

https://dspace.org/

The translation of humour in Neil Gaiman and Terry Pratchett's Good omens

Khoza, Solomzi Sonwabo

2016

http://hdl.handle.net/10539/21812

Khoza, Solomzi Sonwabo (2016) The translation of humour in Neil Gaiman and Terry Pratchett's Good omens, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, <http://hdl.handle.net/10539/21812>

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

University of the Witwatersrand

The Translation of Humour in Neil Gaiman and Terry Pratchett's Good Omens

Solomzi S. Khoza

296800

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Humantities University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Translation Johannesburg, 2016

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to investigate how the different types of humour in Neil Gaiman and Terry Pratchett's *Good Omens* have been translated into French and German as *De Bons Présages* and *Ein Gutes Omen*, respectively. This study applies frame semantics to analyse how the translators recreated the humour of the ST in the instances that they were able to do so. This theory examines how context is created and what expectations arise from an individual's knowledge of context i.e. their understanding of the context and what the reader or hearer associates with it. The novel involves several subplots, but the same humorous elements such as puns, parody and an invented archaic variety of English appear throughout the book and it is the aim of this study to determine how these elements were dealt with by the translators. I will compare the two translations and determine how, and if each translator was able to recreate the same frames that made the ST humorous.

Declaration

I, Solomzi Sonwabo Khoza, declare that this research report is my own unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Translation. It has not been submitted for any other degree or examination in any other university.

Signature:__S.S. Khoza_____

Date: _2016-03-16_____

Table of Contents

Chapter One – Introduction.....1
1.1. Introduction.....1
1.2. About the Authors.....2
1.3. Good Omens.....3
1.4. Aim and Rationale.....5
1.5. Structure of the Study.....6
Chapter Two – Literature Review…….....8
2.1. Humour……..8
2.1.1. Parody.....11
a. Parody of a Genre.....12
b. Parody of an Author/School.....13
c. Parody of a Specific Work.....13
2.1.2. Identifying Parody.....14
2.1.3. Satire.....15
2.1.4. Defining Jokes.....16
2.2 Creating and Translating Humour.....18
2.2.1. Creating Names.....18
2.2.2. Puns.....20
2.2.3. Culture and Translation…….....21
2.2.4. Substitution.....25
2.3. Relevance Theory and GTVH.....25
Chapter Three – Theoretical Framework.....30
3.1 Frame Semantics.....30
3.1.1. Visual Frames.....32
3.1.2. Situational Frames.....32
3.1.3. Text-type Frames.....32
3.1.4. Social Frames.....33
3.1.5. Institutional Frames.....33
3.1.6. Generic Frames.....34
3.1.7. Reinforcement.....35
3.1.8. Metaphoric Mapping.....35
3.1.9. Metonymic Mapping.....35
3.1.10. Modification.....35
3.1.11. Distortion of Existing Frames.....36
3.1.12. Creating New Frames.....36
3.1.13 New Connections between Frames.....36
3.1.14. Activating Erroneous Frames.....36
Chapter Four – Methodology and Analysis……37
4.1. Methodology.....37
4.2. Analysis.....38
Chapter Five – Conclusion.....67
5.1. Conclusion.....67
Bibliography.....72

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Humour is often defined as something that makes a person laugh or smile (Ross, 1998: 1). This definition, while commonly accepted, hardly encompasses the numerous and complex cognitive processes involved in perceiving humour. This definition, however, does hint at the universal nature of humour. All peoples and cultures have humour whether in an oral or written form. Humour is also present in many literary works produced over the years. The translation of literature therefore sometimes involves the translation of humour. Cultural differences are part and parcel of translation, but they acquire a new dimension when it comes to the translation of humour. What is considered humorous differs from culture to culture and the humour that people use may be a way of expressing their belonging to a specific group. As Ross (1998: 1) states: "Like other aspects of language, humour is a way in which people show their allegiance to a group. If someone signals their intention to say something humorous, the listeners are immediately ready to laugh".

The cultural element of humour is not the only obstacle that a translator may face – there are also challenges based on the type of humour. Different forms of humour will, of course require different strategies. Salvatore Attardo (1994: 95) makes a distinction between referential and verbal jokes:

> There are two kinds of jokes (…) On one side, we have "referential" jokes, and on the other, we have "verbal" jokes. The former are based exclusively on the meaning of the text and do not make any reference to the phonological realization of the lexical items (or of other units in the text), while the latter, in addition to being based on the meaning of the elements of the text, make reference to the phonological realization of the text.

So according to Attardo, some jokes are concerned with creating humour at the linguistic level, while others involve humour at the pragmatic level. These different types of jokes will each pose their own unique challenges and will require specific strategies. According to Chiaro (1992: 80-81):

> When the two languages involved in the translation of a joke possess even a little shared cultural ground with each other, although the target version will not always

> be perfectly clear to the recipient, it will at least bear some resemblance, content-wise, to the message in the original text. [However,] many [jokes] play on events, states and situations which are peculiar to their culture of origin. Naturally such jokes create serious problems, not as far as the technicalities of translation are concerned, especially if no punning is involved, but for the recipient's understanding.

This is what drew me to the translation of humour; humour is so subjective and dependent on the recipient's knowledge that looking at its translation fascinated me. There also seems to be a dearth of studies on the translation of humour. Attardo (2002: 154) comments on this gap: "the combined object of humour translation must have seemed until now so vast, disorientating and dangerous an ocean that few academic efforts were made to theorize the processes, agents, contexts and products involved".

1.2. About the Authors

Terry Pratchett

> *Terry Pratchett was born in 1948 and is still not dead. He started work as a journalist one day in 1965 and saw his first corpse three hours later, work experience meaning something in those days.*
>
> - Terry Pratchett

The above biographical information, though factual, is written in Pratchett's typical ironic style. The late Sir Terence David John "Terry" Pratchett was born in Beaconsfield, England in 1948. At the age of 13 his first story, *The Hades Business*, was published in his school's magazine. This story was published commercially two years later, when Pratchett was 15. At the age of 17 he left school to work for Bucks Free Press where he wrote for the children's section under the pseudonym Uncle Jim. While on day release, he passed his A Level in English and took a proficiency in journalism course. In 1968, while interviewing with a publisher, he mentioned that he had been working on a manuscript. The resulting novel, *The Carpet People* was published in 1971. Two more novels followed in 1976 and 1981. He published his first *Discworld* novel, *The Colour of Magic* in 1983. He became a writer full-time after publishing his fourth *Discworld* novel, *Mort*. The series would go on to be a major success for Pratchett, making him one of the United Kingdom's most prolific fantasy authors. He passed away on 12 March 2015.

Neil Gaiman

I was very,very good at taking a voice that already existed and parodying or pastiching it. - Neil Gaiman

Neil Richard McKinnon Gaiman was born in Portchester, England in 1960. As a child, Gaiman read voraciously and he credits the works of C.S. Lewis, J. R.R. Tolkien and Lewis Carroll as his biggest influences. As a young adult, he wrote a letter to science fiction writer, R.A. Lafferty asking him for advice on how to become an author. He also sent a pastiche of Lafferty's work that he had written along with the letter. He pursued journalism in the early 1980s. He wrote his first short story entitled *Featherquest* in 1984. That same year, his first book, a biography on the band Duran Duran was published. In 1987 he left journalism because he felt that the British press would often publish lies and call them the truth. That same year he was hired by DC Comics to work on the *Black Orchid* series. His work on that series caught the eye of Karen Berger (who would go on to become head of DC Comics) who offered Gaiman a job rewriting an old character called The Sandman. The *Sandman* series became one of Gaiman's most noted works. In the late 1980s Gaiman wrote *Don't Panic: The Official Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy Companion*. After the publication of this book he began writing a parody of Richmal Crompton's *Just William* series, called *William the Antichrist*. After showing his writing to Pratchett, whom he had befriended in 1985, the pair began collaborating on a novel.

1.3. Good Omens

Good Omens is the first and only collaboration between Terry Pratchett and Neil Gaiman. It is also Gaiman's first novel. The collaboration began after Gaiman showed his friend, and fellow author, Pratchett a draft of an end of the world parody. Gaiman had had to cease working on this parody in order to focus on his graphic novel, *Sandman*. According to Gaiman the discussion regarding his manuscript went as follows:

> “It's Terry," said Terry. "’Ere. That thing you sent me. Are you doing anything with it?"
>
> "Not really."
>
> "Well, I think I know what happens next. Do you want to sell it to me? Or write it together?

> "Write it together," I said, because I was not stupid, and because that was the nearest I was ever going to get to Michaelangelo phoning to ask if I wanted to paint a ceiling with him (BBC News: 2014).

According to Gaiman, Pratchett contributed to the majority of the writing, but the process was still collaborative.

> We were both living in England when we wrote it. At an educated guess, although neither of us ever counted, Terry probably wrote around 60,000 "raw" and I wrote 45,000 "raw" words of *Good Omens*, with, on the whole, Terry taking more of the plot with Adam and the Them in, and me doing more of the stuff that was slightly more tangential to the story, except that broke down pretty quickly and when we got towards the end we swapped characters so that we'd both written everyone by the time it was done, but then we also rewrote and footnoted each other's bits as we went along, and rolled up our sleeves to take the first draft to the second (quite a lot of words), and by the end of it, neither of us was entirely certain who had written what. It was indeed plotted in long phone daily calls, and we would post floppy disks (and this was back in 1988 when floppy disks really were pretty darn floppy) back and forth (Neilgaiman.com: 2006).

The result was *Good Omens*, which was published on 1 May 1990. The novel parodies stories with naughty, but endearing children such as the *Just William* series as well as end of the world stories such as *The Omen*[1] and also deals with the birth of the Antichrist. Like Damien in *The Omen*, the character of Adam is meant to be swapped with the baby of an American diplomat, but due to an absent minded satanic nun, he ends up being raised by the Youngs, a middle class family from a small English town. The story follows the angel (and rare book dealer) Azipharale and the demon Crowley who have been unlikely companions since their days in the Garden of Eden. They have each in their own way become fond of humanity and when they discover that the child that they thought was the Antichrist is a regular boy, they try to find the real Antichrist in order to delay the end of the world. There are subplots involving the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse and witch hunters who are also looking for the Antichrist.

[1] A 1976 film that tells the story of an American diplomat who finds out that his son Damien is actually The Antichrist

The novel received critical acclaim. It was nominated for the Locus Award for Best Fantasy Novel and the World Fantasy Award in the Best Novel category. In 2003, it was ranked number 68 in BBC's The Big Read survey (BBC, 2014). The book was turned into a radio series that ran from 22 December 2014 on BBC Radio 4. Both authors made cameo appearances as two police officers named Neil and Terry.

A German translation was published a year later, in 1991. The translation was done by Andreas Brandhorst, who at the time was the German translator for Terry Pratchett's *Discworld* series. The French version appeared in 1995. It was translated by Patrick Marcel, who was responsible for translating Neil Gaiman's work into French.

One reviewer describes the novel as having a "fundamental Britishness" (The Bookbag, 2014). This "Britishness" is an important component of the humour in *Good Omens*, especially when it comes to the character of Mr Young and other residents of the fictional village of Lower Tadfield. This cultural aspect of the humour in *Good Omens* was one of the reasons I wanted to see how humour can be translated. Some reviews of *Ein Gutes Omen* made reference to the especially English flavour of the novel, while criticising the translator's handling of it and the quality of the translation itself.

> Leider kommt der Sprachwitz ebenso wenig in der deutschen Übersetzung herüber wie der schottische Dialekt des Hexenjägers Shadwell oder wie Adam Youngs eigenes südenglisches Idiom. Dadurch verliert das Buch viel an Lokalkolorit, an Authentizität. Daher meine Empfehlung: lesen Sie dieses Buch unbedingt im Original! (Literaturwelt, 2007).

The negative reception of the book in German was due to the translator. The reviewer felt that the translator did not succeed in conveying the humour of the original. The fact that the translator is referenced in this review reaffirms my initial interest in the study of humour in translation. The reviewer blames the translator for the humour falling flat, instead of finding the story itself devoid of humour. This is why I wanted to look at the translation of humour and what strategies can be used to recreate humour in another language.

1.4. Aim and Rationale

The aim of this paper is to investigate how the different types of humour in Neil Gaiman and Terry Pratchett's *Good Omens* have been translated into French and German as *De Bons Présages* and *Ein Gutes Omen*, respectively. This study will apply frame semantics to analyse

how the translators recreated the humour of the ST, in the instances that they were able to do so. This theory examines how context is created and what expectations arise from an individual's knowledge of context i.e. their understanding of the context and what the reader or hearer associates with it. The novel involves several subplots, but the same humorous elements such as puns, parody and an invented archaic variety of English appear throughout the book and it is the aim of this study to determine how these elements were dealt with by the translators. I will compare the two translations and determine how, and if each translator was able to recreate the same frames that made the ST humorous.

1.5. Structure of the Study

Chapter Two focuses on humour. In this chapter I define humour and delve into different forms of humour. Different forms of humour requires different translation strategies and I explore the two comedy genres that are used the most in the novel. As the book is a parody, I look at this genre in depth and discuss the defining features of parody and the different types of parody there are. I also define parody according to its use in the text and the author's attitude towards the source material. Similar to parody, is satire. I briefly look at satire and how this genre works. Finally I look at culture and its impact on the creation and translation of humour. This section focuses on different kinds of jokes and how they impact the translation process. I examine the creation of names and puns as methods of creating humour. I then look at cultural substitution as a method of overcoming the challenges that translating humour may present.

The third chapter constitutes the theoretical framework of this study. After examining cultural substitution, I touch on relevance theory and give an in depth study of the General Theory of Verbal Humour. The chapter concludes with an overview of frame semantics and the strategies for creating and translating humour, as defined by Ana Maria Lopez Rojo (2002).

The fourth chapter begins with the methodology of the study. The study examines five extracts from the novel of 5-20 lines each. The analysis follows the methodology. This section consists of a brief introductory paragraph, followed by the selected extract in English and followed by the French and German translations. Then the three extracts are analysed individually using the framework of frame semantics and looking at other elements that have been used to create humour.

The study is concluded in the final chapter. I give a summary of each frame and the conclusions that I have made from analysing them. I then give my findings on the study as a whole.

CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Humour

Humour is often created through the telling of jokes. Put simply, a joke is "something you say deliberately to evoke amusement. It's a thing of words, a unit of communication... It's a formulaic verbal construction designed to elicit a response - laughter" (Carr and Greeves 2006:3). Jokes, therefore must have a certain quality about them that will elicit the desired response. Jokes are more sophisticated than regular speech acts, as their purpose is greater than merely conveying information. According to Carr and Greaves (2006: 33):

> A joke is a highly sophisticated verbal flourish, a product of human culture and intellect and linguistic skill, which has so far defied science's efforts to reproduce it under laboratory conditions. Animals can't do it, and machines can't do it. Telling a joke is complex higher-order communication.

What distinguishes telling jokes from other speech acts is that jokes perform the complicated task of creating humour. It is the humorous punch line or wordplay which causes people to respond to jokes with laughter. If a joke is successful, it will activate certain cognitive processes in the mind of the person who hears it that will cause him/her to respond with laughter. If the purpose of jokes is to create humour, what then is humour exactly? The Oxford Dictionary defines humour as, "the quality of being amusing or comic, especially as expressed in literature or speech". According to Jeroen Vandaele (2002: 153), "Humour is used in everyday parlance to refer simultaneously to an effect and its (con)textual causes, an occurrence so normal(ized) that we don't even notice it". These two definitions demonstrate the extent to which attitudes towards humour have evolved over time. Plato had a greatly negative attitude towards humour. He claimed that humour is a negative phenomenon because it "is based on malevolence and envy, in particular laughter caused by the hardship or ill-fortune of another, or mockery of someone of lower status or privilege" (www.humortheory.com). However these definitions do not fully explain what makes something humorous i.e. what gives a text or an utterance "the quality of being humorous". Even Plato's assertion that humour is based on malevolence and envy, it does not clarify why a person's misfortune or hardship would cause an observer to laugh. A popular explanation for humour among humour theorists is the concept of incongruity resolution. Dynel (2009: 29) states:

> Broadly speaking, the incongruity-resolution model, credited primarily to Suls (1972, 1983), as well as to Shultz (1972, 1974, 1976), holds that incongruity is first observed and later resolved, i.e. made congruous, according to an adequate cognitive rule. Again, the resolution process will manifest itself differently for each humorous form and each incongruity. In addition, it can be argued that it always takes place, even if it coincides merely with the hearer's acknowledgement that there is a humorous incongruity capitalising on a given mechanism.

Incongruity resolution therefore gives finding an unexpected or incongruous situation as the reason that some texts can create a humorous effect. Vandaele (2002: 269) posits what could be seen as an explanation of Plato's stance on humour:

> Aggressive humour, being both aggressive and incongruous, is more often tolerated than pure aggressions [...] If we accept that superiority (aggression) and incongruity are the basic ingredients of humour, it must be the factor of incongruity that accounts for greater tolerance of aggressive behaviour.

