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Abstract

The paper is devoted to a category of comparison in Kazakh and Turkic languages of Siberia. Kazakh is one of the Turkic languages of the Kipchak subgroup according to Baskakov’s classification, or the Northwestern branch, Kipchak Turkic according to Lars Johanson’s classification. Comparison is a mental act by which two objects are assigned a position on a predicative scale. In a semantic aspect all the languages express the same meaning of comparison: a comparison of equality or a comparison of inequality, but the forms expressing comparison in the world languages are quite different. Researchers have expressed a common opinion that comparison is a complex structural system of multi-level means of expression: lexical, morphological, syntactic. In the Turkic languages, the most productive way of expressing comparative relations of equality is the affix -dAy that can be represented in the forms N- dAy and V-GAn-dAy. In the Kazakh language comparative marker –dAy can follow i) Nouns N- dAy and ii) Actional Nominal Verb form V-GAn- dAy. In our paper we will show the peculiarities of comparisons of equality in Kazakh, Altay Turkic, Khakass and Sakha Turkic.

Keywords: a comparison, a subject of comparison, a comparee, a standard of comparison, a module of comparison, a parameter.

1. Introduction

A comparison is known as a multidimensional and multi-level phenomenon. Comparison is an object of study of various disciplines.

Category of comparison is studied in philosophy as a scientific and philosophical method aimed at a single way of knowing the particular and universal; and plays a role in cognition and movement of item changes, but also in discovering causes of certain events: it is a way of classifying and ordering objects and phenomena, a necessary component of any inferences that one employs as evidence (Maslennikov, 1968).

In linguistics, a comparison is a fact of language. In most cases it is considered as syntactic or stylistic category. Comparison also reflects the results of cognitive human activities (Samoylenko, 2010).

Comparison is a consideration or estimate of the similarities or dissimilarities between two things or people (Dixon, 2005).

Comparison is a rhetorical strategy and method of organization in which a writer examines similarities and/or differences between two people, places, ideas, or things (Nordquist, 2014). Comparison is a mental act by which two objects are assigned a position on a predicative scale (Leon Stassen, 1984).


Researchers on the data of the languages of different typological families have expressed a common opinion that comparison is a complex structural system of multi-level means of expression: lexical, morphological (in most cases these include the degrees of comparison of adjectives and adverbs), syntax (comparative prepositions and conjunctions , case endings, comparative speed, etc., with which comparison becomes part of a simple / complicated comparative
2. Materials and Methods

The objective of this study is to describe the grammatical ways of expressing the comparative relations by means of the affixes -day/ dey in Kazakh. These comparative affixes are the most productive and contribute to the formation of both simple and complex syntactic units (with the help of these affixes both simple and complex syntactic units are formed). The number of examples with this affix is over 1,500. The examples have been taken from Kazakh fiction and nonfiction.

We have applied various linguistic and general scientific methods and techniques: comparative method identified various meanings of lexis in all Turkic languages, with descriptive as well as method of component analysis making it possible to collect the data.

During the research a variety of methods and techniques of analysis has been used. The primary method of research is descriptive. When processing the empirical data we used methods of component and transformational analysis, comparative-typological method, and the method of structural modeling.

In the analysis of the data, we used the concepts that used in comparative semantics: the object of comparison, the standard of comparison and comparison module.

3. Problem Statement

It is well known that comparison (Latin ‘comparatio’) as a category of formal logic, suggests the presence of three elements: a) a concept that requires explanation (comparandum); b) a concept, that serves to illustrate (comparatum); c) a concept that serves as a “bridge” between two concepts (tertium comparationis) (Potebnya, 1976).

Comparisons can be represented in simple and extended forms. In the simple comparison only two objects or phenomenon are compared under one common ground. In the extended comparison two or more objects are compared for many common features. The analysis of our data shows that the most frequent type of comparison in Kazakh are simple comparisons, they constitute about 80%. The model of simple comparison can be represented in Kazakh and other Turkic Languages (Altay Turkic, Sakha Turkic, Khakass etc.) by the model N-\textit{dAy}. Whereas, the model of a complex comparison is represented by the form V-G\textit{An}-d\textit{Ay}.

