Phrase-Meaning Relationship According to Situational and Incidental Texts[1]

Mustafa Volkan Coskun[i]

Mugla Sitki Kocman University, Mugla

Perihan Gulce Ozkaya[ii]

Mugla Sitki Kocman University, Mugla

Zeynep Ezgi Uysal[iii]

Mugla Sitki Kocman University, Mugla

Abstract

The purpose of the current study is to conduct a comparative analysis of the situational story of Sait Faik Abasıyanık entitled as "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" and the incidental story of Refik Halid Karay entitled as "Boz Eşek" in terms of syntax on the basis of their deep structures. The current study employed case study, one of the qualitative research methods. Within the context of the study, the situational story of Sait Faik Abasıyanık called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" was analyzed in comparison with the incidental story of Refik Halid Karay called "Boz Eşek" in terms of syntax on the basis of their deep structures. Therefore, document analysis technique was considered to be suitable for data collection. The sentences in the texts used in the current study were analyzed in terms of syntax and the meaningful units in these sentences were found and named according to their meanings. These meaningful units were named by using the names of the terms explained in grammar books. The results were qualitatively and quantitatively compared on the basis of the term and the meaning.

Keywords: *Syntax, deep structure, surface structure, sentence analysis*

----

[i] **Mustafa Volkan Coskun**, Prof. Dr., Mugla Sitki Kocman University, Faculty of Education.

[ii] **Perihan Gulce Ozkaya**, Res. Asist., Mugla Sitki Kocman University, Faculty of Education.

Correspondence: ozkayagulce@gmail.com

[iii] **Zeynep Ezgi Uysal**, Res. Asist., Mugla Sitki Kocman University, Faculty of Education.

Introduction

Syntax that is shaped within the internal world of a language is of great importance in terms of both the meaning and order; thus, meaning and order are two basic elements complementing each other. In the construction of a sentence, the trio of skill-mind-reason operates in a synchronized manner and these have to be in harmony. In case of lack of harmony, sentences cannot be constructed in line with the demands of a language and meaning-syntax relationship cannot be established. Each language has its own unique syntactical rules. The syntactical rules of the world languages included in different language families differ from each other and these rules have been elicited through the studies focusing on particular languages. Similarly, in the Turkish language, there have been many studies conducted on syntax of sentences. For this purpose, there are different studies focusing on grammar. In such studies, meaningful units constituted by words or phrases making up a sentence were separated and these separated meaningful units have been attempted to be named with the names of the terms such as subject, indirect object, adverbial clause, direct object and verb in line with the logic of question-answer.

In such studies, almost always written materials have been used. And almost all of these materials are literary texts. In our country, the studies exploring the syntax of Turkish language are usually presented in a limited context in the syntax sections of Turkish grammar textbooks. There is hardly any book focusing solely on the syntax. Moreover, in such studies, sentences are divided into structures that are considered to be units and these units are named with the names of the terms. These studies have been focusing on the surface structure in line with the logic of question-answer. The path followed in these studies does not allow eliciting deep meanings. In this regard, students taking grammar education have difficulties in finding the borders of the units of a sentence and frequently commit errors in syntactical analyses. Trying to make sense of something on the basis of the surface structure and ignoring the deep structure leads to inadequate development of language skills. Overt emphasis on the surface structure means only asking a few questions by heart and receiving their answers. However, it is only possible to enhance the language skills through the analysis of the deep structure. Conducting activities focused on the deep structure can contribute to the development of language skills in terms of language-thought-imagination relationship. It is often difficult to activate thinking in terms of the deep structure. For thinking to be activated, it is necessary to have a rich vocabulary reservoir and to activate the world of imagination. Syntax analysis works should be initiated at the elementary level in a graded manner, from simple to complex on the basis of the exploration of the deep structure. To do so, sample activities are needed.

The purpose of the current study is to conduct a comparative analysis of the situational story of Sait Faik Abasıyanık entitled as "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" and the incidental story of Refik Halid Karay entitled as "Boz Eşek" in terms of syntax on the basis of their deep structures.

