

# A Study on Verbal Humor in the Neighborhood from the Perspective of Violating Cooperative Principle

An Naer

Inner Mongolia Normal University, Hohhot, China  
anar-hangen@outlook.com

**Abstract:** With the development of pragmatics, there are more and more researches on humor from the perspective of cooperative principle. Many researchers have made extensive research on the verbal humor of various sitcoms from the perspective of violating the cooperative principle, but there is little research on the work *The Neighborhood*. Humorous language is the soul of sitcom. Therefore, it is valuable to study verbal humor in sitcoms from the perspective of violating cooperative principle. This study uses the qualitative method to analyze the verbal humor of the American sitcom *The Neighborhood*, and explores the process of the characters' violation of the cooperative principle to produce humor, as well as their understanding of the inherent laws of humor. It explains how the characters violate the four principles of cooperation in different ways to achieve verbal humor. The results show that the main reasons for violating the cooperative principle to achieve humorous effects are: covering up the facts, avoiding embarrassment, sarcasm, changing the topic and so on.

**Keywords:** Cooperative principle; *The Neighborhood*; Verbal humor

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background of the Research

According to Grice's principle of cooperation, we find that people communicate purposefully. The participants of the conversation will consciously or unconsciously abide by the principle of cooperation. In order to achieve the goal of communication. In order to explain the theory of cooperative principle, Grice put forward four guidelines. They are: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation and maxim of manner.[1] Following the principle of cooperation and the four principles can make the conversation go on smoothly and transfer information effectively. But in the actual conversation, the participants often deliberately violate the four principles of the cooperative principle. One of the purposes of the cooperative principle is to create humorous effects. Through this paper, we can better understand how the cooperative principle affects the sense of humor. Under special circumstances, people often violate these norms, resulting in violation of the principle of cooperation.[2] Grice's cooperative principle opened up a new area for the development of pragmatics. In China, the theory of cooperation principle was put forward by Hu Zhuanglin in the 1980 article "Pragmatics"[3]. Then, under the influence of scholars such as Cheng Yumin and Shen Jiaxuan, discussions on the principle of cooperation raise one after another, with many results. In addition to some articles, there were excellent works on pragmatics. Combined with the current research status at home and abroad, a brief review of the research status of cooperation principles is given.

### 1.2. Purpose and Significance of the Study

Research from the perspective of violation of cooperation, the purpose of the American sitcom is to allow the audience to better understand the humor in the TV series. Or providing people to provide appropriate communication methods, create a harmonious living environment. Therefore this article is based on pragmatics study the principles of cooperation, study the verbal humor in the American TV series *The Neighborhood*. According to Grice's cooperative principle theory, the reason why these principles can not be ignored is that they tell listeners and speakers that they need to improve together to maximize the use of information flow. This principle explains that effective dialogue is indispensable to language in human daily communication. It is very important in the analysis of textual implicature. Cooperative principle and the discourse principle provide us with a normative function, although we can express more meanings than literal meaning. It is usually the theory that the listener thinks the

speaker follows the cooperative principle.

The theoretical significance of violating the cooperative principle of humor: using the cooperative principle theory to provide concrete examples for the corpus analysis. The practical significance of violating the cooperative principle of humor in *The Neighborhood*: humor research dialogue can make the audience better understand the humorous phenomenon and life in the TV play, provide people with an appropriate way of communication, and create a harmonious living environment. Based on the cooperative principle of pragmatics, this paper studies the verbal humor in the American TV series *The Neighborhood*.

## 2. Literature Review

With the development of pragmatics, many scholars at home and abroad have studied verbal humor from the perspective of the cooperative principle.

Previous Studies on Verbal Humor from the Prospective of the CP Abroad: Grice's cooperative principle opens a new field for the development of pragmatics, which is an important part of linguistic research. This is mainly reflected in the long time, many achievements and wide scope of the research. With the development of pragmatics, the cooperative principle has aroused more and more research enthusiasm. Carrell put forward a new point of view. From the listener's point of view, he thinks that any speech is not humorous in itself. The effect of humor is produced by the listener's understanding. He believes that humor needs to have these four elements: humor maker, humorous speech, audience and specific situation.

