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Deverbal reflexive and passive in Chuvash

1. Introduction

The question about reflexives and passives in Chuvash is complicated. Usually, the grammatical elements of the Turkic languages are quite similar in many ways; for example, reflexive and passive verbs are kept separate, each having its own suffixes. Some sources, however, claim that the passive category in Chuvash is formed differently than it is in the other Turkic languages, or even that it does not exist in the first place (Ašmarin 1898: 258–259, Ramstedt 1952: 165, 1957: 149, Serebrennikov 1976: 29, Serebrennikov-Gadžieva 1986: 200). The latest Chuvash grammar does not even mention the word passive when describing the verbal system (V. Sergeev 2002). Yet, the reflexive forms are quite uniform throughout the Turkic languages. This study tries to prove that both of these old Turkic categories do exist in Chuvash, although the line between them can be blurred and their meanings might overlap. The material in this study has been taken from grammars, dictionaries, folklore and translated fiction. Furthermore, the results have been compared to some extent with some of the languages surrounding it (Tatar, Bashkir, Mordvin and Mari) and also with the most studied language, Turkish. The analysis presented here is based on sentences, which has seldom been done in the reference literature used.

Few of the native reseachers of Turkic languages explain the passive. However, their concept of it can be assumed to be similar to the construction in Russian, German or English, where the active sentence, e.g. a) Mary slapped John can have two passive variants: b) John was slapped or c) John was slapped by Mary (Keenan 1985: 243). In b), the primary actant is demoted from the subject position and replaced by the secondary actant. The primary actant can be present as an agent, as it is in c). The foregrounding feature of passive exists in Chuvash, but the backgrounding does not, which has confused Turkologists for a long time. In Chuvash, even agentless passive sentences are rare and the passive and reflexive are expressed by two suffixes, which can be synonymous.

---

1. I am indebted to the reviewers and editors of this volume for many helpful comments on the form and content of the paper, and to Kimberli Mäkäräinen for revising it.
1.1. Historical background

The grammatical tradition in Russia and in adjacent areas deviates from the Western tradition in that many verbal suffixes are dealt with as voice formatting elements, instead of being dealt with as parts exclusive to the greater derivational system. It has been supposed that all of the Turkic languages have five voices – basic, passive, reciprocal, reflexive and causative (Serebrennikov & Gadžieva 1986: 200, Levitskaja 1988: 269). According to Róna-Tas (1998: 75) Proto-Turkic had four voices: a cooperative (or reciprocal) e.g. kör-üş- ‘see another’, a middle (or reflexive), e.g. kör-ün- ‘become visible’, a passive e.g. kör-ül- ‘be seen’, and a causative, e.g. kör-t-kür- ‘show’ (which might consist of two separate causative suffixes).

1.2. Common Turkic passive suffix -l-

According to Serebrennikov and Gadžieva (1986: 200–201) the passive suffix -l/-il/-ul already existed in the ancient Turkic languages known to us and these forms can be found on various literary monuments. The passive suffix can be added to transitive stems. Levitskaja (1988: 303) points out, however, that an exception does exist: Yakut. The lateral suffix is very productive in Chuvash, yet it is hardly ever used as a passive.

The original meaning of the suffix -l- is to form denominal (probably intransitive) positional verbs characteristically so that the derived verb expresses the acquisition of the property or state indicated by the root noun (Levitskaja 1976: 178–179, 1988: 303–304). It is not difficult to notice that the subject is rather passive with these verbs. Some examples of denominal verbs usually derived from adjectives include čĕrĕl ‘revive, recover’ ← čĕrĕ ‘living; lively; fresh, new’, and śĕnel ‘be renewed’ ← śĕne, śĕn ‘new; fresh’ (cf. Appendix for more examples).

There are a remarkable number of works dedicated to finding the prototype of the suffix -l/-il/-ul. For instance, Serebrennikov (1976: 29–32) places this marker for the passive voice into a group of verbs with similar denominal derivational suffixes. According to Fedotov, the voice suffix -ăl/-ĕl in Chuvash also serves as a derivational suffix for forming verbs from nouns (Fedotov 1986: 47). Interestingly enough, -l- can also take on a frequentative meaning in the Turkic languages, although this is not very productive (Serebrennikov-Gadžieva 1986: 200). Some other turkologists have presumed that the suffix originates from the copula verb bol or ol ‘to be’; this etymology being first proposed by Kazem-Bek in 1846 (cf. also Ščerbak 1981: 107–108, 150, Fedotov 1986: 48). On the other hand, it has been proposed that the passive is a rather late phenomenon, particularly because Chuvash does not have this feature (Ramstedt 1952: 165, 1957: 149). Serebrennikov (1976: 30, 33) points out that many Turkic languages have a lateral frequentative suffix, and that in the Permic languages,

---

2. The -l- is now considered to be a derivational suffix (slovoobrazovatel'nyj suffiks).
frequentative suffixes (Komi -š-, Udmurt -šk-) have later developed into reflexive suffixes. The line between the passive and reflexive is to a certain extent blurred, due to the fact that stems ending with -l currently take a passive suffix -n, which can be the result of dissimilation. Older texts show that even lateral stems were followed by passives with -l (Ščerbak 1981: 108).

1.3. Common Turkic reflexive suffix -n-

The reflexive suffix -n/-m/-in can be found in all the Turkic languages existing today and even in the already extinct Turkic languages too, which can be seen on the aforementioned monuments. This suffix probably already existed in Proto-Turkic (Serebrennikov & Gadžieva 1986: 200). The reflexive voice expresses that the action is directed towards its performer itself as a direct object. The reflexive suffix is mostly added to transitive verbal stems. It is assumed that, at first, it had been both a deverbal and a denominal suffix at the same time (Ramstedt 1952: 169, 1957: 152).

In some cases, the reflexive verbs can be derived directly from adjectives, e.g. půšan ‘be freed, released from’ ← půš ‘empty, free’, āšān ‘warm oneself, warm up, heat up’ ← āšā ‘warm, hot; heat; warmly’, sivēn ‘get cold[er], get cool[er]’ ← sivē, siv ‘cold, frost’ (cf. Appendix). Surprisingly, this development has not been accepted by all scholars. Levitskaja (1976: 166–167) has even invented transitional verb forms similar to the adjectives above: (*půša-, *āša-, *sivē-) based on findings in other Turkic languages, as has been pointed out by Fedotov (1986: 48).

The origin of this suffix has been traced back to an incorporated 3rd person pronoun that was then connected to the possessive form an of the pronoun ol. It is generally known that the Turkic languages have preserved traces of the 3rd person pronoun in the form in ~ ın, which had not only the pointing function of ol, but also the distinguishing. The situation is quite the same as it is in the Slavic languages and other languages, too. In Russian, the reflexive suffix has two phonologically conditioned allomorphs -sja and -s’ that originate with the accusative form of the reflexive pronoun sebjja (Lehmann 1995: 44–49). It is only quite recently that this pronoun has been firmly attached to the verbal stem. The various Slavic languages are in different stages of development on this matter and in Russian, it occurs exclusively as a verbal suffix. It cannot be ruled out that the examples from the Turkic languages are a result of contact with their foreign neighbours (Ščerbak 1981: 111–112, with references).

3. Referring to Osttürkische Grammatik … by C. Brockelmann, which is not used in this study.
I.4. Previous work on the Chuvash reflexive and passive

I.4.1. 19th century grammars

The first scientific Chuvash grammar (and third one ever printed) *De lingua tschuwascorum* was written in the beginning of the 1840s by Wilhelm Schott (1802–1889), a German orientalist, sinologist and professor at the University of Berlin. The booklet was tiny, only 32 pages long, but it gave a short description of Chuvash phonetics and morphology and compared this to the other Turkic languages based on regular sound correspondences. As text material, he used the four Gospels translated under the leadership of the bishop of Kazan in 1820 (Benzing 1959: 699). An example of verbal derivation as given by Schott is as follows:

(1) onda oz-il-tschı-s wul-sam-yn koz-sam

then open-ref-pret-pl3 (s)he-pl-gen eye-pl

*tunc aperti sunt eorum oculi’

‘then their eyes were opened’ (Luke 24:31)

In this context, he revealed that the medium (= reflexive) and passive are equal in form in Chuvash and mentioned that the deverbal suffix -tar was used to express transitivity. Schott did not need to write his grammar from scratch; he actually had two predecessors. His main source was the second printed Chuvash grammar *Načertanîe pravilʺ čuvašskago jazyka i slovarʹ, sostavlennye dlja duhovnyhʺ učilišč Kazanskoj eparhii 1836 goda*, published anonymously, although this is commonly attributed to Viktor Petrovič Višnevskij (1804–1885), dean and teacher of the Religious Academy in Kazan. Despite its many mistakes and shortcomings, Višnevskij’s book served as a textbook for students and scholars for decades afterwards (Alekseev 1970: 207–220, Alekseev & Sergeev 1988).

