

# Preservation of the Shor Language of the Small People of Kuzbass as a Component of Russian Coal Cluster Sustainable Development

*Olga Dubrovskaya*<sup>1,\*</sup>, and *Evgeniya Bondareva*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> T. F. Gorbachev Kuzbass State Technical University, Mezhdurechensk branch, 652881, 36 Stroiteley st., Mezhdurechensk, Kemerovo region-Kuzbass, Russia

<sup>2</sup> Beijing University of Language and Culture, No.15 Xueyuan Road, Haidian District, Beijing

**Abstract.** The Shor are a small indigenous people of Western Siberia. In total, there are 13 thousand representatives of this nation in the world. The ethnos was formed in the 6-9 centuries. Kuzbass – the largest coal cluster in Russia – is a home for a significant part of the Shor population, being the indigenous minority of the region. The development of mining operations (mainly coal and iron ore mining) negatively affects the territory of the Shor people habitation. Therefore, the preservation of their cultural traditions, including the original language, is an important part of the sustainable development of the mining region Kuzbass. The suggested study is based on the Shor language material, which belongs to the Turkic branch of the Altai language family. The purpose of the study is to describe the synthetic type of complex sentences in the Shor language, which is designed to help preserve their culture in the system of sustainable development of Kuzbass.

## 1 Introduction

Until 1926, all the tribal groups of the Shors were called Tadar-Kizhi, which means “Tatar man”. The name "Shors" stuck to the people after the 18th century, as they were called by the Khakass and Altaians. The Russians called the people “Kuznetsk Tatars”, “Abintsy, Mras and Kondomsky Tatars”. Today the Shors have other self-names – “Shor-Kizhi”, “Tatar-Kizhi”, and “Tadar”.

The main occupation of the Shor people until the 19th century was iron forging and smelting. Therefore, it is the Shors who are the indigenous founders of the mining cluster in Kuzbass. The craft was especially developed in the north of the region. The Shors paid tribute to the Turkic Kagans with iron products, exchanged them for cattle and felt from the nomads. From the 18th century, they began to sell iron products to Russian merchants, who called them Kuznetsk people, and the places where they lived, Kuznetsk land (now it is Kuzbass).

A large number of Shors speak Russian, 60% consider it their native language. There are two dialects in Shor language: Kondomsky, which belongs to the North Altai group of

---

\* Corresponding author: [dubrovskayaol@yandex.ru](mailto:dubrovskayaol@yandex.ru)

Western Turkic languages; and Mras, belongs to the Kyrgyz-Uyur (Khakass) group of Eastern Turkic languages. Distributed in the Kemerovo region, mainly in the foothills of Altai, Kuznetsk Altai, on the border with the Republic of Altai and Khakassia, along the Tom River and its tributaries.

Each of the dialects breaks down into several dialects. In pre-Russian times, the Shors possessed the ancient Turkic, Orkhon, Old Mongolian and Chinese scripts. Since the 1920s, a literary language based on the Mras dialect was created and the general spread of literacy began. This significantly affected the self-consciousness of the Shors.

We rely on the main theoretical propositions of E.I. Ubryatova [1], developed by her followers – representatives of the Novosibirsk syntactic school. In particular, we use the concept of a poly-predicative construction (PPC), by which we imply as sentence containing more than one predicative clause, regardless of whether the predicates of these units are expressed in a finite or infinite form.

## 2 Materials and Methods

The material of study was a sample of folklore literary and educational texts, as well as data from grammars and dictionaries. The suggested study is based on the Shor language material, which belongs to the Turkic branch of the Altai language family [2-5]. The purpose of study is to describe the synthetic type of complex sentences in the Shor language, expressed by temporal poly-predicative constructions (PPC). The Shor language has known 5 graphic systems in its written history. To facilitate access to the material, we provide all the examples in modern graphics and follow to the current spelling rules. The main research method is a model description of a sentence using three types of analysis: component analysis, transformational analysis, and semantic analysis. We have carried out various transformations of the proposals, changing the shape of existing components, adding and excluding some components. To assess the correctness of the construction of the modified structures, a linguistic experiment was used, the essence of which is that the newly constructed language unit was presented to the native speaker with a request to check the correctness of the transformation and comment on the features of the structures from the point of view of semantics and grammar. This method helped to better identification the semantic and syntactic properties of sentences, as well as the rules and patterns of their use, which is undoubtedly difficult to do on the written basis sources only.