Vandaele also highlights the importance of incongruity in the creation of humour. He does concede that there is is a negative side to humour, in the form of superiority, but he places incongruity above superiority. Even if aggression is a part of humour, that aggression must be couched in humorous language. Blatant aggression is still socially unacceptable, so it must be something else in an aggressive humorous utterance that makes it funny, instead of offensive. This factor is incongruity. Forabosco (1992) explains the process of resolving an incongruity as follows:

> In the first stage, the perceiver finds his expectations about the text disconfirmed by the ending of the joke… In other words, the recipient encounters an incongruity – the punch line. In the second stage, the perceiver engages in a form of problem solving to find a cognitive rule which makes the punch line follow from the main part of the joke and reconciles the incongruous parts. A cognitive rule is defined as a logical proposition, a definition, or a fact of experience. (Forabosco: 47-48)

From the cognitive process described by Forabosco we can see that the incongruity in a humorous utterance presents a challenge to the person who encounters it, not unlike a puzzle. It is in solving this puzzle that the hearer that derives a sense of cognitive satisfaction. In terms of this opposition between incongruity and superiority, Vandaele argues that incongruity causes humour, while a feeling of superiority is caused by the effects of humour:

> In terms of cause/effect, (humour as) perceived incongruity is defined here as a (humorous) effect caused by a departure from normal cognitive schemes. In ordinary language, superiority (as in 'a feeling of superiority') clearly relates to the effect of humour. (Vandaele, 2002: 156)

As we can see, a sense of superiority is one of the effects of humour. This however, is not the only effect, as not all jokes are meant to denigrate a specific target. If humour has the ability to produce different reactions from those who hear/read it, then it stands to reason that not all humour is the same and there are different forms of humour which serve different purposes. Vandaele (2002: 155) believes that:

> Humour should also be subdivided into more specific types, each with its own tangible ('perlocutionary') effects, its own types of laughter (or even other reactions) – rather than being treated as some undefinable, mystic category, possibly subject to different types of Volksgeist. Satire, for instance, can be defined as humour with a further critical effect and caused, for example, by an exaggerated imitation of social norms. Similarly, parody can be seen as humour with an equally sharp edge but is provoked, for instance, by an exaggerated imitation of aesthetic norms.

The nature of the humour and the manner in which it is constructed determine how it will be received and what kind of response it will elicit. Even though humour may be produced to elicit a certain response, not everyone will respond to it similarly. It may have the desired effect on some and miss the mark with others. Humour that misses its mark may be met with indifference at best, or cause offence at worst. According to Vandaele (2002: 154), "Humour based on wordplay may have 'silly' or 'witty' undertones, slapstick may strike some people as 'simplistic', nonsense talk in an unfamiliar environment may be slightly frightening, etc."

The humour sub-genres that Vandaele discusses demonstrate that humour does have other purposes than to ridicule to gain a sense of superiority. The genres of satire and parody both have an element of mockery, but for different purposes. Satire has often been used as a form of social commentary, while parody sends up certain genres or works. The novel parodies *The Omen* and the horror and fantasy genres, as well as some elements of children's literature. I discuss parody and what defines it below.

2.1.1. Parody

Parody can be defined as "parody as any humorous, satirical, or burlesque imitation, as of a person, event, etc." (www.dictionary.com). M.H. Abrams (in Broeder, 2007: 8) however gives the following definition of parody:

> A parody imitates the serious manner and characteristic features of a particular literary work, or the distinctive style of a particular author, or the typical stylistic and other features of a serious literary genre, and deflates the original by applying the imitation to a lowly or comically inappropriate subject.

Another definition of parody comes from Rose (1993: 45) who states: "Parody in its broadest sense and application may be described as first imitating and then changing either, and sometimes both, the 'form' and 'content' (…) of another work". What these three definitions have in common is that they all describe parodies as imitations. Rose and Abrams both make reference to form and style. Parodies mimic the style and conventions of a certain genre which make them familiar to the reader. They then proceed to produce some kind of incongruity, as in the example of applying the imitation to a comically inappropriate subject. In doing so a burlesque is created. According to Abrams (in Broeder, 2007: 8):

> Burlesque has been succinctly defined as 'an incongruous imitation': that is, it imitates the manner (the form and style) or else the subject matter of a serious literary work or a literary genre, in verse or in prose, but makes the imitation amusing by a ridiculous disparity between the manner and the matter.

Once again the matter of incongruity appears. Parody introduces elements of the ridiculous and the absurd in order to create humour. These elements are unexpected, as they were not part of the original work. The fact that these unexpected elements stand out when introduced to the work that is being parodied makes them incongruous. This creates a humorous effect. Rose (1993, 31-32) argues:

> The creation of comic incongruity or discrepancy will be taken as a significant distinguishing factor in parody (…) and may also be said to explain both the production of the comic effect in parody and how the parody may continue to be defined as comic, even when (…) not all readers may have the sense of humour or understanding to comprehend the intended comedy. To put this in other words, the incongruity between the parodied text and the parody which most parodies exploit

> in one intentionally comic way or another may be said to produce the comic effects which act as an indication of the presence of comic parody to the reader (…) so that the parody may still be said to be 'comic' even when its comic aspects are not noticed or understood by a recipient.

According to Rose's assertion that parodies are still comic in nature even when the recipient misses the humour reinforces the idea that incongruity is an essential element of humour. The presence of incongruity marks a text as a humorous work, even if the work does not always have the desired effect. Another result of incongruity is that the parody is still humorous to recipients even if they are not familiar with the work that is being parodied. According to Pratchett, "there are a number of passages in [my] books which are "enhanced" if you know where the echoes are coming from but which are still, I hope, funny in their own right" (qtd. in Abbott, 2002: 2). Even though Pratchett's work contains elements of parody, he admits that prior knowledge of the conventions of the genres or works that he his parodying is not required in order for the enjoyment of his humour. The same principle applies in the case of this novel. Readers who are familiar with *The Omen* will appreciate the twist of the Antichrist eventually being living in a small English town instead of being raised by an American diplomat. For those who are familiar with the film, the incongruity between the parody and the source material adds an additional layer to the humour. For readers to whom the name Damien means nothing, the incongruity within the content of the novel will still create humour. The same applies to readers who are not familiar with Crompton's books, the story of a supernatural entity growing up in a small town is still unexpected and humorous.

As Pratchett states above, his books may sometimes contain "echoes" of other works. This means that parody is one of the styles that he has utilised in that particular book, not necessarily that the entire book is a parody. We must therefore make a distinction between general and specific parodies. Specific parodies target specific works, while general parodies use many works or a certain genre as their inspiration. Broeder (2007: 9-10) provides three types of parody, ranging from the most general to the most specific. These are:

a. Parody of a genre

This type of parody is aimed at an entire literary genre and focuses on imitating and distorting its conventions. These conventions are elements such as the setting, character traits, events and values that are specific to an individual genre. In the case of parody, these are often the stereotypical features that most people associate with a certain genre. (Broeder, 2007: 9).

As a parody of a supernatural thriller, *Good Omens* has fantastical, mythical creatures, such as angels, demons and witches. The plot also involves the forces of good and evil battling over the fate of the universe. As a parody of *Just William*, the young Antichrist, Adam and his friends (known as Them) have adventures and compete with a rival neighbourhood gang.

b. Parody of an author/school

This is parody is mainly aimed at sending up stylistic features. Abrams (1999: 303) states that, "style has traditionally been defined as the manner of linguistic expression in prose or verse – as how speakers or writers say whatever it is they want to say".

c. Parody of a specific work

The subject of this type of parody is one single text (or a series of texts) from one author. Here, the focus is on imitating and distorting the features of this specific text in terms of its manner, its matter or both. (Broeder, 2007: 10). This type of parody focuses on a specific work and spoofs its subject matter, its style or both.

Parody may have multiple targets. A single work may parody both a specific genre and the specific style of an author who writes within that genre. As well as making distinctions according to subject matter, parody may also be defined according to share in the entire text. This means that an entire text may have the sole objective of parodying a specific text or it may parody other works at certain points in the narrative. This is the difference between a formal parody and parodic allusions. Broeder (2007: 10) writes:

> With formal parody, the parody takes up the entire text. The whole text is centred on parodying the original; this is its only aim. With parodic allusions, on the other hand, the text merely contains several passages that could be marked as parodies. However, the parody is not the most important aspect of the text; the text as a whole clearly has a different aim, to which the parody could then contribute.

This distinction should not be seen as a dichotomy, but rather as a spectrum. According to Dentith (2000: 19), "parody should be thought of, not as a single and tightly definable genre or practice, but as a range of cultural practices which are all more or less parodic". There are no clear lines between parodic allusions and formal parody. Parodic works can fall anywhere on the scale between these two poles.

Finally parody may be classified according to its stance towards the original text. These stances may be defined as follows:

- A positive stance, where the imitation often serves as acknowledgement of and tribute to the parodied subject;

- A negative stance, where the imitation is a means to ridicule or comment on the original;

- A neutral stance, where the imitation is merely aimed at producing a comic effect, without judging the subject of the parody (neither positively nor negatively).

2.1.2. Identifying Parody

As mentioned in the above definitions, parody entails more than merely imitating the original work. There are changes in a parody which mark it as such and set it apart from the original work. Rose (1975: 37) gives the following markers for parody:

- Semantic changes;
- Changes to the choice of words and/or the literal and metaphorical functions of words from the original text;
- Syntactic changes (which can also influence the sematic level);
- Changes in tense, person and/or other grammatical features on sentence level;
- Juxtaposition of passages from the parodied work, with each other or with new passages;
- Changes to the associations of the imitated text by means of a new context and/or other co-textual changes (and changes beyond sentence level);
- Changes in sociolect, idiolect or other elements of the vocabulary;
- Changes to metre or rhyme in verse parodies, or to other comparable "formal" elements in parodies on drama or prose, as well as changes to the subject-matter.

As a literary parody of a film, the majority of *Good Omens*' changes are changes to the associations of the imitated text. The novel extends the false identity plot of the film and creates a humorous premise that is even more unlikely than that of the film. This is how the novel parodies the film.

2.1.3. Satire

Harris (in Broeder, 2007: 35) defines satire as:

> a manner of writing that mixes a critical attitude with wit and humor in an effort to improve mankind and human institutions. (…) The satirist may insert serious statements of value or desired behavior, but most often he relies on an implicit moral code, understood by his audience and paid lip service by them. The satirist's goal is to point out the hypocrisy of his target in the hope that either the target or the audience will return to a real following of the code.

Satire therefore may be seen as an indirect attack on a person(s) or institutions through the use of comical devices. The aim of satire is not to create humour, but humour is one of the means through which satire is created. Humour is used to capture and retain the attention of the audience. This humour is used to attack a specific target. This is the defining factor of satire. Berger (1997: 157) states that:

> Most often the attack is directed against institutions and their representatives, notably political or religious ones. It may also be directed against entire social groups and their cultures (…). Or it may be used against individuals, or against theories or literary modes.

While parody sends up certain stylistic features of genres or other works, satire critiques and attacks. They may both be humorous, but parody is meant to be humorous, while satire uses humour as a weapon to mock a target. Dane (1980: 153) makes the following distinction:

> The norms in parody and satire are different; parody deals with literary norms (collective understanding of a text or genre), while satire deals with social norms. When satire calls attention to such a norm, its own plane of expression is unaffected. But when parody calls attention to the norm, it criticizes the very system on which its own plane of expression depends.

Like parody, satire may be divided into formal or direct and indirect satire. Direct satire is written in the first person and directly addresses the reader or a character in the narrative. Indirect satire is written in the third person and therefore, does not address the reader directly. "The most common type of indirect satire is the fictional narrative in which the satire is expressed through characters that make themselves and their opinions ridiculous by what they

say, think and do" (Abrams,1999: 277). Pollard (1970: 67) defines five attitudes that a satirist may use to critique a target.

1. Wit;
2. Ridicule;
3. Irony,
4. Sarcasm;
5. Cynicism/the sardonic.

These may be used in both direct and indirect satire. Pratchett and Gaiman make use of ridicule, irony and wit to satirise overly nationalist attitudes through the characters of Mr Young and American Secret Service agents.

2.1.4. Defining Jokes

In her article, *On the Feasibility and Strategies of Translating Humour,* Debra Raphaelson-West (1989: 128) posits that:

> It is not always possible to translate something such that there is dynamic equivalence. However, there are two kinds of translations to choose from: 1) translation with the goal of dynamic equivalence and 2) translation with the goal of education. It is possible to translate something so that the effects are also translated.

In the instances where translating the effect is not possible, it is possible to create a text that shows the reader that something resembling the TL exists in another language (Raphaelson-West, 1989, 128). For the purpose of this study, I look at how translators attempt to produce texts that also create the same effect as the ST. In response to other theorists such as Eugene Nida and Charles Taber (1969), who believe that translators should focus on content at the expense of form, Wilson advocates for maintaining the form and stylistics of the original text. She argues that:

> The listener or reader is affected by the power of rhetorical devices, not just content. I also believe that although the surface form of a message may change, the extent of the change is a language-specific question and it is not necessary in all cases to obliterate the original structure. (Raphaelson-West, 1989: 128).

This consideration for structure is important in the translation of humour, as Narrative Structure is one of the Knowledge Resources that Attardo outlined for the creation of humour. The content of the joke is still obviously very important, which is why the translator needs to define the type of joke he is dealing with. Raphaelson-West (Raphaelson-West, 1989: 130) provides three definitions of jokes:

I. Linguistic jokes, such as puns;

II. Cultural jokes, such as ethnic jokes;

III. Universal jokes, which involve the unexpected.

She gives the example "Linguistic jokes are punny as hell" (Raphaelson-West 1989: 130). The humour in this joke is created by the fact that the nonsense word "punny", which replaces "funny" in the idiomatic expression "funny as hell", rhymes with funny. Therefore linguistic jokes involve puns and the above expression sounds similar enough to the original expression to create humour. Jokes such as this one are the most difficult to translate, as they rely on specific wording or a turn of phrase that may not be possible to recreate in another language. There are no cultural considerations to be made when translating linguistic jokes, and the only constraints that the translator could have are linguistic ones.

Cultural jokes are jokes that rely on cultural or ethnic stereotypes about another group of people. These jokes are easier to translate than linguistic jokes, as they rely less on wordplay and more on portraying a specific outside group in an unflattering and stereotypical manner. The unflattering stereotypes are not culturally specific and, they may be applied to any culture. According to American humourist, Larry Wilde (1986 in Raphaelson-West, 1989: 132), what are referred to as Polish jokes are actually universal, "In England they're Irish jokes. In Texas, they're Aggie jokes [...] In Canada they're Newfie jokes. Here they're Polish jokes". Therefore the following joke could be applied to any other group:

> An English guy is driving with a Polish guy as his passenger, when he decides to pull over because he suspects that his turn signal may not be working. He asks the Polish guy if he doesn't mind stepping out of the car to check the lights while he tests them. The Polish guy steps out and stands in front of the car. The English guy turns on the turn signal and asks, "Is it working?" To which the Polish guy responds, "Yes, it's working....No, it's not working....Yes, it's working....No, it's not working"

A translator attempting to translate the above joke would have to change the Polish man's nationality or ethnicity to one that is normally the target of jokes in his/her own culture. In a South African context, the above joke would become a Van der Merwe joke.

In terms of universal jokes, Raphaelson-West (1989: 133) gives the example of children making extremely mature or adult remarks, a victim getting harmless, but embarrassing revenge on his offender or an unexpected, unusual response. The following passage is an example of the first kind of universal joke. The passage takes place after the angel Aziraphale has failed to to perform a magic trick at a children's birthday party.

> Aziraphale remembered what Maskelyne had told him about dealing with hecklers. "Make a joke of it, you pudding-heads-and I do mean you, Mr. Fell" (the name Aziraphale had adopted at that time), "Make 'em laugh, and they'll forgive you anything!"
>
> "Ho, so you've rumbled my hat trick," he chuckled. The children stared at him impassively.
>
> "You're rubbish," said Warlock. "I wanted cartoons anyway."
>
> "He's right, you know," agreed a small girl with a pony tail. "You are rubbish. And probably a faggot." (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1990: 54).

The little girl's vulgar language is shocking, precisely because she is a child. The description of her pony tail emphasises her youth and innocence, making her declaration that much more shocking, creating humour. The passage was so shocking that the French translator included a footnote apologising for the word *pédé* and the German translator changed the word to the less offensive “idiot”. This demonstrates how culture can influence translation even in situations that are considered universally humorous.

2.2. Creating and Translating Humour

2.2.1. Creating Names

One of the devices for creating humour that is used quite often in the novel is the creation of new character names. For example, there is the Pulsifer family, a long, proud line of witch hunters with names such as Thou-Shalt-Not-Commit-Adultery, False Witness and Covetousness Pulsifer.

It has already been observed that names in literary works are often used to convey a message to the reader (Marmaridou: 1991). In fact such works seem to operate on at least two levels of communication. One is the "level in text" at which some narrative elements of the novel communicate with one another. The other level is that "between the author of the work and the reader and somehow operates above the text" (Marmaridou 1991: 88). It is at this above-text level that names can function to convey semantic, social semiotic and sound symbolic meaning(s) directly from the writer to the reader in relation to, for instance, a character, place, or object being referred to in the narrative. (Fernandes, 2006: 46).

Character names in literature can play a significant role in conveying several meanings and information about the character, even before any written description by the author. The unusual names that the authors created in this novel carry semantic meaning, as they were specifically created to produce a humorous effect. Fernandes writes:

> In semantic terms, names have a prominent role in children's literature where they usually have their meaning potential activated in order to describe a certain quality of a particular narrative element and/or create some comic effects. The former situation is typically found in the allegorical tradition where, for instance, a character's personality is summed up by their name, where characters are seen as "personifications of either vices [or] virtues or of general qualities relevant to human life" (Fernandes, 2006: 46).

