

Converting a 'Word Bird' into a 'Spirit Bird' in Yunus Emre: Understanding Yunus Emre's 'There Shall Be a Word' in the Sense of Austin's 'Speech-Act' Theory

Yunus Emre'de 'Söz Kuşu'nu 'Can Kuşu'na Dönüştürmek: Yunus Emre'nin 'Söz Olası'na Austin'in 'Söz Edimleri' Kuramı Açısından Bakmak

ZÜBEYİR OVACIK 

Selçuk University

OSMAN ZAHİD ÇİFÇİ 

Selçuk University

Received: 01.10.2021 | Accepted: 31.03.2022

Abstract: The speech-act theory represents an alternative approach to semantic theories by emphasizing the performative/actual capacity of linguistic expressions. Emphasizing actuality of speech as an alternative to the approach that limits the meaning to facts in the analytic tradition in contemporary philosophy, John Langshaw Austin, who created a theory expressed in the form of speech-act, has contributed to the development of original interpretations in various disciplines from law to metaphysics, with his originative approach. However, as a competent representative of the Turkish language, Yunus Emre is a thinker who uses the language plainly but effectively. Yunus puts particular emphasis on the actuality of the word in some of his verses. The current study focuses on some of Yunus Emre's lines regarding Austin's speech-act theory. Therefore, our study considers the assumption that a contemporary theory such as speech-act will offer a dynamic insight into the understanding of Yunus's world of thought as a starting point.

Keywords: Speech-act theory, Yunus Emre, John Langshaw Austin, philosophy of language.

✉ Zübeyir Ovacık
Selçuk Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Felsefe Bölümü
42130, Konya, Turkey | zubeirovacik@gmail.com

✉ Osman Zahid Çifçi
Selçuk Üniversitesi, İslami İlimler Fakültesi, Felsefe ve Din Bilimleri Bölümü
42250, Konya, Turkey | ozcifici42@gmail.com



Introduction

Since the beginning of philosophical thought, language, with its various aspects, has been in the field of interest of many philosophers as a significant problem area since thought is a means of expression and has a close relationship with thinking. Plato's *Cratylus* dialogue, which analyzes the relationship between names and named (denominated) things, is admitted as one of the first written works in which the issue of language is examined with its ontological and epistemological extensions. However, within the scope of linguistic philosophy, Aristotle mentioned the issues in *Organon's* second book entitled 'On Interpretation' (*Peri Hermeneias*), which is more of a logical corpus. In his book aforementioned, Aristotle argues the language issue in a logical framework about the truth value of propositions.

A sentence is a meaningful sound that has meaningful parts on its own, not as affirmations but as utterances. Every sentence is meaningful not as a natural device, but as a conventional phrase, as we have said. But only those which are true or false become declarative, not all. There is no right or wrong in all of them. (Aristotle 2002:17-a)

The language problem, which has been the subject of philosophical interest since ancient times, continued to be one of the issues that many philosophers focused on during the Medieval Ages and in the following centuries. Aristotle's point of view in his work entitled 'On Interpretation' (*Peri Hermeneias*) seems to be the prevailing point of view in philosophical studies on language until the 19th Century. In this context, until the beginning of the 20th Century, the philosophical investigations on language were in the characteristics of studies that seek answers to the language-related questions in logical and epistemological frameworks. Ultimately, although there have been numerous philosophical studies on language throughout the history of philosophy, putting language itself in the center and subjecting it to philosophy corresponds to the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century.

It shall be taken into consideration that the philosophical thought activities dealing with the language problem are categorized into two branches as 'philosophy of linguistic' and 'philosophy of language.' In the



given distinction, while 'philosophy of linguistic' or philosophy of philologist refers to a method, 'philosophy of language' indicates a problem area. John Searle, one of the prominent contemporary philosophers in the field of both philosophy of language and philosophy of mind, revealed the distinction between 'philosophy of linguistics' and 'philosophy of language' with the following words: 'The distinction could be made very simply. 'philosophy of linguistics' and 'linguistic analysis' are the names given to the techniques or methods used to solve philosophical problems. However, 'philosophy of language' is not a technique but a field of study..., it is a branch of philosophy...' (Magee, 2004, s. 238). Searle allowed for the following statements about the philosophy of linguistic: 'Linguistic philosophy is an attempt to solve philosophical problems by approaching the everyday use of certain words or other elements in a particular language.' (Searle, 1969, s. 3).

