

Michał Németh (Kraków)

## **North-Western and Eastern Karaim Features in a Manuscript Found in Łuck\***

### **I. Preliminary remarks**

As reported in MARDKOWICZ (1933b), a considerable part of the Karaim manuscripts stored in the loft of the *kenesa* in Łuck until the First World War were destroyed during the war and the Russian Revolution in 1917. Luckily for us, some of those manuscripts, mostly private letters and circulars, after having been stored and partly edited in 1933 by Aleksander Mardkowicz,<sup>1</sup> ended up in a private collection and have survived in almost perfect condition to this day.

The majority of the surviving manuscripts is written in Hebrew semi-cursive script – most of them in the Łuck subdialect of Łuck-Halicz Karaim (hereinafter called, for the sake of brevity, the Łuck Karaim dialect), a smaller part of the collection being written in Troki Karaim. Even though some of the manuscripts display glosses from other dialects, the reader normally has no particular difficulty classifying the manuscript from the linguistic point of view. They are going to be presented in the near future in another, more extensive study. The collection, however, contains

\* We are indebted to Prof. Henryk Jankowski (Poznań) for reviewing the present paper and for valuable suggestions. We are grateful also to Dr. Marek Piela (Kraków) for Hebraistic help.

<sup>1</sup> We have recently dealt with this part of the collection in NÉMETH (2009) discussing intentional amendments introduced to some of the surviving texts in MARDKOWICZ (1933a).

a document of which we cannot be entirely sure which dialect some of its fragments represent. As it exhibits a number of interesting features, including traces of far-reaching dialect mingling, it undoubtedly deserves a separate presentation.<sup>2</sup>

## II. Description of the manuscript

The manuscript is part of Józef Sulimowicz's (1913–1973) collection and can be found under the catalogue number 50<sup>II</sup> (see the upper-right corner of the sheet). The dark cream-coloured plain sheet of the size of 215 × 165 mm has been folded in four and contains four drafts written in dark brown and black ink. The drafts were ordered by someone who had previously read them (most probably by A. Mardkowicz) and are marked with A, B, C, and D. We copy this order in our transcription as this order follows logically from the arrangement of the four fragments on the sheet. The right and, to some extent, also the left margins of the sheet are somewhat ragged, but the text itself has not been damaged.

It is clear at first glance that the drafts are written by four different hands. Firstly, this transpires from the fact that only the first fragment is vocalised. Secondly, this is especially visible when comparing the shape and the size of the letters (see facsimile provided). The most important differences are: *koph* is considerably different in fragment A and in the rest of the manuscript (where its shape is quite unusual when compared to other Łuck Karaim texts available to us); *tzadhe* and *shin* have different shapes in fragments A, B, and D; and, finally, *daleth* and the final *mem* are shaped differently in parts B and C. The shape of the rest of the letters is simple to such a degree that there are usually only minor differences between them, such as have no value of proof unless an extensive graphological examination is performed. We strongly believe that the above-mentioned dissimilarities in themselves suffice to prove that all of these fragments originate from different authors, even if in terms of handwriting, parts B and C are somewhat similar to each other.

We consider these texts to be drafts because many words have been struck through, amended, or added to the text at a later time. Apart

<sup>2</sup> We are indebted to Mrs Anna Sulimowicz for making access to the digital copy of the manuscript possible.

from this, the signatures of the authors are also missing. The latter fact would support our assumption, especially when seen in the light of the content of line 16.

As far as their content is concerned, all four parts are quite similar to one another and rather simple. In fact, the manuscript is simply a common summons sent to Shemoel the son of Yaakov Simcha by four different people seeking to have their property restored (including jewellery and articles made of gold, silver and copper). Thus, the letter is most probably a result of the authors' joint effort to get their property back.

Our knowledge about the addressee is extremely modest. Based on the information available in the census record list of the census conducted on 8<sup>th</sup> May 1858 (RS 1858), we can say that Shemoel, the son of Yaakov Simcha, was born around 1826, and his father Yaakov passed away in 1855. Additionally, from another document written most probably in 1868 and containing a list of heads of households in the Karaim community of Łuck, we know that his surname was *Kačor*<sup>3</sup> and that he was still unmarried at that time. Finally, the present manuscript tells us that he was living in a village called in Karaim *Rudecki* (= Pol. *Rudecka*), situated approximately 16 km south-east of Łuck in the municipality of Jarosławicze, in the district of Dubno (SGKP XV/2: 556).

Note that this place name is missing from the list of villages inhabited by Karaims in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century drawn up and published by MARDKOWICZ (1933c: 22).

Unfortunately, we do not have enough information to say exactly when the manuscript was written. As such, we can merely attempt to establish an approximate date based on the highly fragmentary information about the author's life. Namely, the fact that the creditors deposited their goods with him and addressed the summons to him means probably that he was already independent financially. Consequently, according to Karaim tradition that would mean that either he should have been married by this time or the letter was sent after his father passed away. Based on the dates previously mentioned, we can say then that the letter was most probably written after Yaakov Simcha's death in 1855.

<sup>3</sup> We quote this Karaim surname basing on the list of family names drawn up in KRPS 674–680 – in a transcription.

### III. Transcription<sup>4</sup>

#### A

- [1] *ʿhwby<sup>5</sup> km<sup>c6</sup> Šemoeł b<sup>7</sup> ʿhwby ʿhy<sup>8</sup> km<sup>c</sup> Jaakov*  
 [2] *Simɣa<sup>9</sup> hzqn<sup>10</sup> zl<sup>11</sup>*  
 [3] *Kołamen seńi ki bojurɣajsen berme<sup>12</sup>*  
 [4] *ćiringńi bałašanyj puskaba da belibawny[.]*  
 [5] *Ospu nerset<sup>13</sup> eki nerseńi ber bu<sup>14</sup>*  
 [6] *ribbiđe ńeprińnenno[.]*

#### B

- [7] *bkpr<sup>15</sup> Rudeckij Šemoeł ben Jaakov Simɣanyn*  
 [8] *kołuna ɕerğań ńersalarimdań artyk bir ńersam*

<sup>4</sup> In order to distinguish the Hebrew fragments we have transliterated them with italic letters. The phonetic value of [w] remains a disputable question in the light of KOWALSKI'S (1929: XLIV) remark about Karaim: 'Doch findet man *w* als individuelle Aussprache, namentlich bei Leuten aus der älteren Generation, auch in der NW-Mundart'. A similar case is that of the voiced uvular [ɣ], which was most probably pronounced as a velar voiced [h] at that time – at least in the Łuck Karaim dialect. We have left [ɣ] in the transcription in view of GRZEGORZEWSKI'S (1903: 5–6) description, in which we can read that this phoneme was still used at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Halicz by elderly people, more precisely 'bei solchen die aus Troki (oder aus dem Oriente) stammen oder längere Zeit dort zugebracht haben'. Thus, the phonetic realisation of [w] and [ɣ] differed depending on the speakers' idiolect.

