

## Translation of Humorous Literature: A Hyper-blend of Mental Spaces

**Galia Hirsch**

*Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies, Bar Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel*

**Abstract.** This contribution is an attempt to integrate the notion of conceptual blending (Fauconnier & Turner, 1998, 2002, 2003) as applied to Translation Studies (Boase-Beier, 2011) with its implementation in the framework of Humor Research (Jabłońska-Hood, 2015), in order to better explain the nature of a translated humorous text. The study is thus based on three conceptual paradigms: Blending Theory, Pragmatic Studies of Humor and Translation Studies. The textual analysis includes examples extracted from a contemporary novel, *Wake up, Sir!* (Ames, 2004).

**Keywords:** Blending theory; Mental spaces; Humor; Incongruity; Translation

1. Introduction
  2. Conceptual Blending
  3. Translation as a Conceptual Blend
  4. Humor and Blending
  5. Pragmatic Studies of Humor
  6. Analysis of a Translated Humorous Text
    - 6.1. An Example from *Wake up, Sir!* by Jonathan Ames and Assaf Gavron's Hebrew Translation, *Hit'orer, adoni!*
    - 6.2. Macro Blends
    - 6.3. Blends at the Sentence Level
    - 6.4. Blends at the Word Level
    - 6.5. Phonological Mimes
  7. Summarizing the Complex Blends Analyzed in This Study, and Comparing Their Features
  8. Concluding Remarks
- References

### 1. Introduction

Reading a translated literary text poses a greater challenge compared to the interpretation of an untranslated one (Boase-Beier 2011, p. 74); one way to explain this difference is to regard the translated text as a conceptual blend: two or more mental spaces combined in a creative mental process (Fauconnier 1994).

The literary text translated to the target language is considered a conceptual blend, because, in the mind of both the translator and the readers it is represented as a source book (Boase-Beier 2011). The fact that a translation is a blend has many consequences, such as clashes at some levels, its multicultural background and hybrid linguistics. Blending also explains the existence of "false friends" (Boase-Beier 2011, pp. 74-80).

Blending Theory can also be used as a framework which offers a linguistic explanation for the origins of a humorous occurrence, provided that the incongruous elements responsible for the humorous effect are regarded as what forms the emergent structure which is the blend (Jabłońska-Hood 2015).

This contribution is an attempt to integrate the notion of blending as applied to Translation Studies (Boase-Beier 2011) with its implementation in the framework of Humor Research (Jabłońska-Hood 2015; Dżereń-Głowacka 2012; Coulson 2005), as means to better explain the nature of a translated humorous text.

In order to address these issues a humorous novel, *Wake up, Sir!* (Ames 2004), was analyzed (Section 6), according to the theoretical frameworks described in Sections 2

(Conceptual Blending), 3 (Translation as a Conceptual Blend), 4 (Humor and Blending) and 5 (Pragmatic Studies of Humor). It is by no means an exhaustive review of the vast body of research conducted in humor studies or under the umbrella of Blending Theory, but rather an innovative attempt to combine different schools of thought, so as to explicate the unique nature of the translated humorous text.

## 2. Conceptual Blending

Conceptual Blending, also called Blending Theory (BT) or Conceptual Integration Theory (CIT), is a theory within Cognitive Semantics, developed by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner (1998, 2002, 2003). "Conceptual blending is described and studied scientifically in terms of integration networks. In its most basic form, a conceptual integration network consists of four connected mental spaces: two partially matched input spaces, a generic space constituted by structure common to the inputs, and the blended space. The blended space is constructed through selective projection from the inputs, pattern completion, and dynamic elaboration" (Fauconnier 2000, p. 4).

Blending Theory was founded upon Mental Space Theory (Fauconnier 1994, 1997), according to which, the mind creates multiple cognitive "spaces" in order to mediate its understanding of relations and activities in the world, and to engage in creative thought. Mental spaces are fields of association constructed in our minds during information processing, for purposes of thought, discourse and action. They are counterparts of a possible worlds, cognitive referential structures, from possibly many conceptual domains, that allow us to think about events or states. They are inter-connected, can be modified and are used cognitively in flexible ways (Fauconnier and Turner 1998). Mental spaces do not necessarily contain a faithful representation of reality, but an idealized cognitive model.

In blending, at least two input mental spaces that have something in common are combined in a creative mental process and selectively projected to a third space, which is the blend. The new mental space contains these elements but also new elements that are not copied from the inputs — the emergent structure (Fauconnier and Turner 2002). At any moment in the construction, the generic space — whatever structure is recognized in the conceptual work as belonging to both of the input spaces — maps onto each of the inputs (Fauconnier and Turner 1998).

In many examples the inputs constitute: the base space, also known as reality space, and the conditional space, which allows us to consider a possibility other than reality and creates the blend. Expressions like prepositional phrases, adverbs, connectives, and more can act as space builders, which set up a mental space in the mind of the reader that is different from the mental space of the real world, yet related to the base space constructed.

