

TRANSLATING HUMOR: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THREE
TRANSLATIONS OF *THREE MEN IN A BOAT*

HARİKA KARAVİN

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2015

TRANSLATING HUMOR: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THREE
TRANSLATIONS OF *THREE MEN IN A BOAT*

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Translation Studies

by
Harika Karavin

Boğaziçi University

2015

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Harika Karavin, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date.....07.08.2015.....

ABSTRACT

Translating Humor: A Comparative Analysis of Three Translations of *Three Men in a Boat*

When academic studies on translating humor are examined in Turkey, there are not sufficient sources or data providing enough space for the discussion of the issue. It is also observed that most of the available studies focus on the linguistic and cultural problems observed in the transference of humorous elements in audio-visual texts and deal only with the translation of the specific humorous elements (e.g. wordplay) in terms of verbal humor. As a conclusion, it has been found out that there does not exist a comprehensive study in the target system that provides detailed information on the translation of verbal humor and the problems to be observed in the translation process. Since the translation strategies display differences in relation to the type of humorous device that texts include, studies focusing on the translation of different humorous devices are required. For this purpose, a descriptive comparison of the three translations of Jerome K. Jerome's famous novel *Three Men in a Boat* including different humorous devices has been carried out. In the comparisons, the target text's solutions to recreate the source text's humorous effect have been analyzed in a descriptive manner and an objective translation criticism has been presented. The textual analysis has benefited from the General Theory of Verbal Humor (GTVH) (Raskin and Attardo 1991) in defining similarities and differences in the translations.

ÖZET

Mizah Çevirisi: *Three Men in a Boat* Adlı Romanın Türkçe'ye Yapılan Üç Çevirisinin Karşılaştırmalı Çözümlemesi

Türkiye’de mizah çevirisi üzerine yapılmış akademik çalışmalar incelendiğinde, konuyla ilgili yeterli kaynak ve verinin olmadığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Yapılan çalışmaların çoğunlukla görsel-işitsel metinlerdeki mizah öğelerinin aktarımında gözlemlenen dilsel ve kültürel sorunlar üzerinde durduğu, sözlü mizah unsurlarının aktarımı ile ilgili ise belirli mizah unsurlarını (sözcük oyunları vb.) ele aldığı görülmektedir. Sonuç olarak, sözlü mizah unsurlarının çevirisi ve çeviri sürecinde karşılaşılan zorluklar, benimsenen çeviri stratejileri ile ilgili erek yazın dizgesinde kapsamlı çalışma bulunmadığı saptanmıştır. Yapılan çalışmalarda mizahi unsurlar içeren bir metnin çevirisinde uygulanacak çeviri stratejilerinin, metnin içerdiği mizah türlerine göre değişiklik göstereceği vurgulandığından, farklı mizah türlerinin çevirisi ile ilgili çalışmalara ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır. Bu amaçla, çalışmada Jerome K. Jerome’un farklı mizah türlerini içeren *Three Men in a Boat* adlı ünlü romanının Türkçe’deki üç çevirisinin betimsel karşılaştırması yapılmış ve nesnel bir çeviri eleştirisi sunulmuştur. Karşılaştırmalarda, erek metinlerin kaynak metindeki “mizahi etkiyi” yeniden yaratırken başvurdukları yöntemler betimsel olarak incelenmiştir. Metinsel incelemede Attardo ve Raskin tarafından geliştirilen GTVH (General Theory of Verbal Humor) teorisinde sunulan parametrelerden faydalanılarak, çevirilerdeki dilbilimsel benzerlik ve farklılıklar tanımlanmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Prof. Dr. Özlem Berk Albachten for her invaluable support and guidance. It is her critical evaluations and suggestions that have made this thesis present. Working on this study with her has been a great scholarly experience for me and I will always regard it as an honor to be her student.

I also wish to express my special thanks to Assoc. Prof. Betül Parlak, Assist. Prof. Arzu Akbatur, Assist. Prof. Martin Cyr Hicks, and Assist. Prof. Oğuz Baykara for kindly accepting to be the member of my thesis committee.

I also would like to extend my thanks to my dearest friends Buse Malkoç, Eda Abacı and İrem Keleşoğlu for always motivating and encouraging me to continue in my study. A special thanks to my colleague Utku Tönel for his patience and the very valuable contributions he has made to almost every page of the study. I would like to also thank my colleague Burak Yılmaz for supporting my academic studies.

The most special thanks to my parents and my brother Asaf Karavin, who have always been near me with their never-ending supports. Finally, I want to express my gratitude to my special friend İsmail Yüce for making me always feel good with his support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: GENERAL INFORMATION.....	14
2.1 Jerome K. Jerome's biography	14
2.2 Jeromian humor	18
2.3 <i>Three Men in a Boat</i>	20
2.4 Humorous devices in the novel.....	25
CHAPTER 3: TRANSLATING HUMOR IN <i>THREE MEN IN A BOAT</i>	29
3.1 Notion of humor	29
3.2 Humor theories	33
3.3 Humor and translation	44
CHAPTER 4: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATION OF HUMOROUS DEVICES IN THE NOVEL	53
4.1 General Theory of Verbal Humor (GVTH).....	53
4.2 Translation of irony	55
4.3 Translation of metaphor.....	87
4.4 Translation of wordplay	106
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	130
REFERENCES.....	138

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Depending on the specific cultural and linguistic context, humor has always been difficult to define because humor does not have a universal definition, which has, consequently, caused serious challenges for humor scholars. Starting from very early times, scholars have usually tried to find solutions both to define and understand the problem of humor using various theories, approaches and perspectives, but none of them have managed to produce a universal definition accounting for all aspects of the humor phenomenon. Since even defining the notion of humor has resulted in serious problems, humor's relationship with translation has proven to be even more problematic.

When the relevant literature on humor and translation is examined, it can be seen that the existing studies on theory and practice of humor translation have mostly focused on the “untranslatability” of humorous elements, especially making reference to some cultural and linguistic issues. For a long time, the explanations have been limited to some prescriptive and subjective statements, including “jokes are untranslatable”, “it's far from easy”, or “these things get lost in translation” etc. In addition, a number of cultural and linguistic analyses in Translation Studies have suggested, “humor translation is qualitatively different from other types of translations” (Vandaele, 2002, p. 150). Such perceptions on the nature of humor translation have put some pressure on translators, forcing them to accept the “untranslatability” of the humorous effect in another language. However, with the appearance of Descriptive Translation Studies, humor has started to be seen not as a “homogeneous category”, but an area to be studied in accordance with “its specific cognitive, emotional, social and interpersonal aspects” (Vandaele, 2002, p. 155).

Literature on humor and translation also reveals that insufficient attention has been given to produce academic studies problematizing the issue of humor translation. Some scholars of Translation Studies foreground the need for more theoretical and systematic research so that translators or scholars can have some relevant strategies to deal with both the analysis of humorous elements and their rendering into a foreign language. In this way, translators can become familiar with some of the most efficient solutions to the common problems encountered in the translation process of the humorous elements.

Having been inspired by the research gap in the academic studies, my study aims to provide a systematic analysis of both humorous devices and their translations. Unlike the prescriptive conclusions underlying the “untranslatability” of the humorous effect, my study will try to specify whether, to what extent, why and under which circumstances humorous effect cannot be transferred into a foreign language. In order to provide an objective answer to this research question, my study will apply the General Theory of Verbal Humor and its hierarchically ordered “knowledge resources” (Attardo and Raskin, p. 1991) to the analysis of humorous devices both in the source and target texts to identify and define the degree of similarity and difference between them. My thesis will also show whether or to what extent the case study will support the hypothesis of the mini-theory of joke translation developed by Salvatore Attardo. According to his mini-theory, “two jokes that differ in Language parameter are perceived to be very similar, whereas jokes that differ by Script Opposition are perceived as very different” (Attardo, 2002, p. 183). He wants to underline that “the degree of perceived difference is assumed to increase linearly, in other words, there is much less perceived difference between two jokes that differ in Narrative Strategy than there is between two jokes that differ in Script

Opposition” (Attardo, 2002, p. 183). Scripts are considered the most important element of the General Theory of Verbal humor in that it offers “a cognitive structure internalized by the speaker which provides the speaker with information on how the world is organized, including how one acts in it” (Attardo, 2002, p. 181). In other words, it is treated as a semantic unit that provides “pragmatic/contextual information” on an event, object or action (Attardo, 2002, p. 181). In order to achieve a humorous content, two fully or partially overlapping scripts that are in opposition to each other are required (Attardo and Raskin, 1991, p. 308). As Attardo claims, “when two jokes differ by Script Opposition they are perceived as most different” (Attardo, 2002, p. 188). Therefore, it is possible to conclude that translators should avoid changing the Script Opposition in order to create the same or a similar humorous effect in the target language.

Depending on this theoretical framework, the main hypothesis of the study has been developed as follows: Translators who recreate the script opposition of source text in the target language are more able to create the same or similar humorous effect in the target text even though they use different strategies. On the other hand, translators are not able to render the humorous effect if they do not reflect the same or a similar script opposition in their translations. However, it should be kept in mind that it is also possible for the translators to use a different script opposition in their target texts. Under such circumstances, the target humorous element will be evaluated as a different version from that given in the source text. In line with this hypothesis, the strength and validity of the parameters of the General Theory of Verbal Humor in terms of analyzing the transference of humorous elements into another language will be problematized. In accordance with the assumptions of this theory, it will be questioned whether the script oppositions have

the most important role in rendering the humorous effect in rendering the different humorous devices.

In addition to this main objective, this study will also attempt to provide an account of the translation of different humorous devices and question whether this theory can be applied to all kinds of humorous texts. With the foresight that different humorous devices will require different methods for evaluation and translation, they will be divided into more specific types with their own idiosyncratic features. For this purpose, the study will deal with the linguistic analyses of the humorous devices based on irony, wordplay and metaphor. Each independent section will question whether the existing theories and the proposed translation strategies suffice to describe the humor transference process between different languages and cultures, leading to contemplate on developing a new model applicable to all kinds of humorous texts. In these parts, translation strategies' impact on contributing to recreating the humorous effect in the source text will be evaluated.

After determining the research questions, the corpus has been chosen in accordance with the judgmental or purposive sampling technique, trying to focus on a specific one that will provide the best examples for the main objectives. For this purpose, Jerome K. Jerome's world famous novel, *Three Men in a Boat*, has been chosen for this thesis. Written in 1889, this novel is rich in different types of humor including irony, wordplay and metaphor-based humor. Both the popularity of the novel throughout the world and its rich content has turned it into a fruitful primary source text. The novel could, furthermore, be an interesting example to test the assumptions of the "Retranslation Hypothesis" since there are five Turkish translations in the Turkish literary system. The Turkish translations of the novel are as the following:

- Nesin, Aziz. (1957). *Teknede üç kişi*. Düşün Yayınevi: İstanbul.
- Çorakçı, Belkıs. (1984). *Teknede üç kişi*. Bilgi Yayınevi: İstanbul.
- Tahiroğlu, Tarık. (2001). *Bir botta üç adam*. Duman Ofset: Ankara.
- (Anonymous). (2003). *Kayıhta üç adam*. Bilge Kültür Sanat: İstanbul.
- Çetin, Ayşegül. (2004). *Teknede üç adam*. Bordo Siyah Klasik Yayınları: İstanbul.

Because of limited time frame, not all of the translations have been given space in this thesis. The motive behind the selection criteria has been mostly related to the time periods in which they were translated. In addition to the time factor, one of the translator's identity had a significant impact upon the selection of the first translation. As a result, the first three versions were chosen to be analyzed for this study. The first translation was published by the publishing house Düşün Yayınevi in 1957. As written on the cover of the novel, it was presented as a translation carried out by Aziz Nesin, one of the most well known humourists of Turkish literature. The publishing house was also founded in the same year as the publication date of the translation. Its founders were Aziz Nesin and Kemal Tahir who were motivated to publish their books in this publishing house¹. Even though the translator was designated as Aziz Nesin on the title page, I have learned from his son, Ali Nesin, that he did not have any link with the translation of this book. As Ali Nesin mentioned, his father's English was not so good at that time. It is obvious that the publishing house must have followed such a policy in order to increase the sales of their newly-founded establishment. Therefore, it should be kept in mind that even though this thesis discusses the examples from the target texts through maintaining Aziz Nesin's name, his son said that it was not translated by his father, claiming that

¹ All the information regarding Düşün Yayınevi was obtained from Ahmet Nesin's blog, available: < <http://ahmetTT1.com/2013/01/04/dusun-yayineviyle-yeniden/>

there exists no such document or information in the archives of Aziz Nesin. The second translation was done by Belkıs Çorakçı in 1984. Çorakçı is both a translator and interpreter, who translated more than many books. She has also been working as a simultaneous interpreter since 1968. Among the books she translated, we can mention such titles as *Çölde Çay* (*The Sheltering Sky*, Paul Bowles), *Kısa Süren Saltanat* (*The Short Reign of Pippin IV: A Fabrication*, John Steinbeck) etc. The other translation is by Ayşegül Çetin, who has been working both as a translator and editor since 1996. The authors from whom she has done translations include Jack London, John Steinbeck, John Freely and Erich Segal. Her latest translation *Yukarı Mahalle* (*Tortilla Flat*) by John Steinbeck was published by Remzi Publishing House in 2014. Throughout the study, all of the translations of Nesin will be referred as TT1 (Target Text 1), while Çorakçı and Çetin's versions will be referred as TT2 (Target Text 2) and TT3 (Target Text 3) respectively.

Following the selection of translations to be examined in detail, a case study will be carried out. The reason why this case study has been preferred as a study design is that it enables to explore and understand a specific issue in its totality, collecting information from various resources. As some of the scholars in Descriptive Translation Studies have emphasized, such kinds of studies can help us to contribute to the development of translation theories regarding the rendering of humor in another language. With this study design, a holistic and in-depth exploration regarding what kinds of tendencies translators have in translating culture and language specific humorous devices into English will be provided. Throughout the analyses, the lexical choices, grammatical constructions and the contexts created by the translators will be examined as they have an impact on the overall rhetoric of the translated texts. Studying different or similar strategies adopted by translators can

enable us to speculate about other aspects such as translator's competence to interpret the humorous content, which elements they have found translatable or untranslatable, and how their translated versions conform to the target culture conventions and target reader expectations.

Finally, the study will be divided into the following chapters: Chapter 1 will touch upon the general framework of the thesis as well as the literature review. Chapter 2 will provide general information about the author, the idiosyncratic features of his humor as well as a summary of the novel. Chapter 3 will touch upon the problems regarding the conceptual definition of the "notion of humor" and its translation, providing operational definitions to be used throughout the thesis. In this chapter, what is meant by "humor" and "translation of humor" will be specified. This chapter will also discuss the importance of humor theories in analyzing both the humorous devices and their translated versions. In Chapter 4, humorous devices of the novel will be identified and a linguistic analysis of their translation will be carried out. Finally, in the conclusion part, the results of the case study will be presented and discussed in line with the theoretical framework.

Before presenting a case study on the comparison of the translation of humorous devices in the novel, a brief summary will be provided related to the field of humor translation both in Turkey and other countries so as to present the current condition of the relevant academic research. Some of the first important systematic studies that examined the relationship between humor and translation were published in a special issue by one of the established translation journals, *Meta*, in 1989. The journal gave space to some case studies working on the transference of humorous elements into another language with the aim of finding some answers or solutions to the problem of "untranslatability" of humorous devices within the same or different

languages. Rather than producing their unique translation models or strategies to render humorous elements, scholars attempted to apply already suggested and commonly used translation strategies or procedures in order to see whether they would offer helpful results to manage the transference effectively. Thanks to the various case studies, readers, translators and the other scholars gained the opportunity to get familiar with some motives behind humor translation as well as the most common problems encountered in this translation process. To sum up, the papers published in this volume focused more on the linguistic aspects of humor translation, touching upon the observed or probable structural, stylistic and semantic difficulties together with some of the suggested translation strategies. In 2002, *The Translator* prepared a special issue entitled *Translating Humor* under the editorship of Jeroen Vandaele, who has made important contributions to understanding the conceptual complexity of defining humor and offered practice-oriented tools for analyzing source text meanings (Vandaele, 2002, p. 169). In this special issue, various attempts were made to delineate types of “humorous effect” through some linguistic and cultural analyses or specific case studies. Unlike the previous studies, these articles introduced new analytical tools to be adopted in both translating humorous texts and comparing them with their source texts. To put it differently, translators were provided with some tools that have been proved useful in some academic studies in terms of grasping and rendering the “humorous effect” of a source text by devising strategies helping to recreate similar or comparable effects in the target text. In addition, translators were made familiar with some analytical frameworks for comparison of the source and target texts in terms of their humorous effect and “the ways in which these effects are encoded by linguistic means” (Vandaele, 2002, p. 150). However, the most important contribution of this volume

was specified by Jeroen Vandaele in the introduction part where the author underlines the need for a collaborative work with other disciplines so that the translators could find better solutions for the translation problems when compared to the previous studies that tended to carry out independent studies without benefiting from the insights of scholars from other research areas (Vandaele, 2002, p. 150). With this purpose in his mind, Vandaele delved into the territory of psychology in explaining the ways to interpret humor. In addition, this magazine offered a new intersemiotic perspective regarding the translation of humor for the stage and screen (Pelsmaecker and Van Besien, 2002, p. 241-266). To sum up, this volume presented reflections on a collection of diverse forms of “verbally expressed humor” in the context of translation and humor (Chiaro, 2005, p. 141). However, it could not completely achieve the intended aim of examining humor translation in an interdisciplinary context taking cultural, social, psychological and other related factors into consideration.

Being aware of this gap, some scholars came together and held a workshop in May 2003 at the University of Bologna’s Summer Residence at Bertinoro, specifically dedicated to Humor and Translation (Chiaro, 2005, p. 140). The main motivation behind the workshop was to foreground humor, which was also revealed by choosing such a title as “Humor and Translation” rather than “Translation and Humor” (Chiaro, 2005, p. 140). As Chiaro puts forth, an interdisciplinary blend of scholars or researchers on this issue emphasized the importance of touching upon different viewpoints regarding the cross-cultural transfer of humorous texts unlike the previous attempts that focused simply on the descriptive aspects of the translation process and product (Chiaro, 2005, p. 141). As a result, scholars of different fields present us with different perspectives. For instance, Christie Davies examines the

cultural transfer of sexual, ethnic and political scripts from a sociological perspective, supplying the reader with broad transcultural elements of ethnic texts. Dirk Delabastita questions what happens when translation is used to produce humor in the works of William Shakespeare. Patrick Zabalbeascoa presents a sociological model “for structuring joke-types according to binary branching model” (Zabalbeascoa, 2005, p. 185). Another translation scholar, Rachele Antonini attempts to measure the audience perception of verbal humor in subtitled sitcoms (Chiaro, 2005, p. 142). As is seen, scholars started to study the perception of humor translation, which will provide useful tools to test similarities and differences in the responses of the target audience to the verbal humorous stimuli in texts. However, Chiaro also emphasized the urgent need to carry out more studies and collect more data in order to test to what extent translation affects the perception of verbal humor, and consequently the behavioural, physiological and emotional response of the target audience (Chiaro, 2005, p. 139).

Apart from the above-mentioned academic studies, it should also be mentioned that the only academic study carried out on the translation of humorous devices in the novel was presented by Veronika Steidlova in a MA thesis titled “Humor in Czech Translations of *Three Men in a Boat*” (Steidlova, 2010). Steidlova deals with the problem of “untranslatability” of humorous elements by focusing on the main humorous devices adopted by the author. Giving detailed information regarding the characteristics of the humorous devices, namely irony, wordplay and metaphor-based humor, she presents her findings concerning the individual translators’ decisions, referring to the already established translation procedures or modes that were specifically offered to deal with the transference of the above-mentioned humorous devices. Though her study sheds light on the possible reasons

why rendering humor into another language can be problematic, her explanations and results regarding the translation strategies of the translators are not grounded upon a theoretical framework. In addition, most of her remarks include descriptive analyses of translators' decisions without mentioning their impact upon the rendering of humorous effect in the target language. The study does not provide answers for the effect of extra-linguistic factors upon rendering the humorous effect in the target language. Though my thesis overlaps with Steidlova's study, hers bases its comparative analysis upon a linguistic general humor theory and evaluates the translation strategies in accordance with its parameters. As a result, my thesis argues that a humor theory can be helpful in analysing different humorous devices, and it attempts to provide answers regarding the probable reasons for the problematic parts in the translations. At some parts of the study, my thesis offers alternative translation solutions or explanations that can be useful in justifying the criticisms directed towards the translation problems.

In Turkey, it is seen that academic studies focusing on humor and translation are very limited in content and quantity. Aslı Süreyya Sayman's MA thesis titled "Quality of Audiovisual Translation in Turkey and the Course of the Production Process: An Empirical Study on the Subtitled and the Dubbed Versions of *Will & Grace*" touches upon the transference of humorous elements in audio-visual translation (Sayman, 2011). Carrying out reception oriented case studies related to the subtitled and dubbed episodes of *Will & Grace*, an American sitcom, Sayman examined the responses of the Turkish audience to the audiovisual translated humor as well as the reasons for the difficulties encountered during the transference process. Similarly, Kübra Çakıroğlu contributed to literature with her MA thesis titled "The Big Bang Theory" (Büyük Patlama) Adlı Komedi Dizisindeki Mizah Unsurlarının

Türkçe Altyazı ve Dublaj Çevirilerine Yansıtılma Sürecinin Karşılaştırmalı ve Eleştirel bir İncelemesi” (A Comparative and Critical Analysis of the Reflection of Humorous Elements of the Sitcom “The Big Bang Theory” in Turkish Subtitle and Dubbing Translations) (Çakıroğlu, 2009). The recent study was carried out by Özden Tüfekçioğlu as a Master thesis that focused on the status of humor translation in the system of audiovisual translation, dealing with the translated version of the *Ice Age* Series. Tüfekçioğlu’s main purpose was to produce a descriptive study of the translation strategies adopted in the translation of humor related to national culture and institutions as well as the linguistic humorous elements, focusing on the effects of verbal signs in the rendering of the source text humor into another language (Tüfekçioğlu, 2011, p. 91). Apart from academic theses, some other studies on humor and translation were carried out in Turkey and published in some Turkish journals. For instance, Nihal Yetkin Karakoç presents an article titled “Text Reduction as a Technical Constraint in Subtitling versus Humor Translation” as part of a multi-disciplinary doctoral dissertation, in which she examines the transference of humorous elements through “Subtitling Oriented Text Reduction Strategies” (Karakoç, 2013). Another scholar, Meltem Ekti, has a similar study about the translatability of humor, working specifically on the translation of culture-specific jokes with examples from Nasreddin Hodja as they are highly rich in cultural referents. In her study, Ekti attempts to question how translation reflects the cultural referents in humorous devices of the source text within the literary conventions and structures of the target culture (Ekti, 2013). In another article titled “Camus: *Yabancı*’nın Dört Çevirisi ve Mizahi Öğelerin Çevrilebilirliği”, Nazik Göktaş works on four translations of Albert Camus’ *The Stranger*, examining what kinds of strategies four translators adopted to translate the humorous elements that form the

ideological content of the book (Göktaş, 2009, p. 335). Göktaş studied how translation can effect the rendering of ideological humorous elements into Turkish.

CHAPTER 2

GENERAL INFORMATION

2.1 Jerome K. Jerome's biography

Jerome Klapka Jerome, best known for his masterpiece *Three Men in a Boat*, was born in the mining town of Walsall on 2 May 1859 into a very religious middle-class family. His mother, Marguerite, was the elder daughter of a Welsh family and he had the very greatest respect for her. His father, Jerome Clapp Jerome, was a “non-conformist preacher” interested in the local coal and iron industries. He had been educated at “Merchant Taylors School” and trained as an architect, but later he was called to the Non-conformist ministry. He preached at several Congregational churches and drew plans for various buildings. All of his financial ventures proved to be failure and he had to move the family to Stourbridge and subsequently to Poplar in the East End of London, where Jerome spent much of his childhood in poverty.² In his autobiography, Jerome gives clues regarding the grim childhood spent in a particular part of London and its effects on his life:

[...] about the East End of London there is a menace, a haunting terror that is to be found nowhere else. The awful silence of its weary streets. The ashen faces, with their lifeless eyes that rise out of shadows and are lost. It was these surroundings in which I passed my childhood that gave to me, I suppose, my melancholy, brooding disposition. I can see the humorous side of things and enjoy the fun when it comes; but look where I will, there seems to me always more sadness than joy in life. (Jerome, 1926, p. 16)

As Joseph Connolly mentions in his book entitled *Jerome K Jerome: A Critical Biography*, this kind of a miserable childhood taught him a great deal about how people feel and he never forgot the sufferings of the underdog. His observation of the plight of the desperate people “gave his humor more than a tinge of truth and lent considerable power to his serious work.” (Connolly, 1982, p. 12)

² qtd. from the website, The Jerome K. Jerome Society, <http://www.jeromekjerome.com/>

Leaving school at the age of fourteen, Jerome took a clerk's job with the London Northwest Railway Company at Euston in order to support his mother and sister. When his mother died, however, he had entered into a difficult period superseded by the fear of loneliness and misery. These difficult times were recounted in his autobiography as the following:

The two or three years following my mother's death remain in my memory confused and disjointed. The chief thing about them was my loneliness. In the day time I could forget it, but when twilight came it would creep up behind me, putting icy hands about me. I had friends and relations in London, who, I am sure, would have been kind, but my poverty increased my shyness: I had a dread of asking, as it were, for pity. I seem to have been always on the move, hoping, I suppose, to escape from solitude. (Jerome, 1926, p. 48)

He did not enjoy working as a clerk and wanted to be a writer. For this purpose, he started to jot down notes as much as he could and devoted his spare time both to reading and writing stories and essays, but it took some time for recognition to come. In order to support himself financially, he began to take parts in the production of theater companies and travelled around the world with some actors. However, this earned him very little money and hence he returned to London after spending three years on the stage, which formed the groundwork for his success as a playwright. Inspired from the three-year stage experiences, he wrote several essays published in a book form in 1885, with the title of *On the Stage— and Off— The Brief Career of a Would-be Actor* (Faurot, 1974, p. 23-24). As of 1877, he tried journalism to earn his living by “penny-a-lining— a sort of jobbing journalism, whereby one would dash all over London covering this or that, usually rather trivial, event, and then rush one's copy back to the newsdesk” (Connolly, 1982, p. 29). According to Connolly, this may be considered the first time when Jerome had started to think about style, concluding that he needed to write something special to ensure the editor to choose his piece. Jerome made his choice in favor of humor and realized that “this was even

given preference over more sober, and possibly more truthful records. At least, in his view, Jerome was now writing and the faint beginnings of a Jeromian style had the chance to emerge” (Connolly, 1982, p. 29-30).

During the same years, he wrote a collection of humorous essays published as a book, *The Idle Thoughts of an Idle Fellow* (1886). Two years later, he married Georgina Henrietta Stanley, the daughter of Lieutenant Nesza of the Spanish army. After their honeymoon spent on the Thames, Jerome started to write his very famous comic book, *Three Men in a Boat*. By this time, Jerome had published his two books and written four plays, including *Sunset*, *Pity is Akin to Love*, and *Fennel*. Following his trip to Germany came the following novels, *the Journey of a Pilgrimage* and *Three Men on the Bummel* (1900). Two years later, his well-praised autobiographical novel, *Paul Kever*, was published.

Before starting to work as an editor, he carried out short-lived jobs including school-mastering, clerk at a solicitor’s office and also worked in a commission agent. Later, he turned to editing, beginning with a monthly magazine, *the Idler*. He was writing for a column called “The Idler’s club”. In addition, he became involved in editing another weekly magazine, *To-day*, in which “Jerome’s editorial notes upon current political and social happenings were brilliant pieces of journalism” (Faurot, 1974, p. 27). Having already become famous, Jerome decided to travel abroad and give lectures in America, Russia and Germany. While he was in America, he met David Belasco who helped him produce one of his most popular plays, *The Passing of the Third Floor Back* (1908). Jerome’s other comic plays include *Fanny and the Servant Problem*, a musical comedy (1908); *The Master of Mrs. Chilvers*, a play on the women’s suffrage question (1911), and *The Great Gamble* (1914), which had a German setting (Faurot, 1974, p. 23-28).

When the war broke out, Jerome joined the French army as an ambulance driver. After the war, Jerome wrote two novels, *All Roads Lead to Calvary* (1919), a polemical novel including a heroine's memories of the war, and *Anthony John* (1922), a novel of Northern industrial England. Towards the end of his life, Jerome recorded his memories in one of his most entertaining books, *My Life and Times* (1926), which still remains the primary source about him and his works. Jerome died of a heart attack in 1927 when he was on a trip to Devonshire with his wife. He is buried in the churchyard at Ewelme, near Wallingford, where Jerome and his family lived for some years.

As mentioned in a number of reviews written about him, it is clear that even though Jerome enjoyed popular success in different genres, he did not climb the stairs in an easy way, having been exposed to severe criticism and rejections, even at the very beginning of his literary career. He wrote various essays, plays and stories, and sent them to some journals to get nothing positive, but only rejections (Margraf, 1983, p. 84). In one of his essays, entitled "On the Stage and Off", Jerome reveals his feelings by referring to the agonies of a rejected contributor as follows:

I ask him if he remembers those dreary days when, written neatly in round hand on sermon paper, he journeyed a ceaseless round from newspaper to newspaper, from magazine to magazine, returning always soiled and limp to Whitfield Street, still further darkening the ill-lit room as he entered. Some would keep him for a month, making me indignant at the waste of precious time. Others would send him back by the next post, insulting me by their indecent haste. Many, in returning him, would thank me for having given them the privilege and pleasure of reading him, and I would curse them for hypocrites. Others would reject him with no pretense at regret whatever, and I would marvel at their rudeness. (Jerome, 1894, p. 223)

After a couple of years, Jerome was able have his writing accepted by a journal. This is mentioned in his memoris by touching upon the intervening years, which served to lessen the excitement the moment would create in him:

I had tried short stories, essays, satires. One—but one only—a sad thing about a maiden who had given her life for love and been turned into a water-fall, and over the writing of which I had nearly broken my heart, had been accepted by a paper called *The Lamp*. It died soon afterwards. The others, with appalling monotony, had been returned to me again and again: sometimes with the Editor's compliments and thanks, and sometimes without: sometimes returned with indecent haste, seemingly by the next post; sometimes kept for months—in a dustbin, judging from appearances. (Jerome, 1926, p. 68)

The majority of the critics tended to direct harsh criticism towards Jerome, who was generally branded as a “new humorist” and mistrusted his easy and colloquial style, accusing him of creating vulgarity with his language use (Connolly, 1982, p. 36). Even though the public liked his style, evident from the mounting sales of newer publications, the critics had always treated him badly: “Max Beerbohm was always very angry with me. *The Standard* spoke of me as a menace to English letters; and *The Morning Post* as an example of the sad results to be expected from the over-education of the lower orders” (Jerome, 1926, p. 75).

