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A comparison of copied morphemes in Sakha (Yakut) and Ėven

1 Introduction

1.1 Borrowing scales

As reflected in the variety of ‘borrowing scales’ that have been set up in the literature (see Matras 2009: 153–165 for an overview), it is widely accepted that there are differences in the ease with which items are copied from one language to another. There is a general consensus that nouns are most easily copied, whereas bound morphology is the least prone to copying. Within bound morphology, a distinction can be made between derivational and inflectional morphology, with the latter bringing up the rear in all copyability scales (Wilkins 1996: table 14.2). (However, as demonstrated by Robbeets [this volume], a distinction should be made between category-retaining and category-changing derivation, especially denominal verbalizers, with the latter being cross-linguistically very rare.) Nevertheless, while the copying of bound morphemes is indeed far less common than the copying of lexemes, it is by now a well-documented outcome of language contact. In particular, several cases are known in which not only derivational but also inflectional affixes have been copied (e.g. Heath 1978; Gardani 2008, 2012; Grant 2008; Seifart 2012).

The reason for the resistance of bound morphology to processes of copying is often implied to be the tight integration of such affixes with the lexical material of the model language, which makes them more difficult to perceive as a separate entity. Backus and Verschik (2012), however, argue that it is less the bound nature than the very general meanings of such items that make them hard to copy. They suggest that the copying of specific meanings leads to the copying of overt forms.
while the copying of general meanings tends to lead to the copying of patterns rather than forms: “[S]emantic specificity should be viewed as a continuum with content items on one end, grammatical markers on the other, and many other things [...] in-between. The more an element is located towards the specific end of this continuum, the more copyable it is, because there is unlikely to be a native element that matches its semantics completely” (Backus and Verschik 2012: 139). Furthermore, they suggest that the more prominent a feature is at the level of discourse pragmatics, the higher are its chances of being copied as an overt form (Backus and Verschik 2012: 130). Seifart (2012) suggests a further factor that might play a role in morphological copying: the Principle of Morphosyntactic Subsystem Integrity (PMSI), which states that copied morphemes are more likely to stem from paradigmatically and syntagmatically interrelated subsystems than from isolated domains.

The factors suggested as facilitating the copying of morphemes (Weinreich 1953: 31–37; Heath 1978: 105–107, 110; Backus and Verschik 2012; Seifart 2012) can be summarized as follows (where ‘>’ signifies ‘are more likely to result in copies’):

(1) Factors facilitating the copying of morphemes:
   b) congruent structures (formal + functional similarity of morphemes) > divergent structures
   c) phonologically salient + syllabic (independently pronounceable) morphemes > phonologically reduced/non-syllabic morphemes
   d) sharp boundaries (stem occurs in isolation as well as with morphemes) > fuzzy boundaries
   e) unifunctional morphemes > multifunctional morphemes > portmanteau morphemes
   f) categorically clear (i.e. function of morpheme is clear in itself without recourse to other morphemes or context) > categorially opaque
   g) specific meaning of morphemes > general meaning of morphemes
   h) affective meaning/pragmatic salience of morphemes > no affective meaning of morphemes
   i) morphosyntactically (paradigmatically and syntagmatically) interrelated morphemes > individual, unconnected morphemes

From this schema one can set up the hypothesis that if the model and recipient languages are structurally congruent, and if they have phonologically salient and syllabic, sharply bounded, relatively unifunctional, categorically clear morphology rather than phonologically reduced, fuzzily bounded, categorially opaque portmanteau morphemes, then affixes could be copied from the model to the recipient language. Furthermore, in such a case it is more likely that the copied
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morphemes will be derivational rather than inflectional, and that they will have a specific, pragmatically salient meaning (with a “high meaning potential”, i.e. a relatively high contribution to the meaning of an utterance, Backus and Verschik 2012: 140) rather than a very general meaning. Lastly, the copied morphemes are expected to form paradigmatically or syntagmatically related subsystems rather than coming from various different domains of the grammar.

In this paper, I explore these hypotheses and, taking into account molecular anthropological data, consider further factors that might affect the outcome of morphological copying. I do this by contrasting two case studies that involve typologically similar languages involved in sociolinguistically similar contact situations: the Turkic language Sakha (Yakut), which was in intense contact with Mongolic languages, and the Lamunkhin dialect of the Tungusic language Ėven, which is still in intense contact with Sakha. In the following, I briefly introduce the two contact situations (Section 1.2) and discuss some methodological issues (Section 1.3) before turning to a description and discussion of the data (Section 2 and 3). Section 4 discusses the findings in the light of the hypotheses set up above, and Section 5 concludes the paper.

1.2 The languages and contact situations

1.2.1 Sakha (Yakut)

Sakha (also known as Yakut) is a divergent Turkic language spoken in the Republic Sakha (Yakutia) in northeastern Siberia (see map) by approximately 450,000 people (Russian census 2010), most of whom are small-scale horse and cattle breeders living in rural settlements. Irrespective of the enormous territory in which Sakha is spoken, it is a very homogenous language with few dialects and minor differences between regional varieties. This homogeneity can possibly be explained by the recent expansion of the language: on the basis of archaeological and genetic data (Gogolev 1993: 61, 88f; Alekseev 1996: 46; Pakendorf et al. 2006), it is estimated that the ancestors of the Sakha migrated from the vicinity of Lake Baikal in the 13th to 14th century CE to a fairly restricted area on the middle Lena. Only in the 17th to 18th century CE did they expand further under pressure of Russian colonization to cover their current territory. This may not have been sufficient time for regional differences to accumulate.

Like other Turkic languages, Sakha is an agglutinative language with quite strict SOV word order and a large amount of derivational and inflectional, practically exclusively suffixing, morphology. With the exception of the possessive case paradigm, where possessor and case are fused into one suffix, morphemes are
easily identifiable and separable, even though the surface form of both roots and suffixes changes due to vowel harmony and consonant assimilation across morpheme boundaries. Mongolic languages, too, are SOV and agglutinative, with a large number of inflectional and derivational suffixes, the surface forms of which are likewise affected by vowel harmony processes. In both languages, the nominative case is unmarked, so that bare noun stems occur frequently; bare verb stems express the imperative 2sg.

Even though nowadays the Sakha are settled at a great distance from Mongolia and no-one speaks or understands Mongolian anymore, their ancestors must have been in close contact with Mongols. This is shown by the large number of copied lexemes from Mongolic languages that are found in the language today: approximately 13% of ~1,400 items included in the “Loanword Typology” database are of Mongolic origins (Pakendorf and Novgorodov 2009: 509). This number
might, however, be an underestimate, with other estimates reaching 30–40% (cf. Pakendorf 2007: 295). No single Mongolic model language is identifiable among the modern Mongolic languages (Kaluzhynski 1962: 122, 126). This provides an indication of the probable time of contact and thus some idea about the sociolinguistic aspects of the contact situation, about which we have no historic records: The Mongolic languages were unified into one single language when Genghis Khan united the Mongol tribes at the turn of the 12th to 13th centuries CE (Janhunen 1998: 203); from this unified language (called Middle Mongolian) the current diversity of the language family developed through subsequent geographic dispersal and contact with speakers of different languages. The fact that no single modern Mongolic language can be identified as the source of the Sakha lexical copies might thus indicate that the contact between the Sakha ancestors and the speakers of Mongolic languages took place when the Mongolic languages were still not distinct; this would place the time of contact before the Sakha migration to the north, i.e. before the 13th–14th century, making it plausible that the Sakha ancestors were in contact with the Mongols at the height of Mongolic power (Kaluzhynski 1962: 119–120). The nature of the copied items provides a further indication that the Mongols were in a socially dominant position (Pakendorf 2007: 296). For example, terminology pertaining to law and order are copied from Mongolic, as are terms for “concubine” or “servant”. A particularly striking example is noχoː, the Sakha term of address for a younger or lower-standing male, which was copied from Mongolic noxoj ‘dog’.

