

BETWEEN TURKIC AND SLAVIC. MATERIALS FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF SLAVIC LOANWORDS IN THE EARLIEST WEST KARAIM SOURCES

Michał Németh

Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie

michal.nemeth@uj.edu.pl

Abstract. This paper offers an overview of the oldest West Karaim written sources with a special focus on the Slavic lexical elements they contain. The main goal of the article is to present the phonetic adaptation processes these loanwords underwent and to answer the question from which Slavic languages they were borrowed. The Slavic linguistic material presented in this article was collected from manuscripts created in the first 100 years of the written history of West Karaim, i.e. in the period between 1671 and 1772. The year 1772, i.e. the year in which the First Partition of Poland took place, has been chosen as the closing time limit mainly because the second half of the 18th century was the time when Slavic–West Karaim bilingualism became a widespread phenomenon which, in turn, resulted in markedly different adaptation processes than in the early decades of these contacts.

Keywords: West Karaim, Slavic loanwords, Kipchak Turkic, contact linguistics, etymology

1. Introduction

Karaim is a Kipchak Turkic language that has existed in several varieties. Today, its only surviving branch is Northwest Karaim, spoken in the cities of Trakai, Vilnius, Panevėžys, and Naujamiestis in Lithuania, with a few other remaining speakers in Poland. Formerly, however, the language was also spoken in communities that existed in the regions of Biržai, Kaunas, Kruonis, Pasvalys, Pumpėnai, Saločiai, Šėta, Šiauliai, and Upytė in Lithuania (to mention only the most important communities), as well as in Kukeziv in Galicia (Ukraine). The closest variety to it is the now extinct Southwest Karaim once spoken in Galicia and Volhynia, mainly in Derazhne, Halych, Kukeziv, Lutsk, Lviv, and Olyka, and in the surrounding rural areas. The last fully competent user of this variety died in Halych in 2003. North- and

Southwest Karaim are together known as West Karaim, as opposed to East Karaim (Crimean Karaim). The latter is an umbrella term for the Turkic varieties that were used in writing and speech by the Crimean Karaims, and the last fully competent native speaker of this dialect died in 1992 (Jankowski 2003: III).¹

2. The oldest known West Karaim written sources

As far as we know, the first texts written in West Karaim emerged in the 17th century. However, in the case of works dating from before 1701, only a few short lyrical-religious poems survived until the present day. The oldest known West Karaim text is a *qinah* (dirge), which was authored in 1649 by Zarach ben Natan and copied in 1671 by an unknown individual (B 263: 26 v^o, 28 r^o). The main text of the manuscript was created in 1662 in Troki by Abraham ben Yoshiyahu (1636–1667) and contains a copy of a Hebrew treatise entitled *Bet Avraham*. The dirge in question was composed to commemorate the death of an individual by the name of Mikhael ben Saduk, is a later addition (from 1671) to this manuscript. It is stored in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg and was first described by Muchowski (2013b: 86–87, 97–98).

Other texts from this group of early West Karaim works include two religious poems by Icchak ben Abraham Troki (1533–1594) beginning with the words *Jamγur juvsa jüzün jernin jašaryr* ‘If the rain washes the surface of the earth, it turns green’ and *Jyjyny Jisraelnin, jalbaryn jaratuvčumuzya, jappaj jazyqlarymyzny* ‘Congregation of Israel! Beg our Creator, may he cover our sins’. These were copied in 1686 (Evr I 699: 15 v^o – 16 r^o) by a person called Mordechai ben Icchak. In the opinion of the present author, this copyist may have been Mordechai ben Icchak ben Mordechai Łokszyński (Németh 2020b: 36), who was born most likely in the mid-17th century in

1 For the sake of clarity it is important to mention that a distinguishing feature of Karaims is that they are Karaites, i.e. followers of Karaite Judaism (Karaism). *Karaims* are, ergo, *Karaites*, but only in terms of their faith. The term *Karaim* is used by both Karaims and Orientalists as an ethnonym and glottonym, see, e.g., the works of Radlov (1896) or Foy (1898). The Turkic speaking tribes that later formed the Karaim ethnos adopted the Karaite religion most likely in the latter half of the 12th century. Although the formerly existing theory that Karaims have Khazarian origins (see, Zajączkowski 1961) is nowadays seen as obsolete, there are no reasonable grounds for questioning the Turkic roots of the Karaims. A balanced description of the ethnogenesis of Karaims and the relationship between *Karaites* and *Karaims* is provided by Harviainen (2003).

the small Karaim community of Święte Jezioro in Lithuania (Tuori 2013: 82), and died before 1709. He is known to have translated two *zemirot*² of Zarach ben Natan of Troki into Karaim as we learn from manuscript RAbk. IV.15 (89 r^o–90 r^o; 112 v^o–113 v^o). A critical edition and concise analysis of these two texts was prepared by Jankowski (2014).

Recently, three works copied between 1685 and 1700 in Halych by Josef ha-Mashbir (ca. 1650–1700) have been discovered in manuscript JSul.I.01 (115 v^o – 116 r^o; 118 v^o – 119 v^o; 121 r^o – 123 r^o). They are the following: a liturgical poem (*piyyut*) with the incipit *Jazyqlarymyz ulyajdylar bijikka astry* ‘Our sins have increased greatly’, and a *qinah* starting with the words *Men miskin qaldyyy* ‘I, the miserable remnant’, both composed by Josef ha-Mashbir, i.e. by the copyist himself, and, thirdly, the *zemer* with the incipit *Bügün Sinaj tavya* ‘Today, to the Mount of Sinai’ by Aharon ben Jehuda of Troki.

The last 17th-century West Karaim text we know of today is the documentation of a portion of the Torah in a letter sent in 1691 by the Swedish Orientalist Gustaf Peringer Lillieblad (1651–1710) to the German Ethiopist Hiob Ludolf (1624–1704). This letter contains the first three verses of the Book of Genesis (Tentzel 1691: 572–575). This fact has been frequently referred to in the scholarly literature and the relevant fragment has been commented upon by many authors, see, e.g., Zajączkowski (1939: 90–99), Szyszman (1952: 228), Dubiński (1991: 219), Jankowski (2019: xii), and Németh (2020a). Shortly after its publication, Peringer’s letter was reprinted several times (and, curiously enough, all its errors were repeated by every publisher), see for instance Schupart (1701: 26) and Schudt (1714: 109–111).³

Another West Karaim manuscript from the 17th century is mentioned by Medvedeva (1988: 92). According to her, ms. A 144₅, which is stored in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences, was copied in Lutsk in 1690. What is surprising, however, is that it is not listed among the many other sources kept in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts used by the compilers of the Karaim–Russian–Polish dictionary, see the list

- 2 *Zemirot* (singular: *zemer*) were religious poems written for the Sabbath, Pesach, Shavuot, Sukkot and other festive occasions. They were often intended to serve a paraliturgical role and were recited or sung both during public services in prayer houses and at home.
- 3 The earliest written records of East Karaim also originate from the 17th century. The oldest known Karaim written source is probably JSul.III.02, which contains an East Karaim translation of the Former Prophets, the Books of Ruth, Esther, and Proverbs (the latter is preserved in fragments), created between 1648 and 1687 (Németh 2016).

of sources in KarRPS, pp. 28–29 under the category *Молитвы и обрядовые песни (многие с переводом)*. It is likely, therefore, that it was written in Hebrew only and does not contain any Karaim text at all.

A number of other extremely valuable Northwest Karaim sources date from the early 18th century. The oldest hitherto discovered comprehensive translation of the Torah and some books of the Ketuvim into Northwest Karaim date from 1720 and 1722, respectively: mss. ADub.III.73 and TKow.01. According to our current knowledge, manuscript ADub.III.73 contains the oldest datable West Karaim translation of any Biblical text. The main part of this manuscript is written in Middle Northwest Karaim – a historical variety of Karaim. It consists of two parts. The first, larger part contains a translation of the Torah (1 r^o – 343 r^o), while the second comprises the Karaim translation of the Book of Ruth (344 r^o – 349 v^o), the Book of Lamentations (350 r^o – 360 r^o), Ecclesiastes (360 v^o – 374 v^o), and the Book of Esther (37 r^o – 388 v^o). A critical edition of the Torah from this manuscript was published by Németh (2021b). Ms. TKow.01, in turn, is a partially vocalised Northwest Karaim translation of the Torah. Both manuscripts were copied in Kukizów by Simcha ben Chananel (ca. 1670–1723), a prominent Biblical scholar born most likely in Trakai. He was among the first migrants who founded the Karaim community of Kukizów in 1688, and he served there as hazzan from ca. 1709 presumably until his death (see Németh & Sulimowicz-Keruth 2023: 559–563).

In 1729, a collection of religious texts in Hebrew and West Karaim was copied by an unknown person in Lutsk. The manuscript is stored in the National Library of Israel under accession number Jer NLI 4101-8. The dialectal affiliation of the Karaim texts it contains is difficult to determine, but it was most likely written in Northwest Karaim. Another source that has survived from this period is manuscript ADub.III.78. In actual fact, it comprises several manuscripts bound together to form a prayer book in Hebrew, Southwest and Northwest Karaim. It was copied by several individuals in the 18th and 19th centuries (ca. 1750 at the earliest, see folios 118 v^o and 251 v^o), probably in Halych, Lutsk, and Kukizów.

The oldest Southwest Karaim texts are somewhat younger and were created in Halych in the second half of the 18th century. The oldest is probably ms. JSul.I.53.13, which is a fragment of a prayer book copied in ca. 1762 by an unknown person. Another important source from Halych is ms. JSul.III.63, a prayer book copied ca. 1778 by Jeshua ben Mordechai Mordkowicz (died 1797). Several fragments of a prayer book marked as JSul.I.01 copied in the second half of the 18th century, as well as ms. JSul.III.65, which contains an

18th-century translation of the Book of Esther are, most likely, of a similar age. The number of handwritten sources from Halych grows rapidly after 1800.

