

**‘C’est pas un malheureux, c’est un abruti’:
Retainingsuperiority- and incongruity-basedhumour
in the English subtitles of *Le Dîner de Cons***

Claire Ellender

Abstract

Francis Veber’s smash-hit comedy film, Le Dîner de Cons, contains multiple instances of superiority- and incongruity-based humour. The present study first grounds itself in existing theory in the fields of humour, translation and audiovisual translation, namely subtitling. It subsequently focuses on six extracts from Veber’s film in order to demonstrate how humour manifests itself in Le Dîner de Cons, to identify the translation / subtitling challenges to which these instances of humour give rise and to examine how these challenges are handled by subtitler, Andrew Whitelaw. In its conclusion, this article recapitulates its findings suggesting if, and how, the humour which characterises Le Dîner de Cons has been preserved in the film’s target language (TL) subtitles.

Keywords: Comedy film; Humour; Incongruity and superiority theories; Subtitling; Translation challenges.

Introduction

The present article centres on the smash-hit comedy film, *Le Dîner de Cons* (1998), by French playwright and film director, Francis Veber. In order to define if, and how, the specific humour which characterises *le Dîner* is preserved in Andrew Whitelaw’s English-language subtitles of the film, this study proceeds in four stages. First, it grounds itself in existing theory, detailing the complex character of humour, the challenges which arise when translating this and, within the context of audiovisual translation, how these difficulties are compounded when humour is subtitled for an audience of another language and culture. Second, setting *Le Dîner* in relation to Francis Veber’s portfolio of films, this study outlines *Le Dîner*’s plot, and suggests which theories can best explain the various manifestations of humour in the film. In its main body, this study subsequently focuses on six extracts from the film which portray protagonist François Pignon as *un con* [a bloody idiot], in order to demonstrate how this humour manifests itself, the translation / subtitling challenges which these instances of humour pose and how these challenges are handled by subtitler, Whitelaw. Ultimately, the present article concludes by recapitulating its findings and, in doing so, suggests if, and how, the particular humour which characterises *Le Dîner* has been preserved in the film’s target language (TL) subtitles.

1) Humour

i) The nature of humour

Humour can be concisely defined as ‘the quality of being amusing or comic, especially as expressed in literature or speech’ (*OED* 1998: 894). To this it should be added that, if humour and laughter are closely related they are, nevertheless, not synonymous. Evolutionary psychologists (Polimeni and Reiss 2006: 1) state that laughter is only a *possible* effect of humour:

Humour is the underlying cognitive process that frequently, but not necessarily, leads to laughter. Laughter is a seizure-like activity that can be elicited by expressing a humorous cognitive stimulus but also other stimuli such as tickling. Thus, one can laugh without a humorous stimulus, and similarly one can experience humour without laughter.

In spite of these relatively straightforward definitions, and the fact that humour and laughter are commonplace in both everyday life and the arts, the theory of humour is extremely complex. Given that this theory has existed and been discussed for over 2000 years (Carroll 2014: 1) -- in the West, its origins can be traced back to Plato -- a plethora of approaches exists (Chiaro 1992: 1). These range from superiority and irony to release and play (Carroll 2014; Smuts 2009). If these distinct schools of thought are all of interest, there is, understandably, no one comprehensive taxonomy thereof (Smuts *ibid.*).

This said, whatever their particular stance, theorists widely acknowledge that humour is always context-based, that is, it is invariably rooted in, and therefore dependent on, the linguistic, sociocultural, and indeed personal context in which it occurs (Chiaro 1992: 77). There is also broad consensus that humour is inherently subjective in character and that sense of humour varies from one individual to another, even within families and friendship groups (Raphaelson-West 1989: 129; Vandaele 2002: 165).

ii) Translating humour

Given the context-dependent and subjective nature of humour within any one culture, the process of translating humour, that is, transferring it into another linguistic and cultural context, within which the target audience’s sense of humour will also be subjective, is clearly a challenging task (Assis-Rosa 2002; Chiaro 2002). Understandably, there has been much debate about the translatability of humour. Essentially, the difficulty of this task resides in the fact that, if humour is to cross linguistic and cultural borders successfully, the source and target audiences must share certain knowledge (Chiaro 2002; Delabastita 1997). Raphaelson-West (1989: 1) suggests that, even if it is impossible to preserve equivalence of effect when rendering humour, there are always means of communicating the humorous nature of the source text (ST) to the target language (TL) audience. Clearly, whichever approach the translator of humour adopts, the first step of this process is to identify, or interpret, the humour present in the source language (SL) (Díaz-Cintas and Remaël 2007: 214; Vandaele

