

HUMOUR AS A SYMPTOM OF RESEARCH TRENDS IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

Juan José Martínez Sierra

juan.j.martinez@uv.es
Universitat de València

Patrick Zabalbeascoa Terran

patrick.zabalbeascoa@upf.edu
Universitat Pompeu Fabra

Abstract

This article is an overview of translation studies applied to the case of humour, divided into four parts, plus an extensive bibliography. The first part goes over humour translation as a relevant object of research and why it is worthy of more academic attention. Humour translation should not be dealt with or looked upon as a strange body within translation studies. Part two is an overview of key contributions to the field, from Spain and elsewhere, covering a considerable number of authors and theories. Part three focuses on promising areas of interest for researchers and illustrates how audiovisual translation is a good instance of dynamism within the field, connecting all this to the rich variety of formats and the importance of technology. Part four sketches the landscape of research methods and theoretical frameworks to signpost possible pitfalls involved when methodologies and theoretical frameworks are not clearly and coherently organised given the complexities of studying humour translation.

Resumen

Este artículo repasa la traductología centrada en el caso del humor. Está organizado en cuatro secciones, más una extensa bibliografía. La primera sección destaca la importancia de investigar la traducción del humor y por qué merece más atención académica. No debe tratarse como un cuerpo extraño dentro de la traductología. La segunda sección es una panorámica de algunas contribuciones destacadas, de España y de otros lugares, incluyendo a muchos teóricos diversos. La tercera sección se centra en temas prometedores para la investigación y señala a la traducción audiovisual como

un campo especialmente dinámico en este sentido, siendo como es rico en formatos de programas y en cuestiones tecnológicas. La última parte es un breve boceto del paisaje investigador de metodologías y marcos teóricos, y alerta del peligro de confundir conceptos y enfoques dada la complejidad del estudio de la traducción del humor.

Keywords: Translation. Humour. Research methodology. Theoretical frameworks. Audiovisual translation.

Palabras clave: Traducción. Humor. Metodología de la investigación. Marcos teóricos. Traducción audiovisual.

Para enlazar con este artículo / To link to this article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2017.9.1>

Para citar este artículo / To cite this article:

MARTÍNEZ SIERRA, Juan José & ZABALBEASCOA TERRAN, Patrick. (2017) "Humour as a Symptom of Research Trends in Translation Studies." In: Martínez Sierra, Juan José & Patrick Zabalbeascoa Terran (eds.) 2017. *The Translation of Humour / La traducción del humor*. *MonTI* 9, pp. 9-27.

1. In search of the relevance of studying humour translation

For many people the distinguishing feature of the human species is natural language, for others it is the possession of a sense of humour. However, in relation to both features there is intense scientific research and some claims that come out of it all that propose that some species or other from the animal kingdom might be said to have a language of sorts, or a sense of humour of sorts. We can probably very safely say that no other species can translate from one set of signs to another for a third party, much less translate jokes or other instances of humour. So, maybe translation is the true mark of a human being, in particular the translation of humour. It is also true that there is a fairly widespread belief that (ideal) translation is actually (theoretically) impossible, and that the translation of humour, in particular, again, is on the whole impossible. As if *impossible* could be thus qualified. A less defeatist claim consists of stating that translation is often difficult, challenging, and sometimes apparently impossible, and humour translation is a case in point. In this sense, the translation of humour is an ideal sounding board for any theory of translation (or humour), and is similarly held up as an example of the impossibility of translation.

Even on a very anecdotal level, *lost in translation* (real or imagined) is a whole source of humour production in one field (humour studies) and of bitter debate in the other (translation studies). Although there are countless instances of poor translations and howlers, we cannot allow translators to be laughed at or translation scholars to be derided. The scholarship involved in researching translation and humour alike must be taken seriously if we honestly wish to gain further insight into the nature of human communication and interaction, socially, politically, culturally, and psychologically.

The challenge of translating humour lies in compounding all of the inescapable difficulties and demands that are characteristic of any translator's job plus having to take on the complex nature of humour, in its perception and in its (re)production. Both translation and humour are problematic even when it comes to reaching a consensus on their definition and scope, given the cultural dimension of their practice and scholarly research. This explains why so

many issues cannot be dealt with in absolute terms and it justifies a number of different approaches.

Humour, translation, and consequently the translation of humour, lose their sharpness and focus if we restrict our outlook and understanding of them exclusively to a literalist interpretation of communication. Indeed, literal translation is not so much the problem as literal readings (especially when literal readings are not intended, as in the case of irony, bantering, sarcasm, satire, symbolism, metaphor, wordplay, and other rhetorical devices). Ultimately, literalism is a sign of Asperger syndrome, of intolerance, of humorlessness. We need a more sophisticated conceptual toolbox, including hermeneutics, pragmatics, stylistics, and semiotics, as well as the more traditional linguistic and literary analyses. We also need to add audiovisual, multimodal, multicultural diversity, and multilingual perspectives and we need to revise what there is of great value in well-tested insights into oral and written humour (e.g. Nash 1985). It seems essential, then, to go beyond lexical semantics in order to understand the matter from broader and more flexible points of view, on the crossroads of interdisciplinary studies.

