Turkish Studies

Volume 14 Issue 3, 2019, p. 1867-1880

DOI: 10.29228/TurkishStudies.22076

ISSN: 1308-2140

Skopje/MACEDONIA-Ankara/TURKEY

INTERNATIONAL
BALKAN
UNIVERSITY

EXCELLENCE FOR THE FUTURE
IBU.EDU.MK

Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi

Article Info/Makale Bilgisi

✍ Received/Geliş: 10.10.2018

✓ Accepted/Kabul: 10.06.2019

✍ Report Dates/Rapor Tarihleri: Referee 1 (25.10.2018)- Referee 2 (22.12.2018)

This article was checked by intihal.net.

A SYNTACTICAL STUDY ON TURKISH ANTI-PROVERBS

Öznur USTA TUZCU*

ABSTRACT

Proverbs as short, traditional, and memorable sayings have been employed to express some evident truths or familiar experiences for centuries, and they are known as inflexible structures. However, the inevitable changes in our life experience such as technology, mass media, appearance, even language itself lead people to modify the traditional proverbs which are thereafter known as anti-proverbs; indicating the recent changes in lifestyles, technology or language. This study aims to examine the Turkish anti-proverbs regarding their structural sentence types, from a syntactic perspective. A comparison has been made in order to ascertain the differences between traditional proverbs and their anti-proverbs regarding certain structural features. It has been recognized that the type of sentence structure is not always maintained due to many mechanisms such as replacing a single word; changing the second part; extending the proverb; adding literal interpretation; melding two proverbs and so on. Despite all the changes applied in the traditional proverbs, the anti-proverbs still remind the receivers of the original versions because of the similar sounds and the main structure borrowed from the traditional one. The examples of the anti-proverbs including 29 anti-proverbs derived from 25 traditional proverbs quoted in this article are in Turkish, and were taken from various sources such as social media; books; magazines; TV series; Social networking sites; songs; movies; newspapers; advertisement and so on.

STRUCTURED ABSTRACT

Proverbs are sayings that reflect the customs, traditions, lifestyle, and life philosophy of a nation. However, the inevitable changes in our life experience such as technology, mass media, appearance, even language itself lead people to modify the traditional proverbs that undergo a change in terms of meaningful perspective after

* Öğr. Gör., Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi, E-posta: oznur.ustatuzcu@erdogan.edu.tr

transformation, which are called as anti-proverb. The prefix –anti is not used as it means “the opposite of something” (Şahin, 2006) but used as “the modified versions of traditional proverbs.” Therefore, anti-proverbs are not the opposite of proverbs. Anti-proverbs arise in a variety of forms, and some of the methods for changing the proverbs in Turkish language are one-word replacement; extension of the traditional proverb; changing the verb from positive to negative (vice versa); the same structure with different meaning; one sound replacement; adding word/s into the traditional proverbs and so on. The changes in the anti-proverbs do not mean that the anti-proverbs are removed from the main structure of the traditional proverbs completely because the former keeps at least one part of the later one.

Considering that one of the most salient features of proverbs is their unchangeable and unreplaceable structures, it is worth to examine the sentence structure of anti-proverbs. Therefore, this study deals with the form verifications of the traditional proverbs reflected in the anti-proverbs and aims to demonstrate the variations and changes which have transpired when the proverb has transformed into an anti-proverb. This study is essential because there are plenty of studies dealing with the structure of traditional Turkish proverbs, but there does not exist any paper examining the structure of Turkish anti-proverbs. Nonetheless, there exists a large number of academic studies on different aspects such as the structure Altun (2004), Uzun (2017), Tuğluk (2013), Burdurlu (1967); the semantics Aksoy (1988), Yurtbaşı (1993, 2007); the history Aksan (2015), Muallimoğlu (1988) of traditional proverbs, but not much on the entire field of area of Turkish anti-proverbs.

Also, the practical value of this paper lies in the fact that the results obtained can be used as a practical or theoretical course material for lectures in paremiology. The research and analysis presented in the article will help those researchers who work in the field of paremiology and paremiography. Also, there is no corpus of Turkish anti – proverbs, so compiling Turkish anti-proverbs from different sources is also a contribution to the world of paremiology.

The structure of Turkish proverbs has been studied by a few scholars such as Altun (2004), Uzun (2017), Tuğluk (2013), Burdurlu (1967) and these scholars have classified the traditional Turkish proverbs in terms of their sentence structure. In this study, the classification of traditional Turkish proverbs and anti-proverbs are not completely based on the aforementioned studies; however, it is established by the author by examining 1419 anti-proverbs which have been derived from 431 traditional proverbs. So, proverbs are divided into five types: Simple Sentence, Complex Sentence Structure (‘Compound Complex Sentence,’ ‘Conditional Complex Sentence,’ ‘Embedded Sentence,’ and ‘Compound Sentence with ‘ki’), Compound Sentence Structure, Coordinated Sentence Structure, and Ellipted Sentence Structure. Following the brief explanation of each sentence structure type, examples from Turkish traditional proverbs and anti-proverbs are presented in order to indicate the syntactic changes. The examples of the anti-proverbs quoted in this article are in Turkish. Also, the traditional proverbs have been presented with their English equivalence (EE) if available, their literal translation

(LT) in order to ensure that non-Turkish readers easily understand the syntactic change.