The main structural types of PPC are analytical and synthetic. The concept of a synthetic type of PPC implies constructions in which the word form of the predicate of the dependent part contains morphological indicators of dependence. In analytical constructions, the role of a link between the parts of a composite sentence, whose predicates are expressed by the finite forms of the verb, is performed by various service words, primarily conjunctions. Among the synthetic PPCs, we can distinguish a subtype of analytical-synthetic ones, in which the dependent predicate contains analytical components – postpositions and service words.

We call different-subject (DS) PPCs the ones where the predicate of the dependent part correlates with its own subject, which is different from the subject of the main part. Mono-subject (MS) PPCs, like different-subject ones, express certain relations between events, but the dependent predicate of these constructions and the main one relate to the same subject. We name as composite sentences only those PPCs in which the dependent part has its own subject, different from the main part subject.

In the Shor language, the composite sentences were studied by E.F. Chispiyakov [6], who gave a general overview of the functional and structural types of the Shor composite sentences, A.V. Esipova [7], who described participial determinative constructions, and I.A.

Nevskaya [4], who studied constructions with a dependent predicate expressed by the adverbial participle and forms of the adverbial type.

Temporal PPCs are the most important functional and semantic type of poly-predicative constructions. Temporal relations between events are expressed not only by temporal constructions, but it is in these constructions that the main syntactic meaning is associated with their expression. We describe Shor temporal PPCs based on the main grammatical (morphological and syntactic) means of expressing the temporal relations between events in these PPCs.

The organization of the temporal synthetic PPCs of the Shor language involves: 1) participial forms; 2) adverbial forms; 3) forms of the adverbial type. The links in the PPC, along with the infinitive form of the verb, are: 1) morphological indicators that are part of the predicate of the dependent part: affixes of the local, dative, initial and instrumental cases; 2) analytical components in the dependent predicate: postpositions, service names, particles.

### 3 Results and Discussion

The synthetic type includes PPCs in which the predicate word form of the dependent part contains morphological indicators of dependence. They are represented by the following subtypes: 1) participial-case constructions and constructions with the form of the local case of the nominal predicates of the dependent part; 2) constructions with one of the adverbial forms and forms of the adverbial type.

PPC with a dependent predicate, expressed by a participle in the form of one of the indirect cases, form the core of the transmitting means system of temporal relations in the Shor language.

Temporal “gan=da” form constructions.

This form is predominantly temporal and denotes a non-specialized temporal circumstantial meaning. It is able to take a personal form between the participle affix and the case. The affixes with which it is conjugated belong to the affixes of the personal-possessive type characteristic of dependent predication: “kel=gen=im=de” “when I come”, “kel=gen=lerin=de” “when you come”. The personal design of this form, as well as other forms of this type (participial-case in circumstantial constructions), is irregular. It is not typical for mono-subject phrases, as well as for different-subject phrases if there is a subject in the dependent part. If there is no subject in the different-subject phrases, the personal registration of this form is mandatory. This PPC can have both MS and DS implementations. The “=gan” past participle does not retain its absolute time value, but has a relative time value. A finite verb can be in terms of past, present, or, less often, future absolute tense.

1. “Pis sootke chagynap kel=gen=ibis=te (kelgenmiste), korok attybysty”. “When we came closer the willow, the chipmunk jumped out”. “Men turaga kel=eber=ge=m=de, pis teatrga parystybyts”. “When I came to the city, we went to the theater”. – In these contexts, the action transmitted by the predicate form of the dependent predicative unit (PU) is oriented to the past, it gets this temporal orientation by the help of the main part predicate, expressed by the form of the recently passed time with =you.

2. “Ore-le kor=ge=n=de, chyltystar pyzynnashchyt kannary koryncha. “When you look up (overhead) twinkling of stars are visible”. “Karsylap kel katkyr=gan=nar=da, kara tash charylcha, kysylep kel kyl=gen=ner=de, kychyn tash shachyrapcha”. “When they roar with laughter, the black stone splits, when they smile slightly, the heroic stone cracks (from the epic)”. In this examples, the form with “=gan=da” expresses an ordinary action that is repeated in the present tense. This form receives this temporal localization by means of the predicate of the main part, which is expressed by the present tense form with “=cha”.

