

Journal of American Academic Research

JAAR Publishing Center

San Francisco, CA, USA

<http://www.american-journals.com>

ISSN: 2328-1227(Print)



ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

Pun and (Un)Intentional Humor

Sura Dhiaa Ibraheem, Iraq
College of Education for Women, Baghdad University

Nawal Fadhil Abbas, PhD, (Corresponding author)
College of Education for Women, Baghdad University, Iraq

Abstract

Several contributions, in this century, revolve around the role which pragmatic plays in the perception and understanding of a humorous language. Pragmatically, linguists are interested in the way humor is communicated in conversations of our daily life and in the function of humorous communication like; irony, pun, teasing and joking. Only, recently, humor has gained its importance pragmatically when some authors and linguists took a few preliminary steps back in the eighties, by looking respectively at the unsaid concerning humor, the construction of comic witticism from a Grecian perspective, and the sociopragmatics of language use in jokes. The present study is intended to show how a selected literary extract can be subjected to a linguistic and a pragmatic analysis by applying the implicature theory of Grice (1975) and the incongruity theory of Kant (1790) by depending on pun as a basic mechanism to create humorous situations consciously and unconsciously. The researchers of the present study aim to investigate how pun can sometimes create intentional and unintentional humor and to differentiate between the creation of intentional humor, produced by smart characters, and unintentional humor, produced by naïve characters.

Despite the fact that this study is a qualitative in nature, some tables are provided for ease of reference and to reach into a deeper, better and more comprehensible analysis.

Index terms: *Measure for Measure*, pun, humor, intentional humor, unintentional humor, Gricean maxims, implicature.

Introduction

Humor has developed through history to include many theories that are suggested to analyze and explain its nature such as: the incongruity theory, the superiority theory, psycholinguistic theory and the cognitive or semiotic theory. At the same time, humor involves many different types, like irony, pun, sarcasm, and double entendre...etc, in which each type generates humor by its own way and create hilarious situations. This paper involves a linguistic and pragmatic analysis of an extract from Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* (1604). This play is selected by the researchers of the present study because of its stylish language, difficulty and mysterious nature which confuses the critics to the extent that they neither categorize it as a tragedy nor as a comedy. As such, they prefer to consider it as tragi-comedy (Hyland, 2011, p.69).

Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* has not been linguistically studied by applying Kant's incongruity theory (1790). The researchers of this paper intend to explain how humor is differently created by using pun as a major mechanism, to show humor intentionality by depending heavily on Grice's conversational implicature theory (1975), with irony, sarcasm, and wit...etc as minor mechanisms. Furthermore, the researchers have the interest to show that despite of the use of the same word (by using the pun technique), yet it brings so many different meanings and variations in humor intentionality.

The Concept of Humor

Recently, UN umbrella is a term used to refer to the word 'humor', with generally positive social desirable connotation, and it includes anything people do or say that is perceived, heard, and understood as funny and laughable. The word 'humor' is said to have a very complex history and it had a totally different meaning from the meaning that we know in the present time (Martin, 2007, p.20).

Many definitions are provided to define humor throughout history such as the definition of Langston Hughes as “laughing at what you haven’t got when you ought to have it” (As cited in Walker, 1988, p.101). It was also defined by Montgomery which says “Humor is a perceptual and a cognitive process involving an ability to recognize and appreciate the absurd and incongruous aspects of a situation” (1997, p.170). And according to The Oxford English Dictionary, humor is defined as “the ability of being amusing, especially as expressed in literature or speech” (Stevenson & Waite, 2011, p.695). From these various definitions, we can conclude that the term humor is a broad term which refers to anything that makes others laugh (Martin, 2007, p.5).

During the sixteenth century, the idea of humor led to its use to refer to any behavior that may contain any kind of deviation from social norms. Then, the word ‘humor’ was used to refer to an odd and weird person because such people were often viewed as objects of laughter, or ridicule. Calling people objects of laughter and ridicule is considered the first step to associate the word ‘humor’ with funniness and laughter and by this the word humor entered the field of comedy.

Eventually, the word ‘humorist’ and ‘the man of humor’ are used to refer to whoever was the object of laughter. Until the mid-nineteenth century, the word humor came to be seen as a talent involving the ability to create humorous situations to make others laugh. Although it has been approved that humor has a biological basis rooted in our genes, we should not ignore the fact that social, cultural norms and learning play an important role in improving the ability to generate humorous situations and simultaneously preventing humorists from choosing inappropriate topics (Martin, 2007, p.4- 5).

