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Abstract. The main Yakut and Altaic comparative constructions types are analyzed from the comparative-contrastive aspect, which revealed common and different parameters due to common typological features and systematic structural characteristics. The common parameters include functioning nominal comparative constructions of the synthetic and analytic types as well as manifestation of synthetic and analytic-synthetic structures. Indicators of comparison do not agree in the plane of expression except the ablative case form and the syntactic indicator formed from the auxiliary verb бро / брос. These indicators are polysemantic. Yakut constructions feature active functioning of the analytical means курсук whereas the structure with the synthetic comparative indicator —дый dominates Altaic.
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Introduction

The problem of studying main structural-semantic types of comparative construction in Yakut and Altai is important as this layer of the related languages has not been studied adequately. Scientific relevance of the study resides in revealing common and specific parameters of the analyzed comparative constructions in Yakut and Altai determined by common typological characteristics and systematic-structural features of the compared languages. The results of the
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study suggest that the common parameters of these constructions are the functioning of nominal comparative constructions of the synthetic and analytic type in them as well as manifestation of synthetic and analytic-synthetic structures in the domain of verbal comparative constructions which is determined by postpositive agglutinative nature of the language system. The indicators of comparison of the considered constructions don’t agree in the plane of expression except for the ablative case form and the syntactic indicator formed from the auxiliary verb бул-/-бол-.

Materials and Methods

With the general research method being the inductive-deductive one, theoretical conclusions are drawn from the analysis of comparative constructions of the synthetic, analytic, and analytic-synthetic types of the languages under consideration. A contrastive analysis of comparative constructions of the Turkic languages Yakut and Altai was made. The comparative contrastive analysis reveals similar and different parameters of the discussed constructions determined by common typological characteristics and systematic structural features of the compared languages. Comparative constructions are characterized by active functioning of the analytical means күрдүк, whereas the Altai languages show the dominance of structures with the synthetic indicator -дый.

The method of component analysis involves deconstruction of comparative constructions into smallest meaningful units codified in lexicographic sources. To decipher functional actualizations it is necessary to study the structure of knowledge behind the comparative construction.

Background

The paper considers the main structural semantic types of comparative constructions in Yakut and Altai in comparative-contrastive aspect. The comparative contrastive analysis reveals similar and different parameters of the discussed constructions determined by common typological characteristics and systematic structural features of the compared languages.

Simile is a figure of speech, “through which we reveal the secret of creation, mysteries of word” (Balzer, 2001: 56). It is linguistically expressed as a model of various comparative constructions involving the object / subject of comparison (what is compared), the model for comparison (with what is something compared), a common criterion for comparison, an indicator of comparison. The importance of this problem is determined by perspectives of this field of comparative studies, in particular, in the field of comparative construction of Yakut and Altai.

Simile, comparative and other constructions are covered in various aspects: structural-semantic, comparative, cognitive, translation, etc. in Russian, English, German and other languages (Alexandrova, 2015; Bogdanova, Malkova, 2014; Boyko, 2016; Goleva and Voronkova, 2016; Malkova, 2014; Valipur, Ibrahimsharifi, 2016; Vedmanova, Kulikova, 2015; Frolova, 2014; Krylova 2016b; Krylova, 2016a; Lytkina, 2016; Mokienko, 2016; Nedosekina, 2015; Nedosekina, 2016; Ogoltseva, 2015; Razuvaeva, 2017; Sidikova, 2016; Bibilova, Chadashkina, Zuzieva, 2015; Brehmer, Golubović, 2007; Bresnan, 1973; Bulgarova, Safonova, 2015; Földes, 1992; Gnutzmann, Ilson, Webster, 2008; Hessky, 1989; Khakulova, 2016; Lapinskas, 2000; Leonidova, 1987; Li, Chshan, 2015; Lichtenberg, 1994;
In Turkology, comparison has been structurally-semantically described in Azerbaijani, Tatar, Uzbek, Kazakh, Khakass, Tuva, Shor, and other languages (Abdullaev, 1974; Antonova, 2012; Efremov, 2013; Konyrov, 1985; Kyrzhinakova, 2010; Mukaramov, 1971; Povarisov, 1965; Shamina, 2014; Cheremisina, Shamina, 1996). It is also studied in comparative aspect, e.g. in Uzbek, Tatar (Boethlingk, 1990; Zufarova, 1971).

In Kazakh, structural elements of comparison have been studied as they are the key to understand comparison as a linguistic phenomenon of a special kind with specific structure and distinctive semantics, with the status of word combination and sentence (Konyrov, 1985). Forty ways of comparison have been revealed and described in the Kazakh language, with each of them having a unique place in the system of comparative knowledge.

