A Study on Humor Translation from the Perspective of Skopostheorie

Zhenyuan Chen

School of Foreign Languages, Yancheng Teachers University, Yancheng 224002, China.

Abstract

Humor has an irreplaceable function in relieving stress and tiredness, as well as enhancing interpersonal amicability. It also works as manifestation of national character and a unique reflection of social reality in a certain period of the time. With enhanced cross-cultural communication, studies on the humor translation is relatively lagged behind despite its universality. Through a review of previous studies on humor translation, the author finds that the dominating opinion over its research is the untranslatability of certain kind of linguistic humor. Guided by the Functionalist theories in general and Skopostheorie in particular, the author holds that humor translation is a purposeful activity and the translation strategies should be designed to fulfill the intended skopos of humor stated in the translation brief.

Keywords

Skopos; humor; translation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Translation used to be considered as a process which entails substituting the language of a text with another language. Though language plays a significant role in translation, many a translation theorists no longer regard translation merely as a code-switching process between two language systems. Translator, likewise is more than a passive reproducer of the source language information, but an active creator of the text. Under the influence of German functionalist theory, the focus of translation studies has shifted from code-switching to cultural substitution(Vermeer, 1994). Since translation on the basis of interlinguistic transition is far from enough, translator has to take into account not only the communicative function of the translated text, but also the social and cultural factors involved. Therefore translation is widely seen as a cross-cultural event(Snell-Hornby, 1988).

Nowadays, with enhanced cooperation among different countries, cross-cultural communication has become even more convenient with the help of translation and interpretation. As the world find more interest in China, especially Chinese culture, it is significant that we introduce our native culture to other countries in a proper way. Humor, in particular, deserves more attention as manifestation of national character and a unique reflection of social reality in a certain period of time.

There is no doubt that humor has an irreplaceable function in relieving stress and tiredness, as well as enhancing interpersonal amicability, which scholars and experts have expanded on from various perspectives, such as philosophy, psychology, sociology and literary criticism etc. The work of transferring it from one language to another with its effect intact has been proved particularly uneasy in practice. Therefore, mistranslation and inadequate ones seem almost inevitable, hence misleading profile about the national character of a country.

2. STUDIES ON HUMOR

2.1. Origin

The word "humor" is the Latin word for "liqud", "fluid", or "moisture", etymologically used in the field of psychology as one of four body fluids that determines a person's temperament and features. It was first translated by Lin Yutang as "youmo" in Chinese and gradually become widely acceptable.

2.2. Definition

According to Goldstein & McGhee(1983:xxi), there is still no agreement on how humor should be defined. Nor is there agreement on how appreciation or comprehension should be determined. Therefore to define humor is by no means easy. Sometimes it is even considered indefinable(Ziv, 1988:1).

In spite of that, many scholars have attempted to cast humor within a variety of roles. For instance, Aristotle defines humor in terms of incongruity; anything ludicrous contains some defect or ugliness, which is not painful or destructive. In its broader sense, humor is popular art form(written or oral) to express one's viewpoints and even perception of the real world. In Encyclopedia Britannica, humor is a "type of stimulation that tends to elicit the laughter reflex".

2.3. Nature

Though no accurate definition could be reached concerning humor, certain characteristics are noticeable. It generally covers four elements: a. laughter, the carrier of humor; b. unexpectedness, humor tends to be off the conventional track of thinking; c. pleasure, the most desirable one; d. playful spirit.

Besides, humor in nature usually bears on the law of contradiction, a contrast of being rational and irrational, good and bad, true and false etc., standards that the humorous expressions in Fortress Besieged just measure up to.

In addition, humor has both universal and culture-specific attributes. Universality of humor(Lin Yutang, 1998:79) takes on two interpretations: a sense of humor is owned by everyone; the techniques for humor creation are universal. The former may also mean that people from different nations have similar response to certain humors due to the commonness in psychology and cognition. "Culture-specific" signifies that humor has a "heavy-in-built" cultural stuff that is quite unique to that single community. Thanks to its universality, devices used for expressing humor either in Chinese or in English have a lot in common, such as metaphor, simile, hyperbole, pun, anticlimax, irony, parody, word-play, etc.

