Intensive contact and the copying of paradigms – an Ėven dialect in contact with Sakha (Yakut)

Brigitte Pakendorf

INTENSIVE CONTACT AND THE COPYING OF PARADIGMS:
AN ÈVEN DIALECT IN CONTACT WITH SAKHA (YAKUT)[1]

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 Èven 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 &

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 Èven, 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 Verkhojansk mountain range in the Republic Sakha (Yakutia). All, or almost all, speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Èven 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[2].

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 Èven 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 Èven. 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 Èven 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.

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)

> *ja*   ulan   ilagan   hiča-*ju*
> **1SG.NOM.R** house from   go.out–**PRS.1SG.R**
> 'I go out of the house.'

(1b) COPPER ISLAND ALEUT Past Tense (Golovko 1996: 70)
> *čvetki-niŋ*   *hula-l-i*
> flowers.R-3PL.PSD.1SG.PSR bloom-**PST.R-PL.R**
> 'My flowers bloomed.'

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

> *segodnja ta:ŋa-x̂*   **bud-ut**   *su-la-x̂či-t'*
> today.R   spirits-SG   **AUXFUT.R-3PL.R** take-MULT-CAUS-**INF.R**
> '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 -*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 *waː* 'to kill' (Myreeva 1964: 51)

	SG	PL
1ˢᵗ	*waː-r.daɣ-im*	*waː-r.dak-put*
2ⁿᵈ	*waː-r.daɣ-iŋ*	*waː-r.dak-kit*
3ʳᵈ	*waː-r.daɣ-a*	*waː-r.dak-tara*

(2b) SAKHA, 'Presumptive' paradigm of *bar* 'to walk'

	SG	PL
1ˢᵗ	*bar-daɣ-ïm*	*bar-daχ-pït*
2ⁿᵈ	*bar-daɣ-ïŋ*	*bar-daχ-χït*
3ʳᵈ	*bar-daɣ-a*	*bar-daχ-tara*

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 Ėven, 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 Ėven-Sakha contact

Similar to the situation in which the Učur dialect of Evenki copied the Sakha 'Presumptive' paradigm, speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Ėven 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 Ėvens; however, these also include children from mixed Sakha-Ėven or Russian-Ėven 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 Ėvens; 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-Ėvens 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 Ėven, which is severely endangered in other locations of Siberia, is still viable in the village, with at least some children acquiring it. However, although Ėven 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 Ėven; for example, during a visit to one of the reindeer brigades I noticed that the predominant language in use was Sakha, not Ėven 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 Ėven mother and Sakha father. The other herders and female 'tent-keepers' accommodated to his lack of knowledge of Ėven by speaking Sakha so that he could understand what was being said.

The time-depth and manner of the Ėven-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 Ėvens themselves has been undertaken, a study of the neighbouring Ėvens of the Ėveno-Bytantaj district, with whom Sebjan-Küöl Ėvens are connected by marriage and migration, has shown that these 'western Ėvens' have very close genetic ties with the Sakha. This indicates that there has been considerable intermarriage between Sakha and 'western Ėvens' 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 Ėvens 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 Ėven: 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 converbs of 'to say' as a quotative marker and complementizer.

The high level of Sakha substance copies in Sebjan-Küöl Èven 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 Èven'[5] felt very shy about his ability to speak 'proper Èven' 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 ÈVEN (ZaxJP_pear_02-04)

(a) JPZ: *bastakï–du…*[EKK: *bastakï–du   e–ʤi   goːn–e*!]   JPZ: *nonap-tụʔ*
      first.Y–DAT   first.Y-DAT NEG-IMP.2SG say–NEG.CVB   first.E-DAT

   EKK: *nọnap-tụ*
      first.E-DAT
   'JPZ: At first…' EKK: 'Don't say "bastakïdu"' [*the Sakha word for 'first'*] JPZ: 'At first?' [*said in Èven*] EKK: 'At first.'

(b) JPZ: *nọnap–tụn ńarị–maja ịa–w   kọmụj–a–g–gar–an*
      first.E-DAT man-AUG what-ACC gather. Y–EP-PROG-HAB-3SG

  kọmụj–a–g–gar–an   [EKK: *čak–a–k–gar*]   *čak–a–k–gar–an*
  gather.Y-EP-PROG-HAB-3SG   gather.E-EP-PROG-HAB   gather.E-EP-PROG-HAB-3SG

  gruša–l–bụ
  pear.R-PL-ACC
  'JPZ: At first a big man was gathering [*said with the Sakha root*] [EKK: 'gathering' - *with the Èven 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 Èven.