2002). This requires that the translator have ‘humour competence’ (Carrell 1997) in both the SL and TL cultures.

iii) Subtitling humour When humour occurs in an audiovisual context and is then translated into a foreign language via subtitles, an additional layer of complexity is added. Subtitling,*1 or ‘the rendering in a different language of verbal messages in filmic media, in the shape of one or more lines of written text presented on the screen in synch. with the original written message’ (Gottlieb 2001: 87), is a highly specific and notoriously difficult task whose multiple challenges have been widely acknowledged and discussed in recent years. Unique in nature, subtitling can be theorised according to each of Jakobson’s three categories of translation (1959/2000: 114). It is *interlingual* (translates text from one national language into another), *intra lingual* (involves rewording or reducing the SL before interlingual translation can take place) and *intersemiotic* (transforms language which is used orally in the SL into a written form of the TL) (Boase-Beier 2012: v).*2 Thus, in addition to handling the interlingual challenges which are posed by translating the ST, subtitlers must respect rigid spatial and temporal constraints (Luyken et al 1991: 156) in order to both synchronise their text with the film’s soundtrack and image and to also account for the reading capabilities of the TL audience (De Linde and Kay 1999: 4-7).*3 Furthermore, when transforming the oral SL into a written form of the TL, they must suggest orality in their writing and ensure, at all times, that the TL corresponds to the images of the original film. Subtitlers are, as Díaz-Cintas points out (2003: 43-4), particularly vulnerable as their translations can always be compared to the original (SL) text.

iv) The challenges of translating comedy films In view of the complex and subjective nature of humour, the difficulty of translating humour across linguistic and cultural boundaries and the added constraints of working within an audiovisual context, it is abundantly clear that subtitling comedy films can be a highly challenging task. The term ‘comedy film’ is broad and can be broken down into a number of subcategories, amongst which: slapstick (Edouard Molinaro’s 1978 *La Cage aux Folles*), parody (Laurent Tirard’s 2009 *Le Petit Nicolas*), romantic comedy (Jean-Pierre Jeunet’s 2001 *Le Fabuleux Destin d’Amélie Poulain*), black comedy (Etienne Chatiliez’s 2001 *Tanguy*) and social satire (Patrice Leconte’s 1978 *Les Bronzés*).

As was previously suggested, given that films belong to an audiovisual medium they are inherently multimodal in character. According to Gambier (2009: 17): ‘[...] audiovisual is a multisemiotic blend of many different codes (images, sounds, colours, proxemics, kinesics, narrative, etc.)’. Thus, despite the existence of these subcategories, some of which have a predominant source of humour – in slapstick films, for instance, humour is frequently visual – , there is increasing consensus that, in the multimodal, and therefore multisemiotic, medium of films, both meaning and humour result from the interaction of elements on a number of levels (Attardo 1994; Zabalbeascoa 1997). Despite its complexity, the audiovisual medium can, however, also facilitate the subtitler’s task; preservation of humour in the TL film does not rely solely on the subtitler’s ability to recapture linguistic amusement in the TL.

2) *Le Dîner de Cons*

i) *The film: background and plot*

Since the early 1970s, the renowned French playwright and filmmaker, Francis Veber, has produced multiple works which have one major feature in common: they all focus on a fictional character, François Pignon (sometimes François Perrin), who is depicted as lacking in intelligence, somewhat naïve, unaware of the circumstances in which he finds himself, unlucky but, unfailingly a fundamentally good and affable person (*La Doublure* 2006; *Le Placard* 2000). *Le Dîner de Cons*, Veber's most well-known and successful film, falls neatly into this mould. In *Le Dîner*, Parisian publisher, Pierre Brochant, organises weekly *dîners de cons* [idiots' dinners], to which he and his friends invite guests. The guests are unsuspecting men with unusual hobbies who Brochant and his friends can mock and ridicule. At the end of each dinner, the men vote on, and choose, a prize idiot. When one of Brochant's friends identifies a potential dinner guest – François Pignon, a Belgian employee of the Finance Ministry, whose hobby involves building models of French landmarks using matchsticks -, Brochant invites Pignon to his house so that they can meet. Shortly before Pignon's visit, however, Brochant suffers two misfortunes: he hurts his back while playing golf and his wife, who is totally opposed to the concept of 'idiots' dinners', leaves him. When Pignon arrives, Brochant finds him annoying. Brochant nevertheless becomes dependent on his visitor due to his reduced mobility and need to locate his estranged wife in order to resolve his relationship problems. Brochant thus requests Pignon's help to make a number of telephone calls. Despite his good intentions, Pignon always manages to aggravate the situation, to the exasperation of his host. Over the course of the film, Pignon's kindness becomes clear and Brochant begins to change his opinion of this man. Nonetheless, Pignon's final attempt to reconcile Brochant and his wife ultimately fails.

