



HAL
open science

Direct copying of inflectional paradigms: Evidence from Lamunkhin Even

Brigitte Pakendorf

► **To cite this version:**

Brigitte Pakendorf. Direct copying of inflectional paradigms: Evidence from Lamunkhin Even. *Language*, 2019, 95 (3), pp.e364-e380. 10.1353/lan.2019.0063 . hal-02292374

HAL Id: hal-02292374

<https://hal.univ-lyon2.fr/hal-02292374v1>

Submitted on 5 Oct 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



PROJECT MUSE®

Direct copying of inflectional paradigms: Evidence from Lamunkhin Even

Brigitte Pakendorf

Language, Volume 95, Number 3, September 2019, pp. e364-e380 (Article)

Published by Linguistic Society of America

LANGUAGE	
A JOURNAL OF THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA	
VOLUME 95, NUMBER 3	SEPTEMBER 2019
Direct copying of inflectional paradigms: Evidence from Lamunkhin Even	364
Review Article	365
Book Review	366
Editorial	367
Contents	368
Index	369
Subscription Information	370
Advertising Information	371
Back Matter	372
Front Matter	373
Table of Contents	374
Index	375
Subscription Information	376
Advertising Information	377
Back Matter	378
Front Matter	379
Table of Contents	380
Index	381
Subscription Information	382
Advertising Information	383
Back Matter	384
Front Matter	385
Table of Contents	386
Index	387
Subscription Information	388
Advertising Information	389
Back Matter	390
Front Matter	391
Table of Contents	392
Index	393
Subscription Information	394
Advertising Information	395
Back Matter	396
Front Matter	397
Table of Contents	398
Index	399
Subscription Information	400
Advertising Information	401
Back Matter	402
Front Matter	403
Table of Contents	404
Index	405
Subscription Information	406
Advertising Information	407
Back Matter	408
Front Matter	409
Table of Contents	410
Index	411
Subscription Information	412
Advertising Information	413
Back Matter	414
Front Matter	415
Table of Contents	416
Index	417
Subscription Information	418
Advertising Information	419
Back Matter	420
Front Matter	421
Table of Contents	422
Index	423
Subscription Information	424
Advertising Information	425
Back Matter	426
Front Matter	427
Table of Contents	428
Index	429
Subscription Information	430
Advertising Information	431
Back Matter	432
Front Matter	433
Table of Contents	434
Index	435
Subscription Information	436
Advertising Information	437
Back Matter	438
Front Matter	439
Table of Contents	440
Index	441
Subscription Information	442
Advertising Information	443
Back Matter	444
Front Matter	445
Table of Contents	446
Index	447
Subscription Information	448
Advertising Information	449
Back Matter	450
Front Matter	451
Table of Contents	452
Index	453
Subscription Information	454
Advertising Information	455
Back Matter	456
Front Matter	457
Table of Contents	458
Index	459
Subscription Information	460
Advertising Information	461
Back Matter	462
Front Matter	463
Table of Contents	464
Index	465
Subscription Information	466
Advertising Information	467
Back Matter	468
Front Matter	469
Table of Contents	470
Index	471
Subscription Information	472
Advertising Information	473
Back Matter	474
Front Matter	475
Table of Contents	476
Index	477
Subscription Information	478
Advertising Information	479
Back Matter	480
Front Matter	481
Table of Contents	482
Index	483
Subscription Information	484
Advertising Information	485
Back Matter	486
Front Matter	487
Table of Contents	488
Index	489
Subscription Information	490
Advertising Information	491
Back Matter	492
Front Matter	493
Table of Contents	494
Index	495
Subscription Information	496
Advertising Information	497
Back Matter	498
Front Matter	499
Table of Contents	500
Index	501
Subscription Information	502
Advertising Information	503
Back Matter	504
Front Matter	505
Table of Contents	506
Index	507
Subscription Information	508
Advertising Information	509
Back Matter	510
Front Matter	511
Table of Contents	512
Index	513
Subscription Information	514
Advertising Information	515
Back Matter	516
Front Matter	517
Table of Contents	518
Index	519
Subscription Information	520
Advertising Information	521
Back Matter	522
Front Matter	523
Table of Contents	524
Index	525
Subscription Information	526
Advertising Information	527
Back Matter	528
Front Matter	529
Table of Contents	530
Index	531
Subscription Information	532
Advertising Information	533
Back Matter	534
Front Matter	535
Table of Contents	536
Index	537
Subscription Information	538
Advertising Information	539
Back Matter	540
Front Matter	541
Table of Contents	542
Index	543
Subscription Information	544
Advertising Information	545
Back Matter	546
Front Matter	547
Table of Contents	548
Index	549
Subscription Information	550
Advertising Information	551
Back Matter	552
Front Matter	553
Table of Contents	554
Index	555
Subscription Information	556
Advertising Information	557
Back Matter	558
Front Matter	559
Table of Contents	560
Index	561
Subscription Information	562
Advertising Information	563
Back Matter	564
Front Matter	565
Table of Contents	566
Index	567
Subscription Information	568
Advertising Information	569
Back Matter	570
Front Matter	571
Table of Contents	572
Index	573
Subscription Information	574
Advertising Information	575
Back Matter	576
Front Matter	577
Table of Contents	578
Index	579
Subscription Information	580
Advertising Information	581
Back Matter	582
Front Matter	583
Table of Contents	584
Index	585
Subscription Information	586
Advertising Information	587
Back Matter	588
Front Matter	589
Table of Contents	590
Index	591
Subscription Information	592
Advertising Information	593
Back Matter	594
Front Matter	595
Table of Contents	596
Index	597
Subscription Information	598
Advertising Information	599
Back Matter	600
Front Matter	601
Table of Contents	602
Index	603
Subscription Information	604
Advertising Information	605
Back Matter	606
Front Matter	607
Table of Contents	608
Index	609
Subscription Information	610
Advertising Information	611
Back Matter	612
Front Matter	613
Table of Contents	614
Index	615
Subscription Information	616
Advertising Information	617
Back Matter	618
Front Matter	619
Table of Contents	620
Index	621
Subscription Information	622
Advertising Information	623
Back Matter	624
Front Matter	625
Table of Contents	626
Index	627
Subscription Information	628
Advertising Information	629
Back Matter	630
Front Matter	631
Table of Contents	632
Index	633
Subscription Information	634
Advertising Information	635
Back Matter	636
Front Matter	637
Table of Contents	638
Index	639
Subscription Information	640
Advertising Information	641
Back Matter	642
Front Matter	643
Table of Contents	644
Index	645
Subscription Information	646
Advertising Information	647
Back Matter	648
Front Matter	649
Table of Contents	650
Index	651
Subscription Information	652
Advertising Information	653
Back Matter	654
Front Matter	655
Table of Contents	656
Index	657
Subscription Information	658
Advertising Information	659
Back Matter	660
Front Matter	661
Table of Contents	662
Index	663
Subscription Information	664
Advertising Information	665
Back Matter	666
Front Matter	667
Table of Contents	668
Index	669
Subscription Information	670
Advertising Information	671
Back Matter	672
Front Matter	673
Table of Contents	674
Index	675
Subscription Information	676
Advertising Information	677
Back Matter	678
Front Matter	679
Table of Contents	680
Index	681
Subscription Information	682
Advertising Information	683
Back Matter	684
Front Matter	685
Table of Contents	686
Index	687
Subscription Information	688
Advertising Information	689
Back Matter	690
Front Matter	691
Table of Contents	692
Index	693
Subscription Information	694
Advertising Information	695
Back Matter	696
Front Matter	697
Table of Contents	698
Index	699
Subscription Information	700
Advertising Information	701
Back Matter	702
Front Matter	703
Table of Contents	704
Index	705
Subscription Information	706
Advertising Information	707
Back Matter	708
Front Matter	709
Table of Contents	710
Index	711
Subscription Information	712
Advertising Information	713
Back Matter	714
Front Matter	715
Table of Contents	716
Index	717
Subscription Information	718
Advertising Information	719
Back Matter	720
Front Matter	721
Table of Contents	722
Index	723
Subscription Information	724
Advertising Information	725
Back Matter	726
Front Matter	727
Table of Contents	728
Index	729
Subscription Information	730
Advertising Information	731
Back Matter	732
Front Matter	733
Table of Contents	734
Index	735
Subscription Information	736
Advertising Information	737
Back Matter	738
Front Matter	739
Table of Contents	740
Index	741
Subscription Information	742
Advertising Information	743
Back Matter	744
Front Matter	745
Table of Contents	746
Index	747
Subscription Information	748
Advertising Information	749
Back Matter	750
Front Matter	751
Table of Contents	752
Index	753
Subscription Information	754
Advertising Information	755
Back Matter	756
Front Matter	757
Table of Contents	758
Index	759
Subscription Information	760
Advertising Information	761
Back Matter	762
Front Matter	763
Table of Contents	764
Index	765
Subscription Information	766
Advertising Information	767
Back Matter	768
Front Matter	769
Table of Contents	770
Index	771
Subscription Information	772
Advertising Information	773
Back Matter	774
Front Matter	775
Table of Contents	776
Index	777
Subscription Information	778
Advertising Information	779
Back Matter	780
Front Matter	781
Table of Contents	782
Index	783
Subscription Information	784
Advertising Information	785
Back Matter	786
Front Matter	787
Table of Contents	788
Index	789
Subscription Information	790
Advertising Information	791
Back Matter	792
Front Matter	793
Table of Contents	794
Index	795
Subscription Information	796
Advertising Information	797
Back Matter	798
Front Matter	799
Table of Contents	800
Index	801
Subscription Information	802
Advertising Information	803
Back Matter	804
Front Matter	805
Table of Contents	806
Index	807
Subscription Information	808
Advertising Information	809
Back Matter	810
Front Matter	811
Table of Contents	812
Index	813
Subscription Information	814
Advertising Information	815
Back Matter	816
Front Matter	817
Table of Contents	818
Index	819
Subscription Information	820
Advertising Information	821
Back Matter	822
Front Matter	823
Table of Contents	824
Index	825
Subscription Information	826
Advertising Information	827
Back Matter	828
Front Matter	829
Table of Contents	830
Index	831
Subscription Information	832
Advertising Information	833
Back Matter	834
Front Matter	835
Table of Contents	836
Index	837
Subscription Information	838
Advertising Information	839
Back Matter	840
Front Matter	841
Table of Contents	842
Index	843
Subscription Information	844
Advertising Information	845
Back Matter	846
Front Matter	847
Table of Contents	848
Index	849
Subscription Information	850
Advertising Information	851
Back Matter	852
Front Matter	853
Table of Contents	854
Index	855
Subscription Information	856
Advertising Information	857
Back Matter	858
Front Matter	859
Table of Contents	860
Index	861
Subscription Information	862
Advertising Information	863
Back Matter	864
Front Matter	865
Table of Contents	866
Index	867
Subscription Information	868
Advertising Information	869
Back Matter	870
Front Matter	871
Table of Contents	872
Index	873
Subscription Information	874
Advertising Information	875
Back Matter	876
Front Matter	877
Table of Contents	878
Index	879
Subscription Information	880
Advertising Information	881
Back Matter	882
Front Matter	883
Table of Contents	884
Index	885
Subscription Information	886
Advertising Information	887
Back Matter	888
Front Matter	889
Table of Contents	890
Index	891
Subscription Information	892
Advertising Information	893
Back Matter	894
Front Matter	895
Table of Contents	896
Index	897
Subscription Information	898
Advertising Information	899
Back Matter	900
Front Matter	901
Table of Contents	902
Index	903
Subscription Information	904
Advertising Information	905
Back Matter	906
Front Matter	907
Table of Contents	908
Index	909
Subscription Information	910
Advertising Information	911
Back Matter	912
Front Matter	913
Table of Contents	914
Index	915
Subscription Information	916
Advertising Information	917
Back Matter	918
Front Matter	919
Table of Contents	920
Index	921
Subscription Information	922
Advertising Information	923
Back Matter	924
Front Matter	925
Table of Contents	926
Index	927
Subscription Information	928
Advertising Information	929
Back Matter	930
Front Matter	931
Table of Contents	932
Index	933
Subscription Information	934
Advertising Information	935
Back Matter	936
Front Matter	937
Table of Contents	938
Index	939
Subscription Information	940
Advertising Information	941
Back Matter	942
Front Matter	943
Table of Contents	944
Index	945
Subscription Information	946
Advertising Information	947
Back Matter	948
Front Matter	949
Table of Contents	950
Index	951
Subscription Information	952
Advertising Information	953
Back Matter	954
Front Matter	955
Table of Contents	956
Index	957
Subscription Information	958
Advertising Information	959
Back Matter	960
Front Matter	961
Table of Contents	962
Index	963
Subscription Information	964
Advertising Information	965
Back Matter	966
Front Matter	967
Table of Contents	968
Index	969
Subscription Information	970
Advertising Information	971
Back Matter	972
Front Matter	973
Table of Contents	974
Index	975
Subscription Information	976
Advertising Information	977
Back Matter	978
Front Matter	979
Table of Contents	980
Index	981
Subscription Information	982
Advertising Information	983
Back Matter	984
Front Matter	985
Table of Contents	986
Index	987
Subscription Information	988
Advertising Information	989
Back Matter	990
Front Matter	991
Table of Contents	992
Index	993
Subscription Information	994</

