

Translating humour in children’s theatre for (unintended) diasporic audiences. Ion Creangă on Spanish stages

Catalina Iliescu-Gheorghiu

University of Alicante, Spain
iliescu@ua.es

Abstract

This article delves into children’s literature, more specifically, children’s theatre containing humour, and its double process of translation and/or adaptation, both “page to stage” and “stage to stage”, when a different language is involved, and the play is to be performed for an audience belonging to the target culture and an unintended diasporic one. The research perspective is descriptive (of the translational process) and comparative (of the source and target products). On the one hand, it analyses the cognitive and social mechanisms which create humour of different types (literary-stylistic, visual-auditive, and situational/of expectations) and those which allow the existence of ethnic humour. On the other hand, it tackles the translators’ decision-making process and the translation/adaptation strategies reflected by the final product. The material used for this research comprises the literary work in original, the script in the source language, the script in the target language, the recordings of the Romanian performance and the performance in Spanish by the Theatre “Anton Pann” (Romania). The author of this article coordinated the team of translators whose hybridity lies in their condition of first and second generation of Romanian residents in Spain. The results of this insight bring into light the debate on ethnic humour legitimacy and, at the same time, draw scholarly attention to the role played by translators in constructing and perpetuating images of cultures/literatures.

Keywords: humour, children’s theatre, ethnotypes, migration, translation.

1. Introduction

Diasporic identities are reflected in texts written in the country of origin and translated by diaspora or target culture translators. Bassnett and Lefevere (1990) highlighted the power of translations in constructing cultural identities and in projecting strong images of writers, texts and cultures. Translators can mimic dominant discourses to guarantee acceptance in the target culture and translation is shown to be a powerful mode of cultural construction, a means by which new nations can establish their identity amongst neighbouring countries, but also a way of constructing fictitious ‘images’ of foreign authors, texts and entire cultures (Bassnett &

Lefevere, 1990, p. 65), an idea later investigated by Flynn et al. (2016). However, migrant groups are often target of ethnic humour, which draws on ethnotypes (stereotypical attributions based on national, supra-national or ethnic character). As Leerssen (2016) observed, children's fiction is the genre that propagates most ethnotypes together with sentimental comedy. Translators recreate, but also negotiate and even block ethnic images and clichés, as Dimitriu (2016) shows.

Romanian migration to Spain started in the nineties but grew massively in the new millennium and is mainly due to economic reasons. A phenomenon inherent to migration is acculturation. The acculturation models, as seen by social psychologists, involve *assimilation* (adoption only of customs belonging to the host society), *integration* (adoption of these customs and equal preservation of those brought from home society); *separation* or *segregation* (preservation of the latter without adopting any customs of the host society); and *marginalization* or *exclusion* (neither preservation of home habits nor adoption of new ones, according to Berry's classification, 1992). A study conducted by sociologists (Rojas et al., 2012) shows that Romanian migrants in Spain would rather adopt host customs in public contexts (political life, education, health, work or consumption), and retain home traditions in the private sphere. According to Vertovec (2009, p. 16), one of the characteristics of transnationalism is the emotional tie with the homeland, nowadays enhanced by new technologies.

Starting from this premise, I will analyse humour in a cross-cultural production circulated in 2012 by a paradiplomatic¹ body, the Romanian Cultural Institute², addressing mainly Spanish host society (children and adults accompanying them), but also the Romanian diaspora (first and second generation). This study adds to the already existing research into the field of theatre and migration, into which, for instance, Marinetti (2018) has delved when describing a complex experiment at the *Teatro delle Albe* performed in two minor languages (Romagnolo and Wolof) to build new identities on stage. My study introduces a third element to the binomial "theatre and migration", namely "children's literature," and aims to reveal interesting data on how different audiences (host and diasporic groups of children and adults) receive the humour in the text (more exactly, the memory of the text) and in the performance.

The project titled *Puppets across the Border* entailed translating children's dramatized literature from Romanian into Spanish and touring several Spanish cities. I coordinated a team of four trainee translators, two first- and two second-generation Romanian migrants who faced difficulties when dealing with ethnographic information, lexis (archaisms and regionalisms) and idioms. The target audience for these shows were children between the age of 3 and 10, both second-generation Romanian immigrants and Spanish-speaking pupils from local primary schools, accompanied by adults, members of the Romanian diaspora and/or host society.

My discussion starts from the translation process and product brought about by this cultural action based on children's literature and aimed at a better understanding between host and incoming population. My research questions include (but are not restrained to): What kind of humorous elements does the tale's original author introduce in his nineteenth-century text? Which of these elements are present (as such, or modified) in the dramatized texts and in the

¹ Some authors understand paradiplomacy, classified by Kuznetsov (2015) into eleven major domains, as the participation of non-central governments in International Relations through networking (permanent or ad-hoc) with public or private entities to promote socioeconomic or cultural development (Cornago Prieto, 2000). Cultural diplomacy has been an essential tool not only in its international dimension, but also as a decisive device in domestic projection ('intermestic affairs').

² The Romanian Cultural Institute (a state-funded institution, subordinate to the Ministry of Culture) was founded in 2003 and was designed to "raise the profile of Romanian culture around the world". A merger of the Cultural and Publishing Foundations, both dating from 1992, the Institute had predecessors in the communist regime. At present, its nature and goals are complemented by such programs as the funding of the translation and publication of Romanian literary works abroad (<http://bdcwebsite.com/the-romanian-cultural-institute/>).

theatrical productions to be performed in Romania? How did the translators re-create humorous effects for the Spanish stage and (un)intended audiences?

2. Theorists on humour

Early insights into laughter by Bergson (cited in Freud, 1905) delved into issues still at stake, such as collective imagination, humans as laughing subjects, but also objects, the detachment from sensibility and emotion entailed by laughter, gregariousness, and social meaning of comicality. A century ago, from the field of aesthetics, Lipps (1987 [1903], p. 312) defined humour as adjacent to the tragic category in terms of the psychological mechanisms that produce them. Both categories are based on a negation or contradiction between “what comes as imposed reality and what the subject demands, which makes her/him focus on the denied object”. The difference between tragic and humorous effects is the way in which the negation occurs; in the former, the negation is serious and provokes suffering; in the latter, it is comical and causes laughter. In Lipps’ opinion, humour falls into three categories: a) the *reflexive* humour that a subject discovers related to the own self in relation to the world and its actions; b) the *representational* humour which one can find, for instance, in literature, residing in the way it is represented, and thus depending on the author who expresses his/her understanding of the world in a humorous way; and c) the *artistic* humour, residing in the characters and objects represented by a literary work. Lipps (1987 [1903]: 314) identifies three manifestations of humour: 1) conciliator or humorous; 2) discordant or satirical; 3) reconciling or ironic. These three categories apply to representational humour and derive from the subject’s attitude towards the world. First, by mocking its meanness, superfluity, or ridiculousness, the subject places him/herself above these defects through conciliatory humour. Secondly, the subject understands the world’s absurdity and opposes it in satirical discordant humour. And thirdly, by recognizing the defects and admitting they should not exist (since they lead to an absurd reality), the subject exerts a reconciling (ironic) humour because he/she sees a solution (even if it is a destructive one). From the field of linguistics, Ruiz Gurillo (2012) observes that the relationship between irony and humour has been controversial throughout recent decades.

