



*Corresponding author:

Amel Kadhum Abed**Hiba Nadhim Jebur**University: Wasit University
College: College of Education
for Human Sciences

Email:

amalkadhum@uowasit.edu.iqhibaj901@uowasit.edu.iq**Keywords:**Cooperative Principle,
flouting, maxim, joke.**ARTICLE INFO****Article history:**

Received 18 Aug 2022

Accepted 10 Sep 2022

Available online 1 Oct 2022

Flouting Grice's Maxims in Some Selected Clean Jokes: A Pragmatic Study**A B S T R U C T**

Jokes are verbal forms that have humorous effect when told and their humorous effect causes laughing on the part of the listeners. One of the reasons that cause the humorous effect of jokes is flouting the maxims of the cooperative principle, known as Grice's maxims. Grice's maxims are seen as a type of agreement between the communicators to cooperate in communication. At the same time, they are not considered as rules. This research tries to explore which of Grice's maxim(s) are flouted to create the humorous effect in jokes. It also tries to find out which maxim is flouted the most. The sample jokes were chosen randomly by the researchers and descriptive qualitative method is used to analyze the data accumulated. The analysis of the twenty clean jokes chosen is based on Grice's cooperative principle. The analysis shows that the maxim of quality is the most flouted as compared with other ones. And the maxim of relevance is flouted more than the maxim of quantity. Similar researches can be conducted on other types and forms of humor or on other types of jokes.

© 2022 LARK, College of Art, Wasit University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31185/>**الإستهزاء بقواعد جرايس في بعض النكات النظيفة المختارة: دراسة تداولية**

م.م. أمل كاظم عبد/جامعة واسط/ كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية/ قسم اللغة الإنكليزية
هبة ناظم جبر/جامعة واسط/ كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية/ قسم اللغة الإنكليزية

الخلاصة:

النكات هي أشكال لفظية لها تأثير روح الدعابة عند إخبارها وتأثيرها الفكاهي يسبب الضحك من جانب المستمعين. أحد أسباب التأثير الفكاهي للنكات هو الاستهزاء بأحكام المبدأ التعاوني، المعروف باسم قواعد جرايس. يُنظر إلى قواعد جرايس على أنها نوع من الاتفاق بين المتحاورين للتعاون في التواصل. في الوقت نفسه، لا تعتبر قواعد. يحاول هذا البحث استكشاف أي من قواعد جرايس يتم الاستهزاء به لخلق التأثير الفكاهي في النكات. كما أنه يحاول معرفة أكثر القواعد التي يتم الاستهزاء بها. عينة النكات تم اختيارها عشوائياً من قبل الباحثين واستخدمت الطريقة الوصفية النوعية لتحليل البيانات المترجمة. يعتمد تحليل النكات العشرين المختارة على مبدأ جرايس التعاوني. يُظهر التحليل أن قاعدة الجودة هي الأكثر انتهاكاً مقارنةً

بالقواعد الأخرى. ويتم الاستهزاء بمبدأ الملاءمة أكثر من قاعدة الكمية.. يمكن إجراء أبحاث مماثلة على أنواع وأشكال أخرى من الدعابة أو على أنواع أخرى من النكات. الكلمات المفتاحية: مبدأ التعاون و الاستهزاء والقاعدة و النكتة.

1. Introduction

Jokes are told and heard almost everywhere in our daily life. Whether one is home or at work or hanging out with his friends, s/he most often hears some kind of jokes. Here, we try to investigate one of the reasons behind the humorous effects of jokes which is flouting Grice's maxims. To do this a pragmatic analysis of jokes is conducted. Pragmatics is defined by Yule (2006, p.3) as "the study of meaning. It studies the utterance of speaker in a conversation, the meaning of the speaker and the meaning interpreted by the listener". He (2006, p.166) also defined pragmatics as "the study of the effect of the context in meaning".