Previous Studies on Verbal Humor from the Prospective of the CP at Home: In China, the theory of cooperative principle was first introduced by Hu Zhuanglin through pragmatics in 1980.[4] Later, under the introduction and influence of Cheng Yumin, Shen Jiakuan and other scholars, the discussion on cooperative principle has sprung up, and the results are quite fruitful. In addition to a single article, there are also some outstanding works in pragmatics. Lin Li Ting (2020) had conducted a research about the principle of speech and humor and cooperation.[5] In this paper, the author analyzes the relationship between the humor discourse and cooperation principles in Humor analysis of Informal Talks from the perspective of cooperative principles. The influence of contextual factors and language understandings and language significance is important to pragmatics. The basis of this article is the principle of cooperation, selecting the "Informal Talk" as an example, analyzing the humor phenomenon caused by the four guidelines for violation of the principles of cooperation. For make people better understand the internal laws of verbal communication and achieve the goal of verbal communication through dynamic and convincing explanation, improve the ability of verbal communication. Xu Hong Yu, Li Zong (2020) had made a research about "Verbal humor resulting from violation of cooperative principle: case study of Modern Family".[6] This paper studies the feasibility of the study of pragmatics in sitcoms and the understanding and application of pragmatics. Sitcoms can fully show the scene of the speaker, it provides a context for the relationship between the dialogue and the interlocutor. This context is complete. From the perspective of pragmatics, this paper will study how sitcoms violate the four maxims of cooperative principle and produce humorous effects. This paper studies verbal humor from two aspects: quantitative statistics of role dialogues and qualitative analysis of typical cases.

### 2.1. Theoretical Foundation

In this part, two aspects would be given. Firstly, it comes to general review of CP. Secondly, four maxims of cooperative principle are presented in detail.

#### 2.1.1. General Introduction to the Cooperative Principle

In a speech at Harvard University in 1967, Grice, a famous American language philosopher, put forward the theory of cooperative principle. Grice believed that in the process of human conversation, both sides of the conversation seem to consciously or unconsciously follow certain rules in order to effectively complete the task of communication. Therefore, H.P. Grice put forward the theory of cooperative principle for the first time,

First of all, the understanding of "cooperation" is an important issue in the research scope of cooperative principle. The principle of cooperation is one of the important topics in the study of pragmatics. Although pragmatics is an interdisciplinary subject, we generally regard it as a category of

linguistics. "Cooperation" should be distinguished from the "cooperation" behavior in social activities. It should refer to the process of mutual consultation of the communicative purpose and the implementation of specific speech behaviors by the verbal communicator in compliance with the community communication regulations, and this should not be seen as a social act of cooperation. It refers to the process in which communicators analyze the purpose of conversation and set specific speech acts on the premise of abiding by communication rules. They ignore the fact that pragmatics contains the theory of cooperative principle. Pragmatics mainly focuses on spoken language in daily conversation, because this part of language is easier to control and more stable.

There are three attitudes to the principle of cooperation—improvement, supplement and denial. [7]The first two are the modification and supplement of the cooperative principle, which is based on the recognition and acceptance of the cooperative principle. However, the latter is negate the principle of cooperation. We believe that there is no question of whether the above - mentioned principles are correct or not, but a question of whether they are appropriate. The purpose and foothold of their research are very important part. For example, there are differences in the definition of context, meaning, processing objects and methods, the cooperative principle and the relevance principle are still complementary in the study of conversational meaning. The principle of cooperation focuses on how the listener recognizes the implicit meaning of the speaker through the literal meaning. While the relevance theory mainly studies how the speaker can obtain the maximum relevance to the listener through explicit reasoning. [8]They are all for better communication between the two parties in the conversation. The cooperative principle is the basis of the development of relevance theory, so it has a high starting point, it can only be complementary coexistence.

### **2.1.2. Four Maxims of the Cooperative Principle**

The principles of cooperation we follow in normal conversation include four maxims, each of which has some standards.

