

UNDERSTANDING HUMOR IN TEMEL JOKES: INSIGHTS FROM CONVERSATION ANALYSIS, CONVERSATIONAL MAXIMS, AND SPEECH ACT THEORY

Abdullah TOPRAKSOY

Dr., Istanbul University, Department of Linguistics, abdullah.topraksoy@istanbul.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-3240-3915

Topraksoy, A. (2025). Understanding humor in Temel jokes: Insights from conversation analysis, conversational maxims, and speech act theory. In O. Çınar, F. Başbuğ & H. Aydemir (Eds.), *Contemporary studies in linguistics I: IMU Linguistics 15th anniversary commemorative volume* (pp. 335–349). Artsürem. <https://doi.org/10.7816/imuling-15-2025-01X018>

ABSTRACT

What we find pleasurable and funny, or in its broader sense, what we laugh at can often be regarded as ‘humor’. Therefore, humor represents one of the main aspects of everyday interactions. Consequently, the issues like the reasons of laughter and what constitutes humor have been questioned since Plato and Aristotle. One reason that humor has come out as a theatrical form is the pleasure people take in laughing. Indeed, one of the most significant reflectors of humor in language is jokes. This study aims at analyzing and describing the linguistic features of humor in Temel Jokes, a cultural figure in Anatolia, regarding Conversation Analysis, Conversational Maxims and Speech Act Theory. 20 randomly chosen jokes of Temel were determined as the database of the study. In terms of Conversation Analysis, these jokes were studied in terms of turn taking and adjacency pairs; in terms of Speech Act analysis, Austin’s performative speech acts and the framework of Finegan and Besnier based on Searle’s study were made use of. The results showed that turn-by-turn allocation of speeches are dominant in Temel jokes and the humor in these jokes can be said to be created mainly by means of the violation of maxims and less likely by obeying to the maxims. Moreover, answers to the questions; assertions; statements and descriptions were significantly observed in Temel jokes and together with illocutionary acts that are mostly seen in the jokes, these acts also play a significant role in creating humor.

Keywords: Humor language, Temel jokes, Conversation analysis, Conversational maxims, Speech act theory

ÖZ

Keyifli ve komik bulduğumuz ya da daha geniş anlamıyla güldüğümüz şeyler genellikle ‘mizah’ olarak kabul edilebilir. Bu nedenle mizah, günlük etkileşimlerin ana

yönlerinden birini temsil eder. Sonuç olarak, gülmenin nedenleri ve mizahı neyin oluşturduğu gibi konular Platon ve Aristoteles'ten bu yana sorgulanmaktadır. Mizahın teatral bir form olarak ortaya çıkmasının bir nedeni de insanların gülmekten aldıkları hazdır. Nitekim mizahın dildeki en önemli yansıtıcılarından biri de fıkralardır. Bu çalışma, Anadolu'da kültürel bir figür olan Temel Fıkralarındaki mizahın dilsel özelliklerini Konuşma Analizi, Konuşma Maksimleri ve Söz Edimi Kuramı açısından incelemeyi ve betimlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Temel'in rastgele seçilen 20 fıkrası çalışmanın veri tabanı olarak belirlenmiştir. Konuşma Analizi açısından bu fıkralar sıra alma ve bitişiklik çiftleri açısından incelenmiş; Söz Edimi analizi açısından Austin'in edimsel söz edimleri ve Searle'ün çalışmasına dayanan Finegan ve Besnier'in çerçevesinden yararlanılmıştır. Sonuçlar, Temel fıkralarında konuşmaların sırayla dağılımının baskın olduğunu göstermiştir ve bu fıkralardaki mizahın büyük ölçüde özdeyişlerin ihlali yoluyla, daha az olasılıkla da özdeyişlere uyma yoluyla yaratıldığı söylenebilir. Ayrıca, Temel fıkralarında sorulara verilen cevaplar; iddialar; ifadeler ve betimlemeler önemli ölçüde gözlemlenmiştir ve fıkralarda çoğunlukla görülen söz edimleriyle birlikte bu edimler de mizah yaratmada önemli bir rol oynamaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Mizah dili, Temel fıkraları, Konuşma analizi, Konuşma maksimleri, Söz-Eylem Kuramı

1. Introduction

Individuals in a society communicate with one another via language, and humor can be regarded as a means of communication since the humorous meaning is transferred to the people through language. "The tendency of particular cognitive experiences to provoke laughter and provide amusement" is the definition of humor (Humor, 2015). Moreover, it is believed that humor does not occur on a single individual itself. To support this idea, Viktoroff (1953: 14) asserts that "one never laughs alone; laughter is always the laughter of a particular social group, and if one does not share the group's norms, feelings, and ideas, or if one is not part of it, one cannot associate oneself with it."