RESEARCH REPORT

Direct copying of inflectional paradigms: Evidence from Lamunkhin Even

BRIGITTE PAKENDORF

UMR5596, CNRS & Université de Lyon

Language-contact studies have shown that the transfer of morphology from one language to another is relatively rare (Gardani 2008, Grant 2012, Matras 2015), and the copying of verbal inflectional morphology is particularly infrequent (Seifart 2017). Copied morphemes are frequently assumed to enter the recipient language via ‘indirect affix borrowing’, whereby complex lexemes are copied and subsequently analyzed into their component parts in the recipient language, thus enabling use of the copied affixes with native roots (Grant 2012, Seifart 2015, Evans 2016). Although ‘direct affix borrowing’, in which speakers of the recipient language identify the meaning of affixes in the model language and transfer them directly for use with native roots, is known to occur, it has until now been identified only for derivational morphemes (Seifart 2015). I here provide evidence that inflectional morphemes, namely four Sakha (Yakut) tense-aspect-mood markers plus associated subject agreement paradigms, were copied directly into the Lamunkhin dialect of Even by fully bilingual speakers. This argument is based on the absence of Sakha verbal roots found with these paradigms in a corpus of Lamunkhin Even recordings, as well as on patterns of cooccurrence of these morphemes in clauses with Even grammatical morphology.*

Keywords: language contact, borrowing, morphology, Tungusic, bilingual utterances

1. INTRODUCTION. Copying of bound morphology is known to be crosslinguistically rare (e.g. Matras 2007:61, Gardani 2008, Grant 2012:104, Matras 2015:48), although intensified efforts at detecting copied morphology show that this type of contact-induced change occurs more frequently than previously assumed (Gardani 2012, Seifart 2017). There are notable differences, however, in the degree of copyability of different types of morphemes. Thus, derivational affixes are copied more frequently than inflectional morphemes, and within the latter category, markers of inherent inflection, especially plurals, are copied more frequently than contextual inflection such as structural case markers or verbal person agreement affixes (Gardani 2012, Gardani, Arkadiev, & Amiridze 2015a:9, Seifart 2017:397). Similarly, the copying of verbal inflection is substantially less frequent than the copying of nominal inflection (Seifart 2017:424). And even though more examples of copied morphology have emerged in recent years, the copying of entire paradigms of verbal subject agreement suffixes from one language to another remains extremely rare (cf. Grant 2008:179, Gardani et al. 2015a:13), albeit not unattested. One such attested case is the Lamunkhin dialect of Even, which has copied entire paradigms of subject agreement markers together with mood suffixes from the neighboring language Sakha (Yakut), as in 1a,b. Throughout the article, ele-

* The data on which this report is based were collected during four field trips that were funded by the Max Planck Society via the MPRG on Comparative Population Linguistics and the Volkswagen Foundation via a DoBeS (Documentation of Endangered Languages) grant; this financial support is gratefully acknowledged. I am also grateful to the LABEX ASLAN (ANR-10-LABX-0081) of Université de Lyon for its financial support within the program ‘Investissements d’Avenir’ (ANR-11-IDEX-0007) of the French government operated by the National Research Agency (ANR). A preliminary and very different version of this paper was presented at a seminar in the ‘Dynamique du Langage’ research unit in Lyon in November 2016, and an amended version was presented during the colloquium ‘From language mixing to fused lexes’ at the Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies in January 2017. I thank the audiences of both events for their feedback, and most especially Michael Daniel for his extensive and insightful comments following the Lyon seminar. Last but not least, I thank all of the speakers who contributed to the corpus, Natalia Aralova for access to the narratives that she recorded and glossed, Ekaterina Shadrina and Ija Krivoshapkina for transcriptions, and Ija Krivoshapkina for translations into Russian and discussions of questions.

