

Semantic Ambiguity in Selected English Comic Videos on Social Media Platforms

Muhammad Shukir Shakir

English Department, College of Languages, Salahaddin University - Erbil,
Kurdistan Region, Iraq

Email: muhammadshukir3@gmail.com

Asst. Prof. Dr. Rashwan Ramadan Salih

English Department, College of Languages, Salahaddin University - Erbil,
Kurdistan Region, Iraq

Email: rashwan.salih@su.edu.krd

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 15/5/2025

Accepted: 6/8/2025

Published: Autumn2026

Keywords: *Semantic*

Ambiguity, Verbal

Humor, Lexical

Relations, Social

Media, Comic Videos

Doi:

10.25212/lfu.qzj.11.4.44

ABSTRACT

This study undertakes a linguistic analysis of how semantic ambiguity functions as a primary mechanism for generating humor in English-language comic vignettes on social media platforms such as YouTube, TikTok, and Instagram. The research is theoretically anchored Semantic Script Theory of Humor (SSTH), with a specific analytical focus on lexical relations including polysemy, homonymy, homophony, paronymy, and homography. Adopting a qualitative approach informed by influential works on semantic theory (Leech, 1974; Cruse, 1986; Kess, 1992), this paper examines a purposively sampled corpus of seven video extracts. Through a detailed interpretive analysis of these extracts, the study interprets the recurring strategies by which content creators leverage linguistic ambiguity to produce comedic outcomes. The findings contribute to the broader scholarly discourse on the mechanics of humor in digitally mediated communication and highlight the evolving nature of verbal comedy in online contexts.

1. Introduction

Puns and wordplay are central to humor, relying heavily on semantic ambiguity—where a word or phrase carries multiple interpretations. Humor is a universal feature of language, and one of its most common forms is the pun—a play on words that includes multiple meanings. Ambiguity is one of the techniques used to create humor. Löbner (2014) considers ambiguity as an expression or utterance which is interpreted in more than one way. Lexical relations such as polysemy, homonymy, homophony, and homograph, contribute to the occurrence of ambiguity (Yule, 2020; Christianito, 2018). There are other linguistic phenomena, apart from lexical relations, that can partake in creating language vagueness, including syntactic ambiguity, phonological ambiguity, punctuation-related ambiguity, etc. While paronyms are moderately similar to homophones and homographs, linguists generally do not classify them under the umbrella term of lexical relations.

With the rise of social media platforms like YouTube, TikTok, and Instagram, short-form comic videos have become a dominant medium for humor dissemination. This study examines how semantic ambiguities function in English-language comic videos on social media. By analyzing selected clips, the research identifies recurring patterns of lexical ambiguity (e.g., polysemy, homophony) and explores their role in generating humor. The study also discusses the implications of such humor for digital communication and linguistic creativity. This study identifies and categorizes types of semantic ambiguity in English comic videos to analyze how these ambiguities create humorous effects and to explore the role of social media in popularizing ambiguity-based humor. The main lexical ambiguities where profoundly discussed in this study include polysemy, homonymy, homophony, and paronymy. This study also focuses on the different contexts and types of humor, such as ‘dad jokes,’ where comic ambiguities arise in.

1.2 Literature Review

A common definition of ambiguity is the fact that the word carries several conflicting meanings; that is, each meaning is completely different from the other meaning which leads to difficulties in word comprehension. Chierchia & McConnell state that “sentences can be understood in multiple ways due to a single ambiguous word, different structural interpretations leading to structural ambiguity, a combination of both lexical and structural ambiguities” (1990: 32). Cruse (1986) categorizes ambiguity into four types: pure syntactic ambiguity, quasi-syntactic ambiguity, lexico-syntactic ambiguity, and pure lexical ambiguity. Kess (1992) groups ambiguity into three types: lexical ambiguity, surface structure ambiguity, and deep (underlying) structure ambiguity. Meanwhile, Fromkin et al. (2017) classify ambiguity into lexical and structural types, with structural ambiguity also referred to as grammatical ambiguity. In summary, ambiguity can generally be divided into two main types: lexical and structural ambiguity. As far as humor is concerned, ambiguity plays a vital role, especially in verbal situations. Attardo (1994) argues that humor often relies on incongruity—where an expectation is violated, leading to surprise and laughter. Puns exploit this by forcing a sudden shift in interpretation (Ritchie, 2004). Social media platforms amplify verbal humor through visual and auditory cues (Shifman, 2014). Short-form videos capitalize on quick, ambiguity-driven jokes, making them highly shareable.

