

UDC 297

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/87-3-35>

**Jamila Rufat RUSTAMOVA,**

*orcid.org/0009-0009-1154-9385*

*Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Doctoral Researcher,  
Associate Professor at the Department of Turkic Philology*

*Baku State University*

*(Baku, Azerbaijan) [cemile.rustemova@gmail.com](mailto:cemile.rustemova@gmail.com)*

## **DIVERGENT APPROACHES TO THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE 'COMPLEX SENTENCE' IN TURKIC LINGUISTICS**

*The present article undertakes an analysis of the diverse approaches to the characterization of the concept of the "complex sentence" as represented in Turkological scholarship, with particular emphasis on contemporary Turkish linguistics. It is revealed that the inherent difficulty of establishing an unequivocal framework for this conceptualization engenders a multitude of divergences concerning the criteria for defining the complex sentence as a grammatical category. Notably, certain syntactic structures that are not regarded as complex sentences within the grammatical tradition of the closely related Azerbaijani language are, under the dominant analytical paradigm of modern Turkish linguistics, unequivocally classified as complex sentences. Given that the discussion pertains to two languages sharing a close genealogical relationship (Azerbaijani and modern Turkish both belonging to the Oghuz branch of the Turkic language family), and considering that both languages are typologically characterized by agglutinative morphology, it follows that the underlying rationale for such (almost polarized) divergences in analytical approach must be sought not in the linguistic data per se, but rather within the theoretical postulates underpinning linguistic inquiry.*

*Indeed, a number of Turkish linguists, through an analysis of simple sentences containing participial, converbal, or infinitival constructions, propose—on the basis of the communicative meaning and semantic content conveyed by such constructions—that these sentences contain two distinct informational nuclei. Accordingly, invoking the principle of semantic duality or semantic embedding, they posit the existence of two or more complex sentences. By contrast, another cohort of linguists, including the majority of Azerbaijani linguists, without disregarding the role of grammatical formalism, upholds the existence of an extended simple sentence as a linguistic reality.*

*Within the scope of the present article, by articulating an authorial position in relation to these divergent approaches, an attempt is made to juxtapose their respective theoretical underpinnings and to elucidate the foundational principle upon which the present analysis is predicated.*

**Key words:** *Turkish linguistics, the problem of the complex sentence, verbal constructions, Azerbaijani linguistics, simple sentence.*

**Джаміля Руфат РУСТАМОВА,**

*orcid.org/0009-0009-1154-9385*

*доктор філософії з філології, докторант,  
доцент кафедри тюркської філології*

*Бакинського державного університету*

*(Баку, Азербайджан) [cemile.rustemova@gmail.com](mailto:cemile.rustemova@gmail.com)*

## **РІЗНІ ПІДХОДИ ДО КОНЦЕПТУАЛІЗАЦІЇ «СКЛАДНОГО РЕЧЕННЯ» У ТЮРКІЙСЬКОМУ ЛІНГВІСТИЦІ**

*У цій статті проводиться аналіз різних підходів до характеристики поняття «складнопірядне речення», представленого в тюркологічних дослідженнях, з особливим акцентом на сучасну турецьку лінгвістику. Виявляється, що притаманна складність встановлення однозначної основи для цієї концептуалізації породжує безліч розбіжностей щодо критеріїв визначення складнопірядного речення як граматичної категорії. Примітно, що певні синтаксичні структури, які не розглядаються як складнопірядні речення в граматичній традиції близькосторідної азербайджанської мови, згідно з домінуючою аналітичною парадигмою сучасної турецької лінгвістики однозначно класифікуються як складнопірядні речення. З огляду на те, що обговорення стосується двох мов, які мають тісний генеалогічний зв'язок (азербайджанська та сучасна турецька мови належать до огузької гілки тюркської мовної сім'ї), і враховуючи, що обидві мови типологічно характеризуються аглютинативною морфологією, з цього випливає, що основне обґрунтування таких (майже поляризованих) розбіжностей в аналітичному підході слід шукати не в самих лінгвістичних даних, а радше в теоретичних постулатах, що лежать в основі лінгвістичних досліджень.*

*Дійсно, низка турецьких лінгвістів, аналізуючи прості речення, що містять дісприкметникові, конвербальні або інфінітивні конструкції, пропонують – на основі комунікативного значення та семантичного змісту, що*

*передаються такими конструкціями, – що ці речення містять два окремих інформаційних ядра. Відповідно, посилаючись на принцип семантичної дуальності або семантичного вбудовування, вони постулюють існування двох або більше складних речень. Натомість інша когорта лінгвістів, включаючи більшість азербайджанських лінгвістів, не хтуючи роллю граматичного формалізму, стверджує існування розгорнутого простого речення як лінгвістичної реальності.*

*У рамках цієї статті, формулюючи авторську позицію щодо цих різних підходів, робиться спроба зіставити їхні відповідні теоретичні основи та з'ясувати основоположний принцип, на якому базується цей аналіз.*

**Ключові слова:** турецька лінгвістика, проблема складного речення, дієслівні конструкції, азербайджанська лінгвістика, просте речення.

