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SPEECH PORTRAIT AS MEANS OF REVEALING THE CHARACTER OF THE HERO: A COMPARATIVE ASPECT

Abstract. This article is devoted to the study of speech portrait of characters in dramatic works of Kazakh and Turkish writers. The authors of the article study the peculiarities of speech, which includes the choice of certain words, phrases and expressions used to create images and characters of the main characters. It is noted that the speech characteristic in the works is an important element in creating the image of the character, and the translation of such a work should be made in such a way as to preserve and reflect the meaning that the author of the original. When comparing the translations of Kazakh and Turkish writers' works, the analysis of the ways of transferring the peculiarities of speech characteristics of characters was made. In the analysis it was found that the authors of works to characterize the main characters use a variety of means of language expressiveness. It is revealed that among the most frequent means the use of emotional-expressive vocabulary is noted. Thus, the authors conclude that the use of language allows writers not only to create detailed psychological portraits of the main characters of works, to reveal their complex inner world and experiences, but also to track and record the main stages of their personal development. The scientific work provides a number of scientific and theoretical opinions of famous literary scholars. The research methods were comparative analysis and the method of solid sampling.
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Сөз портреті кейіпкер мінезін ашу құралы ретінде: салыстырмалы аспект

Аңдатпа. Бұл макала қазақ және турік жазушыларының драмалық шығармаларындағы кейіпкерлердің сөздік портретін зерттеуге әрі тиісті. Макала авторлары басты кейіпкерлердің образдары мен сипаттарын қасау үшін қолданылатын белгілі бір сөздердің, сөз тіркестерінің және оралымдарының тобын қамтылысқа ерекшеліктерінің зерттейді. Шығармаларындағы сөздік сипаттамалардың кейіпкер бейнесін қасау үшін әдісін қолдану мүмкіндігін есептейді. Сөздік сипаттамалар сөздік сипаттамалар және ерекшеліктерінің жетісізуі тәсілдерін талдауға ұсыналады. Қазақ және турік жазушыларының шығармаларының аудармалары қолданылып келетін сөздердің және сөздердің тәсілдерін қолданып, басты кейіпкерлерге мінездеме беру үшін тілдік мәнерлі құралдарының пайдаланылуы анықталды.
Олардың ішінде ең жиі қолданылатыны эмоционалды-экспрессивті лексика екені байқалды. Осылайша, авторлар тілді қолдану жазушыларға шығармалардың басты кейіпкерлерінің психологиялық портреттерін ежей-тегжейлі жасауға, олардың құрделі ішкі емілі мен басынан откізіп сөзгендерін ашуға ғана емес, сонымен қатар олардың жеке түлға ретінде дамуының негізі кездегі кездегі салыстырмалы, жазып алуға қолданылатының бериңіз арығынды жасайды. Ғылыми еңбекте белгілі әдебиеттанушылардың бірнеше кеңістіктерінің мәліметтері берілген. Зерттеу өзгерістері ретінде салыстырмалы-сопоставительді талдау және үздіксіз іріктеу тәсілдері пайдаланылған.
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Речевой портрет как средство раскрытия характера героя: сопоставительный аспект

Аннотация. Данная статья посвящена исследованию речевого портрета персонажей в драматических произведениях казахских и турецких писателей. Авторы статьи изучают особенности речи, которая включает в себя выбор определенных слов, фраз и выражений, используемых для создания образов и характеров главных героев. Отмечено, что речевая характеристика в произведениях является важным элементом в создании образа персонажа, и перевод такого произведения необходимо произвести так, чтобы сохранить и отразить тот смысл, который внёс автор оригинала. При сравнении переводов произведений казахских и турецких писателей был выполнен анализ способов передачи особенностей речевых характеристик героев. При анализе было установлено, что авторы произведений для характеристики главных героев применяют разнообразные средства выразительности языка. Выявлено, что в числе наиболее частотных средств отмечается использование эмоционально-экспрессивной лексики. Таким образом, авторы приходят к выводу, что использование языка позволяет писателям не только создавать подробные психологические портреты главных героев произведений, раскрывая их сложный внутренний мир и переживания, но также отслеживать и фиксировать основные этапы их личностного развития. В научной работе приводится ряд научных и теоретических мнений известных ученых-литературоведов. Методами исследования послужили сравнительно-сопоставительный анализ и метод сплошной выборки.
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1. Introduction