In fact, as Timofeeva (2021) points out, humour began to raise academic interest more than 30 years ago, with Raskin’s script-based semantic theory of humour (Raskin, 1985), Attardo’s (1994) five-level joke representation model and Attardo and Raskin’s (1991) theory of verbal humour as represented by verbal jokes. The linguistic mechanisms of humour have been studied by psychologists and theorists from other fields (anthropology, philosophy, communication, cultural studies, and aesthetics), but in a more general and transversal way, also due to the interdisciplinary character of humour. Nowadays, scholars who approach “linguistic humour” have opened research lines into metalinguistic competences, identity perspectives, virtual contexts, gender or cultural issues. One of the most active scholars in Spanish contexts is Ruiz Gurillo (2012), who X-rays humour from the perspective of three influential frameworks of linguistic analysis: the General Theory of Verbal Humour, the field of Cognitive Linguistics and the Relevance Theory. She reviews the first in order to provide an integrated model where elements such as register, text or gender, as well as the markers used to build humour and the choice of metapragmatics on behalf of the speaker/writer, acquire new senses. This revised model enables scholars to analyse humorous discourse. Its genre par excellence is the joke, followed by stand-up comedy or parody. Spontaneous conversation sometimes employs humour as a conversational strategy. Several models and theories have been proposed to account for this eternal and ubiquitous phenomenon.

From the field of semantics, Raskin (1985, p. 81) develops the concept of ‘script’ (borrowed from anthropology, psychology, sociology, or artificial intelligence) that alludes to the social basis of humour and to the superiority theory. Raskin (1985) introduces the notion of native speakers’ knowledge of a small part of the world which allows humour decoding based on scripts (of semantic information) and states the two conditions necessary and sufficient for a text to be funny, namely, the text is compatible, fully or in part, with two different scripts, and the two scripts with which the text is compatible are opposite (1985, p. 99). Three other theories are related to this finding: the incongruity theory, the release/relief theory, and the stimulus/response theory, but the most influential consequence of Raskin’s developments is Attardo’s (1997) attempt to provide a General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH) which is interdisciplinary, including linguistics but not limited to it. In fact, Raskin’s Semantic Script Theory and Attardo’s GTVH are the most influential linguistic humour theories in the last decades. Still in the sphere of semantics, Ritchie (2006) explores the ‘mental spaces’ theory to account for jokes’ reinterpretation. While traditional humour theories mainly focus on the reader, who has to perform a script-switching or frame-shifting operation (a forced reinterpretation of the joke) after coming across the punchline, Ritchie believes that the initial misinterpretation can also be attributed to a story character in the joke and the reader/listener be perfectly aware and observant of that misunderstanding. This is somehow linked to Raskin’s proposal (1985, p. 103) of a principle of cooperation for joke telling as an “extended form of *bona-fide* communication” (1985, p. 104), where *bona-fide* communication is serious, based on a cooperative text with straight intentions, and *non-bona-fide* communication is the one that violates conversational maxims, hence the idea that humour violates the cooperative principle. Nonetheless, Raskin (1985) warns that, unlike lying, humour is a non-*bona-fide* mode, but it is cooperative. For him, cooperation is a continuum with the absolute *bona-fide* (a manual of instructions) at one end and the complete non-*bona-fide* (lying) at the other end. In this sense, Ruiz Gurillo (2012, p. 38) agrees that non-*bona-fide* information may turn into *bona-fide* if the listener exploits presuppositions or metamessages of jokes, while Attardo does see it as a violation of cooperation. One specific case highlighted by Raskin (1985, p. 102) is the one in which the speaker produces humour when the hearer does not expect it. Raskin suggests that such a mismatch between the two modes of communication may not only lead to a comprehension issue (1985, p. 101), but also to an “infelicitous speech act”.

Later, Raskin et al. (2009) delve into ontological semantics to account for the unreal things that humour adds to the material reality, Attardo (2001) broadens his GTVH to make it applicable to any kind of text and, in her theoretical book, Ruiz Gurillo (2012) mentions that any kind of text can be humorous if it complies with Attardo’s six parameters: script opposition, logical mechanism, situation, target, narrative strategy, and language. Attardo (2002) explains that his GTVH has been extensively applied to translatology on grounds of its implicit theory of translation. When making this statement, he observes that the GTVH allows comparison of two jokes when they differ by one knowledge resource (all the other variables being equal) but if two jokes differ only in language, one can be said to be the translation of the other. However, the six elements in Attardo’s hierarchy affect a translation in different degrees. For instance, in his view, a change in the logical mechanism makes a translation more distant than a change in its target. This general theory and the six Knowledge Resources with their hierarchical structure have been applied to translatology by Robson (2008) or Shipley (2007), but criticized as not applicable intersemiotically by Chiaro (2005), Zanettin (2010), or Zabalbeascoa (2005), who concludes that sameness, or similarity, may have little to do with funniness, and this creates a dilemma for translators wishing to achieve an equivalent effect. In turn, Santana (2011) analyses puns and patronymics to draw on the importance of text type and addressee in humour translation. Addition and compensation are among the strategies employed by the translator

whose priority is to reproduce the humorous effect (Santana, 2011, p. 74). Landert (2021, p. 68) reaches a similar conclusion in her study on spontaneous co-creations of comedy, stating that “humour strategies are dependent on the communicative framework of the text-type, where used”. Related to translation is translanguaging writing, a subject investigated by Vernier (2014) who explores how humour is generated in the process of self-translation.

The post-Gricean cognitive pragmatic framework of Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1995) could not remain on the sidelines of the question of humour. Relevance theorists have rejected the picture of humour as violation of Gricean maxims and have favoured a more individual-centred view on humorous communication, with cognition at its centre. Curcó (1998, p. 321) used the theoretical framework provided by RT to propose an operating mechanism for humour. In Curcó’s vision, humour is our way of implicitly questioning the world and distancing ourselves from criticisable facts. What qualifies us to use verbal humour is a combination of our inclination to interpret the ostensive stimuli (in correlation with the principle of relevance) and what she calls “our theory of the mind”, an unknown element, present in each of us, upon which our sense of humour depends. Based on Raskin’s concept of bona-fide, Yus (2003) observes that if the hearer is warned of the humorous quality of the forthcoming or just-heard discourse, s/he will assume that certain rules are going to be (or have inevitably been) broken for the sake of humour, without necessarily rejecting the text as irrelevant. Yus (2016) draws on four assumptions to account for humour creation and interpretation: (1) compensation for the uninformative nature of humorous texts comes through the effects of a non-propositional nature: laughter, pleasure, solidarity, etc.; (2) humourists’ mindreading abilities enable them to predict the interpretive steps the audience will take. (3) Comprehension relies on subconscious capabilities to rank interpretations and choose the most plausible ones. (4) There are gaps between what is meant and linguistically encoded, and what the audience decode and actually interpret, which can only be filled by inference. Elsewhere, Yus (2018, p. 290) enumerates a series of contextual constraints governing the (un)successful humorous intentions (suitability, hearer’s knowledge, sense of humour or mood, the relationship between interlocutors, aspects of culture and ethnicity) to conclude that humour “cannot be easily exported to other cultures”. Humour, as viewed by cognitive science and its impact on translatology, was approached by Rojo López (2000, p. 108) who focuses on humorous language starting from the notion of “diagram”, also called “schema”, “frame”, “scenario”, “script” by the theorists of cognitive psychology. According to Rojo López, the translator not only has to be aware of the way the author manipulates lexicon and grammar to build messages, but also of the way in which the author plays with readers’ cognitive diagrams (2000, p. 107).