Any type of text can be translated and there may also be features of humour in practically any kind of text, including humour that may be perceived by certain interlocutors or users but was unintended by the author. Academic translation studies and humour studies share much more than the layperson might think. They are fairly new disciplines, not yet fully consolidated if compared to linguistics and literary theory. They are both characteristically interdisciplinary, and this is probably why they are in constant danger of disintegration, thus regularly forced to justify their existence. To a large extent they feed from common sources, including the aforementioned areas (linguistics, literary studies, semiotics, and pragmatics) as well as others, like sociology, cultural studies, anthropology, and communication studies.

The aims of research in humour translation include: (i) a better understanding of how humour is translated (whether by describing, prescribing, or speculating) improves, by extension, our insight into other particular translation problems and the general nature of translation overall; (ii) various areas within translation (by theme, mode, medium, field of specialization) that call for dealing with instances and elements of humour; and (iii) the relationship, real or potential, that there is between academic studies and professional practice. In light of what has been said so far, these aims are not surprising if the goal is to make a contribution to furthering knowledge about the relationship between these two practices and disciplines and to research the range of solutions that actually exist (descriptive studies) or might exist (theoretical

speculations) or are somehow desirable (prescriptive approaches) for different problems that are posed by the presence of humoristic elements in translations and texts to be translated.

Despite all that has been done so far, there still remain multiple spheres to explore, given the polyhedral nature of humour and its translation, regardless of whether it is in writing, spoken or audiovisual, scripted and rehearsed or spontaneous. Because we can translate all sorts of texts and humour crops up also in all sorts of texts and all sorts of ways, humour translation provides a rich field of topics, research methods and theories large and small at the intersection of humour and translation. Good theories are relevant to both fields of study. A good general theory of translation must survive the test of humour translation, just as a good theory of humour must account for translated humour as well. Both humour and translation are often closely related to language and a more intense dialogue is required in a two-way street between linguistic findings and proposals; and their validation for the case of humour translation. Communication theory is an even broader field than linguistics (given that verbally expressed language is just one form of communication) and can accommodate cases of audiovisual and semiotically diverse translation and humoristic resources. In short, both translation (professional practice and academic research) and humour are polyhedral phenomena, with such diverse interplaying factors as ideology, literature, psychology, history, social relationships, education, culture, aesthetics, and semiotics. This means that the keen student or scholar will find at least as many theories as there are disciplines related to the topic, and complex case studies where humour and/or translation may or may not be the main focus of the research. Nonetheless the specialised literature devoted specifically to the topic of humour translation is conspicuously scarce. Within translation studies it is as if humour were considered a slippery elusive object of study, almost entirely dealt with as an appendix to some other point of interest that has much firmer ground or is more easily defined: a certain author, a certain period, a certain type of literature, a certain mode of communication, or certain textual items or linguistic features or units (clauses, idioms, tenses, discourse markers, etc.). Wordplay and wit are closely related to humour, but a pun or a clever way of saying something does not necessarily entail humour. Nor is it clear whether humour is a function or a feeling or an effect or an intention or a quality of a text, while it might even be all of these. Humour is also a sense, which means that any intention to be humorous requires essential cooperation (and/or capacity) from the intended recipient. A translator who might be expected to appreciate source text humour and produce translated text humour will need a two-way sense of humour

for identifying it and being able to render it (and be in the right mood at the required time, or can a mechanical skill be learnt to overcome times when the translator is in a foul mood?).

Hopefully, it has by now become apparent that it is extremely difficult to map and keep track of scholarly work in humour translation. This is partly due to its interdisciplinary nature but also because of the diversity of case studies and the way humour is made visible within them. For example, there are scholarly studies focused on and arranged by writers, film directors, cartoonists, or by text types and genres, such as drama, poetry or novels. None of these labels give us any prior information as to the presence or absence of humour or the ultimate goal of the research, where humour might be a small or a large component or completely absent. Some studies may focus on Disney Productions, for instance, and not say a word about humour, or quite on the contrary, be entirely devoted to this feature. Literary and linguistic studies of metaphor, irony and ambiguity, may include a component of humour or not. Just as one can study the presence of humour in tragedies, it is also possible to study aspects of comedies other than humour. Similarly, theoretical models of translation are not usually labelled (or even explained) according to their relevance to humour translation; for example, when translational studies concentrate on formal, aesthetic or semantic equivalence (or non-equivalence) humour may be taken into account or it may just be an afterthought, but there is no way to know without reading the whole study. There is much humour in advertising, but it is hard to know which studies of advertising translation deal with humour in a way that makes a real contribution to the field. This is what makes a publication like this one so necessary because it results from a specific call for contributions in this area, thus facilitating other researchers' endeavours for finding relevant references.

