Towards a Model of Describing Humor Translation: An Analysis of the General Theory of Verbal Humor*

Harika KARAVİN YÜCE[1]

ABSTRACT

Until recent times, translating humor has mostly been limited to prescriptive and subjective statements that have underlined the "untranslatability" of humorous elements. Most of the previous studies generally focused on the linguistic and cultural problems observed in the transference process and dealt mainly with the translation of only one specific humorous element (e.g. irony). In other words, there did not exist comprehensive studies that provided detailed information regarding the translation of different humorous elements. However, with the emergence of Descriptive Translation Theories, humor translation was studied in accordance with its cognitive and social aspects through more systematic and theoretical research tools. In order to discuss its interdisciplinary nature, this study examines the application of a general theory of verbal humor (GTVH) to the analysis of humor translation. In other words, this study aims to question the function of a verbal humor theory in interpreting and transferring humor during translation process. For this purpose, the parameters of the theory have been applied to the translation of wordplays in the famous film, *Ice Age.* With these parameters, humorous elements in the source and target text have been compared. The analyses have shown that these parameters help the translators the recreate the humorous effect of the source text in the target text in a more successful way.

Key words: Translating humor, GTVH, wordplay translation, humorous elements.

Mizah Çevirisini Betimleme Modeline Doğru: Genel Sözlü Mizah Kuramının İncelenmesi

ÖZET

Yakın zamana kadar mizah çevirisi, mizah unsurlarının "çevrilemezliğini" vurgulayan kuralcı ve öznel açıklamalarla sınırlı kalmıştır. Geçmişteki çalışmaların çoğu genellikle aktarım sürecinde gözlemlenen dilsel ve kültürel sorunlara odaklanmış ve sadece belli bir mizahi unsurun (örn. hiciv) çevirisini ele almıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, farklı mizahi unsurların çevirisiyle ilgili ayrıntılı bilgi sunan kapsamlı çalışmalar bulunmamaktaydı. Ancak Betimleyici Çeviri Kuramlarının ortaya çıkışıyla birlikte, mizah çevirisi daha dizgesel ve kuramsal araştırma araçları sayesinde bilişsel ve sosyal yönleriyle çalışılmıştır. Mizah çevirisinin disiplinlerarası doğasını tartışmak amacıyla, bu çalışma genel sözlü mizah kuramının mizah çevirisi incelemelerine uygulanmasını incelemektedir. Diğer bir deyişle, bu çalışmada sözlü mizah kuramının çeviri sürecinde mizahın anlaşılması ve aktarılmasındaki işlevinin sorgulanması amaçlanmaktadır. Bu amaçla, kuramın değişkenleri ünlü film *Buz Dağı*'nda geçen kelime oyunlarının çevirisine uygulanmıştır. Bu değişkenler aracılığıyla, kaynak ve erek metindeki mizahı unsurlar karşılaştırılmıştır. Yapılan incelemeler kuramın değişkenlerinin çevirmenlerin kaynak metindeki mizahi etkiyi erek metinde daha başarılı bir şekilde yeniden yaratmalarına yardımcı olduğunu göstermiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Mizah çevirisi, Genel Sözlü Mizah Kuramı, kelime oyunu çevirisi, mizahi unsurlar.

[1] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Trakya Üniversitesi, İngilizce Mütercim Tercümanlık Bölümü, harikakaravin@trakya.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5113-4808.

Introduction

Starting from the very early times, scholars have usually tried to find solutions both to define and understand the problem of humor with various theories, approaches and perspectives, but none of them have managed to produce a universal definition accounting for all aspects of the humor phenomenon. Since defining the notion has resulted in serious problems to be dealt in a meticulous way, its relationship with translation has proven to be more problematic. Even though researchers or scholars working in this field have underlined the interdisciplinary relationship between Humor and Translation Studies, there do not exist enough academic studies on the topic of "translating humor". When the relevant literature on humor and translation is examined, it is seen that the existing studies on theory and practice of humor translation have mostly focused on the "untranslatability" of humorous elements, especially making reference to cultural and linguistic issues. For a long time, the explanations have been limited to some prescriptive and subjective statements, including "jokes are untranslatable", "it's far from easy" or "these things get lost in translation" (Vandaele, 2002, p. 150). Such perceptions on the nature of humor translation have put some pressure on translators, forcing them to accept the "untranslatability" of the humorous effect in another language. However, with the appearance of Descriptive Translation Studies, humor has started to be seen not as a "homogeneous category", but an area to be studied in accordance with "its specific cognitive, emotional, social and interpersonal aspects" (Vandaele, 2002, p. 155). Some scholars of the Translation Studies foreground the need for more theoretical and systematic research so that translators or scholars can have some relevant strategies to deal both with the analysis of humorous elements and their rendering into a foreign language. In this way, translators can become familiar with some efficient solutions to the common problems encountered in the translation process of humorous discourse. Having made important contributions to the study of humor translation, Jereon Vandaele expresses the lack of research in this area with the following sentences:

> Whereas the immense practical act of translation itself is also increasingly being theorized in what has come to be known as translation studies [...] the combined object of humor translation must have seemed until now so vast, disorientating and dangerous an ocean that few academic efforts were made to theorize the processes, agents, contexts and products involved (2002, p. 149).

It is also important to mention that the existing studies on the theory of humor translation have generally emphasized its unique nature (Boria, 2009, p. 85). In his article, "(Re-) Constructing Humor: Meanings and Means", Vandaele sheds lights on some of the most important factors that harden the task of the translator dealing with humorous texts. In his practice-oriented perspective, there exist four good reasons to think of humor reproduction as a challenging process (2002, p. 150). First of all, humor translation involves recreating a "humorous effect" (be it laughter or smile), which appears to be more compelling when compared to the meaning perception of other texts, resulting mostly from the undeniable and observable manifestation of humor. Secondly, as some academic studies have shown, the production of humor is rather different from its comprehension and appreciation, making it challenging for the translators to reproduce it in another language (Vandaele, 2002, p. 150). There have been many cases in which translators have found themselves unable to recreate humor in another language though they have managed to fully capture the content of the humorous elements. For this reason, it is possible to conclude that humor (re)- production needs different strategies to adopt during the translation process. As the third challenging factor, Vandaele mentions the

translator's "sense of humor", claiming that the appreciation of humor may vary individually, which implies that a translator may not find a statement funny although he/she is aware of the comic message in the statement. In such instances, the translator may be "confronted with the dilemma of either translating a bad joke" or finding other ways to render the actual humorous effect. Finally, Vandaele argues that the "rhetorical effect of humor" can be so dominant that it can hinder the production of humor by impeding "analytic rationalization" of the translators (2002, p. 150).

1.1. Literature Review

Before starting to discuss the commonly used methods in analysing the translation of humorous elements, a brief summary will be provided related to the field of research on "humor translation" both in Turkey and other countries with the aim of presenting the current conditions of the relevant academic discipline.

The first important systematic studies that analysed the relationship between humor and translation were published in a special issue by one of the established translation journals, *Meta*, in 1989. The journal presented some case studies dealing with the transference of humorous elements into another language with the aim of discussing the problem of "untranslatability" of humorous devices within the same or different languages. Instead of presenting their unique translation models or strategies to render humorous elements, the scholars attempted to apply the already suggested and commonly used translation strategies or procedures in order to see whether they would offer helpful results to manage the transference effectively. Thanks to the various case studies, readers, translators and the other scholars gained the opportunity to get familiar with some motives behind humor translation as well as the most common problems encountered in this translation process. To sum up, the papers published in this volume focused more on the linguistic aspects of humor translation, touching upon the observed or probable structural, stylistic and semantic difficulties together with some of the suggested translation strategies. In 2002, *The Translator* prepared a special issue entitled *Translating Humor* under the editorship of Jeroen Vandaele, who has made important contributions to understanding the conceptual complexity of defining humor and offered practice-oriented tools for analyzing source text humor and providing explanations for the translated versions (Vandaele, 2002, p. 169). In this special issue, various attempts were made to describe types of "humorous effect" through some linguistic and cultural analyses or specific case studies. Unlike the previous studies, these articles introduced new analytical tools to be adopted in both translating humorous texts and comparing them with their source texts. To put it differently, translators were provided with some tools that were proved useful in some academic studies in terms of grasping and rendering the "humorous effect" of a source text by devising strategies helping to recreate similar or comparable effects in the target text. In addition to that, translators were made familiar with some analytical frameworks for the comparison of source and target texts in terms of their humorous effect and "the ways in which these effects are encoded by linguistic means" (Vandaele, 2002, p. 150). However, the most important contribution of this volume was stated by Jeroen Vandaele in the introduction part where the author emphasized the need for a collaborative work with other disciplines so that they could find better solutions for the translation problems when compared to the previous studies that tended to carry out independent studies without benefiting from the insights of scholars from other research areas (2002, p. 150). With this purpose in his mind, Vandaele delved into the territory of psychology in explaining the ways to interpret humor. In addition, this magazine offered a new intersemiotic perspective regarding the translation of humor for the stage and screen (Pelsmaeker &

Van Besien, 2002, p. 241-266). To sum up, this volume presented reflections on a collection of diverse forms of "verbally expressed humor" in the context of translation and interpretation (Chiaro, 2005, p. 141). However, it could not completely achieve the intended aim of examining humor translation with an interdisciplinary context, taking cultural, social, psychological and other related factors into consideration.

Being aware of this gap, some scholars held a workshop in May 2003 at the University of Bologna's Summer Residence at Bertinoro, specifically dedicated to "Humor and Translation" (Chiaro, 2005, p. 140). The main motivation behind the workshop was to foreground humor, which was also revealed by choosing such a title as "Humor and Translation" rather than "Translation and Humor" (Chiaro, 2005, p. 140). As Chiaro puts forth, interdisciplinary blend of scholars or researchers on this issue emphasized the importance of touching upon different viewpoints regarding the cross-cultural transfer of humorous texts unlike the previous attempts that focused simply on the descriptive aspects of translation process and product (2005, p. 141). As a result, we were presented with different perspectives by scholars from different fields. For instance, Christie Davies examines the cultural transfer of sexual, ethnic and political scripts from a sociological perspective, supplying the reader with broad transcultural elements of ethnic texts. Dirk Delabastita questions what happens when translation is used to produce humor in the works of William Shakespeare. Patrick Zabalbeascoa presents a sociological model "for structuring joke-types according to binary branching model" (2005, p. 185). Another translation scholar, Rachele Antonini attempts to measure the audience perception of verbal humor in subtitled sitcoms (Chiaro, 2005, p. 142). As is seen, scholars started to study the perception of humor translation, which will provide useful tools to test similarities and differences in the responses of the target audience to the verbal humorous elements in the texts. However, Chiaro also emphasized the urgent need to carry out more studies and collect more data in order to test to what extent translation affects the perception of verbal humor, and consequently the behavioural, physiological and emotional response of the target audience (2005, p. 139).

In Turkey, on the other hand, academic studies that focus on humor and translation are very limited in content and quantity. Aslı Süreyya Sayman's MA thesis titled "Quality of Audiovisual Translation in Turkey and the Course of the Production Process: An Empirical Study on the Subtitled and the Dubbed Versions of *Will & Grace*" touches upon the transference of humorous elements in audio-visual translation (Sayman, 2011). Carrying out reception-oriented case studies related to the subtitled and dubbed episodes of *Will & Grace*, an American sitcom, Sayman examined the responses of the Turkish audience to the audiovisual translated humor as well as the reasons for the difficulties encountered during the transference process. Similarly, Kübra Çakıroğlu (2009) wrote a MA thesis titled "The Big Bang Theory" (Büyük Patlama) Adlı Komedi Dizisindeki Mizah Unsurlarının Türkçe Altyazı ve Dublaj Çevirilerine Yansıtılma Sürecinin Karşılaştırmalı ve Eleştirel bir İncelemesi", which worked on humor translation in the system of audiovisual translation. Similar study was produced by Özden Tüfekçioğlu (2011), who analyzed the translation of humorous elements in the *Ice Age* Series. Tüfekçioğlu's main purpose was to produce a descriptive study of the translation strategies adopted in the translation of humor related to national culture and institutions as well as the linguistic humorous elements, focusing on the effects of verbal signs in the rendering of source text humor into another language. The recent comprehensive thesis titled "Translating Humor: A Comparative Analysis of Three Translations of *Three Men in a Boat*" was carried out by Harika Karavin in 2015, which provided a detailed descriptive comparison of the translation of different humorous elements in the novel. Apart from academic theses, some other studies on humor and translation were carried

out in Turkey and published in Turkish journals. For instance, Nihal Yetkin Karakoç (2013) presented an article titled "Text Reduction as a Technical Constraint in Subtitling versus Humor Translation" as part of a multi-disciplinary doctoral dissertation, in which she examined the transference of humorous elements through "Subtitling Oriented Text Reduction Strategies". Another scholar, Meltem Ekti, had a similar study about the translatability of humor, working specifically on the translation of culture-specific jokes with examples from Nasreddin Hodja as they are highly rich in cultural referents. In her study, Ekti (2013) attempted to question how translation reflects the cultural referents in humorous devices of the source text within the literary conventions and structures of the target culture. In another article titled "Camus: *Yabancı*'nın Dört Çevirisi ve Mizahi Öğelerin Çevrilebilirliği", Nazik Göktaş (2009) worked on four translations of Albert Camus' *The Stranger*, examining what kinds of strategies four translators adopted to translate the humorous elements that form the ideological content of the book.

Now, I would like to give some space to the methodologies that are most commonly used in analyzing the translation of humorous elements or texts. When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that the scholars have attempted to adapt some of the humor theories for the analysis of translated humorous elements. On the other hand, there have been other scholars that have applied already existing translation strategies or models to describe humor translation. For the purposes of this study, I will focus mostly on the application of already existing humor theories to the analysis of humor translation.

2.1. Script-based Theories of Humor

Script-based theory of humor was developed by Victor Raskin in 1985 with the aim of providing a linguistic analysis of humorous utterances. Before Victor Raskin (1985), no prior research was available on the linguistic analysis of humor and no comprehensive formal theory of humor was proposed (Raskin, 1985, p. 30). Raskin paved the way for the linguistic analysis of verbal humor with his application of a "tentative formal script-oriented semantic theory" (Raskin, 1979, p. 325). According to Raskin's theory, script is an organized chunk of information internalized by the speakers, "which provides the speaker with information on how things are done" (1985: 46). In other words, scripts give information on events, objects, processes and so on.

With this theory, Raskin aimed to create "a formal semantic analysis in terms of what each joke-carrying text would be identified as possessing a certain semantic property such that the presence of this property would render any text humorous" (Raskin, 1979, p. 325). To put it differently, Raskin wanted to create a theory that "provides the necessary and sufficient conditions that a text must meet for the text to be funny" (Attardo, 1994, p. 198). The following excerpt summarizes the main traits of Raskin's script-based theory:

> […] the text of a joke is always fully or in part compatible with two distinct scripts and that the two scripts are opposed to each other in a special way… The punch line triggers the switch from the one script to the other by making the hearer backtrack and realize that a different interpretation was possible from the very beginning. (Attardo & Raskin, 1991, p. 308)

What Raskin and Attardo want to underline is that an overlap of two different scripts are required in order to define a text humorous. It should, however, be noted that the degree of overlapping between two scripts may be partial or total. If the overlapping is total, the text is considered compatible with both of the scripts; if it is partial, some parts of the text will not be compatible with one or the other

script (Attardo, 1994, p. 203). In addition, "the overlapping of two scripts does not necessarily produce a humorous effect. The two overlapping scripts should be opposite in a certain sense" (Raskin, 1979, p. 333). For instance, having analyzed three jokes, Raskin concluded that scripts are in a relationship of opposition that can be categorized in three classes: "actual vs. non-actual, normal vs. abnormal, and possible vs. impossible" (Attardo, 1994, p. 204). To put it briefly, the Script-based Semantic Theory of Humor classifies a text "funny" or humorous "if the text is compatible, fully or in part, with two scripts" that are in opposition to each other (Raskin, 1985, p. 99).

Although this theory enables the reader to come up with different interpretations of the same sentence by looking for "competing scripts" (Raskin, 1985, p. 125), it remains very limited in some instances as it takes the jokes as its primary source, making it difficult to apply it to other types of texts. What is more, the SSTH does not provide any indication as to what kinds of tools can be used to differentiate jokes or deal with other humorous texts (Attardo, 1984, p. 222). For these reasons, Attardo and Raskin (1991) collaborated to develop the "General Theory of Verbal Humor".

2.2. General Theory of Verbal Humor (GTVH)

Attardo and Raskin developed a theory that enables to "relate perceived differences between jokes to six hierarchically ordered Knowledge Resources (parameters), namely knowledge concerning Language; Narrative Strategies; Target(s); Situation; Logical Mechanism(s); Script Opposition(s) (Attardo, 2002: 173). In other words, this model was developed in order to set some parameters for the evaluation of similarity among various jokes. The GTVH dedicates an important part to establish the notion of "joke similarity" in its theoretical framework. Attardo claims that this theory can be of good help for the analysis of humor translation through its "metric of joke similarity, which allows the translator to evaluate how much a translated joke differs from the source joke (2002: 173). In order to understand how these parameters function in the analysis of humor translation, it is important to know the semantic field that they involve.

Language (LA) parameter includes all the information that is necessary for the verbal presentation of a text. It also contains all the choices at the phonetic, phonologic, morphological, lexical, syntactic, semantic levels of language structure. Similarly, the parameter of language has a significant role in the expression of the content of the joke (Attardo and Raskin, 1991, p. 298) For instance, in the case of verbal jokes, the exact wording of the punch line is extremely important in order to create the required humorous effect. For this reason, this Language Knowledge resource is generally preselected by the Script Opposition (Attardo, 2002, p. 177). In other words, the Script Opposition affects the nature of the language to be used in the joke formulation. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that this parameter of language is also responsible for expressing a special joke-meaning apart from the actual meaning the words or sentences denote. *Narrative Strategy (NS)* implies that any joke needs to be expressed in some form of narrative type, including simple narratives, dialogues, riddles, etc. This parameter also deals with the organization and presentation of the humorous elements. For instance, it becomes of important use in analyzing humorous texts of different genres in terms of identifying their narrative strategies. The *Target (TA)* parameter includes the group of people who constitute victims of the humorous discourse. It contains the groups of people or individuals to which the "humorous stereotypes are attached" (Attardo, 2002, p. 178). As Attardo mentions, it should be kept in mind that targets do not just consist of people or individuals, but groups or institutions that can also be treated as subjects of ridicule or satire. Therefore, the notion of "target" in this parameter does not necessarily require a specific group composed of people. The

Situation (SI) parameter, on the other hand, is related to the "objects", "participants" or "props of the joke" (Attardo, 2002, p. 178). It is believed that every joke gives message "about something", benefiting from the scripts in the text. Accepted as the most problematic parameter, *Logical Mechanism (LM),* attempts to account for the way in which the joke is produced, providing tools to identify the resolution of the incongruity, which is one of the most important components of humor (Attardo, 2002, p. 179). It has been argued that a joke must provide a logical justification of the absurdity or unreality it postulates. *Logical Mechanism* embodies a "distorted" or "playful logic" that is not always valid "outside the world of the joke" The last parameter, *Script Opposition (SO),* involves the use of words which trigger disperate readings, as they are associated with one or more scripts" (Attardo, 2002, p. 180). After forming the general framework of his theory, Attardo gives some clues to the translators for their translations of humor. He suggest that translators should respect all six "Knowledge Resources" in their translations. If it is not possible, they should let their translation "differ t the lowest level" in his hierarchical model of GTVH. According to him, "this mechanism of analysing humour and translating is very literal; it focuses on the form and similarity of the joke rather than the message and intention" (2002:183). It is important to know that these parameters are organized hierarchically as follows: Script Oppostion, Logical Mechanism, Situation, Target, Narrative Strategy, Language. This hierarchical organization has been formulated by taking into account various considerations regarding the interdependence and/or independence among the parameters. To put it simply, it has been found out that parameters determine or constrain the parameters following them and are determined or constrained by the previous ones (Attardo, 1994, p. 227). According to some of the scholars working to provide a general theory of verbal humor, "the degree of perceived difference between jokes increases linearly with the height of the knowledge resource in which the two jokes differ" (Attardo, 2002, p. 183). To put it in a simpler way, the degree of difference is assumed to increase linearly, that is, there is much difference between two jokes that differ in script opposition level than there is between two jokes that show difference in narrative strategy level. Since this approach provides such linguistic parameters for language analysis of the texts, it can be adopted to specify some of the required peculiarities of the humorous texts. For instance, Dimitris Asimakoulas applied the GTVH to the analysis of humorous data in the Greek subtitled versions of the films "Airplane!" and "Naked Gun". After analysing humorous elements such as wordplay, comparisons, parody, disparagement and register humor, he concluded that the model provides useful analytical tools in identifying the degree of similarity between source and target text humor. Similarly, Lee Williamson (2014) used the parameters of GTVH in order to describe the differences between source and target text humorous elements in his study titled "The translation of wordplay in interlingual subtitling: A study of *Bienvenue chez les Ch'tis* and its English subtitles". According to his findings, GTVH provided useful analytical tool in the context of audiovisual translation in that it showed how the puns evolved in the translation and therefore provided a better understanding of wordplay to aid the choice of translation strategy.

In the following part of the study, an example will be provided both to show the applicability and usefulness of the GTVH's parameters in determining both the similarity between the source and target text humorous elements as well as their function in describing the rendering of a humorous effect on the target side. For the ease of analysis, I have decided to focus on the translation of specific humorous elements "wordplays" that are mostly characterized with their language and culture specific natures. Considering the scope of the current study, it is not possible to provide enough examples for each humor type. Therefore, the study will restrict its examples to some verbal

humorous elements taken from the famous movie *Ice Age*. As I mentioned before, translation of humorous elements in these series were tried to be described before by Özden Tüfekçioğlu in accordance with the already suggested translation procedures, focusing mostly on the rendering of audio-visual humorous elements. In this study, however, I will work specifically on the translation of verbal humorous elements from the series and try to apply the parameters of GTVH to see how different target text humor is from that of the source text.

Example 1[2]

ST: Now let me tell you about the time I used a sharpened clam Shell to turn a T-Rex into a T-Rachel.

TT: Şimdi de dinleyin bakalım bir keskin istiridye kabuğuyla nasıl yaptım Tireksi, Tireksiye.

This example is taken from a scene where Sansar Buck tells his terrible struggle with the violent dinosaur Rudy and how it gives harm to him. As it is known, T-Rex (tyrannosaurus rex) is a type of dinosaur, and it is used to define the male dinosaur in the excerpt. Sansar Buck tries to emphasize his success over the dinosaur by turning the name of it into T-Rachel. Normally, tyrannosaurus rex is called as the king of lizards, which implies the strength and hugeness of its body. Here Sansar Buck creates wordplay by changing the name of the dinosaur into T-Rachel. In accordance with GTVH terms, the speaker relies upon the script opposition of "real/unreal" instantiated in the example of "a dinosaur name/a male name" and derives a new word "T-Rachel", which makes the reader to think of a female creature. In terms of Logical Mechanism, the speaker benefits from the parallelism between the name of the male dinosaur (-rex) and a female name (Rachel). When we look at the translation, it is seen that the word T-rex is literally transferred to the target text. However, the translator cannot create a similar script opposition on the target side, resulting from the fact that the there does not exist such a polysemous name in Turkish. Nonetheless, the translator still renders a different script opposition in the target text by using the word "Tireksi" as a male name and the word "Tireksiye" as a female name. As is it observed, he/she adds the suffix "-ye" to the male name in order to create a female name, which shows that logical mechanism is transferred to the source text. Recreation of both the script opposition and the logical mechanism enables the source text humor to be reflected in the target text.

Example 2[3]

ST: -Wait. You mean there's something bigger than mommy Dinosaur?
      -Aye.
      -Eye?
      -Aye, aye! He's the one that gave me this!
TT:-Nasıl yani? Dino anadan daha büyük bir şey mi var?
      -Yani.
      -Hani?
      -Var yani. Bakın bu onun eseri.

