

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: LITVANYA KARAYCASI

AUTHORS: Éva Ágnes Csató

PAGES: 33-45

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/305296>

LITHUANIAN KARAIM
LİTVANYA KARAYCASI

Özet

Bu makale yüksek derecede tehlikede olan Litvanya Karaycasının temel fonolojik, gramatikal ve sosyolinguistik özelliklerine dair kısa bir bilgi vermektedir. Batı Kıpçak dillerinden biri olan Karayca diğer çeşitli dillerle çok yakın temas halinde bulunmuş ve sonuç olarak fonolojik, morfolojik, sentaktik ve leksikal düzeylerde birtakım değişikliklere uğramıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Karaim, Karayca, tehlikedeki diller, Litvanya Karaim dili, Kıpçak dili, Kıpçakça

Abstract

This article gives a short account of the basic phonological, grammatical and sociolinguistic features of the highly endangered Lithuanian Karaim language. Karaim is a West-Kipchak language, which has been in close contact with a variety of other languages which, as a result, induced changes in its phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical composition.

Key Words: Karaim, endangered languages, Lithuanian Karaim language, Kipchak language

1. Ethnonyms (Internal Naming and External Naming)

The Karaims call themselves *karaj* ‘Karaim man’ or *karajka* ‘Karaim woman’. The name goes back to the Hebrew verb ‘to read’. In English, the ethnonym is *Karaim*, a plural form in Hebrew, whereas in Turkish their name is *Karay* or *Karay Türkleri*. In German the form *Karäer* is often employed. In Turcology, the form *Karaite* is used to refer to the followers of the Karaite confession. Thus, the name Karaim is used to denote the Turkic speaking Karaites in order to distinguish them from the Karaites who had a different background. The Karaims call the language *karajče* [ka'raytʃɛ] or *karaj tili* [ka'ray tɪ'lɪ]. In English, the language is called *Karaim* or less often *Karay*.

2. Religion and Culture

The communities are followers of the Karaite confession, which developed in the 9th century in Babylonia and spread over the whole Middle East. The main characteristic of this Mosaic confession is the recognition of the Hebrew Bible as the sole source of religious law, to the exclusion of the Oral Law, i. e. the Talmud (W. Zajączkowski 1990, Polliack (ed.) 2003).

3. Geography and Population

The traditional settlements of the Turkic speaking Karaims are situated in three of Eastern European areas: Crimea, Western Ukraine (Galicia) and Lithuania.

The Karaim community counts today about two hundred members. In spite of its small size, the community is a stronghold of the Karaim cultural heritage including the unique musical tradition (Firkavičiūtė 2001, 2003) and the only community in which the language is still spoken by about ten percent of the people. The community is recognized as a historical national minority of Lithuania and enjoys the special rights defined by European conventions. The community is administered by a religious and a cultural board. The leader of the community is the *ullu hazzan* or in certain periods the *hachan*. Two prayer houses, *kenesa*, are functioning in Lithuania: one in Trakai and another one in Vilnius. The Karaim street in Trakai serves as a vivid community center where each summer Karaim summer schools are organized for over one hundred participants both local and from other countries where Karaims live — mostly from Poland, Russia and Ukraine (Harviainen 1997, Csató 2002b, in print a, Csató & Nathan 2002, 2003,). See a review of the Karaim literature in A. Zajaczkowski 1964. The revitalization efforts are today supported also by distance courses at Uppsala University.

4. Historical Background (e.g. Connection to Khazars for Karaim)

The Karaim community has an over six hundred years presence in Lithuania. See about the history and culture of Karaims A. Zajaczkowski 1961, Kobeckaitė 1994, Harviainen 2003a, 2003b, Csató 2006. See about the old Swedish-Karaim relations Csató 2008.

5. Orthography and Notation

Karaim was originally written in Hebrew script. The biblical texts were translated into Karaim and preserved in the community in handwritten books. See more about the biblical texts and other religious texts in Harviainen 2003a, 2003b, and 2007. During the Soviet times, the Cyrillic alphabet was employed, thus, the most comprehensive Karaim dictionary (Baskakov et al. 1974) and grammar (Musaev 1964 and 2004) are written in Cyrillic script. A Latin script based on the Polish writing system was used in the early 19th century (Csató & Nathan 2007).

The present Lithuanian orthography was introduced by Mykolas Firkovičius. He published a number of religious texts, the Karaim prayer book, literary texts and a textbook written in this script (Firkovičius 1989, 1993, 1994, 1996, 1998-99, 2000). His writing system employs the following letters for rendering consonants: *b, c* [ts], *ch* [χ], *č, d, d', dž* [j], *f, g, h* [ɣ], *j, k, l, l', m, n, n'* [n'], *p, r, s, ś* [s'], *š, t, t'* [t'], *v, z, ź* [z'], *ž*. The vowel letters rendering front vowels as the first sound in a word are *i, é, ü, and ö*, e.g. *it'* 'dog', *ét'* 'meat', *üč* 'three', *öp* 'kiss!'. In other positions, the front vowels are written as *ie* [e], *ia* [ä], *io* [ö], *iu* [ü/ù], e.g. *kiel'* [k'el'] 'come!', *üriak* [yr'æk] 'heart', *giol'* [g'ølj] 'lake', *siut'* [s'yt'] 'milk'. An *e*-sound in back syllables is written as *e* [ɛ], e.g. *atej* [a'tej] 'your father'. Observe that the letter *i* marks both the frontness of the vowel and that of the consonant. The misunderstanding that only the consonant is palatal and the vowel is not is partly due to a misinterpretation of the orthography. The back vowels are written in the same form in all positions: *y* [i], *u, o, and a*, e.g. *jarych* [ya'riχ] 'light', *uprach* [up'raχ] 'clothe', *kol* 'hand, arm', *ata* [a'ta]. The soft consonant characters *d', l', n', ś, t'* and *ź* are not used when followed by an *i*, e.g. *éd'liar* [e'd'ljær] 'they were' but *édim* [e'd'im] 'I was', *jel'* [jel'] 'wind' but *kieliaš* [k'e'ljæs'] 'you

come'. After *j* no *i* can be written, consequently the sequence *ju* can be read either as a back syllable [ju] or a front one [jʉ], e.g. *yuv* can be read as [juv] 'wash!' or [jʉv] 'house'.