Another of the earliest mentions of the passive in Chuvash is found in one of the classics of general linguistics *Über das Passivum. Eine sprachvergleichende Abhandlung*, written in 1861 by Hans Conon von der Gabelentz (1807–1874). The author was able to create a typological classification of the passive construction by
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4. The first Chuvash grammar *Sočineniija, prinadležaščii kʺ grammatikē čuvašskago jazyka* was printed at the printing house of the St Petersburg’s Academy of Sciences in 1769. This has been reliably attested with many quite recently found documents by Dimitriev (1967). In the literature, it is often mentioned erroneously as having been published in 1775 and Egorov (1951: 86) incorrectly assumes that *Sočineniija* was reprinted at that time. In all likelihood, it was created by a group of missionaries under the command of Veniamin (1706–1782) (born Vasilij Grigor’evič Pučeč-Gregorovič, Ukrainian of noble birth), the bishop of Kazan and Svijaž, who had in 1769 spent 27 years near the Chuvashes (Dmitriev 1967: 159). Supposedly, this booklet of 68 pages served as the model for the grammars of Mari and Udmurt printed in 1775. (Šamraj 1955, Benzing 1964: 842, Alekseev 1970: 203–207, Fedotov 1987: 10–12). It was reviewed in Germany in 1770. Although the grammar was based on grammars of classical languages, it still had a great impact on the field by convincing many scholars of Chuvash’s relationship to the Turkic languages. It is especially valuable due to its rich vocabulary, some of which ended up disappearing later. Višnevskij’s grammar is mainly based on the first one (Egorov 1949: 117–118, 1951: 90–92).
successfully using materials from different languages. It is generally known that this polyglot was able to read texts in more than 80 different languages. In his linguistic studies, he dealt with more than 200 languages from many corners of the world. His masterpiece *Über das Passivum* deals with 200 languages that have a passive, its usage and its synchronic connections to other categories. He discussed the Chuvash passive in the chapter entitled “Passivum durch eine Reflexivform”, where he notes that, unlike the other Turkic languages, Chuvash has two suffixes for the passive: *l* and *n*. He writes:

“In den türkisch-tatarischen Sprachen scheinen ebenfalls die Formen für Reflexivum und Passivum ursprünglich identisch zu sein, wenigstens ist die Bildung durch *n* beiden gemeinschaftlich, während die Bildung durch *l* meistens nur dem Passivum zukommt. Eine Ausnahme macht hier vielleicht nur das Tschuwassische, das beide Formen für das Passivum hat, dabei aber, wie Schott (*De Lingua Tschuwaschorum* p. 31) ausdrücklich bemerkt, Media und Passiva der Form nach nicht unterscheidet, also beide Formen ebenso gut für das Medium oder Reflexivum wie für das Passivum gebraucht” (von der Gabelentz 1861: 523; he had no examples of the voices in Chuvash).

Soon after that, József Budenz (1836–1892) published a grammatical study of Chuvash based on his own fieldtrips in 1845–1848, Antal Reguly’s (1819–1858) notes from 1843, and various grammars and dictionaries (Fedotov 1987: 23–25). He uses four pages to discuss the derivation of words, only one of which he dedicates to a brief mention about the derivation of verbs and that the derivational suffixes *n*, *en*, *in* are used to form passive verbs, such as *oldala*-n-*as* ‘be dissapointed, be deceived’ ← *oldala*-s ‘deceive, cheat, lie’ [probably a dialectal form, according to the modern orthography of the literary language: *ultalanäs ← ultalas*] (Budenz 1863: 66–67).

One of the leading turkologists and a specialist in Chuvash at the turn of the century, Nikolaj Ivanovič Ašmarin (1870–1933), wrote in his grammar from 1898 that Chuvash has no passive voice, only a reflexive voice. All the same, he found some traces of the passive in special expressions, such as:

(2) Ут окč‑и тат‑ ál‑ман‑ха⁵
horse money‑px3sg break‑refl‑neg‑ptc‑emph‑part
‘Den’gi za lošad’ ešče ne zaplačeny (= ne otorvany).’
‘The money for the horse has not yet been paid.’

He states that some reflexive verbs are not derivations as they do not have a root word, such as *tapra* n ‘move (itr. from its place); begin, rise’, which has the parallel form *pătra* n ‘become muddy’, with the

---

⁵ The numbered examples have been kept as much as possible near the original form, but in the running text they have been unified and written in the Latin alphabet, the derived and stem verbs presented under the examples are presented in the same way.
parallel form of \textit{pătrat} ‘make muddy, surge; stir; dig, root, turn over, muddle’; and \textit{pălxan} ‘get worried; be worried; rebel; become muddy or misty; move (itr.), sway’, which does not have a parallel form. In Aşmarin’s grammar, the nature of deverbal verbs with the suffix \(-n\) can be best seen when the root verbs are transitive, e.g. \textit{parăn} ‘submit, surrender’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{par} ‘give, present; grant’, \textit{tiتان} ‘begin (itr.), start; stay, stand; stammer’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{tt}- ‘hold; take; catch; reach; have, own; use, control’, and \textit{perĕn} ‘hit oneself; touch’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{per} ‘hit; throw, shoot’ (Aşmarin 1898: 258–259, cf. Appendix for more examples).

The author reveals that the reflexive nature of the suffix \(-l\) can be seen in some verbs that have roots ending in the consonants \(r\), \(s\), \(ś\) or \(t\), e.g. \textit{xuśăł} ‘break (itr.), get broken, be cut off, fold up’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{xuś} ‘break, cut, fold’ and \textit{tatăł} ‘break (itr.), tear; end’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{tat} ‘break (tr.), tear (to pieces), cut, saw; pick, collect’ (Aşmarin 1898: 260–261).

1.4.2. 20th century grammars

The next remarkable postwar grammar was printed in 1957 in Cheboksary. In the foreword, the book is said to be the result of collective work, but in fact, only three men participated in writing it, each one having written from two to six chapters. The most troublesome part in describing Chuvash, as with so many other languages as well, fell to Vasilij Georgievič Egorov (1880–1974). He had studied in the Chuvash Pedagogical College and Religious Seminary in Simbirsk, at the Religious Academy in Kazan, and finally, at the University of St Petersburg under the tutelage of many famous scholars (Fedotov 1987: 66–67). Unlike his fellow researchers, Egorov surprisingly sees in the reflexive suffix \(-n\) relics of the former 2nd person pronoun and divides the suffix into several groups based on its meanings (similar to the way this has been done in Russian grammars, too):

Proper reflexives, where the subject is also the object of action:

- \textit{śapăn} ‘take a sauna bath, slap o.s. with a sauna whisk’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{śap} ‘hit’,
- \textit{parăn} ‘surrender, give up’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{par} ‘give’,
- \textit{muxtan} ‘boast’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{muxta} ‘praise’,
- \textit{saltăn} ‘undress’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{salt} ‘open, take off, let go’.

Reflexives expressing changes in subject’s physical or mental state:

- \textit{savăn} ‘be happy, be pleased’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{sav} ‘love, like’,
- \textit{śěklen} ‘rise, get up’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{śěkle} ‘raise, lift up’,
- \textit{puśtarăn} ‘gather (itr.)’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{puśtar} ‘collect, gather’,
- \textit{tavrăn} ‘return (itr.), go back, turn back’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{tavăr} ‘return (tr.), bring back’.

Reflexives, where the subject experiences something it has no effect over:

- \textit{avăn} ‘bend (itr.)’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{av} ‘bend (tr.)’,
- \textit{kurăn} ‘be seen’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{kur} ‘see’,
- \textit{üsen} ‘breed, increase (itr.)’ \(\leftarrow\) \textit{ūs} ‘grow (itr.)’ (Egorov 1957: 167–168).
The passive verbs have been divided into two groups based on their meaning:

**Reflexive-passive**, which is said to be weakly developed:

- `tıtăn` 'get arrested' ← `tıt` 'hold; take; have',
- `vitěn` 'get covered' ← `vit` 'cover',
- `šumlan` 'get counted' ← `šumla` 'count'.