In this example, we are presented with a scene where one-eyed Buck and pouched mice are talking about the dinosaur, Rudy. Buck is telling how he has lost one of his eyes in the combat with Rudy. The

---

[2] Taken from "Ice Age: Dawn of the Dinosaurs" (2009)
[3] Taken from "Ice Age: Dawn of the Dinosaurs" (2009)

mice are surprised that there exists a more powerful creature than the mommy Dinosaur, which is expressed in the first question above. Buck uses the exclamatory mark "Aye" in order to approve his saying. The writer of the script produces a wordplay on it, using the heteronymous words "eye" and "aye". In GTVH terms, the scriptwriter adopts the logical mechanism of cratylism, an assumption that there is a relation between sounds and meaning. On the other hand, humorous effect is established through the script opposition of "an expression of approval" and "the name of an organ". In the translated version, however, neither logical mechanism nor the script opposition is rendered. The translator prefers to create a wordplay through the misunderstanding of "yani" as "hani". However, in real life, it is not a normal situation that one misunderstands the word "yani" as "hani". Therefore, we can conclude that the translator fails to recreate a humorous effect in the target text. When we consider the Turkish literary repertoire, it would be possible to create a similar wordplay in TT by benefiting from the sound similarity between the words "yani" (a sign of approval) and "yağni" (the name of a Turkish meal). In this way, the logical mechanism and script opposition would have been rendered into the target text.

> Example 3[4]:
>> ST: -Maybe we can rapidly evolve into water creatures.
>>> -That's genius, Sid.
>>> -Call me Squid.
>> TT: -Belki suda yaşamak için hızlı bir evrim geçirebiliriz.
>>> -Çok zekice Sid.
>>> -Bana sulu Sid de.

This example is taken from another film of the series where the characters feel the fear of a flood. Unlike them, Sid hopes that they can turn into animals that can live in water, which is ridiculed by Diego. In order to show Sid's desire to live in water, the scriptwriter prefers to add another word ("Squid") to create a wordplay on the character's name. The word "Squid" creates a script opposition of "name of a fish/name of a character". On the other hand, as "Squid" contains in itself the sounds of the word "Sid", it uses the logical mechanism of cratylism. When we look at the Turkish version, we see that the translator reflects neither the logical mechanism nor the script opposition and hence fails to create a humorous effect in the target text. As it is seen, the translator does not change the character's name and add a qualifying adjective "sulu". Actually, he/she could create a more humorous context if he/she used such an expression as "sudan çıkmış Sid". In this way, a similarity between the character and the fish would be established and humor would be produced based on the logical mechanism of false analogy. In addition, the script opposition of "a fish name/ character's name" would be preserved.

Conclusion

In this study, I have tested the applicability of a humor theory to the analysis of the translation of wordplays. After providing general information regarding the current situation of the research on humor translation, I have attempted to show how a humor theory can be used in determining the similarity or difference between source text and target text humorous elements. In order to clarify the assumptions of the theory for the humor translation, I have worked on some verbal examples taken from the famous film, *Ice Age*. As the results of the analysis have showed, Attardo's knowledge resources enable the researcher to interpret the source text humor in a better way. Similarly, it helps

---

[4] Taken from "Ice Age: The Meltdown" (2006)

the researcher to compare the source text and target text humor in an objective manner. In light with the assumptions of this theory, it is suggested that the translator fails to render the humorous effect into the target text if she/he does not reflect the same or a similar script opposition in their versions. However, more case studies are required to test the reliability of these parameters. It should also be kept in mind that this theory can remain limited to some extent in terms of comparing the general humorous tone of the translated texts, since it mostly focuses on smaller linguistic units. There will be some instances where the translators do not reflect the parameters in an individual case, but adopts compensation at other parts of the text and create an equally humorous version.

References

Attardo, Salvatore. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humor*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Attardo, Salvatore and Victor Raskin. (1991). Script theory revis(it)ed: Joke similarity and joke representation model. *Humor: International Journal of Humor*, *4*(3-4), 293-347.

Boria, Monica. (2009). Translating humor: The case of Stefano Benni. In Ashley Chantler and Carla Dente *(*Eds.), *Translation practices: Through language to culture* (pp. 85-98). Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi B.V.

Chiaro, Delia. (2005). Foreword. Verbally expressed humor and translation: An overview of neglected field. *Humor 18*(2), 135-145.

Pelsmaekers, Katja and Fred Van Besien. (2002). Subtitling irony. *The Translator 8*(2), 241-266.

Raskin, Victor. (1979). Semantic mechanisms of humor. In C. Chiearello et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society,* (pp. 325-335). Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Raskin, Victor. (1985). *Semantic mechanisms of humor.* Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster: D. Reidel.

Vandaele, Jeroen. (2002). Introduction: (Re-)constructing humour: Meanings and means, *The Translator 8*(2), 149-172.