Demonstrably the oldest Lutsk Karaim texts date back to the early 19th century. To this group belongs JSul.I.02, a collection of religious songs copied by different individuals, mainly between 1807 and 1832 (the oldest fragments were copied by Mordechai ben Josef of Lutsk in 1807). Its near contemporary is ms. JSul.I.04, created in 1814. It is a translation of the Book of Job copied by Jaakov ben Icchak Gugel. Almost as old is JSul.I.50.06, a manuscript copied ca. 1815, in which we find a Karaim translation of the Book of Esther and a small collection of *piyyutim*. Further sources from the early 19th century that were potentially written in Lutsk do exist, but establishing the exact place of their creation requires an additional investigation.

3. Slavic influence on West Karaim

At the outset we ought to mention the fact that some Slavic loanwords known in Karaim are already attested in the *Codex Comanicus*, a 14th-century Kipchak Turkic source written in Latin script by Christian missionaries. This shows that Slavic–Karaim linguistic contacts might predate the arrival of the earliest migratory wave of West Karaims into the territories they inhabit today. Good examples here are the following: Kar. *salam* ‘straw’ (attested in all Karaim varieties) and CC *salan* id. (KarRPS 462; Drimba 2000: 226)⁴ or NWKar. *peč*, SWKar. *pec* ‘furnace’ and CC *peč* id. (KarRPS 447, 450; Drimba 2000: 93), which can be traced back to continuants of PSlav. **solma* and **pektb*, respectively. However, there can be no doubt that West Karaims began to maintain close linguistic contacts with East and West Slavs after their first settlers arrived in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland. Although documents confirming their presence in these territories date from the turn of the 16th century, the first waves of migration must have occurred somewhat earlier. The first Slavs they had close contacts with were speakers of the respective vernacular forms of Ruthenian (which, roughly from the turn of the 18th century onwards, gradually diverged into distinct regional variants of Belarusian, and Ukrainian) and Middle Polish (East Borderlands Polish). By the 17th century, Polish already enjoyed greater prestige. It was, for instance, the main language used in public life in 18th-century

4 According to Drimba, CC *salan* is an erroneous translation of *salam*. On the other hand, it may perhaps have been blended with Tk. *saman* id.

Vilnius. Several religious texts were translated from Polish into Karaim (Sulimowicz 2015: 101–102), and there is also a translation of a prayer from West Karaim into Polish dating from 1807 (Németh 2021a). Urban varieties of Russian became an important contact language in the Baltic after 1795, whereas its rural varieties became a substantial factor after the 1840s (Čekmonas 2001a–b). In the interwar period, Polish was the dominant language spoken by the majority of West Karaim communities, except those living in the territories of the re-established Lithuania. Today, all members of the Karaim communities in Lithuania and Poland are fluent in at least one Slavic language (Adamczuk 2003: 63–74).

Philological and linguistic analyses show that the changes that took place in the West Karaim sound system during the period between, approximately, the first half of the 18th century and the first half of the 19th, brought West Karaim phonology, phonetics, and phonotactics much closer in terms of their structure to the neighbouring Slavic varieties (Németh 2020b: 56–99). This suggests that the Slavicization of West Karaim gained momentum during this time. However, based on scarce philological evidence, this type of structural influence can be hypothesized to have left its mark even in the oldest texts. For instance, forms such as אַזְלָר אַדִּי *izlar edi* or סוֹזוּנָה *sözüña* in ms. B 263 (26 v^o) exhibit the use of palatalized consonants (*ḷ, ñ*) the appearance of which in West Karaim is widely attributed to Slavic influence (Németh 2020b: 62–64). What makes the presence of Slavic linguistic influences unambiguous and supports the view that many of the significant West Karaim sound changes that took place in the 17th–18th centuries were indeed triggered by Slavic linguistic interference, is the use of Slavic loanwords in these texts. Given that religious texts, and especially translations of the Bible, usually tend to be resistant to external linguistic factors (except, of course, for the impact exerted by the language from which the respective work is translated) and exhibit a limited number of features known from the colloquial language, these loanwords indicate a very strong Slavic influence.

4. Earliest Slavic loanwords in West Karaim

4.1. Introductory remarks

The question of Slavic loanwords in West Karaim has already been addressed by, most importantly, Dubiński (1969, 1987; the latter work discusses the im-

fact of Slavicisms on the Turkic languages in the entire region in question), Wexler (1980), Moskovič & Tukan (1993), Németh (2004), and Németh (2011: 77–79, 91–98; 2023). As Dubiński (1969: 144) has observed already, different chronological layers of Slavic loanwords can be distinguished in West Karaim. The earliest borrowings underwent specific processes of adaptation, a good example being the replacement of *-o* with *-a* as a result of the Turkic phonotactic tendency to avoid low rounded vowels in non-first syllables, such as, e.g., in *belma* ‘cataract’ or *vina* ‘wine’ (see below) borrowed from the respective reflexes of PSlav. *běľmo*, PSlav. **vino*. Words that belong to this layer of loanwords often underwent irregular sound changes in order to adapt the Slavic lexemes to the requirements of the native sound system and the restrictions placed on the combinations of vowels and consonants, see, e.g., *kurpa* ‘groats’, *myhla* ‘mist’, *žubra* ‘wisent’ below.

Slavic verbs were usually borrowed in their infinitive forms, perceived as nominal categories in Karaim, and were used as the first component of compound verbs, whereas the second element was, in most cases, the auxiliary MWKar. *et-* ‘to do’ or *bol-* ‘to be’, which took the verbal markers, see *kajaccet-* ‘to repent’, *karatet-* ‘to punish’, *postanovtet-* ‘to decide’, *pus-ta et-* ‘to desolate’, and *vejatet-* ‘to winnow’ below. In fact, Slavic verbs were adopted in the same way in other Turkic languages, including in Armeno-Kipchak, Kazan Tatar, Bashkir, Kumyk, Kirghiz, Karakalpak, Altay, Gagauz, Uyghur, and Chuvash (Isengalieva 1966: 45–46; Dubiński 1987: 178–181). In this respect, the verb *žalle-* ‘to regret, to sympathise’ presented below, formed through suffix derivation and not compounding, belongs to a small group of interesting exceptions. Another curious form is *slavalj* ‘renown’ which – similarly to *žalle-* – is also built from a Slavic root by means of a derivative suffix instead of using the actual Slavic adjectival form (in this case, this would have been **slavnyj*). The latter process very often took place, as we see in the word *polnyj* ‘(adj.) field’. It is therefore legitimate to speculate whether the adaptation of Slavic loanwords by means of suffix derivation was also a distinctive feature of the oldest layer of Slavicisms.

The oldest West Karaim text, the dirge mentioned above, contains two Slavicisms, namely *puhač* פִּיְהָץ (1671) ‘eagle-owl’, and *sova* סוּבָה (1671) ‘owl’ (B 263: 26 v^o). Although their Slavic origin cannot be questioned, they are good examples that show how difficult it is, in many instances, to establish the exact donor language of a certain word. This is mainly because of the relatively small linguistic distance between the respective contemporary Slavic varieties. The etymons of the above-mentioned two words may be,

respectively, either MPol. *puhacz* id., *sova* id. (SPolXVI XXXIV: 424; LSJP II/2: 1271, III: 334), or Ruth. *pugačъ* (early 17th century) id. and *sova* (16th century) id. (HSBM XXIX: 340, XXXII: 34).

The similarities between the Slavic languages in question are even more pronounced when we consider that the historical varieties of both Northeast and Southeast Borderlands (Kresy) Polish were heavily influenced by East Slavic languages. For instance, the way PSlav. **r* is continued in these Slavic subgroups would appear, at first sight at least, a good criterion for distinguishing between East and West Slavic loanwords in West Karaim. In East Slavic, its reflex is /r/, while in Polish it first evolved into a fricative trill /r̄/, to be continued as a biphonemic [r̄ž] and, finally, a fricative /r̄/. However, the articulation of this sound as a fricative trill survived well into the 20th century in both Northeast and Southeast Borderlands Polish (Smolińska 1983: 47–48; Kurzowa 1985 [2006]: 66–67; Kurzowa 1993 [2006]: 139–141; Sicińska 2013: 168–169). Moreover, in some areas and idiolects it even evolved into a biphonemic [r̄ž] (see, Kurzowa 1993 [2006]: 140; Kurzowa 1985 [2006]: 67), and, due to East Slavic influences, the functioning of this phoneme in these Polish dialects often shifted towards [r], as was reported by Kurzowa (1993 [2006]: 139–140), Kurzowa (1985 [2006]: 66–67, 349–350), and Sicińska (2013: 169–170). Seen in this light, the fact that this sound was consistently rendered with the letter *resh* (ʀ) in the Slavic loanwords attested in West Karaim texts, does not necessarily mean that they all need to be classified as East Slavic loans.

The case is similar when it comes to the usage of *-(n)yyj* ~ *-(n)ij* as variants of the Polish adjectival derivative suffixes *-ny*, *-ni* characteristic of adjectives loaned into West Karaim (Dubínski 1969: 149; Németh 2011: 95), see, again, *polnyj* ‘(adj.) field’ below. The expansive nature of the ESLav. *-yyj*, *-ij* ending in East Borderlands Polish dialects has been well documented e.g. by Koś (1999: 119).