Modern human-centered linguistics emphasizes linguistic individuality in its diverse manifestations, sparking linguists’ interest in the issues of speech image description. The researchers claim that every individual “existing in the linguistic space: in communication, in stereotypes of behavior fixed in language, in the meanings of linguistic units” (Karassik, 2002: 7) is a linguistic personality, defined by Y.N. Karaulov as “a set of abilities and characteristics of a person, which determine the creation of speech works (texts)” and a carrier of linguistic consciousness (Karaulov, 2010: 3). At the same time, the researcher discusses the validity of viewing a piece of art’s character as a linguistic personality and proposes that the texts created by the hero will aid in revealing a “complex artistic image” that is predicated on this personality’s spiritual realm (Karaulov, 2010: 71).
From T. Yesembekov’s statement it can be understood that the theoretical foundations and principles that have been identified in the study of the main artistic trends of Kazakh dramaturgy in terms of genres and artistic methods are in the process of formation. “In the science of Kazakh literary studies the methodology of analyzing poetic samples is quite established, and there are not many optimal and sustainable methods of research aimed at expanding the meaning and content of prose and dramatic works and familiarity with their text in depth” (Yesembekov, 2009: 58).

According to the scholar, the first thoughts that come to mind when talking about the internal elements of composition are mainly related to character. His person, personality, etc. to show character, the writer will need to show various qualities of the character’s behavior. The writer shows his appearance, appearance (portrait), feelings (emotion, expression), speech (monologue, dialog, polylogue, inner play), events (episodes), pictures of nature (landscape), actions, defines his relationship with the environment and other social characters (Yesembekov, 2009: 69). It can be seen that the author tries to fully encompass the hard-to-find life phenomena associated with the portrayal through a more complex structure.

The transformation of the literary hero and the character in general is evident in both contemporary Turkish and Kazakh literature. However, many researchers studying the state of of contemporary Turkish literature have noted that The 1970s were a turning point in the history of Turkish literature. Both in prose and poetry there is a mixing and rethinking of heterogeneous styles and genres, and romantic, realistic and modernist trends are developing in parallel. The increase in social conflicts, the moral state of Turkish society, the spiritual quest of a marginalized individual – these are just a number of problems that are reflected in the works of modern Turkish playwrights.

From this perspective, attention will be paid to the works of Kazakh and Turkish writers in the genre of dramaturgy, and a special distinction will show the writers search and skillful methods of taking into account the peculiarities of the genre of dramaturgy.

2. Methods and materials
2.1 Methods
Personage speech is the main component of dramaturgical discourse. It is divided into dialogic and monologic forms. It carries the main load in the development of dramatic action. Dialogic speech is directly affected by the conventional idiosyncrasies of the dramaturgical sort, which correlate a character’s word with action. The latter requires character communication, which is essential to the play’s dynamic range. The structural component of dialogic speech is the rejoinder – a response phrase of the character, providing an act of dramaturgical communication. Monologic speech, in its turn, does not promote the action, because it lacks the connotations of reversibility. The dramatic monologue is heterogeneous in its literary form: it can convey the inner state; illustrate the dialectic of reflection; convey the “stream of consciousness” of the character. There is no writer’s description or narration in theatrical works. The primary characteristic of the drama genre and style is the prevalence of spoken language.

In this article, we will present the experience of comparative analysis and the method of solid sampling of the images of narrators, who are the central characters of the above-
mentioned works, in order to reveal the role and significance of the inner monologue in revealing their characters.

2.2 Materials

The research materials were the dramatic works of famous Kazakh and Turkish playwrights; the work to date has not been subjected to special research in this area, which determines the relevance and novelty of this article. In the 60-80s of the XX century decisive steps were made in the study of Kazakh dramaturgy. The works that are grounded in real-world Kazakh dramaturgy issues are distinguished by a thorough examination of the genre nature of classical works, a creative differentiation of writing, archival data, and a thorough examination of the evolution, formation, system, and poetics of the genre. N. Gabdullin, M. Duisenov, A. Tazhibayev, S. Ordaliyev and others have studied the problems of Kazakh dramaturgy. A staged drama is formed through dialogue and monologues, leading to the revelation of different truths about existence.

