

Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev and Nino Amiridze
Borrowed morphology: an overview

1 Introduction

Borrowing has traditionally occupied a prominent role in historical linguistics, as it has been viewed as one of the main sources of language change, besides sound change and analogy. While lexical borrowing has attracted particular interest, the borrowing of morphology has generally attracted less attention in the literature. There is no doubt that this can be explained in terms of the apparent relative infrequency of morphological borrowing.

At the turn of the 20th century, two schools of thought dominated this debate. On one hand, advocates of a retentionist view (Müller 1862; Meillet 1921; Sapir 1921; Jakobson 1938) claimed that the borrowing of inflectional morphemes is most unlikely. Most explicitly, Meillet maintained that “il n’y a pas d’exemple qu’une flexion comme celle de *j’aimais*, *nous aimions* ait passé d’une langue à une autre” (1921: 86). On the other hand, Schuchardt, one of the proponents of the opposed diffusionist view (to whom scholars such as Whitney 1881 and Trubetzkoy 1939 also belong), claimed that there are no completely unmixed languages and that morphological borrowing exists (Schuchardt 1884: 9).

The first analytical framework for the study of language contact in general, and borrowing in particular, was provided by Weinreich (1953), who observed that derivational affixes are more easily transferable from one language to another than inflectional affixes, while at the same time reporting instances of inflectional morphemes that were transferred from one language to another (Weinreich 1953: 31–33). Following Weinreich’s seminal work, and based on the apparent resistance of bound morphology to contact-induced change, linguists have interpreted the borrowing of morphology as a reflex of very strong social pressure that one language, the source language (SL), exerts over another, the recipient language (RL). In order to seize different degrees of borrowability, linguists have developed a number of borrowing scales (e.g. Whitney 1881: 19–20; Haugen 1950: 224; Moravcsik 1978: 110–113; Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 74–76; Field 2002: 36–37). All currently accepted hierarchies deem a high intensity of contact to be necessary for morphological borrowing to occur (Matras 2007; Matras 2009: 153–165 and Wohlgenuth 2009: 11–17, provide useful overviews).

The last decade has seen an increased interest in contact-induced morphological change, and several publications reflect this tendency, such as *Borrowing of inflectional morphemes in language contact* (Gardani 2008), *Copies versus cognates*

in bound morphology (Johanson and Robbeets 2012), and *Morphologies in contact* (Vanhove et al. 2012). All in all, a number of attempts have been made to put this field of research on both a theoretical and an empirical footing. Today, thanks to both the compilation of grammars of previously undescribed languages and the publication of studies on structural borrowing based on large cross-linguistic data (e.g. Matras and Sakel 2007a; Wohlgemuth 2009), a substantial number of instances of morphological borrowing are known, and useful comparative analyses – in terms of putatively universal tendencies – have been proposed. Thus, while progress has been made on the empirical side in terms of an extension of the number of attested instances of morphological borrowing, on the theoretical side things have proceeded more slowly. That is, despite the fact that linguists have recognized in their approaches the potential of contact-induced morphological change as a source of evidence for the structure of grammar (see, e.g. Myers-Scotton 2002, 2006; Gardani 2008, 2012; Meakins 2011a), more theoretically inspired work needs to be pursued in order to get deeper insights into the matter and be able to formulate more valid generalizations.

The present book presents advancements in research in morphological borrowing, addressing the need for improving the conceptual and methodological basis of this field of linguistics. The contributions to this volume reflect heterogeneous theoretical and methodological tools, based on the editors' belief that only a variety of approaches can help capture the array of diverse phenomena with which the data confront us.

In the sections that follow, we will sketch the state-of-the-art of current research in morphological borrowing and situate the volume's articles within the research landscape. Among the issues addressed in the volume, one fundamental question concerns the borrowability of morphology. Is morphological borrowing an infrequent phenomenon in cross-linguistic terms, or is it not as rare as is often purported in the literature? A scientific treatment of this question requires, first and foremost, an elaboration of several fundamental distinctions, such as the questions about what is borrowed in terms of matter versus pattern (Section 2), and which type of morphology, derivational or inflectional, is borrowed (Section 3). A further central query relates to the relationship (or distinction) between morphological borrowing *sensu stricto* and phenomena such as code-switching, creolization, and the genesis of mixed languages. Pursuing this last question requires a better understanding of the interplay between sociolinguistic and cognitive conditioning factors of interlinguistic transfer, on the one hand, and different degrees of borrowing, on the other. These issues are treated in Section 4. On the methodological side, the investigation of morphological borrowing is of great importance to historical-comparative linguistics, as correspondences between inflectional and derivational morphemes have often been taken

as strong indicators of, or even diagnostic evidence for, genetic relatedness (see, e.g. Meillet 1921; cf. the discussion in Ross and Durie 1996: 7) (Section 5). No less important are the understanding of cross-linguistic tendencies in morphological borrowing as well as its linguistic and social motivations for linguistic typology and the study of language universals, because morphological borrowing, especially pattern borrowing, is among the principal factors responsible for the diffusion of structural traits and the development of linguistic areas (see, e.g. Ross 1999 or Donohue 2012).

2 MAT-borrowing versus PAT-borrowing

Adopting the terminology of Sakel (2007) and Matras and Sakel (2007b), we distinguish between two types of borrowing: the borrowing of concrete phonological matter (MAT-borrowing); and the borrowing of functional and semantic morphological patterns (PAT-borrowing) from a SL into a RL. (Both types are compatible with borrowing derivation and borrowing inflection; on this, see Section 3.) This distinction is by no means new, and looks back at a rich terminological history. The first type has traditionally been referred to as “borrowing”, “direct transfer”, “direct diffusion”, “transfer of fabric”; the second type has often been called “replication”, “indirect transfer”, “indirect diffusion”, “loan-formation”, “calque”. See also Johanson’s (1999, 2008) terms of “global copying” (roughly corresponding to MAT-borrowing) vs. “selective copying” (roughly corresponding to PAT-borrowing).

Morphological PAT-borrowing implies that a RL rearranges its own inherited morphological structure in such a way that it becomes structurally closer to the SL. An instance of PAT-borrowing from derivational morphology is found in Basque, which replicates a Romance pattern to form deverbal verbs through a prefix expressing repetition. The Basque formative that replicates the Romance pattern expressed by *re-* (cf. Spanish *reproducir* ‘to reproduce’) is *bir-* (or its allomorph *berr-*), as in (1a), compared to the corresponding Spanish lexemes in (1b) (Basque data from Jendraschek 2006: 158–159).

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| (1) | Basque | Spanish |
| | a. <i>aztertu</i> | b. <i>examinar</i> |
| | ‘examine’ | |
| | <i>berr-aztertu</i> | <i>re-examinar</i> |
| | ‘re-examine’ | |

In nominal morphology, a pertinent example of PAT-borrowing is the use of the category of nominal past in Mawayana (Maipurean, Guyana), which has emerged

because of contact with the Cariban languages. In Mawayana, the form *-ba* is suffixed to a nominal element and replicates the Cariban obligatory marking of the nominal past, used to express former possession, deceased persons, gone objects, or pity (Carlin 2006: 322–325). See the use of the suffix to express a former possession in Mawayana, in (2a), and compare it to the Trio (Cariban) equivalents of the nominalized form, in (2b).