2.4. Classification

According to Henri Bergson(1913:103), humor is distinguished between the comic expressed by the language and the comic created by the language. In the former case, the humorous effect comes from the content or what is told rather than from the wording or how it is told. The latter is just the opposite.

Debra S. Raphaelson-West(1989:134) made a distinction between three types of humor: linguistic humor, cultural humor and universal humor. Linguistic humor is the rhetoric device-dependent humor, whose funny effect derives directly from the language itself due to the clever use of rhetorical devices like pun, zeugma and on. So it is almost the same as the comic created by language. Cultural humor makes a pre-stored cultural qualification essential in the understanding process to make sure of the full understanding of humor's setting-up. Universal humor has nothing to do with culture-specific elements or wordplays, thus comprehensible to anyone. In this sense, both the cultural humor and the universal humor are the comic expressed by language.

2.5. Studies on Humor Translation

Humor has long been a topic for discussion by scholars and ordinary people alike. However, studies of humor and its translation have been going on rather slowly due to the complexity and difficulty of the very topic-humor and translation.

A brief review of the studies on humor translation often leads to one of the most popular opinion that translating humor from one language into another could be as desperate as translating poems due to varied linguistic factors as well as cultural backgrounds between the two languages involved.

The dominating debate over the research on humor translation is nevertheless, the untranslatability of certain kind of humor, whose literal meanings are often far from bringing the desired humorous effects, which mostly boil down to three aspects of the dilemma that the translator is constantly challenged with: linguistic, cultural as well as collocational.

On one hand, some scholars voice their disappointment over the attempt. French scholar Diot believes while the denotations can roughly be translated, the connotations can't since "they resist the process of exportation and perish in the shipping(Diot, 1989)."

Historically, language humor has been classified into two groups in terms of translatability. According to Cicero, they are verbal humour (facetiae dicto) (i.e. "involving the phonemic/graphemic representation of the humorous element") that is untranslatable, and referential humour (facetiae re) (Attardo, 1994:27) that is translatable, a distinction coinciding with that used by several modern scholars.

As is mentioned before, Henri Bergson made a distinction between the comic expressed by language and the comic created by language. He believed that "the former could, if necessary, be translated from one language into another, though at the cost of losing the greater portion of its significance when introduced into a fresh society different in manners, in literature, and above all, in association of ideas. But it is generally impossible to translate the latter(Bergson, 1928:103). Here, the comic created by language is almost the same to Debra S. Raphaelson-West's definition of linguistic humor.

The year 1989 saw a collection of papers focusing on this issue from 'Humor et Traduction(Humor and Translation)' META(Shen Guangqiu, 2003). In this collection Debra S. Raphaelson-West differed "three types of humorous writings: linguistic, cultural and universal with increasing translatability." It implies that linguistic humor is the hardest nut to crack. Like Diot, she sees humor translation as analogous to poetry translation in that the form of the language constitutes an integral part of the original appeal. In approching those three types of humorous writings, the translator can adopt corresponding strategies "ranging from direct translation to taking the idea and writing a target-culture from scratch(Raphaelson-West, 1989:134)." Anne-Marie Laurian considered "humor could even meet block in the way of comprehension even in monolingual practice, not to mention the risks to confront in expressing it between languages." D. F. Nilsen thought that "the coincidental similarities, resulted from the mutual impacts between languages in one family, particularly Germanic, served as bridges in translation where the target audience could feel the original charm of humor in the source text(ST), making the translation of humor among kinship languages largely possible(Shen Guangqiu, 2003)." Those above hints that translation between languages from different families could be very difficult or even impossible.

On the other hand, as translation theories advances, some scholars claim that humor is translatable on the grounds that translatability is a dynamic notion according to varied translation criteria. D. Nilsen holds that humor is totally translatable; moreover, the translation should be even better than the original(Nilsen, 1964).