We will close this first section by acknowledging the conspicuous presence of audiovisual translation (AVT) in a volume that is meant to cover a whole range of different cases of humour translation. This is symptomatic of current trends in translation studies, probably just as much as in humour studies and even film studies. Of course, in no way does it imply that there is less humour or less research in other areas, but it does reflect the dynamism and relevance of these areas. By way of example, there is an increasing presence of audiovisual and visual humour combined with captions and subtitles, such as Internet memes and fansubtitles. The word *memes* was coined by Dawkins (1976: 191) and his definition still applies today to the fashion of manipulating images and captioning them as they are intended to spread virally. Another case is that of the just as fashionable emojis, a form of nonverbal communication, which

some say (Danesi 2016) has developed a language of its own. The important point is that we are moving on from purely verbal humour, as proposed by Raskin (1985) to the need for an audiovisual, multimodal, semiotically holistic theory of humour and its translation.

2. An overview of some key contributions to the field. From Spain and elsewhere

As already implied, the answer to the question of what *humour* is does not appear to be an easy one. Even though the study of humour has been undertaken from different perspectives, no common ground seems to have been reached. Nash already pointed out that one is struck by the complexity of this subject (1985: xi). Along a similar line of thought, Attardo (1994: 3) mentioned that finding a definition of *humour* is practically impossible, and this still appears to be true nowadays. In any case, this lack of definition has not impeded a growing number of pieces of research on the translation of humour.

Humour has been analyzed from assorted fields (including psychology and medicine, for example). Within translation studies, different attempts to approach humour in a more or less systematic manner have been made, perhaps their point in common being the following question: If we assume that humour is a complex and culturally embedded subject, how can it be translated? Delabastita's (1996: 133) claim that there is no "one-to-one equivalence between languages" must be, of course, taken for granted. Hence, it is common agreement (or it should be) that, as a result of the importance of context in understanding all speech acts, translation necessarily involves much more than the mere linguistic transference of content from one language to another. As suggested before, it is essential to go beyond words and look at the task from a broader, multiple viewpoint. In this sense, the General Theory of Verbal Humour by Attardo and Raskin (1991) seems worth mentioning, since it did attempt to go beyond words and consider other aspects, such as the context and the target.

Several authors have followed a linguistic or discursive approach to the translation of humour, such as Attardo (1994, 2002), Curcó (1995), Vandaele (2001, 2002a), Yus (2003, 2016) and Ritchie (2004). Chiaro has dedicated several works to this matter, mainly focusing on Verbally Expressed Humour (see, for example, her works of 2000, 2006, 2007). In the field of literary translation, Mateo's (1995) descriptivist work stands as a thorough study of the matter. Oral translation (i.e. interpreting) has also received some attention, such as Pavlicek and Pöchhacker (2002) and González and Mejias (2013), although further research is clearly needed.

As indicated in the previous section, in spite of the open, comprehensive nature of this volume, the presence of articles dealing with humour and AVT is rather copious, which can clearly be interpreted as a sign of the times. Perhaps the reason behind it touches upon the fact that translating humour becomes even more complicated when we consider how conspicuous humour is in audiovisual texts because of all the visual clues and cues. As Manini (1996, 173) asserted, “[A] distinction needs to be made between translating for the stage and translating for the page,” a statement with which most (if not all) researchers on AVT would agree. Audiovisual translators have to deal not only with the complexities suggested above, but also with the professional and technical hurdles of modes such as dubbing and subtitling.

Still, the interest in the translation of humour in audiovisual texts is as intense as recent. In a parallel way to what happened in the case of research on AVT, until relatively recent times the study of humour was not considered serious. AVT was long (and somehow condescendingly) considered by some the *fun* part of the discipline, let alone the study of humour in audiovisual texts, which would epitomize the *summum* of amusement. Fortunately, the scenario has changed.

