Werk

Titel: Middle Chulym: The State of the art

Autor: Lemskaya, Valeriya

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2010

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0014|LOG_0019

Middle Chulym: The state of the art

Valeriya Lemskaya

This paper aims at making a critical analysis of the data presented in a recently published book (Li et al. 2008) on one of the two sub-dialects of the Middle Chulym dialect of the Chulym Turkic language, one of the highly endangered languages of Siberia. The main point of discussion is some data and occasional analytical issues in this book (phonology, morphology, vocabulary, etc.) in the context of those presented in other publications on the language, and compared with my own fieldwork carried out mostly with speakers in the community neighboring the one whose sub-dialect is described in the reviewed publication.

Valeriya Lemskaya, Department of Foreign Languages, Tomsk State Pedagogical University, Komsomolskiy 75-425, 634041, Tomsk, Russia. Email: lemskaya@tspu.edu.ru

0. General remarks

A Study of the Middle Chulym Dialect of the Chulym Language (Li et al. 2008) is one of the few works published on Chulym Turkic in English; I think the only book which had appeared in English on this language is Pomorska 2004, which deals with a rather limited topic. Li et al. 2008 is an attempt at a comprehensive systematic description of the Middle Chulym dialect; it portrays various levels of the language (phonology, morphology, syntax). Other works that recently appeared include Anderson & Harrison 2003, 2006, Lemskaya & Mindiyarova 2007, Lemskaya 2008. There are several papers to appear, e.g. Lemskaya forthcoming.

Being fully based on field data, Li et al. 2008 is an important linguistic source. The authors are clearly precise in transcribing the language and transliterating names, places from Cyrillic etc. throughout the book. The field project is described in every detail on pp. 8-11. All the linguistic data are presented fairly, i.e. in accordance with what the authors recorded, not what is implied or published by others. The fact that the authors produced the book with little or no consultation of previous research has both positive and negative aspects. The analysis of the data has been carried out without the outside bias coming from other scholars' interpretations—e.g. the observation on the "forms with third person possessive suffix" "to be regarded as the basic forms by the informant frequently" on p. 32. On the other hand, consulting legacy data and previously published analysis would have given the authors added explanatory power and hints for original analysis—as on p. 80, where the verbal forms in *-GAč* are viewed as "Future II": I am not aware of such an inter-

pretation in the previous publications; Birjukovič 1981: 73 considers this suffix to form the optative mood and gives a whole paradigm for it (see below.)

Li et al. 2008 opens with a five-page overview on the Chulym Turkic people and language. Unfortunately, the sources of the authors for this description seem to have been web articles such as those from *Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia*, which appear to have inherent inconsistencies and mistakes, and one article by Anderson & Harrison 2003. No information is given regarding the time when the authors retrieved the data. A broader academic description of the people and their language can be found in many works by Dul'zon (1966, 1973, etc.), Birjukovič (in: L'vova et al. 1991: 106-125, 1981, etc.) The most recent publications describing the present state of Chulym Turkic are Anderson & Harrison 2006 and Lemskaya & Mindiyarova 2007.

The remarks below are based on either the publications on the dialects of Chulym Turkic by different scholars (see Bibliography), or my own experience of field work among the speakers of the Lower Chulym and Middle Chulym dialects in the years 2006-2008. I should mention that I was able to work mostly with speakers of a sub-dialect neighboring the dialect spoken by the person who was the consultant for Li et al. 2008 (the Melet sub-dialect in the terminology of Dul'zon 1966: 464, the "Upper" Chulym dialect in the terminology of Anderson & Harrison 2006: 48), but also—though to a much lesser extent—with exactly the same consultant.

1. The "Chulym Language" linguonym

Li et al. 2008 call Chulym Turkic "the Chulym Language". In my opinion, this may imply only one language spoken in the area of the Chulym River. However, historically, the lower part of the Chulym in the Tomsk Region has been the homeland of some Selkup (Samoyed, Ostyak-Samoyed) groups, its upper flow regions in Khakassia and the Krasnoyarsk Territory—of the Kyzyl Turkic groups; along with that, the Chulym has, for the last four centuries, been the homeland of a Russian-speaking population, too. It would be more neutral to call it *Chulym Turkic* (following Radloff 1868: XIV; Dul'zon 1959: 93, L'vova et al. 1991: 6, Pomorska 2004: 19), a term which denotes both the linguistic and the territorial features of the ethnic group in question.

Li et al. 2008 write: "The Chulyms, also called Chulym Tatars..." (p. 1), which is not correct at present. 'Chulym Tatars' used to be a commonly accepted linguonym (as e.g. in Dul'zon 1952), but it has not been in use during the last four decades (see Dul'zon 1966 and later publications.)

The statement "[t]he Chulyms are comprised of the Küerik, Kecik and the Chulym Proper" (Li et al. 2008: 1) begs the question of what is meant by "the Chulym Proper". The quoted Wikipedia source is short and does not, in this case, reflect any serious information. Dul'zon described Chulym Turkic as consisting of two dialects – Lower and Middle, each having sub-dialects which were named after the historical *volost*s (Russian for 'province, political unit') of the 17th century that had been gov-

erned by the indigenous communities (in this case, the Chulym Turks.) Thus, the sub-dialects of the Lower Chulym dialect are said to have been the following: (1) Küärik (Radloff's spelling, see Radloff 1893-1911) sub-dialect: the indigenous name is *küärik jon*, Koryukovskaya volost (the source for this and the subsequent indigenous and historical names is Dul'zon 1973: 17); (2) Ketsik sub-dialect: no indigenous name is given, but the corresponding *volost* is said to be that of Kurchikova; (3) Yezhi sub-dialect *je:ži jon*, Baygul'skaya volost; (4) Yatsi sub-dialect *jatsi jon*, Yachinskaya volost; (5) Chibi sub-dialect *tš'iby d'on*, Kyzyldeyeva volost.

