



# **8<sup>th</sup> International Summer School and Symposium on Humour and Laughter**

**“Dunărea de Jos” University of Galați**

**23-28 June, 2008**



## **Abstracts of Presentations**

**Version 2 : April 2008**

## **CONTENTS**

Dorota Brzozowska

- **Jokes about Women: Gender, Nationality and Sexuality**
- **Humour in Foreign Language Teaching. On the example of coursebooks for Polish as a foreign language**

Christie Davies

- **Political jokes and humour in Totalitarian societies**
- **How are jokes transformed when they move between countries and cultures**
- **Ethnic Jokes about sex**

Jessica Milner Davis

- **Part 1: Humour Terminology across the Disciplines**
- **Part II: Exploring Satire, a Traditional “Style of Humour”**
- **Experiencing Humour: A Conceptual Model of an Interpersonal Transaction**
- **European Farce as the Life-blood of the Theatre**

Christian Hempelmann

- **Meaning for Humor Researchers**
- **Is Incongruity that is Resolved Humor?**
- **Analyzing Texts with the General Theory of Verbal Humor: Why and How?**

Giselinde Kuipers

- **Social differences in sense of humor (and how to study them)**
- **Humor and social theory**
- **The cultural industry of humor**

Diana E. Popa

- **Translating the Language of Humour: Language vs. Culture**
- **Political Satire and Parody in a Mediated World**

Graeme Ritchie

- **An overview of humour research**
- **Computational Humour**
- **The methodology of testing humour theories**
- **The structure of puns**

Willibald Ruch

- **Smiling & Laughter: Typology, structure and dynamics**
- **Who is fearing humour and laughter: New insights into Gelotophobia**
- **Enjoyment of humour and pain tolerance**
- **Unresolved issues in terminology and classification in humour research**

Andrea Samson

- **Theory of Mind, Empathy and Humor**
- **Psychological Humor Theories**

## **Dorota Brzozowska**

### **Jokes about Women: Gender, Nationality and Sexuality**

The main thesis of the presentation is that gender and citizenship are concepts that can be observable in different kinds of texts, and among others also in jokes i.e. in the genre that is a very good example of how condensed stereotypes could be reflected in short texts. The question I am interested in is how the spheres of the public and the private are illustrated in jokes and in which way they are similar to the stereotypical roles of men and women in patriarchal societies – leaving the sphere of home to women and the outside world to men. The next thesis is that out-group and in-group jokes may differ in reflecting women's or men's positions in the world. I have taken into consideration jokes written in Polish about Russians, Germans and Jews as examples of outsiders' views and Polish jokes about Poles, German jokes about Germans and Jewish jokes about Jews as examples of insiders' views on gendered roles in the Polish, Jewish, Russian and German societies. The groups have been chosen as members of the nations that have lived in close geographical proximity and have been connected with strong historical and political bonds of many cultural influences often marked by love-hate types of relationships. Besides, the picture of a Jewish woman in jokes is interesting because it is believed that this picture is significantly different from that of women representing other cultures (Raskin 1985, Davies 2002).

### **Bibliography**

- Attardo, Salvatore. 2001. *Humorous Texts: A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Benton G., 1988, *The origins of the political joke*. In: Powell C., G. Paton, *Humor in Society: Resistance and Control*, London: 33-55.
- Davies C., 1990, *An explanation of Jewish jokes about Jewish women*, "Humor" 3-4: 363-378.
- Davies C., 2002, *The Mirth of Nations*, New Brunswick, London.
- Draitser Emil A., 1998, *Taking penguins to the movies. Ethnic humor in Russia*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Nilsen A. D., 2000, *Encyclopedia of 20<sup>th</sup> Century American Humor*, Phoenix.
- Raskin, Victor. 1985. *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*, Reidel Publishing Company.

### **Humor in Foreign Language Teaching. On the example of coursebooks for Polish as a foreign language**

The presentation presents the results of the study on books for learners of Polish as a foreign language. The aim of the analysis is to examine if humorous texts are present in coursebooks, how much humor is included in them and what type of humor is prevailing. Those questions are vital if we consider the fact that humor is a part of cultural

competence that learners should acquire altogether with the target language skills. The presentation consists of the parts dealing with several broader aspects of the examined problem. The first one covers the language policy for minor languages (on the example of teaching Polish in the country and abroad). The second one deals with humor as a factor facilitating learning seen from the point of view of methodological investigations. And the third issue under discussion is a link between humor studies and intercultural studies. The analytical part shows types of humor present in the coursebooks, the topics touched by these humorous texts, the ways of presenting and explaining culturally imprinted humorous material. Several coursebooks have been analyzed on different levels of language competence to check where humor appears the earliest and if it is developed on the higher levels of foreign language education.