1.2.2 Lamunkhin Ėven

Ėven is a dialectally highly fragmented North Tungusic language with ~13 dialects belonging to two larger dialectal groups (eastern and western; Burykin 2004: 85) spoken in an extensive territory in northeastern Siberia. Mutual intelligibility is quite low between peripheral dialects due to differences in phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon. Here, I focus on the Lamunkhin dialect spoken in the village of Sebjan-Küöl in the Verkhoyansk mountain range of Yakutia (see map). This is the westernmost still viable Ėven dialect, with an estimated number of about 300 speakers, including small children.

Similar to Sakha and Mongolian, Ėven is an agglutinative language. While word order is somewhat free in the eastern dialects (and tends towards SVO in the Bystraja dialect spoken in central Kamchatka), it is fairly consistently verb-final in the Lamunkhin dialect. Like Sakha, Ėven has a large number of inflectional and derivational suffixes, which change their surface form according to rules of vowel harmony and consonant assimilation, and bare noun stems function as the nominative case form. In contrast to Sakha, however, bare verb stems do not occur in Ėven.
Currently, the Sakha are the numerically and sociopolitically dominant indigenous group in Yakutia, and this holds for the situation in Sebjan-Küöl as well. Practically all speakers of Lamunkhin Éven also speak Sakha (with the exception of very small children who do not go to kindergarten) as well as Russian. In public life, Sakha is widely used (e.g. in the village administration, in school, in shops), and there is a tendency to use Sakha as soon as an indigenous interlocutor is present who does not understand Éven. It is thus not surprising that Lamunkhin Éven shows a high degree of contact-induced changes under Sakha influence (Pakendorf 2009).

1.3 Aims of this study and methodological issues

As outlined above, the Mongolic languages, Sakha, and Lamunkhin Éven are all typologically similar languages with morphology that should be relatively easy to copy: they all have a large amount of inflectional and derivational agglutinative morphology that is relatively unifunctional, sharply bounded, phonologically robust and relatively invariant (albeit with regular morphophonological variation), they are all practically exclusively suffixing, and they all have verb-final syntax. The contact situations, too, appear to have been comparable, involving a sociopolitically dominant language and a sociopolitically subordinate language. Thus, in accordance with the hypotheses outlined above, Sakha and Lamunkhin Éven are expected to have copied some morphology from their dominant neighbours, and the amount and types of copied morphemes are expected to be comparable.

However, it should be noted that for all their similarities in linguistic type and in sociolinguistic contact situation, the two case studies show important differences. They differ greatly in historical depth and in the extent to which they have been the focus of linguistic research: The Sakha – Mongolic contact took place approximately 700 to 800 years ago, with no historical accounts and thus no precise knowledge of the actual sociopolitical situation. However, a vast amount of research materials exist for Sakha – extensive dictionaries, grammars, as well as detailed investigations of copied lexemes, notably Kałużyński’s (1962) investigation specifically of Mongolic copies. In contrast, the contact between speakers of Lamunkhin Éven and Sakha is ongoing and synchronically observable, with a high level of bilingualism among Éven speakers. However, other than my own corpus of field data, no research materials concerning this Éven dialect are available. This difference determines the database available for this study: for the investigation of copied morphemes of Mongolic origin in Sakha, I used primarily the list of Mongolic morphemes appended in Kałużyński (1962: 69–118) as well as consulting the information on derivational suffixes in Korkina et al.
A comparison of copied morphemes in Sakha (Yakut) and Even (1982) and Xaritonov (1947). For Lamunkhin Even, in contrast, I was only able to identify Sakha copies in my corpus of oral narratives (and two conversations) collected between 2008 and 2012; this comprises approximately 47,000 words from 27 speakers of both sexes ranging from 11 to 78 years in age. In the examples, the speaker’s name is indicated with an abbreviation followed by the text name (for Lamunkhin Even) and utterance number.

The different types of database that I was able to use for Sakha and Lamunkhin Even determine two potential sources of errors: First of all, I might be underestimating the amount of copied morphology in Lamunkhin Even because low-frequency items might happen to be missing from my corpus. In contrast, I might be overestimating the amount of copied morphology in this language by not being able to securely distinguish between established copies and Sakha items used in instances of code-switching where the matrix language is Sakha (cf. Gardner-Chloros 2009: 30–32, Meakins 2011: 131–133). While I agree in principle with Backus and Verschik (2012: 131) that code-switches should be studied on a par with copies, in this particular study it is desirable to exclude code-switches as much as possible, since I am comparing two different contact situations. With respect to the Mongolic-Sakha contact I can take into account only established copies, since no code-switching is possible anymore and any Mongolic code-switches that may have occurred in Sakha speech at the time of contact are ignored. This makes it desirable to restrict the Sakha items in Lamunkhin Even to established copies as well, since inclusion of items from instances where Sakha functions as matrix language would lead to an artificial increase of copied items found in Lamunkhin Even and thus distort the results of the comparison. Frequently used criteria for established copies are that they should be used by monolingual speakers, and that they should be used relatively frequently and independently of the context (cf. Matras 2009: 106–114). However, the first criterion is impossible to apply in the Lamunkhin Even-Sakha contact situation, since to my knowledge all speakers of Lamunkhin Even (and definitely all the speakers who contributed to my corpus) are fluent in Sakha. Therefore, I had to orient myself solely by frequency of use of items, which of course depends on context and size of the corpus.

Lastly, before turning to the discussion of the copied morphemes, it is necessary to define what I consider a copied morpheme. I only consider morphemes to be copied when they can clearly be shown to stem from an external model language rather than having been inherited from an ancestor language. Furthermore, I include in my definition only morphemes that are dissociated from the model word(s) they may have been copied with and that are freely used with recipient language items (cf. Gardani 2008: 38, 2012: 73), i.e. I exclude what Kossmann (2010) calls Parallel System Borrowing. However, in contrast to Weinreich...
(1953: 31), I do not restrict my definition only to morphemes that have been copied by themselves, independently of a “carrier word” (a process called “direct borrowing” by Seifart forthc.). Thus, I count as copies all morphemes of foreign origin that are freely used with native lexemes, irrespective of whether they also occur with copied lexemes. In contrast to Gardani (2012: 74–75) I do not consider morphemes as copies only if they have maintained the meaning and function they had in the model language. Just as copied lexemes can undergo semantic shifts and functional changes in the recipient language (e.g. Sakha kuruk ‘always, often’ < Russian krog ‘circle’; Pakendorf and Novgorodov 2009: 507), so can copied bound morphemes.

2 Mongolic morphemes copied into Sakha

2.1 Number and kinds of copied suffixes

Kałużyński (1962) lists over 50 suffixes of presumed Mongolic origin in Sakha. However, most of these were never demonstrably productive, since Kałużyński explicitly states that they are found only with Mongolic stems or gives only examples with Mongolic stems; others are of unclear origin, with a similar suffix attested in Turkic. These morphemes therefore do not comply with my definition that copied morphology should be clearly traceable to a model language and be productively used with native lexemes. This leaves the still substantial number of 20 morphemes of Mongolic origin for which Kałużyński states that they are or were productive in Sakha. Of these 20 suffixes, 18 are derivational, comprising 11 nominalizers, four adjectivizers, two adverbializers, and one verbalizer. Only two of the 20 suffixes of Mongolic origin are inflectional, namely the ‘immediate precedence’ converb and a plural suffix.