The production of humor varies according to individuals and their interaction with others. Most people value individuals who are especially good at making them laugh because they enjoy so much the positive emotion of fun. This kind of people, who appreciate humor and humorist, are describe as having ‘a good sense of humor’; the capacity to respond to humorous situations either by laughing or smiling (Morrison, 2012, p. 25).

Types of Humor

Many different types of humor are introduced. Each one of them creates humor in its own way. They are as follows:

A. Wit

Wit is described as a style of humor. Errett (2014) defines wit as a “spontaneous creativity”, and the witty person has “the talent or quality of using unexpected associations between contrasting or disparate words or ideas to make a clever humorous effect” (Arbuckle, 2008, p. 13).

B. Sarcasm

Herawan, Deris and Abauagy (2013) define sarcasm as “the use of irony to mock or convey contempt” and “it is the activity of saying or writing the opposite of what you mean, or of speaking in a way intended to make someone else feel stupid” (2014, p. 281).

C. Irony

Irony is considered the most common way to create humor. Quintilian said that “irony, is that figure of speech or trope in which something, which is contrary to what is said, is to be understood” (As cited in Gordon, 1999, p. 118).

D. Pun

Pun is also considered one of the ways to create humor. It was defined by the Shorter Oxford Dictionary as “the use of the word in such a way as to suggest two or more meanings, or the use of two or more words of the same sound with different meanings, so as to produce a humorous effect; a play on words” (As cited in Delabastita, p. 57).

Intentional and Unintentional Humor

Simply, intentional humor is a planned and an organized process created by some person who has the intention to amuse and make others laugh. Normally, intentional humor involves three sets of players: the initiator, the audience and the subject or the material of humor. The initiator is the basic representative in a humor act who prepares him/herself to tell the joke. The material or the subject involves the joke. Laughter, the response of the spoken joke, is expressed by the final set in the process of humor, the audience, as Henry Bergson notes “laughter appears to stand in head of an echo” (As cited in, Harvey, 1999, p.4). In the act of humor, secondary agents, those

who participate (laugh at the joke) and have aligned themselves with the joke-teller, are also involved (Ibid.). On the other hand, unintentional humor, also called accidental humor, is divided by Nilsen and Nilsen (2000) into physical and linguistic forms. Accidental linguistic humor originates either from errors in logic or mispronunciation or misspelling.

Accidental physical humor involves minor incidents and pratfalls, for instance, a slipping person on a banana peel or spilling juice on someone's shirt. These types of incidents are considered to be funny only if they occur in surprising and incongruous manner and the person who experiences these events is not seriously hurt or awkwardly embarrassed. The main difference between the intentional and unintentional humor lies in the fact that in the case of intentional humor, the speaker intends to say or do things in order to create hilarious situations. While in the case of unintentional humor, the humorous effect is achieved without the intent or the knowledge of the speaker (As cited in, Martin, 2007, p.14).

Methodology

Grice's conversational implicature theory (1975) and Kant incongruity theory will be followed by the researchers of the present study. In 1940s and 1950s, H. P. Grice, (a British philosopher) provided and outlined for the first time his famous theory of implicature that is still dominant (a shorter version of which was published in 1975 in a paper entitled 'Logic and Conversation'). In this theory, Grice intended to explain how hearers arrive at the implied meaning, from what is said to what is meant (Davis, 1998, p.1). Conversational implicature, on the other hand, is defined as "a set of principles that govern the cooperative verbal exchange of information" (Brooks & Kempe, 2012, p.147). It provides an explicit account for how it is possible to suggest or mean more than what is actually said and what is implied varies according to the contexts of the utterances. For example, when you see someone's phone broken and hear him say:

"Great! That is Great, it made me really happy!"

This generates the implicature that this man is really angry because his phone is damaged and he cannot use it any more. Besides, conversational implicature has been widely appreciated and assigned a central place in contemporary pragmatics (Thomas, 1995, p.58). Grice's conversational implicature theory represents an attempt to

explain patterns of inference in the language which cannot be explained completely using the formal devices. This theory was well-received, remained extensively influential and became the starting point for a discussion of the criteria, expectations, and the rules of the maxims that people have in their minds when they talk (Brown, 1983, p.3).