Generic spaces and blended spaces are related, but blends can also contain structures that are impossible for the inputs. There is a common structure for all blends, but not all of them are as successful as others. Therefore, there are optimality principles that a blend can meet (although they may compete), some of which are: "Integration – the blend must constitute a tightly integrated scene that can be manipulated as a unit; Topology – for any input spaces and any element in that space projected into the blend, it is optimal for the relations of the element in the blend to match the relations of its counterpart; Web – manipulating the blend as a unit must maintain the web of appropriate connections to the input spaces easily and without additional surveillance or computation; and Unpacking – the blend alone must enable the understander to unpack the blend to reconstruct the inputs, the cross-space mapping, the generic space, and the network of connections between all these spaces" (Fauconnier 1998, pp. 162–163).

For the same reason, there are also some constraints: Metonymy Projection: "when an element is projected from an input to the blend and a second element from that input is projected because of its metonymic link to the first, shorten the metonymic distance to them in the blend" (Fauconnier 1998, p. 170); and "Backward Projection: as the blend is run and develops emergent structure, avoid backward projection to an input that will disrupt the integration of the input itself" (Fauconnier 1998, p. 178).

In special cases blending is easier to detect, but it is usually an everyday process that goes unnoticed except on technical analysis (Fauconnier and Turner 1998). Processes of representational contracting and stretching are referred to by Fauconnier and Turner (2002) as compression and decompression of blending (Coulson and Oakley 2000, p. 187), which are what makes our way of thinking efficient and creative (Fauconnier and Turner 2003).

At the same time, a blend is less and more than the sum of its inputs: less because it incorporates only the aspects of the input spaces that form the generic space; and more because its integrated structure is not available in any of the inputs (Dzereń-Głowacka 2012, p. 195). It is therefore usually not a possible world, but an impossible one, with some fantastic aspects (Boase-Beier 2011, p. 67). The following section will illustrate how this works in the case of translation.

### 3. Translation as a Conceptual Blend

When applying Blending Theory to Translation Studies, Boase-Beier (2011) claims that reading a translated text poses a greater challenge compared to the interpretation of an untranslated one, because it represents more than the world of the text and the cognitive state embodied in it (Boase-Beier 2011, p. 74). One way to explain this difference is to see a translated text as a conceptual blend.

The target text is considered a conceptual blend, because, in both the translator's and the reader's minds, it is represented as the source book itself: an imagined book which is one of the mental spaces forming the blend. The source text in the mind of reader and translator does have a counterpart in the real world, and the blend of an original and an imagined book also has a counterpart in the book translated. However, the imagined book itself which is one of the inputs to the blend does not exist in reality (Boase-Beier 2011).

In a similar manner, Gouanvic (2005) refers to the illusion of a source text, achieved by the fictional discourse developed within it. He claims that if a literary source text readership adheres to the *illusio* of it, the target text is likely to find a correspondent readership through the agency of a translation. Nevertheless, the source text is neither exactly the same nor entirely different from the translation, and precisely there is where the difficulty of a translation resides (*ibid.*, p. 147).

The blended nature of the translation explains why readers are unsure of how to refer to its author, unless they simply see the translation as the work of the original writer. Unfortunately, the non-existent non-blended book is more strongly represented in the minds of some readers, and especially of critics and publishers, than the blend itself (Boase-Beier 2011). On the other hand, readers are also aware that they have read a translation, even if they do not know the name of the translator; and the cognitive spaces can vary in strength, according to what is known about the authors and the translators (Boase-Beier 2011).

Just as a blend has elements that were not present in each of the inputs, a translation presents new elements that do not exist in the source book. Hence, the fact that a translation is a blend has many consequences. First of all, borrowing a term originally coined in postcolonial studies (Bhabha 1994, p. 224), the translation is a "hybrid", a fact which is reflected in its multicultural background and blended linguistics. That is to say, readers of the translation get a sense of a language not quite their own, because the original language

influences the translation (Boase-Beier 2011). In my opinion, this phenomenon might be referred to as interference: instances of deviation from the norms of a language in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with another language (Weinreich 1953). This hybridity is also due to the fact that readers conceive of the translated book as a blend and are open to nuances of the other language (Boase-Beier 2011).

The conceptual blend of the translation causes clashes at some levels, such as different times, situations, or and languages. Much like Fauconnier and Turner's (2002, p. 125) example of a contemporary philosopher arguing with Kant, in spite of the language, time and space that set them apart; translations also present characters speaking one language but suddenly referring to aspects of another. However, the clashes blends involve are generally managed effortlessly unless the reader suddenly becomes aware that the book is a translation, when studying or reviewing it (Boase-Beier 2011).

Blending also explains the existence of "false friends", where the translator erroneously maps their mental representation of a word in one language onto that of a phonologically similar word in the other language, even though the meaning of the words is not the same (Boase-Beier 2011).

According to Boase-Beier (2011), a more complex conceptual blend is typical of the translation of literary works, because not only the world it describes, but also each individual expression in is a form of conceptual blend. Literary texts add more input spaces into the blend: both the world of the text and the cognitive state embodied in its style, and another input space: the translator's world. Therefore, both the translator and the reader of a translation are living in a fiction, which is first and foremost that the original author wrote the translation.

#### **4. Humor and Blending**

Conceptual Blending Theory can also function as a study of humor (Jabłońska-Hood 2015). In fact, "frame blends were first noticed in the context of humorous examples" (Coulson 2005, p. 110); since "Incongruity makes blends more visible" (Fauconnier and Turner 1998, p. 141). However, "blends need not be incongruous – incongruity is not one of their defining characteristics" (Fauconnier and Turner 1998, p. 141).