2.2 Jeromian humor

Before delving into the stylistic features of *Three Men in a Boat*, I would like to talk about general attributes of Jerome's humor. In most of his writings, it is easy to encounter a recurring phrase used by him to describe the philosophy behind his humor: “pity is akin to love”. As Ruth M. Fautrot mentions, we observe various applications of this understanding in his plays and fiction. Generally, there exists no discrepancy between the laughter on the one hand, and the moral aspect on the other. In other words, “laughter, too, becomes a part of it, not only for what his humor is but for what it is not” (Fautrot, 1974, p. 177). The moralizing aspect naturally enables the humorous devices to become good-natured and tolerant, never tending to mock the society or people in a bitter manner.

His style has been labeled as “the new humor” characterized with its casual and simple diction (Markgraf, 1983, p. 83). As some of the critics suggest, it is the conversational style of the ordinary person. In almost all of his writings, Jerome tends to use contractions to a great extent. Therefore, his essays read easily and sound like a conversation of an ordinary person. His colloquial language usually consists of fresh metaphors, dialect, slang and contemporary expressions (Connolly, 1982, p. 75-76). His style also includes the most apparent feature of humor, the incongruity. In his novel, *The Idle Thoughts of an Idle Fellow* (1886), there are some clues that explain to us what he wants to mean by incongruity, which can be inferred in one of his essays “On Babies”. In this essay, he describes them as follows: “Odd little people! They are the unconscious comedians of the world’s great stage... each one, a small but determined opposition to the order of things in general, is forever doing the wrong thing, at the wrong time, in the wrong place, and in the wrong way”. However, he does not provide such incongruity at first hand, but expects the readers to recognize it with their own effort (Jerome, 1997, p. 136).

There exist both similarities and differences between Jerome’s humor and that of the Victorian period during which the novel was written. When the general features of Victorian humor are analyzed, it is seen that Victorian laughter mostly focuses on “eccentric characters, odd settings and whimsically simple motivation” (Gray, 1966, p. 145). However, Jerome introduces a very fresh and modern style which “has none of the tiresome convolutions associated with many such Victorian novels”, focusing mostly on the ordinary things in life, and presenting them in a simpler manner (Fowler, 2014, p. 16). Apart from that, his humor draws its subject matter from daily activities of common people with his aim of showing the “absurdity of human behavior” by dealing with everyday “banal details” (Lind, 2014,

p. 24). While presenting his humorous passages, he prefers to use a clear, concise and conversational language, adorned with some exaggerated details adopted to “turn mundane experiences into comedy” (Lind, 2014, p. 25-27). As is also obvious in the novel, *Three Men in a Boat*, Jerome highly benefits from irony in order to comment on issues such as poverty and criminality, and kindly mocks various types of people including villagers, fishermen and railway employees.

2.3 *Three Men in a Boat*

Even though its smaller parts had been published serially in *Home Chimes*, it was only in 1889 the first edition of *Three Men in a Boat (To Say Nothing of the Dog)* came out with this title. Twenty years after its publication, the book sold more than 200,000 copies in Britain and more than a million throughout the United States, where it has never been out of print since then (Rodgers and Read, 2013, p. 3). The book’s enormous success abroad has been proven with the translated versions of the novel into many languages, including Russian, French, Danish, Portuguese, Irish, German, South African and Turkish. Although it sold over a million copies, Jerome did not earn much apart from a small annual payment from the American publisher. Like his previous books, *Three Men in a Boat*’s pirated translations emerged in many countries. However, the novel’s success was not only limited to the publishing industry, but it was also filmed three times (1920, 1933 and 1956) in Jerome’s lifetime, and was adapted by Tom Stoppard for television in 1975. In addition, it was turned into a musical by Hubert Gregg in 1962 and staged several times, as well as read aloud on radio programs (Rodgers and Read, 2013, p. 5-6).

When the book was published, it had already gained some kind of reputation in a way that Jerome did not like. As Connolly summarizes, the criticism was

“haughty, condescending, pompous, cruel, uncomprehending and dismissive” (Connolly, 1982, p. 74). One of the first reviews appeared in the *Saturday Review* of 5 October 1889, presenting a negative picture regarding both the content and style of the book. It assaults the real intent of the book, claiming that it is in fact a true story that is not intended for irony. According to many critics, only the “documentary” quality of the book enabled it to be considered valuable in the American publishing industry (Connolly, 1982, p. 74). When it was released, his language was also criticized because of its “vulgarity”. As he puts forth in his biography, one of the outstanding magazines of the time, *Punch* directed harsh criticism towards the novel, accusing it for “scenting an insidious attempt to introduce ‘new humor’ into comic literature” (Jerome, 1926, p. 114). The British public, on the other hand, welcomed this book in a very positive manner, apparent from the large quantity of sales in Britain. Unlike the most critics, they liked its modern, fresh, vulgar and colloquial anecdotes, which are spoken by the ordinary characters. For instance, in the magazine, *The Independent*, Mark Mills likens the novel to the “very best picaresque tales” in that it tells the story of a journey that is “little more than a convenient peg on which to hang a series of observations and discursive asides about life, in all its minute, baffling and absurd complexities” (Mark, 2013, p. 28). In other words, he wants to underline that Jerome manages to create humor from the most mundane situation.

Jerome’s book was considered quite different from the other works of the period in that its story did not contain fantasy with some heroes and villains, but simple people having fun in an ordinary place. Jerome, on the contrary, attempts to create a good and moral story out of the most trivial of incidents. As Faurot claims, he generally turns ordinary incidents into unexpected situations, either by “making

the reality absurd or, inversely, treating absurdity with gravity". He did not tell a unique subject with idiosyncratic characters, but rather with his "touch of brashness in treating ordinary subjects" (Faurot, 1974, p. 46). As a result, it manages to become a very famous novel that is today still considered Jerome's most appreciated book.

When asked of the motive behind his decision to write such a book, Jerome says that he actually intended to write a serious travel book adorned with descriptions of the Thames, which is explicitly mentioned in his autobiography as follows:

I did not intend to write a funny book, at first. I did not know I was a humorist. I never have been sure about it. In the Middle Ages, I should probably have gone about preaching and got myself burnt or hanged. There was to be "humorous relief"; but the book was to have been "The Story of the Thames," its scenery and history. Somehow it would not come. I was just back from my honeymoon, and had the feeling that all the world's troubles were over. About the "humorous relief" I had no difficulty. I decided to write the "humorous relief" first—get it off my chest, so to speak. After which, in sober frame of mind, I could tackle the scenery and history. I never got there. It seemed to be all "humorous relief." (Jerome, 1926, p. 108)

It is true that he had written some chapters directly related to the historical descriptions of the river, but when it was finally published in 1889, there remained very little of them as the publisher rejected to include these in that new version that was mainly based on a very popular subject of its time (Jerome, 1926, p. 108).

During the 1870's, the Thames had been discovered as a place providing opportunities for recreational activities, especially for the working class. In 1888 when Jerome started to work on his book, *Three Men in a Boat*, boating up and down the river had become a favorite sport of many citizens. For this reason, Jerome was writing about the ordinary, which was what provided the book with its unique quality, as expressed by him in the preface to the first edition of the book:

The chief beauty of this book lies not so much in its literary style, or in the extent and usefulness of the information it conveys, as in its simple truthfulness. Its pages form the record of events that really happened. All that has been done is to color them; and for this, no extra charge has been made. (Jerome, 1889, p. 6)

As Donald Gray mentions in his article entitled “The Uses of Victorian Laughter”, one of the uses of Victorian laughter is to furnish a holiday by taking things and ideas seriously, called “laughter of release” (Gray, 1966, p. 147), which is also observed in this book. To put it another way, Jerome does not present a very ridiculous or exaggerated event, but he frees people from the burden of taking everything so seriously and talks about issues that are familiar to everyone’s experience. Similarly, the main characters, George, Harris, and “J.” who was Jerome, were from the real life. Only Montmorency, the dog, was fictional and evolved out of Jerome’s consciousness (Jerome, 1926, p. 108). George was George Wingrave, a bank manager, who entered Jerome’s life when he was working at Tottenham Court Road. Jerome and George shared lodgings when both of them were at the beginning of their careers. Harris was Carl Hentschel, a young man working with his father on photo-etching stuff. Thanks to theatre, he became acquainted with Jerome and their long-standing friendship started.

The story starts in the narrator, J.’s, room where three friends are chatting about their anxiety over their sicknesses. J. believes that he suffers from every disease except for the housemaid’s knee. They believe that taking a vacation together would be a good chance to restore their health. Upon George’s suggestion, they all decide to spend a week in the sea with their dog, Montmorency. They leave for a pub to discuss arrangements for the trip. For this purpose, they prepare a list of what they need to pack, preferring to bring only the most basic needs without which they cannot do. Harris volunteers to write the list, but J. does not find him successful and compares him to his incompetent Uncle Podger, who causes more work for everyone because of his inability to complete even the simplest of tasks. At the end, they decide to bring food that is easy to cook, a cover for the boat, and a special stove.

Next morning they take a train and head towards Kingston where they intend to embark. They eventually start their journey during which J. provides some background information about the area, describing some local landmarks such as Hampton Court and some pubs where Queen Elizabeth was said to dine.

After passing Hampton Court, they row through a lock that is used to “regulate traffic and water flow” in a river (Lind, 2014, p. 8). J. digresses to consider how the clothes of women can create problems during sea journeys. The boat nears Hampton Church and Harris offers to visit the graveyard where someone called Mrs. Thomas has a tombstone. But J. does not accept it as he finds cemeteries very gloomy and depressing. After George leaves them to go into the town to do some work for his employer, Harris and J. eat lunch by the river where a man comes up and accuses them of trespassing. At this point, J. warns the readers not to get deceived by such people as they usually delude people by saying that they work for another person. In addition, J. remembers some embarrassing stories from earlier times when J. and Harris have made fools of themselves at some parties. Then the boat arrives at the village of Shepperton where they reunite with George, who surprises them with the banjo that he has brought. As he is away from the boat all day, they urge him to tow it from the shore, which is a challenging task. This reminds J. of many incidents where tow-lines become tangled, mostly resulting from distraction of the travelers. Although the friends want to spend the night on Magna Charta Island, they decide to stop earlier. Next morning they pass the island and J. speculates about what it would have been like for a peasant to live there when the charter was signed. Then the boat rows past more historical places, including Marlow, Bisham Abbey and Medmenham. When they run out of water near Hambledon Lock, a local lock-keeper advises them to drink water from the river,

which they find disgusting. After the dinner, George plays the banjo so badly that the others ask him not to play it again during their journey. That night, George and J. head into the village for drinks, but Harris does not join them. These two men get lost on their way back to the boat, and find it at last, only by following Montmorency's barking. When they arrive, they learn that Harris has spent the whole night fighting off a flock of aggressive swans. However, he does not remember anything related to swans the next morning, causing the other men to wonder if he dreams. Then they head towards Oxford and spend two days there. On their way back to London, it rains incessantly and the men start to feel very cold and miserable. Therefore, they leave the boat and decide to spend the night at an inn, even though they have sworn to complete the trip. At the end of the novel, they decide to end their trip and the dog barks as a sign of agreement.

2.4 Humorous devices in the novel

As previously mentioned, *Three Men in a Boat* was initially intended as a travel narrative, but its humorous digressions have caused the novel to be known as a comic novel (Lind, 2014, p. 4). Although the novel is mostly accepted as a travel narrative, most of the geographic descriptions are presented by making references to the past events that are humorous in content and usually followed by a comic scene (Varghese and Idiculla, 2013, p. 13825). Since Jerome K. Jerome wrote his novel during the Victorian period, it still carries some of the common features of Victorian laughter though it is accepted as bringing a "new humor" style into the literary system. As Donald J. Gray mentions, one of the most common function of Victorian humor can be attributed to the irony and ridicule adopted in literary devices with an aim of correcting or unsettling ideas which people normally take very seriously

(Gray, 1966, p. 146). Secondly, Victorian humor was used as a kind of device offering “holiday from taking things and ideas seriously” (Gray, 1966, p. 145). To put it differently, humor was considered an escape from the rules, order and imperatives of daily life, “a flight from purpose into innocent play, from gravity into innocent refusal to make sense” (Gray, 1966, p. 153). Thirdly, Victorian humor amuses the audience by releasing responses upon ordinary events through the structures of familiar words or contents resembling the structures of ordinary life (Gray, 1966, p. 160). In other words, one of the most prevalent sources of Victorian laughter was related to the things coming from the contemporary life. Although the content of humorous literary works generally center upon some themes such as cruelty, pain, irrationality and death, the techniques and the manners in which these themes are presented underwent some changes towards the second half of the eighteenth century when the novel was written. Much of the humor started to turn inward, taking its sources in private absurdities rather than relying on social foibles. For this reason, some scholars preferred to define the Victorian humor as domesticated, implying its tendency to focus on the traditions of an approved social order or the harmless absurdities of common people such as policemen, clergymen or children (McArthur, 1992, p. 488). In the novel, Jerome tries to reflect this domesticated strategy by commenting on social issues such as poverty, criminality and deals with the absurdities of common people. Apart from these points, Victorian nonsense gained importance in transferring the humorous discourse during that period, causing the writers to resort to incongruities in language and content (Gray, 1966, p. 167).

Even though *Three Men in a Boat* uses different kinds of humorous devices, irony has the upmost importance in rendering the humorous discourse of the novel.

When the whole novel is examined, it is realized that irony plays a leading role in the representation of the humorous tone of the novel. Jerome's irony is mostly related to revealing and "mocking the pretensions and hypocrisies of certain social conventions" (Lind, 2014, p. 4). Apart from the hypocrisies observed in social structures, much of Jerome's irony targets the pretensions of the middle and upper classes as well as the main characters in the novel. He attempts to illustrate it through the characters wanting what they cannot have and then losing interest about these things when they do obtain them. He tries to show the pretensions observed in how people present themselves to the world. Overall, Jerome prefers to ironically emphasize how people create illusions and delude themselves in their daily lives. Apart from these ironical devices, Jerome adds another layer of humor to the novel by representing J. himself to be guilty of the hypocritical behaviors he criticizes (Lind, 2014, p. 2).

Jerome also resorts to metaphorical devices in order to create a comic effect. In his ironic remarks about a person or event, Jerome especially resorts to idioms, similes, personification and hyperbole to turn down ordinary experiences into comic situations. In addition, Jerome's humor is fed by the ambiguities created mostly on lexical and syntactic levels. In this regard, Jerome benefits from the humorous device of wordplay in order to create humor by causing misunderstandings or misinterpretations on the part of the audience (Steidlova, 2010, p. 57). Deviation in register is another device through which humor is produced in the novel. Jerome's usage of register as a source of humorous effect involves both inappropriate registers and mixing of different registers in the same parts of the novel (Steidlova, 2010, p. 43). To put it differently, Jerome makes use of inappropriate registers in certain situations especially to mock the people or events and hence reinforces the comic

effect (Jerome, 1994, p. 94). Similarly, he adds a humorous dimension to the novel by surprising the reader with sudden changes in diction.

CHAPTER 3

TRANSLATING HUMOR IN *THREE MEN IN A BOAT*

3.1 The notion of humor

Throughout history, the notion of humor and its devices have been the subject of various research areas, including philosophy, history, sociology, linguistics, anthropology, and psychology. Although humor is generally accepted as a universal phenomenon having its impact upon all aspects of human life and relations, defining it as a term is not very easy due to the lack of a precise definition, which has, consequently, caused some challenges for scholars of humor. This section will present some of the most common conceptualizations of humor, touching upon its social and psychological aspects. The discussion will also include some of the historical views of humor, referring to the relevant theories in which this many-sidedness of the notion of humor is reflected.

As the lexicographic studies have shown, the semantic field of what is defined as “humor” has been enriched by using various concepts with fuzzy boundaries, such as humor, irony, sarcasm, ridicule and comedy, creating a need to adopt a generic term in scholarly discussions. As a result, Anglo-Saxon humor studies have decided upon “humor” as an umbrella term, although it has gained different interpretations and functions in the definitions of humor scholars (Attardo, 2001, p. 167). Starting from the very early times, scholars have always tried to find solutions to both define and understand the problem of humor with their theories, approaches or perspectives, but none of them have managed to produce a general theory of humor that accounts for all aspects of the humor phenomena.

When the literal meaning of the word is looked up in the Merriam-Webster dictionary, the word “humor” derives from the Latin word “umor” (moist) and Greek

word “hygros” (wet), whose origin can be traced to medieval times when it was used to denote “bodily fluids”. These bodily fluids, or humors, were categorized as yellow bile, black bile, phlegm and blood. These were thought to be related to people’s temperament, including their biliousness, melancholy, being phlegmatic or sanguine. If these fluids were out of balance in the body of a person, he/she would be considered to have become afflicted with a disease (either mentally or physically), which later paved the way for the foundation of medicine in the Middle Ages (Raskin, 2008, p. 248). It was only at the beginning of the eighteenth century that the notion of humor started to gain a positive connotation, and discussed with its long-standing meaning of “comic” (Cazamian, 1952, p. 10).

When confronted with the question of “What is humor?”, different scholars provide different answers that underline several aspects of the topic. P.E.McGhee, for example, defines humor as “a form of intellectual play, one of which is quite serious and involves knowledge expansion, while the other is intended to be playful and focuses on resolving fantasy incongruities, which are the essence of a child’s humor” (McGhee, 1979, p. 42). Harvey Mindess, a psychologist and playwright, foregrounds the therapeutic power of humor by defining it as “a frame of mind, a manner of perceiving and experiencing life... a kind of outlook, a peculiar point of view, and one which has great therapeutic power” (Mindess, 1971, p. 21). Another important humor scholar, Thomas Veatch, who attempts to formulate a general theory of humor, mentions that “there exists a certain psychological state which tends to produce laughter, which is the natural phenomenon or process we will refer to as humor, or humor perception” (Veatch, 1998, p. 162). According to his definition, not all instances of humor produce laughter and hence he prefers to use the verb “tend to”, instead of asserting a definite judgment. In addition, he talks about some certain

psychological states required for humor perception (Veatch, 1998, p. 162-163). In another widely used definition, Dineh Davis gives a summary of the previous explanations:

Humor is any sudden episode of joy or elation associated with a new discovery that is self-rated as funny. As sense of humor is the subtle but consistent ability to remain lighthearted in a wide range of circumstances, from the obvious occasions of happiness and joy to the more sacred and grave encounters with distress and tragedy. (Davis, 2008, p. 547)

As is clear, contemporary definitions of humor imply the actual moment of fun, or the situations that are thought to cause humorous effects. However, it is clearly observed both from the definitions and the lack of a precise agreement on what is meant by humor, that there is then a need to provide a more general understanding of humor to be used in academic research. As a matter of fact, linguistic, philosophical and psychological analyses of humor have been the most preferred approaches in humor studies, in which Attardo and Raskin have usually been referred to. In their claims, a general theory of humor requires the consideration of various and unrelated knowledge areas that will contribute to the creation of humor. Even though Raskin and Attardo's definition is accepted as "the least restricted" one, which is also considered a refusal to draw boundaries among the different terms or concepts used to express a humorous content, there still exists some problems to identify which phenomena in the world are "humorous" (Attardo, 1994, p. 9-10). For these reasons, it is important to have a look at the classical theories of humor to understand the change in the interpretation of the notion through the ages. In the following part, some of the historical views of humor will be mentioned, starting with the Greek and Latin tradition, and then moving into the modern thought, inspired mostly by the cultural changes brought forth after the Renaissance.

From a historical perspective, it is seen that the notion of humor had negative connotations during the early times, generally considered something as degenerate and ugly. Accepted as the first theorist of humor, Plato defines humor as “a mixed feeling of the soul”, revealed better in the following excerpt taken from his book, *Philebus*, where Socrates is speaking:

[...] Our argument declares that when we laugh at the ridiculous qualities of our friends, we mix pleasure with pain, since we mix it with envy; for we have agreed all along that envy is a pain of the soul, and that laughter is pleasure, yet these two arise at the same time on such occasions. (50A)

As is seen, Plato interprets the notion of “humor” in a negative sense within the semantic field of “ridiculous”, claiming that people generally laugh at other’s misfortunes. In his view, humor arises from the perception of two contrasting feelings at the same time, and laughter is presented as something malevolent stemming from envy. Aristotle, on the other hand, uses the term “comedy” and presents it as “an imitation of men worse than average; worse, however, not in regard to any and every sort of fault, but only in regard to one particular kind of ridiculous, which is a species of the Ugly” (*De Poetica*, 1449). In his definition, it is possible to discern the influence of Plato in that both of them agree that laughter has its basis in some kind of deformity and ugliness, associating it with negative behaviors such as obscenity, profanity and insults from which people should shrink (Attardo, 1994, p. 21). Similarly, Quintilian, a Roman rhetorician, emphasizes the aggressive and negative nature of humor in the following sentence in a stronger manner: “[...] in effect one not only laughs about pointed or amusing sayings or facts, but also about stupid, angry, timid [facts or sayings]; and because of this very fact the reason of this is double, because laughter is not far from derision” (Attardo, 1994, p. 30). Such views that deal with humor through degrading expressions had their impact over a long period of time. For instance, nineteenth century scholars and theorists, such as

Alexander Bain and Henri Bergson tried to underline the fact that it was the faults of people that made one enjoy humor in a real sense. In the twentieth century, William Hazlitt provided a similar explanation that supports the previous remarks on humor. According to him, “we laugh at absurdity... at deformity... at mischief... at what we do not believe... to show our satisfaction with ourselves, or our contempt for those about us, or to conceal our envy or ignorance” (Hazlitt, 1903, p. 8-9). Like the other scholars mentioned above, he attempts to reveal people’s tendency to laugh at things mirroring the foibles and hypocrisies of the society (Raskin, 2008, p. 307).

However, it should be kept in mind that definitions of humor have not been limited to these approaches restricting humor to “derision”, “hostility”, “aggression”, and “absurdity”. On the contrary, many other attempts have been made to explain the notion of humor in various ways: as an incongruent treatment of things; a form of release or relief; an exhibition of superiority over someone; a switch of someone’s attention from something significant to something insignificant, and as a transformation of an expectation into nothing, which shows that humor involves instances containing many related aspects such as social, emotional, cognitive and psychological states. In another context, humor can be interpreted and recast in terms of “humorous effect”, making it much easier to analyze and define what causes humor and what further effects it creates (Vandaele, 2002, p. 154).

3.2 Humor theories

Having examined the historical perspectives of humor, it becomes easy to realize that there exist some recurring ideas such as incongruity, superiority and relief in the definitions made since the ancient times, dating back to Aristotle and Plato. The theories of humor are generally divided into three categories: cognitive/perceptual or

incongruent; social or hostile; and psychological or release/relief. Apart from these general categories, a number of recent theories were developed, including the General Theory of Verbal Humor (Raskin and Attardo, 1991) and Victor Raskin's five-level model for the analysis of joke texts (Raskin, 1985). In the following part, the general features of these approaches will be explained, focusing mostly on the General Theory of Verbal Humor which will be adopted as the theoretical framework of this study.

3.2.1 Incongruity theories

The modern incongruity-based theories, the most widely-known explanation of humor, take their roots in the words of Kant, who defines laughter as “an affection arising from sudden transformation of a strained expectation into nothing” (Kant, 1790, p. 117). As is clear, Kant interprets humor in terms of the incongruity that tends to imply the cognitive features of the process in which humor or humorous texts are appreciated. In this process, the reason why incongruity is observed results from the unexpected situation or message that is perceived by the reader or listener so that the humor can fulfill its function. Under these circumstances, if the audience is unaware of this incongruity or fails to find a solution to understand it, he/she cannot give the required response to the humorous text.

Similarly, Schopenhauer includes the notion of incongruity in his definition of humor, saying “laughter is simply the sudden perception of the incongruity between a concept and the real objects which have been thought through in some relation, and laughter itself is just the expression of this incongruity” (Schopenhauer, 1957, p. 76). That is to say, humor depends on the realization of an incongruity referring generally to the mismatch between two ideas or objects. In addition,

incongruity usually implies “a conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs” in a joke (Shultz, 1976, p. 12). Providing that there exists any event or situation incompatible with the normal situation, it is considered incongruous and carries the potential to cause humorous responses. It should also be kept in mind that the definition of incongruity involves the notion of ambiguity, which is mentioned in the following excerpt:

Incongruity is a term used to include ambiguity, logical impossibility, irrelevance and inappropriateness. It refers to an apparent lack of fit between ideas, attitudes, behaviours and social conventions. [...] [it] consists in the violent dissolution of an emotional attitude. This is done by the abrupt intrusion into the attitude of something that is felt not to belong there, of some element that has strayed, as it were, from another compartment of our minds. (qtd. in Chapman and Foot, 1996, p. 37)

As mentioned above, incongruity theories help to provide a cognitive analysis of humor, focusing primarily on perception and resolution of the incongruity.

According to Thomas R. Shultz, “it is only after the incongruity is perceived by an observer that it can be resolved, and it is in the resolution of the incongruity” that the observer enjoys the humor (Shultz, 1976, p. 12). To put it differently, humor is accepted as “something inherent in the resolution of the incongruity” (Shultz, 1976, p. 12). The mechanism of resolution is required in order to distinguish it from other expressions. In other words, it is of high importance to characterize it as meaningful incongruity that can be comprehended by the readers or audience who are expected to identify, perceive and then resolve the incongruity existing in the text (Shultz, 1976, p. 13).

3.2.2 Superiority theories

When the earliest theories of humor are examined, they all mention the negative element of humor, which is generally expressed through such phrases as

“superiority”, “hostility”, “aggression”, “disparagement”, “derision”, etc. As these theories generally define humor in terms of superiority, they are often called “superiority theories” (Vandaele, 2010, p. 148). In the simplest terms, this theory implies that “the humor we find in comedy and in life is based on ridicule, wherein we regard the object of amusement as inferior and/or ourselves as superior” (Bardon, 2005, p. 2). In other words, humor often ridicules a target or victim and produces a kind of a superior feeling on the part of those who appreciate the humor. Since the ancient times, a number of philosophers including Plato and Aristotle have underlined the fact that humans generally laugh at ugliness, leading one to define humor as “the malicious or derisive enjoyment of others’ shortcomings, which indicates a baseness of the soul” (Bardon, 2005, p. 3). Even though there exist various explanations regarding the nature of the superiority theories, one of the strongest remarks come from the seventeenth century English philosopher, Thomas Hobbes. In the following statements, Hobbes emphasizes the idea that laughter arises from a sense of superiority:

Sudden Glory, is the passion which maketh those Grimaces called LAUGHTER: and is caused either by some sudden act of their own, that pleaseth them; or by the apprehension of some deformed thing in another, by comparison whereof they suddenly applaud themselves. And it is incident most to them, that are conscious of the fewest abilities in themselves; who are forced to keep themselves in their own favor, by observing the imperfections of others. (Hobbes, 1968, p. 125)

In Hobbes’ view, laughter arises from joy that pleases people because of the feeling that they have achieved or realized their own ability. This kind of a realization, as mentioned in the excerpt, can be fostered by the presentation of the failings of others. In other words, people often have a tendency to laugh at the infirmities and absurdities of the other people. The enjoyment from such cases is derived from human’s weaknesses, in which one can realize his/her own superiority. It can also be

inferred that humor is generally found in something inferior to the agent that is exposed to the humorous object.

On the other hand, some theorists have found out some weaknesses of this superiority theory (Bardon, 2005, p. 3). For instance, while Hobbes considers suddenness an important component of humor, some scholars such as David W. Hollingsworth asserts that “surprise cannot be a necessary component of humor, or jokes heard before could scarcely amuse” (Fave and Maesen, 1995, p. 64). On the other hand, Bardon claims that “there seem to be many experiences that might make us feel superior but are not amusing, or there are many instances of humor that have nothing to do with the follies of other” (Bardon, 2005, p. 5). Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the existence of some perceived incongruity does not necessarily create the required conditions for the enjoyment of humor.

As Vandaele mentions, the supporters of the superiority theories have rejected incongruity though it “can easily be related to incongruity in many aspects” (Vandaele, 2002, p. 157):

a) most acts of incongruity can be assigned to a social product and/or agent, which are thus seen as inferior; b) ironic incongruity is controlled abnormality as a sign of superiority; c) incongruity can in most cases be resolved and overcome, thus creating superiority [...] d) some incongruities are conventionalized as humorous [...] (Vandaele, 2002, p. 157).

As is obvious, Vandaele also claims that superiority theories enable a special kind of socialization by creating inclusion or exclusion among a group of people, creating some stereotypes or social pressures upon the victims of the humorous devices. For these reasons, it is of high importance to distance ourselves from the monolithic thinking about the meaning and motives of humor in order to develop an accurate insight without neglecting any of the concepts.