## **Bibliography**

- Attardo, Salvatore, 1994: *Linguistic Theories of Humour*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carrel, Amy, 1997: *Joke Competence and Humor Competence*, "Humor. International Journal of. Humor Research", vol. 10, n. 2, pp. 173 - 185.
- Gałyga, Danuta, 2001: *Ach, ten język polski! Ćwiczenia komunikacyjne dla początkujących. Communicative Exercises for Beginners*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Grala, Maria, 1982: *Say It in Polish. An Intensive Course for Beginners*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Miodunka, Władysław T., 2001: *Cześć jak się masz? A Polish Language Textbook for Beginners*, Kraków: Universitas.

## **Christie Davies**

### **Political jokes and humour in Totalitarian societies**

Far more and better popular political jokes were generated spontaneously by ordinary people in societies such as Ceausescu's Romania than in democratic societies where politics is freely discussed and satire flourishes. What does this imply and how is it best explained? What is the relationship between oppression and joking? Do jokes flourish more when oppression increases or as a function of the breadth of the oppression such that they are vastly more common under socialist tyrannies than in less intrusive forms of autocracy? Are jokes a form of resistance or an admission that resistance is impossible? Is Bakhtin's notion of carnival applicable, relevant and useful or does it run into difficulties?

### **How are jokes transformed when they move between countries and cultures**

In the last fifty years several major joke cycles, for example ethnic jokes, jokes about blondes about lawyers and about disasters have begun in the United States and spread to other countries, where the local people both adapt the jokes and invent similar ones of

their own. Yet in the process they impress upon the jokes their own local flavour. How by comparing the American originals with the ones subsequently told elsewhere can we explain the transformations in terms of social and cultural differences between the societies concerned?

## **Ethnic Jokes about sex**

There are many studies of ethnic jokes and many of sex jokes but fewer of jokes which ascribe sexual attributes to ethnic and national groups or of jokes that treat sexual minorities as being an identity group akin to an ethnic group. It is time to explore how these kinds of jokes are best analysed and explained. Why are particular groups and societies treated as under-sexed or over-sexed? Why are such groups humorously regarded as more likely to indulge in particular forms of unusual or forbidden sexual behaviour? Can we treat jokes about gay men and lesbians in the same way as ethnic jokes, generated sometimes from within the group, sometimes imposed from the outside? What has been the role of social change in this respect?

## **Jessica Milner Davis**

### **What do we Mean by "Styles of Humour"?**

#### **Part 1: Humour Terminology across the Disciplines**

Varying concepts of "humour-styles" have emerged during academic research into humour and how people and societies use it. They range from traditional terms in literary theory, and joke-classifications to terminology now used in social psychology about how people use humour in daily life. Since later uses have evolved despite pre-existing uses in other disciplines, humour scholars are confronted by a clash of terms, just when collaboration between different disciplines studying humour is progressing. How problematic is this issue of terminology? Is there interaction between the notions of personal styles and artistic styles in humour? Do we tend to evolve fixed "humour-preferences", not only in the way we use humour interpersonally, but also in our preferred kind/s of "entertainment humour"? If so, how might we measure that kind of "humour-style", and what would we call it?

#### **Bibliography**

- Craik, Kenneth H. and Aaron P. Wise (1998) 'Humor and Personality in Everyday Life', in Willibald Ruch (ed.), *The Sense of Humor: Explorations of a Personality Characteristic*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 63-94.
- Derks, Peter, R. E. Staley and M. G. Haselton (1998) "'Sense" of Humor: Perception, Intelligence, or Expertise?' in Willibald Ruch (ed.), *The Sense of Humor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 143-158.

## 8<sup>th</sup> International Summer School and Symposium on Humour and Laughter

Martin, Rod A. (2007) *The Psychology of Humor*. Elsevier Academic Press, 1-30 ('Introduction to the Psychology of Humor') and 191-227 ('Personality Approaches to the Sense of Humor').

Ross, Alison (1998) *The Language of Humour*. Lond./New York: Routledge.

### **Suggested Additional Reading**

Dobson, Louise (2006) 'What's Your Humor Style? Are you a joker? A teaser? A clown? How you deploy your sense of humor says a lot about how you relate to others and to yourself.' *Psychology Today Magazine*, Jul/Aug 2006. Available at:

<http://www.psychologytoday.com/articles/index.php?term=20060623-000001&page=1>

Dutton, Kenneth R (2001) 'Farce/Farts: Divergent Styles of Comedy in Medieval France'. *Stylistyka* 10, 351-361.

Kalliny, Morris, Kevin W. Cruthirds and Michael S. Minor (2006) 'Differences between American, Egyptian and Lebanese Humor Styles: Implications for International Management'. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 6 (1), 121-134.

