel</p>

This is an example of a mime, where the words ‘hic’ and ‘stick’ sound very similar, making the expression recognisable despite the small difference and creating the humorous effect of the drunk Uncle Waldo who keeps saying silly things. The sub retains the mime quite literally, using ‘hik’ and ‘schik’ in the translation; this is then a case of PUN > PUN translation, where the target text pun even has the same type. In the dub, however, this situation has been altered. Uncle Waldo now sings a well-known Dutch song, stating he is not yet ready to go home, but his nieces insist that they will. Although there is a PUN > NON-PUN translation here, the contradiction between ‘we gaan nog niet naar huis’ and ‘we gaan wel’ is somewhat humorous. In the sub, there is then a fairly literal translation with no humour loss, and in the dub there is a more free translation, with slight humour loss.

*Example 9*

<p>Goose: We’re on holiday          Goose: For a walking tour of France          Goose: We’re swimming some of the way          Goose: On water, of course</p>	
<p>Sub: - We zijn op reis          - We wandelen          - En zwemmen          - In het water</p>	<p>Dub: - Ja, we zijn met vakantie          - We werken bij het GAK          - Maar we maken nu een tour          - Een Tour de France</p>

This is another interesting example found in the film. Whereas both the source text and the subtitles, which is a literal translation of the source, do not feature any instances of wordplay, the dubbed text does. This is a very clear example of an instance in which the dubbed text strays from the original.



This piece of source text is not particularly important, and so the translator of the dub has taken the opportunity to use the NON-PUN > PUN method here. The geese say they work at the GAK, which is a homophonic pun, referring to the old Dutch ‘Gemeenschappelijk Administratiekantoor’ that is now the ‘UWV’ and the sound that geese make. This is a joke that children, particularly now, will not really pick up on, but because of the onomatopoeic sound, it will likely still be funny.

This film also contains some forms of wordplay which are particularly interesting due to the fact that they are difficult to classify with Nash’s typology. Some could be considered to fall under one of the categories, granted that I stretch their meanings a bit, but others are more similar to examples 3 and 4, which are clear examples of allusion within wordplay, and are not a listed type.

*Example 10*

<i>[Lawyer George falls down the stairs, Butler Edgar rushes to help him]</i>	
Edgar: May I give you a hand?	
George: You haven’t got an extra foot, have you, Edgar?	
Sub: -Laat me u een handje helpen -Je kunt me zeker geen voet lenen, hè?	Dub: -Mag ik u een arm geven, meneer? -Ja, je werkt graag met je ellebogen, hè?

George’s answer to Edgar is a clear play on the idiom ‘to give someone a hand’, meaning to help them. George pretends to understand this phrase literally, and asks if Edgar instead does not have a foot he can lend him. This could then be classified as a homonymic phrase, although the punchline of the joke ‘You haven’t got an extra foot, have you’ is not a homonymic phrase in itself, but merely a response to one. The subtitles attempts a PUN > PUN translation, but fail in this. If the translation had been more literal, and ‘handje helpen’ had been ‘hand geven’ or ‘arm geven’, the translated pun would have been successful and even humorous, but as it is, it is neither, and just results in some awkward sentence coherence. Funnily enough, the dub does translate ‘give a hand’ as ‘arm geven’, but then changes the second line, which consequently also results in a PUN > NON-PUN. George’s response here perhaps works as a foreshadowing to Edgar’s evil plot of catnapping the kittens and claiming all the money for himself, seeing as ‘ellebogenwerk’ in Dutch refers to achieving one’s goals in a dishonest way, but the original has no foreshadowing and it is not necessary. The foreshadowing

makes sense retrospectively perhaps, but is not particularly humorous. In both translations, there is then a slightly awkward PUN > NON-PUN and loss of humour.

*Example 11*

<p><i>[Edgar wants to put Duchess and her kittens into a burlap sack, mouse Roquefort tries to warn them]</i>          Edgar: Duchess, wherever have you been?          Roquefort: Look out for the... sack</p>	
<p>Sub: -Duchess, waar heb jij gezeten?          -Pas op voor de... zak</p>	<p>Dub: -Duchess, we zaten in zak en as          -Ja, die zak! Die zak</p>

The source text shows no wordplay here, and neither does the subtitled translation. However, in the dub, we can see a slight alteration has been made. Edgar now uses the idiom ‘in zak en as zitten’, meaning to be worried about someone. Roquefort, the cats’ small mouse friend, knows what Edgar is about to attempt and tries to warn the cats, by responding directly to Edgar’s use of ‘zak’.

Additionally, on the screen, we now see Edgar put the cats into a burlap sack. This combination of the idiom ‘in zak en as zitten’, Roquefort’s interaction with the word ‘zak’ in a literal meaning, and the image which shows the sack, creates what would be best described as a pun-metaphor; a combination of the figurative meaning of a metaphor or idiom with a literal related element. Both Roquefort’s dialogue and the image work as the literal element here. In the dub, there is then a NON-PUN > PUN with added humour.

*Example 12*

<p><i>[The two giggling geese help a drunk Uncle Waldo]</i>          Goose: You’re just too much          Goose: You mean he’s had too much</p>	
<p>Sub: -Oom Waldo, u bent me er eentje          -Nee, hij heeft er eentje te veel op</p>	<p>Dub: -U bent me der eentje hoor          -Nee, geen eendje, hij is een gans</p>

According to Nash’s list of the most common puns, this joke in the source text would not be a pun, despite its playful use of the language. This example mirrors example 3 from *The Sword in the Stone*, where parallel syntax is used to create a humorous effect. The subbed translation is a mostly literal translation of the source text, also containing the rhetorical device of parallel syntax. There is then a preservation of humour, despite the fact that this is not a pun. The dubbed translation, however, does

suddenly contain a pun. The joke is based on the homophones ‘eentje’ and ‘eendje’, playfully stating that Uncle Waldo is not a duck, but a goose. This joke is similar to the joke in example 6, where there is also a mention of another type of poultry before this is corrected by saying that they are in fact geese, and no other type of bird. This can then be considered a very clever example of compensation, even mimicking a pun that was lost. The dub then has a NON-PUN > PUN with added humour.

This next example, as examples 14 and 15, are similar to examples 3 and 4 and cannot be typed according to Nash’s typology. Most of these puns that cannot be qualified are closest to homonyms, with a word that has one, possibly figurative, meaning, but also is or contains a word that is an allusion to something else in the film, and this latter part is what creates the joke. It should be noted that these forms so far were all found in the Dutch translations, often in a NON-PUN > PUN situation. It is then possible that this type of punning is typical for and particular to the Dutch, which is why it is not found in Nash’s typology.

*Example 13*

<i>[Uncle Waldo explains he was almost cooked in wine]</i>	
Uncle Waldo: Being British, I would have preferred Sherry. Sherry, Sherry.	
Sub: Als Engelsman had ik liever Sherry gehad Sherry, Sherry.	Dub: En nu ben ik helemaal ongans. Ongans, ongans.

Neither the source text nor the subtitle contain a pun. The dub, however, does contain a form of wordplay, though it cannot be placed under any of Nash’s types. The word ‘ongans’ means ‘unwell’ or stuffed with food, which is quite fitting in this case, but it is clear that the main reason this word was chosen is because it contains the word ‘gans’, or ‘goose’. Although Waldo may figuratively feel ‘ongans’, but he does not literally feel this, and so there can be no confusion between the figurative meaning and the pseudomorphish literal meaning. This is not a homonym then. The joke is partially based on the reference of ‘ongans’ to Waldo being a goose, just as ‘uitvissen’ and ‘visserslatjin’ were funny because they alluded to Walt being a fish. Although it is then a NON-PUN > PUN translation with added humorous effect, the pun cannot be classified according to Nash’s typology.

## Example 14

<i>[Scat Cat compliments Duchess]</i> Scat Cat: You're too much	
Sub: Wat een snoezepoes	Dub: Snoezepoes

Again, the source text does not contain a form of wordplay, but both the subtitle and the dub do. The translators have chosen to use the word 'snoezepoes'. This is a term of endearment meaning 'darling', but similarly to the examples mentioned above, the word also contains the Dutch word for cat, namely 'poes'. The translation then uses a word which applies figuratively, but also contains a joke in the reference to the fact that Duchess is literally a cat. For both the sub and the dub, there is then a NON-PUN > PUN, with added humorous elements.

## Example 15

All it needs is a little tidying up and, well, maybe a feminine touch	
Sub: Er moet wel wat opgeruimd worden en er is een vrouwenpoot nodig	Dub: Het kan hier natuurlijk gezelliger worden, het heeft hier en daar een vrouwenpoot nodig

The source text 'feminine touch' has been replaced in both translations with 'vrouwenpoot'. This is literal, of course, since Duchess has paws, but it is also a pun since the normal word 'hand' has been replaced with 'poot'. This, even more than the other examples, shows a clear case of allusion which creates the humorous effect, but is also clearly a form of wordplay. Although both the subtitle and dub are then NON-PUN > PUN translations and have added humorous elements, this form of wordplay too cannot be qualified.

This film presents the first case where I have observed some significant differences between the subtitles and the dub. Six instances of wordplay were found in the original text, of which the subtitle translated two into a pun, and the dub merely one. However, the dub showed a surprising six instances of NON-PUN > PUN, whereas the subtitles only had two. The Dutch subtitles then contained four puns by my count, with the dub containing seven. Unsurprisingly then, although both translation showed a similar amount of humour loss, the dub had six instances of added humour, and

the subtitles only two. In this case then, at least where wordplay is concerned, the dub was the more successful and funnier one.

### 3.4. *The Many Adventures of Winnie the Pooh*

As the name implies *The Many Adventures of Winnie the Pooh* (1977) consists of ‘many’, precisely four, short stories detailing the adventures of Winnie the Pooh and his friends, and features some classic cases of jokes based on misunderstandings that sometimes even turn into dialogue. Many of the misunderstandings and puns are then explained away, so whilst the original ambiguity is very much intended, it often also resolved again.

#### Example 16

<i>[Sign above the door says MR SANDERS]</i>	
Narrator: Winnie the Pooh lived in this enchanted forest under the name of Sanders	
Sub: Winnie de Poeh woonde in het bos, onder de naam Sanders	Dub: Winnie de Poeh woonde ergens in het Honderd Bunderbos onder de naam Sanders

This joke here arises largely from viewer expectations. The combination of ‘living under the name of’ suggests that this is the name someone goes by, as that is normal meaning of this phrase. This expectation is then thwarted when the narrator explains that Pooh literally lives under the name Sanders; it is written above his door. This is a homonymic phrase, where the humour is caused by the difference between the figurative and literal meaning of the phrase ‘live under the name of Sanders’. Both the sub and the dub are a largely literal translation using PUN > PUN, with no loss of humour.

#### Example 17

<i>[The door to a cuckoo clock is open, a little honey pot with a Pooh in it comes out]</i>	
Narrator: Now, when Pooh heard his Pooh-coo clock, he knew it was time for something	
Sub: Toen Poeh zijn Poeh-koeksklok hoorde wist hij dat het tijd was	Dub: Op een keerde hoorde Poeh zijn tijd-voor-iets klok slaan, en hij had het gevoel dat het tijd voor iets was

This is a rare example of a mime in *Winnie the Pooh*. The word ‘cuckoo clock’ has here been changed into ‘Pooh-coo clock’. This works very well, since ‘Pooh’ even rhymes with ‘coo’ and sounds similar

to the ‘cu’ element, which is generally pronounced with an /u:/. Additionally, the little bird in the cuckoo clock is now a small Pooh in a honey pot, so the image matches the text. The subtitles copy this translation, where ‘Poeh’ also rhymes with ‘koe’, and so this translation works similarly to the source text pun. This is then a PUN > PUN translation with no humour loss. The dub, however, has drastically changed this element. ‘Pooh-coo clock’ now becomes ‘tijd-voor-iets klok’. Although there is now a repetition of ‘tijd voor iets’ in both lines, this is not a form of wordplay and it is not humorous. The dub then has a PUN > NON-PUN translation with loss of humour.

*Example 18*

<i>[Christopher Robin has just attached Eeyore’s tail with a nail]</i> Eeyore: It’s not much of a tail, but I’m sort of attached to it	
Sub: Veel staart is het niet, maar ik ben eraan gehecht	Dub: -(hij hangt weer!) -Ik hang ook erg aan hem

Eeyore here comments that he is attached to his tail. This is funny, because the image has just shown Christopher Robin physically attaching Eeyore’s tail to his body with a nail and hammer. Although Eeyore is certainly sentimental about it, he is not merely figuratively attached to his tail, but also literally. This is then an example of a homonym, where this word has two meanings and so creates the humour. The subtitle has a literal translation of the original text. ‘I’m sort of attached to it’ now becomes ‘ik ben eraan gehecht’. The Dutch ‘gehecht’ can be used for both physical and emotional attachment, and so works in the same way as the source text does. The subtitle then has a PUN > PUN translation with no humour loss. The dubbed translation has Eeyore saying ‘ik hang ook erg aan hem’ in response to Roo’s joyful exclamation of ‘hij hangt weer’. Although ‘hangen aan’ has the figurative meaning of being attached to something, the literal meaning does not work here. The tail ‘hangt aan’ Eeyore, but Eeyore does not literally hang on the tail. The mouth movements of this character do not seem to prevent him using the word ‘gehecht’, so this seems to sadly be a missed opportunity by the translator. The dub is then a PUN > NON-PUN translation with loss of humour.