**Introduction.** In the context of resolving various functional-communicative challenges inherent in the analysis of the Turkish complex sentence, certain factors emerge that impede a thorough and comprehensive scholarly inquiry. Specifically, it becomes apparent that an examination of the complex sentence from the standpoint of communicative semantics cannot be undertaken without first elucidating the fundamental nature of the phenomenon itself. The most straightforward explanation for this situation lies in the multiplicity of divergent interpretative responses to the foundational question: “What constitutes a complex sentence?” Accordingly, the present article seeks to shed light on the theoretical premises that account for such discrepancies in scholarly approaches.

At the outset, it is imperative to emphasize that, prior to engaging with the issue of the interrelation between verbal constructions and subordinate clauses within the framework of Turkish linguistics, it is essential to address the problem of defining the complex sentence. This definitional issue is intrinsically linked to the challenges posed by verbal constructions and subordinate clauses. Within Turkish linguistic scholarship, the concept of the complex sentence is designated by various scholars employing a range of distinct terminological formulations.

Linguists such as M. Ergin and T. Banguoglu employ the term complex sentence (*birleşik cümle*) to designate the concept of the complex sentence, whereas researchers including T.N. Genjan, V. Hatiboglu, and H. Dizdaroglu utilize the term complex clause (*birleşik tümce*). Within Turkish linguistics, a sentence structure containing more than one predicate, comprising a main clause and one (or several) subordinate clauses, is considered a complex sentence. M. Gece offers the following interpretation of the structure denoted in Turkish linguistics as complex sentence (*birleşik cümle*): “Structurally complex sentences are syntactic units formed from two or more sentences, characterized by a unified intonation and encompassing multiple ideas within a single framework. Such sentences are constructed from simple sentence structures and their various

combinations” (Gece, 1998: 334). The prevailing view holds that, in Turkish, the main clause typically follows, while the subordinate clause precedes it. This observation makes it evident that the notion of the complex sentence in Turkish linguistics diverges considerably from its counterpart in Azerbaijani linguistics.

**Degree of Problem Elaboration.** Regarding the degree of scholarly engagement with the problem, it is pertinent to draw attention to a noteworthy – and indeed paradoxical – circumstance. Although the issue has received extensive scholarly attention in the field of Turkology, its resolution remains inversely proportional to the intensity of research. In other words, despite being one of the most thoroughly examined issues, a diversity of opinions continues to prevail concerning the criteria for identifying the Turkish complex sentence, and it remains premature to claim that a unified theoretical position has been established. Nevertheless, it would be inappropriate to overlook the contributions of numerous scholars who have made significant advances in investigating the problem of the Turkish complex sentence within Turkish linguistics. Given that the issue examined in this article represents one of the most complex and contested problems in Turkological linguistics, it has provoked vigorous scholarly debates over the course of several decades. Regrettably, to date, no unequivocal theoretical consensus has emerged concerning its resolution. Among the linguists who have expressed their perspectives and considerations on this issue – taking positions either in support of or in opposition to various theoretical frameworks – are M. Fidanji (Fidançı, 1995), L. Karahan (Karahan, 1994), T. Banguoglu (Banquoğlu, 1998), V. Hatiboglu (Hatipoğlu, 1972), H. Dizdaroglu (Dizdaroglu, 1976), M. Ergin (Ergin, 1987), T.N. Genjan (Gencan, 2001), and many others.

**Objectives and tasks.** The principal objective of this study is to analyze the divergences in the conceptualization of the complex sentence within Turkish linguistics. The specific tasks arising from this objective include examining the criteria for identifying the complex sentence in Turkish

linguistics, elucidating the rationale underlying the reliance of these criteria on divergent principles, and advancing a substantiated authorial perspective within this context, among other research objectives.

**Methods.** This study employed comparative, structural, and semantic analysis methodologies. Furthermore, in the process of working with linguistic data, the comparative-historical method – widely utilized in the study of related languages – was applied, facilitating the identification of what is regarded by the author as an objective criterion amid the prevailing divergences between Turkish and Azerbaijani linguistic approaches.