While these suffixes all conform to my definition of copied morphology by occurring with native as well as Mongolic stems, not all are equally productive. In determining the productivity of suffixes I to a large extent relied on the judgments made by Kałużyński (1962) in his discussion of the copied morphemes as well as those found in the comprehensive descriptions of Sakha morphology (Xaritonov 1947, Korkina et al. 1982). In addition, I considered suffixes to be productive that are used with Russian copies, especially where these copies are clearly recent, such as xuligan ‘hooligan’ (a word borrowed into Russian from English (Vasmer 2008: 278), where it is first attested in 1898, cf. Oxford English Dictionary online). It is thus possible to distinguish between currently still productive and unproductive or at most marginally productive suffixes, as will be done in the following. The currently still productive suffixes comprise 10 derivational and the
two inflectional suffixes, while the only marginally productive or unproductive suffixes comprise eight nominalizing suffixes.

2.2 Currently still productive suffixes

2.2.1 Suffixes that derive nouns from verbs

The most productive derivational suffix copied from Mongolic is -AːččI, a deverbal nominalizer (2a) that is developing a function of marking habitual aspect (2b). In my corpus of Sakha oral narratives collected in 2002 and 2003 from elderly Sakha speakers, most of whom were monolingual or had at best a rudimentary command of Russian (Pakendorf 2007: 64), an example occurs with a Russian stem (huluːspalaː- ‘serve in the army’ < huluːspa ‘service’), clearly demonstrating the ongoing productivity of this suffix. Note that in the examples, copies from Russian and Mongolian are indicated with R and M, respectively; copies from Sakha into Lamunkhin Ėven are indicated with Y (< Yakut).

(2a) tujgun huluːspa-l-aːččï-lar χata:hüla-p-pït-tara
    excellent service.R-vr-HAB.M-PL go.for.a.ride-CAUS-PSTPT-3PL
    ‘... they took the excellent soldiers (for a flight).’ [YmyE_192]

(2b) tugu tugu öl-ör-öːččü-gün-üj?
    what.ACC what.ACC die-CAUS-HAB.M-2SG-Q
    ‘What did you usually kill?’ [Chir_047]

Two further copied suffixes deriving nouns from verbs (-AːhIn and -BII) are currently still clearly productive, as shown by their occurrence with Russian stems (e.g. (3) derived from the verb hakkas.taː- ‘order’). As for -BII, of the four tokens found in my corpus, two must have been derived in the 20th century because they do not occur in the major dictionary compiled by Pekarskij ([1907–1930] 1958–1959) in the final decades of the 19th century, demonstrating the ongoing productivity of this suffix. These are öröbül ‘Sunday’ (< örö:- ‘rest a day’) and χarîstabil ‘defense’ (< χarîs-taː- ‘care for, defend’).

(3) električeskaj χobordoːχ haŋa üödüj-de, onno χobordoːχ
hakkas-t-aːhîn-a
order.R-vr-NR.M-POSS.3SG
‘Then electrical frying pans first appeared, so they ordered a frying pan (lit. the ordering of a frying pan), ….’ [Efmy_402]
2.2.2 Suffixes deriving adjectives from verbs

Four suffixes deriving adjectives from verbs can be found among the productive suffixes copied from Mongolic. These are -mtIA, -GAj, -yAr/-gIr, and -(I)mtAyaj. According to Kałużyński (1962: 93), -mtIA is found mainly with Turkic stems, and even derivations from Mongolic roots must have occurred in Sakha, because these roots were first modified with Sakha reflexive and similar forms before the Mongolic adjectivizer was added, e.g. baranïmtïa ‘ending easily’ < baraː-n-ïmtïa [run.out/end.M-refl.Y-ADJR.M]. There is thus little evidence that the adjectivizer ever occurred in Sakha with Mongolian roots (i.e. as “complex loanwords” (cf. Seifart forthc.), from which it could have been extracted and productively added to Turkic roots. Rather, it might have been directly copied from Mongolian by speakers of Sakha bilingual in Mongolian. As for the suffix -GAj (with variants -ɣA and -χAj), although Kałużyński (1962: 77) classifies this as ‘very productive’ with >250 derivations found, and Korkina et al. (1982: 165) count this among the relatively productive suffixes, it is hard to judge to what extent this is still used productively in spoken speech rather than being frozen in lexicalized items. For example, bïtarχaj ‘small’(< bïtarïj- ‘crumble, smash, pulverize’) is likely to be fully lexicalized by now.

The suffix -yAr/-gIr derives adjectives from descriptive verbs. While it is classified as “relatively productive” by Korkina et al. (1982: 164), it is rarely found with Turkic stems (Kałużyński 1962: 80), probably because a large number of the descriptive verbs in Sakha were themselves copied from Mongolic. One example of an adjective derived from a Turkic stem is simigir ‘having narrow eyes’ < sim- ‘to narrow one’s eyes’ (Kałużyński 1962: 80).

2.2.3 Suffixes deriving verbs and adverbs

Only one productive suffix deriving verbs from nouns and adjectives was copied from Mongolic: -(I)rɣAː, which has further developed a function of deriving onomatopoetic verbs (Xaritonov 1954: 194–197). A large number of verbs derived from Turkic stems are listed in Xaritonov (1954: 145–147), such as küchürgə- ‘consider oneself strong’ < kü:s ‘strength, force’.

Two productive adverb-deriving suffixes were copied from Mongolic: -TA, which derives multiplicatives of numerals, and -(I)ččI, which derives adverbs from verbs. The former derives multiplicatives not only from plain numerals, e.g. birde ‘once’ (< bir ‘one’), ikkite ‘twice’ (<ikki ‘two’), but also from derived forms (e.g. uončata ‘approximately ten times’ < uon-ča ‘ten-approximative’). Given that no numerals or other quantifiers that in Mongolian occur with this
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suffices appear to have been copied into Sakha from Mongolian, this, too, seems likely to be a “direct copy”, similar to the direct copying of ordinal prefixes from Visayan languages into Chavacano (Seifart forthc.).

As for -IččI, this has undergone a slight shift in meaning, since in Mongolic it is an imperfective converb. According to Korkina et al. (1982: 350–351), this is particularly productive in poetic language, since it derives adverbs predominantly from onomatopoetic and descriptive verbs (4). It is not entirely clear to what extent this is still productive in everyday Sakha speech, since several items found in the Sakha corpus appear to be lexicalized (e.g. uhulučču ‘particularly’ < uhul- ‘take off, remove’, bulgučču ‘without fail’ < bulguj- ‘unharness’).

