

Making Sense of Humour: The Translation of Humour in the Animation Feature Film *Shrek*

Giselle Lydia Da Silva Murugan

Student N° 296258

A research report submitted to the
Faculty of Humanities,
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg,
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Translation
Johannesburg, 2019

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the strategies adopted in the translation of humour as depicted in the full-length computer-animated feature film *Shrek*, an unprecedented box office success released by DreamWorks Animation in 2001. One of the film's most successful aspects lies in its critically acclaimed appeal to adults and children alike through a significant amount of verbal and visual humour elements. In setting out to explore the film's humour, the concepts of animation and humour are presented in a discussion of *Shrek's* characters, plot and technological mastery.

The study critically examines two core approaches to Translation Studies as fundamental approaches to translation: the notions of Context and Contextualisation (Baker, 2006) and the Relevance Theory of Communication (Sperber & Wilson, 1986 & 1988). Before analysing the subject of the research, the study considers the translation of humour through three key strategies: the General Theory of Verbal Humour (Raskin & Attardo, 1991), Norm Acceptance/ Norm Opposition (Asimakoulas, 2004) and Frame Semantics (Rojo López, 2002).

Drawing on these three primary theories, the report identifies the essence of humour as it is presented through numerous devices and techniques in the film's original English dialogue before analysing the Portuguese dubbed dialogue. Such devices and techniques include wordplay, irony, intertextuality and rhyme supporting a plethora of visual frames. Through an analysis of these laughter-inducing features, the adopted translation strategies are explored in the context of whether or not the identified humour was carried through from the original Source Text to the resulting Target Text.

Declaration

I, Giselle Lydia Da Silva Murugan, hereby declare that this research report is my own unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment 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:

Date: 4 November 2019

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Judith Inggs, for her support, patience and understanding throughout the writing of this report.

This degree and research has been quite a journey and I would especially like to thank the three people who showed unwavering belief that I could do this: Daddy and Mom, thank you for always teaching me that “O Saber não ocupa lugar”. To my superhero, thank you for all your patience and ‘knowing’ I could do it. My handful of friends – thank you for helping me keep perspective and cheering at every small win! Lastly but most importantly, *Elohim* – thank you for the inspiration, ability and all the promises to get me this far.

Jellybean and my future Peanut, this is for you –
May you always feel laughter bubbling all the way down to your core!

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter One - "Once upon a time"	
Description of the Study.....	1
Animation and Humour in <i>Shrek</i>	4
Chapter Two - " Ogres are like onions - they have layers " - Theoretical Framework.....	15
Strategy for Translation - Baker's notion of Context and Contextualisation	16
Strategy for Translation - Sperber & Wilson's Relevance Theory of Communication	22
Translation of Humour	28
Approach to the Translation of Humour through the General Theory of Verbal Humour	32
Approach to the Translation of Humour through Norm Acceptance/ Norm Opposition.....	37
Approach to the Translation of Humour through Frame Semantics	40
Chapter Three - Research Analysis	
Methodology	46
Analysis.....	47
Chapter Four - "Happily Ever After"	
Conclusion and Suggestions for Further Research.....	74
Bibliography.....	77
Appendices	82

Chapter One – “Once Upon a Time” – Introduction

“All entertainment enters intimately into the lives of men and women and affects them closely; it occupies their minds and affections during leisure hours, and ultimately touches the whole of their lives”

– John Nichols (2006:3)

Description of the Study

“Once upon a time” – four simple words that have always captivated my attention. In my experience, these words always open a world of possibilities, telling legends of faraway lands, mystical creatures and tales with twists and turns and while the “happily ever after” part is not always guaranteed, something unforgettable is still sure to follow. So it was with my first memory of watching *Shrek*: I was nearing the end of high school when I first watched this DreamWorks Animation feature film. It was in Portuguese at a cinema in Mozambique and I walked away at the end knowing I had just watched something special – it was like watching the fairy tale that I had never been told as a child. John Nichols’ quote above states how entertainment can “affect” and “touch” people’s lives and *Shrek* certainly remained a significant piece of entertainment for me. Perhaps it was in knowing that I didn’t quite grasp some of the jokes but there was something about this “once upon a time” tale that remained memorable for me.

Fast forward to my postgraduate studies and this same fairytale constituted the ideal material to consider when looking at humour, translation and how these linguistic dynamics come together in computer-generated animation as a growing genre of cinematography. I marvelled at the wit behind each joke, pun and character trait; the originality of creating a movie to entertain both a child and adult viewer – of course that also explained why I didn’t understand some of the humour when I originally watched *Shrek* as a younger viewer. The intertextual creativity of tying in the likes of Cinderella, Snow White, Peter Pan and Tinkerbell (to name a few) as fairytale characters within *this* story, wove a significant thread throughout the film to make it that much more appealing to a dual audience.

Remembering Koenig's (2001:14) "recipe" for an animation classic,¹ *Shrek* debuted in 2001 to tell us the story of a large, solitude-loving and grumpy ogre who finds himself on an adventure with a talking donkey as an unlikely sidekick as they set out on a royal quest to rescue an unusual damsel in distress. While the simple plot, filled with amusing characters and allusions to fairytales, may be aimed at children, the film has been critically acclaimed as an animation worthy of adult interest and this is duly reflected in the many adult-oriented jokes, themes and intertextual ties. As a digital animation feature, *Shrek* appeals to adults and children alike through a significant amount of verbal and visual humour elements. At different stages of my life, I have appreciated different elements of the story and now, with my own child as a little accomplice, I will see the film through a new lens yet again.

Between parody, sarcasm, irony or simple straightforward slapstick humour scenes, the film aims to entertain its viewers, young or not, and incite at least a chuckle. This same intention is carried through in the Portuguese dubbed dialogue, albeit through different translation strategies across the myriad of humorous devices and this in itself presents this film as an interesting study. This study seeks to identify and examine the film's essence of humour as it is presented through numerous devices and techniques in the original English dialogue. The report will discuss the film's humour through the myriad of instances showing wordplay, irony, intertextuality and rhyme as such techniques support various visual frames to create humour. Upon identifying and analysing these laughter-inducing features, the translation strategies adopted in the Portuguese dubbed dialogue will be explored, considering whether or not the identified humour was carried through from the original Source Text to the resulting Target Text.

Based on the novel by William Steig (1993), one of the film's DVD versions may be viewed in English, Portuguese or Spanish, with subtitles in either of the latter two languages, as well as Catalan. The film premiered in 2001 and has proven exceptionally successful, popular and well-remembered by audiences of all ages and backgrounds, increasing that popularity with three sequels, *Shrek 2*, *Shrek the Third* and *Shrek Forever After*, released in 2004, 2007 and 2010 respectively.² When it originally debuted in May 2001 and ran in cinemas until December 6th, 2001, the original *Shrek* movie (the one analysed in this study) grossed a total

¹ In brief this "recipe" or formula acts as a guideline in creating an animation feature to include adventure, mischief, crises, music and laughter.

² DreamWorks Animation also released two short films, *Shrek the Halls* and *Scared Shrekless* in 2007 and 2010 respectively as well as a prequel film, *Puss in Boots* – a key character appearing in all 3 sequels. <https://www.dreamworksanimation.com/shrek/> - accessed February 5th, 2019.

of \$484.4 million around the world. This box office success set the film as the fourth highest-grossing film of 2001 and it has sold an average of more than \$100 million with its DVD release worldwide, setting it as highest selling DVD of all time.³ As will be indicated in the following section, full-length feature animation films such as *Shrek* have been a growing genre within the field of digital cinematography and, given *Shrek*'s language options, plethora of humour and appeal to a dual audience, I chose it as the central focus for a study exploring the dynamics of humour and translation.

In her foreword to a special edition journal dedicated to the translation of humour, Delia Chiaro claims that the translation of humour is a “neglected field [and] problematic issue” (2005:135). Like her, many authorities in either the field of Translation Studies (TS) or those of Humour Studies (HS), readily acknowledge the lack of studies and information linking these respective disciplines, thus calling for greater attention to the “nature of the most complex types of language to translate” (Zabalbeascoa, 2005:185). Crossing geographical borders, individual taste and a spectrum of genres daily, humour is perceived differently, in both linguistic and cultural terms. Lopez (2002a: 34) sums it up by stating that

“humour is a complex phenomenon which is part of human nature...it may become a weapon for defence or attack, a way to protest or accept something we cannot avoid, a method to overcome shyness and establish new relationships”.

Indeed, today's global village views humour as a “cultural fact of life” (Chiaro, 2005:140); one that is increasingly evident in the themes, audio-visual techniques and dialogues shown on our big screens. However, it is also important to note that humour is dynamic and, as a result, its translation may vary considerably. Whether or not the translator is gifted with wit or simply the ability to translate it, s/he has a central role in rendering an appropriate (and hopefully humorous) target text, regardless of the strategies adopted and/or challenges posed by the “personal” nature of humour.

³It is interesting to note that:

- *Shrek 2*, has been recorded as the third highest grossing film of all time with *Shrek the Third* confirming “blockbuster status” by reaching the US \$ 200 billion mark. Lyman, Rick (November 21, 2001). ["Fuzzy Creatures vs. Green Ogre; 'Monsters, Inc.' and 'Shrek' Are Likely Foes for New Oscar"](#). The New York Times. Accessed March 13, 2018
- A fifth instalment to the 4 *Shrek* feature films was also announced when NBC Universal film studio acquired DreamWorks Animation in 2016. <https://www.econotimes.com/Shrek-5-Release-Date-News-Update-Fifth-Movie-Coming-Out-in-2018-1449220> - accessed February 5th, 2019.

Animation and Humour in Shrek

While aiming to “transport viewers, briefly but memorably and meaningfully, into imaginary worlds [...] that burst with possibilities, associations and connections” (Maxwell and Schindler cited in Cholodenko, 2007:205), the art of animation has neither a steadfast definition nor a defined limit. Moreover, as an object of literary criticism and theoretical investigation, animation has been swept aside, lying in obscurity and not receiving much attention as a genre in its own right (Gehman & Reinke, 2005). When one considers how “the very definition of animation has become unstable in the era of digital media (Gehman & Reinke, 2005:7), it is clear that no straightforward or single description could possibly exist for this increasingly popular branch of cinematography. Animation has been widely viewed as “a sequence of frames that, when played in order at sufficient speed, presents smoothly moving images like a film or video. An animation can be digitalised video, computer-generated graphics or a combination thereof” (Scala Broadcast Media, 2008).

Referring to *Shrek*, Jeffrey Katzenberg, the C.E.O. of DreamWorks Animation, described animation as “a team sport, and everything we do is about pure imagination” (DreamWorks Animation, 2018). Any behind-the-scenes look at an animation feature shows such a genre is a collaborative and interactive process involving individual techniques and artistic expressions in group contexts long before any decisions regarding the range of practices employed in the resulting feature are taken, namely: digital graphics, pixilation and abstract digital animations in compact files (Gehman & Reinke, 2005). For both producers and audiences thereof, an animation feature extends beyond “the illusion of motion, frame by frame” (Hebert in Gehman & Reinke, 2005:180) to mean a meeting point for the arts of music, photography, graphics and more. Looking at Disney animation and animation features in general, David Koenig (2001:14) describes this formulaic genre as a rather simple process merely requiring a memorable state of adventure, involving dreams and dilemmas, a group of “mischievous sidekicks”, romance and music, not forgetting the “dash of humour” and happily ever after ending.

At any given time, there is a full-length animation film screening at local cinema theatres and animation features released by motion-picture studios over the last two decades show “an explosion in the production and consumption of feature length animation” where digitalisation has played a key role in animation cinematography (Cholodenko, 2007:23).

Examples of a growing list of such feature films include *A Bug's Life* (1998), *Over the Hedge* (2006), *Finding Nemo* (2003) and its sequel *Finding Dory* (2016), *Megamind* (2010), *Madagascar* (2005) and *The Incredibles* (2004) and respective sequel (2018) – all of which could form part of a study to show the genre's appeal to a dual audience through a plethora of digital animation skills, witty plotlines and an array of humorous devices. Katzenberg DreamWorks Animation, (2018) once stated that “every single thing you see on-screen came out of somebody's creativity. It didn't exist. Everything had to be dreamed”. As mentioned previously, various techniques and methods are drawn upon in the art of animation yet it is important to note that the audio-visual frames viewed in the examples listed above and in other full-length features define today's world of animation; the 1995 production of *Toy Story* was the first digitally mastered full-length animation feature in this branch. Full-length features such as these are now in a class of their own and continue to influence audiences worldwide as animations like these “dominate the lives of kids and kids at heart” (Cholodenko, 2007:23).

On 24 March 2002, *Shrek* set an unprecedented record of success by winning the first ever Academy Award for Best Animated Feature at the 74th Academy Awards. In introducing this report I referred to the film's success as the 4th highest-grossing film of 2001 after it premiered at that year's Cannes Film Festival⁴. In addition to winning the prestigious Academy Award, *Shrek* went on to receive nominations for a Golden Globe Award for category of 'Best Picture – Music or Comedy' and six BAFTA⁵ Awards among many other accolades – including a first-ever BAFTA nomination for a voice-over performance (Eddie Murphy for Donkey's character) and in May 2010, the film's title character was also awarded his own star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame (DreamWorks Animation, 2018). Such a track record of success raises the question of what lead to such phenomenal positive reception by the worldwide audience.

Integrating art and technology from the start, the film begins with a graceful storybook opening its pages and soon evolves into a quick-paced and humorous mocking opinion on the narration, already setting the tone for the movie as a whole. From the start, the experience of the dual audience is already a priority: capture the attention of a young viewer with the visual allusion to traditional fairytales while also captivating a more mature viewer

⁴ Please refer to the preceding section, pages 2 and 3 for detailed information on the film's success.

⁵ BAFTA – British Academy of Film and Television Award

by mocking this same literary genre. Producing this film was a three-year long process of dedication, working with (at that time) advanced technology and producing the film exclusively through computer-animation software, focusing the software to design characters with realistic human-like expressions and fluid movements. Dedicated attention to detail in each character's facial movements, adding real-world textures throughout the background, characters' clothes and even Donkey's fur was essential to ensure unprecedented high-quality visuals.

Various presentational techniques with special effects, lighting, differing camera angles and music were strategically employed with each character and scene, deliberately conveying certain aspects before a single word is uttered as dialogue. For example, the viewer's first sighting of lord Farquaad is one in which the perception of power, dominance and tension is created through low angle camera close-ups of his marching feet, gloved hands and square, firmly set jaw with heavy, sinister music as the backing track. This all turns to humour the moment he steps through a doorway and the camera shot reveals his limited height – a complete paradox of the perception created and showing that his character in fact embodies a parody of power. The montage techniques which the directors have used to show the passing of time are smooth and impeccable and music is repeatedly drawn upon to add to the mood. The film's opening scene, as discussed in Chapter Three, shows Shrek as he goes about his day after sharing his opinion of the fairytale book he read and ripped in his outhouse. The film's title and leading cast credits are introduced flawlessly and naturally as interactions with Shrek's swamp environment. Later, embarking on the quest to rescue Princess Fiona from the dragon-guarded castle, the montage shows Shrek and Donkey travelling across various landscapes with the sunset, moon rising and full heat of day showing the time taken on their journey. Every aspect, from the visual texture of the mud and water in Shrek's swamp and his tattered clothes to the fireball, skeletons and rubble in the dragon's lair and in-sync voice-over performances for each character show the time, skill and high-quality methods that went into the design and overall production of this film.

The film's design team drew on a myriad of techniques to create the best images possible given that the film includes several effects and environments: dust, water, smoke, foliage and mud. The world shown in *Shrek* is realistic, rich in quality and therefore believable as our own – drawing the viewer in and making him/ her want to stay and watch the story unfold in this world (Adamson, 2001: 3). Shrek's character alone was designed with 900 moveable

muscles so he would reflect realistic human facial expressions. Donkey's body movements, fur and facial expressions have been synchronised to create an unforgettable screen personality (Adamson, 2001: 3). The characters' high quality visual design, complex musculatures and believable appearances are so meticulous that the viewer can see the details and movement of the fur on Donkey; the ripples in the dragon's scales and the stubble of lord Farquaad's beard – note that this was before the time of high-resolution screens. Rick Lyman (2001) of *The New York Times* described the film as pushing the envelope when it comes to computer-generated dimensions to tell a tale old and true.

Replete with humour and high-quality visual techniques and presentational devices, full-length animation features such as *Shrek*, *Toy Story*, *Ice Age* and *Finding Nemo* are but a few examples mentionable in a growing genre in cinematography. The plot lines humour and computer-generated technology attracts dual audiences of all ages and cultural backgrounds, yet the recognition of animation as a genre in its own right remains limited. As will be discussed in the following section related specifically to humour, perhaps the opinion of what is funny and what is not may differ from culture to culture and person to person but one thing is certain: the animation features mentioned above primarily aim to make their audiences laugh (or at least smile!) either by what is seen or heard on the silver screen. In view of this, it is important to consider the translation of humour in animation as a focus within the ever-changing field of translation studies and to examine the translation of those features relating to the transfer of humour. This study aims at contributing to this dynamic area by examining the dialogue in the *Shrek* film and making sense of the humour conveyed from the English source text to the Portuguese target text.

“Very much in the eyes and ears of the beholder” (Chiaro, 2005:134), humour remains a complex linguistic phenomenon with no straightforward definition and relies solely on its audience to determine its ultimate success or failure. Considered a cultural fact of life in its own right, humour continues to be an area of interest for many and a good starting point for any discussion might perhaps lie in its definition, or rather, lack thereof. Ross (1998:1) defines humour as something that makes a person laugh, or at the very least smile, in response to what is seen or heard and subsequently perceived as funny. Any general dictionary will tell us “humour” relates to the quality of being amusing, inducing laughter or a term simply describing one's temporary state of mind. Regardless of the various definitions and perspectives, “humour is a complex phenomenon which is part of human nature” (López,

2002a:34) and serves a variety of purposes. It is not merely a linguistic, but also a strong, cultural phenomenon. While personal taste may play a significant role, an individual seldom laughs alone (Ross, 1998:1) and thus, as is the case with translation itself, context is an important, or even primary, aspect of humour, and an essential factor in both its creation and reception.

The way in which the humorous message is sent and received is crucial to the exchange and should consequently form part of any discussion relating to humour and its translation. The intention of the speaker and the relationship between intention and effect may in fact provide a basis for defining humour but, as claimed by Ross (1998), (2002a) and others, an understanding of the context is essential and it should be noted that every occasion involving humour is unique. For the purposes of this particular study, humour is considered in terms of its surrounding context and functions as well as the strategies and devices adopted in its creation.

Once upon a time in a land far away, there were fairytales where princes and knights slew dragons and saved damsels in distress, sealing their happy fate with true love's kiss. Princes were charming and brave, princesses were beautiful and helpless, and the villains were ugly and morals absolute. Then along came *Shrek* and a twist was added: the hero is an ogre with feelings and has a talking donkey as his steed; the damsel is a fiercely independent and fiery modern woman who turns out to be human by day, ogress by night while the villain is a selfish lord wanting to make himself king and have a perfect kingdom at all costs, initially appearing as noble but ends up worse off than the creatures he originally banishes from his kingdom. Inspired by William Steig's novel of the same name, *Shrek* premiered in 2001 to tell the tale of a hero in the shape of a cynical, solitude-loving ogre whose beloved swamp home is taken over by displaced fairytale creatures – the wolf, bears, pigs, dwarfs, fairies and witches we know from childhood storybooks. The fairytale creatures have been banished there by the film's villain, lord Farquaad in his aim to have a perfect world. A chatterbox Donkey escapes capture and bumps head-first into Shrek – marking the start of an unlikely and very comical friendship. Determined to claim back his land and privacy, Shrek sets out to confront lord Farquaad who challenges him to a quest and in return Shrek will get back his swamp sans fairytale neighbours. The quest: save lord Farquaad's wife-to-be, Princess Fiona, from a fiery dragon-guarded castle and bring her back to lord Farquaad. Shrek agrees and sets out with Donkey as his unexpected travelling companion, not knowing his own life

will change once he finds and falls in love with the beautiful Fiona. However, ‘happily ever after’ does not come easily: Shrek does not know it but Fiona has a spell upon her where she turns into an ogress herself after every sunset. In the end, both she and Shrek learn to love and be loved, lord Farquaad ends up eaten by the Dragon and Donkey befriends the smitten fire-breathing Dragon. The film tells a tale where love conquers all, friendship and forgiveness are important, good triumphs over evil, beauty is in the eye of the beholder and remaining true to oneself is the secret to happiness through it all.

Embracing parody, irony, satire and sarcasm in addition to the countless slapstick humour sight gags, this movie tells its tale very differently and the fairytales we know from the Grimm Brothers appear as fleshed-out characters making a cameo appearance. In an article discussing gender discourses and stereotypes in *Shrek*, the authors pointed out that “*Shrek* exists as a product of the culture(s) we have experienced” (Unger & Sunderland, 2005:5). After analysing this film myself, I believe that these allusions create the foundational link for the movie to be enjoyed by a dual audience – child and adult viewer alike: the child will know the fairytale creatures and appreciate the visual humour while an adult will remember childhood tales where these fairytale characters played their own leading roles while *Shrek*’s significant load of adult-oriented humour makes it appealing enough for the adult to stay and enjoy the show.

