

Kamil Stachowski (Kraków)

On First Syllable Reduplications in Karaim

0. Introductory notes 1. Reduplication with a closing consonant 2. Special cases

0. Introductory notes

Among the many types of reduplication in the Tkc. languages, at least four are essentially a reduplication of the first syllable. One of them, the reduplication of the first syllable with an appended closing consonant,¹ vastly outnumbers the others. It also appears to be the type usually meant when using the term first syllable reduplication in everyday speech. (Cf. 2.1.) In general, the phenomenon is poorly investigated. In particular, there does not seem to be any works devoted to its manifestation in Kar.

I decided to split the material presented here into two groups: **1. REDUPLICATION WITH A CLOSING CONSONANT (1.1. MATERIAL, and 1.2. THE CLOSING CONSONANT ISSUE)**, and **2. other reduplications of the first syllable, i.e. taking into account the number of examples, SPECIAL CASES (2.1. ACTUAL FIRST SYLLABLE REDUPLICATION; 2.2. REDUPLICATION WITH AN INSERTED VOWEL; 2.3. REDUPLICATION WITH -MA- / -TA-, and 2.4. APPARENT REDUPLICATIONS)**.

Notes on the presentation of the material:

- When reading the literature on Kar., one finds it difficult to escape the impression that introducing a new transcription every now and then

¹ Or to put it more precisely, reduplication of the initial (consonant and) vowel, to which an extra closing consonant is appended. This applies to all the uses in this paper of the term *syllable* in this context.

seems to be considered good practice in the milieu of researchers in Kar. I have chosen to follow this tradition. I will use a mostly phonological notation which treats each dialect separately. The decision not to use the original transcriptions will allow me to avoid unnecessary repetitions (such as e.g. *бэдава* → *бэс-бэдава* (KRPS), *бэдава* → *бэс-бэдава* (RKS-X), *бэдава* → *бэс-бэдава* (RKS-L)), and enable a sensible alphabetical ordering of the entries. Forms from languages other than Kar. are kept in the original orthography.

- Because the semantics of reduplication is clear, I do not quote the meanings where they are either a simple intensification of the base word, or they have been left unchanged (such as e.g. *ak* ‘white’ → *apak* ‘snow-white’ (Zajączkowski 1931), ‘white’ (KSB, KRPS)).
- For reasons of brevity, I do not quote the base word in all the attestations for all the dialects, and I reduce the meanings to an approximate Engl. translation (unless they are non-standard, see above).
- Where dialect specification was missing, I made a decision on the basis of the place of the attestation or the phonetics.
- Entries are ordered alphabetically, and chronologically with regard to the places of attestation.

1. Reduplication with a closing consonant

1.1. Material

ačyk ‘open’ ♦ E₁ ***apačyk*** (KRPS, RKS-X s.v. *открытый настёж* and *распахнуть*, RKS-L); ***ačmak***² ‘to break open, to throw open’ (RKS-X) ♦ E₂ ***appačyk***³ (KRPS, RKS-L)
ak⁴ ‘white’ ♦ E₁ ***apak*** (KRPS, RKS-L) ♦ E₂ ***appak***³ (RKS-X s.v. *белоснежный*) ♦ NW ***apax*** (Józefowicz 2008 s.v. *bialuteńki* and *bieluteńki*) ♦ SW₁ ***apak*** (Zajączkowski 1931, KSB, Musaev 1964: 183, KRPS) ♦ SW₂ ***appak***³ (KRPS)

² The only example of a reduplicated verb. However, because there is only one example of such a phenomenon, it seems more probable that it had been secondarily derived from the adjective per analogy to the *ačmak* : *ačyk* pair, than that it had been reduplicated as a verb. Cf. also a parallel example from AKipch. *čop čovralan-* ‘otaczać dokoła | entourer tout autour’ (DAK).

³ [Ad: Kar.E *appačyk*, Kar.E and SW *appak*] The only two examples with a doubled closing consonant and no inserted vowel. It is possible that a vowel had originally been present there (**appa.ačyk* and **appa.ak*) and only *-aa-* merged into *-a-*; cf. 2.2. Whether these forms were created before the Kar. split, or whether the Kar.SW *appak* is a borrowing from Kar.E, is impossible to determine at present.

⁴ Cf. *ak* in 2.2.

al ‘red’ ♦ E *apal* (KRPS, RKS-L)

ansyz(yn|dan) ‘sudden(ly), unawares’ ♦ E₁ *afaṅsyz*⁵ (KRPS) ♦ E₂ *apan-syz* (KRPS s.v. *ансыз* and *ан(-)ансыз*, RKS-X, RKS-L); *apan-syzdan*⁶ (KRPS, RKS-X s.v. *от внезапности*, RKS-L); *apansyzyn* (RKS-L)

aryk ‘thin, lean’ ♦ E *aparyk* (KRPS, RKS-L) ♦ NW *aparyx* (Józefowicz 2008)

baška ‘other’ ♦ E *bambaška* (KRPS, RKS-L)

bedava ‘free of charge’ ♦ E *besbedava* (KRPS, RKS-X s.v. *совершенно даром*, RKS-L)

belli ‘clear, obvious’ ♦ E *besbelli* ‘probably’ (KRPS, RKS-L)

beter ‘worse’ ♦ E *besbeter* (KRPS, RKS-L)

bijaz ‘white’ ♦ E *bimbijaz* (KRPS, RKS-X s.v. *белоснежный*, RKS-L)

boš ‘empty’ ♦ E *bomboš* (KRPS, Prik 1976, Musaev 1977: 7, RKS-X s.v. *совершенно пустой*) ♦ NW₁ *bomboš* (KRPS, Józefowicz 2008) ♦ NW₂ *bopboš*⁷ (Musaev 1964: 183; Musaev 1977: 7) ♦ SW *bopbos*⁷ (Musaev 1977: 7)

bošyna ‘in vain’ ♦ E *bombošyna*⁸ (RKS-X, RKS-L)

⁵ The base **ansyz* is not attested. If *f* is original here, this is the only example with *f* as a closing consonant. It seems more probable then that it is just a spirantized version of *p*. This, and the archaic *ŋ* indicate the old age of this form.

A borrowing is not likely since a reduplicated form with *f* does not seem to exist in AKipch., CTat., Ott. or Urum. However, a contamination with Urum *аңсыз* ‘неподівано, раптово’ (UrumS) is not impossible. There does not seem to be any reason to assume a borrowing of either the base word or its reduplication with *p*, even though such forms exist in the neighbouring languages.