Even though Fernandes makes specific reference to children's literature, this technique is not exclusive to the genre and is used several times in the novel. One such example is the character Sister Mary Loquacious. She is part of a satanic order of nuns known as the Chattering Order of St. Beryl. The knowledge of her name and that of her order already gives the reader an indication that this particular character is rather talkative. This type of name that conveys semantic meanings is what is referred to as a loaded name, "Loaded names, which are those seen as "motivated" for translation, range from faintly "suggestive" to overtly "expressive" names and nicknames" (Fernandes, 2006:49). When it came to translating this loaded name, the French translator opted to use direct translation and render the name as Sœur Mary Loquace. Her first name has not been translated. Her name remains Mary, which still marks her as English, as the story is set in England. In the German text she becomes Schwester Maria Redeviel. The translator changed her first name to Maria, the version of Mary that is more popular in Germany. The domestication of her name and the religious connotations it carries

make the reader think of a prototype of a nun. This prototype will undoubtedly clash with her last name, which is a portmanteau of the words *reden* (to talk) and *viel* (a lot). The creation of a portmanteau is a more humorous technique in this instance, as this was the translator's way of creating his own joke, and it is not as "obvious" as a the original name or a direct translation.

2.2.2. Puns

The creation of names is not the only technique favoured by the authors for the purpose of creating humour. Puns are used quite extensively throughout the book. This is why, for the purpose of this study, it is important to define what a pun is. The online dictionary, www.oxforddictionaries.com defines a pun as "a joke exploiting the different possible meanings of a word or the fact that there are words which sound alike but have different meanings". Broeder (2007: 54) gives the following definition:

> The deliberate use of one or more particular words or phrases in a context that signals two or more differing meanings thereof or signals a word or phrase which is (to some degree) identical in form (in pronunciation, graphologically, morphologically, etc.) but differs in meaning, to the end of producing a comic effect.

This echoes Raphaelson-West's assertion that "linguistic jokes are punny as hell". Broeder's definition is the one that best defines Raphaelson-West's joke. Ross (in Broeder, 2007: 55) lists three factors that must be present in order for a pun to create a humorous effect. These are:

- There is a conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs in the pun.

- This conflict is caused by an ambiguity on some linguistic level.

- The punch line is surprising, since it is not the expected interpretation, but it does resolve the arisen conflict

Unlike Raphaelson-West's one line joke, the puns used throughout the novel have a more complex structure, i.e. a setup and a punch line. For example, in the following passage which takes place after Aziraphale's failed magic show. He and Crowley are waiting for the hellhound that will become the Antichrist's companion.

> Crowley found him on the pavement outside, trying to extricate a rather squishy dove from the arm of his frock coat.
>
> "It's late," said Aziraphale.

> "I can see that," said Crowley. "Comes of sticking it up your sleeve." He reached out and pulled the limp bird from Aziraphale's coat, and breathed life back into it. The dove cooed appreciatively and flew off, a trifle warily.
>
> "Not the bird," said the angel. "The dog. It's late." (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1990: 41)

In this passage the confusion comes from the word "late". When Aziraphale says "it's late" he is referring to the hellhound, which still has not arrived. Upon seeing the dead bird in the angel's hand, Crowley assumes that Aziraphale means that the bird is no longer alive. Even though the usage of *late* meaning *deceased* is not as frequent as its other meaning, the description of the dove as squishy and the fact that it had been stored in the arm of Aziraphale's coat tell the reader that the bird may not be alive. When Crowley implies that it's obvious that the bird is dead because it was kept up a coat sleeve, the reader can understand why he would interpret *late* in that way, which creates humour. Aziraphale's correction not only highlights Crowley's misinterpretation, but it displays a degree of exasperation as well. This increases the humorous effect created by the pun.

2.2.3. Culture and Translation

The role that culture plays in both humour and translation cannot be ignored. What makes discussions regarding culture difficult is the fact that culture is quite a nebulous concept that is difficult to describe. Its meaning has evolved significantly over time. Katan (2009: 74) states:

> Originally, culture was simple. It referred exclusively to the humanist ideal of what was civilized in a developed society (the education system, the arts, architecture). Then a second meaning, the way of life of a people, took place alongside. Emphasis at the time was very much on "primitive" cultures and tribal practices. With the development of sociology and cultural studies, a third meaning has emerged, related to forces in society or ideology.

Society entrenches its values and mores through various institutions. These values become known as culture. Culture is taught through various means, which are not always explicit. When culture is acquired, it is "through the subliminal and enforced norms" (Katan, 2009: 74). Goodenough (in Nord, 1997: 23-24) defines culture as follows, stating that culture consists of:

> Whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its members, and do so in any role that they accept for any one of themselves.

> Culture, being what people have to learn as distinct from their biological heritage, must consist of the end product of learning: knowledge… culture is not a material phenomenon; it does not consist of things, people, behaviour or emotions. It is rather an organization of these things. It is the forms of things that people have in their mind, their models for perceiving, relating, and otherwise interpreting them.

If culture is taught through subliminal and enforced norms, then it must be considered as a pervasive and inescapable force. A force such as culture is the lens through which a person sees and interprets the world. Therefore, it can be assumed that humour is also filtered through this very same lens. Humour is obviously dependant on linguistic wordplay, which is understood through the context of culture. So we must examine the connection between language and culture. Opinion is divided with regards to the relationship between language and culture. There are those who believe that language and culture operate independently of each other, while others view language as culture. Those who view language and culture as two separate entities treat translation as a universalist encoding and decoding activity where meaning is transferred from the SL to the TL (Katan, 2009: 75). In this instance culture and cultural differences are carried by the language, without significant loss. In the second instance, where language is culture, Katan (2009: 75) states:

> Others, such as Nida (2002: 29), believe that "the context actually provides more distinction of meaning than the term being analyzed". Hence, meaning is not "carried" by the language but is negotiated between readers from within their own contexts of culture. Each readership is hence bound to receive the text according to their own expectations, and translation is necessarily a relativist form of "manipulation" (Hermans 1985), "mediation" (Katan 1999/2004) or "refraction" (Lefevere 1982/2004) between two different linguacultures (Agar 1994).

Katan (1999/2004) discusses four perception filters based on neurolinguistic programming (NLP) theory. These filters are physiological, culture, individual and language. All of these filters function through modelling. A model is a method of simplifying and understanding complex concepts, such as "reality" (Katan, 2009: 75). Katan elaborates on the role of modelling:

> All models, according to Bandler and Grinder (1975), make use of three principles: deletion, distortion and generalization. In the case of human modelling we cannot perceive all of "what it is that is going on" (deletion); we tend to focus selectively

> or fit what we see to what we know, expect, or what attracts our attention (distortion); and we tend to fill details in from our own model or level out salient differences (generalization), to make the resulting "map of the world" useful.

Modelling is a cognitive process through which we understand the world around us. It allows us to use prior knowledge and experiences as standards by which we judge and analyse the world. When confronted with a new concept, people use the knowledge that they already have as a frame of reference. Culture forms and shapes worldview and greatly influences how people interact with the world. Katan (1999: 26) says that culture:

> is not a visible product, but is internal, collective and is acquired rather than learned. Acquisition is the natural, unconscious learning of language, behaviour, values and belief through informal watching and learning. Learning, on the other hand, is formal and is consciously taught.

Whether or not culture can be separated from language may still be up for debate, but it cannot be denied that culture and environment are the biggest sources from which we draw context. Culture is therefore one of the ways that groups organise their perception of the world, which may be limited, distorted and stereotypical (Katan, 2009: 75). Sperber and Wilson (1986: 15) describe context as "a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world". The hearer unconsciously filters information through these "assumptions about the world":

> At all times, and in any communication, there is a process of "contexting", whereby interlocutors negotiate how much of the meaning is to be retrieved from the context, how much of the context is shared, and if not shared: "it can be seen, as context is lost, information must be added if meaning is to remain constant". (Katan, 2009: 76).

Context is created by various internal and external factors, such as race, age, gender, education and social class. As no two people will have the exact same experiences in life, personal context will always differ from person to person. Common factors such as language and culture will give a group some shared experiences, but context is individual. People are limited by what they know and are in a bubble created by their own environment. They may know of other cultures and environments, but this is not the same as having real, lived experiences in a different environment. This means that there may be multiple interpretations of an utterance, depending on the recipient's context.

This gap between contexts is predictably widened when communication occurs between different languages and cultures. In the case of intercultural communication, consideration for cultural differences must be made as well as for language differences. The words of a text may not be enough to convey the full meaning if the recipient does not have the necessary contextual information to decode the meaning. As Nida (1997: 37) states: "Many translators believe that if they take care of the words and grammar, the discourse will take care of itself, but this concept results from an insufficient understanding of the role of discourse structures in interlingual communication". This attitude towards translation to which Nida is referring ignores the role that culture and context play in conveying meaning. The risk of this approach is that not all connotations are universal and the translator must be aware of the referential meaning as well as the expressive meaning of words and utterances. As Allen (in Katan, 2009: 85) states: "Meaning … is unique, to the extent that it belongs to the linguistic interaction of specific individuals or groups within specific social contexts". Culture and environment mean that people within a certain group will attach meaning to certain words or concepts that other groups would not necessarily do. They see and understand the world in a way that is uniquely theirs and successful intercultural communication must be sensitive to these peculiarities. Leech (in Katan, 2009: 85) points out that those who mediate in intercultural communication:

> will always need to consider how anchored the intended meaning is to its "specific social context" and hence value system; and also how clear it is to the target reader that the meaning is framed within a different model of the world.

This "different model of the world" also includes different humour conventions. Translators need always to be vigilant about such differences. The need to apply a cultural filter will vary, according to the text and other extra-textual factors. According to Katan (2009: 76):

> Others, again, believe that the filter should operate selectively. House (2006: 347), herself states that the 'cultural filter' should be "inserted" only for certain text types, such as tourist information books and computer manuals. For Nida (1964: 130), on the other hand, the degree of intervention depends less on the text type itself than on the cultural and linguistic distance or gap between the languages concerned.

It can be seen that culture affects translation and intercultural communication. I will now look at how cultural substitution can be used as one of the methods of translating humour.

2.2.4. Substitution

The humour creation methods detailed earlier in this chapter share one salient feature, which is that they rely on wordplay. The creation of character names may also make use of puns, so these names can be classified as linguistic jokes, as defined by Raphaelson-West. One of the methods that Fernandes (2006: 52) proposes for translating character names is substitution. This method is different from using an exonym, as in the example of Mary becoming Maria. In terms of substitution, "the TL name and the SL name exist in their respective referential worlds, but are not related to each other in terms of form and/or semantic significance" (Fernandes, 2006: 52). This is similar to Mona Baker's translation strategy of cultural substitution, which she describes as "replacing a culture-specific item or expression with a target language item which does not have the same propositional meaning but is likely to have a similar impact on the reader" (Baker, 1992: 31). Cultural substitution therefore may be used to translate puns when using the target language equivalent does not create the same effect that the source language elicited. The advantage of this method is that the reader has a familiar concept which he can easily identify and as a result makes the humour easy to identify.

Cultural substitution has the potential to make the text more interesting to the readers, as they will recognise their own culture. Göte Klingberger (1986) suggests a similar technique called cultural context adaptation. However he does specify that "there is a difference between cultural context adaptation and the sort of adaptation which is carried out merely to achieve adjustment of the text to the moral values of the TT culture" (Klingberger in Thomson-Wohlgemuth, 1998: 56). The adaptation that is carried out to adjust the text to TT culture mores is the type of adaptation that was made to alter the little girl with pony tail's taboo utterance in the example given above. Klingberg goes on to warn against too much use of cultural context adaptations, as the ST should always take precedence and arbitrary substitutions should be avoided. He differentiates between several categories of cultural context adaptation, namely "foreign languages in the ST, building and home furnishings, food, customs and practices, play and games, flora and fauna, names, or weights and measures" (Klingberg, 1986: 18). For the purpose of this study, the "names" category is the most relevant as it is the one that has been used most extensively in the novel.

2.3. Relevance Theory and GTVH

In his 1998 paper Pragmatic Aspects of Translation, Gutt states that:

> From the relevance-theory point of view, translation falls naturally under the interpretive use of language: the translation is intended to restate in one language what someone else said or wrote in another language. In principle it is, therefore, comparable to quoting or speech-reporting in intra-linguistic use. (Gutt, 1988: 46).

According to relevance theory, translation is a type of speech reporting, as the ST author's words are put into another language by the translator. Gutt (1998: 49) argues that problems that arise in the translation of literature are caused by misunderstanding the context of the text, "by translating a text for a target audience with a cultural background other than that envisioned by the original writer, the translator is, in effect, quoting the original author "out of context"" (Gutt, 1998: 49).

This quoting out of context to which Gutt refers may result in failure to recreate humour in a translation. It is not possible to determine what context the translator is lacking if he mistranslates the ST, but relevance theory posits that context is vital for creating successful translations.

When looking at the translation of humour, it is obviously necessary to first define humour and analyse the elements of a joke that make it humorous to us. Salvatore Attardo (2002) suggests six elements which determine whether or not a text will be humorous. He refers to these elements as knowledge resources (KR). The six resources are language (LA), Narrative Strategy (NS), Target (TA), Situation (SI), Logic Mechanism (LM) and Script Opposition (SO). The Knowledge Resources are explained as follows:

1) **Language (LA)**

"This Knowledge Resource contains all the information necessary for the verbalization of a text. It is responsible for the actual wording of the text and for the placement of the functional elements that constitute it" (Attardo, 2002: 176). As the name implies, this is the Knowledge Resource that deals with the actual language used to create a humorous utterance. According to Attardo (2002: 177), paraphrase is essential for understanding the number of variations for which this KR can account. Paraphrasing, synonyms or other syntactic constructions may be used to reword the joke in a number of ways, while maintaining the semantic content. This corresponds to Gutt's classification of translation as paraphrasing. Language will also determine the position of the punch line in the joke. "The final position of the punch line is essential, both because of the functional organization of the information in the text and […] because of the distribution of the implicit information of the text" (Attardo, 2002: 177). This

means that the information given before the arrival of the punch line will determine whether or not the punch line is able to create the desired humorous effect.

2) **Narrative Structure (NS)**

Simply put, the narrative strategy will determine the narrative organisation of the joke i.e. whether it is a limerick, riddle, a question and answer dialogue etc.

3) **Target (TA)**

This Knowledge Resource selects the target or "butt" of the joke. This may entail certain cultures, language groups, nationalities, professions etc. The target of the joke is often presented in a stereotypical manner, which is essential for this parameter as "(j)okes that are not aggressive (i.e., that do not ridicule someone or something) have an empty value for this parameter" (Attardo, 2002: 178). This ties in with the discussion of prototypes in the theoretical framework.

4) **Situation (SI)**

Situation refers to what the joke is about (visiting a doctor's office, a job interview etc.). "The situation of a joke can be thought of as the 'props' of the joke: the objects, participants, instruments, activities, etc." (Attardo, 2002: 179). The props will generally originate from the scripts that the text activates (Attardo, 2002: 177).

5) **Logical Mechanism (LM)**

Attardo (2002: 179) argues that:

> The Logical Mechanism embodies the resolution of the incongruity in the incongruity-resolution model, familiar from psychology. A consequence of this claim is that, since resolution is optional in humour (as in nonsense and absurd humour) it follows that the Logical Mechanism Knowledge Resource would also be optional. (Attardo, 2002: 179).

This means that Logical Mechanism is an optional parameter for humour.

6) **Script Opposition (SO)**

Attardo (2002: 181) classifies a script as:

> An organized complex of information about something, in the broadest sense: an object (real or imaginary), an event, an action, a quality, etc. It is a cognitive structure internalized by the speaker which provides the speaker with information on how the world is organized, including how one acts in it. (Attardo, 2002: 181).

The concept of a script is further discussed in the theoretical framework, which looks more closely at Frame Semantics. Script Opposition creates humour when the two following requirements are met:

i) The text is compatible, fully or in part, with two different scripts

ii) The two scripts with which the text is compatible are opposite ... The two scripts with which some text is compatible are said to overlap fully or in part in this text (Raskin in Attardo, 2002: 181).

Humour is created when there is an incongruity and the presented script does not have the expected outcome. These Knowledge Resources are arranged hierarchically as follows: **SO→LM→SI→TA→NS→LA**. Script Opposition is ranked as the most important Knowledge Resource, as the incongruity created by having conflicting scripts is the most important component of creating humour. The other Resources are used to create this incongruity. A translator should try to respect all of these parameters if possible, but they may differ at the lowest parameter (language) for their pragmatic purpose (Attardo, 2002: 183).

Attardo's parameters for creating humour each highlight the importance of context in humour. The language, the target, narrative structure and script opposition all give the audience the necessary information to set up a humorous situation. This not only creates contexts in the audience's mind, but also activates certain contexts that the audience may have stored in their minds. These contexts are activated by what Gutt (1991:21) calls semantic representations. These semantic representations activate mental representations based on prior knowledge or assumptions and the mind's ability to make connections based on these factors. This is the process that Gutt (1991:21) discusses in relevance theory:

> Relevance theory is not a descriptive classificatory approach. It does not try to give an orderly description of complex phenomena by grouping them into classes, but tries instead to understan complexities of communication in terms of cause-effect relationships, which, applied to our mental life, are taken to mean computational, and particularly inferential, relationships. Furthermore, because it is tied in with a psychological optimization principle,

> relevance theory provides a natural basis for an empirical account of evaluation and decision making.

By using relevance theory as a broad theoretical framework, I analyse how the ST authors created certain contexts and manipulate these contexts and the expectations that they raise in the readers' minds in order to create a humorous text. By using frame semantics, I identify how the authors were able to create the necessary contexts for the creation of humour. I am also able to identify how the TT translators were able to recreate these same contexts in their translations.