Method

Research Design

The study employed case study, one of the qualitative research methods. Case study is a means of deep description and investigation of a limited system (Merriam, 2013: 40). As the data collection method, the document analysis technique was selected. The document analysis technique involves the analysis of the documents including information about the target phenomenon or phenomena. In qualitative research, document analysis can be used as a means of data collection on its own or together with other data collection methods (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011: 187).

Data Collection Instrument

In the current study, the situational story of Sait Faik Abasıyanık called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" and the incidental story of Refik Halid Karay called "Boz Eşek" were used as the data collection instruments.

Data Analysis

Within the context of the study, the situational story of Sait Faik Abasıyanık called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" was analyzed in comparison with the incidental story of Refik Halid Karay called "Boz Eşek" in terms of syntax on the basis of their deep structures. The sentences in the texts used in the current study were analyzed in terms of syntax and the meaningful units in these sentences were found and named according to their meanings. Then these meaningful units were named by using the names of the terms explained in grammar books. The results were qualitatively and quantitatively compared on the basis of the term and the meaning.

Findings

In the current research of syntax, units found on the basis of meaning were also named according to meaning. The term and meaning-based names of the units making up the sentence are given in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1. *The term and meaning-based names found in the elementary school third and fourth-grade Turkish language textbooks for the units making up the sentences in the texts analyzed*

Grammar Terms	Meaningful Units
Subject	The thing affecting (Ey-v)
	The thing affected (En-v)
	The action affecting (Ey-e)
	The action affected (En-e)
Object	The thing affecting (Ey-v)
	The thing affected (En-v)
	The action affecting (Ey-e)
	The action affected (En-e)
Direct object	Space

	The thing affecting (Ey-v)
	The thing affected (En-v)
	The action affecting (Ey-e)
	The action affected (En-e)
Adverbial clause	Manner, time, process, reason, purpose, prediction, means, condition, similarity, togetherness, direction
Verb	Heart

Depending on the meaning attained in the sentence, the concepts such as "manner, time, process, reason, purpose, prediction, means, condition, similarity, togetherness and direction" were named as a term by using a single phrase "adverbial clause". On the other hand, these concepts were found to be occupying the positions of the one affecting and the one affected in the deep structure. The same is true for the other elements. Thus, the terms of "subject", "object" and "indirect object" are named as "the thing affecting, the thing affected, the action affecting, the action affected". The term of "indirect object" also means the concept of "space". The basic element to which the other elements are connected, "verb" is named as "heart" in the sentence when the meaning is considered.

Table 4.2. *Grammar terms found in the texts called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" and "Boş Eşek"*

Grammar Terms	Texts					
	Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan		Boz Eşek		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Verb	163	32,6	183	29,1	346	30,7
Subject	163	32,6	183	29,1	346	30,7
Object	40	8	46	7,3	86	7,6
Direct object	58	11,6	63	10,04	121	10,7
Adverbial clause	76	15,2	152	24,2	228	20,2
Total	500	100	627	100	1127	100

When Table 4.2 is examined, it is seen that after the basic elements of a sentence (subject-verb), the adverbial clause is the element most frequently used in both of the texts. Analysis of texts in terms of grammar terms can yield certain results related to the sentence structures possessed by the texts and makes it possible to make comparisons. Therefore, a need arises to analyze words and phrases in texts according to their meanings because deep structure-focused analyses can only be conducted by considering the meaning.