## **Part II: Exploring Satire, a Traditional "Style of Humour"**

Volumes have been written in an attempt to define satire, but so far there it has resisted capture, even though we all "know" what it is. Is it a form, style, genre, mood, or mode of discourse? In Anglo-Saxon cultures, loose usage makes satire almost synonymous with "ridicule" (i.e a "send-up", or "put-down"). What can we learn from distinguishing between lampoon, parody, irony, and satire? International copyright law now requires artists and publishers to attend to these distinctions, especially if a "satirical" video, artwork or text borrows/appropriates intellectual property (eg for the purposes of parody). Comparing a video-clip of George Bush and Condi Rice's mutual misunderstandings in the Oval Office with the savage satire of Jonathan Swift's *A Modest Proposal* and with some recent cartoons illustrates the range of satire and its relation to other humorous genres.

### **Bibliography**

Condren, Conal (2002) 'Between Social Constraint and the Public Sphere: On Misreading Early-Modern Political Satire', *Contemporary Political Theory* 1 (1), 79-101.

Orwell, George (1961) *1984: a Novel*. New York: Signet (or other good edition).

Phiddian, Robert (1996) 'Have you Eaten yet? The Reader in Swift's *A Modest Proposal*', *Studies in English Literature* 36, 603-621.

Swift, Jonathan (1729) [A Modest Proposal for preventing the children of poor people from becoming a burthen to their parents or country, and for making them beneficial to the publick.](#) Dublin: S. Harding; London: J. Roberts (or good modern edition).

### **Suggested Additional Reading**

Dane, Joseph (1980) 'Parody and Satire: A Theoretical Model', *Genre*, 13, 145-59.

Curtis, Catherine (2006) 'From Sir Thomas More to Richard Burton: the Laughing Philosopher in the Early Modern Period', in Conal Condren, Stephen Gaukroger and Ian Hunter (eds.) *The Philosopher in Early Modern Europe: The Nature of a Contested Identity*. Cambridge: University Press, 90-112.

Dentith, Simon (2000) *Parody*. London: Routledge.

Draitser, Emil A. (1994) *Techniques of Satire: The Case of Saltykov-Ščedrin*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McAusland, Sally (2007) 'Comedy Right on Target', *The Australian*, Jan. 17. (available at <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,20867,20493499-7583,00.html>)

Rose, Margaret 1993 *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-Modern*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## **Experiencing Humour: A Conceptual Model of an Interpersonal Transaction**

When humour is created, a number of variables in structure, medium and content are selected and combined. Alternatively, a combination may present itself by happenstance and be perceived as humour. There are three classical theories of what makes up humour (*le comique* in the felicitous French term), i.e. superiority; festivity and rule-breaking; and mechanical patterning. From these it is possible to evolve a schema of how 'humour potential' translates into 'humour product', intentionally or accidentally, with varying formats and modalities. The product's reception by its audience will depend on a number of personological and environmental factors, which can also be graphed to produce a chart of what might be called "the humour transaction". How useful might this conceptual approach be in humour research, or does it raise more questions than it answers?

### **Bibliography**

Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984) *Rabelais and his World*. Orig. ed. 1965. Trans. H. Iswolski, Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.

Bergson, Henri (2004) *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*. Orig. ed. 1910. Trans. C. Brereton and F. Rothwell, Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Pub. Available at: <http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/4352>

Freud, Sigmund (1993) *Wit and its Relation to the Unconscious*. Orig. ed. 1905. Trans. A. A. Brill, N.Y.: Dover.

Hobbes, Thomas (1985) *Leviathan*. Orig. ed. 1651. C. B. Macpherson, (ed.), Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 118-125. Available at: <http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/3207>

Morreall, John (1983) *Taking Laughter Seriously*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 4-37 (useful summary of humour theories).

### **Suggested Additional Reading**

Gregory Bateson, Gregory (1972) 'A Theory of Play and Fantasy' in G. Bateson, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. N.Y.: Ballentine, 177-193.

## 8<sup>th</sup> International Summer School and Symposium on Humour and Laughter

- Handelman, Don (1992) 'Passages to Play: Paradox and Process', *Play and Culture*, 5 (1), Feb. 1992, 1-19.
- Koestler, Arthur (1964) *The Act of Creation*. Lond.: Hutchinson.
- Kline, Paul (1977) 'The Psychoanalytic Theory of Humour and Laughter' in A. J. Chapman and H. C. Foot (eds.), *It's a Funny Thing, Humour*. Oxford: Pergamon, 7-12.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur (1964) *The World as Will and Idea*. Trans. R. B. Haldane and J. Kemp, Lond: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Sutton, Dana F. (1994) *The Catharsis of Comedy*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1994.

