

THEORY OF COMICALITY: THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE ESSENCE OF THE PHENOMENON FOR STUDYING THE HUMOROUS DISCOURSE

N. N. Prokopenko, PhD;

S. V. Voropai, PhD, professor assistant

Sumy State University,

Rymkogo-Korsakova Str.,2, Sumy, 40007, Ukraine

E-mail: prokopenko3377@gmail.com, voropaj@gmail.com

The article is devoted to the investigation of the nature of comicality as an aesthetic-linguistic phenomenon. Different theoretical ideas concerning the understanding of the aesthetic category of comicality in the historical spectrum are analyzed with the aim of its linguistic interpretation for the further investigation of the concept of «humorous discourse». The paper deals with the main motives that penetrate all known theories of laughter and are related to the essence of the comicality. In particular, the scientific investigations of Y. Borev, B. Dzemidok, T. Lyubimova, V. Propp, A. Sichov, A. Shcherbyna and other researchers have been analyzed in order to determine the criteria for delimiting the concepts of «comicality» and «fun» as functional categories of humorous discourse. The comicality is considered to be a deviation from the norm, which is interpreted as a generally accepted one, an obligatory order, inherent in public, social, and moral rules. Such an understanding of the phenomenon of comicality is extrapolated to humorous discourse, which is formed by mechanisms that are expressed in expressiveness, intensification of speech, and are generated by linguistic means, which are often put into a humorous text with violations of generally accepted linguistic standards.

Key words: *humorous discourse, expression, comicality, linguistic norm, fun, theory of laughter.*

Anthropocentric cognitive-discursive paradigm causes reorientation of modern linguistic research, which now are directed to a man. The new requirements provide for the study of language not only from the point of view of its structuring, but also in the context of real communication. Such conceptual doctrine suggests that discourse be explored as the manifestation of specific human features and the peculiarities of human impact on the communicative process. In this perspective, a person as a subject of speech is capable of forming texts and discourses of a different functional direction and stylistic affiliation.

Humorous discourse, like any other type, is conditioned by a communicative situation and is based on a specially organized linguistic structure. The conceptual basis of such a discourse is humor, which is defined as "a kind of comicality, a reflection of comicality in life's phenomena and human characters" [1, p. 176].

The **purpose** of the article is to study the immanent nature of the comicality for further linguistic research, in particular, to determine the mechanisms expressivation of speech in texts of humorous character.

Achievement of the set goal involves the solution of a number of **tasks**:

- to understand the accumulated experience in the science of the essence of comicality through the analysis of known conceptions;
- to find out the quintessence of the investigated phenomenon as an aesthetic-linguistic category, which defines humorous discourse;
- to determine the correspondence between the concepts "comic" and "funny" to reveal the intrinsic nature of humorous discourse.

The object of our study is comic as an aesthetic phenomenon and its nature. The subject of study is the criteria and motives of the classification of comicality, which underlie its defining and will allow to further consider the comicality as a conceptual basis of humorous discourse.

In the history of scientific thought, there are numerous attempts to explore the essence and some aspects of comicality. This category has long been in sight of philosophers,

psychologists, literary critics and linguists. Scientific studies that are unprecedented in scale make it possible to generalize the picture of comicality in human culture and form it in a separate aspect of humanitarian knowledge, which unites all branches of science that touch upon the nature of this phenomenon.

The **urgency** of the work is to find out the essence of comicality, the nature of its creation, not only as a form of manifestation of moral stereotypes, but primarily as a linguaphilosophical basis of humorous discourse, that is, in the language experience.

"Comic may be opposed to anything, and obviously this explains a large number of theories and interpretations associated with it" [2, p.3]. Comic theories have repeatedly been subjected to attempts to general systematization not only in aesthetics, but also in medicine and the humanities. It is known that in the 70's of the twentieth century a well-known American journalist Norman Kazins has organized a department at the University of Los Angeles to study problems of laughter and treatment patients with it. Thus, a new science was created that studies the effect on the human body of laughter – gelotology (from the Greek "Gelos" – laughter). And its founder, Norman Kazins, went down in history as "a man who succeeded in making death laugh" [3].