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 Èven' 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)

inńe ǥïn-an   otton süöhü-le-n-en   as-ta-n-an   tïːn-naːχ
thus do-PF.CVB PTL   livestock-VR-REFL-PF.CVB food-VR-REFL-PF.CVB breath-PROP

hïrït-taχ-tara   diː
go-ASS-POSS.3PL EMPH
'And so, keeping cattle for themselves they stayed alive.'

(4b) SAKHA (BesP_32)

bu kiʤʤ-an   tugu   da kïaj-bat   buol-an
this get.older-PF.CVB what.ACC PTL be.able-PRSPT.NEG AUX-PF.CVB

*ïːt-ter-eːri   kel-eːri   **ǥïn-naγ-a**   dien   ʤon-nor-o*
bring.up-CAUS-PURP come-PURP   **do-ASS-POSS.3SG** say.PF.CVB people-PL-POSS.3SG

huruj-bataχ-tar
write-PSTPT.NEG-PL
'His relatives didn't write, saying "He's probably old and helpless and wants to come so that we can look after him." '

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 *diː* (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 ocasionally pronounced the particle *diː* with a final *-n*).

(5) SAKHA (PotP_143-147)

(a) *onton ol bili inaχ töröː-n   bierme-ɣe bili   χajïːl-lar*
then   that that.one cow be.born-PF.CVB farm.R-DAT that.one do.what.PRS-PL

*heppereːter-inen üːt **iʧij-ar**   **buol-laχ-tara**   din*
separator.R-INS   milk **whip-PRSPT** **AUX-ASS-POSS.3PL** **EMPH**
'And then the cows calved, and in the farm they did what, they turned the milk through the separator.'

(b) *onno kïra   kïra-tïk   ini   manï   bess-en-ner   ʤe   χaraɣ-ïm   ʤe*
     th
there small   small-ADVR   this.ACC this.ACC share-PF.CVB-PL   PTL eye-POSS.1SG   PTL
     hïdda:-n   kel-ley-e   din
     grow.light-PF.CVB   **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-laɣ-ïm*
     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) *hüöɣej-de:-bit   ü:t,   huorat he:χ   bess-en-ner   ʤe   χaraɣ-ïm*
     cream-VR-PSTPT   milk   suorat and.such share-PF.CVB-PL   PTL eye-POSS.1SG
     hïdda:-n   kel-ley-e   di:
     grow.light-PF.CVB   **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-le:-n   kel-ley-im   din*
     again work-VR-PF.CVB   **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 Ėven, as will be described below.

4.2. The Assertive-Presumptive paradigm in Sebjan-Küöl Ėven

Similar to the Učur dialect of Evenki discussed in section 2, in the Ėven dialect of Sebjan-Küöl both the mood and the associated person suffixes have been copied from the Sakha Assertive-Presumptive paradigm[6]. 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 Ėven 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. *wa:-r.dak-put* [kill-ASS-1PL], *a:nŋa-r.dak-put* [spend.the.night-ASS-1PL] 'we'll spend the night here', and *d'ew-u-r.dek-put*[7] [eat-

---

[6] The direction of copying has clearly been from Sakha into Sebjan-Küöl Ėven and not the other way round, since the suffix *–TAχ* 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 Ėven 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 –*wun*, which has a similarly rounded vowel. In contrast, no influence of Èven on the form of the copied suffixes is discernible in Sebjan-Küöl.

(6a)   SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KrivAE_childhood_23)

    ee, kuŋa   bi-hiŋ-ij   *buollar   upeː-je-ŋ-čel*
    eh child   be-IMPF.CVB-PRFL.SG   DP.Y   grandmother-ASSOC-ALN-COM
    *bi-**j-deg-im**=di:*
    be-**CONN-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y=EMPH.Y**
    'And when I was a child I lived with my grandmother and her family.'

(6b)   SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KrivMK_bear_47)

    herile   *gerbe tor   bi-hi-n*   *tar   uručun   ühü   tarak,*
    stony.mountain name earth be-PST-POSS.3SG DIST   it.seems   HSY.Y   DIST
    herile-du   *aːŋŋa-**j-dak-pi̭t**=di:.*
    stony.mountain-DAT   stop.for.the.night-**CONN-ASS.Y-1PL.Y=EMPH.Y**
    '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 Èven 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 Lavrillier for helpful discussion of this example.

