

INACCURACY IN THE VERBAL HUMOR SUBTITLE OF *F.R.I.E.N.D.S* AMERICAN SERIES

Rifka Mutiara Syifa

English Literature, Faculty of Language and Arts, The State University of Surabaya
rifikasyifa@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Dian Rivia Himmawati, S.S., M.Hum

English Literature, Faculty of Language and Arts, The State University of Surabaya
dianrivia@unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Menerjemahkan humor verbal ke dalam bentuk *subtitle* selalu menjadi salah satu dari tugas menantang dalam penerjemahan. Di satu sisi, permasalahan terletak pada batasan ruang dan waktu di mana *subtitle* ditampilkan di layar. Di sisi lain, menerjemahkan pesan humor sendirinya sudah cukup rumit karena humor adalah persoalan subjektif. Alhasil, suatu humor bisa dianggap lucu di satu negara, namun tidak di negara lain. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mendeskripsikan bagaimana ketidakakuratan terjadi pada *subtitle* humor verbal di serial Amerika *F.R.I.E.N.D.S* yang dihubungkan dengan strategi penerjemahan *subtitle* yang diterapkan oleh penerjemah dan juga dengan beberapa alasan lain seperti ketidakmampuan penerjemah *subtitle* untuk melihat keberadaan humor verbal dan menemukan padanan terjemahan ke dalam bahasa Indonesia sebagai bahasa target. Untuk memeriksa keakuratan penerjemahan, perbandingan antara teks sumber dan teks target dilakukan beberapa kali. Dengan membandingkan keduanya, dapat terlihat bahwa hilangnya informasi penting dari teks sumber pada subtitle humor verbal terjadi di beberapa kasus, sementara di kasus lainnya, terjemahan *subtitle* menyampaikan pesan yang berbeda dari teks sumber. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa sebagian besar ketidakakuratan terjadi di data permainan kata, karena letak kelucuan permainan kata tidak hanya ada pada kata itu sendiri, namun pada makna yang terkait dengan kata tersebut sehingga sulit untuk menerjemahkan permainan kata dari sebuah bahasa ke bahasa lain.

Kata Kunci: *keakuratan, penerjemahan audiovisual, subtitle, humor verbal*

Abstract

Subtitling verbal humor has always been one of the most challenging tasks in translation. In one case, the problem has to do with the space and time constraint of the subtitle being on screen. In another case, subtitling humor message can be quite tricky since humor is a subjective matter. As a result, something might be funny in one country, but may not be funny in another. The aim of this study is to describe how inaccuracy occurs in the subtitle of verbal humor of *F.R.I.E.N.D.S* American series in relation with the subtitling strategies employed by the subtitler and by other reasons like the subtitler's inability to recognize verbal humor and finding the equivalency in Bahasa Indonesia as the target language. In order to test the accuracy of the subtitle, comparison between source text and target text was done several times. By comparing both texts, it shows that verbal humor subtitle has undergone some omission of important information, while in some cases, the target text have conveyed different meaning with the source text. The result shows that inaccuracy takes place mostly in wordplay data since wordplay is funny not only because of the word itself, but also the meaning which links to the word so it is hard to transfer it from one language to another.

Keywords: *inaccuracy, audiovisual translation, subtitling, verbal humor*

INTRODUCTION

Movie, as an entertainment media, contains humor as its tool to entertain the audience. With humor, a movie will become more interesting and there will be a sort of engagement between the audience and the movie. Generally, humor is divided into verbal humor and non-verbal humor. Verbal humor involves utterances which

are delivered by the speaker to the hearer, while non-verbal humor relates to the actions done by one person which makes other people laugh. If non-verbal humor can be funny with the help of visual image on screen, verbal humor only depends on the utterances and the message contained in it.

Verbal humor can be found in many kinds of movies, one of them is an American Series entitled *F.R.I.E.N.D.S*.

The series was originally aired on NBC from September 22, 1994 to May 6, 2004, which revolves around six friends Rachel, Monica, Phoebe, Chandler, Joey, and Ross who live in Manhattan. As a situational comedy (sitcom), it is not a wonder that humor is the “bullet” of the series. Verbal humor is used by the character to live up the atmosphere; such as wordplay, irony, sarcasm, allusions, and so on. The brilliance of humor in the series engages people; not only of 90s generation but also today’s generation. The fame of *F.R.I.E.N.D.S* was also enjoyed by Indonesian people. In 1997, the series was aired on RCTI. After another 17 years, NET. aired the same series which means that *F.R.I.E.N.D.S* has left a big mark on people’s heart. In airing the series, both the TV Channels did not replace the actors’ voice (dubbing) but they applied subtitling in order to let the audience feel the originality of the dialogues. However, in the case of the verbal humor subtitling in *F.R.I.E.N.D.S*, inaccuracy had taken place due to some factors.