### European Farce as the Life-blood of the Theatre

Comedy has been a part of theatre since the Dionysia festivals of ancient Greece. Despite some important Graeco-Roman antecedents, farce (or low comedy) only emerged formally in early Renaissance Romance cultures (France, Spain and Italy). Name and generic characteristics have remained largely unchanged since then. Held in low critical esteem, farce is universally popular with audiences and examples range from *Mr Bean* movies to traditional Japanese theatre. It combines comic rebellion and revenge with social *Realpolitik* to create a largely visual comedy. Examples of contemporary film and stage-comedies show farce structures/techniques being appropriated for non-farce purposes, but the original genre persists. Writers Vsevolod Meyerhold and Dario Fo both saw farce as the life-giving blood of the theatre, renewing it for successive generations of actors and audiences.

### Bibliography

- Davis, J. Milner (2003) *Farce*. Rev 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Piscataway, NJ.: Transaction, 1-67 ('Introduction to Second Edition').
- Palmer, Jerry (1987) *The Logic of the Absurd on Film and Television*. London: BFI Publications, 115-140 (on John Cleese's *Fawlty Towers* etc).

### Suggested Additional Reading

- Bermel, Albert (1990) *Farce: A History from Aristophanes to Woody Allen*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press (originally *Farce: the Complete and Definitive Account of One of the World's Funniest Art Forms*, N.Y.: Simon and Schuster, 22-24, 27-32, 137-166 (on Mack Sennett), 167-204 (on silent farce), 205-223 (on 'the talkies'), and 224-235 (on animation).
- Davis, J. Milner (2001) 'Order and Disorder in Farce'. *Stylistyka* 10, 327-349.
- Jacobson, Howard (1997) *Seriously Funny: From the Ridiculous to the Sublime*. London: Viking.
- Meyerhold, Vsevolod (1959) 'Farce', trans. Ruby Cohn, *Tulane Drama Review* 4 (1), 139-149.
- Wells, Marguerite and J. Milner Davis (2006) 'Farce and Satire in *Kyōgen*', in J. Milner Davis (ed.), *Understanding Humor in Japan*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2006, 127-152.

## **Christian Hempelmann**

### **Meaning for Humor Researchers**

In many, if not most, of its manifestations humor is transmitted through language. But the most important function of language, meaning, is such a matter of course for humans that we hardly ever examine it or even able to. This leads to problems and oversights when looking at humorous material and when using language in doing research about it, e.g. building theories, terminology, questionnaires. This presentation is intended to make available the store of knowledge semantics has accumulated to humor researchers from all fields, in particular psychology and literary studies. After a brief overview of the history, theories, and methods of semantics, recent semantic work in the field of humor research is introduced, where examples will come include central terms, such as "humor" and "laughter."

### **Is Incongruity that is Resolved Humor?**

Among the major groups of approaches to humor, incongruity theories focus on the humorous text and its processing: Basically, two things in the text don't match. In contrast to superiority and release theories, they are not interested in affectual, psycho- and socio-dynamic, or other functional properties of humor, but rather the essence of the text's humorousness and, potentially, funniness. This lecture will contrast incongruity theories and other approaches, highlight the potential role of resolution, and provide an overview of the main proponents of incongruity theories.

### **Analyzing Texts with the General Theory of Verbal Humor: Why and How?**

Among the linguistic approaches to humor, the General Theory of Verbal Humor (GTVH) has achieved prominence as an encompassing and formalized approach. In the first half of this double lecture we will look at its development as a theory in Raskin (1985) and its expansion in Attardo and Raskin (1991). Adjacent approaches and notational variants will be briefly introduced. One emphasis will be on what the theory does *\*not\** attempt to be, but is usually claimed to be by uninformed critics. The emphasis of the second half will be on introducing recent approaches to further develop the theory and criticism of it, but most importantly, getting our hands dirty on some sample analyses.

## **Giselinde Kuipers**

### **Social differences in sense of humor (and how to study them)**

This lecture explores the relationship between humor and social background, and how such differences can be studied and explained using insights from social science. Humor

is clearly related to social background - it differs between social groups both within and between cultures. Relations between humor and gender have been thoroughly explored by humor scholars, other social background characteristics, such as age, class and ethnicity have gained less scholarly attention.

Drawing on my own research experience, as well as studies by other humor scholars, this presentation will look at the way humor is related to social background. In this lecture, we will ask the question how humor is related to social background (and how this may differ between countries), and how such differences can be interpreted using a social science (i.e. cultural or social) rather than psychological framework. It will also focus on the more practical questions how the relation between humor and social background can be studied.

