

sidered it better *to remain silent* on that head [ch bronte jane]; And we *were silent* again until she spoke [14, p. 342]; The drawing room was full of *silent people*, sitting at a long and ornate table [18, p. 35].

**Эстетический аспект** является способом преодоления вербальной ограниченности передачи смысла полной информации. Писатель пришел к выводу, что слово иногда не может передать подлинное мнение и поэтому он выбрал молчание, напр. англ.: *Quiet and dark, beside him stood the Phantom, with its outstretched hand* [11, p. 193].

Молчание в **религиозно-мистическом аспекте** представляет собой необходимость общения человека с Богом. Так силенциальный эффект проявляется в данном контексте “подключением к высшим силам” [5, с. 108].

**Психологический аспект молчания** - это симптомы душевного кризиса: болезни, отчуждения, чувство одиночества, интимных переживаний, тайны, напр. англ.: *There was no need for him to say another word* [18, p. 32]; *Harry, who had found the need to remain silent increasingly difficult the longer they eavesdropped...* [18, p. 76]; *... and who looked extremely unlikely to say anything more...* [17, p. 112]; *Then he let himself down again, and became silent* [14, p. 136].

Силенциальный эффект в **ритуальном аспекте** - молчание может становиться своеобразным ритуалом. В таком случае оно становится нормативным поведением. Ситуации, при которых молчание целесообразно, являются канонизированными и о них люди предупреждают заранее. Примером этого является минута молчания. Впервые в истории она прошла в 1919 г. в Великобритании.

Силенциальный эффект в англоязычном художественном дискурсе - это синтез ментального и эмоционального. Молчание является невербальным средством общения, интерпретируемое им как своеобразная языковая реальность, отражает состояние коммуны кантов их прагматическую, социокогнитивную деятельность (homo silence) и представляет авторскую языковую картину мира (nature silence).

#### Литература:

1. Анохіна Т.О. Поліфункціональність та поліаспектність графічних знаків. – Вісник Сумського державного університету. – Серія філологічні науки. – 2004. - №3(62). С.9-14.
2. Анохіна Т.О. Онтологічне буття силенціальних лакун. - Вісник Сумського державного університету.- Серія “Філологічні трактати” – 2009. – Том 1, № 3-4.С. 5-10.
3. Арутюнова Н.Д. Молчание: контексты употребления // Логический анализ языка. Язык речевых действий. – М.: Наука, 1994. –С. 106-117.
4. Арутюнова Н. Д. Феномен молчания / Н. Д. Арутюнова // Язык о языке : сб. ст. / под общ. рук. и ред.
5. Н. Д. Арутюновой. – М. : Яз. рус. культуры, 2000. – С. 417–436.
6. Богданов В. В. Текст и текстовое общение / Богданов В. В. – СПб. : Изд-во С.-Петербург. гос. ун-та, 1993. – 68 с.
7. Кочерган М.П. Загальне мовознавство: підручник/ М.П. Кочерган. -Київ: Академія, 2009. – 368с.
8. Светлова А.І. Поліфункціональність та поліаспектність комунікативного мовчання в англomовному художньому дискурсі. - Вісник Сумського державного університету.- Серія “Філологічні трактати” –2010. – Том2, №3.С.104-112.
9. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика : термінологічна енциклопедія / Селіванова О. О. – Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2006. – 716 с.
10. Сусов И. П. Введение в языкознание : учеб. для студ. лингвист. и филол. спец. / Сусов И. П. – М. : АСТ : Восто-Запад, 2007. – 379 с
11. Швачко С.О., Анохіна Т.О. Лінгвістичний статус паузи (на матеріалі англomовних художніх текстів). - Вісник Сумського державного університету. – Серія філологічні науки. – 2002. - №3(36). - С.116-121.
12. Austen Jane The Complete Novels of Jane Austen/ Jane Austen – London: Penguin Group, 2006. – 1288p.
13. Bronte Charlotte Jane Eyre/ Charlotte Bronte – London: Penguin Group, 2006. – 374p.
14. Bronte Emily Wuthering Heights/ Emily Bronte – London: Penguin Group, 2006. – 395p.
15. Charles Dickens Christmas Carol. – London : Wordsworth classics, 2000. - 416p.
16. Charles Dickens Dombey and Son. - London : Wordsworth classics, 2000. – 848p.
17. Charles Dickens Oliver Twist. – London: Wordsworth classics, 2000. – 374p.
18. Rowling J.K. Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows – London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2007. – 608p.

## VERBALIZATION OF HUMOUROUS TEXTS

I. Kobayakova, cand. of philological sciences  
Sumy State University, Ukraine

Conference participant,  
National championship in scientific analytics,  
Open European and Asian research analytics championship

The article in question deals with the problem of humour and its ways of rendering in translational texts. Its categories are being focused upon and described in terms of definitions. The adequacy of translation is paid attention to. The authors' aims of the target texts are not excluded either.

**Keywords:** text, humour, translation, interlingual and intercultural items.

The paper deals with humour as a form of the authors' lingocreative reevaluating activity, which should not be overlooked in the process of translation.

Humour is a thinking category specifically represented in an original text. For a foreigner it is very difficult to comprehend humour as a cross-cultural category. Limited thesaurus does not allow understanding humour as it is. A translator is supposed to be a highly educated person of a broad thesaurus, deep knowledge in many spheres of life, in terms of its political, economic and cultural background of the ethnic community.

