

*Offprint from:*

# Turkic Languages

Edited by  
Lars Johanson

in cooperation with  
Hendrik Boeschoten, Bernt Brendemoen,  
Éva Á. Csató, Peter B. Golden, Tooru Hayasi, Birsal Karakoç,  
Astrid Menz, Irina Nevskaya, Sumru A. Özsoy, Elisabetta Ragagnin,  
Saule Tazhibayeva and Abdurishid Yakup

23 (2019) 1

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

The journal **TURKIC LANGUAGES** is devoted to linguistic Turcology. It addresses descriptive, comparative, synchronic, diachronic, theoretical and methodological problems of the study of Turkic languages including questions of genealogical, typological and areal relations, linguistic variation and language acquisition. The journal aims at presenting work of current interest on a variety of subjects and thus welcomes contributions on all aspects of Turkic linguistics. It contains articles, review articles, reviews, discussions, reports, and surveys of publications. It is published in one volume of two issues per year with approximately 300 pages.

Manuscripts for publication, books for review, and all correspondence concerning editorial matters should be sent to Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Lars Johanson, Turkic Languages, Department of Slavistics, Turcology and Circum-Baltic Studies, University of Mainz, 55099 Mainz, Germany. The email address [johanson@uni-mainz.de](mailto:johanson@uni-mainz.de) may also be used for communication.

Books will be reviewed as circumstances permit. No publication received can be returned.

Subscription orders can be placed with booksellers and agencies. For further information please contact: Harrassowitz Verlag, 65174 Wiesbaden, Germany; fax: 49-611-530999; e-mail: [verlag@harrassowitz.de](mailto:verlag@harrassowitz.de).

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2019

This journal, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.

Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printing and binding by Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed on permanent/durable paper

Printed in Germany

[www.harrassowitz-verlag.de](http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de)

ISSN 1431-4983

## Contents

### Turkic Languages, Volume 23, 2019, Number 1

Editorial note by Lars Johanson .....	1
Obituary	
Bernt Brendemoen: In memoriam Even Hovdhaugen (1941–2018) .....	3
Articles	
Abdurishid Yakup: An Old Uyghur appeal to <i>T(ä)ngrikän Tegin T(ä)ngrim</i> to renounce secular life .....	6
Anna Dybo & Vera Maltseva & Aleksandra Sheymovitch & Elvira Sultrekova: The use of personal markers in the Beltir dialect of the Khakas language from a comparative perspective .....	31
Aynur Abish & Uldanay Jumabay: The complementizer {-U <sup>2</sup> w} in Kazakh as spoken in China .....	49
Gülin Dağdeviren Kırmızı & Bilal Kırkıcı: Locative verbs in Turkish: A psycholinguistic analysis .....	67
Birsel Karakoç & Annette Herkenrath: Understanding retold stories: The marking of unwitnessed events in bilingual Turkish .....	81
Reviews	
Klára Agyagási: Reviews of I. P. Pavlov 2017. <i>Sovremennyj čuvaškij jazyk 2: Morfologija</i> . Čeboksary, and V. I. Sergeev 2017. <i>Morfologija čuvaškogo jazyka. Slovoizmenenie, formoizmenenie i formoobrazovanie</i> . Čeboksary.....	122
Marcel Erdal: Review of Gülcan Çolak 2017 <sup>2</sup> . <i>Türkçede fosil kelimeler</i> . İstanbul .....	132
Leonid Kulikov & Ilona Manevskaia: Review of Robert I. Binnick 2012. <i>The past tenses of the Mongolian verb: Meaning and use</i> . (Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory 1.) Leiden .....	135
Goran Pavelić: Review of <i>Književna smotra: Journal of World Literature</i> 173: 3, Zagreb, 2014 .....	140



## Editorial note

*Turkic Languages, Volume 23, 2019, Number 1*

The present issue of TURKIC LANGUAGES opens with Bernt Brendemoen's obituary of Even Hovdhaugen, an outstanding representative of the Norwegian linguistic tradition who made essential contributions to Turkic language studies.

Two articles are devoted to Turkish issues.

Gülin Dağdeviren Kırmızı and Bilal Kırkıcı present a psycholinguistic study of Turkish locative verbs. These denote motion to a container or surface and occur with two arguments: the 'figure', the moving object; and the 'ground', the location. Non-alternating verb classes are (1) 'figure-oriented non-alternating', with the figure occurring in the direct-object position, or (2) 'ground-oriented non-alternating', with the ground in the direct-object position. Changing the positions of figure and ground leads to ungrammaticality. The results of the study show that while most of the Turkish verbs tested are of the figure-oriented non-alternating class, ground-oriented non-alternating locative verbs also exist, e.g. *sıva-* 'to plaster', *kapla-* 'to coat', *süsle-* 'to adorn', and *ört-* 'to cover'.

Birsel Karakoç and Annette Herkenrath investigate the marking of unwitnessed events in stories retold by children in bilingual Turkish-German families. The quantitative analysis of a recorded corpus of conversations shows that bilingual children use indirective markers much less than their monolingual peers. When talking about events that occurred a generation ago, the bilingual children use unmarked forms that may make a confusing impression on their adult interlocutors.

Three articles deal with other Turkic languages.

Abdurishid Yakup presents an edition of an Old Uyghur text kept at the Beijing National Library, an appeal to a laywoman to give up her secular life and become a Buddhist nun. It is based on a similar Chinese text and even contains some characters used in that version. The edited text contains several words and expressions that are not found in previously known Old Uyghur works, and it also displays a number of stylistically unique features.

Anna Dybo, Vera Maltseva, Aleksandra Sheymovitch, and Elvira Sultrekova deal with personal markers in the Beltir dialect of Khakas from a comparative perspective. The study shows that originally different personal markers have been replaced through analogical developments and that cliticized personal pronouns and particles have developed into new analytical personal markers.

On the basis of materials from Kazakh as spoken in China, Aynur Abish and Uldanay Jumabay discuss matrix predicates that select the complementizer  $\{-U^2w\}$  to embed predications expressing epistemic and deontic modality, manner, evaluation, and purpose.

As a comment on the article ‘Cranberry morphemes in Turkish’, published in *TURKIC LANGUAGES* 22, Marcel Erdal reviews Gülcan Çolak’s *Türkçede fosil kelimeler* [Fossil words in Turkish].

Finally, Klára Agyagási reviews books on Chuvash morphology written by I. P. Pavlov and V. I. Sergeev. Leonid Kulikov and Ilona Manevskaia present R. I. Binick’s book on the past tenses of the Mongolian verb. Goran Pavelić reviews a recent issue of *Književna smotra: Journal of World Literature* that commemorates the twentieth anniversary of the Chair of Turkish Studies at the University of Zagreb.

