

CONCEPT ANALYSIS OF YAKUT FIGURATIVE VERBS WITH MONGOLIAN PARALLELS

Anastasia Egorovna Shamayeva
Candidate of Philology
senior lecturer

Department of the Yakut language of the Institute of Languages and Culture
Peoples of the North-East of the Russian Federation, NEFU. M.K. Ammosova
Yakutsk, Russia

Svetlana Mitrofanovna Prokopeva
Doctor of Philology
Professor

Institute of Languages and Culture
Peoples of the North-East of the Russian Federation, NEFU im. M.K. Ammosova
Yakutsk, Russia

ABSTRACT

Semantic characteristics of Yakut figurative verbs with Mongolian parallels are studied. Research background on Yakut-Mongol linguistic contacts is given in the introduction. The Yakut-Mongolian relations are diachronically divided into earliest Yakut-Mongolian and later Yakut-Middle-Mongolian contacts. Phonetically, most Mongolian parallels in Yakut retain features of the medieval Mongolian language. This body of Yakut vocabulary is generally believed to be Mongolian loanwords. The subject of the present investigation are the following subject groups: figurative verbs characterizing the shape of one's face; figurative verbs characterizing shape, figure, and height of a person; figurative verbs characterizing appearance, form, and structure of an object. Each subject group is, in its turn, divided into two subgroups depending on the presence of non-labialized or labialized vowels. Such division allowed us to specify that the three nominations of Yakut figurative verbs with non-labialized and labialized vowels clearly tend to structure meanings in terms of space, horizontal and vertical development of shades of meaning respectively. The figurative verbs with the non-labialized vowels characterizing the shape of one's face describe the wide face. Whereas the verbs with the labialized wide vowels are used to describe an oval, elongated face. The figurative verbs with non-labialized vowels characterizing one's shape, figure, and height signify a stout, rounded, short person. The verbs with labialized vowels characterize a tall person. The figurative verbs characterizing the form and structure of an object in their non-labialized variants signify a widened, flattened, spread appearance. The verbs with labialized vowels denote an elevated, bulged appearance and form.

Keywords: *concept; Yakut, Mongolian parallel;, labialized vowels; non-labialized vowels.*

Introduction. The Yakut language belongs to the Uyghur group of Turkic languages. Within the system of Turkic languages Yakut is isolated due to its archaic nature and specific features of vocabulary and grammar. Yakut vocabulary involves various elements: Turkic, Kipchak-Turkic, Mongolianic (A.I. Gogolev, St. Kaluzhinskiy, E.I. Ubryatova, N.N. Shirobokova, etc.); Samoyedic (S.I. Nikolaev Somoghotto, S.A. Ivanov); Yenisei (A.P. Dulzon); Even-Evenki (G.V. Ksenofontov, M.S. Voronkin, P.A. Sleptsov, G.V. Popov, etc.); Yukagir (G.N. Kurilov, N.N. Shirobokova); obvious Russian loanwords (P.A. Sleptsov). Yakut differs significantly from other related Turkic languages in the presence of a great deal of Mongolian parallels that were first recognized by professor G.F. Miller. Since then they were studied incidentally and recently have been a separate subject of research.

In early 18th century the famous historian on Siberia G.F. Miller wrote in his work "Description of the Siberian Kingdom ... Book One" (History of Siberia): "The Yakut say that their ancestors has been living with the Mongol and the Buryat from times immemorial whom they now only know from names". G.F. Miller states that Yakut includes many Mongolian and Buryat-like words (Miller: 180). Herewith, G.F. Miller following F. Strahlenberg regarded Yakut as separated from Buryat, treating Mongolian parallels as loanwords. By doing so, he made a breakthrough in the language history.

Wilhelm Schott, the author of the first research paper on Yakut stated that “The Yakut were isolated from their Turkic fellow peoples from time immemorial, on the other had they must have had very close interaction with the Mongolian”. He also demonstrated both abundance of Mongolian loanwords and the fact that many of them “often remained unchanged” (Schott 1843, p. 334). Therewith, W. Schott, being a staunch Altaic researcher, warns against classifying all words and roots with Mongolian equivalents as loanwords since the Mongol borrowed a lot of Turkic words and “many other words may even have been of the common origin in ancient time, that being very likely” (Schott: 334).