<sup>5</sup> אהובי: Hebr. אֶהוּבִי 'my beloved'.

<sup>6</sup> כמע: The abbreviation stands for Hebr. קְבוּדַ מַעְלֵת 'honourable sir, the Honourable' (see e.g. BAADER 1999: 148).

<sup>7</sup> ב: An abbreviation of Hebr. בֶּן 'son; the son of'.

<sup>8</sup> אחי אהובי: Hebr. אֶחָי אֶהוּבִי 'my beloved kinsman'.

<sup>9</sup> שימחה: The Hebrew name *Simcha* שִׂמְחָה – an orthographical variant written with *yodh* here.

<sup>10</sup> הוקן: Hebr. הוֹקֵן '1. aged man; 2. scholar' used with Hebrew definite article ה.

<sup>11</sup> זל: A commonly used abbreviation for Hebr. זְכוֹנוֹ לְבָרָכָה 'may his memory be blessed; of blessed memory' (cf. e.g. BAADER 1999: 112).

<sup>12</sup> A word has been inked over at the end of line 3 in a manner which makes the reading of it impossible, cf. the facsimile.

<sup>13</sup> נרסיל: Probably the first part of the mistakenly (and erroneously) written word *nersełerni* has been struck through here by the author.

<sup>14</sup> בו: Surprisingly, the demonstrative pronoun *bu* appears in this sentence in the role of the definite article. Cf. also the same usage of *bu* in line 14.

<sup>15</sup> בכפר: Hebr. בְּכַפֵּר 'village' used with the Hebrew preposition בְּ 'in; within'.

- [9] kałmady da bir<sup>16</sup> kurušlyx<sup>17</sup> ŋerša saklamadym[.]  
 [10] Eđer jałyan sowłasam to *mšpʔ*<sup>18</sup> *šʔw*<sup>19</sup> po zakonie<sup>20</sup> borčłum<sup>21</sup>[.]

## C

- [11] Kołamen seńi ki bujruγajsen berme bar  
 [12] nerselerimńi *kasjylaryn* ne men berđim  
 [13] seńin kołaryna[.] *bir* Nemeded<sup>22</sup> ofatet[-]  
 [14] memeske<sup>23</sup>[.] Baryn bergin<sup>24</sup> bu<sup>25</sup> ribbińin  
 [15] kołuna<sup>26</sup>[.]

## D

- [16] *ny hłwtm mth mʔyd ʔly ky*<sup>27</sup> *bkpr* Rudecki  
 [17] Šemoel ben Jaakov Simγanyń kołuna berğań ŋerša[-]  
 [18] larimdań baška artyk bir ŋeršam kałmady  
 [19] ńi ałtyn ńi kuńuś<sup>28</sup> ńi bakyr[.] Da bir  
 [20] ŋerša astramadym da *byt dynńiń*<sup>29</sup>  
 [21] bujruγuna *wmlknyń*<sup>30</sup> ijğań kišilarińa[.]

<sup>16</sup> ביר: The author added the word afterwards to the text, between lines 8 and 9.

<sup>17</sup> כורושלוק: This shape of final *koph* is characteristic of Luck Karaim texts.

<sup>18</sup> משפט: Hebr. מִשְׁפָּט 'seat of judgement', here in *status constructus* מִשְׁפָּט.

<sup>19</sup> צואה: Hebr. צִוְיָה '1. command, order; 2. testament, will'.

<sup>20</sup> פו זכוני < Russ. *по закону* 'in compliance with the law'. The *-u > -e* change can probably be explained by contamination with the prepositional case form of Pol. *zakon* 'order, monastery', namely *zakonie*.

<sup>21</sup> בורצלום: The abbreviated *-m* COPULA.1.SG ending (< *-myn*) is quite rare in Karaim texts. As far as we know, it has been mentioned only by BERTA (1998: 309).

<sup>22</sup> The reading of the word remains somewhat unclear. To justify our reading we must assume that the letter *daleth* is written carelessly and that is why it rather resembles *resh*. Cf. also the word *berđim* in the previous line, where *daleth* is very similar to *resh*, too.

<sup>23</sup> אוטייטימיסיכיא: The word form most probably contains a writing error, as from the morphological point of view the repeated syllable *-me-* cannot be explained.

<sup>24</sup> בירגין: A closer examination of the word shows that the author previously wrote an initial *waw* standing for [*v-*], instead of *beth*.

<sup>25</sup> בו: The pronoun is used in the role of definite article. Cf. *bu* in line 5.

<sup>26</sup> כולונה: The final letter is written somewhat carelessly, cf. the facsimile.

<sup>27</sup> Hebr. אָנִי הַחוֹתֵם מִשָּׁה מַעֲיֵד עָלַי כִּי 'I, the undersigned, testify that'.

<sup>28</sup> כומוש: We would expect rather *כיומויש* here rendering [-u-] in both syllables, analogically to the notation of [-o-] < [-ö-] in *kořa* in lines 23 and 24.

<sup>29</sup> ביתדין גין: Hebr. בֵּית-דִּין 'law court' with the Karaim genitive suffix attached.

<sup>30</sup> ומלך גין: The word form consist of Hebr. וְ 'and' and מֶלֶךְ 'king, sovereign'. A separately written genitive case ending is attached to the latter one.

