

A Historical Morphology of Western Karaim: The Two Pluperfect Tenses in Diachronic and Areal Perspective

Michał Németh

Associate Professor, Faculty of Philology, Jagiellonian University in Kraków,
Kraków, Poland

michal.nemeth@uj.edu.pl

Abstract

This article is a continuation of the analysis of the Karaim *-p edi-* past tense presented, for the first time in scholarly literature, in Németh (2015). In the latter paper, this verbal category was described on the basis of a few South-Western Karaim examples, only, and was termed *plusquamperfectum II*. In this paper the description of its semantic scope has been refined based on an analysis of recently discovered North- and South-Western Karaim examples as well as on a further evaluation of Turkic (including Eastern Karaim) data. Importantly, it is argued that the practice of (also) expressing habitual events by means of this verbal category (which is quite an unusual feature in the Turkic linguistic world) is a consequence of contact-linguistic factors, namely the influence of the Polish language, in which Western Karaims were (and still are) proficient. Finally, to obtain a complete picture of its evolution the *-p edi-* pluperfect is placed in the broader context of the Karaim past tense system. Following Németh (2015) and Németh (2019), this paper is the third in a series of articles introducing previously undocumented grammatical categories of Western Karaim.

Keywords

historical morphology – Western Karaim – the Turkic *-p + edi-* pluperfect – past tenses in Turkic

1 Introductory Remarks

Western Karaim – a moribund Kipchak Turkic language that used to be spoken in two dialectal variants – still lacks a proper historical linguistic description. This is mainly because only a handful of Western Karaim sources date from before the 19th century and, in fact, most of them were only discovered in the last few years. Hence, for decades there was no reliable linguistic material on which to base any in-depth historical research.¹ As a result, the analysis of newly discovered written records older than the 19th century provides us with an opportunity to supplement the current historical description of Karaim with new observations.²

In the first of a series of articles introducing hitherto undocumented Western Karaim grammatical categories, we presented seven examples of the SWKar. *-p edi-* past tense (Németh 2015). The category in question is constructed by attaching the *-dy* simple past forms of the auxiliary verb *e-* ‘to be’ to the *-(y)p* perfective converb form of the root verb. For example:

1. [*ajt-* ‘to say’ + *-yp* → *ajtyp* ‘having said’] + [*edi* ‘was’ ← *e-* ‘to be’ + *di*] →
2. *ajtyp edi* > *ajtybedi* (*-p-* > *-b-* voicing caused by the intervocalic position).

We concluded that this construction was mainly employed to express actions that had come to an end before another past action took place, the latter being usually expressed with the *-dy* simple past tense forms. Hence, we termed it *plusquamperfectum II* – in contrast to the *-ġan edi-* *plusquamperfectum I*. However, we left open the question of its exact semantic scope and its relation

1 Currently, the main grammatical descriptions of the dialects of Karaim (ISO 639-3 code in the UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger), i.e. of the now extinct Eastern (Crimean) Karaim with its variants and Western Karaim with its two (i.e., north-western and the extinct south-western) subdialects are as follows: Kowalski (1929), Zajączkowski (1931), Pritsak (1959a), Musaev (1964, 1977), Prik (1976), Firkovičius (1996), Berta (1998), Kocaoğlu (2006), Aqtay (2009: I 33–47), Németh (2011a: 21–76, 2011b), and Gülsevin (2016: 49–131). Karaim word-formation has been described by Zajączkowski (1931: 20–23; 1932) and Çulha (2006: 18–32).

2 The oldest texts written in Western Karaim originate from the second half of the 17th century (see them described in Németh 2020b: 1–5). These are relatively short religious poems recorded in Hebrew script. Three of the six currently known handwritten texts composed before the end of the 17th century have been the subject of critical editions (Jankowski 2014, and Németh 2018). Additionally, the first three verses of the Torah collected as linguistic material by the Swedish Orientalist Gustaf Peringer Lillieblad (1651–1710) and published in 1691 by Tentzel (1691: 572–575) have been analysed in depth by Németh (2020a). The 18th century, in turn, saw the emergence of translations of entire Biblical books into Western Karaim (see below), and a heyday of the paytanic and paraliturgical literature written in the Karaim language.

to other Karaim past tenses owing to the scarcity of available examples and also because of the fact that two of the seven examples clearly referred to habitual actions performed in the past and therefore conveyed rather progressive than pluperfective meaning (Németh 2015: 222–233). Moreover, these two forms were documented out of context in sentences in which there was no mention of another past action that would have served as a chronological reference point (see examples 15 and 16 below).

The main goal of the present paper is to revise and refine the above description and answer the open questions. This is done by:

1. evaluating further examples of this grammatical category,
2. showing contact-linguistic factors that influenced its semantic scope, and
3. presenting it against the background of the Karaim past tense system (primarily by way of a comparison with the *-ğan edi-* pluperfect).³

The linguistic material adduced below was recently discovered in the North-Western, South-Western Karaim translations of the Pentateuch copied in the 18th–19th centuries. As a comparison, Eastern Karaim data of similar age will be presented, too. Given that we are dealing here with a grammatical category that was seldom used not only in Karaim but also in other Turkic languages, the Karaim material discussed in this paper is also modest in size.⁴ Nevertheless, one highly advantageous circumstance that facilitates our work is that the above translations of the Bible allow us to specify the context of each grammatical form very precisely. Just how beneficial this circumstance is has been already shown in Németh (2019).⁵

2 The Turkic Linguistic Background

A general overview of the use of this verbal category in other Turkic languages is provided in Németh (2015: 216–220). In the present analysis, in order to

3 The latter verbal category was only described in some of the above-mentioned works, see: Musaev (1964: 276–278), Prik (1976: 134–135), Berta (1998: 312), Csató (1998: 52; 2000: 737), Aqtay (2009: 40), Németh (2011a: 126–128; 2011b: 48), Gülsevin (2016: 94).

4 In his unpublished notes written in 1969, Józef Sulimowicz (1913–1973), a Polish Turcologist and a native speaker of South-Western Karaim described this tense as only being very rarely used, see Németh (2015: 216, 225). In fact, it took the present author several years of philological work to come across the examples presented below, which also indicates how common this category was.

5 The Biblical context of the respective verses was primarily checked against Benson (1857), Peake (1920), and Friedman (2003).

TABLE 1 The semantic scope of the *-p edi-* forms in selected Turkic languages

	Arm.- Kipch.	Krch. - (Blk.)	Kklp.	Kzk.	Kirg.	Kmk.	Nog.	Chag.	Uyg.	Uzb.
Pluperfect	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Pluperfect for recent events										
Perfect-like past										
Imperfective pluperfect										
Imperfective past		+		+	+					
Resultative past		+								
Narrative past				+				+		+

recapitulate the results of this comparative research in a concise way, we refer to the summarizing table presented in Németh (2015: 220), see table 1.

However, we ought to supplement the latter with some valuable additional information. Firstly, as we know from Grunin (1967: 375) and Pritsak (1959b: 84), the construction in question was also present in Armeno-Kipchak, which is an important fact given the high degree of language relatedness between Armeno-Kipchak and Karaim. Secondly, we can improve the description of the respective Uyghur verbal construction: as demonstrated by Rentzsch (2005: 115–118), in Modern Uyghur the *-(i)vidi-* (< *-p edi-*) forms express “a postterminal aspect (in other terms, a perfect) with the additional feature that the validity of the event is cancelled at the time of speaking” (Rentzsch 2019: 3).⁶

Johanson (1999: 178) describes the *-p edi-* forms as perfect-like (so-called *postterminal*) “pluconstatives”⁷ which, he writes, “may occur in so-called ‘progressive contexts’ without being ‘progressives’ themselves”. He provides the following examples to document his definition: Krch. *kelip edi* ‘had come’, Kzk. *kelip edi* ‘had come’, *žuqlab edi* ‘had fallen asleep, was asleep’, *ölüb edi* ‘had died, was dead’, and *aryb edi* ‘had got tired, was tired’. Based on the above, we supplemented Table 1 with the information that the Krch. *-p edi-* construction also played the role of a pluperfect (see also Johanson 1995: 95; in Johanson 2021: 721: remote past). The role of expressing resultative past (in Karachay) is mentioned by Seegmiller (1996: 23), too, a work not cited in our previous article.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the *-p edi-* (> *-bedi-*) past form was likewise used in the Chagatay texts, see, above all, Eckmann (1966: 179), Blagova (1994: 344–345), and Schöniß (1997: 221ff.). It was employed in narratives for events that take place prior to those expressed by the simple (*-dy*) past.

3 The Available Western Karaim Data

3.1 *Introductory Remarks*

In the interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glossing below (edited according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules) the construction in question as well as the *-ġan edi-* pluperfect and the *-r edi-* imperfect are labelled analytically as a compound of the past tense forms of the auxiliary verb *e-* ‘to be’ and the respective

6 As far as we know, this characteristics of the *-p edi-* past is not mentioned in other descriptions of Uyghur, see, for instance, Pritsak (1959c), Nadžip (1960), and Hahn (1998).

7 Johanson does not provide a definition of this term; the only clarification we find is “cf. pluperfect vs. perfect” (see Johanson 1999: 178). We assume that this term refers to an utterance relaying an event that took place before another event.

non-finite forms of the main verb. Suffixes performing a derivative role as well as non-productive morphemes are not labelled.

3.2 North-Western Karaim Forms

This is the first time the *-p edi-* tense is documented for North-Western Karaim. The material is excerpted primarily from mss. ADub.III.73 and TKow.01. ADub.III.73 contains a translation of the Pentateuch into North-Western Karaim, and six of the examples presented below were found there in 2015–2018 after a careful editing of the entire Torah (folios 1 r^o – 342 v^o), see Németh (2021). As a next step, after reading the Torah in ms. JSul.III.01, further South-Western Karaim examples were collected (see, 3.3 below) and the respective Biblical verses from ADub.III.73 and JSul.III.01 were compared with the content of further two North-Western Karaim sources, namely: TKow.01 and Mickiewicz and Rojecki (1889).

We can locate the linguistic material quite precisely in time and space. Manuscripts ADub.III.73 and TKow.01 were copied by a person called Simcha ben Chananel (born in Trakai, died in Kukizów, in present-day Western Ukraine, on 27 March 1723; the hazzan (head priest) in Kukizów from ca. 1709). He worked on ms. ADub.III.73 in spring 1720 (see 342 r^o – 342 v^o), whereas TKow.01 was finished on 7 December 1722.⁸ The translation of Genesis published by Mickiewicz & Rojecki (1889) originates from the 19th century.

(1) *alybedim* (Genesis 12:19)

- a) *Nek a[jttyj]⁹ tuvduğumdu ol da alybedim any özürña qatynlyq[qa]¹⁰ da haligiña muna qatynyj alğyn da bargyn.* (ADub.III.73: 17 r^o)

Nek	ajt-ty-j	tuvduğ-um-du	ol	da
why	say-PST-2SG	sister 1SG.POSS-3SG.COP	she	and
al-yb=e-di-m	a-ny	öz-ürñ-a	qatynlyq-qa	da
take-CVB=be-PST-1SG	she\ACC	own-1SG.POSS-DAT	marriedness-DAT	and
haligiña	muna	qatyn-yj-Ø	al-ğyn	da
now	lo	wife-2SG.POSS-INDEF.ACC	take-2SG.IMP	and
			go-2SG.IMP	

Why did you say, “She is my sister,” so I had taken her for a wife for myself? Now therefore, lo, take your wife, and go.’

8 For more information regarding Simcha ben Chananel himself and ms. ADub.III.73, see Németh (2014, 2015b). For some more details on TKow.01, see References below.

9 ADub.III.73: damaged text. Reconstructed on the basis of: TKow.01: *ajttyj*, JSul.III.01: *ajttyn*, BSMS 288: *ajttyn*.

10 ADub.III.73: damaged text. Reconstructed on the basis of: TKow.01: *qatynlyqqa*, JSul.III.01: *qatynlyqqa*, BSMS 288: *hatynlyqqa*.

