

**THE TRANSLATION OF CULTURE-SPECIFIC VERBAL
HUMOUR IN THE TV-SERIES *FRIENDS***

**Master's thesis
Johanna Sippola**

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages
English
June 2010

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta - Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos - Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä - Author Johanna Sippola	
Työn nimi - Title THE TRANSLATION OF CULTURE-SPECIFIC VERBAL HUMOUR IN THE TV-SERIES <i>FRIENDS</i>	
Oppiaine - Subject Englanti	Työn laji - Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika - Month and year Kesäkuu 2010	Sivumäärä - Number of pages 128
<p>Tiivistelmä - Abstract</p> <p>Tässä Pro Gradu -työssä tarkastellaan kulttuurisidonnaisen verbaalihuumorin kääntämistä. Aineistona on Frenedit-televisiosarjan (engl. Friends) ilmauksia, joissa käytetään kulttuurisidonnaisia viittauksia huumorin luomisessa. Tutkimuksessa analysoidaan sekä englanninkielisten ilmausten että niiden suomenkielisten tekstitysten sisältämää kulttuurisidonnaista verbaalihuumorista. Tarkoituksena on selvittää, miten englanninkieliset kulttuurisidonnaiset verbaalihuumorista sisältävät ilmaukset on aineistossa onnistuttu kääntämään suomen kieleen ja kulttuuriin soveltuviksi siten, että ne säilyttävät tarkoituksensa (skopoksensa), eli huumorin.</p> <p>Tutkimuksen teoriaosa pohjaa kommunikatiivisiin käännösteorioihin kuuluvaan skoposteoriaan sekä ruutukääntämiseen (screen translation). Päämetodeina käytetään skoposteoriaan pohjaavia analyysikeinoja sekä Chiaron (2006) ja Lorenzo et al.:n (2003) tutkimuksissaan soveltamia tapoja analysoida verbaalihuumorin kääntämistä ja käännöksiä.</p> <p>Tutkimuksessa vertaillaan, miten eri käännöskeinot onnistuvat yhtäältä siirtämään lähtötekstin kulttuurisidonnaiset viittaukset tulotekstiin sekä toisaalta välittämään ne siten, että ne luovat huumoria myös tulotekstiin. Huomiota kiinnitetään lisäksi siihen, miten kulttuurisidonnaiset viittaukset korvataan tulotekstissä niissä tapauksissa, joissa ne eivät toimi käännöksessä ilman kotouttamista.</p> <p>Analyysistä selviää, että tietyt keinot onnistuvat toisia paremmin siirtämään lähtötekstin kulttuurisidonnaiset viittaukset tulotekstiin siten, että tuloteksti täyttää tarkoituksensa. Lisäksi tietyt keinot soveltuvat toisia paremmin kääntämään sellaisia ilmauksia, jotka tarvitsevat kotouttamista. Näin ollen käännöskeinon valinnalla on merkitystä käännöksen onnistumisessa, eli tässä tapauksessa huumorin luomisessa.</p>	
Asiasanat - Keywords verbal humour, verbally expressed humour, non-specific verbally expressed humour, culture-specific, communicative translation theories, skopos theory, screen translation	
Säilytyspaikka - Depository Kielten laitos	
Muita tietoja - Additional information	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	4
2 SITUATION COMEDY AND <i>FRIENDS</i> AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE GENRE	7
3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	10
3.1 Verbal humour	10
3.1.1 Culture-specific verbal humour	18
3.2 Communicative approach to translation	19
3.2.1 Skopos theory	22
3.2.2 Translating culture	26
3.3 Verbal humour and screen translation	29
4 SET-UP OF THE PRESENT STUDY	36
4.1 Aims and research questions	36
4.2 Analytic methodology	37
4.3 Lorenzo et al.'s methods in translating on-screen verbal humour	43
4.4 Data description	47
5 ANALYSIS	49
5.1 Translation of culture-specific verbal humour in semiotic and pragmatic dimensions of the data	49
5.1.1 Cultural replacement	50
5.1.2 Explanatory addition	65
5.1.3 No translation	74
5.1.4 Universal translation	79
5.1.5 Word-for-word translation	94
5.1.6 Explanatory translation	102
6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	118
BIBLIOGRAPHY	126

1 INTRODUCTION

In this study, the aim is to analyse the ways in which humour, particularly verbal humour that is related to culture-specific issues, is translated in the TV series *Friends*. Accordingly, the present study focuses on the type of screen translation strategies used in translating culture-specific verbal humour from English to Finnish and to what extent culture-specific verbal humour is in fact translatable. In addition, the different pragmatic and culture-related translation problems that occur in translating verbal humour are taken into consideration. That is, the present study concentrates on the ways in which culture-specific verbal humour is translated. Since the material is audiovisual, the special features of screen translation in the field of translation studies are also taken into account.

The TV series *Friends* has been selected as the data for the present study, because it provides suitable material in terms of analysing the ways in which culture-specific verbal humour is translated. The material consists of 24 translated episodes of *Friends* from the years 1994 and 1995. The method in analysing the data is mainly qualitative, that is, the material is examined from a qualitative perspective, although some quantitative analysis is also included. *Friends* is an American TV series which can be categorised as a sitcom, a situational comedy. Dealing with the friendship and every-day life of its six main characters, the series uses a great deal of cultural references and allusions to American popular culture. Owing to the large amount of culture-specific references in the data, it is interesting to examine how these references are translated into Finnish in a way that the target audience is able to understand the humour related to them. Accordingly, it seems that a large portion of the humour in *Friends* stems from “saying things funny” rather than from “saying funny things” (Morreal 1983, as cited in Alexander 1997: 11, see, eg. section 3.1 for a more detailed discussion). That is, the focus in analysing the series is placed on the instances of culture-specific verbal

humour in which the humour is context-bound (saying things funny), rather than context-free (saying funny things).

This topic is worth looking into, because it is interesting to examine the ways in which different culture-specific references are translated into another language and culture, particularly in terms of screen translation which is fairly a new direction in the field of translation studies. Many of the studies carried out on screen translation have focused on the translation of wordplay, for instance, but not so much on the translation of the type of culture-specific expressions the humour of which comes from the context, rather than from the expression itself. In consequence, by analysing different methods to translate culture-specific verbal humour, this type of a study could make a practical contribution related to translation tasks. It is also worthwhile to test some of the methods currently used in the study of screen translation to determine whether they work in translating culture-specific verbal humour.

The theoretical framework of the present study draws on the study of verbal humour (see, eg. Alexander 1997; Chiaro 2006), screen translation (see, eg. Gambier 2003; Lorenzo et al. 2003), and communicative translation theories, skopos theory in particular (see, eg. Chesterman & Wagner 2002; Reiss & Vermeer 1986; Vehmas-Lehto 1999). The emphasis is placed on the translation of culture-specific verbal humour, as it seems that the study of humour, and the study of translating humour in particular from the linguistic point of view has often concentrated on the purely linguistic features of humour (such as puns and wordplays), rather than on the type of humorous instances in which the humour lies in the meaning instead of the forms of the expressions.

In addition to the distinction between “saying funny things” versus “saying things funny” suggested by Morreal and Alexander (Morreal 1983, as cited in

Alexander 1997: 11, see eg. section 3.1 for a more detailed discussion), Chiaro's (2006: 202) definition of Verbally Expressed Humour (VEH) as distinct from Non-Specific Verbally Expressed Humour (NSpVEH) (discussed in more detail in section 3.1) is used in the present study. The instances of culture-specific verbal humour of the data are analysed according to dimensions suggested by Lorenzo et al., that is, semiotic and pragmatic dimensions (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 269, 271). Moreover, the material is categorised according to different translation strategies used in translating the instances of culture-specific verbal humour in the data (see, eg. section 4.2 for a more detailed discussion on translation strategies). The success of the chosen strategies is also evaluated.

In this study, taking *Friends* into consideration as a representative of the genre, the special features of situation comedy are addressed in chapter 2. Next, the theoretical framework of the study is presented in chapter 3, including, for instance, verbal humour, communicative approach to translation, and screen translation. Chapter 4 then focuses on the set-up of the present study, that is, aims and research questions, methodology and methods, as well as data description. In chapter 5, concentrating on the translation of culture-specific verbal humour in semiotic and pragmatic dimensions of the data, the material is analysed. Lastly, chapter 6 summarises the findings and draws conclusions on the present study.

2 SITUATION COMEDY AND *FRIENDS* AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE GENRE

The TV series *Friends* aired from 1994-2004 (<http://www.tv.com/shows/n.d.>). The show is a situational comedy about six friends between their twenties and thirties in New York living their lives and trying to grow up together. Monica is a chef who is portrayed as a neat freak always taking care of everyone else. Monica's brother Ross is a palaeontologist with a low self esteem. Ross has secretly been in love with Rachel, Monica's pampered and spoiled childhood friend, for years. At the beginning of the series, having just left her fiancé at the altar, Rachel moves in with Monica. Chandler who is constantly trying to be funny and went to college with Ross is now living with Joey, an aspiring actor, who is portrayed as somewhat intellectually challenged but good-hearted. Phoebe is an eccentric character who seems to follow a different type of logic in her behaviour than most people (<http://www.tv.com/friends/n.d.>).

Being a thirty-minute situational comedy, *Friends* is quite a typical representative of the genre. Berger (1992: 3) argues that situation comedy (along with many others, such as news shows and soap operas) is one of the most important television genres. Neale and Krutnik (1990: 233) define situation comedy, or sitcom, in brief as "a short narrative-series comedy, generally between twenty-four and thirty minutes long, with regular characters and setting". In addition, according to Feuer (1992: 146), the salient features of sitcoms are easily identifiable. These features include, for instance, the half-hour format and the storyline that poses a funny situation to be resolved by the end of each episode (Feuer 1992: 146.). Consequently, - with its half-hour format and the storyline usually resolved by the end of each episode - *Friends* follows the typical structure of a sitcom.

Furthermore, Neale and Krutnik (1990: 234) characterise the narrative structure of sitcoms by claiming that individual sitcom episodes tend to be based on a pattern that follows “a ‘classical’ narrative structuring in that the narrative process is inaugurated by some disruption of or threat to a stable situation, necessitating the movement towards the reassertion of stability”. According to Neale and Krutnik (1990: 235), the narrative structure of sitcoms is based on “circularity”, which basically means that a sitcom episode typically ends with a return to the initial situation. Therefore, in order to maintain the basic parameters of a sitcom, continuity and “forgetting” alternate in the storylines (Neale and Krutnik 1990: 235.). Neale and Krutnik (1990: 235) argue, however, that often in long-running TV shows (such as *Friends*) the basic structure of the episodes may deviate from this circular structure. In consequence, *Friends’* storyline has changed during the years it has been broadcast from this type of an episodic structure towards the structure of a continuing serial (see definitions below).

Consequently, Feuer (1992: 151) claims that the structure of the sitcom has undergone the type of changes in which the formerly episodic series has moved toward a continuing serial. *Friends*, which was aired on TV for ten years, also followed this development. Accordingly, as the characters grew during the series it was natural that the series shifted toward a continuing serial form. Also Feuer (1992: 154) acknowledges this, as she is of the opinion that “the idea of character development inevitably moves a genre based on the episodic series model toward the continuing serial form”.

According to Hartley (2001: 66-67), the genre of situation comedy has evolved from two main types: “the drama of family compartment” on the one hand and “the drama of sexual exploration” on the other. That is, family sitcoms that present internal family roles in the form of blood family, melded family, or metaphorical family, and workplace sitcoms that happen at the workplace (Hartley 2001: 66-67.). Hartley (2001: 67) argues that some sitcoms

are, in fact, hybrids, which connect the family (“living together, couch-centric”) and workplace related (“sexual exploration, flirt-centric”) characteristics of sitcoms. *Friends* is viewed as a classical example of this type of a hybrid (Hartley 2001: 67.).

Moreover, Feuer (1992: 143) argues that from the 1970s onward the basic setting of a TV sitcom has changed from depicting a nuclear family into focusing on “families of unrelated adults”. According to her (1992: 143), changes in the surrounding cultural environment have caused this shift. Also Neale and Krutnik (1990: 241) talk about so called “surrogate family” shows, in which – in a similar manner to the domestic sitcom – “the regular setting and regular characters are bonded together into a repeatable unity, with the structure of the sit-com representing an activity of ‘communalization’, reaffirming the stability of the group and the situation”. *Friends* could be considered as this type of a “surrogate family” show, as the regular characters form a tight group together. Feuer (2001: 69) also argues that series like *Friends* often rely on “a quasi-familial structure in order to satisfy the needs of the viewer”. This type of a structure in which the viewer can identify with the characters represented as a sort of a family is probably among the factors making *Friends* so popular.

3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Verbal humour

According to Attardo (1994: 3), both the definition of humour as well as the division of humour into different subcategories (eg. “humor” vs “comic” vs “ridiculous”) have been under a lot of discussion in humour research. Attardo (1994: 3) claims that it has been suggested that humour is, in fact, undefinable. He (1994: 9) is also of the opinion that if humour is taken as a broad concept – encompassing all the suggested subcategories, or subdivisions – it can be defined as “whatever a social group defines as such”. Furthermore, Kinnunen (1994: 10, 249) argues that as the phenomenon of comedy (including the concept of humour) is so widespread and has so many different forms, it can be quite laborious to study it.

In spite of the fact that it appears to be difficult or laborious to define humour, the study of humour – the emphasis of the present study being in verbal humour – often tries to analyse the structure of different humorous instances and classify humour into different categories (see, for instance, Alexander 1997 and Raskin 1985). With regard to this study, the question of whether humour is definable or not is not given much emphasis, however. This results from the fact that to carry out the present study involves having to define the concept of humour in the context of this particular study. As this study deals with the *translation* of culture-specific verbal humour – and not, for instance, the structure of jokes or humorous instances in general – the different attempts to define and categorise humour, such as the semantic script theory of humour (SSTH) and the general theory of verbal humour (GTVH) (see, eg. Attardo 1994) are not discussed in much detail here either.

Having said that, nevertheless, in order to define humour in the context of this study, one has to take into consideration different approaches to the

definition of humour. In terms of the present study, the idea of humour being something defined by a particular social group seems to be valid (see eg. Attardo 1994: 9). When thinking about *Friends* and the instances of culture-specific verbal humour that occur in the series on the one hand in English and on the other hand in Finnish, the definition of humour from a perspective focused on culture can be claimed to apply well too. The definition of humour used in this study relates to these issues and is taken from Lorenzo et al. (2003: 272). It will be given closer attention in section 3.1.1.

In order to analyse the humorous instances of the data of the present study, the grounds on which the analysed material has been chosen have to be clarified (this will be discussed in more detail in section 4.4). Firstly, as this study focuses on verbal humour, the distinction between verbal and non-verbal humour has to be made. The concept of verbal humour is, therefore, differentiated from the concept of non-verbal humour (see, eg. Raskin 1985: 46; Alexander 1997: 13.). Raskin (1985: 46) encapsulates the difference between these two types of humour by arguing that while verbal humour involves a humorous situation which is created, described, and expressed by a text, the effect of non-verbal humour lies in text extrinsic features (such as in physical comedy). Verbal humour, however, is not limited to different forms of language play, but involves other features of language use as well (see, eg. Alexander 1997: 9-13).

Secondly, Alexander (1997: 5) argues that the grammar of a language is a prerequisite of verbal humour. Consequently, it is evident that instances of verbal humour can be examined, to some extent, through grammatical analysis. This can be inferred from Raskin's (1985: 46) above mentioned definition as well. Furthermore, Nash (1985: 124) argues that "jesting language is frequently 'layered'", that is, its effects are connected to sounds, vocabulary, grammar, and syntax. He (1985: 127) also suggests that

humorous expressions may appear funny “because of their contextual linkages and semantic relationships”, which seems rather a logical conclusion and certainly applies to the data of the present study. In addition, according to Alexander (1997: 18), it is possible to achieve humorous effects by using “specific language ‘devices’”. Thus, it can be argued that these types of “devices” – or, in other words, grammatical features that contribute to the humorous effect of a text – are among the features that make a given instance of verbal humour funny.

Nevertheless, as already stated above, the definition of verbal humour is considered difficult, which is also acknowledged by Alexander (1997: 9). Thus, in defining and categorising the features of verbal humour, he (1997: 9) states that “the phenomenon ... may appear to defy rigid pigeon-holing”. It can, however, be ascertained that verbal humour, by definition, involves language use, but it is not limited to different forms of language play.

Having said that, it is, however, clear that all humorous instances, which include language use are not examples of verbal humour (Alexander 1997: 13). Alexander (1997: 13) exemplifies this by saying that when humour lies in features extrinsic to language, for instance, when a joke is based on logic and is therefore non-linguistic, it is not an instance of verbal humour. The definition of verbal humour can, therefore, be clarified by saying that “in sociosemiotic and functional terms, we are talking about that portion of language behaviour engaged in either specifically with the play or ‘poetic’ function highlighted or with another function primary, but with the play or ‘oblique function’ still fairly prominent for the participants in the discourse (Alexander 1997: 13-14)”. In simplified words, in verbal humour the humour lies either in linguistic play on words or in the specific linguistic content of a given text.

Alexander (1997: 16) also differentiates between verbal and non-verbal humour by claiming that a distinction can be made between jokes that employ linguistic means in producing humour and between jokes that do not (that is, verbal jokes versus non-verbal, for instance, visual jokes, which was already suggested above by Raskin 1985: 46). Furthermore, Alexander (1997: 16) ponders about how to define the distinction between the two types of jokes that are expressed verbally, but differ in the sense that one is dependent on language in creating humour and the other is merely transported by language and relies on logic in creating humour. Accordingly, there are jokes that are examples of verbal humour, although their resolution comes from non-linguistic factors (Alexander 1997: 59). These types of jokes or humorous instances which depend on non-linguistic factors in producing humour (though expressed verbally) form the core of the data of the present study.

Consequently, Alexander (1997: 59) points out that there are a number of factors in verbal humour that go beyond the linguistic level of analysis. He quotes Johnson (1978: 310-311) who speaks of a joking frame which consists of six variables: "1) the object of the joke, 2) the joker, 3) the audience, 4) the context, 5) shared knowledge, and 6) the joke". According to Johnson (1978: 311), the interplay of these variables makes up a joke (Johnson 1978: 310-311, as cited in Alexander 1997: 59.). Therefore, it could be claimed that this interplay between different variables that jokes consist of is a vital factor in interpreting humour in general and jokes in particular. This clearly indicates that in analysing verbal humour, one has to take into account also other factors besides the linguistic components of a given humorous instance. Thus, Alexander (1997: 60) points out that different types of cultural presuppositions are needed in understanding many sentences. He (1997: 60) also states that "pragmatic presuppositions and the corresponding intertextual context[s]" are vital in understanding jokes (Alexander 1997: 60.).

In other words, to understand jokes, one needs to be familiar with the cultural context to which a particular joke refers.

Consequently, as it is evident that verbal humour can, to a certain extent, be analysed through grammatical factors, it is just as evident that in order to examine verbal humour, other features besides grammar that are related to the linguistic content of a given text are to be taken into account. Particularly with regard to this study, different pragmatic and culture-related issues (see the definition of culture used in the present study in section 3.1.1) are given more emphasis than grammatical analysis (which is also, however, taken into consideration). In other words, the focus is placed on the culture-related issues that produce humour but are not necessarily dependent on grammar. In addition, although verbal humour is tied to language, Kinnunen (1994: 10) argues that the non-verbal elements that a given speaker possesses – that is, for instance, speakers' gestures and appearance – also have an impact on comedy (which he uses as an umbrella concept that includes the concept of humour), particularly, if expressed in speech. However, as this study focuses on the pragmatic and culture-related expressions and their translations, this non-verbal side of the humorous instances – although important with regard to the overall humorous effect created by a given instance – is not given much emphasis.

After differentiating between verbal and non-verbal humour, the phenomenon of verbal humour can be divided into different categories. Alexander (1997: 9), for instance, categorises verbal humour according to what he calls fundamental types of humour. He (1997: 9-10) distinguishes six criteria according to which verbal humour can be examined. These include 1) the intentionality of humour, which may overlap with the criterion 2), according to which humour can be defined in terms of whether it is conscious or unconscious. The criterion 3) deals with the nature of the humorous intention: whether the intention is malevolent ("the desire to hurt

via humour”) or benevolent, which Alexander divides between criteria 4) and 5). Thus, the criterion 4) includes the purpose or aim to amuse people, and the criterion 5) deals with the general light-heartedness of the humorous situation’s intention. The sixth and final criterion in Alexander’s preliminary typology of verbal humour is wit, or being witty or whether the verbal humour involves wit or not. Naturally, these criteria often overlap with one another, since, for instance, a humorous event may do both, aim to amuse and involve wit etc. (Alexander 1997: 9-10.).

Furthermore, Alexander (1997: 9) suggests that these six preliminary criteria can be combined with 16 types of humour which often appear in analyses of verbal humour. Although some of these types of humour may correspond to text types and others concentrate on linguistic features or extra-linguistic intentions, they do aid in the process of categorising instances of verbal humour (Alexander 1997: 9.). Consequently, the 16 types of humour, including 1) joke, 2) gag (“a joke or humorous story, especially one told by a professional comedian; a hoax, practical joke”), 3) epigram (“a witty, often paradoxical remark, concisely expressed; a short, pungent, and often satirical poem, especially one having a witty and ingenious ending”), 4) crack (“a malevolent remark”), 5) pun, 6) spoonerism (“the transposition of the initial consonants or consonant clusters of a pair of words, often resulting in an amusing ambiguity of meaning”), 7) howler (“flower of speech, stylistic blunder”), 8) misprint, 9) irony, 10) satire, 11) lampoon (“a satire in prose or verse ridiculing a person, literary work, etc.”), 12) caricature, 13) parody, 14) impersonation, 15) sarcasm, and 16) sardonic (“humour characterised by irony, mockery, or derision”) can be combined with the six criteria introduced by Alexander (Alexander 1997: 9-10). This can be done by figuring out whether a given type of humour fulfils some of these criteria (the definitions of the types of humour are taken from <http://mot.kielikone.fi/mot/jyu/netmot.exe> n.d.). These 16 types of

humour can be divided further into groups, according to the six types of humour discussed earlier in this text (Alexander 1997: 9-10.).

Consequently, Alexander (1997: 10-11) groups joke, gag, epigram, and crack (with pun as a borderline case, since puns can be unintentional as well) as intentional and witty. Furthermore, he (1997: 10-11) argues that spoonerisms, howlers, and misprints are unintentional (on the part of the person who uses them), but they may be witty unknowingly. The last group contains irony, satire, lampoon, caricature, parody, impersonation, sarcasm, and sardonic, as they are used "to ridicule and make fun of people" (Alexander 1997: 10-11.).

This categorisation is by no means exhaustive, however. Alexander (1997: 11) points out that the distinction between joke (as a type of humour) and wit (as a criterion for defining types of humour) could be treated in a slightly different manner. In distinguishing different types of verbal humour, Alexander (1997: 11) uses Long and Straesser's (1988) definition, according to which a joke is context-free, whereas wit is context-bound (Long and Straesser 1988, as cited in Alexander 1997: 11). Accordingly, the humorous effect created by a joke is independent of the context in which it is used, whereas humour which relies in wit is tied to the specific context in which it is uttered.

Alexander (1997: 11) clarifies this distinction by citing Morreall (1983), who distinguishes between "*saying things funny vs saying funny things*" (Morreall 1983, as cited in Alexander 1997: 11). Alexander (1997: 11) suggests that these definitions could be combined as follows: a) "saying things funny - being witty is context-bound" and b) "saying funny things - a joke is context-free" (Alexander 1997: 11.). As the material used in the present study consists mainly of the type of verbal humour in which the humorous effect is context-bound, this distinction between context-bound and context-free verbal humour is vital and more useful than the classification of humour into 16

different types with regard to the present study. Alexander (1997: 59) refers to this type of verbal humour also as “humorous verbal behaviour”.

A similar type of distinction between Morreall and Alexander’s “saying things funny” versus “saying funny things” is made by Chiaro (2006: 202). Firstly, she (2006: 202) distinguishes what Alexander (1997: 13-14) refers to as verbal humour between Verbally Expressed Humour (VEH) and non-specific Verbally Expressed Humour (NSpVEH). These categories can be viewed as similar to Morreall and Alexander’s distinction (1997: 11) between “saying things funny – being witty is context-bound” versus “saying funny things – a joke is context-free”. Accordingly, whereas Alexander (1997: 11) exemplifies “saying things funny” by witty remarks and “saying funny things” by jokes, Chiaro (2006: 202) talks about puns as a typical representative of VEH (ie. Alexander’s “saying funny things”) and good lines as representative of NSpVEH (ie. Alexander’s “saying things funny”). Although this distinction is made to appear clear-cut, these categories are not always mutually exclusive. That is, they may sometimes overlap in that, for instance, a good line may include a pun, or a pun can be related to a particular situation etc. Nevertheless, in the present study, the material seems quite clearly to fall into the category of “saying things funny”, or non-specific Verbally Expressed Humour (NSpVEH), rather than into “saying funny things”, or Verbally Expressed Humour.

Accordingly, Chiaro (2006: 202) defines good lines as “sharp and clever remarks which are hard to define in terms of VEH. In other words, while a pun is dependant upon linguistic ambiguity, cultural ambiguity, or a mixture of both, a good line is not (Chiaro 2006: 202.)”. Both Alexander (1997) and Chiaro (2006) seem to be talking about the same phenomenon and, thus, these definitions will be used alongside in the present study. As the data of the present study largely consists of what Chiaro (2006: 202) calls good lines and what Alexander (1997: 11) calls being witty, the focus is placed on the

type of verbal humour, which is created by instances of NSpVEH and “saying things funny”.

