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INTENSIVE CONTACT AND THE COPYING OF PARADIGMS: AN ĖVEN DIALECT IN CONTACT WITH SAKHA (YAKUT)

Brigitte Pakendorf
Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig

Abstract

The development of the unique structure of Copper Island Aleut, which displays a combination of Russian finite verb morphology and Aleut nominal and non-finite verbal morphology as well as lexicon has been the subject of heated debate. In the absence of other examples of similar inflectional paradigm copying, the processes leading to this development are hard to elucidate. This paper discusses examples of paradigms copied from the Siberian Turkic language Sakha (Yakut) into a dialect of the Northern Tungusic language Ėven spoken in the village of Sebjan-Küöl in northeastern Siberia. These data demonstrate that paradigm copying can take place in a situation of widespread bilingualism, with code-switching playing a vital role. Furthermore, they provide evidence that such mixed forms have the potential of serving as conduits for further copying of grammatical forms, and that they play an important role in the linguistic identity of the speakers, as has been suggested previously for mixed languages such as Copper Island Aleut.

1. Introduction

It is widely accepted that there is a ‘hierarchy of borrowability’, with words for cultural items being among the elements that are most easily borrowed, and bound inflectional morphemes underlying the most stringent constraints (cf. Table 14.2 in Wilkins, 1996, and Haspelmath, 2008: 48-49 and references therein). Although occasional examples are known of the copying of inflectional suffixes, such as Turkish 1PL and 2PL person markers added onto inflected Greek verbs in some Greek dialects formerly spoken in Asia Minor (Janse, forthcoming, based on Dawkins’ (1916) description), the copying of entire inflectional paradigms is exceedingly rare and occupies the lowest position in the above-mentioned hierarchy (Matras, 2003: 158-159). The best-known example of paradigm copying is the mixed language Copper Island Aleut, in which the entire finite Aleut verbal morphology is of Russian origin (cf. section 2). The development of this language as well as other mixed languages is still a matter of debate (Matras, 2000 and the numerous discussions of his paper in the same issue of the journal, as well as the contributions to Matras &

1 This paper has profited immensely from comments by Frank Seifart on an initial draft; I am grateful to him as well as to Dejan Matić for further comments on a later version, as well as to Sally Thomason and two anonymous reviewers for pertinent criticism.
Bakker, 2003). Part of the problem with mixed languages is that their development lies in the (mostly unrecorded) past, so that inferences about the process of mixing have to be drawn from the recorded results.

This paper hopes to contribute to a better understanding of the development of the rare and intriguing outcome of language contact exemplified by Copper Island Aleut by presenting a Siberian case-study of (potentially ongoing) paradigm copying. It deals with the westernmost dialect of Ėven, a Northern Tungusic language spoken by a widely scattered group of hunters and reindeer herders with resulting dialectal differentiation. The western dialect under investigation is spoken in the village of Sebjan-Küöl and associated reindeer brigades in the Verkhoyansk mountain range in the Republic Sakha (Yakutia). All, or almost all, speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Ėven are bilingual in the Turkic language Sakha (Yakut), the dominant indigenous language of Yakutia. The data presented here are based on a total of approximately 720 sentences from over an hour of recorded spontaneous narratives and nearly a quarter of an hour of narratives elicited with the ‘Pear Story’ (Chafe, 1980) that were collected during a six-week long field trip to Sebjan-Küöl in February and March 2008. The Sakha data used for comparison come from my corpus of approximately 3,600 sentences of spontaneous narratives (mainly oral life histories) recorded from 15 elderly speakers in four different districts of the Republic Sakha (Yakutia) during 2002 and 2003.

At the outset, some notes on the terminology and abbreviations used here are in order: Since the term ‘borrowing’ is used with varying meaning by different authors (cf. discussion in Pakendorf, 2007: 26-31, 44-46), I prefer to use the term ‘copying’ to refer to the transfer of any element from one language to another (Johanson, 1992: 175). I restrict the discussion to copied verbal morphology, and refer to ‘paradigm copying’ when copied inflectional suffixes are freely used with native verbs. In all the examples, capital R and Y in the glosses indicate copies from Russian and Sakha, respectively. The somewhat opaque abbreviation Y (from Yakut) was chosen rather than S (from Sakha) to facilitate readability of glosses such as ASS.Y (rather than ASS.S). When necessary, the native origin of an Ėven or Evenki element that contrasts with a copied element is indicated by a capital E in the glosses, the abbreviations for which can be found at the end of the paper. In addition, the morphemes under discussion are highlighted in the examples by bold typeface, both in the text line and in the glosses.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 sets the scene with some known examples of verbal paradigm copying, while section 3 introduces the linguistic situation in Sebjan-Küöl. Section 4 contains the meat of the paper, presenting the Assertive-Presumptive paradigm, which was copied from Sakha into Sebjan-Küöl Ėven. The subsequent sections of the paper discuss various issues pertaining to this copying: Section 5 describes a further copied paradigm, while in section 6 the question of whether these forms constitute examples of code-switching rather than established copies is investigated. In section 7 I discuss the fact that the Sakha mood suffixes were copied jointly with the subject agreement suffixes, while section 8 elucidates the potential spread within Sebjan-Küöl Ėven of Sakha morphemes introduced via paradigm copying. Section 9 discusses the emblematic function of copied elements in Sebjan-Küöl and elsewhere. Finally, section 10 brings together the various lines of argument in a final discussion of the Sebjan-Küöl data in the light of the mixed language debate.

I thank the Max Planck Society for financial support, the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Inc. for funding the 2002 field trip, and all my Sakha and Ėven consultants for their time and patience.
2. Paradigm copying and the development of mixed languages

As mentioned above, the best-known case of paradigm copying is Copper Island Aleut (also known as Mednyj Aleut), in which the entire finite verbal morphology is of Russian origin, including person-marking as well as personal pronouns which replace the Aleut cross-referencing of arguments on verbs (1a-c); on the other hand, the bulk of the lexicon, nominal and derivational as well as non-finite verbal morphology are Aleut. As with other mixed languages, the development of this unique mixture of linguistic components is still debated (Golovko, 1996, 2003; Thomason, 1997; Matras, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 2002: 258-265), but the consensus appears to be that Copper Island Aleut arose in a situation of full bilingualism in Russian and Aleut among the ‘creole’ population on Copper Island. These ‘creoles’ were the offspring of Russian fathers and Aleut mothers and had an intermediate social standing between the Russians and Aleuts amongst the settlers of the island. This separate position may have led to a conscious desire of creating an insider language to match their distinct social identity (Thomason, 1997: 464-465; Golovko, 2003).

(1a) COPPER ISLAND ALEUT Present tense (Menovščikov, 1968: 405)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ja} & \text{ulan} & \text{ilagan} & \text{hiča-ju} \\
1SG.NOM.R & house & from & go.out–PRS.1SG.R \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I go out of the house.’

(1b) COPPER ISLAND ALEUT Past Tense (Golovko 1996: 70)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{čvetki-niŋ} & \text{hula-l-i} \\
flowers.R-3PL.PSR & bloom-PST.R-PL.R \\
\end{array}
\]

‘My flowers bloomed.’

(1c) COPPER ISLAND ALEUT Future Tense (Golovko 1996: 67)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{segodnja} & \text{taŋa-x̂} & \text{bud-ut} & \text{su-la-šči-t’} \\
today.R & spirits-SG & AUXFUT.R-3PL.R & take-MULT-CAUS-INF.R \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Today they will sell spirits.’

Apart from Copper Island Aleut, few examples of copying of entire inflectional paradigms are known. In two recently described mixed languages from Australia, Gurindji Kriol and Light Warlpiri, the verbal TAM system as well as transitive marking derive from Kriol, with the nominal system stemming from the indigenous languages Gurindji and Warlpiri, respectively (McConvell & Meakins, 2005: 10; O’Shannessy, 2005: 36). However, since verbs in Kriol are not inflected for person or tense, these interesting mixed languages are not directly comparable to Copper Island Aleut. Similarly, while Domari, an Indic language spoken by formerly itinerant metalworkers now living in the old city of Jerusalem, has copied Arabic inflectional morphology, this is restricted to copied Arabic modals and auxiliaries (Matras, 2003: 160); this is thus again different from the use of copied morphemes with native roots found in Copper Island Aleut.

Malchukov (2006: 126) mentions a case of paradigm copying in northeastern Siberia involving the Northern Tungusic language Evenki and the Turkic language Sakha (Yakut) which is more directly comparable to Copper Island Aleut. He cites an example from Myreeva (1964: 51), in which the Učur dialect of Evenki copied the Sakha ‘Presumptive’ mood suffix –\text{TAχ}^3 together with

\[3\] Sakha suffixes underlie extensive vowel harmony and consonant assimilation processes leading to very variable surface forms. Morphemes in isolation are therefore presented here in archiphonemic form, in which capital letters indicate phonemes that undergo changes; capital \(A\) represents any low vowel, while capital \(I\) represents any high vowel.
the Sakha person marking (compare the paradigms in 2a and 2b). The Sakha mood suffix is attached to the Evenki Present tense suffix -rV with elision of the vowel, resulting in bimorphemic mood suffixes (2a). In Učur Evenki these copied forms are restricted to the present tense; they express the probability of the event, as well as the speaker’s resoluteness or acceptance of the unavoidability of the event (Myreeva, 1964: 51).