*Example 19*

Pooh: Happy winds-day!
------------------------

Sub: Vrolijk waaifeest	Dub: Vrolijk waaifeest
------------------------	------------------------

It is a particularly blustery day in the Hundred Acre Wood, and Pooh is wishing everyone a happy ‘winds-day’. The pronunciation of ‘winds-’ sounds very much like ‘wednes-’ in ‘Wednesday’, with only the /ɪ/ and the /ɛ/ sounds differing. Because of this similarity between the two words, the pun is a mime. Although the pun does not necessarily function as a joke here, there is an unmistakable connection made between ‘winds-day’ and ‘Wednesday’, which makes it at least somewhat humorous when viewing the film. The phrase is repeated by Pooh several times and this repetition means the wordplay cannot simply be swept under the rug. The subtitles and the dub have used the same translation, namely ‘vrolijk waaifeest’. The nonsense term ‘waaifeest’ is created specifically for this translation, but it is not a pun. The translation is then PUN > NON-PUN, but since the source text does not function as a joke, the loss of humour here is only minimal.

*Example 20*

Roo: What’s the matter Tigger?	
Tigger: Oh thank goodness, I was just getting seasick, from seeing too much	
Sub: -Wat is er, Teigertje? -Gelukkig, ik werd zeeziek omdat ik te veel dingen zag	Dub: -Ben je nu al moe, Teigertje? -Lieve help, ik word echt zeeziek van het kijken naar beneden

Tigger and Roo are up in a tree and Roo is swinging on one of the branches, making the tree shake. Tigger has just realised how high up they are and urges Roo to stop swinging. Roo asks him what is wrong and Tigger replies that he was getting ‘seesick from seeing too much’. This, of course, is a play on ‘seasick’, since ‘see’ and ‘sea’ are homophones. These, however, are not homophones in Dutch. The subtitle translates the word as one normally would, from ‘seasick’ into ‘zeeziek’. Not only does this mean the pun is lost, but both humour and coherence are now also gone. ‘Ik werd zeeziek omdat ik te veel dingen zag’ is what Tigger now says. There is no correlation between being seasick and seeing things. It would have made more sense to translate ‘van al dat schommelen’, since Roo has been causing the tree to swing. Here, the literal translation is not suitable. The dub does a similar thing, but has the excuse of the necessary lip syncing. ‘Seesick’ is here too translated as ‘zeeziek’ and

it is ‘van het kijken naar beneden’. Again, this makes little sense, and it would have been more logical if he had said he had ‘hoogtevrees’ instead of ‘zeeziek’. As such, both translation are PUN > NON-PUN with a full loss of humour.

*Example 21*

<p>Owl: Blast it all  Gopher: Good idea! We’ll dynamite. Save time  Owl: Ah, what’s the charge?  Gopher: The charge, oh about seven sticks of dynamite  Owl: No, no, no, the cost! The charge in money?  Gopher: Nope, no charge account. I work strictly cash.  Owl: Obviously, but I should think...</p>	
<p>Sub: -Wat een klap  -Goed idee. Met dynamiet  -Hoeveel?  -Hoeveel? Een staaf of zeven  -Hoe hoog wordt de rekening?  -Nee, niet op rekening. Alleen contant.  -.....</p>	<p>Dub: (Daar trap ik niet in)  -Waar trapt u niet in?  -We kunnen de boel intrappen, of opblazen  -Wat bedoelt u met opblazen?  -Een goeie lange lont en zeven staven dynamiet  -Onzin, ik vroeg naar uw uurloon  -Ach, ik doe het in ieder geval niet meer zwart, oh nee  -ik hoef de kleur niet te weten</p>

This is a great example of the extended use of homonyms in this film. This entire dialogue is based around misunderstandings due to homonyms. Pooh is stuck in Rabbit’s doorway, and Owl asks Gopher an estimate for the costs of digging him out. Gopher will not give the estimate, prompting Owl’s response ‘blast it all’. He means this as the expletive, but Gopher takes it literally and assumes Owl speaks of blowing up the hole. ‘We’ll dynamite,’ he exclaims. Owl is still thinking about the costs, and asks Gopher what the charge will be. Gopher, again, takes this the wrong way, thinking he speaks of the ‘charge’ of gunpowder or dynamite that is necessary to blow up the hole, and responds to this. Owl then corrects him, stating he means the ‘charge in money’. This cannot be taken to mean anything else than money matters, but Gopher still manages to misunderstand. He does not work with charge accounts, only cash money. This elaborate misunderstanding seems to be classic humour for Winnie the Pooh and an instance of this can also be found in the other Winnie the Pooh film discussed in section 3.9. The subtitle attempts to do a similar thing, but the misunderstanding is slightly more contrived here. Owl says ‘wat een klap’, which could be interpreted in the same literal and figurative



meaning as in the source text, but the line makes less sense, since Gopher not giving an estimate can hardly be called a ‘klap’. Nevertheless, it creates the misunderstanding, and Gopher agrees they can do this with ‘dynamiet’. Owl then asks ‘hoeveel?’, referring to the amount of money. It would have been more logical for Owl to ask ‘hoeveel geld?’ or ‘hoeveel kost het?’, but for the sake of the joke, this has not been done and he simply asks ‘hoeveel?’ which gives Gopher the opportunity to misunderstand him. Owl clarifies yet again, and this time the translated pun does work very well, since ‘rekening’ can mean both ‘bill’ and ‘account’ or ‘tab’, and Gopher understands the latter. The wordplay has been translated, so this is a PUN > PUN, but the conversation flows less naturally. The dub suffers from the same problem as the subtitles do, but to an even larger extent. In order to create the misunderstandings, the dialogue loses some of its credibility and naturalness. Before the start of the conversation, after Owl asks him for the estimate, Gopher states ‘daar trap ik niet in’. Owl, confused, asks him ‘Waar trapt u niet in?’. Subsequently, Gopher replies ‘We kunnen we de boel intrappen’. This is strange, because the only reason Owl uses this term is because Gopher already did, meaning Gopher himself creates his own misunderstanding by using the term in two different ways. Owl then asks him ‘Wat bedoelt u met opblazen?’ to which Gopher gives an explanation. Owl then exclaims ‘Onzin, ik vroeg naar uw uurloon’. This again is slightly strange. In the source text and the subtitle, Owl inquires after the costs, but this is interpreted by Gopher as being about the possible explosion. In the dub, however, Owl does not inquire after the cost, but specifically asks about the blowing up of the hole. So he did in fact ask about the explosion rather than the costs. This phrase would then refer back to before this conversation, when he requested an estimate. Again, this is somewhat too contrived to feel like a natural conversation. Here, there is no more misunderstanding and Gopher simply states ‘ik doe het in ieder geval niet meer zwart’. The translator has attempted to compensate here, by having Owl miss the figurative meaning of ‘zwart werken’ and understanding this literally as the colour black. This compensation works only slightly, as it is not entirely clear what would be black if this were meant literally. The translation is then a very stretched PUN > PUN translation, and has a slight loss of humour, since the misunderstandings are somewhat too farfetched..

Through these examples of similar puns it becomes very clear that this film uses a particular kind of humour which can often be translated rather literally to achieve equivalence. Interestingly, this

film has largely opposite results to *The Aristocats* discussed before. Here, out of a total of six puns, the subtitles use PUN > PUN four times, whereas the dub only does this two times. Out of the six translations, the subtitles show merely two instances of humour loss, one of those being only slight, coinciding with the PUN > NON-PUN translations. The dub, however, shows five instances of humour loss, with two being slight. One of these occurs even though there is a pun in the translation, proving that using a pun does not always result in humour.

### 3.5. *Aladdin*

Although it is a very funny film, *Aladdin* (1992) does not feature many instances of wordplay, showing that the quantity of wordplay in a film says nothing about how funny it is. The story is about the homeless boy Aladdin who falls in love with princess Jasmine and uses the magic lamp and Genie he has found in order to impress her. Much of the humour revolves around Genie, who transforms himself and his environment into numerous silly things. There are many references to pop culture and other Disney films, which add to the humour in the film. The reason I mention this film here despite the minimal use of wordplay is because of these are excellent examples of wordplay that utilise the multimodality of the text.

#### Example 22

<i>[Genie hangs Aladdin on a nail in the wall]</i>	
Genie: Hang on a second	
Sub: Momentje	Dub: Ach, blijf effe hangen

This is an example of a homonymic phrase. Normally this phrase is used in the figurative sense, meaning ‘wait a moment’, and that too is what Genie means; he wants to stretch his neck, and Aladdin has to wait until he is done. However, Genie also utilises the literal meaning of ‘to hang’ by hanging Aladdin on the wall while he waits, which can be seen on the image. The subtitle shows a PUN > NON-PUN, and only translates the figurative meaning of ‘to hang on’. Although the visual humour remains, it is less logical without the accompanying text, and so less funny. The dub gives an almost literal translation of the source text and therefore also translates the literal meaning more closely.

However, in Dutch, this form of ‘to hang’ can also have the figurative meaning of ‘hang around’. This is then also a pun in Dutch and results in PUN > PUN, with the translation also being a homonymic phrase, and featuring no loss of humour.

*Example 23*

<i>[Genie turns himself into a sheep]</i>	
Genie: I feel sheepish	
Sub: Ik voel me ‘n dom schaap	Dub: Wat ben ik een schaapskop

Here we see a homonym that once again works together with the image to make the joke. Aladdin has tricked the Genie into helping him without using up one of his three wishes. Genie notes that he feels ‘sheepish’; figuratively, he feels a bit dumb for being fooled, but to emphasise this, he literally turns into a sheep for a short while. This time, kinetic synchronisation is more important than in the previous example, as Genie turning into a sheep would make no sense without a verbal reference. It is no surprise then to see that both translations incorporate the ‘sheep’ element into the translation. The subtitle has an explicitation that features both meanings of ‘sheepish’, feeling dumb and feeling like a sheep. Although it is still effective in explaining the image, the explicitation makes it slightly less funny and the wordplay is lost, meaning there is a slight loss of humour and PUN > NON-PUN translation here. The dub uses ‘schaapskop’ which is both literal, but also means ‘domoor’. In this case, we then have a PUN > PUN translation, with the target text pun being a homonym.

*Example 24*

<i>[Genie has turned himself into a bee and is whispering advice into Aladdin’s ear]</i>	
Aladdin: Buzz off!	
[...]	
Genie: Be(e) yourself!	
Sub: -Opzoemen -Denk eraan, blijf jezelf!	Dub: -Vlieg op -Hou je hersens bij elkaar

The jokes in the source text revolve around Genie turning himself into a bee and so only work in combination with the image. In the first instance, Aladdin tells Genie to ‘buzz off’ which echoes phrases such as ‘piss off’ or even ‘fuck off’. Although this is a tricky one to classify, and reminiscent

of the examples talked about in *The Sword and the Stone* and *The Aristocats*, it is likely a homonymic phrase. Genie is literally buzzing, since he is a bee, but he is also requested to ‘buzz off’ figuratively. The subtitle echoes this idea, using ‘opzoemen’. This, again, can be taken literally, since ‘zoemen’ is a literal translation of ‘buzz’, but this term too seems to be an adaptation of phrases such as ‘oprotten’, meaning to get lost. The sub is therefore a PUN > PUN translation, and also a tentative homonymic phrase. The dub too does a similar thing, using ‘vlieg op’. This is an existing expression, also meaning to get lost, but the word ‘vlieg’ can also be interpreted as ‘fly’, which is an insect just like a bee, but also simply means ‘to fly’, which is what bees do. This too is then a PUN > PUN translation featuring a homonymic phrase. Both translations have no humour loss.

The second aspect is Genie telling Aladdin: ‘Be yourself’. Normally, this would not be funny at all, but in combination with the image, it is. After all, the word ‘be’ is a homophone with the word ‘bee’, which is what the image is currently showing. Genie also puts some emphasis on this word, so the joke cannot be missed. The subtitle removes this ambiguity and uses the literal meaning, which results in a PUN > NON-PUN and significant humour loss. The translation in the dub is more free and also slightly more contrived, but it does feature the word ‘bij’, which functions both as the preposition and a reference to Genie’s bee form. The dub then has a PUN > PUN translation with no humour loss.

In these examples, the subtitles are a more literal translation of the source text than the dub. They often translate the most common meaning of the pun and thereby erase the ambiguity which causes the humour. Out of the four instances of wordplay I found, in the subtitles three puns result in a NON-PUN, with only one pun being retained. This results in two instances of complete loss of humour, and one slight loss of humour. The dub, in comparison, has a PUN > PUN translation four out of four times, and no humour loss. Here, the dub is then more successful in its retention, despite the fact that the subtitles seem to be a more literal translation of the source text.

### **3.6. *The Lion King***

*The Lion King* (1994) contains some examples of classic and unmistakable puns. The story is about Simba, son of the King of the Savannah Mufasa. When Mufasa gets killed by his jealous brother Scar,

who tries to take over the kingdom with the help of some unsavoury hyenas, Simba flees and encounters meerkat Timon and warthog Pumba, who give him a new home. These last two characters, as well as the hyenas, are the origin of most of the humour in this film, and most of the humour comes from corny puns. These puns are not only obvious to the audience, but often also to the characters themselves.

