ТЮРКСЬКІ МОВИ

Rustamova J.
Baku State University

ANALYZING THE COMPLEXITY OF SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION: A DISCURSIVE ENVIRONMENT PERSPECTIVE AND ITS RELEVANCE

The article delves into the intricacies surrounding complex sentence structures within the Turkish language. It presents an innovative analytical approach aimed at addressing this linguistic challenge, departing from conventional Turkological methodologies. While traditional Turkological inquiries have predominantly focused on appraising structural typologies within the confines of grammatical frameworks, contemporary scholarship advocates for a departure from such conventional paradigms. Rather, it suggests an examination from a novel research standpoint.

Conventional Turkological studies have historically privileged evaluations through a formal-grammatical lens, inadvertently overlooking the dynamic shifts in sentence composition witnessed in authentic communicative contexts, as well as the nuanced decoding of supplementary, implicit, or explicit semantic layers contingent upon contextual cues. This tendency can be attributed to several objective factors: the inherent limitations of formal-grammatical analysis in adequately addressing the intricacies of communicative syntax, owing to a dearth of robust research resources and methodological frameworks.

Consequently, the exploration of complex sentence structures within the Turkish linguistic sphere through the lens of functional-communicative analysis elucidates a gamut of phenomena that lie beyond the purview of conventional analytical modalities. Consequently, the resolution of this issue necessitates a dual-pronged analytical approach, encompassing both the tenets of speech act theory and the tenets of discursive analysis.

Thus, the manifestation of a given idea may vary across disparate discursive milieus. Notably, certain discursive contexts dictate the expression of ideas, thoughts, or intentions within culturally prescribed norms, necessitating their articulation within designated ritualistic frameworks. This engenders the development of complex sentence structures that conform to the exigencies of speech behavior within ritualized settings.

Moreover, in select discursive environments, ideas are directly actualized through speech acts, culminating in their presentation via succinct sentence structures. The article illustrates instances wherein specific manifestations of complex Turkish sentence constructions transcend the ceremonial constraints imposed by simplistic intentions.

Key words: *Turkish language, complex sentence problem, discourse-text, sentence-statement, linguistic pragmatics.*

Introduction. The functional-communicative analysis of the theoretical intricacies surrounding Turkish complex sentence structures inevitably legitimizes and promotes assessments through the lens of communicative codes. Indeed, issues such as the manifestation forms of complex sentences in the speech process, their contextual dependency, perspectives on attaining varied semantic resolutions within the contextual framework, and others, necessitate rigorous and methodical examination.

It becomes apparent that, in numerous instances, Turkish complex sentence patterns fail to attain a syntactic complexity aligned with the genuine manifestation of the conveyed intention or intensity. In many cases, these sentence structures directly mirror the ceremonial and ritualistic components in conformity with the individualized norms of Ottoman court speech behavioral customs. In such scenarios, the mechanism of verbalizing intensities that could be conveyed in the simplest syntactic construction

delineates the polarity between implicature and explicature. That is to say, in certain contexts, the conveyed meaning diverges from the intended meaning in actuality; rather, it is presented in a manner excessively rigid and tailored to the exigencies of complex syntactic structures due to the requisites of conventional expression styles.

The degree of problem elaboration. It is noted that the investigation into the complexity of sentence structures within the domain of linguistics in post-Soviet territories only began to attract scholarly attention from the 1960s onwards. During this period, analyses predominantly focused not on the linguistic-pragmatic facets of complex sentence constructions in speech processes but rather on the scrutiny of formal realization aspects, such as the ellipsis of complex sentence constituents, componential analysis, and the like.

While over time, a corpus of literature addressing the theoretical underpinnings of the functional-communicative realization of sentence problems in general has emerged, these studies were largely grounded in a linguistic-didactic framework. Furthermore, the prominence given to this linguistic-didactic perspective arguably led to the neglect of certain areas where pragmatic considerations in speech were underexplored. While these investigations may suffice for our immediate purposes, we must acknowledge their limited applicability to Turkish language materials.

Indeed, the absence of works within the field of linguistics that directly engage with the linguistic-pragmatic aspect and adopt a functional-communicative analysis format, specifically in relation to Turkish linguistics and Turkish language materials, has created a discernible gap in scholarship.