Through dialogues and monologues, a staged drama is created, prompting the discovery of various truths of being. In the works of theater critics B. Kundakbayev, A. Tokpanov, K. Kuandykov, O. Kaidalova, U. Sadykova, A. Sygay, B. Nurpeysova, taking into account these features of the genre, there are very valuable opinions about the dramaturgy. On the stylistic activity of the hero’s language in Kazakh linguistics told the scientist R. Syzdykova, on the language of fiction M. Sergaliyev, on the language of fiction prose B. Shalabayev, on winged words in the language H. Karimov, on language and stylistic techniques of character G. Sarseke, on the stylistic activity of lexical, syntactic construction of the hero’s language in modern fiction K. Yenebayeva, as well as the works of other researchers.

Such Russian and Turkish scientists as N. Gurbilek, D. Davud, F. Kecheli, E.A. Oganova, R.A. Sevengil, S. Shener and others were engaged in research of the works of Turkish playwrights and analysis of individual periods of the development of modern Turkish drama. Ya. Mergenova considers that a further characteristic of Turkish writing that sets it apart is the depth of its thoughts. These literary works, which are primarily collections of poetry and short stories, were primarily different from the previously stated literary periods in terms of their personality (Mergenova, 2022).

Turkish dramaturgy underwent a thematic crisis in the 1980s and 90s of the 20th century against the backdrop of political and economic issues. A thematic crisis in Turkish dramaturgy emerged against the backdrop of political and economic unrest. Dramatic works that addressed serious societal issues were displaced by challenging political environments. Tragedies started to fade from the theaters, and reading dramas, vaudeville, tabloid jokes, humoresques, and lighthearted comedies replaced tragedies as the primary repertory. Theaters were shut down, and local theater managers and performers were replaced with government-friendly individuals (Sener, 1972: 113).

Determining the similarities and differences between the works of Kazakh and Turkish children’s literature, J.S. Sametova in her recent study gives many examples of continuity in their lyrics of nationalism, Turkism, Turanism, language, land, love for the homeland and native people (Sametova, 2023: 106–117).

The study of the speech of the characters of Kazakh and Turkish playwrights is one of the means of revealing the artistic content of the work. Observation of the language of the
main character from the point of view of revealing his character determines the relevance of this scientific work.

3. Discussion

Character speech patterns in contemporary plays are influenced by postmodernist poetics, which suggests a blending of several aesthetic philosophies. Along with the reduction of the fabulae series, the dialog as a driving element of dramatic action is significantly transformed; its communicative function is leveled out function. The rejoinders of the characters, as a rule, do not provide for back-and-forth interaction. The main intention of the actors’ speech is the desire to speak out. For example, while studying the skills of A. Tazhibayev in dramaturgy, M. Duyssenov in his analysis of the best works of the playwright in other genres, especially poetry, with pronounced poetic power, went to a bunch of words that reflect the creative nature of the character’s speech, dialogue, and monologue in dramaturgy.

However, in K. Satybaldin’s plays, due to the genre peculiarity of dramaturgy, the character’s speech is predominantly given in the form of dialog. The words coming out of his mouth reveal the essence of a person in various situations of life’s journey. There is almost no phenomenon hidden in the words. For example, in the dramatic story “Uzak Zhol” (The Long Way) we can see that the author attaches great importance to the fact of telling the real story of Saken Seyfullin, who longs for new things and loves his people. Spontaneous words are never uttered of Saken’s speech. The image of Saken, strong as a rock, thoughtful and fiery character, showing the historical personality of Saken Seyfullin, a character recognized by the people, and the fact that he speaks directly, can be called the playwright’s own luck.

Consider an extract from the given play. A group of young people coming back from their studies, carefree banter, focusing on the time when the author’s cruel character of human mores begins to take shape, and bringing the work into real expression in the framework of the play’s plot development are all examples of this. There is a state in the minds of all compatriots who miss their country, who enjoy the breeze of their homeland. By this the author meant that the ultimate goal of a Kazakh intellectual is love for his native country.