Most of the anti-proverbs have been collected from various sources such as from online social dictionaries created and contributed by mostly young population based on the development of technology, economic problems, social transformation; social media; books; magazines; TV series; Social networking sites; songs; movies; newspapers; advertisement and so on. Due to the restricted pages allocated for the article, only 29 anti-proverbs derived from 25 traditional proverbs have been selected from the corpus of anti-proverbs.

It has been found out that the type of sentence structure is not always maintained due to many mechanisms such as replacing a single word; changing the second part; extending the proverb; adding literal interpretation; melding two proverbs and so on. Despite all the changes applied in the traditional proverbs, the anti-proverbs still remind the receivers of the original versions because of the similar sounds and the main structure borrowed from the traditional one. Moreover, the analysis of the examples of Turkish anti-proverbs has shown that the creators of anti-proverbs have not always remained faithful to the structure of original proverbs, and changed the syntax based on the methods such as one-word replacement; extension of the traditional proverb, and so on. Commonly, anti-proverbs maintain the same structure of the traditional proverbs from which they are derived, but some of the anti-proverbs retain only some parts of the traditional proverbs, which cause a change in the type of sentence structure. In spite of all changes applied in the traditional proverbs, the anti-proverbs still remind the receivers of the original versions due to the similar sounds as well as the main structure borrowed from the traditional one. Anti-proverbs may also be studied from various perspectives such as pragmatics and stylistics.

Keywords: proverb, anti-proverb, change, syntax, structure.

TÜRK ANTİ-ATASÖZLERİ ÜZERİNE SENTAKTİK BİR İNCELEME

ÖZ

Atasözleri öz, geleneksel ve akılda kalıcı sözler olarak, yüzyıllardır bilinen belli başlı gerçekleri veya benzer deneyimleri ifade etmek için kullanılmışlardır ve bunlar, herhangi bir değişime açık olmayan, kalıplaşmış ifadeler olarak bilinirler. Fakat teknoloji, kitle iletişim araçları, dış görünüş, hatta dilin kendisi gibi yaşam deneyimimizde bulunan kaçınılmaz değişiklikler, insanları atasözlerini bu değişiklikleri yansıtmak şeklinde değiştirmeye yöneltmiştir. Bu çalışma, Türk anti-atasözlerini yapısal cümle türleri açısından sentaktik bir bakış açısıyla incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Geleneksel atasözleri ile anti-atasözleri arasındaki bazı yapısal özellik farklılıklarını tespit etmek için bir karşılaştırma yapılmıştır. Tek bir sözcüğün değiştirilmesi, ikinci bölümün değiştirilmesi, atasözünün genişletilmesi, kelime kökenli yorumların eklenmesi, iki atasözünün birleştirilmesi gibi bir dizi mekanizmalardan ötürü atasözlerinin cümle yapısının her zaman aynı

kalmadığı görülmüştür. Bunun yanı sıra, geleneksel atasözlerine uygulanan tüm değişikliklere rağmen, anti-atasözleri benzer sesler ve geleneksel atasözlerinden aldığı temel yapıdan dolayı orijinal hallerini alıcılara hatırlatır. Bu makalede yer alan anti-atasözlerinin tamamı Türkçedir. Bu anti-atasözlerinin pek çoğu internet kaynaklarından ve kurgusal olmayan kitaplardan, özellikle mizahi edebiyattan alınmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Atasözü, Anti-atasözü, Değişim, Sözdizimi, Yapı.

1. Introduction

Proverbs reflect the common experiences of people that have been acquired over centuries. In order to maintain directions by using proverbs over generations require an intense meaning; that is why proverbs do not give place to any stylistics or structural wordplays. One of the most salient features of proverbs is their unchangeable and unreplaceable structures, so-called certain formalized expressions or fixed expressions. Aksoy (1988:15) notes that its synonyms can replace none of the lexis that composes a proverb; distracting or adding lexis to the original proverbs are not accepted; swapping the parts of the proverbs lose the effect and deeper meaning of these traditional values. However, Başaran (2013) argues that proverbs are generated because of the influence of culture which is a dynamic system, and states that “how correct is it to describe proverbs as frozen structures?” In other words, Başaran (2013) questions the status of proverbs as being frozen. Similarly, Mengi (1986) reasons against the inflexible features of proverbs by providing examples from poetry which consists of proverbs, words of which are swapped or replaced by different words. However, Aksoy (1988:19) insists on the frozen structures of proverbs and says “the existence of various versions of traditional proverbs does not invalidate the feature of inflexibility because each version is independently accepted as a traditional proverb.” For example, *Denize düşen yılana sarılır – Denize düşen yosuna sarılır* ‘A drawing man will clutch at a straw’ (English equivalence). These proverbs say ‘he who falls into the sea will grasp at a snake/moss.’ Each proverb is accepted as a traditional proverb and is supported by Aksoy (1988), and Başaran (2013) in that proverbs may vary based on the differences in time, geography, sex, religion and so on. For example, the proverb *Keskin sirke kabına zarar – Sharp vinegar damages its container* is also known as *Keskin sirke küpüne zarar* - Sharp vinegar damages its Jar. However, whereas Aksoy (1988:19) describes proverbs as static structures, Başaran (2013) notes that proverbs are dynamic and transparent, which allows for the existence of several variants of proverbs.

