Incipient grammaticalization of a redundant purpose clause marker in Lamunxin Ėven: Contact-induced change or independent innovation?

Brigitte Pakendorf

HAL Id: hal-02012636
https://hal.univ-lyon2.fr/hal-02012636

Submitted on 16 Jul 2020

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Incipient grammaticalization of a redundant purpose clause marker in Lamunxin Ėven

Contact-induced change or independent innovation?*

Brigitte Pakendorf

Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage, UMR5596, CNRS & Université Lyon Lumière 2

When languages that are known to be in contact share features, it is often a simple conclusion that these must be due to contact-induced developments. However, such a conclusion needs to be substantiated with careful analysis of crosslinguistic data. This approach will be demonstrated with a case study of an innovation in the Lamunxin dialect of the Tungusic language Ėven. This dialect, which is under strong contact pressure from the Turkic language Sakha (Yakut), is developing a purpose clause marker out of a converb of the generic verb of speech which is structurally parallel to a Sakha purposive construction. Notwithstanding the crosslinguistic frequency of this construction, detailed analysis supports the role of contact in its development in Lamunxin Ėven.

1. Introduction

Lamunxin Ėven is the westernmost still viable dialect of Ėven, a North Tungusic language spoken in fragmented communities spread over a vast geographic territory in northeastern Siberia. The Lamunxin dialect is spoken in the village of

Sebjan-Küöl in the Republic Sakha (Yakutia), and currently all its speakers are bilingual in Ėven and in the Turkic language Sakha (Yakut), the sociopolitically dominant language of the region.[1] This situation has led to noticeable contact-induced changes in Lamunxin Ėven, the most striking of which are the Necessitative and Assertive paradigms copied from Sakha (Pakendorf 2009); other such changes include extensive consonant assimilation within roots and at morpheme boundaries, the use of the free personal pronoun instead of the oblique form in possessive constructions, the loss of the 1PL inclusive/exclusive distinction as well as the loss of agreement within noun phrases, and the development of an evidential meaning of the perfect particple -*čA* (cf. Malchukov 2003, 2006).

When further features are found to be shared between Sakha and Lamunxin Ėven, it is thus at first glance a reasonable assumption that they are the result of contact-induced changes in Ėven. However, as has been discussed previously (e.g. Filppula 2003; Heine 2009), such an assumption is not always easy to substantiate, and careful analysis of the individual features not only in the putative contact languages, but also in a crosslinguistic perspective, is needed to support claims of contact-induced changes.

In this paper, I describe the incipient grammaticalization of a redundant purpose clause marker in Lamunxin Ėven and discuss to what extent this might be emerging as a result of contact pressure from Sakha rather than as a result of internal developments parallel to Sakha.[2] In Section 2, I describe purpose clause marking in Lamunxin Ėven and Sakha, while in Section 3 I consider the possibility of contact as a causal factor in the development of the innovated construction in Lamunxin Ėven. Section 4 is devoted to the discussion of factors that complicate the contact scenario, Section 5 provides further data to explain why only one possible Sakha model construction was copied, and the paper ends with a discussion of the data and its implications in Section 6.

---

1.   To be precise, speakers of Lamunxin Ėven are trilingual in Ėven, Sakha, and Russian; however, the impact of Russian compared to that of Sakha appears to be negligible and is certainly not at the heart of the phenomenon to be discussed here.

2.   It should be noted that even when I use expressions such as "language X is in contact with language Y", or "language X developed a certain feature under contact influence from language Y", I do not intend to state that languages as abstract entities can be in contact with each other or that they can change of their own accord, either independently or through contact influence. Rather, all language change, be it internally or externally motivated, can only take place through the interactions of speakers who produce and propagate innovations. Thus, such expressions are merely intended as shorthand for "speakers of language X are in contact with speakers of language Y and may have developed changes in language X by copying an expression they are familiar with in language Y".

2. Purpose clauses in Ėven and Sakha

In Ėven, the predicate in subordinate clauses expressing purpose is marked by a special purposive converb -*DA*;[3] in subordinate clauses whose subject is noncoreferential with the main clause subject, subject agreement is accomplished by possessive suffixes (1a), while in coreferential clauses agreement is marked by reflexive-possessive suffixes (1b).

(1) Eastern Ėven

    a. *ek-koːč-i-ʤeːn-ʤi-r*   *ịmanna-w aj-ị-č*
         trample-GNR-EP-DUR-FUT-3PL snow-ACC good-EP-INS
         samaljọt   *dọː-**da-n**.*
         airplane.R land-**PURP-POSS.3SG**
         'They trampled the snow for a long time so that the plane would land well.'   (Kamchatka; BP 2009 fielddata; EIA_leaving_Twajan_51/52)

    b. *kọčaj-ra-m*   *aŋaːn-**da-jị**.*
         scrape.hide-NFUT-1SG sew-**PURP-PRFL.SG**
         'I scrape hides in order to sew.'
                                   (Kamchatka; BP 2009 fielddata; EGA_Managič_110)

In the Lamunxin dialect of Ėven, however, such purpose clauses are often additionally marked by a semantically bleached same-subject converb of the generic verb of speech *goːn-* 'say', either the conditional converb *goːmi* or the simultaneous converb *goːniken* (cf. (2a, 2b)). In the remainder of this paper, such same-subject converbs of a generic verb of speech will be referred to as SAY.cvb.

(2) Lamunxin Ėven

    a. *nọŋan e-**de-n***   *beri-r*   ***goː-mi***
         3SG   NEG-**PURP-POSS.3SG** lose-NEG.CVB **say-COND.CVB**
         bekeč-čeːn-ni   *ečin*   *uhi-lke-kken.*
         all-DIM-POSS.3SG like.this rope-PROP-DIM
         '…so that he wouldn't lose (them), everything of his was (tied) with a string like this.'   (BP 2008 fielddata; ZAS_sibling_18)

    b. *ere-w*   *e-ste*   *das-kara-r,*   *haːnịn*
         prox-ACC NEG-NFUT.3PL cover-HAB-NEG.CVB smoke
         *ńoː-**de-n***   *goː-niken.*
         exit-**PURP-POSS.3SG say-SIM.CVB**
         'They don't close this, so that the smoke can exit.'
                                   (BP 2009 fielddata; KNK_eksponat_011)

---

3. Capital letters in morpheme representations indicate phonemes that undergo morphophonological changes.

Table 1. Proportion of purpose clauses in corpus additionally marked by SAY.cvb

Purpose clause subject	# Tokens	With SAY.cvb	Without SAY.cvb
3SG noncoreferential	49	77.6%	22.4%
3PL noncoreferential	11	45.5%	54.5%
SG coreferential	34	11.8%	88.2%
PL coreferential	22	13.6%	86.4%

While in a corpus of glossed and translated oral narratives and elicited materials comprising c. 36,000 words, the frequency of purpose clauses marked with *goːmi* is approximately the same as those marked with *goːniken* (27 vs. 25 instances, respectively), *goːniken* is in actual fact less widely used than *goːmi*. Twenty of the twenty-seven attested examples of purpose clauses marked by *goːniken* were uttered by one speaker, with the remaining seven examples being mainly single uses by six different speakers, while *goːmi* is used by eleven different speakers of both sexes and various ages.

As can be seen from the distribution of attested uses in the corpus summarized in Table 1, the use of SAY.cvb as a marker of purpose clauses in Lamunxin Ėven is not yet obligatory. The table shows clearly that the majority of instances of 3SG noncoreferential purpose clauses, and approximately half the clauses with 3PL noncoreferential subject, are additionally marked with SAY.cvb, while only a minority of coreferential clauses take this redundant marking.