ii) *Theorising humour in Le Dîner de Cons*

As was mentioned in the Introduction to the present article, a number of distinct approaches to theorising humour exist. Although some theorists believe different schools of thought to be mutually exclusive and all theories have limitations as none can be used to account for every instance of humour, the present article argues that superiority theories and their successors (incongruity theories) can both be used to explain the different instances of humour which manifest themselves in *Le Dîner*. In order that the relevance of these two approaches can be justified, each will be outlined briefly. Superiority theories date back to Plato (429 – 347 BC) and Aristotle (384 – 322 BC) and were developed considerably by Hobbes (1588 - 1679). Hobbes posits that humour gives the onlooker both a feeling of pleasure when they are superior to others, and some sense of contempt towards the latter. For Hobbes, characters cause amusement when they are stupid or self-deceived, as they provide onlookers with a sense of their own superiority. In incongruity theory, the object of humour is the presence of incongruity or the subversion of some expectation (Carroll 2014: 16-24). This may occur in language – puns involve incongruity because words are not used in their usual context -, in

relation to characters – who do not have the emotional intelligence which we would expect of them -, or as regards human intelligence. In the latter cases, the audience presumes certain norms of intelligence on the part of the characters which these fictional individuals do not meet.

Against this background, the following pages focus on six short extracts taken from *Le Dîner*; three whose humour can be best understood through application of superiority theory, and three whose humour is grounded in intellectual or linguistic incongruity. For each of the six examples, the way in which humour manifests itself will be suggested, the translation/subtitling challenges which the given instance of humour poses will be examined, and the ways in which these are handled by subtitler Andrew Whitelaw will be discussed.

3) Discussion of scenes

i) Example 1

In this scene, Jean Cordier, a friend of Pierre Brochant who is looking to recruit *un con* for the friends' next dinner, is travelling on a TGV train and working on his laptop. When he arrives and prepares to sit at the table in front of Cordier, François Pignon drops a photograph; a model of the Eiffel Tower which he has himself made using matchsticks. The following conversation ensues:

FP = François Pignon; JC = Jean Cordier

	ST	TT
1)FP	La Tour Eiffel. Entièrement faite avec des allumettes. 346 422 pour être précis. [The Eiffel Tower. Made entirely of matches. 346, 422 to be exact.]	The Eiffel Tower! Made of matchsticks! 345, 422 to be exact.
2)JC	C'est vous qui avez fait ça ? [Did you make that?]	Did you do that?
3)FP	C'est une de mes plus belles pièces. [It's one of my most beautiful pieces.]	One of my finest pieces.
4)JC	Ah bon ? Vous en avez d'autres ? [Really? Do you have others?]	You've done others?
5)FP	Si, j'en ai d'autres. [Yes, I have others.]	I'll say!

6)FP	Si l'angle entre les allumettes n'est pas calculé au dixième de degré, c'est foutu. [If the angle between the matches isn't calculated to a tenth of a degree, it's buggered.]	The angle of the matches can't be a tenth of a degree off!
7)JC	Au dixième degré de près... [A tenth of a degree...]	One tenth of a degree!
8)FP	Vous vous rendez compte ? [Do yourealise?]	Think of it!

Figure 1 *Extract 1*

The intended humour in this scene could be explained by superiority theory as Pignon is evidently being mocked by Cordier. This humour is created thanks to the characters' mannerisms and facial expressions, which is clearly made possible by the audiovisual medium. When Pignon arrives his body language is awkward, his behaviour is clumsy and his facial expressions are gormless. Cordier, by contrast, adopts an overly serious expression in order to feign interest in Pignon's hobby (line 2), then blatantly smirks when he realises that he has a potential recruit for the next dinner (line 4). The language which the characters use does not pose any particular translation difficulties and can be rendered closely in the TL. Given that this scene follows one in which the friends discuss recruiting *un con*, it is the meaning implicit in the dialogue, of which viewers are aware and which therefore results in their feeling superior, which is responsible for the humour.

ii) Example 2

The present scene is set in Pierre Brochant's flat. Brochant's wife, Christine, has been feeling down so he invites her to his next dinner in order to cheer her up. Christine, however, is not at all amused by such dinners; on the contrary, she disapproves strongly of them. Shortly after the following conversation takes place, Christine Brochant leaves her husband.

