Michał Németh

Jagiellonian University
Cracow

ANANIASZ ZAJĄCZKOWSKI'S DOCTORAL THESIS: THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT OF *SUFIKSY IMIENNE I CZASOWNIKOWE W JĘZYKU ZACHODNIOKARAIMSKIM*

1. Introductory remarks

In early February 2012 Professor Andrzej Zaborski (Cracow) handed me a handwritten copy of Ananiasz Zajączkowski's[1] *Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodniokaraimskim* [= Nominal and Verbal Suffixes in Western Karaim] that he had found in one of the cabinets located in his former office in Jagiellonian University's *Collegium Paderevianum*. The manuscript must have been stored there for decades; at least since 1964, i.e. the year the building was erected. At present, the manuscript is in the private hands of Emilia Zajączkowska--Łopatto, Ananiasz Zajączkowski's daughter.

Below, we have provided a description of the manuscript in question together with an analysis of the differences between this handwritten copy of *Sufiksy...* and its published version.

2. General features of the manuscript

The manuscript is written on cream-coloured, plain sheets arranged in a book-like manner. The pages are numbered from 1 to 400. The sheets are mostly folded in two and therefore contain four pages (of the size of 215 × 175 mm), except for pages 28, 41, 46, 47, 51, 64, 70, 113, 123, 128, 140, 183, 194, 257, 283, 303, 317, 321 and 388, which are written on single sheets. There are two

---

[1] Ananiasz Zajączkowski (*Ananjasz* according to the older Polish spelling), born 12th November 1903, died 6th April 1970, a Karaim Polish Turcologist. For further reading on his biography and scientific work see Dubiński (1971), Hensel (1971), Pritsak (1965), Tryjarski (1971).

pages between pages 21 and 23, numbered 22a and 22b. Pages 113, 170, and 192 appear twice instead of being distinguished with the letters *a* and *b*. Additionally, there is a small sheet of paper added to page 211. There was no page 225 in the manuscript. Finally, missing pages 256–257 contained § 19 of chapter II where the suffix -*si* ~ -*i* is discussed. The only fragment that survived from this chapter is the second Karaim word that exemplifies the suffix, published in Zajączkowski (1932: 41–42).

The thesis is written in black ink in A. Zajączkowski's hand. Besides, this we find many handwritten annotations, amendments, and additions, written in pencil by the author and, in some occurrences, by Tadeusz Kowalski[2] (once signed with his initials, i.e. "TK"; see p. 26).

The condition of the manuscript is good, the handwriting is careful and clearly legible.

3. Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis

3.1. General remarks

Primarily, Zajączkowski's work was his doctoral thesis submitted to what was then the Faculty of Philosophy of the Jagiellonian University under the supervision of Tadeusz Kowalski. This is stated in the preface of Zajączkowski's book (Zajączkowski 1932: iii).

As we know from Zajączkowski's letter to Seraya Shapshal[3] written on 26th March 1928[4], the linguistic material based on which the thesis was written was collected by Zajączkowski during the summer of 1927. He was writing a short Karaim grammar in that time (published in 1931).

He defended his thesis two years later, in 1929. Based on the documents stored in the Archive of Jagiellonian University (see A. Zajączkowski's doctoral file stored under the catalogue number WF II 504, below referred to as A.Z. DoctFile), we know that he passed his first rigorosum in Oriental philology and

---

[2] Tadeusz Kowalski, born 21st June 1889, died 5th May 1948, professor of Oriental studies, and the founder of modern Oriental studies in Poland, A. Zajączkowski's teacher. For further reading on Tadeusz Kowalski's biography, academic work and his importance for Polish Oriental studies see, above all, Dziurzyńska (2007), Stachowski, M. (1998, 2010), Zaborski (2000), and Zajączkowski, W. (1953). For a brief *curriculum vitae* see Siemieniec-Gołaś (1998). For further reading on the relationship between these two scholars see the edition of A. Zajączkowski's letters to Kowalski in the years 1925–1948 (Majda 2013).

[3] Seraya Shapshal, born 8th May 1873, died 18th November 1961, a Karaim Orientalist, the spiritual leader of Karaims (hakham) in the time Zajączkowski's letter was written.

[4] I would like to express my thanks to Mariusz Pawelec (Opole) who drew my attention to Zajączkowski's correspondence to Seraya Shapshal and provided me with access to the electronic version of these letters. Zajączkowski's correspondence to Shapshal is currently edited and will be published soon.

www.czasopisma.pan.pl   PAN   www.journals.pan.pl
POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK

Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis: the original manuscript of Sufiksy...

the history of Islam on 14th June, and his second rigorosum in philosophy on 11th October. He achieved excellent marks in both. The doctoral ceremony took place on 15th October.

3.2. Preparations for printing

Soon after his first rigorosum, Zajączkowski began amending his thesis and continued to work on the manuscript for several months, mostly during the initial period of his two-year long travelling scholarship to Berlin and Paris granted by the Ministry of Religions and Public Education.[5] It was for this purpose that Zajączkowski borrowed the manuscript from the dean's office, on two occasions between 25th June 1929 and 15th April 1930. The latter is confirmed by two order slips stored in the above-mentioned doctoral file (A.Z. DoctFile 27, 31). Since the edited manuscript contains a large number of annotations written mostly by the author, it is very probable that the edited copy is the one that was submitted to the dean's office, and, therefore, it is highly likely that this is the copy the order slips referred to.[6]

3.2.1. The bibliography

Thanks to the above scholarship, Zajączkowski managed to incorporate into his thesis a number of additional Karaim and other Turkic comparative linguistic data that he found, mostly, in publications not available in Poland. In his second letter to Kowalski from Berlin on 9th December 1929, Zajączkowski wrote the following:

> Co do moich studiów, to [...] korzystam głównie z wykładów prof. Banga i z biblioteki. Dzięki tej ostatniej mogę uzupełnić swoją pracę o suf[iksach] (rozprawy Böhtlingk'a, słownik jakucki Piekarskiego, artykuły Banga w „Muséon" i „Ungarische Jahrbücher"). (Majda 2013: 46–47)

---

[5] His scholarship ended on 18th August 1931 (Majda 2013: 67).

[6] It remains an open question why the copy was not in Zajączkowski's doctoral file despite the fact that the author obliged himself to return the manuscript by 15th April 1930 to the dean's office. From his letter to T. Kowalski on 18th March 1930 we know that Zajączkowski planned to leave Berlin on 31th March for vacation (during the academic term) and visit Warsaw and Cracow (Majda 2013: 50–51). This, combined with the information we have from another letter sent on 2nd May 1930, namely that the classes in Berlin started on Tuesday, 28th April 1930 (Majda 2013: 52) allows us to state that Zajączkowski was most probably in Poland on 15th April and could have returned the manuscript then. Since there is nothing that would call into his punctuality, and because we know that A. Zajączkowski's home library was completely destroyed during the Nazi bombings in 1944, we can be almost certain that the manuscript was taken from there and not returned by anyone else.

As far as my studies are concerned, [...] I benefit from the lectures of Prof. Bang[7] and from the library.[8] Thanks to the latter, I can supplement my work on suf[fixes] (with the works of Böhtlingk[9], Piekarski's[10] Yakut dictionary, Bang's articles published in *Muséon* and *Ungarische Jahrbücher*).

Indeed, if we compare the list of sources and scholarly literature we find in the manuscript (in chapter *Źródła* [= Sources]; pp. 12–22b) with the final list to be found in its published version (Zajączkowski 1932: 9–15), we see that the following items were added:[11]

1.   Акбаев, И., 1926, *Тылмач. Русско-карачаевский словарь*, Баталпашинск.
2.   Bálint, G., 1877, *Kazáni-tatár nyelvtanulmányok. III. füzet*: *Kazáni-tatár nyelvtan*, Budapest.
7.   Bang, W., 1912, Die komanische Bearbeitung des Hymnus 'A solis ortus cardine'. – *Festschrift Vilhelm Thomsen zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 25. Januar 1912 dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*, Leipzig: 39–43.
8.   Bang, W., 1914, Der komanische Marienpsalter. – *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse*, Neue Folge 13: 242–276.
27.   Bang, W., 1923, Manichäische Laien-Beichtspiegel. – *Le Muséon. Revue d'Études Orientales* 36: 137–242.
28.   Bang, W., 1925, Manichaeische Hymnen. – *Le Muséon. Revue d'Études Orientales* 36: 1–55.
29.   Bang, W., 1926, Türkische Bruchstücke einer nestorianischen Georgspassion. – *Le Muséon. Revue d'Études Orientales* 39: 41–75.
30.   Bang, W., 1925, Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. I. Brief. – *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 5: 41–48.
31.   Bang, W., 1925, Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. II. Brief. *Uzuntonluγ*- die Krone der Schöpfung. – *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 5: 231–251.

---

[7]   Johann Wilhelm „Willi" Max Julius Bang-Kaup, born 9th August 1869, died 8th October 1934, a prominent German Orientalist.

[8]   This is most probably the *Orientalische Abteilung* of the *Preußische Staatsbibliothek* that Zajączkowski writes about.

[9]   Otto von Böhtlingk, born 30th May 1815, died 1st April 1904, German Orientalist.

[10]   Edward Piekarski, born 25th October 1858, died 29th June 1934 (according to the Julian calendar), an autodidact Polish Turkologist, exiled to Siberia for revolutionary actions against the Tsar, lived among the Yakuts for over 15 years.

[11]   We quote these items along with the numbers they received in Zajączkowski (1932: 9–15). We have unified the arrangement of the bibliographical data with the one applied in our paper. In some instances we also supplemented them with information missing from Zajączkowski (1932).

32. Bang, W., 1925, Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. III. Brief. Vorläufiges über die Herkunft des türk. Ablativs. – *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 5: 392–410.

33. Bang, W., 1927, Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. IV. Brief. Das privative Suffix -*sïz*. – *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 7: 36–45.

34. Bang, W., 1930, Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. V. Brief. Lautliches — allzu Lautliches. – *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 10: 16–26.

35. Bang, W., von Gabain, A., 1929, Türkische Turfan-Texte. – *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historische Klasse* 15: 241–268.

36. Bang, W., von Gabain, A., 1929, Türkische Turfan-Texte II. – *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historische Klasse* 22: 411–430.

37. Bang, W., von Gabain, A., 1930, Türkische Turfan-Texte III. – *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historische Klasse* 13: 183–211.

38. Bittner, M., 1912, Die onomatopoetischen Verba des Türkischen. – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 26: 263–269.

39. Böhtlingk, O., 1851, *Über die Sprache der Jakuten*, St. Petersburg.

40. Böhtlingk, O., 1849–1850, Zur türkischen-tatarischen Grammatik. – *Mélanges Asiatiques, tirés du Bulletin historico-philologique de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg* 1: 114–152.

43. Brockelmann, C., 1919, Altosmanische Studien, I. Die Sprache ʿĀšyq pāšās und Aḥmedīs. – *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 73: 1–29.

46. Caferoğlu, A., 1929, *Türkçede »daş« lâhikası* (= *Türk Halk Bilgisine ait tetkikler* 1), İstanbul.

49. Foy, K., 1899, Studien zur osmanischen Syntax. – *Mitteilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* II/2: 105–136.

57. Катанов, Н., 1903, *Опытъ изслѣдованія урянхайскаго языка съ указаніемъ главнѣйшихъ отношеній его къ другимъ языкамъ тюркскаго корня*, Казань.

58. Korsch, T., 1912, Türkische Etymologien. – *Festschrift Vilhelm Thomsen zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 25. Januar 1912 dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*, Leipzig: 198–201.

69. Kowalski, T., 1930, Zu den türkischen Monatsnamen. – *Archiv Orientální* 2: 3–26.

70. von Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, F., 1912, Sprachprobe eines armenisch-tatarischen Dialektes in Polen. – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 26: 307–324.

71. Kúnos, I., 1905, *Janua linguae ottomanicae. Oszmán-török nyelvkönyv. Nyelvtan, szótár, olvasmányok*, Budapest.

74. Ławrzecki, L., 1860, *»Bakałarz« czyli zbiór tłumaczeń poszczególnych zwrotów i wersetów Pisma św. wraz ze słowniczkiem hebr.-karaimskim z roku 1860*, [a manuscript owned by A. Zajączkowski; destroyed during World War II].

76. Malecki, P., 1900, *Seder hallel hakkatan*, Wilno.

78. Mardkowicz, A., 1930, *Elijahunun ucuru* (= *Karaj jazysłar* 1), Łuck.

79. Мелиоранский, П.М., 1894, *Краткая грамматика казакъ-киргизскаго языка. Частъ I. Фонетика и этимологія*, Санктпетербургъ.