Jokes are significant indicators of humors. According to Berger (1976), humor in jokes is a particular kind of communication that creates an incongruent relationship or imaginative meaning and is delivered in a way that elicits laughter. A good many studies on the concept of humor in jokes have been carried out. However, studies on Turkish texts regarding humor in Turkish jokes have mostly been concentrated upon the aspects of literary language, and for this reason, the studies on different kinds of texts including the language of humor in terms of a linguistic perspective are relatively limited. This limitedness of linguistic studies on Turkish jokes in view of humor has been taken as an inspiration while beginning this study. In terms of conversation analysis, turn taking and adjacency pairs are two significant concepts for the present study. Turn taking refers both to the turns of different speakers in a conversation and what is said in each turn of the speakers. Put differently, turn-taking refers to the mechanism via which participants divide up the responsibility or right to engage in an

interactive activity (Jefferson, Schegloff, and Sacks, 1974). Adjacency pairs include the speeches of the speakers and are useful in determining the relationship between the speeches of different speakers in a conversation. This happens when a speaker's statement increases the likelihood of a specific form of response. Question-answer exchanges are the adjacency pairs that are used in conversations the most. Adjacency pairs have strong inherent expectations as a recognized component of conversational structure: inquiries are addressed, declarations are acknowledged, complaints are addressed, and greetings are reciprocated (Pridham 2001: 27). There are pre-allocated systems and turn-by-turn allocation in adjacency pairs. Pre-allocated systems in a conversation refer to long sentence structures uttered only one speaker at a single turn whereas turn-by-turn allocation reflects short and sequential sentence structures in which each person speaks respectively. In regard to conversational maxims, Grice, who introduced the Cooperative Principle, which is constituted by the maxims of conversation, states "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." (Grice 1975: 45). The cooperative principle can be divided into four maxims. These maxims are those of quality, relation, manner, and quantity, being related to "the speaker's commitment to truth, relevance, clarity, and to providing the right quantity of information at any given time" (Attardo 1994:274).

As for speech acts, the classification of speech acts by Finegan and Besnier (1989) based on Searle's speech acts and Austin's (1962) locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts are greatly significant concepts to be mentioned for the current study. Finegan and Besnier (1989: 304) define speech acts as acts performed by means of language. They classified speech acts as follows: *representatives, commissives, directives, declarations, expressives and verdictives*. Affirmations, declarations, claims, theories, explanations, and recommendations are all mentioned by representatives. Generally speaking, they can be classified as true or untrue. Speech acts like vows, threats, pledges, and promises that bind the speaker to a certain course of action are known as commissives. The goal of directives is to elicit responses from the addressee in the form of requests, challenges, invitations, commands, and so on. The conditions that declarations describe—blessings, hirings, firings, marriages, and mistrial declarations—come to pass. Expressives like "hello," "sorry," "congratulations," and "thank you" reveal the speaker's mental condition or attitude. Verdictives render evaluations or conclusions by rating, evaluating, appraising, and etc. Austin divides speech acts into three categories, referring to them as "performatives": The term "locutionary act" refers to the act of performing or saying something; it includes the actual utterance and its apparent meaning, which includes phonetic, phatic, and rhetic acts that correspond to the verbal, syntactic, and semantic aspects of any meaningful utterance; illocutionary acts are the pragmatic "illocutionary force" of the utterance, meaning that its intended

significance is a socially valid verbal action; and perlocutionary acts are the real effects and outcomes of illocutionary acts on people, such as persuading, convincing, frightening, enlightening, inspiring, or in some other way getting someone to do or realize something, whether on purpose or not.