Table 4.3. *Meaningful units found in the texts called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" and "Boş Eşek"*

	Texts					
Meaningful units	Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan		Boz Eşek		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Heart	163	32,6	183	29,1	346	30,7
The thing affecting	101	20,2	108	17,2	209	18,5
The thing affected	104	20,8	119	18,9	223	19,7
The action affecting	6	1,2	23	3,6	29	2,5
The action affected	-	-	1	0,1	1	0,08
Space	46	9,2	38	6,06	84	7,4
Time	37	7,4	37	5,9	74	6,5

Process	1	0,2	-	-	1	0,08
Style	28	5,6	97	15,4	125	11,09
Purpose	1	0,2	1	0,1	2	0,1
Means	3	0,6	8	1,2	11	0,9
Condition	1	0,2	2	0,3	3	0,2
Togetherness	4	0,8	1	0,1	5	0,4
Similarity	5	1	1	0,1	6	0,5
Reason	-	-	3	0,4	3	0,2
Prediction	-	-	4	0,6	4	0,3
Direction	-	-	1	0,1	1	0,08
Total	500	100	627	100	1127	100

The meaningful units detected in the texts analyzed are shown in Table 4.3. From the table it is seen that while the most used element in the text called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" is "space" (f.46; 9.2%); it is "style" in the text called "Boz Eşek" (f.97; 15.4%). As attitudes are given a greater priority in incidental texts, here the element of style is used relatively more frequently because situations are turned into incidences through the style. For an event to occur, styles should be involved in. For example, eating is a state; yet, eating fast results in something sticking across the throat and thus, the state of eating turns to an incident. While the element of style recurs 97 times in the incidental story of Refik Halid, it recurs only 28 times in the situational story of Sait Faik; in this regard, there is a great difference between the two texts. The sample sentences in which the element of style was found in the incidental and situational texts are given below.

En-v/Similarity/**Style/**Heart

Subject/Adverbial Clause/**Adverbial Clause/**Verb

One of them/ like a horse with glanders/was coughing/badly. (Boz Eşek, p.53)

En-v/**/Style**/Ey-e/Heart

Subject/**Adverbial Clause/**Adverbial Clause/Verb

Panco/ is trying/ to hide himself/**by using Luka Efendi as a shield** (Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan, p.27)

The same is true for the actions affecting and elements of means. As there are elements involved in the plot, in incidental texts, these elements are seen to be usually used. While there are 23 elements of action affecting in the incidental text analyzed in the current study, there are 6 elements of action affecting, there is a great difference between these two texts in this regard. In a similar manner, while there are 3 elements of means in the situational text, there are 8 elements of means in the incidental text; thus, there is a great difference between these two texts in this regard. Sample sentences in which the elements of actions affecting and means were detected are given below.

Space/Means/En-e/**Ey-e/**Heart

Indirect object/Adverbial Clause/Subject/**Object/**Verb

From far away/with his keen eyes/someone/saw/**that the empty donkey had returned**. (Boz Eşek, p.60)

En-v/En-v/Style/**Ey-e/**Heart

Subject/Indirect Object/Adverbial Clause/**Object/**Verb

The woman/was telling/me/**how the cat jumped down from the fifth floor/**in Turkish. (Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan, p.26)

En-v/**Means/**Ey-v/Heart

Subject/Adverbial Clause/Object/Verb

The old man/was telling/something/**with his exhausted voice**. (Boz Eşek, p.54)

Means/Heart/En-v

Adverbial /Verb/Subject

 Everything/ starts/ **with loving someone**. (Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan, p.25)

Moreover, in the texts analyzed, while the elements of space, time and style are frequently employed; the elements such as purpose, reason, condition, prediction, togetherness, direction are seen to be rarely used. As these elements are not widely used in the daily life and they are more widely used in special situations, they are employed in both of the texts relatively less frequently when compared to the other elements. Sample sentences in which the elements of reason and purpose were found are given below.

En-v/Purpose/Heart

Subject/Adverbial Clause/Verb

(They)/ slowed down/ to see my face. (Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan, p.23)

Reason/Space/En-v/Heart

Adverbial Clause/Indirect Object/Subject/Verb

With the noise made by the coming people/faces/looked through the doors/one by one. (Boz Eşek, p.55)

Table 4.4. *Patterns found the texts called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" and "Boş Eşek"*