Saken: That's right! Then you know for yourself, Mr. Ziranov! (sighing with a broad chest). If eight paradise places exist on this earth, then probably one of them is on our Saryarka. Isn’t it beautiful, the wind is like fresh horse milk?!

Ordaly (he also sighed and fell down beside Saken): Oh, what do you say, there is no land on this world more beautiful than Saryarka!

Ziranov (talking with smile): Oh, Kazakhs, you talk trifles too. Isn’t it a field where sheep graze?

Saken: “The homeland is sacred to everyone. There is a lot of magic in this land for us” (Satybaldin, 1973: 88)

Play writer K. Satybaldin in the dramatic story “Uzak Zhol” (The Long Way) created a colloquial speech of Saken Seyfullin, reflecting the path of fate in an era of contradictions, vividly recognizing the truth of the era, revealing the soul of a fighter, humane poet. As we can see, the dialog between the main characters of the dramatic story is an integral part of human life. With its peculiar power of influence, authenticity and appeal, dialog inspires, pleases the listener or arouses in him a sense of anxiety and concern.
In the comedy “Qabagan it” (An Angry Dog), where at a certain time of peace among people problems of conscience, goodness and opposite phenomena, contained negativity in the direction of narrowing the human field of new phenomena, penetrating the way of life of his time, intertwined with actions in the context of speech behavior that arouses curiosity. In the work, the author constantly reminds the viewer of rational, transparent and interesting details. Scarcity of description and narration is a genre characteristic of dramaturgy, and the word character is a difficult word that carries the burden of conveying the meaning of many things. Here great importance must lie in the pronunciation of each word. The vision, picture, cognition, premise, tension, solution of what is happening should be reflected. In this context, playwright K. Satybaldin, the most competent master of the genre conditions of dramaturgy, avoids narration with sarcastic phrases, refers to the circumstances in which each of his characters unfolds in its measure, character, situationality, capacious colloquial language is reflected in the play “Ayagoz aru” (Ayagoz Beauty), where the artistic solution begins.

The language of the play is compact, precise, and imaginative to reveal the content of a pressing, tense event. Dalabai in the play is an ordinary poor old man. His tireless life is connected with taking care of his five children. He has been gathering firewood in the forest. He hunts animals. However, he is busy trying to keep his children busy. This simple old man’s kindness, adaptability, wisdom, aversion, sharp language of describing phenomenon, honesty and morality, every action based on faith constitute his national identity. There is an interesting moment in the play where the old man’s grandson insists that he will save his sister from the evil Shatshalakey. After recognizing his grandson’s plan where he will trick the guards by giving them an apple. The old man, trying not to overpower the young lad’s feelings, speaks very affectionately, childishly explaining the complexity of the situation. This can be seen in the dialog between the old man and his grandson:

Daldabai: “If it were that easy to get to him, I’d let you go myself. Unfortunately, we can’t do that”.

Teteles: “Oh, that’s very easy. After that, I will go to the town of Shatshalekey and watch the palace all day long. When night falls, I will climb out of the window and enter the Khan’s palace, snatch Ayagoz by the hand and run away. Or I can enter through the door. But to do that, I’ll have to trick the people at the door with apples”.

Daldabai: “Try it! And where will Shatshalakey known for his fearlessness and ruthlessness against his enemies be? Will he let you wander quietly in his palace?”

Teteles. Is he? He is snoring like a camel at that time.

Daldabai: “While he was snoring, other inferiors will be awake. Stop being childish, my son. I don’t want to lose first Ayagoz and the second you. Got it?” (Satybaldin, 1973: 204).

Even when the empty-headed Khan’s subordinates come to punish the old man, he displays his calm and patient character. His self-pity, demanding and pleading for his inevitable death, is convincing. The playwright has rationalized the crude qualities of an ordinary soul in a short time on the basis of the past and dormant events. At the same time, writers approach reality from a philosophical point of view, seeking to understand the deep essence and nature of the phenomena and processes observed in society (Shakirova, Tuimebekova, Bekmasheva, 2023: 142–151).
K. Satybaldin in his dramaturgical works, which showed the main phenomena of his time, tried to show individual character, individual character at the level of a typical image in accordance with the reality of that environment and that period. The ability of the artist to rely on the typical conditions characteristic of that period, in revealing the contemporary personality of the writer is a creative idleness arising from the spiritual and artistic requirements of his time.

