



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Contact in the prehistory of the Sakha (Yakuts): Linguistic and genetic perspectives**

Pakendorf, B.

### **Citation**

Pakendorf, B. (2007, December 12). *Contact in the prehistory of the Sakha (Yakuts): Linguistic and genetic perspectives*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Utrecht. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/12492>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/12492>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Stellingen behorende bij het proefschrift

*Contact in the prehistory of the Sakha (Yakuts): Linguistic and genetic perspectives*  
van Brigitte Pakendorf

1. The optional person-marking on Sakha converbs cannot be attributed to Evenki contact influence, but represents an internal innovation (contra suggestions by Ubrjatova 1976: 45, and Johanson 2001: 1732)
2. The development of [s] to [h] in Sakha is a very recent internal innovation and cannot be attributed to Northern Tungusic substrate influence (contra suggestions by Menges 1978: 254 and Ubrjatova 1985a: 46).
3. Sakha has developed an indefinite accusative meaning out of the Partitive case under Evenki influence.
4. Under Evenki influence, Sakha has developed a Distant Future Imperative in addition to the Immediate Future Imperative paradigm that it inherited from its Turkic ancestor.
5. The distinct kinds of contact influence that Sakha has undergone from Mongolic languages and from Evenki indicate that the sociocultural parameters of the two contact situations were quite different.
6. Sakha 2<sup>nd</sup> person possessive suffixes are used for ‘non-possessive’ purposes, thus making Samoyedic contact influence in Dolgan implausible (contra Stachowski 1998).
7. The distinction between a Dative and Allative is not a Siberian areal feature (contra Anderson 1998: 13).
8. Markers of epistemic modality can develop into markers of deontic modality, in contradiction to the universal proposed by Bybee and Pagliuca (1985: 66) (Pakendorf & Schalley in press).
9. An ideal study of language contact should include sociolinguistic or social anthropological research as well as molecular anthropological investigations; focussing only on linguistic factors will result in a unidimensional view of the processes involved.
10. Whether the ‘pedigree-based’ or the ‘phylogeny-based’ mutation rate is used in estimates of times of divergence or times of migration needs to be decided with a view to the specific time frame of the event in question.
11. Evidence of recombination in mtDNA of individuals with mitochondrial diseases cannot be taken as evidence of recombination in human mtDNA per se.

12. Social structure has an impact on genetic variation not only in humans, but also in non-human primates.
13. The reason why the Sakha were able to expand numerically ultimately lies in their pastoralist economy.
14. The morphology of Tungusic languages indicates that kinship plays an important role in Tungusic-speaking groups.
15. Thought exists without language – and language exists without thought.