The present study aims to analyze and describe the linguistic features of humor language in Temel Jokes regarding turn-taking and adjacency pairs within Conversation Analysis which emerged under the field of Discourse Analysis; Conversational Maxims developed by Grice (1975) as constituting The Cooperative Principle; and with regard to Speech Act Theory initiated by Austin (posthumously in 1962) and later developed by Searle (1969).

1.1 Significance of the study and research questions

Although a good many studies on the concept of humor in jokes have been carried out, studies on Turkish texts regarding humor in Turkish jokes have mostly been concentrated upon the aspects of literary language, and for this reason, the studies on different kinds of texts including the language of humor in terms of a linguistic perspective are relatively limited. This lack of linguistic studies on Turkish jokes in view of humor has been taken as an inspiration while beginning this study.

Temel jokes in the current study were analyzed within the scope of these research questions:

1. What are the conversational features in Temel jokes in respect to turn-taking and adjacency pairs?
2. Do conversational maxims play a significant role in creating humour in Temel jokes? If so, in what ways?
3. What features can be seen in Temel jokes in regard to speech acts?

2. Review of Literature on Humor

In its many forms, humor seems to be one of the most delineative characteristics of humans. Although humor is commonplace in everyday life, it is thought by some people to be an elusive and indefinite theoretical concept. Lafollette and Shanks (1993) point that humor is a pervasive feature of human life, the nature of which is elusive, and they add that it has generated little theoretical interest among the scholars. Nonetheless, this has not been seen by the scholars of various disciplines as an obstacle in studying humor, which has resulted in “epistemological hairsplitting” rather than clarifying the issue (Attardo 1994:1). Scholars have been studying humor in many fields of research, like psychology, philosophy, linguistics, sociology, and literature. In sooth, studies on humor began to increase especially in the second half of the 20th century and Davies (1987), Raskin (1987), Apte (1988), and Özünlü (1991) carried out studies emphasizing semantic, pragmatic, social and cultural dimensions of

humorous items. According to Eastman (as cited in Raskin 1985: 19), there are Ten Commandments of humor:

a) Be interesting, b) Be unimpassioned, c) Be effortless, d) Remember the difference between cracking practical jokes and conveying ludicrous impressions, e) Be plausible, f) Be sudden, g) Be neat, h) Be right with your timing, i) Give good measure of serious satisfaction, j) Redeem all serious disappointments

As Attardo (1994:4) points out, in the field of literary criticism, for example, that 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 humor. At the turn of the 20th century, Grieg (1923) was able to list a total of eighty-eight separate theories of humor but many of these theories had borrowed heavily from one another, and they differ only in details. Keith-Spiegel (1972) classifies various humor theories into eight categories that can be summarized as: Superiority Theory, Biological Instinct and Evolution Theory, Incongruity Theory, Surprise Theory, Ambivalence Theory, Release and Relief Theory, Configurational Theory and Psycho-analytic Theory. Sometime later, Raskin (1985: 31- 36) divides the theories of humor into three categories: incongruity theories, hostility theories and release theories. For the sake of relevance, they will not be explained in this paper. The following section clarifies the linguistic perspective on humor theorization.

2.1 Linguistic theorization of humor

It is possible to divide humor into two categories: nonverbal and verbal humor. The former contains forms such as cartoons, gestures, facial expressions, and clumsiness observed in both humans and animals whereas the latter includes canned jokes, conversational jokes, witticisms, puns and every day or media discourses, both written and spoken. Such a diversified and broad field cannot be narrowed down to a discipline, and it is nearly impossible to come up with an all-embracing theory of humor. However, if one talks about verbal humor, it becomes a must to apply a linguistic insight to the field. Later, some questions such as given below have been listed by Ermida (2008: 41) as the questions that should be dealt with by linguists studying humor: “What is the language of humor? Is there one, to begin with? In what way, and to what extent, is humor conveyed linguistically? Does it conform to common language usage, or does it subvert its norms and conventions? What linguistic mechanisms do comedians exploit? Are there specific linguistic resources available to humorous use? If so, how do they work?”.

