

ELĪNA KRASOVSKA

HUMOUR IN J.R.R. TOLKIEN'S "THE HOBBIT" IN THE CONTEXT OF ENGLISH AND LATVIAN CULTURE

This article will be introduced by explaining my choice of the subject matter.

I hold the view that humour is a feature of utmost importance for the reason that it helps people to expand cognition of themselves; moreover, cognition is initiated by every analysis of literary works. In addition to this, we know that culture is often referred to as a system of signs enabling society to comprehend itself in relationship with the world [cf. 19].

One of the numerous ways in order to divide culture phenomena into a number of subcategories would be Art, Entertainment, Religion, Philosophy, etc. Thus, it can be assumed that humour and literature belong to Entertainment and it is not possible to picture entertainment without humour [cf. 2]

The term humour is generally used referring to all forms of comic material, everything that tends to provoke laughter and as a matter of fact stories are among the most popular means containing and provoking humour for the reason that " .. the greatest amount of humour is rather told than seen." The ability of humour to strip away pretence has appealed very much to comic writers because humour can reveal the difference between what the person thinks s/he is and pretends to be, and what s/he really is [cf. 8, *Humour*; 13, *Humour*].

As far as style is concerned, humour can be defined as follows:

"The amusing effect of humour is generally brought about by striking juxtaposition of incongruous details or arresting contrast between the substance and form... Humour may likewise be begot by substituting a strikingly illogical, unexpected notion for an ordinarily expected one." [4, 30, 31]

In linguistic analysis it can be observed how the synthesis of different expressive means and stylistic techniques are applied to control and influence the mood, attitude, temperament and emotions of the reader.

It is fairly obvious that both English and Latvian cultures bear a certain difference so does the sense of humour of English and Latvian people the same way

as there are cross-cultural differences and cultural untranslatability. For my understanding of these terms, see Prof. Ieva Zauberga's writings [15].

Another reason of my choice is that I like J.R.R. Tolkien's style, his beautiful and rich language which fascinates many people who appreciate English literature. His style encompasses wonderful and sonorous language of an English professor who treasures his mother tongue.

J.R.R. Tolkien is a representative of literature genre known as Literary Fantasy which is a separate genre of fiction that began to emerge towards the end of the 19th century. Initiators of fantasy have always been alongside e.g. fairy-tales and stories, myths, legends and even the Bible. Generally speaking, all these elements hold the essentials of Fantasy. The earlier Fantasy creators were George MacDonald and William Morris, and George MacDonald is sometimes credited as the "father of fantasy" [16]. On the one hand Fantasy can be regarded as the most ancient of all literary genres taking into account the myths and religions of the ancient civilizations as well as compositions like Beowulf. On the other hand Fantasy as a literary genre has been firmly established only in the 20th beginning with J.R.R. Tolkien who is often entitled to be the father of modern Literary Fantasy. It is often said that J.R.R. Tolkien's landmark works *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings* initiated the recognition of Fantasy genre, offering novel and creative possibilities within the genre [cf. 18].

J.R.R. Tolkien undeniably was a master of language. When he was 23 years old he was awarded First Class Honours degree in English Language and Literature. He became Professor of English Language when he was 32 [20].

The perception of humour in "The Hobbit" is as diverse as our sense of humour depending on our culture and background.

Here a question might be asked what a hobbit is. In the beginning his book "The Hobbit or There and Back Again" J.R.R. Tolkien himself explains that hobbits are little people who are inclined to be fat in the stomach, dress in bright colours, have good natured faces, and laugh deep fruity laughs [cf. 10].

"The Hobbit" is an adventure story of a timid hobbit Bilbo Baggins who is employed as a burglar in the quest of regaining dragon-stolen treasures [ibid.]. The very notions of a shy hobbit and a burglar capable of depriving a horrible dragon of its well-guarded riches seem to be incompatible and funny.

"The Hobbit" was first published in 1937, but the year of the translation (done by Zane Rozenberga), is 1991, consequently there is a considerable time

gap. One can say that the entire culture situation has changed, both English and Latvian.

It should be said that functionally as a work of fiction, "The Hobbit" belongs to *expressive texts* if one has to proceed from translation theory. An expressive text should create an atmosphere and leave an impression upon the reader. The reader should feel that he/she participates in an adventure, rejoices and suffers together with its heroes. *Expressive text* also means that it should be author-oriented. An ideal translation should have the same function and aesthetic effect as the source text [cf. 15].