3.2.3 Release theories

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, scholars started to evaluate humor “as a form of release or relief” (Carrell, 2008, p. 308). Though Herbert Spencer and Sigmund Freud are generally accepted as two of the most prominent relief theorists, there are also others who have taken the notion of relief to the core of their humor definitions. For instance, Lord Shatesbury’s essay “The Freedom of Wit and Humor” is considered the first literary piece to use the word “humor” with its contemporary meaning, which provides a simple explanation of the relief theory (Morreal, 1987, p. 221):

The natural free spirits of ingenious men, if imprisoned or controlled, will find out other ways of motion to relieve themselves in their constraint, and whether it be in burlesque, mimicry, or bufoonery, they will be glad at any rate to vent themselves, and be revenged on their constrainers. (qtd. in Morreal, 1987, p. 221)

The person whose emotions are somehow controlled tries to relieve them in the form of a humorous device, and hence tends to mock or criticize the restricting factors such as the authorities, institutions or the people around themselves. J.C. Gregory, on the other hand, underlines the impact of relief on humor realization in his following statements:

Relief... is written on the physical act of laughing and on the physiological accompaniments. It is written on the occasions of laughter and, more or less, plainly, on each of its varieties. A laughter of sheer relief may be the original source of all other laughters, which have spread from it like a sheaf... Relief is not the whole of laughter, though it is its root and fundamental plan. The discovery of sudden interruption through relaxation of effort merely begins the inquiry into laughter. But it does begin it, and no discussion of laughter that ignores relief or makes it of little account can hope to prosper. (Gregory, 1924, p. 40)

As is clear, Gregory attempts to show that relief is an indispensable component of humor, attributing both a physical and psychological aspect to the notion of humor.

3.2.4 Script-based theories of humor

Recent developments in semantic theory and practice have required the study of linguistic and extra-linguistic context of the utterance. Before Victor Raskin (1985), no prior research was available on the linguistic analysis of humor and no comprehensive formal theory of humor was proposed (Raskin, 1985, p. 30). Raskin paved the way for the linguistic analysis of verbal humor with his application of a “tentative formal script-oriented semantic theory” (Raskin, 1979, p. 325). As a result, Raskin’s script-based semantic theory of humor (1985) was accepted as “the first linguistic based theory of humor” (Carrell, 2008, p. 314). According to his theory, scripts imply “cognitive structures internalized by the speaker, which provides the speaker with information on how things are done” (Raskin, 1985, p. 46). In other words, “the scripts are designed to describe certain standard routines, processes, etc., the way the native speaker views them, and thus to provide semantic theory with a restricted and prestructured outlook into the extra-linguistic world” (Raskin, 1979, p. 325). In order to interpret a sentence, realization of all the scripts is of high importance. Although scripts are considered cognitive objects, Raskin insists on the fact that scripts are evoked by lexical items of a sentence (Attardo, 1994, p. 200). With this theory, Raskin aimed to create “a formal semantic analysis in terms of what each joke-carrying text would be identified as possessing a certain semantic property such that the presence of this property would render any text humorous” (Raskin, 1979, p. 325). To put it differently, Raskin wanted to create a theory that “provides the necessary and sufficient conditions that a text must meet for the text to be funny” (Attardo, 1994, p. 198). The following excerpt summarizes the main traits of Raskin’s script-based theory:

[...] the text of a joke is always fully or in part compatible with two distinct scripts and that the two scripts are opposed to each other in a special way...

The punch line triggers the switch from the one script to the other by making the hearer backtrack and realize that a different interpretation was possible from the very beginning. (Attardo and Raskin, 1991, p. 308)

What Raskin and Attardo want to underline is that an overlap of two different scripts are required in order to define a text humorous. It should, however, be noted that the degree of overlapping between two scripts may be partial or total. If the overlapping is total, the text is considered compatible with both of the scripts; if it is partial, some parts of the text will not be compatible with one or the other script (Attardo, 1994, p. 203). In addition, “the overlapping of two scripts does not necessarily produce a humorous effect. The two overlapping scripts should be opposite in a certain sense” (Raskin, 1979, p. 333). For instance, having analyzed three jokes, Raskin concluded that scripts are in a relationship of opposition that can be categorized in three classes: “actual vs. non-actual, normal vs. abnormal, and possible vs. impossible” (Attardo, 1994, p. 204). To put it briefly, the Script-based Semantic Theory of Humor classifies a text “funny” or humorous “if the text is compatible, fully or in part, with two scripts” that are in opposition to each other (Raskin, 1985, p. 99)

Although this theory enables the reader to come up with different interpretations of the same sentence by looking for “competing scripts” (Raskin, 1985, p. 125), it remains very limited in some instances as it takes the jokes as its primary source, making it difficult to apply it to other types of texts. What is more, the SSTH does not provide any indication as to what kinds of tools can be used to differentiate jokes or deal with other humorous texts (Attardo, 1984, p. 222). For these reasons, Attardo and Raskin (1991) collaborated to develop the “General Theory of Verbal Humor”.

3.2.5 General Theory of Verbal Humor

As is mentioned above, the General Theory of Verbal Humor is a revision and extension of Raskin's Script-based Semantic Theory of Humor (SSTH) and Attardo's five-level joke representation model. While the SSTH is accepted as the first semantic theory of humor, the GTVH is defined as a linguistic theory that includes textual linguistics, the theory of narrativity, and pragmatics by adopting five other Knowledge Resources (KRs) in addition to the script opposition from the SSTH (Attardo, 1994, p. 222). In this revised version, Attardo and Raskin propose a general theory "postulating a hierarchical model of joke representation model" that is based on six levels corresponding to or determined by knowledge resources, each of which is used as a joke parameter to identify perceived differences between jokes (Attardo and Raskin, 1991, p. 293-294). In other words, this model was developed in order to set some parameters for the evaluation of similarity among various jokes. The GTVH dedicates an important part to establish the notion of "joke similarity" in its theoretical framework. Attardo and Raskin claim that "many jokes are similar. Paraphrases and variants of the same joke can be found in print. People often retell jokes to each other, changing various aspects of them in the process" (Attardo and Raskin, 1991, p. 295). As a result, we observe some variations in the presentation of jokes, which can be discussed within the framework of the mentioned parameters. The GVTH benefits from the SSTH as a theory of text-type joke, as well as devising the tools required to handle the necessary features that characterize texts other than jokes (Attardo, 1994, p. 220). In the following section, main features of these KRs will be explained, underlying their importance in determining the level of difference between the jokes in the source texts and their translations.

Language (LA) parameter contains all the information that is required for the verbal presentation of a text. It also includes all the choices at the phonetic, phonologic, morphological, lexical, syntactic, semantic levels of language structure. Similarly, the parameter of language is responsible for the expression of the content of the joke (Attardo and Raskin, 1991, p. 298). In order to understand this parameter, it is necessary to realize the importance of the concept of paraphrase as any joke can be worded or constructed in a number of ways without changing its semantic content (Attardo, 2002, p. 177). However, in the case of verbal jokes, the exact wording of the punch line is extremely important in order to create the required humorous effect. For this reason, this Language Knowledge resource is generally preselected by the Script Opposition (Attardo, 2002, p. 177). In other words, the Script Opposition affects the nature of the language to be used in the joke formulation. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that this parameter of language is also responsible for expressing a special joke-meaning apart from the actual meaning the words or sentences denote. *Narrative Strategy (NS)* implies that any joke needs to be expressed in some form of narrative type, including simple narratives, dialogues, riddles, etc. This parameter also deals with the organization and presentation of the humorous elements. For instance, it becomes of important use in analyzing humorous texts of different genres in terms of identifying their narrative strategies. The *Target (TA)* parameter includes the group of people who constitute victims of the humorous discourse. It contains the groups of people or individuals to which the “humorous stereotypes are attached” (Attardo, 2002, p. 178). As Attardo mentions, it should be kept in mind that targets do not just consist of people or individuals, but groups or institutions that can also be treated as subjects of ridicule or satire. Therefore, the notion of “target” in this parameter does not necessarily require a specific group

composed of people. The *Situation (SI)* parameter, on the other hand, is related to the “objects”, “participants” or “props of the joke” (Attardo, 2002, p. 178). It is believed that every joke gives message “about something”, benefiting from the scripts in the text. Accepted as the most problematic parameter, *Logical Mechanism (LM)*, attempts to account for the way in which the joke is produced, providing tools to identify the resolution of the incongruity, which is one of the most important components of humor (Attardo, 2002, p. 179). It has been argued that a joke must provide a logical justification of the absurdity or irreality it postulates. *Logical Mechanism* embodies a “distorted” or “playful logic” that is not always valid “outside the world of the joke” (Attardo, 2002, p. 180). The last parameter, *Script Opposition (SO)*, involves both the semantic object described in Raskin’s previous theory and linguistic theories of semantics as pragmatic and contextual information. As a result, the GTVH expands the previous theory of humor by introducing linguistic and non-linguistic features in the determination of the characteristics of humorous texts.

From the point of view of the GTVH, a lot of jokes can be created by combining various parameters explained above. It is important to know that these parameters are organized hierarchically as follows: Script Opposition, Logical Mechanism, Situation, Target, Narrative Strategy, Language. This hierarchical organization has been formulated by taking into account various considerations regarding the interdependence and/or independence among the parameters. To put it simply, it has been found out that parameters determine or constrain the parameters following them and are determined or constrained by the previous ones (Attardo, 1994, p. 227). According to some of the scholars working to provide a general theory of verbal humor, “the degree of perceived difference between jokes increases linearly

with the height of the knowledge resource in which the two jokes differ” (Attardo, 2002, p. 183). To put it in a simpler way, the degree of difference is assumed to increase linearly, that is, there is much difference between two jokes that differ in script opposition level than there is between two jokes that show difference in narrative strategy level. Since this approach provides such linguistic parameters for language analysis of the texts, it can be adopted to specify some of the required peculiarities of the humorous texts. In the following part, the relationship between humor and translation will be analyzed, focusing on the applicability and validity of the humor theories in suggesting effective strategies for the translation of humorous devices.

3.3 Humor and translation

Humor Studies and Translation Studies center upon the transference of humorous elements and humorous discourse across geographical and cultural boundaries, which are affected by a number of variables including linguistic, social and cultural barriers. Although the interdisciplinary relationship between Humor and Translation Studies has been underlined by some of the prominent scholars in the relevant fields, this relationship, surprisingly, has not received sufficient attention in terms of academic productions. That is to say, not enough research has been conducted on the translation of humor, which is also emphasized by one of the prominent scholars, Jeroen Vandaele, who has made important contributions to the study of humorous text translation:

Whereas the immense practical act of translation itself is also increasingly being theorized in what has come to be known as translation studies [...] the combined object of humor translation must have seemed until now so vast, disorientating and dangerous an ocean that few academic efforts were made to theorize the processes, agents, contexts and products involved (Vandaele, 2002, p. 149).

It is clear that Vandaele foregrounds the need for more theoretical and systematic research so that translators or scholars can have some relevant strategies to deal with the analysis of humorous elements and their rendering into a foreign language. In this way, they can become familiar with some of the most efficient solutions to the common problems in the translation process of humorous discourse. It is also important to mention that the existing studies on the theory of humor translation have generally emphasized the unique nature of humor translation (Boria, 2009, p. 85). In his article, “(Re-) Constructing Humor: Meanings and Means”, Vandaele sheds lights on some of the most important factors that harden the task of the translator dealing with humorous texts. In his practice-oriented perspective, there exist four good reasons to think of humor reproduction as a challenging process (Vandaele, 2002, p. 150). First of all, humor translation involves recreating a “humorous effect” (be it laughter or smile), which appears to be more compelling when compared to the meaning perception of other texts, resulting mostly from the undeniable and observable manifestation of humor. Secondly, as some academic studies have shown, the production of humor is rather different from its comprehension and appreciation, making it challenging for the translators to reproduce it in another language (Vandaele, 2002, p. 150). There have been many cases in which translators have found themselves unable to recreate humor in another language though they have managed to fully capture the content of the humorous elements. For this reason, it is possible to conclude that humor (re) production needs different strategies to adopt during the translation process. As the third challenging factor, Vandaele mentions the translator’s “sense of humor”, claiming that the appreciation of humor may vary individually, which implies that a translator may not find a statement funny although he/she is aware of the comic message in the statement. In such instances, the

translator may be “confronted with the dilemma of either translating a bad joke” or finding other ways to render the actual humorous effect. Finally, Vandaele argues that the “rhetorical effect of humor” can be so dominant that it can hinder the production of humor by impeding “analytic rationalization” of the translators (Vandaele, 2002, p. 150).

Drawing upon Vandaele’s assumptions regarding the nature of humor translation, many scholars have come to the conclusion that humor is mostly characterized by the notion of “untranslatability” although they have different opinions and arguments regarding the degree or circumstances of untranslatability, depending on the language and culture that are under examination. As mentioned above, the challenges caused by humorous texts in the translation process involves different factors, which is briefly mentioned by Dirk Delabastita in the following statements. He tries to clarify the main reasons for the difficulty of translating humorous texts:

[...]the translation of a playful text confronts the translator with the unique semantic structure not just of a text but of a language as well. Wordplay can therefore be seen as a kind of signature, epitomizing each language’s unique individuality and therefore quite naturally resisting translation—but at the same time calling for the authenticating gesture of translation as a counter signature in another language. (Delabastita, 1996, p. 13)

As Delabastita mentions, humorous elements are difficult to render in another language, resulting from their culture and language specific natures. Therefore, the translator of humor has to accept the fact that humorous elements of a language are mostly group or culture specific, requiring a shared knowledge between the sender and receiver for the humorous content to make sense. As is mentioned in the example above, wordplay that combines “formal similarity and semantic dissimilarity” (Delabastita, 1993 cited in De Geest, 1996), is a good example of the culture-specific

nature of humorous elements. In other words, the culture in which they are produced determines what kind of humorous element is appropriate in a given context. As a result, recognizing and appreciating them requires shared knowledge on the part of the audience. It is a known fact that translator's choices are affected both by textual and extra-textual concerns, bringing forth the significance of the familiarity with the cultural and social context of the source and target languages (Popa, 2004, p. 154). As in other types of translation activity, the shared knowledge is an important issue in dealing with the problem of cultural untranslatability, which is underlined in Irene Del Corral's following statement:

[...] communication breaks down when the levels of prior knowledge held by the speaker/writer and by the listener/reader are not similar. While this is true of any communication, the breakdown is particularly obvious in the case of translated humor, whose perception depends directly on the concurrence of facts and impressions available to both speaker/writer and listener/reader. (Del Corral, 1988, p. 25)

Taking these points into consideration, it is possible to conclude that different cultures laugh at different things in different ways. For this reason, translation of humorous text requires the decoding of a humorous speech in its original context, the transfer of that speech in a different and often disparate linguistic and cultural environment, and its reformulation in a new language which aims to recapture the intention of the original humorous message and elicit in the target audience a similar response (Niedzielski, 1991, p. 141). In some circumstances, a joke can be very specific to a language and culture, making it nearly impossible to be rendered in another language.

As Delia Chiaro says, "jokes, it would seem, travel badly" (Chiaro, 1992, p. 77). Therefore, jokes that are based on culture-specific events, states and situations may create some problems for the audience, most of which are tried to be solved by finding equivalent rhetorical devices on the target side. However, on some occasions,

cultural referents may have no equivalent in the target culture, and the translator has to decide whether this cultural information can be maintained in the translation, or has to be substituted or adapted so as not to “generate alterations in the eventual balance of cognitive effects and mental effort, and parallel alterations in the humorous effects” (Yus, 2012, p. 7). As some case studies have shown, translators encountering such scenarios have a tendency to replace these culture-specific referents with the local ones in the target language with the aim of preserving the communicative humorous effect of the source message in the target culture (Yus, 2012, p. 7). As another useful concept in understanding the cultural aspect of humor translation, we can refer to Maria Tymoczko’s notion of the “comic paradigm”, which suggests the world view determining what is and is not considered funny in a given culture at a given time (Tymoczko, 1987, p. 88). In her view, the “comic paradigm” of a target culture is different from that of the source culture and this affects the reception of the source text in the target culture (Tymoczko 1987, p. 88). As a result, cultural background, historical and literary traditions, and conventions that make up the “comic paradigm” need to be taken into consideration in the analysis of humorous texts.

In addition to cultural factors, the linguistic features of languages have an utmost influence on the transference of humorous elements across languages. According to Vandaele, languages interpret the codes in a specific manner (Vandaele, 2002, p. 164). Vandaele summarizes this in the following categories: (1) “the force of reality” implies that “different languages create different concepts for different realities”. For instance, if a culture does not know some type of a bird, then it may not include a word representing it in its lexicon; (2) “conceptual freedom of language” means “that different languages create different concepts for the same

reality”, as is observed in the philosophical concepts of different languages; (3) “sociolinguistic force” refers to the languages’ tendencies to “attach different connotations to similar denotations” (Vandaele, 2002, p. 164). As Vandaele mentions, difference in connotations causes problems if a concept in the source language has a different linguistic value than its equivalent version in the target language (Vandaele, 2010, p. 150). This kind of an imperfect equivalence can create problems in the translation process, which is pointed out by Umberto Eco’s following statement in an ironical tone:

Polite French people still address cab drivers as *Monsieur*, while it would seem exaggerated to use *Sir* in a similar circumstance in, say, New York. *Sir* would have to be kept if in the original text (*Monsieur*) is intended to represent a very formal relationship, between two strangers, or between a subaltern and his superior, while (*Sir*) seems improper (or even ironical) in more intimate circumstances. (Eco, 2001, p. 18)

In this example, the irony stems from the register incongruity between the French word “Monsieur” and its English counterpart “Sir”. We may encounter a lot of similar instances in which humorous source text contains registers, dialects, sociolects that have no equivalent in the target language. Finally, Vandaele talks about the “metalingual force” which suggests that “different languages adopt different ways of joining various realities” in forms such as wordplay and punning. According to his perspective, the concept of “script” introduced by Salvatore Attardo include all these above mentioned “code-specific language forms” (Vandaele, 2002, p. 165). It is also true that these problems cannot be separated from the problems explained within the framework of cultural elements having an impact on the transference of humorous content in another language. However, Vandaele wants to assert that the specific trouble they create for humor translation results from the fact that “humor has a clear penchant for (socio) linguistic particularities and for

metalinguistic communication” (Vandaele, 2010, p. 150). In conclusion, the translation of humor is affected by some challenging restrictions that have to do with “semiotic and linguistic differences”, “metalinguistic devices” as well as some other socio-cultural elements such as social institutions, genres, themes etc.; the audience’s degree of familiarity or appreciation for the humorous devices (Zabalbeascoa, 2005, p. 191). As Zabalbeascoa underlines, the profile of audience plays an important role in the perception of humorous elements in the text, and hence the translators need to pay attention to the “cognitive distance between the knowledge required to decode a message (i.e., to understand and appreciate the text) and the knowledge one assumes one’s audience to have” (Zabalbeascoa, 2005, p. 191).

In addition to the general factors explained above, I would like to touch upon some other criteria that can be helpful both in the real process and analysis of humor translation, benefiting mainly from Zabalbeascoa’s parameters in his essay entitled “Humor and Translation: An Interdiscipline” (Zabalbeascoa, 2005, p. 191). First of all, it is important for the translators to watch out for the “intentionality” of the humor, to understand whether the humor is created intentionally by the author or occurs by accident in a specific context. As Zabalbeascoa asserts, the interpretation of a humorous content “depends as much on what is in a reader, listener or viewer’s mind as what is on the page, stage or the screen” (Zabalbeascoa, 2005, p. 191). Therefore, translators should be careful of rendering the intentionality in the target language without causing unintended humor in the translation. Secondly, translators may fail to translate certain humorous elements as they cannot decode the implicitly given humorous content. In most of the cases where translators cannot render the covert forms of humor in another language, they resort to overt manifestations, tending to explain the content of the humor or recreate its function in the target

language in accordance with the conventions of the target culture (Zabalbeascoa, 2005, p. 192). In addition, almost all kinds of humorous devices are directed towards a specific target or victim that can be people, individuals, groups of people or institutions, ideas, beliefs, etc. They may be perceived differently in different communities that consequently have an impact on the strategies and the success of translating the humorous content. When the humor does not have an obvious target, translation may become more problematic, since the humor generally tends to become more language and group-specific. For this reason, it is important to identify the nature of humorous devices, taking the victim factor into consideration.

A further consideration in translating humor can be related to the function and importance of the humorous device in terms of rendering the intended message. Some occasions make it compulsory to use a humorous device in order to convey the message, whereas the others use it just as an optional device that help to present the content in a more enjoyable manner. Therefore, translators must be aware of the social function of humor in a specific context and what consequences may come out if the translators do not reflect the humorous content in their translations. In conclusion, translation of humor is accepted as a complicated process that relies on double meaning, ambiguity, metaphorical, abstract or symbolic meanings or absurdity (Zabalbeascoa, 2005, p. 193-194).

Having an important role in the process of transferring humor into other languages, translators affect both the perception of humor and the audience's response in various ways. The translator is a very important variable having a significant impact upon this transfer process. For this reason, it is of high importance to enter into their personal world that gives us some idea regarding their personality, knowledge, worldview, background, education, ideology, etc. In other words, the

reproduction of humor in another language depends on many variables related to the translators, ranging from their personality to the sense of humor they have. As Delia Chiaro mentions, “humor is very much in the eyes and ears of the beholder” (Chiaro, 2005, p. 135). The translator of a text that relies greatly on humor for its effect and meaning encounters the challenge of not only reproducing the linguistic and semantic features of the joke, but also recreating a situation in which the humor functions, generating in the audience a similar pleasure, amusement or laughter with that of the source text (Wallace, 2002, p. 75). According to Carrol J. Wallace, translation is an excellent way to study the functions and techniques of humor in a literary work. In his view, the translator must examine carefully what kinds of strategies are used to generate humor and what responses are evoked in the part of the audience so that she/he can transfer the humor in another language (Wallace, 2002, p. 75). In this way, the translator can find out the relevant strategy for the appreciation of humor by the target audience, which makes it different from the strategies adopted in other literary texts (Antonopoulou, 2004, p. 246). In order to achieve it, translators are required to take into account the differences between the expectations and social, cognitive, linguistic backgrounds of both the source and target text readers. Like the source text readers, the target audience engages in some kind of cognitive effort in understanding the humorous content, and translators are given the task to calculate the amount of effort to be spent on the part of the target reader (Antonopoulou, 2004, p. 246). Considering all the above-mentioned factors, it is possible to conclude that translators need to be acquainted with the intricacies of both recognizing and rendering humorous discourse in another language.

CHAPTER 4

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATION OF HUMOROUS DEVICES IN THE NOVEL

4.1 General Theory of Verbal Humor (GVTH)

In the following part where the translation of humorous elements will be examined, the General Theory of Verbal Humor will be applied as an analytical tool to compare the source and target texts. As mentioned in the previous parts of the study, the GTVH is accepted as “a sound linguistic framework allowing for a comparison of humorous texts” through its “metric of similarity across jokes” (Attardo, 2002, p. 192). As Salvatore Attardo argues in his case study where he offers a translation approach based on the GTVH, translators can estimate how different the target humorous element is from the original. According to this hypothesis, “the degree of perceived difference between jokes increases linearly with the height of the knowledge resource in which the two jokes differ” (Attardo, 2002, p. 183). As a result, translators can both adjust their translations strategies accordingly and describe different translated versions of humorous source texts. In addition, this theory will enable to analyze the humor through a humor theory unlike the previous studies that attempted to explain the humor transference processes with the existing translation theories and strategies. Attardo’s theory of humor translation requires the translators to respect all of the knowledge resources in their translations. But when it is not possible, letting the translation differ at the lowest level is suggested as far as pragmatic purposes are concerned (Attardo, 2002, p. 183) Even though the GTVH provides a very comprehensive linguistic framework including the knowledge parameters of language, situation, narrative strategy, two overlapping opposite scripts, as well as specific targets in its descriptions, it needs to be supported by other

explanations taking pragmatic, social, cultural and contextual concerns into consideration. With this aim in mind, I will benefit from Paul H. Grice's "conversational maxims" in order to interpret and understand the utterances in a correct way.

Although the process of translation of humorous devices into another language can bring out various factors to be discussed, this study aims to explain it in accordance with Vandaele's notion of "humor", mentioning that it can be recast as a "humorous effect and hence translating humor would come down to achieving the same humorous effect" (Vandaele, 2002, p. 151). For this purpose, translators need to examine the pragmatic, social, cultural, linguistic and personal factors having an influence on creating an intended humorous effect in the source text. As Vandaele mentions, pragmatic aspects of language would be useful in understanding the humorous devices in *Three Men in a Boat* as it helps the translators to describe "how humans apparently think, speak, act and, [...] bring across or understand intended humor by referring to coherent, partly theorized categories of intentionality/consciousness" (Vandaele, 2002, p. 160). Incorporating the notion of pragmatics in the discussion of humor translation would also provide answers for the non-linguistic factors. For this purpose, awareness of different humor traditions in the source language and the target language, cross-cultural obstacles caused by the differences in norms, expectations and incongruities in different languages, sociocultural information such as "facts about register, dialect variation, topicality, discourse", etc. will be taken into account in explaining the translation strategies of the translators.

With the aim of reaching generalizations regarding the translator's behaviors in transferring humorous elements into another language, I will divide the humorous

devices of the novel into more specific types that have their own features according to which different strategies need to be developed and adopted. Irony, wordplay and metaphor-based humorous devices will be the main categories that the study will focus on. Each section will provide answers whether the existing theories and the proposed analytic tools suffice to describe the humor transference between different languages and cultures, leading to contemplate on developing a new model applicable to all kinds of humorous texts.

4.2 Translation of irony

When the relevant literature is examined, it is easily seen that little attention has been given to the translation of irony within Translation Studies. Most of the scholars working in this realm agree on the general claim that there are at least two main reasons why the translation of irony has not captured the required attention so far (Wilde, 2010, p. 26). One of the reasons can be attributed to the lack of consensus regarding the definition and theoretical scope of irony. Another reason has been said to result from the fact that we do not have a specific product-oriented methodology to be used in the comparative analysis of ironic texts (Wilde, 2010, p. 26). In order to deal with such conceptual complexity, I will attempt to provide a working definition of the humorous device “irony” to be adopted throughout the comparative analysis of translation.

In recent years, a majority of scholars have come to the conclusion that the old definition of irony as “saying one thing and meaning another” is no longer accepted as the valid definition of the complex techniques used by the writers in literary texts (Mateo, 1995, p. 172). As is suggested by Muecke, irony has started to be accepted as a pragmatic category that activated “an endless series of subversive

interpretations” (Muecke, 1982, p. 31). This pragmatic approach to the study of irony has contributed to the broadening in its definition as “a discursive strategy that depends on context and on the identity and position of both the ironist and the audience” (Hutchen, 1994, p. 178). To put it differently, the notion of “irony” has started to be dealt in contextual terms, implying the significance of the relation of an ironic word to the other words, expressions or situations in the whole text. Therefore, it is not enough just to focus on the lexical units in order to recognize the irony, but contextual features should also be taken into consideration (Mateo, 1995, p. 172). For these reasons, we need to identify the formal and rhetorical devices of the ironic texts.

Although the definition of irony has undergone some changes throughout the years, the basic elements on which irony operates remain almost the same. As Douglass C. Muecke explains, there are three essential elements that are required to define an utterance as ironic (Muecke, 1969, p. 19-20). First of all, irony involves two levels of complex structure in itself. On the lower level, we observe “the situation that is represented by the ironist in the way “as it appears to the victim”. On the upper level, we are provided with the “situation as it appears to the observer or the ironist” (Muecke, 1969, p. 19-20). Secondly, there must exist a kind of contradiction or incongruity between these two levels so that irony can be realized. Another element that contributes to irony is the “innocence that refers to victim’s unawareness of the upper level or the or the ironist’s pretending not to be aware of it” (Muecke, 1969, p. 19-20). In other words, in some circumstances, the ironist speaks as if he/she does not know the truth behind what he/she presents as true. However, as Marta Mateo argues, it should be kept in mind that irony is not used to deceive the audience, but to be recognized as irony. The audience needs to realize

that an utterance has a different meaning from what is mentioned in the text or speech (Mateo, 1995, p. 172).

According to the common categorizations made to classify irony, irony can be studied as “intentional irony” (corresponding to Martin Montgomery’s verbal irony) and “unintentional irony” (corresponding to Montgomery’s situational irony), which will be taken as the reference point in classifying ironical utterances (Mateo, 1995, p. 172). As Mateo explains, “intentional irony” refers to the situations where the ironist intentionally creates an incongruous situation beforehand. In “unintentional irony”, on the other hand, the contradiction happens at the moment of the event and hence creates an unintentional or situational incongruity (Mateo, 1995, p. 172). In the novel that I am working on, it is possible to encounter various examples of “intentional irony” as Jerome expresses his criticism against the society. I believe that it is important to know whether the humorous element results from an unintentional or intentional irony with regard to understanding the author’s point of view and evaluating translation strategies of the translators.

With the aim of clarifying what happens in the formulation process of irony, I would like to refer to Walter Nash’s general formula for humor process. According to Nash, there are two main “executants” in the humor process (Nash, 1985, p. 19). One of them is the author in the text who aims to convey a message. The other author is the persona who speaks on behalf of the author in the text. On the other hand, we have two respondents in this process, one of which is the respondent within the text who is controlled by the persona and gives some responses that are shared or rejected by the outside respondent. In addition, there is also an outside respondent who can be the reader or an observer having a role in the process (Nash, 1985, p. 20). In this formula, the outside respondent is allowed into the joke while the other respondent is

left in the dark and hence is unaware of the real intention of the author (Nash, 1985, p. 20). At this point, we can explain this relationship chain within the framework of superiority theories. In this example, the outside respondent knowing the real intention of the author is considered superior to the other respondent within the text who is presented as unaware of the truth behind his statements or words.

Before moving on to the difficulties and problems observed in the translation process of ironic utterances, I want to use Muecke's categorization of irony types with the purpose of defining and analyzing different types of irony in the novel. According to Muecke, there are four types of irony determined in terms of the part played by the ironist. When the audience is unaware of the ironist and the irony lies in what the ironist says, we can talk about "impersonal irony" (Muecke, 1969, p. 61). When the ironist presents himself ignorant of the situation, we are provided with a "self-disparaging irony". In addition, he suggests another type of irony called "ingénue" in which the ironist withdraws and makes a speaker talk on behalf of him. Finally, there is the "dramatic irony" observed mostly in plays where the ironist completely disappears from the text and hence an ironic situation is created (Muecke, 1969, p. 61-93).