### Main section

#### The Principal Challenges in Defining the Turkish Complex Sentence

As it has been established, the notion of complex sentences in Azerbaijani linguistics is broader than the concept of compound sentence (*birleşik cümle* // *birleşik tümce*) in Turkish linguistics. This concept is somewhat aligned with the notion of subordinate complex sentence (*təbəli mürəkkəb cümlə*) in Azerbaijani linguistics. A considerable number of sentence types classified as complex sentences in Azerbaijani linguistics are examined under distinct terminologies in Turkish linguistics, such as serial sentence (*sıralı cümle*) and coordinated sentence (*bağlı cümle*). However, it cannot be asserted that the Turkish linguistic concepts of coordinated sentence (*bağlı cümle*) and serial sentence (*sıralı cümle*) correspond precisely to the concept of complex sentence (*mürəkkəb cümlə*) in Azerbaijani linguistics. For instance, M. Geje, who investigates the issue of coordinated sentences in Turkish, cites the following sentence as an example of a coordinated sentence: “Yaşlar kurur, iniltirler durur, çukurlar dolar, yangınlar söner, mezarlar çöker, viraneler şenlenir; her şey bitti sanılır...” (Gece, 1998: 338). The first sentence of this example is regarded as a non-subordinate complex sentence (*tabesiz mürəkkəb cümlə*) in Azerbaijani linguistics, while the second sentence is categorized as an expanded simple sentence with coordinate elements. Consequently, the concept of coordinated sentence (*bağlı cümle*) differs substantially from the notion of non-subordinate complex sentence (*tabesiz mürəkkəb cümlə*). It is also pertinent to note that L. Karahan includes the sentence type formed with a conjunction within the category of coordinated sentences (*bağlı cümle*) (Karahan, 1994: 66).

It is also essential to address the distinct interpretation of the concept of serial sentence (*sıralı cümle*) within Turkish linguistics. While certain Turkish linguists examine serial sentences as part of the compound sentence (*birleşik cümle*)

structure, others consider them a distinct sentence type. According to V. Hatiboglu, sentences that are semantically related and connected by a conjunction are referred to as serial sentences (*sıralı cümle*) (Hatipoğlu: 1972: 154-158). T. Banquoğlu defines a serial sentence as a construction wherein two propositions, linked by a conjunction, form a sentence with varied semantic relationships. This scholar further contends that the serial sentence is a subtype of complement compound sentence (*tümleme birleşik cümle*) (Banquoğlu, 1998: 554-558). H. Ediskun, on the other hand, examines serial sentences not from a structural classification but from a morphological perspective (Ediskun, 1999: 383). H. Dizdaroglu, too, does not regard serial sentences as a sentence type from a structural viewpoint and instead studies them under the category of “Sentence Types According to Their Connections” (Dizdaroglu, 1976: 223-247).

The status of the serial sentence remains unresolved within Turkish linguistics. M. Fidanji posits that there is no definitive consensus regarding the existence of serial sentences in Turkish. As such, there is a lack of sufficient scholarly consensus on this sentence type. Some researchers have classified serial sentences as complex sentences, which has further complicated the resolution of the serial sentence issue. Those who treat serial sentences as a separate sentence type generally attempt to classify them based on their meaning rather than their structure, thereby leading to confusion in classification criteria (Fidançı, 1995: 1318-1319).

The majority of Turkish linguists include sentences containing infinitives, verbal noun clauses, and participial constructions (“*eylemsi*”) within the category of complex sentences. These sentence types are sometimes referred to as “integrated sentence,” “integrated compound sentence,” or “complex compound sentence” (Banquoğlu, 1998: 562; Zülfikar, 1995: 26-51). However, in Azerbaijani linguistics, sentences with such structures are examined under the category of simple sentences. A type of sentence in Azerbaijani linguistics that falls outside the structure of complex sentences, known as “mediated and unmediated speech” (*vasitəli və vasitəsiz nitq*), is studied within Turkish linguistics as part of complex sentence structure, specifically as a type of complex sentence.

For this reason, the determination of the boundaries of complex sentences in Turkish is considered one of the most complicated issues in Turkish linguistics. One of the factors that complicate this problem is the differing methodological approaches applied by researchers to define a sentence in the studies on Turkish syntax, as well as the confusion in terminology. It can be observed that researchers

classify sentences using various criteria, often naming the same concepts with different terms, and at times, expressing different ideas using the same term.

### **Variations in the Criteria for Differentiating Turkish Complex Sentences**

In Turkish linguistics, there is considerable confusion regarding the identification of simple and complex sentences, as observed in works on syntax and in the definition of complex sentences. A group of linguists considers sentences that include infinitives, participles, and verbal noun clauses as part of the complex sentence category. These linguists suggest that such sentences (e.g., “Türbenin içine girmek bir imtiyazdır; Yazdığım mektubu masanın üstünde bıraktı; Koca Ali sendeleyerek ayağa kalktı,” etc.) contain two main clauses and, based on context, classify them as complex sentences. It is worth noting that these types of sentences have been labeled by various scholars with different terms, such as T. Banquoglu’s “complex compound sentence,” A. Beserek’s “compound sentence,” T. N. Genjan’s “compound sentence,” H. Dizdaroglu, H. Ediskun, R. Shimshek, S. Saglam’s “integrated sentence,” V. Hatiboglu and M. Kukey’s “integrated-compound,” and Y. Yoruk’s “integrated sentence”.

In works on Turkish syntax, sentences with infinitives, participles, and verbal noun clauses are examined either as simple sentences, as part of complex sentences, or as a distinct sentence structure. V. Hatiboglu, who refers to these structures as “integrated sentence”, presents them under a separate heading. According to this scholar, sentences formed by the combination of a main clause with one or more verbal noun (eylemsi) elements are structured in this manner (Hatipoğlu, 1972: 153). N. Koch follows a similar approach and also considers these sentences as “integrated sentence,” deeming it appropriate to study them separately (Koç, 1996: 547).