The two religious poems by Icchak ben Abraham Troki (1533–1594) edited by Jankowski (2014) contain no Slavic loanwords, but we can find some Slavic conjunctions used in the autograph of Josef ha-Mashbir from ms. JSul.I.01, namely *ni* נִי ‘neither’ (118 v^o), *ani* אִי ‘neither’ (118 v^o), and *a* א ‘and, but (a particle that introduces statements)’ (122 r^o), which is a harbinger of the increasing influence of Slavic structural forms.

While the number of such loanwords in the relatively short poems dating from the 17th-century is very modest a very considerable number of Slavicisms can be found in manuscript ADub.III.73 from 1720. The Biblical

books edited thus far include ca. 80 Slavic words (Németh 2021b: 27–28). The latter is all the more remarkable as it suggests that Slavic translations of the Bible could have been used as subsidiary sources by Karaim translators. From a semantic point of view, these are mainly terms related to the cultivation of cereals, breadmaking, and constructing buildings, as well as the names of family members, animals, plants, precious stones, elements of the natural landscape, and everyday items used in households.

Below, an overview of the Slavic loanwords attested in the oldest West Karaim sources is presented in a phonological transcription along with an etymological commentary. The first 100 years of the written history of West Karaim provide the scope for this glossary (1671–1772). The choice of 1671 as the starting date, i.e., the year when the first West Karaim text was created, is self-explanatory. The second half of the 18th century was, in turn, a time when a number of significant sound changes took place that brought the West Karaim phonological system and phonetics closer to the adstratal Slavic languages. During this period Slavic–West Karaim bilingualism became a widespread phenomenon (see, Németh 2021a), which resulted in markedly different adaptation processes from those observed in the first decades of these contacts. We have, therefore, chosen the year 1772, i.e. the date of the First Partition of Poland, as the final date of our research timeframe. This is also justified by the fact that 1772 marks the end of the period when all West Karaim communities existed within one politically united region – within the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth.

As a consequence, the material presented here is almost exclusively taken from Middle Northwest Karaim texts. The only exception is ms. JSul.I.53.13 from which we adduce below MSWKar. *postanovtet-* ‘to decide’ and *uže* ‘already’. In the glossary, we have marked the accession numbers of the manuscripts in which the respective Slavicisms have been attested. If the place of attestation is indicated with the number of the Biblical verse in which it appears, this means that the data is taken from ADub.III.73 (many of these words occur more than once in the Bible, but only one place of occurrence is indicated below for each form, not all of them). The Slavicisms from ms. TKow.01 still need to be extracted.

4.2. Glossary

a ‘and, but (*a particle that introduces statements*)’ (JSul.I.01: 122 r^o). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *a* id. (SPolXVI I: 1–37); Ruth. *a* (15th century) id.

(HSBM I: 50–55). – **Remarks:** KarRPS (37) interprets Mod.NWKar. *a* id. as a Russian loanword, but a Ruthenian or Polish origin is more likely.

ani ‘neither’ (JSul.I.01: 118 v^o; Exo 33:20). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *ani* id. (SPolXVI I: 153–164); Ruth. *ани* (15th century) id. (HSBM I: 116–117). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (68), Mod.NWKar. *ani* id. is listed as a Polish loanword, but its Ruthenian origin is equally possible.

belma ‘cataract’ (Lev 21:20). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *bielmo* id. (SPolXVI II: 134); Ruth. *белмо, бельмо* (1516–1519) ‘cataract’ (HSBM I: 269). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (112), Mod.NWKar. *beľma* id. is qualified as a Polish loanword, but its Ruthenian origin is equally possible. The *-o > -a* is due to the Turkic phonotactic tendency to avoid low rounded vowels in non-first syllables.

bleħa ~ **blāħa** ‘metal sheet’ (Exo 39:3, Num 17:3). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *blach(a)* ~ *plach(a)* ~ *plech* id. (SPolXVI II: 167–168); Ruth. *бляха* (17th century) id. (HSBM II: 80). – **Remarks:** See also Ruth. *блехар* (1598) ‘tinsmith’ (HSBM II: 53). From a phonetic point of view, it is somewhat more likely to be of Ruthenian origin.

blāħa see **bleħa**

boħon ‘loaf’ (Exo 29:23). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *bochen* ~ *bochenek* ~ *bochnek* ~ *bochonek* id. (SPolXVI II: 249–250; LSJP I/I: 131); Ruth. *бохань* ~ *бохень* ~ *бохонь* (16th century) id. (HSBM II: 169–170). – **Remarks:** Mod.WKar. *boħon* in KarRPS (133) is featured as a Polish loanword, but in light of the *-o-* in the second syllable, it is just as possible that it is of East Slavic origin. Although KarRPS lists Mod. SWKar. *boħon*, we do not find this word in Mardkowicz (1935), which is surprising given that the word semantically forms a part of the basic vocabulary.

cynamon ‘cinnamon’ (Exo 30:23). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *cynamon* id. (SPolXVI III: 719–720); Ruth. *цынамонь* ~ *цинамонь* (17th century) id. (HSBM XXXVI: 256). – **Remarks:** According to KarRPS (616), Mod. WKar. *cynamon* id. is of Polish origin.

čara ‘cup’ (Gen 44 :2). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *czara* id. (LSJP I/I: 343) ~ *czarka* (a *-ka* diminutive of **czara*, SPolXVI IV: 7–8); Ruth. *чара* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XXXVI: 270). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (624), Mod.NWKar. *čara* is not marked as a Slavic loanword.

čerep ‘earthen, clay’ (Lev 14:50). – **Collocations:** In the Torah, used only in the collocation *čerep savut* ‘earthen vessel’ (Lev 14:50, Lev 15:12). –

Possible etymon: Ruth. *чepeнь* ‘1. (17th century) skull; 2. (1516–1519) a piece of crockery’ (HSBM XXXVI: 348). – **Remarks:** MPol. *czerep* ‘skull’, used from the 18th century, is of East Slavic origin (BSEJP 95). The argument that the Karaim word is of East Slavic origin is also more likely for chronological and semantic reasons. In KarRPS (619), Mod.SWKar. *cerep* ‘shell, crust’ is claimed to be of Russian origin, although in this case Pol. *czerep* ‘1. skull; 2. piece of a broken earthen pot’ (SGP I: 279) should also be treated as a potential etymon. Mod. NWKar. *čerep* ‘skull’, in turn, is classified as a Slavic loanword in KarRPS (627). – **Derivatives:** NWKar. *čerepli* ‘earthen’ is used only in the collocation *čerepli savut* ‘earthen vessel’ in the Torah (Lev 6:21, Lev 11:33, Lev 14:5, Num 5:17). It is a Karaim adjectival *-li* derivative from a Slavic nominal base. KarRPS (619, 641) lemmatizes Mod.SWKar. *cerepli* ‘1. (*adj.*) pottery; 2. earthen’, and Mod.EKar. *čerepli* ‘earthen’ (KarRPS 619, 641).

dijament ‘diamond’ (Exo 28:18). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *dyjament* ~ *dyjamant* id. (SPolXVI VI: 278); Ruth. *дияментъ* (1552) id. (HSBM VIII: 84).

đada ‘uncle’ (Lev 10:4). **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *дядя* ~ *дядко* ~ *дядько* id. (15th century) ‘1. uncle; 2. middle-aged man’ (ISUJa I/2: 866). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (185), Mod.NWKar. *đada* ‘uncle’ is classified as a Russian loanword.

farst ‘1. (wood-beamed) ceiling; 2. (wood-beamed) wall, side’ (Exo 30:3). – **Possible etymon:** OPol. *forst* ‘wood-beamed ceiling’ (SSSt. II 366) of Middle High German origin (see, de Vincenz & Hentschel 2010, s.v. *forszt* I). – **Remarks:** The Ruthenian word *фарстъ* ‘decoration on a liturgical vestment’ that we find in HSBM (XXXV: 395) cannot be treated as potential etymon for semantic reasons.

fartuḥ ‘apron’ (Gen 3:7). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *fartuch* id. (SPolXVI VII: 36–37); Ruth. *фартухъ* (1540) id. (HSBM XXXV: 395–396).

fleška ~ **fleške** ‘bottle’ (Gen 21:14, Gen 21:15). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *flaszka* id. (SPolXVI VII: 78); Ruth. *фляшка* (15th century) id. (HSBM XXXV: 415). – **Remarks:** The *a > e* change might be a result of the fronting effect of [ʎa] (cf. **ḥote**, **ḥotej**), which suggests a Ruthenian origin. In KarRPS (594), Mod.NWKar. *fľaška* id. is treated as a Polish loanword.

fleške see **fleška**

galban ‘galbanum’ (Exo 30:34). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *galban* ~

galbanum ‘1. bot. *Ferula schair*; 2. *Ferula schair* resin, galbanum’ (SPolXVI VII: 176–177); Ruth. *кгалбанъ ~ галванъ* (1516–1519) ‘*Ferula schair* resin’ (HSBM XV: 28).

grunt ‘floor’ (Num 5:17). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *grunt* ‘1. land, soil; territory; 2. foundations of a building’ (SPolXVI VIII: 169–176); Ruth. *кгрунтъ ~ зрунтъ ~ крунтъ* (15th century) id. (HSBM XV: 66–69). –

Remarks: Given the *g-*, this word is most probably of Polish origin.

hote ~ hotej ‘even though’ (Gen 48:14; ADub.III.78: 523 v^o). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *хоть ~ хотъ ~ хотя ~ хоця ~ хоць ~ хочъ ~ хочь* (17th century) ~ *хотяй ~ хоцяй* (16th century) id. (HSBM XXXVI: 147–151). –

Remarks: In KarRPS (604), Mod.NWKar. *hote ~ hoí ~ hoía* id., Mod. SWKar. *hotej* id., and Mod.EKar. *hota* id. are all marked as Russian loanwords.