**Reflexive-medial verbs** including all -l cases, stems ending with -r, -s, -ś or -t:

- `xuśăl` 'be broken' ← `xuś` 'break',
- `sarăl` 'broaden, widen (itr.)' ← `sar` 'broaden, widen (tr.)',

In the next decade, Ivan Andreevič Andreev (1928–), a pupil of Egorov, presents four voices: 1) basic `kăškăr-` 'shout', `xăvala-` 'follow, chase', `pulăš-` 'help'; 2) reflexive-passive, e.g. `xuśăl-` 'break (itr.)', `păsăl-` 'go bad, be spolt', `ēślen-` 'go well'; 3) reciprocal `šapaś-` 'fight (each other)', `pallaš-` 'get acquainted with (a person/thing)', `tēkēš-` 'butt, gore, toss', `perkeleš-` 'shoot at each other'; and 4) causative (Russ. `ponuditel'nij`) `kultar-` 'make laugh, entertain', `čakar-` 'back, push away', `tart-` 'make run'. The last one can be added to the other voices, as can be seen in `vit-ēn-ter-` 'make cover oneself', which has both a reflexive-passive and a causative suffix. Slightly confusing is the fact that the author adds that all of the voice-formatting suffixes can act as word-formatting suffixes: `tap-ān-` 'attack' ← `tap-` 'kick, push, hit', `ut-tar-` 'walk' ← `ut-` 'walk' (`-tar` seems to be semantically empty with this stem) (Andreev 1966: 54–55).

In 1975, Gennadij Emel'janovič Kornilov's (1936–) expansive article on the reflexive and passive voices in Chuvash was published. He writes that the passive constructions can have two or three participants and that they do not correspond to passive structures in other languages such as Russian. The closest are reflexive structures, which have two participants: `śurt tăvăna` cf. `dom stroitsja` 'the house is being build', `pulă tıtăna` cf. `ryba lovitsja` 'the fish is being caught'. These now exist in the literary language and have been taken from the lower dialects; they seldom occur in the upper dialects. Reflexive verbs can be formed from transitive or intransitive stems: `ūs-` 'grow' → `ūsēn-` 'go off, pass off', `šit-` 'come, reach' → `šitēn-` 'grow up, ripen' (Kornilov 1975: 46–47). He provides extremely detailed information on how reflexive and passive suffixes, with their numerous allomorphs, are used to form verbs from denominal and deverbal stems. According to him, the Turkish type of constructions with three participants has developed under Arab influence; this can be seen in (3) in Tatar:

(3) `komanda oficer tarafinnan6 bir-el-de` (Kornilov 1975: 72)

order[s] officer POP from the side of give-PASS-PAST.3SG

`komanda otdannaja oficerom`

'order[s] was given by the officer'

6. Even the word itself is a loanword from the Arabic `taraf` 'side' (Kornilov 1975: 72).
There is also a way in Chuvash to express passive structures with three participants: the comitative or instrumental suffix -pal/-pe ~ -palai/-pele ~ -palan/-pelen, which corresponds to the Ancient Turkic postposition bilä, bilän ‘with’, as seen in Chuvash (4), and Tatar (5):

(4) śil‑pe(len) uś‑āl‑na  (Kornilov 1975: 72)
wind‑INSTR(pop‘with’) open‑PASS‑PERF.PTC

(5) žil belän ač‑il‑gan išek  (Kornilov 1975: 72)
wind pop‘with’ open‑PASS‑IPAST door
‘the door was opened by the wind’

He has noted that sometimes the reflexive suffix can have a passive meaning, which can be seen from the following example:

(6) ală supăń‑pe lajăx šăv‑ān‑at’  (Kornilov 1975: 73)
hand soap‑INSTR well wash‑PASS‑PRES.3SG
‘the hand(s) can be cleaned well with soap’

Sometimes the passive and reflexive suffixes in Chuvash are identical in meaning: pēkêr‑ēl‑ or pēkêr‑ēn‑ ‘bend, crook (itr.)’, which has also been borrowed by Mari as pügirn‑aš (Kornilov 1975: 73–74).

In a concise account of Chuvash in a relatively new reference book, the reflexive voice is said to be formed with -(Ă)n, e.g. šăvăn‑ ‘wash oneself’ ← šu‑ ‘wash (tr.)’, although transitive verbs ending in -t, -s, -š, -r form the reflexive with -(Ă)l, e.g. uśäl‑ ‘open (itr.)’ ← uś‑ ‘open (tr.)’. Verbs with -(Ă)n sometimes function as passives, e.g. şırăn‑ ‘be written’ ← šir‑ ‘write’. The active voice lacks the suffix, cooperative-reciprocals are formed with -(Ă)s, and causatives with -(t)tAr (Clark 1998: 443). The same distribution can be found in many Chuvash textbooks and minor works on grammar (V. Sergeev 2000, L. Sergeev 2004).

1.4.3. 21th century grammar

In spite of its modest layout, Vitalij Ivanovič Sergeev’s (1942–) grammar from 2002 is quite comprehensive, almost 300 pages in all. The contents are detailed, the verb section consisting of approximately 65 pages. The book is clearly meant for native speakers of Chuvash, since most of the examples have not been translated into Russian. Not all of the voices can be formed with all of the verbal stems; there are remarkable lexical restrictions. Morphologically, the voice in the Turkic languages comes between the concepts slovoizmenitel’nyj and slovo- or glagoloobrazovatel’nyj, and a new

---

7. According to others this is not proper Chuvash. Nonetheless, even though it might not be the best example, the two main meanings for šăvăn‑ in dictionaries are passive and reflexive.
term osnovooobrazovatel'nyj has even been created for it (Grunina 1987: 14). In some textbooks of higher education, the term reljacionnyj has been used. Traditionally, Chuvash lexicography has treated voice forms as word forming and included them in dictionaries (V. Sergeev 2002: 234).

Nowadays, the passives described in some earlier grammars are no longer accepted. Structures such as the ones in (7) have developed under Russian influence and they are not considered to be proper Chuvash (V. Sergeev 2002: 236–237):

(7) Këneke xitre vula-n-at
    book nicely read-pass-pres.3sg
    ‘Kniga xorošo čitaetsja.’
    ‘The book is nice to read.’

1.4.4. Compound derivatives connected to reflexives

According to Andreev, the denominal verbal suffix -lAn is a compound derivative suffix from -lA and -än, -ën, -n, (the latter forming mainly intransitive verbs, e.g. jëpe-n- ‘to get wet, damp’). The suffix -lAn forms reflexive verbs, such as av-lan- ‘get married (of a man)’ (← *av ‘house’) (Levitskaja 1976: 166), cf. Turkish ev-len ‘id.’ (← ev ‘home, house’), ikkë-len ‘hesitate’ (← ikkë ‘two, twice’) (Andreev 1966: 54, Fedotov 1986: 57). The suffix -lAn is traceable back to all of the Turkic languages. At least one minor study has been dedicated to these verbs in Chuvash (Orlova 1976).

The verbs formed with the suffix -lAn are quite common and are one and a half times more common than verbs with the suffix -lA. The -lAn derivatives have been divided into six groups, all having nouns as their stem word, mainly substantives and adjectives expressing the emergence of a property or the changeover to a new state. However, in most cases, the -lA derivatives are formed from words denoting instruments and objects (Orlova 1976: 157–158).

The suffix -lAn has been borrowed into Mari8 from Chuvash or Tatar in many denominal verbs, e.g. sëmsér-len- → sümser-lan-aš or xajar-lan- → ajar-lan-aš ‘get provoked/angry/worried’. Hesselbäck (2005: 113) writes that it is certain that this has been copied from the Turkic languages, since it mainly occurs with adjective and substantive stems of Turkic origin (Alhoniemi 1985: 162, 1993: 151, without mentioning the suffix’s etymology; Fedotov 1986: 57–58). As the analyzed part of this study concentraites on deverbal verbs, -lA and -lAn verbs have more or less been left out.

