



## Comparative Constructions in English and Hungarian: A Contrastive Analysis

### İngilizce ve Macarca'da Kıyaslama Yapıları: Bir Karşılaştırmalı Analiz

Lect. Süleyman DEMİR

Gumushane University and PhD student at Hacettepe University English Linguistics

#### ÖZET

Bu çalışma İngiliz ve Macar dillerindeki kıyas yapmaya yarayan yapıların karşılaştırmasını yaparak iki dil arasındaki benzerlik ve farklılıkları belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, İngilizce ve Macarca dillerinde yer alan kıyas yapma yapıları sıralanmış, bu yapılar arasından sadece sıfat türündeki kıyas yapılarına odaklanılmış ve söz konusu yapıların benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları ortaya koyulmuştur. Buna göre, her iki dilde de kıyas yapmaya yarayan yapıların üretiminde sınırlı sayıda çekimin söz konusu olduğu görülmüştür ve bu yapıların söz dizimsel ve morfolojik özellikleri betimleme, yan yana koyma ve kıyaslama olmak üzere üç adımda incelenmiştir. Bu karşılaştırmalı morfolojik çalışmanın sonuçları iki dil arasında ortaya çıkan farkların söz konusu dillerin tipolojik özelliklerinden kaynaklandığını göstermektedir. Eklemeli bir dil olan Macarca, ilgili yapıları oluşturmak için çekimsel bağımlı biçimbirimlerden faydalanırken bu biçimbirimlerin seçimini dildeki ünlü uyumu kuralı düzenlemektedir. Öte yandan, İngilizce'de ilgili kıyas yapılarını üretmek için hem bağımlı hem de bağımsız biçimbirimleri kullanmak mümkündür. Bu ikiliğin arkasında yatan kural sözkonusu dilin morfolojik özellikleri ile ilgilidir. Ayrıca, her iki dilde de kurallara uymayan bir dizi yapı söz konusudur ancak Macarca'da bu düzensizlikler tümüyle yeni sözcük üretimlerinden çok dilin fonolojik kısıtlamaları ile ilgiliyken İngilizce'de tam tersidir. Diller arasındaki farklılıklar anadili İngilizce olup Macarca öğrenmeye çalışan ya da tam tersini yapmaya çalışan birisi için olası zorlukların kaynağı konumundadır. Bu açıdan bakıldığında, çalışmanın bulguları çevirmenler, ders kitabı yazarlar, müfredat düzenleyen kişiler, öğrenciler ve öğretmenler açısından çeşitli çıkarımlar yapmayı mümkün kılmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** kıyas yapıları, karşılaştırmalı analiz, İngilizce, Macarca

#### ABSTRACT

This study aims at contrasting and comparing comparative constructions in English and Hungarian languages to pinpoint any similarities and differences between them. For this purpose, inventories of English and Hungarian comparative constructions are listed to highlight their similarities and discrepancies and only comparative adjectives are dealt with for the sake of the present study. Accordingly, both languages have restricted numbers of inflections to make comparative constructions from adjectives and the syntactic and morphological aspects of these morphemes are analysed in three steps: description, juxtaposition and comparison. The results of this contrastive morphological study reveal that the differences between the two languages originate from their typological characteristics. Hungarian, as an agglutinative language, uses inflectional bound morphemes to form the related structures and vowel harmony of the language regulates the choice of suffix. In English, on the other hand, both bound morphemes and free ones are possible to create such constructions. The principle that lies behind this dichotomy is directly related with the morphological aspects of English. Yet, both languages employ some broken forms but in Hungarian this irregularity stems from the phonological constraints of the language rather than a purely converted word formation which is the case in English. The differences are the major source of difficulties for a native speaker of English to learn Hungarian and vice versa. From this respect, based on the findings of the study, some implications can be drawn for translators, textbook writers, syllabus designers, learners and instructors involved in language teaching.

**Keywords:** comparative constructions, contrastive analysis, Hungarian, English

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

Language is used for different aims in different fields. People produce fictitious texts, narratives or daily speeches through language. From this respect, human language has its unique aspects which enable people to use it in a very complicated way. According to Hockett (1960) displacement principle, cultural transmission, productivity, discreteness and duality are among the various aspects of language. Thanks to such aspects of human language, people can talk about

language itself as well as talking about past, future or about South Pole and Santa Claus or Rapunzel etc. In other words, human beings can think and talk upon things which are even physically not present and they can produce and understand novel utterances. In this sense, human language is quite complex and differs from animal communication.