⁶ The base **ansyzdan* is not attested.

⁷ [Ad: Kar.SW *bopbos* and NW *bopboš*] These two forms are surprising. In Tksh., where reduplications have been investigated far more thoroughly than in any other Tkch. language, it is not allowed that the difference between the closing consonant of the reduplicated syllable and the initial consonant of the base word, be voice alone. Had it not been for these two forms, the situation in Kar. would be the same.

The Kar.NW form is attested twice; the Kar.SW form is only attested once. All attestations are by the same author. In both cases, the context leaves no room for doubt as to the eventuality of a misprint.

Parallel forms do not seem to exist in AKipch., CTat., Ott. and Urum. Moreover, should these forms be true, they would be the only ones in Kar., where the closing consonant varies between dialects.

It seems that an immediate solution of this riddle can only be provided by some linguistic conspiracy theory. As to a more conventional answer, it is not yet clear to me whether some revision of alleged rules for the closing consonant is necessary, or rather an errata. Cf. *bombošyna* in 1.1. and *bošbošu|yna* in 2.1.

⁸ Cf. *bošbošuna* in 2.1.

bütün ‘whole’ ♦ E *büsbütün* (KRPS, RKS-L)
čebik ‘quick(ly)’ ♦ E₁ *čarčebik*⁹ (KRPS, RKS-L) ♦ E₂ *čerčebik* (KRPS, RKS-X, RKS-L) ♦ E₃ *čyrčebik*¹⁰ (RKS-X)
*čevre*¹¹ ‘around’ ♦ E₁ *čepčevre* (KRPS) ♦ E₂ *čöpčövre*¹² (KRPS, RKS-L); *čöpčüvre* (KRPS, RKS-L) ♦ E₃ *čüpčüvre* (KRPS, RKS-L) ♦ SW *čipčivre* (KSB: 71, KRPS)
*čevretin*¹³ ‘from around’ ♦ E₁ *čöpčevirtin*¹⁴ (KRPS, RKS-L); *čöpčövre*¹⁵ (KRPS, RKS-L) ♦ E₂ *čüpčüvretin*¹⁶ ‘from all around’ (KRPS, RKS-L); ‘around’ (RKS-L)
čyplak ‘naked’ ♦ E *čyrčyplak* (KRPS, Prik 1976, RKS-X s.v. *догола, нагишом* and *совершенно голый*, RKS-L)

⁹ Lack of vowel harmony in this form is surprising (cf. also footnote 33). I can see at least two possible explanations for this form: **1.** by a contamination with CTat. *čar-čabik* id. (AiM) or maybe Ott. *čar čabuk* (LiO) (a reduplicated form appears to be missing from AKipch. and Urum.), and **2.** by assuming that the reduplication had gone out of use and had become incomprehensible before a harmony shift took place in **čabyk* (VEWT proposes *čap-* ‘to hit’ as the etymon, but with a question mark; at any rate, back harmony is more likely to be original here because of the initial *č*). Unfortunately, I am unable to deploy any conclusive arguments.

¹⁰ This form is not clear. It seems most probable that it should be attributed to the Kar.E manner of pronouncing /e/ in the first syllable: higher and more in the back than in non-first syllables, and more than is usual in most Tk. languages (cf. Prik 1976: 25n. and Jankowski 1997: 7n.). Cf. *jymješly* and also footnotes 44 and 52 on *bokbaklavat* and **kiryšyk* respectively.

¹¹ In Kar.E, only *čevre* and *čüvre* are attested. *Čövre* is not, but it is attested in CC—where its reduplicated form is also noted, *čöp čövre*. Knowing this, and the Tk. languages’ general dislike of the *ö* in the first syllable, it should be safe to explain *čepčevre*, *čöpčövre* and *čüpčüvre* by assuming that in Kar. **čövre* > *čevre*, *čüvre* in both the non-reduplicated and reduplicated versions, and has remained fossilized only in the reduplicated form. What is left to be explained is the perhaps interesting form *čöpčüvre*, which might suggest that reduplication was already unproductive and incomprehensible when this change happened.

An external influence does not seem likely: AKipch. only has *čovra* (DAK, Schültz 1968), CTat., Ott. and Urum only have *čevre* (AiM, LiO, Meninski 2000, UrumS).

In Kar.SW, *čivre* (< **čüvre*) is attested, and does not seem to raise any doubts. Cf. also footnote 12.

¹² The base **čövre* is not attested but cf. footnote 11. The form *čöpčövre* (RKS-X s.v. *вокрыз*) is most probably a misprint for *-*ö*-.

¹³ On vowels, cf. footnote 11. The un-Kar. Abl. in *-tin* requires further investigation.

¹⁴ The base **čevirtin* is not attested, and neither **čevir* alone but cf. *čevirme* ‘окрыжение | оточение’ (KRPS).

¹⁵ The base **čövretin* is not attested but cf. footnote 13.

¹⁶ The base **čüvretin* is not attested but cf. footnote 13.

- **čyrt*¹⁷ ‘silence’ ♦ E *čymčyrt* ‘полная тишина, безмолвие | niezmacona, zupełna cisza, milczenie’ (KRPS); ‘полная тишина’ (RKS-X s.v. *полная тишина*); ‘безмолвие, полная тишина’ (RKS-L)
- incke* ‘thin’ ♦ NW₁ *ipinčke* (Musaev 1964: 183); *ipinčka* (KRPS, Musaev 1977: 36, Józefowicz 2008) ♦ SW *ipinčke* (KSB, KRPS)
- **jaban* ‘alien, foreign’ ♦ E *jat-jaban* (KRPS, RKS-X, RKS-L): probably an apparent reduplication; see 2.4.
- jalyŋyz* ‘lone’ ♦ E *jarjalyŋyz* (RKS-L)
- jaxšy* ‘good’ ♦ NW *jarjaxši*¹⁸ (Musaev 1977: 36); *jarjaxšy* (Musaev 1964: 183, Berta 1998, Józefowicz 2008 s.v. *dobry-przedobry*) ♦ SW *jar-jaksy* (Musaev 1977: 36)
- ješil* ‘green’ ♦ E₁ *jemješil* (Prik 1976); *jemješil* (RKS-L) ♦ E₂ *jymješly*¹⁹ (RKS-X s.v. *совершенно зеленый*) ♦ NW *jemješil* (Józefowicz 2008 s.v. *zieloniutki*) ♦ SW *jemješil* (Zajączkowski 1931)
- juvarlak* ‘round’ ♦ E *jusjuvarlak*²⁰ (RKS-L)
- juvuš* ‘wet’ ♦ NW *öpjuvuš*²¹ (Józefowicz 2008)
- kara* ‘black’ ♦ E *kapkara* (KRPS, Prik 1976, RKS-X s.v. *до черна, совершенно черный* and *черный-пречерный*, RKS-L) ♦ NW *kapkara* (KTDT s.v. *kara*, Józefowicz 2008 s.v. *czarniusieńki*) ♦ SW *kapkara* (Zajączkowski 1931)
- karavlyk* ‘darkness’ ♦ E *kapkaravlyk*²² ‘1. темным-темно, черным-черно | bardzo ciemno; 2. темнота, чернота | ciemność, czerń’ (KRPS); ‘1. темным-темно, черным-черно; 2. чернота’ (RKS-L)