According to Jabłońska-Hood (2015), blending is the process that incorporates the cultural, background and alternative knowledge, of a humor conceptualizer, along with their experience and feelings. Coulson (2003) also claims that not all blends are humorous, but blending is an inherent feature of humor, because humor often involves the unlikely combination of related structures.

In blending, two different mental spaces are brought together on the basis of some similarity, juxtaposition, etc. to form the conceptual blend. Nonetheless, however superimposed they seem at first, due to the original correspondences perceived, the two input spaces are never fully compatible, and that is what forms the incongruity within the blend which is responsible for the humor in many cases.

Unpacking the blend and structuring the input spaces allow the conceptualizer to interpret the humor, which necessarily depend on their having relevant knowledge and shared understandings about these domains. They do so by recruiting blending processes known as completion and elaboration: completion occurs when activating relevant bits of world knowledge given sparse clues, and elaboration is the animation of eclectic models built with pieces from disparate domains (Coulson 2003). Composition has to do with the making of the blend, and it involves, for example, the juxtaposition of information in different spaces (Coulson 2005).

The emergent structure of the blend allows for other ridiculous associations and connotations which do not stem from the original mental spaces and can add more and more to the comical effects (Jabłońska-Hood 2015). Or in Coulson's (2003) words, the humorous effect of a blend goes beyond its formal properties.

As Fauconnier and Turner explain (1998, p. 156), input spaces themselves are often elaborate blends with conceptual history. Coulson denominates blends which are formed on the basis of another blend, "a hyper-blend" (Coulson 2003), a concept that will form part of my categorization, as will be subsequently shown.

Dzereń-Głowacka (2012) also finds conceptual blends in humorous texts at various levels: Macro Blends occur at the story level, where juxtaposition of elements from different worlds and registers evokes the integration of various mental spaces. Structural Blends occur at the phrase level – examples contain a fixed phrase evoking a certain frame, which becomes one of the inputs, the other one being the specific situation or a contrasting aspect of it. Other examples are found at the word level — neologisms, which are characteristic for science-fiction and fantasy texts, and neosemes — which are particularly noticeable in science-fiction and fantasy literature, where new worlds are created. The lowest level is found at phonological mimes, which are examples that exploit the phonological characteristics of language. This categorization will be a useful tool in my study of humorous texts.

This may seem a too encompassing theoretical approach, but, as Jabłońska-Hood (2015) explains, not any haphazard two entities can be easily blended, since the process is safeguarded by the optimality principles, which serve as potential constraints on humor. "Integration and Topology principles are responsible for perceiving the blended relations as a compact unit, while the Web and Unpacking principles ensure that all the mappings function as a network which can be unpacked from the blend via the inputs and back to the generic space easily" (Jabłońska-Hood 2015, p. 8). Nonetheless, in accordance with Backward Projection, the blended relations can be easily deconstructed back to their original mental spaces, only before the emergent structure is established, otherwise there would be chaos (Jabłońska-Hood 2015).

In the study of humor, Blending Theory serves as a higher order theory: it creates a legitimate place for add-ons in humor, and space for the humor respondent, allowing also for multidimensional humor to be investigated (Jabłońska-Hood 2010).

## 5. Pragmatic Studies of Humor

Blending theory in Jabłońska-Hood's view (2010) is a cognitive toolkit which provides apparatus for examination, and common ground for many other theories of humor (incongruity and its resolution, relevance, pragmatic theories, Semantic Script Theory of Humor as well as the General Theory of Verbal Humor, one-stage or two-stage theories, to mention just a few), but the analysis must still be conducted by the user of the theory in question. Following her, I incorporate blending analysis with leading pragmatic studies on verbal humor, some of which will be briefly outlined as following.

Incongruity corresponds, according to Attardo (1997), to the "script opposition", a concept presented by Raskin (1985) in his famous Semantic Script Theory of Humor (SSTH); even though SSTH "was originally declared not to be an incongruity-based theory" (Ritchie 2009, p. 12). The script is the semantic information surrounding the words in the utterance or evoked by them, and it represents the native speaker's knowledge of the world (Raskin 1985, p. 81).

According to the SSTH, the first necessary condition for humor is a full or partial overlap of the scripts (Raskin 1985, p. 100), the two scripts must also oppose (Raskin 1985). Attardo (1997) suggests that after the first "setup" stage of building expectations or script overlap, an

interpretation of humor involves two phases: the discovery of the incongruity or the script opposition, and its resolution.

Another important quality of humor is what Jeffers (1995) denominates "non-sense", which is not a lack of sense but rather a different sense that is characteristic of the humoristic text. This sense differs from "what the order of representation recognizes as sense or "good sense" (p. 55). Ziv (1984, pp. 79-90) also attributes a special logic to humor, which combines realistic and non-realistic features, and is appropriate in a certain way, since it provides some form of explanation of the incongruity.