- b) *Nek ajttyj tuvduğumdu ol da alybedim any özüma qatynlyqqa da haligine muna qatynyj alğyn da barğyn.* (TKow.01: 19 r^o)

Nek ajt-ty-j tuvduğ-um-du ol da al-yb=e-di-m
 why say-PST-2SG sister\1SG.POSS-3SG.COP she and take-CVB=be-PST-1SG
 any öz-üm-a qatynlyq-qa da haligine muna
 she\ACC own-1SG.POSS-DAT marriedness-DAT and now lo
 qatyn-yj-Ø al-ğyn da bar-ğyn.
 wife-2SG.POSS-INDEF.ACC take-2SG.IMP and go-2SG.IMP

'Why did you say, "She is my sister," so I had taken her for a wife for myself?
 Now therefore, lo, take your wife, and go.'

- (2) *qalybedi* (Genesis 18:11)

- a) *Da Avraham da Sara qartlar edilar jetkenlar künlerga qartlyqta qalybedi bolma Sarağa jol qatynlarğa kibik.* (ADub.III.73: 24 r^o)

Da Avraham da Sara qart-lar e-di-lar jet-ken-lar
 and Abraham and Sarah old-PL be-PST-3PL reach-PTCP-PL
 kün-ler-ğa qartlyq-ta qal-yb=e-di-Ø bol-ma
 day-PL-DAT old.age-LOC cease-CVB=be-PST-3SG be-AN
 Sara-ğa jol qatyn-lar-ğa kibik.
 Sarah-DAT way woman-PL-DAT like

'And Abraham and Sarah were old, well along in days of old age; it had ceased to be with Sarah after the way of women.'

- b) *Da Avraham da Sara qartlar ediler jetkenler künlerge qartlyqta qalybedi bolma Sarağa jol qatynlarğa kibik.* (TKow.01: 25 v^o)

Da Avraham da Sara qart-lar e-di-ler jet-ken-ler kün-ler-ge
 and Abraham and Sarah old-PL be-PST-3PL reach-PTCP-PL day-PL-DAT
 qartlyq-ta qal-yb=e-di-Ø bol-ma Sara jol qatyn-lar-ğa kibik.
 old.age-LOC cease-CVB=be-PST-3SG be-AN Sarah way woman-PL-DAT like
 'And Abraham and Sarah were old, advanced in days; Sarah ceased to be after the way of women.'

- (3) *beklebedi* (Genesis 20:18)

- a) *Ki beklaıma beklebedi Adonaj bar qursağ aşyra üvüında Avimelehnin Sara üçün qatyny üçün Avrahamnyn.* (ADub.III.73: 28 v^o)

Ki	beklá-íma	bekle-b=e-di-Ø	Adonaj	bar
because	close-AN	close-CVB=be-PST-3SG	Lord	every
qursaq-Ø	aşyra	üv-ün-da	Avimeleḥ-nin	Sara
womb-INDEF.ACC	through	house-3SG.POSS\LOC	Abimelech-GEN	Sarah
üčün	qatyn-y	Avraham-nyn.		
for	wife-3SG.POSS	Abraham-GEN		

'Because the Lord had surely closed every womb in the house of Abimelech, because of Sarah, Abraham's wife.'

- b) *Ki beklemē beklabedi Adonaj bar qusaq aşıra üviinde Avimeleḥnin işi üčün Sarayn qatynynyn Avrahamnyn.* (TKow.01: 30 v^o)

Ki	bekle-me	beklá-b=e-di-Ø	Adonaj	bar	qursaq-Ø
because	close-AN	close-CVB=be-PST-3SG	Lord	every	womb-INDEF.ACC
aşıra	üv-ün-de				
through	house-3SG.POSS\LOC				

Avimeleḥ-nin	iş-i	üčün	Sara-nyn	qatyn-y-nyn
Abimelech-GEN	matter-3SG.POSS	for	Sarah-GEN	wife-3SG.POSS-GEN

Avraham-nyn.

Abraham-GEN

'Because the Lord had surely closed every womb of the house of Abimelech, because of the matter of Sarah – of Abraham's wife.'

- c) *Ki beklaíma beklabedi H bar qursaq aşıra üvünün Avimeleḥnin Sara qatyny üčün Avrahamnyn.* (Mickiewicz & Rojecki 1889: 24)

Ki	beklá-íma	beklá-b=e-di-Ø	H	bar
because	close-AN	close-CVB=be-PST-3SG	Lord	every
qursağ-y-Ø		aşıra		
womb\3SG.POSS-INDEF.ACC		through		

üv-u-nün	Avimeleḥ-nin	Sara	qatyn-y
house-3SG.POSS-GEN	Abimelech-GEN	Sarah	wife-3SG.POSS

üčuń	Avraham-nyn.
for	Abraham-GEN

'Because the Lord had surely closed every womb of the house of Abimelech, because of Sarah, Abraham's wife.'

(4) *barybedi* (Genesis 24:62)

Da Jichaq keldi kelmektan ki barybedi Be'er Lahaj Ro'iga da ol oltururedi jerinda ol tüşlükün. (ADub.III.73: 36 v^o)

Da and	Jichaq Isaac	kel-di-Ø come-PST-3SG	kelmek-tan trip-ABL	ki because
bar-yb=e-di-Ø go-CVB=be-PST-3SG		Be'er Lahaj Ro'i-ğa Beer.Lahai.Roi-DAT	da and	
ol he	oltur-ur=e-di-Ø dwell-FUT=be-PST-3SG	jer-in-đa land-3SG.POSS\LOC	ol ART	tüşlük-nün. south-GEN

'And Isaac came from a trip, because he had gone to Beer-Lahai-Roi, and he was dwelling in the land of the south.'

(5) *atabedi* (Genesis 26:18)

- a) *Da qajtty Jichaq da qazdy oşol qujularyn ol suvlarnyn ki qazdylyar vaht-larynda Avrahamnyn atasynyn da japtylar alarny Peliştim öliip sortun Avraham da atady alarğa atlar kibik ki atabedi alarğa atasy anyn.* (TKow.01: 41 r^o)

Da and	qajt-ty-Ø go.back-PST-3G	da and	qaz-dy-Ø dig-PST-3SG	oşol ART	quju-lary-n well-3PL.POSS-ACC
ol ART	suv-lar-nyn water-PL-GEN	ki which			
qaz-dy-lar dig-PST-3PL		vaht-laryn-da time-3PL.POSS\LOC		Avraham-nyn Abraham-GEN	
ata-sy-nyn father-3SG.POSS-GEN		da and		jap-ty-lar cover-PST-3PL	
alar-ny they-ACC	Peliştim the.Philistines	öl-üp die-CVB	sortun after	Avraham Abraham	da and
ata-dy-Ø call-PST-3SG	alar-ğa they-DAT	at-lar name-PL			
kibik like	ki which	ata-b=e-di-Ø call-CVB=be-PST-3SG		alar-ğa they-DAT	

ata-sy	a-nyn.
father-3SG.POSS	he\GEN

'And Isaac went back and dug the wells of water that they had dug in the times of Abraham his father and which the Philistines had covered after Abraham died, and he called them by names, like the names that his father had called them.'

(6) *ajtybedi* (Exodus 15:9)

- a) *Ajtybedi par'o duşman quvajym jetejim üleşejim olža tolsun alardan klegim suvurajym qylyčymny tasetsin alarny qolum.* (ADub.III.73: 110 v^o; TKow.01: 115 r^o – 115 v^o)

Ajt-yb=e-di-Ø	par'o	duşman-Ø	
say-CVB=be-PST-3SG	Pharaoh	enemy-INDEF.ACC	
quv-ajym	jet-ejim	üleş-ejim	
pursue-1SG.OPT	catch.up-1SG.OPT	divide-1SG.OPT	
olža-Ø	tol-sun	alar-dan	kleg-im
spoil-INDEF.ACC	fill-3SG.IMP	they-ABL	desire\1SG.POSS
suvur-ajym	qylyč-ym-ny		
draw-1SG.OPT	sword-1SG.POSS-ACC		
taset-sin	alar-ny	qol-um.	
destroy-3SG.IMP	they-ACC	hand-1SG.POSS	

'Pharaoh, the enemy, had said, "Let me pursue, let me catch up, let me divide the spoil, let my desire have its fill of them. Let me draw my sword. My hand shall destroy them."

(7) *belgilebedi* (Exodus 21:8)

- a) *Eger jaman körünse közlerinde bijinin ki özüne belgilebedi any da juludu any jat ulusqa erklenmesin satma any tanğanynda anar.* (TKow.01: 124 r^o – 124 v^o)

Eger	jaman	körün-se-Ø	köz-ler-in-de
if	bad	seem-COND-3SG	eye-PL-3SG.POSS\LOC
bij-i-nin	ki	öz-ün-e	
master-3SG.POSS-GEN	which	self-3SG.POSS\DAT	
belgile-b=e-di-Ø	a-ny	da	julu-du-Ø
designate-CVB=be-PST-3SG	she\ACC	and	redeem-PST-3SG

Ki	jalbarmaq=byla	tüş-tü-m	ki
which	cry=with	fall-PST-1SG	because
ajt-yb=e-di-Ø	Adonaj	taset-me	siz-ni.
say-CVB=be-PST-3SG	Lord	destroy-AN	you-ACC

'And I fell down with cry before the Lord through the forty days and forty nights that I had fallen down with cry because the Lord had said he would destroy you.'

3.3 South-Western Karaim Forms

The South-Western Karaim material presented in Németh (2015) can be supplemented in the present paper with further material found in manuscript JSul.III.01, which also contains a translation of the Pentateuch. It was copied in 19th-century Halych by Jeshua Josef Mordkowicz (born in Halych in 1802, died in Halych on 23 July 1884), a copyist, translator, and hazzan. First, we will present the equivalents of examples 2, 3, 5–8 referred to above. In order to facilitate the semantic analysis of forms from different manuscripts used in the same Biblical context, the numbering of the examples below tallies with the numbering introduced in 3.2.

(2) *qalybedi* (Genesis 18:11)

- c) *Da Avraham da Sara qart ediler jetkenler künlerge qalybedi bolma Sarağa jolu qatynlarnyn.* (JSul.III.01: 17 r^o)

Da	Avraham	da	Sara	qart
and	Abraham	and	Sarah	old
e-di-lar	jet-ken-ler	kün-ler-ge	qal-yb=e-di-Ø	
be-PST-3PL	reach-PTCP-PL	day-PL-DAT	cease-CVB=be-PST-3SG	
bol-ma	Sara-ğa	jol-u	qatyn-lar-nyn.	
be-AN	Sarah-DAT	way-3SG.POSS	woman-PL-GEN	

'And Abraham and Sarah were old, well along in days of old age; the way of women had ceased to be with Sarah.'

(3) *beklebedi* (Genesis 20:18)

- d) *Ki bekleme beklebedi H bar qursaq asyra ivine Avimelehnin isi ücün Sarany qatynynyn Avrahamnyn.* (JSul.III.01: 30 v^o)

Ki	bekle-me	bekle-b=e-di-Ø	H	bar
because	close-AN	close-CVB=be-PST-3SG	Lord	every
qursaq-Ø	asyra	iv-in-e		
womb-INDEF.ACC	through	house-3SG.POSS\DAT		
Avimeleḡ-nin	iş-i	ücün	Sara-nyn	
Abimelech-GEN	matter-3SG.POSS	for	Sarah-GEN	
qatyn-y-nyn	Avraham-nyn.			
wife-3SG.POSS-GEN	Abraham-GEN			

'Because the Lord had surely closed every womb of the house of Abimelech, because of the matter of Sarah – of Abraham's wife.'