One of the examples of this variation is anti-proverbs, which are as old as proverbs themselves (Litovkina & Mieder, 2006). The term ‘anti-proverb’ was coined by Mieder in 1982 and widely accepted by the linguistic community. However, terms such as quasi, twisted, modified, fractured are also used by Paremiologists. The prefix –anti is not used as it means “the opposite of something” (Şahin, 2006) but used as “the modified versions of traditional proverbs.” Therefore, anti-proverbs are not the opposite of proverbs. Anti-proverbs arise in a variety of forms, and some of the methods for changing the proverbs in Turkish language are one-word replacement; extension of the traditional proverb; changing the verb from positive to negative (vice versa); the same structure with different meaning; one sound replacement; adding word/s into the traditional proverbs and so on. The changes in the anti-proverbs do not mean that the anti-proverbs are removed from the main structure of the traditional proverbs completely because the former keeps at least one part of the later one.

Moreover, anti-proverbs consist of the phonological, semantic, and syntactic devices, which are all known as proverbial markers. Pragmatically, these markers allow the receivers to recognize the proverbial structures based on their use, function, meaning, and sound. Indeed, proverbs typically possess certain poetic and structural features (Coinnigh, 2015), which differentiate them from non-

proverbial sentences, which is termed as *proverbiality* by Arora (1984). Coinningh (2015) states that "The more of these stylistic features a sentence possesses, the higher the level of proverbiality, and the greater the probability that the sentence is, or will be identified, like a proverb." So, the characteristic of proverbs, which is an advantage to ease the communicative function of proverbs, is applied to anti-proverbs in order to achieve a similar effect on recipients.

Consequently, this study aims to demonstrate the differences and similarities of the structure of traditional proverbs and anti-proverbs created in Turkish culture. An anti-proverb is not commonly recognized as such in Turkish society, despite their substantial usage in different spheres, such as a book, a newspaper, an advertisement, social networking sites and so on. For instance, one of the recent advertisements which include an anti-proverb *Ugi'yi altın kafese koy yine de garanti der-* They put Ugi into a golden cage, said "oh Garanti" which has been derived from *Bülbülü altın kafese koymuşlar, "ah vatanım" demiş-* They put a gold bullion cage, said "ah country". Although this advertisement is very popular nowadays, most of people do not pay attention to the changes applied to the proverb but the anti-proverb instead. Therefore, remarkably, the anti-proverbs are not dispersed and used in everyday conversation. That is probably why, there exist few studies in this field in Turkey, one of which is the work (Kuşaktan Forumu Geçiş ve Bilgisayar Atasözleri [The Transition from Generation to Forum and Computer Proverbs]) of Selcan Gürçayır (2008). Gürçayır has demonstrated that people who exchange information in the area of computers and the internet, that people have benefited from tradition by replacing terms related to these fields in traditional proverbs. Some of the examples which will be exemplified from Gürçayır's (2008) study as such: *Gönül ferman dinlemez* 'The heart is not commanded.' The anti-proverb says: *Virüs ferman dinlemez* 'The virus is not commanded; *Ak akçe kara gün içindir* 'Save your money for a rainy day,' the anti-proverb says *Ak anti-virüs kara gün içindir* 'Save anti-virus for a rainy day.'

As seen in the examples above, the semantic of proverbs lose the main content and the in-depth message, that is to say, *Virüs ferman dinlemez* is not about love, which is the wisdom of the traditional proverb and *Ak anti-virüs kara gün içindir* is not about money, while the structure remains the same after transformation. Therefore, regardless of the meaning of the anti-proverbs, they seem correct, attractive, and remarkable as it is seen in the 'bank' example above. The anti-proverb has a correct structure as it has copied the proverb as it is; interesting due to the replaced words are both familiar and humorous to the receivers; and remarkable because it is noticed as it is unusual and surprising. In his first book, Noam Chomsky (1957), offers the famous sentence "Colorless green ideas sleep furiously," which is a sentence with no apparent meaning, but to a native speaker, it seems instinctively correct due to its correct grammatical structure. So for Chomsky, the study of syntax is independent of semantics. So, anti-proverbs may be specified as examples of this situation, because, most of the anti-proverbs are created only for fun and do not carry any wisdom of thought; but unlike proverbs, have correct grammatical structure. That is, anti-proverbs are syntactically well-formed but are mostly semantically anomalous.

2. Sentence Types

The structure of Turkish proverbs has been studied by a few scholars such as Altun (2004), Uzun (2017), Tuğluk (2013), Burdurlu (1967) but from a syntactic perspective, and these scholars have classified the traditional Turkish proverbs in terms of their sentence structure. In this study, the classification of traditional Turkish proverbs and anti-proverbs are not completely based on the aforementioned studies; however, it is established by the author by examining 1419 anti-proverbs which have been derived from 431 traditional proverbs. Most of the anti-proverbs have been collected from various sources such as from online social dictionaries created and contributed by mostly young population based on the development of technology, economic problems, social transformation; social media; books; magazines; TV series; Social networking sites; songs; movies; newspapers; advertisement

and so on. Due to the restricted pages allocated for the article, only 29 anti-proverbs derived from 25 traditional proverbs have been selected from the corpus of anti-proverbs.