While Blending Theory is an all-encompassing theory, its connection with SSTH will be detailed in the analysis of the examples in the following section. In general terms, the generic space, which is constituted by structure common to the input spaces, corresponds mainly to the stage of script overlap; the relationship between these inputs is defined by some sort of an opposition. In the following section some of these notions, as well as the concept of "hyper-blend" (Coulson 2003) and Dżereń-Głowacka's categorization (2012) will be incorporated with the frameworks provided by Jabłońska-Hood (2010) and Boase-Beier (2011) to the analysis of a translated humorous text.

## 6. Analysis of a Translated Humorous Text

### 6.1. An Example from *Wake up, Sir!* by Jonathan Ames and Assaf Gavron's Hebrew Translation, *Hit'orer, adoni!*

The translated literary text which will be analyzed in the present section is *Wake up, Sir!* (2004), a novel by Jonathan Ames, an American author who has written a number of novels and comic memoirs. It tells the story of Alan Blair, a young alcoholic writer and his personal valet, an homage to the Bertie and Jeeves novels of P.G. Wodehouse. Alan and Jeeves live in the former's uncle's house and then leave it to embark on a bizarre road journey to an artists' colony in Saratoga Springs, where multiple troubles and adventures await them. It was translated by Assaf Gavron, an Israeli writer, novelist, translator and musician and was titled *Hit'orer, adoni!* (Wake-up, Mister!). The analysis will focus on examples extracted from the first chapter of the novel.

Following Boase-Beier's framework (2011), the translated Hebrew novel is regarded here as a conceptual blend, into which two inputs map: the first one is the source text in English and the second one an imagined text, which only exists in the minds of the readers and maybe the translator, involving the pretense that this is how the author would have written the text had he spoken Hebrew.

Nevertheless, there are instances where the translated text shatters the illusion of being an original, causing clashes at some levels, such is the case in the following example describing the narrator's residence at the beginning of the story:

1. My uncle's house was nestled quite nicely in a bit of secluded woods— very beautiful New Jersey, I've always said, a most unfair reputation. Of course, I'm biased, having grown up in the Garden (*Wake up, Sir!* pp. 9-10).
2. Beito shel dodi kinen benohiut betoh pisa shel ya'ar mevodad –New Jersey  
*Gloss: the house of my uncle nested comfortably inside a piece of wood secluded – New Jersey*  
 hayefefia, tamid amarti: ba'alat hamonitin habilti hognim. Ani  
*the beautiful, always I said: owner of the reputation unfair. I am,*  
 meshuhad, kamuvan, heyot shegadalti bemedinat haganim.\*  
 biased, of course, since I grew up in the state of gardens. \*

\*Kinuya shel medinat New Jersey (*Hitorer, adoni!* p. 25)

\*the nickname of the state of New Jersey

In this occurrence, the footnote explaining the name "the Garden" reminds the reader of the presence of the translator and the fact that he is inside a world not quite his own, in New Jersey. This is in fact, an explicitation, a concept first introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), which refers to the process of making what is implicit in the original explicit in the translation (Klaudy 2003). The present explicitation is an attempt to compensate for the Israeli readership lack of contextual knowledge regarding nicknames attributed to states in the United States of America.

The style embedded in the text, which forms one of the inputs to the blend, is depicted in the author's choice to use the name "the Garden" instead of repeating the formal name of the state. This variation results in both avoiding repetition as a poetic artifact, and also in signaling that the information is meant for the insiders who know it is another name for the state. The fact that the translation is a blend can also be noticed by its blended linguistics with the use of the somewhat unnatural expression: "ba'alat hamonitin habilti hognim" (owner of the unfair reputation).

As much as the former example constitutes a complex blend, it does not involve any humor, which can be regarded as a different conceptual blend in itself. The following instances will present what could be described as a hyper-blend (Coulson 2003) – at least two conceptual blends: that of the translation and of the humor used in the original.

## 6.2. Macro Blends

In the following two examples of the source text, the narrator uses a peculiar expression to describe the uncle in whose house he resides. According to Dżereń-Głowacka's categorization (2012), they represent what she denominates a macro blend at the story level, where the juxtaposition of elements from different worlds evokes the integration of various mental spaces:

3. He was a short, round man with a coal black mustache and a very white beard, and this unusual bifurcated arrangement of his facial hair gave him an uncanny resemblance, despite his Jewish origins, to a Catholic saint-in-waiting— a certain Padre Pio. (*Wake up, Sir!* p. 5)
4. You idiot!" my uncle aspirated out of his Padre Pio beard. "You klutz!" (*Wake up, Sir!* p. 11).

The incongruity within the blend, which is responsible for the humor, originates from putting together two contradictory elements: a Catholic saint and a Jewish man, these are the two inputs that form the blend. They do have some qualities in common, on the basis of which they are brought together, and these form the generic space: they are both human and in possession of an unusual combination of facial hair. In terms of the SSTH, the two inputs to the blend can be viewed as two opposing scripts – one Catholic, one Jewish – which overlap in regard to their facial hair. Notice that the emergent structure of the blend adds elements that did not appear in the original inputs, such as the use of the name Padre Pio as an adjective to describe a beard in example four. This is part of the cognitive state of the author embedded in the style, which forms one of the inputs to the translation blend. The examples were translated as following:

5. Hu haya geveer namuh ve'agol ba'al safam shahor kepeham vezakan lavan meod,  
*Gloss: he was a man short and round owner of a mustache black as coal and a beard white very,*  
 haluka bilti shigratit shel se'ar panim asher shivta lo beofen bilti tivi vebenigud  
*a division not usual of hair of face that gave him in a manner not natural and as opposed*  
 leshorashav hayehudiim mare shel kadosh katoli behithavut — me'ein Padre Pio. \*\*  
*to his roots Jewish a look of a saint Catholic in the making — sort of a Padre Pio. \*\**

\*\*Nazir Italki hanehshav kadosh (*Hitorer, adoni!* p. 20)

\*\*A monk Italian considered a saint

6. "Idiot!" nashaf dodu metoh zakan haPadre Pio shelo.