(7a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KrivAE_childhood_42)

    ńimel-ten-duk   *kuruk*   *ńimel-ten-du*   *derimet-niken*
    neighbour-DISTR-ABL always.Y neighbour-DISTR-DAT run.away-SIM.CVB

    [...] *ee, tačịn*   *hilge-niken*   *erej*   ***ič-e-j-deg-im***
    ... eh DIST.QUAL torment-SIM.CVB trouble.Y see-EP-**CONN-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y**
    'Running away all the time from one family to another [...], suffering like that, I sure saw
    troubles.'

(7b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KrivAE_childhood_99)

    ejm-u   *koke-ri-ke-ńun-ni*   *tar*   *honte* *ahị-w*
    mother-POSS.1SG die-IMPF.PTC-DIM-COM-POSS.3SG DIST other woman-ACC

    ga-j-dag-a=di: *ịma:-rị-kkan-ǯị*
    take-**CONN-ASS.Y-POSS.3SG.Y=EMPH.Y** bury-IMPF.PTC-DIM-INS.PRFL.SG
    'As soon as my mother died he took another wife, right after burying (my mother).'

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 *di:*, in the Sebjan-Küöl dialect of Èven 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 *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 Èven 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 *-TAχ* 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 *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 Èven.

Furthermore, while separate means of expressing probability exist (being marked by a bimorphemic suffix *-čEː.ʤI* in the Sebjan-Küöl dialect, cf. [8]), Èven 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-Küöl Èven, rather than replacing preexisting forms; this 'niche-filling' function may have further facilitated its being copied.

(8) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (StepAA_elk_10)

    *uː   erek toːkị-l araːha   biː   kapka-mu   ụčaŋ-**čaː.ʤi**-l   goː-niken*

    ooh PROX elk-PL maybe.Y 1SG trap.R-ACC.POSS.1SG break-**PRES**-PL say-SIM.CVB
    'Oh, these elks probably broke my trap.'

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)

    *oččoɣo   uː   haχa-liː   kepse-**t-er**   **buol-laχ-pït** diː*
    in.that.case INTS Sakha-ADVR tell-**CAUS-PRSPT** **AUX-ASS-1PL** EMPH
    'So in that case we'll speak pure Sakha, right.'

(9b) SAKHA (XatR_053)

    onu_buolla ɣïna bihigi tïa-ɣa   olor-or   ʤon-nor   üör-üː-nen
    DP   1PL   taiga-DAT sit-PRSPT people-PL be.glad-NR-INS
    *ïl-**ar**   **buol-laχ-pït***
    take-**PRSPT**   **AUX-ASS-1 PL**
    'Well, we, people living in the woods took that gladly.'

The Sebjan-Küöl dialect of Èven 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 Èven verb root by means of the connective glide *-j-*.

(10a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KrivMK_bear_067)

i̦a-ǯi-n   *brosta*   *ečin*   *este-ǯi-n*   *[...]*   *vzorvetsja*
do.what-FUT-3SG   simply.R   PROX.QUAL   blow.up.Y-FUT-3SG   blow.up.3SG.R
*go:-**j-er***   *buol-**lag-i̦m**=di:.*
say-**CONN-PRSPT.Y**   **AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y=EMPH.Y**
' "He will blow up like this", I say, right.'

(10b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (ZaxJP_pear_012)

ogile   *o̦jči̦-**j-ar***   *buol-**lag-a**,*   *e-h-ni,*
on.top   go.up-**CONN-PRS.PTCP.Y**   **AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.3SG.Y**   NEG-NFUT-3SG
e-h-ni   *ik-kere-r*   *hergi-le*   *taraw*
NEG-NFUT-3SG   see-HAB-NEG.CVB   bottom-LOC   DIST-ACC
'He climbs up high, right, doesn't see that (what's happening) below.'

(10c) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (ZaxVN_poselok_028)

uže   *bej-e-l-teki*   *hin*   *aríčča*   *gramota-du̦*   *hin*
already.R   man-EP-PL-ALL   a.bit.Y   a.bit.Y   literacy.R-DAT   a.bit.Y
*tat-**u̦ka-j-ar***   *buol-**lak-tara***   *ee*
learn-**CAUS-CONN-PRS.PTCP.Y**   **AUX.Y -ASS.Y –POSS.3PL.Y**   CONF
'They are already teaching people literacy.'