The film’s storyline, and ultimately humour, is driven in different ways through each character’s drives and beliefs: Shrek believes people judge him before getting to know him so he thinks he’s better off alone and wants to live out his life in solitude on his swamp. As a result, he continuously reinforces the perception people have of ogres as beastly monsters and the unexpected facet of him having feelings and falling in love is amusing. Donkey interrupts Shrek’s world, wanting protection and friendship, believing Shrek is more than just an ogre. His complete disregard for Shrek’s scaring tactics, biting sarcasm and outright ignoring him drive much of their interaction’s humour and incongruity. The two team up to go confront lord Farquaad who will stop at nothing to become king and ensure his kingdom is perfect. His character is an example of the parody of power throughout the film: although he initially appears powerful and dominant, this perception comes to an end when his short height is revealed and he literally becomes the target of ridicule and jokes. Princess Fiona is eager to get married as fast as possible so she can have true love’s kiss, believing that will break her free from the spell she is under. She is a feisty character who drives an element of

humour by showing she is not your typical damsel in distress in need of rescue and can indeed save herself. The characters define and shape the language in the film and, besides the visual humour techniques, this is the primary medium for conveying the film's humour. With the aim of providing an insight of the humorous devices that will be discussed in more detail in the analysis section of this study, below is an overview of how the humour is created in *Shrek*:

- The characters:

As listed above, each character influences the film's humour in his/ her own way, their individual drives and beliefs unravelling the plot and themes while creating amusement along the way. Mike Myers, a native-born Canadian with Scottish ancestors, voices Shrek's character and chose to do so with a Scottish accent, explaining his choice given the accent his mother used when she told him bedtime stories. When voicing the character of Donkey, Eddie Murphy adopted the African American Vernacular English (AAVE) dialect to do so and John Lithgow presents lord Farquaad using a very clear Standard English variety known as Received Pronunciation (RP). According to Hughes et al (2005:12), RP is the only accent in British English that is an exclusively social accent, spoken by the so-called "elite" of society – therefore a suitable choice for lord Farquaad in this case. I have specifically chosen to mention these performed language features as they play a significant part in the build-up and characterisation of these three leading characters. People tend to be "sensitive to the full range of social meaning that any particular dialect [and accent] performance generates" (Garrett et al, 2003:62).

- The plot:

On the previous page I outlined the film's storyline, showing how the hero and princess are ogres, the nobleman is the villain and familiar fairytale characters from childhood tales feature to create a fairytale with a twist and parody many elements of what is considered a 'traditional' fairytale.

- Songs and rhyme:

Music is a strategic device used to set the mood and tone of a film and *Shrek* is no different. In addition to its original soundtrack, the movie also contains multiple instances where a character (especially Donkey) breaks out into song or singing is specifically used to carry the

plot further and detail some issue. For example, the *Welcome to Duloc* song details the kingdom's extreme cleanliness.

{Wooden figurines come out singing}

*Welcome to Duloc such a perfect town
Here we have some rules
Let us lay them down
Don't make waves, stay in line
And we'll get along fine
Duloc is perfect place
Please keep off of the grass
Shine your shoes, wipe your... face
Duloc is, Duloc is
Duloc is a perfect place*

Like the *Welcome to Duloc* song, Robin Hood's song of what he and his Merry Men get up to in the forest contains lyrics that often reflect wordplay, especially in cases of innuendo and euphemisms aimed at adults to render an appropriate text for a child viewing it while still ensuring the musical aspect adds to the amusement.

{Accordion playing}

*Ta, dah, dah, dah, whoo.
I steal from the rich and give to the needy.
He takes a wee percentage,
But I'm not greedy. I rescue pretty damsels
Man, I'm good
What a guy, Monsieur Hood
Break it down
I like an honest fight and a saucy little maid
What he's basically saying
is he likes to get - -
Paid
So when an ogre in the bush
grabs a lady by the tush
That's bad, that's bad
When a beauty's with a beast
it makes me awfully mad
He's mad
He's really, really mad
I'll take my blade and
ram it through your heart
Keep your eyes on me, boys
'cause I'm about to start --*

- **Wordplay:**

The dialogue in *Shrek* contains several examples of wordplay and in an interview, the movie's directors explained this was done on purpose and puns were strategically situated throughout the film.

{Princess Fiona following Shrek as they run through the castle after he has just rescued her} – Wait. Where are you going? The exit's over there.
{Shrek} – Well, I have to save my ass.

Shrek is using the term “ass” to refer to Donkey but at this point, Fiona has not yet met Donkey and also doesn't know of him so Shrek's response may be misunderstood as Shrek trying to save himself.

- **Intertextuality:**

As previously mentioned the film shows characters from traditional fairytales and nursery rhymes making a cameo appearance and in addition to these examples of intertextuality there are also allusions to the real world, for example the parody of the television game show, *The Dating Game* as Magic Mirror introduces the three eligible bachelorettes to lord Farquaad. Perhaps the most significant examples of the reference to fairytale characters are in the scene resembling the slave trade process where the viewer sees the likes of Peter Pan, Tinkerbell, Pinocchio, the Seven Dwarfs, the Three Little Pigs and Goldilocks' Three Bears. These same characters, along with Little Red Riding Hood's wolf (dressed in woman's clothing), Snow White and the Three Blind Mice show up on Shrek's doorstep when lord Farquaad banishes them from his kingdom.

- **Other Speech Events:**

As will be discussed in the analysis chapter, *Shrek* is replete with examples of irony, sarcasm and adult-oriented humour. Donkey is not the smartest character in the film so much of the humour he creates is through incongruity while Shrek's sarcasm is often best understood by the more mature viewer.

The film's overall humour is a complex blend of songs, rhyme and puns that are generally easily to follow and understand while the allusions, sarcasm and irony require some knowledge of the world and more cognitive understanding – even when translated, this blend of humorous devices, in addition to the visual humour techniques, creates an ideal combination for a dual audience, both in age and language or culture.

Owing to the multi-faceted and somewhat elusive nature of humour, Young (2007: 982) suggests two questions to be asked when considering a humorous text. Firstly, what may be the exact cause behind the humorous effect, embracing any and all different strategies? Secondly, what are the consequences of such an effect, paying particular attention to the audience's response in the particular exchange? In addition to geographical boundaries and social contexts, the receiver's age, gender, race or ethnic group, cultural background and personal ideologies all influence his/her response. The cause and effect of humour may also be influenced by time and place of production, "thriving especially on incongruity" (Billerey, 2008:1) and reflecting a particular ideology and thought pattern within a single time and place.

In addition to varying contexts and possible causes, one is also faced with an array of possible intentions a humorous text may have, differing somewhat as determined by specific genres and general constraints. The humour contained in a child's knock-knock joke, for example, will be very different to that found in an adult's use of black humour. In this way, the joke one makes may be bound to time and place, education and culture. It is important to note, however, that humorous texts generally aim to induce the same emotional, physical and behavioural response, that is, "laughter, smiling and exhilaration" (Ruch cited in Chiaro, 2005:136). Besides inducing a simple laugh or, at the very least, an amused smile, humour may be drawn upon to entertain or distract, defend or attack, establish social ties or simply to "make people less nervous [...] make situations more 'cope-able' [...] make people feel included" (John Parrish Sprowl cited in Raphaelson-West, 1989:130). Participants may use humour as a way of protesting or accepting something unavoidable or as a shield behind which to hide and avoid facing something inexplicable or uncontrollable. However, as there is no straightforward and steadfast definition relating to humour itself, what may be considered 'funny' may indeed be cause for debate or even disagreement – once again highlighting the receiver's response as a crucial aspect in the exchange, providing the humour has been understood or, at the very least, recognised. Given this, the multiple facets of humour make it challenging to interpret and consequently translate.

In the chapters that follow, this study will explore the nature of humour and several aspects of this phenomenon when it comes to translation. "One of Shrek's best-known lines, "Ogres are like onions" is the title of Chapter Two, the theoretical framework, where this study considers translation as a practice as defined by Mona Baker's perspective of Context and

Contextualisation as well as the Relevance Theory of Communication as presented by Sperber & Wilson. The chapter is concluded by exploring the translation of humour through the distinct theories in these interdisciplinary fields of study: the General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH) as presented by Salvatore Attardo, Norm Acceptance/ Norm Opposition as defined by Dimitris Asimakoulas and finally, Frame Semantics as applied by Ana María Rojo López – all three theories suggesting a means to view humour and its translation through different perspectives. Drawing on these key theories, Chapter Three provides the methodology and detailed analysis of specific humorous devices and strategies in extracts from the film’s original English and corresponding translated Portuguese dialogues. Chapter Four, “Happily Ever After” concludes this report through a brief summary as well as suggestions for further study.

Chapter Two – “Ogres are like onions – they have layers” – Theoretical Framework

Named after a line in the film where Shrek is trying to explain that he should not be viewed as a stereotypical monster but that there is more to him, this chapter will explore the layers, or levels, that can be considered when discussing translation and, more specifically, the translation of humour. Aiming for either transference of meaning or structural equivalence, the practice of translation is a complex one whose nature, processes and aims have formed the basis of various studies. Until the start of the 20th Century, these studies looked at the practice from a primarily literal perspective, focusing on Biblical and religious texts. Over the last several decades, the study of translation has evolved into a discipline in its own right, receiving particular attention given the focus on globalization, and the appreciation of culture and language differences in the world viewed as a ‘global village’. In fact, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe once wrote that “translation [...] remains one of the most important and worthiest concerns in the totality of world affairs” (Picken 1983:6).

While every translator will approach a task with a unique style, several scholars have attempted to define and detail specific translation strategies thereby giving rise to various schools of thought regarding the definition, purpose and place of translation in the world – each study highlighting its own sense of prominence as *the* definitive approach to translation. Occurring across different languages and contexts, translation deals with the multiple textual features and dynamics of a text and Nord (1997: 62) tells us that “the source text provides the offer of information that forms the starting point for the offer of information [to be] formulated in the target text”. For the purposes of this study, the target text has indeed played a primary role and, given the significance of context and inference in the understanding of humour, we will now consider two prominent approaches to translation studies before focusing particularly on the translation of humour and three key strategies to consider within that discipline.

Strategy for Translation – Baker’s notions of Context and Contextualisation

“A powerful device both in knowledge and cognition” (Akman and Bazzanella 2003, cited in Baker 2006: 322), the notion of *context* has developed into its own area of study and concern for several scholars. Subsequently, this notion remains fundamental to various disciplines (House 2005) although there are differing perspectives regarding its core definition, purpose and relevance in studies related to language and translation. Exploring the elements surrounding Context and the process of Contextualisation, Baker (2006) has adopted a somewhat descriptive and postmodern approach to Translation Studies and highlights the way in which these fluid notions have a bearing, whether directly or indirectly, on the acts of translation and interpreting. Naturally, the goals and ideologies relating to the participants involved in the translation process are essential and this argument will be considered once we view the three key distinctions Baker makes regarding context and its shift towards contextualisation. The usefulness of these key concepts will also be highlighted especially in how they “can tell us much more about the goals and ideological positioning of participants than any static listing of contextual variables, however detailed and comprehensive” (Baker 2006:321).

Embracing the notions of interpretation, situation and culture, context is a somewhat relative concept whose definition, how it should be considered or selected and by whom remain open to debate. Etymological studies show the term arising from the Latin *contextus* meaning “woven together” (Illustrated Oxford Dictionary 1998:997) and, as a result of extensive study, the term has come to mean anything from producing structural and meaningful stretches of language to denoting the conditions in understanding and making sense of a specific stretch of language (Dilley 1999:4). Many view this phenomenon as a “psychological construct that exists within [...] the mind of the language user” (Baker 2005 Or 2006: 322) while others regard it as a listing of elements relating to the real world that influence one’s interpretation of an interaction. As translators, or at the most basic level, language users, it is essential that one is aware of the existing relationship between text and context as context transcends all realms of language organisation and structure, playing a key role in any linguistic practice. In her paper entitled “Contextualisation in Translator- and Interpreter- Mediated Events” (2006: 321), Baker outlines how studies of language and translation have developed in recent years to include “dynamic and negotiable aspects [...] more fluid notions of context, culture, power and ideology”. Although these concepts have

increasingly been drawn on in various studies, greater attention is required in their respective fields while the idea of context as it relates to Translational processes is “rarely critiqued and elaborated” (Baker 2006: 321). In her discussion, Baker offers three broad overviews of context in reflecting the complexity of translation.

As the name suggests, the *Cognitive* approach to context underlines cognitive processes as being responsible for one’s interpretation of a stretch of language or speech event. In this case, the language user’s assumptions about the world are essential in interpretation and distinctions between these assumptions and the real world are made. These subsets of assumptions result from one’s own thoughts and knowledge about the world and, as a translator, such assumptions may even act as a guide in the translation process. Such a view places significant emphasis on how one responds to these assumptions and the speakers’ perceived intentions.

Differing slightly but not entirely, the *Social* or *Interactive* approach to context views it in the light of “pre-existing entities and relations in the real world” (Baker 2005: 323). Baker draws on Hymes’ SPEAKING Model (Situation, Participants, Ends, Act Sequence, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms of Interaction and Genres) and states how this particular approach has been greatly applied in Translation Studies as scholars draw on the *Context of Situation* for both source and target texts. Halliday’s elaboration of *Field*, *Tenor* and *Mode* as well as Nord’s *Extra- and Intra-Textual* features may be considered as examples of this particular approach. Although she speaks of the two approaches separately, Baker remarks how the *Cognitive*, individual view may work alongside the *Social*, more institutionalised view as one simply requires a balance between the two elements.

Shifting from Context to *Contextualisation*, Baker describes the elements relating to more *static* views of context in contrast with more *dynamic* approaches. In this part of her discussion, she outlines the limitations related to social models such as Hymes’ SPEAKING Model showing that such models are problematic if one considers the potential for context to be an ever-changing feature; no one of the elements in such models should be treated as static as one cannot assume that either the source or target setting is static- translation in itself is a dynamic and ever-changing process. The actual set of variables suggested in such models is also problematic as the lists are often open-ended so the analyst is left wondering whether or not more variables should be added to the set whose elements are assumed to be

independent of one another. A further limitation is obvious when the analyst questions the relevance of certain components in interpreting a particular text, spoken or written. The elements considered in these models include factors such as age, gender, profession and race and Baker highlights how such factors may have a bearing on the ever-changing roles a participant adopts in a single interactive situation.

As a result of the emerging “dynamic nature of every aspect of the interpreting event” (Baker 2006: 327), it is clear that a context may either shape or be shaped by the speech event in question as the participants involved may choose to define the context surrounding them. In this strategic process, the notions of *power* and ideology are also reflected as the interaction can be controlled to some degree by the individual with access to the multiple languages involved. While several models of context have come to view it as a *neutral* field open to negotiation by the participants concerned, other perspectives view it as having a somewhat power-sensitive status. The exchange concerned may reflect an imbalance of power directly or indirectly and Baker’s examples indicate how this may negatively impact on the interaction when confusion arises as the translator or interpreter adapts the context to suit individual needs. Here, the dynamic nature of context is clearly reflected as one sees the power a participant has, enabling him or her to set the tone for the interaction.

Mindful of such a phenomenon, one needs to take note of Contextualisation as a process whereby a text is made acceptable to the participants involved. Cited in Baker (2006: 327), Gumperz’s *Contextualisation Cues* are an example of the way in which exchanges may be shaped by participants. One’s prosody, choice of discourse markers and even code used are all examples of such cues and the different strategies employed. When one considers the act of translation as a process of (re)contextualisation whereby an original text is contextualised and made accessible, it is evident that translators and interpreters also rely on such cues and strategies. Whichever way it is employed and achieved, contextualisation redefines the original context and “[such] processes are far more revealing than any set of contextual constraints we might want to enumerate and describe in detail” (Baker 2006: 333).

Although Baker suggests contextualisation as a basis for a theory of translation, explaining several intricacies relating to the text, contextualisation is a strategic process employed by translators and interpreters alike. However explanatory it may be, contextualisation does not necessarily encompass all the factors, such as the role of agency, which influence the act of

translation in some way or another. I believe it is important to establish “the goals and ideological positioning of participants” (Baker 2006: 321), particularly when one considers the source text and the original sender’s intentions and ideologies. As a form of narrativisation, I do not think contextualisation necessarily emphasises aspects of the source text but focuses more on rendering an appropriate target text. A translator or interpreter needs to consider the profiles of the text’s sender and recipient as well as its source and target place and time of publication in addition to considering the text’s communicative function. These aspects may be strongly influenced by a participant’s ‘goals and ideological positioning’ and should therefore also be considered in a theory of translation. The effects of power, the subjective nature of the Interpretative Act as well as socio-cultural factors all play a role in text production and reception and should be taken into account when one considers the various perspectives surrounding the notion of context. Establishing the intentions and ideologies as well as certain socio-specific factors is important and may consequently aid in contextualising a particular text. It is somewhat ironic how such factors and the notion of context itself play such a crucial role in text production and reception, and ultimately the translation act, yet they have been somewhat sidelined in certain studies relating to translation and interpreting. The perspectives outlined in Baker’s discussion only scratch the surface of this central notion to language.

Explaining what translators do in carrying out the translation process, Baker’s view of contextualisation shows translation to be an active act of negotiation with unequal levels of control where the context in question is continually shaped by the participants involved. The elements of contextualisation highlight and describe the different strategies employed by participants as a text unfolds and is made accessible to whom it is intended for; her view is one describing the process of translation itself (rather than prescribing or dictating how it should be carried out), placing significant emphasis on the target system. Her views describe how circumstances may influence the translation act as participants may influence or be influenced by their surrounding contexts. Aligning with the fundamentals of Toury’s “Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies” (1980: 19), where it was stated that translation should focus on the elements of the target system as the source system is “left behind [...and the translation] may well influence the recipient culture and language”, Baker’s views suggest that a variety of techniques should be considered in the translation process. Given such characteristics, Baker’s view may in fact be considered to be consonant

with a descriptive approach to Translation Studies as both fields place significant emphasis on the target system.

Mindful of the above discussion and the elements regarding the processes of context and contextualisation, it is important to consider their respective usefulness for analytical approaches to translation. Occurring across different languages and contexts, translation deals with the *Extra-* and *Intra-* textual features of a text and a translator should be aware of such dynamics. In order to establish certain aspects relating to the translation itself, one needs to consider the text's intended function and audience, prospective time and place and medium of text reception as well as the reason for text production and/ or reception (Nord 1997: 60). These elements relate, in some way or another, to the notion of context, a complex phenomenon playing an important role in any speech event. Bearing this in mind, it is clear that an understanding of the context and all it embraces is essential as it relates uniquely to a particular interaction. The processes of context and contextualisation are useful as resources in attempts at understanding any speech event or interaction. Context itself significantly influences the meaning of a text and, as meaning can be manipulated, so can the context underlying that particular utterance. As a translator or interpreter, one constantly manipulates the text at hand to suit the target audience and convey the essential message. A case in point in our study of *Shrek* would be the several instances of adult-oriented humour, still translated to retain meaning and appeal to the more mature viewer yet not render an inappropriate dialogue for children in the audience.

When we note how context may be manipulated within the creation of meaning, we may consider the issue of ethics and how the processes of context and contextualisation play an important role in ethics. Understanding these processes is useful when producing a text that is appropriate to the target audience and does not portray any elements which may clash with any cultural norms and/or beliefs; can a text actually “remain untainted by its social context?” (Jones 2004, cited in Baker 2006: 333). Baker illustrates this key point by referring to Jones (2004) who faced critical ethical decisions relating to a translation of a work deeply influenced by images invoking particular aspects of Serbian culture.

The notion of context and how it is viewed individually differs significantly- this single phenomenon may invoke, among other things, varying aspects of religion, politics, culture and race- aspects which differ according to one's own personal experience and background.

As a result, awareness of context and the dynamics relating to it may be useful as the translator decides how s/he will appeal to certain elements of it in producing a specific text. Although the notions of context and contextualisation may in fact be useful to various linguistic phenomena, especially translation and interpreting, it is important to remember that they are only a *useful* tool; they *aid* the process but by no means *define* it. These are processes which are constantly open to interpretation themselves and, although they may reveal a significant amount of detail for the translator, they do not reveal everything. Effects of power and dominance, personal history and language contact as well as “the goals and ideological positioning of participants are but a few of the factors not shown in a simple analysis of context but crucial in portraying its message. It is at this point where one may in fact require a detailed and comprehensive list of contextual variables (Baker 2006: 321). The processes of context and contextualisation, like the act of translation, are active processes and may be useful in more ways than one but, in order to aid the translator fully, they need to be used in conjunction with other analytical techniques.

The act of translation and interpreting is an active one where participants shape the interaction as respond as well as define the context based on background knowledge, a range of variables and the power each one holds. In our discussion, we outlined the perspectives relating to context as they were highlighted by Baker and her views of contextualisation. Central to the field of Translation, the notion of context is dynamic in nature and one’s analysis should adjust to these ever-changing dynamics. Contextualisation is a strategic process which may underlie the basis of a theory in such a field but should not be the only element in such a theory as a participant’s goals, ideologies and socio-cultural setting may have a strong bearing on a text’s interpretation. Ranging from emphasis on speaker-led communication to highlighting the dynamic nature of context, the perspectives outlined by Baker should not be observed as mutually exclusive but as views that may be adapted to work simultaneously. The power-sensitive aspects involved in any interaction are an example of the ever-changing and dynamic nature of context while a participant’s assumptions about the real world and the interaction at hand may be a good starting point for relevant analysis. Although a listing of contextual variables may pose significant problems and raise several questions, certain components may be useful in establishing certain aspects relating to the context and its impact on the interaction. When one considers these aspects, I believe the notions of context put forward in Baker’s discussion are useful to any study of translation as each perspective draws on a different aspect of the translation process. In terms

of the present study, context plays a significant role in understanding the humour contained in *Shrek* as much of the humour lies in incongruity and the characters' response to the incongruous situations.

Strategy for Translation – Sperber & Wilson's Relevance Theory of Communication

Approaching communication “from the point of view of competence rather than behaviour: (Gutt 1991:20), the Relevance Theory of Communication has been used by many in an attempt to view translation as a matter of communication, encompassing both the descriptive as well as the interpretive uses of language. Offering a different perspective of language and translation, Relevance Theory centers around inference, the Principle of Relevance and, like numerous schools of thought regarding translation, this theory encompasses the notion of context. The following discussion will highlight aspects central to an understanding of this dynamic theory as well as the importance of context before considering the applicability of and usefulness of such a theory to the multi-disciplinary field of Translation Studies.