Taking the above-mentioned issues into consideration, it is possible to conclude that interpretation and translation of irony is not a simple task, which is made even harder by the fact that irony is not resolved by focusing on the propositional meaning of expressions as it is in direct interpretations (Chakhachiro, 2009, p. 41). For this reason, we need to find accurate and appropriate methods in finding out the intended messages in the ironic utterances. As Malcolm Coulthard mentions, it is of high importance to know the "possible parameters of the speech act, that is, the participants, situation and style" as it can give the translator a great

ability to capture the irony (Coulthard, 1985, p. 44). However, Raymond Chakhachiro attracts the attention to the serious stylistic problem of irony, mentioning that there are various and unlimited ways with which writers use irony in their texts (Chakhachiro, 2009, p. 41). In order to avoid this problem, we need to take into account some of the verbal ironic cues such as “hyperbolic expressions, hyperformality, intensifier, repetition, interjection” and so on (Pelsmaecker and Van Besien, 2002, p. 246).

Grice’s conversational maxims can also be applied as the norms according to which ironic utterances can be analyzed. Gricean “conversational maxims” have been studied by some scholars to explain the process in irony translation (e.g., Sperber and Wilson, 1995; Attardo, 2000; Hatim and Mason, 1990, 1997; Kauffeld, 2001; Hutcheon, 1995). As is known, Grice’s conversational maxims consist of four main principles that help us to identify the ambiguities in expressions. *Quantity* refers to the appropriate amount of the information an utterance or word conveys (Grice, 1975, p. 45). As Grice mentions, the expression should be as informative as required. *Quality* implies that the information needs to be correct, true and adequate; *manner* requires that the expressions needs to be “clear, non-ambiguous, brief and orderly”; *relation* refers to the “relevance to the subject matter and register” (Grice, 1975, p. 45-46). These maxims will be used in the comparison part of the translations with the aim of understanding the incongruity in the formation of irony. As Eugene Nida claims, most of the discussions on the translation of ironic utterances turn around the idea that the audience’s reactions to these expressions are based on some expectations, which also result in some violations on linguistic, stylistic, structural and logical levels (Chakhachiro, 2009, p. 46). As is obvious, this kind of a perspective enables us to deal with the notion of irony and ironical utterances beyond

linguistic levels, focusing also on the role style, context, prior knowledge and other factors play in the analysis of irony. It should be kept in mind that a linguistic approach will not be sufficient in the study of translation of ironical utterances, resulting from the fact that “humor is an occurrence in a social play and it characterizes the interaction of persons in situations and cultures” (Nash, 1985, p. 12). Therefore, we need to be aware of the participant and the situation in which irony is used together with the background information of the culture where it is going to function (Mateo, 1995, p. 174). Even though the distance between cultures causes problems in almost all kinds of translation activity, it is possible to experience it much more seriously in the process of irony translation. In other words, the more distant the culture is, the more difficulty the translator will have in both understanding and transferring the ironical expressions into another language (Mateo, 1995, p. 174).

Before delving into the description of how ironic utterances were translated in the target texts, it would be useful to analyze the general features of ironic expressions in the novel. Even though *Three Men in a Boat* uses different kinds of humorous devices, irony has the upmost importance in rendering the humorous discourse of the novel. When the whole novel is examined, it is realized that irony plays a leading role in the representation of the humorous tone of the novel. In most parts of the novel, we are provided with ironic utterances that present situations incongruous with the real world. For instance, while J. is talking about one of his friends from high school, he utters the following sentences: “if there was any known disease going within ten miles of him, he had it, and had it badly. He would take bronchitis in the dog-days, and have hay-fever at Christmas. After six week’s period of drought, he would be stricken down with rheumatic fever; and he would go out in

a November fog and come with a sunstroke” (p. 52). As is clear, Jerome wants to emphasize the boy’s unluckiness by claiming that he is down with some diseases in the most improbable conditions. For example, he catches rheumatic fever in cloudy weather when there is no rain. In this ironic example, Jerome benefits from the contradiction between the existing time periods, conditions and the features of the diseases. Although ironical structures are derived from incongruous and contradictory situations, they are used for various purposes. In the novel, Jerome’s irony is mostly related to revealing and “mocking the pretensions and hypocrisies of certain social conventions” together with the foibles of the characters (Lind, 2014, p. 4). In the second chapter of the novel, Jerome exemplifies this issue with a digression in which he talks about someone named Uncle Podger who always insists on fixing new things by himself, although he is very bad at it. He does not only cause trouble for himself, but also puts the other family members under unnecessary challenge by just sticking to his own truths and disregarding other’s opinions, which is understood in the following scenario where the uncle makes lots of people work just for fixing a light bulb: “two people would have to hold the chair, and a third would help him up on it, and hold him there, and a fourth would hand him a nail, and a fifth would pass him up the hammer, and he would take hold of the nail, and drop it” (p. 24). Jerome also attempts to illustrate this tendency of human beings through the characters wanting what they cannot have and then losing interest about these things when they do obtain them. Considering the main theme of the novel, it is easy to conclude that Jerome has given much space to such examples throughout his novel. For example, in the following excerpt, J. summarizes the general tendency in people to give up something that they have been looking forward to when they gain the chance to do it:

The idea, overnight, had been that we should get up early in the morning, fling off our rugs and shawls, and throwing back the canvas, spring into the

river with a joyous shout, and revel in a long delicious swim. Somehow, now, the morning had come, the notion seemed less tempting. The water looked damp and chilly; the wind felt cold. (p. 102)

Here, the irony results from the content of the utterance in which the ironist is not visible. Therefore, it can be defined as an “impersonal” irony that is mostly used to give general messages about a topic. In another example, we observe an instance of “ingénue” where the author makes a character to speak on behalf of himself and show the hypocritical behaviour of a man who is strongly desiring to find some beer to drink, but changes his idea when he finds it because of its high price: “I heard a man, going up a mountain in Switzerland, once say he would give worlds for a glass of beer, and when he came to a little shanty where they kept it, he kicked up a most fearful row, because they charged him five francs for a bottle of Bass. He said it was a scandalous imposition” (Jerome, 1994, p. 116). A similar scenario is presented through a kettle, which is likened to the general feature of human beings in that it rejects to boil the water when people need it, and instead waits for the moment when they will not use it:

That is the only way to get a kettle to boil up the river. If it sees that you are waiting for it and are anxious, it will never even sing. You have to go away and begin your meal, as if you were not going to have any tea at all. You must not even look round it. Then you will soon hear sputtering away, and to be made into tea. (p. 91)

Finally, I would like to give another interesting example related to sea-sickness, which makes us understand how people can delude themselves. According to the author, people pretend to forget what they have felt during a sea journey after they go ashore, which is written down in a comic tone in the following excerpt:

It is a curious fact, but nobody ever is sea-sick on land. At sea, you come across plenty of people very bad indeed, whole boat-loads of them; but I never met a man yet, on land, who had ever known at all what it was to be

sea-sick. Where the thousands upon thousands of bad sailors that swarm in every ship hide themselves when they are on land is a mystery. (p. 14)

In all the examples given above, Jerome tries to show how people create illusions and delude themselves in their daily lives by using ironical devices. In order to make it more emphatic, Jerome adds another layer of humor to the novel by representing J. himself to be the guilty of the hypocritical behaviors he criticizes and hence creates “self-disparaging” ironical examples (Lind, 2014, p. 2). In the preface of the novel, Jerome gives us clues regarding the hypocritical nature of the narrator. In the preface of the The author mentions, “the chief beauty of this book lies not so much in its literary style, or in the extent and usefulness of the information it conveys, as in its simple truthfulness. Its pages form the record of events that really happened”, adding that George, Harris and Montmorency are from the real life (Jerome, 1994, p. 1). However, as we read the novel, it is possible to recognize that the content is both fictional and factual and there does not exist a real dog called Montmorency. The author intentionally makes it up with the aim of using it while he directs some criticism towards people and the society as a whole. With regard to the ironic parts where the narrator, J.’s, hypocritical behaviors are presented, it should be kept in mind that the irony needs to be resolved by turning to the previous pages where the contrary statements are uttered. In other words, the author benefits from the literary device of flashbacks to create “self-disparaging irony”. For example, in one part of the novel, J. writes in a serious tone that he “can’t sit still and see another man slaving and working” (p. 36). However, when J.’s general tendency in the previous sections is taken into consideration, it is easy to see that J. usually avoids carrying out tasks such as the packing of the bags before the journey. Another striking example can be observed in the first chapter where J. mentions his ideas regarding a sea journey. Firstly, J. rejects this idea very strongly with his following statements: “I

objected to the sea trip strongly. A sea trip does you good when you are going to have a couple of months of it, but for a week, it is wicked” (p. 12). Interestingly enough, J. starts to explain it in a different way in the following statements, trying to create a self-disparaging irony through the means of pretended innocence: “So I set my face against the sea trip. Not, as I explained upon my own account. I was never queer. But I was afraid for George” (p. 14). As is clear, he pretends not to get disturbed by the sea journey though he expresses a contradictory opinion in the previous pages. Throughout the novel, it is possible to come across some parts where the author criticizes the laziness in people. For this purpose, he makes the narrator underline the importance of being ready and willing to work, which is tried to be shown through J’s words: “It does always seem to me that I am doing more work than I should do. It is not that I object to the work, mind you; I like work; it fascinates me. I can sit and look at it for hours. I love to keep it by me; the idea of getting rid of it nearly breaks my heart” (p. 144). However, the same character starts to complain about doing most of the work in the later parts of the novel after George and Harris accuse him of doing the least work in the boat. In his view, he is the one who has carried out most of the tasks during the journey and hence finds their accusations unfair and he prefers to show his dissatisfaction in an ironic way: “and that was their gratitude to me for having brought them and their wretched old boat all the way up from Kingston, and having superintended and managed everything for them, and taken care of them, and slaved for them. It is the way of the World” (p. 146). As is seen, Jerome again prefers to present it by endowing J. with pretended innocence since he represents himself as someone who does not deserve their accusations.

Apart from the hypocrisies observed in social structures and the main characters of the novel, Jerome's irony also targets the pretensions of the middle and upper classes in the way of how they present themselves to the society. With regard to the pretensions of the middle class, Jerome wants to underline their tendency to represent themselves as members of higher classes in society, which becomes one of the important issues to be criticized in the novel. For example, in Chapter 8, Jerome provides a scene from an ostentatious party where people from the middle class pretend to come from the upper class by adopting their behaviours and lifestyle, which is apparent in the following sentences in which Jerome talks about what people do at the party: "We played morceaux from the old German masters. We discussed philosophy and ethics. We flirted with graceful dignity. We were even humorous –in a high class way" (p. 73). These kinds of pretensions from the middle class lead them into very comic situations, one of which occurs when Harris is asked to sing a comic song that he does not know well. Before being asked to do it, Harris pretends to know a comic song very well, which will later pull him down before the audience. When he starts to sing Gilbert and Sullivan's "The First Lord's Song" from *H.M.S. Pinafore*, both the pianist and the audience become angry as Harris sings something totally different from the original one and repeats strange lines lots of times. In the end, he makes the audience cry instead of eliciting laughter.

After providing general information on both the general linguistic structures that formulate ironical utterances as well as the specific types of the irony used in the novel, the following part will deal with the translation of irony. As far as translations of these ironic utterances are taken into consideration, Mateo's comprehensive model of analyzing irony and its translation which has been formulated by looking at the translation of three English comedies into Spanish would be of good help in the

descriptive part of the study (Pelsmaecker and Van Besien, 2002, p. 251). The study will benefit from Mateo's procedures in defining the translation strategies of the translators. The following list includes the most common procedures adopted in the translation of the ironic utterances that were worked on:

(a) ST irony becomes TT irony with literal translation; (b) ST irony becomes TT irony with "equivalent effect" translation; (c) ST irony becomes TT irony by means of different effects from those used in ST; (d) ST ironic innuendo becomes more restricted and explicit in TT; (e) ST irony becomes TT sarcasm; (f) the hidden meaning of ST irony comes to the surface in TT; (g) ST ironic ambiguity has only one of the two meanings translated in TT; (h) ST irony is replaced by a "synonym" in TT with no two possible interpretations; (i) ST irony is explained in footnote in TT; (j) ST irony has literal translation with no irony in TT; (k) ironic ST is completely deleted in TT; (l) no irony in ST becomes irony in TT (Mateo, 1995, p. 171-178).

All of the examples that will be discussed below will be analyzed in accordance with the GTVH and defined in terms of Mateo's above-mentioned procedures. The first example is taken from the very beginning of the novel where J. complains about having all kinds of diseases. According to him, he suffers from every type of disease, but he is especially anxious about his liver condition, which is for him the main reason for "a general disinclination to work of any kind" (p.8). While expressing his unluckiness resulting from being infected with all the possible diseases, he uses a hyperbolic example that helps to create irony as shown in the following sentences:

I felt rather hurt about this at first; it seemed somehow to be a sort of slight. Why hadn't I got housemaid's knee? Why this invidious reservation? (p. 8)

TT1: Bende bulunmayan biricik hastalık: Mafsal iltihabı... "Peki bu neden yok!" diye biraz içerledim. (p. 5)

TT2: Biran kırılır gibi oldum; aşağılanmışım gibi, geldi bana. Neden yoktu bende dizkapağı iltihabı, neden? Bu haksızlık nedendi? (p. 8)

TT3: Başlangıçta biraz bozulduğumu itiraf etmeliyim; kendimi ezilmiş, haksızlığa uğramış hissediyordum. Yani nasıl olmuştu da hizmetçi dizi bana uğramadan da geçmişti? Niçin bu hastalık benden esirgenmişti? (p. 13)

Jerome pretends to complain about not having the disease “housemaid’s knee”, which is exaggerated in J.’s question where he considers it an “invidious reservation”. Jerome resorts to overstatement and treats the lack of disease as something causing or tending to cause resentment or envy, which results in incongruity with the real feelings of J.. In other words, the language of the irony in this example is determined by the ironic cues of exaggeration and the choice of a rhetoric question, which aims to intensify the incongruity between the character’s words and the real situation. Even though J. is not satisfied with his current condition, the sentences he utters imply contradiction, showing him to be willing to have more diseases than he does. Since the sentences include the script oppositions of “satisfied/unsatisfied” and “real/unreal”, they can clearly be analysed as a humorous content. In terms of Grice’s maxims, on the other hand, it is clear that the author does not comply with the requirements of the “maxim of quality” in that he says what he believes to be false (Grice, 1975, p. 42). In the Turkish versions, TT3 and TT2 maintain the ironic cues in their translations by recreating the question form narrative strategy. In addition, the translators in these versions try to stick to the script oppositions of the source text in their target versions by presenting J. as unsatisfied from the fact that he does not have the “housemaid’s knee”. TT3 and TT2 render the name of the disease as “hizmetçi dizi” (the knee of a housemaid) and “dizkapağı iltihabı” (kneecap inflammation) respectively. In addition, they maintain the complaining attitude of the character by emphasizing that he feels that he is hard done by the disease. As a result, ST irony becomes TT irony with literal translations in these versions (Mateo, 1995, p. 171). However, TT1 renders the irony into the target language by means of other ironic cues than that of the source text. Instead of emphasizing the fact he believes he is treated unfairly by the fate because it has not

“granted” him this disease, TT1 recreates another irony with the adjectival phrase “biricik hastalık” (a unique disease). In this version, the translator also does not use the same narrative strategy or logical mechanism and hence the ironic effect becomes weaker.

In the second chapter, Jerome makes digression and starts to tell the story of a man called Uncle Podger who is known for his clumsiness. As mentioned before, he insists on continuing with what he believes to be correct even though he always causes a lot of trouble when he attempts to handle a task. Constructing this section with ironic statements and examples, Jerome wants to criticize the common trait of narrow-mindedness in human beings in the modern world. In the following example, Uncle Podger’s hammering the wall is presented in an exaggerated way, which creates an ironic effect:

And then he would have another try, and, at the second blow, the nail would go clean through the plaster, and half the hammer after it and Uncle Podger be precipitated against the Wall with force nearly sufficient to flatten his nose. (p. 26)

TT1: Çivinin ucunu tekrar zarp işaretinin tam ortasına yerleştirip bir kez daha vurdu. İşi kadınlara karşı onur meselesi yaptığı için var kuvveti pazıya toplamış, yaradana sığınmış olacak ki bu sefer çivinin başıyla beraber çekicin tam yarısı duvara gömüldü. (p. 20)

TT2: İkinci vuruşunda çivi tümüyle sıvanın içine girip gözden kaybolduktan sonra, çekicin yarısı da içeri geçirdi. Dahası Podger amcam da o hızla duvara toslar, burnunu ezerdi. (p. 28)

TT3: Ardından bir kez daha çiviye duvarakoyup hırsla çekici indirdi. Bu kez sadece çivi değil, çekicin yarısı da alçı duvara gömülür ve amcam hızını alamayarak burnunu duvara çarpardı. (p. 36).

As is seen in the sentence given above, Uncle Podger is presented as an inanimate object that is thrown against the wall in a strong way. In other words, the author makes a comparison between a count noun and a mass noun (Antonopoulou, 2002, p.

203). The sentence construes a count noun (Uncle Podger) as a mass noun by presenting him as something that can be thrown violently or abruptly to the wall. Therefore, in terms of the GVTH, the humorous effect is achieved through the logical mechanism of false analogy and exaggeration. In terms of script opposition, it can be said that the script opposition of “skillful/unskillful” is instantiated in the equation of “human-being/inanimate object”. With regard to the translations, we observe some differences from the source sentence in terms of the GVTH’s parameters. For instance, the logical mechanisms are not rendered in any of the target versions. TT1 prefers to move the emphasis from the count noun to the mass noun as the translator just describes the hammer’s relationship with the wall. Even though the situation changes in this version, the translation still sounds humorous as it exaggerates the strength Podger accumulates in his arms in order to hammer with the Turkish expression “var kuvveti pazyıya toplayıp, yaradana sığınmak” (accumulating all the strength in the arm and seeking refuge in God). On the other hand, TT3 produces a partial rendering of the source text situation by just referring to the metonymic part of the character’s body that “precipitated” against the wall. However, TT2 manages to keep the count-mass reversal by presenting his body as an inanimate object crashed into the wall, which is underlined with the lexical choices of “toslamak” (to go to the wall) and “ezmek” (hit). However, we can still define them as similar humorous sentences because all of them maintain the script opposition of “skillful/unskillful” in their translations though the language becomes less exaggerated and more explicit. In Mateo’s terms, ST irony becomes more restricted and explicit in the target text (Mateo, 1995, p. 171).

As in the previous example, translators resort to “the strategy of explicitation” in the translation of humorous content of the novel (Hirsch, 2011, p. 178). The

Dictionary of Translation Studies defines it as a phenomenon that frequently leads to TT stating ST information in a more explicit form than that of the original. Such a process is governed by the translator who carries out some shifts in the target text by adding explanatory phrases, spelling out ambiguous statements or inserting some connectives to clarify the logical flow of the text by increasing the potential to understand it (Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997, p. 55). Though explicitation is commonly used in rendering humorous devices into another language, scholars have different opinions regarding its effect upon the translation process. Omri Asscher also analyses the influence of “explicitation” on humor translation and discovers that while in some cases it diminishes the comic effect, it may sometimes enhance it, which depends on the complex interaction between comic features and translational norms (Asscher, 2010, p. 238). Taking these issues into consideration, I will analyze how the translation strategy of “explicitation” affects the rendering of humorous parts in the novel.

Although there are a lot of examples showing that translation of humorous devices, especially that of irony, exhibit many instances of explicitation, I will just examine some representative examples in order to understand its effect in recreating the humor in another language. For this purpose, I have chosen a sentence that is differentiated from the other parts of the page as an ironic statement, which is made obvious through the author’s intentional use of italic word to imply the irony hidden in it. In this specific part, the three main characters talk about the maladies they have. At this moment, George shows how bad he feels when he goes to bed. When the previous pages are remembered, however, it is easy to conclude that he does not have anything serious at all. In order to reveal this fact, Jerome prefers to produce irony

and shows the truth with the help of a stylistic device by italicizing the verb “fancy” in the source text sentence:

George *fancies* he is ill: but there is never anything really the matter with him, you know. (p. 11)

TT1: Herhalde kendisini hasta zannediyor. Evham getirmiş... (p. 7)

TT2: George kendini hasta sanır ama, doğruyu söylemek gerekirse, hastalık hastasıdır; anlarsınız ya! (p. 11)

TT3: Bana kalırsa George’unki bir evhamdan ibaret; gerçekte hasta falan olmadığını herkes biliyor. (p. 16)

In all of the translations, the translators do not maintain the stylistic feature of the source text in their target versions. To put it differently, they do not put the ironic expression in italic form, but prefer to adopt explicitation in their renderings.

However, it should be mentioned that not italicizing the ironical word may not have resulted from the translators’ decision, but from other factors related to the publishing house or the editors. Even though the source text author tries to criticize George’s hypochondriac nature through the ironical utterance “fancy” in an implicit way, the translators transform the verb “fancy” into a more specific and strong word “evham” (hypochondria) in the translation and increase the humorous effect. In terms of the GTVH, translators recreate another script opposition “healthy/unhealthy” in their versions by changing the parameter of language with a more strong expression “evham” and hence make it more humorous.

An explicatory statement can be added to the translation by changing the syntactic structure of the sentences, which is generally observed in the expression of questions with direct or exclamatory sentences. Such examples are also seen in the translation, one of which is presented below. The main characters of the novel desire to go on a picnic, but they change their opinion after learning that the weather is going to be rainy. Therefore, they begin to ridicule the people who have set off to go

on a picnic. Benefiting from the ironic device of rhetorical question, the characters pretend not to know the result regarding their picnic journey. Therefore, their rhetorical questions result in incongruity with the real situation and the irony is expressed through the logical mechanism of “ignoring what is obvious”.

“Ah!” we said, as we stood looking put at them through the window, “won’t they come home soaked!” / “Oh, *won’t* those people get wet? What a lark!” (p. 41-42)

TT1: İçimden: “Biraz sonra görüşürüz. Denize düşmüş sıpayı döner misiniz, dönmez misiniz?” diye beklerim. (p. 32)

TT2: “Biz pencereden onlarla, “Ha-hay! Nasıl da sırlıslıkla dönecekler eve!” diyerek eğlendik. “Nasıl ıslanacak o salaklar. Ne güleceğiz!” (p. 48)

TT3: Bizse pencereden acıyan gözlerle onlara bakarak, “Vah zavallılar,” diyorduk, “bir bilseler başlarına neler gelecek!” / “Neye uğradıklarını şaşıracaklar.” (p. 60)

In the Turkish versions, TT2 and TT3 do not reflect the logical mechanism or the narrative strategy as they convey the message in an explicit way with a complete affirmative sentence. Similarly, the translators resolve the suspicion by eliminating the script opposition of “getting wet/remaining dry” in their versions. They delete the ambiguity by revealing the result of their action, which is their “getting wet”. As a result, it is not possible to define these two translated sentences as similar with the source text’s ironical utterance because they show differences at the level of representing the script opposition. TT1, on the other hand, renders the logical mechanism and script opposition in the target language. The translator maintains the question form that enables to express the irony in an implicit manner and includes the possibility of two readings based on the two scripts of “getting wet/remaining dry” in his version.

In addition, Jerome resorts to internal contradictions in presenting the content, which is also considered another device to create irony in the text. In *Three Men in a*

Boat, this contradiction manifests itself in two ways: presentation of content and register. As mentioned above, the audience is required to turn back at some parts of the novel in order to capture the irony because Jerome benefits highly from the literary device of flashbacks in his comic digressions. The following example will be analyzed with the aim of both understanding how this internal contradiction works and is transferred into another language. In this example, J. tells his opinions on work ethics, which involves contradictory statements.

It does always seem to me that I am doing more work than I should do. It is not that I object to the work, mind you; I like work; it fascinates me. I can sit and look at it for hours. I love to keep it by me; the idea of getting rid of it nearly breaks my heart.

You cannot give me too much work; to accumulate work has almost become a passion with me; my study is so full of it now that there is hardly an inch of room for any more. I shall have to throw out a wing soon.

And I am careful of my work, too. Why, some of the work that I have by me now has been in my possession for years and years, and there isn't a fingermark on it. I take a great pride in my work; I take it down now and then dust it. No man keeps his work in a better state of preservation than I do. (p. 144-45)

TT1: Benim bu "iş" denilen baş belasıyla münasebetim eskiden beri samimi olmamıştır. Yani ben işi severim de o beni pek sevmez. Galiba kendisine karşı tutumumu beğenmez. Şu sebepten olmalı: Ben işi severim, işten korkmam! Bana istedikleri kadar iş versinler. Hepsini kabul ederim. Gayet ciddi, ağır ve tedbirli çalışırım. Bu dünyada en büyük tehlike bir işsever insanın işsiz kalmasıdır. Bu korkuyla olacak, ben işlerimi hiç bitirmem. Hep birbirlerine eklerim. İş odam tıka basa işle doludur. Öyle ki yakında bir şube açmak zorunda kalırsam dostlarım hiç şaşmasınlar. İş kısmı, iş sever adamı gözünden tanır. Bu sebeple zorluk bırakmaz çıkarır. Onun da bu dünyada biricik zevki bu olsa gerek... (p. 99)

TT2: Bana hep, üstüme düşenden fazla iş yapıyormuşum gibi gelir. Çalışmaya üşendiğimden değil, inanın. Severim çalışmayı. Hayranlık duyarım. Oturup saatlerce seyredebilirim. Yakınımda olsun isterim. Ondan uzak kalmak fikri, beni son derece üzer. Hiçbir iş ağır gelmez bana. İşleri biriktirmek bende bir tutku halindedir. Çalışma odam tavanlara kadar yapılacak işlerle doludur. Artık yenisini sığdırmaya yer kalmamış durumdadır. Yakında bir kısmını kaldırıp atmam gerekecek, herhalde. Ayrıca işimde dikkatliyimdir de. Yanıma yapmak üzere aldığım o işlerden bazıları, yıllardır orada. Üstlerine aldığım o işlerden bazıları, yıllardır orada. Üstlerine bir parmak izi bile eklenmemiş. İşimden büyük gurur duyarım. Yerinden indirir, tozunu alırım. Hiç kimse, işlerini benden daha temiz tutamaz. (p. 160)

TT3: Zaten bana hep üzerime düşenden daha fazla iş yapıyormuşum gibi gelir. Çalışmaya üşendiğimden değil; severim çalışmayı. Çalışan insanlara da oldum olası hayranlık duymuşumdur. Onları hiç sıkılmadan saatlerce seyredebilirim. Hayatımda daima çalışmaya yer vardır; hatta ondan uzak kalmak düşüncesi beni dehşete düşürür. Ayrıca benim için işe doymak diye bir şey söz konusu değildir, çünkü hayattaki en büyük tutkum, aldığım işleri biriktirmektir. Ne kadar geniş bir koleksiyonum olduğunu görseniz şaşarsınız. Çalışma odam tavanlara kadar biriktirdiğim işlerle doludur, öyle ki artık ufacık bir işe bile yer kalmamıştır. Böyle giderse yakında eve bir çalışma odası daha eklemem gerekecek. Bir başka özelliğim de bana verilen işlere gözüm gibi bakmamdır. Elimdeki işlerin bazılarının üstünden yıllar geçmiş olmasına karşın hala ilk günkü halleriyle, yepyeni dururlar. Üzerlerinde tek bir çizik ya da leke bile bulamazsınız. Bunlar benim için ayrı gurur kaynağıdır. (p. 200)

At the beginning of the example, J. claims that he likes working a lot with strong expressions such as “it fascinates me”. However, as one continues to read the excerpt, it is realised that he is not actually fond of working a lot, emphasised by the amount of the works accumulated without having any sign of action carried out. It should be mentioned that J. prefers to make a comparison between the notion of work (general term) and a specific object to be studied. As is clear, J. talks about the action word “work” as the name of a object, most probably something like a book, which is obvious in the following statements where it is presented as an observable object: “I can sit and look at it for hours”. If we were to explain the content in terms of the GTVH, it would be appropriate to explain the construction of humor as follows: Jerome produces a comic effect through the script oppositions of “like working/dislike working” and “work as something touchable/work as something observable”, presented through the logical mechanism of part-whole equation. Even though it is clear that the compared object implies working, he presents the whole with a small part and flouts the maxim of quality and thus may serve as a cue for irony. With regard to the translations, TT2 and TT3 display more parallelism with the source text in terms of reflecting the script oppositions and the logical mechanism. Both of them manage to preserve the equation of “part-whole” by

treating the notion of “work” like a tangible object. They also maintain the internal contradiction in their target versions by transforming the ST irony into TT irony with “equivalent effect” translation strategy. Although the translator in TT3 preserves the script opposition in most of her version, she changes the emphasis from the inanimate word “work” into the person “worker” in the third and fourth sentences, which may decrease the ironical effect in the target text. In TT1, however, some shifts are seen in the very beginning of the sentence where J. expresses his opinions about “work” in an explicit way, describing it with a metaphorical phrase “baş belası” (a pain in the arse). With his translation, the translator in TT1 decreases the ironic effect and ST irony becomes deleted in the first sentence because of the translator’s explanatory remarks.

As mentioned in the previous section, Jerome also uses linguistic-based ironical devices that are characterized by italicized words or word groups. In other words, Jerome creates irony by italicizing the word or words that are responsible for implying that what the speaker says is not actually what he/she intends to convey. Since this humorous device depends on the writing format of the words, it is not expected to create problems during the translation process. In order to see whether the translators adopt the same linguistic strategy, I would like to analyse some examples below. In the first example, Uncle Podger complains about his wife’s impatience when he is hammering the wall. Feeling humiliated by his wife, Uncle Rodger attempts to defend himself by disguising his awkwardness under the excuse of enjoying what he does.