O.N. Boetlingk’s “On the Language of the Yakut” was an outstanding work in comparative historical studies of Turkic languages in Russia as well as worldwide. O.N. Boetlingk repeatedly mentioned that the Yakut “borrowed a countless number of words” from Mongolian. He illustrates comparison of Yakut words with Mongolian throughout his work. A Buryat scholar Dorzhi Banzarov helped him find Mongolizms, especially Buryatizms. O.N. Boetlingk in “On the Language of the Yakut” suggested that Yakut is an ancient Turkic language that later borrowed a great number of Mongolian words and some grammatical forms (Boetlingk 1989, p. 52).

In 1908 V.V. Radloff published “The Yakut Language in its Relation to Turkic Languages” in German devoted to the issue of the origin of Yakut. He compared Yakut with Mongolian languages (old written Mongolian and Oyrot) in detail, giving a number of parallels illustrating relations of Yakut to Turkic and Mongolic languages. He stated that 452 (25,9%) out of 1,748 indissoluble Yakut stems are of Mongolian origin (Rassadin 1980, p. 14). Besides, V.V. Radloff revealed Mongolic word formation affixes in Yakut. Finally, he entitled Yakut as a language of unknown origin which was first Mongolized and later Turkified. This statement was invalidated by further research.

N.N. Poppe pointed out regarding Radloff’s stand: “One can hardly agree with this V.V. Radloff’s opinion. The point is that, contrary to the Radloff’s opinion, characteristic features of the Yakut languages are of utterly archaic nature ... with Yakut being an extremely important dialect for the Turkish linguistics” (Poppe, 1926, p. 6).

Regarding V.V. Radloff’s assertion of Yakut being originally not a Turkic language, E.I. Ubryatova notes that “non-Turkic elements do not make a system” being just scattered in lexis, morphology, and syntax. Whereas transitions of certain parts in Yakut phonetics found by V.V. Radloff, E.I. Ubryatova considers as “influence of languages of neighboring ethnicities”, adding that “those influences, though powerful and deep, affected only its separate elements”. In her opinion, these “transitions in Yakut phonetics are only observed in one area of consonant system – fricative consonants. Therefore the phonetic system was and remains Turkic” (Ubryatova 1960: 76).

Regarding V.V. Radloff’s stand, the Polish linguist St. Kaluzhinski writes: “ ... V.V. Radloff was prevented from making right conclusions by the original erroneous standpoint that Yakut originally not being of Turkic family was subjected to Turkization quite late. Therewith, it had been filled with Mongolian elements to the degree that it was actually a Mongolic language. In fact, the opposite is true as the phonetic form of most Mongolic features in Yakut suggest their quite recent borrowing. Turkic stems in Yakut except a certain amount of later borrowing from other still unknown Turkic languages possess a number of archaic features on the one hand and, on the other hand, result from independent development of Yakut as originally Turkic” (Kaluzhinskiy 1961, 5-6).

“The Dictionary of the Yakut Language” by E.K. Pekarskiy contains the then sufficient comparative material from Mongolic languages. Contributions were made by V.V. Radloff, V.V. Bartold, B.Y. Vladimirtsev, V.L. Kotvich, N.F. Katanov, N.N. Poppe. The Dictionary has about 900 Yakut stems provided by Mongolian, Buryat, and Kalmyk comparative material (Okoneshnikov 1982, p. 76).

In 1928 Bishop Guriy published the paper titled “The Yakut Language in its Relation to the Turkic and Mongolic Languages” in the “Collected Papers of the Society “Sakha Keskile”, suggesting that Yakut once was not quite Turkic-affected and borrowed Turkic stems in a form impossible to be perceived by a Turkic speaking people. Also, having studied amorphous, stable morphological units, he leaves room for close contacts between both languages in ancient times (Stepanov 1928, p. 58-59).

Later on, almost all researchers touched upon Mongolian loanwords in one form or another (E.I. Ubryatova, L.N. Kharitonov, St. kaluzhinskiy, N.K. Antonov, N.D. Dyachkovskiy, G.V. Popov, P.A. Sleptsov, V.I. Rassadin, N.N. Shirobokova, etc.).

