

Mersin University
Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of English Language and Literature

HUMOUR IN TURKISH: A STUDY ON THE BASIC LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF
HUMOUR LANGUAGE

Memet ÇOLAK

MA THESIS

Mersin
May, 2006

Mersin University
Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of English Language and Literature

HUMOUR IN TURKISH: A STUDY ON THE BASIC LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF
HUMOUR LANGUAGE

Memet ÇOLAK

Supervisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa AKSAN

MA THESIS

Mersin

May, 2006

Mersin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğüne,

Bu çalışma, jürimiz tarafından İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalında YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Başkan.....

Doç. Dr. Mustafa Aksan

(Danışman)

Üye.....

Doç. Dr. Yeşim Aksan

Üye.....

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özler Çakır

Onay

Yukarıdaki imzaların, adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduklarını onaylarım.

...../...../2006

Prof. Dr. Serra DURUGÖNÜL

Enstitü Müdürü

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
ÖZET.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER I: THEORIES OF HUMOUR.....	4
I.1. What is Humour?	4
I.2. Miscellaneous Theories of Humour.....	7
I.2.1. Superiority Theory.....	8
I.2.2. Biological Instinct and Evolution Theory.....	8
I.2.3. Incongruity Theory	9
I.2.4. Surprise Theory.....	9
I.2.5. Ambivalence Theory	10
I.2.6. Release and Relief Theory	10
I.2.7. Configurational Theory.....	11
I.2.8. Psycho-analytic Theory	11

CHAPTER II: AN ECLECTIC APPROACH TO HUMOUR.....	13
II.1. Humour from an Incongruity Theory Perspective.....	13
II.1.1. Structuralist Theory	13
II.1.2. Semiotic Theory.....	14
II.1.3. Sociolinguistic Theory.....	14
II.1.4. Script-Based Theory of Humour.....	15
II.2. Humour from a Relevance Theory Perspective.....	18
II.3. Advantages of an Eclectic Approach to Humour.....	22
 CHAPTER III: AN ANALYSIS OF SAMPLES OF TURKISH HUMOUR IN WRITTEN TEXTS.....	 24
III.1. The Importance of Context of Situation in Analysing Humour Texts.....	24
III.2. Data.....	27
III.3. Ways to Create Humour.....	27
III.3.1. Ambiguity and Puns.....	29
III.3.2. Circularity Humour	32
III.3.3. Connotation Humour.....	34
III.3.4. Contradiction Humour.....	35
III.3.5. Deviation Humour.....	38
III.3.6. Exaggeration Humour.....	46
III.3.7. Logical Fallacy and False Statement Humour.....	49
III.3.8. Impossible Humour.....	51
III.3.9. Juxtaposition Humour.....	52

III.3.10. Metaphor Humour.....	54
III.3.11. Misclassification Humour.....	57
III.3.12. Mistake Humour.....	58
III.3.13. Nonsense/Absurd Humour.....	60
III.3.14. Obviousness Humour.....	63
III.3.15. Personification Humour.....	66
III.3.16. Pretense Humour.....	70
III.3.17. Reversal or Inversion Humour.....	70
III.3.18. Satire.....	72
III.3.19. Self Deprecation Humour (Self-Attack Humour)	76
III.3.20. Simile and Analogy Humour.....	77
III.3.21. Substitution Humour.....	78
III.4. Concluding Remarks.....	83
CONCLUSION.....	85
BIBLIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE DATA.....	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	90

INTRODUCTION

Linguistics tries to identify the rule governed systems of languages by employing scientific methods. Generally speaking, most linguistic studies have been carried out in the fields of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics, which obviously do not go beyond the clause level. However, especially after 1960s, it can be seen that these studies began to concentrate on both written and spoken texts, and linguists have started to investigate the language of politics, the language of advertisement, the language of literature, etc. in their studies. In such studies, they began to take the context of situation into consideration.

It is known that in studies of discourse analysis both spoken and written language can be used as data. Having been increased the studies of discourse analysis, the studies have focused on the relationships between the structure and function of language and generally more detailed studies were performed on the function and usage of language without paying sufficient attention to structure.

The current study regards humour as one of the types mentioned above and aims to determine the main linguistics characteristics of the language of humour, studying in terms of linguistics of the selected humour texts in the boundaries of Relevance Theory and generally accepted theories of humour.

This study aims to determine the basic linguistic features of the language of humour by analysing texts in Turkish humour magazines. It is generally known that there

are different usages of language in different contexts of situations and these kinds of special usages have specific linguistics aspects. A great deal of studies have been done on this topic in the abroad and the linguistics aspects of different kinds of usages have been identified by studying on the texts, especially in English. On the other hand, studies on Turkish texts have mostly been focused on the aspects of literary language, and thus the studies on different kinds of texts including the language of humour are relatively limited. These studies commonly handle the humour texts in terms of literature and do not aim to reveal the linguistics aspects of the texts.

In its many forms, humour appears to be one of the most defining characteristics of humanity. Attempts have been made to define the essence of humour from sociological and psychological viewpoints. Furthermore, it is also approached from a linguistic perspective. Humour seems to be a universal human phenomenon, and its examples can always be seen around us. Raskin (1984) states that funny situations, funny stories, even funny thoughts may occur everyday to virtually everybody.

Humour is one of the most important and interesting phenomena in our lives. When we laugh, we look into a world where all kinds of unbelievable and unusual things happen. Historical surveys of the numerous theories of humour give the impression that there are as many descriptions and definitions as theorists of humour. The most popular and accepted definition of humour is ‘something that makes a person laugh or smile or more generally it is what we laugh at’.

Like all broad definitions, exceptions can be found. Surprisingly, it is even possible to claim that something is humorous, although no one laughed at the time, and it is a frequent case that people laugh, but someone may claim that it is not funny. Although humour should produce laughter, not all laughter is the fruit of humour. Smiling and/or laughter can also be a sign of fear or embarrassment. People may laugh when they ridicule somebody, when they take revenge, or when they watch similar cruel acts. Again, laughter is an insufficient criterion for humour. Despite these objections, this kind of response is an important factor in counting something as humour. Thus, it is more advisable to concentrate on the linguistic features of humour texts in some detail in order to get an adequate understanding of what humour is.

CHAPTER I: THEORIES OF HUMOUR

I.1. What is Humour?

Humour is often defined as what we find pleasurable and funny and therefore, in its broader sense, what we laugh at. Today, humour is a multi-disciplinary field of research. However commonplace it is in everyday life, humour seems to be rather elusive and indefinite as a theoretical concept. However, this has not prevented scholars of various disciplines, from studying humour, which has resulted in “epistemological hairsplitting” rather than clarifying the issue (Attardo 1994:1). Scholars have been studying on humour in many fields of research, such as psychology, philosophy, linguistics, sociology and literature. In fact, the major problem involved in defining humour seems that a number of scholars doubt concerning the possibility of an all-embracing definition of humour.

One of the difficulties in defining humour derives from the fact that the terminology used to describe it is not explicit. Goldstein and McGhee (1983) state that there is still no agreement on how humour should be defined. Nor is there an agreement on how appreciation or comprehension on the part of the listeners/readers should be

determined. Lafollette and Shanks (1993) point that humour is a pervasive feature of human life the nature of which is elusive, and add that it has generated little theoretical interest among the scholars. Similarly, Rucki (1993) states that philosophical literature on humour is both minimal and entrenched in a logical space and language which is inadequate to the scope and complexities of the subject. De Bono (in Andrews: 1993) states that humour is by far the most significant activity of the human brain. Monro (1963), on the other hand, says that laughter is one of the unsolved problems of philosophy. Bremmer and Roodenburg (1997), see humour as any message -transmitted in action, speech, writing, images or music- intended to produce a smile or a laugh. Some scholars, such as Schmidt-Hidding (1963, in Attardo 1994:6-7), have attempted to clarify the issue by proposing semantic maps of humour.

The answer to the question of what humour is ultimately depends on the purpose for which it is used. As Attardo (1994:4) points out, in the field of literary criticism, for example, there is a need for a fine-grained categorization, whereas linguists have often been happy with broader definitions, arguing that whatever evokes laughter or is felt to be funny is humour. It means that humour can be deduced from its effect. Many views of humour are based merely on circular statements. Examine the following statements:

Humour is based on the will to laugh.

Humour is based on what is funny.

We laugh at what is funny.

Humour is based on the ludicrous.

We laugh at the absurd.

Humour is amusement.

Humour is what we find pleasurable.

Humour is a state of happiness and “happiness” is a vague concept. A person may be happy, but not experience humour. Humour is a funny thing and it happens in strange places. When we laugh we are looking into a world of where all kinds of unbelievable and unusual things happen. In all the statements above a term is defined in terms of another less clear term.

As it is obviously seen above the most popular and accepted definition of humour is ‘something that makes a person laugh or smile or more generally it is what we laugh at’. Like all straightforward definitions, exceptions can be found. It is possible to claim that something is humorous, even though no one laughed at the time – and it can often happen that people laugh, but someone can claim, ‘That’s not funny’. Although humour should produce laughter, not all laughter is the fruit of humour. Smiling and/or laughter can also be a sign of fear or embarrassment. We may be ridiculed by someone, be in revenge for something, or laugh at cruelty. Again, laughter is an insufficient criterion of humour. Despite these objections, the response is an important factor in counting something as humour. Examining the linguistic features of languages can then help to explain why people laugh.

I.2. Miscellaneous Theories of Humour

Despite the difficulties discussed above, humour has been studied by many scholars and linguists. At this point it is useful to give an overview of the research done in the field to see if that would help us to understand the scope of the problematics of humour.

The list of philosophers and scholars who have discussed humour is long, including Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Hobbes, Kant, Schopenhauer, Hegel, Spencer, Darwin, Bergson, Freud, Sartre, Bateson, Koestler, and many others.

At the turn of the 20th century, Grieg (1923) was able to list a total of eighty-eight separate theories of humour. He admitted that many of these theories had borrowed heavily from one another, and they differ only in details.

In recent decades, a number of secondary discussions of these theories have appeared, offering overviews of what might be referred to as the field of humour and introducing various types of classification systems to cope with the variety of approaches. Keith-Spiegel (1972), for example, has produced one of the most detailed summaries of the different historical conceptions of humour. She classifies various humour theories into eight categories that can be summarized as in the following parts.

I.2.1. Superiority Theory

This theory stresses ridicule of other people, or laughing at others. Hobbes explains that humans are in a constant competition with each other, looking for the shortcomings of other people. It indicates that a person laughs at others' foolish actions/situations, since s/he thinks that s/he will never do the same foolishness. The assumption of the superiority theory is that we laugh about the misfortune of others that it reflects our own superiority. In a sense, it is a moral theory asserting, in effect, "I'm better than you are." The theory can be found in the work of Aristotle, Hobbes, and Bergson. (Barnes, 1992)

I.2.2. Biological Instinct and Evolution Theory

Some of those holding Biological Instinct and Evolution Theory are Spencer (1860), Darwin (1872), Eastman (1936), McDougall (1923), Rapp (1949), etc. According to this theory, laughter and human potentials are "built-in" to the neurological mechanism. They serve some adaptive function and they are vestiges of archaic adaptive behaviours. We laugh at a contradiction joke out of instinct. All this theory says is that we laugh because we were born that way.

I.2.3. Incongruity Theory

According to this theory, humour arises from disjointed, ill-suited pairings of ideas or situations – or the presentation of ideas and situations that are divergent from habitual customs. Koestler (1964) sees humour as combining things from two incompatible contexts. The incongruity theory focuses on the element of surprise. Kierkegaard (in Morreall 1987) states that wherever there is contradiction, humour occurs. Humour is created out of a conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs in the joke or humorous text.

I.2.4. Surprise Theory

In this theory, elements of “surprise”, “shock”, “suddenness” or “unexpectedness” are necessary conditions for the humour experience. Some writers who hold such theories are Descartes (1649), Hobbes (1651), Darwin (1872), and Stanley (1898).

We are surprised in an acceptable way. This is a factor in many types of humor. Suppose a face suddenly appears in the window. We may be surprised or even in temporary shock. It is a strange and threatening face half-seen through a dark window. But then we notice that it is a friend. The shock or fear turns into a laugh. Surprise humor, like other types of humor, must involve a situation assessed as being nonthreatening and harmless.

With defeated expectation the true becomes false, the false true, the wrong right, the right wrong. False appearance becomes reality, there is unexpected logic, and defeated intention, the pleasurable turns into pain and pain becomes pleasure. It may involve anticlimax humor such as the shaggy dog story. We may pretend to be on one topic, but actually be on another as it turns out. There is a sudden contrast.

I.2.5. Ambivalence Theory

According to this theory, laughter occurs/results when the individual simultaneously experiences incompatible emotions or feelings. Humor is said to be caused by a conflict of emotions. We may call it the "emotional absurdity theory." An emotion is supposedly confronted with a contradictory emotion thereby somehow resulting in humor. For example, joy plus hate leads to laughter. In the incongruity theory of humor, as it is explained above, we have two incompatible ideas. Here, we supposedly have two incompatible emotions at once. Some writers who hold such views are Menon (1931), Gregory (1924), Greig (1923), Freud (1960), and Koestler (1964).

I.2.6. Release and Relief Theory

Gregory (1924) holds that humor is a sudden and surprising interruption by the release of effort regarding a negative event. It is an incongruous relief. It turns the negative into the positive, and so, humanizes and develops sympathy.

Humour functions to relieve and lessen from strain or constraint. Humour releases excess of tension. It is believed that there is an instinctive mechanism which converts pain into pleasure. It is a kind of release. Laughter helps us avoid pain. This theory is popular among those who believe that laughter is salutary for one's health. This view is held by such writers as Spencer (1860), Kline (1907), and Gregory (1924).

I.2.7. Configurational Theory

This view is held by such psychologists as Maier (1932), Scheerer (1948), and Bateson (1953). According to this approach there is a sudden figure-ground shift, or a context deviation. The shift may be from embarrassment to a relieved understanding. Humour is experienced when elements which have originally been perceived as unrelated suddenly fall into place.

I.2.8. Psycho-analytic Theory

According to this theory, the ludicrous or ridiculous or humour represents a saving in the expenditure of psychic energy. For Freud, (1960) "Laughter arises when the sum total of psychic energy, formerly used for the occupation of certain psychic channels, has become unutilizable, so that it can experience absolute discharge." Distinctions are made between;

Wit: "Harmless" as in the enjoyment of nonsense or childishness or "tendentious"

Humour: Turns event which normally causes suffering into one less significant.

As seen above many theories can fall into more than one category. McGhee (1979:1) claims that all of these various theories overlap to a greater or lesser degree and they can all be reduced to two or three basic notions. Specifically, these theories are usually further reduced to the following three classes of general theories:

Incongruity (Surprise, Configurational) Theories

Superiority (Derision, Disparagement or Dispositional) Theories

Relief / Release Theories

Most of the recent authors on the subject agree with this classification of theory types. It can be assumed that each of these three types of humour theories addresses to a different aspect of humour, and it follows that it is possible to integrate all of these different theories into an overall model.