In contemporary philosophy, the language issue has become the priority of philosophical interest in terms of a philosophical method as an analytical tool and a priority of philosophical interest as a philosophical problem area. Analytical philosophy, which played a significant role in the path-determination of contemporary philosophy, came to the forefront as an efficacious philosophical attitude and cult, especially in Anglo-Saxon geography, and made progress on more of an analysis of language problems (Rossi, 2001, s. 1). Thinkers such as Gottlob Frege and Bertrand Russell, who took a philosophical perspective based on mathematics and logic, also played a primary role in the contemporary period when the language problem became the focus of philosophical analysis. Afterward, language became the main route of philosophical thought, particularly with Wittgenstein and the philosophers of Vienna.

The logical positivism tradition, which was very influential in the first half of the 20th Century, addressed the language problem based on truth value. Having remained within the framework of verifiability or falsifiability in their efforts, philosophers such as Russell, Frege, Ayer, and particularly early ideas of Wittgenstein, attempted analysis to explain the relationship of language with the world. Accordingly, these contemporary philosophers only dealt with descriptive sentences in the language issue, made analyses to specify the compatibility of these sentences with the facts they



point to; however, they did not consider the non-descriptive sentences remarkable. This situation, therefore, reduced the meaningfulness into being verifiable and led to the ignorance of the aspect of language as a communicative activity (Altınörs, 2001, s. 6). In the early periods of the analytical tradition, linguistic theories, which were mostly limited to the framework of true and false values, had an orientation of taking into account the broad perspectives; for instance, dealing with everyday language philosophies in later periods, as in Wittgenstein's second period. In this sense, in addition to the analytical language philosophy, approaches such as ordinary language philosophy have also emerged in the contemporary period of philosophy. Ordinary language philosophers draw attention to the actuality of language in terms of the speaker and the listener, and they directly relate the issue to the ethical field (Ricoeur, 2000).

Within the framework of the philosophy of ordinary language, John Langshaw Austin (1911-1960), who showed an original approach such as the speech-act theory, from the Oxford philosophy circle was one of those philosophers who were interested in language. John Searle, a student of Austin, further developed the speech-act theory. Although he was one of the most competent names in the philosophy of ordinary language, he did not use the term 'philosophy of ordinary language', and instead, he preferred the term 'linguistic phenomenology' (Berdini & Bianchi, t.y.; Özcan, 2016, s. 18). With his 'speech-act theory,' Austin objected to the logical positivists' approaches limiting language to the meaning and indicated that speaking essentially corresponds to an action. Emphasizing that language is primarily a communication activity, Austin defended the presumptions of the tradition of ordinary language philosophy and highlighted the necessity of determining the meaning of a sentence according to its context, intention, and social acceptance (Duignan 2009). According to Austin, rather than the harmony between the sentence and the phenomenon a sentence indicated, it was necessary to consider the effect created by a word, and actually, saying something essentially was doing something (Austin, 1962, s. 52). Defined as the philosophy of ordinary language and as an approach emerging within ways of thinking about language, the speech-act theory mainly focuses on the operational capacity of language. In other words, the speech-act theory refers to a state of actuality realized through a language.



Hence, indicated that words in a language did not only have constative and information transfer characteristics but also have a performative character, Austin provided a significant expansion in the field of language philosophy.

While the language issue has been an essential subject of discussion since the beginning of philosophical thought and defined its course with the contemporary methods in the 20th Century, the language problem has been one of the issues overemphasized in classical Turkish thought where the thought is expressed frequently in the structure of poetry. As a competent representative of the Turkish language, when we consider the poems of a thinker such as Yunus, who performs ordinary language very effectively, it seems possible for us to encounter very effective expressions that shorten the distance between words and actions. Regarding Austin's speech-act theory, the current study aims to evaluate some certain poetries of Yunus, who performed ordinary language very effectively.