For example, relevance theory has been applied to the study of the dubbing of humour (for instance, see Martínez Sierra 2008) and of the translation of wordplay (Díaz Pérez 2013). Some authors, such as Mendiluce and Hernández (2004), have explored the important effect that functional translation can have in the box office success of animated comedies such as *Chicken Run*. Likewise, González Vera’s (2010) discursive approach to animated films meant another proof that no cinematographic genre must be left behind. Other authors, such as Asimakoulas (2004), have focused on the subtitling of humour, and have understood it as a key part of intercultural communication – based on the theories about humour proposed by Attardo (2002, for example). Díaz Cintas (2001a, 2001b) also paid attention to the cultural nature of humour, and considered the *limitations* that the translator has to face when translating audiovisual texts for subtitling – without losing sight of the semiotic dimension. Together with Remael, he also devoted one section of their book of 2007 to the subtitling of humour, an issue (plus dubbing) addressed by Jankowska (2009), too. The questions regarding the omnipresent foreignisation/domestication dichotomy (rather a continuum) have been considered in the work of, for instance, Botella Tejera (2006) and Martínez Sierra (2006). Another particularly prolific (and pioneer) author has been Zabalbeascoa (1996, 2005, just to mention a few). His doctoral dissertation (1993) opened the door to considerable further research. Bucaria (2007) examined several American series

that were dubbed into Italian, in order to analyse the degree of manipulation that they may have suffered especially in the case of the translation of humour in texts that mix humour and drama. Fuentes' (2001) contribution is also worth mentioning for being one of the first attempts to conduct a reception study of a translated humorous product. The polysemous nature of language was approached by Martínez Tejerina (2008). Finally, although the list could continue, we can also mention Arampatzis' doctoral dissertation (2011), in which he pays attention to the translation of dialects and accents in the Spanish dubbing of some American sitcoms.

Furthermore, different humour taxonomies have been proposed, such as Ruch and Rath (1993), Zabalbeascoa (1993), Berger (1997), Fuentes (2001) and Vandaele (2002a). Similarly, authors such as Martínez Sierra (2008) have suggested a list of potentially humorous elements in audiovisual texts.

Still, within the umbrella of AVT the areas, issues and phenomena in need of further research (or simply, research) are numerous (as detailed in the next section). Accessibility is clearly one, since few attempts (see, for instance, Martínez Sierra 2009, devoted to the audio description of humour) can be found in the literature.

3. Some promising areas and topics of interest for researchers. AVT as a sample of dynamism within the field

As suggested before, the translation of humour has lately received attention from different standpoints, mainly (at least quantitatively) in the time span of the new millennium. A considerable portion of that interest has come from the field of AVT. Humour as a challenging aspect of translation for dubbing and subtitling has been the subject of a rather considerable number of pieces of research. But, if we agree that AVT involves more translation modes than dubbing and subtitling, the panorama widens significantly, laying bare a clear gap in the research required. In the Spanish case, for example, the recently introduced digital terrestrial television has altered the audiovisual landscape, and has involved the proliferation of a whole new range of television formats previously unavailable in non-premium television. Many of these new programs, such as the so-called *docurealities*, have boosted AVT modes such as voice over, traditionally used to translate *serious* documentaries in our country. Even other less common modes, such as free commentary, are becoming more popular, one of the defining features of this mode being, precisely, its use in humorous television shows. All in all, the 21st century has brought us new formats, new topics, new humour manifestations through a wider spectrum of audiovisual modes.

In the previous section, allusion was also made to the possibilities of exploring the transfer of humour in the context of those AVT modes meant to make the media more accessible to the blind and partially-sighted and to the deaf and hard of hearing. In modes such as audio description for the former and subtitling for the latter (even in sign language, another clear instance of inter-semiotic translation) we witness the combination of extreme time and space limitations with the well-known restrictions stemming from purely linguistic or cultural (if such a dichotomy makes any sense at all) elements.

Besides, the audiovisual field walks hand in hand with technology. New technological advances have brought about new scenarios and problems. Is there room for humour translation (or research) in respeaking, for example? How do we deal with humorous intertextuality in the ever expanding universe of video games? What about the abovementioned emoji language, which is becoming more and more widespread mainly in portable communication devices? Is humour any different in web series compared to television series; in other words, how does the medium affect the way humour is delivered and received?

From this last question we may draw our attention to other AVT modes found outside the television/cinema context that could also benefit from a greater amount of attention. *Opera buffa*'s surtitles/supertitles most certainly offer a vast area for investigation. In addition, theatre translation, once we agree that a play can be considered an expression of an audiovisual text, stands as another scenario wherein conducting humour related studies. Similarly, a broad, flexible conception of *audiovisual translation* allows for the inclusion of the translation of comics in its set of modes, and humour in this type of publications calls for its share of attention, too.

We cannot forget some cinematographic incursions, maybe not new but definitely frequent in the 21st century, such as the developing interest in the study of multilingual cinema. This attention has rather recently included the consideration of humour in this type of films, although the possibilities of further research remain abundant.