*Lars Johanson*

# The use of personal markers in the Beltir dialect of the Khakas language from a comparative perspective

Anna Dybo & Vera Maltseva & Aleksandra Sheymovitch & Elvira Sultrekova

Anna Dybo & Vera Maltseva & Aleksandra Sheymovitch & Elvira Sultrekova 2019. The use of personal markers in the Beltir dialect of the Khakas language from a comparative perspective. *Turkic Languages* 23, 31–48.

Some specific features of the use of personal markers in the Beltir dialect of Khakas have parallels in other Turkic languages and dialects, and result from two different tendencies. First, there are analogical developments of conjugated forms in different paradigms. In some finite and non-finite paradigms, originally different personal markers were replaced by a set of common ones, resulting in the leveling of the respective paradigms due to analogy. Secondly, cliticization of personal pronouns and particles, used in colloquial speech after predicates, is leading to formation of new analytical personal markers.

Keywords: Khakas dialects, Standard Khakas, morphology, personal markers, clitics, verb paradigm.

*A. Dybo, V. Maltseva and A. Sheymovitch, Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences. E-mail: iling@iling-ran.ru. Tomsk State University, Laboratory of Linguistic Anthropology. E-mail: linganthrlab@gmail.com. E. Sultrekova, Municipal Gymnasium<sup>1</sup>, Abakan. E-mail: gimnazia\_abakan@mail.ru. Tomsk State University, Laboratory of Linguistic Anthropology. E-mail: linganthrlab@gmail.com.*

## Introduction

The Beltir (Piltir) sub-dialect of Khakas is traditionally attributed to the Sagay dialect (Borgoyakov 1973: 80).<sup>1</sup> According to our observations, it could be a transitional sub-dialect between the Sagay dialect and the so-called Shor dialect of Khakas, and its closeness to Sagay is motivated by the easy-to-hear common phonetic isoglosses of /s/ and /i/.<sup>2</sup>

- 1 Written as part of the project “Language and ethno-cultural variability of Southern Siberia in synchrony and diachrony: language and culture interaction” (RF Government grant No. 14.Y26.31.0014).
- 2 In Sagay Khakas, /s/ is the standard reflex of the Proto Common Turkic \*š, \*č, \*s, while /i/ (written as *u*) is the reflex of the Proto Common Turkic \*e in the first syllable; e.g., Piltir *Əs* ‘Drink!’, *As* ‘Open!’, *tas* ‘stone’, *pas* ‘head’; *Kil!* ‘Come here!’, *it* ‘meat’, *itter* ‘different kinds of meat’, *idəm* ‘my meat’, *izək* ‘door’. Judging by the materials from our

There are some peculiar morphological phenomena in this sub-dialect. Here we will talk about the use of the personal markers of verbal conjugation.

The research material consists of an oral corpus of conversation comprising about 45 thousand words (10 hours of audio), collected in the villages of Butrakhty, Karagai and Chilany in 2011 from speakers born between 1916 and 1944.

### 1. Personal markers and verbal nominals

In Modern Literary Khakas, finite and non-finite uses of participles,<sup>3</sup> specifically, of the past participle *-GA(n)*, are quite distinct with respect to their personal marking. Personal markers agreeing with the subject attach to both, but the markers are different. The finite forms have a “mixed” paradigm of personal markers consisting of those going back to personal pronouns or to possessive affixes; see Table 1, leaving 3rd person unmarked. Markers attaching to non-finite forms are the possessive affixes; see Table 2.

Table 1. Finite personal (predominantly pronominal) markers in Modern Literary Khakas.

	Singular	Plural
1	<i>-m / -PIn</i>	<i>-PIs</i>
2	<i>-SIŋ</i>	<i>-SAr</i>

Table 2. Non-finite (possessive) personal markers in Modern Literary Khakas.

	Singular	Plural
1	<i>-(I)m</i>	<i>-(I)bIs</i>
2	<i>-(I)ŋ</i>	<i>-(I)ŋAr</i>
3	<i>-(z)I</i>	<i>-(z)I(+LAr)</i>

The marker *-GA(n)* has the form *-GA* (without the final *n*) in the finite paradigm if followed by personal markers: *par-ya-m* ‘I walked’, *tək-ke-zer* ‘you (plural) sewed’.

2016–2017 expeditions, in the variety spoken in small villages of the Tashtyp district, commonly defined as the Shor dialect of Khakas (but different from a Mrassu-Shor variety spoken by immigrants from the Mountainous Shoria), the correspondences are more complex: \*č, \*s > /s/, \*š > /š/, e.g., *ə<sup>h</sup>s!* ‘Drink!’, *A<sup>h</sup>s!* ‘Open!’, *taš* ‘stone’, *pa<sup>h</sup>s* ‘head’. \*e > /e/ in monosyllabic words and before a syllable with an etymologically wide vowel, e.g., *Kel!* ‘Come here!’, *et* ‘meat’, *etter* ‘different kinds of meat’, \*e > /i/ before a syllable with an etymologically narrow vowel, e.g., *idəm* ‘my meat’, *i<sup>h</sup>žək* ‘door’.

- 3 Traditionally in Russian Turcology we use the term “participles” for verbal forms with the markers *-GA(n)*, *-A(r)*, *-GALAK*, and some others, both for their finite and non-finite usages in attributive, complement and adverbial subordinate clauses.

In non-finite positions, combined with possessive markers, the form *-GAN* is used: *oolaxtīŋ maŋzīran-yan-in* [hurry-PP-POS3.ACC] *isken* ‘X heard that the boy hurried’, *Mīnday nime kōrgem min*, *Kindərləg piltərə aalda pol-yan-im-da* [be-PP-POS1SG-LOC] ‘I saw such a thing when I was in the Ust-Kyndyrlyra district’ (Baskakov et al. 1975: 152).

In the Beltir sub-dialect, we have found the non-finite *-GA* in the first person singular and plural in the locative case, used in adverbial clauses. This could be interpreted in two ways: either the non-finite *-GAN* in this sub-dialect behaves differently and loses its final consonant before the possessive markers, or the finite personal markers are used instead of the possessive ones.