CHAPTER II: AN ECLECTIC APPROACH TO HUMOUR

II.1. Humour from an Incongruity Theory Perspective

Koestler (1964) sees humour as combining things from two incompatible contexts. The incongruity theory focuses on the element of surprise. Humour is created out of a conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs in the joke or humorous text. This accounts for the most obvious feature of much humour: an ambiguity, or double meaning, which deliberately misleads the reader, followed by a punch line. A good description of the incongruity theory is found in the following words uttered by Schopenhauer (1983:76):

“The cause of laughter in every case is simply the sudden perception of the incongruity between a concept and the real objects which have been thought through it in some relation, and the laugh itself is just an expression of this incongruity.”

II.1.1. Structuralist Theory

The most prominent structuralist theories of humour are based on Greimas's (1966, 1970, 1972) rather complex notion of isotopy. Isotopies, seen as the semantic components of a text, are basically polysemious and, therefore, ambiguous. To determine

the sense of a text, a process of disambiguation takes place (Attardo 1994:94). Puns, in particular, have been studied within the structuralist framework (Attardo 1994:108); Duchàcek (1970) presented a detailed taxonomy of puns (Attardo 1994:113-114).

II.1.2. Semiotic Theory

The inspiration for semiotic theories comes from Koestler's (1964) cognitive bisociation model. Bisociation is defined by Koestler as "the perceiving of a situation or idea [...] in two self-consistent but habitually incompatible frames of reference" (1964:35, as cited in Attardo 1994:175), and it has been quite influential in the field of literary criticism. One of the scholars with a semiotic approach to humour is Manetti (1976), whose notion of a "relational grid" (Attardo 1994:177) defines the kinds of contrast between isotopies that are regarded as humorous within a given culture; however, he does not provide any actual lists of such oppositions. Another scholar within the semiotic school is Eco (1986), who wants to include "pragmatic competence such as conversational implicatures and intertextuality" (Attardo 1994:180) into humour research. Both Manetti and Eco have applied Grice's Cooperative Principle to humour research (Attardo 1994:272).

II.1.3. Sociolinguistic Theory

Sociolinguistic theories of humour apply conversation analysis to humour research. Jokes are usually divided into canned laughter and conversational (or situational) jokes (Fry 1963), even if, as Attardo points out (1994:296), the boundary between them is

not a clear cut one. Sherzer (1978) and Sacks (1972) have studied conversational puns (Attardo 1994:312), and Tannen (1984) has probed into the study of conversational humour at length (Attardo 1994:316).

II.1.4. Script-Based Theory of Humour

The most prominent one among these theories is the Semantic Script Theory of Humour proposed by Raskin. Raskin (1984:1) claims that “no prior research is available on the linguistics of humour and no formal theory of humour has ever been proposed” and that his is the “first ever application of modern linguistic theory to the study of humour.” He describes the purpose and intent of his approach as follows: “this semantic theory of humour attempts to match a natural intuitive ability which the native speaker has, in this particular case, the ability to perceive a text as funny, i.e., to distinguish a joke from a non-joke.” Raskin (1984)

The theory assumes that a joke is always related with two different scripts that are opposed to each other in a special way. The theory explains that the text of a joke is unambiguous up to the point of the punchline. The punchline triggers a switch from one script to another and makes the hearer realize that more interpretations of the text are possible from the beginning.

The theory postulates three levels of abstraction of script opposition with at the highest level of abstraction the opposition between real and unreal. At a lower level of abstraction these oppositions can take three forms, namely actual vs. non-actual, normal vs.

abnormal and possible vs. impossible. At the lowest level these oppositions can be manifested as oppositions like good vs. bad, live vs. death, sex vs. non-sex, etc.

The main hypothesis of the Semantic Script Theory of Humour is that “a text can be characterized as a single-joke-carrying text if both of the (following) conditions [--] are satisfied:

- i) The text is compatible, fully or in part, with two different scripts
- ii) The two scripts with which the text is compatible are opposite” (Raskin 1984:99).

A script is defined as “a large chunk of semantic information surrounding the word or evoked by it” (Raskin 1984:81), i.e. all the information, both intralinguistic and extralinguistic, or encyclopedic, included in a lexical unit (Attardo 1994:201). Scripts are linked with other scripts, forming “semantic networks” (Attardo 1994:201). Raskin uses the following joke to illustrate his point (1984:100):

“Is the doctor at home?” the patient asked in his bronchial whisper.

“No,” the doctor’s young and pretty wife whispered in reply. “Come right in.”

According to Raskin, the joke above is (at least partly) compatible with the scripts DOCTOR and LOVER and the opposition between the two scripts could be verbalised in the following way: “The patient comes to the doctor’s house to see the doctor vs. the patient comes to the doctor’s house not to see the doctor” (1984:110). With an

interest in pragmatics, Raskin also discusses what he calls the non-bona-fide mode of communication. According to him, non-bona-fide (i.e. humorous) communication differs from bona-fide (i.e. “earnest, serious, and information-conveying”) communication in the way it violates one or more of the four conversational maxims of Grice’s (1975) Cooperative Principle. These maxims, which defining what bona-fide communication is based on, are those of quality, relation, manner, and quantity, relating to “the speaker’s commitment to truth, relevance, clarity, and to providing the right quantity of information at any given time” (Attardo 1994:274). Raskin points out that the violation of these maxims can be either intentional or unintentional on the part of the speaker; in the former case, (s)he is aware of, and in the latter case unaware of the semantic ambiguity (s)he has created (Raskin 1984:100). Therefore, even if in the latter case the speaker is, in fact, earnest and serious, the hearer will interpret the utterance as a non-bona-fide one (that is, if (s)he notices the ambiguity).

As Attardo points out, the Semantic Script Theory of Humour is basically a tool for analysing jokes. Attardo and Raskin (1991) have proposed a revised version called the General Theory of Verbal Humour that could, in principle at least, be applied in the analysis of other humorous genres as well. Although Attardo and Raskin’s General Theory of Verbal Humour is not fully developed, it appears to be an attempt to approach the topic of humour from a global perspective and to account for a wider range of humorous texts than mere jokes (Attardo 1994:229). With the exception of sociolinguistic theories that are more interested in studying humour in context than in defining what humour consists of, the theories presented above seem to coincide in arguing that all linguistic humour involves some sort of ambiguity or incongruity. However, it seems that, fundamentally,

humour is a social phenomenon. The application of Grice's Cooperative Principle to humour research and the idea of linguistic humour belonging to the non-bona-fide model of communication seem to be interesting approaches.

II.2. Humour from a Relevance Theory Perspective

Sperber and Wilson's (1986) Relevance Theory may be seen as an attempt to develop Grice's (1975) central claims that an essential feature of most human communication, both verbal and non-verbal, is the expression and recognition of intentions. In developing this claim, Grice laid the foundations for an inferential model of communication as an alternative to the classical code model. According to the code model, a communicator encodes his/her intended message into a signal, which is decoded by the audience using an identical copy of the code. According to the inferential model, a communicator provides evidence of her intention to convey a certain meaning, which is inferred by the audience on the basis of the evidence provided. An utterance is, of course, a linguistically coded piece of evidence, so that verbal comprehension involves an element of decoding. However, the linguistic meaning recovered by decoding is only one of the inputs to a non-demonstrative inference process which yields an interpretation of the speaker's meaning.

The goal of inferential pragmatics is to explain how the hearer infers the speaker's meaning on the basis of the evidence provided. The relevance-theoretic account is based on another of Grice's central claims that utterances automatically create expectations which guide the hearer towards the speaker's meaning. Grice describes these

expectations in terms his Co-operative Principle. He, then, develops his principle into nine maxims and classifies into four categories:

Maxims of quantity

Make your contribution as informative as is required.

Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Maxims of quality

Do not say what you believe to be false

Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of relation

Be relevant.

Maxims of manner

Avoid obscurity of expression.

Avoid ambiguity.

Be brief.

Be orderly.

Relevance theorists share Grice's intuition that utterances raise expectations of relevance, but question several other aspects of his account, including the need for a Co-operative Principle and maxims, the focus on pragmatic processes which contribute to implicatures rather than to explicit, truth-conditional content, the role of deliberate maxim

violation in utterance interpretation, and the treatment of figurative utterances as deviations from a maxim or convention of truthfulness. The central claim of relevance theory is that the expectations of relevance raised by an utterance are precise enough, and predictable enough, to guide the hearer towards the speaker's meaning. The aim is to explain in cognitively realistic terms what these expectations of relevance amount to, and how they might contribute to an empirically plausible account of comprehension.

In relevance-theoretic terms, any external stimulus or internal representation which provides an input to cognitive processes may be relevant to an individual at some time. According to relevance theory, utterances raise expectations of relevance not because speakers are expected to obey Co-operative Principle and its maxims or some other specifically communicative convention, but because the search for relevance is a basic feature of human cognition, which communicators may exploit.

Then the question to be asked is when an input is relevant? Intuitively, an input (a sight, a sound, an utterance, a memory) is relevant to an individual when it connects with background information he has available to yield conclusions that matter to him: say, by answering a question he had in mind, improving his knowledge on a certain topic, settling a doubt, confirming a suspicion, or correcting a mistaken impression. In relevance-theoretic terms, an input is relevant to an individual when its processing in a context of available assumptions yields a positive cognitive effect. A positive cognitive effect is a worthwhile difference to the individual's representation of the world – a true conclusion, for example. False conclusions are not worth having. They are cognitive effects, but not positive ones. The most important type of cognitive effect achieved by processing an input

in a context is a contextual implication, a conclusion deducible from the input and the context together, but from neither input nor context alone. (Sperber & Wilson 1995)

This relevance-theoretic account of cognition and communication has practical implications for pragmatics. Verbal comprehension starts with the recovery of a linguistically encoded sentence meaning, which must be contextually enriched in a variety of ways to yield a full-fledged speaker's meaning. There may be ambiguities and referential ambivalences to resolve, ellipses to interpret, and other underdeterminacies of explicit content to deal with.

The Communicative Principle of Relevance and the definition of optimal relevance suggest a practical procedure for performing these subtasks and constructing a hypothesis about the speaker's meaning. The hearer should take the linguistically encoded sentence meaning; following a path of least effort, he should enrich it at the explicit level and complement it at the implicit level until the resulting interpretation meets his expectation of relevance:

- a. Follow a path of least effort in computing cognitive effects: Test interpretive hypotheses (disambiguations, reference resolutions, implicatures, etc.) in order of accessibility.
- b. Stop when your expectations of relevance are satisfied.

Relevance theory claims that what makes an input worth picking out from the mass of competing stimuli is not just that it is relevant, but that it is more relevant than any

alternative input available to us at that time. Intuitively, other things being equal, the more worthwhile conclusions achieved by processing an input, the more relevant it will be. Similarly, in relevance-theoretic terms, other things being equal, the greater the positive cognitive effects achieved by processing an input, the greater its relevance will be.

Most of the scholars and linguists believe that the violation of one or more cooperative principles may result in humorous situations. Moreover, most humour writers purposely violate these maxims in order to create humorous texts. While reading a text most of the readers have an ability to understand the type of the texts and Relevance Theory tells us how the process of this interpretation occurs. In other words, we already have a set of frames or schemes which we can subsume under the general label of a humour script, which we use all the time to assess the nature, value, and intention of what we say and hear.

II.3. Advantages of an Eclectic Approach to Humour

Generally speaking, theories of humour are based on a writer's more comprehensive and general theories. A Freudian gives a Freudian view of humour, a Gestaltist gives a Gestalt theory; a linguist gives a discourse analysis, structuralist, speech act or script theory, and so on. Moreover many theories can fall into more than one category. We have our all-permeating metaphors with which we model "reality"-and which arise out of an attempt to understand "reality." Each theory and philosophy may be thought of as an expanded metaphor. The trick is not to become captivated by our metaphors and not to become caught in our own web.

McGhee (1979:1) points out that reading early philosophical writings on humour give us the impression that there are no completely new ideas when it comes to explaining humour. He compares this to the claim made by many comedians that there are no new jokes either; each is simply a take off of an old and familiar joke. The joke structure remains the same, he says, even though the specific content may change. Morreall (1987:128) and many other scholars and linguists state that we are still without an adequate general theory of humour.

Since many theories can fall into more than one category, a piece of humorous text can be analyzed by using the criteria of one or more theories at the same time. That is, we can use an eclectic way while analyzing texts.

CHAPTER III: AN ANALYSIS OF SAMPLES OF TURKISH HUMOUR IN WRITTEN TEXTS

III.1. The Importance of Context of Situation in Analysing Humour Texts

Since the beginning of the 1970s, linguists have become increasingly aware of the importance of context in the interpretation of sentences. Brown and Yule (1983) state that the discourse analyst has to take account of the context in which a piece of discourse occurs. Deictic forms such as '*here, now, I, you, this, that*' are the most obvious linguistic elements that require contextual information for their interpretation.

Firth (in Brown and Yule, 1983:35) states that a context of situation for linguistic work brings into relation the following categories:

The relevant features of participants: persons, personalities

- a) The verbal action of the participants
- b) The non-verbal action of the participants

The relevant objects

The effect of the verbal action

According to Hymes (in Brown and Yule, 1983:37-38), the use of a linguistic form identifies a range of meanings and also a context can support a range of meanings. When a form is used in a context, it eliminates the meanings possible to that context other than the form can signal. Similarly, Lewis has offered a list about the context of situation that coordination of time, place speaker, audience, indicated objects and previous discourse should be considered while interpreting utterances.

In Relevance Theory the deduction in non-demonstrative inference is a result of interaction between new and old information. Contextual implications are contextual effects that they result from a crucial interaction between new and old information as premises in a synthetic implication. (Sperber and Wilson: 1986)

In much of the literature, it is assumed that the context for the comprehension of a given utterance is not a matter of choice; at any given point in a verbal exchange, the context is seen as uniquely determined as given.

In Relevance Theory, it is assumed that the context is chosen as it is indicated by Sperber and Wilson (1986:132).

“The assumption explicitly expressed by an utterance is seen as combining with a context present in the hearer’s mind at the start of the act of the utterance. The simplest version of this view is the hypothesis that the context for the comprehension of a given utterance is the set of assumptions explicitly expressed by preceding utterances in the same dialogue or discourse.” (Sperber and Wilson: 1986:132)

Speech Act Theory and pragmatics both view context in terms of knowledge that what speakers and hearers can be assumed to know and how that language guides the use of language and the interpretation of utterances. For Speech Act theorists, the context is a specific kind of background knowledge called ‘constitutive rules’, (i.e. knowledge about what conditions need to hold if an utterance is to count as a particular speech act). Context is seen as a set of social circumstances in which utterances can be produced and interpreted as realizations of their underlying constitutive rules, (Schiffrin, 1994).

Gricean pragmatics views context as a cognitive contribution to utterance interpretation. The situation, in which the utterance is produced, the speaker’s and hearer’s background knowledge play important role in interpreting utterances.

Schiffrin (1994) states that the background knowledge might be analyzed as a schema that provides structured expectations about what kinds of people and things typically appear in a given setting and what kinds of actions typically occur there Blakemore (1992), similarly, states that communication can be successful only if the context that the hearer brings to bear is identical to the one envisaged by the speaker, and the contents of people’s memories are highly idiosyncratic..