3.1.1 Culture-specific verbal humour

As already stated above, this study focuses on the translation of *culture-bound* or *culture-specific* features of verbal humour. The concept of culture is defined here according to Lorenzo et al. (2003: 272), who, in turn, follow Agost’s (1999: 99) definition. Accordingly, in this study, culture means

all those elements that make one society different from another: specific geographical locations, references to the history, art and culture of a particular society or age (songs, literature, aesthetic concepts, etc.), well-known people and celebrities, mythology, gastronomy, institutions, currency, weights and measures, etc. (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 272.).

This definition of culture used by Lorenzo et al. (2003: 272) suits the purposes of this study, because the culture-specific references in the data tend to stem from the elements they list above. Thus, on many occasions, the humour in the data of this study is caused by references to, for instance, different features of American popular culture that are understandable only to those viewers who are familiar with it.

Furthermore, Alexander (1997: 118) suggests that the appreciation of verbal humour is tied to sociocultural knowledge. He (1997: 118) cites Leeson (1980) by arguing that so called ‘shared upbringing’ of a society or a culture impacts on people’s sense of humour, which he views as culture-bound (Leeson 1980, as cited in Alexander 1997: 118.). Furthermore, as suggested above, Alexander (1997: 59-60) sees context as an important factor in analysing jokes and other humorous instances. In terms of the importance of context, he (1997: 62) cites Mitchell (1978: 226): “[...] punning, irony, parody, and much else in language, reference must be made, in order to explain it, to context” (Mitchell 1978, as cited in Alexander 1997: 62.). Alexander’s view on the importance of context in understanding verbal humour becomes clear, when

analysing the data of this study; if the viewer does not understand the context of a given culture-specific instance of verbal humour, the humour of the scene is likely to be lost.

3.2 Communicative approach to translation

As this study focuses on the *translation* of culture-specific verbal humour – and not merely on the analysis of verbal humour – the perspective taken on translation has to be clarified. Therefore, the approach to translation used in this study is communicative, which entails the view that translation is a form of communication. Communicative translation theories focus also on language external issues, for instance, on culture-specific issues, which are the focus of this study, and not only on linguistic issues, like earlier translation theories (see, for instance, Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 56, 58, 90-91, 113-114.). As different communicative translation theories place stress on pragmatic and culture-related translation problems, it is evident that this study utilises these particular theories, particularly skopos theory (discussed later on in section 3.2.1).

The notion of equivalence has long been one of the central concepts in the study of translation (Reiss & Vermeer 1986: 70). According to Chesterman (1989: 99), the modern discussion on equivalence has greatly been influenced by Eugene A. Nida's emphasis on dynamic equivalence. Koller (1989: 100) defines the concept of equivalence by arguing that it "postulates a relation between SL [source language] text and TL [target language] text". However, according to Koller (1989: 100), the type of relation between the two texts is not self-evident, but has to be "additionally defined". Accordingly, Chesterman (1989: 99) argues that the types of equivalences are numerous: while one type of equivalence applies to one type of text, other type applies to another. Moreover, Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 70) point out that the definition of equivalence is not clear-cut in translation theories. They (1986:

76) clarify the concept by claiming that the relationship between the source text (ST) and the target text (TT) can be described as equivalent, if the texts fulfil (or can fulfil) a similar type of communicative function in both the source and target cultures.

According to Chesterman (1989: 80), Nida's view that stresses dynamic equivalence aims at "a translation which is natural TL as well as close to the ST, and which has (as far as possible) the same effect on the TL receivers as the source text has on the SL receivers". Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 56) clarifies the concept of TL receivers by claiming that according to Nida's theory, if the recipients of the ST and TT react in an essentially similar manner to a given text, the translation can be said to be equivalent to the ST. However, both Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 58) and Chesterman (1989: 80) state that these recipient reactions are difficult to measure, which makes it hard to evaluate translations purely on the basis of these reactions.

Furthermore, Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 56) argues that as the notion of dynamic equivalence goes beyond the semantic equivalence between the ST and TT and therefore allows translators to deviate not only from the ST's linguistic form but also from its meaning, this type of equivalence brings the TT closer to its recipients' culture. This is argued to be the most significant factor in dynamic equivalence theory (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 56.). Consequently, as Nida's theory pays attention to the role of the target culture and text external factors in translating (see, eg. Chesterman 1989: 80), it is also vital with regard to this study.

In a similar manner to Nida's dynamic equivalence theory, functional equivalence theories approach translation as communication (see, eg. Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 70). The main difference between these two communicative approaches is their view on how to evaluate the equivalence between ST and TT. In consequence, functional equivalence theories focus on

the function of the ST and TT, rather than on the recipient reactions that are important in dynamic equivalence (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 70.). This emphasis on the function of a translated text is relevant also with regard to the data of this study: one point of view from which the material is approached is related to the function of the analysed texts or, in other words, the data is examined, among other things, from the perspective of whether it fulfils the function of amusing it is supposed to be carrying out.

The concept of function is sometimes used in different ways (see, eg. Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 70). Thus, for instance, it can be used to refer to the function of a whole text, in which case it usually means the text's purpose of use or other translation related language external factors, such as to the situational context in which a text is used. In addition, the concept of function can be used to refer to the function of a word, an expression, or a sentence (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 70.). When the term function is used in this study, it refers to a text's function as a whole, because the material as a whole is viewed as having the primary function of amusing.

According to Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 70), in functional equivalence theories, ST and TT are considered functionally equivalent, if their functions are similar or close to one another. Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 70) also argues that in a situation in which the function of the SL expression cannot be communicated in the TL by a denotative translation (for example, a saying or an euphemism) a translator can, for instance, use a so called functional equivalent (that is, a TL expression that fulfils the same function as the SL expression, but not literally, see, for instance, Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 70) in order to communicate the same function in the TL. These types of functional equivalents and other translation strategies are discussed in more detail in, for instance, section 4.2 in this study.

Although the concept of equivalence has had a considerable effect on modern translation theory (see, eg. Reiss & Vermeer 1986: 70), it does not seem to apply that well to the translation of humour. Gambier (2003: 183), for instance, is of the opinion that the concept of equivalence (among other concepts used in translation theories, see section 3.3 for a more detailed discussion) should be questioned, because currently there are a wider range of texts to be translated that require different methods (for a detailed discussion on screen translation, see section 3.3). Moreover, Chiaro (2006: 198-199) argues that in translating humour, the concept of *skopos* (meaning “the function of a translation” and discussed in more detail below) is sometimes more useful than the concept of equivalence. This is also addressed by Bell (1991: 6) who argues that “the ideal of total equivalence is a chimera”. He (1991: 6) clarifies this by saying that “[t]o shift from one language to another is, by definition, to alter the forms. Further, the contrasting forms convey meanings which cannot but fail to coincide totally ... Something is always ‘lost’ (or, might one suggest, ‘gained’) in the process [of translation]...” (Bell 1991: 6.).

3.2.1 Skopos theory

The *skopos* theory developed by Reiss and Vermeer (see, eg. Reiss and Vermeer 1986), appears to apply to the translation of humour quite well. This is due to the fact that the theory emphasises the translation of the function (ie. *skopos*, see more detailed definition below) of a given text, instead of, for instance, a strict equivalence between the ST and the TT. Considering the data of this thesis and the analysis of the ST and TT’s instances of culture-specific verbal humour, the function of the ST expressions clearly needs to be emphasised in the translation process. This results from the fact that often the ST expressions need to be domesticated in the TT some way or another in order for them to be understandable to the target audience. In these types of instances, a strict equivalence between the ST and the TT would almost

certainly mean that the translation would not work as well as it could. The focus on the function of a given text in translation allows adjusting the ST into the target culture.

Skopos theory has been influenced by the other communicative translation theories discussed above (see, eg. Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 90-91). However, according to Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 91-92), skopos theory emphasises the concept of adequacy, which is slightly different from the notion of equivalence. Thus, adequacy refers to a translation's relationship to its recipients and the TL. In other words, the main focus is on the question of whether a translation works in the TL community or not, since after a translation has been completed, it belongs only to the TL community (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 91-92.).

When Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 76-77) define the term adequacy, they refer to the skopos, that is the function, of a given translation. Thus, when equivalence is used to refer to the similarity between the communicative function of the ST and TT, the concept of adequacy, for its part, emphasises the function of the translation process. That is, a translation is adequate, if the TT fulfils the specific function it is defined to be carrying out in the TL community. Thus, the concept of adequacy places stress on the skopos, or function, of the translation, rather than the equivalence between the ST and the TT (Reiss and Vermeer 1986: 76-77.).

Accordingly, Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 55) argue that the function, or - in other words - skopos, is an integral part of translating. Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 55) as well as Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 92) define the word skopos, which stems from Greek, as a synonym of the word function; in translation theory, however, it refers particularly to the function of translating or of a translation. Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 55) clarify this by saying that skopos means an aim or a goal. Moreover, they (1986: 58) claim that the skopos of a

translation is the most important factor in translating. That is, the *skopos* determines the means with which a given text is translated (Reiss and Vermeer 1986: 58.). In terms of this study, the notion of *skopos* is very important when analysing the translations of culture-bound expressions. As pointed out by Reiss and Vermeer above (1986: 58.), the means with which the culture-specific ST expressions are translated into the TT are determined by the *skopos* that the TT is defined to convey. As a result, the success of the translations can be analysed in terms of whether they fulfil the *skopos* or not. Also Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 92-93) argues that the *skopos* of a translation determines how a given translation is carried out. Accordingly, contrary to theories that emphasise equivalence, *skopos* theory does not require equivalence, although equivalence can be a *skopos*. The notion of adequacy is, thus, more important than the notion of equivalence (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 92-93.). The *skopos* of a TT can differ from the *skopos* of the ST, but it can be similar in both as well (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 94; Reiss and Vermeer 1986: 59).

Deciding the *skopos* of a translation depends on several factors, such as the purpose of the TT in relation to the ST. In terms of the present study, the *skopos* of the TT has been defined as similar to that of the ST. This results from the fact that both of the two texts are intended to be mainstream TV sitcoms that aim to amuse their audiences. It can thus be assumed that the translator has also wanted to preserve the humour of the ST in the TT when translating the series.

In consequence, if the *skopos* of a given translation is to preserve the humour of the ST, and not, for instance, to preserve a strict equivalence between the ST and the TT, the translator can deviate from the denotative meaning of the ST in the translation process. This is also done in the data of the present study. To preserve the humour of the ST in the TT means, in the context of this study, that the humour of the ST is transferred into the TT. The translated humorous instance in the TT does not have to stem from the

same source as it does in the ST, however. That is, the humour can be preserved, although the humorous instance would have been adjusted to the target culture. Therefore, the concept of *skopos* is vital in regard to the present study. As already stated above, the *skopos* of the material of the present study appears to be similar in both the ST and TT: to amuse the target audience. Thus, the material is analysed, among other things, in terms of whether it fulfils its *skopos* or not and to what extent the translation fulfils its *skopos* of amusing.

Furthermore, the notion of text types is closely connected to *skopos* theory (see, eg. Chesterman 1989: 105; Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 71-72, and Reiss 1989: 108). According to Chesterman (1989: 105), Reiss classifies text types relying on Bühler's functions of the linguistic sign. Moreover, Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 71) and Reiss (1989: 108) talk about Bühler's view (Bühler 1965: 28-33), according to which language or linguistic sign has three basic functions: 1) informative, that is, the main function of the text is to convey information, 2) expressive, that is, the main function of the text is to express, for instance, feelings, and 3) vocative, that is, the main function of the text is to appeal to the reader to react in a way suggested by the text. Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 87) and Reiss (1989: 111) also talk about an audio-medial text type, which has to do with the fact that linguistic signs can be used in interaction with other sign systems, such as in subtitled films. All the three text types can be realised in this audio-medial text type (Reiss 1989: 111; Reiss & Vermeer 1986: 87.). The audio-medial type also takes into consideration the different features of screen translation (discussed in more detail in section 3.3).

According to Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 72), Reiss (eg. 1976: 18), however, approaches Bühler's classification of language functions as text functions and categorises translated texts into text types according to their function (Reiss 1976 as cited in Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 72). In addition, Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 72-73) argues that texts can have several functions, but it can be argued that

these functions can be prioritised and, thus, a given text can be said to have a primary function, or a functional dominant which determines how a given text is translated.

Consequently, Reiss (1989: 108-109) argues that the text types, which display the above mentioned text functions, include the following: informative text type (“plain communication of facts”) with informative function, expressive text type (“creative composition”) with expressive function, and operative text type (“the inducing of behavioural responses”) with vocative function. It can thus be claimed that a translated text usually carries one of these functions as its primary function which is to be communicated in the translation (if the skopos is to communicate the primary function) (see, eg. Chesterman 1989: 105). Therefore, according to Reiss’ classification (1989: 108-109), the text type of the present data could be said to be operative and its primary function could, thus, be vocative, as the text persuades audiences to laugh (which seems to be the case in both the ST and the TT).

Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 87) argue that each text realises a certain text type. According to them (1986: 87), the communicative function of a given text determines which of the three text types is used. As already implied, the chosen text type naturally has an impact on the translation and the translation strategies used in the process of translating (Reiss and Vermeer 1986: 87.). In addition, Chesterman (1989: 105) is also of the opinion that the primary function of the TT cannot but affect the translation process. Accordingly, for instance, when translating a humorous text, the translation has to be carried out in a certain manner in order to preserve the humour.

3.2.2 Translating culture

When talking about the importance of culture in terms of translating, Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 7, 9, 59) emphasise that in addition to being familiar with

the source and target languages in order to achieve a successful translation, it is very important to be familiar with the source and target cultures. They (1986: 7, 46) argue that language and culture are interdependent and that translating is both an intercultural as well as interlingual process. Moreover, Nida (1989: 90) argues that the most challenging issue in translating may well be “the area of cultural specialization”:

In translating a text which represents an area of cultural specialization in the source language but not in the receptor language, the translator must frequently construct all sorts of descriptive equivalents so as to make intelligible something which is quite foreign to the receptor. On the other hand, when one is translating a document which represents a cultural specialization in the receptor language but not in the source language, the translator is forced to make decisions about the original account which may be only faintly implied. (Nida 1989: 90.)

Consequently, in order to achieve a successful translation, the translator has to be familiar with both the source and target cultures. Nida (2001: 13) also argues that “competent translators are always aware that ultimately words only have meaning in terms of the corresponding culture”. Moreover, he (2001: 13) claims that language and culture are “two interdependent symbolic systems”. He (2001: 27) is of the opinion that culture can be seen in language as a representation of it. This owes to the fact that the culture is referred to in the words of a given language. The representation of culture by a given language is not complete or perfect, however (Nida 2001: 27.).

According to Leppihalme (1994: 1), around 1980 a new approach to translation was beginning to be acknowledged in the field of translation studies. In this approach, the focus is “interdisciplinary and culturally oriented” (Leppihalme 1994: 1.). Moreover, she (1994: 2) argues that the target language and the cultural context of a given translation are paid closer attention, instead of, for instance, the discussion on the translatability of STs. Thus, the cultural differences between the ST and the TT’s audiences have to be considered to reach a successful translation (Leppihalme 1994: 2.). Leppihalme also points out (1994: 2-3) that the new approach to translation

emphasises the cultural context of a text first, the situational context second, and then, the text itself.

Nevertheless, even if the translator was familiar with the source and target cultures, it could still be difficult to solve the type of translation problems that occur when translating, for instance, culture-bound issues – that is, issues that are familiar in the source culture, but not in the target culture (see, eg. Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 99). According to Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 99-100), these types of culture-related translation problems can be solved by adapting problematic ST items into the new target culture and language. This is done with pragmatic adaptations or pragmatic changes (cf. also functional equivalents mentioned eg. in section 3.2; these are discussed in more detail in section 4.2). Pragmatic adaptations are used in all communicative translation theories, and they are seen as an integral part of translating (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 99-100.). In performing pragmatic adaptations, the denotative meaning of a ST item is adapted into the TT in a way that the text will become understandable to the TT receivers (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 99-100.).

Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 101) argues that pragmatic adaptations are often used in instances, in which the translation problem stems from 1) differences in time, place, and text function, 2) differences in the background knowledge of the recipients, 3) differences in source and target culture, and 4) differences in conventions. From the point of view of the present study, cultural differences and the differences in background knowledge are the most important reasons for the pragmatic adaptations carried out in the data. Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 102) connects differences in background knowledge closely to cultural differences. The TT readers may have very different cultural background from the ST readers, who usually have the background knowledge needed in order to understand a given text. This naturally varies according to the amount of culture-specificity in the ST (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 102.).

3.3 Verbal humour and screen translation

After discussing verbal humour and communicative translation theories, it should also be noted that in the present study the data consist of subtitles. Although the translation theories discussed above are applicable to screen translation (see the definition below) as well, screen translation requires a more specific theoretical approach. Accordingly, Reiss (1989: 111) argues that the translation of texts that employ several channels of communication - for instance, spoken and written, such as subtitles - is based on certain principles. She (1989: 111) is of the opinion that these types of texts can be included into the audio-medial text type mentioned already in this chapter.

Consequently, Reiss (1989: 111) claims that the special requirements related to the audio-medial text type are to be taken into consideration when choosing a translation method. However, the three text functions discussed above can all be realised in the audio-medial text type (Reiss 1989: 111.). Furthermore, Oittinen (1995: 92) emphasises that it is important to understand the combination between images, sounds, motions, and words that exists in television programmes (among other media). In consequence, these features have to be taken into account in analysing subtitles.

Although subtitles have appeared on Finnish TV screens for quite a long time, the study of screen translation is still quite a new field in translation (Gambier 2003: 171). Not until 1995 did screen translation begin to be recognised in translation studies. Currently, for instance, owing to the development of so called new technology and growing sense of language awareness in Europe, as well as European language policy, the study of screen translation has become more significant in the field of translation studies (Gambier 2003: 171.). According to Gambier (2003: 171), the concept of screen translation can be defined as a specific form of translation, which

encompasses the translation of all the products – television, cinema, computer screen – that are distributed via a screen.

Moreover, Gambier (2003: 171) states that the term screen translation is rather new as well: first studies in the field talked about film translation, then - after the popularisation of TV and video - the term language transfer began to be used. Gradually, the term audiovisual translation (“‘audiovisual’ meaning film, radio, television and video media”) was introduced to accommodate the fact that audiovisual products combine verbal content with elements such as pictures and sounds (Gambier 2003: 171.). In addition to the relationship between the verbal content, pictures, and sounds that have an impact on screen translation, Gambier (2003: 172) lists two other fundamental issues in the field of screen translation. According to him (2003: 172), the relationship between a foreign language and culture and the target language and culture, as well as the relationship between the spoken and written codes in audiovisual products all affect the process of translation (Gambier 2003: 172.).

Consequently, in carrying out the analysis of the present study, which is based on the spoken English dialogue and the Finnish subtitles, the above mentioned factors have to be taken into consideration. The present study thus analyses the material from a perspective that emphasises cultural factors in translating (for more detailed discussion, see, eg. section 4.2). The relationship between the spoken and written language is paid a little less attention, but it is affecting in the background in the perception that the written TT translation needs to summarise the main content of the spoken ST in a way that it captures the humour of the scene. Gambier (2003: 178), in fact, calls subtitling “a kind of written simultaneous interpreting”, as it blurs the boundary between the written and oral codes.

In addition, Gambier (2003: 178) points out that subtitling is affected by temporal factors (reading time), density of information (affected by pictures, sound and language), the relationship between the written and the oral (the subtitles must convey within a limited space what is expressed orally), and special issues of reception (it may seem strange to viewers, if there are no subtitles while characters are speaking on the screen and, conversely, if no character is speaking and subtitles still appear). The effect of all these factors can also be seen in the data of the present study. For instance, it appears that reading time, the density of information, and the relationship between written and spoken language have a big influence on the length of the TT translations. This poses challenges for the translator to capture the main essence of the ST into the TT. Moreover, dividing the translated text into periods in a way that the words appear on the screen at the same time as the characters speak influences the content of the translation, that is, whether it needs to be shortened or possibly elongated, which seems to occur more rarely, at least in *Friends*. Gambier (2003: 178) also argues that as subtitling differs from traditional translating and interpreting, the language transfer taking place in different audiovisual products (such as films, video, and television programmes) could be viewed as a new genre (Gambier 2003: 178.).

Nevertheless, Gambier (2003: 178) also claims that subtitling can be considered translating, if translation is seen holistically as comprising “the genre, the film-maker’s style, the needs and expectations of viewers (who may, for instance, have different reading speeds and habits) and the multimodality of audiovisual communication (language, images, sound)”, and if translation is seen as including different types of translation strategies, such as summarising and paraphrasing, and not as a purely word-for-word transfer. Thus, from this point of view, skopos theory appears to be applicable to screen translation, as it allows different types of translation

strategies requiring that the skopos of the translation is preserved (see the discussion on skopos theory in section 3.2.1).

Futhermore, Gambier (2003: 179) lists different features of accessibility, which he considers a vital concept in screen translation. These features seem to be very important with regard to the analysis of screen translation: all of them have an impact on the content of subtitles. Consequently, the features of accessibility that seem to be relevant with regard to this thesis include:

* *acceptability*, related to language norm, stylistic choice, rhetorical patterns, terminology, etc.

* *legibility*, defined –for subtitling - in terms of fonts, position of subtitles, subtitle rates, etc.

* *readability*, also defined for subtitling in terms of reading speed rates, reading habits, text complexity, information density, semantic load, shot changes and speed rates, etc.

...

* *relevance*, in terms of what information is to be conveyed, deleted, added or clarified in order not to increase the cognitive effort involved in listening or reading

* *domestication strategies*, defined in cultural terms. ... (Gambier 2003: 179.)

In terms of the present study, the domestication strategies appear to be the most important feature of accessibility affecting subtitling. This is due to the fact that domestication strategies can be seen as translation strategies, according to which culture-specific instances of verbal humour are translated. That is, these strategies are used in the data of this study and, thus, they are important in it. These domestication strategies can be connected to the different translation strategies discussed in more detail in, for instance, section 4.2 in the present study. In other words, the different translation strategies introduced in chapter 4 can be viewed as domestication strategies, with the exception of the translation strategy called exoticisation, foreignisation, or estrangement by Chesterman and Wagner (2002: 62-63) (see section 4.2 for a more detailed discussion on the strategy). This strategy cannot be viewed as domestication, due to the fact that it entails translating ST items that are foreign in the target culture as such, without adaptation, or

in other words, without domestication. Accordingly, Gambier (2003: 179) further defines domestication strategies by arguing that

An audiovisual product has to be different enough to be “foreign” but similar enough to what viewers are familiar with to retain their attention. In a way, the “other” has to be sufficiently similar to us to be accepted. In this respect, the needs and expectations of targeted viewers shape the adaptation of the source text (scenario, script, dialogue list). Thus translation may ultimately be involved in exclusively domesticating programmes and films, manipulating them to please dominant expectations and preferences, for the sake of target-language fluency or reader-friendliness, sometimes going as far as reinforcing language purism, censoring dialogues, or changing part of the plot to conform to target-culture ideological drives and aesthetic norms ... (Gambier 2003: 179.)

Thus, in this respect, translating can be seen as a balancing act between the source culture and the target culture. It seems to be clear, however, that different features of the source culture that are unfamiliar to the recipients of the target culture have to be domesticated in order for them to be understandable. In the data of the present study, the humour is in many cases linked to or produced by a culture-bound expression the losing of which would cause the humour – and at the same time the skopos of the text – to disappear. Therefore, it is vital that these cultural elements are domesticated in one way or another.

Furthermore, Gambier (2003: 183) lists different features that are to be considered when thinking about translation strategies. He (2003: 183) stresses that, among others, the strategies for the translation of humour, irony, allusions, and metaphors are to be discussed more in the field. In addition, he (2003: 183) argues that research on screen translation has to question the concepts used in translation studies, such as “‘text’, ‘original’, ‘meaning’, ‘norms’, ‘equivalence’, ‘manipulation’ and ‘acceptability’” in the context of screen translation (Gambier 2003: 183.). Also in this respect, skopos theory can be applied to screen translation, as the concept of adequacy is deemed more important than, for instance, the concept of equivalence. Moreover, Gambier (2003: 185) claims that in screen translation “fidelity is subordinated

to the communicative needs of an audience. The translator mediates between source 'text' (dialogue, commentary), target receivers, and performance 'text' ... " (Gambier 2003: 184-185.).

Chiaro (2006: 198-199) is also of the opinion that it is difficult to apply the basic concepts used in the field of translation studies, such as equivalence and translatability, to the translation of humour: as already stated earlier in this study, in some instances, the translator has to rely on skopos, rather than on equivalence. This is necessary, for example, when the understanding of a joke or a line on the screen requires that the viewer notice the linguistic form and/or the cultural features in the expression, because usually it is very difficult to translate these into another language (Chiaro 2006: 1999.). Chiaro (2006: 198-208) discusses the screen translation of verbally expressed humour by using films dubbed from English to Italian as her data. According to Chiaro (2006: 198), verbally expressed humour is considered one of the most difficult challenges in screen translation.