Tsakona (2017, p. 489) observes the difficulty in capturing the ubiquity of humour and, after presenting several existing taxonomies (including Attardo’s five-categories one, namely texts without a humorous line; texts with a final punch; episodic humour; sequence of jab lines; embedded texts), she proposes (Tsakona 2017, p. 494) her own fourfold classification of: a) genres produced for amusement; b) which may include humour; c) where humour may occur but it is not expected; and d) genres where humour never occurs.

The aforementioned approaches to humour (with their implications for translation) have a direct application to adult theatre, which is based on a discourse that imitates spontaneous speech, although it is, in fact, a meticulous construction encompassing the author’s predictions and spectators’ interpretations (ordered upon plausibility and helped, when necessary, by inference). Unlike adult theatre, that reproduces (albeit artificially) communication based on the cooperative principle and conversational maxims either in bona-fide (cooperative discourse) or in non-bona-fide circumstances (in which maxims are deliberately violated or not observed in order to trigger a certain effect), children’s theatre (based on hyperbolic and fantastic worlds and often emerged from adapted tales) establishes a different type of communication in which

maxims are trespassed from the very beginning and the cooperative principle is complied with only exceptionally. On the reception side, children audiences will not choose the most plausible interpretation and their inferences may not bridge the gap between what is meant (and linguistically encoded) and what is (linguistically and semiotically) decoded, especially in plays addressed to early ages, such as in the case under discussion.

3. Materials and methodology

This paper's aims are, on the one hand, to analyse the cognitive and social mechanisms which create humour of different types (literary-stylistic, visual-auditive, and situational/of expectations) and those which allow the existence of ethnic humour, and, on the other hand, to examine the translators' decision-making process and the translation/adaptation strategies reflected by the final product. The material used for this analysis comprises the original text by Creangă in Romanian, the dramatization and performance by the Theatre "Anton Pann", and the translation into Spanish of the puppet show *¿Dónde está mi saquito?* (Where is my purse?) adapted for a mixed audience made up of Spanish and Romanian children and adults. The author of this article coordinated the team of translators whose hybridity lies in their condition of first and second generation of Romanian residents in Spain. The results of this insight bring into light the debate on ethnic humour's legitimacy and, at the same time, draw scholar attention to the role played by translators in constructing and perpetuating images of cultures/literatures. The show is based on a popular tale collected and narrated by Ion Creangă (1975 [1876]), a nineteenth-century Romanian author, labelled as the "children's writer" par excellence. Unlike 'literary' or 'learned' tales, which are conceived individually, with a clear authorship, transmitted in a written form and in a single version, 'folk' tales are told by a narrator who has collected and adapted them, preserving their structure, plot and key actions. They are described as oral, traditional, fictional, multi-versioned tales, subdivided into fairy tales, tales of animals or tales of customs.

¿Dónde está mi saquito? is an animal fable with a moral. The old woman, greedy and selfish, eats all the eggs laid by her hen and tells her neighbour, the old man, to beat his rooster so that he lays eggs too. Instead, the man sends the rooster away. The creature finds a purse with two gold coins which are then stolen by a greedy landowner. He insists on getting the purse back and pursues it through all kind of quests. The rooster seems immortal, since it is drowned in a well, roasted in an oven, locked in the treasury, but still survives and demands his purse. He finally returns to the old man's house laden with riches. He swallows the gold in the treasury, becomes as huge as an elephant and, due to his bravery, all the farm animals follow him, leaving the landlord as a pauper. The envious old woman sends her hen to fetch the same fortune, which she cannot do, so, in the written text, her owner beats her to death. In the staged version, though, the old man is generous and shares his recent wealth with the old woman. The unhappy ending from literature is repaired on stage through a symmetrical marriage and the two couples, human (old man and old woman) and animal (rooster and hen) live happily ever after. Characteristic of the genre (children's literature and, especially, children's theatre) is the dual nature of its language which combines artistic features, comprising archaisms, regionalisms, traditional symbols, and prosodic elements with a child-like dimension, containing impressionistic elements, reiterations, time adverbs, numerals, juxtapositions, collocations, and an internal logic that needs no verification of verisimilitude in the child's mental frame. Translators into Spanish dealt with "page to stage" and "stage to stage" translation to be performed in a playback modality by puppeteers. A soundtrack would be recorded which included music, sound effects (the gurgle of water, the crackle of fire, the rooster being visited by phantoms in the dungeons

of the nobleman's manor) and the whole dialogue played by the Romanian puppeteers (who were unfamiliar with Spanish). That is why the target text had to be "speakable" and textual units had to be easily identifiable through symmetry, phonic anchorage and similar length.

The research perspective is descriptive (of the translational process) and comparative (of the source and target products). On the other hand, it analyses the cognitive and social mechanisms which create humour of different types (literary-stylistic, visual-auditive, and situational/of expectations) and which allow the presence of ethnic humour. Theatre is one of the most potent tools for mutual knowledge, and, according to López Tamés (1985, p. 78), the best means to introduce children to humour, which, in turn, distances them from their egocentric self. In children's literature, the author introduces humour, but the child reader does not always detect it, whereas through theatre, humorous effects reach the audience directly, by means of asides, furtive gestures, pitch changes, and actor-child interactions which exclude other actors/audience. In this particular case, if one compares the presence of humour in the written tale and in the staged tale, one can notice that humorous effects were added or intensified in the theatrical version of the product. In order to analyse humour in the staged version of *¿Dónde está mi saquito?* (*Punguța cu doi bani* [The purse with two coins] by Ion Creangă), I have drawn on two analytical models: one by Vrabie (1975) and his triadic classification of style in children's literature (*expressive* style, *contact* style and *referential* style), and the other by López Tamés (1985, p. 76) who identifies two main categories: *humour as language* (which ensures a certain type of human communication through jokes, irony, the absurd, ridicule, puns and allows decoding due to shared strategies between listener and speaker) and *humour as situation* (which embodies a disproportion between means and aims, or introduces nonsensical elements into a daily scenario, as in the work of Lewis Carroll). In the analysed play, humour materializes in a number of textual and stage elements responding to different types of comicality, which I broadly classify into five categories: 1) *literary-stylistic* humour; 2) *visual-auditive* humour; 3) *behavioural* humour; 4) *situational-contextual* humour, and 5) *ethnic* humour. In what follows, I will focus on the first, second and fifth categories, since the behavioural and situational-contextual humour deserve a multimodal approach in which video recordings are required to analyse the performance (iconicity, kinesics, and proxemics), which makes the object of a different study.