hotej see **hote**

šovsem ‘all the more’ (Gen 3:24). – **Possible etymon:** OPol. *i owszem* ‘1. furthermore, what is more, and even; 2. especially, particularly’ (SStp. III: 7).

kajaccet- ‘to repent’ (Deu 30:14). – **Morphology:** A compound verb. – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *kajać się* id. (SPolXVI X: 22); Ruth. *каются ~ каются ~ каются* (15th century) id. (HSBM XV: 12–13); cf. also Brus. *каяца* id. – **Remarks:** The Slavic root is used with MWKar. *et-* ‘(aux.) to do’.

kapusta ‘cabbage’ (Num 11:5). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *kapusta* id. (SPolXVI X: 106); Ruth. *капуста* (16th century) id. (HSBM XIV: 273–274).

karanja ‘punishment’ (Gen 18:29; ADub.III.78: 313 r^o). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *karanie* id. (SPolXVI X: 123–131); Ruth. *каранье ~ каране ~ карание ~ каранне* (15th century) id. (HSBM XIV: 279–280). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (292), Mod.WKar. *karanja ~ karańja* id. is marked as a Polish loanword.

karatet- ‘to punish’ (Gen 8:21). – **Morphology:** A compound verb. – **Possible etymons:** Ruth. *карату* id. (SSUM I: 471). – **Remarks:** See also MPol. *karać* id. (SPolXVI X: 108–117), but in light of the *-t-* of the Karaim form, its East Slavic provenance is more plausible. The Slavic root is used with MWKar. *et-* ‘(aux.) to do’. In KarRPS (293, s.v. *карат*), Mod.WKar. *karat et-* id. is not qualified as a loanword, which is probably because it is a Karaim derivative.

kařtan ‘chesnut’ (Gen 30:37). – **Possible etymon:** MPol. *kasztan* id. (SPolX-

VI X: 164). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (300), Mod.NWKar. *kaštan* id. is not classified as a loanword.

kolos ‘ear (of the grain)’ (Gen 41:5). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *колосъ* (16th century) id. (HSBM XV: 217). – **Remarks:** The pleophonic form makes it likely to be of East Slavic origin, cf. MPol. *kłos* id. (SPolXVI X: 415). In KarRPS (330), Mod.WKar. *kolos* id. is marked as being of Slavic origin without specifying the exact donor language.

koreń ‘root’ (Deu 29:18). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *korzeń* id. (SPolXVI X: 664–670); Ruth. *корень* (17th century) id. (HSBM XV: 307–309). – **Remarks:** Under East Slavic influence, the pronunciation of the reflex of PSlav. *ř often shifted towards [r] in the historical varieties of Borderlands Polish (e.g., Sicińska 2013: 169–170). Hence, both a Polish and Ruthenian provenance are feasible. In KarRPS (333, 334), Mod.WKar. *koren* id. and Mod.NWKar. *kořen* id. are classified as being of Russian origin.

koryta ‘gutter’ (Gen 30:38). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *koryto* id. (SPolXVI X: 660–661); Ruth. *корыто* ~ *корумо* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XVI: 44–45). – **Remarks:** The *-o* > *-a* is probably due to the Turkic phonotactic tendency to avoid low rounded vowels in non-first syllables.

kölendra ~ **kölandra** ‘coriander’ (Exo 16:31, Num 11:7). – **Possible etymon:** MPol. *kolendra* id. (SPolXVI X: 467).

kölandra see **kölendra**

krolik ‘rabbit’ (Lev 11:5). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *krolik* id. (SPolXVI XI: 231–232); Ruth. *кроликъ* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XVI: 167).

krovat ‘bed’ (Gen 49:33). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *кровать* (1489) id. (HSBM XVI: 150). – **Remarks:** Mod.WKar. *krovat* id. is marked as a Russian loanword in KarRPS (341).

kruh ‘ledge, rim’ (Exo 27:5). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *кругъ* (15th century) ‘1. circle; 2. round object; 3. a small round area, scaffolding’ (HSBM XVI: 178–180).

kubok ‘cup’ (Exo 27:3). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *кубокъ* (1697) id. (HSBM XVI: 208). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (342), Mod.SWKar. *kubok* id. is marked as a Russian loanword.

kurpa ‘groats’ (Lev 2:14). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *krupa* id. (SPolXVI XI: 272); Ruth. *крупы* (1499) id. (HSBM XVI: 183–184). – **Remarks:** The *kru-* > *kur-* metathesis took place most likely to eliminate the word-initial consonant cluster. An interesting parallel is the origin of Hung. *korpa* (1138/1329) ‘finely ground cereal grain husk used mainly

- as fodder’, which is an early Slavic loanword with the same roots as NWKar. *kurpa*, in which we also see a metathesis (TESz II: 581). Mod. NWKar. *kurpa* ‘groats’ in KarRPS (347), is not marked as a loanword.
- lipa** ‘linden’ (Gen 30:37). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *lipa* id. (SPolXVI XII: 275); Ruth. *лiпa* (1501) id. (HSBM XVII: 42). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (399), Mod.NWKar. *lipa* id. is rightly interpreted as being generally of Slavic origin, without specifying the exact donor language.
- lokot** ‘cubit’ (Gen 6:15). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *локоть ~ локоть* (15th century) ‘1. elbow; 2. cubit’ (HSBM XVII: 112–113). – **Remarks:** Mod. WKar. *lokot* ‘1. elbow; 2. cubit’ is marked as a Slavic loanword in KarRPS (400). Its East Slavic origin is evident.
- loś** ‘elk’ (Deu 14:5). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *loś ~ los* id. (SPolXVI XII: 573); Ruth. *лосць ~ лосць* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XVII: 120). – **Remarks:** Mod.SWKar. *los* id. is rightly classified as a Slavic loanword in KarRPS (400), without specifying the exact donor language.
- mastik** ‘mastic’ (Gen 37:25). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *mastych ~ mastyk ~ mastyka* ‘1. mastic tree; 2. mastic tree resin’ (SPolXVI XIII: 189–190); Ruth. *маслика* (17th century) ‘a resin obtained from certain species of mastic tree’ (HSBM XVII: 275). – **Remarks:** Mod.NWKar. *mastik* id. is classified as a Slavic loanword in KarRPS (404). From a phonetic point of view, it is somewhat more likely to be of Polish origin (*-k* vs. *-ka*).
- moroz** ‘frost’ (Exo 16:14). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *морозь* (15th century) id. (HSBM XVIII: 163). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (409), Mod.WKar. *moroz* id. is referred to as a Russian loanword.
- myhla** ‘mist’ (Gen 2:6). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *мгла* (1489) id. (HSBM XVII: 294). – **Remarks:** See also MPol. *mgla* id. (SPolXVI XIII: 331–332), but in light of the *-h-*, an East Slavic provenance is more probable. The *-y-* in the first syllable is most likely epenthetic, so as to avoid the *mh-* consonant cluster. In KarRPS (413), Mod.WKar. *myhla ~ mygla* id. is classified, generally, as a Slavic loanword.
- ni** ‘neither’ (JSul.I.01: 118 v^o). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *ni* id. (SPolXVI XVI: 522–525); Ruth. *ни* (1340) id. (HSBM XX: 385–386).
- od’verja** ‘1. lintel; 2. side posts; 3. upper door post’ (Exo 12:23). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *одверие* (1489) id. (HSBM XXI: 391). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (424), Mod.SWKar. *odverja* ‘door, door frame’ is referred to as a Polish loanword, which, in the light of Pol. *odrzwia* ‘door frame’, and MPol. *odrzwi ~ odrzwie ~ odrzwia* ‘door frame’ (SPolXVI XX:

- 459) is less likely (for phonetic reasons) than assuming an East Slavic provenance – even if we take into consideration the existence of MPol. *odwierny ~ odwierzny ~ odźwierny* ‘porter’ (SPolXVI XX: 572–573).
- osnova** ‘warp’ (Lev 13:48). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *osnowa* id. (SPolXVI XXII: 159); Ruth. *основа* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM 400–401).
- ozera** ‘lake’ (Exo 7:19). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *ozioro* id. (SPolXVI XXII: 438); Ruth. *озеро ~ возеро озэро* (1392) id. (HSBM XXII: 108). – **Remarks:** The word-initial *o-* clearly points to East Slavic influence. MPol. *ozioro* is attested only twice in the literature, while the dominant and widespread form is *jezioro* (SPolXVI IX: 498–500). Mod.NWKar. *ożera* id. is classified as a Russian loanword in KarRPS (424). The *-o > -a* change took place probably due to the Turkic phonotactic tendency to avoid low rounded vowels in non-first syllables.
- panva** ‘(frying) pan’ (Lev 2:7). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *panew ~ panwia ~ panwa* ‘a pan, a shallow cauldron’ (SPolXVI XXIII: 142, 189; LSJP II/2: 623, s.v. *panew*); Ruth. *панва ~ памва ~ паневъ пановъ* (16th century) id. (HSBM XXIII: 420).
- peč** [or: **pec**] ‘oven’ (Lev 2:4). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *piec* id. (SPolXVI XXIV: 30–32); Ruth. *пець ~ печь ~ печь ~ пець ~ пець* (16th century) id. (HSBM XXIV: 277, 291–292, 295). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (447, 450), Mod.NWKar. *peč* id. and Mod.SWKar. *pec* id. are described, in general, as Slavic loanwords.
- pečora** ‘cave’ (Gen 50:13). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *pieczara ~ pieczora* id. (SPolXVI XXIV: 39); Ruth. *печера ~ печора ~ пецера* (1489) id. (HSBM 289, 294–295). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (447, 450), Mod.NWKar. *pečora* id. and Mod.SWKar. *pecora* id. are described, in general, as Slavic loans.
- perepelica** [or: **peřepelića**] ~ **perepelice** [or: **peřepelice**] ‘quail’ (Exo 16:13, Gen 15:9). – **Possible etymons:** Ruth. *перепелица ~ перэпелица ~ перепелиця ~ перэпелиця ~ перэп’ёлка* (ESBM IX: 67–68) ~ *перепелочка* (17th century) id. (HSBM XXIV: 189). – **Remarks:** Mod.SWKar. *perepelice* id. is described as a Slavic loanword in KarRPS (450), without specifying the donor language.
- perepelice** see **perepelica**
- pole** ‘field’ (Deu 14:5). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *pole* id. (SPolXVI XXVI: 420–429); Ruth. *поле* (15th century) id. (HSBM XXVI: 120–124). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (448), Mod.SWKar. *pole* id. is described, in general, as a Slavic loanword.

