

POSITION OF KARAIM AMONG THE TURKIC LANGUAGES

Henryk Jankowski

The goal of this paper is to assign a proper place to Karaim within Turkic languages. For this reason, both the traditional classifications (Benzing 1959; Menges 1959; Baskakov 1960) and the structural classification by Tekin (1991) were revised. At the same time, Karaim was compared with Armeno-Kipchak, as postulated by Kowalski (1929), and with Krimchak. An important question is: can Western Karaim be correlated with Crimean Karaim? Attention is also paid to written and spoken variants of languages, and some aspects of historical development of the modern languages are touched upon.

1. KARAIMS AND THEIR LANGUAGE

What is certain about the history of Karaims in Eurasia is that these followers of Karaism inhabited the Crimea prior to the 13th-century Mongol invasion. At the time of the split of Crimean Karaim community into western and Crimean group, which occurred at the end of the 14th century, they had already possessed a full-fledged Turkic language. Since this language is closely affiliated to Kuman as documented at the beginning of the 14th century in *Codex Cumanicus*, it must have been adopted, if ever, at least four or five generations earlier, i.e. 100–120 years before. After the resettlement of approximately four hundred Karaim families to Lithuania, new communities were founded in Trakai (Pol. Troki, Kar. Troχ),¹ and then in what is now Ukraine, notably Luck (Pol. Łuck, Kar. Łucka),

¹ In this paper, the original writing of quoted sources is retained as much as possible, but in the case of a few letters it had to be changed; in such an event, attempt is made to follow the current writing used by Karaims in Troki, except palatalization which is marked on every

Halich (Pol. Halicz, Kar. Halic) and Lviv (Pol. Lwów, Kar. Ilew ~ Ilow).² This resulted in isolation of the lives and languages of these new communities, although the contacts have never been completely broken.

Because of a well documented past, Karaim along with Krimchak are the most important North-Western Turkic languages for the study of language history. They are also important from the point of view of general Turkology, for the period of language history they span with Kuman, which was spoken in the preceding period, encloses six hundred years. After critical edition of texts, we will have a unique opportunity to write a historical grammar of North-Western Turkic.

1.1. Identity of Karaims

There is no unique identity shared by all Karaims. Turkic identity became particularly popular with the activities of Seraia Shapshal, the later hakham, in the Crimea, Turkey and Poland in the 1920s, and accepted by eminent Karaim intellectuals, including such renowned linguists as Ananiasz Zajączkowski. Even activists like Mardkovicz, who coined many new words and terms, but did not purify the language of the existing Hebrew lexicon, accepted the Turkic theory.³ This was very important to strengthen the unity of Polish Karaims, and resulted in a spectacular renaissance of social life, culture and language. The Turkic identity also became a constructive basis for a language reform. Many old Karaim words

letter except *r*, also in transcription. As for other Turkic languages, Turkological transcription is used; for Crimean Tatar, the adapted Latin script.

² Crimean Karaim is practically extinct, and the western Karaim is utmost endangered. In Luck the Karaim community no longer exists, in Halicz there are only six or seven individuals who use the Karaim language everyday; in Troki there are ten to fifteen Karaims who have a command of the language, but only three of them speak Karaim regularly, see Csató 1998: 84 (note, however, that more than thirty years earlier Musaeu also said that there were only three or four people able to speak the language (Musaeu 1964: 7). Some of my informants were more optimistic than these figures would allow one to be: they told me that despite a constant mourning over Karaim, they believe in the vitality of their language and community). In Poland, only few people of the oldest generation speak and understand their mother tongue; the Karaims in Vilnius have never formed an impact territory where they could have practised the language. The situation of Karaim in Poniewieżys is similar to that in Troki.

³ In an editorial letter, he writes in Polish ... *uwazamy się przecież za narodowość turecką* '... after all, we consider ourselves a Turkic nationality' (*Karay Awazy* 12, 12). There is an interesting example of a complex, national, territorial and religious identity in a patriotic poem by J. Malecki *Mien barm Karai* ... 'I am a Karai', in which the author writes "our ancestors narrated to us that we are Anan's and Nasi's sons (*ki biz ulanlary Anan ol Nasinin*), but he soon adds *Krym, Dżuŝt-Kale, Micri da Lietuva da chally Lechistan, chaz zamandahylėj*] ... *Karaj ulanlaryn abrejdlar biugiunlej* 'The Crimea, Chufut Kale, Egypt and Lithuania, and the strong Poland, so today as in the past ... protect the sons of Karais' (J. Malecki 1939: 22).

have been revitalized. At the same time, Hebrew vocabulary was reduced.⁴ The Turkic identity is now officially declared by the leaders of the Crimean Karaim Association who even adopted a new self-denomination *karai – krymskie karaimy-tjurki* ‘Karais – the Crimean Karaites-Turks’, which however did not prevent them from the language loss. Not all Karaims in Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine and Russia have accepted this identity feeling. Some Karaims still prefer to search their origins among the sons of Abraham and Moses. They have firm grounds for this in the old religious tradition. For instance, in a Karaim catechism published in 1890 and approved by the hakham, we read,

Originating from Abraham’s offspring, the nation of Israel, we Karaims profess the Law of Moses. ... We adopted the epithet *Karaim* (קראים) after the appearance of Talmud, to distinguish ourselves from Talmudists (Duvan 1890: 6).

In the past, the most important identification was that pronounced in Hebrew *bne miqra’*, or *qaraim*, that is people who profess Karaite religion. Zarachowicz says that the fundamental task for Karaims is to practise religion and preserve the native language (Zarachowicz 1926: 6). At the same time, as we can see in Malecki’s work (1890: v), the Crimea was perceived as their homeland (“the solid rock”), and the biblical patriarchs and prophets as their forefathers. Moses was regarded by him “our lord” (*Moše ribb’im’iz*). In this connection the relationship between Rabbinic Jews and Karaims, usually presented in the terms of enmity, should be closely examined. Naturally, the relations changed over time, depending on community and even personal attitudes. For instance, Malecki is very hospitable towards the Jews his ancestors met in Lithuania at the time of immigration (Malecki 1890: v). He says that his ancestors accepted from them what was not against their doctrine.⁵ On the other hand, Grzegorzewski (1903: 47), who was utmost objective and far from any national antipathy, provided a H term for ‘Jew’ *kijik* (absent from KRPS in this denotation), which must have been strongly derogative since the meaning of it is ‘wild’. It seems that Karaims lived with Jews in peaceful co-existence as long as they did not insult them nor abused their rights. For example, after the publication of an ill-disposed study towards Karaims by Bałaban, who accused them of pretending to be the best among Jews, A[nanjasz] R[ojecki] responded, “Karaims [...] not being Jews (for they differ from Jews in both faith and ethnos), do not need to pretend to be Jews” (Rojecki

⁴ The Turcization of the Karaim language continued until recently with the activities of the senior hazzan Michał Firkowicz/Firkovičius. The so-called “de-Hebraisation” of Karaim vocabulary was touched upon by Altbauer (1979–80), but there are a few debatable points in this article.

⁵ Munkácsi has demonstrated that some religious hymns have been adopted by Karaims from Rabbinic Jewish literature (Munkácsi 1909: 187).

1924: 3). Detailed discussion of this problem should be the subject of another study.

Karaims did not use a unique term for their language for a long time. When writing in Hebrew, they referred to their language either by the name *Qedar*, which is the Hebrew word denoting the territory of the Crimea and north of Black Sea, e.g. *lešon Qedar*⁶, *lašon Qedari*⁷, *bisfat Qedar*⁸ or the word Tatar, e.g. *lešon Tatar*⁹. When referred in Russian, Karaim was mostly called *karaimskoe narěčie*¹⁰ 'Karaim dialect' or *na razgovornom" narěčii karaimov"* (Kobecki 1904).¹¹

Western Karaims usually called Jews *Rabbanlar* (*Karay Awazy* 12, 2–3; KRPS 451).¹² The Hebrew language was always of the highest prestige, even to those who were strongly pro-Turkic. The Hebrew language, except the later scholarly literature, was never called Hebrew, but 'holy tongue' *lešon kodeš*¹³ or *aziz' til*, which is its Turkic equivalent (Malecki 1890: vii). Sometimes other terms also appeared, e.g. *eski Tenach til* (Kokenai 1939: 30). When referring to Hebrew in Polish, Karaims called it 'the language of the Bible' (*język biblijny*) or 'holy tongue' (*święty język*) (Zarachowicz 1926: 6). It is not clear if the formulation *perevod s drevne-evrejskago jazyka* 'translation from the Old Hebrew language' in the publisher's note of Malecki (1890) appeared independently of the author or was put by him because it was in Russian.