Making comparisons between things is another specific ability for human beings. Depending on the development of human mind through millions of years, thinking analytically has been a very particular domain. Thanks to the improvement of this ability, human beings managed to make reasonable choices which led them to produce new cultures, tools, theories, myths. From this point of view, it has been important for millions of years to make a comparison between the two concepts and express this through language. Every language has a mode of establishing orderings among objects but has its own way of expressing comparison between two objects or events on a single scale (Kim, 2010). A typical comparative construction in different languages can be as follows;

Das Auto ist neuer als das Rad. (German)

Araba bisikletten daha yenidir. (Turkish)

The car is newer than the bike. (English)

Depending on these specific comparison examples from three different languages, one can infer that there is a variation among languages in terms of comparing things. Kennedy (2007) suggests that there are five parameters in the construction and he explains these items as follows;

Kim(is)	old	er	than	Lee
<i>Target of Comparison</i>	<i>Gradable Predicate</i>	<i>Comparative Morpheme</i>	<i>Standard Marker</i>	<i>Standard of Comparison</i>

According to this distribution, there are two elements which are compared to one another and a property in terms of which they are compared. The target of comparison, *Kim* in the example above, is compared to the standard of comparison, *Lee*. As for the property which is the focus of the comparison, there is a gradable predicate, *old* in the given example. In other words, Kim and Lee are compared in terms of being old. Apart from these three elements, the canonical comparative also includes the index of comparison which is expressed by the comparative morpheme *-er* and the standard marker *than* which is employed in English.

Although the structure of comparison given above seems really simple, it also includes a wide range of complexity due to the nature of language. Kim (2010) suggests that "If the realm of language is seen as a cosmos, vast, largely, unexplored and sometimes bewildering, then the comparative construction must be a microcosm, reflecting all the complexity of the whole." Underlining this complexity, Hoeksama (1983) compares different comparative constructions in English and claims that they differ not only syntactically, but also semantically as in the suggested examples below;

(1) Moscow is older than Washington.

(2) The Sahara was hotter than I had expected it would be.

According to him, in (1) the standard marker, *than* is followed by an noun phrase which he calls NP-COMPARATIVE while in (2) *than* is followed by a clause which is called as S-COMPARATIVE. He discusses how do these two constructions are different regarding the semantics or syntax of the sentences. As it can be understood, comparative constructions in languages have something to do with the syntax, semantics, phonology or morphology of that particular language. Hence, the variation behind such constructions stems from the sub-domains of the related language. This complexity in languages necessitates a contrastive analysis of these domains. To demonstrate the differences between languages is the main concern of contrastive linguistics. In this vein, the difference in any element may depend on different domains of the contrasted languages. In other words, differences may be related to the morphological, syntactical or phonological constraints of a language and the comparison of any two languages can give clear insights about the reasons of the differences.

Bearing all these in mind, the aim of this present study is to find out how English and Hungarian languages are different from each other in terms of comparative constructions. To this end, this morpho-syntactic study employs a contrastive analysis of such constructions in both languages to highlight the differences between the languages and the dimensions of them. In this sense, the study aims to answer these questions;

1. What are the comparative constructions in English and Hungarian?
2. What are the differences between these two languages in terms of comparative constructions?

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Comparative constructions have received considerable attention in the related literature. Gnutzmann (1973) states that investigations on these constructions start from the assumption that comparative constructions derive from underlying complex sentences. Dixon (2005) on the other hand suggests that the prototypical comparative scheme which is found in most languages involves comparing two participants in terms of degree of some gradable property relating to them. Many attempts have been made to entangle the system of comparative constructions in each language and to understand its intricate interaction with a variety of syntactic and semantic phenomena (Kim, 2010). In this regard, many languages have such constructions and they may have different procedures in producing these structures. This present study intends to find out the differences between Hungarian and English in terms of comparative constructions. This section of the study therefore, is dedicated to the studies on the related grammatical forms in the two languages.