E.I. Ubryatova first recognized in “Studies on the Yakut Syntax” that Mongolian parallels came to Yakut from the Old Mongolian around 13-14th century. She writes: “... it is remarkable that many Yakut words of Mongolian origin turn out to be closer to written Mongolian than to Buryat. Obviously, Yakut words closer to Mongolian than to Buryat are also abundant, however, they are

found more rarely that those coinciding with written Mongolian. It indicates that ancestors of the modern Yakut had relations not only with Buryat but also with a Mongolian group speaking a language close to written Mongolian” (Ubryatova 1950, p. 242-243). Also, the author paid attention to borrowing of verbs from various languages, finding that “Mongolian verbal stems came into Yakut as verbal stems too”, whereas there are no verbs among Evenk loanwords, with Russian verbs being perceived as nouns in Yakut. This indicates that Yakut ancestors spoke Mongolian. It could only occur with very close economic and cultural contacts of the two ethnicities of the same level of historical development (Ubryatova 1950: 242-245).

N.V. Emelyanov in the paper “Origin of Yakut Proverbs and Sayings” draws comparison with Buryat sayings (Emelyanov 1958, p. 109-113). P.P. Barashkov also compared certain Buryat and Yakut words (Barashkov 1958, p. 176-206). However, V.I. Rassadin noted that “in fact, most of these comparisons are medieval Mongolian loanwords in Yakut that are obviously not Buryat according to their characteristics but still being assigned to Buryat” (Rassadin 1973, p. 14).

The most significant works that raised the major issues of Yakut-Mongolian parallels are those by St. Kaluzhinskiy and V.V. Rassadin. In «Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache» (1961) St. Kaluzhinskiy collected and described over 2,500 words. Mainly, he studied two aspects – phonetical characteristics of loanwords and borrowed morphological formants. Yakut words are illustrated by numerous parallels from Mongolic and, if necessary, Turkic languages. Finally, the author drew the conclusion that the analyzed words might have been borrowed by the Yakut from the Mongolian not before 12th - 13th centuries and not after the 15th or even 16th centuries. He also makes very important assumptions on the source of Mongolic loanwords in Yakut. He points at the presence of a number of words with only Buryat parallels and the possibility of partial transfer into Buryat from Yakut (Kaluzhinskiy 1961: 20). St. Kaluzhinskiy states that “... while it is extremely difficult to define from what particular Mongolic language of dialect most Mongolic words were borrowed by Yakut, it is much easier to establish the relative chronology of this process. On the other hand, it also evidences that, as some Mongolic researchers believe, Mongolian didn't show significant dialect differences in late 12th and 13th century. Historic records only mention some distinction of the language of Oyrot at that time. The rest of the dialects probably emerged later. At present, a number of Yakut-Buryat equivalents are observed although most Mongolic loanwords in Yakut are neutral to the modern Mongolic languages” (Kaluzhinskiy, 1961, p. 21).

Lexical-semantic characteristic of Mongolian loanwords is provided by N.K. Antonov and V.I. Rassadin. N.K. Antonov considers the major borrowed terms on livestock farming, landscape names, terms of dwelling types. Also, he was the first to subject Yakut noun stems to a comparative-historical study, including Mongolian parallels. His research results in new conclusions: Mongolian tribes inhabited and developed Yakutia before Turkic ones: “Turkic speaking ancestors of the Yakut, having moved from the upper Lena to its middle course, might have found here areas already inhabited by few Mongolian-speaking tribes who had arrived at the Lena and its eastern tributaries from the upper Amur, the aboriginal area of the Mongolian as many researchers currently believe” (Antonov 1971, p. 53-54).

V.I. Rassadin wrote a number of problem works on Turkic-Mongolic and Yakut-Mongolic language contacts. Studying Buryat loanwords in Yakut, he revealed that “most Mongolian loanwords in Yakut keep characteristics of Medieval Mongolian... Yet, these words are present in all Mongolic languages and are common Mongolic. They cannot be attributed to a particular Mongolic language or languages. It remains only a broad definition that they are certain to have come into Yakut in the Middle Ages” (Rassadin, 1973, p. 170). Later, V.I. Rassadin made a clearer assumption. He showed “mysterious” presence of the consonant *s* at the beginning of a word in Yakut where medieval Mongolian affricates *j* and *č* used to be: *сэмэ* ‘censure, blame; guilt, culpability, misconduct, punishment’ > compare old Old Mongol script *jeme*, Khalkha *зэм*, Buryat *зэмэ* ‘misconduct, guilt’, etc. (Rassadin 1980, p. 78). These results agree with St. Kaluzhinskiy’s assumptions. They both suggest that Mongolian loanwords with *s* in the position of the Mongolian affricates *j* and *č* are mostly later borrowings. Therewith, V.I. Rassadin notes in relation to the initial *s* in the position of Middle-Mongolian *č* and *ǰ* in some Mongolian loanwords: “a part of them came to Yakut long time ago and along with proper Turkic words changes the initial *č* for *s* at certain period of development of the Yakut phonetic system” (Rassadin 1980, p. 83).

