

**THE TRANSLATION ANALYSIS OF PUN
IN THE FILM ENTITLED *MADAGASCAR***



Thesis

**Submitted as a partial fulfillment of requirement
For the Sarjana Sastra Degree at English Department
Faculty of Letters and Fine Arts
Sebelas Maret University**

By:

CANDRA KURNIAJATI

C0302020

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF LETTERS AND FINE ARTS
SEBELAS MARET UNIVERSITY**

2009

**THE TRANSLATION ANALYSIS OF PUN
IN THE FILM ENTITLED *MADAGASCAR***

By
Candra Kurniajati
C0302020

Approved to be examined by the Board of Examiners
Faculty of Letters and Fine Arts
Sebelas Maret University

Thesis consultant

Dr. Djatmika, MA
NIP. 19670726 199302 1 001

The Head of English Department

Dr. Djatmika, MA
NIP. 19670726 199302 1 001

**THE TRANSLATION ANALYSIS OF PUN
IN THE FILM ENTITLED *MADAGASCAR***

By
Candra Kurniajati
C0302020

Accepted and Approved by the Board of Examiners
Faculty of Letters and Fine Arts
Sebelas Maret University

on August 13th, 2009

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---------|
| 1. Chairman | Agus Dwi Priyanto, SS, M.CALL
NIP 19740818 200012 1 001 | (.....) |
| 2. Secretary | Dyah Ayu Nila Khrisna, SS, M.Hum
NIP 19830211 200604 2 001 | (.....) |
| 3. First Examiner | Dr. Djatmika, MA
NIP 19670726 199302 1 001 | (.....) |
| 4. Second Examiner | Ida Kusuma Dewi, SS, MA
NIP 19710525 199802 2 001 | (.....) |

Dean of Faculty of Letters and Fine Arts
Sebelas Maret University

Drs. Sudarno, M.A.
NIP. 19530314 198506 1 001

PRONOUNCEMENT

I pronounce truthfully that the thesis entitled Translation Analysis of Pun in The Film Entitled Madagascar is originally made by the researcher. It is not a plagiarism nor is it made by other people. The things related to other people's word are written in quotation and included in the bibliography. If this pronouncement is proved incorrect in the future, the researcher is ready to take the responsibility.

Surakarta, 12 August 2009

The pronouncer

Candra Kurniajati

MOTTO

“Berdoalah kepada-Ku, niscaya akan Kuperkenankan bagimu

(Q.S . al-Mu'min [40]: 60)

“Bila orang melewati satu hari dalam hidupnya

tanpa ada satu hak yang ia tunaikan

atau suatu fardhu yang ia lakukan,

atau kemuliaan yang ia wariskan

atau pujian yang ia hasilkan

atau kebaikan yang ia tanamkan

atau ilmu yang ia dapatkan,

maka sungguh-sungguh ia telah menganiaya dirinya sendiri”

(Y usuf Qardhawi)

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to:

My beloved Ibu,

My sisters and brothers

My future

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Alhamdulillahirabbilalamin. All the praise to Allah SWT who had given me strength and spirit to finish this work. It's been a long waiting and I'm glad that I finally made it (and I'm not the last man, or woman, standing). This thesis would ever be done without the help of others; therefore I want to give my special thanks to my thesis consultant Dr. Djatmika, MA thanks a lot for all the time, the help and the guidance until I finish my thesis. I want to give my gratitude to my former thesis consultant, Mrs. Ida Kusuma Dewi S.S., M.A., thank you for the advice and everything, the dean, Drs. Sudarno, M.A., and the head of English Department, Dr. Djatmika, MA for approving this thesis.

I also would like to thank Mr. Hendarto, my former academic consultant; Mrs. Dyah Kristina, my academic consultant and to my three raters (R1, R2 and R3). My biggest thank goes also for all the lecturers of ED, from which I learned a lot of things.

To my beloved Mom, my greatest gratitude for the love, the spirit, and the strength that inspire my life. I am sorry for being so late. To mbak Ning & Mas Ari thanks for the advice. To Mas Bowo, thanks for the support and congratulations for your marriage and De Dian thanks for the joy and everything. To De Ema, you're the best! What can I say but thanks for all the happiness, the love, the cry, the laugh, and every single moment we share together.

To Umi, I want to say congratulation for the new family member. I am sorry I haven't visited again. To Noe, don't take the baby to Semeru! Thanks for sharing the room when I needed to *mabit*.

To Ambar, I want to say thanks for the time listening to me and the advice. To Iko_miko, I am sorry for always bothering you, thanks for the ride and everything. To Yunita, Evi, Nana, Maya, when will we go to Amanah again? I miss the moment so much. To Najib, what can I say, but thanks for everything. To all friends in ED 2002, I am happy and proud to have friends like you all. To Reny_caem, I miss the time (thanks for the ride).

To SKI family, I am sorry I can't mention the names one by one, thanks for the ukhuwah. I will keep you all in my heart.

Finally, I realize that this thesis is still far from being perfect, therefore I would be very thankful for all the constructive suggestions and criticism.

Candra Kurniajati

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE APPROVAL OF THE CONSULTANT.....	ii
THE APPROVAL OF THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS	iii
PRONOUNCEMENT.....	iv
MOTTO.....	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
ABSTRACT	xiii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Research Background	1
B. Research Problems	4
C. Research Limitation	4
D. Research Objectives	5
E. Research Benefits.....	5
F. Research Methodology	6
G. Thesis Organization	6
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
A. Translation	8
1. Definition of Translation.....	8
2. Audio Visual Translation.....	9
3. Subtitling.....	11
3.1. Definition of Subtitling	11
3.2. Constraint on Subtitling	12
4. Translation Techniques.....	14
4.1. Definition of Translation Techniques	14
4.2. Classification of Translation Techniques.....	16

5. Translation Equivalence.....	18
B. Pun	19
1. Definition of Pun	19
2. Types of Pun	22
2.1. Homonymy	23
2.2. Polysemy	24
2.3. Homophony	25
2.4. Homography	26
2.5. Paronymy.....	26
C. Madagascar	27
 CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	 28
A. Research Type and Design	28
B. Data and Source Data	29
C. Sample and Sampling Technique.....	29
D. Method of Data Collection	30
E. Research Procedure	32
F. Technique of Data Analysis.....	33
 CHAPTER IV. DATA ANALYSIS	 34
A. Types of Pun	34
1. Paronymy.....	35
2. Polysemy.....	37
B. Translation Techniques.....	40
1. Pun is translated into non pun	41
2. Pun in the ST is copied into TT	46
3. Pun is rendered with other rhetorical device, i.e. rhyme	47
C. Accuracy.....	48
1. Accurate Translation.....	50
2. Less Accurate Translation	50

CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	53
A. Conclusion	53
B. Recommendation	54

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

4.1. Types of Pun in the Film	34
4.2. Number of Data Containing Paronymy	35
4.3. The number of Data of Polysemic Pun	37
4.4. The Number of Data of Translation Techniques	41
4.5. The Classification of Translation Accuracy	49

ABSTRACT

Candra Kurniajati, C 0302020. 2009. Translation Analysis Of Pun In The Film Entitled *Madagascar*. Under Graduate Thesis, Surakarta. English Department, Faculty of Letters and Fine Arts. Sebelas Maret University.

This study is focused the analysis on the types of pun, the analysis of translation techniques in translating pun, and the analysis of the accuracy. The purposes of this study were to describe the types of pun found in the movie and to discover translation techniques employed by the translator and the quality of the translation in terms of accuracy in translating pun.

This study was a descriptive qualitative research where the researcher only described all the facts on the existed data. The data were taken from the film entitled *Madagascar* by means of purposive sampling. There were 21 data applied in this research. In order to obtain reliable result on the quality of translation, questionnaires were distributed to the three raters to define the accuracy of the translation.

The translation techniques employed in the translation are three (3). They are: pun is translated into non pun (16 data), pun in the ST is copied into TT (2 data), and pun is rendered with other rhetorical device (1 datum). The results of the study shows that there are 15.79 % of the data are accurate translation and there are 84.21 % of the data are less accurate translation. The figure shows that the translations are mostly not so accurate.