Lexical relations, also known as semantic relations and sense relations, refer to the links and connections between particular words, including homonymy, polysemy, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy (Stringer, 2019). Aitchison (2004) delves into explaining some lexical items such as semantic fields, synonyms and opposites (antonyms). Yule (2020) elaborates on lexical relations and mentions that words can have relationships with one another; he also states that the meanings of words are obtained in terms of their relationships. The lexical semantics such as synonymy (*conceal/hide*), antonymy (*shallow/deep*), hyponymy (*pine/tree*), homophones (*right/write*),

homonyms (*race/race*), polysemy (*foot*), and metonymy (*house/roof*) have been explored and exemplified by him.

The theoretical framework for the current study focuses on the Semantic Script Theory of Humor (SSTH), proposed by Victor Raskin in his formative 1985 book, *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. The SSTH is built on the cognitive notion of a "script" (also known as a schema or frame). According to Rashkin, a script is "a structured chunk of semantic information in a person's mind about a particular concept. It includes routine activities, expectations, participants, and objects associated with that concept" (1985: 329). Rashkin's central hypothesis is that a text can be characterized as a single-joke-carrying text if two conditions are met: (1) The text is compatible, fully or in part, with two different semantic scripts. (2) The two scripts with which the text is compatible are "opposed" in a specific sense. Examples of opposition include real/unreal, good/bad, normal/abnormal, life/death, etc. Humor arises when the listener or reader, initially processing the text according to a more obvious, primary script, is suddenly forced by a "trigger" in the text to switch to the second, opposing script. This rapid cognitive shift from one script to its opposite is the source of the humorous effect.

1.2.1 Semantic Ambiguity Conceptualization

Ambiguity is the presence of more than one possible meaning in a single word, phrase, clause, or sentence (Jha, 2017). According to Ihsan and Kepirianto (2021), any sentence that cannot be understood meaningfully, or has more than one meaning is ambiguous, and this leads the hearer or listener to not comprehend accurately what is meant. It has been emphasised that in creating lexical ambiguity, homonymy and polysemy are utilized (Christianto, 2018). Seewoester (2009) suggests that the humorous power of language-based jokes would be found through ambiguities. Also, she emphasises that some of them rely on the sound sameness (homophones),

and some others on ambiguous word meanings (polysemy or/and homonyms).

As an example, in the nursery rhyme *Mary had a little lamb*, this directs readers to interpret the meaning of 'lamb' as a small animal. However, in the funny version *Mary had a little lamb, some rice and vegetables*, it lets readers experience the other meaning of it which is a small portion of meat. The word 'lamb' is polysemous that includes more than one closely related meanings. Lutfi (2016) provides an example of polysemy:

Diner: Do you serve crabs?

Waiter: We serve anyone, sir.

In this joke, the waiter manipulates the meaning of the verb 'serve'. Whereas the diner uses it in the sense of 'providing food or drinks', but the waiter intentionally uses the same verb in the sense of dealing with customers in hotels, shops, and etc.

Yule (2020) gives an example of homophones that is the riddle question which asks: *Why is six afraid of seven?* The answer is: *Because 789*. The punchline of the riddle works when the hearer comprehends that number eight is the homophone of the past form of the verb eat (ate); because 7 ate 9. Rodd (2017) writes a homophonous example of the joke '*What did the fish say when he swam into a wall? Dam.*' The humor arises from the identical pronunciation of 'dam' (a reservoir wall) and 'damn' (an exclamation of frustration), in spite of their different spellings. This dual meaning produces an amusing effect as the listener recognizes both senses. The use of humour is a complex and captivating element of individual behaviour (Lutfi, 2019). Vaid (2002) explores the term verbal humour as a specific form of the use of language tactfully, in which at least two dissimilar meanings are interwoven into an expression or utterance through making it ambiguous. It is carried out in such a way that the listener is directed to expect one meaning but experiences the other.