The Tuva language has shown various means of expressing comparison. Also, an attempt has been made to relate certain linguistic forms of comparison with specific meaning and to outline systematic relations between certain forms of comparison and the expressed comparative meaning (Shamina, 2014).

In Khakass, more than ten ways to express comparison at various levels have been found and described: lexical (7 ways), morphological (3), and syntactical (1) (Kyrzhinakova, 2010).

Comparative constructions of the Yakut language were dealt with in the monograph by Y.I. Vasiliev (1986), those of the Altai language were studied in the doctorate research by L.N. Tybykova (1989).

In Yakut, word-formative, morphological means to express comparison as well as comparative constructions expressed by categorymatic words, the postposition курдук and other syntactic words (дылы (диэбикке дылы), кэриэтэ, саха (саҕачча), тэнэ, буолан, биылыллаах, айылаах) have been described. In Altai, comparative constructions with synthetic (affix) and analytic (syntactic) indicators of comparison have been studied.

Results and Discussion

A preliminary analysis of comparative constructions in the compared languages shows that, in general, these constructions are formally characterized by their own means of expression.

A common means of expressing comparative relation in these languages is, first of all, the indicator of the ablative case. However, the comparative case is used to express these relations in Yakut much more commonly (Vasiliev, 1986:43).

Nominal comparative constructions (further, CC) of Yakut and Altai are classified into two types according to the indicator of comparison: synthetic and analytic. In synthetic CC, the indicator of comparison is represented by affix means whether in analytic CC it is represented by syntactic words, postpositions. Verbal CC are poly-predicative sentences the parts of which are related through synthetic and analytic-synthetic (postpositive) means.

In Yakut, the forms of the ablative, comparative, instrumental cases as well as the affix –лыы functionally close to the case forms act as indicators of nominal CC
of the synthetic type (Ubryatova, 1976: 199; Vasiliev, 1986: 49). In Altai, the CC of the synthetic type demonstrates three indicators of comparison =дый /=дый, =наи=наи and the indicator of the ablative case =наи /=наи. They play an important role in expressing comparative relations (Tybikova, 1989: 7).

Indicators of comparison in nominal CC of the analytic type are represented by syntactic words.

**Nominal Comparative Constructions**

1. Synthetic type

1) The Yakut language. Constructions with the ablative case. They indicate an object that “in some respect is inferior to another one” (Boethlingk, 1990: 576), e.g.: Манна баар эр дьонтон барылырыптал кини кыра ункухтаах, хатыныр, мөлтөх коруңнээх ‘Here he is of all men short (lit. with small bones), thin, weak looking’ (Vasiliev, 1986: 39).

In Altai, such constructions express numerical comparison, i.e. numerical opposition “more-less” of a quantity, feature (Tybikova, 1989: 7-8) that can be loaded by figurative meaning depending on the context:

Чыккан айдаң чыпчылаху, Тийген күннең көрүңнээх, Ондый бала бойбой кайты ‘Fairer than the risen moon, More beautiful than the beams of the morning sun, - There was such a girl’ (Vasiliev, 1986: 39).

The functional Yakut equivalent of the above mentioned Altai construction is the construction with the indicator of the comparative case that describes figurative comparative relation: Сибэккитээҕэр тэтэркэй имнээх (Sofronov, 1965: 197) ‘Her cheeks are rosier than the flower’.

This phenomenon verifies an idea according to which the Yakut comparative case is, in some respect, replaced by the ablative case from the domain of comparative constructions (Vasiliev, 1986: 43). Where as in the Turkic languages the affix of the ablative case “is one of the leading means expressing comparison” (Konyrov, 1985: 41).

The Yakut construction with –тааҕар “are mainly used for comparison – opposition to a certain evaluation of the compared object positively or negatively” (Ubryatova, 1976: 200-201). These comparative construction unlike the ones with the ablative case express not both simple and compound sentences: Бынақ сытныааҕар сылы сыта сыты булар (Ojunsjik, 1975: 17) ‘The smell of a horse is more intense than that of a cow’; …тороннут ордун суңутэкөр куңааның тутарғын истэн ... ‘… having heard that you treat your own child worse than cattle …’ (Vasiliev, 1986: 44); Мин этэрим сипи эн эпөрүңэкөр бьыдан чөпчэк куол ‘What I say is an easier way than what you say’ (Ubryatova, Petrov, Efremov et al., 1995: 275).

