

## ЛИНГВИСТИКА

---

V. V. Baranova, M. L. Fedotov, S. A. Oskolskaya

### EXPRESSING ABSENCE IN THE TURKIC LANGUAGES OF THE VOLGA-KAMA SPRACHBUND: CHUVASH AND BASHKIR<sup>1</sup>

The paper describes means of expressing absence and non-participation in (Maloye Karachkino = Poshkart) Chuvash and (Kubalyak) Bashkir, two Turkic languages of the Volga-Kama Sprachbund. The field data were collected in Bashkortostan (2011–2016) and Chuvash Republic (2017–2019). Additionally, we bring into comparison available data on Tatar from existing grammars, dictionaries, and corpora (and, for some aspects, from native speakers).

The presented data reveal that Chuvash, Bashkir, and Tatar use very similar sets of markers to express absence or non-involvement of a participant. In each language, one of the markers (Chuvash *εok*, Bashkir *juq*, Tatar *juk*) can be described as a negative existential/possessive copula, another one (Chuvash *-SƏr*, Bashkir *-hEđ*, Tatar *-sEz*) functions as a caritive (abessive) suffix. These markers are cognate to each other in all three languages. These markers also have the very similar ranges of basic syntactic positions and semantic functions. Syntactically, the copulas form separate clauses and usually occur as predicates of independent clauses. The caritive markers can be used in different syntactic positions: attributive, adverbial, depictive, or predicative (where they compete with the copulas). Semantically, the copulas express meanings expectable for negative existentials: existential negation proper, presentative locative negation, negation of various types of possession, and ‘no’ reply. The caritive markers express the basic caritive meanings: non-involvement or absence of a companion, of an instrument, of various types of possessors (legal and temporary possessors, body parts, relatives, parameters, etc.). Interestingly, the distribution of affirmative counterparts of the caritive marker is practically the same in Bashkir, Chuvash, and Tatar, despite the fact that these comitative-instrumental markers have different morphosyntactic nature: the Chuvash suffix *-PA(lA)* vs. the Bashkir and Tatar postpositions *menæn* and *belæn*.

However, there is a number of differences between these three systems. First, the markers in question can have uses as part of larger constructions that differ in Chuvash, Bashkir, and Tatar. The Bashkir copula *juq* can combine with the participle form (in *-GAn*) in experiential contexts, as well as the Tatar copula *juk*, but not the Chuvash copula *εok*. The copula *εok* in Chuvash can be used with the infinitive in *-mA* to express impossibility, which has not been attested for Bashkir and Tatar. Also, only Chuvash has a complex verbal form combining an infinitive (in *-mA*) with the caritive marker *-SƏr* which functions as a “negative converb”. Chuvash has an exceptive construction which includes the caritive marker: *-SƏr poen’a*, while in Bashkir and Tatar cognate exceptive postpositions *baſqa/baſka* are used with the ablative marker. The Chuvash and Tatar markers *εok* and *juk* can be used attributively without overt marking of subordination, while the Bashkir marker *juq* demands an additional auxiliary verb in such contexts. The Chuvash marker *-SƏr* displays the most features of case markers: unlike the Bashkir marker *-hEđ* and the Tatar marker *-sEz*, it can combine with possessive markers and wordforms with this marker can have nouns as its dependents. And the Chuvash marker and the Tatar marker are similar in that, unlike the Bashkir marker, wordforms with them can have personal pronouns as dependents.

In general, all three Turkic languages of Volga-Kama Sprachbund have similar systems of expressing absence or non-involvement of a participant. They differ only in a number of details, where Tatar has an intermediate position between Chuvash and Bashkir. This is in line with the geographical distribution of the three languages: Chuvash in the West, Bashkir in the North, and Tatar in the middle between the two.

---

<sup>1</sup> The study was supported by RFBR’s grant # 20-312-70009 “Volga Turkic languages: Aspects of grammar”. We would like to express our gratitude to all our language consultants and to an anonymous reviewer.

**Key words:** *Bashkir, Chuvash, Tatar, Kubalyak, Maloye Karachkino, Poshkart, Volga-Kama Sprachbund, caritive, abessive, negative existential, absence.*

### **Introduction**

The paper presents a study of means of expressing absence and non-participation / non-involvement in (Maloye Karachkino = Poshkart) Chuvash and (Kubalyak) Bashkir, two Turkic languages belonging to Bolgar (Oghur) and Kipchak branches, respectively. It aims to describe the main functions and the distribution of these means.

The markers expressing absence in these languages are case-like caritive (or abessive) affixes in the (ad)nominal domain and negative existential/possessive copulas in the domain of non-verbal predication. In our approach to non-verbal predicative negation, we follow Veselinova's classification and terminology, including "existential negation", "ascriptive negation", "locative negation", and "possessive negation" (Veselinova, 2013: 109–111; 2015).

Bashkir field data were collected in the villages of Rakhmetovo and Baimovo in the Abzelilovsky district of Bashkortostan in 2011–2016. They belong to the Kubalyak variety of the Eastern dialect, which is close to Standard Bashkir. Most of the data were collected with elicitation tasks, some aspects were checked in the corpus of the Bashkir oral texts recorded in these two villages (Ovsjannikova et al.).

Chuvash field data were collected in the village of Maloye Karachkino (Poshkart) in the Yadrinsky District of Chuvash Republic in 2017–2019. It is important to note that the Maloye Karachkino (Poshkart) variety (which this paper is mostly based on with respect to Chuvash) is quite distant from Standard Chuvash. These data were also mostly obtained through elicitation, with the additional use of unpublished oral texts recorded in the same village<sup>2</sup>.

Both Chuvash and Bashkir are included to the Volga-Kama Sprachbund (Johanson, 2000), belonging to its westernmost and easternmost "poles". Since the principal field data collected by the authors comes from varieties of these two languages, they are the main focus of the paper. However, for the key issues we also bring into comparison available data on the third Turkic language of the Volga-Kama Sprachbund, Tatar, which come from existing grammars, articles, dictionaries, and corpora, and, for some aspects, from native speakers (see discussion in section 3).

The paper is structured as follows. Sections 1 and 2 are dedicated to expression of absence / non-involvement in Chuvash and Bashkir, respectively. In both sections, the first parts describe the use of negative existential copulas and the second parts describe the use of caritive markers. Since both negative existential copulas and caritive suffixes can refer to predicative negation of possession and some other common contexts, they are compared to each other in the third parts of these sections. The fourth parts are dedicated to affirmative counterparts of the markers in question. In section 3, we compare the data from Chuvash and Bashkir and discuss the general results.

### **Expression of absence in Chuvash**

As a whole, the system of expressing negation in Chuvash includes bound and free markers. First, there is the default verbal negative suffix *-mA*, which is cognate with verbal negative suffixes in many other Turkic languages, including Bashkir and Tatar. Second, there is a group of free morphemes that express negation in non-verbal predication. It consists of negative markers *mar* 'not' and *εok*<sup>3</sup> 'not exist'. The negative particle/copula *mar* functions as ascriptive negation, which negates sentences with nominal or adjectival predicates conveying the meanings of class inclusion,

---

<sup>2</sup> As an additional source, Standard Chuvash texts from (Chuvash Bilingual corpus) were used.

<sup>3</sup> As the paper is based mostly on data for the Maloye Karachkino variety, Chuvash markers are given in their dialectal form (e.g. *εok* instead of *εuk*) by default.

quality, or a temporary state (Baranova, 2020). The negative copula *εok* ‘not exist’ expresses negation in locative, existential, and possessive predications<sup>4</sup>. Third, there is a nominal suffix *-SƏr*, which expresses caritive semantics (‘without’).

We will focus on the copula *εok* and the caritive marker *-SƏr* as those two means that can express the semantics of absence. We will first describe the markers *εok* (1.1) and *-SƏr* (1.2) separately, then compare them to each other (1.3) and discuss their relation to the corresponding affirmative markers: comitative-instrumental and propriative (1.4).

### 1.1. Negative existential/possessive copula *εok*

The negative marker *εok* (Standard Chuvash *εuk*) ‘not exist’ is a copula expressing the meaning of absence, non-existence. It is cognate to similar negative items in other Turkic languages: Turkish *jok*, Bashkir *juq* (see section 2.1), Kirghiz *ǰok*, Yakut *suox*, etc. (Levitskaja (ed.), 1989: 211–212). The marker *εok* has a variant *εokə*; both markers are in free distribution in the function of negative existential/possessive copula.

The main function of the copula *εok* is negative existential predication:

- (1) *Malij Karatekin Morgoz-a avtobus εok.*  
 Maloye Karachkino Morgaushi-OBJ bus NEG\_EX  
 ‘There is no bus from Maloye Karachkino to Morgaushi.’
- (2) *Stipendi il-me-zen, okε-i εok.*  
 scholarship take-INF-CV\_ANT money-P\_3 NEG\_EX  
 ‘(If you) don’t get a scholarship, there is no money.’

It also negates some other types of non-verbal predications, i.e. negative “presentative locative” (in terms of Hengeveld, 1992) predications and negative (“presentative”) possessive predications with different types of possessive relations (legal ownership, temporary possession, kinship and part—whole relations, etc.), cf. (3) and (4). This is in line with the fact that presentative locative and possessive predications share an important feature with existential predications proper in that all three are “presentative”, i.e. they (re-)introduce an entity in the discourse, cf. (Hengeveld, 1992: 120)<sup>5</sup>.