ments of Sakha origin are underlined in examples, and morphemes of interest are in bold font; epenthetic vowels are not glossed separately, but are generally attached to the preceding morpheme.¹

- (1) a. Lamunkhin Even (AVZ_indjuk_internet_022)²
 ta-li ču:li=da naṅti-hn-idži=da
 DIST-PROL disappear-IMP.2SG=PTL grab-LIM-ANT.CVB=PTL
 ebehjeke:ki tute-l-li
 PROX.ALL.DIRECTLY run-INCH-IMP.2SG
 go:j-**deg-e=di**:
 say-CONN-ASS.Y-POSS.3SG.Y=EMPH.Y
 ‘‘Slip through that, grab (a chicken), and run straight here,’’ he said,
 right.’
- b. Lamunkhin Even (RDA_TPK_death_127)
 hi: bolla tar dʒeb-le-we-n ulde-we-n ia-nikan
 2SG DP.Y DIST eat-NR-ACC-POSS.3SG meat-ACC-POSS.3SG HESIT-SIM.CVB
 noṅan dʒebe-d-di-mdes dʒeb-uke-j-**egin**
 3SG eat-PROG-IPFV.PTCP-SML eat-CAUS-CONN-PRS.2SG.Y
 ‘You, however, give (people) that food of his, that meat of his to eat, as
 if he were eating.’

Apart from Lamunkhin Even, only two other cases of copied verbal paradigms are known: (i) the Učur dialect of Evenki, which, like Lamunkhin Even, has copied a mood suffix plus associated subject agreement markers from Sakha (Myreeva 1964:51), and (ii) the probably best-known example, Copper Island Aleut (also known as Mednyj Aleut). In this mixed language, the entire verbal inflectional morphology comes from Russian, while the nominal inflection and the majority of lexical roots are of Aleut origin (Menovščikov 1968:405, Golovko 1996, Thomason 1997). Both Učur Evenki and Copper Island Aleut are by now probably extinct, precluding further research into the factors that led to the adoption of verbal paradigms into these lects. Elucidating the process that resulted in the transfer of paradigms in Lamunkhin Even will thus further our understanding of this rare outcome of bilingual language use.

It should be noted that different authors include different phenomena in their discussions of copied (or ‘borrowed’) morphology. For instance, Mithun (2012) and Thomason (2015) subsume the replication of morphological patterns without actual transfer of forms under this term, and several authors include instances of copied morphemes occurring only with copied lexical items in their discussions of copied morphology (e.g. Comrie 2008, Grant 2012, Matras 2015, Evans 2016). Similarly, Adamou (2012:152–56) uses the term ‘paradigm transfer’ to refer to the use of Turkish tense-aspect-mood

¹ Abbreviations used in glosses: ACC: accusative, ADJR: adjectivizer, ADVR: adverbializer, AGNR: agent nominalizer, ALL: allative, ALN: alienable, ANT: anterior, ASS: assertive, ASSOC: associative, AUG: augmentative, AUX: auxiliary, CAUS: causative, COM: comitative, CONAT: conative, COND: conditional, CONN: connective, CVB: converb, DAT: dative, DIM: diminutive, DIST: distal, DISTR: distributive, DP: discourse particle, EMPH: emphatic, F: feminine, FUT: future, GEN: genitive, HAB: habitual, HESIT: hesitant, HYP: hypothetical, IMP: imperative, INCH: inchoative, INDEF: indefinite, INS: instrumental, IPFV: imperfective, LIM: limitative, LOC: locative, M: masculine, NEC: necessitive, NEG: negative, NFUT: nonfuture, NR: nominalizer, OBL: oblique, PFV: perfective, PL: plural, POSS: possessive, PRED: predicative, PRES: presumptive, PRFL: reflexive possessive, PROG: progressive, PROL: prolative, PROX: proximal, PRS: present, PST: past, PTCP: participle, PTL: particle, Q: question, QUAL: qualitative, R: Russian copy, RES: resultative, SG: singular, SIM: simultaneous, SML: simulative, TRM: terminative, VAL: valency change, Y: Sakha (Yakut) copy.

² Unless otherwise indicated, examples are taken from the corpus of oral recordings on which this article is based; see n. 3.

(TAM) plus subject agreement markers on verbs of Turkish origin in Romani, a phenomenon for which Matras (2015:66–75) uses the term ‘morphological compartmentalization’. This outcome of language contact was extensively described and discussed by Kossmann (2010) under the label of ‘parallel systems borrowing’. Others, most notably Gardani (2012:72) and Seifart (2012:473), restrict their definition of copied morphology to those cases where copied morphemes are used with at least a few inherited lexemes, a terminology that I follow as well (cf. Pakendorf 2015:163–64). Thus, the phenomenon discussed in this report concerns the transfer not of structural patterns, but of actual forms. Furthermore, as can be seen in example 1 and as is shown in detail in §4 below, the verbal paradigms copied from Sakha into Lamunkhin Even are not restricted to copied Sakha verbs, but are used predominantly with native Even verb stems.

Seifart (2017:409) has suggested that copied verbal paradigms are first introduced via wholesale copying of inflected stems, which later get reanalyzed into their component roots and morphemes by speakers of the recipient language, allowing use of the subject agreement paradigms with inherited verb stems. The suggestion that verbal inflectional paradigms are copied indirectly via complex lexemes is in accordance with data from bilingual interactions, since it is widely assumed that ‘[i]n a multilingual communication setting, the choice of “language” amounts to the choice of structures used to anchor the predication and its arguments (verb-inflectional morphology such as person, tense, modality and aspect)’ (Matras 2015:48). Similar observations have led Myers-Scotton (e.g. 2008:22–23; see also Jake & Myers-Scotton 2009:214) to suggest that in situations of code-switching the matrix language of bilingual utterances, which provides the grammatical frame for the mixed clause, is determined by so-called ‘outsider morphemes’, which include subject agreement markers. Structural morphology from the embedded language is generally found only in so-called ‘embedded language islands’, complete phrasal constituents consisting only of embedded language material (Myers-Scotton 2002:139, Jake & Myers-Scotton 2009:210).

In contrast to the assumption that subject agreement paradigms are copied via the transfer of foreign verb stems plus inflection markers, with segmentation of the morphemes for use with native stems occurring only at a later stage, I here argue that the copied paradigms in Lamunkhin Even are the result of what Seifart (2015) calls ‘direct affix borrowing’. This implies that fully bilingual speakers can segment lexemes into their component parts in both of their languages and freely insert subject agreement suffixes from one language into the other.

The paper is structured as follows: I first describe the copied paradigms in Lamunkhin Even (§2), and then briefly introduce the distinction between indirect and direct affix copying (§3). In §4 I present the data in favor of my argument that the paradigms of Sakha origin found in Lamunkhin Even were copied directly. An alternative hypothesis is discussed in §5, namely, that the clauses containing Sakha verbal morphology actually have Sakha as their matrix language, while the Even elements are merely embedded. The report ends with a discussion and conclusions (§6).

2. COPIED PARADIGMS IN LAMUNKHIN EVEN.³ Lamunkhin Even is the westernmost still-viable dialect of Even, a North Tungusic language with a scattered distribution over

³ This article is based on a corpus of approximately eleven hours of transcribed, translated, and glossed oral recordings (amounting to nearly 52,000 Even words) collected in four field trips to Sebjan-Küöl between 2008 and 2012. The corpus comprises mainly monologues, especially autobiographical narratives and anecdotes, but it also includes an hour-long conversation among four speakers. Thirty-six speakers aged eleven to seventy-eight years at the time of recording are represented, twenty-four females and twelve males.

much of northeastern Siberia. Like other Even dialects Lamunkhin Even is morphologically rich, exclusively suffixing, and fairly agglutinative. It is spoken in the village Sebjan-Küöl in central Yakutia by approximately 300–350 individuals (out of some 850–900 inhabitants in total). While there are still some children who are acquiring Even as their home language in Sebjan-Küöl, the lect is under severe pressure from the Turkic language Sakha, and practically everyone who speaks Lamunkhin Even knows Sakha as well. This pressure has led to noticeable Sakha influence in Lamunkhin Even (see e.g. Pakendorf 2009:89–90), including the influx of large numbers of Sakha lexemes.