Furthermore, in the elicited data, two examples with noncoreferential 1SG subject (out of a total of six such clauses) occur with additional SAY.cvb (cf. (3a, 3b)). However, these were both said by a speaker who judged herself as not very fluent, and the subject agreement marker in one of these examples (3b) is the suffix used for 1SG nominal possession (-*W*), while 1SG purposive converbs usually take a different allomorph (-*ku*, cf. (3a)). These examples are thus somewhat doubtful in nature and, without more examples from spontaneous data, should probably not be taken as evidence for the use of SAY.cvb with 1SG purpose clauses. They are therefore not included in Table 1.

(3)   Lamunxin Ėven
   a.   *etike-ŋ-u*   *Pariž-la*   *min-u*
       old.man-ALN-POSS.1SG Paris-LOC 1SG.OBL-ACC
       hor-u-ri-n
       go-CAUS-PST-POSS.3SG
       biː NotreDam-u   *it-**te-ku***   ***goː-niken***.
       1SG Notre-Dame-ACC see-**PURP-1SG**   **say-SIM.CVB**
       'My husband took me to Paris so that I could see Notre Dame.'
                                    (BP 2008 fielddata; S_ConverbsPerception3.2)

b. *min-du*   *oni̦ː-ča-w*   *boː-li*   *biː*
1SG.OBL-DAT draw-PFV.PTCP-ACC give-IMP.2SG 1SG
*it-**te-w***   ***goː-mi.***
see-**PURP-POSS.**1SG   say-**COND.CVB**
'Give me the picture so that I can look at it.'
              (BP 2008 fielddata; S_ConverbsSwitchreferenceSimple2.07)

Interestingly, the vast majority of the instances of purpose clauses marked with redundant SAY.cvb occurred in spontaneous narratives (47 out of 52); the five elicited instances comprised the 1SG purpose clauses discussed above (3a, 3b) as well as one sentence with a 3PL noncoreferential subordinate subject which was translated independently by three informants with a construction using *goːmi*. In the narratives, purpose clauses marked with SAY.cvb are approximately as frequent as purpose clauses without SAY.cvb (51 without vs. 47 with, a ratio of 1.08), while in the elicited data purpose clauses without SAY.cvb are nearly 4 times as frequent as those with redundant SAY.cvb (19 vs. 5). The fact that purpose clauses marked with SAY.cvb are characteristic of spontaneous narratives rather than elicited sentences might indicate that the addition of SAY.cvb is still so recent a process as to be noticeable to speakers and is thus suppressed in the careful speech characteristic of elicitation data, while in the more animated spontaneous narratives, where speakers pay less attention to the form of what they are saying, it is more likely to slip by unnoticed.

In the contact language Sakha, a number of constructions are used to express purpose adjuncts with varying frequency. Constructions occurring only rarely and recorded from only individual speakers are described in Section 5 below; here I describe only the more commonly used constructions. The most common way of expressing coreferential purpose clauses is with the purposive converb *-AːrI*, which can optionally take subject agreement marking (4). Noncoreferential purpose clauses are marked by the subordinate predicate in the hortative or imperative mood plus the same-subject perfective converb of SAY *dien* (cf. (5a, 5b)); this is by far the most frequent construction for third-person noncoreferential purpose clauses. In this construction, SAY.cvb obligatorily accompanies the hortative verb form – only one example in my corpus of Sakha oral narratives lacks *dien*, where it was probably dropped in fast speech. A further relatively common construction that is used with both coreferential and noncoreferential purpose clauses is the future participle carrying a possessive-marked accusative case suffix to mark agreement with the subordinate subject, as in (6a)–(6b).[4]

---

4. Note that the purposive predicate in example 6a is a hesitative – for lack of the right word the speaker inserted a verb derived from *tuoχ* 'what'.

(4) Sakha

*aɣïs oɣo-ɣun   tïːn-naχ   gïn-**aːrï**-gïn   tüːn-ner-i*
eight child-ACC.2SG breath-PROP do-**PURP**-2SG night-PL-ACC
kün-ner-i   üleliːgin
day-PL-ACC work.PRS.2SG
'... in order to keep your eight children alive, you work day and night...'

<div align="right">(BP 2002 fielddata; IvaP_ 027)</div>

(5) Sakha

  a. *mannïk   mah-ïnan baːj-aɣïn   oχtu-ba-**tïn**   dien.*
     this.ADVR wood-INS tie-PRS.2SG fall-NEG-**HORT**[SG] say.PFV.CVB
     '... you tie a piece of wood like this so that s/he can't fall.'

<div align="right">(BP 2002 fielddata; MatX1_112)</div>

  b. *onu   bu biːr **amsaj**   dien   bes-s-i-bit-e.*
     that.ACC this one **taste**[IMP.2SG] say.PFV.CVB give-RECP-EP-PSTPT-3SG
     'One (neighbor) gave that for me to taste.' (Literally: 'Saying "taste this"
     one shared that (with me).')   (BP 2002 fielddata; XatR_331)

(6) Sakha

  a. *min buollaɣïna tugu   tuoχ-t-**ïaχ-pïn***
     1SG PTL   what.ACC what-VR-**FUTPT-ACC.1SG**
     ... otto olor-on   χaːl-ar   buol-laɣ-ïm.
     ... PTL sit-PFV.CVB RES-PRSPT AUX-MDL-1SG
     'I however, in order to do what, ... sat down as usual.'

<div align="right">(BP 2002 fielddata; Pav95_20)</div>

  b. *mannïk   hörüːn-ner-ge taba-ŋ   üör-üŋ*
     this.ADVR cool-PL-DAT   reindeer-POSS.2SG herd-POSS.2SG
     *üčügej-dik hïnńan-an   ah-**ïaɣ-ïn**   örüːgün.*
     good-ADVR relax-PFV.CVB eat-**FUTPT-ACC.3SG** rest.one.day.PRS.2SG
     'On cool (days) like this your reindeer relax well and you rest one day
     so that they can eat.'   (BP 2002 fielddata; MatX2_17)

Of the diverse Sakha noncoreferential purpose clause constructions, the one illustrated in (5a), consisting of the third-person hortative plus SAY.cvb, could arguably have been the model for the Lamunxin Ėven construction with the redundant SAY.cvb, notwithstanding their apparent differences. Although the Lamunxin Ėven construction makes use of a purposive converb to mark the subordinate predicate, and the Sakha construction uses a third-person hortative verb form, the two constructions are in actual fact identical: the purposive converb in Ėven is also used to mark third-person and first-person singular hortatives (cf. Novikova

1980: 77; Malchukov 2001),[5] taking the same possessive allomorphs as are used in purpose clauses – compare the example in (7) with (1a) and (3a).

(7) Eastern Ėven
     *teːleŋ-**de-ku**=kene   Vadim teːleŋ-če-we-n*
     tell-**PURP**-1**SG**=CONTR Vadim tell-PFV.PTCP-ACC-POSS.3SG
     *min=de   teːleŋ-u   oː-**da-n**   čas.*
     1SG.OBL=PTL story-POSS.1SG become-**PURP-POSS.3SG** PTL
     '... let me tell what Vadim told, let it become my story now.'
                              (Kamchatka; BP 2009 fielddata; EIA_ducks_002)

The purposive construction in Ėven is thus exactly the same as the hortative construction, as can also be seen by comparing the purpose clause in (8a) with the hortative clause in (8b).

