Shvachko Svitlana Doctor of Philology, Professor,

Professor of Germanic Philology Department, Sumy State University

Kobyakova Iryne PhD, Professor,

Head of Germanic Philology Department, Sumy State University

Canadian Humour: Language and Speech Deviations

The language of humor was regarded as a useful tool for orators, provided that its use was prudent and balanced. Aristotle himself, in Rhetoric, that the comic effect only supervenes if language contains novelties of expression and deceptive alterations in words in face of which "the hearer anticipates one thing and hears another" [1, c. 11]. In fact, for a long time literary studies absorbed much of the scholarly input into linguistic forms of humor.

Canadian humorous stories, funny remarks in editorials and articles do thrive in linguistic, sociological and psychological manifestations of humour by B. Marshall, (2011), R. Martin, P. Puhlik, G. Larsen, J. Gray (2003), M. Wada, H.Clarke, J. Rozanova (2015).

The subject matter of this research is humour, its semantic charge in the English discourse. 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 Clarc and Gerring deal with humour and irony in a psychological aspect) [4, c. 121]. But up dated the significant questions: "How should humour be rendered into

other languages? Is it possible to render it from original texts into translation ones? Can all types of humour be successfully rendered into foreign language?"

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

There are reasons to state, that humour is relevant to an artistic and aesthetico category which is of prime significance [2, c. 133]. Humour (as a means of creative subjective modality) is a form of the author's appraisal opinion. Practically in modern Englishes and American prose, humour is presented as an original way of world view [3, c.72].

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

Humour arises amusement, laughter, the capacity of recognizing something funny. Humour is a means of cheerful and puzzling treetmen of 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 and a deep and friendly understanding.

Humour is the form of paradox [7]. Paradox is good, great and unexpected at the same time.

Cf. "—*Did I meet you in Tolerado?*

— No, I never was in Tolerado. Neither was I. It must have been two other fellows" [14].

– "A notice was put up on the door of office: "If you haven't anything to Do, Don't Do it Here!" [14].

Alongside with linguistics new and specific definitions of humour appeared. Now there is a great number of them. For example: "*Humour - the expression of one's thoughts in order to make one's remark forceful"* 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 exist within the framework of specific sociolinguistic conditions; the most important among these is love of the mother tongue and aesthetic pleasure derived from its use [14].

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

The universal properties of humour open discussion on territorial and language deviations. Some people take reality as it is, some of them try to exaggerate its advantages, hyperbolize its drawbacks. It is he who uses timid humor to emphasize gently unattractive ugly sides of life. Humour alive is valid for communicative purpose. Humour is charged with artistic and aesthetic charm – comfortable, timid and gentle. It is an aestheticothinking category.

Humour as a subjective modality is English discourse an author's positive appraisal of the world.

In modern Canadian discourse humor is expanded to a particular world perception. This phenomenon is of great significance for scientific world picture. Canadian humour is an integral part of the Canadian Identity. The primary characteristics of Canadian humour are irony, parody, and satire [11, c. 15].

Humour befriends language units in contrastive vicinity. It gives a ground for an addressee to get information with a humourous hint. It is the context that serves a humor marker and objectivizes its dimension. Thus, humour actualizes words in an ambiguous context expressing duality of information and funny amusing effect.

Children understand jokes, may feel humour charm, continue to develop it across early childhood [2, c. 133].

– Q: *Why don't Canadian women wear sleeveless dresses?*

A: They aren't allowed to bare arms

– Q: *Why do you call a Canadian black comedy?*

A: It's Always Snowing in Winnipeg [14].

By humour we understand something, which arises amusement, laughter, the capacity of recognizing, reacting and expressing funny things. Humour brings a deep and mutual understanding. Humour is a paradox of good, great and unexpected nature.

– Q: What is the difference between a Canadian and a canoe?

A: A canoe tips [14].

Humour presupposes a developed intellect on the part of readers. Urgent is love of the mother tongue, its aesthetic values. The things aren't easy to cope with translation. The loss of humour doesn't make a target translation go. Situational humour works on the discrepancy of referents.

– You must be a maple tree, because I would tap that.

– Rush Limbaugh said he'll move to Canada if the Health Care overhaul passes congress! Upon hearing Rush's intentions Canada immediately countered by banning oxycontin! [14].

Linguistic humour is relized gradually in broard contexts, in paragraphs and short stories.

– Knock Knock

Who's there?

Ottawa!

Ottawa who?

Ottawa get a passport for Canada.

- Knock Knock

Who's there?

Quebec!

Quebec who?

"Quebec to the end of the line!"

"Don't Quebec on your promise."

- Knock Knock

Who's there?

Toronto!

Toronto who?