Term-based patterns	f	Meaning-based patterns	f
Subject/Verb	**92**	**Ey-v/Heart**	**46**
		En-v/Heart	**44**
		Ey-e/Heart*	2
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Verb	**46**	**Ey-v/Style/Heart**	**13**
		En-v/Style/Heart*	10
		Ey-e/Style/Heart*	2
		En-v/Purpose/Heart	*1*
		Ey-v/Purpose/Heart*	1
		En-v/Similarity/Heart	*3*
		Ey-v/Similarity/Heart	*1*
		Ey-v/Time/Heart	**4**
		En-v/Time/Heart	**6**
		En-v/Reason/Heart*	2
		En-v/Condition/Heart*	1
		Ey-v/Prediction/Heart*	1
		En-v/Process/Heart	*1*
Subject/Object/Verb	**29**	*En-v/Ey-v/Heart*	*5*
		Ey-v/En-v/Heart	**13**
		En-v/Ey-e/Heart	**11**
Subject/Indirect Object/Verb	**20**	**En-v/Space/Heart**	**6**
		Ey-v/Space/Heart	*5*
		En-v/Ey-v/Heart	**9**
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Verb	**17**	*En-v/Time/Time/Heart*	*1*
		Ey-v/Style/Time/Heart*	1
		Ey-v/Time/Togetherness/Heart	*1*
		Ey-v/Style/Style/Heart*	3
		En-v/Style/Style/Heart*	3
		En-v/Togetherness/Style/Heart	*1*
		En-v/Similarity/Style/Heart*	1
		En-v/Prediction/Style/Heart*	1
		En-v/Time/Style/Heart	**5**
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Indirect Object/Verb	**15**	*Ey-v/Style/Space/Heart*	*4*
		Ey-v/Style/En-e/Heart*	1
		En-v/Style/Space/Heart*	2
		En-v/Time/Space/Heart*	1
		En-v/Time/Ey-e/Heart*	1
		En-v/Style/Ey-v/Heart	*1*
		En-v/Style/En-v/Heart*	1
		En-v/Style/Ey-e/Heart	**3**
		En-v/Similarity/Ey-v/Heart	*1*
Indirect Object/Subject/Verb	**15**	**Space/Ey-v/Heart**	**12**
		Space/En-v/Heart	**3**
Adverbial Clause/Subject/Verb	**11**	*Time/Ey-v/Heart*	*5*
		Time/En-v/Heart	**3**
		Condition/Ey-v/Heart	*1*
		Style/Ey-v/Heart*	1
		Style/En-v/Heart*	1
Subject/Indirect Object/Object/Verb	**11**	**En-v/Space/Ey-v/Heart**	**5**
		Ey-v/Space/En-v/Heart	*1*
		En-v/Ey-v/Ey-v/Heart*	3
		Ey-e/En-v/En-v/Heart*	1
		En-v/Ey-v/Ey-e/Heart	*1*