¹⁷ One of two examples of a reduplicated noun (the other being *kapkaravlyk* but cf. footnote 22). The base word is not attested, which serves to add to its conspicuousness. Despite the meaning, perhaps an onomatopoeia?

¹⁸ Most probably a typo caused by Russ. orthography, pro **jaxšy*. Cf. <йахшы> on pp. 33, 35 &c.

¹⁹ Cf. footnote 10 on *čyrčebik*.

²⁰ Cf. *jumjumarlak* in 2.1.

²¹ This form is completely unclear. *Juvuš* is fairly common in the Tkc. languages (see Zajączkowski 1932: 60, VEWT s.v. *jibi*, and others), always with *-i-i-* or its reasonably understandable derivatives (see Zajączkowski 1932: 154 for more details on labialization in Kar. and elsewhere). **Öp*, on the other hand, is completely opaque to me. A reduplication is conceivable here as follows: **juř.juvuš* > **üř-* > *öp-*. Alternation of the initial *ü-* ~ *ju-* is a well-known phenomenon in Kar.NW. A shift from *ü-* to *ö-*, however, is at best extraordinary. The probability of a simple composition is not very high since **öp* does not seem to be attested as a separate word with a compatible meaning in Kar. or any of the neighbouring languages.

²² One of two examples of a reduplicated noun (the other being *čymčyrt* but cf. footnote 17). It needs to be noted that while the base word has only a nominal meaning, its reduplicated form has both, a nominal and an adjectival one—despite its seem-

- **kat*²³ ‘hard’ ♦ E *kaskat* ‘остолбнение’ (RKS-L)
*kenete*²⁴ ‘sudden(ly)’ ♦ E *kepkenete* (Sulimowicz 1973²⁵, KRPS, RKS-L, RKS-L) ♦ NW *kepkeñata* (KTDT, KRPS, Józefowicz 2008); *kepkeñeta* (KTDT, KRPS, KKS, Józefowicz 2008) ♦ SW *kepkenete* (Sulimowicz 1973)
 **koža*²⁶ ‘huge’ ♦ E *koskoža* ‘неимоверно’ (RKS-X); ‘неимоверный, огромный’ (RKS-L)
 **kos*²⁷ ‘stupid’ ♦ E *komkos* (RKS-X s.v. *совершенно глупый*)
kök ‘blue’ ♦ E *kömkök* (KRPS, RKS-X s.v. *темно-голубой*, RKS-L)
kuru ‘dry’ ♦ E *kupkuru* (RKS-X, RKS-L)
kuzyl ‘red’ ♦ NW *kypkuzyl* (Musaev 1964: 183, Józefowicz 2008 s.v. *czerwony-czerwoniutki*) ♦ SW *kypkuzyl* (Zajączkowski 1931, Musaev 1964: 183)

ingly clearly nominal suffix. However, as it is the only example of such a type, it is impossible to decide at present whether this difference in meaning results in any way from reduplication or rather, from the nature of the Tkc. languages as a whole.

²³ The base **kat* is not attested in a similar meaning in Kar. and neighbouring languages, and this form is not clear. Apart from the separate attestation in the meaning ‘остолбнение’, it appears in two idioms: ~ *kalmak* ‘опешить (досл. в остолбнении остаться)’ and ~ *külmek* ‘громко смеяться; хохотать’ (RKS-L). In Ott. and other Tkc. languages, *kat* has, among others, the meaning ‘(to be) hard’ and appears with these two verbs in similar meanings. A combination of these three features in one language, however, appears to be much more difficult, if even possible, to find.

The origin of this form and its usage in Kar.E might be explained in different ways. It could be that *kaskat* is a native Kar.E reduplication, and only its base had gone out of use, as it appears, without attestation. (I omit here the attestation in the meaning of ‘layer’ (KRPS, RKS-L).) But it might also be that it is a loanword in Kar.E. If this is the case, the meanings would suggest that it was borrowed as a part of the phrase ~ *kalmak*, from which *kaskat* was extracted. The source of the borrowing and the usage in ~ *külmek*, however, would remain unclear. A comprehensive examination for the etymology of *kaskat* goes beyond the scope of this paper.

²⁴ The base **kenete* is not attested but cf. *kenete* ‘plötzlich | gelich’ (CC).

²⁵ Transcribed as <kepkenátá> but cf. Jankowski 1994.

²⁶ The base **koža* is not attested. The reduplication might have also readily been native in Kar., even if the base word has not been preserved. It is, however, at least equally probable that it was borrowed in the reduplicated form from Ott. *koskoca* ‘huge’ (LiO and others). The word is also present in CTat. (only in a non-reduplicated form and in the meaning of ‘муж’) but seems to be missing from AKipch. and Urum. Cf. footnote 29 on **sijax* and 30 on *syrsyklam*.

²⁷ The base **kos* is not attested in a similar meaning in Kar. and neighbouring languages. The form and meaning of *komkos* resemble strongly a reduplication but are unclear.