K. Satybaldin reveals his characters from all sides, both in action and in conversation, showing their linguistic features according to the conditions of dramaturgy. This idea is clarified by the opinion of the scientist S. Ordaliyev: “It is his language that determines the behavior of the characters of dramatic works, all their qualities, inner world, and character” (Ordaliyev, 1970: 17).

Compared to Kazakh modern Turkish dramaturgy is a problematic and under-researched part of Turkish culture. After the establishment of the republic in the 1930s, Turkish literature, as well as the society as a whole, was going through a complex and critical stage of development. A republic was founded, but the structural-institutional and, to a greater extent, social contradictions inherited from the Ottoman Empire continued to exist in republican Turkey, continued to exist in republican Turkey. In the 30s in the country there was an irreconcilable struggle between the supporters of radical renewal of literature and art and those who defended the principles of the old, outmoded traditional culture. The writers faced the question of “Turkish identity” when the idea was put forward that “the basis of the Turkish state should be culture,” but not traditional Islamic, but modern secular culture, when Western models were taken as the basis (Karaosmanoglu, 2017: 229-240).

At present in Kazakhstani science on foreign literature, especially Turkish literature, there is a lack of full-fledged studies concerning the problem of Turkish author’s dramaturgy.

Turkish researcher S. Shener characterizes contemporary Turkish dramaturgy as follows: “For Turks today, the theater is a place of relaxation. The spectator does not want to tire his brain with complex plots; he is waiting for performance, humor, entertainment. This is one of the main problems with the quality of plays presented on the theater stage in Turkey. Another, no less important problem is the endless craving for realism (Shener, 1972: 75).

Z. Aldag, a Turkish literary critic and scholar, similarly criticizes the 1990s Turkish generation for not wanting to resist pop culture and for wanting to be content with simple accessibility (Aldag, 2008: 32).

Three main types of plays can be distinguished in Turkish dramaturgy of the late 19th – early 20th centuries: plays by Turkish authors, plays by Armenian authors, and plays by European authors translated into Turkish and Armenian. It can be said that the Turkish author’s drama of the period under consideration was represented by genre-diverse plays, in which the intertwining of folk drama traditions with different forms of receptions of French dramaturgical art can be clearly traced, which is one of the main regularities of Turkish Enlightenment literature.

It is important to recognize that the literature from the 1920s and 1930s is essentially fresh and reorganized. The circle of literary heroes grows, since they already embody every social stratum inside Turkish culture. The method and idea of portraying the previous literary protagonists, intellectuals (such as officers, artists, doctors, etc.).
The characters also encounter new ideas, people, and situations as a result of the rethinking of the metaphorical framework and the overall tone of the work, rather than just experiencing their own feelings and thoughts. Authors start delving into their interaction with the people and society at large. Social conflict reveals the heroes’ personalities, and historical and socioeconomic factors influence how their lives turn out. Realist writers come to the conclusion that Turkish literature cannot be considered to exist as long as it does not accurately portray the lives of Turkish peasants, who make up the majority of the population and the nation’s class.

As in the Kazakh drama the theme of patriotism, as well as the issues of social life, the formation of the Turkish nation, national consciousness, modernization, the problems of relations between intellectuals and villagers are developed in the one of the dramas “Stranger” (“Yaban”, 1932) of the famous Turkish playwright Yakub Kadri Karaosmanoglu. Therefore, this is the work of Y. Kadri, who was a sincere champion of the ideals of the republic and the principles of the founder of the Turkish Republic Mustafa Kemal, is not only a literary creation, but also a successful example of how the Turkish intelligentsia took upon itself the mission of educating the people.

In the gallery of peasants depicted in Ya. Kadri’s novel “The Stranger” there is not a single beautiful, strong, physically normal person, all of them are endowed with physical defects: slanted, hunchbacked, lame, etc., which means that the author goes for a deliberately negative characterization, although the novel talks about the hard life of peasants: Buraya geldiğim günden beri, kadın veya kız denilmeğe layık tek bir yaratık dahi görmedim // Since the day I came here, I have not seen a single creature worthy of being called a woman or a girl; Bu çocuk tıpkı sakat keçiye benzer//That boy looks like a crippled goat (Karaosmanoglu, 2005 :39). (Here in after the translation is authors’).