Besides, great effort has been made in studying pun translation. Peter Newmark, for example, while considering pun translation as "of marginal importance", admits that it is "of irresistible interest(Newmark, 2001:217)." He finds that puns are most easily translated when they are base on Graeco-latinisms that have near-equivalents in the source and target languages. He also proposes the use of "compensation" by another pun on a word with a different but associated meaning if the pun is only meant to raise laughter.

Useful as the classifications of humor may seem, most probably it turns out to be following the standard of strict formal equivalence, a notion which is somewhat outdated. Modern translation studies therefore shift the attention to the consideration for functions and the equivalence of effect.

Neubert and Shreve believe "equivalence is not really a relationship between textual surfaces; it is a relationship of textual effect-of communicative value (Neubert & Shreve, 1992:144)." Laurian (1992) suggests that while verbal humour may not be translatable from the perspective of strict formal equivalence, it can be translated functionally, relying on the capacity of a translator. In addition, the functional approach could also be adopted in dealing with referential humour since much of referential humor draws from culture-bound elements that may not have the desired effect among the target language audience.

The trend toward cultural aspects in translation studies has shed light on humor translation as well, making the operation more complicated in that a translator not only has to judge whether the TL reader understands the humor in the given text but also to imagine whether the humor works as humor in the target culture. Translating humor, therefore becomes both a social and cultural phenomenon.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: FUNCTIONALISM

As translation theories advance, some scholars rethink humor rendering from a relatively new perspective-functionalism, which would be a challenge to the traditional translation theories. In their opinion, untranslatability is caused by its adherence to conventional view: translation is a process of linguistic transfer.

3.1. German Functionalism as a Whole

Functionalism is a broad term for various theories that approach translation by focusing on the functions of the translated texts, while Skopostheorie has played a major role in the development of it. Throughout the history of translation studies, the priority was usually placed on the source language. Ever since the 1950s and 1960s, western translation studies have been developing hand in hand with the advancement of language studies since linguistics was then perhaps the dominant humanistic discipline(Nord, 2001:6). Translation theorists tend to view translation from linguistic perspectives, for example, Eugene A. Nida put forward "dynamic equivalence" based on linguistics, information theory and semasiology; Peter Newmark tried to include translation into semantic studies.

Equivalence-based linguistics has played a dominant role in the circle of translation studies in Germany as represented by Wolfram Wilss and Werner Koller. This linguistic approach emphasizes the importance of source text by presenting the features of source text (ST) in the translated text. However, the adoption of different or even contradictory standards for the selection of transfer procedure by equivalence theorists makes the equivalence approach rather confusing.

At this point, Functionalism blazes its own path, explaining explicitly linguistics alone is not sufficient for solving the problem. Skopostheorie, in particular, marks a shift of attention from source language (SL) to target language (TL).

There are three sub-branches derived from functionalism respectively represented by three scholars, Katharian Reiss, Hans J. Vermeer, and Justa Holz-Manttari, who have some slightly different interpretations of functionalism as a whole. It is irrational to make a clear-cut division among them in practical situations because their ideas overlap a lot. Those three people have one point in common, that is, all of them have moved away more or less from the linguistically oriented translation theory, which was clearly stated in Vermeer's words "linguistics alone won't help us…so let's look somewhere else(Nord, 2001:10)."

What they agreed more is the claim that translation, as a complicated activity, calls for functional equivalence as a prime principle other than linguistic equivalence. Compared with the traditional views, functionalist approach insists that an ideal translation is to be measured by functional equivalence in the source text and in the target text. This is detectable first in Reiss's words that "functional perspective takes precedence over the normal standards of equivalence(Nord, 2001:9)." And Holz-Manttari treats translation in quite a broad sense, translation within her theoretical model (based on principles of action theory) does not only mean what it is in traditional sense but includes all forms of intercultural transfer even including those with no source text involved. "Message transmitter" is the term she prefers to use, which composes of textual material together with other media such as pictures, body movements and sounds(Nord, 2001:13).