In the interest of scholarly impartiality, it is worth noting that while the present article may not directly engage with the aspect of communicative codes, certain research endeavors have been undertaken within the purview of speech act theory and speech etiquettes, albeit with a predominantly theoretical focus. Notably, in the past two decades, Turkish linguistics has witnessed a considerable engagement with speech act theory and its integration into Turkish language materials. While these studies primarily focused on linguistic-pragmatic assessments, they fell short of incorporating systematic analytical frameworks associated with formal grammatical tools. Furthermore, recent years, particularly the last decade, have seen a burgeoning interest in the psycholinguistic dimensions of speech acts theory within Turkish linguistics. However, even

in these studies [for instance, 4; 158–177], the functional-communicative aspects of the complex sentence problem have been conspicuously absent. Nonetheless, it is through the prism of speech acts theory and its attendant discourse genres that a novel and crucial analytical toolkit has been provided for the adequate explication of implicature and explicature within complex sentence structures.

Purpose and objectives. The primary aim of the study is to ascertain the extent to which Turkish complex sentence structures are contingent upon discursive contexts and to discern extralinguistic factors facilitating the articulation of identical intentions in both simple and complex sentence formats. In pursuit of this aim, the objectives include evaluating Turkish complex sentence structures within the research framework provided by contemporary linguo-pragmatics, as well as identifying the impact of linguo-cultural factors on the syntactic organization of Turkish sentences. Furthermore, as part of the research framework, tasks are undertaken to achieve research objectives, including comparative analysis of Turkish complex sentence structures with those employed in analogous communicative scenarios in other Turkic languages.

Methods. It is noteworthy that, in executing the analysis arsenal delineated by the research objectives, the following research methodologies were employed: initially, descriptive and comparative methodologies were utilized, while comparative-historical methods were engaged to trace the usage of diverse sentence structures across different historical epochs and discursive milieus. Additionally, extensive utilization of discourse analysis methodology was made. Within the purview of applying this methodology, contextual analysis was concomitantly employed alongside other methodological approaches.

Main section. In Azerbaijani linguistics, while attention has been paid to the analysis of the internal semantic structuring of complex sentences through the prism of speech act theory, it is noteworthy that several works exploring various aspects of Austin's theory have also emerged in our national linguistics. Although these studies do not directly contribute to shedding light on the functional-communicative aspects of the complex sentence problem, research on the application of Austin's theory to Azerbaijani language materials is of sufficient importance for the theoretical foundation of our investigation. Notably, among the early works, we can mention the research of Prof. Fakhraddin Veysalli. Describing dialogue act as constituting *«one of the most interesting areas of pragmatics,»* the linguist emphasizes that *it allows*

for the interpretation of the meaning of any utterance. [5; 375]. It is worth recalling that in another work, the linguist articulates his idea based directly on the language-speech dichotomy, by providing clarity with the «sentence» – «utterance» terminological comparison: *«In this book, we will use the term 'utterance' as a unit of spoken communication, and we will always contrast it with the sentence, which is a syntactic unit»* [6; 19]. In other words, utterance is considered as a discourse unit, while the sentence is viewed as a linguistic (and textual) unit. If we consider utterance as a «living text,» then we can ascertain that, in reality, utterance, realized in the format of live communication, is essentially the sentence itself. In this sense, once again referring to F. Veysalli's evaluations, it is worth noting that *«modern linguistics considers discourse to encompass the linguistic-social domain, while the text belongs solely to the linguistic domain. Later, these scholars expand their ideas by writing that the text is an oral representation of communication events, while discourse is the text in terms of the event aspect; it is communication charged with life force, that is, it is the language used in active communication. E. Benveniste (1902–1976)»* stated, *«discourse is the language adopted by the speaker»* [6; 19].

As our inquiry does not target the text-discourse comparison, we endeavor to assess the overarching functional-communicative facets of complex sentences somewhat beyond the issues of sentence-utterance terminology. Although the aspects we are investigating are considered in aggregate, many linguo-pragmatics incorporate properties that pertain to both sentence and utterance (distinctively, not collectively). Nonetheless, we will prioritize exploring them by departing from the overall context of the sentence (without differentiating the utterance). Indeed, as emphasized by F. Veysalli himself, *«it is highly intricate to delineate between discourse and text. It is more advisable to apply text to writing. Hence, discourse can merely be considered as an element of speech. Discourse can never fully encompass language. Nor can text lay claim to functionality (in fact, functionality precisely emerges as a linguistic/speech attribute in communication situations). Both are regulated based on the principles of language.»* [6; 20]. Therefore, we opt to focus on the amalgamation of language and speech specifics or discourse-text specifics in addressing the issue. It is pertinent to note that the discursive conditioning factor inherently holds significance for our research. In our more detailed analyses, as we will proceed, while the same complex sentence model may feel