### ***2.1. English***

There has been a significant interest on comparative constructions in English and such structures have been dealt with from different aspects. Bresnan (1973), for instance, points out that the comparative clause construction in English is almost notorious for its syntactic complexity. According to him, such structures exhibit a variety of grammatical processes like recursion, deletions, permutations, and suppletions and because of this reason they supply a remarkable source to study in dept. In the related study, he discusses the comparative elements in English language like *more* or *-er* from different aspects and tries to put forward a syntactic analysis of such structures.

According to him English comparatives can be descriptively classified into clausal and phrasal types (ibid). Kim (2010) states that clausal comparatives are comparatives in which the standard of comparison, functioning as the complement of the standard marker *than*, shows clausal syntax. For instance;

- a. John met more students than Mary met \_\_\_\_.

On the other hand, phrasal comparatives include only a single NP after the standard marker *than* as in the following example;

- b. John met more students than Mary.

In parallel to Bresnan's study, Pilch (1965) also discusses the syntactic properties in comparative constructions in English. He suggests that syntactic analysis deals with relations among morphemic

elements. They are relations of sequence, substitution, and transformation, and also some more complex, composite relations which are built up out of the simpler ones. In this vein, he deals with the syntax of comparatives in English language.

Dixon (2005), on the other hand, examines the uses of –er and more as the form of the index of comparatives in English and compares the syntax of prototypical comparative constructions with non-prototypical ones. His study also covers the issues about superlative forms of adjectives and the use of adverbs for comparison, too. Gnutzmann (1973) in his corpus based study, deals with a wide range of constructions in English including superlative forms and discusses the nature of such structures.

Bacsikai-Atkari (2014) states that in any human language, there are various means of expressing comparison between entities or properties, and such structures are examined from different aspects. In the same work she uses the following examples to cover the issue of comparison;

- a. Mary was indeed furious when she saw that you had broken her vase. But you should have seen her mother!
- b. Mary is tall but Susan is very tall.
- c. Mary is faster than Susan.

As it can be noticed, there is a kind of comparison in each of the sentences above. However, she claims that (c) exhibits a true comparative structure, which expresses that the degree to which Mary is fast exceeds the degree to which Susan is fast. The sentence in (c) shows the most important elements of comparative constructions: in this case, the degrees of speed of two entities are compared. The reference value of comparison is expressed by faster in the matrix clause (Mary is faster) and it consists of a gradable predicate (fast) and a comparative degree marker (-er). The standard value of comparison (that is, to which something else is compared) is expressed by the subordinate clause (than Susan) and is introduced by the complementiser than, which also serves as the standard marker (ibid). According to Dixon's (2005) taxonomy, the *comparee* is Mary in this example while the *standard* of comparison is Susan. *Parameter* is the adjective fast for this comparison while the index is –er. The *mark* is, on the other hand, *than*. As it can be inferred the comparative degree marker is –er in this simple example and it is one of the ways to produce a comparative construction in English. However, it is not the case in all occasions.

The main focus of this study, hence, is the use of comparative structures as in (c) in English and the way how they differ from Hungarian equivalents. In this sense, it is plausible to explain the rules of comparative adjectives in short. According to Rozakis (2003) comparative is the form of adjectives or adverbs being used to compare two things. In this sense, comparative forms are produced structures in English. Bearing this in mind, if an adjective has one or two syllables –er marker is added to the end of the word as a bound morpheme as in fast/ fast-er, short/short-er or small/ small-er. It should be remembered that, there are some phonological constraints in adding this morpheme to the adjective. For instance, if the final syllable of the adjective is formed like CVC, then the final consonant is repeated as in thin/ thin-n-er or big/ big-g-er. Another exception is about the adjectives ending –y sound as in funny/ funn-ier or sleepy/ sleep-ier.

On the other hand, another rule is used for adjectives which have three or more syllables in English. To illustrate, interesting/ more interesting, expensive/ more expensive or intelligent/ more intelligent are some examples. As it can be noticed from the given formations, *more* is used before an adjective as a comparison marker. In this case, a free morpheme is inserted to the structure which stands in front of the adjective.