85. Munkácsi, B., 1909, Karäisch-tatarische Hymnen aus Polen. – *Keleti Szemle* 10: 185–210.

88. Наливкин, В, Наливкина, М., 1884, *Грамматика сартскаго языка, андежанскаго нарѣчія*, Казань.

99. Rachmatullin, G.-R., 1928, Die Hilfsverben und Verbaladverbien im Altaischen. – *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 8: 1–24.

102. Radloff, W., 1895, *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei*, St. Pétersbourg.

103. Радлов, В., 1888, Ярлыки Токтамыша и Темиркутлуга. – *Записки Восточнаго Отдѣленія Императорскаго Русскаго Археологическаго Общества* 3: 1–40.

104. Ramstedt, G.J., 1912, *Zur Verbstammbildungslehre der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachen* (= *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 28/3), Helsingfors.

109. Szapszał, S, 1928, Kırım Karai Türkleri. – *Türk Yılı* 1: 576–615.

117. Zajączkowski, A., Przekłady Trenów Jeremiasza w narzeczu trocko-karaimskiem. – [published later in:] *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* in 1934: vol. 8: 181–192, vol. 10: 158–178.

From the above list it transpires very clearly that thanks to the enquiries conducted in libraries abroad, Zajączkowski managed to extend his bibliography list of *Sufiksy...* to include an additional 40 items (published by 1930), which, in fact, constitutes one third of the final bibliography. Originally, there were 81 items; three of them have been removed (items no 33, 20, and 69),[12] the published bibliography list consists of 117 items.[13]

The abbreviated cross-references of most of the newly added references were added to the manuscript in pencil by A. Zajączkowski. These were first

---

[12] I.e. the following works: Bang, W., Marquart, J., 1914, Osttürkische Dialektsudien. I. Kapitel: Zum Vocalismus. – *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse*, Neue Folge 13: 1–12; Houtsma, M.Th., 1889, Ein alttürkisches Gedicht. – *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 43: 69–98; and Rojecki, A., *Żeḿerlar. Pieśni karaimskie* [manuscript].

[13] Piekarski's (1907–1930) dictionary is missing from the final bibliography, but we can find it quoted, see e.g. the Yakut comparative data added to KarT. *ḱoṅu* (Zajączkowski 1932: 104). Hence, its absence in the final reference list is a mere oversight.

www.czasopisma.pan.pl   PAN   www.journals.pan.pl
POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK

Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis: the original manuscript of Sufiksy...

of all works containing comparative Turkic data – several works on Altay, Tuvinian, and Yakut, and a number of scholarly studies on the Ottoman and Kipchak languages, i.e. the language of Codex Comanicus, Armeno-Kipchak, Karachay, Kazan Tatar, Kirghiz – but there are some additions on Karaim, too. As far as the latter is concerned, we may be somewhat surprised that Malecki's (1900) סדר הלל הקטן כמנהג בני מקרא קדש [its Russian title is: *Седеръ галлель Гаккатанъ. Славословіе на пасху по обряду караимовъ*] and Munkácsi's (1909) article on Karaim sources were not taken into consideration when writing the doctoral thesis itself, for they contain important linguistic data.

Also missing from the final version of the publication is Radloff's (1887) dictionary on the Turkic lexicon of Codex Comanicus. This absence, however, appears to be significant: even though the linguistic material of the latter was most probably incorporated into Radloff's *Versuch...* (1893–1911) and therefore Zajączkowski's failure to cite the 1887 dictionary did not result in missing data, the fact that this small dictionary was not included in *Sufiksy...* might have been due to Radloff's eroded reputation. In this respect the following fragment of Zajączkowski's correspondence to Kowalski (sent on 10th February 1930) seems especially interesting (he describes the seminars he attended in Berlin) as it reflects young Zajączkowski's critical approach to the scholarly literature in general:

> Ćwiczenia polegają na zestawieniu i opracowaniu poszczególnych wyrazów w językach tureckich. Przy takich zestawieniach (np. wyrazy na oznaczenie „zapachu" lub „kury" itd.) obowiązany jest uczeń 1. wykryć fałszywe formy, podawane przez słownik Radłowa, 2. starać się, o ile możliwe, znaleźć etymologię danego wyrazu. Tu pozwolę sobie wspomnieć, że w ogóle tu się starają na każdym kroku „przygwoździć" Radłowa, ma to ten ujemny skutek, że uczniowie, ile razy nie mogą zrozumieć niejasnego miejsca u Radłowa, mówią: „to jest błędne!". (Majda 2013: 48–49)

> [= The classes consist in a comparison and analysis of certain words in the Turkic languages. During the comparative analysis (e.g. the words for 'smell' or 'chicken' etc.) students are obliged to do the following: 1. detect the incorrect forms presented in Radloff's dictionary [i.e. Radloff (1893–1911) – M.N.], and 2. to find, if possible, the correct etymology of the relevant word. I should mention at this point that they attempt here to "pin down" Radloff on every possible occasion, which has negative consequences in the sense that every time the students fail to understand a fragment in Radloff's work, they say: "this is incorrect!".]

3.2.2. The entries

Each suffix is discussed in a separate paragraph and the structure of the paragraphs remained the same in the final version of the work. Each paragraph contains **(1)** a bibliography, **(2)** a concise semantic and morphological description,

(2) Karaim linguistic data that exemplify the relevant suffix, **(3)** a concise semantic and morphological description of the suffix's Turkic cognates, and **(4)** comparative Turkic linguistic data, often accompanied by **(5)** additional remarks.

A detailed comparison of the handwritten copy of *Sufiksy...* with its published version shows that the thesis itself was not free of errors and shortcomings. Approximately one fifth of the entries (21 of them) contained different types of errors, above all wrongly etymologized words (i.e. words in which the morphological boundaries were not correctly interpreted), but also wrongly etymologized suffixes or erroneously described semantic roles. There were also suffixes omitted in the thesis's primary version and added to the work afterwards. Eventually Zajączkowski amended most of the entries. In fact, if we take into consideration all types of amendments and additions, there are only 8 suffixes whose descriptions remained unchanged.[14]

Below, we will deal with some examples of the said corrections and amendments.

The bibliographies in the entries were supplemented in 79 instances. It is important to note that this also affected the description of a number of suffixes since Zajączkowski often managed to elaborate on their semantic features (in 38 instances) based on the additional Karaim (in 50 entries) and Turkic (in 43 instances) linguistic data. A good example is the suffix -*yχ* which, based on two examples, namely KarT. *aš-yχ-* 'to hurry, to move in hurry' and KarT. *syn-yχ-* 'to be broken down; to lose hope', was described in the manuscript as a denominal suffix building only reflexive verbs (see chapter VII, § 1). However, thanks to two additional non-reflexive derivatives, that is to KarT. *i̯uł-χ-* 'to tear out' and KarT. *kyr-χ-* 'to cut', an additional intensifying role could have been ascribed to it. The latter change also concerned the Turkic comparative data (Zajączkowski 1932: 110–111).

The most conspicuous correction concerns the word *i̯astyχ* 'pillow'. Zajączkowski explained the word as a metathetic form of **i̯atsyχ,* whereas **i̯atsyχ* was supposed to be a -*syχ* derivative of the verb *i̯at-* 'to lie'. In other words, Zajączkowski identified this suffix with -*syq*, which is generally known only from Old Turkic and Manichean Uyghur sources, and is usually described as a suffix that forms verbal nouns with a future-necessitative meaning or "projection participles" that present projections of expectations and intentions (see Tekin 1968: 114; Erdal 2004: 301–302; see also von Gabain 1941: 75, 1959: 36–37). We see this suffix e.g. in OT *ačsyq* 'hunger; a being hungry in the future' (DTS 6). Given that Zajączkowski could not find other Karaim words that would contain this "non-productive suffix", -*syχ* was described in a separate paragraph

---

[14] More precisely: +*była*, -*dačy*, -*χar-*, +*lei̯*, -*na-*, +*oúlań*, -*sa(ł)-*, and +*sy* (Zajączkowski 1932: 42–43, 98–99, 118–119, 44–45, 143–144, 53–54, 124–125, 39, respectively). For a detailed presentation of the implemented content-related changes see Table 1 in the Appendix.

(§ 30 in chapter I). Eventually, Zajączkowski changed his view, reinterpreted the word's origin, and explained it as a *-tyχ* derivative (Zajączkowski 1932: 102) – which is now its generally accepted etymology (see ÈSTJa IV 154–155) – and therefore the entire § 30 had to be erased.[15] His previous opinion is, however, left as an alternative proposition in the final version of his book.[16]

A few suffixes were originally mistakenly identified by Zajączkowski. This was the case with the unproductive *-γuču* and productive *-uvču* forming *nomina agentis*, which were treated as variants of one and the same suffix in the original version of the analysed work (as a result of a *-γuču* > *-uvču* change; see chapter I, § 24). Yet, in Zajączkowski (1932: 96–97: §§ 24, 25) these two compound suffixes are discussed separately, and only a brief remark is left in brackets, which suggests that Zajączkowski still treated these two suffixes as possible cognates.[17]

Moreover, the Turkic cognates of Karaim *-uvču* were also identified wrongly. If we turn to § 1 of the manuscript's first chapter (pp. 24–26), we see that its Turkic equivalent, namely Tkc. (Oghuzic) *-yǯy*, was subordinated to Kar. *-čy* instead of Kar. *-uvču*.[18] Therefore, in order to correct this error, the comparative Oghuzic data were moved to § 25 of the final work, devoted to Kar. *-uvču* (Zajączkowski 1932: 97–98), and replaced by newly collected examples.

Finally, there are also suffixes that were missing from the original version of the thesis (probably due to a simple error), but were added to *Sufiksy...* before publishing. These are mostly unproductive suffixes attested in several words: *+γa-* (in 2 derivatives; Zajączkowski 1932: 134), *-χa-* (in 7 derivatives; Zajączkowski 1932: 111–112), *-ł* (in 6 derivatives; Zajączkowski 1932: 86–87), *+rγa(n)-* (in 2 derivatives; Zajączkowski 1932: 138–139), *+sa-* (in 1 derivative; Zajączkowski 1932: 37–38), *-ty* (in 2 derivatives; Zajączkowski 1932: 85–86), and one suffix that is not described as unproductive, but is rather infrequent:

---

[15] Interestingly, in some cases Zajączkowski's first thought was correct. Such is the case with the word *ḱeča* 'night', which is discussed as an *+a*-derivative (chapter III, § 24), which, at present, is its widely accepted etymology (see e.g. Räsänen 1969: 245; ÈSTJa III 50–52, Pomorska 2004: 37). Eventually, Zajączkowski (1932: 43) classified the word as an adverbial *-ča*-derivative (< *ḱeč-ča*), very probably influenced by Bang's opinion (1930: 19f.).

[16] The etymology based on metathesis seems to be Zajączkowski's own idea, and even though it does not sound convincing, it is a pity that the authors of ÈSTJa IV (154–155) forgot to mention him among those who represented it. ÈSTJa refers the reader to the works of G.J. Ramstedt, M. Räsänen and G. Doerfer only.

[17] Zajączkowski (1932: 97): "Pozatem *-γu-ču* ≥ *-uv-ču*, patrz § 25" [= 'Besides, *-γuču* ≥ *-uvču*, see § 25']. Equating Tkc. *-yg* with *-gy* does not hold water.

[18] This error has been noticed by T. Kowalski, who wrote in pencil the following (on the upper margin of page 26): "Ten sufiks *-yǯy* jest mem zdaniem złożony z *-y* (≤ *-yg*) + *-ǯy*, tak że *gäčiǯi* = kar. *käčuύču*" [= The suffix *-yǯy* in my opinion consists of *-y* (≤ *-yg*) + *-ǯy*, so *gäčiǯi* = kar. *käčuύču*].

+*muš* (3 examples enumerated in Zajączkowski 1932: 40). This amounts to 7 suffixes attested altogether in 23 words.