The scientific comprehension of comicality originates from the time of Aristotle. The notion of comic appeared from its opposition to the notion of "laughter". Laughter as a physiological reaction, a manifestation of the joy of a healthy person – "laughter of the body" – opposes the laughter that arises in the process of knowledge – "laughter of reason". This second laughter reveals the duality of the object and opens in the high – the low, in the beautiful – the ugly, in the good – the evil, in the perfect – the imperfect, in the serious – the non-serious, game. According to his theory, "the funny – it's a kind of flaw or obscenity that does not cause anyone pain or harm" [4, p. 53].

As an aesthetic category, comicality was considered not only by Aristotle, in ancient times comicality became the subject of the study by such philosophers as Plato, Cicero. Later comicality was mentioned in the theories of laughter put forward by Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer and other representatives of the Western European aesthetic school. The works of Y. Borev, N. Hartman, B. Dzemidok, B. Minchyn, V. Propp and other modern researchers were devoted to studying of this phenomenon. There are many theories of comicality, but, as was noted by V. Propp, "a brief review of existing theories of comicality gives not soothing picture" [5, p.5] because of the lack of common views on the interpretation of such concepts as comicality and the funny.

Almost all philosophers believe that the basis of laughter is the presence of a funny object and the subject who laughs. Therefore, the explanation of comicality and laughter is either in the qualities of the object, or in the characteristics of the reaction of the subject. On this basis, for example, T. Lyubimova distinguishes between two types of theories of comic. Theories of the first type include those based on the characteristics of the funny, of what is laughed at, namely: the theory of contrast, discrepancy, contradiction, when the low subject claims to be lofted; the theory of ugly, but harmless, obscene, that which is secretly interested; error theory, falsehood, etc. The second type of the theories includes theories based on the feeling that a person experienced when come across comicality, that is, what kind of feeling is hidden behind the reaction of laughter to a particular situation. These theories tend to be based on the feeling of superiority, or the idea that "laughter is a synthesis of joy and anger, or that it helps to defuse tension, also the theories of unexpectedness ("unjustified expectation"), of novelty, of defensive reaction, of comicality as "exalted wrong side out" (Jean Paul), the dissipation of illusion, excessiveness of psychic energy, the meeting of the soul with "nothing" (I. Kant)..." [2, c.6].

Analyzing the concept of comic, M. Riumina explores three main motives that penetrate all known theories of laughter and are related to the essence of comicality. These motives include the motive of contradiction (contrast, meaninglessness, the transition to the opposite, etc.), the motive of the game and the motive of visibility (dissembling, lie, illusion, virtuality, etc.). Moreover, the motives of the contradiction and the game intersect in the concepts of romantics A. Bergson, K. Groos, Jean Paul and others. In the opinion of

M. Riumina, the motive of visibility is decisive in clarifying the essence of comicality [6, p.74].

On the contrary, A. Sychov tends to think: "The more phenomena, situations and events involved in the sphere of reflection caused of laughter, the more complex the nature of the funny prove to be, and the more questions remain unanswered ..."

B. Croche also notes that "all determinations of comicality are in turn comical and useful only because they evoke feelings they are trying to analyze. A. Zeising called all the literature about comicality "comedy of errors" in the definitions. N. Hartman said that comicality – the most difficult problem of aesthetics. Indeed, laughter is like mercury. Laughter easily escapes from the hands of the theorist. There is complexity in this, but not hopelessness of the study of the nature of comicality" [8, p.3].

Agreeing with the leading scientists in understanding this difficult problem, it is worthwhile, in our opinion, to continue the review of scientific thought in order to make certain conclusions about the essence of comicality.

The same A. Sychov, despite the nihilism of relatively theorizing with respect to comicality, offers two variants of consideration of the conceptions of comicality: in the first definition of laughter, proposed by the millennium history of the existence of the theory of comic, are united on the basis of some common features; in the second variant, the refusal from structuring, from clear definitions and claims for the completion of the solution of the problem ("the structure is replaced by a structureless structure") is foreseen – the study of laughter becomes a collection of different essays, united by a common theme [7, p.4].