The following three examples come from a scene in which a young Simba and his friend Nala have ventured outside of their kingdom. They find themselves in an elephant graveyard, confronted by a group of Scar's hyenas, who threaten to eat them, but do so jokingly through a series of obvious puns they themselves laugh at.

*Example 25*

Banzai: We could have whatever is <i>lion</i> around	
Sub: Als wij het leeuwendeel maar krijgen	Dub: Dan nemen wij wel het leeuwendeel

This is a blatantly obvious pun. The joke is set up very clearly, with emphasis in this line being very much on the word 'lion', which sounds similar to the word 'lying'. This refers to the fact that, if given the chance, the hyenas would eat the two lion cubs. This pun could be seen as both a homophone and a mime. If pronounced correctly, the word 'lying' would not sound like the word 'lion' and the words would only be similar, so then the pun would be considered a mime. However, due to the character's accent, the words are pronounced the same. In fact, they sound so similar that the English subtitles even use the word 'lion', so that the joke would carry over to non-hearers. It is then more a homophone than mime. Since homophones can be tricky to translate, it is no surprise that both the sub and dub have changed the joke somewhat. In Dutch, the allusion to lions has been retained by using 'leeuwendeel' or the lion's share. Although this is similar to some of the jokes that contained a referential element and could not be typed, this one is easier to classify. Although 'leeuwendeel' usually refers to the largest part of the work, it is also simply a large amount. Were the hyenas to eat the two cubs, they would literally and figuratively have the 'leeuwendeel'. This is then a PUN > PUN, using a homonym to create the pun. The humour is partially resolved, but the homonym here is not as funny as the original homophone was, therefore both translations have a slight loss of humour.

## Example 26

Shenzi: Make mine a <i>cub</i> sandwich	
Sub: Doe mij maar een leeuwenburger	Dub: Doe mij maar een leeuwenburger

Similarly to the previous example, there is another play on lions here. This time, the word ‘club’ in the term ‘club sandwich’ has been replaced by ‘cub’, the word for a young lion. Again, this jokingly implies that the hyenas wish to eat the lions. Since the words ‘cub’ and ‘club’ are merely similar and do not sound exactly the same, this is a mime rather than a homophone. The subtitle and dub have the same translation, both using ‘leeuwenburger’ for ‘cub sandwich’. They have preserved the reference to the lions being the food, but in a similar way one would say ‘cheeseburger’. These translations are then PUN > NON-PUN and although the translations work very well, they do not preserve the humour, meaning that both translation show a loss of humour.

## Example 27

<i>[Simba and Nala are running away]</i> Banzai: Did we order this dinner to go? Shenzi: No, why? Banzai: ‘Cause there it goes!	
Sub: -Is het een lopend buffet? -Nee, hoezo? -Ze zijn namelijk op de loop	Dub: -Wist jij dat eten kon lopen? -Nee, hoezo? -Het gaat er vandoor!

Whilst the hyenas are making their jokes about eating the cubs, Simba and Nala see the opportunity to flee. One of the hyenas sees them run away and asks the others if they ordered dinner to go, referring to modern takeaway food which you buy to take with you. In this case, however, it is the dinner itself that is going, without those who eat it; the dinner turns into the active party of the sentence. This subversion and the surprising resolution of the phrase ‘to go’ likely make this pun a homonym. This, however, is stretching the meaning of homonym a bit, since both words still mean ‘go’ or ‘gaan’ despite the different contexts. In Dutch, having a meal ‘to go’ would be ‘meenemen’, but this does not provide the opportunity for a similar joke. Both translations then use a form of ‘lopen’ for the humour, though both use it differently. The subtitles use ‘lopend buffet’ and then uses ‘op de loop’ for the resolution of the joke. Here too there is a surprising twist in the subversion between the active and

passive parties which creates the joke, as usually it is the people that are the ‘lopend’ element in ‘lopend buffet’ rather than the buffet itself. If we follow the same rule as in the source text, this too could be classified as a homonym, since ‘lopend’ and ‘loop’ are forms of the same word, but with different meanings and forms, one being an adjective and the other a noun, in different contexts. This is a PUN > PUN translation with no loss of humour. The dub removes the twist that both the source text and the first target text contain. Here, the walking or going is immediately assigned to the food, when one hyena asked ‘Wist jij dat eten kon lopen?’. In removing this twist from the conversation, the joke disappears as well. The dub then has PUN > NON-PUN translation and also full loss of humour.

*Example 28*

Scar: It's to <i>die</i> for	
Sub: Je zal erin blijven	Dub: Je zal derin blijven

This is a sly joke made by Scar, who is asked by Simba if the surprise his father has for him will be a good one. Scar tells him the surprise is ‘to *die* for’ with the emphasis on ‘die’. The surprise in question is in fact the stampede that will result in the death of Mufasa. The surprise is then quite literally ‘to die for’ in Mufasa’s case. Again, the subtitle and dub show the same translation, and it is quite a disappointing one. Unlike in the source text, ‘je zal erin blijven’ is not a normal, well-known expression. Although it could be argued that Mufasa will stay dead, so ‘erin blijven’, the phrase simply does not work in the same way. This is because ‘die’ is the main focus of the original joke. A translation such as ‘om je te besterven’ would have been much more fitting in preserving both the figurative meaning of the expression as well as the factor of death on which the joke relies. The number of characters is roughly the same and certainly not too long for the line or time, and so the subtitle seemingly has no reason for using this disappointing translation. This would have been a slightly trickier fit in the dub, but the /aɪ/ in ‘die’, /ei/ in ‘blijven’ and the /ɛ/ in ‘sterven’ are all open vowels and similar enough to be interchangeable in lip synching, so an alternative translation could have been made to fit. As a result of this, these translations are then PUN > NON-PUN, and both feature full loss of humour.

## Example 29

Timon: He looks blue Pumba: I'd say brownish-gold	
Sub: -Hij ziet grauw -Eerder bruinachtig goud	Dub: -Hij zit met iets -Hij zit niet, hij loopt

Simba has run away and has just encountered Timon and Pumba. He is sad and confused and Timon comments to Pumba that the cub 'looks blue'. He means this of course figuratively and is stating that Simba seems somewhat down. Pumba, however, misunderstands him and responds to the literal meaning. Since Pumba takes the phrase to be literal instead of figurative, this creates a clash in meanings, making his response surprising and therefore humorous. This is then a homonymic pun. The clash between what Timon says and what Pumba understands is the core of the joke, and this is preserved in both translations. The subtitles once again give a largely literal translation, although 'blue' has been replaced by 'grauw'. Although this is not exactly a colour, like blue is, this could still be interpreted literally as referring to Simba's pelt, and therefore Pumba's response still works. The dub has translated this section more freely, but still maintains the incongruity between both phrases. Timon uses the typical Dutch 'zit', which is an empty interjection with no semantic meaning in this usage, and belongs to the phrase 'ergens mee zitten' meaning to be upset or troubled. Pumba interprets this 'zit' as the literal verb form 'sit' and comments that Simba is not sitting, but walking. Both translations make sense and are equally humorous, and so are PUN > PUN translations with no loss of humour.

## Example 30

Pumba: Kid, what's eating you? Timon: Nothing, he's at the top of the food chain	
Sub: -Wat vreet er aan je? -Hij staat bovenaan de voedselketen	Dub: -Wat is er aan de hand? -Helemaal niks, hij heeft toch geen handen?

In this example, there is a wilful misunderstanding by Timon. Pumba asks Simba what's eating him, meaning what is worrying him. Timon sees the opportunity to make a joke and responds that nothing could possibly be eating Simba, since lions are at the top of the food chain. This is then a homonymic phrase since it concerns a common phrase being misinterpreted, albeit on purpose. Again, the subtitles



show a fairly literal translation. Although ‘wat vreet er aan je?’ is not a well-known expression like it is in English, it is still understandable in its figurative meaning and it is not likely that someone would misunderstand the phrase to be literal. Timon, however, does intentionally misunderstand it here as well, and responds in the same way as he did in the source text. The joke makes sense and shows a PUN > PUN translation with no loss of humour. The dub has likely decided a literal translation is too foreign and has altered it to be something more idiomatic. ‘Wat is er aan de hand?’ asks Pumba. This is a Dutch equivalent of the source text phrase, as this too is used to inquire what is bothering someone. To this Timon then replies that Simba does not have any hands. Although the second line contains an obvious play on the figurative and literal meaning of ‘hand’, the phrase ‘wat is er aan de hand?’ does not have an alternative meaning that it could be mistaken for, so this joke cannot truly be said to be a homonym or a homonymic phrase. It is clear that this is a PUN > PUN translation, but what the type of wordplay is, is less clear. The important thing, however, is that the humour is preserved.

*Example 31*

-What’s a motto? -Nothing, what’s a motto with you?	
Sub: -Wat is een motto? -Niks. Wat mot je	Dub: -Wat is een motto? -Niks, wat motte we met u?

This seems to be the perfect example of what Nash describes as the pun based on a homophonic phrase. As he had stated, these puns are somewhat rare, and this is the first true example that I have found. It is slightly forced, as Nash had said it would be, and as I already indicated, works better due to dialect. Timon and Pumba are talking about their famous motto ‘Hakuna Matata’. In response, Simba asks: ‘What’s a motto?’. Timon again purposefully misunderstands and takes this as Simba asking ‘What’s the matter?’ in an accent. He replies ‘what’s a motto with you?’ or ‘what’s the matter with you?’. Although the joke is slightly stretched, Timon seems to enjoy very bad puns, and it is clear what the incongruity is here, so the pun works. Although the Dutch translations differ somewhat from the source text and from each other, they do a similar thing. The word ‘motto’ is interpreted as a form of the verb ‘motten’ which is slang for ‘moeten’. There is then a repetition of ‘motto’ within ‘mot’ and

‘motte’ in both translations. In a way, ‘mot’ becomes a pseudomorpheme, used in both phrases, but in a wildly different way. Since it does not break up the full word into pseudomorphemes, the joke cannot be said to be a pseudomorph. This is then similar to the examples addressed in *The Sword and the Stone* and *The Aristocats*. Yet again then, although it seems that this some form of wordplay, and the translations are PUN > PUN, the pun cannot be clearly classified according to Nash’s typology. When looking at the flow of the conversation, the translations lack somewhat. In the original, Timon’s response makes sense since he directly responds to the question he supposedly understood. In Dutch, however, he first replies to the actual question, saying that a motto is nothing, before finishing the pun. As such, the conversation does not flow as naturally as in English. Although the repetition of the ‘mot’ preserves some of the humour then, there is without a doubt a slight loss of humour.

*Example 32*

-This stinks -Sorry	
Sub: -Hier zit een luchtje aan -Sorry	Dub: -Het stinkt -Oh, pardon

It is mentioned several times throughout the film that Pumba has a problem with gas, and that he often farts and emits a strong smell. When Timon then says ‘this stinks’, using a slang term to comment on the fact that something sucks, is wrong, and is not as it should be, it is no wonder that Pumba thinks his friend is talking about him and apologises. Seeing as this is a fart joke, there is no doubt that this is funny, particularly to a younger audience, as well as some older audiences. The pun is a homonym, since Pumba mistakes the figurative ‘stinks’ for the literal meaning. In the subtitles, Timon comments ‘Hier zit een luchtje aan’, an expression meaning that something isn’t quite right. However, this could be interpreted as a euphemistic way of saying that something literally smells, and that is what Pumba does. This is then a PUN > PUN translation, with the Dutch using a homonymic phrase to form the wordplay. This time, it is the dub that has the more literal translation. ‘Het stinkt’ says Timon, literally saying that it stinks. Unlike in English, this does not have the same figurative meaning in Dutch, and so Pumba cannot but interpret this literally. Although this is then perhaps an attempt at a PUN > PUN

translation, it simply does not work the same in Dutch, and the translation ends up as a PUN > NON-PUN. However, since the reference to Pumba farting is retained, there is only a slight loss of humour.

What many of these instances of wordplay have in common is that they are made not just for the audience to laugh at, but also for the characters to amuse themselves. The two translations are often similar to each other and do not differ much. However, when they do, it is the dub that comes off worst. Out of the eight puns, the subtitle uses six PUN > PUN translations, whereas the dub has four. Although this does not necessary mean anything in regards to humour, I have noted that the subtitles show two instances of full loss of humour and two instances of slight loss of humour, with the dub having three instances of full loss and three of slight loss. In this case, the subtitles are then funnier and show more retention when it comes to wordplay than the dub.

### ***3.7. The Hunchback of the Notre Dame***

Although *The Hunchback of the Notre Dame* (1996) is without question one of Disney's darker films, there are still some instances of comic relief and wordplay in it. The film is about Quasimodo, the hunchback, who stays hidden in the Notre Dame until one day he meets the gypsy Esmeralda and forms an unlikely friendship with her. When his master Frolo opens the hunt on all gypsies in order to find her, Quasimodo must choose if he is willing to help her or not.

*Example 33*

<i>[Phoebus pats his leg, getting his horse to follow]</i>	
Phoebus: Come on, boy. Achilles, heel	
Sub: Kom op, Achilles.	Dub: Kom op, Achilles. Hiel.