3.2.3. The structure of the book

Originally, the derivative suffixes discussed in the present thesis were divided into seven groups. The author partially followed the traditional division between deverbal and denominal suffixes building verba and nomina, but he also added separate chapters presenting suffixes that form denominal adverbs, deverbal adverbs, and numerals. Such a classification, however, met with T. Kowalski's disapproval which he expressed in his doctoral review. On the second page of his review Kowalski wrote the following:[19]

> Nieco słabiej przedstawia się definicja funkcji znaczeniowych poszczególnych sufiksów. Tutaj będzie mógł autor, przygotowując swą pracę do druku, wprowadzić dużo poprawek, przemyśliwszy jeszcze raz cały swój materjał.
> Głębsze ujęcie istoty zjawisk musi też, mem zdaniem, doprowadzić do zmiany podziału całego materiału, w który niepotrzebnie wprowadzono cechę drugorzędną, mianowicie funkcję syntaktyczną poszczególnych tworów, zamiast trzymania się wyłącznie podziału na sufiksy pni werbalnych i pni nominalnych. Podział obecny świadczy, że autor jeszcze nie całkiem wyzwolił się z pod nienaukowych formułek przeważnej części gramatycznych opracowań języków tureckich, a zarazem nie posiada jeszcze zupełnej swobody spojrzenia na swój bogaty i różnorodny materjał. (A.Z. DoctFile 22)

> [= The definition of the semantic role of particular suffixes looks a little worse. The author may implement many corrections while preparing the text for printing, after reconsidering the whole material once again.
> A deeper insight into the essence of the described phenomena must, in my opinion, result in a different classification of the material, which unnecessarily reflects secondary syntactic features of the relevant forms instead of following exclusively the distinction between the suffixes of verbal roots, and those of the nominal roots. The present classification shows that the author has not entirely freed himself from the unscientific formulas of the vast majority of grammatical descriptions of the Turkic languages and that he is not yet able to look at his rich and diverse linguistic material completely freely.]

Zajączkowski followed Kowalski's recommendation and eventually changed the structure of his book.[20] As a result of these changes, on the one hand, the

---

[19] We present the whole text of the review in the Appendix.

[20] The other review, Prof. J. Rozwadowski's (1867–1935), contained no content-related remarks. The original text is provided in the Appendix.

original chapter IV in which suffixes that form denominal adverbs were discussed, and the original chapter V containing the description of numeral suffixes, were merged with chapter III, in which the denominal nominal suffixes were presented (= chapter I of Zajączkowski 1932; for adverbs refer to §§ 28–34; for numerals see §§ 35–38). On the other hand, chapter VI of the manuscript which presented deverbal adverbial suffixes (of grammatical nature rather than derivative) has been partially left out.[21] From among the examples originally enumerated in this chapter only the lexicalized forms have been included in the final version of the work, see examples for *-a*, *-adoγan,* and *-y* (Zajączkowski 1932: 105–107, 108, §§ 31–34). The suffix *-p* is discussed in § 35 of Zajączkowski (1932: 108), but the only lexical example presented there is missing from the manuscript.

The dissertation originally lacked some of the remarks of the final chapter V concerning the phonetic changes that suffixes underwent on morphological boundaries. Also, chapter VI of Zajączkowski (1932) together with final conclusions and a detailed comparative etymological analysis of the suffixes' components was added to the book at a later stage. These fragments, especially the latter chapter, have considerably improved the work's value. In fact, there were no general conclusions in the original version of the thesis at all.

Finally, Zajączkowski additionally prepared a nine-page long French résumé and detailed indexes of the discussed suffixes and quoted words, which was a rather good decision. A work written in Polish had little chance of being widely quoted by Western scholars. As a matter of fact, some of the reviews (see below for details) were most probably prepared solely on the basis of the French résumé.

All in all, Zajączkowski continued to work on corrections in the first months of 1930, probably until the spring of 1930. From his letters to Kowalski we know that on 14th May 1930 he was copying the last fragments of the amended version of the thesis (Majda 2013: 55), on 22th June 1930 he sent back to the publisher some additional proofs (Majda 2013: 66)[22], and on 3rd August 1930 he sent the last proofs to the publishing house (Majda 2013: 67). From a letter sent on 26th June 1930 it transpires that the last proofs were done by Kowalski (Majda 2013: 66). Zajączkowski was in Paris at that time.

3.4. Unpublished fragments

3.4.1. The sixth chapter of the manuscript contains all the unpublished fragments. They were ignored in the final version of the book as they concern not derivative but grammatical (participial) suffixes. Below, we have presented those 14 pages that

---

[21] We have presented the unpublished parts of chapter VI in paragraph **3.4** below. For a comparison of the tables of contents see table 2 in the Appendix.

[22] From these dates it transpires that the content-related corrections of the final fragments were made at the same time as the first spreadsheets were prepared for printing.

were left out together with a translation and a brief commentary on Zajączkowski's etymological remarks. These fragments are also worth presenting because they still contain a number of minor novelties from academic point of view – mainly as far as the stylistic value and semantics of these participial forms are concerned.

3.4.2. The original text

<div align="center">

Rozdział VI
Sufiksy tworzące przysłówki z pni czasownikowych
</div>

[page 310]

§ 1. Sufiks -*a*, -ʹ*a*, -*i̭*
K̦o̦w̦ạl̦ṣk̦i̦. Karaim. Texte. Str. XXXVIII.
D̦ẹn̦y̦. Grammaire. Str. 897 i nast.
P̦r̦ö̦h̦l̦ẹ. Balkarische Stud. K. S. XV. Str. 190.
Șc̦h̦i̦n̦k̦ẹw̦i̦ṭṣc̦h̦. Rabγūzīs Syntax. S. 69.
Șạm̦o̦j̦ł̦o̦w̦i̦c̦z̦. Грамматика. Str. 65–66.
K̦ạțạn̦o̦w̦. Изслѣд. урянх. яз. Str. 596–604.

Sufiks -*a*, -ʹ*a* (po tematach zakończ. na spółgłoskę) oraz -*i̭* (po temat. zak. na samogłoskę) w karaimskim, zarówno jak w innych narzeczach tureckich, jest produktywny. Tworzy imiesłów nieodmienny (gerundium), oznaczający czynność niedokonaną.
Przykłady:
bar-a 'idąc' od *bar-* 'iść'
tur-a 'stojąc' od *tur-* 'stać'
uruš-a 'walcząc' od *uruš-* 'walczyć'
śu̇-a 'kochając' od *śuv-* 'kochać'
ḱul-a 'śmiejąc się' od *ḱul-* 'śmiać się'
ki̭i̭iń-a 'ubierając się' od *ki̭i̭iń-* 'ubierać się'

[page 311]

tašy-i̭ 'niosąc, dźwigając' (≤ **tašy-i̭-a*) od *tašy-* 'nieść, dźwigać'
śoźle-i̭ 'mówiąc' (≤ **śozla-i̭*[23] ≤ **śoźla-i̭-a*) od *śoźla-* 'mówić'

[...][24]

---

[23] It should be: *śoźla-i̭*.
[24] The continuation of the entry is published in Zajączkowski (1932: 106–107: § 32, last remark) and therefore we do not repeat it here.

[page 315]

§ 3. Sufiks *-a-doɣon || -a-doɣoč, -i̯-doɣon...*
-'a-doɣon || -'a-doɣoč.
K̲o̲w̲a̲l̲s̲k̲i̲. Karaim. Texte. Str. XXXVII.
G̲r̲z̲e̲g̲o̲r̲z̲e̲w̲s̲k̲i̲. Caraimica. RO I. Str. 259
B̲a̲n̲g̲. Osttürk. Dialektst. Str. 4.

Sufiks *-a-doɣon* (po tem. zakończ. na spółgłoskę) oraz *-i̯-doɣon* (po tem. zakończ. na samogłoskę) jest złożony. Składa się z suf. *-a* (wzgl. *-i̯*) tworzącego gerundja (patrz § 1) + *-doɣon* (zmieniona forma z pierwotnego partic.: **-durɣan*). W karaimskim występuje również oboczna forma: *-a-doɣoč*. W narzeczu halickiem sufiks ten brzmi: *-a-doɣa̯n, -a-doɣac,* czyli tu nie nastąpiło zlabjalizowanie pierwotnej końcówki part. *-ɣan ≥ -ɣon*.

Sufiks ten w karaimskim jest produktywny i tworzy imiesłów nieodmienny, nie różniący się znaczeniem od imiesłowu na *-a*.

[page 316]

Przykłady:
bar-a-doɣon || bar-a-doɣoč 'idąc' (z ≤ **bar-a-dur-ɣan, *bar-a-dur-ɣač*) = (wsch. tur.)[25] *bar-y̆-dy̆ɣan* od *bar-* 'iść'
kył-a-doɣon || kył-a-doɣoč 'czyniąc' = (tar.)[26] *kył-y̆-dy̆ɣan* od *kył-* 'czynić'
ai̯t-a-doɣon || ai̯t-a-doɣoč 'mówiąc' od *ai̯t-* 'mówić'
śuʋ́-a-doɣon || śuʋ́-a-doɣoč 'kochając' od *śuv-* 'kochać'
tany-i̯-doɣon 'wiedząc, znając' (≤ **tany-i̯-a-doɣon*) od *tany-* 'znać'
ḱoŕ-a-doɣon || ḱoŕ-a-doɣoč 'widząc' od *ḱoŕ-* 'widzieć'
śoźle-i̯-doɣon 'mówiąc' (≤ **śoźla-i̯-a-doɣon*) od *śoźla-* 'mówić'

[...][27]

[page 318]

§ 4. Sufiks *-p*, *-yp*, *-ip*, *-up*, *-'up*.
K̲o̲w̲a̲l̲s̲k̲i̲. Karaim. Texte. Str. XXXVII.
D̲e̲n̲y̲. Grammaire. Str. 876 i nast.
K̲a̲t̲a̲n̲o̲w̲. Изслѣд. урянх. яз. Str. 578–590.
P̲r̲ö̲h̲l̲e̲. Karatsch. Stud. K. S. X. Str. 234–5.
P̲r̲ö̲h̲l̲e̲. Balkar. Stud. K. S. XV. Str. 185.
S̲a̲m̲o̲j̲ł̲o̲w̲i̲c̲z̲. Грамматика. Str. 65.
S̲c̲h̲i̲n̲k̲e̲w̲i̲t̲s̲c̲h̲. Rabɣūzīs Syntax. Str. 66–68.

---

[25] Data qualified with *wsch. tur.* [= Pol. wschodni turecki] refers to Eastern Turki. Neither the manuscript nor the published work contain a list of used abbreviations.

[26] Pol. *taranczi*, an outdated term for Uyghur.

[27] The continuation of the entry is published in Zajączkowski (1932: 108: § 38).

Michał Németh

Sufiks *-p* (po temat. zakończ. na samogłoskę) oraz *-yp*, *-ip*, *-up*, *-'up* (po tem. zakończ. na spółgłoskę) w karaimskim, zarówno jak w innych narzeczach tureckich, jest produktywny. Tworzy imiesłów nieodmienny (gerundium), oznaczający czynność dokonaną.

Przykłady:
baiła-p 'związawszy' = (krč. balk. …) *bajła-p* od *baiła-* 'związać'
iźla-p 'poszukawszy' = (balk. …) *izlä-p* od *iźla-* 'szukać'

[page 319]

irła-p 'zaśpiewawszy' = (kum. …)[28] *irła-p* od *irła-* 'śpiewać'
üŕu-p 'przeszedłszy' = (kum. …) *jürü-p* od *üŕu-* 'iść'
ał-yp 'wziąwszy' = (kum. …) *ał-yp* od *ał-* 'wziąć'
tanyš-yp 'zapoznawszy się' od *tanyš-* 'zapoznać się'
ḱel-ip 'przyszedłszy' = (kum. …) *käl-ip* od *ḱel-* 'przyjść'
ḱeltir-ip 'przyniósłszy' = (krč. balk. …) *kältir-ip* od *ḱeltir-* 'przynieść'
boł-up 'stawszy się' = (krč. balk. …) *boł-up* od *boł-* 'stać się, być'
ḱoŕ-up 'zobaczywszy' = (kum. …) *kör-üp* od *ḱor-* 'zobaczyć, widzieć'
ölťuŕ-up 'zabiwszy' = (balk. …) *öltür-üp* od *ölťur-* 'zabić'

Uwaga. Gerundja urobione za pomocą tego sufiksu mogą przybierać sufiks liczby mnogiej: *ešit-ip-lar* (oni) 'posłyszawszy'. [Kowalski. Teksty. Str. XXXVII].

[page 320]

§ 5. Sufiks *-p-ty*, *-p-ti*; *-yp-ty*, *-ip-ti*, *-up-ty*, *-'up-ti*
Kowalski. Karaim. Texte. Str. XXXVII.
Kowalski. Przyczynki do etn. RO. V. Str. 210, uw. 15.