(4) χoro-čču ulat-an er-er e-te
stand.tall-ADVR.M grow-PF.CVB INCP-PRSPT be-PST.3SG
‘... she had started to shoot up, ...’ [Pav95_045]

2.2.4 Inflectional suffixes

As mentioned above, only two inflectional suffixes were copied by Sakha from Mongolic: a plural suffix -t (6a-c) and the immediate precedence converb -Aːt:

(5) köonnörü sarayît-an orgu-t-aːt da
simply dry.slightly-PF.CVB boil-CAUS-IMM.CVB.M PTL
süökeː-n lis-ke χat-ar-ar,
pour.out-PF.CVB paper.sheet.R-DAT dry-CAUS-PRSPT
‘... they simply dried it slightly, as soon as it boiled they poured it onto a sheet of paper and dried it, ...’ [XatR_133]

As for the plural suffix, this attaches to nouns ending in -n, and is used predominantly (though not exclusively) with nouns denoting human referents. Initially, this was used to derive nouns with a collective meaning (e.g. tojon ‘lord’ > tojot ‘gentlemen’), but the suffix later became reinforced with the Sakha (Turkic) plural suffix -LAr (Xaritonov 1947: 102–103), resulting in the modern-day suffix -ttAr. The high level of productivity of this suffix is attested to by the occurrence with a Russian noun of very recent origin (küligiatan < xuligan ‘hooligan’, cf. 6a) as well as with an adjective (6b) and even a particle expressing endearment (baraχsan, cf. 6c).2

2 Note that the glosses reflect a diachronic analysis to illustrate the Mongolian provenance of the suffix t; synchronically, ttAr can be considered an allomorph of the plural suffix LAr.
(6a) *hu-bu kiniler kilaːs-tara baɾi manna küḷigēː-t-ter*

EMPH-this 3PL class.R-poss.3PL all here hooligan.R-PL.M-PL

‘Just their class here were all hooligans.’ [IvaP_312]

(6b) *biligin buran-ınan bultuː-r-ga buollaɣïna*

now snow.mobile.R-INS hunt-PRSPT-DAT DP

*ulaçan ıraɾaʃ-t-tar baːl-lar*

big heavy-PL.M-PL existence-PL

‘Now they go hunting with snow-mobiles, and they’re very expensive.’ [LukP_107]

(6c) *hürdeɣ üçüg, aktiːbînaj oyo-lor e-ti-ler, baraxsa-t-tar*

very good active.R child-PL be-PST-PL PTL-PL.M-PL

‘They were very good, active kids, the dears.’ [MalA_177]

The fact that one of the two inflectional suffixes that Sakha copied from Mongolic is a plural marker is in good accordance with cross-linguistic evidence (Grant 2008: 169–171; Gardani 2012). Approximately one third of the copied inflectional morphemes identified by Gardani (2012) in a large cross-linguistic sample are plural markers, making plurals the most frequently copied single category of inflectional morphology. Furthermore, structural factors appear to play a role as well, since 75% of the plural markers listed by Gardani (2012: 86–90), including the Mongolic suffix copied by Sakha, are agglutinative.

### 2.3 At most marginally productive suffixes

This category comprises eight suffixes that derive nouns from verbs. One (-lతA) is listed as ‘marginally productive’ by Korkina et al. (1982), while the others are either not mentioned at all (-l, -Blr, -dAhIn, -lgA(n), -mAr) or are listed among the ‘frozen suffixes of Mongolic origins’ (-m’étI and -mtA). Nevertheless, even though they are not productive anymore, all of these suffixes conform to my criterion of copied morphemes by being found with Turkic stems, e.g. *solodohun* ‘clearing (of a path)’ < soloː- ‘to clear a path’ (Kałużyński 1962: 75), demonstrating that they were productive at the time of copying. Kałużyński (1962: 83) counts “many more than 150” derivations with the suffix -l from both Mongolic and Turkic verbs in Pekarskij’s dictionary, such as *taptal* ‘love’ < taptaː- ‘to love’ (Kałużyński 1962: 83–84).

Even though it is classified as fossilized, a seemingly productive derivation with the suffix -mtA from a verb of Mongolic origin is found in my Sakha corpus:
ergimte ‘turnover’ < ergij- ‘to turn’ (7). In the Sakha-Russian dictionary (Slepcov 1972: 544) this is translated only as ‘surroundings’.

(7) uonna ikki hü:s tihënča χačči ergi-mte-leχ, ikki-s and two hundred thousand money turn-NR.M-PROP two-ORD
gildija-laχ aﬁi-hit buol-but kihi bar bu Bajaya-ttan
guild-PROP sale-AGNR AUX-PSTPT man existence this Bajaga-ABL
‘And there is a man here from Bajaga who became a merchant of the second
guild and had a monetary turnover of 200,000.’ [XatR_047]

In conclusion, the morphemes copied from Mongolic into Sakha conform to
cross-linguistic expectations: a ninefold higher proportion of derivational than
inflectional morphology was copied, and these derivational suffixes predomi-
nantly derive nominals (11 nominalizers and four adjectivizers; cf. Matras 2009:
210). Furthermore, one of the two inflectional suffixes is a plural marker, shown
by Gardani (2012) to be the cross-linguistically most frequent type of copied inflec-
tional suffix. Interestingly, only one quarter of the copied suffixes deriving nouns
that were initially productive, as evidenced by their occurrence with Turkic stems,
are still fully productive. This might possibly be due to ‘competition’ between
suffixes that resulted from the copying of 11 morphemes with the same overall
function into a language that already had similar suffixes of Turkic origin (e.g.
the highly productive -l:, which derives nouns from verbs: ölü: ‘death’ < öl ‘die’).

3 Sakha morphemes copied into Lamunkhin Ėven

3.1 Number and kinds of copied suffixes

Given the nature of the Lamunkhin Ėven data, which as described above is based
solely on my corpus of narrative recordings of speakers with varying degrees
of linguistic dominance in Sakha or Ėven, it is more difficult to assess the status
of copied morphemes. As discussed in Section 1.3, I consider frequently occurring
suffixes used by different speakers to be established copies. A complicating factor
is that some suffixes occur fairly infrequently and are used predominantly or even
exclusively by speakers whom I believe to be dominant in Sakha rather than Ėven.
Thus, the use of such suffixes could be an indication that the matrix language is
actually Sakha, and the Ėven content lexemes are code-switches into this Sakha
frame. However, while this might be occasionally be true, as in (8a), where only
the lexical verb roots and a particle are of Ėven origin, in other cases the Sakha
verbal ending is practically the only Sakha item in the sentence (8b, c; see also
14a), making the hypothesis of Sakha as matrix language rather implausible. It
is therefore more likely that these morphemes represent, if not fully established
copies in Lamunkhin Ėven as a whole, at least ongoing copying that has begun in
a subset of this speech community.

(8a) **tuspa** * naha:* *ja-ajan*
separate.Y very.Y do.what-FUTPT.ACC.3SG.Y
*bayar-ar* *ehni, tegeč-e-jen*
bayar-ar Y-PRSPT.Y PTL live-EP-FUTPT.ACC.3SG.Y
‘she very much wants to live alone, doesn’t she’ (said by a semi-speaker of Ėven) [beseda_0703]

(8b) **derih-nek-e-s** *holu-ridgi*
run.off-COND.CVB-EP-POS.2SG chase-ANT.CVB
džebe-he-jen *höp*
ed-e-l-im-FUTPT.ACC.3SG.Y OK.Y
‘If you run of it might chase and eat you.’ [SPK_oxota_073]

(8c) **ńoguhub-ba-n** *ma:ridgi bolla bej-te[n]*
lead.reindeer-ACC-POS.3SG kill-ANT.CVB DP.Y man-DISTR
bej-e-l-du *bo:če-j-egin, go-li, ...*
‘Having killed his lead reindeer, however, you give (the meat) to people, right, ...’ [RDA_TPK_death_115]

A further complication, to which I return after introducing the copied suffi-
xes, concerns the number of suffixes that have been copied, since nearly all the
inflectional suffixes of Sakha origin found in Lamunkhin Ėven form paradigms.
However, irrespective of whether suffixes of Sakha origin represent firmly esta-
ablished copies or suffixes that are currently still in the process of being copied,
and irrespective of their precise number, two striking facts are apparent in the
Lamunkhin Ėven data: first of all, the vast bulk of copied suffixes are inflectional,
with only two derivational suffixes being possible or certain copies (see below).
Secondly, all these inflectional suffixes are verbal, which is very unusual from
a cross-linguistic perspective (cf. Gardani 2012: 91). In the following, I will first
discuss the derivational suffixes that (may) have been copied from Sakha, before
turning to a discussion of the inflectional suffixes.