#### A). The maxim of quantity

a) What you say should meet the amount of information required for communication, including actual information, with exact time, address, quantity, degree, and other quantifiers or scope.

b) What you say should not exceed the amount of information required for communication, and you should not say more unrelated information after you have accurate information.

#### B). The maxim of quality

a) Don't say what you know is false, don't say what is obviously false and not convincing enough.

b) Don't say words that lack sufficient evidence. What you say without sufficient evidence is of no quality.

#### c). The maxim of relation

Speaking should be relevant. If it is relevant, it is a qualitative improvement. If it is not relevant, it is not enough for people to understand.

#### D). The maxim of manner

Speak clearly and clearly. Clear requirements are the most concise way of speaking.

a) Avoid obscurity and tell others what you are saying.

b) Avoid ambiguity, no matter what the situation is.

c) Concise

d) Be organized

## **3. Research Methodology**

In this part, the research methods are discussed in detail. Firstly, four research problems are put forward and explained. This is the goal of this paper. Then, it explains that this study is based on the method of collecting corpus from neighbors. Finally, the steps of this study are explained.

### 3.1. Research Question

Humor is an indispensable way of conversation in our life, especially in today's sitcoms, humor is the main attractive way of communication, humor is the lubricant of conversation. Humor is divided into situational humor and verbal humor.[9] From the perspective of violating the cooperative principle, this paper makes a detailed analysis of the humorous utterances in *The Neighborhood*, and puts forward how the humorous utterances in sitcoms are reflected by violating the four principles of the cooperative principle.

- ①How does the humorous effect in movies violate the maxim of quantity in pragmatics?
- ②How does the humorous effect in movies violate the maxim of quality in pragmatics?
- ③How does the humorous effect in movies violate the maxim of relevance in pragmatics?
- ④How does the humorous effect in movies violate the maxim of manner in pragmatics?

### 3.2. Introduction to the Neighborhood

*The Neighborhood* is a sitcom written by Jim Reynolds and starred by Cedric Kells and Max Greenfield in 2018. It tells the story of Dave Johnson, a good guy who originally lived in the Midwest and his family moved to the black community in Los Angeles. Not all people here appreciate his style, including the protagonist's new neighbor, Calvin Butler. Dave has been optimistic from day one, and has great hopes that he can be good friends with his neighbors. The big reason they moved to Los Angeles was that Dave's wife had a new job in Los Angeles and became the principal. At the same time, they are also the only white family in this community. Their neighbors, the Butler family, invited them to a party on the first day Johnson family moved, because they didn't expect that they were white, and it was a prank by the Butler's son. But day after day, the optimistic Dave family and the direct Butler family have become an indispensable close relationship in each other's lives.

### 3.3. Research Procedures

This paper uses qualitative research methods to analyze the mechanism of verbal humor in sitcoms. Explains the relationship between violation of cooperative principle and humor according to the standard of cooperative principle.

Firstly, selects several episodes from the corpus and analyzes the discourses.

Secondly, the author analyzes the humorous discourses that violate the four principles of cooperative principle.

Finally, the author selects the lines of humorous discourses that violate the four maxims of cooperative principle.

## 4. Analysis on Verbal Humor in *The Neighborhood* From the Perspective of Violating Cooperative Principle

In this part, we will randomly select examples of humorous utterances that violate the four maxims of cooperative principle in sitcoms, and explain how humorous lines violate the four maxims.

### 4.1. The Violation of Quantity Maxim

Example 1

“Tina: Hi, sweetie.

Grover: I have been thinking about Mr. Benson. Where do people go when they die?

Tina: Well...That is a good question. And the answer is very complicated. You see existence is a complex thing.”