In this article, the Karaim words are given in the present Lithuanian orthography followed in parantheses by a broad phonetic transcription, e.g. *giol'* [g'jöl'] 'lake'. In some cases, Turcological standard notation is employed. Morpheme segmentation is marked with a hyphen. Word accent is denoted by ' in front of the accented syllable, e.g. *kieliad'liar* [k'e'l'æd'liær] 'they come'.

6. Language

This article gives a short account of the main phonological and grammatical features of the highly endangered Lithuanian Karaim language, which has undergone considerable contact induced changes in its phonological, morphosyntactic and lexical composition (Johanson & Csató 1998, Johanson 2002, Csató 2002a). It is important to point out that this high copying language shares basic genealogical features with other Turkic languages and, consequently, its genealogical relatedness to other Turkic varieties is indisputable. Speakers of endangered languages may develop negative attitudes towards copying. These attitudes increase the endangerment of the language (Csató 1998).

More general treatments of Karaim grammar have been written by the Polish Turcologist Tadeusz Kowalski (Kowalski 1929) and the Kazakh Turcologist Kenesbaev Musaev (Musaev 1964 and 2004). Ananjasz Zajączkowski published in 1932 a comprehensive description of nominal and verbal suffixes in Karaim (A. Zajączkowski 1932). Pritsak gives a brief summary of the main features of the Karaim varieties (Pritsak 1959). The Karaim scholar, Aleksander Dubiński wrote a number of studies on Karaim topics (Dubiński 1994). Mykolas Firkovičius' Karaim textbook is a reliable source on Karaim morphology (Firkovičius 1996). Csató 2002c gives an overview of the typological features characterizing Karaim. See more about current research in Csató 2010. The most comprehensive Karaim dictionary is the *Karaimsko-russko-pol'skij slovar'* (Baskakov, A. Zajānčkovski, Šapšal 1974).

6a. The language among the Turkic Languages

Karaim is a West-Kipchak language.

6b. Dialectology

Standard Turcological handbooks, e.g. Pritsak 1959, treat the Turkic varieties of the Karaim communities as dialects of one Karaim language and distinguish between a North-Western variety (Lithuanian or Troki/Trakai Karaim), a South-Western variety (Halich Karaim), and an Eastern variety (Crimean Karaim). The communities have common religious, historical and cultural traditions and the varieties are linguistically related. Even so it is important to point out that the differences between the varieties spoken in Halich and in the Lithuanian community are so significant that speakers of the two varieties prefer to choose Russian or Polish when communicating with each others. The present differences are partly due to the fact that they developed from different Kipchak varieties, partly to the different linguistic surroundings that influenced their later development.

6c. Phonology and morphophonology

Karaim has the typical Turkic vowel system containing five front and four back vowel types. Thus, in Turcological transcription followed by its corresponding IPA notation, the following vowels types can be distinguished: *ü* [y], *i* [i], *e* [e] or [ɛ], *ä* [æ], *ö* [ø] and the back vowels *ı* [ɯ], *u* [u], *o* [o] and *a* [a]. In non-first syllables or after *y*, and especially in absolute auslaut, the high rounded front vowel *ü* is pronounced retracted as *ɯ*, i. e. as a near-front high [ɯ] (between *ü* and *u*), for instance, *ürıatıuvčıu* [yr̥æt̪ʰv̪t̪ʰɯ] ‘teacher’. In some lexical items, the vowels are lengthened, e.g. *bieria* [ˈb̥eːræ] ‘hereto’. Diphtongs and sequences of vowels are avoided. The back vowel *ı* does not occur in initial position. Words beginning in a front high vowel have variants with a *j* e.g. *igit* [iˈɡit̪] or *jigit* [jiˈɡit̪] ‘young’, *üč* [yt̪] or *juč* [jɯt̪] ‘three’. If the vowel is back, this is maintained when preceded by a *j*, e.g. *ır* ‘song’ vs. *jyr* [j̥ir̥] ‘song’. Note that the stem is in both forms classified as back, thus the plural forms are *ırlar* and *jyrlar* ‘songs’.

The inventory of the consonant types includes *b*, *b̊*, *p*, *p̊*, *f*, *f̊*, *v*, *v̊*, *m*, *m̊*, *č*, *č̊*, *t*, *t̊*, *d*, *d̊*, *s*, *s̊*, *z*, *z̊*, *r*, *r̊*, *l*, *l̊*, *j*, *n*, *n̊*, *ts*, *ts̊*, *dz*, *dz̊*, *š*, *š̊*, *ž*, *ž̊*, *tš*, *tš̊*, *ʃ*, *ʃ̊*, *k*, *k̊*, *g*, *g̊*, *χ*, *χ̊*, *ɣ*, *ɣ̊*, *ŋ*, *ŋ̊*. The palatalized variants are marked here with an additional diacritical [̊]. The palatal variants precede front vowels. In syllable final position only *d*, *l*, *n*, *s*, *t* and *z* are palatalized in front syllables. This is reflected also in the orthography e.g. *éd'liar* [ed̊l̊iær̊] ‘they were’, *él'* [el̊] ‘people’, *kiuń* [k̊iyn̊] ‘day’, *kieliaš* [k̊e'l̊æš̊] ‘you come’, *kieliat* [k̊e'l̊æt̊] ‘(s)he/it comes’ and *kiož* [k̊øz̊] ‘eye’.

The following text sample, a prayer, illustrates the present orthography: *Tabu étiabiž Tieńrigia* [taˈbu eˈt̪æb̊iz̊ ten̊r̊iˈg̊æ] *bolušluhu üčiuń bižgia* [bolušluˈɣu yč̊ɯn̊ b̊iz̊g̊æ] ‘We thank God for his help to us.’ Glosses: *tabu étiabiž* ‘we thank’, present form of *tabu ét-* ‘thank’, *Tieńri-gia* ‘to God’, *-gia* = dative case, *bolušluhu üčiuń* ‘for his help’, *-u* = his, possessive of the 3rd person; *üčiuń* ‘for’, *bižgia* [biž-gia] ‘to us’, *-gia* = dative case.