### **Bibliography**

Kuipers, Giseline (2006) *Good Humor, Bad Taste: A Sociology of the Joke*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Martin, Rod (2007) *The Psychology of humor: An Integrative Approach*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Ruch, Willibald (1998) (ed.) *The Sense of Humor: Explorations of a Personality Characteristic*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

### **Humor and social theory**

Humor scholars generally distinguish three classical theories of humor: superiority theory, relief theory, and incongruity theory. In this presentation, I will consider the relationship between these three classical theories of humor, which are generally philosophical or psychological in focus, and sociological (and anthropological) thought about humor: can questions about humor and its social functions be subsumed under these three theories? Do these theories lead to useful research questions or hypotheses about humor? I will argue that, while the three classical theories and their modern incarnations lead to interesting research questions about humor (and laughter), they do not provide a sufficient framework for understanding humor from a sociological perspective. Instead, we are better off using existing sociological theories, and connecting these with questions about, and insight from humor theory. If there will ever be a "social humor theory" in sociological thought about humor, it is more likely to spring from social theory, than from humor theory.

### **Bibliography**

Apte, Mahadev L. (1985) *Humor and Laughter: An Anthropological Approach*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bergson, Henri (1935/1911) *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of Comic*. London: MacMillan.

Billig, M. (2005). *Laughter and Ridicule: toward a social critique of humour*. London: Sage.

Coser, Rose (1959) Some Social Functions of Laughter: A Study of Humor in a Hospital

## 8<sup>th</sup> International Summer School and Symposium on Humour and Laughter

Setting. *Human Relations* 12 (2), 171-182.

\_\_\_\_(1960) Laughter Among Colleagues: A Study of the Social Functions of Humor among

the Staff of a Mental Hospital. *Psychiatry* 23 (1): 81-95

Davies, Christie (1998) The Dog that didn't Bark in the Night: A New Sociological Approach to the Cross-Cultural Study of Humor. In: Ruch, (ed.) *The Sense of Humor*, 293-308.

Freud, Sigmund (1960). *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*. London: Penguin.

Morreal, John (1983). *Taking Laughter Seriously*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Oring, Elliott (1991) Review of 'Ethnic Humor around the World'. *Humor* 4(1), 109-114.

\_\_\_\_(1992) Jokes and their Relations. Lexington: the University Press of Kentucky.

\_\_\_\_ (2003) Engaging Humor. Urbana; University of Illinois Press.

Palmer, Jerry (1994). *Taking Humour Seriously*. London: Routledge.

### **The cultural industry of humor**

Much of the humor people encounter in everyday life they encounter through mass media: television comedy, sitcoms, films, cartoons. A whole industry is based on the invention, production, distribution, and translation of humor. The main center of this global industry is in Hollywood, where American television production is located along with movie industry, but there are many other global, regional, and national centers of cultural production.

This presentation will explore the nature and organization of this "mass production of humor" as well as the international distribution of American comedy around the world. Moreover, it will explore in detail one of the most successful of these commodified forms of humor: the sitcom. How can we understand the way sitcoms use humor to garner mass audiences? And why has it become such a central staple of the global television?

### **Bibliography**

Gitlin, Todd (1994) *Inside Prime Time*. London: Routledge.

Gray, Jonathan (2005). *Watching with the Simpsons. Television, Parody, and Intertextuality*. London: Routledge. .

Kuipers, Giseline (2006) Television and taste hierarchy: the case of Dutch television comedy. *Media, Culture & Society* 28 (3): 359-378.

Mills, Brett (2005). *Television Sitcom*. London: British Film Institute.

## **Diana E. Popa**

### **Translating the Language of Humour: Language vs. Culture**

The debate that has dominated much of the translation of humour research is that of untranslatability of certain kinds of linguistic humour. Linguistic humour has been assigned to two distinct categories on the basis of its translatability. Accordingly, Cicero

distinguishes between verbal humour (*facetiae dicto*), which involves the phonemic/graphemic representation of the humorous element that is untranslatable, and referential humour (*facetiae re*) that is translatable. As useful as the above categories may have once been, it ultimately relies on the somewhat outdated notion of strict formal equivalence. Contemporary translation studies have focused more on functional considerations and the equivalence effect.

As an application, we shall use the Skopos Theory and Christian Nord's functionalist approach. The present analysis will highlight the cultural components of humour language translation. We strongly believe that these theories are excellent tools when analysing the linguistic and cultural coordinates that need to be rendered in a target text, in order to make for a successful translation of the language of humour.

### **Suggested reading**

- Armstrong, N. 2005. *Translation, Linguistics, Culture*. A French-English Textbook. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chiaro, D. 2005. 'Foreword. Verbally Expressed Humour and Translation: An Overview of a Neglected Field', *The International Journal of Humour Research* 18 (2) 135-146
- Laurian, A M. 1992. 'Possible/Impossible Translation of Jokes', *The International Journal of Humour Research* 5 (1/2) p.111-127
- Nord, C. 1991. *Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Trans. C. Nord and P. Sparrow. Rodopi: Amsterdam and Atlanta
- Popa, Diana. 2005. 'Jokes and Translation'. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 13(1). 48-57
- Vermeer, H. J. 1989. *Skopos and Commission in Translational Action. Readings in Translation Theory*. Ed. and trans. Andrew Chesterman. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ob. 173-187.
- Vermeer, H. J. 1992. 'Translation Today: Old and New Problems'. In Mary Snell-Hornby and Franz Pochhacker & Klaus Kaindl (eds.). *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline*. Philadelphia & New York: John Benjamins. 3-16.