So, in this study proverbs are divided into five types: Simple Sentence, Complex Sentence Structure ('Compound Complex Sentence,' 'Conditional Complex Sentence,' 'Embedded Sentence,' and 'Compound Sentence with 'ki''), Compound Sentence Structure, Coordinated Sentence Structure, and Ellipted Sentence Structure. Following the brief explanation of each sentence structure type, examples from Turkish traditional proverbs and anti-proverbs are presented in order to indicate the syntactic changes. The examples of the anti-proverbs quoted in this article are in Turkish. Also, the traditional proverbs have been presented with their English equivalence (EE) if available, their literal translation (LT) in order to ensure that non-Turkish readers easily understand the syntactic change.

2.1 Simple Sentence

A simple sentence has only one clause (subject and predicate), which must be an independent clause and with no sub-clauses. They are typically simple, declarative, non-oppositional, and stylistically unmarked (Coinningh, 2015). A simple sentence appears in both affirmative and negative form. The examples that demonstrate the transformation of traditional proverbs in the form of the simple sentence into other forms as such:

(P1) *Korkunun ecele faydası yoktur.* EE- Cowards die many times before their deaths. LT- There is no use fearing the inevitable. (AP1) *Korkunun ecele faydası yoktur ama çamaşırları pisletir.* LT- There is no use fearing the inevitable, but it dirties the underwear.

The proverb P1 has a simple sentence structure, however, the extension to the traditional proverb connected to the proverb syntactically (by means of coordinating conjunction – but), which turns the structure into a 'compound sentence structure' from a 'simple sentence structure.'

(P2) *Bugünün işini yarına bırakma.* EE- Don't leave it for tomorrow what you can do today. LT- Do not put off till tomorrow what you can do today. (AP2) *Yarın yapabileceğin bir şeyi asla bugünden yapma.* LT- Never fulfill a task today, which you can do tomorrow. (AP3) *Bugünün işini yarına bırak.* LT- Put off till tomorrow what you can do today.

From having a simple sentence structure, P2 becomes a 'compound-complex sentence structure' due to the dependent clause in AP2. Similar sounds (işini, şeyi), common words (bugün, yarın) and the content evokes the receiver into associating the anti-proverb to the traditional one. Although, AP3 retains the same sentence structure type, the status of the sentence changes from negative to affirmative (bırakma, bırak).

(P3) *Yanlış hesap Bağdat'tan döner.* EE- A stitch in time saves nine. LT- Wrong calculation gets returned from Baghdad. (AP4) *Fikrin olsun, tek müşteri Bağdat'tan gelir.* LT- You have an idea, then that the unique customer will come from Baghdad.

P3 has a 'simple sentence structure' which is composed of subject + object + verb has turned into a 'coordinated sentence structure' because AP4 includes two sentences separated by a comma. Keeping the word combination (Bağdat'tan gelir/döner) reminds the receivers of the original proverb.

(P4) *Acele işe şeytan karışır.* – EE- More haste, less speed. LT- The demon involves in haste work. (AP5) *Acele iş yaparsan, işin hızlı biter.* LT- If you hasten, your task finishes fast.

Containing a subject, object and a verb P4 has a 'simple sentence structure'; however, transforming the object in a conditional form (haste work/If you hasten) in AP5 changes the syntax of the sentence and turns it into a 'conditional-complex sentence structure.'

(P5) *Yerin kulağı var.* EE- Walls have ears / Fields have eyes and woods have ears. LT- The ground has ears (It can hear every Word). (AP6) *Yerin kulağı varsa kapıların da gözü vardır.* LT- If the ground has ears, the doors have eyes, then.

Similar to P4, in AP6, the traditional proverb is changed into a dependent clause –and converts the entire sentence into a conditional-complex sentence (*yerin kulağı varsa*) by extending to the traditional proverb.

2.2. Complex Sentence Structure

Complex sentences contain one clause and one or more sub-clauses; the sub-clauses may be adjectival, nominal, or adverbial (Coinning, 2015). A sub-clause is similar to an independent clause, or complete sentence, but it lacks one of the elements that would make it a complete sentence. Sub-clauses cannot stand alone as a sentence, but they can be added to an independent clause to form a complex sentence. Complex sentences are divided into two categories based on their structure: ‘Compound-Complex Sentence,’ ‘Conditional Complex Sentence,’ ‘Embedded Sentence,’ and ‘Compound Sentence with ‘ki’.’

2.2.1 Compound-Complex Sentences

This type of sentence structure consists of at least one independent clauses, which include verbals (participles, gerunds, infinitives). The examples that demonstrate the transformation of traditional proverbs, in the form of a compound-complex sentence, into other forms as such:

(P6) *Görünen köy kılavuz istemez.* – EE- Good wine needs no bush. LT- One does not need a guide when the village is in sight. (AP7) *Görünen köy kılavuz istemez; yol, su, elektrik ister.* LT- The village insight does not require a guide; it requires road, water, and electricity.

P6 has a ‘compound-complex sentence structure’ due to the verbal “görünen.” However, AP7 indicates a ‘coordinated sentence structure’ since it includes two separate sentences which are created by adding an extra sentence to the traditional one.

(P7) *Gülü seven dikenine katlanır.* EE- Love me, love my dog. LT- Who loves the rose bears the thorn. (AP8) *Gülü seven dikenine, OY’u seven seçmenine katlanır.* LT_ Who loves the rose bears the thorn, who loves the vote bears the voter.

Similar to P6, P7 has turned into a ‘coordinated sentence’ by extending the traditional proverb by having only one verb. It should be noted that the extensions indicate parallel structuralism such as *dikenine, seçmenine*, these both words include similar sounds which remind the receivers of the traditional proverb.