The social context is important for the creation and reception of humour. It is hard for humour to cross boundaries of time and social groups – humour becomes outdated as quickly as fashion, and is often dependent on particular cultures and attitudes. There are other ways in which the context is important. The phrase ‘There’s time and place for

everything' is true for humour. It is not felt to be appropriate in certain situations, for example, if it seems trivial or is a distraction from serious matters.

Obviously, the members of the same society or cultural group share a common framework of beliefs and assumptions. These aspects of context are especially important in interpretations of humorous texts. When there is a gap between writers and readers or speakers and listeners in terms of context of situation mentioned above then communication may fail. However, there are always differences which lead not only to difference in the events memorized, but also to different interpretations of the same events.

III.2. Data

The texts that we are going to analyse in this study have been chosen from the Turkish humour magazines such as Leman, Penguen, Öküz, Küstah, etc. In humour magazines, both the textual elements and visual elements (caricatures, comic strips, pictures, etc.) are used to create humour. In this study, we will study on the texts, the visual elements of the humour magazines will not be taken into consideration. While choosing the texts, the variables such as the writer, the subject of the text, the period that the text is written will not be taken into consideration.

III.3. Ways to Create Humour

Humour can be analyzed through the meaning or paradigm of any term or concept. For example, humour has been analyzed in terms of the following terms:

ambiguity, an argument, aggression, creativity, the impossible, incongruity, nonsense, paradox, socialization, a strategy, surprise, superiority, etc.

Humour is largely based on things we cannot understand such as contradiction, nonsense, meaninglessness, and illusion, things being what they are not, and not being what they are. It is as if things which happen are so strange that we cannot even understand them, and so we react by laughing. We expect one thing to happen but the unexpected happens instead.

According to Eastman (1922, in Machovec, 1988), there are seven basic elements of effective humour. These elements can be summarized as below.

- 1- Playful mood: The listener/reader must be in a playful and therefore receptive mood
- 2- Experiencing pleasure: The process and its result must facilitate a feeling of pleasure.
- 3- Transformational: It changes, elevates the mood.
- 4- Short-lived: It has a brief, ephemeral fairy-shadow life.
- 5- Fragile: It has a delicate, gem-like fragility requiring significant skill to effectively deliver.
- 6- Universality: It is a common trait and therefore of potentially universal appeal or appeals to a broad cross-section of people, across languages and cultures.
- 7- Timeless: What's really funny is funny for all time.

As it is stated above, humour is created by deviating from believed, correct, desired, expected, familiar, honest, ideal, intelligible, known, possible, probable, proper, real, reasonable, rules, useful, usual, and so on. In the parts below, we will briefly explain some of the most used ways to create humour and analyse the samples of humour texts.

III.3.1. Ambiguity and Puns

Ambiguity humour is a mistake or clash of different meanings. It often involves double or multiple meanings, sounds, or gestures, which are taken in the wrong way, or specifically in incongruous ways.

The pun is a shift of context in a sense other than double meaning. With pun, there are two meanings for the same word. It shifts our attention from the meanings to the words and sounds themselves. Puns and ambiguity often involve surprise that the word is being used in the wrong way. Puns often have incongruous meanings of a single word to yield incongruity in congruity.

The ambiguity in (1a) lies in whether 'drunk' is perceived as the object or complement. It can be understood in two ways that in one police may be drunk which produces humour or police may find a drunk person in shop window. Again, in (1b), the sentence can be understood as the hunters may shoot or may be shot in which humour is produced. In (1c), a teacher is warning Joe to take the sweet out of his mouth and put his feet in –the desk-. The sentence that the teacher says may be understood as to put his feet into his mouth instead of the sweet and this ambiguity in meaning may produce humour. In

(1d), the word “seafood” is converted into two words as “see” and “food”. There is an incongruity between being on a diet and eating food whenever food is seen or found where humour is produced.

- (1) (a) Police found drunk in shop window.
 (b) The shooting of the hunters was finished quickly.
 (c) Sit up Joe, take that sweet out of your mouth and put your feet in.
 (d) I’m on a seafood diet. I see food and I eat it.

In the example below (2), Hacivat’s sentences are misunderstood by Karagöz because of the multiple meaning of the words written in boldface. These types of words are called homophones. They have same pronunciations but different meanings. In the example, the word “yüz vermek” (to indulge) in Hacivat’s sentence is misunderstood by Karagöz as the number, “yüz” (hundred). Again the word “alaya almak” (to make fun of) is misunderstood by Karagöz as a military term “alay” (regiment). This can, also, be considered as an example of mistake humour.

- (2) Hacivat: Canım efendim, sana **yüz** verdik diye işler böyle oldu.
 Karagöz: Birader, sen de elli verseydin.
 Hacivat: Ne söylersem **alaya** alıyorsun.
 Karagöz: Üzülme Hacıcavcav, gelecek sefere birinci bölüğe alınırısın.

(Özünlü: 1998)

The word written in boldface in the following example (3) may be seen as an example of a pun. It can be understood as “ciddi” (serious) or “ti” (not serious) which has incongruous meaning. The last syllable, “-di”, of the word “ciddi” has been substituted with another word “ti”. Besides being incongruous in meaning, the rhyme in pronunciation of the syllable “-di” and the word “ti” increases the effect of humour. Blending such kinds of words is one of the most used techniques in creating humour.

(3) Hayatı **cid'ti**'ye almak lazım. (Üstündağ: 1998)

In the example below (4), the poet states that he has opposed everything during his life and has been considered as “TİP” by the government. The phrase “menfi bir TİP” may be understood as “an odd, strange or negative person” or “a member of Turkish Labor Party”. This ironic description in the poem produces humour. The title of the poem “Özgeçmişim” (My Autobiography) and explaining the blood type as Rh Negative (Rh-) may increase the effect of humour when his being “TİP” has been taken into consideration.

(4) ÖZGEÇMİŞİM
Ben ömrümce muhalif
yaşadım
Devletçe de “menfi bir
TİP” sayıldım
Onun için Kan
Grubum
RH NEGATİF. (Yücel: 1998)

In the next example (5), Üstündağ is using a new word “trend”, which has been recently seen in Turkish, in a sentence. In the sentence “biz dün **trend’e** bindik!” (We got on a **trend** –here used for train- yesterday), the word “trend” has been substituted with the word “tren” (train).

- (5) “Hayatımıza giren yeni kelime ve deyimleri cümle içinde kullanalım
- biz dün **trend’e** bindik!” (Üstündağ: 2000b)

III.3.2. Circularity Humour

With circularity, there are two words or phrases with the same meaning. With pun, there are two meanings for the same word. Puns often have incongruous meanings of a single word to yield incongruity in congruity. Circularity yields congruity or identity in seeming incongruity. Circular statements repeat the same thing in synonymous words or phrases that can be seen in the questions and answers in (6a and 6b) below.

- (6) (a) Q. Which president wore the largest hat?
A. The one with the largest head.
(b) Q. Why is the train late?
A. Because of its speed.

In the next examples (7a and b), taken from Dabak, the writer presents us the news which is full of nonsense statements. Actually, when we see the word “muziplik”

(kidding) in title of the text, we may easily understand that the text will be about something funny. The sentences, written in boldface in both (7a and b), can be regarded as the examples of circularity humour in which the sentences has been written twice by using a conjunction “aynı zamanda” (at the same time). The nonsense statements of the texts, the meaningless noun phrase “psikoloji psikoloku”, and colloquial usages and misspelling of the words such as “fesleyen” instead of “fesleğen”, “mesleyini” instead of “mesleğini”, and “eylenmeye” instead of “eğlenmeye” are the other aspects that reinforce the effect of humour.

(7) Gökhan Dabak Muziplik Müessesesi Sunar

Haberler

(a) - Kafasına fesleyen saksısı düşen balerin mesleyini bırakıp kendini botanik bilimine verdi. Ve akabinde ıspanaktan bilgisayar sehпасı üretti. **Bilim adamlarını sevince boğan bu olay aynı zamanda bilim adamlarını sevince boğdu...**

(b) - Ünlü psikoloji psikoloku Gökhan Dabak yaptığı araştırmalar sonucu kulaklarını maviye boyayan insanların eylemeye daha meyilli olduğunu iddia etti. **Dünya çapında ilgiyle karşılanan bu iddia aynı zamanda dünya çapında büyük bir ilgiyle karşılandı.** (Dabak: 2000b)

III.3.3. Connotation Humour

We find that everything we see or think has many things which we associate with it. When we see an apple, we associate it with the things such as: red, green, cider, teacher, orchard, worm, crunch, and so on. Connotation humour works by deviating from usual associations such as “Cats are meow boxes”; by combining unlike things on the basis of one or more similar connotations such as “Your eyes are like jello”; or by showing that similar things are really unlike such as “Kimono language” (instead of the “Japanese language”) or “Q. What does cheese say when it has its picture taken? A. Camera (Also its reverse form)”.

In the examples below (8), (9), and (10), Ergen writes new meanings to the words or phrases. In all of the examples, the meanings of the words or phrases have been unusually associated with the items. The word “şeytan” (Satan) in (8) has been described by using the association of “an angel” who quit the high school in which we can relate with the event of Satan’s being expelled from the heaven.

(8) Şeytan: Lise terk melek... (Ergen: 2004b)

In (9), the word “papağan” (parrot) has been defined as “kuş rehberi” (the guide of the birds). Here, the knowledge, that parrots are the birds which have ability of talking, has been associated with the idea of parrots’ being the guide of the birds.

(9) Papağan: Kuş rehberi... (Ergen: 2005a)

In (10), the word “baro” (the bar) has been described as “avukat çetesi” (gang of lawyers) in which we see a humorous similarity of lawyers’ being gang.

(10) Baro: Avukat çetesi... (Ergen: 2005b)

III.3.4. Contradiction Humour

Words or sentences may contradict with other words or sentences. The sentences “It s a legal crime,” “He is a married bachelor” and “He was arrested for driving without a car.” are good examples of contradiction. The crime normally cannot be legal. If we know the meaning of "bachelor," we know that he cannot be married. Being arrested for driving without a driver’s license can be normal but driving without a car is impossible and thus it creates humour.

In the example (11a) below, there is a contradiction, a conflict from the point of view of distance. The text is announcing that there is a shop for sale at Taksim (a square in İstanbul). But there is a contradiction that the shop for sale is 350 kms. away from Taksim. In the second sentence of the text, there is another contradiction that on every hour there is a bus to the shop from Çanakkale (another province), but again the distance is about 350 kms. away from the location of the shop which is for sale.

In another sale advertisement text (11b), again, there is a contradiction between the first phrase, “İstanbul Maltepe’de deniz gören” (-a place- inMaltepe, İstanbul, that has

sea view), and the rest of the sentence. While reading the first phrase, we suppose that the thing for sale is probably a house, but the next phrase, “iki yaşında Alman kurt köpeği” (two years old German shepherd dog), does not respond to our expectations and this contradiction surprises us and thus creates humour.

(11) “Küçük ilanlar.

(a) Taksim’de AKM’ye 350 km. mesafede satılık dükkan... Otobüs her saat başı Çanakkale’den!

(b) İstanbul Maltepe’de deniz gören iki yaşında Alman Kurt köpeği...”

(Yılmaz: 2002)

In the sale advertisement texts below (12 and 13), humour has been created by using contradiction of the statements. Both in (12) and (13), the owners or the writers of the sale advertisements announce that they want to sell something, -in (12) a clock and in (13) a pullover-, but at the end they decide not to sell them for some reasons. Sale advertisements are placed in magazines or newspapers to sell something, but here in the examples we see that they have been written not to sell them.

(12) (İlan) Sahibinden Satılık Çok Hassas Guguklu Saat

Sahibinden Satılık Çok Hassas Guguklu Saat ama şimdi siz onu kurcalar bozarsınız. Yok satmıycam ben. Vazgeçtim. Bilsem ki kurcalamıycaksınız, gene satarım. Ama biliyorum ki kurcalarsınız. Nihayetinde bozarsınız.

(Yılmaz: 2005a)

(13) (İlan)

Satılık Moher Kazak

Balıkçı yaka, saf yün, kolları örgülü. Çok ucuza vericem. Ama önümüz yaz. Yazın nasıl giyiceksiniz şimdi bunu? Ama dersiniz ki şimdiden alayım kışa giyerim dersiniz, bu defa da benim için manası yok. Niye veriyim ki ben size kazağımı? Yok! Satmıycam... (Yılmaz:2005b)

In the example below (14), Solmaz's character, Şaduman Ağabey, is answering consumers' complaints and problems. The consumers' problem in this example is about an escalator that they have constructed in their store. They also complain about the reduction of the customers because of the escalator and they want Şaduman Ağabey to help them. The contradiction is that the escalator they constructed has only two steps and the height of each step is nine meters which does not respond to readers' background or world knowledge and thus surprises readers and makes them smile. Moreover, they insist on the idea that the reduction of the customers is not related to the escalator. As it is stated in chapter one, in Superiority Theory of humour, we laugh at other people's foolishness, and here besides contradiction of the statements we laugh at consumers' foolishness. Another feature, which reinforces the effect of humour in the example, is the irrelevance answer of Şaduman Ağabey. Here, Şaduman Ağabey is talking about the toll roads while answering or solving the problem of the consumers in which we can see another contradiction. The irrelevance answer, also, is a way to reinforce the effect of humour. In the answer of Şaduman Ağabey, we see nonsense and absurd expressions that surprise the readers.

(14) Şaduman Ağabey

Kısa tüketici sorunlarınızı yanıtlıyor

Sayın üstad; biz dükkan sahipleri olarak on gün önce alışveriş merkezimize yürüyen merdiven yaptırmak istedik... Fakat pahalı olduğu için gelmiyor hiç... Acaba bunda yürüyen merdivenlerimizin her bir basamağının 9 metre yükseklikte olması etken olmuş olabilir mi sizce?... Bizce değildir ama...

Şaduman Ağabey'in Yanıtı: Sevgili okurlarım, yıllar önceydi hiç unutmam... O zamanlar henüz 'Paralı yollar' yoktu... 'Paradan daha önemli şeyler vardır' yollar' vardı... O yollardan geçebilmek için 'Dürüst, namuslu, erdemli, saygılı, delikanlı, ahlaklı, merhametli, babayiğit' özelliklere sahip olmak gerekiyordu... O yüzden bomboştu yollar... Hey gidi günler hey...Yaaa... (Solmaz: 2004a)

III.3.5. Deviation Humour

Dziemidok (1993:61) argues that all theories of humour reduce to the acceptable deviation from the norm. We notice deviations from what is familiar to us. If someone considerably deviates, we even say they are mad or crazy. Similarly, Goldstein (1990:39) argues that the rules of language are often only realized or identified when they are deviated from by means of humour.

Some kinds of deviations which produce humour are: Deviation from: desires, the familiar, grammar, the ideal, the practical, pronunciation, purpose, rules or standards,

the usual including obvious lie, unexpected honesty, and even deviation from humour itself.