Jokes are defined by Merriam Webster Dictionary as "something said or done to provoke laughter especially: a brief oral narrative with a climactic humorous twist." Jokes are "the humorous or ridiculous element in something." The current study intends to analyse some selected clean jokes to indicate which maxim(s) is flouted to create the humorous effect. Moreover, it tries to indicate which maxim is flouted more than other maxims. It also presents some statistical information about flouting the maxims in the jokes selected. Finally, this research suggests some further studies related to jokes and Grice's maxims that can be conducted by researchers.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Pragmatics

This section attempts to present an overview about pragmatics, the cooperative principle, the Grice's maxims, and jokes. Pragmatics is defined by Levinson (1983, p.9) as being deals with the relation that links language and context together which is grammatical and implied in the language structure. Crystal (1995, p.467) stated that pragmatics is deals the factors that influence choosing language by a person. Matthews (2007, p.313) defined pragmatics as one of the branches of linguistics that studies meaning which a sentence has in

a certain context where it is uttered. Hence, in particular, pragmatics is the study of implicatures as opposed to 'literal meaning' or 'truth conditions of sentences'.

The origin of the word 'pragmatics' dates back to the work of Charles Morris, the American semiotician and behaviourist (1938) who distinguishes the three parts of semiotics: syntactics, semantics, and pragmatics. He stated that pragmatics is thought of as the relation of signs to those who interpret the signs, the users of the language (Kroeger, 2019, p.4). Akmajian (2001, p.568) said that pragmatic studies the relation between language use, the language structure and context of utterance.

2.1.1 The Cooperative Principle

The cooperative principle is defined as "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Akmajian, 2001, p.568; Grice, 1975, p.45). Another definition is introduced by Hudson (2000, p.323) who stated that cooperative principle means simply to "contribute meaningfully to the accepted purpose and direction of conversation".

Grice's cooperative principle is a result of the common assumption made about communication which looks at it as a cooperative effort. This principle is composed of four sub-principles which are referred to as maxims which provide more detailed principles of conversational cooperation. These maxims are: the maxim of quantity: "say enough, but do not say too much", the maxim of quality: "say only what you have reason to believe is true", the maxim of relation: "say only what is relevant", and the maxim of manner: "be brief, clear, and unambiguous" (Birner, 2013, p.42; Akmajian, et al., 2001, p.575).

2.1.3 Conversational maxims

Before defining the conversational maxim, it is important to define what is meant by conversation which is defined by different linguists, some of these definitions are: Akmajian, et al. (2001, p.400) indicated that "conversations are co-operative endeavours where participants may be expected to comply with the general principle of cooperation." Yule (2006, p.145) stated that conversation in English can be defined as an activity where two or more persons take turns while they are speaking.

Wardhough (1986, p.284) indicated that conversation is an activity which is described as being a co-operative, in the Gricean sense, an activity that relies on both speakers and listeners who share some set of assumptions about what is going on. He added that

conversation is described as being cooperative as speakers and listeners are to accept each other for what they claim to be; in other words, each one accepts the face of the other.

Matthews (2007, p.239) stated that “maxims of conversation as a set of principles advanced by Grice, as part of his account of implicature”. For example, if someone say ' Tom has three sisters.' This would be true, in a strict sense, even if Tom has five sisters. But by a maxim of ‘quantity’ interlocutors are not expected to give less information than is appropriate; therefore, it carries the implicature (strictly this speaker implicature) that Tom has no more than three sisters”. Mey (2009, p.570) stated that a maxim is “an entity that can be flouted to produce implicature. The success of such definition would, however, depend on whether or not one has reached a satisfactory understanding to the notion of a flouting.”

Crystal (1995, p.460) defined conversation maxims as “general principles thought to underline the efficient use of a language, e.g., speakers should be relevant and clear.”

2.1.3 Types of conversational Maxim

There are four types of maxims that we have to follow them in conversations, they are as follows (Grice, 1975, p.45; Akmajian, 2001, p.400)

1. Quantity Maxim: “Be informative. Make your contribution as informative as required in the circumstances of the exchange. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required (talkative).”
2. Quality Maxim: “Try to make your contribution one that is true (be honest), do not say what you believe to be false, and do not say what for which you lack adequate evidence for.”
3. Relation: Be relevant.
4. Manner: Be perspicuous, avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief, and be orderly.