If the Latvian translation of "The Hobbit" is taken into account, it is obvious that the purpose of the translator is to create a book for children and it is the considered addressees for the original, too.

It should be pointed out that this article is not meant as a criticism of the Latvian translation of "The Hobbit" although it might be perceived so. In general the translation is well-done and acceptable, reading the translation one can sense virtually the same effect in the target culture as it in the source culture.

I would like to point out details of the original work and the Latvian translation dealing with different stylistic techniques.

Irony

Irony is a figure of speech or trope realized when the words actually employed seem to say the opposite to the meaning necessary in the context and apparently intended by the speaker.

"In its tone, irony is both playful and serious at once." [4, 33]

Irony is to be considered more subjective than formal stylistic technique because the assessed fact is *subjective*. It is also based on the *realization of dictionary and contextual meaning of the word at the same time*, but the meanings are in conflict. It belongs to so called master tropes [17]. Irony can be benevolent, sad, ill-natured, bitter, wrathful etc. If it is aimed at another person, irony can be sarcastic, functioning as an indirect and polite form of criticism however if the deliberate irony is not recognized then it loses its power [cf. 9 and 13].

The words that carry ironic significance are often uttered by a different intonation. If it is impossible to specify the word whose meanings are in conflict, this is a case of *verbal irony*. Irony is used in the *context* that includes an *amount of a word combination to the situation of a whole book* [cf. 3 and 6].

It is generally known that irony implies *the contrary of what is being said*, but it *conceals a sting* in it as well. It is frequently indicated by a *tone* of voice [cf. 14, *Humour*].

Irony belongs to those stylistic techniques, which are not easy to distinguish because it does not always correspond the definition of being the opposite of what is being told, and it does not always contain a sting or an understatement. Sometimes it can just *instinctively* be *felt* that this is irony. In such cases the result of irony is obtained by a number of remarks. Irony is a foremost rhetorical tactic in parody often characterized by free indirect speech. Irony can be likened to humour if it comes as an *unexpected conflict of the positive and the negative* [cf. 3 and 6].

The following example of irony is to be found in Chapter 1 of J.R.R. Tolkien's "The Hobbit", the title of which is "An Unexpected Party":

"Bungo, that was Bilbo's father, **built the most luxurious hobbit-hole for her (and partly with her money)** that was to be found either under The Hill or over The Hill or across The Water, and there they remained to the end of their days." [10, 14].

The *sting* of **irony** that can be observed here is that Bungo was not able to build the most luxurious hobbit-hole for his own money. The effect is achieved through a detached construction containing author's comment.

In the translation it is:

"Bango, tas ir, Bilbo tēvs, izbūvēja **viņai visgreznāko un visērtāko hobita alu (pa daļai ar viņas pašas naudu)**, kāda bija atrodama zem Pakalna vai aiz Pakalna, vai viņpus Straumes, un tur viņi nodzīvoja līdz pat mūža pēdējām dienām." [11, 6].

Humorous effect is achieved in both languages – English and Latvian because it is a comic situation if a man builds the best, the most expensive and the most beautiful house for his beloved lady, and then it turns out that he did have enough money for the event, thus the lady had to invest her own money in order to have the most comfortable living place in the area.

It is apparent that irony is there, and in the translation it is achieved virtually by the same method – a detached construction and author's comment. It means that the principle of *equivalence* is applied – *dynamic equivalence* in particular [cf. 15].

Phraseological unit in discourse

Phraseological unit is an established pattern of word combination which has a completely or incompletely figurative meaning. Phraseological unit in discourse means that the established pattern of word combination reaches beyond the borders of one text. In order to create any kind of discourse two constituent elements are necessary – one to create and the other to perceive. For example: if there is a book on the table and somebody is sitting beside the book – no discourse is possible. Discourse begins when somebody reads the book and interprets what is written, and if *this* somebody laughs reading the book – humorous discourse is achieved.

Humorous discourse does not exist alone. It exists within the realm of **discourse stylistics**.

Discourse stylistics has recently become known as a new discipline. Discourse stylistics shows how discourse is constructed and what it conveys. Its aim is to proceed to stylistic interpretation and evaluation of a text [7].

An example is provided where the stylistic use phraseological units in discourse is applied for achieving a comic effect. The episode depicts Bilbo and Gandalf's first meeting.