In the example (15), the deviation can be seen in the misspelling of the words. The misspelled words have been written purposely to make the abbreviation fit with the sentence. The words “Penerbahçe” instead of “Fenerbahçe”, “Kalatasaray” instead of “Galatasaray”, and “Dakım” for “Takım” may be seen as the deviation from the standard usage of the words. This misuse of language creates humour and this is one of the most used techniques in creating humour.

(15) P.T.K.D.Ç.L.D.

Penerbahçe Takımıyla Kalatasaray Dakımı Çekişmeli Lig Dakımlarıdır.

(Solmaz: 2004e)

In the next example (16), the deviation can be seen in the substitution of some of the words in the sentence. The sentence is used in necromancy (calling someone’s spirit) and its original form might be as “Ey **Ruh**, geldinse kapıyı iki kere **çal**!” (O spirit! Knock the door two times when / if you come!). Here, we see that the writer uses “Nuh” (Noah) instead of “ruh” (spirit) and “kır-mak” (to break) instead of “çal-mak” (to knock). Substitution of some of the words in idiomatic expressions, especially when it is rhymed, is a way to create humour.

(16) Ey **Nuh**, geldinse kapıyı iki kere **kır**! (Özdemiroğlu: 1999b)

In the example below (17), Pek writes fictitious great rhetoric in the names of historical persons such as kings, princes, and princesses in an ironic way. It can be seen in the text that the mispronunciation of a word “profiterole” is the key word that creates humour. In Turkish, there are some words, especially borrowed ones from other languages, that are difficult to pronounce for native speakers, and “profiterole” can be regarded as one of them. The usage of reduplication (colloquial and usually used by children) in the word “büsbüyük” (very great) reinforces the meaning of the word and creates the effect of humour. There is another humorous situation that Aranzabal spreads his spit everywhere while trying to pronounce the word.

(17) Büyük Ama Güzel Sözler (Büsbüyük Hem)

- Çeşnicibaşı! Lokomotif... Potrolok... Portof. Fortprolok.. Nasıl? Pofort..
Frop.. Yav ne haltsa işte. Üstü çukulatalı o tatlıdan bi tane daha getirin bana..
Protiforok.. Frilotofer.. Pardon tükürüğüm sıçradı.. (Kral Aranzabal)”

(Pek: 2006b)

In the next example (18), Pek’s character Prof. Yattara Valli (a cat) is answering the questions of the (cat) readers at its agony column in the magazine. When we look at the question part of the text, we see that almost all of vowels of the words are changed with wrong ones such as “hocom” instead of “hocam”, “iskelesönün” instead of “iskelesinin”, “bolokço” instead of “balıkçı”, “dodaklarom” instead of “dudaklarım”, etc. This type of vowel alteration in a word is called “antistechon”, (Corbett: 1971, in Özünlü: 1990) and it can be used in creating humour as in this example. There are some other features that reinforce the effect of humour in the text such as personification of the

cats, the usage of the suffix “-sel” in “kedisel”, and the cats being bitten by a scorpion fish which gave us the reason why it has difficulty in speaking.

(18) Kedinizin Köşesi

Siyamlı Profesör Yattara Valli Kedilerin Kedisel Sorunlarını Yanıtlıyor

Sayın hocom, bizim ordo, vopor iskelesönün yanında bolokço vor. Bolokçonun leğenlöründe çöşüt çöşüt bolok vor. Leğene pati sokop bolok totom. Ben ono ısironco dodaklarom ağuzlorum dovul gibö şiştö. Konoşomoyorum.

Rumuz: Leziz gibiydi oysa

Cevap: İskorpit balığı yavrum. Dikenleri var. Onları batırıyor, şişiyor orası zehirli gibi. Gel biz o balığı yemeyelim istersen. (Pek: 2006c)

The next example (19), taken from Barslan, is a label of advertisement that can be seen in markets. “Barul Market” is Barslan’s fictitious market. Here, humour has been got by the deviation or misuse of the last syllable “-rİm” of the word “kötü-rüm” (paralyzed). The root of the word “kötürüm” is “kötü” (bad), and its antonym is “iyi” (good), and the writer has created a new word “iyirim”, (which does not exist in Turkish and thus surprises the readers and may make them smile), by adding the last syllable “-rİm” to the word “iyi”. This type of word creation is called as “proparalepsis”, (Corbett: 1971, in Özünlü: 1990) and it can be regarded as the deviation from the usage of standard language which is an effective way of creating humour.

(19) Barul Market

Kötürüm kalmaktan korkmayın! İyirim geldi. Sabah akşam birer iyirim.

Unutulsun Kötürüm...(Barslan: 2001)

In the texts below (20a and b), it can be seen that the deviation from the standard language may create humour. When we look at the texts, we see the misuse of the tense suffixes, written in boldface, which cannot be accepted in Standard Turkish. The Turkish past tense suffix “-dİ”, in “vardı”, is repeated by adding “idi” which can be corrected as “vardı” or “var idi.” The phrase “başladılar idi” in Dabak’s text can be regarded as the misuse of tense suffixes for the same reasons. In the sentence “Cemal Bey gelir ve dedi ki...” (Cemal Bey comes and said...), the usage tense suffixes confuse the readers, since the expected usage could be as “Cemal Bey gelir ve der ki...” (Cemal Bey comes and says...) or “Cemal Bey geldi ve dedi ki...” (Cemal Bey came and said...). The phrase “*açmıştığım göre” (*as I did had opened it), which cannot be accepted in Standard Turkish, has been deliberately misused instead of “açtığım göre” or “açmış olduğuma göre” (as I opened it). The phrase “*bağışmaktaymışlardılar” in Dabak’s text contains mistakes in terms of the usages of tense suffixes and of the plural suffix “İEr”. Such kinds of deviations can be considered as a way in creating humour.

(20) (a) Kendimi Dergiden Olan Bir Arkadaşın Yerine Neler Yaptım Efendim

...Bizim mecmuada çalışan aslan gibi **gençler vardı idi**, Cemal var, Murat var ve tabii ki Yasin beyefendiye de unutmuyoruz pek de güzel demlediği çayların da adeta içme de yanında yatılabilir efendim. Neyse dağıtmayalım, **Cemal bey**

gelir ve dedi ki “Ercüment Bey mektup gelmiş buyrun, teşekkür ederim Cemal al şu bahşişi, sağol Ercüment Bey, bir şey değil” şeklinde bir mukabele geçmiş oldu. Neyse efendim ben aldım mektupları açıyorum bir de o anda şunu gördüm. Meğer bu mektuplardan birisi bana değilmiş ve o da bu mecmuada yazan bir genç kardeşim olan adı da Fatih Solmaz’dır ve ben de onu yanlışlıkla **açmıştığım**a göre neyse bari açmışken okuyayım da acaba ne demişti?... (Menemen: 1997)

(b) Burnumda palamut besliyorum dedi madam Rezistans. İyi halt ediyorsunuz Matmazel diye kikir dedi Kont Viyadük. Akabinde el ele tutuşup fır dönmeye **başladılar idi**. Bir taraftan da avaz avaz (Yaşasın şebekler uçuşuyor eşekler) diye **bağırışmaktaymışlardılar** ki tamamen simetrik... (Dabak: 2002)

In the next text (21), Pek uses the the aspects of spoken language to create humour. When we look at the text, we see that Şeysoy Başkan (Pek’s character) is addressing to people a speech about football. The features of addressing a speech such as prolonging the vowels of the words as “Beeen”, instead of (Ben), “ligindee” instead of (liginde), “neysee” instead of (neyse), “istemiyoruuuz” instead of (istemiyoruz), etc. can be seen in the text. Besides prolonging the vowels, the misuse of the vowels such as “Türkiyaaa” instead of “Türkiyeee”, and the misuse of the sentences such as “Katılmayacaz” instead of “Katılmayacağız”, “Noolduuu” instead of “Ne oldu” reflect the effect of daily spoken language in a humorous text. The onomatopoeic expression of the phrase when microphone is broken reinforces the effect of humorous situation.

(21) Şeysoy Başkan Kulüpler bazında konuşuyor

Been ... Baktım daaaa.. Türkiyaaa süper ligindeee köklü bir deęişime ihtiyaç vaaar. Kaçın! Fikstür geliyooo. ... neysee! Biiiz... Biiiz! UEFA istemiyoruuz. Katılmayacaz UEFA'ya. EFFEYOFERRO kuracaz biiz. İstermisiniz EFFEYOFERRO? Sayın vat.nd..şll..rr..dızıinnnnykkk.. çat çat çat! Se..se see.. Nooldu lan bu mikrofona? Nooolduuu? ... (Pek: 2002)

In the next example (22), Özdemiroęlu asks fictitious and absurd questions for the students who take the university entrance exam. In Turkey, the university entrance exams are carried out by ÖSYM, “Öęrenci Seçme ve Yerleřtirme Merkezi” (Student Selection and Placement Centre), but, as can be seen in the title of the text, the writer, Vedat Özdemiroęlu, uses “VÖSYM” (Vedat Özdemiroęlu Selection and Placement Centre) by using the first letters of his name and surname instead of “ÖSYM” which can be regarded as a way of creating humour. There are a lot of nonsense statements in the questions and in its answer choices which deviate and contradict from a question that can be seen in the exam. In the answer choice of “e”, we see that a word, “hepbiri” which is out of standard Turkish, has been created by blending the two words “hep” (all / always) and “biri” (each), and used instead of “hepsi” (all of them). Such kinds of deviations from the standard language may surprise and make the readers laugh.

(22) VÖSYM DENEME SINAVI

SAYISAL

1- Ahmet bir işi 9 günde bitiriyor. Mehmet ise aynı işi 43 günde bitiriyor, o da yarım yamalak, tam bitmiş de sayılamaz yani. Mehmet kadar sorumsuz, lakayt

adam olamaz. Haa, eğlence olsun, Mehmet hemen devreye girer. Ama iş deyince kaçır. Bu durumda Ahmet’le Mehmet beraber çalışırlarsa, o işin akıbeti ne olur?

- a) Ahmet, Mehmet’i üçüncü gün kalasla döver!
- b) Ahmet işi bırakır, yük gemisine kaçak olarak binip Nikaragua’ya gider!
- c) Mehmet hepimizi şaşırtıp işi 5 saatte bitirir! (Asla olmaz böyle bişey abi!)
- d) Mehmet, Ahmet’i de kendine benzetir, o iş yıllar yılı bitmez!
- e) Hepbiri. (Özdemiroğlu: 2002)

The next examples (23a and b), again taken from Özdemiroğlu, are fictitious English questions of the university entrance exam. When we look at the questions and their answers, we see that the usages of both Turkish and English words in the same sentences such as “Shut up Selami, you are an **ırz** enemy!” (ırz: chastity or honor in sexual matters), “My husband is very delifishek!” (delifişek: overimpulsive –here the spelling of the word as “delifishek” may also create humour), “Ayva flower açmış, summer mı gelecek?”, etc. can be regarded as a way of creating humour. Moreover, it can be seen that the sentences such as “Morning morning, where are you going?”, “See you later, alligator!”, and “Of course, my horse!” can be heard among the English learners who use them to create humour. This type of humorous texts makes the readers laugh especially the ones who speak English.

(23) İNGİLİZCE

- (a) 1. “Hello Mrs. Crazy! I love you! But I’m afraid of Mr. Crazy! Because he is a carpenter and he is very famous! Now, I’m going to Cüce

Kamil's Restaurant, I will drink dark beer!" sözlerine verilecek en iyi karşılık aşağıdakilerden hangisidir?

- a) Shut up Selami, you are an ırz enemy!
- b) My husband is very delifishek!
- c) Who is Cüce Kamil?
- d) Our surname is Crazy, understand? Ha gülüm?
- e) Debi diye bir şey vardır, isn't it?

(b) 2- Aşağıdakilerden hangisi İngilizce dil kalıplarını aşırı zorlar?

- a) Morning morning, where are you going?
- b) See you later, alligator!
- c) Ayva flower açmış, summer mı gelecek?
- d) Of course, my horse!
- e) Battı fishing, yan going! (Özdemiroğlu: 2002)

III.3.6. Exaggeration Humour

In exaggeration humour, there is a mistake of overestimation, a falsity presented as if it were true, resulting in an impasse or kind of contradiction. It is also the farfetched, or a conceit, according to which everything can be related to everything else. Anything can be exaggerated: size, desires, actions, goals, even smallness.

In the example (24a and b), Özdemiroğlu guesses the events that might occur in 1999. Guessing the events in an absurd and exaggerated way can be regarded a way of

creating humour. Here, he expresses that a third bridge would be built over the Bosphorus, which could be normal, but it is exaggerated that the new bridge would bind the old ones which is impossible. Moreover, shooting at the calves people who do not join the concert in the opening ceremony is another exaggeration that may create humour.

The sentence (24b) is about Bill Clinton (the ex-president of the USA) and Tony Blair (the prime minister of the UK). It is stated exaggeratedly and satirically that Clinton will divorce his wife and marry Blair. It can be seen that famous people are always the butt of humour writers. Another feature that creates humour in this sentence is the usage of the phrase of “papaz nikahı” (wedding performed by a priest) since its association to the phrase “imam nikahı” (wedding performed by an imam) which can generally be seen in Turkey.

(24) Bu yıl neler olacak?

(a) - İstanbul Boğazı'na 3. köprü yapılacak... 1.ve 2. köprüleri birbirine bağlayacak şekilde inşa edilecek yeni köprünün açılışında Selçuk Ural konser verecek. Konsere gitmeyen baldırından vurulacak.

(b) - Bill Clinton karısından ayrılacak ve Tony Blair'le papaz nikahı kıyacak... (Özdemiroğlu: 1999a)

The next example text (25), which has been written ironically, is about promises of the politicians before the elections. It is known that the politicians generally exaggerate their promises and sometimes they promise the voters impossible things or

events in order to affect them. Here, it has been promised that there would not occur earthquake when they get the power, since they promise that they would move the fault lines to abroad. The impossibility of this event may create humour.

(25) ...Oyunuzu bize vererseniz fay hatlarını yurt dışına çıkaracağız!

Fay hatlarını yurt dışına çıkaracağımız için bizim iktidarımızda deprem falan olmayacak! (Oflaz: 1999)

In the the next example of Solmaz's (26), while responding the consumer's absurd problem, Şaduman Ağabey, irrelevantly, mentions about a calendar, "Saatli Maarif Takvimi" which has sheets for each day of the year and shows the time for namaz. The exaggeration is in the action of tearing off the calendar's sheets that he tears off a sheet in every minute even while sleeping, since the calendar, he owns, has sheets for every minute not for the days. The substitution of the word "saatli" (**Saatli** Maarif Takvimi) into "dakikalı" as in (**Dakikalı** Maarif Takvimi) reinforces the effect of humour.

(26) Kel olduğu için hiçbir berber tarafından "saç mı, sakal mı?..." sorusuna maruz kalamayan sorunlunun sorunu : Sayın Şaduman Bey, ben yıllarca Almanya'da işçi olarak çalıştığımı zannediyordum... Fakat meğerse Habeşistan'da kabile büyücüsüyümüşüm... Bunu emekli ikramiyesi olarak 300 tavşan ayağı verdiklerinde öğrendim... Çok acayip di mi?...