Toronto be a law against Knock Knock Jokes [14].

Situational humour provides to create vivid details and sketches. Associative humour is very significant into that. An interpreter follows the principle of creativeness, analogy, provokes the adequate reaction on the part of a reader. With a great effort he gains his aim, resorting to different language means. He isn't expected to keep all stylistic devices alive, but he is supposed to reproduce function of relaxation [10, c. 5].

The diversity of languages, their structures and systems presuppose the diversity of perception. Transformations (both lexical and grammatical) are at work to convert original language units into target language ones. Humour is being rendered at the deep structure level for the surface structure adequacy may fail for social and linguistic properties. Deviations of the predicted word order do not diminish humour appreciation in either verbal jokes or cartoons [15, c. 409].

– Q: What do you call a Canadian sitcom about a naive boy?

A: Leave it to Bieber [14].

– Q: What do Premier Wynne and Mayor Rob Ford have in common?

A: They both have more than enough to eat at home [14].

In humorous contects preferable is play on words and situations.Communicative unitss are of diverse nature – narration and dialogues:

– A French Canadian fellow was challenged on his patriotism with overtones of doubt. I am a proud Canadian, he blurted. And my wife! My wife! She loves Canada so much she had the whole map of Canada tattooed on her bum.

– Coast to coast-to-coast! Trouble is every time she bends over Quebec separate!

– Q: Why did Leandro Barbosa choose to play for the Toronto Raptors? [14].

A: Because they have much better pot in Canada!

– Q: Why does Celine Dion want to purchase the Montreal Canadians?

A: Because she wants to ruin more than just music! [16].

What matters much is the descriptive analysis. A lexical unit of a source text may be exchanged by an unequivalent word / word combination. Humour is hidden; it lies deep in a language structure. That is why an equivalent translation does not always work humour like. It may go alongside with a descriptive one, as a team. They say, humour is rendered in a congruent and adequate way.

Translator's activities extend far beyond them. Translator's task is not only to convey the thoughts of the author but also to keep intact the laws of related languages [10, c. 10]. The process of rendering consists in creating linguo-cultural parity. The translation is bilateral, i.e., interlingual and intercultural. The aim of any rendering is to reach adequacy in information and pragmatic purposes, to do away with overlooked in underevalued things.

Humour is of secondary derivation: it is generated by situations and language units [13, c. 27]. It is made by, of and for people. Humour renders emotions in contacts with irony and sarcasm, latter either irritate people or strike them hard at weak points.

Humour frequents different discourses and genres. Cf. *What flies and has four legs? – Two birds. The English longest word? S—mile–s* [8].

Among quantitative units humourous metaphors single out in Standard English Cf. *tons of pirates, bushels of girls, ounce of sense, loads of friends, acres of sleep, a dram of love, barrels of fun.* Humourous jokes incorporate geographic names in all Englishes. Cf. *I meet you in Tolerado – No, I never was in Tolerado. - Nether was I. It must have been two other fellows*.

England is aparadise for women, ans hell for horses: Italy aparadise for horses, hell for women, as the proverb goes [8, c. 36].

Humour is not indifferent to play on words. *Cf. When I am good, I am very very good. When I am bad. I am better; In two words: im, possible, You can include me out Probable impossibilities are preferred to improbable possibilities*.

Four be the things I'd been better without: Love, curiosity, freckles and doubt [8, c. 57].

Humour makes definitions of referents unserious. *Cf. Woman is at once the servant, the apple – and the belly-ache* [8].

Situations make humour flourish. Linguistic humour permeates edifying zones. Cf.:

– Teacher: If you take 3 from 7 what difference does it make?

Smart pupil: That is what I say [8].

Humour is of secondary creation, but it works also in a tertiary way. Cf.:

– Love me, love my dog and its smell; Veni, vidi, vici – Ukr. Прийшов, побачив, помовчи.

– All day round service, but NOT NOW [8].

Riddles, maxims, puzzles belong to the linguocognitive zone. Canadian small texts aren't apart either. As an aestheticothinking category humour is subtle, evasive, difficult to describe. Humour works with horrorhows within the framework of specific sociolinguistic conditions. Selective nature of humour is observed in both authorized and unauthorized humorous texts. Comprehension of humour depends not only on the quality of the jokes, their witticism but also on the quality of the recipient, his sense of humour. Humour is based mostly on play of thoughts, concepts and previous experience Humour involves addressant, addressee and text, this triad includes a translator who makes communication go.

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 in terms of 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"* .

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

Student — "No wonder so many of us fail in our exams'" [13].

With linguistic humour the figurative meaning is realized gradually in a broad context (in some paragraphs, short story) [13]. Humour is to be kept in the target text. The loss of it can tell on ithe text coherence and the main idea.