Sufiks *-p-ty*, *-p-ti* (po temat. zakończ. na samogłoskę) oraz *-yp-ty*, *-ip-ti*, *-up-ty*, *-'up-ti* (po temat. zakończ. na spółgłoskę) jest złożony. Składa się z suf. poprzedniego *-p*, *-yp*…, tworzącego gerundja (patrz § 4) + *-ty*, *-ti*. To *-ty*, *-ti* nieakcentowane jest pozostałością końcówki 3 os. l.p.: *-tyr* (*-tur*) wzgl. formy pełniejszej *-tur-ur*. [W komańskim gerundjum na *-p*, *-yp* + *-tur-ur*, wzgl. *-tur* tworzy formy czasownikowe czasu przeszłego: Bang, Mr.Ps., 245: *ayt-ip-tur-ur*, 247: *tab-ub-tur*, 250: *kon-up-tur*, 256: *ieŋ-ip-tir* itd.]

Sufiks ten w karaimskim, zwłaszcza w mowie potocznej, jest produktywny. Tworzy imiesłów nieodmienny, nie różniący się znaczeniem od imiesłowu na *-p*, *-yp*… .

---

[28] Kum. stands for Pol. *kumański*, i.e. the language of Codex Comanicus. Zajączkowski uses both *komański* and *kumański* for Coman.

[page 321]

Przykłady:

anła-p-ty 'zrozumiawszy' od *anła-* 'rozumieć'

iźla-p-ti 'poszukawszy' od *iźla-* 'szukać'

ťuźu-p-ti 'wyrównawszy' od *ťuźu-* 'wyrównać'

ał-yp-ty 'wziąwszy' od *ał-* 'wziąć'

ty̷ył-yp-ty 'przemilczawszy' od *ty̷ył-* 'milczeć'

b'er-ip-ti 'dawszy' od *b'er-* 'dać'

kiplan-ip-ti 'wzmocniwszy się' od *kiplań-* 'wzmocnić'

boł-up-ty 'bywszy' od *boł-* 'być'

uruš-up-ty 'stoczywszy walkę' od *uruš-* 'stoczyć walkę, walczyć'

ḱoŕ-up-ti 'zobaczywszy' od *ḱor-* 'zobaczyć, widzieć'

ölťuŕ-up-ti 'zabiwszy' od *ölťur* 'zabić'

ištyrył-yp-ty (K̲o̲w̲. RO. V. 203) 'zebrawszy się' od *ištyrył-* 'zebrać się'

[page 322]

§ 6. Sufiks *-χyn-ča, -γyn-ča, -kyn-ča, -kin-ča*[29], *-gin-ča*[30]
$\qquad$ *-χun-ča, -γun-ča, -kun-ča, -ḱun-ča*[31], *-ǵun-ča*[32]

K̲o̲w̲a̲l̲s̲k̲i̲. Karaim. Texte. Str. XXXVIII

B̲a̲n̲g̲. Zur Kritik … d. Ujg. Turfanfr. SPAW. 1915. XXXIX, str. 632 i nast.

B̲r̲o̲c̲k̲e̲l̲m̲a̲n̲n̲. Zur Grammatik. ZDMG. 70. Str. 208.

D̲e̲n̲y̲. Grammaire. Str. 986–995, Str. 1000 i nast.

P̲r̲ö̲h̲l̲e̲. Karatsch. Stud. K. S. X. Str. 234.

P̲r̲ö̲h̲l̲e̲. Balkar. Stud. K. S. XV. Str. 196. § 81.

S̲a̲m̲o̲j̲ł̲o̲w̲i̲c̲z̲. Грамматика. Str. 67.

B̲ö̲h̲t̲l̲. Mél. As. I. 118–119.

Sufiks *-χyn-ča*, *-γyn-ča*, *-kyn-ča*, *-kin-ča*, *-gin-ča* (po samogł. bilabjalnych)[33] oraz: *-χun-ča*, *-γun-ča*, *-kun-ča*, *-ḱun-ča*, *-ǵun-ča* (po samogł. labjalnych) jest złożony. Składa się z *-χyn*, *-γyn*… + sufiks ekwatywny *-ča* (por. Rozdz. IV, § 4). Co do pierwszej części tego sufiksu: *-χyn*…, to B̲r̲o̲c̲k̲e̲l̲m̲a̲n̲n̲ sądzi, że należy ją również uważać za złożoną: z suf., tworzącego imiona z pni czasownikowych *-yk* + końcówka instrumentalis: *-yn* (*-γyn* ≤ **yk-yn*).

---

[29] It should be: *-kiń-ča*.

[30] It should be: *-giń-ča*.

[31] It should be: *-ḱuń-ča*.

[32] It should be: *-ǵuń-ča*.

[33] An error, it should be *nielabialnych* 'illabial' instead.

[page 323]

Sufiks ten w karaimskim jest produktywny. Tworzy przysłówki czasowni-
kowe, oznaczające granicę czynności („aż do…, tak długo aż…").

Przykłady:

tap-χyn-ča 'aż znajdzie' od *tap-* 'znaleźć'

kał-ɣyn-ča 'aż zostanie' od *kał-* 'zostać'

taχ-kyn-ča 'aż zawiesi' od *taχ-* 'zawiesić'

ḱet-kiń-ča 'aż pojedzie' od *ḱet-* 'pojechać'

ḱel-giń-ča 'aż przyjdzie' od *ḱel-* 'przyjść'

tut-χun-ča 'aż pochwyci' od *tut-* 'pochwycić'

boł-ɣun-ča 'aż będzie' od *boł-* 'być'

ťuš-kuń-ča 'aż zejdzie, aż zszedł' od *ťuš-* 'zejść'

ḱor-ǵun-ča[34] 'aż zobaczy' od *ḱor-* 'widzieć'

čyχ-kyn-ča (Ḳoẉ. RO. V. 213) 'aż wyjdzie' od *čyχ-* 'wyjść'

kuru-ɣun-ča (Ḳoẉ. RO. V. 213) 'aż wyschnie, dopóki nie wyschnie' od *kuru-* 'schnąć'

i̯etil-giń-ča (Ḳoẉ. RO. V. 214) 'aż dojdą, dopóki nie dojrzeją' od *i̯etil-* 'dochodzić'

<u>NB</u>: *ńe-giń-ča* 'dopóki' od *ńe* 'co' [Por. Ḍ̣eṇy. Gramm. str. 960, uw.]

[page 324]

§ 7. Sufiks *-mai̯yn-ča*, *-ḿai̯iń-ča*

                -mai̯yn, *-ḿai̯iń*

Ḳoẉaḷṣḳị. Karaim. Texte. Str. XXXVIII.

Ḍ̣eṇy. Grammaire. Str. 921, 941, uwaga.

Meḷịoṛaṇṣḳịị. Арабъ филол. Str. LXVI. § 10 i 037 uw.

Pṛ̣öḥḷ̣e. Karatsch. Studien. K. S. X. Str. 230.

Pṛ̣öḥḷ̣e. Balkar. Studien. K. S. XV. Str. 183. § 60.

Ṣ̣chịṇḳeẉịṭṣ̣ch. Rabɣūzīs Syntax. Str. 72.

Sufiks *-mai̯yn-ča*, *-ḿai̯iń-ča* jest formą negatywną sufiksu poprzedniego
(*-mai̯yn-ča* ≤ **-ma-ɣyn-ča*). Składa się zatem z negatywnego: *-ma* + *-ɣyn* (por. § 6)
+ ekwatywne *-ča*. To ekwatywne *-ča* często nie występuje, tak że sufiks brzmi
-mai̯yn, *-ḿai̯iń*. Formy z *-ča* lub bez niego są oboczne i nie zmieniają znaczenia
wyrazu.

Sufiks ten w karaimskim jest produktywny i tworzy zaprzeczone gerundja.

Przykłady:

boł-ma-i̯yn || *boł-ma-i̯yn-ča* 'nie będąc' od *boł-* 'być'

---

[34] It should be: *ḱor-ǵuń-ča*.

[page 325]

saɣyn-ma-įyn || *saɣyn-ma-įyn-ča* 'nie wspominając' od *saɣyn-* 'wspominać'
śuv́-ṁa-įiń || *śuv́-ṁa-įiń-ča* 'nie kochając' od *śuv́-*[35] 'kochać'
įetil-ṁa-įiń || *įetil-ṁa-įiń-ča* (Ḳoẉ. Teksty. 40) 'nie doszedłszy' od *įetil-* 'dojść'

Por.: (M.K. 4–5. s. 8): *syį 'kuvma-įyn, iź'laṁa-įiń įałyn išiniń* 'nie ubiegając się o zaszczyty, nie szukając zapłaty za swą pracę' od *kuv-* 'ścigać, ubiegać się', od *iźla-* 'szukać'

[page 326]

§ 8. Sufiks *-kač-oχ, -ɣač-oχ*
          -ḱač-oχ, -ǵač-oχ
Ḳoẉalski. Karaim. Texte. Str. XXXVIII.
Ḍeny. Grammaire. Str. 1009.
Ḳatanoẉ. Изслѣд. урянх. яз. Str. 591–596.
Melioranskiį. Арабъ филол. Str. LXVI. § 10 i 038 uw.

Sufiks *-kač-oχ, -ɣač-oχ, -ḱač-oχ, -ǵač-oχ*[36] jest złożony. Składa się z sufiksu, tworzącego gerundjum *-kač, -ɣač…* (por. § 3: *-a-doɣoč ≤ *-a-dur-ɣač*) + partykuła *-oχ* (nieulegająca harmonji samogłoskowej), precyzująca czas odbycia czynności.
Sufiks ten spotyka się dosyć rzadko, przeważnie w języku literackim. Tworzy gerundja na oznaczenie dokładnego czasu: „właśnie wtedy, gdy…", „z tą chwilą, gdy…"
Przykłady:
1. *ḱel-ǵač-oχ* 'przyszedłszy, z chwilą przyjścia' (Gen. 12,14) od *ḱel-* 'przyjść' [Ḳoẉalski, Teksty. XXXVIII].

[page 327]

2. *ökťamlań-ǵač-oχ* (Ps. 10,4) 'stawszy się dumnym, z chwilą stania się hardym' od *ökťamlań-* 'być dumnym, stać się hardym'
3. *ťuǵań-ǵač-oχ*[37] (Ps. 71,9) 'ustawszy, z chwilą ustania' od *ťuǵań-* 'ustać, skończyć się'
4. (hal.) *cyk-kac-ok* (Ḳoẉ. RO) 'wyszedłszy, z chwilą wyjścia' od *cyk-* 'wyjść'

---

[35] In §§ 1 and 3: *suv-*.
[36] It should be: *-ǵač-oχ*.
[37] It should be: *ťuǵań-ǵač-oχ*.

[page 328]

Sufiks *-kač*, *-ɣač…*, który w karaimskim występuje tylko w połączeniu z *-ok* (*-oχ*) lub w formie zakrzepłej *-doɣoč* (z ≤ *-dur-ɣač*), w innych narzeczach tureckich jest produktywny i tworzy gerundja.

Przykłady:

(ur.)[38] *par-ɣaš* 'po odejściu'

(ur.) *kir-gäš* 'po wejściu'

(čag.) *kör-gäč* 'zobaczywszy, po zobaczeniu'

(kaz.)[39] *ał-ɣač* 'wziąwszy, po wzięciu'

3.4.3. Translation

Chapter VI

Suffixes that build adverbs from verbal stems

[page 310]

§ 1. Suffix   *-a*, -*′a*, -*i̯*

K̦owa̦lșk̦i. Karaim. Texte. p. XXXVIII.[40]

D̦eny. Grammaire. p. 897f.[41]

P̦röḥle̦. Balkarische Stud. K. S. XV. p. 190.[42]

Șchink̦ewitșch. Rabɣūzīs Syntax. p. 69.[43]

Șamo̦jło̦wic̦z. Грамматика. p. 65–66.[44]

K̦ata̦no̦w. Изслѣд. урянх. яз. p. 596–604.[45]

In Karaim, as well as in the other Turkic dialects, the suffix *-a*, *-′a* (after stems ending in a consonant) and *-i̯* (after stems ending in a vowel) is productive. It builds indeclinable participles (gerundium) meaning imperfective action.

Examples:

bar-a '(while) going' ← *bar-* 'to go'

tur-a '(while) standing' ← *tur-* 'to stand'

uruš-a '(while) fighting' ← *uruš-* 'to fight'

śuv́-a '(while) loving' ← *śuv-* 'to love'

---

[38] The abbreviation stands for *urianchajski*, i.e. for an outdated name of Tuvan.

[39] The abbreviation stands for *kazański*, i.e. for Kazan Tatar.