Hudson (2000, p.323-324) provided some examples that give a clear idea about the meaning of each maxim. These examples are the following:

1-Example of Maxim of Quality:

If someone asks how many children so-and-so has and the reply may be 'Three', but impossible to be 'Two' when 'three' is correct. Despite the fact that 'two' is true by entailment.

2- Example of Maxim of Quality:

“When a friend says ‘If I hear this song again, I am gonna kill myself.’, this would be accepted as hyperbole, and keep the radio turned on.

3- Example of Maxim of Relevance:

“When we hear that someone ‘kicked the bucket’, it is understood that the person died though it looks as if it is irrelevant.

4- Example of Maxim of Manner.

“Although it would be possible to arrange things in other than chronological order, a recipe will say ‘Bake about 50 minutes at 400’, check after 40 minutes, when brown, remove from oven and put on a cookie sheet.”

2.1.4 The Use of Co-operative Principle and Maxims

There are some uses of the cooperative principle which the hearers and the speakers recognize and accept. Hudson (2000, P.223-224) wrote that people depend on the cooperative principle to infer what is meant without expressing it overtly in a message. So saying the when someone says ‘the heal is killing me’, when they looks quite healthy, it is directly concluded that whoever said that is discomfort from something other than the heal.

Example:

A. Can Jane solve this problem?

B. She has solved more difficult ones. (We directly infer that she definitely could).

Hudson (2000, p. 223-224) also said that “the maxims may seem like applications of ordinary common sense and not worth mentioning, and may be they are. But just think how chaotic and unhelpful conversation would be if the maxims were often flouted or disobeyed. Their general validity and our consequent ability to rely on them as strategies of interpretation explains much of the effectiveness of most talk, and our ability, by pragmatic inference to get a lot of overly unexpressed but important meaning.”

2.2 Flouting and Violation of a Grace’s Maxims

Mott (2009, P.153) wrote that flout means that the addressee is not observing one or more of the maxims and s/he has answered in an indirect way and has not provided the amount of information expected.

Wardhough (1986, p.282) said that Grice indicates the truth that the speakers may not always follow the maxims he has described and, in such situations, it is possible that they implicate something different completely from what is actually said. They may violate, exploit or out off one of the maxims, or two of the maxims may clash in particular instance. In the following examples, he indicates that there no violation of any of the maxims in the responses of B and the responses are considered adequate ones of A’s remarks.

A. “I am out of petrol.”

B. "There is a garage round the corner."

A. "Smith does not seem to have a girl-friend these day."

B. "He has been paying a lot of visits to New York lately."

Mey (2009, p.569) clarified flouting by saying that there is different ways by which Grice's maxims can be contravened, but crucial importance was given to the blatant, intentional conversation of one or more of the maxims, i.e., flouting.

Finch (2000, p.160) explains that violation is different from flouting. Violating a maxim leads to an element of communication failure: providing too little or too much details being irrelevant or too vague. While in flouting, as Kempson (1977, p.70) states, results when a speaker deliberately and flagrantly breaks the norms of conversation in a way that he knows and has the intention that the hearer has the ability to recognize that the speaker breaks the maxim.

Cummings (2010, p.258) defined "violation in which a hearer presumes the speaker isolating neither the cooperative principle nor the maxims." Leech (1983, P.47) stated that "violation is not made apparent to the listener, the listener is misled by her or his assumption that the speaker is observing to the cooperative principles and its maxims."

Paltridge (2012, P.47) differentiated between flouting and violating the maxims when he stated that in a situation when speakers do not follow the maxims in the conversation in which they are involved with their hearers and have no intention to deceive or mislead their hearers and they have the intention that their hearers will understand the conversation, then they flout the maxims. On the other hand, and when they have the intention to mislead their hearers, then they violate the maxims.

Flouting is a term coined by Grice. A flout happens when a speaker clearly chooses that he is not going to observe one of the maxims or more than one and deliberately intends to create an implicature. The meaning of this is that the speaker has no intention to mislead, deceive or be uncooperative but rather urging the listener to look for meaning beyond the semantic level (Thomas, 1995, p.65). Cruse explains that when a speaker is flouting one or more of the maxims, it is clear to his hearer A. that one or more of the maxims are being flouted and B. that the speaker has the intention to that the hearer is aware that the maxims are being flouted and there are no signs that the speaker is opting out of the co-operative principle, (Cruse, 2000, p.360). Flouting is dependent greatly on the co-operation between the

speakers and the hearers (Levinson 1983:109). It has to be amply obvious to the listener that the speaker is not observing a certain maxim.