CB = Christine Brochant ; PB = Pierre Brochant

	ST	TT
1)PB	Change-toi les idées. Viens avec moi. Tu vas voir, c'est irrésistible, c'est dîners. [Have a change. Come with me. You'll see, these dinners are irresistable.]	Come with me for a change. You'll enjoy our dinners.
2)CB	C'est irrésistible d'inviter un malheureux pour se moquer de lui toute la soirée ? [It's irresistible to invite around a poor man so that you can make fun of him all evening?]	Inviting a poor guy to make fun of him?

3)PB	C'est pas un malheureux, c'est un abruti. Il n'y a pas de mal à se moquer des abrutis. Ils sont là pour ça, non ? [He's not a poor man, he's an idiot. There's no harm in making fun of idiots. They're there for that, aren't they?]	But he's an idiot! Idiots are fair game.
------	--	---

Figure 2 Extract 2

The humour in this scene can again be explained by superiority theory. The dialogue clearly details the nature of the dinners which insult the intelligence of guests and are, as Christine believes, extremely cruel. Some critics justify this cruelty through application of the principle of 'comic distance' which enables audiences to find such superiority-based humour amusing. As Carroll (2014: 31) writes:

Comic distance [in which there is] an absence of empathy and normal concern for characters in jokes and satires [...] relieves us of worries and anxieties about what is happening to the beings which inhabit the joke worlds and other fictional environments of invented humour.

As was the case of Example 1, this extract lends itself to a very close and concise translation approach and does not, therefore, give rise to any linguistic challenges.

iii) Example 3 Here, Pierre Brochant is house-bound due to his recent back injury and is being visited by his doctor. During this visit, Brochant attempts to contact François Pignon, calls his house and gets through to his answerphone. Incredibly amused, he puts the answerphone message, sung by Pignon, on his loud-speaker for his doctor to hear. Before playing the message, Brochant says: *Docteur, j'ai un cas de classe mondiale* [Doctor, I've got a world-class case here.]

D = Doctor; M = Message ; PB = Pierre Brochant

	ST	TT
1)M	Vous êtes bien chez François Pignon, mais il n'est pas là pour l'instant. [This is François Pignon's answerphone, but he isn't here at the moment.]	François is out, but don't pout.
2)M	Laissez un message après le pip-pip, il vous rappellera lors d'une pie. [Leave a message after the beep, he'll ring you back in a jiffy.]	No need to weep, wait for the beep.

3)M	C'est à vous de parler. [It's your turn to speak.]	Your turn to peep!
4)PB	Ah, il n'est pas bien, celui-là? [Oh, isn't the good?]	Isn'thesomething?
5)D	Il a l'air assez exceptionnel, oui. [He does seem quite exceptional, yes.]	Outstanding, I'd say.

Figure 3 *Extract 3*

The present extract can again be explained by superiority theory as it contains puns and is driven by unkind mocking of Pignon. However, in this instance a more creative translation approach is required. The original answerphone message rhymes and is sung by Pignon; this sounds embarrassing and makes the audience feel somewhat awkward upon hearing it. Clearly, the subtitles are set against the original audiovisual backdrop, so the TL audience are able to experience Pignon's version of the message. In addition to this, Whitelaw does an admirable job of preserving the semantic content of the SL in his subtitles while simultaneously providing concise, rhyming translations of the original lines (out / pout; weep / beep / peep).

iv) Example 4 The following dialogue occurs on the landing outside Brochant's flat. After a confused telephone conversation with Brochant's lover, Pignon meets a woman in front of Brochant's front door. Pignon presumes that the woman is Brochant's lover, who Brochant does not want to see, and thus encourages her to leave. However, the woman is in fact Brochant's wife, Christine. This latest *faux pas* results in Christine's leaving Brochant for good.