The Yakut constructions with the instrumental case are mainly found in phraseological groups of words: Бу уол оңола, хадаара оңол, эңэто эңэтинэн ‘This boy is as stubborn, intractable as his grandfather (lit., his grandfather by his grandfather); Ардахыы азнактаах уунан кутар ‘The rain is pouring bucket water’ (about heavy rain) (Vasiliev, 1986: 47-48).

The Altai equivalent of this affix is the postpositional affix -ла(-ле), with the Kazakh one being affix of the instrumental-connecting case мен(ен) (ibid, 51).

Comparative constructions with the indicator -лыны. The structures with –лыны are intermediate between case and adverbial forms (Ubryatova, 1976: 199;
Vasiliev, 1986: 48). The constructions of this type form both mono- and poly-predicative structures: Санаа барады, Самыр бэлтээнэ, Самгарбат ыня Самыр бэлтээн ‘My thoughts / Like rain / Crushed me / Made me speechless’ (Sofronov, 1965: 358); … мутуктарын / Будулуйар мотуок / Бутугастаньы булкуйан‘… larch boughs / Swift stream / Like stirring butugas (butter milk drink) (ibid.: 329-330); Уруккудуу уңунук Уранньыры унутатан ‘Having stopped extensively embroidering (the poem) like in the old times’ (ibid, 252); Ууга охтутумтуу уолунук, Харганга хааттарбыттыы_харбыаластым ‘(I) panicked like falling into water, fumbled about like being in full darkness’ (ibid, 336).

The comparative constructions with –лыы are translated into Russian by structures with conjunctions as, as if, like, just as, much as, as though (Vasiliev, 1986: 20-51) which indicates polysemy of the comparative constructions with the affix -лыы.

2). The Altai language. The CC with the synthetic indicator =дыы /=дийс correlate with the Russian CC with the conjunction like: Школдың оогош балдары кыранын ичиле кара танды ‘Primary school children were walking on the ploughed field like black rooks’ (Tybikova, 1989: 7).

In Yakut, such relation of comparison can be represented by constructions with the analytic comparative indicator курду ‘like’: Оволор суг устун кулунчук курду тойторуна сырсалар ‘Little children are running on the road like frisky foals’.

The Altai CC with the indicator -ча/-чэа are found more rarely. They express comparison of objects only by their size and shape (compare Russian, with the size of). The standard of comparison is represented by a small number of objects mainly of small size: Кадында араттай алаачына акта толу айлык дару ‘Along the Katun’ bank there stood some yurts on the field as small as a palm’ (ibid, 7). In Yakut, the same comparative relations are represented by the structures with the postposition саа that expresses quantitative comparison. Therewith, the standard of comparison is not restricted by objects of small size. Compare: Кини тыс саа сирээх ‘He’s got a land as small as a palm’ (The obstinate Kulun Kullustur. The Yakut Olonkho, 1985: 94) and Эрээс кус саа / Кутта уот илбистээх / Кырыкктаах уот сырылыы / Уңүүтүн тоботугээр хатаан ‘Hooked all that / On the tip of his fierce spear / Burning with bloodthirstiness / Of the size of a medium pot’ (ibid, 365).

As has already been noted before, the Altai CC with the standard of comparison being the ablative case (-наң / -нең) express quantitative comparison, relation of quantitative opposition “more-less” of some quality, feature: Көө жакынын ару, саруңуңаң ылмажак, сый жемел, ийде кожор күүкүл сүү ‘Purer than a tear drop, softer than butter, soothing and giving strength well water’ (Tybikova, 1989: 8). In Yakut, such constructions are found with the ablative and comparative cases: Хайа да сиң унуттун ыраас, түүхтакар да минныгэс, күүң-күүдэс биэрзэ дайдуу олбот менэ уута ‘Purer than water of any other land, sweeter than anything (on earth), giving strength and power, the elixir of life – water of my homeland’.

2. Analytical type of nominal comparative constructions.
1) The Yakut language. The construction with the indicator курдук: Тохсуннуңый тухалар кызээтин курдук Муус өвөгөхир харыбнан (The obstinate Kulun Kullustur. The Yakut Olonkho, 1985: 89) ‘By an icy, limpid / Like a full moon evening in January, eye’ (ibid, 360).

The construction with дылы: Кини … ордо дылы күнүстэри утуйан баччыяныны сытар ‘He … like a child even by day having fallen asleep, is lying snoring’ (Vasiliev, 1986: 81).

The construction with кэриэтэ: Сахам намиын үҥкүүтэ Сахам сирин кэриэтэ ‘My Yakut smooth dance / Is like my land Yakutia’ (ibid, 85).