4. Analysis of translated/adapted humour

According to Albaladejo (1986), discursive truth conditions do not apply in children literature/theatre because everything is perfectly possible in the child's mental frame. Nonetheless, children do recognize *language humour* obtained through clashing sounds, onomatopoeias, alliterations and invented names for characters, or the surprising content of a sentence, especially when it is repeated throughout the show as a leitmotiv. They also recognize *situational humour* easily, especially when built through absurd imitations of humans (animals that simulate human behaviours), as in this case, the talking rooster who is stubborn as a human. According to Freud (1905 [1960], p. 1786), in the case of mimicry and caricature, humour comes from expectation, not from situation. Indeed, although it is known as "situational humour", comicality here comes from the clash between expectations and reality, a mechanism explained at length by the Incongruity Theory, summarized by Lippitt (1994) and explored by Freud and Bergson in the early 20th century. When describing the comic of mimicry, "permeated with caricature" (Freud, 1905 [1960], p. 1786) exaggeration of traits and degradation provoke comicality together with faithfulness (resemblance to the caricatured figure). In this sense, Bergson (Bergson cited in Freud, 1905 [1960], p. 1786) defines the comic effect on grounds of

mécanisation de la vie or attributing a living person the features of an inanimate mechanism. The identical repetition makes us laugh because, according to our experience, “what is living should never be repeated exactly the same” (Freud, 1905 [1960], p. 1786). As every living thing is different from others, we make an expenditure to understand its behaviour. If the mimicry is deceptive (identical and repetitive), we feel “disappointed in the sense of a relief” (Freud, 1905 [1960], p. 1786) and our expenditure on expectation has become superfluous and is discharged by laughter. This Bergsonian formula is applied to cases of “comic rigidity” (*raideur*) of professional customs, fixed ideas, and routinary turns of speech, and proves useful to my analysis of a theatrical performance based on caricature, mimicry, repetition and rigidity of puppets. The rooster’s resilience (no matter how hard the landowner tries to kill him), obstinately repeating his catchphrase (even gargling when he survives the drowning) provokes laughter among the children. Also, his unexpected gigantic size and hyperbolic capacity of swallowing everything is hilarious (especially when accompanied by sound effects), although it turned out to be more surprising, therefore hilarious, for the adult audience rather than for children who took the rooster’s supernatural powers for granted.

Timofeeva and Ruiz Gurillo (2021) analyse children’s verbal humour starting from the Incongruity Theory, warning that not all incongruities lead to humour, but intentional humour lays on incongruity, laughed at by infants from an early age, as McGhee (cited in Timofeeva & Ruiz Gurillo, 2021, p. 85) observes when proposing a six-stage division in children’s acquisition of humour competence (0 to 6 months: Pre-humour stage; 6 to 15 months: Attachment Figure; 15 months to 3 years: Treating an Object as a Different Object; 3 to 5 years: Misnaming Objects or Actions; 5 to 6: Playing with Words; and 6 to 11: Riddles and Jokes). Starting from the age of 11, the child reaches the humour competence of an adult.

Popular tales’ literary style was defined by authors such as Vrabie (1975) as comprising: an *expressive* style reflected in the lyrical monologues, or the opening and closing formulae; a *contact* style, materialized in dialogues or “in-text” formulae; and a *referential* style, hinting at external realities or myths, such as the trinity principle – present here in the three modalities of killing the rooster: drowning, burning and confinement, or the antithetic binomials – the old man and the old woman; parallel structures – the rooster’s travels and the hen’s. Regarding the narrative type, of the several techniques (linear narration, ascendant, in multiple foci, or circular), we deal with a circular narration: the adventure starts and ends in the same setting after the fantastic trip, which is full of perils, among which is a triple murder attempt with its providential reward abundant for the rooster and fatal for the nobleman (stripped off of his wealth).

4.1. Literary-stylistic humour

This first category encompasses the three axes upon which the style of children’s literature lies, as identified by Vrabie (1975) in his seminal book on the poetic structure of tales: *expressive style* (monologues; names; opening and closing formulae); *contact style* (dialogues, repetitions, in-text formulae), and *referential style* (universals such as stereotypes, antitheses – the old man and the old woman; parallel structures – the glorious rooster’s travels and the shameful hen’s travels).

4.1.1. Expressive style

Regarding the expressive style, the strategy that seems to prevail is adaptation³, which very often implies domestication⁴, not so much in monologues or formulae, but definitely in the case of names, which, in this tale, are common names that acquire the status of *dramatis personae*. Such is the case of the Spanish neutralized *viejo/vieja* as the only option for the much more expressive Romanian *babă/moș* (rural, fairy-tale, family register and more colourful than the plain *bătrân/bătrână* (the real equivalent of *viejo/vieja*) and also more likely to produce humour when combined with other elements. In fact, the terms are used in everyday language collocations, such as *Baba Cloanța/Wicked Witch* and *Moș Crăciun/Father Christmas*, since *moș* can also be archaic “uncle” or “grandpa”. The translators opted for domestication due to the lack of equivalents in the target language. As Bassnett (2014) admits, there are things that simply cannot be reproduced, and adaptation (with procedures identified by Bastin (2011, 1993, p. 473) such as: transcription, omission, expansion, exoticism, updating, situational adequation, and creation) is the translator’s only option, especially when reconstructing humour. Here the “updating” procedure has been chosen. In relevance theorists’ views, this requires a supplementary amount of inferential effort on behalf of the readership/spectators, who resort to scenic clues (costumes – her headscarf, physiognomy – her salient eyes, voices – her penetrant pitch) in order to be rewarded with humorous effects in exchange.

4.1.2. Contact style

Concerning the contact style, an important role is played by the “in-text formulae”. This category is broader than the “phatic function” widely studied by *skopos*⁵ theorists, which in turn is based on the pragmatic concept of phatic speech acts. Vrabie opts for the notion of “contact style”, which encompasses not just those “gambits” that open communication, but also other formulaic instances scattered throughout the text. For instance, the recurrent expression *cucurigu, boieri mari* (cock a doodle doo, great noblemen) which is the leitmotiv of the play, was translated by the equivalent onomatopoeic *kikiriki* followed by the domesticated appellative *señorito*. Both elements are meant to create a humorous effect together with intonation and pitch. The plural used in Romanian *Cucurigu, boieri mari/Dați punguța cu doi bani* to ensure the rhyme, was replaced by a singular for the same reason *Kikiriki, Señorito/Dónde está mi saquito*. Also, the imperative *dați* (give [me]!) has become a petitionary interrogation in Spanish (“where is my...?” meaning “where have you hidden it”, “give it back to me”). Another option would have been *kikiriki, señorito, devuélvame el saquito* (give my purse back), but, as a title, the interrogative format, with an ascendent intonation and higher pitch, was found funnier by the translators. According to Haugh (2012, p. 209), high or modulated pitch is a non-verbal humour feature belonging to the phonetic practices used in the construction of laughables (Ford & Fox, 2010). In said example, the question, imitating children’s language and spreading doubt as an expressive speech act seemed funnier than a directive speech act revealing information. “Dialogic exchanges and repetitions” also fall into this second axis (*contact style*), as defined

³ *Adaptation* is the main strategy to present foreign audiences with children’s literature/theatre; it consists of reconstructing the purpose, function or impact of the source text. It is a special kind of equivalence which involves creating a new situation in the target text that can be considered as equivalent to the original one, cultural references included. Pascua (1998) analysed 150 tales and found adaptations to be stylistic, cultural or cognitive.