In addition, Chiaro (2006: 202) points out that the difficulty in exporting humour often lies in linguistic and cultural barriers. As already mentioned in section 3.1, she (2006:202) distinguishes verbal humour between verbally expressed humour (VEH) and non-specific verbally expressed humour (NSpVEH), which is viewed in this study as similar to the distinction made by Alexander (1997: 11) between "saying things funny - being witty is context bound versus saying funny things - a joke is context free". Chiaro (2006: 202) argues that "US sitcoms such as *Friends*, *Sex and the City* and *Ally MacBeal* [...] tend to rely on a good line rather than puns", which is also seen in the data of this study. She (2006: 202) states that "much VEH on both big and small screen tends to be based on irony rather than punning". Chiaro is of the opinion that if these types of good lines and ironic remarks do not have linguistic or cultural ambiguity, it should not be problematic to translate them (2006: 202). However, Chiaro (2006: 202) cites Zabalbeascoa

who argues that “if the viewer has no access to the cultural presuppositions behind the irony, despite a straightforward translation which apparently presents no particular culture-specific or linguistic difficulties, the humour involved may well be lost” (Zabalbeascoa 2002, as cited in Chiaro 2006: 202).

Accordingly, it can be inferred that in translating NSpVEH, the biggest challenges come from the type of culture-specific factors discussed above by Chiaro (2003) and Zabalbeascoa (2002, as cited in Chiaro 2006). In consequence, in order to analyse the translation of these culture-specific features, the skopos of the translation has to be defined and the different translation strategies used in the translation process (introduced in chapter 4) need to be analysed.

4 SET-UP OF THE PRESENT STUDY

4.1 Aims and research questions

The main research question of the present study is: how is culture-specific verbal humour translated in the TV series *Friends*? Therefore, this study aims at analysing instances of culture-specific verbal humour collected from *Friends*, including the English expressions and their Finnish translations in the form of subtitles. The Finnish translations are analysed in terms of whether they fulfil their skopos of amusing the target audience. Moreover, this study aims at categorising the instances of culture-specific verbal humour chosen to be analysed in terms of the translation strategy used (translation strategies are discussed in more detail in section 4.2) and the success of the chosen translation strategy.

In this study, the ST and the TT are analysed as having the same main skopos of amusing their target audience. The skopos is defined as such due to the fact that both the ST and the TT are so called situational comedies (see more detailed discussion on sitcoms in chapter 2) that tend to aim at amusing their audience. Therefore, the Finnish subtitles are analysed from the perspective of whether they preserve the skopos of amusing in the TT or not. In analysing this, the success of the chosen translation method is taken into consideration. Moreover, this study tries to specify whether the skopos of amusing can be preserved in the TT even if the source of humour was different from that of the ST. This applies to instances in which the chosen translation method changes the ST's source of humour in the TT, often owing to the translatability of the ST's instance of culture-specific verbal humour. As a result, this study also addresses the extent to which it is possible to translate culture-specific verbal humour into another language and culture.

In this study, the data are divided into six different categories that represent the six different translation strategies found to have been used in the material. Accordingly, the order in which the data are presented depends on the translation strategy with which the instances of culture-specific verbal humour have been translated. Thus, the translation strategies according to which the pieces of data are analysed comprise: 1. Cultural replacement, 2. Explanatory addition, 3. No translation, 4. Universal translation, 5. Word-for-word translation, and 6. Explanatory translation (see section 4.2 for more detailed information on translation strategies). The material is analysed in this particular order, because it is logical to examine the success of the chosen translation strategies by grouping similar cases together and then comparing them with the other strategies.

Within each section, examples of a given translation strategy are presented, and their ability to succeed in preserving the skopos of amusing is discussed. Moreover, the overall success of the chosen translation strategies is analysed in each section. In the present study, the instances that are analysed have been selected based on the fact that they include instances of culture-specific verbal humour.

4.2 Analytic methodology

As already stated in section 3.2, communicative translation theories can be used in examining cultural translation problems stemming from differences in source and target cultures (Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 99). Thus, from the methodological point of view these theories – of which particularly skopos theory combined with the theory on screen translation – provide practical tools that can be used in analysing the translation of culture-specific verbal humour in the TV series *Friends*.

Accordingly, in this study, different translation strategies for cultural components are viewed as belonging to the domestication strategies (i.e. strategies used in making the TT appear familiar to its audience) outlined by Gambier (2003: 179, as discussed in section 3.3), excluding the translation strategy called exoticisation, foreignisation, or estrangement by Chesterman and Wagner (2002: 62-63) (see further discussion on the strategy later on in this section). According to Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 99-101), pragmatic adaptations can be used in order to adapt certain ST expressions that are not familiar in the target culture into the TT in a way that makes them understandable to the TT audience. Consequently, Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 100-112) introduces different types of pragmatic adaptations, including 1) addition (“lisäys”), which basically entails adding information to unfamiliar SL items in order to make them understandable in the target culture, 2) omission (“poisto”), which entails the omission of a SL item in the TL, 3) replacement (“korvaus”), which entails replacing a SL item with a TL functional equivalent (that is, a TL expression that fulfils the same function as the SL expression, but not literally, see, for instance, Vehmas-Lehto 1999: 70), and 4) the change of order (“järjestyksen muutos”), which entails, for instance changes in the information structure of the TT in comparison to the ST. Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 100) claims that replacements and particularly additions are used very commonly when solving translation problems that derive from the differences between the source and target cultures.

The pragmatic adaptations discussed by Vehmas-Lehto (1999: 100-112) partly overlap with those suggested by Lorenzo et al. (2003: 272), Chiaro (2006: 200-201), and Chesterman & Wagner (2002: 62-63). Thus, in this study, a combination of these translation strategies is used in categorising the translation strategies of culture-specific verbal humour. The different translation strategies complement one another, which is why a combination of them is used. Consequently, of these translation strategies - taken from Vehmas-Lehto (1999), Lorenzo et al. (2003), Chiaro (2006), and Chesterman &

Wagner (2002) – those that are deemed relevant with regard to the topic of the present study are applied to the analysis of the data.

Chesterman and Wagner (2002: 62-63) have outlined (among others, only those deemed relevant with regard to the present study are presented here) the following strategies for translating cultural issues. There is 1) cultural filtering, which includes the following strategies: naturalisation, domestication, and adaptation (that is, adapting ST items into the TL and culture), and exoticisation, foreignisation, estrangement (that is, translating ST items that are foreign in the target culture as such, without adaptation). They (2002: 62-63) also talk about 2) explicitness changes, which include: explicitation (that is, making explicit certain information in the TT that is only implicit in the ST) and implicitation (that is, omitting information expressed in the ST that the TT readers can be expected to infer). Furthermore, there is a strategy called 3) information change, which includes either the addition of new information to a ST expression in the TT or the omission of a ST expression in the TT (Chesterman & Wagner 2002: 62-63.).

Lorenzo et al. (2003: 272), for their part, follow Agost's suggestion on the translation of cultural elements, which entails four basic strategies: 1) no translation, 2) cultural adaptation ("the source elements are replaced by (quasi) equivalents in the target culture"), 3) explanatory translation ("the original elements are paraphrased"), and 4) omission. They also cite Zabalbeascoa (1992: 360) who is of the opinion that "humour is also part of the cultural tradition of a text". According to Lorenzo et al. (2003: 272), Zabalbeascoa considers adaptation, substitution, and different types of compensation ("... introduction or omission of sound effects, plays on words, puns, jokes, etc.") as useful strategies for translating humour in audiovisual texts (Zabalbeascoa 1992: 360 as cited in Lorenzo et al. 2003: 272.).

Furthermore, Chiaro (2006: 200-201) lists three strategies that are commonly used in translating VEH (Verbally Expressed Humour) on screen: “(1) The substitution of VEH in the Source Language (SL) with an example of VEH in the Target Language (TL)”, “(2) The replacement of the SL VEH with an idiomatic expression in the TL” and, “(3) The replacement of the SL VEH with an example of compensatory VEH elsewhere in the TL text”. With regard to the data of this study and the fact that it is subtitled rather than dubbed, the third strategy cannot be applied to the analysis. Thus, only the first two strategies are discussed next in more detail.

Accordingly, the strategy 1), in which the SL VEH is substituted with an example of VEH in the TL, is, according to Chiaro (2006: 200), very difficult in practice: “it is highly unlikely to find the same words, sounds, forms and concepts in two different languages which must also happen to possess the same ambiguity that can be exploited for humorous means”. Nevertheless, she (2006: 200) argues that “if even just a partial aspect of the original VEH can be captured this can lead to a satisfying solution” (Chiaro 2006: 200.). Chiaro (2006: 200-201) gives three instances in which this can be done: 1) “[p]reserving partial meaning of SL VEH”, 2) “[p]reserving SL form” and 3) “[p]reserving (partial) meaning of SL VEH and SL form”. In the strategy 2), the SL VEH is replaced with an idiomatic expression in the TL in order to preserve the humour of the ST in a way that makes it understandable to the TT audience (Chiaro 2006: 201).

As already stated earlier in this chapter, many of the above mentioned strategies overlap with one another. Due to the overlap, the present study combines the strategies that are deemed useful in terms of the analysis into one list of strategies. The list includes all the strategies used in the present study in analysing the ways in which the instances of culture-specific verbal humour of the data are translated. The combination of the strategies is considered necessary due to the fact that together they provide more

comprehensive tools to analyse the material than none of them separately would. In consequence, the strategies combined together from Vehmas-Lehto (1999), Chesterman & Wagner (2002), Lorenzo et al. (2003), and Chiaro (2006) are discussed next.

In consequence, in this study, the data are categorised according to the following translation strategies:

- 1) cultural replacement which includes a) ST culture-specific references to different source culture products that have already been domesticated with functional equivalents into the target culture (for example: *"Tonight, on a very special "Blossom." / "Tänä iltana "Kullammupun" erikoisjaksossa.."*, b) ST culture-specific references that the translator has replaced in the TT with a functional equivalent (*The FICA guys took all my money. / Herra Enn. pid. vei kaikki rahani.*), and c) ST culture-specific references that have been translated by changing the ST expression into a new humorous line in order to domesticate it (Phoebe: *God! Come on. Just do it. Call her. Stop being so testosterone-y.* Chandler: *Which, by the way, is **the real San Francisco treat.*** / Phoebe: *Tee se! Soita hänelle! Älä anna testosteronille valtaa.* Chandler: ***Todellinen valtataistelu***). That is, this strategy comprises instances in which a culture-bound ST item is replaced by a TL functional equivalent or another type of a replacement that is used to adapt ST items into the TT (includes Chesterman & Wagner's naturalisation, domestication, and adaptation, Lorenzo et al.'s cultural adaptation, Vehmas-Lehto's replacement, and Chiaro's strategy 2),
- 2) explanatory addition, which is used in order to explain ST items that are transferred into the TT, and which the translator has considered to require extra information in order to be recognised in the target culture (*Do the words, "Billy, don't be a hero" mean anything to you? / Muistatteko hitin "Billy, don't be a hero"?*) (includes Vehmas-Lehto's additions and Chesterman & Wagner's information change),

- 3) no translation, which includes a) either omitting a whole ST expression (*Oh, good. Lenny and Squiggy are here. / no translation*) or b) omitting a part or parts of a ST expression in the TT (*Okay, okay, okay. I know. Okay, I'm with you, Cheech. / Hyvä on. Meni perille.*) (includes Vehmas-Lehto's omissions, Chesterman & Wagner's explicitness change and information change, and Lorenzo et al.'s no translation or omission),
- 4) universal translation, which includes those ST culture-specific references that have been transferred into the TT without domestication using the SL expression in the TT. These instances include the type of culture-specific references that have probably been deemed to belong to the larger cultural context of the West and do not, therefore, require domestication (*So, I'm in Las Vegas. I'm Liza Minelli. / Olen Liza Minelli Las Vegasissa...*) (includes Chesterman & Wagner's exoticisation, foreignisation, estrangement),
- 5) word-for-word translation, which includes those ST culture-specific references that have been translated word-for-word, because they are probably deemed to preserve the skopos of amusing with the literal translation used. That is, this strategy has been used when a ST expression is transferred either as a whole or partially into the TT without changing the ST expression with the other domestication strategies, that is, when the translator has decided that the same humorous expression works in both the ST and the TT (*Actually I got the extended disco version with (three choruses of ...) "You'll Never Make it on Your Own". / Se oli kuin diskoversio (kappaleesta) "Yksin et ikinä pärjää"*). (includes Chiaro's strategy 1), and
- 6) explanatory translation (concept taken from Lorenzo et al.), in which a ST expression is explained in the TT by paraphrasing it (*No, I worked at a Dairy Queen. Why? / En, vaan jäätelöbaarissa.*) (includes Lorenzo et al.'s explanatory translation).

4.3 Lorenzo et al.'s methods in translating on-screen verbal humour

Lorenzo, Pereira, and Xoubanova (2003: 269-291) have studied the American TV series *the Simpsons* from the perspective of its audiovisual translation, their main focus being the translation of humour, which they consider the series' dominant textual function. Lorenzo et al.'s study belongs to the field of audiovisual translation, of which they employ Agost's (1999: 15) definition "as a type of specialized translation that deals with texts intended for cinema, television, video and multimedia products" (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 271). Their aim is descriptive and evaluative when they analyse the chosen strategies of translation (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 269).

Consequently, in their analysis, Lorenzo et al. concentrate on four episodes of *The Simpsons*, which are rich in "references and allusions to idiosyncratic components of American culture, puns and plays on words, all of which pose serious obstacles for a translator" (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 269). According to them (2003: 271), the field of audiovisual translation requires somewhat different type of analysis tools from other fields of translation, mainly owing to the fact that "several channels of communication coexist in the audiovisual text: oral (voices), written (script) and visual (image)" (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 271). Thus, as Lorenzo et al.'s study is very similar to the present study, their methods of analysis (discussed in more detail below) are used - in the extent to which they are applicable to this study - as analytic tools in examining the data of this study.

In their study, Lorenzo et al. (2003: 269, 271) draw on Agost's model (1999) (developed on the basis of Hatim and Mason's (1990) model) as well as Zabalbeascoa's (1992) and Luque's (2000) models of translation of humour. This they do by dividing their analysis into three dimensions of textual analysis: 1) the pragmatic dimension (which includes "the contextual focus, intentionality and conversational maxims of the source text and their

translation in the target text” and deals with “the relationship between author/translator and text”), 2) the semiotic dimension (including “the translation of ideological and cultural components and intertextual references” which comprises “the signs that shape a particular society”) and, 3) the communicative dimension (including “use (field, tenor and mode) and user (sociolinguistic) varieties” that refer to “linguistic variation that depends on variables such as time, social class, sex, age, relationship between participants etc”) (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 269, 271.).

In this study, the analysis is focused only on the semiotic and pragmatic dimensions, leaving out the communicative dimension. The main reason for this is the fact that the present study emphasises the analysis of the translation strategies used in translating the culture-specific instances of verbal humour and the translation of culture-specific references, rather than the translation of sociolinguistic varieties that are in focus in the communicative dimension. Moreover, in a preliminary analysis carried out for the data of this study, the communicative dimension was taken into consideration, but it appeared not to have an influence on the translation of culture-specific references. The communicative dimension is, however, important in the kind of study by Lorenzo et al. which focuses on the translation of humour from a wider perspective than this study.

In analysing 1) the pragmatic dimension of *The Simpsons*, Lorenzo et al. (2003: 271-272) concentrate on its contextual focus (which determines the genre of the audiovisual product), intentionality (the intention of the text), and its conversational maxims (avoid ambiguity, tell the truth, be brief and clear, and be relevant (cf. Grice 1975) (Lorenzo et al 2003: 271-272). Grice (1989: 26) outlines a conversational principle (CP) which includes the above mentioned maxims. The CP goes as follows: “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.” (Grice 1989: 26).

Thomas (1995: 62) sees the CP as containing the assumption that people generally obey a certain set of rules when engaged in a conversation. Moreover, Grice (1989: 26) adds to the CP the four conversational maxims that people are expected to follow in conversation.

Grice's (1989: 26-27) maxims include:

- Quantity: "1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required."
- Quality: "1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence."
- Relation: "Be relevant."
- Manner: "1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly." (Grice 1989: 26-27).

In this study, the type of humorous instances are examined in which the breaking of a maxim produces verbal humour. According to Attardo (1994: 271), there is a "basic assumption ... that a large number of jokes involve violations of one or more of Grice's maxims". This is evident in the analysis of the data of the present study as well. In the present study, it seems that more often than not some of Grice's maxims are broken in the instances of culture-specific verbal humour. In fact, it appears that the breaking of conversational maxims is almost inherent to the type of culture-specific verbal humour in *Friends*.

The semiotic dimension (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 272-273), for its part, focuses on "the ideological and cultural aspects of the source culture and translation strategies for transfer into the target culture". This dimension is very important in terms of this study, as it focuses on the translation of culture-specific humour and also on the different translation and domestication strategies discussed earlier, for instance, in section 4.2. In the analysis of the data of the present study, this dimension is used in the overall categorisation

of the material. That is, the material is categorised according to the different translation strategies introduced earlier in this study in section 4.2. Accordingly, the semiotic dimension forms the core of the analysis.

Furthermore, in analysing the semiotic dimension, intertextuality meaning “all references to other texts and, specifically in the case of audiovisual translation, to other films, other episodes of the series etc.” (Agost 1999: 103, as cited in Lorenzo et al. 2003: 272) is also examined. Lorenzo et al. (2003: 283) also point out that “intertextual references usually give rise to many translation problems. The translator must spot the reference in the first place, and then evaluate the likelihood of it being recognised by the target audience” (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 283). Intertextuality is present in many instances of culture-specific verbal humour in the data of this study, and it is viewed an important factor contributing to the humour of the ST and the TT. In many cases, an intertextual reference is the phenomenon referred in this thesis as a culture-specific reference. Accordingly, this needs to be taken into consideration in the analysis of the instances of culture-specific verbal humour occurring in the data.

In analysing the communicative dimension of their data, Lorenzo et al. (2003: 272-273) focus on use (field, tenor and mode) and user varieties. Firstly, the concept of field “refers to the subject of the audiovisual text and the way in which it is constructed (technical vs. everyday language)”, and secondly, tenor is used to describe “the social interaction between the characters”, and it is expressed by formal versus informal language use. Finally, mode “refers to the channel through which the text is transmitted” (a combination of the linguistic code and the visual code) (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 273). As stated earlier in this section, however, this dimension will not be used in the analysis of the data of this thesis.

In the present study, the instances of culture-specific verbal humour in the data are divided into references to

- a) (popular) cultural products (songs, films, TV series, and TV/film/cartoon characters, toy characters, novels, sayings etc.)
- b) well-known people and celebrities (actors, authors, musicians, politicians, bands, sportscasters)
- c) material culture (food and drink, different types of products)
- d) measures
- e) social culture, work, and leisure (places, institutions, hobbies, games, festivities, religion, and historical references). (The categorisation is adapted from the definition of cultural elements used by Lorenzo et al. 2003: 272.)

The division is important in terms of the fact that it aids in defining cultural elements in the instances of culture-specific verbal humour in the data.

As already stated in this section, the analysis is focused on the semiotic and pragmatic dimensions of the data, as outlined by Lorenzo et al. (2003: 269-291). In the semiotic and pragmatic dimensions, the material is divided according to the translation strategies discussed in section 4.2. This division is made due to the fact that the differences between the translation strategies, that is, between the methods of translation and their success, ie. if they preserve the skopos of amusing or not, can be shown in these particular dimensions. In the communicative dimension, the categorisation of the data according to the translation strategies is unnecessary, because in the communicative dimension, the use of different translation strategies does not seem to cause variation in the ST and the TT.

4.4 Data description

In this study, the translation of culture-specific verbal humour in the TV series *Friends* is analysed by examining 24 episodes of the series' first season

(from 1994 to 1995). To do this, the episodes and subtitles have been transcribed from DVDs. *Friends* has been chosen to be analysed, due to the fact that in many instances the humour in the series stems from “saying things funny”, rather than from “saying funny things” (Morreal 1983, as cited in Alexander 1997: 11, see, eg., section 3.1 for a more detailed discussion). The series also uses a great deal of culture-specific references in producing humour. Therefore, the data is very suitable from the point of view of analysing the translation of culture-specific verbal humour. All 24 episodes of the series’ first season have been chosen to be analysed in order to collect enough data to draw conclusions on the research question.

The analysed pieces of data contain culture-specific references most of which have the main function of producing humorous effects. That is, the data have been selected based on the different types of culture-specific references that are used in the series to create humour. The culture-specific references do not, however, have to be the only source of humour in a given scene, but they do have to contribute to the scenes’ humorous effect in some way or another.

5 ANALYSIS

5.1 Translation of culture-specific verbal humour in semiotic and pragmatic dimensions of the data

As already pointed out in section 4.3, the semiotic dimension deals with the translation strategies used in translating culture-specific references, whereas the pragmatic dimension with the humorous intentions and conversational maxims of the data. These features are analysed simultaneously in this section. First, the data are divided into different categories, which are based on the translation strategies with which the culture-specific references of the data are translated. These translation strategies include 1) cultural replacement (22 of 100 instances), 2) explanatory addition (7 of 100 instances), 3) no translation (5 of 100 instances), 4) universal translation (27 of 100 instances), 5) word-for-word translation (9 of 100 instances), and 6) explanatory translation (30 of 100 instances).

In this analysis, the success of these translation strategies is examined in the semiotic dimension. In the pragmatic dimension, the six translation strategies are analysed in terms of their humorous intentions and conversational maxims. That is, in the pragmatic dimension the data are examined from the point of view of whether the ST's humorous intentions and breaking of conversational maxims are transferred into the TT with the chosen translation strategies. Combined, the analysis of both dimensions, semiotic and pragmatic, provides insight into answering the research question of how is culture-specific verbal humour translated in *Friends*. The dimensions are interrelated, and they influence on one another. As a result, they are analysed one alongside the other.

In addition to dividing the data into the six categories according to the translation strategies used, the different translation strategies' ability to

preserve the ST's skopos in the TT are examined in this section (see, eg. section 3.2.1 for the definition of the term skopos). That is, the instances of culture-specific verbal humour are analysed in terms of how successfully they are preserved in the TT with a given translation strategy.

5.1.1 Cultural replacement

Of the total of 100 instances of culture-specific verbal humour collected from the data, 22 are translated with the strategy of cultural replacement. In the analysis, these instances are divided into two groups: (1) cases in which the cultural replacement preserves the humour of the ST in the TT and in which the source of humour is similar or the same in both the ST and the TT (18 instances, see List (1a) and List (1b) below) and (2) cases in which the humour of the TT comes from a different source or evokes different connotations than the humour of the ST (4 instances, see List (2a) and List (2b) further on in this section). Accordingly, in all instances in which the translation strategy of cultural replacement is used the skopos of amusing is preserved, although in some instances, the source of humour changes in the translation process.

In this section, group (1) of cultural replacements in which the humour of the ST and the TT comes chiefly from the same source is analysed first. Group (1) includes culture-specific references that have been domesticated into the target culture in other contexts than the ST (13 instances, see List (1a) below). That is, the translator has used expressions which someone else has earlier translated into the TL. This is done in cases in which the culture-specific reference is a cultural product from the source culture (or from a more universal cultural context the products of which are familiar to both the source and target culture audiences) and has been imported into the target culture before the *Friends* episode in question aired in Finland. All these

instances - as could be expected - preserve the skopos of amusing. These types of instances include the instances listed in List (1a).

List (1a)

cartoon characters

Minnie Mouse/Minni Hiiri, Bugs Bunny/Väiski Vemmelsääri,

plays

Pinocchio/Pinokkio, The Fiddler on the Roof/Viulunsoittaja katolla

stories and books

Jack and the Beanstalk/Jaakko ja pavunvarsi, Goldilocks and the Three Bears/Kultakutri ja kolme karhua, The Three Musketeers/Kolme muskettisoturia, and

TV shows and films

Blossom/Kullannappu, An Officer and a Gentleman/Upseeri ja herrasmies, Silence of the Lambs/Uhrilampaat, The Flintstones/Kivoiset ja Soraset, Dead Poet's Society/Kuolleiden runoilijoiden seura, Weekend at Bernie's/Kauan eläkään Bernie

Moreover, in group (1) of cultural replacements, there are also instances in which the ST culture-specific references have a functional equivalent in the target culture (5 instances, see List (1b) below). Thus, as opposed to the first type presented in List (1a), the culture-specific references in List (1b) are not made to translated cultural products from the source culture. Instead, the instances in List (1b) have a functional equivalent in the target culture that can be used to express a similar type of (humorous) meaning in the TT as in the ST. These are shown in List (1b).

List (1b)

institutions

FICA/Enn. pid. (ie. ennakonpidätys)

rhymes and sayings

One Mississippi, two Mississippi.../Yksi pieni elefantti..., Pot,kettle/Pata,kattila

characters

Curious George doll/sinisilmäinen nukke

names

Joseph/Josef, and

sports

baseball/pesäpallo

As already pointed out above, all the instances of culture-specific verbal humour translated with a cultural replacement preserve the humour of the ST (although in four of the instances, the source of humour changes to some extent, which is discussed in more detail later on in this section). This can be seen in Example 1, where Joey's new girlfriend is talking about her profession.

Example 1:

Joey's date Melanie: Anyway, that's when me and my friends started this whole fruit-basket business.

We call ourselves

"The Three Basketeers".

Joey: Like *"The Three Musketeers"*, only with fruit.

Joeyn deitti Melanie: Sitten perustin ystäväieni kanssa hedelmäkoriliikkeen.

Otimme nimeksemme

"Kolme hedelmäsoturia".

