



FACULTADE DE FILOLOXÍA

DEPARTAMENTO DE FILOLOXÍA INGLESA E ALEMÁ

# Translation of puns and humour in Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* into Galician

Grao en Lingua e Literatura Inglesas

Liña temática: Estudos de tradución

Autora: Leticia Rey Mazas

Supervisor: Mario Cal Varela

2017/2018



FACULTADE DE FILOLOXÍA

DEPARTAMENTO DE FILOLOXÍA INGLESA E ALEMÁ

# Translation of puns and humour in Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* into Galician

Grao en Lingua e Literatura Inglesas

Liña temática: Estudos de tradución

Autora: Leticia Rey Mazas

Supervisor: Mario Cal Varela

2017/2018



**Formulario de delimitación de título e resumo**  
Traballo de Fin de Grao curso 2017/2018

APELIDOS E NOME:	Rey Mazas Leticia
GRAO EN:	Lingua e Literatura Inglesas
(NO CASO DE MODERNAS) ITINERARIO EN:	
TITOR/A:	Mario Cal Varela
LIÑA TEMÁTICA ASIGNADA:	Estudos de tradución

SOLICITO a aprobación do seguinte título e resumo:

**Título:** Translation of puns and humour in Lewis Carroll's "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland" into Galician.

**Resumo:** Humorous elements having to do with language, for instance puns or witty components, entail an interesting challenge when translating a text, since the humoristic effect needs to be reproduced in the target text for it not to lose its sense. My aim, with this proposal, is to observe how different translators were able to solve the difficulties that the mentioned elements present in a classical work like "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland" by Lewis Carroll, which contains a great number of idioms, cultural references, jokes and witty puns with humorous purposes that enrich the text, but that require from the translator a deep knowledge of the source and target languages, and a huge creative capacity.

For this purpose, I am going to conduct a comparative analysis of two different Galician versions of the original work in English, both of them being complete texts and addressed to a comparable audience. The first of the versions is translated by Teresa Barro and Fernando Pérez Barreiro, published in 1984, and the other one by Xabier Queipo, published thirty-one years later, in 2015. I am going to identify specific instances of puns and other forms of wordplay used by the author to create humorous effects, and analyse the different proposals of the translators to create a similar effect in the target language.

SRA. DECANA DA FACULTADE DE FILOLOXÍA (Presidenta da Comisión de Títulos de Grao)



Santiago de Compostela, 31 de Outubro de 2017.

Sinatura do/a interesado/a 	Visto e prace (sinatura do/a titor/a)  M. T. R. O. C. A. E.	Aprobado pola Comisión de Títulos de Grao con data  Selo da Facultade de Filoloxía 15 NOV 2017
---	--	---

SRA. DECANA DA FACULTADE DE FILOLOXÍA (Presidenta da Comisión de Títulos de Grao)

## Table of contents

Index.....	i
List of abbreviations.....	iii
List of tables.....	iv
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Humour.....	3
2.1 Theories of humour.....	4
3. Verbal humour.....	7
3.1 Theories of verbal humour.....	7
3.2 Puns.....	10
3.3 Taxonomy of nature of puns.....	11
4. Humour and translation.....	13
4.1 Coseriu's terms.....	13
4.2 Importance of the verbal humour for the area of translation.....	15
4.3 Main problems of verbal humour in translation.....	15
4.3.1 Equivalence.....	15
4.3.2 The implicit knowledge.....	18
4.3.3 Translatability.....	21
4.4 Translation strategies.....	22

5. The analysis of puns in the translations of <i>Alice's Adventures in Wonderland</i> .....	24
5.1 Methodology.....	24
5.2 Classification of puns.....	25
5.3 A comparison of two translations.....	33
6. Conclusions.....	46
Reference list.....	50
Appendix.....	53

## **List of abbreviations**

SL: Source Language

TL: Target Language

ST: Source Text

TT: Target Text

SC: Source Community

TC: Target Community

## **List of tables**

Table 1: Raskin's classification of humour theories.....	4
Table 2: Translation procedures selected by translators A and B, by category.....	33

## 1. Introduction

The art of translating a text is a challenge and a huge responsibility for translators, since they have to take lots of decisions to solve all the problems that may appear during the translation process. Reproducing the content of a text in a specific language into another one is not an easy task, for there has to be an equivalence between both texts and the translator will have to carefully select different tools for the translation process to be successful. The different solutions they use and the parameters they take into account will determine the quality and the accuracy of the result.

Yet, some areas of language may present more problems than others, and humour, specially puns and verbal humorous elements, are some of the areas in which these problems are very clearly seen and very important to solve; they should not be ignored. In the case of puns, finding an equivalence in the target language (TL) is extremely important for the target text (TT) to fulfil the target community's (TC) expectations.

My aim in this essay is to observe and analyse, through a comparative study, the differences between two translations into Galician of an enormously famous literary work as it is Lewis Carrol's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. More precisely, I am going to analyse the different decisions that the translators of both target texts have taken when dealing with the extensive number of puns and linguistic humorous elements.

I have chosen this topic because, when I read *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* a year ago, I wondered how translators would face the presence of the multiple existent puns and which solutions they would find when transferring the text to some other language, because I found it a big challenge. So, I checked some translations, and seeing that translators were very cunning and used several alternatives, I thought it could be interesting to compare two of the versions and examine the decisions of both translators.

For this purpose, some explanations about verbal humour, specially about puns, are going to be introduced, as well as what I consider some important notions about translation, before I start with my analysis in the second part of this essay.

## 2. Humour

A good first step for a research in the field of humour would be having a proper definition to start with, but, as far as I have observed reading all the bibliography I have used, not many authors dare to give a closed definition of what it is. As Smuts (n.d.) states, for many years, it has been matter of debate, and not only object of study for linguistics, but also for philosophy and psychology. However, according to Chiaro (2008, p. 570), there is still no firm theory and it is still understudied and considered not very important by linguists. An interesting, if exceptional, point of view is Vandaele's, who explored deeply the relation between translation and humour and gave the following definition:

At first glance, humor is easy to define. Humor is what causes amusement, mirth, a spontaneous smile and laughter. And humor, it seems, is a distinctly human phenomenon “pour ce que rire est le propre de l'homme” [because to laugh is proper to man], in François Rabelais' phrase. (Vandaele, 2010, p. 1)

But although humour and laughter are connected, according to Aaron Smuts (n.d.) they should not be identified with each other, and we could say that laughter can be an effect of humour, but it is not essential for humour to work; there is humour that does not produce laughter and sometimes we laugh for other causes that are not humour (tickling, for example). Also, depending on the culture and on the person, we may find a joke funny or not, but our reaction is not what determines if it can be considered humour or not. It seems difficult to establish boundaries between what is and what is not humour, and, although I think we can accept his definition in order to talk about the problems it presents in the translation of a text, I find it useful to talk about the main theories of humour very briefly just to understand better what it is.

## 2.1 Theories of humour

As Attardo (1994b) illustrates, the development of humour theories started in ancient Greece with comedy, with Plato, Aristotle and Cicero as the firsts theorists, who had humour and verbal humour in high consideration and explored it.

Many scholars have developed their modern theories of humour after Renaissance, each of them taking into account different parameters and each theory exploring the topic from a different perspective. Theories of some of the major thinkers like Sigmund Freud or Keith-Spiegel seem to have been also influential, and there are some other classifications, but I selected Victor Raskin's (cited in Attardo, 1994b, p. 47) classification because, as far as I have seen, it is the most basic, complete, and the most extended and commented one, maybe because all other theories end up falling into these three categories (Smuts, n.d.).

The table that follows is Raskin's classification of types of theories of humour, divided into three categories: incongruity theories, release theories and hostility theories.

*Table 1: Raskin's classification of humour theories (see S. Attardo, 1994b, p.47):*

Cognitive	Social	Psychoanalytical
Incongruity	Hostility	Release
Contrast	Aggression	Sublimation
	Superiority	Liberation
	Triumph	Economy
	Derision	
	Disparagement	

Incongruity theories have to do with the cognitive features of humour. As reported by Attardo (2008, p. 103), we find humorous the association between two incongruous ideas,

the mixture between two incompatible situations or concepts that does not fulfil our expectations. When a situation breaks with the expectations, we normally find it shocking and absurd, and the main reaction is finding it funny. This is what is called an incongruity. The main theorists were Kant, Schopenhauer or even Aristotle if we go back to the ancient Greece. However, and according to Vandaele (2010, p. 148), “despite its perceived incongruity, the humor is also congruous (understandable) in a different way”. We usually find a sense in this type of humour and end up understanding it; the incongruity ends up being solved, but in a different way than normally. This category is probably the most relevant for my object of study, for it is closely related to language and its cognitive process, which is the basis of puns and verbal humour. The three theories I talk about later on are related with this type of humour theories.

As Attardo (1994b, p. 49) says, hostility theories started with Plato and Aristotle, but other authors like Hobbes contributed as well. He argues that hostility or social theories claim that people find it funny to ridicule or humiliate a specific target, having a feeling of superiority towards who they consider inferior to them. It creates, as said in Vandaele (2010, p. 148) a hierarchy among social groups, the inclusion of some groups and the exclusion of some others. However, Freud described humour as “a mitigated form of aggression” (as cited in Vandaele, idem). Vandaele seems to agree with this idea, for he states that “humor thereby produces superiority feelings which may be mitigated if participants agree that humor is essentially a form of social play rather than outright aggression” (2010, p. 149). I understand that, in this case, hostility theories focus on a type of humour taken as a social agreement by which all the participants of the joke understand that it is only a joke and not an attempt to be disrespectful to anybody (like black humour, for example).

Finally, the release theories, mostly developed by Freud, affirm, from a psychoanalytical point of view, that humour is a way of releasing physic energy accumulated, or that it liberates us from the boundaries of laws and conventions imposed by society (Attardo, 1994b, p. 50). These theories could be also interesting for my object of study (but less than the incongruity theories), for, according to Attardo (idem) they have also to do with the liberation from language boundaries and conventions, which is typical of puns and wordplay.

These are the three major categories in which we can classify all the theories of humour developed by scholars. Yet, humour is a very large concept that includes several branches, and that's why I am going to focus on one type. Willibald Ruch (2008, p. 28) distinguishes between four general types of humour: graphical, acoustical, behavioural or verbal. I am going to focus on the last type, verbal humour, and the reasons why it is important for the area of translation and which problems does it present will be explained, exploring specially the area of puns, wordplay and linguistic elements in translation. For that, first, I need to talk about some theories about verbal humour and explain some notions.

### **3. Verbal humour**

To talk about verbal humour we should first mention Graeme Ritchie's conception about humour. Ritchie (cited in Ritchie, 2010, pp. 33-34) uses the term VEH (verbally expressed humour), and as he himself explains, it refers to all the humour expressed by language. This term is, then, very wide, and he himself adds that it can be divided into two types of humour. One of them is the referential humour, in which the centre of humour is the content (a funny story, a joke, an anecdote, etc). The other one is verbal humour, in which the specific language used has a major role because it is implied in the humorous effect. Ritchie (2010, p. 35) mentions that some scholars like Bergson, Attardo or Armstrong support the proposal that the classification of examples attributed to one or the other category is usually left to intuition, but that sometimes applying the notion of *translatability* functions as a way to distinguish among them. Nevertheless, he argues that, although it is true that both types of humour require a different treatment by translators, this is not very exact and does not mean that verbal humour is untranslatable, as considered by so many scholars. The issue of translatability will be discussed in section 4.3.3.

This belief may be given because of the complexity of verbal humour and its internal mechanisms, which I will try to briefly explain in the following sections, always focusing on puns, and starting with an explanation about some of the most relevant theories of verbal humour.

#### **3.1 Theories of verbal humour**

As I said before, Plato, Aristotle and Cicero helped establish the basis for the modern theories of verbal humour, but although we can find many similarities between some

Greek taxonomies of verbal humour and the modern studies, things have evolved and changed. (Attardo, 1994b)

There are many theories of verbal humour, but two linguistic theories developed by Victor Raskin and Salvatore Attardo are relevant for this field, that have, according to Attardo himself (1994b, p. 49) points in common with incongruity theories, since both are essentialists (this means that they focus on the necessary conditions for something to be considered humour and why do we find it funny) and explore humour from a cognitive point of view. In fact, Attardo (idem) argues that they have been sometimes categorised as incongruity-based theories, although both authors have argued that they are objective and not necessarily belonging to any of the three major categories mentioned before because they are exclusively linguistic. However, it is true that both theories work with an incongruity process. The theories are the Semantic Script Theory of Humour (from now on “SSTH”) and the General Theory of Verbal Humour (henceforth GTVH”) (both cited by Attardo, 2008, pp. 106–109). Attardo (1994c, pp. 62-85, 1994f, pp. 196-223) also explains some other humour theories, but he focuses on three main ones: the SSTH, the GTVH, and the isotopy-disjunction model, which is also related with the incongruity theories and which is very similar to the SSTH and GTVH but explained with other concepts. Attardo examines these theories and explains them very precisely and elaborately, so much, that it could be a good base for an exhaustive investigation of a superior level, but would take me too far away from my objectives. So, given that my issue is translation and not the processing of humour, I am only going to make use of one of these theories to explain, basing myself on Attardo (1994c, 1994f, 2008), how verbal humour (specially puns) works and which problems does it present for translation.

