

Translation of Humor in Dubbed Animations: The Case of *Minions*

Shima Fayazi 

MA Student, Department of English Literature and Translation, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen Branch, Roudehen, Iran

Seyyed Shahabeddin Sadati* 

Assistant Professor, Department of English Literature and Translation, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen Branch, Roudehen, Iran

Abstract

This study aims to investigate how humorous language and content are rendered in audiovisual translation. Focusing on the animated film *Minions*, the study compares two Persian dubbed versions produced by Kaszadeh (2015) and Khajavi (2015). The entire film was analyzed, and humorous instances were identified and compared with their Persian equivalents to examine the translation strategies employed. The findings reveal notable differences between the two translations. Kaszadeh predominantly relies on free translation, while Khajavi more frequently employs cultural equivalence. Furthermore, Khajavi's version demonstrates a higher degree of fluency, suggesting a more effective transfer of cultural nuances and contextual references into Persian. These results underscore the impact of translation strategy choice on the naturalness and reception of humor in dubbed animated films.

Keywords: Animation, dubbing, humor, *Minions*

Original Article

Accepted: 23.01.2026

Received: 05.01.2026

*Corresponding author: sh.sadati@riau.ac.ir

Cite this article: Fayazi, S., & Sadati, S. S. (2025). Translation of humor in dubbed animations: The case of *Minions*. *Translation and Interpreting Research*, 2(7), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.22054/tir.2026.20108>

Publisher: ATU Press

Translation and Interpreting Research is the journal of Research Institute for Translation Studies (RITS), affiliated with Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.

Introduction

Humor is one of the interesting tools people rely on to convey their messages in a more meaningful, effective, and fun way. Linguistic, cultural, and social elements are of great importance in humor (Fefelova & Anisimova, 2025). Vandaele (2010, p. 149) states that “humor occurs when a rule has not been followed; when an expectation is set up and not confirmed; when the incongruity is resolved in an alternative way”.

Humor is a practical tool in mass media for engaging people, conveying a point, and shaping their views (Ofori & Senta Dogbatse, 2023). This function becomes critically crucial in dubbing, where humor must be culturally translated, not just linguistically. A simple literal translation often fails, so adapters must find culturally resonant equivalents—such as swapping a local joke for a foreign one or using a familiar voice actor—to achieve the same emotional effect. In this way, effective dubbing uses humor as a bridge to make foreign content feel local, preserving the original’s engagement and intent for a new audience.

Sarmi et al. (2025) explain that translating humor can be particularly challenging because it often overlooks grammatical correctness. Pragmatic problems can arise when the source and Target Languages (TLs) have different practical ways of thinking or fundamental truths or rules. Dealing with the cultural aspects of humor translation is a major concern for every translator. Humor is a many-sided phenomenon commonly stated in actions or tales perceived as humorous and generating laughs or smiles, linked to the cognitive potential that permits the production or recognition of jokes or witticisms, and that could be considered a strategy (Feingold & Mazzella, 1993).

A dubbing process in translation is one of the critical fields within the translated version. According to Luyken et al. (1991), dubbing is a complex audiovisual translation technique. It does not just translate the words; it replaces the original spoken dialogue with a new recording in a different language. This new version must meticulously synchronize with the existing video, aligning with the actors’ lip motions, the pacing of their speech, and the natural breaks in their conversation, more than just substituting voices. It requires significant cultural adaptation of the translated script to make it suitable for the target audience. Additionally, achieving lip synchronization demands numerous textual alterations. The translator’s role is the first step in this extensive and complex process, which always involves a degree of deviation from the source material. Audiovisual translation is a multi-stage, sequential workflow, meaning that an issue at any stage can negatively impact subsequent ones. In this context, Orero (2004) contends that the translator’s initial text is frequently not the final version, but rather a draft that is later refined and tailored to meet the specific demands of the dubbing medium.

Anyone who has attempted to translate humor into another language understands how frequently the joke falls flat. This is primarily because what is considered funny is often deeply tied to the specific language and cultural context in which it originated. Verbal humor commonly relies on ambiguities, wordplay, and cultural references that are unique to the source culture. The translator’s challenge is greatest when a joke depends on a word or phrase with a double meaning. Success is only possible if the target language has an equivalent term with the same range of meanings. In those rare cases, the translator’s task is nearly complete.