In our study we will pay special attention to the peculiarity of the N-\textit{dAy} form in Kazakh and Turkic languages of Siberia (Altay Turkic, Sakha Turkic, Khakass).

Kazakh is one of the Turkic languages of Kipchak subgroup (Baskakov, 2006) or Northwestern branch, Kipchak Turkic according to Lars Johanson’s classification (Johanson, 1998).

The Altay Turkic language belongs to Kirgiz-Kipchak group. The Khakass language belongs to the Kahass subgroup in the Uighur group. The Yakut language is one of the Turkic languages of the Yakut subgroup in the Uighur group (Baskakov, 2006).

4. The Ways of Expressing Comparative Relations by Means of the Model N-\textit{dAy} in the Kazakh Language

In Turkic languages, the most productive way of expressing comparative relations is the affix - \textit{dAy} that can be represented in the form N- \textit{dAy}.

Comparison constitutes a proposition of comparison that can be encoded in various types of comparative syntactic constructions (CC). Following Maya Cheremisina (1976), we understand CC as constructions involving a module of comparison, i.e. a predicative scale, which is usually encoded as a gradable predicate, and two objects:

1) the object of comparison (the comparee NP), and
2) the standard of comparison, i.e. the object that serves as the “yard-stick” for comparison

Comparison is expressed by various syntactic constructions consisting of several components expressing a comparee, a standard, and a parameter.

Each component, which is mentioned above, means the following:

\textit{e.g.} \textit{She is sly as a fox}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1) Comparee, i.e. the entity which is compared – ‘she’;
  \item 2) Standard, i.e. the entity serving for comparison – ‘fox’;
  \item 3) Standard Marker, i.e.the indicator of a standard –‘as’;
  \item 4) Parameter, the common ground on which items are compared – ‘sly’
\end{itemize}
In our research we use the following abbreviations:

CMP–Comparee  
STAN-Standard  
STM-Standard marker  
PARA-Parameter  
PAM-Parameter marker

e.g. ‘Ayzhan is as beautiful as Zhanar.’

In our research we use the following abbreviations:

CMP–Comparee  
STAN-Standard  
STM-Standard marker  
PARA-Parameter  
PAM-Parameter marker

e.g. ‘Ayzhan is as beautiful as Zhanar.’

4.1 Canonical and non-canonical CC

Comparison is expressed by Canonical and non-canonical CC.

4.1.1 Canonical comparative constructions

The comparative relations are usually expressed in canonical comparative constructions i.e. in a standardized way, by grammatical means.

‘His car is as expensive as (his) house.’

The STM-Standard marker is expressed in a canonical way: by a special comparative morphological marker, or a comparative postposition. Here it is expressed morphologically by the affix - dAy

The CMP is normally the subject of a canonical CC.  
The PARA is its predicate.

4.1.2 Non-canonical CC

In non-canonical constructions, the comparative relations in Kazakh are expressed lexically with words as ‘ten’ – equal, by means of verbs as ‘uqsa=w’- with a lexical semantics in English as ‘be alike’, ‘resemble’, ‘look like’.

e.g. ‘The price of the car is equal to the price of the house’ ≈ ‘The car is as expensive as the house.’
‘His eyes resemble your eyes.’

Onin köz-i senin köz-in-e uqsa-idï
car-GEN eye-POSS3 your eye-POSS2SG-DAT resemble-PRS3

‘He resembles (looks like) his father.’

Ol äkesi-ne uqsai-dï
he father-DAT resemble-PRS3

4.2 Proposition of comparison in simple and complex sentences

Comparison constitutes a proposition of comparison that can be encoded in various types of comparative syntactic constructions (CC). Proposition of comparison can be expressed by simple sentences built according to various patterns:

‘Her eyes shone like stars.’

Közderi žuldzïz-day žarqïra-dï
eye-PL-POSS3 star-CMPR shine-PST3

‘She’s beautiful like the moon.’

Ol ay-day sulw
she moon-CMPR beautiful

‘The hard months stretched like the year.’