Based on phonetic data of Yakut and other Siberian Turkic languages, V.I. Rassadin suggests the following path of development of the Yakut language:

The first stage. Turkic ancestors of the Yakut are tribes linguistically close to Turkic peoples of the Sayan-Altai. During this period they borrow a number of words from neighboring Mongolian languages and substitute medieval Mongolian č and ĵ with the affricate č.

The second stage. Turkic ancestors of the Yakut move to the Baikal area and assimilate with the local Tungusic population. Under their influence the Yakut phonetic system experiences a shift: affricates are lost, hushing sounds are substituted by resonant sibilants resulting in the sound s in place of č and š, the sound s transforms into h at the beginning of a word and between vowels, the initial h therewith falls out. During this period both earlier Mongolian loanwords with the initial č and words of Turkic origin are formed with the initial s. At the same time contacts with Mongolian speaking proto-Buryat tribes spreading over the Baikal area started. Those tribes were also affected by the same factors, losing affricates and replacing s by h. The third stage. The Turkic speaking Yakut were apparently driven to the area between the Lena and the Aldan by neighboring tribes, where they came into contact with some Mongolian speaking tribes living there. They co-existed in bilingual conditions resulting in the dominance of Turkic Yakut that, on the other hand, adopted a great number of Mongolian elements. The Turkic proper Yakut language formed the dialect retaining the unstressed o, whereas Yakut assimilated Mongolian formed the dialect failing to differentiate unstressed back vowel sounds (Rassadin 1980, p. 90).

N.N. Shirobokova argues that “the earliest Mongolian loanwords are those that changed č and ĵ>s subject to the regularity valid in ancient Yakut”. However, she states the fact that Mongolian loanwords do not show dropping of the initial s, concluding that the earliest Mongolian loanwords came into Yakut when s->h->0-, and the process ĵ>s, č>s was still under way (Shirobokova 2001, p. 93).

Thereby, Yakut-Mongolian relations are diachronically divided into earliest Yakut-Mongolian and later Yakut-Middle-Mongolian contacts (not before 12th-13th centuries and not later than 15th or even 16th century). Phonetically, most Mongolian parallels in Yakut retain features of the medieval Mongolian language. This body of Yakut vocabulary is generally believed to be Mongolian loanwords. The issue of the origin of borrowing is still open as most Mongolian loanwords in Yakut are neutral towards modern Mongolian languages. Their parallels are found and shared by all Mongolian languages. However, some scholars note a number of Yakut-Buryat parallels (St. Kaluzhinskiy, V.I. Rassadin, N.N. Shirobokova).

In “Mongolian-Buryat Loanwords in Siberian Turkic Languages” V.I. Rassadin writes that Yakut shows a large group of semantically specific figurative verbs (Rassadin 1980). Recognizing that such verbs are characteristic for Mongolian languages, he makes clear that among Turkic languages they are only found in Yakut, Tuva, Tofalar, and Kyrgyz, less in Altai, Khakass, Kazakh, Karakalpak, few in Uzbek, Tatar, and Bashkir, i.e. their number is greater in languages affected by Mongolian (ibid). Referring to the stems of figurative verbs in these languages phonetically and semantically almost fully matching those in Mongolic languages, he concludes that these figurative verbs may be classified as of Mongolic origin (ibid). Also, E.I. Ubryatova, indicating a great deal of Mongolian loanwords in Yakut, points at their quantitative prevalence in Yakut only among figurative and onomatopoeic words. In most domains of Yakut vocabulary their number is characterized as “isolated instances” (Ubryatova 1960: 261). Further, E.I. Ubryatova suggests that such great body of Mongolic figurative and onomatopoeic words in Yakut gives evidence of long-term bilingualism of both Turkic ancestors of the Yakut and a Mongolic speaking tribe which borrowed this characteristic of their language to the Yakut. She also says that this fact confirms that the Turkic languages of Yakut ancestors had a well-developed imaginative thinking that motivated those borrowings (Ubryatova 1960: 261).

Hence, among Mongolian loanwords in Yakut figurative verbs occupy a special place due to their quantitative dominance over Mongolian parallels in other sectors of Yakut vocabulary. Further study of Yakut-Mongolian contacts is necessary to clarify historical development of the Yakut language.