The advantage of the second option, according to the researcher, is the freedom of the philosopher, which is not limited to strict theories of theories, but has the ability to unbiased comicality and the laughter. However, this does not allow unambiguously describe a funny thing that will be inappropriate for a general theory of comicality. A. Sychov tries, in determining the essence of comicality and the laughter, to avoid confusion in the global concepts of the irrational labyrinth of laughter" [7, p.4]. The scholar believes that laughter should cover the general philosophical sphere of research on the existence of man and society in which the scope of the humanities loses its specificity and mix.

Tracing the ancient stage of comic research, Western European tradition and modern understanding of laughter, A. Sychov considers comicality as a universal phenomenon, while trying to determine the place of laughter in the social structure of society, focusing on the consideration of the ethnic, demographic, professional, national and philosophical humor (the latter, according to the author, is the most specific and extremely important for understanding the philosophy of humor).

On the background of general interpretations of the essence of comicality as a phenomenon that exists, but is difficult to define, the classification, proposed by Polish Scientist B. Dzemidok helps understand comicality.

In the book "On Comicality " he distinguishes six theories of comic (based on two factors: the historical moment of their origin and degree of proximity): 1) the theory of negative quality (the theory of the superiority of the subject of comicality experiencing over the object – Aristotle, T. Hobbes); 2) the theory of degradation (O. Bain); 3) the theory of contrast (I. Kant, G. Spencer); 4) theory of contradiction (G. Hegel, M. Chernyshevsky, A. Schopenhauer); 5) the theory of deviation from the norm (K. Groos); 6) the theory of mixed type, or the theory of intersecting motives (A. Bergson, S. Freud).

In addition, B. Dzemidok divides the theories of comicality, depending on the significance of the role of subject or object for them. All conceptions are divided into three groups: objectivist (the focus is on the objective qualities of a comic object); subjectivist (comicality is defined as the result of subjective abilities of the individual); relationalist (comicality is regarded as the result of the relationship between the objective qualities of the object and the subjective abilities of the individual) [9, p.11].

B. Dzemidok emphasizes that for many theories are characterized by the presence of not only one but several motives. His conception highlights the following motives: the motive of negative quality, advantages, degradation, contrast, contradiction, deviation from

the norm, as well as the motive of unjustified expectations, visibility, unexpectedness, etc. Aristotle still in ancient times used in his theory of comic motives of negative quality, degradation, deviation from the norm (ugliness, error). By analogy it is possible to allocate other motives, for example: the motive of originality, automatism, the discharge of energy, the influence of subconscious ideas.

The proposed approach by B. Dzemidok makes it easy to compare different conceptions without losing their uniqueness, and can also be productive for building a new, more complete theory. He was the first who argued that the explanation of the essence of comicality is based on various motifs that can be combined.

The principles of constructing the theory of comicality of B. Dzemidok of course deserve attention. However, as was noted in the epilogue to the book of A. Zys, objections raise some of the provisions. For example, "it's difficult to draw an exact line between the theory of negative feature and the theory of degradation, between the theory of contrast and the theory of contradiction although they certainly are not identical. But according to their radical philosophical and aesthetic essence, these groups of theories have common foundations" [10, p.203].

As B. Dzemidok notes, the presence of various forms of comicality created difficulties for researchers when making attempt to "give such a definition, which would cover all forms of a funny, at the same time excluding all the phenomena alien to comicality" [9, c. 55]. The researcher divides the notion of comicalness into simple (elementary) and complex (socially saturated) and concludes that all comic phenomena meet two conditions: any phenomena can be considered a deviation from the norm and "nothing of them threatens the individual security of the subject, does not cause fear" [9, c.56].

All listed theories of comicality have a rational grain. However, no single researcher proposed a single approach to the definition of comicality.

Y. Borev calls comicality "the beautiful sister of a funny". He claims that "the comicality is funny, but not all that funny is comic. Laughter is always a personal reaction and not always social" [8, p.10]. The scientist regards the classification of the leading theoretical ideas about the nature of laughter of B. Dzemidok incomplete. The determination of the nature of the comicality, and especially the attempt to classify the theoretical concepts of comicality in the history of aesthetic thought, is not an easy task. In this sense, one can not but agree with A. Zys's idea that "the classification system proposed in any study must be somewhat open and leave room for new approaches and appropriate adjustments" [10, p.203].

