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ON THE LANGUAGE VARIETIES OF KARAIMS
IN THE CRIMEA

Henryk Jankowski

The aim of this paper is to examine the spoken language of Crimean Karaims and its relationship to the literary variants. The data are drawn from both remaining native speakers and from available published and handwritten sources. The paper is illustrated with two photographs of Crimean Karaim language informants and two samples of a manuscript with a translation into a quadrate Hebrew script, a transliteration based on the modern Turkish standard, and a translation into English.

1. CRIMEAN KARAIM – A DISTINCT LANGUAGE OR AN ETHNOLECT OF CRIMEAN TATAR

Some scholars maintain that Crimean Karaim is in fact identical with Crimean Tatar. Radloff (1896: xvi) claimed that Karaims and Krimchaks spoke “the purest Turkish language” varying in the same way as the language of the Crimean Tatars varied in their respective places of residence. In his view, the language spoken by

---

1 After submitting this paper to the editor, I met five further Karaims in the Crimea who had some command of Crimean Karaim. Then in 2002, I heard of four further native speakers more.

2 The writing of this article was possible due to the financial help of the following institutions: The Scandinavian Society of Jewish Studies and American Jewish Community which contributed to the expenses of my participation in the 7th Scandinavian Congress of Jewish Studies when the preliminary version of this paper was presented, Chair of Oriental and Baltic Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University, which covered part of expenses of my travel to Moscow and the Crimea, as well as Polish Committee of Scientific Research for financing my project in edition of manuscripts of the Abraham Firkovich collection which contributed to my travel to Finland and financed my library work in Saint-Petersburg. It is my pleasant task to thank all of them. My best thanks also go to Prof. Yuri A. Polkanov, for his assistance, help in acquiring publications and connecting people in the Crimea, as well as to Ms. Olga Vasylieva, head of Manuscript Department of the National Library of Russia for her kind assistance during my library work in November 2000.
Karaim and Krimchaks from Bakhchisarai and Qarasuv Bazar was identical with the language of the Tatar inhabitants of these cities. Doerfer also shared this opinion. In his detailed study on Crimean Turkish Doerfer wrote: "Crimean Ottoman (Krimtschewisch) is also spoken by Crimean Karaim and Creelas who live in these dialect territories" (Doerfer 1959: 273). A similar opinion was expressed by Ananasz Zajączkowski in his edition of Crimean Kariim čiči songs: "In view of the Karaim-Tatar similar existence in the Crimea, the material presented here should be in general regarded as Crimean Tatar" (Zajączkowski 1939: 45). It is to be stressed, however, that Zajączkowski’s observation refers to a certain type of written literature, not to the language in general. Crimean Karaim themselves did not use a unique denomination of their language in the past. For example, in the title of the famous 1841 Bible edition, the Crimean Karaim language is called Tatar: Sefer Tarqum ha-Torah biLison Tatar. In document 23 of the Abraham Firkovich collection kept in the National Library of Russia in Saint-Petersburg, file 946, the Turkish language into which the Hebrew text of the grammar Kelale ha-Diqduq was translated is called Lision Qedar, i.e. the language of Crimea and the modern Ukraine.3

The first serious critique of Radloff’s Crimean material was presented by Samojlović, who pointed out the inadequacies of Radloff’s principles in his presentation of language material (Samojlović 1917). In Samojlović’s view Radloff published samples of modern Karaim, which "undoubtedly developed from the old language under the influence of Crimean Tatars [and] which, similarly, to the dialects of the latter, reflected an Ottoman, in general South-Turkish influence" (Samojlović 2000: 116). We may confirm that there are serious doubts as to the legitimacy of Radloff’s statements and the reliability of the material he published. Firstly, it is unlikely that Radloff personally checked what his informants said, in other words, that he really examined Crimean Karaim communities in their actual settlements, although his final conclusion that Crimean Karaim dialect differences follow the differences between Crimean Tatar dialects sounds plausible. Secondly, as Samojlović pointed out, Radloff collected in fact samples of literature, both written and oral, not the colloquial language. As I learned from my work with Mrs. Aleksandra Balkal, there is a great difference between the everyday language of Karaimas and the literary language they use, see below.

In his préfice to Prik’s Crimea Karaim grammar, another scholar, Dżamano now, said,

5 This process was well underway as early as the 1920s. In 1976 Dżamano now said that Crimean Karaim was almost dead (Prik 1976: 4).
6 On her see Polkanov 1994: 43-45.
7 Nina Balkal, born 1934, is half Karaim from her father, who died in war in 1941. She said that she had the best opportunity to speak Karaim until 1937, until her step-grandmother was at life. After the years of her childhood, as she maintained, she had hardly any occasion to speak Crimean Karaim.
8 For the time being I have been unable to find any other native speaker. However, Crimean Karaim are a rather closed society and there may still be some people who can remember the language of their childhood of the 1920s and 1930s. Aleksandra Balkal, born 1920, now resident of Moscow, has been living outside the Crimea since the age of seven. She does not use her mother tongue, for she does not have any partner to talk to. Therefore, all her competence is what she learned at home and spoke to her grandparents and father prior to 1939.
9 Other works were not written with linguistic purpose. The bibliography of a few valuable text editions and papers which came out between the beginning of the 20th century and 1939 can be found in Zajączkowski 1939 and KRPS 1974.
the latter is linguistically an ethnolect of Turkish itself rather than an independent language. Therefore, some varieties of Crimean Karaim should be referred to Crimean Tatar, some to Crimean Turkish, whereas some old written documents should be considered Karaim. For this reason, the term Crimean Karaim seems to be better than any other.

2. ON THE HISTORY OF CRIMEAN KARAIM

It is evident that Crimean Karaim and Crimean Tatar were once distinct languages, as were the peoples, and both languages went through a separate, although similar process of evolution.\(^{10}\)

The analysis of the Crimean Karaim historical linguistic materials and their comparison with modern Crimean Karaim documents demonstrate that in the past Crimean Karaim was more different from Crimean Tatar. Unfortunately, we only have a limited number of Crimean Karaim historical language documents and studies at our disposal. Firstly, there is a study by Górdlevskij on a handwritten copy of the Bible (Górdlevskij 1928), a few lines of a text published by Kowalski in his work on the Karaim of Troki (Kowalski 1929), short language samples in Shapshal (1928), Sulimowicz’s edition of a Crimean Karaim fragment of the first Karaim prayer book printed in the Crimea 1734, and the publication of some selected passages of a Crimean Karaim Bible translation, copied probably at the end of the 18th century (Jankowski 1997). There are also a few, very rare, hardly accessible and unstudied Crimean Karaim printed texts listed and annotated in Poznański’s bibliography (Poznański 1913; 1918), the largest of which is the Crimean Karaim Bible translation printed in 1841 in Çufut Qale.\(^{11}\) All these liturgy language documents show that Crimean Karaim was in the past more similar to Western Karaim, which is obvious, for both go back to the same origin of the 14th century.

Tracing the history of Crimean Karaim, we are inclined to agree with Radloff who says that Crimean Karaims started to acquire Russian education in the second half of the 18th and at the beginning of the 19th centuries, thereby assimilating to the Russian language (Radloff 1896: xvii). Indeed, the Russian annexation of the Crimea had a very significant impact on their linguistic identity.