“Oh! You women, you make such a fuss over everything,” Uncle Podger would reply, picking himself up. “Why, I *like* doing a little job of this sort.” (p. 25)

TT1: Amcam, kadınların tezcanlı, sabırsız, telaşçı olduklarına dair uzunca bir nutuk çekti. (p. 20)

TT2: “Ahhh, kadın milleti değil mi... her şeyi büyütürsünüz siz zaten!” derdi amcam doğrulurken. “Ben arasına bu tür işleri yapmaktan zevk duyarım.” (p. 29)

TT3: “Ah, şu kadın milleti,” diye patlardı. “Her şeyi böyle abartır, ufacık bir iş için ortalığı velveleye verirsiniz. Ne var yani, kendi evimin işini yapmak da suç mu?” (p. 36)

In this example, the irony depends upon the script oppositions of “actual/non-actual”, “like/dislike” and the logical mechanism of “pretended innocence”. In TT1, neither script opposition nor the logical mechanism is rendered. The translator deletes the ST irony in his version and expresses Rodger’s complaint with an explicatory sentence. In TT2, on the other hand, ST irony is transferred with literal translation without maintaining the stylistic difference of the ironic verb and hence does not manage to create the same effect as the source text message. It is possible for the reader to misinterpret his sentence as a true statement of Rodger. Although TT3 renders the source text irony by means of a different narrative strategy and makes the speaker ask a rhetorical question, it still manages to maintain the irony in the target text.

A similar example is observed when J. mocks the behaviours of his friends while they are packing their suitcases. According to J., his friends do not do anything except for creating trouble during the packaging process and he uses the modal verb “could” in its negative sense. In fact, J. wants to emphasize their breaking the cup is a sign of the more serious problems that they will cause later.

They started with breaking a cup. That was the first thing they did. They did that just to show you what they *could* do, and to get you interested. (p. 38).

TT1: Kırık dökme marifetine reçel kavanozundan başladılar. Beş dakikaya varmadan kırılanların hesabını şaşırdım. (p. 29)

TT2: İşe önce bir fincan kırmakla başladılar. İlk yaptıkları şey o oldu. Sanıyorum bunu, daha neler yapabileceklerini göstermek, gösterilerine ilgi toplamak için yaptılar. (p. 42)

TT3: İşe bir fincan kırarak başladılar. Bu sadece bir başlangıçtı elbette. Az sonra yapacaklarının yanında devede kulak kalıyordu. Sanırım bu, asıl marifetlerini sergilemeden önce bir çeşit ısınma hareketiydi. (p. 52)

As is seen, the italicized modal verb “could” is used outside its semantic field, suggesting not what they were able to do, but as a lexical sign implying the seriousness of the problems they would cause later. Therefore, the irony is formed with the script opposition of “ability to do something vs. tendency to cause something”. In the Turkish versions, TT1 does not render the source text’s script opposition, but recreates a new one depending on the notions of “skillful vs. unskillful”. The translator forms it by incorporating the word “marifet” (skill) into the first sentence, which enables him to create irony in the target text. Although the translator omits the irony created with the italicized modal verb in the last sentence, he still manages to render the humorous effect thanks to the compensatory lexical item introduced in the first sentence. The translator in TT2 produces a more literal version by rendering each lexical item into the target language. Although her version preserves the irony by maintaining the ambiguity with the expression “neler yapabileceklerini” (what they can do), the humorous effect is not as emphasized as it is in the source text. TT3 also maintains the script oppositions by turning the italicized ironical utterance into the idiomatic expression “devede kulak kalmak” (remaining derisory). Using such a creative alternative, TT3 manages to imply what other serious problems the characters would cause in a humorous way.

Jerome also benefits from the language variety of the novel in order to produce irony. When the literature is examined, it is seen that a number of case studies have looked at the humorous potential of register and the strategies used in

translating them (Maher, 2011, p. 7). Even though register-based analyses of translation have increased in recent years, there are a number of scholars attracting attention to the importance of pinpointing and reproducing sources of humor in the target text. As Brigid Maher claims, “the finest details of sentence structure and lexical choice can have an impact upon the humorous effect of a line of text, whether it is the utterance of a character or the voice of a narrator” (Maher, 2011, p. 7). As a result, translation of these features in turn contributes to the overall humorous effect of the target text.

Although there exist different ways of adopting register-based analysis to the written texts, this study will take Australian tradition of register theories as its basis, especially that of Michael A.K. Halliday’s perspective in describing the register-based approaches in translation analysis. When he defines the appropriate strategy in dealing with register-based translation problems, he emphasizes the importance of contexts in identifying the “value” of different layers that determines the extent of equivalence required in the transfer process (Halliday, 2001, p. 17). Halliday explains the hierarchy of the values to be taken into consideration in determining the relevant translation strategy. In her view, contextual equivalence is the most important criterion to be reflected in the target text as far as register rendering is concerned:

Equivalence at different strata carries differential values; ...in most cases the value that is placed on it goes up the higher the stratum—semantic equivalence is valued more highly than lexicogrammatical, and contextual equivalence perhaps most highly of all; but ...these relative values can always be varied, and in any given instance of translation one can reassess them in the light of the task. (Halliday, 2001, p. 17)

As is emphasized in the previous statements, translators assigned to translate a literary text involving different registers need to reconstruct the context by analyzing

“what has taken place (field), who has participated (tenor), and what medium has been selected for relaying the message (mode)” (Hatim and Mason, 1990, p. 55). Considering these factors, it is required to analyze the novel by paying attention to the following issues: (a) how do translators reflect register deviations in their translation? (b) how is the colloquial language of the lower classes rendered in the target texts?

Jerome’s usage of register as a source of humorous effect involves both the usage of inappropriate registers with their contexts as well as mixing different registers in the same parts of the novel (Steidlova, 2010, p. 43). To put it differently, Jerome makes use of inappropriate registers in certain situations especially to mock the people or events and hence aims to reinforce the comic effect (Jerome, 1994, p. 94). In addition, Jerome adds a different humorous dimension to the novel by applying sudden changes in the register, causing incongruity with the expectations of the audience. In order to make these arguments clearer, it would be useful to examine some of the representative examples. In some parts of the novel, the author uses a very formal register with the aim of exaggerating simple issues and hence creates a comic effect.

I would like to start with some examples involving deviations in registers with regard to the incongruity between the context of the situation and the language used. In one of these digressions, for instance, J. talks about an anecdote related to a woman’s request to keep her cheese for him that smells awfully. In his answer, it is possible to recognize the humor caused by the overstatement in his language. Although J. talks about a simple issue of keeping a woman’s cheese at his house, the author prefers to express it in a very formal way, characterized by the usage of formal expressions such as “regard as”, “it shall never be said that”, “have the

honour of residing”, “what she terms”, “the presence of your husband’s cheese in her house”. Using such a formal language in a daily conversation violates Grice’s maxim of manner and serves for creating irony.

“Madam,” I replied, “for myself I like the smell of cheese and the journey the other day with them from Liverpool I shall ever look back upon as a happy ending to a pleasant holiday. But, in this world, we must consider others. The lady under whose roof I have the honour of residing is a widow, and, for all I know, was possibly an orphan too. She has a strong, I may say an eloquent, objection to being what she terms “put upon”. The presence of your husband’s cheese in her house she would, I instinctively feel, regard as a “put upon” and it shall never be said that I put upon the widow and the orphan.” (p. 14)

TT1: “Bence hiç mahsuru yok, çünkü ben peynir kokusuna bayılırım. Fakat ev sahibem dul bir kadındır. Bu hareketi bir çeşit zorbalık sayması ihtimali vardır. Kimsesiz dul bir kadına peynir kokusuyla da olsa zorbalık ediyorum kanaatini vermek bana yaraşmaz.” (p. 26)

TT2: “Hanfendi!” dedim. “Ben şahsen peynir kokusunu pek severim. Ayrıca geçen gün o tekerlerle Liverpool’dan buraya dek yaptığım yolculuğu da güzel bir tatilin mutlu sonu olarak hatırlayacağım. Ama bu dünyada başkalarını da düşünmek zorundayız. Çatısı altında oturmaktan onur duyduğum hanım bir duldur, kim bilir, büyük bir olasılıkla belki de öksüzdür. Kendi deyimiyle, “kazık yemek” dediği şeye karşı güçlü bir duyarlılığı vardır. Kocanızın peynirlerinin, kendi çatısı altında bulunmasını da kazık yemek sayacağı, içime doğuyor. Benim bir dula ve öksüze kazık atmaya çalıştığımı da kimse iddia etmemeli.” (p. 38)

TT3: “Hanımefendi,” dedim, “ben şahsen peynir kokusunu çok severim, hatta Liverpool’dan buraya kadarki yolculuğum, bu peynirler sayesinde çok rahat geçti. Hayatım boyunca bu yolculuğu güzel bir tatilin mutlu sonu olarak hatırlayacağım. Fakat bu dünyada yalnız kendimizi düşünmek olmaz. Başkalarını da düşünmek gerek. Evinin bir odasını bana kiralamak lütfunda bulunan bayan, dul bir hanımdır. Hatta kim bilir, belki de öksüzdür de. Ayrıca insanlardan “kazık yemek” konusunda son derece hassastır. Eşinizin peynirlerini bu evin çatısı altına sokarsam korkarım ki onu “kazıkladığımı” hissine kapılacak. Hem dul, hem de öksüz bir bayana bunu yapmam.” (p. 48)

As the humor depends heavily on the structural features of the language, the language parameter of the GTVH gains utmost importance in the translation process. In the Turkish versions, the translator in TT1 does not pay attention to reflect the language variety of the source text and instead produces a freer version in Turkish by

omitting most of the expressions. In this version, the seriousness of the problem of maintaining cheese at a woman's house becomes lessened because of the simplicity in his language. TT3 becomes closer to the formal language of the source text, which is obvious from the sentence structure and some of the formal expressions such as "kiralamak lütfunda bulunmak" (to consider worth renting it to someone). However, it does not represent the formality that is apparent in almost all of the sentences given above. In this respect, TT2 follows the formal structure of the source text as close as possible. Instead of rendering the Turkish sentences in a simpler way, the translator chooses to use expressions such as "çatısı altında oturmaktan onur duymak" (to have the honour of residing at his/her house), "kendi deyimiyle, 'kazık yemek' dediği şeye karşı güçlü bir duyarlılığı vardır" (she has a strong sensitivity to being what she terms 'put upon'), "iddia etmemeli" (should not claim) and hence manages to reflect the formality in the target text.

Similarly, the following example resorts to overstatement in its expressions to describe a man waiting at the dock. Jerome wants to emphasize that the man has a very disturbing serious expression on his face. In addition, he explains how the other people get irritated with the whistle sound of the ships warning the main characters to be careful. Even though it is a general scenario to come across at sea journeys, Jerome verbalizes it in a very formal manner, benefiting mostly from the lawful expressions. Since the author's choice of words does not comply with the context of the situation, it can be considered an example of irony:

The expression on the face of the man who, with his hands in his pockets, stands by the stern, smoking a cigar, is sufficient to excuse a breach of the peace by itself; and the lordly whistle for you to get out of the way would, I am confident, ensure a verdict of "justifiable homicide", from any injury of river-men. (p. 127)

TT1: Halbuysa asıl olay sandala sığmaya uğraştığımız zaman meydana geldi. O kadar gürültü oluyor, her kafadan o kadar ses çıkıyordu ki zavallı sandalımız az kalsın gürültü yükünden batacaktı. (p. 86)

TT2: Adamın birini buharlının dümeni başında, elleri cebinde, purosunu ağzında, burnu Kafdağında hava atarken görmek, başlıbaşına barışı bozmak için yeterli nedendir, bence. Buna bir de yoldan çekilmeniz için öttürülen o iğrenç düdüğün sesini eklediniz mi, sanırım ırmak halkından kurulu her jüri size, “haklı cinayet” kararı vermeye hazırdır. (p. 140)

TT3: Bu teknelerin güvertesinde elleri ceplerinde, ağzında purosuyla dikilen, küçük dağları ben yarattım edasıyla kasılarak etrafını süzen kaptanları görünce en mülayim insanın bile kanı beynine sıçrar. Hele bir de yoldan çekilmenizi emreden o iğrenç düdüğü çaldılar mı, ondan sonra işlenecek cinayetten kimse sizi sorumlu tutamaz. Nehir insanlarından kurulu bir halk jürisi olsa, böyle bir cinayeti işleyen kişiyi ağır tahrik nedeniyle beraat ettirirlerdi. (p. 176)

In this case, the opposition results from the incongruity between the topic and the register typical of a more lawful text. As is clear, Jerome mentions that the facial expression of the man as well as the way he stands is considered something that disturbs the peace of the people who see him. Even though it is possible to describe this in a simpler or literary way, the author benefits from the terminology of law texts and uses the expression “to excuse a breach of the peace”. Similar legal terminology is apparent in the following sentence where he claims that the irritating sound will be enough “to ensure a verdict of ‘justifiable homicide’”. When we examine the translations in terms of register rendering, TT1 shows an obvious difference from the others in that the translator changes the context of situation. In this translation, the translator talks about the disturbing effect of the noise when people are getting on the boat. In addition to the changed context, TT1 does not use such a formal language adopted in the source text. Its language does not include any legal expressions or words. The translator in TT2 also tries to recreate the legal register and formal language in the translation by sticking to the lexical items of the source text such as “haklı cinayet” (justifiable homicide). However, TT3 becomes closer to the stylistic

features of the source text. Unlike TT1, the translator attempts to reflect the formal language of the source text by preserving the legal terminology with such expressions as “beraat ettirmek” (to acquit), “ağır tahrik” (severe provocation) and “jüri” (jury). On the other hand, the translator replaces the expression “to excuse a breach of the peace” with an idiomatic one from the target culture and uses the idiomatic saying “kanı beynine sıçramak” (to get furious) in order to describe the people’s anger upon hearing the whistle sound. To put it differently, TT3 produces an “equivalent effect” translation without paying attention to the register’s contribution to creating humor in this sentence.

Throughout the novel, the language variety is also underlined with the usages of both standard and non-standard English. Jerome aims to mock the members of the lower classes by making them speak with a Cockney accent. At these points, it becomes difficult to render the language variety as “the class structure of different societies, countries and nations never replicate one another [...] and there can be no exact parallels between sociolectal varieties of one language and those of another” (Hervey and Higgins, 1992, p. 119). In *Three Men in a Boat*, while the majority of the language is marked formal, some parts are presented in an informal, non-standard English. The following example is taken from a dialogue, taking place between two people from the lower class. As is seen, Jerome uses contractions to underline the informal nature of the language spoken by the lower class members.

“They ain’t a-going to starve, are they?” said the gentleman from the boot-shop.

“Ah! you’d want to take a thing or two with *you*,” retorted “The Blue Posts,” “if you was a-going to cross the Atlantic in a small boat.”

“They ain’t a-going to cross the Atlantic,” struck in Biggs’s boy; “they’re a-going to find Stanley.” (p. 46)

TT1: Birisi: “Eşyaları çok,” dedi. /Çilli sarı oğlan: “Ne taşınması be!” diye atıldı. “Bunlar okyanusu geçecekler. Beş metrelik bir sandalla... O sebepten yanlarına öteberiyi fazla almışlar. Herifler haklı! Üçüncüsü gazeteye bu sabah bir göz atmış olmalı ki: “Uyduruyorsun, diye sözünü kesti, ben biliyorum. Bunlar vahşi ortamlarda kaybolmuş bir kaşifi bulmak için yola çıkıyorlar.” (p. 34)

TT2: Çizmeciden çıkan adam, “Aç kalacağa benzemiyorlar, değil mi?” dedi. Tenekeci, “Eh, insan sandalla Atlantığı geçmeye kalkarken yanına, azıcık bir şeyler almak zorunda,” diye karşılık verdi. Biggs’in çırağı, “Bunlar, Atlantığı geçecek değil,” dedi. “Bunlar kayıp kaşif Stanley’i bulmaya gidiyor.” (p. 52)

TT3: “Şunlara bak, sanki kıtlıktan çıkmışlar,” dedi ayakkabıcıda çalışan çocuk. “Bunca şeyi taşıdıklarına göre aç kalmayacakları kesin.” Konserve kutusu toplayan adam, “El kadar tekneyle Atlantik’i geçecek olsaydın, sen de birkaç şey alırdın herhalde,” diye onu tersledi. “Atlantik’i falan geçecekleri yok,” dedi Biggs’in çırağı. “Bu gidişle kayıp kaşif Stanley’i bulacak bunlar.” (p. 65)

The translators in TT2 and TT3 tend to use a standard Turkish in their versions when compared to the colloquial tone of the source text. However, the translator in TT1 incorporates such informal informal expression as “be!” (used as an exclamation word to object), “herifler” (old cocks) and “uyduruyorsun” (you are making stuff up) and hence contributes to the colloquial tone of the translation. In addition, the last sentence of this version includes both irony and implication. With the sentence “Bunlar vahşi ortamlarda kaybolmuş bir kaşifi bulmak için yola çıkıyorlar” (they are setting off in order to find an explorer who has become lost in wild areas), the translator seems to ridicule the number of the bags the travellers carry along for a short sea journey. Unlike TT2 and TT3 that specify the name of the explorer, the translator in TT1 resorts to an implication and say “bir kaşif” (an explorer).

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that TT2 and TT3 do not recreate the ironic tone of the novel by using a standard Turkish in the translations, which can mainly result from the difficulty of finding an equivalent dialect in the target language. In order to avoid this problem, the translators could have used a marked dialect of the villagers

in Turkey. However, this solution would not be able to show that it is the language spoken by the working class Londoners.

Jerome also tends to incorporate the formal and informal register within the same dialogue in order to emphasize the class differences in the society. In the following example, a dialogue between J. (from middle class) and a graveyard keeper (from lower class) is presented, in which both the formal and informal usages of language are present. In the following example, the graveyard keeper speaks non-standard English, characterized by ungrammatical expressions, simple sentences, contractions and colloquial lexical choices. J., on the other hand, uses standard English and grammatical and complex sentences.

“All right, sur; I’m a-coming, I’m a-coming. It’s all right, sur; don’t you be in a hurry!”

I looked up, and saw an old bald-headed man hobbling across the churchyard towards me, carrying a huge bunch of keys in his hand that shook and jingled at every step.

I motioned him away with silent dignity, but he still advanced, screeching out the while: “I’m a-coming, sur, I’m a-coming. I’m a little lama. I ain’t as spry as I used to be. This way, sur.”

“Go away, you miserable old man,” I said.

“I’ve come as soon as I could, sur,” he replied. “My missis never see you till just this minute. You follow me, sur.” (p. 64)

TT1: “Geldim efendim! İşte buradayım! Çok beklemediniz ya...

Baktım. Kel kafalı bir ihtiyar. Elindeki anahtar destesini şangır şungur sallayarak topallaya topallaya yaklaşıyor.

Etrafa göz gezdirdim. Benden başka kimse yok. Deli midir, nedir?

Herif: “Topallık başa bela!” diye anlatarak üstüme geliyordu. “Topallık berbat... Yoksa sizi uzaktan gördüm. Topal olmasam atlar yetişirdi.” Yanıma gelerek: “Buyurun... Şu kapıdan...” (p. 44)

TT2: “Tamam efendim. Geliyorum, geliyorum. Zıyanı yok efendim, acele etmeyin, şimdi yetişiyorum.”

Başımı kaldırdığım zaman ihtiyar, kel kafalı bir adamın kilise bahçesinden bana doğru topallayarak yaklaştığını gördüm. Elinde kocaman, bir deste anahtar taşıyordu. Her adımında şangırıyordu anahtarlar.

Elimi sallayıp ona, uzaklaşmasını işaret ettim; ama o, yaklaşmayı sürdürdü. Bir yandan durmadan bağıırıyordu.

“Geliyorum, efendim, geliyorum! Ayağım biraz topal. Eskisi gibi çevik değilim. Bu taraftan efendim.” (p. 72)

TT3: “Yettim, geliyorum beyim! A bekleyin, şimdi geliyorum. Acele etmeyin beyim, zıyanı yok, geliyorum!”

Başımı kaldırdığımda kilisenin avlusundan ihtiyar, kel kafalı bir adamın topallaya topallaya üzerime geldiğini gördüm.

Kibar bir el hareketiyle uzaklaşmasını rica ettiysem de o hala bana doğru geliyor, bir yandan da kapı gıcirtısı gibi sesiyle bir şeyler geveliyordu:

“Telaşlanmayın beyim, geldim. Ayağım aksıyor da ondan geciktim. Eh, eski çevikliğimiz kalmadı artık. Buyrun beyim, bu taraftan.”

“Çekil başımdan sefil adam!” dedim.

“Yetiştim ya beyim, ne kıızıyorsun? Benin hanım ancak görmüş sizi, o der demez geldim işte. Gelin gelin bu taraftan.” (p. 90)

The author’s aim to benefit from the language variety to create humorous effect is not recreated in the translations. Translators’ language does not include any difference in language and hence cannot manage to reveal the class difference between these two characters. As a result, the source text irony cannot be produced in the target language. In order to recreate the irony, translators could have chosen a regional dialect of Turkish that resembles the Cockney dialect spoken in England by the members of the lower class.

4.3 Translation of metaphor

Apart from the irony, Jerome resorts to metaphorical devices in order to create a comic effect in the novel. In his ironic remarks about a person or event, Jerome especially resorts to idioms, similes, personification and hyperbole to turn down ordinary experiences into comic situations. According to some scholars, metaphorical expressions and humor share some structural similarities (Kyratzis, 2003, p. 7). Both the metaphorical and humorous expressions rely on the notion of duality and opposition (Kyratzis, 2003, p. 15). As Raskin showed, a text or sentence requires two overlapping and contrasting scripts, the resolution of which results in laughter (Raskin, 1985). Similarly, metaphorical processes involve the bringing of two concepts as the notion of metaphor itself requires that one thing is undertook and interpreted in terms of another (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). In this process, an incongruity is presented between the real script (the item used to describe an object) and the imaginary script (the object described). In addition, the metaphorical expression “transcends semantic conventions of a given language” because it is defined as “a linguistic sign used in predicative function outside its normal usage as defined by the code” (Dobrzynska, 1995, p. 596). As a result, it is not always easy to interpret a metaphorical expression in a correct manner. The “sets of associations fixed in the consciousness of speakers of a language” make metaphorical expressions dependent on the communicational context in which they are used. It is also of vital importance that the participants of the communication share “the common knowledge” in their respective associative fields (Dobrzynska, 1995, p. 597). Therefore, when the speakers of the same language or culture come across a specific metaphorical expression, it does not cause big problems in metaphorical communication. However, when the “shared knowledge” decreases and the

participants live in different cultural environments, the interpretation of metaphorical expressions become more difficult.

While metaphor is said to be useful in terms of linguistic communication, it may create some problems when rendered in another language, resulting from the fact that “another language means another cultural and value system” (Dobrzynska, 1995, p. 595-596). Literature review shows that two main issues have been dealt in the context of translating metaphor. Firstly, translators have touched upon the translatability of metaphors. Secondly, they have analyzed some of the applied translation procedures and strategies (Schäffner, 2004, p. 1253-54). As Schäffner emphasizes, the cultural differences between source language and target language have usually been mentioned as the most important problems for the translation of metaphors (Schäffner, 2004, p. 1264). As Christina Schäffner argues, “if a metaphor activates different associations” in different cultures, it will not be possible to carry out a literal translation. However, if the culture-specificity of the source text needs to be reflected in the target text, it will be more appropriate to “reproduce the SL metaphor and add an explanation” (Schäffner, 2004, p. 1264).

Although scholars have different opinions regarding the factors to be taken into consideration in rendering metaphors in another language, Peter Newmark highlights the importance of analyzing them on a linguistic basis. According to Newmark, metaphorical expressions can be analyzed with the following terms: *the object* referring to actual unconventional referent, *the image* referring to the borrowed idea, something to which the original idea is compared to; the sense “shows in what particular aspects the object and the image are similar” (Newmark, 1981, p. 85). In his view, the purpose of metaphor is to “describe and entity, event or

quality more comprehensively and concisely and in a more complex way than is possible using literal language” (Newmark, 1981, p. 84).

With regard to translation of metaphors, this study will benefit from Newmark’s procedures as summarized below with an aim to examine whether they can be used in the analysis of translated texts using metaphors for humorous purposes:

(a) Reproducing the same image in the TL; (b) replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image which does not clash with the TL culture; (c) translation of metaphor by simile, retaining the image; (d) translation of metaphor by simile plus sense; (e) conversion of metaphor to sense; (f) deletion, if metaphor is redundant; (g) using the same metaphor combined with sense, in order to enforce the image. (Newmark, 1981, p. 48-49)

As Vandaele puts forth, metaphors “can have a humorous effect when the compared parts exhibit less semantic similarity than expected” or when the authors tend to use original metaphors instead of the common ones in the target language (Vandaele, 1996, p. 249). In the novel, we come across instances of stock and original metaphors, some of which will be exemplified below. These metaphors are derived from such figures of speech as personification, simile, idioms and exaggeration.

The following part will provide a detailed discussion of the humorous metaphors’ rendering into Turkish, questioning the effectiveness of the adopted strategies by the three translators. For this purpose, various examples will be provided, most of which consist of the author’s creative original metaphors. In line with the processes identified within the framework of the GTVH, the analysis will mostly focus on the translation of similes that constitute almost all of the metaphorical expressions of the novel. As will be shown in the following pages, these similes generally bring together two overlapping scripts that also contradict

each other in some respects, which consequently contribute to creating a humorous context.

The first example shows how Jerome resorts to the logical mechanism of analogy in an exaggerated way to express their contentment upon having a good dinner on the boat. This analogy is established between humans and slaves who are both represented as the servers of the stomach, which in turn creates a comic effect supported by two different scripts of free/unfree and human/slave. In fact, Jerome wants to underline the greedy nature of human beings with such an ironic example.

We are but the veriest, sorriest slaves of our stomach. Reach not after morality and righteousness, my friends; watch vigilantly your stomach, and diet it with care and judgement. Then virtue and contentment will come and reign within your heart, unsought by any effort of your own; and you will be a good citizen, a loving husband, and a tender father—a noble, pious man. (p. 93)

TT1: Hasılı midemizin zavallı köleleriyiz. Bence insanlar ahlaklarını yükseltmeğe beyhude uğraşıyorlar. Midelerini iyi işletmeye baksınlar. Bir midenin iyi işleyebilmesi için her şeyden önce iyi şeyler yemesi şarttır. Daima iyi şeyler yiyen bir midenin sahibi, ayrıca faziletli bir insan olmağa mecbur değildir. Yani sahici fazilet iyi bir yemeğin arkasından bol bol gelir. Namuslu bir vatandaş, hatırnaz bir koca, şefkatli bir baba, iyi kalpli bir arkadaş olmanın yolları iyi şeylerle dolup boşalan sıhhatli bir mideden geçer. (p. 65)

TT2: Bizler midemizin bahtsız ve zavallı tutsaklarıyız. Siz ahlakı ve dürüstlüğü kovalamaktan vazgeçin dostlarım. Siz midenize dikkat edin, yemeklerinizi dikkatle, özenle seçin. O zaman dürüstlük ve hoşnutluk kendiliğinden gelir, yüreğinize kurulur. Siz hiç çaba göstermeden, iyi bir vatandaş olursunuz, sevgi dolu bir koca olursunuz, seven bir baba olursunuz... soylu, iyi bir insan olursunuz. (p. 103)

TT3: Bizler midemizin emrindeki zavallı bahtsız kölelerimiz aslında. Siz en iyisi beni dinleyin, ahlakmış, adaletmiş boşuna böyle şeylerin peşinden koşmayın. Midenize dikkat edin yeter. Yemeklerinizi özenle seçin, midenizi ihmal etmeyin. O zaman erdem de, huzur da kendiliğinden gelip, yüreğinize yerleşir. İyi bir vatandaş, sevecen bir eş, merhametli bir baba, soylu ve dindar bir adam olursunuz. (p. 130)

As is seen, Jerome personifies the organ and presents it as a human being. Another factor that contributes to the comic effect results from the incongruity between the ordinary situation of eating and the language used. As is obvious from the lexical choices of the author, the language is marked for its elevated register and clashes with the comparison of humans to the slaves of the stomach. The word “slave” is presented with a more powerful and positive connotation in this context, resulting from the language used in the example. Therefore, it would be appropriate to claim that GTVH’s parameter of language and logical mechanism become very important in creating the intended humorous effect in the relevant part. As is seen, the stomach’s importance is exaggerated by bestowing it with power that controls many attributes of human life. All of the translators seem to pay attention to recreate the logical mechanism and script opposition of the source text in their versions. They all reflect the relationship between humans and their stomach within the two scripts of “free/unfree”, which is obvious in the first sentences of the translations describing the human beings as “midenin kölesi” (the slave of the stomach). In addition, the translators maintain the ironic tone in the example by sticking to the formal language of the source text. They prefer to render the elevated register of the source text through a formal language characterized by such lexical items as “fazilet” (virtue) and “erdem” (virtue). As a result, it is possible to suggest that the translators recreate a similar humorous effect in the target language.

Personification is also one of the most important figures of speech through which metaphorical expressions are formed. Jerome’s metaphor also relies heavily on the creative personified similes that increase the overall humorous effect of the novel. On condition that the likened image does not have similarity with that of the compared object, it creates a tension on the part of the reader that consequently leads

to humorous effect. Let us take a closer look at the following example where the year is likened to a young maid.