From above mentioned theories, linguistics has sided with incongruity theories since these theories are essentialist, i.e., the attempt to pinpoint what makes humor funny (Attardo, 1994).

Linguistic approaches to verbal humor have opened the path for more systematic and falsifiable humor theories and “the period from the 1980s to the present has witnessed sustained and progressively heightened

interest among language scholars in linguistically based accounts of verbal humor” (Simpson, 2003: 16). Since then, linguists have contributed to the field with their renewed theories that offers new hypotheses about the cognitive processes of humor. Raskin’s (1985) *Semantic Script Theory of Humor* and Attardo and Raskin’s (1991) *General Theory of Verbal Humor* are still considered as the leading and the most influential theories in linguistics.

2.1.1 Semantic script theory of humor (SSTH)

In Ritchie’s (2004: 69) words, “the Semantic Script Theory of Humor (hereafter, the SSTH) is one of the few attempts to approach verbally expressed humor in a systematic and theoretical fashion, and as such is to be welcomed”. General aim of the SSTH is to form information – processing system which is able to account for the humorousness of a text. For the SSTH, the central aspect of verbal humor was semantic/pragmatic, and it explains the funniness of a joke with scripts or frames defined as “an organized complex of information about some entity, in the broadest sense: an object (real or imaginary), an event, an action, a quality, etc.” (Attardo, 2001: 2).

2.1.2 General theory of verbal humor (GTVH)

Attardo and Raskin (1991) revised the SSTH and extended it into GTVH. GTVH has been further extended by Attardo (1997, 2001) to analyze not only jokes but also narratives, stand-up or longer humorous texts. Attardo (2001: 22) claims that “whereas the SSTH was a semantic theory of humor, the GTVH is a linguistic theory at large – that is, it includes other areas of linguistics as well, including, most notably, textual linguistics, the theory of narrativity, and pragmatics broadly conceived”. The extension has been made with six “knowledge resources” (KRs in short) which are: the script opposition (SO) - known from the SSTH, the logical mechanism (LM), the target (TA), the narrative strategy (NS), the language (LA) and the situation (SI).

For more detailed explanations and some logical mechanisms and examples in jokes, see Attardo (1997) and Attardo et al. (2002).

According to Raskin (1985), the text of a joke is clear up to the punchline. The punchline forces a change in script and opens the hearer's eyes to the fact that there are multiple ways to understand the text from the outset. Furthermore, covered by Raskin (ibid) is the concept of the "non-bona-fide mode of communication." He claims that the manner that non-bona-fide communication deviates from bona-fide communication—which is sincere, serious, and information-conveying—is by breaking one or more of the four conversational maxims of Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle. Moreover, Raskin (1985:100) notes that the speaker may violate these maxims intentionally or inadvertently; in the former scenario, the speaker is conscious of the semantic ambiguity s/he has generated, but in the latter scenario, the speaker is unaware of it. Thus, even if the speaker in the later

instance is sincere, the hearer will see the statement as being dishonest, meaning they will pick up on the ambiguity.

There is a study carried out by Karahan (1997) which is similar to the present study in terms of the features analyzed. In that study, she analyzed Nasreddin Hodja jokes within the viewpoint of conversation analysis and speech acts. She found out that in Nasreddin Hodja's speech turns in the text of jokes, there are pre-allocated systems of turn taking since there is no pressure on Hodja while talking to others and there is no one to interrupt his speech; whereas the other people, whom Hodja talks to, feel pressure on themselves due to Hodja and thus their speech is relatively short and this refers to turn-by-turn allocation. In terms of adjacency pairs, the speech goes on in turns with different people's talking. An important point here is that Hodja does not permit others to talk a second time in a row. According to the classification of Finegan ve Besnier (1989); verdictives, directives and representatives have been found in the Hodja's jokes in regard to speech acts. In addition, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts have mostly been observed. Regarding the conversational maxims, Hodja sometimes obey the maxims when he tells the truth on the jokes and sometimes does violate one or more maxims intentionally so as to make the readers think on the jokes by means of implicature and later find the humor themselves.