- [22] Jałyan sowłamadym. Eđer jałyan sozłaśam<sup>31</sup> da  
 [23] bir ńerśa sakłasam to *mšp̄tka*<sup>32</sup> końa  
 [24] da zakonŷa końa borčŷu bołurmyn<sup>33</sup>[.]

#### IV. Translation

##### A

- [1] My beloved Shemoel the Honourable, the son of my beloved kins-  
 man of blessed memory Yaakov Simcha  
 [2] the Honourable [and] the scholar [~ the aged][.]  
 [3] I ask you to have the kindness to give [back]  
 [4] the jewellery with the tinplate box and the belt[.]  
 [5] Give these two particular articles to the  
 [6] *ribbi* by all means[.]

##### B

- [7–8] Except the articles passed into  
 Shemoel the son of Yaakov Simcha's hands in the village of Rudecki  
 not even one  
 [9] left and I did not store even a [single] worthless<sup>34</sup> thing[.]  
 [10] If I had lied, then an order<sup>35</sup> of the law court<sup>36</sup> [would be enough  
 to state that] in compliance with the law I am [, and not you,] the  
 indebted [~ guilty] one[.]<sup>37</sup>

<sup>31</sup> סוולסיים: The letter *zayin* has been written over an original *waw*, which points to the fact that the author originally wanted to use the verb *sowła-* here, too. Probably the author's intention was to improve the text stylistically, reducing the number of words repeated in one sentence. A *yodh* denoting palatality after the word-initial *samekh* might, in fact, be expected here, as it is also used for [-o-] in the postposition *כיוריה* *końa*. The lack of it, in this case, can be explained as a result of corrupt amendment. Another possible explanation for such writing would be to interpret the word form as *sözleşem*, see the relevant chapter in the *commentary and conclusions*.

<sup>32</sup> משפט קא: Hebr. מִשְׁפֵּט 'seat of judgement' with a separately written dative case suffix.

<sup>33</sup> בולורמין: The author made a significant error by writing the word originally with an initial *o-* (cf. the facsimile, the initial *aleph* and *waw* is clearly legible under *beth*).

<sup>34</sup> Literally: 'one *kuruš*'s worth of something'.

<sup>35</sup> צואו: Corruptly written Hebr. צִוְּיָה 'command, order'.

<sup>36</sup> משפט: Hebr. מִשְׁפֵּט 'seat of judgement', here in *status constructus* מִשְׁפֵּט.

<sup>37</sup> The meaning of the last line is somewhat vague.

## C

- [11] I ask you to have the kindness to give [back] all of  
 [12] my articles that I passed into  
 [13] your hands[.] There is nothing to be taken  
 [14] away[.]<sup>38</sup> Pass all [of them back] into the  
 [15] *ribbi's* hands[.]

## D

- [16–17] I, the undersigned, testify that except the articles passed into  
 Shemoel the son of Yaakov Simcha's hands in the village of  
 Rudecki  
 [18] [there is] not even one [article] left,  
 [19] either [made of] gold, silver or copper[.] And  
 [20] I did not hide [away] even a single thing, either,  
 [21] [according] to the order of the law court and the [order of the]  
 sovereign sent to the people[.]  
 [22] I did not lie. If I had lied and  
 [23] stored even a single thing, I would be [, and not you], according  
 to the law court  
 [24] and in compliance with the law, the indebted [~ guilty] one[.]

## V. Commentary and conclusions

It must be stated at the outset that Karaim manuscripts in general – written in any of the dialects – usually reflect different degrees of irregular writing, in parts very irregular. This, being characteristic also of the edited text, makes the assignment of the particular fragments to respective dialects, based on orthographical evidence only, fairly difficult, all the more so as the fragments are very short. Not only that, but the north-western fragments and even eastern Karaim elements occurring in the manuscript compel us to treat the whole document even more cautiously, irrespective of the fact that the addressee was a member of the community in Łuck and that the manuscript was stored and found in that town, too.

### Part A

The first, four-line-long Karaim fragment can be conclusively classified, based purely on linguistic evidence, as clearly a south-western type. Already

<sup>38</sup> The translation is uncertain due to difficulties in reading the handwriting.

the first verbal form קולמן *kołamen* (3) itself – with the KarŁ. personal ending *-men* as opposed to KarT. *-myn* – is enough to rule out north-western Karaim.<sup>39</sup> Similar morphonological evidence is provided by בוירַהֲיָסֶן *bojuryajsən* (3) and בֶּרְמָה *berme* (3) – as opposed to KarT. *bujuryejsyn* and *berma*, respectively. Furthermore, based on the word forms פּוֹסְקָבָא *puskaba* (4) and אוֹסְפוֹ *ospu* (5) we can rule out eastern Karaim as the language of this particular fragment, too. Given that the distinction between *samekh* used for [s] and *shin* for [š] is retained throughout in the text, we can confidently postulate south-western [s] in those words. Note that the first of these is a loanword from Pol. *puszka* [-š-] ‘box’, and the second one is an equivalent of KarK. *ušbu* ‘this; this particular’ (KRPS 587).<sup>40</sup> Finally, an additional piece of evidence supporting the south-western origin of the fragment is the simple fact that the author addressed Shemoel the son of Yaakov Simcha as his kinsman (see lines 1–2), i.e. they possibly belonged to the same community.

Worth mentioning are the rules of spelling of this fragment, more precisely the notation of [e]. Compared to other Łuck Karaim manuscripts, this letter displays a distinct difference when representing this sound in every position.

The notation of medial [-e-] deserves special attention. The most significant difference is the use of *shwa* for indicating both [-e-] and the absence of a vowel, even in Karaim words, cf. קולמן *kołamen* (3) and נִרְסְנִי *nerseñi* (5). As a matter of fact, in Łuck Karaim manuscripts, at least those available to us, medial [-e-] occurs as a realization of *shwa* solely in the case of words of Hebrew-origin, obviously simply because in those words the original spell-

<sup>39</sup> We claim this even though the medial [-e-] as written in the word is quite unusual, namely with *shwa*. Further explanations of this notation will follow below.