Analyzing various conceptions of comicality, we agree with many outstanding researchers (in particular, B. Dzemidok, T. Lyubimova, A. Sychov, etc.) at least in the fact that the ancient period of research laid the foundation for theoretical understanding of the laughter. But most of the philosophical postulates of the time in the future no scientist rationally refreshes, but only deepened and redefined.

In the classical (antique) period, two opposing systems of views on the funny were born. The first is presented by Aristophanes, Lucian, Democritus, and explains laughter as a holistic outlook that complements the serious perception of the world. Comicality, in their view, reveals the imperfection of the world and is called to change it. The second system of views is presented by Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero, who see the essence of the comism in a "painless mistake" and limit it to just a sphere of entertainment and recreation ("Funny is a certain mistake and ugliness, but painless and such that it does not hurt anyone" [11, p.650]). That is, all philosophers of the antique period consider laughter as a social and critical fact, but they beware its destructive function [7, p.23].

The next stage in the study of the nature of comicality is associated with Western European tradition, whose representatives have developed and supplemented their influential predecessors. Neither the Middle Ages, nor the Renaissance have brought in the science the new and original theories of laughter. And only since the seventeenth century, laughter again became the object of research, as evidenced primarily by the emergence of a

subjective theory of comicality in the German classical philosophy (G. Hegel, I. Kant), and later in the irrational philosophy of A. Bergson, F. Nietzsche, S. Freud, A. Schopenhauer.

So I. Kant (1724 – 1804) considered the notion of laughter as "the effect of the unexpected transformation of intense expectation into nothing" [12, p. 352], that is laughter is the result of the destruction of illusions.

Jean Paul (1763-1823) argued that the irony and humor belong to the sphere of the funny. Thus, irony is an expression of objective contrast that conceals subjectivity in it; humor, in turn, relies on a subjective contrast. So it will be humorous that demonstrates the comicity of the situation in terms of knowledge of a person. A satire appears when the transition from the realm of reason to the sphere of morality took place [7, p.30].

G. Hegel (1770 –1831) believed that laughter cleansed society from outdated ideas, which try to endow itself a sign of majesty. He argues that only isolated moments of history are marked by masterpieces of comic art, and each epoch corresponds to its dominant type of comicality [2, p.17].

The theory of laughter by A. Schopenhauer (1788 – 1860) has an epistemological character, since laughter is generated either by a lie, or by illusion, or by the mistake of perception. According to A. Schopenhauer, a man who laughs sincerely learns the world and, overcoming his own and other's illusions and dullness, is raised both intellectually and morally.

According to A. Bergson (1859 – 1941), "the sphere of comicality is not just all that belong to human, but everything to what people can give a meaning, and then put themselves in a gambling relation to this meaning. Comicality is a game with meaning. Everything that may be comprehended may also be made great play with, accordingly, potentially be ridiculed, if the prohibition and norms regulating our reactions and emotions are not involved in the case" [2, p.24]. That is, there is no the funny out of the human, and the person who laughs must be indifferent to the object of laughter, that is to feel "short-term anesthesia of the heart", because the feelings of regret, sympathy, and fear destroy the laughter.

S. Freud (1856 – 1939) considers the function of a laugh as the main function of discharge and explains comicality (wit, etc.) through the mechanism of displacement and the saving of psychic energy. Humor and comicality correlate through such a postulate: "A witty joke is created, comicality is found" [13, p.183].

Arthur Keestler (1905 – 1983), a well-known English writer, publicist, philosopher, argued that humor, as well as creativity, is based on the process of bissociation (the formation of an original connection between the various elements of two situations ("associative contexts"), which forms a new value), that is, on the combination of two different matrices. A sense of humor, for Keestler, reflects the ability of a person to notice points of contact of heterogeneous concepts and combine them into a single whole. That is, the creative function is dominant for humor [14].