Subject/Adverbial Clause/Object/Verb	**10**	*En-v/Style/Ey-e/Heart*	*1*
		En-v/Style/Ey-v/Heart*	2
		Ey-v/Style/En-v/Heart*	1
		Ey-v/Time/En-v/Heart*	1
		Ey-v/Means/Ey-v/Heart*	1
		En-v/Time/Ey-v/Heart	**4**
Subject/Object/Indirect Object/Verb	**5**	*Ey-v/En-v/Space/Heart*	*4*
		Ey-v/Ey-v/Space/Heart*	1
Subject/Object/adverbial Clause/Verb	**5**	**En-v/Ey-v/Style/Heart**	**5**
Indirect Object/Subject/Indirect Object/Verb	**4**	*Space/En-v/Means/Heart*	*1*
		Space/Ey-v/Style/Heart*	3
Subject/Indirect Object/Indirect Object/Verb	**2**	*En-v/Space/Space/Heart*	*1*
		Ey-v/Space/Ey-v/Heart*	1
Adverbial Clause/Subject/Indirect Object/Verb	**2**	*Time/En-v/Ey-v/Heart*	*1*
		Time/En-v/En-v/Heart*	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Object/Adverbial Clause/Verb	**2**	*En-v/Time/Ey-v/Style/Heart*	*1*
		Ey-v/Style/En-v/Style/Heart*	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Object/Verb	**2**	*Ey-v/Time/Style/En-v/Heart*	*1*
		En-v/Style/Condition/En-v/Heart*	1
Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause /Indirect object/Subject/Verb	**2**	*Time/Time/Space/Ey-v/Heart*	*1*
		Time/Style/Space/En-v/Heart*	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Indirect Object/Verb	**2**	*Ey-v/Style/Togetherness/Space/Heart*	*1*
		Ey-v/Style/Style/Space/Heart*	1
Verb/Subject	*2*	*Heart/Ey-v*	*2*
Indirect Object/Adverbial Clause/Subject/Verb	*2*	*Space/Tarz/Ey-v/Heart*	*2*
Subject/Indirect Object/Adverbial Clause/Object/Verb	*2*	*En-v/En-v/Style/Ey-e/Heart*	*1*
		Ey-v/Space/Time/En-v/Heart	*1*
Subject/Verb/Indirect Object	*1*	*Ey-v/Space/Space*	*1*
Object/Subject/Verb	*1*	*En-v/Ey-v/Heart*	*1*
Adverbial Clause/Verb/Subject	*1*	*Means/Heart/En-v*	*1*
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Verb/Indirect Object	*1*	*En-v/Time/Heart/Space*	*1*
Subject/Indirect Object/Verb/Adverbial Clause	*1*	*En-v/Space/Heart/Style*	*1*
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Verb/Adverbial Clause	*1*	*En-v/Style/Heart/Time*	*1*
Indirect Object/Subject/Object/Verb	*1*	*Space/En-v/Ey-v/Heart*	*1*
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Verb/Indirect Object	*1*	*En-v/Time/Style/Heart/Space*	*1*
Adverbial Clause/Subject/Indirect Object/Adverbial Clause/Verb	*1*	*Time/En-v/Space/Style/Heart*	*1*
Subject/Object/Adverbial Clause/Indirect Object/Verb	*1*	*Ey-v/En-v/Style/Space/Heart*	*1*
Subject/Indirect Object/Object/Indirect Object/Verb	*1*	*Ey-v/Space/En-v/Space/Heart*	*1*
Subject/Adverbial/Clause/Object/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Indirect Object/Verb	*1*	*Ey-v/Time/En-v/Style/Togetherness/Space/Heart*	*1*
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Object/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Object/Verb	*1*	*Ey-v/Means/Time/En-v/Time/Style/En-v/Heart*	*1*
Subject/Indirect Object/Adverbial Clause/Verb*	9	En-v/Space/Style/Heart *	3
		Ey-v/En-v/Style/Heart *	3
		En-v/Ey-v/Means/Heart *	2
		Ey-v/Space/Style/Heart*	1
Adverbial Clause/Subject/Adverbial Clause/Verb*	3	Time/En-v/Style/Heart*	2
		Time/Ey-v/Style/Heart*	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Verb*	2	Ey-v/Time/Means/Style/Heart *	1
		Ey-v/Style/Style/Style/Heart *	1