The most noticeable and notable impact of the intense pressure exerted by Sakha is the presence of copied verbal inflectional paradigms, consisting of a Sakha mood suffix with associated Sakha subject agreement suffixes (Pakendorf 2009, 2014, 2015). For example, comparing the Lamunkhin necessitive in 2a with the necessitive from the eastern Ola Even dialect (which is not in contact with Sakha) in 2b and the Sakha necessitive in 2c shows that not only has the Sakha necessitive mood marker *-ieχteχ* (which in 2c is merged with the verb root *hie-* ‘eat’) replaced the Even necessitive suffix *-nne* in Lamunkhin Even, but the Lamunkhin Even subject agreement marker *-kin* is identical to Sakha *-χin* and has replaced the Even 2SG person marker *-s*.

- (2) a. Lamunkhin Even (RDA_TPK_death_128)
 koke-če bej džebe-d-di-mdes džebe-**jektek-kin**
 die-PFV.PTCP human eat-PROG-IPFV.PTCP-SML eat-NEC.Y-PRED.2SG.Y
 ‘You have to eat as if the deceased is eating.’
- b. Ola Even (Novikova 1980:109; glosses and English translation mine)
 hi: čakabak-la tore-**nne-s**
 2SG meeting-LOC speak-NEC-2SG
 ‘You have to speak at the meeting.’
- c. Sakha (MatX2_120)
 ij-ga ikki ere taba-nī **hieχteχ-χin**
 month-DAT two only reindeer-ACC eat-NEC-PRED.2SG
 ‘Per month you must eat [i.e. are allowed to eat] only two reindeer.’

Far from all of the inherited TAM forms have been replaced in Lamunkhin Even: the imperative, subjunctive, and indicative past, nonfuture, and future are all of Even origin. Nor has the Sakha subject agreement marking replaced the inherited Even person markers for all TAM forms (in contrast to what is stated by Seifart 2017:table 13 and p. 423), as shown by 3a,b: in 3a, the past-tense suffix *-ti/-ri* combines with the 2SG subject agreement suffix *-s* (which is identical to the nominal possessive suffix and also found with the Even necessitive in 2b), whereas in 3b the nonfuture tense takes the 2SG subject agreement suffix *-nni*. This is consistent with the structure of Even, where specific TAM forms take different sets of subject agreement markers.

- (3) a. Lamunkhin Even (ZAS_arrival_Tashkent_016)
 iadaj tarak asatkam ηa:t-**ti-s** e:ri-**ri-s** hi:
 what.for DIST girl.ACC call-PST-2SG call-PST-2SG 2SG
 ‘Why did you invite that girl?’
- b. Lamunkhin Even (LAT_family_history_045)
 hi: keñeli ɔ:-**nni** go:n-če min-u e-**he-nni**
 2SG bad make[NFUT]-2SG say-PFV.PTCP 1SG.OBL-ACC NEG-NFUT-2SG
 dɔlda-r go:n-če
 hear-NEG.CVB say-PFV.PTCP
 ‘“You did (something) bad, you didn’t listen to me,” he said.’

The paradigms copied into Lamunkhin Even are the necessitive illustrated in 2a, the assertive illustrated in 1a, the present indicative shown in 1b, and the hypothetical shown in 4 below. In each case, the Sakha mood marker was copied together with the corresponding set of Sakha subject agreement suffixes (see Tables A1–A4 in the appendix). It should be noted that in Lamunkhin Even the Sakha present indicative occurs with a future or necessitive reading as well, depending on the context.

- (4) Lamunkhin Even (beseda_1698_NPZ)
 ta-du go:n-e-m ogi-de-du ibga-w ńan=da teti-**je:kkin**
 DIST-DAT say-NFUT-1SG top-SIDE-DAT good-ACC and=PTL wear-HYP.2SG.Y
 [na:da]
 [need.R]
 ‘to that I say [reply] “on the top you need to put on something good as well”’

Given that practically every speaker of Lamunkhin Even is also fluent in Sakha—with Sakha probably being the dominant language of several individuals who contributed to the narrative corpus—identifying established copies is not an easy task. Nevertheless, an analysis of the frequency of use (Table 1) demonstrates that the assertive and the necessitive can probably be considered established copies, while the present indicative and the hypothetical are best considered ongoing copies.

	SAKHA COPY		EVEN FORM	
	# TOKENS	# SPEAKERS	# TOKENS	# SPEAKERS
ASSERTIVE	59	20	N/A	N/A
NECESSITIVE	90	18	17	5
PRESENT TENSE	53	17	hundreds	36
HYPOTHETICAL	19	10	~50	~17

TABLE 1. Comparison of frequency of use of Sakha copies vs. Even forms.⁴

Thus, the assertive and necessitive are widely used by many speakers, including those who are arguably dominant in Even, and the copied necessitive occurs far more frequently than the inherited Even forms⁵ (there is no inherited Even form that fulfills the functions of the assertive). The Sakha present indicative and the hypothetical, by contrast, are used predominantly by speakers who probably use Sakha more in their everyday interactions, and the inherited Even forms are used more frequently and by more speakers than the copied forms. Furthermore, my main consultant, for whom Lamunkhin Even is arguably the dominant language, commented negatively on the copied present tense used by some speakers, whereas she found no issue with the copied assertive or necessitive, which she herself frequently uses and considers an integral part of Lamunkhin Even. As to the copied hypothetical, while she did produce it in an elicitation task, she explicitly flagged it as the Sakha form. All of these arguments lead me to judge the assertive and necessitive as established copies in Lamunkhin Even,

⁴ Note that there is no one-to-one correlation of the functions of the Sakha present tense and the Even nonfuture, so a precise count of the present-tense uses of the Even nonfuture is impossible; however, there are over 2,000 tokens of this tense form in the corpus. Similarly, there is no single Even form that covers the meaning of the Sakha hypothetical; the count is based on searches in the translation line of ‘can’, ‘able’, and ‘cannot’, as well as tokens of the presumptive suffix *-čAxʒi* without a probability reading and the Even suffix *-dʒinA*, which in Lamunkhin Even is used in a similar vein as the copied Sakha hypothetical.

⁵ Of the five speakers who used the Even necessitive, two are teachers of Even trained to use the ‘literary’ Even forms (illustrated in the Ola Even example in 2b), and one is a strong advocate of using ‘literary’ Even. Two of the five (including one of the teachers) also used the Sakha necessitive.

while the present tense and hypothetical forms are still in the process of being copied (see also Pakendorf 2015:172).

In Sakha, the affirmative assertive can be expressed either synthetically, with the mood and person suffix attaching to the verb stem, or via an analytical construction, in which the lexical verb carries a participial suffix and the mood marker is attached to the auxiliary *buol-*. The Sakha negative assertive is only expressed via such an analytical construction (Pakendorf 2009:95–96). In Lamunkhin Even, all three assertive constructions are found: the synthetic affirmative (5a), the analytical affirmative making use of the Sakha present participle (5b), and the analytical negative (5c).

- (5) a. Lamunkhin Even (AXK_1930s_106)
 burduka-ŋa-tna man-u-j-**dag-a** ehni
 flour.R-ALN-POSS.3PL use.up-VAL-CONN-ASS.Y-POSS.3SG.Y PTL
 upe:-ńdže-je-l-bu
 grandmother-AUG-ASSOC-PL-POSS.1SG
 ‘My grandmother and them’s⁶ flour had run out, right.’
- b. Lamunkhin Even (IVK_memories_109)
hatakka egdže-kie-meje-l ńaldańa-maja-l
 in.addition.Y big-EMPH-AUG-PL coal.black-AUG-PL
 ič-u-j-**er** **bol-lak-tara**
 see-VAL-CONN-PRS.PTCP.Y AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.3PL.Y
 ‘In addition they looked huge and black.’
- c. Lamunkhin Even (AVZ_indjuk_internat_037 [ex. 13 in Pakendorf 2015])
 indjuk gerbe bi bolla ha:j-**bat** **bol-lag-im**
 turkey.R name 1SG DP.Y know-CONN-NEG.Y AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y
 iak=kol tarbača-maja-w huta-ku
 what=INDEF DIST.QUAL-AUG-ACC become.red-ADJR
 ‘It’s called “indjuk” [turkey], and I didn’t know that, right, something like that big red (creature).’

As mentioned in the introduction, Seifart (2017:409) suggests that subject agreement paradigms such as those found in Lamunkhin Even might enter the recipient language via indirect affix copying. In the following section I briefly introduce the distinction between indirect and direct affix copying.