---

8. In Hill Mari, the suffix -lAn is (more) productive.
2. Materials and methods

2.1. The data

The first textual sources used was *Gebräuche und Volksdichtung der Tschuwassen* (= Gebr), collected in 1900 by Heikki Paasonen (1865–1919), but published only 1949 by other peoples\(^9\). This material comes mainly from Novoye Yakushkino in the Buguruslan district, Samara government. The second source used was John R. Krueger’s *Chuvash Manual* from the year 1961 (= ChM). These have been very convenient due to the German or English translations. A comprehensive Chuvash–Russian dictionary Čuvašsko-russkij slovar’ (= ČRS), a smaller Chuvash–Finnish dictionary Moisio–Fomin–Luutonen: Tšuvassilais-suomalainen sanakirja (2007) (= TšSS), and a small reference book by Ašmarin: Sbornik” čuvašskih” pĕsen”\(^{10}\) (1900) (= Sbor), with material from 11 villages in 3 governments, have also been used. On the referee’s recommendation, the electronic corpus Pavlik Morozov (= PaMo) has been studied. This originally Russian story by Vitali Georgievič Gubarev of a young pioneer and his hard fate in the 1930s has been translated into many Finno-Ugrian languages and Chuvash, too. The electronic corpus consists of 1,608 sentences on 50 pages. These parallel corpora are made by and kept in the Research Unit for Volgaic Languages at the University of Turku.

2.2. Methodology

For the sentences in this study, I have applied valence roles from case grammar and examined the relations between deverbal verbs having -n or -l suffix in order to illustrate the syntactic changes caused by the suffix. For the analysis, I have used the same roles as distinguished in Geniušienė (1987: 39–41). In the passive sentences, I have distinguished between three roles for the semantic subjects or first actants: AGENTIVE, EXPERIENCER, and CAUSER (or FORCE).

At the top of the subject hierarchy is the AGENTIVE – an animate, who is consciously controlling his/her actions. The EXPERIENCER is an animate, who participates in an action, but does not influence it, the action influencing its consciousness instead. The CAUSER is a moving meteorological force, not materia. The fourth role, NEUTRAL, occurs only in automative expressions, it is a participant in a space or process, but the action does not affect it considerably (applied to the Ob-Ugrian languages, see Kulonen 1989: 11). The term NEUTRAL is approximately the same as Anderson’s (1971: 37) NOMINATIVE. The fifth role, ACTOR, occurs only in reflexive utterances, when the subject and object conflate.

---

\(^9\) Some parts of the collection have been sent some years later to Finland by Paasonen’s (only?) informant, more details in (Salo 2010b: 70, 88–89). Paasonen’s influence on other turkologists is discussed by Fedotov (1987: 44–46).

\(^{10}\) In the examples, the original orthography has been slightly altered.
For semantic objects or second actants, I have two roles: GOAL/PATIENT and CONTENT. One role is sufficient for the semantic dative: BENEFACTIVE, a living being, who benefits from the action. Sometimes other roles are necessary, too: LOCATIVE, which expresses motion into/towards, or the location of the referent or time, SOURCE, which expresses the starting point of a motion or an indicator of origin that can express time, too. Finally, the role INSTRUMENT, the inanimate participant of action, has also been included. These roles have been used in describing basic sentences in Finnish (Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 102–104). I have already used these roles to analyze verbs in Mordvin (Salo 2006b, 2010a) and Mari (Salo 2006a).

In order to better analyze the Chuvash verbs that have an -l or -n suffix, I have applied the tripartite division of derivational suffixes created by Kangasmaa-Minn (1982: 43–44). She has started to use the terms CHANGER (Finn. muuttaja), TRANSFORMER (muuntaja) and MODIFIER (modifioija). CHANGER moves words from one main category to the other: nouns into verbs, and vice versa. It might be the same as the Russian term slovoizmenitel'nyj. TRANSFORMER operates in a single category causing changes to the argument structure, e.g. changing intransitive verbal stems into transitives and transitives into intransitives. The number of (obligatory) arguments or actants decreases or increases. It appears to be the same as the Russian term slovoobrazovatel'nyj. The third group, MODIFIERS do not usually cause any great changes in the behaviour of verbs; they just add some nuances. This is the same division I have used in my Master’s Thesis on Erzya Mordvin derivatives (Salo 1988).

3. Data analysis

3.1. Passives

All Chuvash grammars agree that passives occur very infrequently. The passive is only used if an agent is not present (Benzing 1943: 87). Often the passive meaning is combined together with the reflexive in describing derivational suffixes. Benzing has searched through all 17 volumes of Ašmarin’s dictionary for passive examples and based on his findings, he went on to state that the passive is rare: kas-ăn- ‘rubit’ sam soboju; cut oneself’, cf. kas-ăl- ‘byt’ razrezyvaemym; be cut’. Furthermore, he states that the latter often has more of a reflexive meaning than a passive meaning (Benzing 1959: 720). In an active sentence, the first or primary actant appears in the subject position. When the primary actant is demoted from the subject position, its place is occupied by a secondary actant. In Chuvash, the AGENTIVE is always hidden in passive sentences, although it can be inferred that the actant is animate. In Mari, the situation is similar to this. In Mordvin, however, the agent in the dative is possible, yet not very common (Salo 2006a: 333, 2006b: 172–176). The surface subject has the semantic role of GOAL/PATIENT, as in (8) to (11). With the passives, the derivative suffix is a TRANSFORMER.
(8) *Sāmax-sem ujrām sasā-sem śine pajlan-āccē.* (ChM 200, 249)  
word-pl separate sound-pl pop(into, on) be.divided-pres.3pl  
‘Words are divided into separate sounds.’

*pajlan* ‘divide (itr.), be distributed’  
← *pajla* ‘divide (tr.), share, distribute’  
← *paj* ‘part, share; branch, section; detail’

(9) *tārn-i kūlēn-nē, te-t, śerźi* (Gebr 185)  
crane-px3sg get.harness-perf.ptc say-pres.3sg sparrow  
*akapuž-ē tit-nā, te-t.*  
plough-px3sg take-perf.ptc say-pres.3sg  
‘Der Kranich war vorgespannt, der Sperling faßte an der Pflugsterze.’  
‘The crane was harnessed, says, the sparrow took ahold of the plough handles, says.’

*kūlēn* ‘get harnessed, go (enter) into’  
← *kūl* ‘harness (verb)’

Sometimes the dictionary says that the -an verb has a passive meaning, as in (10):

(10) čaka įyväč laiāx čavän-āmt (ČRS 576)  
lime.tree wood good be.hollowed-pres.3sg  
‘the wood of a lime tree is good for hollowing out’

*čavän* ‘be dug out, be hollowed’  
← *čav* ‘dig, scratch, paw, hollow; claw, scrape’

(11) *šāmi-zem pir śir-e puśtar-ān-nā.* (Gebr 192)  
bone-pl one place-dat/acc collect.-pass-perf.ptc  
‘Die Knochen waren an einer Stelle zusammengekommen.’  
‘The bones were collected into one place.’

*puśtarān* ‘collect, gather (itr.), be collected, be gathered’  
← *puśtar* ‘collect, gather (tr.)’

For the verb in (11), only the reflexive reading is indicated (TšSS: 141): *pěr šēre puśtarān* ‘gather (itr.) together in one place’ and *šula tuxma puśtarān* ‘get ready for a journey’. Another source gives more readings including several passives: *tirpl xāvārt puśtarānāt* ‘the corn shall be reaped quickly’ and *větē širla čas puśtarānamast* ‘small berries are not picked quickly’ (ČRS: 319).
3.2. Automatives

In automative sentences, the AGENTIVE is never present. The occurrences arise spontaneously. The majority of Chuvash verbs with an -n or -l suffix represent a specific type of agentless passive. For this group, Kulonen (1985: 290) has started to use the term automative for the active-passive axis alongside the reflexive, as reflexive and passive are often loosely used to refer to several different semantic categories. In automative events, the AGENTIVE is absent from both the deep and surface structure. The only actant of this type of verb, the subject, does not control the event or state. Many automative verbs can be derived from adjectives, e.g. măkal- ‘become blunt, dull; become stupid’ ← măka ‘blunt, dull; stupid’, šutal ‘twinkle, shine; lighten; dawn, brighten up’ ← šutā, šut ‘light; bright, enlightenment, education’, tasad ‘become clean, be purified; disappear, be lost’ ← tasa ‘clean, tidy’ (Levitskaja 1988: 303–304). (Depending on the arguments, the reading can also be passive.) With nominal stems the derivative suffix is a CHANGER, with verbal stems being TRANSFORMERS. There are two kinds of subjects for the types of verbs: EXPERIENCERS (12, etc.) or NEUTRALs, as in séšě măkalnä ‘the knife became blunt’ (TSSS 97).