(8) Eastern Ėven
     a. *testo-w   nek-koːt-te   egʤen-du kastrjulja-du ...*
         dough.R-ACC do-GNR-NFUT.3PL big-DAT   pot.R-DAT   ...
         *čele-du-n   oːja   bi-**de-n**.*
         all-DAT-POSS.3SG much be-**PURP-POSS.3SG**
         'The dough they make in a big pot [...] so that there will be a lot (of bread) for everyone.'
                              (Kamchatka; BP 2007 fielddata; VIA_tabun_014)

     b. Eastern Ėven
         čajak   muke-le-s   bilet-e-s
         go.away posterior-LOC-POSS.2SG ticket.R-EP-POSS.2SG
         *bi-s-ni,   in-ŋi=tken   bi-**de-n**   čas,*
         be-NFUT-3SG 2SG.OBL-PRED.POSS=RESTR be-**PURP-POSS.3SG** PTL
         'Go away, your ticket is in your backside, let it be yours alone...'
                              (Kamchatka; BP 2009 fielddata; EIA_kino_041)

It is thus clear that the Sakha and the innovative Lamunxin third-person purpose constructions can be equated, as illustrated in (9):

(9) **Sakha**:   Hortative.3SG/3PL + SAY.cvb = Purpose
     Lamunxin: Purposive.3SG/3PL (+SAY.cvb) = Purpose
                     Purposive.3SG/3PL = Hortative. 3SG/3PL
          →   Hortative.3SG/3PL (+SAY.cvb) = Purpose

---

5.   It should be noted that the use of the purposive converb with reflexive possessive markers as second-person distant future imperative forms, as described by Novikova (1980: 76) and Malchukov (2001: 165–168), does not occur in either the Lamunxin or the Kamchatkan dialect of Ėven (BP 2007, 2008 fielddata), nor in the dialects spoken in the villages of Topolinoe and Berëzovka in Yakutia (Dejan Matić, p.c.).

We are therefore faced with a feature shared between two at most distantly related lects that are known to be in contact, making contact influence in its development a plausible assumption. In order to identify the direction of the putative change, it is necessary to establish in which of the lects the feature is inherited (or at least old) and in which it is innovated (cf. Thomason 2001: 93–94; Pakendorf 2007: 53; Heine 2009: 37); this issue will be addressed in the next section.

3.   SAY.cvb-marked purpose clauses as a contact-induced feature?

As was already indicated in Section 2, the redundant SAY.cvb to mark purpose clauses is not characteristic of Ėven as a whole, but is practically found only in Lamunxin Ėven: purpose constructions using SAY.cvb are completely absent from a corpus comprising c. 14,300 words of Kamchatkan Ėven, one of the easternmost dialects of Ėven far removed from any Sakha influence, which furnished examples (1a)–(1b), (7), and (8a)–(8b). Similarly, in the eastern dialect of Berëzovka, this construction is practically absent: only two examples are found in a narrative corpus of 12,000 words, and these were used by individuals with close personal relationships with Sakha speakers, thus making it highly likely that they were incidences of individual contact-induced changes (Matić & Pakendorf, in prep.). And even in the western dialect of Tompo, which is spoken relatively close to the Lamunxin dialect, only four examples are found in a narrative corpus of 18,500 words (Dejan Matić, p.c.), as compared to the 47 tokens found in the narrative corpus of Sebjan (comprising c. 31,300 words).[6] Furthermore, while specialized converbs to mark purpose clauses are found in several Tungusic languages from both the South and the North Tungusic branch, e.g. Udihe, Nanai, and Evenki (Nikolaeva & Tolskaya 2001: 744; Avrorin 1961: 166–169; Nedjalkov 1997: 52, respectively; cf. (13e) below for a standard Evenki example), and can thus be assumed to be an inherited feature of Ėven (Sunik 1962: 167–168), additional redundant purpose marking with a generic verb of speech is not typical of this language family.[7] It is thus quite clear that the construction in Lamunxin Ėven is an innovative

---

6.   That is, there are about twelve times as many tokens of SAY.cvb-marked purpose clauses in the Sebjan narrative corpus, which is less than twice as big as the Tompo corpus.

7.   However, as pointed out by Martine Robbeets (p.c.), Benzing 1955 (135–136) notes that in various unspecified Tungusic languages, the same morpheme (though not a cognate form across the languages) is used to express both hortatives and purpose. Benzing interprets this as a grammaticalization from hortative to purpose marker (e.g. Ėven *emni eweski bel-de-s* [come.IMP.2SG here help-DE-POSS.2SG 'come here, you must help' → 'come here in order to help'), and as Robbeets explains, in noncoreferential juxtapositions, the insertion of a generic verb of speech might have furthered the grammaticalization process (e.g. with respect to (1a) above, 'they

feature of this dialect, a conclusion further strengthened by the variation in use described in Section 2, with SAY.cvb-marked purpose clauses occurring far more frequently in spontaneous speech than in more careful elicitation data.

In contrast, purpose clauses marked by SAY.cvb are characteristic of the Turkic language family (Johanson 1998: 64). For example, in Turkish the subordinate verb takes optative marking (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 462; cf. (10a)), while in Tuvan noncoreferential third-person purpose clauses it takes hortative marking (cf. (10b)), identical to what is found in Sakha.

(10) a. Turkish
    kışın   üşü-me-ye-lim   diye
    in.winter be.cold-NEG-**OPT**-1PL **say.CVB**
    kalorifer   yap-tır-dı-k.
    central.heating make-CAUS-PST-1PL
    'We've had central heating installed so that we shan't be cold in winter.'
                  (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 463, ex.5; glossing mine)

   b. Tuvan
    *ača-m   konču-tun-**ma-zɨn**   **deeš**   men*
    father-1SG scold-SUF-**NEG-IMP.3SG** **say.CVB** 1SG
    ɨjaš-tɨ   čar-ɨp   kal-dɨ-m.
    firewood chop-CVB AUX-PST-1SG
    'I chopped firewood so that my father would not scold me.'
                  (Bergelson & Kibrik 1995: 400, ex.55c)

It would therefore seem as if the question concerning the development of this construction can be answered quite straightforwardly, with contact influence from Sakha leading to the copying of SAY.cvb as a redundant purpose clause

---

trampled the snow; the plane must land' → 'they trampled the snow, saying that the plane must land'). Further along in the grammaticalization process, the speech verb would have eroded and disappeared. If this were indeed the case, the use of generic verbs of speech to mark purpose clauses may once have been more widespread in Tungusic languages, and thus its (re-) occurrence in Lamunxin Ėven might be supported by Sapirian drift. However, synchronically the polysemy of imperative/hortative and purposive proposed by Benzing is quite restricted: it is found in Ėven, as described above, and in its sister languages Evenki and Negidal (albeit restricted to the second-person distal imperative; Nedjalkov 1997: 262; Cincius 1982: 35–36, respectively). In the South Tungusic branch it has been described only for the first-person singular hortative in Nanai (Avrorin 1961: 129). As shown by Malchukov (2001, this volume), the imperative meaning is likely to have developed from the purposive in a process of insubordination; this is also the explanation offered by Avrorin for Nanai. Such a process of insubordination does not necessitate embedding with a generic verb of speech, so that one cannot conclude that SAY.cvb was historically characteristic of the Tungusic languages, nor that the emergence of the redundant SAY.cvb as a purpose marker in Lamunxin Ėven is supported by Sapirian drift.

marker in Lamunxin Ėven. However, notwithstanding the apparent clarity of the data, there are problems with this explanation, as will be discussed in the following.

4.   Some problems with the contact scenario

4.1   Range of contexts in which the construction is used

The first problem concerns the fact that SAY.cvb-marked purpose clauses occur in a wider range of contexts in Lamunxin Ėven, the putative recipient language of the contact situation, than in Sakha, the putative model language. This goes against the widely received hypothesis that it is a narrowing of functions and contexts that is to be expected during a process of language contact; in this hypothesis, the lect with the wider range of functions of a construction is presumed to be the model language (e.g. Heath 1978: 23, 75; Hock 1991: 435, 437; Heine 2009: 47), rather than the opposite. In Sakha, the construction using a hortative-marked predicate plus SAY.cvb, which was arguably the model for the Lamunxin construction, is restricted to third-person noncoreferential purpose clauses, as illustrated in (5a), while in Lamunxin Ėven the redundant SAY.cvb also occurs with coreferential purpose clauses ((11a, 11b); cf. Table 1).