3. INDIRECT VS. DIRECT AFFIX COPYING. Several authors have noted that copied morphology can ‘sneak into’ a recipient language via the transfer of fully inflected lexemes (Weinreich 1953:31, Matras 2009:209, Meakins 2011:74, Grant 2012:118–19, Seifart 2015, Evans 2016:31), with the morphemes being segmented and transferred to inherited roots only at a later stage. This process is termed variously ‘backwards diffusion’ (Matras 2009:209), ‘retroactive transfer’ (Grant 2012:105), ‘trojan horse borrowing’ (Evans 2016:31, using a term coined by Meakins 2011), or ‘indirect affix borrowing’ (Seifart 2015). I here follow Seifart’s terminology; however, since the term ‘borrowing’ is used in different ways by different authors (see Pakendorf 2007:26–31 for discussion, and Johanson 1992:175 for further criticism of this term), I prefer to use ‘copying’ instead of ‘borrowing’ to refer to the transfer of items from one language to another in situations of language contact. I therefore use the terms ‘indirect affix copying’ and ‘direct affix copying’.

In indirect affix copying, speakers of the recipient language first copy large numbers of complex lexemes containing one and the same affix attached to a variety of roots; the

⁶ Though nonstandard English, this translation is the best rendition of the Even associative plural.

presence of these complex copies enables them to identify the meaning of the affix, which they subsequently segment and use productively in combination with inherited roots. The best-described example of this process is the integration of the French suffix *-able* into English, where it now productively derives words such as *knowable* or *workable* (Seifart 2015:511).

However, as shown by Seifart (2015), morphemes can enter a recipient language not only via such indirect affix copying but also via direct affix copying. In direct affix copying speakers of the recipient language have sufficient knowledge of the model language to permit them to identify the meaning of an affix in situ; they thus copy the affix directly into the recipient language, without first copying large numbers of complex forms.

A prerequisite for indirect affix copying to take place is the presence of complex copies consisting of a model-language root plus the model-language affix in the recipient language (Seifart 2015:513, Evans 2016:31). Seifart (*ibid.*) argues that it is furthermore important that the recipient language should have copied not only complex lexemes, but also the plain root without affixes, enabling speakers to identify the meaning of the transferred morphemes and thus extend their use to native roots. In contrast, if no complex copies can be found in the recipient language, ‘then the affix can only be taken from knowledge of the donor language, that is, through direct borrowing’ (Seifart 2015:513). In his crosslinguistic study, Seifart (2015) identifies direct affix copying only for derivational morphemes, in particular for morphemes involved in numeral derivation.

With respect to inflectional morphology, Evans (2016:31) suggests that this might enter the recipient language ‘in the form of borrowed words that host the relevant paradigms, with the extension to native stems being a later process’, that is, via indirect affix copying. Seifart (2017:409), too, suggests that verbal subject agreement markers may have been copied via indirect affix copying. As I argue in the following, however, the four verbal paradigms copied into Lamunkhin Even from Sakha are most likely the result of direct affix copying.

4. EVIDENCE FOR DIRECT AFFIX COPYING OF SAKHA PARADIGMS INTO LAMUNKHIN EVEN. The presence of copied inflectional paradigms in Lamunkhin Even is striking and calls for an explanation of the underlying process that led to this rare outcome. The most straightforward hypothesis is that they first entered the language via monolingual embedded language constituents in cases of code-switching (cf. Jake & Myers-Scotton 2009:219, Meakins 2011). If these occurred with high enough frequency, and if the corresponding Sakha roots also occurred by themselves in Lamunkhin Even discourse, the meaning of the recurrent suffixes in the embedded language constituents could have been identified by the speakers of Lamunkhin Even and subsequently been used with verb stems of Even origin; that is, such code-switched constituents might have served as the basis for indirect affix copying.

If this hypothesis were true, we would expect to find the Sakha inflectional morphemes occurring together with Sakha verb stems (cf. Seifart 2015:513, Evans 2016:31). As is evident from Table 2, however, this is not at all what we find. Instead of the Sakha verbal morphemes occurring predominantly or at least frequently with Sakha stems, the vast majority of tokens of the copied suffixes occur only with Even stems.

Of course, it is debatable whether a corpus consisting of a mere ~52,000 tokens produced by ~10% of the speech community is really representative of Lamunkhin Even as a whole, all the more so as audio and video recordings in the presence of foreign linguists are highly artificial speech situations. In addition, such a corpus provides only a synchronic slice of the lect, and as such might not really permit diachronic analyses. But the corpus probably does provide a fairly representative sample of the speech com-

	TYPES	TOKENS	SAKHA VERB
NECESSITIVE	34	90	0
ASSERTIVE (SYNTHETIC)	28	39	2
ASSERTIVE (ANALYTICAL)	19	20	1
ASSERTIVE (NEGATIVE)	4	5	2
PRESENT TENSE	26	53	0
HYPOTHETICAL	10	19	0

TABLE 2. Frequency of verb stems occurring with Sakha verbal morphology in the Lamunkhin Even narrative corpus.⁷

munity, since a relatively broad range of speakers is included, from children and teenagers up to elderly speakers; it also encompasses individuals with diverse occupations, from reindeer herding to teaching. Furthermore, a third of the recordings were undertaken in somewhat natural settings, involving at the least a native speaker of Even as audience and interlocutor, and some speakers who faced only the recording linguist(s) got so carried away by their narrative that they clearly forgot about the microphone and camera. Thus, the corpus probably does reflect relatively naturalistic speech overall. Lastly, given that the present-tense and hypothetical-mood paradigms are likely still in the process of being copied, while the necessitive and assertive paradigms appear to be well-established copies, as argued in §2, the corpus does appear to provide a snapshot of change in progress that can be used for historical investigations. Taking all of these points together, it appears reasonable to extrapolate conclusions drawn on the basis of the corpus data to Lamunkhin Even and the copying process as a whole.

As can be seen from Table 2, none of the tokens of the Sakha necessitive, present-tense indicative, or hypothetical mood occur with Sakha verbs in the corpus; they occur exclusively with Even verbs. Only the assertive occurs with Sakha verbs, although the synthetic and analytical affirmative constructions occur far more frequently with Even verbs than with Sakha verbs. This finding is highly unexpected and clearly indicates that the paradigms are not being transferred via indirect affix copying.

It should be noted that this surprising finding is not due to an aversion on the part of Lamunkhin Even speakers to copying Sakha verbs: seventy-one verbs of Sakha origin are found in the corpus, of which fifty-nine occur only with Even morphology, eight occur only with Sakha morphology (not just the suffixes discussed in this report, but also converbial suffixes, and including clear examples of alternational code-switching, that is, switches between languages at clause boundaries or at turn-taking), and four occur with both Sakha and Even morphology. Fifteen of these Sakha verb roots are used by three or more speakers, and five more are used by two different speakers. This clearly indicates that if the Sakha mood paradigms had indeed entered Lamunkhin Even via embedded language constituents and indirect affix copying, one should expect to see complex copies consisting of Sakha verb stems with Sakha inflectional morphology, especially with the present tense and hypothetical suffixes.

Table 3 lists the Sakha verb stems that occur with the Sakha assertive in the corpus. Of these, *ülele:-* ‘work’ seems to be treated as an Even verb,⁸ since the Sakha morphology is integrated with a connective glide (6). This connective glide, which occurs only in Lamunkhin Even, is used exclusively when Sakha verbal suffixes are connected to Even

⁷ For the type and token counts, the Sakha TAM forms include the Sakha subject agreement markers that are associated with them.

⁸ It should nevertheless be noted that the native Even stem *gurgewči-* is vastly more frequent, with 105 tokens occurring in the corpus.

verb stems (see 1a,b or 5a–c above),⁹ not in the integration of Sakha roots into Even morphology (Pakendorf 2009:97). Thus, of the affirmative assertive forms occurring in the corpus, arguably only two occur with Sakha verb stems (namely *hīsta-* ‘get infected’ and *eppietes-* ‘answer’), as opposed to forty that occur with Even verb stems.¹⁰

VERB	ASSERTIVE CONSTRUCTION	# OF TOKENS IN CORPUS WITH	
		SAKHA MORPHEMES	EVEN MORPHEMES
<i>ülele-</i> ‘work’	synthetic	1	14
<i>hīsta-</i> ‘get infected’	synthetic	1	1
<i>eppietes-</i> ‘answer’	analytical affirmative	1	0
<i>bil-</i> ‘know’	negative	2	0
<i>tik-</i> ‘sew’	negative	1	0

TABLE 3. Sakha verbs with assertive morphology.