According to the lore on this film, the main reason Phoebus' horse had the name Achilles was so this joke could be made. Whether or not this is true, the joke exists, and is clearly a pun. It plays on the word 'heel' which is used to bring a horse to heel, and the term 'Achilles heel'. This will only be funny if one is familiar with the concept of the Achilles heel, and so some outside knowledge is required to understand the joke. However, apart from the fact that this idea is very well-known, the joke does rely largely on language, and will not necessarily work the same in other languages, and as

such it is a pun. Whether this is then a homonym, or something more akin to the difficult examples mentioned in the sections above is not entirely clear. Since the joke relies solely on the distinction and similarity between ‘Achilles, heel’ and ‘Achilles heel’, both with a rather different meaning, I would classify this as a tentative homonym. For some inexplicable reason, the subtitle has only translated the first section of the original text. Since the final word ‘heel’ or ‘hiel’ has been omitted, there is no pun here, and incidentally also a loss of humour. In the dub, this final part has been retained. Similarly to the source text, Phoebus now says ‘Achilles. Hiel’ and preserves the joke. The dub then shows a PUN > PUN translation with no loss of humour.

*Example 34*

Frollo: I'm sure you'll whip my men into shape	
Sub: Je leert m'n mannen het klappen van de zweep wel	Dub: Maar ik verwacht dat u er flink de zweep over zal leggen

Phoebus, the new guard captain, has reported to Frollo, his boss, who is watching someone being whipped. It is heavily implied that this is in fact the old guard captain and that Phoebus is taking his place. Frollo informs him that he is sure Phoebus will do better and will ‘whip [his] men into shape’. To Frollo, this is clearly a joke, as he puts extra emphasis on the word ‘whip’. The joke has an extralingual factor, since it relies on the viewer’s observance of the scene just before this conversation takes place to appreciate it, if appreciate is the right word. However, since the joke is contained in the word ‘whip’ in combination with the image, and some of the audio track, this is a pun. Frollo hopefully does not expect Phoebus to literally whip his men and means simply that he expects Phoebus to be a strict and inspiring captain, but nevertheless there is a menacing allusion to literal whipping. This duality of meanings types this pun as a homonym. Both the subtitle and the dub have retained the reference to whipping. The subtitle uses the expression ‘het klappen van de zweep’ which refers to being knowledgeable or experienced. If Frollo then tells Phoebus he expects him to teach his men ‘het klappen van de zweep’ he states that he expects Phoebus will share his expertise with the men and be a good mentor, but it still retains the threatening aspect of whipping. This is then a PUN > PUN translation with retention of humour. The dub uses a different expression, namely ‘de zweep

(er)over leggen’ which means to harshly urge someone on. This translation is then more openly menacing than the source text and subtitle translation, but still functions in a similar way. This is also a PUN > PUN translation with a retention of humour. Both translations are hard to classify, but due to their similarity with the source text and their usage of ‘zweep’ in a figurative sense with allusion to a literal one, I will place these under the type homonym too.

*Example 35*

Phoebus: I didn’t know you had a kid	
Sub: Ah, je hebt een kind	Dub: Hulp uit onverwachte hoek

Phoebus is sent to capture Esmeralda and the two come to a fight in the middle of the Notre Dame. During the fight, Phoebus is headbutted by Esmeralda’s goat, Djali, and he states ‘I didn’t know you had a kid’. It is not difficult to imagine a scenario in which a line like this might be uttered, and most of those would involve a newly formed couple in which one of the involved has a child. This line in the film is a play on such a situation, especially considering the fact that Esmeralda and Phoebus are exchanging witty remarks and are clearly attracted to each other, even getting together later in the film. In this case it is of course not a ‘kid’ as in a ‘human child’, but rather a kid goat. This pun is then a homonym, playing on the most prominent meaning of kid, and one that is used less often. The subtitle here shows a literal translation, but with ‘kid’ interpreted and translated in the most well-known meaning: child or ‘kind’. Although Phoebus could be using sarcasm, referring to Djali as Esmeralda’s actual child, this seems slightly farfetched. The translation is then neither funny nor particularly logical. Using ‘geitje’ would have not have been humorous either, but would at least have made sense in context. The dub does use a more logical and free translation. ‘Hulp uit onverwachte hoek’ might seem like a vastly different translation, but this is actually much logical than the subtitle, despite deviating from the source text. In fact, this phrase can even be classified as a pun. This is figuratively ‘hulp uit onverwachte hoek’ since Phoebus would not have expected to be attacked by a goat, but it can also be interpreted literally, since Djali is much smaller than the two humans and attacks from below, hitting Phoebus in the stomach whilst he is focussed on Esmeralda. She then literally receives ‘hulp uit onverwachte hoek’. Although the translation is then quite different, it does

result in a PUN > PUN translation. Since the pun is less apparent than that of the source text, there is some humour loss, but also some retention.

*Example 36*

Esmeralda: Maybe Frolo's wrong about the both of us. Hugo: What did she say? Laverne: Frolo's nose is long, and he wears a truss.	
Sub: -Frolo heeft 't mis over ons allebei -Wat zegt ze? -Frolo slist en heeft een gewei	Dub: -Dus misschien had Frolo ongelijk over ons allebei -Wat zei ze nou? -Frolo weegt een ons en het is half mei

This is the only example that seems to classify as what Nash as a mimetic phrase. Although according to him, mimetic phrases are usually plays on well-known expressions or literary texts, that is not the case here, but despite that this is clearly a mimetic phrase. In this scene, Esmeralda and Quasimodo are talking on the roof on the Notre Dame, and the gargoyles are trying to eavesdrop. One asks what Esmeralda just said, and the joke is then created by the other giving a completely nonsensical answer that merely sounds similar to what Esmeralda originally said, but is not logical at all. In the source text 'wrong' becomes 'long' and 'both of us' becomes 'truss'. Since the joke is made by replacing words in the original phrase with words that sound similar but are completely different, this is then a mimetic phrase. The sub and the dub have attempted to mimic this. As in the source text, some words have been replaced by similar sounding and rhyming ones. In the subtitles 'mis' becomes 'slist' and 'allebei' becomes 'gewei'. The words 'allebei' and 'gewei' work very well, because they are a full rhyme, but the replacement of 'mis' with 'slist' works slightly less well, since the inflection on the verb means that these words do not fully rhyme. However, they are still similar enough for the mime to work. The dub uses 'ongelijk' rather than 'mis' but does nothing with this. Rather, it seems to simply take the pronoun 'ons' from the first line and use it with a different meaning in the second line, repeating it. The word 'allebei' is changed, and this becomes 'half mei'. The dub lacks somewhat from not following the structure of the original joke and sentence more. Since 'ons' and 'allebei' are placed next to each other in the first line, having them spaced out in the second line is noticeable, as the sentence now does not flow as well as the English joke or even the subtitled version of it. Although

both translations are then PUN > PUN, the dub has a slight of humour, whereas the subtitles have no loss.

*Example 37*

Clopin: Gather around, everybody! There's "good noose" tonight	
Sub: Kom hier, allemaal. We zitten met 'n goede strop	Dub: Kom erbij iedereen. Wat een strop voor jullie

This is another excellent example of a mime, emphasised by the character himself. Quasimodo and Phoebus have made their way into the gypsies' hiding place to warn them of an oncoming attack, but they are mistake for spies and captured. As punishment, they are to be hanged. The character Clopin tells all gypsies to gather around, since there is 'good noose'. This is play on the words 'good news' where 'news' has been replaced by 'noose'. This refers to the fact that Phoebus and Quasimodo will be hanged, and this functions as entertainment for the gypsies. Both the subtitles and the dub have translated 'noose' literally as 'strop'. In the subtitle, the translator has chosen to use 'we zitten met 'n goede strop'. This is somewhat confusing, since 'strop', if not meant literally, usually refers to something negative, such as a disadvantage or bad luck. 'Goede strop' then only makes sense if it is a 'strop' for Phoebus and Quasimodo but 'goed' for the viewers. In the dub, Clopin says 'Wat een strop voor jullie'. This can only be addressed to Quasimodo and Phoebus, since this situation is in no way a 'strop' for the onlookers. However, it is very clear that Clopin is here addressing his audience, the other gypsies, rather than the two victims, and so the line does not make sense at all. The mention of the word 'strop' is then slightly funny, but less so because it is not very logical in context. Although both translations then attempt a PUN > PUN method here, the wordplay is too forced and hinders coherence, which in turn results in some loss of humour.

Out of the five instances of wordplay there were found in this film, the subtitles translated three as PUN > PUN, whereas the dub translated all five as PUN > PUN. Despite this, the subtitles and dub had equal instances of humour loss, though not to the same extent. In the subtitles there were two instances of full humour loss and one of slight humour loss, but three instances of slight humour loss in the dub. This shows that even if the translator manages to translate all puns, there can still be a loss

of humour. In fact, if the translator goes too far in searching for puns, it can actually hamper rather than help the text, as could be seen in the last example.

### 3.8. *Hercules*

The film *Hercules* (1997) details the journey of Hercules from a zero to a hero in order to take his rightful place in Olympus with his family. He is trained by the satyr Philoctetes and has to fight monsters, not the least of which his uncle Hades, God of the Underworld. This film too does not feature many instances of wordplay, rather relying on intertextuality with Greek mythology and American pop culture for the humour. However, there are some uses of wordplay.

*Example 38*

Muse: Heroes like Hercules Muse: Honey, you mean Hunkules.	
Sub: -Helden zoals Hercules -Je bedoelt Herculekker	Dub: -Helden als Hercules -Zeg liever Herculekker

This is a typical example of a mime. A bound morpheme of the word is replaced by a similar sounding word that gives or changes the meaning of the word. In the source text, the syllable ‘Herc-’ is removed from the text and replaced by the word ‘hunk’, referring to a man who is particularly handsome. Though Hercules is originally only his name, ‘Hunkules’ now gives an extra meaning that says something about his character, so the joke is functional too. The translations acknowledge this and have also used mimes, although they have used a different one. In both the sub and the dub, it is ‘-les’ that is omitted and replaced by ‘lekker’, an adjective sometimes used in Dutch to refer to people who are hot. This functions then in the same way. Both translations use a PUN > PUN method, resulting in a retention of the humour.

*Example 39*

Random Kid: Maybe we should call him Jerkules	
Sub: We kunnen ‘m beter Harkules noemen	Dub: (beter?) Klunzules



Extremely similar to the previous example, this example too shows a play on Hercules' name. It is again a mime and the joke is formed in much the same way. However, where in the previous example the added meaning was positive, here it is negative. In the source text, 'Herc-' has been replaced by the similar rhyming word 'Jerk', creating the humorous effect and negative connotation. Again, the translations have retained this element, though slightly differently. The subtitle uses 'Harkules'. Here, the 'Herc-' has been replaced by 'Hark', which is extremely similar to the original syllable in pronunciation. The created meaning too is similar to that of 'Jerkules'. The dub, however, uses a different translation here. Sadly, there were several voices overlapping in the dubbed scene, so it was unclear what else was said, but 'Klunzules' was very audible. Here, the part 'Herc-' has also been omitted and replaced with something else, in this case 'Kluns' or 'Klunz', meaning someone who is very clumsy. Whilst this is fitting in meaning, it does not work as a mime. The morpheme 'Herc-' is too different from 'Kluns'. They barely contain similar sounds. This is then an unsuccessful PUN > NON-PUN, despite the attempt. Consequently, there is some loss of humour.

*Example 40*

Zeus: You'll work yourself to death	
Sub: Je werkt je nog eens dood	Dub: Je werkt jezelf nog dood

This is another example of a pun that is not easy to classify. Zeus tells Hades that he should relax more since he is working himself to death. When he realises what he has said, he bursts out in laughter. The reason this is funny is because Hades is the God of the underworld; he works and lives among the dead. Had this been said to anyone else, there would not have been a joke. In this case, there is then a pun, since it takes the figurative meaning of the expression 'work yourself to death' and contrasts it with actual 'death', which refers to Hades' position in the underworld. The joke needs additional information to work, such as the context, image and the knowledge that Hades is the God of the underworld, but all of these elements are made clear in the film, and the play is still on the words themselves. This is then again similar to the earlier examples mentioned, in which part of the pun is based on an allusion to something else; in this case the association of death with Hades. The

translations do exactly the same, both using ‘je(zelf) dood werken’, a literal translation. This is then a PUN > PUN translation with no loss of humour, but also no clear pun type.

*Example 41*

<i>[Hercules is fighting and Phil is giving advice; Herc charges headfirst, head-butting the monster]</i>	
Phil: Use your head!	
Sub: Gebruik je hoofd	Dub: Gebruik je hoofd

As with some of the *Aladdin* examples, this is a clear instance of a homonymic phrase. Phil is using the normal, figurative interpretation of the phrase, meaning that Hercules needs to think and be smart. Hercules, however, understands the phrase in a literal meaning, and acts out the instruction, headbutting the monster he is fighting, to the dismay of his mentor. The humour is here created by the incongruity between the literal and figurative meaning. This is copied in both the sub and the dub, which use the same literal translation of the source text. Here too, the phrase could be interpreted both figuratively and literally. The translations are PUN > PUN, both homonymic phrases with no loss of humour.

*Example 42*

<i>[Meg's spirit is floating in a pool of the dead]</i>	
Hades: Meg's running with a new crowd these days, and not a very lively one at that	
Sub: Meg heeft nu nieuwe vrienden. En er zit niet veel leven in	Dub: Meg heeft een nieuwe vriendenkring en er zit niet veel leven in

The joke is here in the fact that there is literally no life in the ‘new crowd’ that Meg is with, since she is a spirit in the underworld. Normally, the word ‘lively’ would be used figuratively and not literally, as in this case, which is where the incongruity comes from. This pun is then a homonym. The sub and the dub use the same translation again, here ‘er zit niet veel leven in’, literally meaning ‘there is not much life in [them]’. This is also a phrase which is usually meant figuratively rather than literally, except in this case. Both translations use a PUN > PUN method, and because they are based on the phrase ‘er zit niet veel leven in’ this is a homonymic phrase rather than a homonym. With the preservation of the pun, there is also a preservation of humour here.