(2a) UČUR EVENKI, ‘Presumptive’ paradigm of wa: ‘to kill’ (Myreeva 1964: 51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>wa:r.day-im</td>
<td>wa:r.dak-put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>wa:r.day-ŋ</td>
<td>wa:r.dak-kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>wa:r.day-a</td>
<td>wa:r.dak-tara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2b) SAKHA, ‘Presumptive’ paradigm of bar ‘to walk’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>bar-day-im</td>
<td>bar-dag-ŋt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>bar-day-ŋ</td>
<td>bar-dag-ϕt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>bar-day-a</td>
<td>bar-dag-tara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The copying of this paradigm has taken place under intense pressure from Sakha: although Evenks were in the majority in the Učur district in 1960, when Myreeva collected the data for her sketch, the language had already been replaced to a large extent by Sakha: In one village with a population of 268 Evenks, 18 Sakha and 20 Russians, only 25% of the Evenk population still knew Evenki well; those settled in the village (as opposed to leading a nomadic reindeer-herding or hunting life-style) spoke only Sakha. In the second village, where Evenks constituted 84% of the 516 inhabitants, only 15 individuals still spoke Evenki. The close ties of the inhabitants of this village with Sakha speakers went back a long time, leading to mixed marriages and a shift of Evenks from their nomadic way of life to the settled cattle- and horse pastoralism preferred by the Sakha (Myreeva, 1964: 6-8).

This case of paradigm copying is quite intriguing, especially with respect to the potential parallel with the development of Copper Island Aleut verb morphology. At first glance, one might argue that TAM forms predominantly expressing probability constitute a marginal and infrequently used paradigm, and that it is precisely in this rarely used part of the verbal system that an entire TAM paradigm including subject agreement markers can enter the verbal system of a language without causing noticeable disruption of the system as a whole. From this peripheral mood the copied inflectional suffixes might then gradually spread to more frequently used TAM paradigms, ultimately leading to a wholesale replacement of the inflectional morphology of the verb, as happened in Copper Island Aleut. This parallelism between the Učur Evenki ‘Presumptive’ and Copper Island Aleut was first suggested by Sarah Thomason during a talk at the workshop on ‘Language Contact and the Dynamics of Language’ in May 2007. However, as will be shown below, the Sakha ‘Presumptive’ is not as infrequently occurring a form as its label would lead one to expect; rather, it is precisely its frequency of use that arguably facilitated its being copied (cf. section 4.1 - 4.2).

On the other hand, it has been suggested that mixed languages, including Copper Island Aleut, arose abruptly in a very brief period of time (e.g. Bakker, 2003: 130, Thomason, 2001: 205-206), which would weaken the hypothesis of a gradual spread of copied inflectional morphology from a rarely-used paradigm to the rest of the language. However, it is difficult to evaluate the competing
hypotheses in the absence of data concerning the actual frequency of use of different verbal paradigms, both in the model and the recipient language. The present paper aims at contributing towards this debate by discussing a similar case of paradigm copying from Sakha into another Northern Tungusic language, Sebjan-Küöl Éven, where more is known about the actual use of copied forms. As will be shown in the following, these data provide evidence against the initiation of paradigm copying in rarely used moods, while lending support to the suggestion that initial code-switching as well as conscious involvement of speakers may be instrumental in paradigm copying.

3. The sociolinguistics and history of Sebjan-Küöl Éven-Sakha contact

Similar to the situation in which the Učur dialect of Evenki copied the Sakha ‘Presumptive’ paradigm, speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Éven are heavily influenced by Sakha, notwithstanding the fact that they are the majority group in the settlement. Currently, the village has 780 inhabitants, of whom 660 are registered as Évens; however, these also include children from mixed Sakha-Éven or Russian-Éven marriages. The statistics from the village administration do not distinguish between Sakha and Russians (or other nationalities) for the 120 inhabitants who are not registered as Évens; however, from my superficial observations it would appear that Russians and other Europeans constitute the clear minority group in the village, so that probably most of the non-Évens are Sakha. The main occupation is reindeer herding, with 12 reindeer brigades herding over 20,000 domesticated reindeer. The village is geographically very isolated, accessible for a brief period every year (approximately four months in winter-spring) by overland transport via frozen rivers; during the remainder of the year, it can only be reached by air transport which, however, operates in very irregular intervals at best. This isolated location might account for the fact that Éven, which is severely endangered in other locations of Siberia, is still viable in the village, with at least some children acquiring it. However, although Éven is still spoken in many homes, in the public domain (e.g. in the village administration or amongst teachers in school) Sakha is the main language used, as it is in households with mixed linguistic backgrounds. In addition, it is used in the presence of people who do not know Éven; for example, during a visit to one of the reindeer brigades I noticed that the predominant language in use was Sakha, not Éven as I had expected. Upon enquiry it turned out that one of the young reindeer herders had grown up in the Verkhojansk district speaking only Sakha with his Éven mother and Sakha father. The other herders and female ‘tent-keepers’ accommodated to his lack of knowledge of Éven by speaking Sakha so that he could understand what was being said.

The time-depth and manner of the Éven-Sakha contact in Sebjan-Küöl are not yet known, and further fieldwork with a sociolinguistic focus is clearly necessary. However, judging from the results of molecular anthropological investigations the contact may have been long-standing and physically intense. Although as yet no molecular anthropological study of Sebjan-Küöl Évens themselves has been undertaken, a study of the neighbouring Évens of the Eveno-Bytantaj district, with whom Sebjan-Küöl Évens are connected by marriage and migration, has shown that these ‘western Évens’ have very close genetic ties with the Sakha. This indicates that there has been considerable intermarriage between Sakha and ‘western Évens’ going back several generations, since individuals with known Sakha ancestry in the parental or grandparental generation were excluded from the study (Pakendorf et al., 2007). A similarly long-standing history of intermarriage between the Évens settled in Sebjan-Küöl and their Sakha neighbours is quite probable.

This potentially long-standing and intense contact situation has led to widespread bilingualism in Sakha, which in turn has strongly influenced Sebjan-Küöl Éven: a large number of lexical copies, especially discourse particles\(^4\), are found, as are lexical calques, and there has been some

\(^4\) This is comparable to other contact situations, such as the copying of Spanish discourse markers into indigenous languages of Mesoamerica (Stolz & Stolz 1996: 97-99), or the copying of Arabic discourse particles into Domari (Matras 1999: 44). This frequent copying of discourse particles can perhaps be
phonological influence, with consonants undergoing frequent assimilation. Furthermore, a fair amount of morphological influence can be detected, such as the loss of the inclusive/exclusive distinction for 1PL pronouns as well as the regularization of nominal plural marking and verbal person marking. Finally, some syntactic restructuring appears to have taken place on the model of Sakha, such as the lack of agreement within NPs, or widespread use of converses of ‘to say’ as a quotative marker.

The high level of Sakha substance copies in Sebjan-Küöl Ėven is very noticeable to the speakers themselves and is frequently commented upon, often in a negative manner. Thus, one woman (EKK) constantly corrected her granddaughter (JPZ) while the latter was narrating the ‘Pear Story’ (3a, b). Similarly, a man whose sister is well-known in the village as an advocate of “literary Ėven”

felt very shy about his ability to speak ‘proper Ėven’ and thus only told a brief story before referring me to his sister, who in turn proudly spoke for a long time with hardly a Sakha copy.

(3) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ĖVEN (ZaxJP_pear_02-04)

(a)


EKK: nọnap-tụ
first.E–DAT

‘JPZ: At first...’ EKK: ‘Don’t say "bastakïdu!” [the Sakha word for ‘first’] JPZ: ‘At first?’

[said in Ėven] EKK: ‘At first.’

(b)

JPZ: nọnap–tụn ńarị–maja ja–w komuj–a-g–gar–an


guruša–l–bu
pear.R–PL–ACC

‘JPZ: At first a big man was gathering [said with the Sakha root] [EKK: ‘gathering’ - with the Ėven root] gathering pears.’

As will be described in the following, one of the most striking results of this influence is the copying of an entire verbal paradigm, the Assertive-Presumptive mood plus associated subject agreement suffixes, from Sakha to Sebjan-Küöl Ėven.

4. The Assertive-Presumptive mood: original and copy

4.1. The Assertive-Presumptive mood in Sakha

In traditional descriptions of Sakha (e.g. Korkina et al., 1982: 341-343), the mood formed with the suffix –TAχ plus Possessive suffixes to mark subject agreement has been called the ‘Presumptive’ mood. However, these forms are widely used in narratives with a meaning of emphasis or factual statement (in this they do not appear to differ from the Indicative mood), mainly referring to the past (Korkina, 1970: 271-273); in this function, they very frequently occur with the emphatic particle diː (4a). Since the assertive function of these forms predominates over the

explained by their ‘gesture-like’ nature, which facilitates their dissociation from the content of the utterance (Matras 1998: 309).

5 In the 1930s one of the eastern dialects spoken on the coast of the Okhotsk Sea was declared the ‘standard’, and literacy materials were developed on this basis (Burykin 2004: 260). However, this ‘literary Ėven’ is not widely used or understood, notwithstanding its being taught in school curricula.
presumptive meaning in narratives, I prefer to call them the ‘Assertive-Presumptive’ mood (glossed ‘ASS’), even though one of the functions of these forms is to express probabilities (4b).