- mavy* ‘blue’ ♦ E *masmavu* (KRPS s.v. *маву*, RKS-L); *masmavy* (Prik 1976, RKS-L)
- mor* ‘violet’ ♦ E *mosmor* (RKS-X s.v. *темно-лиловый*, RKS-L) ‘dark violet’
- saglam* ‘1. healthy; 2. whole’ ♦ E *sapsaglam*²⁸ (KRPS s.v. *сагълам*, RKS-X s.v. *совершенно здоровый*, RKS-L)
- sary* ‘yellow’ ♦ E *sapsary* (RKS-X s.v. *совершенно желтый* and *желтый-прежелтый*) ♦ NW *sapsary* (Musaev 1964: 183, KRPS) ♦ SW *sapsary* (Zajaczkowski 1931, Musaev 1964: 183)
- **sijax*²⁹ ‘black’ ♦ E *simsijak* ‘coal-black’ (KRPS, RKS-L); ‘совершенно синий’ (RKS-X s.v. *совершенно синий*); *simsijax* (KRPS, RKS-L)
- **syklam*³⁰ ‘wet’ ♦ E *syrsyklam* (KRPS); <сыр-сыклам>³¹ (RKS-L after KRPS)
- sylak* ‘wet’ ♦ E₁ *symsylak* (KRPS s.v. *көт*); <сым>-сылак³¹ (RKS-L after KRPS) ♦ E₂ *syplax*³² (RKS-X s.v. *насквозь промокший*) ♦ E₃ *syr-sylak* (KRPS s.v. *сылакѳ*); <сыр>-сылак³¹ (RKS-L after KRPS)

²⁸ Cf. 2.4. on *sav-saglam*.

²⁹ Probably borrowed in the reduplicated form from Ott. *simsiyah* id. (LiO s.v. *sim* and *siyah*, and others). The word appears to be missing from AKipch. It is present in CTat., only without the final consonant: *siya*. In Urum, the word itself is attested as *суйа*, *суйаһ* and *суйах* but in a reduplicated form only as *сим-суйа*. As the word originates from Pers. (Ott. *sijax*, CTat., Kzk. *sija* < Pers. *siyāh* (Stachowski 1977, 1998)), it is unlikely that it was inherited from an earlier stage of Kar., but only in its reduplicated form.

Cf. footnote 26 on *koskoѳa*.

The final *-k* can probably be attributed to a hypercorrection, as the word had originally had *-x*. Spirantization of final *-k* is a common phenomenon in Kar.NW and numerous Tksh. and Tkc. dialects, whence it is often regarded as non-literal and rustic. Cf. footnote 32 on **slax*.

³⁰ The base **syklam* is not attested. It is most probably borrowed in the reduplicated form from Ott. *sır sıklam* id. (LiO and others). In AKipch., CTat. and Urum, neither *sıqlam* and *sır-sıqlam* nor similar forms seem to exist. The origin of the word is not clear. It is not impossible then, that it is inherited in Kar. but has only survived in the reduplicated form. Cf. footnote 26 on *koskoѳa*.

³¹ [Ad: <сым>-сылак, <сыр>-сылак and <сыр-сыклам>] Angle brackets are used in RKS-L to mark *начало и конец перевода, правильность которого по первоисточнику вызывает сомнение*. Unfortunately, the reason for doubt is not specified.

³² The base **slax* is not attested. It is probably a slovenly (dialectal? rustic?) pronunciation of *sylak*. Cf. Kar.E *slak* ‘мокро’ (RKS-X) and footnote 29 on *simsijak*. The preservation of *syр-* probably means that such pronunciation came into being only after reduplication as the method became unproductive.

- tamam* ‘whole, wholly’ ♦ E₁ *tastamam* (KRPS s.v. *тамам*, RKS-L);
*testaman*³³ ‘как раз’ (RKS-X)
 **tek*³⁴ ‘stupid; sloven’ ♦ E *tentek* (KRPS, RKS-X s.v. *раздильдйй*, RKS-L
 s.v. *нерадивый*, *разгильдйй* and *рассеянный*) ♦ NW *teñtak* (KRPS,
 Józefowicz 2008) ♦ SW *tentek* (KSB, KRPS)
temiz ‘clean’ ♦ E₁ *teptemiz* (RKS-X) ♦ E₂ *tertemiz* (KRPS s.v. *тэр II*
 and *тэр-тэмиз*, RKS-X s.v. *совершенно чистый*)
tez ‘quick(ly)’ ♦ E *teptez* (KRPS s.v. *тэз*, RKS-L)
tok ‘full, satiated’ ♦ E₁ *tomtok* (RKS-L) ♦ E₂ *toptok* (KRPS, RKS-L)
tokal ‘blunt’ ♦ E *tostokal* (Kakuk 1991)
*tolu*³⁵ ‘full’ ♦ E *toptolu*³⁶ (RKS-X s.v. *битком набито* and *полным-полно*);
toptoly (KRPS, RKS-L) ♦ NW *toptolu* (KRPS, Musaev 1964: 183,
 Musaev 1977: 36, Józefowicz 2008 s.v. *peñniutki* and *przepeñniocy*)
 ♦ SW *toptolu* (Zajączkowski 1931, KSB, KRPS, Musaev 1964: 183,
 Musaev 1977: 36)
tomalak ‘round’ ♦ E *tostomalak* (KRPS, RKS-L)
tögerek ‘round’ ♦ E *tömtögerek* (KRPS, RKS-L)
*tüz*³⁷ ‘straight’ ♦ E₁ *tümtüz* (KRPS, Kakuk 1991 s.v. *tümqara* after KRPS,
 RKS-X s.v. *совершенно ровный*, RKS-L) ♦ E₂ *tüptüz* (RKS-L)
*tyk*³⁸ ‘vertical, upright’ ♦ E *tymytyk* (RKS-X)
uzun ‘long’ ♦ E *upuzun* (Prik 1976)

³³ This form is unclear. Another form with a destroyed vowel harmony is *čarčebik* (cf. footnote 9). In this case, however, a pair needed for contamination (**testemem* or *temem*) appears to be missing. **Taman* with *-n* does not seem to be attested except in this word, either. The form might have resulted from even two dissimilations: *-a-a-a-* > *-e-a-a-* and *-m-m* > *-m-n*. While the latter appears to be considerably more credible (for it does not assume a destruction of vowel harmony), I can offer no proof for either, or in fact, any other more plausible explanation.

³⁴ The base **tek* is not attested in Kar. and neighbouring languages. The form and meaning of *tentek* resemble strongly a reduplication (perhaps < **tem.tek*) but are unclear.

³⁵ Cf. *tolu* in 2.3.

³⁶ The base **tolu* is not attested but cf. Kar.SW and NW *tolu* id.

³⁷ It is possible that one more form belongs here: *tüztümüz* ‘straight’ (RKS-X). Its structure, however, is unclear.

³⁸ The spelling with <Ы> is probably only meant to mark a non-palatalized pronunciation of *t*, or a somewhat velar pronunciation of *i* (though not the actual /y/ yet). KRPS spells the word *мик*. AKipch., CTat., Ott. and Urum all only have the palatal variant, too.