(11)   Lamunxin Ėven

    a.   *tarịt   ịlan   korzina-j   miltere-mken-**de-j***
        then   three   basket.R-PRFL.SG   become.full-CAUS-**PURP-PRFL.SG**
        goː-mi   gurgeːwči-wre-n.
        say-CVB   work-HAB[NFUT]-3SG
        '…then he is working in order to fill his three baskets.'
                                  (BP 2008 fielddata; TVK_pearstory_006)

    b.   *delbi   dʒuptụ-ča-l   kụlịn-dụ*
        very.Y   put.on.many.layers-PFV.PTCP-PL   mosquito-DAT
        *e-**deːr**   dʒeb-e-p-te   goː-mi.*
        NEG-**PURP.PRFL.PL**   eat-EP-MED-NEG.CVB   say-CVB
        '… (they) had put on layer after layer so that they wouldn't be eaten by
        the mosquitoes.'   (BP 2009 fielddata; IVK_memories_087)

This raises the question whether we are not rather dealing with independent developments after all. However, as can be seen from Table 1, there is a clear frequency cline in purpose constructions marked by additional SAY.cvb in Lamunxin Ėven, with third-person noncoreferential clauses being far more frequently marked than coreferential ones. This is an indication that the development

of SAY.cvb as a redundant marker of purpose clauses began with third-person constructions, just as in Sakha, while the extension of the construction to coreferential purpose clauses is in its initial stages. Thus, it is quite plausible that speakers of Lamunxin Ėven have copied the Sakha noncoreferential third-person construction and are only now beginning to extend this to coreferential clauses as well.

4.2   Crosslinguistic frequency of SAY to mark purpose

A further problem with the contact scenario concerns the fact that generic verbs of speech are well known to have grammaticalized into markers of purpose in languages around the world (Ebert 1991; Saxena 1995; Chappell 2008: 49; Güldemann 2008: 460–464; Aikhenvald 2009: 388–389). This crosslinguistic distribution points to the fact that there must be language-internal factors that facilitate such a development, which again weakens the case for contact-induced change (cf. Heine 2009: 43) – if generic verbs of speech have developed into purpose markers in several languages independently, why not in Sakha and Lamunxin Ėven? In Siberia, SAY.cvb as a marker of purpose clauses is found in several unrelated or at most distantly related languages: in addition to Sakha and Lamunxin Ėven, it is attested in narrative corpora of the Mongolic language Buryat, the Turkic languages Tuvan and Shor, eastern dialects of the North Tungusic language Evenki, and in Kolyma Yukaghir (Matić & Pakendorf, in prep.).

With respect to the Siberian languages manifesting this feature, there is a difference between Tuvan and Buryat on the one hand and Eastern Evenki and Kolyma Yukaghir on the other. As was mentioned in Section 3, SAY.cvb to mark purpose clauses is well attested in Turkic languages and can therefore be assumed to be an inherited feature in Tuvan; the same holds for Buryat, since this construction is widespread in Mongolic languages (Sanžeev 1964: 249). Thus, while it is impossible to say anything about the provenance of this construction in Proto-Turkic and Proto-Mongolic – where it could have arisen through independent developments, contact, shared ancestry if the proposed genealogical unity of these languages should be true, or a combination of these factors – at least for the daughter languages Tuvan and Buryat, this construction is clearly the result of parallel inheritance.

This is different for Eastern Evenki and Kolyma Yukaghir: as mentioned in Section 3, SAY.cvb to mark purpose clauses is not characteristic of the Tungusic language family as a whole, and, as outlined in footnote 7, there is not much evidence in favor of it having been more widespread at an earlier stage of the family's history. It is therefore safe to assume that Eastern Evenki, like Lamunxin Ėven, did not inherit this feature; nor can it be assumed to have arisen via Sapirian drift. This holds all the more because the eastern Evenki dialects and Lamunxin Ėven are the only dialects of their respective languages that show this phenomenon; the

western Evenki and eastern Ėven dialects, which are not in contact with Sakha, do not make any use of SAY.cvb in purpose clauses (Matić & Pakendorf, in prep.).

Unfortunately, it is difficult to know whether SAY.cvb-marked purpose clauses in Kolyma Yukaghir represent an inherited feature. While the sketch grammar of Tundra Yukaghir, its only remaining relative, mentions two different means of expressing purpose clauses – with the hortative particle *alhan* (Maslova 2003: 66) and with case-marked nominalized verb forms (Maslova 2003: 77–78) – no use of SAY.cvb is mentioned, nor does it occur in any of the purposive examples. However, to be able to exclude its existence in this language with certainty it would be necessary to investigate narratives, which I have not been able to do. Both Eastern Evenki and Kolyma Yukaghir are or have been in contact with Sakha to varying degrees, as demonstrated for Eastern Evenki both by sociolinguistic data as well as by attested Sakha copies and even phonological and morphological contact-induced changes (cf. Vasilevič 1948: 253–254, 301, 326; Romanova & Myreeva 1962, 1964). Thus, the question of whether we are dealing here with changes induced by contact with Sakha or independent developments holds as much for Eastern Evenki and Kolyma Yukaghir as for Lamunxin Ėven.

One approach to solving this question is to examine not only the prevalence of SAY.cvb as a purpose clause marker, but also to take into account the form of the subordinate predicate, since it is specifically the noncoreferential construction with the hortative plus SAY.cvb that is shared between Sakha and Lamunxin Ėven and might have been copied. Unfortunately, typological studies such as Saxena (1995) and Güldemann (2008) focus on the form and origin of the purpose clause marker rather than on the form of the subordinate predicate, making any conclusions in this respect rather tentative; however, judging from what information there is, imperatives do not appear to be crosslinguistically widespread predicate forms in noncoreferential purpose clauses marked by generic verbs of speech. Thus, for the isolate language Kunama spoken in Eritrea, Güldemann (2008: 461) states that "a dependent form of either of two quotative verbs is preceded by an irrealis clause with a 1st-person subject" to mark purpose, while for the Dogon language Donna Sɔ he states that the subordinate predicate can take "different finite or non-finite dependent verb forms" (Güldemann 2008: 462).

The South Siberian Turkic languages Tuvan and Altay do make use of hortative-marked dependent predicates specifically in noncoreferential purpose clauses (Čeremisina 1987: 25–26; Bergelson & Kibrik 1995: 401); this is consistent with the inherited nature of this construction in Sakha and these languages. In Buryat, too, noncoreferential purpose clause predicates are marked with imperative verb forms, while coreferential predicates take the future participle *-xA* (Skribnik 1987: 43). This raises the possibility that noncoreferential purpose clauses with hortative/imperative-marked predicates are an areal feature of Siberian languages.

However, in contrast to this hypothesis, in a narrative corpus of Kolyma Yukaghir comprising c. 20,600 words (Maslova 2001; Nikolaeva 2004; analyzed in Matić & Pakendorf, in prep.), only one purpose clause marked by SAY.cvb out of five such examples has a hortative-marked subordinate predicate (cf. (12a)); in the other examples, the subordinate predicate takes the form of indicative finite verbs or converbs, irrespective of the reference of the subordinate subject (e.g. (12b)). As can be seen from example (12a), the variant with the hortative is still very close to direct speech, since the literal translation would be 'The knives were moving, saying "Let him not escape!"'.

