

FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CONJUGATED SYNTAGMAS

Mustafa Turmush

Department of languages

Caucasian University

Hyrdalan settlement, 16-th kilometer of Sumgait highway,

Baku city, Azerbaijan, AZ 0101

Abstract

There is the close correlation between conjugation and syntagmatic segmentation of speech expressed in certain syntagma typicality. The conjugated syntagma in live Russian speech and language of piece of art are identical on its structural-grammatical models. In the article is carried out an analysis of syntagmatic peculiarities of few Turkic languages, syntagma structures, its spontaneity, its additional functions, universal peculiarities of speech, possibility of syntagmatic segmentations; there was defined that all these peculiarities are more typical for informal language. At the same time there are specified the lexical and grammatical means at determination of the role of syntagma in speech sections conjunction. Among these means it is very important to consider the role of intonation and conjunctive means (prepositions, addresses and so on). The character of intonation-semantic unity in Turkic languages somewhat differs from the other language groups including Slavic or Romanic-Germanic ones. This is expressed in fact that syntagmas conjugated to the main structural-grammatical part of sentence are typified. The modern language processes that are represented first of all in formation of bilingualism have an influence on substantial syntagmas characteristics including Turkic languages.

Keywords: conjunctive connection, sentence (phrase), incomplete proposition, conjugated part, syntagmatic segmentation of speech.

© *Mustafa Turmush*

1. Introduction

The division of language flows on sensible units shaped phonetically, grammatically and by intonation is very interesting for every language system in spite on number of its bearers. In this aspect syntagma play an exclusive role in shaping of speech, its oral expression, rhetorical possibilities.

Syntagma has several senses:

1. Binomial structure which parts are related as determined (T) and determining (T1) ones and it is not only words but also morphemes; compound sign of speech in which identification-recognition functions are distributed between its components, and there must be two components because of binary character of syntagma.

2. The result of this phrasing is the result of syntactic-stylistic division (segmentation) of phrase [1].

N. Sorokoletova thinks that “combination can be called syntagma only if it corresponds to the language laws. *To appreciate joke, to cask parcel, to celebrate wedding, to present book* – are true syntagmas. Syntagma (something that is combination what is not segmented) must always be based on the classes of units. If there is no such support, there is no syntagma.

Syntagmas – the natural combination of units are formed by language on the all its levels – from sounds to propositions. The compound propositions are syntagmas formed of propositions. The syntagmas diversity is truly inexhaustible” [2].

2. Survey of problem condition

The terms “conjunctive connection” and “conjunctive construction” were offered by L. V. Scherba [3] and firstly described by V. V. Vinogradov [4] as specific stylistic technique. Conjunction appears as the next word, word combination, proposition that follows the main sentence and expresses the additional idea that sometimes is not in the same plane with the main sentence. The conjugated part adds, specifies (sometimes from unexpected side), develops the previous idea, it can be connected with the main sentence in semantic and grammatical aspect and appears in the process of speech or after it [4].

The essence of conjunction phenomenon is presented in aspect of differentiation between language and speech. Proposition is a unit of language and sentence (phrase) is the unit of speech and these units not always coincide in its limits. This very case of mismatch is observed especially in conjunction of words and propositions.

A. P. Velichuk gives the following definition of conjunctive construction: “Conjunctive constructions are the syntactic units which subjective perspective has two plans and at two and more conjugated elements – has many plans”» [5, 6]. According to the author the difference between coordination and conjunction is that “coordination is the method of syntactic consolidation of functionally homogenous units within the limits of communicative unit and conjunction is the method of syntactic consolidation of subjectively different syntagmas as a part of syntagmas of superior order” [6] (according to the author syntagma of superior order is conjunctive construction).

3. Materials and Methods

Syntagmas are a conjunctive construction (in other words conjugated part, conjugated element) defined as:

- 1) Idea that unexpectedly occasionally came to mind;
- 2) Additional judgment;
- 3) Explanation of aforesaid;
- 4) Specification of circumstances of action or qualities of object or person;
- 5) Construction that expresses an idea absolutely opposite to expected one, so-called “logical jump”;

6) Syntactic unities which subjective perspective has two or many plans.

“The problem of conjunctive quality of syntagmas is closely connected with parcelling phenomenon existing in syntactic system of language. Proposition divided on parcels has two sides – conjugating and conjugated ones. Conjugating side is the main one, it is also called basis proposition. It is parcel, it corresponds with topic. In fact conjunctive side is the part of conjugating one. As conjugating side is usually structurally incomplete such propositions can be called conjunctive incomplete propositions” [7, 8].