- polk** ‘company’ (Gen 37:25). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *polk* ‘a military unit with an unspecified number of soldiers’ (SPolXVI XXVII: 21, s.v. *polek*); Ruth. *полк* ‘1. military unit; 2. tribe; 3. many’ (ESUM IX: 272–273). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (448), Mod.WKAr. *polk* ‘1. army, regiment; 2. mass’ is qualified as a Russian loanword.
- polnyj** ‘(adj.) field’ (Lev 14:4). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *polny* id. (SPolXVI XVI: 459–464); Ruth. *польный ~ полный ~ польный* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XVI: 233). – **Remarks:** The expansive nature of the ESlav. *-yj, -ij* ending in East Borderlands Polish is well known (Kość 1999: 119), which makes the Polish origin of the word also a possibility. As a rule, Slavic adjectives were predominantly adopted in their masculine forms on Karaim ground, as there is no grammatical gender in Turkic.
- postanovtet-** ‘to decide’ (ADub.III.78: 285 r^o; JSul.I.53.13: 7 v^o). – **Morphology:** A compound verb. – **Possible etymons:** Ruth. *постановити ~ постановити ~ постановить* (1547) id. (HSBM XXVII: 188–192). – **Remarks:** The Slavic root is used with MWKar. *et-* ‘(aux.) to do’.
- praunuq** ‘great-grandson’ (Gen 21:23). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *prawnuk* id. (SPolXVI XXX: 143); Ruth. *правнукъ* (17th century) id. (HSBM XXVII: 453–454). – **Remarks:** For phonetic reasons, the word is somewhat more likely to be of East Slavic origin; cf. also Brus. *праўнук* id. In KarRPS (449), we find Mod.NWKAr. *praunuk* id. categorized, generally speaking, as a Slavic loanword.
- pražma** ‘roasted grain’ (Rut 2:14). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *pražmo* id. (SPolXVI XXX: 239); Ruth. *пражмо ~ пряжмо* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XXVII: 475). – **Remarks:** The *-o > -a* is probably due to the Turkic phonotactic tendency to avoid low rounded vowels in non-first syllables.
- pripečka** ‘stove’ (Lev 11:35). – **Possible etymons:** Ruth. *прыпеч ~ прыпечка ~ прыпечокъ* id. (ESUM X: 123; HSBM XXVIII: 397). – **Remarks:** Cf. also MPol. *przypiecek* id. (LSJP II/2: 1222–1223, s.v. *przypiec*), but the East Slavic origin of the word is evident.
- puhač** ‘eagle-owl’ (B 263: 26 v^o). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *puhacz* id. (SPolXVI XXXIV: 424); Ruth. *пугачь* (17th century) id. (HSBM XXIX: 340). – **Remarks:** KarRPS (449) refers to Mod.NWKAr. *puhacz* id. and Mod.SWKAr. *puhac* id. as Polish loanwords, but their East Slavic origin is equally possible.
- pusta et-** ‘to desolate’ (Lev 26:29). – **Morphology:** A compound verb. – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *pusty* ‘empty’ (SPolXVI XXXIV: 477–480);

Ruth. *пустый* (1415) id. (HSBM XXIX: 370–371). – **Remarks:** The Slavic root is used with MWKar. *et-* ‘(aux.) to do’.

pusta jer ‘desert’ (Lev 16:22). – **Morphology:** A compound noun. – **Possible etymons** (of its first component): MPol. *pusty* ‘empty’ (SPolXVI XXXIV: 477–480); Ruth. *пустый* (1415) id. (HSBM XXIX: 370–371). – **Remarks:** For its semantic development, cf. MPol. *pustynia* ‘desert’ (SPolXVI XXXIV: 480–482) and Ruth. *пустыня* ~ *постыня* ~ *пустыня* id. (HSBM XXIX: 373–374) or MPol. *puszcza* ‘desolate place; desert’ (SPolXVI XXXIV: 482–485), and Ruth. *пуца* ~ *пусча* ~ *пуца* ~ *пушча* id. (HSBM XXIX: 385–386) derived from the same Slavic root. The second component of the compound is Kar. *jer* ‘place’, thus, literally, *pusta jer* means ‘empty place’.

qasja ‘cassia’ (Exo 30:24). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *kasyja* id. (SPolXVI X: 161); Ruth. *кассия* ~ *касия* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XIV: 296). – **Remarks:** The word could also be an example of a learned borrowing; cf. Lat. *cassia* id., Gr. *κασσία* id.

qoš ‘basket’ (Lev 6:8). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *kosz* id. (SPolXVI XI: 11–12); Ruth. *кошь* (1499) id. (HSBM XVI: 78–79).

quma ‘concubine’ (Gen 22:24). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *kuma* ‘female companion’ (LSJP I/2: 1182, s.v. *kum*); Ruth. *кума* (1590) id. (HSBM XVI: 217) – **Remarks:** Cf. also MPol. *kum* ‘male companion’ (SPolXVI XI: 545–546).

revent ‘willowherb’ (Exo 30:34). – **Possible etymons:** Of uncertain origin; probably related to Russ. dial. *ревенка* ‘willowherb (*Chamaenerion angustifolium*)’ SRNG (XXXIV: 367). – **Remarks:** In the translation of the Book of Exodus, the word is used to render Heb. *שְׁחִילֵץ* *šhilet* ‘onycha’, which is associated with (and perhaps etymologically related to) the Hebrew root *שָׁחַל* *š-ḥ-l* ‘to roar’ and *שָׁחַל* *šahal* ‘lion’ (Klein 1987: 650). The reason behind the decision to translate it as *revent* might be the fact that Russ. *ревенка* could have been, in turn, associated with Russ. *реветь* ‘to roar’. Cf. SWKar. *revend* ‘willowherb’ used in manuscript JSul.III.01 (Exo 30:34).

rubin ‘ruby’ (Exo 28:17). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *rubin* id. (SPolXVI XXXVII: 118–119); Ruth. *рубинъ* (1509) id. (HSBM XXX: 461).

skala ‘rock’ (Exo 17:6). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *skala* id. (LSJP III: 246); Ruth. *скала* (15th century) id. (HSBM XXXI: 292). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (476), Mod.WKar. *skala* id. is rightly described as a Slavic loanword.

- slavaly** ‘renown’ (Num 16:2). – **Morphology:** A Karaim derivative from a Slavic nominal base. – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *slawa* id. (LSJP III: 280); Ruth. *слава* (1387) id. (HSBM XXXI: 404–406). – **Remarks:** Derived by means of the Karaim adjectival suffix *-ly*; see, Mod.SWKar. *slava* ‘fame’ marked as a Slavic borrowing in KarRPS (476).
- smarak** ~ **šmarak** ‘emerald’ (Exo 28:17, Exo 39:10). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *szmaragd* id. (LSJP III: 554); Ruth. *смаракъдъ* ~ *смаракъдъ* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XXXI: 474). – **Remarks:** The *š*- ~ *s*- alternation shows that a double borrowing (simultaneously from both West and East Slavic) is feasible in this case.
- smola** ‘pitch’ (Gen 6:14). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *smola* id. (LSJP III: 319); Ruth. *смола* (1489) id. (HSBM XXXI: 495–496).
- sova** ‘owl’ (B 263; 26 v°). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *sova* id. (LSJP III: 334); Ruth. *сова* (16th century) id. (HSBM XXXII: 34). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (476), Mod.WKar. *sova* is justly described as a Slavic loanword.
- stol** ‘table’ (Exo 25:23). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *stól* id. (LSJP III: 420–421); Ruth. *столь* ~ *столь* (16th century) id. (HSBM XXXII: 412–413).
- stolp** ‘pole, pillar’ (Gen 19:26). – **Possible etymons:** Ruth. *столпъ* ~ *стовпъ* (15th century) id. (HSBM XXXII: 409–411). – **Remarks:** Cf. also MPol. *stolpowy* ‘(adj.) pillar’ (LSJP III: 424; s.v. *stolpiasta sól*), nevertheless, an East Slavic etymology is more likely.
- stolpec** *‘tablecloth’ (Exo 25:29). – **Possible etymons:** Russ. *столбецъ* (17th century) ‘a roll of fabric’, *столнець* (16th century) ‘a unit of measurement of fabric for tablecloth’ (SRJaXI–XVII XXVIII: 79–80, 85–86). – **Remarks:** The meaning of the Karaim word is reconstructed based on the context of its use and the semantics of the Russian equivalents.
- stupeń** ‘step’ (Exo 20:26). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *ступень* (1489) id. (HSBM XXXIII: 22–23). – **Remarks:** Polish origin is less probable, see MPol. *stopień* id. (LSJP III: 425–426).
- sturlap** ‘household idol’ (Gen 31:19). – **Possible etymon:** Russ. *стурлабы* (1512) ‘gods, idols’ (SRJaXI–XVII XXVIII: 222). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (481), Mod.NWKar. *sturlab* ‘god, idol’, and Mod.SWKar. *sturlap* id. are not classified as loanwords.
- styrta** ‘stack; heap of grain’ (Exo 22:5; Rut 3:7). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *styrta* id. (LSJP III: 456); Ruth. *стырта* (1444) id. (HSBM XXXIII: 27–28). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (481), we find Mod.WKar. *styrta* id. rightly described as a Slavic loanword.