Languages differ in terms of the ways employed to produce comparative constructions. According to Bacskai-Atkari (2014), some languages like German allow only the morphological way of comparative adjective formations such as müde (tired)/ müde-r (more tired) or dunkel (dark)/ dunkler (darker). However, some languages like Turkish employ the latter rule for such construction like güzel (beautiful)/ daha güzel (more beautiful) or zayıf (thin)/ daha zayıf (thinner).

Additionally, rules of comparative constructions are not limited to these two forms in English. As Rozakis (2003) also states, some very frequently used adjectives have their own rules which are called irregular adjectives. For instance, good/ better, bad/ worse or far/ further are among these exceptions. Even the marker *more* is the comparative form of many or much in English and it is discussed in depth by Pilch (1965).

## ***2.2. Hungarian***

When it comes to Hungarian, it is a Uralic language spoken mostly in Hungary and an agglutinative one which uses various affixes in word formation depending on its grammar rules. One of the most significant underlying rules in Hungarian is vowel harmony. Yavuz (2011) defines vowel harmony as a type of assimilation between neighbour vowels. Göksel and Kerlake (2005) on the other hand, consider vowel harmony as “a phonological process which determines what vowel will appear in all

but the first syllable of a word. In this regard, it is plausible to deal with the vowels in Hungarian. Rounds (2013) states that Hungarian vowels are classified as front vs. back assonance and rounded vs. unrounded. These terms come from describing the tongue position in the mouth and the roundedness of the lips, respectively. According to this the vowel inventory of Hungarian can be as follows;

Back vowels: a, á, o, ó, u, ú

Front unrounded vowels: e, é, i, í

Front rounded vowels: ö, o", ü, u"

Vowel harmony rules in Hungarian require that front or back assonance in the vowels of a stem be maintained throughout the entire word, thus for the most part – except for recent loan words – Hungarian words have either only back vowels in them or only front vowels (Rounds, 2013: 10).

Depending on this, in Hungarian most of the suffixes have both front and back vowel variants like –nak (back vowel suffix) and –nek (front vowel suffix). Accordingly, when a stem contains back vowels, the added suffix also contains back vowels and the same is true for front vowel containing word stems.

The rounded/unrounded distinction in the last vowel requires a second stage in vowel harmony rules in Hungarian language. According to this rule, if there is a front and rounded vowel in the last syllable of the stem then it takes a suffix with a front rounded vowel. In parallel to this, if the stem's last vowel is front and unrounded, it takes a front unrounded suffix. Rounds (2013) states that although suffixes for most words have front/back vowel variants only a few endings have rounded/unrounded variants (examples include the allative case, -hoz/-hez/-höz, or the plural suffix, -ok/-ek/-ök).

Bearing these in mind, it should be mentioned that comparative constructions in Hungarian also require a morphological process which works in accordance with vowel harmony as well. Before describing the rules of such constructions, the nature of adjectives in Hungarian should be underlined. Törkenczy (2008) states that adjectives in Hungarian can be used either attributively or non-attributively. When they are used attributively, adjectives do not receive any case or plural marking. For instance, “*nagy kutya*” (big dog). On the contrary, if they are used non-attributively, adjectives then agree with the number of the subject. To illustrate, *ez a ház hatalmas* (this house is huge) or *ezek a házak hatalmasak* (these houses are huge).

In this regard, it should be mentioned that, adjectives in Hungarian behave as Lowering Stems when they receive suffixes. For instance, *magasat* (tall+ACC), *magasak* (tall+ PL), *vöröset* (Red+ACC), *vöröse* (red+PL), *zöldet* (green+ACC), or *zöldek* (green+PL). However, there are some exceptional non-lowering adjectival stems in Hungarian as well like *agg* (very old)- *aggok* (very old+PL), *nagy* (big)- *nagyok* (big+PL) and nationality denoting words such as *görög* (Greek)- *görögök* (Greek+PL) or *angol* (English)- *angolok* (English+PL).