Inaccuracy in subtitling verbal humor may have been affected by the fact that verbal humor only depends on the words, phrases, or sentences uttered by a speaker, so it is not an easy matter to deliver verbal humor to the target audience. Moreover, the verbal humors are translated from a foreign language that some factors are included in the problems encountered by a subtitler to transfer the message from the source text to the target text. First of all, and most importantly, is the subtitler’s expertise in comprehending the language and culture of both the source language and target language. With a sufficient knowledge, a subtitler is able to transfer verbal humor from the source text into the target text as accurate as possible. However, cultural differences between source language and target language makes the subtitler have a difficult time in creating a good equivalence to the target language in the most possible way. The next factor has to do with the limitations of space and time the subtitle being on screen. Typically, only a maximum of two lines with approximately 35 characters is allowed to be on screen. Cintas and Ramael (2008: 82) add that subtitle may not drag the audience’s attention from the movie to it, so it needs to be at most two twelfths of the screen. Otherwise, the subtitle would take up the space on screen and make the viewer focus more on reading the subtitle than watching the movie.

Not only encountering difficulties in transferring the subtitle itself, Baker et al. (2009:16) supposes that the audience have an access on the original speech of the source language. Therefore, the audience will unavoidably compare the translated subtitle with what they hear in the movie, so the audience who get the background knowledge of the source language and culture will directly notice if there is some mistranslation occurs in the subtitle. Hence, a subtitler needs to put much attention on how to transfer both the form and the message conveyed by the verbal humor into the target text. Otherwise, the verbal humor may not cause the audiences to laugh. For worst, the audiences may not recognize the existence of humor in the dialogue which results to the translated text fail delivering the message which the source text has intended.

This study used the approach by Spanakaki (2007) in order to define the type of verbal humor of which inaccuracy occurred. She classified three types of verbal humor which are usually found in people’s utterances. They are as follows.

Wordplay

As defined by Delabastita (in Spanakaki, 2007), wordplay occurs when structural features of the language(s) are used and exploited in order to bring a significant confrontation of two of more linguistic structures with more or less similar forms and more or less different meanings. In short, wordplay occurs in a sentence which has ambiguity or confrontation between two or more meanings. The ambiguity leads the hearer make a relation of the wordplay with the possibilities of meanings it may carry, which result on the hilarious effect if the hearer owns the background knowledge of the wordplay. The example of wordplay would be *dig*, which can refer to forming a hole by removing soil and to like or admire (Meriam-Webster Mobile Dictionary). Another example is *flour* and *flower*, which are pronounced in the same way as /'flaʊ.ər/. However, wordplay is culture and time-specific (Nash, in Nieminen, 2007) and is language-dependent as well (Gottlieb, qtd. in Ulrichsen, 2011). Therefore, a translator needs to be creative to find solution of a similar wordplay, so the wordplay would successfully be rendered to the target audience. Therefore, a play of word may be funny in another country, but may not give any effect in another.

Allusion

Mayer (1968, in Leppihalme, 1997: 3) referred allusion to the use of preformed linguistic material in either its original or modified form, and of proper names to convey implicit meaning. Allusion is a guide to interpretation and a device in characterization (Leppihalme, 1997:31). Allusion is divided into proper name allusion and key phrase allusion. While PN allusion refers to names of fictional and non-fictional people, names of organizations, song and movie titles, and etc., KP allusion can refer to song lyrics, quotations, and well-known literary works.

Verbal Irony

In order to evoke laughter, presenting contradiction between the spoken words and the conversation can be done. By delivering verbal irony, a person may say one thing but mean another. Mateo (in Spanakaki, 2007) states that irony has a dependency on the context of the conversation, since it springs from the relationships of a word, expression, or action with the whole text or situation.

When one talks about verbal irony, it is hard to separate it with sarcasm. Sarcasm has a similar definition with irony, but with different purpose. Kreuz and Glucksberg (1989, in Cheang and Pell, 2008) defines sarcasm as verbal irony which expresses negative and critical attitude toward persons or events. Sarcasm, consequently, can be perceived as a special case of irony. In short, sarcasm is a verbal irony with an offensive intentional means to the interlocutor which is delivered indirectly.

Dissimilar with Spanakaki (2007), Raskin (1944) claimed that verbal humor is not restricted to wordplay, allusion, or verbal irony. Instead, he assumed that all humor delivered spoken are included as verbal humor.

In order to help examining how inaccuracy can occur in the verbal humor subtitle, the subtitling strategy should be taken into consideration. This study uses ten subtitling strategies proposed by Gottlieb (1992). They are as follows.