3.2. The Definition of Skopostheorie

The concept of Skopostheorie was first introduced by Hans J. Vermeer in 1970s, who defines human action as intentional, purposeful behavior that takes place in a given situation; it is part of the situation at the same time as it modifies the situation (Nord, 2001:11).

Skopos, a Greek word, means "purpose". Skopostheorie is therefore called by Vermeer as a theory of purposeful action(Nord, 2001:12). From Vermeer's point of view, one of the most important factors determining the purpose of a translation is the addressee, who is the intended receiver or audience of the target text with their culture-specific world knowledge, their expectations and their communicative needs. Every translation is directed at an intended audience, since to translate means to "produce a text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addressee in a target circumstance(Nord, 2001:12)."

Vermeer's theory highlights the dominant status of the target language readership, while regarding the source only as "an offer of information(Nord, 2001:12)."

Christiane Nord further develops the theory by putting forward "Function plus Loyalty", in which "loyalty" is absent in the original Skopostheorie and is introduced to cope with culture-specific concepts of translation. The "Skopos rule" by Christiane Nord specifies that a translational action depends on its Skopos, and therefore "the end justifies the means(Nord, 2001:29)." Clearly, the "Skopos rule" is designed to deal with the chronic debates concerning translation methods, just like those of free translation vs. literal translation, dynamic equivalence vs. formal equivalence, and so on. Therefore whether a "free" or a "faithful" translation is desirable depends on the purpose for which the translation is needed. Thus the communicative goal of translation could be achieved.

Generally there are three kinds of purpose in the field of translation: the general purpose aimed at by the translator in the translation process (perhaps 'to earn a living'), the communicative purpose aimed at by target text in the target situation (perhaps 'to instruct the reader') and the purpose aimed at by a particular translation strategy or procedure (for example, 'to translate literally in order to show the structural particularities of the source language'). Nevertheless, the term Skopos usually refers to the purpose of the target text(Nord, 2001:27-28).

While talking about these concepts, Christian Nord has made a basic distinction between intention and function, which is proved to be very useful in translation studies. Intention is sender-oriented, which is defined from the viewpoint of the sender "who wants to achieve a certain purpose with the text". While function is receiver-oriented, which indicates that the receiver will use the text with a certain function based in his "expectation, needs, previous knowledge and situational conditions". As the receiver and the sender live in "different cultural and situational settings", the intention of the sender may not correspond with the function adopted by the receiver. Thus this distinction is extremely important and necessary for the translator.

As a general rule, Vermeer considers the above words to be equivalent, subsuming them under generic concept of Skopos. Therefore, the top-ranking rule for any translation is the "Skopos rule".

4. FUNCTIONALISM APPLIED IN HUMOR TRANSLATION

4.1. Limitations of Traditional linguistic Approach

Mary Snell-Hornby(1988) mentions in Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach that translation theories basically fall into two kinds, respectively the linguistic approach and the functionalist approach.

In Christiane Nord's opinion, the equivalent-based linguistic approach focuses on the ST without giving due attention to the internal relationship between factors outside the text, e.g. situation, and factors within the text, e.g. language. Besides, the equivalence approach overlooks the tremendous influence of culture over language, though language could be seen as an indispensable part of culture. Finally, the equivalence approach which based on the ideal of "universally applicable", fails to give thought to the difference between SL culture and TL culture, and therefore does not apply to humor translation.

Moreover, the linguistic approach often ignores the author's intention, target text type and reader type, while the functionalist approach requires the translator take into consideration those pragmatic factors as the target language reader, the intention of translated text.

4.2. Major Factors Affecting Humor Translation

Currently, translation studies pay more attention to the equivalence of function as well as effect. Language humor may be untranslatable, but if the translator's capability permits, s/he could follow a functionalist approach. Since many referential humor are dependent on cultural factors, the translator would risk failing to arouse the expected effects in target language readers. When cultural factors are involved, humor translation would complicate in that the translator has to decide whether the target language reader understand the humor, and it would produce the desired effect, such as amusement or laughter as well.