### **Political Satire and Parody in a Mediated World**

The media have become so pervasive that they constitute public life in contemporary societies. The rise of television in the 20<sup>th</sup> century has turned the concept of publicness into a genuinely mediated form of communication that is time and space flexible. Since the communicative forms of the media have often blurred the clear-cut distinction between private and public, between factual and fictional representation, they have complicated the field of politics.

On the other hand, politics has always been among the most important sources of inspiration for humorists. Authority is a perpetual source of humour and such subjects as chicanery, self-importance, corruption and scandals are perennial. However, humour about a particular subject, be it politics or public life, for instance, is not necessarily satirical because the subject itself is often a subject of satire. Nor is humour using the great satirical tools of parody and caricature meant in a satirical sense, per se. What is the role played by political satire and parody in the contemporary mediated public life? We cautiously posit that by problematising social and political order, both political satire and parody work as a corrective for the poor social and political behaviour.

### **Suggested reading**

- Calhoun, C. (ed.). 1992. 'Introduction: Habermas and the public sphere'. In *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, Mass., and London: the MIT Press, 1-48.
- Habermas, J. 1962/1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere – An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (trans. T. Burger and F. Lawrence). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lockyer, Sharon. 2006. 'A Two-Prolonged Attack? Exploring Private Eye's Satirical Humour and investigative reporting'. *Journalism Studies* 7 (5). 765-781.
- Ruben, Quintero (ed.). 2007. *A Companion to Satire*. Oxford: Blackwell.

## **Graeme Ritchie**

### **An overview of humour research**

This talk is a very general and gentle introduction to humour research, aimed at complete newcomers to the field. It will consider issues such as “what do humour researchers do?” and “is humour research a discipline in its own right?” Brief mentions will be given to some of the principal application areas and to the most commonly proposed types of theory.

#### **Suggested reading:**

- Attardo, S. (1994) *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chapman, A. J. & Foot, H. C. (1996) (Eds.). *Humor and Laughter: Theory, Research and Applications*. London: Transaction Publishers. (First published 1976.)
- McGhee, P.E. & Goldstein, J. (Eds.) (1983). *Handbook of Humor Research*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Morreall, J. (1987) (Ed). *The Philosophy of Laughter and Humour*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- HUMOR: International Journal of Humor Research*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

### **Computational Humour**

This talk starts by outlining the motivation, methodology and results of recent computational work on humour, summarising the two main strands: automatic classification of texts, and computer generation of verbal humour. This will be followed by a brief demonstration of the STANDUP interactive riddle generator, which was developed recently at three Scottish universities (<http://www.csd.abdn.ac.uk/research/standup>). This software, specially designed for children with language impairment, allows the user to explore words and phrases by building simple puns.

**Suggested reading:**

- Hulstijn, J. & Nijholt, A. (1996). *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Computational Humor. Twente Workshops on Language Technology 12*. University of Twente, Enschede, NL.
- Mihalcea, R. & Pulman, S. (2007) *Characterizing Humour: An Exploration of Features in Humorous Texts*. Proceedings of the Conference on Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing (CICLing), Springer, Mexico City.
- Mihalcea, R. & Strapparava, C. (2006) *Learning to Laugh (Automatically): Computational Models for Humor Recognition*. *Journal of Computational Intelligence* 22(2). Pp 126–142.
- Ritchie, G. (2004). *The Linguistic Analysis of Jokes*. London: Routledge. (Chapter 10)
- Ritchie, G., Manurung, R., Pain, H., Waller, A., O'Mara, D. (2006) *The STANDUP Interactive Riddle Builder*. *IEEE Intelligent Systems* 21 (2), March/April. Pp. 67-69.
- Stock, O., Strapparava, C. & Nijholt, A. (2002). *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Computational Humor (TWLT14)*. University of Twente: Enschede, NL.

**The methodology of testing humour theories**

If we adopt the long-term aim of constructing a rigorous scientific theory of humour, then we have to develop methodologically appropriate working practices for testing potential theories. In this talk we discuss some of the issues and make some suggestions, drawing illustrations where possible from recent humour research.

**Suggested reading:**

- Ritchie, G. (2004). *The Linguistic Analysis of Jokes*. London: Routledge. (Chapter 2)
- Ruch, W., Attardo, S., Raskin, V. (1993). Toward an empirical verification of the General Theory of Verbal Humor. *HUMOR*, 6(2), pp. 123-136.
- Vaid, J., Hull, R., Heredia, R., Gerkens, D., Martinez, F. (2003). Getting a joke: the time course of meaning activation in verbal humor. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35, pp. 1431-1449.