The present study is made within phonosemantics, a developing branch of linguistics at the interface between phonetics, semantics, and lexicology.

The purpose of the study is to reveal specifics of the semantics of Mongolian loanwords in Yakut with non-labialized vowels a, ə on the one hand, and labialized vowels o, ø, on the other.

The study is the first to show semantic characteristics of Yakut figurative verbs borrowed from Mongolian from the phonosemantic perspective.

The figurative verbs with these vowels demonstrate a clear tendency toward structuring the shades of meaning “wide” and “elongated”. It is the first study to reveal common and specific

characteristics of semantics of Yakut figurative verbs and their Mongolian parallels from phonosemantic perspective. The study is based on the general principles of cognition: analysis, synthesis, induction, analogy, comparison, the principle of systematic and comparative analysis.

S.V. Voronin defines sound figurativeness as a property of a word to possess a necessary, essential, repetitive, and relatively stable involuntary association between the its phonemes and the characteristic of the object-denotation (motif) being the basis of nomination (Voronin 1982, p. 5). Figurative system of sound includes onomatopoeia and sound symbolism. Onomatopoeia is a regular unintentional phonetically motivated association between the phonemes of a word and the sound (acoustic) characteristic of the denotation (motif) underlying nomination. Sound symbolism (phonetic symbolism) is a regular unintentional phonetically motivated association between the phonemes of a word and the non-sonic characteristic of the denotation (motif) underlying nomination. Sound symbols (figurative words, ideophones) are figurative words mostly denoting various types of movement, light phenomena, form, size, remoteness of objects, properties of their surface, walk, mimics, physiological and emotional condition of human and animals (Voronin 1982, p. 7).

Common and specific features of semantics of figurative verbs in Yakut-Mongolian parallels are illustrated here by examples from the “Great Dictionary of the Yakut Language” (2004-2016) and the “Great Academic Mongolian – Russian Dictionary” (in 4 volumes) (2001-2004). Additionally, we analyzed the material of the informant, a speaker of the modern Mongolian language Shagdarzhav Narantuya, the author of a phraseological dictionary of the Mongolian language, the 6 volume collection of tales and myths of Mongolian, works on teaching of the Mongolian language.

L.N. Kharitonov undertook a detailed study of Yakut figurative words in “Types of Verbal Stems in Yakut” devoted to the nature of root and affix elements of figurative verbs, describing their structure and semantics. Three root types are distinguished: onomatopoeic roots, the ones related to categorematic words, and sound-mimic roots. The former two are thought to transfer to figurative words as a result of “substitution of one member by other according to their relation” (Kharitonov 1954, p. 203). The meaning of sound-mimic roots is said to “be associated with facial mimics determined by pronunciation of various sounds and sound groups” (Kharitonov 1954, p. 220). Thereby, Professor L.N. Kharitonov laid the groundwork for studying figurative words in terms of sound symbolism (Kharitonov 1954, p. 223).

L.D. Shagdarov showed that in Buryat figurative words “the vowel a is usually found in words associated with loud sounds of large objects, o – clear sounds of small objects, y – voiceless sounds, and я – strong and high tone sounds” (Shagdarov 1962, p. 53, 55). As to variability of vowels in roots, he notes that “the words, in which only initial consonants or middle vowels alter, are more semantically related than words with the same consonants but different vowels in the initial syllable. The former are used to denote properties of the same objects, the latter can characterize different objects, forming their own series” (Shagdarov 1962, p. 112). So, symbolization of the denotation’s size depends on the openness of the oral cavity and the position of the tongue.

A similar phenomenon is found in Yakut figurative verbs. Here, the indicator of the denotation’s movement in breadth or height depends on the lips’ role in formation of vowels. It is worth mentioning that by the vowel harmony all non-labialized vowels and diphthongs in Yakut can be followed by the corresponding non-labialized vowels only. Labialized wide vowels o, ø can be followed by labialized both wide and narrow vowels and diphthongs.

The subject of the present investigation are the following subject groups: 1) figurative verbs characterizing the shape of one’s face; 2) figurative verbs characterizing shape, figure, and height of a person; 3) figurative verbs characterizing appearance, form, and structure of an object. Each subject group is, in its turn, divided into two subgroups depending on the presence of non-labialized or labialized vowels. Such division allowed us to specify that figurative verbs with non-labialized vowels a, э denote movement in breadth, whereas figurative verbs with labialized vowels o, ø denote movement in height and length. Each lexeme was provided by a parallel from modern Mongolian.