Grice (1975) sets four maxims he called the “conversational maxims.” Those maxims can be used to describe how implicature can be derived from participants. For Grice, those maxims are only valid for language use that is meant to be informative; for instance, categories such as small talk and snap chat (Renkema, 2004, p.20).

Grice summarizes these maxims as follows:

1. Maxim of quantity: make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purpose of the exchange). Do not make your contribution more informative than required.
2. Maxim of quality: do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
3. Maxim of relation: be relevant.
4. Maxim of manner: avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly (Grice, 1975, pp.45-46).

These maxims may perfectly be observed if speakers normally obey their rules, but sometimes these maxims are not observed, in many ways, either to make a specific communicative point or to express a non-literal meaning. When Grice first listed the four famous maxims in 1975, he was aware that there are many occasions when people fail to observe them.

Therefore, he also listed five ways in which maxims are not observed (Huang, 2010, p.180).

- Flouting a maxim.
- Violating a maxim.
- Opting out of a maxim.
- Infringing a maxim.
- Suspending a maxim.

According to these five ways, people may fail to observe a maxim because they chose to cheat others or they chose to lie intentionally or unintentionally. Or maybe they are unable to speak clearly and honestly, or simply they do not want to seem ignorant and try to give false information.

The incongruity theory became the dominant account of laughter and humor in both psychology and philosophy in the 20th century. It was first introduced by Aristotle but he never developed it. The most famous version of this theory is by Kant (1790) who described it as “an emotion caused by the sudden transformation of an expectation into nothing” (As cited in, Attardo, 2014, p. 568). Much like Kant, Schopenhauer proposed an incongruity theory of humor. According to Schopenhauer, the essence is located in the incompatibility between one's sensory knowledge and one's abstract knowledge of things. While according to Kant, humor essence is located in the evaporation of an expectation. Schopenhauer's version of the incongruity theory suggests that when one is stuck by some kind of clash between a concept and a perception, that are “supposed” to be of the same thing, humor arises (Roedelein, 2006, p.540). Some theorists argue that for humor to be present, we only need an incongruity; while others argue that for humor to be present we need an incongruity and a resolution of that incongruity. Kant's incongruity theory of humor is best analyzed and explained and understood in relation to Gricean maxims to see how their violation, infringing and flouting create humor and hilarious situations. Philosophers who support the incongruity theory believed that humor and laughter are derived from a surprise, or a sudden shock. They argued that when two incompatible things clash, and the points where we mix the two incongruous planes and the ‘jokes’ spark, we laugh.

Data analysis

The researchers of the present paper select a certain extract from Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* which they believe it to suit the purpose of this paper. The chosen extract is examined pragmatically by following the incongruity theory by Kant (1790) and the implicature theory by Grice (1975). Specific steps are put accurately by the researchers starting by contextualizing and analyzing each extract, examining the non-observed mechanisms, explaining the different meanings caused by implicature and ending up by applying the most dominant theory of humor on the flouted, infringed and the violated utterances identified by the researchers.

Pompey's attempt to defend Froth against Elbow's claim (II, I, 146-198)

- Pompey. I beseech you, sir, look in this gentleman's
Face. Good Master Froth, look upon his honor;
'tis for a good purpose. Doth your honor mark his
Face?*
- (150) *Escalus. Ay, sir, very well.*
- Pompey. Nay, I beseech you, mark it well.*
- Escalus. Well, I do so.*
- Pompey. Doth your honor see any harm in his face?*
- Escalus. Why, no.*
- (155) *Pompey. I'll be supposed upon a book, his face is the
worst thing about him. Good, then; if his face be
the worst thing about him, how could Master Froth
do the constable's wife any harm? I would know
that of your honor.*
- (160) *Escalus. He's in the right. Constable, what say you
to it?*
- Elbow. First, and it like you, the house is a re-
Spected house; next, this is a respected fellow;
and his mistress is a respected woman.*
- (165) *Pompey. By this hand, sir, his wife is a more respected
person than any of us all.*
- Elbow. Varlet, thou liest; thou liest, wicked varlet! The
time is yet to come that she was ever respected with*

man, woman, or child.