CB = Christine Brochant ; FP = François Pignon

	ST	TT
1)FP	C'est vous que j'ai eue tout à l'heure au téléphone. [It's you who I spoke to earlier on the telephone.]	We spoke on the phone.
2)FP	J'ai appelé le médecin et je suis tombé sur vous. Et j'ai compris ensuite que vous étiez sa petite amie. [I called the doctor and I got through to you. And then I understood that you were his girlfriend.]	I called the doctor and got you. Later I realized: you're his girlfriend.
3)CB	Sa petite amie ? [His girlfriend?]	Girlfriend?
4)FP	Oui. Je suis désolé. J'ai un peu embrouillé au bout du fil. Parce qu'en fait, la situation est très simple. [Yes. I'm sorry. I confused things a bit at the end of the line. Because	Sorry I garbled it. It's very simple:

	actually, the situation is very simple.]	
5)FP	Sa femme l'a quitté, mais il s'en fout un point. Il va très bien. Là, il est heureux, il dort [His wife left him but he doesn't give a shit, full stop. He's very well. Now he's happy, he's asleep]	His wife left him, but he doesn't care. He's asleep
6)FP	Et il veut pas qu'on le dérange. [And he doesn't want to be disturbed.]	and can't be disturbed.
7)FP	C'est clair ? [Is that clear?]	Got it?
8)CB	Très clair, oui. [Very clear, yes.]	Perfectly.

Figure 4 *Extract 4*

Due to the telephone conversation which has taken place just before this scene, the audience is fully aware of Pignon's misunderstanding here; the comedy present in this extract could, then, potentially be described as superiority humour. However, this dialogue lends itself yet more to an incongruity-theory interpretation. There is intellectual incongruity between what Pignon does, but does not, know; social incongruity between how he does, and should, behave; together, these result in situational incongruity. In this particular instance, neither character uses complex language. This can thus again be rendered in the TL subtitles by employing a close, concise translation approach.

v) *Example 5* In the following extract, Brochant is about to brief Pignon on a telephone call which he would like him to make to a man called Juste Leblanc. As *Juste* is not only a first name, but also means 'just' (a synonym of 'only') and 'correct' in French, this word causes Pignon some confusion. Brochant tries to clarify the misunderstanding but, when Pignon fails to follow the explanation, Brochant becomes increasingly exasperated.

FP = François Pignon ; PB = Pierre Brochant

	ST	TT
1)PB	Il s'appelle Juste Leblanc. [He's called Just Leblanc.]	He's called Just Leblanc.
2)FP	Ah bon, il n'a pas de prénom ? [Really? He doesn't have a first name?]	He has no first name?
3)PB	Je viens de vous le dire : Juste Leblanc. [I've just told you :Juste Leblanc.]	I told you: Just Leblanc.
4)PB	Leblanc, c'est son nom. Et c'est Juste, son prénom. [Leblanc is his name. And Just is his first name.]	Leblanc's his name, Just his first name.

5)PB	Monsieur Pignon, votre prénom [Mr. Pignon, your first name]	Mr. Pignon, your first name's
6)PB	c'est François, c'est juste ? [is François ; is that correct?]	François. Just think:
7)PB	Eh ben, lui c'est pareil, c'est Juste. [Well, he's the same, it's Just.]	His is Just.
8)PB	Bon, on a assez perdu de temps comme ça. [Right, we've wasted enough time on that.]	We're wasting time.

Figure 5 Extract 5

The humour in this extract is caused entirely by the linguistic incongruity to which use of the polysemic SL *Juste* gives rise and by Pignon's consequent misunderstanding. As was the case in previously discussed extracts, humour is reinforced by the audiovisual context in which it occurs; Pignon has a confused, lost expression and Brochant's mounting irritation is reflected in the increasing speed and volume of his voice. On a linguistic level, Whitelaw renders the uncommon French male name *Juste* with the equally unusual and polysemic TL name 'Just', which enables the confusion to be fully preserved (lines 1, 3, 4, 6, 7). Line 4 is particularly confusing in the TL as '*c'est juste*' could be understood as 'it's *only* his first name' or 'his first name is *correct*'. Confusion is preserved in the TL through use of the ambiguous construction: 'Just his first name', rather than a more explicit phrase such as 'Just *is* his first name'. In line 6, the expression *c'est juste?* [is that correct?] is employed deliberately in order to increase misunderstanding. The usual question form, *n'est-ce pas*, would have avoided this. As no equivalent expression using 'just' exists in English, Whitelaw modifies the TL to ensure that this word remains in his subtitle. *C'est juste?*[Is that correct?] therefore becomes 'Just think'.

vi) *Example 6* The following conversation between Brochant and Pignon occurs after the latter has just spoken to a woman on the telephone. Believing this woman to be Brochant's sister, Pignon tells her in some detail about Brochant's current health issues. In the following extract, Brochant realises, to his exasperation, that Pignon has made another gaffe; due to a linguistic misunderstanding, Pignon has in fact just spoken at length to Brochant's lover, Marlène Sasseur, rather than to his wife.

