ANTI-PROVERB AS A TYPE OF INTERTEXTUAL JOKE[1]

Öznur TUZCU[2]

Abstract

Intertextuality is one of the most complicated disciplines of literary studies, which a large number of theorists have attempted to define; still, the definitions greatly differ from each other in terms of their focal points. Whilst some scholars such as Rifaterre (1994) and Barthes (2001) emphasize the role of readers and reading process in the discipline, others like Bakhtin (1981) and Kristeva (1980) are mainly concerned with the relationship among texts. Studies have investigated intertextuality in different fields such as advertising (Oppenheim, 2014), sitcom series (Kinnonen, 2012), music (Barron, 2015), and so on; our study attempts to examine intertextual references on the basis of creating humor, specifically, through the popular phenomenon of anti-proverbs. In other words, anti-proverbs have been analyzed from the point of the view of humor theories –superiority, incongruity, and relief theories, attempting to discover how the intertextual references function in creating a humorous content in the new text- anti-proverbs.

Keywords: intertextuality, humor, anti-proverb, intertextual jokes

METİNLERARASI MİZAHIN BİR TÜRÜ OLARAK ANTİ-ATASÖZLERİ

Özet

Metinlerarasılık, çok sayıda kuramcının tanımlamaya çalıştığı, edebi çalışmaların en karmaşık alanlarından biridir. Dolayısıyla bu alanda yapılan tanımlamalar, odak noktaları açısından birbirinden oldukça farklıdır. Rifaterre (1994) ve Barthes (2001) gibi bazı düşünürler okurların ve okuma sürecinin bu disiplindeki rolünü vurgularken; Bakhtin (1981) ve Kristeva (1980) gibi diğer düşünürler daha çok bu disiplinin diğer metinlerle ilişkisi üzerinde durmuşlardır. Metinlerarasılığı reklam (Oppenheim, 2014), durum komedisi (Kinnonen, 2012), müzik (Barron, 2015) gibi farklı alanlarda inceleyen çalışmalar bulunmaktadır. Bu makale ise, özellikle popüler bir olgu olan

34

anti-atasözleri aracılığıyla mizah ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlayan metinlerarası referansları incelemeye çalışmıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, metinlerarası referansların yeni bir metin olan anti-atasözlerinde mizahi bir içerik oluşturmada nasıl bir işlev gördüğü ortaya koymaya çalışılmış ve anti-atasözleri Üstünlük, Uyuşmazlık ve Rahatlama Teorileri olan mizah teorileri açısından analiz edilmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: metinlerarasılık, mizah, anti-atasözü, metinlerarası referanslar

Introduction

Intertextuality is defined as "a text's dependence on prior words, concepts, connotations, codes, conventions, unconscious practices and texts. Each text is an intertext that borrows, knowingly or not, from the immense archive of previous culture" (Leitch, 2001: 21 cited from Zengin (2016). The term "intertextuality" was coined by Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s, though it is a common belief that the concept of intertextuality dates back to the ancient times, to the first person, first text and discourse (Alfaro, 1996) and recorded in different forms that can be found in the classics. For example, Plato (c. 428 B.C.E. – c. 348 B.C.E.) considers the creation of poets as a copy of earlier studies, for Aristotle (384 B.C.E. – March 7, 322 B.C.E.), it is a reduction and intensification of the works of written literature and the oral tradition of myths, stock characters or social codes of conduct. As a concept, intertextuality has been defined by various theorists such as Sassure (1966), Bakhtin (1981), Barthes (2001), Kristeva (1980), Riffaterre (1994), Genette (2011) and so on and despite having their own intertextual theories, theorists and practitioners come to the common point that "no text exists own its own, and all texts are in a relationship with other texts". The more present day theoreticians as both originators and contributors such as Umberto Eco, Harold Bloom, Laurent Jenny, and so on who have an influence in the creation of intertextuality as a critical theory will be kept out of the scope of this study due to the limited length of the study and to keep the focus of the paper on the practical study on Anti-proverbs known as humorous structures from the perspective of intertextuality.