Most instances of wordplay that were found in *Hercules* were all translated as PUN > PUN in both the subtitle and the dub, aside from one PUN > NON-PUN in the dub. All pun translations featured the same type of wordplay as the source puns except for the instance where a homonymic pun turned into a homonymic phrase pun. It is unsurprising then that only the PUN > NON-PUN translation found in the dub came with a slight loss of humour. Apart from that, there were in this aspect no distinct changes between the source text and translations.

### 3.8. *The Princess and the Frog*

*The Princess and the Frog* (2009) is one of the newest Disney films, which is noticeable in the Anglicisms that are used in the translations. The film is about waitress Tiana, who has spent her entire life working to buy her own restaurant, only to be robbed of her opportunity the night before she would have succeeded. When she meets a frog prince who promises her he can help her if she kisses him and turns him back into a human, everything goes wrong and she herself is turned into a frog. Many of the jokes, as in *The Aristocats* revolve around the frogs, and some of the other animals they meet along the way.

#### Example 43

<i>[Lawrence's head gets stuck into a tuba]</i>	
Naveen: You finally got into the music	
Sub: Je bent dus toch betoeterd	Dub: Je bent dus toch betoeterd

Prince Naveen has just arrived in New Orleans with his servant Lawrence. Naveen has joined a few buskers in playing music and dancing on the streets. Lawrence is trying to drag Naveen away, but fails at this. He trips and falls, ending up with his head in a tuba. Naveen laughs and tells him 'You finally got into the music!' before clarifying that he says this because Lawrence's head is in the tuba. Naveen even takes the time to explain the joke, so translating the wordplay is necessary in this case. This is a homonymic phrase, playing on the expression 'get into the music', which refers to enjoying it very much. Naveen, however, means this literally, as Lawrence is literally 'into the music', since his head got stuck in a tuba. The subtitle and dub have the same translation. They retain the reference to music

by using the word ‘betoeterd’ which contains the word ‘toeter’. Here, once again, is an example of a pun that is difficult to classify. The literal pseudomorphic meaning works here, due to the reference to the musical instrument, but the figurative, general meaning of the word does not. These translation are PUN > PUN, but they cannot be classified according to Nash’s typology. Since the word ‘betoeterd’ only makes sense here because of the joke, but has no other meaning, there is then a slight loss of humour in both cases.

*Example 44*

<i>[Naveen has a leech on his arm]</i>	
Tiana: You said you were fabulously wealthy	
Naveen: No no no, my parents are fabulously wealthy. But they cut me off for being a LEECH, leech!	
Sub: -Je zei dat je schatrijk was -Nee, m’n ouders zijn schatrijk. Maar ze vinden me een.... Bloedzuiger	Dub: -Jij hebt gezegd dat je harstikke rijk was -Nee, nee, nee, nee. M’n ouders zijn vreselijk rijk maar zij geven me niks, ik ben een... feest BEEST

This a very clear example of a homonym, in which both meanings of the word ‘leech’ are alluded to. Naveen is talking about the fact that his parents have cut him off. The term ‘leech’ is used for both a literal leech, as in the animal, and a figurative leech, someone who lives off others. Naveen is a leech, but also has a leech on his arm when he looks, meaning the word works in both meanings. In the subtitles, this does not provide a problem. The literal translation ‘bloedzuiger’ can function in both the literal and figurative meaning, though perhaps the figurative meaning is somewhat stronger than in English. This literal translation is then also a PUN > PUN translation and retains the original humour. In the dub, however, this is not as simple. The word ‘bloedzuiger’ is clearly longer than the word ‘leech’ and so this could not have been used, or the lip synchronisation would have been off. Hence, the word ‘leech’ has been translated as ‘feestbeest’, with ‘feest’ coinciding with the first exclamation of ‘leech’ and ‘beest’ with the second one. In terms of dubbing, this fits, since both ‘feest’ and ‘beest’ are about the same length as ‘leech’ and sound similar enough to fit for the same word. However, the dual meaning of the word is somewhat lost. The part ‘feest’ refers to what Naveen said before, and ‘beest’ refers to the image of the leech. However, ‘feest’ already coincides with Naveen’s first noticing the leech on his arm, and as such this part of the exclamation seems somewhat out of place. Perhaps a

similar division between ‘feest’ and ‘beest’ could have been achieved with ‘bloed’ and ‘zuiger’. This is one instance in which those that worked on the dub have decided to adhere to lip synchronisation over humour and even slight coherence. Whether or not this is a pun is somewhat difficult to say, but due to the fact that the morpheme ‘beest’ refers both to the leech and to ‘feestbeest’, I have decided to classify this as an instance of wordplay. The translation is then PUN > PUN, but there is a definite loss of humour.

*Example 45*

<i>[Tiana and Naveen are bound together by their tongues]</i>	
Ray: I guess you and your boyfriend got a little carried away, am I right?	
Sub: Jij weet wel hoe je een man moet strikken, hè?	Dub: Meid, jij weet wel hoe je je vriendje aan je moet binden zeg, heb ik gelijk of niet hè?

Interestingly enough, here both target texts contain a pun where there was none in the source text, but it is not the same pun, although it is the same pun type. Both puns are homonyms, that work together with the image to invoke both the literal and figurative meaning of the terms. The subtitle states ‘Jij weet wel hoe je een man moet strikken, hè?’. In terms of personal relationships, ‘strikken’ is usually meant figuratively, meaning to catch or rope someone into doing something, and not as in literally tying something. However, the image currently shows Tiana and Naveen constricted and bound together by their tongues, so the literal meaning is here also shown. Similarly, the dub uses ‘je vriendje aan je [...] binden’. This ‘binden’ would usually refer to the bond between two people, but can also refer to tying something up. This second meaning is again brought to mind due to the image. This is then a perfect example of how a homonym can work in audiovisual texts. Both the sub and the dub have a NON-PUN > PUN translation with an added aspect of humour.

*Example 46*

<i>[Ray the firefly turns on his light]</i>	
Ray: Let me shine a little light on the situation	
Sub: Ik werp even een ander licht op de zaak	Dub: Ik werp wel eens effe een lichtje op de <i>situation</i>

Here, we have an example of a homonymic phrase. This line comes right after the previous one and relates to the same situation. Ray, the firefly, tells Naveen and Tiana that he will ‘shine a little light on the situation’ after which he turns on his little firefly light. This is then a play on the expression ‘shine a light on something’, meaning to make everything a bit more clear. Ray does this both literally, by providing them with more light by which they can see, and figuratively, by giving them a hand in getting untangled. The subtitle uses a similar Dutch expression, namely ‘een (ander) licht op de zaak werpen’ meaning to see things from a new and different perspective. Again, this works both literally and figuratively. Ray ‘werpt een licht’ on the situation quite literally, but he is also a fresh pair of eyes who solves the situation in a different way. The dub uses ‘een licht werpen’, which is a literal translation of the source text and works in the same way. Both translations use a PUN > PUN method and have no loss of humour.

*Example 47*

<p>-Listen here, mister. This stick in the mud has had to work two jobs her whole life while you've been sucking on a silver spoon chasing chamber maids around your... your ivory tower! -Actually, it's polished marble</p>	
<p>Sub: -Hoor 's, manneke. Ik heb altijd twee baantjes gehad terwijl jij in de watten lag en achter de kamermeisjes aan zat in je ivoren toren -Het is gepolijst marmer</p>	<p>Dub: -Luister eens, prinsje. Deze ouwe taart hier heeft al twee banen sinds haar schooltijd, terwijl jij van gouden bordjes at en kamermeisjes versierde in je, je, ivoren toren -Je bedoelt Italiaans marmer</p>

This is a play on the expression ‘ivory tower’. Naveen has a heavy accent in the source text and it is implied that his first language is not English. When Tiana accuses him of having grown up in an ‘ivory tower’, meaning that he has led a secluded and luxury life, Naveen understands this literally, and tells her that the tower was in fact made out of ‘polished marble’ instead of ivory. This confusion between the usual meaning of the expression and the literal meaning of the words makes this a pun based on a homonymic phrase. In the subtitles, these lines have been literally translated, and in the dub only ‘polished marble’ has been changed into ‘italiaans marmer’, which is not a significant difference. The expression ‘ivory tower’ also exists in Dutch as ‘ivoren toren’. Therefore, the literal translation works fine here, and there is a PUN > PUN with a retention of the humorous elements.

## Example 48

Tiana: Hop to it!	
Sub: Schiet op	Dub: Aan het werk

This pun is likely also a homonym. Tiana uses the expression ‘hop to it’ in its figurative meaning, telling Naveen to hurry up and get to work. However, since at this point they are both frogs, the word ‘hop’ is also slightly ironic, an allusion to the literal hopping of frogs. In both the sub and the dub, the pun has disappeared. The subtitle focusses on the fact that Naveen needs to hurry, whereas the dub simply states that he needs to go to work. Both are then a PUN > NON-PUN translation with a loss of humour. Alternatively, something like ‘hup’ could have been used to preserve some of the humour, as this can refer to both jumping or hopping, but is also used to urge someone on. This is then one of the cases in which a loss of humour would not have been unavoidable.

## Example 49

Mama Odie: How’s your grandmama? Ray: Oh, she’s fine. Got into a trouble for flashing the neighbours again	
Sub: -Hoe gaat het met je oma? -Prima. Alleen zeuren de buren over haar naaktloperij	Dub: -Hoe is het met je oma? -Oh, heel goed. Ze is druk op zoek naar een knipperlicht relatie

Mama Odie, the voodoo queen of the bayou asks firefly Ray how his grandmother is doing. He responds that she is fine, but in trouble for ‘flashing the neighbours’. This is a play on the word ‘flash’, which can refer both to the flashing of a light, such as the light of firefly, but also to public nudity. Since both meanings are alluded to here, this is a clear case of a homonym. When we look at the subtitles, we can see that the translator has chosen to focus on the second meaning, rather than the first. This is a little strange, not only since the focus is now fully on nudity and this remains primarily a children’s film, but also since there is no particular reason for using this literal translation, rather than anything else that would have retained some humour, which is clearly a more important aspect here. This is then a PUN > NON-PUN translation with loss of humour. The dub, however, has opted to change the text, but retain the presence of a joke based around the fireflies. Now Ray responds that his

grandmother is looking for a ‘knipperlicht relatie’. Here we then have a reference to the light of a firefly, but also to something else of a somewhat cheeky character. Since this is similar to the source text pun, this too can be classified as a homonym. The dub translation, in being more idiomatic than the subtitle translation, works much better in this context. The dub has used a PUN > PUN translation and has no loss of humour.

When we look at these two translations overall, we again do not see much of a difference. Out of the six source text puns, the subtitles have retained four, the dub five. Both also had an instance of NON-PUN > PUN. Considering the loss of humour due to translating or not translating the wordplay, there is no difference between the two texts. Both showed two full and one slight instances of loss and one instance of added humour. In terms of wordplay then, the two texts are largely similar.

### 3.9. *Winnie the Pooh*

The final film I looked at is another film about Winnie the Pooh, carrying the unoriginal name *Winnie the Pooh* (2011). It is in many ways similar to the one discussed in section 3.4. as it again consists of an amusing story about the adventures the animals get up to. This film too contains the humour that is particular to Winnie the Pooh. Although I have only one example from this film, it is a very interesting one, similar to example 19 and just as silly.