- šipšin** ‘prickle’ (Num 33:55). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *szypszyna* ‘a species of rose with stems covered with thorns, wild rose’ (LSJP III: 587); Ruth. *шпшшина* ~ *шпшшына* (1582) ‘wild rose’ (HSBM XXXVII: 104).
- šmarak** see **smarak**
- šnur** ‘cord’ (Num 3:37). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *sznur* id. (LSJP III: 556–557); Ruth. *шнуръ* ~ *снуръ* (1443) id. (HSBM XXXVII: 161–163). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (647), Mod.NWKar. *šnur* id. is described as a Polish loanword, although an East Slavic provenance is also feasible.
- tanec** ‘dance’ (Exo 32:19). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *taniec* id. (LSJP III: 599–600); Ruth. *танецъ* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XXXIII: 211–212). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (510, 513), both Mod.NWKar. *tañec* id. and Mod.SWKar. *tanec* id. are generally described as words of Slavic origin.
- töte** ‘aunt’ (Exo 6:20). – **Possible etymon:** Russ. *тема* ~ *темя* (11th century) id. (SRJaXI–XVII XXIX: 337). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (524), we find Mod.NWKar. *tóta* id. described as a Russian loanword. Attested in ADub.III.73 (95 r^o) in a possessive 3rd sg. accusative form; the value of the first-syllabic vowel is uncertain: perhaps טוֹטִיטִי should phonetically be interpreted as [tótesin] or [tótešín].
- unuq** ‘grandson’ (Gen 21:23). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *внукъ* ~ *унукъ* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM IV: 70). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (579), Mod.NWKar. *unuk* id. is classified as a Slavic loanword.
- utok** ‘woof’ (Lev 13:48). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *утокъ* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XXXV: 279). – **Remarks:** For semantic reasons, MPol. *utok* ‘cloth roll (element of a treadle loom)’ (LSJP IV: 105, s.v. *utoczyć*) cannot be treated as a possible etymon in this case.
- uže** ‘already’ (ADub.III.78: 284 v^o, 312 v^o; JSul.I.53.13: 7 r^o). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *уже* ~ *вже* ~ *вжэ* (15th century) id. (HSBM XXXIV: 273–274). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (573, 575), both Mod.NWKar. *už*, *uže* id. and Mod.SWKar. *uze* id. are described as words of Russian origin.
- vejatet-** ‘to winnow’ (Rut 3:2). – **Morphology:** A compound verb. – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *веяти* ~ *веети* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM III: 172). – **Remarks:** Cf. also MPol. *wiejacz* ‘winnower’ (LSJP IV: 201), which suggests that a MPol. **wiejać* might also have existed. The Slavic root is used with MWKar. *et-* ‘(aux.) to do’.
- vina** ‘wine’ (Num 6:3). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *wino* id. (LSJP IV: 241); Ruth. *вино* (16th century) id. (HSBM III: 281–284). – **Remarks:** The *-o* > *-a* is due to the Turkic phonotactic tendency to avoid low rounded

vowels in non-first syllables. KarRPS (157) includes Mod.WKar. *vina* id. classified as a Slavic loanword.

vole ‘(anat.) crop’ (Lev 1:16). – **Possible etymon:** MPol. *wole* (17th century) id. (BSEJP 707).

zasek ‘barn’ (Deu 28:8). – **Possible etymon:** Ruth. *zacek* (1565–1566) ‘barn’ (HSBM XI: 145–146). – **Remarks:** Erroneously translated as ‘abatis’ in Németh (2021: 941).

žalle- ‘to regret; to sympathise’ (Deu 13:9). – **Morphology:** A Karaim derivative from a Slavic nominal base. – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *żal* ‘grief, sorrow, pity’ (LSJP IV: 678); Ruth. *жаль* ‘pity; sorrow’ id. (HSBM IX: 264–266). – **Remarks:** The Karaim verb is a *-la* ~ *-le* derivative from MKar. **žal* ‘pity’, cf. Mod.NWKar. *žal* ‘pity’ described in KarRPS (185) as a Slavic loanword. Cf. also Mod.NWKar. *želle-* ~ *žeyle-* ~ *žejla-* ‘to regret, to sympathize’ (KarRPS 186) also referred to as Slavic borrowings.

že ‘intensifying particle’ (ADub.III.78: 314 v^o). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *że* id. (LSJP IV: 872); Ruth. *же* ~ *жэ* (1457) id. (HSBM IX: 275–276). – **Remarks:** In KarRPS (185), Mod.NWKar. *že* id. is described as a Slavic loanword.

žubra ‘wisent’ (Deu 14:5). – **Possible etymons:** MPol. *żubr* ‘European bison, wisent’ (LSJP IV: 1027); Ruth. *зубрь* ~ *жубрь* (1516–1519) id. (HSBM XIII: 222). – **Remarks:** The emergence of the word-final *-a* is most likely a result of a paragoge to avoid the segment *-br*, which is alien to Karaim phonotactics.

4.3. Closing remarks

One conclusion that transpires from the above is that both Ruthenian and Polish may have acted as the main donor languages for Karaim as far as 17th- and early-18th-century lexical borrowings are concerned. Additionally, although the presence of Russian in the Baltic region was not as pronounced during this time period as it would be later on, some of the loanwords can only be explained by juxtaposing them with their Russian equivalents. Now, if we compare the West Karaim data with the historical material of the respective neighbouring Slavic languages, we see how inaccurate the etymological qualifiers in the Karaim–Russian–Polish dictionary (KarRPS) are. This goes to show how difficult a task it is to etymologize the earliest Slavic loanwords in West Karaim. Some of the reasons for this have already been

mentioned in the sections above (e.g., the short linguistic distance between the Slavic varieties, and significant linguistic interactions between West and East Slavic). However, it is also important to emphasize that until the end of the 19th century, all West Karaim texts were recorded in the Hebrew script, thanks to which a great many phonetic and phonological facts actually remain hidden behind the script and require careful reconstruction.

Bearing in mind the gradual development of Slavic–Karaim bilingualism in the late 18th century and continuing into the 19th century, we can hypothesize that Slavic loanwords were most probably pronounced by West Karaims in the same way they sounded in the respective donor languages. In fact, 19th- and early-20th-century fieldwork reports confirm that Karaims in Trakai, Panevėžys, and Lutsk had a native command of Polish (see Smokowski 1841: 162; Smoliński 1912: 116; Kowalski 1925: 26, Firkowicz 1935–1936). Interestingly, even forms exhibiting both East and West Slavic traits typical of the local transitional Slavic varieties had entered Karaim. A good example is SWKar. *istrymacet-* ‘to withstand, to refrain’ < Ukr. *виступаму* ‘to withstand’ blended with Pol. *wytrzymać* id. (Németh 2011: 287).⁵ This is another factor that makes determining the exact Slavic donor language difficult or impossible.

In general, the number of Slavic loanwords and calques documented in the entire West Karaim literary output is immense and includes lexemes representing almost every part of speech, mainly nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, pronouns, conjunctions, and particles. In contrast, Slavic loanwords in East Karaim are mainly nouns, borrowed only from Russian, e.g., EKar. *qapysta* ‘cabbage’ < Russ. *kapusta* id., *ystol* ‘table’ < Russ. *stol* id. (Aqтай & Jankowski 2015: 192, 289).

Acknowledgements



The research upon which this publication is based has been awarded funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement number 802645).

5 The word-medial *-ac-* reflects the Pol. infinitive ending *-ać*, whereas the prefix has a clearly East Slavic shape (Pol. *iz-*, the continuant of PSlav. **jbz*, fell out of use in the 14th–15th centuries: the continuants of PSlav. **jbz* and **sʋ* merged into *s- ~ z-*, see, e.g., BSEJP: 723, s.v. *z*).