- (3) *Man xola-ra kvartir εok.*  
 I.GEN city-LOC flat NEG\_EX  
 ‘I do not have an apartment in the city.’
- (4) *Kil-de nim=de εok.*  
 home-LOC nothing=ADD NEG\_EX  
 {Go to the store.} ‘There is nothing in the house (to eat).’

<sup>4</sup> In some contexts the copula *εok* also competes with the verb *pol* ‘be’ with the negative suffix *-mA*. This more peripheral strategy will not be discussed in this paper.

<sup>5</sup> Strictly speaking, the corresponding negative predications of these three types do not, as a matter of a fact, introduce a new referent, but they are still united by a shared property. In all these three types, the predication of existence/presence of a (non-referential) entity is included in the scope of negation. Cf. *There are no unicorns* ≈ ‘It is **not** the case that (there **exist** unicorns)’; *There’s no food in the fridge* ≈ ‘It is **not** the case that (there **exists** food which would be located in the fridge)’; *I don’t have a car* ≈ ‘It is **not** the case that (there **exists** a car which would belong to me)’. This can be compared to negation of non-presentative types, where the predication of existence/presence is presupposed (and the entity is referential). E.g., for non-presentative locative predications: *The food’s not in the fridge* ≈ ‘As for the [**existing**] food, it is **not** the case that (it is located in the fridge / the place it is located in is the fridge)’.

The marker *εok* can also be used (at least in Standard Chuvash) with verbs in the infinitive form with the suffix *-mA*, the whole construction introducing the semantics of impossibility:

- (5) Standard Chuvash  
 <...>, *pyrt-ĕn-tĕe*                      *εavrĕn-mA*      *εuk*.  
                  house-P\_3-LOC                      spin-INF                      NEG\_EX  
 {People have crowded into one house}, 'it's **impossible to** [even] **turn** in the house.' (Chuvash Bilingual corpus)

Such intrusion of an existential negation marker into the domain of standard negation is a well-described path of diachronic change, leading to use of negative non-verbal predication constructions as negative verbal forms/constructions (Croft, 1991; Veselinova, 2016).

The word *εok* also serves as the negative reply ('No'):

- (6) *εok*,                      *vāl*                      *pĕldĕr*                      *ki-ze*.  
                  NEG\_EX                      that                      last\_year                      come-CV\_SIM  
 'No, he came last year.'

The marker *εok* does not agree with the subject in person and number and does not attach any inflectional markers of its own<sup>6</sup>. In Chuvash, it is historically and also synchronically, to some extent, a noun meaning 'poverty, misery' or 'nothing, a trifle'. Cf. also the noun *εukki* 'absence' derived from the same root (seemingly with the possessive/definite suffix) and a lexicalized expression *εuk-pa pĕrex* (nothing-INS same) 'close to nothing, same as nothing'.

## 1.2. Caritive marker -Sĕr

### 1.2.1. Morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties of caritive marker -Sĕr

Chuvash has a dedicated caritive suffix *-Sĕr* (*-sĕr/-sĕr/-zĕr/-zĕr*) 'CAR', which makes part of the case paradigm. Cf. several illustrations below. It is frequently accompanied by the "emphatic" particle *-Ak* 'EMPH' (9).

The marker *-Sĕr* can modify absentees<sup>7</sup> with any properties (animacy, referential status, status with respect to information structure), including proper nouns, personal (17), negative, and interrogative pronouns. It can modify heavy NPs, including those containing relative clauses:

- (7) *Vāl*    *sagĕr*    *kĕnege-zĕr*    / *matematika*    *kĕneg-i-zĕr*    *kil-ze*.  
       that    eight    book-CAR    math                      book-P\_3-CAR    come-CV\_SIM  
 'He came without eight books / without the math book.'
- (8) *Jep*    *igĕ*    *ul-lĕ*                      *pĕtĕ-i-zĕr*                      *kil-d-ĕm*.  
       I        two    son-PROP    elder\_brother-P\_3-CAR                      come-PST-1SG  
 '[I have two brothers]. I came without [my] brother that has two sons.'
- (9) *Per*    *kil-e*                      *kar<sup>i</sup>-ĕmĕr*    *vĕrman-da*    *top-nĕ*                      *kozak-sĕr(-ax)*.  
       we    house-OBJ    go.PST-1PL    forest-LOC    find-PC\_PST    cat-CAR-EMPH  
 'We went home without the cat that we found in the forest.'

<sup>6</sup> It seems only to co-occur with the retrospective marker *=tĕĕ* 'COP\_PST', which is in fact a clitic.

<sup>7</sup> We use the term *absentee* to refer to the participant which is absent or which does not participate in the situation.

NPs with the marker *-Sər* can also be headless, functioning as an attribute inside an NP without an overt head. In this case it may (or may not) attach a 3<sup>rd</sup>-person possessive marker *-ə(n)/-i(n)* ‘P\_3’, functioning as a substantivizer and/or as a definiteness marker modifying the covert head. Other nominal markers can attach on top, which are semantically modifying the covert head, cf. the plural marker in examples (10)–(12) (in this case, two plural markers can be present) and the objective case marker in example (12):

- (10) *Sumkə(-zam)-zər* *xər* *atə-i-zem* / *Sumkə-zər-i-ə-zam*  
 bag-PL-CAR girl child-P\_3-PL bag-CAR-P\_3-PL  
*pet* *xidə* *kalaz-atəə*.  
 very strong talk-NPST.3PL  
 ‘[There is a group of girls in the street: some are with bags and others are without bags]. The girls without bags / Those without bags are talking loudly.’
- (11) <sup>OK</sup> *Joldaş-sər(-zam)* *xojgə-lə*.  
 friend-CAR-PL sorrow-PROP  
 / <sup>OK</sup> *Joldaş-sər-i-zem* *xorlək-lə*.  
 friend-CAR-P\_3-PL sorrow-PROP  
 / <sup>OK</sup> *Joldaş-sam-zər-zam* *xorlək-lə*.  
 friend-PL-CAR-PL sorrow-PROP  
 / <sup>OK</sup> *Joldaş-sam-zər-i-zem* *xorlək-lə*.  
 friend-PL-CAR-P\_3-PL sorrow-PROP  
 ‘[Those] without friends are [in general] sad.’
- (12a) *Vəl joldaş-sam-zər-zani-a* *poləz-at*.  
 that friend-PL-CAR-PL-OBL help-NPST[3SG]  
 / <sup>OK</sup> *Vəl joldaş-sər-zani-a* *poləz-at*.  
 that friend-CAR-PL-OBL help-NPST[3SG]  
 / <sup>OK</sup> *Vəl joldaş-sam-zər-i-ə-zani-a* *poləz-at*.  
 that friend-PL-CAR-P\_3-PL-OBL help-NPST[3SG]  
 ‘He helps [those] without friends.’
- (12b) <sup>OK</sup> *Vəl joldaş-sər-a* *poləz-at*.  
 that friend-CAR-OBL help-NPST[3SG]  
 ‘He helps [the one] without friends.’

As for the nominal morphology of the absentee, the suffix *-Sər* can attach on top of several nominal suffixes (which are semantically modifying the absentee). There can be the plural marker (13), the 1<sup>st</sup>- and 2<sup>nd</sup>-person possessive markers (accepted by some speakers) (14), and the 3<sup>rd</sup>-person possessive marker *-ə(n)/-i(n)* ‘P\_3’ (15) in its definite or possessive functions:

- (13) *Jep* *əner* *ku* *vərəm* *əin-zani-a* *usi-zem-zər-ek*  
 I yesterday this long man-PL-OBJ moustache-PL-CAR-EMPH  
*təli* *bol-d-əm*.  
 place be-PST-1SG  
 ‘Yesterday I met these tall people without moustaches.’
- (14) *Man* *podarok-sər* / <sup>OK</sup> *podarog-əm-zər* *atəa-zam*,  
 I.GEN gift-CAR gift-P\_1SG-CAR child-PL

*man batn'ia gil-ër.*  
 I.GEN to come-IMP.2PL  
 '[Ded Moroz ( $\approx$  Santa Claus):] — Children without my presents, come closer to me.'

- (15) (*Man*) *igë pitë-i-zër ep kaj-m-a-p.*  
 I.GEN two elder brother-P<sub>3</sub>-CAR I go-NEG-NPST-1SG  
 'Without my two brothers, I won't go.'

NPs with the marker *-SƏr* also can attach, at least in Standard Chuvash, the comparative/attenuative suffix *-(tA)rAk/-(tA)rAx* 'CMPR' and the depictive/adverbializing suffix *-(Ə)n* 'ADVZ'. This suggests that wordforms with the marker *-SƏr* may (at least sometimes) have adjectival properties, and that they may have gradable interpretation ('without X to a certain extent')<sup>8</sup>.

- (16) Standard Chuvash  
*...leş-ë kəmäl-sər-taraxx-ən al sul-të=te....*  
 other-P<sub>3</sub> character-CAR-CMPR-ADVZ hand wave-PST-3SG=ADD  
 {The husband told something to his wife,} 'and she waved her hand somewhat without enthusiasm and went on.' (Chuvash Bilingual corpus).