(6) Lamunkhin Even (AEK_childhood_123)

tar noŋan sahil perme-du-n
 DIST 3SG fox.Y farm.R-DAT-POSS.3SG
ülele-j-deg-e=di
 work.Y-CONN-ASS.Y-POSS.3SG.Y=EMPH.Y
 ‘Well he worked on the fox farm, right, ...’

The two examples of the affirmative assertive with Sakha verb stems (7a,b) involve verbs that practically do not otherwise occur in the corpus (the verb *hīsta-* ‘get infected’ was used twice by the same speaker). This contrasts with several Even verbs, such as *koke-* ‘die’, *gom-* ‘say’, or *hor-* ‘go’, that were used with affirmative assertive forms by different speakers. It is thus highly unlikely that such rare instances of Sakha verb stems found in the Lamunkhin Even affirmative assertive construction pool, where they are far outweighed by Even verb stems, would have served as the model for indirect copying of the affirmative assertive forms.

(7) a. Lamunkhin Even (AEK_childhood_033)

bilirgi bej il-la-n=da girka-hjara-n
 previous.Y human stand.up-NFUT-3SG=PTL walk-LIM.HAB[NFUT]-3SG
 ta-du hīsta-dag-a
 DIST-DAT **get.infected.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.3SG.Y**
 ‘In the past, a person would get up and walk off, and catch this (disease).’

b. Lamunkhin Even (AVZ_indjuk_internet_079)

otton mut ebe-di-t=de tore-ssi-reke-t
 DP.Y 1PL Even-ADJR-INS=PTL speak-CONAT-COND.CVB-1PL
 ŋoka-di-t eppieteh-er
 Sakha-ADJR-INS **answer.many.times.Y-PRS.PTCP.Y**
bol-lak-tara
 AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.3PL.Y
 ‘Even if we try to speak Even (with them), they answer in Sakha.’

The only candidate for indirect affix copying is the negative assertive: two of the four verb types found in the corpus are Sakha (8a,b), and two are Even (5c, repeated here

⁹ The exceptions are the necessitive and hypothetical, which themselves start with a glide.

¹⁰ This number is the total number of verb types found with the synthetic and analytical assertive in Table 2 (forty-seven), minus five types that occur in both constructions and not counting the two types of Sakha origin.

as 8c, and 8d), with 8a clearly representing a Sakha clause with an embedded Even direct object.

- (8) a. Lamunkhin Even (AEK_childhood_083 [ex.17b in Pakendorf 2009])
 unta-wu buolla kĭajan tik-pet
 fur.boots-ACC.POSS.1SG DP.Y not.be.able.Y **sew.Y-NEG.Y**
buol-lag-im=di:
 AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y=EMPH.Y
 ‘Fur boots I cannot sew, right.’
- b. Lamunkhin Even (RDA_old_remains_traditions_043)
 tar amarra mut bil-bet buol-lax-pit ŋi: tawar
 DIST later 1PL **know.Y-NEG.Y** AUX.Y-ASS.Y-1PL.Y who that
 ga-čadzi-r
 take-PRES-3PL
 ‘Later we don’t know who took it.’
- c. Lamunkhin Even (AVZ_indjuk_internat_037 [ex. 13 in Pakendorf 2015])
 indjuk gerbe bi bol-la ha:j-bat bol-lag-im
 turkey.R name 1SG DP.Y know-CONN-NEG.Y AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y
 iak=kol tarbača-maja-w huta-ku
 what=INDEF DIST.QUAL-AUG-ACC become.red-ADJR
 ‘It’s called “indjuk” [turkey], and I didn’t know that, right, something like that big red (creature).’
- d. Lamunkhin Even (AEK_childhood_087 [ex. 10d in Pakendorf 2009])
kĭajan girka-j-bat buol-lag-im mere:či
 not.be.able.Y walk-CONN-NEG.Y AUX.Y-ASS.Y-POSS.1SG.Y circle
 ɔ:-kan begi-če, ...
 become-TRM.CVB freeze-PFV.PTCP
 ‘I can’t walk, right, (my legs) froze until they reached such a diameter ...’

As stated by Seifart (2015:513; emphasis mine): ‘The presence of complex loanwords is a necessary condition for indirect borrowing. IF THERE ARE NONE, then the affix can only be taken from knowledge of the donor language, that is, THROUGH DIRECT BORROWING’. Since the necessitive and, more importantly, the present-tense indicative and the hypothetical-mood forms, which were argued to still be in the process of being copied into Lamunkhin Even, occur exclusively with Even verb stems, the obvious conclusion appears to be that these were/are being copied directly. In addition, as argued above, even the affirmative assertive appears more likely to be the result of direct than indirect copying. However, as is discussed in the following, there is an alternative hypothesis that needs to be investigated before this conclusion can be firmly reached.

5. DIRECT COPYING OF SAKHA VERBAL PARADIGMS OR SAKHA UTTERANCES WITH EMBEDDED EVEN ITEMS? The data discussed in §4 seem to speak for themselves: not a single token of a complex copy consisting of a Sakha root plus Sakha suffixes is found in the corpus for the necessitive, present-tense, or hypothetical paradigms. The conclusion would thus seem obvious: these paradigms—plus, as I argue above, the affirmative assertive forms—can only have been copied directly. But there is of course an alternative explanation for the findings: since subject agreement morphology is considered to define the matrix language of an utterance in bilingual language use (Myers-Scotton 2008:23, Jake & Myers-Scotton 2009:214, 216, Matras 2015:48), perhaps all of these instances of supposedly directly copied Sakha suffixes in Lamunkhin Even actually

- (10) a. Lamunkhin Even (RDA_TPK_death_115)
 ńoǵuhub-ba-n ma:-ridzi bolla bej-te[n]
 lead.reindeer-ACC-POSS.3SG kill-ANT.CVB DP.Y human-DISTR
 beje-l-**du** bo:-če-j-egin go:li beje-s
 human-PL-DAT give-RES-CONN-PRS.2SG.Y PTL self.Y-POSS.2SG
 džeb-dži-nni
 eat-FUT-2SG
 ‘Having killed the lead reindeer, however, you give (the meat) to people, right, you yourself eat.’
- b. Lamunkhin Even (SPK_oxota_070)
 toǵ-**u** dur-u-j-egin ahukan-du ǵoǵ
 fire-ACC burn-VAL-CONN-PRS.2SG.Y near-DAT firewood
 bi-hik-en
 be-COND.CVB-POSS.3SG
 ‘You light a fire if there is wood nearby.’
- c. Lamunkhin Even (IDB_traditions_029)
 bi ǵia-čal dže tor-re ujamkam
 1SG friend-COM well.Y earth-LOC mountain.sheep.ACC
 ujamkam=gu bujum=gu bujuse-ridži
 mountain.sheep.ACC=Q wild.reindeer.ACC=Q hunt-ANT.CVB
 ma:-mi bi ǵia-**di** bo:-jekte:k-pin
 kill-COND.CVB 1SG friend-DAT.PRFL.SG give-NEG.Y-PRED.1SG.Y
 ere-**w**
 PROX-ACC
 ‘If I kill a mountain sheep or a wild reindeer while hunting with my friend, I have to give this (carcass) to my friend.’

Furthermore, there are examples where such a supposed switch in matrix language would be occurring across very tightly connected clauses, as in 1a above, where the matrix language of the direct speech is Even, while the main clause would have Sakha as matrix language, or in 7b, 10b, and 11, where the matrix language of the subordinate clause is Even, while the matrix language of the main clause would be Sakha. While this might in theory be possible (Jake & Myers-Scotton 2009:209), it appears rather implausible.

- (11) Lamunkhin Even (stado#10_SEN_traditions_021)
 bujusi-mnja ńari bujun-dule hore-d-**dek-en** ahi
 hunt-AGNR man wild.reindeer-LOC go-PROG-COND.CVB-3SG woman
 e-**jektek** noŋman koje:t-te e-**jektek** noŋandun
 NEG-NEG.Y 3SG.ACC look.at-NEG.CVB NEG-NEG.Y 3SG.DAT
 to:di-t-te ńari hiwkeŋken beje-n hore-**jekte:k**
 help-RES-NEG.CVB man quietly self.Y-POSS.3SG go-NEG.Y
 ‘When a man, a hunter goes after wild reindeer, the woman mustn’t look at him, mustn’t help him, the man has to leave quietly by himself.’