John: Tom, I wonder if you know who took my books?

Tom: It is Ronny or Lily but I am not sure it is Lily.

A response such as Tom's response is seen as violating the maxim of quantity due to the fact that he provides more information than is required as mentioning the name of the person who took the books would be informative answer. In addition to that, no reason is there to think of Tom to be uncooperative, consequently, his answer is believed to be cooperative. As he is definitely trying to be co-operative, John is obliged to try to find out what reason is the cause of his obvious flouting of the maxim of quantity. The reason for Tom to flout the maxim of quantity can be stated if one assumes that he intends not to flout the maxim of quality. There is a clash between the two, because Tom does not want to say anything that he does not have adequate evidence for. His answer can therefore be seen as a compromise, where he is signalling that he strongly believes that it was Ronny who ate all the candy, but at the same time he signals that his belief might not be accurate (Thomas 1995, p. 65-66). Flouting can be used to create different effects and it is most commonly used to create comedian effect in both everyday speech as well as in television shows. Weiwei (2012, p.22) argues that conversational humour is often resulted from not observing the co-operation principle. However, as Levinson (1983, p.109) states that, co-operation establishes flouting, it is crucial to distinguish non-observance of the maxims from non-observance of the co-operation principle. When the co-operation principle is not being observed, this means that the speaker does not have the desire to cooperate. While, as shown in the example above, a speaker may select not to observe one of the maxims but he still shows a desire to co-operate. As a result, the maxims can be seen as the tools that we use in interpreting messages.

Thomas (1995, p.72) explained three other ways by which the speaker may not observe one or more of the maxims. These ways are opting out, infringing and suspending. A speaker opts out a maxim when he shows an "unwillingness to co-operate in the way that the maxim requires" (Ibid, p.74). This kind of non-observance of the maxims is common in public life where a speaker is able to provide his answer in a way that is in a normal way expected. Such kind of non-observances can be found in a situation where the person involved is bound by some sort of confidentiality agreement such as counsellors, police officers or priests (Ibid). Speakers who have failed to observe a maxim and have no intention

to create an implicature or mislead the hearer is said to infringe the maxim. Speaker who has imperfect linguistic performance in the language, foreign speakers or children who do not have full mastery of the language, and an adult native speaker whose performance is somehow impaired because of be drunkenness, excitement or simply because the speaker is constitutionally incapable of speaking clearly can create such type of non-observance. Suspending a maxim as a type of non-observance contrasts the other types of non-observances in the fact that the cultural and social norms are its bases. Such non-observance does not create an implicature as suspending the maxim is considered as a norm that is culturally or socially accepted and the speaker is not expected to observe that particular maxim in that context. An example of suspending a maxim: In the acting community in Britain people refrain from saying the name of Shakespeare's play Macbeth because it is believed to be bad luck. Instead, they refer to it as The Scottish Play, and thereby they are not observing the maxim of quantity (ibid, p.77).

2.3 Jokes

Jokes are defined as a common verbal form of humour that is usually found in the different forms of mass media. Jokes have the characteristics of being short and causing laughter (Alharthi, 2016, p.16). Sherzer (1985) provide a description of jokes depending on the components they have: discourse units consist of two-parts, the first is the setting of the scene and the second is the punch line (as cited in Tisgam, 2009, p.2). In the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2013), punch line is defined as either one complete sentence or a phrase in a joke that causes a climatic laughing point. An example is: a teacher asks one of his students to mention two pronouns, then the student says fearfully: “who... me?” The teacher comments: “excellent”! The punch line in this example is the teacher’s answer as it is the result of the climatic laughing point.

Shixiang and Yiping (2014, p.3) asserted the fact that jokes are important due to their critical roles they playing producing laughter in the process of communication. Lipps (1898) defined a joke as comic thing which is described as being completely subjective. He also explained that jokes can be considered as a conscious and successful appeal of comic observation or of situation” (Alharthi, 2016, p.17). There are different channels for presenting jokes. As Lin (1985) pointed out, jokes can be presented either orally or in a written forms (as cited in Shixiang & Yiping, 2014, p.4).