The theory of intertextuality has its own origins in the exceptional work of the Swiss linguist Saussure (1966), in the early twentieth century. Saussure's revolutionary structuralism and his ideas of arbitrariness in signs and their differential aspect provide a basis of intertextuality in the sense that the meaning of a word comes from its difference from other linguistic elements rather than its relation to things. Besides, Saussure's linguistic theory of claiming that language operates in two axes: syntagmatic and paradigmatic is another face of intertextuality. As such, syntagmatic axis is representative of the juxtaposition of words in

order to compose a sentence; whilst the paradigmatic axis represents the selection of choice of words from possible words. In essence, stemming from the word level, texts are interrelated with each other and their meanings depend on their relationship to other texts. So, intertextuality is an inevitable fact of creating meaning and texts.

Intertextuality is a notion belonging to the post structuralist (1960) and post-modernist theory in a way that the reader who has a cultural and historical background determines the meaning of the text, whilst modern attitude is objective. In the broadest sense, the post structuralist theory sees text as an object to be decoded and denies objectivity in interpretation, plus, the discipline of post-structuralism claims that there is no work on its own, all the works emerge from each other. In this respect, it is believed that all texts are interdependent upon each other. Moreover, for Kristeva (1980), any work of art is an inter-text, interacting with, rewritten, transformed and parodied versions of other texts, which is considered as intertextuality. Alfaro (1996) defines intertextuality as traces and, tracing of others, due to the differential and historical features of texts and adds that the concept of intertextuality has drawn attention to the interrelation of texts rather than being individual structures.

For Kristeva (1980), the interdependence of both literary and non-literary texts is the primary focus of intertextuality. Besides, according to Aktulum (2007), translations of books from various fields make the relationship among other sciences possible. Norrick (1989) extending the content of intertextuality from written text to spoken as it is clear in his definition "intertextuality occurs any time one text suggests or requires references to some other identifiable text or stretch of discourse spoken or written". Norrick (1989) points out that unnamed sources are freely used in everyday conversation whilst scholarly texts use intertextual references as accurately and conspicuously as possible. Zengin (2016) defines intertextuality in its simplest sense, as creating texts by borrowing words and concepts from other texts, and adds that writers are actually readers of previous or concurrent texts which are naturally affected by other texts in various ways such as references, citation, and so on. Bakhtin (1981) argues that every text has been written / uttered previously, so a writer or a speaker is not the creator of what they write or utter, none of us "Adam". Therefore, it seems impossible, that any text is unique and not used before, so there is a dialogism instead of monologism in literary works. Bakhtin's dialogism is related with intertextuality in the sense that "the meaning of other word or utterance is formed through the speaker's relation to other people, other people's words and expressions and the specific culture experienced in a

specific time and place." (Zengin, 2016). Bakhtin's theory of dialogism and heteroglossia (the presence of two or more voices in a text or other artistic works) paved the way for Julia Kristeva's theory of intertextuality.

Intertextuality, for Kristeva (1980), occurs in each text and there is not a unique text whether be literary or non-literary, due to the dialogic nature of language and the generation of meaning derived from a text's relation with other texts. Henceforth, the authors are not viewed as the creators of the original texts but rather compilers of previous texts by transforming, rewriting or parodying them. According to Kristeva (1980), writers are readers of the texts before they are creators of the texts, which is also a post-structuralist and post-modernist attitude. Kristeva (1980) asserts the subjectivity of language and adds that every utterance or text has its performer's (writer or speaker) assumptions and knowledge, so, texts and utterances can be naturally interpreted differently. That may be the reason for the occurrence of a wide range of different interpretations of one single poem or other literary works. Kristeva (1980) also emphasizes that the reading process is both complicated and productive in a way that old texts interfere with the new texts and the reader shifts from the role of consumer to that of producer, by interpreting and finally producing the meaning.