Although several examples of philosophers can base upon a discussion on issues such as the possibility of language in the Turkish thought, its limits, and representation of the world by language, it is not difficult to say that performing such a discussion through Yunus Emre, as the most competent Turkish representative we practice today, will enable a more convenient analysis. Starting from a theory shaped within the analytical line of the 20th Century, heading towards a thinker from the classical period, such as Yunus Emre, will cause certain hesitations. However, discussing Yunus, who has revealed a universal thought system in terms of the general thought history of humanity, not only in terms of Turkish thought but in the sense of contemporary linguistic theories will make significant contributions to offering a dynamic insight into today's Turkish thought. Moreover, it is unthinkable that the studies focusing on today's Turkish thought remain ignorant for the discussions on the philosophy of language in the contemporary period.

With the contribution to the efforts to introduce new initiatives related to Turkish thought, the current study aims to discuss the action capacity of language in Yunus Emre's thought via taking into account the contemporary methods in the philosophy of language. In addition to increasing efforts to compare different thought basins, comparing Yunus and any other name in modern Western philosophy will expand awareness



for such thinkers beyond the Turkish-speaking geographies. In this regard, it will be meaningful in the beginning to primarily and briefly mention Austin's theory.

The Speech-Act Theory of Austin: Saying Something is Doing Something

The Speech-act theory reveals that performing a language is not only descriptive but also leads to a change of state among its speakers (Çelebi, 2014, ss. 78-79). As in cases such as dismissing someone, placing a bet, and making a promise, when we consider that some actions can only be performed with words, with a linguistic expression, what is indicated by the speech-act would better be understood (Green, 2007).

Austin, who developed an alternative philosophy of language against the approach that reduced a language of analytical philosophy to communication and description, manifested his theory called 'Speech-Act Theory' within the framework of ordinary language philosophy. Austin's work, *How to Do Thing with Words*, which included his theory leaning to the principle of 'saying is doing' consisted of notes from the lectures he gave at Harvard University in 1955. In his work, which has been translated into Turkish with the name of 'Saying and Doing', Austin referred to the performative capacity of the language, while giving information about the performative situations. After emphasizing that performatives were different from communicative and descriptive expressions, and concerning performative speech as they did not 'describe', 'communicate', or 'determine' anything, they are not 'right' or 'wrong', he emphasized that 'saying the sentence here is acting, or it is also part of taking action and this action is normally a saying, or cannot be described as 'just' saying something' (Austin, 1962, s. 5). Eventually, Austin, who indicated the action performed through words by the speech-act theory, specified that the speech activity performed for varying purposes was not just a case report but approaches reducing various forms of speech to only descriptive speech would be a fallacy (Austin, 1962, s. 5).

It is noteworthy that Austin, who did not introduce his theory in a holistic way but with a work he wrote and developed the theory in his lectures, made revisions in his theory throughout the courses. Principally,



Austin, who begun with objecting to consider language as an inanimate object to be manipulated, emphasizes that language is a reality-creating force rather than a tool reflecting the existing realities. When he started to build his theory, he initially differentiated between descriptive sentences and the sentences, that caused action and objected to logical positivists only considering descriptive sentences. According to him, description constitutes only one aspect of language. On the other hand, language is an element that has the power to create actions in life. According to him, logical positivists attribute too much importance to the descriptive aspect of language. Therefore, what needs to achieve should be revealing the other functions of the language. The sentences delivering actions such as promising, declaring, ordering, and betting are the main functions of language. Making sentences with such content is also to put forward actions. Because when such sentences are recited, they put forth actions (Austin, 1962, s. 5).

According to Austin, while the meanings of sentences describing only the existing things in the language-world relationship can be measured by the truth value they express, movement-creating sentences are exempt from this value since they do not make any description. They do not make descriptions; however, they pave the way for the occurrence of a situation that did not exist before the word was spoken, the formation of new contexts of fact, and the bringing into existence of new things (Green, 2007).

While Austin indicates the performativity of the word, he discusses this issue as separate performativity from the physical acts. For example, the movement of a finger in an action of pulling the trigger is considered a body action. However, we cannot state that speech-act lead to physical activity, such as pushing directly. There is a consensus in speech-act (Özcan, 2020, ss. 242-243). In addition, conditions that the speaker and the listener must meet for the performativity to take place in a speech activity or an utterance, and as well as indicating that certain conditions related to the environment must also be met, Austin expresses the following statements on the subject:

'A.I. There must be an accepted conventional procedure with a certain conventional effect, and this process must also include the saying of certain words by certain people under certain conditions.