(4a) SAKHA (XatR_252)
\[
\begin{align*}
inńe & \ gïn-an & \text{thus} & \text{do-PF.CVB} & \text{livestock-VR-REFL-PF.CVB} & \text{breath-PROP} \\
\text{on} & \text{ton siohii-le-n-en as-ta-n-an tiın-naχ} & & & & \\
\text{thus} & \text{do-PF.CVB} & \text{PTL livestock-VR-REFL-PF.CVB food-VR-REFL-PF.CVB breath-PROP} \\
\text{hiiχ-taχ-tara di:} & \text{go-ASS-POSS.3PL EMPH} & \text{And so, keeping cattle for themselves they stayed alive.'}
\end{align*}
\]

(4b) SAKHA (BesP_32)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bu} & \text{kiʤʤ-an} & \text{this get.older-PF.CVB} & \text{what.ACC} & \text{PTL be.able-PRSPT.NEG AUX-PF.CVB} \\
\text{tugu} & \text{da kiaj-bat} & \text{what.ACC be.able-PRSPT.NEG AUX-PF.CVB} & \text{PTL} & \text{do-ASS-POSS.3SG} \\
\text{diː} & \text{say.PF.CVB people-PL-POSS.3SG} & \text{PTL} & \text{huruj-bataχ-tar write-PSTPT.NEG-PL} & \text{His relatives didn’t write, saying "He's probably old and helpless and wants to come so that we can look after him."} & \\
\text{EMPH}
\end{align*}
\]

Depending on how emotionally involved narratives are, Assertive-Presumptive verb forms can make up a good portion of the finite verbal forms: in my corpus of Sakha narratives with a total of approximately 3,600 sentences, the Assertive-Presumptive mood occurs 137 times, 50 times with the emphatic particle \text{di:} (i.e. about 36% of the occurrences are with the particle). The most frequently occurring form is the 3SG (82 instances), followed by the 1SG (31 instances), 1PL (12 instances) and 3PL (9 instances). Second person forms occur very rarely: the 2SG is found only twice and 2PL only once. This skewed distribution of person-number forms can be accounted for by the nature of the data, which consists of narratives, not conversations.

One particularly emotional speaker used the Assertive-Presumptive in 28 out of a total of 240 finite verbs, i.e. with a frequency of 12%. In one section of his narrative, in which he recounted how he had nearly starved during World War II, the frequency of the Assertive-Presumptive mood rose to 23% of finite verbs, with a sequence of five clauses containing verbs in this mood (5a-e; for unknown reasons, this speaker occasionally pronounced the particle \text{di:} with a final -n).

(5) SAKHA (PotP_143-147)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{onton ol} & \text{bili} & \text{that.that.one cow be.born-PF.CVB farm.R-DAT} & \text{that.that.one do.what.PRS-PL} & \text{ separator.R-INS milk whip-PRSPT AUX-ASS-POSS.3PL EMPH} \\
\text{bili} & \text{bierme-ɣe} & \text{PTL be.able-PRSPT.NEG AUX-PTL} & \text{diː} & \text{PTL EMPH} \\
\text{töröː-n} & \text{heppereːter-inen īt iŋj-ar buol-ley-tara din} & \text{separator.R-INS milk do-ASS-POSS.3PL EMHP} & \text{And then the cows calved, and in the farm they did what, they turned the milk through the separator.'}
\end{align*}
\]
(b) **onno kïra kïra-tïk ini mani bess-en-ner dïe ɣaray-im dïe**
theresmall this.ACC this.ACC share-PF.CVBind.PL eye-Poss.1SG PTL
**hïdda-n** kel-ley-e din**
grow.light-PF.CVBind.INCP-ASS.Poss.3SG EMPH
‘They gave me a bit of this and that, and my eyes started to get brighter again (i.e. I got better).’

(c) **bili aŋaddas as-tan öl-büt kihi buol-lay-im**
that.one only food-ABL die-PSTPT person AUX-ASS.Poss.1SG
‘I was a person who only for (lack of) food (nearly) died.’

(d) **hüögye-deb-bit üːt, huorat heɣ bess-en-ner dïe ɣaray-im**
cream-VR-PSTPT milk suorat and.such share-PF.CVBind.PL eye-Poss.1SG
**hïdda-n** kel-ley-e di:
grow.light-PF.CVBind.INCP-ASS.Poss.3SG EMPH
‘Giving me milk from which the cream has been taken, suorat (yoghurt) and such, I got better
(my eyes started to grow light again).’

(e) **emie üle-leːn kel-ley-im din**
again work-VR-PF.CVBind.INCP-ASS.Poss.1SG EMPH
‘And I started working again.

It is thus clear that the ‘assertive’ functions of the Assertive-Presumptive mood can occur quite
frequently in narratives in Sakha, and that it is not as marginal a form as the ‘probability’ meaning
(and the label ‘Presumptive’) might lead one to expect. This might explain why the Assertive-
Presumptive paradigm was copied into Sebjan-Küöl Éven, as will be described below.

### 4.2. The Assertive-Presumptive paradigm in Sebjan-Küöl Éven

Similar to the Učur dialect of Evenki discussed in section 2, in the Éven dialect of Sebjan-Küöl
both the mood and the associated person suffixes have been copied from the Sakha Assertive-
Presumptive paradigm. In contrast to the Učur ‘Presumptive’ forms, however, the Sakha suffixes
attach not to the Present (Nonfuture) Tense forms of the verb, but are attached to the verb root with
the help of a connective glide (6a, b); this connective glide is found only in verb forms consisting of
Éven roots and copied Sakha suffixes (see section 5 below). Furthermore, although the Učur dialect
of Evenki has copied the entire Sakha paradigm of mood plus person suffixes, here the 1PL subject
agreement suffix differs from the other person markers: whereas all other person markers copied
from Sakha have an unrounded vowel (cf. the Učur ‘Presumptive’ paradigm in [2a], especially the
1SG, 2SG, and 2PL forms), the 1PL suffix has a rounded vowel, e.g. **waː-r.dak-put** [kill-ASS.1PL],
**aːnŋa-r.dak-put** [spend.the.night-ASS.1PL] ‘we’ll spend the night here’, and **d’ew-u-r.dek-put** [eat-

---

6 The direction of copying has clearly been from Sakha into Sebjan-Küöl Éven and not the other way round,
since the suffix –TAY that marks the Assertive-Presumptive mood also functions as a Conditional-Temporal
mood marker in Sakha; furthermore, the subject agreement markers occurring in this mood are identical to
the nominal Possessive suffixes in Sakha and are cognate to the possessive suffixes found in other Turkic
languages. Neither the mood suffix nor the person suffixes, however, occur elsewhere in Éven or in other
Tungusic languages.

7 Actually, the example given in Myreeva (1964: 51) is written as **d’ew urdekput**, i.e. as two words [eat ?-ASS.1PL]. However, this appears to be a typographical error, as one would expect this to be a single word:
EP?-ASS-1PL] ‘we’ll eat (well)!’ (Myreeva 1964: 51). It is hard to explain why the 1PL person suffix alone would have this rounded vowel; a possible explanation is that it developed under the influence of the Evenki 1PL exclusive subject agreement suffix –wu:n, which has a similarly rounded vowel. In contrast, no influence of Éven on the form of the copied suffixes is discernible in Sebjan-Küöl.

(6a) **SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÉVEN** (KrivAE_childhood_23)

\[\text{ee, } \text{kụŋa } \text{bi-hiŋ-ij } \text{buollahu } \text{upe-je-ŋ-ćel} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bi-j-deg-im } &= \text{di;} \\
\text{be-CONN-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y}=\text{EMP.H.Y}
\end{align*}
\]

‘And when I was a child I lived with my grandmother and her family.’

(6b) **SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÉVEN** (KrivMK_bear_47)

\[\text{herile } \text{gerbe } \text{tor } \text{bi-hi-n } \text{tar } \text{uručun } \text{ūhū } \text{tarak}, \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{herile-du } &= \text{apppa-j-dak-piṭ}=\text{di;} \\
\text{stony.mountain-DAT } \text{stop.for.the.night-CONN-ASS.Y-1PL.Y}=\text{EMP.H.Y}
\end{align*}
\]

‘It was a so-called ‘stony mountain’, we spent the night on a ‘stony mountain’, right.’

In my narrative corpus from Sebjan-Küöl, the Assertive-Presumptive mood was used 31 times by five out of thirteen speakers, 22 times by one speaker alone (cf. below). Not surprisingly, given the content of most of the narratives (childhood experiences and oral life histories), 1SG forms predominate (15 instances), followed by 3SG forms (13 instances), with 3PL and 1PL forms occurring very rarely (only twice and once, respectively). Second person forms do not occur, probably because the corpus does not contain conversational data. This is comparable to the Sakha data, where second person forms occurred only three times out of a total of 137 examples of the Assertive-Presumptive mood (cf. section 4.1).