- (2) a. *njee* *katabi-ke-ba* *jimaada* (Mawayana)
 human.being catch-AG.NMLZ-PST jaguar
 ‘Jaguar used to catch people.’ (lit. jaguar was a catcher of people)
- b. *witoto* *apëi-ne-npë* *teese* *kaikui* (Trio)
 human.being catch-AG.NMLZ-PST he.was jaguar
 ‘Jaguar used to catch people.’

In this volume, Thomas Stolz provides a fascinating cross-linguistic study on PAT-borrowing, with a focus on NP-internal agreement (concord). Based on a wealth of cross-linguistic data, Stolz proposes and exemplifies three scenarios of change in adjective-noun agreement in contact situations: (1) loss of agreement (Armenian in contact with Turkic); (2) reshaping of agreement on the model of the SL (Nahuatl in contact with Spanish); and (3) rise of agreement (Baltic-Finnic in contact with Indo-European languages).

A subtype of PAT-borrowing is contact-induced grammaticalization or, in Heine and Kuteva’s (2003) terminology, “replica grammaticalization”, which, as they claim, involves the replication of a process of grammaticalization rather than of a fixed pattern. For a recent reassessment of contact-induced grammaticalization, see Wiemer et al. (2012) and in particular, Gast and van der Auwera (2012). For example, based on the model of neighboring Ewe, Likpe (both belong to different branches of the Kwa family in the Niger-Congo phylum, Ghana, Western Africa) has developed plural-marking on a subset of kin terms (the ego’s parents’ generation) and proper names (Ameke 2006: 126–127). The pluralizing suffix *-má*, in (3a), has the same form and meaning as the 3pl pronoun *má*, in (3b) (Ameke 2006: 130).

- (3) Likpe
- a. *éwú* *éwu-má*
 grandmother grandmother-PL
- b. *mə* *lá* *ntí*
 3PL LOC midst
 ‘among them’

The evolution from (3b) to (3a) parallels the Ewe patterns in (4). In Ewe, *wó* is both a plural clitic on nouns (4a) and a third person plural pronoun (4b).

(4) Ewe

- a. *ame* (eve *má=*)**wó** *ko*
 person two DEM=PL only
 ‘only (those two) people’
- b. *wó-dzo* (**wó**)
 3PL-fly 3PL
 ‘They flew (them).’

As we have already mentioned, MAT-borrowing concerns the concrete phonemic matter that an RL takes from an SL. An appropriate example of MAT-borrowing has been described by Breu (1991) for Bulgarian, Macedonian, and other Balkan languages. Throughout the Balkan Sprachbund, the formative *-s-* is productively used as a loanverb marker. It was borrowed from the Greek verbalizer *-iz-*, such as in *alat-íz-o* ‘to salt’ from *aláti* ‘salt’. In Macedonian, for example, the Turkish verb *bit-mek* ‘to finish’ has been integrated as a composite stem *biti-s-*, to which the stem-building formative and the inflections apply (data from Breu 1991).

(5) Macedonian

- biti-s-uv-a*
 finish-LVM-SUFF-PRS.1SG
 ‘I finish’

In our volume, the issue of borrowed loanverb formatives is taken up by Metin Bağrıaçık, Angela Ralli and Dimitra Melissaropoulou, who analyze it in areal terms. Two distinct Turkic suffixes borrowed into several typologically distinct languages are used to create “input forms” (Wohlgemuth 2009, Ch. 5) to accommodate loanverbs from Oghuz Turkic. The distribution pattern of the borrowed suffixes enables the authors to identify two separate linguistic areas. The perfect/inferential marker *-mİş* (accompanied by a light verb) is found in the area including Eastern Asia Minor, Transcaucasia, and Transoxiana, while the past marker *-D(I)* (with no light verb present) occurs in borrowed Turkic verbs in various languages of the area encompassing the Balkan peninsula and Western Asia Minor. Crucially, the paper shows that structural reasons are at hand for the selection of either formative: in the case of *-D(I)*, the selection is determined by the type of base that “is operative in the recipient language for word-formation purposes”, whereas in the second area, the selection of *-mİş* is guided by the independent existence of both perfect grams and the use of a light verb strategy to create denominal verbs in the RLs.

The illustration of MAT-borrowing through example (5) suffices to fill the space of this brief overview, because nine out of ten papers of the volume focus

on MAT-borrowing. This preponderance has been the editors' explicit choice, not least because to date publications have been focusing on PAT-borrowing rather than on MAT-borrowing (see Mithun 2012, for a very recent paper, and many articles in Matras and Sakel 2007a; for contact-induced grammaticalization, see Grandi 2002; Heine and Kuteva 2003, 2005, 2006; Gast and van der Auwera 2012; Wiemer et al. 2012).

Another issue that we placed on the agenda of research on morphological borrowing and which is not systematically represented in the present volume (though cf. the contribution by Felicity Meakins, who investigates the functional development of the Gurindji ergative marker in Gurindji Kriol) is the question of the degree of semantic-functional matching between a borrowed morpheme in the RL and its counterpart in the SL. For example, the study of "relabelling" in creoles and mixed languages (Lefebvre 2008), that is, the process whereby phonetic strings drawn from the lexifier language replace original forms expressing the same concept in the substrate language(s), has shown that the new lexeme has the same semantic and syntactic properties of the original one, but its phonological representation is different. Conversely, lexical borrowing need not involve the transfer of the full polysemy of the SL's lexical items (see, e.g. Weinreich 1953: 55–56; Rohde et al. 1999). Finally, Heine (2012) claims that, in contact-induced grammaticalization, the replica element or construction in the RL almost invariably occupies a less advanced stage of functional-semantic development than its model in the SL. There is thus no reason to assume that MAT-borrowed grammatical morphemes in a RL take over the full gamut of functions of their sources, as is implied, e.g. in Johanson's notion of global copying. As has been repeatedly shown by different scholars (see Winford 2003: 91–92, for an overview), if interlinguistic transfer of morphemes occurs at all, it is the morphemes with a higher degree of functional transparency that are borrowed more frequently. From this, it follows that morphemes that are polyfunctional in the SL, are borrowed into the RL primarily with their more concrete and transparent functions. This claim is supported by studies on the borrowing of Slavic and Germanic verbal prefixes and particles into various contact languages, such as varieties of Romani (see, e.g. Rusakov 2001; Schrammel 2002) or Balkan Romance languages. For instance, in the varieties of Romanian spoken in Serbia, the prefix *do-* borrowed from Slavic denotes the attainment of the final point of motion or activity (Petrović Rignault 2008), as the following example shows.