CHAPTER THREE - THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. Frame Semantics

As I mentioned in the chapter above, context is an important component of humour. I will be using frame semantics to illustrate how the authors created certain contexts and subverted them and the expectations that they raise in order to create humorous scenes in the book. By using frame semantics as a framework I am able to define how the authors' use of certain words and register creates expectations in the readers' minds. These expectations give readers an idea of how certain characters should behave or how certain situations should occur. I examine how subverting or reinforcing these frames enabled the authors to create humorous situations. I also use frame semantics to determine whether or not the translators were able to recreate the same frames and how they were able to do so. According to Fillmore:

> The meanings of words may, more than we are used to thinking, depend on contexted experiences; that is, the contexts within which we have experienced the objects, properties or feelings that provide the perceptual or experiential base of our knowledge of the meaning of a word (or phrase, or grammatical category) may be inseparable parts of those experiences. Second, the process of interpreting an utterance may depend, more than we are used to thinking on our perception of the context in which the utterance is produced and our memories of the contexts for earlier experiences with the utterance or its constituent parts.
>
> A second notion needed for the concept of framing is that of prototype or paradigm case. […] The idea is that in order to perceive something or to attain a concept, what is at least sometimes necessary is to have in memory a repertory of prototypes, the act of perception or conception being that of recognizing in what ways and object can be seen as an instance of one or another of these prototypes. This "situating" process depends not only on the existence of individual prototypes, but also on the character of the whole available repertory of prototypes. (Fillmore, 1976: 24)

In the same 1976 article, *Frame Semantics and the Nature of Language*, Fillmore makes reference to the idea of people understanding utterances with the aid of frames. These frames are based on contexts within which the hearer has experience of the objects, properties or feelings that form the basis of the hearer's knowledge of the meaning of a word, phrase or

grammatical category. Understanding is also based on how the hearer perceives the context and how his earlier memories influence how he interprets that context. Fillmore then refers to prototypes; "The prototype of any category is the member or set of members of a category that best represents the category as a whole" (www.sil.org, 2004). This means that a prototype is the basic, first idea that a person has when they think of a certain concept. This is the idea that the hearer builds upon when hearing a concept, but the prototype aids in understanding the utterance, as it acts as point of reference for the hearer.

Fillmore discusses cognitive and interactional frames: "The interactional frames amount to a categorization of the distinguishable contexts of interaction in which speakers of a language can expect to find themselves, together with information about the appropriate linguistic choices relevant to these interactions" (Fillmore, 1976: 25). This means that speakers expect certain behaviours depending on whichever situation they may find themselves in. He gives the example of a "greeting frame", where in some cultures a socially inferior person may be expected to be the one to greet his/her socially superior interlocutor. He says of cognitive frames: "There is in English […] a semantic domain connected with what we might call the commercial event. The frame for such an event has the form of a scenario containing roles that we can identify as the buyer, the seller, the goods and the money" (Fillmore, 1976: 25).

The cognitive frame is especially significant in the study of humour in terms of the frame in which the humorous utterance is made as well as the expectation that these frames build, based on the speakers' experience of the world. Humour often relies on the subversion and distortion of these frames to elicit a humorous effect. Through presenting prototypes in an uncharacteristic manner, or creating frames that completely defy expectations, humour can be created. Prototypes, however, need not always be presented in uncharacteristic ways to create a humorous effect. As blonde jokes, Van der Merwe jokes and any jokes based on nationality prove, reinforcing the hearer's ideas regarding a certain group and making them behave in a manner that has become stereotypical of them also creates a humorous effect.

Ana Maria Rojo López (2002: 316) outlines five cognitive frames based on the work of Manuel De Vega (1984). She distinguishes between five frames: VISUAL, SITUATIONAL, TEXT TYPE, SOCIAL and GENERIC frames.

3.1.1. Visual Frames

These are frames that activate certain images in the mind of the reader. Rojo (2002: 318) gives the example of a room being characterised by the words *roof*, *floor* and *walls*. This frame creates a prototype of a room that the reader can build upon without knowing what kind of room it is specifically, e.g. dining room, kitchen, bathroom etc. According to Rojo:

> When reading a description, images mostly based on our visual experience form in our mind. Visual frames function like other types of frames: they generate expectations and allow us to infer details that we have not actually seen by providing 'absent' information on the basis of previous visual experiences. (Rojo, 2002: 319)

This type of frame may also be created by words describing gestures or by verbs of movement. These can call to mind an image that the readers may associate with a certain state of mind or attitude. In terms of translation, it is important for the translator to recognise the significance of these words and to know how to recreate these frames in the TL.

3.1.2. Situational Frames

These frames are also referred to as scripts. Situational frames refer to information chunks that relate to conventional situations (Rojo, 2002: 320). These conventional situations can be anything, such as going to a doctor's office or buying something at a shop. Each of these situations follows a basic script with clearly defined roles (e.g. doctor and patient) and conversational conventions (e.g. "How are you feeling today?" at a doctor's office). Comedy is often created by manipulating or subverting these situations. Introducing an unexpected or uncharacteristic element to a situational frame creates the incongruity that is necessary for the creation of humour. Translators must take into consideration how these situations play out and are manipulated for comic effect in different cultures.

3.1.3. Text Type Frames

These frames perform the same function as Attardo's Narrative Structure Knowledge Resource. They indicate to the reader the nature of the text e.g. whether it is a joke, limerick etc. The activation of this frame gives the reader an idea of how the text is structured so they may anticipate what is going to follow.

3.1.4. Social Frames

These frames describe how our social knowledge is governed. Rojo (2002: 326) lists the following social frames:

1. Generic frames
2. Themes
3. Role themes
4. Interpersonal themes
5. Life themes
6. Ideologies and systems of beliefs

Social frames have implications for language use, as the social relationship between characters or even the characters' social status will influence their speech. Rojo (2002: 327) states:

> These frames are particularly interesting from the point of view of translation, since the organization of our social knowledge also includes the knowledge of the type of language which is appropriate to different types of roles and interpersonal relationships. In this sense, as we mentioned when dealing with situational frames, social frames help us to predict what linguists have called tenor of discourse together with other features of the situational context or 'situational dimensions.'

These frames carry the greatest impact on language and culture. The translator must be aware of how these social relationships operate in the TL culture as well as the markers of social status and personal relationships.

3.1.5 Institutional Frames

This frame covers the intrinsic features and values of a society. These are the things and ideals that a culture holds dear. According to Road (2002: 341):

> A culture is not only reflected in its members' behaviour and social status; a culture is also manifested in the material objects and institutional systems created by a certain society to satisfy its human needs and facilitate its daily working.

3.1.6. Generic Frames

These frames are similar to prototypes of people. They identify a character as a villain, businessman, spoilt brat or other stereotypes Rojo (2002: 343) writes:

> When categorizing a person, we normally use both our knowledge about prototypical types of people and the knowledge we have about ourselves. In such categorization processes we consider both non-verbal factors (e.g. physical aspect, social behaviour, etc.) and linguistic factors (e.g. most frequent words, "manner of expression" etc.).

Language plays a very large part in the depiction of a character. A character that activates a masculine frame will tend to use more masculine words (Rojo, 2002: 343). Therefore, just as a person's personal idiolect reflects their personality, so does a character's word choice reflect what kind of character they are to the reader.

As we can see, frames and prototypes are connected to Attardo's (2002) Knowledge Resources. The Knowledge Resources are what create the frames which give the necessary context and information to create humour. The issue that arises when it comes to the translation of humour, is that not all frames and prototypes are universal. The translator will have to manipulate Attardo's Knowledge Resources in order to convey all of the contextual information of the ST into the TT in an attempt to create the same humorous effect. Ana Maria Rojo Lopez (2002:38) investigated the role of context in the translation of humour:

> In this sense, an adequate translation of an emission that leads to laughter should have on the target audience an equivalent effect to that the ST has on its audience, that is, to make them laugh. The importance of pragmatic equivalence in the translation of humour is undeniable; however, what a cognitive approach like the one we propose here tries to outline is that to achieve such equivalence often requires adjusting the comprehension mechanisms of both audiences. For example, for Spanish readers to understand an English person's joke about Irish people they need to have access to the prototype of the ignorant and foolish Irish that all English and Irish people have.

What Rojo refers to in the above quote as a prototype can also be a prop or the target of a joke, according to Attardo's Knowledge Resources.

In addition to puns and creation of names I will discuss four additional procedures for creating humour, as proposed by Rojo (2002). These procedures are: modification, reinforcement, metaphoric mapping and metonymic mapping.

3.1.7. Reinforcement

Reinforcement relies on confirming the reader's preconceptions and fulfilling his expectations. Even though humour is often created by unconventional and unexpected situations, reinforcing the reader's cultural frames also effectively creates a humorous effect. Reinforcement may take the form of a character speaking in an ungrammatical manner, activating the frame FOREIGN ACCENT. Cultural jokes, as discussed above, also reinforce reader's prototypes about certain groups to create humour.

3.1.8. Metaphoric Mapping

Gibson (1994: 207) defines metaphor as "a fundamental mental capacity by which people understand themselves and the world through the conceptual mapping of knowledge from one domain onto another". Metaphoric mapping therefore entails applying the qualities of one domain onto another for humorous effect. Rojo gives the example of a person being described as having yellow fangs. This is mapping the characteristics of an animal onto a human being, evoking the image of a person with comically long canine teeth.

3.1.9. Metonymic Mapping

Metonymic mapping is differentiated from metaphoric mapping by the fact that the latter involves mapping between two domains, while the former entails using an entity to relate to another related entity within the same frame. Rojo gives the example of the verb phrase "to eye something". In this phrase "eye" is a verb meaning "to look" as well as the organ that one uses to look.

3.1.10. Modification

I will discuss this procedure in more detail, as this is the most commonly used procedure by the authors of *Good Omens*, and by extension, the translators. Modification may involve distorting existing frames, creating new frames, creating connections between frames or activating erroneous frames. I discuss these four methods below.

3.1.11. Distortion of Existing Frames

This procedure relies on prototypes. Distorted frames are created when incongruous elements are added to already existing frames. This incongruity is created by having certain kinds of people act out of character or portraying institutions in uncharacteristic ways. Rojo (2002: 40) gives the example of university lecturers, who are normally considered serious, formal people, being portrayed as people who go to strip clubs, have affairs and use vulgar and informal language.

3.1.12. Creating New Frames

The creation of character names is one way of creating new frames. As discussed in Chapter 2, proper names may be used to convey a certain characteristic of a character, often with humorous effects. As translating loaded character names requires great linguistic skill, the most widely used strategy for translating character names is transcribing the name into the TL and compensating for the loss of humour elsewhere.

3.1.13. New Connections between Frames

This entails using existing frames and manipulating the context to activate several frames and create connections between them (Rojo, 2002: 48).

3.1.14. Activating Erroneous Frames

This entails activating a frame in a context that requires the activision of a different frame (Rojo, 2002: 51). Activating an erroneous frame creates a humorous misunderstanding between characters.

CHAPTER FOUR - METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

4.1. Methodology

For this study, I analysed five excerpts of 5-20 lines from Neil Gaiman and Terry Pratchett's first and only co-authored novel, *Good Omens* and its French and German translations *De Bons Présages* and *Ein Gutes Omen*, respectively. I chose each extract based on the type of frame it represents and the strategies that the authors used to create humour and parody the horror genre. This is to illustrate the different methods that the authors utilised to create humour and parody. Each frame contains different strategies for creating humour. I analysed these strategies in the ST extracts and attempted to find the same strategies in the translations as well as any shifts the translators were required to make in order create humorous texts. The shifts in the text have changed the tone of the texts in some cases created new frames, which impacted how the text would be interpreted.

I introduce each extract with a short paragraph that identifies the frame and situates the extract within the context of the story. The introduction is followed by the extract and the French and German target texts. After the extracts I provide my analysis of the ST where I provide explanations the frames and techniques that the authors used to create situations and characters that are humorous based on the reader's prior general knowledge. Following that, I analyse the translations, focusing on the strategies offered by Rojo that the translators used to recreate the ST's frames and whether there were shifts made from the ST. If there were shifts I discuss how they impact the reader's understanding of the frame and whether or not they aided in retaining the humour of the ST.

4.2 Analysis

Frame One - Situational Frame

The first frame that I looked at is a situational frame. The scene entails a conversation between Sister Mary Loquacious, a satanic nun, and Mr Young, who has just become a father. The interaction takes place in Mrs Young's hospital room where she is sleeping after having given birth. Sister Mary, in accordance with the tenets of her order, is chattering ceaselessly, making Mr Young, who is already distrustful of nuns, nervous. The main focus of this scene is a case of mistaken identity. Sister Mary is under the impression that Mr Young is the American Cultural Attaché whose baby she and the other nuns were supposed to swap with the Antichrist. Sister Mary thinks that she is talking to someone who is completely foreign to English culture and this mistake leads to a very awkward conversation with Mr Young.

Frame One English Source Text

> "I expect it was very different where you were before," Sister Mary went on.
>
> "I suppose so," said Mr. Young, who'd never really thought about it. Luton, as far as he could remember, was pretty much like Tadfield. The same sort of hedges between your house and the railway station. The same sort of people.
>
> "Taller buildings, for one thing," said Sister Mary, desperately.
>
> Mr. Young stared at her. The only one he could think of was the Alliance and Leicester offices.
>
> "And I expect you go to a lot of garden parties," said the nun.
>
> Ah. He was on firmer ground here. Deirdre was very keen on that sort of thing. "Lots," he said, with feeling. "Deirdre makes jam for them, you know. And I normally have to help with the White Elephant." This was an aspect of Buckingham Palace society that had never occurred to Sister Mary, although the pachyderm fitted right in. "I expect they're the tribute," she said. "I read where these foreign potentates give her all sorts of things." "I'm sorry?" (Gaiman and Pratchet, 1990: 16).

Frame One French Translation

«Je suppose que c'était très différent dans votre ancien poste, poursuivit la sœur Mary.

— «Probablement, en effet.» Mr Young n'y avait jamais vraiment réfléchi. Luton, dans son souvenir, ressemblait beaucoup à Tadfield. Les mêmes haies entre votre jardin et la gare. Les mêmes gens.

«Des bâtiments plus hauts, par exemple», ajouta la sœur Mary à bout d'arguments.

Mr Young la regarda. Un seul bâtiment lui venait à l'esprit : le siège de la compagnie d'assurances Alliance & Leicester.

«Et on doit souvent vous inviter à des garden-parties», poursuivit la sœur.

Ah ! Là, Mr Young se retrouvait en territoire connu. Deirdre raffolait de ce genre de choses et le mettait à contribution pour tenir le stand de brocante, dans les grandes occasions.

«Des tas, répondit-il avec chaleur. Deirdre prépare elle-même des confitures, vous savez. Et en général, je donne un coup de main, pour les antiquités. »

La sœur Mary n'avait jamais imaginé sous cet angle les réceptions à Buckingham, mais il est vrai que le terme décrivait parfaitement nombre de gens qu'elle avait vus en photo.

«C'est une grande responsabilité, je suppose,» dit-elle. J'ai entendu dire que Sa Majesté recevait souvent des hôtes étrangers assez âgés.»

— «Je vous demande pardon?» (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1995: 35).

Frame One German Translation

»Wahrscheinlich dauerte es eine Weile, bis Sie sich eingewöhnten«, fuhr Schwester Maria fort.

»Wie man's nimmt«, erwiderte Mr. Young ausweichend. Soweit er sich erinnern konnte, gab es zwischen Luton und Tadfield kaum Unterschiede. Die gleichen Leute. Die gleichen Hecken zwischen den Häusern und der Eisenbahnstrecke.

»Ich nehme an, dort, wo Sie früher tätig waren, sind die Gebäude größer«, hakte Schwester Maria nach. Es klang fast verzweifelt. »Und höher.«

Mr. Young musterte die Nonne unsicher. Meinte sie vielleicht die Niederlassungen der Banken und Versicherungsgesellschaften?

»Sicher veranstalten Sie häufig Gartenparties«, mutmaßte Schwester Maria.

Ah, dies war vertrauteres Terrain. Deirdre fand großen Gefallen an Gartenfesten.

»Ja«, bestätigte er erleichtert, »meine Frau läßt unsere Gäste von ihrer selbstgemachten Marmelade kosten, und ich muß mich um die Bratwürstchen und den Kartoffelsalat kümmern.«

Schwester Maria Redeviel runzelte überrascht die Stirn. Sie hörte nun zum erstenmal, daß im Buckingham Palace auch derart bürgerliche Speisen auf den Tisch kamen. Nun, die Königin ist auch nur ein Mensch.

»Nun, mit bestimmten Dingen muß man sich eben abfinden«, kommentierte sie. »Ich habe gelesen, daß sie ständig Geschenke von ausländischen Würdenträgem erhält.«

»Wie bitte?« (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1991: 23).