As it can be inferred, the nature of adjectives is a bit different from that of English adjectives in terms of taking case or plural marking procedures. As for the comparative constructions, it can be said that a morphological process is active as well. In other words, most adjectives in Hungarian, as Törkenczy (2008) also states, have endings that indicate comparative degree. According to this, comparative degree of adjectives in Hungarian is produced with –abb/-ebb suffixes. The choice of –abb or its allomorph –ebb depends on the rule of vowel harmony that is explained before. For instance, *gazdag* (rich)- *gazdagabb* (richer), *meleg* (hot)- *melegebb* (hotter). However, if the adjective ends in a vowel, then a vowelless variant –bb is added to the adjective as in *fekete* (black)- *feketébb* (blacker) or *olcsó* (cheap)- *olcsóbb* (cheaper). In Hungarian, there are some irregular forms as in English. For example, *jó* (good)- *jobb* (better), *szép* (beautiful)- *szébb* (more beautiful) or *kicsi* (small)- *kisebb* (smaller). Yet, it can be said that even in irregular forms of adjectives –bb suffix is mostly seen and it mainly affects the phonology of the word stem rather than the suffix.

### 3. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Depending on the information given above this part of the study is dedicated to the contrastive analysis of comparative construction in English and Hungarian. To this end, three steps should be followed for the sake of a contrastive study. These steps are (a) description, (b) juxtaposition and (c) comparison.

#### a. Description

To describe the properties in this sample study, it is plausible to remember the research questions that the study aims to answer;

1. What are the comparative constructions in English and Hungarian?
2. What are the differences between these two languages in terms of comparative constructions?



As it was stated earlier, the nature of adjectives is different in these two languages. Although, as a part of speech, adjectives are available in both languages and used to compare things with one another, they are not pluralised in English while they agree with the number of subjects in Hungarian.

As for the comparative constructions in these languages, it can be suggested that the process is both morphological and syntactic in both languages. Therefore, this study can be described as a morpho-syntactic analysis. In English, there are three ways of producing comparative constructions with adjectives. Depending on the number of syllables either a bound morpheme, *-er*, is added to the end of the word or *more* is used as a free morpheme in front of adjectives. It should be noted that *-er* morpheme has some variations depending on the final sound of the related adjective which implies a phonological constraint as well. Additionally, there are some common irregular forms of adjectives for comparison which have their own forms apart from the two rules mentioned.

When it comes to Hungarian, there is a morphological process for such constructions which also have links with phonological properties of the language. According to this, it can be suggested that in Hungarian *-abb* is a bound morpheme added to adjectives to get comparative forms and its allomorph *-ebb* is used depending on the constraints of vowel harmony. As in English, there are some irregular forms as well but this irregularity is observed mostly on the root of the words while the suffix is still the same in a sense.

### **b. Juxtaposition**

The second step of a contrastive analysis is juxtaposition. The comparative construction procedures were clarified so far. According to this, there are three different ways of producing comparative constructions with adjectives in English. Accordingly, depending on the number of syllables of an adjective the related rule is employed. For one-two syllable adjectives, *-er* suffix is added as well as its variations like *-r* or *-ier* depending on the final sound of the adjective. As for longer adjectives, in other words for three or more syllable adjectives the word *more* is used before the adjective as a free morpheme. Apart from these there are some irregular ones as the third way of comparative adjectives.

In Hungarian on the other hand there is one main way of producing comparative forms from adjectives and a secondary rule which refers to a limited number of irregular adjectives. In this regard, Hungarian adjectives are converted into comparative ones through *-Abb* suffix and its allomorph *-ebb* in general regardless of syllable numbers.

### c. Comparison

The comparison between English and Hungarian comparative constructions in terms of adjectives can be discussed in different sub-sections.

#### *3.1. Differences between English and Hungarian in terms of Comparative Adjectives*

##### *3.1.1. Regularity and Irregularity*

It can be said that in both languages, adjectives are mostly converted into comparative structures in a regular way. Similarly, in both languages there are some irregular adjectives as well. However, it can be suggested that this irregularity is more distinct in English as the form of the adjective is mostly changed and the new form seems as a complete new word such as good-*better* or bad-*worse*.

In Hungarian, on the other hand, the word stem may have some conversions but –bb suffix is still added to the word which reminds the comparative suffix –Abb in a sense. In other words, even irregular adjectives are used with a suffix and what makes them irregular is the way how this suffix is added. In other words, -abb or –ebb suffixed words are regular in Hungarian but –obb is considered as an irregular form. For instance, gyors**abb** (faster) and meleg**ebb** (hotter) are regular adjectives while nagy**obb** (larger) is irregular.