Thus, different author’s assessments, positions, different worldviews and attitudes to the people, to the common man – peasant – caused different interpretation of the images of peasants and their role in the national liberation struggle.

4. Results

The novel “Stranger” takes place in 1919–1921 in a village in Anatolia between the Porsuk River and the Haymana Plain, which was not occupied. The life of the peasants is illuminated from the words of Ahmet Celal, an officer wounded in the war, inspired by the ideas of patriotism and national unity, who decides to settle in a remote Turkish village in order to get closer to the people, but instead of feeling fusion with the people, friendship and mutual sympathy, he begins to feel for the peasants the same hostility as they have towards him, both with their way of life and ideals, secular Western education, is opposed to the people, and in this comparison is shown even in a more favorable light. The difference in lifestyle and thoughts between a resident of Western Anatolia and Istanbul and a resident of the eastern and central zone of the country is enormous:

Onlar gibi olmak, onlar gibi giyinmek, onlar gibi yiyip içmek, onlar gibi oturup kalkmak, onların diliyle konuşmak... Haydi bunların hepsini yapayım. Fakat, onlar gibi nasıl düşünebilirim? Nasıl onlar gibi hissedebilirim? // To be like them, to dress like them, to eat and to drink like them, to speak their language. Suppose I do that. But how can I “think like them? How can I feel like them?” The village, which has always been a center of purity, warmth, a place where traditions continue, in this novel becomes a place where it is difficult to live – a stranger, a swamp, a foreign land, a swamp.
In this work, all the contradictions between reality and the reforms that have been carried out, the speech portrait of main heroes have openly demonstrating the Turkish society’s unpreparedness for the new way of life, and more importantly, its thoughts.

In the work of F. Tursunova with the help of monologic speech describes the inner feelings of the characters affected by the problems of the time in the comics of Abdullah Kodiriy. In the article the writer’s ability to use folklore traditions to reveal the heroic psyche is revealed through the analysis of examples (Tursunova, 2021: 446)

5. Conclusion

The plot line in the drama is solved on the basis of the dialog of the characters. The playwright develops the plot and action according to the requirements of the stage. In dramatic works, the image of the hero is revealed in the course of the struggle. It is not easy for a playwright to present a character whose character is manifested not only through actions, but also through language. A special role in the creation of images of dramatic works plays the language of characters; their image is reflected in the language of characters. The plot line in the drama is solved on the basis of the dialog of characters. The playwright develops the plot and action according to the requirements of the stage. In dramatic works, the image of the hero is revealed in the course of the struggle. It is not easy for a playwright to present a character whose character is manifested not only through actions, but also through language. A special role in the creation of images of dramatic works plays a special role in the language of characters; their image is reflected in the language of characters.

Turkish scholars Muktar A. and Umer A. consider that the oral literatures heroes have short structures with broad contents. These are short sayings, short stories, proverbs, folktale, prophecies, blesses, curses, and songs; and they are used to promote education, development, freedom, courageousness, firmness, truthfulness against betrayed, patience, unity and hope (Muktar, Umer, 2020: 51).

It is known that the content of character language is clear and its structure is concise. Linguistic and stylistic methods occupy a separate place in presenting the aesthetic function of the characters’ language. In Kazakh linguistics, some issues related to the language of characters in literary literature are considered in the works of M. Balakayev, A. Kaidarov, R. Syzdykova, M. Sergaliev, S. Issayev, R. Amirov, H. Nurmukhanova, B. Shalabayev and others. In general, artistic works, the wording and style of speech of each character is different. It depends on their social status and environment. Therefore, each of them has a different manner of speaking. Such features of the character’s language are realized through the lexical and grammatical layers of the language. Through the character’s language, their culture, age, job, profession, upbringing, politeness, rudeness etc. images are seen. It is known that the originality of the character’s speech begins with his vocabulary.

In general, the system of speech organization of the text of modern drama goes beyond the traditional conceptual apparatus, which is naturally due to a change in the general generic characteristics of drama and requires further detailed understanding.
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