1.2.2 Lexical Relations

1.2.2.1 Polysemy

Polysemy 'is where a word has several very related senses' (Hurford, Heasley and Smith, 2007, p. 130). Lobner (2014, p. 44) defines polysemy as word that 'has two or more interrelated meanings.' The word 'mouth' is polysemous as it can refer to both a part of an animal's face and the place where a river meets the sea (Hurford, Heasley and Smith, 2007).

1.2.2.2 Homonymy

Homonymy is 'when one form (written or spoken) has two or more unrelated meanings' (Yule, 2020, p. 137; Palmer, 1977, p. 59) as in these examples:

bat (flying creature) – *bat* (used in sports)

mole (on skin) – *mole* (small animal)

pen (writing instrument) – *pen* (enclosed space)

pupil (student) – *pupil* (the black part of the eye)

1.2.2.3 Homophony

Homophony is when pairs, trios, and even foursomes of words sound alike but differ in meaning (Stageberg, 1981). Löbner (2014) states that where two lexemes with unrelated meanings have the same sound form, they are known as homophones, for example *tail/tale*, *story/storey*, *cue/queue*, *bear/bare*, *pair/pare*, *meet/meat*, *flour/flower*, *write/right*, *so/sew*, and etc. (Löbner, 2014, p. 43-44; Yule, 2020, p. 137).

1.2.2.4 Homographs

Homograph refers to words that have the same spelling but differ in pronunciation. The word 'bow' that can be rhymed with *go* is an instrument for shooting arrows, also rhyming with *cow* demonstrating a bending of the body as a form of respectful greeting. The lexeme 'lead' as it is pronounced as /li:d/ indicates the act of leading or directing; and as /led/ is a soft, heavy,

grey metal. Brewer (2023) provides several examples of homographs in English such as:

close (near - /kləʊs/) - *close* (to shut - /kləʊz/)

minute (small - /maɪˈnju:t/) - *minute* (measurement of time - /ˈmɪn.ɪt/)

tear (rip - /teəˈ/) - *tear* (crying - /tɪəˈ/)

1.2.2.5 Paronymy

A paronym refers to a common linguistic phenomenon where the pronunciation of two or more words is similar to one another; or words that are close to each other in terms of their external forms (Juraeva and Sabirova, 2023). Paronyms—also known as near-homophones—are viewed as lexically-related words that might create confusion easily. Examples of paronyms are: *accept/except, affect/effect, advice/advise, lose/loose, assure/insure/ensure, then/than, causal/casual, lair/liar, molar/moral, etc.*

2. Research Questions

In the current study, the researchers try to answer the following research questions.

1. What types of semantic ambiguity are prevalent in English comic videos?
2. How do English comic videos create humorous effects?

These questions encourage investigation into the types of ambiguity that create humor in verbal communication. Tackling these questions reveal common patterns in how semantic ambiguity is exploited for humor, contributing to a broader understanding of verbal comedy in digital media.

3. Methodology and Data

This study adopts a qualitative analytical approach to analyze numerous short comic videos produced in English language. For selecting the data, the researcher utilized the purposive sampling technique, also known as

judgmental or selective sampling, which is a technique used mainly in qualitative research to deliberately choose units or samples based on the objectives of the study. In addition, the selection criteria for the videos are based on the fact the clips have clear instances of semantic ambiguity for the purpose of humor. The videos reflect everyday situations and the content mirrors common experiences (work, relationships, social media trends). For the sampling purpose, the rule of thumb (rule of 30) is used and thus the researchers have selected 7 data sources from various social media platforms. The sources of the comic videos range from short videos on social media platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, to longer comic videos on YouTube. These data samples contain several examples of semantic ambiguity which serve as samples for analysis in the current study. The researchers manually selected videos that met the criteria in which each video was reviewed, filtered, and identified which type of ambiguity it includes, then selected as an extract. For the analytical framework, a qualitative content analysis was conducted, categorizing ambiguities based on types of lexical ambiguities (polysemy, homonymy, etc.).

4. Findings and Discussions

This section includes the extracts (data) and their descriptions and analyses where each one of them has a case of semantic ambiguity.