3. GEOGRAPHICAL CLASSIFICATION OF CRIMEAN KARAIM DIALECTS

Our knowledge of Crimean Karaim dialects in the remote past is very poor. Most of what we know is based on written texts from the 18th century to approximately 1919. Since Radloff’s study that related Crimean Karaim dialects to the geographically corresponding Crimean Tatar dialects, it is customary to correlate Crimean Karaim with Crimean Tatar. This is why Crimean Karaim dialects are always classified as Crimean Tatar dialects. This approach seems to be more suitable for the study of those language elements, which are copied and partially copied from Crimean Tatar. However, it is necessary to establish the distinctive vocabulary and grammatical structures, characteristic of Crimean Karaim, and distinct from Crimean Tatar (see section 6, below).

Radloff said that “... the language of the Karaims in Eupatoria shares many features of the steppe dialect” (Radloff 1896: xvi). However, we must keep in mind that the official, literary language used by Karaims in Eupatoria was different. For example, in the 1841 Bible edition (p. 1), Eupatoria was written in an official Turkish form Gölçe, as opposed to the Tatar Köšel – Kesel. At this point, following Samojlović, it is important to make a distinction between the spoken and literary language forms.

Unfortunately, we do not have good, reliable dialect material from the recent past, i.e. from the years 1919–45, either. In this respect, Prik’s grammar, finished in 1947, does not fill this gap.

The samples of Crimean Karaim appended to Prik’s grammar have the following characteristics.\(^{12}\) Firstly, they are all literary texts and do not reflect the spoken language directly. Secondly, two out of nine samples, notably sample 1 and sample 3, were drawn from manuscripts (mejumars). The majority of these texts (samples 1, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9, all proverbs) represent central Crimean Karaim. Sample 3 is central Crimean Karaim with southern elements, sample 5 is southern with central, and only sample 2 is southern Crimean Karaim. How misleading it is to draw linguistic conclusion about the language of Karaims on the basis of recited pieces of literature, is illustrated by sample 5, which is, as said above, predominantly southern with only a few central Crimean Karaim features. This text was recorded from A. Bakal, with whom I worked. All the colloquial material I recorded from her is typically central Crimean Karaim, whereas most pieces of

---

\(^{10}\) Naturally, one has to agree with Samojlović who said that it is unclear whether Old CK was the original language of Karaims or not (Samojlović 2000: 116).

\(^{11}\) Unless other old Crimean Karaim printed books will be discovered, his bibliography should be considered comprehensive, for hardly any printed texts appeared after 1918.

\(^{12}\) We leave aside WC texts appended to this grammar.
literature in her narration are recited in the southern dialect. The language samples published by Prick are the following:

1. Yumagbach; first published by Shapshal 1918, drawn from a mejuma, C CK; 172–173
2. Fuqare bilen olüm; recorded from B. Shamash from Simferopol, S CK; 175
3. Kelinin türkäsi; drawn from Kefeli’s mejuma dated 1878, written in Eupatoria, C + S CK; 176–177
4. Untitled, the name of informant not provided, C CK; 178
5. Qayana; recorded from A. Bakkal, S + C CK; 179
6. “A lyric song” , recorded from M. Sinani from Simferopol, C CK; 180–181
7. Songs referred to as “chastushkii”; in fact, these are well-known çiiis; recorded from M. Iskijik, C CK; 182–183
8. Tapmacar; the same informant? C CK; 183
9. Atalar söri; proverbs, the name of informant not provided; C CK; 184.

One of two texts from Eupatoria, being a song recorded by Prick (1976: 178) is really like northern Crimean Tatar of Eupatoria, e.g. uýin bolur as opposed to S evöl olur ‘you will have a home’, whereas the other, drawn from a 1878 manuscript, although predominately northern, reveals some southern traits, e.g. qas gitti, as opposed to C and N qas ketti ‘the girl has gone’ (176). The same northern features are present in a tale recorded by Shapshal in Çufut Qale (172–173). The text recorded from Shamash in Simferopol (175), does not represent the dialect characteristic of Simferopol region, which is central Crimean, but is basically Turkish, as the language of coastal settlements between Baidar and Sudak. The other text recorded in Simferopol from an informant called Sinani is quite different and is typical of the Simferopol region, with the forms like bolmar ‘(it) will not be’, but sevdim as opposed to N südüm ‘I loved’. This text contains two forms which are untypical of central Crimean Tatar, and may be attributed to

Crimean Karain: sicol versus CTat sicol ‘hair’ and sicolledim ‘I told’ which is not used in Crimean Tatar, and corresponds to CTat aydim.

As for the present Crimean Karain dialects, I have to rely on my own language documentation from 2000. However, both of my informants are from the same city, Bakhchisarai, and there is no comparable material available from other Crimean Karain dialect areas. In principle, the vocabulary and grammatical structures used in the language of both AB and NB are similar. The similarities are the following:

- Old Turkic b- is preserved in every absolute initial, e.g. bol-, bar, unlike S CTat ol-, var ‘to be’ and ‘there is’, respectively; the only exception was noted in the expression Alla razi olur ‘thank you’ (AB);
- Old Turkic γ has changed into y, as in central and northern CTat, e.g. üyren- ‘to learn’, versus S CTat üyren-; this is more consistently realized in the pronunciation of NB, whereas AB once pronounced soqqu instead of suyuq ‘cold’;
- the negative particle was dugul (AB) and dûgul (NB), as opposed to the predominantly S CTat degil and the N CTat tavl ‘no; [is] not’;
- the change γ > .logs was evidenced in one word only, süg tegaran cawurd ‘a little milk has run out’, otherwise there is always γ, e.g. AB yilay ‘he is weeping’, cf. S CTat a길라, but N CTat ila (Üsenov 1994: 10; 357 only as ilaqay);
- grammatical verb suffixes are typically north-western, e.g. bilem ‘I know’, versus south-western bilyürum (but not the N bilyenem); bilmeyim ‘I do not know’, versus bilmeyurum (but not the N bilmeyenem); algan versus south-western almaz;
- noun case suffixes are north-western, e.g. qazus ‘girlACC’, versus kiz; however, körün ‘her buttocks3 POSSACC’, and not körün;
- no noticeable Turkish influence of recent date, e.g. the word for ‘to work’ is ışle- and not calay-;
- the word for God, notwithstanding different religion, is normally Alla, borrowed from CTat, both in expressions, e.g. Alla sağlasın (NB) ‘save God’, and in religious context; some other religious terms related to religion are also common, e.g. sünnet ‘circumcision’.

There were also differences in phonetic form and vocabulary of AB and NB. In general, the language of AB revealed more southern traits. For example, NB kiche ‘small’ (cf. Nog. kiskey NOS 168), versus AB kiyik. AB also used the southern term oruç ‘fast’ in oruç tutamz ‘we fast’, while SS used the corre-
sponding C and N C T a t oraza tutanız. On different kinship terms in the speech of AN and NB see 6.1, below.

In conclusion, the analysis of the language of my two informants shows that the Crimean Karaim dialect they speak is very close to the territorially corresponding Crimean Tatar dialect, though not the same. Firstly, it is more resistant to the influx of Turkish vocabulary and phonetically more conservative. Secondly, this dialect is also resistant to some expansive features of northern Crimean Tatar. And lastly, it has preserved a few expressions, which, although of recent origin, are only rarely used in C C T a t (e.g. Alfa razi ızan, versus C T a t suv b o l - soğ ol; aybeteniz, versus C T a t başğılalıiz ‘excuse me’).