The original text runs as follows:

““Good morning!” said Bilbo, and he meant it. The sun was shining, and the grass was very green. But Gandalf looked at him from under long bushy eyebrows that stuck out further than the brim of his shady hat. “What do you mean?” he said. “Do you wish me a good morning, or mean that it is a good morning whether I want not; or that you feel good this morning; or that it is morning to be good on?”” [10, 15, 16]

The Latvian translation is:

“– Labs rīts! – teica Bilbo, un tas bija sacīts no tīras sirds. Saule spoži mirdzēja, un zāle kuploja sulīgi zaļa. Taču Gandalfs tikai pameta viņā drūmu skatienu no garo, pinkaino uzacu apakšas, kuras slējās tālāk uz priekšu nekā platās cepures mala.

– Ko jūs ar to gribat teikt? – viņš noprasīja. – Vai jūs novēlat man labu rītu vai arī gribat teikt, ka rīts ir labs neatkarīgi no manas vēlēšanās; vai arī gribat sacīt, ka pats jūtaties labi šai rītā; vai arī vēlaties dot mājienu, ka šādā rītā visiem jābūt labiem?” [11, 7]

The **phraseological unit** “Good morning!” is very ordinary and is not perceived as a phraseological unit for that reason. It touches the “funny bone”

because it is a conventional and polite way to say “Good morning!”, and it is done every day when people meet somebody in the morning. It is not a common occasion to ask what it means. It is a surprise of an unexpected question that makes the reader laugh. Thus a stylistic colouring is given to a very traditional phraseological unit.

In the translation the function of humour is retained. There are few additions like *vēlaties dot mājienu, ka šādā rītā visiem jābūt labiem? In or that it is morning to be good on?* There is nothing said about giving hints or that everyone should feel good. The translator has added things for the sake of fluent target text and it has been done successfully.

Another example of a **phraseological unit in discourse** is from Chapter 12 “Inside Information”. There is a situation when the little hobbit has to enter a cave guarded by a terrible dragon:

“Then the hobbit slipped on his ring, and warned by the echoes to take more than hobbit’s care to make no sound, he crept noiselessly down...” [10, 204]

The Latvian version follows:

“Tad hobits uzvilka pirkstā gredzenu un, skaņo atbalsu brīdināts, ka šoreiz pat hobita piesardzīgā gaita divkārt jāklusina, bez trokšņa lida lejup...” [11, 134]

The base form of the phraseological unit is *to take care*. (For the definition of base form in phraseological units, see: 7.) Here the phraseological unit is modified in a creative way to *take more than hobbit’s care*, thus achieving a humorous discourse.

The result of translation is moderately different from the original. An effect of overtranslation is produced [cf. 15]. *Echoes* are translated as *skaņās atbalsis*, *to take more than hobbit’s care* translated as *hobita piesardzīgā gaita divkārt jāklusina*. Humorous effect is thus reduced although it is an attempt of compensation due to untranslatability. *To take care* means *piesargāties, rūpēties, pieskatīt, uzmanīties*. Hobbits are well-known for their ability to move almost noiselessly and be very careful. I would suggest *vairāk nekā hobituzmanīties* because it sounds funny and breaks the convention in Latvian, too.

Conversion and neologisms

Conversion is the use of a word as another part of speech without changing its form. It is very productive means of word-formation in English [cf. 12].

Bilbo, who is not used to unconventional situations and people, is annoyed by Gandalf:

("...Bilbo got quite uncomfortable and even a little cross.

'**Good morning!**' he said at last. By this he meant that the conversation was at an end.

'What a lot of things you do use *Good morning* for!' said Gandalf. 'Now you mean that you want to get rid of me, and that it won't be good till I move off.')

To think that I should have lived **to be good-morninged** by Belladonna Took's son, as if I was selling buttons at the door!" [10, 16, 17]

Actually *good morning* is not used as a verb, at least not according to the standard pattern of the English language. Tolkien using the phraseological unit *good morning* has created a new verb by means of **conversion**. J.R.R. Tolkien uses so called occasional conversion that takes place when the word is applied as another part of speech in order to present the meaning more lively just in the given context. Usually no new words are coined in the English language from these cases. Jerome K. Jerome is one of these authors who has made a lot of conversion in his works for humorous purposes [cf. 5]. In this particular case Tolkien has done the same.