T. Banquoglu, under the label “complex compound sentence,” views sentences with infinitives, verbal noun clauses, and participles as a subtype of complex sentences. He also notes that these sentences exhibit variations in the forms of verbal nouns, adjectives, and adverbial participles (Banquoglu, 1998: 562). A similar approach is found in T. N. Genjan’s work, where he, like Banquoglu, accepts these sentences as a type of complex sentence and refers to them as “Integrated Compound Sentence” (Gencan, 2001: 156). R. Shimshek also considers such constructions within the category of complex sentences (Koç, 1996: 253). H. Dizdaroglu adopts the same approach (Dizdaroglu, 1976: 195). B. Goyush divides Turkish sentences into simple and complex sentences, classifying sentences containing infinitives, participles, and verbal noun clauses as complex sentences (Erdem, 2007: 89).

I. Aydin discusses the example sentences “Ava giden, avlanır” (“Those who go to hunt, hunt”) and “Irmağa giden yol, kasabadan kurtulunca, göz alabildiğine uzanan sayısız şeftali bahçeleri arasında geçerdi” (“The road leading to the river, after escaping the village, passed through countless peach orchards stretching as far as the eye could see”). In the first example, there is one subordinate clause (“ava giden”), while in the second example, there are four subordinate clauses (“ırmağa giden,” “kasabadan kurtulunca,” “göz alabildiğine,” “uzanan”). In our opinion, these are nothing more than verbal noun constructions. The author provides additional examples where the same pattern is evident: “Kadın parayı naylon kutuya atarken bir yandan da sesini büsbütün yükselterek yolcuları masaya çekmeye çalışıyordu” (“While the woman threw the money into the nylon box, she was also raising her voice and trying to pull the passengers to the table”); “Bir öykümü ilk kez dergi sayfalarında gördüğüm günü hatırlıyorum şu anda” (“I remember the day I saw one of my stories for the first time in the pages of a magazine”); “Şu Adnan da doçent olduğundan beri övünmekten yorulmadı” (“Since Adnan became an associate professor, he hasn’t tired of boasting”); “Sara aşçının geldiğini haber verdi” (“Sara informed that the cook had arrived”); and others (Aydın).

In the context of the Turkish language, S. Kara, who investigates the issue of complex sentences, considers sentences with such structures – i.e., sentences containing verbal adjectives, verbal clauses, and verbal noun constructions – not to be simple sentences but rather complex sentences. In this regard, he writes: “It is not possible to consider a sentence separate from its semantics. The internal structure of the sentence, along with its external structure, is also considered important in sentence construction. In the Turkish language, the incomplete sentences that are used highlight the significance of this point. In these types of incomplete sentences, missing words and expressions are completed in the listener’s mind according to the content of the sentence. Therefore, both the external structure and the internal structure of the sentence play an important role in sentence formation. Based on this concept, it can be said that sentences formed with these structures have an additional judgment or semantics” (Kara, 2012: 647).

A group of linguists argue that the sentences mentioned above should not be considered complex but rather simple. According to these linguists, verbal nouns, verbal adjectives, and verbal clauses are non-conjugated forms of verbs, referred to as “eylemsi” or “filimsi” in Turkish literary language, and therefore, they cannot form a complete sentence. To form a

complex sentence, it is necessary to have two clauses constructed with conjugated verbs. Linguists supporting this view include E. Yaman, H. Zulfikar, I. Jemiloglu, M. Karaors, M. Ergin, L. Karahan, S. Eker, R. Erkul, M. Musaoglu, A. Mehmedoglu, and others.

M. Ergin, a Turkish Turkologist who divides sentences structurally into two categories (simple and complex sentences), regards sentences containing verbal nouns, verbal clauses, and verbal adjective structures as simple sentences (Ergin, 1987: 404–406). L. Karahan does not accept the sentence type referred to as complex sentence in Turkish linguistics. He explains the reasoning behind classifying such sentences as complex as follows: “Verbal nouns, verbal clauses, and verbal adjectives are considered to express a partial judgment or auxiliary judgment, and for this reason, these sentences are classified as complex. Therefore, each of these words is considered a dependent clause attached to the main clause, and the function of the predicate is to link these judgments to the conclusion” (Karahan, 1994: 22). In this context, the task of the main clause is to link multiple judgments, which is why these types of sentences are considered complex, not simple. The researcher further argues that verbal adjectives, verbal clauses, and verbal nouns do not express judgments, and therefore, their inclusion in a sentence conflicts with the concept of a “judgment” (Karahan, 1994: 22–23). In another work, L. Karahan also addresses this issue, stating: “Sentences formed with verbal adjectives, verbal clauses, or verbal nouns, or those formed with word combinations including such structures, are considered simple sentences in terms of structure. These words and word combinations do not express a judgment” (Karahan, 1999: 61).