- 1) Expansion, which is used if the source text requires an additional explanation due to cultural differences which is not retrievable in the target language.
- 2) Paraphrase, which refers to the strategy applied when the phraseology of the source language cannot be reconstructed in the same syntactic way in the target language.
- 3) Transfer, which refers to the complete transmission of both the form and message of the source language into the target language. Also, there is no single word which is not translated.
- 4) Imitation, a strategy which maintains the same form of the source message by constructing an identical expression of the source text into the target text.
- 5) Transcription, which refers to the strategy used in those cases where a term is unusual even in the source text, so the subtitler seeks for the closest natural equivalent from word in source language into the target language.
- 6) Dislocation, the strategy adopted when the source text employs some sort of special effects, e.g., a silly song in a cartoon where the translation of the effect is more important than the content.
- 7) Condensation, which is the shortening of a text in the least obvious way possible in an over-lengthy dialogue without reducing the content which the source language tries to convey. The redundancies are eliminated for achieving higher coherence with shorter sentence.
- 8) Decimation, which is an extreme form of condensation where perhaps for reasons of discourse speed, even potentially important elements either in the semantic or stylistic content are omitted.
- 9) Deletion, which refers to the omission of the less important aspects with no verbal content, such as repetitions, word fillers, and question tags without changing the source message.
- 10) Resignation, which describes the strategy adopted when no translation solution can be found and meaning is inevitably lost.

Lastly, checking the inaccuracy itself is done by comparing the source text and target text for several times. It is one of the ways to check the accuracy as claimed by Larson (1998). He assumes that a comparison between the translated text and the source text should be done for several times to make a good quality of translation (1998: 531). The comparison includes several factors, such as omissions of some parts of the source message, additions of some parts which did not exist in the source text into the target text, zero meaning (when the form used has no communicative function), and differences of meaning between the source text and the

target text. If these lacking still can be found in the final result of a translation, it can be concluded that the translation is inaccurate.

In relation with the background of the study supported with the review of literature, this study is aimed to investigate how inaccuracy occurred in the verbal humor subtitle of *F.R.I.E.N.D.S*. The inaccuracy is checked through deep comparison between the source text and target text with considering the subtitling strategies employed by the subtitler and other reasons like the inability of the subtitler to recognize the existence of the verbal humor which may result to the inaccuracy of the verbal humor subtitle.

METHOD

Since this study focused on the analysis of inaccuracy in verbal humor subtitle and how it was related to the strategies employed by the subtitler, descriptive qualitative method was suitable to be applied in this study. As supported by Patton and Cochan (2002), this method generates words than numbers. Additionally, it relies on experiences and phenomena which need to be interpreted and explained (Hansen, in Nieminen, 2007).

This study chose the six main characters of *F.R.I.E.N.D.S* American series as the subject of the study; Rachel, Monica, Phoebe, Chandler, Joey, and Ross. Those six characters are best friends whose lives revolve around Manhattan, United States of America. Because they are best friends, it is not odd to see them making jokes to each other and about each other. The setting of the conversations occurred in the series was in casual places, such as each character's apartment in which Monica's was where the dialogues mostly taken place, and also in a coffeehouse called Central Perk which became their favorite place to hang out. Other than that, the setting was done in Monica's apartment hall, streets, Chandler's office, etc.

The data for this study was taken manually from the original DVD of the ninth season of *F.R.I.E.N.D.S* American Series (2003), since the subtitle was considered as more reliable than subtitles which people acquired through subtitle websites. The data taken covered words, phrases, or sentences uttered by the main characters which contained verbal humor in the original speech, (English as the source language) and in the subtitle (Bahasa Indonesia as the target language).

There were some procedures which had been undergone in conducting this research. They were acquiring the original VCD of *F.R.I.E.N.D.S* through online purchasing, downloading the series' scripts from *livesinabox.com*, watching the series, transcribing the conversation, deciding the types of verbal humor by using Spanakaki (2007) theory and subtitling strategies applied by the theory proposed by Gottlieb (1992), and lastly combining the previous results and examining the inaccuracy of the data based on Larson (1998) theory of accuracy.

In order to provide good data analysis, there are three concurrent flows of data analyzing technique. The first flow is *data condensation*, followed by *data display* as the second flow and *drawing and verifying conclusions* as the

last flow (Miles et al., 2014: 31-33). In data condensation, only the humor which involved words, phrases, or sentences uttered by the six main characters (Rachel, Monica, Phoebe, Chandler, Joey, and Ross) or utterances by other characters which referred to those six characters were taken as the data to be analyzed. In short, humor which was depending too much on the visual image or physical gags was not taken into consideration. The next thing had to do with the less important sentences of the conversation which were condensed in order to make an effective data display. In data display, the data were in the form of conversations provided in tables. Lastly, in drawing and verifying conclusions, the way to answer each research question and examine the validity of the data by relating them with the theories was done. In order to answer the fulfill the aim of this study, which was to investigate how inaccuracy occurred in the verbal humor subtitle of *F.R.I.E.N.D.S*, the first thing to do was defining the verbal humor types which were found to be inaccurate by using Spanakaki (2007) theory of verbal humor. Then, in order to investigate the inaccuracy, the subtitling strategies applied were taken into consideration (Gottlieb, 19992). After that, the analysis was done based on the accuracy theory by Larson (1998).

RESULTS

This study found that among three verbal humor types, only wordplay and verbal irony humor were found to be inaccurate, while there were also two data which were included in unclassified verbal humor as they were not considered as wordplay, allusion, or verbal humor.