I discarded the isotopy-disjunction model because the concept of isotopy was criticized, reformulated, and finally considered fragile and not very formal (Attardo,

1994c, pp. 75–85), so it was considered not a very successful theory, although it contributed to the investigations of humour (Attardo, 2008, p. 107).

The General Theory of Verbal Humour is a revision and expansion of the Semantic Script Theory of Humour, developed by Raskin and Attardo to broaden a little bit the concept and be able to analyse other areas of language that does not have to do only with semantics, as for example verbal humour. They realised that the SSTH, being a method focused only on the semantics, could be applied both to referential and to verbal humour, but, as both types of humour behave in a different way, they should not be analysed by the same system (Attardo, 1994f, p. 220). The GTVH studies other areas of linguistics and not only the semantics, so, to conduct a complete and deep analysis of each of my examples of puns or wordplay, I should deeply explain and use it. However, to present the basic notions of the functioning of verbal humour to help myself speak about the problems of their translation, it is enough to use the SSTH because the base is the same and it is simpler.

Basically, the SSTH describes the joke as being part of two different but overlapped scripts. A script is the semantic network and the context that a concept evokes, a frame or a context, and it contains information about the reality and how things work. Each of the scripts evoke a different context, and both coexist in the joke. This means that it is ambiguous and it can be part of both present scripts. But ambiguity is not enough to find an element humorous: both scripts have to be opposed (for example the opposition *possible vs. impossible*) to produce an incongruity and we find it funny. When we start reading the joke, we find the first script, and the second script appears suddenly and makes us find it amusing. The passage from one script to another is caused by an element called *script switch trigger*.

However, despite the fact that all verbal humour works in a similar way, there are some peculiarities when it comes to elements like puns.

### 3.2 Puns

According to Ritchie (2010, p. 42), puns are the most extended form of verbal humour, defined by the *Collins New English Dictionary* as “a play on words similar in sound but different in sense”. The definition that the *Oxford English Dictionary* gives seems a bit more precise:

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

According to Attardo (1994d, p. 110), “puns are an example of non-casual speech”. This means that both speaker and hearer are aware of the phonological structure of the utterances and the strings of sounds. Ritchie uses the term *pun* inside the category of *wordplay*, so we can understand that *wordplay* is a wider term that includes, among other forms, puns. Again, basing myself in Attardo (1994d, 2008), I am going to explain how puns work.

In day to day language, when finding an ambiguous term or sentence, our brain disambiguates it and chooses the more accurate script to understand the meaning of the sentence. But puns keep both senses coexisting together, and, to get it, the person who listens or reads the joke, reads mainly the first script, but has to reconsider the utterance to observe the second script, which is apparently occult. Both scripts overlap and coexist, and the fact that they are discordant produces an incongruity and, hence, amusement. The disambiguation process takes place, because the reader is able to identify scripts, but, whereas in a non-punning utterance the hearer chooses one of the scripts to understand the global meaning, in puns, the ambiguity is maintained during all the utterance, even

after the process of disambiguation has already taken place. This happens probably because some information that would definitely disambiguate and preclude the coexistence of both senses is not said. An important element is the *script switch trigger*, which allows the reader to pass from the first script to the second, despite one of them has already been rejected in the disambiguation process. Thanks to this element, the second script or sense is included and understood.

To later explore the problem that puns present when translating a text, we need to study and identify their nature, grouping them in several categories to see how each one behaves and the characteristics they share.

### **3.3 Taxonomy of nature of puns**

According to Attardo (1994d, pp. 113-127), there are several taxonomies to identify the nature of the pun depending on the parameter chosen to focus on: on linguistic phenomenon, on linguistic structure, on phonemic distance and eclectic. As none of the taxonomies proposed by Attardo in his book is perfect for my examples, I have taken the liberty of elaborating my own taxonomy combining three of the proposed by Attardo, for it to fit my purposes better. One of them is based on linguistic phenomena, developed by Duchàček (cited in Attardo, 1994d, p. 113), a very simple but explanatory taxonomy that I have combined with a systematic taxonomy (also based on linguistic phenomena), based on the usage of the syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes by Saussure (cited in Attardo, 1994d, p. 114), developed by Miller (idem), which is not specifically for puns, but it is useful in this case. The third one is Vittoz-Cannuto's (cited in Attardo, 1994d, p. 126) eclectic taxonomy from which I took very little, but on which I based part of the structure. The taxonomy is the following one:

1. Homonymy
  - 1.1 Homography
  - 1.2 Homophony
    - 1.2.1 between different words
    - 1.2.2 between two or more words
    - 1.2.3 between a simple word with a composed one
    - 1.2.4 between one word with a group of two or more words
    - 1.2.5 between two groups of words
  - 1.3 Paronymy
    - 1.3.1 Syntagmatic paronyms
    - 1.3.2 Paradigmatic paronyms
2. Polysemy
3. Antonymy
4. Morphemic attraction
5. Neologism

One thing to clarify is that Vittoz-Canuto talks about neologism when a new meaning is added to an existent word. The categories are not mutually exclusive, so some of them may be combined with some others. Later on, the classification of my examples will be presented in more detail, after I present some notions about translations that I find essential for this essay.

## 4. Humour and translation

Finding an accurate definition of what is translating is not an easy task, for it seems that, not only there is not a unique conception of the translation process, but also it is very difficult to find a scholar that says what is exactly translating. Among the few definitions that I have found, although each scholar presents a different and very interesting notion, Munday's (2009, p. 235) is the one that I find the most useful and descriptive:

A mental activity performed by a translator/interpreter allowing him/her to render an ST (oral, written, audiovisual, etc.), formulated in an SL, into a TT using the resources of a TL. It is a complex cognitive process which has an interactive and non-linear nature, encompassing controlled and uncontrolled processes, and requiring processes of problem-solving and decision-making, and the use of strategies. Its specific characteristics vary according to the type of translation (written, oral, audiovisual, etc.).

Yet, this definition is a bit broad, and to talk about translation, and to be able to explain the problems of translation and my analysis later on, it is necessary to find a terminology to refer to the different aspects of an element that is going to be translated. One that can be useful is Coseriu's.

### 4.1 Coseriu's terms

Coseriu (1977, pp. 220–221) talks about translation with three notions developed by himself, which will be used throughout this essay because they will allow a proper explanation of the process of translation, since talking about it can be a bit abstract sometimes.

Coseriu said that the purpose of translation is expressing the same *textual content* in several languages, but that this is not an idiomatic content, it is a supraidiomatic content. This means that the content we must translate is not the content of a language, since languages are not translatable, but the content of the text can and must be translated, and

this is a linguistic content which contains three notions: *meaning, designation and sense* (my translation). The *meaning* is the content of each specific language, each fragment of extralinguistic reality that creates the cosmovision of each specific language. The *designation* is the reference to the extralinguistic factors; we could say it is what connects the linguistic with the extralinguistic. The *sense* is the pragmatic meaning, or the content of the utterance in context. The purpose of the translation is not reproducing the same meaning, because meanings can not be translated, for they are contents of the realities of languages, but the same designation and the same sense (sometimes the meaning in the TL is the same as in the source language (SL), but, in that case, there would not be any problem of translation, although this is not very common). These three notions are really useful to talk about translation and to comment the processes that different translators have used, as done in section 5.

One example that could illustrate the functioning of these terms is the translation into Spanish of the idiom *speak of the devil and he shall appear*. The meaning of this sentence is the strictly linguistic meaning of the sentence. It designs the extralinguistic situation in which the person who is mentioned in a conversation suddenly turns up, and it is related to the pragmatic meaning, that is, to the intention of the speaker. The pragmatic meaning could vary in the case of this idiom, anyway. There is an equivalent idiom for this designation in Spanish, which is *hablando del rey de Roma, por la puerta asoma*. Despite the fact that the content or meaning is different from the original one in English, it results idiomatic and has an equivalent designation, because it designs the same fact, and it can be also equivalent in sense, because it can have the same pragmatic meaning.

## **4.2 Importance of the verbal humour for the area of translation**

Despite the connection between the humour studies and linguistics, the translation of humour has been largely ignored throughout the history of linguistics, even by scholars dedicated to the study of humour, only with exception of a few ones. In fact, it was very easy for me to find bibliography about verbal humour and about translation separately, but I found it really hard to find useful articles or books studying the translation of verbal humour. It seems that it hasn't been given much importance, but the truth is that humour is present in our daily realities and our interpersonal relationships. Thus, we're very likely to find it in literature, presented in lots of forms, and a translator has to know how to deal with the problems it presents when it comes to transfer a text from one language to another one.

## **4.3 Main problems of verbal humour in translation**

Verbal humour is a challenge for a translator whatever format it appears for many reasons. The main problems I am going to talk about are the implicit knowledge (Vandaele, 2010, p. 150), equivalence and translatability (Chiaro, 2008, p. 570).

### **4.3.1 Equivalence**

The notion of equivalence is something totally essential to talk about translation, for it is what permits the translator to find in the TL an element comparable to the original element in the ST. One useful theory about equivalence is Eugene Nida's (cited in Newmark, 2009, p. 28) in which he develops two types:

- *functional equivalence*: the TC would react to the TT and understand it just in the same way that the source community (SC) would react to the source text (ST). In other words, the TT would reproduce the designation and the sense of the ST and it would have its original effect in the TC. But, for this, the translation can not be

considered only a linguistic process, it also implies extralinguistic facts, like pragmatics, and the translator would have to sacrifice the original features of the text, such as the linguistic order or the meanings. It is more TC oriented and focuses on the effects that the text produces on it.

- *Formal correspondence*: developed by Nida & Taber (idem); it is the translation understood as a mere linguistic process that supports the existence of a perfect translation in which the TT can perfectly reproduce exactly the same contents and form on the ST in a different language. This type of correspondence is more focused on being faithful to the ST than being faithful to the TC, so the result is not very successful because the readers of the TT would not probably understand it very well, and the effect would definitely not be the same as the produced by the ST on the SC. For this, translators had to start looking for an equivalence in designation and sense, and this correspondence was substituted by the functional equivalence from 1970 on.

Koller (cited in Chiaro, 2008, p. 575) distinguished between what he called *connotative equivalence*, in which both ST and TT had the same designation, *text normative equivalence*, in which words from ST and TT are used in the same or a similar context in both languages, and the *pragmatic equivalence*, which would be the same as the *functional equivalence* by Nida or the *sense* by Coseriu.

As Chiaro (idem) explains in this chapter, we can not expect a text to reflect another one, but we can establish a connection between them through the equivalence. This notion of equivalence is very important for verbal humour because, as normally these linguistic elements or puns are language-specific, the translator has to make some changes to keep the humorous sense of the original text, or at least try to do it. This means that he has to produce a functional equivalence because a formal correspondence is not possible.

The problem in puns is that the two scripts or senses are usually brought together through the linguistic features of some elements of the sentence (the *script switch triggers*), and not only the semantics. This means that, to translate the pun, we need an element in the TL that, either semantically or by its linguistic form, evokes two opposed and overlapped scripts that the TC understands well. This is enormously difficult, if not impossible, most of the times.

Yet, in order to have a functional equivalence, the translator will have to rewrite the joke or the wordplay to the point that it is completely understandable for the TC and has the same effect as the ST on the SC, but very different from the original, and not connotative nor text normative equivalent. Chiaro (2008, p. 578) raises the question of that if a translation is very different from the ST, to what extent it can be considered a translation instead of a rewriting. In the case of verbal humour it is very common to have to rewrite the text to maintain the humorous purposes. Toury (as cited in Chiaro, 2008, p. 578) suggests, then, that we may start talking about degrees of equivalence, for, although the ST and the TT are not independent texts, some translations are based on its original to a larger extent than others, being some translations very loyal and similar to the ST, but being some others a very different text that had to be rewritten.

But with the issue of equivalence appears the problem of who be faithful to, as Chiaro goes on. The translator must decide if he is going to keep loyalty to the ST or to the TC, or, in other words, to the *word* or to the *sense* (2008, p. 575). But, as formal correspondence is almost impossible in the case of an area of language as it is verbal humour, the only possibility he has is a functional equivalence and being faithful to the community of readers, as far as possible.

It is also important to take into account the type of readers the text is addressed to. Sometimes puns and wordplay may imply a political or historical background that is

important to maintain a functional equivalence (Chiaro, 2008, p. 580). However, when translating a text like *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, mainly addressed to children, the translator may decide to obviate and avoid those political or historical hints in the translation, or even to ignore the whole pun, and select an easier solution focusing on other aspects of the text, for the children would not probably get them and it does not fulfil with the TC's expectations.

#### **4.3.2 The implicit knowledge**

As Coseriu illustrates (1977), a very important thing we need to keep in mind when speaking about translation is that languages are not translatable. The translatability of texts is a different topic that has brought a huge debate to the linguistic field, and about which I will speak later on, but what is clear is that languages can not be translated because each of them implies a concrete system of worldview and it is not possible to translate it. In other words, translation is not about working with the meanings expressed by each language, but searching for an equivalent designation and sense in the target language.