<sup>40</sup> ÇULHA (2006: 115) quotes KarKT. *ušpu*, probably assuming an assimilative *-šb- > -šp-* change in respect of the Crimean form. It may well be, however, that the authoress of the latter dictionary misrepresented the data found in KRPS, and ascribed the KarT. form *ušpu* ‘this; this particular’ also to the eastern dialect. It also remains unclear why Tksh. *öteki* ‘the other one; the further; the one over there’ is provided as the meaning of the word in the dictionary discussed (Tksh. *işbu* would be much more appropriate). Older Karaim dictionaries and Łuck Karaim texts we have had the opportunity to read so far do not note it. Perhaps it is a mistake? Even CLAUSON (1972: 254–255), cited by ÇULHA (2006: 115), does not provide the above-mentioned meaning for compound words containing Tkc. *oš* and *bu* (for the structure and etymology of the pronoun see STACHOWSKI 2007: 172–173). In our text the meaning ‘this; these’ fits in well with the context. We cannot find the above-mentioned eastern form in CHAFUZ (1995) and LEVI (1996).

ing tended to be retained. This notation has its roots most probably in the tradition of reading Hebrew liturgy and prayers, which was still alive at that time. It fits with the fact that the basic realisation of *shwa* in Hebrew texts was [e] amongst the Karaims in the Crimea and in Lithuania, see HARVIAINEN (1997: 106ff.). There is, in fact, also some evidence allowing us to assume that the same was the case in Halicz (see HARVIAINEN 1997: 109) or even in Łuck (see HARVIAINEN 1997: 112). Consequently, to a certain extent we may treat this notation as an additional piece of evidence showing that the basic realisation of *shwa* in the 19<sup>th</sup>-century Hebrew current among Łuck Karaims could have been [e], too.

Another curiosity of the fragment is the use of the vowel sign *seghol* (plus a *yodh*, i.e. -י), in the word בְּלִיבְבְּנִי *belibawny* (4) for rendering [-e-]. This, similarly to the previous notation, is very rare in Karaim manuscripts from Łuck. And again, from the manuscripts available to us, it is clear that *seghol* was used mostly in Hebrew loanwords.

The third vowel sign used for medial [-e-] is *tzere* written without *yodh* after it (see בְּרֵמָה *berme* in line 3). Even though this was not the most frequent notation in Łuck Karaim manuscripts, it was frequent enough not to be treated here as a peculiarity.

In initial position [e-] appears once: in the word אֶקִי *eki* (5), i.e. it is noted with *aleph* with *tzere* (אֶ). It is true that one example is wholly insufficient to be representative. Still, we can say that the notation is unusual when compared to those manuscripts from Łuck we have seen. In those, the vocalised fragments display mostly *aleph* with *tzere* plus *yodh* (-אֵי) – *aleph* with *tzere* is very rare. Hebrew loanwords – in which the original spelling was kept unchanged – and proper names are, of course, an exception here.

We have only one attestation of final [-e] in this part, rendered by *seghol* and *he* (הֵ) in the word בְּרֵמָה *berme* (3). In this case we cannot find any analogical example in the materials compared. Both the vowel sign *seghol* in general, and *he* for final [-e], are extremely rare.

The lexicon and the syntax of this short fragment display evident Slavonic, more precisely Polish and Russian influence. Besides the word *puska* (4), already mentioned, two other Slavonic words, namely בְּלִישְׁנִי *balášanyj* (5) and נִפְרִימֵנּוּ *népriμένno* (6), appear here. Surprisingly enough, the letter *yodh* after *lamedh* in the word *balášanyj* most probably reflects the Russian palatal *l* in *бляшный*, which would be a rather interesting influence of Polish orthography, in which the letter *i*, that is to say the graphic equivalent in the Latin alphabet of Hebr. *yodh*, is used for expressing palatality

of a prevocalic consonant. If *yodh* stood for *-j-*, we would expect the vowel sign *pattāh* to be written underneath it, not after it.<sup>41</sup>

As is usually the case in Łuck Karaim texts, the word order is strongly influenced by Slavonic constructions (SVO). In fact, the whole fragment copies Slavonic syntax and word order, except for the use of the demonstrative pronoun בּוּ *bu* (5) used, on the model of Hebrew, as a definite article. The Hebrew influence in this case is unambiguous; the more so as the pronoun stands before the title *ribbi* – just as in the case of other Hebrew honorifics used with the definite article הַ in Karaim, Hebr. הַיָּקָן ‘1. the scholar; 2. the aged’ used in line 2 (see *hzqn*) being a good example. What makes the use of the pronoun in question even more interesting is the fact that, to the extent we know, in the grammatical descriptions to date this role has been attributed only to the pronoun *ot* ‘that; those’ (PRITSAK 1959: 331).

## Part B

The most important clue allowing us to identify the language of the second fragment is the notation of the vowels [a] and [e]. In particular, the expression פּוּ זָכוּנִי *po zakońe* (10), of Slavonic origin, clearly shows us that final [-e] was written, as expected, with *yodh*. It is important to state that *yodh* is also used in all places where, in each of the three Karaim dialects, there is [e]. Additionally, the conjunction דָּא *da* (9) confirms that the final *aleph* was used by the author for rendering [-a]. Seen in this light, the word form נִרְסָא *ńerśa* (9) cannot be read but with final [-a] as opposed to KarŁ. *nerse* with [-e]. The same can be said about *aleph* in medial position: it must have been used for [-a-] in the word נִרְסָאֲרִימְדָאִן *ńerśalarimďań* (8), as we cannot see any reason why it would not be noted with *yodh* if it had been pronounced [e]. In any case, it is also clear from the Łuck Karaim manuscripts known to us that medial *aleph* was never used for [-e-]; thus the latter word cannot be interpreted as KarŁ. *nerseřerimden*. This is the first argument to show that the current fragment should be classified as written in Troki Karaim.

