



Models of Visual Perception in the Turkish Language Worldview

Nigorakhon Saidgani kizi Amirova

Doctoral student, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Published Online:
25 March 2023

Corresponding Author:

**Nigorakhon Saidgani
kizi Amirova**

This article is devoted to the study of the mechanism of modeling visual perception in the Turkish language picture of the world. It should be noted that when modeling visual perception, a number of factors play a role, under the influence of which different models are formed. This explains the structure of a typical visual perception situation, which is presented as the basis of modeling.

KEYWORDS: word-centric approach, verbocentric approach, anthropocentric approach, typical visual perception situation, components of a typical situation, modeling, display direction, lexical content, semantic complication, display angle, observer factor.

In the study of the problem of the linguistic designation of visual perception, three approaches are distinguished, replacing one another: 1) word-centric approach, i.e. lexico-semantic analysis of verbs of visual perception in the direction from the word to its meaning; 2) verbocentric approach, according to which not the meaning of the verb of visual perception is investigated, but the realization of its meaning in the utterance, i.e. analysis in the direction from the meaning to its expressed means; 3) an anthropocentric approach, according to which the unit of analysis is a typical situation of visual perception and ways of modeling it in an utterance, due to the speaker's position.

It should be noted that the first two approaches are more popular in the works of Turkish scientists. The study of the issue of modeling a typical situation of perception, in particular visual perception, in Turkish linguistics is a relatively new and not yet fully investigated direction. Nevertheless, there are a number of works in which one can notice a certain position of Turkologists to this problem, based on the ideas of European researchers, in particular Viberg (See: Viberg 1984; Viberg 1993, Viberg 2008). At the same time, three main implementations of these ideas can be distinguished. The first is due to the fact that Turkish researchers borrow only the classification of perception verbs put forward by Viberg and based on a set of features, which include: the organ of perception, the name of this organ, profiling of its work. Thus, a number of Turkish scientists, relying on the classification of verbs of perception by A. Viberg, consider them on the material of the Turkish language already from the point of view of structural and semantic analysis (See: Şahin 2012; Kamchybekova 2011; Ayan, Türkdil 2014; Kalkan 2016; Sandalyeci 2016; Dolati

Darbadi 2018; Özeren, Alan 2018; Acar 2019; Yegin 2019; Aydoğmuş 2021; Doğan, Erdin 2021.; Erarslan, Güner 2021).

At the same time, the ideas of Viberg were reflected in the studies of Gökçe and Yıldız, who, without referring to him directly, nevertheless, considered the situation of perception from the point of view of the features of its modeling in language (See: Gökçe 2015, Yıldız 2017, Yıldız 2018). On the basis of the verbs of visual perception of the Old Uighur and Old Turkic languages, they identified the subject of perception, the perceived object and perception itself. However, the relationship between these components is interpreted differently. From the point of view of Gökçe, the main component is perception itself, expressed by the verb and including in its semantics an indication of the subject and object of perception. These participants get their full realization in context. See for example: Özüm körmedi bu ajun mâlım / ya edgü isiz bu kişi hâlımı – Modern Turkish version: Ben bu dünya malımı görmediğim gibi, iyi veya kötü bu insanların haline de vâkıf değilim. (trans. Since I do not see these worldly goods, I am not familiar with these people, good or bad.), where the semantics of the verb körmedi predetermines the character of the participants in visual perception. In particular, it is the perceiving subject and the object in the field of vision (Gökçe 2015, p.66).

Unlike Gökçe, Yıldız, believes that each component of the perception situation is autonomous and includes a common element of meaning that binds them into one whole, ex.: Kıtabımın körgen eşitgen kişi / şahımın du'a' birle yad kılsu tip. – Modern Turkish version: Kitabımı gören (yahut) işiten (her) kes şahımı dua ile yad etsin. (trans. Everyone who sees (or hears) my book, remember my king

with prayer.), where the realization of the meaning of visual perception depends on all the components of the situation under consideration, between which semantic agreement is established (Yıldız 2018, p.172).

As for the works of Sarı and Seçkin, scientists in their works consider certain aspects of Viberg’s theory on the material of the modern Turkish language, directly referring to it (See: Sarı 2019, Seçkin 2019, Seçkin 2020). Sarı, as a follower of Yıldız, analyzing the components of a typical situation of visual perception, turns his attention to the subject and object of perception and their relationship in a typical situation (Sarı 2019, p.144-145).