Extract 1

Character	Utterance	Time
Mr. Brown	What is the capital of England?	00:01
Ranjeet	'E'.	00:02
Mr. Brown	I will rephrase that. What is the capital city of England?	00:08-12
Ranjeet	London.	00:13

The dialogue above is one of the examples in which the teacher, Mr. Brown, asks one of the students, Ranjeet, to state what the capital of *England* is. Due to the multiple meanings of the word ‘capital’, the student provides an unexpected answer: letter ‘E’. Although his answer was somewhat correct, but it was not the one that was intended by the teacher which is ‘London.’ This prompts the teacher to add the phrase ‘city of’ to disambiguate his statement. Some of the meanings of the word ‘capital,’ in the Cambridge University Press (2025), are:

- a.** a city that is the centre of government of a country.
- b.** the most important place for a particular business or activity.
- c.** a form of a letter used to begin sentences and names of people, places, and organizations.

Mr. Brown was seeking meaning **a.** *a city that is the center of a country*; however, Ranjeet gave him an answer with the interpretation of **c.** *the capital letter of a word*. This can be considered as a case of *polysemy*, where the word ‘capital’ has several related meanings.

Extract 2

Character	Utterance	Time
The traffic warden	Ma’am why did you park here?	00:00-02
The driver	Because that sign says: ‘Fine for Parking’.	00:02-05

In this short video the traffic warden asks the driver why she has parked there, and the driver replies that it is written ‘Fine for Parking’ in the sign. The ambiguity can be found in the word *fine* as it includes two different, somehow opposite, meanings. The dissimilar meanings according to Cambridge University Press (2025) are:

- a.** As an adjective: good or good enough; healthy and well.

b. As a noun: an amount of money that has to be paid as a punishment for not obeying a rule or law.

The driver interprets the word ‘fine’ in the sign as something good and well, as it is conveyed in the first definition. However, the actual meaning is the latter one that people have to pay an amount of money if they park there.

‘Fine’ can also be used as other parts of speech (word classes). Namely, when it is used as an adverb, in the example ‘*It was working fine yesterday*’; it has some connections with the description of **a**. Additionally, when it plays the role of a verb, that is almost always used transitively, its meaning is associated with the definition of **b**. For instance, ‘*She was fined for parking illegally.*’ Due to the multiple unrelated meanings of the word *fine*, it can be verified that the above short video comprises an example of *homonymy*.

Extract 3

Character	Utterance	Time
Speaker 1	How’s my son?	00:00-01
The doctor	He’s going to be all right.	00:02
Speaker 3	Oh, thank God.	00:03
The doctor	That’s a great attitude. I gotta tell you, if I was getting this news, I don’t know that I’d take it this well!	00:05-10
Speaker 1	But you said he was alright!	00:11
The doctor	Yes, he’s lost his left hand, so he is going to be all right.	00:12-15

The setting of this short video is a hospital. A woman, the mother of a patient, asks a doctor to reassure her about the state of her son. The doctor gives her a vague answer that includes both positive and negative aspects. In other words, his answer does not precisely tell whether the son is in good or bad condition.

‘He’s going to be all right’ is the response of the doctor where the phrase ‘all right’ is homophonous with the lexeme ‘alright.’ The doctor’s intention is to convey that the patient has lost his left hand—that is bad news—and what he is going to do in the future will be only with his right hand. However, the mom takes it positively and interprets the news that his son is fine (alright). The homophony between ‘alright’ and ‘all right’ generated an amusing ambiguity in this scenario.

Extract 4

Character	Utterance	Time
The cook	What’s the problem?	00:00
The diner	I ordered this medium, and it is well-done!	00:01-03
The cook	Thank you.	00:04
The diner	No no no, it’s well-done!	00:05-06
The cook	I know it is; I made it.	00:07-08

In this short video, the setting is a restaurant where the diner, who is a woman, complains about her food that is not what she ordered. But the cook misapprehends and believes that she is praising him. In Data 5, the woman uses the phrase ‘well done’ referring to the meat that cooked all the way through while she asked to be medium. However, the cook is extremely proud of it as he thinks she gives him commitments and approves for what he has done.