Further, there is another orthographical feature which can be explained only with Troki Karaim morphonology. In such word forms as בִּרְגָאִן *berġań* (8), נִרְסָאֲרִימְדָאִן *ńerśalarimďań* (8), נִרְסָם *ńerśam* (8) and סוּלְסָם *sowłasam* (10) the suffix vowel is not noted, which points to the reading with [-a-], too. It is because the vowel [-e-], expected here if the words were

<sup>41</sup> Such notation was characteristic also of north-western Karaim texts, cf. ZAJĄCZKOWSKI, A. (1931–1932: 184).

written in Łuck Karaim, was nearly always written *plene* in south-western non-vocalised texts, by contrast with [-a-] which was very frequently not noted, both in Łuck and in Troki Karaim manuscripts.

Although our reasoning is corroborated by the handwritten Troki Karaim material available to us, the argumentation presented above does not exclude without any reservation Crimean Karaim as the possible language of this fragment. The crux of the problem is that even though in printed Crimean materials *aleph*, according to SULIMOWICZ (1972: 43) and JANKOWSKI (1997: 4–5) at least, was not used for denoting medial [-e-] or [-ä-], the non-vocalised Crimean manuscript presented by JANKOWSKI (2003: 126–129) gives evidence of such notation.<sup>42</sup> Additionally, [e] was quite frequently not noted word-medially, according to what we can see in JANKOWSKI (1997: 4–5 and 2003: 126–129). But one must also admit that the spelling of the Crimean manuscript presented in JANKOWSKI (2003) is irregular to such a degree that we can find there any kind of orthographic feature.

Regardless of this, if we take a look at the manuscript as a whole, there are some additional hints pointing to the fact that the discussed fragment was written by a Karaim speaking the north-western dialect. As argued below, Part D must be classified as Troki Karaim with some eastern Karaim elements. If so, it seems somewhat more plausible that the manuscript consists of two Łuck Karaim fragments (A and C) and two Troki Karaim fragments (B and D) with eastern Karaim elements (*vide infra*), than to suppose a linguistically mingled document comprising all three dialects at once. We think so, even though in the fragment discussed we can find the word כורושלוק *kurušluχ*<sup>43</sup> (18), being certainly a trace of Crimean influence, cf. e.g. CTat. *kuruš* ‘piaster’ (KtRS 372). On the other hand, this lexicological feature might also demonstrate that the author of the present fragment and the author of part D had their roots in the same milieu of Karaims speaking north-western Karaim, interspersed with the Crimean Karaim word. This idea of a ‘common language’ for these two authors is supported by the verb *sawła-* (19, 22), not listed in any of the existing Karaim dictionaries (nor in those manuscripts known to us), and used only in fragments B and D. Moreover, if we take a closer look at the lexical material of the manuscripts, we can see that in general the lexicon is shared by parts A and C, as opposed to B and D.

<sup>42</sup> The idea that the Crimean Karaim [e] in non-first syllables was pronounced as [a], as suggested by SULIMOWICZ (1972) and (1973), has been, in our opinion, rightly refuted in JANKOWSKI (1994: 109–112).

<sup>43</sup> The [-k] > [-χ] change in Troki is regular (see e.g. KOWALSKI 1929: XXXII).

### Part C

The unusual notation of medial and final [e] is a feature characteristic also of this fragment. Firstly, the use of the letter *he* for final [-e], as is the case in the word ברמה *berme* (11), is very rare in the Łuck Karaim texts available to us. But what is more significant for us is that, surprisingly, medial [-e-] is often not noted here, as was the case in the previous fragment, too. A closer examination of the relevant word forms, however, leads to a different conclusion than in the case of part B. The issue here is that the personal endings in the verbal forms קולמן *kolamen* (11) and ביוריהיסן *bujuryajsen* (11) would have been noted with an additional *yodh* in both cases if the words had been written in the north-western dialect of Karaim, i.e. if we read here *kolamyn* and *bujuryajsyn*, respectively. This is for the simple reason that [y] was, as far as we know, always written with this letter both in Troki and Łuck Karaim texts, as well as in the Crimean dialect (see e.g. JANKOWSKI 1997: 5, TIRJAKI 2004: 256). In comparison, we can find corroborating examples where [-e-] is omitted in all dialects, although only a few exists in Łuck Karaim.

Troki Karaim can be neglected here even more conclusively in the light of the word קוללרינא *kollaryna* (13) – the form in Troki Karaim is *kollaryja*.

These examples, however, do not exclude Crimean Karaim as the possible language of this fragment. The relation of this dialect to the note of five lines is the more interesting, given the significant error found in the text, which points to an evident eastern Karaim feature. Namely, in line 14 the word בירגין *bergin* was originally written with initial *waw* which points to the reading with [v-], i.e. points to Crimean influence (cf. KarK. *ver-* ‘to give’ listed in KRPS 158). The same word, however, dispels the doubt on the dialectal affiliation of the fragment discussed; the imperative suffix *-gyn* does not exist in Crimean Karaim, see PRIK (1976: 144).<sup>44</sup>

The syntax of this portion of the text resembles that of Part A, and, in fact, that of Łuck Karaim texts in general as it clearly copies Slavonic sentence structures. The only exception is, again, the use of the demonstrative pronoun בו *bu* as the definite article (line 14; cf. description of part A). Slavonic influence on the lexicon is represented by only one, corruptly written word: אוטייטימסיסכיא *ofatmemeške* (13–14).

### Part D

The dialectal classification of the last fragment as Łuck Karaim is, similarly to part B, dubious. As will be argued below, it seems very likely that it was written in Troki Karaim.

<sup>44</sup> Cf., however, the manuscript edited by AQTAY (2009: 41), where this suffix is noted.

At first sight, south-western Karaim would seem to be excluded owing to the shape of the letters *shin* and *tzadhe*, which are characteristic rather of manuscripts written in north-western Karaim.<sup>45</sup> We can treat, however, this piece of palaeographical evidence, merely as supportive.