The Latvian translation is as follows:

"Kas to būtu domājis, ka piedzīvošu **tādu laburītu** no Belladonnas Tukas dēla, it kā būtu atnācis pie viņa durvīm, pogas tirgodams!" [11, 7]

Here a substitution is used instead of making a verb out of noun. In English it is acceptable that a noun can by means of conversion become a verb and vice versa, but for the Latvian language it is not a conventional way when verbs and nouns can easily be converted. It is possible to say *labritot* in Latvian but it sounds artificial whereas *to be good-morninged* does not sound so strange in English [cf. 12].

Neologism is a new word, usage, or expression, or the act of inventing a word or phrase, or a newly invented word or phrase.

In Chapter 13 "Not at Home" there is an example containing a rather funny word *cram*. The English text is:

"..there they rested for a while and had such a breakfast as they could, chiefly *cram* and water. (If you want to know what *cram* is, I can only say that I don't know the recipe; but it is biscuitish, keeps good indefinitely, is supposed to be sustaining, and is certainly not entertaining, being in fact very uninterest-

ing except as a chewing exercise. It was made by the Lake-men for long journeys.)” [10, 231]

It is humorous and not accepted to speak about food as “chewing exercise”. It is not very amusing to have tasteless food. The situation is ironic; the author jests about his heroes.

The Latvian translation is:

“..iekoda šādas tādas brokastis – galvenokārt *stūķi* ar ūdeni. (Ja jūs gribat zināt, kas ir *stūķis*, es varu tikai pateikt, ka recepti nezinu; bet tas ir kaut kas cepumam līdzīgs, ilgstoši uzglabājams, it kā barojošs un, bez šaubām, negaršīgs; taisnību sakot, prieka tas sagādā maz, toties ir labs treniņš žokļiem. To izgudrojuši Ezera cilvēki gariem ceļojumiem.)” [11, 150]

The method of translation applied here is *calque*. Calque is a loan translation – a compound, derivative, or phrase that is introduced into a language through translation of the constituents of a term in another language (as *superman* from German *Übermensch*) [cf. 12 and 15]. There is no such word as a *cram*. To *cram* means to eat until one is sated; or to put something somewhere so that the space is completely filled; like *cram books into the suitcase*.

In Latvian *stūķēt, piestūķēt (vēderu)* has a meaning of eating too much (*pārēsties*). *Stūķis* is nonexistent in Latvian either. Zane Rozenberga has been very creative in translating this word *stūķis* because it sounds funny and corresponds to the original. Both words are neologisms and have a humorous sound effect.

Simile

Simile is whereby two concepts are imaginatively and descriptively compared. Simile is a figure of speech or a stylistic technique, which is applied in order to increase a certain quality, to strengthen it. Simile discloses the governing feature of a phenomenon by contrasting it to another in which the feature is exhibited in the highest grade [cf. 3; 4;13]. Similes compare different things in one or more aspects sometimes involving comparison of phenomena belonging to diverse classes.

Similes are classified among tropes because they are built upon the principle of analogy. Trope is defined as a figure of speech or the use of a word or phrase, which attracts the attention of the reader. It is any of several types of diversion from the literal meaning to the figurative [cf. 6 and 17].

The difference between simile and comparison lies in the fact that in case of simile a pair of things belonging to different classes are compared, however in case of comparison two things belonging to one class are likened.

Apart from having two or more objects to compare, simile possesses connective words as structural constituents. These connectives are the following: *like, as, as if, as though, seem, such as, as like, as...as*, etc. [cf. 3 and 6].

It is possible to employ a simile in order to create an assortment of nuances. Examples of similes that are going to be analysed here produce either a comic or horrible effect.

As simile can draw a distinction between things of very different categories, the more clashing the phenomena are, the funnier the effect is.

Similes from J.R.R. Tolkien's "The Hobbit" mostly are those in which *a person* (not a human being, but a personality – a dwarf, a hobbit, or a dragon) are *compared to an animal*, or their *deeds are compared to actions generally performed by an animal*.

In Chapter 2 of "The Hobbit" entitled "Roast Mutton" the little hobbit being consider a professional burglar which he is not, has to go on his first spying tour. Source text goes:

"Now scuttle off, and come back quick, if all is well. If not, come back if you can! If you can't, (1) **hoot twice like a barn-owl and once like a screech-owl**, and we will do what we can.'