*Gloss: "Idiot!" aspired my uncle out of his Padre Pio beard.*

"Klutz! Shekmotha!" (*Hitorer, adoni!* p. 27)

*"Klutz! As you are!"*

In the translation, the world of the text, that is the emergent structure of the humor in the source text, which is in fact a blend of its own, is one of the inputs to the hyper-blend. The second input is the use of the name Padre Pio as an adjective, as described before, which is part of the cognitive state of the author embedded in the style. The third input would be the translator's presence, which, as in example number two, is embodied in the footnote used again to compensate on the lack of shared contextual knowledge of the Hebrew readers. As a result, the translation is a blend of a blend, perhaps this also explains the fact that the humor in the original is somewhat diluted.

The following description of the narrator's uncle is another example of a macro blend at the story level, presenting a clash between register and context which evoke various mental spaces:

7. And though he wasn't an Orthodox Jew, he wore official davening gear: about his shoulders was his silky, white tallith with its blue stripes and fringes, and on his left arm and on his forehead were his tefillin — the leather boxes and straps avored by Jews for their morning prayers. The boxes, like a mezuzah, contain the Shema, God's directions to Moses, found in Deuteronomy. One of the lost directions, according to Jewish lore, is "Don't go out with a wet head!" Luckily, this important health command has been orally maintained for thousands of years (*Wake up, Sir!* p. 8).

The source text presents a first incongruity between the register utilized to describe Jewish customs, specifically the verb "avored", which semantically implies choice, and the actual obligation observed by male orthodox Jews to pray with tefillin. In terms of the SSTH, the register is one of the scripts, and the customs the other. Each of these elements constitutes another mental space, and both inputs map into the blend in which obligations and preferences are combined. In the emergent structure of the blend, the act of putting on tefillin is presented as a hobby, a pass time enjoyed by the Jews.

Another incongruous blend can be found as a result of the opposing scripts (Raskin 1985): actual commandments and comments typical of Jewish families. The two indeed share some qualities which are part of the generic space, such as directions, and wisdom passed on from generation to generation. This is also where the two scripts overlap. Nonetheless, the comparison between the commandments, which are believed to God's words, and an unfounded health suggestion attributed to *Yiddishe Mames* boards on absurdity or a different kind of logic – local logic (Ziv 1984). The incongruity also brings into mind Bergson's claim (1911) that humor is a result of "Any incident is comic that calls our attention to the physical in a person, when it is the moral side that is concerned" (Bergson 1911, p. 51). The physical



aspect of a wet hair and its implications are mentioned in similarity to the high and moral biblical Ten Commandments. The resulting conceptual blend is projected backwards towards the Ten Commandments, presenting them as detached from reality and bearing dubious implications. Since the translation in itself is a conceptual blend, its case brings about additional complications:

8. Ve af al pi shelo haya yehudi dati ata al atsmo et hatsiyud harishmi: tallit meshi  
*Gloss: and even though he was not Jewish religious he put on himself the gear official: tallith of silk*  
 Levana im pasei tkhelet vetsitsiyot al ktefav, veal mitsho vezro' o hasmalit tfillin –  
*white with stripes light blue and tsitsiyot on his shoulders, and on his forehead and arm left tefillin*  
 kufsaot vertsu'ot ha'or hahvivot al hayehudim betfilot haboker shelahem.  
*boxes and straps of leather favored by the Jewish in prayers of morning of theirs.*  
 Hakufsaot, kmo hamezuza, mehilot et kriat shma, hahoraot shenatan Elohim  
*The boxes, like the mezuzah, contain the Shema, the directions that gave God*  
 leMoshe veshenimtsaot besefer Dvarim. Ahat hahoraot haavudot, lefi  
*to Moshe and that are found in the book of Deuteronomy. One of the directions lost, according to*  
hamasoret hayehudit, hi "lo tetse mehabait berosh ratuv!" Lemarbe hamazal, diber  
*the tradition Jewish, is "Do not leave the house with a head wet!" Luckily, commandment*  
habriut hehashuv haze hu'avar midor ledor be-al pe bemesheh alfei shanim.  
*of health important this was passed on from generation to generation orally for thousands of years*  
 (*Hitorer, adoni!* p. 23)

Even though the translation adds another input space to the blends, as shown in the following two diagrams, it seems that in this case the pragmatic function of humor was retained. It might be even more salient to a Hebrew speaking audience familiar with the mitzvah of the tefillin and the popular saying. The additional input space of the translator's contribution maintains both incongruities existing in the initial blends: the clash between register and context with the use of *havitot* (favored) and the comparison between the Ten Commandments and grandma wisdom.