Thus, an important moment in the development of the theory of comic of this period was the search for sources of comic in subjective experiences and in human mind, in the sphere of interaction between the subject and the object of comicality, in the development of Aristotle's idea of the presence of contradiction in comicality [4]. This may be a contradiction between the concept and reality (A. Schopenhauer), the purpose and means (Z. Freud), the living and mechanical (A. Bergson), the logical and alogical (I. Kant), greatness and nicety (Jean Paul, G. Spencer), their own advantages and other people's weaknesses (T. Hobbes) and others. It is this concept that formed the basis of the theory of deviation from the norm by B. Dzemidok (discussed above).

As A. Sychev noted, emphasizing the achievements of the Western European theory of laughter, representatives of the German philosophical school carried out an important work to define the conditions necessary for nascence of laughter, namely: the need to feel the superiority of the subject over the object of laughter; the presence of unexpectedness in comicality, the ability to laugh only over a man and the human [7, p. 42].

Fundamental study of the theory of comicality is associated with the name of V. Belinsky (XIX century). The next stage of its development is presented in the humanities of the twentieth century in works by M. Bakhtin, Y. Borev, B. Dzemidok, L. Karasov, T. Lyubimova, V. Propp, T. Ryumin, O. Fortov and others. Among the main provisions of the modern theory of laughter, one can distinguish the following: 1) comicality appears in the moral sphere (V. Belinsky, L. Karasov, V. Propp); 2) laughter is a social phenomenon (A. Dmitriev, O. Lunacharsky); 3) when determining comicality one must take into account historical experience (T. Ryumin).

Almost all modern theories of comicality sum up the previous with respect to the essence of the concept of "laughter", his understanding, the classification of existing the theories of comicality, the definition of its types and genres, etc.

The analysis of the concepts of comicality convinces that one of the criteria for clarifying the essence of the notion of comicality is to establish its conformity and to determine the difference with the concept of the funny. Some researchers consider the aesthetic category of comicality inseparably from the notion of the laughter (for example, V. Propp). However, some scholars (in particular, T. Lyubimova) believe that these two concepts do not coincide in certain circumstances. The researcher stresses that there is not the funny without comicality, whether it is the strong emotion, when die of laughter, which excludes all other manifestations of feelings, or merriment, which barely emerges and manifests itself simply in an imaginary assessment..." [2, p. 7]. However, not all the funny can be comic. "Comicality in general can be called aesthetically organized the funny, and the funny then will be implemented in a specific situation comicality (that is, what in the culture are fixed as hidden rules and prohibitions on such the game relationships, in principle, can causes laughter, is comicality, and the realization of such the game relationship is the funny)" [2, p. 7].

Different kinds of comicality may cause different laughter. And the object of laughter, as it seems to us, is the various spheres of human life - mental, physical, moral, and spiritual.

As V. Propp notes, today there are no attempts in science to classify all possible types of laughter. He believes that exactly the ridiculous laughter is closely and stably associated with the notion of comicality [5, p.16].

T. Lyubimova, who at first glance does not share the position of V. Propp concerning the equivalence of the concepts of comicality and the funny, tends to the same opinion, but argues that all the theories of comicality and the funny represent not different concepts of laughter, but the concept of different kinds of laughter and different kind of comicality " [2, p.25].

Given that laughter arises in the presence of two substances such as a funny object and a person who laughs, and that comicality is always directly or indirectly related to a person, it is necessary to determine the types of laughter that are tangent to the comicality. As noted in his book *Soviet Cinema Comedy* by R. Hureniev, "laughter can be joyful and sad, kind and angry, intelligent and stupid, proud and sincere, lenient and flattering, contemptuous and frightened, offensive and promising, brazen and timid, friendly and hostile, ironic and hearty, sarcastic and naive, affectionate and rude, meaningful and wanton, victorious (triumphant) and making excuses, shameless and disturbing. You can even increase this list: funny, tedious, nervous, hysterical, mocking, physiological, animal. There may be embarrassing laughter!" [15, p.8].