It is our belief that further attention must also be paid towards taboo humour as a translational factor, including, among others, offensiveness, blasphemy, and cursing. Taboo is a universal phenomenon, but because its specifics are culturally defined and determined, the precise nature of what is offensive varies from culture to culture, and even within a given culture as a distinguishing feature of certain communities within a culture (by religion, by politics, by generation, etc.). Just as taboo and offensiveness is dealt with in humour studies, but also within linguistics, sociology, and anthropology it also

deserves more academic studies as a part of translation studies; for example, Jay's (1992) book as the first serious and extensive examination of American cursing from a psycholinguistic-contextual point of view. Thus, taboo expressions and themes aimed at producing humour should clearly be part of our concerns, even if (subjectively) disturbing. Such a topic will axiomatically lead us to a connected area: that of ideology and, especially, the possible manifestations of (self)censorship.

And of course, we cannot ignore the (by definition) anarchic world of *fantranslation*, in which only descriptive approaches to humour (and to everything, in fact) seem to be possible, since any prescriptive consideration to this phenomenon would be, in itself, a *contradictio in terminis*.

4. Methods and frameworks for studying humour in translation.

Descriptivism, functionalism, genres and other typologies

In the final section of this article we will sketch the landscape of research methods and theoretical frameworks in an attempt to warn new researchers about the possible pitfalls of confusing the issues in their quest for contributing to research in humour translation. Due to space restrictions they are presented as bullet point items of types of research and the variety of approaches, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but like any good recipe, first need to be identified separately, weighed and counted, and only then, combined.

- Searches for (new) theoretical models and concepts for humour, for translation or specifically for humour translation in the first instance (e.g. humour types for translation proposed by Raphaelson-West 1989, Zabalbeascoa 1996, Fuentes 2001, Martínez Sierra 2008, or Delabastita's 1996 classification of shifts for wordplay translation).
- Descriptive studies, in the first instance, for various purposes, e.g. to develop or validate a given theory, or simply to document certain instances of humour translation *out there* in the real world (e.g. Delabastita's 2002 study of Shakespeare's *Henry V* as an instance of multilingual text translation).
- Case studies, which tend to study a piece of literature (Maher 2011), film or any other type of communication, either from a descriptive methodology, with a hypothesis or not, or otherwise a critical analysis, judging the merits of the piece (either the source text or the target text, or both). Of course, some case studies may be slightly muddled and display some descriptive traits, or even declare themselves to be

descriptive, while at the same time they offer critical analysis and evaluation of the quality of the translated text.

- Corpus studies, as a branch of descriptivism, which differ from case studies in their attempt to accumulate as many instances as possible, and serve as a tool for later analysis or practical applications that a corpus might have. We are not aware of any corpus that is specifically designed for humour translation. This means that whatever corpora there are may or may not include samples of humour and/or translation as possible browsing criteria (e.g. Chiaro et al. 2008). Some studies, like doctoral dissertations, might take on an examination of metaphor translation, or the translation of idioms or phraseology, vulgar language, proper nouns, forms of address, expletives... and accumulate a large number of samples, some of which will be humorous while others will not be so.
- Critical analysis and evaluation. Studies which openly declare a bias (though not always openly, unfortunately) towards one way or another of translating, and will set out to demonstrate why and how a given translation is good or bad, or better or worse than another (real or ideal). This case is always better, methodologically, than to declare one's study as descriptive, while adding to it and within it statements of judgement or criteria for correctness and good practice. An example of this is Venuti's defence of foreignising over domesticating translation practices (e.g. 1995).
- Humour as the central focus of the study. Along with honourable exceptions like Maher (2011), Chiaro (e.g. 1992, 2010a, 2010b) is thankfully one of the few authors to explicitly acknowledge the simultaneous presence of both humour and translation as an object of academic research.
- Humour not as the central focus of the study (case study or otherwise), but as a component among other components, in aid of some other central focus (e.g. audiovisual translation techniques, or the difficulty of translating cultural elements, studies in politeness or pragmatics...). A representative example is Díaz-Cintas (2003), displaying all the various aspects of translating for subtitling, including the element of humour; or, for general studies and claims about translation, Hurtado Albir (2001).
- The area where the researcher is most interested in making a contribution is an important variable; for example, linguistics, linguistic theories of translation, or linguistic theories of verbally expressed

humour. Other such areas include (any combination of): audiovisual (or film) and multimodality studies, cultural studies, semiotics, communication theory, literary studies, discourse studies, interdisciplinary studies of ideology, social psychology, political science, and pragmatics (Raskin 1985, Yus 2016).