The productivity in intertextuality is also seen in the works of Barthes, who asserts that a text is a process of production even after its writing process. Barthes defines text as a combination of old texts and every text is created out of other texts, therefore, as Terry Eagleton defines Barthesian conception of text "All literary texts are woven out of other literary texts, not in the conventional sense that they bear the traces of "influence" but in the more radical sense that every word, phrase or segment is a reworking of our writings which precede or surround the individual work. There is no such thing as literary 'originality' so such a thing as the 'first' literary work: all literature is intertextual (2008: 19 cited from Zengin (2016). All the quotations and insertions shape the reader's interpretation and signification of the text which leads to the emergence of different meanings and interpretations of a single text that reminds us that Barthes's declaring the death of the author and celebrating the birth of the reader. Barthes asserts this idea because according to him, the meaning of the text is not single, on the contrary, the text is plural, which means that both the readers of the texts and the authors of the texts are always in interaction with other texts. Therefore, the generation of the meanings of a text occurs at both the production and the reception level.

Genette defines "transtextuality" or textual transcendence as the relation between a text with other texts or different from its own, and categorizes into five types in which intertextuality is a text that contains words coming from another text or writer; paratextuality is a text in which creators are influenced by items which are not in the text themselves, such as titles; metatextuality which is about to citing of another works' texts in a different text; architextuality which is about a text by title; and hypertextuality which contains something like translation and adaptation which is limited to a text, but also to film, painting, and even music (Mirenayat & Soofastaei, 2015).

Intertextuality which is consciously or unconsciously applied from the previous texts can be detected by the reader in a number of ways such as direct quotation, citation, allusion, echo, reference, imitation, collage, parody, pastiche, literary conventions. All these examples of intertextuality provide a text to be either transformation or reproduction versions of previous texts. From this aspect, anti-proverbs are one of the more salient examples of intertextuality and this study attempts to examine the anti-proverbs as an intertextual practice, humor and anti-proverbs, which are interconnected notions, and will be explained in the following sections.

Furthermore, intertextual reference helps create humor in many ways. "Intertextual jokes can involve references from different literary genre sources as indicated in Norrick's work (1989) such as other jokes, a well-known phrase from literature (Shakespeare), a nursery rhyme, a post card, a proverbial phrase, a popular song, and so on, therefore, as a part of wider artistic practice, intertextuality evidently crosses its boundaries. Attempting to understand the notion of humor, the following section deals with the theories of humor that will be assessed from the perspective of linguistics in this study, which focuses on the humorous effect of anti-proverbs created through intertextuality.

Humor

Humor, as determined by the common sense, is defined as 'something that makes a person laugh or smile' (Ross, 2015) and due to its being a multi-disciplinary concept has been studied in many fields of research such as psychology, philosophy, linguistics, sociology, literature and so on. Humor will be assessed from the perspective of linguistics in this study which focuses on the humorous effect of anti-proverbs created with intertextuality. It should be noted that most humor in anti-proverbs comes from the comparison between the source and the new text. Therefore, the recognition of the source text is necessary to achieve a

humorous impact on the receiver, which determines the achievement by the laughter of the receiver at the correct moment.

In his study Norrick (1989) introduces the terminology and theoretical perspective of humorous discourses and asserts that the humorous part of a discourse occurs in the punch line, "The build-up of any joke introduces a specific scene or point of view which the punch line undermines by introducing a conflicting point of view or a new scene entirely". Norrick (1989) notes that a dual processing is experienced by conveying the mental attention from the original version of the data (the original source text) to the new text (the adapted version of the source text) which causes a confliction, and results in a simultaneous double association - bisociation (Koestler's term (1964) cited from Norrick (1989)). The punch line rises to the occasion during this bisociation process of the audience and surprises and finally generates laughter. So, humor noticeably depends on the audiences' intelligence and background knowledge to recognize the source text. Intertextuality drives all this mechanism. The performer's performance in creating and introducing a new text by applying pre-existent text anticipating that the new text will become a humorous discourse, and laughter is a response to the new text, based on the ability of the audience to connect the new text to his/her previous knowledge from a movie, a book, a sculpture, a proverb and so on, which sounds 'intertextuality'.