**3.2 Derivational suffixes**

One derivational suffix has clearly been copied from Sakha: this is the suffix
-*Is that derives ordinal numerals (-*(I)s in Sakha). Interestingly, this always
occurs in NPs with a Russian head noun, most frequently in the context of enumerating reindeer herd brigades (stada ‘herd’ as an administrative unit, cf. 9a) or school classes/grades (klas). In contrast to the copied ordinal prefix in Chabacano mentioned above (Seifart forthc.), this is not a direct copy, since Sakha ordinal numerals are used as well (9b), though less frequently.

(9a) ḏąp-k-ịs stada ḏąː-la- n omettu
eight-ORD.Y herd.R house-LOC-POS.3SG together
teg-e-t-niken
sit.down-EP-RES-SIM.CVB
‘We lived in the house of the eighth brigade together (with them).’

(9b) tała bọlla mestnost’ naha: ḫba, axsĩs stada, Kurũŋnaːx
there DP.Y area.R very.Y good eighth.Y herd.R K.
‘That is a very good place, the eighth brigade, Kurungnax.’

A second derivational suffix of Sakha origin encountered in the Lamunkhin Ėven corpus is the suffix -LAN, which derives verbs from nouns. In Sakha, this can be analyzed as a combination of the general verbalizing suffix -LA: with the reflexive suffix -(I)n; however, it frequently occurs with a specific meaning of acquisition in a wider sense (e.g. oyolon- ‘have children’ < oyo ‘child’, ḏjeilen- ‘found a household’ < ḏje ‘house’, idelen- ‘acquire a habit, learn’ < ide ‘habit’). In the Lamunkhin Ėven corpus, it is found only twice, used by two different elderly speakers3 with two different verbs: tramba- laniw ‘I injured myself’ < Russian travma ‘injury’, and kuŋalan- ‘have a child’ < kuŋa ‘child’ (10). Even though both instances of this suffix occur in contexts in which the matrix language is clearly Ėven, its infrequency in the corpus makes its status as an established or even ongoing copy rather doubtful; it is therefore not included in the overall count of copied suffixes (cf. Section 3.4).

(10) elekes kuŋa-łan-dar nek-e-d-de-p ...
at.first child-VR.Y-PURP.CVB.PRL.PL do-EP-PROG-NFUT-1PL ...
‘We are about to have our first child.’ [LAT_fam_hist_091a]

3 One of these two speakers probably uses Sakha more than Ėven in her daily life, since her second husband is a Sakha, and her daughter (from her first marriage) does not speak Ėven.
3.3 Inflectional suffixes

As was mentioned above, the suffixes of Sakha origin are largely paradigmatic, belonging to the following four TAM paradigms: necessitative, assertive, indicative present tense, and hypothetical (used in periphrastic potential and deontic constructions); only one morpheme occurs independently of a paradigm. The copied nature of the necessitative and assertive mood is not in doubt (cf. Pakendorf 2009), since they are used in high frequency and by speakers of unquestionable dominance in Ėven. The indicative present tense and hypothetical suffixes, in contrast, are used far less frequently and only by speakers whose relative dominance of Ėven versus Sakha is unclear or certain to be weaker. As mentioned above, these might therefore possibly represent ongoing copying rather than fully established copies. However, the fact that entire paradigms are involved, and that the morphemes are used in different contexts by different speakers, makes them similar enough to established copies to be included here in the overall count.

Sakha has different subject agreement suffixes for different TAM forms: predicative person suffixes (e.g. in the necessitative mood and indicative present tense), possessive suffixes (e.g. in the assertive mood), or case-marked possessive suffixes (e.g. accusative-marked suffixes in the hypothetical mood), which have been copied with the corresponding TAM suffixes into Lamunkhin Ėven. Tables 1–4 show the Lamunkhin Ėven TAM and person-number forms encountered in the corpus in comparison to their Sakha models. It should be noted that Sakha consonants undergo bidirectional assimilation at morpheme boundaries, so that the initial consonants of the person suffixes, which in the table are given in their underlying form, are realized differently in the necessitative, assertive, and hypothetical mood (Tables 1, 2, and 4). Thus, following upon the mood-final χ, the first person suffixes are realized as -pIn/-pIt, the second person suffixes are realized as -kIn/-kIt, and the 3pl suffixes are realized as -tAr/-tArA/-tArIn. In contrast, the final consonant of the assertive mood suffix -TAX is voiced before the vowel-initial suffixes of the singular subject agreement markers. Not shown in Tables 2 and 3 are the connective glides which precede the assertive and indicative present tense suffixes of Sakha origin in Lamunkhin Ėven (cf. Pakendorf 2009: 97–100).

As can be seen in Tables 2, 3, and 4, no 2pl forms of the assertive mood, indicative present tense, or hypothetical mood occur in the Lamunkhin Ėven corpus. This is not surprising given the nature of the corpus, which consists mainly of autobiographical and other narratives where reference is made to first and third persons; thus, 2pl forms are overall rare, be they of Sakha or Ėven origin. In addition, the pragmatic force of the assertive mood makes this a form not expected to occur with respect to the addressee (see below).
A comparison of copied morphemes in Sakha (Yakut) and Éven

### Tab. 1: Copied paradigm of the Sakha necessitative mood in Lamunkhin Éven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lamunkhin Éven</th>
<th>Sakha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-jAktA:kpln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-jAktA:kkln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>-jAktA:k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-jAktA:kplt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-jAktA:kkl / -jAktA:kkl-hnAn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>-jAktA:k-A-l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the table, Lamunkhin Éven has copied all the person-number forms of the necessitative paradigm (with the 3SG subject agreement marker being zero in both Sakha and Lamunkhin Éven) except for the 3PL form, where the Sakha plural marker -LAr has been replaced by the Éven plural marker -l (preceded by an epenthetic vowel). The 2PL form appears to be in transition between a form with the Sakha 2PL marker -Glt (realized as -klt) and a form with the Lamunkhin Éven 2PL possessive marker -hnAn. This appears to be a merger between the Sakha form and the Éven form, as witnessed by the syllable -kI- intervening between the mood and the person marker; were the Éven 2PL possessive merely attached to the mood suffix -jAktA:k, one would expect the form -jAktA:k-A-hnAn. Two 2PL forms with the Sakha person marker occur in the corpus, both said by one speaker (e.g. 11), while the forms with the Éven person marker were given by my main consultant during elicitation.

(11) tara-w  bekeč-če:-m-e-n   hu:  ọlok
   DIST-ACC all-DIM-ACC-EP-POS.3SG 2PL EMPHY
   ùtal-a-jakta:kkit
   understand-EP-NEC.2PL.Y
   ‘All of those you have to understand ...’ [MKK_nastavlenie_034]

### Tab. 2: Copied paradigm of the Sakha assertive mood in Lamunkhin Éven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lamunkhin Éven</th>
<th>Sakha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-dAglm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-dAgln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>-dAgA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-dAkplt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>-dAktArA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assertive 2pl form does not occur in the corpus, and both the 2sg and the 2pl forms are elicited with difficulty. This can be explained by the pragmatic function of this mood: the assertive gives a strong nuance of emphasis to the assertion that would not be used with reference to the addressee. Thus, the 2sg forms occurring in the corpus are used with self-reference or generic reference (12); only one example in a conversation occurs with reference to the addressee.