H. Zulfikar also thoroughly investigated this issue and concluded that, considering the fact that the forms derived from verbs and functioning as nouns, adjectives, or adverbs do not express a specific judgment nor relate to a particular time, it is not accurate to refer to combinations formed with these as dependent clauses or to classify them as complex sentences (Zulfikar, 1995: 648). Similar views have also been expressed by H. Savran. The researcher agrees with L. Karahan’s view that sentences containing verbal adjectives, verbal clauses, and verbal noun constructions should be considered simple sentences (Savran, 1999: 325–330). N. Demir has also expressed his perspective on this issue in Turkish linguistics (Demir, 2010: 464–467).

A key point of consideration is that in Turkic linguistics, scholarly debates concerning whether sentences containing infinitives, converbs, and participles should be categorized as complex sentences remain unresolved. The inclusion of such

sentences in middle school curricula and textbooks on the Turkish language further substantiates this observation (Kerimoğlu, 2007: 102–103). This circumstance underscores significant theoretical ambiguity and illustrates the fundamental reasons behind the persistent challenges in defining and identifying the Turkish complex sentence.

### **The Underlying Reasons for Divergent Theoretical Approaches to the Turkish Complex Sentence**

The emergence of this issue within Turkic linguistics can be attributed to the divergence of scholarly opinion regarding whether constructions involving converbs, participles, and infinitives express auxiliary predication. Certain linguists maintain that these constructions do indeed convey auxiliary predication, whereas others refute this position. In essence, proponents of the former view argue that converbial, participial, and infinitival constructions embody auxiliary predication, positing that the Turkish language prioritizes semantic content over formal structure; consequently, they contend that the semantic function of a sentence, rather than its formal composition, should serve as the primary criterion for classification. On this basis, they deny that sentences containing participles, converbs, and infinitives represent independent predications. Conversely, scholars who classify sentences with infinitives, participles, and converbs as simple sentences emphasize formal structure as the principal criterion. They assert that constructions incorporating converbs, infinitives, and participles do not constitute sentences in their own right but rather function as sentence components. According to this perspective, irrespective of how many sentences are conceptualized in thought, the primary emphasis must be placed on their manifestation in written form. Thus, the formal composition of a sentence assumes greater significance than its semantic content. In this context, L. Karahan observes: “According to a perspective that classifies such sentences as structurally simple, for example, sentences such as “Çocuk, koşarak geldi.” (‘The child came running.’), “Çalışan, kazanır.” (‘The one who works, earns.’), and “Çalışmak ilerlemektir” (‘To work is to progress.’), which contain infinitives, converbs, and participles, are regarded as complex sentences by another school of thought; this constitutes the core of the issue” (Karahan, 1994: 19).

Analogous interpretations are encountered within turkological scholarship, where sentences containing infinitival, participial, and converbial constructions are sometimes regarded as subordinate complex sentences. Addressing this matter, A.Z. Abdullayev, who has investigated subordinate complex sentences

in the Azerbaijani language, writes: “On this question, turkologists adopt a range of perspectives. Accordingly, they may be divided into three groups:

1. Those who classify all constructions (participial, converbial, and infinitival) as subordinate clauses.
2. Those who classify only constructions with an explicit subject as subordinate clauses.
3. Those who do not regard any of these constructions as subordinate clauses.

Linguists in the second and third groups contend that the first group errs in classifying all such constructions as subordinate clauses. It is noteworthy, however, that the second and third groups are themselves divided. Linguists in the second group criticize the first group for indiscriminately categorizing all constructions as subordinate clauses, maintaining that only constructions with an explicit subject should be considered subordinate. Meanwhile, the linguists in the third group criticize both the first and second groups for classifying these constructions as subordinate clauses on various grounds. As a result, although the second and third groups share a common opposition to the first, they are not fully aligned with one another” (Abdullayev, 1974: 8–9).

This analysis demonstrates that divergent views regarding the classification of complex sentences exist not only within Turkic linguistics but also across Turkological studies more broadly. While some linguists consider sentences formed with infinitives, converbs, and participles to be complex sentences, scholars such as A.Z. Abdullayev (Abdullayev, 1974: 8–84), Q. Kazimov (Kazimov, 2000: 299–304), R. Rustamov (Rüstəmov, 2012: 124–133), and T. Muzaffaroglu (Müzəffəroğlu, 2002: 72–74) classify such sentences as simple. The examination of infinitival, participial, and converbial constructions as subordinate clauses, and of sentences containing such constructions as complex sentences, both within Turkic linguistics and Turkology, can be attributed to several factors, foremost among which is the conflation of logical and grammatical categories and the tendency to interpret grammatical phenomena predominantly through a logical lens.

Türk dilçiliyində sintaksislə bağlı terminologiyada qarışıqlıq o səviyyədədir ki, bəzi araşdırıcılar “birleşik cümle” terminindən əl çəkməyi, onun yerinə “birlikte cümle” terminini işlətməyi məqsəduyğun hesab edirlər (Ayдын: 252–255).