As we can see, in this construction, the participial and finitive actions relate mainly to the absolute-temporal plans of the past and present times. But in our materials there are also phrases in which the participial and finitive actions refer to the future absolute-modal plan, which indicates a further relativization of the temporal value inherent in the participial indicator in the form with “=gan=da”. In comparison with the form with “=ca=//”, which specializes in the designation of an action (in the meaning of a non-specialized time indicator – condition for performing the main action) related to the plan of the future time, the form with “=gan=da” in this case emphasizes the obligation to perform this future action, the complete confidence of the speaker that it will necessarily happen, as well as the value of the completeness of the commission, factitivity, future action, which determines the time of another action in the future.

3. “Abazybys annap parganda, jet akeler”. “When the father goes hunting, (he) will bring meat”. “Shaj izhip alganda, aalyp pararys”. “When we have tea, we will go to visit”. The fact that the attribution of the adverbial action to the plan of the future tense is not an absolutely new phenomenon in the Shor language is evidenced by the presence of similar examples already in the dictionary of V.N. Verbitsky [7]: “Men kelgende, chudabassyn”. “When I come, you will not be poor”.

Temporal “=baan=da” form constructions.

The “=baan=da” form (with assimilative variants) is a negative pair of “=baan=da” form. It expresses the absence of some action, and in the vast majority of cases of its use it expresses the circumstantial meanings of the causal block: the causes, the conditions, the unreal condition. In some cases, this construction is able to convey the circumstantial value of the another action, setting a certain time interval without marking its boundaries. Both actions belong to the plan of the past tense or have a timeless character.

“Men choryn unnabaanda, abam maga shana ishtep pergen. “When I could not walk yet, my father has already made me ski”. Katja agrybaanda, kystyk palazy anda chatkan”. “When Katya was not ill, her granddaughter lived there”. “Pis teminde kelbeende (or kelbeeste – kel=bee=bis=te), mama kanakchyr”. “When/If we don't come in time, Mom gets angry”).

Temporal “=ar=da” form constructions. One of the ways of expressing temporal relations is the future participle with “=ar” in the form of the local case “=ar=da”. This form is quite widely represented in the language of the Khakass heroic epic. In the Shor language, however, it is not widely used, although in the Mrass dialect it occurs in the meaning of the temporal conditionality of the reference action. Moreover, both actions are localized on the timeline.

“Pis achykka par=ar=da, alty, chetti kizhideñ chepsenchabys”. “When we go (before departure) to the fishery, we are equipped with six or seven people”. – The view of the present. The action is normal (multiple). Here in the main part is the form of the present tense. The action is expressed in the dependent PU has the character of the usual, repeated: “always when we go”. “Kolhoznikter nan=ar=da ishken kuzuktaryn atka arttylar”. “When the collective farmers returned, they loaded the horse with nuts, which they knocked out (from the cones)”. – The view of the past. The action is of an isolated nature. “Cher ystybe parchatkann=ar=da parfan chollary taktap odurgan”. “When they walked on the ground, the path they walked on was trampled down”. – The view of the past. The action is normal (multiple). “Chasky kanikuler pazhal=ar=da, pic pichikty yrgennerbis”. “Before spring holiday begins, we'll learn the ABC”.

Temporal “=galak=ta” form constructions.

It is formed by the form of the local reliable participle of the action that has not yet been realized with “=galak”, which also contains the semantics of the general temporal correlation “when not yet”. PPCs with this form of dependent predicate indicate the time of the main action. It is performed while the expected dependent action is missing.

Accordingly, the dependent action is procedural, despite the fact that the lexical meaning of the verb – predicate of the dependent part can be both factual and procedural. The action of the main part can also be procedural, then they are both completely simultaneous. In the case of a factual main action, the dependent and the main action coincide only partially in time, since the main action occurs against the background of the dependent.

“Ol okkys art kalgan, pallardy shkolga pargalaktarynda (par=galak=taryn=da)”. “She became an orphan when the children had not gone to school yet”. “Kar jejergelekte, pis shanaba annap chorchabys”. “While the snow has not yet melted, we go hunting on ski”.

The model “=galak=ta” is also found in other Turkic languages of Siberia. Depending on the form of the main predicate, the action of the dependent PU in this model is perceived either as an ordinary action, repeated in the absolute past, a single action in the past, or an action in the extended present. The predicate of the main part can be expressed in the “=gan” form of the past, the present “=cha” form.

Temporal constructions with the local case form of nominal predicates.

The forms of the local case of names in the function of the nominal part of the compound nominal predicate, most often the names of presence and absence-see, can be expressed by the predicates of the dependent parts of complex sentences of time not only in Shor, but also in other Turkic languages.