However, it is possible for a direct translation of the words to exist, while the cultural foundation of the humor remains too specific to be understood, creating a barrier that cannot be overcome. Baker (2018) states that the SL word may express a concept unknown in the target culture. Consequently, translating humor is a complex task, and the translator should be able to distinguish humor and be

familiar with the cultures of both the SL and the TL. Newmark (1988/1995, p. 92) calls them “cultural words” and relates their existence to “gaps” between the SL and TL that cause translation problems.

The purpose of this study is to examine the translation strategies for humor in *Minions*. It tries to find out which strategy is applied in the two translations based on Newmark’s model, as well as how to attract more children to animation in each country’s culture. The central focus of this analysis lies in the significance of cultural meanings embedded within the ST and how these meanings are effectively transformed into TT. The study attempts to answer the following research questions:

- What strategies are used by Kaszadeh (2015) and Khajavi (2015) in translating the humorous phrases of the animation *Minions* based on Newmark’s model?
- Which of the two Persian translations is more fluent based on the cultural equivalent?

Literature Review

The academic study of humor has a long history, originating with classical thinkers like Plato and Aristotle, and now spans a wide range of disciplines from mathematics to medicine. The field is supported by dedicated scholarly associations, as well as numerous academic journals and book series. Within this field, known as humorology, linguistics has played a particularly important role. This is both due to its significant theoretical contributions and because language itself is the primary vehicle for a great deal of humor. Attardo (2017) argues that even humor created entirely outside language (for example, visually or musically) should be defined in language by scholars analyzing it.

Laurian (1989) and Xia et al. (2003) clarify that, humor often cannot be translated because of fundamental issues with word meanings, including both their literal definitions and their implied cultural associations. Furthermore, Vandaele (2010) notes that translating humor is linguistically complex because it often relies on specific words, dialects, and wordplay (puns). These elements are tricky to translate directly. The main issue is that humor loves to use these very things—in-group language and playful wordplay—to strengthen social bonds within a group, which makes it especially hard to translate. Translation problems arise from linguistic “denotation” when a joke is built around a concept, object, or social reality that exists only in the source culture and has no direct equivalent in the target language. It explains that a significant challenge in translating comedy arises from register and language variety. It gives the example that a specific type of joke—like using a formal “Sir” in an informal New York cab—does not work in French because the same social dynamics does not exist with “Monsieur” in a Paris taxi. The core problem is that comedy often relies on the clash between different social dialects, registers, and speech patterns (like “the Queen’s English”) that may not have direct equivalents in another language. The text ends by posing the problematic question of how a translator could recreate the humor from these very specific English sociolects in a language like French (Antonopoulou, 2014; Vandaele, 2010).

The features of humor are multifaceted, often operating through the interplay of incongruity, superiority, and relief. Incongruity-based humor arises from the violation of logical or expected patterns, creating surprise through absurdity, irony, or witty wordplay (Grawe, 2015; Karpenko, 2017). Conversely, superiority theory suggests that laughter stems from a feeling of enhanced self-esteem at others’ expense, as seen in slapstick comedy or satire, where characters become the butt of a joke. Additionally, psychoanalytic relief theory posits that humor serves as a release valve for psychological tension and forbidden impulses, enabling the safe expression of taboo subjects. These core mechanisms are further expressed through a vast range of techniques, including hyperbole, understatement, sarcasm, and parody, all of which serve to provoke amusement, critique societal norms, or forge a shared sense of connection through laughter (Grawe, 2015).

Linguistically, humor can involve syntactic, semantic, and contextual dimensions, including the use of specific lexicons, structural statistics, and phonetic styles, contributing to sentence congruity (Khurana et al., 2024). Moreover, Zhou and Chen (2013) explain that this form of humor, often categorized as verbal wit or linguistic humor, arises from the clever and frequently subversive use of the fundamental building blocks of language. It operates on multiple levels, from the simple manipulation of phonetics, as in puns and homophones that create double meanings with a single sound, to the bending of syntax and grammar for unexpected comedic effect.