The Middle Chulym dialect comprised according to Dul'zon two sub-dialects: (1) Tutal sub-dialect *tutał tš'onu*, Tutal'skaya volost; (2) Melet sub-dialect *pilet tš'onu*, Meletskaya volost (Dul'zon 1973: 17; see also L'vova et al. 1991; also a more concise electronic version form of it in L'vova no date.) The Küärik, Ketsik and Yatsi sub-dialects were already extinct during the time of Dul'zon's field trips in the 1940-1950s, and there remained only one speaker of the Chibi sub-dialect (Dul'zon 1973: 21-22.) I am aware of only one single speaker of the Yezhi sub-dialect now (Lemskaya forthcoming; also mentioned in Li et al. 2008: 8.)

Different authors have always stated that the Tutal sub-dialect of Middle Chulym is spoken within the borders of the Tomsk Region, in the middle flow of the Chulym River, in what is now the Tegul'detskiy Subregion (the region's capital being Tegul'det Village); its Melet sub-dialect, on the other hand, is spoken in the Krasnoyarsk Territory, also in the middle flow of the Chulym River, in the Tyukhtetskiy Subregion with the vast majority of speakers in Pasechnoye Village (see also Birjukovič 1981: 6, L'vova et al. 1991: 4, and others.) Dul'zon has clearly shown that the two sub-dialects, though showing a number of variations, belong to the same dialect (Dul'zon 1973: 23, and other publications); this view has been taken over and developed in academic literature (Pritsak 1959: 622-623; all publications by Birjukovič, etc.)

The only consultant for Li et al. 2008, a resident of the Tegul'detskiy Subregion, speaks the Tutal sub-dialect, while the so-called 'Upper Chulym dialect' (referring to that spoken up the Chulym River outside the Tomsk Region in Anderson & Harrison 2006) is nothing other than the Melet sub-dialect of the Middle Chulym dialect in Dul'zon's terminology. As mentioned above, the upper flow of the Chulym River is populated by another Turkic group, the Kyzyls. The relationship of the Chulym Turks to the Kyzyl (and thus the Khakas) is well described in Dul'zon 1959. These statements undoubtedly refer to the discussion of the meaning of the terms 'dialect' and 'sub-dialect', as well as 'dialect' and 'language'. Without going deeper into this matter, I would like to mention another point. Both the sub-dialects listed by Dul'zon and the division made by Anderson and Harrison draw a border between (sub-)dialects on the basis of the historical situation with the *volosts*. But if we ascribe a separate dialect to every geographical *volost*, we should not forget the fact that there were at least 14 Chulym-Turkic *volosts* already in the 18th c. (*Russia* 1780: 312), and that the Chulym-Turkic language is a geographical rather than a linguistic term. In its diachronic perspective (without any written standard and/or

norm) it comprised a (sub-)dialectal continuum with the neighboring (sub-)dialects showing only slight differentiation, while those at the extremes or the periphery of the area (in the lower and middle flow of the Chulym River) were rather mutually unintelligible to the speakers (Dul'zon 1973: 16.) For the reasons mentioned I reject the term 'Upper Chulym dialect' and follow Dul'zon's terminology. The question remains: *What is meant by "the Chulym Proper"?*

2. Self-identification of the Chulym Turkic people

The statement that the Chulym Turkic native designation for the language, namely *ös tılı* (also after Anderson & Harrison 2003; 2006), a derivation from their naming of the Chulym River (*ȫs* in the Tutal, and *ūs* / *ös* in the Melet sub-dialects, confirmed by my field data), goes back to the Old Turkic word "*ügüz*" 'river' (Li et al. 2008: 5) is rather an unproven hypothesis. According to M. Ölmez (personal communication), there are cases of the word *öz* being used in the meaning of 'river, brook' already in the Old Turkic, as well as modern dialects in Turkey, its etymology probably being 'water flowing in the valley' (cf. Clauson 1972: 278, *Türkiye Türkçesi ağızları sözlüğü, Derleme sözlüğü* 1977: 3367.) M. Erdal (also personal communication) suggested that other cases of the *ögü* combination of Old Turkic turning into a single vowel in Chulym Turkic may prove the connection between the modern Chulym Turkic *ȫs* / *ūs* and the Old Turkic *ögüz*. So far I have been unable to find examples of the kind, which actually speaks in favor of the *ȫs* / *ös* / *ūs* < *ȫz etymology.

I should also mention that the village of Novo-Tarlagany, where V. M. Gabov, the consultant for Li et al. 2008, was born (as noted on p. 9), does not exist now, as many other Chulym Turkic settlements referred to in the previous publications. V. M. Gabov seems to be the youngest speaker not of Middle Chulym (which is written on p. 10, and concluded after Anderson & Harrison 2006: 47-48), but of the Tutal sub-dialect. In my field work I have discovered younger speakers (in their late 40s) of the Melet sub-dialect of Middle Chulym, which Anderson & Harrison call 'Upper Chulym dialects'.