(10d) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KrivAE_childhood_87)

ki̦ajan   *gi̦rka-**j-bat***   *buol-**lag-i̦m***   *mere:či*
be.able.Y   walk-**CONN-NEG.Y**   **AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y**   circle
o̦:-ka-n   *begi-če,*
become-TRM.CVB-POSS.3SG   freeze-PF.PTC
'I can't walk, right, (my legs) froze until they reached such a diameter ...'

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 Èvens 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 Èven 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 ÈVEN (KrivAE_childhood_085)

o̦:n=ihi   *begi-**j-en***   *buolumuna,*   *i̦ak=ta*   *o̦j*   *gerbe*   *ačča*
how=PTL   freeze-CONN-PF.CVB.Y   of.course.Y   what=PTL   clothes   name   NEG
*buol-**lag-a**,*
AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.3SG.Y
'Well and of course you freeze, there were no clothes, right…'

(11b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KrivAE_childhood_108)

    nehi:le   *ịlan-ńụn*   *kịla:h-a-lkan*   **buol-lag-ịm=di:**

    barely.Y three-COM grade.R-EP-PROP   **AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y=EMPH.Y**

    'And I have barely three grades (i.e. I was able to go to school for barely 3 years).'

The presence of an entire verbal paradigm of Sakha origins in Sebjan-Küöl Èven 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 Èven root and a following Sakha inflectional morpheme, e.g. *a:ŋŋa-j-dak-pịt=di:* in (6b), *go:-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 **hịsta-dag-a** [get.infected.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.3SG.Y] '(s/he) gets infected', with only one exception: **ülele-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 Èven 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* **atịla:-r** [NEG-PST-POSS.1SG **sell.**Y-NEG.CVB] 'I didn't sell'. Likewise, it does not occur in ordinal numerals consisting of an Èven numeral and the copied Sakha ordinal suffix *–Is*:

(12) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KejTV_family_26)

    tarak *erek* *ịl-**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 Èven 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 Èven with an initial glide *–ja/–je*. This diphthong has entered Sebjan-Küöl Èven predominantly via yet another paradigm copied from Sakha in its entirety, namely the Necessitative mood[8]. 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 Proprietive suffix *–LA:χ* resulting in the Necessitative form *–IAχtA:χ*, e.g.

---

[8] Malchukov (2006: 126) mentions that the Tompo dialect of Èven (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.

(13) SAKHA (RaxAR_058)

*min   beh-is   kïlaːs-ka   Ïtïk-Küöl-ge   üören-**ieχ.teːχ-pin**,   kïaχ   suoχ,*
1SG   five-ORD   class-DAT   Y.K.-DAT   learn-**NEC-PRED.1SG** opportunity NEG

mama-m   iːp-pa-ta
mama-POSS.1SG   send-NEG-PST.3SG

'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 Èven, 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[9] (14a-c). In one instance it was used with the Èven Possessive suffix expected with the Èven Necessitative Participle (14d); when asked, however, my consultant confirmed that one could also use the Sakha person suffix *–kït*.

(14a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL Èven (KrivAE_childhood_080)

*ere–w   ïrbač–i–**jaktaːk–kïn**,   ọd–diǯi=ńun*
PROX-ACC drag-EP-**NEC.Y–PRED.2SG.Y**   stop-ANT.CVB=EMPH

*em–e–**jekteːk–kïn**   ǯuː–la–j   goː-niken*
come-EP-**NEC.Y–PRED.2SG.Y**   house-LOC-PRFL.SG say-SIM.CVB

'You have to drag this, only when you have finished you have to come home, they said....'