There is also an interesting Khazar identity,¹⁴ very popular among Karaim intellectuals, but in lack of sound arguments it is very doubtful if this hypothesis will ever be definitely accepted or rejected.¹⁵

⁶ לשון קדר, as in the title of Malecki's prayer book (Malecki 1900); see also Pritsak 1959: 318.

⁷ לשון קדרי, as in the front page of the printed translation of Pentateuch into Karaim by Mickevič & Rojecki (1889), quoted from Kowalski 1929: lxxvi.

⁸ As in the title of the translation of Lamentations by Simcha Dubiński, published in 1895 (quoted from Altabauer 1979–80: 53: *bisfat Qēdār*).

⁹ לשון טטר, as in the front page of the Bible translation published in 1841 in Eupatoria, *Sefer Targum* 1841; the author of the translation of the Book of Ruth into Krimchak (published in 1906) also called his language Tatar (I E3).

¹⁰ As in the note in Russian in the title page of Malecki (1900).

¹¹ Quoted from Kowalski 1929: lxxviii.

¹² The CKar. term *Čufut* (KRPS 633) < *ğuhūd* < Ar. *yahūd* came into use with the Turkic influence.

¹³ For example, in a translation of the Book of Job (Kowalski 1929: 1) and in Malecki 1890: vii; the same name for Hebrew is used by Krimchaks (Polinsky 1991: 130).

¹⁴ Note that the Khazar identity is not an exclusive Karaim idea. In the past, it was very popular among many Rabbanite Jews in Eastern Europe, and was contested by Karaims, see an editorial article in *Karay Awazy* (1939, pp. 2–3). In addition, on the wave of the Soviet anti-Jewish policy and Nazi extermination, some Krimchaks also adopted a pro-Turkic and Khazar course (for the critique of this, see Polinsky 1991: 125).

1.2. Distinctive features of the linguistic situation of Karaims

The distinctive features of Karaim linguistic situation are the following:¹⁶

1. All Karaims have been at least bilingual for at least two centuries, but Western Karaims much longer.
2. They have never had their own state.
3. They live in dispersed communities, having no common homeland, no common second language.¹⁷
4. Within the north-western group of the Turkic languages, they share a common trait with Urums, Armeno-Kipchaks and Krimchaks:¹⁸ they are non-Muslims; this fact has a few linguistic implications.¹⁹
5. With Krimchaks they share the following further features:
 - 5.1. There is an admixture of Jewish blood in Karaims and Krimchaks.²⁰
 - 5.2. Their language of liturgy, science and communication with other religious communities was Hebrew (Kowalski 1929: xix–xx).
6. Karaims have been for centuries an endogamous society; inter-marriages with members of other groups are tolerated only recently, but children of mixed couples are still not considered Karaims by

¹⁵ Careful scholars like Kowalski approached the Khazar theory with caution. See also Pritsak 1959: 318–319, which contains many valuable details on Karaims, and is still a very useful, concise description of Western Karaim.

¹⁶ Musaev showed the following three distinctive features of Western Karaim that distinguish it from the other Turkic languages: 1. The lowest number of speakers 2. Surrounded by non-Turkic speaking peoples, and 3. Non-compact character of their habitats (Musaev 1964: 6).

¹⁷ Once Hebrew, then for some time, Russian was best intelligible.

¹⁸ Urum is now an endangered language, Armeno-Kipchak is extinct, and Krimchak is not a language of communication after the Nazi holocaust of this people in 1941 and 1942 (Polinsky 1991: 130, and my own fieldwork in the Crimea); however, it must be observed that recently significant measures have been taken to revitalize the Krimchak culture and language: in 1989 a Krimchak Association of Culture and Education *Qrimčaxlar*, and a school for children *Pxata Axtiğin Midraši* was founded (Ačkinazi 2000: 136).

¹⁹ Kowalski (1929: lxxv) did realize this. Naturally, he could not use the Krimchak material, for this was not available at that time, and the Old Karaim was only accessible in the 1841 edition of the Bible.

²⁰ According to Kowalski (1929: ix–x), the Western Karaims are a mixture of Turkic and Jewish anthropological type.

many. For this reason, the number of Karaim language speakers constantly diminishes.

2. POSITION OF KARAIM IN TURKOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATIONS

It was Kowalski who first proved that Western Karaim is most cognate with Kuman as documented in *Codex Cumanicus*, and with Old Written Armeno-Kipchak (Kowalski 1929: lix–lxv, lxvi–xxi), although attention to this had already been drawn by Radloff and Grzegorzewski.

Menges (1959: 6) classifies Karaim together with Kumuk, Karachai-Balkar and Crimean Tatar within the Ponto-Caspian group of Turkic languages. Also Baskakov (1960: 142) links these languages within a subgroup, calling it the Kipchak-Kuman (Polovets) subgroup of the Kipchak group. Benzing (1959: 1) positions Karaim within one group with Karachai-Balkar and Kumuk, but separates it from Crimean Tatar.

In his grammars of Western Karaim, Musaeu also classifies Karaim in the same group (Musaeu 1977: 5; 1997: 255).²¹ In his most detailed description, Musaeu outlines the classifications of Karaim presented by Turkologists so far (Musaeu 1964: 17–19). A similar position is assigned to Karaim by scholars of Karaim origin, e.g. Zajaczkowski (1931: 5) and Firkovičius (1996: 14).²²

In a very interesting, structural classification of Turkic languages, Tekin classifies the Karaim language in the so-called *tawli* group. This group in Tekin's classification falls into five subgroups, the Halicz dialect of Western Karaim being placed in the 2nd, *qos*- subgroup, the Troki dialect of Western Karaim in the 3rd *qoš*- subgroup; furthermore, Halicz dialect belongs to the *yas*- division (as a reflex of Common Turkic *yāš*), whereas the Troki dialect belongs to the *beš* division (as a reflex of Common Turkic *bēš*) (Tekin 1991: 13–15).²³

Now we shall check to what extent these groupings are applicable. Firstly, if we put aside the aforementioned shortcomings, Tekin's classification is basically correct. However, in the case of Karaim, it turns out that a classification based

²¹ At the same time, he formulates an opinion that Crimean Karaim has been assimilated to Crimean Tatar, and that there is no unique Karaim language.

²² In Zajaczkowski's view, Western Karaim belongs to so-called Kipchak or Kipchak-Kuman, or north-western group of Turkic languages; he also subdivides Western Karaim into the northern (Troki) and southern group (Łuck-Halicz). Firkovičius places his mother tongue in the Western Kipchak group of a "Turkic subfamily", along with the same, most closely affiliated Karachai, Kumuk and Crimean Tatar.

²³ However, this classification has also a few inadequacies, e.g. Crimean Karaim has been neglected, Karachai-Balkar should be distinguished from other languages in "X. 3. *qoš*-" group, since it is a *ğoš* language and cannot be joined with Kumuk, Troki Karaim, Crimean Tatar etc.

only upon phonological criteria is insufficient. Then, applying morphological criteria, we shall test the validity of traditional classifications. If we examine noun (but not pronoun) case suffixes, Crimean Tatar is the language that best preserved a paradigm which is most similar to Western Karaim. In Karachai-Balkar and Kumuk, there is a change *-nIŋ > -nI* in the genitive, in Karachai also *-lAr > -lA* (but in Balkar *-lAr*), in Kumuk *-lAr > -lA* before some case suffixes. In addition, Karachai has also changed some verbal person suffixes, from *-mAn, -sAn* into *-mA, -sA* (as opposed to Balkar *-mAn, -sAn*). With regard to function words with no meaning but grammatical function, Karachai-Balkar has more postpositions common with Western Karaim which do not exist in Kumuk, e.g. *deri* 'to; until', *sartin* 'because of', while Kumuk shares with Western Karaim a few question words, which Karachai-Balkar does not possess, e.g. *nek* 'why' and *nelik(ke)* 'what for'. Despite the case suffixation of Crimean Tatar mentioned above, it is certain that this language was deeply affected by Turkish, and lost many features typical of the group, so its similarity to the other languages is problematic. Moreover, when we examine syntax, we shall see that Western Karaim and some varieties of Crimean Karaim should be separated from the other languages, i.e. Kumuk, Karachai-Balkar and Crimean Tatar,²⁴ and located in a different subgroup. Ianbay and Erdal speak of a "non-Muslim Western Turkic syntax" which is typical of Krimchak, Gagauz, Polish, Lithuanian and Ukrainian varieties of Karaim, the Turkish dialect of Balkan Gypsies and Armeno-Kipchak (I E5).²⁵ Csató (1998: 87) calls Western Karaim a "Europeanised Turkic language".