1) Yakut figurative verbs characterizing the shape of one’s face

The somatisms forehead, lips, nose, and ears are common. In terms of phonosemantics figurative verbs with non-labialized vowels a, э describe a wide face, e.g.:

Мардьай ‘flabby, wide, flaccid (of face)’, compare Mongolian **марзайх** ‘smile, break into a smile’. Compare Mongolian **марчийх** ‘become pitted, be pitted’; **марчийчихах марчийх-ийн нэгэнтээ** ‘become pitted’; **царай чинь марчийчихаж** ‘your face has all turned pitted’.

Мэлтэй ‘looking rounded, wide (of face, full moon)’, compare Mongolian **мэлтийх** ‘overflow, overfill (with liquid); run over’.

Ньялбай ‘looking too flat, wide (of face)’, compare Mongolian **нялхрах** ‘get weak, tender, fragile’.

Ньяппай ‘have a too flat face with thin eyes and flattened nose’, compare Mongolian **навхайх** ‘sink, get down, decrease’.

Ньэлбэй ‘swollen, puffy due to stress (of face)’. compare Khalkha **нэли** ‘get wide’, Mongolian **дэлбийх** ‘get wide, protuberant (of ears), awkward, loose (of clothes); get wide, loose’.

Ньэлчэй ‘having wide and retreating forehead’, compare Mongolian **няцлах** ‘press, chop’.

Сартай ‘wide, dilated, sticking out on sides (e.g. nostrils)’, dilate one’s nostrils **сартайх** ‘get wide, dilate (of nostrils)’.

Даллай ‘be too big, wide, sticking out (of man’s ears, animals’ ears). compare Mongolian **дэлдийх** ‘stick out, stand out; hang down (of ears)’.

The following verbs with the labialized wide vowels o, ө characterize an oval, elongated face:

Моччой ‘chubby, smooth, oval, small (of face)’, compare Mongolian **молцойх** ‘convex’ (e.g. flower bud, informant).

Олой ‘have an elongated face with dumb, puzzled look’, compare Mongolian **олийх** ‘become squint-eyed’ (informant); **ёлийх** ‘lengthen (of face), e.g. when looking out of window’.

Холой ‘having elongated face’, compare Mongolian **голийх** ‘become stout, fat, put on weight’.

Хохой ‘having hollow cheeks, look pinched’, compare Mongolian **хонхойх** ‘have a hollow; be hollow; get pinched; form a hollow; become hollow, sunken’.

Also, certain linguistics units characterize a high bridge of nose, sticking out lips, and a salient tooth:

Лонсой ‘big, prominent nose with high bridge’, compare Mongolian **лонхойх** ‘paunchy, jug-like’.

Томтой ‘be bulged, high (of nose)’, compare Mongolian **томбойх** ‘get bulged, stuck out, protrude’.

Чорбой ‘be sticking out (of lips)’, compare Mongolian **жомбойх** ‘sticking out, protruding; stick out, protrude (of lips)’; **жорбойх** ‘bulged, stuck out; bulge, stick out (of lips)’.

Орсой ‘have a salient front tooth’, compare Mongolian **орсойх** ‘snaggle, irregular (of teeth)’.

2) Yakut figurative verbs characterizing shape, figure, and height of a person

The verbs with non-labialized vowels are used to describe stout, rounded figure or part of body. Of special interest are the verbs denoting a combined characteristic of a person ‘short’ and ‘stout’. Small height emphasizes the rounded shape of body or part of body:

Лаглай ‘short, stocky, solid, equally wide on all sides (of body type, form of something)’, compare Mongolian **лаглайх** ‘ponderous; with broad basement’.

Лаппай ‘being of small height but quite stout, broad (e.g. of a person)’, compare Mongolian **лавтайх** ‘sprawl, lounge, stretch oneself (of a person)’.

Лэскэй ‘stick out, protrude by a rounded shape (e.g. of a short person’s belly)’, compare Mongolian **тэсгий** ‘grow paunchy, stout; get swollen, blown’.

Балбай ‘get stout, widen (of an overweight person)’. In Mongolian **балхайх** ‘get stout, overweight; grow wide, swell’.

A rounded form of a part of body:

Лэскэй ‘having a bulging belly’, compare Mongolian **тэсгий** ‘grow paunchy, stout; get swollen, blown’.