From a social and emotional perspective, humor can be understood through theories of superiority and relief (Bužarovska, 2011). Furthermore, Hussain and Ameer (2024) state that humor often carries a sense of correction and sympathy, and can involve tenderness, distinguishing it from satire, which may contain bitterness. In addition, Rosenberg et al. (2024) explain that an ideal sense of humor can include caring as a key trait, even if it occasionally incorporates elements like sarcasm or hostility, the balance of which is often culturally determined. Effectively wielding humor, especially in a leadership role, is a complex skill that demands a keen reading of the context, a clear and positive intention, and sound judgment. This must be paired with skillful delivery and an acute awareness of the audience's reactions. Ultimately, both the creation and reception of humor are profoundly shaped by the prevailing atmosphere and the broader socio-cultural context (Rosenberg et al., 2024).

Translating humor is increasingly essential for cross-cultural communication, but it presents a unique challenge (Kovacs, 2020; Wang & Zhan, 2024). As Chiaro (2010) observed, humor is a complex mix of universal, cultural, linguistic, and personal elements. This multi-layered nature makes it a concrete and challenging problem for translators to solve.

The first stage of communication involves the ST author and the translator. The author, as the communicator, expresses a message with both an informational purpose (the joke itself) and a communicative intention (the desire to amuse the reader). The translator, acting as the audience, must do more than decode the words. They need to use contextual clues to infer the author's intentions and identify the humorous part of the text. By applying the principle of relevance, the translator seeks the most logical connection between the humorous utterance and the surrounding context. This is an active process of interpretation, as simply understanding the literal meaning of the words is not enough to grasp the humor (Wang & Zhan, 2024). On the other hand, in cases where the humor is tightly bound to the original semantic and syntactic structures (e.g., a pun that can be directly translated, or wordplay that exists in both languages), a semantic approach can be attempted. Its use is justified when the literal meaning itself is the source of the humor and can be effectively transferred (Farghal & Ymak, 2025; Jiang et al., 2019).

On the other hand, dubbing is a major form of revoicing, so challenging that it is often referred to as *traduction totale* (total translation) (Abdirasulov & Abiyatova, 2025; Cary, 1960). In dubbing, the translated dialogue must closely match the actors' lip movements. This is challenging because the original and translated languages often have different sentence lengths and grammatical structures, making perfect lip-sync difficult to achieve (Zaki & Dole, 2024). This distinction highlights a key difference between the two methods. Dubbing aims for seamlessness, making it appear as if the on-screen characters natively speak the viewer's language, thereby concealing the translation process. In contrast, the voiceover constantly reminds the audience that they are watching something foreign and translated. This inherent visibility places voiceover, along with subtitling, in the category of overt translation (Díaz Cintas & Orero, 2010). The translation mode in an audiovisual context usually depends on the target audience and the country where the translation will be presented.

Much research has been done on the translation of humor. Among the studies conducted in the area, Rong et al. (2025) analyzed how humor was translated in the sitcom *The Big Bang Theory*. Using Schmitz's (2002) and Newmark's (1988) models, the study identified 159 instances of humor, which

fell into three categories: Universal humor was the most common, followed by Linguistic humor and culture-based humor. To translate this humor effectively, translators used techniques like paraphrasing, cultural equivalence, transference, and notes/glosses. The goal of these methods was to preserve the comedic effect by adapting the content to the target audience's culture, retaining authentic references, and explaining complex ideas. Moreover, Hashemian and Farhang-Ju (2021) analyzed the translation of humor from three dubbed Iranian series based on qualitative research (*Shamsolemareh*, *Chimney*, and *Medical Building*) into English. The most frequent types of humor used in the series were 'clumsiness' and 'parody'. The three most common translation strategies used were 'omission', 'word-for-word translation', and 'free translation'. The study concluded that these strategies were largely unsuccessful at preserving the humorous tone of the original series, preventing English-speaking audiences from fully appreciating the humor. The researcher suggested that these findings could help improve the quality of humor translation in the future.

In a follow-up study, Khodabande (2019) analyzed the translation of humor in the Persian dubbing of *The Boss Baby*, comparing versions from two TV channels: *Nahal* and *Gem Junior*. The study found that *Gem Junior* most frequently used 'literal translation'. However, *Nahal* most often used 'replacing' and 'deleting' humorous content. The study concluded that the two channels had different translation approaches: *Nahal* adopted a target-culture-oriented approach, adapting the dialogues to be closer to Iranian children's culture. On the other hand, *Gem Junior* used an approach that was a mix of 'domestication' and 'foreignization'.