## (1) Beltir dialect

*Mīnīŋ aldında, kolχos tuz-in-da, kolχos-ta tovin-va-bīs-ta,*  
 this.GEN before kolkhoz time-POS3-LOC kolkhoz-LOC work-PP-1PL-LOC  
*anaŋ sosχa pala-lar-i sad-aŋa čör-žeŋ pol-va-bīs.*  
 then pig child-PL-POS3 sell-INF walk-HAB be-PP-1PL

‘Earlier, in the time of collective farms, when we worked in the kolkhoz, (then) we usually went to sell piglets.’ (VR, 64, Karagai)

## (2) Beltir dialect

*Kil-tər, χīra paz-in-da kil-ge-m-de,*  
 come-INDIR field edge-POS3-LOC come-PP-1SG-LOC  
 “*Sin noŋa χīra tart-ča-zīŋ?*”  
 you why field plow-PRES-2SG

‘[He] came when I went to the edge of the field, [and asked:] “Why are you plowing the field?”’ (ZG, 96, Chilany)

We could not find any mention of this phenomenon in papers published about Khakas. The choice between the two interpretations could be possible if similar forms of the second person could be found.<sup>4</sup> We were more inclined to accept the second interpretation, because such a phenomenon is easily explained by the merging of the non-finite and finite paradigms, natural in spontaneous speech. Furthermore, in other types of clauses, the non-finite forms take possessive markers, just like in literary Khakas.

## (3) Beltir dialect

*A vot min, andarī čör-əp, χajdi ograda ötəre kil-gen-əm-nə*  
 well I there walk-PCONV how hedge through come-PP-POS1SG-ACC

4 Our informant denied the possibility of analogous second person forms, which, admittedly, does not say much about their actual existence in spontaneous texts.

*χajdaŋ pəl-əp ədi čooχtaan {čooχta-GAn} kəzə pol-ar ol.*  
 which.ABL know-PCONV so tell:PP {tell-PP} human be-FUT s/he  
 ‘But how could he know and say that I went there and got through the hedge?’ (IE 114, Butrakhty)

## (4) Beltir dialect

*Külən čurtaan {čurta-GAn} čurtaz-īm čaril-ip*  
 happily live:PP {live-PP} life-POS1SG be.separated-PCONV  
*χal-dī-ŋ χon-xan-īm-naŋ.*  
 remain-RPAST-2SG spend.night-PP-POS1SG-ABL  
 ‘My life, that I lived happily, you got separated from my husband.’ (lit. ‘the person with whom I spent nights’) (ZG, 109, Chilany)

There is also an example where the habitual participial marker *-čA(ŋ)* behaves similarly; see (5).

## (5) Beltir dialect

*Minə, avīr-ča-m-da, Šulbaev, pu L'on'a Šulbaev kil-tər.*  
 I.ACC be.ill-HAB-1SG-LOC Sh. this L. Sh. come-INDIR  
 ‘To me, when I was ill, Shulbaev, this Lyonya Shulbaev, apparently came.’ (ZG, 96, Chilany)

Irina Nevskaya (in personal communication) drew our attention to similar forms in Shor dialects. After studying the Shor materials we have found that there is more than one strategy of declension of verbal nominals in Shor; compare similar tendencies of personal marking of predicates in subordinate clauses in further Altaic languages (Čeremisina et al. 1984; Čeremisina et al. 1986). The first one, typical for adverbial clauses, presupposes no agreement with the subject of the non-finite clause; see (6), (7), and (8).

## (6) Shor

*Tarīn-čadīr čälbägän-gä. “Män čüt-kän-dä üröd-ör-üm!”*  
 be.angry-INDIR chelbegen-DAT I reach-PP-LOC teach-FUT-1SG  
 ‘He was apparently angry with the *chelbegen* (monster): “I’ll teach you a lesson when I catch you!”’ (From the epic Altin-Taychi, verses 110–111) (Funk 2018: 173)

## (7) Shor

*Men čakšī ürgeŋ-gen-neŋ aara paška klass-ka kir-ibis-ti-m.*  
 I well learn-PP-ABL due.to other class-DAT enter-PERF-RPAST-1SG  
 ‘Because I studied well, I advanced.’ (lit. ‘entered to the next class’) (Dyrenkova 1941: 292)

## (8) Shor

*Aŋna-čay ak tajga-ŋ-a aŋna-p kušta-p*  
 hunt-HAB white taiga-POS2SG-DAT hunt-PCONV hunt.birds-PCONV

*šik-paan-nay* {*šik-PA-GAn-DAn*}

rise-NEG:PP-ABL {rise-NEG-PP-ABL}

*ala pir kirik čil ert par-dī.*

since one 40 year pass go-RPAST

‘Since you went to your taiga where you used to hunt, 40 years have passed.’ (From an epic) (Dyrenkova 1941: 292)

Such forms are quite common also in other Turkic languages (see SIGTYa 1986: 120–122).

The second strategy, typical for complement clauses, presupposes that verbal nominals functioning as their predicates take possessive personal markers; compare literary Khakas. This strategy is mainly used if the verbal nominal is in the nominative or accusative (Dyrenkova 1941: 124); see (9).

## (9) Shor

*Seeŋ, Aba Qulaq, aara par-yan-ij par pol-ar,*  
 you.GEN A. K. there go-PP-POS2SG existing be-FUT

*paza nan-čay-ij čoq pol-ar.*

but return-HAB-POS2SG non-existing be-FUT

‘You, Aba-Kulak, will go there, but you will not return.’ (lit. ‘Your going will be, your returning won’t be.’)

## (10) Shor

*Minda-yi čer-de köp odur-za-ŋ, aš par-yan-ij-ni*  
 here.LOC-ATTR land-LOC much sit-COND-2SG, traverse go-PP-POS2SG-ACC

*uŋna=n-maan* {*uŋna=n-PA-GAn*} *qal-ar-zij.*

know=REFL-NEG:PP {know=REFL-NEG-PP} remain-FUT-2SG

‘If you live in this land for a long time, you won’t notice your own perishing.’

This strategy can also be used with verbal nominals in the locative (Dyrenkova 1941: 293); see (11).

## (11) Shor

*Agaš ara-zī-ba čügür-ibis-ken-ibis-te (čügür-büs-ken-mis-te)*

tree between-POS3-INSTR run-PERF-PP-POS1PL-LOC run-PERF-PP-1PL-LOC

*pür kagžiray-ina kiži-da ün-i uy=ul-baan-ča.*<sup>5</sup>  
 leaf rustle-POS3:DAT person-ADD voice-POS3 hear=PASS-NEG.CONV-PRES  
 ‘When we were running through the forest, because of the rustle of the leaves (on the earth) even a human voice could not be heard.’