All 31 instances of the Assertive-Presumptive have an assertive rather than presumptive meaning. As in Sakha, there is a correlation between the degree of emotional content of the narrative and the amount of Assertive-Presumptive verb forms that are used. One speaker in particular, a 72-year old woman who told the story of her very difficult childhood, made very frequent use of the Assertive-Presumptive: 22 out of 87 finite verbs in her narrative (i.e. 25%, excluding comments, questions, and interjections by her interlocutor) were in the Assertive-Presumptive mood (6a, 7a, b). Her speech was characterized by a larger amount of Sakha elements than usual, so that it is hard to evaluate whether the frequency with which she used the copied Assertive-Presumptive forms is a function of the high degree of Sakha influence she has undergone, a function of the emotionally difficult content of her narrative, or both. Since other speakers used the copied Assertive-Presumptive forms as well (e.g. 6b, 10a-c), and since these forms did not elicit any comments by my primary consultant during the translation of the narratives, I judge them to be part of the grammar of Sebjan-Küöl Éven as a whole and not restricted to this speaker alone.

there is no separate verbal root u- in Evenki, and there is also no verbal form in Evenki that would consist only of the root. I thank Alexandra Lavrilier for helpful discussion of this example.
In contrast to the use of the Assertive-Presumptive in Sakha, in which the majority of uses is as a bare form, without the emphatic particle $\textit{di}$, in the Sebjan-Küöl dialect of Ėven the Assertive-Presumptive frequently occurs with the particle (16 out of 31 times, i.e. in ~50% of the occurrences), as seen in most of the preceding examples. In addition, the consultant who transcribed the narratives added the particle in her transcription, even though it is not actually audible, in four sentences, indicating that the particle is expected with the Assertive-Presumptive. This high incidence of the Assertive-Presumptive together with the emphatic particle $\textit{di}$ indicates that the model for these forms were verbs with an assertive meaning; as mentioned in section 4.1, this is the more frequent function of the Assertive-Presumptive in Sakha narratives. That it is precisely the assertive meaning of this mood that served as a model for the Ėven copies is further corroborated by the fact that the Assertive-Presumptive forms in my corpus of Sebjan-Küöl narratives have only an assertive, not presumptive, meaning.

Although in Sakha the Assertive-Presumptive forms are definitely not marginal mood forms, but can occur relatively frequently, as discussed in the preceding section, they are not the most frequent verb forms encountered in Sakha speech. This raises the question why the Assertive-Presumptive was copied from Sakha into Northern Tungusic dialects rather than the more frequently occurring Indicative mood forms. The answer arguably lies in the greater degree of saliency of the Assertive-Presumptive forms over the more frequent Indicative forms. Sakha Indicative tenses are formed on the basis of the Present, Past and Future Participle: the Present Participle plus Possessive marking forms the Imperfective, the Past Participle gives rise to two distant past tenses, and the Future Participle participates in the formation of the Future Tense. In addition to their occurrence in Indicative verb forms, the participles function as modifiers of NPs and in clause conjunction. There is thus no one-to-one relation between form and function in the Indicative mood. Although there is also no strict one-to-one relation between form and function in the Assertive-Presumptive mood, the suffix $\textit{-TA}_\chi$ that marks this occurs in only one other context, namely the Conditional-Temporal mood; however, here it occurs with a restricted set of person markers, so that Conditional verbs are formally very different from Assertive-Presumptive forms. In addition, as described here, the Assertive-Presumptive can have an assertive or even emphatic meaning, especially in naturally occurring discourse, which is further emphasized by the particle $\textit{di}$. The frequent occurrence of these verb forms with a recurrent, pragmatically salient meaning facilitates their perception in the speech stream, and it is arguably this ease of perception that led to their being copied into Učur Evenki and Sebjan-Küöl Ėven.
Furthermore, while separate means of expressing probability exist (being marked by a bimorphemic suffix -čEː.ʤI in the Sebjan-Küël dialect, cf. [8]), Éven lacks a separate ‘Assertive’ mood, making use of the Indicative mood to express factual or emphatic statements. The copied assertive meaning of the Sakha Assertive-Presumptive mood therefore enriches the complement of mood forms in Sebjan-Küël Éven, rather than replacing preexisting forms; this ‘niche-filling’ function may have further facilitated its being copied.

(8) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÉVEN (StepAA_elk_10)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{uː} & \quad \text{erek} & \quad \text{toki-l} & \quad \text{aracha} & \quad \text{bi} & \quad \text{kapka-mu} & \quad \text{učaŋ-čaː.ʤị-l} & \quad \text{goː-niken} \\
ooh & \quad \text{PROX} & \quad \text{elk-PL} & \quad \text{maybe.Y} & \quad \text{1SG} & \quad \text{trap.R-ACC.POSS.1SG} & \quad \text{break-PRES-PL} & \quad \text{say-SIM.CVB} \\
\text{‘Oh, these elks probably broke my trap.’}
\end{align*}
\]

4.3. Analytic forms with the copied Sakha auxiliary buol

In Sakha, there exist analytic forms of the Assertive-Presumptive mood which consist of participles of all three tenses, Past, Present, and Future, plus the auxiliary buol (9a, b); the resulting meaning is suggested to be one of probability or assertion in the past, present or future (Xaritonov, 1947: 213; Korkina, 1970: 281-282). However, in my Sakha narrative corpus, forms with the Present Participle are not restricted to present tense meaning (9b), and they are more common than forms with the Past or Future Participle.

(9a) SAKHA (XatR_001)

\[
\begin{align*}
oččoɣo & \quad \text{uː} & \quad \text{haχa-lïː} & \quad \text{kepse-t-er} & \quad \text{buol-laχ-pït} & \quad \text{di} \\
in.that.case & \quad \text{INTS} & \quad \text{Sakha-ADVR} & \quad \text{tell-CAUS-PRSPT} & \quad \text{AUX-ASS-1PL} & \quad \text{EMPH} \\
\text{‘So in that case we’ll speak pure Sakha, right.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(9b) SAKHA (XatR_053)

\[
\begin{align*}
onu_buollaɣiña & \quad \text{bihig-i} & \quad \text{tä-ya} & \quad \text{olor-or} & \quad \text{ŋon-nor} & \quad \text{üör-ü-i-nen} & \quad \text{DP} & \quad \text{1PL} & \quad \text{taiga-DAT} & \quad \text{sit-PRSPT} & \quad \text{people-PL} & \quad \text{be.glad-NR-INS} & \quad \text{il-ar} & \quad \text{buol-laɣ-pït} & \quad \text{take-PRSPT} & \quad \text{AUX-ASS-1 PL} & \quad \text{‘Well, we, people living in the woods took that gladly.’}
\end{align*}
\]

The Sebjan-Küël dialect of Éven has also copied the analytic forms consisting of the Sakha Present Participle plus the Sakha auxiliary buol in the Assertive-Presumptive mood (10a-d): nine out of the 31 Assertive-Presumptive forms are analytic. Interestingly, not only the Sakha affirmative Present Participle has been copied in these constructions, but so has the negative Present Participle (10d); the Sakha Past or Future Participles, however, have not been copied. This might be explained by the infrequent use of the Past and Future Participle in analytic Assertive-Presumptive forms in Sakha, as noted above. As with the synthetic Assertive-Presumptive forms, the Sakha Present Participle is attached to the Éven verb root by means of the connective glide -j-.
(10a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÉVEN (KrivMK_bear_067)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ja-ʤi-n} &\quad \text{brosa} &\quad \text{čin} &\quad \text{este-ʤi-n} &\quad [...] &\quad \text{vzorvetsja} \\
\text{do.what-FUT-3SG} &\quad \text{simply.R} &\quad \text{PROX.QUAL} &\quad \text{blow.up.Y-FUT-3SG} &\quad \text{blow.up.3SG.R} \\
\text{go-ʤ-er} &\quad \text{buol-lag-ịm =di:} \\
\text{say-CONN-PRSPT.Y} &\quad \text{AUX.Y-ASS,Y-POSS.1SG.Y=EMPH.Y} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘He will blow up like this’, I say, right.’

(10b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÉVEN (ZaxJP_pear_012)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ogile} &\quad \text{ọjčị–j–ar} &\quad \text{buol–lag–a,} &\quad \text{e–h–ni,} \\
\text{on.top} &\quad \text{go.up-CONN-PRS.PTCP.Y} &\quad \text{AUX.Y-ASS,Y-POSS.3SG.Y} &\quad \text{NEG-NFUT-3SG} \\
\text{e–h–ni} &\quad \text{ik–kere–r} &\quad \text{hergi–le} &\quad \text{taraw} \\
\text{NEG-NFUT–3SG} &\quad \text{see-HAB-NEG.CVB} &\quad \text{bottom-LOC} &\quad \text{DIST-ACC} \\
\text{‘He climbs up high, right, doesn’t see that (what’s happening) below.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(10c) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÉVEN (ZaxVN_poselek_028)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{uže} &\quad \text{bej-e-t-tękį} &\quad \text{hin} &\quad \text{aričča} &\quad \text{gramota-du} &\quad \text{hin} \\
\text{tät–uka–j–ar} &\quad \text{buol–lak–tara} &\quad \text{ee} \\
\text{learn-CAUS-CONN-PRS.PTCP.Y} &\quad \text{AUX.Y-ASS,Y-POSS.3PL.Y} &\quad \text{CONF} \\
\text{‘They are already teaching people literacy.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(10d) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÉVEN (KrivAE_childhood_87)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kïajan} &\quad \text{gīrka-j-bat} &\quad \text{buol–lag–im} &\quad \text{merezči} \\
\text{be.able.Y} &\quad \text{walk-NEG.Y} &\quad \text{AUX.Y-ASS,Y-POSS.1SG.Y} &\quad \text{circle} \\
\text{ọr–ka–n} &\quad \text{begi-če,} \\
\text{become-TRM.CVB-POSS.3SG} &\quad \text{freeze-PF.PTC} \\
\text{‘I can’t walk, right, (my legs) froze until they reached such a diameter ...’}
\end{align*}
\]

In Sakha, the auxiliary in the analytic Assertive-Presumptive forms is developing into an intensifying particle (Korkina, 1970: 282), especially in its 3SG form (Korkina et al., 1982: 343). However, although the Évens of Sebjan-Küöl have copied several particles from Sakha, amongst others those derived from the auxiliary buol (such as buollar in [6a], or buolla in [17b] and [19a]), and make frequent use of them, the auxiliary in the Present Assertive-Presumptive was probably copied as a separate element of the analytical TAM paradigm, independently of the copying of the particles. This can be deduced from the fact that the auxiliary is fully inflected in the same way as the synthetic Assertive-Presumptive forms, and that it occurs independently as a copula in Éven clauses as well (11a, b). In addition, the fact that the Sakha Present Participle was copied in both its affirmative and negative form demonstrates that these phrases are not just fixed collocations, but full-fledged members of the Sebjan-Küöl verbal inflection.