Off Bilbo had to go, before he could explain that (2) **he could not hoot even once like any kind of owl any more than (3) fly like a bat.**" [10, 42]

Target text goes:

"'Joz arī un tikpat arī atgriezies, ja viss ir kārtībā. Ja nav, skrien atpakaļ, ja vien vari tikt! Ja nevari, (1) **iebrēcies divreiz kā plīvurpūce un vienreiz kā purva pūce**, un tad mēs darīsim, ko varēsim.

Un tā nu Bilbo vajadzēja jozt arī prom, un viņš pat nepaguva paskaidrot, ka (2) **neprot nevienu reizi iebrēkties kā pūce, vienalga, kādas sugas**, (3) **tāpat kā viņš neprot lidot kā sikspārnis.**" [11, 26]

Bilbo is forced to depart and spy on trolls. Actions of a person are compared to actions usually carried out by an animal. There are three sections that should be observed:

(1) it is a comparison to rather specific kinds of birds. Most people have a concept of what an owl is, but a person should be either ornithologist or interested in birds very much to be aware of such minute difference between them. It is

known that there are various kinds of owls, but to an ordinary human being they all might look similar, not even speaking about the tone of their hooting;

(2) is a reiteration of previous simile, and

(3) is another simile that presents an impossible action. It is obvious that hobbits cannot fly therefore the suggestion of unrealisable course of action is humorous in both languages.

In my opinion this particular translation is not very successful nevertheless the contribution of the translator should be appreciated. The translation of *scuttle* by *joz* is good for both words have connotational meaning – particular association with the word. To *scuttle* means a quick shuffling pace or a short swift run, the standard translation into Latvian is *bēgt, mukt, steigties* [cf. 2]. Whereas *jozt* means to run as quickly as you can in order to do something and is usually translated by *dash, rush, run*. The English text is very funny but in Latvian it is very difficult to restore the effect completely. *Off Bilbo had to go* has a neutral meaning apart from emotional construction, but it is translated by *Un tā nu Bilbo vajadzēja jozt* arī prom which is a compensation for the lost funny effect because emotion construction which is there in the English text cannot be rendered into Latvian because of the difference in word order. The English language as an analytic language, where inflections are not important in determining the relations in the sentence, has a fixed word order, and inversion of word order as in *Off Bilbo had to go* (the standard version would be *Bilbo had to go off*) stands for emotional construction. In the Latvian language, which is synthetic – the relations in the sentence are determined by inflections rather than the position of words, has a free word order, the item which is more important is put in the first place but it cannot convey the same stylistic gradation. The idea is conveyed although complete amplitude of stylistic nuances is not retained.

Another example of a simile to be provided here is created when Bilbo flies on an eagle. This is a fearful experience for the little hobbit. He tries to hold tighter on the eagle, but the eagle is dissatisfied with his attempt:

“Don’t pinch!” said his eagle. You need not be frightened like a rabbit, even if you look rather like one.” [10, 113]

“Neknieb, uzsaucā ērglis. – Nevajag būt bailīgam kā trusim, kaut gan tu patiešām joti izskaties pēc truša.” [11, 72]

In English the humorous effect lies within the comparison of the hobbit and rabbit, these words even sound similar, they rhyme. This effect is not retained in

Latvian. The Latvian effect is rather serious. I suggest that the usage diminutives like *nevajag būt bailīgam kā trusītim* and *tu patiešām ļoti izskaties pēc trusīša* would obtain a lighter tone, although *hobits* and *trusītis* do not exactly rhyme, just *-its* and *-ītis* could bear certain resemblance of rhyme..

A lot of humour can be brought about by puns.

Pun

In general stylistics a pun or wordplay is broadly characterised as an ambiguity. It involves the use of a polysemous word to suggest two or more meanings or the use of homonyms. Pun is also called a foregrounded lexical ambiguity [7].

The most wide-ranging definition of a pun would be – any play on words where play on various meanings of the same word or phrase; either of sides involved sees a different interpretation of the word or the phrase is misunderstood or a different meaning is realised as a result.

However, according to some views, it is not only the interplay of two meanings of particular words etc. that gives rise to wordplay. It can also be seen as resulting from the “clash between two (or more) domains of human knowledge and experience” [1, 138].