As for syntactic positions and subtypes of caritive semantics, NPs marked with *-SƏr* can be used in all positions and functions typologically predicted for caritive constructions (cf. Oskolskaya 2020). Below we give examples of several combinations of these parameters: an adverbial use in companion function (17); attributive uses in body part (18) and parameter (19) functions; an adverbial use in instrument function (20); and a predicative use expressing temporary possession (21). For depictive<sup>9</sup> uses with different possessive semantics, see (7) and (16) above.

- (17) *Pet'ə vərman-a man-zər-ak kaj-za.*  
 Petya forest-OBJ I-CAR-EMPH go-CV\_SIM  
 'Petya went to the forest without me.'
- (18) *Lavka-ra usi-zër arzin ëel-et.*  
 shop-LOC moustache-CAR man work-NPST[3SG]  
 'A moustacheless man works at the shop.'
- (19) *Jep telej-zër poləz-a kor-d-əm.*  
 I happiness-CAR fisherman-OBJ see-PST-1SG  
 'I saw a miserable (lit. "happiness-less") fisherman.'
- (20) *Sem'ion butilk-a ştopar-zər uε-r<sup>j</sup>-ə.*  
 Semyon bottle-OBJ corkscrew-CAR open-PST-3SG  
 'Semyon opened the bottle without a corkscrew.'
- (21) <sup>OK</sup> *Jep maşinə-zər bol-d-əm.*  
 I car-CAR be-PST-1SG  
 'I was without [my/a] car.'

<sup>8</sup> Also, stems marked with *-SƏr* sometimes occur with derivational suffixes like the verbalizer *-lA*, cf. *sən-zər-la-t* (face-CAR-VBZ-CAUS) 'disfigure', or the nominalizer *-lƏx~lƏk*, cf. *zakon-zər-lək* (law-CAR-NMLZ) 'lawlessness'.

<sup>9</sup> Or participant-oriented adverbial.

Finally, the Chuvash caritive can also be governed by a postposition *poen'a* / Standard Chuvash *puene* (< 'head:P\_3:OBJ'), which is used in the exceptive function 'except for X':

- (22) *Man-zər*      *boen'a* /      \**Man-zər*,      *por=da*      *xola-ja*      *kaj-za*.  
I-CAR      except      I-CAR      all=and      town-OBJ      go-CV\_SIM  
'Everyone except me went to town.'

In Maloye Karachkino Chuvash, this postposition is used only in the exceptive function. But in some other varieties of Chuvash, according to Ashmarin's dictionary, *puene* can or at least could be used to express caritive proper, too (Ashmarin, 1928–1950: iss. X, p. 25).

### 1.2.2. "Negative converb" with *-mA-zƏr*

The suffix *-SƏr* functions not only in the nominal domain, but also to some extent in the verbal domain. It can attach to verbal stems after an infinitive suffix *-mA*; the resulting form in *-mA-zƏr* 'INF-CAR' is used as a "negative converb". It tends to co-occur with the emphatic particle *-Ak*, just like in the nominal uses of the marker *-SƏr* (24).

- (23) *Nim*      *dəle-me-zər*      *ber-d-əm=de*.  
nothing      aim-INF-CAR      shoot-PST-1SG=ADD  
'And I shot without aiming.'  
(From a spoken text)
- (24) *Nim*      *kala-ma-zər-ak*      *jep*      *pərd-e*      *kər-d-əm*.  
nothing      say-INF-CAR-EMPH      I      house-OBJ      enter-PST-1SG  
'Without saying a word, I entered the house.'

This complex form in *-mA-zƏr* can denote concurrent situations (simultaneity) (25b) and preceding situations (anteriority) (26b). Its affirmative counterparts are the default ("simultaneous") converb in *-SA* (25a) and the anterior converb in *-SAn* (26a):

- (25a) *Xər*      *atəa*      *komnat-ran*      *taşla-za*      *tok-r'-ə*.  
girl      child      room-ABL      dance-CV\_SIM      go\_out-PST-1SG  
'The girl left the room dancing.'
- (25b) *Xər*      *atəa*      *komnat-ran*      *taşla-ma-zər*      *tok-r'-ə*.  
girl      child      room-ABL      dance-INF-CAR      go\_out-PST-1SG  
'The girl left the room without dancing.'
- (26a) *Urok*      *tu-zan*      *Van'ə*      *vil'a-ma*      *gari-ə*.  
homework      do-CV\_ANT      Vanya      play-INF      go.PST-1SG  
'Having done his homework, Vanya went out for a walk.'
- (26b) *Urok*      *tu-ma-zər*      *Van'ə*      *vil'a-ma*      *gar'-ə*.  
homework      do-INF-CAR      Vanya      play-INF      go.PST-1SG  
'Without doing the homework Vanya went out for a walk.'

However, the form in *-mA-zƏr* is not the negative counterpart for all uses of these converbs. For example, unlike *-SAn* 'CV\_ANT', it does not occur in conditional constructions: the regular negative form in *-mA-zAn* 'NEG-CV\_ANT' is used there:

- (27) *Ėner* *ɛomər* *pol-ma-zan* *per* *xola-ja*  
 yesterday rain be-NEG-CV\_ANT we city-OBJ  
*kaj-a-pər=təĕ.*  
 go-NPST-1PL=COP\_PST  
 ‘If it hadn’t been raining yesterday, we would have gone to the city.’

### 1.3. Competition between the markers *ɛok* and *-Sər*

#### 1.3.1. Predicative uses

The copula *ɛok* and the caritive marker *-Sər* (with a zero copula or an overt copula *pol* / *=təĕ*, cf. (21)) can both be used predicatively. But it should be noted, that in predicative uses, they compete only in expressing negation of possessive predications (not negation of existential or “presentative locative” predications, in which the marker *-Sər* cannot be used). In these uses, they can express different types of possessive relations, including body-part relations (28), kinship (29), legal ownership (30), and temporal possession (31):

- (28a) *Vəl* *ɛin-ən* *pər* *al-i*<sup>10</sup> *ɛok.*  
 that man-GEN one hand-P\_3 NEG\_EX  
 ‘This man doesn’t have a hand [he’s one-handed].’
- (28b) <sup>OK</sup> *Vəl* *ɛin* *pər* *al-i-zër.*  
 that man one hand-P\_3-CAR  
 ‘This man doesn’t have a hand [he’s one-handed].’
- (29a) *Man* *pitə-i* *ɛok.*  
 I.GEN elder\_brother-P\_3 NEG\_EX  
 ‘I don’t have an elder brother.’
- (29b) <sup>OK</sup> *Jep* *pitə-i-zër.*  
 I elder\_brother-P\_3-CAR  
 1. ‘I don’t have an elder brother’;  
 2. ‘I’m without [my] elder brother [now].’
- (30a) *Ėem’ion-ən* *kil* *ɛok.*  
 Semyon-GEN house NEG\_EX  
 ‘Semyon doesn’t have a house.’
- (30b) <sup>OK</sup> *Ėem’ion* *kil-zër.*  
 Semyon house-CAR  
 ‘Semyon doesn’t have a house’; ‘Semyon is homeless; has nowhere to live.’

<sup>10</sup> The use of the 3<sup>rd</sup>-person possessive marker *-ə(n)/-i(n)* ‘P\_3’ marker in these examples, both with the copula and with the caritive marker, seems not to be conditioned by the choice of the construction, but rather by the type of the possessive relation (alienable vs. inalienable).



- (31a) — *San okɛa por=i (bërle)?*  
 thou.GEN money be=Q together  
 — *Man(-ən) okɛa zok.*  
 I.GEN(-GEN) money NEG\_EX
- (31b) <sup>OK</sup> — *San okɛa por=i (bërle)?*  
 thou money be=Q together  
 — *(ɛok,) jep okɛa-zər.*  
 NEG\_EX I money-CAR  
 ‘— Do you have money?  
 — No, I don’t have money [on me] [at the moment].’

As can be seen from the examples, both constructions are compatible with all of the listed types of possessive relations. However, the construction with the copula *ɛok* seems to be the default one for predicative expression of negative existence in general. This can be seen in the way the majority of such stimuli were translated in our data: the copula *ɛok* was the first response and the marker *-Sər* was approved as an alternative after being suggested, cf. the “OK” marks in (28b)–(31b) and in (32b).

At the same time, there seems to be a slight difference between the two constructions in respect to expression of temporal possession. Although both are compatible with such contexts (31), for the marker *-Sər* it seems to be the default reading, while the copula *ɛok*, without special context, is interpreted as expressing a permanent state of possession (32):

- (32a) *Man maʃinə ɛok.*  
 I.GEN car NEG\_EX  
 Default reading: ‘I don’t have a car [**at all**]’ (but also compatible with the temporary reading ‘I don’t have my car [today]’).
- (32b) <sup>OK</sup> *Jep maʃinə-zər.*  
 I car-CAR  
 Default reading: ‘I am without [a/my] car [**now**]’ (but also compatible with the permanent reading ‘I don’t have a car at all’).