The statement in Li et al. 2008: 1 that "The core part of the Chulyms are descended from the Khanty (= Ostyaks) and/or Kets" shows a glaring error: It is not the Khanty, but other people—the Selkup (Samoyeds), also bearing the name 'Ostyak' in the past—that are supposed to have been Turkicized (along with the Ket) and form the present Chulym Turkic nation. Dul'zon has shown this in several publications, notably 1954.

3. Middle Chulym phonology

The whole section on phonology in Li et al. 2008 represents generalizations based on empirical data, i.e. word lists with corresponding English translations and comparisons from Birjukovič 1984. It is not explained why this particular word list was chosen, or whether the research was specifically done to compare the field data with

that published in the work mentioned. This source is not used for data comparison in the subsequent sections of the book, which in my opinion deprives both the authors and the readers of very important comparative and contrastive diachronic material.

The word stress in the examples of the *Vowels* subsection is not marked. This hampers the reader's comprehension of the data, especially under such terms as "long vowels" and the "elongated pronunciation" (Li et al. 2008: 13.) It is also not mentioned which words were extracted from a narrative context and which were elicited in isolation. To my mind, the words elicited repeatedly in isolation may show higher instance of long vowels compared to those observed in a discourse environment. Some of the quotations of the Russian sentences asked as stimuli show incorrect grammar; it is not clear whether instances such as "Какая площадь город?" (Li et al. 2008: 51) are misprints or whether this was really what the informant was asked.

It is stated that the [æ] "allophone is acoustically very similar to [a]" (Li et al. 2008: 14); the authors quote the informant as having said *anajek* 'wife' while the variant they expected was *ɐnɐjɐk* (cf. "*änäqəm* 'the wife of the brother of my father who is older than me'" recorded by Dul'zon 1954: 72.) Based on my experience of working with the speaker of Middle Chulym Mr. Gabov, Middle Chulym front phonemes are generally highly centralized as in other Siberian Turkic languages (Seljutina forthcoming; see also Birjukovič 1979b.) For example, the vowel [ø] is more central, very close to [o]: *køpɛ* 'how many, how much' <*köp pä* 'is it many/much?' (cf.Li et al. 2008: 16.)

Some parts of the subsection on *Consonants* in Li et al. 2008 should be revised. On p. 20 they write, e.g., that [k] is a velar plosive while [q] is a uvular plosive *phoneme*, confusing the phonemes and allophones: [q] is an allophone of /k/ because it occurs exclusively in the environment of back vowels and shows no minimal pairs with [k] (see Birjukovič 1979b.) The quality of the [v] phone is not given; it is not present in the consonant phoneme table but appears in some examples of sound alternation: *parva:ɣɨl* vs. *parba:ɣɨl* 'don't go!', *pajna* vs. *vajna* Russian 'war' (p. 21.) This sound is not a labio-dental but rather a bilabial consonant close to English [w] (Birjukovič 1979b: 5 and my data.) Some other symbols occurring in the examples in Li et al. 2008 are not adequately defined either: "ʁ" in *paɫiʁ* 'expensive' (p. 28-29), "ā" in *köpäs pä de āl* 'several villages, some villages' (p. 30.)

The /ʤ/ phoneme is said to be a "[v]oiceless postalveolar affricate /ʤ/" (p. 26), which must be a misprint, for the phoneme is *voiced*. A better explanation is needed regarding the fact that "[g] alternates freely with [ɣ]" (p. 27.) It is true that /ɣ/ (transcribed as "ɣ" in the subsequent sections of Li et al. 2008) occurs "in non-initial positions", but further analysis is required regarding the statement that it "occurs mainly in words with back vowels" (p. 28.) The neighboring Melet sub-dialect shows numerous examples of the occurrence of /ɣ/ in the environment of front vowels, also due to alternation: e.g. *iɣi* 'two', *tilii ɣe* 'to search', *ädär ɣe* 'to do', *pü ɣünde* 'in the field', etc.

4. Middle Chulym morphology and vocabulary

The lexical combination *köpäs pä de* is regarded as a simple "word" in Li et al. 2008: 30, where it is translated as 'several, some' but not explained properly, though a comment is later made that *köpäs* "may go back to **köp ämäs*" (p. 70.) In my field data on the Melet sub-dialect there are many cases of *kömäs* 'some, a little' which obviously goes back to **köp ämäs* 'many/much not', while the former combination is rather a development from **köp ämäs pä* (with the interrogative particle.) Some other unexplained cases, on p. 42 for example, are in fact contractions: *anzōndïn* 'next time' <**an-ïŋ soŋ-ïn-dïn* 'it-GEN subsequent-POSS3SG-ABL' (Birjukovič 1984: 29.)

The so-called instrumental-comitative case has (unlike in publications by Dul'zon, Birjukovič and others) not been included in the Middle Chulym case paradigm in Li et al. 2008 (as it is written, the "*-(BI)la* (<*-birle/-bile*)" is "a suffixed postposition": the *Cases* subsection on p. 30; also p. 64.) A comparative description and diachronic study of Turkic affixes going back to the postposition varieties *birlä*, *bilä* and *bilän* is given in Schönig 1998. The "*-BILA*" affix had long ago entered the Chulym Turkic case system and was in fact documented as a suffix for the Lower Chulym variety by Dul'zon 1966: 450: "*была, бъла – bulä, bälä, пыла, пъла – nulä, nälä*", while the Middle Chulym dialect shows other forms: *-B(I)lA* (with an optional *-lA*; "*ла – le*" in Dul'zon 1966: 450) for the Tutal sub-dialect, and *-LAŋ* (with *l* assimilated to *n* after *m, n, ŋ, j* sonorants) in the Melet sub-dialect (Birjukovič 1979a: 39-40.) The degree of grammaticalization of this postposition in Chulym Turkic (it may be added directly to the word stem, but not to the form of the genitive) proves that the element has entered the system of cases: *til-le* 'language-INS' (Anderson & Harrison 2006: 59); *adaj-laŋ* 'dog-INS', *kizi-näŋ* 'person-INS' (field data of the Melet sub-dialect.)