(12) Хĕр-не хора ан кал-ăр, (Sbor 42)
girl-DAT/ACC black NEG.IMP.PART say-IMP.2PL
Ар-па вырт-сан сарал-ать.
husband-INSTR lie-CR.D.GER2 turn.yellow-PRES.3SG
‘Don’t say that the girl is black, when she sleeps with (her) husband, she turns yellow.’

saral, sarăx ‘turn yellow’
~ sarat ‘make yellow’
← sară, sar ‘yellow’

Cognitive and mental verbs form an important group of automatives. Although the first actants are EXPERIENCERS, they are not visible in the surface structure and are hidden somewhere in the background. In these cases, the second actant is the CONTENT, which does not participate in any way in the situation expressed by the verb. Often an argument in a local case is also present and the SOURCE in the ablative case (13) or LOCATIVE (14).

(13) Ката-ран ҫутă корăн-ать. (Sbor 41)
far-ABL light be.seen-PRES.3SG
‘Far away, a light is visible.’

korăn, kurăn ‘be seen, become visible’
← kor, kur ‘see, look; experience, endure, hold, bear’
In (14) Şül-te, pĕlĕt aj-ĕnče // (ChM 212, 262)
high-LOC cloud under-LOC,px3sg
tărrı jur-ri iltĕn-et,
lark song-px3sg be.heard-pres.3sg
‘In the sky under the clouds // the song of the lark can be heard;’

iltĕn ‘be heard’
← ilt ‘hear’, metathetic itle ‘listen; obey’

The following examples have an external participant in the instrumental case -pal/-pe,
which can only be considered a reason, not an agent. In some examples from Mari in an earlier study, I considered the wind to be the only representative of the force agent (Salo 2006a: 335–336). This could also be the case in Chuvash, too, as can be seen in examples (15) and (16). Nonetheless, they are borderline cases. More examples of instruments: ujsem jur pa vitĕncĕs ‘the fields were covered with snow’ (ČRS 82), xĕvelpe xĕrtĕn ‘tan in the sun’ (ČRS 555). In example (17), the eyes in the instrumental case, are an instrument.

(15) epĕ sasă-pa văran-t-ăm (Gebr 120)
I voice-instr waken-pres-1sg
‘Ich erwachte, als sie rief.’
‘I woke up, when she shouted.’

văran ‘wake up (itr.)’
~ vărat ‘wake up, revive; stay awake’

(16) Çıl-ne nĕrlе çĕmĕrt çыхлан-ать (Sbor 5)
wind-instr together bird.cherry get.tangled-pres.3sg
‘The leaves of the bird cherry are tangling up in the wind.’

šıxlan ‘get mixed, get tangled’
? ← šix ‘knit, twist; tie, knot’

(17) Kuś-ĕ-sem-pe păx-nă čух // (ChM 214, 263)
eye-px3sg-pl-instr look-perf,ptc pop(when)
kaččă-n čĕr-i šĕklen-et.
young.man-gen heart-px3sg surge-pres.3sg
‘When she looked with her eyes // men’s hearts surged.’

šĕklen ‘rise, ascend; grow; start, begin, become inspired’
← šĕkle ‘raise; carry, bear; stimulate, encourage’

In (18), the -n and -l suffixes, here used with the same verbal stem, are even mutually exchangeable in the given context.
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(18) йывăҫ‑ҫем ҫил‑пе маийăн‑ассе / маийăн‑ассе (ČRS 437–438)
    tree‑pl wind‑instr bend‑pres.3pl / bend‑pres.3pl
    ‘The trees are bending in the wind’

tajăl, tajăn ‘bend, lean (itr.), sway, sink down’
    ← taj ‘weigh; bend, lean (tr.), press down’

In the following two examples, the door opens and closes, probably by itself. Actually, the involvement of a hidden agent cannot be excluded. But in (21), the tree fell down all by itself.

(19) śapla kala‑san‑ax alăk‑ӗ te uśăl‑nă… (Gebr 108)
    so speak‑crd.ger2‑emph.part door‑px3sg and open‑perf.ptc
    ‘Kaum hatte er diese Worte gesprochen, so öffnete sich das Tor, …’
    ‘No sooner had he spoken these words than the door opened, …’

    uśăl ‘open (itr.); start, be established; be cleaned, air; freshen up’
    ← uš ‘open; start (to do something), establish’

(20) Прийомăn алăк‑ӗ – üëc алăк, … (Sbor 11)
    consulting door‑px3sg brass door
    Епĕр кӗр‑се кай‑сассăн хопăн‑ать.
    we enter‑crd.ger go‑crd.ger2 close‑pres.3sg
    ‘The consulting door – the brass door, … when we enter, it closes.’

    xopăn ‘close (itr.)’
    ← xop ‘close (tr.)’

(21) juman‑ӗ xăjĕssĕnex kasăl‑sa (Gebr 109)
    oak‑px3sg by.itself be.cut‑crd.ger1
    vaklan‑sa vırt‑nă.
    break‑crd.ger1 lay‑perf.ptc
    ‘Die Eiche fiel von selbst um und lag in Stücken auf der Erde.’
    ‘The oak fell down by itself and lay chopped up into pieces on the ground.’

    kasăl ‘be cut, be chopped; be spoilt’
    ← kas ‘cut, chop, tear’
    vaklan ‘get smaller, get chopped, crumble (itr.)’
    ← vakla ‘make smaller, chop, crumble’
    ← vak, vakă ‘small, little, minor’

In (22), the subject is inanimate, but with an animate subject, the verb would be reflexive:
(22) Шерте карта-па ныр-са çapăn-çê (PaMo 958)
pole fence-DAT/ACC go-CRD.GER1 bump-PAST.3SG
‘A pole bumped into the fence.’

şapăn ‘bump [into], crash into’
← şap ‘hit, slam, slap’

In (23), the reason is expressed with the ablative case. In (24), the tree as a subject is situated between EXPERIencers and NEUTRALS; it lives and dies and reacts to climate and seasons. In (25), the SOURCE is in the ablative case; in (26), the LOCATIVE is in the dative/accusative case.

(23) kurâk-sem jêpe-ren pičče (Gebr 116)
grass-PL moisture-ABL elder.brother
jêpen-se šît-r-ê.
become.wet-CRD.GER1 perf.vb-PRET-3SG
‘Der Bruder wurde von dem feuchten Gras ganz naß.’
‘The brother was quite wet from the damp grass.’

jêpen ‘get damp, get wet, grow moist’
← jêpet ‘water, wet, moisten’
← jêpe ‘wet, moist, damp; dampness, humidity’

(24) xâva ÿâvâç avân-amt; (Sbor 50–51)
willow tree bend-PRES.3SG
‘The willow tree bends;’

avân ‘bend, break, crook (itr.)’
← av ‘bend, break, crook, twist (tr.)’

(25) Amme-ne anâ-ren yûąrâl-t-âm; (Sbor 48–49)
father-INSTR mother-ABL leave-PRET-1SG
‘I said farewell to my father and to my mother;’

uįrâl, uįrâl ‘be separated, fall apart; come loose/off/out’
← uįr ‘divide, separate; determine, nominate; identify, recognize’

(26) Шыв-а йар-сан кêmêl irêl-mê. (Sbor 22)
water-DAT/ACC put-CRD.GER2 silver melt-NEG
‘Silver doesn’t melt if you put it in the water.’

irêl ‘melt, dissolve (itr.)’
?← ir ‘mix, crush, knead’
3.3. Reflexives

In the reflexive utterances, the subject (AGENTIVE) and object (PATIENT) have been conflated, and the only obligatory actant is ACTOR, which fills both roles. Benzing’s (1959: 720) reflexive examples are e.g. šăvăn- ‘wash oneself’ ← šu- ‘wash’, vitēn- ‘cover oneself’ ← vir- ‘cover’. The reflexive derivational suffixes are TRANSFORMERS. A typical example is tumlan- ‘dress’ (27). Often, when the subject changes its location, a LOCATIVE in the dative/accusative is present, as in (28).

(27) xaj kaxal tumlan-sa tux-nă ta... (Gebr 108)
that lazybones dress-CRD.GER1 go.out-PERF.PTC and
‘Der Faulenzer zog sich an, ging hinaus,…’
‘The lazybones got dressed, went out,…’

tumlan ‘get dressed in (festival dress, uniform)’
←→ tum ‘dress, clothing’ (obviously the form *tumla has disappeared)

(28) Irxi zarjadka tu-r-ēś te šiv-a (ChM 198, 247)
morning exercise do-PRÉT-3PL and water-DAT/ACC
kēr-se čüxen-čĕ-ś.
go.in-CRD.GER wash-PAST-3PL
‘They did morning exercises and bathed (washed themselves) by going in the water.’
čüxen ‘[s]plash, dabble; wash o.s.; pour over o.s., have bath; swing, sway’
← čüxe ‘rinse, wash out; disinfect (the seeds)’

In my earlier studies on Mordvin (Salo 2006b: 181–182, 2010a: 80), I have separated a small group of reflexives that have the special meaning of moving in some direction and named them INTENTIONALS. The second role is very frequently lative or locative LOCATIVE. This kind of meaning is also quite common among the Chuvash verbs presented in (29) to (31). In this function, even a verbal structure kur-ma ‘to see’ is possible (30).

(29) “tură man-a xa-m-a pitan-ma xuš-at, (Gebr 181)
God I-DAT/ACC self-PX1SG-DAT/ACC hide-INF order-PRES.3SG
ās-ta pitan-as?” te-nē.
where-LOC/LAT hide-FUT.PTC say-PERF.PTC
‘Gott befiehlt mir, mich zu verstecken, wo habe ich mich zu verstecken?’
‘God told me to hide myself, where shall I hide myself?’
[he] said. [The boy is talking to his horse.]
pitan ‘hide oneself, go into hiding; be hidden’
~ pitar ‘hide [away], conceal, mask; bury, cover’
(30) *pëtĕm ʃǐn tuʃ jër-ma puxăn-nă.* (Gebr 231)
all people wedding see-INF gather-PERF.PTC
‘alle Leute versammelten sich, um die Hochzeit zu sehen.’
‘all the people gathered to see the wedding.’

← *puxăn* ‘assemble, gather (together) (itr.)’
← *pux* ‘gather, collect’

(31) *kil-ne tavrăn-san man-ə xa-măr* (Gebr 121)
home-PX3SG.DAT return-CRD.GER2 I-DAT/ACC self-PX1PL
kil-e ješ-r-ĕ.
home-DAT/ACC drive-PRET-3SG
‘Nachdem wir heimgekehrt waren, führte er mich in unser Haus.’
‘After we came home, he drove me to our own house.’

tavrăn ‘come back, return, arrive’
← *tavăr* ‘turn around, wrap; return, give back’

A source in the ablative is present in (32). Obviously, the temporal meaning can also be in the second role, as in (33).

(32) *Băl amăš-h-hen čañäll-h-h ax vëserēn-čē* (PaMo 713)
(s)he mother-PX3SG.ABLAT easily-EMPH.PART withdraw-PAST.3SG
‘He drew apart easily from his mother.’

vëserēn ‘withdraw [from], free’
← vëšer ‘loosen, release’

(33) *çulla kashkär tapăn-ma-st te-ççē,* … (PaMo 5)
in.summer wolf attack-NEG-AOR.3SG say-PAST.3SG
‘it was said that wolves do not attack in the summer,…’

tapăn ‘attack’
← *tap* ‘kick, push, hit’

Sometimes the local element can be included in the meaning of the verb:

(34) *Chăxh-x-hem šawlän vê-c-e salan-čê*. (PaMo 1240)
hen-PL loudly fly-CRD.GER1 scatter-PAST.3PL
‘Hens flew off loudly in different directions,…’

*salan* ‘undress; scatter; loosen’
~ *salat* ‘spread (tr.); take to pieces’
The next verb tipĕn- ‘dry up’ is marked as a reflexive verb in the dictionary, meaning that it is impossible for it to have an object.

(35) muněn-me nũp-m-e kẹp
    dry-INF house-DAT/ACC enter
    ‘come inside to dry (one’s clothes)’

    tipĕn ‘dry up (one’s clothes, but itr.)’
    ← tip ‘dry (itr.), become dry’ ~ tip, tipē ‘dry; dry place, dryness, hot weather season’

In my material, (36) is especially interesting due to the fact that it proves that the suffix -l- in Chuvash can also be read as a reflexive. Examples (37) and (38) present another case where the suffixes -l- and -n- can be used equally. With a neutral subject, the reading would be automative, e.g. păr xuskančĕ ‘the ice moved’ (ČRS 567).

(36) Алăк‑ран тух‑р‑ăм, тайăл‑т‑ăм – (Sbor 48–49)
    door‑ABL go.out‑PRET‑1SG bend‑PRET‑1SG
    ‘I went out the door and bent (down) –’

    tajăl ‘bend, lean (itr), sink down’
    ← taj ‘weigh; bend, lean (tr), press down’

(37) хресчен‑сем кӗрешӗв‑е хускал‑нă (ČRS 567)
    peasant‑PL battle‑DAT/ACC move‑PERF.PTC
    ‘the peasants started to move to the battle’

(38) ан хускан! (ČRS 567)
    NEG.IMP.PART move.IMP
    ‘don’t move!’

    xuskal, xuskan ‘move, start to move (itr.)’
    ~ xuskat ‘move, start to move (tr.)’

3.4. Zero meaning

Since Ašmarin, it has been recognized that some Chuvash verbs can take the reflexive suffix -n without this changing the original meaning of the verbs, e.g. xĕpĕrte or xĕpĕnten ‘be happy, rejoice’ (Ašmarin 1898: 260). In this case, the derivative suffix can be considered to be semantically empty and is then classified as a modifier; therefore the term zero meaning is suitable. Such pairs are easiest to find in dictionaries, e.g. xër and xērěn ‘become hot’ (ČRS 553–554), or šis and šisăn ‘swell, puffy, distended; get greasy, get thick[er]’ (ČRS 627, TšSS 272). The first argument can be (43)
EXPERIENCER, (40) quasi-EXPERIENCER, or (39), (41)¹¹, (42), (44), NEUTRAL. Often a reason or INSTRUMENT in the instrumental case can be present, as can be seen in (42), (43), and (44). In the following three pairs of sentences, the suffix has zero meaning:

(39) ура-па тылчак ӳыпӑс-на

foot-DAT/ACC mud stick-PERF.PTC
‘the mud stuck to [his/her] feet’

(40) хуҫӑл-на шӑмӑ ӳыпсӑн-на

be.broken-PERF.PTC bone stick-PERF.PTC
‘the broken bone(s) grew back together’

ӳипӑс, ӳипсӑн ‘stick, fasten (itr.), adhere’

(41) улмуссӑ ухӑр-на

apple.tree dry-PERF.PTC
‘the apple tree dried up’

(42) уяр-па уй-хир хӑрӑн-ать

dry.weather-INSTR field-meadow dry-PRES.3SG
‘the dry weather is parching the agricultural land’

хӑр, хӑрӑн ‘dry, get dry, get parched’ ~ хӑр ‘dry (adj.)’

(43) сывӑ-пе чӗтрен

cold-INSTR shake
‘shake with cold’

(44) йывӑр машинӑ-сем пыни-пе кӗпер чӗтрен-ет

heavy car-PL going-INSTR bridge vibrate-PRES.3SG
‘the bridge vibrates when heavy cars go across [it]’

чӗтрен, чӗтрен ‘shake, tremble, shiver, rattle, vibrate’
~ чӗтрен ‘shaking, tremble, (substantive or adjective)’

3.5. One more potential meaning

The next example shows that texts are sometimes incompatible with the meaning derived from dictionaries. Here, in this context, I would like to propose a modal nuance for the suffix: ‘be able to find’. The argument structure does not change, so the derivative suffix type is MODIFIER. This case is very similar to Mordvin в-derivatives,

¹¹. Cf. previous ex. (18)
where *dynamic modality* ‘be able to do something, can’ is one of the many meanings of this ambiguous suffix (Salo 2006b: 182–183). In Mordvin, this meaning is so important that the word *vozmožnyj* or *vozmožnost* ‘possible/possibility’ is always mentioned in the relatively new comprehensive Erzya and Moksha dictionaries beside the term reflexive (*vozvratnyj*), including the passive and automatic.

(45) ** ku pět-ně kěrü jeple tup-ăn-čě?**
    this die-*PERF.PTC* son-in-law how find-*MOD-PAST.3SG*

‘Wie hat dieser verstorbene Schwiegersohn hergefunden?’
‘How has the dead son-in-law been able to find [his way] here?’

*tupăn* ‘be found, be able to find’
← *tup* ‘find’

4. Other Turkic languages

4.1. Reflexive and passive in Tatar and Bashkir


It has been reported that (cooperative-)reciprocals with -š have displaced reflexives in Bashkir dialects in particular. This has been attested in some eastern and southern dialects. In one eastern subdialect (gover), Aysk, this is even more widespread, as the reflexive forms have displaced some basic forms: ašan ‘eat’ cf. aša ‘id.’ in the literary language, respectively tegen ‘sew’ cf. tek ‘id.’ (Maksjutova 1976: 59, 58, 198). In the southern subdialect of Ik-Sakmarsk, reciprocals fill basic, reflexive and passive functions (Miržanova 1979: 66, 211–212).

It is rare to be able to study the conditions under which passives and reflexives can be used. A study on 1,950 verbs in Tatar revealed that more than half of the verbs studied (1,013) could not take an -l or -n suffix; most of them were intransitives (Zinnatullina 1965: 189). Another study says that the suffix -n with intransitive stems expresses intensiveness and frequency (Tumaševa 1969: 211–212).
In the Turkic languages, unambiguously reflexive verbs are mostly expressed by reflexive pronouns: e.g. Turkish *kendini öldür* ‘kill oneself’ is a causative of *öl*– ‘die’. Sometimes reflexive verbs have special lexical meanings, e.g. the Turkish *sev*– ‘love’ → *sevin*– ‘rejoice’ has a parallel counterpart in Chuvash: *sav*– ‘love’ → *savăn*– ‘rejoice’ (Johanson 1998: 55). In Turkish, the passives can be derived from intransitive verbs (46) and the first actant of the corresponding active sentence is not necessarily expressed, which makes them close to Finnish impersonals. Obviously, this structure does not occur in Chuvash.

(46) *Burada güzel yasa-n-tyor.*  
here nice live-pass-aor.3sg  
‘One lives well here / Life is fine here.’

### 4.2. Some remarks about modality in Turkic languages

In Chuvash there are also forms of possibility and impossibility. In the literary language possibility is formed with the suffix *-aj/-ej* following the stem: *kur-aj-r-ām* ‘I could see’, sometimes with the final suffix vowel dropped. It is rarely found and the Viryal “upper” dialect does not have this feature at all. The corresponding negative form in the literary language is *kur-aj-ma-r-ām* ‘I could not see’, which can be found in the Viryal dialect as *kur-i-ma-r-ām* ‘id.’. In some Anatri ‘lower’ subdialects, the suffix is *-ajr/-ejr*: *śit-ejr-ēn* ‘I can go’ (Andreev 1966: 55). According to Clark (1998: 443), the suffix order is: voice + ability + negation. Ramstedt (1952: 190–191, 1957: 170) sees the origin of this modality in the incorporated verb *u-* ‘können; can’.

In Tatar and Bashkir, possibility and impossibility can be expressed by various converb constructions (Berta 1998: 291). Dmitriev has proposed that Bashkir and other Turkic languages have four parallel conjugation or aspect paradigms: positive, negative, possible and impossible. The possible aspect is formed using the gerund *-a* and the auxiliary verb *al- ‘take’, e.g. *jaȥa aldi* ‘(s)he could write’ (Dmitriev 1948: 135–137).

### 4.3. Different suffix combinations

Recently, a substantial amount of time has been devoted to investigating combinations of verbal suffixes with each other in Turkic linguistics. The passive morpheme has two phonetically conditioned allomorphs: *(I)n-* after vowel-final stems and laterals, and *(II)*– elsewhere. The *n*-variant is identical with the medium voice, and

---

12. The capital “I” indicates that the vowel is subject to a four-way alteration, rendered orthographically by <u, ü, ı, i>, and determined by the rules of vowel harmony (Haig 2000: 219).
in some cases, it is difficult to distinguish the medium from a passive (Haig 2000: 219). In Yakut, there can even be suffixes of three voices incorporated into a single verb (Ščerbak 1981: 101). It has become apparent from large text corpora that in contemporary Turkish materials monoclausal double passives do occur:

    This chateau-LOC strangle-PASS-PASS-AOR.3SG
    ‘One is strangled (by one) in this chateau.’

A human agent in Turkish passives can be expressed in the clause via the quasi-postposition tarafından ‘from the side of’, and a non-human agent with the ablative case, e.g. rüzgar-dan ‘by the wind’ (Haig 2000: 225). Even one word sentences are possible: Öl-üń-ür or Öl-üń-ül-ür ‘It is [has] died.’ There are also complex causative-passive, causative-causative, and double causative-passive forms, such as öl-dür-ül- ‘be killed’, öl-dür-t- ‘cause to kill’, öl-dür-t-ül- ‘be caused to kill’, all derived from the stem öl- ‘die’ (Johanson 1998: 56). Sometimes a sentence is ambiguous as to whether or not it is reflexive or passive:

(48) Mehmet yıka-n-di.
    Mehmet wash-REFL/PASS-PAST.3SG
    ‘Mehmet washed himself. / Mehmet was washed.’

Once a second passive morpheme has been added, the sentence can only be read as passive: Mehmet yıka-n-ul-di. This type of double passive is called a passive intensifier by Özkaragöz, who separates also a second type of double passive connected to modality, one with the abilitative modal auxiliary suffix -Ebıl:

(49) Burada çalış-ul-abil-in-ir.
    here work-PASS-MOD-PASS-AOR.3SG
    ‘Here it can be worked.’

A diligent search has exposed cases where the suffixes are in a different order:

(50) Bu durum-a tabii ki üz-ul-ün-ebil-ir.
    such situation-DAT of course CONJ hurt-PASS-MOD-PASS-AOR.3SG
    ‘One can be hurt by such words.’

Andreev has examples of Chuvash causative markers that can be added twice: śi-ter-t-er ‘make to feed’ or can be added to other voices, as kala-š-tar ‘make to speak/discuss’ or vit-ēn-ter ‘make to cover oneself’ (Andreev 1966: 54–55). The last one can also have another meaning:
Even cases with three causative suffixes have been reported: xăp-
13 -tar14 ‘make to get up’ ←←← xăp ‘come loose’. These suffixes can be regarded as allomorphs for the sake of convenience (V. Sergeev 2002: 234). A reflexive suffix can be added after a frequentative suffix -kala-/kele: šap-kala-n ‘push, poke several times; rush; gesticulate; ramble’ ←←← šap ‘hit’ or vět-kele-n ‘hurry; try’ ←←← vět ‘scorch, burn’ (V. Sergeev 2002: 235–236).

Sometimes verbs having a reciprocal -š or other suffixes can be synonymous with -l or -n verbs as in (52) and (53), e.g. kutănlan and kutănlaš and ‘be stubborn, recalcitrate, be capricious’ (TšSS 85), ača kutănlašat ‘the child is capricious’, laša kutănlašat ‘the horse is agitated’ (ČRS: 198). It is also possible to say tumtir tipšerně or tipšenčě ‘the cloths got dry’, even though the stem tip has the meaning ‘get dry’ (ČRS: 483).

The sentence in (54) shows a combined suffix with a more specified meaning than its semantically related verbs from the same adjectival stem.

---

13. Almost no attention has been paid to causative suffix -atl/-et/-t due to its rarity (V. Sergeev 2002: 234).
14. It sometimes has the allomorph -ttar/-tter, but not in this case.
(54) Sivĕ, xajar xĕl irt-er //
cold bad winter pass-pret.3sg
kaj-at jĕr-se, xurlan-sa;
go-pres.3sg weep-crd.ger1 grieve-crd.ger1

‘[The] cold unpleasant winter passes //
goes a-weeping, grieving’

xurlan ‘mourn, grieve’
← xurla ‘defame, abuse, tell tales’
cf. xural ‘turn black, blacken; darken; get dirty’
xuran ‘be seen as black, dark’
← xura ‘black; dark, gloomy: dirty, dirt; bitter, acrid’

5. Conclusions

Whereas the Chuvash passive and reflexive suffixes are systematically used for forming lexemes, in many other languages passivization and reflexivization are purely syntactic processes. The Chuvash state of affairs is not relevant to the grammar – lexicon dichotomy, because the causative and passive morphemes are both used within the grammar and within the lexicon. They can make nouns into verbs, especially the reflexive suffix, which has a wider range of use, but verbs with the passive suffix can also have a reflexive reading. The picture is not clear, however, because some stems accept only -n suffixes and do not take -l suffixes at all. In addition, reflexive suffixes are the same as the suffixes deriving nouns into verbs. Rezjukov (1959: 136) tries to avoid the problem by combining both suffixes under the passive-reflexive voice. Dictionaries have provided simple solutions throughout the decades: Egorov (1954: 317–318) lists derivational suffixes, the -l and -n suffixes are divided into two categories, deverbal and denominal, and the -n is also considered to have a passive meaning (ČRS 662). The newest grammar does not say anything about the passive, but states that the suffixes of the reflexive and reciprocal voices are derivational, while suffixes of the causative voice are multifunctional and can be added very widely to verbal stems (V. Sergeev 2002: 237).

In Turkish, the difference between voices is sometimes clear: ög-il ‘be praised’
cf. ög-in ‘boast’ (Gusev 1986: 6–7). Serebrennikov suggests, that in the Turkic languages, there are two passive suffixes -l- and -n-, which have developed independently, although in some languages these have conflated. He thinks that the passive meaning has evolved from the reflexive meaning (Serebrennikov 1976: 33).

15. The original translation by Krueger is ‘growing black’, but this might be incorrect, as the dictionaries do not include the meaning ‘grow black, blacken’, the usual word for ‘grow black’ is xural (ČRS 565).
It seems to me that in the turkological work published in the Soviet Union or Russia the term reflexive is often used loosely and sometimes might even be close to the term intransitive. Usually, the term passive is defined in relation to the active. It has been most disadvantageous to Soviet turkology that there tends to only be a superficial knowledge of the Finno-Ugrian languages, which are also agglutinative in nature. Anyone who has studied Finnish grammar in depth can clearly see that the passive voice formed with the -t- affix in Finnish is obviously something other than a derivational suffix. Both the reflexive and passive categories are clearly derivational in the Turkic languages, as many of the examples have shown. At least from the morphological point of view there is no reason to maintain a separate voice category. Ultimately, the language decides what category to place its verbs in: in Russian vernnut'sja is a reflexive verb, but the English return (itr.) and the Finnish palata are not. In Russia, not much in-depth research on the derivation of verbs has been carried out, due to the fact that lists of verbs cannot reveal much at all; context is what greatly influences results. Some researchers consider this situation unpleasant and propose more studies on verbal categories in their native languages, such as Zinnatullina (1965: 185), who considered the five voices of Tatar dating back to 1895 to be insufficient.

So far, the Chuvash meanings presented are very similar to the meanings of -Alt verbs in Mari. Verbs in Mari using the am-forms have a passive, automative, reflexive or zero-meaning, too. The Mari Alt-verbs seem to be indisputably deverbal (as are the Mordvin v-verbs), so their derivational suffixes are transformers and modifiers, while in Chuvash, derivational suffixes from all three categories are used. There are, however, other meanings\(^\text{16}\) for these Alt-suffix verbs, especially if they take em-forms (cf. Salo 2006a: 337). Although the Pavlik Morozov corpus has not turned up any new meanings, the result might be different if more extensive corpora of modern languages were to be examined. The Mordvin v-verbs have more meanings and occur in texts more frequently than the corresponding Chuvash and Mari verbs do.

Except for in the case of zero meaning, -l and -n suffixes are used to reduce the verbs’ valences. This is particularly valid with deverbal derivatives. In very old cases of nomen-verbum, the few stem verbs are intransitive and seem to be more common than their derivatives, which have more restricted uses. As is often the case with nominal stems, the derived intransitives and transitives seem to be equal. On the following pages in Appendix, the term intransitive refers to the reflexive, automative and passive, with context often being the determining factor. For the sake of completeness, the causatives are also represented, as they are needed to describe the alternation between the transitive and intransitive meanings.

---

\(^{16}\) The frequentative meaning of am-verbs could also be referred to the l-frequentative on the Turkic side.
Appendix

Chuvash derivational patterns for verbs are mainly based on materials gathered from ČRS and TšSS. The case inventory of Chuvash makes finding an object rather difficult due to the fact that the object is marked with the dative/accusative case, which is also used to mark local utterances. So it is more than likely that not every intransitive or transitive meaning of the treated verbs has been included.

Deverbal patterns

Transitive stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tr.</th>
<th>itr.</th>
<th>tr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taj bend</td>
<td>→ tajăl bend</td>
<td>→ tajăltar make to bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ tajăn bend</td>
<td>→ tajănentar make to bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kas cut</td>
<td>→ kasăl be cut, cut oneself</td>
<td>→ kasăltar make to be cut, cut oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ kasăn be cut, cut oneself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vit cover</td>
<td>→ vitën be covered</td>
<td>→ vitëntar make to cover, make to cover oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš break</td>
<td>→ išel be broken</td>
<td>→ išelter make to break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>išter make to break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šix tie, bind</td>
<td>→ šixăn be bound up</td>
<td>→ šixăntar connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ šixlan get involved</td>
<td>→ šixlantar join</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šir write</td>
<td>→ širăn be written</td>
<td>→ širăntar make to be written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kur see</td>
<td>→ kurăn be seen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilt hear</td>
<td>→ iltën be heard</td>
<td>→ iltëntar make to be heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ilter make to hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salt open, take off</td>
<td>→ saltăn undress</td>
<td>→ saltăntar make to undress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>salttar make to open, take off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tavăr return</td>
<td>→ tav[ă]răn return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tavărttar make to return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muxta praise</td>
<td>→ muxtan boast</td>
<td>→ muxtantar make to boast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>muxtattar make to praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šĕkle raise, lift up</td>
<td>→ šĕklen rise, get up</td>
<td>→ šĕklenenter make to rise, get up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šĕklette make to raise, lift up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intransitive stem

\(xĕr\) warm up → \(xĕrel\) redden
   → \(xĕrĕn\) warm up
   → \(xĕret\) paint red (tr.) → \(xĕretter\) make to paint red
   → \(xĕrt\) warm (tr.) → \(xĕrtĕn\) warm to up (itr.) → \(xĕrtĕnter\) make to warm up

No clear precedence

\(tapran\) move (itr.) ↔ \(taprat\) move (tr.)
   \(taprantar\) make to move (itr.) \(taprattar\) make to move (tr.)
\(pitan\) hide (itr.) ↔ \(pitar\) hide (tr.) → \(pıtaran\) hide (itr.)
   \(pıtantar\) make to hide \(pıtarttar\) make to hide

Nomen-verbum patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>itr. + noun</th>
<th>itr.</th>
<th>tr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(tip) dry</td>
<td>(tipĕn) get dry</td>
<td>(tipĕnter) make to dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(tipĕt) dry (tr.)</td>
<td>(tipĕtter) make to dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(tipšer) get dry</td>
<td>(tipšen) get dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xăr) dry</td>
<td>(xărăn) dry up</td>
<td>(xărăntar) make to dry up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denominal patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noun</th>
<th>itr.</th>
<th>tr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(tum) dress</td>
<td>(tumla)?</td>
<td>(tumlan) dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(šilē) anger</td>
<td></td>
<td>(šillen) get angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(uşēr) drunken</td>
<td></td>
<td>(uşērēl) get drunken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(jēpe) wet</td>
<td></td>
<td>(jēpen) get wet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noun</th>
<th>tr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(paj) part</td>
<td>(pajla) divide into parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pajlattar) make divide into parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vak) little</td>
<td>(vakla) make smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vaklattar) make to make smaller (tr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**noun** | **tr.** | **tr.**
---|---|---
tâxa? buckle → tâxan dress → tâxantar dress somebody → tâxantart make dress somebody

**noun** | **several derivatives**
pêkê harness bow → pêkên bend (itr.)
   → → pêkêrel bend (itr.) → pêkêrelter bend (tr.)
   → → pêkêren bend (itr.)
   → → pêkêrt bend (tr.)
tasa clean → tasal become clean (itr.)
   → tasalan become clean[er] (itr.)
   → tasat clean (tr.) → tasattar make clean (tr.)
puš head → pušân begin (itr.) → pušântar make to begin (itr)
   → pušar start
   → pušla begin (tr.) → pušlattar make to begin (tr.)
   ↓
pušlan begin (tr.)

**Glosses and abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABL</th>
<th>ablative</th>
<th>MOD</th>
<th>modal(ity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>NEG.IMP.PART</td>
<td>negative imperative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARIT</td>
<td>caritive</td>
<td>P.</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRD.GER1</td>
<td>first coordinative</td>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gerund -sa, -se</td>
<td>PERF.PTC</td>
<td>perfect participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRD.GER2</td>
<td>second coordinative</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gerund -san, -sen, -sassan, -sessen</td>
<td>POP</td>
<td>postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT/ACC</td>
<td>dative/accusative</td>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH.PART</td>
<td>emphatic particle</td>
<td>PRES.GER</td>
<td>present gerund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn.</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>PRET</td>
<td>preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>PURP</td>
<td>purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id.</td>
<td>idem</td>
<td>PX</td>
<td>possessive suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>Russ.</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itr.</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>tr.</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT</td>
<td>lative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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