- Humour as a translation problem, which may feed a partial theory of translation (Holmes 1988, Zabalbeascoa 1996), which in turn may aspire to make a contribution towards a more general theory of translation. So, the relevance of researching humour translation lies in the fact that if we can crack that hard nut it may in all likelihood provide tremendous insight into how so many other problems and challenges in translation (practice and theory) can be accounted for.
- Humour as an exception to the rule, or as a real test for general statements and models for translation (for example, the abovementioned Pavlicek and Pöchhacker 2002, who studied humour as a problem in interpreting). This kind of research is like the previous point in that it connects partial theory to general theory but it works in the opposite direction, i.e. it starts by taking a general theoretical claim about translation (e.g. relevance theory; see Martínez Sierra 2008 or Díaz Pérez 2013), which may work in other areas, and tests its validity for the case of humour translation, and its results can be either that *all is well* and the general claim is validated, or that there is a discrepancy, which in turn offers two possible outcomes: either humour is deemed to be an exception to the rule, or the rule or claim is thrown out as invalid, certainly as a general or *universal* theory since we have found a case that it cannot account for.
- Experimental studies of humour translation, which as the name suggests, involve the design and implementation of some sort of experiment (e.g. eye-tracking studies as carried out by Kruger, Szarkowska and Krejtz 2015) to test, for instance, the funniness of a translation by measuring informants' reactions, or by asking them through questionnaires.

For reasons of space and scope, in this article we cannot offer a full selection of theoretical frameworks that can be used in humour translation research. Suffice it to say that it is important not to mix up or confuse research methods and interests, as outlined above, with theoretical frameworks, although they might be said to be part of the researcher's toolbox. Thus, there are linguistic theories such as functional linguistics or pragmatic-linguistic theories such

as relevance theory or Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle. Then there are translation studies specific theories, such as norm theory (Toury 1980) or Skopos theory (Reiss and Vermeer 1984), and then, of course, there are theories that come out of humour studies, that may then be applied to translation (e.g. Attardo 2002, Raskin 1985, Nash 1985). The interesting case of humour as a challenge for AVT has been amply dealt with above, and basically implies that any theory for AVT will have to be tested and validated against the case of humour, regardless of whether humour turns out to be a sense or a function or a device or a mood or an elusive quality. Already in 1964, Nida proposed the theoretical concept of *dynamic equivalence*, whereby he envisaged that translation equivalence could (or should, he was somewhat prescriptive at certain points) be measured by comparing the reactions (as in reception studies) of the users of the source text and target text.

References

- ARAMPATZIS, Christos. (2011) *La traducción de la variación lingüística en textos audiovisuales de ficción humorística: dialectos y acentos en la comedia de situación estadounidense doblada al castellano*. Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- ASIMAKOULAS, Dimitris (2004). "Towards a Model of Describing Humour Translation: A Case Study of the Greek Subtitled Versions of *Airplane!* and *Naked Gun*." *Meta* 49:4, pp. 822-842.
- ATTARDO, Salvatore. (1994) *Linguistic Theories of Humour*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- ATTARDO, Salvatore. (2002) "Translation and Humour." *The Translator* 8:2, pp. 173-194.
- ATTARDO, Salvatore & Victor Raskin. (1991) "Script theory revis(it)ed: joke similarity and joke representation model." *Humor* 4:3-4, pp. 293-347.
- BERGER, Peter. L. (1997) *Redeeming Laughter. The Comic Dimension of Human Experience*. Berlin & New York. Walter de Gruyter.
- BOTELLA TEJERA, Carla M. (2006) "La naturalización del humor en TAV: ¿Traducción o adaptación? El caso de los doblajes de *Gomaespuma: Ali G Indahouse*." *Tonos Digital* 12.
- BUCARIA Chiara. (2007). "Humour and Other Catastrophes: Dealing with the Translation of Mixed-Genre TV Series." *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 6, pp. 235-254.
- CHIARO, Delia. (1992) *The Language of Jokes. Analysing Verbal Play*. London & New York: Routledge.