(P8) *Denize düşen yılana sarılır.* EE- A drowning man will clutch at a straw. (AP9) *Denize düşen yüzme bilmiyorsa, ayvayı yer.* LT- A drowning man will be in trouble unless he swims.

In this example, AP9 keeps only the first two words of the traditional proverb and is completely different from the traditional one in terms of their sentence structure, the number of words and content. In other words, AP9 and P8 have only the subject in common. However, and surprisingly, AP9 reminds the P8 to the receivers. As for the sentence structure, due to the conditional situation, the sentence becomes a conditional sentence structure from a ‘compound-complex sentence structure.’

(P9) *İşleyen demir pas tutmaz.* EE-Better to wear out than to rust out. LT- A rolling stone gathers no moss. (AP10) *Dandik ağ, wins tutmaz.* LT- A dull network does not hold wins.

With P9 the infinitive verb in AP9 *işleyen* makes the sentence a Compound-Complex structure, but in AP10 *işleyen* has been substituted by *dandik* which is a noun. So replacement the verbal form

with a noun form in AP10 has changed the structure and turned the sentence to a 'simple sentence structure.'

(P10) *Son gülen iyi güler*. EE- who laughs last, laughs longest. (AP11) *Üzülme, son gülen sen olacaksın. Çünkü hep geç anlıyorsun*. Never mind, you will be the one who laughs last, because you catch it late.

Whereas, AP11 has been created by adding two more sentences to the traditional proverb – one to the beginning and one to the end by the conjunction. The first sentence of AP11 has a coordinated sentence structure due to two independent clauses connected by a 'comma.' The second sentence begins with a conjunction 'because' and is a 'simple sentence structure.'

2.2.2. Conditional-Complex Sentence Structure

Conditional sentences express real implications or imaginary situations and their consequences; because the validity of the main clause of the sentence is conditional on the existence of certain circumstances, which may be expressed in a dependent clause or may be understood from the context. A full conditional sentence contains two clauses: the dependent clause expressing the condition, the protasis; and the main clause expressing the consequence, the apodosis. In the Turkish language, the conditional is provided with the suffix 'se, sa'. The examples that demonstrate the transformation of traditional proverbs in the form of the conditional complex sentence into other forms as such:

(P11) *Köpeğin duası kabul olsaydı gökten kemik yağardı*. EE- If wishes were horses, then beggars would ride. LT- If the dog's prayer was accepted, the bone was falling from the sky. (AP12) *Eski politikacılara rağbet olsaydı, sandıklara OY yağardı*. LT- If the old politics were in demand, the vote would rain into the voting box.

P11 has a conditional sentence structure and maintains the same structure as in AP12 since both use the same verbs in both dependent and independent clauses. Although the words, except the verbs, are replaced by different words, the same form and structure remind the original proverb.

(P12) *Herkes ne ederse kendine eder*. LT- whatever anyone does is for himself. (AP13) *Self-modifying code eden, kendine eder*. LT- Whoever does self-modifying code is for himself.

The second part of the P12 is wholly preserved in AP13, which make the receivers able to connect the P12 and AP13. However, the conditional situation in the first part has changed into a relative clause, therefore changing the structure into a 'Compound-Complex sentence structure.'

2.2.3 Embedded Sentence Structure

This form of sentence structure includes another sentence, and this inner sentence can be the subject, object, or another element of the underlying sentence.

(P13) *Bülbülü altın kafese koymuşlar, "ah vatanım" demiş*. LT- They put a gold bullion cage, said: "ah country."

(AP14) *Bülbülü altın kafese koymuşlar, "bunun swarovski taşlısı yok mu" demiş*. LT- They put a gold bullion cage, said: "Is not there a cage with Swarovski?"

(AP15) *Bülbülü altın kafese koymuşlar. "24 ayar olsun" demiş*. LT- 'They put a gold bullion cage, said: "let it be 24 carats".

P13 has an 'embedded sentence structure.' According to Hunutlu (2017:167), when a sentence which stands as an independent sentence on its own becomes a part of another sentence, we call them "embedded sentence." In P13, "ah vatanım" is an ellipted sentence which implies "ah vatanım nerdesin?- Ah, the country where are you?". However, in AP14 and AP15 "ah vatanım" has been

replaced by proper sentences “*bunun swarovski taşlısı yok mu*- Is not there a cage with Swarovski” or “*24 ayar olsun* - let it be 24 carats” which can stand on its own but become a part of the first part of the proverb “*Bülbülü altın kafese koymuşlar*”. This anti-proverb meet the requirements of the features of an embedded sentence.

(P14) *Deveye “boynun eğri” demişler, “nerem doğru ki” demiş.* LT- They told the camel that his neck was crooked, and he answered, "Is there any part of me that's straight." (AP16) *Deveye demişler boynun eğri, deve demiş “I am tired of the society's unrealistic beauty standards.”* LT- They told the camel that his neck was crooked, and the camel said, "I am tired of the society's unrealistic beauty standards”.

P14 has an ‘embedded sentence structure,’ which is also sustained in AP16. However, this anti-proverb is also interesting in a way that it continues in "English." Moreover, in P14 both parts of the proverb have a canonical structure presenting a regular word order with verbs placed at the end of the sentences, but in the changed versions the structures of word order in both parts are similar to ‘English language syntax.’ For example, AP16 begins with "deveye sormuşlar- they told the camel that" and similarly, the second part begins with "deve demiş- the camel said." Yet, the sentence structure has been sustained due to the quote which can stand as a sentence on its own but a part of a dependent clause in this example.