There are similarities and differences between the current research and the mentioned studies. The present study on *Minions* shares fundamental similarities with the mentioned research, as all primarily investigate the translation of humor in audiovisual media, focusing specifically on dubbing. A key commonality is the analytical focus on identifying and categorizing the specific translation strategies employed, with the present study explicitly aligning with Rong et al. (2025) by utilizing Newmark's model for this purpose. Furthermore, like Khodabande's research, this study adopts a comparative framework, analyzing two different dubbed versions to contrast how translation choices diverge. Underlying all these works is a central concern for cultural adaptation, exploring the continuum between domestication (adapting to the target culture) and foreignization (retaining source culture elements) to understand how humor is bridged for a new audience.

The primary differences lie in the specific research focus, source material, and cultural direction. Unlike Rong et al. (2025), who incorporated a typology of humor (e.g., universal, culture-based), the present *Minions* study appears to focus more narrowly on translation procedures themselves rather than first classifying the humor type. The source material also differs significantly; while Khodabande (2019) also analyzed an American animation, the unique nature of the *Minions* franchise—with its heavy reliance on visual gags, non-standard language, and distinct cultural positioning—presents a different set of translation challenges compared to a sitcom (*The Big Bang Theory*) or other animations. Finally, the direction of translation is exclusively from English to Persian, which contrasts with Hashemian and Farhang-Ju's study (2021), which analyzed the reverse (Persian to English).

Method

The purpose of this study was to investigate the translation of humor in Persian dubbing of the American animation, *Minions*, as translated by Ali Kaszadeh (2015) and Mohammad Khajavi (2015), and by dubbing Manager Mehrdad Raisi and Hooman Khayat, respectively. The entire 91-minute animation was analyzed to document instances of humor embedded in its dialogues. This process involved identifying specific phrases or sentences. These humorous items were then compared to their Persian equivalents in the two dubbed versions. The study then focused on the identification of translation strategies relying on Newmarks' (1988/1995) model as presented in Table 1 below. The

strategies were then classified and the frequency and percentage of each strategy were calculated to present the results.

Table 1. Newmark's Translation Strategies (1988)

Methods / Strategies		Definitions
1	Word-for-word translation	The SL word order is preserved and the words are translated singly by their most common meanings, out of context.
2	Literal translation	The SL grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest TL equivalents, but the lexical words are translated singly, out of context.
3	Faithful translation	It attempts to produce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the TL grammatical structures.
4	Semantic translation	It differs from 'faithful translation' only insofar as it must take more account of the aesthetic value of the SL text.
5	Free translation	It produces the TL text without the original's style, form, or content.
6	Idiomatic translation	It reproduces the message of the original but tends to distort nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms that do not appear in the original.
7	Communicative translation	It attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in a way that makes both the content and the language readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership.
8	Adaptation	It is the freest form of translation, used mainly for plays (comedies) and poetry; themes, characters, and plots are usually preserved, the SL culture is assimilated to the TL culture, and the text is rewritten.
Procedures / Strategies		Definitions
9	Cultural Equivalent	It means replacing a cultural word in the SL with a TL one; however, they are not accurate.
10	Transference	It is the process of transferring an SL word to a TL text. It includes transliteration and is the same as "transcription" (Harvey, 2000).
11	Naturalization	It adapts the SL word first to the standard pronunciation, then to the typical morphology of the TL.
12	Functional equivalent	It requires the use of a culture-neutral word, i.e., deculturalising a cultural word, which is the most accurate way of translating.
13	Descriptive equivalent	In this procedure, the meaning of the culturally bound term (CBT) is explained in several words.
14	Translation Label	This is a temporary translation, usually for a new institutional term that should be placed in quotation marks and can later be discreetly withdrawn.
15	Through-translation	The literal translation of common collocations, names of organizations, and components of compounds. It is the same as calque or loan translation.
16	Shifts or transpositions	It involves a change in the grammar from SL to TL. One type is the change from singular to plural. The second type of shift is required when an SL grammatical structure does not exist in the TL. The third type of shift is one in which literal translation is grammatically possible but may not accord with natural usage in the TL.
17	Modulation	It occurs when the translator reproduces the message of the original text in the TL, in conformity with the current norms of the TL, since the SL and the TL may appear dissimilar in perspective.
18	Recognized translation	It occurs when the translator uses the official or the generally accepted translation of any institutional term.