⁴ *Domestication* and *foreignization* are two basic translation strategies coined by the translation theorist Lawrence Venuti (1995, p. 20); the former refers to an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values (moving the author towards the target audience) and the latter is an ethnodeliant pressure on those (cultural) values focused on the differences of the foreign text (moving the reader towards the original author).

⁵ For the *Skopostheorie*, the process of translation is determined by the function of the product. What determines the process of translation is the purpose (*skopos*) of the translational action (see Nord, 1997).

by Vrabie. The dialogue (consisting of orders and reprimands) between the landowner and his servant is representative as a humour device. The latter's discourse contains repetitions of lexis and structures, paralinguistic elements such as: pauses, fillers (*uhmmm; o-o*), intonation and pitch corresponding to a silly, dim-witted character. All of them converge into a humorous effect. The two Guignol-like characters establish an archetypal antagonism with a hilarious effect reinforced by the soundtrack. The translators' strategy was to adapt the paralinguistic features and reproduce the lexical and syntactic repetitions.

4.1.3. Referential style

On the third axis – the referential style (which regards universals in popular tales, such as triads, antitheses, or parallelisms) humour is embedded in the antagonistic characters, their behaviour, their parallel development and, eventually, in the gender stereotype. Children's literature rests on archetypal structures. As in universal tales (Cinderella, Snow White), in Romanian tales, the female element is ambivalent. Either as victims or executioners, women compete for men's attention and, in a genre until recently mainly authored by men, women are often associated with treachery, malice, and sadism. In this tale, the female characters appear in opposition to males, and the antagonist pattern favours the male element: the rooster brings back innumerable riches while the hen can only find a pathetic glass bead; the old man is good and poor while the old woman is heartless and comfortably well off. Both performances (in Romanian and Spanish) maintain the gender stereotype, although, as I said, they avoid the question of death and moderate the mistreatment of animals in comparison with the written tale.

4.2. Visual-auditive humour

When she touches on the separate treatment given to music on stage, Espasa's (2000, p. 51) options for songs in plays are: incorporating or omitting music, humming, and creating a new song. In the case of the staged tale analysed here, Romanian folkloric music is used as a backbone for the entire spectacle. In fact, any Romanian listener would immediately recognize the tunes, especially the one used as a paratext. The same song, with lyrics based on the old man's hunger and the old woman's abundance of eggs, and music borrowed from the well-known folkloric song "Trandafir de la Moldova", is used instead of an opening/closing formula. The song is the same because we deal with a circular type of narration (the adventure starts and ends in the same setting after the fantastic trip, only with a transformed protagonist).

Foaie verde de secară /Frumoasă-i viața la țară
C-un cocoș și c-o găină /De ouă e curtea plină.
Ouăle-s mâncare bună /Șapte zile-n săptămână
Că le bați și faci papară/Sau omletă, sau jumară

*Hojas verdes de azalea /Bien se vive en la aldea
Con tu gallo y tu gallina/Huevos hay toda la vida
El huevo es comida sana/Siete veces por semana
Huevos fritos y rellenos/Estrellados y revueltos.⁶*

⁶ Green leaves of a rhododendron/In the country life is heaven
With your rooster and your hen/You eat eggs time and again
Egg is healthier than meat /Seven days a week you eat
Eggs are cooked, or fried, or boiled /Sunny side up, poached, or scrambled

The humorous effect of the song (a satire of the greedy and mean old woman) is created both by the form (easy rhymes and a well-known folkloric tune with adapted lyrics) and by the content (the old woman always eating eggs, cooked in every possible way, praising country-life, while the old man, with an empty belly, is not so fond of it). The translators' choice in this case was to keep the tune and translate the lyrics (as much as possible with rhyme and metrics) into Spanish, not without a number of drawbacks mainly related to prosody. The most difficult task for translators was to preserve both sense and rhyme without excessively extending the verse or missing the humour. For instance, the recurrent formula (a *cultureme*⁷) in Romanian folklore *foaie verde* followed by the name of a plant is, in fact, a phatic formula and a marker to help readers identify immediately the genre: oral literature (+folklore; +versified; +tune) does not have a Spanish equivalent. The name of the plant added to the formula is meant to guarantee the rhyme with whatever comes next. Translators opted for *foreignizing* the target version through a literal translation, again, using the plural for sounding more natural (*hojas verdes*), followed by any plant that would comply with the prosodic requirement in Spanish (e.g. *azalea* which would rhyme with *aldea*/village; *encina*/oak with *campesina*/peasant). This idiosyncratic element is opaque for a Spanish audience, whereas, for the Romanian diaspora, it represents an identity sign, as well as the visual clues: the countrymen's costumes, the landowner's moustache, the carriage, the village architecture, and so on. On the other hand, the translation of the semantic content of the song is submitted to *domestication* when adapting various Romanian dishes made with eggs to Spanish cuisine, from which *tortilla* could not be omitted.

Hojas verdes como el pino/Qué bien vive el campesino
Come un huevo a mediodía/Y en la cena agua fría
Hojas verdes de encina /No quiero ser campesina
Yo quiero comer *tortillas*/Y tener *lavavajillas*⁸

The countrywoman's desire to live in the city and have facilities is represented by the word *chiuvetă* (sink, suggesting "running water" – a progress indicator) which the translator *intensifies* into *lavavajillas* (dishwasher), a stronger emancipation indicator. The clash between the bucolic, agrarian atmosphere of the song's lyrics and the unexpected image of a dishwasher produces a humorous effect, mainly in adults.

Once the lyrics had been translated, a Romanian mother (who is a singer), sang them in Spanish for the puppeteers (who did not speak any Spanish) to imitate pronunciation, syllable division, stress, or contractions. The whole *Puppets across the Border* project used recorded tracks, so puppeteers did not have to perform in Spanish except when recording the sound. In fact, Cervera (1991) pointed out this freedom of the mediator (actor) who remains occult in this kind of a show in which the puppet is not the exclusive narrator, since voicing over is a feature of the play. As a final remark, I would say that music is a source of humour throughout the entire play. Not only the choice of songs and the tailored lyrics, but also the pace can be hilarious. For instance, the traditional tune accompanying the tribulations of the main character (the mighty

⁷ *Culturemes* are simple or complex words, phrases, syntagmas, and sentences that reflect social and cultural realities of a community and pose problems when it comes to their of transfer from one language to another. Culturemes bear a cultural specificity characteristic of the source language, a historical and socio-cultural motivation, which does not occur at all, or is partially found (not with the same value) in the target language (Lungu-Badea, 2004, p. 25-68).