1) Wordplay

Wordplay is culture-specific and language-dependent, so it would be tricky to translate wordplay since it needs the subtitler's creativity and ability to transfer the wordplay from the source text to the target text and make it as funny as possible. However, if the subtitler does not succeed in finding the solution to overcome the translation problem, the subtitle would have failed and the audience would think that there is something wrong with the subtitle or, for the worst; they would think that the original utterances are not actually funny. The first inaccuracy found in the subtitle of wordplay could be seen in the following datum.

Datum 1.

Source Text	Target Text
J : Person named Wiener . God that kills me.	J : Orang bernama Wiener . Lucu sekali.
P : Look at you, all grown up.	P : Lihat, kau sudah dewasa.
(Episode 3, 00.01.51 – 00.01.58)	

* J: Joey P: Phoebe

The conversation above occurred when Rachel mentioned that she went to a doctor called Dr. Wiener. Upon hearing the name, Joey kept laughing. It might be funny for people who spoke English as they knew what

was behind the name *Wiener* which made Joey laughed. However, to the target audience, Indonesians, the conversation was plain as the subtitle provided no reason for them to laugh. In this case, the subtitle had delivered zero meaning since it did not deliver anything to the target audience.

In order to check where the problem came about, the subtitling strategy which was employed should be noticed. The subtitler translated the wordplay *Wiener* into the same form without adding any information. So, it meant that imitation strategy was employed in the subtitle. If the wordplay was related to familiar term, it would not have been a problem for the target audience. However, Indonesian people were not so accustomed to hear the word *wiener*, so they had encountered a big problem in understanding Joey's utterance which was supposed to be funny. They did not even recognize that there was a wordplay contained in the conversation.

According to Meriam-Webster Mobile Dictionary, "wiener" was derived from *frankfurter*, a cured cooked sausage (as of beef or beef and pork) that may be skinless or stuffed in a casing. Apparently, the meaning of the word "wiener" that Joey thought funny was not what it literally meant as it was in the dictionary, but that of a vulgar slang "wiener" which referred to "penis".

The subtitler should have at least added some information regarding the meaning of wiener. For a better translation, employing expansion strategy would have been recommended for the subtitler to do. So, what Joey said, *Person named Wiener* would have better be translated into *Orang bernama Wiener (=penis)*. With the additional information following the wordplay, the audience would have a better understanding on why Joey thought the name was funny.

Another failed wordplay translation due to the subtitler's choice on applying imitation strategy occurred in the following conversation.

Datum 2.

Source Text	Target Text
C : I suppose that Monica will have the manipulative Shrew . (Episode 5, 00.17.37 – 00.17.43)	C : Dan Monica pasti akan pesan Shrew manipulatif .

* C: Chandler

The datum above was taken in a conversation between Chandler and Monica. Monica and Chandler got into this funny quarrel because Monica found out that Chandler smoked cigarettes when he was in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Even though Chandler made him upset, but Monica did not want to waste her time to quarrel because she wanted to make love with Chandler as they attempted on getting pregnant. This made her pretending that she was not mad at Chandler to get him into bed. However, after they had done it, Chandler found out that Monica played pretend so he felt manipulated.

So, when they went to Phoebe's birthday dinner, the atmosphere between them was still cold and they ended

up mocking each other by playing words on the menu. Monica first said, *Well, I suppose that Chandler will have the smoked duck* which was replied by Chandler, *I suppose that Monica will have the manipulative Shrew*. Monica insisted that Chandler would eat smoked duck (*bebek asap*), in which smoke could also refer to *merokok*. Chandler, in turn, supposed that Monica would eat manipulative shrew, as she had manipulated him. Here, shrew meant two things based on Meriam-Webster Mobile Dictionary. The first was “a small animal that looks like a mouse with a long, pointed nose” and the second was “an unpleasant, bad-tempered woman.” Chandler’s response was hilarious, as shrew would have never been written on the menu, so it meant that Chandler played with the word just to get Monica more upset.

In the subtitle, the wordplay *smocked duck* was translated into *bebek asap* and *manipulative shrew* was translated into *Shrew manipulatif*. In order to translate the first wordplay, the subtitler employed transfer strategy as it was translated literally and completely to Bahasa Indonesia. For the second wordplay, the subtitler used imitation strategy as s/he just changed the order of the words without changing the words themselves. The first wordplay was considered acceptable as “*asap*” could refer to both smoking cigarette or smoked beef or meat. However, the main problem was on the second wordplay. Since the subtitle kept the same form from the source text into the target text without changing or adding anything, Chandler’s utterance became insignificant and failed to deliver humorous message to the target audience.

It was suggested for the subtitler to apply either expansion strategy to translate the wordplay by adding informational bracket following the source text. As a result, the *manipulative shrew* was translated into *shrew penipu* (*shrew = cecurut/ wanita pemarah*), with *manipulative* being translated into *penipu* as it sounded more natural. It was essential to be noted that no wordplays could be successfully rendered from the source language into the target language with the same form and meaning. However, with the translation above, at least the meaning of the wordplay would have survived and be rendered to Indonesian audience.