Furthermore, similarly to what has been said above regarding part B, the lack of the letter *yodh* in suffixes, where in Łuck Karaim there would have been a medial [-e-] – juxtaposed to KarT. [-a-], is, again, a serious argument against classifying this fragment as south-western Karaim, cf.: בירגן *berǵań* (17) נירסהלריסדן *ńersalarimǵań* (17–18) and כישילרינא *kišilarina* (21). Even though we can find several forms in which the use of *yodh* could suggest medial [-e-], and, consequently, could point to Łuck Karaim word forms (cf. e.g. נירסים *ńersam* in line 18), we believe that, in these cases, the letter *yodh* could have been used as a diacritic, pointing to a palatal consonant preceding [a]. This phenomenon, as we have already mentioned above, was frequent even in north-western religious texts, and was irregular, too, just as in the case of this fragment, see ZAJĄCZKOWSKI, A. (1931–1932: 184).

Some additional evidence against a Łuck Karaim provenience of this fragment emerges from the clear distinction between the use of the letters *shin* <ש> and *samekh* <ס>. From the spelling of the words בשקא *baška* (18), כומוש *kuńnuš* (19), and כישילרינא *kišilarina* (21), it is clear that <ש> is used only in those cases where the Turkic equivalents of these words have [š], likewise in proper names and appellatives of Hebrew origin. On the other hand, *samekh* <ס> is consistently used for [s].

The idea here presented should be supplemented with the fact that we can perceive some Oghuz, most probably Crimean Karaim influence in this fragment, too, which makes this manuscript even more unique. The most significant example here is the word form בולורמין *boturmyn* (24) written initially as *oturmyn* (with -או-), which is clearly visible in the manuscript (see facsimile). Given such evidence, it seems plausible that the word כור מוש *kuńnuš* (19) should be deciphered rather as *kümüş*<sup>46</sup> (in the light of *waws* used without the expected *yodh* + *waw* combination – i.e. כ\*וימוש),

<sup>45</sup> The shape of these letters, visible e.g. in words בורצלו *borčtu* or Hebr. משפט (in the last and last but one lines of the manuscript, respectively; see facsimile), are very similar to those used in the cursive Ashkenazi script from 19<sup>th</sup>-century Germany, presented by YARDENI (1997: 272, 273).

<sup>46</sup> Or as *kumüş*. The status of the palatal rounded vowels in the first syllable in Crimean Karaim has not been entirely clarified yet (see JANKOWSKI 1994: 112). This applies also to *sözleşem* mentioned below.



**bujur-** ‘to have the kindness’ (1)

◆ OPT.2.SG: בויורהיסן [11]

● Cf. **bojur-**.

**bujuruk** ‘order, command’ (t)

◆ DAT.POSS.3.SG: בוירוגונה [21]

**čiring** ‘jewellery’ (1) ◆ ACC: צירינגני [4]

**da** ‘and, too’ (1, t) ◆ CONI: ד [4] ◆ דא [9, 19, 20, 22, 24]

**eđer** ‘if’ (t) ◆ CONI: אגר [10, 22]

**eķi** ‘two’ (1) ◆ NOM: אקי [5]

**ij-** ‘to send’ (t) ◆ PART.PRAET: אייגין [21]

**jałʎan** ‘lying, deceitful’ (t) ◆ NOM: ילגן [22] ◆ ילגן [10, 22]

● ~ **sowła-** ‘to lie’ [10, 22]

◆ ~ **šoźła-** ‘to lie’ [22!]

**kajsy** ‘which, that’ (1) ◆ ACC: קייסילרין [12]

**kał-** (t) ‘to stay, to remain’ ◆ PRAET. NEG.3.SG: קלמדי [9, 18]

**ki** ‘to, in order to’ (1) ◆ CONI: כי [3]

**kiši** ‘man’ (t) ◆ DAT.PL.POSS.3.SG: כישילרינא [21]

**koł** ‘hand’ (1, t) ◆ DAT.POSS.3.SG: קולונא [8] ◆ קולונה [15] ◆ קולונא [17]

◆ DAT.PL.POSS.2.SG: קוללרינא [13]

**koł-** ‘to ask; to entreat’ (1) ◆ PRAES. 1.SG: קולמן [11] ◆ קולמן [3]

**kořa** (*dat.*) ‘according to, in respect for’ (t) ◆ POSTP: כוריה [23, 24]

**kuńuś** ‘silver’ (t) ◆ NOM: כומוש [19!]

**kurušlux** ‘worth (a certain amount of) *kuruš*’ (t) ◆ NOM: כורושלוק [9!]

● < CTat. *kuruš* ‘piaster’ (KtRS 372) with the suffix *-luk* forming *nomina abstracta* (ZAJĄCZ-KOWSKI, A. 1932: 29–30).

**men** ‘I’ (1) ◆ NOM: מן [12]

**ne** (*pron.*) ‘which’ (1) ◆ NOM: ני [12]

**nemedede** ‘nothing’ (1) ◆ COPULA.3.SG: נימידיד [13]

**ńeprimenno** ‘by all means’ (1)

◆ ADV: נִפְרִימֵנְנֹו [6]

● < Russ. *неприменно* ‘by all means, necessarily’. The vowel *-i-* possibly reflects the actual pronunciation of the unaccented Russ. *e*.

**nerse** (1) ~ **ńerša** (t) ‘affair, thing’

◆ NOM: נירסא [9] ◆ נירסיה [20, 23]

◆ NOM.POSS.1.SG: נירסים [18] ◆ נִי־

רסם [8] ◆ ACC: נִירְסֵנִי [5] ◆ ACC.

PL.POSS.1.SG: נירסילריסני [12]

◆ ABL.PL.POSS.1.SG: נירסאלריסדן [8] ◆ נירסיהלריסדן [17–18]

**ńi** ‘neither, nor’ (t) ◆ CONI: ני [19]

● ~ ... ~ ... ‘neither ... nor ...’ [19]

● < Pol. *ni* ‘neither, nor’, Russ. *nu* id., Ukr. *ni* id.

**ospu** ‘this, this particular’ (1)

◆ PRON: אוספו [5]

● Karaim dictionaries note only KarŁ. *uspu* ‘this, this particular’ (KSB 68, KRPS 583). The *u* > *o* change took place most probably due to dissimilation. For a similar example cf. **bojur-**.