Joey: *Kuin "Kolme muskettisoturia" meloneilla!* (Episode 24)

In this scene, the analysis in the semiotic dimension is related to the translation of Joey and his date Melanie's lines: *We call ourselves "The Three Basketeers"*. (Melanie) and *Like "The Three Musketeers", only with fruit.* (Joey) and the Finnish translations *Otimme nimeksemme "Kolme hedelmäsoturia"*. (Melanie) and *Kuin "Kolme muskettisoturia" meloneilla!* (Joey). The translator has used the strategy of cultural replacement in translating the lines, which preserves the humorous intention of the ST in the pragmatic dimension. The humour of the scene comes from the culture-specific reference to the novel and film *The Three Musketeers*, which is familiar in both the source and target cultures.

Therefore, the cultural replacements *Kolme hedelmäsoturia* and *Kuin kolme muskettisoturia meloneilla!* work well in preserving the skopos of amusing. In fact, the expression *Kuin kolme muskettisoturia meloneilla!* introduces an extra level of humour to the TT, because the translator has used the word *meloneilla* instead of *hedelmillä* (cf. the word *fruit* in the ST). The extra level of humour

comes from the fact that the word *meloneilla* refers to *The Three Basketeers'* gender (it becomes clear from the larger context that they are women). In this particular scene, the culture-specific reference is a significant factor contributing the humour of the scene. Since it is preserved in the TT, the humour of the scene is also preserved.

In terms of conversational maxims, the ST firstly breaks the maxim of manner. This can be seen in Melanie's expression *We call ourselves "The Three Basketeers"*, which can be perceived as ambiguous. Moreover, Joey's line *Like "The Three Musketeers", only with fruit* breaks the maxim of quantity, because the line can be interpreted as explaining Melanie's line in too much detail. Joey's comment seems to suggest that he thinks Melanie's line needs to be clarified to the others, suggesting at the same time that he himself needed the explanation when he heard the expression for the first time. The translation strategy of cultural replacement successfully manages to transfer this aspect of the ST into the TT as well, thus preserving the humour of the ST.

In Example 2, the skopos of amusing is also preserved by using a cultural replacement to translate the culture-specific reference. In this scene, Monica (who is a chef) has visited a place where a new restaurant will be opened. She may get a job there and is very enthusiastic about it.

Example 2:

Rachel: The meeting with the guy went great?

Monica: So great! He showed me where the restaurant's gonna be.

It's this cute little place on 10th street.

It's not too big, not too small.

It's just right.

Chandler: *Was it formerly owned by a blond woman and some bears?*

Rachel: Menikö tapaaminen hyvin?

Monica: Meni!

Se ravintola on ihana

paikka 10th Streetillä.

Ei liian iso eikä pieni,

vaan juuri sopiva!

Chandler: *Omistivatko sen aiemmin*

blondi ja kolme karhua? (Episode 15)

In the pragmatic dimension, the main humorous intention of Example 2 comes from Chandler's reference to the story *Goldilocks and the Three Bears*. His line makes fun of Monica's enthusiasm about the restaurant. Chandler's comment *Was it formerly owned by a blond woman and some bears?* highlights the fact that in his view Monica sees the place just as lovely as Goldilocks saw the house of the three bears in the story, indicating that he feels she is overly excited about the place. As the story is familiar to the target audience as well (or it can be assumed that it is), in the semiotic dimension, the translation strategy of cultural replacement *Omistivatko sen aiemmin blondi ja kolme karhua?* preserves the humour of the ST in the TT.

Furthermore, in Example 2, Chandler's line *Was it formerly owned by a blond woman and some bears?* breaks the maxim of manner: the line is ambiguous and to understand it the viewer needs to spot the culture-specific reference to the story *Goldilocks and the Three Bears*. The breaking of the conversational maxim is also transferred into the TT with the chosen translation strategy. Similarly to Example 1, in Example 2, the breaking of conversational maxim is an important factor contributing to the humour of the scene.

In Example 3 below, Phoebe, Rachel, and Monica are talking about Rachel's life after she has recently broken up with her fiancé.

Example 3:

Phoebe: *You are just like Jack.*

Rachel: *Jack from downstairs?*

Phoebe: *No. "Jack and the Beanstalk".*

Monica: *Ah, the other Jack.*

Phoebe: *Yeah, right. See, he gave up something but then he got those magic beans. And then he woke up and there was this this big plant outside of his window, full of possibilities and stuff. And he lived in a village, and you live in the Village.*

Rachel: *Okay, but, Pheebs, Jack gave up a cow. I gave up an orthodontist. Okay, now I know I didn't love him...*

Phoebe: *See, Jack did love the cow.*

Phoebe: *Olet ihan kuin Jaakko.*

Rachel: *Alakerran Jaakko?*

Phoebe: *Ei. "Jaakko ja pöytävarsi".*

Monica: *Se toinen Jaakko!*

Phoebe: Aivan.

Hänkin luopui jostakin, mutta sai taikapapuja.

Herättyään hän löysi ikkunansa alta suuren kasvin...

täynnä mahdollisuuksia! Hän asui kylässä, ja on se kylä tämäkin.

Rachel: *Jaakko luopui lehmästä, minä hammaslääkäristä.*

En tosin rakastanut häntä, mutta...

Phoebe: *Niin. Jaakko rakasti lehmää.* (Episode 4)

In this scene, in the pragmatic dimension, the humorous intention is related to Phoebe comparing Rachel's situation to the story about *Jack and the Beanstalk*. The irrelevance of her lines (which is also noticed by Rachel and Monica, along with the viewers) is intended to produce the humorous effect in the ST. This intention is successfully transferred into the TT with the chosen translation strategy, because the story about *Jack and the Beanstalk* is familiar in the target culture as well (*Jaakko ja pavunvarsi*).

In Example 3, the humour chiefly comes from Phoebe breaking the maxim of relation. Firstly, her comparison of Rachel's situation to the story about *Jack and the Beanstalk* seems to make little sense to everyone else (Rachel, Monica, viewers), except Phoebe, which contributes to the humour of the scene. Moreover, as opposed to most viewers, Phoebe seems to think that her comparison perfectly captures the situation. A large part of the humour of the scene derives from the fact that everyone else but Phoebe herself is expected to see the irrelevance of her lines. At the same time, Phoebe thinks that the fact that *Jack loved the cow*, whereas Rachel *didn't love the orthodontist*, is the only difference between the story and Rachel's situation. In general, this is typical of Phoebe's humorous scenes: she has her own logic, which differs from that of the mainstream making her lines very funny.

In consequence, Example 4 below is also a typical representative of the humour of Phoebe's lines. In the scene, Phoebe is talking about her new boyfriend David with Monica, Rachel, and Ross:

Example 4:

Phoebe: David's like, a scientist guy. He's very methodical.

Monica: I think it's romantic.

Phoebe: Me too!

Did you ever see "An Officer and a Gentleman"?

Monica: Yeah.

Phoebe: *He's kind of like the guy I went to see that with.*

Phoebe: David on tiedemiestyyppi. Hyvin järjestelmällinen.

Monica: Sehän on romanttista.

Phoebe: Aivan!

Näittekö "Upseerin ja herrasmiehen"?

Monica: no translation

Phoebe: *Hän on vähän kuin kaveri, jonka kanssa näin sen leffan.* (Episode 10)

In Example 4, the humour and humorous intention come from Phoebe breaking the maxim of relation in the pragmatic dimension. Phoebe's line *Did you ever see "An Officer and a Gentleman"* creates an expectation that she will compare her new boyfriend to the main character in the film, not to the man she has seen it with. Because the cultural replacement *Upseeri ja herrasmies* works in the target culture, the humour of the scene is preserved in the TT as well.

In the second type of group (1) of the translation strategy of cultural replacement in which the ST culture-specific references have a functional equivalent in the target culture, all five instances (see List 1b above) preserve the skopos of amusing. This can be seen, for example, in Example 5, where Rachel gets the first paycheck of her life.

Example 5:

Rachel: *Who's FICA? Why's he getting all my money?*

Rachel: *Kuka on Enn. pid. ja miksi hän saa rahani?*

Rachel: *The FICA guys took all my money.*

Rachel: *Herra Enn. vei kaikki rahani.* (Episode 4)

In this scene, after talking about how hard she has been working at her first job, Rachel gets her first paycheck and realises that taxes cut a large portion of her pay. In the pragmatic dimension, the culture-specific reference to *FICA* significantly contributes to the humour of the scene. The fact that Rachel personifies the institution also enhances the humour. With the reference,

Rachel breaks the maxim of manner. That is, her reference to *FICA* is obscure and ambiguous, and the humour of the scene is lost, if the viewer does not understand the reference. In the semiotic dimension in the TT, being a functional equivalent to *FICA*, the cultural replacement *Herra Enn. pid.* successfully preserves the humour of the ST.

In a similar manner to Example 5, in Example 6, the cultural replacement used in translating the ST culture-specific reference preserves the skopos of amusing. In Example 6, Ross' pet monkey has reached sexual maturity and has been "playing" with Rachel's doll.

Example 6:

Rachel: Marcel, stop it! Marcel!

Bad monkey!

Ross: What?

Rachel: *Let's just say my Curious George doll is no longer curious.*

Rachel: Marcel, lopeta! Tuhma apina!

Ross: Mitä?

Rachel: *Sanotaan vaikka, että nukkeni ei ole enää sinisilmäinen.* (Episode 21)

In this scene, the intention is to produce humour with Rachel making an indirect reference to what the monkey has been doing to the doll. This is done with the culture-specific reference *my Curious George doll is no longer curious*. At the same time, by being indirect and ambiguous, Rachel's line breaks the maxim of manner. In translating the line, the translator has not used a target culture toy character as a functional equivalent. Instead, s/he has replaced the word *curious* with the word *sinisilmäinen*, which, in this context, works as a cultural replacement for *curious*. The cultural replacement *sinisilmäinen* also breaks the maxim of manner. Therefore, the humour of the ST is preserved in the TT.

In a similar manner to Example 6, the breaking of conversational maxim in the pragmatic dimension is also transferred into the TT in Example 7 below.

In this scene, Joey is thinking about a new stage name because, according to his agent, his own is too ethnic.

Example 7:
 Joey: Joe Stalin.
 You know, that's pretty good.
 Chandler: *You might wanna try Joseph.*
 Joey: *Joseph Stalin!*
I think you'd remember that!
 Chandler: *Oh, yes!*
Bye Bye Birdie,
starring Joseph Stalin.
Joseph Stalin is
The Fiddler on the Roof!
 Joey: Joe Stalin.
 Se on aika hyvä.
 Chandler: *Miten olisi Josef?*
 Joey: *Josef Stalin!*
Se nimi jää mieleen.
 Chandler: Totta vie!
Bye Bye Birdie,
tähtenä Josef Stalin!
Josef Stalin on
Viulunsoittaja katolla! (Episode 21)

In this scene, in order to make fun of the situation, Chandler suggests the name Joe Stalin without realising that Joey does not know who he is. As Chandler notices this, he continues the joke and, therefore, breaks the maxim of quality by not telling Joey who Joseph Stalin actually was. Accordingly, in this scene, the humorous intention is to make fun of the fact that Joey does not recognise the reference to Joseph Stalin. In the semiotic dimension, the cultural replacement *Josef Stalin* used by the translator preserves the humour of the TT due to the fact that the target audience can be expected to grasp the reference to Joseph Stalin.

Next in this section, group (2) of cultural replacements is analysed. Accordingly, group (2) includes cases translated with the strategy of cultural replacements and in which the humour of the TT comes from a different source or creates different connotations than the humour of the ST (4 instances, see lists 2 (a) and 2 (b) below). In these instances, in spite of the fact

that the source of humour changes in the TT, the TT still manages to preserve the skopos of amusing.

Consequently, group (2) includes (1) instances in which the translator has used a cultural replacement which creates a slightly different connotation in the TT than the one used in the ST (because the cultural replacement in the TT is a functional equivalent that carries somewhat different type of meaning than the ST expression, see List (2a) below) (2 instances) and 2) instances in which the translator has created a new humorous line in the TT, because the ST culture-specific reference would probably not work in the target culture (chiefly because it does not have a functional equivalent in the target language, see List (2b) below) (2 instances).

List (2a)

Chandler: *Things sure have changed here on Walton's mountain.* /
Chandler: *Onnela ei ole entisensä.*, and

Rachel: *I know I had it when I was in the kitchen with...*
Chandler: *Dinah?* /
Rachel: *Olin keittiössä...*
Chandler: *Teijan kanssa?*

List (2b)

Phoebe: *God! Come on. Just do it. Call her. Stop being so testosterone-y.*
Chandler: *Which, by the way, is the real San Francisco treat.* /
Phoebe: *Tee se! Soita hänelle! Älä anna testosteronille valtaa.*
Chandler: *Todellinen valtataistelu.*, and

Joey: *He's back. The peeper's back. Get down!*
Rachel: *Get down?*
Chandler: *And boogie.* /
Joey: *Tirkistelijä on palannut! Maahan!.*
Rachel: no translation
Chandler: *Ampu tulee.*

In Example 8 below, in translating the ST culture-specific reference the translator has used a cultural replacement which creates a slightly different connotation in the TT than the one used in the ST. Before this scene has occurred in the episode, Joey has found out that his father is cheating on his

mother. In addition, Joey has made his father confess this to his mother. Joey's mother, however, has known about the situation for quite a long time and is fairly content with it. In Example 8, Joey is telling the other *Friends* about the incident.

Example 8:

Monica: So you talked to your dad?

Joey: Yeah, he's gonna keep cheating on my ma, like she wanted. Ma's gonna keep pretending she doesn't know even though she does and my sister Tina can't see her husband anymore 'cause he got her a restraining order. Which has nothing to do with anything, except that I found out today.

Chandler: *Things sure have changed here on Walton's mountain.*

Monica: Puhuit siis isäsi kanssa.

Joey: Hän jatkaa äidin pettämistä...

...ja äiti teeskentelee edelleen, ettei tiedä.

Ja pikkusiskoni Tinan aviomies sai lähestymiskiellon...

Mikä ei liity asiaan, mutta sain tietää sen tänään.

Chandler: *Onnela ei ole entisensä.* (Episode 13)

In this scene, Chandler's culture-specific reference to *Walton's Mountain* (*The Waltons'* was an American television series) highlights the irony of the situation. By referring to the TV series *The Waltons'* when he says the line *Things sure have changed here on Waltons' mountain*, Chandler draws attention to the fact that the situation between Joey's mother and father is the exact opposite of what *The Waltons'* stands for. His comment is funny, because of the contradiction between the high morals of the TV series and the somewhat immoral behaviour in which Joey's mother and father are (quite happily) engaging. Furthermore, Chandler's line breaks the maxim of manner, because the reference is ambiguous. As the humour of the scene to a large extent depends on the reference, the breaking of the maxim has to be transferred into the TT to preserve the humorous intention of the ST. This is successfully carried out with the use of the cultural replacement *Onnela*, because the reference also breaks the maxim of manner in the TT.

In consequence, the culture-specific reference to *The Waltons'* is translated with the expression *Onnela ei ole entisensä*. The TT cultural replacement may produce somewhat different connotations than the expression used in the ST,

however. The word *Onnela* may create connotations to the Finnish novel and TV series *Puhtaat valkeat lakanat*, which does not necessarily create similar type of connotations as the fictional town of *Walton's Mountain* in the TV series *The Waltons*'. This is due to the fact that the *Onnela* in *Puhtaat valkeat lakanat* is not as a moral and happy place as *Walton's Mountain* in *The Waltons*' appears to have been. Nevertheless, without this connotation, the word *Onnela* probably creates an association to a place where everyone is happy and content. In this case, the expression creates a similar type of connotation in the TT as the expression in the ST (ie. that things are not as moral between Joey's mum and dad as they are in the *Walton's Mountain* or in *Onnela*). In either case, the TT still manages to preserve the skopos of amusing. If the connotation to *Puhtaat valkeat lakanat* is evoked, however, the TT is left a little less ironic than the ST, because the contradiction between *The Walton's* and Joey's situation is larger than the contradiction between *Puhtaat valkeat lakanat* and Joey's situation.

Another example in which the connotation of the cultural replacement used in the TT is slightly different from that of the culture-specific reference in the ST can be seen next in Example 9. In this scene, Rachel is trying to find her lost engagement ring which she is supposed to return to her ex-fiancé.

Example 9:

Rachel: *I know I had it when I was in the kitchen with...*

Chandler: *Dinah?*

Rachel: *Olin keittiössä...*

Chandler: *Teijan kanssa?* (Episode 2)

In Example 9, in the pragmatic dimension the humorous intention is connected to Chandler's reference to the song *I've Been Working On the Railroad* in which the expression *in the kitchen with Dinah* is used. The culture-specific reference in the ST breaks the maxims of manner and relation. Chandler's expression is thus again, ambiguous and requires cultural knowledge to be understood. Moreover, in the context of the scene

Chandler's line is also irrelevant, as one would expect him to answer Rachel's question by saying something that would help her to find the ring. Instead, Chandler breaks the maxim of relation with his answer by making a reference to a song. The irrelevance of Chandler's line is a significant source of humour in the scene. Without the reference, the scene would not be funny. The breaking of conversational maxims is also transferred into the TT with the translation strategy of cultural replacement.

In consequence, in Example 9, Chandler's reference is translated with the cultural replacement (*Olin keittiössä...*) *Teijan kanssa*. (*Teijan keittiössä* was a cooking show in Finland). This cultural replacement preserves the skopos of amusing. The TT expression may, however, produce a different type of connotation than the expression (*in the kitchen with...*) *Dinah*. Accordingly, a song may carry a youthful connotation, whereas a TV show on cooking - *Teijan keittiössä* in particular - may carry, for instance, a more motherly connotation. This does not, however, diminish the humour of the scene.

In the next two extracts, Example 10 and Example 11, the translator has created a new humorous line in the TT, probably because the ST culture-specific reference would not work in the target culture. In Example 10, Chandler has been on a date with a girl he likes, but does not want to call her too soon after the date for the fear of seeming needy.

Example 10:

Monica: I can't believe my parents
are actually pressuring me...

to find one of you people.

Phoebe: God!

Come on. Just do it.

Call her.

Stop being so testosterone-y.

Chandler: *Which, by the way,*
is the real San Francisco treat.

Monica: Ja vanhempani vielä painostavat
minua löytämään teidänlaisenne!

Phoebe: *Tee se! Soita hänelle!*

Älä anna testosteronille valtaa.

Chandler: *Todellinen valtataistelu.* (Episode 20)

Example 10 makes fun of the relationship games people play. The culture-specific reference *Which, by the way, is the real San Francisco treat*. Chandler makes is, again, ambiguous and irrelevant in the context. Therefore, it also breaks the maxims of manner and relation. At the same time, it is a major factor contributing to the humour of the scene. Contrarily to Examples 1 to 9, in Example 10, the breaking of conversational maxims is not transferred into the TT, however, owing to the fact that the reference is replaced by a new humorous line in the TT, rather than with, for instance, a functional equivalent. Nevertheless, the TT is funny, but the source of humour is no longer connected to the breaking of conversational maxims. Instead, the humour of the TT comes from the wordplay the translator has used to replace the ST culture-specific reference.

The translator has probably chosen to replace Chandler's line with a new humorous line, because Chandler's comment is culture-specific (he is referring to Rice-A-Roni, a boxed food mix called *The San Francisco Treat!*, which is a registered trademark.). Accordingly, the translator has replaced this cultural reference by inventing a wordplay based on Phoebe's comment *Stop being so testosterone-y*, which precedes the reference. The translator has thus kept one part of the ST's humorous line in the TT, but left the other one out (probably because the reference does not transfer well into the target culture). In spite of the fact that this cultural replacement does not preserve the culture-specific reference of the ST and the breaking of conversational maxims, it, nevertheless, creates a new humorous expression in the TT. In consequence, the humour of the ST is not lost; it only comes from a different source than in the ST.

Another example of a similar kind can be seen in Example 11 in which *Friends* have noticed that somebody is spying on them from the apartment opposite to their's.

Example 11:
 Joey: *He's back.*
The peeper's back.
Get down!
 Rachel: *Get down?*
 Chandler: *And boogie.*
 Joey: *Tirkistelijä on palannut!*
Maahan!
 Rachel: no translation
 Chandler: *Ampu tulee.* (Episode 20)

Similarly to Example 10, in Example 11 the ST culture-specific reference *Get down! Get down? And boogie.* is replaced in the TT with a new humorous expression *Maahan! Ampu tulee.* This is probably due to the fact that the ST culture-specific reference is made to a song (*Boogie Oogie Oogie* by A Taste of Honey), and songs are in general difficult to translate (which can be seen in other examples in this study as well). In the pragmatic dimension, the humorous intention of the scene comes from both the fact that Joey is afraid of the peeper, as well as from the fact that Chandler makes his remark (which breaks the maxims of manner and relation, again). Although Chandler's culture-specific reference is not transferred into the TT, the skopos of amusing is preserved. This owes to the fact that the translator has used a cultural replacement, which changes the source of humour in the ST still managing to make the scene appear funny. Thus, although the humorous intention of the ST changes in the TT, the skopos of amusing can still be preserved in the TT.

In Example 11, the ST uses breaking of conversational maxims more extensively than the TT. This results from the fact that the culture-specific reference is lost in the translation process. Nevertheless, in Example 11, both the ST and the TT break the maxim of relation, but the ST does this more noticeably: Chandler's line *And boogie!* in the ST seems more irrelevant in its context than his line *Ampu tulee.* in the TT. This results from the fact that when somebody asks you to *Get down!* it is more common to get down, because of *ampu tulee* than because you want *to boogie*. In addition, the ST's breaking of the maxim of manner by being ambiguous in the reference to the

song *Boogie Oogie Oogie* is not transferred into the TT, because of the cultural replacement used in the TT changes the source of humour.

In summary, as all 22 instances of cultural replacements found in the data preserve the skopos of amusing in the TT, it can be said that the strategy works very well in translating the type of culture-specific verbal humour that is used in *Friends*.

5.1.2 Explanatory addition

There are a total of seven instances out of 100 of culture-specific verbal humour translated with the strategy of explanatory addition in the data. These instances can be divided into two groups: (1) instances which are translated with an explanatory addition while a ST culture-specific expression is left untranslated (5 instances, see List (3a) below), and (2) instances translated with an explanatory addition while a ST culture-specific expression is translated into the TT word-for-word; that is, a combination of two translation strategies have been used to preserve the skopos of amusing (word-for-word translation is discussed in more detail in 5.1.5) (2 instances, see List (3b) below). In group (1), in four instances out of five, the skopos of amusing is successfully preserved with the strategy of explanatory addition, while one instance fails to preserve the skopos. In group (2), both two instances preserve the skopos of amusing with the combination of two translation strategies. Accordingly, of the seven occurrences of explanatory addition, four preserve the skopos of amusing, two preserve the skopos of amusing with the combination of explanatory addition and word-for-word translation, while one instance fails preserve the skopos.

List (3a)

Ross: *Do the words, "Billy, don't be a hero" mean anything to you? /*
 Ross: *Muistatteko hitin "Billy, don't be a hero",*

Phoebe: *I brought Operation./*

Phoebe: *Minä toin Operation-pelin.,*

Chandler: *The fifth dentist caved, and now they are all recommending Trident? /*

Chandler: *Nyt kaikki hammaslääkärit suosittavat Trident-tahnaa.,*

Phoebe: *Oh, it's Dr. Seuss! /*

Phoebe: *Tohtori Seussin satuja!, and*

Joey: *It's Giants-Cowboys. /*

Joey: *Giants-Cowboys-matsi!*

List (3b)

Rachel: *I got the extended disco version with three choruses of ... "You'll Never Make it on Your Own". /*

Rachel: *Se oli kuin diskoversio kappaleesta "Yksin et ikinä pärjää"., and*

Ross: *Now, what is wrong with my Snuggles? /*

Ross: *Mikä Hali-huuhtelussa on vikana*

Accordingly, in group (1) of the translation strategy of explanatory addition there are two scenes in which the humour of the ST is not restricted to the meaning of the untranslated ST expression in the TT. Therefore, merely the use of the explanatory addition is able to preserve the humour of the ST in the TT. This can be seen in Example 12 in which Ross (who has recently been divorced) reminisces the time he last dated girls other than his former wife.

Example 12:

Ross: *Do the words, "Billy, don't be a hero" mean anything to you?*

Ross: *Muistatteko hitin "Billy, don't be a hero"? (Episode 1)*

In this scene, it seems justifiable not to translate the ST expression "*Billy, don't be a hero*", because the explanatory addition *hitin* already clarifies the fact that the expression refers to a song. In addition, as the humour of the scene does not come from the meaning of the song's name (cf. to Example 16 with reference to the song "*You'll never make it on your own*" discussed below in this section). Instead, the humour derives from the fact that the song is from the 1970s, that is, it refers (exaggeratingly) to the time Ross last went on a date. To translate the song with a cultural replacement (a song popular in Finland in the 1970's) would also be an option, but it could take the

domestication effect too far. Most viewers can hear Ross' expression, and it could irritate some viewers, if the song was replaced by a Finnish functional equivalent.

In the pragmatic dimension, the humorous intention of the scene is also transferred into the TT with the explanatory addition. In Example 12, the humour is tied to the culture-specific reference. Being ambiguous, Ross' line *Do the words, "Billy, don't be a hero" mean anything to you?* breaks the maxim of manner. It also seems to break the maxim of quantity in the ST, because to be understandable the expression could need some extra information. This extra information is added into the TT with the explanatory addition *hitin*. Thus, the TT does not break the maxim of quality, but the humour of the scene is still preserved. This is probably due to the fact that the humour does not completely derive from the breaking of the maxim of quality. Instead, it mainly comes from Ross comparing the time he last went on a date to a song from the 1970s.