From the outset, it should be noted that Relevance Theory is not a descriptive-classificatory approach to language and does not provide checklists for orderly descriptions and groupings of complex phenomena. Instead, the Relevance Theory of Communication, proposed by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson in the late 1980s, breaks away from code-based models and classificatory approaches in an attempt “to understand the complexities of communication in terms of cause and effect relationships, which, when applied to our mental life, are taken to mean computational, and particularly inferential, relationships” (Gutt 1991:21). In addition to the encoding, transfer and decoding of a given message, the theory at hand regards communication as essentially involving inference and intended meaning. In this sense, *meaning* is understood as semantic content but, more importantly, takes into account the *context* in which the given message is received and consequently interpreted.

Simply stated any given utterance⁶ carries its relevant semantic associations in addition to any contextual information which will subsequently be combined with any inferential or implied meaning. As a result of this, one utterance can have multiple and even opposite meanings. Consider the following example:

⁶Please note that while I may use the speaker-hearer relationship throughout my discussion as a point of reference, Relevance Theory is not restricted to this category but may also include the writer-reader relationship.

Mickey: “The phone is ringing.”

Minnie: “I’m in the bath.”

Although Minnie infers from Mickey’s statement that he is indirectly asking if she will be able to answer the phone, she does not directly answer him or even give a response which, on the surface, would appear relevant. Instead she informs she is in the bath. In one scenario, we can assume she tells him this with the intention of quickly getting out and rushing to the phone. In this case, Mickey would gather from her answer that she is coming as soon as she possibly can. In a different scenario however, Minnie may be known to take her time soaking in the tub and, in this situation, Mickey understands full well that Minnie could be a while and unless he answers it, the phone will continue ringing. Although the above example is a rather simple exchange, it is sufficient to reflect two very important aspects: a) one utterance can convey different meanings and b) the importance of context and contextual background information in the subsequent interpretation of any given utterance. Clearly then, “a communicative act may essentially be described as successful depending on whether or not the audience receives the information correctly, that is, the speaker-intended information and context” (Hickey 1998:42). Consequently, the communicative exchange may clearly be described as a process whereby a communicator produces a stimulus – verbal or otherwise – with a particular informative intention and the audience is left to infer the intended meaning and (hopefully) gain some knowledge and positive contextual effects.⁷ Should the audience not grasp the necessary contextual information, any and all consequent inferences will also fail and the respective exchange may be considered a failure.

Embracing the notions of interpretation, situation and culture, context is a somewhat relative concept whose definition, how it should be considered or selected and by whom remain open to debate. As previously mentioned, etymological studies show the term arising from the Latin *contextus* meaning woven together and, as a result of extensive study, the term has come to mean anything from producing structural and meaningful stretches of language to denoting the conditions in understanding and making sense of a specific stretch of language (Dilley 1999:4). Many view this phenomenon as a “psychological construct that exists within [...] the mind of the language user” (Baker 2005: 322) while others regard it as a listing of elements relating to the real world that influence one’s interpretation of an interaction. As

⁷Please note that the notion of *Contextual Effects* is explained later in the discussion, in relation to the aspect of Optimal Relevance.

translators, or at the most basic level, language users, it is essential that one is aware of the existing relationship between text and context as context transcends all realms of language organisation and structure, playing a key role in any linguistic practice. Within the Relevance Theory framework, *context* is a cognitive entity, a set of premises available and used in interpreting any given utterance which is a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world. Context in this sense

“is not limited to information about the immediate physical environment or the immediately preceding utterances: expectations about the future, scientific hypotheses or religious beliefs, anecdotal memories, general cultural assumptions, beliefs about mental state of the speaker, may all play a role in interpretation”

(Sperber & Wilson 1986:15).

Consequently, according to Relevance Theory, context is considered to be a *cognitive environment* which encompasses external factors such as cultural background, age, situational circumstances, etc. but focuses primarily on the information such factors may provide (Gutt 1991:25). This cognitive environment is significantly large and is comprised of details and information that may be perceived in the surrounding physical environment and/or be retrieved memory.

In addition, Relevance Theory also assumes context to be an organised phenomenon and such organisation and structure consequently impact the accessibility and interpretation of any particular contextual information at any given time. For example, having just mentioned Mickey and Minnie Mouse in an earlier example, as a reader, you may find stored information on such classic animation figures easily accessible *right now*. However, at a different time, it may be somewhat challenging to recall the likes of Daffy and Donald, Pluto and Goofy and the rest of Walt Disney's creations. Through this illustration, it is clear that there is indeed some sort of correlation between our assumptions of the world, the accessibility to a range of information and the effort required to retrieve and required information at a particular time.

The notion of *Optimal Relevance* is particularly important to Relevance Theory as it is considered “a central factor that makes communication succeed [...] on the part of both the communicator and the addressee” (Hickey 1998:43). An utterance may be considered

optimally relevant if and when said utterance satisfies two essential conditions: firstly, upon receiving the utterance, the addressee is able to find the intended meaning contained in the text without unnecessary effort and secondly, said intended meaning is worth the addressee's effort in that s/he is adequately and appropriately benefitted. The benefits, *positive contextual effects*, were briefly mentioned earlier in our discussion as the result of a successful communicative exchange. They may be described as psychological in nature as they refer to any and all changes in the addressee's knowledge and understanding of the world and general state of affairs. According to Gutt (1991), these contextual effects can be one of three kinds: the addressee will derive certain *contextual implications* from the given utterance, *strengthen* or confirm certain assumptions already held or, as a result of conflict or contradiction, *eliminate* certain assumptions. Relevance Theory assumes the human mind has a natural interest in somehow modifying another person's understanding of the world and consequently *affects his/her contextual assumptions*. *The first set*, contextual implications, refers to inferences resulting from a combination of propositional content, contextual assumptions as well as an inferential combination of two sets of propositions. According to Relevance Theory, our assumptions of the world can be determined and held with varying degrees of strength and belief. As addressees, we are positively benefitted when someone's message ultimately strengthens the convictions of those assumptions. On the contrary, *contextual effects* may indeed eliminate and completely modify a set of previously held assumptions. In such a situation, such effects are the result of contradictory propositional content.

Essentially linked to this notion of Optimal Relevance and, in fact underlying its very basis, is the central Principle of Relevance which is "believed to be an innate constraint in our human psychological make-up" (Gutt 1991:30). The theorists behind this approach claim the following as the Principle of Relevance, "every act of ostensive communication communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance" (Sperber & Wilson 1986:158). In its simplest form, this principle may be explained as follows: whenever a person establishes communication and sets out to declare any given utterance, s/he automatically assumes that whatever will be transmitted will in turn be optimally relevant to the recipient. Given this, the notion of Optimal Relevance is important for all parties concerned in the communicative exchange as both senders and receivers of the message are guided by the search for optimal relevance to transmit and consequently receive the speaker-intended context and interpretation respectively.

Relevance of course is highly reliant on the above-mentioned contextual effects and processing, or inferring, effort. Given this, as well as our brief look at the notion of context as it is understood within the domains of this theory, it is important to note that relevance is a context-dependent entity, an important element to be considered when approaching translation and an understanding thereof. Lastly, relevance may be considered a comparative concept – different utterances vary in their degrees of Optimal and interpretive Relevance.

Given that Relevance Theory deals with *meaning* and the semantic content of an utterance, we need to consider the significance of *Semantic Representations* within the domain of the theory as these representations are linked to linguistic expressions and the addressee's ultimate inference. The human mind processes any linguistic data and codes such data to a set of mental representations that 'mean' or 'represent' something (Gutt 1991:24). These 'mental representations' or *semantic representations* are often incomplete and are considered mere assumptions which then need to be strengthened and developed to become fully truth-conditional. Once a semantic representation has been processed, it may be considered a thought with a propositional form. To derive a propositional form from an original semantic representation requires context as this phenomenon clarifies speaker-intended meaning and inference and the consequent contextual effects influence the original assumption as previously explained.

Another aspect crucial to the understanding of Relevance Theory is its claim that there are two cognitively distinct modes of using language, namely: the descriptive use and the interpretive use.

“A language utterance is said to be used descriptively when it is intended to be taken as true of a state of affairs in some possible world. An utterance is said to be used interpretively when it is intended to represent what someone said or thought”

(Hickey 1998:44)

In the first use, a speaker maintains a certain truth about something while in the second use, the claim is not necessarily a fully truthful fact but rather just a report or representation of someone else's descriptive (and assumed to be fully truthful) utterance.

While descriptive use of language may be considered fairly clear and easily understood, interpretive use may be somewhat more intricate as a result of interpretive resemblance. Relevance Theory claims the relationship between what we say and the thoughts we intend to communicate is one of interpretive resemblance. Simply put, what we say may not necessarily reflect what we think but it ultimately resembles what we wish to communicate (Gutt 1991:32). This interpretive resemblance may then be applied to the relationship between an original utterance (descriptive use) and one used to represent said utterance (interpretive use).

Resemblance, like relevance, is a context-dependent entity and also relies on the sharing of explicatures and implicatures between participants (Hickey 1998:45). The more explicatures and implicatures that are shared, the more two utterances will interpretively resemble one another. A direct quotation for example will reflect the highest degree of resemblance to an original (descriptive) utterance while a summary will show less resemblance. Instinctively, a speaker may aim for a high degree of interpretive resemblance. However, aiming for Optimal Relevance and the essential underlying the Principle of Relevance, s/he will have varying degrees of interpretive resemblance. As a result of this,

“the utterance of the speaker comes with a claim to faithfulness: the speaker guarantees that his/ her utterance is a faithful enough representation of the original: that is, resembles it closely enough in relevant respects”

(Sperber & Wilson 1988: 137).

Given this outline of the two psychologically distinct uses of language, it is clear that translation may be considered an interpretive use of language, significantly influenced by the claim to faithfulness, “the translation is intended to restate in one language what someone else said or wrote in another language” (Hickey 1998:46). Linking up to the phenomenon of translation, Relevance Theory views the translator as a communicator who, like any other sender of a message, is addressing a particular audience. The translator also has a particular intention s/he would like to communicate and the Principle of Relevance addresses *how* and *what* s/he can reasonably expect to communicate while achieving the highest possible degrees of Optimal Relevance and interpretive resemblance. Context is particularly crucial to the translator: this cognitive environment may directly affect the translator’s own understanding of the original message based on differing contextual assumptions and consequently influence the translation and transmission thereof.

The Relevance Theory of Communication was developed by Sperber and Wilson and put forward as a shift in the traditional, code-based and classificatory approaches to translation. Underlying this dynamic theory are the Principle of Relevance and the notion of Optimal Relevance which work together in determining the success of any given communicative exchange. When considering this theory in terms of translation, we have considered how context is particularly important as this may influence the translator's interpretive resemblance and the subsequent contextual effects for the audience.

Both approaches discussed above, Baker's views on context and contextualisation and Sperber and Wilson's perspectives on relevance, inference and context, may be considered a suitable framework in approaching the process of translation. In this particular study, the notions detailed within this framework play a significant role as the humour from the original English source text has been reinforced, modified or adapted to render an appropriate Portuguese target text. The strategies for conveying the myriad of humour devices are outlined in the following section before an analysis of such humour is provided.

Translation of Humour

Playing a significant role in today's globalised world, translation is considered by many as a cultural phenomenon yet questions regarding its very nature remain complex and somewhat open-ended; such questions may range from its focus on the target text to the importance of the source text message and the role context may play in the translation act. Does one merely consider the linguistic aspect involved in the act of translation or does this cognitive process go beyond the linguistic domain? Should the source text intention be considered or should one look primarily at the aspects surrounding the target audience? These are but a few of the points that arise when considering *translation* on its own; however, juxtaposing this term alongside any discussion of *humour* and the *translation of humour* brings to light similar questions for debate. In fact, when considering Translation Studies (TS) and any studies relating to humour, it is evident that such studies are “interdisciplinary fields of research [...] both draw from linguistics, psychology and sociology, among other disciplines, for their descriptions and their theoretical models and constructs” (Zabalbeascoa, 2005: 185).

Chiaro (2002) readily admits that the translation of humour may be a contentious issue, swinging back and forth between two extremes, meaning and formal structural equivalence.

Elaborating on the concept of meaning and its relation to equivalence, Eugene Nida (1969) developed the notions of “dynamic (or functional) equivalence” versus “formal equivalence” to stress the significance of transferred meaning and grammatical form respectively. Even if it is at the expense of original text organisation, word order and grammatical structure, dynamic equivalence aims at transferring the meaning, message or thought pattern contained within the Source Text. On the contrary, formal equivalence aims at rendering a word-for-word reading of the original text, maintaining literal fidelity to that source text. As will be illustrated in the analysis of the *Shrek* dialogue, the significance of transferred meaning versus formal structural equivalence is an important one as the translators have made significant choices in translating the humorous exchanges, often shifting the humour to different textual points in the dialogue while, at other times, adhering to structure but consequently losing meaning. Since humour has often been dealt with from a primarily linguistic perspective, there may indeed be a tendency to focus on correspondence of meaning while the act of translation itself may call for strict adherence to structure. However, as previously stated, a strong focus on maintaining original text organisation may similarly result in significant loss of humorous meaning (Young, 2007:831).

As is the case with translation, no two acts of humour are the same and an array of devices and techniques may be drawn upon to create a particular humorous effect. Several scholars have pointed out the various means by which humour may be expressed: ambiguity, a cliché, paradox or comparison; implicature, irony or satire; wordplay, straightforward knock-knock jokes or mockery; nonsense and the absurd; register and tone or simple incongruity (Ross, 1991). The humour may be straightforward or rely on innuendo and subtlety to make a point, manipulating time, place and language in accordance with the sender’s proposed intention. Mindful of the range of possibilities available in terms of type and function a humorous text may represent, it is important to consider the different elements surrounding and influencing the translation of humour, particularly as different humorous devices pose different challenges in the translation process; “the target language may not have the same array of language manipulation or carry the same connotations [present] in the original text” (Billerey, 2008: 2). The study of Humour Translation is considered a dynamic and fascinating area within Translation Studies, particularly as the translation of humour

“involves various kinds of problems, many of which are of a cultural nature and may apply only to specific language pairs. Other problems, on the other hand, are of a

more linguistic or technical nature and apply to most humour translations, irrespective of the source and target languages”

(Schnitzer cited in Young, 2007: 986).

When we consider humour in either its audio or visual media, its (un)translatability comes into play; can all instances of humour possibly be transferred into another language and culture, attempting to induce the same emotional, physical and behavioural response? Indeed, given the varying social contexts central to any occasion displaying humour, it is clear that humour goes beyond the linguistic into the cultural realm and may in fact be considered “an intercultural issue” (Chiaro, 2005:136). In addition, the sending and receiving agents involved in the translation process would do well to remember that, despite any strategies and techniques adopted, the resulting target text may not always have the same humorous effect as the original and humour is only “translatable if and only if the respective cultures are interested and available” (Raphaelson-West, 1989: 140).

At the start of my discussion, I commented on the complexity of the interdisciplinary fields of translation and humour, as well as the lack of studies linking these fields in terms of strategies and solutions. Cited in López (2002b), Marta Mateo (1995) outlines three general translation procedures which may assist in discussion, I commented on the complexity of the interdisciplinary fields of translation and humour, as well as the lack of studies linking these fields in terms of strategies and solutions. Cited in López the translator’s task within the context of humour and which may be guided by the circumstances surrounding the translation act itself. Firstly, she suggests the translator could aim to be faithful to the message contained within the Source Text where the humorous excerpt allows for easy, direct translation. Secondly, the translator may choose to adapt the text to the Target Language and culture and, thirdly, she indicates the translator may even refuse to explain the text in question as this step may inadvertently affect and destroy the humorous element. In addition to these general steps, Mateo mentions a Scale of Difficulty, determined by situational, logistic or cultural elements, “the greater the cultural load and/ or dependency on linguistic factors, the more difficult it will be to be faithful to the Source Text” (López, 2002a:37).

As diverse as the techniques and devices are in humour production, so too are the strategies employed by translators in their aim to create a target text which will convey the same, or at least similar, messages and humorous effects. In her view of translation, Raphaelson-West

(1989: 128) explains it is possible to translate the message as well as the effects of a particular text and this, I believe, is of particular importance in humour translation regardless of why the text is being translated in the first place. The translation of a humorous text, as with any other text, involves a certain degree of analysis, syntactically and semantically as well as incorporating other elements of textual analysis. Substitution, addition or displacement may be the primary strategies adopted and it is important to note how the translator's strategies and solutions are significantly influenced by the devices and techniques employed in the original text to create the humorous effect.

Extra-textual and extra-linguistic factors may also need to be considered when approaching humour translation as these may indicate certain key elements regarding the target culture, audience and background, such as situations in which taboo-related matters are used to create humour (Young, 2007). Moreover, additional factors may need to be considered when translating humour for children who are more or less likely to have cognitive access to the ST culture and intertextual references such as fairytales and nursery rhymes. Similar devices and techniques in the original may not necessarily command a single approach; wordplay is one example of this (Asimakoulas, 2004). In this case, the translator may choose to translate directly or render the humorous effect with another rhetoric device like repetition, rhyme, referential vagueness or irony. Total omission may be employed or structural changes may be made to the text in order to portray humour elsewhere in that text. Whatever strategy the translator chooses, s/he needs to consider what makes the respective text funny and how the humour is created: "several options are [then] offered to the translator, whose stylistic and linguistic sense govern the final decision" (Billerey, 2008: 12).

Humour is created through different strategies and devices, all of which can pose serious difficulties in comprehension, even in the same language. While the range of these strategies and devices may have varying effects and responses, it may also pose a rather intricate web of difficulties for the translator; should translation of humour focus primarily on equivalence where one aims at adopting and reflecting the same humorous technique at the same point in the target text as in the source text - even though many scholars readily admit that much may be lost in the fight for equivalence (Chiaro, 2005). I mentioned above that humour is "very much in the eyes and ears of the beholder" and here one questions the possible effect of the translator's own attitude and personality on the target text. Considered by some to require a certain degree of creativity and talent, the translation of humour, perhaps like any other

translation typology, certainly demands a certain mastering of the languages and cultures in question as well as a general awareness of the world and state of affairs. In addition, the translator working with a humorous text would do well to have some knowledge of the relationship between, and status of, the sender(s) and receiver(s) involved in the exchange (Ross, 1998:62).

In addition to creativity and a certain degree of skilful technique, the resulting target text in a humorous exchange may also be affected by the translator's own taste and cultural background as well as experience, training and working conditions. Perhaps more than any other language type, humour, written or spoken, subtle or not, involves the speaker's tone, facial expression and general body language, although the significance of body language may differ according to the relative context and medium of expression. Cited in López's (2002a) elaboration of Frame Semantics and Humour, Nash (1986) indicates how both written and oral humour are context-dependent, relying on the sender's intentions, expectations and associations. However, while oral humour reflects an immediate audience, written (and visual) humour is often aimed at a distant and unknown audience which may need to interpret the text in a more complicated way, looking for the interwoven cues and clues. Such differing complexity is particularly important when we later consider the notion of frame and prototype in our understanding of humour.

Approach to the Translation of Humour through the General Theory of Verbal Humour

Perhaps one of the most prominent theorists in humour translation is Salvatore Attardo, particularly with reference to his work with Victor Raskin in developing a key incongruity theory known as the General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH), an adaptation of Raskin's Semantic Script Theory of Humour (SSTH) (1985). The two scholars re-evaluated the SSTH in their research entitled "Script theory revisited: joke similarity and joke representation model". The SSTH considered humour through semantic or pragmatic features and was limited to occurrences of humorous utterances in narrative texts (Krikmann, 2006:28). Once developed, Raskin and Attardo's model of GTVH considered all aspects of the humorous discourse, including all kinds of texts. In their particular theory, humour is generally "created out of a conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs" (Ross, 1998: 7). Attardo described his model as encompassing a "metric of similarity

between texts which can go a long way towards providing the criterion for determining similarity of meaning/ force in the domain of texts whose perlocutionary goal is the perception of humour” (2002:175). In their adaptation, Raskin and Attardo drew on multiple branches of linguistics such as pragmatics, textual linguistics, and the notion of opposing scripts, not limiting humour to any specific medium. Given the multi-faceted approach of the model, the GTVH can be considered a suitable strategy in the analysis of humour and its translation as it allows translators to take into account both the visual and verbal aspects of the humorous exchange. To demonstrate this, in their study Raskin and Attardo (1991:295) showed that the GTVH provides an appropriate empirical framework for translating comics.

In developing their model of GTVH, Raskin and Attardo (1991:296) considered elements which determine humour competence and the humorous exchange can consequently be analysed in terms of six hierarchically organised parameters known as *Knowledge Resources*; all six of which may later be used in an analytical approach to the translation of humour and one Knowledge Resource is often determined by the other. These six *Knowledge Resources* include the following hierarchically organised elements, from the language of the humorous exchange right until the most fundamental aspect of opposing scripts to create the humour:

- **Language (LA)**

This parameter “contains all the information necessary for the verbalisation of a text, any sentence can be recast in a different wording [...] without changes to its semantic content” (Young, 2007:983). All the linguistic components drawn upon to create a humorous exchange are considered within this particular Knowledge Resource. This category encompasses the speaker’s choices across a spectrum of levels, ranging from phonetic and morphological to semantic and pragmatic levels of communication, all influenced by the participants’ individual frames and experience of the world. At this level, the message is simple within a translation framework: substitute Target Text language for Source Text language.

- **Narrative Strategy (NS)**

Following language, we have the “micro-genre of the joke” (Asimakoulas, 2004:823) which indicates the narrative organisation and structure of the humorous exchange. As a result, this particular Knowledge Resource is closely linked with Language and is used to categorise different types, or genres, of humorous utterances. When translating humour, this category is often unaffected unless the source structure and type of humour is unknown to the target audience. A prime example of this would be irony or satire as these vary across cultures. Princess Fiona is understood to be a beautiful damsel in distress who is chosen by lord Farquaad to be his wife and consequently make him king of Duloc. Ironically, we find out that Princess Fiona is not quite the picture of perfection as, when the sun sets, she turns into an ogre as a result of a spell cast on her at a young age.