[40] = Kowalski (1929a).

[41] Deny, J., 1921, *Grammaire de la langue turque (dialecte osmanli)*, Paris.

[42] Pröhle, V., 1915, Balkarische Studien. – *Keleti Szemle* 15: 165–276.

[43] Schinkewitsch, J., 1926–1927, Rabɣūzīs Syntax. – *Mitteilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* II/29: 130–172; 30: 1–57.

[44] Samojlovič, A.N., 1925, *Kratkaja učebnaja grammatika osmansko-tureckogo jazyka*, Leningrad.

[45] Katanov, N., 1903, *Opyt″ izsledovanija urjanchajskago jazyka s″ ukazaniem″ glavnejšich″ otnošenij ego k″ drugim″ jazykam″ tjurkskago kornja*, Kazań.

ḱul-a '(while) laughing' ← *ḱul-* 'to laugh'
kiịiń-a '(while) getting dressed' ← *kiịiń-* 'to get dressed'

[page 311]

tašy-ị '(while) carrying' (≤ *tašy-ị-a)[46] ← *tašy-* 'to carry'
śoźle-ị '(while) talking' (≤ *śoźla-ị ≤ *śoźla-ị-a) od *śoźla-* 'to talk'

[...][47]

[page 315]

§ 3. Suffix   *-a-doγon || -a-doγoč, -ị-doγon...*
          -'a-doγon || -'a-doγoč.
K̲o̲w̲a̲l̲s̲k̲i̲. Karaim. Texte. p. XXXVII.
G̲r̲z̲e̲g̲o̲r̲z̲e̲w̲s̲k̲i̲. Caraimica. RO I. p. 259[48]
B̲a̲n̲g̲. Osttürk. Dialektst. p. 4.[49]

The suffix *-a-doγon* (after stems ending in a consonant) and *-ị-doγon* (after stems ending in a vowel) is complex. It consists of the suffix *-a* (or *-ị*) that builds transgressives (see § 1) + *-doγon* (an altered form of the original participial **-durγan*).[50] In Karaim there is an *-a-doγoč* variant of this suffix. In Halych Karaim it takes the sound *-a-doγạn*, *-a-doγac*, thus the *-γan ≥ -γon* rounding of the participial suffix has not taken place.

This suffix is productive in Karaim and builds indeclinable participles that do not differ semantically from the *-a* participles.

[page 316]

Examples:
bar-a-doγon || bar-a-doγoč '(while) going' (≤ *bar-a-dur-γan, *bar-a-dur-γač) = (Eastern Turki)[51] *bar-ўy-dўγan* ← *bar-* 'to go'

---

[46] For *ị* < *ịa see e.g. Räsänen (1957: 185–186), Berta (1996: 668).

[47] The entry's continuation is published in Zajączkowski (1932: 106–107: § 32, last remark).

[48] Grzegorzewski, J., 1916–1918, Caraimica. Język Łach-Karaitów. – *Rocznik Orienta-listyczny* 1/2: 252–296.

[49] Bang, W., Marquart, J., 1914, Osttürkische Dialektsudien. I. Kapitel: Zum Vocalismus. – *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse*, Neue Folge 13: 1–12

[50] We do not know of other etymology of Kar. *-adoγon*, see e.g. Räsänen (1957: 173). For similar suffix structure cf. e.g. Kklp. *-atuγun* < *-a turγan*, Uyg. *-idiγan* < *-a turγan*, but in these cases the combination of the *-a* converb and the past participle of *tur-* 'to stay' resulted in a future participle suffixes (Baskakov 1952: 429, Nadžip 1960: 91). It may equally be, however, that in the case of Karaim the converbial element of the complex suffix became semantically dominant.

[51] Data qualified with Pol. *wsch. tur.* [= Pol. wschodni turecki] calques Germ. *Osttürkisch*, which in Zajączkowski's work stands for Eastern Turki or, more generally, Karluk Turkic.

kył-a-doɣon ‖ *kył-a-doɣoč* '(while) doing' = (Uyg.)[52] *kył-y̆-dy̆ɣan ← kył-* 'to do'
ai̯t-a-doɣon ‖ *ai̯t-a-doɣoč* '(while) saying' ← *ai̯t-* 'to say'
śuv́-a-doɣon ‖ *śuv́-a-doɣoč* '(while) loving' ← *śuv-* 'to love'
tany-i̯-doɣon '(while) knowing' (≤ **tany-i̯-a-doɣon*) ← *tany-* 'to know'
ḱoŕ-a-doɣon ‖ *ḱoŕ-a-doɣoč* '(while) seeing' ← *ḱoŕ-* 'to see'
śoźle-i̯-doɣon '(while) talking' (≤ **śoźla-i̯-a-doɣon*) ← *śoźla-* 'to talk'

[...][53]

[page 318]

§ 4. Suffix *-p*, *-yp*, *-ip*, *-up*, *-′up*.
K̠o̠w̠a̠l̠s̠k̠i̠. Karaim. Texte. p. XXXVII.
D̠e̠n̠y̠. Grammaire. p. 876f.
K̠a̠t̠a̠n̠o̠w̠. Изслѣд. урянх. яз. p. 578–590.
P̠r̠ö̠h̠l̠e̠. Karatsch. Stud. K. S. X. p. 234–5.[54]
P̠r̠ö̠h̠l̠e̠. Balkar. Stud. K. S. XV. p. 185.
S̠a̠m̠o̠j̠ł̠o̠w̠i̠c̠z̠. Грамматика. p. 65.
S̠c̠h̠i̠n̠k̠e̠w̠i̠t̠s̠c̠h̠. Rabɣūzīs Syntax. p. 66–68.

In Karaim, as well as in the other Turkic dialects, the suffix *-p* (after stems ending in a vowel) and *-yp*, *-ip*, *-up*, *-′up* (after stems ending in a consonant) is p̠r̠o̠d̠u̠c̠t̠i̠v̠e̠. It builds indeclinable p̠a̠r̠t̠i̠c̠i̠p̠l̠e̠s̠ (g̠e̠r̠u̠n̠d̠i̠u̠m̠) expressing p̠e̠r̠f̠e̠c̠t̠i̠v̠e̠ action.
Examples:
bai̯ła-p 'having tied' = (Krč.-Balk. …) *bajła-p ← bai̯ła-* 'to tie'
iźla-p 'having searched' = (Balk. …) *izlä-p ← iźla-* 'to search'

[page 319]

irła-p 'having sung' = (Com …) *irła-p ← irła-* 'to sing'
üŕu-p 'having walked' = (Com. …) *jürü-p ← üŕu-* 'to walk'
ał-yp 'having taken' = (Com. …) *ał-yp ← ał-* 'to take'
tanyš-yp 'having acquainted with' ← *tanyš-* 'zapoznać się'
ḱel-ip 'having came' = (Com. …) *käl-ip ← ḱel-* 'przyjść'
ḱeltir-ip 'having brought' = (Krč.-Balk. …) *kältir-ip ← ḱeltir-* 'przynieść'
boł-up 'having became' = (Krč.-Balk. …) *boł-up ← boł-* 'to become, to be'
ḱoŕ-up 'having seen' = (Com. …) *kör-üp ← ḱor-* 'to see'
ölt́uŕ-up 'having killed' = (Balk. …) *öltür-üp ← ölt́ur-* 'to kill'

---

[52] Expressed with Pol. *taranczi*, an outdated term for Uyghur (instead of *ujgurski*).
[53] The continuation of this entry is published in Zajączkowski (1932: 108: § 38).
[54] Pröhle, V., 1909, Karatschajische Studien. – *Keleti Szemle* 10: 215–304.

Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis: the original manuscript of Sufiksy...

Remark. Transgressives built with this suffix may receive the plural suffix: *ešit-ip-lar* (they) 'having heard'. [Kowalski. Teksty. p. XXXVII[55]].

[page 320]

§ 5. Suffix *-p-ty*, *-p-ti*; *-yp-ty*, *-ip-ti*, *-up-ty*, *-'up-ti*
Kowalski. Karaim. Texte. p. XXXVII.
Kowalski. Przyczynki do etn. RO. V. p. 210, remark 15. [56]

The suffix *-p-ty*, *-p-ti* (after stems ending in a vowel) and *-yp-ty*, *-ip-ti*, *-up-ty*, *-'up-ti* (after stems ending in a consonant) is complex. It consists of the suffix *-p*, *-yp*… mentioned above that builds transgressives (see § 4) + *-ty*, *-ti*. This unstressed[57] *-ty*, *-ti* is a remnant of the 3ʳᵈ ps. sg. ending *-tyr* (*-tur*) or of its full *-tur-ur* form.[58] [In Coman the *-p*, *-yp* transgressive + *-tur-ur* or *-tur* forms past

---

[55] = Kowalski (1929a).

[56] = Kowalski (1929b).

[57] The fact that *-ty* is not stressed is not mentioned in other grammatical descriptions.

[58] Musaev (1964: 299) argues against Kowalski's (1929a: xxxvii–xxxviii) standpoint, which is also repeated by A. Zajączkowski in his dissertation: in Musaev's view, the segment *-ty* ~ *-ti* cannot be identified with an earlier *-*tyr* < *-*tur*-, but is rather the conjunction *ta* ~ *da* which evolved into *ty* ~ *ti*. His argumentation goes as follows: **(1)** such Trakai Karaim sentences as **(a)** *ḱoťuŕupťa jüzľarin, baɣyndy ałynɣa* and **(b)** *ištyryłypta bary bir orunɣa bašłejdłar eľaťa unnu da kajɣyradłar kim bulɣar* (published in the journals *Dostu Karajnyn* and *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, vol. 5, respectively; without the exact place of attestation provided by Musaev) clearly show that there were also variants with *-a* of the discussed segment; **(2)** the Kar. *a > y* change is very frequent; and **(3)** the Russian translation of the sentences above, namely *И подняв голову, посмотрел вперед* and *И собравшись все в одно место, начинают сеять муку и заботятся о том, кто будет месить*, clearly show that the analysed segment is of conjunctional origin since Russ. *u* 'and' introduces both sentences.

Musaev's argumentation does not hold water for many reasons:

Firstly, it is not the conjunction *ta* ~ *da* which is added to *ḱoťuŕup* '(after) lifting' and *ištyryłyp* '(after) gathering', but rather the intensifying particle *-ta* ~ *-ťa*, known also from south-western sources (Németh 2011: 319).

Secondly, there is no *a > y* change in Karaim that would be frequent. Indeed, an *a > y* change often takes place in front of *j*, but it is caused precisely by the adjacent *-j-* (see the negated present tense forms, optative mood marker), which makes the difference. The alternation of the future tense forms with *-ar* and *-yr* takes place only in south-western Karaim and is of morphological origin.

Thirdly, we have found the source of the second sentence and it came as something of a surprise to see that in Kowalski's (1929b: 203, 204) article there is no *ištyryłypta*, but *ištyryłypty*! Astonishingly, Musaev altered the quoted data. Fortunately, we have managed to find the other Karaim sentence, too, on page 7 of the second volume of *Dostu Karajnyn* in a poem of Zarach Firkowicz (only his pen name *Zefir* is provided). Indeed, in lines 13–14 we read (in the original orthography): *Kiotiuruptia juzlaryń* / *Bahyndy ałynha*. Even though Musaev made a corrupted copy (he transcribes the word *juzlaryń* as *йÿзлярин*), the *-ťa* ending is clearly legible.

tense verbs: B̲a̲ng, Mr.Ps., 245[59]: *ayt-ip-tur-ur*, 247: *tab-ub-tur*, 250: *kon-up-tur*, 256: *ieŋ-ip-tir* etc.]

This suffix is p̲r̲o̲d̲u̲c̲t̲i̲v̲e̲ in Karaim, especially in colloquial speech. It forms indeclinable participles, which do not differ semantically from the *-p*, *-yp*… participles.