It must be stressed again that, unfortunately, we do not have any language material from other cities and regions, e.g. Feodosia, not to speak about Eski Qırım, Taş Yargon, Qarasuv Bazar, Yalta, and the newly inhabited Crimean cities like Sevastopol (C T a t. Açığer), Simferopol (C T a t. Aq Mescit – Aqmecit), Kerch and Armiansk.

4. SOCIAL VARIETIES OF CRIMEAN KARAİM

Although Radloff (1896: xvi) said that the language of educated people differed from the language of common people everywhere, we do not have any direct evidence of this. However, we may deduce that office-holders in khan’s service in the past, and later in Russian service (which demanded knowledge of Crimean Tatar, e.g. Simha Babovich, Semen Duvan), and Karaim intellectuals who cooperated with Crimean Tatars (e.g. Ilia Kazas), knew Crimean Tatar very well and their language could be influenced by literary Crimean Tatar. It must be noted that Crimean Karaim were familiar with Crimean Tatar, Turkish, as well as Arabic writing. On a number of documents in the Firkovich collection there are various notes written with Arabic letters, sometimes quite professional. In calculations, the Arabic numbers were used (in Arabic, not European form). On the other hand, Karaim men of God and educated people who maintained ties with western Karaims in Poland and the Karaim community in Turkey had a good command of Hebrew, as well as Western Karaim and Turkish, respectively. Some of them, e.g. Pigt, Luntski, Abraham Firkovich, Shapshal, moved from country to country and contributed to the intellectual life of various communities.

Among the common people there were craftsmen and traders, who were in commercial contacts with representatives of other Crimean nationalities. They also had to know the official Crimean Tatar language, beside the local variant, which was probably close to their language used at home and within the Karaim community. Many Crimean Karaim family names reflect their crafts, e.g. Mağs-

maci ‘producer and seller of mąqıma (kind of beverage)’, Qazas ‘silk manufacturer and seller’, Çapağıça ‘cooper’.

Naturally, the fact that educated people knew the official Crimean Tatar language does not imply that they used it at home and in the community. Clearly, every one who is able to speak the higher, prestigious language will use it in contacts with outsiders, including Turkologists who visited them and made their observations. Even social varieties of language depend on their geographical setting. Aleksandra Bakkal told me that the Sevastopol branch of her family was deeply assimilated to the Russian language and culture, whereas her grandparents from Bakchusarai did not speak Russian at all and cultivated national traditions.

5. WRITTEN AND ORAL LITERATURE

In this section, we shall examine Crimean Karaim literature15 from the linguistic point of view. As already observed, Crimean Karaim literature existed in written and oral form and should be distinguished from colloquial Crimean Karaim in both linguistic structure and function. Written literature can be subdivided into religious and secular literature. It may be assumed that basic types of religious literature survived in both manuscripts and printed books. Religious literature included Bible translations (Jankowski 1997), prayer books (Stulimowicz 1972; 1973), sermons and orations (Poznański 1913: 41), and catechisms (Poznański 1918: 76). Printed secular literature included grammars, dictionaries, and textbooks for the study of Hebrew, as well as calendars and other occasional papers.

The Turkic language of these books has not yet been studied. Fortunately, we can have some insight into it from a paper by Harvianen (1997: 102–114). Harvianen published four sentences from an undated grammar published in Eupatoria by Abraham Firkovich.16 Here I shall quote the second and the fourth sentences, converting them from the H b. script to a standard Tur. writing with an additional diacritic for [ı] and maintaining Hb. diacritics for Hb. terms (in bold):

Yod hıreqlen niqqd<seenektan> gayrı tene’alanı birilen gelikte o yoddan evvel gelen lewamın okunanı tebdıl eder de hıreqlı okunması belzeder, mosela ‘if a show comes before a vocalized yod except for a hıreq, the pronunciation of it changes to the pronunciation similar to a hıreq, for example ...’ Kaldı ki hıreqlen niqquldengen yoddan evvel gelen lewam tebdıl olmayı, adetl üzere okulur, mosela ...
However, while before a yod vocalized with a hireq, the shva does not change and is pronounced as usual, for example ... (Harvinnem 1997: 112, fn. 38).

As we can see, the language of this book is basically Turkish (olur, olmaz, evvel, bektar, gelen) with an admixture of non-standard Tur. elements: -len instead of -le, -gen instead of -en, and -nur instead of -nun. The first one may be attributed to dialect forms, since it occurs in various Oghuzic dialects, whereas -gen can be both Kipchak and Eastern Turkic, also used, however, in Ottoman Turkish. The suffix -in in the place of -in (okurun), can be again Kipchak.  

The first examples of secular Crimean Karaim literature in Cyrillic writing were probably published in 1911 in the journal Karaimskaja Žizn’ in Petersburg. However, these years mark not the emergence, but the decline of the Crimean Karaim literature and language.

Many more documents of both religious and secular character are preserved in manuscripts. There were numerous Crimean Karaim translations of Bible chapters, and probably also prayers. Secular literature is best known from the manuscripts called mejumma. As is well known, the first and the only mejumma was published by Radloff. However, Radloff’s publication is not a critical edition of a mejumma, this is a text of a mejumma set in Hebrew printed characters after the narration of [J]. Erak, with addition of portions of other mejummas and poems of Erak. Furthermore, not the whole text of the basic mejumma was published (Radloff 1896: xvii). The contents of that part of mejumma which was published in Hebrew script were described and examined by Sunnjovíč (2000: 117–119). The 15 sections of mejumma transcribed into Cyrillic letters were provided by Radloff in the table of contents in 1896.

Katky’s mejumma that I have recently examined also contains pieces of literature, with little influence from the spoken language. The language of poems and prose stories is southern Crimean Tatar, more exactly Turkish mixed with Tatar words, e.g. p. 113 bayazın mahlıyur ‘he praises the white [colour]’. It is interesting that titles of some stories are written in central or even northern Crimean Karaim, while the language of the stories themselves is Turkish, e.g. Asıkk Garının türküsü ve metsele ‘the song and the story of Ashik Garib’ (pp. 25–97).

Among the manuscripts in the Firkovich collection there are documents which until now have not been mentioned in the scholarly literature. They include various administrative, juridical and financial notes, records and letters. One document from file 946 is a register of expenditures made for reconstruction or building works. The register, written in Turkish with a Hebrew semi-cursive typical of Crimean Karaim, records construction materials and payments made to workers on a weekly basis. Although the majority of case suffixes are Turkish, e.g.elixer ustaeya yedi gulfedik ‘salary for seven-day-job for the carpenter’, there are also Kipchak case suffixes, e.g. Ahmedke (Xêynên) bir gûnlêk ‘one daily salary for Ahmed’. Although Turkish, this language is heavily influenced by the local Crimean language, e.g. titles, Abrahom ayqâqa ‘to/for Abraham [HONORIFIC]’ and words used normally in the Crimea, açça ‘money’, rüble ‘ruble’, erğê ‘day labourer’ etc.

The evaluation of the language of religious literature is a more complex task than that of secular literature, because religious literature is better evidenced and it spans a period of one hundred and fifty years at least.