Altogether, 104 forms are listed. The following ones deserve perhaps a particular attention:

- unclear (fourteen cases): *appačyk* and *appak* (footnote 3), *bopbos* and *bopboš* (7), *čöpčevirtin*, *čöpčövretin* and *čüpčüvretin* (13), *čymčyrt* (17), *kaskat* (23), *komkos* (27), *öp.juvuš* (21), *tentek* (34), *testaman* (33) and *tüztümüz* (37),
- base not attested (nine cases): *čöpčevirtin*, *čöpčövretin* and *čüpčüvretin* (13 and 14), *čöpčövre* (12), *kaskat* (23), *komkos* (27), *sypslax* (32), *tentek* (34) and *tüztümüz* (37),
- probably (also) reduplicated in a different way (seven cases): *bošyna* (cf. 2.1.), *jaban* (2.4.) *juvarlak* (2.1.), *saglam* (2.4.), *tolu* (2.3.) and probably *ačyk* and *ak* (2.2.),
- the reduplicated and initial base syllables not matching (four cases): *čöpčövre* (footnote 11), *čyrčebik* and *jymješly* (10), and *sypslax* (32),
- borrowed (all < Ott.; three cases): *simsijax* (29), *syrsyklam* (30) and perhaps *koskoža* (26),
- non-Kar. formation (three cases): *čöpčevirtin*, *čöpčövretin* and *čüpčüvretin* (13),
- closing consonant doubled (two cases): *appačyk* and *appak* (3),
- closing consonant only differing with voice from the initial consonant of the base (two cases): *bopbos* and *bopboš* (7),
- non-harmonic (two cases): *čarčebik* (9) and *testaman* (33),
- nouns (two cases): *čymčyrt* (17) and *kapkaravlyk* (22),
- closing consonant spirantized (one case): *afašsyz* (5),
- verb (one case): *apačmak* (2).

1.2. The closing consonant issue

Below is a summary of the closing consonants of the reduplicated syllable (unclear and borrowed forms, nouns and the verb are excluded).

base	E	SW	NW	base	E	SW	NW
<i>ačyk</i>	<i>p</i>	–	–	<i>bijaz</i>	<i>m</i>	–	–
<i>ak</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>boš</i>	<i>m</i>	–	<i>m</i>
<i>al</i>	<i>p</i>	–	–	<i>bošyna</i>	<i>m</i>	–	–
<i>ansyz(...)</i>	<i>p</i>	–	–	<i>bütün</i>	<i>s</i>	–	–
<i>aryk</i>	<i>p</i>	–	<i>p</i>	<i>čebik</i>	<i>r</i>	–	–
<i>baška</i>	<i>m</i>	–	–	<i>čevre</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	–
<i>bedava</i>	<i>s</i>	–	–	<i>čevretin</i>	<i>p</i>	–	–
<i>belli</i>	<i>s</i>	–	–	<i>čyplak</i>	<i>r</i>	–	–
<i>beter</i>	<i>s</i>	–	–	<i>incke</i>	–	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>

base	E	SW	NW	base	E	SW	NW
<i>jalyňyz</i>	<i>p</i>	–	–	<i>sary</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>jaxşy</i>	–	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>sylak</i>	<i>m, p, r</i>	–	–
<i>jeşil</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>tamam</i>	<i>s</i>	–	–
<i>juvarlak</i>	<i>s</i>	–	–	<i>temiz</i>	<i>p, r</i>	–	–
<i>kara</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>tez</i>	<i>p</i>	–	–
<i>karavlyk</i>	<i>p</i>	–	–	<i>tok</i>	<i>m, p</i>	–	–
<i>kenete</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>tokal</i>	<i>s</i>	–	–
<i>kök</i>	<i>m</i>	–	–	<i>tolu</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>kuru</i>	<i>p</i>	–	–	<i>tomalak</i>	<i>s</i>	–	–
<i>kyzyl</i>	–	<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>tögerek</i>	<i>m</i>	–	–
<i>mavy</i>	<i>s</i>	–	–	<i>tüz</i>	<i>m, p</i>	–	–
<i>mor</i>	<i>s</i>	–	–	<i>tyk</i>	<i>m</i>	–	–
<i>saglam</i>	<i>p</i>	–	–	<i>uzun</i>	<i>p</i>	–	–

To the best of my knowledge, there have been four, reasonably similar, attempts to describe the situation in Kar.: Zajączkowski 1931 (Kar.SW), Musaev 1964: 183 (Kar.NW and SW), Prik 1976 (Kar.E) and Musaev 1977: 36 (Kar.NW and SW). They all note that *p* is the most common closing consonant; some mention *jeşil* as an exception, and Prik 1976 is the only one to enumerate all the possibilities: *m*, *p*, *r* and *s*. None, however, goes so far as to produce a distribution rule.

This is not very surprising. I know of no other study devoted to reduplication in Karaim. In Tksh., the quality of the closing consonant has been subject to intensive study in recent years; see Müller 2004 for a comprehensive summary and commentary. But despite the considerable effort of those involved, this research did not yield anything close to a straight-forward and definite answer. There does not seem to be any sound historical explanation for reduplication in Kar., Tksh., or Tkc. in general, and neither is there any effectual correlation with the phonetic shape of the base word, its meaning or anything else.

It is my belief that the answer can only be obtained through a much broader study that encompasses diachronically the entire family. Despite their preliminary and supplementary character, I will discuss below some of the conclusions drawn from the Kar. material.

As early as 1931 Zajączkowski observed that *p* is the most common closing consonant: out of the 49 forms³⁹, it occurs in 24 (including seven beginning

³⁹ I only count forms with different closing consonants. Forms from different dialects are counted as one, since in all the cases where one word has a reduplication in more than one dialect, the closing consonant is always the same.

with a vowel, where it seems to be obligatory⁴⁰); it is followed by *m* that occurs in eleven forms, *s* in ten, and *r* occurs in four forms only. There are four words with more than one possible reduplication: *sylak*, *temiz*, *tok* and *tüz*. *P* can be the closing consonant in all of them, *m* in three, *r* in two and *s* in none. This is almost inversely proportional to the total number of appearances, except in the case of *p* and *s*, which are swapped with one another.

There is surely more than one way of interpreting the above data. Below I present those that I believe to be the most plausible:

- *P* is most widely used (in half of the examples); it seems to be exclusive to the words that begin with a vowel; it appears in all the undecided words (i.e. those which have more than one possible closing consonant), and in the apparently archaic *afarɣsyz* (cf. footnote 5).⁴¹ This points to the conclusion that *p* is the oldest of all the closing consonants.