*Example 50*

<p>Rabbit: Can you tie a knot?  Piglet: I cannot  Rabbit: Ah, so you can knot!  Piglet: No, I cannot knot  Rabbit: Not knot?  Pooh: Who's there?  Rabbit: Pooh!  Pooh: Pooh Who?  Rabbit: No, Pooh, it's... Piglet, you'll need more than two knots  Piglet: Not possible  Owl: Ah, so it is possible to knot those pieces  Piglet: Not these pieces  Pooh: Yes, knot those pieces  Piglet: Why not?  Eyoore: 'Cause it's all for naught  Piglet: Oh dear dear, I can't tie a knot</p>
--



<p>Sub: Rabbit: Kun je knopen maken?  Piglet: Nee, ik niet  Rabbit: Ah, dus je kan wel nieten  Piglet: Nee, ik niet niet  Rabbit: Niet niet?  Pooh: Nooit niet  Rabbit: .....  Pooh: Wat?  Rabbit: Hou op. Kun je ze aan elkaar nieten?  Piglet: Ik niet  Owl: Ah, je kan ze dus aan elkaar nieten  Piglet: Niet deze stukken  Pooh: Ja, niet die  Piglet: Waarom niet?  Eyoore: Ik geniet niet  Piglet: O, ik zie het niet meer zitten</p>	<p>Dub: Rabbit: Kun je knopen knopen?  Piglet: Ik niettuh  Rabbit: Niet nieten, knopen  Piglet: Nee, ik kan geen knoop knoop  Rabbit: Knoop knoop?  Pooh: Wie is daar?  Rabbit: Poeh!  Pooh: Poeh wie?  Rabbit: Nee, Poeh, ik... Knorretje, knoop de  eindjes aan elkaar  Piglet: Dat lukt me niet  Owl: Ah, dus knopen lukt niet, maar je kunt wel nieten  Piglet: Uh, wel nieten?  Pooh: Ja, niet de touwen aan elkaar  Piglet: Waarom niet?  Eyoore: Omdat we in de knoop zitten  Piglet: Ik kan er geen touw meer aan vastknopen</p>
---	--

Just as in the example from the other Winnie the Pooh film, this entire conversation is one large misunderstanding. Whereas in the previous film this was based around homonyms, here it is largely because of homophones. Rabbit, Owl, Pooh, Kanga, Roo and Eeyore are stuck in a hole and Piglet has to help them climb out. Since there are six people, the rope that would have gotten them out is cut into six pieces. Of course this means they not long enough to reach the bottom, and so Rabbit asks whether or not piglet knows how to knot. Many of the puns in this joke are then based on the ‘knot’/’not’ homophone, but there are some others too. Piglet states he cannot knot, and the ‘cannot’ is mistaken for ‘can knot’, leading the others to think that he can knot, when he cannot knot. Rabbit is confused and ask ‘not knot?’ which Pooh then interprets as being ‘knock knock’, the beginning of a joke, and he responds to that, derailing the conversation. This is then a mime, since the words ‘not knot’ and ‘knock knock’ do not sound exactly alike. After the conversation is back to the subject at hand, there is more confusion again. ‘Not possible’, says piglet, which is interpreted as ‘knot possible’, which would mean he can. Owl asks Piglet to confirm this and he states ‘knot those pieces’ to which Piglet replies ‘Not these pieces’. Pooh again thinks Piglet is saying ‘knot’ and says ‘Yes, knot those pieces’. Piglet is now confused, interpreting ‘knot’ as ‘not’ and asks ‘Why not?’ those pieces. Eeyore then interjects ‘‘Cause it’s all for naught’, adding the homophone ‘naught’ to the already existing pair. Finally Piglet exclaims ‘I can’t tie a knot’, which to my knowledge is not an existing expression and so would not be

a pun. This entire conversation is very roundabout and tiring and contains several puns, namely one instance of repeated homophones, one mime, and one other homophone. The Dutch translations suffer some loss of naturalness, just as in example 19.

The subtitles and the dub have solved the repeated homophone in the same way, namely by using a homonym. Starting with the subtitles, Rabbit here also asks Piglet if he can tie a knot. Piglet replies 'ik niet'. The word 'niet' is both the negative marker, as well as the verb for 'staple'. Although it is not very logical that Piglet would be carrying a stapler with him into the forest, in terms of the homonym, this does work. Rabbit exclaims 'dus je kan wel nieten' to which Piglet replies 'ik niet niet'. Apparently, he does not staple either. Rabbit asks 'niet niet?' and Pooh states 'nooit niet'. These lines are the translation of the 'knock knock' set up. This joke is entirely skipped, and because of this Rabbit's exclamation of 'Pooh!' is also removed. The conversation continues again with Rabbit asking if Piglet can 'niet' the ropes together, to which Piglet again replies 'ik niet'. The repetition of the 'knot/not' joke is then more frequent and monotonous in the subtitles, also because it here only the homonym 'niet'. When it comes to Eeyore's joke, he states 'Ik geniet niet', which is again a double repetition of the word 'niet', but it is not a pun, as it is not an additional homophone or homonym in this case. Out of the three puns that were in this joke, there is then one PUN > PUN translation, and two PUN > NON-PUN. There is then some loss of humour.

The dub also uses the word 'niet', but handles the conversation and the jokes differently. Instead of saying 'so you can knot!' or 'dus je kan wel nieten', Rabbit immediately dismisses the idea of stapling and says 'niet nieten, knopen', bringing the attention back to the knotting. Piglet replies 'ik kan geen knoop knoop'. This is somewhat strange, since this is not grammatically correct, and even the slightly simple Piglet generally speaks in a way that is grammatically correct. However, it should be noted that in at least one instance in the source text, Piglet treats an irregular verb as though it was regular. This change is then somewhat jarring and unlikely, but not entirely unthinkable for Piglet. The ungrammatical form is used to set up the knock knock joke, since 'knoop knoop' sounds similar to 'klop klop'. The mime has then been preserved, but at the cost of some logic. Rabbit continues the conversation by telling Piglet to knot the ends together, which Piglet says he cannot do. Owl then replies 'dus knopen lukt niet, maar je kunt wel nieten'. This again is slightly illogical since the stapling

angle of the joke has already been abandoned for a few lines. However, the conversation continues from here and Piglet asks ‘wel nieten?’, possibly confused by this use of a positive and negative in a row. Pooh agrees ‘Ja, niet de touwen aan elkaar’, which confuses Piglet even more. Once again, it is time for Eeyore’s joke and he interjects ‘Omdat we in de knoop zitten’. This is not a homophone, nor is it anything else I can classify, although it is wordplay. The animals are figuratively ‘in the knoop’, in trouble, but not literally. The ‘knoop’ aspect refers to the conversation and Piglet’s inability to tie the knot. The joke works then since it refers to both the position they are in, as well as the issue with the rope. This is another example of the type of wordplay I have found throughout this case study, which only works as a joke due to the reference to something either in the image or simply in the context. This text contains one final joke. Piglet here ends by saying ‘ik kan er geen touw meer aan vastknopen’, a homonymic phrase. Piglet literally cannot tie the ropes together, but he also can’t understand the conversation anymore, playing on both meanings of the phrase.

Although only one segment of wordplay was selected from this film, it did contain some interesting examples that clearly posed a problem for the translators. Out of the three instances of wordplay that I identified in this text, the dub contains three PUN > PUN translations, and to my knowledge even adds a NON-PUN > PUN. The sub, however, only has one PUN > PUN translation and two PUN > NON-PUN. The subtitles then suffer some significant loss of humour here, whereas the dub only loses slight amount.

## Conclusion

In this thesis, I looked at subtitling, dubbing, and wordplay to prove the hypothesis that the subtitles would be a more literal translation of the source text, and as such retain more of the wordplay and humour than the dubbed translation of the source text. In order to do this, I used two models to conduct my case study. In doing this, I found Nash's typology to be somewhat insufficient for the purpose of this thesis. First of all, some of the types listed by him lack a clear definition and caused some confusion, such as the pun-metaphor. Additionally, the distinction between when something should be considered a homonym/homophone/mime or a homonymic/homophonic/mimetic phrase is unclear. This caused some trouble in classifying the puns. Moreover, there were several instances where I struggled in categorising the puns I had found, as they did not properly fit any of Nash's types. There was a type of wordplay that reoccurred throughout the study; one where part of the joke was based on an allusion or reference to something else that was shown in the image or was explained in the context, and was made by either using a word that in itself contained the reference, such as 'death' in example 40 or 'in de knoop zitten' in example 50, or using a word which contains this referential word, such as 'uitvissen' in example 4 and 'snoezepoes' in example 14. This type of joke does not seem to fit with any of Nash's types. As I noted before, perhaps this has something to do with the fact that most of these types of puns were found in the Dutch translations, and the reason it is not mentioned in Nash's typology is simply because this type of punning is much more frequent in Dutch than in English. After all, Nash did state that the puns on his list were not all types of puns, but merely the ones that were most frequently used. In addition to this issue, Nash's typology was not made for audiovisual texts. As such, jokes which are certainly wordplay but depend on the image for the additional layer of meaning that creates the joke are not clearly represented in the model and as such also difficult to categorise. Furthermore, the model includes some pun types that did not appear at all, such as the etymological pun, but excludes things such as register humour. One note for further research would then be to develop a typology of puns more fitting for audiovisual texts, adding the form of referential wordplay I have found, but removing those that are unlikely to be used. I would

also suggest removing the distinction between homonym/homonymic phrase, mime/mimetic phrase, and homophone/homophonic phrase, since it is often unclear when a pun is one and when the other, and this does not affect the actual categorisation or understanding of wordplay. Furthermore, I would argue that a clearer definition and more examples of the different pun types would help avoid confusion and make typing puns easier.

Delbastita's model of translation methods for puns was very useful, albeit quite general, as it says nothing about the type of wordplay or whether or not the wordplay is equally humorous or logical in the target text as in the source text. It is also the case that several methods, such as the editorial technique and copying of the source text, did not appear in my case study, and are rather unlikely to be used in any audiovisual translation. If this model were adopted for use in audiovisual translation, it would be my advice to simply remove these methods and focus more on those that would be useful in audiovisual translation.

The results of my case study were somewhat of a surprise to me. The first aspect of my hypothesis was confirmed, as throughout my analysis of the data, I found that Yuanjian was correct. The subtitles are in fact much more often a literal translation of the text than the dub, and the dub in general shows more deviation from the source text. This was likely because of the presence of the original source text on the one hand, and lip synchronisation and a wish for a more idiomatic target text on the other hand. As for the second part of my hypothesis, this was largely debunked, and I found that the subtitles do not show more retention and are not necessarily funnier than the dub when it comes to wordplay. It is in fact the other way around: Although the overall differences between the subtitles and the dub are minimal enough to be a coincidence or mistake on my part, it should be noted that the overall winner, so to speak, is the dub.

In all source versions of the films, I counted a total of 47 instances of wordplay. Out of these instances, the subtitles have 29 PUN > PUN translations and 18 PUN > NON-PUN. In the dub, the number of PUN > PUN translations is 31, and the number of PUN > NON-PUN translations is only 15. In general, the dub then shows more retention of wordplay than the subtitles, even if this is only by a difference of two instances. There are however also some cases of NON-PUN > PUN in several films, which could be used to straighten the balance in terms of the number of instances of wordplay

in the translations. In the subtitles, there are a total of 3 of these translations. In the dub, I found 8, though 6 of these are in *The Aristocats*, which makes this film somewhat of an outlier. In the subtitles, the final wordplay count is then 34, and in the dub 37, so a difference of three in favour of the dub. The dub then not only shows more retention of wordplay, but also more addition of wordplay than the subtitles. Both, however, still show a loss in the total number of wordplay compared to the source text, with 10 fewer instances of puns in the dub, and 13 fewer in the subtitles. If possible then, I would advise translators to attempt more compensation, to even out this number somewhat more.

As I have noted before, wordplay does not always equal humour, so although the dub shows more retention, this does not necessarily mean it is funnier. However, when tallying the number of lost and added instances of humour, it is again the dub that seems to be the best. The total count of humour because of wordplay that is found in the subtitles is 30,5, whereas this is 37 for the dub. This is largely due to the fact that the dub adds more instances of NON-PUN > PUN than the subtitles do, and so has more addition of wordplay and humour. Both forms of translation, however, again show a significant loss in comparison with the source text. To my count, the original number of humour due to wordplay was 47,5, which means both translations had over ten instances of humour loss. Note that this is of course only related to humour that is derived from wordplay and says nothing about the humour in the films that is conveyed by means other than wordplay, such as image or non-pun jokes, and so nothing about the funniness of the films in general.

What is interesting, is that the numbers sometimes vary wildly per film. For example, *The Many Adventures of Winnie the Pooh* and *The Lion King* have more retention of puns in the subtitles, four and six respectively compared with two and four in the dub, and also show fewer instances of loss of humour than the dubs for these films. However, *The Aristocats* has a higher count of total puns and humour in the dubbed translation than in the subtitles, and even than in the source text, and *Winnie the Pooh* has the same thing, though to a lesser extent. In general, however, there are more films where the dub shows more retention or addition than the subtitles.

From the case study, it can then be concluded that although the subtitles are often more literal, they do not show more overall retention of either wordplay or humour, and it is in fact often the dub that has been more successful in preserving and adding instances of wordplay and humour. However, I

also concluded that this is not necessarily the case for every film and that there are some instances in which the subtitles showed more retention than the dub. I must also add that other than some instances of text reduction and the necessity of adherence to lip synchronisation, I could find no clear reasons for deviating translations, nor have I found any examples where it seems that the respective audiences have influenced the translations. To get an even clearer picture of the differences between subtitled and dubbed translation and the possible effects of the constraints of the technologies and intended audiences, one would need to look at an even larger corpus, and see if the results are the same as in this thesis or if they fluctuate even more.