(12)   Kolyma Yukaghir

   a.   *Čoɣojə-pul ... norqəɣə-nu-ŋi*
        knife-PL   jerk-IPFV-3PL

        əl=šejr-ej-gə-n   ***mon-u-t.***
        NEG-ESCAPE-PFV-IMP-3SG   say-EP-SS.IPFV.CVB

        'The knives were moving ... in order to prevent me from going out.'
                (Matić & Pakendorf, in prep: ex.1; from Nikolaeva 2004: 38.12)

   b.   *taː samyj omo-l öː-k   jal-l'əl-mələ   id'iː jö-m*
        there most.R good-AN child-PRED send-EV-OF.3SG now see-TR.3SG

        mə=qod-oː-l'əl-tə-j   *jöː-m*   ***mon-u-t.***
        AFF=lie-RES-EV-FUT-3SG   see-**TR.3SG** say-EP-SS.IPFV.CVB

        'He sent his best child to see if they were lying on the road.'
                                        (Nikolaeva 2004: 19.16)

In Eastern Evenki narratives, two examples of purpose clauses marked with the same-subject simultaneous converb *gunne* are found; in a coreferential clause, the subordinate predicate takes future indicative marking (cf. (13a)), while a non-coreferential clause has a hortative-marked predicate (cf. (13b)). This distribution of predicate forms is reminiscent of Buryat, where, as mentioned above, coreferential purposive predicates take the future participle and noncoreferential ones take imperative forms; both are marked by SAY.cvb. Brodskaja (1987: 62–63) demonstrates that, even though in Eastern Evenki SAY.cvb-marked purpose clauses are rare on the whole, there are three means of expressing the subordinate predicate: these are the hortative mood plus SAY.cvb, as exemplified in (13b), the future indicative plus SAY.cvb in (13a) and (13c), and the purposive converb plus SAY.cvb, as in (13d). As can be seen by the standard Evenki example (13e),[8] in which the purposive converb alone expresses purpose, the addition of SAY.cvb in (13d) is completely redundant. All five examples provided by Brodskaja are noncoreferential purpose clauses, and the construction with the purposive converb appears

---

8.   Standard Evenki is based on a western dialect of Evenki.

three times, which might provide an indication that this construction is used most
frequently in these dialects.

(13)   a.   Eastern Evenki

ič-e-**diŋe-v**   sine-ve   **gun-ne**   em-e-ď̌e-m.
see-EP-**FUT-1SG** 2SG.OBL-ACC **say-SIM.CVB** come-EP-PRS-1SG
'I am coming in order to see you.' (Literally: 'Saying "I want to see you"
I am coming') (Varlamova & Varlamov 2004: 142.178; glossing mine)

   b.   Eastern Evenki

biː   bimi manaː-wu-ɣ**in**   **gun-ne**
1SG PTL   end-PASS-**HORT.3SG** **say-SIM.CVB**
taːmiː-wa   dalga-či-ŋki-w.
willow-ACC burn-RES-PST-1SG
'I burned the willow twigs so that he would disappear (saying let him
disappear).' (Romanova & Myreeva 1964: 69, 3.14; glossing by D. Matić)

   c.   Eastern Evenki

ilan   diliči   uksuki-nd͡ʒe eme-kse   hute-l-du-wi
three having.head eagle-AUG   come-ANT.CVB child-PL-DAT-PRFL.SG
d͡ʒeb-u-wken-d͡ʒeŋe-n[9] **gun-ne**   emen-en.
eat-EP-CAUS-FUT-3SG **say-SIM.CVB** leave-NFUT.3SG
'He left (food) so that the three-headed eagle would feed its children
after coming.'   (Brodskaja 1987: 63; glossing mine)

   d.   Eastern Evenki

e-hik-i-n   miel-la   čiwuke-t
NEG-COND.CVB-EP-3SG wake.up-NEG.CVB awl-INS
gida-či-l-ča-n   miel-**da-n**   **gun-ne**.
stab-RES-INCH-PFV.PTCP-3SG wake.up-**PURP-3SG** **say-SIM.CVB**
'Because he didn't wake up she started to poke him with an awl, so that
he would wake up.'   (Brodskaja 1987: 62; glossing mine)

   e.   Standard Eenki

girki-vi   tala   uŋ-če-tyn   haval-d͡ʒa-**da-n**.
friend-PRFL there send-PST-3PL work-IPFV-**PURP-POSS.3SG**
'They sent their friend there to work (so that he would work).'
                              (Nedjalkov 1997: 52, ex. 214)

---

9.   The original publication has d͡ʒebuwkend͡ʒenen, but since there is no verbal suffix -d͡ʒene in
Evenki that would take person agreement markers, and since the velar nasal diacritic was manu-
ally added to the examples, it is probable that the velar nasal was simply forgotten in this
example.

To summarize the above: Hortative/imperative verb forms do not appear to be crosslinguistically widespread subordinate predicates in purpose clauses. While in Siberia hortative-marked subordinate predicates plus SAY.cvb are characteristic of noncoreferential purpose clauses in the Turkic and Mongolic language families and thus represent inherited features in Sakha, Tuvan, and Buryat, they are not typical of Kolyma Yukaghir, where only one example out of five marked by SAY.cvb in the narrative corpus has a hortative verb as the subordinate predicate. Nor is this the most frequent form of the predicate in Eastern Evenki purpose clauses with SAY.cvb. Furthermore, it should be noted that SAY.cvb-marked purpose clauses are not characteristic of Siberian languages as a whole – they are found only in the handful of languages discussed here and are absent from the Ob-Ugric, Samoyedic, and Chukotko-Kamchatkan language families as well as from the isolates Ket and Nivkh (Matić & Pakendorf, in prep.). Thus, the case for an independent innovation of this construction in Lamunxin Ėven is weaker than the crosslinguistic frequency of purpose clauses marked by generic verbs of speech at first leads one to believe. However, as will be discussed in the following, the Eastern Evenki data constitute yet another complicating factor in the scenario of contact-induced change.

4.3   Eastern Evenki purpose clauses in comparison to Lamunxin Ėven

As demonstrated above, the related North Tungusic lects Lamunxin Ėven and Eastern Evenki share noncoreferential purpose clause constructions consisting of a combination of inherited purposive converb and redundant SAY.cvb (compare examples (2a), (2b), and (13d)). These constructions differ, however, in that in Evenki, in contrast to Ėven, the purposive converb does not generally express hortatives; rather, a specialized form (seen in (13b)) is used for this. Thus, while the forms used in Lamunxin Ėven purpose clauses with noncoreferential third-person subordinate subject are identical to hortatives and thus ambiguous between a purposive and a hortative reading, the Eastern Evenki constructions are unambiguously solely purposive.

Eastern Evenki furthermore shows the presence of SAY.cvb-marked purpose clauses in which the subordinate predicate is expressed not by the standard Tungusic purposive converb, but by the specialized hortative verb form, as in (13b), or by the future indicative, as in (13a) and (13c). This variation of SAY.cvb-marked purpose clauses in Eastern Evenki raises the question whether any or all of these constructions can be explained by contact influence, and whether the process of change was the same for all Evenki constructions and Lamunxin Ėven.

The Eastern Evenki noncoreferential purpose clause construction with the hortative predicate is structurally identical to Sakha noncoreferential purpose

clauses with a third-person subordinate subject. It can therefore quite plausibly be analyzed as a calque from Sakha (or Buryat, another language with which some of these dialects are in contact, and where, as mentioned above, noncoreferential purpose clauses also take imperative predicates and are marked by SAY.cvb), since it exactly parallels the Sakha construction and differs greatly from the inherited Tungusic construction with the purposive converb (having a finite subordinate predicate instead of a converbal one).