It was a glorious morning, late spring or early summer, as you care to take it, when the dainty sheen of grass and leaf is blushing to a deeper green; and the year seems like a fair young maid, trembling with strange, wakening pulses on the brink of womanhood. (p. 48)

TT1: Tabiat, yeni kadınlaşan oynak bir genç kız gibi renkli-taze... (p. 37)

TT2: Nefis bir sabahtı. Bahar sonu ya da yaz başı...İçinizden nasıl geçiyorsa, öyle. Otların, yaprakların canlı rengi giderek daga koyu bir yeşile dönüşüyordu. Yıl, göze gepgenç, güzel bir kız gibi görünüyordu; kadınlığın eşiğinde, nabız atar gibi titrek bir uyanış içinde. (p. 55)

TT3: Muhteşem bir sabahtı. İster bahar sonu deyin, isterseniz yaz başı; içinizden nasıl gelirse. Yaprığın, çimenin o filizi yeşili koyulaşmaya, yeryüzü kadınlığın eşiğinden yeni adımını atmış taptaze bir dilber gibi tuhaf uyanışlarla ürpermeye başlamıştı. (p. 69)

When the excerpt is analysed according to the terms of the GTVH, it can be evaluated as a humorous content for different reasons. Firstly, it involves a simile that compares the year (or the earth) to a young maid who trembles with strange pulses that wakens her up. As is obvious, the author resorts to the narrative strategy of false analogy in order to create a comic effect. On the one hand, the readers are presented a lively and positive atmosphere related to the beginning of a new season, which is emphasized with the lexical choices of the author such as “glorious morning”, “blushing green leaves”. While the presence of the year is associated with positive connotations, the object to which it is compared brings out a disturbing scenario with a young maid, which is underlined with the lexical choices of “strange”, “wakening” pulses. As a result, it can be concluded that the simile draws on the script opposition of “lively/uneasy” and “human/non-human”. To put it differently, the incongruity between the image and the described object cause humor in the above-given example. TT1 preserves the script opposition of “human/non-human” by describing the nature as “yeni kadınlaşan oynak genç kız” (a flirtatious

young girl who is on the brink of womanhood) and hence produces a humorous effect in the target text, although the other script opposition of “easy/uneasy” is deleted. TT2 also presents a target version that is similar to that of TT1 by likening the nature to a young maid on the brink of her womanhood. Unlike these versions, TT3 manages to reflect both of the scripts in the target language. It brings together the opposition between the positive atmosphere observed in the nature and the disturbing “strange wakening pulses” of the young girl, saying that “yeryüzü kadınlığın eşiğinden yeni adımını atmış taptaze bir dilber gibi tuhaf uyanışlarla ürpermeye başlamıştı” (the earth started to tremble like a fair young maid on the brink of her womanhood with strange awakenings).

Jerome also uses original metaphors to produce a comic effect in most parts of the novel. In the following example, Jerome creates another original metaphorical expression, inspired by the connotative meaning of the verb “pepper” denoting the action of pelt with or as if with shot. Although the expression of “pepper somebody with questions” is usually encountered in daily language, Jerome produces a new idiom “pepper somebody with jokes”, which sounds comic as the reader can make an association between the spice “pepper” and the adjective “stale”, both of which are used to describe a situation where someone is invaded by unoriginal jokes.

They peppered him with stale jokes, they even made a few new ones and threw them at him. (p. 154)

TT1: Ağızlarına geleni söylüyorlardı. (p. 105)

TT2: Bayat espriler savurdular, birkaç yeni espri uydurdular. (p. 182)

TT3: Adamın beceriksizliğine dair türlü benzetmeler yaptılar, bayat espriler savurdular. (p. 212)

The originality in the source text idiomatic expression is not reflected in any of the Turkish versions. TT1 causes a shift on the semantic level with its idiomatic

expression “ağzına geleni söylemek” (to tell somebody one’s mind), which generally brings into mind bad or swear words in the target language. Therefore, it is not possible to evaluate TT1 as a humorous content. TT2 and TT3 render the creative idiomatic expression with a common saying in Turkish “bayat espri” (stale joke). As they cannot preserve the originality of the source text expression by just rendering its sense, the target versions do not sound as humorous as the source text.

In another example, J. talks about the diseases he has by claiming to be infected with all of the types a hospital can shelter under its roof. He employs the logical mechanisms of exaggeration and analogy to describe his vulnerable health state. In fact, the animate image is compared to the hospital with their shared grounds of embodying diseases. The real health condition of the character is opposed to the exaggerated and imaginary condition presented through the metaphorical image of the hospital.

Students would have no need “to walk the hospitals” if they had me. I was a hospital in myself. (p. 8)

TT1: Halbuki beni ele geçirseler (tıp öğrencileri) de oturup tetkik etseler, çatır çatır imtihan verirler de diplomalarını kurtarırlar (p. 6)

TT2: Bir kere benim gibi biri ellerine geçse, öğrencilerin artık hastane hastane dolaşmalarına ne gerek vardı! Ben kendim ayaklı hastaneydim. (p. 9)

TT3: Ellerin de benim gibi bir hasta varken, tıp öğrencilerini hastane odalarında dolaştırmalarına gerek kalmayacaktı. Ben tek başıma bir hastane dolusu vaka ediyordum zaten. (p. 13)

This humorous content is preserved in TT2 and TT3 as the translators render the metaphor in a literal way into the target language. As is seen, their translations manage to emphasize the message J. aims to convey through their expressions of “ayaklı hastane” (a walking hospital) and “bir hastane dolusu vaka etmek” (to come to mean events that can fill a hospital). Although both of the versions render the logical mechanism and script opposition of the source text with the metaphors they

created, TT2 can be said to result in a stronger humorous effect. TT1, on the other hand, deletes the metaphor and renders the sense by presenting the character as a patient to be treated by the students of the medical school. However, it reflects the exaggeration of the source text in a humorous way, saying that the students of medicine who treat him will have enough information to pass their exams. Using an emphatic expression like “çatır çatır imtihan vermek” (to pass the exams with no difficulty), TT1 also manages to recreate the humorous effect in the target language.

Similar original metaphor is evident in the following example where the sail that they come across during their voyage is compared to a winding sheet. Here J. is talking about the difficulty they have experienced while fixing up the sail against the strong windy weather. For this reason, he compares the sail to a winding sheet and himself to a corpse that implies the effect of working hard on his body and mind.

The impression on the mind of the sail seemed to be that we were playing at funerals, and that I was the corpse and itself was the winding sheet. (p. 156)

TT1: Fakat bu sefer de, yelken denilen bu bela beni ölü, kendisini kefen sanıyor, ne kadar kurtulmağa uğraşsam beni sarıp sarmalağa çabalıyordu. (p. 106)

TT2: Yelken de herhalde cenazecilik oynuyoruz sanıyordu. Beni ceset, kendisini kefen diye kabul etmekteydi. (p. 171)

TT3: Bu arada yelken herhalde cenazecilik oynuyoruz sanıyordu ki kendisi kefen rolü oynuyordu, ben de ceset olmuştum. (p. 213)

The humor here results from the relationship established between the sail and the winding sheet. Even though the word “winding sheet” denotes a special kind of sheet in which a corpse is wrapped for burial, it can also bring into mind a sheet that is used for wrapping something. However, the incongruity is resolved thanks to the image of the corpse used in the other comparison. As the compared object does not share similarities, the resulting effect becomes humorous through the logical mechanism of false analogy. In terms of script oppositions, this comparison relies on

the contradictions of “death/alive”, “attractive/unattractive”, which are also retained in all of the three Turkish versions given below. Translators reproduce the same metaphor in the target language by defining the sail as “kefen” (a winding shet) and the character as “ceset” (a corpse) and hence produce humorous versions.

Another interesting metaphor is presented in a digression where George talks about a water picnic that he went on with two ladies. In order to express his regret and dissatisfaction regarding the oversensitivity of them against the daily issues such as the condition of weather or the boat, Jerome develops a metaphor including a historical reference. Upon seeing the dust on the boat, the women begins to complain and feel disturbed, which is described through the manner they show.

One of them rubbed the cushion with the forefinger of her glove, and showed the result to the other, and they both sighed, and sat down, with the air of early Christian martyrs trying to make themselves comfortable up against the stake. (p. 61)

TT1: Onlar Roma meydanlarında vahşi hayvanlara atılan ilk Hristiyanlar gibi gözlerini yumarak tekneye geçtiler. (p. 42)

TT2: Birtanesi beyaz eldiveninin işaret parmağını oturacağı yere şöyle bir sürdü, sonucu arkadaşına gösterdi, sonra ikisi de içlerini çektiler, aslanlara atılacak Hristiyanlar gibi gamlı gamlı oturdular. (p. 69)

TT3: Aralarında biri beyaz eldivenli parmağını oturacağı yere sürttü, sonra da arkadaşına gösterdi. İkisi birden içlerini çekip yüzlerinde acıklı bir ifadeyle yerlerine oturdular. Onları gören biri, Hristiyanlığın ilk çağlarında kazıklara oturtulan şehitlerle aynı acıyı çektiklerini sanabilirdi. (p. 86)

In Jerome’s perspective, the way they sigh can be likened to that of an early Christian martyr who is known as a person killed for following Jesus. According to the historical documents, in early church years, the followers of Jesus were under pressure to betray their friendships with him. Therefore, they started to die rather than betray their friendships with Jesus and they still suffer martyrdom in some countries. This is generally carried out through some forms of torture including stoning, crucifixion or burning at the stake. Taking the above-mentioned information

into consideration, it should be underlined that the shared knowledge regarding the cultural reference in this example is important in terms of both rendering and understanding the humor created in the metaphorical comparison. The audience should be aware of the meaning of a Christian's martyrization both for the relevant culture and the person who sacrifices himself/herself for the Christ. If we were to explain the example in accordance with the terms of the GTVH, it can be categorized as a humorous content, since it brings two overlapping yet opposing senses together in a metaphorical comparison. This is accepted as overlapping because both the describing and the described image is associated with an implausible situation, one of which is related to the women's dissatisfaction and the other to the martyrization of a Christian. However, it should be underlined that the image to which the manners of women are compared is presented in a positive sense, leading to an ironing effect in the source text. It is possible to mention that this ironic effect in the last sentence of the excerpt relies on the opposing scripts of "comfortable/uncomfortable". On the whole, the incongruity is established between the women's displeasure vs. contentment of a Christian martyr who is on the verge of sacrificing himself for Jesus. In this way, the feeling of dissatisfaction is exaggerated by introducing the common ground of "pain", which contributes to increasing the humorous effect of the comparison. However, all of the translated versions do not reproduce the same or similar comic effect in the target texts, as they do not retain the irony created with the reference of a Christian martyr's burning at the stake. This partly results from their tendency to omit the adjective "comfortable" in the Turkish versions. Instead, the translators prefer to convert the metaphor into sense. Even though the translations reproduce the logical mechanism of exaggeration in the comparison, they fail to recreate the script oppositions. In all the three translated versions, the notion of

“pain” is foregrounded while the opposition of “plausible/improbable” is deleted. A Christian martyr’s sitting up against the stake is presented as an ordinary event without incorporating the humorous device of irony into the content. As a result, the incongruity contributing to creating humor in the comparison loses its function in the target text. In addition, the lexical choices of the translators may have a negative effect upon the reproduction of humor in the target language. For instance, while the source text makes a strong comparison between two images, Çetin’s verbal choice of “sanmak” (to think) to describe their similarity results in decreasing the link between them. Therefore, it is important to pay attention to the connotations each lexical item produces in a specific context.

As mentioned before, Jerome benefits from similes in his humorous or ironic remarks about somebody or something, which is also evident in the following excerpt where a man is described through a creative simile formed with a specific type of dog. A Newfoundland puppy is a big type of dog that is commonly known for its strength, intelligence, endurance and quickness. It is also said to be very courageous, friendly, peaceful and reliable. Jerome constructs a metaphor with this image in order to define a very indifferent man and hence produces irony in the text. Though he is defined, at the beginning of the sentence, as a thickheaded and light-hearted man, he is then said to have as much sensitivity as a Newfoundland puppy does. On the condition that the audience did not know the characteristics of this specific dog, he/she would most probably imagine it as a very indifferent type.

The man they had got now was a jolly, light-hearted, thick-headed sort of chap with about as much sensitiveness in him as there might be in a Newfoundland puppy. You might look daggers at him for an hour and he would notice it, and would not trouble him if he did (p. 24)

TT1: Meğer oğlan pazı kuvvetini meydana vurmak için fırsat gözlememiş? Önce kaşla, gözle işaret ettim, anlamadı. Kızların güzelliğini

öğüyorum sanıyor da sırtıyor, sırttıkça kürekleri istese de beceremeyeceği şekilde sulara çarpıyor. (p. 42)

TT2: Bu sefer küreklere geçen adam neşeli, coşkun, kalın kafalı, anlayışsızın biriydi. Bir saat boyunca bakışlarınızla bıçak saplıyormuş gibi gözlerine baksanız ruhu duymazdı. Duysa da rahatsız olmazdı. (p. 70)

TT3: Yerime geçen delikanlının ancak bir köpek yavrusu kadar anlayışa sahip olduğunu bilemezlerdi elbette. Bu coşkun, gamsız delikanlıya saatlerce gözümüzü dikip kötü kötü baksanız ruhu bile duymazdı. Duysa bile umursamazdı. (p. 87)

Benefiting from the logical mechanism of false analogy and script opposition of “indifferent/sensitive”, Jerome provides an ironic utterance. In the Turkish versions, none of the translators reproduce the same metaphor in the target texts. In TT1, the translator only implies how the boy deludes himself of being strong by showing his clumsy behaviors in rowing the boat, which can be considered a replacement of the original ironical utterance by reducing most of its aspects and hence reducing the ironic effect. TT2, on the other hand, omits the metaphor from the target text and turns it into sense, explaining the general characteristics of the man in an explicit way with such expressions as “neşeli” (cheerful), “kalın kafalı” (thick-headed). As a result, the translator does not recreate a similar humorous effect in the target text. Similarly, the translator in TT3 does not render the specificity of the dog type, but prefers to use a more general expression “köpek yavrusu” (puppy) to describe the insensitivity of the man, and hence deletes the script opposition and the logical mechanism in the target version.

The author usually adopts the logical mechanism of exaggeration in order to turn ordinary instances into comic situations, which is also evident in the translation of another creative metaphorical expression that describes the way the characters tie up a towline in the boat. As the author narrates, Harris holds the towline scientifically and then puts it into George’s hand. After that, George starts to untie it

in a very careful manner, which he tries to underline with a creative comparison given below. George's careful behaviors are compared to those of a person who takes off the swaddling clothes of a new-born infant.

George had taken it firmly, and held it away from him, and had begun to unravel it as if he were taking the swaddling clothes off a new-born infant. (p. 80)

TT1: Vilyam bir çocuk kundağıymış gibi dikkatle kaldırdı, Jorj'a uzattı. Doğrusu Jorj da aynı itınayı göstererek almıştı. (p. 55)

TT2: George da onu sıkıca tutmuş, yeni doğmuş bir bebeğin elbiselerini çıkarıyormuşçasına, özenle katlarını açmaya koyulmuştu. (p. 93)

TT3: George halatı aldı, sanki bebeğin alt bezini açıyormuş gibi kendinden olabildiğince uzakta tutarak çözmeye koyuldu. (p. 112)

The metaphorical expression results in a comic effect since the compared items do not share any similarity at all. In other words, the way a man unravels a towline cannot be the same as taking off a new-born baby's clothes, for the required strength from the agent of the action must be different. In real scenarios, the person untying a towline needs to spend more energy and work harder than the delicate action of a person dealing with baby clothes. Therefore, it would not be erroneous to claim that Jerome brings together the opposite scripts of "tough work/delicate work" in the analogy and creates a humorous content. TT1 changes the context of the metaphorical expression by recreating a new situation where William holds the swaddling clothes instead of unraveling them, and hence creates incongruity with the situation in the source text where the author intends to describe the untying process of the character. Although TT1 changes the situation, it renders the script opposition in the target text, comparing the hard task of lifting a rope with that of lifting swaddling clothes of babies. Therefore, it manages to produce a humorous effect in the target language. In TT2, the translator recreates both the script opposition and the situation, turning the metaphor into "yeni doğmuş bebeğin elbiseleri" (the clothes of

a new-born baby) and describing the action of unraveling the rope as “özenle katlarını açmak” (to unravel the layers of the rope in a meticulous manner). In TT3, the image is changed into a diaper that is kept away while George is unraveling the towline. The translator’s choice of replacing the swaddling clothes with a diaper does not only change the situation of the humorous content, but it also deletes the sense of the source text metaphor. In this version, it is possible to interpret George’s attitude as a sign of disgust or precaution to protect himself from the disturbing effects of a baby’s diaper. As this content evokes different scripts (disturbing vs. delightful), we can categorize it as a completely new humorous content in accordance with GTVH’s perspectives. To put it differently, TT3 does not remain within the conceptual border of the source text metaphor by elaborating on it with a different script opposition. However, it still manages to produce a humorous effect in the target language.

Similarly, Jerome resorts to exaggeration in his description of a scene where the characters try to open a can during their sea journey. For this purpose, they beat the can with different means but still cannot manage to open a hole in it, which is presented in a very exaggerated way, implicitly establishing a similarity between the described object and an unearthly wild creature that frightens George.

We beat it out flat; we beat it back square; we battered it into every form known to geometry- but we could not make a hole in it. Then George went at it, and knocked it into a shape, so strange, so weird, and so unearthly in its wild hideousness, that he got frightened and threw away the mast. (p. 117)

TT1: Jorj zaten kutuya kin bağlamıştı. Bu sefer geometrik biçimler kayboldu. Onların yerini yangından çıkmış demir çinko, teneke kaplar aldı. Kutu öyle korkunç şekillere girip çıkıyordu ki bize, açıkçası, dehşet elverdi. (p. 81)

TT2: Onu önce yassıltık, sonra dikdörtgen prizması yaptık; sırayla geometride bilinen her biçime soktuk... ama bir yerine bir delik açamadık. Sonra George ayağa kalktı, kutuyu öyle iğrenç bir biçime soktu ki, kendi bile korktu, sopayı elinden attı. (p. 128)

TT3: Kutu elden ele dolaştı, geometri biliminin tanımladığı tüm şekillere girip çıktı, ama üzerinde ufacık bir delik bile açılmadı. Sonunda George kutuyu öyle tuhaf bir şekle soktu ki kendisi de yarattığı şeyden korkup elindeki direği bir kenara fırlattı. (p. 162)

The humorous effect results from the usage of a metaphor incorporating the script opposition “earthly object/unearthly object”. This opposition is not only established between the compared objects, but between the agent and the result of the action of knocking the tin into a strange shape. As is seen, the agent is represented as a kind of person that can create unearthly shapes out of an earthly object, creating an ironic and humorous effect in the source text. Jerome brings them together through the logical mechanism of false analogy and exaggeration. The Turkish versions, however, do not reproduce a similar humorous effect in the target language. The reason of this can be traced to the translators’ tendency to reduce the conceptual aspects of the metaphor by just describing the shape with such phrases as “korkunç şekil” (a terrible shape), “tuhaf bir şekil” (a strange shape), “iğrenç bir biçim” (a disgusting shape). As a result, they do not recreate the script opposition in the translation and decrease the comic effect.

It is also possible to encounter some culture-specific referents in the metaphors used by the author. In a similar exaggerated example, Jerome makes a reference to a historical figure called Oliver Cromwell, who was an English political and military leader during the period of 1653-1658. Jerome uses this figure in order to define their dog’s happiness upon seeing a cat in front of him. Montmorency’s cry of joy is likened to that of a stern warrior. As an example, the author makes references to the cry of the leader Cromwell, who defeated The Scots in Preston in 1648. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that Jerome resorts to false analogy and compares the cry of an animal with that of a leader and hence produces humor:

Montmorency gave a cry of joy – the cry of a stern warrior who sees his enemy given over to his hands – the sort of cry Cromwell might have uttered when the Scots came down the hill – and flew after his prey. (p. 124)

TT1: Düşmanını görünce Monmoransinin bütün tüyleri dikildi. İskoçyalıları apansız gören Kromvel nasıl kahramanca üstlerine atılmışsa bizimki de öylece pertav etti. Hem de savaş naraları basarak...(p. 84)

TT2: Montmorency hemen bir sevinç çılgılığı attı, Düşmanını avucuna düşmüş gören savaşçının çılgılığına benziyordu, attığı çılgılık. Cromwell'in, İskoçları tepeden aşağıya doğru yaklaşır gördüğü zaman attığı çılgılığa benziyordu. (p. 137)

TT3: Montmorency onu görür görmez sevinç dolu bir çılgılık attı. Düşmanını eline geçirmiş bir savaşçının zafer çılgılığına benziyordu bu ses. Cromwell tepeden aşağı bakıp da yamaçları tırmanan İskoçları gördüğünde de herhalde böyle bir çılgılık atmıştı. (p. 173)

In all of the Turkish versions, translators preserve a similar analogy with that of the source text by describing the dog's excitement to catch the prey in an exaggerated way. The cultural referent, Cromwell, is preserved in all of the translations. They resemble the cry of the dog to the cry of a warrior attacking its enemy in a cowardly manner. TT1 uses more exaggerated expressions while defining both the dog's "cry of joy" and the way it chases the cat. For instance, the translator prefers to use such strong expression as "şavaş naraları basmak" (to let out a war cry) in order to describe the dog's happiness. Similarly, the expression "kahramanca üstlerine atılmak" (to attack someone in a brave manner) enables the audience to understand the connotations of the cultural referent and enjoy the humor. In TT2 and TT3, it is also possible to understand the meaning of the cultural referent as the translators give a clue about it in their first sentences where they define the "cry of joy" as "sevinç çılgılığı" (a cry of joy) and "sevinç dolu bir çılgılık" (a cry filled with joy). Therefore, the cultural referent in this example does not cause a problem in terms of rendering the humorous effect.

Finally, the following examples will be allocated for the discussion of how Jerome’s use of “personification” contributes to humor when it is applied in an awkward and inappropriate way. In the first example, Jerome personifies the towlines as a kind of person worth their salt. In the previous sentences, it is clear that the author wants to emphasize that the towlines display strange features regarding their structures. As mentioned in the previous pages, towlines are likened to a structure turning into knots very quickly even though one attempts to stretch it out lots of times. However, there are also some other types considered exceptional with regard to their behaviours. As Jerome tries to show it in an ironical way, these towlines tend to assume a respectable attitude by not pretending to behave as if they were crotchet-work. It is obvious that Jerome makes a comparison between towlines and crotchet work to underline their common feature of becoming unnecessarily tangled in a short time.

There may be tow-lines that are a credit to ther profession – conscientious, respectable tow-lines – tow-lines that do not imagine they are crotchet-work, and try to knit themselves up into antimacassars the instant they are left to themselves. (p. 80)

TT1: omission

TT2: Doğal olarak, bu arada bazı akli başında, onurlu, saygın çekme halatları bu kuralın dışında kalabilir. Belki adlarına onur kazandıran çekme halatları da vardır; kendilerini tığ işi sanmayan çekme halatları da vardır. (p. 89)

TT3: Belki de bu mesleğin yüz akı olan, akli başında, sorumluluk ve vicdan sahibi halatlar da vardır. Belki onları kendi hallerine bıraktığınız anda tığ işi sepetlere dönüşmeye kalkışmıyorlardır. (p. 112)

Unlike the translator in TT1, who completely deletes the part from the target text, the other translators personify the ropes and reflect the hyperbole in the target language. In their versions, humor is produced through the lexical items “mesleğin yüz akı”

(the honor of the profession), “aklı başında” (of sound mind), and “vicdan sahibi” (conscientious) used to define the ropes.

Another comic effect is observed when a tin is personified with an image that does not have much similarity with the personified object. In this example, Jerome attempts to create a similarity between the dent of a tin that is beaten lots of times and the appearance of a mocking grin. As it is not a common way of describing a part of the tin with a characteristic feature of human beings and there does not exist a similarity between them at all, it can be evaluated as an original humorous metaphor that depends on the logical mechanism of false analogy in order to increase the comic effect.

There was one great dent across the top that had the appearance of a mocking grin [...] (p.117)

Aziz: Kutunun her çukuru, her kıvrımı, bize sırtan, bizimle alay eden cadıkarı ağzına benziyordu. (p. 81)

TT2: Tepesinde sırtıyormuş, bizimle alay ediyormuş gibi bir çöküntü vardı. (p. 128)

TT3: Derken bir şey dikkatimizi çekti. Kutunun tepesi hafifçe çökmüş, kapağının ortasında hain bir sırıtışa benzeyen bir girinti oluşmuştu. Sanki onca dayağa rağmen açılmadığı için gülüyor, bizimle alay ediyordu. (p. 162)

In terms of script opposition, this humorous content can be said to involve “smiling object/non-smiling object” instantiated through the overlapping notion of a shape resembling a hole. Translations render the personified dent in different ways. For instance, TT2 tends to preserve the image of the dent by foregrounding the lexical items of “alay etmek” (to mock) and “sırtmak” (to grin). TT3 renders the “mocking grin” of the dent as “hain sırıtış” (treacherous grin) and results in a more exaggerated version. The translator in TT1, on the other hand, likens the dent to a “cadıkarı ağzı” (the mouth of a scold). This version can be evaluated as a creative solution as the

translator uses a local image in the target text that is able to create a humorous comparison with the shape of the “mocking” dent and the mouth of a scold who is famous for her tendency to scold the others. Therefore, it can be said that TT1 produces a more humorous effect with the translation strategy of the translator.

4.4 Translation of wordplay

This section will involve the discussion of the definition and functions of wordplay, which will be followed with the issues related to the translatability of wordplay as well as evaluating the efficiency of some of the proposed strategies for their translation. It is a known fact that humor and wordplay have been studied for a long time with different perspectives. More than twenty years ago, for instance, Peter Newmark underlined the importance of wordplays, claiming, “the translation of puns is of marginal importance and of irresistible interest” (Newmark, 1988, p. 217). Since then there has been an increase in the production of essays bringing forth the importance of wordplay translation in some of the best-known translation magazines such as *The Translator* (Low, 2011, p. 62). In this context, Dirk Delabastita’s essays in his book entitled *Traductio: Essays on Punning and Translation* provide some tools for the translators working on humorous texts with an aim to show that wordplay is in fact translatable (Delabastita, 1997). An article by Henrik Gottlieb lists some procedures that can be adopted in subtitling wordplay in TV comedy shows and underlines the possibility of translating them into another language (Gottlieb, 1997, p. 226). Another article in the same book discusses six different strategies used by the translators in translating the puns in Shakespeare’s comedies. In this article, Malcolm Offord claims that the “translator weaves his own web of wordplay from the strategies and sources available to him”, suggesting that the way a

wordplay can be rendered into another language largely depends upon the creativity of the translators (Offord, 1997, p. 248).

According to the dictionary meaning, wordplay can be defined as the verbal wit created by playing with the language and the ambiguities of the words. When the relevant literature is examined, it is realized that in most of the researchers the scholars have shown tendency to use the words “pun” and “wordplay” interchangeably while some others prefer to treat “puns” as a specific sub-category of wordplay, decreasing the semantic field of the term (Leppihalme, 1997, p. 142). On the other hand, the term “wordplay” is usually defined in a more broad sense by some of the scholars such as Delia Chiaro. In her view, “the term wordplay includes every conceivable way in which language is used with the intent to amuse” (Chiaro, 1992, p. 2). In addition to underlying its function in producing amusement, Chiaro also wants to emphasize the term’s broad meaning. According to her, “the term wordplay conjures up an array of conceits ranging from puns and spoonerisms to wisecracks and funny stories” (Chiaro, 1992, p. 4). On the other hand, Salvatore Attardo discusses wordplay as “a consciously metalinguistic phenomenon”, implying that language users play with some features of languages (benefiting mainly from such linguistic structures as homonyms, and polysemous words etc.) to create a humorous effect (Attardo, 1994, p. 168). Taking into account the disagreement regarding the definitions of “wordplay” and “puns”, it would be appropriate to determine an operational definition of the term “wordplay” for the purposes of this study. Therefore, I will follow Dirk Delabastita's definition of wordplay as it provides a comprehensive framework for the analysis of wordplays in the text:

Wordplay is the general name for the various textual phenomena in which structural features of the language(s) used are exploited in order to bring

about a *communicatively significant confrontation of two (or more) linguistic structures with more or less similar forms and more or less different meanings* (Delabastita, 1996, p. 128).

In Delabastita's definition, it can be concluded that wordplays occur within a text and they are observed at the levels of language, including the levels of phonology, morphology, syntax, sentence structure and semantics. As he mentions, "wordplays do not only *exist* by virtue of texts, but they will also *function* within them in a variety of ways" (Delabastita, 1996, p. 129). In order to form a wordplay, the "linguistic structures resembling each other in form are contrasted" for various functions including "adding to the coherence, producing humor, forcing the reader/listener into greater attention, adding persuasive force to the statement, deceiving our socially conditioned reflex against sexual and other taboo themes" (Delabastita, 1996, p. 129). To put it differently, wordplays create meaningful associations between words or word groups that are similar in form, but different in meaning. Wordplays are considered as a device that epitomizes the "slipperiness of meaning", implying that wordplays should not always be expected to express a distinct or single function in the presentation of a content (Newmark, 1991, p. 57). As is obvious, the functions of wordplays display similar features to those of humorous devices. According to Attardo, both humor and wordplay may have such social functions as facilitating interaction in a group and excluding the outsiders (Attardo, 1994, p. 322-330).

If we were to turn back to Delabastita's definition of wordplay, wordplay benefits from meaning differences on the basis of linguistic structures and formal similarity. This relation of similarity can be examined in accordance with the following categories: "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)” (Delabastita, 1996, p. 128). Apart from these single-word instances of wordplay, there exist other versions created through the ambiguous structures. As Low argues, the most important element of wordplay is the verbal ambiguity (Low, 2011, p. 62). Ambiguous elements that are required to produce wordplay can be found at all levels of language: “phonological (homophones etc.), morphological (derived and compound words the parts of which have lost their literal meaning), lexical (polysemous words and idioms), and syntactic (ambiguous phrases or sentences)” (Delabastita, 1996, p. 130-131). Even though ambiguity plays an important role in creating a humorous effect through wordplay, it is not enough, as they require a context to be activated (Delabastita, 1996, p. 129-130). For this reason, the wordplays of the study will be analyzed taking into account the contextual factors.

Apart from the ambiguous structures on different levels of language, modification in idiomatic expressions can also create wordplay (Veisbergs, 1997, p. 157). According to Andrejs Veisberg, a way of modifying an idiom can be carried out by introducing a shift on the semantic level where the idiom remains the same while the context to which it is used serves to change its meaning. In addition, modification can be made by introducing structural changes into the conventionalized idioms with some words inserted, omitted or substituted (Veisbergs, 1997, p. 157-58).

Considering the above mentioned facts related to the structural features of wordplays, a clash between two different meanings is observed, which brings into mind the notion of overlapping and opposite scripts in Attardo and Raskin’s definition of humor (Attardo and Raskin, 1991). Like the humorous devices, wordplays can be interpreted in two different ways and hence accepted to be

compatible with the two scripts of the two different meanings. Therefore, translation of wordplay can be evaluated in accordance with the parameters of the GTVH, which this study will try to carry out in the following pages.