### 6.3. Blends at the Sentence Level

In the next occurrence, the humorous blend in the motto of the novel is at the sentence level, altering a fixed phrase.

9. "Live and don't learn— that's my motto." —ALAN BLAIR (*Wake up, Sir!* p. 1)

The fixed phrase evoking a certain frame is "Live and learn" – which is a common cliché in the English language, used to describe how people learn from their mistakes. The phrase becomes one of the inputs to the blend or one of the scripts, while the other is the opposite script, the contrasting aspect of it – "don't learn" – formed here with an explicit negation of the expected second part of the sentence. Thus; the blend "live and don't learn" frustrates our expectations and causes humor at the expense of the protagonist, who, as will turn out, indeed refuses to learn from his mistakes and constantly gets into trouble.

10. "Haye ve'al tilmad — ze hamoto sheli." —Alan Blair. (*Hitorer, adoni!* p. 13)  
*Gloss: live and don't learn — that's my motto.*

The translation is again a blend of a blend, or a hyper-blend, because the original incongruous blend represents the world of the text and one input. The second input is the cognitive state of the author embedded in his stylistic choice to introduce novel elements to a fixed phrase. The

third input is represented by the translator's direct translation into Hebrew – "Haye veal tilmad". While the sentence describes the character's reluctance to learn from his mistake, it does not evoke a certain frame, like its English counterpart does, because "haye vetilmad", although perfectly understandable, is not a common proverb in Hebrew. The result is a less salient incongruity; or in other words, less expectations built upon the beginning of the phrase, which in its turn induces less frustration. Thus, like the former example, the hyper-blend here is less humorous than the original.

#### 6.4. Blends at the Word Level

The following examples are blends at the word level, namely neologisms and neosemes (Dzereń-Głowacka 2012). Here is an example of a description of the uncle's situation with a neologism widely used by Ashkenazic Orthodox Jews in America: to daven in its Anglicized gerund inflection — davening.

11. "He's on his stationary bicycle and he's davening, sir." Jeeves had picked up the Anglicization of the Yiddish from me, adding the *ing* to *daven* (to pray) as I did. (*Wake up, Sir!* p. 4).

The neologism, davening, which is the first blend, is formed by the input of the English inflection with the input of the Yiddish word to *daven* (to pray). This is in itself a conceptual blend, albeit not necessarily humorous.

However, in the situation described, the use of "davening" (the first input) is indeed incongruous and thus humorous, because it is pronounced by a clear non-member of the community evoked (the second input). The two inputs to the blend can also be regarded as two opposing scripts: one – the very Jewish linguistic choice and the second – the person uttering it. In other words, "davening" is funny when announced by the personal butler Jeeves, to the point that the protagonist explains how he has come to learn that verb. As the first mental space to form one of the inputs is already a blend in itself, this is a case of a hyper-blend, even before reaching the part of the translation.

12. Hu al haofanaim hanayahim shelo, mitpalel shaharit, adoni." Jeeves lamad  
Gloss: *he on the bicycle stationary of his, praying Shaharit, sir.* "Jeeves learned  
mimenei kama musagim beyahadut. (*Hitorer, adoni!* p. 18)  
*from me a few concepts in Judaism.*

In the translation, the hyper-blend is one of the inputs, the second one being the particular style of the author evoking the Jewish American community. In this case, the translator's style and beliefs are represented by the choice to simply state the name of the prayer in Hebrew and to add "Jeeves learned from me a few concepts in Judaism". This shift indeed sounds natural in Hebrew, but it cancels the original blend of "davening", leaving only the incongruity of a gentile so familiar with Jewish concepts. Hence, the effect of the translation, a blend to a third degree, is less humorous than the original.

The next humorous occurrence is a neoseme: introducing a new sense to a specific word.

13. "I'm sorry I'm such an idiot," I whispered, and then I oozed down the hall to hide in my room. (*Wake up, Sir!* p. 12).

The definition of the entry, ooze, in the Oxford dictionary reads: (of a fluid) slowly trickle or seep out of something. The evoking of a cognitive frame of liquids, thus, forms the first

mental space which is one of the inputs to the blend; or one of the scripts. The second input — or opposite script — is the situation actually described, which is a person stealthily moving; the common ground, or the generic space, being the act of movement — which is also where the scripts overlap. The objectification of the person in the blend is what causes the incongruous humor.

14. "Ani mitsta'er sheani kaze idiot," lahashti, veaz hehlakti bemorad hamisdaron  
*Gloss: "I am sorry that I am such an idiot," I whispered, and then I slipped down the hall*  
 kedei lehithabe behadri. (*Hitorer, adoni!* p. 29)  
*in order to hide in my room*

In the translation, the humorous blend in the source text is one of the inputs to the blend. The second one is the metaphoric use which objectifies the person and forms the specific stylistic choice made by the author. The third input, the one of the translator, is his use of a verb which is not restricted to materials: *helahkti* (I slipped). The choice to normalize the text, which is not rare in translations, was referred by Toury (1995), in his law of growing standardization, as the tendency of the source text textemes to be converted into target language reportemes (*ibid.*, pp. 267–268). Be that as it may, the result here is indeed a blend, but it is no longer a humorous one.