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------------------|
| (6) | Vlach Romanian | Serbian |
| | a. <i>do-facu</i> | b. <i>do-jesti</i> |
| | PRV-do:PST.3SG | PRV-eat:INF |
| | ‘S/he finished doing sth.’ | ‘to finish eating’ |

Importantly, however, in Vlach Romanian, the borrowed prefix does not have the perfectivizing role characteristic of the SL, Serbian, as well as of the Slavic verbal prefixes, in general. That means that the more abstract function realized by the morphemes of the SL, or even associated not just with particular morphemes but with the whole make-up of the verbal system, has not been introduced into Vlach Romanian. This example alone shows that the semantic aspect of morphological borrowing is *de facto* quite complex and deserves much more attention than, to our knowledge, it has received so far.

In addition to MAT-borrowing and PAT-borrowing, there seems to be a type of morphological transfer that lies in between. In our volume, Eleanor Coghill portrays a complex issue of verbal derivational patterns borrowed from Arabic by three distinct modern Aramaic languages. The distribution of phonological material in the Semitic verbal stem is organized by segmental morphology and more abstract structural templates. Coghill shows that Arabic loan derivations are first largely limited to Arabic loanverbs, but can subsequently spread to the inherited Aramaic lexical stock, giving rise, for example, to a new mediopassive category in Western Neo Aramaic.

3 Borrowability of morphology

It is common knowledge that morphology is a cover term for a rather wide range of phenomena, roughly including compounding, derivation, and inflection, which seem to be processed in different areas in grammar. Accordingly, claims have been made that different areas of morphology show different degrees of propensity for borrowing, which is reflected in the various borrowability scales mentioned above. Generally, it is assumed that derivation is borrowed more frequently than inflection: for example, Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 74–75) situate derivational borrowing (DER-borrowing) at level 3 of their borrowing scale, whereas inflectional borrowing (INF-borrowing) ranks at level 4, the highest level.

With respect to inflection, Gardani (2008, 2012) has shown that variance in the degree of borrowability of inflectional formatives correlates with their classification as realizing either inherent inflection or contextual inflection, according to Booij's (1994, 1996) famous dichotomy. In this connection, the borrowing of formatives that realize features of inherent inflection (i.e. context-autonomous inflection), such as nominal number or semantic case, verbal voice, tense, aspect, negation, mood, or evidentiality, largely outweigh the borrowing of formatives that realize contextual inflection (i.e. inflection induced by obligatory syntactic

government or agreement), such as nominal grammatical case or verbal person, number, and gender.¹

As a prototypical value of inherent inflection, nominal plural has a higher-than-average borrowing rating (Gardani 2012). As a case in point, consider the case of Bolivian Quechua nouns ending in a vowel (the vast majority), which realize the plural via a suffix *-s* borrowed from the contact language, Spanish [data in (6a) from Muysken (2012: 33), based on Urioste (1964)].

- | | | |
|-----|------------------|-----------------|
| (7) | Bolivian Quechua | Spanish |
| | a. <i>algu</i> | b. <i>perro</i> |
| | ‘dog’ | |
| | <i>algu-s</i> | <i>perro-s</i> |
| | ‘dogs’ | |

An example of the rare cases of borrowed formatives that realize contextual inflection is found in Megleno-Romanian, a Balkan Romance language spoken in south-eastern Macedonia and northern Greece. In the Megleno-Romanian varieties spoken in the villages of Nănti, Ošinj, Lundzinj, and Kupă, some verbs, belonging to a specific theme vowel class (*-a-*) and ending in the consonant cluster *muta cum liquida*, display the formative *-ș*, for the 2sg of the indicative present, which is added to the corresponding native Romance formative *-i* on inherited Romance bases (*a antra* ‘to enter’ < Latin *intrare*) [data in (8a, b) from Capidan (1925: 159) and Atanasov (1990)].² The formative *-ș* has been borrowed from south-eastern Macedonian dialects. In (8), the verb form with borrowed formative (8a) is contrasted with the corresponding form both of the same verb in the standard variety of Megleno-Romanian (8b) and of the Macedonian verb *gali* ‘to caress’ (8c).

¹ There is no disguising the fact that the distinction between inflection and derivation is neither obvious nor uncontroversial, and so is the distinction between morphological compounding and formation of phrases in syntax (see, e.g. Booij 2005, 2010). Both dichotomies are to a large extent language-specific. Born out in linguistic studies focusing on Indo-European languages, the distinction between inflection and derivation has proved “particularly elusive” to capture (Laca 2001: 1215). Some scholars (e.g. Bybee 1985; Dressler 1989; Plank 1994) have advocated a non-discrete, gradual distinction along a continuum which matches that ranging from the syntax to the lexicon, while others, like Bauer (2004), have proposed a more refined typology of morphological processes with several, instead of just two or three, major types. Still others (e.g. Behrens 1996; Haspelmath 2013) challenge the validity of this distinction as a universally applicable comparative concept. See Laca (2001: 1215–1218), for an insightful discussion.

² While an explanation of the phenomenon in terms of an internal Romance development is conceivable, too, the explanation in terms of the influence of Macedonian on the Megleno-Romanian dialects cannot be ruled out completely (see Friedman 2012: 324–328).

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------|----|---------------|
| (8) | Megleno-Romanian | | Macedonian |
| a. | <i>antri-ş</i> | b. | <i>antri</i> |
| | enter:2SG-2SG | | enter:2SG |
| | ‘you enter’ | | ‘you enter’ |
| | | c. | <i>gal-iş</i> |
| | | | caress-2SG |
| | | | ‘you caress’ |

While there seems to be a consensus that inflectional borrowing is a relatively rare phenomenon (although its actual frequency in different contact situations is still to be determined in a world-wide typological study), derivational morphology seems to be more susceptible to borrowing. The amount of data collected in a wealth of publications indicate this tendency, although to date there has been no comprehensive survey of the great amount of borrowed derivational morphology in the world’s languages. The general consensus about this claim rests ultimately on the abundance of derivational borrowings in the most studied language of the world – English – dating back to the time when (Middle) English extensively borrowed from French. Recent works, such as the papers collected in Matras and Sakel (2007a), Matras (2009: 209–212) and, especially, Seifart’s (2013) newly published *A world-wide survey of affix borrowing (AfBo)* have provided a collection of numerous instances of derivational borrowing.

A superficial look at *AfBo* shows that adjectivizers, diminutives, and nominalizers rank highest among the borrowed derivational affixes. This conforms to the long-held opinion that categories which carry out “concrete” meaning are more prone to borrowing. We exemplify this with a case from Tetun Dili, an Austronesian language spoken in East Timor, which has borrowed the agentive suffix *-dór* (9a) from Portuguese (9b) and applies it to native roots, as in the following example from Hajek (2006: 172).