The distinction between front vs. back syllables plays a significant role in Karaim. Both vowels and consonants signal the quality of the syllable. See the [+front] monosyllabic word *kiož* [k̊øz̊] ‘eye’ vs. the [-front] word *koz* [koz̊] ‘nut’. The distinctive feature, the syllabic frontness or non-frontness, is a suprasegmental feature that spreads over both the consonants and the vowels in a syllable (Csató & Johanson 1996, Csató 1999b, Csató & Johanson 1996, 2009). A tendency towards syllabic harmony manifested by the systematic suspension of phonological features in suffix syllables is typical of Turkic. In this respect, syllables in a word harmonise with one another in terms of frontness vs. backness and in some cases the vowels also in terms of roundedness vs. unroundedness. Karaim is in this respect a typical Turkic language. Some suffixes with low vowels have two variants: a front one and a back one, e.g. the plural suffix *-LAR*: *jazyš-lar* [jaz̊iʃ̊lar̊] ‘writings’ vs. *bitik-liar* [b̊it̊ik̊l̊iær̊] ‘letters’. Suffixes containing high vowels, have four vowel variants characterised as [± front] and [± rounded], e.g. the first person possessive suffix *-(l)m*: *jazyš-ym* [jaz̊iʃ̊im̊] ‘my writing’, *bitig-im* [b̊it̊iˈg̊im̊] ‘my letter’, *kioz-ium* [k̊øz̊i̯um̊] ‘my eye’ and *koz-um* [koˈzum̊] ‘my nut’.

The typical Turkic aversion to consonant clusters is relaxed in Karaim, because of the many lexical items copied from the contact languages. Thus the name of the town *Troki* is pronounced without any inserted vocalic element in the initial consonant cluster.

Consonant assimilation is observed in Karaim, e.g. *al-dy* [take-PAST] vs. *at-ty* [throw-PAST]. Word-final voice reduction, i.e. that lenis obstruents are pronounced with reduced voicing in word-final position is also observed in Karaim e.g. Karaim *at* ‘name’ but *ad-im* [name-POSS1SG] ‘my name’, *bitik* ‘letter’ but *bitig-im* [letter-POSS1SG] ‘my letter’, *čych!* [tʃix] ‘go out!’ vs. *čyhat* [tʃiyat] ‘goes out’.

A special type of consonant dissimilation occurs when two *l*-sounds follow each other, e.g. as a result of suffixation: *giol* [gʲɔlʲ] ‘lake’ but *giol-liar* [gʲɔlʲlʲær] ‘lakes’. This is not indicated in the orthography. Observe also the form *eñli* [eŋʲlʲi] ‘fifty’, cf. Turkish *elli*, and *ullu* [uɫlu] ‘big’, cf. Turkish *ullu*.

The stress pattern is similar to the normal Turkic one. The stressed syllable is normally the last syllable in the word. The realisation of the stress is, however, different from other Turkic languages, because stress and high-pitch falls always on the same syllable. When a suffix that cannot carry stress, as for instance the negation suffix *-MA*, the preceding syllable is stressed, e.g. *anlamadym* [anʲlamadɪm] ‘I didn’t understand (it)’. Compounds are stressed on their first element, e.g. *biugiur* [bʲygʲuɾ] ‘today’. This pattern is valid also in compounds which are today not analysable any more, as for instance *jalbarma* [ʲalbarma] ‘to pray’ *kiogiut* [kʲøgʲutʲ] ‘grass’ and in some verbs including a causative suffix, e.g. *siekirmia* [sʲekʲirmʲæ] ‘to jump/to dance’. Many adverbs display an irregular accentuation pattern, e.g. *hale* [ʲa:lɛ] ‘now’, *ančech* [antʃəx] ‘only’.

6d. Morphology and Syntax

In the domain of word formation Karaim has copied some non-Turkic derivational suffixes such as *-ka*, *-čA* and employs them to mark feminine lexical forms, e.g. *haver* ‘friend’, *haver-ka* ‘female friend’, *jubij* ‘the master of the house’, *jubijčia* ‘housewife’. Gender agreement is sometimes marked, namely when the adjective is a copied item with adjectival morphology, e.g. *ol é-di inteligent-na* [she COPULA-PAST3SG intelligent-feminine] ‘She was intelligent’. See more about word formation in Csató in print b.

The prevailing Turkic type of compound nouns follows the following pattern: N + NPOSSESSIVE3SG. This is also employed in Karaim, e.g. *jaz-baš-y* [summer-head-POSSESSIVE3SG] ‘spring’. A further non-Turkic type is illustrated by the example *savuchturuvču tiš-liar-niñ* [doctor tooth-PLURAL-GENITIVE] ‘dentist’.

Karaim has a synthetic morphological structure employing numerous morphosyntactic categories with very generalised contents. The nominal paradigm includes singular and plural forms, seven case suffixes, and five possessive suffixes.

The plural suffix is *-LAR*, e.g. *at* ‘horse’ *at-lar*, *it* ‘dog’ *it-liar* ‘dogs’. The case suffixes include seven cases. The instrumental, which is marked by the suffixed form of the postposition *byla* ‘with’ has become a case suffix in Karaim. Karaim has copied the combinational properties of the Slavic instrumental suffix. Thus, for instance in copular clauses, the instrumental case is assigned to the predicative element, e.g. *Ol vachtta édi üriatiuvčiu-bia* [that time-LOC COP-PAST3SG teacher-INSTR] ‘At that time, he was a teacher’. The postposition *-ba* ‘with’ can also be governed by a postposition or an adverb, e.g. *mienimbia yanaša* [I-GENITIVE-WITH next to] ‘next to me’; compare