Contrary to Example 12, in Example 13, the untranslated ST expression is a major source of humour, because it includes wordplay. In most cases, this would pose problems in translation, but the same wordplay (surprisingly) works in the TT as well. In Example 13, *Friends* are preparing to spend their evening playing different games.

Example 13:

Phoebe: *And I brought Operation.*

But I lost the tweezers, so we can't operate. But we can prep the guy.

Phoebe: *Minä toin Operation-pelin.*

Ilman pinsettejä ei tosin operoida. Mutta voimme valmistella potilaan. (Episode 4)

Owing to the fact that the word *Operation* can be used in the Finnish wordplay as well, the translation strategy of explanatory addition works well in this scene. If it the expression did not work in the TL (which is more usually the case), a mere explanatory addition would probably not suffice to

preserve the humour of the ST. Then, the translator would probably have to change the source of humour in the TT, or use another translation strategy to preserve the humour of the ST in the TT.

In Example 13, the humorous intention is tied to the culture-specific reference and wordplay: the humour is created by the wordplay with the word *Operation*. With the wordplay, Example 13 breaks the conversational maxims of manner and quantity in the ST. The maxim of manner is broken, because the extended wordplay may seem ambiguous; the maxim of quantity, for its part, is broken due to the fact that the text does not explicitly explain what Phoebe is referring to with the word *Operation*. With the translation strategy of explanatory addition, the TT is not as ambiguous as the ST, that is, it does not break the maxim of manner, or not to the same extent as the ST does. Moreover, similarly to Example 12, the maxim of quantity is not broken in the TT, due to the use of the explanatory addition. This does not diminish the humour of the scene, because it relies more on the wordplay than on the breaking of the maxim of quantity.

In contrast to Examples 12 and 13, Example 14 does not fully manage to preserve the skopos of amusing. In Example 14, Rachel storms into a room where all other *Friends* are spending time together to share some special news. In this scene, Chandler's comment is the main source of humour.

Example 14:

Rachel: Guys, guess what, guess what, guess what?

Chandler: *Um, okay. The fifth dentist caved, and now they are all recommending Trident?*

Rachel: Arvatkaa mitä?

Chandler: *Nyt kaikki hammaslääkärit suosittlevat Trident-tahnaa?* (Episode 18)

In Example 14, the ST's intention is to produce a humorous effect when Chandler answers in an unpredictable way to Rachel's question by referring to a chewing gum ad with his line *Um, okay. The fifth dentist caved, and now*

they are all recommending Trident? In this scene, the principal source of humour in the ST comes from this culture-specific reference to *Trident* (Trident Gum is known for their slogan, “Four out of five dentists agree”). With the reference, Chandler also breaks the maxim of relation, due to the fact that he answers in a completely irrelevant way to Rachel’s question. In the TT, the irrelevance of Chandler’s comment is transferred, but the culture-specific reference is not. That is, in the semiotic dimension, the explanatory addition *Nyt kaikki hammaslääkärit suosittelevat Trident-tahnaa?* does not sufficiently clarify the ST’s culture-specific reference. This is probably caused by the fact that *Trident Gum* is not familiar to the Finnish audience. Therefore, although the TT preserves the irrelevance of Chandler’s comment, the TT’s inability to clarify the ST culture-specific reference diminishes the humour of the TT.

Consequently, the ST expression *The fifth dentist caved, and now they are all recommending Trident?* should probably have been domesticated more in order for the TT to preserve its skopos of amusing. Nevertheless, this would be quite difficult, because it is hard to find, for instance, a suitable functional equivalent to this particular ST expression. Perhaps the translator could have domesticated (and thus made the expression more understandable) the expression by using a brand, which is more familiar to the target audience, such as *Jenkki gum* (ie. *Vihdoin kaikki hammaslääkärit puhuvat Jenkki-hymyn puolesta?* etc.). In these types of instances, it is, however, very difficult to determine when the ST expression is too foreign to be mentioned in the TT, or when a target culture functional equivalent makes the TT seem too domesticated.

Another instance in which an explanatory addition with an untranslated ST expression is used can be seen in Example 15. In this scene, Rachel, who is very picky about gifts, is opening her birthday presents.

Example 15:
 Rachel: This one's from Joey.
 It feels like a book.
 I think it's a book.
 And it's a book!
 Phoebe: *Oh, it's Dr. Seuss!*
 Joey: That book got me through
 some tough times.
 Rachel: Tämä on Joeylta. Se tuntuu
 kirjalta. Se taitaa olla kirja.
 Se on kirja!
 Phoebe: *Tohtori Seussin satuja!*
 Joey: Tuo kirja auttoi minut
 vaikeiden aikojen yli. (Episode 24)

In Example 15, the ST's intention is to produce a humorous effect when Rachel gets presents she does not like and does not try very hard not to show it (this can be interpreted from her non-verbal behaviour). In addition, Joey's present (a book by Dr. Seuss) can be considered a fairly unsuitable present for a person in her mid-twenties, which *Friends* characters other than Joey and Phoebe acknowledge. The fact that Joey and Phoebe think the present is good in comparison to the fact that the others do not enhances the humour of the scene. With the translation strategy of an explanatory addition, these humorous intentions are transferred into the TT. Even if the TT audience was not aware of who Dr. Seuss was, the explanatory addition of *satuja* would clarify the fact that the present can be considered unsuitable.

Furthermore, in Example 15, the conversational maxims of quality and quantity are broken in the ST. That is, Phoebe's line *Oh, it's Dr. Seuss!* breaks the maxim of quantity, as it does not become clear from her expression that she is referring to a book. It is, however, very likely that the source text audience knows she is talking about a book, because of *Dr. Seuss's* status as a classic. In any case, the TT does not break the maxim, as the explanatory addition of *satuja* is used in the translation. The breaking of the maxim of quality in the ST is evident in Rachel's lines, because she does not mean what she says. To a large extent, the humour of the scene derives from this, which

is also transferred into the TT with the translation strategy of explanatory addition.

In contrast to group (1), in group (2) of explanatory addition, the ST culture-specific expressions are translated into the TT word-for-word in addition to the explanatory additions (2 instances) (word-for-word translation discussed in more detail in section 5.1.5). In group (2), the translator has probably deemed it necessary to translate the ST culture-specific expressions, because in these particular instances the humorous intention derives from the expressions. This can be seen in Example 16 below, before which Rachel has told her father she wants to start living independently, without his financial help. In the scene, Rachel is telling about her father's reaction to this to the other *Friends*.

Example 16:

Rachel: *Actually I got the extended disco version with three choruses of ...*

"You'll Never Make it on Your Own".

Rachel: *Se oli kuin diskoversio kappaleesta "Yksin et ikinä pärjää".* (Episode 5)

As a major part of the ST's source of humour comes from the meaning of the name of the song "*You'll Never Make it on Your Own*", it is justifiable to translate the song's name word-for-word in the TT (see word-for-word translation in more detail in section 5.1.5). Thus, in this instance, the combination of the explanatory addition *kappaleesta* and the word-for-word translation "*Yksin et ikinä pärjää*" works well in preserving the skopos of amusing. Although the song probably produces connotations in the ST which it does not create in the TT (as there is no song called *Yksin et ikinä pärjää* in the target culture), the TT still manages to preserve its skopos of amusing. This results from the fact that the literal meaning of the ST expression is transferred into the TT with the word-for-word translation.

In comparison to Example 12, which uses the source language expression *Billy don't be a hero* in the TT without losing the humour of the scene with the

explanatory addition of *hitin*, in Example 16 the mere explanatory addition is not enough to preserve the skopos in the TT. This results in the fact that the meaning of the song's name contributes to the humour of the scene. In other words, while in Example 16 the humorous intention is related to the meaning of the ST culture-specific reference, in Example 12 the humour comes from another source (analysed earlier in this section). Thus, in some instances, a mere explanatory addition seems to be enough to preserve the skopos, while in others, other translation methods have to be used as well to preserve the humour of the ST depending on the source of humour (cf. *Se oli kuin diskoversio kappaleesta "You'll Never Make it on Your Own."*, which might be too foreign).

Furthermore, Example 16 breaks the maxims of manner and quantity in the ST. That is, Rachel's line is slightly ambiguous and could need some extra information to be understandable due to the reference to the song "*You'll Never Make it on Your Own*". Similarly to most examples using the translation strategy of explanatory addition, also in Example 16, the TT is not as ambiguous as the ST. This results from the use of the explanatory addition. As the humour of the scene is not entirely dependent on the ST breaking the maxims of manner and quantity, the TT manages to preserve the skopos of amusing.

The other instance in group (2) of explanatory addition is quite similar to Example 16. Accordingly, in Example 17, Ross and Rachel are going to do laundry together. Ross is madly in love with Rachel, which Rachel is not aware of.

Example 17:

Chandler: Oh, and the fabric softener?

Ross: *Now, what is wrong with my Snuggles?*

Chandler: Entä tuo huuhteluaine?

Ross: *Mikä Hali-huuhtelussa on vikana?* (Episode 5)

Similarly to Example 16, in this scene the explanatory addition *huuhtelussa* is combined with another translation strategy, that is, word-for-word translation, in order to make the ST expression *Snuggles* understandable to the TT audience. This is due to the fact that the meaning of the word *Snuggles* is important with regard to the humour of the scene. The humorous intention of the ST is related to the fact that Ross' fabric softener is named *Snuggles*. On the one hand, the word seems to refer to Ross being insecure about Rachel's feelings for him by implying that there is something wrong with Ross's attempts (ie. *Snuggles*) to get Rachel to like him. On the other hand, Chandler seems to suggest that Ross using a fabric softener, in particular one named *Snuggles*, is not manly enough if he wants to make an impression on Rachel.

Moreover, by conveying different type of connotations the culture-specific reference to *Snuggles* in Example 17 also breaks the conversational maxims of quantity and manner. That is, the reference to *Snuggles* implies (at least) two different things, as analysed in the paragraph above. These implications are not fully transferred into the TT, because it uses the explanatory addition of *huuhtelussa*. This does not completely diminish the humour of the TT, however, because of the fact that there are other sources of humour in the ST, which are, in fact, transferred into the TT, mainly including the fact that Chandler implies that to use fabric softener, and particularly one named *Snuggles*, or *Hali*, will not help Ross to win Rachel over.

On the whole, it seems that the strategy of explanatory addition works fairly well in preserving the skopos of amusing. Nevertheless, as only four of the instances translated with this strategy (the other two which preserve the skopos are combinations of two strategies) preserve the skopos, it can be claimed that the strategy works well only in translating particular types of culture-specific verbal humour, such as that presented in Example 12 (*Do the words, "Billy, don't be a hero" mean anything to you? / Muistatteko hitin "Billy,*

don't be a hero") where the literal meaning of the ST culture-specific reference is not the main source of humour.

5.1.3 No translation

Of the total of 100, there are five instances in the data in which the ST culture-specific references are translated with the strategy of no translation. In other words, the references are left untranslated. These instances are divided into two groups: (1) instances that are left untranslated with no discernible reason (two instances, see List (4a) below) and group (2) instances in which there may have been a valid reason for leaving a specific ST expression untranslated (three instances, see List (4b) below). In three of the instances of no translation, the TT completely or partly fails to preserve the skopos of amusing (in both instances of group (1) and in one instance of group (2)). In two instances, the skopos is partly preserved owing to the fact that the humour of the ST is not restricted to the culture-specific reference, and the translator has managed to translate the other sources of humour (group (2)).

List (4a)

Paul: *No, I'm telling you, last night was like... all my birthdays, graduations, plus the barn-raising scene in "Witness" and*

Monica: *Lenny and Squiggy are here.*

List (4b)

Rachel: *Okay, I'm with you, Cheech.,*

Joey: *No, it's the pregame. I'm gonna watch it at the reception., and*

Ross: *"Here we come walking down the street get the funniest looks from everyone we meet hey, hey -*

Accordingly, neither of the instances in group (1) preserve the humour of the ST in the TT. This results from the fact that the ST culture-specific references are the source of humour in the ST; because they are not transferred into the

TT the humour is lost. This can be seen in Example 18 in which Monica and Paul have been on a great date, which they are talking about the next morning.

Example 18:

Paul: Thank you. Thank you so much.

Monica: Stop!

Paul: *No, I'm telling you, last night was like... all my birthdays, graduations, plus the barn-raising scene in "Witness".*

Paul: Se oli mahtavaa.

Kiitos sinulle.

Monica: no translation

Paul: *no translation* (Episode 1)

In Example 18, the ST culture-specific reference *No, I'm telling you, last night was like... all my birthdays, graduations, plus the barn-raising scene in "Witness"* is not translated into the TT. Since the humorous intention of the scene derives from this particular reference, the skopos of amusing is not preserved in the TT. In order to preserve the skopos, the reference could have been translated, for instance, by using an explanatory translation (such as, "*Eilinen oli kuin parhaimmasta deittileffasta.*" etc.), which would have preserved some of the humour of the ST, although the culture-specific reference would have been lost (explanatory translation is discussed in more detail in section 5.1.6).

Moreover, in Example 18 the culture-specific reference in Paul's line is used to highlight the fact that Paul and Monica's date has been successful. At the same time, the reference breaks the maxims of manner and quantity by expressing this in an ambiguous way that could use some explanation. The expression is also exaggerated, again breaking the maxim of quantity. Naturally, because the expression is left untranslated the TT does not break the maxims, and the humour of the ST is not transferred into the TT.

Similarly to Example 18, in Example 19 the fact that the ST culture-specific reference is not translated into the TT makes the humour of the ST to

disappear in the TT. In Example 19, Monica comes home to find Joey and Chandler (who live next door) sitting in her living room.

Example 19:

Monica: Oh, good. *Lenny and Squiggy are here.*

Monica: no translation (Episode 1)

In the ST in Example 19, the intention is to produce a humorous effect with Monica's reference to Lenny and Squiggy from the TV show *Laverne and Shirley*, comparing them to Chandler and Joey. As the culture-specific reference has not been translated into the TT, the humorous intention is not preserved. By ambiguously using the culture-specific reference, the scene also breaks the maxims of quantity and manner, which largely contributes to the humour of the ST. Similarly to Example 18, the fact that the expression is left untranslated in the TT makes the TT lose its skopos of amusing.

In group (2) of no translation, there are instances in which there may have been a valid reason for leaving a ST culture-specific reference untranslated. This can be seen in Example 20 where Phoebe has noticed that Steve - Monica's prospective future employer who has come for a visit - has been smoking marijuana.

Example 20:

Phoebe: In the cab on the way over,

Steve blazed up a doobie.

Rachel: What?

Phoebe: Smoked a joint, you know?

Lit a bone. Weed, hemp, ganja.

Rachel: *Okay, okay, okay.*

I know. Okay, I'm with you, Cheech.

Phoebe: Steve veti myssyä taksimatalla.

Rachel: Mitä?

Phoebe: Sytytti marisätkän.

Poltti pilveä, ruohoa...

Rachel: *Hyvä on. Meni perille.* (Episode 15)

In Example 20, the humour of the scene comes from several sources in the pragmatic dimension. For instance, in the scene, the contradiction between

the fact that Phoebe, Monica, and Rachel have thought that Steve would be a well-behaved businessman and that he, instead, appears to be under the influence of marihuana and behaves otherwise badly as well is a significant factor in creating the humour of the scene. In addition, the fact that Phoebe seems to know several names for smoking marihuana enhances the humour of the scene. Among other things, the humour comes from the fact that Phoebe breaks the maxim of quantity by listing many names for marihuana. As this is also transferred into the TT, the humour of the scene is not entirely lost in the TT, in spite of the ST culture-specific reference being translated with the strategy of no translation. The ST culture-specific reference to Cheech (Cheech Marin, an American comedian and actor, who starred in the Cheech and Chong "stoner" movies in the 1980's) enhances the humorous effect of the scene in the ST; as this is not transferred into the TT the humour of the TT in comparison to the ST is diminished.

Nevertheless, in spite of the strategy of no translation in translating the ST culture-specific reference the skopos of amusing is not completely lost in the TT in Example 20. This results from the fact that the other sources of humour in the ST besides the culture-specific reference are transferred into the TT. The ST reference could, however, have been translated, for instance, by using an explanatory translation (such as *"Meni perille pössyttelijä/pilviveikko."* etc.), which would have preserved some of the humour of the culture-specific expression, in spite of the actual culture-specific reference being left untranslated.

Next, in Example 21 the strategy of no translation is used in translating a song, which is typically very difficult. The following scene deals with the fact that Ross and Carol have got a divorce, because Carol has found a lesbian life partner, Susan. Carol is, however, pregnant with Ross' baby. Ross and Susan do not get along.

Example 21:

Carol: Look, you don't have to talk to it. You can sing to it if you want to.

Ross: Oh, please. I am not singing to your stomach.

Susan: How's it going? (Enters into the room)

Ross: Shh! *"Here we come walking down the street get the funniest looks from everyone we meet hey, hey –"*

Ross: Hey, did you just feel that?

Carol: I did.

Ross: Does it always -- ?

Carol: No, that was the first!

Susan: Keep singing! Keep singing!

Ross: (*"Hey, hey, you're my baby and I can't wait to meet you when you come out I'll buy you a bagel and then we'll go to the zoo"*)

Susan: I felt it that time!

Ross: *"Hey, hey, I'm your daddy I'm the one without any breasts"*

Carol: Ei sille tarvitse puhua. Laula vaikka.

Ross: En laula vatsallesi!

Susan: Miten menee?

Ross: *no translation*

Ross: Tunsitko tuon?

Carol: *no translation*

Ross: Potkiiko se aina...

Carol: Ei, se oli ensimmäinen.

Susan: Jatka laulamista!

Ross: (Hei hei, oma vauvani

Tuskin maltan sua odottaa

Ostan sulle rinkelin

Ja sitten mennään eläintarhaan)

Susan: *no translation*

Ross: Hei hei, minä olen isäsi

Se jolla ei ole rintoja (Episode 9)

In Example 21, the intention is to produce a humorous effect when Ross is reluctant to speak and sing to the unborn baby in Carol's stomach, but starts singing instantly when Susan comes in. The fact that Ross sings The Monkees theme tune is supposed to enhance the humorous effect of the scene. By singing the song Ross breaks the conversational maxim of manner, because the reference may not be familiar to all viewers. Due to the strategy of no translation this is not transferred into the TT. The strategy of no translation does not work well in Example 21, since it does not preserve the humour of the scene. Similarly to Example 20, however, the ST of Example 21 does contain other sources of humour than the ST culture-specific reference, including the fact that Ross starts doing something he feels uncomfortable with only because he does not like Susan and wants to show her he is doing something special with Carol. Furthermore, even though the song is not

translated in the TT, the target audience may be able to infer the humour included in it, because they can hear Ross singing and because the next line of the song is in fact translated.

It is, nevertheless, difficult to determine how songs should be translated. In terms of Example 21, The Monkees theme tune is probably not that familiar with the target audience. Another line of the song is, however, translated word-for-word in Example 21 (*Hei hei, oma vauvani/Tuskin maltan sua odottaa/Ostan sulle rinkelin/Ja sitten mennään eläintarhaan*), and it does not seem to preserve the humour of the ST (see section 5.1.5 for more detailed discussion on word-for-word translation). When the song is translated word-for-word in Example 21, the humour of the TT does not come from the same source as in the ST. The TT may, however, be perceived funny for other reasons (because the Finnish words sound funny etc).

To conclude, with three of the instances of the strategy of no translation partly (Example 21) or completely (Example 18 and Example 19) failing to preserve the skopos of amusing, the strategy, unsurprisingly, does not seem to work well in translating culture-specific verbal humour. In addition, the instances that preserve the skopos preserve it only partly merely owing to the fact that the humour of the ST is not completely restricted to the culture-specific references.

5.1.4 Universal translation

There are a total of 27 instances out of a 100 of the strategy of universal translation in the data. Of all the translation strategies examined in this study, the success of this strategy is probably the most difficult one to determine. This results from the fact that of the pieces of data translated with universal translation many are culture-specific references that can be viewed as belonging to a larger cultural context of the West. Thus, it can be expected

that the receivers of the TT are able to understand them without much domestication. However, this may not be the case in many of the instances, due to different background knowledge of the viewers. The instances of this type include references to, for example, famous people, bands, plays, and films, as well as TV shows. In 16 of these instances, the skopos of amusing is deemed to be preserved, in nine, the skopos is partly preserved, and in two, it is not preserved.

The instances of universal translation are divided into two different groups: (1) instances in which the culture-specific reference can be viewed as belonging to the cultural context of the West. Therefore, the references can be expected to be understood by the target audience, in spite of no domestication (however, it is still possible that not all members of the target audience understand the reference) (16 instances, see List (5a) below) and (2) instances, in which the references appear to be too foreign in the context of the TT, but which still make sense if the TT recipients happen to know the reference (11 instances, see List (5b) below).

List (5a)

Joey: *I meant female nudity. All right, I don't need to see Lou Grant frolicking.*

Monica and Phoebe: *Hugh! Hugh Grant! /*

Joey: *Tarkoitin naisia! En kaipaa Lou Grantin viuhahtelua.*

Monica and Phoebe: *Hugh Grantin!,*

Rachel: *I mean, we are way past the "fling" thing. I'm feeling things I've only read about in Danielle Steel books, you know. I mean, when I'm with him, I'm just totally totally... /*

Rachel: *Tämä ei ole hetken huumaa. Tällaisia tunteita on Danielle Steelin kirjoissa. Hänen kanssaan olen niin...,*

Everybody: *Oo ooh.*

Rachel: *Ooh, what Phoebe: --ma Thurman. /*

Kaikki: *ei käännöstä Rachel: Uu mitä?*

Phoebe: *Uu...ma Thurman...,*

Chandler: *I don't know, but I think it's about to attack the Enterprise. /*

Chandler: *En tiedä, mutta se taitaa kohta hyökätä Enterpriselle.,*

Chandler: *Yeah, I think that for us, kissing's pretty much like an opening act.. Like the stand-up comedian you have to sit through.. before Pink Floyd comes out. /*

Chandler: *Meille suuteleminen taas on lämmittelyesiintyjä.
Kuin pakollinen koomikko ennen Pink Floydin esiintymistä.,*

Chandler: *So, I'm in Las Vegas. I'm Liza Minelli. /*

Chandler: *Olen Liza Minelli Las Vegasissa...,*

Phoebe: *Hi, Max.*

Max: *Yoko. I've decided to go to Minsk without you. /*

Phoebe: *Hei Max.*

Max: *Yoko. Olen päättänyt lähteä Minskiin ilman sinua.,*

Phoebe: *How about Agamemnon? /*

Phoebe: *Entä Agamemnon?,*

Chandler: *Okay. It's his first time out, so he's probably gonna wanna do some of the
touristy things. I'll go to Cats. You go to the Russian Tea Room. /*

Chandler: *Se on ensi kertaa ulkona, joten se kiertää varmaan nähtävyyksiä. Minä
menen Catsiin, käy sinä Russian Tea Roomissa.,*

*"fake-Monica": There's an open call for Cats. I'm thinking we go down there, sing
"Memories"... and make complete fools of ourselves. What do you say? /*

*"vale-Monica": Catsiin haetaan esiintyjä. Mennään laulamaan Memories ja
nolataan itsemme täysin.*

Monica: *Wow. Then I would definitely not recommend Mrs. Doubtfire. /*

Monica: *Sitten en todellakaan suosittelen Mrs. Doubtfirea!,*

Monica: *Oh, God! I'm like those women that you see... with shiny guys named Chad.
I'm Joan Collins. /*

Monica: *Olen kuin naiset, joita näkee Chad-nimisten tyyppien kanssa! Olen Joan
Collins!,*

Joey: *Listen, next time you talk to him... could you ask him which one the strongest
Power Ranger is? /*

Joey: *Kysy häneltä ensi kerralla, kuka on vahvin Power Rangereista.,*

Chandler: *I think last night was great. You know, the karaoke thing? Tracy and I
doing "Ebony and Ivory". /*

Chandler: *Se karaoke oli tosi hauskaa! Tracy ja minä lauloimme Ebony and Ivoryn,
and*

Monica: *It was so wild. We told them we were the Gunnersons in room 615...only to
find out that the Boston Celtics had taken over the entire sixth floor! /*

Monica: *Hillitöntä! Sanoimme olevamme Gunnersonit huoneesta 615,.....mutta
koko kuudes kerros olikin Boston Celticseillä!*

List (5b)

Ross: *Helen Geller? I don't think so!*

Carol: *It's not gonna be Helen Keller. /*

Ross: *Helen Geller? Tuskinpa!*

Carol: *Ei hänestä tule Helen Gelleriä,*

Ross: *Hey, when did you and Susan meet Huey Lewis? /*

Ross: *Milloin sinä ja Susan tapasitte Huey Lewisin?,*

Mr Heckles: *I saw Regis Philbin once. /*
 Mr Heckles: *Näin kerran Regis Philbinin.,*

Chandler: *Um. Let's see. Alvin, Simon, Theodore.... No. /*
 Chandler: *Alvin, Simon, Theodore... Emme!,*

Joey: *Hey, Pheebs. Guess who we saw today*
 Phoebe: *Oh, fun, okay! Liam Neeson. Joey: No Phoebe: Morley Safer. /*
 Joey: *Phoebs. Arvaa kenet näimme?*
 Phoebe: *Hei kiva leikki!*
 Phoebe: *Liam Neesonin? Morley Saferin?,*

Chandler: *Mazel tov! /*
 Chandler: *Mazel tov!,*

Aunt Iris: *Is Tony Randall dead? /*
 Iris-täti: *Onko Tony Randall kuollut?,*

Rachel: *See! But Joanie loved Chachi. That's the difference. /*
 Rachel: *Mutta Joanie rakasti Chachia! Se on eri asia.,*

Rachel: *Oh, cool. Urkel... in Spanish is Urkel. /*
 Rachel: *Jännää...Urkel on espanjaksi Urkel.,*

Dr. Mitchell: *Here, we brought wine. Look at this. It's from the cellars of Ernest and Tova Borgnine. /*
 Tohtori Mitchell: *Toimme viiniä. Se on Ernest ja Tova Borgninen kellareista., and*

Carl: *I'm just saying, if I see one more picture of Ed Begley Jr...in that stupid electric car...I'm gonna shoot myself! /*
 Carl: *Jos näen vielä yhdenkin kuvan Ed Begley Jr:sta sähköautossaan,.....ammun itseni!*

In all the instances in group (1), the humour is either partly or completely dependent on the culture-specific references made in the ST. Thus, as they have been translated with the strategy of universal translation, the references have to be familiar to the TT audience in order for them to understand the humour of the scenes. As group (1) consists of instances in which the culture-specific references can be expected to be (almost) as familiar in the target culture as they are in the source culture, it can be argued that the strategy of universal translation is successful in these particular cases. As pointed out earlier in this section, this is very difficult to measure, however.