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|----|---------------------|
| (9) | Tetun Dili | | Portuguese |
| a. | <i>hemu-dór</i> | b. | <i>descobri-dor</i> |
| | ‘someone who likes to drink’ | | ‘discoverer’ |

On the basis of the currently available evidence and the publications mentioned above, we propose the following tentative borrowability scale for morphology: derivation > inherent inflection > contextual inflection (an idea originally developed in Gardani, in press). Further empirical research and theoretical insights are certainly needed in order to test and refine this generalization and especially to provide a principled explanation for the “differential access” of different kinds of morphology to borrowing, grounded in identifiable cognitive factors rather than in the rather vague and elusive dichotomy between inflection and derivation (cf., e.g. Myers-Scotton’s 4M-model as a possible approach to this issue, see Myers-Scotton 2002).

In this volume, the general issues of borrowability of morphology are addressed from different perspectives by two leading experts in the field of contact linguistics.

Sarah Thomason argues that inflectional borrowing is “considerably more common than one might guess from the general language contact literature” and shows that the borrowing of inflectional matter is especially common in situations characterized by intense contact and by close relatedness of languages and varieties of the same language. In contrast, Yaron Matras argues that cognitive, communicative, and sociocultural constraints inhibit the borrowing of morphological matter, especially inflectional morphology. He maintains that “[s]traightforward cases of borrowed inflectional morphemes are hard to find” and addresses the issue of the differential susceptibility of derivational vs. inflectional morphology to borrowing from the viewpoint of his “activity-oriented” approach (Matras 2009, 2012). Matras – in our view similarly to Myers-Scotton’s theory – considers inflection to be indicative of the language choice made by the bilingual speaker and related to their identity, whereas derivational morphology, because of its heavier semantic load, is in charge of constructing and modifying meanings. In Matras’ terms, “the purpose of borrowed derivational morphology is to replicate procedures of meaning derivation from the source language in the recipient language”, while “the purpose of borrowed inflectional morphology is to re-draw social boundaries”, and thus the borrowing of inflectional morphology, having considerably more far-reaching effects on both the language system and the social identity of the speakers, is “strongly dispreferred”.

In an attempt to reconcile Thomason’s and Matras’s proposals on the borrowability of inflectional morphology in situations of ordinary language contact (for extreme borrowing and language mixing, see Section 4), one might hypothesize that, given a disparity between linguistic communities in terms of prestige, speakers of the less prestigious language who strive for a higher social status may be more prone to borrowing inflectional matter the higher the degree of structural similarity between the languages is. Obviously, only the investigation of morphological borrowing based on the largest possible number of contact situations, diverging in terms of degree of genealogical relatedness, structural congruity of the languages involved, and sociolinguistic scenarios, will allow for robust generalizations and principled explanations of what are preferred and dispreferred types of morphological borrowing.

4 Extreme borrowing and mixed language genesis

Different language contact situations can give rise to different linguistic processes and results. Thomason (2001: 60) proposes a three-fold outline, based on the structural effects induced by language contact, including contact-induced language change, extreme language mixture, and language death. With respect to morphological borrowing, some scholars (e.g. Thomason and Kaufman 1988) treat

ordinary contact-induced change and mixed languages as separate phenomena, based on the argument that languages which have undergone contact-induced change, but are clearly traceable back to a single ancestor from which they descend, cannot be treated on a par with new languages that emerged from the mixture of two or more SLs under specific social circumstances. However, other scholars (e.g. Field 2002; Meakins 2011a), do not differentiate between “ordinary” contact-induced change and language mixing and use “borrowing” to describe both developments due to ordinary contact-induced language change and occurrences of SL-derived formatives in creoles and mixed languages. Clearly, the type of morphology that is found in mixed languages differs – in both quantitative and qualitative terms – from that found in languages that have undergone ordinary contact-induced morphological change. As a matter of fact, the status of a language as a mixed language is acknowledged precisely because it shows (complete) paradigm borrowing.

The transfer of entire inflectional paradigms has long been regarded as the last challenge to morphological borrowability. Weinreich (1953: 44) had observed that the adoption of a full set of morphemes “has apparently never been recorded”. The later-reported case of the Russian-derived finite verbal paradigm in Mednyj Aleut, which was spoken east of Kamchatka in Russia, has been dealt with as a case of borrowing of entire inflectional paradigms (Menovščikov 1969; Golovko and Vakhtin 1990; Thomason 1997). But considering this to be a case of *borrowing* is not uncontroversial, for the very fact that Mednyj Aleut is a mixed language. In (10), we exemplify paradigm borrowing in Mednyj Aleut, comparing the present tense forms of Mednyj Aleut (10a) with those of Russian (10b) and of Bering Aleut (10c) (data from Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 234–235; based on Menovščikov 1969: 132).

(10)	Mednyj Aleut	Russian ³	Bering Aleut
	a.	b.	c.
	1sg <i>uŋuči-ju</i>	<i>stro-ju</i>	<i>uŋuči-ku-q</i>
	2sg <i>uŋuči-iš</i>	<i>stro-iš</i>	<i>uŋuči-ku-xt</i>
	3sg <i>uŋuči-it</i>	<i>stro-it</i>	<i>uŋuči-ku-χ</i>
	1pl <i>uŋuči-im</i>	<i>stro-im</i>	<i>uŋuči-ku-s</i>
	2pl <i>uŋuči-iti</i>	<i>stro-iti</i>	<i>uŋuči-ku-xt-xičix</i>
	3pl <i>uŋuči-jat</i>	<i>stro-jat</i>	<i>uŋuči-ku-s</i>
	‘I/you/he/she/we/they sit’	‘I etc. build’	‘I etc. sit’

³ We have replaced the Russian example given by Thomason and Kaufman through a verb from a more productive inflectional class showing more direct correspondences to the Mednyj Aleut borrowed morphemes; Russian wordforms are given in a broad phonological transcription.

In our volume, Brigitte Pakendorf reports on a case of paradigm borrowing in Lamunkhin Èven. This endangered Western dialect of Èven (Northern Tungusic), spoken in the village of Sebjan-Küöl in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia, Siberia, Russia), has heavily borrowed from the Turkic language of Sakha (a.k.a. Yakut). Two paradigms, the necessitative and the assertive, are established borrowings, while two other paradigms, the indicative present tense and the hypothetical mood, are potentially ongoing borrowings. Also, Pakendorf compares morphological borrowing in Lamunkhin Èven with that in Sakha (Turkic) and shows that, while affixes borrowed from Sakha into Lamunkhin Èven are mostly inflectional, the majority of Mongolic morphological borrowings in Sakha are derivational suffixes. The author demonstrates that it is not similar structural preconditions, such as structural congruence, and similar contact situations (both RLs are subordinate in socio-political terms), but divergent sociocultural characteristics of the two contact situations that have played a determining part in the borrowing asymmetry found. While molecular anthropological material reveals no intimate contact between the Sakha ancestors and Mongols, genetic evidence discloses an intimate, long-lasting social and physical interaction between the Èven and the Sakha, which makes the existence of contact on a close level (through intermarriage and bilingual families) a probable factor boosting inflectional borrowing.