Also,



A.2. Each person and conditions in a given situation must be the persons and conditions eligible to apply for that particular operation.

B.1. The operation shall be made both errorless

B.2. and in full by all persons participating in the operation.

Γ.1. If there is a situation where the operation is designed to be used by people with certain thoughts and feelings, or to make any of the participants in the operation behave in a certain way (which often is the case), anyone who participates in the operation and refer to must indeed have those feelings or thoughts; those who participate in the operation must have the intention to exhibit the behavior in question, and also

Γ. 2. It must subsequently present that pattern of behavior in actual' (Austin, 1962, ss. 14-15).

Seeking to justify his theory with the distinction he made among sentences, Austin concluded in his following lessoning-periods that there could not be any sentence creating no action; and according to him, the distinction between descriptive sentences and action-generating sentences lost its prominence. Since the theory required a reclassification after reaching this conclusion, Austin made a new classification of sentences and in this classification, all sentences were classified in such a way as to create action. The classification of 'locution', 'illocution', and 'perlocution' are the ones emerged at this stage, and here, the action-generating sentences, which Austin put forward in response to the descriptive sentences before, found their places in the classification of 'illocution' (Austin, 1962, s. 108).

Therefore, Austin introduced the speech-act as three different acts such as *locution, illocution, and perlocution*.

1. *Locutionary act*: With the locutionary act, Austin directly refers to the speech itself as a sound. The locutionary act is to make meaningful sounds. According to Austin, there are three sub-acts in the locutionary act such as vocalism, expression, and interpretation:

'(A. a) it always means performing some act of making sounds (an act of 'vocalizing'); here, speaking is a phonation.

(A. b) It always means to act out some word or words with a certain intonation, etc.; that is, certain sounds in a certain vocabulary since it takes place in a certain vocabulary; in a certain structure, in other words, suitable



for that grammar since it has a structure suitable for a certain grammar. This act is called the act of 'expressing'; and we may also name the word uttering, which is revealed by the act of making a sound (...), as 'expression'.

(A. c) it usually means the act of using the utterance or its constituent components with a more or less precise 'sense' and a more or less precise 'reference' (also corresponds to 'meaning'). We can call this as the act of interpretation, and the utterance that emerges with the act of making a sound, 'signification' (Austin, 1962, ss. 92-93).

2. *Illocutionary act*: The illocutionary act is an act of performing a job through language. Expressions made through language such as asking a question, making a request, informing, ordering, asking for, making a bet, and making an appointment are included in the scope of illocution. Austin gives the following explanations about illocution:

I consider performing an act as to perform an 'illocutionary' act; in other words, I explain it as doing something while saying something, as opposed to doing an act of saying something (Austin, 1962, s. 98).

When Austin discusses a linguistic act with an illocutionary act, he refers to a stage further than a verbal act. Here, it is mentioned about the action performed through a language, saying something and taking an action correspondingly. At this point, Austin mentions the convention for the realization of the illocutionary. It is impossible to remark an illocutionary act without considering the conventions (Austin, 1962, ss. 104-114-115).

3. *Perlocutionary act*: The perlocutionary act is revealed by affecting the listener through the phrase expressed. Because we have been acting by saying something. By the performance we have been saying, we have been influencing something. Austin gives the following explanations about the perlocutionary act:

In perlocutionary acts such as making someone believe, convince, give up, and even, for instance, surprise or mislead, we may also perform actions that we cause or perform through saying something (Austin, 1962, s. 109).

'It is characteristic of perlocutionary acts that the uttered reaction or the utterance that follows the reaction performed or an illocutionary utterance can be performed separately, or by means other than pure locution: Indeed, threatening can be done by waving a stick or pointing a gun. We



can even achieve a reaction non-verbally when it comes to making someone convince, persuade, subjugate, and deceive (...)” (Austin, 1962, ss. 117-118).

Every, almost every perlocutionary act, under certain special conditions, with or without pre-calculation; any enunciation of any kind, especially an enunciation that is clearly indicative (if such a thing really exists, of course) is an act accomplished through production (Austin, 1962, s. 109).