Awiʔr ay-lar žïl-day sozïl-dï
hard month-PL year-CMPR stretch-PST3

‘He roared like a lion’

Ol arïstan-ša aqïr-dï
he lion-CMPR roar-PST3

A proposition of comparison can be expressed in complex sentences where the patterns of simple comparative clauses undergo reductions and transformations:

‘We heard that he was roaring like a lion.’ = ‘We heard he roared like a lion.’

Biz We ONIN ARYSTAN-ŠA AQRYRANIN estidik
he-GEN lion-CMPR roar-ACC hear-PST1

‘The mirage rose glowing in the sun white villages and some houses look like an egg.’

Žariq künde ʃəŋgiʃɨp köringen aq awldardï sa im köter
house-PL egg-CMPR be-CVB look-PRS3
‘Having met in a dark cemetery we clashed like two angry bears.’

Qaranyi beyittiğ işinde ekewmiz şappa-şap kelip qapsira quşqertasip, talasqan eki

5. Semantic Types of Constructions of Comparison

A logical operation of comparison results either in similarity (equality), or difference of two entities. There are only two basic results that can be expressed in a construction of comparison:

(a) identity or similarity,
(b) difference.

If the result shows that the two entities in question do not differ with respect to the quality or property, we are dealing with a comparison of equality:

John is as tall as Mary.

On the other hand, if two entities do indeed differ, then the result will be termed as a comparison of inequality:

John is taller than Mary. (Andersen, 1983)

Relations of identity are expressed in the following types of constructions of comparison:

- equative
- simulative

Martin Haspelmath and Oda Buchholz (1983) consider simulative constructions together with equative as they have close semantic and formal similarities with equatives. Equatives express equal extent, and simulatives express an equal manner.

5.1 Comparison of equality in Turkic Languages.

The term equative is applied to comparative-like constructions in which the degrees compared are identical rather than distinct. The parameter here is expressed by a nominal.

Equative constructions in Kazakh:

‘Ayžan (is) as beautiful as Zhanar.’ ≈
‘Ayžan is beautiful to the same extent as Zhanar.’ (the equal extent of the quality “beautiful” is expressed)
The standard marker is expressed by the affix - day.

Ayžan NP
CMP

‘Ie Ugar loved that foal white as milk.’
The standard marker is expressed by the affix - tiyy.

Altay Turkic (Tybykova 1989):

le Wgar ta neniy de wcwn ol syć-tiyy ak kwln-dî syćyğen.
‘le Ugar loved that foal white as milk.’
The standard marker is expressed by the affix - tiyy.

Khakass (Kyrzhinakova 2010):

Xarayi xoy xaray-in-dag.
‘Her eyes are as sheep’s eyes.’
Tiz-i xozan tiz-in-deg.

‘Her teeth are as a hare’s teeth.’

Petya Kolya osxas tabirax.

‘Peter is as quick as Kolya.’

Sirayï izig kös osxas hizil.

‘Face is as red as hot coals.’

Tiyrek-če sîn-nîy.

‘The height is like a poplar.’

Tiykpe-če ayil-i çox.

‘Stupid as a stand.’

 Sakha Turkic (Vasileyv 1986):

Marba siyre’ye’ bwspwt alaadî kwrdwkw tögürük.
‘Marbach’s face (is) round like a fried pancake.’

Asfalt taas wwlwssa ostwol nwwrw kwrdwkw kiyle’rke’y.
‘A paved street is like the smooth surface of a table.’
5.2 Comparison of similarity in Turkic Languages.

A Similative construction is a construction expressing sameness or similarity of manner or being. The parameter here is expressed by a verb.

Similative constructions in Kazakh:

Ol arîstan-day soyïs-tï.

‘He fought like a lion.’ = ‘He fought in the same way as a lion.’ (equal manner is expressed)

Altay Turkic (Tybykova 1989):

filamaštïn iïregiy, kenerte ÿrkiydîyp iyügen kwçkaş çïlap, sert è'dîyp kalgan.

‘Dylamash’s heart shuddered like a suddenly frightened bird.’