Seçkin in his work, on the other hand, focuses on ‘orientation’, which is an epistemological criterion for the ability to detect mental movements and defines the verb statement ‘Peter looked at birds’ in the paradigm of perception verbs by Viberg as “duyum (girdi) fiili (verb of sensation (input), which refers to the process of sensation, the phase of data collection by the senses, and which also has a physical aspect.” Unlike the first, the verb of the statement ‘Peter saw birds’ is considered as a perception verb, which is associated with the perception of input. Thus, the researcher, arguing about the confusion of the verbs of perception and sensation, considers it wrong to deal the verbs of sensation among mental verbs, since they are ‘undirected’ verbs (Seçkin 2019, p.32-33; Seçkin 2020, p.47-48).

The research by Hirik is a direct development of the ideas of Viberg (See Hirik 2017, Hirik 2019). Unlike Viberg, who based his interpretation of the situation of perception on non-linguistic reality, Hirik focused on the problem of reflecting the situation of perception in the semantics of Turkish verbs of visual perception. He divided the verbs of visual perception into verbs of conscious (bilinçli) and unconscious (bilinçsiz) perception (Hirik 2019, p.809). Cf. in the work of Gisborne, this feature is studied using ‘deliberately test’ (Gisborne 1996, p. 114). See the examples from the work of Hirik: 1. Ali kedilere baktı. (trans. Ali looked at the cats); 2. Ali kedileri gördü. (trans. Ali saw cats). Hirik interprets these sentences as follows: “In the first example, the use of the verb bakmak actualizes the activity of the subject and the implementation of his actions consciously. As for the second sentence with the verb görmek, here the semantics of this verb is connected with the interpretation of the subject of perception as a patient and focuses on the visual act itself” (Hirik 2017, p.60). Based on this, the author notes the importance of taking into account the human factor in the semantics of visual perception verbs and the need to reflect it in explanatory dictionaries. The publication of the articles by Hirik can be considered a significant phenomenon, since a step has been taken from the atomistic consideration of Turkish verbs of visual perception towards their systematic and propositional analysis.

In this paper, attention was paid to the mechanism of modeling a typical situation. It should be noted that a

typical situation refers to the state of affairs in the world, i.e. the proposition underlying statements like:

- a) Adam gökyüzüne bakıyor. (trans. A man looks at the sky);
- b) Adam gökyüzünü görüyor. (trans. A man sees the sky).

For a typical visual perception situation, the relevant components are 1) ‘the one who is looking’, 2) ‘what is being looked at’, 3) ‘the attitude of looking’. In other words, this typical situation includes such mandatory components as the subject of visual perception, the object of visual perception and visual perception itself. It should be especially emphasized that the meaning of visual perception is included in the semantic structure of each of these components.

It should be noted that a typical situation of visual perception can be presented in different ways, which is due to a number of factors, namely: lexical content of a typical situation of visual perception; foreshortening of the display.

First of all, this concerns the direction of displaying the situation of visual perception, cf.:

- a) Adam gökyüzüne bakıyor. (trans. A man looks at the sky)
- b) Adam gökyüzünü görüyor. (trans. A man sees the sky)
- c) Adama deniz görünüyor. (trans. A man can see the sea),

where in the statement (a) the situation is displayed in the direction from the subject to the object of perception, i.e. as a purposeful action; and in the statement (b) – in the direction from the object of perception to the subject, i.e. as an experienced state in which the subject of perception is immersed. The utterance (c) reflects, in fact, the perception itself. These variants of a typical situation are basic, and all other possible models are based on one of these variants. Let’s consider the action of the factors underlying other types of modeling.

As for the modeling associated with the lexical content of a typical perception situation, it can be considered by the example of the following statements:

- a) Selim ağacı gördü. (trans. Selim saw a tree);
- b) Selim ağacı vurdu. (trans. Selim hit a tree);
- c) Selim problemin çözümünü gördü. (trans. Selim saw the solution to the problem)
- d) Selim anahtarı buldu. (trans. Selim found the keys), i.e. ‘he sees them’.

The statement (a) contains an indication of the subject of visual perception (Selim), endowed with the ability of vision; the object of visual perception (ağaç (tree)), located in the field of vision; the act of visual perception (gördü (saw)). In (b) the rule of semantic agreement of the components of the utterance is violated. As a result, we are talking about another non-linguistic situation, in particular, about the active influence of the subject on the object. In (c) there is also a semantic mismatch between the components of the non-linguistic situation: Selim and problemin çözümünü (solution to the problem), which leads to a mental reading of this situation. In (d) semantic agreement between the subject and the object of visual perception allows a verb that is not

actually a verb of visual perception to acquire this meaning due to this context.

