

(M<sub>1</sub>). However it is surprised when their child said “Mum usually drinks a lot more than that” (M<sub>2</sub>).

Hence this humor manipulates **lexical ambiguity** especially **homonymy**. Homonymy is a case of pronouncing and spelling a word like another word but with a different meaning. Here, the word drinks can give two ambiguous meaning which are:

(M<sub>1</sub>): Drinks: to take liquid (water) in to the mouth.

(M<sub>2</sub>): Drinks: to drink alcohol such as wine, beer, etc.

Actually what the child meant by “Mum usually drinks a lot more than that” is that his mother never drink water at home in the small amount. But at the restaurant he saw his mother drinks in a small amount. He didn’t know the tradition of drinking wine; thus it creates funniness from the child’s misunderstanding of the word “drinks”.

2. Fillicia, my sleepy five-year-old niece, slipped into my bed just as my husband was heading downstairs to prepare breakfast.” Why do you hate eggs, untie?” she asked me. “Who said I hate eggs?” I replied. “But,” she said, “I just heard you ask Uncle Anthony to break a few eggs and beat them up for you!”

#### Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when Fillicia, five-year-old niece, slipped into her auntie bed and asked her auntie “Why do you hate eggs?” Then her auntie answers “Who said I hate eggs?” Hence, the funniness of this humor gained through her niece’s statement: “I just asked Uncle Anthony to break a few eggs and beat them up for you!”

That statement might create 2 ambiguous meanings of the word “eggs” which are:

(M<sub>1</sub>): An egg especially of a hen, used as food.

(M<sub>2</sub>): The cell from which a new young creature is formed; an ovum.

Therefore this humor manipulates **lexical ambiguity** especially **homonymy** and the punch line is gained through the girl’s wrong perception or interpretation of the word eggs.

3. I was visiting my daughter, Cheryl, a successful young professional when I noticed half a piece of French bread in its original wrapper in her recycling box. When I told her that she could not put bread in the recycling box she said, “Why not? It tastes like cardboard!”

Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when once her mother noticed that Cheryl, her daughter, put half a piece of French bread in its original wrapper in the recycling box. Then her mother told that she couldn’t put it in the recycling box (M<sub>1</sub>). Then it is funny since Cheryl suddenly replied “Why not?” “It tastes like cardboard!” (M<sub>2</sub>).

Therefore this humor manipulates **lexical ambiguity** especially **homonymy** of the word cardboard in Cheryl’s utterance: “It tastes like cardboard!” Actually what is meant by her statement is that the bread was tasteless just like cardboard so that she put it into recycling box instead of put it into the right place such like in the bread box.

(M<sub>1</sub>): A thick stiff paper used for making boxes, the cover of books, etc.

(M<sub>2</sub>): tasteless, no flavor.

The punch line of this humor is gained through Cheryl's utterance: "Why not?"

"It tastes like cardboard!"

4. When a distant relative of mine passed away recently, I thought it was time to introduce the concept of death to my five-year-old daughter, Amy. I reminded her of the time we spent at this farm and the loss we face now. "It's very sad, your uncle George is dead," I said. "Now when you go to the farm you won't be able getting any fresh milk." Amy, with a look of utter disbelief, replied, "Wow! You mean Uncle George made all that milk? I thought it was the cows"

#### Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when a mother tried to introduce the concept of death to her five-year-old daughter, Amy, after a distant relative of hers passed away. She tried to remind her daughter of the time they spent at her relative's farm and the loss they face now. "It's very sad; your Uncle George is dead". "Now when you go to the farm you won't be getting any fresh milk

(M<sub>1</sub>). However it is surprised that Amy with a look of utter disbelief replied "Wow! You mean Uncle George made all that milk? I thought it was the cows"

(M<sub>2</sub>).

Therefore this humor manipulates **lexical ambiguity** since it can create two interpretations about from whom she won't be getting any fresh milk. Actually her mother just try to remind Amy about her uncle who always give them fresh milk every time they go to uncle George's home (M<sub>1</sub>), but right after her mother said that we won't be getting any fresh milk, Amy spontaneously thought that perhaps uncle George made all of that milk (M<sub>2</sub>). The punch line is gained through Amy's utterance: "Wow! You mean Uncle George made all that milk? I thought it was the cows".