«obligated» to express the same meaning indirectly through discourse in a specific discursive environment due to functional-communicative requisites, the same meaning may be directly conveyed through speech act in another discursive environment. For instance, ***«Could you kindly transcribe our discussions?»*** – the complex sentence model indirectly implies the speech act and is formulated accordingly to the speech genre. Hence, such requests reflect the social distancing of communication participants or manifest subordinative appeal in social hierarchy (requesting from subordinate to superior, asking, etc.). The emphasis on transcription or notation depends on the context of the request. However, the same intention can find a succinct resolution with the phrase «Please transcribe them here» in the scholastic-Education discourse environment. Thus, the discursive context plays a pivotal role in shaping sentence models and warrants systematic evaluation within the framework of functional-communicative analysis of complex sentence problems.

«When I opened the notebook, I placed it in front of my master's knees. ***'Could you please write your name and sign here?'*** *The names of today's prominent literary figures and artists were written in a very respectful tone in the notebook.»* [7]. As explained in context, the dialogue occurring based on deferential communication takes place within the framework of theatrical discourse. Therefore, communication-addressing by individuals possessing an elite linguistic identity conforms to the norms of deferential speech etiquette, i.e., communication-addressing in the formal request genre as required by speech etiquette.

However, in the next example, since there are no requirements for analogous discursive environment, there is no need for using the ritual address format: the sentence is structured in the instructional speech genre.

«Please write your name, ID number, exam room number, and seat number in the relevant fields of your exam booklet and ***sign***»* [8].

In the first instance, we encounter a complex sentence, whereas in the second example, since there is no requirement for a ritual address format in the discursive environment, we encounter a simple sentence model (to be precise, a simple compound sentence).

In addition, it is worth recalling that, generally, *«in the field of pragmatics, context is differentiated into two categories: 1) linguistic context; 2) physical context. Linguistic context refers to the set of words encompassing lexical bonds within the question and*

the sentence. Physical context pertains to the spatial location of the given word and the situational context in which it is employed» [9; 8].

In this context, it can confidently be asserted that there is no resolution to the issue of complex sentence structure outside the contextual framework, and its systematic exploration is only viable through the affordances of context, which engenders a deep-layered semantics realized through pragmatic substrates (for a more comprehensive treatment, see: [10]), or through the assessment of discursive conditioning.

For comparative purposes, it should be noted that instances of presenting simple communicative intentions in a rigid format, i.e., instances of expressing communicative intentions in a prescribed ceremonial style, are not as inherent to Azerbaijani as they are to other Turkic languages. It is pertinent to recall that comparing operative models of complex sentences, which fall within the same language family (Turkic language family) and the same language group (Oghuz language group), at a functional-communicative level suggests that Azerbaijani complex sentence models deviate further from the demands of ceremonialism. Naturally, this does not imply that the implicature and explicature of Azerbaijani complex sentence models completely coincide, and that illocutionary force finds its direct resolution at the locutionary level. Such a level of adequacy is infeasible due to the rigid psycho-emotional characteristics of human nature. However, Azerbaijani complex sentence models are not subjected to as much «artificial» (ceremonial, ritualistic) rigidification owing to the exigencies of existing speech behavior traditions in Azerbaijani

society (or, more precisely, due to the lack of urgency of different requirements). This phenomenon may be associated with the lesser tendency towards stereotypical speech behavior that leads to the indirect expression of intention, unlike the Ottoman court speech etiquette. Undoubtedly, instances of artificial rigidification are also observable in Azerbaijani complex sentence models. Nonetheless, these instances predominantly encompass formats of expression evaluated as manipulative, contingent directly on the specific speech situation. For example: *«If you do not undertake this action, you will be deemed intelligent; If you take this action, it will not yield favorable outcomes,»* and so forth.

Conclusions. From the provided exemplars, it is discernible that certain discourses necessitate the articulation of ideas in a ceremonial or ritualistic manner, thereby engendering the manifestation of intricate sentence structures. Conversely, within specific discursive milieus, ideas are directly conveyed through speech acts, resulting in encounters with the same concepts presented within simpler syntactic frameworks. The relatively prevalent occurrence of artificially formalized complex sentence patterns imbued with ceremonial attributes in contemporary Turkish appears to be linked to the perpetuation of certain speech behavior stereotypes inherited from Ottoman Turkish. To delineate more precisely, while the language reforms spearheaded by Atatürk aimed at liberating the language from excessive rigidity and Persian-Arabic influences, speech behavior models persist in retaining vestiges of the intricate formalities characteristic of its predecessor, even within simplified linguistic paradigms.