**po** ‘according to, on the basis of’ (t)

◆ PRAEP: פו [10]

● ~ **zakońe** ‘in compliance with the law’ [10!].

● < Russ. *no* ‘according to, on the basis of’.

**puska** ‘box’ ♦ INSTR: פּוֹסְקָבָא [4]

- < Pol. *puszka* ‘box’.

**ribbi** ‘*ribbi*, teacher (used as a title)’ (י) ♦ GEN: רִיבִינִין [14] ♦ DAT: רִיבְגָה [6]

- < Hebr. רִבִּי ‘a title given to Jewish religious scholars’.

**sakła-** ‘to store’ (t) ♦ PRAET. NEG.1.SG: סַקְלָמִידִים [9] ♦ COND.1.SG: סַקְלָסִם [23]

**sen** ‘you (*thou*)’ (י) ♦ ACC: סִינִי [11] ♦ סְנִי [3] ♦ GEN: סִנִּין [13]

**sowła-** ‘to speak’ (t) ♦ PRAET.NEG. 1.SG: סוּלְמִידִים [22!] ♦ COND.1.SG: סוּלָסִם [10!]

- **jałyan** ~ ‘to lie’ [10, 22]
- The word could be read also as *sawła-* and *sewle-*. The latter one is less probable in the light

of the lack of *yodh* for noting [-e-]. For comparative data cf. KTKc. *sowła-* ‘to speak’ (GRUNIN 1967: 405), M-Kipch. *sawła-* ‘to speak’ and *jałyan sawła-* ‘to lie’ (ZAJĄCZKOWSKI, A. 1968: 101), KarK. *sewle-* ‘to speak’ (RADLOFF 1911: 501, s.v. *cäwlä-*).

**soźla-** ‘to speak’ (t) ♦ COND.1.SG: סוּזְלָסִים [22!]

**to** ‘then; in that case’ (t) ♦ CONI: טו [10, 23]

- < Pol. *to* ‘then, in that case’, Russ. *mo* ‘then, in that case’.

**zakon** ‘law’ (t) ♦ DAT: זַכּוֹנָא [24] ♦ RUSS: פּוֹ זַכּוֹנִי [10!]

- < Russ. *закон* ‘law’, Ukr. *закон* ‘rule of law’.

## 2. Proper names

**Šemoel ben Jaakov Simḡa**

- ♦ NOM: שְׁמוּאֵל בֶּן יַעֲקֹב שִׁמְחָא [1–2]

- ♦ GEN: שְׁמוּאֵל בֶּן יַעֲקֹב שִׁמְחָהֲנִין [7, 17]

**Rudecki** ‘a village, approximately 16 km south-East of Łuck (in the

municipality of Jarosławicze, district of Dubno)’ ♦ NOM: רוּדִיעְדִּי [16] ♦ רוּדִיעְדִּי [7]

- < Pol. *Rudecka* (see SGKP XV/2: 556).

**Rudeckij** see **Rudecki**

## VII. Abbreviations and symbols

### 1. Languages

**CTat.** = Crimean Tatar | **Hebr.** = Hebrew | **KarK.** = Crimean Karaim (E dialect) | **KarŁ.** = Łuck Karaim (SW dialect) | **KarT.** = Troki Karaim (NW dialect) | **M-Kipch.** = Mameluk-Kipchak | **Pol.** = Polish | **Russ.** = Russian | **KTKc.** = Kipchak-Turkic | **Tksh.** = Turkish | **Ukr.** = Ukrainian

### 2. Grammatical terms

**Abl.** = Ablativus | **Adv.** = Adverbium | **Acc.** = Accusativus | **Art.def.** = Articulus definitus | **Cond.** = Conditionalis | **Coni.** = Coniunctio | **Dat.** =

Dativus | **Fut.** = Futurum | **Gen.** = Genetivus | **Imper.** = Imperativus | **Inf.** = Infinitivus | **Loc.** = Locativus | **Neg.** = Negatio | **Nom.** = Nominativus | **Opt.** = Optativus | **Part.praet.** = Participium praeteriti | **Pl.** = Pluralis | **Poss.** = Possessivus | **Postp.** = Postpositio | **Praes.** = Praesens | **Praet.** = Praeteritum | **Praep.** = Praepositio | **Pron.** = Pronomen | **Sg.** = Singularis

### 3. Symbols used in the text

[...] = in transcription and translation: complementary fragments facilitating the reading | [~ ...] = alternative translation | **abe** = in transcription: text lined through by the author | ↔ = contamination | >, < = phonetic development, borrowing | [!] = in glossary (after the line number): additional commentary in part III. or V.

## VIII. References

- AQTAY, G., 2009, *Eliyahu Ben Yosef Qılçı's Anthology of Crimean Karaim and Turkish Literature. Critical Edition with Introduction, Indexes and Facsimile*, 1–2 [1: Introduction, Text and Indexes; 2: Facsimile] (= *Yıldız Dil ve Edebiyat Dizisi* 8), İstanbul.
- BAADER, F.H., 1999, *Kurzwort- und Abkürzungslexikon. Hebräisch-Deutsch und Hebräisch-Englisch*, Schömborg.
- BERTA, Á., 1998, West Kipchak Languages. – Johanson, L. / Csató, É.Á. (eds.): *The Turkic Languages*, London–New York: 301–317.
- CHAFUZ, M.È., 1995, *Russko-karaimskij slovar'. Krymskij dialekt*, Moskva.
- CLAUSON, G., 1972, *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*, Oxford.
- ÇULHA, T., 2006, *Karaycanın Kısa Sözarlığı. Karayca–Türkçe Kısa Sözlük* (= *Dil ve Edebiyat Dizisi* 6), İstanbul.
- GRUNIN, T.I., 1967, *Dokumenty na poloveckom jazyke XVI v. (sudebnye akty kamenec-podołskoj armjanskoj obščiny). Transkripcija, perevod, predislovie, vvedenie, grammatičeskij kommentarij i glossarij*, Moskva.
- GRZEGORZEWSKI, J., 1903, Ein türk-tatarischer Dialekt in Galizien. Vokalharmonie in den entlehnten Wörtern der karaitischen Sprache in Halicz. (Mit Einleitung, Texten und Erklärungen zu den Texten). – *Sitzungsberichte der kais[erlichen] Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 146: 1–80.
- HARVIAINEN, T., 1997, Three Hebrew Primers, the Pronunciation of Hebrew among the Karaims in the Crimea, and Shewa. – Wardini, E. (ed.):