Humour as a complicated phenomenon covers more than one sphere. No wonder that it is dealt with by psychologists and psycholinguists. Recently, several theories of humour have been proposed (Pretence Theory by Clark and Gerring that deal with humour and irony in a psychological aspect). But none of them has ever tried to solve the significant problem: "How should humour be rendered into other languages? Is it possible to render it from original texts into translation ones? And if it is possible, can all the types of humour be successfully

rendered into foreign language?"

Some people take it for granted, the others try to exaggerate its advantages or hyperbolize its drawbacks; emphasising the unattractive and sometimes even ugly side of life, expressing amusing things about it. But it is important to keep humour fresh and original.

There are some reasons to state, that humour is relevant to an artistic and aesthetic connotation of the text and belongs to the elements of the prime significance [1]. Humour (as a means of creative subjective modality) is a form of the author's appraisal opinion. Practically in modern English and American prose, humour is presented as an original way of world view [2].

Before dealing with the translation of humour one should acknowledge the meaning of its category and subcategories, the ways of their verbalization.

Humour arouses amusement, laughter, the capacity of recognizing something funny. Humour is a means of cheerful and puzzling towards reality. The attempts of defining humour were made by philosopher Agnes Repplier (1858-1950), a social critic, who assumed that humour was associated with tolerance. Humour brings a deep and friendly understanding.

Humour is the form of paradox. Paradox is good, great and unexpected at the same time.

Cf. "—Did I meet you in Tolero?"

—No, I never was in Tolero. Neither was I. It must have been two other fellows" [3].

"A notice was put up on the door of office: "If you haven't anything to Do, Don't Do it Here!" [3].

Alongside with development of linguistics new and specific definitions of humour appeared. Now there are quite a great number of them. For example: "Humour - the expression of one's thoughts, in order to make one's remark forceful" [4] or: Humour, irony is the use of words to express something different from and often opposite to their literal meaning.

Humour presupposes a highly developed intellect and can only exist within the framework of specific sociolinguistic conditions; the most important among these is a love of the mother tongue and aesthetic pleasure derived from its use [3].

The problem of translation of humour has not been paid proper attention to. It is enormously important and significant. The loss of humour in translation can lead to the loss of information of the author's style's, make his work of literature in a target language uninteresting and faked [5].

We distinguish two types of humour: situational and linguistic. Situational humour is usually realized in some sentences contexts that rarely exceed a paragraph.

Situational humour often appears as the discrepancy between outward and inner characteristics of an object described.

Cf. Professor - "You can't sleep in my class". Student - "If you didn't talk so loud I could" [3].

Professor — "A fool can ask more questions than a wise man can answer"

Student — "No wonder so many of us fail in our exams" [3].

With linguistic humour the figurative meaning is realized gradually in a broad context (in some paragraphs, short story)[3]. Humour is to be kept in the target text. The loss of it can tell on its coherence and the main idea [5].

Cf. Popularity is the crown of laurel which the world puts upon bad art. Whatever is popular is wrong [6].

More marriages are, ruined nowadays by common sense of the husband than by happy with a man who insists on treating her as if she were a perfectly rational being [6].

The research of linguistic mechanism of humour enables the analyst to discover many relevant items of language structure and semantics overlooked in previous linguistic researches and to give new assessment to facts. Humour is always implicit, the context serves as a marker of it. While achieving the humorous effect authors use both verbal and non-verbal means involved in the play on social/linguistic experience. Humorous effect is verbalized by traditional and non-traditional means, actualizing the adaptive principles of language. Cf. situational humour:-

1) There is a man outside with a wooden leg, Mr. Smith.

What's the name of his other leg! [3].

2) Policeman - "Miss, you were driving sixty miles an hour!"

She - "Oh, isn't that splendid I only learned to drive yesterday" [3].

Cf. linguistic humour:

1) Jessie — "Her husband didn't leave her much when he died, didn't?"

Jennie - "No, but he left her very often when he was alive" (Pochepstov 1981: 280).

2) Teacher — "When was Rome built?"

Percy — At night.

Teacher - Who told you that?

Percy - "You did. You said Rome wasn't built in a day" [3].

Linguistic means of humour vary and translation of humour is rather a complicated task. Translation consists in rendering information from one language into another. The assignment of the translator extends far than a mere translation. Translator's task is not only to convey the meaning, the thoughts of an author but also to keep intact the laws of both languages. The process of transformation results in creating linguocultural equality of the text. The translating is assumed to be both interlingual and intercultural.

The aim of any rendering is to reach adequacy, i.e. to make a text matching to standards of the target language preserving as many peculiarities of the author's style and the work of literature as possible. Humour is the use of words in a context to express something illogical to provoke laughter. The lack of knowledge on the part of the translator deprives the text of the national colouring. So all this should be taken into account for a translator to render humour in a proper way. Consequently the next step in humour translation is to convey it into the target language. Among all the ways of transformation syntax flexibility comes into the foreground.

#### References:

1. Komissarov, V.N. 1990. Teoriya perevoda. Moscow, Vysca Skola.
2. Glickberg, Ch. 1969. Vision on Modern Literature. The Hague: Nijhoff.
3. Pochepstov, G.G. 1981. Language and Humour. Kiev: Vysca Skola.
4. Hornby 1996. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Moscow: Sigma Press.
5. Kobyakova, I.K. 2007. Kreativne constujuvannia vtornnukh utvoruvan v anglomovnonu duskursi. — Vinnitsa: Nova knuga.
6. Wilde, O. 1986. Aphorisms. The Book of Irish Humour. Moskva: Raduga Publishers.