Humor has been studied and attempts to be clarified by different scholars such as Morreal, Raskin, Attardo, Monro, Lyttle, Spiegel and so on from the point of view of the definition of humor to the characteristics of response or both (Smuts, 2006). However, the theories of humor are simply divided into three main categories: Superiority Theory, Relief Theory and Incongruity Theory.

According to the superiority theory of humor, human nature has a feeling of a sudden sense of superiority over others that can create humor or amusement. Mulder and Nijholt (2002) explain the superiority theory as "laughing about the misfortunes of others; it reflects our own superiority". For example, the extract "If I were only casting the White Swan the role would be yours" is an allusion to the movie Black Swan and it can be recognized only by the viewers who saw the movie Black Swan before (Kinnunen, 2012). Indeed, this notion of theory of superiority dates back to Plato (c. 428 B.C.E. – c. 348 B.C.E.) and Aristotle (384 B.C.E. – March 7, 322 B.C.E.). Plato also suggests that deficiencies, limitations, weaknesses of human drive others to laugh and it makes them feel superior than other people, for example, human may see themselves as wealthier, more handsome or smarter than they really

are ("Laughter - Superiority Theory", 2018). Plato again emphasizes that humor derives from the mixture of pleasure and pain that lies in the malice of amusement (Smuts, 2006). Aristotle develops the theory of Plato and believes that laughable is a subdivision of the ugly, plus, laughter can be a desirable thing so long as it is not too much. Hobbes characterizes laughter as a 'sudden glory' and an expression of a sudden realization that we are better than others (Ross, 2015).

Another theory of humor is the relief theory. This theory attempts to describe humor from a psycho-psychological viewpoint. Freud (1928) asserts the idea that humans save "psychic energy" generated by repression and released by humor. Alleging that the human brain creates so-called "cencors" in order to create barriers to prevent from thinking "unpleasant" or "forbidden" thoughts such as death, sex, … so" to be able to elude these barriers jokes are a way of releasing the "physic energy in the form of laughter. According to Mulder and Nijholt (2010), this release is spontaneous and expresses itself in laughter.

While the Superiority Theory says that the cause of laughter is the feeling of superiority, and that the Relief Theory thinks that it is the release of nervous energy, the Incongruity Theory stipulates that it is the perception of "something" incongruous—something that violates our mental patterns and expectations. This approach was taken by James Beattie, Immanuel Kant, Arthur Schopenhauer, Søren Kierkegaard, philosophers and psychologists. Incongruity is now the dominant theory of humor in philosophy and psychology ("Author and Citation Information for "Philosophy of Humor"", 2018).

The incongruity theory determines that all humor derives from the comparison between the source and the new text in a way that humans compare what they know and expect in everyday life and what they experience in the new situation. The differences which contradict with their expectations create a sense of incongruity and so humor in humans. In other words, humor is widely regarded as a response to an incongruity which is defined in the Longman dictionary as "the fact that something is strange, unusual, or unsuitable in a particular situation". The incongruity theory is the cognitive side of the humor theories. According to this theory, there are rules between the objects and the events so humans regulate their lives in accordance with those rules. The situations which occur beyond the rules and contradict humans' expectations cause humor (Şahin, 2010) and this is what is called incongruity. Accordingly, Şahin (2010) explains the situation which humans laugh when they see someone fall down, representative of an example of incongruity theory because this behavior of "falling down" is not congruent to what humans expect 'Humans walk or

stand but do not fall down'. In other words, humans' all expectation, knowledge and experiences become upside down when they see someone falling, becoming a source of humor. However, not all incongruent situations are regarded as humorous, for example, earthquakes, traffic accidents, fires are also incongruent but humans do not show a sense of humor. Mulder & Nijholt (2002), on the other hand, consider the incongruity theory as part of the linguistics discipline due to its function of explaining the structure of jokes and lack of attention to the reasons of humor, and they also find this theory insufficient in regards to "why we can hear a joke more than one time and still find it funny and why not all incongruities are funny".