However, none of these facts seems actually to exclude the possibility of *p* being, conversely, the youngest and the most expansive.

- On the other hand, *r* has a very limited usage and a half of its occurrences are in undecided forms. It seems reasonable to assume that it was introduced not very long before the mechanism of reduplication became unproductive.

But again, the opposite could also be suspected: *r* could be the oldest closing consonant and might have become unproductive sufficiently long ago that it was displaced from all but four of the forms that it had previously been present in.

- *M* and *s* are in the middle of the field. They appear eleven and ten times respectively, but *m* is just one of the possible options in a fourth of the forms while *s* is always the only one. This may suggest the following explanation: both *m* and *s* appeared as closing consonants at approximately the same time. *M*, however, became unproductive quite early on, and was displaced by *p* (*p* and *r* in one case: *sylak*), while *s* remained productive as long as, or nearly as long as reduplication itself.

Why it was *p*, and not *s* or *r*, that displaced *m* can possibly be explained by the fact that *p* appeared earlier than *s* and *r*, and became much more common (i.e. more frequent in everyday speech) by the time of the termination of *m*.

⁴⁰ Seven examples are, in my opinion, not enough to allow us to say with certainty that this rule derived from Tksh., is also valid in Kar.

⁴¹ Also, in two seemingly impossible and indeed unclear forms, *bopboš* and *bopbos* (cf. footnote 7) and the typologically unclear *appačyġk* and *appak* (cf. footnote 3).

To summarize, on a relative time scale the following scheme seems to be the most plausible: **1.** appearance of *p*; **2.** appearance of *m* and *s*; **3.** termination of *m*; **4.** appearance of *r*.

2. Special cases

2.1. Actual first syllable reduplication

It could be considered a little surprising that the actual first syllable reduplication is considered a special case here. In everyday speech, first syllable reduplication in reference to a Tk. language is usually understood as first syllable reduplication with an appended or modified closing consonant. This is the result of the ratio of the number of examples: in Kar., reduplication with a closing consonant outnumbers actual first syllable reduplication more than twelve times.

It is noteworthy that two of the four forms listed below can also be reduplicated with a modification of the closing consonant: *bošbošuna* : *bombošyna* and *jumjumarlak* : *jusjuvarlak*.

birlej ‘only, sole, single’ ♦ E *birbirlej*⁴² (KRPS, RKS-X, RKS-L) ♦ SW *birbirtej* (KRPS s.v. *бур-бурлэӱ* and *бурлэӱ*)

**boklavat*⁴³ ‘meanness, baseness, villainy’ ♦ E *bokbklavat*⁴⁴ (RKS-X); *bokboklavat* (KRPS)

*bošuna*⁴⁵ ‘in vain’ ♦ E *bošbošuna* (RKS-X); *bošbošyna* (KRPS, RKS-L) *jumarlak*⁴⁶ ‘round’ ♦ E *jumjumalak* (KRPS, RKS-L); *jumjumarlak* (KRPS, RKS-L)

2.2. Reduplication with an inserted vowel

This type of reduplication is built as follows: first syllable of the base word + a closing consonant (see below) + *a/e* + the base word.

It appears that in Kar. there are only two (or perhaps four? see below) examples of this type of reduplication. I decided however, to separate it into another group because there are more in Tksh. (*cep*.(e)-

⁴² The base **birlej* is not attested but cf. Kar.SW *birtej* id.

⁴³ The base **boklavat* is not attested. Its connection with *bok* ‘faeces’ (KRPS) seems to be apparent but the form itself is not clear.

⁴⁴ The base **baklavat* is not attested. Probably a reduction similar to that in *čyrčebik* and *jymješly* (cf. footnotes 10 and 19 respectively).

⁴⁵ Cf. *bombošyna* in 1.1.

⁴⁶ Cf. *jusjuvarlak* in 1.1.

çevre, düp.(e.)düz, gep.(e.)genç, sap.(a.)sağlam, tıp.a.tıp, yap.(a.)yalnız (Stachowski 2009: 119n), also *güpegündüz*), and therefore it can be expected that from the point of view of the entire family, it is not such an uncommon type.

In both Kar. examples, the closing consonant of the first syllable is doubled. In the whole material, there are in total four forms with such a doubling. This suggests that the remaining two, *appačyk* and *appak* (cf. footnote 3), might in fact originate from **appa.ačyk* and **appa.ak* with a repaired hiatus, and should therefore be counted among this group rather than in 1.1. The Tksh. examples above make it clear that doubling is not obligatory from the general Tkc. perspective. The two (four?) Kar. examples do not form a basis that is solid enough to draw final conclusions on the rules in Kar.

ak ‘white’ ♦ NW **appa.ax** (Józefowicz 2008 s.v. *bialuteńki* and *bieluteńki*)
kündüz(ün) ‘at daytime’ ♦ E **küppe.gündüz**⁴⁷ (Jankowski 2005); **küppe.kündüz(ün)** (KRPS, RKS-L s.v. *çpedv*)

2.3. Reduplication with *-ma-* / *-ta-*

This type or reduplication is constructed as follows: first syllable of the base word (see below) + *-ma-* / *-ta-* + the base word.

It might be interesting to observe that reduplication with *-ma-* / *-ta-* can, but does not have to be combined with a reduplication with a closing consonant: in five out of nine cases, the consonant was changed (*basta.barabar*, *darma.dagy-* and *topma.tolu*), and in the rest it was left unmodified. The case of *tolu* is especially interesting as it is the only one with both an attested combined and a non-combined form. It is perhaps not coincidental that *tolu* is one of just three words whose reduplications exist in all the dialects (always with *p* as the closing consonant; the other two are *kara* and *sary*), and is the only one that also has a form reduplicated with *-ma* / *-ta*.

-Ta appears only once, in *bas.ta.barabar*. The other five forms all have *-ma*. This might suggest that this type is in fact a reduplication with *-ma*, and *bas.ta.barabar* is just accidentally phonetically similar (cf. also 2.4. AP-PARENT REDUPLICATIONS)

⁴⁷ The base **gündüz* is not attested; probably a simple intervocalic sonorization.