The compound adjective ‘well done’ and the two-word phrase ‘well done’ are two different expressions that are utilized for distinct purposes. Here is their difference (Cambridge University Press, 2025):

- a. Well done: (of meat) cooked all the way through.

b. Well done: used as a way of praising someone and saying that approve of something they have done.

This can be determined as an instance of homonymy since both phrases have the same spelling and pronunciation. Also, sometimes the first phrase is hyphenated, becomes well-done, that will be easier to recognize. In that case, the cause of ambiguity would be homophony, as both phrases do not get the same form.

Extract 5

Character	Utterance	Time
The caller	We are sinking, we're sinking!	00:28-30
The call receiver	What are you <i>thinking</i> about?	00:31-33

A lexical ambiguity in the example above produces a humorous misunderstanding. Someone in danger calls a so-called lifeguard to carry out something to save them. In response, the receiver replies with a funny question. The caller anxiously tells the receiver that they are sinking, the receiver calmly questions what they are thinking about—perceives the /θ/ sound as /s/.

In phonology, this phenomenon is called phonemic or phonological substitution where one phoneme of a word is substituted by another. This has happened for different purposes, including phonological simplification, usually for babies, and phonological disorders, used by those speakers who cannot pronounce the exact sound. Instead, they try to find the closest sound to the actual one (Davenport and Hannahs, 2005). This is an example of *paronymy* where the two words are equivocal due to the difference between the phonemes.

Extract 6

Character	Utterance	Time
Speaker 1	I remember my friend's last words before he kicked the bucket.	00:00-07
Speaker 2	What were they?	00:07
Speaker 1	He said: 'How far do you think I can kick this bucket?'	00:09-14

Ambiguity in an idiomatic expression mostly occurs when the idiom has more than one interpretation, and most probably the listener comprehends the literal words of the speech. Sometimes, listeners might misunderstand because they interpret the exact lexemes of a sentence as idioms.

This video illustrates an example where the hearer gets the actual words as idiomatic. Speaker 1 articulates that he can remember the last words of his friend before he kicked a bucket. The phrase 'kicking the bucket' seems to be a simple sentence, while it can carry the meaning of the most decisive thing in life—death. The second speaker believes that the meaning of the expression would most probably be the latter one; therefore, he curiously requests to know what the words were. Consequently, the first speaker says that his quote was: 'How far do you think I can kick this bucket?', and it gives the listener a deep smile.

In this video, another example of polysemy has been shown and discussed in which the phrase 'someone kicked the bucket' can refer to the real act of kicking a bucket (a cylindrical or round container with an open top), or/and a person died.

Extract 7

Character	Utterance	Time
Speaker 1	Hey Siri, I failed my final exams; can you tell me a joke to cheer me up?	00:00-05
Siri	What's the difference between you and grandma?	00:06-07
Speaker 1	What?	00:08

Siri	Your grandma passed!	00:09-10
------	----------------------	----------

Dad jokes include a certain kind of comedy where almost all of them have pun—humorous linguistic ambiguity.

This example presents a comedic case of linguistic vagueness in which a guy asks Siri, a virtual assistant created by Apple Company, to put a smile on his face by telling a joke after he has failed the examination. The assistance system asks, ‘What’s the difference between you and grandma?’ The guy asks: ‘What?’ Siri then tells that his grandma passed, meaning that he did not.

The funny interpretation is that the word ‘passed’ comprises two distinct meanings: one of them is passing a test or exam (not failing), the other meaning refers to death. When it is thought firstly, it seems to be meaningless, since there is no funny situation in saying that your grandma died; however, when it is thought again, it gives you humor due to the other meaning of the word ‘passed.’ This case of ambiguity contains *homonymy*, as the lexeme ‘pass,’ here, has double interpretations. Even though, it possesses further denotations in other contexts.

5. Conclusion

This study has comprehensively demonstrated that semantic ambiguity is a fundamental and highly effective mechanism for generating humor in English-language comic videos across social media platforms. By analyzing a curated selection of seven video extracts through the theoretical lens of the Semantic Script Theory of Humor (SSTH), this research has addressed its core questions, revealing both the types of ambiguity used and the methods by which they create humorous effects.