## 6.5. Phonological Mimes

The last category which Džereń-Głowacka (2012) suggests is phonological mimes. Such is the next example, which refers to a collision between two human beings, the narrator and his uncle, in terms of a plane crash:

15. The physics was this: my head, in the lead of my body, was rising up the stairs, breaking the plane of the landing, just as my uncle was hanging a hard and hurried left down the stairs, with his belly, in the lead of his body, breaking the same plane. Two broken planes. A midair collision. The nose of my plane went into his fuselage with not a little force. (*Wake up, Sir!* p. 11).

The source text presents a humorous pun, based on two different senses of the word plane, which are the two opposing scripts. One sense and the first input to the blend is a geometrical surface used to depict the movement. The second input and sense is "airplane". The generic space — where the scripts overlap — is the phonological resemblance, since the relationship between the two words is based on homonymy. The two input spaces map into a conceptual blend which allows us to discuss the encounter between two people as if it were an aircraft collision.

16. Mebhina fizikalit ze hitrahesh kakh: roshi, veaharav kol gufi, hitromemu  
*Gloss: from an aspect physical it happened like that: my head, and after it all my body, rose*  
 bema'ale hamadregot vehadru el mishor harahava sheme'al hamadregot, bidyuk  
 up the stairs and penetrated the plain of the square above the stairs, just as  
 bizman shedodi bits'a pniya hada umehira smola lekivun morad hamdregot, veaz  
 at the same time my uncle made a turn sharp and fast left in direction of down the stairs, and then  
 habeten shelo, veaharea kol gufo, hadru leoto mishor. Shnei mishorim nehdarim.  
 the stomach of his, and after it all his body, penetrated to the same plain. Two plains penetrated.  
 Hitnagshut hazitit baavir. Hartom metosi nikhnas beguf metoso be'otsma lo ktana.  
 Collision frontal in the air. The nose of my plane entered the body of his plane with force not small.  
 (*Hitorer, adoni!* p. 27)

The translation is a hyper-blend, since the initial humorous blend of the source representing the world of the text involves two more input spaces. The first one is the cognitive state embodied in the author's use of this complex figurative language; and the second one being the translator's beliefs, which are here reflected by the choice to ignore the pun and compare the collision to two airplanes without any context. This shift, which is obligatory because it is provoked by linguistic differences (Toury 1995), has also a negative effect on the humorous pragmatic function.

### 7. Summarizing the Complex Blends Analyzed in This Study, and Comparing Their Features

The following table summarizes all the complex blends analyzed in this paper, comparing their different features.

<b>Example</b>	<b>Input 1</b>	<b>Input 2</b>	<b>Input 3</b>	<b>Blend</b>
<b>2</b>	<u><b>The world of the text</b></u> New Jersey	<u><b>The cognitive state embodied in the style</b></u> The garden	<u><b>The translator's world</b></u> <b>Clashes at some levels – explicitation:</b> The state of gardens* *the nickname of the state of New Jersey	<u><b>The translation</b></u> <b>Blended linguistics:</b> Owner of a reputation unfair
<b>3 + 4</b>	Catholic saint	Jewish man	X	A Padre Pio beard
<b>5 + 6</b>	<u><b>The world of the text</b></u> A blend: a beard of a Catholic saint on a Jewish man	<u><b>The cognitive state embodied in the style</b></u> His Padre Pio beard "Padre Pio" an adjective	<u><b>The translator's world</b></u> <b>Clashes at some levels – explicitation:</b> The state of gardens* *A monk Italian considered a saint	<u><b>The translation</b></u> A blend of a blend → humor?
<b>7</b>	Favored	Tefillin	X	Incongruity: Tefillin a hobby

8	<b><u>The world of the text</u></b> A blend: Tefillin a hobby	<b><u>The cognitive state embodied in the style</u></b> Use of an inadequate verb	<b><u>The translator's world</u></b> havivot: same incongruity	<b><u>The translation</u></b> A blend of a blend → humor!
9	Live and learn	don't learn	X	Incongruity: Live and don't learn
10	<b><u>The world of the text</u></b> A blend: Live and don't learn	<b><u>The cognitive state embodied in the style</u></b> Novel element in a fixed phrase	<b><u>The translator's world</u></b> Haye ve'al tilmad Not a common cliché	<b><u>The translation</u></b> A blend of a blend → humor?
11	A blend: davening	Non-member of the community	X	Incongruity
12	<b><u>The world of the text</u></b> A blend of a blend: humor	<b><u>The cognitive state embodied in the style</u></b> Anglicization of the Yiddish	<b><u>The translator's world</u></b> Shift: Jeeves learned from me a few concepts in Judaism	<b><u>The translation</u></b> A blend of a blend → humor? Less incongruity
13	ooze	Situation: a person moving	X	Incongruity: objectification of the person
14	<b><u>The world of the text</u></b> A blend: A person oozing	<b><u>The cognitive state embodied in the style</u></b> objectification	<b><u>The translator's world</u></b> Standardization, normalization	<b><u>The translation</u></b> hehlakti → no humor!
15	a geometrical surface	Airplane	X	encounter as an aircraft collision

16	<u>The world of the text</u>	<u>The cognitive state embodied in the style</u>	<u>The translator's world</u>	<u>The translation</u>
	A blend: 2 meaning of plane	Pun	shift	Hyper blend → humor?