Anti-Proverb

Anti-proverbs have been in existence for many years, though the term "anti-proverb" was not coined by Wolfgang Mieder until 1982. An anti-proverb is the transformation of a standard proverb. Paremiologist Wolfgang Mieder (2004) puts it as "parodied, twisted, or fractured proverbs that reveal humorous or satirical speech play with traditional proverbial wisdom" (p.28). Obviously, anti-proverbs, though not all, have a humorous effect on the receivers, based on their main characteristics as being comical. Herkman (2000) (cited in Kinnonen 2012:7) defines 'comical' as 'combining surprising elements together, placing something familiar into an unfamiliar surroundings or acting in an unconventional way'. Anti-proverbs have also been defined as an allusive distortion, parody, misapplication, or unexpected contextualization of a recognized proverb, usually for comic or satiric. As understood from the definitions of "anti-proverbs" and "comical", the humor lies in the incongruity, so, the source text which is reinterpreted to fit in its new location -in the anti-proverbs- has to create an unaccustomed situation. However, incongruity is not sufficient to reveal humor, it also requires the ability to surprise receivers in the punch line as Aristotle says that "[t]he effect is produced even by jokes depending upon changes of the letters of a word; this too is a surprise. You find this in verse as well as in prose. The word which comes is not what the hearer imagined".

Moreover, to have complete effect, an anti-proverb should be based on a known proverb and borrow its entire structure from the original proverbs in order to create humor on receivers. In some anti-proverbs, a part of a proverb is borrowed and used in a part of the anti-proverb (with the wrong concept). Alternatively, the creators import a text from the original proverb to create an unnoticed but funny meaning, and varies the content but not structure (to keep the familiarity with the source text) to create humor. Plus, unlike prose, the structure of

the anti-proverb, which is mostly created by applying a number of intertextual references, is mostly one-line expressions and does not allow the creator to do any explanation regarding the text.

Therefore, when using anti-proverbs, the receivers are not challenged to discover the original text though some anti-proverbs as intertextual jokes require the receiver's laughter, some just develop a witty remark. If an anti-proverb is intertextually referencing a film, a song, a book or other sources, the meaning and/or humor of the anti-proverb may only be understood and appreciated if receivers are familiar with the source text as Norrick (1989) points "jokes draw on the entire spectrum of recognizable texts for the creation of intertextual humor" (p.130).

Examples of Turkish Anti-Proverbs and Their Analysis

The creation of anti-proverbs already depends on an intertextual practice, since using any parts from original text in correct or incorrect way clearly counts as an intertextual relationship. Anti-proverbs are created in a number of ways, such as, substituting, replacing, eliciting, and so on, the original wording of the proverbs to better suit the new context in a humorous way. The receivers enjoy the humor by recognizing the similarities and differences between the intertextual references and anti-proverbs.

The examples of anti-proverbs have been chosen from Turkish anti-proverbs. Proverbs from which the anti-proverbs are derived have been indicated in **bold**, they are followed by their literal translation (LT) in English if necessary and/or meaning (M) in English, and English proverbs equivalent (EE) to the proverbs if available. Then, anti-proverbs have been introduced with their literal English translation (LT). Lastly, the relationships between the proverbs and anti-proverbs, outside sources, their meaning and contribution to the text as well as their humorous effect on the receivers have been discussed.

(P1) Korkunun ecele faydası yoktur.

EE: Cowards die many times before their deaths.

(AP1) Korkunun ecele faydası yoktur, sadece iç çamaşırları kirletir.