In the discussion of structural changes in language mixing, the case of Gurindji Kriol (northern Australia) is of particular relevance, because it is – to date – the only mixed language to have been documented diachronically from the mid-1970s through to today (McConvell 1988; McConvell and Meakins 2005; Meakins 2011b), although with serious lacunae in the 1980–90s, when extensive code-switching between the Australian language Gurindji and the English-based Kriol started to stabilize, giving rise to the mixed language (Meakins 2011b: 145). Meakins shows that, in Gurindji Kriol, the ergative and dative case-formatives are Gurindji-derived. In the following example, (11a) shows a Kriol-derived noun (cf. English *pussycat*), to which the Gurindji-derived ergative suffix applies (Meakins 2011a: 68), while (11b) shows a noun marked by the same source formative, in Gurindji (Meakins 2011b: 14).

- (11) Gurindji Kriol
- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| a. <i>pujikat-tu-ma</i> | b. <i>ngakpam-tu</i> |
| cat-ERG-TOP | frog-ERG |

In our volume, Meakins deepens her research on Gurindji Kriol and shows that the ergative case suffix not only applies to transitive subjects only optionally

but can also mark (again optionally) intransitive subjects and is thus analyzable as an optional marked nominative rather than an ergative. Meakins shows that the development of the case morpheme from an obligatory and exclusively ergative marker in Gurindji to a pragmatically loaded nominative marker in Gurindji Kriol, is linked to differences in word order and syntactic encoding of information structure between Gurindji and Kriol. All this makes the paper an important contribution not only to the study of mixed languages and morphological borrowing but also to the diachronic typology of case systems.

A topic that has so far never been addressed in the language contact literature is the borrowing of so-called “autonomous morphology” (Aronoff 1994; Maiden et al. 2011).⁴ In our volume, Clancy Clements and Ana Luís investigate a peculiar case of morphological borrowing in Korlai Indo-Portuguese, a Portuguese-based creole language in contact with Marathi, which, in addition to the three conjugation classes inherited (in reduced form) from Portuguese, has created a new inflectional class, specifically for integrating Marathi loan verbs. By investigating the Marathi verbal paradigm, the authors show that the source of the new inflectional class in Korlai Indo-Portuguese was the non-finite form occurring in the Marathi negative imperative construction, and that this inflectional affix was reanalyzed as an inflectional class marker in the RL.

Language mixing under special sociolinguistic conditions seems to be the only known type of language contact in which contextual inflection, such as nominal case markers or verbal person-number inflections, is systematically transferred from one language to another. Going back to Matras’s claim that the borrowing of inflection is a function of “redrawing of social boundaries”, we should relate the fact that the transfer of contextual inflection does happen in situations of language mixing to the sociolinguistic frame in which language mixing occurs. According to a well-established assumption, language mixing can be motivated by dissociation of identity, that is, the wish of one of the groups involved in the contact situation to establish a new social and linguistic identity, distinct at least from the identity of the sociolinguistically and culturally dominating group language. From this, we can infer that the conditions under which

⁴ Autonomous or pure morphology is a kind of morphology that has relevance only for the morphological component of grammar; it doesn’t serve the syntax, nor contribute any kind of meaning, and thus stands by itself. Inflectional class formatives, e.g. in the Slavic and Romance languages, are examples of autonomous morphology.

language mixing occurs, favor the transfer of formatives that realize contextual inflection (on this issue, see, e.g. Croft 2003; Matras and Bakker 2003: 13–15; Meakins 2013: 181, 184–185).

5 Borrowing or inheritance?

As already claimed by Boas (1917, 1920), language contact can affect languages to such an extent that genealogical traceability becomes impossible (see also Swadesh 1951, for the so-called Boas-Sapir controversy). Thomason and Kaufman (1988, especially chapter 8) have proposed to assess genealogical affiliation in situations of language contact in terms of a distinction between “normal” language transmission and abnormal or “interrupted” transmission. In “normal” language transmission, the genealogical traceability of a language is possible even in cases of strong contact influence, whereas in abnormal transmission, usually involving imperfect adult language acquisition, genealogical ties are disrupted and can pave the way for the emergence of mixed languages. In particular, Thomason and Kaufman argue that languages in which the lexicon and the morphology come from different sources are suspect of having undergone abnormal transmission sometime in their history (see Donohue 2013, for a discussion of this issue with respect to the genealogical classification of some Melanesian languages as either “Austronesian” or “Papuan”). Recently, Karatsareas (2009, 2014) has established clarity in the much debated and intricate study of Cappadocian Greek as an extreme case of language change. Focusing on the loss of the Greek traditional tripartite gender distinction into masculine, feminine, and neuter, the author demonstrates that this innovation is not the result of language contact with Turkish, as has been generally claimed in the literature, but rather the result of a series of internal analogical processes, which were probably boosted, but not triggered, by language contact.

Extreme contact situations and their outcomes notwithstanding, recent publications have shown how important it is to distinguish between cognate and borrowed morphological elements (Johanson and Robbeets 2012). In cases in which the genealogical relatedness of languages is still a matter of debate (as, e.g. in the Transeurasian or Altaic hypothesis), this distinction is fundamental, because the identification of certain formally and functionally corresponding elements as inherited from a common antecessor language, and not as of a result of borrowing, provides strong evidence for common genealogical ancestry. Thus, the study of morphological transfer has proved a useful heuristic tool in

investigations of the genealogical relatedness of languages or language groups (see Robbeets 2012, for a fruitful example with respect to the Transeurasian hypothesis; and Whaley 2012, for a study of genealogical relatedness, based on evidence from derivational morphology).⁵ No less relevant is the distinction between “copies” and “cognates” when the focus is both on the degree of contact-induced convergence between genealogically related languages and the origins of morphemes common to two or more languages (see, e.g. Bowerman 2013; Epps 2013; Law 2013; Mithun 2013, for morphological change induced by contact between genealogically related languages).

A particularly telling example of difficulties that possibly arise in the study of morphological borrowing between closely related languages comes from the Slavic-Baltic contact area (see Koptjevskaja Tamm and Wälchli 2001; Wiemer 2003, 2004, 2009; Wiemer et al. 2014). For example, both Slavic and Baltic have verbal prefixes expressing various spatial and non-spatial modifications of the verbal lexical meaning, as well as Aktionsart and perfectivity. Most of these prefixes are cognate, but instances of MAT-borrowing are also attested. In some cases, the Slavic and Baltic prefixes show non-trivial regular phonological correspondences, which makes their status as cognates seem indisputable, cf. Russian *na-* vs. Lithuanian *nu-* or Russian *v(o)z-* vs. Lithuanian *už-*. In the event that formally close morphemes violate the independently established phonological correspondences, borrowing is the only way to account for the presence of a prefix both in Slavic and Baltic, as in the case of Russian *raz-* and Lithuanian dialectal *raz-* (regular sound change would predict Lithuanian **arž-*). However, regular phonological development can produce (nearly) homonymous forms, such as Russian *pri-* and Lithuanian *pri-* or Russian *po-* ([pa-] in unstressed position) and Lithuanian *pa-* (both pairs of prefixes are considered cognates), or Russian *do-* ([da-] when unstressed) and Lithuanian *da-*.⁶ When this happens, cognates cannot be distinguished from potential borrowings on formal grounds only, and more intricate methods should be invoked in order to determine the origin of a particular morpheme; for instance, the distribution

⁵ As a word of warning, the methods of contact linguistics and historical linguistics should not only be applied soundly but also complement each other. The long-held belief that morphology is the most reliable basis for genealogical classification of languages (the so-called “Ludolf’s rule”) may lead to wrong analyses, for example, if borrowings are not recognized as such (see Grant 2008: 166).

⁶ Lithuanian linguists regard the Lithuanian *da-* as a borrowing from Slavic and therefore exclude it from the standard language; this matter is, however, not uncontroversial, see, e.g. Kozhanov (2014) for an assessment.

of its type frequency with respect to the geographical areas with more or less contact between the languages in question and the degree of similarity between the semantic profiles (polysemy patterns) of morphemes in these languages (see Kozhanov 2014 on the application of these methods to the abovementioned prefix *da-* in Lithuanian).

In our volume, the problem of “copy vs. cognate” in morphology is addressed in the articles authored by Martine Robbeets on denominal verbalizers in the Transeurasian languages and by Françoise Rose on pronominal paradigms in Arawakan. Both papers provide detailed empirical analyses and arrive at negative conclusions concerning the possibility that morphological borrowing has occurred. Robbeets investigates “suspect” derivational markers in the languages traditionally known as “Altaic” (Turkic, Mongolic, Tungus-Manchu, Korean, and Japanese) and tests four phonologically similar, denominal verbalizers against a set of criteria designed to determine whether bound morphemes are borrowings or cognates. The diagnostics of borrowing include, among others, the forms’ restriction to bases shared between the languages in question (which are thus possibly lexical borrowing themselves); unilateral morphological complexity of morphemes; morphological, phonological, and functional mismatches; and, limitation of the shared morpheme’s distribution to contact zones. Based on a wealth of data, the author concludes that the correspondences and similarities between the studied forms indicate that they are inherited rather than borrowed. Robbeets’s article is not only rich in empirical evidence but, crucially, provides linguistics with a whole array of criteria to apply to other disputed cases in the historical-comparative research.

By contrast, Rose investigates just one language, Mojeño, and portrays an innovation occurred in its rich pronominal paradigm, in which a distinction based on the gender of the speaker has developed. This distinction is not attested in Proto-Arawak, Old Mojeño, or elsewhere in the Arawak family. Other innovations in Mojeño are the introduction of a non-human third person category and the development of a non-specified third person category. Rose considers all possible genesis explanations, both contact-induced and internally motivated, and shows that none of the potential candidates as SLs of Mojeño’s innovative pronominal forms stands the test. She concludes that there is not sufficient evidence for a borrowing scenario. Even this negative result is, in our view, extremely valuable in terms of methodology, because it makes explicit that the postulation of morphological borrowing requires an extremely accurate examination of the existing linguistic and socio-historical facts, and that the burden of proof for a borrowing hypothesis may sometimes be insurmountable.

6 Conclusion

This introductory chapter portrays the current trends of research in contact-induced morphological change and shows how far the articles published therein advance the field. As we have seen, the volume enriches the research landscape in terms of:

- i. empirical evidence, by providing data on morphological borrowing from a large number of languages;
- ii. methodology, by explicitly addressing cases that are hard to attribute to internal or external causation, or even to the result of multiple causation, and by providing instruments to test the probability of borrowing rather than genealogical inheritance;
- iii. theory, by showcasing what types of morphology are borrowed in the languages of the world and how different degrees of borrowability are explainable, owing to different approaches to language contact, both structurally, functionally, and sociolinguistically inspired.

The ten chapters published in the present volume are thematically divided into three parts. In Section I – Theory – two articles (by Thomason and Matras) discuss the ease of borrowability of morphology. The other three sections of the book are defined by the theoretical issues focused upon in the respective articles. Section II (Coghill; Bağnaçık, Ralli and Melissaropoulou; and Robbeets) deals with the borrowing of derivational morphology in terms of MAT-borrowing, and Section III discusses the borrowing of inflectional morphology, in terms of both MAT-borrowing (Pakendorf; Meakins; Clements and Luís; Rose) and PAT-borrowing (Stolz).

Acknowledgments

The editors strongly believe in the advantages of serious selection procedures. Ten papers, out of fourteen submitted, have been selected for publication in this book. The review procedure was three-fold, consisting for each submitted paper of a blind peer review by external experts, an internal review by the fellow authors, and the editors' review. We wish to thank Evangelia Adamou, Mark Aronoff, Walter Breu, Petra Eccarius, Lenore Grenoble, Eitan Grossman, Ilja Gruntov, Martin Haspelmath, Brian Joseph, Petros Karatsareas, Yury Lander, Marianne Mithun, Pieter Muysken, Stefan Schnell, Eva Schultze-Berndt, Florian Siegl, Donald Winford, Fernando Zúñiga, Inge Zwitterlood, as well as all contributors to the volume for their invaluable help. Thanks are due to Yaron Matras for reviewing the whole manuscript. Usual disclaimers apply.

Abbreviations in glosses

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
AG	agentive
DEM	demonstrative
ERG	ergative
INF	infinitive
LVM	loanverb marker
NMLZ	nominalizer
PL	plural
PRS	present
PRV	perfective
PST	past
SG	singular
SUFF	suffix
TOP	topic

References

- Ameka, Felix K. 2006. Grammars in contact in the Volta Basin (West Africa): On contact-induced grammatical change in Likpe. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic typology*, 114–142. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by itself: Stems and inflectional classes*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Atanasov, Petar. 1990. *Le mégléno-roumain de nos jours: Une approche linguistique* (Balkan-Archiv, Beiheft 7). Hamburg: Buske.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2004. The function of word-formation and the inflection-derivation distinction. In Henk Aertsen, Mike Hannay & Rod Lyall (eds.), *Words in their places: A festschrift for J. Lachlan Mackenzie*, 283–292. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit.
- Behrens, Leila. 1996. Lexical rules cross-cutting inflection and derivation. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 43. 33–65.
- Boas, Franz. 1917. Introductory. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 1(1). 1–8.
- Boas, Franz. 1920. The classification of American languages. *American Anthropologist* 22(4). 367–376.
- Booij, Geert E. 1994. Against split morphology. In Geert E. Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 1993*, 27–50. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Booij, Geert E. 1996. Inherent versus contextual inflection and the split morphology hypothesis. In Geert E. Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 1995*, 1–16. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Booij, Geert E. 2005. Compounding and derivation: Evidence for Construction Morphology. In Wolfgang U. Dressler, Dieter Kastovsky, Oskar Pfeiffer & Franz Rainer (eds.), *Morphology*