According to Vandaele (2010, p. 150), one of the main problems in humour translation is this difference of languages and culture and the implicit knowledge. Each community and culture share an area of knowledge of the world. Sometimes humour belongs to a specific cultural pattern that dictates what is funny and what is taboo or socially unaccepted. Besides, in order to get a joke or a humorous element, we may need that implicit knowledge, in the same way that we need the original to understand the parody of something. Here is where the problem of the difference of languages and the cosmovision implied in them appears, since very often humour has its basis on a particular construction of reality of a particular language and what is funny and correct for the SC may not be funny at all and may be even rude for the TC. Supposing that the ST is

appropriate to the SC, the translator has to achieve the TT to be also accurate for the TC and preserve the humorous effect (that is, the sense), acting as a mediator and making the pertinent changes for the TT to be humorous and socially accepted.

For example, some jokes in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* have an implicit historical or political reference that only people who know the history or the political background of England (mostly English people) will understand. For example, lots of the poems in the novel are parodies of other original ones, and the reader has to know the originals in order to find the parody humorous. One example of this is *You are old, father William* (Carroll, 1865, pp. 39-41), which is, according to Jones & Gladstone (1998) a parody of *The Old Man's Comforts and How He Gained Them*, a poem by Robert Southey very popular in England, so only a determinate community can understand it and recognise the parody of the original.

Furthermore, the meaning expressed in the ST may not have a correspondence in the TT, or may not even have a designation and the translator would have to work only with the notion of sense. Two different languages could reflect a different reality as for one of them to have elements with no correspondent or equivalent in the other one. I personally think that, in order to have a successful translation, the best option is always being faithful to the TC, so the most accurate solution for this problem would be reproducing on the TT the sense and the effect that the ST has on the SC, modifying the text and probably substituting that joke for other with a completely different designation and meaning that produces the same or a similar effect in the TC. Yet, this is not an easy decision and each text has different characteristics and a different community of readers and this has always to be taken into account, as well as the fact that some literary works are classics and it is not easy to take the decision of being unfaithful to them. But when it comes to the issue

of puns, Low (2011, p. 69) states that “to translate a joke in a way that cannot elicit a smile is a betrayal, no matter how semantically accurate it may seem (...)”.

An important problem in the translation of puns and wordplay is that the scripts that those elements activate must be previously incorporated to the knowledge of the world of the speakers, for them to be able to understand the pun and know exactly all its connotations. If the speaker does not know what a specific utterance or word implies or does not understand one of the scripts, the pun is not going to be funny because the person is not going to see the opposition of the scripts or the incongruity. When translating, it is very important to have this in account, for the TC has to have the scripts evoked incorporated in their experience for the joke to be funny. They need to understand the contexts. Vandaele (2010, p. 150) states that the problem of translation when dealing with puns and forms of wordplay or verbal humour can not be separated from culture because they are a translation problem also beyond language, and this is what scripts imply. Humour has to do with social groups and and it maintains the homogeneity of a group because people belonging to each community share the same implicit knowledge so the humour they perceive and they produce depends on it.

For this reason, the translator has to be a mediator between both languages and adapt the joke to be well understood and accepted by the target community, looking for the equivalence, sometimes difficult to achieve. But this need of creativity and resources towards the many difficulties they have to deal with leads sometimes to demotivation and to the conclusion of the untranslatability of an element (Vandaele 2010, p. 151).

### 4.3.3 Translatability

*Translatability* is a term which is very close to *equivalence*, and it is defined by Delia Chiaro as “the capacity of some kind of meaning to be transferred from one language to another without undergoing radical changes” (2008, p. 580).

The main difficulty of translating puns is that they use the specific features of a language (Low, 2011) and, according to Chiaro (2008, p. 571), they are thought to be untranslatable because it is very difficult to pun on the same word in different languages, specially if we look for the same type of pun. As far as I have seen, many scholars agree with the idea that puns are untranslatable. In fact, Attardo affirms that referential humour can be easily translated, but verbal humour “is either imposible or must rely on unsystematic correspondences between the codes” (1994c, p. 95).

According to Zalabasco (2005), when only the meaning and designation are translated and we see that humour does not travel automatically from one language to the other, is when we say that something is untranslatable.

However, Low states that

claims that jokes are untranslatable have two main sources: either translators’ incompetence (jokes are indeed lost but no serious effort has been made to find equally humorous substitutes) or a narrow notion of translation, combined with an unrealistic standard of success. (2011, p. 59)

A successful translation of puns comes by looking for an equivalence of senses and not a mere transposition of meanings or designations. It may not be equally funny, but it has at least to be recognised as humour in the TL.

In most of the cases, the most important part of a pun is the humorous sense, so it should be a priority to look for an equivalence in this aspect, rather than translating

meanings. However, as I said, when facing a classic as it is *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* it may be too reckless to change the designations.

So, in order to face the translation, the responsible of transferring a text from one language to the other, needs a series of criteria and a series of tools or strategies to conduct the process without failing.

#### **4.4. Translation strategies**

Taking into account his affirmation that almost everything, if not everything, is translatable, Low (2011, p. 67) presents a series of procedures specific for the translation of puns which are very transparent and very useful for my examples, that I will apply in the practice part. The procedures are the following:

- a) **Replicating the ST pun.** Sometimes it is possible to find an equivalence in the TL so the translated pun corresponds in meaning, designation and sense to the original one. This would be the perfect translation in which no information is lost in the procedure and the TT fulfils the TC's expectations and needs being also faithful to the ST and the writer.
- b) **Creation of a new pun verbally connected with the original one,** achieving a functional equivalence. For this, may be necessary to look for an equivalence only in sense, but it may not be possible to find it in designation.
- c) **Usage of a different humorous device,** specially if the humorous sense is more important than the meanings, then the pun can be substituted for another device that causes the same effect on the TC, even if the original text has to be modified.
- d) **Usage of compensation in place.** If the pun is not easily translatable, the translator may need to omit the pun itself, but decide to add some wordplay near the original pun for the effect to be the same.

- e) **Give an expanded translation.** The pun may need to be sacrificed and explained, either in the middle of the text, or in an explicative note written by the translator, so common when it comes to a translation in which the elements are specific from a culture or language, so it is difficult to translate them, as it happens sometimes in puns.
- f) **Ignoring the pun** and omitting the wordplay, translating it literally or only one of the elements of the original ambiguity. This should be the last of the options, recurring to it only when something is untranslatable and none of the former strategies is useful. However, this leads us again to the debate of whether something is really untranslatable or it is only the lack of creativity of the translator which impedes him to translate difficult cases. Nevertheless, it is an option to take into account and, as we will see in the table of the analysis of the examples, was used in more than one case.

This taxonomy will help see the aspects that both translators prioritised to take the different decisions, and make a comparison between the criteria used by them both in the following part of the essay.

## 5. The analysis of puns in the translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*

### 5.1. Methodology

After this explanation of what I considered some basic theoretical notions about humour and translation, it is time to put them into practice on a comparative study between two translations into Galician of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. For this, I will classify all the puns I found on the original version according to their nature with the taxonomy explained in section 3.3, to see which problems they present for the translator when dealing with this work. Then, I will analyse the decisions taken by both translators in each group of puns using the taxonomy presented in section 4.4.

The materials used for this analysis are two translated versions of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* into Galician. The first one was translated by Teresa Barro and Fernando Perez Barreiro in 1984, with *Xerais* publishing company (Translation A). The other one was translated by Xabier Queipo in 2015 by *El patito editorial* (Translation B).

Although there are many more translations into Spanish, very different between them and some of them very good ones, I thought it could be a good idea to explore two versions into Galician, because, to my knowledge, much less have been written about the translation of this work into Galician, and because I wanted to contribute to the usage and investigation of the language.

The most part of the translations to Galician were adaptations for children, but, for this study, the complete text was needed, so the options were very few. Most of the complete text translations were reeditions of translation A, with some minor changes, so I decided to choose one of those editions, the edition of 1984, and the most recent one I could find, which is translation B, from 2015. I did this, among other reasons, because of the temporal

gap that there is between them both, to see if this has a repercussion on the decisions taken by each of the translators.

## **5.2. Classification of puns**

A total of 26 puns have been found in the ST. To simplify my analysis, they have been grouped according to the categories of the taxonomy explained above, based, mainly, on the linguistic phenomena, to see the problems of each of the categories when it comes to translating them.

In this section, a brief explanation of the ST is offered. I have shortened the texts of the examples I chose, so that due attention can be paid to the key elements. Each example has been assigned a number for ease of reference. The full context of each of the examples and both translations (A and B) are given in the appendix. The Galician versions will be discussed in 5.3.

### **Homonyms**

These puns are built on pairs of words with the same graphemic or phonetic representation but their designation and meanings are different. There are two types of homonyms.

#### **Homographs**

They are words with the same spelling and pronunciation but with different designation. The following four instances have been found on this type.

(1) “But they were *in* the **well**,” Alice said to the Dormouse, not choosing to notice this last remark.

“Of course they were,” said the Dormouse; “— **well** in.” p. 62

(2) (...) “there’s a large mustard-**mine** near here. And the moral of that is—‘The more there is of **mine**, the less there is of yours.’” P.76

(3) (...)“Do you know why it’s called a **whiting**?”

(...) “***It does the boots and shoes***,” the Gryphon replied very solemnly. P.86

(4) (...) Then again—‘*before she had this fit*—’ you never had fits, my dear, I think?”

(...) “Then the words don’t **fit** you,”(...). P.103

Of course, each of the examples require a different solution and present a different and specific problem, but it is true that puns of each type share some characteristics. The general problem with this group of words is that there are two different words with the same spelling designating two different extralinguistic elements (meanings), so the translator would need to find two words that, with the same graphemes and pronunciation, evoke also two different scripts equivalent to the ones of the ST. Finding a word with the same *textual content* and punning on it in Galician is almost impossible, so some procedures and creativity will be needed.

Certainly, all the categories present more or less the same problems, except some concrete examples.

### **Homophones**

Puns based on homophones are words which are pronounced equally but have a different graphemic representation and designate different things. We can find two types among the selected examples.

- Homophones between two different words:

(5) “Mine is a long and sad **tale**!” (...)

“It is a long **tail**, certainly,”(...). P.25

(6) “I had **not**!” cried the Mouse, sharply and very angrily.

“A **knot!**” said Alice, always ready to make herself useful, and looking anxiously about her. P. 26

(7) “(...) You see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its **axis**—”

“Talking of **axes**,” said the Duchess, “chop off her head!” P.50

(8) “That’s the reason they’re called **lessons**,” the Gryphon remarked: “because they **lessen** from day to day.” P.82

(9) “The twinkling of *what?*” said the King.

“It *began* with the **tea**,” the Hatter replied.

“Of course twinkling *begins* with a **T!**” said the King sharply. P.95

- Homophones between one word and a group of words:

(10) “We called him **Tortoise** because he **taught us**,”(...). P. 80

The peculiarity of this category is that both words are pronounced in the same way, but their spelling is different; they designate different things so the meaning is different. The problem would be, again, finding two homophone words that designate the same extralinguistic elements than the ones used in the original text. García Yebra (1990, p. 72), states that homophones are not an issue of the translation theories, because they are written differently and have different meanings so they are different words, but the truth is that, in the case of puns, they are actually a problem if we want to maintain ambiguity and, hence, both scripts.

Number (8) is a bit complex because, although both words are homophones, the wit in this pun is that the meaning of the second word is somehow related with the first one and attributed to it by analogy, having, actually, nothing to do. This is what is called by Vittoz-

Canuto (cited in Attardo, 1994d, pp. 126-127) *neologism*, by which a meaning is added to a pre-existent one.

Number (10) presents the phenomenon *morphemic attraction*, by which one word sounds the same as another group of words. This is a problem because it is hard for the translator to find another word that sounds like a group of words and designates the same in Galician.

### **Paronymy**

Two paronym words are almost homonyms. They have similarities in pronunciation and spelling but they are not equal, and they have different meanings.

For this type of puns, I am going to divide the classification into syntagmatic paronyms and paradigmatic paronyms. The paradigmatic paronyms appear when only one of the scripts is represented by a word in the text, but the other one is immediately evoked by the first one, and syntagmatic when the second element is also physically in the text. I have made this distinction only for the classification of paronyms following Vittoz-Canuto's (cited in Attardo, 1994d, pp. 126-127) model. Besides, all the rest of examples of the other categories are syntagmatic.

#### **Sintagmatic paronyms**

(11) “Did you say ‘**pig**’ or ‘**fig**?’” said the Cat. P.54

(12) (...) “Why, if a fish came to *me*, and told me he was going a journey, I should say ‘With what **porpoise**?’”

“Don’t you mean ‘**purpose**?’” said Alice. P.87

### **Paradigmatic paronyms**

(13) “**Reeling** and **Writhing**, of course, to begin with,” the Mock Turtle replied; P.81 (**reading** and **writing**).

(14) “and then the different branches of Arithmetic—**Ambition, Distraction, Uglification and Derision.**” (...)P.81 (**Addition, subtraction, multiplication** and **division**).