The Eastern Evenki purpose clause with the future-marked predicate (cf. (13a), (13c)) might also have arisen under Sakha or Buryat influence. However, since both Sakha and Buryat use future-marked predicates plus SAY.cvb only for coreferential purpose clauses (Table 2 below, Skribnik 1987: 43, respectively), only the Eastern Evenki coreferential purpose clause, as in (13a), can be considered a true calque. The sentence in (13c) might provide an indication that this construction is currently grammaticalizing further to a general purpose clause construction; however, due to the paucity of data, this conclusion can at best be tentative.

Thus, two of the three innovative Eastern Evenki purpose clause constructions using SAY.cvb can be accounted for by calques from either Sakha or Buryat (or possibly both). The origin of the construction consisting of the purposive converb plus SAY.cvb found in both Eastern Evenki and Lamunxin Èven, however, poses a problem. It is noteworthy that these two related lects show parallel surface constructions, but that the addition of SAY.cvb can be semantically motivated only in Lamunxin Èven, and not in Eastern Evenki. Thus, constructions that combine a hortative with a verb of saying, such as the Sakha, Tuvan, or Lamunxin Èven constructions (cf. (2a), (2b), (5a), (10b) above) are occasionally still semantically close to speech acts with hortatives, as pointed out for the Kolyma Yukaghir example (12a); similarly, a literal reading of (2a) as: 'Saying "let him not lose (them)", everything was (tied) with a string like this' is still marginally possible. The same does not hold for the Eastern Evenki construction in (13d), where a literal translation such as 'Because he didn't wake up she started to poke him with an awl, saying "so that he would wake up"' is not possible. Thus, here SAY.cvb is clearly entirely redundant, and it is all the more striking that Lamunxin Èven and Eastern Evenki share this construction.

There are three theoretical possibilities for this development: (i) Lamunxin Èven and Eastern Evenki dialects may have independently (or jointly, via interdialectal contact) extended the inherited Tungusic purposive construction by adding redundant SAY.cvb; (ii) they may both have developed it in parallel under contact influence from Sakha; or (iii) the constructions may be the result of separate developments in the two lects, possibly with some Sakha influence. The first alternative can be discarded, since it is unlikely that only those dialects that are in close contact with Sakha, and not other Tungusic lects, would have independently

innovated a construction through internal development that is widespread in Turkic languages.

The second alternative, parallel contact-induced changes in Eastern Evenki and Lamunxin Ėven under Sakha influence, is also hard to substantiate. As discussed in Section 3, the role of Sakha contact influence in the development of the Lamunxin Ėven purpose construction marked by SAY.cvb is highly plausible, given the identical constructions used for third-person noncoreferential purpose clauses in these languages (cf. (9)). In contrast, as outlined above, the Eastern Evenki construction exemplified in (13d) is not structurally identical to the Sakha construction because the purposive converb with third-person subject agreement in Evenki does not express hortatives. Thus, in contrast to the scenario proposed for Lamunxin Ėven, the contact-induced change in Eastern Evenki cannot be assumed to have been the copying of the Sakha construction as such (as outlined above, the result of such copying are arguably the constructions exemplified in (13a) and (13b)). Rather, if Sakha contact influence is assumed to have led to the innovations in both Eastern Evenki and Lamunxin Ėven by the same process of change, this process can have involved only the insertion of SAY.cvb as a marker of subordination into the inherited Tungusic purpose construction. Since in Sakha SAY.cvb is widely used to mark different kinds of complements and adjuncts (Matić & Pakendorf, in prep.; see Section 5 below), the prevalence of this element in discourse might have led bilingual Evenki-Sakha and Ėven-Sakha speakers to copy it as an additional marker of subordination. Thus, this explanation would have to assume that the structural parallelism between the Sakha construction with hortative plus SAY.cvb and the Lamunxin Ėven purposive converb with SAY.cvb is coincidental, and that the contact-induced change in both Eastern Evenki and Lamunxin Ėven concerned merely the insertion of SAY.cvb into the inherited Tungusic purpose construction. Given the exact structural match between the Sakha and the innovated Lamunxin Ėven constructions, this explanation does not appear very likely.

The third, and most plausible, alternative postulates separate processes of change for Eastern Evenki and Lamunxin Ėven which resulted in parallel constructions. For Lamunxin Ėven, the suggested process of change is a straightforward calquing of the Sakha noncoreferential construction with third-person subordinate subjects. This assumption is supported by the structural identity between noncoreferential purpose clauses with third-person subordinate subjects in Sakha and Lamunxin Ėven. In contrast, the process of change in Eastern Evenki would have involved only the copying of SAY.cvb as a purpose clause marker under the influence of the widespread use of SAY.cvb as a subordinate marker in Sakha (see Section 5).

Of course, it cannot be excluded that we are dealing here with multiple causation. Thus, the contact-induced changes may have been strengthened by the cross-linguistically demonstrated predisposition to mark purpose clauses with converbal and other forms of the generic verb of speech, while interdialectal Evenki–Ėven contact may have further enhanced the development; as shown by Keiser (2009), even low levels of interdialectal contact may suffice to spread innovations.

5.   Purposive constructions in Sakha revisited

One question still remains open: as mentioned in Section 2, in Sakha there are several different constructions that are used to express purpose adjuncts. Given this diversity of purpose constructions in Sakha, why does only one of them appear to have had an influence on the development of Lamunxin Ėven purpose clauses, and not any other? It was already pointed out in Section 2 that not all the Sakha constructions are found with equal frequency; rather, two constructions are most commonly used to mark purpose clauses with coreferential and noncoreferential subordinate subjects: the purposive converb (cf. (4) above and (14a)) and the hortative-marked subordinate predicate and SAY.cvb (cf. (5a) above and (14b)), respectively (see also Table 2, below).

(14) Sakha

    a. *ʤaχtal-lar kiehe   as-tarïn   ast-**aːrï***
        woman-PL evening food-ACC.3PL cook-**PURP.CVB**
        erde   kel-bit-tere
        early come-PSTPT-3PL
        '...the women came early in order to cook the evening meal...'

                                        (BP 2002 fielddata; XatR_275)

    b. *ol   ihin ʤie-ɣe   kil-ler-en   baːj-allar*
        that for house-DAT enter-CAUS-PFV.CVB tie-PRS.3PL
        *... ohoχ suoh-uttan   berih-inner-**din***
           stove heat-ABL.3SG share-CAUS-**HORT**[SG]
        dien*   *tïmnïj-ba-**tïn   ***dien**.*
        say.PFV.CVB be.cold-NEG-**HORT**[SG] **say.PFV.CVB**
        'Therefore they brought (the calf) into the house and tied (it) in order to let it share the heat of the stove, so that it would not be cold.'

                                  (BP 2002 fielddata; XatR_248/249)

In addition, in the corpus different constructions are used occasionally by individual speakers to mark coreferential purpose adjuncts: a dative case-marked

present participle (15a), the same-subject imperfective converb *-A* with additional SAY.cvb (15b), the perfective converb *-An* without any further marking of purpose (15c), and even (in constructions very reminiscent of direct speech) a future indicative form and SAY.cvb (15d).