Episode 1, Season 1

After Benson's death in the series, Johnson and Butler's family are preparing for his memorial service. At this time Grover didn't understand the true meaning of death because of his young age. He

asked his aunt Tina “Where do people go when they die?” Grover asked Tina directly when his mother was preparing for the long-form education as usual, because Tina's answers are always relatively simple, and the answer is relatively short from a child's perspective. Here for Grover, Tina's answer satisfies the amount of information he needs, and does not exceed the expected effect. But his mother would tell him not only this, but would consider a lot while also saying a lot of everything related to it, which was obviously beyond the amount of information for Grover. Tina's answer is to cover up the truth and violates the maxim of quantity in the cooperative principle.

#### Example 2

“Dave: Well, they left behind potato family farmers. At first, I started playing it, ironically, and then I got cooked.

Grover: Daddy, my family is starving!”

#### Episode 5, Season 1

In the fifth episode of the first season, when Dave talked to Gemma about the game. Dave said: “Well, they left behind potato family farmers. At first, I started playing it, ironically, and then I got cooked.” Grover said: “Daddy, my family is starving!” What his son said is more than the information need to talk to, so it change the subject and violates the maxim of quantity in pragmatics.

#### Example 3

“Dave: I thought you and were going to the lobster factory.

Tina: Yes, we are, but the Johnsons are coming with us, and we are not going to the lobster factory. We are going to this hip new place called sprout and Jar. We have been dying to try it. Everything is served in mason jars. Except for the drinks, which come to the table in a communal trough.

Dave: Come on, Tina. Saturday is one of my cheat days. I just want to go to a classy place...”

#### Episode 5, Season 2

Dave asked Tina “I thought you and were going to the lobster factory.” Tina said “Yes, we are, but the Johnsons are coming with us, and we are not going to the lobster factory. We are going to this hip new place called sprout and Jar. We have been dying to try it. Everything is served in mason jars. Except for the drinks, which come to the table in a communal trough.” Because Dave didn't ask Tina who she was going to have dinner with, the sentences Tina answer is to avoid embarrassment and violates the maxim of quantity in pragmatics, so the sentences Tina said had a humorous effect.

#### Example 4

“Dave: Maybe we should go some place else. I did just read about a new soul food restaurant. Gemma, are you cool with that?

Gemma: I mean... sure, it just took me 6 weeks to get the reservation...

Dave: Calvin, what do you say?”

#### Episode 5, Season 2

Gemma says “Sure, it just took me 6 weeks to get the reservation.” Gemma actually means that she is a little concerned about changing restaurants, because it took her six weeks to book the restaurant, but she said it only took her six months, which violates the maxim of quantity of pragmatics to cover up the truth and it causes humorous effect.

When people talk, people need to make the contribution as informative as that is required for the current proposal of the exchange, shouldn't make the contribution more informative than is required. If people make that contribution more informative than is required, then people violate the maxim of quantity.

## 4.2. *The violation of Quality Maxim*

#### Example 1

“Young lady: Hey Malcolm, hey Marty. Looking good!

Malcolm: Yeah, thank you.

Marty: Oh, thank you.

Malcolm: Wait, why were you saying thank you?

Marty: She was talking to me.

Malcolm: No, she wasn't. She was clearly talking to me."

Episode 1, Season 2

At the beginning of the second season, the first anniversary of the Johnson family's move was also the barbecue day of the Butler family. At that time, the two sons of the Butler family were sitting on the money steps of the house, and suddenly a girl came over to greet them. Then both Marty and Malcolm felt that the girl greeted one of them. The two of them decided very confidently to say hello to themselves. Malcolm thought he was more handsome, so the girl greeted him, but Marty also felt that the girl greeted him. The two of them have been robbing. But no one knows who the girl greeted, no one can prove it, and there is no evidence that she greeted one of them. That is to cover up the truth. So here is a violation of the maxim of quality in the cooperative principle.

Example 2

"Marty: And, don't worry. You are gonna find somebody. The world is full of girls, man. One of them is got to like you.

Malcolm: You think she is cute?

Marty: Oh yeah, in a nerdy, comic book loving, headgear-wearing type of way.

Malcolm: Yeah, she sounds hot. You know what man we should go to that bar.

Marty: Actually, my gut's telling me she don't get out much."