[page 321]

Examples:

anła-p-ty 'having understood' ← *anła-* 'to understand'
iźla-p-ti 'having searched' ← *iźla-* 'to search'
ťuźu-p-ti 'having smoothened' ← *ťuźu-* 'to smoothen'
ał-yp-ty 'having taken' ← *ał-* 'to take'
tyiͅył-yp-ty 'having been silent' ← *tyiͅył-* 'to be silent'
b́er-ip-ti 'having given' ← *b́er-* 'to give'
kiplan-ip-ti 'having strengthened' ← *kiplań-* 'to strengthen'
boł-up-ty 'having been' ← *boł-* 'to be'
uruš-up-ty 'having fought' ← *uruš-* 'to fight'
ḱoŕ-up-ti 'having seen' ← *ḱor-* 'to see'

Fourthly, Musaev's argument that the Russian translation clearly supports his idea is completely ridiculous. The fact that a grammatical construction in one language can be translated into another is in no way proof that the two constructions are structurally similar. It is still quite amusing, however, to realize that the author of this translation is in fact Musaev himself. He had actually translated a Karaim sentence into Russian, and then used this Russian translation to determine the structure of the Karaim original. Incidentally, there is nothing that would motivate the translator to begin the translation with 'and'. In Kowalski's (1929b: 203, 204) article quoted by Musaev the translation of the second sentence (ignored by Musaev) goes as follows: "Zebrawszy się wszyscy w jedno miejsce, zaczynają przesiewać mąkę i troszczą się, kto będzie mieszał". There is thus no sentence-beginning Pol. *i* 'and', even though Polish syntax would undeniably allow that. Given that Kowalski's article is a result of field work, I have no reason to doubt his transcription or translation.

Finally, Musaev (1964: 299) did not mention the available Turkic comparative data that supports the idea of a **tur-* > **-tyr* > *-ty* change. If we turn to the closest Kiptchak linguistic data, namely, on the one hand, to the language of *Codex Comanicus* and, on the other, to Armeno-Kiptchak, we see that there is a complex past tense built with the verb *tur-* attached to the *-p* converb there. This tense is used to express finished actions (see e.g. von Gabain 1959: 70; Pritsak 1959: 84; Grunin 1967: 373–374; for further data see Räsänen 1957: 172). It goes without saying that these two grammatical categories, i.e. a converb of *anterior* character, and a past tense in which the emphasis is put on the action's finiteness, are very closely related.

In my opinion, for the time being, there is no valid argument against Kowalski's view, whereas *-ťa* in *ḱoťuŕupťa* should probably be explained as an intensifying particle which has nothing in common with *-ty*. But, it is difficult to say anything decisive based on one word, a fact that Musaev also should have been aware of.

[59] Zajączkowski refers to: Bang, W., Marquart, J., 1914, Osttürkische Dialektsudien. III. Kapitel: Der komanische Marienpsalter. – *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse*, Neue Folge 13: 242–276.

ölt́uŕ-up-ti 'having killed' ← *ölt́ur* 'to kill'
ištyryŀ-yp-ty (Ḳo̠w̠. RO. V. 203[60]) 'having gathered' ← *ištyryŀ-* 'to gather'

[page 322]

§ 6. Suffix   *-χyn-ča, -γyn-ča, -kyn-ča, -kiń-ǎ, -giń-ǎ*
　　　　　　 -χun-ča, -γun-ča, -kun-ča, -ḱuń-ǎ, -ǵuń-ǎ

Ḳo̠w̠a̠l̠s̠k̠i̠. Karaim. Texte. p. XXXVIII
B̠a̠n̠g̠. Zur Kritik … d. Ujg. Turfanfr. SPAW. 1915. XXXIX, p. 632f.[61]
B̠r̠o̠c̠k̠e̠l̠m̠a̠n̠n̠. Zur Grammatik. ZDMG. 70. p. 208.[62]
D̠e̠n̠y̠. Grammaire. Str. 986–995, p. 1000f.
P̠r̠ö̠h̠l̠e̠. Karatsch. Stud. K. S. X. p. 234.
P̠r̠ö̠h̠l̠e̠. Balkar. Stud. K. S. XV. p. 196. § 81.
S̠a̠m̠o̠j̠ŀo̠w̠i̠c̠z̠. Граммaтика. p. 67.
B̠ö̠h̠t̠l̠. Mél. As. I. 118–119.[63]

The suffix *-χyn-ča, -γyn-ča, -kyn-ča, -kin-ǎ, -gin-ǎ* (after illabial vowels) and *-χun-ča, -γun-ča, -kun-ča, -ḱun-ǎ, -ǵun-ǎ* (after labial vowels) is complex. It consists of *-χyn, -γyn*… + the equative suffix *-ča* (cf. chapt. IV, § 4).[64] As far as the first element of the suffix goes, (*-χyn*…) B̠r̠o̠c̠k̠e̠l̠m̠a̠n̠n̠ believes that it should also be treated as a complex suffix consisting of the deverbal nominal suffix *-yk* + the instrumental case ending *-yn* (*-γyn ≤ *yk-yn*).

[page 323]

This suffix is p̠r̠o̠d̠u̠c̠t̠i̠v̠e̠ in Karaim. It forms verbal adverbs that denote the l̠i̠m̠i̠t̠ of an action ('until…', 'as long as…').
Examples:
tap-χyn-ča 'until finding' ← *tap-* 'to find'
kaŀ-γyn-ča 'until staying' ← *kaŀ-* 'to stay'
taχ-kyn-ča 'until hanging' ← *taχ-* 'to hang'
ḱet-kiń-ǎ 'until driving (away)' ← *ḱet-* 'to drive (away)'
ḱel-giń-ǎ 'until coming' ← *ḱel-* 'to come'
tut-χun-ča 'until catching' ← *tut-* 'to catch'

---

[60] = Kowalski (1929b).
[61] Bang, W., 1915, Zur Kritik und Erklärung der Berliner Uigurischen Turfanfragmente. – *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* 39: 623–635.
[62] Brockelmann, C., 1916, Zur Grammatik des Osmanisch-Türkischen. – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 70: 185–215.
[63] Added in pencil. The abbreviation stands for: Böhtlingk, O., 1849–1850, Zur türkischentatarischen Grammatik. – *Mélanges Asiatiques, tirés du Bulletin historico-philologique de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg* 1: 114–152.
[64] For this etymology see also Räsänen (1957: 190–191), Musaev (1964: 302), Džanmavov (1967: 120–121).

boł-ɣun-ča 'until being' ← boł- 'to be'
t́uš-ḱuń-ča 'until going down' ← t́uš- 'to go down'
ḱor-ǵuń-ča 'until seeing' ← ḱor- 'to see'
čyχ-kyn-ča (Ḳow. RO. V. 213) 'until coming out' ← čyχ- 'to come out'
kuru-ɣun-ča (Ḳow. RO. V. 213) 'until drying' ← kuru- 'to dry'
i̯etil-giń-ča (Ḳow. RO. V. 214) 'until reaching; until ripening' ← i̯etil- 'to reach'
<u>*Nota bene*</u>: ńe-giń-ča 'as long as' ← ńe 'what' [Cf. Ḍeny. Gramm. p. 960, remark.]

[page 324]

§ 7. Suffix　*-mai̯yn-ča, -ḿai̯iń-ča*
　　　　　　 -mai̯yn, -ḿai̯iń
Ḳowalsḳi. Karaim. Texte. p. XXXVIII.
Ḍeny. Grammaire. p. 921, 941, remark.
Melioransḳij. Арабъ филол. p. LXVI. § 10 and remark 037.[65]
Pröhlẹ. Karatsch. Studien. K. S. X. p. 230.
Pröhlẹ. Balkar. Studien. K. S. XV. p. 183. § 60.
Sçhinkewitsçh. Rabɣūzīs Syntax. p. 72.

The suffix *-mai̯yn-ča, -ḿai̯iń-ča* is the negative form of the previously discussed (*-mai̯yn-ča* ≤ **-ma-ɣyn-ča*). It consists therefore of the negation *-ma* + *-ɣyn* (cf. § 6) + the equative suffix *-ča*.[66] This equative *-ča* is often not used, thus the suffix may sound *-mai̯yn, -ḿai̯iń*. Forms with *-ča* and without it are the variants of one and the same suffix and have the same meaning.

This suffix is <u>productive</u> in Karaim and builds negative transgressives.
Examples:
boł-ma-i̯yn ‖ *boł-ma-i̯yn-ča* 'not being' ← *boł-* 'to be'

[page 325]

saɣyn-ma-i̯yn ‖ *saɣyn-ma-i̯yn-ča* 'not recollecting' ← *saɣyn-* 'to recollect'
śuv́-ḿa-i̯iń ‖ *śuv́-ḿa-i̯iń-ča* 'not loving' ← *śuv-* 'to love'
i̯etil-ḿa-i̯iń ‖ *i̯etil-ḿa-i̯iń-ča* (Ḳow. Teksty. 40) 'not reaching, not arriving' ←
　　 i̯etil- 'to reach, to arrive'

---

[65] Melioranskij, P.M., 1900, *Arab″ filolog″ o tureckom″ jazyke*, Sanktpeterburg″.
[66] Musaev (1964: 302) links *-mai̯yn* to OT *madyn ~ matyn* etc. (see von Gabain 1950: 124–125). Räsänen (1957: 193) doubts this explanation, but does not propose any other. Berta (1996: 669) writes about the converbial suffix *-yXn*, which "ist eine frequentive Endung bei negativen Verbstämmen". Zajączkowski's idea, in the light of the well attested *-ɣ-* > *-i̯-* change (see Zajączkowski 1932: 155, e.g. *đei̯iń* 'until' < **dägin*), still remains interesting, but we did not find it repeated elsewhere. The origin of the equative *-ča* is clear.

www.czasopisma.pan.pl   PAN   www.journals.pan.pl
POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK

Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis: the original manuscript of Sufiksy...

Cf.: (M.K. 4–5. s. 8[67]): *syį ꞌkuvma-įyn, iźꞌlaŧa-įiń įaɫyn išiniń*[68] 'not soliciting honours, not searching reward for one's work' ← *kuv-* 'to pursue, to solicit', ← *iźla-* 'to search'

[page 326]

§ 8. Suffix *-kač-oχ, -γač-oχ*
　　　　　-ḱač-oχ, -ǵač-oχ

Kowalski. Karaim. Texte. p. XXXVIII.
Deny. Grammaire. p. 1009.
Katanow. Изслѣд. урянх. яз. p. 591–596.
Melioranskij. Арабъ филол. p. LXVI. § 10 and remark 038.

The sufix *-kač-oχ, -γač-oχ, -ḱač-oχ, -ǵač-oχ* is complex. It consists of the suffix *-kač, -γač…* that forms transgressives (cf. § 3: *-a-doγoč ≤ *-a-dur-γač*) + the *-oχ* particle (not affected by vowel harmony) which specifies the time of the action performed.[69]

The suffix is used rarely, mostly in the literary language. It forms transgressives that specify the exact time of the action: 'exactly when…', 'from the moment when…'.

Examples:

1. *ḱel-ǵač-oχ* 'having come' (Gen. 12,14)[70] ← *ḱel-* 'to come' [Kowalski, Teksty. XXXVIII].

[page 327]

2. *ökťamlań-ǵač-oχ* (Ps. 10,4)[71] 'having became proud, from the moment of having became haughty' ← *ökťamlań-* 'to be proud, to become haughty'
3. *ťuǵań-ǵač-oχ* (Ps. 71,9) 'having stopped, from the moment of having ended' ← *ťuǵań-* 'to stop, to end'
4. (KarH.) *cyk-kac-ok* (Kow. RO[72]) 'having came out' ← *cyk-* 'to come out'

---

[67] Firkowicz, Sz., 1928, Kyna (aziź sahynczyna E. Kobeckiniń). – *Myśl Karaimska* 1/4–5: 8–9.
[68] In the original orthography: *syj kuwmain, iźlamiaiń jaɫyn iszyniń*.
[69] Such an etymology is supported by comparative linguistic data. The same etymology for Kar. *-kačoχ* is proposed by Räsänen (1957: 189–190). For Turkic cognates of the intensifying particle *-ok* see Räsänen (1957: 248), Džanmavov (1967: 187–188). Musaev (1964: 301) describes this suffix as < *-ka(n)* + *-čaχ*, but no further explanations or comparative data are provided.
[70] Gen. = Genesis.
[71] Ps. = Psalms.
[72] The exact volume and page number are missing.

[page 328]

The suffix *-kač*, *-γač…*, which in Karaim is used with *-ok* (*-oχ*) or in the fossilized form *-doγoč* (≤ *-dur-γač), in other Turkic dialects is productive and forms transgressives.

Examples:

(Tuv.) *par-γaš* 'after leaving'

(Tuv.) *kir-gäš* 'after entering'

(Chag.) *kör-gäč* 'having seen, after seeing'

(KazT.) *ał-γač* 'having taken, after taking'

4. Final *-k* or *-ḱ*?

There is an interesting phonetic feature attested throughout the manuscript: the word-final /k/ in the palatal consonantal environment – which in the scholarly literature is usually transcribed with *-k* in this position (see e.g. Kowalski 1929a). In Zajączkowski's manuscript it is written with a palatal *-ḱ* which may suggest that it was also pronounced so. Significantly, this has been changed in Zajączkowski (1932): the palatality of the final *-ḱ* is not noted at all; we find there *-k*, consistently.