Russian *rjadom so mnoj* [next to with I-INSTRUMENTAL] 'next to me'. The accusative case is -*NI* after the third person possessive -*N*, e.g. *at-ny* 'horse (accusative)', *it'-ni* 'dog (accusative)', *uvul-nu* 'son (accusative)', *kiož-n'ü* 'eye (accusative)' but *uvl-u-n* 'his/her son (accusative)'. The genitive suffix is -*NIN*, e.g. *at-nyn* 'of the horse', *it'-nin* 'of the dog', *uvul-nun* 'of the son', *kiož-niuñ* [k'öz'n'ün] 'of the eye'. The dative suffix has three back and two front variants. Compare *at-cha* [ata'χa] 'to the horse', *ata-ha* [ata'ya] 'to the father', *Troch-ka* [troχ'ka] 'to Trakai', *it'-kia* [it'k'æ] 'to the dog' and *kiož-gia* [k'öz'g'æ] 'to the eye'. After the third person possessive suffix the dative is different, see e.g. *ata-syn-a* 'to his father'. The locative and ablative suffixes are -*DA* and -*DAN*. The instrumental is built with the suffixed form of the postposition 'with' -*BA*, e.g. *at-ba* [atba] 'with horse', *it'-bia* [it'b'æ] 'with dog'. The instrumental suffix is not accented.

The possessive suffixes are -(*I*)*m*, -(*I*)*j*, -(*s*)*l*, -(*I*)*m**l**Z* and -(*I*)*j**l**Z*. The third person singular and plural are identical, e.g. *at-ym* 'my horse', *at-yj* 'your horse', *at-y* 'his/her their horse', *at-ymyz* 'our horse', *at-yjyz* 'your (pl.) horse'. Observe that a stem final [a] or [æ] becomes [ε] respectively [e] when the possessive suffix of the second person -*j* or -*j**l**Z* follows; e.g. *ata* 'father', *ate-j* 'your father', *inia* [i'n'æ] 'needle', *inie-j* [i'n'ey] 'your needle'.

The personal pronouns are: *mieñ*, *sieñ*, *ol*, *biž*, *siž*, *alar*. The dative forms are *maja*, *saja*, *anar*, *bižgia*, *sižgia*, *alarha*. The demonstrative pronouns are *bu* 'this', *ol* 'that', *ušpu* 'this here', *ošol* 'that there'. Some of the most frequent interrogative pronouns are *kim* 'who', *nie* 'what', *niečik* 'how', *niñdi* 'what (like)', *kajsy* 'which', *kejre* 'whereto', *niek* 'why', *niegia* 'for what', *nie üčiuñ* 'for what', *kačan* 'when'. Some of the indefinite pronouns are *bar* 'all', *har* [yar] 'each', *nie-ės* 'something', *kim-ės* 'somebody', *kačan-ės* 'sometimes', *kiši-die* 'nobody', *niemiet* 'nothing', *hieč* [y'eč] 'no', *öñgia* 'other'. The reflexive pronouns are based on *öz* 'self': *özium* 'myself', *öziuj* 'yourself', etc. Adjectival forms are *alej* 'so', *bulej* 'this way'.

Karaim employs a comparative suffix -*rAK*, e.g. *jachšy-rach* [good-COMPARATIVE] 'better'. The superlative is expressed by a particle and the comparative, e.g. *ėnk jachšy-rach* 'best'. The Turkic pattern of comparison is used, e.g. *mieñdiañ jachšy-rach* [I-ABLATIVE good-COMPARATIVE] 'better than I'. Moreover, new non-Turkic syntactic patterns employing a comparative junctor have been copied, e.g., *jachšy-rach niečik mieñ* [good-COMPARATIVE as I] 'better than I'.

Karaim is a postpositional language (Csató 2000a). Frequently used postpositions are: *üčiuñ* 'for, about', *kibik* 'as, like', *son* or *sortun* (with the ablative) 'after', *ašyra* 'over', *sartyn* 'because of, by reason of', *janaša* (with the instrumental) 'by', *kioria* (with the dative) 'according to', *dejiñ* and *dieria* (with dative) 'until'. The secondary postpositions include *üst'iunia* 'on' or 'onto', *üst'iuñdiañ* 'from the top of', *tiubiunia* 'under' or 'underto', *tiubiüñdiañ* 'from below', *alnyna* 'in front of' or 'to the front of', *alnyndan* 'from the front of', *artyna* 'behind' or 'to behind', *artyndan* 'from behind', *arasyna* 'between, among', *arasyndan* 'from', *katyna* 'by', *katyndan* 'from', *utru* 'opposite to'.

Karaim employs the interrogative particle *mo/me/mia*, although less frequently than, for instance, Turkish. The particle is often used in a non-Turkic way, i.e. it follows the first word of the clause even when it questions the whole clause. Consider the following example: *bil'-mim mieñ mia kibit'kia bar-y-m* [know-NEGATION-PRESENT1SG I interrogative.particle shop-DATIVE go-

AORIST1SG] 'I don't know whether I will go to the shop'. The Polish interrogative particle *czy* has been copied and is frequently used clause initially (Csató 1999).

Negation is expressed by *tiuviul* 'not', e.g. *kiorkliu tiuviul* 'not beautiful'. Some other particles and conjunctions are, e.g. *DA* 'also', *da* 'and' *dahy* [dayi] 'and, also', *hanuz* ['yanuz] 'still, yet', *hiem* [y'em] 'or', *jemiešia* 'or', *klia* 'or', *tiek* 'only', *égier* 'if', *ki* 'that, because', *bunar ki* 'in order to', *anyn üčiuń ki* 'because of'. The word for 'yes' is *é* or *éhieš*, for 'no' *jo*. The particle *é* is a vocative particle used in prayers: *é Tieńri* 'oh God'.

The verbal paradigm is somewhat less complex compared to big Turkic languages (Csató 2000b). The typical Turkic category of the indirective (Turkish *-mlş*) is missing.