(12) ịa-w-an  tiju-m  ǹọkat-tịği  
what-ACC-EP-POSS.3SG  staff-ACC  break.TRNS-ANT.CVB  
ne:j-er  bọl-lagịnj  tadụ  
put-CONN-PRSPT.Y  AUX.Y-ASS.2SG.Y  there  
‘And then you put the staff there after breaking it.’ [RDA_TPK_death_113]

It should be noted that in addition to the synthetic assertive mood forms, Lamunkhin Ėven has also copied the periphrastic construction consisting of the Sakha present participle -Ar and the Sakha auxiliary buol- in the assertive mood, as seen in the example above (12). This partly resembles Parallel System Borrowing in auxiliaries found in the Indo-Aryan language Domari and the Tibeto-Burman language Sunwar (Kossmann 2010: 470–471); however, in contrast to the cases discussed by Kossmann, in Lamunkhin Ėven the lexical verb takes the Sakha participial suffix, not an Ėven suffix. Thus, it is more than just the auxiliary that is of foreign origin.

The present participle also functions as the 3SG present tense indicative form in Sakha (see Table 3), and occurs as such in the Lamunkhin Ėven corpus (14b). Furthermore, the Sakha negative present participle -BAt is found in periphrastic negative assertive constructions ((13); cf. Pakendorf 2009). However, three out of six tokens of this morpheme occur with Sakha verb roots, and two of the Ėven verb roots found with this suffix occur in contexts that indicate a probable switch to Sakha as the matrix language. Therefore, this morpheme is not included in the overall count of copied morphemes. Nevertheless, the fact that it is in paradigmatic opposition to -Ar in the periphrastic assertive constructions is notable.

(13) ındjuk  gerbe,  bi  bọlla  ha:j-bat  bọl-lagịm  
 turkey.R  name  1SG  DP.Y  know-CONN-NEG.Y  AUX.Y-ASS.1SG.Y  
 ịak=kọl  tarbača-maja:w  ńụtaku.  
what=INDEF  DIST.QUAL-AUG-ACC  red  
‘It’s called indjuk (turkey), and I didn’t know that, right, something like that big red (creature).’ [AVZ_indjuk_internat_037]
A comparison of copied morphemes in Sakha (Yakut) and Ėven

Tab. 3: Copied paradigm of the Sakha indicative present tense in Lamunkhin Ėven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lamunkhin Ėven</th>
<th>Sakha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-Abln</td>
<td>-A-Bln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-Agln</td>
<td>-A-Gln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>-Ar</td>
<td>-Ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-AbIt</td>
<td>-A-BIt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-GIt</td>
<td>-A-GIt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>-AllAr</td>
<td>-Ar-LAr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sakha present tense paradigm has different mood markers in the first and second person (-A, the imperfective converb; cf. 14a) and the third person (-Ar, the present participle). The present participle is widely used in Sakha; in Lamunkhin Ėven, in addition to occurring in the indicative present tense (14b), it has also been copied in the periphrastic assertive mood forms illustrated above in (12). However, while the indicative present tense forms of Sakha origin occur with a wide variety of Ėven roots and are produced by different speakers, they are mainly found in utterances by speakers who seem dominant in Sakha rather than in Ėven. Their status as established copies in Lamunkhin Ėven as a whole is therefore rather uncertain, although they do occur in sentences in which Ėven is clearly the matrix language (14a, b).

(14a) ʤụː-la hor-e-mel-mi hor-ridʒi  
house-LOC-PRFL.SG go-EP-DES-COND.CVB go-ANT.CVB  
em-e-j-egin  
come-EP-CONN-PRS.2SG.Y  
‘If you want to go home you go and come back ...’ [AVZ_indjuk_internat_053a]

(14b) ahịkk-čaka-l bọlła ńamića-čaka-l-bụ  
girl-PLEN-PL doe  
qoni em-e-j-er uže  
reindeer come-EP-CONN-PRSPT.Y already.R  
‘And the girls (milk) the does; the reindeer come already.’ [AXK_svatovstvo_103]

Tab. 4: Copied paradigm of the Sakha hypothetical mood in Lamunkhin Ėven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lamunkhin Ėven</th>
<th>Sakha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-jAkpIn</td>
<td>-lAχ-Bln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-jAkIn</td>
<td>-lAχ-GLn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>-jA:GlIn // -jAn</td>
<td>-lAχ-(G)lIn // -lAn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-lAχ-BItln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-lAχ-GItIn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>-jAktArln</td>
<td>-lAχ-LArln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impersonal</td>
<td>-jAkkA</td>
<td>-lAχ-GA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Sakha, the hypothetical mood occurs in periphrastic constructions with the deontic particle *naːda* ‘must’ (copied from Russian) or the affirmative particle *sōp/hōp* ‘OK’, and it is in such constructions that it is found in the Lamunkhin Ėven corpus (8b). Like the indicative present tense forms, in the corpus these constructions are used by speakers whose dominance in Ėven is questionable, and some occurrences are clearly insertions of Ėven verb roots into a Sakha matrix language (8a). Nevertheless, what speaks for a copied status of these morphemes is the fact that even my primary consultant, for whom Ėven is unquestionably the dominant language, used the Sakha form when asked to translate a sentence with potential meaning into Ėven (15a). In the corpus, when it is not the Sakha form that is used, potential meanings are expressed by the indicative future (15b), a form also used by my primary consultant in her personal narrative. Thus, the Sakha hypothetical form might be preferred only when an unambiguously hypothetical reading is needed.

(15a) ńarị ahikan-duj oj-y em-u-jen hōp
man girl-DAT clothes-ACC come-CAUS-FUTPT.ACC.3SG.Y OK.Y
‘The man might bring clothes for the girl.’
[IVK_S_DesignativeA27a]

(15b) boːdel-dʒi toː-dʒi-nni e-le hergi-li
step-on-FUT-2SG prox-LOC bottom-PROL
hukel-lek-e-n
slip.off-COND.CVB-EP-POSS.3SG
‘you might step on it if it slips off.’ [KNK_eksponat_198]

In addition to these paradigmatically structured suffixes, one further inflectional suffix of Sakha origin occurs in the Lamunkhin Ėven corpus. This is the perfective (sequential) converb *-An*, which occurs in the corpus eleven times in utterances by five different speakers (though predominantly in use by one speaker). As in Sakha, it occurs as an affirmative answer to polar questions (16a). Furthermore, in one instance it appears to have been used with a meaning of reason, a function common in Sakha, though the speaker corrected herself and gave an Ėven finite construction instead (16b). The fact that this suffix is used mostly by one speaker (who is married to a Sakha and switched to Sakha a lot), and that a speaker trying very hard to speak good Ėven corrected herself, might be indications that this suffix has not yet entered Lamunkhin Ėven as an established or even ongoing copy; it will therefore not be included in the final count of copied suffixes.
3.4 Separate or joint copying of TAM and subject agreement suffixes?