(15) “Well, there was **Mystery**” the Mock Turtle replied, counting off the subjects on his flappers. P.81 (**history**)

(16) with **Seaography**: P.81 (**sherography**)

(17) (...) *he* taught us **Drawling, Stretching, and Fainting in Coils**”. P.81 ( **drawing, sketching and painting in oils**)

(18) (...) “he taught **Laughing** and **Grief**, they used to say.” P.81 (**latin** and **Greek**).

(19) “I wonder if I shall fall right *through* the earth! How funny it’ll seem to come out among the people that walk with their heads downward! The **antipathies**, I think—” (...). P.9 (The **antipodeans**).

The problem with the translation of paronyms is that the translator would need to find another pair of paronyms in the TL that refer to the same extralinguistic meaning, this is, a pair of different words that are very similar in spelling and pronunciation, but with a different meaning. It is very difficult to reproduce in an equivalent way the play with phonemes, specially when it comes to the paradigmatic paronyms. The equivalent words should not only refer to the same extralinguistic elements, but also evoke the same second script even it is not present in the text.

In the case of the (13), *reel* and *writhe* are semantically related, as it happens also in (14), where the four words have a similar connotation of “not very positive”, so in both

cases, the translation should reflect a group of words semantically related with the same connotations as the source text. The case of *uglification* is more difficult to infer than the other three, but the reader can come up with the correspondent *multiplication* because of the semantic relation between the other three, and because we could consider that they rhyme assonantly. Moreover, in the case of the (14), the text explains that the four words are the branches of Arithmetic, so it is easier to infer the second implicit script. That is why I added it to this group.

### **Polysemy**

It is the phenomenon in which one word has several meanings and connotations, and the pun depends on them because it is used twice, each time with a different sense. All the definitions to explain each of the possible senses in these examples are taken from the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

(20) (...) *I'll soon make you **dry** enough!*"

(...) This is the **driest** thing I know. Silence all around, if you please! 'William the Conqueror, whose cause was favoured by the pope, (...)—' " P.22

Sense 1: Said of a body of water, or of moisture on a surface, that has disappeared by evaporation, or by being wiped or drained away: Dried up.

Sense 2: Deficient in interest; unattractive, distasteful, insipid. (*fig.* from food that wants succulency.)

(21) "I'm a **poor** man, your Majesty," he began.

"You're a *very poor speaker*," said the King. P.95

Sense 1: Of a person or people: having few, or no, material possessions; lacking the means to procure the comforts or necessities of life, or to live at a standard considered

comfortable or normal in society; needy, necessitous, indigent, destitute.

Sometimes: *spec.* so destitute as to be dependent upon gifts or allowances for subsistence.

Opposed to *rich*.

Sense 2: Lacking or deficient in the proper or desired quality; of little excellence or worth; of a low or inferior standard or quality.

(22) (...) “but I know I have to **beat** time when I learn music.”

(...) “He won’t stand **beating**. Now, if you only kept on good terms with him, he’d do almost anything you liked with the clock. (...)” p.59

Sense 1: to mark musical time by beating a drum, by tapping with the hands, feet, a stick, etc., by striking the air with a baton; also *fig.* to keep time with.

Sense 2: A stroke or blow in beating.

(23) “Very true,” said the Duchess: “flamingoes and mustard both **bite**. (...)” P.76

Sense 1: To cut into, pierce, or nip (anything) with the teeth.

Sense 2: To make (the mouth, throat, etc.) smart.

(24) And so these three little sisters—they were learning to **draw**, you know—”

“What did they **draw**?” said Alice, quite forgetting her promise.

“Treacle,” said the Dormouse, without considering at all this time.

(...)

“But I don’t understand. Where did they **draw** the treacle from?”

Sense 1: To cause (anything) to move toward oneself by the application of force; to pull. // †7. *trans.* To bring together by sewing (edges of a rent, etc.); to mend (a rent); cf. also *to draw up* at Phrasal verbs, and FINE-DRAW *v.* *Obs.*

Sense 2: To make (a picture or representation of an object) by drawing lines; to design, trace out, delineate; formerly also, to mould, model.

The problem with polysemic words is very similar to the one that the homographs present. The translator would need to find a polysemic word that designates the same extralinguistic meaning that the originals expressed in the source text. This problem presented by the semantic play is, sometimes, very successfully solved by both of the translators of my examples, but some cases are very difficult and they need to modify the text for it to be coherent and amusing.

### **Antonyms**

Words whose meanings are opposite one from another are also a problem in translation when they are chosen with a humorous purpose, as the following two cases.

(25) (...) “Do you know why it’s called a **whiting**?”

(...) “*It does the boots and shoes,*” the Gryphon replied very solemnly.

“Why, what are *your* shoes done with?” (...)

(...) They’re done with **blacking**, I believe.” P.86

(26) (...) “he taught **Laughing** and **Grief**, they used to say.” P.81

In these examples, part of the witticism is in the fact that they’re actually antonyms and there is a play with the opposition of both meanings and what they evoke. The problem they present is additional to the problems of homography and paronymy, because, to maintain the same humorous effect and an equivalence, the words chosen in the TL shall be antonymous as well as paronyms or homographs.

It is difficult to establish a series of characteristics or difficulties that a whole category of puns presents, because each case is very specific and different from the others, so each one presents different problems and require different solutions and, sometimes, a lot of imagination and creativity. In the next section we will see how each of the translators have dealt with the difficulties of each of the categories.

### 5.3. A comparison of two translations

The following table summarises the translations of the examples of puns selected in the ST, and the procedure that both translators have used as well. I am using the numbers assigned to each of the examples in the classification of the puns and the letters assigned to each of the strategies. Later on, comments on the two translators' decisions will focus on the patterns observed in the table and what happened in each category.

The reason why not all the examples are commented one by one, but grouped in the categories, is a matter of space. It would be very interesting to comment each of the examples because each of them has some particularity and difference from the others, and the same happens with each of the translations. However, it is necessary to make an effort and synthesise the information in the following table. Letters in bold are the predominant strategies used by each of the translators on each category. Again, I am using the short version of the examples, but there is a table with the complete versions in the appendix.

*Table 2: Translation procedures selected by translators A and B, by category.*

Examples	Translation procedure A	Translation procedure B
Homographs (1)(2)(3)(4)	<b>a, f</b>	<b>f</b>
Homophones (5)(6)(7)(8)(9)(10)	<b>a, b, d, e</b>	<b>a, b, e, f</b>

Syntagmatic paronyms (11)(12)	<b>b</b>	<b>c, e</b>
Paradigmatic paronyms (13)(14)((15)(16)(17)(18)(19)	<b>a, b, f</b>	<b>a, b, f</b>
Polysemy (20)(21)(22)(23)(24)	<b>a, b, c</b>	<b>a, c, f</b>
Antonymy (25)(26)	<b>a, b</b>	<b>a, f</b>

### Homographs

As we can see, both translators opt, in the group of homographs, for omitting the pun most of the times, since finding a pair of homographs in the TL equivalent to the content of the ST in meaning, designation and sense is almost impossible. Finding an equivalence only in sense seems also highly difficult. Nonetheless, whereas it can be a complicated task, the translator of the version A makes some more attempts to be creative and reproduce the textual context somehow. An example of this is case (3):

(3)	(...) “Do you know why it’s called a <b>whiting?</b> ” (...) “ <i>It does the boots and shoes,</i> ” the Gryphon replied very solemnly. (...) P.86	(...) Ti sabes que a <b>pescadiña</b> é un peixe branco. ¿E sabes por que lle chaman así a ese peixe? (...) —Porque se <i>frega nos zapatos e nas botas</i> - replicou moi solemne o Grifón. (...) P.137-138	«Sabes por que se chaman <b>cariocas?</b> » (...) « <b>Porque é un peixe branco, que danza moi ben na tixola, e que frega nas botas e nos zapatos doutros peixes</b> », respondeu o Grifón moi cerimonioso. (...) P.104
-----	---	---	--

Translator A tries to reproduce the sense adding the datum that the *pescadiña* is a white fish to relate the connotation of the colour with the fact of cleaning, but this fact does not really explain why the fish is called like that, so, although it seems to be an attempt of being humorous, the pun falls in the abyss and gets lost for the TC. Translator B, in

contrast, translates simply one sense of the wordplay, probably leaving the reader a little confused. In this case, both scripts can not overlap because the first part of the pun and the second one are not related in the translations, so the sense of the joke is lost.

There are some similarities between this example and number (2):

(2)	<p>(...)          “It’s a mineral, I <i>think</i>,” said Alice.          “Of course it is,” said the Duchess, who seemed ready to agree to everything that Alice said; “there’s a large mustard-<b>mine</b> near here. And the moral of that is—‘The more there is of <b>mine</b>, the less there is of yours.’”          P.76</p>	<p>(...)          —É un mineral, coido eu —dixo Alicia.          —É, si señora —dixo a Duquesa, que parecía estar lista a concordar con todo o que lle dicía Alicia; aquí pretiño hai unha mina grande de mostarda. E a lección moral diso é...          “Canta máis hai na <b>miña mina</b>, menos haberá na túa.” P.123</p>	<p>(...)          «Coido que é un mineral», dixo Alicia.          «Claro que é», dixo a Duquesa, que semellaba disposta a concordar con todo o que Alicia dicía.          «Aquí do lado hai unha gran <b>mina</b> de mostaza. E a moral disto é: <i>Canto máis eu teño, menos tes ti.</i>» P.90-91</p>
-----	--	---	--

In case (2), both translators omit the pun and translate it more or less literally. However, I came up with a translation, through the procedure *a* (replicating the pun), that would turn the pun into a paronym that would be completely equivalent to the ST in meaning, designation and sense, and valid for the TC: *canta máis hai na mina, menos haberá na túa*. The pun survives in the same position, and the same word evokes two different scripts coexisting in the *script switch trigger*, which would be *mine*, and keeps ambiguity, with no need of omitting or modifying the pun. Moreover, the scripts evoked by this are the same than the scripts evoked by the same two elements in the original pun (*mine* as a possessive determiner and *mine* as an underground excavation for the extraction of metals, etc).

There are some cases in which not only the pun is lost, but also the whole situation lacks coherence and it is obscure to understand because of the usage of technique *f* of ignoring the pun. This happens specially in the case of translator B, who ignores many

puns and, sometimes, leaves the reader a bit confused. Although it happens almost in all the categories, there are cases in which it is more noticeable, like example (4):

(4)	<p>“Nothing can be clearer than <i>that</i>. Then again—‘<i>before she had this fit</i>—’ you never had fits, my dear, I think?” he said to the Queen.” (...) “Then the words don’t <i>fit</i> you,” said the King, looking round the court with a smile. P.103</p>	<p>—(...) ¡Mais claro non pode estar! E despois di tamén aquí “antes que ela <b>trocase o modelo</b>”. E ti nunca trocáche-lo modelo, ¿non é certo, cara esposa? —díxolle á Raíña. (...) —Entón —dixo o Rei, sorrindo e ollando todo arredor da sala— esas palabras non che <b>serven de modelo</b>. P.161-162</p>	<p>«Nada pode ser máis claro ca iso». Entón novamente: «Di <i>Antes que ela amañara todo</i>, e ti nunca trocaches o modelo, miña querida, creo eu?», preguntoulle á Raíña. (...) «Entón, as palabras non che <b>serven</b>», dixo o Rei, mirando ao redor da sala do xulgado cun sorriso. P.123</p>
-----	---	--	--

The excerpts make reference to a verse in a poem that a character recites a page ago. The sentence in italics is the verse that brings the conflict into the scene. Part of translator B’s translation is equal to translation A. However, where he should translate the same sentence again, he uses a new one and this makes impossible for the reader to understand what is happening.

### Homophones

On the whole, it seems that translators have drawn upon more strategies in the category of homophones than in the former one. However, translator B keeps on using the strategy of omitting the pun and translating it literally or translating only one of their senses to a larger extent, whereas translator A does not select, in this group of puns, the option of omitting any of the puns, but she uses some of the strategies seen above. In general, the decisions taken by translator A for this group of puns seem to satisfy the TC’s needs better than the proposals of translator B.

For example, case (6) is a challenge because it seems impossible to find in the TL a pair of homophones equivalent in meaning and designation, presenting a similar phonological play.

(6)	<p>(...) “you had got to the fifth bend, I think?”          “I had <b>not!</b>” cried the Mouse, sharply and very angrily.          “A <b>knot!</b>” said Alice, always ready to make herself useful, and looking anxiously about her. p.26</p>	<p>—(...)–; xa ía pola quinta volta ¿non é?          —¡<b>No</b>, pois...! ¡Así non sei como imos facer! –berrou o Rato, con voz afiada e moi alporizado.          —¡Un <b>nó!</b> –dixo Alicia, ollando todo arredor con ansia e sempre con afán de axudar–. P. 56</p>	<p>(...) «Xa ía pola quinta reviravolta, non si?».          «<b>Non chegara aínda!</b>», berrou o Rato, tallante e alporizado.          «É que tes o rabo <b>anoado?</b>», preguntou Alicia, disposta sempre a axudar, e mirando con ansia a todos os lados, dixo: «Déixame axudar a desfacelo, ho!». P.33</p>
-----	---	---	--

Whereas translator B ignores the pun, translator A solves it in a very witty way, proving that it is translatable. Nonetheless, one thing to keep in mind is that in this case the translator A uses a borrowing from Spanish, for the word *no* does not exist in Galician, it would be *non*. The fact of coming upon words that are not correct in Galician and are not accepted in the current regulations happens more than one time throughout this translation. However, I’ve been investigating, and, although there were some other proposals before, the first official regulations of Galician language were adopted by the RAG in 1982, only two years before the publication of this translation, so the correct forms were not probably completely integrated in the vocabulary of the speakers. This could be the reason for the usage of borrowings and incorrect forms, since this does not happen in translation B, from 2015. We could say, then, that this translation is perfectly acceptable and that it fulfils the TC’s expectations in a very smart way, achieving an equivalence in meaning, designation and sense, but by using an option that is not even

available for translator B, who has to stick to the official regulations of 2015, more fixed and integrated among the speakers.