Frame One Analysis

The main method of creating humour in this frame is activating erroneous frames. An erroneous frame is activated when there is a misunderstanding between characters. In this case, the misunderstanding is caused by Sister Mary's belief that she is talking to an American diplomat. Everything that Sister Mary says in this scene is based on this belief. Even though the two characters are conversing with each other, they are having different conversations. Sister Mary assumes that Mr Young's life is much more glamorous than it actually is. The humour is created by the fact that the readers are aware that Mr Young is a simple man from a small town. Mr Young's bewilderment and desperate attempts to understand Sister Mary and answer her seemingly odd questions also create humour in this scene. When Mr Young thinks about Luton and Tadfield having the same hedges between the houses this creates a visual of SUBURBIA. This is in contrast with the tall buildings that Sister Mary mentions in the next sentence. The mention of tall buildings creates the visual frame BIG CITY. This juxtaposition between these

two frames creates humour as Mr Young tries to think of tall buildings in his small town. He does not understand that Sister Mary is referring to American style high-rise buildings when she mentions tall buildings. He interprets her utterance based on his own knowledge of his small town and thinks of the Alliance and Leicester building. The misunderstanding continues when Sister Mary mentions garden parties, imagining grand affairs at Buckingham Palace, while Mr Young thinks she is talking about smaller parties. Mr Young is relieved at the change of subject, as shown by the interjection *ah* and the feeling that he is on firmer ground. The reader is aware that this is not the case, thus the misunderstanding will continue. Mr Young says that he helps with the *White Elephant*, thinking that Sister Mary is talking about a simple neighbourhood garden party. The word "sale" is omitted because it is generally understood that people will know that a *White Elephant* refers to a second hand goods sale. In order to create humour in this frame, the reader must understand this implicature and why Sister Mary interprets the term literally. *White Elephant* also aids in creating the visual frame of SURBURBIA. A White Elephant Sale is normally associated with churches or schools in middle class neighbourhoods. This depicts Mr Young as a typical, suburban, middle-class man, which adds to the humour because Sister Mary thinks he is a cosmopolitan diplomat. Sister Mary is so convinced that he is such an important political figure, that she cannot imagine that he is talking about a simple sale. The word *pachyderm* makes it clear that Sister Mary is thinking of an actual white elephant. She thinks that the elephant is a gift from world leaders and tries to understand what Mr Young is saying in terms of her own fantasy. When Sister Mary shares her thoughts with Mr Young he is understandably bewildered, creating a misunderstanding. In this frame, the authors activated an erroneous frame by creating a conflict between two visual frames. The two conflicting visual frames result in a script opposition as described by Attardo. This opposition of incongruous scripts creates a humorous situation in this frame.

The French translation maintains many of the elements of the ST. Some additions are made to the text by the translator, presumably for the benefit of French readers who may not be familiar some of the culture specific terms or English places. The translator gives a description of Alliance and Leicester that was not included in the ST. This addition is not necessary, as the name alone would create the idea that Alliance and Leicester is a company. Knowing what type of company it is is not necessary to create humour in this frame. There is a shift in terms of Mr Young's reaction to the mention of garden parties. The interjection *ah* is followed by an exclamation, demonstrating a greater sense of relief than the character displayed in the ST. The

change of punctuation in this text better demonstrates the joy and sense of hope that Mr Young feels as a result of this change of subject. A more significant shift made for the benefit of French readers comes in the form of changing *White Elephant* to taking care of the *antiquités*. Changing *White Elephant* to *antiquités* still gives the impression that Mr Young is involved in a simple, neighbourhood sale, creating a visual frame that non-English speakers are able to understand. The same misunderstanding occurs in the French text whereby Sister Mary thinks Mr Young is referring to a much more elaborate event. In the French text, Sister Mary thinks that *antiquités* refers to the older guests at the garden parties at Buckingham Palace. Because of this shift, the nature of the misunderstanding changes. As in the ST, Sister Mary tries appear knowledgeable about Buckingham Palace and she tries to make sense of what Mr Young is saying in the context of the glamorous life she that has imagined for him. Her suggestion that the Queen must receive older guests is met by confusion from Mr Young. The translator was able to retain humour of the ST by creating the same frames as the original authors. Even though some shifts had to occur in order to account for cultural differences, these shifts did not detract from or negatively affect the humour of the text.

The German translator made similar changes to the ST as the French translator. In this text the name Alliance and Leicester is omitted and Mr Young makes reference to an insurance company instead. The German text also gives Mr Young a different duty at the garden parties. In this text Mr Young is in charge of bringing food to the parties. While the French text substituted *White Elephant* with a more general term, which is similar to the English term, the German translation has Mr Young providing *Bratwürstchen* and *Kartoffelsalat*, which has a slight domesticating effect on the text. This is an odd change, as Mr Young is depicted as a very traditional and nationalistic Englishman. A character such as him would stereotypically have some anti-German sentiments. This is why it seems odd and out of character for him to make stereotypically German dishes such as *Bratwurst*. The character of Sister Mary finds these dishes odd and out of place at Buckingham Palace, not because of their foreign nature, but because they are much less sophisticated then what she expects to be served at a royal party. She thinks to herself that the Queen is also human after all. Sister Mary however thinks that such common food may disappoint the Queen and thinks that sometimes one must make do with what one has. This can be read as an insult to Mr Young, but he shows no reaction to this comment. She then remarks that the Queen is always receiving gifts from foreign dignitaries, which may explain why Sister Mary is not surprised by the foreign nature of Mr Young's dishes. The German and French texts both retained the activation of an erroneous frame. The

translators could not use the exact same situation from the ST, is it may have been unfamiliar to their readers, but they used their own situations to create confusion between the characters. Mr Young and Sister Mary are talking about the same thing, but they have different contexts. What this translation lacks is the play on words created by *White Elephant* and *antiquités*. These words have a double meaning, but this play on words is lost in the Germans translation. The procedure of creating an erroneous frame was retained, but the loss of the pun did mean that the text lost some humour.

Frame Two - Generic and Situational Frame

The first part of the following scene is a combination of a generic frame as well as a visual frame. The scene takes place after Sister Mary and her colleague have switched babies and the wrong baby has been left with the Youngs. The second part is a situational frame, as Sister Mary and Mr Young have a conversation that a new parent typically has at the hospital.

Frame Two English Source Text

> Sister Mary's error might have been noticed by the other nun had not she herself been severely rattled by the Secret Service men in Mrs. Dowling's room, who kept looking at her with growing unease. This was because they had been trained to react in a certain way to people in long flowing robes and long flowing headdresses, and were currently suffering from a conflict of signals. Humans suffering from a conflict of signals aren't the best people to be holding guns, especially when they've just witnessed a natural childbirth, which definitely looked an un-American way of bringing new citizens into the world. Also, they'd heard that there were missals in the building.
>
> Mrs. Young stirred.
>
> "Have you picked a name for him yet?" said Sister Mary archly.
>
> "Hmm?" said Mr. Young. "Oh. No, not really. If it was a girl it would have been Lucinda after my mother. Or Germaine. That was Deirdre's choice."
>
> "Wormwood's a nice name," said the nun, remembering her classics. "Or Damien. Damien's very popular." (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1990: 17).

Frame Two French Translation

L'erreur commise par la sœur Mary aurait pu être découverte par la seconde bonne sœur si celle-ci n'avait pas été sévèrement perturbée par les agents des Services Secrets qui occupaient la chambre de Mrs Dowling et considéraient la religieuse avec un malaise croissant. En effet, on leur avait appris à réagir d'une certaine façon face à des gens vêtus de longues robes et de longues coiffes, et ils se trouvaient confrontés pour l'heure à des signaux contradictoires. Les gens troublés ne sont pas les plus qualifiés pour manipuler des armes, particulièrement quand ils viennent d'assister à un accouchement par la méthode naturelle, une façon absolument antiaméricaine de mettre de nouveaux citoyens au monde. Pour tout aggraver, ils avaient entendu dire que le couvent possédait une réserve de missels.

Mrs Young remua.

«Vous avez choisi un prénom?» susurra la sœur Mary.

— «Hmm ?» demanda Mr Young. «Oh, non, pas vraiment. Si ça avait été une fille, nous l'aurions baptisée Lucinda, comme ma mère. Ou Germaine. Ça, c'était l'idée de Deirdre».

— «Absinthe, c'est très joli », suggéra la bonne sœur, qui connaissait ses classiques. « Ou Damien. C'est très en vogue, Damien. » (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1995: 42).

Frame Two German Translation

Vielleicht wäre die andere Satanistin auf Schwester Marias Fehler aufmerksam geworden, wenn sie nicht durch die Anwesenheit der Geheimdienstmänner in Mrs. Dowlings Zimmer überaus verstört gewesen wäre. Ihre Ausbildung verlangte ein gewisses Reaktionsmuster von ihnen, wenn ihnen Gestalten begegneten, die lange Umhänge und Tücher vor den Gesichtern trugen. Derzeit sahen sie sich mit widersprüchlichen Signalen konfrontiert, woraus sich ein höchst problematischer innerer Konflikt ergab. Menschen, die sich mit widersprüchlichen Signalen konfrontiert sehen und an höchst problematischen inneren Konflikten leiden, sollten keine geladene und entsicherte Waffe in der Hand halten. So etwas ist noch weitaus weniger ratsam, wenn sie gerade eine natürliche Geburt gesehen haben -

was eine völlig unamerikanische Methode zu sein schien, neue Bürger zur Welt zu bringen. Außerdem hatten sie gehört, es gebe Gebetbücher in dem Gebäude.

Mrs. Young bewegte sich.

»Haben Sie sich schon für einen Namen entschieden?«fragte Schwester Maria schelmisch.

»Hmm?« erwiderte Mr. Young. »Oh. Nein, eigentlich nicht. Ein Mädchen hätten wir Lucinda genannt, nach meiner Mutter. Allerdings meinte Deirdre, Germaine klinge viel besser.« Die Nonne erinnerte sich an ihre satanistischen Pflichten. »Wie wär's mit Wormwood?« schlug sie vor. »Oder Damien. Ja, Damien ist derzeit sehr beliebt.« (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1995: 26).

Frame Two Analysis

The first way in which humour is created in this frame is through satire. The American Secret Service agents are experiencing conflicting emotions because they have been trained to react in a certain way to people in "long flowing robes and long flowing headdresses". In this case this description refers to the nuns, but it may be inferred from this description that the Secret Service agents are normally wary of people of Middle Eastern descent. Firstly, the authors create a visual frame of Secret Service agents looking at the nun with growing unease. The phrase *kept looking* could suggest a repeated or sustained action. The adverbial phrase *with growing unease* creates the image that the agents grew more agitated every time they saw a nun, which would occur quite frequently in a convent. Each time the agents see the long flowing robes and headdresses (that the reader will assume are meant to activate the generic frame of ARAB) the agents feel a sense of danger and they must remind themselves that they are in fact safe. The conflicting emotions that they feel are caused by the fact that this time the people wearing the long flowing robes are nuns, and therefore a part of Western culture, but their training is telling them that they should be wary of them. This is satirising the way that Middle Eastern people are stereotyped in the West, which is why the Secret Service agents are battling to ignore the cues which are telling them that the nuns are a danger to them.

The description of a natural birth as an "un-American way of bringing a new citizen into the world" further characterises the agents as stereotypically patriotic Americans. *Citizen*, which carries connotations of nationality is not a word that is usually used to refer to a baby. Seeing a natural birth was an unpleasant experience, which is described as "un-American". This

displays the way that the agents associate what is foreign with what is bad, as if natural births only occur in foreign hospitals. The authors also use a pun to explain the agents' agitation. The agents hear that there are *missals* in the building, which they mistake for *missiles.* The two words are homophones in Standard American English. This explains why the agents, who are shown to be unfamiliar with religion would think of explosive weapons and not prayer books when they hear *missals*. This plays into the idea that they one track minded and ignorant about everything else that does not involve their jobs.

In the last part of the frame, Sister Mary and Mr Young are trying to make conversation. When Sister Mary brings up the topic of baby names, she suggests the name Wormwood, which she considers a "classic". This is a reference to a passage in the book of Revelations:

> The third angel blew his trumpet, and a great star fell from heaven, blazing like a torch, and it fell on a third of the rivers and on the springs of water. The name of the star is Wormwood. A third of the waters became wormwood, and many people died from the water, because it had been made bitter. Rev.8.10

The name may also be a reference to the character of the same name in C.S. Lewis's *The Screwtape Letters*. This is an example of creating new connections between frames. Firstly, the name Wormwood will make the reader think of the book of Revelations and the above quote. The Bible quote details what will occur during the Apocalypse, which is also one of the themes of the novel. This creates a link between the biblical Apocalypse and the one that the baby will bring about. Secondly, there is another link to Lewis's Wormwood, who is learning how to tempt an Englishman known as "The Patient" under his uncle's tutelage. This similar to how the Antichrist will have the forces of darkness teaching him how to be evil. Just as the earth's waters will become bitter, the baby will also become evil. It seems as if Sister Mary is giving Mr Young clues about the real identity of his baby, but he is not as familiar with the classics as Sister Mary is, and therefore he does not understand the signs. She then suggests Damien which she says is very popular. This is a reference to the antichrist character in *The Omen*, the film which is parodied by the book. If the reader is familiar with the horror film, the name Damien will remind him of the child Antichrist in that film. This is an example of a meta-reference, as Sister Mary alludes to the fact that she is aware of the film *The Omen* while she

is in a parody of *The Omen*. By making this allusion Sister Mary breaks the fourth wall[2] and lets the reader know that she is aware that she is in a parody of *The Omen.*

The French text does not vary greatly from the ST, but there is a minor shift in the following line, "ils se trouvaient confrontés pour l'heure à des signaux contradictoires" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1991:42). This is quite different from the ST where the Secret Service agents are suffering from conflicting signals. Having them confronted by conflicting signals lessens the impression of an internal struggle on the agents' part. The wording of the ST effectively depicts the agents as paranoid and unsure of themselves. The French text does make them appear confused, but not as deeply conflicted as they are portrayed in the ST. The use of *troublée* also makes the agents appear merely disconcerted, but it does not convey the feeling of having one's entire world view challenged in the same manner that the repetition of "suffering from conflicting signals" does. Suffering from conflicting signals creates a greater sense that the Secret Service agents are under a great deal of stress due to their negative associations with innocuous items such as long robes and headdresses. The natural birth which also has the agents shaken up is described as *anti-Américain* in the French text. This shift changes the tone of the text. *Anti-Américain* denotes a hostile attitude towards Americans. The agents thinking that a natural birth is *un-American* means they see it as something that is scary and foreign to them, therefore it has to be *un-American*. This plays on the reader's preconceptions about Americans and their patriotism. Changing the adjective to anti-American gives the text an unnecessarily hostile and somewhat confusing tone.

There is an instance where the translator does not make a shift, while I feel it would have been better had he done so. This occurs in the line: "Pour tout aggraver, ils avaient entendu dire que le couvent possédait une réserve de missels" (Gaiman and Pratcett, 1995: 42). Here the joke with the word *missals* is retained, however this is not as effective in this instance. What made the joke funny in the ST is the fact that *missile* and *missal* are homophones, therefore the reader understands why the presence of prayer books would make the Secret Service agents feel anxious. The same homophony does not exist in as the French words *missile* and *missel* are pronounced /misil/ and /misɛl/ respectively. Therefore there is no real pun in this instance and the humour of the ST is not successfully reproduced in this text.

[2] A situation in a work of fiction whereby a character displays awareness of being in a fictional work and of being watched by an audience.

As for Sister Mary's suggested baby names, the name *Wormwood* becomes *Absinthe*. This same word can also be found in the French translation of the Bible. This means that the same frames as those in the ST are activated. However, in the case of Wormwood in *The Screwtape Letters*, the connection is lost. The film *The Omen* was released as *La malédiction* in France. This means that French readers are just as likely to associate the name Damien with the antichrist from the film as English readers. This association will make Sister Mary breaking the fourth wall humorous. This frame is not recreated entirely successfully in the French translation, especially the generic frame involving the Secret Service agents. Where it does succeed is when it comes to the names, where the translator succeeded in matching the tone of the ST.

In the German text the nuns' long flowing robes and headdresses are translated as "lange Umhänge und Tücher vor den Gesichtern". Both www.wordreference.com and www.dict.cc define *Umhänge* as capes, with the latter also giving *wrap, cloak* and *poncho* as translations. This shift does not effectively create the same image as the ST, as cloaks bear no real resemblance the *abaya* and the *dishdash* (which the Secret Service agents have come to regard with suspicion) let alone a nun's habit. The shift from long flowing headdresses to fabric covering their faces is more effective, because this wording does describe most Westerners' prototype of traditional Middle Eastern clothing. Therefore this shift effectively demonstrates why the agents would be bewildered by the nuns' dressing in a way that they associate with the people that they have been trained to regard with suspicion. The reaction that the agents have to the nuns is said to cause a "höchst problematischer innerer Konflikt" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1991:26). This conveys the same message regarding the agents' state of mind as the ST, but in a more explicit manner.

While I was critical of the French text for minimising this internal conflict, I feel that the German translator is explaining the joke to the readers instead of letting the reader work it out for himself. In the next sentence the translator uses the same turn of phrase as the ST and says the agents are suffering from conflicting signals. He could have used the phrase in the first place instead of the long, explanatory sentence that gives the impression that the reader is being led by the hand towards a conclusion. There is another shift in the text where it states that people who are suffering from an internal conflict "sollten keine geladene und entsicherte Waffe in der Hand halten" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1991: 42). The adjectival phrase *locked and loaded* is not present in neither the French nor the source text. This time the translator's addition

to the text is effective, as describing the guns as locked and loaded heightens the tension of the situation and sense of danger that armed and paranoid men pose.