The central place of articulation for Austin’s theory, and the valuable part for our study, is his emphasis on the fact that language is a means of communication and action. Fundamentally, speaking is communicating. While communicating, certain behavior is expressed, and it is essential to understand what is being expressed correctly. One sentence may express a belief, desire, or regret. While addressing Austin’s theory and his new classification in his book entitled ‘The Theory of Communicative Action,’ Habermas did not neglect to emphasize the communicative aspect of language. His findings are eye-opening in understanding Austin’s final classification:

By performing a speech act, an effect is generated on something in the world. Thus, the three acts Austin enumerated may also be characterized by the following locution: saying something (locution); having action by having said something (illocution); and having an effect (perlocutionary) on something by taking action through saying something. (Habermas, 2001, s. 308)

To summarize; without including the details of Austin’s theory and the evolution of thought that led to these details since it will exceed the scope of our work, his theory emphasizes two main points:

1. Language is not an inanimate object that allows us to operate on it. It is alive and creates lives. Therefore, it cannot be considered from one direction; it should be essential to view the language holistically.

2. Concurrently, language has the power to create a state of reality. In other words, a social reality is built through language on the physical existence and mechanical functioning of the world we live in. There is a social reality that has been generated through language in law, politics, art, education and many other fields. For instance, besides biological sex, we witness that social norms created through language constitute social genders. It is an unmistakable reality that these norms have settled as a new layer



on the biological sex classification (Büyüktuncay, 2014, s. 95).

To what Austin draws attention is that these functions and powers of language have attracted the attention of many other thinkers coming after him, and the view of logical positivists has been replaced by thoughts that realize the power of ordinary language. It is possible to observe a particular emphasis on the action capacity of the word to act in Yunus's poems. Accordingly, few examples from Yunus's poems can be examined closely.

Speech-Act Theory in Yunus Emre's Poems: Converting the Word Bird into the Spirit Bird

As Fuat Köprülü indicated, Yunus Emre is a competent representative of pure Anatolian-Turkish in consideration of the language he used (Köprülü, 1976, s. 292). As seen in his following verses; 'Yunus has said a word unlike any other words, hypocrites have enshrouded its inner face with hands' (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 555), Yunus introduced an expression about the act of speaking itself, regarding the locutionary act. While analyzing Yunus's poems in terms of both content and language, approaching the subject from a philosophical point of view will provide important insight into Turkish thought style. In this context, it seems plausible to evaluate some expressions in Yunus Emre's poems within the scope of speech-act theory. As also seen in his following line; 'For those who listen to advise, my words shall be like sugar country' (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 104), he draws attention to the fact that the word creates a situation. It is tellable that some expressions in Yunus's poems, which indicate that saying a word generates a state of action, strongly reflect the performative capacity of the word:

'There shall be a word ending the war, there shall be a word beheading the head'

'There shall be a word making poisoned eats into honey and butter' (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 209).

In the first part of this line, there is an example of how making an order with the word reveals a situation of actuality. As Austin pointed out, saying something is also acting: 'I consider performing an act as to perform an 'illocutionary' act; in other words, I explain it as doing something while saying something, as opposed to doing an act of saying something' (Austin,



1962, s. 98).

As an illocutionary example, we may contemplate what kind of actuality in Yunus's 'There shall be a word ending the war' expression corresponds to in a war situation. Because in the middle of a hot conflict, a verbal order such as 'ceasefire!' will truly end the war. When we consider the issue from this point of view, the statements of Yunus about the action capacity of the word are remarkable. At this point, it is necessary to draw attention to the condition of conventionality, which is one of the terms that Austin put forward for the speech-act state of the word. Austin used the expression 'There must be an accepted conventional procedure with a certain conventional effect, and this process must also include the saying of certain words by certain people under certain conditions' (Austin, 1962, s. 14). There must be a certain convention for the word to generate a situation of actuality, such as ending the war or beheading. At this point, Austin mentions the convention for the realization of the illocutionary. It is not possible to talk about an illocutionary act without considering the conventions (Austin, 1962, ss. 104-114-115). For instance, the word 'ceasefire!' shall be taken into account that such a word must have a conventional character to end the actual conflict in an active ongoing war process. For example, when 'ceasefire!' is worded, there shall be a platform on which those who say the word and those who deal with this word agree on it. Yet, as Austin indicated, 'Each person and conditions in a given situation must be the persons and conditions eligible to apply for that particular operation.' For the word 'ceasefire!' in our example; therefore, there should be a war condition, and those who hear this word in that war should be the suitable people to do what is necessary. Furthermore, 'those who participate in the operation must have the intention to exhibit the behavior in question, and must also subsequently present that behavior in actual' (Austin, 1962, ss. 14-15). When the convention terms are met, the addressees of the 'ceasefire!' word will fulfill its requirement.