## (12) Shor

*Revolucija-zin-ga töönče (töönčü) men baj-lar-ya čalči pol-ip*  
 revolution-POS3-DAT before I rich-PL-DAT peon be-PCONV  
*čör-čit-kan-ım-da, ton+azay-ım čudaŋ pol-yan.*  
 walk-DUR-PP-POS1SG-LOC coat+shoe-POS1SG outworn be-PP  
 ‘Before the revolution, when I worked for *bays*, being a farm-hand, my clothes were worn out.’

With the third strategy, verbal nominals take personal markers and drop *-n* at the end of the affix *-GAn*, like in Beltir. In Shor, we have found such forms not only in the first-person singular and plural, but also in the second-person singular (Dyrenkova 1941: 293–294); see (13) and (14).

## (13) Shor

*Öre le kör-ge-ŋ-de, čiltis-tar pizıñnaš-čit-kan-nar-ı kör-ün-ča.*  
 up PTCL look-PP-2SG-LOC star-PL twinkle-DUR-PP-PL-POS3 see-REFL-PRES  
 ‘When you look up, (overhead) the stars twinkle.’ (lit. ‘twinkling of the stars is seen’)

- 5 In Khakas, there are two different negative forms: NEG.CONV *-Pin* (as the harmonically neutral *-i-* shows, it originated from NEG *\*-MA* + CONV *\*(X)yIn*; see Erdal 2004: 316–317) and NEG.PP *-PA-GAn* > *-baan* etc. (superficially). In Shor, these two forms have coalesced phonetically as *-PAAn*, and Dyrenkova (1941: 128) identifies them wrongly. Despite the high grade of fusion in previously analytical forms of the present tense in modern Khakas and Shor (originating from *-(I)p* + *čat-* ‘lie’) we must analyze them as containing two affixes, PCONV *-(I)p* (or its negative form; *-(I)p* can be dropped in some morphophonological positions, and PRES *-čA*, since it is possible to insert a particle between them without breaking the word-form boundary: Khakas *tör-əb-ök-če* [be.born-PCONV-ASS-PRES] ‘he is born indeed’; *sayın-min-daa-ča* [think-NEG.CONV-ADD-PRES] ‘he doesn’t even think’; Shor *taab-ok-čadi-bis {tap-Ip-}* [find:PCONV-ASS-PRES-1PL] ‘we hunt indeed’, *odur-baan-ok-ča* [sit-NEG.CONV-ASS-PRES] ‘he does not sit indeed’ (Dyrenkova 1941: 248). We should not be deterred from this analysis by possible repetition of con-verb, participial, tense and aspect affixes inside one and the same word-form: Turkic languages, like all languages of the “Altaic type”, it appears, belong to the so-called “unparadigmatic” languages (see, e.g., Alpatov 2018: 35–43), and their synthetic word-forms are best described within the framework of combinatorial grammar with cycles (see Gleason 1955: 111–118; for a description of Korean verbal word-form structure see Martin 1992: 244–274).

## (14) Shor

*Alïy-dañ müñ sös uk-ka-m-če, sayış=tïy-dañ pir le*  
 fool-ABL 1000 word hear-PP-1SG-PROL mind=COM-ABL one PTCL  
*sös uy-ajïn.*  
 word hear-OPT1SG

‘Instead of listening to a thousand words from a stupid man, I would rather listen to only one word from a wise man.’

The “short” predicative markers of the first person in Shor and Khakas are identical to possessive markers, but markers of the second person, which can combine with *-GA(n)*, differ. The possessive marker *-(I)ŋ* attaches to verbal nominals functioning as predicates of complement clauses, while the pronominal marker *-SIŋ* attaches to their finite predicative uses. Dyrenkova (1941: 183) remarks that finite forms in *-GA(n)* taking the second-person singular marker *-ŋ* also occur in the Kondoma dialect of Shor (as well as in the varieties spoken in the Mountainous Altai; see Nevskaya et al. 2017: 222). Therefore, we tried to find finite and non-finite uses of the form *-GA(n)* in the second-person singular in the texts of one Shor speaker—and we managed it. All the examples below are from a famous Shor epic teller V. E. Tanagashev. He adds *-(I)ŋ* to all non-finite uses of verbal nominals with the marker *-GA(n)* and *-SIŋ* for all their finite predicate uses.

## (15) Shor

*Am, sen ajlan kel-ge-ŋ-de, uluy toj sal kör-eeŋ-ner!*  
 now you turn.back come-PP-2SG-LOC big feast put look-IMP.INCL-PL  
 ‘Now that you are back, let us make a great *toj!*’ (Funk 2012: 112–113, strings 284–285)

## (16) Shor

*... qortuq čajal par-yan-zïŋ.*  
 ... coward be.created go-PP-2SG  
 ‘... you were created as a coward.’ (Funk 2012: 42–43, string 105)

Thus, it is clear that non-finite uses of *-GA(n)* in Shor differ from the literary Khakas forms in morphophonology rather than in syntax. We can therefore suppose that the fact that Beltir uses *-GA(n)* with the possessive of the first singular and plural is partly conditioned by its intermediate position between Shor (probably the Shor dialect of Khakas) and Standard Khakas (or Saghaj).

## 2. Analytic personal markers in the Beltir dialect

A number of predicative forms in the Beltir dialect use the pronoun *min* ‘I’ as the marker of the first-person singular (in addition to the personal affixes).

## (17) Chilan sub-dialect

*Am pol=in-maadax {pol=in-PA-GAdAG} min*  
 now be=REFL-NEG:ASSUM {be=REFL-NEG-ASSUM} I  
*čun pol-baadax {pol-PA-GAdAG} min.*  
 wash be-NEG:ASSUM {be-NEG-ASSUM} I  
 ‘Now I’m not able to do (anything), I can’t wash.’ (MV 71, Karagai)

## (18) Chilan sub-dialect

*Pu soox, soox pol-baan {pol-PA-GAn} pol-za, min tiŋ na*  
 this cold cold be-NEG:PP {be-NEG-PP} be-COND I very PTCL  
*pədi majix-pas-čix min-ox.*  
 so get.tired-NEG.FUT-IRR I-ASS  
 ‘If this cold, this cold weren’t here, I would not get so tired.’ (MV 71, Karagai)

## (19) Chilan sub-dialect

*Ime, xajdi tə-zeŋ pol-dī-lar olar-dī? Agit...*  
 well how say-HAB be-RPAST-PL they-ACC A.  
*čiplada undud-ibis-fir min.*  
 completely forget-PERF-INDIR I  
 ‘Well, how they were called? Agit... Completely forgot.’ (IE 104, Butrakhty)

In Čertykova (1992), only the Beltir harmonizing affix *-mīn/-mən* is mentioned (which seems to correlate to the literary *-PIn* with slightly different rules for the realization of the initial consonant). It turns out that the subject marking in (17)–(19) is achieved with a postponed personal pronoun which is not harmonical. See also Borgoyakov (1975: 165) citing the excerpts from Müller’s materials from “Kangat Tatar” recorded in the 1730s: *men uzu-p-čur-men* [I sleep-PCONV-IPF-1SG] ‘I sleep’, *men kur-ru-men {kōr-ūr-PAn?}* [I see-IPF-1SG]<sup>6</sup> ‘I see’.

