广西师范大学

硕士学位论文

等值论和目的论视角下的言语幽默翻译研究

姓名：张玉宏

申请学位级别：硕士

专业：英语语言文学

指导教师：袁斌业

20080401

2005

A Study of Translation of Verbal Humor

From the Perspectives of Equivalence Theory and Skopos

Theory

Postgraduate: Zhang Yuhong   Grade: 2005   Supervisor: Professor Yuan Binye

Major Field of Study: English Language & Literature

Orientation: Translation Studies & Practice

Abstract in English

The paper firstly carries on a study on the definition of humor only to find definitions vary with different schools for different purposes of study. With numerous variant definitions, humor could therefore be reckoned as a term of taxonomy free. For the purpose of study, and according to the relationship between humor and language, the paper gives a basic classification of verbal and nonverbal humor; and according to the features of verbal humor and its translatability, it is further separated into universal, cultural and linguistic ones. Through the comparison of English and Chinese humor, they are found to share with each other the same cognitive mechanism. Principles to produce disparity to mislead and intrigue humor are similar in the general way between English and Chinese humor. This proves the translation of humor across English and Chinese is basically possible. The comparison also reveals that differences between English and Chinese humor definitely pose great predicament for the translation. Humor though primarily is translatable; translatability witnesses its less possibility in linguistic and cultural ones, which has dominated much of the humor research of the paper.

The comparison of the functions of humor across English and Chinese is also carried out since in the study of humor, importance has always been attached to its functions as the core consideration. Humor across English and Chinese turns up to express the same idea in different ways, but have the same psychological and sociological functions. The same function constitutes a precondition to translatability. Functional equivalence is expected since the universal psychological and social functions of English and Chinese humor overlap. Guided by the Skopos Theory, in the translation activity of humor, different cases are assessed within the social cultural framework of the TL with emphasis on the expected effects and functions. For the most challengeable linguistic humor, it may play with lexical ambiguity (as in puns), or make use of linguistic deviation like ill-formedness. Together with the creative application of rhetorical devices, humorous effects are intrigued. However, the deviation and rhetorical devices used

innovatively are often hard to reproduce directly. In order to convey the message maximally and at the same time retain much of the function of the SL, the translator often turns to the semantic approximation in the TL with the same notion but different forms of expression. In this way, the translation strategy of adaptation is applied, finding substitutions in the target language and culture to fill in and compensate for which is lost.

A lack of cultural background or an insufficient evaluation of the target recipients' linguistic ability, aesthetic consuetude, and cultural liability would render the translation unacceptable though conveying the message. Skopos Theory again offers a noticeable perspective, since it considers translation as a kind of communication with the practice of comparing, introducing, and absorbing the new aspects of another culture. Thus, for the translation of cultural humor as well as those playing with specific background knowledge, annotating and introducing the totally different and fire-now cultural background knowledge hold true.

For the translation of universal humor, literal translation in the most cases is sufficiently to fulfill the skopos of achieving the same function.

Abbreviations

SL	Source Language
TL	Target Language

Acknowledgements

The completion of the dissertation comes after the support and assistance of many sides. Among them, my thanks go, above all, to Professor Yuan Binye, my academic supervisor. His timely guidance and enlightening suggestions, helpful criticism, and positive encouragement have helped me a lot. It was for them that I was courageous enough to rise to this challenge and continued with the study when difficulties emerged.

I also would like to express my gratefulness to all the professors during the graduate studies in the College of Foreign Studies, Guangxi Normal University. They have helped me to develop interests in E-C and C-E translation and to acquire basic knowledge of many aspects in translation studies. Including my supervisor, all professors' instructions have given inspiration to me, thus benefit me a lot. Their motivating questions and illuminating arguments have enlightened me a lot to sharp ideas on several issues that are presented in the dissertation.

My sincere thanks also extend to Zhang Zhiqun, a friend of mine in Shanghai Jiaotong University. When I was in Shanghai doing research, he accommodated me, which made me feel at home while at the strange land. With his material help and spiritual support, I have made a good use of time and finished the research work in Shanghai effectively.

My dear classmates are always my supporters, and they are my friends all in my life. Without the concerns and conveniences they provided for me, I wouldn't finish the dissertation on time. With them I discussed academic problems and from them I always got the right mood to continue my research.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my dearest families who were neglected during my three years' study for master degree. They are always on my side and offer constant support to me. Without them, I would not have been able to accomplish so much over the past three years.

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Human life cannot be separated from humor. Humor does make the dull everyday life become alive, fresh and animate. As a mode of communication with dramatic entertaining function, humor, no matter verbal or nonverbal, is a particular and exclusive characteristic of human being, a serious subject and a holy land for which the explorer must equip himself thoughtfully. Verbal humor, for its unique artistic effects and communicative values strikes the fancy of the public. With a comfortable and harmonious communicative environment it creates, communicative parties laugh and enjoy, meanwhile perceive the philosophy of life. However, humor across cultures falls flat every now and then, even understood word by word In this case, translation of humor is the only resort to cracking such a hard nut in cross cultural communication. Moreover, translation of humor is different from that of literary texts, due to the elusive nature of humor and its different cultural and linguistic traits. Consequently, the question of translatability frequently confronts the translator. However, on all account, equivalence counts for much in translation. So far as humor is concerned, since its major functions are to communicate and to arouse amusement, functional equivalence is discussed with the expectation to achieve similar responses between TL and SL recipients. This also reveals that a good translation is function-oriented. Skopos Theory highlighting translation with its function and purpose, well meets this requirement, thus is worth discussing in this paper.

1.2 Stimulus for Humor Study from the Translational Scope

"Existence, identity, consciousness, and humor are all axiomatic concepts of the human condition" (Diana-Elena Popa, 2005:48). Yet when it comes into our consciousness, "humor seems to be one of the least understood" ibid. ,because its hermetic structure and elusive nature refuse to open up to researchers. Scholars of all schools have explored humor with numerous efforts, and the exercise of humor studies is as old as humor itself, tracing back to the times of Aristotle. It initially was confined to one of the branch of Philosophical studies, which has been focusing on the development of a satisfactory definition of humor. Considering the nature and features of humor, theories concerned can be classified into three groups: incongruity, superiority, and relief theories. Incongruity theory is said to have its origin in Aristotle's comments in the *Rhetoric*, and now it is a leading and prevailing research approach. Taking incongruity——a broadly used term embracing ambiguity, logical impossibility, irrelevance, and inappropriateness as the central features of all humor, the theorists of incongruity theory treat humor as response to incongruity in the violent dissolution of such inappropriateness. Later it

was termed as Incongruity-Resolution Theory claiming that humorous effect arises from the perception and cognition of two incompatible ideas and resolution of such incongruity. With a linguistic basis on Relevance Theory, it illuminates the underlying cognitive mechanism involved in humor comprehension. In this way it finally gives an answer to the question why something rather than others are humorous——a question haunting over humor studies long ago. However, until recently, there are only a few philosophers focusing on humor studies, probably due to the reason that the studies of humor are proved to be daunting, inviting numerous tricky problems and repeated failures. Moreover, endeavor to study humor is inevitably intertwined with interdisciplinary fields, thus it is necessary to draw insights from linguistics, literature, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and so on.

Humor has witnessed its sharp increased studies since 1960s when linguistics has provided a broad theoretic perspective, thus vastly extending its studies into the field of linguistics, literature and translation.

Attardo and Raskin's 1991 General Theory of Verbal Humor GTVH , with its six hierarchical Knowledge Resources, illustrates how jokes and wordplay are generated by bringing together two scripts containing the information necessary for generating a joke. The General Theory of Verbal Humor GTVH also claims itself to be the first tool for analyzing humor translation. For Attardo (2002:174-175) two utterances in two different languages, or even in the same language, can never be identical, but merely similar to some extent, thus he proposes GTVH as a metric for translating humor, because it already includes a way of measuring similarities between texts, whether they are in the same language or in different ones. GTVH therefore is strictly a linguistic theory for measuring the similarity and difference between texts. Moreover, such theory with its orientation mainly to jokes and wordplay, theoretical extension to humor, may not applicable to humor on the whole, since jokes and humor are definitely not the same, though there is overlapping.

Modern studies have gradually shifted its emphasis towards cross-cultural issues, which has had profound implications for the translation studies as well as humor study. In the modern world, people are integrated more tightly; humor as an essential tool of everyday communication and an important component of literary works, mass media and art in general, deep roots in the specific cultural and linguistic context, thereby confronts a great challenge for its cross cultural study. However, such dilemma well justifies that a cross cultural study of humor is urgent and indispensable. Philosophical and linguistic studies on humor in general have run into predicaments of neither taking on an interdisciplinary perspective nor being attentive enough to the culturally-specific traits of humor. However, translational studies of humor offer a new turning point. Within this field, humor is seen as an outcome of interdisciplinary researches, as

well as a production of each specific nation's long-time interaction of philosophy, ideology, culture, economics, politics, and linguistics and so on.

1.3 Significance to Study Humor Translation across Cultures

Admittedly, explorations of humor and its translation have always been carrying on in this field, though the pace is relatively slow because of complexity and the numerous difficulties attached to this very topic——humor and translation. Compared with the literary and technical translation, translation of humor is meagre indeed, for its involvement of special linguistic traits as well as cultural factors. The translator with his or her effort to reproduce humor across cultures is compared to a ropewalker, indicating that humorous effects would easily be lost and the potential of failure is really high. Thus the sticking points finally come up, namely, what kind of balance or equivalence to use the technical term   is expected and how to keep it. This offers a cut-in point for this paper. Based on the above questions frequently coming up in translating humor, this paper takes English and Chinese as two distinctively different carriers of humor, carries out an interdisciplinary research, emphasizes its trans-lingual and cross-cultural traits, and finally paves the way to attain acceptable translation strategies. Inevitably, a series of questions come up when going into the concrete aspects, as stated below.

1.4 The Statement of Related Research Questions

By the statement of those questions, this paper aims to make clear the contents and structure dealing with them, and to carry on the research and study accordingly.

1. How to define humor, its nature and classification?
2. How to distinguish English and Chinese humor, their similarities and differences?
3. What are the challenges of translating humor? Or in other words, how to render humor across English and Chinese with smooth transference of effects, cultural, linguistic and ethical feature? That's to say:
4. What kind of equivalence is expected in translation humor, and how to? Such questions require us to think over:
5. What are the satisfying theoretical foundations for humor translation to bridge over translational practice and theoretical feasibility for major types of humor? This also leads to another important yet urgent question:
6. Based on certain translation theories, what are the adoptable translation strategies for each specific type of humor?

All the questions would be expounded thereafter, and the structure of the paper is built up on them, though it may not be in line with the order above.