	ST	TT
1)FP	C'était votre sœur. [It was your sister.]	It was your sister.
2)PB	Je n'ai pas de sœur. [I don't have a sister.]	I don't have one.
3)FP	Vous n'avez pas de sœur ? [You don't have a sister?]	You don't?
4)FP	Je lui ai dit 'Qui est à l'appareil' ? [I said 'Who is it?']	I said, 'Who is this?' She said 'His sister'.

	Elle m'a dit 'Sa sœur'. [Shesaid 'Hissister'.]	
5)PB	Il a appeléMarlène ! [He called Marlène!]	He called Marlène!
6)FP	C'est pas votresœur ? [It isn't your sister?]	She's not your sister?
7)PB	C'est son nom, Sasseur. Marlène Sasseur. [It'shername, Sasseur. Marlène Sasseur.]	Her name is MarlèneHissister.
8)FP	Je ne pouvais pas savoir, moi. Elle a dit 'Marlène' Sa Sœur ', c'est vrai que c'est confusant. [I couldn't know that. She said 'Marlène, his sister'. It's confusing.]	How could I know? She said: 'Marlène, his sister'. It's confusing.

Figure 6 *Extract 6*

In this instance, humour is again caused by linguistic incongruity. Pignon hears *Marlène Sassoœur* as *Marlène sa soeur* [Marlène, hissister]. Whitelaw fully preserves this confusion, and the resulting amusement, by contracting the TL possessive pronoun, 'his', and noun, 'sister', to create an ambiguous surname, 'Hissister'. As was the case in the subtitles of Example 5, a greater degree of linguistic creativity is required here in order to preserve the humour of the SL in the English-language subtitles.

Conclusion

The present article has focused on six short extracts from Francis Veber's 1998 comedy film, *Le Dîner de Cons*. The first three of these extracts can best be understood through application of superiority theory (Hobbes, Plato) and the latter three, by referring to some of the key tenets of incongruity theory. Given that the multisemiotic nature of the audiovisual medium plays a considerable role in preserving ST humour in the TL version of the film (Attardo 1994; Zabalbeascoa 1997), much of the humour contained in all of the six above-examined examples is automatically preserved in the English-language version of the film. In three of the scenes (Examples 1, 2 and 4), the language can be translated closely and concisely in the TL. Subtitling only becomes more challenging from a linguistic point of view when the original film's humour is rooted in linguistic playfulness and creativity. In Example 3, it was witnessed that Whitelaw was required to be more playful in his rendering of a rhyming answerphone message. In Examples 5 and 6, some creativity was also required and SL puns were recaptured with very similar wordplays in the TL. In sum, in the six above-discussed examples, Whitelaw works with the existing audiovisual backdrop of *Le Dîner de Cons* to preserve very convincingly for an Anglophone audience the superiority- and incongruity-based manifestations of humour which characterise Veber's French smash-hit comedy film.

Notes:

1 For basic definitions of subtitling, see also Chiaro (2009 : 48) and Díaz-Cintas and Remaël (2007: 8).

2 Assis-Rosa (2001: 213-14) describes a number of changes which take place during the process of *intersemiotic* translation.

3 For further discussion of the constraints on subtitling, see Díaz-Cintas and Remaël (2007); Hatim and Mason (1997); Ivarsson and Carrol (1998).

Film corpus / references :

CHATILIEZ, Etienne. 2001. *Tanguy*, DVD version : C'est la vie. (France, 108 mins.).

JEUNET, Jean-Pierre. 2001. *Le Fabuleux Destin d'Amélie Poulain*, DVD version : UGC Images. (France, 116 mins.).

LECONTE, Patrice. 1978. *Les Bronzés*, DVD version : Studio Canal. (France, 94 mins.).

MOLARINO, Edouard. 1978. *La Cage aux Folles*, DVD version : Metro Goldwyn Mayer Studios. (France 93 mins.).