Example number (8) presents also a huge challenge for the translator if he wants to maintain the humorous effect, and translator A does it in a very successful way.

(8)	“That’s the reason they’re called <b>lessons</b> ,” the Gryphon remarked: “because they <b>lessen</b> from day to day.” P.82	—É que por iso se chama <b>dar</b> clases –observou o Grifón–; porque cantas máis <b>dás</b> , menos quedan, e cada día son menos. P.131	«Esta é a razón pola que lles chaman <b>leccións</b> », observou o Grifón: «porque <b>diminúen</b> día a día». <sup>13</sup> P.97-98
-----	--	--	--

She has to convert a pun based on an homophone into another one based on polysemy, and she puns on another word and not in the original, so meanings are not equivalent, but it perfectly fulfils the function and it is equivalent in designation and in sense, and keeps both scripts and ambiguity through the creation of a new pun. The verb *dar* here has two meanings, each of them evoking a different script: one of the meanings is *teaching a lesson* and the other *giving or delivering something*. The scripts are not the same evoked by the original pun, for meanings and designations are different, but the sense is the same.

Something very interesting we can find in this category is the decision of adding an explanatory note, which seems more common in this group than in the others. In case (5), but also in case (8) in translation B, translator decides to omit the pun and add a note of translation in each example. This is not very creative, but it is also another solution that can be taken when dealing with a translation problem that seems impossible. Adding a note at the end of the page is a valid device for those cases in which the translator can not simply find an equivalent element in the TL so he finds it better to ignore the pun and explain it, as in this case. Leaving apart the debate of whether this is a lack of effort from the translator or not, the problem with this concrete edition is that all the notes are

gathered at the end. One of the possibilities with this option is that the readers never go to the list of explanations at the end of the book because they will have to interrupt their reading. Moreover, in most of the cases, they won't find it necessary to read the notes because the fact of omitting those puns does not affect the argument of the novel and the literal meaning is completely understandable. They won't find any motivation to read the notes of something that they have already understood, even if those notes inform that there was a humorous component in the original text. The other option is reading all the notes together, but readers would not remember all the cases throughout the novel, and I do not think they would go back to read each of them if it is not necessary, so they would miss part of the sense of the ST. I would find it a better option to add the note at the end of the page, as the first translator does in some of the cases. Of course, this may not be a decision of the translator, maybe the editor was responsible on taking the decision of gathering all the notes at the end of the book, but, anyhow, I do not think this is an effective solution.

Translator A does the same in the example (7):

(7)	<p>“(…) You see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its <b>axis</b>—”  “Talking of <b>axes</b>,” said the Duchess, “chop off her head!” P.50</p>	<p>—(…)A Terra tarda vinte e quatro horas en tornar arredor do seu <b>eixo</b>…  —¡Que <b>machada!</b> E falando de <b>machados</b> ¡que a descabecen!* P.88</p>	<p>«(…)Saiba que a Terra leva vinte e catro horas para xirar sobre o seu <b>eixe</b>…»  «Falando de <b>eixes</b>», dixo a Duquesa, «córtalle a cabeza!» p.59</p>
-----	---	--	--

She, however, does not omit the pun. As it is difficult to translate the pun into another pun, what she does is adding another compensatory element by strategy *d*, paronym of *machados*, which is *¡que machada!*. Both words have different meanings, but they have some linguistic and also semantic connection, accurate for this context. By adding this element she can be faithful both to the ST and to the TC and create an equivalent sense.

Nevertheless, she adds a note anyway to explain the original wordplay. The main difference with the translation B is that this is a footnote, so it is in the same page as the pun and this makes easier to the reader to pay attention to the note. Maybe this note was not necessary, because the reader can perfectly understand the text and there is also a pun in the TT; I find it more necessary to use the note in other cases and she does not do it.

## Paronyms

Curiously, the predominant strategies in the group of paronyms are, in most of the cases, the same from both translators, specially *b* (creating a new pun verbally connected with the original) and *f* (ignoring the pun), but we can also find the usage of *a* (replicating the ST pun) or even *c* (using a different humorous device), used for the first time until now in the example (11).

One of the peculiarities of this category is that lots of neologisms are created to try to reproduce the effect of the ST in the TT.

From example, cases from (13) to (18), they belong to the same excerpt. I divided or grouped the puns basing myself in word's semantic relationship, or in their translation, since the procedure changes a bit for each of the cases. We can see that in most cases, the decisions taken by both translators A and B are the same or almost the same between them.

In the case of (13), both translators use the same strategy and adopt the same solution translating *reeling and writhing* as *largura e estreitura*.

Paradigmatic paronyms (13)	“I could’t afford to learn it,” said the Mock Turtle with a sigh. “I only took the regular course.” “What was that?” inquired Alice.	—Eu á clase esa non puiden asistir —dixo a Tartaruga de Imitación, botando un suspiro—. Eu só puiden face-los cursos normais.	«Eu non podía darme o luxo de pagar», dixo a Falsa Tartaruga cun salouco. «Eu só fixen o curso estándar.» «E en que consistía?», preguntou Alicia.
----------------------------	--	---	---

	“ <b>Reeling and Writhing</b> , of course, to begin with,” the Mock Turtle replied; (...) P. 81 ( <b>reading and writing</b> ).	—¿E cales eran? –inquiriu Alicia. —Para empezar, naturalmente, <b>Largura e Estreitura</b> –replicou a Tartaruga de Imitción–. P.130	«Para comezar <b>largura e estreitura</b> , por suposto», respondeu a Falsa Tartaruga. P.96
--	---	---	---

The absent elements evoking one of the scripts (*reading and writing/lectura e escritura*) of both TTs are perfectly correspondent to the ST’s, and both words are also semantically related between them, so, despite the fact that the present elements that evoke a script (*reeling and writhing*) are not equivalent in meaning, there is a functional equivalence.

Example (14) is a little complex and follows a different process.

(14)	“and then the different branches of <b>Arithmetic—Ambition, Distraction, Uglification and Derision.</b> ” (...) P.81 ( <b>Addition, subtraction, multiplication and division</b> ).	E logo, os ramos todos de Aritmética... <b>Ambición, Distracción, Afeazón, e Derrisión.</b> (...) P. 130	«E, a continuación, as distintas ramas da Aritmética: <b>Ambición, Distracción, Feísmo e Escarnio.</b> » (...) P. 96
------	---	--	--

As we see, the four words are semantically related because they are branches of Arithmetic. Translator A makes a perfect equivalence through strategy *a* in all terms but in *afeazón*. The other three terms are equivalent in meaning, designation and sense in both scripts, keeping the ambiguity. Words of both the original and the translation A evoke the same scripts, which coexist in the elements. Yet, by creating this neologism she breaks up with the semantic field of the branches of the arithmetic with a word that is not related at all with *multiplication* and it is difficult to infer the absent part of the paronym that evokes the second script. Besides, *derisión* has the same problem as *no*: it is also a borrowing from Spanish. It could be that in 1984 it was accepted by the normative, but today it does not exist in Galician. This could also be the reason why translator B had to

choose a literal translation of *derision* and translate it as *escarnio*, being faithful to the meaning of the ST but omitting the second implicit element of the pun. As in the case of the A, he also uses a neologism for the translation of *uglification* and translates it as *feísmo*, so it is more difficult to recognise the four branches of Arithmetic, although he translates the first two terms achieving equivalence, like translator A.

The case of (17) is almost the same, but makes usage of the strategy *b*, unlike case (14). It contains another neologism, as example (19), evoking a second script that is not present in the text, but easily inferable because of the presence of one of the elements.

### Polysemy

In contrast to the complexness of the translation of the paronyms, it seems that polysemic puns allow the translators to use the strategy *a* in most of the cases, that is to say, to reproduce the pun with not many complications. However, sometimes they also use the strategy of using other humorous devices because they find it impossible to reproduce the pun. Nonetheless, I think that all the polysemic examples I found, except the number (24) could be translated by strategy *a*. This is the case of (21) and (22), which I find even more difficult to translate with some other procedure.

Example (20) uses the strategy *c*.

Polysemy (20)	<p>“Sit down, all of you, and listen to me! <i>I’ll</i> soon make you <b>dry</b> enough!”          (...) “are you all ready? This is the <b>driest</b> thing I know. Silence all around, if you please! ‘William the Conqueror, whose cause was favoured by the pope, (...)—’ ” p.22</p>	<p>—¡Sentarse todos e escoitade ben! ¡Veredes como vos deixo <b>enxoiitos!</b>          (...) —(...)¿Listos todos? ¡Aí vai isto, que é o máis <b>seco</b> que coñezo! ¡Calarse todos, Fagan o favor!          ... Guillermo o Conquistador, apoiada a súa causa polo Papa, (...) p.50</p>	<p>«Sentade todos e escoitádeme! En breve vouvos facer <b>enxugar</b> de vez!»          (...) «están todos preparados? Esta é a cousa máis <b>seca</b> que coñezo. Silencio total, por favor! William, o Conquistador, cuxa causa foi favorecida polo Papa,(...)» P.27</p>
---------------	--	---	--

Both translators use synonyms for the translation to achieve an equivalence, and this successes in maintaining, to a certain extent, the humorous sense of the text, but the truth is that this example could have been translated very easily with strategy *a*, for *seco* is also a polysemic word in Galician. This is the same case as the example (21), in which *poor* could be translated as *pobre* in both cases because it is also a polysemic word in the TL.

The case (23) is a little bit peculiar. Both translators use strategy *a* and achieve equivalence in all levels, but the translation is even more idiomatic in the TL than the original pun in the SL.

(23)	“Very true,” said the Duchess: “flamingoes and mustard both <b>bite</b> . (...)” P.76	—¡Éche ben certo! —dixo a Duquesa—; os flamingos e maila mostarda, <b>pican</b> .(...).” P.123	«É verdade», dixo a Duquesa: «flamingos e mostaza, os dous <b>pican</b> . (...).» P. 90-91
------	---	--	--

What happens in the case (24) is very interesting:

(24)	And so these three little sisters—they were learning to <b>draw</b> , you know—” “What did they <b>draw</b> ?” said Alice, quite forgetting her promise. “Treacle,” said the Dormouse, without considering at all this time. (...) “But I don’t understand. Where did they <b>draw</b> the treacle from?” “You can <b>draw</b> water out of a water-well,” said the Hatter; “so I should think you could <b>draw</b> treacle out of a treacle-well—eh, stupid?” P.62	—(...)Pois logo estas tres irmás... que estaban aprendendo a <b>sacar debuxos</b> , sacaron... —¿O que <b>sacaron</b> ? —dixo Alicia, que esquecera xa que dera palabra de estar calada. —Melaza —dixo o Leirón, desta vez sen pararse a pensalo. (...) —Pero non entendo. ¿De onde <b>sacaron</b> a melaza? —Ti podes <b>sacar</b> auga dun pozo de auga —dixo o Sombreiro- conque me parece a min que dun pozo de melaza poderás <b>sacar</b> melaza... ¡que paponal! P.106	«E así estas tres pequenas irmás... estaban aprendendo a <b>coser</b> , sabes.» « <b>Coser</b> o que?», preguntou Alicia, esquecendo a promesa. «Melaza», dixo o Leirón, sen ter conta do tempo. (...) «Mais non entendo. De onde <b>extraen</b> a melaza?» «Se é posíbel <b>tomar</b> auga dun pozo de auga», dixo o Sombreiro, «entón poderíase pensar que se pode <b>coller</b> melaza dun pozo de melaza, ou ti es parva?». P.74-75
------	--	---	--

Whereas translator A decides to use *sacar debuxos* as a synonym of *debuxar*, the translator B translates *draw* as *coser*. Both build a coherent TT. Translation A could be considered more faithful to the ST because it retains the same meaning as well, and, despite it is a little strained, it is equivalent. Translation B, in contrast, uses an obsolete meaning of the word *draw* and, although the pun is lost in translation, I find it interesting anyway to see how the translator has built the TT in a coherent way and maintaining two different meanings (despite the fact that he has used two different words and not one polysemic), and I find it original that the translator has translated it as *coser*.

### Antonyms

Finally, it is difficult to find regularities in a so small category. This category is not independent from the other ones. In fact, the example (26) is also composed of paronyms, so the translator has to keep an equivalence in the translation of the example as a pair of paronyms and also as a pair of antonyms.