(11a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÉVEN (KrivAE_childhood_085)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ọzn=ihi} &\quad \text{begi-j–en} &\quad \text{buolumuna,} &\quad \text{jak=ta} &\quad \text{of} &\quad \text{gerbe ačča} \\
\text{how=PTL} &\quad \text{freeze-CONN-PF.CVB.Y} &\quad \text{of.course.Y} &\quad \text{what=PTL} &\quad \text{clothes} &\quad \text{name NEG} \\
\text{buol-lag–a,} &\quad \text{AUX.Y-ASS,Y-POSS.3SG.Y} \\
\text{‘Well and of course you freeze, there were no clothes, right...’}
\end{align*}
\]
The presence of an entire verbal paradigm of Sakha origins in Sebjan-Küöl Ėven is intriguing. It raises several further questions, such as whether we are dealing with instances of established copies or rather just code-switching, whether these forms could potentially serve as a point of entry for further morpheme or paradigm copies, and whether the copied forms serve a sociolinguistic function. These issues will be explored in the following sections. Before turning to these questions, however, it is necessary to discuss the potential origins of the connective glide, which will introduce yet another copied paradigm.

5. Potential origin of the connective glide -j- and implications for the sequence of events involved in Sebjan-Küöl paradigm copying

As mentioned in section 4.2 and as seen in the preceding examples, the copied Sakha morphemes are integrated with the help of the connective glide –j–. This connective glide occurs only in verb forms consisting of an Ėven root and a following Sakha inflectional morpheme, e.g. aŋŋa-j-dak-pịt=diː in (6b), goː-j-er in (10a), gịrka-j-bat in (10d), or begi-j-en in (11a). It does not occur in verbs consisting of a copied Sakha root with Sakha morphemes, as seen in all the above examples with the Sakha auxiliary buol or in hista-dag-a [get.infected.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.3SG.Y] ‘(s/he) gets infected’, with only one exception: ụilele-j-deg-e [work.Y-CONN-ASS.Y-POSS.3SG.Y] ‘(s/he) works’. Furthermore, it does not occur in verbs consisting of a Sakha root with Ėven inflectional morphemes, e.g. čụgaha-d-dak-a-n [come.closer.Y-PROG-COND.CVB-EP-POSS.3SG] ‘when (it) came closer’, e-č-u atliː-a [NEG-PST-POSS.1SG sell.Y-NEG.CVB] ‘I didn’t sell’. Likewise, it does not occur in ordinal numerals consisting of an Ėven numeral and the copied Sakha ordinal suffix –Is:

(12) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ĖVEN (KejTV_family_26)

tarak erek il-ịs koška-t

DIST PROX three-ORD,Y cat.R-POSS.1PL

‘That is our third cat.’

This connective glide is thus specific to the integration of Sakha verb morphemes with Ėven roots. Its origins are somewhat obscure, but one possible explanation is that it developed by reanalysis of Sakha morphemes containing the diphthong –ïa/–ie, which are copied into Sebjan-Küöl Ėven with an initial glide –ja/–je. This diphthong has entered Sebjan-Küöl Ėven predominantly via yet another paradigm copied from Sakha in its entirety, namely the Necessitative mood⁸. In Sakha, the Necessitative mood is comprised of a bimorphemic mood suffix followed by Predicative person suffixes. The mood suffix consists of the Future Participle –IAχ followed by the Proprietary suffix –LAːχ resulting in the Necessitative form –IAχtAːχ, e.g.

⁸ Malchukov (2006: 126) mentions that the Tompo dialect of Ėven (spoken in the village of Topolinoe) also copied the Sakha Necessitative suffix, but not the Sakha person suffixes. However, in a corpus of spontaneous and elicited data recorded in the village of Topolinoe in 2007 the Sakha Necessitative suffix does not occur (Matić, pers. comm.), so that in this dialect the Sakha copy might be rather marginal.
‘I had to go to Ytyk-Küöl to the fifth grade, but there was no possibility, my mother didn’t send me.’

In Sebjan-Küöl Éven, the Sakha Necessitative has been copied as –jEktEːk. Unfortunately, it occurs only five times in my corpus, four times with the corresponding Sakha Predicative person suffixes. In one instance it was used with the Éven Possessive suffix expected with the Éven Necessitative Participle (14d); when asked, however, my consultant confirmed that one could also use the Sakha person suffix –kît.

9 In Sakha, there is no difference between the Possessive and Predicative subject agreement suffixes for 1PL and 2PL (both are –BIt and –GIt, respectively), so that the glosses for these forms do not specify the type of person marker (e.g. 6b, 14b). The Sakha Predicative subject agreement marker for 3SG is zero, as seen in (14c).
In addition to the Sakha Necessitative paradigm, the Sakha diphthong can be found in my corpus of Sebjan-Küöl Even in another morpheme that contains the (phonologically contracted) Sakha Future Participle. This is a periphrastic way of expressing possibility, consisting of the Accusative-marked Future Participle in the possessive declension plus the particle höp; for 3SG, the inflected Future Participle is contracted to -IAn in Sakha (15a). In my corpus of Sebjan-Küöl Even, this hypothetical form also occurs (15b); however, it is doubtful whether this expression is already an established copy. I obtained it only as the result of translation of one and the same sentence by two separate consultants, who both explicitly stated that they only knew the Sakha way to express possibility. The speakers’ judgement that this expression is Sakha, not Even, makes it clear that in this instance the speakers took recourse to the Sakha way of expressing possibility because they could not come up with the Even expression at that moment. That the Even means of expressing possibility is still accessible for at least one of these two consultants is shown by one of three examples of the Even Hypothetical Participle taken from her childhood memories (15c).

(15a) SAKHA (YmyE_186)

`tial ʤe kïtaːnaχ köt-üt-en idyɨ-e bar-ían höp kihi-ni`
wind well hard fly-CAUS-PF.CVB carry-IPF.CVB go-HYP.3SG.PTL person-ACC

‘The wind is terrible, it can lift a person up and blow him away.’

(15b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL EVEN (elicitation corpus, KrivIV_DesignativeA27a)

ńarị ahị-kan-du ọj-ụ em-u-jen höp
man woman-DIM-DAT clothes-ACC come-CAUS-HYP.3SG.Y PTL.Y

‘The man is able to/can bring clothes for the woman.’

(15c) SEBJAN-KÜÖL EVEN (KrivIV_memories_111)

ńan ịa-w ukčen-ʤiŋe-j?
and what-ACC tell-HYP.PTC.E-PRFL.SG

‘What else can I tell?’

Apart from one instance in which my consultant started to translate a Russian sentence with the standard Even Necessitative before correcting herself and changing to the Sakha Necessitative (cf. 20a, b below), only one speaker in Sebjan-Küöl used the standard Even Necessitative (16). This was the advocate of ‘literary Even’ mentioned above (section 3), who clearly consciously eschewed all Sakha copies during the recording of her narrative, which therefore cannot be taken as truly representative of this dialect of Even. It would thus appear that the Sakha Necessitative is by now an established copy in Sebjan-Küöl Even, notwithstanding the small number of examples found in my corpus; especially considering the judgement of my consultant herself (cf. 20b below).

(16) SEBJAN-KÜÖL EVEN (StepZA_hunting03)

temɨ hi aj bujus-i-mŋe ov-da-jj, .nanoap
therefore 2SG good hunt-EP-AGRN become-PURP.CVB-PRFL.SG the.first
ma-daŋ-ị objazatelno hawdni bej-du box-nne-s
kill-PST.PTC-PRFL.SG without.fail.R old man-DAT give-NEC.E-POSS.2SG.E

‘Therefore, in order for you to become a good hunter, you absolutely have to give your first kill to an old person.’

As was discussed at the beginning of this section, the connective glide is restricted to the integration of Sakha verbal morphemes with Even roots. There is no phonological need for the
insertion of the glide, since the copied morphemes conform to Even phonotactic requirements; on the contrary, the insertion of the connective glide between a consonant-final Even root such as *it ‘to see’ and the Sakha Assertive-Presumptive creates an unacceptable sequence of consonants, necessitating the further insertion of an epenthetic vowel between the root-final consonant and the connective glide in *ič-e-j-deg-im (e.g. in 7a). This raises the question of why this glide is present in these hybrid verb forms and what its source is. Since the glide is restricted to the integration of Sakha verbal morphemes with Even roots, not occurring in any other hybrid forms, it is most likely to have taken its origin in a form consisting of an Even root and a Sakha morpheme. In this context it is notable that the only Sakha verbal morpheme that is not integrated with the glide is the Future Participle present in the Necessitative (14a-d) and in the Hypothetical mood (15b), since the suffix-initial diphthong is copied into Sebjan-Küöl Even as an initial glide. A potential explanation for the origin of the connective glide is therefore that it was reanalyzed from one of the copied suffixes containing the Sakha Future Participle to take on the function of integrating other copied Sakha morphemes with Even verb roots. Admittedly, this cannot explain why the initial glide from the copied Sakha diphthong was dissociated not only from the rest of the morpheme, but from the accompanying vowel; for the moment, I do not have an explanation for this. If the diphthong in the Future Participle is indeed the source of the connective glide, then it must have been copied from Sakha prior to the copying of the Assertive-Presumptive paradigm. However, as mentioned above, the Hypothetical suffix is still classified as a Sakha form by my consultants, while the copied Necessitative mood is regarded as part of the local Even inventory (cf. section 9 below); this implies that the Hypothetical suffix is a very recent innovation, while the Necessitative is already an established copy. From this it follows that the Necessitative mood must have been copied before the Hypothetical suffix entered the language, and consequently, if the connective glide prevalent in verbs consisting of Even roots and Sakha morphemes indeed derives from the Sakha Necessitative, this must have been copied from Sakha prior to the copying of the Assertive-Presumptive paradigm.