We examined the modifications of modeling a typical situation of visual perception using the example of the basic verbs *görmek* (to see) / *bakmak* (to look). Along with this, modeling data can be associated with the use of other visual perception verbs that are semantically more complex. They either convey a purposeful action, i.e. observation, or characterize the state of the subject of perception. From this point of view, they can be divided into verbs of the *bakmak* (to look) group and verbs of the *görmek* (to see) group. The group with the general meaning of *bakmak* (to look) includes such verbs as: *bakmak* (to look), *izlemek* (to observe), *seyretmek* (to contemplate), *bakınmak* (to look around), *gözden geçirmek* (to view), *incelemek* (to study), *dikizlemek* (to peek), *gözetlemek* (to stalk), *gözlemek* (to stalk), *dikkat etmek* (pay attention), *gözlemlemek* (observe), *gözlemek2* (observe), etc. As for the group with the general meaning of *görmek* (to see), these include: *görmek* (to see), *farketmek* (to notice), *ayırt etmek* (to distinguish), *tanık olmak* (to be a witness), *şahit olmak* (to become a witness), *odaklanmak* (to concentrate), *görünmek* (to be visible), *görüştük* (to meet), *rastlaşmak* (to encounter), *rast gelmek* (to encounter), *rastlamak* (to bump into), *çarpılmak* (to come across), *karşılaşmak* (to meet), *göz göze gelmek* (to meet face to face), *yüz yüze gelmek* (to meet face to face), etc.

Let's consider modeling a typical situation with verbs of the *bakmak* group (watch):

- a) O bana bakıyor. (trans. He is looking at me)
- b) O beni izliyor. (trans. He is watching me)
- c) O beni dikizliyor. (trans. He is spying on me)

In the statement (a), the basic verb *bakmak* (to look) is used. In (b), the meaning of look is complicated by the indication of the duration of the action and its evaluation, i.e. 'look and evaluate'. In (c) it is indicated that the subject is observing the object covertly, with a certain intent, i.e., 'to watch secretly in order to expose'.

Modeling of a typical situation with the verbs of the *görmek* group (to see) can be observed by the example of the following statements:

- a) Ben sandalyeyi gördüm. (trans. I saw a chair)
- b) Ben sandalyeyi farkettim. (trans. I noticed a chair)
- c) Ben sandalyeye rastladım. (trans. I bumped into a chair)

In (a) the basic verb *görmek* (to see) is used; in (b) the object falls into the field of view of the subject, i.e. two meanings are realized: 'to see and to discover, i.e. 'to see what was hidden'. In the statement (c), the semantic complication of a typical situation is connected on the one hand with the characteristic of the subject of perception (he is in motion), on the other – the object of perception (its forms: in this case, it is a sharp or hard object of small size, cf.: *çarpılmak* (to come across), where the object is interpreted as having impressive dimensions.

Modeling a typical situation of visual perception, associated with the angle of its display, leads to a number of other modifications. It is based on the factor of observer, which is a function of the text, understood as a built-in valence on the observer. At the same time, the observer may be inside the described situation, or outside it, cf.:

- a) Önünde çiçek açan bir bahçe vardı. (trans. A blooming garden stretched before him)
- b) Çiçek müdürün odasına gelenleri gözlüyor. (trans. Çiçek keeps an eye on those who come to the director's office)

Thus, in the statement (a), the non-linguistic situation is presented as if from within, the observer describes it as a direct participant. In (b) the situation is described as if from the outside, the observer's position is external.

The second type of modeling, associated with the factor of observer, is determined by the angle of the display of the situation of visual perception, i.e. which of the components of a typical situation is in the center of his attention, cf. the above example with the following:

- a) Melek'e deniz görünüyor. (trans. Melek can see the sea);
- b) Mehmet gözünü almadan bakıyor. (trans. Mehmet looks without looking away);
- c) Dosyaları teker teker inceliyorlar (trans. Documents are studied one by one).

Thus, visual perception in a language can be expressed in different ways, but can be reduced to one invariant, interpreted as a typical situation.

A typical situation includes as mandatory components the subject of visual perception, the object of visual perception and the actual visual perception, between which there is a close relationship and interdependence.