In practice, only religious texts and the texts closely related to religion demonstrate Hebrew influence. The strongest influence is revealed in translations from Hebrew in which syntactic structures and word order are copied into Karaim. Hebrew lexical influence is not so extensive. In any case, the number of Arabic and Persian loanwords in Karaim translations from Hebrew surpasses the number of Hebrew borrowings. According to my calculations, only 38, i.e. 6.4 %, out of all 593 words listed in Sulimowicz’s wordlist to the 1734 prayer is of Hebrew origin. In the samples of the Bible translation (Jankowski 1997), 33 Arabic, 31

---

17 As said above in section 1, I have studied a manuscript of this grammar in the Firkovich collection in St. Petersburg. The future analysis should demonstrate if it is identical with the printed version. The language of the manuscript is also predominantly Turkish, although it contains some Kipchak elements, e.g. the first verse: [J]. Beki beyadne tu bani inuyadak (2) hor dilin buelki kikilip ‘as is well known, there have been set up pillars for all languages in this world’.

18 I have also some documentation of oral religious literature. These are prayers recited by Mr. Tiryaki, the hazzan of Eupatoria, recorded during a service in the kehora in 1999. The language of these prayers is very archaic, almost identical with WK, the Crimean pronunciation. I am not sure if it was taken from WK prayer books, and this is why I did not decide to include them in the present study.

19 The manuscript is undated, probably from the beginning of the 20th century, written very untidily on pages of a notebook with many mistakes; the last or a few final pages are missing. On p. 1 there is an annotation in Russian with Cyrillic letters: Medtuna Katkya SPB ‘Katky’s mejumma, St (Petersburg)’, it is unclear whether it was property of Aaron Katky, the author of the play Yadíx, published in 1919 in Eupatoria. The pages have two paginations, the full one starts with number 1 and ends up with number 206. On p. 97, there is a kind of inner colophon, which contains the name of the copyist, Barab Mangabi. The manuscript contains poems of türkî and sembî type, as well as stories, called mesele; on the last page there is one takelame.

20 The Ar. > Tur. word for the ‘fairy’ tale is in KRPS bk motal (404), bk motal (406), and masula (400); the latter is cited from Radloff’s dictionary, in which is provided as motal (Tûsd, vol. iv, 1985); the compilers of KRPS did not include another Karaim variant of this word from Radloff’s dictionary: matal (Tûsd, vol. iv, 2108); in Katky’s mejumma, this word is written either Xêynên (91) or Xêynên (92), suggesting two readings: matal and probably masula or mesele.
6. FEATURES DISTINGUISHING CRIMEAN KARAISM FROM CRIMEAN TATAR

Distinctive features are to be found at most linguistic levels. Below, we shall point to only a few of them.

6.1. Names, surnames and kinship terms

In addition to the surnames demonstrated in section 4, above, we shall point to a few others, which, although of Turkic origin, were not used by Crimean Tatars. These names are quoted from the list of subscribers and donors of the 1841 edition of the Bible: Babali (388), Köégis (389), Ponarti (?< Ponarli, 387), Saqal (397), Yontaq-baq (390). Some names of this kind were in fact used by Crimean Tatars, but as nicknames, whereas Karaims used them as official names. This list can be extended with names from other sources, e.g. Kült and Kume Ü (Küme), (KCRPS 675–676). Surnames derived from toponyms such as Kafe (Peodesia) and Mangub, e.g. Kafei, Mangubi (KCRPS 676–677) were not used by Crimean Tatars, either. Female names drawn from the grave inscriptions edited by Abraham Fickovich were the subject of Dubinski’s study (1994). Among these names there are names of Turkic origins that are not used by Crimean Tatars any longer, e.g. Arq, Altnaqz, Bileçe, Bije, Biyana, Bilelek, Biykön, Töte (190–196) and others. Interestingly is Murat as female, not male name.

Among the kinship terms related to me by Nina Bakkhal, there are some specific items. For example, the word for ‘son’ is ulan, standard CTag aqul, which corresponds to the Kipchak ulan ‘boy’, as in Noghai (NOS 382), but in a number of languages it has also the meaning ‘son’ (EST 3a 1, 411); the word for ‘uncle’ is aq, which in Crimean Tatar has a phonetic equivalent aq ‘elder brother’, and in Noghai semantic equivalent aqu ‘uncle’ (Ussin 1994: 10; NOS 10), the word aqu in the dialect of NB has the same meaning as in central and northern Crimean Tatar, that is ‘husband’, similarly as aqu was used in the designation of ‘wife’. In contrast, AB used in these designations the words qori and qoca, which are identical with southern Crimean Tatar. Another peculiarity of the dialect of NB is the word tata for ‘aunt’, which is normally used in Crimean Tatar dialects in the designation of ‘older sister’.

6.2. Food terminology

Food terminology constitute a firm part of the vocabulary even of those peoples who changed their language for another. This is especially so if food names are related to distinctive religious feasts. Here are listed only those food names which are of Turkic origin, but unknown to Crimean Tatars: ayag (KCRPS k 51; Aleksandra Bakkhal: cewz ayag and ~ ayag, (Lebedeva 1992: 16), sarma (Lebedeva 1992: 164) ‘kinds of pastry’, as well as the famous, but debatable hazar qamage ‘kind of halva’ (Lebedeva 1992: 223–224), which are translated as ‘Khazar halva’. It is unclear whether it really recalls Khazar times or is a kind of popular etymology. Spinach in the name of a cooked meal is called alahan (Lebedeva 1992: 86). This word is absent from KCRPS and Ússin (1994), but listed in Radloff (1893: 357) in the form aqan ‘Sauerklöser’. The Crimean Tatar equivalent is the European word (via Turkish) ispaaq ‘spinach’ (Ússin 1994: 111).
6.3. Names of weekdays

KRPS gives the names of weekdays in all the three Karaim dialects. Aleksandra Balkal remembered the following days: yüşkên, yubahşkın, orikskin and şabhat-kên ‘Sunday, Monday, Wednesday and Saturday’, although she counted them from Monday, telling that yüşkên is Monday (evident influence of the modern European calendar in which a new week begins on Monday).

6.4. Old Crimean Karaim words absent from Crimean Tatar vocabulary

In KRPS, there are other words shared with Western Karaim and absent from Crimean Tatar. As the historical vocabulary of Crimean Karaim is insufficiently known, we do not know if these words were present in the past in this language and then replaced with new words, mostly of Turkish provenance. Here are a few examples only. CK tusesûl ‘to perish’ (KRPS thk 504), CK tavašl ‘strong’, 2. ‘bold’ (KRPS k 544, in h and t tavašl and tavesûl respectively).

The Crimean Karaim word for ‘step’ is both the archaic alan (KRPS thk 83), unknown in Crimean Tatar, and the modern adum. Beside aşam ‘evening’ (KRPS k 59), as in modern Crimean Tatar, Crimean Karaim also possesses the old word inšur (KRPS k 651), as WK inşir, inşîr etc. The Crimean Karaim word for ‘holy; sacred; saint’ is ayruqül and ayruksu, as in WC (i ayrixi, h ayriksi etc., KRPS S4–55), although Prik provides the word azis < Ar. ‘azir’, also listed in KRPS (655, although only in the meaning ‘dear’); however, the word azis for ‘saint etc.’ is also known in the two Western Karaim dialects (KRPS 49).

There are some other, very interesting words, e.g. teq ‘table’, mentioned by both A. Polkanov (1995: 34) and Prik (1976: 161), absent from KRPS and unknown in Crimean Tatar.