Abbreviations

adj. = adjective | **aux.** = auxiliary verb | **Brus.** = Belarusian | **CC** = the Kipchak Turkic language of *Codex Comanicus* | **Deut.** = Book of Deuteronomy | **dial.** = dialectal | **EKar.** = East Karaim | **ESlav.** = East Slavic | **Exo.** = Book of Exodus | **Gen.** = Book of Genesis | **Gr.** = Greek | **Hung.** = Hungarian | **Kar.** = Karaim | **Lat.** = Latin | **Lev.** = Book of Leviticus | **Mod.NWKar.** = Modern Northwest Karaim | **Mod.SWKar.** = Modern Southwest Karaim | **Mod.WKar.** = Modern West Karaim | **MPol.** = Middle Polish | **ms.** = manuscript | **MSWKar.** = Middle Southwest Karaim | **MWKar.** = Middle West Karaim | **Num.** = Book of Numbers | **NWKar.** = Northwest Karaim | **Pol.** = Polish | **PSlav.** = Proto Slavic | **r^o** = recto | **Russ.** = Russian | **Rut.** = Book of Ruth | **Ruth.** = Ruthenian | **SWKar.** = Southwest Karaim | **Ukr.** = Ukrainian | **v^o** = verso

References

- Adamczuk, Lucjan (ed.). 2003. *Karaimi na Litwie i w Polsce*. Warszawa, Vilnius.
- Aqtay, Gülayhan & Jankowski, Henryk. 2015. *A Crimean Karaim–English dictionary*. (= *Prace Językoznawcze* 2). Poznań.
- Barchudarov, Stepan Grigoŕeвиč & Filin, Fedot Petrovič & Šmelev, Dmitrij Nikolaevič & Bogatova, Galina Aleksandrovna & Kryško, Vadim Borisovič (eds.). 1975–2008. *Slovař russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv.* Vol. 1–28 [A–Sulebnyj]. Moskva.
- Baskakov, Nikolaj Aleksandrovič & Zajączkowski, Ananiasz & Šapšal, Seraja Markovič (eds.). 1974. *Karaimsko-russko-poľskij slovař. Słownik karaimsko-rosyjsko-polski*. Moskva.
- Benkő, Loránd et al. (eds.). 1964–1984. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. Vol. 1–4. Budapest.
- Boryś, Wiesław. 2005. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków.
- BSEJP see Boryś, Wiesław (2005).
- Čekmonas, Valeriy. 2001a. Russian varieties in the southeastern Baltic area. Rural dialects. In: Dahl, Östen & Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (eds). *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: 101–136.
- Čekmonas, Valeriy. 2001b. Russian varieties in the southeastern Baltic area. Urban Russian of the 19th century. In: Dahl, Östen & Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (eds). *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: 81–99.
- Drimba, Vladimir. 2000. *Codex Comanicus. Édition diplomatique avec fac-similés*. București.

- Dubiński, Aleksander. 1969. Über die slawischen Einflüsse in der karaimischen Sprache. – *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 15: 139–144.
- Dubiński, Aleksander. 1987. Slavjanske elementy v tjurkskich jazykach na teritorii Połsi, Litvy i Ukrainy. In: Piłaszewicz, Stanisław & Tulisow, Jerzy (eds). *Problemy języków Azji i Afryki*. Warszawa: 175–185.
- Dubiński, Aleksander. 1991. Die Karaimen. Eine türkische Minderheit des alttestamentischen Glaubens. – *Acta Orientalia Belgica* 6: 213–225.
- ESBM see Martynaŭ, Viktar Uladzimeravič et al. (eds.) (1978–2017).
- ESUM see Mel’nyčuk, Oleksandr Savič et al. (eds.) (1982–2006).
- Filin, Fedot Petrovič & Sorokoletov, Fjodor Pavlovič et al. (eds.). 1965–2016, *Slovaŭ russkich narodnych govorov*. Vol. 1–49 [A–Charjatyj]. Moskva, Leningrad/Sankt-Peterburg.
- Firkowicz, Szymon. 1935–1936. Przyczynek do zagadnienia wpływów obcych na język karaimski. – *Mysł Karaimska* 11: 69–72.
- Foy, Karl. 1898. Karaimisch-türkische Sprachproben aus Kalič in Galizien. In: *Mittheilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin. Westasiatische Studien* 1/2: 172–184.
- Gumečka, Lukija Lukijanivna & Kernýčyj, Ivan Mychajlovyč (eds.). 1977–1978. *Slovník staroukrajinskoji movy XIV–XV st.* Vol. 1–2. Kyjiv.
- Harviainen, Tapani. 2003. The Karaites in Eastern Europe and the Crimea: An overview. In: Polliack, Meira (ed.): *Karaite Judaism. A Guide to its History and Literary Sources*. Leiden, Boston, 633–655.
- HSBM see Żuraŭski, Arkadź & Bulyka, Aljaksandr (eds.) (1982–2017).
- Isengalieva, Valentina Ajteševna. 1966. *Tjurkskie glagoly s osnovami, zaimstvovannymi iz russkogo jazyka (proizvodnye glagoly sintetičeskogo i analitičeskogo obrazovanija)*. Alma-Ata.
- ISUJa see Tymčenko, Jevgen Kostjantynovyč (ed.) (1930–1932).
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2003. On the language varieties of Karaims in the Crimea. – *Studia Orientalia* 95: 109–130.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2014. Two Karaim religious poems by Isaac ben Abraham Troki. – *Karaite Archives* 2: 35–57.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2019. Introduction. In: Jankowski, Henryk & Aqtay, Gulayhan & Cegiołka, Dorota & Çulha, Tülay & Németh, Michał. 2019. *The Crimean Karaim Bible. Volume 1: Critical edition of the Pentateuch, Five Scrolls, Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah*. (= *Turcologica* 119). Wiesbaden: ix–xxxix.
- Karłowicz, Jan. 1900. *Słownik gwar polskich*. Vol. 1. Kraków.
- KarRPS see Baskakov, Nikolaj Aleksandrovič & Zajączkowski, Ananiasz & Šapšał, Seraja Markovič (eds.) (1974).
- Klein, Ernest. 1987. *A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the Hebrew language for readers of English*. Jerusalem.
- Kość, Józef. 1999. *Polszczyzna południowokresowa na polsko-ukraińskim pograniczu językowym w perspektywie historycznej*. Lublin.

- Kowalski, Tadeusz. 1925. Sprawozdanie z wycieczki naukowej do Karaimów w Wilnie i Trokach. – *Sprawozdania z Czynności i Posiedzeń Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności* 30.6: 25–29.
- Kurzowa, Zofia. 1985 [2006]. *Polszczyzna Lwowa i Kresów południowo-wschodnich do 1939 roku*. 3rd edition. Kraków.
- Kurzowa, Zofia. 1993 [2006]. *Język polski Wileńszczyzny i Kresów północno-wschodnich XVI–XX w.* 2nd edition. Kraków.
- Linde, Samuel Bogumił. 1807–1814. *Słownik Języka Polskiego*. Vol. 1–4 (vol. 1/1: 1807, vol. 1/2: 1808, vol. 2/1: 1809, vol. 2/2: 1811, vol. 3: 1812, vol. 4: 1814). Warszawa.
- LSJP see Linde, Samuel Bogumił (1807–1814).
- Mardkowicz, Aleksander. 1935. *Karaj sez-bitigi. Słownik karaimski. Karimisches Wörterbuch*. Łuck.
- Martynaŭ, Viktor Uladzimeravič et al. (eds.). 1978–2017. *Ètymalagičny sloŭnik belaruskaj movy*. Vol. 1–14 [A–Гэчка]. Minsk.
- Mayenowa, Maria Renata et al. (eds.). 1966–2020. *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. Vol. 1–38 [A–Siewo]. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków (vol. 1–4, vol. 19–22), Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk (vol. 5–12), Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Łódź (vol. 13–18), Warszawa (vol. 23–37).
- Medvedeva, L. Ja. 1988. O kolekcii karaimskich i krymčakskich rukopisej v LO Instituta vostokovedenija AN SSSR. – *Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* 6: 89–102.
- Mel’nyčuk, Oleksandr Savič et al. (eds.). 1982–2006. *Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajinskoji movy*. Vol. 1–7 vols. Kyjiv.
- Moskovič, Wolf & Tukan, Boris. 1993. The Slavic component in the dialects of the Karaim Language. In: Moskovič, Wolf & Shvarzband, Shmuel & Alekseev, Anatoly (eds.). *Jews & Slavs*. Vol. 1. Jerusalem: 296–303.
- Muchowski, Piotr. 2013. *Folk literature of the Polish-Lithuanian Karaites. Abkowitz 3 Manuscript, Part 2*. Paris.
- Németh, Michał. 2004. Some disputable Slavic etymologies in Crimean-Karaim. – *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 9: 111–118.
- Németh, Michał. 2011. *Unknown Lutsk Karaim letters in Hebrew script. A critical edition*. (= *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 12). Kraków.
- Németh, Michał. 2016. A Crimean Karaim handwritten translation of the Book of Ruth dating from before 1687. Another contribution to the history of Crimean Karaim and to the question of the stemma codicum of the Eupatorian printed edition of the Tanakh from 1841. – *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 26/2: 161–226.
- Németh, Michał. 2020a. Gustaf Peringer’s Karaim Biblical Material Revisited. A Linguistic Commentary on a Text Sample from 1691. – Szczyrbak, Magdalena & Tereszkievicz, Anna (eds.). *Languages in contact and contrast. A Festschrift for Professor Elżbieta Mańczak-Wohlfeld on the occasion of her 70th birthday*. Kraków: 295–309.
- Németh, Michał. 2020b. *Middle Western Karaim. A critical edition and linguis-*