V. Propp identifies six kinds of laughter: good, evil (cynical), cheerful, ritual, riotous, ridiculous, both as aesthetic and non-aesthetic category. The researcher believes that most often in art and in life there is a ridiculous laugh, which is always associated with comicality. And since constant, continuous laughter is not possible, exactly the ridiculous laugh, which is like an instant flash, is a reaction to the sudden revealing of the shortcomings of a comic object [5, p.141-142].

According to A. Shcherbina, "the laughter has a huge range in its tone and emotional strain, from a soft, good-natured, benevolent, gentle smile to an evil and horrible irony, an

angry sarcasm. There is another scale of shapes and shades of laughter: it can be fun... cheerful, and maybe bitter, gloomy, joyless... In its semantic orientation and saturation, the laughter can be meaningful, associated with accurate observation, interesting and sly thought, and maybe empty, objectless, showing one's ivories" [16, p.19].

Most researchers under the notion of comicality means those types of laughter, which could be described with aesthetic categories. Y. Borev concludes that the funny is wider than comicality. Unlike Y. Borev, V. Propp, in contrast, does not fundamentally distinguish between funny and comic and uses these terms as synonyms. With this it is difficult to agree, since comicality, going beyond the limits of the funny, includes phenomena that correspond to the structure of comicality, but do not cause a laugh reaction (for example, a sharp blatant satire). Simultaneously the funny, going beyond comicality line, includes laughter as a physiological phenomenon (for example, hysterical laughter).

So, as T. Lyubimova noticed, the laughter "is not a self-sufficient value of comicality, it is only its means or material. And as any means, it should not be excessive; in the ideal case, it simply has to meet the goal" [2, p.7].

Philosophy and linguistics consider methods and means of creation of a comic. Receptions have wide possibilities of formation and perfection: they are most often connected with the plot of the work, characteristics of images and phenomena, can be generated by actions of characters, have situational nature, comicism can be created with the clothes of the heroes and with the details of the ordinary objects, etc. These methods are formed through comic means – directly through language means.

The notion of comicality is the basis of a humorous text, which is based not so much on language models and norms of language usage, but on the contrary it is based on the basis of a deviation from the linguistic standards in order to cause a reaction from the reader or listener, so it is interactive. So comicality is the determining factor in the creation of humorous discourse.

An overview of the scientific achievements associated with the concept of comicality, makes it possible to draw certain **conclusions**.

1. It should be distinguished the notions of comicality and the funny, where comicality is an aesthetic category, and the laughter may be a laughter of the body and the laughter of reason, that is, lies in the plane of human manifestations.

2. In the presence of clearly formulated theories of comicality, in our opinion, one should focus on those which 1) are based on a combination of different motives and the definition of the role of the subject and object in the creation of comicality; 2) which distinguish ridiculous laughter, which arises as the result of identifying certain disadvantages in human life; 3) which are based on the assertion that there is something in the world around us that contradicts our notion of norm; 4) which put a game with meaning in the basis of comicality.

3. Laughter as a means of comicality should be adequate to the task that leads to the creation of a comic situation.

4. Having analyzed various conceptual approaches to the understanding of the category of comicality, we believe that in order to clarify the concept of the humorous discourse one should consider comicality as a deviation from the norm, which is a normal, legal, generally accepted, mandatory order, and which may apply to any social, ethical, etiquette, moral rules.

5. The category of comicality is the conceptual basis of humorous discourse, which is also based on a deviation from the standards in order to cause a certain effect.

ТЕОРІЇ КОМІЧНОГО: З'ЯСУВАННЯ СУТНОСТІ ЯВИЩА ДЛЯ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ГУМОРИСТИЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ

Н. М. Прокопенко, канд. філол. наук, викладач,
С. В. Воронай, канд. філ. наук, доцент
Сумський державний університет,
вул. Римського-Корсакова, 2, м. Суми, 40007, Україна
E-mail: prokopenko3377@gmail.com