Indirect Object/Indirect Object/Subject/Object/Verb*	2	Space/Means/En-v/Ey-e/Heart*	1
		Space/Time/Ey-v/Ey-v/Heart*	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Indirect Object/Verb*	2	En-v/Time/Style/Ey-e/Heart*	1
		En-v/Time/Time/Space/Heart *	1
Adverbial Clause/Indefinite Object /Verb*	2	Time/Ey-v/Heart*	2
Adverbial Clause/Indirect Object/Indefinite Object/Verb*	1	Time/Space/Ey-e/Heart *	1
Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Subject/Verb*	1	Time/Togetherness/Ey-v/Heart *	1
Adverbial Clause/Indirect Object/Subject/Verb*	1	Reason/Space/En-v/Heart*	1
Adverbial Clause/Subject/Adverbial Clause/Object/Verb*	1	Prediction/En-v/Style/Ey-v/Heart *	1
Adverbial Clause/Subject/Indirect Object/Indirect Object/Verb*	1	Style/En-v/Space/Space/Heart *	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Object/Indirect Object/Verb*	1	En-v/Style/En-v/Space/Heart*	1
Subject/Indirect Object/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Verb*	1	En-v/Space/Style/Style/Heart *	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Object/Object/Verb*	1	En-v/Prediction/Ey-e/Ey-e/Heart *	1
Adverbial Clause/Subject/Adverbial Clause/Indirect Object/Verb*	1	Process/En-v/Style/Space/Heart*	1
Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Verb*	1	Means/Time/Ey-v/Time/Style/Heart*	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Verb*	1	En-v/Style/Means/Style/Style/Heart *	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Indirect Object/Object/Adverbial Clause/Verb*	1	En-v/Time/Space/Ey-v/Style/Heart*	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Verb*	1	Ey-v/Style/Style/Style/Style/Direction/Heart*	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Object/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Verb*	1	Ey-v/Time/En-v/Time/Style/Distance/Heart*	1
Subject/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause/Adverbial Clause /Object/Adverbial Clause/Verb*	1	Ey-v/Time/Means/Style/Ey-v/Style/Heart*	1
56 term-based phrases	346	120 meaning-based phrases	346

The patterns determined in the texts analyzed in the current study are given in Table 4.4. The patterns shared by both of the texts are given in "**bold**", the patterns only found in the text called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" are presented in "*italic*" and the patterns only found in the text called "Boz Eşek" are indicated with "*".

As a result of the analysis of the total 346 sentences found in the texts explored in the current study, 56 term-based phrase and 120 meaning-based phrase. Of the 56 meaning-based phrases, 19 are common in both of the texts; 16 are only found in the text called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" and 21 are only found in the text called "Boz Eşek". Of the 120 meaning-based phrases, 17 are shared by both of the texts; 42 are only found in the text called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" and 61 are only found in the text called "Boz Eşek".

When all these data are considered, it is seen that the number of the meaning-based phrases is higher than that of the term-based phrases. This shows the richness of Turkish language.

Table 4.5. *The first elements of the phrases found in the texts called "Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan" and "Boş Eşek"*

Grammar Terms	f	%	Meaningful Units	f	%
Subject	290	83,8	Ey-v	163	47,1
			En-v	122	35,2
			Ey-e	5	1,4
Adverbial Clause	29	8,3	Time	20	5,7
			Condition	2	0,5
			Style	2	0,5
			Means	2	0,5
			Reason	1	0,3
			Prediction	1	0,3
			Process	1	0,3
Indirect Object	24	6,9	Space	24	6,9
Verb	2	0,5	Heart	2	0,5
Object	1	0,2	En-v	1	0,3
Total	346	100	Total	346	100

The frequencies and percentages of the first elements of the phrases found in the texts analyzed in the current study are given in Table 4.5. From Table 4.5., it is seen that in 83.8% of the sentences, the subject is the first element; yet, when the deep structure is examined, it is seen that in 47.1% of the sentences, the thing affecting; in 35.2% of the sentences, the thing affected and in 1.4% of the sentences, the action affecting is the first element of the sentence. In a standard sentence constructed according to the rules of syntax in Turkish language, the initial position is occupied by the subject and the final position is occupied by the verb. Thus, in light of the findings of the current study, it can be argued that both of the authors adhered to the rules of syntax of Turkish language to a great extent in their works.

The research findings also show that Refik Halid Karay and Sait Faik Abasıyanık not only used the subject in the initial position of their sentences, but also some other elements such as adverbial clause, indirect object and object. Furthermore, in the text written by Sait Faik, inverted sentences were also used. Thus, in 8.3% of the analyzed sentences, the initial position is occupied by an adverbial clause; in 6.9% of the sentences, the first element is the indirect object; in 0.5% of the sentences, the first element is the verb and 0.3% of the sentences, the first element is the direct object. When we look at the deep structure, it is seen that space (6.9%) and time (5.7%) elements are used more frequently as the first element than the other elements. As these elements are widely used in the daily life, they might have been attached greater priority in both of the texts.