Apart from the cultural factors, humor translation also has its unique difficulties. The translator is challenged with the threat of failed reproduction. Jeroen Vandaele(2002:149-172) suggests four elements that may discourage translation researchers from a practice-oriented perspective.

First, humor as a meaning effect has an undeniable, exteriorized manifestation (laughter or smiling), whereas the "meaning" of other texts is sometimes "less compelling" in terms of perception.

Second, sophisticated research has confirmed the intuition that the comprehension of humor (and its appreciation) and humor production are two distinct skills. Individuals may be very sensitive to humor but unable to produce it successfully; translators may experience its compelling effect on themselves and others (laughter) but feel unable to reproduce it. Thus,

there are indeed good reasons to think of humor (re)production as talent-related, not learnable (hence not teachable) enough to be profitable, unlike, say, the skill of writing business letters, journalistic articles, academic papers, etc. (which also involve talent but are not evaluated in such drastically binary and overt terms as "fun or no fun").

Third, also related to a translator's sense of humor, the appreciation of humor varies individually, which means that a translator may recognize an instance as (supposedly) comic but not really find it funny, and therefore be confronted with the personal dilemma of "translating a bad joke" or going for a "real" funny effect.

Fourth, the rhetorical effect of humor on translators may be so overwhelming that it blurs the specifics of its creation; strong emotions may hinder analytic rationalization.

4.3. Humor Translation from the Functionalist View

Vermeer's theory and the traditional ones define translation differently, leading to their different views on translation equivalence (TE), a disputed, repeatedly discussed and unavoidable issue in both modern and traditional translation studies. Equivalence is not abandoned in the framework of Skopostheorie but redefined as equivalence of the same communicative function or functions as the ST. A piece of translation, under functionalist approach, is no longer measured by equivalence on linguistic level but the function that the target text has achieved, which accordingly is often accompanied by substantial alteration in translating.

Skopostheorie is accepted by some scholars as a theoretical guide in the translation of humorous discourse. Ouyang Lifeng(2002:49), for example, discusses humor translation in the framework of functionalism. In his view, humor usually contains little information because the main purpose of humor is to raise laugher among readers rather than supply new things. Therefore, what counts most in a translation is whether it has the same or similar effects among its readers as the ST does among its readers. So he believed adaptation (one of compensation) could be viewed as the guideline in dealing with linguistic humor translation.

4.3.1 Humorous Text Types

For convenience of analysis, the author makes a distinction between pure humorous texts and non-pure humorous texts. The former includes texts intended solely to amuse people, such as humorous short stories, jokes, crosstalk scripts and comedy scripts; the latter includes texts in other literary forms which have the amusing effect. The translation of those two types of humorous text will be discussed separately.

In Groundwork for a General Theory of Translation(1984) co-authored by Reiss and Vermeer, Reiss divides texts into three types based on the language functions explicated by German psychologist Karl Buhler: informative, expressive, and operative.

Pure humorous texts fall into the scope of the operative type. Its language is featured by dialogues and the focus of the text is to imbue readers, i.e. to fulfill the function of amusement. Therefore, the skopos of translation is to elicit the expected response of laughter. As for the translation of this type of texts, Reiss suggests the methods of editing translation and equivalent translation. It is safe to conclude that for pure humorous texts, the functions of translated texts(TT) and source texts(ST) are equivalent, and therefore Reiss's text typology can be used to direct humor translation. However, in most cases, the functions of TT and ST are not always the same, and can even be completely different. In dealing with those situations, Vermeer's Skopostheorie will be of guiding significance.

In an ideal situation, the initiator of the translation process would give as many details as possible about the purpose of the text, including the addressee, time, place, occasion and medium of the intended communication and the function that the text is intended to have, all of which would constitute an explicit translation brief. The brief will not only inform the translator

of the specific translation strategies, but can help the translator determine the skopos. The term brief implicitly compares the translator with a barrister who has received the basic information and instructions but is then free (as the responsible expert) to carry out those instructions as they see fit(Nord, 2001:30).