- tic analysis of pre-19th-century Karaim interpretations of Hebrew piyyutim.* (= *Languages of Asia* 22). Leiden, Boston.
- Németh, Michał. 2021a. Early-19th-century Polish spoken by Karaims: Linguistic analysis of a Polish text written in Hebrew script. – *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 77.2: 297–336.
- Németh, Michał. 2021b. *The Western Karaim Torah. A critical edition of a manuscript from 1720. Vol. 1–2.* (= *Languages of Asia* 24). Leiden, Boston.
- Németh, Michał. 2023. Slavic influence on Karaim. In: Greenberg, Marc L. (editor-in-chief) & Grenoble, Lenore A. (general editor). *Encyclopedia of Slavic languages and linguistics online*. Brill. Consulted online on 07 September 2023; http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2589-6229_ESLO_COM_039764.
- Németh, Michał & Sulimowicz-Keruth, Anna. 2023. The emergence and evolution of the West Karaim Bible translating tradition: Manuscripts, translators, and copyists. – *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 143.3: 555–580.
- Radlov, Vasilij Vasiľevič. 1896. *Obrazcy narodnoj literatury sévernyx” tjurkskix” plemen” sobrany V. V. Radlovym”. Časť VII. Narěčija krymskago poluoostrova. Proben der Volksliteratur der nördlichen türkischen Stämme gesammelt und übersetzt von Dr. W. Radloff. VII. Theil. Die Mundarten der Krym. St.-Peterburg“.*
- Schudt, Johann Jacob. 1714. *Jüdische Merckwürdigkeiten: Vorstellende was sich Curieuses und denckwürdiges in den neuern Zeiten bey einigen Jahr-hunderterten mit denen in alle IV. Theile der Welt sonderlich durch Teutschland zerstreuten Juden zugetragen. Sammt einer vollständigen Franckfurter Juden-Chronick darinnen der zu Franckfurt am Mayn wohnenden Juden von einigen Jahr-hunderterten biß auff unsere Zeiten merckwürdigste Begebenheiten enthalten. Benebst einigen zur Erläuterung beygefügtten Kupffern und Figuren. Mit Hiftorischer Feder in drey Theilen beschrieven von Johann Jacob Schudt. Franckfurt, Leipzig.*
- Schupart, Gottfried Johann. 1701. בַּת הַקְּרָאִים, *sev, Secta Karræorum disserta-tionibus aliquot historico-philologicis sic adumbrata, ut e codicibus mstis utplurimum ortus, progressus ac dogmata ejusdem præcipua eruta com-pareant.* Jenæ.
- SGP see Karłowicz, Jan (1900).
- Sicińska, Katarzyna. 2013. *Polszczyzna południowokresowa XVII i XVIII wieku (na podstawie epistolografii)*. Łódź.
- Smokowski, Wincenty. 1841. Wspomnienie Trok w 1821 r. – *Athenaeum. Pismo poświęcone historii, filozofii, literaturze, sztukom i krytyce* 5: 157–179.
- Smolińska, Barbara. 1983. *Polszczyzna północnokresowa z przełomu XVII i XVIII w. Na podstawie rękopisów Jana Władysława Poczobuta Odlanickiego i Antoniego Kazimierza Sapiehy*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Łódź.
- Smoliński, Józef. 1912. Karaimi i bożnica ich w Łucku. – *Ziemia. Tygodnik krajoznawczy ilustrowany* 1: 116–119.
- SPolXVI see Mayenowa, Maria Renata et al. (eds.) (1969).

- SRJaXI–XVII see see Barchudarov, Stepan Grigořevič & Filin, Fedot Petrovič & Šmelev, Dmitrij Nikolaevič & Bogatova, Galina Aleksandrovna & Kryško, Vadim Borisovič (eds.) (1975–2008).
- SRNG see Filin, Fedot Petrovič & Sorokoletov, Fjodor Pavlovič et al. (eds.) (1965–2016).
- SStp. see Urbańczyk, Stanisław et al. (eds.) (1953–2002)
- SSUM see Gumečka, Lukija Lukijanivna & Kernyčkyj, Ivan Mychajlovyč (eds.) (1977–1978).
- Sulimowicz, Anna. 2015. Nieznany przekład Roty na język karaimski. – *Almanach Karaimski* 4: 101–116.
- Szyszman, Simon [= Szymon]. 1952. Gustaf Peringers Mission bei den Karäern. – *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 102/2: 215–228.
- Tentzel, Wilhelm Ernst (ed.). 1691. *Monatliche Unterredungen einiger guten Freunde von allerhand Büchern und andern annemlichen Geschichten; allen Liebhabern der Curiositäten zur Ergetzlichkeit und Nachsinnen heraus gegeben*. Leipzig.
- TESz see Benkő, Loránd et al. (eds.) (1964–1984).
- Tuori, Riikka. 2013. *Karaite zēmīrōt in Poland-Lithuania. A study of paraliturgical Karaite Hebrew poems from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries*. Helsinki.
- Tymčenko, Jevgen Kostjantynovyč (ed.). (1930–1932). *Istoryčnyj slovnyk ukrajinskogo jazyka*. Vol. 1–2. Charkiv, Kyjiv.
- Urbańczyk, Stanisław et al. (ed.). 1953–2002. *Słownik staropolski*. Vol. 1–II. Warszawa (vol. 1–10/3), Kraków (vol. 2/4–11), Wrocław (vol. 2/5–10/3), Gdańsk (vol. 6/3–10/3), Łódź (vol. 7/6–10/3).
- de Vincenz, Andrzej & Hentschel, Gerd. 2010. *Das Wörterbuch der deutschen Lehnwörter in der polnischen Schrift- und Standardsprache*. (= *Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia* 20). Göttingen, Oldenburg [on-line edition: <http://diglib.bis.uni-oldenburg.de/bis-verlag/wdlp/>].
- Wexler, Paul. 1980. The Byelorussian impact on Karaite and Yiddish. – *The Journal of Belarusian Studies* 4.3–4: 99–111.
- Zajączkowski, Ananiasz. 1939. Najstarsza wiadomość o języku tureckim Karaimów w Polsce (z XVII w.). – *Mysł Karaimska* 12 (1937–1938): 90–99.
- Zajączkowski, Ananiasz. 1961. *Karaims in Poland. History. Language. Folklore. Science*. Warszawa.
- Žuraŭski, Arkadž & Bulyka, Aljaksandr (eds.). 1982–2017. *Historyčny sloŭnik belaruskaj movy*. Vol. 1–37. Minsk.

Manuscripts

A 144₅ see KarRPS (28–29).

ADub.III.73 = A translation of the Torah, the Book of Ruth, the Book of Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and the Book of Esther into Northwest Karaim. The

Torah was created between 25 Mar 1720 and 31 May 1720, the other books were created ca. 1720; more precisely after 31 May 1720, and before 27 Mar 1723. Copied in Kukizów by Simcha ben Chananel (died 27 Mar 1723). Stored in Warsaw in the private archive of the late Aleksander Dubiński (1924–2002).

- ADub.III.78 = A prayer book in Hebrew, Southwest and Northwest Karaim. The work of several copyists created in the 18th and 19th centuries (ca. 1750 at the earliest, see folios 118 v^o and 251 v^o). Several manuscripts bound together. Copied in Halych and (probably) Lutsk.
- B 263 = A manuscript (*Bet Avraham*) in Hebrew written in 1662 in Troki by Abraham ben Yoshiyahu (1636–1667) with brief Northwest Karaim additions from 1671 (a *qinah* authored by Zarach ben Natan in 1649). Stored in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg.
- Evr I 699 = A commentary on the precepts of the faith written by Icchak ben Abraham Troki (commentary on Eliyahu Bashyachi's *Adderet Eliyyahu*) in Hebrew and Northwest Karaim. Copied by Mordechai ben Icchak (perhaps Mordechai ben Icchak Łokszyński) in the 17th century. Stored in the National Library of Russia in Saint Petersburg.
- Jer NLI 4101-8 = A collection of religious texts in Hebrew and Northwest Karaim. Copied in Lutsk by an unknown person. Stored in the National Library of Israel.
- JSul.I.01 = A translation of the Torah and of some fragments of the books of Joshua, Judges, 1–2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Obadiah, Micah, Habakkuk, and Zechariah (i.e., Torah and Haftarah) into Southwest Karaim. Copied by Jeshua Josef Mordkowicz (1802–1884) in Halych in the mid-19th century. Stored in Warsaw in the private archive of the late Józef Sulimowicz (1913–1973).
- JSul.I.02 = A collection of *zemirot* written in Hebrew, Karaim, and Polish. Copied in Lutsk in the 19th century (sometime between 1807 and 1832 with a few later additions) by Mordechai ben Josef of Lutsk.
- JSul.I.04 = A translation of the Book of Job into Southwest Karaim. Copied in Lutsk in 1814 by Jaakov ben Icchak Gugel.
- JSul.I.50.06 = A translation of the Book of Esther into Southwest Karaim and a collection of *piyyutim* in both Hebrew and Southwest Karaim. Copied ca. 1815 in Lutsk by an unknown copyist.
- JSul.I.53.13 = A fragment of a prayer book in Hebrew and Southwest Karaim. A copy of volume 1 of *Siddur* (1737) bound together with handwritten additions. What remained from this item is page 11 of the printed *siddur* and 10 folios of handwritten text copied in the mid-18th century (probably ca. 1762) by an unknown person, most probably in Halych.

- JSul.III.01 = A Southwest Karaim translation of the Torah. Copied in Halych in the mid-19th century by Jeshua Josef Mordkowicz. Its edition, created in 2022 by Anna Sulimowicz-Keruth, Dorota Smętek (Cegiołka), and Zsuzsanna Johan (Olach) is available online at: <https://middleturkic.lingfil.uu.se/manuscripts/middle-karaim/JSul.III.01>.
- JSul.III.63 = A prayer book in Hebrew and Southwest Karaim. A copy of volume 1 of *Siddur* (1737) bound together with handwritten additions copied ca. 1788 (1797 at the latest) in Halych by Jeshua ben Mordechai Mordkowicz.
- JSul.III.65 = 18th-century handwritten additions in Hebrew and Southwest Karaim bound together with volume 4 of *Siddur* (1737). The folio \aleph verso contains an annotation with the date 10 Tevet 5553 A.M., i.e. 25 December 1792. Copied in Halych. It contains various religious works and a Southwest translation of the Book of Esther.
- RABk.IV.15 = A prayer book in Hebrew and Northwest Karaim. The work of many copyists bound together. Copied in the 18th century and the 1st half of the 19th century. The place of its creation is uncertain.
- TKow.01 = A translation of the Torah into Northwest Karaim. Copied by Simcha ben Chananel. It was finished on 7 December 1722 A.D. Until 2019, kept in Kraków in the private archive of the inheritors of the late Tadeusz Kowalski's (1889–1948) private archive. Now, kept in the private archive of Anna Sulimowicz-Keruth in Warsaw.