(14b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (elicitation corpus, KrivIN_Converbs2.06 – a very similar sentence was given by a second consultant, cf. 20b below)

*mut ïbgọ–t   gurgeːwči–**jekteːk–pit**   mut kuŋa–l–tï   ïbgọ–t*
1PL   good–INS   work-**NEC.Y–1PL.Y**   1PL child-PL-POSS.1PL   good–INS

bi–de–dnen   goː–mi
be-PURP.CVB-POSS.3PL   say-COND.CVB

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

(14c) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (NikM_pear_17)

tar kọmụj–a–d–dï   bej–eńǯe xoːnuli it–če–le–n
DIST gather.Y-EP-PROG-IMPF.PTC man-AUG   ??   see-PF.PTC-LOC-POSS.3SG

*ǯoːr=ńun korzina ïlgam–a–d–da–n,   ïlan bi–**jekteːk***
two=EMPH   basket.R stand–EP-PROG-NFUT-3SG   three be-**NEC.3SG.Y**

'When the man who was gathering (??) looked, only two baskets are standing, but it should be three.'

(14d) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (elicitation corpus, KrivIV_location23)

*ponedelnik–la   ïstala gurge–wur   ọd–a–**jaktaːk–kï**–**hnan***
Monday.R-LOC   until   work-PRFL.PL stop-EP-**NEC.Y**-??-**POSS.2PL.E**

'You have to finish your work by Monday.'

---

[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 Èven 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 Èven, 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 Èven, 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 Èven expression at that moment. That the Èven means of expressing possibility is still accessible for at least one of these two consultants is shown by one of three examples of the Èven Hypothetical Participle taken from her childhood memories (15c).

(15a) SAKHA (YmyE_186)

tïal	*ʤe*	*kïta:naχ*	*köt-üt-en*	*iʤʤ-e*	*bar-**ïan***	***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 ÈVEN (elicitation corpus, KrivIV_DesignativeA27a)

ńarị	*ahị-kan-dụ*	*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 ÈVEN (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 Èven Necessitative before correcting herself and changing to the Sakha Necessitative (cf. 20a, b below), only one speaker in Sebjan-Küöl used the standard Èven Necessitative (16). This was the advocate of 'literary Èven' 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 Èven. It would thus appear that the Sakha Necessitative is by now an established copy in Sebjan-Küöl Èven, notwithstanding the small number of examples found in my corpus; especially considering the judgement of my consultant herself (cf. 20b below).

(16) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (StepZA_hunting03)

te:mi	*hi:*	*aj*	*bujus-i-mŋe*	*ọ:-da-jị,*		*nọnap*
therefore	2SG	good	hunt-EP-AGNR	become-PURP.CVB-PRFL.SG		the.first

ma:-daŋ-ị		*objazatelno*	*ha:wdị*	*bej-du*	*bö:-**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 Èven roots. There is no phonological need for the

insertion of the glide, since the copied morphemes conform to Èven phonotactic requirements; on the contrary, the insertion of the connective glide between a consonant-final Èven 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 Èven roots, not occurring in any other hybrid forms, it is most likely to have taken its origin in a form consisting of an Èven 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 Èven 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 Èven 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 Èven 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 Èven 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 Èven constitute established copies that have fully entered the grammar of this Èven 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 Èven. 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 Èven. 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 *ḳọmụj* 'to gather, collect' is used by four out of five narrators of the 'Pear Story', but the Èven verbs *ụmụj, čak*, and *taw* with the same meaning are also used, mainly by older speakers. These speakers appear to be aware of *ḳọmụj* as a Sakha item (cf. ex. 3b, where the grandmother corrects her granddaughter's use of *ḳọmụj*), so that their use of *ḳọmụj* might be regarded as code-switching; on the other hand, *ḳọmụj* appears to have fully entered the Èven 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 Èven 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 Èven into Sakha, in which the entire verb phrase is in Sakha (17a, b).

(17a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KrivAE_childhood_034)
    kuŋa bi-hi-ʤeːk-i̯=de   **ho̩ččo̩**   **bil-bet**
    child be-IMPF.PTC-NR-PRFL.SG=PTL   **this.much.Y** **know.Y-NEG.Y**
    buol-lag-i̩m,   *o̩mŋo̩-j-do̩g-i̩m=di:*
    AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y forget-CONN-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y=EMPH.Y
    'But the time when I was a child I don't know very well, I forgot, right.'