The construction with Алаас сы: Тимир хала сыына / Хам аңынан кээспит (The obstinate Kulun Kullustur. The Yakut Olonkho, 1985: 88) ‘The jacket on him being as wide as a half of a glade, is skintight’ (ibid, 359).

The construction with тэҥэ: Сэгэрим сибэкки тэҥэ нарын, күн тэҥэ күндү ‘My beloved is as tender as a flower, as valuable as the sun’ (ibid, 90).

The construction with буолан: Мин түүлбэр эн таҥара буолан күндү ‘Into my dream you came as (lit. having become) a goddess’ (ibid, 92).

The construction with быылаах: Кыи быылаах оҕо ‘a child looking like a man’ (ibid, 93).

The construction with айылаах: Дьахтар тырыбынас дьүү күндү ‘The woman’s shining face as if faded away’ (ibid, 93).

2) The Altai language. The analytical types of the nominal CC includes constructions with the indicator of comparison as special particles and semi-categorematic words with comparative semantics. These are чылап (< чыл а = п), ошкош, немедий (the most common), кире, көр, болуп, etc. (less common).

CC with чылап, ошкош are comparative proper constructions. They are relevant to the CC with the synthetic indicator-дый/-дий. The standard of comparison combined with чылап functions as the adverbial modifier: Ободёнин яңын кеңгенин сүүнин Аня, төрт ло күчкаш чылап, Арьы-бери сунат ‘Being happy about her husband’s comeback, Anya is running hither and thither just as a restless little bird’ (Tybikova, 1989: 8); карошкошак ‘as white as snow’ (compare, кардыяк ‘as white as snow’ (Russian-Altaic Dictionary, 1964: 236). In Yakut, these constructions are represented by structures with the postposition курдук: Аня, ыйэтэ кээн ийэрин көрөн, чыячаах оротун курдук утары эүүрэн төркүүнү жайда ‘Anya, having noticed mother approaching her, rushed towards her like a nestling moving little legs’; Хаар курдук манган / хаа манган (as white as snow).

Altai CC with comparative semantics are formed with the indicators түнөй ‘similar, alike’ and semi-categorematic copulas with a close comparative semantics бүдүштөө, ёрзүүнө ‘look like by face, figure’, көберлү ‘similar to’ (compare to the Russian adjective similar). The auxiliary word түнөй keeps its lexical and categorial meaning to some extent and is considered as an adjective approximating postpositions: Тууразынан көрө, ол чын ла японский дипломат түнөй ‘If viewed from aside, he really looks like a Japanese diplomat (ibid, 9). In the Yakut language, the phrases of this type are represented by sentences with the predicate маарынгана ‘resemble, look like’: Туораттана көрөохө, кины, кырдык,
дьоппуон дипломатыгар маарыныыр. The indicator jÿз jÿндеш is formed from jÿз ‘face’, буудүшети – from буудуу ‘appearance’, кеберлү – from кебер ‘look, form’. In CC with these indicators characterized by lexical meaning comparison is made by resemblance only (resemble in face, figure): Ярашына ёраш косхүндү, Алып-Манаашка jÿз jÿндеш болдо ́ ‘Beauty added to beauty, looked like Alpyn-Manash’; Кулгаахтара қызылы қызымды темирге буудүшети ‘The ears looked like hot iron’ (ibid).

Comparative relations of the type considered above are given in Yakut by the constructions with the predicate expressed by the verb маарыҥнаа- ‘resemble’ as well as the analytic structure with the indicator курдук: Кини Алып-Манаашка маарыҥныыр этэ; Кулгаахтара қытарбыт тимир курдуктара ‘He resembled Alyp-Manash’.

Verbal comparative constructions
1. Synthetic.
1) The Yakut language. Synthetic structures with the indicator of the ablative case are mainly found in nominal constructions. Y.I. Vasiliev (1986) marks as comparative compound sentences of the synthetic type only constructions with the indicator of the comparative case and the form ending with -лыы.

Structures with the indicator of the comparative case. These constructions express simile if a generalized view of an object or event is used as a standard of comparison: Эн үөрэхтэммиккинээҕэр ыт үрбүтэ быдан ордук ‘Comparing to the way you received education, dog’s barking is better’ (Vasiliev, 1986: 45).

Structures with the indicator -лыы: Айма абытут абыны аныыммытыны, Сымнааастык сыйыя, сыйыгыны сыйпыты ‘[The Lena river] as if compassioning on her [woman’s] sorrow, /was humbly running, hissing (Sofronov, 1965: 327).