## Works Cited

- Attardo, Salvatore. *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994. Print.
- “About.” *The Walt Disney Company*. The Walt Disney Company, 2016. Web. 23 June 2016. Retrieved from <https://thewaltdisneycompany.com/about/>
- Baker, Mona and Braño Hochel. “Dubbing.” *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. ed. Mona Baker. London: Routledge, 1998. 74-76. Print.
- Chaume, Frederic. *Audiovisual Translation: Dubbing*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2012. Print.
- Chiaro, Delia. “Issues in Audiovisual Translation.” *Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. Ed. Jeremy Munday. London & New York: Routledge, 2009. 141-165. PDF File.
- . “Translation and Humour, Humour and Translation.” *Translation Humour and Literature*. Ed. Delia Chiaro. London: Continuum, 2010. 1-32. Print.
- Díaz Cintas, Jorge and Aline Remael. *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*. New York: Routledge, 2014. Print.
- Delabastita, Dirk. “Introduction.” *Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation*. Ed. Dirk Delabastita. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997. 1-22. Print.
- . “Introduction.” *Wordplay and Translation*. Special Issue of *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 2.2 (1996). 127-140. Print.
- Fong, Gilbert C. F. “Let the Words Do the Talking: The Nature and Art of Subtitling.” *Dubbing and Subtitling in a World Context*. Ed. Gilbert C. F. Fong and Kenneth K. L. Au. Hong Kong: Chinese UP, 2009. 91-106. Print.
- . “The Two Worlds of Subtitling: The Case of Vulgarisms and Sexually-oriented Language.” *Dubbing and Subtitling in a World Context*. Ed. Gilbert C. F. Fong and Kenneth K. L. Au. Hong Kong: Chinese UP, 2009. 39-61. Print.
- Gamier, Yves. “Subtitling.” *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. Ed. Keith Brown. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006. 258-263. PDF File.
- Georgakopoulou, Panayota. “Subtitling for the DVD Industry.” *Audiovisual Translation: Language*



- Transfer on Screen*. Ed. Jorge Díaz Cintas and Gunilla Anderman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 21-35. PDF File.
- Gottlieb, Henrik. "Subtitling: Diagonal Translation." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 2.1 (1994): 101-21. PDF.
- Ivarsson, Jan. "The History of Subtitles in Europe." *Dubbing and Subtitling in a World Context*. Ed. Gilbert C. F. Fong and Kenneth K. L. Au. Hong Kong: Chinese UP, 2009. 3-12. Print.
- Ivarsson, Jan & Mary Carroll. "Code of Good Subtitling Practice." Berlin: European Association for Studies in Screen Translation, 17 October 1998. Web. 18 May 2016.
- Karamitroglou, Fotios. "A Proposed Set of Subtitling Standards in Europe." *Translation Journal* 2.2 (1998): n. pag. Web. 18 May 2016.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2012. Print.
- Nash, Walter. *The Language of Humour: Style and Technique in Comic Discourse*. Harlow: Longman, 1985. Print.
- Pérez-González, Luis. "Audiovisual Translation." *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London & New York: Routledge, 2009. 13-20. PDF File.
- Ritchie, Graeme. "Linguistic Factors in Humour." *Translation Humour and Literature*. Ed. Delia Chiaro. London: Continuum, 2010. 33-48. Print.
- Ross, Alison. *The Language of Humour*. 1998. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005. eBook.
- Sanderson, John D. "Strategies for the Dubbing of Puns." *New Trends in Audiovisual Translation*. Ed. Jorge Díaz Cintas. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2009. 123-132. Print.
- "serif, n. and adj." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, May 2016. Web. 18 May 2016.
- Tveit, Jan-Emil. "Dubbing versus Subtitling: Old Battleground Revisited." *Audiovisual Translation: Language Transfer on Screen*. Ed. Jorge Díaz Cintas and Gunilla Anderman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 85-96. PDF File.
- Vandaele, Jeroen. "Humor in Translation." *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Ed. Gambier Yves and Van Doorslaer Luc. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010. 147-52. PDF File.

Yuanjian, He. "A Functional Gap Between Dubbing and Subtitling." *Dubbing and Subtitling in a World Context*. Ed. Gilbert C. F. Fong and Kenneth K. L. Au. Hong Kong: Chinese UP, 2009. 63-78. Print.

Zabalbeascoa, Patrick. "Dubbing and the Nonverbal Dimension of Translation." *Nonverbal Communication and Translation : New Perspectives and Challenges in Literature, Interpretation and the Media*. Ed. Fernando Poyatos. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1997. 327-342. PDF.

## Films Cited

*Aladdin*. Dir. Ron Clements, John Musker. Walt Disney Pictures, 1992. Dvd.

*Hercules*. Dir. Ron Clements, John Musker. Walt Disney Pictures, 1997. Dvd.

*The Aristocats*. Dir. Wolfgang Reitherman. Walt Disney Productions, 1970. Dvd.

*The Hunchback of the Notre Dame*. Dir. Gary Trousdale, Kirk Wise. Walt Disney Pictures, 1996. Dvd.

*The Lion King*. Dir. Roger Allers, Rob Minkoff. Walt Disney Pictures, 1994. Dvd.

*The Many Adventures of Winnie the Pooh*. Dir. John Lounsbery, Wolfgang Reitherman, 1977. Dvd.

*The Princess and the Frog*. Dir. Ron Clements, John Musker, 2009. Dvd.

*The Sword in the Stone*. Dir. Wolfgang Reitherman. Walt Disney Productions, 1963. Dvd.

*Winnie the Pooh*. Dir. Stephen J. Anderson, Don Hall. Walt Disney Pictures, 2011. Dvd.

## Appendix A: Pun Data

### *The Sword in the Stone (1963)*

Time	Image	Original Text	Type	Subtitle Text	Dubbed Text	Method	Type	Humour Loss
4:34	The owl Archimedes sticks his head out his birdhouse	-He should be here in, uh, I'd say half an hour -Who? Who? I'd like to know who	Homophone	-Hij kan hier over 'n half uur zijn -Wie? Ik wil graag weten wie.	-Hij kan hier zijn over een klein half uurtje. -Wie? Wie? Nou, nou, ik wil weten wie	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: N/A	Sub: Slight Dub: Slight
7:58	Wart falls through the roof, into a chair at the table	So, you, you did drop in for tea after all	Homonym	Zo, je komt toch maar even binnenvallen voor de thee?	Dus je komt even binnenvallen	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonym Dub: Homonym	Sub: No Dub: No
36:00	[Wart is telling about being turned into a fish and attacked by a pike]	-He was a monster! The biggest fish I ever saw -And boy, that's the biggest fish story I ever heard	Homonym	-Hij was 'n monster. Een enorme vis -Beter visserslatijn heb ik nog nooit gehoord	-Het was een monster! De grootste vis van de wereld -En Wart, das het beste visserslatijn van de wereld	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: ???? Dub: ????	Sub: Slight Dub: No
36:19		Well he's either out of his head, or there's something mighty fishy going on around here	Homonym	Of hij is niet goed snik, of ik moet dit eens uitvissen	Of hij is niet goed bij zijn hoofd, of ik moet eens uitvissen wat hier aan de hand is	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: ???? Dub: ????	Sub: No Dub: No

### *The Aristocats (1970)*

Time	Image	Original Text	Type	Subtitle Text	Dubbed Text	Method	Type	Humour Loss
-	-	The Aristocats	Mime	De Aristokatten	De Aristokatten	PUN > PUN	Mime	Slight
4:44	George falls down the stairs, Edgar rushes to help him	-May I give you a hand? -You haven't got an extra foot, have you, Edgar?	Homonymic Phrase (?)	-Laat me u een handje helpen -Je kunt me zeker geen voet lenen, hè?	-Mag ik u een arm geven, meneer? -Ja, je werkt graag met je ellebogen, hè?	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: N/A	Sub: Yes Dub: Yes
41:04	The two geese dive, their bums sticking up out of the water	Bottoms up	Homonymic phrase	Duiken	N/A	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > ZERO	Sub: N/A Dub: N/A	Sub: Yes Dub: Yes
42:08		-We're on holiday -For a walking tour of France -We're swimming some of the way	N/A	-We zijn op reis -We wandelen -En zwemmen -In het water	-Ja, we zijn met vakantie -Wij werken bij het GAK -Maar we maken nu een tour -Een Tour de France	Sub: N/A Dub: NON-PUN > PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: Homophone	Sub: No Dub: Added

		-On water, of course						
42:28		-Hiya, chicks -We're not chickens, we're geese.	Homonym	-Hallo, meisjes -We zijn geen meisjes, maar ganzen	-Hi meisjes -Zijn geen meisjes, gansjes	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: N/A	Sub: Yes Dub: Yes
45:27		My two favourite nooses	Portmanteaux	Mijn allerliefste nichtjes	Alles kits	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: N/A	Sub: Yes Dub: Yes
46:05		Being British, I would have preferred Sherry. Sherry, Sherry.	N/A	Als Engelsman had ik liever Sherry gehad Sherry, Sherry.	En nu ben ik helemaal ongans. Ongans, ongans.	Sub: N/A Dub: NON-PUN > PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: ????	Sub: No Dub: Added
46:18		-You're just too much -You mean he's had too much	N/A (rhetorical device)	-Oom Waldo, u bent me er eentje -Nee, hij heeft er eentje te veel op gans	-U bent me der eentje hoor -Nee, geen eendje, hij is een gans	Sub: N/A Dub: NON-PUN > PUN	Sub: (rhetorical device) Dub: homophone	Sub: No Dub: Added
46:		-Birds of a feather must hic together -That's stick together	Mime	-Ik ga mee, dan ben ik in m'n hik -In m'n schik, bedoelt u	-En we gaan nog niet naar huis -Oja, we gaan wel	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: Mime Dub: N/A	Sub: No Dub: Slight
56:08		You're too much	N/A	Wat een snoezepoes	Snoezepoes	Sub: NON-PUN > PUN Dub: NON-PUN > PUN	Sub: ???? Dub: ????	Sub: Added Dub: Added
1:02:24		All it needs is a little tidying up and, well, maybe a feminine touch	N/A	Er moet wel wat opgeruimd worden en er is een vrouwenpoot nodig	Het kan hier natuurlijk gezelliger worden, het heeft hier en daar een vrouwenpoot nodig, maar verder is het mooi	Sub: NON-PUN > PUN Dub: NON-PUN > PUN	Sub: ???? Dub: ????	Sub: Added Dub: Added
1:06:20	Edgar puts Duchess and the kittens into a sack	-Duchess, wherever have you been? -Look out for the... sack	N/A	-Duchess, waar heb jij gezeten? -Pas op voor de... zak	-Duchess, we zaten in zak en as -Ja, die zak! Die zak	Sub: N/A Dub: NON-PUN > PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: Pun-Metaphor	Sub: No Dub: Added

### *The Many Adventures of Winnie the Pooh (1977)*

Time	Image	Original Text	Type	Subtitle Text	Dubbed Text	Method	Type	Humour Loss
3:17	Above the door is written 'MR SANDERS'	Winnie the Pooh lived in this enchanted forest under the name of Sanders	Homonymic phrase	Winnie de Poeh woonde in het bos, onder de naam Sanders	Winnie de Poeh woonde ergens in het Honderd Bunderbos onder de naam Sanders	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonymic phrase Dub: Homonymic phrase	Sub: No Dub: No
3:30	There is a cuckoo clock with a small Pooh in it instead of	Now, when Pooh heard his Pooh-coo clock, he knew it was time for something	Mime	Toen poeh zijn Poeh-koeksklok hoorde wist hij dat het tijd was	Op een keerde hoorde Poeh zijn tijd voor iets klok slaan, en hij had het gevoel dat het tijd voor	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: Mime Dub: N/A	Sub: No Dub: Yes

	a bird				iets was			
8:43	Christopher Robin is shown to have just attached the tail	It's not much of a tail, but I'm sort of attached to it	Homonym	Veel staart is het niet, maar ik ben eraan gehecht	(hij hangt weer!) Ik hang ook erg aan hem	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: Homonym Dub: N/A	Sub: No Dub: Yes
18:44		-Blast it all -Good idea! We'll dynamite. Save time -Ah, what's the charge? -The charge, oh about seven sticks of dynamite -No, no, no, the cost! The charge in money? -Nope, no charge account. I work strictly cash. -Obviously, but I should think...	Homonym	-Wat een klap -Goed idee. Met dynamiet -Hoeveel? -Hoeveel? Een staaf of zeven -Hoe hoog wordt de rekening? -Nee, niet op rekening. Alleen contant. -.....	(Daar trap ik niet in) -Waar trapt u niet in? -We kunnen de boel intrappen, of opblazen -Wat bedoelt u met opblazen? -Een goeie lange lont en zeven staven dynamiet -Onzin, ik vroeg naar uw uurloon -Ach, ik doe het in ieder geval niet meer zwart, oh nee -ik hoef de kleur niet te weten	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonym Dub: Homonym	Sub: No Dub: Slight
28:41 (etc)		Happy winds-day!	Mime	Vrolijk waai feest	Vrolijk waai feest	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: N/A	Sub: Slight Dub: Slight
1:04:10		-What's the matter tigger? -Oh thank goodness, I was just getting seasick, from seeing too much	Homophone	-Wat is er, Teigertje? -Gelukkig, ik werd zeeziek omdat ik te veel dingen zag	-Ben je nu al moe, Teigertje? -Lieve help, ik word echt zeeziek van het kijken naar beneden	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: N/A	Sub: Yes Dub: Yes

**Aladdin (1992)**

Time	Image	Original Text	Type	Subtitle Text	Dubbed Text	Method	Type	Humour Loss
34:22	Genie hangs Aladdin on a pin in the wall	Hang on a Second	Homonymic Phrase	Momentje	Ach, blijf effe hangen	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: Homonymic Phrase	Sub: Yes Dub: No
42:14	Genie turns into a sheep	I feel sheepish	Homonymic Phrase	Ik voel me 'n dom schaap	Wat ben ik een schaapskop	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: Homonym	Sub: Slight Dub: No
55:03	Genie has turned himself into a bee	Buzz off	Homonymic Phrase?	Opzoemen	Vlieg op	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonymic Phrase? Dub: Homonymic Phrase?	Sub: No Dub: No
55:05	(Continuation of	Be(e) yourself	Homophone	Denk eraan, blijf jezelf	Hou je hersens bij elkaar	Sub: PUN > NON-	Sub: N/A	Sub: Yes

	above)					PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Dub: Homophone	Dub: No
--	--------	--	--	--	--	-----------------------	----------------	---------