In the following Example 22, the reference to actor Hugh Grant can be expected to be familiar to the target audience. In the scene, *Friends* have been

to see the movie *Four Weddings and a Funeral*, which has been in the theatres in Finland as well.

Example 22:

Joey: Hey, I don't need violence
to enjoy a movie...

just so long as
there's a little nudity.

Monica: There was nudity.

Joey: *I meant female nudity.*

All right, I don't need to see

Lou Grant frolicking.

Monica and Phoebe: *Hugh! Hugh Grant!*

Joey: Ei hyvä leffa kaipaa väkivaltaa,
kunhan on paljasta pintaa.

Monica: Siinähan oli!

Joey: *Tarkoitin naisia!*

En kaipaa Lou Grantin viuhahtelua.

Monica ja Phoebe: *Hugh Grantin!* (Episode 19)

Accordingly, the humour in Example 22 stems from the fact that Joey has not particularly enjoyed the film (the target audience of which is probably women), and that he does not seem to know who Hugh Grant (a well-known British actor) is. As the reference to Hugh Grant and the film *Four weddings and a funeral* can be expected to be familiar to the TT audience, the humour can be claimed to be preserved in the TT in spite of the fact that there is no domestication with the translation strategy of universal translation.

Furthermore, Example 22 breaks the maxim of quantity: when Joey talks about nudity, he seems to think that it only means female nudity and does not give enough information for the others to understand that he means female nudity in particular. This is also a significant factor in making the scene funny, which is transferred into the TT as well.

Most of the instances in group (1) of universal translation are similar to Example 22. Nevertheless, also in many of these types of scenes, the culture-specific reference could have been made clearer in the TT by using another translation strategy. This can be seen, for instance, in the following scene in

which Ross is talking with Chandler and Joey about his feelings toward Rachel in one room, while Rachel, Monica, and Phoebe discuss Rachel's relationship to an Italian man named Paolo in another room. Rachel does not know that Ross is in love with her.

Example 23:

Ross: Wasn't this supposed to be just a fling? Shouldn't it be... flung by now?
(to Joey and Chandler in one room)

Rachel: I mean, we are way past the "fling" thing. *I'm feeling things I've only read about in Danielle Steel books, you know.* I mean, when I'm with him, I'm just totally totally...

(to Monica and Phoebe in another room)

Ross: Nauseous. I'm physically nauseous.

What I am supposed to do? Call immigration?

I could call immigration.

Ross: Sen piti olla hetken huumaa.

Eikö huumaus jo riitä?

Rachel: Tämä ei ole hetken huumaa.

Tällaisia tunteita on Danielle Steelin kirjoissa.

Hänen kanssaan olen niin...

Ross: Huonovointinen. Voin huonosti.

Soitanko siirtolaisvirastoon? Sen voisinkin tehdä. (Episode 12)

In Example 23, the humour comes from many different sources, including, for instance, the wordplay with the word *fling/huuma* and the fact that Ross' lines end those of Rachel's as the scene is cut from Rachel to Ross. In addition, the fact that Ross thinks Rachel's relationship with Paolo will only last for a short time, while Rachel thinks the opposite, also makes the scene funny. Although Rachel's culture-specific reference to *Danielle Steel* (a well-known romance writer) is not the main source of humour in this extract, it contributes to the humour of the scene. This is transferred into the TT if the viewers recognise the reference.

Being slightly ambiguous, Rachel's reference to *Danielle Steel* breaks the conversational maxim of manner. Although the reference can be expected to be familiar to the target audience, also the strategy of explanatory translation could have been used to clarify it (such as "*Tälläisiä tunteita on romanssinovelleissa/-kirjoissa.*" etc.). However, should the translator choose to

do this, the breaking of the conversational maxim would not be transferred into the TT.

Similarly to Example 23, in Example 24 below, another translation strategy could also have been used to make the TT more domesticated. In the scene, Rachel's Italian boyfriend Paolo has made a move on Phoebe, while he has been in her massage studio. *Friends* are trying to decide whether or not to tell Rachel about it.

Example 24:

Phoebe: And all of a sudden, his hands weren't the problem anymore.

Monica: Was it...?

Phoebe: Boy Scouts could've camped under there.

Everybody: *Oo ooh.*

Rachel: *Ooh, what?*

Phoebe: --*ma Thurman.*

Ross: The actress!

Everybody: Uma Thurman.

Phoebe: Ja yhtäkkiä hänen kätensä eivät olleetkaan ongelma.

Monica: Oliko...

Phoebe: Sen alle voisi leiriytyä.

Everybody: *no translation*

Rachel: *Uu mitä?*

Phoebe: *Uu...ma Thurman...*

Ross: Se näyttelijä!

Everybody: *no translation (Episode 12)*

In Example 24, not unlike Example 23, the humour comes from different sources in the pragmatic dimension. Accordingly, the humour is created by the way in which Phoebe describes Paolo's behaviour. In addition, it comes from the fact that as Rachel comes into the room, in order not to tell her about Paolo, Phoebe continues the line *Oo ooh* - which the others are saying in referring to the situation with Paolo - by saying the name of the actor *Uma Thurman* (the beginning of *Uma* pronounced similarly to *Oo ooh*). The cultural reference to Uma Thurman could have been domesticated by a functional equivalent in the TT that has a similar phonetic pattern (such as "*Uu...no Turhapuro...*"), but this is not necessary, as Uma Thurman is probably familiar in the target culture as well. Moreover, Ross' line *The actress!/Se näyttelijä!* clarifies the reference in both the ST and the TT. As the

humour of the scene does not come from knowing the actor Uma Thurman, but instead, from the fact that her name is said in order not to tell Rachel about Paolo's behaviour, the reference does not require clarification with a different translation strategy.

In terms of conversational maxims, Example 24 breaks the maxim of quality, because the others lie to Rachel about Paolo with the reference to *Uma Thurman*. In addition, being ambiguous and irrelevant in the sense that one would probably not expect Phoebe to continue the line *Oo ooh* with the reference to *Uma Thurman*, Phoebe's comment *-ma Thurman* breaks the maxims of relation and manner. Accordingly, the humour of the scene partly derives from the breaking of conversational maxims: the joke comes from the contradiction that the viewers and other people than Rachel know what is going on, while Rachel does not. This is also transferred into the TT, partly owing to the fact that the humour is not completely tied to the culture-specific reference, but instead, to the larger context of the scene.

In the next scene, Example 25, the intention is to produce a humorous effect, when Chandler compares Ross' baby's ultrasound picture to something that might attack Star Trek's spaceship *Enterprise*. In Example 25, Joey and Chandler are looking at an ultrasound picture of the baby.

Example 25:

Joey: What are we supposed to be seeing here?

Chandler: *I don't know, but I think it's about to attack the Enterprise.*

Joey: Mitä tuossa pitäisi näkyä?

Chandler: *En tiedä, mutta se taitaa kohta hyökätä Enterpriselle.* (Episode 2)

As Star Trek is familiar in the target culture as well, and the spaceship is called *Enterprise* in the Finnish translation of the show, it can be claimed that the humorous intention of the ST is preserved in the TT with the translation strategy of universal translation. However, in order to clarify this (because not all people who watch *Friends* also watch Star Trek), the reference could

also have been translated with an explanatory translation, (such as “...*se taitaa kohta hyökätä avaruusalukselle.*” etc.). The universal translation still seems to work (if the viewer recognises the reference) and, therefore, it preserves the humorous intention. In Example 25, the maxims of quantity and manner are broken, owing to the fact that the culture-specific reference may seem ambiguous. This is also transferred into the TT.

As already pointed out, in most cases in which universal translation preserves the humorous intention of the ST, the humour is preserved in the TT if the viewer can be expected to spot the reference. Nevertheless, for instance in the following Example 26 where *Friends* are talking about kissing, the viewer does not necessarily have to know the band *Pink Floyd* in order to find the scene humorous.

Example 26:

Chandler: *Yeah, I think that for us, kissing's pretty much like an opening act.. Like the stand-up comedian you have to sit through.. before Pink Floyd comes out.*

Ross: Yeah, and it's not that we don't like the comedian. It's just that that's not.. why we bought the ticket.

Chandler: You see, the problem is though that after the concert, no matter how great the show was... you girls are always looking for the comedian again.

Chandler: *Meille suuteleminen taas on lämmittelyesiintyjä.*

Kuin pakollinen koomikko ennen Pink Floydin esiintymistä.

Ross: Ja kyllähän me siitä koomikosta pidämme,...

mutta emme ostaneet lippua hänen takiaan.

Chandler: Mutta vaikka konsertti olisi ollut miten hyvä tahansa,...

te tytöt huudatte jälleen koomikkoa lavalle. (Episode 2)

In Example 26, the intention of the ST is to produce a humorous effect when Chandler and Ross compare kissing to a stand up comedian/warm-up performer and sex to the main performer/*Pink Floyd*. Moreover, the intention is to make fun of the differences between men and women. As the humour of this scene comes from this comparison, the TT viewers, even if they did not know *Pink Floyd*, can infer from the context that it is some kind of a bigger/more famous performer than a stand-up comedian/a warm-up performer. Thus, the humorous intention is not completely lost with the translation strategy of universal translation, even if the viewer did not know

who Chandler and Ross are referring to. In addition, by making the comparison the scene breaks the maxim of manner due to being ambiguous, which can also be seen in the TT.

In group (2) of the translation strategy of universal translation (11 instances), the culture-specific references may seem foreign in the TT, and thus, the humour of the ST may (partly or completely) vanish in the translation process. This can be noticed, for instance, in Example 27 in which Ross, his former wife Carol, and her girlfriend Susan are thinking about the name of their unborn baby. Ross and Susan cannot stand each other.

Example 27:

Susan: Oh, please! What's wrong with Helen?

Ross: *Helen Geller? I don't think so!*

Carol: *It's not gonna be Helen Keller.*

Susan: Mikä Helenissä on vikana?

Ross: *Helen Geller? Tuskinpa!*

Carol: *Ei hänestä tule Helen Gelleriä.* (Episode 2)

In Example 27, the humour of the ST does not seem to be preserved in the TT, because the culture-specific reference to Helen Keller – a child known for being disabled – is probably not very familiar to the target audience. Ross objects to his child being named Helen Geller (Geller is Ross' surname), because of the similarity to the name Helen Keller. Therefore, the humour of the ST comes from the fact that Ross sees the similarity between the names Helen Geller and Helen Keller. This also breaks the maxims of quantity and manner, because the reference is ambiguous and could require some clarification to be understood. Even if the TT audience did not notice this reference, however, the scene might still appear funny because the pronunciation of the name Helen Geller (the first and last names rhyme) and because the viewers know that Ross probably objects to anything that Susan suggests.

Since the type of a reference presented in Example 27 is both culture-specific as well as tied to the phonetic similarity between the two names, it is very difficult one to translate in the semiotic dimension. The universal translation properly works only if the viewer notices the reference to Helen Keller. A cultural replacement is quite hard to come up with, and even if this instance was translated with an explanatory addition (such as "*Ei hänestä Helen Kelleriä, kuurosokeaa lasta tule.*"), the humour would probably still be lost, because Helen Keller is not that familiar in the target culture, and because it would be quite hard to notice the difference between *Geller* and *Keller*, as the subtitles move on so quickly (that is, the viewers would probably not notice that Carol was using another surname in her answer instead of that of Ross').

On the whole, in group (2) of universal translation, the humour of the ST is not completely preserved in the TT in any of the instances, due to the foreignisation effect being too extensive (or only those viewers who are familiar with American culture can be expected to understand the references). However, on many occasions, such as in the following scene, in which Ross is looking at a picture of Susan, Carol, and a third person unknown to him, the humour of the ST is not completely lost in the TT in spite of foreignisation. In Example 28, while visiting Susan and Carol, Ross mistakes a person (a female) in a picture as Huey Lewis (a male musician). In the scene, Susan and Carol have also found out about the gender of their and Ross' child.

Example 28:

Ross: *Hey, when did you and Susan meet Huey Lewis?*

Carol: That's our friend Tanya.

Ross: Of course it's your friend Tanya.

Carol: Don't you wanna know about the sex?

Ross: The sex?

I'm having enough trouble with the image of you and Susan together.

When you throw in Tanya...

Carol: The sex of the baby, Ross!

Ross: *Milloin sinä ja Susan tapasitte Huey Lewisin?*

Carol: Se on ystävämme Tanya.

Ross: Tietenkin se on ystävämme Tanya.

Carol: Kiinnostaako sukupuoli?

Ross: Sukupuolielämä?
 Minun on tarpeeksi vaikea kuvitella sinua ja Susania.
 Tanya menee jo överiksi.
 Carol: Vauvan sukupuoli, Ross! (Episode 12)

Example 28 makes fun of Ross being uncomfortable with the fact that his former wife (Carol) is now with a woman (Susan). In the pragmatic dimension, Ross misunderstanding the word *sex* breaks the maxim of quantity, because there is not enough information in Carol's line *Don't you wanna know about the sex?*, which enhances the humour of the scene. In addition, in this scene the stereotype of masculine looking lesbians is made fun of, as Ross sees the photo of Carol, Susan, and the third person (female), who he mistakes for Huey Lewis (male).

Due to the fact that the other sources of humour, besides the culture-specific reference to Huey Lewis, are transferred into the TT the skopos of the TT is, to a certain extent, preserved with the translation strategy of universal translation. Moreover, the target audience probably knows that Huey is a man's name, while Tanya a woman's. Thus, even if the viewers did not recognise the ST reference to Huey Lewis, the humour would not be completely lost if they noticed the fact that Ross mistakes Tanya as a male.

Furthermore, there is another instance of a universal translation in which the TT manages - to a certain extent - to preserve the humour of the ST, even if the TT audience did not grasp the ST culture-specific reference. This can be seen in Example 29 in which Monica and Rachel are looking for Ross' pet monkey that has gone missing. Mr. Heckles is their neighbour who is represented as somewhat eccentric in the TV series.

Example 29:
 Monica: The monkey, have you seen a monkey?
 Mr. Heckles: *I saw Regis Philbin once.*
 Monica: Oletteko nähnyt apinaa?
 Mr. Heckles: *Näin kerran Regis Philbinin.* (Episode 19)

In Example 29, the intention is to produce a humorous effect, when Mr. Heckles answers Monica's question about Ross' missing monkey in an irrelevant way. In other words, Mr. Heckles' answer is irrelevant in the context, because not many people would expect that kind of an answer to the question which is asked in the scene. Therefore, the humour of the scene chiefly comes from Mr. Heckles breaking the maxim of relation.

In Example 29, the humour of the ST is not completely lost in the TT, even if the TT audience was not familiar with Regis Philbin (a TV show host). This results from the fact that in order for a viewer to see the irrelevance of Mr. Heckles' answer, they do not necessarily have to know who he is referring to, because it is quite evident that he is referring to a person, rather than Ross' pet monkey. This is transferred into the TT with the universal translation, thus making the TT to preserve the skopos of amusing to a certain extent. In the ST, however, the humour may also partly derive from the fact that Mr. Heckles' answer may be interpreted in a way that he would be suggesting that Regis Philbin looks like a monkey. For this to be transferred into the TT, the TT audience would need to recognise the reference.

Another example of this type is presented in Example 30 in which Joey and Chandler have met Phoebe's twin sister about whom Phoebe has not told anyone, because they do not get along with each other. In the scene, Phoebe is guessing who the boys have met.

Example 30:

Joey: Hey, Pheebs.

Guess who we saw today?

Phoebe: *Oh, fun, okay!*

Liam Neeson.

Joey: No

Phoebe: *Morley Safer.*

Joey: No.

Phoebe: The woman who cuts my hair!

Joey: No.

Monica: This could be a really long game.

Chandler: Your sister, Ursula.

Joey: Phoebs. *Arvaa kenet näimme?*

Phoebe: Hei kiva leikki!
 Phoebe: *Liam Neesonin?*
Morley Saferin?
 Kampaajani?
 Monica: Tästä voi tulla pitkä leikki.
 Chandler: Sisaresi Ursulan! (Episode 16)

In Example 30, the intention is to produce a humorous effect when Phoebe answers the boys in an unexpected and irrelevant manner by breaking the conversational maxim of relation. In spite of the fact that the culture-specific references might not be clear to the target audience, the irrelevance of Phoebe's answers is transferred into the TT with the universal translation. In some instances, such as Example 30, it is not completely necessary for the TT viewers to recognise the culture-specific reference in order for the scene to be funny. That is, in some cases where the culture-specific reference is not the main source of humour, and the other sources - such as the breaking of conversational maxims - are translated into the TT, the humour of the ST can to a certain extent be preserved in the TT in spite of the fact that the ST culture-specific reference is not domesticated.

In all instances in group (2) of universal translation in which the ST culture-specific references seem too foreign in the TT, the humorous intention of the ST is only partially, or not at all, transferred into the TT (provided that the culture-specific references are too foreign for the target audience). This can also be seen for instance in Example 31 in which Rachel, who Ross secretly loves, has gone on a date with a man named Carl, and Ross is asking Chandler and Joey whether they know him.

Example 31:
 Ross: Do you guys know who this Carl is?
 Chandler: *Um. Let's see.*
Alvin, Simon, Theodore....
 No.
 Ross: Tunnetteko te sen Carlin?
 Chandler: *Alvin, Simon, Theodore...*
Emme! (Episode 24)

It is unlikely that the humorous intention of the ST in Example 31 is fully transferred into the TT, because the culture-specific reference is not domesticated in any way by a translation strategy other than universal translation (which carries a more of a foreignisation effect, rather than domestication). In Example 31, the ST intention is to produce a humorous effect when Chandler lists the three chipmunks from the band *The Three Chipmunks* in order to make fun of Ross' panic about Rachel dating another man. By doing this, Chandler also breaks the maxims of relation and manner, as he does not take Ross' question seriously and answers him in an irrelevant manner which may be ambiguous to some viewers.

In consequence, due to the fact that the humour of the ST is largely dependent on Chandler breaking the maxim of relevance with the culture-specific reference to *The Three Chipmunks* and the fact that the universal translation does not fully manage to make the expression understandable in the TT, the humour of the ST does not transfer into the TT completely. This results from the fact that the TT audience is unlikely to know the reference. Nevertheless, the irrelevance of Chandler's answer is – to some extent – transferred into the TT, because even if the TT audience did not recognise the culture-specific reference, Chandler's line would still be irrelevant in the TT as well. Therefore, in spite of the ST culture-specific reference seeming foreign in the TT with the universal translation, the humour of the scene may not be completely lost in the TT.

In summary, it is quite difficult to decide whether the strategy of universal translation is successful in preserving the skopos of amusing or not. This results from the fact that it is hard to determine whether the target audience can be expected to recognise the ST culture-specific references or not. Nevertheless, as the cultural context of the West seems to be constantly broadening, at least in Finland, it can be assumed that this strategy in

translating, for instance, the names of different types of cultural products will continue to be frequently used.

5.1.5 Word-for-word translation

There are a total of nine instances of the strategy of word-for-word translation in the data. The nine instances are divided into two groups: (1) instances that are successful in preserving the humour of the ST in the TT, which probably results from the fact that the meanings of the ST expressions work in the TT as well (ie. the literal translation works in the TT, see List (6a) below) (six instances) and (2) instances, which do not (completely or partly) preserve the skopos of amusing, including, for instance, songs that have been translated word-for-word (see List (6b) below) (three instances).

List (6a)

"fake Monica": Well, that's probably just because of your Amish background.

"real Monica": What?

"fake Monica": You're Pennsylvania Dutch, right?

"real Monica": Right. Till I bought a blow dryer. And then I was shunned. /

"vale-Monica": Se johtuu amishitaustastasi.

"oikea Monica": Mitä?

"vale-Monica": Olet Pennsylvanian hollantilainen.

"oikea Monica": Kunnes ostin hiustenkuivaajan ja minua alettiin karttaa.,

Chandler: Hey, you guys in the living room all know what you want to do. You know, you have goals. You have dreams. I don't have a dream!

Ross: Umm, the lesser known "I Don't Have a Dream" speech. /

Chandler: Olohuoneessa istuvat tietävät, mitä haluavat. Teillä on päämääriä ja unelmia. Minulla ei ole unelmaa!

Ross: Vähemmän tunnettu "minulla ei ole unelmaa" -puhe.,

Rachel: Actually I got the extended disco version with three choruses of ..."You'll Never Make it on Your Own". /

Rachel: Se oli kuin diskoversio (kappaleesta) "Yksin et ikinä pärjää".,

Ross: Now, what is wrong with my Snuggles? /

Ross: Mikä Hali-huuhtelussa on vikana?,

Rachel: And then I got really freaked out, and that's when it hit me. How much Barry looks like Mr. Potato Head. /

Rachel: Silloin tajusin, miten paljon Barry muistuttaa herra Perunapäättä!, and

Chandler: Joey Switzerland? /

Chandler: Joey Sveitsi?

List (6b)

Ross: *“Hey, hey, you’re my baby and I can’t wait to meet you when you come out I’ll buy you a bagel and then we’ll go to the zoo /*

Ross: *Hei hei, oma vauvani Tuskin maltan sua odottaa Ostan sulle rinkelin Ja sitten mennään eläintarhaan,*

Rachel: *Who’s George Snuffleupagus?*

Phoebe: *That’s Big Bird’s friend. /*

Rachel: *Kuka on George Snifulupus?*

Phoebe: *Hän on Ison Kotkan kamu., and*

Phoebe: *Raindrops on roses and whiskers on kittens doorbells and sleigh bells and something with mittens la la la something and noodles with string these are a – /*

Phoebe: *Ripottelua sateen ja viiksiä kissan kilinää kellon ja ... lapasia Lallallaa ja muuta sellaista*

The instances that are deemed to preserve the humour of the ST are scenes in which the culture-specific references can be viewed as belonging to the larger cultural context of the West (cf. universal translation in section 5.1.4). In these instances, the literal translation, that is, word-for-word translation, preserves the humour of the ST in the TT. One of these instances is presented in Example 32 where Monica’s credit card has been stolen by a woman (referred to as “fake Monica”) who now pretends to be her in order to use Monica’s credit card. When looking at her credit card bill, the real Monica notices that the “fake Monica” lives a life far more exciting than she and decides to get to know her. In order to do that, the real Monica goes to a step class which the “fake Monica” is taking, pretends that her name is Monana and that she’s a Pennsylvania Dutch (as a white lie, because the “fake Monica” suddenly asks where her name comes from). Monica and the “fake Monica” then become friends.

Example 32:

“fake Monica”: *There’s an open call for Cats.*

I’m thinking we go down there,

sing “Memories”...

and make complete fools

of ourselves. What do you say?

“real Monica”: *No, no, no, no.*

Remember who you’re dealing with here.

I’m not like you. I can’t even

stand in front of a tap class.

“fake Monica”: *Well, that’s probably just because of*

your Amish background.
 "real Monica": What?
 "fake Monica": *You're Pennsylvania Dutch, right?*
 "real Monica": *Right.*
Till I bought a blow dryer.
And then I was shunned.
 "vale-Monica": Catsiin haetaan esiintyjä.
 Mennään laulamaan Memories
 ja nolataan itsemme täysin.
 "oikea Monica": Ei, ei, ei!
 Muista, etten ole kuin sinä.
 Kainostelen steppiryhmässäkin.
 "vale-Monica": *Se johtuu amishitaustastasi.*
 "oikea Monica": Mitä?
 "vale-Monica": *Olet Pennsylvanian hollantilainen.*
 "oikea Monica": *Kunnes ostin hiustenkuivaajan*
ja minua alettiin karttaa. (Episode 21)

In Example 32, the humour derives from the fact that Monica has lied about her background to the "fake Monica" who has no difficulty in believing that Monica comes from a very strict religious background, because she is so uptight in comparison to her. The underlying lie breaks the maxim of quality, because Monica has to lie all the time to keep the real situation hidden from the "fake Monica". As Monica is portrayed throughout the series as a slightly uptight person who likes routines and rules, this scene also makes fun of her character. In addition, the Amish religion is a source of humour, as Monica's behaviour is compared to the behaviour of the Amishes, which is generally considered very conservative. For instance, the expression *Till I bought a blow dryer. And then I was shunned.* makes fun of the Amish religion by referring to their old-fashioned way of living. Since the Amish religion can be expected to be familiar to the TT audience as well, the literal word-for-word translation *Se johtuu amishitaustastasi* preserves the humour of the ST in the TT.