## 7. Concluding Remarks

The analysis in this contribution focused on six hyper-blends extracted from the first chapter of a translated novel by Johanthan Ames (*Wake-up, Sir!*). Using the classification of Džereń-Głowacka (2012), they were categorized as following: two Macro Blends and eight Structural Blends: one at the sentence level, one phonological mime, and two at the word level.

The occurrences in question were regarded as blends first and foremost because they produced a humorous effect provided by incongruous elements forming an emergent structure (Jabłońska-Hood 2015). Conceptual blending occurs in these cases on another level yet, since they are part of a target translated text mentally represented as the source book itself: an imagined book which is one of the mental spaces forming the blend. (Boase-Beier 2011). Being blends which are formed on the basis of another, the instances analyzed were regarded as hyper-blends (Coulson 2003).

Analysis of these hyper-blends has revealed that with the exception of one case, there was a shift in the pragmatic function of humor. The Macro Blend which involved a clash between effective register and religious context, the use of the tefillin, transmitted to a great extent the humor present in the original blend. In the other Macro Blend, as well as in the Structural Blends at the sentence level and the neologism at the word level, it was observed that the pragmatic function of humor was somewhat diluted, rendering the translated target text less humorous than the source novel. The last two examples presented an even more extreme case, where the neoseme was flattened in the Hebrew version with the use of a more "normal" verb, and the elaborate pun of the phonological mime was reduced to a slightly obscure reference.

The humorous occurrences studied here form indeed very complex conceptual blends in translation, as they evoke certain frames which bring about the different worlds of the authors, translators and readers. It might be suggested that the additional complication of a hyper-blend does not increase the humorous effect, but can even reduce it.

## References:

- Ames, Jonathan. 2004. *Wake up, Sir!*. New York: Scribner.
- Ames, Jonathan. 2013. *Hit'orer Adoni!* (Wake up, Mister!). Translated by Assaf Gavron. Tel Aviv: Yedioth Ahronot.
- Attardo, Salvatore. 1997. "The Semantic Foundation of Cognitive Theories of Humor". *Humor*, 10, pp. 395–420.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Boase-Beier, Jean. 2011. *A Critical Introduction to Translation Studies*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Coulson, Seana. 2003. *What's so funny? Conceptual Integration in Humorous Examples*. Available at: <http://cogsci.uscd.edu/~coulson/funstuff/funny.html>

- Coulson, Seana. 2005. "Extemporaneous Blending: Conceptual Integration in Humorous Discourse from Talk Radio". *Style*, 39(2), pp. 107–122.
- Coulson, Seana and Oakley, Todd. 2000. "Blending Basics". *Cognitive Linguistics*, 11(3/4), pp. 175–196.
- Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 2005. "A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances". *The Translator* 11(2), pp. 147–166.  
DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2005.10799196
- Dzereń-Głowacka, Sylwia. 2012. "Formal and Conceptual Blending in Terry Pratchett's Discworld". *UK-CLA*, 1, pp. 193–208.
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1994. *Mental Spaces*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1997. *Mapping in Thoughts and Language*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 2000. Entry for him in *The Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Amsterdam and New York: Elsevier.
- Fauconnier, Gilles and Turner, Mark. 1998. "Conceptual Integration Networks". *Cognitive Science*, 22(2), pp. 133–187.
- Fauconnier, Gilles and Turner, Mark. 2002. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending*
- Fauconnier, Gilles and Turner, Mark. 2003. "Conceptual Blending: Form and Meaning". *Recherches en Communication*, 19, pp. 57–86.
- Jabłońska-Hood, Joanna. 2015. "Mental Spaces Beyond and Within: A Conceptual Blending Analysis of Monty Python's Humour". In: Anna Bondaruk and Anna Prażmowska (eds.), *Within Language, Beyond Theories: Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*, Vol. 1, Ch. 23. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholar Publishing, pp. 386–397.
- Jabłońska-Hood, Joanna. 2010. "Can blending function as a humour theory? Building bridges between different fields of linguistics". *4th LAFAL Symposium, Theoretical Issues in Humour: Building Bridges across Disciplines*, Łódź, Poland, 17–18 March 2016.
- Jeffers, Jennifer. 1995. "Beyond Irony: The Unnamable's Appropriation of its Critics in a Humorous Reading of the Text". *The Journal of Narrative Technique*, 25(1), pp. 47–66.
- Klaudy, Kinga. 2003. *Languages in Translation: Lectures on the Theory, Teaching and Practice of Translation*. Budapest: Scholastica.
- Raskin, Victor. 1985. *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Ritchie, Graeme. 2009. "Variants of Incongruity Resolution". *Journal of Literary Theory*, 3(2), pp. 1–20.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul and Darbelnet, Jean. 1958. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction*. Paris–Toronto–London: Didier.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Ziv, Avner. 1984. *Humor VeIshiyut* [Hebrew: *Humor and Personality*]. Tel Aviv: Papyrus.

Address correspondence to Galia Hirsch, at [galia.hirsch@biu.ac.il](mailto:galia.hirsch@biu.ac.il)