The following interesting example (12a) provides further evidence that the matrix language in utterances with Sakha TAM and subject agreement suffixes is Even, not Sakha. This clause contains the verb root *ia-* ‘do what’, which in Lamunkhin Even functions as a placeholder for verbs when the correct lexical root is not immediately accessible. As shown by 12b,c, this hesitant marker is fully specified for the TAM and subject agreement to be carried by the lexical verb. In 12a, however, the hesitant car-

ries Even TAM and subject agreement marking, while the lexical verb carries the Sakha present tense and associated Sakha subject agreement suffix. As noted above, in Lamunkhin Even the Sakha present tense carries not only present-tense meaning, but depending on the context it can have future meaning as well, explaining this apparent shift in tense between the hesitative and the lexical verb. Given the fact that the hesitative marker carries Even subject agreement morphology and thus defines the matrix language of the clause as Even, it is hard to argue that the Sakha subject agreement morphology on the lexical verb represents Sakha as the matrix language. Rather, this example shows that the Sakha suffixes belong to the Lamunkhin Even morpheme repertoire.

- (12) a. Lamunkhin Even (beseda_0977_RDA)
 bi: emie ia-**dʒi-m** iečemeče-j-**ebin**
 1SG also.Y HESIT-FUT-1SG to.race-CONN-PRS.1SG.Y
 ‘I will also take part in the (reindeer) race.’
- b. Lamunkhin Even (EAK_reindeer_herd_090)
 tara-w hir-gara-ri-w ńajuku-kõ:n
 DIST-ACC to.milk-HAB-PST-POSS.1SG quietly-DIM[EMPH]
 ńajuku-kõ:n hir-nikan ulam ulam
 quietly-DIM[EMPH] to.milk-SIM.CVB gradually.Y gradually.Y
 ia-ri-w tat-ti-w
 HESIT-PST-1SG learn-PST-1SG
 ‘That (reindeer doe) I milked quietly, quietly milking I gradually learned.’
- c. Lamunkhin Even (AXK_Sebjan_history_1_026)
 dʒebeme-d-di narõta-l ia-**galda** mut
 be.hungry-PROG-IPFV.PTCP people.R-PL HESIT-IMP.1PL 1PL
 il-**galda**
 stand.up-IMP.1PL
 ‘Hungry people, let’s stand up.’

The following humorous verse recorded from an Old Russian Settler community in Yakutia (13) provides further support for the ability of fully bilingual speakers to directly insert inflectional morphemes from one of their languages into the other (Sakha elements underlined).

- (13) Old Russian Settlers, Yakutia (Golovko 2003:188; transcription and translation adjusted, glosses mine)
 simpatičnij devuška-nĭ
 pretty.M girl.F-ACC.Y
olus olus ja ljublju
 very.Y very.Y 1SG love.PRS.1SG
 iz-za ètogo, naverno,
 because.of that.GEN probably
tü:n-ü bĭ:ha ja ne splju
 night-ACC.Y throughout.Y 1SG NEG sleep.PRS.1SG
 ‘A pretty girl very very much I like, probably because of that I don’t sleep all night’

Here, the Sakha accusative case marker is added to the Russian noun *devuška* ‘girl’ to achieve both the necessary meter as well as a rhyme with the following line; Russian is presumably the matrix language of the whole verse. Such an insertion of a structural case marker for artistic purposes again shows that fully bilingual speakers are able to

freely draw from both of their linguistic repertoires, and that direct affix copying of inflectional morphology is possible.¹²

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS. The data thus demonstrate that Lamunkhin Even speakers who are fully bilingual in Sakha are able to insert Sakha inflectional suffixes directly into their Even matrix language. This is probably facilitated by several structural factors, namely (i) the typological congruity of the languages, (ii) the easy recognition of Sakha verb stems and thus easy segmentability, and (iii) the specifics of the Sakha TAM system.

First of all, both lects are agglutinative (Sakha even more so than Lamunkhin Even), with rich suffixing morphology. This makes it easy to segment words and to identify individual suffixes. That bilingual individuals are indeed able to identify separate morphemes is shown by comments made during a task in which speakers were asked to judge the acceptability of sentences containing complex copies. In several cases, participants in the task pointed out that the endings in certain verbs were Sakha (e.g. 14a,b).

- (14) a. Lamunkhin Even (judgment task)
 anŋa-j-dak-pit=di:
 spend.the.night-CONN-ASS-1PL=EMPH.Y
 ‘we spent the night, right’ → ‘Sakha ending’ (M29)
- b. Lamunkhin Even (judgment task)
 oða-jakta:k-kit
 finish-NEC-2PL.Y
 ‘you have to finish’ → ‘the ending is Sakha’ (M57)

In this context, the probable indirect process of copying the negative assertive can be explained by typological incongruence: like other Tungusic languages (cf. Hölzl 2015), Even expresses negation with the help of a negative auxiliary that carries tense and subject agreement marking, while the lexical verb carries aspectual marking and is in an invariant negative converbal form (see 3b or 11 above). Sakha, in contrast, expresses negation with the help of various negative suffixes that attach to the lexical verb stem.

Second, since in Sakha (but not in Even) the bare verb stem functions as a 2SG imperative, bare verb stems occur in normal spoken speech. This facilitates the recognition of the verb stem in morphologically complex forms and correspondingly permits easier identification of the suffixes (15a,b) and subsequent transfer to Even roots (15c).

- (15) a. Sakha (RaxA_271)
 če üčügej-dik **olor** die-te, ...
 PTL good-ADVR **live[IMP.2SG]** say-PST.3SG
 ‘“Well, live well” he said ...’
- b. Sakha (RaxA_283)
 ol kurduk olor-**doɣ-put** di: oyo-lor-bun kitta
 that like live-ASS-1PL EMPH child-PL-ACC.1SG with
 ‘So that’s how we live, with my children.’
- c. Lamunkhin Even (MKK_bear_047 [ex. 6b in Pakendorf 2009])
 herile-du a:ŋŋa-j-dak-pit=di:
 stony.mountain-DAT stop.for.the.night-CONN-ASS.Y-1PL.Y=EMPH.Y
 ‘... we spent the night on a stony mountain, right.’

¹² As pointed out by an anonymous referee, this humorous poem illustrates the conscious and creative manipulation of language by bilinguals, raising the question of whether deliberate manipulations may have been involved in the copying of the Sakha paradigms into Lamunkhin Even. The Lamunkhin corpus data do not

Lastly, Sakha has hardly any dedicated TAM markers; rather, the combination of a multifunctional suffix¹³ (generally a participle) with a specific set of subject agreement suffixes results in a particular TAM reading. It is thus not possible to simply copy the assertive suffix, for example; in order to obtain the desired reading, the mood suffix has to be combined with the correct set of subject agreement suffixes. This helps to explain why speakers of Lamunkhin Even copied both the TAM and the person-marking suffixes from Sakha (Pakendorf 2014:301–5).

In conclusion, the data from Lamunkhin Even discussed here demonstrate that direct copying of verbal inflectional affixes is possible, albeit rare. Whether this process was involved in the genesis of Copper Island Aleut can no longer be elucidated. However, it is highly likely that the transfer of the Sakha assertive paradigm into Učur Evenki took place via direct affix copying as well, given that the same enhancing factors as those discussed for Lamunkhin Even would have held in the Učur Evenki–Sakha contact situation. Here, too, the Sakha verb roots would have been easily recognizable and the particular TAM reading of the assertive paradigm would have been achieved only through additional copying of the requisite subject agreement paradigm. Furthermore, Učur Evenki shows the same level of typological similarity with Sakha as Lamunkhin Even. Such typological similarity facilitates the insertion of inflectional morphemes from the model language into the corresponding verb slots in the recipient language. Further research into language contact involving typologically congruent languages might uncover more such cases.

APPENDIX: TABLES OF MORPHEMES ATTESTED IN THE LAMUNKHIN EVEN NARRATIVE CORPUS
(from Pakendorf 2015:173, 175)

	LAMUNKHIN EVEN	SAKHA
1SG	-jAktA:kpIn	-IAχtA:χ -BIn
2SG	-jAktA:kkIn	-IAχtA:χ -GIn
3SG	-jAktA:k	-IAχtA:χ
1PL	-jAktA:kpIt	-IAχtA:χ -BIt
2PL	-jAktA:kkIt // -jAktA:kkI-hnAn	-IAχtA:χ -GIt
3PL	-jAktA:k-A-l	-IAχtA:χ -LAr

TABLE A1. Necessitive mood.

	LAMUNKHIN EVEN	SAKHA
1SG	-dAgIm	-Taχ -(I)m
2SG	-dAgIŋ	-Taχ -(I)ŋ
3SG	-dAgA	-Taχ -(t)A
1PL	-dAkpIt	-Taχ -BIt
2PL		-Taχ -GIt
3PL	-dAktArA	-Taχ -LArA

TABLE A2. Assertive mood.