Puns are widely used in comical works. They have many forms and ways of expression. Puns are built upon the principle of analogy [cf. 6]. Puns are based on the interplay of different meanings of the word [cf. 3]. Pun is a play on words, play on two meanings of a word, or homonyms, or on the literal and transferred meaning of a phrase or an idiom.

Pun belongs to lexical stylistic techniques however syntactical stylistic techniques also help to produce an effect of pun.

It is a play on words, when one word is said and another one is meant as in this example:

It is said that once Ben Johnson was asked by a friend to make a pun. Ben answered, “Pun what subject?” meaning “Upon what subject?” His friend laughed and added, “Upon the king.” Now Ben replied, “But the *king* is not a *subject*. He is the *king*.” [Cf. 14, *Humour*]

An example from “The Hobbit” to be commented on deals with the situation when Bilbo gets into trouble, spying on trolls. Willing to prove himself as a fearless burglar, he tries to steal a troll’s purse, and is caught red-handed:

““What are yer?”

Bilbo Baggins, a **bur**— a **hobbit**,” said poor Bilbo, shaking all over, and wondering how to make owl-noises before they throttled him.

“A **burrahobbit**?” said they a bit startled.” [10, 44]

The comical effect is obtained by the fact that Bilbo is about to say that he is a burglar, then he realises that it is not the right thing to say to a troll whose purse you have just tried to steal, and he says that he is a hobbit. The pun shows Bilbo’s fright, that he cannot collect his thoughts properly. The trolls can be surprised because of the strange species of hobbits they have not heard before. In the hobbits’ world it is well-known that *hobbits* live in the holes however it turns out that they can also live in *burrows*. As a matter of fact a *burrow* – a hole in the ground made by an animal (as a rabbit) for shelter and habitation is very similar to a hole – a hollowed-out place as a cave, pit, or well in the ground [cf. 2]. At any rate the trolls who are one of the least bright species in Tolkien’s secondary world seem distressed by an odd species of hobbits.

Latvian text follows:

“Kas tu tāds esi?

– Bilbo Baginss, **kramp... hobits**, – teica nabaga Bilbo, trīcēdams pie visām miesām un prātodams, kā lai atdarina pūces brēcienus, pirms šie briesmoņi nav viņam aizžņauguši rīkli.

– **Kramphobits**? – tie pārjautāja tādi kā iztrūcināti.” [11, 27]

Here by means of *semi-calque* the funny effect is rendered perfectly [cf. 15]. *Semi-calque* would mean that half of the word is translated, but the other half is a calque or loan translation. (See above). *Kramphobits* has a humorous sounding in Latvian that could be a *hobbit made of flint* – *krams* (if the sound P is assimilated due to fast speech) – somebody who is strong and fear inspiring to scare the trolls, it could also be a *hobbit having fits* – *krampi* and that could be dangerous for the trolls.

A version of the following text is very popular with those who take pleasure in Tolkien’s works and fantasy genre: “The English speaking world is divided into two parts – those who have read Tolkien and those who are going to read”.

Now that we have the translations of J.R.R. Tolkien’s works, and we are also able to say that “Latvian society is divided into two parts – those who have read Tolkien, and those who are going to read.”

In the conclusion it should be indicated that humour in J.R.R. Tolkien’s “The Hobbit” is brought about via numerous lexical and syntactical stylistic tech-

niques and expressive means as irony, phraseological units in discourse, conversion, neologisms, similes, and puns.

Although it is possible to convey the idea contained in the original, it is very difficult or almost impossible to preserve a complete set of stylistic nuances intact in the translation. Occasionally the translator has to use different stylistic techniques to recreate the humorous effect and compensated for the untranslatable points.

Compensation is a means of usage in translation of stylistic hues especially those concerning sentence structure when a text is rendered from an analytic language like and English and into a synthetic language like Latvian.

There are many potential ways how to render untranslatable issues and cross-cultural differences, it is not possible to say strictly that one way is necessarily better than the other and only one version acceptable.

