

**I. Kobyakova PhD, Professor,**  
Head of Germanic Philology Department, Sumy State University

## **LINGUISTIC MECHANISM OF HUMOUR**

The language of humour 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” (Aristotle, 1959). In fact, for a long time literary studies absorbed much of the scholarly input into linguistic forms of humor.

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) (Clark @ Gerrig, 1984). 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 and original. There are reasons to state, that humour is relevant to an artistic and aesthetico category which is of prime significance (Angeleri @ Airenti, 2014). 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.

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 treatment 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. Paradox is good, great and unexpected at the same time. Alongside with linguistics new and specific definitions of humour appeared. Humour presupposes a highly developed intellect and can exist within the framework of specific sociolinguistic conditions; the most important among this is love of the mother tongue and aesthetic pleasure derived from its use.

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 aesthetic thinking 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.

Humour befriends language units in contrastive vicinity. It gives a ground for an addressee to get information with a humorous 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.

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.

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.

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.

In humorous contexts preferable is play on words and situations. Communicative units are of diverse nature – narration and dialogues.

What matters much is the descriptive analysis. A lexical unit of a source text may be exchanged by an unequivocal 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. 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 underevaluated things.

Humour is of secondary derivation: it is generated by situations and language units. 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.

Riddles, maxims, puzzles belong to the linguocognitive zone. 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.

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. 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 (Kobyakova, 2013). 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* (p. 1). English translation by W.D. Ross, Oxford: O.U.P., 1959.
2. Angeleri, R. and Airenti, G. (2014). *The development of Joke and Irony Understanding: A narrative study with 3 - to 6-year-old children*. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology* (p. 133 - 146). / *Revue canadienne de psychologie expérimentale*, 68(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cep0000011>
3. Clark, H. and Gerrig, R. (1984). *On the Pretense Theory of Irony* (p. 121-126)./ *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 1984, Vol. 113, No. 1.
4. Dynel, M. ( 2013). *Developments in Linguistic Humour Theory* (p., 125). John Benjamins Publishing: Lodz University.
5. Kobyakova, I. (2013). *Verbalization of Humorous Texts* (p. 50). GISAP: Philological Sciences, № 2, London., IASHE. [file:///Users/kobyakov\\_om/Downloads/Kobyakova-012%20%20Pages%20from%20Philological%20sciences\\_GISAP2.indd\\_%20\(6\).pdf](file:///Users/kobyakov_om/Downloads/Kobyakova-012%20%20Pages%20from%20Philological%20sciences_GISAP2.indd_%20(6).pdf)

**Linguistic mechanism of humour [Текст] / І. Кобуакова // [Філософія мови та нові тенденції в перекладознавстві й лінгвістиці: збірник матеріалів II Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції / Отв. ред. Н.Є.Леміш. - Київ: Національного педагогічного університету імені М.П. Драгоманова. – 2019. - С.222-227.**