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

More marriags are, ruined nowadays by common sense of the husband than by happy life with a man who insists on treating her as if she were a perfectly rational being [18].

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!

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

She – "Oh, isn't that splendid I only learned to drive yesterday" [13].

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" [13, c. 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"[13].

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 and to provoke laughter. The lack of knowledge on the part of the translator deprives the text of the national colouring. 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.

Consequently, future research should investigate humor across a broader range of humor originators and audiences and in various cultural and contextual situations. Additional studies should also look at other types of humor and examine whether the strategies applied as well.

References

1. Aristotle IV BC. 1959. *Rhetoric.* English translation by W.D. Ross, Oxford: O.U.P., 1959. (Aristotle 1959, 11).

2. Angeleri, Romina, and Airenti, Gabriella. 2014. *The development of Joke and Irony Understanding: A study with 3- to 6-year-old children. Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology / Revue canadienne de psychologie expérimentale, 68(2).http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cep0000011]* (Angeleri and Airenti 2014. 133 - 146).

3. Berezhan, Sergei. 1973. *Semantičeskaâ èkvivalentnost' leksičeskih edinic* . Moldova: Shtiincza Publishers (Berezhan 1973, 371).

4. Clark, Herbert and Gerrig, Richard. 1984. *On the Pretense Theory of Irony* / Journal of Experimental Psychology: General 1984, Vol. 113, No. 1 (Clark and Gerrig 1984, 121-126).

5. Dynel, Marta. 2013. *Developments in Linguistic Humour Theory.* John Behjamins Publishing: Lodz Univeresity (Dynel 2013, 425).

6. Glickberg, Charles. 1969 *The Ironic Vision In Modern Literature*. The Hague: Nijhoff (Glickberg 1969, 164).

7. Hornby, Albert. 1958. *Oxford Advanced Leaner's Dictionary of Current English*– London: Oxford University Press (Hornby 1958, 1527).

8. Kobyakova, Iryne, 2007. *Kretivne konstrujuvannya vtorrunnukh utvoruvann v anglomovnomy duskyrsi.* Vinnytzia: Nova Knuga (Kobyakova 2007, 128).

9. Kobyakova, Iryne, 2013. *Verbalization of Humorous Texts*. GISAP: Philological Sciences N 2, London., IASHE (Kobyakova 2013, pp. 50 - 41). file:///Users/kobyakov_om/Downloads/Kobyakova-012%20%20Pages%20from%20Philological%20sciences_GISAP2.indd_%20(6).pdf

10. Kobyakova, Iryne and Shvachko, Svitlana. 2016. *Teaching Translation: Objectives and Methods*. *Advanced Education.* Kyiv: Kyiv Polytechnic Institute, N 5. DOI10.20535/2410-8286.61029 (Kobyakova and Shvachko 2016, 9 - 13).

11. Marshall, Barara. 2011. *The graying of "sexual health": A critical research agenda.* Canadian Review of Sociology, 48, doi:10.1111/j.1755-618X.2011.01270.x (Marshall 2011, 390–413).

12. Nieguth, Tim. 2015 *The Politics of Popular Culture: Negotiating Power, Identity, and Place*: Negotiating MQUP, 2015 (Nieguth 2015, 200).

13. Pochepschov, Georgiy. 1990. *Language and Humour.* Kyiv: Vytsha skola (Pochepschov 1990, 327).

14. Short Canada Jokes source: http://www.jokes4us.com/miscellaneousjokes/worldjokes/canadajokes.html.

15. Shultz, Thomas R. 1974. *Order of Cognitive Processing in Humour Appreciation.* Canadian Journal of Psychology / Revue canadienne de psychologie, 28(4). *http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0082006* (Shultz 1974, 409 - 420).

16. Warner, Glen. 2009. *The Great Canadian Joke Book.* Toronto: Folklore pub (Folklore pub. 224). https://www.chapters.indigo.ca/en-ca/books/great-canadian-joke-book/9781894864800-item.html

17. Zekavat, Massih. 2017. *Satire, Humor and the Construction of Identities.* John Behjamins Publishing: Lodz Univeresity (Zekavat 2017, 210).

18. Wilde, Oscar. 1986, Aphorisms. The Book of Irish Humour. Moskva: Raduga Publishers (Wilde 1986, 134).

Shvachko, S. Canadian Humour: Language and Speech Deviations [Text]: monograph / S. Shvachko, I. Kobyakova // Ukraine-Canada: Modern Scientific Studies: Collective Monograph (in U45 three books). - Book 3. - Lutsk: Vezha-Druk, 2018. - P. 42-50.