- CHIARO, Delia. (2010a) "Translation and Humour, Humour and Translation." In: Chiaro, Delia (ed.) 2010. *Translation, Humour and Literature*. London & New York: Continuum, pp. 1-29.
- CHIARO, Delia. (ed.) (2010b) *Translation, Humour and the Media*. London: Continuum.
- CHIARO, Delia; Christine Heiss & Chiara Bucaria. (eds.) (2008) *Between Text and Image: Updating Research in Screen Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- CURCÓ, Carmen. (1995) "Some Observations on the Pragmatics of Humorous Interpretations: a Relevance Theoretic Approach." *Working Papers in Linguistics* 7, pp. 27-47.
- DANESI, Marcel. (2016) *The Semiotics Of Emoji. The Rise of Visual Language in the Age of the Internet*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- DAWKINS, Richard. (1976) *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DELABASTITA, Dirk. (1996) "Introduction." In: Delabastita, Dirk (ed.) 1996. *Wordplay and Translation: Essays on Punning and Translation. Special issue of The Translator* 2:2, pp. 1-22.
- DELABASTITA, Dirk. (2002) "A Great Feast of Languages Shakespeare's Multilingual Comedy in 'King Henry V' and the Translator." *The Translator* 8:2, pp. 303-340.
- DÍAZ CINTAS Jorge. (2001a) "The Value of the Semiotic Dimension in the Subtitling of Humour." In: Desblache, Lucile (ed.) 2001. *Aspects of Specialised Translation*. Paris: La Maison du Dictionnaire.
- DÍAZ CINTAS Jorge. (2001b) "Aspectos semióticos en la subtitulación de situaciones cómicas." In: Pajares, Eterio, Raquel Merino & José M. Santamaría (eds.) 2001. *Trasvases culturales: literatura, cine, traducción* 3. Vitoria: Universidad del País Vasco.
- DÍAZ-CINTAS, Jorge. (2003) *Teoría y práctica de la subtitulación: inglés-español*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- DÍAZ CINTAS, Jorge & Aline Remael. (2007) *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- DÍAZ-PÉREZ, Francisco Javier. (2014) "Relevance Theory and Translation: Translating Puns in Spanish Film Titles into English." *Journal of Pragmatics* 70, pp. 108-129.
- FUENTES, Adrián. (2001) *La traducción del humor audiovisual traducido: estudio comparativo de fragmentos de las versiones doblada y subtitulada de la película Duck Soup, de los hermanos Marx*. Granada: Universidad de Granada. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- GONZÁLEZ, Luis D. & Glenda M. Mejias. (2013) "The Interpreter's Ultimate Challenge: Humor in Conferences." *Translation Journal* 17:4.
- GONZÁLEZ VERA, Pilar. (2010). *The Translation of Recent Digital Animated Movies. The Case of DreamWorks' Films Antz, Shrek and Shrek 2 and Shark Tale*. Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

- GRICE, Paul. (1975) "Logic and Conversation". In: Cole, Peter & Jerry Morgan (eds.) 1975. *Syntax and Semantics. Volume 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-58.
- HOLMES, James. (1972) "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." In: Holmes, James S. 1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Madrid: Rodopi.
- HURTADO ALBIR, Amparo. (2001) *Traducción y traductología. Introducción a la traductología*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- JANKOWSKA, Anna. (2009) "Translating Humor in Dubbing and Subtitling." *Translation Journal* 13:2.
- JAY, Timothy. (1992) *Cursing in America. A Psycholinguistic Study of Dirty Language in the Courts, in the Movies, in the Schoolyards and on the Streets*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- KRUGER, Jan Louis; Agnieszka Szarkowska & Izabela Krejtz. (2015) "Subtitles on the Moving Image: an Overview of Eye Tracking Studies." *Refractory: A Journal of Entertainment Media* 25.
- MAHER, Bridgid. (2011) *Recreation and Style: Translating Humorous Literature in Italian and English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- MANINI, Luca. (1996) "Meaningful Literary Names: Their Forms and Functions, and their Translation." In: Delabastita, Dirk. (ed.) 1996. *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication* 2:2. Manchester: St. Jerome, pp. 161-178.
- MARTÍNEZ SIERRA, Juan José. (2006) "La manipulación del texto: sobre la dualidad extranjerización / familiarización en la traducción del humor en textos audiovisuales." *Sendeban* 17, pp. 219-231.
- MARTÍNEZ SIERRA, Juan José. (2009) "The Relevance of Humour in Audio Description." *Intralinea*, 11.
- MARTÍNEZ SIERRA, Juan José. (2008) *Humor y traducción. Los Simpson cruzan la frontera*. Castelló: Universitat Jaume I.
- MARTÍNEZ TEJERINA, Anjana. (2008) *La traducción para el doblaje del humor basado en la polisemia*. Alicante: University of Alicante. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- MATEO, Marta. (1995) *La traducción del humor. Las comedias inglesas en español*. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo.
- MENDILUCE, Gustavo & Ana I. Hernández. (2004) "Este traductor no es un gallina: El trasvase del humor audiovisual en Chicken Run." *Translation Journal* 8:3.
- NASH, Walter. (1985) *The Language of Humour. Style and Technique in Comic Discourse*. London: Longman.
- NIDA, Eugene. (1964) *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- PAVLICEK, Maria & Franz Pöchhacker. (2002) "Humour in Simultaneous Conference Interpreting." *The Translator* 8:2, pp. 385-400.