A possible explanation regarding the fact that "[t]he forms with third person possessive suffix seem to be regarded as the basic forms by the informant frequently" (Li et al. 2008: 32) is offered by Birjukovič 1979a: 28, in whose opinion the basic meaning such forms convey is that of *inalienability*.

The subsection on the dative case in Li et al. 2008 opens with the statement that this case "is marked by the suffix *-GA*," and "[t]he suffix can be *-A* after the third-person possessive suffix *-I(n.)*" (p. 32.) The *+Ā* suffix is not only used in this position: it merges with the word stem ending in a vowel to form a long low unrounded vowel, in cases where there is no possessive suffix between them (see Birjukovič 1979a: 33.) The quality of the stem vowel determines the frontness or backness of the suffix vowel: *tura* 'town' + *+Ā* > *turā* 'city.DAT' or *kiži* 'person' + *+Ā* > *kižē* 'to the person' (Birjukovič 1979a: 33.) A question remaining in this case is whether the omission of the possessive marker observed here is a result of the influence from Russian (which has no such grammatical category.) It is also mentioned that the ablative case "expresses point of departure" and "denotes the material from which something is made" (Li et al. 2008: 33.) Later on p. 50 the authors give an example

where the ablative has a meaning of comparison, but they do not mention this in the subsection on this case: *po köl te γ köl-dün ulu γ* 'this lake is bigger than that lake.' In the existing bibliography on Chulym-Turkic, the ablative has been said to have several other meanings as well: that of reason, time and price (значение "меры (стоимости)": see Birjukovič 1979a: 46-48).

When quoting different case forms of the Chulym Turkic recorded by Dul'zon, Li et al. (2008: 37) mix up two dialects: the article by Dul'zon 1966 described mainly the Lower Chulym dialect with some minor notes on the Middle Chulym dialect. That is why the forms given in square brackets (i.e. all forms of the locative and the second and third person plural of the ablative case) may turn out to be different in Middle Chulym. Luckily, the forms from Dul'zon 1966 coincide with the Middle Chulym material given in Birjukovič 1980: 133.

Li et al. 2008 sometimes reconstruct forms in an unwarranted way, e.g.: "The <u>correct</u> instrumental forms of the second person singular and the third person singular <u>may be</u> *sēŋbile* and *ānïŋbïla* (or *āŋbïla*) respectively" (p. 37, the *Personal Pronouns* subsection; underlined emphases added – *V. L.*). This statement is surprising: firstly, the instrumental is not included in the case system as they describe it on p. 30: "*-(BI)la* (< *birle/bile*)… is not a case suffix but a suffixed postposition"; so the link between the reconstructed forms and the personal pronoun *case* system is not clear. Secondly, the expressions "correct forms", "may be", and the suggestion of reconstructed forms without an asterisk sign are rather unscientific.

Paradigms of Middle Chulym personal pronouns were given in Birjukovič 1981: 17, so the suggested instrumental form of the third person singular **ānïŋbïla* corresponds to *a:nïŋbïla* (*а:ныҥбъла*), and *a:nïŋvïla* (*а:ныҥвъла*.) However, the latter source does not specify what dialect these examples belong to. Archival field notes show a different form of this personal pronoun form in the Tutal sub-dialect: *olaŋlaŋ* (*олаҥлаҥ*) (Boni 1973:167.) My field data on the Lower Chulym show *anïmïla* in this meaning. All these forms should be further tested with the native speakers of the language.

I do not, at present, have Middle Chulym forms to prove or contradict the pronominal forms **silärniŋdin* and **olarnïŋdïn* proposed in Li et al. 2008: 37 as "the ablative forms of the second person plural and the third person plural", but a Lower Chulym text recorded by Dul'zon 1952: 177 contains only *olardïn* as the ablative case of the latter; cf. also Old Turkic *siznidin* and *olardïn* mentioned in Erdal 2004: 192 and 199.

Unlike the data in the *Phonology* section, the language material presented in the *Morphology* section in Li et al. 2008 was not compared with the Chulym Turkic-Russian glossary published by Birjukovič 1984: 26-77, nor with her other publications on the language. It should be mentioned here that the data on both subdialects of the Middle Chulym dialect were usually presented mixed in the publications of the past, with rare notations of "Tutal" and "Melet"; this on the whole does hamper the dialectological study of Chulym Turkic. A comparison of the data recorded in Li et al. 2008 with those published previously could give important dialectological re-

sults as well as allow tracing any possible changes in the lexicon of the Middle Chulym dialect: e.g., both *ana* and *anɣa* were recorded as equivalents of "he/she(obl)-DAT" (p. 39); only *ana* was noted in Birjukovič 1981: 17; the same form is also found in my field data on the Melet sub-dialect. The data on the interrogatives also show interesting varieties across different dialects: *nȫmä* for 'what; why' (p.44), my field data on the Melet sub-dialect show *nöɣa* 'why', while Birjukovič noted it as *noɣa* (Birjukovič 1981: 20-21.) What is more interesting, the same publication claims the accusative for *nömä* to be *nömäni* (Birjukovič 1981: 20), our field data show *nȫnü*, and Li et al. 2008 *nȫni* (p. 44.)