All these classifications disregard Krimchak and Urum. Krimchak, as is known, is a Turkic ethnolect of a small group of Crimean Rabbanite Jews, whereas Urum is the Turkic language of Crimean Greeks, resettled in 1778 to the northern coast of the Azovian Sea. Both are very close to Crimean Tatar.²⁶

²⁴ Note, however, that the infinitive *-mA* in Kumuk resembles that in Western Karaim, because it is used to express various functions with auxiliary verbs, e.g. inchoativity (*-mAgA bařla-*), ability (*-mAgA bil-*), permission (*-mA bol-*) and necessity (*-mA(g)A kerek*).

²⁵ Probably the retention of the non-Kipchak and non-Oghuz strata of Kumuk and Karachai-Balkar should be attributed to the non-Turkic admixture to their ethnic components. Surprisingly, Kumuks, Karachais and Balkars are by some scholars all held to be indigenous Caucasian peoples, Turkicized in a later period, not to speak of a hypothetical influence of Khazar (Golden 1992: 389–391). Islam was finally implemented to Balkars as late as the 17th–18th centuries, and Kumuks are related to the Caucasian, Christian people of *Ġumiq*.

²⁶ Since Radloff's claim that the dialects of Crimean Karaims, Krimchaks and Greeks do not differ from the surrounding Tatar dialects (Radloff 1896: xvi), although this view was soon rejected by Samojlovič, Turkology reference books have disregarded these languages until 1997. On Krimchak, see Rebi, Ačkinazi & Ačkinazi 1997; on Urum, there is a new monograph with language documentation by Garkavec, published in 1999 in Almaty. However, since it is still inaccessible, Urum language evidence was not taken to this paper.

3. LEXICAL SIMILARITIES OF KARAIM, KRIMCHAK AND ARMENO-KIPCHAK

It is worth noting that except *ki*²⁷ no Hebrew conjunction, preposition or other function words are used in Karaim and Krimchak. All the other lexical items borrowed from Hebrew are meaningful words, mostly nouns, including proper names. Verbs are usually derived by internal, Turkic derivation. From this fact, we can draw two conclusions. First, at the time when Hebrew loanwords were borrowed, both Karaims and Krimchaks possessed a complete grammatical system of a Turkic language. In this system, there already were many function words copied from Persian, as *anuz* ~ *ajiz*, *eger*, *har*, *vali*, *ki* etc. This system was sufficient for the adaptation of all Hebrew syntactic structures copied from canonical and liturgy texts. Second, Krimchaks and those Karaims who were of Jewish origin must have changed their Hebrew language much earlier. Further development of the language proceeds in the way of very intensive, direct language contacts. These languages were Polish for Western Karaims and Tatar, then Turkish for Crimean Karaims and Krimchaks. The grammatical structure of Polish made it possible to preserve non-agglutinative syntactic structures in the spoken language, and thus additional Slavic function words, such as *a*, *ale*, *no*, *okom/okrom*, *puki*, *to* were borrowed, whereas the structure of Tatar and Turkish limited the infiltration of these structures into spoken Krimchak and Crimean Karaim. An overt "un-Turkic" syntax of some Krimchak texts in Polinsky (1991) is a result of recent dramatic events, which brought about language change.

Karaim, Krimchak and Armeno-Kipchak possess a vocabulary that is alien to Crimean Tatar.²⁸ For example, *alay* ~ *alej* (KRPS *hk* 61, 67; I E 21, Tr. 61) 'thus; so'; *bulay* ~ *bulej* (KRPS *hk* 138, *t* 140; I E 17; Tr. 167) 'thus'; *küčey-* ~ *k'uč'ej-* ~ *kicej-* (KRPS *k* 355, *t* 397, *h* 325; I E 17) 'to get strong' (in AK in the transitive form *kučayt-* 'to strengthen', Tryjarski 1993: 96) *nečik* ~ *n'eč'ik'* ~ *necik* (KRPS *t* 419; *kh* 422; I E 21; Polinsky 1991: 135), *něčik'* Tr. 546); *tigel* ~ *tügel* ~ *t'ug'al'* (KRPS *h*, *k*, *t* 524, 551, 569; I E 16), *tugal* (Tr. 783–784) 'thorough; full; perfect'.

Some words are used in different forms, e.g. *anuz* ~ *hanuz* (KRPS *t* 70 ~ *th* 164 etc.), *ajiz* (I E 16), *hanuz* (Tr. 267–268) 'more'; *čöple-* ~ *č'op'l'a-* (KRPS *k* 632; 628 etc.; I E 18), *čopla-* (Tr. 197) 'to gather, glean'; *keret* ~ *k'er'at'* ~ *k'eret*

²⁷ The Hb. *ki* 'for, because' is homophonous with Per. *ki* 'that, which' etc., therefore, it is difficult to determine the origin of this word even in a totally copied Hebrew construction.

²⁸ For a comparison of Armeno-Kipchak and Crimean Tatar vocabulary, see Tryjarski 1992: 332; 345–349.

(KRPS *h* 307, *t* 308, *k* 393; I E 17; in CTat. *kere* < Tur.)²⁹ ‘time; -fold’; *kibik* (KRPS *thk* 316; I E 16), *k’ibik*, *k’yibik* (Tr. 391–392) ‘like, as’.

Furthermore, Western Karaim and Armeno-Kipchak share an old Kuman vocabulary that disappeared from modern languages in the group, e.g. Kar. *jerge* (with variants, KRPS *thk* 273, 274) ‘range; degree; article’ etc., AK *jerga* ‘rite’ (Tryjarski 1993: 108); Kar. *koltka* ~ *koltcha* ~ *qoltqa* (KRPS *thk* 331, 369), AK *χoltχa* (Tr. 485); *umsun-* (KRPS *thk* 578), AK *umsan-* (Tr. 805) ‘to hope’.

We cannot maintain that these words were never used in Crimean Tatar, Kumuk and Karachai-Balkar. Some of them could exist in these languages, being over time replaced with Turkish and other equivalents.

It is the vocabulary of religious and liturgy terms that distinguishes Armeno-Kipchak, as a language of Christians, from the languages of Karaims and Krimchaks, as peoples who profess Karaism and Judaism. For example, Karaim and Krimchak possess the following Hebrew words: *adonay* אֲדֹנָי (KRPS *th* 46; I E 17); ‘God’; *malax* מַלְאָךְ (KRPS *th* 402;³⁰ I E 16) ‘angel’; *navi* נָבִיא (KRPS *th* 417; I E 15) ‘prophet’; *pesax* פֶּסַח (KRPS *th* 447, 450; I E 17) ‘Passover’; *raša* רָשָׁע (KRPS 452) ‘sinner’, (I E 17) ‘wicked’; *tame* טָמֵא (KRPS *h* 510) ‘pork fat, bacon’, (I E 16) ‘unclean’; *tefila* תְּפִילָה (KRPS 568 etc.; I E 16). In contrast, many religious terms in Armeno-Kipchak have been borrowed from Armenian and Polish.³¹

There can be other common Hebrew words in spoken Karaim and Krimchak. However, modern Krimchak texts available give a very scant evidence of them. Among phrases provided by Rebi (1993: 21–26), only one Hb. word was found. It is *mexila* < Hb. מַחֲיִלָה, in the expression *mexila qollayim* (Rebi 1993: 25) ‘Excuse me’, H *mechilla* (KRPS *h* 416).

There are also some genuine Trk. words in Karaim and Krimchak, which probably existed in Old Kuman, but cannot be evidenced in the modern languages, e.g. WK *karuv* ~ *qaruv* (KRPS *ht* 295, *k* 364) ‘answer; responsibility’; *qarov* (I E 46) ‘recompense, reward’, loanwords that do not exist in corresponding forms or meanings in other modern languages of the group, e.g. *šeraatčī* and *šeraat et-* (Jankowski 1997: 73; I E 15) ‘judge’ and ‘to judge’ (Ar. *šarī‘at* + Trk. *et-*), *tutki* (KRPS *k* 549; I E 17) ‘as if’ (Trk. *tut* + Per. *ki*).