The question remains: why did Zajączkowski alter his transcription? Did *-k* reflect, for instance, the actual literary pronunciation while *-ḱ* existed only in idiolects? Whatever the reason might have been, it seems noteworthy that the word-final *-ḱ* may have occurred in certain idiolects of Lutsk Karaim, as we adduced in Németh (2011: 141, fn. 8, 9).

The following suffixes (we follow Zajączkowski's transcription) appear consistently with *-ḱ* in the respective examples:

1. *-aχ* ~ *-aḱ* (chapter III, § 1),
2. *-čyχ* ~ *-čeχ* ~ *-čiḱ* ~ *-čeḱ* ~ *-čuχ* ~ *-čoχ* ~ *-čuḱ* ~ *-čoḱ* (chapter III, § 3),
3. *-dyχ* ~ *-diḱ* ~ *-duχ* ~ *-čuḱ* (chapter I, § 27),
4. *-maχ* ~ *-ḿaḱ* (chapter I § 23),
5. *-raχ* ~ *-ŕaḱ* (chapter III, § 10),
6. *-yχ* ~ *-iḱ* ~ *-uχ* ~ *-uḱ* ~ *-ḱ* (chapter II, § 3).

In a few other cases the notation is inconsistent and occasionally we find *-k* instead of *-ḱ*. Nevertheless, since forms with *-ḱ* are clearly dominant, this alternation seems to be due merely to inattention, see:

7. *-aχ* ~ *-aḱ*[73] (chapter I, § 4),
8. *-čaχ* ~ *-čaḱ* ~ *-čuk* [a few lines below: *-čuḱ*] ~ *-čuń*[74] (chapter I, § 21),

---

[73] The form *-ak is* attested several times.

[74] There are nearly the same number of lexical examples with *-čaḱ* ~ *-čak* as with *-čuḱ* ~ *-čuk*.

    9. *-χ ~ -ḱ ~ -yχ ~ -iḱ ~ -uχ ~ -'uḱ*[75] (chapter I, § 6),
10. *-łyχ ~ -liḱ ~ -łuχ ~ -čuḱ*[76] (chapter III, § 12),
11. *-vuχ ~ -čuḱ*[77] (chapter I, § 12).

There are no other suffixes that would end in /k/.

5. Reviews of Zajączkowski (1932)

    Shortly after its publication, Zajączkowski's book was received favourably, being reviewed by five authors: Kowalski (1932–1934), Mentzel (1934), Yoshitaka (1934), Menges (1935), and Em (1935). In their view, the most important value of the book was the author's comparative approach to the linguistic material. In addition, as in the 1930's Karaim was still a poorly documented Turkic language, and every academic work was most welcome.[78]

    Zajączkowski's (1932) work was ground-breaking, not only as far as Karaim was concerned, but also for Turkological scholarly literature as a whole – as was also emphasized by Kowalski (1932–1934: 114). Up to then, no Turkic language has had its derivation system described in such a detailed way. It is enough to point out that it was published twenty-five years before Räsänen's (1957) epoch-making *Materialien zur Morphologie* and thirty-four years before Sevortjan's (1966) excellent study on Azerbaijani comparative nominal word formation. In fact, as we know from Zajączkowski's letter to Seraya Shapshal written on 26th March 1928, he modelled his thesis after similar studies from the field of Mongolic and Altaic studies, namely Ramstedt's (1912) study on Mongolic and Turkic verbal suffixes and Poppe's (1923–1927) article on Mongolian nominal suffixes. As a matter of fact, the subject of Turkic derivation and historical morphology still await a more detailed treatment. Studies of the type are still very much in demand in Turkology.

    The only drawback of Zajączkowski's work, as Menges (1933: 168) wrote, was the language it appeared in. However, despite the fact that it was written in Polish, it was, and still is, cited very often in scholarly circles. In fact, although published more than 80 years ago, it is still considered to be an important study as far as Karaim and Turkic comparative word formation are concerned.

---

[75] Written with *-k* in one word and 17 times with *-ḱ*.

[76] Written consistently with *-ḱ* on pages 229–230, but quoted with *-k* on pages 231–232.

[77] Written once as *-čuk*, three times as *-čuḱ*.

[78] How poorly known Karaim was in those times is clearly evident in Menzel's (1934) and Em's (1935) reviews where Trakai Karaim is referred to as "Ost-Karaimisch".

6. Appendix

6.1. Tables

Table 1. Additions and corrections implemented in the final version of *Sufiksy...*

Suffix or remark	Manuscript			Type of additions or changes					Zajączkowski (1932)		
	ch.	§	page no.	biblio-graphy	comp. data	Karaim data	descrip-tion	correc-tions	ch.	§	page no.
-čy	I	1	24–26	+	+		+	+	II	19	89–90
-m	I	2	27–30	+	+	+			II	1	57–58
-š	I	3	31–35	+	+	+			II	2	59–61
-aχ	I	4	36–38	+	+	+			II	3	61–63
-χaχ	I	5	39–41	+	+		+	+	II	14	82–83
-χ	I	6	42–48	+	+	+			II	4	63–66
-y	I	7	49–52	+	+	+	+		II	31	103–105
-a	I	8	53–54	+	+		+	+	II	32	105–107
-χy	I	9	55–60	+	+	+			II	5	66–68
-χa	I	10	61–65	+	+				II	6	68–70
-v	I	11	66–71	+	+	+		+	II	8	73–75
-vuχ	I	12	72–73				+		II	9	75–76
-yn	I	13	74–76	+	+	+	+	+	II	11	77–79
-an	I	14	77–78	+	+	+			II	10	76–77
-χan	I	15	79–82	+		+		+	II	12	79–81
-χyn	I	16	83–85	+	+	+	+		II	13	81–82
-χyč	I	17	86–89	+	+	+	+	+	II	7	71–73
-č	I	18	90–93	+	+	+	+		II	18	87–89
-mač	I	19	94–95				+		II	22	94–95
-t	I	20	96–98	+	+	+	+	+	II	15	84–85
-čaχ	I	21	99–101	+	+	+	+		II	20	90–92
-ma	I	22	102–105	+	+	+			II	21	92–94
-maχ	I	23	106–109	+	+	+	+		II	23	95–96
-ɣuču	I	24	110–113	+	+		+	+	II	24	96–97
-vču	I	24	110–113	+		+	+	+	II	25	97–98
-dačy	I	25	113–114						II	26	98–99
-r	I	26	115–119	+	+	+			II	27	99–101
-dyχ	I	27	120–121	+	+	+			II	29	102–103

Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis: the original manuscript of Sufiksy...

Suffix or remark	Manuscript			Type of additions or changes					Zajączkowski (1932)		
	ch.	§	page no.	biblio-graphy	comp. data	Karaim data	descrip-tion	correc-tions	ch.	§	page no.
-myš	I	28	122–124	+		+	+		II	28	101–102
-asy	I	29	125–126		+				II	30	103
-syχ	I	30	127–128						–	–	–
-na	I	31	129				+		II	33	107
-ty	–	–	–						II	16	85–86
-ł	–	–	–						II	17	86–87
+a-	II	1	134–138	+	+	+	+		IV	1	130–132
+y-	II	2	139–141	+	+			+	IV	2	132
+yχ-	II	3	142–144	+	+	+	+		IV	3	132–134
+γar-	II	4	145–146	+					IV	5	134–135
+r-	II	5	147–150	+	+		+		IV	6	135–136
+aį-	II	6	151–153	+	+	+	+		IV	7	136–138
+χyr-	II	7	154–158	+				+	IV	9	139–140
+γura-	II	8	159–161	+				+	IV	10	140–141
+ra-	II	9	162–164	+					IV	11	141–142
+da-	II	10	165–167	+			+		IV	12	142–143
+na-	II	11	168–169						IV	13	143–144
+ša-	II	12	170–171	+					IV	14	144–145
+sa-	II	13	172–174	+	+				IV	15	145–146
+šla-	II	14	175–176	+					IV	16	146–147
+ła-	II	15	177–180	+		+			IV	17	147–148
+ta-	II	16	181–184	+	+	+	+	+	IV	18	148–149
+łan-	II	17	185–188	+		+			IV	19	149–150
+γa-	–	–	–						IV	4	134
+rγan-	–	–	–						IV	8	138–139
+aχ	III	1	192–195	+		+			I	1	17–18
+χyna	III	2	196–199	+	+				I	3	20–21
+čyχ	III	3	200–204	+		+			I	7	24–26
+ča	III	4	205–207	+	+	+	+		I	6	23–24
+γač	III	5	208–210			+			I	4	21–22
+č	III	6	211–213	+	+	+	+		I	5	22–23
+ył	III	7	214–215	+			+	+	I	21	40
+an	III	8	216–219			+			I	2	19–20

Suffix or remark	Manuscript			Type of additions or changes					Zajączkowski (1932)		
	ch.	§	page no.	biblio-graphy	comp. data	Karaim data	descrip-tion	correc-tions	ch.	§	page no.
+*man*	III	9	220–221	+	+				I	8	26–27
+*raχ*	III	10	222–224	+					I	9	27–28
+*saχ*	III	11	226–228					+	I	18	38–39
+*łyχ*	III	12	229–233	+		+	+		I	11	29–31
+*ły*	III	13	234–236	+		+			I	12	31–32
+*syz*	III	14	237–240	+		+			I	13	32–33
+*čy*	III	15	241–244	+	+	+			I	10	28–29
+*daš*	III	16	245–247	+					I	16	36–37
+*γy*	III	17	248–253	+	+				I	14	33–35
+*sy*	III	18	254–255						I	20	39
[+*si*]	III	19	?–258				?	?	I	25	41–42
+*ka*	III	20	259–261	+	+	+	+		I	15	35–36
+*duz*	III	21	262–263	+					I	23	41
+*sun*	III	22	264						I	19	39
+*mar*	III	23	265	+					I	24	41
+*a*	III	24	266–267					+	I	26	42
+*był a*	III	25	268						I	27	42–43
+*sa*	–	–	–						I	17	37–38
+*muš*	–	–	–						I	22	40
+*n*	IV	1	272–277	+		+			I	31	45–47
+*ła*	IV	2	278–279					+	I	29	44
+*lei̯*	IV	3	280–282						I	30	44–45
+*ča*	IV	4	283–284			+			I	28	43
+*ry*	IV	5	285–288	+	+		+		I	32	47–48
+*χary*	IV	6	289–292	+			+		I	33	48–49
+*tyn*	IV	7	293–295	+	+		+		I	34	49–50
+*nčy*	V	2	299–300	+					I	35	51
+*ar*	V	3	301–302	+		+			I	36	52
+*ov*	V	4	303–305				+		I	37	52–53
+*oʋlań*	V	5	306–307						I	38	53–54
-*a*	VI	1	310–312						–	–	–
-*y*	VI	2	313–314						–	–	–
-*adoγon*	VI	3	315–317	+			+	+	II	34	108

Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis: the original manuscript of Sufiksy...