This discussion has touched upon one of the problems inherent in the data presented so far, namely how to distinguish between established copies and ongoing code-switching. This will be discussed in the following sections.

6. Code-switching or copying?

It is not always easy to know whether Sakha elements in Sebjan-Küöl Even constitute established copies that have fully entered the grammar of this Even dialect, or rather examples of code-switching which are as yet only accessible via the Sakha grammar available to practically all speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Even. Following Backus (2000: 103) I assume that the distinction is mainly a matter of degree and time, i.e. established copies arose from erstwhile code-switching. When a large number of speakers use a Sakha element persistently, e.g. the Sakha discourse particle *buolla(r), it is easy enough to judge this an established copy that is part of the lexicon of Sebjan-Küöl Even. However, matters become more difficult when several speakers use a Sakha element, but when this element is still perceived as Sakha by at least some people. For example, the Sakha verb *kọmụj ‘to gather, collect’ is used by four out of five narrators of the ‘Pear Story’, but the Even verbs *ụmụj, čak, and taw with the same meaning are also used, mainly by older speakers. These speakers appear to be aware of *kọmụj as a Sakha item (cf. ex. 3b, where the grandmother corrects her granddaughter’s use of *kọmụj), so that their use of *kọmụj might be regarded as code-switching; on the other hand, *kọmụj appears to have fully entered the Even lexicon of at least a few of the younger speakers.

A similar difficulty pertains to the copied Assertive-Presumptive paradigm. In most instances, the Sakha mood and person suffixes attach to Even stems, and since these forms are used by several speakers and did not elicit any comment by my primary consultant, I judge them to be established
copies. However, there are also examples of what are arguably switches from Ėven into Sakha, in which the entire verb phrase is in Sakha (17a, b).

(17a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ĖVEN (KrivAE_childhood_034)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{kụŋa} \quad \text{bi-hi-ʤeːk-i=de} \quad \text{bọč̆op} \quad \text{bil-bet} \\
\text{child} \quad \text{be-IMPF.PTC-NR-PRL.SG=PTL} \quad \text{this.much.Y} \quad \text{know.Y-NEG.Y} \\
\text{buol-lag-im} \quad \text{ọmŋo-j-dog-im=diː} \\
\text{AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y} \quad \text{forget-CONN-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y=EMPH.Y}
\end{array}
\]

‘But the time when I was a child I don’t know very well, I forgot, right.’

(17b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ĖVEN (KrivAE_childhood_083)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{tarịt} \quad \text{buolla, ūnta-w-u} \quad \text{buolla} \quad \text{kìajan} \quad \text{tik-pet} \\
\text{then} \quad \text{DP.Y} \quad \text{fur.boots-ACC-POSS.1SG} \quad \text{DP.Y} \quad \text{be.able.Y} \quad \text{sew.Y-NEG.Y} \\
\text{buol-lag-im=diː} \quad \text{AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y=EMPH.Y}
\end{array}
\]

‘And then, well I can’t sew fur boots, right.’

These examples are rather interesting, in that these phrases contain the Sakha Present Assertive-Presumptive. The verb phrase containing the copied Sakha Present Assertive-Presumptive in example (17b), \text{kìajan tikpet buollagimdiː}, differs from that in (10d), \text{kìajan gịrkajbat buollagim}, only in that the latter contains an Ėven verb root, \text{gịrka} ‘to walk’. It is not yet clear whether the modal element \text{kìajan} is an established copy in Sebjan-Küöl Ėven, as it is in Kolyma Yukaghir (cf. Maslova 2003: 497-498), since only one speaker used it. It is therefore difficult to assess the code-switched vs. copied status of the verb phrases in (10d), (17a), and (17b). If one assumes that both \text{kìajan} and the Present Assertive-Presumptive are established copies, then (17b) would constitute an example of a copied or code-switched Sakha verb root inserted into a Sebjan-Küöl Ėven phrase consisting of elements originating from Sakha. If, on the other hand, \text{kìajan} is not an established copy, and the Present Assertive-Presumptive is only in the process of being copied, then (17b) would better be analyzed as a code-switched phrase. In either case, these examples illustrate how fluidly bilingual speakers utilize their languages. Furthermore, these examples might provide some indication of how the analytic Assertive-Presumptive mood forms entered Sebjan-Küöl Ėven: they may have initially been inserted into Ėven speech in entire code-switched verb phrases, and later become dissociated and used as independent forms with native Ėven roots.

7. Joint copying of TAM and person suffixes

The discussion so far has referred only to examples taken from texts. To facilitate a comparison of the copied person markers, I here present entire paradigms (18a, b). Since the data on which this paper is based are taken predominantly from narratives (cf. Introduction), in which not all possible person-number forms of the discussed paradigms occur, I have constructed the forms in (18a, b) based on actual data by adapting the suffixes to harmonize with the root chosen for the example. Asterisks mark those person-number forms that do not occur at all in my corpus; in these cases, the suffixes were constructed based on what would be expected from the Sakha forms. No attempts were undertaken to elicit these paradigms.

(18a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ĖVEN, constructed Assertive-Presumptive paradigm of \text{aŋŋa} ‘spend the night’

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{SG} & \text{PL} \\
1^{st} & \text{aŋŋa-j-dag-im} & \text{aŋŋa-j-dak-pit} \\
2^{nd} & *aŋŋa-j-dag-ịŋ & *aŋŋa-j-dakkịt
\end{array}
\]
3rd aŋŋa-j-dag-a aŋŋa-j-dak-tara

(18b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ĖVEN, constructed Necessitative paradigm of em ‘come’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Sakha Morphemes</th>
<th>ĖVEN Morphemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>*em-e-jektek-pin</td>
<td>em-e-jektek-pin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>em-e-jektek-kin</td>
<td>em-e-jektek-kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>em-e-jektek</td>
<td>em-e-jektek-e-l¹⁰</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is striking about the copying of both the Assertive-Presumptive and the Necessitative paradigms from Sakha into Sebjan-Küöl Ėven is that the mood plus person suffixes appear to have been copied as a whole. Thus, in Sebjan-Küöl Ėven the copied Assertive-Presumptive suffix –TAx occurs exclusively, and the copied Necessitative suffix –jEktEːk occurs predominantly with Sakha subject agreement markers. Furthermore, –TAx occurs with Sakha Possessive suffixes, and –jEktEːk occurs with Sakha Predicative suffixes – while the Ėven Necessitative takes Possessive person marking, as seen in (16).

Both Sakha and Ėven are agglutinative languages in which individual morphemes are generally easily separable from each other. In both languages, different TAM verb forms take one of two different types of subject agreement marker. In Sakha, these are the Possessive suffixes and the Predicative suffixes, which both also function in nominal morphology (cross-referencing the person and number of the possessor, and of the subject of nominal predicates, respectively). In Ėven, one type of verbal subject agreement marker is identical to the nominal Possessive suffixes; the other is restricted in use to verbal person-marking. It should therefore be possible for speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Ėven, who are bilingual in Sakha, to analyse both Sakha and Ėven verbal forms into the constituent mood and person suffixes and to copy one without the other.

This co-occurrence of the Sakha mood suffixes with Sakha person suffixes therefore provides further evidence that these forms arose from code-switches into Sakha. Had the speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Ėven copied only the mood marking, one would expect the Sakha suffixes to occur with Ėven person suffixes, as seen in example (14d) and as suggested by Malchukov for Tompo Ėven (cf. footnote 8). In this respect it is of interest that the Sakha Necessitative occurred with an Ėven person-marking suffix in one example, and that it takes the Ėven plural suffix for 3PL agreement: this might be a further indication of the greater age of the copied Necessitative in Sebjan-Küöl Ėven, as compared to the Assertive-Presumptive. Speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Ėven would have had the time to dissociate the copied person suffixes from the copied Necessitative mood suffix and to combine the latter with Ėven person suffixes, while this has not yet happened with the Assertive-Presumptive.

Such a dissociation of copied elements from the morphemic context in which they were copied might provide a means for their further spread as independent elements in the recipient language. This possibility will be discussed in the following.

8. The Present Assertive-Presumptive as a gateway for the introduction of the Sakha Present Participle?

In Sakha, the affirmative Present Participle without person suffixes functions as the Present tense form for the third person, while the negative Present Participle with Predicative person markers forms the Indicative Present tense negative paradigm; with Possessive suffixes it functions as an Imperfect. In Sebjan-Küöl Ėven, the copied analytic Present Assertive-Presumptive forms might

1⁰ The 3PL form of this paradigm takes Ėven plural marking rather than Sakha plural marking; the expected form with the Sakha plural would be em-e-jektek-ter.