- barabar* ‘together’ ♦ E *bas.ta.barabar* (KRPS, RKS-X)
 **dagy*⁴⁸ ‘scatter(ed)’ ♦ E *dar.ma.dagylgan*⁴⁹ (RKS-X); *dar.ma.dagan*⁵⁰
 ‘разбросанность’ (RKS-L s.v. *разбросанность*); *dar.ma.dagyn*⁵¹
 (KRPS, RKS-L)
karyšyk ‘mixed’ ♦ E *kar.ma.karyšyk* (KRPS, RKS-X); *kar.ma.-*
*kiryšyk*⁵² (RKS-X)
syk ‘1. often; 2. thick’ ♦ E *syk.ma.syk* ‘full; overfilled’ (KRPS, RKS-X,
 RKS-L)
*tolu*⁵³ ‘full’ ♦ E *tol.ma.tolu* (RKS-X s.v. *книжный шкаф*); *top.ma.tolu*
 (RKS-X s.v. *переполненный*)

2.4. Apparent reduplications

There are five cases which could be described as reduplicational will-o’-the-wisps.⁵⁴ It appears to be rather more probable that they are all semantic juxtapositions (such as e.g. Kar.E *žan-žyger* ‘closest, dearest, beloved’ < *žan* ‘1. soul; 2. life’ + *žyger* ‘1. liver 2. kidneys’ (KRPS)) even though their shape so strongly resembles the first syllable reduplications. I believe, nevertheless, that they might turn out to be actually quite interesting for the study of reduplication in that their existence raises some stimulating suppositions as to the origin of the phenomenon as a whole.

⁴⁸ It is uncertain whether *dyrma-dorgan* ‘disorder, mess’ (RKS-X) belongs here, too.

It seems to give the impression of an echo-word rather than a reduplication but its structure is not clear.

⁴⁹ The base **dagylgan* is not attested but cf. *dagylmak* ‘to scatter’ and *dagylkyk* ‘scattered’ (KRPS, RKS-X, RKS-L).

⁵⁰ The only example of a noun.

⁵¹ The base **dagyn* is not attested except for in the meaning ‘emě’ (KRPS, RKS-L), but cf. *dagynyk* ‘scattered’ (KRPS).

⁵² The base **kiryšyk* is not attested. Cf. footnote 10 on *čyrčebik*.

⁵³ Cf. *tolu* in 1.1.

⁵⁴ I only include here words which give the impression of reduplication. I omit forms whose alleged base does not exist separately (e.g. *sersem* ‘oafish, gawky’ (KRPS and others) < probably via Ott. *sersām*, *sersem* ‘betäubt, erstaunt, erstarrt’ < MPers. *sarsām* ‘Fieberwahn, Delirium; Gehirnhautentzündung’ < *sar* ‘Kopf’ + *sām* ‘Entzündung’ (Stachowski S. 1976, republished 1998)), or whose closing consonant is neither *m*, *p*, *r* or *s*, nor the same as the second consonant of the supposed base word (e.g. Kar.E *kuč-kuvat* ‘very strong’ < *küč* ‘power’ + *kuvat* ‘power’ (on backward harmonization cf. e.g. *subašy* in Majtczak 2011) or Kar.E *bašbat(u)ra* ‘1. completely; 2. forever’, probably an ancient composition of *baš* ‘head’ + *bat.ur.a* ‘drowning (*transitive*)’).

**jaban* ‘alien, foreign’ ♦ E *jat-jaban* (KRPS, RKS-X, RKS-L)

Probably borrowed in this form from Urum *ġam-ġaban* ‘зовсім чужий’ (UrumS): *jat* is present in AKipch., CTat., Kar.E, and Urum.; *jaban* ‘foreign’ is present in AKipch., CTat. and Urum, and *jat-jaban* is present in Kar.E and Urum. This points quite clearly to a borrowing Urum > Kar.E. Cf. **selamet* below.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no study on the quality of the closing consonant in the reduplicated first syllable in Urum. It is therefore not possible to exclude a reduplication in this case, and especially so, as *t* apparently can be used in this function in CTat. (cf. Jankowski 1992: 129; e.g. *чет-чешум* ‘very diverse, varied’ < *чешум* ‘diverse’).

A semantic juxtaposition seems to be at least equally probable.

jasnavuk ‘lightning’ ♦ NW *jas-jasnamax* (KTDT, KRPS, Józefowicz 2008); *jas-jasnavux* (KTDT, KRPS, Józefowicz 2008) ♦ SW *jas-jasnavuk* (KRPS s.v. *ġac*)

Jas ‘lightning’ (KRPS and others) exists in both Kar.NW and SW; *jasnavuk* is attested for Kar.SW; *jasnavux* and *jasnamax* are not attested for Kar.NW but they seem to be possible derivatives from Kar. NW and SW *jasna-* ‘to flash, to shine, to glitter’. It appears therefore that the composed forms here are juxtapositions rather than actual first syllable reduplications.

mal ‘property’ ♦ E *mal-malal* (KRPS); *mal-melâl* (KRPS, RKS-L s.v. *имущество* and *состояние*)

Most probably borrowed in this form from Ott. *مال ملال mâl melâl* ‘Hab und Gut’ (Zenker 1866 s.v. *مال ملال melâl*). Neither *ma|elal* nor *mal-ma|elal* seem to exist in AKipch., CTat. or Urum. *Melal* itself is an Ott. distortion of *منال menâl* (< Ar.) which can also be used in a composition with *mal*, but not without a *ve*: *مال و منال mâl ve menâl* (Zenker 1866 s.v. *منال menâl*). In the light of the above data, it would seem to be highly unlikely that this form is a reduplication rather than a trivial semantic juxtaposition.

The Kar.E form with *-a-* appears to be a simple secondary harmonization.

saglam ‘1. healthy; 2. whole’ ♦ E *sav-saglamym* [pro: *sav-saglam*] (RKS-L)

While the possibility of *v* as a closing consonant, or that of *p* being spirantized cannot be definitively excluded (cf. *afanysz* and *saglam* in 1.1. and **selamet* below), it seems considerably more probable that this form is a composition of the well-attested *sav* ‘healthy’ with the equally well-attested *saglam*.

**selamet* ‘well-being, prosperity, health’ ♦ E *sav-selamet* (KRPS, RKS-L, RKS-X)

Probably borrowed in this form from Urum *сав-селамент* ‘здоровый, щасливый, благополучный’ (UrumS): *sav* is present in Kar.E and Urum⁵⁵; *selamet* is present in CTat. and Urum, and *sav-selamet* is present in Kar.E This quite clearly points to a borrowing Urum > Kar.E. Cf. **jaban* above.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no study on the quality of the closing consonant in the reduplicated first syllable in Urum. It is therefore not possible to exclude a reduplication in this case. It is also not possible to exclude a spirantization; cf. *sahlam* above. But it also needs to be noted, that *sav* appears in other compositions, too; cf. *sav-esen* ‘very healthy’ (KRPS and others) and *saglam* above. In this light, a semantic juxtaposition seems to be more probable.