19	Paraphrase	It is used to explain or reinforce the meaning of a section of the text. Usually, this strategy is used in an 'anonymous' text when it is poorly written or has important implications and omissions.
20	Reduction and expansion	A term of little importance in the TL culture may be deleted or expanded. These are said to be somewhat imprecise translation procedures. In some cases, they are practiced intuitively.
21	Compensation	It occurs when the loss of meaning, sound effect, metaphor, or pragmatic effect in one part of a sentence is compensated for in another part or in a contiguous sentence.
22	Componential analysis	It is the process of comparing an SL word with a TL word which has a similar meaning but is not an obvious one-to-one equivalent, by demonstrating first their common and then their differing sense components.
23	Couplet	It occurs when the translator combines two different procedures.
24	Synonymy	It is a "near TL equivalent." Here, economy trumps accuracy.
25	Omission	It occurs when a word or phrase in the SL is omitted from the TL text.

Data Analysis

A few examples of humorous items in the original animation and their Persian translations are examined below.

Example 1:

ST: Love is the way, brother! (00:17:52)

TT1 (by Khajavi): قربان چرخت برم که بچرخه که منو بردی!

TT2 (by Kaszadeh): داداش نوکرتم! دمت گرم!

The phrase "Love is the way, brother!" as humor implies a light-hearted and playful perspective on the concept of love, emphasizing its importance and presenting it in a catchy and colloquial manner. The humor in this phrase may stem from the unexpected combination of the profound notion of love with the casual and familiar term "brother", creating a humorous contrast that elicits amusement and lightheartedness. Both translators applied the concept of "cultural equivalent" because they recognized the importance of capturing the cultural nuances and references present in the original English animation and conveying them effectively in Persian. By utilizing cultural equivalents, the translators aimed to maintain the humorous and comedic impact of the original film by finding equivalent expressions, jokes, or references that would resonate with the Persian-speaking audience.

Example 2:

ST: But I'm so very polite that I shall keep my mouth shut. (00:53:37)

TT1 (by Khajavi): اما نظر بنده اصلاً مهم نیست و شما هم چیزی نشنیدین.

TT2 (by Kaszadeh): البته بنده در این مورد نباید چیزی به شما می‌گفتم ولی جداً همه جوهره تو در دسر افتادیم.

The phrase "But I'm so very polite that I shall keep my mouth shut" as humor conveys a sense of irony and wit. The humor lies in the contrast between the character's claim of being extremely polite and the implication that they have something to say or express but choose to remain silent. This contradiction between their professed politeness and the underlying implication of withholding their thoughts or opinions adds a humorous twist to the statement. The phrase plays with the audience's

expectations and creates a comedic effect by highlighting the discrepancy between what is said and what is implied.

The first translator used “modulation” because he recognized the need to adapt the humorous expression from a different angle or a different way of thinking. However, the second translator used “free translation” because he aimed to prioritize conveying the overall meaning and comedic effect of the humorous expressions rather than sticking closely to the original wording. Free translation allows greater flexibility and creativity, enabling the translator to adapt humorous expressions more freely to suit the linguistic and cultural context of the TL.

Example 3:

ST: You are three tiny, golden, pill-shaped miracle workers. (00:53:54)

TT1 (by Khajavi): شما سه تا نابغه کوچولوی کپسولیِ بلا هستید.

TT2 (by Kaszadeh): شما سه تا کوچولوی زرد موزی ...

The phrase “You are three tiny, golden, pill-shaped miracle workers” as humor implies a playful and exaggerated description of the characters being addressed. The humor lies in the extravagant and unexpected portrayal of the characters as “tiny, golden, pill-shaped miracle workers.” This humorous statement is likely intended to evoke amusement by using vivid, imaginative language to describe the character in a whimsical, exaggerated way. The phrase plays with the audience’s expectations and injects a lighthearted tone into the dialogue, adding an element of humor to the overall scene or situation.