References

1. Alexieva, Bistra. There must be some system in this madness : metaphor, polysemy and wordplay in a cognitive linguistics framework. In: Delabastita, Dirk (ed.). *Transductio: Essays on Punning and Translation*. New York : St. Jerome Publishing, 1997.
2. *Encyclopædia Britannica*. CD-ROM. Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., 1994–2001.
3. Galperin, I.R. *Stylistics*. Moscow : Vysshaya Shkola, 1977, 332 p.
4. Geniushas, A. *A Digest of Style*. Riga : LU, 1972.
5. Ginzburg, R.S. et al. *A Course in Modern English Lexicology*. Moscow : Vysshaya Shkola, 1966.
6. Kukhareno, V.A. *A Book of Practice in Stylistics*. Moscow : Vysshaya Shkola, 1986, 144 p.
7. Naciscione, Anita. *Phraseological Units in Discourse : Towards Applied Stylistics*. Riga : Latvian Academy of Culture, 2001, 283 p.
8. *Purnell's New English Encyclopedia*. Purnell&Sons, Ltd., Instituto Geografico de Agostini, 1965.
9. Timofejevs, L. un N. Vengrovs. *Mazā literatūrzinātnes terminu vārdnīca*. Riga : Liesma, 1965.
10. Tolkien, J.R.R. *The Hobbit or There and Back Again*. London : Unwin Paperbacks, 1979, 288 p.

11. Tolkien, J.R.R. *Hobits jeb Turp un atpakaļ*. Rīga : Sprīdītis, 1991, 193 lpp.
12. Veisbergs, Andrejs. *English and Latvian Word-formation : Contrastive Analyses*. Rīga : University of Latvia, 1997, 158 p.
13. Wales, Katie. *Dictionary of Stylistics*. Harlow : Pearson Education Limited, 2001.
14. *The World Book Encyclopedia*. Chicago : World Book, Inc., 1994.
15. Zauberga, I. *Approaching Translation*. Rīga : University of Latvia, 1999, 112 p.

Internet sources

16. Åsman, Calle. (1999) *Science Fiction and Fantasy 232.8°C* [online] [accessed April 10, 2000]. Available from <http://hem.passagen.se/gumby/>
17. Belton, R.J. (1996–2000) *Words of Art*. Okanagan University College: Department of Fine Arts [online] [accessed March 15, 2000]. Available from <http://www.ouc.bc.ca/fina/glossary/gloshome.html>
18. Collett, Cary and Rachel (1998) *The Science Fiction, Fantasy, and Horror Database* [online] [accessed May 10, 2004]. Available from <http://books.ratatosk.org/>
19. Latvijas Kultūras akadēmija (Latvian Academy of Culture), home page (2005) [online] [accessed January 7, 2004]. Available from <http://www.lka.edu.lv/>
20. The Life and Works of J.R.R. Tolkien (2001) [online] [accessed January 7, 2005]. Available from <http://home.c2i.net/selgaen/lifeand.htm/>

Elīna Krasovska

Humors Dž.R.R. Tolkīna "Hobitā" angļu un latviešu kultūras kontekstā

Kopsavilkums

Šī raksta mērķis ir aplūkot Dž.R.R. Tolkīna "Hobitu" un tā tulkojumu latviešu valodā. Raksta autore uzskata, ka humors ir cilvēka dzīves neatņemama daļa un ļoti svarīga īpašība. Humors ir svarīgs elements kultūrā, un tas var palīdzēt cilvēkiem izzināt sevi. Humora izpratne ir dziļi personiska un individuāla, un tā atspoguļošanas veidi atšķiras katras kultūras kontekstā, jo mēs visi esam indivi-

di, kā arī katrs pārstāvam savu tautu un kultūru. Tāpat kā angļu un latviešu kultūras ir atšķirīgas, tāpat atšķirīga ir arī angļu un latviešu tautām piemītošā humora izjūta.

"Hobita" autors Dž.R.R. Tolkīns ir izcils angļu rakstnieks un valodnieks, kurš bieži tiek minēts kā literārās fantāzijas "tēvs". "Hobits" ir kļuvis par literārās fantāzijas stūrakmeni, kaut gan sākotnēji autors to uzrakstīja kā stāstiņu saviem bērniem. Humora uztvere "Hobitā" ir tikpat atšķirīga kā mūsu humora izjūta atkarībā no mūsu kultūras un izcelsmes.

Šajā rakstā tiek analizēti dažādi stilistiskie paņēmieni, kuri izmantoti humora efekta radīšanā, piemēram, salīdzinājumi, ironija, vārdu spēle, frazeoloģiskās vienības diskursā un to efekta saglabāšana atkarībā no tulkošanas paņēmieniem. Īpaši uzsvērta atziņa, ka tulkojumam, lai tas izraisītu humora efektu, ir jāatbilst konkrētās kultūras kontekstam.