(170) *Pompey. Sir, she was respected with him before he
married with her.*

*Escalus. Which is the wiser here, Justice or Inquiry?
Is this true?*

*Elbow. O thou caitiff! O thou varlet! O thou wicked
(175) Hannibal! I respected with her before I was mar-
ried to her! If ever I was respected with her, or she
with me, let not your worship think me the poor
Duke's officer. Prove this, thou wicked Hannibal,
or I'll have mine action of batt'ry on thee.*

(180) *Escalus. If he took you a box o' th' ear, you might
have your action of slander too.*

*Elbow. Marry, I think your good worship for it. What
is't your worship's pleasure I shall do with this
wicked caitiff?*

(185) *Escalus. Truly, officer, because he hath some offences
in him that thou wouldst discover if thou couldst,
let him continue in his courses till thou know'st
what they are.*

*Elbow. Marry, I think your worship for it. Thou seest,
(190) thou wicked varlet, now, what's come upon thee.
Thou art to continue now, thou varlet; thou art to
continue.*

Escalus. Where were you born, friend?

Froth. Here in Vienna, sir.

(195) Escalus. Are you of fourscore pounds a year?

Froth. Yes, and't please you, sir.

Escalus. So. [To Pompey] What trade are you of, sir?

Pompey. A tapster, a poor widow's tapster.

(Shakespeare, 1964, pp. 65-57).

Contextualizing the selected extract

Escalus attempts to discover the truth about what actually happens to Elbow's wife. But, Pompey's wit, which represents the source of destruction to Escallus with Elbow's malapropisms, prevents Escalus from knowing the true facts concerning 'what was done to Elbow's wife by Froth.' This question is left to the readers' imagination because Escalus could not make Froth say anything due to his friend's wit, Pompey (Llnes, 2004, p.14).

Analyzing the selected extract

The selected extract contains nine utterances. The first three utterances are all said by Pompey to Escalus; the first one occurs in line (147), which says "*Good Master*", the second utterance occurs in lines (155-156), which says "*His face is the worst thing about him the worst thing about him, how could Master Froth do the constable's wife any harm?*", The third and the fourth utterances are said by Elbow to Escalus. The third utterance occurs in lines (162-164), which says "*First, and it like you, the house is a respected house; next, this is a respected fellow; and his mistress is a respected woman.*" The fourth utterance occurs in line (165), which says "*respected.*" The fifth utterance is said by Pompey in line (168), which says "*respected.*" The sixth utterance is said by Pompey to Escaluse in line (170), which says "*respected.*" The seventh utterance is said by Elbow to Escalus in lines (175-179), which says "*O thou caitiff! O thou varlet! O thou wicked Hannibal! I respected with her before I was married to her! If ever I was respected with her, or she with me, let not your worship think me the poor Duke's officer. Prove this, thou wicked Hannibal, or I'll have mine action of batt'ry on thee.*" The eighth utterance is said by

Elbow to Escalus in line (196), which says “*Yes, and’t please you, sir.*” The last utterance is said by Pompey to Escalus in line (198), which says “*A tapster, a poor widow’s tapster.*” The following table (4.9) clarifies the producers and receivers of the humorous utterances:

Table (1.1): Utterances, their producers and receivers in the selected extract

No.	Producer	Utterance	Receiver	Form
1.	Pompey	Good Master	Froth	phrase
2.	Pompey	His face is the worst thing about him. Good, then; if his face be the worst thing about him, how could Master Froth do the constable’s wife any harm?	Escalus	paragraph
3.	Elbow	First, and it like you, the house is a respected house; next, this is a respected fellow; and his mistress is a respected woman.	Escalus	sentence
4.	Pompey	Respected.	Escalus	word
5.	Elbow	Respected.	Pompey	word
6.	Pompey	Respected.	Escalus	word
7.	Elbow	O thou caitiff! O thou varlet! O thou wicked Hannibal! I respected with her before I was married to her! If ever I was respected with her, or she with me, let not your worship think me the poor Duke’s officer. Prove this, thou wicked Hannibal, or I’ll have mine action of batt’ry on thee.	Pompey	paragraph
8.	Froth	Yes, and’t please you, sir.	Escalus	sentence
9.	Pompey	A tapster, a poor widow’s tapster.	Escalus	sentence

Examining Flouting, Infringing and Violation of Gricean maxims in the selected extract