- **Target (TA)**

Particularly important to our case study is this third knowledge resource in which we are able to pinpoint and analyse the different individuals or groups reflected as targets of the humour; these participants essentially become the “butt” of the joke. As a result, Attardo and Raskin highlighted this element as vital in the translation process (1991: 301). These targets may be people, ethnic groups or even an institution such as marriage (Young, 2007:983).

It is worth noting how the film’s villain character, lord Farquaad, is introduced: when we first see lord Farquaad, we are given the idea of someone mighty and strong, with an imposing and dominating presence as a result of varying camera angles, dramatic music and overhanging shadows. Instead, we encounter a rather short man who overcompensates for his physical shortcomings with an incredibly developed ego, sense of self and authoritarian manner. Our introduction to lord Farquaad’s character is significantly contrasted to that of Shrek and Donkey’s initial appearances where humour, light and a sense of being carefree dominate the scenes. In a later scene, his bride-to-be, who has yet to meet her groom, questions her rescuers about lord Farquaad and we can see language, narrative strategy and target all at play as Shrek and Donkey both mock him:

{Princess Fiona} – And what of my groom-to-be? Lord Farquaad? What's he like?
{Shrek laughs} – Let me put it this way, Princess. Men of Farquaad's stature are in short supply.

{Donkey} – I don't know. There are those who think little of him.

{Princess Fiona} – Stop it. Stop it, both of you. You're just jealous you can never measure up to a great ruler like lord Farquaad.

{Shrek} – Yeah, well, maybe you're right, Princess. But I'll let you do the "measuring" when you see him tomorrow.

Donkey, once Fiona has seen lord Farquaad's imposing castle in the distance, tells her "You know, Shrek thinks lord Farquaad's compensating for something, which I think means he has a really little---"

- **Situation (SI)**

Significant to any study of translation and crucial to the understanding of humour is the notion of context which, according to the GTVH, is deemed as *situation*. This particular Knowledge Resource encompasses the elements needed to tell the story or create the text as it were. These elements include the object, participants, places and general events described in the exchange. While any joke or humorous text may in fact be specific to a particular situation, the significance and influence of the surrounding context may differ across individual exchanges. On their rescue mission to free Princess Fiona, Shrek and Donkey meet a fire-blowing dragon. The obvious result of such an encounter is fear and the audience even sees the skeletons of previous knights who failed in similar missions. In this situation however, we see a hint of romance as this fiery-tempered dragon takes an immediate, if somewhat surprising, liking to Donkey.

- **Logical Mechanism (LM)**

The logical mechanism resource relates to the GTVH's basic notion of humour being based upon incongruity and refers to the resolution of that incongruity. These logical mechanisms are distorted or conflicted, therefore leading to opposing frames and creating the funniness. In the more common version of Westernised fairytales such as *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*, *Sleeping Beauty* and *Rapunzel*, the brave prince rescues the beautiful damsel in distress, giving her true love's first kiss before going on to live happily ever after. The same is expected in *Shrek*. Instead, our damsel is in for something a little more unorthodox and unpredictable as Shrek's character is very different to the prototypical fairytale prince: he is neither handsome nor charming and he does not attempt to woo the princess and offer her his vast kingdom. The following excerpt shows their interaction the first they meet: Princess

Fiona wanting romance and traditional fairytale chivalry to the moment, addressing Shrek as “Sir Knight”, asking about his “valiant steed” and expecting to be swept off her feet with poetry. Shrek on the other hand, ridicules her – both in his perplexed reaction at her expectations and in his sarcastic responses.

{Shrek – shaking Fiona awake} – Wake up!
{Fiona – visibly startled} – What?!
{Shrek} – Are you Princess Fiona?
{Fiona} – I am, awaiting a knight so bold as to rescue me.
{Shrek} – Oh, that's nice. Now let's go!
{Fiona} – But wait, Sir Knight. This be-ith our first meeting. Should it not be a wonderful, romantic moment?
{Shrek} – Yeah, sorry, lady. There's no time.
{Fiona} – Hey, wait. What are you doing? You should sweep me off my feet out yonder window and down a rope onto your valiant steed.
{Shrek} – You've had a lot of time to plan this, haven't you?
{Fiona} – Mm-hmm.
{Shrek grunts, picks up Fiona, puts her over his shoulder and starts running while Fiona starts screaming}
{Fiona} – But we have to savor this moment! You could recite an epic poem for me. A ballad? A sonnet! A limerick? Or something!
{Shrek} – I don't think so.
{Fiona} – Can I at least know the name of my champion?
{Shrek} – Um, Shrek.
{Fiona} – Sir Shrek. {Cleans throat} I pray that you take this favor as a token of my gratitude {Fiona hands Shrek a white linen handkerchief and he uses it to wipe his dirty, smoke-covered face}
{Shrek} – Thanks!
{Sound of Dragon roaring roaring}
{Fiona} – You didn't slay the dragon?
{Shrek} – It's on my to-do list. Now come on! {Shrek picks up Fiona and puts her over his shoulder again and starts running through the castle}
{Fiona screaming} – But this isn't right! You were meant to charge in, sword drawn, banner flying. That's what all the other knights did.
{Shrek} – Yeah, right before they burst into flame.
{Fiona} – That's not the point. Oh!
{Fiona} – Wait. Where are you going? The exit's over there.
{Shrek} – Well, I have to save my ass {referring to Donkey}
{Fiona} – What kind of knight are you?
{Shrek} – One of a kind.

- **Script Opposition (SO)**

Originally introduced in Raskin's Semantic Script Theory of Humour (1985), this is the most significant of the six hierarchically organised knowledge resources as it is considered the

fundamental requirement for a text to be considered humorous. In brief, this parameter states that a humorous text may be characterised as such if it contains two or more opposing scripts or frames working together and overlapping thereby creating the funniness. This particular category also links with the notion of frame semantics, the theory to be discussed in the following section. In GTVH, scripts are considered as

“Cognitive structures internalized by the speaker with information on how the world is organised, including how one acts in it. A script is a semantic object but in Raskin’s theory it incorporates what most linguistic theories of semantics would view as pragmatic/ contextual information.”

(Attardo, 2002:181)

Script Opposition is perhaps the most significant of all six elements as any humorous text will reflect script opposition as influenced by the differing narrative structures, contexts, language and other elements defining the humorous exchange since it considers humour as “a conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs” (Ross 1998:7). When considering this element from a translator’s point of view, a text’s script opposition should, as far as possible, remain unchanged as this is essentially where the humour is reflected. Once we meet lord Farquaad we are also introduced to a familiar fairytale character, the Magic Mirror from *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*. Instead of the sober, deep-voiced character remembered from the popular children’s story, the Magic Mirror plays a game show host with a sing-song voice.⁸

Approach to the Translation of Humour through Norm Acceptance/ Norm Opposition

Drawing on Attardo and Raskin’s GTVH, Dimitris Asimakoulas (2004) presents a model of *norm acceptance/ norm opposition* as a theory and strategy for humour translation. Norm acceptance refers to the use of a stereotype or cliché that has been established as funny while norm opposition involves the clash of two or more interpretations, for example a pun, in a single context thus creating a humorous effect and relying on social and, possibly, cognitive incongruity. The theory focuses on humour as founded on a divide between what is considered normal and abnormal. Asimakoulas (2004: REF) states that ideally the humour or

⁸Please refer to the analysis of Extract Four in the next chapter as the Magic Mirror forms part of an analysed excerpt.

joke is produced through incongruity which is represented by what we expect and what actually happens. This theory was initially intended to focus on the role of subtitles translating humorous utterances. Through this, Asimakoulas aimed to prove that the translation of humour in audiovisual media involves a degree of creativity when faced with humour presented as wordplays or puns for example. To ensure consistency between the humour in the Source Language and the Target Language, the translator should ask several questions such as: does the humorous utterance break a social convention or an accepted norm? What type of logical mechanism is used? Who is attacked, criticized or targeted by the humour? What is the situation in the humour? What narrative strategy and language are employed to convey the humour? Finally, what would be the best way to compensate for any losses in the translation process?

According to Jeroen Vandaele (2002:223) these questions may be answered through the norm acceptance/norm opposition concepts being grounded on the principle of incongruity. Used in conjunction with the GTVH's *Knowledge Resources*, the norm acceptance/ norm opposition model may be used to analyse the respective humorous text in terms of syntax, semantics and context and consequently benefit the translation process as aspects and norms from both the source and target cultures are observed. For instance, Target (TA) will be prevalent in the genre of satire, parody or irony as someone or something becomes the butt of the joke. Asimakoulas (2004) indicated that other KRs such as language determine the realization of norm acceptance/opposition. Language can be considered funny when a particular utterances deviates from what the audience may consider the norm' and this particular Knowledge Resource also determines how the humorous utterances are organized in the text overall.

Contextual factors such as image, constraints, presupposed knowledge, intertextuality, and interpersonal level (Assis, 2010: 95) may also influence the receiver's perception and understanding of the humour when considered from a norm acceptance/ norm opposition perspective. Asimakoulas (2004) indicated that the images portrayed on audiovisual productions play a significant role in the production of the humorous effect of a particular section or segment of the text section. Constraints refer to the possibilities (or limits) of the language used to create humour and therefore influence the success in translating a particular humorous utterance. Certain lexical items, sentences or phrases might be more humorous in one language than another. For example, a particular word can be used as a pun in English,

but its translation does not allow for a pun in the Target Language. Presupposed knowledge essentially refers to the knowledge that people possess individually or as a group. This knowledge represents cultural assumptions, linguistic and non-linguistic presuppositions made every time someone speaks and other forms of knowledge gained through people's experience of the world around them. According to Asimakoulas (2004) presupposed knowledge involves all forms of knowledge that the audience should possess to understand a particular joke. Asimakoulas (2004) noted that Intertextuality refers to the connections between texts and includes elements of the same text or two different texts. This contextual factor looks at commonly repeated segments, parodies and allusions that are drawn upon to create or add to the humour. The interpersonal level looks at the expression of attitudes and feeling in creating the humour; for example a sense of superiority in satire. Asimakoulas (2004) stated that interpersonality represents the personal relationships that are at play in a given situation and therefore the audience plays an essential role in the translation of audiovisual production.

In summary, Asimakoulas stated that a translated humorous utterance in an audiovisual production has to be consistent with the original source language (Assis, 2010: 96). In this case, both humorous utterances must be as close as possible with reference to the contextual factors outlined above, including the use of the appropriate language to convey the specific humour. If the humorous utterance is intended to be satirical, or a case of parody, the target should not be altered. However, Asimakoulas also acknowledged that there may be instances where the translator may be forced to make changes or employ different strategies to translate the humour in an effort to observe the culture of the Target Language (Assis, 2010: 97). This is the case for example in *Shrek's* opening scene: the title character makes his opinion clear of a fairytale by ripping the page, saying "What a load of ---" before the audience hears the sound of a toilet flushing. In both languages, this expression would involve the use of a swearword thereby rendering the dialogue inappropriate for children in a family-oriented film. However, in Portuguese the direct translation of the expression – even without the swearword – is still inappropriate and as a result, the translators have Shrek declaring "Como se fosse possível ---" [as if that were possible] followed by the sound of the toilet flushing – thereby still conveying the original English meaning.

Approach to the Translation of Humour through Frame Semantics

Another perspective to consider when looking at the translation of humour is the theory encompassing Frame Semantics. In her article entitled *Frame Semantics and the Translation of Humour*, López (2002a) elaborates on humour translation in view of frame semantics as something natural. “More than a simple conductor to a pleasant laugh” (López, 2002a:34), humour can be viewed from several different perspectives. However, as López explains, all the views and attempted definitions of humour, explicitly or implicitly, suggest a common ground between the participants involved in the exchange. Embracing this presupposition, Charles Fillmore’s semantic theory, known as *Frame Semantics*, encompasses this common ground to analyse language beyond its lexis and grammar and include “the description of the cognitive and interactional frames speakers use to interpret their environment, formulate and understand messages and store or create their own model of the world” (López, 2002a:35). Cited in Ungerer et al, (1996: 209), Fillmore outlined the concept of *frame* as

“any system of linguistic choices – the easiest cases being collections of words, but also including choices of grammatical rules or linguistic categories – that can get associated with prototypical instances of scenes.”

Drawing on Fillmore’s theory, López (2002a: 35) explains humour from a cognitive perspective, encompassing the notions of *cognitive context*, *prototype* and *frame* in an attempt to understand humour as a cultural phenomenon. The cognitive context is at once linked to the immediate context surrounding the humorous exchange as well as the expectations and perspectives of the relevant participants, all influenced by individual experiences of the world. To this end, López (2002a:34) highlights the notion that frame semantics essentially influence how the audience interprets a particular statement with reference to the context. From this perspective, an audience’s understanding of a particular utterance depends on how the person’s ability to perceive or decode the context and how s/he uses earlier memories and experiences to influence how the context is interpreted (Shardakova, 2016: 468).

Fillmore’s idea of prototype is particularly important to Frame Semantics and may be linked to the concept of frames, that which “we use to structure, classify and interpret [our] experiences” (López, 2002a:35). In its simplest form, prototypes represent the first idea that

comes into someone's mind when s/he thinks of something and these ideas or concepts are then built upon as the person experiences the world. An example related to our study of *Shrek* lies in the film's title character: ogres are typically thought to be hideous, dirty beasts stomping the earth looking for humans to devour (Illustrated Oxford Dictionary: 1998). According to Frame Semantics, essentially, in order to understand any given entity, perceive and interpret it, the relevant participants need to access a series of prototypes or original perspectives that we store in our memories. These perspectives are based on individual backgrounds and experiences of the world and therefore account for the interpretative differences reflected by individual participants. In terms of humour, the prototype acts as the point of reference for the audience in understanding a humorous utterance or exchange (Shardakova, 2016: 467).

Finally, when considering the notion of frames, López (2002a:34) explains that there are interactional frames which consider the behaviour that people expect depending on the situation. For example, greeting someone is an example of an interactional frame where certain language, forms of address and cues are expected to occur. Cognitive frames on the other hand, draw on people's experiences of the world and are therefore fundamental to the study of translating humour as the humour itself depends on the distortion of these cognitive frames. In her study, López (2002:37) outlined five cognitive frames, namely visual, situational, text-type, social and generic frames.

Visual frames are literally frames that activate or stimulate images in the mind of the audience and generate expectations based on previous experiences. These frames evoke images in the mind that the audience associates with certain attitudes or perceptions. These images may be formed by words, phrases, and sentences describing something in particular. For instance, the image of a room is created through words such as roof and walls. The image of a farm will evoke related images like open fields, farmyard animals and a barn. The initial frame or image becomes the starting point for the audience's understanding of the ensuing text. When considered in an approach to translating humorous utterances, it is essential for the translator to know how to recreate visual frames from the Source Language to the Target Language. If we consider this aspect in *Shrek* for example, when Donkey first sees Shrek's swamp from a distance (not knowing that's where Shrek lives), he exclaims,

“Whoo! Look at that. Who’d want to live in a place like that?” to which Shrek responds “that would be my home.”

The notion of *home* evokes more than just a place to live; it carries connotations of warmth, comfort and belonging. In Portuguese, the same lines have been translated as

{Donkey} – “Mmm, olha lá pr’aquilo. Quem é que consegue numa coisa daquelas?”
[Mmm, look at that. Who can live in a thing like that?]
{Shrek} – “Aquela coisa é aonde eu moro” [That *thing* is where I live].

In this case, the Portuguese dialogue leaves Shrek reiterating Donkey’s use of the word “thing” and therefore not carrying the same connotations, or visual frames, as the use of the word “home” in the source language. However, Shrek’s tone conveys his disdain for Donkey’s opinion so although the visual frame is not necessarily recreated in the translation, his tone conveys his sense of belonging and protection of where he lives.

According to López (2002a:40), *Situational frames* refer to situations that follow a pre-created script with clearly defined roles. For Instance, a visit to the doctor could be considered a situational frame because the doctor and the patient are guided by professional and certain conversational conventions. Within this framework, humour is created as a result of diverging from or distorting the scripts or frames associated with a particular situational frame; López (2002a:41) viewing the occurrence of incongruity as essential in the creation of humour. Given this, in the translation process, translators need to be aware of how the situational frames are manipulated to create the humorous segments in the source language and therefore maintain this consistency in the Target Language. In *Shrek*, the situational frame of a traditional fairytale where the knight or Prince Charming with a horse typically rescues the Princess is distorted as here it is Shrek, an ogre accompanied by a donkey is the one who rescues the damsel in distress. This event makes for a comical conversation in the subsequent scene in the original English dialogue and the same element of verbal humour has been carried through and conveyed in the resulting Portuguese target text.

Text-types frames draw on the notions outlined in Raskin and Attardo’s concept of Narrative Strategy and considers the audience’s implicit understanding of how a text is structured to then anticipate what is to follow. When there is distortion in the frames within the text,

humour ensues. When meeting Shrek for the first time, Donkey compliments Shrek on how he handled the army of soldiers initially chasing Donkey through the forest. Instead of showing the expected appreciation, or at the very least, acknowledgement of the compliment, Shrek completely ignores Donkey and walks away from him. . This frame allows the audience to have an idea of how a humorous utterance is designed so that they can anticipate what to follow (Shardakova, 2016: 472).

Social frames refer to those that “describe the cognitive structures that organise our social knowledge” (2002b:326). These frames rely on a person’s social knowledge and have a strong influence on language use, draw upon the social relationships between people. For example, the register that is appropriate in different roles and interpersonal relationships and therefore appropriate in a particular culture. Examples of social frames would include terms of address. Social frames may be influenced, changed or distorted to create humour and a translator needs to be aware of how the Source Language’s social frames operate in the Target Language or the humour may be lost in translation. When Shrek initially hears about lord Farquaad he declares “I’m gonna see this Farquaad guy right now” – clearly not conveying the level of respect that should be observed when someone has ‘lord’ as a title. In the Portuguese target text, Shrek says “Vou falar com esse Farquaad imediatamente” [I’m going to speak with *that* Farquaad immediately] – the use of “esse” meaning “that” showing how the translators have conveyed the same disregard for title in the Portuguese translated dialogue.

Lastly, *generic frames* refer directly to “prototypes of people” (2002b:343). These frames are categories of social frames and are used by someone to categorize people by connecting prototypical types of people to the knowledge that s/he already has. This knowledge considers aspects such as physical appearance, mannerisms, behaviour or commonly used expressions. For example, the generic frame someone has of a businessman will be different to that s/he has of child; hero versus villain. In *Shrek*, humour is created when the army of soldiers deserts its Captain when face-to-face with Shrek in the forest. Our generic frame of a soldier is someone brave, disciplined and united in their mission – not of one who is scared and abandons their colleague in the face of danger (the irony of which is not lost on the audience and an occurrence that Shrek finds amusing).

The frames outlined above each play a significant role in the process of translating humorous segments or utterances (López, 2002a:37). Applying the theory of Frame Semantics to the study of humour and its translation, López (2002b) explains how humour may be viewed differently and consequently translated, taking into account the respective linguistic aspects as well as the prototype and cognitive context relating to the given humorous exchange.

Humour may be created through the *Modification*, *Reinforcement*, *Metaphoric* or *Metonymic Mapping* of individual frames. *Modification* changes or distorts existing frames, relying significantly on the principle of incongruity, to create a humorous effect. *Reinforcement* typically affirms the frames that a person draws from his/ her repertoire of stored prototypes. Particularly when considering humour, it is important for the audience to have an understanding of the full picture, or the different frames confirming each other otherwise it is impossible to understand the humour – very much like not hearing a joke from the beginning, the final punch line won't make much sense. *Metaphoric* and *Metonymic Mapping* are often drawn upon as a combined strategy when considering frames within a humorous exchange. Metaphoric mapping is usually employed with satire or parody as devices to create humour as one frame is interpreted through a different frame; it is a “conceptual mapping of knowledge” (López, 2002a:39). The audience needs to have an understanding of one frame in order to grasp the one referred to in the humorous device. Metonymic mapping draws on one entity to refer to another within the same frame. In *Shrek*, for example, the fairytale Gingerbread character Gingy, literally a biscuit has been mapped with the frame of something animate and sentient, a being with feeling, awareness and a rather defiant personality at that.

Translation and humour are interdisciplinary fields of study and this report has considered several issues surrounding the task of humour translation. No straightforward or steadfast definitions are offered for this particularly unique area of Translation Studies but three key theories were considered, namely Attardo and Raskin's General Theory of Verbal Humour and six *Knowledge Resources*, Asimakoulas' model of Norm Acceptance/ Norm Opposition as well as López' presentation on Frame Semantics and the Translation of Humour; each theory establishing analysis as a key approach. It is important to remember that the translator, as with any translation typology, plays a significant role in humour translation while the strategies and solutions drawn upon in the act of translation may be as diverse and complex as those used to create a humorous effect in the first place. This phenomenon has

been explored in this study within the analysis of the animation feature *Shrek* where instances of humour are identified in the English Source Text before drawing on aspects of these three key theories to examine the translation strategies adopted to recreate the humour in the resulting Portuguese Target Text.

Chapter Four – Research Analysis:

Methodology

The key questions in this study concerns how the humour is created in *Shrek*. As a result, the analysis involves identifying and analysing the different devices and techniques adopted for creating humour in the film. Once the humorous device has been identified and analysed in the source text, we will consider how this humour is subsequently translated in the Portuguese dialogue before considering any effects of translation on the humour produced in the target text – for example, any resulting shifts in humour, cases where the Source Text humour has not been translated or even examples where the humour is conveyed at a later stage in the target text compared to the source text.

As previously mentioned, one of the film's DVD versions may be viewed in English, Portuguese or Spanish, with subtitles in each language respectively. For the purposes of this report, I have transcribed Shrek in English and Portuguese and have selected certain scenes in order to compare and analyse the dialogue, lexical items and the respective translation as these aspects relate to the humour contained in the film. For several reasons, transcription may be the best approach in this study: the transcriptions facilitate analysis and reference to the dialogue in both languages and in considering the visual medium. Although this study focuses specifically on the *dubbed* dialogue, it is worth noting that in many scenes throughout the film, particularly in the Portuguese version, the subtitles do not correspond directly to the spoken dialogue. The present study focuses specifically on the film's dubbing feature in the analysed extracts, particularly as we examine how the resulting translation of the audio-visual material is consequently depicted.