For non-pure humorous texts which mostly are in literary forms, however, the initiator and the receiver which determine the skopos would not be so much essential as the ST and ST producer, which arouses many doubts over the theory's applicability to literary translation, or even criticism that Functionalism does not respect the original.

To solve this problem, Christiane Nord puts forward Function plus Loyalty, in which loyalty denotes the interpersonal relationship between the translator, the ST producer, the receiver and the initiator. In a situation where the interests of the other three parties conflict with each other, the translator will be acting the loyalty rule in intervening and coordinating. Therefore, in translating non-pure humorous texts, the translator would alternate between proneness to the ST producer and catering to the needs of TT receiver. Such diverse choices constitute a dynamic process where translating is loyal to both the ST and TT.

In the general model, loyalty would be an empty slot that in a particular translation task, is fulfilled by the demands of the specific translation concepts of the cultures in question(Nord, 2001:125).

To understand the idea of translation concepts better, Peter Newmark's theory on semantic translation and communicative translation could be used for explanation. In his opinion, semantic translation is "where the translator attempts, within the bare syntactic and semantic constraints of the TL, to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the author"; while communicative translation, is "where the translator attempts to produce the same effect on the TL readers as was produced by the original on the SL readers(Newmark, 2004: 39)." As is indicated, semantic translation emphasizes the semantic content of the SL texts and communicative translation focuses on the comprehension and response of target language receiver.

In other words, "in communicative translation, the emphasis should be on conveying the message of the original in a form, which conforms to the linguistic, cultural and pragmatic conventions of TL. Both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership. Semantic translation consequently tends to strive to reproduce the form of the original as closely as TL norms will allow(Shuttleworth and Cowie, 2004: 22)." In this sense, communicative translation emphasizes the effect and flexibility of translation with TT reader at the centre.

In view of the stylistic feature of non-pure humorous texts, it seems that semantic translation would be more appropriate; however, when the art of humor is taken into account, the effect of translation would be essential in evaluating a piece of translation. Obviously, communicative translation would excel in fulfilling the need. Besides, sometimes, rigid compliance with the principles of semantic translation without appropriate adaptations according to the cultural standards of target language may even lead to deviation of the original function, hence an unfaithful translation.

To conclude, both semantic translation and communicative translation could shed some light on the translation of non-pure humorous texts. Generally, in translating non-pure humorous texts, semantic translation should be used to guide the overall methods of translation, while decisions on specific choices between semantic translation and communicative translation should be made according to specific situations.

According to De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), textuality consists of seven features, all of which must occur simultaneously to identify any oral or written extract as text. These seven criteria are: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability (by the targeted

audience/readership), informativity (including progressiveness and closure), situationality (pertinence) and intertextuality (formal or semantic connections with texts of the same type). Among them, cohesion and coherence are the most important for indicating the buildup of different parts into a meaningful whole. Yet the success of a text as a communicative event relies on its intentionality and acceptability. Therefore cohesion and coherence of the humorous text with the context should be the translator's first consideration. Then the translator could balance his/her intention with the reader's needs so as to decide if it is possible to preserve the humorous effect, and then choose between semantic translation and communicative translation.

4.3.2 Skopos of Humor Translation

The objective of humor translation should be creating a target text which is humorous in much the same degree as source text. Eugene Nida points out that the readers of a translated text should be able to understand and appreciate it in essentially the same manner as the original readers did(Nida, 2001:87).

In a situation where limited amount of information is concerned and the humorous text is basically intended to amuse, the importance of effect outweighs that of meaning and the translator is obliged to reproduce the appeal of ST to the maximum.

However, when it comes to translating humor in literature, the situation is quite different. Humor plays a significant role in literature as a vital vehicle for expressing one's viewpoint and speaking out the truth. Through exposing social reality and disorder, it emerges as an indispensable prerequisite for new changes.

Before translating humor, the translator must bear in mind what the purpose of this humor is. While eliciting laughter is undoubtedly a basic function, there are always other bigger purposes behind just making people laugh. Therefore, the translator must accurately understand the functions of the humor first.

According to Nord, it is not the source text or its effects on the recipients stipulated in the equivalence theory that determines the translation process, nor is the function that the author wants the text to achieve, but the requirements of the customers or initiators on the expected function or purposes of the texts. With the shift of attention from ST to TT, translator is entitled to offer what he finds important from the humorous source so as to meet the skopos of the target text. If the need of eliciting laughter is overshadowed by other more important purposes, the humorous element can be decreased by a certain degree or even removed out of necessity.

Within the functionalist framework, the yardstick to judge a successful humor translation is determined by the translation's accordance with the skopos and coherence in the target context instead of ST's equivalence to TT. With different purposes, ST and TT may diverge from each other quite considerably. In this way, translator will be granted with more flexibility in making tentative effort in overcoming the problem.

In a sense, functionalist theory provides translators with a new vision and frees them from being too restricted to the form of the original, giving them more freedom in transmitting humors from one language to another so that some humors can survive in a new culture. However if the humor appears in a literary text, functionalist translation may not be an ultimate way to solve the problems although it sounds workable theoretically. Anyway, it guides us to look at humor translation with a new perspective instead of treating it with traditional method.

5. CONCLUSION

It is a widely acknowledged opinion that linguistic humor is untranslatable. Despite the lengthy investigation into current progress as to the difficulty posed by linguistic and cultural barriers, it is fairly a challenge and almost an illusion to translate humor between English and Chinese with both the linguistic form and humorous effect intact.

To translate humor, one must fully understand its intended function in the target situation, accurately decode the humorous ingredients from ST and transmit them in a way that meets the requirements in the translation brief of humor translation.

REFERENCES

[1] Attardo, S. Linguistic Theories of Humor[M].Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994.

[2] Bergson, Henri. Laughter:An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic. trans. by Cloudesley Brereton and Fred Rothwell[M].New York: The MacMillan Company, 1913.

[3] Diot, R. Humor for intellectuals: Can it be exported and translated?[J].META Journds des Traducteurs, XXXIV, 1, 1989.

[4] Goldstein, J. H.&McGhee, P. E. Humor: Its Origin and Development[M].San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1983.

[5] Laurian, A. Possible/impossible translation of jokes[J].HUMOR, 1992, 5(1-2):111-127.

[6] Lin, Yutang. The Importance of Living[M].Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 1998.

[7] Neubert, A.&Shreve, G.Translation as Text[M].Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1992.

[8] Newmark, Peter. A Textbook of Translation[M]Shanghai:Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.

[9] Newmark, Peter. Approaches to Translation[M].Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2004.

[10] Nida, Eugene.A. Language and culture: Context in Translating[M].Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.

[11] Nilsen, Don LF. Better than the original: Humorous translation that succeed[M]. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1964.

[12] Nord, Christiane. Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained [M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.

[13] Raphaelson-West Debra S. On the Feasibility and Strategies of Translating Humor[A].META, Humor et Traduction[C].Montreal:les Presses de L' Universite de Montrea1,1989.

[14] Shen Guangqiu. On E-C Translation Strategy of Humorous Language[MA]Guangxi University, 2003.

[15] Shuttleworth & Cowie. Dictionary of Translation Studies[M].Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2004.

[16] Snell-Hornby, Mary. Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach[M].Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988.

[17] Vandaele, Jeroen. (Re-)Constructing Humour: Meanings and Means[J].The Translator. Volume 8, Number 2, 2002.

[18] Vermeer, Hans J.1994.Translation Today: Old and New Problems[A].Mary Snell-Hornby(eds). Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline[C]Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins True, Herb. Fummy Bone: American Humor Guild, 1981.

[19] Ziv, Avner. National Style of Humor[C]New York:Greenwood Press, 1988.