In another study, Uçar (2014) studied the puns collected from the specialized authentic corpus which is built from the transcriptions of the video recordings of the television show *Komedi Dükkanı* 'Comedy Shop'. Puns can be defined shortly as the use of words in a way that suggests two or more meanings which are usually incompatible and thus the creation of humorous effect. The instances used in *Komedi Dükkanı* 'Comedy Shop' were categorized and from the analysis, Uçar determined that these puns has a different structure from other humor genres like stand-up and sitcoms and thereby puns can be defined as a new humor genre.

3. Method

3.1 Sample

To test the questions of the study, lots of Temel jokes were found. However, although humor is created through linguistic features in some jokes, it results from adult jokes in some others. Thus, with the aim of censoring unwanted meanings, this latter kind of jokes were excluded from the scope of the study and 20 randomly chosen jokes of Temel were determined as the database of the study. They were gathered from various websites since it is easier to get them from websites given in the references section.

3.2 Data collection and analysis

The framework of analysis in Temel jokes was adapted from General Theory of Verbal Humor (GTVH) based on three different levels.

In regard to Conversation Analysis, these jokes were studied in terms of turn taking which determines the turns of different characters in the jokes and adjacency pairs that include the speeches of these characters and their relationships and later conversational maxims in Temel jokes were analyzed in order to find out their importance in creating humor.

Finally, speech act analysis was carried out on Temel jokes. In this part, first, the framework of the classification of speech acts by Finegan and Besnier (1989) based on Searle's study was employed and then Austin's performative speech acts were investigated in the jokes.

Later on, the findings were described, and the results gathered from the analysis were based on descriptive statistics and given in tables with relevant numbers of instances and their frequencies.

It is crucial to note that this study adopts a text-based methodology, with a specific focus on delineating and interpreting linguistic features within Temel jokes. The intent is not to generalize humor language but to offer a detailed account of linguistic nuances specific to this particular genre. The analysis and numerical data were processed without the use of any software tool.

For convenience and clarity before entering the analysis of jokes, a short description of characters in Temel jokes is given: the main character in these jokes is mainly Temel. He is from Rize in some jokes and from Trabzon in some others. Dursun and/or İdris are secondary characters. Fadime is either Temel's wife or his lover. All the characters, primarily Temel, generally perform illogical or absurd behaviors in jokes to create humor and to make the readers laugh.

Notably, the textual scripts of the jokes are not included in this paper for brevity. Interested readers can access both the English and original scripts, each numerically aligned with the linguistic analysis section, through the provided link below:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gQ325uls50CXuRXEru3xl vVTtoKFMnw9c/edit>

4. Results

As the analyses were text based relevant to each joke and each category, it is a long file. Therefore, the linguistic analyses carried out can be reached at the link provided below:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1jEORkiz4jFMsbJBQ2F12qKoZMldHTYAzVs7vHf_M2VeI/edit?usp=share_link

The results of the study are described in tables and explanations for tables are given beneath them. Table 1 shows the numbers related to turn-taking and adjacency pairs. Table 2 demonstrates conversational maxims occurred in the jokes. Table 3 shows speech acts based on Finegan and Besnier's classification and Table 4 reflects Austin's speech acts.

Table 1. Uses of turn takings and adjacency pairs in Temel jokes

Categories	Instances in the jokes (n=)	Percentage
Turn-by-turn allocation	18	90%
Pre-allocated systems	1	5%
Uncategorized	1	5%
TOTAL	20	100%

Out of 20 jokes, there is a huge dominance of turn-by-turn allocation of speeches over the other categories as seen in Table 1. This means that the talking-turns of the characters are sequential and that Temel has no pressure on the other characters in these jokes. There is one instance of a ‘pre-allocated system’ in the study and it results from the announce in the plane. The content of the announce is pre- determined and thus it can be regarded as a pre-allocated system. In addition, there is another instance which is ‘uncategorized’. This group occurs since there is no conversation in one of the jokes analyzed. Temel talks in a monolog, not in a dialog.