Bibliography:
1. Akşehirli S. Söz edimleri kuramı açısından kurgusal anlatı metinlerinde söz aktarımı. Turkish Studies – International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic Volume 6/2 Spring 2011. p. 143–162. URL: https://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423934126.pdf

2. Şekerçi F.M. John L. Austin'in söz edimleri kuramı hakkında bir değerlendirme, Yüksek lisans tezi, Sakarya Universiteti, 2016. 108 s. URL: https://acikerisim.sakarya.edu.tr/handle/20.500.12619/91146

3. Hirik, E. Söz edimleri kuramı bağlamında Atasözleri-deyimlerde Toplum/Topluluk adları və duygu değerleri. *Motif Akademi Halkbilimi Dergisi.* 2018. №11 (24). 158–177 URL: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/595160

4. Çelebi V. Gündelik Dil Felsefesi ve Austin'in Söz Edimleri Kuramı. *Beytulhikme An International Journal of Philosophy.* Volume 4. Issue 1. June 2014, s. 73–89. URL: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/40517

5. Veysəlli F.Dilçiliyə giriş, Bakı: Mütərcim, 2017. 456 s.

6. Veysəlli F. Seçilmiş əsərləri, Bakı: Mütərcim, 2021. 447 s.

7. Soseki, N. Ben bir kediyim, Ankara: Ötüken Neşriyat, 2018. 455 s.

8. Sınav künyesi, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi, Ocak 2018. URL: https://www.bursahayat.com.tr/egitim/aof-sinav-giris-yerleri-belli-oldu-9200

9. Abdullayeva İ.Ə. Müasir İngilis və Azərbaycan dillərində müraciət bildirən sözlərin praqmatik xüsusiyyətləri, filologiya üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru ....disser.avtoreferatı, Bakı, 2012. 28 s.

10. Dawkins J. Syntax and Readability, Delaware 1971. 54 s. URL: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED103814.pdf

Рустамова Дж. АНАЛІЗ СКЛАДНОСТІ КОНСТРУКЦІЇ РЕЧЕННЯ: ПЕРСПЕКТИВА ДИСКУРСИВНОГО СЕРЕДОВИЩА ТА ЇЇ АКТУАЛЬНІСТЬ

Стаття заглиблюється в складні структури речень у турецькій мові. Він представляє інноваційний аналітичний підхід, спрямований на вирішення цього лінгвістичного виклику, відступаючи від традиційних тюркологічних методологій. У той час як традиційні тюркологічні дослідження здебільшого зосереджені на оцінці структурних типологій у межах граматичних рамок, сучасна наука виступає за відхід від таких традиційних парадигм. Це скоріше пропонує розгляд з точки зору нового дослідження.

Звичайні тюркологічні дослідження мають історично привілейовані оцінки через формально-граматичну призму, ненавмисно випускаючи з уваги динамічні зміни в композиції речень, які спостерігаються в автентичних комунікативних контекстах, а також нюансне декодування додаткових, імпліцитних або експліцитних семантичних шарів, що залежать від контекстуальних сигналів. Цю тенденцію можна пояснити декількома об'єктивними факторами: притаманними обмеженнями формально-граматичного аналізу в адекватному розгляді тонкощів комунікативного синтаксису через брак надійних дослідницьких ресурсів і методологічних основ.

Отже, дослідження структур складних речень у турецькій лінгвістичній сфері через призму функціонально-комунікативного аналізу прояснює низку явищ, які лежать поза межами звичайних аналітичних модальностей. Отже, розв'язання цього питання потребує подвійного аналітичного підходу, який охоплює як принципи теорії мовленнєвих актів, так і принципи дискурсивного аналізу.

Таким чином, прояв певної ідеї може відрізнятися в різних дискурсивних середовищах. Примітно, що певні дискурсивні контексти диктують вираження ідей, думок або намірів у рамках культурно встановлених норм, що вимагає їх артикуляції в рамках визначених ритуальних рамок. Це породжує розвиток складних структур речень, які відповідають вимогам мовленнєвої поведінки в ритуальних умовах.

Крім того, у вибраних дискурсивних середовищах ідеї безпосередньо актуалізуються через мовленнєві акти, кульмінацією яких є їх представлення за допомогою стислих структур речень. Стаття ілюструє випадки, коли конкретні прояви складних турецьких речень виходять за межі церемоніальних обмежень, накладених спрощеними намірами.

Ключові слова: *турецька мова, проблема складного речення, дискурс-текст, речення-висловлювання, лінгвістична прагматика.*