Стаття присвячена дослідженню природи комічного як естетико-лінгвістичного явища. Проаналізовано різні теоретичні ідеї щодо розуміння естетичної категорії комічного в історичному спектрі з метою його лінгвістичної інтерпретації для подальшого вивчення поняття «гумористичний дискурс». У роботі розглянуто основні мотиви, що пронизують усі відомі теорії сміху і мають стосунок до сутності комічного. Зокрема проаналізовано наукові розвідки Ю. Борева, Б. Дземидока, Т. Любимової, В. Пропта, А. Сичова, А. Щербини та інших дослідників з метою визначення критеріїв розмежування понять «комічне» і «смішне» як функціональних категорій гумористичного дискурсу. Комічне розглянуто як відхилення від норми, яку інтерпретовано як загальноприйнятій, обов'язковий порядок, притаманний суспільним, соціальним, моральним правилам. Таке розуміння явища комічного екстраполюється на гумористичний дискурс, що утворюється завдяки механізмам, які полягають в експресивізації, інтенсифікації висловлювання і породженні мовними засобами, вжитими в гумористичному тексті часто з порушеннями загальноприйнятих лінгвістичних стандартів.

Ключові слова: гумористичний дискурс, експресія, комічне, лінгвістична норма, смішне, теорія сміху.

ТЕОРИИ КОМИЧЕСКОГО: ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЕ СУЩНОСТИ ЯВЛЕНИЯ ДЛЯ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ ЮМОРИСТИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА

Н. Н. Прокопенко, канд. филол. наук, преподаватель,
С. В. Воронай, канд. филол. наук, доцент
Сумский государственный университет,
ул. Римского-Корсакова, 2, г. Сумы, 40007, Украина
E-mail: prokopenko3377@gmail.com

Статья посвящена изучению природы комического как эстетико-лингвистического явления. Проанализированы различные теоретические идеи, касающиеся понимания эстетической категории комического в историческом спектре, с целью его лингвистической интерпретации при последующем изучении понятия «юмористический дискурс». В работе рассмотрены основные мотивы, которые пронизывают все известные теории смеха и имеют отношение к сущности комического. В частности проанализированы научные труды Ю. Борева, Б. Дземидока, Т. Любимовой, В. Пропта, А. Сычова, А. Щербини и других исследователей с целью определения критериев разграничения понятий «комическое» и «смешное» как функциональных категорий юмористического дискурса. Комическое определено как отступление от нормы, которую интерпретировано как общепринятый, обязательный порядок, присущий общественным, социальным, моральным правилам. Такое понимание явления комического экстраполируется на юмористический дискурс, рождаемый благодаря механизмам экспрессивизации, интенсификации высказывания, которые создаются языковыми средствами, употребляемыми в юмористическом тексте зачастую с нарушением общепринятых лингвистических стандартов.

Ключевые слова: комическое, лингвистическая норма, смешное, теория смеха, экспрессия, юмористический дискурс.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Літературознавчий словник-довідник / ред. Р. Т. Гром'як [та ін.]. – К. : Академія, 2007. – 752 с.
2. Любимова Т. Б. Комическое, его виды и жанры / Т. Б. Любимова. – М. : Знание, 1990. – 64 с.
3. Смехотерапия оказалась успешным методом лечения [Електронний ресурс] / Режим доступу: <http://biblepravda.com/page.php?id=1109>. – Дата доступу: 10.11.2017.
4. Аристотель. Поэтика / Аристотель; пер. Б. Тена. – К. : Мистецтво, 1967. – 136 с.
5. Пропт В. Я. Проблемы комизма и смеха / В. Я. Пропт. – М. : Искусство, 1976. – 183 с.
6. Рюмина М. Т. Эстетика смеха: смех как виртуальная реальность / М. Т. Рюмина / изд. 3-е. – М. : Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2010. – 320 с.
7. Сычов А. А. Природа смеха или философия комического / А. А. Сычов. – Саранск : Изд-во Мордов. ун-та, 2003. – 176 с.
8. Боров Ю. Комическое или о том, как смех казнит несовершенство мира, очищает и обновляет человека и утверждает радость бытия / Ю. Боров; отв. ред. А. Я. Зись. – М. : Искусство, 1970. – 270 с.
9. Дземидок Б. О комическом / Б. Дземидок; перевод с польского. – М. : Прогресс, 1974. – 224 с.
10. Зись А. Послесловие. Комическое и его польский интерпретатор / А. Зись // О комическом / Дземидок Б. – М. : Прогресс, 1974. – 224 с. – С. 199 – 206.