***The Lion King (1994)***

Time	Image	Original Text	Type	Subtitle Text	Dubbed Text	Method	Type	Humour Loss
20:00		We could have whatever is <i>lion</i> around	Homophone	Als wij het leeuwendeel maar krijgen	Dan nemen wij wel het leeuwendeel	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonym Dub: Homonym	Sub: Slight Dub: Slight
20:05		Make mine a cub sandwich	Mime	Doe mij maar een leeuwenburger	Doe mij maar een leeuwenburger	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: N/A	Sub: Yes Dub: Yes
20:12	At the end of these lines, Simba and Nala can be seen fleeing	-Did we order this dinner to go? -No, why? -'Cause there it goes!	Homonym?	-Is het een lopend buffet? -Nee, hoezo? -Ze zijn namelijk op de loop	-Wist jij dat eten kon lopen? -Nee, hoezo? -Het gaat er vandoor!	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: Homonym? Dub: N/A	Sub: No Dub: Yes
31:19		It's to <i>die</i> for	Homonym	Je zal erin blijven	Je zal derin blijven	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: N/A	Sub: Yes Dub: Yes
42:36		-He looks blue -I'd say brownish-gold	Homonym	-Hij ziet grauw -Eerder bruinachtig goud	-Hij zit met iets -Hij zit niet, hij loopt	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonym Dub: Homonym	Sub: No Dub: No
42:46		-Kid, what's eating you? -Nothing, he's at the top of the food chain	Homonymic phrase	-Wat vreet er aan je? -Hij staat bovenaan de voedselketen	-Wat is er aan de hand? -Helemaal niks, hij heeft toch geen handen?	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonymic phrase Dub: ????	Sub: No Dub: No
44:22		-What's a motto? -Nothing, what's a <i>motto</i> with you?	Homophonic phrase	-Wat is een motto? -Niks. Wat mot je	-Wat is een motto? -Niks, wat motte we met u?	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: ???? Dub: ????	Sub: Slight Dub: Slight
56:56		-This stinks -Sorry	Homonym	-Hier zit een luchtje aan -Sorry	-Het stinkt -Oh, pardon	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: Homonymic phrase Dub: N/A	Sub: No Dub: Slight

***The Hunchback of Notre Dame (1996)***

Time	Image	Original Text	Type	Subtitle Text	Dubbed Text	Method	Type	Humour Loss
18:04	Phoebus pats his leg, getting his horse to	Come on, boy. Achilles, heel	Homonym?	Kom op, Achilles.	Kom op, Achilles. Hiel.	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: Homonym	Sub: Yes Dub: No

	follow					Dub: PUN > PUN		
18:54	[off screen, the old captain of the guard is being whipped whilst Frolo observes]	I'm sure you'll whip my men into shape	Homonym	Je leert m'n mannen het klappen van de zweep wel	Maar ik verwacht dat u er flink de zweep over zal leggen	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonym? Dub: Homonym?	Sub: No Dub: No
31:44	Djali the goat headbutts Phoebus in the stomach	I didn't know you had a kid	Homonym	Ah, je hebt een kind	Hulp uit onverwachte hoek	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: Homonymic Phrase	Sub: Yes Dub: Slight
41:16	Esmeralda and Quasimodo are talking, the Gargoyles are eavesdropping	-Maybe Frolo's wrong about the both of us. -What did she say? -Frolo's nose is long, and he wears a truss.	Mimetic Phrase	-Frolo heeft 't mis over ons allebei -Wat zegt ze? -Frolo slist en heeft een gewei	-Dus misschien had Frolo ongelijk over ons allebei -Wat zei ze nou? -Frolo weegt een ons en het is half mei	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Mimetic Phrase Dub: Mimetic Phrase	Sub: No Dub: Slight
1:07:19		Gather around, everybody! There's "good noose" tonight	Mime	Kom hier, allemaal. We zitten met 'n goede strop	Kom erbij iedereen. Wat een strop voor jullie	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonym Dub: Homonym	Sub: Slight Dub: Slight

***Hercules (1997)***

Time	Image	Original Text	Type	Subtitle Text	Dubbed Text	Method	Type	Humour Loss
0:54		-Heroes like Hercules -Honey, you mean <i>Hunkules</i> .	Mime	-Helden zoals Hercules -Je bedoelt Herculekker	-Helden als Hercules -Zeg liever Herculekker	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Mime Dub: Mime	Sub: No Dub: No
5:47		You'll work yourself to death	????	Je werkt je nog eens dood	Je werkt jezelf nog dood	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: ???? Dub: ????	Sub: No Dub: No
15:09		Maybe we should call him Jerkules	Mime	We kunnen 'm beter Harkules noemen	(beter?) Klunzules	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: Mime Dub: N/A	Sub: No Dub: Slight
31:21	Hercules charges headfirst into the monster he is fighting	Use your head!	Homonymic Phrase	Gebruik je hoofd	Gebruik je hoofd!	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonymic Phrase Dub: Homonymic Phrase	Sub: No Dub: No
1:17:23	Meg's spirit is floating in a pool of the dead	Meg's running with a new crowd these days, and not a very lively one at that	Homonym	Meg heeft nu nieuwe vrienden. En er zit niet veel leven in	Meg heeft een nieuwe vriendenkring en er zit niet veel leven in	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonym Dub: Homonym	Sub: No Dub: No

***The Princess and the Frog (2009)***

Time	Image	Original Text	Type	Subtitle Text	Dubbed Text	Method	Type	Humour loss
------	-------	---------------	------	---------------	-------------	--------	------	-------------

17:20	Lawrence gets his head stuck in a tuba	You finally got into the music	Homonymic Phrase	Je bent dus toch betoeterd	Je bent dus toch betoeterd	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: ???? Dub: ????	Sub: Slight Dub: Slight
32:40	Naveen has a leech on his arm	-You said you were fabulously wealthy -No no no, my parents are fabulously wealthy. But they cut me off for being a LEECH, leech!	Homonym	-Je zei dat je schatrijk was -Nee, m'n ouders zijn schatrijk. Maar ze vinden me een.... Bloedzuiger	-Jij hebt gezegd dat je harstikke rijk was -Nee, nee, nee, nee. M'n ouders zijn vreselijk rijk maar zij geven me niks, ik ben een... feest BEEST	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonym Dub: Homonym?	Sub: No Dub: Yes
42:36	Tiana and Naveen are stuck together with their tongues constricted	I guess you and your boyfriend got a little carried away, am I right?	N/A	Jij weet wel hoe je een man moet strikken, hè?	Meid, jij weet wel hoe je je vriendje aan je moet binden zeg, heb ik gelijk of niet hè?	Sub: NON-PUN > PUN Dub: NON-PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonym Dub: Homonym	Sub: Added Dub: Added
42:43	The firefly, Ray, turns on his light	Let me shine a little light on the situation	Homonymic Phrase	Ik werp even een ander licht op de zaak	Ik werp wel eens effe een lichtje op de <i>situation</i>	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonymic Phrase Dub: Homonymic Phrase	Sub: No Dub: No
49:33		-Listen here, mister. This stick in the mud has had to work two jobs her whole life while you've been sucking on a silver spoon chasing chamber maids around your... your ivory tower! -Actually, it's polished marble	Homonymic Phrase	-Hoor 's, manneke. Ik heb altijd twee baantjes gehad terwijl jij in de watten lag en achter de kamermeisjes aan zat in je ivoren toren -Het is gepolijst marmer	-Luister eens, prinsje. Deze ouwe taart hier heeft al twee banen sinds haar schooltijd, terwijl jij van gouden bordjes at en kamermeisjes versierde in je, je, ivoren toren -Je bedoelt Italiaans marmer	Sub: PUN > PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: Homonymic Phrase Dub: Homonymic Phrase	Sub: No Dub: No
53:29		Hop to it!	Homonym	Schiet op	Aan het werk	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: N/A	Sub: Yes Dub: Yes
58:19		-How's your grandmama? -Oh, she's fine. Got into a trouble for flashing the neighbours again	Homonym	-Hoe gaat het met je oma? -Prima. Alleen zeuren de burens over haar naaktloperij	-Hoe is het met je oma? -Oh, heel goed. Ze is druk op zoek naar een knipperlicht relatie	Sub: PUN > NON-PUN Dub: PUN > PUN	Sub: N/A Dub: Homonym	Sub: Yes Dub: No

**Winnie the Pooh (2011)**

Time	Image	Original Text	Type	Subtitle Text	Dubbed Text	Method	Type	Humour loss
37:51		Rabbit -Can you tie a knot? Piglet -I cannot	Homophone Mime	Rabbit -Kun je knopen maken? Piglet -Nee, ik niet	Rabbit -Kun je knopen knopen? Piglet -Ik nientuh	Sub: PUN > PUN PUN > NON-PUN	Sub: Homonym Dub: Homonym	Sub: Slight Yes



	<p>Rabbit -Ah, so you can knot!  Piglet -No, I cannot knot  Rabbit -Not knot?  Pooh -Who's there?  Rabbit -Pooh!  Pooh -Pooh Who?  Rabbit -No, Pooh, it's....  Piglet, you'll need more than two knots  Piglet -Not possible  Owl -Ah, so it is possible to knot those pieces  Piglet -Not these pieces  Pooh -Yes, knot those pieces  Piglet -Why not?  Eyoore -'Cause it's all for naught  Piglet -Oh dear dear, I can't tie a knot</p>	Homophone	<p>Rabbit -Ah, dus je kan wel nieten  Piglet -Nee, ik niet niet  Rabbit -Niet niet?  Pooh - Nooit niet  Rabbit -.....  Pooh -Wat?  Rabbit -Hou op. Kun je ze aan elkaar nieten?  Piglet -Ik niet  Owl -Ah, je kan ze dus aan elkaar nieten  Piglet -Niet deze stukken  Pooh -Ja, niet die  Piglet -Waarom niet?  Eyoore -Ik geniet niet  Piglet -O, ik zie het niet meer zitten</p>	<p>Rabbit -Niet nieten, knopen  Piglet -Nee, ik kan geen knoop knoop  Rabbit -Knoop knoop?  Pooh -Wie is daar?  Rabbit -Poeh!  Pooh -Poeh wie?  Rabbit -Nee, Poeh, ik...  Knorretje, knoop de eindjes aan elkaar  Piglet -Dat lukt me niet  Owl -Ah, dus knopen lukt niet, maar je kunt wel nieten  Piglet -Uh, wel nieten?  Pooh -Ja, niet de touwen aan elkaar  Piglet -Waarom niet?  Eyoore -Omdat we in de knoop zitten  Piglet -Ik kan er geen touw meer aan vastknopen</p>	<p>PUN &gt; NON-PUN  Dub: PUN &gt; PUN  PUN &gt; PUN  PUN &gt; PUN  NON-PUN &gt; PUN</p>	<p>????  Homonymic  Phrase</p>	<p>Yes  Dub: Slight  No  No  Added</p>
--	---	-----------	---	--	--	--	--

## Appendix B: Humour Data

### Subtitles:

Film	Total Original Pun Instances	PUN > PUN	PUN > NON-PUN	PUN > ZERO	NON-PUN > PUN	NON-PUN > NON-PUN	Total Target Text Puns	Original Humour	Humour loss	Added Humour	Total Humour
<i>The Sword in the Stone</i>	4	3	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	3
<i>The Aristocats</i>	6	2	4	0	2	4	4	6,5	4,5	2	4
<i>The Many Adventures of Winnie the Pooh</i>	6	4	2	0	0	0	6	6	1,5	0	4,5
<i>Aladdin</i>	4	1	3	0	0	0	1	4	2,5	0	1,5
<i>The Lion King</i>	8	6	2	0	0	0	6	8	3	0	5
<i>The Hunchback of the Notre Dame</i>	5	3	2	0	0	0	3	5	2,5	0	2,5
<i>Hercules</i>	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	5
<i>The Princess and the Frog</i>	6	4	2	0	1	0	5	6	2,5	1	4,5
<i>Winnie the Pooh</i>	3	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	2,5	0	0,5
<b>Total</b>	47	29	18	0	3	4	34	47,5	20	3	30,5

### Dub:

Film	Total Original Pun Instances	PUN > PUN	PUN > NON-PUN	PUN > ZERO	NON-PUN > PUN	NON-PUN > NON-PUN	Total Target Text Puns	Original Humour	Humour loss	Added Humour	Total Humour
<i>The Sword in the Stone</i>	4	3	1	0	0	0	3	4	0,5	0	3,5
<i>The Aristocats</i>	6	1	4	1	6	0	7	6,5	4,5	6	8
<i>The Many Adventures of Winnie the Pooh</i>	6	2	4	0	0	0	2	6	4	0	2

<i>Aladdin</i>	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	4
<i>The Lion King</i>	8	4	4	0	0	0	4	8	4,5	0	3,5
<i>The Hunchback of the Notre Dame</i>	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	1,5	0	3,5
<i>Hercules</i>	5	4	1	0	0	0	2	5	0,5	0	4,5
<i>The Princess and the Frog</i>	6	5	1	0	1	0	6	6	2,5	1	4,5
<i>Winnie the Pooh</i>	3	3	0	0	1	0	4	3	0,5	1	3,5
<b>Total</b>	47	31	15	0	8	0	37	47,5	18,5	8	37