(17b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KrivAE_childhood_083)
    tari̩t buolla, u̩nta-w-u̩   *buolla* **kïajan**   **tik-pet**
    then DP.Y fur.boots-ACC-POSS.1SG DP.Y **be.able.Y** **sew.Y-NEG.Y**
    buol-lag-i̩m=di:
    AUX.Y -ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y=EMPH.Y
    '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), *kïajan tikpet buollagimdi:*, differs from that in (10d), *kïajan girkajbat buollagim*, only in that the latter contains an Èven verb root, *girka* 'to walk'. It is not yet clear whether the modal element *kïajan* is an established copy in Sebjan-Küöl Èven, 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 *kïajan* 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 Èven phrase consisting of elements originating from Sakha. If, on the other hand, *kïajan* 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 Èven: they may have initially been inserted into Èven speech in entire code-switched verb phrases, and later become dissociated and used as independent forms with native Èven 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 ÈVEN, constructed Assertive-Presumptive paradigm of *aːŋŋa* 'spend the night'
    SG   PL
  1st *aːŋŋa-j-dag-i̩m*   *aːŋŋa-j-dak-pi̩t*
  2nd **aːŋŋa-j-dag-i̩ŋ*   **aːŋŋa-j-dak-ki̩t*

3rd *aːŋa-j-dag-a*   *aːŋa-j-dak-tara*

(18b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN, constructed Necessitative paradigm of *em* 'come'
    SG   PL
  1st **em-e-jekteːk-pin* *em-e-jekteːk-pit*
  2nd *em-e-jekteːk-kin* *em-e-jekteːk-kit*
  3rd *em-e-jekteːk*   *em-e-jekteːk-e-l*[10]

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

Both Sakha and Èven 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 Èven, 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 Èven, who are bilingual in Sakha, to analyse both Sakha and Èven 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 Èven copied only the mood marking, one would expect the Sakha suffixes to occur with Èven person suffixes, as seen in example (14d) and as suggested by Malchukov for Tompo Èven (cf. footnote 8). In this respect it is of interest that the Sakha Necessitative occurred with an Èven person-marking suffix in one example, and that it takes the Èven plural suffix for 3PL agreement: this might be a further indication of the greater age of the copied Necessitative in Sebjan-Küöl Èven, as compared to the Assertive-Presumptive. Speakers of Sebjan-Küöl Èven would have had the time to dissociate the copied person suffixes from the copied Necessitative mood suffix and to combine the latter with Èven 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 Èven, the copied analytic Present Assertive-Presumptive forms might

---

[10] The 3PL form of this paradigm takes Èven plural marking rather than Sakha plural marking; the expected form with the Sakha plural would be *em-e-jekteːk-ter*.

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 Èven 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 ÈVEN (KrivAE_childhood_112)
    Indibal-du   buolla   er-teki   ibgo = nun   bej-i-l   em-e-j-er
    Yndybal-DAT DP.Y   PROX-ALL good=EMPH man-EP-PL come-EP-**CONN-PRS.PTC.Y**
    buolla, kuŋa-l-li   em-e-j-eller   [ta-la
    DP.Y   child-PL-POSS.3SG come-EP-**CONN-PRS.PTC.PL.Y** DIST-LOC
    em-e-j-eller   tarit].
    come-EP-**CONN-PRS.PTC.PL.Y** then
    'Here, to Yndybal, only able people could come, and their children also came.' [*interlocutor*: 'came there']

(19b) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (KejTV_family_005)
    ... bi: ukčen-ʤi-m   od-ča-la-w   em-e-j-er,
    1SG tell-FUT-1SG stop-PF.PTC-LOC-POSS.1SG come-EP-**CONN-PRS.PTC.Y**
    i:-ʤi-n   ča:gaw   go:-li.
    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 Èven 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 Èven 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 Èven 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 Ėven, 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 devuška-**nï** 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 Iengra in southern Yakutia the form *naːma-d'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 *naːma-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 Iengra Evenki, B.P.] aiment à préciser que leurs voisins, les Évenks du village de Ust'-Njukža [...] utilisent pour la même signification l'innovation *naːma-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-vaet*** [**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 Ėven, too, the Sakha copies have emblematic functions, with a number of people commenting on the fact that this is the way they speak Ėven in Sebjan-Küöl. This awareness of the Sakha copies as an integral part of Sebjan-Küöl Ėven became particularly clear during an elicitation session: At first my primary consultant, a teacher of Ėven at the local school, produced a sentence with the standard Ėven Necessitative mood form (20a). However, she immediately corrected herself

saying that was 'literary Èven' and produced the Sebjan-Küöl form with the copied Sakha Necessitative mood and person suffixes (20b).