(5) *atabedi* (Genesis 26:18)

- b) *Da qajty Jıçaq da qazdy osol qujularyn ol suvlarnyn ki qazdylar vaḡt-larynda Avrahamnyn atasynyn da japtylar alarny Peliştım elip sortun Avraham da atady alarğa atlar kibik ki atabedi alarğa atasy anyn.* (JSul.III.01: 27 r^o)

Da	qajty-ty-Ø	da	qaz-dy-Ø	osol	quju-lary-n
and	go.back-PST-3G	and	dig-PST-3SG	ART	well-3PL.POSS-ACC
ol	suv-lar-nyn	ki			
ART	water-PL-GEN	which			
qaz-dy-lar		vaḡt-laryn-da		Avraham-nyn	
dig-PST-PL-3SG		time-3PL.POSS\LOC		Abraham-GEN	
ata-sy-nyn		da		jap-ty-lar	
father-3SG.POSS-GEN		and		cover-PST-3PL	
alar-ny	Peliştım	el-ip	sortun	Avraham	da
they-ACC	the.Philistines	die-CVB	after	Abraham	and
ata-dy-Ø	alar-ğa	at-lar			
call-PST-3SG	they-DAT	name-PL			

kibik	ki	ata-b=e-di-Ø	alar-ğa	ata-sy	a-nyn.
like	which	call-CVB=be-PST-3SG	they-DAT	father-3SG.POSS	he\GEN

'And Isaac went back and dug the wells of water that they had dug in the times of Abraham his father and which the Philistines had covered after Abraham died, and he called them by names, like the names that his father had called them.'

(6) *ajtybedi* (Exodus 15:9)

- b) *Ajtybedi par'o dusman quvajym jetejim Jisera'elni ilesejim olža tolsun alardan klegim suvurajym qylycymny tasetsin alarny ħali qolumnun.* (JSul.III.01: 74 r^o – 74 v^o)

Ajt-yb=e-di-Ø	par'o	dušman-Ø	quv-ajym
say-CVB=be-PST-3SG	Pharaoh	enemy-INDEF.ACC	pursue-1SG.OPT
jet-ejim	Jisra'el-ni		
catch.up-1SG.OPT	Israel-ACC		
iles-ejim	olža-Ø	tol-sun	alar-dan
divide-1SG.OPT	spoil-INDEF.ACC	fill-3SG.IMP	they-ABL
kleg-im	zan-ym-nyn		
desire\1SG.POSS	heart-1SG.POSS-GEN		
suvur-ajym	qylyc-ym-ny	taset-sin	alar-ny
draw-1SG.OPT	sword-1SG.POSS-ACC	destroy-3SG.IMP	they-ACC
ħal-i	qol-um		
potential-3SG.POSS	hand-1SG.POSS		

'Pharaoh, the enemy, had said, "Let me pursue, let me catch up with Israel, let me divide the spoil, let the desire of my heart have its fill of them. Let me draw my sword. The potential of my hand shall destroy them."

(7) *belgilebedi* (Exodus 21:8)

- b) *Eger jaman körindi ese ol közlerinde bijinin ki ezine belgilebedi any da juludu any jat ulusqa erklenmesin satma any taŋanynda anar.* (JSul.III.01: 80 v^o)

Eger	jaman	körin-di=e-se-Ø
if	bad	seem-PST=be-COND-3SG

köz-ler-in-de	bij-i-nin	ki	
eye-PL-3SG.POSS\LOC	master-3SG.POSS-GEN	which	
ez-in-e	belgile-b=e-di-Ø	a-ny	da
self-3SG.POSS\DAT	designate-CVB=be-PST-3SG	she\ACC	and
julu-du-Ø	a-ny	jat	
redeem-PST-3SG	she\ACC	foreign	
ulus-qa	erklen-me-sin	sat-ma	
people-DAT	have.right-NEG-3SG.IMP	sell-AN	
a-ny	tan-ğan-yn-da	an-ar.	
she\ACC	deceive-PTCP-3SG.POSS\LOC	she\DAT	

'If she would seem bad in the eyes of her master who had allotted her to himself and redeemed her, he shall have no right to sell her to a foreign people in his deceiving of her.'

(8) *ajtybedi* (Deuteronomy 9:25)

- c) *Da tisip jalbardym alnynda H-nyn osol qyrq ol künde da osol qyrq ol kecede ki tisip jalbardym bosatlyq qoladoğac anyn üçin ki ajtybedi H tasetme sizni.* (JSul.III.01: 202 r^o)

Da	tis-ip	jalbar-dy-m	aln-yn-da	H-nyn
and	fall-CVB	beseech-PST-1SG	before\3SG.POSS\LOC	Lord-GEN
osol	qyrq	ol	kün-de	da
ART	forty	ART	day-LOC	and
osol	qyrq	ol	kece-de	ki
ART	forty	ART	night-LOC	which
tis-ip	jalbar-dy-m	bosatlyq-Ø	qol-adoğac	
fall-CVB	beseech-PST-1SG	atonement-INDEF.ACC	ask-CVB	
a-nyn	üçin	ki	ajt-yb=e-di-Ø	H
that\GEN	about	because	say-CVB=be-PST-3SG	Lord
taset-me	siz-ni.			
destroy-AN	you-ACC			

'And I fell down and besought the Lord for forty days and for forty nights that I had fallen down and besought asking for atonement because the Lord had said he would destroy you.'

Besides the six examples presented above, in JSul.III.01 we can find further instances of the use of *-p edi-* forms:

(9) *qojubedi* (Genesis 28:18)

Da künlej turdu Ja'aqov erten bylada da aldy osol ol tasny ki qojubedi baslary tibine da qojdu any maceva da qujdu jav basy istine anyn. (JSul.III.01: 30 r^o)

Da	künlej.tur-du-Ø	erten.byla-da	da	al-dy-Ø
and	rise.early-PST-3SG	morning-LOC	and	take-PST-3SG
osol	ol	tas-ny	ki	
ART	ART	stone-ACC	which	
qoj-ub=e-di-Ø	bas-lar-y	tib-in-e	da	
put-CVB=be-PST-3SG	head-PL-3SG.POSS	bottom\3SG.POSS\DAT	and	
qoj-du-Ø	a-ny	maceva	da	
set-PST-3SG	it\ACC	pillar	and	
quj-du-Ø	jav-Ø	bas-y		
pour-PST-3SG	oil-INDEF.ACC	head-3SG.POSS		
ist-in-e	a-nyn.			
top-3SG.POSS\DAT	it\GEN			

'And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put under his head, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil on the top of it.'

(10) *kelibedi* (Exodus 15:19)

Ki kelibedi aty par'onun markavy byla da jalan atylary byla tengizge da qajtar dy H alar istine osol suvlaryn ol tengiznin da uvullary Jisraelnin bardylar quru byla ortasynda ol tengiznin. (JSul.III.01: 74 v^o)

Ki	kel-ib=e-di-Ø	at-y	par'o-nun
because	come-CVB=be-PST-3SG	horse-3SG.POSS	Pharaoh-GEN
markav-y	byla	da	
chariot-3SG.POSS	with	and	
jalan.atly-lar-y	byla	tengiz-ge	da
horseman-PL-3SG.POSS	with	sea-DAT	and
qajtar-dy-Ø	H	a-lar	ist-in-e
bring.back-PST-3SG	Lord	they\PL	top-3SG.POSS\DAT

osol	suv-lar-y-n		ol	tengiz-nin
ART	water-PL-3SG.POSS-ACC		ART	sea-GEN
da	uvul-lar-y		Jisra'el-nin	bar-dy-lar
and	child-PL-3SG.POSS		Israel-GEN	go-PST-3PL
quru	byla	orta-syn-da	ol	tengiz-nin.
dry.ground	with	middle-3SG.POSS\LOC	ART	sea-GEN

'Because the Pharaoh's horse with his chariot and with his horsemen had come in the sea, and the Lord brought back the waters of the sea upon them, and the children of Israel went on dry ground through the midst of the sea.'

(11) *alybedi* (Numbers 12:1)

Da cajnnav sözledi Mirjam da Aharon Moşe üçün isleri üçün ol kuşlu qatynyn ki aldy ki kuşlu qatyn alybedi. (JSul.III.01: 157 1^o)

Da	cajnav.sözle-di-Ø	Mirjam	da	Aharon	Moşe
and	accuse-PST-3SG	Miriam	and	Aaron	Moses
üçün	is-ler-i	üçün			
about	matter-PL-3SG.POSS	about			
kuşlu	qatyn-nyn	ki		al-dy-Ø	
Ethiopian	woman-GEN	which		take-PST-3SG	
ki	Kuşlu	qatyn-Ø		al-yb=e-di-Ø.	
because	Ethiopian	woman-INDEF.ACC		take-CVB=be-PST-3SG	

'And Miriam and Aaron accused Moses of the matter of the Ethiopian woman whom he had taken – because he had taken an Ethiopian woman.'

(12) *qahirlenibedi* (Deuteronomy 9:19)

Anlyq byla ki qorqtum alnyndan ol acuvnun da ol qahirnin ki qahirlenibedi H siznin istine tas etme sizni da qabul etti H tefilemni benim dağyn olda keretni. (JSul.III.01: 199 v^o)

Anlyq=byla	ki	qorq-tu-m	aln-yn-dan	ol
in.addition.to	which	be.afraid-PST-1SG	before\3SG.POSS\ABL	ART
acuv-nun	da	ol	qahir-nin	
anger-GEN	and	ART	fury-GEN	
ki		qahirlen-ib=e-di-Ø	H	siz-nin
which		be.angry-CVB=be-PST-3SG	Lord	you-GEN

ist-in-e top-3SG.POSS\DAT	tas.et-me destroy-AN	siz-ni you-ACC	da and
qabul.et-ti-Ø accept-PST-3SG	H Lord	tefile-m-ni prayer-1SG.POSS-ACC	dağyn as.well
ol=da that=too	keret-ni. time-ACC		

'In addition to which I was afraid of the anger and wrath with which the Lord had been furious with you to destroy you. But the Lord accepted my prayer at that time as well.'

(13) *acuvlanybedi* (Deuteronomy 9:20)

Da Aharon da acuvlanybedi H astry tasetme any da tefile ettim dağyn Aharon icin ol vaħtta ol. (JSul.III.01: 199 v^o)

Da and	Aharon-da Aaron-LOC	acuvlan-yb=e-di-Ø be.angry-CVB=be-PST-3SG	H Lord	astrы very
taset-me destroy-AN	a-ny he\ACC	da and	tefile.et-ti-m pray-PST-1SG	
dağyn as.well	Aharon Aaron	icin for	ol that	vaħt-ta time-LOC
				ol. that

'And the Lord was very angry with Aaron so as to destroy him. And I prayed for Aaron at that time as well.'

(14) *alybedi* (Deuteronomy 24:3)

Da ħorlasa any ol er ol sondrağy da jazsa anar get bitigi da berse qoluna anyn da sirse any ivinden jemese ki else ol er ol sondrağy ki alybedi any ezine qatynlyqqa. (JSul.III.01: 213 v^o)

Da and	ħorla-sa-Ø despise-COND-3SG	a-ny she\ACC	ol that	er husband
ol ART	sondrağy latter	da and	jaz-sa-Ø write-COND-3SG	an-ar she\DAT
get.bitigi-Ø document.of.divorce-INDEF.ACC			da and	ber-se-Ø give-COND-3SG
qol-un-a hand-3SG.POSS\DAT			a-nyn she\GEN	da and

sir-se-Ø drive-COND-3SG	a-ny she\ACC	iv-in-den house-3SG.POSS\ABL	jemesē or	ki if
el-se-Ø die-COND-3SG	ol that	er husband	ol ART	
sondrağy latter	ki which	al-yb=e-di-Ø take-CVB=be-PST-3SG	a-ny she\ACC	
ez-in-e self-3SG.POSS\DAT	qatynlyq-qa. marriedness-DAT			

'And if the latter husband despises her and writes a document of divorce for her and puts it in her hand and drives her out of his house, or if the latter husband dies, who had taken her for a wife:'

4 Evolution of the Middle Western Karaim *-p edi-* pluperfect – the Relation of Internal and Contact-Induced Phenomena

4.1 *Semantic Analysis of the Western Karaim -p edi- Forms*

At the outset, let us present a concise explanation of the Biblical context in which the respective forms appear. The English translation of the analysed word forms is highlighted with bold letters.