2.3.1 Types of Jokes

Zabalbeascoa (1996) as cited in Shixiang and Yiping (2014, p.6) presented six types of jokes, these types are:

2.3.1.1 International Joke

International joke does not play on linguistic features or references to culture. Its content is known universally in such a way that it is enough for the target audiences to be able to understand in context. (p.6)

2.3.1.2 National-Culture- and-Institutions Joke

"A joke that depends on the cultural or institutional references, which is mostly cultural-specific enough for the audience and translator to digest." (p.6)

2.3.1.3 National-Sense- of-Humor Joke

"This type joke is usually used in a specific country or nationality. It contains basically one country's prejudice and irony over the other specific country or nationality. It is mostly created to mock others in particular. Accordingly, this joke type is "apparently more popular in some countries or communities than in others"(p.6).

2.3.1.4 Language- dependent Joke

"This language-specific type of joke uses "features of natural language for their effect, such as polysemy, homophony, and zeugma, but has to be differently understood in the different contexts" (p.6).

2.3.1.5 Visual Joke

"This joke type primarily depends on the visually conveyed information and actor's facial expression on the screen. This joke is coined on the screen and presented via the subtitles." (p.6)

2.3.1.6 Complex Joke

"This category represents the joke that contains and combines the features owned by the previous five types." (p.6)

3. Flouting Grice's Maims in Jokes.

After presenting a theoretical framework in the previous sections. The framework includes presenting a literature review of the topics: pragmatics by providing some definitions and the topic of cooperative principle and the conversational maxims which are the core of this research. Some definitions of the principle and the maxims are presented accompanied by some examples. The review contains also an explanation about the use of the

maxims and how they are flouted by the speakers by listing some examples with illustrations. Then a review of the jokes and their types is provided. This section is dedicated to analyse how the humorous effect of the jokes selected is created by flouting one or sometimes more than one of Grice's maxims. And also, to indicate which maxim is flouted more than others. Each joke is analysed depending on the cooperative principle of Grice.

4. Data Analysis

Analysis of Jokes (1)

Instead of answering Eve's question by saying " Yes or No", Adam asks her a question. By doing this, he apparently flouts the maxim of quantity, so his reply is not informative and this what creates the humorous effect of this joke.

Analysis of Jokes (2)

The humorous effect is accomplished through flouting the maxim of relevance as the passenger was asking about the height of the plane while the flight attendant replies him by indicating how high the plane is off the ground.

Analysis of Jokes (3)

The humorous effect of this joke occurs in the second part when the soldier flouts the maxim of quality in his second reply as he provides untrue information clearly because in his first reply he says that he has change. He does that as a reaction against the officer who seems to annoy him by his way of speaking.

Analysis of Jokes (4)

The clergyman flouts the maxim of relevance by providing irrelevant information as he says that he is in sales not management when he replies the very nervous lady who asked him to do something as he is a clergyman and supposed to be a source of comfort. And this is what accomplishes the humorous effect in this joke.

Analysis of Jokes (5)

In this joke, the humorous effect is established by the second speaker who flouts the maxims of quality when he mentions untrue information about the first restaurant which is to open on the moon. He explains that he did not only heard about the restaurant that is to open on the moon, but he also tried its food which was great but what he did not like about it was that it had no atmosphere.

Analysis of Jokes (6)

The humorous effect of this joke is established by flouting the maxim of quality by the second speaker when he provides information for which he has no evidence as the radio has never been mentioned in the bible.

Analysis of Jokes (7)

This joke is humorous since the student flouts the maxim of relevance in his reply to the teacher's question as he provides irrelevant information. This clearly because the teacher does not ask about Adam, the first man which God created.

Analysis of Jokes (8)

This joke is humorous as the speaker in flouts the maxim of quality as he provides untrue information. The information is untrue as there is no evidence that God first created all men bald.