In the subsection on demonstrative pronouns of Li et al. 2008: 40, two forms are translated with the same English expression: "*po* 'this', *ol* 'that' and *teɣ* 'that'", but the difference between the latter two is not specified. *Ol* and *teɣ* are not identical in their meaning and also function unlike demonstratives in other Turkic languages (e.g. Turkish *bu, şu, o*). Birjukovič 1981: 18-19 mentions that *ol* is rather used in anaphoric function ("в заместительной функции".) Two examples from this subsection in Li et al. 2008 show rather interesting data (p. 41): *a po-zu-n čol-da* 'and this-3p.sg.POSS-ACC way-LOC'; *a po mon-zu-n čol-da* 'and this this(obl)-3p.sg.POSS-ACC way-LOC'; *ā-zï pïjaq* 'that(obl)-3p.sg.POSS roe deer' with the unusual *pozun* and *monzun* (cf. Old Turkic accusative forms *bunï/munï* Erdal 2004: 199) and *āzï* (cf. Old Turkic nominative *ol* and oblique *an+* forms Erdal 2004: 199).

An unusual lexeme appears in one of the examples in the *Ordinals* subsection – *leksturnï*: *ič po lekstur-nï üčünčü-zü-n kün-ge* 'drink this medicine-ACC third-3p.pl.POS-ACC day-DAT' (Li et al. 2008: 56.) This is followed by *ič po mekstur-u-n üčünčü-zü-n kün-de* 'drink this medicine-3p.pl.POSS-ACC third-3p.pl.POSS-ACC day-LOC' (both sentences translated as 'Take this medicine three times a day'.) The footnote on *meksturun* suggests that "*leksturnï* is expected here instead of *meksturun*". In fact, both *lekstur* and *mekstur* come from Russian, the latter from *микстура* 'mixture; liquid medicine'. The former appears to be a spontaneous blend of *лекарство* 'medicine' with *микстура*, which the informant comes up with. What is more, the Russian accusative form of *микстура* is *микстуру*, with an /u/ sound at the end; so the *meksturun* form may be associated with that. It is also unclear why the glosses in these two sentences describe the possessive markers to be of the plural, but not singular, person.

Li et al. 2008 recorded the word *tïʃə* (< Russian "тысяча") for 'thousand' (p. 14.) Interestingly, my Middle Chulym field data (Melet sub-dialect) also show *tïšə*, while my Lower Chulym field data show *mïn* < common Turkic *mïŋ*. Later the publication mentions that "[t]he informant gave the forms *mēŋ čēgirbe pala* 'my twenty children'... to the questions 'my twentieth child'" (p. 57.) In order to acquire the ordinal form of the numeral 'twenty' it would, I think, be better for the context to have material objects, not 'children'.

5. Middle Chulym verb forms

The infinitive is said to be generally "expressed with the suffix *-arɣa/-ärge*" (Li et al. 2008: 66); if the verb base ends with a vowel, the latter "and the vowel of the infinitive combine and form a secondary long vowel *ī* or *ē* while the *r* of the suffix is dropped" (pp. 66-67). According to Birjukovič 1981: 92, verbs with vowel stems form the infinitive with the back *ï* or front *i* in Lower Chulym, but *ī* (always a long front sound not subject to vowel harmony variation) in Middle Chulym (I have encountered a single case of *ī* in the Melet sub-dialect: *ïrlīɣa* 'to sing'.) As for the stems ending in *r*, Birjukovič 1981: 92 claims that the infinitive formation element is *-Aɣ*, not *ē* (Li et al. 2008: 67.) I have not come across any *ē*-based infinitives in my field work as yet, but Li et al. 2008 record *sidēge* 'to urinate' and *āzïrēɣa* 'to sneeze' (p. 67). Several examples with *-Aɣ* marker are also shown, but this is not said to be a suffix here: *ēzireyɣe* 'to be drunk', *parayɣa* 'to go' (p. 67).

The *Tense and Aspect* subsection in Li et al. 2008 gives several forms of the present tense: "Present I" in *-AdI* ("the present habitual tense": p. 72), "Present II" in *-(I)ptIr* ("the present progressive tense": p. 73) and "Present III" on *-(I)bIl* ("also the present progressive tense": p. 75). In the "Present II" material (p. 74), the authors give examples lacking the *-tIr* element such as *silär ayd-ïp-sïŋnar* 'you (pl.) tell-PRES-2pl.' and mention that "Anderson & Harrison (2006: 65) regard" such forms as those of "the evidential present". The question of the so-called "evidential present" needs further investigation. There is only one such case in the quoted source, namely *bil-ïp-sïŋ* glossed as know-PRES:EVID-2 where PRES denotes 'present', and EVID 'evidential' (Anderson & Harrison 2006: 65). The *-ïp* here is no doubt historically identical with the most common converb suffix of the Turkic languages. In the subsection mentioned, Li et al. 2008 depicts three cases with this converb immediately followed by personal endings of the verb conjugation: *aydïpsïŋnar* (twice) and *pil-ip-siŋnar* (p. 74). I have not encountered any similar examples in the field data of the Melet sub-dialect, or in Lower Chulym records, nor are any such forms present in the texts or grammatical materials published by either Dul'zon or Birjukovič. One possible explanation for such a form is that it might have resulted from contraction (a very common phenomenon in the Siberian Turkic languages), and the context does actually imply a tense building element between the converb and the endings (like *ïs-* originally meaning 'send' or the like, see Birjukovič 1981: 32-43; Lemskaya 2008). On the other hand, it might be "a verb phrase of the shape *-(X)p* with pronoun, which is put to finite use in some modern Turkic languages and in Middle Turkic" (see Erdal 2004: 311).