- (1) Gen 12:10–20. Abraham went to Egypt and foresaw that the beauty of his wife Sarai (i.e., Sarah) would rouse the desire of the Egyptians, who might then kill him. To save his life, he begged his wife to pass herself off as his sister. Pharaoh took her into his harem, but he was smitten by God with sickness and (hence) learned the truth. Then Pharaoh asked Abraham why he told him that Sarai was his sister. Pharaoh said that it was because Abraham had not told the truth that **he had taken** her for wife as a result of which God smote him with great plagues. Pharaoh ordered Abraham to take his wife and go.
- (2) Gen 18:1–12. Abraham's guests (three men) conveyed the Lord's promise that Sarah would have a son. The reader is informed by the narrator that Abraham and Sarah were old at the time the visitors came and that conception could not take place because **Sarah had ceased to share her bed** with Abraham.
- (3) Gen 20:1–17. Abraham made the mental reservation that Sarah was not his wife but rather was his sister and hence she was taken to the harem of Abimelech, King of Gerar. Abimelech learned the truth in a dream through divine communication and gave Sarah back to Abraham. Then

Abraham prayed to God to heal Abimelech and his household, because previously – in order to preserve Sarah's honour – *God had plagued* them with illness preventing Sarah from giving birth.

- (4) Gen 24:1–63. Abraham sent his servant to bring to Isaac, his son, a wife from his own homeland. The servant travelled to the place called Aram Naharaim, found Rebekah, and took her to Abraham's abode. Isaac met her after he returned from Beer-Lahai-Roi, where *he had gone* before.
- (5) Gen 21:25–30, Gen 26:1–22. Like his father Abraham, famine forced Isaac to migrate and he went to Gerar, whose king was Abimelech, King of the Philistines. Isaac's flocks and herds multiplied, and the Philistines envied him. Abimelech's men seized Abraham's well (see Gen 21:25–30, Gen 26:15) and the king called on Isaac to leave. Isaac's servants once more dug the wells which the servants of Abraham had dug and gave them the same names Abraham, his father, *had given* them.
- (6) Exo 15:1–10. After having crossed the Red Sea and after having destroyed Pharaoh and his army, Moses and his people sang The Song of Triumph (Exo 15:1–18). In this song the events of Exo 14 are eulogized. First, in Exo 15:1 and Exo 15:4–5, Pharaoh's defeat and death is described. Then, in Exo 15:9, the listener is informed of what Pharaoh *had said* before his defeat when he decided to pursue Moses and his people. Cf. example 9 below. In Exo 15:10 the listener is told that Pharaoh was then covered by the sea.
- (7) Exo 21:6–11. The initial part of Exo 21 sets out the laws for female servants. In Exo 21:8, it is stated that if a female servant does not suit the man who *had allotted* her for himself as his concubine and redeemed her, her relatives might redeem her or she might be sold to another Israelite.
- (8) Deu 5:1, Num 13:16–33, Num 14:1–5, Deu 9:22–28. Moses called his people (Deu 5:1) and repeated to them all the laws and judgements of God. He recalled all the previous occasions when the children of Israel had not obeyed God's commandments. Moses reminded them that he prayed to God because previously God *had said* that he would destroy the children of Israel because of the events that had taken place at Kadesh-Barnea (described in Num 13:16–33, Num 14:1–5).
- (9) Gen 28:1–18. Isaac sent Jacob off to Paddan-Aram to marry into his mother's family (Gen 28:1–2). On his way there Jacob chanced on a place and lay there for the night and took a stone for his pillow. In his dream he saw a vision (Gen 28:12–17). When he woke up, he recognized that the place he had stayed overnight was God's house and set the stone, the stone *he had taken* for a pillow, as a pillar and anointed it with oil.
- (10) Exo 14:23–29, Exo 15:1–19. After having crossed the Red Sea and after having destroyed Pharaoh and his army, Moses and his people sang The Song

of Triumph (Exo 15:1–18). In this song the events of Exo 14 are eulogized. Exo 15:19 is a link verse in which the narrator recapitulates the events described in Exo 14:23–29, namely that after Pharaoh and his hosts *had entered* the Red Sea, God brought back the waters and made them drown.

- (11) Num 12:1–2: Num 12:1–2: In Num 12:1, the Biblical narrative informs the reader that Miriam (Moses' sister) and Aaron (Moses' brother) complained that Moses *had taken* a Cushite woman for a wife.
- (12) Exo 34:1–28, Deu 5:1, Deu 9:12–19. Moses called his people (Deu 5:1) and repeated to them all the laws and judgements of God. He recalled the moment he went up to Mount Sinai (see Exo 34:1–28) for the second time to receive the second set of the Tablets of the Law. He beseeched God to have mercy on the children of Israel, because God *had become furious* because of their sinning against him.
- (13) Exo 32:1–4, Exo 32:9–13, Deu 5:1, Deu 9:12–21. Moses called his people (Deu 5:1) and repeated all the laws and judgements of God. He recalled the moment when, in the time he went up into Mount Sinai to receive from God the Ten Commandments, the Israelites cast a golden calf as an idol for their worship under the leadership of Aaron (Exo 32:1–4). Moses beseeched and pleaded with God that they be spared (Exo 32:11–13) when he learned that God *had become angry* with Aaron and had decided to destroy Aaron and the people of Israel (Exo 32:9–10).
- (14) Deu 24:1–4. The initial part of Deu 24 describes the right of divorce. In particular, it explains that a divorced woman whom another man *had taken* for a wife and whose marriage to that man had later also ended through divorce or through his death, cannot then marry her first husband again because she is in disgrace.

The main function the adduced examples have in common is that they all refer to an action that took place earlier than another past action.¹¹ In addition,

11 The only uncertainty might lie in the interpretation of the use of NWKar. *alybedim* in example 1 (Exo 12:19). The past event which succeeds chronologically the event expressed with the *-p edi* past form appears in Exo 12:17, i.e. two verses before the *-p edi* form itself is used: *Da has[tala]tty Adonaj oşol par'onu {ullu hastabyqlar} [byla] da oşol elin iivün[ün] Saraj ücün qatyny ücün Avramnyn* 'And the Lord made Pharaoh and the people of his house [sick with] {great diseases} because of Sarai, Abram's wife.' (ADub.III.73: 17 r°, see Németh 2021). However, one pivotal circumstance is that from the perspective of the speaker (i.e., Pharaoh), there is a causal link between the fact that he had taken Sarah for a wife and (hence) God's smiting him with plagues and the actual succession of events leaves no doubts. In general, the past events that are related to each other do not have to appear in the same utterance, see, for instance, Juldašev's work (1965: 194) for respective examples in the Turkic languages.

all the *-p edi-* forms listed above refer to completed actions¹² and they are primarily employed in narrative contexts. Used in conjunction with the simple past forms, the construction's role is to shift the time-frame of the narrative backwards in time (to be then followed, again, by simple past forms operating in the anterior time-frame). In other words, the *-dy* simple past is guided by chronology, whereas the *-p edi-* tense refers to relative chronology.

The above philological data suggest that the semantic scope of the WKar. *-p edi-* past tense should not be defined on the basis of so-called *focality* – a notion that Johanson (1999: 176, 2000: 110, 121) considers to be key to describing the *-p edi-* past in the Kipchak Turkic languages. In Johanson's view, the semantic range of this construction is “restricted to what is still relevant of the event” from the respective point of view (i.e., it is a “focal” category). To exemplify that, he quotes the semantic opposition of Krch. “*ketib edi* ‘had left (and was still gone)’ or ‘was gone’ vs. *ketgen edi* ‘had gone’ [...]” (Johanson 2000: 120–121), in which *ketib edi* is defined as a *focal* (“+FOC”) form, whereas *ketgen edi* is supposed to be its *nonfocal* (“–FOC”) counterpart.¹³ As we see, however, this mental category has little relevance to the Karaim *-p edi-* forms: some of them behave, so to speak, in compliance with the above juxtaposition (such as, for instance the use of *qalybedi* ‘had ceased’ in example 2); some of them, in turn, convey exactly the opposite meaning, see *barybedi* ‘had gone’ meaning, after adding the context to it, ‘had gone and returned some time ago’ in example 4. Csató (2000: 746) states that in Karaim “focality oppositions which are so central in other Turkic languages are lost both in non-anteriority and anteriority”, which, in her view, “may be the result of a process of simplification, which is partly due to the fact that Karaim has ceased to be used as a full-fledged vernacular.” Since the latter observation was based on modern data, it is worth

12 This accords with the basic meaning of the WKar. *-p* converb which denotes an action that is finished, see A. Zajęczkowski's description edited by Németh (2013: 217–218, 134–136).

13 It is, however, not entirely clear how *focal* the Kipchak *-p edi* forms are from Johanson's perspective. In Johanson (1999: 176) he considers them to be “of lower focality” and quotes Krch. *ölüb edi* ‘had died’ as an example, but in Johanson (2000: 110) the same construction is described as “high-focal”, without any reference to his article of 1999 and a Karachay example, namely *ketib edi* ‘was gone’, is given here, too. The same is the case with the Tk. *-ğan edi* construction: he considers it “nonfocal” in Johanson (2000: 120–121), but then it is classified as “of lower focality” in Johanson (1999: 178). What makes Johanson's analysis less compliant with a discussion based on philological data is that in his highly theoretical works the respective verbal forms are adduced and defined without documenting the context, i.e. without providing entire utterances (see, e.g., Johanson 1995, 1999, 2000). This gives rise to situations such as, for instance, both Kzk. *kelip edi* and Kzk. *kelgen edi* being translated as ‘had come’ in an article devoted to the specific features of these grammatical categories (see Johanson, 1999: 178, 179).

stressing that the data analysed here stems from a time period when Karaim was still a fully-fledged vernacular.

A comparison of the verses analysed above with their equivalents in the other available Western (and Eastern) Karaim translations of the Torah allowed us to make the following observation: In the vast majority of cases in which no *-p edi-* forms were used in the respective verses it is the (purely temporal) *-dy* simple past tense that was applied by the translators (see tables 2, 4). This demonstrates the semantic similarity between these two tenses, while bearing in mind the reservations noted above.

However, none of the forms listed above express habitual events, which is especially noteworthy in light of the two South-Western Karaim verb forms presented in Németh (2015: 222; see examples 15, 16 below) that are used for repeated and habitual events, i.e. for events usually expressed by the WKar. *-r edi-* imperfect tense forms. This seems to be an anomaly in light of the fact that such use of the *-p edi-* past is alien to other Turkic languages. In Németh (2015) we refrained from giving a definite answer to the question of how these two forms relate semantically to the other five examples in which the role of the *-p edi-* forms was exactly the same as it is in sentences 1–14 above. However, having now much more reliable data at our disposal, let us take a closer look at these two forms once more and propose a contact-linguistic explanation of this phenomenon.

Firstly, let us remind the reader that examples 15 and 16 were found in a notebook of Józef Sulimowicz, in which he gathered Karaim linguistic material from other native speakers and supplemented it with his own observations and explanations.

(15) *barybedim*

Buvalo barybedim mamaba saharha. (Sulimowicz 1969)

Buvalo ¹⁴	bar-yb=e-di-m	mama-ba	sahar-ha.
it.used.to.happen	go-CVB=be-PST-1SG	mama-INSTR	town-DAT

'It used to happen that I went with mama to the town.'

14 < Ukr. *бувало* 'it used to happen (used for expressing that an event used to happen repeatedly, though irregularly)'.