Analysis of Jokes (9)

The second speaker though answering the first speaker's question, but he provides more information than required. By doing this he flouts the maxim of quantity and this is the reason of the humorous effect of the joke

Analysis of Jokes (10)

The second speaker's reply is less informative than required. As by the information he supplies, he does not answer the first speaker's question. So he flouts the maxim of quantity to creates the humorous effect of the joke.

Analysis of Jokes (11)

While the first speaker's question is to be answered by saying "Yes or No" so that the first speaker either informing him about the rumor or they may both discuss it. Instead, the second speaker provides irrelevant information which is the cause of creating the humorous effect of this joke.

Analysis of Jokes (12)

This joke has a humorous effect as the second speaker provides untrue information as what he mentions is not the real cause for calling the ages as being dark. So the speaker here flouts the maxim of quality.

Analysis of Joke (13)

The humorous effect is established when the second speaker first flouts the maxim of quantity as he did not answer the question asked by the first speaker. Then he provide irrelevant information so here, he flouts the maxim of relevance.

Analysis of Jokes (14)

The reply provided by the second speaker for the first speaker's question is less informative than required as he did not answer the question at all. And by flouting the maxim of quantity, the humorous effect is established.

Analysis of Joke (15)

This joke has a humorous effect as the second speaker flouts the maxim of quantity. He does not reply the first speaker's question informatively. He does not mention the real reason that the chicken coop only have two doors.

Analysis of Jokes (16)

The second speaker by his reply flouts the maxim of relevance though first it looks like as if he provides relevant one. Flouting the maxim of relevance is what makes this joke humorous.

Analysis of Jokes (17)

The reason provided as a reply for the question is untrue. This means that the second speaker flouts the maxim of quality which makes this joke humorous.

Analysis of Jokes (18)

The humorous effect of this joke comes from flouting the maxim of quality. This is as the second speaker provides untrue information as a reply for the question of the first speaker.

Analysis of Jokes (19)

The information provided by the second speaker as a reply for the question asked by the first one is untrue. This is because the fact that this not the real reason behind the blind people's inability of skydiving. It is obvious that the second speaker flouts the maxim of quality which results in establishing a humorous effect in this joke.

Analysis of Jokes (20)

The second speaker in this joke flouts the maxim of relevance as in his reply he provides irrelevant information. The humorous effect of this joke comes from flouting maxim of relevance.

5. Conclusion

It is concluded that pragmatics studies the meaning of a speaker and a listener in a conversation. Then we have the term 'the cooperative principle' which first introduced by Grice which deals with the kind of things people will say, how they will say things and how

specific we need to be when engaging in talk. Then we move to the term of ‘the conversational maxims’ which studies the efficient use of language. It is also concluded that there are four types of conversational maxims. These maxims are: quantity, quality, manner and relevance. The term ‘joke’, on the other hand, can be defined as a narrative structure that make people laugh because of its humorous effect and it consists of set-up and a punchline. Then, we find that the types of flouting maxims are the conversational maxims themselves. Finally, through the analysis of some jokes, it is concluded that the humorous effect of eight of the jokes selected depends on flouting the maxim of quality which covers 40% of the total number of the jokes selected. Flouting the maxims of relevance to create the humorous effect comes next as seven of the selected jokes derive its humorous effect form flouting this maxim and flouting this maxim covers 35% of the total number of the jokes selected. Flouting the maxim of quantity comes last as only six jokes selected depends on flouting this maxim to create their humorous effect. Flouting the maxim f quantity covers 30% of the total number. It is also concluded that in some jokes more than one maxim can be flouted at the sae time.

References

- [1] Akmajian, A, et al. (2001). Linguistic and Introduction to Language and Communication. MIT press.
- [2] Alharthi, A. A. (2016). Challenges and strategies of subtitling humour: A case study of the American sitcom Seinfeld, with particular reference to English and Arabic. University of Salford.
- [3] Birner, J. (2013). Introduction to pragmatics. Wiley-Blackwell.
- [4] Philips, B. “The World's Greatest Collection of clean Jokes”. 1998. Harvest House Publisher.
- [5] Crystal, D. (1995). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge University press.
- [6] Crystal, D. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. (2nd ed.). Cambridge University press.
- [7] Cummings, L. (2010). Pragmatics Encyclopaedia. Routledge
- [8] Finch. (2000). Linguistic Terms and Concepts. Macmillan, Press Ltd.
- [9] Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P . Cole and Morgan (eds.). Syntax and Semantics, Vol.3, Speech Acts, PP. 41- 58. Academic Press.