- RAPHAELSON-WEST, Debra S. (1989) "On the Feasibility and Strategies of Translating Humor." *Meta* 34: 1, pp. 128-141.
- RASKIN, Victor. (1985) *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht, Boston & Lancaster: D. Reidel.
- REISS, Katharina & Hans Vermeer. (1984) *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- RITCHIE, Graeme. (2004): *The Linguistic Analysis of Jokes*. Routledge: London.
- RUCH, Willibald & Sigrid Rath. (1993) "The nature of humor appreciation: Toward an integration of perception of stimulus properties and affective experience." *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 6, pp. 363-84.
- TOURY, Gideon. (1980) "Equivalence and Non-equivalence as a Function of Norms." In: Toury, Gideon (ed.) 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University, pp 63-71.
- VANDAELE, Jeroen. (2001) "Si sérieux s'abstenir: Le discours sur l'humour traduit." *Target* 13:1, pp. 29-44.
- VANDAELE, Jeroen ed. (2002a) "Introduction. (Re-)Constructing Humour: Meanings and Means." *The Translator* 8:2, pp. 149-172.
- VANDAELE, Jeroen (ed.) (2002b) *The Translator (Special Issue 8:2): Studies in Intercultural Communication – Translating Humour*. Manchester: St.Jerome Publishing.
- VENUTI, Lawrence. (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- YUS, Francisco. (2003) "Humor and the Search for Relevance." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35, pp. 1295-1331.
- YUS, Francisco. (2016) *Humour and Relevance*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- ZABALBEASCOA, Patrick. (1993) *Developing Translation Studies to Better Account for Audiovisual Texts and Other New Forms of Text Production*. Lleida: Universitat de Lleida. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- ZABALBEASCOA, Patrick. (1996) "Translating Jokes for Dubbed Television Situation Comedies." *The Translator* 2:2, pp. 235-257.
- ZABALBEASCOA, Patrick. (2005) "Humor and Translation — an Interdiscipline." *Humor* 18:2, pp. 185-207.

BIONOTES / NOTAS BIOGRÁFICAS

JUAN JOSÉ MARTÍNEZ SIERRA works as a senior lecturer in the Department of English and German Studies at the Universitat de València. In addition to a doctorate in Translation Studies (Universitat Jaume I, 2004), he holds a degree in English Language and Culture (Universitat Jaume I, 1995) and an MA in Intercultural Communication (University of Maryland, Baltimore County, USA, 2001). He is specialized in Audiovisual Translation. To date, this activity has been generously fruitful in the form of lectures, seminars, invited talks, and papers at conferences. Besides, he has published numerous works, including five books, several book chapters, reviews, and many other pieces of research in the form of articles in prestigious scientific journals. He coordinates CiTrans, and also collaborates with the research groups TRAMA (Universitat Jaume I) and SILVA (Universitat de València).

JUAN JOSÉ MARTÍNEZ SIERRA es profesor titular de universidad del Departamento de Filología Anglesa i Alemanya de la Universitat de València. Licenciado en Filología Inglesa (Universitat Jaume I, 1995), posee un Máster en Comunicación Intercultural (University of Maryland, Baltimore County, 2001, becado por la Comisión Fulbright) y un doctorado en Traducción (Universitat Jaume I, 2004). Su investigación se ha dirigido, fundamentalmente, al ámbito de la traducción audiovisual y, de manera particular, al estudio de la traducción del humor. Hasta la fecha, ha publicado múltiples trabajos, entre los que se incluyen varios libros y capítulos de libros, numerosos artículos en revistas científicas, actas y reseñas. Asimismo, ha participado como ponente en diversos congresos y ha impartido diferentes conferencias invitadas. Además de fundador y director de CiTrans, es colaborador de los grupos de investigación SILVA (Universitat de València) y TRAMA (Universitat Jaume I).

PATRICK ZABALBEASCOA TERRAN is qualified (since 2011) as full professor at the Universitat Pompeu Fabra. He lectures and researches in translation theory and audiovisual translation, and foreign language learning through translation. He has published widely and internationally in these areas and played a leading role in several EU-funded and Spanish research projects, such as ClipFlair. He is currently working on the Trafilm.net project. He is well-known for his research in the field of humour translation ever since his PhD (1993) proposed a typology of humour translation and a theoretical model of Priorities and Restrictions based on a study of the BBC sitcom, *Yes, Minister*. For further details visit <http://upf.academia.edu/PatrickZabalbeascoa>

PATRICK ZABALBEASCOA TERRAN está acreditado desde 2011 como catedrático universitario en la Universitat Pompeu Fabra. Imparte docencia y realiza sus investigaciones en las áreas de teoría de la traducción y traducción audiovisual, así como la traducción pedagógica aplicada al caso del aprendizaje de idiomas. Tiene numerosas publicaciones internacionales sobre estos temas y ha tenido participaciones destacadas en proyectos financiados españoles y europeos como, por ejemplo, ClipFlair. En la actualidad es miembro investigador del proyecto Trafilm.net. Se le conoce por sus investigaciones en el campo de la traducción del humor desde que en 1993 se dio a conocer su tesis doctoral en la que propone una tipología de traducción para el humor junto con un modelo teórico de prioridades y restricciones, todo ello basado en un estudio de caso de la serie cómica de la BBC, Sí Ministre. Para mayor información, visite <http://upf.academia.edu/PatrickZabalbeascoa>