Therefore, the first translator’s use of “idiomatic translation” aimed to reproduce the core message and humor of the original animation, even if it meant potentially sacrificing certain nuances of meaning in favor of colloquial and idiomatic expressions that were more culturally relevant to the Persian-speaking audience. On the other hand, the second translator applied “reduction” because they aimed to simplify or condense the humorous expressions in the translation process. Reduction involves minimizing or streamlining the original content to convey the core message or comedic effect more concisely.

Results and Discussion

The study’s primary focus was not on categorizing the nature or source of the humor itself (e.g., as universal, social, cultural, or linguistic), but rather on analyzing the translational response to the inherent challenges that humor presents. By adopting Newmark’s model of methods and procedures, the study addresses how translators overcome the obstacles posed by humor’s complex features. Therefore, 70 humor samples were extracted, and the Persian translations of *Minions* (2015) were analyzed to determine the methods and procedures applied by the translators (Kaszadeh, 2015; Khajavi, 2015).

The findings indicate that the most frequently used strategy by Kaszadeh for translating humor in the “method” subcategory was “free translation”. Figure 1 shows the frequency with which Kaszadeh applied the strategies.




Figure 1. Frequency of strategies used by Kaszadeh

With regard to Khajavi's version, the results reveal that "cultural equivalent" with 14 occurrence was the most frequently used strategy and modulation with only 3 instances the least frequently used one. Figure 2 presents the frequency of translation strategies used by Khajavi.




Figure 2. Frequency of strategies used by Khajavi

The statistical data from the two translations show that Khajavi's most frequently employed strategy was "cultural equivalent," with 14 cases (20%). On the other hand, the most frequently used strategy by Kaszadeh was "free translation", with 15 cases (21.42%). Moreover, Kaszadeh used the strategy "cultural equivalent" nine times, which was fewer than Khajavi. The study found that Khajavi's Persian translation is more fluent according to Newmark's cultural equivalent. Figure 3 illustrates the comparison between the two translators' application of the "cultural equivalent" strategy.




Figure 3. Use of cultural equivalent by two translators

Humor in films, such as the *Minions* animation, is a powerful tool that fosters connection, evokes laughter, and communicates universal and culturally specific ideas (Banazeer Banu & Gunasekaran, 2025; Gibson, 2019). Many forms of humor have demonstrated cross-cultural appeal, meaning they can be appreciated and understood by people from different cultural backgrounds. Humor can be used to create lighthearted moments, relieve tension, and elicit laughter, thereby fostering a positive and memorable viewing experience (Davies, 1998; Rong et al., 2025). The ambiguous and culturally dependent nature of humor makes it difficult to translate directly. A single error can undermine the entire comedic effect, as jokes are often culture-specific. Consequently, the translator must not only transfer language but also bridge cultural knowledge gaps for the target audience, a process that can sometimes compromise the joke's original spontaneity (Noor et al., 2025; Sarmi et al., 2025). According to Attardo (1994), one of the challenges in defining humor lies in the skepticism expressed by certain scholars regarding the possibility of formulating a comprehensive definition that encompasses all aspects of humor. However, Rosenthal (1956) explained that humor is often associated with the temporary alleviation of the numerous constraints imposed by the physical and social environment on individuals.

Research on the humor genre has evolved into a significant area of interest in studies on audiovisual translation. As Chiaro (2010) notes, the field was initially overlooked, with early scholarship primarily concentrated on wordplay in literary works. In recent years, however, it has risen to prominence and is now recognized as a vital sub-discipline of AVT studies (Martínez Sierra & Zabalbescoa Terran, 2018). Furthermore, as Perego (2016) argues, audiovisual translation functions not only as a linguistic bridge but also as a crucial specialized instrument.

The results of this study were not consistent with those by Koolaji and Haratyan (2017). They considered a cultural comparative analysis of humor translation in the *Ramona Quimby* series. The most comprehensive ideas regarding the translation of cultural aspects and translational strategies have become a significant area of interest. The functional equivalent was the most frequent strategy used by the translator. In addition, the findings of the study were not consistent with those by Khodabande (2019), which examined humor translation in the Persian dubbing of an American animated film, *The Boss Baby*. The results showed that 'literal translation' was the most common strategy in dubbing the *Gem junior* channel, and 'replacing' and 'deleting' were the dominant *Nahal* channel strategies.