Different case happened when the problem was not coming from the strategy of subtitling, but from the subtitler’s inability to recognize the verbal humor contained in the utterances. The example would be found in the following datum.

Datum 3.

Source Text	Target Text
C : Oh, she’s just regional Vice President. She’s... just b-low me .	C : Dia wakil direktur cabang. Dia di bawahku
M : She did WHAT?	M : Apa?
C : BE-LOW me!	C : Di bawahku .
(Episode 10, 00.36.47 – 00.36.57)	

C: Chandler

M: Monica

In the conversation above, Monica and Chandler were talking via phone, so there was a chance that a miscommunication happened between them. The problem occurred when Chandler told a story about his work partner and said the word “below”. What Chandler meant was that his work partner was below her, which meant that she had a lower position than him in the office. However, what Monica thought was that his work partner was “blow” her, which then referred to sexual intercourse. That was why Monica asked, *she did what?* Chandler knew that Monica misinterpreted it, so he emphasized the word “be” on the “below”.

However, it did not seem that the subtitle had a good outcome on transferring the wordplay. In the subtitle text, it only seemed that Chandler simply repeated his words because Monica could not hear him clearly. Moreover, Monica’s utterance *she did what?* was translated with resignation strategy so the essential part was omitted. When it should have been translated into *dia melakukan apa?*, the subtitler only transferred it into *apa?* which supported to the vagueness of the conversation.

It seemed like this conversation needed much fixing in order to let the audience recognize the humor message contained in the utterances. It would have been better if the subtitler had transferred the conversation as in the following conversation.

Chandler : Oh, she’s just regional Vice President. She’s... just **b-low** me.
Dia wakil direktur cabang. Dia di bawahku. (below = di bawah, blow = meniup)

Monica : She did WHAT? *Dia melakukan apa?*

Chandler : BE-LOW me! Di ba-wah-ku!

Indeed, it would have been impossible to transfer the wordplay above from the English utterance into the subtitle in Bahasa Indonesia effectively since it was language-dependent so it would be difficult to give the similar sense of humor contained in the source language. However, with the suggested subtitle above, the audience would have understood that Monica’s mishearing led to wordplay and it was meant to be funny. Even though it needed more time for Indonesian audience to grasp the wordplay and they probably needed to rewind the scene, but the new translated text would have given a better understanding compared to the original translated text.

Another example of the subtitler’s inability to recognize wordplay was also expressed in the following conversation.

Datum 4.

Source Text	Target Text
R : Finally, factoring the profusion of new species recently discovered: Giganotosaurs, Argentinosaurus...	R : Akhirnya, faktor dalam banyaknya spesies baru yang ditemukan: Giganotosaurus, Argentinosaurus...
C : Not to mention the cold sores .	Belum lagi Dingin-saurus

(Episode 23, 00.26.31 00.26.40)	C :
---------------------------------------	-----

* R: Ross C: Chandler

This conversation occurred when all the characters went to Barbados to listen to Ross' speech. As Ross delivered his speech regarding many types of dinosaurs, Chandler was making joke by playing with the word "saurs" of the dinosaurs with "sores". When Ross kept on mentioning names of dinosaurs, he said, *not to mention cold sores*. Cold sores meant a small sore area around or inside the mouth that is caused by a virus (Meriam-Webster Mobile Dictionary). What made it funny was that both "saurs" and "sores" were pronounced as /'sōrs/ so they were included as homophony as they were pronounced in the same way but they had different spelling and meaning.

However, it seemed that the subtitler failed to identify the wordplay so s/he still thought that Chandler still talked about dinosaur. So, in the subtitle, he translated *not to mention the cold sores* into *belum lagi dingin-saurus*. If we took a lot at the subtitle only, it did not make any sense at all. And definitely, it could not be said that it was a joke since it was not funny.

The subtitler should have sought for more opportunities of wordplay before s/he translated the English utterance into Bahasa Indonesia. In order to make it funnier, the subtitler should have used expansion strategy. As a result, Chandler's utterance *not to mention the cold sores* should have been translated into *belum lagi cold-saurus (cold sores = luka infeksi)*. With the improvement, the target audience would have noticed that Chandler was not talking about another kind of dinosaurs, but different topic.

2) Verbal Irony

Commonly, in order to translate verbal irony, a subtitler uses deletion strategy to omit unimportant parts in the conversation to match the space and time of the subtitle. However, if the subtitler omits the essential parts of the utterance, it would have resulted on the loss of the meaning or style of the utterance. The example could be seen in the subtitle of the verbal irony below.

Datum 5.

Source Text	Target Text
J : You, you want me to help you with that?	J : Mau kubantu?
Rs : Why? Does it look like I'm having trouble with my misshapen claw?	Rs : Kelihatannya aku ada kesulitan dengan jariku?

* J: Joey Rs: Ross

This conversation happened in the hospital where Ross checked his injured right hand because of his fight with Joey. Ross was given an administration file for him to fill. Since he was a right-handed, he was not able to

write. Seeing that, Joey rhetorically asked Ross whether or not Ross needed his help. Feeling that he did not have to answer Joey's stupid question, he sarcastically responded by saying, *Why, does it look like I'm having trouble with my misshapen claw?* which resembled contradictory because he actually had trouble with his "misshapen claw".

However, the subtitler seemed to simplify the utterance and employed decimation strategy by translating Ross' utterance into *Kelihatannya aku ada kesulitan dengan jariku?*. Obviously, the message could not be successfully delivered as he translated the most essential part, *my misshapen claw*, into *jariku* which resulted on the loss of verbal irony essence in Ross' humor. With the translation, there was no contradictory spotted in Ross' utterance, which meant that the verbal irony was failed to be rendered to Indonesian audience.

Ross' utterance, *Kelihatannya aku ada kesulitan dengan jariku?* did not seem as a verbal irony. Instead, it looked like it was only a general question asked by someone who just got injured. The best suggestion for this conversation is to translate it with using transfer strategy, so it would turn out as *Apa kelihatannya aku mendapatkan masalah dengan "cakar"ku yang tidak berbentuk?*. With the revised subtitle, the utterance was given a strong sense of insulting and the target audience could get that Ross was actually said it because he wanted to mock Joey's stupidity for asking rhetorical question.

Another failure on translating verbal irony on *F.R.I.E.N.D.S* American Series was found in the following datum.

Datum 6.

Source Text	Target Text
J : Rachel thinks I asked her to marry me!	J : Rachel mengira aku melamarnya
C : What?! Why does she think that?	C : Apa? Kenapa begitu?
J : Okay well, I was down on one knee with the ring in my hand...	J : Aku sedang berlutut dengan cincin di tangan...
C : As we all are at some point during the day.	C : Memang begitu caranya.
(Episode 1, 00.04.06 – 00.04.21)	

*J: Joey C: Chandler

As resignation strategy describes the condition where no translation solution can be found and it lost its meaning, so it could be said that this datum was failed to be delivered to the target audience.

The conversation above occurred between Chandler and Joey when Joey told Chandler that he "accidentally" proposed Rachel. Joey told Chandler that he really looked like he was proposing because he stood on one knee and put out a ring in front of Rachel, even though what he actually did was not that. Chandler was confused as Joey

did not say he proposed but all he did in front of Rachel representing the act of proposing.

So, when Joey said, *Okay well, I was down on one knee with the ring in my hand...* Chandler interrupted him and he said, *As we all are at some point during the day when what he really meant was that there was nobody did it if it was not for proposing.*

However, the subtitler seemed to lose the sense of verbal irony and also the meaning of Chandler's utterance by employing resignation strategy. So, Chandler's verbal irony was translated into Bahasa Indonesia and became *Memang begitu caranya* like he was doing an act of agreement with Joey's action. In order to make a better translation and to meet the target audience's better understanding, another strategy of subtitling should be applied. Transfer strategy would have been best to be applied in translating verbal humor. So, the suggested translation with transfer strategy would be *Seperti yang kita semua lakukan di siang hari*. With the new translation, the target audience would have understood what Chandler meant to say to Joey, that he was saying to show the opposite thing that no one actually did it during the day. He said it because he thought that Joey's accidental proposal was ridiculous.

3) Unclassified Verbal Humor

This part discussed the inaccuracy of two conversations which did not include in wordplay, allusion, or verbal irony. The data below could be considered as verbal humor since verbal humor covered all kinds of humor which were delivered verbally or spoken by the characters.

Datum 7.

Source Text	Target Text
Rs : Hi, this is Ross Geller in suite 206.... is there anything you have that I haven't asked for already? Yeah, go ahead, send up some tampons . (Episode 19, 00.10.06 – 00.10.38)	Rs : Ini Ross Geller dari kamar 206.... ada lagi yang belum kuminta? Ya, bawakan juga tampon.

*Rs: Ross

In this conversation, the humor was spotted in Ross' conversation via telephone with a hotel's telephone operator. The context of conversation was that Ross and Chandler had spent a fortune on staying a night in the hotel that they feel so used and wanted to take advantage of the hotel as much as possible. So, they decided to take all the complementary hotel amenities and asked for more. As a result, Ross also made a request for the room service to bring him tampons, which was ridiculous, since tampons were supposed to be for female.

However, it seemed that the subtitler did not translate the humor into Bahasa Indonesia, which probably, based the reason that that there was no meaning equivalency of "tampons" in Bahasa Indonesia. Apparently, it was uncommon for Indonesian people to use tampon. Therefore, it was difficult to translate. However, the subtitler's decision to employ imitation strategy was incorrect, as he made the humor message absent in Ross' verbal humor.