5. The first time my son was on a bike with training wheels, I shouted, “Step back on the bike will brake!” He nodded, but still rode straight into a bush. “Why didn’t you push back on the pedals?” I asked, helping him up. “You said if I did, the bike would break”.

Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when a mother shouted to her son who was on bike with training wheels at the first time, “Step back on the pedals and the bike will brake!” (M<sub>1</sub>). It was surprised because right after that, her son still rode the bike straight into a bush and his mother asked “Why didn’t you push back on pedals?” He replied “You said if I did, the bike would break” (M<sub>2</sub>).

Therefore this humor manipulates **lexical ambiguity** especially in the case of **Homophony**. Homophone is a word pronounced like another word but with a different meaning and spelling. Here, the word brake and break absolutely create different meanings that eventually build confusion and funniness.

(M<sub>1</sub>): Brake /Breik/ v/ to make something slow down or stop for a car, bicycle, train etc.

(M<sub>2</sub>): Break/ Breik/ v/ to cause a whole object to be damaged.

The punch line is gained through the statement: “You said if I did, the bike would break”.

6. When my daughter, Tiffany, was five years old, I gave her a scratch card. She started scratching the silver panel excitedly with a coin. When she was done, she stopped to look at the card. She sighed then she continued scratching. She looked at the card again. “Mum,” Tiffany said, “can you help me?” I looked at the card, “Sorry, dear,” I said, “You didn’t win.” “But Mum,” Tiffany said, “it says Try Again!”

Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when her daughter, Tiffany (five years old) gave me a scratch card. Then she started scratching the silver panel excitedly with a coin. When she was done, she stopped to look at the card. She sighed then she continued scratching. She looked at the card again. "Mum," Tiffany said, "can you help me?" I looked at the card, "Sorry, dear," I said, "You didn't win" (M<sub>1</sub>). It is funny when she said "But Mum," Tiffany said, "it says Try Again!" (M<sub>2</sub>). Here, the statement "Try Again!" creates two ambiguous meanings which can be interpreted:

(M<sub>1</sub>): We are not lucky to win the present from that's written in the card.

(M<sub>2</sub>): We must try to scratch the card once more time.

Actually "Try Again!" in the statement above means (M<sub>1</sub>) since we are not lucky enough to win the present that's written at the card. Besides that implicitly the card said to stop scratching, while Tiffany thought it was (M<sub>2</sub>). Therefore this humor manipulates **lexical ambiguity** especially **homonymy**, where the punch line is gained through the answer "But Mum," Tiffany said, "it says Try Again!"

7. For her 40<sup>th</sup> birthday, my wife said "I'd love to be ten again. "So that Saturday, we had a heaping stack of chocolate chip pancakes, her favorite childhood breakfast. Then we hit the playground and a merry-go-round. We finished the day with a banana split. "So, how did you enjoy being a kid for a day?" I asked. "Great," she said. "But when I said I wanted to be ten again, I meant my dress size."

#### Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies in his wife's utterance when she said that she'd love to be ten again. Hence the funniness of this humor is gained through the husband's misunderstanding toward his wife's statement when celebrating her

40<sup>th</sup> birthday. Here, the statement “I’d love to be ten again” created two ambiguous meanings which can be interpreted:

(M<sub>1</sub>): she wants ten for her dress size.

(M<sub>2</sub>): she wants to be treated like children of ten years old.

Actually what his wife meant with her utterance is whether or not she’ll get ten for her dress size (M<sub>1</sub>). However, her husband misinterpreted her utterance. Thus he took his wife at the playground, had had a heaping stack of chocolate chip pancakes, her favorite childhood breakfast, and finally finished the day with a banana split. He thought that his wife wants to be treated like children of ten years old (M<sub>2</sub>). Therefore this humor manipulates **lexical ambiguity**, specifically **homonymy**. The punch line is gained through the wife’s answer: “But when I said I wanted to be ten again, I meant my dress size.”

8. My four-year-old son, Jacob, could hardly wait for his first day of school. He waited anxiously with his mother, Katherine, for the bus to arrive. When the doors of the bus opened he ran from her and started climbing into the bus. With tears in her eyes, Katherine said, “What about a kiss?” Jacob stopped, retraced a few steps, and promptly kissed the bus driver before he sat down.

#### Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when Jacob wait for the bus that picked him up to his first day of school. Together with his mother, Katherine, he is patiently waiting for the bus to arrive. A few minutes later the bus came and he ran from her mother to get up into the bus. With tears in her eyes, his mother said “What about kiss?” (M<sub>1</sub>). It is funny when Jacob misunderstood his mother’s utterance by then kissed the bus driver before he sat down (M<sub>2</sub>).

Therefore this humor manipulates **lexical ambiguity** since it can create 2 interpretations in his mother utterance “What about kiss?” Actually what her mother wants is that Jacob could give her a kiss before he went to school instead of kissing the bus driver. The punch line of this humor is gained through Jacob’s action when he stopped, retraced a few steps, and promptly kissed the bus driver before he sat down.

9. On a nighttime visit to his brother’s base, my son Joe was impressed by the large airplane hangar in which Billy worked. But when Billy led him through another door, Joe was absolutely astounded by the massive, darkened room. “This is the largest building I’ve ever been in!” he said. “What do you call it?” His brother answered, “The outside.”

Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when n a nighttime visit to his brother’s base, my son Joe impressed by the large airplane hangar in which Billy worked. Then Billy led him through another door. Joe was absolutely astounded by the massive, darkened room. He said “This is the largest building I’ve been in! “What do you call it?” (M<sub>1</sub>). Then it is funny since Billy answered that it was “the outside” (M<sub>2</sub>).

Therefore this humor manipulates **lexical ambiguity** of the word “the outside”. Actually what Billy’s meant by “the outside” is that something outside his base. But Joe thought it was such a big and very huge room that he has ever been in before.

(M<sub>1</sub>): The outer area of something

(M<sub>2</sub>): The widely room.

The punch line of this humor is gained through Billy’s answer, “The outside.”

#### 4.1.2. The Manipulation of Grammatical Ambiguity

1. A little boy went to the library to check out a book titled Comprehensive Guide for Mothers. Is this for your mother?" the librarian asked. No," said the boy. So why are you checking it out? "Because I started collecting moths last week"

##### Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when a little boy went to the library to check out a book titled Comprehensive Guide for Mothers. Hence, the funniness of this humor is gained through the librarian's misunderstanding toward the boy's statement. Here, the statement that he needs a book titled Comprehensive Guide for Mothers created two ambiguous meanings because of its affixation; the word Moth + suffix er becomes 'Mother' which can be interpreted:

(M<sub>1</sub>) = A female parent

(M<sub>2</sub>) = A person who collects moths (an insect like butterfly that mainly find at night and attracted to bright lights).

Actually the librarian interpretation in the above statement means (M<sub>1</sub>), while the boy said at the last "because I started collecting moths last week" (M<sub>2</sub>). Therefore, this humor manipulates **grammatical ambiguity** especially in the process of affixation of the root word "Moth" becomes "Mother". Grammatical ambiguity appears as a result of grammatical process like affixation, reduplication, etc. The punch line is gained through the boy's answer: "because I started collecting moths last week"

### 4.1.3. The Manipulation of Truth Conditional Semantics

1. “Hello, this is the base operator. How may I help you?” I said to the caller. “Can you connect me to Lieutenant Smith, please?” he asked. “There are a number of Smiths here,” sir. Would you his first name?” There was a pause. “Uh...lieutenant?”

#### Analysis:

The build up of this humor is lies in the operator when he/she take a telephone call for someone who wants to speak with Lieutenant Smith. Hence, the funniness of this humor is gained through the base operator when he/she said “There are a number of Smiths here,” sir. Would you his first name?” (M<sub>1</sub>). Then the caller answered that the first name is Lieutenant since the name was Lieutenant Smith (M<sub>2</sub>). Therefore this humor manipulated **truth conditional semantics** which states:

**The first name is Lieutenant Smith is true if and only if it is not such title in the police officer.**

2. A young couple were on their way to the church to get married. On the way there, they were killed in a car accident. The couple soon found themselves standing in front of St. Peter at the Pearly Gates. The young woman asks Peter if they could get married in Heaven. He replies that he'll get back to them on that.

A month later, St. Peter finds them and announces that they can get married in Heaven. To his surprise, the woman asks “Just wondering, if things don't work out will we able to get a divorce?” With a stern look in his eye, Peter says, “Look lady, it took me a month to find a preacher up here...you really think I'm gonna find a lawyer?”

#### Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies in the situation that a young couple were on their way to the church to get married. But on the way there, they were killed in the car accident. The couple found themselves standing in front of St. Peter at

the Pearly Gates. The young woman asks Peter if they could get married in Heaven ( $M_1$ ). A month later, St. Peter gets back to them and announces that they can get married in Heaven. However, this situation in reality and what happened next didn't support the truth, since the woman wondered "if things don't work out will we be able to get a divorce?" ( $M_2$ ). Therefore this humor manipulates truth conditional semantics, which states:

**The couple could either married or divorce is true if and only if they still alive.**

Here, the punch line is gained through the utterance: "Look lady, it took me a month to find a preacher up here...you really think I'm gonna find a lawyer?"

3. After giving birth, I couldn't lose the 40 pounds I'd gained. So I dragged my husband to the mall in search of more flattering clothes. We were encouraged by a sign over a rack of suits: "Instantly hides ten pounds!" "Look," he said. "You just need to buy four of these"

#### Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when a wife dragged his husband to the mall in search of more flattering clothes since she couldn't lose the 40 pounds weight after giving birth. They got a great interest by a sign over a rack of suits: "Instantly Hides 10 Pounds!" The expected idea that might come up after seeing that sign is that when somebody wears that suits, he/she can look slimmer since it is said "Instantly Hides 10 Pounds!". If she is 40 pounds, it means she would have only 30 pounds by wearing that suit ( $M_1$ ).

However, it is funny since his husband said that “You just need to buy four of these” (M<sub>2</sub>). It means that if his wife buy four suits, she will lose all of her weight. Actually, being slim is something expected for by every woman, but it cannot be gotten instantly, it needs a lot of exercise to keep healthy and slim in a good way. Therefore this humor manipulates **truth conditional semantics**, which states:

**The woman could instantly hides her weight is true if and only if she get enough exercise to keep healthy.**

The punch line of this humor is gained through the statement “Look. You just need to buy four of these”

4. In an effort to save water, my husband and I swapped our dish washer for a washing-up bowl. We then used the leftover water to clean our car, which often gets dirty because we live in a country area. This worked very well until my husband tossed one particular bowl of soapy water over the car – forgetting first to check whether there were still any dishes in it.

Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when a couple swapped their dish washer for a washing up bowl in an effort to save water. Then, they used the leftover water to clean up their car (M<sub>1</sub>). However, it is funny when someday her husband forgets tossed one particular bowl of soapy water over the car without checking first whether there were still have any dishes in it (M<sub>2</sub>). Therefore this humor manipulates **truth conditional semantics**, which states:

**The effort to save water is true if and only if he wasn't forget checking whether there're still have any dishes in it or not.**

The punch line of this humor is gained through until my husband tossed one particular bowl of soapy water over the car – forgetting first to check whether there were still any dishes in it.

5. My five-year-old son, Patrick, who's the oldest of four siblings, only visits the hospital when I have a baby. One day we were visiting my in-laws when he noticed that his cousin Troy was not there. "Mum, where's Troy?" Patrick said. "Troy's in the hospital," I replied. "Mum," he asked, "is Troy having a baby?"

Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when Patrick, five-year-old son, only visits the hospital when his mother has a baby. One day, they were visiting at their in-laws home and Patrick noticed that his cousin Troy wasn't there. "Mum, where's Troy?" Patrick asked to his mother. And his mother said that Troy is in the hospital (M<sub>1</sub>). However, it is funny when Patrick suddenly said to his mother: "Mum, is Troy having a baby?" (M<sub>2</sub>).

In this case, Patrick seems misunderstanding his prior knowledge of knowing hospital is a place for giving birth since he just once visiting hospital when his mother have a baby. Whereas in fact, hospital is a place to give medical treatment and care for ill and injured people and also for giving birth. Therefore this humor manipulates truth conditional semantics, which states:

**"Patrick thought of hospital is true if and only if Troy is a woman"**

Here, the punch line is gained through Patrick's utterance, "Mum, is Troy having a baby?"

6. After I applied for jobs at both a library and a shoe store, my husband said he hoped that I'd get the one at the store. "It would be nice to have employee discounts on shoes," he explained. Then, without thinking, he added, "Of course, if you get the job at the library, we'll get free books."

Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies after the wife applied for jobs at both a library and a shoe store. Right after that, her husband said he hoped that his wife would get one of those stores. “It would be nice to have employee discount on shoes” he explained ( $M_1$ ). It is surprised when suddenly her husband added his explanation before by saying “Of course, if you get the job at the library, we’ll get free books” ( $M_2$ ). Therefore this humor manipulates **truth conditional semantics**, which states:

**“His wife could get either free shoes or books is true if and only if his wife accepted there”**

In this case, her husband seemed expected too much from it. Whereas the reader of this humor might think that there are two possibilities whether or not she was accepted at both library and shoe store. Here, the punch line is gained through her husband’s utterance: “Of course, if you get the job at the library, we’ll get free books”

7. Despite his low opinion of lieutenants, the sergeant kept a respectful tone as he taught us how to bail out of a plane in an emergency. “Sirs, to open the hatch,” he began, “turn this lever to the right, then pull that handle.” “What if we don’t follow that sequence?” a second lieutenant asked. “Then, sir,” said the sergeant patiently, “you hit the hatch handle with a crash axe.” “That’ll open the hatch?” “No, sir,” he said. “But it will keep your mind occupied until you crash”

Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when the sergeant kept a respectful tone as he taught us how to bail out of a plane in an emergency. The sergeant gave a direct command to the Lieutenant “Sirs, to open the hatch,” he began, “turn this

lever to the right, then pull that handle.” A second lieutenant then asked to the sergeant “What if we don’t follow that sequence?” The sergeant patiently answered lieutenant’s question “you hit the hatch handle with a crash axe” (M<sub>1</sub>). It is funny when the sergeant’s answered “No, sir,” he said. “But it will keep your mind occupied until you crash” (M<sub>2</sub>). Therefore this humor manipulates **truth conditional semantics**, which states:

**The hatch will open is true if and only if the Lieutenant keep on trying to hit the hatch with a crash axe.**

Actually what the sergeant meant with his utterance “No, sir, but it will keep your mind occupied until you crash” is that if the lieutenant doesn’t follow the instruction to hit the hatch handle with a crash axe then you will get the airplane crash. Also, if the lieutenant want to get out from the emergency condition on the airplane, he must keep on trying to open the hatch by hit it up with a crash axe as well as he can.

#### **4.1.4. The Manipulation of Causal Fallacy**

1. A drunk walks into a drugstore and asks for a bottle of mouthwash. “I’m not selling you that,” says the pharmacist. “You’ll drink it for the alcohol and get sick outside my door!” “Not true!” insists the drunk. “I have my first date in over a year, and I want to make a good impression.” “Oh, I’m sorry. Here.” The pharmacist takes a bottle of mouthwash off the shelf and puts it on the counter. The drunk stares at it. “Got one that’s been refrigerated?”

##### Analysis:

The build up of this humor happened when a drunk walks into a drugstore and asks for a bottle of mouthwash to the pharmacist. The expected idea that may

come is whether or not a drunk really needs a bottle of mouthwash for refreshing his mouth ( $M_1$ ). Hence, the pharmacist ignores a drunk's request by saying that he/she is not selling a bottle of mouthwash since a drunk will drink it as an alcohol. Then a drunk said "Not true!" I have my first date in over a year, and I want to make a good impression." The pharmacist finally believes in a drunk's reason then takes a bottle of mouthwash off the shelf and puts it on the counter.

However, it is funny when the drunk stares at it and said "Got one that's been refrigerated" ( $M_2$ ). It means that the drunk really needs a bottle of mouthwash as an alcohol since he asks for the one which is in cool condition. Therefore, this humor manipulates **causal fallacy** since the reason for asking a bottle of mouthwash is wrong, not used for get good impression on his first date, but used as an alcohol. The punch line is gained through a drunk's statement: "Got one that's been refrigerated".

2. A friend's daughter worked part-time in his office while she attended graduate school. One morning, a call came in for her. "She's not in yet," my friend said. "Can I take a message?" "I'll call back later," the woman said. At 11 o'clock, she tried again, and he reported that his daughter had gone to lunch. The last call came at 3.30. "Sorry, she's left for the day. Anything I can help you with?" "Yes," the caller said. "How can I get a job with you?"

#### Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when there is a call came in for a girl who worked part time in the office. But she wasn't there since she attended graduate school. Her friend took the call and said "She is not in yet, Can I take a message?" Then the caller said "I'll call back later at 11 o'clock she tried to call back again, but unfortunately my friend had gone lunch ( $M_1$ ). However, it is surprised that she

has a great willingness to talk to my friend again at the last call came at 3.30 and I said “Sorry, she’s left for the day, anything I can help with you?” “Yes” the caller replied. “How can I get a job with you?” (M<sub>2</sub>).

Therefore this humor manipulates **causal fallacy**. The reader might think that the caller has an urgent or important thing to say with my friend since she call 3 times to the office and don’t want to leave any message for her. Then it becomes funny that the reason for not telling anything to anybody except my friend is just she want to look for a job in this office. The punch line is gained through this statement: “How can I get a job with you?”

3. A guy drives into a ditch, but luckily, a farmer’s there to help. He hitches his horse. Buddy, up to the car and yells, “Pull, Nellie, pull!” Buddy doesn’t move. “Pull, Buster, pull!” Buddy doesn’t budge. “Pull, Coco, pull!” Nothing. Then the farmer says “Pull, Buddy, pull!” And the horse drags the car out of ditch. Curious, the motorist asks the farmer why he kept calling his horse by the wrong name. “Buddy’s blind,” said the farmer. “And if he thought he was the only one pulling, he wouldn’t even try”

#### Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when a guy drives into a ditch. Luckily, a farmer helps him. The farmer hitches his horse, Buddy up to the car and yelled: “Pull, Nellie, Pull!” “Pull. Buster, Pull!” “Pull, Coco, Pull!” “Pull, Buddy, Pull!” After shouting with three different names, finally the horse drags the car out of ditch (M<sub>1</sub>). Hence, the motorist curious and asked the farmer why he kept calling his horse by the wrong name. It is funny when the farmer said “Buddy’s blind” “If he thought he was the only one pulling the car, he wouldn’t even try”.

Therefore this humor manipulates **causal fallacy** since the humor creates confusion by mistakes in reasoning why the farmer keep on yelling with the

wrong names. The readers might think that the farmer forget the names of his horse instead of thinking the horse is blind. The punch line is gained through the farmer's answered: "Buddy's blind" "If he thought he was the only one pulling the car, he wouldn't even try".

4. My cousin, Merle, is trained in Reiki, a form of healing touch, and she offered me a treatment in her specially prepared room. The candles were lit, and wonderful New Age music was playing on the stereo. At one point, the music swelled along with the sound of cascading water. "Your water music is beautiful!" I exclaimed. There was a pause, then Merle said, "I don't know if I should tell you this, but my husband just flushed the toilet".

Analysis:

In this humor the build up lies when my cousin, Merle was trained in Reiki, a place of healing touch service and she offered me a treatment in her specially prepared room. The candles were lit and wonderful music was playing on the stereo. The music is so beautiful swelled along with the sound of cascading water. "Your water music is beautiful!" I exclaimed (M<sub>1</sub>). However it is funny that my cousin Merle said, "I don't know if I should tell you this, my husband just flushed the toilet" (M<sub>2</sub>).

In this case, the humor manipulates **causal fallacy** since there was wrong cause and effect that eventually create funniness at the end of the humor. It is funny when Merle said that the beautiful music comes from the sound of flushing the toilet. Whereas the writer of this humor thought that it was the beautiful sound of cascading water or water music. The punch line of this humor is gained in Merle's statement: "I don't know if I should tell you this, my husband just flushed the toilet."

5. Twenty minutes into our two-hour journey to our friend Alison's party, my wife announced, "Stop. We've got to back." "Why?" I asked. "I've forgotten my phone." "Why do you need your phone?" "So that I can phone Allison and tell her we'll be late." "Why will we be late?" My wife gave me pitying look. "Because we've had to go back for my phone".

Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when our two-hour journey to Alison's party stopped when my wife announced that we must to go back home. "Why?" her husband asked. And my wife said that she's forgotten her mobile phone at home and she must take it. Then her husband asked the reason for taking that mobile phone and she answered "So that I can phone Alison and tell her we'll be late (M<sub>1</sub>). However it is surprised that the reason for calling Alison is just to inform her that we have had to go back for taking his wife's phone thus we will come late at the party (M<sub>2</sub>). It can be seen through her husband's question: "Why will we be late?" and she replied "Because we've had to go back for my phone".