The translator's tendency to explain the humour to the reader continues in the following example: “Die Nonne erinnerte sich an ihre satanistischen Pflichten. »Wie wär's mit Wormwood?« schlug sie vor” (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1991: 26). There is a shift as *classics* becomes *satanic duties*. Sister Mary suggests Wormwood as a name, not because she deliberately wants to give the child an evil name, but because she genuinely thinks it would be good name for the baby. Sister Mary and the other satanists in the novel are characterised as not being particularly evil, but rather as people who follow the religion in which they were raised. She is merely suggesting a name that is significant in her faith, as would anyone else who followed any other religion. By saying that Sister Mary makes her suggestion because she is duty bound the translator ignores the novel's commentary on religion. Also to be noted is the fact that Wormwood is kept in its English form instead of being translated as *Wermut*. Keeping the name in English eliminates the connection to the Biblical star and strongly implies that Sister Mary is referring to C.S. Lewis’s Wormwood character, as his name was also left unchanged in the German translation of *The Screwtape Letters*. Readers may of course, still make the connection to the Book of Revelations. In this frame there are more failures than successes, unfortunately. The translator made additions to the text which resulted in the text being long and ungainly in some parts. It also explained the humour far too much, for this reason, the humour of the ST was not successfully transferred to the TT.

Frame Three - Social Status Frame

The third frame is a combination of creating new frames as well as two kinds of social frames. The first technique is used several times throughout the book, with several of the characters’ names. The frame I selected occurs after four Hell's Angels, Big Ted, Skuzz, Pigbog and Greaser, meet War, Death, Famine and Pollution, the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. The latter are now known as the Four Bikers of the Apocalypse. The Hell's Angels are allowed to join the Horsemen on their journey to Tadfield and on the way they decide that they need new names to match their new positions. The following exchange occurs when Pigbog decides that he wants to be called Really Cool People. While he is explaining his choice, his fellow biker, Things Not Working Properly Even After You've Given Them A Good Thumping (formerly Embarrassing Personal Problems and Skuzz before that) joins in the tirade against cool people and is inspired to change his name yet again.

Frame Three English Source Text

"Yeah," said Cruelty to Animals. "An' they all wear sunglasses even when they don't need 'em."

"Eatin' runny cheese, and that stupid bloody No Alcohol Lager," said Things Not Working Properly Even After You've Given Them A Good Thumping. "I hate that stuff. What's the point of drinking the stuff if it dun't leave you puking? Here, I just thought. Can I change again, so I'm No Alcohol Lager?"

"No you bloody can't," said Grievous Bodily Harm. "You've changed once already."

"Anyway," said Pigbog. "That's why I wonter be Really Cool People."

"All right," said his leader.

"Don't see why I can't be No bloody Alcohol Lager if I want."

"Shut your face."

Death and Famine and War and Pollution continued biking toward Tadfield. And Grievous Bodily Harm, Cruelty to Animals, Things Not Working Properly Even After You've Given Them A Good Thumping But Secretly No Alcohol Lager, and Really Cool People traveled with them. (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1990: 213)

Frame Three French Translation

— «Ouais, dit Cruauté envers les Animaux. Et puis, y portent tous des lunettes noires, même quand y en a pas besoin».

— «Et ils bouffent du fromage qui coule, et ces bières Sans Alcool à la con», dit Objets Qui Marchent Jamais Même Quand On Leur File Un Coup de Latte. «Ça, je déteste. Ça sert à quoi de boire, si ça te file pas envie de gerber ? Eh, j'y pense. Je peux encore changer ? Comme ça, je serai Bière sans Alcool».

— «Ah, non, merde, déclara Intervention Violente dans la Gueule. T'as déjà changé une fois».

— «Bon, bref, intervint Purin. Voilà pourquoi j'veux être Gens Vraiment Cools».

— «C'est bon, lui accorda son chef».

— «J'vois pas pourquoi j'pourrais pas être Bière Sans Alcool si j'veux, bordel».

— «Ta gueule.»

La Mort, la Famine, la Guerre et la Pollution continuaient leur chevauchée vers Tadfield. Et Intervention Violente dans la Gueule, Cruauté envers les Animaux, Objets Qui Marchent Jamais Même Quand On Leur File Un Coup de Latte Mais En Secret Bière Sans Alcool et Gens Vraiment Cool faisaient route avec eux. (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1995: 136).

Frame Three German Translation

»Klar«, bestätigte Tierquälerei. »Sie tragen dauernd dunkle Sonnenbrillen, obwohl mit ihren Augen alles in Ordnung ist.«

»Sie essen weichen Käse und trinken komisches alkolholfreies Bier«, fügte Dinge Die Nicht Richtig Funktionieren Obwohl Man Sie Ordentlich Geschüttelt Hat hinzu. »Kann das Zeug nich' ausstehen. Wie soll man sich mit alkoholfreiem Bier einen hinter die Binde gießen, frage ich euch? He, das bringt mich auf eine Idee. Kann ich Alkoholfreies Bier sein?«

»Kommt überhaupt nicht in Frage«, erwiderte Schwere Körperverletzung. »Du hast deinen Namen schon einmal geändert.«

»Na, egal«, sagte Schweini, »deshalb bin ich von jetzt an Echt Coole Typen.«

»In Ordnung«, bestätigte SKV.

»Warum darf ich nicht Alkoholfreies Bier sein, ha?«

»Mann, mach den Mund zu, es zieht!«

Tod, Hunger, Krieg und Umweltverschmutzung fuhren weiterhin in Richtung Tadfield. Schwere Körperverletzung, Tierquälerei, Dinge Die Nicht Richtig Funktionieren Obwohl Man Sie Ordentlich Geschüttelt Hat (aber insgeheim Alkoholfreies Bier) und Echt Coole Typen folgten ihnen. (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1991: 260).

Frame Three Analysis

The authors created humour by utilising multiple complementary frames. The first thing the reader will notice about these four characters is their nonstandard dialect. Their habit of dropping consonants that are normally not silent and words like *wonter* instead of *want to* and *dunt* instead of *don't* activate the prototype of WORKING CLASS SLANG. The authors have created a social status frame with the use of nonstandard English. This alone does not create the humour in the scene, but it does activate the prototype that is necessary to understand why the characters say the things they say and their choice in names. Their reasons for hating cool people also reinforce a social status frame. The cool people that they hate sound like the kind of affluent people who would look down on people from the bikers' social class. The characters are stereotypes of the kind of people who join motorcycle gangs. They speak in slang and they seem to have a fondness for violence, as shown by two of them calling themselves Grievous Bodily Harm and Cruelty to Animals. The bikers' vulgarity is further shown by the fact that Embarrassing Personal Problems only seems to drink to get drunk to the point of vomiting, and therefore hates non-alcoholic beer.

This frame contains an element of absurd humour as well. The idea of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse forming a motorcycle gang and recruiting new members is ridiculous. Even more ridiculous are the names that the new members think are appropriate for Horsemen of the Apocalypse. The creation of these new names further reinforces the social status frame. The context in which the conversation between the bikers occurs is already ridiculous and the nature of their conversation adds to the absurdity of the situation. The absurdity of the scenario is perfectly reflected by the last two lines of the excerpt.

> Death and Famine and War and Pollution continued biking toward Tadfield. And Grievous Bodily Harm, Cruelty to Animals, Things Not Working Properly Even After You've Given Them A Good Thumping But Secretly No Alcohol Lager, and Really Cool People traveled with them. (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1990: 214).

This activates a visual frame with the use of verbs of movement like *continued biking* and *travelled*. This creates the image of the Four Horsemen biking towards a small English village. Even though the Horsemen have become bikers, seeing their names listed in this manner still paints an ominous and foreboding picture. This picture is then juxtaposed with the new Horsemen and their nonsensical names. The use of multiple frames that complement each other and absurd humour worked well to create a humorous text.

The French text contains the same use of informal language and slang to characterise the bikers as street thugs. This can be seen from the third line of the excerpt. The translator uses the verb *bouffer* instead of the more standard *manger*. There are other examples of informal language such as contracting the personal pronoun *je* with verbs that begin with a consonant. The language used by the bikers does not activate the same social status frame as the ST. Their language use is informal, but it does not carry the same connotations of social class as the language in the ST. The bikers' attitudes towards cool people and their names are the elements that create a social status frame in this text. The translation of the names is mostly straightforward, with some variations on the English names. *Things Not Working Properly Even After You Give Them A Good Thumping* becomes *Objets Qui Marchent Jamais Même Quand On Leur File Un Coup de Latte*. There is a slight change in the verb, which becomes *kick* instead of *thump*. Even the phrase *coup de latte* is an informal form of the verb. This informal use of language aids in the characterisation of the bikers, as people in gangs are more likely to use informal varieties of a language. There is greater variation from the English in the translation of *Grievous Bodily Harm*, who becomes *Intervention Violente dans la Gueule*. The translator opted to create his own version of the character's name instead of calling him *Coup et Blessures*, which is the translation of GBH given by www.wordreference.com. One of the entries under *intervention* on www.wordreference.com is *surgery*, therefore the name the translator created may be translated as Violent Facial (Reconstructive) Surgery. The translator's new name conveys the violent nature of the character, while still creating humour due to the comical nature of the phrase. The character *Pigbog's* name is translated to *Purin* which means *liquid manure*. This is fitting as *bog* is a slang term for *toilet*.

In the second last paragraph of the passage the translator changes *biking* to *chevauchée*. This changes the scene slightly, as *chevauchée* can either be translated as a *horse ride* or a *cavalcade*. While the second definition of *chevauchée* is most likely the one that the translator meant to convey given the context of the scene, the first definition does also spring to mind, as one would expect the Four Horsemen to be on horseback. Even if the reader were to infer from the overall context of the scene that the translator meant the second meaning of *chevauchée, cavalcade* does not create the same absurd image of fearsome, mythical beings riding motorcycles that was present in the ST. The last sentence of the scene conveys the same humour as the ST with the summary of the new Horsemen's new names, even the extended name of *Objets Qui Marchent Jamais Même Quand On Leur File Un Coup de Latte Mais En Secret Bière Sans Alcool*. The translator was able to maintain the elements of the ST by using an

informal register for the bikers' speech and creating names that were similar to their English names. The closing part of the scene loses some of the humour of the ST, but overall the translator was able to recreate the same absurd elements that made the ST humorous.

The German texts contains some variations on the ST as well. The first shift can be found in the first line: "»Klar«, bestätigte Tierquälerei. »Sie tragen dauernd dunkle Sonnenbrillen, obwohl mit ihren Augen alles in Ordnung ist.«" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1991: 260). Cruelty to Animals says that cool people wear sunglasses even though there is nothing wrong with their eyes. In the ST he says that they wear sunglasses even though they do not need to do so. The ST implies that cool people wear sunglasses indoors, at night or any other time when wearing them is unnecessary. The German text implies that cool people wear sunglasses despite not having medical reasons to do so. The second shift occurs where Brandhorst translated *stupid bloody No Alcohol Beer* as *komisches alkoholfreies Bier*. While the word *komisch* demonstrates that the character does not have positive feelings towards alcohol-free beer, it is not as negative as the ST. The character comes across more bemused by alcohol-free beer than angered by it. Another change can be seen when Dinge Die Nicht Richtig Funktionieren Obwohl Man Sie Ordentlich Geschüttelt Hat explains why he dislikes alcohol-free beer. He asks "Wie soll man sich mit alkoholfreiem Bier einen hinter die Binde gießen", instead of "What's the point of drinking the stuff if it dun't leave you puking?". According to www.dict.cc the phrase *sich etwas hinter die Binde gießen* means *to knock back drinks*. While this does imply that the character enjoys heavy drinking, it changes the characterisation that he thinks that the purpose of drinking is to drink until the point of vomiting. This once again creates the impression that the character does not understand alcohol-free beer instead of despising it.

As in the French text, the Horsemen's journey to Tadfield is not referred to as a motorcycle ride. The translator merely states that the Horsemen continued their ride towards Tadfield. This is closer to the English than the French texts and achieves the effect of creating an unexpected image as in the ST. When it comes to the characters' names, the translator did not deviate greatly from the English text. There is a slight change in the name, Dinge Die Nicht Richtig Funktionieren Obwohl Man Sie Ordentlich Geschüttelt Hat. The German character gives things a good shaking instead of a good thumping, however this change does not affect the humorous quality of the name. Whether one gives appliances that are out of order a good shake or a good thumping, believing that this is a terrible thing and taking it as a name is still comical. In the last line of the scene the translator makes another change and gives a character's name as Dinge Die Nicht Richtig Funktionieren Obwohl Man Sie Ordentlich Geschüttelt Hat (aber insgeheim

Alkoholfreies Bier). In this text the fact that he secretly refers to himself as Non Alcoholic Beer is placed in parentheses. The part in parentheses becomes a piece of extra information that the narrator provides instead of being part of an already long and nonsensical name. As a standalone text this changed name is still humorous, but when compared to the ST and French translation, one can see that not placing that one part between parentheses renders the text more humorous.

Frame Four - Role Themes Frame

The following scene creates humour by combining a misunderstanding between the characters with the creation of new frames. In this scene the reader learns how the satanic nuns make an error during the switching of the babies and the Antichrist ends up being raised by a couple from a small village instead of the American Cultural Attaché and his wife. In this scene Sister Mary Loquacious, a scatter-brained satanic nun is in a delivery room with Mr Young, whom she believes is the American Cultural Attaché. She has already exchanged the Youngs' baby with the Antichrist when another nun enters the room. The second nun does not realise that Sister has switched the babies and she takes the Youngs' baby, thinking that he is the Antichrist. The nuns do not communicate verbally during the switch and merely wink at each instead, each believing that the other is on the same page. The scene explains what each nun meant to convey through their wink and their interpretation of the other's wink. This scene gives the reader insight into the nuns' thoughts and we see how the new nun leaves with the wrong baby.

Frame Four English Source Text

> As methods of human communication go, a wink is quite versatile. You can say a lot with a wink. For example, the new nun's wink said:
>
> *Where the Hell have you been? Baby B has been born, we're ready to make the switch, and here's you in the wrong room with the Adversary, Destroyer of Kings, Angel of the Bottomless Pit, Great Beast that is called Dragon, Prince of This World, Father of Lies, Spawn of Satan, and Lord of Darkness, drinking tea. Do you realize I've nearly been shot?*
>
> And, as far as she was concerned, Sister Mary's answering wink meant:
>
> *Here's the Adversary, Destroyer of Kings, Angel of the Bottomless Pit, Great Beast that is called*

Dragon, Prince of This World, Father of Lies, Spawn of Satan, and Lord of Darkness, and I can't talk now because there's this outsider here.

Whereas Sister Mary, on the other hand, had thought that the orderly's wink was more on the lines of:

Well done, Sister Mary - switched over the babies all by herself. Now indicate to me the superfluous child and I shall remove it and let you get on with your tea with his Royal Excellency the American Culture.

And therefore her own wink had meant:

There you go, dearie; that's Baby B, now take him away and leave me to chat to his Excellency. I've always wanted to ask him why they have those tall buildings with all the mirrors on them. (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1990: 17).

Frame Four French Translation

Dans le registre des communications humaines, un clin d'œil est riche de sens. Un seul clin d'œil peut signifier beaucoup de choses. Par exemple, celui de la nouvelle arrivante avait dit :

Où Diable étais-tu ? Le bébé B est là, nous sommes prêtes à faire l'échange, et tu es en train de boire ton thé dans la mauvaise chambre, avec l'Adversaire, le Destructeur de Rois, l'Ange de l'Abîme sans Fond, la Grande Bête nommée Dragon, le Prince de ce Monde, le Père du Mensonge, l'Engeance de Satan et le Seigneur des Ténèbres. Tu te rends compte que j'ai failli me faire tirer dessus?

Pour elle, le clin d'œil que lui adressa la sœur Mary en réponse signifiait :

Voici l'Adversaire, le Destructeur de Rois, l'Ange de l'Abîme sans Fond, la Grande Bête nommée Dragon, le Prince de ce Monde, le Père du Mensonge, l'Engeance de Satan et le Seigneur des Ténèbres, et je ne peux pas parler pour l'instant, à cause du non-initié ici présent.

Tandis que, pour la sœur Mary, le clin d'œil de sa collègue signifiait plutôt :

Bien joué, sœur Mary – tu as interverti les bébés toute seule. Maintenant, indique-moi le bébé surnuméraire, que je t'en débarrasse pour te laisser savourer ta tasse de thé en compagnie de son Éminence Royale, le Culturel Américain.

Par conséquent, son propre clin d'œil avait valeur de :

*Tiens, ma chère, le voilà : c'est le bébé B, emporte-le et laisse-moi bavarder avec son Excellence. J'ai toujours voulu savoir pourquoi ils avaient ces grands bâtiments tout couverts de miroir*s. (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1995: 40).

Frame Four German Translation

Die menschliche Kommunikation läßt für gewöhnlich einen breiten Interpretationsspielraum, was insbesondere auf das Zwinkern zutrifft. Aus einem Zwinkern kann man viel herauslesen. Die zweite Nonne teilte damit folgendes mit:

Wo zur Hölle sind Sie gewesen? Baby B ist geboren, und wir müssen den Austausch vornehmen. Aber Sie sitzen hier im falschen Zimmer bei Widersacher, Zerstörer von Königreichen, Engel der Dunkelheit, Großes Tier-das-man-Drachen-nennt, Herr dieser Welt, Vater aller Lügen, Satansbrut und Fürst der Finsternis - und trinken Tee. Ist Ihnen eigentlich bekannt, daß man mich fast erschossen hätte?

Nonne Nummer Zwei glaubte, in Schwester Marias gezwinkerter Antwort folgende Botschaft zu erkennen:

Hier ist der Widersacher, Zerstörer von Königreichen, Engel der Dunkelheit, das große Tier-das-man-Drachen-nennt, Herr Dieser Welt, Vater aller Lügen, Satansbrut und Fürst der Finsternis. Ich kann nicht sprechen, weil ein Außenstehender zugegen ist.