“Kachan seen akcha chok=ta, kem saaga itpek sadar na!” “When you have no money, who will sell you any bread!” “Meen abam ishtebeencha, ol pallardy korchu, pis ishte=de/ish=te=bis=te”. (“My father doesn’t work, he looks after the kids while we’re at work»). “Kachan kizhi chash=ta, pir daa nebeden korukpaanchyr”. “When a person is young, he is not afraid of anything”. Temporal constructions with the dative case affix.

According to our research, two models with the dative case affix are used in the expression of temporal relations: “=galak=ka” и “=ar=gaa”.

Temporal “=galak=ka” form constructions.

This form is formed from the “=galak=ka” participle that expresses an action that has not yet been performed. It denotes the temporal conditionality of the reference action: “by the time.” Poly-predicate phrases with a given participle are usually different-subject.

“Irod sheriglerin ys=kalak=ka, Iosiftyn tyzhynde Kudajdyn angely kelip ajtkan...” “By the time when Herod was still not managed to send troops to Joseph angels came in a dream and said...”. “Suga chet=keleg=ibis=ke, ortekter kodyrylyp uchuk parybystylar”. “No sooner had we reached the river than the ducks rose and flew away”. “Men orta cholga chet=keleg=im=ge, nagbyr shachrap keldi”. “Before I had reached the middle of the road, the rain began to fall”.

Temporal “=ar=ga” form constructions.

This construction is extremely rare in literary sources, but it is quite common in oral colloquial speech.

“Ylar ched=er=ge, nebeleri sug pol pardy”. “Before they got there, their clothes got wet” “Altyn-Manyspa ijgele cheri churtarynga nan=ar=ga, jezen-menchi perdiler”. “I said goodbye to Altyn-Manys before returning to my lands”. Temporal constructions with the initial case affix.

The original case is also associated with the expression of temporal relations. In temporal constructions, this case is usually not used without a postposition that clarifies the semantics of the participial case form. This is also typical for other Turkic languages of Southern Siberia. M.I. Cheremisina [9], explains this by the polyfunctionality of this form, its overload with different syntactic meanings. We could only find an “=ar=dan” construction with a dependent predicate.

“Myys chyg=ar=dan kulak gzer”. “Before the horns come out, the ears will grow”. In this example the “=dan” affix is attached to the future “=ar” participle. A subordinate clause expresses an action that is excluded (not allowed), considered impossible, due to the

commission or non-completion of the main action expressed by the predicate of the main sentence.

Temporal constructions with the instrumental case affix.

The instrumental “=pa/ ba/ ma” case in the Shor language consists of the postposition *пыла*. In the predicative declension of participles, it takes part in the PPC composition with the “=gan” and “=ar” participle. These constructs are to illustrate the fast following of the main event after the dependent semantics: “Pis kireris pe, alar shym polybystylar”. “As soon as we entered, they became silent”.

## 4 Conclusions

The preservation of the Shor language is an important part of the system of sustainable development of the mining region of Kuzbass, aimed at preserving the cultural foundations of its indigenous population. In this article, we tried to present a synthetic type of temporal poly-predicative constructions of the Shor language, which we distinguished, first of all, taking into account the form of the dependent predicate. The data obtained in the study and presented in the article can be used in the Shor language teaching to both speakers it and those who want to learn it. The results obtained, thanks to the use of a single developed base in theory and terminology, facilitate comparison with the languages of other systems.

## References

1. E.I. Ubryatova, *Problems of comparative study of Turkic languages* (Nauka, Moscow, 1970)
2. M. Erdal, *A Grammar of Old Turkic* (Brill, Leiden, 2004)
3. D.M. Nasilov, X. Isxakova, S. Safarov, I.F. Nevskaya, *The imperative sentences in Turkic Languages* (Nauka, Moscow, 2001)
4. I. Nevskaya, *Depictive secondary predicates in South Siberian Turkic* (Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, Oldenburg 2008)
5. L. Johanson, *On Turkic Converb Clauses* (Springer, New York, 1995)
6. E.F. Chispiyakov, *Shor language textbook* (Kemerovo Books Publishing, Kemerovo, 1992)
7. A.V. Esipova, *Siberian People Languages* (Kemerovo Books Publishing, Kemerovo, 1977)
8. V. Verbitsky, *Wanderer* **5**, 145-156 (1862)
9. M.I. Cheremisina, *Some questions of the theory of complex sentences in languages of different systems* (Novosibirsk State University Publishing House, Novosibirsk, 1979)