The (25) is a good example of a good translation of antonyms, formed, in this case, by the opposition *white-black*.

(25)	<p>“Do you know why it’s called a <b>whiting</b>?”</p> <p>“I never thought about it,” said Alice. “Why?”</p> <p>“<i>It does the boots and shoes,</i>” the Gryphon replied very solemnly.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>“Why, what are <i>your</i> shoes done with?” said the Gryphon. “I mean, what makes them so shiny?”</p> <p>Alice looked down at them, and considered a little before she gave her answer. “They’re done with <b>blackening</b>, I believe.” P.86</p>	<p>—(...) Ti sabes que a pescadiña é un peixe <b>branco</b>. ¿E sabes por que lle chaman así a ese peixe?</p> <p>—Pois nunca pensei niso –dixo Alicia–. ¿E logo por que é?</p> <p>—Porque se <i>frega nos zapatos e nas botas</i> -replicou moi solemne o Grifón.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>—¿Ti que lles dás aos zapatos? –dixo o Grifón–. O que quero dicir é, ¿que lles fregas para os deixar negros e relucintes?</p> <p>Alicia baixou a vista para eles e pensou por un pouco antes de contestar.</p> <p>—Bótolles <b>betume negro</b>, coido. P.137-138</p>	<p>«Sabes por que se chaman cariocas?»</p> <p>«Nunca o pensara», dixo Alicia. «E por que?»</p> <p>«Porque é un peixe <b>branco</b>, que danza moi ben na tixola, e que frega nas botas e nos zapatos doutros peixes», respondeu o Grifón moi cerimonioso.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>«Que é o que lle dás aos teus zapatos para lustralos?», preguntou o Grifón. (...)</p> <p>Alicia mirou para eles, cavilando antes de dar unha resposta.</p>
------	--	---	--

			«Bótolles <b>betume</b> , coido eu». P.104
--	--	--	--

While *blackening* is a substance used to make shoes shiny, in this context also evokes a funny opposition with the *whiting*. Translator A solves the problem adding some lines ago that the *pescadiña* is a white fish, and that the betume is *black*, so by adding the name of the colours she establishes the opposition, although it is not humorous. In contrast, translator B specifies that *cariocas* are white, but then does not add the colour of the *betume*, so the opposition is lost.

I find this a very difficult case, because the translator does not seem to have many options. He would have to rewrite the whole text in order to have an equivalence in the TL, and, possibly, the situation would be a different one, but this is a bit risky, since he is dealing with a very famous and classic work.

## 6. Conclusions

During the elaboration of the table and the analysis of the translation procedures, I thought that I had made a mistake choosing version B, for in most of the cases, the translator simply overlooks the pun and chooses a literal translation, and I thought that was not going to allow me to make a substantial comparison. However, subsequently, I realised that such difference made me reconsider and think about some aspects about translation, which is, after all, one of the objectives of this essay.

The simplest and more visible conclusion is that the first translation is more creative than the second one, which ignores many of the puns. The translator of translation A tries to reproduce in a wittier way all or most of the puns, even those which seem untranslatable, and when she decides to use the strategy *f*, in many of the examples, an attempt of reproducing the humorous sense can be perceivable. This, in my opinion, turns this translation in a very successful one, for the TC is also capable of finding the wit and double sense to the situations and perceive, thus, something similar to what the SC feels reading the ST, despite the fact that this seemed an impossible challenge in some of the cases. In this sense, I find it a very successful translation, and it is true that comparing it to the translation B, we can observe that in the second one there are some weaknesses, mainly because in most of the cases, the translator decides to translate the pun literally or translating only one of the senses.

But this may have a reason. Despite the fact that the text is a complete text, as the translation A, the aesthetics of Xabier Queipo's translation are, maybe, a bit more infantile. The hard cover, the colours, the illustrations, which are not the originals, like in translation A, but were designed by another illustrator and fill a whole page, in addition to the big typography and the size of the book, could lead us to think that, even it is not an adapted version, it could be specially thought to be addressed to young age readers.

This is not an excuse to ignore all the puns, since the original has also in account that part of its community of readers is going to be mostly formed by children, but, taking into account the difficulty of some of the puns, it could be that the translator had decided to omit them because, under his discernment, they were not so important for the comprehension of the whole work, for most of them do not affect to the development of the plot, and even less if the readers are children. Besides, the translator of this work has the advantage that it is a work in which the absurd is very present and has a major role, so if the reader has not understood a joke or a situation, it makes little difference, because this work is known for having absurd elements, and the reader knows that what is going to be told is not coherent.

Moreover, it could be that the translator wanted to be faithful to the ST for being such a famous and so many times translated novel, and found it risky to take the responsibility of rewriting it, preferring to translate it literally or add some translation notes. However, this opens the debate of whether it is more faithful to translate the meanings and designations as the ST or reproducing the humorous sense, which is the main characteristic of puns.

One of the things I wanted to explore during the process of the comparison was the temporal gap between these two translations. Although there were some other proposals for a regulation of Galician language, the first official regulation of the Galician language was accepted by the RAG and the ILG in 1982, and something that I could see is that the Galician of the TL of the translation A was less fixed and established, with lots of borrowings and not pure forms, probably because the regulation was recently adopted, and speakers did not have the vocabulary integrated and had doubts about the usage of the language. That made the translator A choose translation options that translator B could

not even consider thirty-one years after, having to stick to the regulation of 2015, much more fixed.

In spite of the temporal gap I find it interesting to comment that, in some occasions, like in examples (4) and (17), it almost seems that translator B has inspired his translation in translation A. This would not be something unthinkable, and I am not talking about plagiarism at all, but version B is much later, and it could be that the translator had checked some other former versions to see how he could make his. Taking into account that there are not many translations of this work to Galician, and that the most part of them are reeditions of version A, this possibility does not seem remote.

In the case of a work as *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, I would say that the sense is more important than the meaning and designation, at least in most of the cases, since the goal of a pun is producing amusement or laughter. Of course, in the process of translation, part of the textual content is lost, and so it is a part of the sense. From my point of view, none of the two translations is able of reproducing the wit and humour of the original, but this can not be intended either, for we have already seen that translations are not an exact science, nor depend they on languages, but go much beyond than that and sometimes imply a reform of the reality of the text that is needed to be taken in account. Therefore, I think that if it reproduces part of the textual content of the original, like the sense, as to fulfil the TC's needs, we can consider it a successful translation.

The analysis of such table made me also think about the notion of translatability, so many times discussed by so many scholars, and about which I talked in the theoretical part. Verbal humour is defined by many of them as something impossible to translate (in contrast to the referential humour), specially puns, which are elements that play with specific characteristics of language, as phonetics, morphology or their historical meaning. Yet, comparing these two versions, I observed that the first translator solves in a very

smart way almost all the problems that the translation of the original novel presents, and there are very few occasions in which the discourse remains disjointed or a lot of textual content is lost. It could be that readers do not find the proposals of the translation amusing, or at least not as much as the original by Carroll, but the attempt of reproducing the humorous sense is visible and there is an equivalence.

The fact of observing that, in some cases, both translators solve the same problem successfully in different ways, and that translator A solves almost all the problems somehow, makes me also draw as a conclusion the flexibility and variability of the art of translation. There is not a fixed and valid translation for each example, because translations are multiple and the range of possibilities is very wide. For this reason, I also fall in the drawer of those who defend, as Low does, that affirming that something is untranslatable is closing the eyes to the existent multiple possibilities.

## Reference list

- Alexander, R. J. (1997). Humour and Verbal Humour. In *Aspects of Verbal Humour in English* (pp. 3–20). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen. Retrieved from <https://books.google.es/books?hl=es&lr=&id=zi0y07JVHcwC&oi=fnd&pg=PA3&dq=types+of+verbal+humour&ots=dHJzLEKp5&sig=Blj6XK1A7OmoDP5AV29g5XjZZVg#v=onepage&q=types of verbal humour&f=false>
- Attardo, S. (2008). A primer for the linguistics of humor. In V. Raskin (Ed.), *The primer of humour research* (pp. 101–156). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, S. (1994a). Introduction. In V. Raskin & M. Apte (Eds.), *Linguistic Theories of Humor* (pp. 1–13). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, S. (1994b). Survey of the Literature. In V. Raskin & M. Apte (Eds.), *Linguistic Theories of Humor* (pp. 14–59). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, S. (1994c). The linear organization of the joke. In V. Raskin & M. Apte (Eds.), *Linguistic Theories of Humor* (pp. 60–107). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, S. (1994d). The analysis of puns. In V. Raskin & M. Apte (Eds.), *Linguistic Theories of Humor* (pp. 108–142). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, S. (1994e). Resolution in puns. In V. Raskin & M. Apte (Eds.), *Linguistic Theories of Humor* (pp. 143–173). Berlin; New York.
- Attardo, S. (1994f). Script-based theories. In V. Raskin & M. Apte (Eds.), *Linguistic Theories of Humor* (pp. 195–229). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carrel, A. (2008). Historical views of humor. In V. Raskin (Ed.), *The primer of humour research* (pp. 303–332). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carrol, L. (1865). Alice's Adventures in Wonderland. In *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland & Through the Looking Glass* (2015th ed., pp. 1–106). New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc.
- Carrol, L. (2015). *Alicia no País das Maravillas*. Santiago de Compostela: El Patito Editorial.
- Carrol, L. (1984). *Alicia no país das maravillas*. Vigo: Xerais.
- Chiaro, D. (2010). Translation and Humour, Humour and Translation. In D. Chiaro (Ed.), *Translation, humour and literature* (pp. 1–29). London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group. Retrieved from

[https://books.google.es/books?id=kCelpJ2V0HQC&printsec=frontcover&hl=es&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.es/books?id=kCelpJ2V0HQC&printsec=frontcover&hl=es&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)

Chiaro, D. (2008). Verbally Expressed Humor and translation. In V. Raskin (Ed.), *The primer of humour research* (pp. 569–608). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Coseriu, E. (1977). Lo erróneo y lo acertado en la teoría de la traducción. In *El hombre y su lenguaje* (pp. 215–239). Madrid: Gredos.

García Yebra, V. (1990). Polisemia, ambigüedad y traducción. In *En torno a la traducción: Teoría, crítica, historia*. (pp. 70–90). Madrid: Gredos.

Jones, J. E., Gladstone, J. F., & Porter, R. (1998). *The Alice companion: a guide to Lewis Carroll's Alice books*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Low, P. A. (2011). Translating jokes and puns. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 19(1), 59–70.

Munday, J. (2009). Key Concepts. In J. Munday (Ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 235–236). New York: Routledge.

Newmark, P. (2009). The linguistic and communicative stages in translation theory. In J. Munday (Ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 20–35). New York: Routledge.

Raskin, V. (2008). Theory of humor and practice of humor research: Editor's notes and thoughts. In V. Raskin (Ed.), *The primer of humour research* (pp. 1–16). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ritchie, G. (2010). Linguistic factors in Humour. In D. Chiaro (Ed.), *Translation, humour and literature* (pp. 33–48). London: Continuum International Publishing Group. Retrieved from [https://books.google.es/books?id=kCelpJ2V0HQC&dq=verbal+humour+linguistic+referential&hl=es&source=gbs\\_navlinks\\_s](https://books.google.es/books?id=kCelpJ2V0HQC&dq=verbal+humour+linguistic+referential&hl=es&source=gbs_navlinks_s)

Ruch, W. (2008). Psychology of humor. In V. Raskin (Ed.), *The primer of humour research* (pp. 17–100). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Smuts, A. (n.d.). Humor. In *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved June 28, 2018, from <http://www.iep.utm.edu/humor/>

Vandaele, J. (2010). Humor in translation. In Y. Gambier & van D. Luc (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 147–152). Oslo: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075>

Zabalbeascoa, P. (2005). Humor and translation - an interdiscipline. *International Journal of Humor Research.*, 18(2), 185–207.