Episode 4, Season 2

Marty tells Malcolm that Malcolm will find a girlfriend. Malcolm said it might be in that bar. But Marty said he guess the girl will be the kind who doesn't like to leave home. What Marty said in this conversation is his own conjecture rather than the fact. So it violates the maxim of quality in pragmatics for satire and it achieves a sense of humor.

Example 3

"Dave: How about we take a five-minute break. So Dad can rest his eyes?

Grover: How will you know when it's been five minutes?

Dave: I will tell you.

Grover: How will you know?

Dave: Buddy..."

Episode 10, Season 2

In the play, Grover asked his dad Dave "How do you know that five minutes have passed?" He answered "I will tell you." This answer is just to fool the children. There is no practical meaning or accurate answer.

Example 4

"Calvin: I guess we know who wears the antlers in your house.

Dave: What's that supposed to mean?

Calvin: You get run over worse than the moose did.

Dave: OK, come on, I did not get run over."

Episode 20, Season 2

Dave wanted to hang the deer's head at home, but he told Calvin that he decided to put it in the warehouse after discussing with Gemma. Calvin said "You get run over worse than the moose did." But Dave defends himself that Gemma and he are equal partners. Therefore, it violates the maxim of quality of pragmatics to cover up the truth and achieves a sense of humor.

When people talk, what they say is not true, they know it is false, or they lack enough evidence, which violates the maxim of quality. According to these standards, we can determine which one is violate the maxim of quality.

#### **4.3. The violation of Relation Maxim**

Example 1

“Grover: Hey, Kayla.

Kayla: Hey, Grover.

Grover: Do you like lizards

Kayla: No.

Grover: Me neither.

Grover: Are you excited about starting third grade?

Kayla: Totally.

Grover: I asked you about the lizards right?”

Episode 1, Season 2

Grover prepared for a few minutes to talk to the little girl. Grover asked a few words while talking to the little girl. The first sentence is “Do you like lizards?” The second sentence is “Are you excited about starting third grade?” These two sentences are actually not related at all. There are totally two different things. It may also because Grover is young and his speech does not form the principles of cooperation. It may also because he feels that the little girl likes him and causes tension and loses the ability to express himself. But whatever the reason, it violates the relation maxim in the cooperative principle.

Example 2

“Dave: Because the gift basket is refundable, too. Hey, sweetie, we're...

Gemma: Holy moly! That's the moose head.

Dave: Oh, hey, guys. What do you think? I think it's awesome.

Gemma: We have something dead on our wall.”

Episode 20, Season 2

Gemma saw the moose head hanging on the wall and said that they have something dead on our wall. This sentence has nothing to do with the previous part, so it violates the relation maxim in pragmatics to avoid embarrassment and achieves the effect of humor.

Example 3

Dave: What are you thank for baby?

Grover: Chicken fingers, can I have some?

Dave: Uh... Okay.

Episode 14, Season 2

Dave asked Grover: “What are you thank for baby?” Grover said: “Chicken fingers, can I have some?” The sentence he answered had nothing to do with the question Dave asked because Grover wanted to eat chicken fingers. He didn't mean to thank the chicken. Therefore it violates the relation maxim to change the subject.

Example 4

“Dave: We're having Italian for dinner.

Gemma: And you know what's the best part is? No matter where you are, it always feels like he's looking at you.

Gemma: Sweetie, could I talk to Dad for a minute?”

Episode 20, Season 2

What Gemma said has nothing to do with what Dave said, so it violates the relation maxim in pragmatics and achieves the humorous effect.

When people speak, the dialogue needs to be related to the above content. If there is no connection, it violates the relation maxim.

#### **4.4. The violation of Manner Maxim**

Example 1

Gemma: I got you a present. It's for our one-year anniversary as friends.

Tina: That's so sweet. I didn't get you anything. I feel bad.

Gemma: Oh, you don't have to feel bad.

Tina: I... Let me see what you got! It's a... It's a, uh... Peasant blouse!

Gemma: Exactly! It's just like the one I have that you complimented me on.

Tina: Oh, what a good memory you have.

Gemma: Do you love it?

Tina: Well, to be honest... not really. No, no, no, but listen. I really appreciate the thought, honestly.

Gemma: I'm sorry. I just... I figured you would like it. And maybe we'd be twins.

Tina: Gemma, you don't have to be sorry. I mean, we're not gonna always like the gifts that we give each other. Like those hoop earrings that I gave you that you hate.

Gemma: I don't hate those earrings. I love them.”

Episode 1, Season 2

On the first anniversary of Gemma and Tina's acquaintance, Gemma gave Tina a Peasant blouse. Tina directly said that she didn't like this gift, and said she also know that Gemma don't like the gift she gave, earrings. Gemma denied at the time and said that she liked the gift. But she never wore that earring. She also said that she wanted to wear those earrings for special singing, but Tina knew that she didn't like earrings. It's just that Gemma didn't want to admit it. Later Gemma put on earrings to show that she really liked the gift, but the earrings were not her style and made her uncomfortable. So here Gemma violates the maxim of manner.

Example 2

Mable: Calvin? What are you doing here?

Calvin: I'm letting these people know before they spend their black dollar that the chef's white.

Mable: Really? Sabotaging this restaurant? I can't believe you.

Calvin: I can't believe you either. Anyone who cared about me would not support this business or eat this food.”

Episode 5, Season 2

When Mable asked Calvin what he was doing. Calvin replied "I'm leaving this people know before they spend their black dollars that the chef's white." Black dollar in this sentence refers to black people's money instead of black money. White chef refers to white man instead of white colored chef, so it violates the maxim of manner and achieves humorous effect.

Example 3

Dave: Now, it's really past your bedtime. So we got to clean up.

Grover: Yes, actually, I'm pretty tired from slaying dragons.

Dave: Good night, so we got to clean this mess.”

Episode 10, Season 2



Grover and Dave was playing the game when about to finish. Dave said “Now, it's really past your bedtime. So we got to clean up.” and, Grover said “Yes, actually, I'm pretty tired from slaying dragons.” Because people can't really kill dragons in reality, which is ambiguous, so his answer is against the maxim of manner.

Example 4

“Tina: Well, if you hate it so much, then tell him to take it down.

Gemma: I did, and he accused me of being manipulative.

Tina: So he figured it out.

Gemma: Figured what out?

Tina: That you manipulate him sometimes.

Gemma: I do not.

Tina: It's okay, Gemma. All good wives do. It's how we let our husbands think they're in charge. You know what they say--sneaky wife, happy life.

Gemma: That's ridiculous.

Tina: No, it's not. In fact, I am manipulating Calvin right now.”

Episode 20, Season 2

Tina said to Gemma “It's how we that our husbands think they are in charge. You know what they say? Sneaky wife, happy life.” In fact, she said it to coax Gemma. There is a slight ambiguity. Because a happy wife makes a happy life. This violates the pragmatic maxim of manner and achieves the humorous effect.

Maxim of manner explains when people talk, they should be perspicuous, avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief, be orderly. So when people violate this principle, they violate maxim of manner.

## 5. Conclusions

In this paper, we explain how the humorous utterances in sitcoms violate the four principles of cooperation and draw a conclusion. In the major findings, expounds the reasons why humorous utterances violate the four principles and some findings. And then elaborate some implications about the study on verbal humor in sitcom from the perspective of violating cooperative principle. At last, elaborate some limitations and suggestions.

### 5.1. Major findings

From the study of the four principles of violation of cooperative principle and its influence, we can see how sitcoms violate the four principles of cooperative principle. Through the analysis of examples, we find that the humorous discourse in sitcoms intentionally or unintentionally violates the four principles of cooperative principle, so as to achieve the goal of conversational humor. It is found in the study that the humorous utterances violating the four maxims in sitcoms are usually used to cover up the truth, avoid embarrassment, satire, and change the subject. In daily life, the purpose of violating the principle of cooperation is to make communication better, avoid direct conflict, maintain dignity, or show politeness when talking with elders. Therefore, for communicators, knowing how to violate the four principles of cooperative principle will make communication achieve better results, that is, humor effect.

### 5.2. Implications of study on verbal humor in sitcom from the perspective of violating cooperative principle

Promote the combination of the cooperative principle and the sense of humor in sitcom, and enhance the explanatory power of the cooperative principle. I think the past research data fully express that the principle of cooperation has great vitality. Although there are still some deficiencies in the cooperative principle, it will be gradually improved in the future practice. The four principles of cooperative principle are an important part of pragmatics. With the development of pragmatics, the four

principles of cooperative principle will be more practical and explanatory. It can express the criterion of sense of humor more accurately. Generally speaking, the cooperative principle is an interdisciplinary theory subordinate to linguistics. At the same time, it is also the research direction of social psychology, logic and other disciplines. Therefore, any of the above disciplines is related to the principle of cooperation. Therefore, the sense of humor explained by the cooperative principle can be related to the logic of the sitcom, the psychological activities of the characters and so on.

### 5.3. Limitations of Current Study and Suggestions for Future Research

There is no perfect thing in the world, and Grice's cooperation principle has also been violently criticized by many parties. This shows that the cooperation principle also has its own limitations.

Firstly, the concept is very vague. Cooperative principle is defined as "to provide appropriate words according to the change of the purpose or direction of the conversation." But what is "cooperation" and what is "appropriate", these crucial words have no clear explanation, which is also an important reason for controversy. I think that if these crucial words are explained accurately, the theory of cooperative principle will become clearer.

Secondly, Lack of pragmatic poor explanatory power. The cooperative principle conveys conversational meaning through the speaker deliberately violating or using a certain criterion, and the listener knows that the speaker deliberately violated a certain rule, and then the speaker can know the meaning of the words conveyed by the other party. This regards the reasoning process as a deliberate or conscious thought process, and often ignores the natural and unconscious nature of understanding. Therefore, ambiguity, metaphor, irony and other linguistic phenomena cannot be scientifically and appropriately explained. I think it would be better to use the cooperative principle to explain all kinds of language phenomena.

Finally, the standard is too general, and it is easy to give consideration to one and lose the other when explaining. Xu Shenghuan believes that the various criteria of the cooperative principle are too general, so that anything can be deduced according to meaning on a certain occasion. In fact, the cooperative principle is only a necessary condition for meaning derivation, but not a sufficient condition. In addition, when deriving the meaning of conversation, it is often necessary to comply with the principle of cooperation in a way that violates the principle of cooperation, and ignore the other. This requires people to talk more effectively than ignore each other in order to comply with the principles of cooperation.

### References

- [1] Grice H. P. (1969). *Utterer's meaning and intention*. *The Philosophical Review* 78(2), 147-177.
- [2] Levinson S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. 102.
- [3] Dai Weidong, He Zhaoxiong (2010) *A new course in concise English linguistics Second edition* Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press. 98-100.
- [4] Qing Yang. (2011). *Analysis of Word Humor in the Movie "The King's Speech"*. *Film literature* 19, 147-148.
- [5] Fei Wang. (2017). *See the Humorous Words in Crosstalk "I Want to Attend the Spring Festival Gala" From the Perspective of Relevance Theory*. *Journal of Hubei Open Vocational College* 3, 151-153.
- [6] Wu Zhen; Rui Yanfang (2015) *Analysis of Verbal Humor in the American sitcom "The Big Bang of Life"*. *Overseas English* (16). 25-28
- [7] Wang Muqun; Liu Hongyu (2011) *The cognitive mechanism of conceptual metonymy in the generation of English humor* *Journal of Foreign Languages* (01). 12-18
- [8] Wang Yong (2001). *Looking at humorous language from the perspective of relevance theory* *Foreign Language Teaching* 22 (1), 23-27.
- [9] Luo Liang (2007) *The interpretive power of conceptual integration theory in understanding humorous language*, *Journal of Southwest University for Nationalities, Humanities and Social Sciences Edition* (S1), 140-143.