Şaduman Ağabey'in Yanıtı: Bak sevgili sorun sahibi okurum, bizim zamanımızda Saatli Maarif Takvimi değil de Dakikalı Maarif Takvimi

kullanırdık... Yani dakika başı takvim yaprağı kopartmak zorunda kalıyorduk...
 Bu yüzden yanımızda takvimle gezerdik... O değil de uyurken bile takvim
 yaprağı kopartmak bayağı meşakkatli oluyordu... Yaaa, yaaa!...
 (Solmaz: 2005a)

III.3.7. Logical Fallacy and False Statement Humour

Logical fallacies are statements which are false or contradictory. They are also arguments which do not follow from what is given. False statements can be seen as humorous, because they deviate from what is intelligible. There are many ways of making mistakes with arguments. All these ways are called logical fallacies. Nearly all of them involve the misuse of language. Logical fallacies may be thought to be kinds of deviations. We laugh at something that is irrational or something which does not make any sense to us.

Carpenter (1925) states that humour involves falsehood and the pleasure of being fooled. Anything presenting falsehood that is suddenly perceived as such by an effort of judgment is comic. We take false statements as if they were true, or we take metaphors literally. It is like ambiguity and pun where a word has two different meanings and we take the wrong meaning. The humour derives from the contradiction. Similarly, Engel (1976) wrote that all fallacies and false statements can be used for humorous effects. The clearer we are about how our ordinary, everyday language works, the better we will be able to think.

The text below (27), taken from Solmaz, can be an example of logical fallacy and false statement humour. The presenter of a TV programme warns the audiences not to leave and to keep on watching the programme before the break for the advertisements. The character of the text, Fahretmedin, takes the warning seriously. He does not go anywhere and keeps on watching TV although he needs to go to the toilet, and dirties everywhere in the room. The irrational situation of the character makes the readers laugh. The name of the character, “Fahretmedin”, may be seen as another humorous feature in the text. It has been used instead of “Fahrettin” (a male name) which is purposely misperceived as a verb, “*Fahr-et-mek” that does not exist in Turkish, and it is negated as “Fahr-et-me-mek” by using the negation suffix “-mE”. Creating a word by changing a noun into a verb, and its being wrong and meaningless may cause humour as in the example.

(27) Şaduman Ağabey...

Kısa Tüketici Sorunlarınızı Kısa Ama Öz Yanıtıyor

İkitelli'den Fahretmedin: Sevgili Şaduman Ağabey geçen gece televizyonda bir program izliyordum. Sunucu reklamlara geçmeden önce ‘Sakın bizden ayrılmayın’ dedi... Ben de aman bir problem çıkmasın diye ayrılmadım... Fakat çok kakam olduğu için afedersin altıma s..tım... Üst baş, koltuk filan hep battı... Bu durumda benim o programdan tazminat alma hakkım doğar mı acaba?

(Solmaz: 2004c)

III.3.8. Impossible Humour

We may laugh when we are faced with the impossible. We see, or are asked to do, what is not possible. We can accept and laugh at the impossible. For example, we laugh at a small boy who complains because he does not want to grow, or wants to walk to the moon. Exaggeration of the statements can also be a type of impossible humour.

In the example below (28), humour has been created by expressing an absurd and impossible event which is about “an ironing desk” whose duty is to catch the people wearing wrinkled clothes, and to iron their clothes. The phrase “ütü masası” (ironing desk) may be regarded as an interesting and funny association of homicide or theft desks of the police departments. The reasonable interpretation of the phrase, “ütü masası”, could be as an ironing board, however using the unexpected association surprises readers and thus creates humour. Exaggerating the duty of the desk as ironing the old people and making them younger, using mockery and slang expressions may be considered as the other elements that create and reinforce humorous situation.

(28) Şaduman Ağabey...

Tüketici sorunlarınızı yanıtıyor...

Şaduman Ağabey’in Yanıtı: Sevgili okurum, hatırlarım da bizim zamanımızda buruşuk elbiseyle gezenleri yakalamak için ütü masası kurulmuştu... Bu masanın görevi kırışık, buruşuk gezenleri yakalayıp oracıkta istimli ütülerle ütileyip toplumun göz zevkine uygun hale getirmektir... Hatta arada buruşuk

yaşlıları da yakalayıp ütülemek suretiyle gençleştiriyorlardı desem inanır mısın?... Bence inanma... Şaka lan şaka inan tabii hayvan... (Solmaz: 2004c)

III.3.9. Juxtaposition Humour

Juxtaposition is the art of putting unlike things together. We juxtapose things to create humour and metaphor. Two or more unlike words may be combined, or two unlike things may be placed side by side. Juxtaposition asks the question, "What if...?" What if these objects were put together?

The example sentence (29), “sütten ağzı yanan yoğurdu pipetle içer!”, has been altered from a Turkish proverb “Sütten ağzı yanan yoğurdu üfleyerek yer.”, which means “Once bitten, twice shy”. The violation of the verb – object agreement in the sentence is one of the features that create humour. When we use the verb “yemek” (to eat) for a drink instead of “içmek” (to drink) such as “*süt yemek” (*to eat milk) or “içmek” for a food instead of “yemek” as in “*elma içmek” (to drink apple), it may create humour because of the violation of the meaning as in this example. Another feature that should be considered in the example is the usage of the word “pipet” (pipette) instead of “to blow or to breathe hard on” which reinforces the effect of humour in the sentence.

(29) Sütten ağzı yanan yoğurdu pipetle **içer!** (Üstündağ: 2000a)

In the next example (30), the phrase “kulak memesi” (earlobe) has been described as “Memede kulak olmasından daha iyidir”, in which the humorous effect can be

seen in the reversal usages of the words “kulak” (ear), and “meme” (breast / mamma) when it is interpreted as “kulakta meme” (mamma on ear) and “memede kulak” (ear on mamma).

(30) Kulak Memesi: Memede kulak olmasından daha iyidir... (Ergen: 2004a)

In the example below (31), Solmaz’s character, Şaduman Ağabey, is telling a funny aphorism. The aphorism is about an environmentalist boxer who trains with “kum kese kağıdı” (sand paper bag) instead of “kum torbası” (sandbag). The transformation of the noun phrase “kum torbası” into “kum kese kağıdı” and the boxer’s being an environmentalist are the features that create humour.

(31) Şaduman Ağabey...

Şaduman Ağabey’den Özlü Sözler.

Çevreci boksör kum torbası yerine kum kese kağıdında çalışır. (Solmaz: 2004)

In the examples below (32a, b, and c), we see some funny nicknames or pseudonyms when they are read one after another. The first one (32a), “Narlidere’den Sezai” (Sezai from Narlıdere -a town the name of which can be translated as “a brook which is surrounded by pomegranate trees-) may be considered as a usual pseudonym, but when we look at the second one (32b), we see a fictitious town name, “Narsızdere”, which has been created by substituting the adjective making suffix “-li” into “sız” (without). The last town name “Vardere” in (32c), “Narlı ya da narsız olmasının ne önemi Vardere’den Hüdai” (Hüdai from Vardere, no importance of being “narlı” or “narsız”), has ben created by omitting the word “Narlı” and using “var” (exist) instead of it.

(32) (a) Narlıdere'den Sezai

(b) Narsızdere'den Şerifali

(c) Narlı ya da narsız olmasının ne önemi vardere'den Hüdai (Solmaz 2004a)

III.3.10. Metaphor Humour

In language, a metaphor is a rhetorical expression defined as a direct comparison between two or more seemingly unrelated subjects. In a metaphor, a first concept is described as being or precisely equal to a second concept. Thus the first concept can be economically described, because implicit and explicit attributes from the second concept are used to enhance the description of the first. This device is known for usage in literature, especially in poetry, where with few words, emotions and associations from one context are associated with another. Expressing the word “sleep” as “a short vacation from life”, “mind “ as “ a very thin fluid”, “oil” as “life blood”, and “space” as “a box with no top, no bottom, and no sides” can be considered as metaphorical expressions.

In the first sentence of the example below (33), Üstündağ approves a generally accepted statement that “insan topraktan yaratılmış” (human being is created from soil), which may be understood as human is soil “insan topraktır”. In the second sentence, he writes another statement “bazen çamurlaşıyor” (Human being sometimes slings mud at somebody or something) by using the relation of “insan – toprak” (human – soil) and

“toprak – çamur” (soil - mud) in which the metaphorical expression of human being’s being mud creates humour.

(33) İnsan topraktan yaratılmış doğru.. bazen çamurlaşıyor. (Üstündağ: 2002b)

In the next example (34), the word “kalp” (heart) has been metaphorically used instead of goods or a thing (probably a piece of clothing) which remains clean when we do not use. The knowledge of the statement, that a seldom used thing remains clean, and its association with “heart” is the feature that creates humour.

(34) Kalbimiz çok temiz, çünkü pek kullanmayız. (Üstündağ: 2002a)

In the next example (35), there can be seen deviations in the sayings and aphorisms by substituting the word “Viagra” (a kind of pill which has aphrodisiac properties). In the first sentence, it is used instead of the word “tüfek” (rifle), in the second sentence as “kaçmak” (to run away), in the third sentence as “kadın” (woman), and in the last sentence as “güneş” (the sun). There are more word substitutions in the first and the last sentences that the word “erkeklik” (here used as ‘sexual potency’) has been used instead of “mertlik” (bravery), and in the last sentence the word “iktidarsızlık” (sexually impotent for male) instead of “doktor” (doctor). Such kinds of substitutions, especially in proverbs, sayings, and aphorisms, can be considered an effective way of creating humour.

(35) Viagra icat oldu erkeklik bozuldu!

Çünkü artık erkekliğin onda dokuzu Viagra!

Her başarılı erkeğin arkasında bir Viagra var!

Viagra giren yere iktidarsızlık girmez! (Oflaz: 1998a)

In the next text (36), Pek writes a fictitious story about the progression of the invention of elevator. The ‘head inventor of the palace, Ciovanni Fiasco’, briefs the king about his new invention “demir oda” (iron room) which is later named as “asansör” (elevator). The metaphorical usage of the phrase “demir oda” (iron room) instead of “asansör” (elevator) may be considered one of the humorous aspects of the text. In his briefing, Fiasco presents his new invention, which is actually a great failure, as if it is a great discovery. The name of the head inventor, Great Fiasco or Great Fiasko, has been used relatively with the failure or fiasco of the invention. Expressing fictitious and absurd historical stories may be a way of creating humour,

(36) Büyük Ama Güzel Sözler

Sayın kralım, içinde bulunduğunuz bu demir odayı biz sarayın çatısından ittirdiğimiz anda siz sarayın dördüncü katından salisede bahçeye inmiş olacaksınız. Sonra biz ‘asansör’ adını verdiğimiz bu demir odayı üç gün içinde yeniden sarayın çatısına çıkaracağız. O zamana kadar siz de iyileşmiş olursunuz. Yeniden binersiniz asansöre. (Saray Baş Mucidi Ciovanni Fiasco - Büyük Fiasko-). (Pek: 2006a)

In the example below (37), Ergen writes funny and unusual meaning to the phrase “Temiz Kağıdı” (a report stating that someone is not previously convicted of a crime). He objects to get the report (temiz kağıdı) from the public prosecutorship, and

offers that we should get it from public bathroom, and the word “temiz” (clean) has been related to the word bathroom.

(37) Temiz Kağıdı: Niye savcılık veriyo ki, hamamdan alaydık... (Ergen: 2006a)

III.3.11. Misclassification Humour

Misclassification stresses a technique of creating humour involving putting things in improper classes. Classificatory systems are typically arbitrary and based on limited qualities for limited purposes. Thus, such unlike things as people and whales are classified together as both being warm blooded. Animate and inanimate creatures are also arbitrary classifications.

In the example below (38), Budak writes fictitious news about the feast of the sacrifice. In the feast of the sacrifice, Muslims sacrifice animals to acquire merit in God’s sight. Here, a man sacrifices his car instead of a sacrificial animal in which we see a misclassification of animacy and inanimacy situation. The idea of sacrificing his car is a misunderstanding of the term HP (Horse Power) which is one of the humorous aspects in the text. The man, then, learns that it is not religiously permissible to sacrifice a horse, and this time, he mistakenly sacrifices his brother in law (kayın) instead of sheep (koyun) in which we see another humorous situation. Here, the writer purposely misuses the word “koynu” instead of “koyunu” to get a rhymed expression when used with “kayın”.

(38) Kurbanlık Köşe

Olası Kurban Haberleri

Süper sayıda sevap kazanmak için 102 beygirlik arabasını kurban eden adamın, beygir kesmenin caiz olmadığını öğrendikten sonra, yanlışlıkla **koynu** yerine **kaynını** kesmesi... (Budak: 2006)

III.3.12. Mistake Humour

This is deviation from something which is correct, or a standard. Mistake is involved in nearly every type of humour. Any sort of mistake may be a source of humour. How we take mistake-angrily or humorously- reveals our attitude toward life and our ability to accept. Delia Chiaro, (1992), states that situation comedies also involve someone getting into some kind of mess.

In the example (39), it can be seen that the question has been answered in an unexpected and humorous way because of the misunderstanding of the word “forty” as “forty children” instead of “forty years old”.

(39) Q. Should a woman have children after forty?

A. No, forty's enough.

In the examples below (40) we see humorous definition of the word. The word “Fiyaka” has been defined as “Karşıyaka’nın eski ismi.” (the old / ex name of Karşıyaka –a quarter in İzmir-) by using the word “karşı” instead of “fi”, the first syllable of “fiyaka”

which is another term used to express the old times. The second sentence in the definition “Ama çok eski” (but very old) reinforces the humorous aspect of the definition. The word “çok” (very) has been written as “çook” by double using the vowel “o” to acquire a relation with the meaning of “fi”.

(40) Lehce-tül Hakayık

Fiyaka: Karşıyaka'nın eski ismi. Ama çok eski...(Ergen: 2005a)

In (41), again taken from Ergen, the phrase “Kapalı Otopark” (parking garage) has been defined. In the definition, the false interpretation of the word “kapalı” (which can be interpreted as “closed” and “covered” in Turkish) as “closed” is the punline that creates the humorous situation. The colloquial usage of “ne yapalım” as “napalım” may be considered as another humorous aspect.

(41) Lehce-tül Hakayık

Kapalı Otopark: Eh napalım, biz de otomuzu açılınca parkederiz... (2005a)

In the example below (42), a person whose pseudonym is “Şaşkın” (confused) confuses the terms “Devlet Demiryolları” (State railways) and “Devlet Asfalt yolları” (State roads). The confusion of the terms and creation of a new term, “Devlet Asfalt yolları”, and his pseudonym may be seen as the humorous aspects of the text.

(42) Şaduman Ağabey...

Tüketici sorunlarınızı yanıtlıyor...

Abicim ben niye “Devlet Demiryolları” dendiğini çok merak ediyorum? Zira arabaların gittiği yola “Devlet Asfalyolları” mı deniyor sanki?