Relation, quantity and quality are the non-observed maxims in the selected extract. Pompey violates the relation as well as the quality maxims, in the first utterance, when he produces an irrelevant answer to Escalus about Elbow's wife; Escalus asks Pompey to tell him about what happens to Elbow's wife while he answers him by saying "look at Froth's face." While, Pompey, in the second utterance violates only the quality maxim when he first says that Froth's face is ugly and this is untrue, second, he says that Froth is 'a master' while he is a foolish man. Whereas the quality maxim is infringed by Elbow, in the third utterance, when he says that Mistress Overdone's house is a respected house and also he says that both Pompey and Mistress Overdone are respected. Despite the fact that Pompey uses the same word which causes the non-observance of Gricean maxims in the previous utterance, he does not infringe the quality maxim like Elbow, who violates it in the fourth utterance, intentionally when he says that Elbow's wife is a respected woman while he believes she is not. Pompey, in the fourth utterance, calls Elbow's wife "*suspected*", instead of "*respected*." Once again, the poor Elbow repeats the same mistake and infringes the quality maxim, in the fifth utterance, when he says "*respected*", instead of "*suspected*." Pompey, as a response, again, calls Elbow's wife "*suspected*", instead of "*respected*", in the sixth utterance.

Elbow, infringes the quality maxim, in the seventh utterance, when he first, calls Pompey "*Hannibal*", where he should say "*cannibal*", second, when he says "*respected*" two times when he mentions his wife, where he should say "*suspected*." Third, he repeats the same mistake which he says in the fourth extract, "*the poor Duke's officer*", where he should say that he is the Duke's poor officer. Fourth, one more time, he calls Pompey "*Hannibal*", where he should say "*cannibal*." In the last time, Elbow says an incorrect word "*batt'ry*", when he wants to accuse Pompey. Froth flouts the quantity as well as the quality maxims, in the eighth utterance, when he says too much and false information to Escalus. At the end, Pompey violates the quality maxim when he says an incorrect thing to Escalus when the latter asks him about his trade.

The different meanings caused by implicature in the selected extract

It seems that Froth is a respected character and Pompey appreciates him very much to the extent that he calls him “*Master Froth*”, in the first utterance. While in fact, Pompey, through his wit, says so as an attempt to make fun of Froth sarcastically though he is his friend. When Pompey asks Escalus, in the second utterance, to observe Froth’s face, Escalus thinks that Pompey is trying to give some help to solve the case and make everyone know the truth about what has done to Elbow’s wife. While in fact, Pompey says so as an attempt to distract Escalus, through his wit, saying a very sarcastic remark to describe Froth; when he says that Froth has the ugliest face in the world how could do any harm to Elbow’s wife! Indeed, Pompey succeeds in distracting Escalus, through his violation, and no one ever knows what really happens.

Obviously, Elbow says something but defiantly he means something else, in the third utterance. He wants to convince Escalus that Pompey is a wicked and criminal fellow working for a wicked woman namely Mistress Overdone whose house, the brothel, is the source of the all bad things. Unfortunately, Elbow fails and instead, he says that Pompey is a respected man who works at a respected woman, Mistress Overdone, and the house they come from is a respected house.

Pompey, the witty clown, knows very well that Elbow hates him and he means to say, in the previous utterance, that Pompey is “*suspected*”, due to the pun he uses ironically, and he would never call Pompey “*a respected*” man. Thus, as a response to Elbow’s claim, he accuses Pompey of being irrespectful and by using the same technique ‘pun’, Pompey in a parodic way says, in the fourth utterance, that Elbow’s wife is “*a more respected*” woman than any one of us. Yet, what he actually means is that Elbow’s wife is the more suspected woman than any one of us all. Once again, Elbow, in the fifth utterance, instead of saying that his wife has never been “*suspected*” with any one, he says that his wife has never been “*respected*” with any one and this is also due to the pun technique used by Shakespeare in this play to show how a single word can turn the meaning upside down in which the “*respected*” person becomes “*suspected*”! Pompey, in the sixth utterance, uses Elbow’s mistake again in a parodic way and instead of saying that Elbow’s wife is “*a respected*” woman, he says that she is “*a suspected*” woman and there was an illegal relationship between them.