The present tense is formed by the suffix *-A/j*, i.e. *-A* after consonant stems and *-j* after vowel stems. Thus, the verb *al-* 'take' has the following present tense forms: *al-a-m* 'I take', *al-a-s* 'you take', *al-a-t* '(s)he/it takes', *al-a-byz* 'we take', *al-a-syz* 'you (pl.) take', *al-a-dlar* 'they take'. The *-t* in the third person singular and the *-d* in the third person plural are contracted forms of *-DIR* that have become obligatory markers of the third person. The present tense forms of *sana-* 'to count' are: *sane-j-m* 'I count', *sane-j-s* 'you count', *sane-j-t* '(s)he/it counts', *sane-j-byz* 'we count', *sane-j-syz* 'you (pl.) count', *sane-j-dlar* 'they count'. Observe the morphophonological change of the stem vowel [a] > [ε] preceding [j]. This change does not affect the backness of the syllable. The negated forms are: *al-my-m* 'I do not take', *al-my-s* 'you do not take', *al-my-t* '(s)he/it does not take', *al-my-byz* 'we do not take', *al-my-syz* 'you (pl.) do not take', *al-my-dlar* 'they do not take'.

The aorist functions as a future tense. The aorist suffix is *-r* after vowels and a high vowel after polysyllabic stems and certain monosyllabic stems in first and second persons. In the third persons the original *r* is maintained. In regular monosyllabic stems, the suffix is *-ar* or *-iar*. The aorist forms of *at-* 'to cast' are: *at-ar-m* 'I shall cast', *at-ar-s* 'you will cast', *at-ar* '(s)he/it will cast', *at-ar-byz* 'we shall cast', *at-ar-syz* 'you (pl.) will cast', *at-ar-lar* 'they will cast'. The monosyllabic verb *al-* 'to take' takes high vowel suffix, thus the aorist forms are: *al-y-m* 'I shall take', *al-y-s* 'you will take', *al-yr* '(s)he/it will take', *al-y-byz* 'we shall take', *al-y-syz* 'you (pl.) will take', *al-yr-lar* 'they will take'. The negated forms are: *al-ma-m* 'I shall not take', *al-ma-s* 'you will not take', *al-mas-t* '(s)he/it will not take', *al-ma-byz* 'we shall not take', *al-ma-syz* 'you (pl.) will not take', *al-mas-tlar* 'they will not take'.

The past tense in *-DI* in Karaim does not exhibit any specific features. The high vowel in the suffix has four variants and the consonant is in back stems [d] or [t] and in front stems [dʲ] or [tʲ]; see the past tense forms of *al-* 'to take': *al-dy-m* 'I took', *al-dy-j* 'you took', *al-dy* '(s)he/it took', *al-dy-ch* 'we took', *al-dy-jyz* 'you (pl.) took', *al-dy-lar* 'they took' and compare them to those of the front stem *kiel'-* 'to come': *kiel'-di-m* 'I came', *kiel'-di-j* 'you came', *kiel'-di* '(s)he/it came', *kiel'-di-k* 'we came', *kiel'-di-již* *kiel'-di-liar* 'they came'. The meaning can also be rendered as a perfect, e.g. *aldym* 'I have taken'.

An intraterminal past tense is built with the aorist and the past tense of the copula. For instance, *al-yr é-di-m* 'I was taking', *al-yr é-di-j* 'you were taking', *al-yr é-di* '(s)he/it was taking', *al-yr é-di-k* 'we were taking', *al-yr é-di-již* 'you (pl.) were taking', *al-yr éd'liar* 'they were taking', or in the

negative forms *al-mas é-di-m* 'I was not taking', etc. The forms can get a habitual reading, e.g. *al-yr é-di-m* 'I used to take', 'it was characteristic of me at that time to take'.

The modal forms include the imperative, voluntative, potential, optative and hypothetical (Csató (2012a, 2012b)). The imperative of the second person singular is either the naked stem or a form in *-GIN*, e.g. *al-hyn!* 'take!', *kiel'-giń!* 'come!', *ochu-hun!* 'read!', *at-chyn!* 'cast!'. This more elaborated form is used in prayers and biblical texts, e.g. *Kiuńdiagi öt'miag-imiż-ni biergin biźgia* [daily bread-POSSESSIVE1PL-ACCUSATIVE give-IMPERATIVE2SG we-DATIVE] 'Give us our daily bread'. In the second person plural, the ending is *-(l)jIZ*; *al-yjyz!* 'take!', *kiel-ijiz!* 'come!', *ochujuz!* 'read!'.

The voluntative paradigm includes first and third person forms. See the following voluntative forms of the verb *al-* 'take': *al-ajym* 'let me take', *al-ajych* 'let us take', *al-syn* 'let her/him take', *al-synlar* 'let them take'.

The optative is formed with the suffix *-Gej*, e.g. *bar-hej-m* 'may I go', *bar-hej-s* 'may you go', *bar-hej* often *bar-hej-t* 'may (s)he go', *bar-hej-byz* 'may we go', *bar-hej-syz* 'may you (pl.) go', *bar-hej-lar* often *bar-hej-dlar* 'may they go'. The past tense forms are considered to be more polite, e.g. *kliagiej-di-m* 'I would like to'.

Potential forms can be built synthetically with the old postverb *-(y)al-* or analytically with the combination of the potential form of the copula *bol-* and the infinitive in *-MA* of the lexical verb, e.g. *Bolalam sioźliamia karajče* 'I can speak Karaim'. The synthetic forms of the potential in the present of the verb *al-* 'to take' are: *bar-al-a-m* 'I can go', *bar-al-a-s* 'you can go', *bar-al-a-t* '(s)he/it can go', *bar-al-a-byz* 'we can go', *bar-al-a-syz* 'you (pl.) can go', *bar-al-a-dlar* 'they can go'. The negated forms are: *bar-al-my-m* 'I cannot go', etc.

A hypothetical (conditional) in *-SA* is inflected in the regular way, e.g. *ajt-sa-m* 'when I say', *ajt-se-j* 'when you say', *ajt-sa* 'when (s)he says', *ajt-sa-ch* 'when we say', *ajt-sa-jyz* 'when you (pl.) say', *ajt-sa-lar* 'when they say'.