The paradigmatic nature of the suffixes of Sakha origin in Lamunkhin Ėven complicates the count of copied suffixes. The question is whether the different TAM suffixes were copied separately from the subject agreement suffixes, or whether the different person-number forms were copied as a whole (as depicted in the tables above). It is quite plausible that in Sakha the individual suffixes are perceived as separate morphemes by speakers, since they all occur in various contexts. Thus, for instance, the assertive mood marker -TAχ also occurs in the conditional-temporal mood, where it takes a different set of person markers (e.g. kepse:-tɛχ- pine ‘when/if I tell’). The necessitative mood marker can be analyzed in Sakha as a fusion of the future participle -IAχ plus the proprietive -LΛχ (with the initial [l] of the proprietive assimilating to the final [χ] of the future participle), both of which occur separately in high frequency: for example, the future participle occurs in the indicative future tense with possessive person markers (il-iaγ-im ‘I will take’) and, as seen in Table 4, in the hypothetical mood, where it takes accusative-marked possessive suffixes as subject agreement markers.

In Lamunkhin Ėven, however, the case for individual perception of these morphemes is not as easily made. On the one hand, the subject agreement markers do recur – there is no distinction in Sakha between the predicative and possessive suffixes for 1PL and 2PL, which are both -BIt and -GIt, respectively; these forms (at least the 1PL form) occur in the necessitative and assertive mood
and the indicative present tense (cf. Tables 1–3). Furthermore, in the 1sg and 2sg the predicative suffixes and the accusative-case-marked possessive suffixes are homophonous (-Bln and -Gln, respectively), so that these suffixes recur in the necessitative and hypothetical mood and the indicative present tense. On the other hand, the TAM markers do not occur independently of the copied paradigms in Lamunkhin Ėven. Since the necessitative meaning cannot be derived compositionally from the meaning of the future participle and the proprietive, it is unlikely that -jAk and -tA:k were copied as separate morphemes; rather, -jAktA:k as a whole can be assumed to have been copied as the necessitative mood marker. Thus, one cannot assume that -jAk found in the hypothetical mood is a recurrent form of -jAk as it occurs in the necessitative. Furthermore, while the mood marker recurs throughout the paradigm for the necessitative and the assertive mood, as mentioned above the indicative present tense marker in Sakha is split between the imperfect converb -A for the first and second person and the present participle for the third person (with all persons taking predicative subject agreement marking, which is zero for 3sg), making it more plausible that the different person-number forms were copied in their entirety.

A strong indication that the TAM and person markers of the hypothetical paradigm were copied as a whole comes from the existence of both the full 3sg form -jA:gIn and the contracted form -jA:n in Lamunkhin Ėven. While in Sakha the contraction is due to a frequent morphophonological process in which intervocalic voiced velars are elided (-IAχ -(t)In results in the surface form -IAɣIn which results in -IA:n), such elision does not take place in Lamunkhin Ėven. Therefore, both the full and the contracted form must have been copied from Sakha.

In contrast, an argument in favor of the separate perception and copying of the TAM and person suffixes might be the existence of the necessitative 3pl with Sakha person marking (cf. Table 1). This indicates that for this mood, at least, the TAM and the person suffixes are indeed separate entities. However, it is quite likely that the Sakha TAM-person suffixes were copied as a whole and only later were analyzed as separate morphemes, leading to the replacement of the Sakha 3pl suffix in the necessitative mood. An argument in favor of this scenario is the variation still observable in the 2pl necessitative; similarly, in attempts to elicit 2pl assertive forms, both Sakha (-dAkklt) and Ėven (-dAglhnAn) subject agreement forms were given. Therefore, for the purposes of this paper I will assume that the Sakha mood forms were copied as a whole in Lamunkhin Ėven, comprising both TAM and person suffixes.

Thus, a total of 21 inflectional suffixes of Sakha origin are found in the corpus of Lamunkhin Ėven, in contrast to one clearly copied derivational suffix. While it is quite probable that the forms missing in Tables 3 and 4 have also entered Lamunkhin Ėven and merely do not occur in the somewhat restricted narrative
corpus, I can here only count those forms that are attested. As will be discussed in
the following, the copies in Lamunkhin Ėven differ strikingly from those in Sakha
discussed in Section 2 above.

4 Discussion

In this paper I set out to investigate whether languages that are structurally
congruent and that have phonologically salient and syllabic, sharply bounded,
relatively unifunctional, categorically clear morphology would more readily copy
affixes, as predicted in (1) above. I also aimed at elucidating whether such a
contact situation would lead to the copying of derivational rather than inflec-
tional morphology, whether morphemes with a specific or pragmatically salient
meaning would be more likely to be copied than morphemes with a general
meaning, and whether copied morphemes would be paradigmatically and syn-
tagmatically structured. The data can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tab. 5: Summary of copied suffixes in Sakha and Lamunkhin Ėven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflectional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several noteworthy issues are apparent from this table. First of all, both
Sakha and Lamunkhin Ėven have copied a large number of suffixes, 20 and 22,
respectively. This is far more than attested in most other cases of large-scale
morphological copying: for example, none of the languages of Arnhem Land,
Australia, has copied more than eight suffixes (Heath 1978: 68–118), and the
Spanish-based creole Chabacano has copied six prefixes and two suffixes from

4 In Lamunkhin Ėven, the number is likely to be even larger, since only those forms attested in
the corpus were included in the count.
the Philippine language Hiligaynon, with another prefix of unclear origin (Steinkrüger 2003: 257–259) – though note that the Arawakan language Resígaro has copied 36 morphemes from Bora (Seifart 2012: 482). This confirms the hypothesis laid out in Section 1.1, namely that structural congruence and agglutinative morphology facilitate morpheme copying, possibly enhanced further when the contact situation is asymmetric. Resígaro and Bora, too, have congruent agglutinative morphology, and the model language Bora was socio-politically dominant over Resígaro (Seifart 2012: 477–478).

Secondly, while Sakha and Lamunkhin Ėven are similar as regards the number of copied morphemes, they are strikingly different with respect to the type of copied morphology: Of the 20 suffixes copied from Mongolic into Sakha, 18 (90%) are derivational and two (10%) are inflectional. Lamunkhin Ėven, in contrast, copied 22 suffixes from Sakha, of which 21 are inflectional (95.5%) and only one (4.5%) is derivational. Thus, Sakha conforms to cross-linguistic expectations, but Lamunkhin Ėven doesn’t – even though the morphosyntactic structures and sociolinguistic parameters of the two contact situations are comparable, with a socio-politically subordinate recipient language copying morphemes from a dominant language (Section 1.2.1 and 1.2.2). Furthermore, the entire inflectional morphology copied by Lamunkhin Ėven is verbal. This contrasts strongly with other cases of large-scale morphological copying, where the copied inflectional morphology is predominantly nominal; copying of verbal inflection is cross-linguistically exceedingly rare (Gardani 2012: 91). The fact that the copied suffixes in Lamunkhin Ėven are mainly from the domain of modality (necessitative, assertive, and hypothetical) corroborates the findings of Matras (2007: 46) that modality is more likely to be affected by contact than aspect/aktionsart, and that tense is the least likely to undergo contact-induced changes. Furthermore, the copying of these mood paradigms conforms with the expectation raised by Backus and Verschik (2012: 140) that the more semantically and pragmatically salient an item, the more likely it is to be copied as a form-meaning unit (also termed global copying [Johanson 1999: 41] or copying of matter [Matras and Sakel 2007: 829]).