**The structure of puns**

Much of humour research focusses on humour in language, and there have been several studies of *puns* (jokes where phonetic similarity between words is central). This talk looks at a few of the commoner types of puns, analysing what combinations of linguistic relations are typically used. In particular, we shall look at puns made in context, such as occur in everyday life (in some cultures). We will not provide a complete explanation of why puns are funny, but will instead throw some light on what aspects of a text make it a pun.

**Suggested reading:**

Attardo, S. (1994) *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ritchie, G. (2004). *The Linguistic Analysis of Jokes*. London: Routledge. (Chapter 9)

## Willibald Ruch

### Smiling & Laughter: Typology, structure and dynamics

Smiling and laughter are the most frequent responses to humour. In the presentation I will address the following questions essential for empirical research: How many types of smiles and laughter exist and what is their nature? What is the relationship between smiling and laughter? How to measure smiling and laughter? Which type of smile and laughter signals amusement? We will learn that research on facial expression distinguishes among altogether about 20 types of smiles that are functionally and anatomically different. I will present our current research aimed at distinguishing among types of laughter. We will discuss what speaks in favour of smiling and laughter being qualitatively (not quantitatively) different. Traditionally humour researchers used the so-called “mirth-spectrum” and the mirth-index to recorded smiling and laughter. More recently, humour researchers started to adopt the Facial Action Coding System (FACS; Ekman, Friesen & Hager, 2003), an anatomically based assessment tool for the measurement of 44 facial actions. We will define the so-called *Duchenne display* as the expression of genuine enjoyment of humour and discuss the criteria to distinguish it from others (e.g., phoney, masking, miserable, and contempt smiles). Finally, the minimal number of facial displays relevant to humour research will be discussed and participants will learn how to distinguish among them.

#### Suggested\* and further reading

Ekman, P. (2003). *Emotions Revealed: Recognizing Faces and Feelings to Improve Communication and Emotional Life*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.

Ekman, P., Friesen, W. & Hager, J. (2003). *The facial action coding system*. CD-ROM. [http://face-and-emotion.com/dataface/facs/new\\_version.jsp](http://face-and-emotion.com/dataface/facs/new_version.jsp), <http://face-and-emotion.com/dataface/general/homepage.jsp>

Ekman, P. & Rosenberg, E. L. (Eds.) (2005). *What the face reveals. Basic and applied studies of spontaneous expression using the Facial Action Coding System*. Oxford; Oxford University Press.

Ruch, W. (in press). The FACS in research on humour and laughter. In Doris Peham & Eva Bänninger-Huber (Eds.) *Proceedings of the FACS-Workshop 2007*. Innsbruck, Austria: Innsbruck University Press

### Who is fearing humour and laughter: New insights into Gelotophobia

Based on clinical practice and observations Titze (1996) described the phenomenology and behavioural manifestations of *gelotophobia*--the fear of being laughed at--and one

consequence: the *Pinocchio Complex*. A research project was developed aimed at examining whether the findings of case studies can be generalized to the population of healthy adults. Indeed, research with the GELOPH (a 46 items questionnaire assessing gelotophobia) showed that the fear of being laughed at is a valid individual differences variable, which can also be assessed via a semi-projective test (i.e., the Picture-Geloph). Meanwhile, the fear of being laughed at has been verified in a multi-nation study (comprising app. 80 nations and 40 languages; Proyer et al. 2008) and several experiments and correlational studies with normal adults and patients were conducted to learn about it. For example, Platt (in press) showed that gelotophobes cannot discriminate well between good-natured teasing and bullying. The lecture will explore possible antecedents (dispositions for emotion, experiences of shame, being laughed at, personality) and consequences (humorlessness, psychosomatic complaints) of this fear. It will be highlighted that humour researchers and practitioners need to be aware of the existence of individuals fearing humour and laughter.

**Suggested\* and further reading:**

- Platt, T. (in press). Emotional responses to ridicule and teasing: Should gelotophobes react differently? *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*.
- Proyer, R.T., Hempelmann, C.F., & Ruch, W. (2008). They're all gonna laugh at you! Or are they? Are gelotophobes actually laughed at? *Manuscript submitted for publication*.
- Ruch, W., & Proyer, R. T. (2008a). The fear of being laughed at: Individual and group differences in gelotophobia. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 21(1), 47-67.
- Ruch, W., & Proyer, R.T. (2008b). Who is gelotophobic? Assessment criteria for the fear of being laughed at. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 26, 1-9.
- Titze, M. (1996). The Pinocchio Complex: Overcoming the fear of laughter. *Humor & Health Journal*, 5, 1-11.