(15) Sakha

a. *uonna otton töhö   eme kuobaɣ-ï   öl-ör-ön...*
   and   PTL   to.what.extent PTL rabbit-ACC die-CAUS-PFV.CVB...
   *hien-ner-bitiger   taŋas   oŋor-**or-go**.*
   grandchild-PL-DAT.1PL clothes make-**PRSPT-DAT**
   'And he has killed a lot of rabbits, ... to make clothes for our grandchildren.' (Literally: '... for the making of clothes for our grandchildren')
                                                      (BP 2002 fielddata; Efmy_264)

b. *armija-ɣa   hulu:spa-**lï:**   **dien**   uonna*
   army.R-DAT service.R-VR.**SIM.CVB** **say.PFV.CVB** and
   kel-beteɣ-e.
   come-PSTPT.NEG-3SG
   'He (left) to serve in the army and didn't return.'
                                                      (BP 2002 fielddata; BesP_024)

c. *onu kenniki   manna ostuoruja-tïn   ïl-**an***
   PTL afterwards here   history.R-ACC.3SG take-**PFV.CVB**
   balï:ha   arχï:ba-tïn   ïrït-tar-bïp-pït
   hospital.R archive.R-ACC.3SG scrutinize-CAUS-PSTPT-1PL
   tuoχ da huru-llu-bataχ.
   what PTL write-PASS-PSTPT.NEG
   'Afterwards in order to take his (medical) history we made the hospital archives scrutinize (everything), nothing was written.'
                                                      (BP 2002 fielddata; XatR_126)

d. *Tuostaχ-χa bar-a   hilʤi-bït-tara   bu oɣo-lor*
   T.-DAT   go-IPFV.CVB IPFV-PSTPT-3PL this child-PL
   *hugun-**nuoχ-put**   dien.*
   blueberry-VR.**FUTPT-1PL** say.CVB
   'These children went to Tuostax to pick blueberries.' (Literally: 'These children went to Tuostax saying "We will pick blueberries".')
                                                      (BP 2002 fielddata; Efmy_705/706)

Furthermore, two constructions are used with both coreferential and noncoreferential purpose clauses: the construction with the future participle taking a possessive accusative case-marked suffix to index subject agreement, as exemplified in

(6a) and (6b), and a construction with the necessitative and additional SAY.cvb, as in (16a) and (16 b).

(16) Sakha

    a. *min ülel-**ieχteːχ-pin dien**   Saχa   sir-iger*
       1SG work-**NEC-1SG say.PFV.CVB** Sakha land-DAT.3SG
       kel-bit-im.
       come-PSTPT-1SG
       'I came to Yakutia in order to work.'

                        (BP 2003 fielddata; elicitation question)

    b. *ol ihin buollaːna ol   mototsikl   il-lï-bït   onton*
       that for PTL   that motorcycle.R take-PST-1PL then
       *hotoru bult-**uoχtaːχ   dien**   anï haː il-lï-bït.*
       soon   hunt-**NEC[3SG] say.PFV.CVB** PTL gun take-PST-1PL
       'So we bought the motorcycle, then soon after that we bought a gun so
       that he could hunt.'   (BP 2002 fielddata; Efmy_379)

The diverse purpose constructions found in Sakha are summarized in Table 2, together with an overview of their frequency and their use in coreferential (SS) or noncoreferential (DS) clauses.

From this overview, it becomes clear that the construction comprising a hortative-marked subordinate predicate and SAY.cvb is the most common, and thus salient, construction to express noncoreferential purpose adjuncts. In addition, this is the only construction in which the marking of the subordinate predicate in Sakha has a direct parallel with the inherited Èven purpose clause marker, through the overlap between purposive converb and hortative in Èven illustrated in (7) through (9) above. Thus, speakers of Lamunxin Èven could easily be identifying Sakha

Table 2. Overview of purposive constructions in Sakha; SS = coreferential, DS = noncoreferential

Construction	Example	Referentiality	# Tokens in narratives
PURP.CVB	4, 14a	SS	17 (6 speakers)
PRSPT-DAT	15a	SS	1
PFV.CVB	15c	SS	2 (same speaker)
IPFV.CVB + **SAY.cvb**	15b	SS	2 (same speaker)
FUT + **SAY.cvb**	15d	SS	2 (same speaker)
FUTPT-ACC.POSS	6a, 6b	SS/DS	2 (different speakers, plus 3 speakers elicited)
NEC + **SAY.cvb**	16a, 16b	SS/DS	2 (same speaker, plus elicited)
IMP/HORT + **SAY.cvb**	5a, 5b, 14b	DS	12 (4 speakers)

third- person noncoreferential purpose clauses with their inherited purpose claus-
es and adding SAY.cvb to make the two structures fully identical to each other. This
would explain why it is only this one Sakha construction that appears to have
played a role in the Lamunxin innovation – there is sufficient structural parallel-
ism for "interlingual identification" (Weinreich 1953: 7–8) to take place easily.

6.   Discussion

Taking together all the strands of evidence outlined above, it appears highly prob-
able that contact influence from Sakha led to the development of the redundant
use of SAY.cvb to mark purpose clauses in Lamunxin Ėven. This conclusion is cor-
roborated by the fact that the construction is inherited in Sakha, while it is a recent
innovation in Lamunxin Ėven, and by the fact that the Lamunxin construction is
exactly parallel to the Sakha construction, consisting of a subordinate predicate
carrying a hortative suffix and an additional same-subject converb of the generic
verb of speech in both languages. Furthermore, the frequency cline of the con-
struction in Lamunxin Ėven demonstrates that this innovated construction
originated with third-person noncoreferential purpose clauses, which is the con-
struction they are restricted to in Sakha. Interestingly, in Lamunxin Ėven the
construction is also found with coreferential purpose clauses, which is not the case
in Sakha. This demonstrates that the copy is not an identical replica of the model,
but has gone beyond it; this possible extension of functions of copied items in lan-
guage contact was previously pointed out by Johanson (1992: 175–176). Further-
more, this indicates that in Lamunxin Ėven we are dealing not merely with a calque
of the Sakha construction, but that incipient grammaticalization of SAY.cvb as a
(redundant) purpose clause marker is taking place, triggered by the Sakha con-
struction. In this light, the existence of 1SG purpose clauses marked by SAY.cvb
(cf. (3a, 3b)), albeit only in elicited data that are not fully trustworthy, is interesting
since it illustrates a potential further step in the grammaticalization process.
     As demonstrated by the overview of the diverse Sakha constructions that can
express purpose (Section 5), arguably solely the Sakha construction consisting of
the hortative plus SAY.cvb served as the model for the Lamunxin Ėven construc-
tion due to its saliency in Sakha and its match with the Lamunxin Ėven hortative/
purposive construction, which was then further enhanced by adding the converb
of SAY. In addition, a further enhancing effect both in Lamunxin Ėven and Eastern
Evenki might well be found in the simple prevalence of purpose constructions in
Sakha that make use of SAY.cvb, as mentioned in Section 5 (exemplified in ((15b),
(15d), (16a), and (16b)). Thus, SAY.cvb is a frequently occurring marker of pur-
pose adjuncts in Sakha discourse, which probably enhances its saliency for bilin-
gual speakers of Sakha and Ėven or Evenki and thereby increases its 'copyability'.

Thus, it would appear that the various strands of evidence investigated here do support a role of Sakha contact influence in the incipient grammaticalization of SAY.cvb as a further purpose clause marker in Lamunxin Èven, supporting Filppula's (2003) conclusion that with careful argumentation it is possible to make a case for external changes rather than internal changes. Furthermore, the comparison with Eastern Evenki data has demonstrated that similar contact situations might lead to different outcomes, and that identical surface constructions can be due to very different processes of change. Finally, the discussion of the data has shown that seemingly simple conclusions need to be re-evaluated when more fine-grained data are added to the picture; this underscores the need to include dialectal data in studies of language contact, if possible.