- [10] Hudson, G. (2000). *Essential Introductory Linguistics*. Blackwell Publisher Inc.
- [11] Kempson, R. (1977). *Semantic Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Kroeger, P. (2019). *Analyzing Meaning: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Language Science Press.
- [13] Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.
- [14] Leow, C.S. et al. (2015). *Trapping the Cunning Fox: Never get Lies Again in Business, Relationship and Marriage*. Human Behaviour Academy.
- [15] Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press
- [16] Matthews, P.H. (2007). *The Concise Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford University Press
- [17] Merriam Webster Dictionary. (2013) *Joke*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/joke>
- [18] Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- [19] Mey, J.L. (2009). *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*. Elsevier Ltd.
- [20] Morris, C. (1938). *Foundation of the Theory of Signs*. University of Chicago Press.
- [21] Mott, B. (2009). *Introductory Semantics and Pragmatics for Spanish Learners of English*. Spain Universtate de Barcelona
- [22] Pattridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Bloomsbury.
- [23] Shixiang, G. & Yiping, W. (2014). A study on the translation of jokes: Bridget Jone's diary as a case in point. *journal of applied foreign languages*, 21, 1-21. Retrieved from: [dnclresources/pdf/A14032903](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dnclresources/pdf/A14032903).
- [24] Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman.
- [25] Tisgam, H. K. (2009). *Translating cultural humour: Theory and practice*. Iraq: university of Baghdad- college of education for women
- [26] Wardhough, R. (1986). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell.
- [27] Weiwei, Pan. 2012. *Linguistic basis of humor in uses of Grice's Cooperative Principle*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(6): 20-25.
- [28] Yule, G. (2006). *The Study of Language*. Oxford University press.
- [29] (<https://parade.com/1041830/marynliles/clean-jokes/>). (Accessed May 12, 2019)

Appendix (1)

The Jokes Selected for the Analysis

1. Eve: Adam, do you love me?

Adam: Who else?

2. Passenger: Excuse me. How high is this plane?

Flight Attendant: About 30,000 feet.

Passenger: And how wide is it?!

3. Officer: Soldier, do you have change for a dollar?

Soldier: Sure, buddy.

Officer: That's no way to address an officer.

Now, let's try that again. Soldier, do you have change for a dollar?

Soldier: No, sir!

4. An airliner flew into a violent thunderstorm and was soon swaying and bumping in the sky. One very nervous lady happened to be sitting next to a clergyman and turned to him for comfort. "Can't you do something?" she demanded. "I'm sorry, ma'am," said the reverend gently. "I'm in sales, not management."

5. Did you hear about the first restaurant to open on the moon?

It had great food, but no atmosphere.

6. When was radio first mentioned in the Bible?

When the Lord took a rib from Adam and made a loudspeaker.

7. Teacher: Why was Adam a famous runner?

Student: Because he was first in the human race.

8. A bald man's retort: "In the beginning God created all men bald. Later He became ashamed of some and covered them with hair."

9. How do you measure a snake?

In inches—they don't have feet.

10. Why is Peter Pan always flying?

Because he Neverlands.

11. You heard the rumor going around about butter?

Never mind, I shouldn't spread it.

12. Why were they called the "dark ages?"

Because there were a lot of knights

13. What's the best thing about Switzerland?

I don't know, but the flag is a big plus.

14. What do you call a dog with no legs?

It doesn't matter, it's not going to come anyway.

15. Why does a chicken coop only have two doors?

Because if it had four doors, it would be a chicken sedan.

16. Where should you go in the room if you're feeling cold?

The corner—they're usually 90 degrees.

17. You know why you never see elephants hiding up in trees?

Because they're really good at it.

18. What do you call a religious person who sleepwalks?

A roaming Catholic.

19. Why don't blind people skydive?

Because it scares their dogs

20. Can a kangaroo jump higher than the Empire State Building?

Of course! The Empire State Building can't jump.