The "Present III" tense with the *-(I)bIl* element not only "has also the converb *-(I)p*" (Li et al. 2008: 75), but was explained by Birjukovič 1981: 51 to be contracted from an *-(I)p olur-* ('sit') combination.

Past forms with *-DI* were not encountered by Li et al. 2008 (see p. 77); they have been reported only in the Lower Chulym dialect and appear to have been extremely rare even decades ago (Birjukovič 1981: 62.) Nevertheless, a relic of such a form

was recorded in one example by Anderson & Harrison 2006: 55; several occurrences of it are also found in the Middle Chulym field note archives. All these occurrences are with one particular verb stem, *de- (~ *te-) 'say': di-di-m 'I said' [say-REC.PST-1] (Anderson & Harrison 2006: 55); moɣalaq paar käl' di-de 'bear go come say-PST' (Birjukovič 1971: 627).

Interesting is the statement on the existence of "Future II" which "is expressed by -GАč" and "denotes actions that will happen in the near future" (Li et al. 2008: 80.) Dul'zon spoke about a -(G)Аy form of the future in the Lower Chulym (Dul'zon 1966: 461), which Birjukovič states to be equal to the "-GАč" form of the optative with a seme of the near future in the Middle Chulym dialect (1981: 73-77): kün alt-ïn-a ba-gač-im 'sun under-3p.sg.-DAT go-OPT-1p.sg.' (in the "Mangush" story by a Tutal subdialect speaker; published by Abdraxmanov 1970: 60). Such forms also exist in the Melet sub-dialect: körgēš'im 'I am going to look' (both future and optative meaning; note that š here corresponds to Tutal č). The examples in Li et al. 2008 and in my materials, with the -GАč element denoting near future, are all in the first person singular; the examples with the verbs in the third person singular denote epistemic modality and have rain as the subject: suɣ paydïɣ čaɣ-yač 'rain probably rain-FUT' (Li et al. 2008: 80.) It is not quite clear why the word paydïɣ denotes 'perhaps, probably' (Li et al. 2008: 80, 83.) I have not encountered this form in my field data, nor in archive data or publications by Dul'zon or Birjukovič. The lexeme pay means 'rich', and paydaq 'many, much' (Birjukovič 1984: 52). A possible explanation is that paydïɣ is related to the Russian parenthetical word noдu /padi/ 'it seems, it looks like'.

Converb forms similar to -GАč exist in a number of other Turkic languages; however, finite Middle Chulym -GАč needs a different interpretation. Note that Shor analytical constructions with infinitive + auxiliary verb čat- (-rga čat-) have a tendency towards a higher degree of grammaticalization: pararga čam 'I am about to go' (Nevskaya 1993: 87; see also Nevskaya 1988). It is also possible to suppose (M. Erdal, personal communication) that the -GАč element was developed from a sequence of *-GА with čak as Turkish -(y)AcAk (in Old Turkic, "čak is a ... particle signifying 'just, exactly, no other'": Erdal 2004: 343). The origin, present state and function of verbs with the -GАč element in the Middle Chulym dialect are still unresolved issues.

The paradigm given as "Optative-Imperative" in Li et al. 2008: 81 (äkäl 'bring', par-ax-tar 'let us go') is regarded as only imperative in Birjukovič 1981: 68-73. A better term for this paradigm is "the volitional paradigm" (Erdal 2004: 235). The differences between the forms listed in Li et al. 2008 in this paradigm and those in Birjukovič 1981 are (1) that the 1st person singular is not singled out in the former, but is said to have -im as the verb ending in the latter: al'im 'let me take/may I take' (ал'им 'возьму-ка я'; Birjukovič 1981: 69), and (2) that the distinction is made between the two forms of the 1st person plural in the latter: the form with the plural ending is described as a form of plurality: pis al'ibïs 'may we take' ("мн. число nuc ал'ибыс 'возьмем-ка'"), and the one without, as a form of duality: alaq 'let us take'

("дв. число *алаҳ* 'давай возьмем'; Birjukovič 1981: 69.) There is another view on the subject, i.e. such forms as the Middle Chulym ones in *-K, -AK* (Li et al. 2008: 81) are rendered as expressing minimal inclusiveness, and such forms that end in *-aqtar/-axtar* in Middle Chulym are considered as those of augmented inclusiveness (Nevskaya 2005).

Birjukovič distinguishes two other forms of participles in Chulym Turkic along-side the *-GAn* form identified in Li et al. 2008 in the *Participles* subsection on p. 84; this form is said to be that of the past participle (Birjukovič 1981: 84); the other two are the *-Ar/-i* present-future participle, and the *-LXq* future participle (Birjukovič 1981: 85-89).

Li et al. 2008 presents data on one converb only, namely the one in *-(I)p* (*Converbs* subsection, p. 87.) Birjukovič also mentions two other converb suffixes in Middle Chulym *-A*, and *-GAč* (1981: 90).