As is known, postpositive personal pronouns are used for marking the sentence subject both in Tuvan and Tofa, as well as in Old Turkic (see Isxakov & Palmbax 1961: 222; Rassadin 1978: 171; Erdal 2004: 230). They originally served as a source for the paradigm of finite personal markers in other Turkic languages. However, in Khakas and its dialects, we normally have finite personal markers of this type that have already been largely rebuilt. It is doubtful that the Beltir forms are archaic.<sup>7</sup> We can see that in Beltir, as well as in other Turkic idioms, finite personal markers can

6 It was probably a marker of IPF, similar to the Modern Khakas DUR *-i(r)* that appears nowadays only with the verbs *par-* ‘go’ and *kil-* ‘come’ and, apparently, originates (as the harmonically neutral *-i-* shows) from the auxiliary verb *\*jōr-* ‘walk’ synthesized before the phonetic shift *\*j- > \*ž > č* in the Shor-Khakas group.

7 According to what M. Borgoyakov wrote about the Beltir ethnogenesis (Borgoyakov 1973: 80–81), one can postulate their contact origin. The Beltir dialect is spoken in the villages lying along the road to Tuva, so Tuvan-Beltir language contacts were there before and still exist now.

be innovatively rebuilt from postpositive personal pronouns. This phenomenon was recorded, among other cases, in peripheral Turkmen dialects in SIGTYa (2002: 120–121) (Nokhurli, Dueji, Cheges, Mukri, Ata, Anauli, Khasar, Kirach dialects), and in Tuba (Dybo 2017: 136). Observe also the forms in the Dictionary of Abi-Khayan, a 15th century Arabic-Kypchak monument, in which personal pronouns are repeated after the predicate. The predicates involved in this process also include the past tense *-di*, which usually employs possessive personal markers: *Biz qajdasä kätmädi-biz* ‘We did not go anywhere’; *Sän nä jedi sän* ‘What did you eat?’ (cited according to Najip 1975: 44).

In some cases, Beltir duplicates the subject using a personal pronoun postpositive to the predicate, already marked for person; see (20).

## (20) Beltir dialect

*A anij pala-lar-ï, min olar-diñ pala-lar-ïn-mañ*  
 and he.GEN child-PL-POS3 I they-GEN child-PL-POS3-INSTR  
*ojnaa-m {ojna-GA(n)-(I)m} min.*  
 play:PP-1SG {play-PP-1SG} I  
 ‘As for their children, I played with their children.’ (ZG 91, Chilany)

## (21) Beltir dialect

*Poz-ï, ime, xažan-da aba-zï Arbät-sartın-oç*  
 self-POS3 well when-INDEF father-POS3 Arbat-from.the.side.of-ASS  
*kil-tär ol.*  
 come-INDIR he  
 ‘Himself, well, one day his father came from the Arbat side.’ (IE 114, Butrakhty)

The source of such developments, it seems to us, is sentences with the pronominal subject in the post-predicate position.<sup>8</sup> Baskakov et al. (1975: 329) notes: “There are cases, when in the modern literary languages the subject appears after the predicate. Mostly it happens in writing: *Mañat çurtaan ol* ‘Well lived he’; *Ədi teen aybaç ot* ‘Thus spoke the Tumbleweed’. This breaking of the usual norm seems to be allowed by focusing on the action of the subject. On the other hand, in the language of the press it could happen under the influence of Russian, where subjects can stand after predicates. However, it must be noted that such cases are possible when the context allows for such inversions.”

8 Baskakov et al. (1975: 303) writes that a nominal predicate must agree with the subject in person, but that the agreement is facultative. In Turkic idioms, some verb forms, participial in origin, can retain this property of a nominal predicate, which may have caused the non-agreeing forms in Müller’s materials, mentioned by Borgoyakov (1975: 165) (see above). One should not, however, put Salar and Saryg-Yugur in the same box, as in them, personal agreement of subject and predicate is completely absent for both participial and proper finite verbal forms (see Tenišev 1976a: 137, Tenišev 1976b: 83); this phenomenon can be more convincingly explained by Turkic-Chinese and Turkic-Mongolian contacts.

As we can see in our corpus, however, in spoken Khakas sentences with pronominal subjects in final position occur more frequently than in mass-media texts, and they do not usually look like calques of Russian. The rare examples that can be suspected of being calques are authors' words rendered by a direct speech construction; they occur more often in literary texts than in spoken ones (here and below are examples from the corpus); see (22) and (23).

## (22) Literary Khakas

*“Kem-zer s̄arer, χan-pig-əm?” – tee-m {te-GA(n)-(I)m} min.*  
 who-2PL you(PL) lord-POS1SG say:PP-1SG {say-PP-1SG} I  
 ‘I said “Who art thou, Lord?”’ (The Bible, Acts of the Apostles 26:15)

## (23) Literary Khakas

*Xarindaz-īm t̄ij aȳir-ībīs-t̄i, m̄ina bolnitsa-a ,*  
 brother-POS1SG very fall.ill-PERF-RPAST so hospital-DAT  
*čat=ir-ībīs-t̄i-lar nand̄ir-ya-m min.*  
 lie=CAUS-PERF-RPAST-PL answer-PP-1SG I  
 ‘– My brother fell ill, so they put him in a hospital, – I answered.’ (N. F. Troshkin, My memoires (paper articles), 1065, <http://khakas.altai.ru/corpus>)

Inversion in questions also occurs in the literary language and in dialects; see (24) and (25).

## (24) Literary Khakas

*Noya anday-z̄ij sin?*  
 why such-2SG you  
 ‘Why are you such (a person)?’ (Šulbaeva 1977)

## (25) Beltir dialect

*Xajda kize-m {kiz-A(r)-(I)m} min?*  
 where wear:FUT-1SG {wear-FUT-1SG} I  
 ‘Where would I wear (this)?’ (ZG 109, Chilany)

In most examples, the final position of the subject is due to communicative factors, not grammatical ones; see (26) and (27).