##### *3.1.2. Syllable Structure*

Another difference between these two languages is about the number of syllables of adjectives. In English the rules of comparative adjectives is directly related to the syllable number. In other words, adjectives are considered short or long ones. In this sense, one-two syllable adjectives or the shorter ones are converted into comparatives with the addition of –er suffix as in small- *smaller*, short- *shorter* or quiet- *quieter* etc. On the contrary, if an adjective has three or more syllables in English, they are classified as long adjectives and they are not converted into even longer units with an additional suffix. Instead, a free morpheme, *more*, is used before adjectives to indicate a comparison as in expensive-*more* expensive, beautiful-*more* beautiful or important-*more* important.

In Hungarian, on the other hand, the number of syllables makes no sense. All adjectives are converted into comparative entities with a suitable suffix. For example, édes (sweet)- édes**ebb** (sweeter) or különös (special)- különös**ebb** (more special).

### 3.1.3. *Phonological Constraints*

Although comparative constructions are mostly a morpho-syntactic process, there are some constraints due to the phonological constraints of the two languages. This is directly related to the addition of suffixes to the adjectives in both languages. The –er suffix in English is added to some adjectives which already have “e” sound in the final syllable as –r as in nice- nicer or cute-cuter. Similarly, if the adjective ends in “y” sound, then the suffix is added as –ier as in easy-easier or funny-funnier. Another constraint in English is about the structure of final syllable. If the final syllable is shaped as CVC, then the final consonant is repeated before the –er suffix as in thin-thinner or big-bigger.

As for Hungarian, the process is mostly phonological due to a specific rule called vowel harmony. According to this, the frontness, backness or roundness of the vowels in the preceding syllables, determines the choice of suffix either –abb or –ebb. For instance, piros (red)- pirosabb (redder) or édes (sweet)- édesebb (sweeter). On the other hand, if the adjective ends in the vowels a or e, the vowel is lengthened when adding -bb; adjectives ending in other vowels witness no change in the stem. To illustrate, in drága (dear, expensive)- drágább (dearer, more expensive) or fekete (black)- feketébb (blacker) a or e vowel is lengthened while it is not observed in szomorú (sad)- szomorúbb (sadder) or régi (old)- régibb (older). In addition to these some adjectives lose their final vowel -ú/-ű sound in comparative forms such as hosszú (long)- hosszabb (longer) or ifjú (young)- ifjabb (younger).

## 4. CONCLUSION

This study aimed to compare and contrast comparative constructions in English and Hungarian languages. As the analysis referred to the relationship between adjectives and modified nouns as well as the agreement between subjects and noun phrases it can be considered as a syntactic study. Additionally, the study referred to some morphological aspects and affixation procedures. From this respect it also covered morphology as a subbranch of linguistics. In this sense this analysis can be considered as a morpho-syntactic one. According to this, this study aimed to answer two research questions regarding the strategies in producing comparative constructions through adjectives.

When the related literature is taken into account, it can be suggested the there are plenty of studies on the comparative constructions in English language. Most of these studies focus on such structures and discuss the underlying syntactic and semantic processes of these issues. However,

there are less studies on Hungarian concepts. Similarly, there seems a lack in the related literature in terms of a contrastive analysis of the related concepts between the two languages. Hence, this study aimed to conduct such an analysis to contribute the field with a specific scope. It should be remembered that this study focuses only comparative forms of adjectives and other comparative constructions like superlative forms, adverbials or equality markers are ignored. This can be considered as a suggestion for further studies.

As for the answers of the research questions, the study followed the steps of a contrastive analysis which are called description, juxtaposition and comparison. Depending on the findings of the current study, one should refer to two specific terms in a contrastive analysis: type and degree.

The findings revealed that comparative constructions in English are produced with the use of two different morphemes one of which is a free morpheme, more while the other is a bound one, -er. Similarly, in Hungarian such constructions are produced with –Abb suffix which is a bound morpheme and its allomorph –ebb. From this respect, these two languages can be considered as similar in terms of the type of such constructions. However, the degree of these findings is different in these languages in that English has two different morphemes while Hungarian has one.