LT: Cowards die many times before their deaths, it only dirties the underwear.

The first part of the anti-proverb is a proverb which means "Cowards die many times before their deaths". While the second part refers to an idiom which means "frighten the pants off" in its original version but in this version, it literally says "it only dirties the underwear". The humor comes from two sources in this text: the first one is the unexpected extension of

the saying and the second is the polite style in using the idiom. It can be considered under category of relief theory of humor. The proverb containing the subject of "death" which is an unpleasant idea for human being causes the receivers to feel stressed until the second part is introduced. The humorous way of referencing an idiom enables the receivers to release the energy with laughter.

(P2) Bülbülü altın kafese koymuşlar, "ah vatanım" demiş.

(LT) They put the nightingale in a golden cage, it still craved for its country.

(LT) They put a gold bullion cage, said "ah country".

(AP2) Bülbülü altın kafese koymuşlar, bülbül yine bülbül.

(LT) They put the nightingale in a golden cage, but it's still a nightingale.

(P3) Eşeğe altın semer vursalar, eşek yine eşektir.

(EE) You can put lipstick on a pig, but it's still a pig

(AP3) Eşeğe altın semer vurmuşlar, "ah vatanım" demiş.

(LT) You can put lipstick on a pig, said "ah country".

AP2 and AP3 whose first parts belong to proverbs have become anti-proverbs by swapping the second parts of their original extensions. Consequently, the intertextuality occurs between two proverbs by swapping their second parts. Incongruity theory and relief theory overlap in AP2. Considering the situation of the nightingale jailed in a cage, causing stress on the receiver which is not a pleasant situation for the animal, but later on it ends with an unexpected way (with a different proverb), so it causes a sense of humor and incongruity that enables the receiver to release the energy through laughter.

(P4) Bülbülün çektiği dili belası.

(LT) The trouble the nightingale gets from her tongue (speech).

(M) If someone speaks without thinking, it may cause some trouble in the future.

(AP4) Bülbülün çektiği piyango biletine bir şey çıkmaz.

(LT) The lottery ticket picked by the nightingale does not earn anything.

(AP5) Bülbülün çektiği dili belasıdır, siyasetçi de aynen öyledir. Nefes alıp durmadan yerli yersiz konuşur.

(LT) If someone speaks without thinking, it may cause some trouble in the future. A politician is exactly the same, he/she speaks out of turn.

Both AP4 and AP5 are derived from the proverb indicated in P4. AP4 is connected to P4 with the word "çekmek" which is a homonymous word. In P4, it means "suffer" whilst in AP4 it means "pick". The misuse of the proverb with the text "pick the lottery ticket" which is a popular phrase in Turkey creates humor on the receivers since it is an incongruent situation. In AP5, the nightingale is compared to a politician in a way that they both put themselves into difficulty due to their over-speaking.

(P5) Görünen köy kılavuz istemez.

(EE) Good wine needs no bush.

(LT) One does not need a guide when the village is in sight.

(AP6) Görünen köy, uzakta değildir. (Umudumuz şaban –film)

(LT) The village in sight is not in distant.

AP6 has been used in a popular Turkish movie called "Umudumuz Şaban (Our hope is Şaban) by a well-known Turkish actor. Its humorous effect depends on the viewers' knowledge of a children song "there is a village in distant, it is our village, even if we do not go there, …) which is referred to the second part "uzakta değildir (not in distant). The actor who is a mayor in the scene begins his speech with a proverb but unexpectedly finishes it with a part of a song, which causes laughter on the receivers. From this point of view, it can be considered under the category of incongruity theory.

(P6) Üzüm üzüme baka baka kararır.

(LT) Grape blackens by looking at other grapes.

(EE) If you lie down with dogs you will rise up with fleas.

(AP7) Üzüm üzüme baka baka solarium!

(LT) Grape solarium by looking at other grapes!