- Built on Solid Rock. Studies in Honour of Professor Ebbe Egede Knudsen on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday April 11th 1997*, Oslo: 102–114.
- JANKOWSKI, H., 1994, Jak krymscy Karaimowie czytali *pataḥ* i co z tego wynika? – Górska, E. / Ostafin, B. (eds.): *Studia Orientalia Thaddaeo Lewicki oblata. Materiały z sesji naukowej poświęconej pamięci Profesora Tadeusza Lewickiego, Kraków, 17–18 listopada 1993*, Kraków.
- JANKOWSKI, H., 1997, A Bible Translation into the Northern Crimean Dialect of Karaim. – *Studia Orientalia* 82: 1–84.
- , 2003, On the Language Varieties of Karaims in the Crimea. – *Studia Orientalia* 95: 109–130.
- KOWALSKI, T., 1929, *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki* (= *Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności* 11), Kraków.
- KRPS = BASKAKOV, N.A. / ŠAPŠAL, S.M. / ZAJONČKOVSKIJ, A. (eds.), 1974, *Karaimsko-russko-połskij slovař*, Moskva.
- KSB = MARDKOWICZ, A., 1935, *Karaj sez-bitigi. Słownik karaimski. Karaimisches Wörterbuch*, Łuck.
- KtRUS = GARKAVEC, A.N. / USEINOV, S.M., 2002, *Krymskotatarsko-russko-ukrainiskij slovař*, 1 (A–L), Simferopól.
- LEVI, B.Z., 1996, *Russko-karaimiskij slovař. Krymskij dialekt*, Odessa.
- MARDKOWICZ, A., 1933a, Jedi bitik. – *Karaj Awazy* 6: 6–10.
- , 1933b, Sahyncyna „babinecnin”. – *Karaj Awazy* 6: 1–6.
- , 1933c, Sifcegi sałałarnyn. – *Karaj Awazy* 6: 22.
- NÉMETH, M., 2009, Errors with and without purpose: A. Mardkowicz’s transcription of Łuck-Karaim letters in Hebrew script. – *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 126: 97–106.
- PRIK, O.Ja., 1976, *Očerok grammatiki karaimskogo jazyka (krymskij dialekt)*, Machačkala.
- PRITSAK, O., 1959, Das Karaimische. – Deny, J. et al. (eds.): *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, Wiesbaden: 318–340.
- RADLOFF, V.V., 1911, *Opyt slovarja tjurkskich narečij. Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*, 4, Sankt-Peterburg".
- RS 1858 = Census record list (*Ревизская сказка*) conducted in Łuck in 1858 [in private ownership].
- SGKP = CHLEBOWSKI, B. et al. (eds), 1902, *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, 15/2, Warszawa.
- SULIMOWICZ, J., 1972, Materiał leksykalny krymskokaraimskiego zabytku językowego (druk z 1734 r.). I–II. – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 35/1: 37–76; 36/1: 47–107.

- STACHOWSKI, M., 2007, Die Etymologie von ttü. *şimdi* 'jetzt' und *işte* 'voilà' vor gemeintürkischem Hintergrund. – *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 12: 171–176.
- TIRIJAĞI, V., 2004, Nekotorye osobennosti karaimского перевода Dekaloga v izdanii TaNaHa 1841 g. – Abkowicz, M. / Jankowski, H. (eds.): *Karaj kiuñlari. Dziedzictwo narodu karaimskiego we współczesnej Europie*, Wrocław: 253–257.
- YARDENI, A., 1997, *The Book of Hebrew Script. History, Palaeography, Script Styles, Calligraphy & Design*, Jerusalem.
- ZAJĄCZKOWSKI, A., 1931–1932, Przekłady Trenów Jeremiasza w narzeczu trocko-karaimskim. – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 8: 181–192.
- , 1932, *Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodniokaraimskim (przyczynek do morfologii języków tureckich)* (= *Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej Polskiej Akademji Umiejetności* 15), Kraków.
- , 1968, Materiał kolokwialny arabsko-kipczacki w Słowniku « ad-Durra<sup>t</sup> al-muđī'a fi-l-luğat at-turkiya ». – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 31/1: 71–115.

[1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10]

A.  
 אצויה סעק שמאן באצויה אמי נעק יעקוב  
 מיטחה יתרון  
 אלמן פון פריזונזענען פריזע  
 פריזונזענען פריזע  
 אונס פון ~~פריזע~~ און נעק פריזע  
 פריזענען פריזענען

B.  
 בכס רנדעקן און דא יעק: אמה יען  
 קלונג גונג רעפאלאט זן ארטיק בונ ענס  
 קלונג דעך בורושע רעס סעלעזש  
 אעב יען סולאס אדעם זכונ בוראליש

111 קלונג סע ביי בוררדישן ברעג בר  
 112 רעפאלאטען פריזענען יען פריזע  
 113 סען קולאריטא דוד רעארט אונס  
 114 פריזענען ביי פריזע ביי פריזע  
 115 קלונג

116 אד היורעס אעב יעב עא ביי בכס רנדעקן.  
 117 שמואן קא יעק שמואן קולאס בייזען רעס  
 118 אביס יען פריזע ארטיק ביי רעס קלונג  
 119 ע אונס יען בארעק יען בייזע אעב  
 120 רעס יען ארטיק בייזע אעב יען  
 121 בייזע רעס יען אעב יען אעב יען  
 122 יען סולאס יען אעב יען סולאס אעב  
 123 ביי רעס סולאס יען אעב יען אעב יען  
 124 יען אעב יען אעב יען אעב יען

50

50