1.5 Structure of the paper

This paper is organized by five parts. In chapter one, the purpose and necessity of humor study and humor translation are stated. In Chapter Two, a literature review is given to assess briefly the translational studies of humor across English and Chinese, with which the theoretical and practical starting point of research of the paper comes forth. In chapter three, the paper attempts to furnish humor translation with theoretical basis of Equivalent Theory and Skopos Theory, with which applicable translational strategies would be adopted in the translation of different types of humor. But before that, it should get down to the nature and features of humor. Thus it is necessary to make clear firstly in chapter four the nature of humor and different ethical traits between English and Chinese humor. A classification of humor into universal, cultural and linguistic ones is given for the purpose of humor translation of the paper. Subsequently, chapter four tries to drive the translation of each type of humor home with strategies of adaptation and annotation based on the foregoing theories of functional equivalence and Skopos Theory discussed in chapter three. An outspread of humor in humorous short messages is touched upon in chapter four as a field of later study. Chapter five is the conclusion.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

With a relatively long history, humor is archaic and a hard nut to crack, which can be traced back to the time of Aristotle. China, similarly, has a long history of "xiaohua"(　　), tracing back to *the Analects of Confucius.* However, concerning the word "humor" itself, a popular viewpoint in the 1930's by Lu Xun was that there was no "humor" in China, since humor as a kind of borrowed western culture, there is no such a corresponding term to it in China. Western philosophers at that time, tended to think that humor as the embodiment of western culture could hardly be transplanted into another culture. However, finally "humor" took root in the soil of Chinese culture by Lin Yutang and his transliteration of "　　"

1993:50　, and sooner becomes a proper word in Chinese language. Now it's a widely used term. However, concerning the humor translation across English and Chinese, some scholars compare it with the poem, exclaiming that both of them have reached the degree of being untranslatable.

When referring to translation of English humor, the Chinese translation studies scholar, Liu Miqing (1998: 83) in his book *Style and Translation*, stated:

> Language is a complicated thinking and communicating tool. Its complicatedness is demonstrated above all by the history, culture, and psychology unique to a nation. Some of these backgrounds are barriers in the way of transference…. Humorous and punning language can hardly be translated because humor comes from the witty use of words, and the wit easily vanishes in translating process. …Rhyming always produces humor…. Rhyming is generally untranslatable; prosaim becomes a necessity in translating….Puns always refuse to be translated.

The adoption of rhetoric devices and linguistic features, such as rhyming, and linguistic deviation is for sure a great barrier to overcome. This in the same way well applies to the translation of Chinese humor deep rooted in Chinese language and endowed with Chinese cultural characteristics. In their book *Psychology of Humor*, after they have studied numerous pieces of Chinese humor　which is termed in China as "xiaohua　　"　, most of which in fact "employ Chinese character play", finally Xiao Sa et al　1989: 231　note down: "these humorous stories　employing character play　are best called native specialty for they can only grow and be consumed on the motherland and find no way to making foreign "money"——being translated into other languages, other characters. …Generally speaking, jokes with language structure involved are untranslatable. "

Those views decades ago well prove that English and Chinese are two different language systems possessing respectively distinctive traits. Translation of humor across English and Chinese may be a formidable task. Hence, the urgent task of comparing humor across English and Chinese confronts to the paper and the dominant question of its translatability emerges. Such questions urge scholars' painstaking workings on it at the same time inspire the paper a lot.

Recent studies of humor translation has witness a shift turning from emphasizing on its difficulties and untranslatability to the consideration that humor across English and Chinese are mostly translatable though the degree may vary. Focusing on the obstacles that cross national traits constitute for humor translation, and according to its degree of translatability, most translation studies of humor recently tend to analyze humor primarily from the pragmatic perspective of relevance theory and cooperative theory, the semantic perspective and the cultural perspective, all of which could generally be concluded as either focusing on linguistic features, culturally and ethically loaded traits or communicative functions and purposes.

Zheng Huiying, in her *On the Obstacles of Humor Text Translation and Its Strategies* ﹙2004:104-107﹚, admits that translation of humor encounters obstacles owing to distinctive features of two languages and cultures, and there is no such absolute equivalence between the SL and TL, however, she agrees that translatability substantially exists as long as the translated text reproduces the response of a reader in target culture that is "essentially like" the response of the "original" one (Nida﹐1964: 164). She divides humor into verbal and non-verbal ones. Verbal humor is further separated into universal, cultural and linguistic humor. Linguistic universality, identity of human thinking form and infiltration of culture well prove that literal translation is available for universal humor. While for cultural and linguistic humor endowed with extraordinaire traits, the functionalist approach is preferred in order to achieve similar responses.

In their research of humor and its translation, Xu Qingli and Wang Fuxiang, Luo Lian and Wu Yejun narrow down humor studies to pragmatics and cultural scripts perspectives respectively. Xu Qingli and Wang Fuxiang, start their research on humor translation with a brief review of the fundamental Relevance Theory. Though in their suggestion of humor translation, Xu Qingli and Wang Fuxiang haven't made clear how the translator could draw insights from the Relevance Theory and what kind of strategies are preferred based on it, they inspire humor translational studies to explore a mutual communicative mode, and to think over how humor are produced and perceived. In this way, humor across cultures is proved to be endowed with basic commonness. Luo Lian and Wu Yejun's research, though merely focuses on the cultural sphere, they do enlighten the consideration that background knowledge, context and encyclopedia knowledge are necessary to comprehend and reproduce humor loaded with distinctive cultural and ethical traits, and for those traits refusing to be transferred into TL annotation is the last

resort to compensating for the background knowledge default.

For all of them, humor across English and Chinese is translatable, though some obstacles frequently come up limiting the degree. However, they haven't stricken the point clearly that since it is translatable, in their various translation strategies adopted what kind of metric they should use to measure between TL and SL. In other words, what kind of equivalence is expected? But all of them view humor translation as cross cultural communication and highlight its communicative functions, thus similar responses are expected in the TL. This inspires this paper to resort to the functional equivalence between TL and SL. Moreover, for them the major aim of humor translation is either to overcome obstacles or to achieve similar responses, thus to exert the same function. Consequently, a variety of translation strategies are discussed in order to keep the same function. This stimulates the thought that translation is a purposeful activity especially that of humor translation, Skopos Theory considering translation as a purposeful activity therefore deserves discussion. After a check of numerous researches on humor, it is found that there is no scholar attempting to study humor translation from the perspectives of functional equivalence as well as Skopos Theory. This could prove the study of the paper is fresh and new. However, in general, functions of humor have always been the pivot of studies on it, which determines the concrete requirements for humor translation are to reproduce the same effects and responses between SL and TL. Functional equivalence follows the principle of equivalent effects and similar responses. Skops Theory focuses on the functions of translation for its target recipients and by an analysis of functions of both SL and TL texts, translational strategies are discerned. Therefore the two theories together offer desirable theoretical perspectives.

Chapter 3 Introduction to Equivalence Theory and Skopos Theory

3.1 Theory of Equivalence

The discussion of the translation of humor might well arouse a debate over the translatability and untranslatability of certain kinds of humor. "Translatability appears to be a cline rather than a clear-cut dichotomy. Source language texts and items are more or less translatable rather than absolutely translatable or untranslatable" (Catford, 1965: 102). Moreover, broadly speaking, failure of translation falls into two categories: those whose difficulty is linguistically, and those of culture. Humor in this sense though primarily is translatable; translatability witnesses its less possibility in those of linguistic and cultural ones, which has dominated much of the humor research of the paper. Accordingly, on the basis of its degree of translatability, humor could be sorted out as universal humor, linguistic humor and cultural humor. Linguistic humor and cultural humor involve the phonemic or graphematic representations of the humorous elements and the cultural associations, which are intractable to translate; while universal humor is translatable to a large extent.

Thought on the translatability of humor consequentially reminds us of the notion of equivalence, a central theory of translation. Equivalence "is commonly established when SL and TL words supposedly refer to the same thing in the real world on the basis of the referential or denotative equivalence" (Koller, 1979:187). According to Nida there are two different types of equivalence, namely formal correspondence and dynamic equivalence. Formal correspondence "focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content", while dynamic equivalence is based upon "the principle of equivalent effect" (Nida, 1964:159). Formal correspondence consists of a TL item which represents the closest equivalent of a SL word or phrase. However, Nida and Taber in their second edition of *The Theory and Practice of Translation* 1982 make it clear that there are not always formal equivalents between language pairs. The dynamic equivalence is thus created, when words and expressions of both SL and TL lead to the same effect on their respective readers. Nida proposed the concept of dynamic equivalence in 1964, in his *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964). He pointed out that the relationship between the target recipient and the target text should be the same as that between the source recipient and the source text. Thus for the dynamic equivalence, the recipients of the TL respond substantially the same as the recipients of SL. Later, Nida (1969) revised dynamic equivalence into functional equivalence to avoid misunderstanding that might be aroused by the word dynamic , but the concept of functional equivalence shared the same as that of dynamic equivalence. Moreover, Functional equivalence as Shuttleworth and Cowie further explained is "the type of equivalence that seeks to adapt to the function of the original to suit the specific context in and for which it was

produced" (Shuttle worth & Cowie, 1997:64).

Therefore, as the term suggests, formal correspondence is the equivalence at the level of form. Nida calls the translation guided by formal correspondence a gloss translation, which aims to make the target recipients understand as much as possible the source language by literal translation of the same word from SL to TL. To the modern translation studies, a great importance of functional considerations and the equivalence of effects have been attached than ever. Neubert and Shreve (1992:144) point out that "equivalence is not really a relationship between textual surfaces; it is a relationship of textual effect of communicative value", whereas Laurian (1992) suggests that while verbal humor may not be translatable within strict formal equivalence, it can, depending on the capacity of a translator, be translated functionally. Functional equivalence, as the term denotes, is the principle a translator sticks to in translation, in which the TL will have the same function as that the original has upon its recipients. A newer theory of translation termed as function-equivalent translation therefore comes forth. From the comparison of formal correspondence and functional equivalence, it is obvious that Nida is in favor of the application of the latter, as a more effective translation procedure. So far as humor concerned, it functions the same to enlighten people's life, to break away from embarrassment and to educate people. The same function constitutes a precondition to translatability. Functional equivalence therefore provides a new and sound perspective to the translation strategy of humor, since it is by definition "the type of equivalence that seeks to adapt to the function of the original to suit the specific context in and for which it was produced (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997:64)."So far as humor is concerned, by this type of equivalence, the skopos of translation activity is to seek the same function between TL and SL humor by adaptation.

3.2 Skopos Theory

Functional equivalence highlights the functional considerations to obtain the functional equivalence between SL and TL. Skopos Theory similarly is "a process of intercultural communication, whose end product is a text which is capable of functioning appropriately in specific situations and context of use" (Schäffner, 1998a: 3). In the Skopos Theory, Hans J. Vermeer's views translation as a process in which it is of prime importance to determine the purpose of a translation. Consequently, the major focus is the functions a translation has for its target recipients. This as well determines the methods and strategies for attaining this purpose.

Skopos Theory therefore is of high relevance the study on humor translation, by which translators have to be fully aware of the function of humor in the target-language's socio-cultural situation as well as that in source-language's.

Developed in Germany in the late 1970s, and drawing inspiration from the communication

theory, the action theory, text linguistics and the text theory, as well as movements in literary studies towards reception theories, this theory reflects a general shift from predominantly linguistic and formal translation theories to a more functionally and socio-culturally oriented concept. Skopos as a Greek word means purpose. It "is a technical term for the aim or purpose of a translation" (Vermeer, 2000: 221). Theorists of Skopos assert that "any action has an aim or a purpose, thus translation is considered not as a process of trans-coding, but as a form of human action which has its own purpose basically decided on by the translator" (Schäffner, 1998b: 235; Hönig, 1998: 9). To be more exactly, Vermeer (2000: 229) explained, "the skopos of a translation is the goal or the purpose, defined by the commission and if necessary adjusted by the translator, and the commission is the instruction, given by oneself or by someone else, to carry out a given action (which could be translation)." Thus, a text for theorists of skopos is an offer of information from its producer to the recipients. Translation is then the secondary offering of information originally offered in another language within another culture. However, "Neither the selection made from the information offered in the source text, nor the specification of the skopos happens at random; rather, they are determined by the needs, expectations, etc. of the target text recipients" (Baker, 1998: 236). The translator, consequently, must interpret ST information "by selecting those features which most closely correspond to the requirements of the target situation" (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997: 156). From this point of view, translation is a process that not (necessarily) determined exclusively by the source text, its effects on its native recipients, or the intention of its author, but prospectively by the skopos of the target text as determined by the target recipient's needs and anticipation. They could, however, be discerned and decided by the translator himself or herself. However, what he or she should also bear in mind is that for the skopos, a translation is largely constrained by target text recipients and their situations or cultural backgrounds.

Hans Vermeer also considers culture as "the total of conventions to be observed in a society" (Vermeer, 1992: 9). He claims that when translating culture-specific text-types, translators should "introduce into a society and its literary tradition, new aspects either of form or of content or of meaning and thereby new aspects of the world, thus enriching the target culture" (1992: 13). He continuously maintains that "to expand the possibilities of translation and increase the range of possible translation strategies" (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997: 156). To this extent, the translation strategy of annotation may be possible for the translation of humor loaded with cultural elements by introducing a new aspect of culture into the target language or acquainting the target recipients with the SL background.

Admittedly, a perfect theory of translation should be an overall concern over all elements bound to the SL and TL situations and should meet the functional requirements concerning the

situations. All in all, for humor emphasis is always put on its functions; and in cross-cultural communication and translation, the concrete requirements towards functional consideration are always to achieve the same response and effects. As Nida suggests in the functional equivalence for the translation intertwined with linguistic and cultural considerations, the translated text should reproduce response of recipient of target culture that is "essentially like" the response of the "original" recipient. If it does not, he suggests making adaptation in the text as in order to solicit the initial response (Nida & Taber, 1969: 202). Thus translation of humor as an activity with a clarified purpose, its skopos is of prime importance to guide the whole translating process by affecting the translator's overall analysis of source and target situations, decisions making of translation methods and strategies and so on. Considering this, Skopos Theory also provides a theoretical foundation as Christiane Nord concludes the entire Skops Theory as "the ends" to "justify the means" (Nord, 1997:29). This shines much light on the translation of verbal humor below.

Chapter 4 Translation of Verbal Humor

4.1 Cognition of Humor

4.1.1 Nature of Complexity

Once typing in the searching engines the key words of definition of humor, there are hundreds of pop-up websites. It seems that today "humor" is a term with high frequency of usage. A compliment of "You are humorous" or "You have a good sense of humor" makes us smile knowingly. But when the notion of "what is humor" comes into our mind, words fail to expound it exactly. Though it is commonplace in everyday life, humor seems to be rather elusive as a theoretical concept. Most of prominent figures in the history of philosophy have proposed some theories, but after 2500 years of discussion there has been little consensus about what is humor and what constitutes humor. "The problems involved in defining humor are such that several scholars have doubted that an all-embracing definition of humor could be formulated" (Attardo: 1994, 3). Psychologists, philosophers, aestheticians, sociologists and linguists for many centuries have defined, redefined and confined it in many ways according to diverse purposes. Classifications accordingly are not absolute or essential groupings. Each scientific method of grouping is determined by a purpose. However, every cognition of humor can be reckoned as experience and restructure in the territory of humor, and such experience and restructure are changing over time, place, people, and so on, which make diversity of humor definitions and its classification as well.

4.1.2 Its Definition and Classification

Humor, with a historical angle, is initially the liquid parts of the body; according to the ancient theory as defined in the *New Encyclopedia Britannic*, "humour also spelled humor (from Latin 'moisture'), in early western physiology, one of the four fluids of the body that were thought to determine a person's temperament and features. In the ancient physiology still current in the Middle Ages and later, the four cardinal humors were blood, phlegm, choler(yellow bile), and melancholy(black bile); the variant mixture of these humors in different persons determined their 'complexions', or 'temperaments', their physical and mental qualities, and their dispositions" (Goetz 1768 145) . According to *the New Oxford Dictionary* 1989 the word "humor" itself is of relatively recent origin. It arose during the 17th century out of psycho-physiological scientific speculation on the effects of various humors that might affect a person's temperament.

However, from its general sense, humor is that the features of people, objects or situations sufficiently to evoke amusement, laughter and entertainment in behavior, speeches and articles;

that intends to induce laughter or amusement; and that the ability to perceive, appreciate, enjoy and express the features. As it is defined, humor may roughly be detected from three essentials: the sender, the recipient, and the carrier of humor. Wherefore, we may work over humor and discuss its classification in terms of the following: an analysis of the sender and the recipient, what's the intention of a humorist or what the humor is used for and recipient's reactions to the humor; how it works; techniques involved; the various applying domain of humor; and even the negative or opposite emotion to the particular type of humor. Accordingly, considering different recipients, humor may be divided into adults and children humor, while with a view to the manner of humorists' addressing of humor, it may also be separated into spontaneous humor versus conscious, deliberate, and intended humor. From the sender's part, there also exists another kind of humor, slightly different from spontaneous one that is the rational humor which we deliberately and consciously induce, control and create. Taking the applying field into account, humor is widely applied to public, political, familial, economic, even network and mobile phone communications. In view of its nature, humor can be further classified into self-enhancing, aggressive, afflictive and self-defeating ones, which is not new among scholars or into the traditional red, black and gray humor.

Definitions of humor vary out of different purposes; so does the classification, Classifications of humor generally are not absolute or all-embracing. To this extent, with its intrinsic nature of complexity, humor could actually be deemed as taxonomy free. Attardo makes it clear that "it has not been possible to agree how to divide the category of humor" (Attardo 1994:3). And for O' Neill, Patrick, "there is continued lack of any generally accepted taxonomy of humor" (P. O'Neill, 1993:61).

4.1.3 Verbal Humor to Its Narrow Sense

One humorous utterance may illustrate numerous types of humor at one time. "Everything is abnormal" may be classified as: all fallacy, contradiction humor, satire, insight humor, reduction to absurd, exaggeration humor, etc. Thus, the full context, situation and setting of should also be given. This humorous utterance illumes the classification of humor in this paper in that back to its primitive state, background and language as the major situation and carrier of humor respectively account for much for humor. No matter how diverse, multiplex, complex, and elusory it is; humor basically embraces verbal and nonverbal ones. Non-verbal humor could be appreciated in the pantomime, deadpan (doing something humorous without showing facial changes), slapstick, ect., using exaggerated or unexpected gestures, movements, and comic sounds, deriving humor from the way characters act in specific situations. Non-verbal humor can also merely be visual, like funny paintings, on which other forms of non-verbal humor

techniques are involved.

Verbal humor, on the other hand, is more intricate, daedal and reticular. Usually, people refer to verbal humor in two senses. From its broad sense, it is applied to all literature and all informal speeches or writings with the purpose of amusing, or triggering laughter from recipients while in its narrow sense, humor is distinguished from wit, satire, and farce. Compared with wit, it is less intellectual and more imaginative; it shows more sympathy and less cruelty than satire; and finally it is more subtle than farce. For the purpose of study and from the perspective of translation, this paper refers verbal humor to its narrow sense, namely a text, a discourse, or a context which the sender or the humorist gives with the function of laughter-making, recreation, enlightenment, social and cross-cultural communication. It could be further divided into universal humor, cultural humor and linguistic humor. Another prevailing classification of humor in its narrow sense is situational humor and linguistic humor, in which situational humor stressing the importance of the background condition, shares a lot with the universal humor, but not necessarily denotes the cognitive factors, namely the universal commonness of cognition among different peoples; while the linguistic humor relates to the different cultural and linguistic elements in the study of humor translation. For the study of this paper, the former classification is preferred for it offers a concrete, detail and assoeted threshold of study.

4.2 Ethical Traits of Humor: a Comparison between English and Chinese Humor

The word humor or "　　", from its coming into being in Chinese language, has a history of more than 70 years in China; early in 1930's, Lin Yutang when translating it, illustrated that, "　　" as a transliteration from the western "humor", was not equal to Chinese joke, meanwhile different from that of wit, satire, and facetiae 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　1993:50 . Based on his illustration, it is clear that humor, though as a transliteration in China, has found itself the trace of successful transference between English and Chinese as early as 1930s. Moreover, since it can be transplanted into the soil of Chinese culture, conveying the similar ethical feeling, this adequately proves that a corresponding notion of humor does exist in the Chinese culture and ideology.

English and Chinese humor share many similarities, which are firstly seen in the general mental mechanism of humor making. Thought on humor usually prompts our association with laughter, thus brings a question for us: the relationship between humor and laughter. Does humor equal to laughter? At least some people take it for granted that laughter is the quid pro quo of humor. However, John Morreall (1987) makes a much more subtle distinction: laughter results from a pleasant psychological shift, whereas, humor arises from a pleasant cognitive shift.

Concerning this, laughter could be reckoned as one of the psychological and physical responses to humor and humor is just one of the cognitive stimulations which make us laugh. Touching upon such principles would unavoidably leads us to one of the most prevailing, yet influential theory of humor——incongruity theory, which investigates humor in the aspect of cognition and linguistics. Humor, according to incongruity theories, may be deemed as finding of the inappropriate within the appropriate. When humor takes indirectness or accidental irrelevance as their features thus to decrease the relevance to the real implication in hearer's mind, incongruity is engendered. For incongruity theory, when there is disparity between the hearer's expectation and the speaker's actual intention, in his effort of relevance seeking, the hearer finally paves the way for clarifying disparity only to find the result is out of expectation and amusing. In such process, incongruity is produced and later resolved, accompanied by humorous effects. Principles to produce such incongruity to mislead are similar in the general way between English and Chinese humor. One of such efficacious principles or techniques is to apply rhetoric devices to humor. Sharing with the same features of being implicit and indirect, English and Chinese humor exercise similar rhetoric devices to evoke laughter, to satire, to educate and to edify, take the most common one——pun for an example.

The second important similarity could be seen in their functions. Humor across English and Chinese frequently expresses the same idea in different ways, but have the same psychological and sociological functions. English scholar Peter Newmark 2001 classified language functions into six main categories: the informative function, expressive function, vocative function, aesthetic function, phatic function and metalingual function. Humor at this point possesses most of these functions. Specifically, humor as reflection of people's optimistic attitudes to life and noble aesthetic appeals plays a significant role in enlightening people's life; humor of all nations and cultures works the same way. Such universal function determines that English and Chinese humor share a lot chiefly in enlivening the atmosphere, breaking away from embarrassment and educating people, and at the same offering us a new scope of interpreting humor with functional equivalence. The same function constitutes a precondition to translatability. As Nida 1964: 241-245 depicts, in the translation, there are three technical procedures: (1) analysis of the source and target languages; (2) a through study of the source language text before making attempts to translate it; (3) making judgments of the semantic and syntactic approximations. In these procedures it is inevitable to make a comparison between source language and target language, so it is advisable to study differences of English and Chinese humor in ideological, cultural and linguistic aspects to give functional equivalence a full play in the inter-lingual transference.

English humor and Chinese humor differ to a large degree, which could be detected

ideologically, culturally and linguistically. Different nations have different philosophy of life, with a long history and related factors like environment, climate, politics, etc., consequently, deep-rooted and fixed patterns of thinking are settled. Thoughts differences between Chinese people and western people are mainly: Chinese people are used to thinking collectively and directly while western people are in favor of individual and indirect or counter-direct thinking; Chinese people are good at imaginary thinking, while western people are partial to abstract thinking; compared with western people's formal logic thinking, Chinese people tend to have a strong sense of dialectical ideology. These two different modes of thinking have nurtured two languages with their own specific styles and features. A collective and integrated way of thinking counts for much for the general and vague meanings of Chinese vocabulary, while the English ones take on the features of being concrete and general. Consequently, in humor translation, and in translation as well, we need to reproduce English abstract concepts with Chinese concrete concepts or vise versa, and to convert unique Chinese images with imaginable entities in English, or vise versa.

Language is always implicated in humor. Humor may play with lexical ambiguity (as in puns), or make use of linguistic deviation like ill-formedness, stigmatized forms, dialect features, etc. English and Chinese respectively belong to Sino-Tibetan family and Indo-European family; any adoption of such linguistic techniques to humor would give rise to great difference between English and Chinese humor, hence constitutes great challenges for transference of humor in linguistic level. Moreover, language is always combined with cultural aspects like literature background information or conventionally accepted norms and stereotypes, humor to this extent, witnesses its maximal difference and therefore calls for more adaptive strategies to transfer it.

Culture, under the interaction of holistic ideology and language, takes on its own features, which could also be traced in the language. Cultural difference in humor accordingly could be seen externally in the way humor constructed and featured linguistically and internally in the manner of people's perception of humor. Humor as an effective and powerful discourse, is endowed with abundant unique cultural characteristics, composing barriers for intercultural communication and translation.

Similarities between English humor and Chinese humor make it possible for inter-lingual translation of humor; differences between them definitely pose great predicament for cross-cultural communication, whereas testifying the necessity of humor translation. Still, ideology or thinking patterns, language and culture are closely related and mutually interwoven, to this extent, a classification of humor into universal, linguistic and culture ones, may not cover all the form of verbal humor in its narrow sense, and the dividing lines among them are not necessarily clear-cut, for there should be some overlapping. Subsequently, in consideration of

translation study of humor, according to these three categories of humor discussed, workable translational approaches with illustrations are studied in the following just as a trial to ravel out one of the most daunting problems of English and Chinese translation practice.

4.3 Verbal Humor and Its Translation

Indeed, Raphaelson-West (Raphaelson-West, 1989:130) has also divided jokes into three main categories: linguistic jokes (e.g. puns), cultural jokes (e.g. the ethnic jokes), and universal jokes (the unexpected). Though jokes are different from verbal humor, the research Raphaelson-West carried on jokes from the scope of translation gives certain inspiration to that of humor. She points out that "the jokes are progressively easier to translate" (ibid), following the above order from top to bottom. To be more exact, she describes according to this order, the translation of linguistic jokes, is compared to "punny as hell" (ibid).   By revising the idiom "funny as hell"(ibid), she tends to show that with the word punny rhyming with the word funny,

"It would be necessary to have an idiomatic expression about humor which contained a word which rhymed with a word which means something about puns or language. This word which means something linguistic would have to be semantically similar to the word it rhymes with, and its presence would have to add a little meaning to the sentence" (ibid.).

For the second category, the cultural jokes are seen to be "more widely translatable" (ibid.), but translation of such kind of joke might run into obstacles for "even if the listener is good-natured and can laugh at himself, he might not understand the stereotype"(ibid.). To make it more explicit, Raphaelson-West (1989:132) further explains: "there are many jokes which may mean the same thing semantically, but in terms of pragmatics and culture, there is something sorely missing which makes the joke hard to translate". Yet, a universal joke is that people of different cultures can understand easily with the common knowledge, the processing efforts involved are much less than that of linguist and cultural jokes, thus a literal translation would be satisfied. The exploration above of Raphaelson-West towards joke and its translation fits well into verbal humor and its translation, which would be studied accordingly thereafter.

4.3.1 Linguistic Humor and Its Translation

A great part of humor is characteristic with linguistic features. When initiating such a discussion on the linguistic humor and its translation, it is necessary to make clear what is meant by the term "linguistic humor". Nash, in 1985 defined it in this way: "by linguistic humor we

mean resulting from peculiar intensities of linguistic patterning" (Nash, 1985: 135). According to him, linguistic humor could be said to highlight itself by making use of its unique phonetic, morphological, syntax, semantic, grammatical and pragmatic features. More concretely speaking, linguistic humor, first of all, by its verbal denotation, would inevitably involve some special linguistic rules, no matter phonologically, calligraphically, syntactically and pragmatically, as well as cultural factors. What's more, we have often noticed that in linguistic humor there is a common application of deviant linguistic forms, by which disparity frequently arises between the speaker and the listener. So far as English and Chinese are concerned, it is confirmed that there is wide difference between them, which could be detected in writing system, grammatical structure, and phonological representation and so on.

Functional equivalence as indicated above by Shuttleworth and Cowie is "the type of equivalence that seeks to adapt to the function of the original to suit the specific context in and for which it was produced" (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997:64). In other words, according to the theory of functional equivalence, with effort making of achieving the same or similar effects, responses and functions, translation of linguistic humor is theoretically considered to be translatable on the whole though the degree varies. As what has been shown in his further illustration of functional equivalence, Nida used J. B.Philip's translation of *Romans 16:16* as an example: the idea of "greeting with a holy kiss" was translated into "giving one another a hearty handshake all around", in which adaptation is applied to attain the same greeting function and finally to meet the socio-cultural needs of the TL recipients (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990: 26). Skopos Theory analyzed above also gives such a theoretical support. Indeed, Vermeer (1992) has ever advocated the use of adaptation as an alternative to semantically-based translation. Newmark also points out that "comedies and farces are often adapted, since their humor may have intractable cultural elements (banana skin) which are not funny when translated" (Newmark, 1991, in Roy Ouyang, *On the Translatability of Linguistic Humor*: http: //www. geocities.com/ writingmacaoissue1/ Articles/ On _the_ translatability _of_ humour.htm). He (1982) illustrates that in communicative translation, the translator adapts permissibly to make the transmitted linguistic and cultural content of the original more accessible to the target reader. Mildren Larsen (1984: 95) also accepts that adaptation or the so called "unduly free" translation in condition that the same intention to evoke humor or other similar response is attained in the target recipients. Thus, theoretically and also practically, in translation of linguistic humor, adaptation is a highly desirable approach, though not a panacea.

Unlike transcription (or literal translation), adaptation is aimed at rewriting the target text in line with the same spirit of the source language, thus producing a text meeting the expectations of target recipients. In the case when such linguistic humor is made solely for arousing laughter

and maintaining humorous effects in the course of translating, the translator may "change the reality that the text refers to in the original language" (Laurian, 1992: 112). Such "reality", according to Laurian, could be a similar notion. Newmark (1988) further explicates it by compensating it with another piece of different but associated meaning. A vivid example goes like this: in the magnum opus *Gimple the Fool* written by American great writer Singer, who is famous for his polished way of writing and straightaway description, the first sentence reads "I am Gimple the Fool". Two possible translation versions are offered below:

A

B   ,   . 2003：75

With the transliteration to achieve formal correspondence, version A is basically right, however, B is much more directly oriented to the given culture of Chinese people and displays more vividly the linguistic features of Chinese language by replacing Gimpel with "   ", an expression which per se suggests a fool in the Chinese folk saying. As an adaptation rather than transliteration of Gimpel, version B testifies itself as an excellent work integrating the phonetic, semantic and pragmatic feature together in the TL, at the same time returning the writing features of the original writer: polishing but concise in wording. Adaptation in translation of linguistic humor justifies itself fantastically in such example, but considering more linguistically-loaded humor, for instance the rhetorical devices, especially the pun, adaptation would definitely encounter much more tricky challenges.

Pun or wordplay, as a major carrier of humor, is "an expression that achieves emphasis or humor by contriving an ambiguity, two distinct meanings being suggested either by the same word or by two similar-sounding words" (Baldick, 2000:181). According to the degree of similarity, puns can be further divided into (Delabastita, 1996:128): homonymy (identical sounds and spelling); homophony (identical sounds but different spellings); homography (different sounds but identical spelling) and paronymy (there are slight differences in both spelling and sound), all of which are very effective mechanisms to produce humor, which could be exemplified by just a few of them.

Example 1

A: What makes a road broad?

B: The letter" B"   2007   206   .

Chinese version one:

：   ？

：   B

Version two:

"   "

Version three:

English and Chinese are such kind of languages, in which every word with its fixed phonetic form, distinctive structure and established semantic content should be used and comprehended as a whole. In other words, they cannot be split at random; however, it doesn't mean that words can never be taken apart. As we all know, a polysyllabic word often consists of several morphemes. Sometimes a writer would purposefully take apart disyllabic single-morpheme words or compound words, and sometimes inserts some other elements in between. Such deviant formation can sometimes result in special humorous effects. In the above example, the rhetorical device of wordplay is used. Its humorous effects could easily be perceived by the SL recipients, however, constitutes a great challenge for the translator, since Chinese characters and English alphabetic are of two totally different writing systems. However, the thought of adaptive strategy would enable a translator to find a kind of approximations between the two linguistic systems, on which a good translation of linguistic humor is precisely built. Such effort can often give rise to new meanings and a delicate touch of humor.

Translation version one, with its rigid formal correspondence, aims to make the target recipients understand as much as possible the source language by direct literal translation of the same word from English to Chinese. However, as Fawcett (1997) points out, the use of formal correspondence might at times have serious implications in the TL since the translation will not be easily understood by the target recipients. Nida and Taber also assert that "typically, formal correspondence distorts the grammatical and stylistic patterns of the receptor language, and hence distorts the message, so as to cause the receptor to misunderstand or to labor unduly hard" (Nida and Taber, 1982: 201). Thus, in version one, humorous effects vanish away and the communicative purpose has not been successfully fulfilled, not to mention to achieve the functional equivalence. The translation is obviously ambiguous or awkward, leaving the recipients uninformed and confounded, completely at sea.

However, for functional equivalence, it follows the principle that the relationship between the recipients of SL and TL should be the same. So far as humor is concerned, recipients of SL and TL should response similarly, that is to say, the effects and functions of SL and TL should be the same. Concerning example one, with the rhetorical device of word play of splitting word, its humorous effect arouses in the recipients' comprehension of such linguistic deviation, thus the skopos of Chinese version should be reproduced accordingly. Therefore, in version two, a grasp of ad rem of such jeu de mots as splitting "broad" into the word "road" and letter "b", by such inference, the translator rewrites in the TL in line with such spirit in the similar way by disparting the Chinese compound character of "　"(as correspondence with the meaning of

'broad' in English) into " " and " ". Displaying a gleam of Wisdom, version two though seemingly is not faithful to the SL, well addresses to its target reader the pith of the SL, meanwhile retains the entertaining effect and interprets the mental mechanism of such a humor, sequentially achieves the functional equivalence as the result of attaching great importance to the similar humorous effects.

Moreover, functional equivalence attempts to rewrite words from one language to another, and caters to the recipient's linguistic competence and cultural needs. Therefore, the adoption of function-equivalent translation strategy more specifically and culturally would sometimes make the TL texts readable on levels at which they were not intended initially. Thus, in this specific example, as the above discussion of distinction between English and Chinese collective thinking patterns shows that Chinese people tend to have a more imaginative and associative thinking pattern, thus in the given situation of Chinese context, the mention of the word of road or " " would lead to its specific cultural and ideological notions. Traditional Chinese philosophy thinks that heaven and man are united into one. Human life being in a highly harmony with the nature renders the nature and the man is in fact an entirety. This logic and ideology has long influenced Chinese people and formed their manner of thought as a whole. Consequently, the belief and necessity to establish a broad interpersonal relationship schema to ease life and expand the channels have been firmly held among Chinese people. Thus, anticipation is inspired to reproduce such humor in this unique cultural setting. In this case, " "not only refers to the concrete object of door or gate, but also has a more specific cultural association and concerning its connotative meaning; so in Chinese, we do have the phrase   , or   to use kind of interpersonal relationship network for a broad channel of doing things . Concerning the three technical procedures of translation proposed by Nida 1964: 241-245 : (1) analysis of the source and target languages; (2) a through study of the source language text before making attempts to translate it; (3) making judgments of the semantic and syntactic approximations, translation version two and three could be said to be successful since they follow the procedures and give the semantic approximations respectively. Moreover, the more elaborate adaptive strategy it adopts in version three, not only makes a delicate touch of humor appear vividly, but also renders the transmitted linguistic and cultural contents of the original more accessible to the target recipients by giving rise to new meanings. And with the theory of functional equivalence, "the form of the original text is changed; but as long as the change follows the rules of back transformation in the source language, of contextual consistency in the transfer, and of transformation in the receptor language, the message is preserved and the translation is faithful"(Nida and Taber, 1982:200). To this extent, we can safely conclude that version three is more purposive and culturally specific. It caters to Chinese recipients' special cultural needs,

therefore, make the TL more readable on levels at which they were not intended initially.

It is true that in the translation of linguistic humor, such cases do exist where adaptation is not necessarily a universal remedy for all the trans-lingual translation puzzledoms. That's to say if linguistic humor cannot be fully adapted, can it be satisfactorily translated? Consequently, the question whether we can get the gist of a humorous text across emerges. Confronted with such a challenge to retain the same level of impact and appeal in the target language, the translator may have to resort to some more adaptable strategies. Vermeer as quoted above has maintained that "to expand the possibilities of translation and increase the range of possible translation strategies" (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997: 156). For the Skopos Theory, a text is an offer of information from its producer to the recipient. Translation is then the secondary offering of information originally offered in another language within another culture. The choice of the information in the source text, and the specification of the skopos of translation are not made at will. They are not decided exclusively by the source text, but also by the target recipient's needs and anticipation. The translator, consequently, should take care of communicative needs of the SL and the TL, as well as the recipient's linguistic competence and cultural background. Therefore, in the situation where the content of the message exceeds the humorous impact in terms of importance, it is preferable to preserve the former as prior and treat the latter as secondary to satisfy the primary need of meaning transference and communication across cultures. TAN Zai-xi as a Chinese translation scholar, who follows Nida's functional equivalence theory, suggests (1999) that since translation is the reproduction of the source language message to obtain the closest natural equivalent in the recipient's language, translators are therefore confronted, all the way through translating, with the conflicts of form and content, meaning and style, equivalence and identity, and so on. However, in translation the content of the message of the source language is above all important. Hence, the transference should give priority to the transference of message. The version will probably decrease or even clear away the original humorous flavor but will serve the purpose of cross-cultural communication. However, in order to transmit the message of the source text, to achieve a most equivalence to the SL and to meet the purpose to arouse laughter at full steam, compensational strategy of annotation is often used. Check the following example and its translation first.

Example 2

Hopeless widower: "Nothing can mend a broken heart."

Hopeful widow: "Except re-pairing."

Chinese version:

"   "

"   "

("Repairing"   repair   mend
   re   pair   )   2006 131

Still a word play, "repair" in English could be understood as a synonymy of mend. At the same time, the word itself could be separated morphologically into the prefix "re-" which means once again and the verb "pair" means to make a match, therefore, "repair" in this sense means to make a good match again. Unfortunately, there is no semantic approximation of such word play in Chinese. In this instance, the entertaining function gives way to the communicative purpose of transferring TL message and to make clear how humorous effects arise in its linguistic aspect. Based on this, it is true that in cross-cultural communication of humor, the case does exist in which the same entertaining function of humor may not be fully achieved in the TL. However, Skopos Theory as a complementary method to make up for the missing effects is desired. In the practical translation of linguistic humor, when adaptation could not find a correspondence or approximation in the TL, annotation is expected to compensate for the missing information, to acquaint the recipients of TL with default background information and thus to enrich the target culture. Therefore, the above example as a case in point, well illustrates that in translating of humor featured by linguistic and artistic techniques, like pun or some other rhetorical devices, the TL as an endeavor strives to maintain the communicative purpose and humorous effects to its most degree, in case of not being satisfactory to both side, the translator should make a compromise by taking the communicative purpose as priority to that of humor, and retrieve the effects bereaved of in the TL by compensational strategy of annotation.

Language as the carrier of message is performed in order to serve a variety of functions over its "ideational" function (Halliday, 1978:222). In performing all its functions, language is determined situationally, i.e., the selection of linguistic elements to convey a particular meaning is determined by the elements of the situation in which these elements are used. So far as humor is concerned, the native speakers of any language are capable of maintaining the logical relationship that exists between a group of linguistic units in humor even without explicating this relationship. And languages may again exhibit many differences in the application of rhetorical devices to humor. The reason behind these differences is self-evident: it is associated with a specific people's conceptual experiences and ideologies, which could be roughly considered as background knowledge distinctive to the native speakers. To be more concretely speaking, linguistic humor often plays with the distinctive thinking patterns, set conventions, and accepted norms in a given culture to ridicule and deride certain type of people or to self-mockery. This could be detected by the following example:

Example 3

The professor rapped on his desk and shouted: "Gentlemen　order!"

The entire class yelled: "Beer!"　　　　　　，2001：45

Chinese version 1:

"　　　　　　　　　"

"　　　"

order　　　　　　"　"　　　"　"

Version 2:

"　　　　　　　　　　"

"　　"

As in the above example, still a pun, the word "order" could have double meanings of "be quiet please" and "to order something". Version one deems that there is no such semantic approximation in Chinese, therefore annotation is applied to drive home the rhetorical device used which arouses the humorous effects. However, compared with version two, in translation version one, without a fully judgment of the semantic and syntactic approximations between SL and TL, by annotation below, the entertaining function has not been brought into its full play, and much of the original humorous effects has been blanked. Moreover, even referring to the note below, target readers without the background knowledge may not understand why it is humorous at the first sight. A question would inevitably come into the mind of Chinese recipients who respect professors to a large degree that is how the students could understand a respected professor's interrogatory in this way? In the final analysis, the impediment is due to two sticking points: why the professor is made a laughingstock and how do they make fool of him? Humor, when translating from one language to another, depends on an accumulation of shared understandings about how people say things in a given culture. Much of English humor is based on antiauthoritarianism, especially that of British and American. While for the Chinese people, who emphasize much on the ethics of respecting the old, the senior, the superior, and the learnt, such jeer towards a much respected professor is hard to understand. Thus, concerning the distinctive thinking pattern of antiauthoritarianism in English to give rise to humor, the successful translation should firstly represent such antiauthoritarianism to the Chinese recipients running short of such background information; Skopos Theory with adaptive strategy is therefore desirable. Meanwhile it should have the same effect on the TL and SL recipients and exert the same antiauthority and entertaining functions. Functional equivalence is satisfying to cater to this specific skopos of translation activity. The students in order to act against the professor on purpose, deliberately mistake "order" which means to be disciplined for "to order something to

drink". By this way, they make fun of their professor. After the careful analysis of the source language and a through study of the source language text, the semantic approximation is found. "To order something to drink" has its semantic corresponding of "   " in Chinese. Moreover, by the adaptive strategy of adapting "   " to "   ",a homophony of the former, much of the humorous effects have been reserved, the antiauthority and entertaining functions have been exerted fully, a representation of the naughty students is vividly portrayed and the image of a derided professor emerges lively in the minds of target recipients.

The example above well proves Toury's statement that "translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions" (Toury 1978:200). As it implies, the translator is constantly confronted with the question of how to represent specific and implicit cultural aspects of the ST by finding the most appropriate technique to render these aspects explicit in the TL. "These problems may vary in scope depending on the cultural and linguistic gap between the two (or more) languages concerned" (Nida, 1964:130). Thus, as delicate as that of linguistic humor, the translation of culturally specific humor as well requires the translator to apply strategies apropos.

4.3.2 Cultural Humor and Its Translation

First let's look at the following example.

Example 4

        "   "

"   "

"   "

1952   in Roy Ouyang, http:// www.geocities.com/writingmacaoissue1/Articles/ On_the _translatability _of_humour.htm

To discuss the cultural humor and its translation, it is necessary to drive home that what culture means in sense of cultural humor. Culture is a holistic and inclusive system, interweaving with the ideology and linguistic system of a whole nation, portrayed by Nida, "it is defined succinctly as the totality of beliefs and practices of a society"   Nida, 2001: 78   . It comes from the Latin word "colere", which means to build on, to cultivate, and to foster. It is a set of accepted behavior patterns, values, assumptions, and shared common experiences. From a broad sense, it defines social structure, decision-making practices, and communication styles. It could said to be a kind of communication for it is a way people create, send, process and interpret

information. Therefore, it dictates common and collective behavior, etiquette, and protocol of a whole society. However, from its narrow sense, culture is something we learn. It impacts everyone, and influences how we act and respond. More specifically concerned with translation, Newmark defines culture as "the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression" (Newmark, 1988:94), acknowledging that each language group has its own culturally specific features. Thus, each culture has its own style of humor; it often involves wordplay and very colloquial expressions, therefore to understand humor of a specific culture requires an in-depth acquaintance of its culture and exceptional knowledge of its language. Humor translation calls for such cross-cultural awareness not only culturally fluent in the target culture but also having a solid understanding of the source culture.

It is true that much of cultural humor draws from culture-bound elements that may not have the desired effect in the TL recipients. Those culture-bound or culturally-loaded elements for translation of humor may take in various factors ranging from morphology, syntax, to ideology and ways of life in a given culture. It is an urgent task for the translator to represent those culture-bound elements by deciding to what extent it is satisfying to translate them and how to transfer them into the TL. The skopos for translation of cultural humor is thus to have the same intended readership for both the SL and the TL. Defining culture-bound elements as those which "refer to concepts, institutions and personnel which are specific to the SL culture" (Harvey, 2000:2), Harvey considers Functional equivalence as one of the major techniques for translating those culture-bound texts. "It means using a referent in the TL culture whose function is similar to that of the source language (SL) referent" (Harvey, 2000:2-6). By "referent", it means different culture has its own different cultural referents to the notion discussed, or the same notion discussed could have different referents in specific cultures. Based on this, in cultural humor translation, in order to render clear the same notion of different cultures, adaptive translation strategy is promising for it gives a different referent in the TL yet denotes to the same notion in the SL.

If linguistic humor is the use of deviant formation phonetically, lexically, and grammatically, and the creative application of rhetorical devices to achieve special humorous effects, cultural humor could be the same. It is endowed with substantive and distinctive culture-bound elements, culture-linguistic and ethical features. Culturally-loaded linguistic expression with rhetorical devices is one of the most evident, as what has been shown in " ". " " is a cultural expression in Chinese, having the cultural implications of referring to the male basically, and further indication of being manly, vigorous, powerful and superior. Thus " " in Chinese could have the literal meaning of "to pass herself as a male" and the implying meaning of "to

flaunt one's power and superiority". It is a pun again, which combines "formal similarity" and "semantic dissimilarity"(Delabastita, 1993: 137-151), thus forms a good example of humor being culture-specific. "   "as a homographic pun unique in the Chinese culture, any literal translation of it is awkward and rusty. Since in the given example above, it means "to flaunt one's power" to the first man, but the second man deliberately misinterprets it as "to pass herself as a male". Laughter and humorous effects are produced in his purposeful mix-up to deride the woman. By any literal translation stating word by word the original notion of the SL in order to make the target recipients understand as much as possible the SL, much of the entertaining effect will be blanked. However, considering the same communicative purpose and function of intriguing laughter, the functional equivalence translation should be satisfying by adapting an English referent implicating the same double notions and functioning similarly to that of Chinese. However, the chance to find such a referent homographic pun in English is very rare.

For the Skopos Theory, translation is as well conceived primarily "as a process of intercultural communication, whose end product is a text which is capable of functioning appropriately in specific situations and context of use" (Schäffner, 1998a: 3). Cultural humor across nations is undoubtedly expected to exert the appropriated function of entertaining, educating and enlightenment. Thus the Skopos Theory to humor translation could also be considerable when it comes to cultural humor. However, according to the theorists of Skopos, "neither the selection made from the information offered in the source text, nor the specification of the skopos happens at random; rather, they are determined by the needs, expectations, etc. of the target text recipients" (Baker, 1998: 236). The translator, consequently, must interpret ST information "by selecting those features which most closely correspond to the requirements of the target situation" (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997: 156). Specifically, in order to keep in the TL the linguistic features of rhetorical devices from which humorous effect arises, the translation of wordplay from the SL to the TL, according to Leppihalme (1996b) has basically three options available: wordplay, some other rhetorical device or no wordplay, the last of which is the least desirable. After a careful analysis of the text in SL and specification of skopos of translation, the selected feature of SL is determined by the distinctive homographic pun meaning "to flaunt one's superiority" and "to pass oneself as a male". Based on all the considerations above, with functional equivalence, the skopos of translating this cultural humor is to adapt the Chinese homographic pun to English. The English idiom "cock of the walk" as a referent in English carrying two meanings of "a person who dominates others" and "male of other kinds of birds or animals" well satisfies the requirements of target situation. Such coincidence of wordplay in English helps to reproduce the humorous effect, accordingly the skopos of achieving the same function between SL and TL is realized. A possible translation reads as follows:

Yang Liang saw a young woman come and stand by his side. She slowly lowered down the heavy basket on her shoulder to the ground, crying out loudly and hastily: "Uncle Guo, hurry up and take it!"

"Just a basket of fruit makes her stagger and shriek under the weight. And she thinks she's cock of the walk!"

"She, cock of the walk? Not a chance! She doesn't have a cock!"

They all started laughing again.

(RoyOuyang,http://www.geocities.com/writingmacaoissue1/Articles/On_the_translatability_of_humour.htm

However, in cross-cultural communication and translation, such chance is quite slim, and the choice between the options at hand is not simple. Quite the contrary, it includes both textual and extra-textual concerns. SL may contain, for example, literary background, stereotype, elements that are hard to reproduce, or even taboo, all that may have to confine the representation of them in the TL since culture defines what kind of wordplay is appropriate and such reproducing and recognizing require background knowledge.

Example 5

A dead leaf fell in Soapy's lap. That was Jack Frost's card (2001   55).

Chinese version one:

　　　　　　　　　　　　,　　　　　·　　　　　　　　　　(　　　　,1961: 31)

Version two:

　　　　　　　　　　,　　　　　　　·

　　　　　frost　　　　　　　　Jack Frost

In version one, there is no manifestation of the original humorous tinge of O. Henry, consequently, in his book, Mr. Wang Zhongnian annotates at the bottom to provide the Chinese readers with the background information that Jack Frost in English is a name referring to the "frost". After checking the annotation, target readers may catch on the meaning and rhetorical device used in the original text, but the continuous reading excitement has been interrupt since they have to make up for a meaning default in the comprehension. Considering this, and after a consideration of the functional equivalence and Skopos Theory, the final question lies on what is the selected feature of the target text, according to which a direct referent in Chinese may be found. By "Jack Frost", a pun as well as a proper name referring to the name of a person and the name of "frost" in English cultural background, the writing feature of this sentence by O. Henry is his personifying of frost. This could be deemed as the distinctive features of the source text.

Therefore, in version two, concerning there is no such referent pun of proper name in Chinese, it resorts to another rhetorical device of personification to meet the requirement in the target situation and to function similarly to liven up the "frost". Moreover, annotation is used to well address this culturally-loaded expression in English, consequently to compensate furthest the background knowledge and the humorous writing features of O. Henry. In addition, the selection of the Chinese verb "   "conveys the same meaning of indicating that winter is coming, thus echoes soundly with the SL punny expression of "Jack Frost".

Example five is again a convincing proof to the notion that background information, or shared knowledge, or encyclopedia knowledge in humor translation really counts for much, especially that of cultural humor. Culture therefore could be compared to an iceberg. The tip of the iceberg is easy to notice. This includes the visible aspects, apparent do's and don't, as well as intelligible taboos in other cultures. The remaining huge chunk of the iceberg hidden below the surface includes the invisible aspects of a culture such as the values, traditions, experiences and behaviors that define each culture. In this sense, to export the culturally loaded humor into different cultures without adequate preparation can be just as dangerous as a ship maneuvering icy waters without charts, hoping to be lucky enough to avoid hitting an iceberg. A much common but tricky venture English and Chinese humor translation may run into could be stereotype. *Webster's New World Dictionary* (Joyce, http://culturalsavvy.com/stereotyping.htm) defines stereotypes as: "... an unvarying form or pattern; a fixed or conventional notion or conception, as of a person, group, idea, etc., held by a number of people, and allowing for no individuality, critical judgment..." Stereotyping thus is a risky, offensive, and non-productive exercise on humor, and cultural humor is often seen built on a foundation of misinformation and bias, consequently a lack of knowledge of stereotype of the target culture in most cases would give rise to a great potential of failure in cross-cultural communication. The following example offers a vivid illustration.

Example 6

An airplane takes off from the airport. The captain is Jewish and the first officer is Chinese. It's the first time they've flown together and it's obvious from their silence that they don't get along.

After thirty minutes, the Jewish captain mutters, "I don't like Chinese."

The First Officer replies, "Ooooh, no rike Chinese? Why dat?"

"You bombed Pearl Harbor. That's why I don't like Chinese."

"Nooooo, noooo... Chinese not bomb Peahl Hahbah. Dat Japanese, not Chinese."

"Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese...it doesn't matter, they're all alike."

Another thirty minutes of silence. Finally the First Officer says, "No rike Jews."

"Why not? Why don't you like Jews?"

"Jews sink Titanic."

"No, no. The Jews didn't sink the Titanic. It was an iceberg."

"Iceberg, Goldberg, Rosenberg, no mattah...all same."

(Joyce, Millet. http://culturalsavvy.com/stereotyping_examples.htm)

The above example may not happen in the real life; however, it is a token of western people's stereotyped attitude towards Chinese and Asian people. Such bias is for sure offensive for the Chinese officer. In his back talk, he deliberately mixes iceberg up with the Jewish names ended with "berg" by misinterpreting it as a name for Jewish people, since "berg" in English refers to a large mass of ice floating at sea, usually broken off of a polar glacier, meanwhile "…berg" is also a very common name among Jewish. Such rhetorical device of pun of paronymy, may well be perceived by the western people who are acquainted with the stereotype towards Jewish people and related cultural background information. Jewish people historically do not have a family name until 18th century. In order to strengthen its rule on Jewish people, the Austria-Hungary under Hapsburg domination pushed them to apply a fix family name by compelling force. Jews had to buy names from the authority, and those who were unable to purchase a beautiful sounding name, the authorities gave an ugly name. Thus omnifarious scrannel and harsh names were given to some Jewish people, like "Galgenstrick" which means "gallows rope" or "Eselkopf" which means "donkey's head". Names among Jews have been vastly exaggerated. They occur more frequently in jokes and sarcastic humor towards Jews. By "…berg", as a case in point, the Chinese officer retorts blow for blow. However, Chinese recipients who are lack of such encyclopedia cultural background information would feel at a loss. Thus the question lying in front of the translator is how to drive home the stereotype towards Jews. To be more concrete, and according to the Skopos Theory, the purpose to achieve in the translation is to reproduce "Iceberg, Goldberg, Rosenberg" in Chinese with the same effect and the same sarcastic function, meanwhile to acquaint the Chinese recipients with such encyclopedia cultural background knowledge of stereotype, and finally to enrich the target culture. Pondering over above considerations, a possible translation version is offered below:

Chinese version:

30   "   "

       "   "

"   ,   "

"   "

"   "

                                    "   "

        "   "

        "   "

        "   "

        "   "

                              "   …berg"   "   ……   "

For Hans Vermeer, culture is "the total of conventions to be observed in a society" (Vermeer, 1992: 9). He advocates that when translating culture-specific text-types, the translator should "introduce into a society and its literary tradition, new aspects either of form or of content or of meaning and thereby new aspects of the world, thus enriching the target culture" (1992: 13). Accordingly, in above translation version the translational strategy of annotation is adopted to compensate for the lost background knowledge of stereotype towards Jews in English, thus to enrich the target Chinese culture. Moreover, in the translation version a compensational but associated notion of "   " is adopted, for it not only has a similar pronunciation with "   "   referring to the Jewish family names ended with "…berg" in this specific example , as an adaptive strategy it also helps to drive home the point of the deriding first Chinese officer and render the innuendo into its full effects.

To this extent, this culturally-specific humor is said to successfully rewrite in the target language of Chinese. By adaptation and compensational strategy of annotation, target recipients could be said to get some aspects of background information of the source culture, but far from enough. The translator venturing across the sea of English and Chinese culture, though this time has fortunately detected the iceberg and made the tip of iceberg visible to the target recipients. By steering away the iceberg, the translator has left the huge chunk of the iceberg hidden below the surface untouched. The frequent coming up question of shared background knowledge is still at large and disturbing. For the theorists of skopos theory, the source text is an offer of information, which should be selected cautiously according to a series of requirements of the target situation. In other words, target situation counts much for the skopos in the process of translation. That's to say, for the translator, what he or she should also keep in mind is that a translation is largely constrained by target text recipients and their situations or cultural backgrounds. However, what is sure is that the much more frequent communication cross

English and Chinese people would provide extensive background knowledge to expand and ease the way of translation.

With the verbal humor whatever linguistically or culturally, the purpose is always the same: to elicit laughter. Balancing between SL linguistic and cultural restrictions and TL demands, the translator is engaged in what could be compared to an exercise of tightrope walking, in which the immediacy of effect can easily be lost. Translation of humor therefore has witness its hard sledding task in that a translator may have less latitude with a humorous text; in the way the translation struggles to be able to function maximally similarly for the TL recipients as the original text did for the SL recipient, even if this were achieved by substantially adapting it. But a consideration of functional equivalence and Skopos Theory, handicap to translation of humor becomes less disconcerting. For humor, emphases are always laid on the entertaining functions it has and the responses of its recipient gives. Functional equivalence and Skopos Theory qualifying with a specific perspective concerning the nature, function and effects of humor, are therefore desirable. Guided by them, in practical translation, adaptation strategy of seeking a semantic approximation and cultural referent is adopted in order to render the TL to exert the same function as that of SL. Compensational strategy of annotation as well works in that it compensates the missing background knowledge to comprehend. Therefore it acquaints the target recipients with the background information, meets the requirements of target situation and enriches the target culture. On all accounts, humor for sure is closely bound to the overall elements of human being that make the translation work complicated, however, there do exist one kind that is less challengeable——universal humor.

4.3.3 Universal Humor and Its Translation
4.3.3.1 Universal Humor and Its Translation

In the above analysis, as a basic exploration to the nature of humor, comparison between English and Chinese humor is studied, in which the universal resemblance of cognition mechanism of all peoples is found, namely in the audience's effort of seeking balance between the hearer's expectation and the speaker's real intention, oddities and discrepancies are usually settled by misunderstanding, humorous effects arise thereafter in his ravel-out of such oddities and discrepancies. From this perspective, humor as a study subject basically has much to do with the cognition and language. The following example may help to illustrate the point.

Example 7

Call Me a Taxi

"Call me a taxi," said the fat man haughtily

32

"Okay," said the gatekeeper, "You're a taxi but you look more like a truck to me."

, 2001: 45

"Call me a taxi" having different context meanings for the fat man and the gatekeeper, for the former it is his giving out of an order to the gatekeeper to get him a taxi, while for latter, he deliberately takes it as the fat man's demand to greet him with the appellation of "taxi". Subsequently Different cognitive contexts would result in different implications of the utterances. The fat man, together with the audience spontaneously anticipates that the gatekeeper would most possibly response that he would agree to get him a taxi or he just refuses the arrogant fat man. To be more exactly, the most possible reply to the fat man would be "Yes, sir, my pleasure", since from his perspective this is the most relevant answer using his existing contextual assumption with the smallest processing effort. However, the actual response of the gatekeeper is totally contradictory to the expectation or the pre-assumed answer, hence surprises the fat man as well as the audience. Humorous effect arises along with a sudden awareness misled by the gatekeeper; audience has accordingly interpreted it along the wrong line. However, basically speaking, what leads to the wrong assumption of the audience is their intrinsic preoccupied cognition towards the gatekeeper's real intention, rendering them apt to expect the gatekeeper to give a response most related to their expectation. This common and universal cognitive mechanism towards humor being almost the same of all cultures, that's what we named as universal humor, in which cultural and linguistic factors can be comprehended and dissolved by the universal cognitive mechanism of humor and recede into the background..

For Skopos Theory, translation is a purposeful activity. Its skopos is of prime importance to guide the whole translating process by affecting the translator's overall decisions making of translation methods and strategies, analysis of source and target situations and so on. Therefore, guided by this theory, the translation of universal humor, which not necessarily involves the transference of certain distinct linguistic and cultural features, for such features contained can be received and understood directly by the TL audience with the similar cognitive mechanism, its skopos is to represent the SL text to its full scale or as Nida puts to achieve the closest natural equivalence. "If a more or less literal correspondence is functionally equivalent in both designative and associative meaning, then obviously no adjustments in form are necessary. But if this is not the case, the translators should make some adjustments in order to achieve the closest natural equivalence" Nida, 1964: 166 . A literal translation in this sense would be direct and sufficient to realize the purpose and to get the closest natural equivalence. Moreover, as what has been mentioned before, situation counts for much for universal humor; radiance of humorous effects flashes into it as soon as putting it into certain conditions, hence a literal translation

would be more vivid to directly convey the panorama of the SL situation. Subsequently, the closest natural equivalence between the SL situation and that of TL could be achieved, through which the translatability of humor to its greatest extent in universal humor is proved. The above example as a case in point, by literal translation, the real intention of the gatekeeper to retort and deride the fat man could be realized. The TL will reproduce the same effects as that of SL, thus functions in the same way. A probable translation goes like this:

" "

" " " "

4.3.3.2 An Outspread of Universal Humor and Its Translation

The most distinctive characteristic of all humor is incongruity, or the contrast between the expected and the unexpected, the possible and the plausible, the impossible and the implausible. Such characteristic has been maximally and vastly developed in the internet, and recently it has also witnessed a momentum of increased usage in the mobile phone texts or the so-called short messages. It is a unique communicative model in the informationalized and digitalized society nowadays, by acting against people's usual way of thinking, or the logic. Most short messages are sent to ridicule the recipient for getting the fun. Just one example would reveal the power of such short messages to elicit laughter or other humorous effects alike.

Example 8

……

, 2007 56

A great part of the humorous short messages could be identified as a dramatic showing of universal humor. They are plays of words or plays of notions, which are easy to understand, and do not necessarily involve certain distinctive cultural or linguistic elements. As what has been analyzed above in the translation strategy for universal humor, guided by the Skopos Theory, the skopos of translation of humorous short messages is the same as that of universal humor to represent the SL text to its full scale and to achieve the closest natural equivalence. A literal translation is therefore anticipated. However, more attention should be attached to the situation for its humorous effects work mainly in the send-and –receive situation. In such situation and with a discontinuous text, the humorous short messages sent deliberately produce a kind of discontinuity in the recipient's reading and an interval of his understanding, disparity formed, but the excitement and curiosity of reading continues. Soon, the recipient would find the final

information is out of his expectation, humorous effects hence arise. The cognitive psychology is basically the same as all forms of humor. A possible translation of example 7 would be:

I am too tired to live through my life;

Sleepy to stand up;

Necessary to wait for a bus;

Afflicted to carry a torch;

Tasteless to eat;

Easy to drunk;

Exhausted to work;

Unable to plunder;

Obliged to ratepaying;

What's more?

…

Even charged to text an ass.

In the translation version, generally it follows the principle of literal translation, in which the rhetorical device of parataxis is used to arouse the recipient's interests of reading, and the suspension point is used to produce a reading interval to intrigue the recipient's curiosity and eagerness to continue to read the following content to find out the answer, but finally being derided as an ass. However, each word in a specific language brings to mind a certain concept or a set of concepts. A particular word tends to activate certain region of semantic network. However, such activation witnesses its varying semantic networks from regions to regions. Animals are widely used in almost all cultures; with their inborn and instinctive characters, they are used to refer to and describe certain kind of people with the characters alike, and such allusion is widely used in short messages. However, such allusive semantic referents of animals vary in different culture.

Skopos Theory once again provide a promising perspective in that it considers the translation as the secondary offering of source information, thus highlights an analysis of overall SL and TL situations, the target recipients, needs and anticipations, and their linguistic competence and cultural background; in that it lays a major focus on the function of translation for its target recipients which determines the methods and strategies for attaining the same function between SL and TL. Moreover, to achieve the same function, the functional equivalence theory is expected in that it seeks to make an adaptation of the function of the SL to suit the specific context of the TL. The target cultural situations in Chinese and English are different. In

Chinese, talking about a pig or a swine renders people to associate it with the character of being stupid and slow, while English does have the expression a stupid swine, however, a much more commonly used referent animal is the donkey or the ass. However, the entertaining and deriding function should be retained in the TL, considering this only adaptation would be satisfying to reproduce the same effect and function. Moreover, a careful analysis of target situation from its recipients' part, the latter semantic referent of "ass" is more preferable for it is a much more common expression among young people in daily language in English, and since such short messages are a kind of humorous and witty daily communication, whose users in most cases are young blood.

Therefore, it is much easier to comprehend and rewrite the following humorous short message:

Example 9

                     :

                        ,

            ,   ……

                   :

                                      ！（   2006 70）

Chinese version

Sth to tell u,

Some guy call u an ass behind ur back,

So rude and irritating,

That I criticized him seriously,

…

He shouldn't name a person only by his appearance!

Notice the abbreviation of "u" is used instead of "you" and "ur" is used rather than "your" in the translation version. Since short messages with its unique eidos, has become a new exhibition of popular communications and linguistic phenomena, symbols, alphabetic characters, abbreviations, numeral, and numeral words are widely used in the short messages. At this point, short messages are closely bond to culture, language, ideology, psychology; hence a simple identification of all as universal humor at this time may not be satisfying. However, considering the limited space, and their connection with the subject in discussion, this paper won't go deep. But what is confirm is that humorous short messages definitely offer a totally new perspective and more opportunities to study humor, extending it to a much broader scope, and meanwhile

confronting a great challenge for humor and its translation as well.

   All in all, all the above examples are accumulated and extracted from various channels and most of them are reproduced by the writer painstakingly, thus in her bold attempt to ravel out one of the most daunting problems in the cross cultural communication between English and Chinese, the translation methods may not be all securing and applicable to all instances. Therefore, the rewriting of these examples is open to discuss. After all, humor as the distinctive and vivid manifestation of language is unavoidably and closely bound up with language. And language as the effective agent to carry out thinking and communication of human being, it changes perforce with people, place, time and so on, hence inviting the guiding theories of language and its translation to have some kind of adaptation to such change thereby. Moreover, such theories are effective for their systematical description of language and reality rather than setting rules or prescription. Yet what is sure is that Functional Equivalence Theory and Skopos Theory discussed in the paper are prosperously satisfying in that they fundamentally call for changeability of translation methods for different context. Or in other words, translation guided by Functional Equivalence Theory and Skopos Theory changes invariably with time, place, people and so on, since Functional Equivalence highlights an adaptation of methods to achieve the same responses and Skopos Theory is as Christiane Nord concludes "the ends" to "justify the means" (Nord, 1997:29).

Chapter 5 Conclusion

Complex though its nature is, and a term of taxonomy free, humor in its many manifestations, appears to be one of the most defining aspects of humanity. Hence, repeated attempts have been made to define the essence of humor from various perspectives. Although humor has been approached from several angles, it has rarely been systematically studied as a specific translation problem. However, modern translation studies attaching great importance to the functional and cultural considerations has given a new perspective of the study of humor.

In humor, certain traits frequently come up, showing oddities and discrepancies. They are endowed in the humor but often ignored. With them artistic tinges are enhanced, humorous effects are stirred, challenges as well are raised to perceive and translate it. Culturally opaque elements and language-specific devices are often used to produce discrepancies, which make the translation work difficult. Scholars have long discussed the question of translatability. Some take an optimistic view; while others, pessimistic. However, the research on the current studies sufficiently proves that so far as Chinese and English verbal humor is concerned, the majority part is translatable. Yet it takes language proficiency, costs effort and invariably draws inspiration on the part of the translator. With accurate decoding and smooth transference of the original message while not reducing the information and lessening equally amusing effect on the TL recipients, the translation could be reckoned as a success and its purpose is accomplished.

The difficulties analyzed above have provided some indications of the factors that should be taken into account in translation of humor. Moreover, it also drops a hint that the question lies in how to achieve the same effects and function. Thus, it is important to determine the function of humor. The major functions of humor are often to amuse or simply to cause laughter. A higher function in interpersonal communicative level is to build consensus, dissolve awkward situation, or manage discourse. The latter function is often situation, culture and language dependent. According to this, and as the study shown above in the paper, we can conclude that if humor is separated into the linguistic, cultural and universal ones, it can be examined more constructively, and analyzed more efficiently. Potentially some appropriate translation solutions may be figured out. However, since situation culture and language elements usually co-exist in the humor, translators should strive to convey all of them, or take one or two as priority. The decision finally rests with obtaining the functional equivalence between the SL and the TL. The concept of functional equivalence to humor translation basically implies that the original function is transferred to or adapted to target cultures. Focusing on functional considerations and following the principle of equivalent effects, functional equivalence is there working as a guide theory.

In practical translation of humor, concerning different strategies, it is often their levels of

applicability that makes it a tangible problem for the translator. However, the purpose is assured to maintain the same function. Thus the problem may be resolved in one way or another or even combining different strategies together. The choice could also be manipulated in terms of Skopos Theory. Accordingly, when reproducing a cultural specific SL text requisite to introduce a notion without direct corresponding one in the TL culture, generally the translator has to resort to adaptation with a cultural referent in the TL. To this extent, humor could be reckoned as secret agreements or shared information between the speaker and the audience in the source culture. Such secrets could also be linguistically. Adaptation as an alternative approach in dealing with those seemingly untranslatable cases of linguistic humor, prove its force in that with semantic approximation, it transmits the message of SL along the similar meaning, compensates for the features lost and exerts the same function. For the universal humor, since the fundamental cognitive mechanism of humor is almost the same between Chinese and western people, it is easy for both of them to get through a kind of humor that makes use of the situation. Hence a literal translation is satisfied to render the most natural equivalence between SL and TL and with which the skopos of gaining the same function is easily fulfilled. An important feature of humor is the unexpected comes out the expected. Such feature makes people laugh and helps them unwind. That is especially distinct in the short messages. As a vivid manifestation and outspread of humor, it deserves a deep and full research later.

It should also be noted that the paper aims to draw attention to the fact that humor translation is a complex phenomenon that requires transfer the SL in the way keeping with the translation Skopos and the overall purpose of achieving the equivalent function. There are no ready-made and all securing solutions; what's more, there is also no guarantee of transferring all the features of humor from SL to TL. After all, humor is a subversive play with conventions and established ideas, breaking the rules, and going against what ought to be and the desired of a culture. Thus, it can only be understood by those who share the culture and it can hardly be caught on by those who don't. Annotation is deemed as the last resort, though some of humorous tint has been diminished. But it is desirable for those who have no shared knowledge or background information. Moreover, it is also a strategy justified by Skopos Theory and a way for Vermeer (1992, 13) "to enrich target cultures".

On all accounts, guided by Functional Equivalence and Skopos Theory, the writer strives to rewrite most of the examples in the paper. Her reproduction is open to discuss for humor is unique also in the way it encompasses cultural and linguistic features, which are at the same time obstacles for a translator to conquer. However, what is sure is that through skopos theory and functional equivalence, as well as with the frequent communication across cultures and the deep and strengthened exploration to language and cultures of all kinds, translation of humor could be

expected to have prosperity of a hundred flowers' blossom and a hundred of schools of thought contend, and to weed through the old and bring forth the new.

Bibliography

[1]   Attardo, S. & Raskin, V. Script Theory revised: Joke Similarity and Joke Representation Model [J]. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 1991, 4(3-4): 293-347.

[2]   Attardo, S. *Linguistic Theories of Humor* [M]. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994.

[3]   Attardo, S. Translation and Humor: an Approach Based on the General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH). *The Translator,* 2002, 8(2): 174-175.

[4]   Baker, M. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* [M]. London and NY: Routledge, 1998.

[5]   Baldick, C. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms* [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2000.

[6]   Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. *Translation, History and Culture* [M]. London: Pinter, 1990.

[7]   Burchfield R.W. (ed.), *The Oxford English Dictionary (2nd edition)* [M]. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

[8]   Catford, J. C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: an Essay in Applied Linguistics* [M]. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

[9]   Delabastita, D. *There's a Double Tongue: An Investigation into the Translation of Shakespeare's Wordplay, with Special Reference to Hamlet* [M], Amsterdam and Atlanda: Rodopi, 1993.

[10] Delabastita, D. *Wordplay and Translation* [M], Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1996.

[11] Fawcett, P. *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained* [M], Manchester: St Jerome Publishing, 1997.

[12] Gentzler , E. *Contemporary Translation Theories* [M]. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

[13] Goetz, P. *The New Encyclopedia Britannica* [M] Chicago Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc, 1768.

[14] Halliday, M. A. K. *Language as Social Semiotic* [M]. London: Edward Arnold, 1978.

[15] Harvey, M. *A beginner's course in legal translation: the case of culture-bound terms* EB/OL . : http://www.tradulex.org/Actes2000/harvey.pdf, 2007-10-9

[16] Hönig, H. G. Positions, *Power and Practice: Functionalist Approaches and Translation Quality Assessment* [A]. In C. Schäffner (ed.). *Translation and Quality* [C], Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1998.

[17] Joyce, Millet. *The Dangers of Stereotyping : A Risky, Offensive & Non-Productive Exercise* EB/OL . : http://culturalsavvy.com/stereotyping.htm, 2008-10-13

[18] Joyce, Millet. *The Dangers of Stereotyping : A Risky, Offensive & Non-Productive Exercise* EB/OL . : http://culturalsavvy.com/stereotyping_examples.htm, 2008-10-14

[19] Koller, W. *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft* [M]. Heidelberg and Wiesbaden: Quelle und Meyer, 1979.

[20] Larson, M. L. *Meaning-based Translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence* [M]. Landham (Maryland): University Press of America, 1984.

[21] Laurian, A. M. *Possible/Impossible Translation of Jokes* [J]. *Humor*, 1992, 5 (1-2):111-127.

[22] Leppihalme, R. *Translation and Cognition*[R]. Helsinki, 1996b-11-12.

[23] Morreall, J. *The Philosophy of Laughter and Humor* [M]. New York, SUNY, 1987.

[24] Nash, W, *The Language of Humor* [M], London/New York: Longman, 1985.

[25] Neubert, A., Gregory, M. S*., Translation as Text* [M]. Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1992.

[26] Newmark, P, *Approaches to Translation* [M], Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.

[27] Newmark, P. *A text Book of Translation* [M]. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.

[28] Newmark, P. *A Textbook of Translation* [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.

[29] Newmark, P. *About Translation*: *Multilingual Matter* [M]. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 1991.

[30] Newmark, P. *About Translation* [M]. In: Roy Ouyang, *On the Translatability of Linguistic Humor.* EB/OL .: Http: //www. geocities.com/ writingmacaoissue1/ Articles/ on the translatability of humour.htm, 2007-9-2.

[31] Nida, E. A. *Toward a Science of Translating* [M]. Leiden: EJ Brill, 1964.

[32] Nida, E. A., Taber, C.R., *The Theory and Practice of Translation* [M]. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1969.

[33] Nida, E. A., Taber. C.R., *The Theory and Practice of Translation* [M], Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1982.

[34] Nida, E.A. *Language and Culture Contexts in Translating* [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.

[35] Nord, C. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained* [M]. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.

[36] Patrick, O.N. *The Comedy of Entropy: the Contexts of Black Humor* [A], In *Black Humor: Critical Essays*[C]. NY: Garland, 1993.

[37] Popa, D. E. Jokes and Translation [J]. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 2005, 13(1): 48-57.

[38] Raphaelson, W., Debra, S., On the Feasibility and Strategies of Translating Humor [J],

Special Issue on Humor and Translation, 1989, 34(1):128-141.

[39] Roy Ouyang. *On the Translatability of Linguistic Humor* EB/OL . : Http: //www. geocities. com/ writingmacaoissue1/Articles/On the translatability of humour.htm, 2007-9-28.

[40] Schäffner, C. *Action (Theory of Translatorial Action)* [A]. In Baker, M. (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*[C]. London: Routledge, 1998a.

[41] Schäffner, C. *Skopos Theory* [A]. In Baker, M. (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*[C]. London: Routledge, 1998b.

[42] Shuttleworth, M., Cowie, M., *Dictionary of translation studies* [M]. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.

[43] Toury, G. *The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation* [A]. In Venuti, L. (ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader* [C]. London: Routledge, 1995.

[44] Vermeer, H. J. *Skopos and Commission in Translational Action* [A]. In Venuti, L. (ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader*[C]. London: Routledge, 2000.

[45] Vermeer, H. J. *Translation Today: Old and New Problems* [A]. In: Snell, H. M., Franz, P. & Klaus, K. (ed.). *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline* [C]. Philadelphia & New York: John Benjamins, 1992.

[46] Warren, Shibles. *Humor: Reference Guide:A Comprehensive Classification and Analysis* EB/OL . : Http: // facstaff. uww. Edu /shiblesw/ humorbook/h4.html, 2007-10-2.

[47] . [M].1952. In: Roy Ouyang, *On the Translatability of Linguistic Humor*. EB/OL .: Http: //www. geocities.com/ writingmacaoissue1/ Articles/ on the translatability of humour.htm, 2007-9-2.

[48] . [J]. , 2001(3): 44-45.

[49] , . [J]. 2003, 12(3): 73-76.

[50] [J] , 2001, 2(1) 52-55.

[51] . [A]. , . [C]. : , 1993.

[52] . [M]. : , 1998.

[53] , . . , 2004, 12 6 9-11.

[54] . [EB/OL].: 2007-10-21.

[55] . [J]. , 2007, 17(1) 56-59.

[56] . [M]. , 1999.

[57] . [J]. , 2006, 27 9 69-71.

[58]   ,   ·   [M].   , 1961.

[59]   .   [J].   , 2006, 23   3   131-132.

[60]   ,   ,   .   [M].   , 1989.

[61]   ,   .   [J].   , 2002, 9, 23
        5   : 21-26.

[62]   .   [J].   , 2007, 4, 28   4   104-107.

Publications during the Postgraduate Program

[1]   ,   .   [J].   2006.10:
61-65.