However, this description is not enough to cover the parameters of the related languages. English language depends mainly on the number of syllables to determine which morpheme to use. In other words, English adjectives are attached –er suffix if they are one-two syllable ones otherwise, a free morpheme, more, is used before adjectives. On the contrary, Hungarian language makes no distinction among adjectives regarding their syllable numbers. In other words, -Abb suffix can be added to all adjectives regardless of their length.

Another difference is related with the written forms of the bound morphemes in such constructions. In other words, the way how –er suffix in English or –Abb suffix in Hungarian is added to adjectives create some variations depending on the phonology of the adjectives. In English this variation creates three different ways; -r, -ier or the repetition of the final sound of the adjective with CVC syllable types. These variations occur to protect the phonology of the stem in English, otherwise the word stem might be pronounced differently. In Hungarian, on the other hand, -abb or –ebb suffix is added according to a specific rule in the language; vowel harmony which is available in most of the agglutinative languages. In other words, the choice of the suffix is constrained by this rule in Hungarian. According to this, the types of vowels in preceding syllables determine the vowel type in the suffix. The aim here is to make the pronunciations easier and smoother.

In addition to these, it can be said that both languages have some irregular forms in terms of such constructions in limited numbers. However, in English the comparative forms are mostly different from the original forms of the adjectives. They turn out to be new word forms. However, in Hungarian the irregularity stems from the addition of the suffix. In other words, it is still possible to find at least –bb sound at the end of such adjectives. What changes is either the vowel in the suffix or the shape of the word stem.

Another difference between the two languages is related to the nature of adjectives in that English adjectives are not pluralised but depending on the number of modified nouns their singularity or plurality is implied by using a definite or indefinite article before adjectives. In Hungarian, adjectives agree with the number of subjects of the sentence. Both languages may employ a standard marker after comparative constructions under some circumstances. This standard marker is ‘*than*’ in English while it is ‘*mint*’ in Hungarian. However, in Hungarian there is another way of implying this comparison. According to this, neither *mint* nor a comma is used, but the target of the comparison is put into the –nal or –nel suffixes which are the adhesive case markers in Hungarian.

In sum, the process in comparative constructions in English and Hungarian has a morpho-syntactic interface. In other words, both syntactic and morphological processes are active in both languages. Apart from this, there are some phonological constraints as well. According to the findings of this contrastive analysis, it can be said that these languages are in a sense similar in terms of the type of comparative constructions but they are different in terms of degree. The differences are mainly because of the typologies of the languages. In this sense, English, as an analytical language uses both bound morphemes as well as free morphemes regarding the length of words. Hungarian, on the contrary, as an agglutinative language employs bound morphemes much more freely.

## REFERENCES

- Bacsikai-Atkari, J. (2014). *The syntax of comparative constructions*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- Bresnan, J. W. (1973). Syntax of the Comparative Clause Construction in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 4(3), 275–343.
- Dixon, R. (2005). Comparative Constructions in English. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*. Retrieved from <http://ifa.amu.edu.pl/sap/files/41/01Dixon.pdf>
- Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. New York: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203340769>
- Gnutzmann, C., Ilson, R., & Webster, J. (1973). Comparative constructions in contemporary English\*. *English Studies*, 54(5), 417-438. doi: 10.1080/00138387308597575
- Hockett, Charles F. The Origin of Speech, *Scientific American*, 203, 1960.
- Hoeksema, Jack. 1983. Negative Polarity and the Comparative. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1, 403-434.
- Kennedy, Christopher. 2007. Standards of Comparison. Papers presented at the Colloque de Syntaxe et Sémantique de Paris.
- Kim, J. (2010). A Contrastive Analysis between English and Korean Comparative Constructions. *English Language And Linguistics*, 16(1), 137-162. doi: 10.17960/ell.2010.16.1.006
- Pilch, H. (1965). Comparative Constructions in English. *Language*, 41(1), 37. doi: 10.2307/411850
- Rounds, C. (2013). *Hungarian*. Florence: Taylor and Francis.
- Rozakis, L. (2003). *English Grammar for the Utterly Confused*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Törkenczy, M. (2008). *Hungarian verbs and essentials of grammar*. New York: McGraw.
- Yavuz, H. (2011). Why study sounds? In Z. Balpınar (Ed.), *Turkish Phonology and Morphology* (pp. 2-13). Eskişehir: Anadolu University.