TIRARD, Laurent. 2009. *Le Petit Nicolas*, DVD version : SudoPictures. (France, 89 mins.).

VEBER, Francis. 1998. *Le Dîner de Cons*, DVD version : Gaumont. (France, 77 mins.).

_____. 2000. *Le Placard*, DVD version : Gaumont. (France, 81 mins.).

_____. 2006. *La Doublure*, DVD version : Gaumont. (France, 82 mins.).

References:

ASSIS-ROSA, Alexandra. 2001. Features of Oral and Written Communication in Subtitling. In GAMBIER, Y. and GOTTLIEB, H. *Multimedia Translation: concepts, practice, research*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001, pp. 213-22.

ATTARDO, Salvatore. 1994. *Linguistic Theories of Humour*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

BOASE-BEIER, Jean. 2012. *The Next Big Thing. Norwich Papers: Studies in Translation*, vol. 20. Norwich: University of East Anglia Press.

CARRELL, Amy. 1997. Joke competence and humour competence. In *Humour*, De Gruyter, vol. 10, issue 2. Available at: <www.degruyter.com/view/j/humor.1997.10.issue.2>.

- CARROLL, Noël. 2014.*Humour: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CHIARO, Delia. 1992.*The Language of Jokes: Analysing Verbal Play*. London, New York: Routledge.
- DELABASTITA, Dirk. 1997.*Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation*. Manchester and Namur: St. Jerome Publishing and Presses Universitaires de Namur.
- DE LINDE, Zoe, KAY, Neil. 1999.*The Semiotics of Subtitling*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- DIAZ-CINTAS, Jorge. 2003.*Teoria y practica de la subtitulacion. Inglés-Español*. Barcelona : Ariel.
- DIAZ-CINTAS, Jorge, REMAEL, Aline. 2007. *Audiovisual Translation : Subtitling*. Manchester : St Jerome.
- GAMBIER, Yves. 2009.Challenges in research on audiovisual translation. Available at: <isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/tip_2_2009/chapters/gambier.pdf>.
- GAMBIER, Yves, GOTTLIEB, Henrik. 2001.*Multimedia translation: concepts, practice, research*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- GOTTLIEB, Henrik. 2001.Subtitling: Visualising filmic dialogue.In LORENZO GARCIA, L. and PEREIRA RODRIGUEZ A.M. *Traducción Subordinada (II)El Subtitulado*. Vigo: Servicio de Publicacions de la Universidad de Vigo: 85-110.
- HATIM, Basil, MASON, Ian. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.
- IVARRSSON, Ian, CARROLL, Mary. 1998. *Subtitling*. Simrishamn: Trans Edit.
- JAKOBSON, Roman. 1959/2000.On linguistic aspects of translation.In VENUTI, L.*The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 138-44.
- LUYKEN, Georg-Michel, HERBST, Thomas, LANGHAM- BROWN, Jo, REID, Helen, SPINHOF, Herman. 1991. *Overcoming Language Barriers in Television: Dubbing and Subtitling for the European Audience*. Manchester: European Institute for the Media.
- POLIMENI, Joseph, REISS, Jeffrey. 2006. The First Joke: Exploring the Evolutionary Origins of Humour. In *Evolutionary Psychology*. Available at: <www.evp.sagepub.com/content/4/1/147470490600400129.full.pdf>.
- RAPHAELSON-WEST, Debra S. 1989. On the Feasability and Strategies of Translating Humour. In *Meta: Translators' Journal*, vol. 34, no. 1, 1989, pp. 128-41. Available at:<www.erudit.org/revue/meta/1989/v34/al/003913ar.pdf>.

SMUTS, Aaron. 2009. The Ethics of Humour: Can Your Sense of Humor be Wrong?. In *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, vol. 13, issue 3, 2009, pp. 333-47.

VANDAELE, Jeroen. 2002. *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication – Translating Humour*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

ZABALBEASCOA, Patrick. 1997. Translating Jokes for Dubbed Television Situation Comedies. In DELABASTITA, D. *Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation*. Manchester and Namur: St. Jerome Publishing and Presses Universitaires de Namur, 1997, pp. 235-57.

Claire Ellender

19, Peterhouse Close,

Peterborough, PE3 6EN, England

claire.ellender@univ-lille3.fr

In SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation [online]. 2016, vol. 9, no. 2 [cit. 2016-14-11]. Available online <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI10/pdf_doc/01.pdf>. ISSN 1336-7811