### 1.3.2. Attributive uses

As was already mentioned, the marker *ɛok* mostly occurs in predicative uses. However, it also has “bare” attributive uses, where it too competes with the caritive marker, cf. (33):

- (33a) [*Kil ɛok ɛin-zam] ʃən-atɛə.*  
 House NEG\_EX man-PL freeze-NPST.3PL
- (33b) [*Pört-sër ɛin-zam] ʃən-atɛə.*  
 House-CAR man-PL freeze-NPST.3PL  
 ‘Homeless people (/ people who don’t have a home) are cold.’

In such uses of the marker *ɛok*, it is difficult to say whether it forms a relative clause or already functions as a postposition-like unit. This is because, in contrast to the (other) known types of Chuvash relative constructions, this putative relative clause contains no marker of subordination (the same is true for the affirmative existential copula *por* ‘be’, cf. *pört por ɛin* (house be person) ‘person with a house’). However, there is some evidence for a clausal status of the attributive con-

struction with the marker *εok*: it may contain adverbs modifying the state of (unrealized) possession:

- (34) *Kil-de atεa-zam εok εin-zam*  
 house-LOC child-PL NEG\_EX man-PL  
*xaklε-rax podarok il-me-εē.*  
 expensive-CMPR gift take-NEG.NPST-3PL  
 ‘People who don’t have children **at home** don’t buy expensive presents.’

Such constructions also can be used headlessly (in a headless relative clause?), cf. *kil εok-i* (home NEG\_EX-P\_3) ‘homeless one, one who doesn’t have a home’ and example (35) below. In this case, again, a 3<sup>rd</sup>-person possessive marker *-θ(n)/-i(n)* ‘P\_3’ is used in the function of a substantivizer.

- (35) *Tərgəs-lə maşin-i todək-rak tərgəs(-sam) εog-ən-dzan.*  
 wheel-PROP car-P\_3 rusty-CMPR wheel-PL NEX\_EX-P\_3-ABL  
 ‘The car with wheels is more rusty than the [one] without wheels.’

In all attributive uses, the caritive suffix is much more preferred than the marker *εok*. Cf. a native speaker’s comment: “One can say *telej εok εin* [‘unhappy person’, with the marker *εok*], but *telejzər* [‘unhappy’, with the caritive suffix] is better”.

Unlike the caritive marker, the construction with the marker *εok* cannot be used adverbially or as a secondary (depictive) predicate:

- (36a) *εin-zan<sup>i</sup>-a maşinε-zər porən-ma ozal.*  
 man-PL-OBJ car-CAR live-INF bad
- (36b) *\*εin-zan<sup>i</sup>-a maşinε εok porən-ma ozal.*  
 man-PL-OBJ car NEG\_EX live-INF bad  
 ‘[It’s] bad for people to live without a car [not having a car].’

The comparison of the two markers shows us that both the caritive marker *-Sθr* and the negative copula *εok* can express various meanings of absence and non-participation in various syntactic positions: attributively, as a headless attribute, predicatively, and (this is available only to the caritive marker) adverbially or in a depictive position. According to their syntactic functions, the two markers show only partial complementary distribution, with an overlap in some contexts. In predicative uses, the copula *εok* seems to be a more basic, default means than the caritive suffix *-Sθr*, but both are equally accepted by the speakers as alternatives. Also, in predicative uses, the copula *εok* seems to tend to express more permanent and the marker *-Sθr* more temporary states of absence/lack. However, in the attributive position, the caritive marker *-Sθr* is the predominant and the default one. The attributive uses of the marker *εok*, which seem to involve (or have developed from) unmarked relative clauses, are less frequent and more restricted.

#### 1.4. Comparison with affirmative counterparts

Affirmative counterparts of sentences with the copula *εok* are formed with the copula *por* ‘be’ or sometimes with a zero copula, cf. example (3’) below (and example (31) above for a possessive use):

- (3') *Man xola-ra kvartir bor / Ø.*  
 I.GEN city-LOC flat be  
 'I have an apartment in the city.'

The caritive marker *-SØr* has two affirmative counterparts in Chuvash, which are distributed mostly according to semantics and the syntactic position of the marked NP. One is the proprietary case suffix *-lØ* 'PROP' (37a), (37b) and the other one is the comitative-instrumental case suffix *-PA(lA)* 'INS' (37a), (38), (39), (40):

- (37a) *Marusja uzor-lØ / <sup>OK</sup>uzor-ba platja i-ze.*  
 Marusja pattern-PROP pattern-INS dress take-CV\_SIM  
 'Marusja bought a patterned dress.'  
 (parameter; attribute)

- (37b) *Lavka-ra usi-lØ arzin ëcl-et.*  
 shop-LOC moustache-PROP man work-NPST[3SG]  
 'A moustached man works at the shop.'  
 (body part; attribute)

- (38) *Ëner Vaeə joldaş-pa kil-tə-ë.*  
 yesterday Vasya friend-INS come-PST-3SG  
 'Yesterday, Vasya came with a friend.'  
 (companion; adverbial)

- (39) *Simon şu-ba / \*şu-lØ<sup>11</sup> kil-tə-ë.*  
 Semyon water-INS water-PROP come-PST-3SG  
 'Semyon came with water [he brought water with him and put out the campfire].'  
 (temporary possession; depictive / participant-oriented adverbial)

- (40) *Sim'on butilk-a stopar-ba uε-r<sup>j</sup>-ə.*  
 Semyon bottle-OBJ corkscrew-INS open-PST-3SG  
 'Semyon opened the bottle with a corkscrew.'  
 (instrument; adverbial)

The distribution of the comitative-instrumental and proprietary markers is also definitely influenced by the syntactic position. The proprietary marker seems to be impossible in all adverbial positions (i.e. possible only in attributive, depictive, and predicative positions).

Finally, the comitative-instrumental marker *-PA(lA)* (but not the proprietary marker) also functions as a nominal coordinating device:

<sup>11</sup> In another example with similar semantics and syntactic position, both markers were accepted, although the alternative with *-ba* was still considered preferable:

(i) *Vasie okəa-ba / <sup>OK</sup>okəa-lØ kil-në.*  
 Vasya money-INS money-PROP come-PC\_PST

'Vasya came with money' (1. 'came to the shop'; 2. 'returned from working elsewhere' — the alternative with *-lØ* was accepted for both readings).

- (41) *Arzin ate-a-ba idə bankə-ra lar-agan şaba ɛ-in-e*  
 man child-INS dog jar-LOC sit-PC\_PST frog top-P\_3-OBJ  
*pək-sa lar-atə.*  
 look-CV\_SIM sit-NPST.3PL  
 ‘A boy **and** a dog are watching a frog sitting in a jar.’ (From a spoken text)

Let us summarize the distribution of the caritive (CAR) marker and the instrumental (INS) and propriative (PROP) markers in the system of expressing participation and non-participation in a situation, across different semantic subtypes:

Table 1

**Distribution of caritive and comitative-instrumental / propriative markers in Chuvash**

Function/role	Non-participation (negative)	Participation (affirmative)
companion	CAR	INS / *PROP
possessee (temporary poss.)	CAR	INS / (PROP)
possessee (legal ownership)	CAR	(INS) / PROP
possessee (body part)	CAR	(INS) / PROP
possessee (kinship)	CAR	*INS / PROP
instrument	CAR	INS / *PROP
vehicle	CAR	INS / *PROP
...		
concomitant situation (with verbs)	CAR (form in <i>-mA-zƏr</i> )	—
coordination	—	INS

## 2. Expression of absence in Bashkir

The absence or non-involvement in Bashkir is expressed with the negative existential marker *juq* (Mishchenko, 2017) and the caritive marker *-hEđ* (Oskolskaya, 2016). These markers are cognate to the Chuvash markers *ɛok* and *-SƏr*, respectively (Levitskaja, 1976: 24–25; Levitskaja (ed.), 1989: 211–212; Fedotov, 1983: 39–40).

In this section, we will describe the use of the markers *juq* (2.1) and *-hEđ* (2.2), compare them to each other (2.3) and discuss their relation to the corresponding affirmative markers: possessive, comitative-instrumental, and propriative (2.4).

### 2.1. Negative existential/possessive copula *juq*

The predicative expression of absence is performed with the copula *juq*. It does not have any allomorphs. It can be used in a number of contexts related to the domain of existential negation. It can compete with the negative form of the verb *bul-* ‘be’ in some contexts. Besides, there is another marker for non-verbal negation, *təgel* ‘not’ (46), that is mainly used to express negative ascription. The means of expressing non-verbal negation in Bashkir were described in detail in (Mishchenko, 2017).

The core function of the copula *juq* is negative existential predication:

- (42) *Hin tej alla juq tip æjt-∅ tej*  
 thou say.IPFV God NEG\_EX say.CV say-IMP say.IPFV  
*bøtøn næmæ juq.*  
 whole thing NEG\_EX  
 “‘You, — he says, — say that God doesn’t exist, doesn’t exist at all.’”  
 (Ovsjannikova et al.: 160818\_mmmT\_Dzhinny- 031)

Bashkir *juq* is also used in the negative presentative locative predications:

- (43) *Af-hrw-ða øθtæl juq.*  
 food-water-LOC table NEG\_EX  
 ‘There’s no table in the kitchen.’  
 (Baranova, Mishchenko, 2021: 346)

The Bashkir copula *juq* is also the main means to express the predicative negation of possession. It can be used for different types of possession, including kinship relations (44), legal ownership (45), temporary possession.