Moreover, the outcome of the current research was not in line with the results of the study carried out by Rong et al. (2025), who analyzed humor on the sitcom *The Big Bang Theory* based on Newmark's model. They found the dominant strategy to be 'paraphrasing'. The second commonly used strategy was 'cultural equivalent', which was similar to Khajavi's translation strategy.

Conclusion

Comedy often reflects cultural values, social norms, and specific references that may be more easily understood by audiences familiar with that particular culture (Friedman, 2014; Rusi et al., 2025). The results of the present study revealed that “free translation” was the most frequently employed strategy by Kaszadeh (21.42%). This indicates that the strategy prioritizes producing the TL text rather than replicating the original text’s style, form, or content. Free translation is the subdivision of Newmark’s method and considers the whole text. When a literal translation is impossible, a translator has to abandon the form of the SL and choose free translation, keeping only its intended meaning (Lu & Fang, 2012).

Moreover, according to the outcome of the study, “cultural equivalent” was the most frequently employed strategy by Khajavi (20%). It refers to a translation procedure where a cultural word or concept in the SL is replaced with an equivalent term or expression in the TL. When a translator encounters a cultural gap between the SL and TL, they may need to create a different equivalent that is more suitable or familiar to the target culture. Instead of attempting a literal translation, which may result in confusion or misinterpretation, the translator seeks to find a TL term or expression that conveys a similar cultural meaning or effect (Newmark, 1988/1995).

References

- Abdirasulov, B., & Abiyatova, B. (2025). Audiovisual translation: Subtitling and dubbing challenges. *Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(6), 336-343. <https://doi.org/10.47390/SPR1342V5I6Y2025N55>
- Antonopoulou, E. (2014). A cognitive approach to literary humour devices: Translating Raymond Chandler. *The Translator*, 8(2), 195–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2002.10799132>
- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humor*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, S. (Ed.). (2017). *The Routledge handbook of language and humor*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315731162>.
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation (3rd ed.)*. Routledge.
- Banazeer Banu, G., & Gunasekaran, S. (2025). Transcending cultures through humor: A study of Wit and Satire in the works of Stephen Leacock, Mark Twain, And R.K. Narayan. *Journal of Neonatal Surgery*, 14(6), 406-413. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jns.v14.2354>
- Bužarovska, R. (2011). Why is a talking bird funny? Aspects of humor in The Jewbird by Bernard Malamud. *Belgrade English Language and Literature Studies*, 3(1), 175-185. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.18485/bells.2011.3.10>
- Cary, E. (1960). La traduction totale: Cinema. *Babel*, 6(3), 110-115. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.6.3.02car>
- Chiaro, D. (2010). Translation, humor, and literature (Vol I). *Continuum*.
- Davies, C. H. (1998). *Jokes and their relations to society*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Díaz Cintas, J., & Orero, P. (2010). Dubbing and voice-over. In Y. Gambier, & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 441-445). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Farghal, M., & Ymak, S. (2025). Subtitling humour genres and translation strategies: Egyptian movies as an example. *The European Journal of Humour Research*, 13(3), 248-271. <https://doi.org/10.7592/EJHR.2025.13.3.1047>