A. Valiyeva likewise draws attention to one of the principal challenges: the inclusion of participial, converbial, and infinitival constructions within the framework of the Turkish complex sentence. The linguist does not merely underscore that this matter possesses theoretical relevance and serves as a criterion

for establishing common parameters; she also rightly asserts that recognizing participial, converbial, and infinitival constructions as components of complex sentences diminishes the richness of Turkish syntax and, to some extent, oversimplifies its analytical scope (Vəliyeva, 2017: 189–194). We align with this position and contend that considering sentence models formed with participial, converbial, and infinitival constructions as instances of complex sentences not only fosters terminological ambiguity and compromises the principle of unified criteria, but also emerges as a superficial analytical model when juxtaposed with the acknowledged syntactic richness of Turkish. Indeed, the Turkish language—particularly the Oghuz branch of Turkic languages—demonstrates the profundity of cognitive and perceptual frameworks through its diverse and intricate syntactic constructions.

### **The Issue of Terminological Ambiguity Concerning the Turkish Complex Sentence**

In the field of Turkish linguistics, the emergence of this problem can be attributed to the inadequate delineation of the boundaries of terminological lexicon and the failure to observe distinctions between technical terminology and common lexicon.

It is pertinent to recall that linguistic scholarship recommends the consideration of various criteria to differentiate terms from general vocabulary. Specifically, terms are distinguished from non-technical words on the basis of the following characteristics:

1. While terms are stylistically neutral, common words do not possess this attribute;
2. In contrast to general lexicon, terms are devoid of modality;
3. Terms are context-independent and never derive their meaning solely from textual surroundings;
4. Unlike polysemous common words, terms are monosemous;
5. Terms fulfill a nominative function;
6. Terms possess a definitive function;
7. Emotional and expressive nuances are alien to terms;
8. Terms are domain-specific;
9. Terms are defined with precision within their respective fields, with definitions constructed upon domain-specific conceptual frameworks;
10. Terms exhibit a systematic quality;
11. The origins, formation methods, and means of terms differ from those of ordinary words.

M. Ismayilova supplements these characteristics by noting an additional criterion: “In contrast to common words, terms display distributional constraints in sentence usage. It is evident that terms

such as “hydroxide group,” “benzene”, “vector,” “integral,” “center of gravity,” and “transisto” can be collocated with a more limited set of lexical units compared to ordinary words” (İsmaylova, 1997: 25).

The neglect of these principles in the terminological discourse concerning complex sentences in Turkish linguistics has led to significant terminological ambiguity. It must be emphasized that a core property of a term is its capacity to denote a concept. Indeed, the meaning of a term is revealed through its definition. However, a term's definition may also be articulated through its definitive explanation. Addressing this matter, S. Sadigova observes: “Contextual dependence is eliminated only after a term has acquired its definition – that is, once a word or phrase has been assigned a specialized designation and has undergone the process of terminologization. During the stages of formation and definitional consolidation, the term remains context-dependent. In other words, the increased frequency of an ordinary word or phrase being used with the same meaning within texts facilitates the specification and precision of a particular semantic nuance within its semantic field, thereby contributing to the emergence of a definitive definition. Thus, the specialization of meaning for an ordinary word or phrase, leading to its assignment as a term within a specific field, initially relies heavily on contextual factors. Subsequently, the term attains autonomy from textual context and acquires systemic independence, manifesting as an autonomous phenomenon of specialized terminological meaning” (Sadigova, 1997: 15–16).

The discussion presented thus far unequivocally demonstrates that the terminology employed in Turkish linguistics with respect to the complex sentence remains markedly intricate. The utilization of such terminology in the analysis of complex sentences results in a conflation of distinct conceptual categories, which is methodologically untenable.