Матай ‘prominent due to bulging broad chest’, compare Mongolian **матийх** ‘bend, arch’.

Мэтэй ‘stick out, protrude, bulge out (of chest)’, compare Mongolian **мэтийх** ‘bend, curve, arch’.

Ньялбай ‘be or seem swollen (of a person)’, compare Mongolian **нялхрах** ‘become weak, tender, fragile’, **биенялхрах** ‘become weak, tender (after giving birth or balneological treatment)’. Unlike Mongolian, this verb in Yakut developed four directions of semantics: 1) **Ньялбай** ‘spread about, loosing shape (e.g. during thawing)’; 2) of an object – **ньялбай** ‘be, seem flat, flattened, spread (of something big)’; 3) one’s physical condition – **ньялбай** ‘be or seem too flat, wide (of face), swollen (of a person)’; 4) one’s emotional-psychological condition – **ньялбай** ‘become sentimental, be moved, melt (e.g. as a result of excitement, capriciousness)’.

Figurative verbs with labialized vowels characterizing a tall person:

Логлой ‘stand out by a quite massive figure’, compare Mongolian **логлойх** ‘be plumb, chubby’, with native speakers also adding ‘rise as a hill’.

Огдой 'have a short body with raised shoulders, seem like that (of a long-legged person)', compare Mongolian **огдойх** 'be short, tight'.

Ходьбой 'stand out by slenderness, hold oneself upright, become straight, draw oneself up', compare Mongolian **годойх** 'protrude, rise to a vertical position, erect (e.g. of a short tail); stick up'.

Хончой 'stand erect tense, get straight (of a tall person)', **хоруоба хончойбут** 'he died, passed away', compare Mongolian **гонзойх** 'prolonged, oval, elongated, oblong'.

3) Figurative verbs characterizing the shape and structure of an object in their non-labialized variants denote a widened, flattened, swollen appearance of an artifact, e.g.:

Кэнкэй 'wide-opened; as wide as an abyss', compare Mongolian **хэнхийх** 'very wide, large (e.g. of a wide chest); high and extended; tall and stooping'.

Лаглай 'having a low, wide, spreading top (of plants)', compare Mongolian **лаглайх** 'heavy; with wide basement'.

Лаппай 'become blunt, stub (of an end of something), having a blunt point', compare Mongolian **лавтайх** 'sprawl, lounge, stretch oneself'.

Налбай 'become flat, flattened, settle sinking', compare Mongolian **налмайх** 'be wide, flattened'.

Ньалбай 'be, seem flat, flattened, spread (of something big)', compare Mongolian **нялхрах** 'become weak, tender'.

Ньахчай 'be, seem sunk, flattened (of buildings)', compare Mongolian **нагжайх** 'be short-necked, have a short neck'.

Ньэлчэй 'seem flattened and widened downward', compare Mongolian **няцлах** 'push down, chop'.

Figurative verbs with labialized vowels characterizing erected, bulged shape and form of an object:

Логлой 'rise as a hill', also describes appearance of a person 'stand out by a quite massive figure'. The dictionary of the Mongolian language gives just one meaning **логлойх** 'be plumb, chubby'. However, native speakers also indicate the meaning 'rise as a hill' similar to Yakut.

Лоппой 'swell, become swollen; have a bulged appearance, rise as a hill', compare Mongolian **томбойх** 'become bulged, rising above surface; bulge; protrude, appear (of top of a mountain, etc.); stick out, bulge out; break, come out (of pimples)'.

Conclusions

The study of phonosemantic features revealed that the three nominations of Yakut figurative verbs with non-labialized and labialized vowels clearly tend to structure meanings in terms of space, horizontal and vertical development of shades of meaning respectively.

The figurative verbs with the non-labialized vowels а and э characterizing the shape of one's face describe the wide face, e.g.: **мэлтэй** 'be, seem rounded, wide (usually of face). Whereas the verbs with the labialized wide vowels о and ө are used to describe an oval, elongated face, e.g. **холой** 'having an elongated face'.

The figurative verbs with non-labialized vowels characterizing one's shape, figure, and height signify a stout, rounded, short person, e.g. **лаглай** 'short, stocky, solid, equally wide on all sides (of body type)'. The verbs with labialized vowels characterize a tall person, e.g. **логлой** 'stand out by a quite massive figure', implying the figure of a tall person.