Solarium as technical term defines a bed equipped with ultraviolet lights used for an artificial sun tan, plus, "sun tan" and "kararmak" are semantically related words. So, the intertextual reference refers to a technical term in this anti-proverb and it creates humor due to its unexpected usage.

(P7) Her yiğidin bir yoğurt yiyişi vardır.

(LT) Every braveman has his own way of eating yoghurt.

(M) Everybody cherishes his own way of doing things

(EE) Different strokes for different folks.

(AP8) Her aslanın bir terbiyeci yiyişi vardır.

(LT) Every lion has its own way of eating its handler.

AP8 uses the structure of the proverb in P7 though the meaning is completely different. Only two words (braveman and yoghurt) were replaced with words (lion and handler) which are out of context and irrelevant, but after finding the original source the receivers find it humorous.

(P8) Pilavdan dönenin kaşığı kırılsın.

(EE) Come hell or high water.

(LT) Someone who refuses rice, let the spoon break.

(AP9) Pilavdan dönenin, kuru fasülyede gözü vardır.

(LT) Someone who refuses rice has eyes on white beans.

The proverb (P8) means that a person who spurns the opportunities that come his way is someone who doesn't deserve to be helped in any way. The word "pilav (rice)" is the opportunity and "kaşık (spoon) is the help in this context. However, the AP9 uses the first part of the proverb as exactly how it is but the second part is different both structurally and semantically. In Turkish culture, rice and white beans are like a couple as a meal and people prefer to eat them together. AP9 has a humorous effect on the receiver due to their unexpected usage in this way.

Discussion and Conclusion

This paper has attempted to define three main issues: what intertextuality is from different perspectives; humor and humor theories; anti-proverbs; and how intertextuality functions in the structures and semantics of anti-proverbs. Besides, the anti-proverbs have been analyzed more thoroughly from the point of humor, concerning the function of the intertextual references in creating the anti-proverbs' humorous content.

The first issue was intertextuality as one of the main characteristics of post-modern texts, which not only exists in literature but also in different fields such as music, art, architecture and so forth. For theorists of intertextuality, a text is produced by harmonizing in its own with parts of other texts, which means all texts are related to previous texts, and there is no text independent from other texts. The second issue was humor which depends on the readers' competence in pursuing the intertextual echoes in a text, in other words, humor can be achieved only if the relationship between textual links can be recognized. The last issue was anti-proverbs which are created in a number of ways such as substitution, replacement,

elicitation and so on; the original wording of the proverbs to better suit the new context in a humorous way. The receivers enjoy the humor by recognizing the similarities and differences between the intertextual references and anti-proverbs. It should be noted that investigating intertextuality in anti-proverbs can be regarded as an objective approach since anti-proverbs are derived from proverbs which are set expressions and known by people. Though, the intertextual references which do not belong to a proverb require a general culture, background information and some research in order to be recognized. That is why, finding out the original source might be difficult without any previous knowledge and if the viewer cannot recognize the reference, anti-proverbs will most likely appear pointless.

Analyzing the intertextual references showed that the anti-proverbs in this study included allusions from different sources such as movie, TV show, technology, and so on, but most of the references were allusions to proverbs. It was possible to detect three main categories in which to place the example references according to what their humor function seemed to be: incongruity, superiority or relief theories. However, it should be taken into account that the categories overlapped in some anti-proverbs. For example, although most of the examples were categorized under the category of incongruity theory, some also belonged to the relief and superiority theory based on the intertextual references' contributions. The superiority theory was effective especially in references that were challenging for receivers to recognize without any previous knowledge of the original source. In general, the intertextual references were used in anti-proverbs where they appeared in unexpected, unconventional and surprising ways which have a humorous effect.

Obviously, the limited length of this study only allows presenting a limited number of anti-proverbs. Besides, the focus of this study regarding the part of humor is linguistics. However, it should not be forgotten there is a wide psychological aspect that requires further survey at a later time. Therefore, the phenomenon of intertextuality, humor and anti-proverbs are new to be searched from different perspective such as pragmatic, linguistic, sociologic, psychologic point of view.