- (44) *Anxŋ ber kem-e=læ juq, <...>*  
 that.GEN one who-P\_3=also NEG\_EX  
 ‘He didn’t have anyone,’ {nobody knows which village he’d come from.}  
 (Ovsjannikova et al.: 140719\_aamB\_Vojna-061)

- (45) *Mineŋ mafina-m juq.*  
 I.GEN car-P\_1sg NEG\_EX  
 ‘I don’t have a car.’  
 (Baranova, Mishchenko 2021: 346)

The word *juq* also serves as the negative reply (‘No’):

- (46) *Juq, min Ræxmæt-tæ togel.*  
 NEG\_EX I Rakhmetovo-LOC NEG\_AUX  
 {(Talking on a cell phone:) — Hello, where are you, are you in Rakhmetovo?} ‘— No, I am not in Rakhmetovo.’  
 (Baranova, Mishchenko, 2021: 346)

Unlike Chuvash, Bashkir does not employ a construction which looks like “infinitive + negative copula”. It may be due to the absence in Bashkir of a form that would be cognate to Chuvash infinitive in *-mA*. Still, *juq* can be used as a part of a different verbal negation construction combining with the past participle form in *-GAN*. This construction has an experiential meaning:

- (47) *Unda ber qasan=da bul-~~van~~-xm juq.*  
 that.LOC one when=EMPH be-PC\_PST-1SG NEG\_EX  
 ‘I have never been there.’  
 (Baranova, Mishchenko, 2021: 350)

## 2.2. Caritive marker *-hEð*

In Bashkir, the caritive meanings are expressed by the suffix *-hEð* (*-hrð/-heð/-hoð/-høð*). The choice of the allomorph depends on the vowels of the stem according to the vowel harmony.

The marker *-hEð* is traditionally described as an adjectivizing derivational marker (Poppe, 1964: 64; Juldashv, 1981: 173; Dmitriev, 1948/2008: 83). However, it is productive and regular, so it shares some features of case markers. In this section, we will discuss the morphological, syntactic, and semantic features of the caritive marker in Bashkir.

The caritive marker can combine with proper names, with personal pronouns, with plural stems (48):

- (48) *Ræxmæt-kæ*      *Bolat*      *bala-lar-hxð*      *kil-de.*  
 Rakhmetovo-DAT      Bulat      child-PL-CAR      come-PST  
 ‘Bulat came to Rakhmetovo without his children.’

Unlike case markers proper, the caritive marker cannot combine with possessive suffixes<sup>12</sup>:

- (49) *Min*    *mæktæp-kæ*    *avaj(\*-xm)-hxð*      *kil-de-m.*  
 I      school-DAT    elder\_brother-P\_1SG-CAR      come-PST-1SG  
 ‘I came to school without my elder brother.’

A comparative/attenuative suffix *-(E)rAk* can be attached on top of the caritive marker if it fits semantically:

- (50) *Bolat*    *Mansur-ða*      *qaravanda*    *ixtibar-hxð-xraq.*  
 Bulat    Mansur-LOC      against      attention-CAR-CMPR  
 ‘Bulat is more inattentive than Mansur.’

A wordform with a caritive marker can have its own dependents: adjectives (51), numerals, relative clauses.

- (51) *Min*    *Bolat-tr*      *mɣɣɣq-lɣ*      *duθ-hxð*      *kɔr-ðe-m.*  
 I      Bulat-ACC      moustache-PROP      friend-CAR      see-PST-1SG  
 ‘I saw Bulat without his moustached friend.’

However, the use with dependent demonstrative or possessive pronouns and dependent nouns (52) is considered infelicitous by many speakers:

- (52) \* *Min*    *qunaq-qa*      *Bolat-trɣ*      *ul-hxð*      *kil-de-m.*  
 I      guest-DAT      Bulat-GEN      son-CAR      come-PST-1SG  
 ‘I came to visit (my friends) without Bulat’s son.’

Like the Chuvash suffix *-SƏr*, the Bashkir caritive suffix can express all basic subtypes of caritive semantics: the absence / non-involvement of a companion (51), of an instrument (53), of different types of possesseees (54)–(55).

- (53) *Min*    *ikmæk-te*      *bɣsaq-hxð*      *tel-æ*      *al-ma-j-xm.*  
 I      bread-ACC      knife-CAR      cut-IPFV      take-NEG-IPFV-1SG  
 ‘I cannot cut bread without a knife.’

<sup>12</sup> The only exception is a closed list of nouns denoting relatives (mostly elder ones) that are used in the context of associative plurality: *ataj-xm-dar-hxð* (father-P\_1SG-PL-CAR) ‘without my parents’ (Oskolskaya, 2016: 175–176).

- (54) *Magazin-da mɣɣɣq-hɣð hat-ɣw-sɣ eflæ-j.*  
shop-LOC moustache-CAR sell-NMLZ-AG work-IPFV  
'A moustacheless salesman works in the shop.'
- (55) *Taw-ðə tæðræ-heð øj tor-a.*  
hill-LOC window-CAR house stand-IPFV  
'There's a house without windows on the hill.'

Syntactically, the caritive phrase can have adverbial (53), attributive (54)–(55), depictive (56), and predicative (57) functions.

- (56) *Ul sumka-hɣð kil-de.*  
that bag-CAR come-PST  
'He came without a bag.'
- (57) *Bɣl qatrɳ bala-lar-hɣð ikæn.*  
this woman child-PL-CAR be.PC\_PST  
'This woman was childless.'

Bashkir has an exceptive postposition *baŋqa*, which is parallel/cognate to Chuvash *poen'a/puene* (Egorov, 1964: 169), but the caritive marker *-hEð* cannot combine with it. Neither can the marker *-hEð* express exception of a participant on its own (Oskolskaya, 2011).

There are also no special verbal negative constructions involving *-hEð* in Bashkir (that would be analogous to the Chuvash "negative converb" form in *-mA-zƏr*). It can be partly explained by the absence of a cognate converbial marker *-mA* in Bashkir. At the same time, we do find some examples of a combination of *-hEð* with action nominalizations ("infinitives") in *-(E)w*, cf. (58) (and (61) below):

- (58) *dofman menæn aja-w-hɣð*  
Enemy with feel\_sorry-NMLZ-CAR  
*køræf alɣ-p bar-ɣw*  
struggle take-CV go-NMLZ  
'to wage a **pitiless** struggle against the enemy' (lit. "**without** pity-ing")  
(Akhmerov et al., 1958: 68).

But in these examples it is used attributively rather than adverbially, and seems to be an absolutely transparent combination of a (lexicalized?) deverbal noun with a caritive marker. And, in contrast to the Chuvash *-mA-zƏr*, this combination is not treated in grammars as a special verb form.

### 2.3. Competition between the markers *juq* and *-hEð*

The caritive marker *-hEð* competes with copula *juq*. It concerns mostly the contexts of negative possession, since both items can express this meaning, cf. examples (44), (45) and (56), (57). The following comparison is based mainly on examples from the Bashkir corpus (Ovsjannikova et al.). There are not many examples (12 for *-hEð* and 42 for *juq*) in the corpus, which does not allow us to make strong conclusions. However, a number of observations can be made.

The copula *juq* is used mainly in predicative position. It can also be a head of an adverbial or relative dependent clause (59). A bare copula *juq* cannot be used (is not attested in the data nor

mentioned in the dictionaries) in attributive function like the Chuvash marker *εok* can (section 1.3). It acquires an auxiliary verb form when used in a relative clause:

- (59) ...*ful ikmæk juq bul-kan køn-dær-ðe* —  
 that bread NEG\_EX be-PC\_PST day-PL-ACC  
*jæj kønø.*  
 summer day  
 ‘...these were days without bread — in summer.’  
 (Ovsjannikova et al.: 170709\_nsgB\_Detstvo\_v\_derevne\_Kolxoz-05)

Bashkir *juq* seems not to be used in a secondary (depictive) predicate position:

- (60) *Baldaq juq. fulaj tege ful baldaq-hxð fulaj*  
 ring NEG\_EX so that that ring-CAR so  
*tip tuj ot-te.*  
 say.CV wedding pass-PST  
 ‘There are no rings. And so the wedding passed without rings.’  
 (Ovsjannikova et al.: 170716\_ggmT\_Zamuzhestvo-070)

The two sentences in (60) provide examples for both markers used in very similar semantic contexts. The main difference is syntactic: *juq* is used in predicative position while the caritive marker is used in a depictive position.

In general, the copula *juq* appears to be the default means of expressing negative possession in predicative position, while the caritive marker *-hEð* seems more restricted in it. The available examples suggest that wordforms with the caritive markers may be more likely to be used in predicative position if they are lexicalized / are more adjective-like, cf. (50) above and (61):

- (61) *Bala-lar bik trɣla-w-hxð bul-a tor-ɤajnr-lar.*  
 child-PL very listen-NMLZ-CAR be-IPFV stand-PLPF-PL  
 ‘The children were very disobedient.’  
 (Ovsjannikova et al.: 150704\_rrm\_Rabota\_uchitelem-006)

On the other hand, the caritive marker *-hEð* is more likely to express negation of possession in attributive, adverbial, or depictive positions.