2.2.4 Compound Sentence with ‘ki.’

These forms of sentences are structurally independent, semantically dependent clauses. However, these sentences are in the position of dependent clauses in the sentence because of functioning as a modifier of a part, or parts, of the dependent clauses (Hunutlu 2017:186). It should be noted that ‘ki’ is not always used in the sentences, but it is implied as it is demonstrated in the example;

(P15) *Al malın iyisini, çekme kaygısını.* LT- Buy the quality goods, and have no regrets.

(AP17) *Al programın orjinalini, çekme kaygısını.* LT- Buy the original program, and have no regrets.

In P15, there is a hidden ‘ki’ in the first part of the proverb, which can be demonstrated as "Malın iyisini al ki, çekme kaygısını." The structure and syntax are sustained in the anti-proverb in which words have been replaced in the new context (goods- program and quality-original).

(P16) *Ağzı torba değil ki büzesin.* LT- People’s mouths are not sacks with drawstrings.

(AP18) *Abur cubur gıda değil ki yiyesin.* LT- Junk food is not a nutrient so that you eat.

P16 has a structure of the compound sentence with ‘ki,’ and the anti-proverb has been created only by replacing the words in the proverb. Therefore the features of syntax are applied to anti-proverb.

2.3 Compound Sentence Structure

A compound sentence consists of at least two independent clauses joined by coordinating conjunctions. The coordinating conjunctions used to join independent clauses are "for, and, nor, but, or, yet, so." The examples that demonstrate the transformation of traditional proverbs in the form of the compound sentence into other forms as such:

(P17) *Sinek küçüktür ama mide bulandırır.* LT- A fly is small, but it is enough to make you sick. (AP19) *Sinek küçüktür ama boğa yılanı büyüktür.* LT- A fly is small, but a gopher snake is big. (AP20) *Bug küçüktür ama mide bulandırır.* A bug is small, but it is enough to make you sick.

P17 has a 'Compound Sentence Structure,' and patently the two anti-proverbs retain the same structure. The structural function of connecting parts of a sentence and its semantic importance may convince the creators to keep the conjunction 'but' in anti-proverbs. Similar situations and explanations may be applicable in the following example.

(P18) *Ya göründüğün gibi ol, ya da olduğun gibi görün.* LT- Either seem as you are or be as you seem (AP21) *Ya olduğun gibi görün ya da gözüme hiç görünme!* LT- Either seem as you are or get out of my sight!

Referring to the analysis of P17, P18 keeps the same sentence structure; however, it should be noted that AP21 also uses an 'imperative form' to convey the message, which is a warning.

2.4 Coordinated Sentence Structure

A coordinated sentence consists of at least two independent clauses connected with a comma (,) or semicolon (;). The examples that demonstrate the transformation of traditional proverbs in the form of the coordinated sentence into other forms as such:

(P19) *Su küçüğün, söz büyüğün.* LT- Water for the younger, word for the elder. (AP22) *Şu küçüğün, sürahi büyüğündür.* LT- Water for the younger, pitcher for the elder. (AP23) *Şiir küçüğün.* LT- Poem for the younger.

AP19 has a Coordinated Sentence Structure and AP22 maintaining the same structure, in which only one-word *söz* has been replaced by *sürahi*. However, AP23 is a simple sentence because it consists of a subject and a verb and *su* have been replaced by *şiir*.

(P20) *Su uyur, düşman uyumaz.* LT- Water sleeps, but the enemy never sleeps. (AP24) *Su uyur, kahve uyumaz çünkü içinde kafein vardır.* LT Water sleeps, but the coffee never sleeps because it has caffeine in it.

The first part of AP24 borrows the same form as P16 but with one difference: *düşman* has been replaced by *kahve*. However, adding another sentence with a conjunction "because" to the traditional proverb change the structure from coordinated to compound sentence structure.

(P21) *Dağ dağa kavuşmaz, insan insana kavuşur.* LT- Mountains do not meet, but the human does. (AP25) *Node node'a kavusunca insan insana kavusur.* LT- when nodes meet, human meet.

In P21, two separate sentences are juxtaposed, which creates a coordinated sentence structure. In AP25, the connected preposition (when) has altered the structure and combined the two sentences, meaning the first part of P21 changes from an independent sentence into a dependent one. Therefore, AP25 has a Compound-Complex sentence structure.

(P22) *Her inişin bir yokuşu, her yokuşun bir inişi vardır.* EE- after an uphill comes a downhill. LT- there is an uphill for every downhill and downhill for every uphill. (AP26) *Her inputun bir outputu vardır.* LT- There is output for every input.

P22 has a 'coordinated sentence structure' with one common verb. Using some common word and form of P22 (*her, bir, vardır*), AP26 reminds P22 to the receivers although the structure has changed to 'simple sentence structure.' It should also be noted that the words which are replaced by the words in P22 have similarity in terms of sounds (*inişi, inputun; yokuşu, output*).