Elbow, in the seventh utterance, says his most interesting soliloquy in this play. First of all, he calls Pompey “*Hannibal*”, which means the great warrior, where he actually wants to say “*Cannibal*”, which refers to a flesh eater (Stevenson & Waite, 2011, p.205). Second, he also says “*respected*” instead of “*suspected*” when he mentions his wife. Third, here, Elbow, again repeats what he says in the fourth extract, he says “*the poor Duke’s officer*”. Elbow, ironically, uses the word ‘poor’ as an adjective to qualify the Duke not him unintentionally (Lall, 2010, p.171). Fourth, he also says “*Hannibal*”, instead of “*Cannibal*.” The last amusing thing that Elbow says in his soliloquy is that “*I’ll have mine action of batt’ry on thee*.” Here, Elbow says, through his ironic remark, that he would sue Pompey because the latter physically attacks him, due to the word he uses, ‘*batt’ry*’ which refers, according to Lall (2010), to a physical attack not to a calumny. But in fact, what Elbow wants to say is that he would sue Pompey for slandering him not for attacking him. All of these mistakes occur because Elbow is a mentally deficient in that he always misuses and misplaces the words through the pun he uses unconsciously.

Despite the fact that Froth answers Escalus for his question, in the eighth utterance, when he says “*are you of fourscore pounds a year?*”, but this ironic answer confuses Escalus. Although that Froth says “yes”, what he really means is that he earns eighty pounds a year only if that pleases Escalus! This answer shows how contradictory Froth is in which he would rather earn much more this amount of money to please Escalus not for himself.

Whereas in the last utterance, there is a shift from an ironic answer, said by a foolish and a contradictory character (Froth), to a sarcastic answer, which is said by a witty and clever character (Pompey). Pompey, sarcastically, says he works as a barman at a poor widow, when Escalus asks him about his trade. While in fact Pompey intends to say the word poor to show to Escalus that he is as ‘poor’ as his boss. At the same time, he says so just to make fun of his boss’s name because he is sure that Escalus will ask him about his boss’s real name; Mistress Overdone has had nine husbands and by the last one she is done! That’s why she is called so. Table (1.2) below shows humor types and the non-observance mechanisms:

Table (1.2): Humor types and the non-observance mechanisms in the selected extract

No.	producer	Non-observance mechanism	Non-observed maxim	Humor type
1.	Pompey	Violation	relation-quality	wit-sarcasm
2.	Pompey	Violation	quality	wit-sarcasm
3.	Elbow	infringing	quality	pun-irony
4.	Pompey	Violation	quality	pun-wit-parody
5.	Elbow	infringing	quality	pun-irony
6.	Pompey	Violation	quality	pun-wit-parody
7.	Elbow	infringing	quality	pun- irony
8.	Froth	Flouting	quantity-quality	irony
9.	Pompey	Violation	quality	irony-wit-sarcasm

Applying the incongruity theory of humor in the selected extract

Humor evokes, according to the incongruity theory of humor, when Escalus, in the first utterance, expects that Froth is a real gentleman when Pompey calls him “*Master Froth.*” While this expectation is actually vanished when readers realize that Pompey is making fun of his friend though the fact that he is trying to save him from prison! Humor provokes, in the second utterance, when Escalus expects Pompey to say a very important and valuable note when the latter asks him to look at Froth’s face. But in fact, this expectation is actually faded when Escalus realizes that Pompey tries to show him that Froth owns the ugliest face! Elbow tries his best, in the third utterance, to make Escalus believe that Pompey and Mistress Overdone are suspected people. Thus, humor arouses when Escalus realizes that Elbow says he brings the respected people, means Pompey and Mistress Overdone, from the respected house.

Humor arouses, in the fourth utterance, when Elbow expects that Pompey says that his wife is respected. While in fact, this expectation is vanished when Elbow realizes that Pompey actually means to say that his wife is a suspected woman not respected at all. Elbow becomes very angry when he realizes what Pompey says indirectly, thus humor provokes, in the fifth utterance, when Pompey expects Elbow to clear up everything concerning his wife. But unfortunately, Pompey realizes that

Elbow, accidentally, says that his wife has been suspected with everyone; man, woman and child! Pompey continues his witty remarks. Therefore, humor evokes, in the sixth utterance, when Elbow expects that Pompey believes at the end that his wife is a good woman; not suspected as he thinks. He also realizes that Pompey says that his wife was suspected with him before marriage indirectly just to tease him.