2) The Altai language. Synthetic structures with the subordinate predicate expressed by a participle with -ган, provided by the indicator дый: Оныҥ бакпырына не де токто калғандый, кажы қа сости чыгара айдарга ого сүрекей уур болдо ́ ‘As if something stuck in the throat, it was difficult for him to speak every word’ (Tybikova, 1989: 15). In Yakut, such relation can be expressed by a combination of two sentences, with one being closed with the particle курдук ‘as if’: Күөмэйигэр туох эрэ туран хаалбыт курдук. Кыайан саҥарбат. ‘As if something stuck in the throat. [He] Cannot speak’.

1) The Yakut language. The structures with the postposition курдук are most common, they can function as compound sentences: Уу тынаа аныыр үөрэ ууга сырсыйбытын курдук булла ‘Such a splash of water was heard in the pond, as if a herd of horses had run on it’ (Ojunsjjik, 1975: 127).

The construction with дылы (comparative parallelism): Мин эпшетэ дылы, мыхэ кыныырып ‘He is angry with me as if I said that’ (Sofronov, 1965: 82).

The construction with керэти: Сизэкки куйаас кун сылааныыр оссо ордук сиилгили үүзин ырып, кыны огө эйзээх керээни олдоо оссо ордук керэтийэр, тунсар ‘Like a flower blooms more on a hot sunny day, as a girls becomes more beautiful in a good peaceful marriage’ (ibid, 86).

The construction with саганы (comparative-identifying relation): Эн онгорорун саганы онгорор инибин ‘I’ll probably make the same as you do’ (colloquial).
Constructions with тэҥэ: Биискин кине үлэлирин тэҥэ үлэлиэхпим ‘We’ll work as much has he does’ (ibid, 91).

2) The Altai language. A mono-subject poly-predicative construction with чылап: Айу, кандый да чымыл урдиткен чылап, тамышарыла атпас ээле, бир кекоо көрүнөй көлдө ‘The bear waved its paws, as if scaring off some flies, disappeared for some time’ (Tybikova, 1989: 15-16). In Yakut, such a phrase is expressed by a mono-subject pol-predicate construction with курдук: Ээн, ханык эрэ саахсырулары үрүөлөр курдук, баппаайынан ханыйда, бир көмө киин хараар көстүбэт буола сырытта (translated the same).

The hetero-subject poly-predicate construction with түңей: Буттың айлында кар кылыран түрүұны, ёнит кунарди үй кешининд түрүңө түңей болду ‘That snow was crunching under feet was like a heifer chewing’ (ibid, 17). In Yakut, such relation is expressed by a compound sentence with the subject subordinate clause where the main clause is a standard for comparison with the analytic indicator курдук: Хаар хаачырыргыра тыңарас көзиндрин курдук ‘That snow was crunching under feet was like a heifer chewing’.

The mono-subject poly-predicate construction with болуп: Темитей бу солун жүруктарды ончобыстан оэоз тапкан ла көрүп ийден киже болуп, колын жанын түрүп, кыйыгыр күчүлу ‘Temitey had to wave his arms and shout like a man who has seen and found these wonderful paintings before us’ (ibid, 16). In Yakut, this phrase is expressed by the construction with буолан: Темитей бу дөйтө айулары ким да ишүү ээр көрүң күнү буолан, ишүүрүүн даливайырьандыахтаах, ханаңынахтаах.

Conclusions
The comparative analysis of Yakut and Altai comparative constructions shows that they have typologically common synthetic and analytic indicators of comparison. However, formally such indicators are mainly unique for each compared language, excluding the ablative case form and the analytic structure буолан (Altai – болуп) which is determined by non-contact development of the given languages. Verbal comparative constructions are represented by poly-predicate sentences whose clauses are combined with synthetic and analytic-synthetic means. Yakut comparative constructions are characterized by active functioning of the indicator курдук, whereas the Altai language demonstrates the dominance of the structure with the synthetic indicator -дый.

In the plane of content these indicators are polysematic, thus they express comparative semantics depending on the nature of the lexical-grammatical contents of the sentence composition and the context. This phenomenon is determined by specifics of Turkic languages that, in contrast to inflected languages (e.g. Russian), shows the principle of grammar economy. Yakut comparative constructions are characterized by active functioning of the indicator курдук, whereas the Altai language demonstrates the dominance of the structure with the synthetic indicator -дый.

Certainly, typological investigation of comparative constructions in related and non-related languages is of great interest for further research.
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