The present participle is formed with *-A/jdoyon* e.g. *kiel-iadohon* 'coming', *sioźlie-jdohon* 'telling', and the past participle with *-GAN*, e.g. *oburlahan* 'enchanted', *bier-giań* 'given', *él't-kiań* 'brought'. The past participle forms a pluperfect together with the appropriate form of the past copula *édi* 'was', e.g. *Kačan maja jomachla-dy bu jomach-lar-ny mień alar-ny tuj-han joch é-di-m* [when I.DATIVE tell-DI.PAST3SG this tale-PLURAL-ACCUSATIVE I they-ACCUSATIVE hear-PAST.PARTICIPLE not-existing COPULA-DI.PAST-1SG] 'When he told me these stories, I had not yet heard them'.

A resultative is expressed by an analytic construction which is diathetically neutral, e.g. *bar-t yaz-han* [existing-COPULA.3SG write-POSTTERMINAL.PARTICIPLE] 'is written', *ol öl'giań* '(s)he is dead. A special expression is illustrated by the following example: *bar-t tuj-han-ym* [existing-COPULA.3SG hear-PAST.PARTICIPLE-POSSESSIVE1SG] 'I have heard it'. The past participle can also express indirective nuances, e.g. *Ol tuj-ma-han* [(s)he hear-NEGATION-PAST.PARTICIPLE] '(S)he has apparently not heard it'.

The most frequently used converbs are *-(j)lp(tA)*, e.g. *kior-iup(tia)* 'seeing', *ajt-yp* 'saying', *-A/y*, e.g. *tanych étia* 'witnessing', *sahyndyra* 'reminding', and *-GANdA*. e.g. *kiel'giańdia vachty* 'when its time comes'. The present participle can be employed in adverbial function, e.g. *kiel-iadohon*

Trochka ‘when coming to Trakai’. The converb form is built by adding -č to the present participle: *ajt-adohonč* ‘saying’.

In Karaim the number of postverbs is reduced. A lexicalized form of the frequentative formed with a postverb is, e.g., *kiet’-kialia-* ‘to travel / drive around’ vs. *kiet’-* ‘to travel, drive’, *bahyn-hale-j-dlar* ‘they look again and again’ vs. *bahyna-a-dlar* ‘they look’. See also the potential forms.

Turkic languages are typically relatively rigid SOV languages. Karaim, on the other hand, observes a typically right-branching syntax. The basic word order is SVO with relatively free word order, e.g. *Ullu hazzan jazar édi jomachlar ulanlar üçiuń* [great hazzan write-AORIST COPULA-DI.PAST3SG story-PLURAL child-PLURAL FOR.POSTPOSITION] ‘The great hazzan was writing stories for the children’. In some recent publications, verb final sentences are preferred for normative reasons. This is, however, a purely normative effort to Turkify the word order and does not reflect the linguistic facts. SVO word order characterizes all early written texts.

Genitive constructions follow both the NGEN + N(POSSESSIVE) and the reverse N(POSSESSIVE) + NGEN patterns, e.g. *Tieńri-niń ad-y* [God-GENITIVE name-POSSESSIVE3SG] or *ad-y Tieńri-niń* (Csató 2011). The possessive suffix may be missing, e.g. *biż-niń bijlik* [we-GENITIVE country] or *bijlik biż-niń* or *biż-niń bijlig-imiż* [we-GENITIVE country-POSSESSIVE1PL] or *bijlig-imiż biż-niń*. The genitive attribute may be preceded by another attribute of the head noun, e.g. *ullu biż-niń bijlig-imiż* [great we-GENITIVE country-POSSESSIVE1PL] ‘our great country’.

Turkic embedded clauses differ syntactically and morphologically from main clauses. They are based on infinite verb forms, and units of the infinite verbal morphology function as junctors. Karaim embedded clauses are similar to the European type. They are rightbranching structures introduced by a free junctor and based on finite verb forms. See the following examples. A nominal action clause: *Klia-j-m sa-ja ajt-ma ki juvdia biż siožle-j-biż karajče* [want-PRESENT-1SG you.DATIVE say-INITIATIVE that we speak-PRESENT-1PL Karaim at home] ‘I want to tell you that we speak Karaim at home’. A relative clause: *Bar-t kolega kajsy-nyn tierk altmyš jyl-y bol-ur* [existing-COPULA3SG friend which-GENITIVE soon sixty year-POSSESSIVE3SG become-AORIST3SG] ‘I have a friend who will soon be sixty’. An adverbial clause: *niečik bir ulan tuv-a-t* [when a child is.born-PRESENT3SG] ‘when a child is born’.

Predications indicating possession are formed in Karaim as in other Turkic languages, e.g. *bar-t achča-m* [existing-COPULA3SG money-POSSESSIVE1SG] ‘I have money’. An alternative, and equally frequent construction with the same meaning is, e.g. *mieńdia bar-t achča* [I-LOCATIVE existing-COPULA3SG money].

6e. Lexicology and Sociolinguistical Aspect

The names of the days are: *jechkiuń* ‘Sunday’, *jechbaškiuń* ‘Monday’, *ortakiuń* ‘Tuesday’, *chankiuń* ‘Wednesday’, *kičibaraski* ‘Thursday’, *baraski* ‘Friday’, *šabbatkiuń* ‘Saturday’. The Karaims apply a moon calendar. The names of the month are: *artcharych-aj* ‘March-April’, *kural-aj* ‘April-May’, *baškuschan-aj* ‘May-June’, *jaz-aj* ‘June-July’, *ulah-aj* ‘July-August’, *čirik-aj* ‘August-September’, *ajrychsy-aj* ‘September-October’, *kiuž-aj* ‘October-November’, *sohum-aj* ‘November-December’, *kyš-aj* ‘December-January’, *karakyš-aj* ‘January-February’, *siuviuńč-aj* ‘February-March’ and *artych-aj* ‘March-April (only in leap years)’.

Thus, the most frequently used basic vocabulary is of Turkic origin. In addition, a high number of Slavic-Baltic words have been copied and adjusted to the Karaim phonological and grammatical frame. Verbs are copied employing the usual Turkic strategy to use the Karaim light verb adding a nominal form of the copied verb, e.g. *zvont' ét'* - 'to call'.