## 2.4. Comparison with affirmative counterparts

The main affirmative counterpart of the copula *juq* is the copula *bar* ‘there is’<sup>13</sup> (Mishchenko, 2017: 134–135):

- (62) a. *Awɣl-da klub bar.*  
 village-LOC club there\_is  
 ‘There’s a club in the village.’

<sup>13</sup> The use of zero copula instead of *bar* is not described for Bashkir, but seems to be possible at least in rapid speech. Cf. an example from the Bashkir corpus:

(i) *Ular-ðɣɣ ul-dar-ɣ Kolja[,] un øs jæf-tær tiræ-he-ndæ.*  
 that.PL-GEN son-PL-P\_3 Kolja ten three age-PL vicinity-P\_3-LOC  
 ‘They [have] a son Kolja, about thirteen years [old].’  
 (Ovsjannikova et al.: 130700\_rmm\_Raja\_i\_Klavdija-002)



- b. *Awɹl-da klub juq.*  
village-LOC club NEG\_EX  
'There's no club in the village.'

(Mishchenko, 2017: 136)

- (45') *Mineŋ maŋina-m bar.*  
I.GEN car-P\_1SG there\_is  
'I have a car.'

(Mishchenko, 2017: 121)

The caritive marker *-hEð* has two affirmative counterparts: the proprietive suffix *-IE* (cf. examples (63) and (55)) and the postposition *menæn* 'with' (cf. examples (64) and (53)). Bashkir lacks a special comitative or instrumental case marker, but the distribution of the postposition *menæn* is very similar to the distribution of the Chuvash comitative-instrumental case suffix *-PA(lA)* 'INS', including its use for NP coordination (65).

- (63) *Taw-ðə matur tæðræ-le øj tor-a.*  
hill-LOC beautiful window-PROP house stand-IPFV  
'There's a house with beautiful windows on the hill.'

- (64) *Min bɹl bɹsaq menæn ikmæk tel-æ al-ma-j-ɹm.*  
I this knife with bread cut-IPFV take-NEG-IPFV-1SG  
'I can't cut bread with this knife.'

- (65) *Xəsæjen menæn Iðris Xajət isem-le qɹð-ka*  
Husain with Idris Hayat name-ADJ girl-DAT  
*kaŋiq bul-kan-dar.*  
enamoured be-PC\_PST-PL  
'Husain and Idris were in love with a girl named Hayat.'

(Ovsjannikova et al.: 150716\_aamB\_Skala\_Idrisa-003)

Table 2 summarizes the distribution of the caritive marker *-hEð* and its affirmative counterparts<sup>14</sup> across different semantic subtypes:

Table 2

Distribution of caritive and comitative-instrumental / proprietive markers in Bashkir

Function/role	Non-participation (negative)	Participation (affirmative)
companion	CAR	<i>menæn</i>
possessee (temporary poss.)	CAR	<i>menæn</i>
possessee (legal ownership)	CAR	PROP
possessee (body part)	CAR	PROP
possessee (kinship)	CAR	PROP

<sup>14</sup> The precise distribution of the suffix *-hEð* with the postposition *menæn* was not studied extensively: only first translations of stimuli for each type were collected. Therefore, possible additional variation between them in particular contexts may have been overlooked.

Function/role	Non-participation (negative)	Participation (affirmative)
instrument	CAR	<i>menæn</i>
vehicle	* CAR	<i>menæn</i>
...		
concomitant situation (with verbs)	* CAR	—
<i>coordination</i>	—	<i>menæn</i>

Like the caritive marker *-hEđ*, the propriative marker *-IE* displays grammatical features both of derivational suffixes and of inflectional case markers. However, the propriative marker is closer to derivation than the caritive marker. Although the suffix *-IE* is rather productive and can attach to all common nouns, modal words, and numerals, it cannot attach to proper nouns or personal pronouns (only marginal examples can be found on the Internet). It can occasionally combine with plural marker *-LAr*, but it cannot combine with possessive markers. Wordforms with *-IE* can have adjectives, adverbs, and numerals as their dependents, but not other nouns.

Grammatical features of the postposition *menæn* are quite typical of postpositions: it can attach to any kind of NPs, including heavy ones with many dependents.

### 3. Discussion

The presented data reveal that Chuvash and Bashkir use similar means to express absence or non-involvement of a participant. Available sources on Tatar (see citations below) also show a very similar system. There are two basic markers with this functions in all three languages. One of the markers (Chuvash *εok*, Bashkir *juq*, Tatar *juk* (Zakiev (ed.), 1992: 270)) can be described as a negative existential/possessive copula, another one (Chuvash *-SƏr*, Bashkir *-hEđ*, Tatar *-sEz* (Zakiev (ed.), 1992: 270; 1995: 355)) functions as a caritive marker. Chuvash, Bashkir, and Tatar markers are cognate to each other. Their grammatical status is also similar: negative existential markers are copulas, while caritive markers are suffixes. These markers also have very similar or identical ranges of basic syntactic positions and semantic functions.

Syntactically, the copulas form separate clauses and usually occur as predicates of independent clauses. The caritive markers can be used in different syntactic positions: attributive, adverbial, depictive, or predicative. In all three Turkic languages of Volga-Kama Sprachbund, Bashkir, Chuvash, and Tatar, caritive markers compete with negative existentials in predicative contexts (for Tatar, see (Zakiev (ed.), 1992: 270)).

Semantically, the copulas express a range of meanings expectable for negative existentials: existential negation proper, presentative locative negation, negation of various types of possession, and ‘no’ reply. The caritive markers express the basic caritive meanings: non-involvement or absence of a companion, of an instrument, of various types of possessors (legal and temporary possessors, body parts, relatives, parameters, etc.).

The distribution of affirmative counterparts of the caritive marker is practically the same in Chuvash and Bashkir, despite the fact that the comitative-instrumental markers in these two languages have different morphosyntactic nature: the Chuvash marker *-PA(lA)* is a suffix, while the Bashkir marker *menæn* is a postposition. The Tatar comitative-instrumental postposition *belæn* ‘with’ is, too, very similar in distribution, cf. (Asylgaraev et al. (eds.), 2007b: 225–226). In fact, the Chuvash suffix *-PA(lA)* is etymologized as also going back to a postposition, *\*birle(n)* (Fedotov, 1983: 38). And as such, it is undoubtedly cognate to the Tatar postposition *belæn* (ibid.: 39;

Tenishev, 1988: 496) and probably also to the Bashkir postposition *menæn* (Tenishev, 1988: 496; Dmitriev, 1948/2008: 118).

However, there are a number of differences between these three systems.

First, the markers in question have uses as part of larger constructions that differ in Chuvash, Bashkir, and Tatar. The Bashkir copula *juq* can combine with the participle form in *-GAn* in experiential contexts, as well as the Tatar copula *juk* (Zakiev (ed.), 1993: 98), but the Chuvash copula *εok* does not have equivalent uses. On the other hand, the copula *εok* in Chuvash can be used with the infinitive in *-mA* to express impossibility, which has not been attested for Bashkir and Tatar. Also, Chuvash has a complex verbal form combining an infinitive in *-mA* and the caritive marker *-Sθr*, which functions as a “negative converb” (an adverbial clause expressing unrealized simultaneous or preceding situations). Although in Bashkir and Tatar we find some examples of similar-looking combinations of caritive markers *-hEδ/-sEz* with action nominalizations (“infinitives”) in *-(E)w/-U/-w<sup>15</sup>*, they differ from the Chuvash construction in that they are used attributively rather than adverbially and that they seem to be transparent combinations of lexicalized deverbal nouns with caritive markers.

Chuvash has an exceptive construction which includes the caritive marker (*-Sθr poen'a* / Standard Chuvash *-sθr puene*). Although the Bashkir and Tatar exceptive constructions are based on cognate (Egorov 1964: 169) postpositions *baſqa/baſka*, they do not include the caritive marker, but rather the ablative marker (for Tatar, cf. (Ganiev (ed.), 1997: 233; Asylgaraev et al. (eds.), 2007a: 212)). However, in some other Chuvash varieties, *poen'a* is also found with ablative case marking (Ashmarin, 1928–1950: iss. X, p. 25). Moreover, this ablative marking seems to be diachronically original for Chuvash, the caritive marking being a more recent development (Andreas Waibel, p.c.).

There are also slight differences in the syntactic properties of the markers in question. The Chuvash marker *εok* can be used attributively without overt marking of subordination (as if it was a postposition), while the Bashkir marker *juq* demands an additional auxiliary verb in a participial form in such contexts. Tatar seems to be closer to Chuvash in this respect: for the Tatar negative existential marker *juk* (and the affirmative existential marker *bar*) we too find equivalent “bare” attributive uses<sup>16</sup>, including headless ones<sup>17</sup>. This pattern of using negative (and affirmative) existential markers in an attributive clause without any overt marking of subordination is also of a more general interest. It is also attested in some other Turkic languages. And in several of them, using this strategy, lit. “[Y there isn’t] X”, is the only way to attributively express caritive semantics ‘X without Y’, or ‘Y-less X’, since these languages lack a dedicated caritive marker cognate to *-Sθr/-hEδ/-sEz*. Fedotov (Fedotov, 1983: 40) describes Altai, Tuvan, Shor, and Yakut (Sakha) as such languages. Cf. Tuvan *korguſ ʃok tajuun-ʃu* («коргуш чок дайынчы») (fear NEG\_EX war-AG) ‘fearless warrior’.