To make a better translation, the subtitler should have employed paraphrase strategy and found the closest equivalency of the word tampon in Bahasa Indonesia. As a result, it was recommended to change Ross' utterance from *Ya, bawakan juga tampon* into *Ya, bawakan juga pembalut*. Even though *pembalut* and *tampon* were distinct in their shapes, they shared similarity in the function, which was for feminine hygiene product. With the suggested translation, the target audience would have understood the humor; that Ross was even requesting for a female stuff since he wanted to make use of his stay there as much as possible.

A different case of inaccuracy happened in the following datum between Rachel and Joey.

Datum 8.

Source Text	Target Text
J : Oh, by the way, that egg nog in our fridge was great! Rc : Joey, that was formula . (Episode 15, 00.14.28 – 00.14.33)	J : Dan omong-omong, telur campur di kulkas kita, enak sekali. Rc : Joey, itu adonan .

* J: Joey Rc: Rachel

In this conversation, Joey told Rachel that he had drunk something great, which he assumed as 'egg nog'. Rachel then said that it was 'formula'. In order to translate the word 'formula', which became the point of humor in this conversation, the subtitler used transfer strategy, in which s/he chose *adonan*. But then, it seemed that there was something wrong with the subtitle since in the previous talks, there was nothing which referred to Rachel making something and put it in the refrigerator. So, it would have been better to seek of the possibility of another translation of 'formula' other than *adonan*.

'Formula' has more than one sense-relation. They were (1) a list of the ingredients used for making something (such as a medicine or a drink), (2) a general fact, rule, or principle expressed in usually mathematical symbols, (3) a milk mixture or substitute for feeding an infant (Merriam-Webster mobile dictionary). In this case, the subtitler had failed in finding the sense-relation of formula in the context of the datum above.

In order to find the correct sense-relation, the overall context of the conversation should have been taken into consideration. Translating *formula* into *adonan* could have been right, but considering the fact that Rachel was

not a woman who liked the idea of cooking made it appropriate to say that *formula* did not refer to *adonan*. Then, another possibility coming from the fact that Rachel had a baby of whom may need formula, or baby milk, which denoted to the meaning (3) of *formula*. Therefore, it would have been better if the subtitle was changed into *Joey, itu susu bayi*.

DISCUSSION

Based on the results which had been analyzed in the previous section, it was found that some factors which contributed to inaccuracy had taken place in the verbal humor subtitle of *F.R.I.E.N.D.S*, mostly in wordplay and in two cases of verbal irony. They were as follows.

First of all, the inaccuracy had happened because the subtitle had applied the least suitable strategy to transfer verbal humor. Based on the results, the implementation of certain subtitling strategies to certain verbal humor type had been proven to make the data inaccurate.

Through some cases, there were some proofs where wordplay data were inaccurate when translated with imitation strategy. Imitation strategy, as had been assumed by Gottlieb (1992), is a strategy which maintains the same form of the source message by constructing an identical expression of the source text into the target text. Frequently, imitation strategy was applied to proper name allusion data since they dealt with names of people, places, song titles, etc. In most cases, allusions which were translated with imitation strategy were accurate. However, if it was implemented to wordplays, it would have had a totally different outcome. For the wordplays in datum 1 and 2, *wiener* and *manipulative shrew*, were not translated into Bahasa Indonesia, the target audience had encountered a difficulty in comprehending the meaning of the utterances which were supposed to be funny. As a result, the wordplays and the meanings they intended to deliver to the audience were failed to be rendered. The wordplays, for instance, was recommended to be translated with expansion strategy, which is a strategy that gives an additional explanation on the verbal humor (Gottlieb, 1992).

In the case of subtitling verbal irony, decimation strategy and resignation strategy had caused inaccuracy since the application of these strategies might contribute to the loss of either semantic or stylistic content and the meaning of the verbal irony as well (Gottlieb, 1992). In datum 5, the subtitler applied decimation strategy. S/he omitted the most important characteristic of a verbal irony, which was the ironic style. For that reason, the intention which was contained in the source text was not delivered by the target text. In sum, as supported by Larson (1998), this datum was inaccurate since it delivered different meaning if compared to the source text. In datum 6, the subtitler employed resignation strategy, which means which describes the strategy adopted when no translation solution can be found and meaning is inevitably lost (Gottlieb, 1992). Definitely, if the meaning was lost, then the translation was inaccurate. In this datum, not only the meaning was lost, but also the meaning of the utterance was changed which resulted on the loss of ironical sense in the verbal irony.

Secondly, the inability of the subtitler to recognize the existence of verbal humor had taken place in some wordplay data (datum 3 and 4). Since wordplay was a culture specific (Nash, in Nieminen, 2007), it was no wonder that the subtitler would have had difficulties in comprehending the wordplay contained in verbal humor. The cultural difference made the subtitler had failed to notice the wordplay in the utterance. As a result, s/he literally transferred the utterance with wordplay into Bahasa Indonesia. This action had caused the utterances to be not making any sense. In short, these two data had delivered zero meaning, in which they did not deliver any communicative function (Larson, 1998).