Similarly to Example 32, also Example 33 preserves the humour of the ST with the strategy of word-for-word translation. Also in this case, this results from the fact that the culture-specific reference can be expected to be familiar to the TT audience. In Example 33, Chandler has just quit his job in order to pursue his dreams only to realise that he does not seem to have any.

Example 33:

Chandler: *Hey, you guys in the living room all know what you want to do.*

You know, you have goals.

You have dreams.

I don't have a dream!

Ross: *Umm, the lesser known*

"I Don't Have a Dream" speech.

Chandler: *Olohuoneessa istuvat tietävät, mitä haluavat.*

Teillä on päämääriä ja unelmia.

Minulla ei ole unelmaa!

Ross: *Vähemmän tunnettu*

"minulla ei ole unelmaa" -puhe. (Episode 15)

In this scene, the culture-specific reference Ross makes to Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech is a significant factor in creating the humour of the scene. As the speech is (or it can be expected to be) familiar in the target culture as well, the word-for-word translation preserves the humour of the ST in the TT. Moreover, with Ross making the reference to Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech, Example 33 breaks the maxims of manner and quantity, because the reference can be perceived slightly ambiguous. In order for the viewers to understand the humour in Ross' reference, they need to spot the culture-specific reference. By making the reference, Ross makes fun of Chandler's situation and discreetly implies that he does not take Chandler's apparent turmoil very seriously. If the viewers do not notice the reference, the meaning of Ross' line will probably be left slightly unclear.

In contrast to Example 32 and Example 33, the culture-specific reference in the ST of Example 34 below (*Mr. Potato Head*) is unlikely to be as familiar to the audience of the TT as it is to the audience of the ST. In spite of this, the word-for-word translation of the reference (*herra Perunapäättä*) still manages to preserve the skopos of amusing in the TT, although the source of humour changes in it. In Example 34, Rachel has left her fiancé and is describing the moment she decided to do that to the other *Friends*.

Example 34:

Rachel: *Oh, God!*

Well, it started about a half-hour before the wedding.

I was in this room where we were keeping all the presents and I was looking at this gravy boat. This really gorgeous Limogenes gravy boat. And all of a sudden I realize

– Sweet 'N Low?

I realized that I was more turned on by this gravy boat than by Barry. And then I got really freaked out, and that's when it hit me. How much Barry looks like Mr. Potato Head. You know, I mean, I always knew he looked familiar, but /

Rachel: *Voi luoja!*

Se alkoi puoli tuntia ennen häitä.

Olin lahjapöydän ääressä ja tuijotin yhtä kastikekulhoa.

Se oli upea kastikekulho, ja yhtäkkiä...

Makeutusainetta?

Tajusin, että se kulho kiihotti minua enemmän kuin Barry!

Silloin tajusin, miten paljon Barry muistuttaa herra Perunapäätä!

Hän on aina näyttänyt tutulta, mutta...(Episode 1)

In Example 34, one of the intentions is to create a humorous effect with Rachel comparing her ex-fiancé Barry to the toy character *Mr Potato Head*. By making the culture-specific reference with the unexpected comparison, Rachel also breaks the conversational maxim of relation; one would probably not expect her to be so seriously comparing her fiancé to a toy character and implying it to be one reason to leave him to the altar. Moreover, the contradiction between the seriousness of the situation and culture-specific reference to a not-so-serious character are among the factors making this scene funny. In addition, the maxims of quantity and manner are, to some extent, broken because the reference may seem ambiguous, and the viewers need to recognise who or what *Mr Potato Head* is in order to know who or what Rachel is comparing Barry to.

The strategy of word-for-word translation seems to capture at least some of the humour created by the maxims being broken, in spite of the fact that the culture-specific reference is lost in the TT (there is no *herra Perunapää* toy character in the target culture). Therefore, the word-for-word translation works quite well, even though the culture-specific reference is not replaced by a functional equivalent. This results from the fact that the viewers can imagine what something or someone called *herra Perunapää* would look like,

irrespective of them not knowing that it is a toy character in the source culture.

Moreover, similarly to *Mr Potato Head* in the ST, the expression *herra Perunapää* probably creates similar type of connotations to a character that is not very serious, thus producing the same contradiction between serious and non-serious in the TT as in the ST. Due to the chosen translation strategy, however, the source of humour slightly changes in the TT. In the ST, the source of humour is connected to the culture-specific reference, while in the TT the humour mainly derives from the connotation created by the expression *herra Perunapää*. In addition to the strategy of word-for-word translation, also for instance an explanatory addition, such as *herra Perunapää-lelu*, could have been used to emphasise the fact that *Mr Potato Head* is a toy character in the ST. Moreover, a cultural replacement, such as some Finnish toy character, could also have been used, but it might have taken domestication too far.

In contrast to Examples 32, 33, and 34, in Example 35, the ST's culture-specific reference seems to be entirely lost in the TT. In this scene, the translator has used the strategy of word-for-word translation in translating a song. This, naturally, does not preserve the culture-specific reference of the ST in the TT. Nevertheless, the skopos is not completely lost in the TT, because the TT version of the song may be perceived funny for other reasons than what the culture-specific reference stands for (eg. because the words sound funny and meaningless etc.). In Example 35, Rachel is feeling very low because of her break-up with Barry, and Phoebe tries to make her feel better.

Example 35:

Monica: Okay, just breathe. Breathe, that's it. Just try to think of nice, calm things.

Phoebe: (singing) *Raindrops on roses and whiskers on kittens doorbells and sleigh bells and something with mittens la la la something and noodles with string these are a -*

Rachel: I'm all better now.

Phoebe: I helped.

Monica: Hengitä syvään. Ajattele mukavia asioita.

Phoebe: *Ripottelua sateen ja viiksiä kissan*

kilinää kellon ja ... lapasia

Lallallaa ja muuta sellaista

Rachel: Voin jo paremmin.

Phoebe: Minä autoin! (Episode 1)

In Example 35, Phoebe is singing a song from *the Sound of Music* (with slightly altered lyrics) to make Rachel feel better. The fact that the song is from *the Sound of Music* evokes certain type of a warm connotation, which emphasises the fact that Phoebe is trying to cheer Rachel up. Because the song is translated word-for-word, the culture-specific reference is not transferred into the TT. As a result, the connotation created by the reference is not transferred either. The skopos of amusing is not completely lost in the TT, however. This results from the fact that the reference in itself is not the main source of humour in the ST.

In consequence, in Example 35, the main source of humour stems from the breaking of conversational maxims. For instance, for Phoebe to sing to Rachel to comfort her can be perceived somewhat odd in the context of the situation (although not in the context of Phoebe's character), which breaks the maxim of relation. Also the reference to *the Sound of Music* may be ambiguous to some viewers, which means that the maxims of manner and quantity are broken also in this instance. Moreover, by lying to Phoebe to get her to stop singing, Rachel breaks the maxim of quality. The contradiction between the fact that Phoebe thinks that Rachel is serious when she says *I'm all better now* while the other characters and the viewers know that she is not enhances the humour of the scene. The humour comes from the fact that Phoebe seems to think that she actually really helped Rachel who only said she was feeling better in order to get Phoebe to stop. This is also transferred into the TT, not so much with the word-for-word translation, however, because the humour chiefly comes from other sources. The word-for-word translation of the song in the TT may, however, even increase the effect of Phoebe breaking the

maxim of relation, because the Finnish words are more irrelevant in the context, as they do not seem to be referring to any particular song.

In Example 36, for its part, it seems that the strategy of word-for-word translation fails to preserve the skopos of amusing in the ST. In the scene, Phoebe, Monica, and Rachel are accidentally delivered a pizza which is ordered by the politician George Stephanopoulos. Phoebe and Monica know who he is (and think he is handsome), while Rachel does not. In Example 36, the similarity between and the difficulty of pronunciation of the names of the politician George Stephanopoulos and the Sesame Street character Snufflepagus are a major source of humour. The fact that Phoebe notices this similarity, particularly as Rachel mispronounces the name, and Rachel does not, is another means of producing humour in the ST:

Example 36:

Rachel: Who's George Snuffleupagus?

Phoebe: *That's Big Bird's friend.*

Rachel: Kuka on George Snifulupus?

Phoebe: *Hän on Ison Kotkan kamu.* (Episode 4)

In Example 36, the TT preserves only the phonetic side of the fact that Rachel pronounces the name of the politician George Stephanopoulos incorrectly and thereby accidentally says the name of the Sesame Street character *George Snuffleupagus*. The humour in the TT lies in the incorrect pronunciation, not in the accidental reference to a TV character. In addition, the word-for-word translation of *Big Bird* into *Iso Kotka* seems foreign in the TT, because the *Sesame Street* character's name is not *Iso Kotka* in the Finnish translation of the show.

Moreover, since these culture-specific references are not transferred into the TT, the fact that Phoebe breaks the maxim of quality by lying to Rachel or not telling her what she is talking about is not transferred either. By making the reference to the *Sesame Street* character *Big Bird* after Rachel has

mispronounced the politician's name, Phoebe also breaks the maxims of manner and quantity, due to the ambiguity of her answer. The humour of the scene is largely dependent on the culture-specific reference and the fact that it breaks conversational maxims: if the viewers do not notice this, the only source of humour left in the scene is Rachel's mispronunciation. Because the translation strategy fails to preserve these factors, the humour of the ST is almost completely lost in the TT.

To conclude, the strategy of word-for-word translation only seems to work on occasions where the meaning of the culture-specific reference can be transferred into another language word-for-word. In other words, the strategy works in cases where the literal translation of the ST expression is understandable in the TT, such as in references that are familiar to the TT audience from a broader cultural context. In cases where the word-for-word translation does not carry the same meaning in the TT as in the ST, the strategy does not work very well. Nevertheless, also in some cases of this type, the skopos of amusing can partially be preserved, if the humour of the ST is not completely dependent on the culture-specific references, but also on other factors that are successfully transferred into the TT. In addition, sometimes the TT word-for-word translation may be funny for other reasons than it is in the ST.

5.1.6 Explanatory translation

With its 30 occurrences, explanatory translation is the largest one of the six translation strategies used in the data. A total of 28 of the 30 instances of this translation strategy are successful in preserving the skopos of amusing, although in some instances, the culture-specific reference is lost in the translation process. In one instance, the skopos is only partly preserved, while in another instance, the skopos seems to have been lost in the translation process. The instances are divided accordingly into two groups:

(1) instances that preserve the skopos of amusing in the TT (28 instances, see List (7a) below), and (2) instances in which the skopos is partly or completely lost in the TT (2 instances, see List (7b) below). In general, in most of the instances of explanatory translation the ST culture-specific references are explained in the TT by making a specific reference into a more general one.

List (7a)

Rachel: I was looking at this gravy boat. This really gorgeous *Limogenes gravy boat*. /

Rachel: ja tuijotin yhtä kastikekulhoa,

Monica: Oh, wait, unless you happened to catch the *Wee One's* (production of "Pinocchio") at the Little Theatre in the Park. /

Monica: (Ellet sattunut näkemään) *uutta versiota* ("Pinokkiosta"),.

Phoebe: *No, I worked at a Dairy Queen. Why?* /

Phoebe: *En, vaan jäätelöbaarissa.*,

Chandler: *Bullwinkle socks. That's so sweet.*

Janice: I knew you had *the Rockys*. So I figured that *you could wear Bullwinkle and Bullwinkle or you could wear Rocky and Rocky*, or you can mix and match. Moose and squirrel. Whatever you want. /

Chandler: *Hirvisukat! Voi miten kilttiä!*

Janice: *Sinulla on jo oravasukat, joten voit pitää hirvisukkia, tai oravasukia, tai hirveä ja oravaa yhdessä. Mielialan mukaan.*,

Ross: And they fixed the ride, and *we were asked never to return to the Magic Kingdom*. /

Ross: *Laite korjattiin, mutta saimme porttikiellon koko taikamaahan.*,

Ross: You know what I love? *Her Sweet 'N Lows*. How she was always stealing them from restaurants. /

Ross: *Minä puolestani rakastin hänen makeutusaineitaan.*

Hän varasteli niitä ravintoloista.,

Chandler: Nothing. *It's just that your overcoat sounds remarkably like Brent Musburger*. /

Chandler: *Päällystakkisi kuulostaa aivan urheiluselostajalta.*,

Joey: You know those *posters for the City Free Clinic*?

Monica: Oh, wow! So you're gonna be one of those healthy, healthy, healthy guys?

Phoebe: You know, the asthma guy is really cute.

Chandler: You know which one you're gonna be?

Joey: No. But I hear *Lyme disease* is open, so...

Chandler: Good luck, man. I hope you get it. /

Joey: *Niissä kaupungin terveysjulisteeissa.*

Monica: Oletko yksi niistä tosi terveistä tyypeistä?

Phoebe: Se astmatyyppi on tosi söpö.

Chandler: Kuka niistä sinä olet?

Joey: En tiedä. *Hyviä tauteja on vapaana.*
 Chandler: Toivottavasti saat jonkun niistä.,

Monica: And I assume that Chandler, you're still boycotting *all the pilgrim holidays?* /

Monica: Ja Chandler kai boikotoi yhä *tällaisia juhlapyhiä?*,

Joey: *Set another place for Thanksgiving.* My entire family thinks I have VD. /

Joey: *Se siitä juhlasta.* Perheeni luulee, että minulla on sukupuolitauti.,

Chandler: The most unbelievable thing has happened! *Underdog* has gotten away! /

Chandler: Uskomaton juttu! *Sarjakuvapiski* on karannut!,

Monica: Something went wrong with *the Underdog* and they couldn't get his head to inflate. /

Monica: *Puhallettavan piskin* päähän ei sitten saatukaan ilmaa...,

Chandler: (No, we don't have to watch this. "*Weekend at Bernie's*") is on *Showtime, HBO and Cinemax!* /

Chandler: (Ei katsota tätä. "*Kauan eläköön Bernie*") tulee joka kanavalta.,

Phoebe: *Boy Scouts could've camped under there.* /

Phoebe: *Sen alle voisi leirytyä.*,

Monica: I swear I've seen birds do this on "*Wild Kingdom*". /

Monica: Linnut tekevät noin *luontodokumenteissa.*,

Monica: Hello! Were we at the same table? *It's like...*

cocktails in Appalachia. /

Monica: Istuitko samassa pöydässä? *Sukurutsainen seurue!*,

Mean lady at the laundrette: *Well, I had a 24-inch waist.* You lose things. Now, come on. Get out of my way. /

Ilkeä pesulan rouva: *Minullakin oli ampiaisvoytärö.* Kaikki on katoavaista. Pois tieltä.,

Ross: *I was the James Michener of dirty talk.* /

Ross: *Olin tuhman puheen kunkku.*,

Rachel: Okay....

Let me put it this way.

Anything from *Crabtree & Evelyn?* /

Rachel: Entä jotakin *lahjapuodista?*,

Chandler: *Who? Dee, the sarcastic sister from What's Happening!* /

Chandler: *Sarkastista siskoa siitä to-sarjasta!*,

Rachel: Oh. *Those little clunky Amish things* you think go with everything. /

Rachel: *Ne palikkakengät,*

joita pidät joka asun kanssa.,

Monica: *Spray Lysol in my shoe* and wait for Ross to kill you. /

Monica: *Desinfioi kenkäni ja odota tappotuomiota Rossilta.,*

Chandler: I can't believe you would actually say that. *I would much rather be Mr. Peanut than Mr. Salty.*

Joey: No way! *Mr. Salty is a sailor, all right. He's gotta be, like, the toughest snack there is./*

Chandler: Miten voit sanoa noin? *Olisin mieluummin herra Pähkinä kuin herra Suolatikku!*

Joey: *Herra Suolatikku on sentään merimies! Hän on kovin kundi, jota voi napostella.,*

Ross: *"The hills are alive with the sound... .. of music."/*
Ross: *"Näin Sound OF Musicin.",*

Monica: Oh, god. I just had sex with someone who wasn't alive during *the Bicentennial!* /

Monica: Harrastin juuri seksiä ihmisen kanssa, joka ei muista *70-lukua!*,

Carol: I wanted a stuffed animal. *And Susan wanted a Chunky.*

Ross: Oh, Susan wanted a --- You're having a baby! A baby! /

You don't stop for Chunkies!
Carol: Minä ostin pehmoeläimen ja Susan halusi suklaata.

Ross: Hän saa vauvan! *Suklaan takia ei pysähdellä!,*

Rachel: Okay.

It's light.

It rattles.

It's...

Travel Scrabble! /

Rachel: Se on kevyt, se helisee... *Aakkospelin matkapainos!,*

Joey: *Yep, Ice Capades.*

Chandler: This is serious. *I've never known you to pay money for any kind of "capade". /*

Joey: *Menemme ulos.*

Chandler: Sen täytyy olla vakavaa. *Et yleensä maksa rilluttelusta., and*

Chandler: Come on. *What was with that Black Bart speech?*

"When I play poker,
I'm not a nice guy!" /

Chandler: *Mikä se palopuhekin oli?*

"Kun pelaan pokeria,
en ole mukava kaveri."

List (7b)

Chandler: *It's just that I'm sick of being a victim of this Dick Clark holiday.* /

Chandler: *Olen kyllästynyt tähän juhlaan., and*

Chandler: *We sure showed those Hasidic jewelers a thing or two about softball.* /

Chandler: *Jalokivikauppiaat oppivat yhtä ja toista pesiksestä.*

Accordingly, as pointed out above, in group (1) of the strategy of explanatory translation, the skopos of amusing seems to be preserved in the TT in all instances. This can be seen in Example 37 in which Phoebe is reminiscing the day she got her first paycheck.

Example 37:

Phoebe: I remember the day when I got my first paycheck. There was a cave-in in one of the mines, and eight people were killed.

Monica: You worked in a mine?

Phoebe: *No, I worked at a Dairy Queen. Why?*

Phoebe: Kun minä sain ensimmäisen palkan, yksi kaivos romahti ja 8 ihmistä kuoli.

Monica: Olitko töissä kaivoksella?

Phoebe: *En, vaan jäätelöbaarissa.* (Episode 4)

In Example 37, the humour comes from Phoebe breaking the maxim of relevance in talking about the day she received her first paycheck. Most people would probably talk about what it felt like to get their first paycheck, but instead, Phoebe talks about what happened during the day in general. This is not at all unlike her character, however, as already seen in the other instances in this study.

In Example 37, the humour of the ST seems to derive chiefly from Phoebe breaking the maxim of relation, not merely from the culture-specific reference to *Dairy Queen*. Nevertheless, had the culture-specific reference not been explained in the TT, the humour of the ST would not have been

properly transferred into the TT. This results from the fact that the culture-specific reference is an important part of the joke. Therefore, the strategy of explanatory translation is a significant factor in making the TT to preserve its skopos of amusing.

Similarly to Example 37, of the instances of explanatory translation, the humour of the ST is most successfully preserved in those instances in which the culture-specific reference is not the only source of humour in the scene but in which it complements the joke in general. That is, the humour comes from the idea behind the particular culture-specific reference. In these types of instances, it is possible to translate the ST culture-specific references with an explanatory translation that makes the specific ST expression into a more general one in the TT. This can be seen in Example 38 in which Ross and his father reminisce Ross' grandmother who has recently passed away.

Example 38:

Ross: *You know what I love? Her Sweet 'N Lows.* How she was always stealing them from restaurants.

Ross' father: Not just from restaurants, from our house.

Ross: *Minä puolestani rakastin hänen makeutusaineitaan.*

Hän varasteli niitä ravintoloista.

Rossin isä: Ja meidän kotoamme myös. (Episode 8)

In this scene, the main source of humour is not so much the culture-specific reference to the *Sweet 'N Low* sweetening product, but instead, the fact that an old lady has stolen sweeteners, which is presented as funny and endearing. This is successfully transferred into the TT with the explanatory translation *hänen makeutusaineitaan*. The culture-specific reference to *Sweet 'N Low* breaks the maxim of manner and quantity by being ambiguous in the ST. With the explanatory translation strategy, this does not occur in the TT. As the humour of the scene does not come from the breaking of the conversational maxim, and the TT manages to translate the ST's source of humour, the fact that the breaking of conversational maxims is not transferred into the TT does not diminish the humour of the scene.

In contrast to Example 38, in Example 39 the breaking of conversational maxims plays an important role in the humour of the scene. In this instance, being an aspiring actor Joey has been modelling for the City Free Clinic and is hoping to get his face on their advertisement poster.

Example 39:

Phoebe: What were you modelling for?

Joey: *You know those posters for the City Free Clinic?*

Monica: Oh, wow! So you're gonna be one of those healthy, healthy, healthy guys?

Phoebe: You know, the asthma guy is really cute.

Chandler: You know which one you're gonna be?

Joey: *No. But I hear Lyme disease is open, so...*

Chandler: *Good luck, man. I hope you get it.*

Joey: Thanks.

Phoebe: Missä poseerasit?

Joey: *Niissä kaupungin terveysjulisteeissa.*

Monica: Oletko yksi niistä tosi terveistä tyypeistä?

Phoebe: Se astmatyyppi on tosi söpö.

Chandler: Kuka niistä sinä olet?

Joey: *En tiedä. Hyviä tauteja on vapaana.*

Chandler: *Toivottavasti saat jonkun niistä.*

Joey: no translation (Episode 9)

In Example 39, the humour comes from the fact that when Joey tells about him wanting to be in posters that represent illnesses, it is presented in a way that he actually would like *to get* one of the diseases. This is evident in Chandler's line *Good luck, man. I hope you get it*, which breaks the maxim of quality by joking at Joey's expense. The humour of the scene derives from the fact that when Joey says that the "*Lyme disease is open*" and Chandler answers "*Good luck, man. I hope you get it.*", Chandler is implying that Joey would get the actual disease and Joey does not understand that, but instead, thinks that Chandler means he hopes that Joey gets the part of the person with the disease. Therefore, Joey's answer "*Thanks*" is literal, that is, he means what he is saying, while Chandler's line has two meanings.

In the semiotic dimension, the humour is preserved in the TT with the explanatory translation, owing to the fact that the meaning of the culture-specific references that are used in the ST can easily be translated with this

strategy by generalising the references. Moreover, the fact that it is possible to use the general word *tauti* instead of *Lyme disease* makes the strategy successful. This is possible, because the specific disease referred to in the ST is not the source of humour, but instead, the humour is created by the misunderstanding between Joey and Chandler. Same applies to the expressions *City Free Clinic* and *terveysjuliste*.

As opposed to Example 39, in Example 40, the culture-specific expression is a significant factor in creating the humour of the scene. In this instance, the humorous intention that the reference conveys in the ST is preserved with the strategy of explanatory translation in the TT. In this scene Ross, who is known for being a nice guy, has learned to speak dirty, because his current girlfriend wants him to do so.

Example 40:
 Joey: So how did it go with Celia?
 Ross: I was unbelievable.
 Joey: All right, Ross!
 Ross: *I was the James Michener
 of dirty talk.*
 It was the most elaborate filth
 you have ever heard.
 Joey: Miten Celian kanssa meni?
 Ross: Olin uskomaton!
 Joey: Niin sitä pitää!
 Ross: *Olin tuhman puheen kunkku.*
 Se oli nerokasta rivoutta. (Episode 15)

In Example 40, the ST's humorous intention is to produce humour with Ross learning to speak dirty to his girlfriend and being proud of himself because of that fact. The ST culture-specific reference to James Michener (James Michener was a bestselling American author) is meant to emphasise the humorous effect. This humorous intention is preserved in the TT with the explanatory translation strategy, even though the ST culture-specific reference is generalised in the TT. The intention is preserved, due to the fact that the meaning of the culture-specific reference is successfully transferred into the TT.

Moreover, Example 40 breaks the maxim of manner with the ambiguous culture-specific reference that the viewers have to understand in order to grasp the humour of the scene in the ST. As the culture-specific reference is not transferred into the TT, this layer of humour is not transferred either. Nevertheless, as the meaning of the reference is translated, the humour of the scene is not lost in the TT.

The next Example 41 differs from Example 40 in the way that in the previous example the culture-specific reference has a larger impact on the humour of the scene. In Example 41, the culture-specific reference is not the main source of humour. In Example 41, Ross' pet monkey has gone missing while Rachel has been looking after it, and Ross is coming home. The monkey has also defecated in Monica's shoe.

Example 41:

Rachel: Wow wow wow. What am I gonna do, what am I gonna do?

Monica: Okay. You stay here
and just wait by the phone.

*Spray Lysol in my shoe
and wait for Ross to kill you.*

Rachel: Mitä minä teen?

Monica: Vahdi puhelinta.

*Desinfioi kenkäni ja odota
tappotuomiota Rossilta. (Episode 19)*

In Example 41, the intention of the ST is to produce humour with the fact that Rachel is afraid of Ross because she has let his monkey to get lost. In addition, the fact that the monkey has defecated in Monica's shoe is supposed to enhance the humorous effect of the scene. Therefore, the culture-specific reference to *Lysol* is not important in terms of the humour of the scene. The meaning of the reference is, however, important and as the explanatory translation successfully transfers it with the translation *Desinfioi kenkäni*, the intention of the scene is preserved in the TT. Similarly to Example 40, Example 41 breaks the maxim of manner and quantity with the reference to *Lysol* (because it is not explained what it is) in the ST. This is not transferred into the TT due to the explanatory translation. Because the

breaking of conversational maxims is not the source of humour in the scene, the fact that it is not transferred into the TT does not have an impact on the humour of the TT.