Therefore this humor manipulates **causal fallacy** since the reason for coming back home is funny. The reader might think that it is such an urgent or important matter for taking her mobile phone at home. But in fact she just wants to tell her friend that they will come late. The easiest way to solve this problem is just borrow her husband or her friend's phone so that she doesn't need to waste time for taking it at home. The punch line of this humor is gained through the statement: "Because we've had to go back for my phone".

6. A man arrived at his workplace with both ears bandaged. "What happened?" asked the boss. "I was ironing my shirt when the telephone rang and I accidentally answered the iron," the man explained. "That accounts for one ear, but what about the other?" "Well, after the accident I had to phone the doctor."

### Analysis:

The build up of this humor lies when a man arrived at his workplace with both ears bandaged. Then his boss asked “What happened?” The man answered the reason why one of his ears bandaged since he accidentally answered the iron when the telephone rang ( $M_1$ ). It is funny when he did the foolish thing for twice. His boss asked “What about the other?” He replied “Well, after the accident I had to phone the doctor” ( $M_2$ ).

Therefore this humor manipulates **causal fallacy** since there is confusion between cause and effect. The punch line of this humor is gained through the statement: “Well, after the accident I had to phone the doctor.”

## **4.2. Findings**

After analyzing those 23 short text humors one by one, the writer eventually find both the linguistic component of the humor and the manipulation that mostly occurred in the humor text. The linguistic component of the humor described by breaking down each sentences in the humor text word by word based on its part of speech. The result is that from Reader’s Digest issued on October 2009, the Verb (v) becomes the most occurred part of speech of all. From 10 texts, it is found 7 verbs dominated, 3 nouns (n) in the second position, and followed with other part of speech like pronoun, adjective, adverb, conjunction, preposition and interjection. It shows that the humor text mostly insert process of doing to express the notion that some entity ‘does’ something. At last it can create funniness in the humor since the action of doing something gives the readers their

own interpretation of what the action probably is. This kind of situation almost the same with the result from the Reader's Digest issued on November 2009. From 7 texts it is found 4 verbs dominated, 3 nouns (n) in the second position, and followed with other part of speech like pronoun, adjective, adverb, conjunction, preposition and interjection. Whereas the result form Reader's Digest issued on December 2009 is a little bit different. From 6 texts it is found 4 nouns dominated, 2 verbs (v) in the second position, and followed with other part of speech like pronoun, adjective, adverb, conjunction, preposition and interjection. It indicates that the humor texts also insert nouns as a word used to name or identify any of a class of things, people, places, or ideas, etc.

The result of each manipulation will be classified and counted the frequency of each type by presenting table as follows:

| No. | Semantic Mechanisms            | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-----|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1.  | Semantic Ambiguity:            |           |                |
|     | a) Lexical Ambiguity           | 9         | 39%            |
|     | b) Grammatical Ambiguity       | 1         | 4%             |
| 2.  | Conditional Semantics:         |           |                |
|     | a) Truth-conditional Semantics | 7         | 30%            |
|     | b) Causal Fallacy              | 6         | 27%            |
|     |                                | 23        | 100            |

Table 4.1. Table of Frequency's Result of each Semantic Mechanism

The table above shows that the manipulation of lexical ambiguity has the highest number among the other semantic mechanisms. There are 9 short text humors that manipulate lexical ambiguity with 39%. It means that the manipulation of lexical ambiguity semantic happens most frequently in short text humor. It shows that short text humors often manipulate lexical ambiguity to sound funniness. Therefore readers should have enough vocabulary and knows its meaning more than that usually stated in the dictionary in order to understand humor texts better. If not they will be puzzled.

While, truth conditional semantics with 30% is in the second possibility after lexical ambiguity of semantic and followed by causal fallacy with 27%. It shows that the manipulation of truth-conditional semantics is also often creating the funniness of humor texts. Therefore readers should have logical thinking in order to well understand the humor. On the other hand, there is only one manipulation of grammatical ambiguity with 4 % in short text humors taken from Reader's Digest magazine of October, November and December 2009 editions.

From the analysis, the writer find out that the data are adequate enough to describe how the manipulation of semantic mechanisms work in creating the funniness in short text humors. Besides, the analysis also enables the writer to know what kind of semantic mechanisms manipulated in short text humors and which one of those semantic mechanisms occurs most in creating the wit of the short text humors.