In a real utterance, it can be modeled due to various factors, among which are: the direction of relations between the components of the situation; its lexical content; using semantically complex verbs of visual perception of the groups *görmek* (to see) / *bakmak* (to look); as well as the display angle.

REFERENCES

1. Acar E. Codex Cumanicus'ta Bulunan Mental Fiillerin Günümüz Anadolu Ağızlarındaki Kullanımları Üzerine // Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi. 2019. Sayı 8/3. S.1276-1292.
2. Ayan E., Türkdil Y. Anlam Bilimi Açısından Kazak Türkçesinde Görme Duyu Fiilleri // Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi. 2014. Cilt 7, Sayı 35. S.26-41.
3. Aydoğmuş E. Özbek Türkçesinde mental fiiller // RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2021. Sayı 22. S.135-151.
4. Doğan L., Erdin C. Gagauz Türkçesinde Mental Fiiller // International Journal of Languages'

- Education and Teaching. 2021. Volume 9, Issue 2, P. 191-221.
5. Dolati Darbadi M. Nehcü'l Feradis'te Mental Fiiller // Bartın Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. 2018. Sayı 3/1. S.85-113.
 6. Erarslan M., Güner G. Babürnâme'deki mental fiillerin yapı ve içerik bakımından sınıflandırılması // Uluslararası filoloji Bengü. 2021. Cilt 1, Sayı 1. S.18-66.
 7. Gisborne N. English Perception Verbs: PhD Thesis. London, 1996. 218 p.
 8. Gökçe F. Kutadgu Bilig'de Kör- 'Görmek': Çok Anlamlılık, Metafor ve Gramerleşme // Türkbilig. 2015. Sayı 29. S. 59-76.
 9. Hirik E. Türkçede Duyu Fiilleri Ve Kılımsı Arasındaki İlişki // X. Uluslararası Dünya Dili Türkçe Sempozyumu. Eskişehir, 2019. S.805-816.
 10. Hirik E. Türkiye Türkçesi Duyu Fiillerinde Anlam ve Kelime Sikliği İlişkisi // SUTAD. 2017. Sayı 41. S.53-74.
 11. Kalkan N. Başkurt Türkçesinde Mental Fiiller // Actual Problems of Turkic Studies. St.Petersburg, 2016. S.177-186.
 12. Kamchybekova A.K. Kırgız Türkçesinde Duyu Fiilleri // ODÜ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2011. Cilt 2, Sayı 3. S.87-102.
 13. Özeren M., Alan İ. Kırgız Türkçesinde Mental Fiiller // Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2018. Sayı 61. S.203-224.
 14. Şahin S. Mental Fiil Kavramı ve Türkmen Türkçesinde Mental Fiiller // Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi. 2012. Sayı 1/4. S.45-62.
 15. Sandalyeci S. Bir Eski Anadolu Türkçesi Metni Olan Şeyyat Hamza'nın Yūsuf U Zeliha Mesnevisinde Mental Fiiller // Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. 2016. Sayı 6/12. S.157-171.
 16. Sarı İ. Algı Fiillerinde Çok Anlamlılık: Gör- Örneği // Algı'ya Dair. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları. 2019. S.129-161.
 17. Seçkin K. Eski Türkçe Metinlerden Örneklerle Mental Fiil Teorisi. Konya: Palet Yayınları. 2020. 175 s.
 18. Seçkin K. Eski Türkçede Mental Fiiller. Doktora Tezi. Trabzon: Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi. 2019. 176 s.
 19. Viberg Å. Crosslinguistic Perspectives on Lexical Organization and Lexical Progression // Progression and Regression in Language: Sociocultural, Neuropsychological and Linguistic Perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1993. P.340-385.
 20. Viberg Å. Swedish Verbs of Perception from Typological and Contrastive Perspective // Language and Cultures in Contrast and Comparison. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 2008. P.123-172.
 21. Viberg Å. The verbs of perception: A typological study. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1984. 306 p.
 22. Yegin A. Mental Fiil Kavramı ve Şeyyâd Hamza'nın Yūsuf u Zelihâ Mesnevisinde Mental Fiiller // Bartın Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. 2019. Sayı 4/1. S.51-74.
 23. Yıldız H. Atebetü'l-Hakayık'ta Algı Fiilleri // Karadeniz Araştırmaları. 2018. Sayı XV/60. S.163-181.
 24. Yıldız H. Eski Uygurcada Göz Fiilleri. Journal of Old Turkic, Vol. 1, no.1. 2017. S.145-213.