Conjugation is characterized with peculiar rhythmic-melodic pattern. Conjunction is the natural condition of informal speech caused by its spontaneous character.

Conjunction is closely connected with syntagmatic segmentation of speech. Syntagmas which syntactic and intonation integrity is not doubted are conjugated to the main part of sentence. Breaking or crushing of syntagmas and its conjunction is observed rather seldom.

The collected material allows conclude that syntagmas conjugated to the main part of sentence are typified in structural-grammatical aspect.

4. Experimental procedure

In most cases syntagmas are conjugated in intonation way as we saw above. We worked with lexical content of several Turkic languages and with the other sources especially from artistic literature and folklore.

At the same time there are special means in speech that connects conjugated part with the main part of sentence.

5. Results. Discussion

The received results were grouped in several directions based on the means of connection and expression.

Means of coordinative words connection:

1) Adversative intonation: (Azərbay.) Dinmədim. *Qonşunun məni çağırmasına baxmayaraq* (danışiq dilində); Samitin vəjinə olmadı. *Professor qaşlarını çatıb alnını qırırdırsa da* (Ə. Vəliyev) (Türk) Öyrenji jevap veremiyordu. *Öyretmen konuşmasa da*.

2) Coordinating and adversative conjunctions *da, -də, həm, lakin (ləkin), amma (ama), fəqət:* (Azərbay.) Çərkəz həyəjan keçirirdi. *Bu xəbəri eşidən dostu da* (İ. Şıxlı); Bulanıq görünürdü. *Yarməmmədin özü də, gözləri də* (İ.Məlikzadə); (Türkü) Men də köyə gediyorum. *Arkadaşım da;* (Tatar) Menə büqen də... Haman şul uk koyaş. *Ay da şul uk. Yıldızlar da. İke tau arasındaqı çışmələr də...*(İ. Qazi).

Syntagmas conjunction with the help of special means. The most part of studied syntagmas are conjugated to the main sentence with the help of means which semantics determines its function.

There are words *məsələn, xüsusilə də, xüsusən* and so on which conjunction function is consisted in connection with the main sentence.

(Azerb.) Böyük Atabəy oğlanlarını da, qızlarını da yaxşı tanıyırdı. *Xüsusilə də Mələkəni* (Ə. Cəfərzadə).

There are also syntagmas with intensifying meaning shaped with *hətta, həttə, xəttə*: (Azerb.) Kəndin heyvanlarını parçalayan canavarları da məhv etdilər. *Hətta* toyuq-cücəni yeyən tülküləri də (Ə.Vəliyev); (Tureü): «Çıt-çıt» diye içimizde kırılanlar da var! Hatta kurban gidenler de («Rize» qəzetindən); (Tatar) Çın ir üzenen yaraların bütənnərqə kürsətmi. *Xəttə* xatınına da (Q. Absalyamov).

Quite often conjugated syntagmas are shaped by words *həmçinin, məsələn, yəni, yəqni, bilqele, əlbəttə, elbette* and so on. (Turkish.) Bu bölgenin Rizeden daha fazla güneş görməsi çaya tam da tiryakilerin sevdiği buruk tadı veriyor. *Toprak, güneş ve elbette Karadenizin yüksek dağları...* («Rize» qəzetindən); (Azerb.) Orxan yuxudan oyanan kimi, bu qərara gəldi ki, Çarıqqayadan getsin. Gəzməli, görməli yerlər nə çox. *Dost-tanış da həmçinin.* (İsi Məlikzadə); Bu barədə heç düşünməmişdi. *Yəni dünənki söhbət barədə* (İsi Məlikzadə); (Tatar) Ə menə talant yanına maturlıq ta kilep östəlsə. *Məsələn, biznen Ləylədəqe kebek!* (İ. Qazi); Min annın bernindi faydasın kürmim. *Yəqni yabıqu buenja* (N. Fattax).

As a conclusion it can be noted that conjunction to the main sentence is realized by specific intonation. At the same time the means of coordinating and subordinating words connection that is coordinating and subordinating conjunctions and conjunctive words play an important role in conjunction of words and constructions to the basis proposition. The more active are the means that explain relations between words (*məsələn, xətta, həttə, özü də, da, də* i t.d). Uşaq yatmışdı. *Özü də üzüqoylu* (Ə.Nijət)

Functional-semantic characteristics of conjugated syntagmas. The conjugated syntagma functions as a separate part of proposition. But the possibilities of conjunction of separate proposition parts are different as it will be considered below.