**Conclusion.** The analyses conducted within the framework of this article substantiate the assertion that the issue of the Turkish complex sentence continues to retain its relevance in contemporary Turkish linguistics. Despite the extensive body of theoretical research and valuable scholarly contributions developed over several decades, the persistence of divergent classification criteria still gives rise to highly varied typologies of Turkish complex sentence models. This circumstance not only underscores the ongoing terminological ambiguity but also, in our assessment, erroneously attributes complex sentence status to simple sentences that incorporate participial, converbial, and infinitival constructions—a categorization that is fundamentally unsound. The most effective means of resolving such inconsistencies lies in the comprehensive evaluation of the Turkish complex sentence, employing both traditional linguistic criteria and the principles of functional-communicative syntax. This approach would ultimately facilitate the precise delineation of the boundaries between simple and complex sentences.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abdullayev Ə.Z. Müasir Azərbaycan dilində tabeli mürəkkəb cümlələr. Bakı: Maarif, 1974. 419 s.
2. Apaydın M. Yeni Bir Terim Önerisi: Birlikte Cümle. Türk dili, sayı 537, Eylül 1996, s. 252-255
3. Aydın İ. Türkçede Yan Tümce Türleri ve İşlevleri URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/780651>
4. Banquoğlu T. Türkçenin Grameri. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları, 1998. 628 s.
5. Demir N. Türk Dili Dergisi ve Söz Dizimi Yazıları. Türk Dili, sayı 700, 2010, s. 453-472.
6. Dizdaroğlu H. Tümcebilgisi, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları. 1976. p. 234.
7. Ediskun H. Türk Dilbilgisi. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi yayınları. 1999. p. 408.
8. Erdem M. Türkmen Türkçesinde İç Cümleciklerin Morfosentaktik Açidan İncelenmesi. Modern Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi, C.4, sayı 3, Ankara: 2007. s. 26-51.
9. Ergin M. Türk Dil Bilgisi. İstanbul: Boğaziçi yayınları, 1987. 407 s.
10. Fidançı M. Sıralı Cümle. Türk Dili, sayı 534, Haziran, 1995. s.1315-1324.
11. Gece M. Türkiye Türkçesinde Bağlı Cümle. Türk Dili, sayı 562, Ekim, 1998. s. 332-339.
12. Gencan T.N. Dilbilgisi. Ayraç yayınları, Ankara: 2001. p. 638.
13. Göğüş B. Türkçede Cümlelilerin Kuruluşu ve Temel Cümlecığe Bağlanma Şekille. Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten, 1969 s. 89-142.
14. Hatipoğlu V. Türkçenin Sözdizimi, TDK Yayınları, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1972, s. 2-95.
15. İsmaylova M. Azərbaycan dili terminologiyasının lingvistik təhlili, Bakı: Ozan. 1997. Diss.avtoreferatı. p. 27.
16. Kara S. Girişik Cümle Problemi Üzerine Bir İnceleme. Turkish Studies, International Periodical For the Language, Literature and History of Turkish and Turkic , Volume 7/2, Spring, 2012. s. 643-648.
17. Karahan L. Türkçede Birleşik Cümle Problemi. Türk Dili, sayı 505, Ocak 1994, s.19-23.
18. Karahan L. Türkçede Söz Dizimi, Ankara: Akçağ yayınları, 1999. p. 192.
19. Kazımov Q.Ş. Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Sintaksis, Bakı: Ünsiyyət, 2000, 496 s.
20. Kerimoğlu C. Türkçe Dil Bilgisi Öğretiminde Yapı Bakımından Cümle Sınıflandırmaları. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, sayı 21, 2007, s. 97-108.
21. Koç N. Yeni Dilbilgisi, İstanbul: İnkılap, 1996. p. 599.