In the subsection on *Actional Modifications* the authors write that the "auxiliaries (postverbs) *al-* 'to take', *īs-* 'to send', *par-* 'to go', *sal-* 'to put' serve to build trans-formative actional phrases" and the "auxiliaries *čörü-* 'to walk', *qal-* 'to stay', *tur-* 'to stand' build non-transformative verbs" (Li et al. 2008: 88.) In the previous publications *tur-* (originally 'stand') was said to have entered the paradigm of the present tense, *čat-* 'lie', and *as-* 'exceed' were labeled as markers of actionality, and *čörü-* 'walk' and *qal-* 'stay' were not mentioned as elements of actionality (see Birjukovič 1981: 32-43).

The conclusions presented in the section on *Word Formation* in Li et al. 2008: 90-96 should be compared to those in Pomorska 2004. Although the latter is a study on noun formation only based on the publications on the Chulym Turkic language, it offers many important observations. Thus, it shows the existence of *+(a)č ~ +(a)š* diminutive suffix (Pomorska 2004: 39), which makes us think that the lexeme *kičeč* 'small' in Li et al. 2008: 90 was not actually formed by "*kičig + gäč*", but rather by **kičig+Ač*. Moreover, there we find the meanings of the suffix *+KI* (attested in Li et al. 2008: 91): those of time and locality (Pomorska 2004: 54.)

6. Various issues

The only example of a Turkic nominal compound, that in the *Nominal Phrases* sub-section in Li et al. 2008: 99 (noun + noun with a possessive suffix: *äp kižizi* 'woman' < *äp* 'house' *kiži-zi* 'person-3p.sg.POSS'), has many counterparts in my field data; e.g. *ūs' kizi-zi* 'river man-3p.sg.POSS; Chulym Turk'.

The example translated as 'you have drawn a picture' in the subsection on *Coordination* in Li et al. 2008: 104 shows *silär šïy-aŋ-nar kartına*, lit. 'you.2p.pl. write-PST-2pl picture'. This whole expression is an obvious calque from Russian, where 'draw a picture' is *написать картину* lit. 'write a picture' (cf. Birjukovič 1981: 76 for *šïy-* 'write').

The materials in the *Appendices* (whose data are rendered in both phonetic and phonological transcription) reflect what is written in the main part of Li et al. 2008.

Here are a few additional notes: In the glosses of verb forms some morphemes are glossed as "AUX" (auxiliary), but little explanation of peculiarities and/or differences between them is offered (like some notes on p. 88.) These "auxiliaries" undoubtedly contribute to the formation of Aktionsart forms. An attempt to study them is made in Lemskaya 2008 and already in Birjukovič 1981: 32-43. Furthermore, various types of tenses are mentioned in Li et al. 2008: 72-81), usually marked with the Roman characters "I, II," etc. These are not, however, reflected in any glosses, i.e. only general meanings are given, like PST for Past, etc., or in some cases several translations are offered with a past simple and present perfect form to compensate for the insufficiency of the glosses. An interpretation of the meanings of Middle Chulym tense forms is given in Birjukovič 1981: 43-83.

Throughout the book by Li et al. 2008 there are some misspellings of English; glosses and footnotes are often transferred to the subsequent page, hampering readability. In some cases the entries do not correspond to the translation (e.g., *törtčïlïn* on p. 58, which should be translated as 'four together', not 'three together'). Russian loan words or cases of code mixing in Chulym Turkic—a highly understudied topic—are rarely marked in the grammar part of the *Study* (e.g. *pazdravľad ēd-ibilmin* on p. 85, where the first element is the Russian verb *поздравлять* 'congratulate'). Calques from Russian in the informant's answers are not noted there either (p. 34: '[m]y grandfather is a hundred years old' in fact being lit. 'to my grandfather (is one) hundred years', which is a direct translation from Russian). 'Russicisms' are marked in the *Vocabulary* chapter of the book. The task of studying calques is one of the many aspects of the Chulym Turkic language system still awaiting the attention of the linguistic community.

All things considered, the book is a good field study and a valuable introductory resource of this endangered and little described Siberian language.

References

Abdraxmanov, M. A. 1970 Teksty čulymsko-tjurkskogo jazyka (sredne-čulymskij dialekt.) In: *Jazyki i toponimija Sibiri*. II. Tomsk: Izdatel'stvo Tomskogo universiteta. 58-69.
Anderson, G. D. S. & Harrison, D. K. 2003. Middle Chulym: theoretical aspects, recent fieldwork and current state. In: *Turkic Languages* 7, 245-256.
Anderson, G. D. S. & Harrison, D. K. 2006. Ös Tili: towards a comprehensive documentation of Middle and Upper Chulym Dialects. In: *Turkic Languages* 10, 47-71.
Birjukovič R. M. 1971. Materialy po jazyku čulymskix tatar (polevye zapisi.) III. [Unpublished notebooks.]
Birjukovič R. M. 1979a. *Morfologija čulymsko-tjurkskogo jazyka. I. Kategorija imeni suščestvitel'nogo (Učebno-metodičeskie materialy.)* Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut Jazykoznanija.
Birjukovič R. M. 1979b. *Zvukovoj stroj čulymsko-tjurkskogo jazyka (metodičeskoe posobie.)* Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut Jazykoznanija.
Birjukovič R. M. 1980. Stroj čulymsko-tjurkskogo jazyka. ["Doktor nauk" dissertation, Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut Jazykoznanija, Moskva.]

Birjukovič R. M. 1981. *Morfologija čulymsko-tjurkskogo jazyka. II.* Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo universiteta.