The chosen scenes (transcriptions of which have been recorded as Appendices located at the end of this reFport) for analysis have been selected as they introduce the viewer to the film's key characters, drive the plot and significantly reflect the aspects of humour discussed in the study's opening chapter: wordplay, intertextuality, songs and rhyme, irony and sarcasm as well as adult-oriented humour versus child-specific humour. The extracts will be analysed according to their frames and manipulation thereof, drawing on aspects of Attardo's six Knowledge Resources to analyse the text organisation and López' Frame Semantics to detail

the incongruities creating the humorous effect. It should be noted that the goal is to discuss and describe these humorous techniques and their respective translations and not to search for or focus on any possible errors in translation.

Analysis

Extract One – Film’s opening sequence where the viewer meets Shrek

“Once upon a time” – four simple words uttered by countless storytellers, past and present, recounting endless tales of old through generations and captivating the imaginations of children and adults alike time and time again. Weaving its own fairytale magic, the movie *Shrek* makes no exception and draws on the same four words as the first words read aloud in the film’s opening shot: the narration accompanying the image of a thick and slightly worn storybook – a classic opening frame in traditional fairytale movies. Given such an opening, the viewer is initially led to believe this movie’s story will unravel like the traditional medieval-style fairytale pictures and writing shown on screen:

Narrator: “Once upon a time there was a lovely princess but she had an enchantment upon her of a fearful sort which could only be broken by love’s first kiss. She was locked away in a castle guarded by a terrible fire-breathing dragon. Many brave knights had attempted to free her from this dreadful prison, but none prevailed. She waited in the dragon’s keep in the highest room of the tallest tower for her true love and true love’s first kiss.”

Although the narration suggests nothing out of the ordinary in the fairytale world of enchanted princesses, brave knights and fiery dragons, it soon becomes apparent that the central protagonist is a hero unlike any other. Just a few seconds into this conventional opening sequence, the film’s first of many comedic elements through unexpected occurrences is introduced: after uttering the fairytale words above, the narrator lets out a laugh and says boldly “Like that’s ever gonna happen!” before a big, green hand rips the page from the storybook. This act of mockery ends with the subsequent sound of a toilet flushing while the words “What a load of --” leave the more mature viewer with little doubt regarding the narrator’s opinion of the tale he has just been reading.

Until this point, a slow and mellow classical tune has been playing.⁹ Films typically use music as a device to set the scene and mood and traditional fairytales tend to have slow, rich, soft classical music in the happy scenes while drawing on loud, sinister ‘da-da-dum’ tunes for scenes involving the villain or depicting an unpleasant point in the plots. These opening notes in *Shrek* further reinforce the fairytale prototype in the repertoire of visual and social frames for the audience. However, once the toilet is heard flushing, a distinct shift in mood occurs as Smashmouth’s *All Star* lyrics are heard and a big, green ogre exits a wooden outhouse – this same moment marking the viewer’s first encounter with Shrek – the film’s title character and the ogre behind the narrating voice and hand ripping the pages.

At this juncture it is important to note the abundance of visual humour that lies within the remainder of the film’s opening sequence as we also get to know the protagonist: upon exiting the outhouse, Shrek unabashedly stops to pull his underwear from being wedged between his buttocks before he has a mud shower. He also kills fish as he lets off gas in a muddy swamp, catches bugs and brushes his teeth by squeezing a worm’s guts onto a twig before breaking a mirror with his smiling reflection. His day is spent painting “Keep out!” signs before finally sitting down to a candlelight dinner for one. Throughout this portrayal of Shrek’s day (with *All Star* as the ongoing backing track) the visual humour described above is emphasised as the film’s title and opening credits interact with the ogre’s environment: the movie title appears in green, swampy water; Mike Myers’ name (the voice of Shrek’s character: the hero of the story) appears as mud spat out by Shrek while he “showers”; Eddie Murphy’s name (the voice of Donkey’s character: the trusty sidekick) is carved in the wood behind the mirror Shrek shatters when he smiles into it; Cameron Diaz’ name (the voice of Princess Fiona: the damsel in distress) comes up as thick green algae with pink lilies and finally, John Lithgow’s name (the voice behind lord Farquaad: the villain of the story) is formed by maggots – a rather ironic choice for Lithgow’s name to appear given that his character ends up dying when eaten by a dragon in the film’s happily-ever-after ending.

So far, any generic frame or “prototypes of people” (López, 2002a: 34) the viewer may have of an ogre and associated behaviour has been drawn upon and even reinforced: a large, grotesque and beastly creature common to fairytales and folklore, whose behaviour is rough, hygiene is muddy to say the least and whose “Keep Out!” painted signs and dinner for one

⁹Note: The tune playing in the background is “It is you I have loved” by Dana Glover.

emphasise his isolation. At the same time, the surrounding society's dislike is shown through a shot of a group of townsmen standing over a sand diagram of an ogre before gathering pitchforks and weapons and heading in the direction of Shrek's home. Wanting to capture Shrek, the men speculate that an ogre will "grind your bones for bread". Adding humour to their fear, Shrek comes up behind them and *corrects* them, saying that giants grind bones but

"Ogres, they're much worse. They'll make a suit from your freshly peeled skin [...] they'll shave your liver. Squeeze the jelly from your eyes! Actually, it's quite good on toast."

The generic frame of an ogre as a scary monster is reinforced through the townsmen and their collective fear, especially after Shrek roars at them and they stand screaming but unmoving – either from the fear or the bad breath and spittle emanating from Shrek's roar (or both). Ironically, Shrek then whispers to them, "This is the part where you run away" before they drop weapons and run very far and very fast.

However, despite the generic frames reinforced as outlined above, at the same time there is also something about this particular ogre that indicates something will be different: he is smiling and going about his day in a jovial manner – contrary to the portrayal of ogres in traditional childhood fairytales who go about angrily stomping the earth, roaring and feeding on human beings. In these initial four minutes the film's tone has been set: although the initial generic frame of an ogre is reinforced, the *All Star* backing track and Shrek's jovial disposition and his amusing conversation with those trying to capture him, aid in the message that this movie will be a different, comical and mocking take of one's idea of a fairytale and that of the storybook whose pages were washed away in an outhouse.

When we consider the Portuguese version of the film and its opening sequence as described above, the initial narration has been translated to observe both the meaning and form of the original English text. The translated utterances (with accompanying back translation) can be seen clearly in the table below to show how the translated text reinforces the frames that the viewer draws from any stored prototypes as per the English text explained above.

Shrek's Original English utterance	Shrek's Translated Portuguese utterance	Back translation
Once upon a time there was a lovely princess but she had an enchantment upon her of a fearful sort which could only be broken by love's first kiss.	Era uma vez princesa bela mas ela sofria de uma terrível maldição que só poderia ser quebrada pelo beijo do verdadeiro amor.	[There was once a beautiful princess who suffered a terrible curse that could only be broken by a kiss from true love.]
Like that's ever gonna happen! What a load of –	Como se fosse possível!	[As if that were possible!]

It should however be noted in the Portuguese version that while the narrator 'reads' in Portuguese, the visual of the medieval-style storybook's words remain in English. The English narration and visual frame tell of "an enchantment upon her [a princess] of a fearful sort which could only be broken by love's first kiss". On the other hand, the Portuguese narration speaks of her suffering a terrible curse and mentions true love's kiss as the only way to break this curse – the word "maldição" containing heavy connotations of evil.¹⁰ Although shifting slightly in the Portuguese translation, the language and narrative strategy still allude to romance as one of the film's central themes as well as a plot element common to the social frame of what happens shortly before 'happily ever after' in traditional/ stereotypical fairytales.

As previously mentioned, while the English film's mocking tone is set with the narrator's line "what a load of -", it is important to note that in the Portuguese audio, this same utterance has been shortened and has not been directly translated. Instead, the audience hears the narrator laughing and saying "Como se fosse possível!" [as if that were possible] before we hear the sound of a toilet flushing. This particular strategy is worth noting when we consider the cognitive context of the dual audience targeted with this film: the English "what a load of -" works well as word play before the sound of a toilet flushing, leaving little to the imagination and therefore understood by the older viewer. The Portuguese language does not contain the same word play so a direct translation would not have been possible. In order for this particular line and associated humour load to be conveyed effectively and carry the same familiarity in Portuguese, a vulgar expression with a swearword would be required thereby

¹⁰ *Dicionário de Inglês-Português 4.a Edição 2005*. Porto Editora: Porto

rendering an inappropriate text for the child viewer. As a result, the translators used a different expression [as if that were possible] and relied on the audience's context and understanding of the situation, i.e. the sound of a toilet flushing, to convey the original humour in the target text – a risky strategy as the humorous effect may well be lost if the viewer fails to see the connection and therefore Shrek's opinion of the fairytale he has just been reading.

As Shrek goes about his day as discussed above, the Portuguese film also maintains *All Star* as the backing track. This is significant to note as the lyrics' humour and meaning are lost on the non-English speaking Portuguese audience. In addition, similar to the visual shot of the storybook's English wording, the Portuguese film does not show a visual translation for Shrek's painted masterpieces "Beware Ogre!" and "Stay Out!". Instead, the Portuguese narrator's voice comes over the music once saying "Cuidado Ogre!" [Beware Ogre!] – this audio strategy serving to convey the same generic frame of the ogre and reinforce the stereotype suggested with the English text as previously discussed.

Besides Shrek's initial reading of the storybook and the English *All Star* lyrics, the opening scene detailed above consists mainly of elements pertaining to visual humour – a slapstick piece directed at the enjoyment of children and drawing upon the "stored repertoire of [fairytale] prototypes" (López, 2002a: 34) in a fairytale situational frame. This slapstick opening scene and its visually humorous elements are simple enough for the child viewer to enjoy and these elements have been rendered 100% in the resulting Portuguese film. Before discussing further humorous elements, it is important to note that the film contains several instances whereby humour is created through visual elements thereby calling on its audience's repertoire of situational and visual frames. As noted in the directors' commentary, a large part of the humour in *Shrek* belongs to the visual category and "these elements present fewer problems in transfer and their use was intentional with the aim to make the humour of the film internationally available." These instances of visual humour are successfully portrayed in the film's Portuguese version, remaining as equally appealing to the target audience as they are to the original English-speaking viewer, both child and adult alike. If nothing else, the sheer surprise at this opening scene showing mud, maggots, burping and flatulence will gage some reaction from the audience while sending the message: expect the unexpected, this is no ordinary fairytale!

Extract Two – Scene showing the capturing of fairytale creatures where the viewer first meets Donkey

Following Shrek's candlelight dinner for one, and his quick dismissal of the townsfolk group aiming to capture him, a shot of a Western era style poster (dropped by the townsfolk) appears on screen with the words "Wanted: Fairytale Creatures". This same poster image, with the English words, appears in the Portuguese film as Shrek, sounding bored just reads aloud "Recompensa por personagens dos contos de fadas. Ugh." [Reward for fairytale creatures. Ugh – i.e. sound of disgust]. This visual frame is significant as it hints at what is to come in the movie's plot; in fact this search for fairytale creatures and them soon landing on Shrek's doorstep is the event that sets everything in motion for Shrek. This particular visual frame also links the audience to the next scene – marked by our first encounter with Donkey's character, our hero's lovable loudmouth and loyal sidekick. Applying the notion of frame semantics to Donkey's character, throughout the film Donkey is an example of metaphoric mapping as the dual audience maps the frame of an animal onto that of a talking creature (quite an energetic chatterbox actually), pet and companion for the story's hero. It will be through Donkey's hyperkinetic interaction with Shrek that the audience really gets to know Shrek; is able to witness the development of an unexpected (and unwanted by Shrek) friendship and laugh at the humour which arises through their interaction and Donkey's overall demeanour.

In a short scene where the social and situational frames resemble the practice associated with slave trade scenarios, the well-known likes of Goldilocks' Three Bears, Tinkerbell, Peter Pan and the Three Little Pigs can be seen awaiting their fate among cages in this fairytale with a twist. Also making an appearance are Collodi's Geppetto selling off his masterpiece Pinocchio and the Grimm Brothers' Seven Dwarfs as they are handcuffed and lined up in single file while singing about their woes. Successfully incongruent, the audience's first sighting of Donkey is at his desperate plea:

Original English utterance	Translated Portuguese utterance	Back translation
{Donkey} – Please, don’t turn me in. I’ll never be stubborn again. I can change. Please! Give me another chance!	Por favor, não me entregues.	[Please, don’t give me away.]
{Captain of the Guards} – Five shillings for the possessed toy.	Cinco xelins para o brinquedo demoníaco.	[Five shillings for the demonic toy.]
{Old Woman reprimanding Donkey} Talk, you boneheaded dolt!	Fala, seu burro idiota!	[Talk, you idiotic donkey!]
{Old Woman attempting ventriloquism with Donkey} – I can talk. I love to talk! I’m the talkingest damn thing you ever saw!	Eu falo. Adoro falar. Sou autentico falador. Nunca me calo.	[I can talk. I adore talking. I’m a real chatterbox. I never shut up.]
{Donkey as he takes flight} – You might have seen a housefly, maybe even a superfly but I bet you ain’t never seen a donkey fly!	Já viste o Super Homem voar, já viste um elefante voar mas aposto que nunca viste um burro voar!	[You’ve already seen Superman fly, you’ve already seen an elephant fly but I bet you’ve never seen a donkey fly!].

In the Portuguese version, Donkey’s plea is a significant shift from the original English situational frame where “don’t turn me in” carries a connotation that he has done something wrong or against the law and is being handed over to a body of authority. Instead, the Portuguese line, although conveying a social frame of giving away an animal, does not carry the same connotation and is said with an exaggerated pleading tone further reinforcing the humour and incongruity of the situation – donkeys don’t talk.

Humour takes on a slightly sinister twist in the next exchange as the Captain of the Guards, after hearing Pinocchio declare that he’s “a real boy” offers “five shillings for the possessed toy”. The Portuguese dialogue carries the same black humour through the word “demoniac” [demonic] in the same utterance. While a child or young viewer may not appreciate (or even recognize) the guard’s exaggeration of Pinocchio’s status, the more adult viewer (familiar with the original tales of Pinocchio and his mischievous adventures as a “real boy”) may see

the humour. This is conveyed through the metonymic mapping of the generic frame of this childhood fairytale character: the exaggerated irony of calling Pinocchio “possessed” [demonic in Portuguese] and drawing on the notion that the “little wooden puppet” should not be able to talk and, as per Collodi’s original plot, behaves extremely badly.

Once Pinocchio is taken away to be locked up, Donkey is next in line and brought before the guards by an elderly woman wanting to exchange the “talking donkey [...] really quite a chatterbox” for ten shillings. Of course, when commanded to speak, Donkey keeps mum much to the impatience of the Captain of the Guards and the embarrassment of the old woman. While simple and straightforward enough in the original English text, the language and narrative strategy of the ensuing exchange in the Portuguese dialogue reinforces the audience’s prototype of a donkey as a simple (i.e. not very intelligent) animal. This is completely modified seconds later when Donkey talks and does so with attitude when he also takes flight! Earlier in the queue, the old woman tells Donkey “shut up!” when he is pleading for her not to turn him in. Now, at his refusal to prove his vocal gift, the old woman commands him to talk, calling him a “boneheaded dolt”. Just as impatient, the old woman’s tone in the Portuguese dialogue conveys the same message but the humour is taken one step further in the translation. The Portuguese language does not possess a literal or direct equivalent term of address for “boneheaded dolt” so the translation states “seu burro idiota!” [You idiotic donkey!]. The term for ‘donkey’ in the Portuguese language is *burro* but the same term can also refer to the quality of being dim-witted or simply stupid.¹¹ As a result, the above-mentioned reinforced situational frame forms the target of the humour, thereby encouraging a humorous reaction in the Portuguese audience as the pun comes into full force with the old woman’s reference to Donkey as a stupid, idiotic animal. A clever and witty strategy, both the English and Portuguese name-calling insults of the donkey will also appeal to a younger audience as the use of simple language, insults and name-calling are social frames children often resort to in conflict or mocking situations.

When Donkey refuses to speak, the old woman grabs Donkey’s mouth and adds an element of slapstick humour to her conversation with the Captain of the Guards by performing an exaggerated (and unsuccessful) act of ventriloquism, even throwing in a neologism,

¹¹ *Dicionário de Inglês-Português 4.a Edição 2005*. Porto Editora: Porto

“talkigest” into the mix. The Portuguese dialogue does not translate this neologism; instead the dialogue states “Eu falo. Adoro falar. Sou autentico falador. Nunca me calo” [I can talk. I adore talking. I’m a real chatterbox. I never shut up.] – not quite a direct translation but the meaning has been retained, in fact adding “nunca me calo” [I never shut up] in the Portuguese text to compensate for the neologism in the English text, however the target of the humour remains the old woman’s attempt at ventriloquism. A child will laugh at the sight, poking fun at how ridiculous the old woman looks and sounds, while a more mature viewer may find amusement as ventriloquism as a skill is exaggerated and momentarily becomes the target or butt of the joke and audience’s enjoyment and laughter. Finally, in the small conversation that follows, Donkey breaks free of the old woman and, accidentally hit by Tinkerbell’s pixie dust, lifts off the ground and takes flight. At once talking and flying, Donkey creates comedic relief as the audience’s visual frame of this animal is further distorted to activate a frame consistent with the film’s role for Donkey – a parody of the traditional fairy tale where a horse or stallion usually accompanies the story’s hero.

For a traditional-savvy viewer, the language in the next few seconds are rich in humour and intertextuality as Disney’s “Peter Pan” and “Dumbo” movies become the target of the funniness: “He can fly!” being declared by Peter Pan – this same utterance was said about him in his namesake fantasy tale of 1904 and animated feature film in 1953. The three little pigs say the same thing in awe as these fellow four-legged creatures are in captivity and therefore look on at Donkey wistfully. Donkey’s response adds to the visual humour as he literally *looks down* at the onlookers stating, “You might have seen a housefly, maybe even a superfly but I bet you ain’t never seen a donkey fly!” This clever play on words – ‘fly’ as a noun and a verb – does not work in the Portuguese so in order to maintain the effect of seeing a donkey fly and the character’s cheeky take on it, the Portuguese version directly references the classic superhero, Superman and Dumbo: “Já viste o Super Homem voar, já viste um elefante voar mas aposto que nunca viste um burro voar!” [You’ve already seen Superman fly, you’ve already seen an elephant fly but I bet you’ve never seen a donkey fly!]. As Donkey flies up higher, gliding among the treetops, the visual humour is clear in both versions of the film and his cheeky declaration, while not directly translated, retains the same form and meaning in the target text as that of the original text. Before concluding our overview of Donkey’s first appearance in the film, it is worth noting that the words “You ain’t never seen” are an example of the character’s language and use of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) as discussed in the previous chapter – a characteristic strategy

used for added humorous effect in the original English dialogue but not a strategy that is carried through in the target Portuguese text.

Extract Three – Shrek and Donkey meet for the first time

“Oh-oh” captures the end of Donkey’s soaring moment as the pixie dust effect runs out and Donkey escapes into a forest. The first of many visual humour examples through Donkey’s character, his clumsiness and less-than-graceful movements are in fine form here as, chased by the guards from the previous scene, he bumps head-first into Shrek’s behind – also marking the moment the story’s hero meets his trusty sidekick, soon-to-be travelling companion and best mate. Completely unaware of what was happening in the forest beyond his “Keep Out!” signs, Shrek stops putting up yet *another* sign and glares down at Donkey until the soldiers, coming to an abrupt stop, get his attention by calling out: “You there! Ogre!” Shrek responds with a Scottish “Aye?” and the Captain of the Guards, audibly nervous, proceeds to read the following as he unravels a scroll:

“By the order of lord Farquaad, I am authorized to place you both under arrest and transport you to a designated [pause] resettlement facility.”

Reading this decree from the “F” – letter emblazoned scroll evokes both a situational and visual frame for the dual audience. A more mature viewer will link this with a medieval context, familiar with scrolls as a form of communication to pass on important messages or updates, particularly from royalty, or government. At the same time, a younger viewer may associate the moment with the likes of fairytales such as *Cinderella*, *Sleeping Beauty* and *The Frog Prince* to name but a few well-known and timeless tales showing royal decrees, news and invites to palaces on emblazoned scrolls at some point in the story.

The soldiers, who seconds before were bravely chasing Donkey, are now fearful facing Shrek and the humour of this is exaggerated when Shrek sarcastically asks the Captain, “Oh really? You and what army?” – the other soldiers having deserted the scene, abandoning weapons in mid-air. This logical mechanism is a clear example of incongruity as soldiers are expected to be fearless, stick together and definitely not abandon their unit, mission or mandate. At this point, it is worthy to note that Shrek’s sarcasm has simply been translated as “Tu e mais quem?” [You and who else?]. The irony and wordplay employed as a humour

device in the original English dialogue is not carried through to the Portuguese. Furthermore, the connotations associated with the words “designated resettlement facility” in the Captain’s declaration (understood by a more mature viewer) are completely lost in the Portuguese text. This expression has been translated as “reajuntamento provisório” [interim or temporary housing]. The translation neither conveys the ‘forced move’ implication nor the associated connotation carried through in such a situational frame for the older viewer.

In my earlier discussion of Shrek and Donkey as individual characters, we considered how their accents (Shrek’s Scottish Brogue and Donkey’s African American Vernacular English, AAVE) play a significant role in defining these key characters. In the exchange for this extract, we also see how their language characteristics and narrative strategy add to the humour through incongruity, target and script opposition. After throwing his hands up and whimpering, the remaining soldier runs away, leaving Shrek alone – or so Shrek thinks. In the dialogue in this scene, the viewer sees the first of many interactions between Shrek and Donkey where much of the humour is conveyed through their conversation – Shrek’s utterances typically short and to the point, “Oh that’s great. Really” while Donkey chatters away, often digressing beyond the current subject matter, “Just like the time [mumbles because Shrek holds his mouth closed] that I ate some rotten berries. I had some strong gases eeking outta my butt that day”.

The interaction above draws on multiple frames, incongruities, narrative strategies and targets to create humour. For starters, young or not, the viewer’s notion of complimenting someone, trying to get to know someone and even being invited into someone’s home as separate situational frames are essentially distorted as they overlap while the two characters walk from their initial meeting point in the forest to Shrek’s home. The humour in this scene lies significantly in the incongruity that Donkey is not afraid of Shrek. Originally reinforced in the opening scene as previously discussed, the viewer’s prototypes of ogres as beastly, scary monsters are now modified through Donkey as he shows no fear of Shrek, refuses to leave him alone and reads but ignores the “Beware Ogre!” and “Stay Out!” painted signs as he follows Shrek down to Shrek’s swamp home and tries to get to know him,

{Donkey} – “Man, I like you. What’s your name?”

Shrek, on the other hand, tries to reinforce the notion of frightening, unclean and brute ogre by roaring at Donkey and declaring:

“Listen little donkey. Take a look at me. What am I? I’m an ogre. You know, “grab your torch and pitchforks”. Doesn’t that bother you?”

{Donkey} – Nope.

{Shrek} – Really?

{Donkey} – Really, really.

{Shrek} – Oh.

Visually, Donkey’s facial expressions and funny faces as well as his ignorance at Shrek trying to dismiss him all make for Shrek’s all make for straightforward sight gags and humorous moments. Throughout the film, Shrek’s visible annoyance at Donkey’s chatter, singing and presence in general add to this humour.

Donkey’s compliment to Shrek, “Listen you was really, really, really somethin’ back there, Incredible!” – using “was” instead of “were” and therefore interrupting concord agreement between subject and verb according to Standard English grammar is a distinct feature of AAVE. This comment is either ignored or not heard by Shrek who has already started walking away from the spot where Donkey originally bumped into him. The fact that Shrek literally catches a fright at Donkey speaking to him, nearly trips over Donkey and does not thank him for the compliment (at any point) encourages a humorous reaction from the viewer; “Are you talking to me?” Through Shrek’s reaction, we’re already seeing the narrative strategy turned upside-down through unexpected occurrences and opposing frames. One typically shows appreciation at receiving a compliment instead of surprise at being spoken to in the first place!

Although the Portuguese version maintains the same incongruity and modification of these social frames and prototypes, it is worth noting that Donkey’s original compliment has simply been translated as: “Foste super, super, super genial! Incrível!” [You were super, super, super great! Incredible!] – Donkey’s Portuguese utterance is 100% grammatically correct but the text-type and social frames evoked through Donkey’s AAVE characteristics and any subsequent humorous effect are entirely lost on the target text viewer. Donkey’s continued appreciation of Shrek also shows the translators employing different strategies in the target text.

{Donkey} – Yes. I was talkin' to you. Can I tell you that you that you was great back here? Those guards! They thought they was all of that. Then you showed up, and bam! They was trippin' over themselves like babes in the woods. That really made me feel good to see that.
{Shrek} – Oh, that's great. Really.

The expression 'to be all of that' implies someone thinking s/he is superior while 'babes in the woods' refers to a person's naiveté or lack of experience and preparedness to do well in a situation. Donkey's language openly mocks the soldiers who ran away frightened by Shrek. While the mocking tone may be perceived, these same text-type frames won't necessarily be understood by a younger viewer. The Portuguese translation, "Até se passaram a tropeçar a torto e a direito. Altamente adorei aquela cena!" has conveyed the mockery, humour and Donkey's appreciation of Shrek through Donkey's tone and his indication that the soldiers were so 'dumbstruck they were tripping left, right and centre' and he really adored that scene.

Shrek's sarcasm, disdain and tone as humorous devices come through clearly in utterances such as "Oh, that's great. Really."; "Now, why don't you go celebrate your freedom with your own friends, hmmm?" and "Well, it's no wonder you don't have any friends." Oscar Wilde once wrote that "sarcasm is the lowest form of wit but the highest form of intelligence". Shrek's use of sarcasm could be considered as adding to the dialogue's humour load because ogres are not thought to be intelligent and Donkey either ignores the sarcasm or simply doesn't let it affect him. He responds to Shrek by telling him, "But, uh, I don't have any friends" and "Wow! Only a true friend would be that cruelly honest." Of course, Donkey's unexpected responses, amusing as they may be for the viewer, only annoy Shrek further. He literally continues walking away from Donkey, trying not to engage further, roars at Donkey and even picks him up by his ears and tail to forcefully remove him from the path. Shrek's hostility and annoyance are played out as sarcasm to create humour and this same strategy is mirrored in the resulting target text:

Shrek's Original English utterance	Shrek's Translated Portuguese utterance	Back translation
Oh, that's great. Really.	Ainda bem, Que fixe!	[Oh good. How cool!]
Now, why don't you go celebrate your freedom with your own friends, hmmm?	Então porque não vais celebrar essa liberdade com os teus amigos?Hmmm?	[So why don't you go celebrate with your friends? Hmmm?]
Well, it's no wonder you don't have any friends.	Bodes! Não admira que não tenhas amigos!	[Goodness, no wonder you don't have friends.]

Once again, it is important to note that with specific reference to the Portuguese dialogue, the characters' accents as defining features of humour and subsequent generic frames have not been carried through to the target text and therefore any related nuances of humour are lost in translation.

When Shrek roars at Donkey trying to scare him away, Donkey just stares at him unwavering and then bluntly says:

“Oh Wow! That was really scary. If you don't mind me sayin' if that don't work, your breath will certainly get the job done, 'cause you definitely need some Tic Tacs or something 'cause your breath stinks!”

Tic Tacs are a brand of small, hard sweets commonly used as breath fresheners. Donkey has literally just met Shrek yet he is being very direct in telling Shrek his breath smells! The Portuguese dialogue takes it one step further: although “Tic Tacs” has been replaced by “rebuçados” [sweets], in the Portuguese dialogue Donkey even suggests Shrek should go to the dentist! This addition to the translated text adds to the humour and exaggerates Donkey's distortion of the situational frame associated with meeting someone and getting to know him/her.

Looking down at a swamp, Donkey figuratively puts his foot in it as he criticises what he sees, not knowing that's actually where Shrek lives. This verbal *faux pas* will encourage laughter from an adult viewer – fully understanding the situational frame of inadvertently causing trouble for oneself by saying something out of turn. Given the opening scene and

Shrek's strong attachment to his little corner of the world, the audience already knows Donkey has hit a nerve – Shrek's reaction tells it all in this example of a visual frame:

“Whoo! Look at that. Who'd want to live in a place like that?” to which Shrek responds “that would be my home.”

The notion of *home* evokes more than just a place to live; it carries connotations of warmth, comfort and belonging. In Portuguese, the same lines have been translated as:

{Donkey} – “Mmm, olha lá pr'aquilo. Quem é que consegue numa coisa daquelas?”
[Mmm, look at that. Who can live in a thing like that?]
{Shrek} – “Aquela coisa é aonde eu moro” [That *thing* is where I live].

In this case, the Portuguese dialogue leaves Shrek reiterating Donkey's use of the word “thing” and therefore not carrying the same connotations, or visual frames, as the use of the word “home” in the source language. However, Shrek's tone conveys his disdain for Donkey's opinion so although the visual frame is not necessarily recreated in the translation, his tone conveys his sense of belonging and protection of where he lives.

By this point it is becoming clear that Donkey is a significant driving force of both visual and verbal humour in the film. Trying to backpedal and show a complete change in opinion, Donkey now compliments Shrek and the swamp:

{Donkey} – Oh! And it is lovely! Just beautiful. You know you are quite a decorator. It's amazing what you've done with such a modest budget. I like that boulder. That is a nice boulder.

Once again, encompassing the essence of incongruence, Shrek completely ignores Donkey's compliment and continues marching down the hill towards home. Donkey follows suit, still trying to compensate for his original insult and even complimenting the boulder he sees along the path – who looks at and compliments a big rock! The flattery in Donkey's line “You know you are quite the decorator. It's amazing what you've done on such a modest budget!” evokes a situational frame for the adult viewer – a child won't necessarily understand the concepts of real estate, home décor and budgeting. Donkey's continued chattering and attempt at making small talk is ignored by Shrek. The target of the humour in Donkey trying to bond with Shrek is highlighted when Donkey just does not seem to grasp that Shrek is not interested in engaging with him. Continuing the pattern of irony, Donkey's

remark “Like I hate it when you got somebody in your face. You’re trying to give them a hint and they won’t leave. There’s that awkward silence you know” – there literally is an awkward silence as the target of the humour at this point and for a moment it appears Donkey finally gets the irony that he is the one being given a hint. Then he flips the humour and incongruence switch once again by asking and begging to stay with Shrek. Flouting the social and situational frames of what to do as a guest in someone’s home, Donkey immediately jumps up onto Shrek’s comfy chair and makes himself right at home declaring, “This is gonna be fun! We can stay up late, swappin’ manly stories, and in the mornin’ I’m makin’ waffles”.

This particular scene really highlights Donkey and Shrek’s relationship where Shrek will be the reserved, uncommunicative party while Donkey chatters on, making small talk and usually annoying Shrek. These same elements are not lost in the Portuguese dialogue but Donkey’s declaration that he’ll make “waffles” has been translated as “torradas” [toast] – not quite the same culinary delight Donkey aims for in English but still a reference to something commonly served for breakfast. The fact that Donkey clearly does not see Shrek as an ogre even lies in his amusing suggestion of “waffles” – Shrek’s earlier dinner showed eyeballs as olive stand-ins for his martini and a slug with a side of slime as his meal so waffles may not really be his first choice for a bite to eat! Even in this first encounter, Donkey is trying to create a shared bond or sense of masculine solidarity with Shrek and develop a friendship – once again reinforcing but at the same time distorting the social and situational frames associated with trying to get to know someone. The logical mechanism of continuous incongruity throughout this scene and many others makes the humorous load significant and this humour is retained throughout the translation process.

Extract Four – Introduction of lord Farquaad as he interrogates Gingy and talks to the Magic Mirror

The scene selected in this extract marks the audience’s first encounter with lord Farquaad – the film’s villain. It is worth noting how this particular character is introduced to the viewer: low camera angles, focusing on his marching feet and shadows of his upper body, accompanied by sinister backing music, create the perception that who we are about to meet is someone big, imposing and menacing. In reality, he turns out to be extremely short – a

feature that Shrek and Donkey both mock later in the film, as shown by the following examples:

{Shrek – turning to Fiona} – Let me put it this way: Men of Farquaad’s stature are in short supply.

Donkey, once Fiona has seen lord Farquaad’s imposing castle in the distance, tells her “You know, Shrek thinks lord Farquaad’s compensating for something, which I think means he has a really little---”

As previously stated, lord Farquaad’s height can be considered a parody of the power he thinks he has. Interestingly, the viewer’s first sighting of him is in sharp contrast to that of Shrek and Donkey first appearances – carefree, jovial and full of light and colour.

In this particular scene, lord Farquaad marches into a room and interrogates Gingy, the fairytale Gingerbread Man, before meeting the Magic Mirror and choosing an eligible bachelorette to marry and make himself king of Duloc (the castle and surrounds in which he lives). Gingy is a tough cookie to break and when lord Farquaad enters the room, he is already being tortured in a mockery of an interrogation room with harsh lighting and a damp, cold atmosphere. He resists all questions and is consequently threatened with drowning in a glass of milk, losing his favourite possessions ‘the gumdrop buttons’, “No, no, not the buttons. Not my gumdrop buttons!” and having his legs broken. Both children and adults will laugh at this, possibly remembering fondly how they used to “torture” gingerbread cookies, breaking them apart, piece by piece and eating them – often starting with the gumdrop buttons! Applying the notion of frame semantics to this character, one sees an example of metaphoric mapping as the audience maps the frame of a cookie, something inanimate, onto that of something animate, with eyes, a nose and mouth, a sentient being with feeling and awareness who is being tortured by lord Farquaad, a man who ironically thinks he has more power and dominance than what reality reflects.

Once in the interrogation room with Gingy who has just been dunked in a glass of milk – a parody of the torture technique of having someone’s head drenched in water – lord Farquaad continues Gingy’s torture. This is significantly strong in black humour as lord Farquaad mocks and intimidates Gingy who lies helplessly on a baking tray surrounded by baking utensils, the instruments of his torture. Lord Farquaad literally crumbles one of Gingy’s legs and taunts Gingy, “Run, run, run as fast as you can. You can’t catch me. I’m the Gingerbread

Man”. These three sentences allude to the folktale entitled *The Gingerbread Man* (also known as *The Gingerbread Boy*) which first appeared in print in 1875 and, like many folktales, relied on repetition for effect. In the version printed in 1875, the reader is told the tale of an old woman who bakes a gingerbread man who then leaps from the oven and runs away, taunting:

“I’ve run away from a little old woman,
A little old man,
And I can run away from you, I can! I can!
Run, run, run as fast as you can
You can’t catch me, I’m the Gingerbread Man!”

The tale eventually ends when the Gingerbread Man is snatched up by a fox. According to legend, while being devoured by the fox, the Gingerbread Man cried out “I’m quarter gone...I’m half gone...I’m three quarters gone...I’m all gone!”

Calling lord Farquaad “a monster”, Gingy spits milk at him and rebelliously says “Eat me!” – humour being conveyed through this pun because Gingy is literally a biscuit therefore completely edible however, this idiomatic expression also conveys Gingy’s contempt or defiance and his attempt at telling off lord Farquaad. Additional humour is created through the next utterances in reference to the Muffin man, the character from a well-known traditional British children’s nursery rhyme, who lives on Drury Lane, a popular street in eastern London. Although the characters appear unaware that they are reciting verse, part of the initial dialogue in this scene follows the popular rhyme, almost word for word and reinforces and confirms a social and text-type frame the dual audience may already have from childhood. The repetition of “the Muffin Man” in the scene reflects the repetition in the actual nursery rhyme:

“Do you know the Muffin Man?
The Muffin Man, the Muffin Man.
Do you know the Muffin Man,
Who lives on Drury Lane.
Yes, I know the Muffin Man,
The Muffin Man, the Muffin Man.
Yes, I know the Muffin Man,
Who lives on Drury Lane.”

The Muffin Man later appears as a character in the movie’s sequels, as Gingy’s creator and helper, showing his home near a signpost for ‘Drury Lane’. In this particular scene, the Muffin Man and his ‘wife’ becomes lord Farquaad’s targets as so it is amusing that a

gingerbread cookie would be threatened with torture. Further irony and humour lies in the fact that lord Farquaad thinks Gingy has revealed the hideaway for the “others” from the “fairytale trash” he believes are ruining his world.

Lord Farquaad’s conversation with Gingy is interrupted by soldiers bursting into the room, exclaiming “My lord! We found it!” With this, the narrative strategy and situation of the interrogation scene then shifts its focus from a somewhat serious atmosphere to a satirical view of meeting one’s future spouse. Taking a break from torturing Gingy, lord Farquaad has an amusing conversation with the Magic Mirror which audiences will remember from the childhood favourite, *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*. Unlike the sober and always truthful mystical object character featured in *Snow White*, this Magic Mirror takes on the role of a cheerful, tongue-in-cheek game show host with expressions such as “Although she lives with seven men, she’s not easy”; Find out what a live wire she is” and “fiery redhead [...] she’s a loaded pistol.” Here in *Shrek*, the Magic Mirror is consequently adapted to this game show context with its own details and allusions thereby allowing the audience, both young and old, to modify an already existing frame and establish a new connection between certain frames and notions.

“Mirror, mirror on the wall. Is this not the most perfect kingdom of them all?” This sentence, spoken by lord Farquaad, alludes to the original line in *Snow White*’s fairytale, where the Evil Queen asks, “Mirror, mirror on the wall. Who is the fairest of them all?” (or “Mirror, mirror in my hand. Who is the fairest in the land?” for versions where the Magic Mirror is a handheld, not hanging piece). Interestingly, lord Farquaad varies the question to refer to his kingdom rather than his appearance. In the original fairytale, the Magic Mirror typically agrees with the Evil Queen, responding with “My queen, you are the fairest one of all it is true.” In *Shrek* however, in keeping with the twist on fairytales, facing lord Farquaad, the Magic Mirror’s response is clear incongruity as he tells lord Farquaad “Well, technically you’re not a king.” Add in the shot of Thelonius (one of Gingy’s torturers) smashing a handheld mirror and the Magic Mirror completes the humorous exchange by looking worried and hastily correcting himself, thereby launching into the ‘game show’ parody section of this scene.

Focusing on the choice of a possible wife for lord Farquaad, this scene resembles a US-syndicated game show, *The Dating Game*, which ran from the 1960s to the 1980s. The show

was a contest in which a bachelorette would typically view and question three bachelors who were hidden from her view. By the end of the show the bachelorette would choose one of the three bachelors to go on a date with her, paid for by the show. A visual parody of the show, flowers identical to those on the logo for *The Dating Game*, appear as the background to the Magic Mirror's bachelorette's presentation. In addition, humour is created for a more mature audience through frame-based modification as a frame the audience may already have becomes distorted, consequently resulting in the creation of a new frame: *Shrek* creators changed the original frame by having a bachelor viewing three bachelorettes instead. In addition, he doesn't ask them anything, all biographical information is provided by the blunt and quirky Magic Mirror:

So, just sit back and relax, my lord, because it's time for you to meet today's eligible bachelorettes. And here they are!

Bachelorette number one is a mentally abused shut-in from a kingdom far, far away. She likes sushi and hot tubbing anytime. Her hobbies include cooking and cleaning for her two evil sisters. Please welcome Cinderella.

Bachelorette number two is a cape-wearing girl from the land of fancy. Although she lives with seven other men, she's not easy. Just kiss her dead, frozen lips and find out what a live wire she is. Come on. Give it up for Snow White!

And last, but certainly not least, bachelorette number three is a fiery redhead from a dragon-guarded castle surrounded by hot boiling lava! But don't let that cool you off. She's a loaded pistol who likes pina coladas and getting caught in the rain. Yours for the rescuing, Princess Fiona!

So will it be bachelorette number one, bachelorette number two or bachelorette number three?

In introducing Cinderella and Snow White, the visual frames on screen reinforce those the viewer knows well: Cinderella cleaning before appearing in a gown and about to step into a glass slipper. Snow White is shown lying dead still in a glass box in the forest – fairytale-savvy viewers will know this is how Prince Charming eventually finds her before he kisses her and she awakens and the spell is broken. The last bachelorette however is shown differently by the Magic Mirror: she appears almost 3-dimensional in the mirror and her world interacts with the world in *Shrek*. For example, lord Farquaad cowers and withdraws his face from the heat of the lava and the dragon's fire displayed when the Magic Mirror introduces Princess Fiona – an unexpected sight gag because lord Farquaad might not be as brave as makes himself out to be after all. In fact, as a final poking fun at the game show,

lord Farquaad's soldiers help him make a choice between the three bachelorettes – mimicking the interaction a contestant typically has with the audience to help on a game show.

The first two bachelorettes are examples of reinforced frames as they are direct references to the well-known fairytale characters, Cinderella and Snow White, while the third one, “a fiery redhead from a dragon-guarded castle” could possibly be linked to Rapunzel but no direct reference is made. An adult, or more mature viewer, will be amused by Fiona who “likes pina coladas and getting caught in the rain” – a direct quote from the 1979 song by Rupert Holmes. The viewer's social frame of this song is further reinforced when the song is played as the backing track once lord Farquaad chooses Princess Fiona as his desired bachelorette.

When we consider this same scene in the Portuguese dialogue version of the film, it is significant to note that several elements have been changed in the translated target text. Firstly, where the English Gingy says “Eat me!” to his torturer, the Portuguese version tells lord Farquaad “vai comer bolachas!” [go eat biscuits!] – a rather polite way of telling someone off in Portuguese. The Muffin Man is a foreign concept to Portuguese audiences so his mention has been adapted to “O Homem QueQue qui vive na pastelaria” [the cake man who lives in the bakery]. The word *QueQue* (phonetically pronounced like the English word *cake*) literally refers to a small soft cake made from the basic ingredients of flour, butter, sugar and eggs. At this point in the original English text, if the viewer is familiar with the intertextual link to the British nursery rhyme, it is clear that Gingy has not revealed the location for the “others” – instead he's just recited rhyme. However, the target text does not convey the same allusion therefore the Portuguese viewer is left like lord Farquaad, trying to make sense of what Gingy has said.

Although the Magic Mirror formally addresses lord Farquaad by his title in Portuguese, he continues to address him the second person singular subject pronoun “tu” [you] – the less formal term of address, typically reserved for use between friends, addressing children or once a certain level of comfort and rapport have been reached. For discourses involving authority, strangers or seniority, the more formal “você”, the second person plural subject pronoun should be used. Here, the Magic Mirror has literally just met lord Farquaad and should be subservient to him yet he flouts his status through his various references to lord Farquaad as “tu”. This translation strategy could be to ensure a more accessible text for the

younger viewer. Alternatively, it could also be a satirical device to mock lord Farquaad and therefore understood by the more mature viewer who will grasp the sense of disrespect implied when one uses the incorrect form of address in Portuguese culture.

The game show adaptation in the Portuguese text is close to the English original and when introducing the three bachelorettes, the Portuguese dialogue has retained the Magic Mirror's tongue-in-cheek tone and original English meaning for the most part. The original source language, in describing each bachelorette, contains certain expressions whose (suggestive) humour is best understood by a more mature viewer. For example, "she likes sushi and hot tubbing any time"; just kiss her dead, frozen lips and find out what a live wire she is" and "don't let that cool you off, she's a loaded pistol". The Portuguese translations do not contain the same suggestive/ connotative meaning so the non-English speaking viewer hears a 'factual' description of each bachelorette. A clear example of this would be in Snow White's description, "although she lives with seven other men, she's not easy!" As an English expression, referring to a woman as easy conveys a certain sexual connotation and implies promiscuity. This same line, translated directly in the Portuguese target text, does not carry the same connotation. Rather, the direct translation "*ela vive com sete homens mas não é uma mulher fácil*" implies this bachelorette is a complex and difficult person.

The references to the Rupert Holmes song mentioned in the source language dialogue, "she likes piña colada and getting caught in the rain", are directly translated in the Portuguese. In addition, the song as a backing track to Princess Fiona has been removed in the Portuguese version of the film. as a result, the humour implied by the reference is not reinforced for the Portuguese viewer. In fact, since the translation is so direct and no alternative strategies were employed, the reference overall is lost in the translation.

In an interview with one of the film's directors, Vicky Jensen stated that the scene discussed above "is one of those sequences that really sets the type of humour that we did. Everyone contributed to this sequence by sitting around and giving ideas". This collaboration contributed to several discourses in this scene: *The Dating Game* show parody as discussed previously, the description of each bachelorette – including the undesirable qualities such as 'mentally abused shut-in'; dead, frozen lips" and "dragon-guarded castle" – and finally ending with lord Farquaad choosing Fiona as his wife-to-be. He completely ignores the Magic Mirror's warning of "the little thing that happens at night [...] after sunset" and

decides to host a tournament to find someone who will rescue Fiona on his behalf – ironic as he is meant to rescue her himself. This irony may however be considered as reinforcing the notion that Shrek parodies traditional fairytales- unlike those frames where Prince Charming typically finds and rescues the damsel in distress, lord Farquaad will have someone do the rescuing for him.

The *Language* contained in the original is clear enough for the audience to understand and translators have maintained that level in the Portuguese version, also maintaining the originally clear and simple *Narrative Strategy* and structure of the original text. The *Situation* is understood by both the source and target audiences: it is a mock interrogation followed by a reference to a game show in which one of the characters chooses between three female figures to have as his wife and make him king of the land. Although a young audience may not grasp the link to the above-mentioned 1960's game show, the humour is not entirely lost as the movie's creators brought in the references to popular fairytale maidens. The different elements reflecting the scene's *Script Opposition* with frames being modified, reinforced or even created have been maintained in the translation with the exception of "the Muffin Man" – unknown to a Portuguese audience and consequently changed completely in the translation. This sequence alone in both versions contains repetition, intertextuality on varying levels and mockery and can be considered amusing for both child and adult even though adaptations have been made to the Portuguese version.

Extract Five – Shrek and Donkey arrive in Duloc and embark on a quest

Spotting a parking lot sign stating "You are parked in Lancelot", a textual allusion evoking the generic frame related to the tale of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table, Shrek and Donkey find Duloc where Shrek is determined to find lord Farquaad and reclaim his swamp, minus all the fairytale creatures that were dumped there. His initial sighting of Duloc contains elements of humour best understood by a more mature viewer: looking at the height of lord Farquaad's castle as it towers over Duloc (the camera panning up to emphasise the imposing height), Shrek laughs and says to Donkey, "So that must be lord Farquaad's castle. Do you think maybe he's compensating for something?" To which Donkey looks at Shrek and back at Duloc, a quizzical expression crossing his face. For the viewer, the dramatic irony in knowing lord Farquaad's height (not yet known to Shrek) is already an amusing moment. However, taking this one step further into adult humour, the humour load

increases significantly with a situational frame: the idiomatic expression “to compensate for something” implies an attempt to offset something, to try and do well in one thing to make up for lacking in something else. In this case, “compensating for something” (accompanying the visual shot of the castle towering over them) also conveys phallic connotations and implies Shrek’s innuendo at lord Farquaad’s genital inadequacy.

Once inside the turnstile entrance, Shrek remarks on how quiet everything is. Spotting an information stand, Donkey pulls the lever near the sign and, resembling a cuckoo clock mechanism and associated visual frame of something popping out, a ticking sound is heard before the small doors open and little wooden figurines sing the following song:

*Welcome to Duloc such a perfect town
Here we have some rules
Let us lay them down
Don't make waves, stay in line
And we'll get along fine
Duloc is perfect place
Please keep off of the grass
Shine your shoes, wipe your... face
Duloc is, Duloc is
Duloc is perfect place*

Closely related to the tune of Disney’s “It’s a Small World”, the Welcome to Duloc song gives the rules and regulations for being in Duloc: “don’t make waves, stay in line [...] please keep off the grass, shine your shoes, wipe your...face”. The song is written and sung in rhyme with accompanying dance moves by the figurines. The line “wipe your...face” has clearly been altered because the obvious humour lies in the figurines facing away from the viewer and bending down, then slightly turn around to say “faces”, not the word that would otherwise have rhymed with “grass”. The pause just before “face” also hints at the intention to use an inappropriate word. The implied humour will be understood by a more mature viewer while a child watching this will appreciate the slapstick humour. The song ends, the figurines retreat, the doors shut once more and a shutter sound is heard: resembling the photos one gets at amusement parks, a photo slides out the side of the info stand, showing Shrek and Donkey’s comical expressions at having watched this little show. In true form, Donkey wants to watch it again even though, ironically the first time he initially cowered behind Shrek, not knowing what to expect at the ticking sound.

The Portuguese sequence of Shrek and Donkey arriving at Duloc conveys the same adult-oriented humour: Shrek's line "Do you think maybe he's compensating for something?" has been directly translated as "Achas que ele quer compensar com alguma coisa?" has been directly translated and literally conveys the same humour and innuendo as its source language equivalent, "Do you think he's compensating for something?" As for the Duloc *Welcome* song, this has mostly been directly translated into Portuguese, the target text just differing in two lines but the humour remaining fit for adults: "Please keep off the grass, shine your shoes, wipe your ...face" is sung as "E assim nós como tu, não sujemos o...chão" [and we, like you, won't dirty...the floor]. Accompanied by the same dancing figurines bending down with backs to the viewer, the same humour as the source text is implied without necessarily using the Portuguese term for 'bottom' and thereby still rendering a text appropriate for children. This dubbed translation functions in the corresponding narrative strategy in the Portuguese film as the words and phonetic features fit the melody of the song and are considered suitable for the film's dual audience.

Much of Shrek and Donkey's time in Duloc contains adult-oriented humour, the situation evoking situational and generic frames: following their amused reaction to the song, Shrek and Donkey head off in the direction of noise coming from trumpet fanfare. The ensuing scene shows Shrek meeting lord Farquaad, with the latter literally looking down at Shrek and Donkey beside him. Seconds later, Shrek is fighting several knights who are hoping to kill Shrek, win the tournament and rescue Princess Fiona. Interestingly, in line with his egotistical character, lord Farquaad states, "Some of you may die, but it's a sacrifice I'm willing to make". This allusion to speeches before battles is ironic as the quest is to gain Princess Fiona for him yet the knights may lose their lives in doing so. Once Shrek is spotted, lord Farquaad remarks "What is that? It's hideous!" to which Shrek replies, "Ah, that's not very nice. It's just a donkey". Shrek has completely missed the point that lord Farquaad was actually referring to him as hideous. Changing the game plan, lord Farquaad makes him the target of the tournament and as the knights come at him, Shrek casually asks "Can't we just settle this over a pint?" Directly referring to the mug of beer he is holding, Shrek's humour and this social frame will be understood by a more mature viewer – the concept of settling something over a drink should not be familiar to a child.

The subsequent fighting scene is rich in visual humour techniques and is made even more comical particularly through Donkey's fighting techniques. Shrek's general fighting moves

strongly resemble and reinforce the frame of a WWE (World Wrestling Entertainment) match – the parody including a fighting ring and use of a chair as a weapon. Children and adults alike will resonate with the situational frame implied by Donkey’s line “Hey Shrek, tag me! Tag me!” evoking memories and generic frames of the childhood playground game where being ‘tagged’ means you’re to turn to chase, or throw or, in this case, knock the knight unconscious. Shrek eventually wins and speaking directly to lord Farquaad, agrees to go on the quest to rescue Princess Fiona and in turn the “squatters” (i.e. fairytale creatures) will be removed from his swamp. Interestingly, the Portuguese text has translated “squatters” as “desalojados” [homeless] – the Portuguese term not necessarily conveying the connotations of illegal occupying of land as the English term.

After striking the deal with lord Farquaad, Shrek sets out on the quest with Donkey and the subsequent scene makes for a rich humorous load as the social frames of going on a road trip, bonding and meaningful conversations about feelings become the target of the humour. Starting up a conversation, for the first time since they have met Donkey reinforces the prototypes of ogres as mean beasts by asking Shrek why he didn’t “just pull some of that ogre stuff” on lord Farquaad. Donkey is already annoying Shrek by pointing out the obvious; they are in this quest to get something for lord Farquaad so Shrek can get back his swamp yet lord Farquaad’s the reason he does not have the swamp in the first place. Ask any child or adult and the truth is simple: (usually) no-one likes to be reminded of the obvious, especially in an unpleasant situation. In this case, Donkey’s reinforcement of the ogre stereotype evokes a highly sarcastic response from Shrek, replete with dark humour as he describes what he could have done to the entire village:

{Shrek} – Oh, I know what. Maybe I could have decapitated an entire village and put their heads on a pike, gotten a knife, cut open their spleen and drink their fluids. Does that sound good to you?

At this description, Donkey looks disgusted: his suggestion seconds earlier of “ogre stuff” not so appealing now. Shrek then goes on to say “there’s a lot more to ogres than people think” and states one of the film’s best-known lines, “ogres are like onions”. As with most of their interactions, Donkey is the driving force behind the humour and here he takes the simile literally:

{Donkey} – {Sniffs the onion Shrek is holding out} They stink?

{Shrek} – Yes - - No!

{Donkey} – They make you cry?

{Shrek} – No!

{Donkey} – You leave them in the sun, they get all brown, start sproutin' little white hairs.

Donkey's literal understanding of Shrek's figurative comparison exasperates Shrek to the point where Shrek even confuses himself in Donkey's yes/no questioning to the stereotypes of ogres smelling foul. What is meant to be a conversation about feelings, sincere and meaningful becomes amusing given Donkey's misunderstanding and literal viewpoint and this incongruence fuels Shrek's irritation with him. The yes/no question and answer technique as a narrative strategy ensures that the dialogue jumps back and forth rapidly: Donkey asking questions as independent phrases and Shrek answering with short, dependent responses. Donkey's literal understanding of Shrek's comparison presents a fair amount of visual frames, including another one of desserts when he thinks of 'cake' as a better alternative to 'onions'. Shrek's exasperation intensifies and Donkey's continued ignorance ensures this scene is amusing for a dual audience. In trying to cheer up Shrek, Donkey mentions "parfaits" as another comparison, referring to a frozen dessert made of fruit, eggs and whipped cream. In the Portuguese version of this scene, the translation has maintained the same narrative strategy of question/ answer to retain the humour and irony of the meaningful conversation getting twisted. However, as with the earlier reference to Tic Tacs not existing in Portuguese, the same is the case with "parfait". The Portuguese term "lampreia", a sweet treat made from eggs and often shaped like a miniature animal, has been used as a replacement for "parfait" thereby still retaining the essential meaning in the reference to a dessert and therefore still evoking a frame of something sweet in Donkey's comparison.

The "parfait" suggestion leads to Shrek's ultimate insult of Donkey, calling him "a dense, irritating miniature beast of burden". Despite Shrek's insult, Donkey does not leave him and a montage shows the two of them travelling across various landscapes under a sunset, starlit night and bright sunshine. The backing track, "I'm on my way" sung by The Proclaimers in a Scottish accent, is not translated in the Portuguese film – as is the case with the backing music and lyrics to the film's opening sequence. This is worth noting as the English song's lyrics and humour, and subsequent situational frames evoked in drawing upon this song for the trip that Shrek and Donkey embark on, is lost on the Portuguese viewer due to the lack of translation. The irony of using a song sung in a Scottish accent for the main character is also not conveyed in the Portuguese version of the film.

Conclusion and Suggestions for Further Research:

I introduced this study by describing my experience of watching *Shrek* as a child and again later as an adult, both experiences differing significantly in my understanding of the film's humour and themes. In outlining the film's plot, characters and international success, this study considered the skill behind the computer-generated animation process in an attempt to explain the success behind animation feature films and highlight *Shrek's* success as DreamWorks Animation's first release and the first of its kind in a growing genre of cinematography appealing to multiple audiences – both in age and language.

With the aim of clearly understanding the film's humour, this research report highlighted the myriad of humorous devices and techniques which form the core of the film's appeal to audiences of all ages: the film's humour is presented through visual techniques, wordplay, irony, sarcasm and parody as well as through intertextuality, song and rhyme. *Shrek's* characters drive the plot and themes as a modern-day fairytale with a twist through their language, interactions, relationships and incongruous reactions to their situations.

Günter Grass once defined translation as “that which transforms everything so that nothing changes” (cited in Pearson, 2013: 147) and this perspective is significant when we consider the translation of humour and whether or not the objective lies in the transference of meaning or direct structural equivalence. Given the complex nature, processes and aims in the translation of humour, in an attempt to understand this dynamic field of Translation Studies, this research report has explored translation as a practice as defined by two key approaches, namely: Mona Baker's perspective of Context and Contextualisation as well as the Relevance Theory of Communication originally presented by Sperber & Wilson.

Three approaches were considered in the objective to investigate the translation of humour: the General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH) as presented by Salvatore Attardo, Norm Acceptance/ Norm Opposition as defined by Dimitris Asimakoulas and finally, Frame Semantics as applied by Ana María Rojo López. These three theories, in particular the notion of frames, were drawn upon as a means to identify and examine the film's humorous

techniques in the original English Source Text and their subsequent translation in the dubbed Portuguese Target Text. This study applied a descriptive approach to translation, analysing the humorous devices semantically as they occurred throughout the selected scenes.

The scenes chosen for analysis were as a result of their significance in the film: either introducing key characters or driving the plot and considerably reflecting the aspects of humour discussed in the study's opening chapter: wordplay, intertextuality, songs and rhyme, irony and sarcasm as well as adult-oriented humour versus child-specific humour. As indicated in the preceding analysis chapter, in most instances the humour was retained throughout the translation and one can see that meaning, rather than structural equivalence, was maintained as the focus in the translation process. Puns and idiomatic expressions pose a significant challenge in translation and the case was no different with the translation of this film; however, in cases where wordplay was used to create misunderstanding, the original narrative strategy was translated into Portuguese and the same sense of incongruent humour was conveyed. In some instances, the Portuguese utterances employed wordplay and conveyed a different type of humour that was not present in the original Source Text; for example the Old Woman's address to Donkey as a "boneheaded dolt" in the scene where we first meet Donkey was translated as "seu burro idiota" [you idiotic donkey] – the term for 'donkey' in Portuguese is *burro* but the same lexical item can also refer to the quality of dim-witted. Throughout the analyses scenes, whether the translation of the humorous load has been through direct meaning or structural equivalence, the underlying themes of intertextuality, parody and a fairytale with a twist have been conveyed through the characters, their actions and relationships. As discussed, the characters' respective accents play a distinct role in the development and characterisation of each leading character. Mike Myers chose to voice Shrek's character with a Scottish accent; Eddie Murphy adopted the African American Vernacular English (AAVE) dialect to voice Donkey and John Lithgow presents lord Farquaad using a very clear Standard English variety known as Received Pronunciation (RP). These accent and dialect choices were not carried through in the film's Portuguese dubbed dialogue and I believe any humour associated with the respective accent or dialect in the original Source Text has been lost in the translation to the resulting Target Text.

At the start of the preceding analysis chapter, I specifically noted that this study considers the dubbed version of the Portuguese movie and does not focus on the film's subtitling

feature. There is a great deal to examine when considering subtitles and their subsequent translation as well as a comparison between the dubbed dialogue versus the subtitled dialogue of a film. As a result, I would suggest examining the dubbed Portuguese dialogue and the Portuguese subtitles and drawing a comparison between these two forms of communication as contrasted with the original English film's utterances. With specific reference to the film's humour, one could consider evaluating the translation of humour, if and how it differs between the dubbed version and the subtitled feature.

This report has aimed to investigate the strategies adopted in the translation of humour as depicted in the full-length computer-animated feature film *Shrek*. This movie is just one of many films in the animation genre of cinematography – a genre that has grown considerably over the last two decades with an increased number of computer-generated animation feature films. One of the genre's most successful aspects (reflected strongly in *Shrek*) lies in its critically acclaimed appeal to adults and children alike through a significant amount of verbal and visual humour elements. As previously discussed, humour is dynamic in nature, relying on context and the receiver's understanding of and response to the communication. In *Shrek*, further study could consider the response of children to the film's humour compared to that of an adult audience and contrast these findings with a study comparing different cultures since humour can be perceived differently across different cultures.

Whether to prove a point or simply out of curiosity, for decades scholars have been studying humour and translation across a myriad of media. This study has focused specifically on the audiovisual translation of one particular animation feature film and could be considered an introduction to further research within this field, applying the analysis approach to different film's translated languages and manifestation of humorous techniques. The translation of humour, parody and intertextuality within animation films is multi-faceted and this study has aimed to explore the strategies that may be adopted while retaining or transferring the humour in the Target Text.

Bibliography:

Primary sources:

- Film: Adamson, Andrew and Jenson, Vicky. 2001. *Shrek*. DreamWorks Animation
- Book: Steig, W. 1993. *Shrek!* New York: Farrar, Starus and Giroux.

Dictionaries consulted:

- *Dicionário de Inglês-Português 4.a Edição 2005*. Porto Editora: Porto
- *Reader's Digest Illustrated Oxford Dictionary*. 1998. Oxford University Press: Oxford

Literature sources:

Adamson, A. (2001). *Shrek: The Story behind the Screen*. California: PDI Dreamworks.

Venuti, L. 1992. *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London and New York: Routledge.

Asimakoulas, D. 2004. "Towards a Model of Describing Humour Translation: A Case Study." *Meta*, 49 (4): 822-842.

Asimakoulas, D. 2004. Towards a Model of Describing Humour Translation: A Case Study. *Meta*, 49 (4): 822-842

Assis, R. A. (2010). "Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS)". *Handbook of Translation Studies* 11:94-104.

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

Baker, M. 2005. "Contextualisation in Translator- and Interpreter-Mediated Events". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38 (2006), 321-337.

Barrier, M. 2003. *Hollywood Cartoons: American Animation in its Golden Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Billerey, R. *Translating Humour*: P.G. Wodehouse and French. URL accessed on 23 May 2018: <http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/grads/billerey/papers/humor.pdf>

Chiaro, D. 2005. "Verbally Expressed Humor and Translation: An Overview of a Neglected Field." *Humor: An International Journal of Humor Research*, 18-2:135-145.

Cholodenko, A. (ed.). 2007. *The Illusion of Life II: More Essays on Animation*. Sydney: Power Publications. Communication, 8 (2).

Dilley, R. 1999. *The Problem with Context*. New York: Berghahn Books

Fleischer, R. 2005. *Out of the Inkwell: Max Fleischer and the Animation Revolution*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Gehman, C. & Reinke, S. (ed.). 2005. *The Sharpest Point: Animation at the end of Cinema*. Toronto: YYZBooks.

Gutt, E. 1991. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Oxford: Blackwell

Hickey, L. 1998. *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

House, J. 2005. "Text and Context in Translation". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38 (2006), 338-358.

Hughes, A., Trudgill, P. & Watt, D. 2005. *English Accents and Dialects. An introduction to social and regional varieties of English in the British Isles*. London and New York: Hodder Arnold

Koenig, D. 2001. *Mouse Under Glass: Secrets of Disney Animation and Theme Parks*. California: Bonaventura Press.

Krikmann, A. 2006. "Contemporary Linguistic Theories of Humour" *Folklore: Electronic Journal of Folklore*. 33, 27-58.

Kussmaul, P. 1995. *Training the Translator*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

- López, A. 2002a. "Frame Semantics and the Translation of Humour." *Babel*, 48 (1):34-77.
- Lopez, A. 2002b. "Applying Frame Semantics to Translation: A Practical Example." *Meta* XLVII (3): 311-349.
- Nichols, J. 2006. "Countering Censorship: Edgar Dale and the Film Appreciation Movement". *Cinema Journal* 46 (1):3 – 22
- Nida, E. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill for the United Bible Societies.
- Nord, C. 1992. *Text Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a mode for translation-oriented text analysis*. Translated by C. Nord and P. Sparrow. Amsterdam: Rodopi
- Nord, C. 1997. *Translating as a purposeful activity*. Manchester: St Jerome
- Palmer, J. 1994. *Taking Humour Seriously*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Picken, C. 1983. *The Translator's Handbook*. London: Aslib
- Raphaelson-West, D. 1989. "The Feasibility and Strategies of Translating Humour." *Meta*, 34(1):128-141.
- Raskin, V. 1985. *Semantic Mechanisms of Humour*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Ross, A. 1998. *The Language of Humour*. London and New York: Routledge
- Shardakova, M. 2016. "American Learners' Comprehension of Russian Textual Humor." *The Modern Language Journal*. 100, 466-483.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. 1986. *Relevance, Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. 1988. "Representation and Relevance". In R.M. Kempson (ed.) *Mental Representations: The Interface between Language and Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ungerer, F. & Schmid, H.J. 1996. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman

Unger, J. & Sunderland, J. 2005. *Gendered Discourses in a Contemporary animated film: subversion and confirmation of gender stereotypes in Shrek*. Lancaster: Lancaster University Press.

Vandaele, J. (2002). "Humor Mechanisms in Film Comedy: Incongruity and Superiority". *Poetics Today*. 23, 221-249.

Young, T. 2007. "Towards a Humour Translation Checklist for Students of Translation." *Interlinguistica*, 17: 981-988

Zabalbeascoa, P. 2005. "Humor and Translation – An Interdisciplinary." *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 18-2:185-207.