TABLE 2 The WKar. *-p edi-* forms and their Hebrew and Karaim equivalents in other sources

Ex. no.	Verse no.	ADub.III.73	TKow.01	JSul.III.01	BSMS 288	Mickiewicz & Rojecki (1889)
(1)	Gen 12:19	<i>alybedim</i>	<i>alybedim</i>	<i>aldym</i> (simple past)	<i>alyp edim</i>	<i>alajejzdim</i> (simple past)
(2)	Gen 18:11	<i>qalybedi</i>	<i>qalybedi</i>	<i>qalybedi</i>	<i>tyjylyp edi</i>	<i>qaldy</i> (simple past)
(3)	Gen 20:18	<i>beklebedi</i>	<i>beklābedi</i>	<i>beklebedi</i>	<i>tyjyp edi</i>	<i>beklabedi</i>
(4)	Gen 24:62	<i>barybedi</i>	deest	deest	deest	deest
(5)	Gen 26:18	<i>atady</i> (simple past)	<i>atabedi</i>	<i>atabedi</i>	<i>atady</i> (simple past)	<i>atady</i> (simple past)
(6)	Exo 15:9	<i>ajtybedi</i>	<i>ajtybedi</i>	<i>ajtybedi</i>	<i>ajtty</i> (simple past)	—
(7)	Exo 21:8	<i>belgil[e]di</i> (simple past)	<i>belgilebedi</i>	<i>belgilebedi</i>	<i>kelišti</i> (simple past)	—
(8)	Deu 9:25	<i>ajtybedi</i>	<i>ajtybedi</i>	<i>ajtybedi</i>	<i>ajtty</i> (simple past)	—
(9)	Gen 28:18	<i>qojdu</i> (simple past)	<i>qojdu</i> (simple past)	<i>qojubedi</i>	<i>qojdy</i> (simple past)	<i>qojdu</i> (simple past)
(10)	Exo 15:19	<i>keldi</i> (simple past)	<i>keldi</i> (simple past)	<i>kelibedi</i>	<i>keldi</i> (simple past)	—
(11)	Num 12:1	<i>aldy</i> (simple past)	<i>aldy</i> (simple past)	<i>alybedi</i>	<i>aldy</i> (simple past)	—
(12)	Deu 9:19	<i>ačuvlandy</i> (simple past)	<i>ačuvlandy</i> (simple past)	<i>qaḡhirlenibedi</i>	<i>ačuvlandy</i> (simple past)	—
(13)	Deu 9:20	<i>ačuvlandy</i> (simple past)	<i>ačuvlandy</i> (simple past)	<i>acuvlanybedi</i>	<i>ačuvlandy</i> (simple past)	—
(14)	Deu 24:3	<i>aldy</i> (simple past)	<i>aldy</i> (simple past)	<i>alybedi</i>	<i>aldy</i> (simple past)	—

(16) *ystyrynybediler*

Kacanes, davno Karajlar ystyrynybediler zerette. (Sulimowicz 1969)

Kacan-es¹⁵ davno¹⁶ Karaj-lar ystyryn-yb= e-di-ler zeret-te.
 when-PTCL long.ago Karaim-PL assemble-CVB=be-PST-3PL cemetery-LOC

'Formerly, long ago, Karaims used to assemble at the cemetery.'

15 SWKar. *kacanes* 'formerly, once' is built on the basis of Slavonic pattern, i.e. *kacan* 'when' + *-es* (<Pol. *-ś*, Ukr. *-сь* id.) particle building indefinite pronouns, cf. Pol. *kiedyś* 'formerly, once'.

16 < Ukr. *давно* 'long ago', Pol. *dawno* id., Russ. *давно* id.

In both sentences the informant, more precisely Rachela Eszwowicz (born 1869, died 1946), refers to actions that took place in the distant past. In sentence no. 16 this is explicitly indicated by the use of the adverb *davno* 'long ago', but in the case of example no. 15 we must place the content of this utterance in the context of the following genealogical facts: Rachela's mother, Salomea Eszwowicz was born in 1837 and died in 1903 (Anna Sulimowicz, personal communication on 02 Jan 2019), whereas Rachela was the only one of Salomea's three children who lived to be an adult. Rachela was the half-sister of Józef Sulimowicz's mother and she was one of the oldest members of the Karaim community of Halych at the time when, in 1933, Józef Sulimowicz enrolled at the University of Warsaw to study Turkology (see Sulimowicz, A. 2013: 5). This means that it was in the early 1930s, i.e., ca. 30 years after the death of Rachela's mother, when Józef Sulimowicz had the opportunity to record Rachela's linguistic material (later, in 1969, this material was copied in Józef Sulimowicz's notebook). Thus, in example 15 the respective event is recalled after the passing of at least 30 years.

A reference to the distant past is, however, certainly not an intrinsic semantic component of the Tk. *-p edi-* tense. In the Turkic languages this feature is rather implied by the context and is a semantic concomitant of its pluperfective role. In Western Karaim the appearance of this role was, in our view, a result of the influence of the Polish verbal system: although Polish pluperfect was typically used to express a past action that preceded another past action, less dominantly it also denoted actions that took place in the distant past (Klemensiewicz & Lehr-Splawiński & Urbańczyk 1955: 373; Klemensiewicz 2002: 620), regardless of its perfective or imperfective meaning.¹⁷ This mirrors the semantic scope of the above South-Western Karaim forms. Our assumption is all the more valid as the Polish language unquestionably had an impact on Rachela Eszwowicz's idiolect – just as it had a strong influence on South-Western Karaim in general, see, e.g. Németh (2010; 2011a: 62–76; 2022 (forthcoming)).

The latter data might also suggest that – at least, to be on the safe side, in Rachela Eszwowicz's idiolect – the main semantic component of the Karaim *-p edi-* past was intended to convey the anterior character of an action in relation to another past action, regardless of the fact of whether the action was habitual

17 Even though South-Western Karaim was shaped also by other Slavonic languages, we have mainly concentrated here on Polish because the Russian pluperfect disappeared well before the oldest Karaim manuscripts analysed in this paper were written (Matthews 1975: 208). On the other hand, although it continued to remain a productive category in spoken Ukrainian for a somewhat longer time, it did not perform the function of expressing actions performed in the distant past (Medvedjev 1955: 176–178).

or non-habitual in its nature. Note, that even though both sentences are quoted out of context, in each case we can safely say that the relevant actions that “had been performed in distant past” are logically contrasted with the state of their not being performed both in the recent past and at the moment of speaking.

4.2 *The Relation of WKar. -p edi- to the -ġan edi- Pluperfect*

It is already Johanson (1999: 178–179) who wrote that the “functional difference” between the *-ġan edi-* and *-p edi-* forms in the Kipchak languages is “subtle” (he refrained from discussing it in the cited paper). But what makes a proper comparison of the two Western Karaim pluperfects even more difficult is that we know of only a few 18th- and early 19th-century forms that could formally be interpreted as the *-ġan edi-* pluperfect.

The fact is that forms like *aryġan edi* (see sentence 17 below) can morphologically be interpreted in two ways: on the one hand, as the 3rd person *-ġan edi-* pluperfect form of *ary-* ‘to become tired’ or, on the other, as the word *aryġan* ‘tired’, formally a *-ġan* participle of the above-mentioned verb (lemmatized in KarRPS 77), used with the simple past form of the copular verb *e-* ‘to be’. We must be aware of this syncretism during our analysis and we believe that some of the 18th–19th century *-ġan edi-* forms we found actually functioned as predicative nominals rather than as verbal predicates.¹⁸

But, first, let us take a look at this linguistic material in its entirety:

(17) *aryġan edi* (Gen 25:29)

- a) *Da biširdi Ja’aqov aš da keldi ‘Esav ol tüzďan da oledi aryġan.* (ADub.III.73: 38 r^o; TKow.01: 40 r^o)

Da	bišir-di-Ø	Ja’aqov	aš-Ø	da	kel-di-Ø
And	cook-PST-3SG	Jacob	food-INDEF.ACC	and	come-PST-3SG
‘Esav	ol	tüz-ďan	da	ol	
Esau	ART	field-ABL	and	he	
e-di-Ø		ary-ġan.			
be-PST-3SG		become.tired-PTCP			

‘And Jacob was cooking food, and Esau came from the field, and he was exhausted.’

¹⁸ We are also restrained by the fact that if we are to contrast their use accurately, the linguistic material must originate from the period when both pluperfects were still productive categories, preferably the Middle Western Karaim (i.e., before the early 19th century) period (Modern Western Karaim data is discussed in the final chapter of this paper). Seen in this light, we are fortunate to have at least some data at our disposal.

- b) *Da bisirdi Ja'aqov as da keldi 'Esav ol tizden da ol aryğan edi.* (JSul.III.01: 26 v^o)

Da	bisir-di-Ø	Ja'aqov	as-Ø	da	kel-di-Ø
and	cook-PST-3SG	Jacob	food-INDEF.ACC	and	come-PST-3SG
'Esav	ol	tiz-den	da	ol	ary-ğan-Ø
Esau	ART	field-ABL	and	he	become.tired-PTCP
e-di-Ø.					
be-PST-3SG					

'And Jacob was cooking food, and Esau came from the field, and he was exhausted.'

- (18) *tutqunlangan edilər* (Gen 39:20)

- a) *Da aldy biji Josefnin any da berdi any ol zyndan üvğa orunğa ki tutqunlary ol bijnin tutqunlangan edilər da edi anda ol zyndan üvdä.* (ADub.III.73: 65 r^o; TKow.01: 67 r^o)

Da	al-dy-Ø	bij-i	Josef-nin	a-ny
and	take-PST-3SG	lord-3SG.POSS	Joseph-GEN	he\ACC
da	ber-di-Ø	a-ny	zyndan.üv-ğa	
and	give-PST-3SG	he\ACC	prison-DAT	
orun-ğa	ki	tutqun-lar-y	ol	bij-nin
place-DAT	which	prisoner-PL-3SG.POSS	ART	lord-GEN
tutqunlan-ğan	e-di-ılar	da		
be.imprisoned-PTCP	be-PST-3PL	and		
e-di-Ø	anda	ol	zyndan.üv-ďä.	
be-PST-3SG	there	ART	prison-LOC	

'And Joseph's lord took him, and put him in prison, a place where the lord's prisoners were imprisoned, and he was there in the prison.'

- b) *Da aldy biji Josefnin any da berdi any ol zyndan ivge orunğa ki tutqunlanganlary ol melehnin tutqunlangan ediler da edi anda ol zyndan ivde.* (JSul.III.01: 44 r^o)

Da	al-dy-Ø	bij-i	Josef-nin	a-ny
and	take-PST-3SG	lord-3SG.POSS	Joseph-GEN	he\ACC
da	ber-di-Ø	a-ny	zyndan.iv-ge	
and	give-PST-3SG	he\ACC	prison-DAT	

orun-ğa	ki	tutqunlan-ğan-lar-y	ol
place-DAT	which	be.imprisoned-PTCP-PL-3SG.POSS	ART
meleḥ-nin	tutqunlan-ğan	e-di-ler	
king-GEN	be.imprisoned-PTCP	be-PST-3PL	
da	e-di-Ø	anda	ol
and	be-PST-3SG	there	ART
		zyndan.iv-de.	
		prison-LOC	

‘And Joseph’s lord took him, and put him in prison, a place where the lord’s prisoners were imprisoned, and he was there in the prison.’

The word form *tutqunlangan ediġar* ‘were imprisoned’ is repeated two more times in exactly the same textual and grammatical context in Gen 40:3 (in the singular form *tutqunlangan edi*) and Gen 40:5 – in mss. ADub.III.73 (65 v^o), TKow.01 (67 v^o), and JSul.III.01 (44 r^o, 44 v^o). We refrain from repeating such data here.

(19) *quṣurajmağan edi* (Exo 12:39)

Da biṣirdılar oşol ol ḥamurnu ki çyğardylar Micridan jajmalar macalar ki quṣurajmağan edi ki sürüldüler Micriden da bolalmadylar keçikme da dağyn azyqta qylmadylar özleriña. (ADub.III.73: 106 r^o–106 v^o)

Da	biṣir-di-ġar	oşol	ol	ḥamur-nu
and	bake-PST-3PL	ART	ART	unleavened.dough-ACC
ki	çyğar-dy-lar	Micri-đan		
which	pull.out-PST-3PL	Egypt-ABL		
jajma-lar		maca-lar-Ø		ki
cake-PL		unleavened.bread-PL-INDEF.ACC		which
quṣuraj-ma-ğan		e-di-Ø		ki
leaven-NEG-PTCP		be-PST-3SG		because
sürül-dü-ler	Micri-den	da		bolal-ma-dy-lar
be.driven-PST-3PL	Egypt-ABL	and		be.able-NEG-PST-3PL
keçik-me	da	dağyn		azyq-ta
delay-AN	and	also		provision-INT
qyl-ma-dy-lar	öz-leriñ-a.			
prepare-NEG-PST-3PL	OWN-3PL.POSS\DAT			

‘And they baked unleavened dough which they brought out of Egypt: cakes of unleavened bread, because it was not leavened, because they were driven out of Egypt and could not delay, and they also had not prepared provisions for themselves.’