6f. Text sample

S. A. Firkovič: *Oburlahan sanduk* 'The enchanted chest'

Trochta, Gal'vie gioliuńdia jarym miń jyldan artych, jatat battyrhan tiemir sanduk.	In Trakai, in the Lake Galve, more than half a thousand year, lies an iron chest, which was sunk here.
Üriujt' chabar ki bu sandukta tabulat bahaly taşlar, altyn, kiumiuş, bahyr, kiop achča, üziukliar, syrhalär da öngia.	The rumour circulates that in this chest there are precious stones, gold, silver, copper, a lot of money, rings, earrings and other things.
Bundahy dunja ajtadlar ki jarych ajly kiečialiardia tiemir sanduk kiotiuriuliat' suv üštiunia diejiń da tan saruvdan burun éniat' jane tiupkia.	People here say that during nights with moonlight the chest rises up to the surface of the water and before dawn it sinks again to the bottom.
Az tiuviul' balychčylar, iščiliar da öngia jarlylar da kliavčiliar chodžalanma kyjnaladyrlar bu sanduhuba.	Many fishermen, workers and other poor people and those who want to get rich were tormented by this chest.
Kiel'giańdia vachty éńmia tiupkia, sanduk öz avurluchba üziar édi bar avlarny, örkiańliarni syndryr édi tiušliu karmachlarny da akryn tiobriadihon éniar édi ornuna.	When it was time for the chest to sink to the bottom, with its weight it destroyed all nets and tore the ropes, all sorts of crooks and with an easy sway it sank to its place.
Sansyz kabarčychlar kaplar édiiliar giol' juziur, biuriuškiań suv kiotiuriur édi tolhunlarny, tanyh étia ki sanduk tieriań kazyndy imšach jergia.	Numerous bubbles covered the surface of the lake, waves rose on the swaying water witnessing that the chest got buried deep into the soft soil.
Iščiliar kiučsiuž kalyp kyjynly kiečiadiań son, jomachlar éd'liar ki bu sanduk bajlahan tiemir syndžyrlarba ullu taşlarha suv tiubiuńdia ki ol mohorlahan éski Lietuva bijlik mohorlaryba da kiuń kieč saklejdlar any kiorkliučialiar giol' kyzlary da ki ol oburlahan énk bijikriak kara tonlularba.	The workers, who were weak after the painful night, told that the chest was tied with iron chains to large stones at the bottom of the water and that it was stamped with the stamps of the old Lithuanian kingdom and beautiful mermaids took care of it and that it was enchanted by giant black monks.
Niečik anda bart, alej bart, ančech biugiurńliej bu jomach Trochta tiriliat', avuzdan avuzha kiočup ašat sahyndyra ašchanlychny.	How it is so it is. However, this tale is alive in Trakai. It goes from mouth to mouth reminding of the past.
Birliari kiul'miasejd'liar bu jomachtan.	Some people would not laugh this tale off.
Öngialiari čomadohon kajikliardia korchuna bahynhalejdlar suvha kyryjlary katyna bolhan bij kiermiańliarniń da tioziad'liar ki oburlahan sanduk bir kiorkliu ajly kiečadia kiotiuriulur da ačylyp, kajtaryr kajsyna-de alardan biutiur bahaly da suklančy chaznasyn bijniń.	Others sitting in boats look frightened into the water and to the shores of the castle of the late king and expect that one night when the moon is beautiful, the chest comes to the surface, opens and returns to someone all the precious and desirable treasures of the king.

7. Sources

- Baskakov, Nikolaj A., Seraja M. Szapszał & Ananiasz Zajączkowski (1974). *Karaimsko-russko-pol'skij slovar'*. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
- Csató, Éva Á. (1998). "Should Karaim be 'purer' than other European languages?". *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 5. 81–89.
- Csató, Éva Á. (1999). "Analyzing contact-induced phenomena in Karaim". In: Chang, Steve S. & Liaw, Lily & Ruppenhofer, Josef (eds.) *Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society, Special Session: Caucasian, Dravidian, and Turkic linguistics*. Berkeley Linguistic Society 25 S. 54–62.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2000a). "Syntactic code-copying in Karaim". In: Dahl, Östen & Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (eds.) *The Circum-Baltic languages: Their typology and contacts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 265–277.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2000b). "Some typological features of the viewpoint aspect and tense system in spoken North-Western Karaim". In: Dahl, Östen (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 671–699.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2002a). "Karaim: A high-copying language". In: Jones, Mari C. & Esch, Edith (eds.) *Language change. The interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors*. (Contributions to the sociology of language 86.) New York & Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 315–327.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2002b). "The Karaim community in Lithuania". In: Maciejewski, Witold (ed.) *The Baltic Sea region. Cultures, politics, societies*. Uppsala: Baltic University Press. 272–275.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2002c). "Karaim". In: Stolz, Thomas (ed.) *Minor languages of Europe*. (Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung 30.) Bochum: Brockmeyer. 1–24.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2006). "The Karaims: The smallest group of Turkic-speaking people". In: Çagatay, Ergun (ed.) *The Turkic speaking world. 2000 years of art and culture from Inner Asia to the Balkans*. Munich: Prestel Verlag. 384–403.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2008). "Karaim studies at Uppsala". *Orientalia Suecana* 17. 165–172.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2010). "2010. Report on an Uppsala workshop on Karaim studies". *Turkic Languages* 14. 261–282.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2011). "A typological coincidence: Word order properties in Trakai Karaim biblical translations". In: Rona, Bengisu & Erguvanli-Taylan, Eser (eds.) *Puzzles of language. Essays in honour of Karl Zimmer*. (Turcologica 86.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 169–186.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2012a). "On the sustainability of inflectional morphology". In: Johanson, Lars & Robbeets, Martine (eds.) *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*. (Brill's Studies in Language, Cognition and Culture). Leiden & Boston & Tokyo: Brill.
- Csató, Éva Á. (2012b). "Modal categories in Karaim: A case of complex contact morphology". In: Otsuka, Hitomi & Stroh, Cornelia & Urdze, Aina (eds.). *More morphologies. Contributions to the Festival of Languages, Bremen 17 Sep 7 Oct, 2009*. (Diversitas Linguarum 35.) Bochum: Brockmeyer. 121–131.
- Csató, Éva Á. (in print, a). "Spracherhalt und Kontinuität in den karaimischen Gemeinden". In: Erdal, Marcel (ed.) *Akten der 6. Deutschen Turkologenkonferenz mit dem Rahmenthema "Kontinuität und Erneuerung in der Turcia" an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität. Frankfurt am Main, 23.–26. Juli 2005*.