The Chuvash marker *-Sθr* displays more features of inflectional case markers than the Bashkir marker *-hEδ*. Unlike the Bashkir marker, the Chuvash marker can combine with possessive

<sup>15</sup> Bashkir and Tatar lack markers cognate to the Chuvash *-mA*. This absence of cognate forms/derivations could probably (at least partially) explain the attested differences between the languages with respect to larger constructions based on them.

<sup>16</sup> (i) 

<i>Bala-sr</i>	<i>juq</i>	<i>kefe</i>	<i>ker-mæ-sæ</i>	<i>dæ</i>	<i>bala-sr</i>
child-P_3	NEG_EX	person	enter-NEG-COND	ADD	child-P_3
<i>bar</i>	<i>kefe</i>	<i>ker-er.</i>			
there_is	person	enter-POT			

‘Even if those without children (lit. “people [who] don’t have children”) don’t enter, those with children (lit. “people [who] have children”) will enter.’ (Tatar National Corpus)

<sup>17</sup> (ii) 

<i>Ef-e</i>	<i>juk-nrŋ</i>	<i>af-r</i>	<i>juq.</i>
work-P_3	NEG_EX-GEN	food-P_3	NEG_EX

‘An idler (lit. “work-less [one]”) has no food.’ (Asylgaraev et al. (eds.), 2007b: 685)

markers and wordforms with this marker can have all types of dependents, including personal pronouns. As for Tatar<sup>18</sup>, the caritive marker *-sEz* here shares most properties that are common for both Chuvash and Bashkir: it covers same functions (can denote absence of a companion, of an instrument, of different types of possessors), it can attach to personal pronouns, to proper names, to plural stems, is compatible with the comparative suffix. However, in those properties where Chuvash and Bashkir differ, the Tatar marker sometimes patterns with the Bashkir marker and sometimes with the Chuvash marker. On the one hand, it cannot combine with possessive suffixes nor have nouns as its dependents (as in Bashkir). On the other hand, wordforms with the caritive suffix can have personal pronouns as dependents (as in Chuvash).

To sum up, Chuvash, Tatar, and Bashkir, all three Turkic languages of Volga-Kama Sprachbund, have similar systems of expressing absence or non-involvement of a participant. They differ only in a number of details, and Tatar appears to occupy in this respect an intermediate position between the two other languages: some features are shared only with Bashkir (“participle + *juq/juk*” construction; ablative case marking in the exceptive construction; incompatibility of the caritive marker with preceding possessive suffixes and dependent nouns), while some other features are shared only with Chuvash (compatibility of the caritive marker with dependent personal pronouns; “bare” attributive uses of *εok/juk*). Such an intermediate behaviour is in line with the geographical position of Tatar between Chuvash and Bashkir.

### Abbreviations:

1/2/3 — first/second/third person, ABL — ablative, ACC — accusative, ADD — additive, ADVZ — adverbializer, CAR — caritive, CAUS — causative, CMPR — comparative, COND — conditional, COP\_PST — past-tense copula (retrospective shift marker), CV\_ANT — anterior converb, CV\_SIM — default (simultaneous) converb (is also used finitely as one of the past-tense forms), DAT — dative, EMPH — emphatic particle, EX — existential, GEN — genitive, IMP — imperative, INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, IPFV — imperfective, LOC — locative, NEG — negation, NMLZ — nominalization, NPST — non-past, OBJ — objective case (accusative + dative/directive), P\_1SG — 1<sup>st</sup>-p. sg. possessive suffix, P\_3 — 3<sup>rd</sup>-p. sg. possessive suffix (also expresses meanings related to definiteness), PC — participle, PL — plural, PLPF — pluperfect, POT — second future (in Tatar), PROP — proprietive (~‘having X’), PST — past, Q — question particle, SG — singular, VBZ — verbalizer.

### References:

- Axmerov K. Z., Baishev T. G., Bikmurzin A. M., Kajumova U. M., Sajargaleev B. S. and Teregulova R. N. (eds.).** Bashkirsko-russkij slovar' [Bashkir-Russian dictionary]. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyh i nacional'nyh slovarej, 1958. (in Russian)
- Ashmarin N. I.** Slovar' čuvaškogo jazyka [A dictionary of Chuvash]. In 17 volumes. Kazan; Cheboksary, 1928–1958. (in Russian)
- Asylgaraev Sh. N., Ganiev F. A., Zakiev M. Z., Minnullin K. M., Ramazanov D. B. (eds.).** Tatarsko-russkij slovar' [Tatar-Russian dictionary]. Vol. 1. Kazan: Magarif, 2007. (in Russian)
- Asylgaraev Sh. N., Ganiev F. A., Zakiev M. Z., Minnullin K. M., Ramazanov D. B. (eds.).** Tatarsko-russkij slovar' [Tatar-Russian dictionary]. Vol. 2. Kazan: Magarif, 2007. (in Russian)
- Baranova V. V.** Pokazatel' otricanija *mar* v chuvashskom jazyke [Chuvash negation marker *mar*]. Tomskij zhurnal lingvističeskix i antropologičeskix issledovanij (Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology). 2020. Issue. 4 (30). Pp. 9–17. (in Russian)

<sup>18</sup> The following generalized description is based on data from existing Tatar grammatical descriptions (Zakiev (ed.), 1992, 1993, 1995; Ganiev, 1974: 162–165; Burbiel, 2018: 96), dictionaries (Ganiev (ed.), 1997; Dmitriev (ed.), 1955: 38), and corpora (Tatar National Corpus), and, for some aspects, also from native speakers.

- Baranova V., Mishchenko D.** Non-verbal negation markers and the Negative Existential Cycle in Bashkir and Kalmyk with some typological parallels // Ed. by A. Hamari and L. Veselinova (eds.) *The Negative Existential Cycle*. Berlin: Language Science Press, 2021. Pp. 339–375.
- Burbiel G.** *Tatar Grammar: A Grammar of the Contemporary Tatar Literary Language*. Stockholm & Moscow: Institute for Bible Translation, 2018.
- Croft W.** The evolution of negation // *Journal of Linguistics*, 1991. Vol. 27. Pp. 1–27.
- Chuvash Bilingual corpus. (Available online at <https://ru.corpus.chv.su/>, accessed on 05.06.2021).
- Dmitriev N. K.** *Grammatika bashkirskogo yazyka* [Bashkir grammar]. Moscow: Nauka, 2008 [1948]. (in Russian)
- Dmitriev N. K. (ed.)**. *Russko-tatarskiy slovar'* [Russian-Tatar dictionary]. Vol. I. Kazan: Tatknigoizdat, 1955. (in Russian)
- Egorov V. G.** *Etimologicheskiy slovar' chuvashskogo yazyka* [An etymological dictionary of Chuvash]. Cheboksary, 1964. (in Russian)
- Fedotov M. R.** *Chuvashskiy yazyk v sem'e altayskix yazykov* [Chuvash in the Altaic language family]. Vol. II. Cheboksary, 1983. (in Russian)
- Ganiev F. A.** *Suffiksals'noe slovoobrazovanie v sovremennom tatarskom literaturnom yazyke* [Suffixal derivation in Modern Standard Tatar]. Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1974. (in Russian)
- Ganiev F. A. (ed.)**. *Russko-Tatarskiy slovar'* [A Russian-Tatar dictionary]. Moscow: "INSAN", 1997. (in Russian)
- Hengeveld K.** *Non-verbal Predication: Theory, Typology, Diachrony*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996.
- Johanson L.** Linguistic convergence in the Volga area // Ed. by D. Gilbers, J. Nerbonne & J. Schaeken. *Languages in contact*. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi. Pp. 165–178.
- Juldashev A. A. (ed.)**. *Grammatika sovremennogo bashkirskogo literaturnogo yazyka* [Grammar of Standard Modern Bashkir]. Moscow: Nauka, 1981. (in Russian)
- Levitskaja L. S.** *Istoricheskaya morfologiya chuvashskogo yazyka* [Chuvash historical morphology]. Moscow: Nauka, 1976. (in Russian)
- Levitskaja L. S. (ed.)**. *Etimologicheskiy slovar' t'urkskix yazykov* [Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages]. Vol. 4. Moscow: Nauka, 1989. (in Russian)
- Mishchenko D. F.** Neglagol'nye predlozheniya bashkirskogo yazyka i sposoby vyrazheniya otritsaniya v nix [Non-verbal predication in Bashkir and the ways of its negation] // *Acta linguistica petropolitana. Transactions of the Institute for Linguistic Studies of Russian Academy of Sciences XIII*, 1. St. Petersburg.: Nauka, 2017. Pp. 110–146. (in Russian)
- Oskolskaya S. A.** *Funkcionirovanie edinic iskljuchenija v bashkirskom yazyke* [Use of exceptive markers in Bashkir] // *Etnogenez. Istorija. Kul'tura: I Jusupovskie chtenija. Materialy konferencii, posvjashhennoj pamjati R.M. Jusupova*, g. Ufa, 17–19 nojabrja 2011. Ufa: IJaL UNC RAN, 2011. Pp. 219–224. (in Russian)
- Oskolskaya S. A.** *Svoystva karitivnoj formy na -həð v bashkirskom yazyke* [Properties of the caritive form with -həð in Bashkir] // *Acta linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy Instituta lingvisticheskix issledovanij*. Vol. XII. Issue 1. Issledovanija po tipologii i grammatike. St. Petersburg.: Nauka, 2016. Pp. 173–185. (in Russian)
- Oskolskaya S.** Typological study of caritives: an overview and methodology of research // *Caritive constructions in the languages of the world. Abstracts of the international conference, Saint Petersburg* / Online 30 November-2 December 2020. Compiled by M. Fedotov, S. Klimenko, E. Koile, K. Kozhanov, S. Oskolskaya, E. Zabelina, N. Zaika, A. Zhuk. Saint Petersburg: ILS RAS, 2020. Pp. 49–50.
- Ovsjannikova M., Say S., Aplonova E., Smetina A., Sokur E.** *Spoken corpus of Bashkir (Rakhmetovo and Baimovo)*. St. Petersburg: Institute for linguistic studies; Moscow: Linguistic Convergence Laboratory, NRU HSE. (Available online at [https://linghub.ru/oral\\_bashkir\\_corpus/](https://linghub.ru/oral_bashkir_corpus/), accessed on 19.05.2021).
- Poppe N. N.** *Bashkir manual. Descriptive grammar and texts with a Bashkir-English glossary*. Bloomington; The Hague, 1964.
- Tatar National Corpus** "Tugan tel": <http://web-corpora.net/TatarCorpus/search/> (available at 05.06.2021).
- Tenishev E. R. (ed.)**. *Sravnitel'no-istoricheskaya grammatika tyurkskix yazykov. Morfologiya* [Comparative-historical grammar of the Turkic languages. Morphology]. Moscow: Nauka, 1988.
- Veselinova L.** Negative existentials: A cross-linguistic study // *Italian Journal of Linguistics*. 2013. Vol. 25(1). Pp. 107–145.
- Veselinova L.** Special Negators in the Uralic Languages: Synchrony, Diachrony and Interaction with Standard Negation // M. Miestamo, A. Tamm, B. Wagner-Nagy (eds.). *Negation in Uralic Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2015. Pp. 547–600.
- Veselinova L.** The Negative Existential Cycle through the lens of comparative data // E. van Gelderen (ed.), *The Linguistic Cycle Continued*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins, 2016. Pp. 139–187.
- Zakiev M. Z. (ed.)**. *Tatarskaja grammatika* [A Tatar grammar]. Vol 3. Kazan, 1992.