⁸ Green leaves of a pine, oh dear/ Peasants' life is heaven here
With an egg for lunch you're fatter/And you dine a glass of water
Green leaves of a holm oak tree/Just a peasant I won't be
I want omelette for my breakfast/ And a dishwasher as servant

rooster) is speeded up while the rooster is chased by the carriage and is slowed down (as in a slow-motion playback) when the characters are tired.

4.3. Ethnic humour

Apart from these four categories of humour, a fifth one refers to “ethnic humour”. Raskin (1985) already identified two popular ethnic scripts (stupidity and canniness/craftiness) which he claimed to be universal because they are found in virtually any language and country. As Popescu (2011, p. 176) shows, while the former is negatively labelled, the latter presumes a quick mind, provoking some admiration. Ethnic humour does not have to be culture-specific, but it must be rooted in an ethnic script. Jokes based on stupidity are very similar in all cultures, but each has a different target group. This group may represent a nation (French about Belgians) or a profession (Romanian jokes on policemen). In the tale *¿Dónde está mi saquito?*, the servant represents a group which is the victim of mockery (on stage, not in the written text by Creangă, though) and for a children’s audience to decode the added humour, a series of signals were introduced, such as the facial features of the puppet, his slowness, the paralinguistic clues he uses (onomatopoeic sounds, pitch and intonation) and language distortion (accent, monosyllable words, and interjections) that verbalize the script of stupidity related to a certain social status. The whole group of “servants” is thus presented as intellectually inferior on stage, since the performance resorts to strategies of stereotyping, ridicule and mimicry to elicit laughter. In this case, humour is based on paralinguistic and semiotic elements easily identifiable by spectators of an early age. However, in this play, the exponential ethnic humour is embodied by a female character: the “gypsy cook”.

Raskin (1985, p. 194) characterized “specific ethnic scripts” as being conventional and fictional. Davies (1990, p. 326) warned against a common confusion between ethnic scripts (i.e. topics of jokes) and their corresponding stereotypes since, in his opinion, jokes are playful, they are not expressions of aggression and, as Popescu interprets (2011, p. 177), they do not create or exacerbate tensions between peoples or groups, as their authors do not believe their targets to actually have those features. Triezenberg (2008, p. 538) introduces the notion of “humour enhancer”, which is not comical in itself but it helps the audience to understand that the text contains a humorous clue. In this scholar’s views, a script may take the form of a shared stereotype, already familiar to the audience, and the joke’s author/teller draws on the existing scheme rather than building up a fresh script in the receiver’s mind.

In their introduction to *Interconnecting Translation Studies and Imagology*, Flynn et al. (2016) cite Simeoni’s observation that translation, as a dynamic force related to *state-building*, rather than merely reflecting differences, in fact *co-constructs* them.⁹ They believe images and stereotypes continue to be framed by nations monolingually and *mediated by translators across linguistic and cultural spaces*. The ethnotype is a stereotypical attribution of national, supra-national or ethnic character responding not to an anthropological reality, but to an opposition between the auto-image and the hetero-image, in other words, between the Self and the Other. As Leerssen (2016) observed, children’s fiction is the genre that propagates most ethnotypes together with sentimental comedy. One interesting example here (not attributable to the interlingual, but to the intersemiotic translation) is the female cook in *¿Dónde está mi saquito?*, who, in Creangă’s original story, is a *hârcă* (pejorative for a wicked, ugly, and old woman) that “cruelly” throws the rooster into the flames, but she is not a Roma character.

⁹ Indeed, the editors seem reluctant to give up the nation state as a frame for studying imagology, be it in our multicultural neighbourhood (in daily situations of hidden translation and image building), or in a global sense, with instant access to information (entailing selection processes) that reinforce cultural stereotyping.

Since the nineteenth century, alternative English names for “gypsy” have adopted terms such as *Rom* the plural of which includes *Roma* or *Roms* and *Romani* (Romany) with the plural *Romanies*, a noun used nowadays to designate the whole ethnicity, whereas *Roma* is the label given to the branch concentrated in Eastern Europe and the Balkans. In Romania, the Roma minority is perceived as problematic. According to Popescu (2011, p. 184), the public discourse is dominated by overt and covert protests ringing with hate speech and revolves around issues such as Roma living on government subsidies and charity, criminal activity and begging. A common belief is that Roma do not value education and that the lack of command of the official language contributes to their lack of success; most Roma are unable to work and remain illiterate. Their high birth rate makes them be perceived as a demographic threat. Here, the female Roma character does not speak, so she does not have the occasion to distort language (in Raskin’s terms, a well-known “script” of stupidity). This is because this “feature” is already attributed to the servant, while the gypsy cook’s main characteristic is her wickedness. Moreover, the performance is addressed also to small children who would not recognize the typical language distortions (accent, intonation, pronunciation, lexical choices, and phonological modifications, such as placing the “h” sound in front of vowels) assigned to Roma speech in Romanian.

In some illustrations of Ion Creangă’s tale, this character has been represented as a gypsy, probably due to the ethnotype of malignity, which comes as no surprise, since not only the Romanian collective imaginary, but also the language is full of hints of Roma marginal status and despicable behaviour (the verb *a se țigăni*, literally “to go gypsy on something”, which means to bargain over something, to haggle; or idioms related to their idleness or children stealing). The text/play also encloses the implicitness of the generalized practice in nineteenth-century Romania, of having gypsies as servants at the landlord’s manor,¹⁰ which comes as no surprise for Romanian parents, but requires a decoding effort from both Spanish child and adult audience and Romanian children. The “gypsy cook” stereotype has been used also in modern performances (for instance Theatre “Colibri” in Craiova, Romania) as a potent tool for enhancing humour.

In the analysed performance, the ethnotype was misleading since the “gypsy cook” looked more like a black maid in twentieth-century American cartoons than a Roma servant on a Romanian manor in the late nineteenth century, when Ion Creangă published the tale.