Table 2. Violations of maxims

Category of maxims	Violation of maxims(n=)	Percentage
Relevance	7	30,43%
Quantity	5	21,73%
Quality	2	8,69%
Manner	1	4,34%
No violation	8	34,78%
TOTAL	23	100%

There are 23 instances of maxims observed in total in the jokes. The humor in these jokes is created sometimes with the help of the violation of maxims and sometimes of obeying the maxims. Violation of maxims (n=15, 65,22% out of 23 total) is the one that is most observed in the jokes. This means that Temel generally gives responses to other characters but in an irrelevant (n=7, 30,43% out of 23 total) way and by doing so, the humor is created. Violation of quantity (n=5, 21,73% out of 23 total) follows it and humor is said to have been created in some instances through the violation of the maxim of quantity. However, there are also instances in which humor is created by means of obeying the maxims. There are 8 instances (34,78% out of 23 total) in this category.

Table 3. Speech acts in Temel jokes based on Finegar and Besnier’ s classification

Categories	Instances(n=)	Percentage
Representatives	20	66,66%
Verdictives	6	20%
Directives	4	13,33%
Declarations	0	0%
Expressives	0	0%
Commissives	0	0%
TOTAL	30	100%

Out of 30 instances of speech acts given in Table 3, the most observed category is ‘representatives’ with 20 instances (66,66%) in the jokes. ‘Verdictives’ follow ‘representatives’ with 6 instances (20%) and lastly ‘directives’ (13,33%) have been observed with 4 instances. The interpretation of this result is that there are many answers given to the questions in the jokes, and assertions, statements, claims and descriptions are generally found in Temel jokes. Furthermore, the presence of verdictives in the jokes show that some assessments or judgments are made in the conversations of these jokes. Finally, the instances of directives in the jokes represent that commands and requests are seen during conversation in some jokes. Commissives, declarations and expressives have not been observed and this means that, in terms of humor in Temel jokes, there is no place for them since humor in these jokes is not based on these categories.

Table 4. Austin’s speech acts in Temel jokes

Categories	Instances(n=)	Percentage
Illocutionary acts	26	43,33%
Locutionary acts	21	35%
Perlocutionary acts	13	21,66%
TOTAL	60	100%

It is clear from the Table 4 that illocutionary acts (n=26, 43,33% out of 60 total) are the mostly observed speech acts. This means that illocutionary acts in the jokes represent that there are questions and requests mostly used in the conversation of the jokes and humor is created mostly through questions and requests. In the second place, locutionary acts (n=21, 35% out of 60 total) follow illocutionary acts and this reflects that in many parts of the jokes, humor is behind the statements uttered by the characters. Finally, the small presence of perlocutionary acts (n=13, 21,66% out of 60 total) refers to the instances in which characters try to persuade or otherwise get someone to do or realize something in the jokes. The humor is created in few numbers of jokes by doing so.

5. Discussion

In regard to turn-taking and adjacency pairs, turn-by-turn allocation of speeches are dominant in Temel jokes since the main character Temel does not have any pressure on the other characters and the sequences of turn-taking and duration of talking are more or less similar for any character in the jokes. In addition, the humor in Temel jokes can be said to have been created sometimes by means of the violation of maxims and sometimes by obeying the maxims. However, the most violated maxim is the maxim of relevance. This means that Temel generally gives responses to other characters but in an irrelevant way and by doing so, the humor is created. Examining the classification of speech acts by Finegar and Besnier, a substantial preponderance of 'representative' speech acts is observed in Temel jokes. Responses to questions, assertions, statements, and descriptions emerge as prominent linguistic features, overshadowing the relatively sparse instances of assessments, judgments, and commands within these narratives. The overarching reliance on question-and-answer formats further aligns Temel jokes with Austin's notion of illocutionary acts, establishing a significant link between linguistic acts and humor creation. In parallel, the investigation into locutionary acts reveals that humor often emanates from the statements articulated by characters in Temel jokes. This underscores the centrality of locutionary acts as vehicles for humor, underscoring the linguistic intricacies that contribute to comedic effects. While perlocutionary acts, encompassing persuasion, convincing, and influencing actions, play a role in humor creation, they constitute a smaller proportion of instances within Temel jokes.