6.5. Phonetic differences

There are a few phonological processes well known from some Turkic languages and attested in Crimean Karaim, but not evidenced in the extant dialect material of Crimean Tatar. These processes produce phonetic differences. One is i > ı before the labial m, e.g. kım ‘who’ (Jankowski 1997: 26–27), CTat. kem; AB ekım ‘doctor’ (in çağırırım ekümm ‘I shall call a doctor’), CTat. being ekım. The other is a > e before j (a feature shared with the Troki dialect of Western Karaim) and sometimes ç, e.g. AB etyler < aytylar ‘they say’; ecîyim < aciyim ‘I am sorry; I feel compassion’; sæç < saç (KRPS k 500).

6.6. Different syntactic structures

Both Western Karaim and Crimean Karaim have SV as the basic word order in sentences with intransitive verb. However, in sentences with transitive verb, in contrast to Crimean Tatar which is a typical SOV language, spoken Crimean Karaim seems to have the main word order SVO, e.g. Universitetde eglum lens ‘I learned German at university’ (AB); in many cases, an adverbial complement also comes after the verb, e.g. Men de aşam sız bilet ‘I shall eat with you, too’ (AB). However, the SOV word order also occurs, e.g. Men soni ecîyim ‘I am sorry because of you’ (AB).

Crimean Karaim seems to make little use of conversers and converbal clauses. Modal verbs are linked with the main verb in the infinitival forms -mAyâ ~ -mâ: ~ -mâ, similarly to Western Karaim, e.g. lagır投资人 bohmey ‘[she] cannot talk’ (NB), cf. literacy CTat. laf etip alamay, N CTat. lap etalmay (< ete almay); korek edî işleme ‘One had to work’ (AB).

7. CONCLUSION

This paper does not satisfactorily reply to the most interesting questions, what was the spoken Crimean Karaim like and what differences were between the regional and social varieties of Crimean Karaim. It is because the documentation of spoken Crimean Karaim is very poor. Unfortunately, there is little chance to get any oral documentation more.

Nevertheless, an attempt was made to outline the existing studies and critically evaluate them. New evidence was also presented. Based upon existing material, it can be assumed that Crimean Karaim preserved their native language over the centuries, although Karaim, being very similar to the central dialect of Crimean Tatar gradually assimilated to it. Because none of these languages was strictly standardized, it would be illusory to look for a homogenous language and misleading to try to construct it. It is very likely that Karaims, similarly to Crimean Tatars, always used diversified language varieties. At the same time, the written language must have been better codified, yet its standard also changed over time. This is what concerns Karaim proper. On the other hand, Karims must have always been open to speak the language of their rulers, the Crimean khans. They probably used a different language in contacts with external world, and a different language at home and within their own community. It is like their dual names, something well-known in minority language strategies. Their distinct native language must have existed as long as other distinctive features of their culture exist.
ed. However, in the period of 18th–19th centuries while Crimean Karaim was rapidly assimilating to Crimean Tatar, the linguistic situation changed more to diglossia than bilingualism.

Much better perspectives are in relation to written language, for archival documents, old printed books and manuscripts are preserved and await further research. Both religious and secular written literature of Crimean Karaims deserve to be discovered and studied. The examination of the extant archival documents of non-literary value such as administrative, economic, financial, juridical and epistolary works may also shed light on the colloquial, spoken Crimean Karaim as used in the past.

Abbreviations

| AB | Aleksandra Bakkal |
| Ar | Arabic |
| C  | Central dialect |
| CK | Crimean Karaim |
| CTat | Crimean Tatar |
| h | Hakic dialect of WK in KRPS |
| Hb | Hebrew |
| k | Crimean Karaim in KRPS |
| N | Northern dialect |
| NB | Nina Bakkal |
| Per | Persian |
| S  | Southern dialect |
| SSH | Sergey Shamash |
| t | Troki dialect of WK in KRPS |
| WK | Western Karaim |
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At this point, it is worth mentioning that the first Karaim printing house in the Crimea started its activities in 1731, that is about one hundred and fifty years before Ismail Gaspirli founded the first Tatar printing house in Bakhchassarai in 1883.
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 Kumans 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, Kur. Tog),¹ and then in what is now Ukraine, notably Luck (Pol. Luck, Kar. Lucka),

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, attempts 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). 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, Karaims 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 Seria Shapshuil, the later hakhami, in the Crimea, Turkey and Poland in the 1920s, and accepted by eminent Karaim intellectual, including such renowned linguists as Ananiacz Zajacezkowicz. Even activists like Mardkowicz, who coined many new words and terms, but did not purify the language of the existing Hebrew lexicon, accepted the Turkic theory. 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 the Karaim community no longer exists, in Halic 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 Czóś 1998: 84 (note, however, that more than thirty years earlier Musaev also said that there were only three or four people able to speak the language (Musaev 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 Ponevičiūnė is similar to that in Troki.

3 In an editorial letter, he writes in Polish ... uważamy się przecież za narodowko turecką... (after all, we consider ourselves a "Turkic nationality" (Karaj Away, 12, 12). There is an interesting example of a complex, national, territorial and religious identity in a patriotic poem by J. Malecki, Miern barm Karai...: 'I am a Karai', in which the author writes: "One ancestors narrated to us that we are Anan's and Nas's sons (by bit tạmary Ann ol Nasihi), but he soon adds Krym, Dziati-Kale, Micel da Lithua da chally Lekhtban, cza samandalyui... Karaj uchelmiy zbeskaliy biringuihui." "The Crimea, Chaufit 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. 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-turki ‘Karai – 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 Karains profess the Law of Moses... We adopted the epithet Karaim (zbeki) after the appearance of Talmud, to distinguish ourselves from Talmudists (Dorvan 1890: 6).

In the past, the most important identification was that pronounced in Hebrew bne migra’, or qaraim, that is people who profess Karite 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 Crimen 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’i). In this connection the relationship between Rabbinc Jewish and Karains, 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. On the other hand, Grzegorzewski (1903: 47), who was utmost objective and far from any national antipathy, provided a 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 Karains 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 Karains by Balabun, who accused them of pretending to be the best among Jews, A[naniasz] Rojecki responded, “Karains [...] not being Jews (for they differ from Jews in both faith and ethnos), do not need to pretend to be Jews” (Rojecki 1939: 22).

4 The Turkization of the Karaim language continued until recently with the activities of the senior haszad Michal Firkowicz/Firkowicz. The so-called “de-Hebraization” of Karaim vocabulary was touched upon by Althauer (1972–89), but there are a few debatable points in this article.

5 Munkácsai has demonstrated that some religious hymns have been adopted by Karaim from Rabbinic Jewish literature (Munkácsai 1989: 187).
1924: 3). Detailed discussion of this problem should be the subject of another study.