The researcher recommended the translator to enhance his/her knowledge on wordplay in order to produce a quality translation. Since the focus of this study is at the level of accuracy, the researcher expected that other students or researchers would like to enhance the study on the related topic such as the readability and acceptability.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Research Background

Humor has been one of the defining aspects of humanity. In the *Oxford English Dictionary*, humor is defined as the quality of action, speech or writing, which excites amusement, oddity, jocularly, facetiousness, comicality, fun. From

the definition, it can be said that the form of humor varies. Slapstick which is a form of humor using action to arouse laughter, for example a clown who fall down because of banana peel, is favored by children, but other types of humor need more mature audiences in understanding them.

Audrieth in his book *The Art of Using Humor in Public Speaking* (1998) mentions 61 types of humor. Two of them are pun and wordplay. In his book, pun and wordplay are considered as different types of humor, yet he did not give a clear definition that can give clear cut differentiation between them. While Delabastita employs the word pun and wordplay synonymously. He defines wordplay as:

“...the general name for the various *textual* phenomena in which *structural features* of the language(s) used are exploited in order to bring about a *communicatively significant confrontation* of two (or more) linguistic structures with *more or less similar forms* and *more or less different meanings*.” (Delabastita in Koponen, 2004: 37)

From the definition it can be said that in order to create humor, the linguistic structures resembling each other in form are contrasted. Attardo (in Koponen, 2004: 40) discusses wordplay as a consciously metalinguistic phenomenon, which means that the speakers are deliberately taking advantage of certain characteristics of language (namely the existence of homonyms, polysemous words, etc.) to create humorous effect. Although there are some scholars who reject that the purpose of pun is merely to create humor. Readers or audiences may have varying reactions to wordplay.

Partly universally, culturally or linguistically bound, puns often create specific problems toward translators, especially when the puns appear in the movie. In subtitling, a translator is not only confronted with the complexity of the

text, but also to the several constraints in subtitling. Hatim and Mason (1997: 78) summarize four main constraints in subtitling. They are the shift in mode from speech to writing, the time and space limitations, the reduction of the source text as a consequence of the second constraint, and the requirement of matching the visual image.

Schwarz stated that the overriding goal of good subtitles must be their simplicity, clarity and adequacy. They must not become the primary focus for the movie viewers. Although good subtitles enhance the experience for the audiences, it must remain subordinate to the rest of the visual and oral stimuli since movie viewers go to the theatre to watch the movie instead of reading the subtitles (<http://accurapid.com/journal/22subtitles.htm>).

In order to produce quality translation, several careful strategies are inevitably needed by the translator during the translation process. Since the research is focused on the translation product, it analyses the translation techniques and tries to find out how they work related to the translation equivalence. Below are the examples of the types of pun found in the film:

(1.1) ALEX: She is finito! I define any rescue boat within a million miles won't miss this baby! When the moment is right, we will ignite the Beacon of the Liberty! And be rescued from this awful nightmare! What do you think? Pretty cool, ha? How's *the liberty fire* going, Melman?

Sudah selesai. / Aku jamin kapal penyelamat sejauh 1 mil dari sini ... / pasti bisa lihat ini. / Pada saat yang tepat, kita nyalakan obor kebebasan ini. / dan kita akan diselamatkan dari mimpi buruk ini. / Apa pendapatmu? Bagus bukan? / Bagaimana *api kebebasannya*, melman?

The phrase *the liberty fire* is included into polysemy, since it shares two meanings, i.e. the fire of the Liberty statue as a symbol of freedom in America and the fire that would be seen by the rescue boat which can send them to the their *liberty*'. The phrase is rendered into *api kebebasannya* which might not be able to show the ambiguity in the phrase *the liberty fire*.

(1.2) Marty feels happy being in the wild, which lead him to name his hut "del Voir"

MARTY : Welcome to castle *del Voir!* Take a load off! Hey, watch your feet.

Selamat datang di Wisma liar. Duduklah./ Hei, bersihkan dulu kakimu./

The example shows the similarity of phonemic and graphemic similarity between them. Marty pronounces the word *del Voir* which is a French word similar to the pronunciation of word *the wild*. The pun here is translated into non-pun, which might loose the sense of similarity in the phonemic and graphemic similarity perhaps due to the shift mode from spoken to written.

The above phenomena lead the researcher to carry out a study on the types of pun, the translation techniques in the translation of pun in the movie and its accuracy. The research is conducted under the title THE TRANSLATION ANALYSIS OF PUN IN THE FILM ENTITLED *MADAGASCAR*.

B. Research Problems

Based on the research background, the problem statements in this research are:

1. What types of pun are found in the film *Madagascar*?
2. What techniques are employed by the translator to translate pun in the film *Madagascar*?
3. How is the accuracy of the translation of pun in the film entitled *Madagascar*?

C. Research Limitation

This research analysis focuses on the types of pun found in the film entitled *Madagascar*. It also analyses the techniques employed by the translator in translating pun and the accuracy of translation of pun in the film entitled *Madagascar*.

D. Research Objectives

This research is conducted for the following objectives:

1. To find out the types of pun in the film entitled *Madagascar*.
2. To find out the techniques employed by the translator in translating pun in the film entitled *Madagascar*.
3. To find out the accuracy of the translation of pun in the film entitled *Madagascar*.

E. Research Benefits

This research is expected to be beneficial for:

1. Students

The result of this research can give advantages as the additional information as well as references for those who want to analyze about subtitling and translating pun.

2. Lecturers

The result of this research can become additional information in lecturing translation, especially about translating pun and subtitling.

3. Translators

The result can be an input for the translator to give more attention to the specific problems of translation, including the translation of pun especially in subtitling pun.

4. Other researchers

Finally, the result of this research is hoped to stimulate other researchers to conduct further research on subtitling in order to develop translation studies.

F. Research Methodology

This research employs a descriptive qualitative method. A qualitative study is defined as an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting (Creswell, 1994: 1-2). This research was conducted upon several steps. Further details on Research Methodology will be discussed in Chapter III.

G. Thesis Organization

This thesis consists of five chapters.

Chapter I, INTRODUCTION, covers Research Background, Research Problems, Research Limitation, Research Objectives, Research Benefits, Research Methodology, and Thesis Organization.

Chapter II, LITERATURE REVIEW, consists of Theories and Studies related to the research, i.e. The Theories and References about translation, subtitling, pun, and translation quality assessment.

Chapter III, RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, includes the research type and design, the data and source of data, the research procedures, the method of data collection, and the technique of data analysis.

Chapter IV, DATA ANALYSIS, discusses about the analysis of the types of pun, the analyses of the translation techniques in translating pun and the analysis of the accuracy of the translation.

Chapter V, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION, consists of Conclusion and Recommendation of the research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Translation

1. Definition of Translation

There are various definitions of translation proposed by some experts. Brislin in Choliludin (2005: 18) defines translation as: “the general term referring to the transfer of thoughts and ideas from one language (source) into another (target), whether the language are in written or oral form...”. This definition is considered not to be quite comprehensive by Nababan in his book *Teori Menerjemah* (1999: 19) since Brislin only gives attention to the transferring of the thoughts and ideas; leave alone the style of the target language.

Nida and Taber (in Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997: 182) propose that “Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style.” One thing that can be pointed out from this definition is that sometimes it is not easy to choose which one should be given the most priority, the form or the content. Nida (in Munday, 2001: 40) underlines that if equivalent effect is to be achieved “correspondence in meaning must have priority over correspondence in style.”

Another definition comes from Newmark. He defines translation as “a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language.” (1988: 5)

Larson (1984: 2) states “Translation consists of translating the meaning of the source language into the receptor language. This is done by

going from the form of the first language to the form of the second language by way of semantic structure. It is the meaning, which is being transferred and must be held constant. Only the form changes.”

From the definitions of translation above, it can be concluded that translation deals with the transferring of message from one language (SL) into another (TL). Although meaning plays the most important part in the transferring process, it is also important to take a note on the style, in order to get the best translation.

2. Audio-Visual Translation

According to Gambier (1994: 276-277), there are various ways of conveying the linguistic meaning of a foreign language message to a target audience. They are:

- a. Subtitling: of films, commercials, TV series and programs. (Further explanation is presented in the next part of this chapter)
- b. Subtitling in real time or simultaneous subtitling, for instance live performance interviews.
- c. Dubbing (lip-synchronization)

It is defined as the process in which the foreign dialogue is adjusted to the mouth movements of the actor in the film (Dries in Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997: 45).

- d. Interpreting

Interpreting refers to the oral translation of a spoken message or text (Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997: 83)

e. Voice-over is simultaneous interpreting, characterized by the faithful translation of the original speech and approximately synchronous delivery.

f. Narration

While voice-over is applied mainly to spontaneous speeches, with narration, the original speech is prepared, translated, and possibly condensed in advance before being read by a journalist or an actor.

g. Commentary

It is a way of adapting a program to a new target audience not literally duplicating the original speech, but adding new information, like creating a new work, with the identity of the commentator (actor) distinct from that of any of the program's participants.

h. Revoicing or multilingual broadcasting

It means the receiver selects a soundtrack with an appropriate language.

i. 'Surtitles' or 'Supratitles'

These are normally presented on a line-screen using digital print. It is used for instance in opera houses or theatre.

j. Simultaneous translation

It is a type of sight translation from a script or a subtitle in a foreign language taken from a written source text. It is used during film festivals and in film libraries.

3. Subtitling

3.1. Definition of Subtitling

Subtitling can be defined as the process of providing synchronized caption for film and television dialogue (Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997: 161). Subtitling usually consists of one or two lines of an average maximum length 35 characters, which can be placed at the bottom of the picture and are either centered or left-aligned (Baker, 2001: 245).

Gottlieb (in Jaskanen, 1999:8) defines subtitling as a (1) written, (2) additive (i.e. new verbal material is added in the form of subtitles), (3) immediate, (4) synchronous, and (5) polymedial (i.e. at least two channels are employed) forms of translation. He follows Jakobson in distinguishing between different forms of subtitling. He distinguishes subtitling based on two viewpoints, i.e. linguistic and technical viewpoints (in Baker, 2001: 247). From the linguistic viewpoint, there is *intralingual* (within one language) and *interlingual* (between two languages); whereas technically speaking subtitles can be either *open* (not optional, i.e. shown in the film) and *closed* (optional, i.e. shown via teletext). Intralingual subtitling changes the mode from speech to writing without any changes on the language. It includes subtitling of domestic programmes for the Deaf and hard of hearing and subtitling of foreign-language programmes for language learners. In the interlingual subtitling, the subtitler crosses over from speech in one language to writing in another, thus changing mode and language. Television subtitling is interlingual and open (so is the film subtitling) that means that SL linguistic material (speech, other linguistic material) is transformed into TL subtitles. The subtitles are broadcast simultaneously with the program.

3.2. Constraints on Subtitling

Jaskanen (1999: 9) states that there are two constraints in audio-visual translation, which distinguishes it from other forms of translation. They are technical and contextual constraints. Gottlieb (in Jaskanen, 1999:9) use a different terminology on both constraints, i.e. *formal (quantitative)* and *textual (qualitative)* constraints in subtitling.

Textual constraints are those imposed on the subtitles by the visual context of the film. In subtitling, coherence is required between the subtitled text and the moving image itself. Schwarz states that the match of dialogue and picture must be retained when translating. In other words, the appropriate subtitle must appear synchronous with the picture (<http://accurapid.com/journal/22subtitles.htm>).

Formal constraints are the constraints dealing with the physical limitation of the space factor and the time factor. *Space* refers to the number of characters and rows used in subtitling (Jaskanen, 1999: 20). Gottlieb (in Baker 2001: 245) states that subtitles usually consist of one or two lines of an average maximum length of 35 characters. While Schröter (2005: 32) mentions that one subtitle line normally has space for between 30-40 characters, including spaces. Jaskanen (1999: 20) states that the maximum number of characters is more or less constant in the figure of some 35-37 characters.

Dealing with the characters, ordinary script is used while cursive scripts are used for untranslated foreign words, voice over narration, and/or songs. Sometimes there are differences of conventions in the use of cursive scripts

between subtitling companies and individual subtitler (Jaskanen, 1999: 20). Capital letters are used for titles and captions.

To sum up, the average length of one line subtitle is between 30 – 40 characters, as Schröter says the number depends on the font used and the spelling of the words in it (2005: 32). A line will accommodate more small letters than capital letters, and more *i*'s and *j*'s than *m*'s and *w*'s.

Time refers to the presentation time of the subtitles (Jaskanen, 1999: 21). Pollard (in Schröter, 2005:32) mentions that the rule is three to five seconds for a line and four to six for two lines. While Linde and Kay (in Schröter, 2005:32) found that the actual times are around three seconds for a line, five to six seconds for two, and eight seconds for three lines. Gottlieb (in Baker, 2001: 247) mentions that a two line subtitle of 60-70 characters to stay on the screen for 5-6 seconds, and presentation rate of more than 12 characters per second (cps). The time changing between different subtitles is at least 4 frames (1/6 of a second) so that viewers will notice the change (Ivarsson in Schröter, 2005: 32).

Due to the physical constraints of subtitling, reduction of the text can hardly be avoided. Gottlieb (in Baker, 2001: 247) mentions that in television subtitling the text volume is typically reduced by one third. Kovačič (1994: 273) says that reductions are a typical feature of subtitling. The shortening of the text for subtitling purposes is nothing more than deciding what is padding and what is vital information (Reid in Gottlieb, 1994: 273).

Gottlieb (in Schröter, 2005: 36) stresses the more problematic aspects of spoken language that must be translated into written:

- pauses, false starts, self correctness, and interruptions,

- unfinished sentences and ‘grammatically unacceptable’ constructions
- slips of the tongue, self contradiction, ambiguities, and nonsense
- situations where people all talk at the same time.

Hatim and Mason (1997: 78-79) state that there are at least four main constraints in subtitling. They are the shift in mode from speech to writing, factors which govern the medium or channel in which meaning is to be conveyed, the reduction of the source text, and the requirement of matching the visual image.

4. Translation Techniques

4.1. Definition of Translation Techniques

The difference between an SL and TL and also the cultures make the translating process challenging for the translator. Careful translation strategies should be chosen in order to solve the problems that emerged during the translation process. Darwish (1999: 18) asserts that the ultimate goal of translation strategy is to solve the underlying problem on the translation process in order to unlock potential alternatives.

Even translation strategies are very important in the translation process, yet there seems to be some confusion over the definition of the term translation strategy. In the literature, translation strategies are often referred and equated to methods, techniques, procedures and types (Ibid. 19).

Molina and Albir (2002) make a careful distinction between the terms translation techniques, translation methods, and translation strategy. They also propose several translation techniques in their article *Translation Techniques*

Revisited: a Dynamic and Functionalist Approach
(<http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/008033ar>).

Translation method refers to the way a particular translation process is carried out in terms of translation objective, i.e. a global option that affects the whole text (p. 11). The choice of translation methods depend on the aim of the translation: interpretative-communicative, literal, free and philological. The term literal here is different from the literal translation in the translation techniques in a way that literal translation as translation method affects the whole text, while literal translation as translation techniques affects micro units of the text.

According to them, strategies are the procedures (conscious or unconscious, verbal or non-verbal) used by the translator to solve problems that emerge when carrying out the translation process with a particular objective in mind (p. 12). They assert that since strategies play an essential role in problem solving, they are a central part of the sub competencies that make up translation competence. Strategies enable the translator finding a suitable solution for a translation unit. The solution will be materialized using a particular translation technique. Therefore, they concluded that strategies and techniques occupy different places in problem solving. Strategies are part of the process, while techniques affect the result.

Translation techniques are defined as procedures to analyze and classify how translation equivalence works (p. 13). According to them, a technique can only be judged meaningfully when it is evaluated within a particular context.

Translation techniques are not good or bad in themselves;
they are used functionally and dynamically in terms of:

The film is intended to be family free, therefore the words that are not appropriate, such as swearing, to be heard by children. Here the script is blurred into the word *dam*, which has similar pronunciation to the word *damn*. The translation, however, is not showing the similarity between *dam* and *damn*.

3) Pun rendered with another rhetorical device or punoid

A punoid is not a pun. It can be in the form of repetition, alliteration, rhyme, referential vagueness, irony, paradox etc. This is done in order to replace some of the lost effect of the wordplay.

(2.3.) SL: Did that just say *Grand Central station*? Or my *aunt's constipation*?

TL: Katanya “*Stasiun Grand Central*” atau “*bibiku mual*”

In the SL, the play on words involving the similarity of the sounding between *Grand Central station* and *aunt's constipation*, while in TL it involves only the words *central* and *mual* which possess rhyme ‘al’.

4) Pun rendered with zero pun

The pun is simply omitted and not rendered at all.

5) ST pun copied as TT pun

The pun is copied into TT without being translated.

(2.4.) SL: Wait! Wait! Come on! Wait! Here comes Alex!

Hold still! Wait! Wait! Wait! Hold still! No!

Come on! Come on! Here I come! Look!

Look! Look, look! It's Gloria! It's *Gloria*!

Oh hey, it is Gloria.

TL: Tunggu, tunggu [Diam] / Tunggu Alex

[Diam] / Lihat! Lihat! Lihat! / Itu Gloria.

Itu *Gloria.* / Hei, itu Gloria. / Astaga...

6) Non-pun à pun (a new pun introduced)

A compensatory pun is inserted, where there was none in the ST, possibly making up for ST puns lost elsewhere, or for any other reason

7) Zero pun rendered as pun (addition of a new pun)

A totally new textual material is added, containing wordplay as a compensatory device.

8) Editorial techniques

Explanatory footnotes or endnotes, comments in translator's forewords, 'anthological' presentation of different, complementary solutions etc.

5. Translation Equivalence

Equivalence is a term used by many writers to describe the nature and the extent of the relationships which exist between SL and TL texts or smaller linguistic units (Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997: 49).

Nida (in Munday, 2001) subdivides the notion of equivalence into two typologies: formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence.

Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content.... One is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language. (p. 41)

Formal equivalence is oriented towards the ST structure, which exerts strong influence in determining accuracy and correctness.

Dynamic equivalence, on the other hand, is what Nida calls ‘the principle of equivalent effect’, where ‘the relationship between the receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and message’ (p. 42).

Nida accepts that there is conflict between the traditional notions of content and form, he then underlines that ‘correspondence in meaning must have priority over correspondence in style’ if equivalence effect is to be achieved. (p.42)

B. Pun

1. Definition of Pun

Sobkowick in *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (1994: 3411) defines pun as deliberate use of lexical ambiguity (homonymy or homophony) in speech, mostly, through by no means exclusively, for jocular purposes. In this definition, it is stated that homonymy and homophony which become means to create pun. This definition also mentions that the purpose of pun is humor.

In *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* (1996: 391) pun is defined as figure of speech of *repetition*, a play on words through the coupling of words that *sound similar* but which are very different semantically and etymologically. In the definition, the play on words involves repetition, which shares the similarity in sound.

Pun in Wynne-Davies is referred to the entry for *Play on words*, which is defined as “the use of word with more than one meaning or of two words which

sound the same in such a way that both meanings are called to mind.” (in Schröter, 2005: 85)

Louden defines pun as a connection between two *similar sounding words* which invests the relationship between them with additional meaning. (in Schröter, 2005: 85)

The definition from Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics, Wynne-Davies and Louden gives attention on the sounding of the words in creating pun.

The definition of pun in the Oxford English Dictionary is as follows:

The use of a word in such a way as to suggest two or more meanings or different associations, or the use of two or more words of the same or nearly the same sound with different meanings, so as to produce humorous effect; a play on words.

According to Schröter (2005: 156), this definition is vague since the Oxford English Dictionary’s definition does not give clear distinction between pun and non-pun. The problem also deals with the degree of “sameness” or “nearly the same”. The words “same or nearly the same” do not state a rule about, for example, the number of phonemes that have to coincide in two words in order to form potential punning material. He adds that it is even more problematic since humorous effect seems to be required for a pun, or at least the intention of bringing about humorous effect.

Hammond and Hughes differentiate between pun and play on words. They restrict pun to homophone. According to them a pun is made when someone notices that two different words sound the same, and constructs a sentence containing this sound. Both meanings of the sentence depend on the

interpretation of the ambiguous sound, while play on words is referred to homonyms. They state that a play on words is made when someone notices that one word has two different meanings, and construct a sentence containing this word. The two meanings of the sentence depend on the interpretation of the ambiguous word.

The difference between the pun and the play on words is that in the pun completely different words, having completely different meanings, are noticed to have the same or similar sounds, and are brought together in one sentence; whereas in the play on words one word is noticed to have two meanings, which have diverged from one common root word, and these different meanings of the same word are brought out.

Delabastita (in Koponen, 2004: 35) defines wordplay, a term which he uses interchangeably with pun, as:

“Wordplay is the general name for the various *textual* phenomenon in which *structural features* of the language(s) used are exploited in order to bring about a *communicatively significant confrontation* of two (or more) linguistic structures *with more or less similar forms and more or less different meanings.*”

Koponen (2004: 35-36) notices three aspects that can be pointed out from Delabastita’s definition of wordplay. The first aspect is that linguistic structures which have similar forms are contrasted to create humour out of their different meanings. Delabastita lists four different ways that linguistic structures can share a similar form. They are homonymy, homophony, homography and paronymy (further explanation will be presented in the next part of this chapter).

The second aspect is that to create humorous effect of wordplay, ambiguity alone is not enough. They require a context, either verbal or situational

to be activated. Verbal context deals with the human knowledge and expectation of grammatical and coherent texts and contextualized phrases. Situational context on the other hand, would include, for example pictorial element of comics, which gives an additional meaning to the text.

The third aspect is the communicative significance factor. There are differences between accidental ambiguities in the text and those used intentionally for wordplay and the effect it creates. Even Delabastita admits that it is often very difficult to determine the intention of the author.

From all of the definition of pun above, Delabastita perhaps gives the clearest definition of pun (or wordplay).

2. Types of Pun

Delabastita (in Koponen, 2004: 35) divided pun into four categories. They are homonymy, homophony, homography and paronymy. While Schröter, in his dissertation (2005: 168), mentions five categories of pun. The categories are presented in the table below.

Table 2.1. Categories of Pun

Name of Category	Relationship between the punning items
Homonymy	Pronunciation and spelling identical; etymological relationship non-existent or opaque
Polysemy	Pronunciation and spelling identical; etymological relationship transparent
Homophony	Pronunciation identical and spelling different
Homography	Pronunciation different and spelling identical

Paronymy	Pronunciation and spelling similar, but not identical
----------	---

A closer look in the individual categories will be presented in 2.1. – 2.5.

2.1. Homonymy

The term homonymy is used to refer to the relationship between two (or more) linguistic structures that are *formally identical*, both in spelling and sound, but have divergent meanings (Schröter, 2005: 168). Nash and Gottlieb (ibid.,169) call any items that have the same form, but have different meanings, homonyms. On the other hand, Hausman and Delabastita give a distinction between homonymy and polysemy based on the etymological relationship. Homonyms are those which do not have any relationship between them.

Homonymy in the Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics (Bussman, 1996: 210) is defined as a type of lexical ambiguity involving two or more *different* words (emphasis added).

Since there is no instance of homonyms in the corpus, the example is taken from Schröter's study. The example is taken from the film *The Adventures of Rocky and Bullwinkle*.

(2.5.) In one of the coops, the rooster Rocky is entertaining a crowd of chickens with jokes while at the same time consuming some apparently intoxicating beverage from a white funnel. At one point, he pulls out a feather from his tail and puts it into his drink.

Rocky: *Cocktail!*

The root of *cocktail* in the sense of '(blend of) alcoholic beverage(s)' is uncertain. Whether it has something to do with a cock's tail is completely obscure. Therefore Schröter counted it among homonymic variety.

2.2. Polysemy

Polysemy is characterized by a clash of orthographically and phonetically identical structures with divergent meanings and etymologically connected. (Schröter, 2005:181). He added that puns that are included in polysemy category only if the semantic link between the core items can be readily established without the help of additional information.

The term polysemy is coined by Breal (Bussman, 1996: 210). Polysemy is an expression which has two or more definitions with some common features that are usually derived from a single basic meaning.

(2.6.) MAURICE: Say just where are you giants from?

ALEX: We're from New York and we...

KING JULIEN: All hail *the New York Giants!*

THE LEMURS: *New York Giants!*

The four characters coming to Madagascar are all big, contrasted with the local inhabitants. When they said that they come from New York, the local inhabitants call them *the New York Giants*, which can refer to the famous football team from the same city. The way they shout it is as the supporters of the team do. The common features they share can be understood from the context.

2.3. Homophony

Homophones are defined as two or more words or other linguistic structures that sound the same, but are spelt differently (Schröter, 2005:197).

The definition of homophony in Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics (1996: 211) is a type of lexical ambiguity in which two or more expressions have an identical pronunciation but different spellings and meanings.

The example below is taken from Crystal (in Schröter, 2005:199).

(2.7.) ‘Dad, what are all those in the new shed?’

‘They’re *knot* holes.’

‘What do you mean “They’re *not* holes?” I can put my finger right through them.’

The play on words involving here is between *knot* and *not*. They are pronounced identical /nɒt/.

2.4. Homography

In contrast to homophones, homographs can be defined as written forms that are identical, but not the pronunciation (Schröter, 2005:197). Two expressions are homographic if they are orthographically identical but have different pronunciation. (Bussman, 1996: 210). Since the ambiguity in homography is based on the identical on the written form, it hardly finds them in films, which mostly dealing with spoken material.

The example is taken from Schröter (2005: 166)

(2.7.) What choice does a discontent soldier face who is about to sent to the Sahara? – Desert or desert?

2.5. Paronymy

Paronymy is defined as the relationship between linguistic structures that are formally similar, but not identical on either phonetic or the orthographic level (Schröter, 2005:197). According to de Vries and Verheij (1997: 76) paronymy is the use of words with only a slight difference in surface form. In their examples the similarity mostly involves one or two letters. The similarity in paronymy is weaker than in homonymy but still strong enough to be related to each other in the mind of the listener or reader.

(2.8.) MARTY: We shall call it *San Dilemo Zoo*

Marty is trying to compare the place they have just cast away, Madagascar, with the place they have already known, San Diego Zoo.

(2.9.) ALEX: *You maniac! You burned it up! Darn you! Darn you all to hack!*

Alex's dialogue is a reference to the line in *Planet of the Apes*: "You blew it up! Damn you! Damn you all to hell!" (<http://en.wikipedia/wiki/Madagascar>).

C. Madagascar

Madagascar is a computer-animated film produced by DreamWorks Animation, and released in movie theatres on May 27, 2005. The film tells the story of four [Central Park Zoo](#) animals; Marty, Alex, Gloria and Melman who have spent their lives in blissful captivity and are unexpectedly shipped back to [Africa](#), getting shipwrecked on the island of [Madagascar](#) (<http://en.wikipedia/wiki/Madagascar>). The story begins when Marty stated his wish to see the rest of the world out of Central Park Zoo, the place where they belong. In trying to escape from the zoo, Marty and his friends are catch by the police and finally they are really transported to wildlife Africa. Unfortunately, they cast away in Madagascar, a place that they never seen before. In Madagascar they finally get the real experience of live outside the zoo and get the meaning of friendship.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Type and Design

This research is *descriptive qualitative* research. Cresswell defines a qualitative study as an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting (1994: 1-2). Bogdan and Taylor (in Moleong, 2005: 4) define qualitative methodology as *prosedur penelitian yang menghasilkan data deskriptif berupa kata-kata tertulis atau lisan dari orang-orang dan perilaku yang diamati*. According to them, there

is no hypothesis in this type of research. This research is descriptive since the data are in the form of words instead of numbers.

This research is a single embedded case study. According to Merriam (in Cresswell, 1998: 61), a case study is an exploration of a “bounded system” or a case (or multiple cases) over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich in context. This study focuses on the translation of puns existed in the film entitled *Madagascar*. It is an embedded case study since it analyzes the specific aspect of the case (Yin in Cresswell, 1998: 63). This study is intended to describe the types of puns found in the movie and to find out the translation techniques of puns and the accuracy of the translation.

Data and Source of Data

The data of this research are all of dialogues containing puns, which were taken from a film entitled *Madagascar* by DreamWorks Animation. In order to get more complete information about the phenomena, open-ended questionnaires were spread out to three informants. Patton (1980: 28) states that the purpose of gathering responses to open-ended questions is to enable the researcher to understand and capture the points of view of other people without predetermining those points of view through prior selection of questionnaire categories. By doing so, the researcher will be able to understand the world as seen by the informants. The qualitative research uses the term *informant* instead of respondent since it is the information that is highly needed instead of the responses. Those who fulfill the criteria were chosen in order to get the best answer for the research questions. The informants involved in this study are called raters.

Sample and Sampling Technique

Patton (in Crabtree and Miller 1992: 33) states that qualitative inquiry typically focuses in-depth on relatively small samples, even single case (n=1), selected purposively. He further adds that different from quantitative sampling, which concerns with representativeness, qualitative sampling concerns with information richness. He also suggests that sample size is not the determinant of the research significance because, as it has been stated above, it is the information that is highly needed and not the number. One of the characteristics of qualitative inquiry is **purposive sampling**. According to Moleong (2005: 35), *sampling bertujuan dimaksudkan untuk memilih sejumlah "kecil" dan tidak harus representatif; sampel dimaksudkan untuk mengarah pada pemahaman secara mendalam.*

The sample of this research covers dialogues containing puns. The second data are taken from the informants. The informants are chosen based on purposive sampling or criterion-based selection. Those who meet several criteria determined are selected; in the hope that the best and elaborate answers for the research questions are obtained. The criteria in determining the informants are those who master both languages (i.e. English and Bahasa Indonesia). Secondly, the informants which were chosen should have knowledge in translation and also have a practical experience in translation. Moreover, they were chosen as they were willing to participate in the study.

Method of Data Collection

According to Cresswell (1998: 120) there are four basic types of information to collect: observations (ranging from nonparticipant to participant), interviews (ranging from semi structured to open-ended), documents (ranging from private to public), and

audio-visual materials (including materials such as photographs, compact disks, and videotapes). The objects of this study are the dialogues containing puns in the film entitled Madagascar and its translation. In collecting the data, the researcher applied two methods. They were content analysis and questionnaires. In content analysis, the researcher collected the data of the dialogues containing puns in the film and the Indonesian translation.

In order to get a more reliable data in terms of the accuracy, the help from a key informant is highly needed. The key informants chosen in this research are called raters.

The translation quality assessment of the subtitles, i.e. the accuracy of the translation, is determined by using close and open-ended questionnaires. It means that the raters firstly determined the accuracy of the translation and secondly they gave comments or any information needed related to the questions. The raters had to rate or score the accuracy of the data based on the scales determined by the researcher. The scales of the scoring are as follows:

Score	Category	Description
1	Accurate	The meaning of pun in the source text is conveyed into target text in accordance to the context, the effect of pun in the target text is equal with the source text
2	Less Accurate	The meaning of pun in the source text is conveyed into target text, however the effect of the pun in the target text is not equal with the source text
3	Inaccurate	There is a distortion of meaning of pun in the target text.

The open-ended questionnaires allow the informants to give a more complete and elaborate information, which might be important for the study and perhaps never been thought by the researcher before. The informants chosen for answering the questions are those who meet the determined criteria, which have been stated above. It is done in order to get the information needed for finding the answer for the questions in the study.

Research Procedure

Research procedures are the steps from which the researcher conducted the research. The researcher followed these procedures:

Determining the object of research

The object of this research is the translation of puns in the subtitle of *Madagascar*.

Collecting the data

There are two methods in gathering data for this research. The first was content analysis. The data were collected and written.

The second is the open-ended questionnaires spread out to three informants who meet the criteria that have been determined before.

Making a list of the data in the form of a questionnaire and asking for the three raters to rate the accuracy of the data.

Analyzing the data

The data were analyzed based on the problem statements. The first was describing the types of pun found in the movie. Secondly, the translation

techniques were described. Then, the accuracy of the translation was analyzed based on the information gathered from the questionnaires.

Drawing conclusion.

The last step was drawing conclusions based on the analysis that had been done.

Technique of Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure, and meaning to the mass collected data (Marshall & Rossman, 1994: 111). Analysis starts shortly after the first data are collected and proceeds simultaneously with data collection (Crabtree and Miller, 1992: 235). Below are the techniques of analyzing the data in this research, which were conducted as follows:

All of the collected data were identified and coded as explained in the Research Procedure.

The data were observed to find out the types of puns

The data were analyzed to find out the techniques employed by the translator in translating humor.

The data taken from the questionnaires were analyzed to describe the accuracy of the subtitles.

Based on the analysis of the data, the conclusions were drawn.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the result of the research which is divided into three sub-chapters. The analysis begins with the research findings on the types of puns. It is followed by the analysis on the techniques employed by the translator in translating puns. The accuracy of the translation becomes the last part of this chapter to be analyzed.

A. Types of Pun

This sub-chapter deals with the categories of pun which are found in *Madagascar*. In the film, there are two types of pun, namely polysemy and paronymy. The total number of the pun is 19. The table below shows the distribution of each types.

Table 4. 1. Types of pun in the film.

Types of pun →	Polysemy	Paronymy	Total
Numbers	10	9	19
Percentage	52.63 %	47.37 %	100 %

Polysemy is more commonly used than the other type of pun in this film.

The figure shows the percentage of polysemy is 52.63 %, which means more than a half of the total number of the puns is polysemy. Paronymy appears in the movie as many as 9 instances, or 47.37 % from the total number of the puns. A detailed discussion of each types of pun is presented below.

1. Paronymy

As it has been stated above that as many as 9 instances of paronymic puns are found in the film. The table below shows the number of data included into this type of pun.

Table 4. 2. Number of data containing paronymy

	Number of data	Total
Paronymy	2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 12, 16, 17, 19	9

According to Schröter (2005: 206-207), paronymy is defined as the relationship between linguistic structures that are formally similar, but not identical on either the phonetic or the orthographic level. de Vries and Verheij (in Schröter 2005: 207) mention that although the similarity in paronymy is weaker than in homonymy, it is still strong enough for the two words to be related each other in the mind of the listener or reader. The following instance shows the similarity of the orthographic level or near-homographs. The central issue of puns is typed italic.

- (4.1.) Skipper, the leader of the four penguins in Central Park Zoo, wants to escape from the zoo as he thinks that it is a conspiracy that a penguin exists in New York City. He asked his friends to dig the zoo line but when he succeeds the digging he finds himself in Marty's cage, that is still inside the Central Park Zoo.

SKIPPER: Hoover *Dam!* We're still in New York. Abort! Dive, dive, dive!

The word *dam* is pronounced /dʌm/ which is similar to the pronunciation of the word *damn* in a way that the pronunciation of *damn* is /dæm/. The difference in the pronunciation is only in the vowel /ʌ/ and /æ/. Orthographically, the word *dam* is similar to the word *damn*, with only the letter "n" which differentiates them. Therefore, the word *dam* is considered as paronymy. As the movie is family friendly, taboo words, such as *damn*, are avoided. Yet, for adult viewers it will be strong enough to relate the word *dam* which is pronounced with an accent with the word *damn*.

In the data, there are three instances of paronymy which intend to blur the word *damn*. The example below also shows how this word is blurred.

- (4.2.) Marty is trying to go to Connecticut to find the 'wide open spaces' which he really eager to see. When he arrived at the Grand Central Station he missed the train. He feels dissapointed.

MARTY: *Dinamit!* I missed the express! Looks like I'm gonna have to take the Stanford local.

The word *Dinamit!* is pronounced similar to the word *Damn it*. This example shows both near-homophones and near-homographs. The letter "i" is

inserted in the word *damn* after “d” and the letter “n” is moved to the front after “i”. From this word formation children can hardly recognize it as *Damn it*.

The definition of paronymy from Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics (1996: 350-351) is more or less quite the same as the above definition, i.e. involving near-homophones and near homographs. Paronymy is defined as phonic similarity between two expressions from different languages. The examples from this book are the word *summer* in English and the word *sommer* in German. The example shows the similarity of phonemic and graphemic similarity between them. There is one instance of this kind of paronymy in the movie. Marty pronounces the word *del Voir* which is a French word similar to the word *the wild*.

(4.3.) Marty feels happy being in the wild, which lead him to name his hut “del Voir”

MARTY: Welcome to castle *del Voir!* Take a load off! Hey, watch your feet.

There is one datum taken from the caption, which is unlike the other data that are taken from the dialogues. When Alex tries to get someone to help him, he makes a word *HELP* using some coconut trees. The part of the letter “p” fall to the ground, which makes it is read *HELL* instead of *HELP*. It is considered paronymy since the words are similar with only the last letter that differentiates them.

2. Polysemy

Polysemy, according to Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics, is defined as an expression that has two or more definitions with some common features that are usually derived from a single basic meaning

(1996: 371). The feature of polysemy is that it is phonetically and orthographically identical with divergent meaning. The semantic variants of polysemic expressions can be traced from a single root. The number of the data of polysemic puns is shown in the table below.

Table 4. 3. The number of data of polysemic pun

	Number of data	Total
Polysemy	1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18	10

Of the total number of the data, there are five data which the words (or phrases to be more precisely) are exactly the same. The phrase is *The New York Giants*. When Alex, Marty, Gloria and Melman are cast ashore in Madagascar, the local inhabitants ask them who they are. They tell them that they come from New York. Since their body is bigger than the inhabitants, the inhabitants call them as *The New York Giants*. The phrases trigger SL viewers mind to link it to a football team from the same city. The instance below is taken from King Julien dialogue when the first time the phrase is uttered.

(4.4.) MAURICE: Say just where are you giants from?

ALEX: We're from New York and we...

KING JULIEN: All hail *the New York Giants!*

THE LEMURS: *New York Giants!*

Meaningful names can result polysemic pun if they express a certain link between the bearers of the names and some of their characteristics (Schröter 2005:

186). The name *Gloria* is uttered many times in the film, but only one is considered as polysemic pun since it fulfills the criteria of being a polysemic pun.

(4.5.) Alex is trying to get Melman out of the box using a coconut tree. Melman feels that it will be very painful if such a big coconut tree hit him. Therefore, when he sees Gloria, he tries to change Alex attention to Gloria by calling Gloria outloud.

MELMAN: Wait! Wait! Wait!

ALEX : Hold still!

MELMAN: No! Come on! Come on!

ALEX : Here I come! Look! Look! Look, look!

MELMAN: It's Gloria! It's *Gloria!* Oh hey, it is Gloria.

In the above example, when Melman calls *Gloria* for the first and the third time, the word *Gloria* is not counted as a pun. It is when Melman calls Gloria for the second which is counted as a pun. The word *Gloria* is uttered in such a way, which brings into mind the meaning of the word that is 'praise and worship'.

The second name is *Private*. *Private* is the name of one penguin in Central Park Zoo. The penguins think themselves as agents and their existence in the zoo is because of a conspiracy. In their effort to escape from the zoo, they are led by Skipper. Of the four penguins, *Private* is in the lowest rank, while the word *private* means 'soldier of the lowest rank'. The name and the context meet, therefore it is considered as a polysemic pun.

(4.6.) Skipper and the three penguins want to save Marty from Alex, which becomes savage. He always thinks that they are agents and he is the leader. Kowalski and Rico position are below him and Private is in the lowest rank.

SKIPPER: Boys, our monochromatic friend is in danger. Looks like we have a job to do. Captain's log. Bargain the hostile environment. Kowalski, we'll need to win the hearts and the minds of the natives. Rico, we'll need special technical equipment. We're gonna face extreme peril. *Private* probably won't survive.

The next instance shows the clash of meaning that can be drawn through the dialogue and the picture. Alex, Gloria and Melman go to the Grand Central Station to find Marty in order to get Marty back to the zoo, but as the people are panic to see them in the Station, Melman hits the clock in the station. Gloria is trying to get the clock out of Melman's head while the police officers come. The clock is just like a cuckoo clock then. Yet, when Alex told the police that Marty went *a little cuckoo in the head*, Marty got insulted, since it may mean 'crazy' or 'fool' when it is used as a slang word.

(4.7.) ALEX: No, no, you don't talk now, okay? You're not so good with the putting the words together and their coming out, good thing. You keep it thss! Hey! How you're doing? Yeah! You know what, everything's cool, we just have a little situation here. Little internal situation. Actually my friend just went a little crazy. It happens to everybody. The city gets to us all. Just went a little *cuckoo in the head*.

MARTY: Hey! Don't be calling me *cuckoo in the head*!

B. Translation Techniques

This sub-chapter presents translation techniques employed by the translator in translating puns in the movie entitled *Madagascar*. The researcher found three techniques employed by the translator in translating puns, i.e. translating pun into non pun, copying pun in the ST into pun in the TT and translating pun into other rhetorical device. According to Delabastita, wordplay involves a confrontation between sounds and spellings. This might be a challenge for the translator since the phonological and graphemic structures that are

important for wordplay are different in different languages. Meanwhile he/she should preserve the communicative goal and effect of the puns in the translation. The table below shows the number of the techniques used by the translator and the detailed analysis is presented underneath.

Table 4. 4. The number of data of translation techniques

No	Translation Techniques	Number of Data	Total	Percentage
1	Pun is translated into non pun	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19	16	84.21
2	Pun in the ST is copied into TT	7, 10	2	10.53
3	Pun is rendered with other rhetorical device, i.e. rhyme	4	1	5.26

1. Pun is translated into non pun

This technique means a non-punning phrase which may retain all the initial senses (non-selective non-pun), or a non-punning phrase which renders only one of the pertinent senses (selective non-pun), or diffuse paraphrase or a combination of the above (Delabastita in Asimakoulas, 2004). This technique leads to the lost of some aspects of wordplay. There are 17 instances of the data (80.95 %) employing this technique. Some

instances of the use the second technique in translating patronymic and polysemic wordplays are presented below.

1. Paronymy

There are eight (8) data containing paronymy rendered using this strategy.

(4.9.) Skipper, the leader of the four penguins in Central Park Zoo, wants to escape from the zoo as he thinks that it is a conspiracy that a penguin exists in New York City. He asked his friends to dig the zoo line but when he succeeds the digging he finds himself in Marty's cage, that is still inside the Central Park Zoo.

SKIPPER: Hoover *Dam!* We're still in New York. Abort!
Dive, dive, dive!
Bendungan Hoover! Kita masih di New York.
Batalkan. Masuk kembali!

The example shows how the translation of the paronymic pun *dam* that is *bendungan* loses the play on the sound *dam* with *damn*. The ST viewers are able to relate the word *dam* with the *damn*, but for TT viewers the word *bendungan* is far from the meaning of the word *damn* that is *sial*. It seems that the translator did not realize that there is wordplay in the in *Hoover Dam*.

The second example also shows how the translation loses some aspects of the wordplay. The example is taken from Marty's utterance. Marty is upset when he misses the train that will bring him to Manhattan. Marty is trying to say *damn it*, but to make it unclear that he is swearing, the word *damn* is changed into *dinamit*. This is done since this film is intended to be family friendly, meaning that all family members can watch, including children. Yet, it is translated into *sial*. The word *sial* is

the direct translation of *damn it*, therefore the translation loses the play on the word *dinamit*.

(4.10.) MARTY: *Dinamit!* I missed the express! Looks like I'm gonna have to take the Stanford local.

Sial! Ketinggalan kereta itu! / Aku harus naik kereta Stanford. /

The next example was taken from caption.

(4.11.) (CAPTION)

HELP → **HELL**

TOLONG! → *NERAKA*

The word *help* that changed into *hell* was translated into *tolong* and *neraka*. The word *hell* is formed from the part of the word *help* made by Alex in his effort to save he and his friends from the island. The letter *p* of the word *help* which is made of branches falls down and the word is read *hell*. The translation, however, does not show the correspondence between the words *tolong* and *neraka*.

The next example from this strategy is concerning with the similar sound between French and English, i.e. *del Voir* and *the wild* pronounced by Marty.

(4.12.) MARTY: Welcome to castle *del Voir!* Take a load off! Hey, watch your feet.

Selamat datang di *Wisma Liar*. Duduklah. / Hei, bersihkan dulu kakimu. /

The word *del Voir* which has similar sound to the word *the wild* is translated into *Wisma Liar*. The translation loses the similarity on the sound. This happens since English and French have a close historical relationship while bahasa Indonesia does not have it.

2. Polysemy

There are eight (8) data of polysemic puns transferred into TT employing this strategy. The data include text internal reference and text external reference. Below are the examples of the second technique used by the translator in translating polysemic puns.

The example below is taken from King Julien's dialogue. He mentions the phrase *New York Giants* three times. All of them are rendered using this strategy.

(4.13.) KING JULIEN : All hail *the New York Giants!*

Semua, hidup *raksasa New York*.

The phrase *the New York Giants* here refers to not only *raksasa New York* since the size of the four animals coming to the island is bigger than the inland animals (very big indeed, if they are compared to all animals in that island) but also refers to the one of the football team in New York. New York itself is the place where *the giants* come from. Therefore King Julien calls them *The New York Giants*. The phrase

raksasa New York does not possess the same ambiguity as the phrase in the English version. The phrase *raksasa New York* only serves the first reference.

The next example will also show how the ambiguity is lost in the translation.

(4.13.) ALEX: She is finito! I define any rescue boat within a million miles won't miss this baby! When the moment is right, we will ignite the Beacon of the Liberty! And be rescued from this awful nightmare! What do you think? Pretty cool, ha? How's the *liberty fire* going, Melman?
Sudah selesai. / Aku jamin kapal penyelamat sejauh 1 mil dari sini ... / pasti bisa lihat ini. / Pada saat yang tepat, kita nyalakan obor kebebasan ini. / dan kita akan diselamatkan dari mimpi buruk ini. / Apa pendapatmu? Bagus bukan? / Bagaimana *api kebebasannya*, melman?

The phrase *the liberty fire* shares both meanings of the fire of the Liberty statue as a symbol of freedom in America and the fire that would be seen by the rescue boat which can send them to their *liberty*. The phrase is rendered into *api kebebasannya* which fails to show the ambiguity of the phrase.

There are two names of the character which can be categorised into punning names; they are Private and Gloria.

(4.14) SKIPPER: I want you to look cute and cuddly, *Private*.

Today we're gonna blow this dam.

Harus tampak manis dan lucu, *prajurit*. /
Hari ini kita pergi dari sini.

Private is one of the three friends of Skipper. Skipper thinks that all of them (the penguins) are secret agent. They think that they are captured in a mission. *Private* means *soldier at the lowest rank*. Skipper think that he is the leader of the penguins while *Private* seems to be at the lowest rank after Kowalski and Rico. Even in the earlier dialogue, Skipper mentions *Private* as cadet. The translation however does not show or lost this part of the ambiguity. The word *Private* is translated into *prajurit* with the letter “p” is written uncapitalized.

2. Pun in the ST is copied into TT

There are two data using the third technique, which is copying. The pun in the ST is copied into TT, without being translated. Both data are polysemic puns.

(4.15.) MELMAN: Wait! Wait! Come on! Wait! Here comes Alex!
Hold still! Wait! Wait! Wait! Hold still! No!
Come on! Come on! Here I come! Look!
Look! Look, look! It's Gloria! It's *Gloria*!
Oh hey, it is Gloria.

Tunggu, tunggu [Diam] / Tunggu Alex
[Diam] / Lihat! Lihat! Lihat! / Itu Gloria.
Itu *Gloria*. / Hei, itu Gloria. / Astaga...

In the example above *Gloria* is copied into TT. While listening to the original dialogue viewers notice when Melman pronounces Gloria meaning the name of his friend and when he meant to praise God. The dialogue takes place when Alex tried to get him out from the crates using coconut tree. Melman thinks that it will be very painful if Alex get him out of the crate using the coconut tree. Therefore when Melman sees Gloria he feels that he is out of the misery, so he praise the God by saying *Gloria*.

(4.16.) THE LEMURS: *New York Giants!*

New York Giants!

The phrase *New York Giants* is copied into TT. Viewers with knowledge of American football will recognise that the phrase refers to not only the giant animals coming to the island but also refers to the one of American football team in New York.

3. Pun is rendered with other rhetorical device, i.e. rhyme

Only one datum used the fourth technique in translating pun. The datum is a paronymic pun.

(4.17.) ALEX: Did that just say *Grand Central station? Or my aunt's constipation?*

Katanya "*Stasiun Grand Central*" atau "*bibiku mual?*"

The instance above is paronymic since there is play on words between *Grand Central Station* and *my aunt's constipation*. According to

de Vries and Verheij (1997, 76), two words can be considered as paronymic pun even though they only involve one or two letters. The translation can not be included into paronymic pun since they involve rhyme that is “al” between the word *Stasiun Grand Central* and *bibiku mual*.

C. Accuracy

The accuracy level of the translation is analyzed based on the result of the questionnaires delivered to the three raters. In the questionnaires, firstly the three raters were asked to determine the accuracy by giving mark on the space available; secondly, they might give their comments or suggestions related to the accuracy. The three raters were coded as R1, R2, and R3.