Khakass (Kyrzhinakova 2010):

Siyn miyni aŋ-ïçax-tï çïliy in-de twd-arya xin-çä-zïn.

‘You want to keep me in a hole as a little animal.’

5.3 Standard markers in equative and simulative constructions.

In Kazakh, Altay Turkic and Khakass equative and simulative constructions are formed by the same means, and are closely related to each other. In such languages (where they are expressed in a very similar way) we may distinguish equative constructions from simulative by analyzing their structural features and determining whether the construction expresses sameness of extent or sameness of manner.
Compare:
Kazakh

‘Ayzhan (is) as beautiful as Zhanar.’ – equative construction

\[
\text{Ayzan} \quad \text{Žanar-day} \quad \text{sulw} \\
\text{CMP} \quad \text{NP-CMPR} \quad \text{beautiful} \\
\]

‘He is shining like a star.’ – similative construction

\[
\text{Ol} \quad \text{žuldïz-day} \quad \text{žarkïra-y-dï.} \\
\text{he} \quad \text{star-CMPR} \quad \text{shine-PRS3} \\
\]

The standard marker in both constructions in Kazakh is the affix – day/-dey.

Altay Turkic (Tybykova 1989):

\[
\text{Ie Wgar ta neniyn de wçöm ol sýît-tiyy ak kwïm-dï sýygen} \\
\text{‘Ie Ugar loved that foal white as milk.’ (equative)} \\
\]

Karakwy kiyrïyp le kelerde, tïndanïp, kiyske-diyy lïmjan altaganïs, örko kïrgïn iyyt-tiyy, çeber ön ol og öniys.
‘As soon as it got dark, treading softly, like a cat, carefully making his way as a dog when she saw a gopher, we listened.’ (similative)

The standard marker in both constructions in Altay Turkic is the affix – tiyy/ diyy.

The marker of standard is one of the obligatory components as it expresses a comparison. The marker of standard in equative and similative constructions can be formed in synthetic and analytical ways.

5.3.1 The standard marker in Kazak equative constructions.

A synthetic marker of standard in Kazakh equative constructions is formed with the help of a comparative affix –day/-dey. As in:

‘Ayzhan (is) as beautiful as Zhanar.’

\[
\text{Ayzan} \quad \text{Žanar-day} \quad \text{sulw} \\
\text{CMP} \quad \text{NP-CMPR} \quad \text{beautiful} \\
\]

‘He (is) as strong as you.’

\[
\text{Ol} \quad \text{sen-dey} \quad \text{küšti} \\
\text{he} \quad \text{you-CMPR} \quad \text{strong} \\
\]

An analytical marker of standard in Kazakh is formed with the help of a postpositions siyaqtï / sekildi. See:

‘Ayzhan (is) as beautiful as Zhanar.’

\[
\text{Ayzan} \quad \text{Žanar} \quad \text{siyaqtï/sekildi} \quad \text{sulw} \\
\text{CMP} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{PSTP} \quad \text{beautiful} \\
\]

‘He (is) as strong as you.’

\[
\text{Ol} \quad \text{sen} \quad \text{siyaqtï/sekildi} \quad \text{küšti} \\
\text{he} \quad \text{you} \quad \text{PSTP} \quad \text{strong} \\
\]
Both synthetic and analytical markers follow a standard of comparison.

5.3.2 The standard marker in Kazak similative constructions.

The marker of standard in Kazak similative constructions like equative constructions is formed in synthetic and analytical ways.