Elbow, in the seventh utterance, switches the words unintentionally. Thus, humor evokes, when Pompey and Escalus expect Elbow to call Pompey the wicked flesh eater. While in fact they realize that Elbow calls him the great warrior. In the second time, humor provokes when Pompey and Escalus expect Elbow to say that he respects his wife and he can never suspect her. But what he actually says is that he suspects her and he never respects her. The third time, humor arouses when they expect Elbow to say that he is a poor officer who works in the stuff of the Duke. Besides, they realize that he calls the Duke poor! For the fourth time, humor evokes when Elbow calls Pompey the great warrior instead of the flesh eater. Finally, humor arouses when Pompey and Escalus expect Elbow to say that he would sue Pompey for slandering him. Yet, they realize that Elbow says that he would sue Pompey for attacking him. Froth, also makes a hilarious situation, in the eighth utterance. Here, Escalus expects Froth to say that he earns this amount of money to live and get a better life. But in fact, humor arouses when Escalus realizes that Froth says that he earns this money just to please him! Humor evokes at the end, in the last utterance, when Escalus expects that Pompey says the truth, when he says that the woman that he works at is poor. While in fact, Escalus realizes that this woman is actually is not poor at all, on the contrary, she is the worst. She is called Mistress Overdone because she has had nine husbands, and she is done of men by the last one!

Conclusion

The analysis, presented in this paper, has shown how the characters in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* fail to observe the Gricean maxims over and over through their ironic, parodic and sarcastic remarks with each other. Consequently, they consciously and unconsciously create hilarious situations in the chosen extract. The present analysis is based on Grice's conversational implicature theory, to be more specific, on the non-observance of the Gricean maxims, and on Kant's incongruity theory of humor. This analysis has shown the following results: first, the use of pun

has sometime a possibility to create intentional and unintentional humor even by using the same word by different characters in the same context.

Second, smart and witty characters, like Pompey, create intentional ludicrous instances purposefully, to mock and tease others, by violating Gricean maxims intentionally, expressed by the pun they use. While stupid or naïve characters, such as Elbow, tend to create unintentional humor instances either by infringing or flouting Gricean maxims, due to their imperfect command of the language, also expressed by the pun they use unconsciously by using the wrong word in the wrong place.

Acknowledgments: The researchers of the present paper are grateful to the College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad, Al-Jadiriyya, for conducting this research paper.

References

- Attardo, S. (2014). *Encyclopedia of Humor Studies*. 2nd Ed. Washington: Sage.
- Arbuckle, G. A. (2008). *Laughing With God: Humor, Culture and Transformation*. Minnesota: Liturgical.
- Brooks, R. J & Kemp, V. (2012). *Language Development*. London: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Brown, G & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin.
- Davis, W.A. (1998). *Implicature, Intention, Convention and Principles In the Failure of Gricean Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delabastita, D. (1993). *There's A Double Tongue*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Fitch, S. P & Manziuk, R. M. (1997). *Sojourner Truth As Orator*. London: Greenwood press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. London: Elsevier.
- Gordon, G. (1999). *Turning Toward philosophy: Literary Device And Dramatic Structure in Plato's Dialogues*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Huang, y. (2010). *The Oxford Dictionary of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford

University Press.

Herawan, T, Deriss, M. M., & Albawajy, J. (2013). *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Advanced Data and Information Engineering*. London: Springer.

Harvey, J. (1999). *Civilized Oppression*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield publishers.

Lall, R. (2010). *Measure for Measure*. 17th Ed. New Delhi: Rama Brothers.

Llnes, S. (2004). *Measure for Measure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Montgomery, B. (1997). *Core Curriculum for Holistic Nursing*. Maryland: Aspen publishers.

Morrison, M. k. (2012). *Using Humor to Maximize Living: Connecting With Humor*. 2nd Ed. Plymouth: R & L Education.

Martin, R. A. (2007). *The Psychology of Humor: An Integrative Approach*. California: Academic Press.

Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin.

Roeckelein, J, E. (2006). *Elsevier's Dictionary of Psychology Theories*. London: Elsevier.

Stevinson, A. & Waite, M. (2011). *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, J, A. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Routledge.

Walker, N. A. (1988). *A Very Serious Thing: Woman's Humor and American Culture*. Minnesota: Minnesota University Press.