References

Alfaro, M. J. M. (1996). Intertextuality: Origins and development of the concept. *Atlantis*, 268-285.

Aktulum, K. (2007). *Metinlerarası ilişkiler.* Öteki Yayınevi.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination: Four essays by mm bakhtin (m. holquist, ed.; c. emerson & m. holquist, trans.).

Barron, F. (2015). Intertextuality in Music videos. [online] prezi.com. Available at: https://prezi.com/m/buj_pncrknp7/intertextuality-in-music-videos/ [Accessed 5 Jan. 2018].

Barthes, R. (1994). 11 The Death of the Author. *Media Texts, Authors and Readers: A Reader*, 166.

Dynel, M. (2009). Beyond a joke: Types of conversational humour. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *3*(5), 1284-1299.

Freud, S. (1928). Humour. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*.

Kinnunen, J. (2012). " I'm Indiana Jones!": intertextuality and humor in How I Met Your Mother.

Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*. Columbia University Press.

Leon S. Roudiez, Transl. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez), Columbia University Press, New York.

Laughter - Superiority Theory. (2018). Projects.eightron.net. Retrieved 1 January 2018, from http://projects.eightron.net/laughter/theory1.php

Mieder, W. 2004. Proverbs. A Handbook. Westport, CT and London: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Morreall, John, "Philosophy of Humor", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/humor/>.

Morreall, J. (1983). *Taking laughter seriously.* Suny Press.

Mulder, M. P., & Nijholt, A. (2002). *Humour research: State of art* (No. TR-CTIT-02-34). University of Twente, Centre for Telematics and Information Technology.

Norrick, N. R. (1989). Intertextuality in humor. *Humor - International Journal of Humor Research*, *2* (2), 117-140.

Oppenheim, R. (2014). *Postmodern Advertising and Intertextuality.* [online] prezi.com. Available at: https://prezi.com/mbhyipun7jky/postmodern-advertising-and-intertextuality/ [Accessed 4 Feb. 2018].

Riffaterre, M. (1994). Intertextuality vs. hypertextuality. *New Literary History*, *25*(4), 779-788.

Ross, A. (2015). *Language of humour.* London: Routledge.

Saussure, F. D. (1983). course in General linguistics. ed. Charles bally and Albert Sechehaye, in collaboration with Albert Riedlinger. *Translated from the French by Wade Baskin. London: Duck-worth.*

Sechehaye in collabration with Albert Riedlinger, Trans and Intr. Wade Baskin), McGrawHill Book Company, New York, Toronto and London:

Smuts, Aaron (2006). Humor. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.*

Speake, J. (Ed.). (2015). *Oxford dictionary of proverbs.* OUP Oxford.

Şahin, H. İ. (2010). Bektaşî Fıkraları ve Gülme Teorileri. *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi*, (55).

Zengin, M. (2016). An Introduction to Intertextuality as a Literary Theory: Definitions,

Axioms and the Originators. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute,* 2016 (50), 299-327. http://dx.doi.org/10.5505/pausbed.2016.96729

Internet Sources

https://prezi.com/mbhyipun7jky/postmodern-advertising-and-intertextuality/

https://prezi.com/buj_pncrknp7/intertextuality-in-music-videos/

http://www.guzelimsozler.com/sozleri-oku/12788-kizini-dovmeyen-torununu-erkensever.html

https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=226229820770412&id=168410306552 364

http://keyiflidakikalar.blogcu.com/atasozleri/5673991

https://www.uludagsozluk.com/k/cenk-erdem-modeli-atas%C3%B6zleri/

http://www.atasozlerianlamlari.com/atasozu-ara/

https://www.uludagsozluk.com/k/atas%C3%B6zlerini-de%C4%9Fi%C5%9Ftirip-komikhale-getirmek/