Im Gegensatz dazu hatte Maria Redeviel das Zwinkern der anderen Krankenschwester folgendermaßen interpretiert:

Gut gemacht, Schwester Maria - Sie haben den Austausch ganz allein vorgenommen. Zeigen Sie mir jetzt das andere Kind, damit ich es fortbringen und Sie Ihrem Gespräch mit Seiner Königlichen Exzellenz der amerikanischen Kultur überlassen kann.

Und deshalb bedeutete ihr eigenes Zwinkern:

Sie haben völlig recht. Teuerste, es ist bereits alles erledigt. Baby B liegt dort. Nehmen Sie es und lassen Sie mich mit Seiner Exzellenz allein. Endlich habe ich Gelegenheit, ihn zu fragen, warum die Häuser in Amerika so hoch sind und aus lauter Spiegeln bestehen. (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1991: 25).

Frame Four Analysis

The humour in this scene comes in the form of the catastrophic misunderstanding between the two nuns. As previously stated, there is no verbal communication between the characters, but we are given a glimpse of their thought processes. Seeing what each character meant to convey with a wink and what they thought the other was thinking and knowing that they are each mistaken is what creates humour in this scene. The other humorous element is the rather long and pompous list of titles given to the Antichrist: *the Adversary, Destroyer of Kings, Angel of the Bottomless Pit, Great Beast that is called Dragon, Prince of This World, Father of Lies, Spawn of Satan, and Lord of Darkness*. What is immediately striking about this list of titles is just how long it is. The repetition of these titles further emphasises how cumbersome it is to have to address someone in such a manner, rendering the titles ridiculous instead of terrifying. The fact that the person who is being referred to with these titles is a new born baby adds another layer of the absurd to the scene. This is one example of creating a new frame that can be found in the scene.

Another humorous element comes in the form of Sister Mary referring to the American Cultural Attaché as *his Royal Excellency the American Culture*. This description is immediately comical because of how nonsensical it is sounds. Firstly, as an American government official, Mr Dowling, the real Cultural Attaché could never have the word *royal* in his title. Secondly, the last part of the title is simply incomprehensible. This further aids in the characterisation of Sister Mary as a bumbling scatterbrain, which makes her somewhat endearing. This is not how one would expect a character that is described as a Satanist to be portrayed. Instead of an evil, devious mastermind, the reader encounters a silly, bumbling character who appears to be a bigger danger to herself than anyone else.

In the final line Sister Mary thinks about asking about the tall, mirror-covered buildings in America. This is one of many American stereotypes that Sister Mary expresses throughout her interaction with Mr Young. In her prototypical American city, all of the buildings are covered in glass. Seeing Mary's thoughts to further interrogate Mr Young about life in America is humorous because the reader knows that this question will confuse Mr Young.

The authors created a humorous text by activating an erroneous frame that also gave the reader an insight that the characters do not have and the reader can see the misunderstanding slowly occur while the characters are oblivious to what is happening. Creating new frames in the form

of heralding a new born baby as the *Adversary* and *Father of Lies*, among other titles, was used to create humour in this frame.

In terms of recreating the same frames as the ST, Marcel's translation of the new-born antichrist's titles remain faithful to those of the ST, therefore successfully recreating the same new frame that the authors did. In the French text Mr Young is referred to as *a non-initié*, instead of *étranger*, as one would expect to see as the translation of *stranger*. This serves to further distance Mr Young as someone who has absolutely no involvement in the plot to exchange the American Cultural Attaché's baby with the antichrist. The word *non-initié* also conveys the idea of someone who does not have information that other people have. Not only is Mr Young not involved in the plot, but he is also completely unaware of the nuns' order and their work. This shows just how much Sister Mary is mistaken about Mr Young's identity. This greater discrepancy between the two nuns' perceptions of Mr Young creates a different element to the humour in the French text. In the French text *his Royal Excellency, the American Culture* is translated as *son Éminence Royale, le Culturel Américain*. The Cultural Attaché is referred to as *le Culturel Américain* instead of the *American Culture* in the French text. Given that the title was nonsensical in the first place, the translator had freedom to create his own word combination, resulting in *le Culturel Américain*. There is an inversion of the noun and adjective in the phrase *Culturel Américain*. *Culturel* is not one of the adjectives of beauty, age, goodness or size which generally appear before the noun in French grammar. This inversion further illustrates Sister Mary's ignorance, as it seems that she is merely throwing words together to produce an official sounding title for Mr Young. With some minor changes at the grammatical level, the French text activated the same frames as the ST, while in some parts explicitly amplifying the elements that create humour in the text.

In the German text, the infant antichrist is hailed as *der Widersacher, Zerstörer von Königreichen, Engel der Dunkelheit, das große Tier-das-man-Drachen-nennt, Herr Dieser Welt, Vater aller Lügen, Satansbrut und Fürst der Finsternis*. There are minor changes as he becomes *the Destroyer of Kingdoms* and *the Angel of Darkness*. The first change from *Destroyer of Kings* to *Destroyer of Kingdoms* is negligible, but the second shift from *Angel of the Bottomless Pit* to *Angel of Darkness* makes his final title of *Lord of Darkness* somewhat redundant. Once again, the translation would read better as a stand-alone text, but appears weaker when compared to the ST and French text.

Mr Young becomes *Seiner Königlichen Exzellenz der amerikanischen Kultur* in this translation. His Royal Excellency of the American Culture is an equally nonsensical title even though it is more grammatically correct than the ST and French text. The same nonsensical elements remain, such as applying the term *royal* to an American government official and the fact that referring to someone as His Royal Excellency of something simply does not make sense.

There is a significant shift in the final line of the extract. In this text Sister Mary thinks; "Endlich habe ich Gelegenheit, ihn zu fragen, warum die Häuser in Amerika so hoch sind und aus lauter Spiegeln bestehen". At first glance, the decision to translate *buildings* as *Häuser* seems illogical and it appears to be a poor translation. However, I think it makes sense for Sister Mary, who is not all that bright, to mistake tall high-rise buildings in business districts for houses. When we are first introduced to Sister Mary we learn that, "she would be quite bright, if she was ever put in a position to find out, but long ago found that being a scatterbrain, as she'd put it, gave you an easier journey through life" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1990: 15). From this description, Sister Mary seems like someone who avoids having to make a mental effort if she can help it. Therefore it would not be out of character for her to never have considered that the tall glass covered constructions that she considers houses are in actual fact office buildings. This question, as well as referring to a Cultural Attaché as *Seiner Königlichen Exzellenz der amerikanischen Kultur* adds an element of absurd humour in this text that is not present in the other two texts. Ultimately the translator was able to activate the same frames as the ST in his text and add another dimension to the humour by changing one word in the last line.

Frame Five - Generic Frame

The following is an example of a generic frame, where the reader meets Famine for the first time. The reader will have a prototype of a villain and this frame explains how Famine fits into the role of a villain. Another prototype upon which the reader relies when reading the scene is that of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, specifically Famine. Prior to the extract that I have selected we are introduced to Famine, alias Raven Sable. Sable is very successful businessman who owns a multinational food company that manufactures nutritionally deficient food. His food causes weight loss, no matter how much of it people eat. The reader knows that Famine is responsible for hunger in the world and in the following scene we see how he achieves this goal in the 20th century.

Frame Five English Source Text

Two years of *Newtrition* investment and research had produced CHOW®. CHOW® contained spun, plaited, and woven protein molecules, capped and coded, carefully designed to be ignored by even the most ravenous digestive tract enzymes; no-cal sweeteners; mineral oils replacing vegetable oils; fibrous materials, colorings, and flavorings. The end result was a foodstuff almost indistinguishable from any other except for two things. Firstly, the price, which was slightly higher, and secondly the nutritional content, which was roughly equivalent to that of a Sony Walkman. It didn't matter how much you ate, you lost weight.

...

Sable sat back and watched the money roll in. He watched CHOW® gradually fill the ecological niche that used to be filled by the old, untrademarked food. He followed CHOW® with SNACKS® junk food made from real junk. (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1999: 110).

Frame Five French Translation

Deux ans d'investissement et de recherche chez *Newtrition* avaient abouti à PLATS™. PLATS™ contenait des molécules de protéines, filées, tressées, tissées, encapsulées et codées, méticuleusement conçues pour être ignorées des enzymes digestives les plus gloutonnes ; des édulcorants sans calories ; des huiles minérales substituées aux huiles végétales ; des matériaux fibreux, des colorants et des agents de sapidité. Le résultat final était un nutriment presque semblable à tous les autres, à deux détails près. D'abord le prix, légèrement plus élevé, et ensuite le quotient nutritif, à peu près comparable à celui d'un baladeur Sony. Vous pouviez en manger autant que vous vouliez, vous finissiez toujours par perdre du poids

...

Sable, carré au fond de son fauteuil, avait regardé l'argent couler à flots. Il vit PLATS™ occuper petit à petit la niche écologique jusque-là dévolue aux anciens aliments, ceux qui n'étaient pas des marques déposées. À PLATS™, il fit succéder VITCROCK™, des petites cochonneries vraiment fabriquées à partir de cochonneries – des ordures ménagères, en fait. (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1995: 255)

Frame Five German Translation

> Zwei Jahre der Investitionen und Forschungen führten zum ersten Schpaise-Produkt: FUTTER™. FUTTER™ bestand aus speziell bearbeiteten, speziell strukturierten und speziell entkalorisierten Protein-Molekülen, die selbst von den hartnäckigsten Enzymen des Verdauungstrakts ignoriert wurden. Die Süßstoffe schmeckten süß - aber damit hatte es sich auch schon. Hinzu kamen fibröse Materialen, Pigmente und geschmacksintensive Konservierungsmittel. Das Ergebnis waren Lebensmittel, die sich kaum von anderen unterscheiden. Es gab nur zwei wichtige Unterschiede. Erstens: Der Preis war ein wenig höher. Zweitens: Der Nährwert entsprach dem eines Sony Walkman. Es spielte keine Rolle, wieviel man davon aß - man verlor Gewicht.
>
> ...
>
> Sable lehnte sich zurück und hörte die Kasse klingeln. Es dauerte nicht lange, bis FUTTER™ eine ökologische Nische füllte, die bisher von modern-klassischen, ohne das hochgestell ™ ausgestatteten Speisen beansprucht worden war. FUTTER™ bildete den Anfang. Es folgte SNACKS™ -Junk Food aus echtem organischen Müll. (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1995: 134)

Frame Five Analysis

Firstly humour is created by Famine's alias as well as the name of his company. The alias is an example of a loaded name. His first and last names, Raven and Sable, are both synonyms for the colour black. This is a reference to the fact that the Four Horsemen are always depicted riding different coloured horses and Famine rides the black horse. The company's name is *Newtrition Corporation*. *Newtrition* is a portmanteau of *new* and *nutrition*. This name creates the idea that this company produces a modern kind of food that is revolutionary and unlike anything else that is on the market. The description of the kinds of products that *Newtrition* manufactures is a shocking illustration of just how unlike anything else the company's food is. What is humorous in this situation is just how evil the plot is as well as how ingenious it is of Famine to cause millions to starve in an age when one would expect hunger to have been eradicated. It is more ingenious that he is causing famine in developed countries such as the United States, where we first meet Famine. We learn earlier in the novel that the Horseman Pestilence was thwarted by the invention of penicillin, so learning how Famine has been able

to survive in a modern world is humorous. The humour is created by the fact that the general public does not know that their much beloved food products are slowly killing them as well as the idea of food that has been genetically modified to cause starvation. This is incongruous with the readers' understanding of food, which creates humour.

The second way that humour is created is through the names of the products that *Newtrition* manufactures. The food that Sable's company produces is only discussed in terms of it being genetically modified to taste like anything. The ambiguous nature of this food is highlighted by generic names such as *CHOW*® and *SNACKS*®. The generic nature of names like snacks and chow clashes with the registered trademark symbol. The registered trademark also illustrates how consumers will buy anything as long as it is a brand name item, much to Sable's pleasure, "He watched CHOW® gradually fill the ecological niche that used to be filled by the old, untrademarked food" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1990: 111). The need for consumers to buy new products that have a trademark reinforces the humour created by the name *Newtrition*. This passage is also satirising people who slavishly follow every food trend and follow whichever diet is popular at the time. There is also an element of metaphoric mapping. *CHOW*® is said to fill an ecological niche as if the need for trademarked food products were a natural phenomenon, instead of a result of effective marketing. The author is comparing *CHOW*® to an apex predator that enters an ecosystem and becomes dominant in it. By activating the script of a natural ecosystem and applying it to supermarkets, the authors succeeded in creating humour.

Earlier in the excerpt there is another example of metaphoric mapping. Sable's food products are said to be "carefully designed to be ignored by even the most ravenous digestive tract enzymes" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1990: 110). *Ravenous* calls to mind a wild beast that is looking to devour its prey completely; it is not usually used to describe digestive enzymes. The other part of the metaphor is the fact that Sable's food is so not filling that it leaves a person hungry even to the smallest parts of his being. That is how effective Famine is at his job. There is also a sense of frustration that is created by this metaphor and the idea of frustrated digestive enzymes is as absurd as the idea of ravenous enzymes. Ravenous also makes the reader think of Famine's alias, Raven Sable, which makes the name even more humorous.

Words such as *molecules*, *coded*, *carefully designed* and *fibrous materials* activate the visual frame LABORATORY, a setting that is not normally associated with food. This reinforces the idea that Sable's food is unnatural. It is also referred to as a *foodstuff*. While this term is by no

means negative, in the context of this frame and the scientific language which is used to describe this food, foodstuff implies that *CHOW*® is an unidentifiable imitation of food. The fact that the product's nutritional value is compared to that of a cassette player emphasises the unnatural and unhealthy nature of *CHOW*®.

Lastly, there is metonymic mapping in the sentence, "He followed CHOW® with SNACKS® junk food made from real junk" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1999: 110). The word *junk* in junk food usually does not refer to literal garbage, rather it refers to the unhealthy nature of the food. When it is revealed that *SNACKS*® is made from garbage, *junk* food becomes a pun, creating humour. The information that Sable is willing to sell garbage as food in addition to selling nutritionally deficient foodstuffs is the cue that activates the generic frame of VILLAIN. The somewhat absurd nature of Sable's villainy and the idea that he can cause hunger by selling food create humour in this frame.

In the French text, Sable's name was left untranslated. While his name reflected his status as the rider of the black horse among the Four Horsemen in the English text, it does not have the same effect in French. The name Raven has no particular meaning for French readers and Sable is identical to the French word for sand. A substitution would have been a better strategy in this instance. The translator would have had to make sure at least one his names was an allusion to the colour black in order to retain the reference to Famine's black horse. His company becomes *NEWtrition*, maintaining the English portmanteau, and consequently the same play on words. The first three letters are capitalised, emphasising the pun and making it more obvious. However, the capitalising of some of the letters in *NEWtrition* makes the name look more like a stylised brand that would catch the eye of the consumers that are satirised in this frame.

In this translation, *NEWtrition*'s product *CHOW*® becomes *PLATS*™. *Plat* may be translated as dishes, but as an adjective the word plat also means dull and unimaginative. This double meaning is effective as it emphasises the product's nature as a bland, generic foodstuff. There is the same metaphoric mapping and "the most ravenous digestive tract enzymes" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1990: 110) becomes "des enzymes digestives les plus gloutonnes" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1995: 255). www.wordreference.com defines *gloutonne* as glutinous or greedy. This description of digestive enzymes is effective, as it reflects the people who buy up all of the company's meals in order to avoid gaining or to lose weight.

The last line, "He followed CHOW® with SNACKS® junk food made from real junk" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1999: 110) is rendered as " À PLATS™, il fit succéder VITCROCK™, des petites cochonneries vraiment fabriquées à partir de cochonneries – des ordures ménagères, en fait" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1991: 255). *VITCROCK*™ is a portmanteau of *vite* (fast) and *croquer*, which www.wordreference.com (2005) defines as *to munch.* This wordplay is an effective translation of snacks, which are made to be consumed easily and quickly. It also sounds like a genuine product name, especially from a company such as *NEWtrition* that is trying to be trendy and exploit the market for brand name products. The same pun on junk food is present in the French text with the word *cochonnerie*, which means both *junk food* and *junk*, but the translator made additions to the text. He adds as an aside that *VITCROCK*™ is made from household waste. I find that this additional piece of information serves no real purpose. One can speculate that it implies that people are being fed their own waste, but I feel that that implication was already present without the additional explanation. In spite of this curious addition, the French text successfully recreated the humour of the ST and even contained some elements that were not present the ST.

Similar to the French text, Raven's name was not translated in the German text. As in the French text, Raven Sable is no longer a loaded name, but rather an unusual English name. In the German text *Newtrition* becomes *Schpaise-Produkt*. This unconventional and stylised spelling of *Speise* has the same effect as the spelling of *NEWtrition* in the French text, i.e. it sounds like and resembles the name of a trendy, modern company. The product that *Schpaise-Produkt* sells becomes *FUTTER*™ in this text. According to www.dict.cc *Futter* is animal feed. While the English *chow* does not specifically refer to animal food, it may have that meaning sometimes. There is no such ambiguity with the word *Futter*. This makes the product name even funnier, as the public is being told explicitly what the company *Schpaise-Produkt* thinks of them and yet they continue to make their product a bestseller. It also illustrates the contempt that Sable has for humanity, further reinforcing the VILLAIN generic frame.