Birjukovič R. M. 1984. *Leksika čulymsko-tjurkskogo jazyka. Posobie k speckursu.* Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo universiteta.

Boni R. A. 1973. Materialy po jazyku čulymskix tatar. VII. [Unpublished notebooks.]

Clauson, Sir G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Derleme Sözlüğü. IX. L-R. Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 211/9. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi. 1977.

Dul'zon, A. P. 1952. Čulymskie tatary i ix jazyk. In: *Učenye zapiski Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo instituta* IX, 76-211.

Dul'zon, A. P. 1954. Terminy rodstva i svojstva v jazykax Narymskogo kraja i Pričulym'ja. In: *Učenye zapiski Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo instituta* XI, 59-94.

Dul'zon, A. P. 1959. Tjurki Čulyma i ix otnošenie k xakasam. In: *Učenye zapiski Xakasskogo naučno-issledovatel'skogo instituta jazyka, literatury i istorii* 7, 93-102.

Dul'zon, A. P. 1966. Čulymsko-tjurkskij jazyk. In: *Jazyki narodov SSSR II. Tjurkskie jazyki.* Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka". 446-466.

Dul'zon, A. P. 1973. Dialekty i govory tjurkov Čulyma. In: *Sovetskaja tjurkologija* 2, 16-29.

Erdal, M. 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic.* Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.

L'vova, E. L. & Dremov, V. A. & Aksjanova, G. A. et al. 1991. *Tjurki taježnogo Pričulym'ja. Populjatsija i etnos.* Tomsk: Izdatel'stvo Tomskogo universiteta.

L'vova, E. L. No date. Istoričeskaja zapiska o čulymcax. In: *Central'noaziatskij istoričeskij server.* Accessed May 15, 2009 at: http://www.eurasica.ru/articles/chulym/istoricheckaya _zapiska_o_chulymtsah/.

Lemskaya, V. M. 2008. Akcional'nye formy glagola v čulymsko-tjurkskom jazyke. In: *Istoriko-kul'turnoe vzaimodejstvje narodov Sibiri: Materialy Meždunarodnoj naučno-praktičeskoj konferencii.* Novokuzneck: Izdatel'stvo KuzGPA. 85-90.

Lemskaya, V. M. forthcoming. Çulım-Türk Dilinin Bugünkü Durumu. To appear in: *The proceedings of the VI Uluslararası Türk Dili Kurultayı.* Ankara.

Lemskaya, V. M. & Mindiyarova, E. R. 2007. Rezul'taty lingvističeskix ekspedicij 2007 g. k vostočnym xantam i čulymskim tjurkam. In: *Materialy II Vserossijskoj naučno-praktičeskoj konferencii "Inostrannye jazyki i mežkul'turnaja kommunikacija v razvivajuščemsja obrazovatel'nom prostranstve: teoretičeskie i prikladnye aspekty".* Tomsk: Veter. 17-24.

Li, Yong-Sŏng & Lee, Ho-Young & Choi, Hyong-won & Kim, Geon Sook & Lee, Dong Eun & Ölmez, Mehmet. 2008. *A Study of the Middle Chulym Dialect of the Chulym Language.* Altaic Languages Series 3. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.

Nevskaya, I. A. 1988. Upotreblenie formy na –rga v šorskom jazyke. In: Ubrjatova, E. I. et al. (eds.) *Grammatičeskie issledovanija po tjurkskim jazykam.* Novosibirsk. 43-67.

Nevskaya, I. A. 1993. *Formy dejepričastnogo tipa v šorskom jazyke.* Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo Novosibirskogo universiteta.

Nevskaya, I. A. 2005. Inclusive and exclusive in Turkic languages. In: Filimonova, E. (ed.) 2005. *Inclusive and exclusive.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 339-357.

Pomorska, M. 2004. *Middle Chulym noun formation.* Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia 9. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, Jagiellonian University, Institute of Oriental Philology.

Pritsak, O. 1959. Das Abakan- und Čulymtürkische und das Schorische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 598-640.

Radloff, W. 1868. *Proben der Volkslitteratur der Türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibiriens.* 2. Theil. *Die Abakan-Dialecte (der Sagaische, Koibalische, Katschinzische), der Kysyl-Dialect und der Tscholym-Dialect (Küärik.)* Sankt-Petersburg.

Radloff, W. 1893-1911. *Opyt slovarja tjurkskix narečij.* Sankt-Peterburg.

Russia: or, a compleat historical account of all the nations which compose that empire. The Second Volume. London, printed for J. Nichols, T. Cadell, in the Strand; H. Payne, Pall-Mall; and N. Conant, Fleet-Street. 1780.

Schönig, Cl. 1998. Suffixartige und postpositionelle Ausdrücke für instrumentales und komitatives 'mit' im Türkischen. In: *Doğan Aksan armağanı.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi. 145-154.

Seljutina, I. [forthcoming]. South Siberian vocalism as a reflection of language contacts. To appear in: Erdal, Marcel & Menz, Astrid & Nevskaya, Irina *Areal, historical and typological aspects of Siberian Turkic.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Türkiye Türkçesi ağızları sözlüğü. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu. Accessed January 14, 2009 at: http://tdkterim.gov.tr/ttas/?kategori=derlay&kelime=%F6z.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	OPT	optative
ACC	accusative	p.	person
DAT	dative	pl.	plural
FUT	future	POSS	possessive
GEN	genitive	PRES	present
INS	instrumental	PST	past
LOC	locative	REC	recent
OBL	oblique	sg.	singular