Rumuz:Şaşkın....(Solmaz:2005b)

III.3.13. Nonsense/Absurd Humour

Webster's Dictionary (1986) defines "nonsense" as:

- a) Words or language having no meaning or conveying no intelligible ideas.
- b) Language or conduct that is absurd or contrary to good sense.
- c) Things of no importance.
- d) (adj.): Being a simulated unit of speech fabricated by arbitrary grouping of speech sounds or symbols.

The last definition says that nonsense appears to be meaningful, but in fact, it is not. A statement is seen as a meaningless, but is stated as if true. We expect people to be saying meaningful things, but with nonsense our expectations are defeated. This satisfies the contradictoriness criterion for the creation of humour.

The absurd is a significant feature of humour. If nonsense and contradiction are taken seriously or as being unacceptable, they become absurd. The absurd is regarded as illogical, unreasonable, incongruous, futile, unintelligible, meaninglessness, impossibility. The examples such as “Take vitamin N for nose.” and “Open this letter from the inside.” are absurd sentences since there is not any kind of vitamin N and it is impossible to open an envelope from the inside.

The text below (43), taken from Dabak, may give us signals of nonsense humour in various ways. A rabbit's washing its socks and pegging it up on a clothesline which is stretched between its ears, and measuring the earth's area at the same time is nonsense because of its being illogical, meaninglessness, and impossibility. The meaningless noun phrases such as "Perili lokum ve ütü", "Perili paraşüt ve ütü", "prens börek kuzusu", and illogical competition may be considered as the signs of nonsense or absurd humour. Using irrelevance, illogical, meaningless and incongruous statements in the same text may create humour.

- (43) Yıkadığı çoraplarını iki kulağı arasına gerdiği ipe mandallayan tavşan bey serin esen rüzgara karşı gururla poz verdi. Bir taraftan da kainatın yüzölçümünü hesaplamaktaydı. Armut pişirip ağzına düşürme yarışması hakemlerin baleye başlaması münasebetiyle koptu. Perili lokum ve ütü. Havada uçan lolipoplara prens börek kuzusunun kulaklarına dolmaktaydı. ... Öyleyse duran asansöre binen tavşan bir aşağı bir yukarı inip çıkıp yapar böyle. ... Perili paraşüt ve ütü. Tavşanın çorapları kurudu di mi Cevat Aabi. (Evet.). (Dabak: 2002)

In the next examples (44), again taken from Dabak, the writer presents us the news which is full of nonsense statements. The news in (44a) is about a father and his son who is sent to market by his father to buy parsley but comes back with spinach fifteen years later which is illogical and thus nonsense. Besides, the father gets angry with his son and commits suicide by hanging himself –eight times- in which we can see absurd or nonsense events.

In (44b), a traffic accident is presented in an absurd way. A lorry which is full of mad (people) goes out of control and plunges into a chess club. The people in the club are injured badly and become vegetative persons. It can be considered as a normal traffic accident up to now, except the lorry's being full of mad (people). The last sentence can be considered as the punchline of the text, since when the official governor of the provincial visits the injured people at the hospital he waters and fertilizes them. Here, the confusion or the relation of injured people's being vegetative and thus watering and fertilizing them creates humour. This text may also be an example of logical fallacy and mistake humour.

(44) Gökhan Dabak Muziplik Müessesesi Sunar

Haberler.

(a) - Maydonoz almaya gönderdiği oğlu onbeş yıl sonra ıspanakla geri dönünce sinir krizi geçiren baba kendini sekiz kez asarak intihar etti. Gözyaşları içinde basına açıklama yapan yüzkarası oğul (vicdan azabı çekiyorum, bundan böyle sevgili babamın anısını yaşatmak için hergün maydonozlu köfte yiyeceğim) dedi.

(b) - Frenleri patlayan deli yüklü kamyon satranç kulübüne daldı. Satranççılar bitkisel hayata girdiler. Derhal hastaneye gelen Yalova Kaymakamı hastaları sulayıp gübreledi. (Dabak: 2000)

III.3.14. Obviousness Humour

The obvious is well-known things presented as if they are new knowledge, for example, “How to tell a joke: start at the beginning, go on to the middle and stop at the end.” The result is surprise and defeated expectation. Jokes of circular types are examples of obvious humour. Obvious humour involves describing any simple, familiar action, such as giving instructions for how to drink water, chew gum, make a hamburger, walk down the street, etc. The answers to the questions such as “- What is warm in summer and cold in winter? / - Just about anything.” and “- How do you take (drink) your coffee? / - With my mouth.” may be considered as examples of obvious humour.

In the example below (45), Oflaz suggests the readers some clues of how to succeed in coming out of an economic crisis in a satirical way. For example, he exaggeratedly offers people to eat each other when they are hungry, to sell their eyes or other organs, etc. that creates black humour. The title of the text, “krizsavar”, (here used as a person who can get over the economic crisis) is derived from another word “uçaksavar” (antiaircraft gun) by blending the words “kriz” (crisis) and “savmak” (to get over a problem successfully) which can be regarded as a way of creating humour.

(45) Krizsavar!

Sizi ekonomik krizden Kemal Derviş çıkaramadı ama ben çıkaracağım. Bu konuda oldukça iddialyım. Ancak bunun için dediklerimi harfiyen uygulamalısınız. ... Hazır mısınız?

Öyleyse şu andan itibaren işinize eşekle ya da atla gidip gelin!... Acıktıkça derin derin nefes alın. ... Karnınızı doyurmak için birbirinizi yiyin! Yine de karnınız doymazsa kafayı yiyin!.. Böbreğinizin birini satın! Buna rağmen ekonomik krizden çıkamadıysanız gözünüzün birini de satın!... (Oflaz: 2002)

In the next example (46), the writer informs the readers about an epidemic disease, “Kuş Gribi” (Avian Influenza) and the ways of protecting against it. He expresses humorous and absurd suggestions such as not to shake hands with the birds, not to kiss them, not to have sexual intercourse with them, etc. When the rules to be obeyed in case of an epidemic disease are expressed in an unusual way as in this example, it creates humour.

(46) Kuş Gribini Tanıyalım

Kuş gribine yakalanmamak için herhangi bir kuşla tokalaşmamak, öpüşmemek, söz konusu kuşun bardağından su içmemek ve hiçbir kanatlı hayvanla cinsel ilişkiye girmemek gerekmektedir... (Açıkgöz: 2006)

The next example (47), is, again, about an epidemic disease in a different way. The title of the text has been deviated from “Kuş Gribi” (Avian Influenza) as “Bush Gribi” to indicate that “Bush” (the president of the USA) is like an epidemic disease the association of which may create humour. The terms of the reasons and ways of protecting against a disease have been used for the situation of imperialism or colonialism that a country may face. The whole text has been written by using the colloquial features of a Turkish accent which is especially used by the people at the Black Sea Region, which can be regarded as a way of creating humour. There are some expressions which contain funny

similes such as “sivilce gibi üsler” (bases like pimple), “kültüre karşı üşüme” (feel cold or chilly against culture), and the title of the text “Bush Gribi” which reinforce the effect of humour.

(47) Bush Gribi

Efendum Bush gribine çok dikkat etmek lazımdır. Bush gribi bulaşmış ülke ve halkların durumu içler acisidir. Belirtilerine gelince... Virüsün bulaştığı ülkenin yeraltı ve yerüstü kaynakları haböyle damarlarından çekilip alınmaktadır. Kendi öz kültürüne karşı bir titreme ve üşüme, daha sonra da yabancılaşıma başlamaktadır. Gribun etkilerinden biri de, hasta ülkenin bazı bölgelerinde haböyle sivilce gibi Amerikan üsleri peydah olmaktadır. Bush gribi bir kez sirayet ettikten sonra artık o bünyede bağımsuz bir dış politika ve halkın mutluluğu için bir iç politika uygulayabilmek mümkün değildir... (Okumuş: 2006)

In the next example (48), Müjde prepares a funny dictionary which explains the meanings and the ways of pronouncing some of the difficult words that are mostly used by the bureaucrats during the discussions of EU. The term “derogasyon” (derogation) is one of the items of the dictionary. In the definition, he, first, gives a suggestion how to pronounce the word by the help of a Turkish word “dere” (brook) for the first part of the word, “dero”. Then, he says “dereyi geçmek”, that can be understood as both “cross the brook” and “skip this step”, and thus creates humour. While explaining the meaning of the term, he humorously associates the term to a tattoo. When we compare this way of definition with the ones in a regular dictionary, we see a contradiction between them, and

this makes us laugh. There are some other aspects that reinforce the effect of humour such as using colloquial and swearwords.

(48) AB yle vardık şanlı Ekime,
Girsek de s..., girmesek de s... Beni ilgilendiren AB, üyelik, oradan gelecek fonlar, paralar filan değil. Şu sıralar AB sözlüğü üzerine çalışıyorum. Eminim sokaktaki insan da bu sözcüklerin karşılığını bulmakta zorlanıyor. Zaten şundan kesinlikle eminim ki sokaktaki insan şu aralar tek bir şeyi düşünüyor. “Kodumunun Halkalı otobüsü ne zaman gelecek abi”... İşte burdan yola çıkarak size bir Avrupa Birliği sözlüğü hazırladı güzel yazarınız.

- Derogasyon: İlk kez Kıbrıs müzakerelerinde gündeme geldi bu sözcük. Söylenişi oldukça zor... Dere geliyor dere gibi bişey...Dero demek zor geliyorsa dereyi söylüyorsun önce. Dereyi geçtikten sonra arkasına bi gasyon ekledin mi telaffuzu daha kolay oluyor. Derogasyon aslen kıvrırma payı oluyor. “Anayasayı bir kez delsek noolur canım” gibi bişey. Bir nevi dövme... Geçici olunca az acıtıyor. Kalıcı olursa lazerle bilem izinin çıkması zor. (Müjde: 2005)

III.3.15. Personification Humour

Personification is a kind of metaphor. In personification humour, non-human creatures are treated as humans. In fable, animals are personified and speak. This is one of the most used techniques by the writers in creating humour. We find a great deal of

examples of personification humour texts in the magazines, since it is one of the most preferred techniques by the humour writers.

In (49) below, the text is pretended to be written by a sacrificial sheep called Şemsi which can be regarded as an example of personification humour. The text has been written as if it is the diary of the sheep, Şemsi. When we look at the text, we see that

(49) Kurbanlık Koyun Şemsi'nin Günlüğü

Geçen Bayramdan devam...

8 Ocak: Sevgili günlük... Kurban Bayramı gelirken, sürüden üst üste iki bayram gören ilk koyun ben olucam diye nabzım tavana vurdu valla... (Sahibinin derin dondurucusunda bi bayram unutulmuş Hazma abiyi saymıyorum tabi)

9 Ocak: Celep Abi hepimize dövmeler, tatuular falan yaptı bu sabah... Ben 'forever kınalım' yazalım istedim, ama çarpıda karar kılındı sürü psikolojisi etkisiyle...

10 Ocak: Kamyonetle yanımızdan geçen bi adamdan koyunların da deri döktüğünü öğrendim günlük... Ayrıca otların arasından çıkan 4 yapraklı yonca'yı da yemeyip sakladım uğurludur diye...

12 Ocak: Yonca sayesinde yanlarına yerleştiğim evin ufak çocuğu sürekli ağlıyo... Burada güzel bi kolye takıldı boynuma.... Dışardaysa gözü bağlı saklanbaç oynayan koyunlar, damlardan atlayan sığırlar... Ortam can, ortam eğlenceli... Küçük ağlıyo hala...

13 Ocak: Önemli gelişmeler için canlı yayındayız günlük... Bıçaklı bi abi geldi az önce... Küçük çooook ağlıyo. Baba bıçaklı abiye bişey söyledi... Bıçaklı abi kızdı gidiyo... Evet, küçük ilk kez sevinçli... Bana sarılıyo, öpüyo, okşuyo küçük... Fakat? İnceden ısıriyo mu ne sanki! Küçük şimdi de koşarak bıçaklı abiye gidiyo... Bıçaklı abi geri dönüyo... Günlük buradan aktaracaklarım şimdilik bu kadar... Umarım yeni gelişmeler olmaz... Söz sende Banu! Çabuuk keselim yalnız bağlantıyı... keselim çabuk ipi! Çabuuu... (Budak: 2006)

In the following examples (50), (51), and (52), Pek's character Prof. Yattara Valli (a cat) is answering the questions of the (cat) readers at its agony column in the magazine. When we look at the problems or questions of the cats, we see that they ask for simple definitions of some words such as "beton" (concrete or cement) in (50), "otomobil" (car) in (51), and "tavuk" (hen) in (52) by telling funny stories in which we see some associations with the words they want to learn. The reason why we laugh at the texts may be the ignorance of not knowing such simple definitions or terms. Although they use associations, it is hard to guess the term they want to learn, unless we read the answer parts of the texts. There are some other aspects that we laugh at such as the pseudonyms of the cats, (Moamma, Denişik, and Mırıldak), onomatopoeic expressions (fişfişfiş, vıcık) which reinforces the effect of humour.

(50) Kedinizin Köşesi

Siyamlı Profesör Yattara Valli

Soru: Hocam, yan tarafın orda vıcık vıcık sokak var. Vıcık sokak ama sımsıkı. Neden vıcık dersen, kedi pati köpek pati karışık, çukur pati olayı var. Ama ben basıyorum çukur pati olayı olmuyor. Vıcık sokak gibi sıkı sokak. Peki sıkı sokakta çukur pati olayı nasıl oluyor? (Rumuz: Moamma)

Cevap: Yavrucuğum, birinci gün vıcık sokak. Öbür gün sıkı sokak. Sonra yağmur yağsa bile daima sımsıkı sokak. Biz ona beton diyelim mi?

(Pek: 2006b)

(51) Kedinizin Köşesi

Siyamlı Profesör Yattara Valli

Soru: Hocam, size de üstüne kıvrınıp uyuduğunuzda aradan zaman geçince ve uyandığınızda çok böyle bambaşka şekilli başka gibi evler var, diyar gibi. Sokaklar var olduğu oluyor mu? (Rumuz: Denişik)

Cevap: Onun üstünde uyuyorsun. Demek derin uyuyorsun. Gidiyor alttan yuvarlaklarıyla oraya. Otomobil yavrucuğum. (Pek: 2006a)

(52) Kedinizin Köşesi

Siyamlı Profesör Yattara Valli

Soru: Sayın hocam, bahçada yatarken fişfişfiş oldu. Ben yokarı bakınca balkonda sakallı adam var. Fışfişfiş yaptı, bahçaya yemek attı. Arkadaşları birbirimizi cırmalayarak kapış yaptık. Arkadaş ete ‘tavuk’ dedi. Tavuk ne hocam? (Rumuz: Mırıldak)

Cevap: Yavrum, tavuk sana nasıl anlatayım? Çatal tipi patiler, tüy kedidekinden değişik, dudaklar sert, bıyık sıfır, kulak sıfır, kuyruk yüzde on. Kanat varsa ye. Kuş, tavuk, balık, sinek. Hepsi olur.” (Pek: 2005)

III.3.16. Pretense Humour

Monro (1963) states that one type of humour is anything masquerading as something it is not. We know a clown is acting, if not, is regarded as a fool. Pretense involves metaphor. It is to show or say, "X is Y." Humorous pretense comes from the basic metaphorical way in which we use language. We can create hypothetical solutions, models, and humor by speculating, "What would you do if...?" Pretense creates a counterfactual or contrary to the fact condition.