(20a) SEBJAN-KÜÖL ÈVEN (elicitation corpus, KrivIV_ Converbs2.06)
    *mut egʤen-e-t gurgeːwči-**nne-t** ....* [interrupted herself]
    1PL big-EP-INS work-**NEC.E-POSS.1PL.E**
    'We have to work hard….'

(20b) *mut egʤen-e-t gurgeːwči-**jekteːk-pit** mut kuŋa-l-ṭị ịbgọ-t*
    1PL big-EP-INS work-**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 Èven 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 Èven being fluent in Sakha, but not vice versa. This bilingualism has led to noticeable influence from Sakha in Sebjan-Küöl Èven, both as regards substance as well as schematic copies. Amongst the most interesting contact-induced features of this dialect of Èven 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 Èven copied the Sakha form only with the assertive meaning, which is further enhanced by the use of the emphatic particle *diː* occurring with half the Assertive-Presumptive forms in Èven (cf. section 4.2). As shown by the presence of a connective glide with all copied or code-switched Sakha verbal morphemes attached to Èven roots (with the exception of the Necessitative), the first Sakha paradigm to have been copied into Sebjan-Küöl Èven 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 Èven, 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 Èven (cf. section 8). These copied forms serve an emblematic, identity-giving function, clearly demarcating Sebjan-Küöl Èven as a separate entity amongst the various Èven 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 Èven. This of course contradicts the hypothesis mentioned in section 2 that the 'Presumptive' forms copied into the Učur 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 Èven. 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 Èven 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 Èven 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 Èven 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 Èven (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 Èven using an Èven verb root inflected with a Sakha suffix and apologizing that they knew only the Sakha, and not the Èven way of expressing such possibility. This demonstrates that for bilingual speakers of Èven and Sakha, the Èven 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 Èven, 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 Èven way of expressing possibility uses Èven in the home as well as with some colleagues, and belongs to the group of strong Èven speakers; during the recording of her childhood memories she had no problems in spontaneously producing the Èven 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 Èven 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 Necessitative, 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 Èven 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 Èven and Sakha than for bilingual speakers of Aleut and Russian, since Èven and Sakha are typologically very similar. Due to their agglutinative structure, the recognition of meanings associated with individual morphemes is fairly easy, facilitating the dissocation 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 Èven 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 Èven TAM suffixes, while the Sakha Necessitative occurs with the Èven plural suffix to mark agreement with a 3PL subject (18b), and occurred once with an Èven 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 Èven in Sebjan-Küöl is still ongoing. It is therefore possible that with time further Sakha verbal forms will enter the local Èven 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 Èven 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 Èven' was able to speak for half an hour with hardly a Sakha copy. This awareness of the Sakha origin of many Sebjan-Küöl Èven 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.

References

Backus, Ad. 2000. Insertional codeswitching in an immigrant language: 'just' borrowing or lexical re-orientation? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 3-2: 103-105.

Bakker, Peter. 1997. *A Language of Our Own*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakker, Peter. 2003. Mixed languages as autonomous systems. In: Matras & Bakker (eds.), 107-150.

Burykin, Aleksej A. 2004. *Jazyk maločislennogo naroda v ego pis'mennoj forme*. St. Petersburg: Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie.

Chafe, Wallace L. (ed.) 1980. *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production.* Norwood: Ablex.

Dawkins, R.M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (cited from Janse, forthcoming).

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 2000. The tortoise and the hare: distinguishing processes and end-products in language contact. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 3-2: 112-114.

Golovko, Evgenij V. 1996. A case of nongenetic development in the Arctic area: The contribution of Aleut and Russian to the formation of Copper Island Aleut. In: Ernst H. Jahr & Ingrid Broch (eds.), 63-77, *Language Contact in the Arctic. Northern Pidgins and Contact Languages*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Golovko, Evgenij V. 2003. Language contact and group identity: The role of "folk" linguistic engineering. In: Matras & Bakker, 177-207.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability. In: Thomas Stolz, Dik Bakker & Rosa Salas Palomo (eds.): *Aspects of Language Contact. New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes*. 43-62. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Janse, Mark (forthcoming). Agglutination, Watkins' Law, and the psychology of double inflections in Asia Minor Greek. To appear in: Mark Janse, Brian D. Joseph & Angeliki Ralli (eds.), *Studies in Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*.

Johanson, Lars. 1992. Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten. *Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 169-299.