(20) *titinlengen edi* (Exo 19:18)

Da tavy Sinajnyn titinlengen edi barysy anyn ücün ki endi anyn istine şeḥi-nasy H-nyn ot byla da kötirildi titini anyn titini kibik ol kirec pecnin da qal-trady bar ol tav astry. (JSul.III.01: 79 r^o)

Da and	tav-y mountain-3SG.POSS	Sinaj-nyn Sinai-GEN	titinlen-gen be.smoked-PTCP
e-di-Ø be-PST-3SG	bary-sy all-3SG.POSS	a-nyn that\GEN	ücün about
ki because		en-di-Ø descend-PST-3SG	a-nyn it\GEN
šeḥina-sy divine.Presence-3SG.POSS		H-nyn Lord-GEN	ist-in-e top-3SG.POSS\DAT
		ot fire	byla with
da and	kötiril-di-Ø ascend-PST-3SG	titin-i smoke-3SG.POSS	a-nyn it\GEN
			titin-i smoke-3SG.POSS
kibik like	kirec lime	pec-nin kiln-GEN	da and
qaltra-dy-Ø tremble-PST-3SG	bar whole	ol ART	tav mountain
			astrý. very

'And Mount Sinai was all smoke, because the Lord's divine Presence descended on it in fire. And the smoke of it ascended like the smoke of a lime kiln, and the whole mount trembled greatly.'

The question of which of the above *-ġan edi-* forms are finite forms and which are to be treated as nominal predications poses something of a challenge. Not only the context, but also the equivalents of the *-ġan edi-* forms in the standard Hebrew Bible, as well as the nominal predicative forms serving as their counterparts in some of the North-Western and Eastern Karaim translations of the Bible (see Table 3) point rather to nominal predication and the absence of a pluperfective meaning in the case of examples 17 and 18 (as well as in verses Gen 40:3 and 40:5, in which the form attested in example 18 is repeated). With respect to the form *tutqunlangan edilár* in example 18 above, we should also mention that the alternative nominal predicative form would be *tutqunlan-ġan-lar e-di-lár* 'were imprisoned' (= be.imprisoned-PTCP-PL + be-PST-3PL), with the *-lar* plural also attached to the participial form, which

would then evidently be a copula form. But the use of the additional plural suffix is not obligatory in this case and thus its absence in other forms is not decisive. Secondly, it is worth emphasizing – even though it should not be treated as a decisive argument, either – that in the Eastern Karaim ms. BSMS 288 as well as in the North Western Karaim translation of Genesis published by Mickiewicz & Rojecki (1889) in verses Gen 25:29, Gen 39:20, Gen 40:3, and Gen 40:5 the present tense copula suffix forms are used to express the meaning that the *-ğan edi-* past tense form was meant to convey in ADub.III.73. These forms, which are also presented in Table 3, are as follows: EKar. *ary-ğan-Ø* ‘is tired’ (= become.tired-PTCP-3SG.COP; BSMS 288: 29 r^o), *tutqun-durlar* ‘are prisoners’ (= prisoner-3PL.COP; BSMS 288: 44 v^o), *tutqun-dur* ‘is a prisoner’ (= prisoner-3SG.COP; BSMS 288: 44 v^o), *tutqun-dyrlar* ‘are prisoners’ (= prisoner-3PL.COP; BSMS 288: 44 v^o), see Jankowski et al (2019: 39, 66, 67, respectively), and Mod.NWKar. *ary-ğan-Ø* ‘is tired’ (= become.tired-PTCP-3SG.COP; Mickiewicz & Rojecki 1889: 31), *tutħunlan-ğan-Ø* (= be.imprisoned-PTCP-3SG.COP; Mickiewicz & Rojecki 1889: 51), and *tutħunlan-ğan-lar* (= be.imprisoned-PTCP-3PL.COP; Mickiewicz & Rojecki 1889: 51).

The situation is somewhat different in case of the forms used in sentences 19 and 20. After consulting the context, the structure of the original Hebrew text, and the Karaim equivalents used in other manuscripts they can still be interpreted in two ways: as nominal predicates and as pluperfective verbal forms. However, one interesting observation in this context is that the *-ğan edi-* past form *qužurajmağan edi* (28), which features in manuscript ADub.III.73, was replaced by the same copyist and author (i.e. by Simcha ben Chananel), with the nominal predicative construction *tivül-Ø qužur-Ø* ‘is not leavened’ (= is.not.3SG.COP + leavened; TKow.01: 110 v^o) in manuscript TKow.01, while in Eastern Karaim BSMS 288 it is the *-p edi-* pluperfect (see example 23) that is used in the very same context. Hence, the use of the negative suffix *-ma-* in ADub.III.73 (instead of the negative particle *tivül*) suggests the need to treat example 29 as a *-ğan edi-* pluperfect.

Thus, if we compare the limited available material with the role which the *-ğan edi-* past plays in the Turkic linguistic world – see, above all else, Juldašev’s (1965: 167–184) analysis for an exhaustive description (without, however, any Karaim data being adduced) – it seems valid to speculate that the *-ğan edi-* pluperfect was employed to express a single, completed event, or a state which resulted from a completed action, which took place prior to another action in the past.

In other words, the *-p edi-* pluperfect apparently functioned as a narrative past, whereas the *-ğan edi-* pluperfect was primarily marked with a resultative and perfective shade of meaning. For this reason, depending on which

TABLE 3 The WKar. *-gan* *edi*-forms and their Hebrew and Karaim equivalents in other sources

	Biblical Hebrew	ADub.111.73	TKow.01	JSul.111.01	BSMS 288	Mickiewicz & Rojecki (1889)
Gen 25:29	עָיֵף <i>ʾəyēp</i> '[was] weary, faint' (ADJ, MASC, SG)	<i>edi aryġan</i>	<i>edi aryġan</i>	<i>aryġan edi</i>	<i>aryġan</i>	<i>aryġan</i>
Gen 39:20	מְסֻרִים <i>ʾəsūrīm</i> '[were] confined' (PASS.PTCP, MASC, PL)	<i>tutqunlangan edilär</i>	<i>tutqunlangan edilär</i>	<i>tutqunlangan ediler</i>	<i>tutqundurlar</i>	<i>tutħunlan-dylar</i>
Gen 40:3	מְסֻרִים <i>ʾəsūrīm</i> '[was] confined' (PASS.PTCP, MASC, SG)	<i>tutqunlangan edi</i>	<i>tutqunlangan edi</i>	<i>tutqunlangan edi</i>	<i>tutqundur</i>	<i>tutħunlangan</i>
Gen 40:5	מְסֻרִים <i>ʾəsūrīm</i> '[were] confined' (PASS.PTCP, MASC, PL)	<i>tutqunlangan edilär</i>	<i>tutqunlangan edilär</i>	<i>tutqunlangan ediler</i>	<i>tutqundylar</i>	<i>tutħunlanganlar</i>
Exo 12:39	עָנֵף <i>ʾənēf</i> 'was not leaved' (PERF, 3SG.MASC)	<i>qužurajmaġan edi</i>	<i>tivvil qužur</i>	<i>tivil qužurıġan</i>	<i>äččimäjp edi</i>	—
Exo 19:18	עָנֵף <i>ʾənēf</i> 'smoked; was in smoke' (PERF, 3SG.MASC)	<i>tiütinlendi</i>	<i>tiütinlendi</i>	<i>tiütinlengen ediler</i>	<i>tiütinlendi</i>	—

semantic component of the *-p edi-* past was foregrounded by the speakers, it was either the *-dy* simple past or the *-ġan edi-* past or even the *-r edi-* imperfect (used to denote habitual, progressive actions in the past – in contrast to the *-ġan edi-* past, which was restricted to single and completed events) that gradually replaced it in the finite verbal system.



Finally, it is ought to mention that the use of the pluperfect constructions in the Western Karaim translations of the Torah bears no relation to the Hebrew forms used in the original. Firstly, as a grammatical category the pluperfect is alien to Biblical Hebrew. Secondly, the Hebrew equivalents of the Karaim forms adduced above can appear both with and without a waw-consecutive, see, e.g. וָקַח *wāqqah* ‘so I might have taken’ (Gen 12:19) in example 1 and וָהָיָה *hādālah* ‘had passed being’ (Gen 18:11) in sample 2.

4.3 Comparative Eastern Karaim Data

We should begin by pointing out that we found no examples of the EKar. *-ġan edi-* pluperfect (see its description by Prik 1976: 134–135) in the translation of the Torah edited by Jankowski et al. (2019). But one viewpoint that tallies with our above observations was that recently forwarded by Jankowski (2019: xx) with reference to EKar. *-p edi-* forms documented in this manuscript. In his view, this category “expresses action in the past related to another subsequent action or point of view, similarly to the past perfect.” As far as the verses analysed above are concerned, in ms. BSMS 288 the discussed verbal construction is used in examples 1–3, see:¹⁹

- (1) *Nučün aġttny qyz qardaşymdyr ol da alyp edim any özümä hatqnllyqqa da endi muna hatynny al da ket.* ‘Why did you say, ‘She is my sister,’ so that *I had taken* her for my wife? Now then, here is your wife. Take her and go.’ (Gen 12:19)
- (2) *Da Avraham da Sara qartlar jetkänlär künlärgä tyjylyp edi bolma Sarağa töräsincä hatynlarnyň.* ‘And Abraham and Sarah were old, advanced in days. *It had ceased* to be with Sarah according to the custom of women.’ (Gen 18:11)
- (3) *Ki tyjma tyjyp edi H [ačmaġin] barča qursaqnny [evinä Avimelehnij] säbäbi uçun Saranyň hatyny Avraha{m}nyň.* ‘For the Lord *had* surely

¹⁹ Given that the present article is devoted primarily to Western Karaim – and also so as to comply with the length restrictions set by the editors – the Eastern Karaim linguistic material is presented without a morpheme-by-morpheme analysis.

closed all the [apertures of the] wombs of [the house of Abimelech] because of Sarah, Abraham's wife.' (Gen 20:18)

The Pentateuch copied in that particular manuscript contains a further ten examples of the *-p edi*- construction:

- (21) [...] *Da barča terägi ol jerniñ bolmasthan burun jerdä da barča otu ol tüzniñ bitmästän burun ki jajdyrmajyp edi H Tägrä ol yer üstünä da adam joq edi iślämä ol jerni, [...]* '[...] And when no bush of the field was yet in the land and no grass of the field had yet grown, because the Lord God **had not caused it to rain** on the land, and there was no man to work the ground, [...]' (Gen 2:5)
- (22) *Da Avimeleḥ juvyqlašmajyp edi aḥar da aḥitty.* 'But Abimelech **had not approached** her, and he said:' (Gen 20:4)
- (23) *Da edi nečik ki tavustu Jičḥaq alğyšlama šol Ja'aqovny da edi tek čyqma čygyp edi Ja'aqov qatyndan jüzläriniñ Jičḥaq atasiniñ da 'Esav qardaşy keldi avlamağyndan.* 'As soon as Isaac had finished blessing Jacob, when Jacob **had** scarcely *gone* out from the presence of Isaac his father, Esau his brother came in from his hunting.' (Gen 27:30)
- (24) *Birgäsinä kimniñ ki tapsaḥ šol Tägräniñ tirilmäsin qaršysyna qardaşlarymyznnyñ tanyğyn özüñä nedir birgämizgä da alğyn özüñä da bilmädi Ja'aqov ki Raḥel oğurlap edi alarny.* 'Anyone with whom you find your gods will not live. In the presence of our brothers point out what I have that is yours, and take it.' But Jacob did not know that Rachel **had stolen** them.' (Gen 31:32)
- (25) *Atam ant berip edi maḥa muna men ölärmän zerätimdä ki qazdym özüñä jerindä Kena'anynyñ anda kömgin meni da endi čyğajym endi da kömäjim šol atamny da qajtajym.* 'My father **had made me swear**, "Behold, I die. In my grave which I have dug for myself in the land of Canaan: bury me there." And now let I go up and bury my father, and let me return.' (Gen 50:5)
- (26) *Da symarladylar Josef uçun demä atañ symarlap edi ölmäsindän burun demä.* 'And they ordered [a messenger] to Joseph, saying, "Your father **had commanded** before dying, saying:"' (Gen 50:16)
- (27) *Da piširdilər šol ḥamurny ki čygardylar Mysyrdan kömäčlär mačalar ki äččimäjp edi ki sürüldilər Mysyrdan da bolaj almadylar kečkmä da dağyn azyq qylmadylar özlärinä.* 'And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought out of Egypt, for it **had not leavened**; because they were driven away out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any provisions.' (Exo 12:39)