When compared to the results of the study on Nasreddin Hodja Jokes carried out by Karahan (1997), some points can be mentioned between Temel Jokes and Nasreddin Hodja Jokes. First of all, turn-by-turn allocation of speeches are dominant in Temel jokes in terms of turn-takings since Temel does not have any pressure on or dominance over the other characters while pre-allocated systems are seen in Hodja's jokes due to his dominance in his jokes. Secondly, moving on maxims, the humor in both characters' jokes are created through mostly the violation and, to a lesser degree, obeying to these maxims. Thirdly, while the Hodja is a dominant character and thus perlocutionary acts can be greatly encountered in his jokes, illocutionary and locutionary acts are frequently observed in Temel Jokes since he is not a dominant character giving commands to others or he does not have any pressure on the other characters in the jokes.

In summary, the exploration of Temel jokes reveals a nuanced interplay of linguistic elements, wherein turn-taking dynamics, maxim violations, and speech acts collectively contribute to the intricate fabric of humor. This study adds a distinctive layer to the understanding of humor in linguistic contexts, underscoring the unique comedic dynamics inherent in Temel jokes.

6. Conclusion

This study undertook a comprehensive analysis of Temel jokes, employing a multifaceted approach encompassing turn-taking and adjacency pairs, conversational maxims, and speech acts classified within the frameworks of Finegan-Besnier and Austin. The findings offer valuable insights into the dynamics of humor creation within the context of Temel jokes.

The dominant observation in turn-taking dynamics reveals a conspicuous preference for a turn-by-turn allocation of speeches over pre-allocated systems. This pattern suggests that Temel, as the main character, operates without exerting pressure on other characters, fostering a conversational landscape characterized by uniformity in turn-taking sequences and duration of speech for each character.

Furthermore, the analysis of humor in Temel jokes underscores a noteworthy reliance on the violation of conversational maxims as a primary mechanism for generating comedic effects. Notably, the maxim of relevance emerges as the most frequently violated, with Temel often responding to other characters in an irrelevant manner, thus constituting a foundational element in the creation of humor.

Delving into the realm of speech acts, the study reveals a marked preference for 'representative' acts, particularly answers to questions, assertions, statements, and descriptions within Temel jokes. Assessments, judgments, and commands, while present, constitute a minor proportion within the narrative. Given the prevalent question-and-answer format of Temel jokes, a predominance of illocutionary acts, as theorized by Austin, becomes evident, playing a pivotal role in humor creation.

Moreover, the study illuminates the nuanced role of locutionary acts, indicating that humor occasionally emanates from the statements made by characters in Temel jokes. In contrast, acts related to persuading, convincing, or influencing actions are infrequent within these narratives, suggesting a limited role in humor creation.

In summary, while the inherent illogical and nonsensical behaviors of characters contribute to the humor in Temel jokes, a deeper examination reveals the pivotal role played by linguistic features. The intentional violation of conversational maxims, coupled with a reliance on specific speech acts, emerges as a robust mechanism for humor creation within Temel jokes. These linguistic intricacies, outlined in the study, significantly contribute to our understanding of the unique comedic dynamics inherent in Temel jokes.

References

- Apte, M. (1988). Disciplinary boundaries in humorology: An anthropologist's ruminations. *International Journal of Humor Research*, 1(1), 5–26.
- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humor*. Mouton de Gruyter.