Abbreviations

AKipch. = Armeno-Kipchak | **CTat.** = Crimean Tatar | **E** = Kar.E. | **Engl.** = English | **Kar.** = Karaim | **Kar.E** = Karaim, Eastern (Crimean) dialect | **Kar.NW** = Karaim, northwestern (Trakai) dialect | **Kar.SW** = Karaim, southwestern (Halych) dialect | **Kzk.** = Kazakh | **MPers.** = Middle Persian | **NW** = Kar.NW | **Pers.** = Persian | **Russ.** = Russian | **Ott.** = Ottoman | **SW** = Kar.SW. | **Tkc.** = Turkic | **Tksh.** = Turkish

References

- AiM = *Alem-i Medeniye*, 2009.09.27, <http://medeniye.org/lugat>.
 Berta Á. 1998, West Kipchak Languages. – Johanson L. / Csató É.Á., ed., *The Turkic Languages*, London–New York, 301–17, 306.
 CC = Grønbech K. 1942, *Komanisches Wörterbuch. Türkischer Wort-index zu Codex Cumanicus (= Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Maioris. Subsidia I)*, København.
 DAK = Tryjarski E. 1968–72, *Dictionnaire Arméno-kiptchak d’après trois manuscrits des collections viennoises*, 1, Warszawa.
 ÈSTJa = Levitskaja A.S. / Dybo A.V. / Rassadin V.I. 1997, *Ètimologičeskij slovař tjurkskix jazykov. Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie leksičeskie osnovy na bukvy «k», «q»*, Moskva.
 Jankowski H. 1992, *Gramatyka języka krymskotatarskiego*, Poznań.

⁵⁵ The CTat. shape is *sag*, not **sav* (AiM).

- Jankowski H. 1994, Jak krymscy Karaimowie czytali *pataḥ* i co z tego wynika? – Górska E. / Ostafin B., ed., *Studia Orientalia Thaddaeo Lewicki Oblata*, Kraków, 107–13.
- Jankowski H. 1997, A Bible Translation Into the Northern Crimean Dialect of Karaim – *Studia Orientalia* 82, 1–84.
- Jankowski H. 2005, Reading Loose Sheets of Paper Found among the Pages of Crimean Karaim *Mejumas – Mediterranean Language Review* 16, 145–65.
- Józefowicz G. 2008, *Słownik polsko-karaimski w dialekcie trockim*, Troki–Wilno–Warszawa–Wrocław–Gdańsk–Nashville.
- Kakuk Zs. 1991, Ein krimkaraimisches Wörterverzeichnis – *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* XLV (2–3), 347–401.
- KKS = Çulha T. 2006, *Karaycanın Kısa Sözcükleri. Karayca-Türkçe Kısa Sözlük* (= *Dil ve Edebiyat Dizisi* 6), İstanbul.
- KTDT = Kowalski T. 1929, *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki. Eingeleitet, erläutert und mit einem karaimisch-polnisch-deutschen Glossar versehen* (= *Prace Komisji Orjentalistycznej Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności* 11), Kraków.
- KRPS = Baskakov N.A. / Zajončkovskij A. / Šapšal S.M. 1974, *Karaimsko-russko-poľskij slovař*, Moskva.
- KSB = Mardkowicz A. 1935, *Karaj sez-bitigi. Słownik karaimski. Karaimisches Wörterbuch*, Łuck.
- LiO = Ahmet Vefik Paşa 2000, *Lehce-i Osmânî* [hazırlayan: R. Toparlı], Ankara.
- Majtczak T. 2011, Old Turkic *sü* ‘army’ – its form, meaning and etymology – [to appear in] *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 16.
- Meninski à Mesgnien F. ¹1680, ²2000, ed. Ölmez M. / Stachowski S., *Thesaurus Linguarum Orientalium Turcicæ-Arabicæ-Persicæ*, ¹Vienna, ²İstanbul.
- Musaev K.M. 1964, *Grammatika karaimskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*, Moskva.
- Musaev K.M. 1977, *Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk karaimskogo jazyka*, Moskva.
- Müller H.G. 2004, *Reduplikationen im Türkischen. Morphophonologische Untersuchungen* (= *Turcologica* 56), Wiesbaden.
- Prik O.Ja. 1976, *Očerk grammatiki karaimskogo jazyka (krymskij dialekt)*, Maxačkala, 85.
- Rad = Radloff W. 1893–1911, *Opyt slovarja tjurkskix narečij. Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Türk-Dialecte*, Sanktpeterburgъ.

- RKS-L = Levi B.Z. 1996, *Russko-karaimskij slovař. Krymskij dialekt. Urus-Karaj sözlük*, Odessa.
- RKS-X = Xafuz M.Ė. 1995, *Russko-karaimskij slovař. Krymskij dialekt*, Moskva.
- Schültz E. 1968, *An Armeno-Kipchak Chronicle on the Polish-Turkish Wars in 1620–1621*, Budapest.
- Stachowski M. ²2009, *Gramatyka języka tureckiego w zarysie*, Kraków.
- Stachowski S. 1977, Studien über die neupersischen Lehnwörter im Osmanisch-Türkischen. V, *Folia Orientalia* XVIII, 87–118.
- Stachowski S. 1998, ed. Ölmez M., *Osmanlı Türkçesinde Yeni Farsça Alıntılar Sözlüğü*, İstanbul.
- Sulimowicz J. 1973, Materiał leksykalny krymskokaraimskiego zabytku językowego (druk z 1734 r.). II: Słownik – Dictionnaire – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* XXXVI/1, 47–107.
- UrumS = Garkaveć O. 2000, *Urumskij slovnyk*, Alma-Ata.
- VEWT = Räsänen M. 1969, *Versuch eines etymologisches Wörterbuchs der Türk Sprachen (= Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XVII/1)*, Helsinki.
- Zajączkowski A. 1931, *Krótki wykład gramatyki języka zachodnio-karaimskiego (narzecze łucko-halickie)*, Łuck, 17 (§22).
- Zajączkowski A. 1932, *Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodniokaraimskim (= Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności 15)*, Kraków.
- Zenker J.Th. 1866, *Türkisch-arabisch-persisches Handwörterbuch. Dictionnaire turc-arabe-persan*, Leipzig.