TABLE 4 The EKar. *-p edi-* forms and their Hebrew and Karaim equivalents in other sources

Ex. no.	Verse no.	ADub.III.73	TKow.01	JSul.III.01	BSMS 288	Mickiewicz & Rojecki (1889)
(1)	Gen 12:19	<i>alybedim</i>	<i>alybedim</i>	<i>aldym</i> (simple past)	<i>alyp edim</i>	<i>alajezdim</i> (simple past)
(2)	Gen 18:11	<i>qalybedi</i>	<i>qalybedi</i>	<i>qalybedi</i>	<i>tyjylyp edi</i>	<i>qaldy</i> (simple past)
(3)	Gen 20:18	<i>beklebedi</i>	<i>beklābedi</i>	<i>beklebedi</i>	<i>tyjyp edi</i>	<i>beklābedi</i>
(21)	Gen 2:5	<i>javdu[rmady]</i> [simple past]	<i>javdurmady</i> (simple past)	<i>javdurmady</i> (simple past)	<i>jağdyrmajyp edi</i>	<i>javdurmagan edi</i> (pperf. I)
(22)	Gen 20:4	<i>juvumady</i> (simple past)	<i>juvumady</i> (simple past)	<i>juvumady</i> (simple past)	<i>juvyqlaşma-jyp edi</i>	<i>juvumady</i> (simple past)
(23)	Gen 27:30	<i>čyqty</i> (simple past)	<i>čyqty</i> (simple past)	<i>cyqty</i> (simple past)	<i>čygyp edi</i>	<i>čyħty</i> (simple past)
(24)	Gen 31:32	<i>urlady</i> (simple past)	<i>urlady</i> (simple past)	<i>urlady</i> (simple past)	<i>oğurlap edi</i>	<i>urlady</i> (simple past)
(25)	Gen 50:5	<i>antettirdi</i> (simple past)	<i>antettirdi</i> (simple past)	<i>ant ettirdi</i> (simple past)	<i>ant berip edi</i>	<i>ant ettirdi</i> (simple past)
(26)	Gen 50:16	<i>bujurdu</i> (simple past)	<i>bujurdu</i> (simple past)	<i>cava'a etti</i> (simple past)	<i>symarlap edi</i>	<i>ceva'a etti</i> (simple past)
(27)	Exo 12:39	<i>qužurajmağan edi</i> (pperf. I)	<i>tivül qužur</i> (predicative)	<i>tivil qužuraj-gan</i> (predicative)	<i>äččimäjp edi</i>	—
(28)	Exo 13:19	<i>antettirdi</i> (simple past)	<i>antettirdi</i> (simple past)	<i>ant ettirdi</i> (simple past)	<i>ant berip edi</i>	—
(29 ₁)	Deu 34:7	<i>tunmady</i> (simple past)	<i>tunmady</i> (simple past)	<i>tunmady</i> (simple past)	<i>sönükmäjp edi</i>	—
(29 ₂)	Deu 34:7	<i>sönmedi</i> (simple past)	<i>sönmedi</i> (simple past)	<i>senmedi</i> (simple past)	<i>solumajyp edi</i>	—

(28) *Da aldy Moše šol süjäklärin Josefniñ birgäsinä ki ant bermä ant berip edi oğlanlaryna Jisra'elniñ demä sağynma sağynsa Täñri sizni da čygargajsyz šol süjäklärimni mundan birgäñizgä.* 'And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, for *he had* solemnly *sworn* the sons of Israel, saying, "God will surely remember you, and you shall carry up my bones with you from here." (Exo 13:19)

- (29) *Da Moše jüz jigirmi yašar kiši edi ölgänindä sönükmäjip edi közü da solumajyp edi qyzyly janağynyň.* ‘Moses was a hundred and twenty years old when he died; his eye **had not dimmed** and the red colour of his cheeks **had not faded**.’ (Deu 34:7)²⁰

We found no Eastern Karaim examples expressing habitual events with EKar. *-p edi-* which, to a certain extent, tallies with our view regarding the contact-induced nature of the Western Karaim anomaly, given that Polish exerted no influence on Eastern Karaim.

5 Final Thoughts on Middle and Modern Western Karaim Pluperfects

As the linguistic material shows, both categories were already only moderately productive in the 18th century and became very rarely used in the 19th century. This chronology appears to follow precisely the same time frame as that marking the disappearance of the Polish *plusquamperfectum*: it was rendered obsolete in the 19th century and the early 20th century, but the process of its disappearance was already underway in the 18th century (Andersen 1987: 27; Klemensiewicz 2002: 620). The strong structural influence of Polish on Western Karaim, which also influenced the finite verb forms of the latter, is a fact (see it discussed, e.g., in Csató 1996, 2000; Németh 2010, 2011a: 62–76). Hence, it seems likely that both the weakening of the original system of Turkic pluperfects in Karaim and the anomalous evolution of the semantic scope of SWKar. *-bedi-* was due to the influence by the Polish adstratum. Seen in this light, quite telling is the fact that Mykolas Firkovičius, who was a native speaker of Karaim and Polish, with an excellent command of his native tongues (born 1924, died 2000), also left the *-ğan edi-* pluperfect undiscussed in his grammatical description (Firkovičius 1996). This suggests that Firkovičius perceived this verbal category as non-productive (nor did he discuss the *-p edi-* past in his grammar; apparently for the same reason). The only *-ğan edi-* verbal form we managed to find in this work is, in fact, described as a *-ğan* participle, see:

²⁰ As we see, there is no trace of the *-Vp edi-* > *-Vbedi-* change in ms. BSMS 288. The same is true for manuscript Gaster Hebrew MS 170, see e.g. *eri ki alyp edi any özüñä hatynlyqğa* ‘his man, who had taken her for himself for a wife’ (Deu 24:3), see Jankowski et al. (2019: 337, fn. 833) and example 14 above.

(30) *barhan edim*

Meñ šaharha barhan edim, anyn üčün sižğa kečiktim. (Firkovičius 1996: 109)

Meñ	šahar-ha	bar-han	e-di-m	a-nyn
I	town-DAT	go-PTCP	be-PST-1SG	it\GEN
üčün	siž-ğa	kečik-ti-m.		
about	you-DAT	be.late-PST-1SG		

'I went to the town, because of that I was late for you.'

In his grammar, Musaev (1964: 277) claims that the *-ğan edi-* past is rarely used, but the examples he adduces must be taken with a grain of salt: we managed to localize the original attestation of one of them, namely Mod.NWKar. ***šuvğan edim tuğalčamni* ***'I loved my beauty'* (Musaev 1964: 277), and it turned out that the actual fragment, documented by Kowalski (1929: 58), is *šuvār edim tuğalčamni* 'I used to love my beauty'. It is the second time we found proof of Musaev misquoting data in his grammar (see Németh 2013: 135); in this case he changed an *-r edi-* (imperfect) form into a *-ğan edi-* (pluperfect) form.

Csató (2000: 737) provides two late-20th-century examples, which show that, to certain extent, the *-ğan edi-* past continued to function, at least in some idiolects, as a productive category until recent times. However, the latter might be also true with respect to the *-p edi-* pluperfect, given that in the 1960-ies Józef Sulimowicz's interlocutors (and J. Sulimowicz himself) were aware of its existence (see Németh 2015: 225). Even more importantly, however, examples of the use of both pluperfect forms in the 20th century show that the appearance of these forms in 18th- and 19th-century Bible translations reflects their natural use in spoken Middle Western Karaim. The latter is also supported by the adduced Turkic comparative material.

Finally, one terminological remark is due. Since the *-ğan* past tends to be termed as preterite II (see, e.g., Pritsak 1959a: 335), from purely terminological point of view it would be perhaps more appropriate to term the *-ğan edi-* past as *plusquamperfectum II*, whereas it is the *-p edi-* past which should rather be termed *plusquamperfectum I*.

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). The task of preparing the transcription and the English translation of manuscript ADub.III.73 as well as the process of collecting the required linguistic data from it has been financed by the National Science Centre of Poland (Pol. *Narodowe Centrum Nauki*), research project agreement number UMO-2015/17/B/HS2/01498.

Editorial Symbols

[...]	missing portion of text
[abc]	damaged and reconstructed fragment
{abc}	interlineal or marginal addition in a manuscript by another hand
<i>abc > cba</i>	borrowing, internal development
<i>abc → cba</i>	derivation
<i>**abc</i>	nonexistent, hypothetical, or erroneous form

Abbreviations

ABL = ablative | **ACC** = accusative | **ADJ** = adjective | **AN** = action nominal | **arch.** = archaic. | **Arm.-Kipch.** = Armeno-Kipchak | **ART** = article | **BHeb.** = Biblical Hebrew | **COND** = conditional | **COP** = copula | **CVB** = *-p* converb | **DAT** = dative | **Deu** = Book of Deuteronomy | **EKar.** = Eastern Karaim | **Eng.** = English | **ex.** = example | **Exo** = Book of Exodus | **fn.** = footnote | **FUT** = future | **GEN** = genitive | **Gen** = Book of Genesis | **Heb.** = Hebrew | **IMP** = imperative | **INDEF** = indefinite | **INSTR** = instrumental (case) | **INT** = intensifying particle | **Kirg.** = Kirghiz | **Kmk.** = Kumyk | **Kklp.** = Karakalpak | **Krch.(-Blk.)** = Karachay(-Balkar) | **Kzk.** = Kazakh | **lit.** = literally | **LOC** = locative | **MASC** = masculine | **Mod.NWKar.** = Modern North-Western Karaim | **ms.** = manuscript | **mss.** = manuscripts | **NEG** = negative suffix | **Nog.** = Nogai | **NOM** = nominative | **NWKar.** = North-Western Karaim | **OPT** = optative | **PASS** = passive | **PERF** = perfect | **PERS** = personal ending | **PL** = plural | **Pol.** = Polish | **POSS** = possessive | **PPERF** = pluperfect | **PRED** = predicative | **PST** = simple (Tkc. *-dy*) past | **PTCL** = particle | **PTCP** = *-gan* participle | **Russ.** = Russian | **SG** = singular | **SWKar.** = South-Western Karaim | **Tkc.**

= Turkic | **Ukr.** = Ukrainian | **Uyg.** = Uyghur | **Uzb.** = Uzbek | **WKar.** = Western Karaim

References

Primary sources

- ADub.III.73 = A translation of the Torah, the Book of Ruth, the Book of Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes, and the Book of Esther into North-Western Karaim. The Torah was copied between 25 Mar 1720 and 31 May 1720, the other books were copied after 31 May 1720 and before 27 Mar 1723, in Kukizów by Simcha ben Chananel (died 27 Mar 1723). Stored in Warsaw in the private archive of the late Aleksander Dubiński (1924–2002) under the accession number ADub.III.73. 385 folios. Critically edited in Németh (2021).
- BSMS 288 = A translation of the Tanakh (without 1–2 Chronicles) into Eastern Karaim. Copied in four volumes in the 18th century. Volumes 1 and 4 (i.e., Pentateuch, The Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah) were critically edited in Jankowski et al. (2019). Stored in the Cambridge University Library under the accession number BSMS 288. 620 folios.
- Gaster Hebrew MS 170 = An Eastern Karaim translation of a large portion of the Torah (Genesis 1:1 – Deuteronomy 32:51) and the Book of Lamentations (4:11–5:22). Copied in the beginning of the 19th century. Stored in the John Rylands Library of The University of Manchester Library. Described by Jankowski (1997), its full text compared with BSMS 288 in Jankowski & Aqtay & Cegiółka & Çulha & Németh (2019). Full text available at: <https://luna.manchester.ac.uk/luna/servlet/s/a0jk2m> (accessed 4 Oct 2019). 265 folios.
- JSul.III.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 South-Western Karaim. Copied by Jeshua Josef Mordkowicz (1802–1884) in Halych in the 2nd half of the 19th century. Stored in Warsaw in the private archive of the late Józef Sulimowicz (1913–1973). 298 folios.
- Mickiewicz, Zacharjasz [= זכריה מיצכיוויץ] & Rojecki, Elijahu [= אליהו רואצקי] (transl.). 1889. הקראים קהלות בפי המורגלת קודש מקרא לבני קדרי ללשון מתורגם תורה חומשי חמשה ספר. 1889. רוסיה בגלילות הדריס. *Хамиша хумше тора, т. е., Пятикнижие Ветхаго Завета, переведенное на караимское нарѣчье посредствомъ Захарія Михайлова Мицкевича и Илья Исаева Роеукаго*. Vilnius.