In the example below (53), “yerçekimi” (gravity) has been defined as “Ya gök itiyosa?” (What if the sky pushes the earth?). It can be seen that when there is a counterfactual condition to the truth or the statement, we can see a humorous situation.

(53) Yerçekimi: Ya gök itiyosa?.. (Ergen: 2005c)

III.3.17. Reversal or Inversion Humour

This is a technique of inverting or reversing beliefs, roles, sentences, situations, values, cause and effect relationship, expectations, etc. Transposition of two or more

sounds or words is called a “spoonerism” that can be exemplified as in the usages of “tons of soil” for “sons of toil.” “mardon me padam” for “pardon me madam”, or “pilli miyango” for “milli piyango”. It is a clever transposition especially if the reversed statement is an elucidating commentary on the original sentence. We expect, by reversing a sentence, that the opposite of the truth, nonsense, will be produced. Either way, the result can be humorous that can be seen in the sentences such as “He spent all his money on women; she spent all her men on money.”, and “I am a serious comedian.”

In the example below (54), it can be seen that the word “kamyonet” (pickup truck) has been defined as “Geri geri giden et kamyonu” (a meat truck which goes backwards). While defining the word “kamyonet”, it has been purposely misunderstood and divided into two words as “kamyon” (truck) and “et” (meat), and they have been reversed as “et kamyonu” (meat truck) in which we see a funny expression. The meat truck’s going backwards or reverse is another aspect that reinforces the effect of humour, and may reflect the importance of thinking reverse in creating humour.

(54) Kamyonet: Geri geri giden **et kamyonu**. (Ergen: 2004a)

The next example (55a), again from Ergen, the phrase “Süs Köpeği” (toy dog) has been defined as “Köpek şeklinde süs” (an ornament in the shape of a dog) in which humour is produced by changing the order of the words in the noun phrase. This can be regarded as an effective way of creating humour. Similarly, in (55b), the phrase “Damla Sakızı” (a kind of chewing gum) has been defined as “sakız damlası” (drop of gum) in which we see that the word “damla” has been used as “drop” and “a kind of gum”.

- (55) (a) - Süs Köpeği: Köpek şeklinde süs yani...
 (b) - Damla Sakızı: Sakız damlasının tersi belli ki. Bunda anlamıyacak ne var?!
 (Ergen:2005c)

In the next example (56), Üstündağ makes a reference to the well known of Descartes' saying, "I think, therefore I am", and changes it into the sentence as "Gereği düşünüldü: Düşünmek gereksizdir." which means that "we, (judges), reached a verdict that thinking is unnecessary". The contradiction of the statement, that in order to reach a verdict thinking is necessary, produces humour. The phrase "gereği düşünüldü" is a term of judgement which is used by the judges when they give their verdict on a trial, therefore, the example may be considered as an implicit criticism of the judgment system because of the charges against intellectuals who express their opinions. For this reason, we can say that the language of humour gives the writers a great chance of expressing their ideas effectively and economically as in the example.

- (56) Gereği düşünüldü: Düşünmek gereksizdir. (Üstündağ: 1998)

III.3.18. Satire

Satire is being critical of anything which we can be critical of. It uses humour to present the criticism. It exposes contradiction, inconsistency, hypocrisy, mistake, and harmful actions or beliefs. We can say things humorously that we could not get away with

saying otherwise. If satire is bitter, or ridicule, it ceases to be humour. Thus, satire can be divided into two types as humorous, and hostile. Hostile satire cannot be accepted as humour. Humorous satire is not ridicule. Satire makes a point but, as humour, it cannot be taken negatively. If satire is to be humorous, it cannot be malicious.

In the example of (57), Oflaz is criticizing the media because of its supporting war to Afghanistan after the USA invaded there. While criticizing, he prefers using the English word “war” instead of its Turkish equivalent “savaş” in order to reinforce the effect of satiric expression, and to get a rhymed expression when the word “war” is used with “var” (exist). The usage of a foreign language word with a Turkish word side by side can be regarded as an effective way of creating humorous texts. The satirical expression that media’s becoming armed, and attacking to Afghanistan may be another humorous situation that can be seen in the text.

(57) War Var!

Medyamızın gözü aydın, Amerika Afganistan’a saldırdı. Amerika’nın Afganistan’a saldırısı biraz daha gecikseydi, medyamız silahlanıp Afganistan’a saldıracaktı. Maalesef şimdi dünyamızda war var!... (Oflaz: 2001)

In the next example (58), again taken from Oflaz, we see the criticism of the USA and New World Order. He gets a rhymed expression by using the last syllable “-kan” (means “blood” in Turkish) of the word “Amerikan”, and by omitting some letters of the word “Amerika” as “Amerika... Amerik... Ameri...”, which may be regarded as an example of pun.

(58) Kan...Kan... Amerikan!

Amerikan, adında bile var kan!

Amerikan... Amerika... Amerik... Ameri...

S.O.S. veriyor Amerikan yapımı Yeni Dünya Düzeni.” (Oflaz: 1998b)

In the next example (59), Budak is satirizing Turkey’s deliberation of entering the union with the European Union in an ironic way. The discussions of the delegations have been exaggerated to produce humour in the text. The sleeping of the Turkish Prime Minister during the discussions, misusing of the words “kraker” (cracker) instead of “kriter” (criterion), delegations’ misunderstanding each other, using ambiguities and puns such as “AB” for both (water) and (EU), and deviations of the discussions from the main points are all the features that can be seen in a humorous text.

(59) OLASI AB MÜZAKERELERİ (17 ARALIK 2004)

Evet arkadaşlar görüşmeleri açıyorum derken... Türk heyetini uyandırılım bu arada...

Necati’yi durdurun, Rüştü yatma ayağına, Ammann...Ne, hıhh, n’oluyo?

Müzakere masası üstünde uyuyup kalmışsınız Tayip Bey...

41 yıldır kapıda beklemekten yorulup, iki Dakka şu masada kestirmişsiniz çok mu? Ayrımcılık yapıyorsunuz bize...Demin şu Alman üye de sızıp kaldıydı, ona bişey demedin ama... hatta biralı salyası aktıydı güzelim kayına..

E sizde bazı meselelerde biraz geri kayın ama dimi? Hem “Bugün AB için ne yaptın Tayip?” diye sordun mu hiç kendin kendine?

Hoşgörü bahçeleri açtım çeşmesinden AB-1 deryalar akan... Artık halkım sabah abdestiyle birlikte vaftizini de çıkaracak aradan... Ayrıca istediğiniz Kopenhag krakerlerini de aratmaktayım. Baharatçılar Çarşısı'nda, onu da bulunca... (Budak: 2004)

In the next example (60), Müjde is referring to the sea pollution in a satiric way. When we look at the text, we see that it is written in a diary form of which is pretended to be the diary of a famous actor, Dustin Hoffman. Using diaries in the name of other people or things is one of the most used techniques in writing humorous texts. When we look at the text, we see that Hoffman considers sea pollution, when he sees aubergines and cabbages at the sea, as success of growing vegetables at the sea in which we can see a false statement or a logical fallacy that creates humour. The usage of the sentence, “Helal olsun adamlara.” (Bravo! / Good for them!), for congratulating the Turks instead of “Congratulations!” may be considered as another feature that reinforces the effect of humour, since it has an idiomatic usage in Turkish, and it is commonly used colloquially in Turkish. Another humorous aspect that can be seen in the text that the usage of the word “hıyar” (cucumber) can be understood as a kind of vegetable or as its metaphoric meaning “dolt or blockhead -person-”.

(60) Dustin Hoffman'ın Türkiye Günlüğü

15 Ağustos 1997

Nefis bir havada, tekne ile Türkiye sınırlarına girdik... Cennet gibi koylarda geziyoruz. Bu arada Türkler çok ilerlemişler. Denizde patlıcan ve lahana yetiştirmeyi başarmışlar. Helal olsun adamlara...

22 Ağustos 1997

...Türkiye'nin denizlerinde hıyar da yetişiyor. İlginç. (Müjde: 1988)

III.3.19. Self Deprecation Humour (Self-Attack Humour)

This is humour about oneself. We humorously point out our own faults or mistakes. It is not really self-deprecation or it would not be humour. To laugh at oneself is to accept oneself. Thus, we accept our faults, rather than take them too seriously. Self-deprecation often treats the self as if it were another and different person. Robert Benchley, one of the best-known humorists and comedians of his time says that “It took me fifteen years to discover I had no talent for writing, but I couldn't give it up because by that time I was too famous.”

In the example below (61), two men, Ökkeş and Ökkredi, are writing a letter about their problems to the agony column of Şaduman Ağabey. Here, first we should handle the names, “Ökkeş and Ökkredi”, in terms of humour. The second syllable (-keş) of “Ök-keş” (a male name in Turkish) has been used to create another fictitious name “Ök-kredi” by using the association of the pronunciations and meanings of English words “cash” and “credit”. This type of pun may not be meaningful and humorous to those who do not know the meaning and the pronunciation of the word “cash”. Another aspect of humorous situation in the text can be seen in Ökkeş and Ökkredi's regarding themselves as stupid persons. Here, the word “yapmaklık”, in the sentence of “biz Savaş Ay'la röportaj yapmaklık iki salağız” (we are so stupid that Savaş Ay - a journalist- can interview with

us), cannot be seen in standard Turkish, since the noun making suffix “-lik” cannot be used after a verb as in this example (“yapmak” -to do or make-). Such kinds of deviations from the standard language may create humour. The other humorous feature that can be considered is the ironic expression of the journalist as “Araştırmacı - Taşhak Geçmeci Gazeteci”, and the usage of the slang or swearword “Taşhak Geçmeci” instead of “mockery or ridicule” in the expression.

(61) Şaduman Ağabey...

Tüketici sorunlarınızı yanıtlıyor...

Balıkesir’den Ökkeş’le Ökkredi: Sevgili Şaduman Ağabey, biz Savaş Ay’la röportaj yapmıklık iki salağız. Acaba Savaş Ay bizimle de röportaj yapıp, bizim de salaklığımızı gün ışığına çıkarmak suretiyle ‘Araştırmacı - Taşhak Geçmeci Gazetecilik’ adına bizi meşhur eder mi ha ağabey?... (Solmaz: 2004d)

III.3.20. Simile and Analogy Humour

Simile and analogy are comparisons between two things. They usually use the words "like," or "as". A simile is a type of metaphor in which it relates unlike things. The comparison may use many other types of humour as well. Parables and stories are often told in terms of likenesses of familiar situations. "What is it like?" is a basic critical question to ask. If we are given a vague concept, or words which are too large, then we may ask this question, "What is it like?" If it is like nothing within our experience, then it may be rejected as being meaningless.

In the example below (62), the analogy between the words “printır” (printer) and “pembe printır” (pink printer –here used in association with a famous cartoon character “pink panther”) in the dialogue is one of the aspects that creates humour. The colloquial usages of the phrase “işı bağlamak” (to complete a job successfully), the word “oğlum” (my son), “kap gel” in A’s sentences, and the slang addressing word “lan” (Hey! Hey you!) in B’s sentence can be considered as the other humorous features of the dialogue. There is another humorous statement that the speaker B sees himself as “pembe printır” because of alcohol in which we assume that when a person drinks too much alcoholic drinks his face may turn red (here pink).

(62) Kılılandırma Servisi

A: - Teo, işi bağladık oğlum... Diziyi yapıyoruz. Hemen printırını kap gel...

B: - Ne printır lan, ben alkolden pembe printır gibi olmuşum burada...

(Özdemiroğlu: 1999c)

III.3.21. Substitution Humour

We substitute humorous words for the usual or expected word. By substituting one term for another, we can clarify the meaning of the term. If we find that time is just change, we can substitute "change" wherever we have a time word. For example, instead of "time passes," it would be more accurate to say "change changes." "Euphemism" is the substitution at an acceptable word for an unacceptable word. It avoids the facing of an unpleasant idea. It may also be denial, hypocrisy, or dishonesty to do so. Examples:

Cemetery means "Sleeping place." "Put the animal to sleep," instead of "Kill the animal." But to create humour, we substitute the wrong term, or an odd word.

The words in traditional sayings, folk wisdom, proverbs, and colloquial expressions are substituted for in order to produce humour. What often results is also insight or the reduction of such statements to absurdity. Thus, it is also deviation-from-rule humour, expansion of a metaphor humour, etc. The sentences such as "A stitch in time saves *none*. (nine)", or "Dogs that bark, do not bite. Dogs that bite are not able to bark." may be considered humorous because of some of the substitutions of the words. This is one of the most used techniques in creating humour.

In the example below (63), Üstündağ re-writes one of the most famous sayings of Mevlana (Either exist as you are or be as you look) by changing the last word "ol" (be) into "öl" (die). The slight difference between the two words completely changes the meaning of the sentence in which humorous effect is created. The rhyme in the pronunciation is another aspect that reinforces the effect of humour.

- (63) - Ya olduğun gibi görün, ya görüdüğün gibi ol. (Mevlana)
 - Ya olduğun gibi görün, ya görüdüğün gibi *öl*. (Üstündağ: 1998)

In the next example (64), the substitution of the words "baba" (father) and "amca" (uncle) in the sentence, "Size **baba** diyebilir miyim **amca**?" (May you be my father? – May I call you father, uncle/sir?), is the feature that creates humour. This is one of the most used sentences in Turkish melodramas. The boy or the girl calls the man as

father without knowing that the man is the real his/her father. Here, the question or offer, in the sentence “Size **baba** diyebilir miyim **amca**?”, is directed to the word “amca”. When the offer is directed to the word “baba” as in the substituted sentence, “Size **amca** diyebilir miyim **baba**?” (May I call you uncle, father?), it reinforces the effect of humour.

(64) - Size **baba** diyebilir miyim **amca**?

(Size **amca** diyebilir miyim **baba**?)

-Bu amca senin baban yavrum... Belki bu amca da... Hatta bu amca da...(Müjde: 2005b)

In the next example of Üstündağ (65), one of the sayings of Atatürk, “Beni Türk **hekimlerine** emanet ediniz” (Entrust me to the Turkish doctors.), has been changed as “Beni Türk **hakimlerine** emanet ediniz.” (Entrust me to the Turkish judges.), which can be regarded as a satirical expression of criticizing the Turkish judgment system by using the humorous aspects. The slight difference in pronunciation and complete difference in the meaning of the substituted words may be another aspect that reinforces humorous effect.

(65) - Beni Türk **hakimlerine** emanet ediniz.

(- Beni Türk **hekimlerine** emanet ediniz.) (Üstündağ: 1998)

In the examples below (66a and b), Üstündağ changes some of the words or phrases of proverbs with new ones that we can see some phonological, syntactic, and semantic associations between them. In (66a), the word “solarium” has been used instead

of “kararmak” (to get dark or to turn black) in which we see a semantic association between to turn black and solarium. However, there can be seen a syntactic deviation in using a noun, “solarium”, instead of a verb “to get dark or to turn black” in which humour is produced. In (66b), the substitution of the word “enkaz” (wreckage or ruin) for “tavuk” (hen) is meaningful, since the new created proverb has been used to criticize the building contractors after the earthquake occurred at the Marmara region. The rhymed usage of the words “kaz” and “enkaz” reinforces the effect of satiric expression.