## (26) Literary Khakas

*Minday nime k̄or-ge-m min, kind̄erl̄ag pilt̄ar-ə*  
 such thing see-PP-1SG I Kyndyrla estuary-POS3  
*aal-da pol-γan-īm-da.*  
 village-LOC be-PP-POS1SG-LOC  
 ‘I saw such things, when I was in the Ust-Kyndyrla village.’ (Baskakov et al. 1975: 152)

(27) Beltir dialect

*Tasχil-dan*    *χajil-ip*    *aχ-čan*    *sub-lar,*    *pol-bas*    *pa*  
 mountain-ABL    melt-PCONV    flow-PRESPT    river-PL    be-NEG.FUT    Q  
*ze*    *ol.*  
 EMPH    that

‘The ice melts and rivers flow from the mountains, indeed.’ (AS 1, Butrakhty)

There are significantly more sentences with pronominal subjects in sentence final position in the Beltir and Sagay dialects than in Kachin. In the corpus of oral texts in the Kachin dialect, 29,000 words in volume, we could only find 34 such examples; there are 47 examples in the 12,000-word corpus of the Askiz sub-dialect of Sagay, and 170 in the 43,000-word Beltir corpus. In literary works of Beltir authors, e.g., V. G. Šulbaeva (from the Chilany village) and L. I. Čebodaeva (from the Butrakhty village), final pronominal subjects also appear quite frequently. On the other hand, in the collection of articles written by N. F. Troškin (from the Troshkino village, Kachin dialect), there are only two examples with pronominal subjects in the post-predicate position in the 60,000-word corpus.

Thus, this phenomenon could be an important syntactic parameter of interdialectal variations in Turkic idioms, which needs to be taken into account when collecting dialectal material.

### 3. Position of the question particle (Q)

In Literary Khakas, the postpositive clitic *PA* marks the focus of a general question. By the rules of orthography, it is written separately, but it is affected by harmony from the preceding syllable, and chooses the realization of the initial morphophoneme *P* depending on the preceding consonant (the last consonant of the preceding word form) according to the same rules that govern the intraword realizations of the *P* morphophoneme. Thus, morphophonologically it behaves no differently than an affix. See the following examples from Baskakov et al. (1975).

(28) Literary Khakas

*Čooχta*    *sın-ni,*    *χin-ča-zij*    *ma*    *mayaa?*  
 tell    truth-ACC    love-PRES-2SG    Q    I.DAT  
 ‘Tell me the truth, do you love me?’

(29) Literary Khakas

*Tim-de*    *be ni*    *Nad’a*    *nan-ar-ya?*  
 readiness-LOC    Q    EMPH    N.    return-FUT-DAT  
 ‘Is Nadya ready to return?’

- (30) Literary Khakas  
*Paba-ŋ mel'nikpe?*  
 father-POS2SG miller Q  
 'Is your father a miller?'

If a verbal predicate is the focus of a question, the *PA* particle in Beltir can be inserted into the verb form before the personal marker. We have seen examples in the present and past tenses where this particle is inserted before the possessive personal markers of the second person.

- (31) Beltir dialect  
*A kəzə-ler toβin-če-ler tə-p-če-me-ŋ.*  
 and human-PL work-PRES-PL say-PCONV-PRES-Q-2SG  
 'So the people are working you say?' (AS, Butrakhty)
- (32) Beltir dialect  
*Som-ka suur-če-beer {suur-čA-PA-ŋAr}?*  
 picture-DAT take.off-PRES-Q:2PL {take.off-PRES-Q-2PL}  
 'Do you do take photos?' (ZG 108, Chilany)
- (33) Beltir dialect  
 "Al-amaar {al-A(r)-PA-ŋAr}" tee-m {te-GA(n)-(I)m}  
 take-FUT:Q:2PL {take-FUT-Q-2PL} say:PP-1SG {say-PP-1SG}  
 "minə am?"  
 I.ACC now  
 '“Would you take”, I said, “me now?”' (VR 64, Karagai).

See Borgoyakov (1973: 91) for similar formations in the past tense: *Pol-ya-ma-ŋ?*, *Pol-ya-ba-ŋ?* 'Have you been?', in the present: *Pəl-če-me-ŋ?* *Pəl-če-be-ŋ?* 'Do you know?'

Similar forms are mentioned in Čertykova (1992: 70) for the sub-dialect of the Verkh-Kindirla village (also the Beltir dialect). For instance, past forms: *Paryamiŋ?* 'Did you (singular) go?', *Paryamar?* 'Did you (plural) go?', *Toyasxamiŋ?* 'Did you (singular) meet?'; present forms: *Polčeməŋ?* 'Are you (singular) usually?', *Saxtap-čemer?* 'Are you (plural) waiting?'; future forms: *Paramiŋ?* 'will you (singular) go?'; nominal predicates: *Papuškadamīŋ?* 'Are you (singular) at grandma's?', *Əžezəməŋ?* 'Are you (singular) his mother?' (with different rules of vowel reduction in affixes than those in our and Borgoyakov's material, or with different phonological settings of recording).

- 9 M. Borgoyakov writes that the Beltir form ends in *-ma* while the *-ba* form is Sagay; in our Beltir material, both are encountered, while there are no such forms in the Askiz sub-dialect of Sagay.

This position in a Khakas word form<sup>10</sup> allows for inserting other particles (we have found some instances with the assertive *-OK*); cf. Beltir (34).

- (34) Beltir dialect  
*Anda, abakan ol sar-in-da, tajkala-p, me, čör-gen-oχ-siη.*  
 there Abakan that side-POS3-LOC be.in.tajga-PCONV well walk-PP-ASS-2SG  
 ‘There, on that side of Abakan, being in the taiga, well, you walked indeed.’ (IE 114, Butrakhty)

The insertion of the interrogative particle *\*mO*<sup>11</sup> into synthetic verbal forms occurs in different branches of Turkic languages; see (35) and (36).

- (35) Kumyk, before a personal marker on the Future *-Ar*  
*Bar-ar-siz-mi?* vs. *Bar-ar-mi-siz?*  
 go-FUT-2PL-Q go-FUT-Q-2PL  
 ‘Will you (plural) go?’ (Dmitriev 1940: 102)
- (36) Turkish, before temporal affixes derived from temporal forms of a copula  
*Git-se mi-y-di-k?*  
 go-COND Q-COP-PAST-1PL  
 ‘Should we go?’
- Başla-mış mı-y-dı-nız?*  
 start-INDIR.PERF Q-COP-PAST-1PL  
 ‘Have you started?’
- Burada mı-y-mış?*  
 here Q-COP-INDIR.PERF  
 ‘This was here?’ (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 104)
- (37) Turkish, before pronominal personal markers and the *-Dir* focus particle:  
*Gid-iyor mu-sun?*  
 go-PRES Q-2SG  
 ‘Are you going?’
- Hazır mı-sınız?*  
 ready Q-2PL  
 ‘Are you ready?’