While further analyzing the phrase of 'there shall be a word beheading the head' in the continuation of Yunus's line above-mentioned, we may give the 'fire!' or 'fire at will!' examples as verbal orders. At this point, the opposite situation arises from the above examples, and here also, it is understood that a state of conventionality and the terms that will enable this



speech act to emerge must be provided.

In the afterward of Yunus's respective poem, we come across the following verses, which we may consider as a *perlocutionary-act* within the scope of speech-act theory: "There shall be a word making poisoned eats into honey and butter" (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 209).

In this line, it is described that how words could make a change within the scope of the perlocutionary-act performance.

In the following verses, it is also possible to come across the expressions that could be presented as examples of how words lead to a stative word by Yunus.

'I broke hearts with the high words, I got furious, I hurt souls' (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 184).

'There is the word making the heart happy; there is the word making the kin/friend alienate'

'Everyone either have contempt or honor with the words' (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 142).

In here, we witness expressions that can be given as examples of how an effect is generated by saying something. Emphasizing that the word makes room for spiritual and mental comfort, Yunus states that honor and dishonor are directly related with the word.

'It is a word brightening the face of those knowing how to word'

'It is a word prospering those saying by ripening the word' (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 209).

Emphasizing the power of the word for the whole of human life, Yunus openly reveals the effect of the word. In the following verses below, Yunus makes pure statements about the power of the word:

'Let us seek out the past master, let us find out him'

'He is the man with heart open, my words have new meanings to him' (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 144).

'Ripen your words, find the wound and parse it out'

'Ponder your words with wisdom, do not untimely speak it out' (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 209).



'Come my brother, O! who is worthy of sultanate, just listen to my word'

'A word turns the mother earth into thousands of jewels and gold' (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 209).

'One shall set off value of his word, shall not say a badly word'

'into an eight-door heaven, a word turns this hell of the world' (Yunus Emre, 2012, s. 209).

Yunus, who has referred to expressions in Sufi philosophy, emphasizes the soul immortality and its priority over the body and uses the phrase 'spirit bird' in some of his verses (Yunus Emre 2012:451, 507). Yunus also draws attention to the connection between 'spirit bird' and 'word'; also implying the 'aliveness' of 'word bird' in a sense.

Conclusion

By emphasizing the performative/actual capacity of linguistic expressions, the speech-act theory represents an alternative approach to semantic theories. Austin, theory-created such as speech-act as an alternative to the method limiting the meaning to facts in the analytic tradition in contemporary philosophy, naturally originates from his own historical and philosophical experience. In this respect, comparing Austin and Yunus Emre side by side may cause some hesitation. The current study seeks to overcome these hesitations via objecting to the transformation of Yunus's words into archaic and outdated historical texts. Therefore, our study accepts the assumption that a contemporary theory such as speech-act will offer an insight into the understanding of Yunus's world of thought as a starting point. The language issue has been at the center of the attention of several thinkers within the tradition of Turkish-Islamic Thought. Furthermore, the language issue approached by researchers from different disciplines and as well as philosophers should be discussable with contemporary methods, particularly through poets, who are considered to be the foremost representatives of the Turkish thought tradition.

With the example he presented in some of his verses, a competent representative of Native Anatolian-Turkish and effective language user, Yunus drew attention to what kind of actuality the word itself contains.