Because of their language and culture-specific nature, wordplays have usually been discussed with regard to their translatability. The translation of wordplay has always been considered “a particular challenge” that requires an ingenious work from the translators (Craig, 1989, p. 215). This fact becomes more significant and obvious when the two languages involved are unrelated to each other. In this case, it is a natural outcome that the meanings that are represented in the source language by words similar in form or sound need to be reflected by different words in the target language (Weissbrod, 1996, p. 221). However, as some scholars claim, this should not mean that wordplay is wholly untranslatable. Ronald Landheer’s following statements can be given as an important attempt challenging the dogma of untranslatability of the wordplays:

Translation strategy should first of all focus on the identification of the functional load of the poly-isotopic utterances of the source text and then on a recreating procedure that aims more at the maintenance of both the global and local isotopic cohesion of the source text than on a strict reproducing in the target language of the double reference of particular words. Thus, there turns out to be far less “untranslatability” than is usually assumed. (Landheer, 1991, p. 133)

As is clear, Landheer claims that wordplays can be translated into another language with “functional equivalent” translation strategy. In his view, it can be possible to recreate the function of the wordplay without concerning too much by finding an equivalent wordplay in the target text. Similarly, Kathleen Davis argues that wordplays cannot be explained as either completely “untranslatable” or “translatable” (Davis, 1997, p. 32). According to her, it is possible to talk about

untranslatability when a word has a meaning that is completely outside the system of the target language, without having any relationship with other words or concepts in the system. As words have some relationship with other words or concepts in the same language, it will always be possible to render it into another language though the level of equivalence can change in different circumstances (Davis, 1997, p. 38). Delabastita brings in another perspective to the discussion of the translatability of wordplays, pointing out that some types of wordplay can be more easily transferred into another language than the others (Delabastita, 1996, p. 135-136). As polysemy is a universal nature of all languages in the world, it can enable wordplays to be translated more easily even if the languages are not very related.

As is obvious in the following statements, translating wordplay presents some problems to the translator. Before starting to translate a text involving wordplays, translators need to take some factors into consideration. The important steps translators should take in rendering wordplay into another language can be summarized with Delabastita's words:

[w]hen attempting to describe how wordplay is translated one obviously needs to rely on an operational definition of the pun, including criteria for describing and comparing puns in terms of (say) their formal structure, semantic structure, underlying linguistic mechanism, textual function, and / or any other aspect deemed relevant to the comparison" (Delabastita, 1997, p. 208).

Translators have the responsibility to firstly determine an operational definition of wordplay as it includes a broad range of aspects. Secondly, translators need to analyse the wordplays in term of their lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactic structure. They should also pay attention to the intended function of the translated item when making decisions on to what extent they need to retain it in the

target text. In addition, some considerations need to be given to cultural and systemic factors including the norms and conventions of the target culture.

Even though different scholars offer different strategies and procedures for the translation of wordplay, this study will rely on Delabastita's comprehensive methods in describing the translation strategies of the translators.

PUN -> PUN: the source-text pun is translated by a target-language pun, which may be more or less different from the original wordplay in terms of formal structure, semantic structure, or lexical function

PUN -> NON-PUN: the pun is rendered by a non-punning phrase which may salvage both senses of wordplay but in a non-punning conjunction, or select one of the senses at the cost of suppressing the other; of course, it may also occur that both components of the pun are translated 'beyond recognition'

PUN -> RELATED RHETORICAL DEVICE: the pun is replaced by some wordplay-related rhetorical device (repetition, alliteration, rhyme, referential vagueness, irony, paradox, etc.), which also aims to recapture the effect of the source-text pun

PUN -> ZERO: the portion of text containing the pun is simply omitted

PUN ST = PUN TT: the translator reproduces the source-text pun and possibly its immediate environment in its original formulation, i.e. without actually 'translating' it

NON-PUN -> PUN: the translator introduces a pun in textual positions where the original text has no wordplay, by way of compensation to make up for source-text puns lost elsewhere, or for any other reason

ZERO -> PUN: totally new textual material is added, which contains wordplay and which has no apparent precedent or justification in the source text except as a compensatory device

EDITORIAL TECHNIQUES: explanatory footnotes or endnotes, comments provided in translator's forewords, the anthological presentation of different, supposedly complementary solutions to one and the same source-text problem, and so forth. (Delabastita, 1996, p. 134)

Apart from these methods, the analysis of wordplay and its translation will be described in accordance with the parameters of the General Theory of Verbal

Humour. According to this theory, wordplays need to be handled differently from other types of humor as the “logical mechanism preselects some features of the language parameter (Attardo, 2002, p. 191). Wordplays rely on the logical mechanism of “cratylism” that is based on the assumption that “two words having the same or similar sounds must have the same meanings as well, and therefore one can freely switch from one sense to the other” (Attardo, 2002, p. 180). It is known that this theory allows differences at the level of language in normal circumstances except for the translation of wordplay that is closely related to the language in terms of semantic field. In other words, the language used determines to a great extent the actual form of the text. However, according to this theory, the translation of wordplay presents no special problem, since if the similarity cannot be reflected at the language level, one can still render a similar humorous content by preserving the script opposition in the target text (Attardo, 2011, p. 190).

The following section will provide a comparative and descriptive analysis of both the general features of the wordplays used by the author and the strategies adopted by the translators for their rendering into Turkish. Although it is mentioned that there are various ways of creating wordplay in a text, Jerome’s wordplays mostly rely upon the lexical and syntactic ambiguity. In *Three Men in a Boat*, Jerome uses some polysemous words and ambiguous syntactic structures that contribute to creating humour. In order to show the mechanisms behind the formulation of wordplays, I will provide a discussion of some of the representative examples with their translations. While choosing the examples to work on, I have paid attention to select those showing the regularities in the translators’ strategies with an aim to reach a generalization regarding the rendering of wordplays in another language. For this purpose, I would like to start with a simpler example where the structural ambiguity

is very obvious. In this example, the author provides a scene where the characters are getting ready to sleep. They have to sleep in one bed and hence Harris utters a question that is given above. Actually, Harris intends to ask whether J. prefers to sleep inside or outside of the bed that they have to share together, but he leaves a gap within the sentence and creates an ambiguity. In other words, he flouts Grice's maxim of quantity by not providing enough information. Even though what Harris asks is apparent from the context, J. benefits from the ambiguity and gives an ironic answer emphasizing the place he wants to sleep. As the sentence lacks the relevant object in the source text, the wordplay is considered to result from the syntactic structure of the sentence Harris constructs.

“Do you prefer the inside or outside, J.?”

I said, I generally preferred to sleep *inside* a bed. (p. 39)

TT1: Yataklara girdik. (p. 30)

TT2: “İç tarafı mı, dış tarafı mı tercih edersin, J.?” diye sordu.

Ben genellikle yatağın içinde yatmaktan hoşlandığımı söyledim. (p. 44)

TT3: Harris: “Duvar kenarında mı yatacaksın?” diye sordu.

“Mümkünse yatakta yatmayı tercih ederim,” dedim.

(p. 56)

According to GTVH, the question relies upon the script opposition of “general/specific” instantiated in the example of “inside bed/inside a place or anything”. Translators adopt different strategies in dealing with this structural ambiguity. For instance, the translator in TT2 seems to have understood the author's intention, which can be inferred in her preference to retain the ambiguity in her version with the expression “iç tarafı mı, dış tarafı mı” (inside or outside?), since it

can also evoke the script opposition of the source text successfully. TT3 shows a tendency to specify the place with the expression “duvar kenarı” (next to the wall). As a result, the lexical choice of “duvar kenarı” (next to the wall) brings into mind the notion of bed, since “duvar kenarında yatmak” (to sleep next to the wall) is a common expression mostly associated with sleeping in a bed. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that TT3’s version decreases the effect of ambiguity on humor. On the other hand, the translator in TT1 omits the ambiguity and just mentions the result of the action in his version, saying that “yataklara girdik” (we got into the bed). As a result, TT1 does not produce a humorous effect in the target language.

Now, I would like to proceed with the wordplays based on phonological structures of the words. In the following excerpt, the characters talk about the best way to get rid of their stress that they have accumulated in the city for a long time. At this moment, Harris makes a suggestion presented in a comic tone by the author who benefits from the similarity between the letter “T” and the drink “tea”. As a result, J. intentionally misinterprets the meaning of the idiomatic expression constructed with this letter.

“Harris said, however, that the river would suit him to a “T”. I don’t know what a “T” is (except a sixpenny one, which includes bread-and-butter and cake *ad lib.*, and is cheap at the price, if you haven’t had any dinner). It seems to suit everybody, however, which is greatly to its credit.” (p. 16)

TT1: “Dur hele, benim ne üstüme vazife canım! Taymış’ta dolaşmak benim işime gelir.” (p. 12)

TT2: “Bundan sonra Harris ırmak gezisinin kendisi için biçilmiş kaftan olduğunu söyledi.” (p. 17)

TT3: “Bütün bunların ardından, “Tekne gezisi bana uyar,” dedi. (p. 23)

In this example, Jerome brings together two scripts that have different meanings. The first instance of the expression “to suit somebody to a T” can be seen to refer to the

idiomatic expression meaning “perfectly, completely”. Though Harris intends to imply this meaning, J. intentionally misinterprets it as “suit somebody to a tea” with the implication that the trip would be okay for him if it includes any light meal eaten by the British in the late afternoon or in the evening. Therefore, we can say that the humorous content depends on the logical mechanism of polysemy and the script opposition of “letter/a meal”, “perfectly suiting/something to eat”. When the Turkish versions are examined, it is possible to conclude that three translators choose to delete the wordplay in their translations and render its sense. For instance, TT1 translates wordplay with the idiomatic expression “benim işime gelir” (it would suit me). TT2 and TT3 prefer other idiomatic expressions and say “bana uyar” (it suits my book) and “benim için biçilmiş kaftan” (it is right my alley) respectively. Although in most cases, translators resort to omission when the same or similar structure does not exist in the recipient culture. However, in this instance, translators could have translated the wordplay with another wordplay by maintaining the script opposition. For this purpose, they could have changed the sentence into something like “Nehir gezisi, Harris için bal demektir” (River trip means honey for Harris). In my suggested solution, the wordplay is constructed thanks to the different associations that can be created by the word “bal” (honey) in Turkish. It can both maintain the script opposition of “perfectly suiting/something to eat” as well as the logical mechanism of cratylism. As a result, translators’ attempt to omit the wordplay can be concluded as an unsuccessful solution.

A similar example is observed in the following part where the author again plays with the language in order to create a humorous tone in the representation of the content. As is seen, the author provides detailed information regarding the features of a barometer. At the beginning, it seems as if he creates an informative

text, but when one continues to read, the use of wordplay is realized. While explaining the directions of the barometer changing with the wind, the author uses a creative expression “Nly” and “Ely”, which implies that winds coming from the north changes the sign of the barometer to the North part while the others coming from the East changes the sign to the east. Using the adverbial suffix “-ly”, the author aims to signify the direction through a newly formed word. As there also exists a British person’s name, Ely, in the source language, the author benefits from this fact by pretending to assume that it actually refers to the personal name, underlined with the information inserted in the parenthesis.

There is one side for 10 a.m. yesterday, and one side for 10 a.m. tomorrow, but you can’t always get there as early as ten, you know. It rises or falls for rain and fine, with much or less wind, an done end is “Nly” and the other “Ely” (what’s Ely got to do with it?), and if you tap it, it doesn’t tell you anything. (p. 44)

TT1: “Bunlar her gün tam saat ondaki havayı gösterirler. Halbuysa insanoğlu her gün tam saat onda barometrenin karşısında bulunabilir mi?” (p. 33)

TT2: Bir yanında “dün sabah 10”, bir yanında “bugün sabah 10” diye yazılı yerler var. Ama insan, her sabah onda onun başına yetişemiyor. Yağmura ve rüzgara göre düşüp yükseliyorlar. Tık tık vursanız bile bir şey söylemiyorlar. (p. 49)

TT3: Bir tarafı dün sabah saat onu gösteriyor, öbür tarafı da bu sabah saat onu. Sabahın onunda koşup başına dikilmezseniz o günkü hava durumunu kaçırdınız yani. Yağmura ya da sıcak havaya göre yükselip alçalıyor, hatta rüzgara göre bile değişiyor. Rüzgar kuzeyden eserse bir yana, doğudan eserse öte yana dönüyor. Bu barometreleri ne kadar tıklatsanız da size istediğiniz cevabı vermiyorlar. (p. 62)

The comic tone is, however, not reflected in either of the translated versions. TT1 deletes the wordplay in terms of both its formal structure and sense. TT2 also omits the whole part including the wordplay. TT3 seems closer to the sense of the source text, since the translator at least tries to render the information regarding the

directions of the sign on the device. In other words, the translator prefers to render the wordplay by using an explicating translation strategy as follows: “Rüzgar kuzeyden eserse bir yana, doğudan eserse öte yana dönüyor” (it turns to one side when the wind blows from the north and to another when it blows from the east). If we were to offer a version in Turkish, it would be okay to preserve the wordplay by translating the words “Nly” and “Ely” as “Kuzey” (North) and “Doğu” (East) because they are also used as a private male name in the source language. In this way, it would be possible to preserve the comic tone of the source text.

As is the case in almost all languages, the majority of the wordplays derive from the polysemous words, which is also evident in the novel. Unlike the ones created at the level of phonology and morphology, polysemous words can easily be transferred into other languages as “polysemy is somehow rooted in extralingual reality and wordplay based on it can occasionally be reduplicated with little loss even between historically unrelated languages” (Delabastita, 1996, p. 135). For this purpose, the following section will provide important examples shedding light on this issue. Let us start with a very fruitful example in which the author displays a vivid play on the words “bow” and “stroke” in various respects. Jerome talks about two people who start to direct a boat for the first time in their lives. These two novices are presented with the names “Bow” and “Stroke”. While bow means a rower closest to the bow of the boat, stroke denotes a rower closest to the stern of the boat and is usually considered the most competitive rower in the competitions.

To see two novices try to keep time with one another is very amusing. Bow finds it impossible to keep pace with stroke, because stroke rows in such an extraordinary fashion. Stroke is intensely indignant at this, and explains that what he has been endeavouring to do for the last ten minutes is to adapt his method to bow’s limited capacity. Bow, in turn, then becomes insulted, and requests stroke not to trouble his head about him (bow), but to devote his mind to getting a sensible stroke.

“Oh, shall *I* take stroke?” he adds, with the evident idea that would at once put the whole matter right. They splash along for another hundred yards with still moderate success, and then the whole secret of their trouble bursts upon stroke like a flash of inspiration. (p. 151)

TT1: Hiç rastladınız mı bilmem? Dünyada en gülünç, en tatlı seyir, iki aceminin aynı teknede, beraber kürek çekmeye kalkışmalarıdır. Biri önde, biri arkada... Küreklerin temposunu bir kere uydursalar mesele kalmayacak... Katiyen uyduramazlar. Öndeki küreğini arkadaki küreğe vurur, arkadaki kürek sapını öndekinin beline... Sanki suda gezmek için çıkmadılar da, bu işe idman için çıktılar.... nihayet öndeki dayanamaz, yer değiştirmeyi teklif eder. (p. 103)

TT2: Acemilerin birbirleriyle tempo tutturmaya çalışmasını izlemek pek eğlencelidir. Öndeki asla arkadakine uyamaz; çünkü ona göre arkadaki, çok aptalca kürek çekiyordur. Arkadaki buna sinirlenir, deminden beri öndekine uymak için uğraştığını, onunsa pek yeteneksiz olduğunu ileri sürer. O zaman öndeki bozulur, arkadakinin kendisiyle uğraşacağına, adam gibi kürek çekmeyi öğrenmesini önerir. Yüz metre kadar ilerlerler, ama durum düzelmez. Derken akıllarına parlak bir fikir gelir. (p. 167)

TT3: Hele iki aceminin bir sandalda kürek çekişini seyretmek pek keyiflidir. Bir türlü aynı tempoyu tutturmayı başaramazlar. Öndeki kürekçi arkadakine ayak uyduramaz, çünkü arkadaki pek beceriksizdir. Arkadaki ise esas suçun öndekinde olduğunu, son on dakikadır onun kısıtlı kabiliyetine uyum sağlamak için kendini zorladığını söyler. Öndeki bu işe pek bozulur, arkadakine, “Sen benim kürek çekişime kafa yoracağına kendi işine bak!” der. Arkadaki ise, “İstersen ben öne geçeyim?” diye bir teklifte bulunur. Tavrına bakılırsa bunun bütün sorunu çözeceğini düşünmektedir. Yüz metre kadar böyle beceriksizce ilerledikten sonra içlerinden birinin aklına parlak bir fikir gelir. (p. 208)

Starting from the beginning of the excerpt, Jerome plays on the words bow and stroke in many ways to create a humorous effect that is intensified by the repetition within the same sentence and the whole excerpt. Therefore, the first script opposition occurs in the instantiation of “proper name/common noun”. In addition, each word is bestowed with the actions that are in accordance with the lexical connotations of them. In the following sentences, other meanings of the words come to the fore. For instance, in the sentence telling the Bow’s asking “stroke not to trouble his head about him, but to devote his mind getting a sensible stroke”, we are confronted with the instance of “bow” as the action of rowing itself, and the instance of “stroke” as the act of hitting or rowing as a stroke oar of a boat. The issues become more

complex with the following sentence, where bow utters the question to the stroke: “Shall I take a *stroke*”, bringing in another meaning of stroke as “action”. Finally, the last sentence turns the word “stroke” into a metaphorical expression that gains the meaning of “epiphany”. However, the author’s intention to tell the story of a two new-rowers by playing on the words is not reflected in the Turkish version. All of them turn the wordplay into zero and prefer to render the sense. In order not to be judgemental about the translators’ translation strategy, it is important to take into account the Turkish lexicon. Since the Turkish language does not have a corresponding word that accounts to such different meanings as the words “bow” and “stroke” imply, translators do not seem to have any other chance except for turning the wordplay into non-wordplay. For instance, while the author uses the word “stroke”, TT2 renders it with the following expressions: “arkadaki” (the person who strokes at the back side of the boat), “kürek çekmek” (get a stroke), “parlak bir fikir” (a stroke of genius).

In another example, with the polysemous word “prophesy”, Jerome intentionally or unintentionally produces irony, resulting from the fact that the word contains both a neutral meaning as to “predict something” and a more emotive one as to “predict something by divine inspiration”, which creates incongruity to the normal situation. The ironic tone created by this wordplay is intensified by the word “ghastly” given in the parenthesis. As this word has a connection with the figure of ghost, the verb “prophesy” brings into mind a divine atmosphere.

George got hold of the paper, and read us out the boating fatalities, and the weather forecast, which latter prophesied “rain, cold, wet to fine” (Whatever more than usually ghastly thing in weather that may be) “occasional local thunderstorms, east wind, with general depression over the Midland Counties (London and Channel). Bar. falling. (p. 42)

TT1: [...] Jorj gazetede deniz kazalarına ait bütün haberleri yüksek sesle okudu. Sonra meteoroloji raporuna geçti. Bu rapora göre günümüz müthiş fırtınalar, boralalar, çeşitli şağanaklarla dolup taşacaktı. P.32

TT2: George gazeteyi kaptı, bize tekne kazalarını, hava raporunu okudu. Raporda yağmur, soğuk, nemli hava müjdeleniyordu. İnsanın aklına gelebilecek her türlü kötü olasılık, sıralanıyordu. “Ara sıra mevzii fırtınalar, doğu rüzgarı, Londra ve Manş üzerinde alçak basınç; barometre de düşüş.” (p. 47)

TT3: George gazeteyi açarak o günkü nehir kazalarını ve hava tahmini raporunu okumaya koyuldu. Raporda yağmurlu, soğuk ve rutubetli hava müjdesi veriliyordu. Üstüne üstlük “yer yer şağanak yağışla fırtına görülecek. Londra ve Manş üzerinde alçak basınçla birlikte barometre düşecekti.” Bunların ardından da tekne yolculuğuna çıkacak kimselerin başına gelebilecek diğer felaketler sıralanıyordu. (p. 59)

TT1 does not manage to create the same ironic effect in his version, since the translator does not reflect the polysemy in either of his lexical choices. In other words, the script opposition resulting from the polysemy of the words “prophecy” and “ghastly” is not transferred into the target text. In the other two translations, however, the choice of the verb “müjdelemek”, referring to the act of giving someone good news, enables them to transfer the wordplay with a related rhetorical device. With the word “müdje” (good news), TT2 and TT3 create an incongruous situation in the target texts and produce humor.

Another interesting example is seen in the digression that shows the yelling of Kingston cavaliers upon seeing the imperial caiques. In the sentence that they utter, the author uses some exclamatory expressions, one of which can be evaluated as wordplay intentionally used by the author for creating humor. As an exclamatory expression, the author uses the word “Gadzooks” assumed to be a wordplay derived from the phrase “God’s hooks” referring to the nails of the Christ’s Cross. Therefore, it can be concluded that play on the sounds has turned the phrase into the expression “Gadzooks” that is used as a sign of surprise, shock. According to Delabastita’s

categorization, it can be analyzed as a paronymy, since there exists slight difference in the spellings and sounds of the phrases. There also exists a similarity between both of the phrases as the nails of Christ's Cross can also create a reaction of surprise. The reason why he prefers to use this wordplay can be linked to his intention to emphasize the surprise of the cavaliers seeing the imperial caiques because it also brings into mind the crucifixion scene of Christ.

“What Ferry, ho! Gadzooks, gramercy.” (p. 50)

TT1: omission

TT2: omission

TT3: “Savulun, majesteleri geliyor! Yüce İsa'nın çivileri adına, şu kayığın ihtişamına, asaletine bir bakın!” (p. 71)

In terms of the GTVH, the usage of such a wordplay produces humorous effect, bringing together two overlapping and opposite scripts of “God's hooks” vs. “an expression of surprise”. With regard to translations, TT1 and TT2 omit the whole sentence from the target text while TT3 turns the wordplay into non-wordplay by foregrounding only the script related to the nails of Christ. In TT3, the translator prefers to render the expression of surprise as “Yüce İsa'nın çivileri adına” (in the name of Christ's nails). Though TT3 does not render the wordplay with another wordplay, it still manages to recreate the intended meaning of the existing word “Gadzooks”. However, it should be underlined that as the wordplay in this example is both culture and language specific, it cannot be possible to find a corresponding wordplay in the target language. For this reason, the translator's tendency to render the sense of the wordplay cannot be judged as an unsuccessful attempt.

A similar humorous context is formed with a polysemous adjective triggering ambiguity in the following example taken from the beginning of a digression where

J. starts to talk about a sea journey that he has had with his female cousin. The following sentence is uttered at the beginning of the story.

I remember being terribly upset once up in the river (in a figurative sense, I mean). I was out with a young lady – cousin on my mother’s side – and we were pulling down to Goring. (p. 86)

TT1: Şimdi aklıma geldi. Vaktiyle bir genç kızla seyrana çıkmıştık. Ben her zamanki gibi kürekteydim. Dalmış, geç kalmıştık. (p. 59).

TT2: Bir keresinde ırmakta epey korktuğumu hatırlıyorum. Ana tarafından akrabam olan bir genç hanımla birlikteydim. Goring’e doğru kürek çekiyorduk. (p. 96)

TT3: Bir keresinde yine böyle akşam saatlerinde nehirde kürek çekerken ne kadar korktuğumu hatırlıyorum. Anne tarafından kuzenim olan genç bir bayanla nehre açılmıştık. (p. 120)

In this excerpt, the usage of the adjective “upset” supports two different scripts, from which Jerome aims to evoke humorous effect. The first instance of the adjective can be seen to refer to the most commonly used meaning of “feeling nervous or disturbed” while the second instance can be easily related to the state of being overturned in the boat”. Jerome seems to benefit from the fact that since it is the beginning of the story taking place on a boat journey, both of the meanings can possibly come to the mind of the reader. In order to underline this polysemy on the adjective, the author provides clarifying information in the parenthesis that resolves the ambiguity. Translations, however, do not reflect either the logical mechanism or the script opposition in their versions. For instance, TT1 omits the wordplay and renders the expression “being terribly upset” as “dalmak, geç kalmak” (to get engrossed and be late). As is seen, the translator in TT1 seems to not pay attention to the connotation of the adjective “upset” and does not recreate the humorous effect in the target language. The translators in TT2 and TT3, on the other hand, turn the wordplay into sense and translate it as “korkmak” (to feel nervous). Their versions do not also manage to produce a similar comic tone. Although the wordplay is

language specific in this example, the translators could have recreated the logical mechanism by choosing a polysemous expression from the target language. For example, using such an expression as “yerle bir etmek” (to level to the ground) would enable the audience to think of both the literal and metaphorical connotation of the expression in the same sentence. To put it differently, this Turkish expression includes the script opposition of “literal vs. metaphorical”. While it implies “making someone feel very upset”, it also means “overturning someone”.

Finally, I would like to conclude this section with another humorous example that derives its humour from the polysemy of the phrase used. While the characters are talking about their rowing experiences, J. remembers an anecdote related to the owner of the raft who comes up suddenly with a stick in his hand. Even though it is apparent from the facial expression of the man that he feels angry with J., he intentionally wants to misinterpret and disregard the threat. Jerome’s usage of the phrase “teach somebody something” contributes to presenting this content in an ironical way.

He says he’ll teach you to take his boards and make a raft of them; but, seeing that you know how to do this pretty well already, the offer, though doubtless kindly meant, seems a superfluous one on his part, and you are reluctant to put him to any trouble by accepting it. (p. 152)

TT1: omission

TT2: Adam size, onun kütükleri alınıp da nasıl sal yapılmış göstereceğini söylüyordu bağıra çağıra. Oysa siz, bu işi zaten bildiğiniz için, yapılan bu nazik teklifi kabule yanaşmıyorsunuzdur! (p. 163)

TT3: Sonra size kendi keresteleriyle sal yapmanın ne demek olduğunu göstereceğini söyler, ama bu konuda da onun yardımına ihtiyacınız olmadığı açıkça ortadadır. Herhalde nezaketen böyle bir teklifte bulunduğunu düşünür, ona daha fazla zahmet vermemek için bu teklifi kibarda geri çevirirsiniz. (p. 204)

As is known, the expression “to teach somebody something” can bring in a script opposition depending on both its literal and idiomatic meaning. Therefore, the first opposition can be formed as “literal vs. idiomatic meaning”. While one of the scripts includes the information of giving instruction to someone on a topic, the other refers to causing someone to suffer the unpleasant consequences of some actions or behaviours. J’s intentional misinterpretation of the first script as the second one becomes obvious in the last sentence of the example where he mentions that the owner does not need to be concerned about teaching him about the craft of making a raft. To put it differently, the author brings the same scripts into opposition by playing on the same phrase. Briefly, the play on the phrase enables to create an ironic context in which the character pretends not to be aware of the danger the owner can cause to him. TT1 deletes the part including the wordplay from the target text while TT2 and TT3 prefer to render it with an idiomatic expression “ne demek olduğunu göstermek” (to teach someone what it means), which refers to one of the scripts the wordplay implies. With this expression, translators refer only to the negative aspect of the wordplay and hence delete the irony Jerome aims to create in the source text. Instead of using an explicit expression, the translators could have chosen to a more implicit expression or a similar wordplay that includes the phrase “ders vermek”. In this way, they could also have managed to preserve the irony related to the intention of the owner.

The following example presents another case that shows how the creative interventions by the translators can affect the humorous dimension of the target text. For this purpose, some representative examples will be discussed below apart from the others given before. In the first example, Jerome wants to show how our stomach dominates the other organs, including our heart. As is clear, Jerome personifies the

stomach throughout the whole excerpt, sentences of which are characterized by lots of metaphorical descriptions and some similes. In addition, the sentences are written in an elaborate manner with complex lexical and syntactic structures.

After hot muffins, it says, “Be dull and soulless, like a beast of the field – a brainless animal with listless eye, unlit by any ray of fancy, or of hope, or fear, or love, or life. And after brandy, taken in sufficient quantity, it says, “Now, come, fool, grin and tumble, that your fellow-men may laugh – drivell in folly, and splutter in senseless sounds, and Show what a helpless ninny is the poor man whose wit and will are drowned, like kittens, side by side, in half an inch of alcohol. (p. 93)

TT1: Ufacık börekleri sıcak sıcak atıştırdınızsa bu seferki teklifi şöyle olur. “Suya yatmış mandalar gibi ağır, vurdum duymaz olacaksın. Aşka, maşka paydos! Uyuş kal!” Eğer bir kaç kadeh viski yuvarladınsa mideniz bu sefer başka hava tutturur: “Gül eğlen! Zıpla! İnsan kardeşlerini keyiflendir! Saçmala! İki kadeh içkinin en rabıtalı bir insanı nasıl maskara ettiğini herkese göster.” (p. 65)

TT2: Sıcak börekten sonra da der ki, “Salaklaş, ruhsuz ol, otlaktaki hayvanlar gibi mayış... gözü görmeyen beyinsiz bir hayvan gibi, ne kafanda bir hayal ışığı, ne bir umut, ne sevgi, ne de yaşama sevinci olsun.” Konyağı yeterli miktarda aldınızsa, o zaman da der ki, “Haydi, şimdi budalalıklar yap, durmadan sırtı, hopla zıpla, dostlarını güldür, çılgınlıklar yap, saçma sapan konuş, akıllı ve iradesi yenilmiş bir insanın ne kadar zavallı olduğunu, iki parmak içkiyle nasıl arsız kedi yavrularına benzediğini göster.” (p. 103)

TT3: Sıcak çöreklerden sonra midenizden şöyle bir emir gelir: “Mayış, yayıl, uyukla. Tıpkı otlaktaki koyunlar gibi düşünmeden, hissetmeden yaşa. Her şeye kayıtsız kal. İçinde ne bir sevinç, ne bir umut, ne bir korku ne de bir sevgi kırıntısı kalsın. Hayatı da, ölümü de boş ver gitsin.” Öte yandan birkaç kadeh konyaktan sonra bambaşka şeyler söyler: “Haydi bakalım seni budala, suratında ahmakça bir sırıtişla aval aval bak. Kalk dans et, soytarılık et ki herkes haline gülsün. Aptalca işler yap, saçma sapan sözler söyle. İnsan aklının, iradesinin iki parmak alkolde nasıl boğulduğunu, koskoca bir adamın nasıl da şaşkın bir kedi yavrusuna dönüştüğünü göster herkese.” (p. 130)

TT1 does not reflect the source text in terms of both formal and semantic level. In contrast to the formal and flowery diction in the source text, TT1 adopts a more colloquial style in his version. It sticks to simpler expressions and short sentences, and does not render a number of items in his version. For example, the translators

intervenes the target text by adding some local expressions such as “suya yatmış mandalar”, which is generally used in the target culture to describe lazy and fat people. His freer version also contains some informal sayings like “aşk maşk” (love affair). For these reasons, it can be concluded that TT1 does not stick to the syntactic, formal and semantic features of the source text in his translation, and instead prefers to resort to some creative expressions, benefiting from some local expressions. TT2 and TT3, on the other hand, display contradictory translation strategies. TT2 produces a translation that replicates almost all the images in the target text and shows similarity with the source text in terms of formal language. However, TT3 can be considered as the closest one to the source text in terms of stylistic features. Using sentences that are more complex in structure and stronger in conveying the irony, the translator in TT3 pays more attention to represent the style of the source text author. Although TT2 and TT3 are closer to the formal features of the source text, TT1 produces a more humorous text in the target language. This can result from the translator’s tendency to introduce some creative expressions that are more familiar to the Turkish audience, which may be considered an evidence revealing the impact of cultural distance in the perception of the humorous effect.