Thirdly, inaccuracy had also been influenced by the subtitler's failure on finding the closest natural equivalency of a cultural-specific term in the English source text into Bahasa Indonesia. The example was found in datum 7. The use of unfamiliar term had caused the target audience to fail understanding the verbal humor utterance. Instead of not translating it into Bahasa Indonesia, the subtitler should have sought for other possibilities which could have a similar meaning to the term, even if they were not the same thing.

Lastly, the failure of defining the sense-relation of a word had also become one of the reasons inaccuracy happened in the verbal humor subtitle of *F.R.I.E.N.D.S*. It occurred to datum 8. For the reason that the subtitler had different interpretation of a word in the utterance, s/he had made the subtitle to be misleading as it conveyed different meaning to the source text.

Those four factors which contributed to the inaccuracy of *F.R.I.E.N.D.S*' verbal humor subtitle indirectly showed that the subtitler did not do enough comparison of both source text and target text when subtitling the verbal humor, as had been assumed by Larson (1998) as the most influential way to make a good quality of translation. If the comparison had been done efficiently, inaccuracy would not have happened to many data of verbal humor.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

Inaccuracy in the verbal humor subtitle had a relation with the strategy of subtitling applied by the subtitler. For instance, wordplay was failed to be rendered if translated with imitation strategy as it maintained the same form from the source text to the target text. It resulted on the zero meaning of the wordplay. It did not communicate anything since the wordplay was not transferred into Bahasa Indonesia. Meanwhile, in verbal irony, the use of decimation strategy and resignation strategy had resulted on the different meaning delivery between the source text and target text. The use of decimation strategy had made verbal irony to fail in rendering the contradictory essence of an utterance which resulted on the failure of sarcastic means delivery, while resignation strategy had contributed to a total different message between the source text and target text.

Wordplay had been the most difficult verbal humor to translate, since the humor essence was not only depending on the word itself, but the meaning(s) it carried. The

subtitler had encountered a big challenge since it was impossible to render both the form and the meanings of the wordplay into the target language. Not only that, it was not an easy matter to recognize wordplay, since the ability to do so related to the background knowledge which the subtitler possessed in understanding both the language and the culture of the source text.

Lastly, the subtitler should have done more comparison on both the source text and target text, since the inaccuracy did not happen only because the cultural differences which resulted to the difficulty of subtitling, but also because of the subtitler failed to find the closest equivalency the sense-relation of a word would not have happened.

Suggestion

This study was conducted in hope to trigger future researchers to have more interests on translation field, audiovisual translation in specific. There are still many possible topics in relation with humor audiovisual translation, which also covers dubbing. This field has a great number of interesting topics to be studied and the objects could be found everywhere; in movies, books, advertisements, social media, etc.

Any suggestion or constructive criticism will gladly be welcomed to make this study better. Hopefully, it can be a reference for future studies in translation, especially in subtitling verbal humor.

Last but not least, this study is expected to help scholars have a better understanding on how subtitle have a great influence on the delivery of humor message to the target language. Not only that, this study can be a reference for subtitlers to what strategy is not suitable to be used for translating certain verbal humor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Deepest gratitude was sent to Dian Rivia Himmawati, S.S, M.Hum. as my advisor and the second writer of this article, for her insights and suggestions encouraged this study to be completed.

REFERENCES

- Baker, Mona. 2011. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge. Print.
- Cheang, Henry S. Marc D Pell. 2007. The Sound of Sarcasm. *Speech Communication* 50 (2008), 366–381. Electronic.
- Cintas, Jorge D. Aline Remael. 2014. *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*. New York: St. Jerome Publishing. Electronic.
- Gottlieb, Henrik. 1992. Subtitling - A New University Discipline. In Dollerup & Loddegaard (Eds). *Teaching Translation and Interpreting* (pp. 161-172). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Electronic.
- Hurford et al. 2007. *Semantics: A Course Book*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Electronic.
- Larson, Mildred L. 1998. *Meaning-Based Translation*. Maryland: University Press of America. Print.
- Miles et al. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. United States of America: SAGE Publications, Inc. Electronic.
- Nieminen, Sini. 2007. *Comparing and Contrasting the Translations of Verbal Humor in Screen Translations of Shrek*. Turkey: University of Jyväskylä. Electronic.
- Rahmawati, Anindia Ayu. 2013. *Verbal Humor in the Rio Animated Film and Its Translation in the Indonesian Subtitling*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. Electronic.
- Raskin, Victor. 1944. *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company. Print.
- Šmilauerová, Anna. 2012. *TV Sitcom Friends: Analysis of Character Humor Strategies Based on the Violation of Grice's Conversational Maxim*. Prague: Charles University. Electronic.
- Spanakaki, Katia. (2007). Translating Humor for Subtitling. <http://translationjournal.net/journal/40humor.htm>, retrieved on 20 May 2015.