(66) “Zamane Atasözleri

(a) - üzüm üzüme baka baka **solarium!**

(üzüm üzüme baka baka **kararır!**)

(b) - kaz gelecek yerden **enkaz** esirgenmez!

(kaz gelecek yerden **tavuk** esirgenmez!) (Üstündağ: 2000a)

In the next example (67), the usage of the word “rating” instead of “ateş” (fever), in the sentence that means “Because of drinking water when I am sweaty, I became fevered”, surprises the readers and makes them laugh. The sentence may be regarded as a critique of the media in which we see a competition of rating. The usage of the Turkish first personal possessive suffix “-Im” after a foreign word may be considered as another humorous feature of the sentence.

(67) Hayatımıza giren yeni kelime ve deyimleri cümle içinde kullanalım

terli terli su içince gece **rating**’im çıktı! (Üstündağ: 2000b)

In the example below (68), a well known American Indian proverb, which advises the white man (Americans) not to destroy the environment, has been changed as a Leman proverb in which we can see a critique of the American imperialism. The original title of the text “Listen White Man” has been changed as “Dinle Öküz Adam” (Listen Ox Man) which may be understood that it is addressed to the president of the USA. The colloquial usages “emmek” (to suck) for “tüketmek”, “sallamak” for “atmak” (to throw), etc, and usage of swearword in the text may be considered as other humorous aspects.

(68) Dinle Beyaz Adam!

Son ağaç kesildiğinde, son nehir kurutulduğunda, son balık yakalandığında anlayacaksın paranın yetmediğini. (Kızılderili atasözü)

Dinle Öküz Adam!

Son petrolü emdiğinde, son bombayı salladığında, son ülkeyi istila ettiğinde, son parayı yuttuğunda, anlayacaksın ne süper g... olduğunu. (Leman atasözü)

(Çağçağ: 2005)

In the example (69), there can be seen a deviation in the substitution of the word in the idiom, “ah vah, verilmiş sadakanız yokmuş”, that the usage of the word “yok” (nonexisting) instead of “var” (existing) surprises the readers and thus creates humour. The metaphorical usage of “kaçmak” (run away) as “yusuf yusuf adımlarla uzaklaşmışmak” (to run away fearfully), and creation of a new word by blending the two verbs, “uzaklaşmak” (to leave or go) and “sıvışmak” (to sneak off), as “uzaklaşmışmak” can be seen effective humorous expressions of the text.

- (69) ...‘ah vah, verilmiş sadakanız yokmuş’ diye kekeleyerek ve de bir adım ileri, iki adım geri atarak, hızlı ve emin, yusuf yusuf adımlarla uzaklasıvıştım oradan. (Üstündağ: 1998)

III.4. Concluding Remarks

When we look at the analyzed examples in the previous sections, we see that the distinguishing and specific aspects of humour texts can be defined in terms of the subfields of linguistics; phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. In the process of the inference of humorous texts, the reader uses both intralinguistics and extralinguistics elements. The elements that constitute context of situation, mentioned in previous chapter, have a great effect in the inference process.

As it can be seen in the examples, the contradiction or conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs in the text creates humour. This conflict can be seen in most of the examples which surprises us and makes us laugh.

The basic characteristic features of humour language can be summarized as below:

- a) The language of humour mostly uses colloquial usages of the words or phrases, including slang, swearwords, accents, etc.
- b) Anything can be the subject of humour regardless of its being a taboo, a religious or moral subject provided that it is not used for hostility.

- c) The language of humour uses puns and rhetoric such as metaphor, simile, exaggeration, satire, personification, etc.
- d) The deviations from the standard language in a humorous text can be considered tolerably.
- e) The language of humour is an open field to the creation of new words in many ways whether they are meaningful or not.
- f) Nonsense, absurd and illogical expressions and statements can be regarded tolerably and they are some of the effective ways in creating humour.

CONCLUSION

Within the context of the present study, we can see that not only does humour have significant uses, in the various disciplines and in our personal lives, but it also makes life worth living. The question is not to ask where humour plays a significant part in our lives, but rather where does it not do so? If we are attentive to our actual behavior, look and see what we actually value and experience, we will observe that humour is often the most important thing in our lives. If one had everything else one wanted, but no humour it would still be a dreary world. Imagine, for example, a marriage or a job without any humour. They would be intolerable and oppressive. Humour is almost a synonym of enjoyment. Humour provides us with the quality of our lives. It is an ultimate aesthetic experience. Humour is seen to involve adjustment, happiness, hope, intelligence, joy, love, and life. To say, "I do not like humour" is a contradiction. Humour is defined as liking. It is a circular statement. And if one does not like humour one does not like life. The antonym is grave.

Humour has various effects, whether these are intentional or not. It is simplicity to say that, it is just for a laugh. It is possible to laugh and admit that, in a sense, it is not funny. There may be a target for the humour- a person, an institution or a set of beliefs- where the underlying purpose is deadly serious. Humour can occur in surprisingly serious context, as in sick jokes about death. Humor cannot hurt people, regardless of what it is about. This is because, for something to be humorous it must be a mistake, or

deviation, which we accept, and which is not fearful. If it is humor, we accept it. Humor says, "Don't take this seriously." which is to say, "Don't take this negatively." We need to gain permission for acceptance. We can, then, tell religious jokes, sex jokes, or any kind of joke, as long as no one takes it seriously.

Humour lets us escape into a world of contradiction and paradox, an impractical, purposeless world, a world where all the rules are broken, a world where what appears true is false, and what appears false is true, where good is bad, and bad is good. There is sense in nonsense, and nonsense in sense. It is an accepted, happy world which we may escape into. We leave behind hardship, and an often too cruel reality. We escape from serious or fearful rationality to new and pleasurable sorts of rationality. We create a world of humour.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE DATA

- Açıköz, Metin. (2006). Dilli Düdük. *Küstah Dergisi*. Sayı:9
- Barslan, Can. (2001). Barul Market. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2001/43
- Budak, Olgun. (2004). Olası AB Müzakereleri. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2004/51
- Budak, Olgun. (2006). Kurbanlık Köşe. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2006/03
- Çağçağ, Mehmet. (2005). Kapak sayfası. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2005/31
- Dabak, Gökhan. (2000a) Deli Cevat. *Leman Dergisi*. SAYI 2000/06
- Dabak, Gökhan. (2000b) Deli Cevat. *Leman Dergisi*. SAYI 2000/49
- Dabak, Gökhan.(2002) Deli Cevat. *Leman Dergisi*. SAYI 2002/15
- Ergen, Kemal Kenan. (2004a). Hisseli Harikalar Diyarı. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2004/21
- Ergen, Kemal Kenan. (2004b). Hisseli Harikalar Diyarı. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2004/44
- Ergen, Kemal Kenan. (2005a). Lehce-tül Hakayık. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2005/11.
- Ergen, Kemal Kenan. (2005b). Lehce-tül Hakayık. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2005/13.
- Ergen, Kemal Kenan. (2005c). Lehce-tül Hakayık. *Leman Dergisi* Sayı: 2005/32.
- Ergen, Kemal Kenan. (2006a). Lehce-tül Hakayık.*Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2006/05.
- Menemen, Ercüment. (1997). Altaylardan Gelen Zampara. *Lemanyak Dergisi*. Sayı:20
- Müjde, Gani. (1988). *Seni Sevdiğimi Kimseye Söyleme. Çünkü Ben Herkese Söyledim.*
İstanbul: Parantez Yayınları.
- Müjde, Gani. (2005a). Peynir Gemisi. *Penguen Dergisi*. Sayı: 2005/41
- Müjde, Gani. (2005b). Peynir Gemisi. *Penguen Dergisi*. Sayı: 2005/44
- Oflaz, Lütfü.(1998a).Yazıkätür. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 349.

- Oflaz, Lütfü.(1998b).Yazıkatur. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 359.
- Oflaz, Lütfü.(1999).Yazıkatur. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 396.
- Oflaz, Lütfü.(2001).Yazıkatur. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2001/41.
- Oflaz, Lütfü.(2002).Yazıkatur. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2002/11.
- Okumuş, Yılmaz. (2006). Laz Kapital. *Küstah Dergisi*. Sayı:9.
- Özdemiroğlu, Vedat. (1996). Vedat Bey'in Görkemli Hayatı. *Öküz Dergisi*. Sayı: 8.
- Özdemiroğlu, Vedat. (1999a). Kılılandırma Servisi. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 373.
- Özdemiroğlu, Vedat. (1999b). Kılılandırma Servisi. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 396.
- Özdemiroğlu, Vedat. (1999c). Kılılandırma Servisi. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 397.
- Özdemiroğlu, Vedat. (2002). VÖSYM. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2002/24.
- Özünlü, Ünsal. (1999). *Gülmecenin Dilleri*. Ankara: Doruk yayınları.
- Pek, Behiç. (2002). Şeysoy Başkan. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2002/39
- Pek, Behiç. (2004). Kedinizin Köşesi. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2004/49
- Pek, Behiç. (2005). Kedinizin Köşesi. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2005/17
- Pek, Behiç. (2006a). Kedinizin Köşesi. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2006/12
- Pek, Behiç. (2006b). Kedinizin Köşesi. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2006/14
- Pek, Behiç. (2006c). Kedinizin Köşesi. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2006/16
- Solmaz Fatih. (2004a). Şaduman Ağabey. *Penguen Dergisi*. Sayı: 2004/39
- Solmaz Fatih. (2004b). Şaduman Ağabey. *Penguen Dergisi*. Sayı: 2004/40 30 Eylül 2004.
- Solmaz Fatih. (2004c). Şaduman Ağabey. *Penguen Dergisi*. Sayı: 2004/41
- Solmaz Fatih. (2004d). Şaduman Ağabey. *Penguen Dergisi*. Sayı: 2004/42
- Solmaz Fatih. (2004e). Patates Baskı. *Penguen Dergisi*. Sayı: 2004/43
- Solmaz Fatih. (2005a). Şaduman Ağabey. *Penguen Dergisi*. Sayı: 2005/11
- Solmaz Fatih. (2005b). Şaduman Ağabey. *Penguen Dergisi*. Sayı: 2005/44

- Üstündağ, Metin. (1998). *İmza: Bir Dost*. İstanbul: Parantez yayınları.
- Üstündağ, Metin. (2000a). Açık Büfe. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2000/43.
- Üstündağ, Metin. (2000b). Açık Büfe. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2000/49.
- Üstündağ, Metin. (2002a). Açık Büfe. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2002/19.
- Üstündağ, Metin. (2002b). Açık Büfe. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2002/26.
- Yılmaz, Ahmet. (2002). Cümbür Cemaat. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2002/39
- Yılmaz, Ahmet. (2005a). Cümbür Cemaat. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2005/17
- Yılmaz, Ahmet. (2005b). Cümbür Cemaat. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 2005/24
- Yücel, Can. (1998). Özgeçmişim. *Leman Dergisi*. Sayı: 369.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrews, Robert, (1993). *The Columbia Dictionary of Quotations*. NY: Columbia University.
- Attardo, Salvatore, and V. Raskin.(1991) " Script Theory Revis(i)ted: Joke Similarity and Joke Representation Model." *Humor: IJHR* 4 293-347.
- Attardo, Salvatore. (1994). *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Barnes, Clive. (1992) *Comedy in Dance*. In: Sorrel, Walter –ed. - Pennington: Capella books.
- Blakemore, Diane (1992). *Understanding Utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bremmer, Jan, and H. Rodenburg, (1997).eds, *A Cultural History of Humour: From Antiquity to Present Day*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, Cambridge; UK: Polity Press.
- Brown, G. and G. Yule (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Coulthard, M. (1985). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Doğan, G. (1996). Söylemin Yorumlanması. *Söylem Üzerine*. Ankara: Hitit.
- Eastman, Max. (1972). *The Sense of Humor*. NY: Scribners 1921; NY: Octagon.
- Eco, Umberto. (1981). *Il comico e la regola*. Tr. 1986. *The Comic and the Rule*. In: *Travels in Hyperreality*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Freud, Sigmund. (1938). "On Humor." *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 9 1-6.

- Freud, Sigmund. (1960). *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*. J. Strachey, trans. NY: Norton.
- Fry, W. F. Jr. (1963). *Sweet Madness: A Study of Humor*. California: Pacific.
- Goldstein, Jeffrey, and Paul McGhee, eds. (1983). *Handbook of Humor Research*. 2 vols. New York: Springer.
- Green, M.G. (1996). *Pragmatics and natural language understanding*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Gregory, J. C. (1924). *The Nature of Laughter*. NY: Harcourt, Brace.
- Greig, J. Y. (1923). *The Psychology of Laughter and Comedy*. NY: Dodd, Mead.
- Grice, H. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Haynes, J. (1989). *Introducing Stylistics*. UK: Unwin Hyman.
- Keith-Spiegel, P. (1972). "Early Conceptions of Humor: Varieties and Issues", in Goldstein, McGhee (eds.), 3-39.
- Kintsch, Walter & Van Dijk Teun A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 85, 363-394.
- Koestler, Arthur. (1964). *The Act of Creation*. London: Hutchinson.
- Leech, Geoffrey (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- LaFollette, Hugh, and N. Shanks. (1993). "Belief and the Basis of Humor." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 30, 4 329-339.
- Lakoff, R.T. (1995). Conversational implicature. in J. Verschueren et al. (Eds.). *Handbook of pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publ. Co.
- Levinson, C.S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarty, M. (1997). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.

- McGhee, P.E. (1979). *Humor: Its Origin and Development*. San Francisco, Calif.: W.H. Freeman.
- Monro, David H. (1963). *Argument of Laughter*. (Orig. 1951) paperback Notre Dame.
- Morreall, John, ed. (1987). *The Philosophy of Laughter and Humor*. Albany, NY: SUNY.
- Nash, Walter. (1985) *The Language of Humour*. London: Longman.
- Nash, Walter. (1997). *Creating texts: an introduction*. London: Longman.
- Oring, Elliott. (1992). *Jokes and their Relations*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.
- Palmer, Jerry (1994). *Taking Humour Seriously*. London: Routledge.
- Raskin, V.(1984).*Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Ross, Alison (1998). *The Language of Humour*. London: Routledge.
- Rucki, Elizabeth. (1993). *Disrupting Humor: A Critical Study of Philosophical Theories of Humor*. Queen's University at Kingston, Canada, Ph.D. diss..
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sherzer, Joel. (1978). "Oh! That's a Pun and I Didn't Mean It." *Semiotica* 22, 3/4 335-350.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tannen, Deborah. (1984). *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Vogel, Susan C. (1989).*Humour: a semiogenetic approach*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Wilks, Y. (1986). *Relevance and beliefs*. In T. Meyers, K.
- Brown, and B. Mc Gonigle (eds).*Reasoning and Discourse Processes*. London: Academic Press.
- Yule, G. (1997). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: OUP.