As a final example, I would like to analyze an interesting excerpt that represents the general tendencies of the translators in a perfect way. The example is taken from a scene where J. is wakened up while he is dreaming of the old days when the British gain their freedom upon signing the Magna Carta charter, remembering the kings and the barons.

I was sitting on the bank, conjuring up this scene to myself, when George remarked that when I was quite rested, perhaps I would not mind helping to wash up; and, thus recalled from the days of the glorious past to the prosaic present, with all its misery and sin, I slid down into the boat and cleaned out

the frying-pan with a stick of wood and a tuft of grass, polishing it up finally with George's wet shirt (p. 108)

TT1: Ben kendimi o devrin ileri gelen baronlarından birisinin yerine koymuştum. Sırtımda parıl parıl zırhlar, elim kılıcımda... Maiyetimde kendi askerlerim... Kralın suratına dik-dik bakıyorum. İçinden geçirdikleri bana malum oluyor. Atından inmeyip arkasındaki Fransızlara bir işaret çekmeğe kalkışsa ilk hamlede bu düzenbaz herifi tepeleyeceğim. Yapar mıyım yaparım. Hiç bakmam! Ben kimim yahu? Ben milletin hürriyeti için kralına kafa tutmayı göze almış, kocaman Lord bilmem ne değil miyim? Jorj'un sesini işte tam bu sırada duydum. Birisine diyor ki: "Artık iyice dinlendin köpoğlusunu! Kendi kendine kibirli kibirli sırtımağa bile başladın. Haydi şu bulaşıkları yıkayıver." Yıkasın yaa... Elbette bulaşıklar yıkansın! Biz burada milletin hürriyeti için kelleimizi koltuğumuza almışız. Meğer alçak herif, terbiyesiz oğlan bu lafları bana demez miymiş? Ürpererek hayalden hakikate döndüm. Fakat fena halde canım sıkılmıştı. Belli etmedim ama tavayı, tabakları yıkayıp temizledikten sonra dalgınlığa getirip hepsini Jorj'un ıslak gömleğiyle kuruladım. (p. 74)

TT2: Ben kıyıda oturmuş, kafamda bu sahneleri canlandırırken, George'un sesi duyuldu. Eğer yanlış duymadıysam, bulaşıklara yardım etmek isteyip istemediğimi soruyordu; böylelikle de beni, o görkemli geçmişten günahlarla, sefaletlerle dolu olan bugüne getiriverdi. Sandala indim, tavayı bir değnekle kazıyıp temizledim, sonra otlarla sildim, en sonunda da George'un ıslak gömleğiyle parlattım. (p. 119)

TT3: Ben kıyıda oturmuş kafamda bu sahneleri canlandırırken George tepeme dikilip eğer çok zahmet olmayacaksa bulaşıklara yardım etmemi söyledi. Böylelikle de beni o görkemli geçmişten koparıp günahlarla kötülüklerle dolu bugüne geri getirmiş oldu. Tekneye dönüp tavayı aldım, bir dal parçasıyla dibinde kalanları sıyırdım, bir tutam otla temizleyip son olarak da George'un ıslak gömleğiyle bir güzel parlattım. (p. 151)

Although the source text does not include a humorous content, TT1 gains a comic tone thanks to the interventionist approach of the translator in TT1. While the source text starts implicitly by making reference to the last part of the previous chapter, TT1 reminds the readers of the context. In addition to that, it creates a new situation that does not exist in the source text. The translator puts himself in the shoes of one of the important barons and describes his relationship with the king in a humorous way.

The translator also presents the cowardice of the barons against the king in an ironical way: "Ben kimim yahu? Ben milletin hürriyeti için kralına kafa tutmayı göze

almış kocaman Lord bilmem ne değil miyim?” (Who am I? Am I not the great Lord who has dared to rise against the king for the freedom of the people). Apart from the lexical items, the tone of language TT1 uses contributes to the humorous effect of the target text. Even though Jerome writes this part in a formal manner, TT1 uses a very colloquial language and hence results in incongruity with the author’s intention of representing the main characters as coming from the middle-class of the society through the language they use. Although there do not exist any slang words in the source text, TT1 uses such words as “köpoğlusu” (son of a dog), “alçak herif” (dastard). For these reasons, it is possible to conclude that TT1 “rewrites” this part and creates a humorous content while the other two translators maintain the stylistic features of the source text by adopting a literal translation strategy. In TT2 and TT3, translators only render the source text elements and do not produce a humorous effect. However, it should be underlined that it is important for the audience to be aware of the cultural referents given in TT1 (such as the significance of the king vs. the position of the barons)

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this study, I aimed to provide a systematic analysis of the translation of humorous devices in a world-renowned literary novel that is rich in humorous content.

Applying the General Theory of Verbal Humor, I wanted to question whether a theory of humor could be used to understand and describe the similarities and differences between the source text's humorous devices and their translations in the target text. In other words, I tested the applicability and validity of a general humor theory as a linguistic framework to define the observed changes in the target texts regarding the rendering of humorous content. In the most general sense, my study aimed to question whether the assumptions of this general humor theory are valid in the rendering of different humorous devices. On the one side, my case study seems to support my hypothesis and the assumptions of this general humor theory. In line with the general argument of this theory, the study revealed that the differences between the source text and target text's humorous content increased linearly with the height of the Knowledge Resources that are organized hierarchically. It also showed that the target versions that did not recreate the same or a similar Script Opposition in the target language could not generally produce the same or a similar humorous effect in the target text. It was seen that though the translators usually reflected the other knowledge resources in their versions, they did not recreate the same or a similar humorous effect in Turkish. This result verified that the knowledge resources of the GVTH could be used as an analytical tool providing a linguistic framework for the analysis of humorous effect in another language.

On the other hand, I have encountered some limitations of the theory in terms of explaining the reasons behind the problems come across in rendering the

humorous elements into another language. For instance, the theory does not provide answers to the interpersonal factors such as the subjectivity of the reader and the translator. It should not be forgotten that the perception of humor could also vary from individual to individual, depending upon their knowledge of different cultures and languages as well as their sense of humor. Similarly, while the translators (as readers) may have difficulty in recreating a humorous element in another language though they understand it. As a result, translators (dis) ability to render the humorous effect in another language may result from some personal factors, such as the subjectivity of the readers, whom are not operating within the framework of this general humor theory. As another extra-linguistic factor, the issues related to publishing or editorship may also have an impact upon the recreation of humorous effect in the target language. As my case study showed, the translated versions do not have any italicized word to underline the irony. At this point, it is not possible to make certain evaluations through a linguistic analysis. Most importantly, it was seen that culture and language specific factors played a significant role in recreating the same or similar humorous effect in the translation. As the examples showed, the language specific features in wordplays caused some problems to find equivalent wordplays in the target language. For these reasons, translators generally resorted to rendering their sense into the target language. Similarly, cultural referents in some jokes made it impossible to create a similar humorous effect in the target text. Finally, this general humor theory remained limited to some extent in terms of comparing the general humorous tone of the three translations, since it focused on smaller linguistic units and provided source-text oriented analytical tools that necessitated evaluating the target texts in accordance with the selected smaller linguistic units. However, when the overall effect of the translations was examined, it

was seen that the translator of TT1 applied “compensation” (Díaz Cintas ve Remael, 2007) in some parts of the translation and hence made it more humorous when compared to both the source text and the other two translations. For instance, there occurred significant amount of additions in TT1, especially manifested through added colloquial Turkish expressions and various exaggeration remarks. Briefly, translation strategies of TT1 to render humorous devices were directed more towards the norms of the target text, since the translator seemed to produce a more fluent and acceptable text in the target culture. The translator of TT3 and TT2, however, displayed different tendencies in their translation strategies. While the translator of TT2 almost always tried to stick to the formal and lexical items of the source text, the translator of TT3 sometimes added new lexical items in order to increase the humorous effect. It was also observed both of the translators of TT2 and TT3 seemed not to have paid enough attention to the function of cultural referents in presenting the humorous content. They either completely deleted such parts from the target text or rendered them literally. Unlike the translator TT1, they did not resort to compensation in order to compensate for the loss their version create because of linguistic and cultural differences between the source and target language.

In terms of study design, the thesis was divided into four main chapters that are organized with a topic-based approach. In Chapter 1, I included general bibliographical information about the author, which was followed with a part involving a detailed discussion of the stylistic features of Jerome’s novels. Gaining a familiarity with the stylistic features of an author, without doubt, becomes highly important in both representing his/her style and the content of work in another language. Another reason for my focus on the stylistic features of Jerome resulted from the novelty he brought in the understanding of “humor” during his period. Even

though his humor shares some grounds with that of the Victorian period when the novel was written, it was seen that he introduced what was called “new humor” which is characterized by its simple diction, colloquial language and the universality of the topics.

Apart from this main objective, I attempted to show how the other humor theories have an influence on interpreting the humorous elements appropriately in the source text. For this purpose, Chapter 2 provided a discussion of humor theories that were proved to be useful in decoding the humor in the source text. Within the framework of this study, incongruity and superiority theories also presented a theoretical ground for describing the function and formulation of the humorous devices adopted in the novel. After elaborating on the general problems encountered in the transference process of humorous elements into another language, a comparative analysis was carried out in Chapter 4. In addition to identifying the general tendencies in translator’s translation decisions, I wanted to explore whether the GTVH can be applied to different types of humor or whether they needed to be treated differently in terms of both the conceptual framework and the relevant translation strategies to be adopted. For this purpose, I organized such sub-chapters as irony, wordplay and metaphor, each of which was evaluated with regard to its contribution to the presentation of the humorous content. Before comparing the translated versions of the meticulously selected representative examples, I gave detailed information about the various mechanisms having an impact upon the formulation of humor in ironical, metaphorical expressions and wordplays. This study confirmed my presumptions that different humorous devices need to be evaluated with different methodological tools. Apart from the GTVH used as a general framework in the whole part of the analysis, I attempted to benefit from some

of the most comprehensive translation strategies or procedures that have been commonly used by the scholars dealing with the issue of “humor and translation”. For instance, translator’s decisions to render the ironical utterances were evaluated and described by referring to Mateo’s comprehensive model developed for the analysis of translating irony. Translating wordplay, on the other hand, was explained according to Delabastita’s translation procedures for puns. Metaphor-based humor was analyzed through Newmark’s translation procedures. The purpose of incorporating these procedures in the analysis part resulted from the fact that they are considered the most comprehensive methods offered so far. The study questioned the efficiency and validity of these procedures in describing the humor transference in a literary work. In addition, contextual factors were taken into consideration while describing the translators (non-) solutions.

The case study carried out in the analysis part shed light on various factors related to how the knowledge resources of the source text affect the recreation of the humorous effect in the target language. Following a very detailed analysis of examples from each category, specific and general results were discussed regarding the translators’ decision. Firstly, Jerome’s irony was not expected to cause serious translation problems as they embodied the universal features of ironical utterances except for one type that relies on the stylistic usage of the author. With regard to translating ironical utterances, it was observed that it was important for the translators to pay attention to recreating the ironical cues – namely, hyperbole, intensifiers, rhetorical questions, and hedges – in their versions. As the examples demonstrated, humorous effect gets lost when the ironical cues are not appropriately reflected in the target text. In other words, it is possible to argue that replicating the logical mechanism of the source text is of vital importance in terms of retaining the

same or similar humorous effect in the target language. Secondly, it was shown that the narrative strategy also plays an important role in transferring the humorous devices with a similar effect. However, the most important factor, as mentioned in the GTVH, was found to be related to the script oppositions created by the source text author. Translators who did not recreate the same or a similar script opposition in their versions were not generally able to retain humor in the target language. Even though the target language has the equivalent linguistic devices that will account for creating the same script opposition, translators did not use them in their translations. As a result, they were not able to create ironical utterances of the same or similar effect with those of the source text. While rendering the idiosyncratic ironical device of Jerome, translators resorted to explicitation method instead of maintaining the same technique in their versions. Adding explanatory remarks was proven to decrease the humorous effect in the target text. In some parts of the novel, Jerome's irony resulted from the divergences he created at the level of language. Jerome used a very formal language in some sections in order to exaggerate simple events or mock the pretensions of the people. Juxtaposing different sociolects in the same dialogues, he aimed to mock the people coming from lower classes of the society. These language-dependent humorous devices were not rendered into the target language, since the translators did not reflect the language variety in their translations. As a consequence, the register-based irony was not able to be retained in the translation.

As for metaphorical usages, Jerome's humor is fed by creative similes that compare two objects with less or no similarity, personification and hyperbole. Jerome benefits from metaphorical expressions in order to elicit irony and laughter. They were also explained in GTVH's terms and revealed similar results as

mentioned in the previous paragraph. When metaphors were turned into the same or similar target metaphors by preserving the same script opposition, it was realized that the humor effect was successfully rendered into the target language. However, when the metaphors contributing to the humorous effect of the sentence were omitted or their meaning was explained in the target text, the ironic and emotive effect got lost. Finally, the examples indicated that it is important to reflect all aspects of the metaphorical expressions in order not to harm the humorous effect. Nevertheless, changing the knowledge resources of target, situation and language did not present serious problems as long as the same script opposition was retained in the translation.

Final category deals with the translation of wordplay that is considered the most problematic one to be recreated in another language because of its high dependence on the formal structures of languages. Although there are various ways of creating wordplay in a text, Jerome's wordplays were observed to be mostly dependent upon the lexical and syntactic ambiguity. In other words, Jerome benefits from the logical mechanism of polysemy, which is considered one of the most important knowledge resources in formulating wordplays. However, it was concluded that translators did not seem to have realized the importance of wordplays in terms of the novel's comic tone. Similarly, they almost always tended to turn the wordplay into zero in Delabastita's terms. As an alternative strategy, they also resorted to rendering wordplays with non-wordplays by using expressions that foreground their sense. It should be mentioned that their failure did not seem to result from the lack of an equivalent wordplay in the target language, for which I tried to provide evidence with my own translation solutions.

In line with the findings of the study, it may be safe to conclude that the General Theory of Verbal Humor can make significant contributions to Translation

Studies through its knowledge resources used to identify the similarity and difference between source text and target text's humorous elements. Based on these knowledge resources, translators can estimate how different the target humor is from the source humor and adjust their translation strategies accordingly. As it was found out that the priority and the significance of each knowledge resource changes depending on the type of the humorous device and some extra-linguistic factors, the general humor theory can remain limited in terms of evaluating the impact of translation upon both the rendering and perception of humor in the target language.

It should be underlined that this study did not include the personal factors affecting the translation strategies of the translators, which can be problematized in another study. In addition, how translations affected the appreciation of humor elements and the audience's responses to them were not tested. Therefore, this thesis can be expanded with quantitative case studies that measure the translations' impact on the response of the target audience to the humorous elements of the text.

REFERENCES

- Antonopoulou, Eleni. (2004). Humor theory and translation research: Proper names in humorous discourse. *Humor* 17(3), 219-255.
- Asscher, Omri. (2007). Stylistic norms and Hebrew translation of British humor. MA Thesis, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.
- Asscher, Omri. (2010). A model for Hebrew translation of British humor: Amplification and overstatement. *Target* 22, 2.
- Attardo, Salvatore. (2001). *Humorous texts: A semantic and pragmatic analysis*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, Salvatore. (2001). Humor and irony in interaction: From mode adoption to failure of detection. In L. Anolli, R. Ciceri and G. Riva (Eds.), *Say not to say. New perspectives on miscommunication* (pp.166-185). Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Attardo, Salvatore. (2002). Translation and humor: An approach based on the general theory of verbal humor (GTVH). *The Translator* 8(2), 173-194.
- Attardo, Salvatore. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humor*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, Salvatore and Victor Raskin. (1991). Script theory revis(it)ed: Joke similarity and joke representation model. *Humor: International Journal of Humor*, 4(3-4), 293-347.
- Bardon, Adrian. (2005). The philosophy of humor. In Maurice Charney (Eds.), *Comedy: A geographic and historical guide* (pp. 1-21). Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Boria, Monica. (2009). Translating humor: The case of Stefano Benni. In Ashley Chantler and Carla Dente (Eds.), *Translation practices: Through language to culture* (pp. 85-98). Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi B.V.

- Brigid, Maher. (2001). *Recreation and style: Translating humorous literature in Italian and English*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Catford, John Cunnison. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cazamian, Louis. (1952). *The development of English humor*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Chapman, Anthony J. and Hugh C. Foot (Eds.). (1996). *Humor and laughter: Theory, research and application*. London, UK: Transaction Publishers.
- Chakhachiro, Raymond. (2009). Analyzing irony for translation. *Meta: Translator's Journal* 54(1), 32-48.
- Craig, Charlotte M. (1989). A.W. Schlegel's rendering of Shakespearian wordplays. *Michigan Germanic Studies* 15(2), 215-225.
- Connolly, Joseph. (1982). *Jerome K. Jerome: A critical biography*. London: Orbis Publishing.
- Chiaro, Delia. (2005). Foreword. Verbally expressed humor and translation: An overview of a neglected field. *Humor* 18(2), 135-145.
- Chiaro, Delia. (1992). *The language of jokes*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Çakıroğlu, Kübra. (2009). The Big Bang Theory (Büyük Patlama) adlı komedi dizisindeki mizah unsurlarının Türkçe altyazı ve dublaj çevirilerine yansıtılma sürecinin karşılaştırmalı ve eleştirel bir incelemesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Coulthard, Malcolm. (1985). *An Introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman.

- Davies, Christie. (2005). European ethnic scripts and the translation and switching of jokes. *Humor: Special Issue* 18(2), 147-160.
- Davis, Dineh. (2008). Humor and communication. In Victor Raskin (Ed.), *The Primer of Humor Research* (pp. 543-569). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- De Geest, Dirk. (1996). Review of there's a double tongue by Delabastita. *The Translator* 2(2), 328-332.
- De Wilde, July. (2010). The analysis of translated literary irony: Some methodological issues. *Linguistica Antverpiensa New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 9, 25-44.
- Delabastita, Dirk. (1996). Introduction. *The Translator: Wordplay and Translation: Essays on Punning and Translation* 2(2), 127-139.
- Del Corral, Irene. (1988). Humor: When do we lose it? *Translation Review* 27(1), 25-27.
- Diaz Cintas, Jorge. (2003). Audivisual translation in the third millennium. In G. Anderman and M. Rogers (Eds.), *Translation today. Trends and perspectives* (pp. 192-204). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Diaz Cintas, Jorge and Aline Ramael. (2007). *Audiovisual translation: Subtitling*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Dobrzynska, Teresa. (1995). Translating metaphor: Problems of meaning. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24, 595-604.
- Eco, Umberto. (2001). *Experience in translation*. Toronto: University of Toronto , Press.

- Ekti, Meltem. (2013). Relating to the translatability of humour. *Milli Folklor* 25, 162-170.
- Faurot, Ruth M. (1974). *Jerome K Jerome*. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc.
- Freud, Sigmund. (1905). *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten*. Leipzig: Deuticke. Engl. Tr. *Jokes and their relation to the unconscious*. New York: Norton. 1960.
- Fowler, Christopher. (2014, January 26). Jerome K. Jerome. *The Independent* 16, Retrieved from: < <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books/features/invisible-ink-no-208--jerome-k-jerome-9082965.html>>
- Gray, Donald. (1966). The uses of Victorian laughter. *Victorian Studies* 10 (Fall), 145-176.
- Grice, Paul Herbert. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Cole, P. and J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). New York, Academic Press.
- Gregory, J.C. (1924). *The nature of laughter*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Gottlieb, Henrik. (1997). You got the picture? On the polysemiotics of subtitling wordplay. *Traductio. Essays on punning and translation* (pp. 207-232). Manchester and Namur: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood and Ruqaiya Hasan. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. (2001). Towards a theory of good translation. In Erich Steiner and Colin Yallop (Eds.), *Exploring translation and multilingual text production*, (pp. 13-18). Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Hazlitt, William. (1903). *Characters of Shakespear's plays and lectures on the English poets*. London, UK: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Hervey, Sandor and Ian Higgins. (1992). *Thinking translation. A course in translation method: French and English*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hirsch, Galia. (2011). Explications and other types of shifts in the translation of irony and humor. *Target* 23(2), 178-205.

Hutchen, Linda. (1994). *Irony's edge. The theory and politics of irony*. London: Routledge.

Hobbes, Thomas. (1968). *Leviathan*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Jerome, Jerome K. (1994). *Three men in a boat*. London: Penguin.

Jerome, Jerome K. (1957). *Teknede üç kişi* (Aziz Nesin, Trans.). Istanbul: Düşün Yayınevi. (Original work published 1889).

Jerome, Jerome K. (2004). *Teknede üç adam* (Ayşegül Çetin, Trans.). Istanbul: Bordo Siyah Klasik Yayınları. (Original work published 1889).

Jerome, Jerome K. (1984). *Teknede üç kişi* (Belkıs Çorakçı, Trans.). Istanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi. (Original work published 1889).

- Jerome, Jerome K. (1926). *My life and times*. New York and London: Harper and Brothers.
- Jerome K. Jerome. (1984). *My first book*. London: Spottiswoode and Co.
- Jerome K. Jerome Society. (2014, November 8). Jerome K. Jerome. Retrieved from: <http://www.jeromekjerome.com/jerome-the-man-2/jerome-the-man/>
- Kant, Immanuel. (1970). *Kritik der Urteilskraft*. Berlin: Lagarde. English translation: *Critique of judgement*. New York: Hafner, 1951.
- Karakoç, Yetkin. (2013). Text reduction as a technical constraint in subtitling versus humor translation. *Modern Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi* 10(4), 177-187.
- Kyratzis, Sakis. (2003). Laughing metaphorically: Metaphor and humour in discourse. *8th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference: July 20–25, 2003, University of La Rioja, Spain*.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- La Fave Lawrence, Jay Haddad and William A. Maesen. (1996). Superiority, enhanced self-esteem, and perceived incongruity in humor theory. In Chapman, Anthony J. and Hugh C. Foot (Eds.), *Humor and laughter: Theory, research and application* (pp.63-92). New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Landheer, Ronald. (1991). La Poly-isotopie comme probleme traductologique. Mladen Javanovic (Ed.), *Translation, a creative profession: Proceedings XIIIth World Congress of FIT* (pp. 133-140). Beograd: Prevodilac.
- Leppihalme, Ritva. (1997). *Culture bumps. An empirical approach to the translation of allusions*. Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Lind, Abigail. (2014, November 8). *GradeSaver (TM) ClassicNotes: Three Men in a Boat (To Say Nothing of the Dog)*. Retrieved from:
<<http://www.gradesaver.com/three-men-in-a-boat/study-guide/related-links>>

Louis, Cazamian. (1952). *The development of English humor*. Durham (North Carolina): Duke University Press.

Low, Alan Peter. (2011). Translating jokes and puns. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 19(1), 59-70.

Maher, Brigid. (2011). Humorous translation and style. *Recreation and style: Translating humorous literature in Italian and English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.

Margraf, Carl. (1983). Jerome K. Jerome: An annotated bibliography of writings about him. *English Literature in Transition 1880-1920* 26(2), 83-132.

Mateo, Marta. (1995). Translation of irony. *Meta: Translator's Journal* 40(1), 171-178.

McArthur, Tom. (1992). *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford: Oxford Publishing.

McGhee, Paul E. (1979). *Humor: Its origin and development*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.

Mills, Mark. (2013). *Three Men in a Boat* by Jerome K Jerome. *The Independent*. Retrieved from: <<http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books/reviews/book-of-a-lifetime-three-men-in-a-boat-by-jerome-k-jerome-8734130.html>>

Mindess, Harvey. (1971). *Laughter and liberation*. Los Angeles: Nash.

Morreal, John. (1983). *The Philosophy of laughter and humor*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

- Muecke, Douglass Colin. (1982). *Irony and the ironist*. London: Methuen.
- Muecke, Douglass Colin. (1969): *The compass of irony*. London: Methuen.
- Nash, Walter. (1985). *The language of humor*. London and New York: Longman.
- Nazik, Göktaş. (2009). Camus: *Yabancı*'nın dört çevirisi ve mizahi öğelerin çevrilebilirliği. *Frankofoni* 21, 335-351.
- Newmark, Peter. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford and New York: Pergamon.
- Newmark, Peter. (1991). *About translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Niedzielski, Henry. (1991). Cultural transfers in the translating of humor. *Translation: Theory and practice and interdependence: American Translators Association scholarly monograph series 5* (pp. 138-155). New York: State University of New York.
- Offord, Malcolm. (1990). Translating Shakespeare's word play. Peter Fawcett and Pwen Heathcote (Eds.), *Translation in performance: Papers on the theory and practice of translation* (pp. 104-140). Bradford, West Yorkshire: University of Bradford, Department of Modern Languages.
- Pelsmaekers, Katja and Fred Van Besien. (2002). Subtitling irony. *The Translator* 8(2), 241-266.
- Popa, Diana-Elena. (2005). Jokes and translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 13(1), 48-57.
- Popa, Diana-Elena. (2004). Language and culture in joke translation. *Ovidius University Annals of Philology* 15, 153-159.

- Raskin, Victor. (1979). Semantic mechanisms of humor. In C. Chiearello et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* (pp. 325-335). Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Raskin, Victor. (1985). *Semantic mechanisms of humor*. Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster: D. Reidel.
- Raskin, Victor. (2008). *The primer of humor research*. Berlin and New York: Moutonde Gruyter.
- Rodger, Frank and Andrew P. Read. (2013, November 9). Jerome K. Jerome: A bibliography of his works in English. Retrieved from:
<<http://www.jeromekjerome.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/JKJ-bibliography>>
- Sayman, Aslı Süreyya. (2011). The quality of audiovisual translation in Turkey and the course of the production process: An empirical study on the subtitled and the dubbed versions of Will and Grace. Boğaziçi University, MA thesis, Istanbul.
- Sancaktaroğlu Bozkurt, Sinem. (2014). Re-translations of Shakespeare's drama: A case study of the re-translations of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. In Deniz Bozer (Ed.), *Shakespeare 450*. Ankara: Büro.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur. (1819). *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, v.1. Leipzig: Brockhous. English Translation: *The world as will and idea*, v.1. London: Routledge and Kegan, 1957.
- Schäffner, Christina. (2004). Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 1253-1269.
- Shultz, Thomas R. (1976). A Cognitive-developmental analysis of humor. In Tony Chapman and Hugh Foot (Eds.), *Humor and laughter: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 11-36). London: Wiley.

- Steidlova, Veronika. (2010). Humor in Czech translations of *Three Men in a Boat*. MA Thesis, Masaryk University Faculty of Arts, Brno, Czech Republic.
- Tüfekçioğlu, Özden. (2013). Görsel-işitsel metinlerin çevirisinde mizah unsurlarının çevirisi: “Ice Age” serisi ve çevirilerinin İncelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Tymoczko, Maria. (1987). Translating the humor in early Irish hero tales: A polysystems approach. *New Comparison* 3, 83-103.
- Wallace, Carol J. (2002). Translating Laughter: Humor as a special challenge in translating the stories of Ana Lydia Vega. *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 35(2), 75-87.
- Weissbrod, Rachel. (1996). Curiouser and curiouser: Hebrew translation of wordplay in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. *The Translator: Special Issue, Wordplay and Translation* 2(2), 219-234.
- Varghese Marina and Algy Idiculla. (2015). Humor as social critique in *Pickwick Papers* and *Three Men in a Boat*. *European Academic Research* 2(10), 13817- 13830.
- Vandaele, Jeroen. (2002). Introduction: (Re-) constructing humour: Meanings and means. *The Translator: Special Issue. Translating Humor* 8(2), 149-172.
- Vandaele, Jeroen. (2010). Humor in Translation. In Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 147-152). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Vandaele, Jeroen. (2001). Wordplay in Translation. In Gambier, Yves and Luc van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* 2 (pp. 180-183). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Vandaele, Jeroen. (2002). Introduction: (Re-)constructing humour: Meanings and means. *The Translator* 8(2), 149-172.

Veatch, Thomas. (1998). A theory of humor. *Humor: International Journal of Humor* 11(2), 161-215.

Veisbergs, Andrejs. (1997). The contextual use of idioms, wordplay, and translation. In Delabastita (Ed.), *Traductio: Essays on punning and translation* (pp. 155-176). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Yus, Francis. (2012). Relevance, humor and translation. In Ewa Walaszewska and Agnieszka (Eds.), *Relevance theory. More than understanding* (pp. 117-145). New Castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing,

Zabalbeascoa, Patrick. (2005). Humor and translation – An interdiscipline. *Humor* 18 (2), 185-20.