Conjunction of subject syntagma. Subject can be the conjugated syntagma rather seldom. The existing singular examples are not typical: (Azerb.) Dünən yuxarı getmişdilər. *Şəfi müəllim, Fərhad* (S. Əhmədov); Dağların, bağların, uja qovaq ağajlarının altından min il bundan əvvəl atılmış, lakin hələ soyumamış, uzaq sürən top gülləsi kimi yüksəlirdi. *Günəş* (Mir Jəlal); (Turey) Həpsi evdeydilər. *Ömer de* (N.Hikmet); (Tatar) Borılıştan avır sostav kürende. Poşkır-a-poşkır-a kilə. «*Pobeda*» parovozi (M.Maqqeev).

Conjunction of predicate syntagma. As the bearer of semantic load and predication kernel the predicate is separated from it also seldom. M.Z. Zakiev thinks that if this phenomenon takes place it certainly forms an incomplete proposition (8, page 199) but not a conjunction.

We can say about conjunction of predicate syntagmas only if it is specifying or homogeneous to the predicate of basis sentence: (Tatar) Bolar bar da soüial-demokrat çuması. *Orlov aqıtaiüise* (T. Qizzat); (Azerb.) Qozbel ərik ağajının budaqlarında tumurjuqlar doğmağına lap az qalan düyə yelini kimi şişmişdi. *Qızarmışdı* (Ə. Əmirli).

Conjunctive syntagmas characterize person. At describing person there are used typified constructions that can be considered as conjunctive ones. It functions as subjects or predicates.

a) The largest group includes conjunctive syntagmas that designates person's profession, post, status, occupation, specialty and so on: (Turkish) Çalışıyorum. *Hürriyet Gazetesinin yayın müdürü* («Rize» qəzetindən); Hedefim budur. *Pilot olmaq* («Rize» qəzetindən); (Azerb.) Kənddə işləyirəm. *Orta məktəbdə müəllim*; (Tatar) Min pioner laqerında. *Pedaqoq* (Q.Muxamətşin).

b) The other rather big part of syntagmas being conjugated designates person's names and surnames: (Azerb.) Tanış olduğum adam. *Həsən*; (Tatar) Tanıym: berse bezne ukıtıp çıqarqan ukıtıtuçı. *Zəynəp apa* (A.Bayanov).

c) The third group of conjugated syntagmas expresses object or person but with time, place, relationship and so on characteristics: (Turkish) Çok seviyordum. *Evimin yanında olan köyümü* («Rize» qəzetindən), (Tureü) İdam etdiler. *On yedi sene evvel* («Rize» qəzetindən); Sizi takip edejek ve bir gün sizi silip sürejektir. *Ölünjeye kadar* («Rize» qəzetindən); (Tureü) Allah korusun. *Memleketi* («Rize» qəzetindən); (Tureü) Numara taşınabilirliği uygulamasıyla taşınacak numaraların hangi operatörde olduğunun müşteriler tarafından nasıl algılanabileceği konusunda bir bilgilendirme yapma ihtiyajı duyduk. *Son dönemde* («Rize» qəzetindən); (Azerb.) Doğulmuşam. *1955 –in oktyabrında* (Danışiq dilindən); (Tatar) Bu minem yuldaşım Ayzat. *Kazan eqete* (Q. Muxamətşin); (Turkm.) Ol okər. *Turkmen oba xojalık institutunun suv qurluşık bölümünde* (A.Qarliev).

d) The fourth group of described syntagmas includes words that express positive and negative personal characteristics: (Azerb) Barmağında var idi. *Briliyant qaşlı üzük*; (Tatar) Tasma tellənqən bula bit ələ. *Börokrat!* (Q.Axunov).

Conjunction of attribute syntagmas. As it is known attribute with defined word forms the one syntagma. But the necessity of concretization, specification that is so typical for informal speech compels the speaker to describe object even with delay [9, 10]. So we have an actualization of attributes, acquisition of the new quality. (Azerb.) Ortaboylu qız idi. *Yumrusifət.* (A. Məmmədov), Dağ gövdəli adamlar vardı. *Enlikürək, uja*; (Tatar) –Ütkən pəke bu, malay! *Balıklı!* (Q. Başırov).