Oxford English Dictionary. (n.d.). Retrieved July 21, 2018, from <http://www.oed.com/>

## Appendix

Type	Source Text	Translation A	Translation B
Homographs (1)	<p>“But I don’t understand. Where did they draw the treacle from?”</p> <p>“You can draw water out of a water-well,” said the Hatter; “so I should think you could draw treacle out of a treacle-well—eh, stupid?”</p> <p>“But they were <i>in the well</i>,” Alice said to the Dormouse, not choosing to notice this last remark. “Of course they were,” said the Dormouse; “—<b>well</b> in.” P. 62</p>	<p>—Pero non entendo. ¿De onde sacaron a melaza?</p> <p>—Ti podes sacar auga dun pozo de auga —dixo o Sombreiro- conque me parece a min que dun pozo de melaza poderás sacar melaza... ¡que paponal!</p> <p>—Pero é que estaban dentro do <b>pozo</b> —díxolle Alicia ó Leirón, facendo coma que non oíra aquilo ultimo.</p> <p>—Pois si que estaban -dixo o Leirón-; dentro do pozo, <b>e metidas nel</b>, e por iso se podían sacar. P. 106</p>	<p>«Mais non entendo. De onde extraen a melaza?»</p> <p>«Se é posíbel tomar auga dun pozo de auga», dixo o Sombreiro, «entón poderíase pensar que se pode coller melaza dun pozo de melaza, ou ti es parva?»</p> <p>«Mais elas vivían no <b>pozo</b>», díxolle Alicia ao Leirón, preferindo esquecer o ultimo comentario que el fixera. «Está claro que alí estaban», dixo o Leirón, «<b>ben dentro!</b>». P. 74-75</p>
(2)	<p>“Very true,” said the Duchess: “flamingoes and mustard both bite. And the moral of that is—‘Birds of a feather flock together.’ ”</p> <p>“Only mustard isn’t a bird,” Alice remarked.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>“It’s a mineral, I <i>think</i>,” said Alice.</p> <p>“Of course it is,” said the Duchess, who seemed ready to agree to everything that Alice said; “there’s a large mustard-<b>mine</b> near here. And the moral of that is—‘The more there is of <b>mine</b>, the less there is of yours.’ ” P. 76</p>	<p>—¡Éche ben certo! —dixo a Duquesa-; os flamingos e maila mostarda, pican. E a lección moral diso é... “Os paxaros dunha caste, voan para a mesma árbore.”</p> <p>—Non sendo que a mostarda non é un paxaro —observou Alicia.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>—É un mineral, coido eu —dixo Alicia.</p> <p>—É, si señora —dixo a Duquesa, que parecía estar lista a concordar con todo o que lle dicía Alicia; aquí pretiño hai unha mina grande de mostarda. E a lección moral diso é... “Canta máis hai na <b>miña mina</b>, menos haberá na túa.” P. 123</p>	<p>«É verdade», dixo a Duquesa: «flamengos e mostaza, os dous pican. E a moral disto é: <i>Os paxaros dunha bandada sempre voan xuntos</i>».</p> <p>«Só que a mostaza non é un paxaro», observou Alicia.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>«Coido que é un mineral», dixo Alicia.</p> <p>«Claro que é», dixo a Duquesa, que semellaba disposta a concordar con todo o que Alicia dicía.</p> <p>«Aquí do lado hai unha gran <b>mina</b> de mostaza. E a moral disto é: <i>Canto máis eu teño, menos tes ti</i>.» P. 90-91</p>
(3)	<p>“Thank you,” said Alice, “it’s very interesting. I never knew so much about a whiting before.”</p> <p>“I can tell you more than that, if you like,” said the Gryphon. “Do you know</p>	<p>—Pois moi agradecida —dixo Alicia-; é ben interesante. Nunca tanto soubera das pescadiñas.</p> <p>—Pois se queres aínda che podo contra máis delas -dixo o grifón-. Ti sabes que a <b>pescadiña</b> é un peixe</p>	<p>«Grazas», dixo Alicia, «é moi interesante: nunca antes souben tanto de cariocas».</p> <p>«Pódoche contar máis cousas, se é que che gusta tanto o tema», dixo o Grifón. «Sabes</p>

	<p>why it's called a <b>whiting</b>?"</p> <p>"I never thought about it," said Alice. "Why?"</p> <p><i>"It does the boots and shoes,"</i> the Gryphon replied very solemnly.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>"Why, what are <i>your</i> shoes done with?" said the Gryphon. "I mean, what makes them so shiny?"</p> <p>Alice looked down at them, and considered a little before she gave her answer. "They're done with blacking, I believe." P. 86</p>	<p>branco. ¿E sabes por que lle chaman así a ese peixe?</p> <p>—Pois nunca pensei niso —dixo Alicia—. ¿E logo por que é?</p> <p>—Porque se <i>frega nos zapatos e nas botas</i> - replicou moi solemne o Grifón.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>—¿Ti que lles dás aos zapatos? —dixo o Grifón—. O que quero dicir é, ¿que lles fregas para os deixar negros e relucintes? Alicia baixou a vista para eles e pensou por un pouco antes de contestar.</p> <p>—Bótolles betume negro, coido. P. 137-138</p>	<p>por que se chaman <b>cariocas</b>?»</p> <p>«Nunca o pensara», dixo Alicia. «E por que?»</p> <p>«<b>Porque é un peixe branco, que danza moi ben na tixola, e que frega nas botas e nos zapatos doutros peixes</b>», respondeu o Grifón moi cerimonioso.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>«Que é o que lle dás aos teus zapatos para lustralos?», preguntou o Grifón. (...)</p> <p>Alicia mirou para eles, cavilando antes de dar unha resposta.</p> <p>«Bótolles betume, coido eu». P. 104</p>
(4)	<p><i>My notion was that you had been</i></p> <p><i>(before she had this fit)</i></p> <p><i>An obstacle that came between</i></p> <p><i>Him, and ourselves, and it.</i></p> <p>(...)</p> <p>"Why, there they are?" said the King triumphantly, pointing to the tarts on the table. "Nothing can be clearer than <i>that</i>. Then again— '<i>before she had this fit</i>—' you never had fits, my dear, I think?" he said to the Queen.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>"Then the words don't <i>fit</i> you," said the King, looking round the court with a smile. P. 102-103</p>	<p>El mandoulles dicir que eu non fora</p> <p>(ben sabemos que isto foi certo)</p> <p>e se ela vai e o corrobora non te salvas nin lonxe nin perto.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>—Claro, aí as tedes .dixo o Rei triunfante, sinalando para as tortas que estaban enriba da mesa—. ¡Mais claro non pode estar! E despois di tamén aquí "antes que ela <b>trocácase o modelo</b>". E ti nunca trocáche-lo modelo, ¿non é certo, cara esposa? —díxolle á Raíña.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>—Entón —dixo o Rei, sorrindo e ollando todo arredor da sala— esas palabras non che <b>serven de modelo</b>. P. 159, 161-162</p>	<p><i>A miña idea foi que fuches ti</i></p> <p><i>(antes que ela tivera ese arrouto)</i></p> <p><i>Un obstáculo que se interpuña</i></p> <p><i>Entre el, nós mesmos, e o soño afouto.</i></p> <p>«Por que, alí están elas!», dixo o Rei triunfante, apuntando para as tortas sobre a mesa: «Nada pode ser máis claro ca iso». Entón novamente: «Di <i>Antes que ela amañara todo</i>, e ti nunca trocaches o modelo, miña querida, creo eu?», preguntoulle á Raíña.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>«Entón, as palabras non che <b>serven</b>», dixo o Rei, mirando ao redor da sala do xulgado cun sorriso. P. 122-123</p>
Homophones (5)	<p>"Mine is a long and sad <b>tale</b>!" said the Mouse,</p>	<p>—O <b>conto</b> que levo atrás é ben triste e con moito <b>rabo</b>!</p>	<p>«O meu é un <b>conto</b> longo e tortuoso como a miña <b>cola</b>», dixo o Rato</p>

	turning to Alice, and sighing. “It is a long <b>tail</b> , certainly,” said Alice, looking down with wonder at the Mouse’s tail; (...) P. 25	—dixo o Rato, virándose para Alicia e suspirando. —O <b>Rabo</b> é ben longo —dixo Alicia, ollando pasmada para o rabo do Rato- pero, ¿e logo por que di que é tan triste? P. 54	saloucando e volvéndose cara a Alicia. «É unha <b>cola</b> ben longa <sup>4</sup> , abofé», concordou Alicia, mirando con asombro a cola do rato, (...). P. 31
(6)	“I beg your pardon,” said Alice very humbly: “you had got to the fifth bend, I think?” “I had <b>not!</b> ” cried the Mouse, sharply and very angrily. “A <b>knot!</b> ” said Alice, always ready to make herself useful, and looking anxiously about her. “Oh, do let me help to undo it!” P. 26	—Disculpe —dixo Alicia humildemente—; xa ía pola quinta volta ¿non é? —¡ <b>No</b> , pois...! ¡Así non sei como imos facer! —berrou o Rato, con voz afiada e moi alporizado. —¡Un <b>nó!</b> —dixo Alicia, ollando todo arredor con ansia e sempre con afán de axudar—. ¿Axudo eu a desatalo? P. 56	«Disculpe», dixo Alicia humildemente: «Xa ía pola quinta reviravolta, non si?». « <b>Non chegara aínda!</b> », berrou o Rato, tallante e alporizado. «É que tes o rabo <b>anoado?</b> », preguntou Alicia, disposta sempre a axudar, e mirando con ansia a todos os lados, dixo: «Déixame axudar a desfacelo, ho!». P. 33
(7)	“(...) You see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its <b>axis</b> —” “Talking of <b>axes</b> ,” said the Duchess, “chop off her head!” P. 50	—(...)A Terra tarda vinte e catro horas en tornar arredor do seu <b>eixo</b> ... —¡Que <b>machada!</b> E falando de <b>machados</b> ¡que a descabecen! * P. 88	«(...)Saiba que a Terra leva vinte e catro horas para xirar sobre o seu <b>eixe</b> ...» «Falando de <b>eixes</b> », dixo a Duquesa, «córtalle a cabeza!» P. 59
(8)	“And how many hours a day did you do lessons?” said Alice, in a hurry to change the subject. “Then hours the first day,” said the Mock Turtle: “nine the next, and so on.” “What a curious plan!” exclaimed Alice. “That’s the reason they’re called <b>lessons</b> ,” the Gryphon remarked: “because they <b>lessen</b> from day to day.” P. 82	—¿E cantas clases daban cada día? -dixo Alicia, bulindo a mudar de tema. —O primeiro día, dez horas —dixo a Tartaruga de Imitación—; o seguinte día, nove, e así. —¡Que horario máis raro! —exclamou Alicia. —É que por iso se chama <b>dar</b> clases —observou o Grifón—; porque cantas máis <b>dás</b> , menos quedan, e cada día son menos. P. 131	«E cantas horas de clase tiñas por día?», preguntou Alicia, con présa de cambiar de tema. «Dez horas o primeiro día», dixo a Falsa Tartaruga, «nove no seguinte, e así en diante». «Que plan tan estraño!», exclamou Alicia. «Esta é a razón pola que lles chaman <b>leccións</b> », observou o Grifón: «porque <b>diminúen</b> día a día». <sup>13</sup> P. 97-98
(9)	“I’m a poor man, your Majesty,” the Hatter began, in a trembling voice, “—and I hadn’t begun my tea—not above a week or so—and what	—Eu valer non vallo cousa, Maxestade —empezou o Sombreiroiro, con voz tremelante— e aínda non empezara a merendar... non haberá máis dunha semana	«Eu son un home pobre, Maxestade», comezou o Sombreiroiro, coa voz trémula. «Hai agora unha semana ou así que comecei a miña

	<p>with the bread-and-butter getting so thin—and the twinkling of the tea—”</p> <p>“The twinkling of <i>what?</i>” said the King.</p> <p>“It <i>began</i> with the <b>tea</b>,” the Hatter replied.</p> <p>“Of course twinkling <i>begins</i> with a <b>T!</b>” said the King sharply. P. 95</p>	<p>ou así... e co pan con manteiga máis fino de cada vez, e o tintilar do te...</p> <p>—¿O tintilar do que? —dixo o Rei.</p> <p>—Empezou co <b>te</b> —replicou o sombreireiro.</p> <p>—Ben sei que tintilar empeza cun <b>T</b> —dixo o Rei ásperamente—. P. 150</p>	<p>merenda, e cada vez o pan con manteiga minguaba de vez... e o titular do té...»</p> <p>«O titilar do que?», preguntou o Rei.</p> <p>«Todo comezou co <b>té</b>», respondeu o Sombreireiro.</p> <p>«Está claro que titilar comeza cun <b>T!</b>», dixo o Rei espelido. P. 114</p>
(10)	<p>“When we were little,” the Mock Turtle went on at last, more calmly, though still sobbing a little now and then, “we went to school in the sea. The master</p> <p>was an old Turtle—we used to call him Tortoise—”</p> <p>“Why did you call him Tortoise, if he wasn’t one?” Alice asked.</p> <p>“We called him <b>Tortoise</b> because he <b>taught us</b>,” said the Mock Turtle angrily. “Really you are very dull!” P. 80</p>	<p>—Cando eramos moi noviños —seguíu por fin a Tartaruga de Imitación, máis calma xa aínda que botando suspiros de cando en vez —íamos á escola do mar. O mestre era un Sapoconcho xa vello (que nós chamabámoslle <b>Sabiochocho</b>)...</p> <p>—¿E logo por que lle chamaban así? —preguntou Alicia.</p> <p>—Chamabámoslle chocho porque <b>ás veces, cando se ía da clase, estaba ido, e sabio, porque cada un sabe de si</b> —dixo a Tartaruga de Imitación, toda enfadada—. ¡Ti es ben obtusa! P. 129</p>	<p>«Cando eramos pequenos», a Falsa Tartaruga proseguiu ao cabo con máis calma, aínda que saloucando un pouco de cando en vez: «nós fomos á escola no mar. A mestra era unha vella Tartaruga e acostumabamos alcumala <b>Trataruga</b>».</p> <p>«Por que chamala Trataruga se non o era?», preguntou Alicia.</p> <p>«Chamámola Trataruga porque <b>trataba e tiña conta de nós</b>», dixo a Falsa Tartaruga con rabia: «es verdadeiramente aborrecida!». P. 95</p>
Syntagmatic paronyms (11)	<p>“Did you say ‘<b>pig</b>’ or ‘<b>fig</b>?’” said the Cat. P. 54</p>	<p>—¿Dixeches <b>cocho</b> ou <b>moucho</b>? —dixo o Gato. P. 94</p>	<p>«Dixo <b>porco</b> ou <b>figo</b><sup>8</sup>?», preguntou o Gato. P. 64</p>
(12)	<p>(...) “Why, if a fish came to <i>me</i>, and told me he was going a journey, I should say ‘With what <b>porpoise?</b>’”</p> <p>“Don’t you mean ‘<b>purpose?</b>’” said Alice. P. 87</p>	<p>— (...) E logo, se un peixe vén canda min e me di que vai a algunha parte, eu o primeiro que lle pregunto é “¿e con que <b>delfín?</b>”</p> <p>—¿E non quererá dicir “<b>con que fin?</b>”? P. 138</p>	<p>«(...) por que, se un peixe vén canda min, e me di que está de viaxe, eu direille: Que camiño é o que se fai sen un <b>golfinho?</b>».</p> <p>«Non quererás dicir: <b>sen propósito o camiño?</b>», preguntou Alicia. P. 105</p>
Paradigmatic paronyms (13)	<p>“I could’t afford to learn it,” said the Mock Turtle with a sigh.</p>	<p>—Eu á clase esa non puíden asistir —dixo a Tartaruga de Imitación, botando un</p>	<p>«Eu non podía darme o luxo de pagar», dixo a Falsa Tartaruga cun</p>