2.5 Ellipted Sentence Structure

The elliptical sentence is accepted only if it is recoverable and can unambiguously be specified. An ellipted or elided clause exists once it is either preceded or followed by a non-elliptical sentence, and the meaning is recoverable from the context. The elliptical structure should have only one clue-

source related to the missing information. The interpretation of the elided sentence should be based on a single notion or criterion. Elliptical constructions are typically utilized in everyday conversation and arise out of the situation, and are sometimes referred to as reduced, contracted, deleted, or "abbreviated" constructions. (Hakobyan, 2016)

(P23) *Kel başa şimşir tarak.* EE- He wears a ten-dollar hat on a five cent head. LT- A bald head and boxwood comb do not go together. (AP27) *Kel başa şimşir peruk yakışır.* LT- A bald head and a boxwood wig go together.

P23 has an ellipited sentence structure due to the missing verb item, granted that the receivers are aware of the context. That missing word (verb in P23) has been supplied by the creator based on the pattern or meaning of AP27, therefore has changed the structure as a 'simple sentence' by adding a verb.

(P24) *Az veren candan, çok veren maldan.* EE- He that gives me small gifts, would have lived me. LT- One giving less is from the heart, one giving much from wealth! (AP28) *Az veren candan, çok veren enayiliğinden verir.* LT- One giving less is from the heart, one giving much from foolishness!

In P24, native Turkish speakers can easily presuppose that the missing words in the ellipited sentence is the verb and complete it as "verir" based on the clear context. AP28 is a declarative sentence in the structure of 'compound-complex.'

(P25) *Az laf, çok iş.* EE- Lest haste more speed. LT- Less speech, more work. (AP29) *Az iş, çok laf* (umudumuz şaban. Film) LT- Less work, more speech.

P25 and AP29 have both ellipited sentence structure, in order to have a humorous effect and convey a different message than expected the nouns are swapped.

3. Conclusion and Suggestions

This study focuses on Turkish proverbs becoming anti-proverbs. Although the Turkish language and culture has many anti-proverbs, a very little academic study has been undertaken in this field. The reasons for this could be that the Turkish people are not aware of the existence of anti-proverbs; they even do not know the term 'anti-proverb.' Considering the examples collected for academic studies on Turkish anti-proverb, most of them have been gathered from online social dictionaries created and contributed by mostly young population based on the development of technology, economic problems, social transformation, social media and so on. Therefore, it can be said that the creators of anti-proverbs are mostly restricted within the younger population. Moreover, unlike proverbs, anti-proverbs are not used in everyday life; transformed from generation to generation; changed into various forms and in a different context –for example, the proverb *Besle kargayı, oysun gözünü.* EE- Don't bite the hand that feeds you LT- Bite the hand that feeds you has sixteen variants. As a result, there is very little literature on the field of Turkish anti-proverbs, and the principal authority on this field over the world is German-born Wolfgang Mieder in the world. Although the field of Turkish proverbs is rich for corpus and in-depth study from a social, cultural aspect to linguistics, it is remarkable that there exist few studies on anti-proverbs. Moreover, the existing ones are written in the Turkish language, which is a restriction concerning introducing the Turkish anti-proverbs to the world of Paremiology. Even though a study on Turkish anti-proverbs "Anti-proverb as a type of intertextual joke" has been conducted in the English language (Usta Tuzcu, 2018). Nonetheless, there exists a large number of academic studies on different aspects such as the structure Altun (2004), Uzun (2017), Tuğluk (2013), Burdurlu (1967); the semantics Aksoy (1988), Yurtbaşı (1993, 2007); the history Aksan (2015), Muallimoğlu (1988) of traditional proverbs, but not on the entire field of area of Turkish anti-proverbs.

Taking the whole into consideration, this study is important because it demonstrates the differences and similarities of the structure of traditional proverbs and anti-proverbs created in Turkish society. The analysis of the examples of Turkish anti-proverbs has shown that the creators of anti-proverbs have not always remained faithful to the structure of original proverbs, and changed the syntax based on the methods such as one-word replacement; extension of the traditional proverb; changing the verb from positive to negative (vice versa); the same structure with different meaning; one sound replacement; adding word/s into the traditional proverbs and so on. Commonly, anti-proverbs maintain the same structure of the traditional proverbs from which they are derived, but some of the anti-proverbs retain only some parts of the traditional proverbs, which cause a change in the type of sentence structure. In spite of all changes applied in the traditional proverbs, the anti-proverbs still remind the receivers of the original versions due to the similar sounds as well as the main structure borrowed from the traditional one. Anti-proverbs may also be studied from various perspectives such as pragmatics and stylistics.