Discussion, Results and Suggestions

Discussion

In the current study, it was concluded that detection of the words and phrases in texts on the basis of the meaning they possess enables the reader to reach a better understanding and internalization of the meaningful units making up sentences. The findings of Üstünova (2010), Demirci (2010), Kurudayıoğlu (2014) and Börekçi (2015) also support this finding. In these studies, it was emphasized that meaning should be taken into consideration in syntax analyses because deep-structure focused studies can only be conducted by considering the meaning.

Consideration of the meanings of the words gained in sentences and meaning-focused syntax analyses allow us to discover the richness of a language. In a study conducted by Işık (2012), it was concluded that internalization of the phrase-meaning relationship can make positive contributions to the development of language skills. This finding concurs with the findings of the current study.

Results

Inadequate amount of research focusing on syntax in our country, its being restricted to grammar books and investigation of it mostly on the basis of surface structure result in lack of emphasis on thought and imagination while studying the concept of sentence. However, the concept of sentence that is always with us in our life is our regular, real and continuous partner. Understanding and making sense of the sentence primarily depends on what kinds of works are conducted on it. One of these works, probably the most important one, is meaning-based activities focusing on syntax.

In the current study, the sentences were analyzed according to both the meanings they posses and the existing grammar terms. It was found that sentence analysis conducted on the basis of the grammar terms is quite superficial when compared to the one conducted on the basis of the meaning. Thus, it was concluded that the sentence analysis conducted considering the meaning enables us to discover the deep structure of sentences, to establish language-thought-imagination relationship and to reveal the richness of a language.

Suggestions

In syntax analysis studies conducted in line with the classic approach, the main focus is on the surface structure and deep structure is mostly ignored. In order to focus on the deep structure, the trio of language-thought-imagination should operate in harmony in human mind. For the construction of this trio and establishment of the harmony, there is a need for a serious instruction on language-thought-imagination relationship. This instruction should be initiated at the elementary education and proceeds through schooling in a systematic manner.

Research conducted on the basis of phrase-meaning relationship is believed to offer guidance for academicians and practitioners studying in this field. Such research can make contributions to the detection of the meaningful units making up a sentence by investigating the deep structure, to the comprehension of these meaningful units by referring to the daily life, to the development of listening, speaking, reading and writing skills within the context of language-thought-imagination, to the easier comprehension of abstract constructs and to the generation of proper and accurate associations between abstract and concrete entities (abstract-abstract, abstract-concrete, concrete-concrete).

References

Abasıyanık, S. F. (2002). Alemdağ'da Var Bir Yılan. İstanbul: YKY.

Börekçi, M. (2015). Söz Dizim Kuralları Bağlamında Türkçe Söz Dizimi. Turkish Studies-International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 10(16), 355-370.

Demirci, K. (2010). Derin Yapı ve Yüzey Yapıdan Ne Anlıyoruz?. Turkish Studies-International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 5(4), 291-304.

Işık, H. (2012). Cümlede Öbek-Anlam İlişkisinin Kavratılması Yoluyla Dil Becerilerinin Geliştirilmesi (İlköğretim II. Kademe Öğrencileri Örneği). Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Muğla Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü: Muğla.

Karay, R. H. (2010). Memleket Hikâyeleri. İstanbul: İnkılap.

Kurudayıoğlu, M. (2014). Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Dil Bilgisi Öğretiminin Temel Problemleri.

Murat Özbay (Ed.), Türkçe Eğitimi Açısından Dil Bilgisi Öğretimi içinde (s. 47-70). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Merriam, S. B. (2013). Nitel Araştırma (Desen ve Uygulama için Bir Rehber). Engin Karadağ (Çev.). Ankara: Nobel.

Üstünova, K. (2010). Yüzey Yapı- Derin Yapı Kavramları Üzerine. Turkish Studies-International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 5(4), 697-704.

Yıldırım, A.& Şimşek, H. (2011). Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri. Ankara: Seçkin.