22. Müzəffəroğlu T. Müasir Azərbaycan dilində mürəkkəb cümlənin struktur semantikasi, Bakı: Azərnəşr, 2002. 304 s.
23. Rüstəmov R. Türk dilinin sintaksisi. Bakı: Elm və Təhsil, 2012. 202 s.
24. Savran H. Birleşik Cümle Üzerine. Türk Dili, sayı 568, Nisan, 1999, s. 325-330.
25. Sadıqova S. Azərbaycan dilində fizika-riyaziyyat terminologiyasının formalaşması və inkişafı, Bakı: Elm. 1997. p. 195.
26. Şimşek R. Türkçe Sözdizimi. Kuzey Gazetecilik Matbaacılık, Trabzon: 1987. p. 11.
27. Vəliyeva A. Türk dilində feili sıfətlərin sintaksisdəki mövqeyi. İPƏK YOLU, No. 2, 2017, səh.189-194 URL: [https://au.edu.az/upload-files/menu/ipekyolu/2017\\_2/19 Vəliyeva A. pdf](https://au.edu.az/upload-files/menu/ipekyolu/2017_2/19 Vəliyeva A. pdf).
28. Zülfikar H. «Girişik Cümle» Sorunu. Türk dili, sayı 521, Haziran, 1995. s. 643-648.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdullayev Ə.Z. (1974) Müasir Azərbaycan dilində tabeli mürəkkəb cümlələr [Subordinate complex sentences in modern Azerbaijani language]. Bakı: Maarif, 419 p. [in Azerbaijani]
2. Apaydın M. (1996) Yeni Bir Terim Önerisi: Birlikte Cümle [Suggesting a New Term: Sentence Together]. Tuk language, number 537, September p. 252-255 [in Turkish]
3. Aydın İ. Türkçede Yan Tümce Türleri ve İşlevleri [Subjunctive Sentence Types and Functions in Turkish]. URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/780651> [in Turkish]
4. Banquoğlu T. (1998) Türkçenin Grameri[Grammar of Turkish]. Ankara: Ankara University, Turkish Language Association Publications, 628 p. [in Turkish]
5. Demir N. (2010) Türk Dili Dergisi ve Söz Dizimi Yazıları[Turkish Language Journal and Syntax Articles]. Turkish Language, issue 700, pp. 453-472. [in Turkish]
6. Dizdaroğlu H. (1976) Tümcebilgisi [Syntax]. Ankara: Turkish Language Association Publications. p. 234 [in Turkish]
7. Ediskun H. (1999) Türk Dilbilgisi[Turkish Grammar]. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi Publications. p. 408 [in Turkish]
8. Erdem M. (2007) Türkmen Türkçesinde İç Cümleciklerin Morfosentaktik Açidan İncelenmesi[Morphosyntactic Analysis of Internal Clauses in Turkmen Turkis]. Journal of Modern Turkish Studies, Vol.4, issue 3, Ankara: pp. 26-51. [in Turkish]
9. Ergin M. (1987) Türk Dil Bilgisi[Turkish Grammar]. Istanbul: Boğaziçi Publications, 407 p. [in Turkish]
10. Fidançı M. (1995) Sıralı Cümle[Sequential Sentence]. Turkish Language, issue 534, pp.1315-1324. [in Turkish]
11. Gece M. (1998) Türkiye Türkçesinde Bağlı Cümle[The Connected Sentence in Turkish]. Turkish Language, issue 562, pp. 332-333 [in Turkish]
12. Gencan T.N. (2001) Dilbilgisi [Grammar]. Ayrac Publications, Ankara: p. 638 [in Turkish]
13. Göğüş B. (1969) Türkçede Cümlemsilerin Kuruluşu ve Temel Cümlecige Bağlanma Şekiller [The Formation of Sentences in Turkish and Forms of Attachment to the Basic Clause]. Yearbook of Turkish Language Studies Belleten, pp. 89-142. [in Turkish]
14. Hatipoğlu V. (1972) Türkçenin Sözdizimi[Turkish Syntax]. TDK Publications, Ankara: Ankara University Press, pp.2-95 [in Turkish]
15. İsmaylova M. (1997) Azərbaycan dili terminologiyasının lingvistik təhlili [Linguistic analysis of Azerbaijani language terminology]. Bakı: Ozan. Diss.avtoreference. p.27 [in Azerbaijani]
16. Kara S. (2012) Girişik Cümle Problemi Üzerine Bir İnceleme [A Study on the Complex Sentence Problem]. Turkish Studies, İnternational Periodikal For the Language, Literature and History of Turkish and Turkic, Volume 7/2, pp. 643-648. [in Turkish]
17. Karahan L. (1994) Türkçede Birleşik Cümle Problemi [The Problem of Compound Sentences in Turkish]. Turkish Language, issue 505, pp.19-23. [in Turkish]
18. Karahan L. (1999) Türkçede Söz Dizimi [Syntax in Turkish]. Ankara: Akçağ Publications, p. 192 [in Turkish]
19. Kazımov Q.Ş. (2000) Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Sintaksis [Modern Azerbaijani language. Sintaksis]. Bakı: Ünsiyyət, 496 p. [in Azerbaijani]
20. Kerimoğlu C. (2007) Türkçe Dil Bilgisi Öğretiminde Yapı Bakımından Cümle Sınıflandırmaları [Sentence Classifications in Terms of Structure in Teaching Turkish Grammar]. Dokuz Eylül University Buca Faculty of Education Journal, issue 21, pp. 97-108. [in Turkish]
21. Koç N. (1996) Yeni Dilbilgisi [New Grammar]. Istanbul: İnkılap, p. 599 [in Turkish]
22. Müzəffəroğlu T. (2002) Müasir Azərbaycan dilində mürəkkəb cümlənin struktur semantikasi[Structure semantics of ink sentences in modern Azerbaijani language]. Bakı: Azerneshr, 304 p. [in Azerbaijani]
23. Rüstəmov R. (2012) Türk dilinin sintaksisi[Syntax of the Turkish language]. Bakı: Elm ve Tehsil, 202 p. [in Azerbaijani]
24. Savran H. (1999) Birleşik Cümle Üzerine [On Compound Sentences]. Turkish Language, issue 568, pp. 325-330. [in Turkish]
25. Sadıqova S. (1997) Azərbaycan dilində fizika-riyaziyyat terminologiyasının formalaşması və inkişafı[Formation and development of physics-riyaziyyat terminology in Azerbaijani language]. Bakı: Elm. 1997. p.195 Bakı: Elm. p.195 25. [in Azerbaijani]
26. Şimşek R. (1987) Türkçe Sözdizimi[Turkish Syntax]. Kuzey Gazetecilik Matbaacılık, Trabzon: p.11 [in Turkish]
27. Vəliyeva A. (2017) Türk dilində feili sıfətlərin sintaksisdəki mövqeyi[Position in the syntax of verb adjectives in Turkish language]. İPEK YOLU, No. 2, pp.189-194 URL: [https://au.edu.az/upload-files/menu/ipekyolu/2017\\_2/19 Vəliyeva A. pdf](https://au.edu.az/upload-files/menu/ipekyolu/2017_2/19 Vəliyeva A. pdf). [in Azerbaijani]
28. Zülfikar H. (1995) «Girişik Cümle» Sorunu[The Problem of “Complex Sentence”]. Turkish Language, issue 521, pp. 643-648. [in Turkish]