Conjunction of object syntagmas. Conjunction of direct and indirect objects that are necessary for completeness of sentence is observed much more seldom than attributes, adverbial modifiers of time and place. For example: (Azerb.) Səidə göy üzünü gördü. *Ayı, ulduzları* (Ə. Muğanlı), (Tatar). Ök...ələ əna ukıp beterde ul. *Un klassını* (R.İşmuratov).

Conjunction of syntagmas designating time and place. Conjunction of such syntagmas is most easy and it is observed much more frequently than syntagmas characterized with other meanings: cause, aim, measure, degree and so on.

a) Conjunction of syntagmas designating time. These syntagmas can be absolutely different on volume: it can consist of one word, word combination, sometimes of compound subordinate clause.

1) Syntagmas that consist of one word conjugated to the main sentence are most often the adverbs of time: (Azerb.) Həmid əsgərlikdən gəldi. *Payızda* (Danışiq dilində); (Tureü) Başkentde evlendi. *Dün* («Rize» qəzetindən); (Tatar) Ütkənnər şəüləse...Ay-əy ozak gzarleklədelər alar mine! *Sonınnan da...* (A.Bayanov).

2) The conjugated time syntagmas are shaped by the participle form *-anda, -əndə, -qanda*: (Azerb.) Bizim eldə yaz olur. *Sən gələndə*; Yer şumlayıb, toxum səpib, taxıl əkəydim. *Yaz günəşi saçlarını düzə yayanda* (S.Vurğun); (Tatar) Anı basmaçılar totıp üterqənnər. *Razvedkaqa barqanda* (Ş.Usmanov).

b) Conjunction of syntagmas designating place. The frequency of use of conjugated syntagmas designating place corresponds with frequency of time syntagmas conjunction. For example: (Azerb.) Vaxtı ilə onu sürgünə göndərmişdilər. *Sibirə* (Ə.Vəliyev); (Tatar) Politexnikat institutında ukiy. *Məskəüdə* (A.Rasix); (Tureü) Sürmüşdüler. *Uzak Kıpra*.

At last conjunction most often consists of one syntagma. But the succession of speech chain causes also an appearance of chain of conjugated syntagmas both homogenous and heterogenous ones.

6. Conclusions

There is a close connection between conjunction and syntagmatic segmentation of speech expressed in certain typicality of syntagmas. Conjugated syntagmas in the live Russian speech and in language of pieces of art are identical on its structural-grammatical models.

References

- [1] Axmanova, O. S. (2007). Slovar lingvisticheskix terminov. Moscow: KomKniga, 2007.
- [2] Sorokoletova, N. Yu. (2009). Intonacionnye osobennosti finalnyx sintagm v territorialnyx variantax sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka. Vestnik BomGU, seriya 2, Yazykoznanie, № 2.
- [3] Shherba, L. V. (1928). O chastyax rechi v russkom yazyke. V sb.: Russkaya rech. YY novaya seriya. Lvov.
- [4] Vinogradov, V. (1936). Stil «Pikovej damy». V sb.: Vremennik Pushkinskoj komissii, 2. Izd-vo AN SSSR.
- [5] Xatiashvili, L. G. (1963). Prisoedinitelnye svyazi v russkom yazyke. Tbilisi.
- [6] Velichuk, A. P. (1960). O specifike prisoedinitelnoj svyazi v sovremennom russkom yazyke. (Sochinenie i prisoedinenie). AKD, Baku.
- [7] Kobzev, V. P. (1987). Nepochnye predlozheniya prisoedinitelnogo tipa v sovremennom russkom literaturnom yazyke. AKD, Leningrad, 1966; Kudimova V. N. Strukturno-semanticheskaya sootnositelnost polnyx i nepolnyx predlozhenij v sovremennom russkom yazyke. AKD, Kiev, 1980; Kyazimov I. B. Nepochnoe predlozhenie v tyurkskix yazykax oguzskoj grupy. AKD, Baku.
- [8] Zyakiev, M. Z. (1974). Xyazerge tatar yadyabi tele. Sintaksis. Kazan, Tatarstan kitap nyashriyaty.
- [9] Shherba, L. V. (1963). Fonetika francuzskogo yazyka. Moscow.
- [10] Bulanin, L. L. (1970). Fonetika sovremennogo russkogo yazyka, Moscow.