Journal of Language Contact – VARIA 2 (2009)
www.jlc-journal.org
Intensive contact and the copying of paradigms

with time serve as a gateway for the introduction of the Sakha Present Participle as an independent inflectional form into the verbal system, if speakers analyse the analytic mood form into its component parts. As mentioned above, the prerequisites for such an analysis already exist, in that the inflected Sakha auxiliary is already used as a copula in Even clauses (11a, b). This facilitates the dissociation of the Present Participle from the Assertive-Presumptive-marked auxiliary in Present Assertive-Presumptive phrases. Furthermore, the fact that both the affirmative and negative forms of the Sakha Present Participle have been copied and are used as individual elements in the analytic Present Assertive-Presumptive indicates that they are viewed as separate elements that contribute to the mood form as a whole, rather than being fixed collocations. Two (admittedly somewhat unclear) examples from my corpus of narratives lend further support to the suggestion that the Sakha Present Participle might with time come to be used independently:

(19a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ĖVEN (KrivAE_childhood_112)

Indibal-du buolla er-teki ịbgo = nụn bej-i-l em-e-j-er
buolla, ụga-l-li em-e-j-eller [ta-la]
come-EP-CONN-PRS.PTC.PL.Y

‘Here, to Yndybal, only able people could come, and their children also came.’ [interlocutor: ‘came there’]

(19b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ĖVEN (KejTV_family_005)

... bi: ukčen-dji-m od-ča-lu-w em-e-j-er.
1SG tell-FUT-1SG stop-PF.PTC-LOC-POSS.1SG come-EP-CONN-PRS.PTC.Y
dji-n čagaw go-lij.
enter-FUT-3SG other say-IMP.2SG

‘... when I finish telling, that one comes, will come in, right.’

Unfortunately, in both examples the sentences are not very well formed, and it is thus hard to know what the speakers really meant to express. The 3SG Present Participle emejer in (19a) might also be taken as constituting part of the analytic Present Assertive-Presumptive, with buolla representing a phonologically contracted form of the Assertive-Presumptive 3SG. However, since both the speaker and her interlocutor subsequently used the 3PL Present Participle emejeller by itself, this appears much more likely to represent an independent form of the Sakha Present Participle, similar to emejer in (19b). A further indication that the Sakha Present Participle is entering or has already entered the verbal system of Sebjan-Küöl Ėven lies in a statement made by my primary consultant that here it has a meaning of necessity and compulsory action. Although that does not appear to hold for either of the above examples, this statement shows that the Sakha Present Participle by itself is being assigned a meaning specific to Sebjan-Küöl Ėven that is not inherent in the model form. However, in my narrative corpus there are as yet only the above examples of Sakha Present Participles independent of the Assertive-Presumptive, and no examples of the Present Participle inflecting for any person other than the 3SG and 3PL. This indicates that its establishment as an independent TAM marker in Sebjan-Küöl Ėven is at most ongoing, but far from complete.
9. The emblematic function of copied elements

It has been suggested that mixed languages serve as markers of in-group identity (Thomason 2003: 34; cf. Muysken 1997: 376 on Media Lengua, and Matras et al. 2007: 143 on Angloromani). Thus, Copper Island Aleut, with its finite verbal morphology copied from Russian, probably developed out of a desire of the ‘creole’ population on Copper Island to have a language of their own corresponding to their intermediate social position (Thomason 1997: 463). Similarly, the mixed language Michif, in which the nouns and nominal morphology are of French origin, while the verbs and verbal morphology are of Cree origin, is said to have developed out of a desire of the offspring of French fathers and Cree mothers to have a separate language matching their identity as a separate social group (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 233; Bakker 1997: 206-209, 278-280). In the case of the Australian mixed language Gurindji Kriol, however, it is the retention of indigenous elements rather than the insertion of copies that plays a role as an identity marker, with the speakers identifying positively as specifically Gurindji, rather than just Aboriginal Australians (Meakins 2008: 86).

Golovko (2003: 185-189) describes the use of Sakha-Russian code-switching amongst Russian Old Settlers on the Middle Kolyma as an identity marker of the group that is recognized as such both by the members of the community as well as outsiders: “[…] ‘fluid code-switching’ is the only accepted mode of speech within the speech community. Moreover, this way of speaking has become an identity marker for the group. [...] People from other areas are very well aware of their neighbours’ specific way of speaking.” (Golovko, 2003: 186). However, the code-switching described by Golovko differs from the paradigm copying found in Copper Island Aleut and Sebjan-Küöl Even, because it involves not the insertion of Sakha morphemes, but of entire Sakha words or phrases into Russian. Golovko presents only one exception, in which a Russian noun takes the Sakha Accusative case marker: simpatičnij devyška-nil olus olus ja ljublju [pretty.R.M girl.R.F-ACC.Y very.Y very.Y 1SG.R love.PRS.1SG.R] ‘a pretty girl very very much I like’ (taken from a song; p.188).

Data on dialects of Evenki spoken in southern Yakutia and the northern Amur region, however, demonstrate that salient morpheme copies can very well serve as demarcators of linguistic identity. Thus, Lavrillier (2004: 437) writes: “Chaque village a ses propres innovations, et cette différence est une référence identitaire qui semble compter.” For example, in the village of lengra in southern Yakutia the form namàd’ere-vat’ [riding.saddle-IPFV-INF.R] ‘to saddle a riding reindeer’ is in use; this contrasts with the neighbouring village of Ust’-Njukža in the northern Amur district, in which the same meaning is rendered by the form namà-č-et’ [riding.saddle-DUR?-INF.R]. According to Lavrillier, this dialectal variation in the use of mixed forms is emphasized by the Evenks themselves: “Ces derniers [the speakers of lengra Evenki, B.P.] aiment à préciser que leurs voisins, les Évenks du village de Ust’-Njukža [...] utilisent pour la même signification l’innovation namà-č-et’ [...]”. Furthermore, Lavrillier suggests that Evenki-Russian hybrid constructions are created consciously by adolescent Evenks living a settled life in the village; they serve to fill gaps in the reindeer- or hunting-specific lexical domains in Russian, and occasionally to exclude outsiders who do not know Evenki (Lavrillier, pers. comm.). Frequently, however, forms such as povtori-d’ere-vac [repeat.IMP.R-IPFV.E-PRS.3SG.R] ‘He doesn’t stop repeating himself!’ arise out of pure playfulness: “... bien souvent, elles relèvent tout simplement d’une intention ludique ou humoristique” (Lavrillier 2004: 436-437).

In Sebjan-Küöl Even, too, the Sakha copies have emblematic functions, with a number of people commenting on the fact that this is the way they speak Even in Sebjan-Küöl. This awareness of the Sakha copies as an integral part of Sebjan-Küöl Even became particularly clear during an elicitation session: At first my primary consultant, a teacher of Even at the local school, produced a sentence with the standard Even Necessitative mood form (20a). However, she immediately corrected herself...
saying that was ‘literary Éven’ and produced the Sebjan-Küöl form with the copied Sakha Necessitative mood and person suffixes (20b).

(20a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÉVEN (elicitation corpus, KrivIV_Corverbs2.06)
\[
\text{mut egđen-e-t gurgetči-\textit{nene-t} ... [interrupted herself]}
\]
1PL big-EP-INS work-\textit{NEC.E-POSS.1PL.E}

‘We have to work hard….’

(20b) \[
\text{mut egđen-e-t gurgetči-\textit{jekteč-pit} mut kụŋa-l-ti \textit{jibgo-t}}
\]
1PL big-EP-INS work-\textit{NEC.Y-1PL.Y} 1PL child-PL-POSS.1PL good-INS
teg-e-t-te-dnen
sit.down-EP-RES-PURP.CVB-POSS.3PL

‘We have to work hard so that our children can live well.’

This example demonstrates very well the extent to which the Sakha copies have been internalized as constituting part of the specific features of Éven as spoken in Sebjan-Küöl.

10. Intensive contact, paradigm copying, and Copper Island Aleut

Before attempting to come to a conclusion regarding paradigm copying and its relevance for the development of a mixed language like Copper Island Aleut, let me briefly recapitulate the varied data on which my arguments are based: In Sebjan-Küöl we find widespread unidirectional bilingualism, with speakers of Éven being fluent in Sakha, but not vice versa. This bilingualism has led to noticeable influence from Sakha in Sebjan-Küöl Éven, both as regards substance as well as schematic copies. Amongst the most interesting contact-induced features of this dialect of Éven is arguably the copying of two entire verbal paradigms, the Assertive-Presumptive and the Necessitative. The data presented above (cf. section 4.1) demonstrate that the Sakha Assertive-Presumptive mood has not only a meaning of probability, but more commonly a meaning of emphasis and/or assertion, and it is a frequently occurring and highly salient inflectional form in Sakha narratives. Sebjan-Küöl Éven copied the Sakha form only with the assertive meaning, which is further enhanced by the use of the emphatic particle \textit{diː} occurring with half the Assertive-Presumptive forms in Éven (cf. section 4.2). As shown by the presence of a connective glide with all copied or code-switched Sakha verbal morphemes attached to Éven roots (with the exception of the Necessitative), the first Sakha paradigm to have been copied into Sebjan-Küöl Éven appears to have been the Necessitative (cf. section 5). The mood and person suffixes of both the Assertive-Presumptive and the Necessitative were copied as one unit, arguing for an origin of these forms via code-switching. This code-switching probably occurred ‘out of necessity’ in order to fill an expressive gap, as appears to be the case with the Sakha Hypothetical mood (ex 15b); it may, however, also have occurred deliberately when bilingual speakers manipulated their two languages. After becoming established and fully integrated into Sebjan-Küöl Éven, these forms might serve as vehicles for the further introduction of Sakha verbal forms, as demonstrated by the seemingly independent use of the Sakha Present Participle in Sebjan-Küöl Éven (cf. section 8). These copied forms serve an emblematic, identity-giving function, clearly demarcating Sebjan-Küöl Éven as a separate entity amongst the various Éven dialects.