Korkina, Evdokija I. 1970. *Naklonenija glagola v jakutskom jazyke*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka'.

Korkina, Evdokija I., Elizaveta I. Ubrjatova, L.N. Xaritonov & N.E. Petrov 1982. *Grammatika sovremennogo jakutskogo literaturnogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka'.

Lavrillier, Alexandra. 2004. Dialectes et norme écrite en évenk contemporain (langue toungouse). In: Fernandez-Vest, M.M. Jocelyne (éd.) : *Les langues ouraliennes aujourd'hui – The Uralic Languages Today*. 433-446. Paris: Editions Honoré Champion.

Malchukov, Andrej L. 2006. Yakut interference in North Tungusic languages. In: Hendrik Boeschoeten & Lars Johanson (eds.). 122-138. *Turkic Languages in Contact*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Maslova, Elena. 2003. *A Grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matras, Yaron. 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics*, 36: 281-331.

Matras, Yaron. 1999. The state of present-day Domari in Jerusalem. *Mediterranean Language Review* 11: 1-59.

Matras, Yaron. 2000. Mixed languages: a functional-communicative approach. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 3-2: 79-99.

Matras, Yaron. 2003. Mixed languages: Re-examining the structural prototype. In: Matras & Bakker, 151-176.

Matras, Yaron & Peter Bakker. (eds.). 2003. *The Mixed Language Debate. Theoretical and Empirical Advances*. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matras, Yaron, Hazel Gardner, Charlotte Jones & Veronica Schulman. 2007. Angloromani: A different kind of language? *Anthropological Linguistics* 49-2: 142-184.

McConvell, Patrick & Felicity Meakins. 2005. Gurindji Kriol: A mixed language emerges from code-switching. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25-1: 9-30.

Meakins, Felicity. 2008. Land, language and identity. The socio-political origins of Gurindji Kriol. In: Miriam Meyerhoff and Naomi Nagy. *Social Lives in Language*. 69-93. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Menovščikov, Georgij A. 1968. Aleutskij jazyk. In: *Jazyki narodov SSSR, vol. 5: Mongol'skie, tunguso-man'čžurskie i paleoaziatskie jazyki*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka': 386-406.

Muysken, Pieter. 1997. Media Lengua. In: Sarah G. Thomason (ed.): *Contact Languages. A wider perspective*. 365-426. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Myreeva, Anna N. 1964. Očerk govora učurskix ėvenkov. In Agnija V. Romanova & Anna N. Myreeva (eds.): *Očerki učurskogo, majskogo i tottinskogo govorov*. Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka': 6-74.

O'Shannessy, Carmel. 2005. Light Warlpiri: A new language. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25/1: 31-57.

Pakendorf, Brigitte. 2007. *Contact in the Prehistory of the Sakha (Yakuts): Linguistic and Genetic Perspectives*. LOT Dissertation series 170. Utrecht: LOT.

Pakendorf, Brigitte, Innokentij N. Novgorodov, Vladimir L. Osakovskij & Mark Stoneking. 2007. Mating patterns amongst Siberian reindeer herders: inferences from mtDNA and Y-chromosomal analyses. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 133: 1013-1027

Stolz, Christel & Thomas Stolz. 1996. Funktionswortentlehnung in Mesoamerika. Spanisch-amerindischer Sprachkontakt (Hispanoindiana II). *Sprachtypologie und Universalien-forschung*, 49: 86-123.

Thomason, Sarah G. 1997. Mednyj Aleut. In: Sarah G Thomason (ed.), *Contact Languages. A wider perspective*. 449-468. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2003. Social factors and linguistic processes in the emergence of stable mixed languages. In: Matras & Bakker, 21-39.

Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1991. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press (First published in 1988).

Wilkins, David P. 1996. Morphology. In: Hans Goebl, Peter H. Nelde, Zdeněk Starý & Wolfgang Wölck (eds.). 109-117. *Contact Linguistics. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Xaritonov, Luka N. 1947. *Sovremennyj jakutskij jazyk. Čast' pervaja: fonetika i morfologija*. Yakutsk: Naučno-Issledovatel'skij Institut jazyka, literatury i istorii JaASSR.

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 Èven/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

INS Instrumental

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 Possessive

PROG Progressive

PROP Proprietive

PROX Proximal Demonstrative

PRS Present

PRSPT Present Participle

PSD Possessed

PSR Possessor

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