10 In Literary Khakas, too; see CXJa, Grammar chapter, pos. 19 in the word form scheme.

11 See the reconstruction reasoning in (Dybo 2017: 129–131).

*Ev-de*        *mi-dir?*  
 home-LOC    Q-DIR  
 ‘Is s/he at home?’ (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 103)

We see that the Q particle is usually inserted into the former analytical word forms, where the final part of the word form had historically been separated by a word boundary. On the other hand, pronominal personal markers that have been derived from postpositive personal pronouns have gone through the stage of clitics. But finite forms with possessive or other personal markers (such as the past tense form *-TI*, the conditional form *-SA*, and the imperative-optative forms) have never demonstrated any existence of inter-word boundaries before person markers.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, it is the possessive person markers (the “short” ones) that are used in the first and second persons in our examples with a form-internal interrogative particle.<sup>13</sup>

As is shown by Borgoyakov (1975: 175–177), Dybo (2017: 134–135), and others, the possessive marker of the first person singular *-(I)m* has spread in most of the Sayan-Altai idioms in all “participial” verbal forms of finite predication thanks to the analogy to “purely” finite ones. The pronominal person marker *-PI**n* occurs with nominal predicates and rarely with verbal ones, often in parallel with *-(I)m*.

The possessive second-person singular marker *-(I)ŋ* was recorded by M. Borgoyakov in Shor finite verbal forms of nominal origin; according to Dyrenkova (1941: 183–194), this flection is compulsory in all Shor dialects in the negated past *-PAA**n*, while in Literary Shor (based on the Mrassu dialect) it is used in the present tense *-čA*<sup>14</sup> and in the negated present *-PAA**nčA*. It is optional for the Kondom sub-dialects in the past in *-GA*(*n*) (*-GA-ŋ*); recorded for some sub-dialects in the future in *-Ar* (*-Ar-Iŋ*). Simultaneously, in some sub-dialects, the flection *-SIŋ* is also recorded: in the present form *-čA-SIŋ*, in the negated present form *-PAA**nčA-SIŋ*. The second-person plural marker in Shor finite verb forms of nominal origin always seems to be of the pronominal type, *-SA*(*A*)*r*.<sup>15</sup>

12 For more on the origin of personal-numeral markers, see Dybo (2017).

13 D. Patačakova’s suggestion, cited in Čertykova (1992), that these forms developed as a result of the phonetic contraction of the particle with the pronominal markers cannot be phonetically proven.

14 This form also appears in our materials on the Shor dialect of Khakas: *Xaja parčəŋ?* ‘Where are you going?’.

15 The pronominal person marker of the second person plural *-SIŋ-LAr* > *-SIŋ-nAr* > *-SIŋAr* > *-SAAr* > *-SAr* is a result of an analogical formation using the plural affix on the second-person singular *-SIŋ*, formed in analogy with the possessive marker *-(I)ŋ-LAr* > *-(I)ŋ-nAr* > *-(I)ŋAr* > *-AAr*. There are also inflectional *siler*, *sirer*, noted as the second-person plural markers (Fuyu Kyrgyz *-Srlr*, Tuba *-sler*), and used as clitics in Tuvinian and Tofan; this is a new pronominal formation (see Dybo 2017: 136). Castrén (1857: 31) cites the examples *sêler*, *sêlar*, which Borgoyakov quotes and qualifies as “unclear”; they had been taken from Karagass (Tofan), and not Koybal (Khakas); i.e. they are, indeed, postpositive pronouns.

In Middle Chulym, according to Birjukovič (1981: 46), the present form *-A-TI* receives possessive personal markers (*-A-TI-m*, *-A-TI-η*, *-A-TI*, *-A-TI-Pls*, *-A-TI-ηnAr*). Birjukovič considers this tense to be a historically analytical form with *tur-* ‘to stand’. However, there is also a form *-Tlr* that opposes the form *-A-TI* as marked in actionality, which receives pronominal markers (as well as any form with an auxiliary verb). The *-A-TI* is probably a result of merging between the action participle on *-A(j)* (cf. *sanidi* from *sana-* ‘to think’) and the *\*e(r)-di* preterite. The possessive markers can also be used on the past tense forms (positive and negative) *-GAN*, *-PAAn*: *-gaam*, *-gaanη*, *-gaabis*, *-gaanar*; see Birjukovič (1981: 64). Other Chulym forms, including the future *-Ar*, receive only pronominal markers.

Similar phenomena in Kypchak languages are listed in Dybo (2017: 144–146) (particularly for Tatar and Bashkir dialects). As a whole this material shows that we are dealing with a gradual penetration of the possessive personal affixes into the original sphere of usage of pronominal person markers, and passing the stage of combining markers of both types in one paradigm. According to the material at hand, the process begins with the forms of the first-person singular, then continues with the second-person singular and the second-person plural (first-person plural forms are identical or very close in both series of markers). The order in which the aspect-temporal forms derived from verbal nominals are included in this process seems to be random, by the data we have now. However, verbal nominals used as finite forms with possessive or pronominal flexions have not yet been thoroughly documented and studied for Turkic dialects. We must note that in ATNG, this problem is reflected only in one map (No. 98), which does not differentiate between the present forms in *-A(j)* and the future forms in *-Ar*; in DABJa (2005) information on these flexions is missing entirely. However, as can be seen in the material above, when collecting dialectal data one ought to pay attention to the use of personal markers of different persons and numbers in different tenses, while also making note of whether or not synthetic negation and synthetic interrogative markers occur. Consistent research on the use of both types of markers in different synthetic forms can help us to define dialectal areas more thoroughly.

## Conclusion

The phenomena noted here are characteristic for the Beltir dialect material, but they are very rare in our materials on the Askiz sub-dialect of Sagay, the Kachin dialect and different sub-dialects of Shor. Judging by the data, they are important parameters of inter-idiom variation not only for the Khakas dialects, but for Turkic languages and dialects as a whole. It is important to determine the areas of spreading for each of them, and relevant questions should accordingly be included in dialectological surveys.