The affix -day/-dey is frequently used as a synthetic marker for standard in similative constructions. See:

‘He shines like a star.’

\[
\text{Ol žuldïz-day žarqïra-y-dï} \\
\text{CMP} \quad \text{STAN-STM} \\
\text{PARA}
\]

‘His hands became frozen like ice because of the frost.’

\[
\text{Qol-dar-ï ayaz-dan muz-day qatïp qalabis} \\
\text{CMP} \quad \text{STAN-STM} \quad \text{PARA} \quad \text{PARA}
\]

One more affix serving as a synthetic marker of standard in similative constructions is the affix – ša/-še. Look at the examples:

‘He roared like a lion’

\[
\text{Ol arïstan-ša aqïrdï} \\
\text{CMP} \quad \text{STAN-STM} \\
\text{PARA}
\]

‘He began to understand many things as (like) an adult.’

\[
\text{Ol köp närse-ni uliken-der-še payïmda-y basta-dï.} \\
\text{CMP} \quad \text{STAN-STM} \quad \text{PARA}
\]

Similative constructions are formed in an analytical way with the help of postpositions sïyaqtï / sekildi:

‘He went jumping like a little boy.’

\[
\text{Ol kiškentay bala sïyaqtï/sekildi sekir-ip ket-t-i.} \\
\text{CMP} \quad \text{STAN} \quad \text{STM} \quad \text{PARA}
\]

5.3.3 The standard markers in Altay Turkic, Khakass, and Sakha Turkic equative and similative constructions.

The equative constructions in Altay Turkic can be expressed by the affix – tiyy/diyy (synthetically). In Khakass such constructions can also be formed synthetically with the help of the affixes –dag/-deg; –ça/-če or analytically by the postposition ‘osxas’ – ‘as,like’. In Sakha Turkic comparison of equality is represented by the ‘kwrðwk’ – ‘as,like’.

The similative constructions in Altay Turkic can be expressed synthetically by affix – tiyy/diyy or analytically by the postposition ‘çïlap’ – ‘as,like’. In Khakass similative constructions can be formed also synthetically with the help of the affix –ça/-če or analytically by the postposition ‘chïlï’ – ‘as,like’.

The result of our analysis is outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Equative Constructions</th>
<th>Similative Constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthetic STM</td>
<td>Analytical STM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>–day/-dey</td>
<td>sïyaqtï/sekildi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altay Turkic</td>
<td>tiyy/diyy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khakass</td>
<td>–dag/-deg; –ça/-če</td>
<td>osxas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakha Turkic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Conclusion

In this study we have examined the comparison of equality in Kazakh and the Turkic languages of Siberia. The comparison of equality is expressed in equative and simulative constructions. Equatives and similatives in Kazakh language are expressed in the same way, i.e. they have the same standard markers. The standard marker can be synthetic or analytic. The synthetic standard markers in Kazakh comparisons of equality are expressed with the help of affixes day/dey, tay/tey, ša/še. The affix of comparison –day/dey is used in both constructions, whereas the affix –ša/še is used only in simulative ones. The affix -day/dey can be attached to any noun, the affix –ša/še only to animate nouns. The analytic standard marker in Kazakh comparisons of equality is expressed with the help of postpositions ‘siyaqtï’, ‘sekildi’. The postpositions ‘siyaqtï’, ‘sekildi’ form the standard NP in both constructions.

Kazakh and Turkic languages of Siberia have common features when expressing the comparison of equality. In Kazakh, Altay Turkic and Khakass variations of the same affixes are used. The standard marker in these languages can be formed in synthetic and analytic ways.

Equative and simulative constructions are very similar and closely related. Only the parameter helps us to distinguish them, as the parameters in these constructions are different. The parameter in the equative construction is expressed by an adjective. In equative constructions, the adjective does not bear any special marker of equality of the compared entities. However, the parameter may have an adverb expressing the grade of quality which is shared by both the comparee and the standard. The parameter in the simulative constructions may be expressed by any finite or non-finite verb form. Equatives express equal extent of a parameter, and similatives express equal manner of a parameter. Therefore the presence of a parameter is obligatory as it differentiates equatives from similatives.

The analysis shows that all constructions of equality possess common features. They constitute the same components such as a comparee, a standard, a standard marker and a parameter.

Abbreviations

1- first person
2- second person
3- third person
ABL - ablative
ACC - accusative
AUX - auxiliary
CMPR - comparison
CVB - converb
DAT - dative
GEN - genitive
NEG - negative
NOM - nominative
NP - nominal phrase
PL - plural
POSS - possessive
PRS - present
PP - past participle
PST - past
SG - singular
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