Sulimowicz (1969) = A notebook of Józef Sulimowicz with notes in Polish on Karaim grammar and lexicography. Stored in the private archive of Józef Sulimowicz (1913–1973) in Warsaw.

TKow.01 = A translation of the Torah into North-Western Karaim. A partially vocalised sister manuscript of ADub.III.73 mistakenly described by Kowalski (1929: 289) and Zajączkowski (1939: 94) as a manuscript created in 1723 in Derażne. Copied by Simcha ben Chananel, the copyist of ADub.III.73; it was finished on 7 December 1722 A.D. Kept in Kraków in the private archive of the inheritors of the late Tadeusz Kowalski's (1889–1948) private archive. 351 folios.

Secondary sources

Andersen, Henning. 1987. From auxiliary to desinence. In: Harris, Martin & Ramat, Paolo (eds.), *Historical development of auxiliaries*, 21–51. [= *Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs* 35]. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Aqtay, Gülayhan. 2009. *Eliyahu ben Yosef Qulci's anthology of Crimean Karaim and Turkish literature. Critical edition with introduction, indexes and facsimile*. [= *Yıldız Dil ve Edebiyat Dizisi* 8]. Vol. 1–2. İstanbul: Eren Kitabevi.

Baskakov, Nikolaj Aleksandrovič & Zajączkowski, Ananiasz & Šapšal, Seraja Markovič (eds.). 1974. *Karaimsko-russko-poľskij slovar'. Słownik karaimsko-rosyjsko-polski*. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.

Benson, Joseph. 1857. *The Old Testament and New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. (According to the present authorized version.) With critical, explanatory, and practical notes: The marginal readings of the most approved printed copies of the New Testament with such others as appear to be countenanced by the original Greek: A copious collection of parallel texts; summaries of each book and chapter; and the date of every transaction and event recorded in this part of the sacred oracles, agreeably to the calculations of the most correct chronologers*. Vol. 1. New York: T. Carlton & J. Porter. [Available on-line, without page numbers indicated, at <https://biblehub.com/commentaries/>].

Berta, Árpád. 1998. West Kipchak Languages. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Ágnes (eds.), *The Turkic Languages*, 301–317. London, New York: Routledge.

Blagova, Galina Fedorovna. 1994. «Babur-Name». *Jazyk, pragmatika teksta, stil'. K istorii čagatajskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura RAN.

Csató Éva Ágnes. 1996. Some typological properties of North-Western Karaim in areal perspectives. In: Boretzky, Norbert & Enninger, Werner & Stolz, Thomas (eds.), *Areale, Kontakte, Dialekte. Sprache und ihre Dynamik in mehrsprachigen Situationen*, 68–83. [= *Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung* 24]. Bochum: Brockmeyer Verlag.

Csató Éva Ágnes. 1998. *Über die finiten Verbformen des gesprochenen Nordwest-Karaimischen*. In: Demir, Nurettin & Taube, Erika (eds.), *Turkologie heute – Tradition*

- und Perspektive*, 47–53. [= *Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica* 48]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Csató, Éva Ágnes. 2000. Some typological features of the viewpoint and tense system in spoken North-Western Karaim. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 723–751. [= *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 20–6]. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Çulha, Tülay. 2006. *Karaycanın Kısa Sözlüğü. Karayca–Türkçe Kısa Sözlük*. [= *Dil ve Edebiyat Dizisi* 6]. İstanbul: Sanat Kitabevi.
- Eckmann, János. 1966. *Chagatay Manual*. [= *Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series* 60]. Bloomington, IN: Mouton.
- Firkovičius, Mykolas. 1996. *Mieñ karajče ürianiam*. Vilnius: Danielius.
- Friedman, Richard Elliott. 2003. *The Bible with sources revealed. A new view into the Five Books of Moses*. New York: HarperOne.
- Grunin, Timofej Ivanovič. 1967. *Dokumenty na poloveckom jazyke XVI v. (sudebnye akty kamenec-podolskoj armjanskoj obščiny)*. [= *Pamjatniki pišmennosti vostoka* 3]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Gülsevin, Selma. 2016. *Karay Türklerinin Dili (Troki Dialekti)*. [= *Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları* 1165]. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Hahn, Reinhard F. 1998. Uyghur. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Ágnes (eds.), *The Turkic Languages*, 379–396. London, New York: Routledge.
- 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, Gülayhan & Cegiołka, Dorota & Çulha, Tülay & Németh, Michał, *The Crimean Karaim Bible. Volume 1: Critical edition of the Pentateuch, Five Scrolls, Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah*, ix–xxxix. [= *Turcologica* 119]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Jankowski, Henryk & Aqtay, Gülayhan & Cegiołka, Dorota & Çulha, Tülay & Németh, Michał. 2019. *The Crimean Bible. Vol. 1. Critical edition of the Pentateuch, Five Scrolls, Psalms, Proverbs, Ezra and Nehemiah. Vol. 2. Translation*. [= *Turcologica* 119]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Johanson, Lars. 1995. Mehrdeutigkeit in der türkischen Verbalkomposition. In: Erdal, Marcel & Tezcan, Semih (eds.), *Beläk Bitig: Sprachstudien für Gerhard Doerfer zum 75. Geburtstag*, 81–101. [= *Turcologica* 23]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Johanson, Lars. 1999. Typological notes on aspect and actionality in Kipchak Turkic. In: Werner, Abraham & Kulikov, Leonid (eds.), *Tense-aspect, transitivity and causativity. Essays in honour of Vladimir Nedjalkov*, 171–184. [= *Studies in Language Companion Series* 50]. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Johanson, Lars. 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.): *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 27–187. [= *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 20–6]. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

- Johanson, Lars. 2021. *Turkic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Juldašev, Achnef Achmetovič. A. 1965. *Analitičeskie formy glagola v tjurkskich jazykach*. Moskva: Nauka.
- KarRPS see Baskakov, Nikolaj Aleksandrovič & Zajączkowski, Ananiasz & Šapšal, Seraja Markovič (eds.) (1974).
- Klemensiewicz, Zenon & Lehr-Splawiński, Tadeusz & Urbańczyk, Stanisław. 1955. *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Klemensiewicz, Zenon. 2002. *Historia języka polskiego*. Warszawa [7th edition]: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Kocaoglu, Timur (in collaboration with Frikovičius, Mykolas). 2006. *Karay. The Trakai dialect*. [= *Languages of the World. Materials* 458]. München: Lincom.
- Kowalski, Tadeusz. 1929. *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki*. [= *Prace Komisji Orjentalistycznej Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności* 11]. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Matthews, William Kleesman. 1975. *Russian historical grammar*. London [reprint]: University of London.
- Medvedjev, Fedir Pylypovyč. 1955. *Istoryčna gramatyka ukrajinskoi moyi. Korotkyj narys. Častyna perša*. Charkiv: Charkivskýj deržavnyj universytet imeni O. M. Gořkogo.
- Musaev, Kenesbaj Musaevič. 1964. *Grammatika karaimskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Musaev, Kenesbaj Musaevič. 1977. *Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk karaimskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Nadžip, Ėmir Nadžipovič. 1960. *Sovremennyyj ujugurskij jazyk*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.
- Németh, Michał. 2010. O wpływach polskich na język Karaimów łuckich. *LingVaria* 5.2: 199–212.
- Németh, Michał. 2011a. *Unknown Lutsk Karaim letters in Hebrew script (19th–20th centuries). A critical edition*. [= *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 12]. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press.
- Németh, Michał. 2011b. *Zwięzła gramatyka języka zachodniokaraimskiego z ćwiczeniami*. [= *Prace Karaimoznawcze* 1]. Poznań: Katedra Studiów Azjatyckich.
- Németh, Michał. 2013. Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis. The original manuscript of *Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodniokaraimskim*. *Folia Orientalia* 50: 115–157.
- Németh, Michał. 2014. An early North-Western Karaim Bible translation from 1720. Part 1. The Torah. *Karaite Archives* 2: 109–141.
- Németh, Michał. 2015. A historical morphology of Western Karaim. The *-p edi* past tense in the south-western dialect. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 68/2: 215–228. DOI: 10.1556/062.2015.68.2.6.

- Németh, Michał. 2018. An early North-Western Karaim text copied before 1700. A linguist's contribution to the biography of Josef ha-Mashbir. *Almanach Karaimski* 7: 83–98.
- Németh, Michał. 2019. A historical morphology of Western Karaim. The *-a-d-*continuative in the north-western dialect. *International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics* 1/2: 268–308 DOI: 10.1163/25898833-12340017.
- Németh, Michał. 2020a. Gustaf Peringer's Karaim Biblical Material Revisited. A Linguistic Commentary on a Text Sample from 1691. In: Szczrybak, Magdalena & Tereszkiewicz, Anna (eds.). *Languages in contact and contrast. A Festschrift for Professor Elżbieta Mańczak-Wohlfeld on the occasion of her 70th birthday*, 295–309. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Németh, Michał. 2020b. *Middle Western Karaim. A critical edition and linguistic analysis of pre-18th-century Karaim interpretations of Hebrew piyyutim*. [= *Languages of Asia* 22]. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Németh, Michał. 2021. *The Western Karaim Torah. A critical edition of a manuscript from 1720* Vol. 1– 2. [= *Languages of Asia* 24]. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Németh, Michał. 2022 (forthcoming). Slavic impact on Karaim. Forthcoming in: Greenberg, Marc L. (editor-in-chief): *Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online*. Brill].
- Peake, Arthur S. (with the assistance of Grieve Alexander James) (eds.). 1920. *A commentary on the Bible*. New York, London: Thomas Nelson & Sons.
- Prik, Oľga Jakovlevna. 1976. *Očerki grammatiki karaimskogo jazyka (krymskij dialekt)*. Machačkala: Dagestanskij gosudarstvennyj universitet imeni V. I. Lenina.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. 1959a. Das Karaimische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.), *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. Vol. 1, 318–340. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. 1959b. Das Kiptschakische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.), *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. Vol. 1, 74–87. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. 1959c. Das Neuigurische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.), *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. Vol. 1, 525–563. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Rentzsch, Julian. 2005. *Aspekt im Neuigurischen*. [= *Turcologica* 65]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Rentzsch, Julian. 2019. Review of the cumulative habilitation treatise *A history of the Karaim language during the period from the second half of the 17th century up to the second half of the 19th century (based on an analysis of newly discovered written sources)* by Dr. Michał Németh. Mainz (8 September 2019).
- Schönig, Claus. 1997. *Finite Prädikationen und Textstruktur im Babur-name (Heiderabad-Kodex)*. [= *Turcologica* 31]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

- Seegmiller, Steve. 1996. *Karachay*. [= *Languages of the World. Materials* 109]. München, Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Sulimowicz, Anna. 2013. Mieczek i Siunek. *Awazymyz* 38.1: 4–13.
- 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: Fritsch.
- Zajączkowski, Ananiasz. 1931. *Krótki wykład gramatyki języka zachodnio-karaïmskiego (narzecze łucko-halickie)*. Łuck: Aleksander Mardkowicz.
- Zajączkowski, Ananiasz. 1932. *Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodniokaraïmskim (przyczynek do morfologii języków tureckich)*. [= *Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Prace Komisji Orjentalistycznej* 15]. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.