Examples of the speech actuality approach theorized by Austin in contemporary philosophy can be encountered in some verses of Yunus, a leading name in Turkish literature, consequently in Turkish thought. The following verses of Yunus 'There shall be a word ending the war, there shall be a word beheading the head/There shall be a word making poisoned eats into honey and butter' clearly indicates the emphasis on the action capacity of the word. The current study, which points out that turning to Turkish thought with some theories of contemporary philosophy will bring movement to our world of thought, proposes to try new ways of thinking based on Yunus's world of thought.

References

- Altınörs, A. (2001). *Anlam Doğrulama ve Edimsellik* (1. bs). Alfa Basım Yayın.
- Aristotle. (2002). *Yorum Üzerine* (S. Babür, Çev.). İmge Kitabevi.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Clarendon Press.
- Berdini, F., & Bianchi, C. (t.y.). Austin, John Langshaw. İçinde *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* / <https://iep.utm.edu/austin/>. <https://iep.utm.edu/austin/>. Geliş tarihi 13 Ocak 2022, gönderen <https://iep.utm.edu/austin/>
- Büyüktuncay, M. (2014). Söz Edimleri Kurami ve Edebiyat: Anlam, Bağlam ve Yinelenebilirlik. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 2(2), 93-93. <https://doi.org/10.18033/ijla.66>
- Çelebi, V. (2014). Gündelik Dil Felsefesi ve Austin'in Söz Edimleri Kuramı. *Beytulhikme An International Journal of Philosophy*, 4(1), 73-89. <https://doi.org/10.18491/bijop.43006>
- Duignan, B. (2009). Speech Act Theory. İçinde <https://www.britannica.com/topic/speech-act-theory>. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/speech-act-theory>
- Green, M. (2007). Speech Acts. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/speech-acts/#Aca>. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/speech-acts/#Aca>
- Habermas, J. (2001). *İletişimsel Eylem Kuramı* (M. Tüzel, Çev.). Kalcı Yayınevi.
- Köprülü, M. F. (1976). *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* (3. bs). Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı.
- Magee, B. (2004). Dil Felsefesi, John Searle ile Söyleşi. İçinde *Yeni Düşün Adamları, Çağdaş Felsefeyi Yaratarlardan Kimileriyle Söyleyişler*. Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.



- Özcan, Z. (2016). *Dil Felsefesi II, (Gündelik Dil Paradigması)*. Sentez.
- Özcan, Z. (2020). *Dil Felsefesi IV (Austin'de Eylemsel Paradigma)*. Sentez.
- Ricoeur, P. (2000). *Söz Edimleri Kuramı ve Etik* (A. Altınörs, Çev.). Asa Kitabevi.
- Rossi, J.-G. (2001). *Analitik Felsefe* (A. Altınörs, Çev.; 1. bsk). Paradigma.
- Searle, J. R. (F). (1969). *Speech Acts an Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge at the University Press.
- Yunus Emre. (2012). *Dîvân-ı ilâhîyât* (M. Tatcı, Çev.; 1. bs). Kapı Yayınları.

Öz: Söz edimleri kuramı, dilsel ifadelerin edimsel/fili kapasitesini öne çıkartmakla anlam teorilerine alternatif bir yaklaşımı temsil etmektedir. Çağdaş felsefede analitikçi gelenek içerisindeki anlamı olgularla sınırlandıran yaklaşıma alternatif oluşturacak şekilde sözün edimselliğini vurgulayan söz edimleri şeklinde ifade edilen bir kuram oluşturmuş olan John Langshaw Austin, ortaya koyduğu özgün yaklaşımıyla hukuktan metafiziğe çeşitli disiplinlerde özgün yorumların gelişmesine katkıda bulunmuştur. Türk dilinin önemli ismi olan Yunus Emre, dili sade fakat etkili bir şekilde kullanan bir düşünürdür. Yunus, kimi dizelerinde sözün edimselliğine özel vurgu yapmaktadır. Mevcut çalışma, Austin'in söz edimleri kuramından hareketle Yunus Emre'nin kimi dizelerine yönelmektedir. Çalışma söz edimleri gibi çağdaş bir kuramın Yunus'un düşünce dünyasının anlaşılmasında dinamik bir açılım sağlayacağı varsayımını hareket noktası olarak kabul etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Söz edimleri kuramı, Yunus Emre, John Langshaw Austin, dil felsefesi.