The metaphoric mapping present in the ST is successfully recreated in the text as "speziell entkalorisierten Protein-Molekülen, die selbst von den hartnäckigsten Enzymen des Verdauungstrakts ignoriert wurden" (Gaiman and Pratchett, 1991:134). Here digestive enzymes are described as *hartnäckig*, which means *tenacious* or *persistent*. This word choice is effective because it emphasises the futility of eating Sable's food. Just as the food will never be properly digested by the body's enzymes, people who eat it will never be nourished by it, despite their efforts. The name of Sable's latest product, *SNACKS*™ is does not change in this

text. The explanation that the product is made from actual junk does not have the quite the same humorous effect as in the other texts. In both the ST and the French text it is the homophony created by the repetition of *junk* and *cochonnerie* respectively which create the humour. Junk Food is borrowed from English and the joke here relies on the reader's knowledge that the word “junk” can also mean trash or the slightly inaccurate translation *orgänischem Müll*. While this part of the text does have metonymic mapping, this technique for creating humour is not aided by the use of homophones as it is in the French and source text. However the text was successful in recreating the same frames as the ST well as improving on the humour of the ST in one instance.

CHAPTER FIVE – CONCLUSION

5.1. Conclusion

This study aimed to examine the creation of humour and determine whether or not it is possible to translate it into other languages. The extracts analysed in this essay each represented a combination of frames as outlined by Rojo. They also contained a combination of her proposed procedures for creating humour, though the most commonly used procedure was the distortion of frames. The majority of the frames are social frames between two or more characters. Due to the commonalities between English, French and German cultures, translating these frames, which often possess a great deal of cultural significance, did not prove to be much of a problem for the translators. The interactions in these frames were also universal, so cultural scripts were not such an important consideration when it came to translating them.

The first frame was a social frame that involved a misunderstanding between the two characters in the scene. The misunderstanding itself is the biggest source of humour in this frame. The usage of visual frames aids in understanding the source of the misunderstanding and gives the reader insight into the characters' thoughts. This frame contains a culture specific concept that had to be adapted in the translations. English speakers are able to easily identify *white elephant* as a type of sale where second hand goods are sold. In the French text, this concept was replaced by a different type of sale. The German text did away with the sale altogether and had the proudly English Mr Young preparing German dishes. The *white elephant* of the English text and the *antiquités* of the French text each aid in creating humour based on wordplay. The German text loses this feature, which detracts from the overall humour of the text. As the last joke of that particular scene in the novel, the failure of the German text leaves the scene ending on a low note. Overall, both translations were successful in maintaining most of the frames and humour of the ST. Both translations added a small piece of background information regarding a certain company for the benefit of their readers. The German text only fell short when it came translating a culture specific concept.

The second frame was a combination of generic and social frames. The generic frame makes use of visual frames and satire to create humour. There is a satirical portrayal of American Secret Service agents, who are shown to be nervous and skittish in the presence of unfamiliar people like nuns. Visual and generic frames work together to create satire. The description of the nuns' habits as *long flowing robes and headdresses* creates a visual frame of EXOTIC FOREIGNER. The fact that this frame is incongruous with the concept of nuns demonstrates

that the agents' fear of people who dress in a certain way is ridiculous. Humour is used to attack and critique xenophobic attitudes. The French text successfully recreated the visual frames, while the Germans text curiously used the word *Tücher* for *robes*. The shift in the German text did affect the visual frame somewhat, as *Tücher* does not create the same visual of a MIDDLE EASTERN PERSON wearing a traditional *abaya* or *dishdash*. Both translations were unsuccessful in maintaining the humour in the visual frame that described people who are suffering from conflicting ideas. The French text completely changed this frame, removing some of the depth that the characters had. The German text included additional information which made the text less humorous, as it felt like the translator was explaining the joke to the reader.

The play on the word *missal* proved to be a significant hindrance in both of the translations. The word *missal* is a homophone of *missile* in Standard American English. The exact same joke is used in the French text even though these two words do not have the same homophonous relationship in French. In this instance merely replacing a SL term with a TL equivalent was not sufficient to recreate the humour in the text. The German translator opted to paraphrase *missal* and called it a prayer book. Once again, the homophonous relationship between a prayer book and missile is lost. Finding a similar play on a religious term may have been the better solution. In this case a linguistic joke proved to be difficult to successfully translate.

The third frame represents a social status frame where members of a motorcycle are discussing their new names now that they are riding with the Horsemen of the Apocalypse. The riders' vocabulary and grammar characterise them as working class. Both translations used informal language, but the register used in the ST was slang whereas the translators used colloquial language. The register the translators used did not quite activate the same social status frame, as colloquial language does not necessarily demonstrate a person's social status. The Germans text also changed one of the characters' complaints that non-alcoholic beer does not leave one sick and vomiting. This shift in the text changed the portrayal of the character, as it made him appear less vulgar and less of a thug. When it comes to creating new frames, the translators were successful in recreating the same frames while making minor changes due to linguistic differences.

The fourth frame also used the creation of frames as a method for creating humour. The French text was faithful to the ST in terms of recreating the same name. The German text contained minor shifts which did create a little repetition. As for the second instance of creating a new

frame, *His Royal Excellency the American Culture* became *Son Éminence Royale le Culturel Américain* and *Seiner Königlichen Exzellenz der amerikanischen Kultur*. Both translations are slightly more grammatically correct than the ST term, and less of an odd jumble of words. Even though these titles are still nonsensical, they are slightly less ludicrous than SL term, which looks like miscellaneous of words haphazardly thrown together. Finally, a significant shift occurred in the German translation of the last line of the frame. Mirror covered buildings became mirror covered houses in the German text. While mirror covered buildings created a visual frame that represented a stereotypical major American city in the ST, mirror covered houses creates an incongruity that makes the German text more humorous. The reader will think of glass covered structures in America and realise that Sister Mary is just as mistaken about the identity of the man in her presence and the baby that she has just exchanged. In this frame, both translators made shifts in the translation of a nonsensical title, making it less sound slightly less ludicrous. A clever shift on the part of the Germans translator resulted in in a situation where the TT was more humorous.

The final frame is a generic frame that introduces the character Famine. Once again several different frames and humour creation techniques were combined to create the overall generic frame. The first technique was creating new frames. Famine's alias, Raven Sable is reference to the fact that Famine is the Horsemen with a black horse. Both translations did not change this name, which meant that the name was not a loaded name as it was in the ST. More new frames were created with the name of Famine's company as well as the names of the unhealthy food products that the company sells. In the instance of the company name, the French translator retained the English name, which was a portmanteau, but chose to spell it a different stylised manner, which I found quite effective. In the Germans text, the name became a stylised spelling of *Speise,* which was also very effective in creating the impression of a modern, trendy company. The translators used different methods for the translation of the product names. The French translator used a portmanteau to translate the name *SNACKS®*, which becomes *VITCROCK™*. The German translation, *FUTTER™*, was better, in my opinion, as it made the character's villainy more exaggerated and comical. One area where the German text failed was in the translation of the play on words where Famine is said to sell junk food made from real junk. The French text had the word *cochonnerie*, which has the same double meaning of junk and junk food as the ST term. The German text did not contain this same pun. The German word for junk food has been borrowed from English, but in this instance *junk* only has one meaning. Linguistic limitations meant that the pun could not be recreated in this instance.

Even though Rojo gave separate examples of techniques for creating humour, what I discovered during the course of this research is that more often than not, these techniques are used in conjunction with each other and reinforce each other. In the third extract, creating new frames was used in order to create a social class frame. This social class frame, in turn contributed to the creation of an overall generic frame. In the second extract, visual frames were used to satirise US Secret Service agents, creating a generic frame. Finally in the last extract, new frames are created in order to create and bolster the generic frame of VILLIAN. This interplay and interdependence of the frames occurs throughout the narrative. In the instances where the translators were able to maintain this interplay between different frames, the target texts were successful in activating the same frames as the ST, therefore successful in transferring the humorous elements.

On several occasions, language proved to be a hindrance to translating humour. Puns proved to be the most problematic to translate, especially in the German text. Translating these directly proved to be an unsuccessful strategy in the French text when it came to translating the confusion caused by the presence of missals in the convent. The German text was not successful in retaining the pun on the word "junk food", because of linguistic limitations. Creating new puns in the TL proved to be a more successful strategy. However, this strategy is used inconsistently by the French translator, and completely ignored by the German.

It became apparent during the course of the study that co-authored novels are uncommon. There are therefore not many discussions regarding novels that have more than one author. *Good Omens* was the authors' first and only collaboration and this posed a different challenge for the translators. Brandhorst, the German translator was responsible for translating Pratchett's *Discworld* novels into that language. Marcel translated Gaiman's works into French. Both translators were therefore only familiar with the style of one of the collaborators. A brief overview of the reviews of the translators' previous works and a comparison between the reviews for *Good Omens* would have been an interesting addition to the study.

The study revealed several instances where both translators made questionable choices regarding the translation of linguistic humour. Perhaps further studies in the field could include improvements on the translations that are found to be lacking. This, as well as examining collaborative literature are my suggestions for studies in this field.

Ultimately, this study has shown that the translation of humour is possible if the translator is aware of how different elements of the text work together to create incongruity and therefore,

humour. What is considered humorous may be subjective, but by using strategies that allow for the interaction of frames and creation of linguistic jokes that make use of SL conventions, translation of humour is possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Gaiman, N. and Pratchett, T. 1995. *De Bons Présages*. Paris: J'ai lu.

_____1991. *Ein Gutes Omen*. Hamburg: Roger & Bernhard.

_____ 1990. *Good Omens*. London: Gollancz.

Secondary Sources

Abbott, W.T. 2002. *White Knowledge and the Cauldron of Story: The Use of Allusion in Terry Pratchett's Discworld*. Johnson City: East Tennessee State University.

Abrams, M.H. 1999. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Andersen, D. 2006. *Bewitching Writing. An Analysis of Intertextual Resonance in the Witch-sequence in Terry Pratchett's Disc World*. Aalborg: Aalborg University.

Attardo, S. 1994. *Linguistic Theories of Humor.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

_____ 2002. "Translation and humour: An Approach Based on the General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH)" in *The Translator*, 8 (2): 173-194.

Baker, M. 1992. *In Other Words – A Course book on Translation*. London: Routledge.

BBC. 2014. The Big Read [Online] Available from: http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/bigread/top100_2.shtml. [Accessed 18 October 2015].

BBC News. 2014. How Neil Gaiman and Terry Pratchett Wrote a Book [Online] Available from: http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-30512620. [Accessed 5 September 2015].

_____ 2015. Sir Terry Pratchett: Tributes to Discworld or [Online] Available from: http://www.bbc.com/news/entertainment-arts-31855710. [Accessed 5 September 2015].

Berger, P. L. 1997. *Redeeming Laughter: The Comic Dimension of Human Experience*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

The Bookbag. 2014. Good Omens by Terry Pratchett and Neil Gaiman [Online] Available from: http://www.thebookbag.co.uk/reviews/index.php?title=Good_Omens_by_Terry_Pratchett_and_Neil_Gaiman. [Accessed 5 September 2015]

The Booksmugglers. 2008. Book Review: Good Omens [Online] Available from: http://thebooksmugglers.com/2008/07/book-review-good-omens-continued.html. [Accessed 5 September 2015].

Broeder, L. 2007. *Translating Humour: The Problem With Translating Terry Pratchett*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.

Buchtips. 2010. Ein gutes Omen [Online] Available from: (http://www.buchtips.net/rez4687-ein-gutes-omen.html. [Accessed 4 September 2015].

Carr, J. and Greeves, L. 2006. *The Naked Jape: Uncovering the Hidden World of Jokes*. London: Michael Joseph.

Chiaro, D. 1992. *The Language of Jokes: Analysing Verbal Play*. London: Routledge.

Critiques Libres. 2005. Ange et Démon [Online] Available from: http://www.critiqueslibres.com/i.php/vcrit/7482. [Accessed 10 August 2015].

Dane, J. A. 1980 "Parody and Satire: A Theoretical Model." in *Genre: A Quarterly Devoted to Generic Criticism*. 13 (2): 145-159.

Dentith, S. 2000. *Parody*. London: Routledge.

Dynel, M. 2009. *Creative Metaphor is a Birthday Cake: Metaphor as the Source of Humour*. Łódź: University of Łódź.

Eco, U. 2013. *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*. London: Phoenix.

Elbakin. 2004. De bons présages [Online] Available from: http://www.elbakin.net/fantasy/roman/de-bons-presages-544. [Accessed 5 July 2015].

Fernandes, L. 2006. "Translation of Names in Children's Fantasy Literature: Bringing the Young Reader into Play" in *New Voices in Translation Studies*. 2: 44-57.

Forabosco, G. 1992. "Cognitive Aspects of the Humor Process: the Concept of Incongruity" in *Humor*. 5 (1/2): 45-68.

Fillmore, Ch. J. 1976 “Frame Semantics and the Nature of Language” in S. Harnad et al. (eds) *Origins and Evolution of Language and Speech*. 280: 20-32. New York: Academy of Sciences.

Grimoires. 2005 Ein gute Omen [Online] Available from: http://www.grimoires.de/buch/Ein-gutes-Omen_278.htm. [Accessed 10 August 2015].

Gutt, E. 2004. *Application of Relevance Theory to Translation - A Concise Overview*. Unpublished manuscript.

_____1998. “Pragmatic Aspects of Translation: Some Relevance Theory Observations” in L. Hickey (ed) *The Pragmatics of Translation*. 12: 41-53. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters

_____ 2000. “Issues of Translation Research in the Inferential Paradigm of Communication” in M. Olohan (ed) *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I. Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. 1: 161-179 Manchester: St. Jerome.

_____1991. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harris, Robert. 1997. A Glossary of Literary Terms. [Online] Available from: http://home.cfl.rr.com/eghsap/apterms.html [Accessed 10 August 2015].

Internet Movie Database. 2005. The Omen [Online] Available from: http://m.imdb.com/title/tt0075005/. [Accessed 10 August 2015].

Katan, D. 1999. *Translating Cultures*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

_____2009. “Translation as Intercultural Communication” in J. Munday (ed*) The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. 74-92. New York: Routledge.

Klingberg, G. 1986. *Children’s Fiction in the Hands of the Translators*. Lund: Bloms Boktryckeri AB.

Krichtafovitch, I. 2009. Humour Theory [Online] Available from: www.humortheory.com/. [Accessed 15 January 2016].

Leacock, S. 1935. *Humour*. London: John Lane and Bodley Head.

Leibold, A.1989. *The Translation of Humour: Who Says it Can't be Done? Meta*, 34 (1): 109-111.

Literaturwelt. Das Blog. 2007. Ein gutes Omen [Online] Available from: http://rezensionen.literaturwelt.de/content/buch/p/t_pratchett_terry_ein_gutes_omen_mtz_133.html. [Accessed 4 September 2015].

Lspace.org. Words from the Master [Online] Available from: http://www.lspace.org/books/apf/words-from-the-master.html. [Accessed 10 August 2015].

Marmaridou, S. A. S. 1991. *What's so Proper about Names? A Study in Categorisation and Cognitive Semantics.* 15. Athens: Parousia.

Neil Gaiman's Journal 2006. Several Days of Unposted Mailbag [Online] Available from: http://journal.neilgaiman.com/2006/05/several-days-of-unposted-mailbag.html?m=1. [Accessed 10 August 2015].

New York Times. 1990. The Four Bikers of the Apocalypse [Online] Available from: http://www.nytimes.com/1990/10/07/books/the-four-bikers-of-the-apocalypse.html. [Accessed 5 September 2015].

Nida, E. A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

_____1997. "The Principles of Discourse Structure and Content in Relation to Translating" in K. Klaudy and J. Kohn (eds) *Transferre necesse Est…Current Issues of Translation Theory*. 37-42. Budapest: Scholastica.

_____2002. *Contexts in Translating*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nida, E. A. and Taber, C. R. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Nord, C. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Online German Dictionary. [Online] Available from: www.dict.cc. [Accessed 5 September 2015].

Oxford Online Dictionary. [Online] Available from: www.oxforddictionaries.com. [Accessed 7 August 2015].

Palmer, J. 1994. *Taking Humour Seriously*. New York: Routledge.

Pollard, A. 1970. *Satire.* London: Methuen.

Raphaelson-West, D. 1989. *On the Feasibility and Strategies of Translating Humour*. Meta, 34 (1): 128-141.

Rojo, A.M. 2002. *Applying Frame Semantics to Translation: A Practical Example*. Meta, 47 (3): 311-350.

_____ 2002. *Frame Semantics and the Translation of Humour*. Babel. 48 (1): 34-77.

Rose, M. E. 1993. *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-modern*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ross, A.1998. *The Language of Humour*. London and New York: Routledge.

Rothbart, S. L. 2009. *The Translation of Humour in Roald Dahl's Parody: A Study of The Twits and George's Marvellous Medicine.* Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Sil International. 2004. What Is a Prototype? [Online] Available from: http://www-01.sil.org/linguistics/GlossaryOfLinguisticTerms/WhatIsAPrototype.htm. [Accessed 5 August 2015].

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Thomson-Wohlgemuth, G. 1998. *Children's Literature and its Translation. An Overview*. Guildford: University of Surrey.

Tymoczko, M. 2006. "Reconceptualising Translation Theory – Integrating Non-Western Thought about Translation" in *Translating Others*. 1: 13-32. Manchester: St Jerome.

Vandaele, J. 2002. "Introduction: (Re-) Constructing Humour: Meanings and Means" in *The Translator*. 8 (2): 149-172.

West, D. 1989. *On the Feasibility and Strategies of Translating Humour*. Meta, 34(1): 128-141.

Word Reference Online Dictionaries. [Online] Available from: www.wordreference.com. [Accessed 6 September 2015].