The accuracy of the translation is measured based on the scale as shown below:

Score	Category	Description
1	Accurate	The meaning of pun in the source text is conveyed into target text in accordance to the context, the effect of pun in the target text is equal with the source text
2	Less Accurate	The meaning of pun in the source text is conveyed into target text, however the effect of the pun in the

		target text is not equal with the source text
3	Inaccurate	There is a distortion of meaning of pun in the target text.

After the scores from the raters were obtained, the mean of the scores were then calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\sum \text{scores}}{\sum \text{raters}}$$

The mean or the average point was used to classify the data into categories below:

a. Accurate translation.

It consists of the data of which the point is 1,0

b. Less accurate translation.

It consists of the data of which the average point ranges from 1,1 to 2,9

c. Inaccurate translation.

It consists of the data of which the point is 3,0.

Table 4. 5. The classification of translation accuracy

Categories	Data number	Total number	Percentage
Accurate	1, 16, 19	3	15.79
Less Accurate	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14,	16	84.21

	15, 17, 18		
--	------------	--	--

From table above, of 19 data, there are 3 data (15.79 %) that are accurately translated, 16 data (84.21 %) are less accurately translated, and there is no datum classified into inaccurate translation. The description of each category was presented below:

1. Accurate Translation

There are 3 data (15.79 %) that are classified into accurate translation.

The example is datum number 1.

(4.18) ST: I want you to look cute and cuddly, *Private*

TT: Harus tampak manis dan lucu, *prajurit*.

Three raters agreed that this data was included into accurate. Private means soldier of the lowest rank, while *prajurit* in Bahasa Indonesia is also the lowest rank in military.

The second example is from datum number 16. The example below is taken from caption. It happens when Alex is trying to get help from any boat which might pass, he writes a word “HELP” using coconut trees. When he is waiting for the help, the part of the letter “P” in the word “HELP” fall down to the ground which makes it is read “HELL” instead of “HELP”

(4. 19) ST: *HELP*
TT: *TOLONG/*

ST: **HELL**
TT: **NERAKA**

2. Less Accurate Translation

There are 16 data (84.21 %) included into less accurate translation.

Here are the examples of the data:

The example is taken from datum number 10.

(4. 20) ST: *New York Giants!*

TT: *New York Giants!*

In this datum, the three raters scored it differently. R1 scored it 1 as R1 thought that borrowing (or copying using Delabastita's term) must be accurate. R2 scored this datum 2. R2 thought that it needs footnote or explanation therefore the audience will know what the *New York Giants* here refers to. Different from R1 and R2, R3 gave score 3 to this datum. According to R3 the translation should be *raksasa New York* instead of *New York Giants*.

The second example is datum number 18. R2 and R3 scored it 1, while R1 scored it 3. According to R1 opinion, the translator gives priority to the acceptability instead of the accuracy since *del Voir* in French means *melihat*. The pun in this datum is translated into non pun, but unlike datum number 21 which works quite successfully, the technique employed in this datum does not work the same way.

(4. 21) ST: Welcome to castle *del Voir!* Take a load off! Hey, watch your feet.

TT: Selamat datang di *Wisma Liar*. Duduklah. / Hei, bersihkan dulu kakimu. /

Below is the third example.

(4.22) ST: No, no, you don't talk now, okay? You're not so good with the putting the words together and their coming out, good thing. You keep it thss! Hey! How you're doing? Yeah! You know what, everything's cool, we just have a little situation here. Little internal situation. Actually my friend just went a little crazy. It happens to everybody. The city gets to us all. Just went a little *cuckoo in the head*.

TT: Jangan bicara sekarang. Mengerti? / Kau tak pandai menyusun ... / kata yang kesimpulannya bagus. Kau diamlah. / Apa kabar? Semua baik-baik saja. / Kami baru alami sedikit masalah. Masalah pribadi. / Temanku hanya agak kacau. Bisa terjadi pada siapapun. / Kota ini membuat kami semua agak *gila*. /

R1 and R3 scored them 1, while R2 considered it as not so accurate since R2 thought that the play on words *cuckoo in the head* here also employing visual image; Melman's head in the cuckoo clock. Therefore R2 scored it 2, because the target text is lack of the play on the visual image.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asher, RE (ed). 1994. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* vol.6. British: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Asimakoulas, D. 2004. *Towards a Model of Describing Humour Translation A Case Study of the Greek Subtitled Versions of Airplane! and Naked Gun*. [online] Available from: <http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2004/v49/n4/009784ar.pdf> [accessed: May, 22 2008]
- Audrieth, A.L, 1998. *The Art of Using Humor in Public Speaking*. [online] Available from: www.squaresail.com/onhumor.html [accessed: November 7, 2006]
- Baker, M (ed). 2001. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge
- Bussman, H. 1996. *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. New York: Routledge
- Choliludin, 2005. *The Technique of Making Idiomatic Translation*. Jakarta: Kesaint Blanc.
- Crabtree, B F, and Miller. W.L. 1992. *Doing Qualitative Research*. USA: Sage Publication.
- Creswell, J.W. 1994. *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. USA: Sage Publication.
- Creswell, J.W. 1998. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Traditions*. USA: Sage Publication.
- Darwish, A. 1999. Towards a Theory of Constraints in Translation.
- de Vries, A & Verheij, A.J.C. 1997. *Wordplay in Four Twentieth-Century Translation of the Hebrew Bible*. In: Delabastita, Dirk (ed). 67-94.
- Gambier, Y. 1994. Audio-Visual Communication: Typological Detour. In: Dollerup, Cay, and Annette Lindegaard (eds). *Teaching Translation and Interpreting II: Insights, Aims, Visions: 275-283*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Gottlieb, H. 1994. Subtitling People Translating People. In: Dollerup, Cay, and Annette Lindegaard (eds). *Teaching Translation and Interpreting II: Insights, Aims, Visions: 261-274*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Hatim, B and Mason, I. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. New York: Routledge.

- Jaskanen, S. 1999. *On the Inside Track to Louserville, USA: Strategies Used in Translating Humour in Two Finnish Versions of Reality Bites* [thesis]. University of Helsinki. [online] Available from : <http://www.thesis.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/hum/engla/pg/jaskanen/ontheins.pdf> [accessed: March 27, 2006]
- Koponen, M. 2004. *Wordplay in Donald Duck comics and their Finnish Translation*. [online] Available from: <http://ethesis.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/hum/engla/pg/koponen/wordplay.pdf>. [accessed: December 24, 2008]
- Kovačič, I. 1994. Relevance as a Factor in Subtitling Reductions. In: Dollerup, Cay, and Annette Lindegaard (eds). *Teaching Translation and Interpreting II: Insights, Aims, Visions*: 245-251. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Larson, M. L. 1984. *Meaning-Based Translation; A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Marshall, C and Rossman, G.B. 1994. *Designing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition. USA: Sage Publication
- Moleong, L. J. 2005. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif* (edisi revisi). Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Molina, L, and Albir, A. H. 2002. *Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach*. [online] Available from: <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/008033ar>. [accessed: December 24, 2008]
- Munday, J. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Implications*. London: Routledge
- Nababan, M.R. 1999. *Tori Menerjemah Bahasa Inggris*. Yogyakarta: Putra Pelajar.
- Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Oxford English Dictionary. 1992. Vol VII. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Patton, M.Q. 1980. *Qualitative Evaluation Methods*. USA: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Schwarz, B. *Translation in a Confined Space – Film Sub-titling with Special Reference to Dennis Potter’s “Lipstick on Your Collar” Part 1*. [online] Available from: URL: <http://accurapid.com/journal/22subtitles.htm>. [accessed: July 25, 2007]
- Schröter, T. 2005. *Shun the Pun, Rescue the Rhyme? – The Dubbing and Subtitling of Language Play in Film* [dissertation]. Sweden: Universitetstryckeriet. [online] Available from: http://www.diva-portal.org/diva/getDocument?urn_nbn_se_kau_diva-704-1_fulltext.pdf [accessed: July 16, 2008]
- Shuttleworth, M, and Cowie, M. 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Spanakaki, K. 2007. *Translating Humor for Subtitling*. [online] Available from:
URL: <http://translationjournal.net/journal/40humor.htm> [accessed: July 25,
2007]

<http://en.wikipedia/wiki/Madagascar>