²⁹ The CTat. form is certainly a new loanword from Tur. < Ar., whereas the form *keret* can reflect an earlier borrowing from Per. *kerret*.

³⁰ Regarded by KRPS as Arabic.

³¹ In addition to religious terms of Turkic, Persian and Arabic origins (Tryjarski 1993: 65).

4. COMMON GRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF KARAIM, KRIMCHAK AND ARMENO-KIPCHAK³²

Phonological properties common to all languages treated here and differentiating them from the other representatives of the group are not substantial.³³ Although not numerous, morphological distinctive features are fairly characteristic.³⁴ The most characteristic is syntax. This different syntax is usually explained as affected by the non-Turkic speaking environment and the syntax of translated canonical literature.³⁵ However, it should be noted that the first argument does not hold for Old Krimchak and Old Crimean Karaim, because these languages were predominantly in contact with Turkic languages, and the second argument does not explain why the syntax of Arabic and Persian literature translated into Turkic languages did not affect them as much as it affected Karaim, Krimchak and Armeno-Kipchak. The role of a non-Turkic substrate, which is more likely in the case of Krimchaks, in the case of Karaim and Armeno-Kipchak is debatable. At least, it has not been yet proved. Therefore, the linguistic copies must be, for the time being, defined in the terms of an adstratum which arose as a result of language contacts. What is very important is a kind of openness, readiness to adopt another language, and once it happened, to modify it. In contrast, the languages of Crimean Tatars, Kumuks, Karachais and Balkars changed under the influence of Turkish, which did not affect syntax.

4.1. Phonology

Krimchak and Karaim³⁶ texts written with vocalized Hebrew letters can reflect phonological processes occurring in vowels fairly well. In contrast, the Armenian

³² In the following, only a selection of some typical features is presented. For more details on the grammar of Old Crimean Karaim, although based on the fragments of a single manuscript, see Jankowski 1997.

³³ Tryjarski (1992: 332–342) has shown quite a lot of features differentiating Crimean Tatar from Armeno-Kipchak. However, he used the material of modern standard Crimean Tatar, and we should observe that most distinctive forms are found in dialects.

³⁴ Among the morphological features selected by Tryjarski to compare Crimean Tatar with Armeno-Kipchak, there are many similarities (Tryjarski 1992: 342–344).

³⁵ See, for example, Pritsak (1959: 338), who attributes this “enttürkisiert” syntax to the influence of written Hebrew and spoken Slavic. According to him, the syntax of Armeno-Kipchak is also “un-Turkic” (Pritsak 1959: 322).

³⁶ It is Łuck-Halicz dialect of Western Karaim that occupies an isolated place in the group with the $\ddot{o} \ddot{u} > e i$ change in every position, and the \check{s} and $\check{c} > s c$ (IPA \overline{ts}) change, although the latter also occurs in Balkar, and some reflexes of it can be found in *Codex Cumanicus*.

alphabet is not very suitable to represent Armeno-Kipchak vowels. As for front-back vowel harmony, it can be said that in Western and Crimean Karaim, as well as Old Krimchak, it operates further than in Crimean Tatar, in many dialects of which it does not go beyond the second syllable.³⁷ As for Armeno-Kipchak, it is clear that at least some texts show a front-back harmony operating as far as the fourth syllable, e.g. *olumsuzluk* (Tryjarski 1993: 77) 'immortality', *konuluk'nu* 'the truth_{ACC}' (Tryjarski 1993: 99).

With regard to *y- > ğ-* change, which characterizes Karachai-Balkar and some Crimean Tatar vocabulary, except Kumuk the languages compared are more conservative. Notably, Western Karaim is entirely a *y-* language, as well as Armeno-Kipchak (Tryjarski 1992: 340), Old Krimchak and probably Old Crimean Karaim.³⁸

What is different from Crimean Tatar, Kumuk and Karachai-Balkar, is the fronting of back vowels before and after [j d̪ɜ] in some words, e.g. CKar., OKrim. *eyt-* (I E 41³⁹; KRPS *k* 656) < *ayt-* 'to say';⁴⁰ CKar. *eği-* < *aği-* (KRPS *k* 654), OKrim. *ağit-* 'to hurt, to grieve' (I E 36).

Kowalski, who established consonant harmony as a compensatory process for the loss of vowel harmony in the Troki dialect of Karaim, also assumed a similar phonotactic rule in Armeno-Kipchak (Kowalski 1929: lxix–lxx). There is, however, no strong evidence of the lack of vowel harmony in Krimchak. Vowel inventory reduced to five phonemes has not been confirmed by Rebi, Ačkinazi and Ačkinazi (1997: 310), nor by my own recordings, although there are some constraints on front round vowels.

4.2. Morphology

The 2SG imperative is often *-KIn*⁴¹, e.g. T *kijingin* (Musaev 1964: 268) 'dress up', WK (L-H) *ackyn* 'open' (Zajaczkowski 1931: 24); OKrim. *vergin*; *tutqun* (I E21) 'give; hold'; AK *juvgin* (Tryjarski 1993: 66) 'wash'; cf. Kowalski (1929: lxix).

³⁷ For Western Karaim see Musaev 1964: 53–55; for Crimean Tatar, see Jankowski 1992: 64; for Old Crimean Karaim, see Jankowski 1997: 10. Note, however, that some vocalized texts reveal a non-harmonizing, even disharmonizing tendency, which contrasts with unvocalized texts. This should be regarded as a kind of hypercorrection; for Old Krimchak, see I E 8.

³⁸ In the fragments of the Bible translation there was only one example of *ğ-*initial (Jankowski 1997: 63). In modern Karaim and Krimchak, *ğ-*initial appears with CTat. words, e.g. Kar. *cuvur-* 'to run (out)' (see Jankowski, "On the language varieties of Karaims in the Crimea", in this volume); Krim. *ğoy-* 'to lose' (Rebi 1993: 24). On the other hand, some Kumuk words have also *ğ-* in the initial, e.g. *ğuv-* 'to wash', *ğiy-* 'to gather' (Bammatov 1969: 140, 141).

³⁹ The form *ayt-* was only attested in *aytī* (I E37).

⁴⁰ Armeno-Kipchak, however, probably retained the form *ayt-*.

⁴¹ The bare stem forms also occur in all languages; among the modern North-Western Kipchak languages, this suffix occurs in Kumuk, and beyond them in Kirghiz (Pritsak 1959: 336).

Except for modern Crimean Tatar and Krimchak, the other languages in question do not possess the Oghuz future tense exponent *-ĠAK*.⁴² The idea of future is expressed by the suffix *-r* or/with adverbial modifiers.

As observed by Kowalski (1929: lxx), both Kuman and Western Karaim make much use of infinitive constructions with the suffix *-mA*.

4.3. Syntax

4.3.1. Word order

The basic word order of possessive constructions is HEAD, GENITIVE. Kowalski (1929: lxx) demonstrated that this is as a common feature of Western Karaim⁴³ and Armeno-Kipchak. The same holds true for Old Krimchak, e.g. *adi ol kišiniŋ* (I E 15) 'the name of this man'.

The basic word order of predicate, subject and object is in Western Karaim and Krimchak⁴⁴ SVO, e.g. *H kabul ettim bitik* (*Karay Awazy* 13, 9) 'I have received a letter', Krim. *aldı agačlarnı* (Polinsky 1991: 148) 'he took some poles out'. However, in many Armeno-Kipchak texts the word order of the intransitive sentence seems to be SV, and of the transitive sentence is frequently SOV (see texts in Deny & Tryjarski 1964 and Tryjarski 1997).

4.3.2. Conjunction

In Western Karaim, Old Crimean Karaim, as well as Old Krimchak and Armeno-Kipchak, the conjunctive clauses and phrases are joined with the conjunction *da* (Kowalski 1929: lxx–lxxi; 180; Jankowski 1997: 22; I E39; Tr. 202–203), which developed from the Trk. particle *DA*, unlike modern Crimean Karaim and modern Krimchak, in which Arabic conjunction *ve* is commonly used.⁴⁵

Therefore, the newly emerged conjunction should not be mixed up with the particle, from which it developed, and which behaves like a normal Turkic

⁴² This suffix first appeared with the influence of Turkish. In the fragments of the Bible translation one occurrence of it was evidenced by Jankowski (1997: 15). At the same time, it must be noted that the *-QAY* suffix is a marker of optative (I E 2) or desiderative and subjunctive (Jankowski 1997: 16–17), not future.

⁴³ The word order of Old Western Karaim, both spoken and written, if not translated from Hebrew, could have been more rigorously SOV. Unfortunately, as the original written literature is so far known only from poems, we cannot draw any final conclusion, since the word order of Turkic verse is relatively free. Cf. e.g. *T'en'rig'a sarnahyn, maŋtavun kotarhyn* 'sing a song to God, proclaim His praise' but *tynla m'en'i azhyna* 'listen to me a little' (quotations from a poem of Shalomo b. Aharon, 1650–1715, in Firkovič 1989: 188).

⁴⁴ Of the texts published by Polinsky (1991: 145–146), only text 4 demonstrates a proportion between SOV and SVO order.

⁴⁵ The Ar. *ve* may incidentally appear in Old Karaim and Old Krimchak, but it is untypical.

particle. The formal difference between the particle and the conjunction is that the former is affected by vowel harmony, and the latter has always one form *da*. One function of *da* is sentence initial binding with a preceding sentence, always before a verb. In this function *da* occurs in Western Karaim and Krimchak, and is copied from the Hebrew *wa-* (Jankowski 1997: 22; I E 15), e.g. *da aytü, da oldu* (Hb. וַיֵּאמֶר, וַיְהִי). However, when the conjunction *da* stands between two words, phrases and clauses of the same class, its syntactic function is typically connective. In addition to Western Karaim and Old Krimchak, it is also used in Armeno-Kipchak, e.g. AK *soznu étuvçi da tanglawuçi* ‘one who speaks and one who listens to’; *aytilir k’i êk’i awazsüz dr da içina awazlı jazov bolgay* ‘it is said that there are two consonants and between them there should be a vocalic letter’ (Tr. 202). The fact that all these languages use this construction independently of each other, and the evidence of Kuman in *Codex Cumanicus*, e.g. *ol sözni aytü da ğanyñ tejeri eline berdi* ‘he uttered these words and gave soul to the hands of God’ (Grønbech 1942: 80) demonstrate that this way of connecting word groups and clauses is not an innovation, but is inherited from the common syntactic system of the Kuman-Kipchak language group before the 14th century.⁴⁶

Naturally, converbal constructions⁴⁷ in the same function as connective clauses linked with a conjunction also existed in that syntactic system. They are even encountered in non-translated Old Western Karaim, e.g. *bir bolup kajtajyk* ‘let us come back as one’, *s’en’i tynlap syndym* ‘I broke down after listening to you’ (Firkovič 1989: 185, 186). These sentences would sound now like *bir bolalym da kajtalym* and *m’en’ s’en’i tynladym da syndym*, respectively.

4.3.3. Relative clauses

Instead of a participial, prepositional construction typical of Turkic languages, the normal relative construction is in Karaim, Krimchak and Armeno-Kipchak expressed by subordinate, postpositional clause introduced mostly by the conjunction *ki*, which comes after a predicate in a finite form or after a nominal predicate, e.g. H *isanabyz, ki alaj kylynır* (*Karay Awazy* 1939, 2) ‘we believe that it will be so done’; OKrim. *ol nevuaniñ ki aškere oldu* (I E 22) ‘the prophecy which was revealed’; AK *har k’im k’i baxar xatun k’işi^g usna* (Tryjarski 1997: 312) ‘everybody who looks at a woman’.

⁴⁶ Although the standard descriptions of such modern languages as Kumuk, Karachai-Balkar and Crimean Tatar do not exemplify the connective function of *da* (but give evidence for adversative one), I have heard it in this way used in spoken Crimean Tatar.

⁴⁷ Converbal clauses appear in Western Karaim secondarily under the influence of Slavic syntax, e.g. H *Ekinci kinge uxujdu xazan kensada beraxa, qoladohac tenrini, kim tutqaj ol anany sawluqta* ‘On the next day, the hazzan reads up a blessing, requesting God that He keep the mother clean’ (Grzegorzewski 1918: 273, 294).

This type of constructions is also encountered in other Trk. languages, but their use is restricted, whereas in the languages discussed this is the basic type. A relative clause like this type can stand for most types of subordinate clauses, such as clauses of place, time, result, cause etc.

4.3.4. Clauses of purpose

The clauses of purpose are normally expressed by subjunctive *-QAy*, e.g. T *kylajym dahy bunu ki t'ug'al' bolhej iši siddurlarnyn* (Malecki 1890: vii; Kow. 146) 'I shall also do this that work on prayer books be completed', AK 40 *k'un oručnu postanovit etler ... k'i bu zamanda bizni iuxundan oyangaybiz* (Tryjarski 1997: 314, 319) '... have established a forty days' fast in order that we could in this time be awake from our sleep'.

5. KARAIM IN CONTACT WITH NON-TURKIC LANGUAGES⁴⁸

Because of the special ethnic, geographic, cultural and confessional character of Karaim, this language has been influenced by a range of factors that did not have such a strong impact on the other languages of the group. In the linguistic structure, one may point to a few types of copying.

However, we shall remember that each dialect of Karaim is functioning in a few variants. In fact, the most appropriate procedure is to discuss the linguistic structure of each variant separately. Language variants that can be studied on the basis of linguistic documentation are written and spoken languages. Most documentation is limited to written language. Written language documents are predominantly religious texts. There are also some secular texts, mostly poems. The spoken language was either documented by linguists, e.g. Grzegorzewski, or composed and compiled by Karaim language teachers to provide learners with samples to study. Evidently, the latter are not natural, but specially prepared texts. Somewhere in between we can position plays which provide dialogues very close to natural, spontaneous speech, e.g. Š. Firkovič's plays published by Kowalski, Katyk's play *Yaddes* etc.⁴⁹ The first to analyse different variants of H Karaim was Grzegorzewski. It is important to point to some of his statements before going any further. Namely, he remarked that in one poem by Zarach Abrahamowicz, *Ucared bir tigircik*, there are an "Altaic syntax", two Persian and two Arabic, three Slavic and no Hebrew loanwords (Grzegorzewski 1918: 292). According to Grzegorzewski, *Kisenc*, another poem by Abrahamowicz, resembles the general trends in

⁴⁸ On the Slavic influence on Western Karaim see Dubiński 1994.

⁴⁹ Yosef b. Ichak Erak's *Tragedia*, published by Radloff (1896: 411–424), does not reflect the spoken language.

traditional Karaim literature, so it retains constructions copied from the contact languages, but avoids Slavic loanwords (Grzegorzewski 1903: 80). At the same time, the number of Hebrew words in a translation of psalms is high, and in Grzegorzewski's calculation amounts to twelve items, the other loanwords being Persian 11, Slavic 7 and Arabic 6 (Grzegorzewski 1918: 280). Two samples of natural, spontaneous narration in Karaim recorded by Grzegorzewski (1903: 68–69) are plenty of not only Slavic words, but also of total copies in all language levels, i.e. lexical, semantic and syntactic levels. These texts resemble what Polinsky called “a dramatic example of language attrition” (Polinsky 1991: 149).

5.1. Lexical copies

There is a rich literature on lexical loanwords in Karaim. Also Karaim scholars have studied this question, e.g. Firkovičius (1996: 15–16), who exemplifies Slavic and Lithuanian borrowings. Some loanwords came into use with the impact of syntax quite early. In Firkovič's edition of a poem attributed to Zarah b. Natan (?1595–1663), we find an early borrowing of the Pol. modal word *niechaj* ‘let ...’, *anlat ma kumhunam | ... | n'exaj m'en' anlajym |* (Firkovič 1989: 183)⁵⁰ ‘explain me, my dear friend, that I could understand’.

In some cases, a borrowed lexical item may cause restriction on the use of morphemes, and lead to the linear reordering of a phrase, e.g. *T tuvul zulumlamaχ üč'un'* (Malecki 1890: v) ‘not to oppress’. In this example, negation is not expressed by the suffix *-mA*, but by the negation particle *tuvul*. In Old Krimchak, we find a Turkic construction in this function, e.g. *varmamaχ üčün* (IE 21) ‘not to go’. I could not find any evidence for such a use of *dugul* in Armeno-Kipchak, either. Therefore, it seems to be a Western Karaim innovation.

5.2. Morphological copies

Morphology is rightly considered the most resistant component of Turkic languages. It is so because it is clear, predictable and fairly regular. For this reason, mostly those elements of word formation were copied which did not have semantic equivalents and were extralinguistically motivated. To the few cases belong the feminine gender suffix *-ka* and the adapted Trk. suffix *-ča*. However, in spoken, spontaneous language use, because of interference with Slavic languages, other Slavic suffixes are commonly used. For instance, Grzegorzewski (1903: 47–48) distinguished eight word formative Slavic suffixes.

⁵⁰ Note, however, that this is not a critical edition.

As a result of very intensive contacts with Slavic languages, Western Karaim and Armeno-Kipchak copied verbs in the form of an infinitive, then took them as exponents of lexical meaning, and thus formed new verbs by postponing to them a Karaim or Armeno-Kipchak verb to express 'to do' or 'to be', mostly *et-* and *bol-*, e.g. H *zaprovaty* (Grzegorzewski 1903: 39) < *zaprowadzić etti* 'he carried'; AK *zapaliça bol-* 'to burn', *zapailit' èt-* 'to burn something' (Tr. 841). These formations are not normally documented by native speaking authors, as considered incorrect. The copies like this also occur in modern "Islamic" Turkic languages, e.g. CTat. *zvont et-*, *armiyada slujit et-* 'to ring up', 'to do military service'.

Morphological copies are also present in the negative sense, i.e. in the restriction on the use of some Karaim suffixes. For example, Grzegorzewski has shown that 'in Turkish' is said *tirkca*, but the *-ca* suffix is not allowed with the word 'Polish' **poliska*, for a total copy *po polsku* 'in Polish' is used (Grzegorzewski 1903: 46).⁵¹

5.3. Syntactic, semantic and pragmatic copies

Nearly all innovations discussed in 4.3 are copied from dominating contact languages, either Polish in everyday and official use or Hebrew in translations. In practice, it is sometimes hard to make a clear-cut distinction between a Hebrew and a Polish syntactic copies. One clear Hebrew syntactic copy is the sentence initial *da*, see 4.3.2, above. Rendering the Hb. definite article *ha-* by Kar. *ol*, pointed out by Grzegorzewski (1918: 291), is a semantic copy rather than syntactic.⁵²

A total semantic copy can be illustrated by T *avazraç* (Kow. 112) 'louder' < Pol. *głośniej*. In this case, the Pol. expression was calqued from the Kar. (< Per.) word *awaz* 'voice; sound' following the pattern of Polish formation, with the Kar. superlative suffix *-raç*. Compare H *najtatlerak* (Grzegorzewski 1903: 28) 'the sweetest' < Pol. *najśłodszy*, in which we have a total morphological copy of the Pol. prefix *naj-*, in addition.

The following examples illustrate total semantic-syntactic copies in which there is a complete correspondence between the semantic and syntactic contents of the original, borrowed form and the resultant Karaim form, e.g. H *alaj ezi*, T *alej öz'u* 'identically' < Pol. *tak samo*; T *İççak uzun burunbá* (Kow. 112) 'Isaak

⁵¹ In WK 'Polish' should be *esav*, and therefore 'in Polish' in H would be **esavca*, which is not, though, confirmed by KRPS. The dictionary provides only the T form *esav t'il'in'd'a* (KRPS 669).

⁵² Note, however, that in the prose texts of *Codex Cumanicus*, as Grønbech (1942: 176) observed, the pronoun *ol* is also frequently used as a definite article, what Grønbech attributed to the influence of missionaries.

with his long nose' < Pol. *İcchak z długim nosem*; T *bolma Karajba* (Čaprocki 1939: 5) 'to be a Karai' < Pol. *być Karaimem*. However, in all the three examples the morphotactic rules and the suffixes remain intact.

The following example shows a total syntactic copy, notably T *n'e m'en' tujam* (Kow. 109) 'what am I hearing?' < Pol. 'co ja słyszę?'

In another example the syntactic copy is partial, because the possessive construction *toranyn syjy* is unchanged, whereas the rest is copied, *a n'eč'ik' din' t'ušt'u, to toranyn syjy jeñil' boldu* (Malecki 1890: vi; Kow. 145) 'how much the religion weakened, so much the esteem of the Torah became light' < Pol. *a jak ..., to ...* In addition, both sentences retain a full morphological and lexical autonomy. However, the verb *t'ušt'u* seems to have been semantically copied from the Pol. *upadł* 'fell down'.

In many cases, the copying of a Slavic syntactic structure opens the gate to the implementation of function words, change of verb forms and word order, and consequently, to an extensive restructuring of the whole construction, e.g. Pol. *nim zrobi* > H *nim esler* Grzegorzewski (1903: 49), which rules out the genuine H *eslegince* 'until he does, after he did'.

The following is a pragmatic copy, which imitates a corresponding Polish situation, T *kołam* (Kow. 112) 'Come in!' < Pol. 'Proszę!' (said, when somebody knocks on the door).

6. CONCLUSION

As shown above and evidenced in Kowalski (1929), Musaev (1964) etc., modern Western Karaim is unlike modern Crimean Karaim, and should be related to an earlier historical stage of this language. However, it is not correct to compare languages at different historical stages, and Tekin was right when he criticized Menges for comparing modern languages with historical languages (Tekin 1991: 9). Therefore, there is no other solution than to separate modern Western Karaim from modern Crimean Karaim. In fact, Tekin did so by separating dialects and classifying them into different groups.

As for the cohesion of the traditionally established North-Western Kipchak group, it is evident that there are a few important features that distinguish Western Karaim from other languages in the group. Probably Baskakov was right when he pronounced the opinion that the Karaim language, due to a range of distinctive features, should be separated from the "Kipchak-Polovets" subgroup and considered a distinct unit (Baskakov 1960: 150). However, he eventually located it alongside other modern languages, i.e. Kumuk, Karachai-Balkar and Crimean Tatar. Of these, the two former are closer to each other than any of them to Crimean Tatar. Kumuk and Karachi-Balkar share a range of features, which are

relics of old grammar and vocabulary, and are unknown to Crimean Tatar. On the other hand, the Kipchak dialect of Crimean Tatar exhibits common features with Karachai-Balkar, while the Oghuz dialect is more like Kumuk.

In the light of the above arguments, treating Western Karaim as a separate language within the North-Western group of Turkic languages seems justified. The remaining modern languages can be subdivided into two subgroups, Caucasian with Kumuk and Karachai-Balkar, and Crimean with Kipchak dialect of Crimean Tatar, Kipchak dialect of Urum,⁵³ extinct modern Crimean Karaim and extinct Krimchak.

ABBREVIATIONS

AK	=	Armeno-Kipchak
Ar.	=	Arabic
CKar.	=	Crimean Karaim
CTat.	=	Crimean Tatar
<i>h</i> , H	=	Halicz dialect of Western Karaim
Hb.	=	Hebrew
<i>k</i>	=	Crimean Karaim
Kar.	=	Karaim
Krim.	=	Krimchak
L	=	Łuck dialect of Western Karaim
OKrim.	=	Old Krimchak
Per.	=	Persian
Pol.	=	Polish
Sl.	=	Slavic
<i>t</i> , T	=	Troki dialect of Western Karaim
Trk.	=	Turkic
Tur.	=	Turkish
WK	=	Western Karaim

⁵³ Because of lack of data, this is done tentatively. For the same reason the Crimean Tatar ethnolect of Gypsies is also neglected.

REFERENCES

- AČKINAZI, I. V. 2000. *Krymčaki. Istoriko-ětnografičeskij očerok*. Simferopol': Dar.
- ALTBAUER, Mosché 1979–80. O tendencjach dehebraizacji leksyki karaimskiej i ich wynikach w Słowniku karaimsko-rosyjsko-polskim. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3–4(1): 51–60.
- BAMMATOV, Z. Z. (ed.) 1969. *Kumyksko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija.
- BASKAKOV, N. A. 1960. *Tjurkskie jazyki*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj Literatury.
- BENZING, Johannes 1959. Classification of the Turkic Languages. In: Jean Deny et al. (eds.), *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, I: 1–5. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- CSATO, Éva Ágnes 1998. Should Karaim be 'purer' than other European languages. *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 5: 81–89.
- DENY, Jean & Edward TRYJARSKI 1964. "Histoire du sage Hikar" dans la version arméno-kiptchak. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 27(2): 7–61.
- DUBIŃSKI, Aleksander 1994. Über die slawischen Einflüsse in der karaimischen Sprache. In: Aleksander Dubiński, *Caraimica. Prace karaimoznawcze*: 145–150. Warszawa: Dialog.
- DUVAN, Ja. 1890. *Katihizis. Osnovy karaimskago zakona. [...] Odobren Karaimskim Gahamom*: S.-Peterburg: Tipografija Ėttingera.
- FIRKOVIČ, M. I. 1989. *Karaj jylary*. Vilnius: Lietuvos Kultūros Fondas, Karaj B'irl'ig'ı.
- FIRKOVIČIUS, Mykolas 1996. *Mieñ Karajče Ūrianiam*. Vilnius: Danielius.
- GOLDEN, Peter B. 1992. *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz.
- GRZEGORZEWSKI, Johann v. 1903. Ein türk-tatarischer Dialekt in Galizien. Vokalharmonie in den entlehnten Wörtern der karaitischen Sprache in Halicz. *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 146: 1–80.
- (Jan Grzegorzewski) 1918. Caraimica. Język-Lach-Karaitów. Narzecze południowe (łucko-halickie). *Rocznik Oryentalistyczny* 1(2): 252–296.
- GRØNBECH, K. 1942. *Komanisches Wörterbuch*. København: Einar Munksgaard.
- I E = Iala Ianbay & Marcel Erdal, The Krimchak translation of a Targum Šeni of the Book of Ruth. *Mediterranean Language Review* 10 (1998): 1–53.
- JANKOWSKI, Henryk 1992. *Gramatyka języka krymskotatarskiego*. Poznań: UAM.
- 1997. A Bible translation into the Northern Crimean dialect of Karaim. *Studia Orientalia* 28: 1–84.
- KOKENAI, B. 1939. Bir-nieča bergianliar Karaj sioz-bitiktian. *Onarmach* 3: 25–31.
- Kow. = Kowalski, Tadeusz, *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1929.
- KRPS = N. A. Baskakov, A. Zajončkovskij & S. M. Šapšal (eds.), *Karaimsko-russko-pol'skij slovar*. Moskva: Russkij Jazyk, 1974.
- MALECKI, J. 1939. Mien barm Karai. *Onarmach* 3: 22.
- MALECKI 1890 = Maleckij, F. A. *Runne Pallet'*. Vil'na: L. L. Mac", 1890. [Title and the name of the editor and translator: פּינחס מלאצ'קיי רני פּלעט.]
- MALECKI 1900 = Maleckij, F. A. *Seder Gallel' Gakattan. Slovoslovie na pasxu po obrjadu karaimov*. Vil'na: I. Ī. Pirožnikov, 1900. [Title and the name of the editor and translator in Hebrew: סדר הלל הקטן, פּינחס מלאצ'קיי.]
- MENGES, Karl H. 1959. Classification of the Turkic Languages. In: Jean Deny et al. (eds.), *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, I: 5–8. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- MUNKÁCSI, Bernhard. 1909. Karäisch-tatarische Hymnen aus Polen. *Keleti Szemle* 10: 185–210.
- MUSAEV, K. M. 1964. *Grammatika karaimskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.

- MUSAEV, K. M. 1977. *Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk karaimskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.
- 1997. *Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk karaimskogo jazyka*. In: È. R. Tenišev (ed.), *Jazyki mira. Tjurkskie jazyki*: 254–264. Biškek: Ilim.
- POLINSKY, Maria S. 1991. The Krymchaks: History and Texts. *Ural-Altai Yearbook* 63: 123–154.
- PRITSAK, Omeljan 1959. Das Karaimische. In: Jean Deny et al. (eds.), *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, I: 318–340. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- RADLOFF, Wilhelm 1896. *Proben der Volksliteratur der nördlichen türkischen Stämme*. St. Petersburg.
- REBI, D. I. 1993. Krymčakskij jazyk. Qrımčax tili. Simferopol'. [52 pp.; unpublished textbook]
- REBI, D. I., V. M. AČKINAZI & I. V. AČKINAZI 1997. Krymčakskij jazyk. In: È. R. Tenišev (ed.), *Jazyki mira. Tjurkskie jazyki*: 309–319. Biškek: Ilim.
- ROJECKI, Ananjasz 1924. Karaimi w Polsce. (O artykule Dr. M. Bałabana). *Myśl Karaimska* 1: 3–4.
- Sefer Targum Torah biLšon Tatar*, I. [ספר תרגום תורה בלשון טטר] 1841. [גוזלווא] Gözleve.
- TEKIN, Talat 1991. A new classification of the Turkic languages. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 2: 5–18.
- Tr. = Tryjarski, Edward, *Dictionnaire arméno-kiptchak d'après trois manuscrits des collections viennoises*, I, fascicules 1–4. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1968–1972.
- TRYJARSKI, Edward 1992. Das gemeinsame kiptchakische Substrat des Krimtatarischen und des Armeno-Kiptchakischen. *Alta Orientalia Belgica* 7: 325–349.
- 1993. Religious terminology in Armeno-Kipchak. *Journal of Turkology* 1(1): 59–111.
- 1997. One more sermon by Anton Vartabed. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 50: 301–320.
- ZAJĄCZKOWSKI, Ananjasz 1931. *Krótki wykład gramatyki języka zachodnio-karaimskiego (narzecze lucko-halickie)*. Łuck: Aleksander Mardkowicz.
- ZARACHOWICZ, Zarach 1926. Kilka uwag o naszych zadaniach w chwili obecnej. *Myśl Karaimska* 3: 5–6.

APPENDIX

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PUBLICATIONS ON KARAIMS IN RUSSIA, UKRAINE AND FRANCE¹

To his paper published in 1997, Tapani Harviainen appended a list of twelve publications issued by Karaims in Lithuania and Poland between 1989 and 1995.² Since after the disintegration of the Soviet Union a spectacular revival of the Karaim culture and religion has also been taking place in the Crimea and a few other places in Russia and Ukraine to which Crimean Karaims once emigrated, it is worth compiling a preliminary bibliography of publications that came out in these places. The bibliography also includes a few publications produced by the late M. S. Sarač (d. 2000) in France. It contains 30 items, published in the 1990s.³

In Russia:

- ČOREF, M[ihail] Ja[kovlevič] 1993. *Krymskie karaimy*. Moskva: M. S. Sarač. [44 pp.; From the contents: Remnants of paganism of Crimean Karaims; Čeburek pies and brown roosters; the first Crimean printing house; Ač-kez [!] (a Karaim tale); Karaim aphorisms; Karaim proverbs and sayings; Karaim riddles; Hoja Nasreddin stories and parables.]
- FUKI, Aleksandr 1995. *Karaimy – Synov'ja i dočeri Rossii. Rasskazy i očerki ob učastii i bojah ot Krymskoj vojny do Velikoj Otečestvennoj*. Moskva: Interprint. [153 pp.; among others, the book includes Preface by M. Sarač 5–7; Introduction 8–9; Historical overview 10–30 and bibliographical notes on Karaims who participated in Russian military campaigns:

¹ I am indebted to Prof. Dr. Yuri Polkanov, author of valuable works on Karaim, for granting me many publications included in this bibliography and to Ms. Mariola Abkowicz, editor of *Awazymyz*, for her important additions to this list.

² “Signs of New Life in Karaim Communities”, in: M’hammed Sabour & Knut S. Vikør (eds.), *Ethnic Encounter and Culture Change* (Nordic Research on the Middle East, 3): 72–83. Bergen: Nordic Society for Middle Eastern Studies, 1997.

³ Although Poland falls out of the scope of this bibliography, it is to note that at the end of the 1990s a bulletin *Awazymyz* devoted to the history, social and cultural affairs of Karaims began to appear. It is published by the Karaim Religious Association and the Association of Polish Karaims: 1(2) 1999 [12 pp.; number 2 refers to a brochure issued 10 years ago, regarded as the predecessor of the present bulletin], 2(3) 1999 (20 pp.) and 1(4) 2000 (20 pp.). This fact is worth mentioning because Polish Karaims did not have any periodical publication for years, and the list by Harviainen (1997), includes in fact only one Polish publication.

- 1854–55 (3); 1877–78 (2); 1904–05 (7); 1914–18 (27); 1941–45 (247), and the World War II in France 1939–45 (5).]
- HAFUZ, M. È. 1995. *Russko-karaimskij slovar'. Krymskij dialekt*. Moskva: Obščestvo Vostokovedov RAN. [216 pp.; Forward 3–5; Grammar 6–68; Female names of Crimean Karaims 69–73; Family names of Crimean Karaims 74–86; Dictionary 87–215; the dictionary, compiled by a non-professional, should be looked up with caution.]
- SARAČ, M. S. (ed.). *Karaimskaja Narodnaja Ėnciklopedija*. Vol. I *Vvodnoj* ['Introductory'] 1995 (Moskva), Vol. II 1996. *Vera i religija. Religija krymskih karaev (karaimov)* ['Creed and Religion. The Religion of Crimean Karais (Karaims)'] (Pariž), Vol. III 1997. *Jazyk i fol'klor karaimov* ['The Language and Folklore of Karaims'] (Moskva); Vol. IV 1998. *Proishozhdenie krymskih karaev (karaimov)* ['Origin of Crimean Karais (Karaims)'] (Moskva).
- 1997. *Karaimy i Moskva. Izdanie posvjaščeno 850-letiju Moskvy*. Moskva: Mežregional'noj centr otraslevoj informatiki Gasatomnadzora Rossii. [25 memoirs of various personages.]
- 1994. *Karaimskie vesti. Karaite News. Qaraj xaberler*. Moskva: M. S. Sarač. [A socio-cultural newsletter.]
- 1997. *Anan ben David – posledovatel' Sokrata*. [8 pp.; an occasional paper, devoted to David b. Anan as a successor to Socrates.]
- 2000. *Istorija i sut' religioznyh verovanij*. Moskva: M. S. Sarač. [135 pp.; philosophical essays.]
- SIMAČENKO, Ju. B. (ed.) 1992. *Materialy k serii "Narody i kul'tury". Vypusk 14. Karaimy. Kniga 1*. Moskva: Institut Ėtnologii i Antropologii im. N. N. Mikluho-Maklaja RAN.
- (ed.) 1993. *Materialy k serii "Narody i kul'tury". Vypusk 14. Karaimy. Kniga 2. Karaimskij bibliografičeskij slovar' (ot konca XVIII v. do 1960 g.)*. [Compiled by B. B. Eljaševič]. Moskva: Institut Ėtnologii i Antropologii im. N. N. Mikluho-Maklaja RAN.
- POLKANOV, Ju. A. 1994. *Rodovoe gnezdo karaimov. Kyrk-er – Kale – Čuft-Kale (Čufut-Kale). Stihi, Predaniia, Folklor, Fotografii*. Moskva: M. S. Sarač. [40 pp.; 11 photographs; poems, legends, folklore texts and photographs.]

In France:

- POLKANOV, A. I. 1995. *Krymskie karaimy (karai – korennyj maločislennyj tjurkskij narod Kryma)*. Pariž. [IV + 275 pp.; edited by Yu. A. Polkanov, with a foreword by Ju. Kochubej (I–IV) and Ju. Polkanov (7–14); without the name of publisher; this is a slightly modified version of the undated edition, extended by numerous paragraphs inserted in italics by Ju. A. Polkanov.]
- SARAČ, M. S. 1996. *Učenie Anana*. [31 pp.; an appendix to the newsletter *Karaimskie Vesti*; also appeared in an English translation, see below.]
- 1997. *Anan's Teaching. Appendix to "Karai News"*. [22 pp.; English translation of the above; no publication place provided.]

In Ukraine:

- BABODŽAN, A., T. BOGOSLAVSKAJA, G. KATYK, V. KROPOTOV & A. POLKANOVA 1999. *Krymskie karai (Krymskie karaimy-tjurki). Samoidentifikacija. Kratkij očerok istorii i kul'tury*. Simferopol'-Aqmedžid: Asociacija Krymskih karaimov. [28 pp.; a short information brochure on Crimean Karaims.]

- JALPAČIK, G. S. 1993. *Rusko-karaimskij razgovornik. Urus-Qaray laqyrdylyq*. Simferopol': Tavrija. [112 pp.; the phrasebook includes dialogues 8–53; portions of a play by Katyk 53–60; brief notes on Karaim grammar 60–69; a few specimens of texts with translations into Russian 70–79 and a Karaim-Russian glossary 80–110.]
- KAPON-IVANOV, Valentin 2000. *Tunes of Karaim Wedding (collection of children's pieces) for piano*. Kharkiv: National Composers' Union of Ukraine. [16 pp.; title also in Russian, Ukrainian and Karaim; the titles of pieces of music in English, Karaim and Ukrainian.]
- KEFELI, O[leksij] (transl.) 1998. Kazka pro ljedačogo hlopcja. Karaims'ka narodna kazka. Dönbel ulanniñ yomağı. Qarayım halq yomağı. In: *Stježkami premudryh kazok. Narodni kazki: 86–92; 93–99*. Kiiv.
- LEBEDEVA, È. I. 1992. *Recepty karaimskoj kuxni*. Simferopol': Redotdel Krymskogo komiteta po pečati. [272 pp.; Karaim recipe book.]
- 2000. *Očerki po istorii krymskix karaimov-tjurkov*. Simferopol'. [116 pp.; published by the author; studies on the history and national customs of Karaims 3–57; 58–63; a chapter on Karaim personal names 64–84, with lists of family, male and female names 85–113.]
- LEVI, B. 1995. *Karaimskaja škola*. Odessa: Asociacija nacional'no-kul'turnyx i kul'turno-prosvetitel'nyh organizacij odesskoj oblasti. [24 pp.; a well documented history of Karaim education in Odessa.]
- 1996. *Rusko-karaimskij slovar'. Krymskij dialekt. 8120 slov. Urus-Karay Sözlük*. Odessa. [118 pp.; a well documented, reliable Russian-Crimean Karaim dictionary.]
- 1997. *Progulka po Odesse*. Odessa. [28 pp.; without the name of the publisher; a well documented sketch of activities of Karaim intellectuals in Odessa.]
- POLKANOV, A. I. [undated, without the place of publication] *Krymskie karaimy*. [90 pp.; a version of A. I. Polkanov 1995, printed in Ukraine.]
- POLKANOV, Ju. A. 1994. *Obrjady i obyčaj krymskix karaimov-tjurkov: ženit'ba, roždenie rebenka, pohorony*. Bahčisaraj. [52 pp.; description of the related national customs of Crimean Karaims in Russian with a short glossary of Karaim terms, a bibliographical note on Sima Mangubi and information on the fascicules of Karaim Encyclopedia published so far; there is no information on the transmitters of the most of customs described.]
- 1995a. *Qrymqa[ra]jlarnyñ Atalar-Sozy. Poslovicy i pogovorki krymskix karaimov*. Bahčisaraj. [78 pp.; over 1,000 Karaim riddles with Russian translation, drawn from the works by Dubiński, Kefeli, Radloff, Filonenko and KRPS, and recorded from informants indicated in the introduction, with no information on this at a particular riddle.]
- 1995b. *Legendy i predanija karaev (krymskix karaimov-tjurkov)*. Simferopol'. [67 pp.; a selection of legends collected by B. Kokenaj, S. Krym and S. Šapšal, some of which have already been published, pp. 9–38, with compiler's comments and bibliographical notes on the collectors; in Russian.]
- 1997. *Karais – the Crimean Karaites-Turks. History. Ethnology. Culture*. Simferopol': The State Committee on National Affairs and Deported Citizens of the Crimean Autonomous Republic and the Association of the National and Cultural Societies of the Crimea. [149 pp.; most of the study written in Russian with a parallel English translation.]
- RUSAJEVA, M. B. (ed.) 1996. *S. E. Duvan "Ja ljublju Evpatoriju". Slovo i delo Gorodskogo Golovy*. Evpatoria: Izdatel'stvo Južnye vedomosti. [4 + 154 pp. and 40 photographs; Life story of the renown citizen and public person of Eupatoria, with an outline of his activities, including documents such as speeches, projects and photographs.]
- ŠAPŠAL, Seraja, s.a. *Karaimy i Čufut-Kale v Krymu. Kratkij očerok*. [No place of publication nor publisher provided; an extended and annotated re-edition of Šapšal's earlier publication, 37 pp.; prefaced by Ju. A. Polkanov, 3–4, with a bibliographical note on Šapšal.]