**Enjoyment of humour and pain tolerance**

Among the many putative positive effects of humour and laughter on physical and psychological well-being, the link with pain perception seems to be one of the most promising. As early as 1928, Walsh observed that laughter seemed to have analgesic effects on postoperative pain. More recently, the famous case of Norman Cousins gave rise to the idea that laughter may lead to the release of endorphins, but two studies did not support this claim. Nevertheless, a review of the literature shows that overall results seem to favour the existence of such a link. While both negative and positive emotions do seem to enhance pain tolerance immediately after viewing an arousing film, research by Weisenberg et al. (1998) demonstrates that 30 minutes after the film the enhanced pain tolerance prevails only in the humour group. Zweyer et al. (2004) and Baumann, Städeli and Ruch (submitted) replicate this finding and show that the effects are contingent on genuine enjoyment of humour. Only participants showing the so-called Duchenne display often are the ones tolerating pain immediately after and 20 minute after watching the funny film. Implications for further applied studies are discussed.

**Suggested\* and further reading:**

Weisenberg, M., Raz, T. & Hener, T. (1998). The influence of film-induced mood on pain perception. *Pain*, 76, 365-375.

Zweyer, K, Velker, B. & Ruch, W. (2004). Do cheerfulness, exhilaration and humour production moderate pain tolerance? A FACS study. In R.A. Martin (Ed.), *Sense of Humor and Health [special issue]*. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 17, 67-84.

## **Unresolved issues in terminology and classification in humour research**

Humour researchers are spread all over the world, were raised in different cultural backgrounds, speak different languages, and had their training in different disciplines. Progress in other disciplines started once a common classification and common terminology existed, i.e., common frame of reference was achieved. For example, the DSM and ICD provide classifications systems in Psychiatry and the periodic system in chemistry. Humour research as not yet achieved a common terminology; in fact, different terminologies seem to coexist. Tracing the meaning of the words “humour” and “wit” in the English language will allow explaining the current confusion occasionally to be found in current literature. The second part of the talk will be dedicated to presenting attempts to classify humour behaviour, humour stimuli and responses to humour.

### **Suggested\* and further reading:**

Martin, R. A. (2007). *The Psychology of Humor: An Integrative Approach*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Ruch, W. (2007). Tools used for diagnosing humor states and traits. In: W. Ruch (Ed.), *The sense of humor: Explorations of a personality characteristic*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 405-412.

## **Andrea C. Samson**

### **Theory of Mind, Empathy and Humor**

Is humor processing influenced by abilities such as empathy or Theory of Mind? Theory of Mind can be seen as the cognitive aspect of empathy which describes the ability to attribute mental states to others such as beliefs, intentions or motivations (Premack & Woodruff, 1978). Empathy includes also more emotional components such as empathizing. Some humor models state that the ability of Theory of Mind is necessary to comprehend and appreciate humor (Howe, 2002; Jung, 2003). This presentation gives an overview on the existing studies that addressed these issues: Some studies used questionnaires to measure empathy and sense of humor, others investigated subjects with minor Theory of mind abilities (patients with the Asperger syndrome or autism) and their performance in humor experiments. Studies that used the method of functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging will also be taken into account. The several studies come to an inconsistent picture on the relationship of Theory of Mind, empathy and humor.

## 8<sup>th</sup> International Summer School and Symposium on Humour and Laughter

Therefore the influence of the methods to measure empathy, theory of mind and humor as well as the influence of the stimuli used in the experiments will be discussed.

### **Suggested and further\* reading:**

Howe, N.E. (2002). The origin of humor. *Medical Hypotheses*, 59 (3), 252-254.

\*Jung, W. E. (2003). The Inner Eye Theory of Laughter: Mindreader Signals Cooperator Value. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 1, 214-253.

\*Lyons, V. & Fitzgerald, M. (2004). Humor in Autism and Asperger Syndrome. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 34, 5, 521-531.

\*Premack, D. & Woodruff, G. (1978). Does the chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 4, 515-526.

### **Psychological Humor Theories**

This introductory talk gives an overview on the main psychological humor theories: Disparagement/Superiority theories, Psychoanalytic Theories and incongruity-resolution theories. Its roots and developments as well as empirical data that (do not) support this theories will be presented.

### **Suggested and further\* reading:**

\*Freud, S. (1928). Humor. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 9, 1-6.

\*Gruner, Charles R. (1978). *Understanding laughter: The workings of wit and humor*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Martin, R. (2007). *The Psychology of Humor. An Integrative Approach*. Toronto: Academic Press.

Ruch, W. (1998). *The Sense of Humor: Exploration of a Personality characteristic*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

\*Suls (1972), J.M. A two-stage model for the appreciation of jokes and cartoons: an information-processing analysis . In J.H. Goldstein & P.E. McGhee (eds). *The psychology of humor: Theoretical perspectives and empirical issues*. New York: Academic Press.