- Csató, Éva Á. (in print, b). 189. *Karaim*. In: Müller, Peter O. & Ohnheiser, Ingeborg & Olsen, Susan & Rainer, Franz (eds.) *Word formation. International handbook of the languages of Europe*. (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science, HSK). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Csató, Éva Á. & Johanson, Lars (1996). "Zur Silbenharmonie des Nordwest-Karaimischen". *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 48, 329–337.
- Csató, Éva Á. & Johanson, Lars (2009). "Kuzeybatı Karaycasında Hece Uyumu Üzerine". In: Yılmaz, Emine & Eker, Süer & Demir, Nurettin (eds.) *Articles on Turcology. Festschrift to commemorate the 80th anniversary of Prof. Dr. Talat Tekin's birth. International Journal of Central Asian Studies* 13. Seoul. 137–148.
- Csató, Éva Á. & Nathan, David (2002). *Spoken Karaim. Multimedia CD-ROM*. Tokyo University of the Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Csató, Éva Á. & Nathan, David (2003). "Multimedia and the documentation of endangered languages". In: Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language documentation and description 1*. London: Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project. 73–84.
- Csató, Éva Á. & Nathan, David (2007). "Multiliteracy, past and present, in the Karaim communities". In: Austin, Peter K. (ed.) *Language documentation and description 4*. London: Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project. 207–230.
- Dubiński, Aleksander (1994). *Caraimica. Prace Karaimoznawcze*. Warszawa: Dialog.
- Firkavičiūtė, Karina (2001). *Liturgical music of Lithuanian Karaims*. PhD thesis. Vilnius: Lithuanian Academy of Music.
- Firkavičiūtė, Karina (2003). "The musical heritage of Lithuania's Karaims". In: Polliack, Meira (ed.) *Karaite Judaism. A guide to its history and literary sources*. Leiden & Boston: Brill. 855–871.
- Firkovičius, Mykolas (ed.) (1989). *Karaj jyrlary*. Vilnius.
- Firkovičius, Mykolas (ed.) (1993). *Karaj koltchalary*. Vilnius.
- Firkovičius, Mykolas (ed.) (1994). *David' bijniñ machtav čozmaxlary*. Vilnius.
- Firkovičius, Mykolas (1996). *Mieñ karajče ürianiam*. Vilnius.
- Firkovičius, Mykolas (ed.) (1998-1999). *Karaj diñliliarniñ jalbarmach jergialliari 1-2*. Vilnius: Karaim Religious Community in Lithuania.
- Firkovičius, Mykolas (ed.) (2000). *Šelomonun mašallary*. [= Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 771] Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Harviainen, Tapani (1997). "Signs of new life in Karaim communities". In: Sabour, M'hammed & Vikør, Knut (eds.) *Ethnic encounter and culture change. Papers from the Third Nordic Middle East Conference on Middle Eastern Studies, Joensuu, 1995*. [Nordic Research on the Middle East 3.] Bergen: Nordic Society for Middle Eastern Studies. 72–83. <<http://www.hffak.uib.no/Institutter/smi/pajlHarviainenD.html>>
- Harviainen, Tapani (2003a). "The Karaites in Eastern Europe and the Crimea: An overview". In: Polliack, Meira (ed.) *Karaite Judaism. A guide to its history and literary sources*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies. Handbuch der Orientalistik. The Near and Middle East. 73.) Leiden & Boston: Brill. 633–655.
- Harviainen, Tapani (2003b). "The Karaites in contemporary Lithuania and the former USSR". In: Polliack, Meira (ed.) *Karaite Judaism. A guide to its history and literary sources*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies. Handbuch der Orientalistik. The Near and Middle East. 73.) Leiden & Boston: Brill. 827–854.

- Harviainen, Tapani (2003b). "Abraham Firkovich". In: Polliack, Meira (ed.) *Karaite Judaism. A guide to its history and literary sources*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies. Handbuch der Orientalistik. The Near and Middle East. 73.) Leiden & Boston: Brill. 875–892.
- Harviainen, Tapani (2007). "Marriage contracts and items of dowry among the Karaims in Eastern Europe". *Studia Orientalia* 101, 61–83.
- Johanson, Lars (2002). *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts*. [With an introduction by Bernard Comrie.] London: Curzon.
- Johanson, Lars & Éva Ágnes Csató (eds.) (1998). *The Turkic languages*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Kobeckaitė, Halina (1994). "Lithuanian Orient: its roots and researches". In: *Kipčiaku Tiurku Orientas Lietuvoje*. Vilnius: Danielus. 24–28.
- Kowalski, Tadeusz (1929). *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki*. Krakow: Polish Academy of Sciences.
- Kowalski, Tadeusz (1996). *Karayım lehçesi sözlüğü*. Translated and edited by Kemal Aytaç. Ankara: Engin.
- Musaev, Kenesbaj M. (1964). *Grammatika karaimskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Musaev, Kenesbaj M. (2004). *Sintaksis karaimskogo jazyka*. Moskva: RAN.
- Polliack, Meira (ed.) (2003). *Karaite Judaism. A guide to its history and literary sources*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Pritsak, Omeljan (1959). "Das Karaimische". In: Deny, Jean et al (eds) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta 1*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. 318–340.
- Zajączkowski, Ananiasz (1932). "Les suffixes nominaux et verbaux dans la langue des karaïms occidentaux". Krakow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Zajączkowski, Ananiasz (1961). *Karaims in Poland: History, language, folklore, science*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe. La Hague & Paris: Mouton & Co.
- Zajączkowski, Ananiasz (1964). "Die karaimische Literatur". In: Baxin, Louis (ed.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta 2*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. 793–801.
- Zajączkowski, Włodzimierz (1990). "The Karaites in Eastern Europe". In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. 1990. Leiden: Brill. 608–609.