As already pointed out, almost all of the instances of explanatory translation preserve at least partly the ST's humorous intention. In some instances, however, the ST's humorous intention does not appear to be that well preserved. Nevertheless, in these instances, it is still possible to achieve the skopos of amusing. This can be seen, for instance, in Example 42 in which Joey is going out with a girl who he really likes, and Chandler makes fun of him.

Example 42:

Rachel: Are you seeing her again tonight?

Joey: *Yep, Ice Capades.*

Chandler: *This is serious.*

I've never known you to pay money for any kind of "capade".

Rachel: Tapaatko hänet taas tänään?

Joey: *Menemme ulos.*

Chandler: *Sen täytyy olla vakavaa.*

Et yleensä maksa rilluttelusta. (Episode 16)

In this scene, the ST's intention is to produce a humorous effect by making fun of Joey's infatuation with the girl he has met, because he is not normally very serious with women. In addition, the culture-specific reference to *Ice Capades* and Chandler's line *I've never known you to pay money for any kind of "capade"* which creates a wordplay enhance the humour of the scene. As this culture-specific reference and wordplay are not transferred into the TT, the ST's humorous intention changes in the TT. Nevertheless, although the ST's humorous intention is not fully transferred into the TT, the skopos of amusing is preserved in the TT, because the TT expression preserves the meaning of the ST's wordplay.

Similarly to Example 40 and 41, also Example 42 breaks the maxims of manner and quantity in the ST, with the reference to *Ice Capades*. As the

reference and the wordplay included in it are not transferred into the TT, the TT does not break any maxims. Owing to the fact that the translator has managed to explain the meaning behind the ST culture-specific expressions, the skopos of amusing is preserved in the TT in spite of the fact that the breaking of conversational maxims is not transferred.

Unlike Examples 40, 41, and 42 above, the TT of Example 43 preserves the breach of conversational maxims in the ST. This is probably due to the fact that the breaking of conversational maxims in this scene contributes to the humour of the scene more than in Examples 40, 41, and 42. In Example 43, Phoebe's birthday is coming up, and Rachel wants to know what she would like for a present. Phoebe's mother has died when she was a child.

Example 43:

Rachel: So, Phoebes. What do you want for your birthday?

Phoebe: Well, what I really want is for my mom to be alive and enjoy it with me.

Rachel: *Okay...*

Let me put it this way.

Anything from Crabtree & Evelyn?

Rachel: Phoebes. Mitä haluat syntymäpäivälahjaksi?

Phoebe: Haluaisin, että äiti olisi elossa viettämässä syntymäpäivääni.

Rachel: *Entä jotakin lahjapuodista?* (Episode 16)

In Example 43, Phoebe's answer to Rachel's question breaks the maxim of relation, owing to the fact that it is irrelevant and unexpected in the context: generally people would not answer in this way to the type of question Rachel is asking. The humour of the scene is, thus, created with Phoebe's irrelevant answer and Rachel's reply to her. This is also transferred into the TT. The culture-specific reference to *Crabtree & Evelyn* does not have a major impact on the humour of the scene. Therefore, the explanatory translation is sufficient in preserving the humour of the scene.

In Example 44, similarly to Example 43, the TT preserves the breach of the conversational maxim done in the ST. In this example, Monica and Joey are on a date with two people who Monica thinks are a brother and a sister, because Joey has lied to her about it. Joey has arranged the date in order to break the pair up. Joey wants to date the woman and Monica the man, when the woman and the man are actually dating each other and think that Joey and Monica are dating each other. The woman and the man are acting like the couple they are, while Monica tells a story about *Underdog* (a cartoon character).

Example 44:

Monica: *Something went wrong with the Underdog and they couldn't get his head to inflate.*

So anyway, his head is, like, flopping down Broadway right. And I'm just thinking...

how inappropriate this is.

Monica: *Puhallettavan piskin päähän ei sitten saatukaan ilmaa...*

Olin sanomassa...

Sen pää liehui pitkin Broadwayta, ja minä mietin,...

miten sopimatonta tämä on. (Episode 9)

In Example 44, the breaking of the maxim of quality, that is Joey's lie, is the main source of humour in the scene. Thus, the breach of the conversational maxim is more important in terms of the humour of the scene than the culture-specific reference to *Underdog*. As this is transferred into the TT, the humour of the ST is also preserved. The ST also breaks the maxims of manner and quality, as the audience needs to possess certain cultural knowledge to understand the reference to *Underdog*. The explanatory translation of *Puhallettava piski* does not break these maxims, because it explains the reference, but it works well in the TT in spite of this. This owes to the fact that the main source of humour in the scene comes from Joey breaking the maxim of quality, that is lying.

The following Example 45 takes place in the same situation as Example 44. In this scene, Monica and Joey have gone away from the restaurant table for a moment to discuss the situation.

Example 45:

Monica: Hello! Were we at the same table? *It's like... cocktails in Appalachia.*

Joey: Come on. They're close.

Monica: Close? She's got her tongue in his ear.

Joey: Like you've never got a little rambunctious with Ross.

Monica: Joey, this is sick. It's disgusting. It's... not really true, is it?

Monica: Istuitko samassa pöydässä? *Sukurutsainen seurue!*

Joey: He ovat läheisiä.

Monica: Naisen kieli on hänen korvassaan!

Joey: Etkö itse muka ole riehaantunut Rossin kanssa?

Monica: Tämä on sairasta ja iljettävää...

Se ei ole totta, vai mitä? (Episode 9)

As Joey has lied to Monica that the people they are on a date with are siblings, Monica naturally thinks it is disgusting that they are acting as a couple. The humorous effect of the scene is produced by Joey breaking the maxim of quality with his lie, which is transferred into the TT. The culture-specific reference in the ST to *cocktails in Appalachia* enhances the humour of the scene, but it is not the main source of humour, similarly to Example 44. Nevertheless, as the culture-specific reference to *cocktails in Appalachia* that breaks the maxim of manner and quantity is not transferred into the TT, the humour of the scene is slightly diminished. This results from the fact that the reference appears to carry slightly more humour than the reference in Example 44.

In contrast to the instances in group (1), in group (2) of explanatory translation, the skopos of amusing is only partly or not at all preserved in the TT. Accordingly, in Example 46 the strategy of explanatory translation does not seem to preserve the humour of the ST as successfully as the scenes presented above. In Example 46, the culture-specific reference in the ST conveys a humorous meaning which is not successfully transferred into the TT by the explanatory translation. In this scene, *Friends* are talking about their plans for New Year's Eve:

Example 46:

Chandler: *It's just that I'm sick of being a victim of this Dick Clark holiday.* I say this year, no dates, we make a pact. Just the six of us. Dinner.

Everybody: Sure, fine.

Chandler: I was hoping for a little more enthusiasm.

Chandler: *Olen kyllästynyt tähän juhlaan.* Tehdään sopimus: ei seuralaisia.

Vain me kuusi päivällisellä.

Everybody: no translation

Chandler: Toivoin vähän enemmän innostusta. (Episode 10)

In Example 46, the strategy of explanatory translation preserves the humour of the ST only partially. This owes to the fact that Chandler's expression *Dick Clark holiday* refers to the TV show *Dick Clark's Rocking New Year's Eve* (which broadcasts the countdown to the New Year each New Year's Eve) and to its host Dick Clark. It has been translated by omitting the culture-specific reference and paraphrasing the expression as *tämä juhla* (it is clear from the broader context of the scene that Chandler is referring to New Year's Eve). As the culture-specific reference is important in regard to the humorous intention of the scene, the explanatory translation fails to transfer the humour of the scene in this respect.

In Example 46, the expression *Dick Clark holiday* entails something more than just *olla kyllästynyt tähän juhlaan*; it also refers to the pressures one might feel when watching the show (with happy people celebrating together) and the expectations it creates for Chandler and for people in general. This meaning that the culture-specific reference conveys is not transferred into the TT with the translation strategy of explanatory translation. Perhaps an explanatory translation that explained the expression in more detail would have been able to preserve the humour of the ST slightly better (such as, *Olen kyllästynyt tähän seurustelevien ihmisten juhlaan.* etc.). Nevertheless, although the culture-specific reference is not transferred into the TT, the humour is not completely lost. For instance, the fact that *Friends* are not that enthusiastic about Chandler's idea (which also produces humour) is transferred into the TT. It is also possible for the TT viewers to infer what Chandler means with the expression *tämä juhla*, although the ST expression carries more meaning.

The two scenes in which the strategy of explanatory translation does not completely preserve the skopos of amusing are also unsuccessful in transferring the conversational maxims that are broken in the ST into the TT. This can also be seen in Example 46. Accordingly, Chandler breaks the maxims of manner and quantity, as the expression *Dick Clark holiday* is ambiguous. The translator has clarified this expression in the TT by using the expression *tämä juhla*. Therefore, the TT does not break the maxims that are broken in the ST. This also diminishes the humour of the scene in the TT.

In Example 47, the humour of the ST appears to be completely lost, due to the fact that the ST culture-specific reference conveys a specific meaning that produces humour, which is not transferred into the TT with the translation strategy of explanatory translation. As the source of humour in this scene comes only from the reference, it can be argued that the humour is completely lost. In this scene, *Friends* have been playing softball with Alan, who is Monica's boyfriend, whom everybody but Monica likes very much.

Example 47:

Chandler: *We sure showed those Hasidic jewelers a thing or two about softball.*

Chandler: *Jalokivikauppiaat oppivat yhtä ja toista pesiksestä.* (Episode 3)

In Example 47, the expression *Hasidic jewelers* probably refers to Hasidic Judaism, and the reference is the main source of humour in the ST. As it is not transferred into the TT, the translation strategy of explanatory translation does not work in this case. The ST culture-specific reference is difficult to translate, due to its wordplay as well as the fact that Judaism is not as common in the target culture as it is in the source culture. Example 47 also breaks the maxims of manner and quantity with the ambiguous reference to *Hasidic jewelers*. Because the translation strategy fails to transfer this ambiguity into the TT, the skopos of amusing is not transferred either. This results from the fact that the reference is the main source of humour in the ST.

In conclusion, although there are a couple of examples in which the explanatory translation strategy does not work, on the whole, it can be argued that this strategy preserves the skopos of amusing very well, with 28 of the total of 30 instances preserving at least part of the humour of the ST in the TT. In many cases, the ST intentions are preserved in spite of the fact that the culture-specific references are translated with the generalising explanatory translation strategy. Nevertheless, if the humour of the ST is completely dependent on its culture-specific reference, this strategy may fail to preserve the humour, due to the fact that it generalises the references in the TT.

6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to analyse the ways in which culture-specific verbal humour is translated in 24 episodes of the TV series *Friends* from the years 1994 to 1995. Focusing on the type of translation strategies used in translating culture-specific verbal humour from English to Finnish, it became evident that there are quite a few strategies used to translate this type of humour on screen. In this study, six strategies were identified: 1. Cultural replacement, 2. Explanatory addition, 3. No translation, 4. Universal translation, 5. Word-for-word translation, and 6. Explanatory translation. After analysing these strategies and their ability to preserve the TT's skopos of amusing, it can be said that none of the strategies was completely unsuccessful. Nevertheless, certain strategies proved to be better able to preserve the skopos of amusing than others. Moreover, some strategies worked better than others in translating certain type of culture-specific verbal humour.

In consequence, the strategy of cultural replacement had been used in 22 instances of the total of 100, all of which preserved the skopos of amusing. Accordingly, the cultural replacements used preserved the humour of the ST in the TT when the source of humour was similar or the same in both the ST and the TT. This could be expected, but what was not as expected was the fact that this strategy also managed to preserve the skopos of amusing in cases where the humour of the TT came from a different source or evoked different connotations than the humour of the ST. As a result, it can be claimed that if a cultural replacement is available for a particular ST culture-specific expression in the TL and it is used in translating the expression in the TT, the translation is likely to preserve the skopos of amusing.

Of the 100 instances of culture-specific verbal humour, seven were translated with the strategy of explanatory addition. Firstly, these included instances

translated with an explanatory addition with the ST culture-specific expression left untranslated in the TT, that is, the TT included the ST culture-specific expression in English with a Finnish explanation in connection with it. Secondly, there were instances translated with an explanatory addition with the ST culture-specific expression translated into the TT word-for-word. Of the seven occurrences of explanatory addition, four preserved the skopos of amusing, two preserved the skopos of amusing with the combination of explanatory addition and word-for-word translation, and one instance failed to preserve the skopos. As a result, with only four instances preserving the skopos of amusing solely with an explanatory addition, it can be claimed that this strategy worked well only in translating certain types of culture-specific verbal humour, such as those in which the literal meaning of the ST culture-specific reference was not the main source of humour and did not need to be translated word-for-word (eg. Example 12 *Do the words, "Billy, don't be a hero" mean anything to you?/ Muistatteko hitin "Billy, don't be a hero"*).

In five of the 100 instances, the ST culture-specific references were translated with the strategy of no translation, that is, they were left untranslated. One would expect that this strategy failed in preserving the skopos of amusing. This was true in three of the instances; in them, the TT (completely or partly) failed to preserve the skopos of amusing. In two instances, however, the skopos was - to some extent - preserved, owing to the fact that the humour of the ST was not restricted to the culture-specific reference, and the translator had managed to translate the other sources of humour. Accordingly, in these instances in which the skopos of amusing was - to a certain extent - preserved in spite of the strategy of no translation, the ST's humour came also from other sources than the culture-specific references, and the translator had been able to preserve those sources of humour. Having said that, it seems clear that if the ST's humour was tied to the culture-specific reference, and the reference was not translated into the TT, it would be impossible to preserve the skopos of amusing with this translation strategy.

A total of 27 instances of 100 were translated with the strategy of universal translation the success of which was probably the most difficult one to determine of the translation strategies examined in the present study. This resulted from the fact that of the pieces of data translated with the strategy of universal translation, many were culture-specific references that could be viewed as belonging to a larger cultural context of the West that referred to for example, famous people, bands, plays, and films, as well as TV shows. Thus, in some instances, it could be expected that the TT receivers would be able to understand them without much domestication. However, this might not be the case in many of the instances either, due to different background knowledge of the viewers. In 16 of these instances, the skopos of amusing was deemed to be preserved, while in nine, only partly preserved, and in two, not preserved at all.

In the 16 instances in which the humour was preserved, the culture-specific references could be viewed as belonging to the cultural context of the West, and thus, they could be expected to be understood by the target audience, in spite of the lack of domestication. In those instances in which the skopos was only partly preserved or not preserved at all, the culture-specific references appeared to be too foreign in the context of the TT. That is, they were references to forms of American popular culture that are not part of the larger cultural context of the West. Nevertheless, they could still make sense, if the TT recipients happened to know the reference.

In consequence, as already stated earlier, it was difficult to decide whether the strategy of universal translation was successful in preserving the skopos of amusing or not. This resulted from the fact that it was hard to determine whether the target audience could be expected to recognise the ST culture-specific references without domestication. The cultural context of the West appears to be constantly broadening, however, at least for Finns. Thus, it can

be assumed that the strategy of universal translation will continue to be used in translating, for instance, the names of different types of cultural products.

Of the total of 100 instances, there were nine instances in the data translated with the strategy of word-for-word translation. Of the nine instances, six were successful in preserving the humour of the ST in the TT. This resulted from the fact that the meanings of the ST expressions, that is literal translations, worked in the TT as well. Three instances of nine did not (completely or partly) preserve the skopos of amusing in the TT. These comprised, for instance, songs that had been translated word-for-word in the TT.

Similarly to the strategy of universal translation, some of the instances that preserved the humour of the ST were scenes in which the ST culture-specific references could be viewed belonging to the larger cultural context of the West. In these instances, word-for-word translation preserved the humour of the ST in the TT, due to the fact that after translating word-for-word a particular ST expression referring to the larger cultural context of the West, the TT audience could be expected to grasp it. In contrast to universal translation, these instances were not names of cultural products, etc., but for instance, references to religion and historical events that could be expected to be familiar to the TT audience. Moreover, some of the instances that preserved the humour of the ST in the TT were cases in which the ST expression worked in the TT, because the word-for-word translation managed to capture the humour of the ST. That is, the TT expression was able to convey the humour of the ST expression with the literal translation. The three instances that did not (completely or partly) preserve the skopos of amusing in the TT were instances, in which the word-for-word translation failed to capture the meaning of the ST expression.

Thus, the strategy of word-for-word translation only appeared to work in cases where it was possible to transfer the meaning of the ST culture-specific reference into another language word-for-word. In other words, this occurred in instances where the literal translation of the ST expression worked in the TT in an understandable way. In cases where the word-for-word translation did not carry the same meaning in the TT as in the ST, the strategy did not work that well. Nevertheless, in some cases of this type, the skopos of amusing could be preserved to a certain extent if the humour of the ST was not completely dependent on the culture-specific reference, but also on other factors that were successfully transferred into the TT. Moreover, in some instances, in spite of the fact that the TT word-for-word translation did not capture the meaning of the ST's expression, the TT literal translation might still have been funny for other reasons.

With 30 instances of 100, the strategy of explanatory translation was the largest one of the six translation strategies used in the data. Of the 30 instances, 28 were successful in preserving the skopos of amusing. In one instance, the skopos was only partly preserved, while in another, the skopos appeared to have been completely lost in the translation process. Generally, the instances of explanatory translation explained the ST culture-specific references in the TT by making a specific reference in the ST into a more general one in the TT. With 28 instances successful in preserving the skopos of amusing in the TT, this method usually worked well. In the two instances that completely or partly failed in preserving the skopos of amusing, the culture-specific reference in the ST carried a humorous meaning which was not successfully transferred into the TT with the explanatory translation.

In spite of the fact that there were a couple of examples in which the explanatory translation strategy failed in preserving the skopos of amusing, it can still be argued that this strategy was successful, with 28 of the total of 30 instances preserving at least part of the humour of the ST in the TT.

Nevertheless, as this translation strategy generalised the ST references in the TT, the humour of the ST might not have been preserved in the TT, if it was completely dependent on the culture-specific reference. In these types of instances, the skopos of amusing could still be preserved, however, if the TT managed to create humour with another means.

Having completed this analysis, it can be claimed that it is possible to translate culture-specific verbal humour, although in some cases it may be quite difficult. In addition, examining the ways in which culture-specific verbal humour was translated on screen in *Friends* might prove to be helpful in future translation tasks: if a translator is aware of different translation strategies used in the translation of culture-specific verbal humour, it is probably easier for s/he to determine how to translate problematic cases, among other things.

Moreover, it was worthwhile to study the translation of culture-specific verbal humour because many of the studies carried out on the translation of humour from the linguistic perspective have often focused on the translation of purely linguistic features of humour (such as puns and wordplays), rather than on the type of humorous instances in which the humour lies in the meaning instead of the forms of the expressions. When considering the analysis carried out in this study, the special features of screen translation (see, eg. Gambier 2003; Lorenzo et al. 2003; or section 3.3 in the present study) had to be taken into consideration too. Accordingly, their effect on the Finnish translations influenced on the background of the present study.

In the present study, it was also useful to test some of the methods currently used in the study of screen translation to determine whether they work in translating culture-specific verbal humour. Consequently, as stated earlier in this chapter, in the TV series *Friends* several methods were used to translate culture-specific verbal humour. As a large portion of the humour in *Friends*

stemmed from “saying things funny” rather than from “saying funny things” (Morreal 1983, as cited in Alexander 1997: 11, see eg. section 3.1 for a more detailed discussion), the methods adopted from Vehmas-Lehto (1999), Lorenzo et al. (2003), Chiaro (2006), and Chesterman & Wagner (2002) proved to be useful in analysing the data of the present study. Furthermore, Chiaro’s (2006: 202) definition of Verbally Expressed Humour (VEH) as distinct from Non-Specific Verbally Expressed Humour (NSpVEH) (discussed in more detail in section 3.1) were of use in categorising and analysing the data.

Accordingly, the methods and concepts used in the present study appeared to be efficient in examining the translation of the type of culture-specific verbal humour that is context-bound rather than context-free. Nevertheless, in analysing the translation of culture-specific verbal humour in *Friends*, a combination of the strategies presented by Vehmas-Lehto (1999), Chesterman & Wagner (2002), Lorenzo et al. (2003), and Chiaro (2006) was needed in order to categorise the instances. That is, none of the methods would have been enough by themselves in categorising the data.

In comparison to, for instance, the study carried out by Lorenzo et al. (2003: 269-291), the present study concentrated on a more specific level of translating humour, that is, the translation of culture-specific verbal humour, while Lorenzo et al. (2003: 269) defined their focus more broadly as the translation of humour. Lorenzo et al.’s (2003: 269-291) data was also significantly smaller (four episodes) than the data of the present study (24 episodes). Nevertheless, both the present study and the one carried out by Lorenzo et al. (2003: 269-291) examined the issues of translating humour on screen. Lorenzo et al. (2003: 289) conclude that in terms of the semiotic dimension of analysis many cultural references did not constitute a problem in translation. This resulted from the fact that both the source and target cultures were part of “the same cultural macrosystem (the West)”. They also

point out, however, that it can sometimes be difficult to determine the source or target audiences' background knowledge in terms of specific references (Lorenzo et al. 2003: 289.). This was evident in the present study as well, particularly in terms of the translation strategy of universal translation (discussed earlier in this chapter and in section 5.1.4). Moreover, according to Lorenzo et al. (2003: 289), their study indicated some hesitation between foreignisation ("being faithful to the source text") and domestication ("producing a text which is acceptable to the target audience") in the translations. As this was also shown in the findings of the present study, it appears that this issue is central in the translation of humour and could be the target of future research as well.

Moreover, for instance, Gambier's (2003: 179) definition of domestication strategies from the perspective that "an audiovisual product has to be different enough to be "foreign" but similar enough to what viewers are familiar with to retain their attention" would be interesting to examine further. This could be done, for instance, by extending the topic of the present study to involve also recipient reactions to the translation of instances of culture-specific verbal humour. It would also be interesting to find out whether the reactions vary according to the recipients' age and different social factors, among other things. This might then help in deciding how much to domesticate audiovisual products aimed at different target groups. Furthermore, Gambier (2003: 183) stresses that, among others, the strategies for the translation of humour, irony, allusions, and metaphors need to be discussed more in the field of screen translation. This would also be an interesting target for future research: the topic of the present study could, again, be extended to include other forms of humour as well, that is, for instance, the translation of irony, allusions, or metaphors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

24 episodes of the TV series *Friends* from the years 1994 and 1995

Secondary sources

Alexander, R. J. 1997. *Aspects of verbal humour in English*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.

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

Bell, R. T. 1991. *Translation and translating: theory and practice*. London and New York: Longman.

Berger, A. A. 1992. *Popular culture genres: theories and texts Vol. 2*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, Inc.

Chesterman, A. and E. Wagner 2002. *Can theory help translators? a dialogue between the ivory tower and the wordface*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Chesterman, A. (ed.) 1989. *Readings in translation theory*. Loimaa: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.

Chiaro, D. 2006. Verbally expressed humour on screen: reflections on translation and reception. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 198-208.

Creeber, G. (ed.) 2001. *The television genre book*. London: British Film Institute.

Feuer, J. 2001. Situation comedy, part 2. In G. Creeber (ed.), *The television genre book*. London: British Film Institute, 67-70.

Feuer, J. 1992. Genre study and television. In R. C. Allen (ed.), *Channels of discourse, reassembled*. London: Routledge, 138-159.

Gambier, Y. (guest ed.) 2003. *The Translator Screen Translation: special issue*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Gambier, Y. 2003. Introduction: Screen Transadaptation: Perception and Reception. *The Translator Screen Translation: special issue*, 171-189.

- Grice, P. 1989. *Studies in the ways of words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hartley, J. 2001. Situation comedy, part 1. In G. Creeber (ed.), *The television genre book*. London: British Film Institute, 65-67.
- Kinnunen, A. 1994. *Huumorin ja koomisen keskeneräinen kysymys*. Juva: WSOY.
- Koller, W. 1989. Equivalence in translation theory. In A. Chesterman (ed.), *Readings in translation theory*. Loimaa: Oy Finn Lectura Ab, 99-104.
- Leppihalme, R. 1994. *Culture Bumps on the translation of allusions*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Lorenzo L., A. Pereira, and M. Xoubanova 2003. The Simpsons/Los Simpson: Analysis of an Audiovisual Translation. *The Translator Screen Translation: special issue*, 269-291.
- Mot-sanakirjat. (n.d.) <http://mot.kielikone.fi/mot/jyu/netmot.exe>
- Nash, W. 1985. *The language of humour style and technique in comic discourse*. London and New York: Longman.
- Neale, S. and F. Krutnik 1990. *Popular film and television comedy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nida, E. A. 2001. *Contexts in translating*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nida, E. A. 1989. Science of translation. In A. Chesterman (ed.), *Readings in translation theory*. Loimaa: Oy Finn Lectura Ab, 80-98.
- Oittinen, R. 1995. *Kääntäjän karnevaali*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Raskin, V. 1985. *Semantic mechanisms of humor*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Reiss, K. 1989. Text types, translation types and translation assessment. In A. Chesterman (ed.), *Readings in translation theory*. Loimaa: Oy Finn Lectura Ab, 105-115.
- Reiss, K. and H. J. Vermeer 1986. *Mitä kääntäminen on*. Helsinki: Oy Gaudeamus Ab.
- Thomas, J. 1995. *Meaning in interaction an introduction to pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.

tv.com. (n.d.)

http://www.tv.com/shows/az.html?l=F&era=&pg_shows=5&tag=paginaton;next

http://www.tv.com/friends/show/71/summary.html?tag=show_table;title;12

Vehmas-Lehto, I. 1999. *Kopiointia vai kommunikointia? johdatus käännteoriaan*. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.