The findings show that various forms of lexical relations are consistently exploited for comedic purposes. The analysis of the extracts identified clear instances of polysemy, homonymy, homophony, and paronymy. In each case, humor is generated by creating deliberate inappropriateness. The setup of the joke guides the audience toward a primary, expected semantic script, while the

punchline acts as a trigger, forcing a sudden cognitive shift to a second, opposing script. This rapid reinterpretation is the source of the comedic effect, a principle central to the SSTH. The study found these techniques applied across a range of familiar contexts, such as classroom and restaurant interactions, underscoring the versatility of ambiguity as a comedic tool.

The implications of this research extend to the broader discourse on digital communication and linguistic creativity. It highlights how timeless principles of verbal humor have been successfully adapted and amplified within the constraints and capabilities of short-form video content on platforms like YouTube, TikTok, and Instagram. The audiovisual nature of these platforms enhances the delivery of puns and wordplay, making ambiguity-driven humor highly shareable and culturally significant in the digital age.

In conclusion, this research confirms that semantic ambiguity is not merely a linguistic curiosity but a vital, dynamic element of modern comedy. While the platforms for entertainment continue to evolve, the clever manipulation of language remains a cornerstone of what makes us laugh, proving that a well-placed pun is as potent in a 15-second TikTok video as it has been in centuries of comedic tradition.

References:

- Aitchison, J. (2004) *Teach Yourself Linguistics*. United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Companies, Incorporated.
- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. De Gruyter.
- Cambridge University Press (2025). *Cambridge Dictionary*. [online] Cambridge Dictionary. Available at: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/> .
- Chierchia, G., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1990). *Meaning and grammar: An introduction to semantics*.
- Christianto, D., 2019. *Lexical and Syntactic Ambiguity in Humor*. Sanata Dharma University, pp.1-2.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2017). *An Introduction to Language*. 9th ed. Canada: Wadsworth Cengage Learning

- Hye-Knudsen, M. (2021). Dad Jokes and the Deep Roots of Fatherly Teasing. *Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture*, 5(2), pp.83–98.
- Jha, S.K. (2017). EXPLORING AMBIGUOUS STRUCTURES IN ENGLISH. *Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 6(3), pp.1–4.
- Juraeva, I. A. and Sabirova N. K. (2023). A Critical Review of Existing Views on the Problem of Paronymy and Related events, *Elementary Education Online*, 20(4), pp. 567–573.
- Löbner, S. (2014). *Understanding Semantics*. Routledge.
- Lutfi, A.F. (2019). A Semantic Pragmatic Study of English Jokes. *Al-Adab Journal*, (116), pp.1–16. doi: <https://doi.org/10.31973/aj.v1i116.472>.
- Kess, Joseph F. (1992). *Psycholinguistics: Psychology, Linguistics and the Study of Natural Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Press, P. (2017). *Dad Jokes: The Punniest Joke Book Ever*. Simon and Schuster.
- Ritchie, G. (2004). *The Linguistic Analysis of Jokes*. Routledge.
- Seewoester, S. (2009). Linguistic Ambiguity in Language-based Jokes. *College of Communication Master of Arts Theses*.
- Shifman, L. (2014). *Memes in Digital Culture*. MIT Press.
- Stageberg, N.C. (1981). *An Introductory English Grammar*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stringer, D. (2019). Lexical Semantics. *Advances in Linguistics and Communication Studies*, [online] pp.180–203.
- Vaid, J. (2002). Humor and Laughter. *Encyclopedia of the Human Brain*, pp.505–516. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/b0-12-227210-2/00377-0>.
- Yule, G. (2020). *The Study of Language*. 7th ed. New York, Ny: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIXES:

Extract 1

<https://www.tiktok.com/@jayjayb881/video/7374399304276135173?lang=en>
s

Extract 2

https://youtube.com/shorts/V7M1HlaARt8?si=B_U4dh5aloOeTQVP

Extract 3

https://www.tiktok.com/@funny_j_Official/video/7226914888654785794?lang=en
SSSSSS

Extract 4

https://www.tiktok.com/@funny_j_Official/video/7229519790660963585?r=1&t=ZS-8sBxYpWpTEe