- Attardo, S. (1997). The semantic foundations of cognitive theories of humor. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 10(4), 395–420.
- Attardo, S., & Raskin, V. (1991). Script theory revis(it)ed: Joke similarity and joke representation model. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 4, 293–347.
- Attardo, S., Attardo, C. H., & Ritchie, S. M. (2002). Script oppositions and logical mechanisms: Modeling incongruities and their resolutions. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 15(1), 3–46.
- Austin, J. L. (1962/2005). *How to do things with words* (2nd ed.). Harvard University Press.
- Barnes, C. (1992). Comedy in dance. In W. Sorrell (Ed.), *Pennington*. Capella Books.
- Berger, A. A. (1976). Anatomy of the joke. *Journal of Communication*, 26, 113–115.
- Davies, C. (1987). Language, identity, and ethnic jokes about stupidity. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 65, 39–52.
- Ermida, I. (2008). *The language of comic narratives: Humor construction in short stories*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Finegan, E., & Besnier, N. (1989). *Language: Its structure and use*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Freud, S. (1960). *Jokes and their relation to the unconscious* (J. Strachey, Trans.). Norton. (Original work published 1905)
- Gregory, J. C. (1924). *The nature of laughter*. Harcourt, Brace.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Humour. (2015, December 13). In *Wikipedia*. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Humour>
- Karahan, F. (1997). Nasreddin Hoca'nın söylemi üzerine bir deneme. In H.Ü. *İngiliz Dilbilimi Bölümü 25. Yıl Yazıları (1972–1997)*. Bizim Büro Basımevi.
- Keith-Spiegel, P. (1972). Early conceptions of humor: Varieties and issues. In J. H. Goldstein & P. E. McGhee (Eds.), *The psychology of humor* (pp. 3–39). Academic Press.
- Koestler, A. (1964). *The act of creation*. Hutchinson.
- LaFollette, H., & Shanks, N. (1993). Belief and the basis of humor. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 30(4), 329–339.
- Morreall, J. (1987). *The philosophy of laughter and humor*. SUNY Press.
- Özünlü, Ü. (1991). Fıkralar ve gülmece dili. *Çağdaş Türk Dili*, 37.
- Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic mechanisms of humour*. D. Reidel.
- Ritchie, G. (2004). *The linguistic analysis of jokes*. Routledge.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

- Simpson, P. (2003). *On the discourse of satire: Towards a stylistic model of satirical humor*. John Benjamins.
- Speech act. (2015, November 16). In *Wikipedia*. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Speech_act
- Uçar, A. (2014). Gülmece ve gülme kaynağı olarak sözcük oyunları. *Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 11(1), 17–43.
- Viktoroff, D. (1953). *Introduction to social psychology of laughter*. Presses Universitaires de France.

The sources from which Temel Jokes are retrieved

- 'Hasan'. Retrieved October 8, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/hasan.html>.
- 'Mazeret'. Retrieved October 8, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/mazeret.html>.
- 'Önem almak'. Retrieved October 8, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/nlem-almak.html>.
- 'Bakış'. Retrieved October 8, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/bak.html>.
- 'Islaklık'. Retrieved October 8, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/islaklik.html>.
- 'Çirkinlik'. Retrieved October 8, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/irkinlik.html>.
- 'Yılan'. Retrieved October 8, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/ylan.html>.
- 'Su derin mi?'. Retrieved October 8, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/su-derin-mi.html>.
- 'Temelin Treni'. Retrieved October 8, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/temelin-treni.html>.
- 'Tek Asker'. Retrieved October 8, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/tek-asker.html>.
- 'Karne'. Retrieved October 5, 2015 from <http://www.fkracenneti.com/temel-fikralari/karne-2-2-2>.
- 'Cinsiyet'. Retrieved October 5, 2015 from <http://www.gulum.net/fikra/bolumler.php?op=goster&id=292>.
- 'Temel ve Zeka Gücü'. Retrieved October 5, 2015 from <http://www.gulum.net/fikra/bolumler.php?op=goster&id=1113>.
- 'Kiminle Evli?'. Retrieved October 5, 2015 from http://www.kubidik.com/fikralar/temel_fikralari.htm.
- 'Temele Mercedes Lazım'. Retrieved October 5, 2015 from http://www.trsohbeti.net/pages/fikra_oku.htm.
- 'Temel Uçakta'. Retrieved October 5, 2015 from http://www.erenet.net/fikralar.php?op=FikraOku&id=Temel_Ucakta_bc3.
- 'Avcı Temel'. Retrieved October 5, 2015 from <http://temeldursunfikralari.blogspot.com/2008/09/avc-temel.html>.
- 'Tanker'. Retrieved October 5, 2015 from

<http://www.fikrasi.com/tanker-10011.htm>.

'Adi neydi ?' . Retrieved October 5, 2015 from

<http://www.fikrasi.com/adi-neydi-513.htm>.

'Temel ile Fadime parkta' . Retrieved October 5, 2015 from

<http://www.fikrasi.com/temel-ile-fadime-parkta-10073.htm>.