11. Аристотель. Сочинения : в 4-х т. / Аристотель; общ. ред. А. И. Доватура. – М. : Мысль, 1983. – Т.4. – 830 с.
12. Кант Иммануил. Сочинения в 6 томах / Иммануил Кант; общ. ред. В. Ф. Асмуса, А. В. Гулыги, Т. И. Ойзермана. – М. : Мысль, 1966. – Т. 5. – 564 с.
13. Фрейд З. Остроумие и его отношение к бессознательному / З. Фрейд. – СПб., 1997. – 319 с.
14. Мартин Р. Психология юмора / Р. Мартин; пер. с англ. – СПб. : Питер, 2009. – 480 с.
15. Юренев Р. Советская кинокомедия / Р. Юренев. – М. : Наука, 1964. – 540 с.
16. Щербина А. О. Жанры сатиры і гумору / А. О. Щербина. – К. : Дніпро, 1977. – 136 с.

REFERENCES

1. Hromiak, R. T. Et al. (Eds.). (2007). *Literaturoznavchyi slovnyk-dovidnyk* [Literary Dictionary-Reference Book]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Akademia.
2. Liubymova, T. B. (1990). *Komicheskoye: yego vidy i zhanry* [Comic, its types and genres]. Moscow, Russia: Znanye.
3. *Smekhoterapiya okazalas uspeshnym metodom lecheniya* [Laughter-therapy proved to be a successful treatment]. Retrieved November 10, 2017, from <http://biblepravda.com/page.php?id=1109>
4. Aristotel. (1967). *Poetics*. B. Ten (Trans.). Kyiv, Ukraine: Mystetstvo.
5. Propp, V. Ya. (1976). *Problemy komizma i smekha* [Problems of the comicality and laughter]. Moscow, Russia: Iskusstvo.
6. Riumina, M. T. (2010). *Estetika smekha: smekh kaka virtualnaya realnost* [Esthetics of laughter : Laughter as a virtual reality] (3rd ed.). Moscow, Russia: Knyzhnyi dom «LIBROKOM».
7. Sychov, A. A. (2003). *Priroda smekha ili filosofiya komicheskogo* [Nature of laughter or philosophy of comicality]. Saransk, Russia : Mordovian University Pub.
8. Borev, Yu. (1970). *Komicheskoye ili o tom kak smekh kaznit nesovershenstvo mira, ochischayet i obnovliayet cheloveka i utverzhdayet radost bytiya* [Comicality or about that how laughter executes the imperfection of the world, purifies and renews the man and affirms the joy of being]. Moscow, Russia: «Iskusstvo».
9. Dzemydok, B. (1974). *O komicheskoye* [About the Comicality]. Moscow, Russia: Prohress.
10. Zys, A. Ya. (1974). Poslesloviye. Komicheskoye i yego pol'skii interpretator [Afterword. Comicality and its Polish Interpreter] (pp.199–206). In Dzemydok, B. *About the Comicality*. Moscow, Russia : Prohress.
11. Aristotel. (1983). Works (1-4 vols) (A. Y. Dovatur, Ed.), Vol. 4. Moscow, Russia: Mysl.
12. Kant, Immanuil. Works (1- 6 vols). (1966). (V. F. Asmus, A. V. Hulyha, & T. I. Oizerman, Eds), vol. 5. Moscow, Russia: Mysl.
13. Freid, Z. (1997). *Ostroumiye I ego otnosheniye k bessoznatelnomu* [Wittiness and its Attitude towards the Unconscious]. St.-Petersburg, Russia.
14. Martin, R. (2009). *Psikhologiya yumora* [Psychology of humor]. St-Petersburg, Russia: Piter.
15. Yureniev, R. (1964). *Sovetskaya kinokomediya* [Soviet cinematic comedy]. Moscow, Russia: Nauka.
16. Shcherbyna, A. O. (1977). *Zhanry satyry i humoru* [Genres of satire and humor]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Dnipro.

Received: November, 6, 2017