Both Sakha and Ėven confirm Seifart’s (2012) hypothesis that copied morphemes are more likely to come from paradigmatically or syntagmatically structured subsystems: in Sakha, 15 of the 20 copied morphemes derive nominals (nouns and adjectives) from verbs, while in Lamunkhin Ėven the copied morphemes form clear paradigms. Of course, the paradigmatic structure of some of these copies (the indicative present tense and the hypothetical mood) was used in support of counting them as copies, resulting in a circular argument. Nevertheless, the copied necessitative and assertive paradigms are clearly established in Lamunkhin Ėven as a whole and thus support the hypothesis.
How can we explain the striking difference between Sakha and Lamunkhin Ėven? Structural factors can be excluded, since in both Sakha and Lamunkhin Ėven the structure of the recipient language is congruent with that of the model language, and morphemes are phonologically salient and syllabic (i.e. independently pronounceable), categorically clear, and relatively unifunctional (that is, they are not portmanteau morphemes). Furthermore, in both Mongolic languages and in Sakha the bare verb root functions as a 2sg imperative, so that verb stems in both model languages are sharply bounded. All of these factors should have made it equally easy for Sakha to copy verbal inflectional suffixes from Mongolic as Lamunkhin Ėven did from Sakha – but this did not happen.

The explanation must therefore be sought elsewhere, notably in the contact situation. Although the two contact situations appear superficially similar (with a sociopolitically dominant model language and a subordinate recipient language), differences may exist in the actual intensity of the contact. Indeed, while there are no direct observations or historical data on the Sakha-Mongolic contact situation, molecular anthropological data show no evidence for intimate contact between the Sakha ancestors and the Mongols: there are no signs of admixture between the two in the paternal line, and hardly any evidence for admixture in the maternal line (Pakendorf et al. 2006). In contrast, the Ėven-Sakha contact taking place in Sebjan-Küöl is intense, with extensive bilingualism and strong cultural pressure from Sakha. Furthermore, there is genetic evidence of Sakha paternal admixture in Lamunkhin Ėvens that is indicative of close social and physical interactions that go back several generations (Duggan et al. 2013). Thus, the prehistoric contact between the ancestors of the Sakha and the speakers of Mongolic languages appears to have been a lot less intimate than the ongoing contact between Sakha and Lamunkhin Ėven. This is corroborated further by the large number of mixed Sakha-Ėven marriages existing in Sebjan-Küöl today. For Resígaro, too, close contact with speakers of Bora has been documented, and it is probable that Resígaros and Boras intermarried regularly (Seifart 2012: 478). Thus, it seems that close contact at an intimate level might be a further factor facilitating not only large-scale copying of morphology, but especially of inflectional morphology (cf. Gardani 2008: 88).

5 Conclusions

The comparison between morphological copies in Sakha and Lamunkhin Ėven has shown that structural factors alone do not determine the outcome of contact. While the typological congruence between the model and the recipient languages in both case studies, and the agglutinative structure of the languages, may
well have been decisive in producing the striking amount of copied suffixes, the differences in outcome can only be explained by differences in the sociocultural aspects of the contact situation. This is in good accordance with Thomason and Kaufman’s statement that “it is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers, and not the structure of their language, that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language contact” (1988: 35).

What is intriguing is the evidence indicating that the Sakha-Éven contact situation is biased towards Sakha men marrying Éven women. This is reminiscent of Copper Island Aleut, which emerged in a community of mixed parentage, where the men were of Russian origins and the women were Aleuts. Copper Island Aleut is famous for its mixture of Russian verbal inflection and Aleut lexicon and noun structure (Thomason 1997) – and while Lamunkhin Éven is still very far from having replaced its rich verbal inflection with Sakha morphology, it is nevertheless noteworthy that it is precisely the verbal inflection that has been or is being copied. While it is unclear why specifically the copying of verbal inflectional morphology would be favored in these communities with mixed households, one could speculate that in mixed households where the father stems from the socially dominant group, it is his language that predominates. Since the verbal morphology provides the predicative frame of the utterance, bilingual speakers who are dominant in their father’s language would be inserting lexemes from their mother’s language into this frame. This might open the door for verbal morphemes from the paternal language to enter the maternal language.5
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJR</td>
<td>adjectivizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 It is true that Michif, a mixed language that also emerged in a community of mixed ancestry, uses the verbal morphology of the mother’s language, Cree. However, Michif differs from Copper Island Aleut and Lamunkhin Éven in that the entire VP is of Cree origin, i.e. the verb stem plus the inflection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVR</td>
<td>adverbializer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGNR</td>
<td>agent nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT</td>
<td>anterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>augmentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>connective glide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>desiderative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>distal demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTR</td>
<td>distributional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>discourse particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>epenthetic vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTPT</td>
<td>future participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMM</td>
<td>immediate precedence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCH</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCP</td>
<td>inceptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>limitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mongolic copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>necessitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFUT</td>
<td>non-future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>ordinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEN</td>
<td>plenitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRFL reflexive possessive
PROG progressive
PROL prolative
PROP proprietive
PROX proximal demonstrative
PRS present
PRSPT present participle
PST past
PSTPT past participle
PTCP participle
PTL particle
PURP purposive
Q interrogative clitic
QUAL qualitative
R Russian copy
REFL reflexive
RES resultative
SG singular
SIM simultaneous
TRNS transitive
VR verbalizer
Y Sakha (Yakut) copy
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Appendix: Mongolic model forms for the suffixes copied into Sakha

In the following table I list the suffixes that were copied into Sakha (column “copy”) in the order of discussion in the text, together with the Mongolic model form (column “model”) proposed by Kalużyński (1962: 69–118), the Mongolic function as described by Poppe (1954), and the page number(s) in Kalużyński 1962 on which the given suffix is discussed (column ‘reference’).

As will be seen from a comparison of the model with the copy, some of the latter have undergone substantial phonological changes – far more than found for the Sakha copies in Lamunkhin Ėven discussed in Section 3. This is probably because of the long period of time that has elapsed since the Mongol-Sakha contact, as opposed to the still ongoing Sakha-Lamunkhin Ėven contact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Mongolic function</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-AːččI</td>
<td>-yač (&gt;-a:či)</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-AːhIn</td>
<td>-yasun (&gt; -a:sun)</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>70–71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-BII</td>
<td>-yul (&gt; -a-yul &gt; a’ul &gt; -u:l)</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>72–73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mtIA</td>
<td>-mtayu (-mtu:)</td>
<td>deverbal adjectivizer</td>
<td>93–94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-GAj</td>
<td>-GAj</td>
<td>deverbal and denominal nominalizer</td>
<td>76–78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-yar/-gIrr</td>
<td>-yAr/-gIrr</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer and adjectivizer</td>
<td>79–80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(I)mtAɣaj</td>
<td>-mtaɣaj</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(I)rɣAː</td>
<td>-rqa</td>
<td>denominal verbalizer</td>
<td>105–106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-TA</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>multiplicative numerals</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(I)ččI</td>
<td>-ču/-džu/-dži/-či</td>
<td>imperfective converb</td>
<td>112–113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>plural suffix</td>
<td>116–118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Aːt</td>
<td>-yač (&gt; -a:či)</td>
<td>perfective converb</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ltA</td>
<td>-lta</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>86–87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-l</td>
<td>-l</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>83–84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Blr</td>
<td>-bUrl</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>73–74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dAhIn</td>
<td>-dasun</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-IgA(n)</td>
<td>-lya(n)</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>85–86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mAr</td>
<td>-mar</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>89–90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mňI</td>
<td>-mʤi</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>90–91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mtA</td>
<td>-mta</td>
<td>deverbal nominalizer</td>
<td>91–92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>