	<p>“I only took the regular course.”</p> <p>“What was that?” inquired Alice.</p> <p>“<b>Reeling and Writhing</b>, of course, to begin with,” the Mock Turtle replied; (...) P. 81 (<b>reading and writing</b>).</p>	<p>suspiro-. Eu só puiden face-los cursos normais.</p> <p>—¿E cales eran? –inquiríu Alicia.</p> <p>—Para empezar, naturalmente, <b>Largura e Estreitura</b> –replicou a Tartaruga de Imitación-. P. 130</p>	<p>salouco. «Eu só fixen o curso estándar.»</p> <p>«E en que consistía?», preguntou Alicia.</p> <p>«Para comezar <b>largura e estreitura</b>, por suposto», respondeu a Falsa Tartaruga. P. 96</p>
(14)	<p>“and then the different branches of <b>Arithmetic—Ambition, Distraction, Uglification and Derision.</b>”(…) P. 81 (<b>Addition, subtraction, multiplication and division</b>).</p>	<p>E logo, os ramos todos de Aritmética... <b>Ambición, Distracción, Afezación, e Derrisión.</b></p> <p>(...)</p> <p>˘P. 130</p>	<p>«E, a continuación, as distintas ramas da Aritmética: <b>Ambición, Distracción, Feísmo e Escarnio.</b>»</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>P. 96</p>
(15)	<p>“Well, there was <b>Mystery</b>” the Mock Turtle replied, counting off the subjects on his flappers.</p> <p>“—Mystery, ancient and modern, (...) P. 81 (<b>history</b>)</p>	<p>—Pois... dabamos <b>Histeria</b></p> <p>–replicou a Tartaruga de Imitación, levando a conta das disciplinas coas patas– ...</p> <p>Histeria Antiga e Moderna, (...) P. 130</p>	<p>«Ben», respondeu a Falsa Tartaruga, levando a conta das materias coas patas: <b>Histeria</b>, antiga e moderna, (...) P. 97</p>
(16)	<p>(...) with <b>Seaography:</b> (...) P. 81 (<b>sherography</b>)</p>	<p>(...) e tamén <b>Mareografía;</b> (...) P. 130</p>	<p>(...) con <b>Mareografía;</b> (...) P. 97</p>
(17)	<p>(...) then Drawling—the Drawling-master was an old conger-eel, that used to come once a week.</p> <p>(...) <i>he</i> taught us <b>Drawling, Stretching, and Fainting in Coils.</b> P. 81 ( <b>drawing, sketching and painting in oils</b>)”.</p>	<p>(...) logo había <b>Tribuxo...</b> o professor de Tribuxo era un congro vello que viña unha vez por semana; ensinaba <b>Depinicar, Rebozar e Fritura en óleo.</b> (...) P. 131</p>	<p>(...) e logo había <b>Tribuxo;</b> o mestre era un congro vello, que adoitaba vir unha vez por semana e aprendeunos <b>Tribuxo, ou sexa Esticado, Reptado, e Destrozo.</b> (...) P. 97</p>
(18)	<p>(...) “he taught <b>Laughing and Grief</b>, they used to say.” (<b>latin and Greek</b>). P. 81</p>	<p>— (...) Daba <b>Ruín e Crego</b>, coido. P. 131</p>	<p>(...) «Din que se aprendía <b>Risa e Tristeza</b>». P. 97</p>
(19)	<p>“I wonder if I shall fall right <i>through</i> the earth! How funny it’ll seem to come out among the people that walk with their heads downward! The <b>antipathies</b>, I think—” (...). (The <b>antipodeans</b>). P. 9</p>	<p>—¿E furarei a Terra dun lado a outro? –seguíu dicindo -. ¡Ha ser chistoso se vou saír entre xente que anda de cabeza para baixo! As <b>Antílopas</b>, coido...(…)</p> <p>P. 31</p>	<p>«Será que estou atravesando a terra! Que divertido vai ser ir dar entre persoas que camiñan cabeza abaixo! Os <b>antipáticos</b>, coido eu (...).» P. 14</p>

Polysemy (20)	At last the Mouse, who seemed to be a person of authority among them, called out, “Sit down, all of you, and listen to me! <i>I’ll</i> soon make you <b>dry</b> enough!” (...) “Ahem!” said the Mouse with an important air, “are you all ready? This is the <b>driest</b> thing I know. Silence all around, if you please! ‘William the Conqueror, whose cause was favoured by the pope, (...)—’ ” P. 22	Por fin o Rato, que parecía ser persoa de certa autoridade entre eles, faloulles: —¡Sentarse todos e escoitade ben! ¡Veredes como vos deixo <b>enxoiitos!</b> (...) —¡Ehem, ehem! —carraspeou o Rato. dándose importancia—. ¿Listos todos? ¡Aí vai isto, que é o máis <b>seco</b> que coñezo! ¡Calarse todos, Fagan o favor! ... Guillermo o Conquistador, apoiada a súa causa polo Papa, (...) P. 50	Por fin, o Rato, que parecía ser persoa de autoridade entre eles, mandounos calar: «Sentade todos e escoitádemme! En breve vouvos facer <b>enxugar</b> de vez!» (...) «Hum!» dixo o Rato cun ar de importancia, «están todos preparados? Esta é a cousa máis <b>seca</b> que coñezo. Silencio total, por favor! William, o Conquistador, cuxa causa foi favorecida polo Papa,(...)» P.27
(21)	“I’m a <b>poor</b> man, your Majesty,” he began. “You’re a <i>very poor speaker</i> ,” said the King. P. 95	—Eu non <b>vallo</b> cousa, Maxestade —empezou. —Para o que non <b>vales</b> é para orador —dixo o Rei. P. 151	«Eu son un home <b>pobre</b> , Maxestade», comezou. «Vostede é un orador moi <b>pobre</b> », dixo o Rei. P. 115
(22)	“I dare say you never even spoke to Time!” “Perhaps not,” Alice cautiously replied: “but I know I have to <b>beat</b> time when I learn music.” “Ah! that accounts for it,” said the Hatter. “He won’t stand <b>beating</b> . Now, if you only kept on good terms with him, he’d do almost anything you liked with the clock. (...)” p.59	—(...)Seguro que nin falaches nunca co Tempo! —Seguramente que non —replicou Alicia con prudencia—; pero na clase de música ben sei que teño que <b>bate</b> -lo compás para medi-lo tempo. —¡Así se explica! —dixo o Sombreiro—. ¡É que moi mal lle senta que <b>batan</b> nel! Pero en troques se o tratas con miramento, fará co reloxo case calquera cousa que lle pidas. P. 101	«Eu ouso dicir que nunca falaches co Tempo!» «Se cadra non», dixo Alicia con receo, «mais eu teño que <b>controlar</b> o tempo cando estudo música». «Ah! Iso conta», dixo o Sombreiro. «Non soporta que <b>batan</b> nel. Agora, se tes boa relación con el, farías co reloxo case calquera cousa que ti quixeses(...)».
(23)	“Very true,” said the Duchess: “flamingoes and mustard both <b>bite</b> . (...)” P.76	—¡Éche ben certo! —dixo a Duquesa—; os flamingos e maila mostarda, <b>pican</b> .(...)” P.123	«É verdade», dixo a Duquesa: «flamengos e mostaza, os dous <b>pican</b> . (...)» P. 90-91
(24)	And so these three little sisters—they were	—(...)Pois logo estas tres irmás... que estaban	«E así estas tres pequenas irmás...

	<p>learning to <b>draw</b>, you know—”</p> <p>“What did they <b>draw</b>?” said Alice, quite forgetting her promise. “Treacle,” said the Dormouse, without considering at all this time.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>“But I don’t understand. Where did they <b>draw</b> the treacle from?”</p> <p>“You can <b>draw</b> water out of a water-well,” said the Hatter; “so I should think you could <b>draw</b> treacle out of a treacle-well—eh, stupid?”</p> <p>P. 62</p>	<p>aprendendo a <b>sacar debuxos</b>, sacaron...</p> <p>—¿O que <b>sacaron</b>? –dixo Alicia, que esquecera xa que dera palabra de estar calada.</p> <p>—Melaza –dixo o Leirón, desta vez sen pararse a pensalo.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>—Pero non entendo. ¿De onde <b>sacaron</b> a melaza?</p> <p>—Ti podes <b>sacar</b> auga dun pozo de auga –dixo o Sombreiro- conque me parece a min que dun pozo de melaza poderás <b>sacar</b> melaza... ¡que papona!</p> <p>P. 106</p>	<p>estaban aprendendo a <b>coser</b>, sabes.»</p> <p>«<b>Coser</b> o que?», preguntou Alicia, esquecendo a promesa.</p> <p>«Melaza», dixo o Leirón, sen ter conta do tempo.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>«Mais non entendo. De onde <b>extraen</b> a melaza?»</p> <p>«Se é posíbel <b>tomar</b> auga dun pozo de auga», dixo o Sombreiro, «entón poderíase pensar que se pode <b>coller</b> melaza dun pozo de melaza, ou ti es parva?». P. 74-75</p>
<p>Antonyms (25)</p>	<p>“Thank you,” said Alice, “it’s very interesting. I never knew so much about a whiting before.”</p> <p>“I can tell you more than that, if you like,” said the Gryphon. “Do you know why it’s called a <b>whiting</b>?”</p> <p>“I never thought about it,” said Alice. “Why?”</p> <p>“<i>It does the boots and shoes</i>,” the Gryphon replied very solemnly.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>“Why, what are <i>your shoes</i> done with?” said the Gryphon. “I mean, what makes them so shiny?”</p> <p>Alice looked down at them, and considered a little before she gave her answer. “They’re done with <b>blacking</b>, I believe.”</p> <p>P. 86</p>	<p>—Pois moi agradecida –dixo Alicia-; é ben interesante. Nunca tanto soubera das pescadiñas.</p> <p>—Pois se queres aínda che podo contra máis delas - dixo o grifón-. Ti sabes que a pescadiña é un peixe <b>branco</b>. ¿E sabes por que lle chaman así a ese peixe?</p> <p>—Pois nunca pensei niso –dixo Alicia-. ¿E logo por que é?</p> <p>—Porque se <i>frega nos zapatos e nas botas</i> - replicou moi solemne o Grifón.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>—¿Ti que lles dás aos zapatos? –dixo o Grifón-. O que quero dicir é, ¿que lles fregas para os deixar negros e relucintes?</p> <p>Alicia baixou a vista para eles e pensou por un pouco antes de contestar.</p> <p>—Bótolles <b>betume negro</b>, coido. P. 137-138</p>	<p>«Grazas», dixo Alicia, «é moi interesante: nunca antes souben tanto de cariocas».</p> <p>«Pódoche contar máis cousas, se é que che gusta tanto o tema», dixo o Grifón. «Sabes por que se chaman cariocas?»</p> <p>«Nunca o pensara», dixo Alicia. «E por que?»</p> <p>«Porque é un peixe <b>branco</b>, que danza moi ben na tixola, e que frega nas botas e nos zapatos doutros peixes», respondeu o Grifón moi cerimonioso.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>«Que é o que lle dás aos teus zapatos para lustralos?», preguntou o Grifón. (...)</p> <p>Alicia mirou para eles, cavilando antes de dar unha resposta.</p> <p>«Bótolles <b>betume</b>, coido eu». P. 104</p>

(26)	(...) “he taught <b>Laughing</b> and <b>Grief</b> , they used to say.” P. 81	— (...) Daba <b>Ruín</b> e <b>Crego</b> , coido. P. 130-131	«Din que se aprendía <b>Risa e Tristeza</b> ». P. 96-97
------	--	---	--