REFERENCES

- Aksoy, Ö. A. (1988), *Atasözleri ve Deyimler Sözlüğü I Atasözleri Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi Yayın Sanayi ve Tic. A.Ş.
- Altun, M. (2004). Türk Atasözleri Üzerine Sentaktik Bir İnceleme. *Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(21), 79-91.
- Arora, S. L. (1984). The Perception of Proverbiality. *Proverbium: Yearbook of International Proverb Scholarship* 1, 1-38.
- Bağırsakçı, S. (2014). Politikada atasözü uygulamaları. *İskenderun Gazetesi*. Retrieved from <http://www.iskenderungazetesi.com/politikada-atasozu-uyarlamalari/>
- Başaran, U. (2013). Atasözlerinin Kalıpsallığı Üzerine. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 8(9).
- Bilgisayarcı Atasözleri. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://dolunay.kocbey.com/atasozu.html>
- Burdurlu, İ. Z. (1967a). İncelemeler: Atasözlerimizin Cümle Yapısı I. *Türk Folklor Araştırmaları*, 19 (217), 4491-4495.
- Burdurlu, İ. Z. (1967b). İncelemeler: Atasözlerimizin Cümle Yapısı II. *Türk Folklor Araştırmaları*, 19 (219), 4559-4562.
- Cey. (2016). Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/ceytengri/status/781227472893468672>
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structure*. Mouton.
- Dağpınar, A. (1994). *Tipki ve benzer Türk-İngiliz atasözleri ve deyimleri* (Vol. 2115). A. Dağpınar.
- Dağpınar, A. (2017). *Proverbs and Idioms with their Turkish Equivalents*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Demirci, C. (2004). *Hayata düşen yalana sarılır*. İstanbul: Bileşim Yayınları.
- Dijimig. (2018). Reklamın atasözleri. Retrieved from <http://www.dijimig.com/reklamin-atasozleri/>
- Ekşi sözlük. (2002) Neo atasözü. Retrieved from <https://eksisozluk.com/neo-atasozu--297323>
- Ekşi sözlük. (2002). Bilgisayar atasözleri. Retrieved from <https://eksisozluk.com/bilgisayar-atasozleri--448583>
- Ekşi sözlük. (2000). Coder atasözleri. Retrieved from <https://eksisozluk.com/coder-atasozleri--88459?p=1>

- Emotional intelligence. (n.d.). In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/258346?redirectedFrom=emotional+intelligence#eid>
- Gülünç Atasözleri. (2010). Retrieved from <https://www.facebook.com/notes/t%C3%BCrk%C3%A7enin-dirili%C5%9F-hareketi-tdh/g%C3%BCl%C3%BCn%C3%A7-atas%C3%B6zleri/126163170765427/>
- Gürçayır, S. Kuşaktan Forumu Geçiş ve Bilgisayar Atasözleri. *Milli Folklor, Yıl, 20*, 70-77.
- Güzelim sözler. Retrieved from <http://www.guzelimsozler.com/geyik-sozler/>
- Hunutlu, Ü. (2017). *Cümle nitelikleri yönüyle Türkçe Atasözleri*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi Tic. Lit. Şti.
- Komik atasözleri ve deyimler. (2011) Retrieved from https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=226229820770412&id=168410306552364
- Litovkina, A. T., Mieder, W., & Földes, C. (2006). *Old proverbs never die; they just diversify A collection of anti-proverbs* (Vol. 4). University of Vermont Press.
- Mac Coinnigh, M. (2015). *Structural Aspects of Proverbs*. In H. Hrisztova-Gotthardt, & M. Aleksa Varga (Eds.), *Introduction to Paremiology: A Comprehensive Guide to Proverb Studies*. (pp. 112-132). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Manser, M. H.(2007). *The Facts on File Dictionary of Proverbs*. New York: Facts On File
- Mengi, M. (1986). Necâî'nin şiirlerinde Atasözlerinin Kullanımı. *Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Dergisi*, 47-56.
- Menteş, M (2012), *Korkma Ben Varım*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Metal Damage. (n.d.). Komik atasözleri. Retrieved from <http://metaldamage0.tr.gg/Komik-AtaS.oe.zleri-k1-De&%23287%3Bi&%23351%3Btirilmi&%23351%3B-k2-.htm>
- Özdemir, E. (2001). *Açıklamalı atasözleri sözlüğü*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Özkan, İ. (2011). Türk atasözlerinde yinelemeler. *Turkish Studies*, 6(1), 1595-1603.
- Özkan, S. (2016). Sağlığının düşkünü meyve yer kış günü. *Yeşil gazete*. Retrieved from <https://yesilgazete.org/blog/2016/04/02/yesil-atasozleri-sagliginin-duskunu-meyve-yer-kis-gunu-simaynur-ozkan/>
- Speake, J. (Ed.). (2015). *Oxford dictionary of proverbs*. OUP Oxford.
- Şahin, H. (2006). Türkçe'de Ön Ek. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(10), 65-77.
- Tibet, K. (1979). *Umudumuz Şaban*. Türkiye: Uğur Film.
- Tuğluk, M.E. (2013). Atasözlerinde giriş ve bitiş kalıpları. *International journal of social science*, 6 (6), 1125-1144. doi: 10.9761/JASSS1550
- Uludağ Sözlük. (2015) Atasözlerini değiştirip komik hale getirmek. Retrieved from <https://www.uludagsozluk.com/k/atas%C3%B6zlerini-de%C4%9Fi%C5%9Ftirip-komik-hale-getirmek/>
- Uludağ Sözlük. (2010). Besle dalgayı versin dalgayı. Retrieved from <https://www.uludagsozluk.com/k/besle-kargay%C4%B1-versin-dalgay%C4%B1/>
- Usta Tuzcu, Ö. (2018). Anti-Proverb as a Type of Intertextual Joke. *Humanitas*, 6(12), 34-48

-
- Uzun, N. E. (2017). Atasözlerinin kısalığı ya da dilbilimsel eksilti sorunu. *DTCF Dergisi*, 33(1-2).
- Yurtbaşı, M. (1993). *Dictionary of Turkish Proverbs*. Turkish Daily News Yayınlar.
- Yurtbaşı, M. (2007). *Turkish and English Proverbs İngiliz ve Türk Atasözleri*. İstanbul: Bahar yayınları.