Karaim dialects 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. lešen Qedar, lešon Qedar, bīsfat Qedar or the word Tatar, e.g. lešon Tatar. When referred in Russian, Karaim was mostly called karaimskoe naręcie “Karaim dialect or na razgovorno” naręcii karaimov” (Kobecki 1904).11

Western Karaim usually called Jews Rabbanat (Karay Avazy 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 kodem or asix til, which is its Turkic equivalent (Malecki 1890: vii). Sometimes other terms also appeared, e.g. eski Tenach til (Kokeni 1939: 30). When referring to Hebrew in Polish, Karaim 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-evreyskogul jezyka ‘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

6דבש מושву, as in the title of Malecki’s prayer book (Malecki 1900); see also Pritus 1959: 318.
7דבש מושライフ, as in the front page of the printed translation of Pentateuch into Karaim by Mičkovič & Rojek (1899), quoted from Kowalski 1929: bxvi.
9דבש מושライフ, as in the front page of the Bible translation published in 1841 in Eupatoria, Sfury Targum 1841; the author of the translation of the Book of Ruth into Krimchak (published in 1906) also called his language Tatar (175).
10As in the note in Russian in the title page of Malecki (1900).
11Quoted from Kowalski 1929: bxvii.
12The CKar. term Cafi (KRPS 633) < ḥabid < Ar. ḥabid came into use with the Turkic influence.
13For example, in a translation of the Book of Job (Kowalski 1929: 1) and in Malecki 1890: viii; the same name for Hebrew is used by Krimchaks (Polinsky 1991: 130).
14Note 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 Karaim, see an editorial article in Karay Avazy (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 Karaim

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. With the north-western group of the Turkic languages, they share a common trait with Urumis, 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 Karaim and Krimchaks.20
5.2. Their language of liturgy, science and communication with other religious communities was Hebrew (Kowalski 1929: xix-xx).
6. Karaim people have been for centuries an endogamous society; intermarriages with members of other groups are tolerated only recently, but children of mixed couples are still not considered Karaim by

15Careful scholars like Kowalski approached the Khazar theory with caution. See also Pritus 1959: 318-319, which contains many valuable details on Karaim, and is still a very useful, concise description of Western Karaim.
16Musayev 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 habitat (Musayev 1964: 6).
17Once Hebrew, then for some time, Russian was most intelligible.
18Urum is now an endangered language, Armeno-Kipchak is extinct, and Krimchaks 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 Qrimčaklar, and a school for children Qara Attyqın Mirdiati was founded (Afskunz 2000: 136).
19Kowalski (1929: bxv) 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.
20According to Kowalski (1929: ix-x), the Western Karaim 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: lx–lxxv, 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-Caspiian 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, Masiev also classifies Karaim in the same group (Masiev 1977: 5; 1997: 255). In his most detailed description, Masiev outlines the classifications of Karaim presented by Turkologists so far (Masiev 1964: 17–19). A similar position is assigned to Karaim by scholars of Karaim origin, e.g. Zajaczkowski (1931: 5) and Firkovičius (1964: 14).

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 Halićz dialect of Western Karaim being placed in the 2nd, *gos* subgroup, the Troki dialect of Western Karaim in the 3rd *gos* subgroup; furthermore, Halićz dialect belongs to the *yar* division (as a reflex of Common Turkic *yyl*), whereas the Troki dialect belongs to the *beš* division (as a reflex of Common Turkic *bes* (Tekin 1991: 13–15).

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 only upon phonological criteria is insufficient. Then, applying morphological criteria, we shall test the validity of traditional classifications. If we examine nouns (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 *-dny* > *-nl* in the genitive, in Karachai also *-arl* > *-al* (but in Balkar *-arl* > *-al* before some case suffixes. In addition, Karachai also has changed some verbal person suffixes, from *-mAn*, *-sAn* into *-mAl*, *-sAl* (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’, sarin ‘because of’, while Kumuk shares with Western Karaim a few question words, which Karachai-Balkar does not possess, e.g. nek ‘why’ and nelik (ne) ‘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, and located in a different subgroup. Inbay 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 (*ES*). Csáto (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 Rabbitine 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.

---

24 Note, however, that the infinitive *-m* in Kumuk resembles that in Western Karaim, because it is used to express various functions with auxiliary verbs, e.g. inchoativity (*-mGdAb bol*), ability (*-mGdAb bili*), permission (*-mAb bol*) and necessity (*-mGdAb lar*).

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, Kumuki, Karachais and Balkars are by some scholars all held to be indigenous Caucasian peoples, Turkized in a later period, not to speak of a hypothetic influence of Kipchaks (Goldin 1992: 389–391). Islam was finally implanted to Balkars as late as the 17th–18th centuries, and Kumuk are related to the Caucasian, Christian people of Giman.

26 Since Radloff’s claim that the dialects of Crimean Karaimas, Krimchaks and Grecs do not differ from the surrounding Tatar dialects (Radloff 1896: xvi), although this view was soon rejected by Samoglov, Turkology reference books have disregarded these languages until 1997. On Krimchak, see Rebi, Aškanzi & Aškanzi 1997; on Urum, there is a new in-depth with language documentation by Garkave, published in 1999 in Almaty. However, since it is still inaccessible, Urum language evidence was not taken to this paper.
3. LEXICAL SIMILARITIES OF KARAÏM, KRIMCHAK AND ARMENO-KIPCHAK

It is worth noting that except a few Hebrew conjunction, preposition or other function words are used in Karaïm 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 Karaïms and Krimchaks possessed a complete grammatical system of a Turkic language. In this system, there already were many function words copied from Persian, as ams - ams, eger, har, vali, ki et cetera. This system was sufficient for the adaptation of all Hebrew syntactic structures copied from canonical and liturgy texts. Second, Krimchaks and those Karaïms 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 Karaïms and Tatars, then Turkish for Crimean Karaïms 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, ohom(ob)rom, puki, to were borrowed, whereas the structure of Tatars and Turkish limited the infiltration of these structures into spoken Karaïm and Crimean Karaïm. An overt "un-Turkic" syntax of some Krimchak texts in Polinsky (1991) is a result of recent dramatic events, which brought about language change.

Karaïm, Krimchak and Armeño-Kipchak possess a vocabulary that is alien to Crimean Tatar. For example, alay - aly (KRPS h 61, 67; I E 21, Tr. 61) 'thus; so'; bulay - bulay (KRPS h 138, 140; I E 17; Tr. 167) 'thus'; kucy - k'ec ef - kicej - (KRPS k 355, 397, h 325; I E 17) 'to get strong' (in AK in the transitive form kucy - to strengthen), Tryjarski 1993: 96) nečik - n'ec ik' - nečik (KRPS t 419; k 422; I E 21; Polinsky 1991: 135), nucit (Tr. 546); tigel - tigel - i'ug a' (KRPS k, h, t 524, 551, 569; I E 16), tigil (Tr. 783-784) 'thorough; full; perfect'.

Some words are used in different forms, e.g. anuz - hana (KRPS i 70 - h 164 et cetera), ams (I E 16), hana (Tr. 267-268) 'more'; cöple - c'op l'a - (KRPS k 632; 628 et cetera; I E 18), cöpla - (Tr. 197) 'to gather, glean'; keret - k'er a't - k'er et (KRPS h 307; h 308, k 393; I E 17; in CTat. kere < Tur.) 'time; -fold'; kibik (KRPS k 316; I E 16), k'ibik, k'ibik (Tr. 391-392) 'like, as'.

Furthermore, Western Karaïm and Armeño-Kipchak share an old Kurdish vocabulary that disappeared from modern languages in the group, e.g. Kar. jerge (with variants, KRPS k 273, 274) 'range; degree; article' etc., AK jerge 'rite' (Tryjarski 1993: 108); Kar. koltha - koltha - goltha (KRPS k 331, 369), AK goltha (Tr. 485); umsan - (KRPS k 578), AK umsan - (Tr. 805) 'to hope'.