**List of abbreviations**

1,2,3	Person	IRR	Irrealis
ABL	Ablative	LOC	Locative
ACC	Accusative	NEG	Negation
ADD	Additive particle	OPT	Optative
ASS	Assertive particle	PCONV	Converb <i>-(I)p</i>
ASSUM	Assumptive participle	PERF	Perfective
ATTR	Attributivizer	PL	Plural
CAUS	Causative	POS	Possessive
COM	Comitative	PP	Past participle (the <i>-GA(N)</i> form in Khakas and Shor; when used as a finite predicate, it expresses unmarked past tense semantics)
COND	Conditional mood	PRES	Present
COP	Copula	PREDPL	Plural Of Predicate
DAT	Dative	PRESPT	Present (imperfective) participle
DUR	Durative	PROL	Prolative / equative
EMPH	Emphatic particle	PTCL	Particle
FUT	Future participle	Q	Question
GEN	Genitive	REFL	Reflexive
HAB	Habitual participle	RPAST	Recent past (past <i>-DI</i> in Khakas and Shor)
IMP.INCL	Imperative minimal inclusive (referring to the 1st and 2nd persons: you:SG and me)	SG	Singular
INDIR	Indirect evidentiality	-	Inflectional morpheme boundary
INDEF	Indefinite pronoun	=	Derivational morpheme boundary
INF	Infinitive	:	Fusion
INSTR	Instrumental	.	Cumulation
IPF	Imperfective		

**References**

- Alpatov, V. M. 2018. *Slovo i časti reči* [Word and parts of speech]. Moscow: Jazyki Slavjanskix Kultur.
- ATNG — *Atlas tatarskix narodnyx govorov* [Atlas of Tatar folk dialects]. 2011–2012. <http://newipi.antat.ru/atlas/maps.html?mapnom=98>. Accessed 12.12.2018

- Baskakov, N. A. et al. 1975. (ed.) *Grammatika xakasskogo jazyka* [The grammar of Khakas]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Birjukovič, R. M. 1981. *Morfologija čulymsko-tjurksskogo jazyka 2* [Morphology of the Chulym language 2]. Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo universiteta.
- Borgoyakov, M. I. 1973. Bel'tirskij govor sagajsskogo dialekta [Beltir variant of the Saghai dialect]. In: Patačakova, D. F. (ed.) *Dialekty xakasskogo jazyka* [The dialects of Khakas]. Abakan: XakNIJALI. 80–104.
- Borgoyakov, M. I. 1975. Razvitie form sprjaženija v xakasskom jazyke [The development of conjugation forms in Khakas]. In: *Učenyje zapiski NIJALI. Serija 3* (filologičeskaja). [Transactions of KhakNIJALI. Series 3 (philology)]. Abakan. 20, 161–181.
- Castrén, M. A. 1857. *Versuch einer koibalischen und karagassischen Sprachlehre*. Saint Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Čebodaeva, L. I. 2011. *Po dorogam predkov (rasskazy) 2*. [By the roads of ancestors (short stories) 2.]. Abakan: Xakasskoe knižnoe izdatelstvo.
- Čeremisina, M. I. & Brodskaja, L. M. & Gorelova, L.M., et al. 1984. *Predikativnoe sklonenie pričastij v altajskix jazykax*. [Predicative declination of participles in Altaic languages]. Novosibirsk: Nauka, Sibirskoe otdelenie.
- Čeremisina, M. I. & Brodskaja, L. M. & Skribnik, E. K., et al. 1986. *Strukturnyje tipy sintetičeskix polipredikativnyx konstrukcij v jazykax raznyx sistem* [Structural types of synthetic polypredicative constructions in languages of different language systems]. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Čertykova, M. D. 1992. Affiksy skazuemosti v govore naselenija ulusa Verx-Kindirla [The affixes of predicativity in the idiom of Ust-Kindirla]. In: Ažiganova, O. P. (ed.) *Xakasskaja dialektologija* [Khakas dialectology]. Abakan: Xakasskoe knižnoe izdatelstvo. 65–71.
- CXJa – *Electronic corpus of Khakas language*. <http://khakas.altaiica.ru/> Accessed 12.12.2018
- DABJa 2005 – Xisamitdinova F. G. (ed.) *Dialektologičeskij atlas baškirskogo jazyka* [The dialect atlas of Bashkir]. Ufa: Gilem.
- Dmitriev, N. K. 1940. *Grammatika kumyjskogo jazyka* [The grammar of Kumyk]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Dybo, A. V. 2017. Ešče raz ob istorii pokazatelej lično-čislavogo sprjaženija v turksskix jazykax [Again on the subject of the history of personal-numeral conjugation in Turkic languages]. *Ural-Altai Studies* 3: 26, 127–150.
- Dyrenkova, N. P. 1941. *Grammatika šorskogo jazyka* [The grammar of Shor]. Moscow & Leningrad: Nauka.
- Erdal, M. 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Funk, D. A. 2012. *Šorskij geroičeskij epos 3*. [Shor heroic epics 3.]. Kemerovo: Primula.
- Funk, D. A. 2018 (ed.) *Šorskie epičeskije skazanija v zapisjax W.W.Radlowa* [Shor epic tales recorded by W. Radlow]. Astana: Gylym.
- Gleason, H. 1955. *Introduction to descriptive linguistics*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Göksel, A. & Kerlake, C. 2005. *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Isxakov, F. G. & Palmbax, A. A. 1961. *Grammatika tuvinskogo jazyka* [The grammar of Tuvan]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Martin, S. E. 1992. *A reference grammar of Korean*. Rutland & Vermont & Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.

- Najip, E. N. 1975. *Tjurkojazyčnyj pamjatnik XIV veka Gulistan Sejfa Sarai i ego jazyk* [The Turkic monument of XIV century *Gulistan* by Seif Sarai and its language]. Alma-Ata: Gylym.
- Nevskaya, I. A. et al. (ed.) 2017. *Grammatika sovremennogo altajskogo jazyka. Morfologija* [The grammar of modern Altaic]. Gorno-Altai: NII Altaistiki im. Surazakova.
- Rassadin, V. I. 1978. Morfologija tofalarskogo jazyka v sravnitel'nom osveščennii [The morphology of Tofalar in a comparative perspective]. Moscow: Nauka.
- SIGTYa 1986 – Serebrjannikov, B. A. & Gajieva, N. Z. 1986. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov: Sintaksis* [Comparative grammar of Turkic languages: Syntax]. Moscow: Nauka.
- SIGTYa 2002 – *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov: regional'nye rekonstrukcii* [Comparative grammar of Turkic languages: Regional reconstructions]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Šulbaeva, V. G. 1977. *Syn müüzə: pjesa* [Antlers of a red deer]. *Ax Tasxyl* (Abakan) 25: 89–119.
- Tenišev, È. R. 1976a. *Stroj salarskogo jazyka* [The structure of Salar]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Tenišev, È. R. 1976b. *Stroj saryg-jugurskogo jazyka* [The structure of Yellow-Uyghur]. Moscow: Nauka.