**Zakiev M. Z. (ed.).** Tatarskaja grammatika [A Tatar grammar]. Vol 2. Kazan, 1993.

**Zakiev M. Z. (ed.).** Tatarskaja grammatika [A Tatar grammar]. Vol 1. Kazan, 1995.

Baranova Vlada Vyacheslavovna, candidate of historical sciences.

Associate professor.

**National Research University Higher School of Economics, St. Petersburg.**

16 Union of Printers st., St. Petersburg, Russia, 190008.

Research fellow.

**RAS, Institute for linguistic studies.**

9 Tuchkov lane, St. Petersburg, Russia, 199053.

E-mail: vbaranova@hse.ru

Oskolskaya Sofia Alekseevna, candidate of philology, senior research fellow.

**RAS, Institute for linguistic studies.**

9 Tuchkov lane, St. Petersburg, Russia, 199053.

E-mail: sonypolik@mail.ru

Fedotov Maksim Leonidovich, junior research fellow.

**RAS, Institute for linguistic studies.**

9 Tuchkov lane, St. Petersburg, Russia, 199053.

E-mail: tequila.lime@gmail.com

*Материал поступил в редакцию 18 июня 2021 г.*

**В. В. Баранова, М. Л. Федотов, С. А. Оскольская**

#### **СПОСОБЫ ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ ОТСУТСТВИЯ В ДВУХ ТЮРКСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ ВОЛГО-КАМСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВОГО СОЮЗА: ЧУВАШСКОМ И БАШКИРСКОМ**

Статья посвящена способам выражения отсутствия или неучастия/невовлеченности в (малокарачкинском = пошкартском) чувашском и (кубалакском) башкирском, двух тюркских языках Волго-Камского языкового союза. Данные были собраны в ходе экспедиций в респ. Башкортостан (2011–2016 гг.) и Чувашскую респ. (2017–2019 гг.). Кроме того, мы также привлекаем данные татарского языка, взятые из имеющихся грамматик, словарей и корпусов.

Представленные данные показывают, что в чувашском, башкирском и татарском языках используются очень похожие наборы показателей отсутствия или невовлеченности участника. В каждом языке один из показателей (чувашский *сок*, башкирский *juq*, татарский *juk*) представляет собой отрицательную экзистенциальную/посессивную связку, а другой (чувашский *-SƏr*, башкирский *-hEđ*, татарский *-sEz*) функционирует как каритивный (абессивный) суффикс. Эти показатели когнатны друг другу во всех трёх языках. Эти показатели также имеют очень похожие наборы основных синтаксических позиций и семантических функций. Синтаксически, связки образуют отдельные клаузы и чаще всего употребляются как предикаты независимых клауз. Каритивные показатели могут занимать различные синтаксические позиции: атрибутивную, обстоятельственную, депиктивную и предикативную (где они конкурируют со связками). С точки зрения семантики, связки выражают ожидаемые значения показателей экзистенциального отрицания: собственно экзистенциальное отрицание, презентативное локативное отрицание, отрицание разных типов обладания, ответная реплика 'нет'. Каритивные показатели выражают основные каритивные значения: невовлеченность или отсутствие спутника, инструмента, разных типов обладаемого (легального или временного, части тела, родственника, параметра и др.). Интересно отметить, что дистрибуция утвердительных коррелятов каритивных показателей также практически одинакова в башкирском, чувашском и татарском, хотя инструмен-

тально-комитативные показатели имеют разный морфосинтаксический статус: чувашский суффикс *-PA(lA)* против башкирского и татарского послелогов *menæn* и *belæn*.

Однако между этими тремя системами есть и ряд различий. Во-первых, рассматриваемые показатели могут использоваться в составе более крупных конструкций, которые различаются в чувашском, башкирском и татарском языках. Так, башкирская связка *juq*, как и татарская *juk*, сочетается с причастной формой (на *-Gan*) в эксперициальных контекстах, в отличие от чувашской *εok*. Связка *εok* в чувашском может использоваться с инфинитивом (на *-mA*) для выражения невозможности, что не засвидетельствовано для башкирского и татарского. Кроме того, только в чувашском имеется сложная форма, сочетающая инфинитив (на *-mA*) с каритивным маркером *-SƏr*, которая функционирует как «отрицательное деепричастие». В чувашском имеется конструкция исключения, включающая показатель каритива: *-SƏr poεn'ia*, в то время как в башкирском и татарском когнатные эксперитивные послелог *bařqa/bařka* управляют аблативом. Чувашский показатель *εok* и татарский показатель *juk* могут использоваться атрибутивно без эксплицитного выражения подчинения, в то время как башкирский показатель *juq* в этом случае требует дополнительного вспомогательного глагола. Чувашский каритивный показатель *-SƏr* проявляет больше всего падежных свойств: в отличие от башкирского *-hEđ* и татарского *-sEz*, он может сочетаться с посессивными показателями, а словоформы с этим показателем могут иметь существительные в качестве зависимых. Чувашский и татарский показатели также похожи тем, что, в отличие от башкирского показателя, словоформы с ними могут иметь личные местоимения в качестве зависимых.

Таким образом, все три тюркских языка Волго-Камского языкового союза имеют похожие системы выражения отсутствия или невовлеченности участника. Они различаются только рядом параметров, по которым татарский занимает промежуточное положение между чувашским и башкирским. Это согласуется с географическим положением трех языков: чувашского на западе, башкирского на севере и татарского посередине между ними.

**Ключевые слова:** башкирский язык, чувашский язык, татарский язык, кубалаякский говор, малокарачкинский говор, пошкартский диалект, Волго-Камский языковой союз, каритив, абессив, экзистенциальное отрицание, отсутствие.

Баранова Влада Вячеславовна, кандидат исторических наук.

Доцент.

**Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики»,**

**Санкт-Петербург.**

Ул. Союза Печатников, д. 16, г. Санкт-Петербург, 190008.

Научный сотрудник.

**Институт лингвистических исследований РАН.**

Пер. Тучков, д. 9, г. Санкт-Петербург, 199053.

E-mail: vbaranova@hse.ru

Оскольская Софья Алексеевна, кандидат филологических наук, старший научный сотрудник.

**Институт лингвистических исследований РАН.**

Пер. Тучков, д. 9, г. Санкт-Петербург, 199053.

E-mail: sonypolik@mail.ru

Федотов Максим Леонидович, младший научный сотрудник.

**Институт лингвистических исследований РАН.**

Пер. Тучков, д. 9, г. Санкт-Петербург, 199053.

E-mail: tequila.lime@gmail.com