We cannot maintain that these words were never used in Crimean Tatar, Kumak 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 Armeño-Kipchak, as a language of Christians, from the languages of Karaim and Krimchak, as peoples who profess Karaïm and Judaism. For example, Karaim and Krimchak possess the following Hebrew words: adonay ΥΣ (KRPS k 46; I E 17); 'God'; malag ΖΝ (KRPS k 402; I E 16) 'angel'; navi ΧΝ (KRPS k 417; I E 15) 'prophet'; pesag ΝΣ (KRPS k 447, 450; I E 17) 'Passover'; raʃa ΖΝ (KRPS 452) 'sinner', (I E 17) 'wicked'; tane ΝΣ (KRPS k 510) 'pork fat, bacon', (I E 16) 'unclean'; tefila ΨΝ (KRPS 568 et cetera; I E 16). In contrast, many religious terms in Armeño-Kipchak have been borrowed from Armenian and Polish.31

There can be other common Hebrew words in spoken Karaïm and Krimchak. However, modern Krimchak texts available give a very scant evidence of them. Among phrases provided by Rebi (1993: 21-26), only one Hebrew word was found. It is megila < ΦΗΜΗ, in the expression megila qollayim (Rebi 1993: 25) 'Excuse me', H mechila (KRPS k 416).

There are also some genuine Trk. words in Karaïm and Krimchak, which probably existed in Old Kurdish, but cannot be evidenced in the modern languages, e.g. WK karav ~ garav (KRPS k 295, k 364) 'answer, responsibility'; garav (I E 46) 'recompense, reward', loanwords that do not exist in corresponding forms or meanings in other modern languages of the group, e.g. jarać (Jankowski 1997: 73; I E 15) 'judge' and 'to judge' (Ar. ʃar'at + Trk. et -), tuki (KRPS k 549; I E 17) 'as if' (Trk. tuk + Per. ki).

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

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

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

30 Regarding KRPS as Arabic.

31 In addition to religious terms of Turkish, Persian and Arabic origins (Tryjarski 1993: 65).
4. COMMON GRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF KARAIM, KRIMCHAK AND ARMENO-KIPCHAK

Phonological properties common to all languages treated here and differentiating them from the other representatives of the group are not substantial. Although not numerous, morphological distinctive features are fairly characteristic. 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. 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 Armenco-Kipchak. The role of a non-Turkic substrate, which is more likely in the case of Krimchaks, in the case of Karaim and Armenco-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, Kumaks, Karachais and Balkars changed under the influence of Turkish, which did not affect syntax.

4.1. Phonology

Krimchak and Karaim texts written with vocalized Hebrew letters can reflect phonological processes occurring in vowels fairly well. In contrast, the Armenian 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. As for Armenco-Kipchak, it is clear that at least some texts show a front-back harmony operating as far as the fourth syllable, e.g. olumsuzlu‘ (Tryjarski 1993: 77) ‘immortality’, konuluk ‘the truth’ (Tryjarski 1993: 99).

With regard to γ → ə̃- change, which characterizes Karachai-Balkar and some Crimean Tatar vocabulary, except Kumak the languages compared are more conservative. Notably, Western Karia is entirely a γ- language, as well as Armenco-Kipchak (Tryjarski 1992: 340), Old Krimchak and probably Old Crimean Karaim.

What is different from Crimean Tatar, Kumak and Karachai-Balkar, is the fronting of back vowels before and after [ŋ] in some words, e.g. CKar. ÇKrim. ayı- (I E 41); KRPS k 656) < ayı- ‘to say’; CKar. eği- < aği- (KRPS k 654), CKrim. ağıt- ‘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 Armenco-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, Ackmazi and Ackmazi (1997: 310), nor by my own recordings, although there are some constraints on front round vowels.

4.2. Morphology


32 For Western Karaim see Mussev 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 3.
33 In the fragments of the Bible translation there was only one example oğ-initial (Jankowski 1987: 63). In modern Karaim and Krimchak, ə-initial appears with CWat. words, e.g. Kari. ca,war- ‘to run out’ (see Jankowski, “On the language varieties of Karaims in the Crimea”, in this volume); Krim. şov- ‘to lose’ (Rebi 1993: 24). On the other hand, some Kumak words have also ə in the initial, e.g. şov- ‘to wash’, şov- ‘to gather’ (Bannamov 1969: 140, 141).
34 The form ayı- was only attested in ayı (I E37).
35 It is Kipchak dialect of Western Karia that occupies an isolated place in the group with the ə u > e i change in every position, and the ə u > e i (IPA Tė) change, although the latter also occurs in Balkar, and some reflexes of it can be found in Codex Cumanicus.
Except for modern Crimean Tatar and Karimchak, the other languages in question do not possess the Q̄huz future tense exponent ČAK. 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 Karaim and Armeno-Kipchak. The same holds true for Old Krimchak, e.g. adī ol kishīnīq (I E 15) ‘the name of this man’.

The basic word order of predicate, subject and object is in Western Karaim and Krimchak, e.g. H kabul ettim bitik (Karay Aways 13, 9) ‘I have received a letter’, Krim. adī aqaçılañ (Polsinsky 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.

Therefore, the newly emerged conjunction should not be mixed up with the particle, from which it developed, and which behaves like a normal Turkic 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 ayiti, da ol hu (IIb. 30, 7). 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 sozru etuçi da tanglañteçi ‘one who speaks and one who listens to’; ayiti k’i eki awaßi de de i$$a$$wa awaazzi jaçv bolguy ‘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 Comanicus, e.g. ol sâzå ayiti da gânya teşer etine bérde bi ‘he uttered these words and gave soul to the hands of God’ (Grenbech 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.

Naturally, conversal constructions 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 kajtyjyk ‘let us come back as one’, s’en tynlap sándym ‘I broke down after listening to you’ (Firković 1989: 185, 186). These sentences would sound now like bir bolalydm de kajtalym and m’en s’en tynladym da sándym, 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 àsana, ki olaj kylynyr (Karay Aways 1939, 2) ‘we believe that it will be so done’; OKrim. ol nevæñin ki aikore ola (I E 22) ‘the prophecy which was revealed’; AK har k’im ki bâyär xatun k’is’i nana (Tryjarski 1997: 312) ‘everybody who looks at a woman’.

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 -Q̄H 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 know only from poems, we cannot draw any final conclusion, since the word order of Turkic verse is relatively free. Cf. e.g. T’en’irg’a saranuq, maççaqan kafañen ‘sing a song to God, proclaim His praise’ but tyña m’en i sâzâna ‘listen to me a little’ (quotations from a poem of Sholom b. Akhron, 1650–1715, in Firković 1989: 188).
44 Of the texts published by Polsinsky (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.
46 Although the standard descriptions of such modern languages as Kuwaš, Kamčuk-Ulak 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 Conversal clauses appear in Western Karaim secondarily under the influence of western syntax, e.g. H Ekore aqagywa xuxaq kemañu boraxa, golbolax awwam, biñitiq ol omayw czawla ‘On the next day, the hazzan reads up a blessing, requesting God that He keep the mother clean’ (Grzegorewski 1918: 273, 294).
This type of constructions is also encountered in other Turkic 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 -Ωην, e.g. Τηλεγοράλα διαλέγεται τί έκταί τις περιστάτικες (Malecki 1889: vii; Kow. 146) 'I shall also do these that work on prayer books be completed', AK Α4 k’ un oruçnu postanovit étér ... k’ šu zamanda hizni ýuqunoy oyunq.芀iyor (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 LANGUAGES

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. 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 Zaruch Abrahamowicz, Ucared bir tigireth, there are an “Altaic syntax”, two Persian and two Arabic, three Slavic and no Hebrew loanwords (Grzegorzewski 1918: 292). According to Grzegorzewski, Kisenec, another poem by Abrahamowicz, resembles the general trends in traditional Karaim literature, so it retains constructions copied from the context 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 1994: 149).