Internet Sources:

- DreamWorks Animation – Shrek page, available at <https://www.dreamworksanimation.com/shrek/> (accessed December 15th, 2018).
- Shrek series update, available at <https://www.econotimes.com/Shrek-5-Release-Date-News-Update-Fifth-Movie-Coming-Out-in-2018-1449220> (accessed February 5th, 2019).
- Shrek financial earnings data, available at [Fuzzy Creatures vs. Green Ogre; 'Monsters, Inc.' and 'Shrek' Are Likely Foes for New Oscar](#)" written by Lyman Rick (November 21, 2012). The New York Times. (accessed March 13th, 2012).
- Merriam Webster Online Dictionary, available at <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ogre> (accessed November 29th, 2018).
- A Brief Overview of Humour Theories, <http://humortheory.com> ,(URL accessed repeatedly since 18 July 2018).

- Official Website for the Shrek Series, <http://www.shrek.com/main.php>, (URL accessed repeatedly since 15 November 2017).
- A Short History of Animation, <http://www.fi.edu/fellows/fellow5/may99/History/history.html> (URL accessed 12 August 2018).
- Do You Know the Muffin Man, <http://www.enchantedlearning.com/rhymes/Muffinman.shtml>, (URL accessed 16 December 2018).
- Magic Mirror, http://disney.wikia.com/wiki/Magic_Mirror (URL accessed 16 December 2018).
- Escape (The Pina Colada Song), <http://www.songfacts.com/detail.php?id=2896> (URL accessed 16 December 2018).
- The Dating Game, <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0058795/> URL accessed 16 December 2018.
- Animation Defined. Scala Media. <http://www.scala.com/definition/animation.html> , URL accessed on 23 November 2018.

Appendices:

- **Extract One – Film's opening sequence where the viewer meets Shrek**

{Man's voice narrating} Once upon a time there was a lovely princess. But she had an enchantment upon her of a fearful sort which could only be broken by love's first kiss. She was locked away in a castle guarded by a terrible fire-breathing dragon. Many brave knights had attempted to free her from this dreadful prison, but none prevailed. She waited in the dragon's keep in the highest room of the tallest tower for her true love and true love's first kiss.

{Laughing} Like that's ever gonna happen!

{Paper ripping, toilet flushes} What a load of ---

Somebody once told me the world is gonna roll me

I ain't the sharpest tool in the shed

She was looking kind of dumb with her finger and her thumb

In the shape of an "L" on her forehead

Well the years start coming and they don't stop coming

Fed to the rules and I hit the ground running

Didn't make sense not to live for fun

Your brain gets smart but your head gets dumb

So much to do, so much to see

So what's wrong with taking the back streets?

You'll never know if you don't go

You'll never shine if you don't glow

{Mirror shatters}

Hey now, you're an all-star, get your game on, go play

Hey now, you're a rock star, get the show on, get paid

And all that glitters is gold

Only shooting stars break the mould

It's a cool place and they say it gets colder

You're bundled up now, wait till you get older

But the meteor men beg to differ

Judging by the hole in the satellite picture

The ice we skate is getting pretty thin

The water's getting warm so you might as well swim

My world's on fire, how about yours?

That's the way I like it and I never get bored

Hey now, you're an all-star, get your game on, go play

Hey now, you're a rock star, get the show on, get paid

All that glitters is gold

Only shooting stars break the mould

{Shrek Burps}

Hey now, you're an all-star, get your game on, go play

Hey now, you're a rock star, get the show on, get paid

All that glitters is gold
Only shooting stars break the mould

{Village Man 1} – Think it's in there?

{Village Man 2} – Alright, let's get it!

{Village Man 3} – Whoa! Hold on. Do you know what that thing can do to you?

{Village Man 4} – Yeah, it'll grind your bones for its bread.

{Shrek Laughs} – Yes, well, actually, that would be a giant. Now, ogres - - They're much worse. They'll make a suit from your freshly peeled skin.

{Group of village men} – No!

{Shrek} – They'll shave your liver. Squeeze the jelly from your eyes! Actually, it's quite good on toast.

{Village Man 2} – Back! Back, beast! Back! I warn ya!

{Gasping}

{Shrek roars at group of village men}

{Group of village men screams in fear}

{Shrek continues roaring at group of village men}

{Shrek whispers} – This is the part where you run away.

{Village men gasp, drop all weapons and run away}

{Shrek laughs} – And stay out!

{Shrek laughs and reads a poster dropped by one of the village men}: "Wanted. Fairytale creatures."

{Shrek sighs and walks back to his swamp}

- **Extract Two – Scene showing the capturing of fairytale creatures where the viewer first meets Donkey**

{Man's voice} All right. This one's full. Take it away!

{Captain of the Guards } – Move it. Come on! Get up!

{One of the seven Dwarfs gasps}

{Captain of the Guards} – Next!

{Soldier}- Give me that! Your flying days are over.

{Captain of the Guards} – That's 20 pieces of silver for the witch. Next!

{Soldiers standing near wagon} – Get up! Come on!

{Captain of the Guards} – Twenty pieces.

{Thudding}

{Soldiers standing near wagon} – Sit down there! Keep quiet!

{Little bear crying} – This cage is too small.

{Donkey} – Please, don't turn me in. I'll never be stubborn again. I can change. Please! Give me another chance!

{Old woman} – Oh, shut up.

{Donkey} – Oh!

{Captain of the Guards} – Next! What have you got?

{Geppetto} – This little wooden puppet.

{Pinocchio} – I'm not a puppet. I'm a real boy.

{Captain of the Guards} – Five shillings for the possessed toy. Take it away.

{Pinocchio} – Father, please! Don't let them do this! Help me!

{Captain of the Guards} – Next! What have you got?

{Old woman} – Well, I've got a talking donkey.

{Captain of the Guards grunts} – Right. Well, that's good for ten shillings, if you can prove it.

{Old woman} – Oh, go ahead, little fella.

{Captain of the Guards grunts} – Well?

{Old woman} – Oh, oh, he's just - - He's just a little nervous. He's really quite a chatterbox. Talk, you boneheaded dolt - -

{Captain of the Guards} – That's it. I've heard enough. Guards!

{Old woman} – No, no, he talks! He does. {imitating ventriloquism} I can talk. I love to talk. I'm the talkingest damn thing you ever saw.

{Captain of the Guards grunts} – Get her out of my sight.

{Old woman} – No, no! I swear! Oh! He can talk!

{Old woman gasps as Donkey suddenly lifts off the ground}

{Donkey} – Hey! I can fly!

{Peter Pan} – He can fly!

{Three Little Pigs} – He can fly!

Captain of the Guards} – He can talk!

{Donkey} – Ha, ha! That's right, fool! Now I'm a flying, talking donkey. You might have seen a housefly, maybe even a superfly but I bet you ain't never seen a donkey fly. Ha, ha!

- **Extract Three – Shrek and Donkey meet for the first time**

{Donkey} – Oh-oh
 {Captain of the Guards} – Seize him!
 {Soldier} – After him! He's getting away!
 {Donkey grunts and gasps as he tries to run away}
 {Soldier} – Get him! This way! Turn!
 {Captain of the Guards} – You there. Ogre!
 {Shrek} – Aye?
 {Captain of the Guards} – By the order of lord Farquaad I am authorized to place you both under arrest and transport you to a designated..... resettlement facility.
 {Shrek} – Oh, really? You and what army?
 {Captain of the Guard looks behind him, gasps, whimpers and runs away}
 {Donkey chuckles}– Can I say something to you? Listen, you was really, really, really somethin' back here. Incredible!
 {Shrek} – Are you talkin' to - - me? Whoa!
 {Donkey} – Yes. I was talkin' to you. Can I tell you that you that you was great back here? Those guards! They thought they was all of that. Then you showed up, and bam! They was trippin' over themselves like babes in the woods. That really made me feel good to see that.
 {Shrek} – Oh, that's great. Really.
 {Donkey} – Man, it's good to be free.
 {Shrek} – Now, why don't you go celebrate your freedom with your own friends? Hmm?
 {Donkey} – But, uh, I don't have any friends. And I'm not goin' out there by myself. {looks back at the woods, a scared expression on his face} Hey, wait a minute! I got a great idea! I'll stick with you. You're a mean, green, fightin' machine. Together we'll scare the spit out of anybody that crosses us.
 {Shrek stops walking and roars in Donkey's face}
 {Donkey} – Oh, wow! That was really scary. If you don't mind me sayin', if that don't work, your breath certainly will get the job done, 'cause you definitely need some Tic Tacs or something, 'cause you breath stinks!
 You almost burned the hair outta my nose, just like the time - - {Donkey mumbles incoherently as Shrek holds his mouth shut} that I ate some rotten berries. I had strong gases eking out of my butt that day.
 {Shrek} – Why are you following me?
 {Donkey} – I'll tell you why. {Breaks out into a song and dance}

*'Cause I'm all alone
 There's no one here beside me
 My problems have all gone
 There's no one to deride me
 But you gotta have friends - -*

{Shrek} – Stop singing! It's no wonder you don't have any friends.
 {Donkey} – Wow. Only a true friend would be that cruelly honest.
 {Shrek} – Listen, little donkey. Take a look at me. What am I?
 {Donkey, looks Shrek up and down} – Uh - - Really tall?
 {Shrek} – No! I'm an ogre! You know. "Grab your torch and pitchforks." Doesn't that bother you?
 {Donkey} – Nope.

{Shrek} – Really?
 {Donkey} – Really, really.
 {Shrek} – Oh.
 {Donkey} – Man, I like you. What's your name?
 {Shrek} – Uh, Shrek.
 {Donkey} – Shrek? Well, you know what I like about you, Shrek? You got that kind of I-don't-care-what-nobody-thinks-of-me thing. I like that. I respect that, Shrek. You all right.
 {Looking down at Shrek's swamp} Whoo! Look at that. Who'd want to live in place like that?
 {Shrek} – That would be my home.
 {Donkey} – Oh! And it is lovely! Just beautiful. You know you are quite a decorator. It's amazing what you've done with such a modest budget. I like that boulder. That is a nice boulder. {Donkey walks down to the swamp with Shrek and along the way he sees some of Shrek's "Keep out!" signs}
 {Donkey} – I guess you don't entertain much, do you?
 {Shrek} – I like my privacy.
 {Donkey} – You know, I do too. That's another thing we have in common. Like I hate it when you got somebody in your face. You're trying to give them a hint, and they won't leave. There's that awkward silence.
 {Silence between Donkey and Shrek}
 {Donkey} – Can I stay with you?
 {Shrek} – Uh, what?
 {Donkey} – Can I stay with you, please?
 {Shrek} – Of course!
 {Donkey} – Really?
 {Shrek} – No.
 {Donkey} – Please! I don't wanna go back there! You don't know what it's like to be considered a freak. {Looks at Shrek} Well, maybe you do. But that's why we gotta stick together. You gotta let me stay! Please! Please!
 {Shrek} – Okay! Okay! But one night only.
 {Donkey} – Ah! Thank you! {Walks into Shrek's home and jumps onto the couch}
 {Shrek} – What are you - - No! No!
 {Donkey} – This is gonna be fun! We can stay up late, swappin' manly stories, and in the mornin' I'm makin' waffles.
 {Shrek frustrated} – Oh!
 {Donkey, looking around} – Where do, uh, I sleep?
 {Shrek} – Outside!
 {Donkey} – Oh, well. I guess that's cool. I mean, I don't know you, and you don't know me, so I guess outside is best, you know.
 {Donkey snuffles as he walks out of Shrek's house}
 {Donkey} – Here I go. Good night.
 {Shrek slams the door behind Donkey}
 {Donkey sighs} – I mean, I do like the outdoors. I'm a donkey. I was born outside. I'll just be sitting by myself outside, I guess, you know. By myself, outside.
 {Donkey curls up on the doorstep and starts singing}

I'm all alone

There's no one here beside me

- **Extract Four – Introduction of lord Farquaad as he interrogates Gingy and then talks to the Magic Mirror**

{Sound of grunts and whimpering}
 {lord Farquaad} – That’s enough. He's ready to talk.
 {Gingy coughing}
 {lord Farquaad laughing and clears throat for table to be lowered}
 {lord Farquaad} – Run, run, run, as fast as you can. You can't catch me. I'm the gingerbread man!
 {Gingy} – You are a monster.
 {lord Farquaad} – I'm not the monster here. You are. You and the rest of that fairytale trash, poisoning my perfect world. Now, tell me! Where are the others?
 {Gingy} – Eat me!
 {lord Farquaad} – I've tried to be fair to you creatures. Now my patience has reached its end! Tell me or I'll - -
 {Gingy} – No, no, not the buttons. Not my gumdrop buttons.
 {lord Farquaad} – All right then. Who's hiding them?
 {Gingy} – Okay, I'll tell you. Do you know the muffin man?
 {lord Farquaad} – The muffin man?
 {Gingy} – The muffin man.
 {lord Farquaad} – Yes, I know the muffin man, who lives on Drury Lane?
 {Gingy} – Well, she's married to the muffin man.
 {lord Farquaad} – The muffin man?
 {Gingy} – The muffin man!
 {lord Farquaad} – She's married to the muffin man.
 {Door opens and soldiers burst in}
 {Soldier} – My lord ! We found it!
 {lord Farquaad} – Then what are you waiting for? Bring it in.
 {Gingy} – Oh!
 {lord Farquaad} – Magic mirror - -
 {Gingy} – Don't tell him anything!
 {Gingy is thrown into a dustbin and whimpers} – No!
 {lord Farquaad} – Evening. Mirror, mirror on the wall. Is this not the most perfect kingdom of them all?
 {Magic Mirror} – Well, technically you're not a king.
 {lord Farquaad} – Uh, Thelonius.
 {Thelonius smashes a handheld mirror}
 {ord Farquaad} – You were saying?
 {Magic Mirror} – What I mean is, you're not a king yet. B-b-ut you can become one. All you have to do is marry a princess.
 {lord Farquaad} – Go on.
 {Magic Mirror Chuckles}– So, just sit back and relax, my lord , because it's time for you to meet today's eligible bachelorettes. And here they are!

Bachelorette number one is a mentally abused shut-in from a kingdom far, far away. She likes sushi and hot tubbing anytime. Her hobbies include cooking and cleaning for her two evil sisters. Please welcome Cinderella.

Bachelorette number two is a cape-wearing girl from the land of fancy. Although she lives with seven other men, she's not easy. Just kiss her dead, frozen lips and find out what a live wire she is. Come on. Give it up for Snow White!

And last, but certainly not least, bachelorette number three is a fiery redhead from a dragon-guarded castle surrounded by hot boiling lava! But don't let that cool you off. She's a loaded pistol who likes pina coladas and getting caught in the rain. Yours for the rescuing, Princess Fiona!

So will it be bachelorette number one, bachelorette number two or bachelorette number three?

{Three different soldiers} – Two! Two! Three! Three! Two! Two! Three!

{lord Farquaad} – Three? One? Three?

{Thelonius, holding up two fingers} – Three! Pick number three, my lord !

{lord Farquaad} – Okay, okay, uh, number three!

{Magic Mirror} – Lord Farquaad, you've chosen Princess Fiona.

If you like pina coladas

And getting caught in the rain

{lord Farquaad} – Princess Fiona.

If you're not into yoga

{lord Farquaad} – She's perfect. All I have to do is just find someone who can go ---

{Magic Mirror} – But I probably should mention the little thing that happens at night ---

{lord Farquaad} – I'll do it.

{Magic Mirror} Yes, but after sunset ---

{lord Farquaad} – Silence! I will make this Princess Fiona my queen, and Duloc will finally have the perfect king! Captain, assemble your finest men. We're going to have a tournament.

- **Extract Five – Shrek and Donkey arrive in Duloc and embark on a quest**

{Donkey} – But that's it. That's it right there. That's Duloc. I told ya I'd find it.
 {Shrek} – So, that must be lord Farquaad's castle.
 {Donkey} – Uh-huh. That's the place.
 {Shrek} – Do you think maybe he's compensating for something? {Laughs}
 {Donkey} – Hey, wait. Wait up, Shrek.
 {Townsperson running through the parking lot} – Hurry, darling. We're late. Hurry.
 {Shrek} – Hey, you!
 {Duloc mascot screams}
 {Shrek} – Wait a second. Look, I'm not gonna eat you. I just - - I just - -
 {Duloc mascot falls whimpering}
 {Shrek upon getting through the turnstile} – It's quiet. Too quiet.
 {The sound of a signpost creaking}
 {Shrek} – Where is everybody?
 {Donkey} – Hey, look at this!
 {Donkey pulls the lever next to the information stand and a ticking sound is heard}

*{Wooden figurines come out singing}
 Welcome to Duloc such a perfect town
 Here we have some rules
 Let us lay them down
 Don't make waves, stay in line
 And we'll get along fine
 Duloc is perfect place
 Please keep off of the grass
 Shine your shoes, wipe your... face
 Duloc is, Duloc is
 Duloc is perfect place*

{Camera shutter clicks
 {Whirring}
 {Donkey} – Wow! Let's do that again!
 {Shrek} – No. No. No, no, no! No.
 {Trumpet fanfare}
 {Crowd cheering}
 {lord Farquaad} – Brave knights. You are the best and brightest in all the land. Today one of you shall prove himself - -
 {Shrek} – All right. You're going the right way for a smacked bottom.
 {Donkey} – Sorry about that.
 {Crowd cheering as per instructions on giant flash cards}
 {lord Farquaad} – That champion shall have the honour - - no, no - - the privilege to go forth and rescue the lovely Princess Fiona from the fiery keep of the dragon. If for any reason the winner is unsuccessful, the first runner-up will take his place and so on and so forth. Some of you may die, but it's a sacrifice I am willing to make.
 {Crowd cheering as per instructions on giant flash cards}
 {lord Farquaad} – Let the tournament begin!
 {Everyone gasps}
 {lord Farquaad} – Oh! What is that? It's hideous!

{Shrek} – Ah, that's not very nice. It's just a donkey.
{lord Farquaad} – Indeed. Knights, new plan! The one who kills the ogre will be named champion! Have it him! Get him!
{Shrek} – Oh, hey! Now come on! Hang on now.
{lord Farquaad} – Go ahead! Get him!
{Shrek} – Can't we just settle this over a pint?
{Woman in crowd screams} – Kill the beast!
{Shrek} – No? All right then. Come on!

*I don't give a damn about my reputation
You're living in the past
It's a new generation
A girl can do what she wants to do
And that's what I'm gonna do
And I don't give a damn about my bad reputation
Oh, no, no, no, no, no. Not me
Me, me, me*

{Donkey} – Hey, Shrek, tag me! Tag me!

*And I don't give a damn about my bad reputation
Never said I wanted to improve my station*

{Shrek fighting and laughs as he takes down another knight} Ah!

*And I'm always feelin' good when I'm having fun
And I don't have to please no one*

{Woman in crowd screams} – The chair! Give him the chair!

*And I don't give a damn about my bad reputation
Oh, no, no, no, no, no. Not me
Me, me, me*

Oh, no, no, no, no, no. Not me, not me

{Bell dings}

{Crowd cheers}

{Shrek laughs} – Oh, yeah! Ah! Ah! Thank you! Thank you very much! I'm here till Thursday. Try the veal! Ha, ha!

{Shrek laughs}

{Crowd gasping, murmuring}

{Captain of the Guards}– Shall I give the order, sir? {i.e. kill Shrek}

{lord Farquaad} – No, I have a better idea. People of Duloc, I give you our champion!

{Shrek} – What?

{lord Farquaad} – Congratulations, ogre. You're won the honour of embarking on a great and noble quest.

{Shrek} – Quest? I'm already in a quest, a quest to get my swamp back.

{lord Farquaad} – Your swamp?

{Shrek} – Yeah, my swamp! Where you dumped those tale creatures!

{Crowd murmuring}

{lord Farquaad} – Indeed. All right, ogre. I'll make you a deal. Go on this quest for me, and I'll give you your swamp back.

{Shrek} – Exactly the way it was?

{lord Farquaad} – Down to the last slime-covered toadstool.

{Shrek} – And the squatters?

{lord Farquaad} – As good as gone.

{Shrek} – What kind of quest?

{After striking the deal with lord Farquaad, Shrek sets out on the quest with Donkey.}

{Donkey} – Let me get this straight. You're gonna go fight a dragon and rescue a princess just so Farquaad will give you back a swamp which you only don't have because he filled it full of freaks in the first place. Is that about right?

{Shrek} – Maybe there's a good reason donkeys shouldn't talk.

{Donkey} – I don't get it. Why don't you just pull some of that ogre stuff on him? Throttle him, lay siege to his fortress, grinds his bones to make your bread, the whole ogre trip.

{Shrek} – Oh, I know what. Maybe I could have decapitated an entire village and put their heads on a pike, gotten a knife, cut open their spleen and drink their fluids. Does that sound good to you?

{Donkey} – Uh, no, not really, no.

{Shrek} – For your information, there's a lot more to ogres than people think.

{Donkey} – Example?

{Shrek} – Example? Okay, um, ogres are like onions.

{Donkey} – {Sniffs the onion Shrek is holding out} They stink?

{Shrek} – Yes - - No!

{Donkey} – They make you cry?

{Shrek} – No!

{Donkey} – You leave them in the sun, they get all brown, start sproutin' little white hairs.

{Shrek} – No! Layers! Onions have layers. Ogres have layers! Onions have layers. You get it? We both have layers. {Sighs}

{Donkey} – Oh, you both have layers. Oh. {sniffs an onion Shrek dropped on the floor} You know, not everybody likes onions. Cake! Everybody loves cakes! Cakes have layers.

{Shrek} – I don't care... what everyone likes. Ogres are not like cakes.

{Donkey} – You know what else everybody likes? Parfaits. Have you ever met a person, you say, "Let's get some parfait," they say, "No, I don't like no parfait"? Parfaits are delicious.

{Shrek} – No! You dense, irritating, miniature beast of burden! Ogres are like onions! And of story. Bye-bye. See ya later.

{Donkey} – Parfaits may be the most delicious thing on the whole damn planet.

{Shrek} – You know, I think I preferred your humming. Do you have a tissue or something? I'm making a mess. Just the word parfait make me start slobbering.