The figurative verbs characterizing the form and structure of an object in their non-labialized variants signify a widened, flattened, spread appearance, e.g. **лаппай** 'become blunt, stub (of an end of something), having a blunt point'. The verbs with labialized vowels denote an elevated, bulged appearance and form, e.g. **лоппой** 'swell, become swollen; have a bulged appearance, rise as a hill'.

As to Yakut-Mongolian equivalents, it should be noted that the meaning generally agree. As a rule, Yakut and Mongolian use universal features to describe a person, e.g. Yakut **лэскэй** 'having a bulging belly' and Mongolian **тэсгий** 'become paunchy'. However, both languages demonstrate specific features. Divergent development of semantics is observed in the compared languages, e.g. **лонсой** 'big, prominent nose with high bridge (of one's nose)', compare Mongolian **лонхойх** 'paunchy, jug-like'.

The extra linguistic reasons of shared features among figurative verbs in Yakut and Mongolian are as follows. First, the Yakut and the Mongol have historical contacts. Second, as E.I. Ubryatova noted, the Turkic language of Yakut ancestors demonstrated developed figurativeness that motivated borrowing of Mongolian figurative and onomatopoeic words in such great numbers (Ubryatova 1960, p. 261).

The tendency of Yakut figurative verbs to structure meanings in terms of space, i.e. to develop shades of meanings horizontally or vertically, depending on the presence of labialized or non-labialized vowels is not always present in Mongolian parallels, e.g. Yakut **холлой** 'having an elongated face', Mongolian **голийх** 'become stout, fat, put on weight'.

The next step would be to expand linguistic material for adequate description of the picture of the world and analysis of speakers' background knowledge in terms of cognitive linguistics

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study was conducted for the State Research Project "Comparison of Figurativeness of Yakut with Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Altai, and Mongolian", the reference number 34.3377.2017/ПЧ.

We express our sincere gratitude to the informant for the Mongolian language illustrations Shagdarzhav Narantuya.

References

1. Antonov, N.K. (1974). *Materials on Historical Vocabulary of the Yakut Language*. Yakutsk: Book Publishing.
2. Barashkov, P.P. (1958). *On Mongolian-Buryat and Yakut Language Contacts*, *Collection of Papers on Philology*, 3: 176-206.
3. Boetlingk, O.N. (1989). *On the Language of the Yakut*. Novosibirsk: Science.
4. Emelyanov, N.V. (1958). *Origin of Yakut Sayings and Proverbs*, *Proceedings of the Yakut Branch, Siberian Division, USSR Academy of Sciences*, 1(VIII): 90-117.
5. Kaluzhinskiy, St. (1961). *Some Issues of Mongol Loanwords in the Yakut Language*, *Proceedings of the Institute of Language, Literature, and History, Yakut Branch, Siberian Division, USSR Academy of Sciences*, 3 (8): 5-21.
6. Kharitonov, L.N. (1954). *Types of Verbal Stems in the Yakut Language*. Moscow – Leningrad: UDSSR AS Press.
7. Luvsandendeva, A., Tsendendamba Ts., Pyurbееv G.Ts. (Eds.) (2002). *Great Academic Mongolian-Russian Dictionary*. Moscow : Academy.
8. Okoneshnikov, E.I. (1982). *Perkarskiy as a Lexicographer*. Novosibirsk: Science.
9. Rassadin, V.I. (1980). *Mongol-Buryat Loanwords in Siberian Turkic Languages*. Moscow: Science.
10. Rassadin, V.I. *Buryatims in the Yakut Language*, in O.N. Boetlingk and his Work on the Language of the Yakut, pp. 167-179. Yakutsk: Yakut Branch SD UDSSR AS
11. Schott, W. (1843). *Ueber die Jakutische Sprache*, in *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Kunde von Russland*, pp. 333-342. Berlin: G. Reimer.
12. Shagdarov, L.D. (1962). *Figurative Words in the Modern Buryat Language*. Ulan-Ude: Buryat Book Publishing.
13. Shirobokova, N.N. (2001). *Historical Development of the Yakut Consonant System*. Novosibirsk: Science.
14. Stepanov, G. (1928). *The Yakut Language in its Relation to Turkic and Mongolic Languages*, *Collection of Papers of the Research Society "Saqa keskile"*, 5: 29-60.
15. Ubryatova, E.I. (1950). *Research on Syntax of the Yakut Language*, Vol. 1. Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies USSR AS.
16. Voronin, S.V. (1982). *Fundamentals of Phonosemantics*. Leningrad: Leningrad University Press.