5.1. Lexical copies

There is a rich literature on lexical loanwords in Karaim. Also Karaim scholars have studied this question, e.g. Firkovič (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. Nathan (?1595–1663), we find an early borrowing of the Pol. modal word niechaj ‘let ...’, anił na kemhubusam | ... n’egoj m’en aniłjam | (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 tawul zahidamlaq ič’i’una (Malecki 1889: v) ‘not to oppress’. In this example, negation is not expressed by the suffix -ma, but by the negation particle tawa. In Old Krimchak, we find a Turkic construction in this function, e.g. varmanaq ičam (I E 21) ‘not to go’. I could not find any evidence for such a use of dugal 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 -ca. 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.

---

48 On the Slavic influence on Western Karaim see Dubińska 1994.
49 Yosef b. Ichak Erak’s Tragedie, published by Radloff (1896: 411–424), does not reflect the spoken language.
50 Note, however, that this is not a critical edition.
As a result of very intensive contacts with Slavic languages, Western Karaim and Armenian-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 Armenian-Kipchak verb to express ‘to do’ or ‘to be’, mostly et- and bol-, e.g. H zaprowat (Grzegorzewski 1903: 39) < zaprowadził etti ‘he carried’, AK zapalića bol- ‘to burn’, zapalić et- ‘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. CTag. zvoniti et- armiyyada sıği 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 türkçe, but the -A suffix is not allowed with the word ‘Polish’ *polska, for a total copy po polsku ‘in Polish’ is used (Grzegorzewski 1903: 46).}

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 avazar (Kow. 112) ‘louder’ < Pol. głosniej. In this case, the Pol. expression was calqued from the Kar. [< Per.] word awa – ‘voice; sound’ following the pattern of Polish formation, with the Kar. superlative suffix -ara. Compare H najłatwiej (Grzegorzewski 1903: 28) ‘the sweetest’ < Pol. najślodzniej, 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 alaj ož ‘u ‘identically’ < Pol. tak samo; T Lyzak uzum burubud (Kow. 112) ‘Isaak

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

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

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 Kumyk 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 = Armo-Kipchak
Ar. = Arabic
CKar. = Crimean Karaim
CTat. = Crimean Tatar
h, H = Halicz dialect of Western Karaim
Hb. = Hebrew
k = Crimean Karaim
Kar. = Karaim
Krim. = Krimchak
L = Luck dialect of Western Karaim
OKrim. = Old Krimchak
Per. = Persian
Pol. = Polish
Sl. = Slavic
T, 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.
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APPENDIX

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

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. 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. Surač (d. 2000) in France. It contains 30 items, published in the 1990s.

In Russia:

Corb, M. [I'am] Kal'kovlevich] 1993. Kryanke karainy, Moskva: M. S. Surač, [44 pp.; From the contents: Remnants of paganism of Crimean Karaims; Ceburin pies and brown roosters; the first Crimean printing house; Aë-ker [1] (a Karaim tale); Karaim aphorisms; Karaim proverbs and sayings; Karaim riddles; Hoja Nasreddin stories and parables.]


1 I am indebted to Prof. Dr. Yuri Polikanov, author of valuable works on Karaim, for granting me many publications included in this bibliography and to Ms. Mariela Aleksievska, editor of Awanmyzy, for her important additions to this list.
3 Although Poland falls out of the scope of this bibliography, it is to note that at the end of the 1990s a bulletin Awanmyzy devoted to the history, social and cultural affairs of Karains began to appear. It is published by the Karaim Religious Association and the Association of Polish Karains: (1) 1999 (12 pp.); number 2 refers to a brochure issued 10 years ago, regarded as the predecessor of the present bulletin; (2) 1999 (20 pp.) and (4) 2000 (20 pp.). This fact is worth mentioning because Polish Karains did not have any periodical publication for years, and the list by Harviainen (1997), includes in fact only one Polish publication.
A Bibliography of Publications on Karaims. [153]

JALIPEČ, G. S. 1993. Rusko-karaimský rasspravnik. Urus-Varzy laygrydoj. Simferopol', Tavrija. [112 pp.; the phrasebook includes dialogues 8-33; portions of a play by Kuty 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.]


—. 2000. Oebra po istorii krymskix karainov-turkov. Simferopol'. [116 pp.; published by the author; studies on the history and national characters of Karaim 3-57, 58-63, a chapter on Karaim personal names 84-85, with lists of families, male and female names 85-113.]


—. 1997. Progulka po Odessu. Odessa. [28 pp.; without the name of the publisher; a well documented travelogue of Karaim institutions in Odessa.]

POLKANOV, A. [undated, without the place of publication] Krymskie karaimy. [90 pp.; a version of A. I. Polkanov 1995, printed in Ukraine.]

POLKANOV, A. I. 1994. Obyajki i obyajcia krymskich karaimov-turkov: lenča, redenje rebeka, pohorony. Bahhüzaag. [52 pp.; description of the related national customs of Crimean Karaim in Russian with a short glossary of Karaim terms, a bibliographical note on Sona Mangeli and information on the facsimile of Karaim Encyclopaedia published so far; there is no information on the transmitters of the bulk of most customs described.]

—. 1995a. Zhitnyigradskix Astor-Sory. Postovlyi i popovoroki krymskich karaimov. Bahhüzaag. [78 pp.; over 1,000 Karaim ridles with Russian translation, drawn from the works by Dobatski, Kefel, Radiof, Zilenko and KRIP, and recorded from informants indicated in the introduction, with no information on this at a particular ridge.]

—. 1995b. Legendy i perejazan karay (krymskich karaimov-turkov). Simferopol'. [67 pp.; a selection of legends collected by A. I. Polkanov, S. Krym and S. Shakal, some of which have already been published, pp. 9-38, with compiler's comments and bibliographical notes on the collectors; in Russian.]


RUSLAVA, M. B. (ed.) 1996. S. E. Divan “Ja lijidalj Epatarijenii”. Slovo i delo Gorodskogo Godov. Epataria: Izdatelstvo Udzyne vedomosti. [4 + 154 pp. and 40 photographs; Life story of the renown citizen and public person of Epataria, with an outline of his activities, including documents such as speeches, projects and photographs.]

ŠAPTAL, Senya, t.a. Karaimy i Chufax-Kale v Krymu. Krakžky ocherk. [No place of publication ad publisher provided; an extended and annotated re-edition of Šapikal's earlier publication, 37 pp.; published by J. A. Polkanov, 3-4, with a bibliographical note on Šapikal.]

In France:

POLKANOV, A. I. 1995. Krymskie karaimy (karai — korennyi naseleniennyj tjaatrnik narod Kryma). Paris: [IV + 275 pp.; edited by Yu. A. Polkanov, with a foreword by J. Kukhnie (3-IV) and J. Polkanov (7-14); without the name of the publisher; this is a slightly modified version of the undated edition, extended by numerous paragraphs inserted in italics by J. Polkanov.]

SARÁČ, M. S. 1996. Ulenie Anoma. [31 pp.; an appendix to the newsletter Karaimstke Vesti; also appeared in an English translation, see below.]

—. 1997. Avant's Teaching. Appendix to "Karai News". [22 pp.; English translation of the above; no publication place provided.]

In Ukraine: