The paper illustrates the stability of bound morphology in the Karaim language. The speakers of this small Turkic language have lived in an asymmetric contact situation with speakers of some Slavic and Baltic languages. Examples are given to show how selective copying has shaped Karaim morphology without introducing new morphemes into the language, i.e. without global copying.

1 Introduction

The main concern of this volume is the copiability of bound morphemes and the evidence of shared morphology for establishing genealogical relationship. In this paper, examples relevant for the following two questions will be presented:

- How stable has the morphology of the high copying Karaim language remained in a long-lasting asymmetric contact situation which has lasted for more than six centuries?
- How has selective copying shaped the Karaim morphology without introducing new morphemes into the language, i.e. without global copying? The introduction of an instrumental case and a new auxiliary to denote possibility will illustrate the role selective copying has played in changing Karaim morphology.

2 A Terminological Note

The theoretical model of Code Copying (Johanson 2002) will be used here to describe contact processes. The copying language in the examples to be discussed is the Karaim variety spoken in the territory of present Lithuania. This variety is also known as Troki (Polish) or Trakai (Lithuanian) Karaim (Kowalski 1929; Musaev 1964). The model languages, from which
Karaim has copied, are Slavic languages, Polish, Russian, Belorussian, and the Baltic language Lithuanian.

Global copies are elements copied as whole globes of semantic, combinational (morphosyntactic), material (phonological) and frequential properties. The global copies have been inserted into the grammatical frame of Karaim and adapted to it. For instance, *zvont’ et’* ‘to call’ is a global copy of the Russian verb *zvonit’*. The Karaim auxiliary *et’* ‘to do’ is added in order to adapt the foreign infinitive to the Karaim grammatical frame.

Semantic, combinational, material and frequential properties can be copied selectively on native elements. Thus, for instance, a combinational property of Wh-words in the contact languages is that they take a clause-initial position. This combinational feature has been copied onto Karaim question words to the effect that they are now obligatorily clause-initial. Selective copying does not introduce new lexical items but changes the phonological, morphosyntactic, frequential and semantic properties of native elements.

Karaim interrogative sentences

(1) **K’im k’el’-ir b’ug’ün?**
who come-AOR3SG today
‘Who will come today?’

(2) **Kayda s’en’ t’ir’il’-à-s’?**
where you live-PRES-2SG
‘Where do you live?’

In Turkish, however, Wh-words are preferably in pre-verbal position. See the two corresponding Turkish questions.

Turkish interrogative sentences

(3) **Bugün kim gel-ecek?**
today who come-FUT3SG
‘Who will come today?’

(4) **Sen nerde otur-uyor-sun?**
you where live-PRES-2SG
‘Where do you live?’