Abbreviations

1	first person	FUT	future
2	second person	FUTPT	future participle
3	third person	GNR	generic
ABL	ablative	HAB	habitual
ACC	accusative	HORT	hortative
ADVR	adverbializer	IMP	imperative
AFF	affirmative	INCH	inchoative
ALN	alienable possession	INS	instrumental
AN	action nominalizer	IPFV	imperfective
ANT	anterior	LOC	locative
AUG	augmentative	MDL	modal suffix
AUX	auxiliary	MED	mediopassive
CAUS	causative	NEC	necessitative
COND	conditional	NEG	negative
CONTR	contrastive	NFUT	nonfuture
CVB	converb	OBL	oblique
DAT	dative	OF	object focus
DIM	diminutive	OPT	optative
DUR	durative	PASS	passive
EP	epenthetic vowel	PFV	perfective
EV	evidential	PL	plural

POSS	possessive	R	Russian copy
PRED	predicative	RECP	reciprocal
PRFL	reflexive-possessive	RES	resultative
PROP	proprietive	RESTR	restrictive
PRS	present	SIM	simultaneous
PRSPT	present participle	SG	singular
PST	past	SS	same subject
PSTPT	past participle	SUF	unspecified suffix
PTCP	participle	TR	transitive
PTL	particle	VR	verbalizer
PURP	purposive converb	Y	Sakha copy

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2009. Semantics and grammar in clause linking. In *The Semantics of Clause-Linking: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds), 380–402. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Avrorin, Valentin A. 1961. *Grammatika nanajskogo jazyka, Tom vtoroj* (A grammar of Nanai, Vol. 2). Moscow, Leningrad: Izdateľstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Benzing, Johannes. 1955. *Die tungusischen Sprache: Versuch einer vergleichenden Grammatik.* Wiesbaden: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz in Kommission bei Franz Steiner Verlag.

Bergelson, Mira B. & Kibrik, Andrej A. 1995. The system of switch-reference in Tuva: Converbal and masdar-case forms. In *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds), 373–414. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brodskaja, Lilija M. 1987. Zavisimoe upotreblenie konstrukcii s prjamoj reč'ju v evenkijskom jazyke (Dependent use of direct speech constructions in Evenki). In *Pokazateli svjazi v složnom predloženii (na materiale jazykov raznyx sistem)* (Clause linkers in complex sentences (in typologically different languages)), Maja I. Čeremisina & F. A. Litvin (eds), 65–72. Novosibirsk: Akademija nauk SSSR, Ordena lenina sibirskoe otdelenie, Institut istorii, filologii i filosofii.

Čeremisina, Maja I. 1987. Služebnoe slovo dep i formiruemye im sintaksičeskie konstrukcii (na materiale altajskogo jazyka) (The function word dep (in Altai) and its syntactic constructions). In *Pokazateli svjazi v složnom predloženii (na materiale jazykov raznyx sistem)* (Clause linkers in complex sentences (in typologically different languages)), Maja I. Čeremisina & F. A. Litvin (eds), 4–31. Novosibirsk: Akademija nauk SSSR, Ordena lenina sibirskoe otdelenie, Institut istorii, filologii i filosofii.

Chappell, Hilary. 2008. Variation in the grammaticalization of complementizers from verba dicendi in Sinitic languages. *Linguistic Typology* 12(1): 45–98.

Cincius, Vera I. 1982. *Negidaľskij jazyk: Issledovanija i materialy* (Negidal: Analyses and materials). Leningrad: Nauka.

Ebert, Karen H. 1991. Vom Verbum dicendi zur Konjunktion: Ein Kapitel universaler Grammatikalisierung. In *Von Europa bis Ozeanien – von der Antonymie zum Relativsatz: Gedenkschrift für Meinrad Scheller*, Walter Bisang & Peter Rinderknecht (eds), 77–95. Zurich: Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.

Filppula, Markku. 2003. The quest for the most 'parsimonious' explanations: endogeny vs. contact revisited. In *Motives for Language Change*, Raymond Hickey (ed.), 161–173. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Göksel, Asli & Kerslake, Celia. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A Synchronic and Diachronic Survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heath, Jeffrey. 1978. *Linguistic Diffusion in Arnhem Land*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Heine, Bernd. 2009. Identifying instances of contact-induced grammatical replication. In *Topics in Descriptive and African Linguistics: Essays in Honor of Distinguished Professor Paul Newman*, Samuel G. Obeng (ed.), 29–56. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 1991. *Principles of Historical Linguistics.* 2nd edn. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Johanson, Lars. 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten* [Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J.W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main 29(5)]. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Johanson, Lars. 1998. The structure of Turkic. In *The Turkic Languages*, Lars Johanson & Éva Ágnes Csató (eds), 31–66. London: Routledge.

Keiser, Steven Hartman. 2009. When "Speech Islands" aren't islands: Parallel independent development, drift, and minimal levels of contact for diffusion. *Diachronica* 26(1): 1–35.

Malchukov, Andrej L. 2001. Imperative Constructions in Even. In *Typology of Imperative Constructions*, Viktor S. Xrakovskij (ed.), 160–180. Munich: Lincom.

Malchukov, Andrej L. 2003. Russian interference in Tungusic languages in an areal-typological perspective. In *Convergence and Divergence of European Languages*, Per Sture Ureland (ed.), 235–249. Berlin: Logos Verlag.

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

Maslova, Elena S. 2001. *Yukaghir texts*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Maslova, Elena S. 2003. *Tundra Yukaghir*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Matić, Dejan & Pakendorf, Brigitte. In preparation. Non-canonical SAY in Siberia: Areal and genealogical patterns.

Nedjalkov, Igor. 1997. *Evenki*. London: Routledge.

Nikolaeva, Irina & Tolskaya, Maria. 2001. *A Grammar of Udihe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nikolaeva, Irina. 2004. Kolyma Yukaghir documentation. <http://www.sgr.fi/yukaghir/index.html>

Novikova, Klavdija A. 1980. *Očerki dialektov evenskogo jazyka: Glagol, služebnye slova, teksty, glossarij* (Sketches of Èven dialects: Verbs, function words, texts, word list). Leningrad: Nauka.

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

Pakendorf, Brigitte. 2009. Intensive contact and the copying of paradigms: An Èven dialect in contact with Sakha (Yakut). *Journal of Language Contact* – Varia 2: 85–110.

Romanova, Agnija V. & Myreeva, Anna N. 1962. *Očerki tokkinskogo i tommotskogo dialektov* (Sketches of the Tokko and Tommot dialect). Moscow, Leningrad: Izdateľstvo akademii nauk SSSR.

Romanova, Agnija V. & Myreeva, Anna N. 1964. *Očerki učurskogo, majskogo i tottinskogo govorov* (Sketches of the Uchur, Maja, and Totto dialect). Moscow, Leningrad: Izdateľstvo 'Nauka'.

Sanžeev, Garma D. 1964. *Sravniteľnaja grammatika mongoľskix jazykov: Glagol* (A comparative grammar of Mongolic languages: The verb). Moskva: Nauka.

Saxena, Anju. 1995. Unidirectional grammaticalization: Diachronic and cross-linguistic evidence. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF)* 48(4): 350–372.

Skribnik, Elena K. 1987. Burjatskie polipredikativnye konstrukcii s pokazatelem geže (Polypredicative constructions with geže in Buryat). In *Pokazateli svjazi v složnom predloženii (na materiale jazykov raznyx sistem)* (Clause linkers in complex sentences (in typologically different languages))*, Maja I. Čeremisina & F. A. Litvin (eds), 32–50. Novosibirsk: Akademija nauk SSSR, Ordena lenina sibirskoe otdelenie, Institut istorii, filologii i filosofii.

Sunik, Orest Petrovič. 1962. *Glagol v tunguso-mančžurskix jazykax* (The verb in Tungusic languages). Moscow, Leningrad: Izdateľstvo Akademii nauk SSSR.

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

Varlamova, Galina I. & Aleksandr N. Varlamov. 2004. *Skazanija vostočnyx evenkov* (Legends of the Eastern Evenks). Yakutsk: JaF GU Izdateľstvo SO RAN.

Vasilevič, Glafira Makaŕevna. 1948. *Očerki dialektov ėvenkijskogo (tungusskogo) jazyka* (Sketches of Evenki dialects). Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdateľstvo Ministerstvo prosveščenija RSFSR, Leningradskoe otdele.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York NY: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York.