Extract 5

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GT86iWiH2ml>

Extract 6

<https://www.instagram.com/reel/DG7rKQINxyt/?igsh=bW56N3ZoY2plNGx4>

Extract 7

<https://www.facebook.com/reel/573959671789337>

پوخته

ئەم توێژینە وە یە شیکارییەکی زمانەوانی ئەنجام دەدات دەربارەی ئەوەی کە چۆن ناپوونی مانا وەک میکانیزمیکی سەرەکی بۆ دروستکردنی نوکتە لە کورتە قیدیۆ کۆمیدیەکانی زمانی ئینگلیزیدا لە سەکۆکانی سۆشیال میدیای وەک یوتیوب، تیک تۆک و ئینستاگرام کار دەکات. توێژینە وە کە لە ڕووی تیۆرییە وە پشت دەبەستێت بە تیۆری واتاسازی تیکستی نوکتە (SSTH)، لە گەڵ گرنگیدانی شیکاری تایبەت لە سەر پەڕە نەدیە واتاسازییەکان لە وانه فرە واتا، هاویشیوویی، ھۆمۆفۆنی، پارۆنیمی و ھۆمۆگرافی. بە گرتنە بەری ڕیپازیکی چۆنایەتی کە لە لایەن کارە کاریگەرەکان لە سەر تیۆری مانای (Leech, 1974; Cruse, 1986; Kess, 1992)، ئەم توێژینە وە یە بە دوا داچوون بۆ داتایەکی نمونەیی ئامانجدار دەکات کە لە حەوت پارچە قیدیۆی کورت پیکھاتوو. لە ڕینگە شیکارییەکی وردی لیکدانە وە بۆ ئەم کلیپانە، توێژینە وە کە ئەو ستراتیژییە دووبارە بووانە لیکدەداتە وە کە بە ھۆیانە وە دروستکەرانی ناوەرۆک ناپوونی زمانەوانی بە کار دەھێنن بۆ بەرھەمھێنانی دەرئەنجامە کۆمیدیەکان. دۆزینە وە کان دووپاتی گوتاری زانستی فراوانتر لە سەر میکانیکی نوکتە لە پەڕە نەدیە دیجیتالییەکان دەکەنە وە و تیشک دەخەنە سەر سڕوشتی پەرەسەندنی کۆمیدیای زارەکی لە چوارچێوەی سەرچاوەکانی ئۆنلایندا.

وشه‌ی سه‌ره‌کی: ناروونی مانا، نوکته‌ی زاره‌کی، په‌یوه‌ندییه وشه‌بییه‌کان، سو‌شیال میدیا، فیدیوی کۆمیدی

ملخص

تُجرى هذه الدراسة تحليلاً لغوياً لكيفية عمل الغموض الدلالي كآلية رئيسية لتوليد الفكاهة في القصص المصورة القصيرة باللغة الإنجليزية على منصات التواصل الاجتماعي مثل يوتيوب وتيك توك وإنستغرام. ويرتكز البحث نظرياً على نظرية النص الدلالي للفكاهة (SSTH)، مع تركيز تحليلي محدد على العلاقات المعجمية، بما في ذلك تعدد المعاني، والتجانس اللفظي، والتجانس الصوتي، والمجاورة، والتماثل اللفظي. وتعتمد هذه الدراسة نهجاً نوعياً مستوحى من الأعمال المؤثرة في نظرية الدلالة (ليتش، 1974؛ كروز، 1986؛ كيس، 1992)، وتدرس عينة مختارة بعناية من سبعة مقاطع فيديو. ومن خلال تحليل تفسيري مفصل لهذه المقاطع، تُفسر الدراسة الاستراتيجيات المتكررة التي يستخدمها منشئو المحتوى لاستغلال الغموض اللغوي لإنتاج نتائج كوميدية. تُسهم هذه النتائج في توسيع نطاق النقاش العلمي حول آليات الفكاهة في التواصل الرقمي، وتسلط الضوء على الطبيعة المتطورة للكوميديا اللفظية في السياقات الإلكترونية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الغموض الدلالي، الفكاهة اللفظية، العلاقات المعجمية، وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي، مقاطع الفيديو الكوميدية