- Fefelova, G. G., & Anisimova, A. (2025). The study of comic discourse through the prism of language and culture. *Issues of Applied Linguistics*, 57(1), 71-97. <https://doi.org/10.25076/vpl.57.03>
- Feingold, A., & Mazzella, R. (1993). Preliminary validation of a multidimensional model of wittiness. *Journal of Personality*, 61(1), 439-456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1993.tb00288.x>
- Friedman, S. (2014). *The cultural currency of a good sense of humor*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/59932/>
- Gibson, J. (2019). *An introduction to the psychology of humor*. Routledge.
- Grawe, P. H. (2015). Mathematics and humor: John Allen Paulos and the Numeracy Crusade. *Numeracy*, 8(2), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.5038/1936-4660.8.2.11>
- Hashemian, M., & Farhang-Ju. (2021). Analysis of translation of audiovisual humor in Iranian series. *IJREE*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.52547/ijree.6.1.64>
- Jiang, T., Li, H., & Hou, Y. (2019). Cultural differences in humor perception, usage, and implications. *Cultural Psychology*, 10(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00123>
- Karpenko, H. (2017). Humor as a part of interpersonal communication. *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University*, 4(1), 195-199. <https://doi.org/10.15330/jpnu.4.1.195-199>
- Khodabande, F. (2019). Humor translation in Persian dubbing of American animation *The Boss Baby*: Investigating translation strategies in two different reception environments. *Language and Translation Studies*, 52(3), 121-154. <https://doi.org/10.22067/LTS.V52I3.82721>
- Khurana, T., Pande, V., Pillalamarri, K., & Singh, M. (2024). LOLgorithm: Integrating semantic, syntactic, and contextual elements for humor classification. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.06335>
- Kovacs, G. (2020). Translating humor: A didactic perspective. *Philologica*, 12(2), 68-83. <https://doi.org/10.2478/AUSP-2020-001>
- Laurian, A. (1989). Humour et traduction au contact des cultures. *Meta*, 34(1), 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.7202/003418ar>
- Lu, W., & Fang, H. (2012). Reconsidering Peter Newmark's theory on literal translation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(4), 741-746. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.4.741-746>
- Luyken, G., Herbst, T., Langham-Brown, J., Reid, H., & Spinhof, H. (1991). *Overcoming language barriers in television: Dubbing and subtitling for the European audience*. European Institute for the Media.
- Martínez Sierra, J. J., & Zabalbescoa Terran, P. (2018). Humour as a symptom of research trends in translation studies. *MonTi Monografías De Traducción E Interpretación*, 9(1), 9-27. <https://doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2017.9.1>
- Newmark, P. (1988/1995). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall International.
- Noor, N., Arshad, A., Noor, H., & Latif, T. (2025). Linguistic fidelity vs. comic effect: A study of humor loss in Aab-e-Gum's English tTranslation. *Journal of Arts and Linguistics Studies*, 3(2), 2849–2886. <https://doi.org/10.71281/jals.v3i2.348>
- Ofori, M., & Senta Dogbatse, F. (2023). "We are only to appear to be fighting corruption ... we can't even bite": Online memetic anti-corruption discourse in the Ghanaian media. *Online Media and Global Communication*, 2(1), 77-99. <https://doi.org/10.1515/omgc-2023-2007>
- Orero, P. (2004). *Topics in audiovisual translation*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.56>

- Perego, E. (2016). History, development, challenges and opportunities of empirical research in audiovisual translation. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 17(2), 155-162. <https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2016.17.2.1>
- Rong, W., Husin, N., & Vijayarajoo, A. R. (2025). Translation of humorous language in The Big Bang Theory Sitcom. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, IX(1), 2957-2974. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.9010240>
- Rosenberg, C., Caballero, C. L., Hayley, A., & Walker, A. (2024). The success elements of humor in workplace leadership: A proposed framework with cognitive and emotional competencies. *PLOS One*, 19(5), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0304650>
- Rosenthal, F. (1956). *Humour in early Islam*. Brill.
- Rusi, E., Spaho, J., & Shyta, I. (2025). The fall of the masks: Virtues and vices in Albanian comedy in the early 20th century. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(2), 314-325. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i2.8068>
- Sarmi, N. N., Pasopati, R. U., Ratna Jelita, D. A., Handika Putra Siadari, Y. V., Putri Agil, A., & Daffa Firzatullah, M. (2025). The subtextual significances of pragmatic equivalence in translating humor. *Mutiara Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin Indonesia*, 3(3), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.61404/mutiara.v3i3.390>
- Vandaele, J. (2010). Humor in translation. In Y. Gambier, & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 147-152). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.1.hum1>
- Wang, Y., & Zhan, D. (2024). Study on translation of verbal humor in Bridget Jones' Diary from the perspective of relevance theory. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 14(1), 113-119. <https://doi.org/10.54097/vmee6j86>
- Xia, C., Amini, M., & Lee, K. F. (2003). Humor translation: A case study on the loss of humorous loads in SpongeBob SquarePants. *Edição Regular (Fluxo Contínuo)*, 43, 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2023.e89705>
- Zaki, M. Z., & Dole, S. M. (2024). Multimodal and multimedia: An evaluation of revoicing in Agent Raghav TV Series of Hausa in Arewa24. *Journal of Translation and Language Studies*, 5(1), 23-31. <https://doi.org/10.48185/jtls.v5i1.894>
- Zhou, T., & Chen, S. (2013). Rhetorical strategies in Chinese and English talk show humor: A comparative analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1380702>