	LAMUNKHIN EVEN	SAKHA
1SG	-AbIn	-A -BIn
2SG	-AgIn	-A -GIn
3SG	-Ar	-Ar
1PL	-AbIt	-A -BIt
2PL		-A -GIt
3PL	-AllAr	-Ar -LAr

TABLE A3. Indicative present tense.

provide any indications of wordplay involving the Sakha morphemes, making deliberate change unlikely—although this cannot be excluded based on the extant data.

¹³ It should be noted that these suffixes are bound morphemes that show no resemblance to auxiliaries, in contrast to Seifart's (2017:409) description.

	LAMUNKHIN EVEN	SAKHA
1SG	-jAkpIn	-IAχ -BIn
2SG	-jAkkIn	-IAχ -GIn
3SG	-jA:gIn // -jAn	-IAχ -(t)In // -lAn
1PL		-IAχ -BitIn
2PL		-IAχ -GitIn
3PL	-jAktArIn	-IAχ -LArIn
IMPERSONAL	-jAkkA	-IAχ -GA

TABLE A4. Hypothetical mood.

REFERENCES

- ADAMO, EVANGELIA. 2012. Verb morphologies in contact: Evidence from the Balkan area. *Morphologies in contact*, ed. by Martine Vanhove, Thomas Stolz, Aina Urdze, and Hitomi Otsuka, 143–62. Berlin: Akademie.
- COMRIE, BERNARD. 2008. Inflectional morphology and language contact, with special reference to mixed languages. *Language contact and contact languages* (Hamburg studies on multilingualism 7), ed. by Peter Siemund and Noemi Kintana, 15–32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- EVANS, NICHOLAS. 2016. As intimate as it gets? Paradigm borrowing in Marrku and its implications for the emergence of mixed languages. *Loss and renewal: Australian languages since colonisation* (Language contact and bilingualism 13), ed. by Felicity Meakins and Carmel O’Shannessy, 29–56. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- GARDANI, FRANCESCO. 2008. *Borrowing of inflectional morphemes in language contact*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- GARDANI, FRANCESCO. 2012. Plural across inflection and derivation, fusion and agglutination. *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*, ed. by Lars Johanson and Martine Robbeets, 71–97. Leiden: Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789004230477_005.
- GARDANI, FRANCESCO; PETER ARKADIEV; and NINO AMIRIDZE. 2015a. Borrowed morphology: An overview. In Gardani et al. 2015b, 1–23.
- GARDANI, FRANCESCO; PETER ARKADIEV; and NINO AMIRIDZE (eds.) 2015b. *Borrowed morphology*. (Language contact and bilingualism 8.) Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- GOLOVKO, EVGENIY V. 1996. A case of nongenetic development in the Arctic area: The contribution of Aleut and Russian to the formation of Copper Island Aleut. *Language contact in the Arctic: Northern pidgins and contact languages* (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs 88), ed. by Ernst Håkon Jahr and Ingvild Broch, 63–77. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- GOLOVKO, EVGENIY V. 2003. Language contact and group identity: The role of ‘folk’ linguistic engineering. *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances* (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs 145), ed. by Yaron Matras and Peter Bakker, 177–207. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- GRANT, ANTHONY. 2008. Contact-induced change and the openness of ‘closed’ morphological systems: Some cases from native America. *Journal of Language Contact* 2(1).165–86. DOI: 10.1163/000000008792525264.
- GRANT, ANTHONY. 2012. Bound morphology in English (and beyond): Copy or cognate? *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*, ed. by Lars Johanson and Martine Robbeets, 99–122. Leiden: Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789004230477_006.
- HÖLZL, ANDREAS. 2015. A typology of negation in Tungusic. *Studies in Language* 39.118–59. DOI: 10.1075/sl.39.1.05hoe.
- JAKE, JANICE L., and CAROL MYERS-SCOTTON. 2009. Which language? Participation potentials across lexical categories in codeswitching. *Multidisciplinary approaches to code switching*, ed. by Ludmila Isurin, Donald Winford, and Kees de Bot, 207–42. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- JOHANSON, LARS. 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main 29:5.) Stuttgart: Steiner.
- KOSSMANN, MAARTEN. 2010. Parallel system borrowing: Parallel morphological systems due to the borrowing of paradigms. *Diachronica* 27.459–87. DOI: 10.1075/dia.27.3.03kos.

- MATRAS, YARON. 2007. The borrowability of structural categories. *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, ed. by Yaron Matras and Jeanette Sakel, 31–73. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- MATRAS, YARON. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MATRAS, YARON. 2015. Why is the borrowing of inflectional morphology dispreferred? In Gardani et al. 2015b, 47–80.
- MEAKINS, FELICITY. 2011. Borrowing contextual inflection: Evidence from northern Australia. *Morphology* 21.57–87. DOI: 10.1007/s11525-010-9163-4.
- MENOVŠČIKOV, GEORGIJ A. 1968. Aleutskij jazyk [Aleut]. *Jazyki narodov SSSR, Tom pjatyj: Mongol'skie, tunguso-man'čurskie i paleoaziatskie jazyki* [The languages of the USSR, vol. 5: Mongolian, Tungusic, and Paleosiberian languages], ed. by Petr Jakovlevič Skorik, Valentin Aleksandrovič Avrorin, Trofim Alekseevič Bertagaev, Georgij Alekseevič Menovščikov, Orest Petrovič Sunik, and Ol'ga Aleksandrovna Konstantinova, 386–406. Leningrad: Nauka.
- MITHUN, MARIANNE. 2012. Morphologies in contact: Form, meaning, and use in the grammar of reference. *Morphologies in contact*, ed. by Martine Vanhove, Thomas Stolz, Aina Urdze, and Hitomi Otsuka, 15–36. Berlin: Akademie.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, CAROL. 2002. *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MYERS-SCOTTON, CAROL. 2008. Language contact: Why outsider system morphemes resist transfer. *Journal of Language Contact* 2(1).21–41. DOI: 10.1163/000000008792525318.
- MYREEVA, ANNA N. 1964. Očerki govora učurskix èvenkov [A sketch of the dialect of the Učur Evenks]. *Očerki Učurskogo, majskogo i tottinskogo govorov*, ed. by Agniya V. Romanova and Anna N. Myreeva, 6–74. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka.
- NOVIKOVA, KLAVDIJA A. 1980. *Očerki dialektov èvenskogo jazyka: Glagol, služebnye slova, teksty, glossarij* [Sketches of Even dialects: Verb, auxiliary words, texts, glossary]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- PAKENDORF, BRIGITTE. 2007. *Contact in the prehistory of the Sakha (Yakuts): Linguistic and genetic perspectives*. (LOT dissertation series 170.) Utrecht: LOT.
- PAKENDORF, BRIGITTE. 2009. Intensive contact and the copying of paradigms: An Èven dialect in contact with Sakha (Yakut). *Journal of Language Contact* 2(2).85–110. DOI: 10.1163/000000009792497724.
- PAKENDORF, BRIGITTE. 2014. Paradigm copying in Tungusic: The Lamunxhin dialect of Èven and beyond. *Paradigm change in historical reconstruction: The Transeurasian languages and beyond*, ed. by Martine Robbeets and Walter Bisang, 287–310. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- PAKENDORF, BRIGITTE. 2015. A comparison of copied morphemes in Sakha (Yakut) and Èven. In Gardani et al. 2015b, 157–87.
- SEIFART, FRANK. 2012. The principle of morphosyntactic subsystem integrity in language contact: Evidence from morphological borrowing in Resígaro (Arawakan). *Diachronica* 29.471–504. DOI: 10.1075/dia.29.4.03sei.
- SEIFART, FRANK. 2015. Direct and indirect affix borrowing. *Language* 91.511–32. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2015.0044.
- SEIFART, FRANK. 2017. Patterns of affix borrowing in a sample of 100 languages. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 7.389–431. DOI: 10.1075/jhl.16002.sei.
- THOMASON, SARAH GREY. 1997. Mednyj Aleut. *Contact languages: A wider perspective* (Creole language library), ed. by Sarah Grey Thomason, 449–68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- THOMASON, SARAH GREY. 2015. When is the diffusion of inflectional morphology not dispreferred? In Gardani et al. 2015b, 27–46.
- WEINREICH, URIEL. 1953. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

[brigitte.pakendorf@cncrs.fr]

[Received 16 May 2018;
revision invited 3 September 2018;
revision received 17 September 2018;
accepted 28 October 2018]