- and its demarcations: *Selected papers from the 11th Morphology Meeting, Vienna, February 2004*, 109–132. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Booij, Geert E. 2010. *Construction morphology*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bowern, Claire. 2013. Relatedness as a factor in language contact. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2). 411–432.
- Breu, Walter. 1991. Abweichungen vom phonetischen Prinzip bei der Integration von Lehnwörtern. In Klaus Hartenstein & Helmut Jachnow (eds.), *Slavistische Linguistik 1990: Referate des XVI. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens Bochum/Löllinghausen 19.–21.9.1990*, 36–69. München: Otto Sagner.
- Bybee, Joan L. 1985. *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Capidan, Theodor. 1925. *Meglenoromâni. I, Istoria și graiul lor* (Academia Română. Studii și Cercetări). Bucarest: Cultura Națională.
- Carlin, Eithne B. 2006. Feeling the need: The borrowing of Cariban functional categories into Mawayana (Arawak). In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic typology*, 313–332. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Croft, William. 2003. Mixed languages and acts of identity: An evolutionary approach. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 41–72. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Donohue, Mark. 2012. Typology and areality. *Language Dynamics and Change* 2(1). 98–116.
- Donohue, Mark. 2013. Towards a Papuan history of languages. *Journal of the Linguistics Society of Papua New Guinea* 31(1). 24–41.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1989. Prototypical differences between inflection and derivation. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42(1). 3–10.
- Epps, Patience. 2013. Inheritance, calquing, or independent innovation? Reconstructing morphological complexity in Amazonian numerals. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2). 329–357.
- Field, Fredric W. 2002. *Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Friedman, Victor A. 2012. Copying and cognates in the Balkan Sprachbund. In Lars Johanson & Martine I. Robbeets (eds.), *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*, 323–336. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- 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. In Lars Johanson & Martine I. Robbeets (eds.), *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*, 71–97. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Gardani, Francesco. In press. Morphology and contact-induced language change. In Anthony Grant (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of language contact*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gast, Volker & van der Auwera, Johan. 2012. What is ‘contact-induced grammaticalization’? Examples from Mayan and Mixe-Zoquean languages. In Björn Wiemer, Bernhard Wälchli & Björn Hansen (eds.), *Grammatical replication and borrowability in language contact*, 381–426. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Golovko, Evgenij V. & Nikolai B. Vakhtin. 1990. Aleut in contact: The CIA enigma. *Acta linguistica Hafniensia* 22(1). 97–125.
- Grandi, Nicola. 2002. *Morfologie in contatto: Le costruzioni valutive nelle lingue del Mediterraneo*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

- Grant, Anthony. 2008. Contact-induced change and the openness of 'closed' morphological systems: Some cases from Native America. *Journal of Language Contact* 2(1). 165–186.
- Hajek, John. 2006. Language contact and convergence in East Timor: The case of Tetun Dili. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic typology*, 163–178. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2013. An inflection/derivation distinction on the other side of the globe? <http://dlc.hypotheses.org/388>.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26(2). 210–231.
- Heine, Bernd. 2012. On polysemy copying and grammaticalization in language contact. In Claudine Chamoreau & Isabelle Léglise (eds.), *Dynamics of contact-induced language change*, 125–166. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2003. On contact-induced grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 27(3). 529–572.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2006. *The changing languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1938. Sur la théorie des affinités phonologiques entre les langues. In *Actes du quatrième Congrès International de Linguistes, tenu à Copenhague du 27 août au 1er septembre 1936*, 48–59. Copenhagen: Einar Munskgaard.
- Jendraschek, Gerd. 2006. Basque in contact with Romance languages. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic typology*, 143–162. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johanson, Lars. 1999. The dynamics of code-copying in language encounters. In Bernd Brendemoen, Elizabeth Lanza & Else Ryen (eds.), *Language encounters across time and space: Studies in language contact*, 37–62. Oslo: Novus forlag.
- Johanson, Lars. 2008. Remodeling grammar: Copying, conventionalization, grammaticalization. In Peter Siemund & Noemi Kintana (eds.), *Language contact and contact languages*, 61–79. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Johanson, Lars & Martine I. Robbeets (eds.) (2012). *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2009. The loss of grammatical gender in Cappadocian Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 107(2). 196–230.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2014. On the diachrony of gender in Asia Minor Greek: The development of semantic agreement in Pontic. *Language Sciences* 43. 77–101.
- Koptjevskaja Tamm, Maria & Bernhard Wälchli. 2001. The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and contact*, vol. 2: *Grammar and typology*, 615–748. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kozhanov, Kirill. 2014. Priešdėlio *da-* semantika lietuvių kalboje. In Artūras Jūdžentis, Tatjana V. Civjan & Marija V. Zavjalova (eds.), *Baltai ir slavai: dvasinių kultūrų sankirtos*, 254–274. Vilnius: Versmė.
- Laca, Brenda. 2001. Derivation. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals*, vol. 1, 1214–1227. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Law, Danny. 2013. Inherited similarity and contact-induced change in Mayan Languages. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2). 271–299.

- Lefebvre, Claire. 2008. Relabelling: A major process in language contact. *Journal of Language Contact* 2(1). 91–111.
- Maiden, Martin, John C. Smith, Maria Goldbach & Marc-Olivier Hinzelin. 2011. Introduction: The concept of autonomous morphology. Background and rationale. In Martin Maiden, John C. Smith, Maria Goldbach & Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (eds.), *Morphological autonomy. Perspectives from Romance inflectional morphology*, 1–9. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matras, Yaron. 2007. The borrowability of structural categories. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 31–73. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron. 2012. An activity-oriented approach to contact-induced language change. In Claudine Chamoreau & Isabelle Léglise (eds.), *Dynamics of contact-induced language change*, 17–52. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Matras, Yaron & Peter Bakker. 2003. The study of mixed languages. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *The mixed language debate: Theoretical and empirical advances*, 1–20. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel (eds.) (2007a). *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel. 2007b. Introduction. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 1–13. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McConvell, Patrick. 1988. MIX-IM-UP: Aboriginal code-switching, old and new. In Monica Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*, 97–150. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McConvell, Patrick & Felicity Meakins. 2005. Gurindji Kriol: A mixed language emerges from code-switching. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25(1). 9–30.
- Meakins, Felicity. 2011a. Borrowing contextual inflection: evidence from northern Australia. *Morphology* 21(1). 57–87.
- Meakins, Felicity. 2011b. *Case-marking in contact: The development and function of case morphology in Gurindji Kriol*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Meakins, Felicity. 2013. Mixed languages. In Peter Bakker & Yaron Matras (eds.), *Contact languages: A comprehensive guide*, 159–228. Boston & Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1921. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Paris: Champion.
- Menovščikov, G. A. 1969. Aleutskij jazyk. In P. J. Skorik (ed.), *Jazyki narodov SSSR*, vol. 5: *Mongol'skie, tunguso-man'čžurskie i paleoaziatskie jazyki*, 386–406. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2012. Morphologies in contact: Form, meaning, and use in the grammar of reference. In Martine Vanhove, Thomas Stolz, Aina Urdze & Hitomi Otsuka (eds.), *Morphologies in contact*, 15–36. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2013. Challenges and benefits of contact among relatives: Morphological copying. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2). 243–270.
- Moravcsik, Edith A. 1978. Language contact. In Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson & Edith A. Moravcsik (eds.), *Universals of human language*, vol. 1: *Method & theory*, 93–122. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Müller, Max. 1862. *Lectures on the science of language, delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain in May, April, and June 1861*, 2nd edn. New York: Scribner.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2012. Root/affix asymmetries in contact and transfer: Case studies from the Andes. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16(1). 22–36.

- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2006. *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing.
- Petrović Rignault, Marijana. 2008. *DO-*: étude d'un préfixe verbal en valaque. In Biljana Sikimić & Tijana Ašić (eds.), *The Romance Balkans: Collection of papers presented at the international conference The Romance Balkans, 4–6 November 2006*, 261–288. Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute for Balkan Studies.
- Plank, Frans. 1994. Inflection and derivation. In Robert E. Asher (ed.), *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, vol. 3, 1671–1678. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Robbeets, Martine. 2012. Shared verb morphology in the Transeurasian languages: Copy or cognate? In Lars Johanson & Martine I. Robbeets (eds.), *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*, 427–446. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Rohde, Ada, Anatol Stefanowitsch & Suzanne Kemmer. 1999. Loanwords in usage-based model. In Sabrina J. Billings, John P. Boyle & Aaron M. Griffith (eds.), *Chicago Linguistic Society 35-1: Papers from the main session*, 265–275. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Ross, Malcolm. 1999. *Exploring metatypy: How does contact-induced typological change come about?* Keynote paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Australian Linguistic Society, Perth, 1999.
- Ross, Malcolm & Mark Durie. 1996. Introduction. In Mark Durie & Malcolm Ross (eds.), *The comparative method reviewed: Regularity and irregularity in language change*, 3–38. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rusakov, Alexander Y. 2001. The North Russian Romani dialect. Interference and code-switching. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages*, vol. 1: *Past and present*, 313–337. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. Types of loan: Matter and pattern. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 15–29. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and company.
- Schrammel, Barbara. 2002. *The borrowing and calquing of verbal prefixes and particles in Romani dialects in contact with Slavic and German*. Graz: University of Graz MA thesis.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1884. *Dem Herrn Franz von Miklosich zum 20. Nov. 1883. Slawo-Deutsches und Slawo-Italienisches*. Graz: Leuschner & Lubensky.
- Seifart, Frank. 2013. *AfBo: A world-wide survey of affix borrowing*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available online at <http://afbo.info>.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1951. Diffusional cumulation and archaic residue as historical explanations. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 7(1). 1–21.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 1997. Mednyj Aleut. In Sarah G. Thomason (ed.), *Contact languages: A wider perspective*, 449–468. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact: An introduction*. Edinburgh & Washington, DC: Edinburgh University Press and Georgetown University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Trubetzkoy, Nicolai S. 1939. Gedanken über das indogermanenproblem. *Acta Linguistica* 1(1). 81–89.
- Urioste, Jorge L. 1964. *Transcripciones quechuas I–VII*. La Paz: Instituto de Cultura Indígena.

- Vanhove, Martine, Thomas Stolz, Aina Urdze & Hitomi Otsuka (eds.) (2012). *Morphologies in contact*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Whaley, Lindsay. 2012. Deriving insights about Tungusic classification from derivational morphology. In Lars Johanson & Martine I. Robbeets (eds.), *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*, 395–409. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Whitney, William D. 1881. On mixture in language. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 12. 5–26.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2003. Dialect and language contacts on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the 15th century until 1939. In Kurt Braunmüller & Gisella Ferraresi (eds.), *Aspects of multilingualism in European language history*, 105–143. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2004. Population linguistics on a micro-scale. Lessons to be learnt from Baltic and Slavic dialects in contact. In Bernd Kortmann (ed.), *Dialectology meets typology: Dialect grammar from a cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2009. Zu entlehnten Präfixen und anderen morphosyntaktischen Slavismen in litauischen Insel- und Grenzmundarten. In Lenka Scholze & Björn Wiemer (eds.), *Von Zuständen, Dynamik und Veränderung bei Pygmäen und Giganten: Festschrift für Walter Breu zu seinem 60. Geburtstag*, 347–390. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Wiemer, Björn, Ilja Seržant & Aksana Erker. 2014. Convergence in the Baltic-Slavic contact zone: Triangulation approach. In Juliane Besters-Dilger, Cynthia Dermarkar, Stefan Pfänder & Achim Rabus (eds.), *Congruence in contact-induced language change: Language families, typological resemblance, and perceived similarity*, 15–42. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Wiemer, Björn, Bernhard Wälchli & Björn Hansen (eds.) (2012). *Grammatical replication and borrowability in language contact*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Winford, Donald. 2003. *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2009. *A typology of verbal borrowings*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev, Nino Amiridze (Eds.)
Borrowed Morphology

Language Contact and Bilingualism



Editor
Yaron Matras

Volume 8

Borrowed Morphology

Edited by
Francesco Gardani
Peter Arkadiev
Nino Amiridze

DE GRUYTER
MOUTON

ISBN 978-1-61451-556-2
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-1-61451-320-9
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-1-5015-0037-4
ISSN 2190-698X

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2015 Walter de Gruyter, Inc., Berlin/Boston/Munich
Typesetting: Compuscript Ltd., Shannon, Ireland
Printing and binding: CPI Books GmbH, Leck
♻️ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev and Nino Amiridze

Borrowed morphology: an overview ____ 1

Part I Theory

Sarah G. Thomason

When is the diffusion of inflectional morphology not dispreferred? ____ 27

Yaron Matras

Why is the borrowing of inflectional morphology dispreferred? ____ 47

Part II Borrowing of derivation

Eleanor Coghill

Borrowing of verbal derivational morphology between Semitic languages: the case of Arabic verb derivations in Neo-Aramaic ____ 83

Metin Bağrıaçık, Angela Ralli and Dimitra Melissaropoulou

Borrowing verbs from Oghuz Turkic: two linguistic areas ____ 109

Martine Robbeets

Common denominal verbalizers in the Transeurasian languages: borrowed or inherited? ____ 137

Part III Borrowing of inflection

Brigitte Pakendorf

A comparison of copied morphemes in Sakha (Yakut) and Even ____ 157

Felicity Meakins

From absolutely optional to only nominally ergative: the life cycle of the Gurindji ergative suffix ____ 189

J. Clancy Clements and Ana R. Luís

Contact intensity and the borrowing of bound morphology in Korlai Indo-Portuguese ____ 219

Françoise Rose

Innovative complexity in the pronominal paradigm of Mojeño: a result of contact? ____ 241

Thomas Stolz

**Adjective-noun agreement in language contact: loss, realignment
and innovation — 269**

Index of subjects — 303

Index of languages — 307