The semiotic load (her caricature-like features, her big lips, big breasts, her low-cut dress) and the hilarious Guignol scene that she shares with the rooster in which she chases him all over the place in order to prepare him for cooking, accompanied by a popular tune played at a fast rhythm, are the elements intended to create a humorous effect. Although she was not the only caricatural puppet in the show (the Old Woman, the Lord of the manor, and the Servant are equally loaded with comicality, not only through their aspect, but also through their behaviour, with repetitions and imitations of inanimate mechanisms, or *mécanisation de la vie* in Bergsonian terms), her aspect did recall an ethnotype. The character in Creangă’s tale was an old, ugly, and wicked woman, which pointed not at an ethnotype, but at a more general stereotype against women, which is also dangerous since humour is sometimes based on a denigrating scheme (in which the self is regarded as superior), a mechanism which, on the other hand, is paradoxically inherent to the creation of humorous effects, as Lipps had already noticed when defining his “conciliatory humour” (as a device through which the subject places

¹⁰ This ethnic group is formed by immigrated *paria* (lacking rights and freedom) who reached Romanian territory in the 15th century, lived in slavery till the Emancipation Act in 1856 but continued to be marginalized economically, politically, and socially. In 1996, the term *rrom* is adopted in official documents, but tensions generated by the civil society and ethno-nationalist discourse rose when Romania negotiated joining the EU. Today, the ethnotype of an “uncivilized, uneducated and nomadic” group is still in force (Woodcock, 2007).

him/herself above others' defects by mocking its meanness, superfluity, or ridiculousness). As I quoted before, not only the exaggeration of traits is laughed at but faithfulness too in the comicality of mimicry. The performances in Alicante were attended by Romanian diaspora (first and second generation) and both Spanish children and adults, mainly mothers (as traditional conveyors of cultural identity) who helped children decode the messages accurately, being aware of the fact that humour is meant precisely to combat against and reflect upon prejudice and misconceptions.

5. Conclusions of this project

In the theatrical production *Dónde está mi saquito?*, the “page to page” process starts from the inter-linguistic translation of a script based on the well-known tale, coping with difficulties of a pragma-linguistic, cultural and communicative nature (avoiding sounds that Romanian puppeteers could not reproduce) followed by a “page to stage” inter-semiotic translation which adapts stage-signs and puppetry code from one audience to another in order to obtain a product which is accessible to Spanish audiences, but still recognizable as an identity exponent in the eyes of the Romanian community in Spain. Translation is a powerful tool for cultural construction, a means by which diasporas can establish their identity amongst hosts, but also a way of constructing fictitious “images” of other cultures or groups. If the translated text belongs to the genre of children’s literature, translation is responsible for the imagological message that text might introduce in early readers’ educational process. But if the text is played on a stage, its iconicity will make it even more powerful.

I do not intend to discuss here the incorrectness of such a staging decision as the presence of the “gypsy female cook”, but I would like to draw scholarly attention to the fact that *humour* based on *ethnic differences* and *stereotypes* (and there is a long history of this kind of humour in western traditions) may cause offence. In fact, an unexpected turn of events took place in relation to this aspect, when a four-year-old boy’s mother made a complaint to the organizers about the puppet representing the female cook. She alleged that both the exaggerated features – big lips, big breasts – and the aggressiveness of the character represented an offence to the black population living in Spain. She alleged that her son, whose father is Nigerian, had been disturbed by what he considered to be an offensive image of African people. In turn, the theatrical tour organizers asked the stage director and puppeteers about the connotations of this character. They agreed the female cook was an archetypal character whose features were exaggerated, but they argued that the rest of the characters were too because the show was intended as an allegory with farcical accents for children to laugh and to learn that greed is punished as a human defect. In this case, ethnic humour was not language-based but strictly scenic, so translators did not have to make a choice. However, one of the on-going questions related to ethics in translation theory and practice is what translators can do when facing such situations. Are they entitled to mitigate stereotypes on stage? Should they use paratexts to distance themselves? Can they block clichés through self-censorship or modify them through manipulation? Can they refuse to translate texts which perpetuate prejudices? These are issues for further investigation in children’s literature translation and this paper has tried to bring back into light the debate on either discarding ethnic humour as politically incorrect or accepting Davies’ evidence (cited in Popescu, 2011, p. 177) that “ethnic jokes are playful, not expressions of aggression and do not create or exacerbate tensions between peoples or groups, as their authors or animators do not believe the targets have the qualities ascribed to them in the jokes”.

This discussion has made me realise that humour is a two-ways communication artifact, and that communication may suffer from unexpected or overlooked aspects that escape

translational duties. Therefore, one avenue for future research might be the dangers of stereotyping in connection to translational choices when dealing with multimodal artistic communication.

References

- Albaladejo, T (1986). *Teoría de los mundos posibles y macroestructura narrativa* [Theory of possible worlds and narrative macrostructure]. Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alicante.
- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humour*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, S. (1997). The semantic foundations of cognitive theories of humor. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 10(4), 395-420.
- Attardo, S. (2001). *Humorous texts. A semantic and pragmatic analysis*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, S. (2002). Semiotics and pragmatics of humor communication. *BABEL: Aspectos de Filología Inglesa e Alemana*, Número Extraordinario 1, pp. 25-66.
- Attardo, S., & Raskin, V. (1991). Script theory revis(it)ed: joke similarity and joke representation model. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 4(3-4), 293-347.
- Bastin, G. L. (1993). La notion d'adaptation en traduction [The notion of adaptation in translation]. *Meta*, 38(3), 473-478. doi.org/10.7202/001987ar.
- Bastin, G. L. (2011). Adaptation. In M. Baker & K. Malmkjær (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. Second revised edition (pp. 3-5). Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation*. Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (Eds.) (1990). *Translation, history and culture*. Printer Publishers.
- Berry, J. W. (1992). Cultural transformation and psychological acculturation. In J. Burnet, D. Juteau, E. Padolsky, A. Rasporich & A. Sirois (Eds), *Migration and the transformation of cultures* (pp. 23-54). Multicultural History Society of Ontario.
- Cervera, J. (1991). *Teoría de la literatura infantil* [Theory of children's literature]. Universidad de Deusto.
- Chiaro, D. (2005). The wisecracking dame: An overview of the representation of verbally expressed humour produced by women on screen. *Mediazioni*, 1. Retrieved March 12, 2023 from https://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it/images/stories/PDF_folder/document-pdf/2005/articoli2005/3%20chiaro.pdf.
- Creangă, I. (1975 [1876]). Punguța cu doi bani [The purse with two coins]. In Creangă, I., *Povești. Amintiri. Povestiri* [Tales, memories, narrations] (pp. 32-38). Editura Ion Creangă. First published in *Convorbiri literare* 10, 1 January, 1876.
- Cornago Prieto, N. (2000). Diplomacia, paradiplomacia y redefinición de la seguridad mundial: dimensiones de conflicto y cooperación [Diplomacy, paradiplomacy and redefinition of global security: Dimensions of conflict and cooperation]. In F. Aldecoa. & M. Keating (Eds.), *Paradiplomacia: las relaciones internacionales de las regiones* [Paradiplomacy: International relations of regions] (pp. 55-77). Marcial Pons.
- Curcó, C. (1998). Indirect echoes and verbal humour. In V. Rouchota & A. H. Jucker (Eds.), *Current issues in relevance theory*. (pp. 305–325). John Benjamins.
- Davies, C. (1990). *Ethnic humour around the world: A comparative analysis*. Indiana University Press.
- Dimitriu, R. (2016). Translation as blockage, propagation and recreation of ethnic images. In L. van Doorslaer, P. Flynn & J. Leerssen (Eds.), *Interconnecting translation studies and imagology* (pp. 201-215). John Benjamins.
- Espasa, E. (2000). Performability in translation. In C.-A. Upton (Ed.), *Moving target. Theatre translation and cultural relocation* (pp. 48-58). Routledge.

- Flynn, P., Leerssen, J., & Doorslaer, L. van (Eds.) (2016). On translated images, stereotypes and disciplines. In L. van Doorslaer, P. Flynn & J. Leerssen (Eds.), *Interconnecting translation studies and imagology* (pp. 1-18). John Benjamins.
- Ford, C. E., & Fox, B. A. (2010). Multiple practices for constructing laughables. In D. Barth-Weingarten, E. Reber & M. Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in interaction* (pp. 339-368). John Benjamins.
- Freud, S. (1905, 1960). *Jokes and their relation to the unconscious*. Translated by Strachey, J. W. W. Norton & Company. Retrieved March 12, 2023 from <https://ia902907.us.archive.org/17/items/SigmundFreud/Sigmund%20Freud%20%5B1905%5D%20Jokes%20and%20their%20Relation%20to%20the%20Unconscious%20%28James%20Strachey%20translation%2C%201955%29.pdf>.
- Haugh, M. (2012). Teasing. In S. Attardo (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and humor* (pp. 204-218). Routledge.
- Kuznetsov, A. (2015). *Theory and practice of paradiplomacy. Subnational governments in international affairs*. Routledge.
- Landert, D. (2021). The spontaneous co-creation of comedy: Humour in improvised theatrical fiction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 173, 68-87.
- Leerssen, J. (2016). Imagology: On using ethnicity to make sense of the world. *Iberic@l, Revue d'études ibériques et ibéro-américaines*, 10, 13-31.
- Lippitt, J. (1994). Humour and incongruity. *Cogito*, 8(2), 147-153.
- Lipps, T. (1987 [1903]). *Estetica. Psihologia frumosului și a artei. Partea I: Bazele esteticii* [Esthetics. Psychology of beauty and art. Part one: The bases of aesthetics]. (G. Popa, Trans.), Vol. II. Meridiane. (Orig. edition: *Ästhetik. Psychologie des Schönen un der Kunst*. Verlag von Leopold Voss.)
- López Tamés, R. (1985). *Introducción a la literatura infantil* [Introduction to children's literature]. Universidad de Cantabria.
- Lungu-Badea, G. (2004). *Teoria cultuuremelor, teoria traducerii* [Theory of cultureemes, theory of translation]. Editura Universității de Vest.
- Marinetti, C. (2018). Theatre as a “translation zone”: Multilingualism, identity and the performing body in the work of Teatro delle Albe. *Translator*, 24(1), 1-19.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained (translation theories explored)*. Routledge.
- Pascua Febles, I. (1998). *La adaptación en la traducción de la literatura infantil* [Adaptation in Children's Literature Translation]. Servicio de Publicaciones de la UPLGC y Fundación Mapfre Guanarteme.
- Popescu, C. (2011). Understanding ethnic humour in Romanian jokes. In M. Dynel (Ed.), *The pragmatics of humour across discourse domains* (pp. 168-182). John Benjamins.
- Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic mechanisms of humour*. D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Raskin, V., Hempelmann, C. E., & Taylor, J. M. (2009). How to understand and assess a theory: The evolution of the SSTH into the GTVH and now into the OSTH. *Journal of Literary Theory* 3(2), 285-312. doi.org/10.1515/jlt.2009.016.
- Ritchie, G. (2006). Reinterpretation and viewpoints. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 19(3), 251-270.
- Robson, J. (2007). Lost in translation? The problem of (Aristophanic) humour. In L. Hardwick, & C. Stray (Eds.), *A Companion to classical receptions* (pp. 166-182). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rojas Tejada, A. J., Sayans-Jiménez, P., & Navas Luque, M. (2012). Similitud percibida y actitudes de aculturación en autóctonos e inmigrantes [Perceived similarity and acculturation attitudes in local and immigrant population]. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 5(1), 5-13.

- Rojo López, A. M. (2000). Una aproximación cognitiva a la traducción del lenguaje humorístico [A cognitive approach to translation of humorous language]. In M. P. Navarro Errasti et al. (Eds.), *Transcultural communication: Pragmalinguistic aspects* (pp. 99-110). Anubar.
- Ruiz Gurillo, L. (2012). *La lingüística del humor en español* [The linguistics of humour in Spanish]. Arco Libros.
- Santana López, B. (2011). De mariposas, telégrafos, caprichos y espejos: la traducción del humor [Of butterflies, telegraphs, whims and mirrors: humour translation]. In A. Freixa & J. G. López Guix (Eds.), *Actas del II Coloquio Internacional "Escrituras de la Traducción Hispánica"* [Proceedings of the Second International Symposium "Writings of Hispanic Translation"]. San Carlos de Bariloche, November 5-7, 2010 (pp. 59-77). Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Retrieved March 12, 2023 from <http://www.traduccionliteraria.org/coloquio2/actas/Santana.pdf>.
- Shipley, T. Y. (2007). Towards a humour translation checklist for students of translation. *Interlingüística*, 17, 981-988.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*, 2nd edition. Blackwell.
- Timofeeva Timofeev, L. (2021). El humor en contexto español [Humour in Spanish contexts]. In L. Timofeeva Timofev (Ed.), *Humour in Spanish context*. Special Issue. *Spanish in Context*, 18(1), 1-7. doi.org/10.1075/sic.18.1.
- Triezenberg, K. (2008). Humour in literature. In V. Raskin (Ed.), *The primer of humour research* (pp. 523-542). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tsakona, V. (2017). Genres of humor. In S. Attardo (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and humor* (pp. 489-503). Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (1995/2008). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Second edition. Routledge.
- Vernier, M. (2014). Humour in translingual writing. *The AALITRA Review: A Journal of Literary Translation*, 8, 33-40.
- Vertovec, S. (2009) *Transnationalism*. Routledge,
- Vrabie, G. (1975). *Structura poetică a basmului* [Poetic structure of tales]. Ed. Academiei.
- Woodcock, S. (2007). Romania and EUrope: Roma, Rroma and Țigani as sites for the contestation of ethno-national identities. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 41(5), 493-515.
- Yus, F. (2003). Humour and the search for relevance. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(9), 1295-1331. doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00179-0.
- Yus, F. (2016). *Humour and relevance*. John Benjamins.
- Yus, F. (2018). Positive non-humorous effects of humor on the internet. In V. Tsakona & J. Chovanec (Eds.), *The dynamics of Interactional humor. Creating and negotiating humor in everyday encounters* (pp. 283-303). John Benjamins. doi.org/10.1075/thr.7.
- Zabalbeascoa, P. (2005). Humor and translation: An interdiscipline. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 18(2), 185-207. doi.org/10.1515/humr.2005.18.2.185.
- Zanettin, F. (2010). Humour in translated cartoons and comics. In D. Chiaro (Ed.), *Translation, humour and the media*, Vol. 2 (pp. 34-52). Continuum.