Apart from the interest they constitute in and of themselves, in which way do these data help to shed light on the development of Copper Island Aleut? First of all, it is arguably the relatively high frequency of use of the Assertive-Presumptive forms as well as their pragmatic salience which has facilitated the copying of the entire paradigm from Sakha into Éven. This of course contradicts the hypothesis mentioned in section 2 that the ‘Presumptive’ forms copied into the Účur dialect of Evenki were copied due to their rarity, and by analogy, that the initial development of a mixed
language like Copper Island Aleut may have started from such infrequent paradigms. However, although the copied paradigm may not have ‘sneaked into’ the language via ‘the back door’ of some infrequently used mood, the Assertive-Presumptive has potentially opened the way for further Sakha inflectional verb forms to enter Sebjan-Küöl Ėven. Thus, the Sakha Present Participle might with time spread from its use in the Present Assertive-Presumptive to an independent verbal marker.

Secondly, it is abundantly clear that such paradigm copying can only take place in situations of full bilingualism, because only then are both languages fully accessible to speakers in need of a particular way of expressing themselves. This provides further support for the suggestions that the creators of Copper Island Aleut must have been fully bilingual (Thomason, 1997: 462, 2001: 197; Golovko, 2003: 191). Furthermore, the data on Sebjan-Küöl Ėven appear to support an initial origin of the copied paradigms via code-switching. This is shown by the fact that the mood and person suffixes were copied as a unit, and also by examples concerning the analytic Present Assertive-Presumptive (10d, 17a, b); some of these arguably constitute switches to Sakha, while others appear rather to be phrases consisting of an Ėven root with copied Sakha inflection. Thus, the Sakha analytical Present Assertive-Presumptive might have originated via insertions of entire Sakha phrases, which were later analysed into component parts, enabling the insertion of Ėven stems. The question of whether code-switching can be at the root of mixed languages such as Michif or Copper Island Aleut is highly debated (e.g. Backus, 2000; Gardner-Chloros, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 2002: 258-265; Bakker, 2003: 128-134); however, the data of McConvell and Meakins (2005) demonstrate that code-switching can indeed lead to the emergence of a mixed language, since the mixed language Gurindji Kriol developed out of previous code-switching patterns between Gurindji and Kriol. Thomason (2003: 30) claims that: “[...]

Mednyj Aleut also doesn’t look like a plausible later stage of a process that began as codeswitching. This does not, of course, mean that no codeswitching at all was involved in the genesis of the language, but it does suggest that codeswitching probably wasn’t a major factor.” However, the example of the Sakha Hypothetical mood occurring in Sebjan-Küöl Ėven (15b) appears to me to be particularly illustrative of how such code-switching might actually have taken place: here, two consultants translated a Russian sentence expressing possibility into Ėven using an Ėven verb root inflected with a Sakha suffix and apologizing that they knew only the Sakha, and not the Ėven way of expressing such possibility. This demonstrates that for bilingual speakers of Ėven and Sakha, the Ėven way of expressing certain ideas or moods might not always be fully accessible, in which case recourse is taken to Sakha, a language which the interlocutor is known to understand just as well. While in some cases the Sakha form might be more immediately present because Sakha, rather than Ėven, is by now the speaker’s dominant language, this does not hold for all speakers. In particular, one of the two consultants who was unable to come up with the Ėven way of expressing possibility uses Ėven in the home as well as with some colleagues, and belongs to the group of strong Ėven speakers; during the recording of her childhood memories she had no problems in spontaneously producing the Ėven Hypothetical form (15c). From such code-switches ‘out of necessity’ these forms might spread, perhaps with a conscious element of language manipulation involved (Golovko, 2003; Lavrillier, 2004: 435-437), and with time become the more natural and even only way of expression. It is, for example, not yet entirely clear to what extent the Assertive-Presumptive forms have truly entered ‘the grammar’ of Sebjan-Küöl Ėven rather than being restricted to speakers with particularly strong Sakha influence. Thus, although these mood forms are much more frequent in my corpus than the Necessititative, they were used by speakers with a noticeably high degree of Sakha elements in their narratives. This might therefore represent a real-time example of how such forms can enter a language, starting with initial code-switching by some speakers, developing into established copies in their linguistic repertoire, and over time and with constant repetition by this group of innovators finally entering the language of those speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Ėven who are not radically opposed to Sakha copies, but who view them as salient features of their dialect. Of course, such code-
switching and language manipulation is arguably a lot easier for bilingual speakers of Even and Sakha than for bilingual speakers of Aleut and Russian, since Even and Sakha are typologically very similar. Due to their agglutinative structure, the recognition of meanings associated with individual morphemes is fairly easy, facilitating the dissociation of morphemes from stems in one language and their insertion into verb phrases in another language.

A further difference between Copper Island Aleut and Sebjan-Küöl Even is that in the former the entire finite verbal morphology was replaced, while in the latter we have evidence of only two paradigms that have been copied. It is for instance notable that so far there exist no examples of Sakha person markers occurring with Even TAM suffixes, while the Sakha Necessitative occurs with the Even plural suffix to mark agreement with a 3PL subject (18b), and occurred once with an Even 2PL Possessive suffix (14d). However, the development of Copper Island Aleut was completed by the time the language was recorded, while the interaction of Sakha and Even in Sebjan-Küöl is still ongoing. It is therefore possible that with time further Sakha verbal forms will enter the local Even dialect, as seen by the potentially incipient copying of the Hypothetical mood from Sakha (15b).

The data furthermore appear to support the suggestion that some conscious decisions on the side of the speakers are involved in such paradigm copying, as has been proposed for the development of Copper Island Aleut (Thomason, 1997: 464-465; Golovko, 2003). Speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Even are clearly aware of the Sakha origin of many of the elements in their language; this is shown by the metalinguistic comments I frequently heard in Sebjan-Küöl, by the admonishments of the grandmother in (3a, b), as well as by the fact that the advocate of ‘literary Even’ was able to speak for half an hour with hardly a Sakha copy. This awareness of the Sakha origin of many Sebjan-Küöl Even forms might make it easier for speakers to manipulate their two languages, inserting Sakha forms to enhance ingroup identity, for example, or refraining from doing so when trying to achieve a different goal. Such conscious mixing of elements from two languages has also been documented by Lavrillier (2004: 435-437) in some dialects of Evenki. In conclusion, copied elements can indeed play a role in the establishment of linguistic identity, as has been previously suggested. The influence of Sakha on Northern Tungusic dialects discussed in this paper has additionally provided us with a glimpse of the morphosyntactic mechanisms potentially at work during the initial stages of development of a mixed language such as Copper Island Aleut.
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List of abbreviations:

- **ABL**: Ablative
- **ACC**: Accusative
- **ADVR**: Adverbializer
- **AGNR**: Agent Nominalizer
- **ALL**: Allative
- **ALN**: Alienable Possession
- **ANT**: Anterior
- **ASS**: Assertive-Presumptive
- **ASSOC**: Associative
- **AUG**: Augmentative
- **AUX**: Auxiliary
- **CAUS**: Causative
- **COM**: Comitative
- **COND**: Conditional
- **CONF**: Confirmation
- **CONN**: Connective (glide)
- **CVB**: Converb
- **DAT**: Dative
- **DIM**: Diminutive
- **DIST**: Distal Demonstrative
- **DISTR**: Distributive
- **DP**: Discourse Particle
- **DUR**: Durative
- **E**: Even/Evenki (root/morpheme)
- **EMPH**: Emphatic
- **EP**: Epenthetic Vowel
- **F**: Feminine
- **FUT**: Future
- **HAB**: Habitual
- **HSY**: Hearsay
- **HYP**: Hypothetical
- **IMP**: Imperative
- **IMPF**: Imperfect
- **INCP**: Inceptive
- **INF**: Infinitive
- **INTS**: Intensive
- **IPFV**: Imperfective
- **LOC**: Locative
- **M**: Masculine
- **MULT**: Multiplicative
- **NEC**: Necessitative
- **NEG**: Negative
- **NFUT**: Nonfuture
- **NOM**: Nominative
- **NR**: nominalizer
- **ORD**: Ordinal
- **PF**: Perfect
- **PL**: Plural
- **POSS**: Possessive
- **PRED**: Predicative
- **PRES**: Presumptive
- **PRFL**: Reflexive
- **PROG**: Progressive
- **PROP**: Proprietive
- **PROX**: Proximal Demonstrative
- **PRS**: Present
- **PRSP**: Present Participle
- **PSD**: Possessed
- **PSR**: Posse
- **PST**: Past
- **PSTPT**: Past Participle
- **PTC**: Participle
- **PTL**: Particle
- **PURP**: Purposive
- **QUAL**: Qualitative (Demonstrative ‘like this/that’)
- **R**: Russian (root/morpheme)
- **REFL**: Reflexive
- **RES**: Resultative
- **SG**: Singular
- **SIM**: Simultaneous
- **TRM**: Terminative
- **VR**: Verbalizer
- **Y**: Sakha (root/morpheme)
- **??**: a word or morpheme whose meaning is unclear