Suffix or remark	Manuscript			Type of additions or changes					Zajączkowski (1932)		
	ch.	§	page no.	biblio-graphy	comp. data	Karaim data	descrip-tion	correc-tions	ch.	§	page no.
-p	VI	4	318–319			+	+	+	II	35	108
-pty	VI	5	320–321						–	–	–
-χynča	VI	6	322–323						–	–	–
-mai̯yn	VI	7	324–325						–	–	–
-kačoχ	VI	8	326–328						–	–	–
-yχ-	VII	1	331–332	+	+	+	+		III	1	110–111
-n-	VII	2	333–336	+		+	+	+	III	3	112–113
-l̇-	VII	3	337–339	+					III	4	114
-š-	VII	4	340–343	+					III	5	115–116
-γyr-	VII	5	344–347	+		+			III	6	116–117
-yr-	VII	6	348–351	+		+			III	7	117–118
-χar-	VII	7	352–353						III	8	118–119
-ar-	VII	8	354–355	+	+				III	9	119
-t-	VII	9	356–359	+		+	+		III	10	120–121
-tyr-	VII	10	360–364	+					III	11	121–123
-tar-	VII	11	365–366	+		+			III	12	123–124
-sa(l̇)-	VII	12	367–368						III	13	124–125
-χała-	VII	13	369–372	+			+		III	14	125–126
-ał-	VII	14	373–374	+		+			III	15	126–127
-ma-	VII	15	375–376			+			III	16	127
-χa-	–	–	–						III	2	111–112
remark	VIII	1	382			+	+		V	1	152
remark	VIII	2	383	+	+	+	+		V	2	152–153
remark	VIII	3	384–385	+	+	+	+		V	3	153–154
remark	VIII	4	386–387	+	+	+	+		V	4	154
remark	VIII	5	388						V	5	154–155
remark	VIII	6	389–391	+	+	+	+	+	V	6	155–156
remark	VIII	7	392		+		+		V	7	156
remark	VIII	8	393	+	+	+	+		V	8	156–157
remark	VIII	9	394	+	+	+	+		V	9	157–158
remark	VIII	10	395–396	+	+	+	+		V	10	158–159
remark	–	–	–						V	11	159
remark	VIII	11	397–398		+	+	+		V	12	160

Michał Németh

Suffix or remark	Manuscript			Type of additions or changes					Zajączkowski (1932)		
	ch.	§	page no.	biblio-graphy	comp. data	Karaim data	descrip-tion	correc-tions	ch.	§	page no.
remark	VIII	12	399–400			+			V	13	160–161
remark	–	–	–						V	14	161–162
remark	–	–	–						V	15	162–163
chapter	–	–	–						VI	1–9	164–171

Table 2. Tables of contents of A. Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis and its printed version

Manuscript	Zajączkowski (1932)
Wstęp.................................. 1–12 [= Introduction]	Wstęp .... 1–8 [= Introduction]
Źródła .... 13–22b [= Sources]	Spis literatury .... 9–16 [= References]
Rozdział I. Sufiksy tworzące imiona z pni czasownikowych .... 23–132 [= Chapter I. Suffixes that build nomina from verbal bases]	Rozdział I. Sufiksy tworzące imiona z pni imiennych .... 17–56 [= Chapter I. Suffixes that build nomina from nominal bases]
Rozdział II. Sufiksy tworzące czasowniki z pni imiennych .... 133–190 [= Chapter II. Suffixes that build verba from nominal bases]	Rozdział II. Sufiksy tworzące imiona z pni czasownikowych........ 57–109 [= Chapter II. Suffixes that build nomina from verbal bases]
Rozdział III. Sufiksy tworzące imiona z pni imiennych .... 191–270 [= Chapter III. Suffixes that build nomina from nominal bases]	Rozdział III. Sufiksy tworzące czasowniki z pni czasownikowych . 110–129 [= Chapter III. Suffixes that build verba from verbal bases]
Rozdział IV. Sufiksy tworzące przysłówki z pni imiennych .... 271–296 [= Chapter IV. Suffixes that build adverbs from nominal bases]	Rozdział IV. Sufiksy tworzące czasowniki z pni imiennych....130–151 [= Chapter IV. Suffixes that build verba from nominal bases]
Rozdział V. Sufiksy tworzące liczebniki z pni liczebnikowych .... 297–308 [= Chapter V. Suffixes that build numerals from numeral bases]	Rozdział V. Uwagi dotyczące zmian fonetycznych w pniach i sufiksach .... 152–163 [= Chapter V. Remarks on phonetic changes in bases and suffixes]

Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis: the original manuscript of Sufiksy...

Michał Németh

6.2. Reviews of A. Zajączkowski's doctoral dissertation (along with translation)

[page 1–2]

Ocena

pracy doktorskiej p. Ananjasza Zajączkowskiego
p.t. „Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodnio-karaimskim."

Po okresie nader szybkiego ale powierzchownego zaznajamiania się z coraz to nowemi zabytkami dawnych języków tureckich i narzeczami współczesnemi, weszły badania turkologiczne w okres prac monograficznych. Gramatyka porównawcza języków tureckich może powstać dopiero wówczas, gdy przynajmniej najważniejsze zabytki językowe i pewna ilość współczesnych języków zostaną opracowane pod względem gramatycznym w sposób monograficzny.

Z takich rozważań ogólnych powstała praca p. A. Zajączkowskiego, która sobie stawia za zadanie opracowanie zasadniczego działu morfologji zachodnio-karaimskiej, t.j. zasobu sufiksów, tak wielką rolę odgrywających w językach aglutynacyjnych.

Trzymając się podziału pni na nominalne i werbalne, dzieli p. Zajączkowski cały swój materjał na 1) grupę sufiksów tworzących imiona z pni werbalnych 2) grupę sufiksów tworzących czasowniki z pni nominalnych 3) grupę sufiksów tworzących się z pniami nominalnemi i tworzących pochodne nominalne 4) sufiksy tworzące przysłówki z pni imiennych 5) sufiksy obserwowane przy liczebnikach 6) sufiksy tworzące z pni czasownikowych nieodmienne twory gerundjalne 7) sufiksy tworzące z pni werbalnych twory czasownikowe odmienne.

Sposób opracowania każdego sufiksu jest następujący: najpierw podano literaturę, dotyczącą odnośnego sufiksu, dalej następuje definicja funkcji znaczeniowej, wreszcie zestawienie materjału karaimskiego ze wskazaniem źródeł i próbę etymologizacji przytoczonych pochodnych. Przy każdym sufiksie znajdujemy też rzut oka na materjał pozakaraimski, co bardzo ułatwia porównawczą ocenę zjawisk. Przy sufiksach produktywnych ograniczył się autor do przytoczenia kilku charakterystycznych przykładów, natomiast przy sufiksach małoproduktywnych i martwych przytoczył cały istniejący materjał.

Najbardziej wartościową stroną pracy jest zestawienie materjału nadzwyczaj sumiennie i oględnie. Autor mógł się tu oprzeć na praktycznej znajomości języka, który zna od dziecka i na dokładnej znajomości całej wydanej dotychczas literatury zachodnio-karaimskiej. Prócz tego sięgnął on jeszcze do źródeł rękopiśmiennych, między innemi wykorzystał całkowicie rękopiśmienny przekład Psalmów. W ten sposób zgromadził on materjał ogromny, niemal kompletny, który zapewnia pracy trwałą wartość, gdyż jest on najzupełniej nowy, dotychczas nigdzie nie wyzyskany.

www.czasopisma.pan.pl   PAN   www.journals.pan.pl
POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK

Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis: the original manuscript of Sufiksy...

W celu naukowego zrozumienia zebranych faktów, użył autor metody porównawczej, zaznajamiając się ze stanem rzeczy w innych językach tureckich przy pomocy całej niemal odnośnej literatury językoznawczej.

Wskutek zebrania bardzo obfitego materjału, który odpowiednio zestawiony sam się wzajemnie wyjaśnia, dalej wskutek dokładniejszego, niż to było dotychczas możliwe, określenia funkcji poszczególnych sufiksów, zdania sobie sprawy ze zmian fonetycznych zachodzących przy zetknięciu się sufiksów z pniami i wreszcie wskutek porównawczego traktowania zjawisk, mógł autor wyjaśnić trafnie cały szereg tworów językowych, dotychczas niejasnych lub wyjaśnianych błędnie.

Nieco słabiej przedstawia się definicja funkcji znaczeniowych poszczególnych sufiksów. Tutaj będzie mógł autor, przygotowując swą pracę do druku, wprowadzić dużo poprawek, przemyśliwszy jeszcze raz cały swój materjał.

Głębsze ujęcie istoty zjawisk musi też, mem zdaniem, doprowadzić do zmiany podziału całego materiału, w który niepotrzebnie wprowadzono cechę drugorzędną, mianowicie funkcję syntaktyczną poszczególnych tworów, zamiast trzymania się wyłącznie podziału na sufiksy pni werbalnych i pni nominalnych. Podział obecny świadczy, że autor jeszcze nie całkiem wyzwolił się z pod nienaukowych formułek przeważnej części gramatycznych opracowań języków tureckich, a zarazem nie posiada jeszcze zupełnej swobody spojrzenia na swój bogaty i różnorodny materjał.

Poza temi zastrzeżeniami jednak uważam pracę za wybijającą się ponad przeciętną miarę dysertacyj doktorskich. Stanowi ona istotne wzbogacenie naszej wiedzy turkologicznej. Zebrany w niej materjał i cały szereg wysnutych zeń wniosków zachowa wartość trwałą. Autor dowiódł w niej zdolności samodzielnej pracy naukowej: umiejętnego zbierania materjałów, grupowania go i objaśniania, tudzież logicznego wyciągania wniosków. Dowiódł dalej znajomości odnośnej literatury naukowej i umiejętności posługiwania się nią.

Biorąc to wszystko pod uwagę, stwierdzam, że praca p. Zajączkowskiego czyni w zupełności zadość warunkom dysertacji doktorskiej i że na jej podstawie może być Kandydat dopuszczony do egzaminów ścisłych na doktora filozofii.

W Krakowie, dn. 9. czerwca 1929.

Tadeusz Kowalski

Praca p. Zajączkowskiego jest cennym przyczynkiem do gramatyki języków tureckich i będzie posiadać trwałą wartość. Dlatego przyłączam się w zupełności do opinji prof. Kowalskiego.

Kraków 12 czerwca 1929.

Prof. dr. Jan Rozwadowski

Michał Németh

Translation

An opinion

concerning Mr. Ananjasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis entitled
Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodnio-karaimskim

After a period of acquainting itself quickly but cursorily with newly found sources of ancient Turkic languages as well as with the contemporary Turkic dialects, Turkological research has entered an era of monographs. A comparative grammar of Turkic languages may appear only when at least the grammar of the most important linguistic monuments and a certain number of contemporary languages have been monographed.

Mr. A. Zajączkowski took such matters into consideration when writing his work, in which he aimed to present a fundamental part of the Western Karaim morphology, namely the suffixes which play a very important role in agglutinative languages.

Following the division between nominal and verbal roots, Mr. Zajączkowski divides his entire material into 1) a group of suffixes that build nomina from verbal bases, 2) a group of suffixes that build verba from nominal bases, 3) a group of suffixes that build nomina from nominal bases, 4) suffixes that build adverbs from nominal bases, 5) suffixes used with numerals, 6) suffixes that build indeclinable transgressives from verbal bases, 7) suffixes that build inflected verbal forms from verbal stems.

Each suffix has been described in the following way: Firstly, a bibliography that concerns the relevant suffix is presented. This is followed by a semantic description of the suffix. Finally, the Karaim linguistic material is presented along with references to the sources and some etymological remarks on the derivatives. In each entry we also find comparative linguistic material, which greatly facilitates any comparative evaluation of the phenomena. In the case of productive suffixes, the author limited himself to presenting a few characteristic examples. In the case of less productive and unproductive suffixes, however, he enumerated all the available examples.

The most valuable aspect of the work is the fact that the material has been gathered with utmost conscientiousness and care. The author was able to rely on his good command of Karaim, which he has spoken since childhood, as well as on his thorough knowledge of all Western Karaim literature hitherto published. In addition, he has also exploited handwritten sources; among others he made use of a handwritten translation of the Book of Psalms. Thanks to this, he has managed to gather together a vast amount of material, nearly complete, which ensures the work permanent value since its sources are completely new and have never been used before.

www.czasopisma.pan.pl PAN www.journals.pan.pl
POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK

Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral thesis: the original manuscript of Sufiksy...

To gain a more scientific view of the collected data, the author has applied comparative methods and acquainted himself with the respective linguistic facts in other Turkic languages by making use of almost the entire relevant linguistic literature.

Thanks to his rich material, which, if juxtaposed in the right way, becomes self-explanatory, further, and also thanks to his functional description of suffixes, which is more precise than was hitherto possible, and thanks to observing the phonetic processes that take place between stems and suffixes, as well the comparative treatment of phenomena, the author has managed to explain accurately a number of linguistic forms hitherto obscure or erroneously explained.

The definition of the semantic role of particular suffixes looks a little worse. The author may implement many corrections while preparing the text for printing, after reconsidering the whole material once again.

A deeper insight into the essence of the described phenomena must, in my opinion, result in a different classification of the material, which unnecessarily reflects secondary syntactic features of the relevant forms instead of following exclusively the distinction between the suffixes of verbal roots, and those of the nominal roots. The present classification shows that the author has not entirely freed himself from the unscientific formulas of the vast majority of grammatical descriptions of the Turkic languages and that he is not yet able to look at his rich and diverse linguistic material completely freely.

Notwithstanding these reservations I consider this work to be above the average level of doctoral dissertations. It constitutes an important enrichment of our Turkological knowledge. The collected material and the whole range of conclusions drawn from it will be of permanent value. The author has proved that he is capable of working independently: collecting linguistic material skilfully and grouping and explaining it, as well as of reaching logical conclusions. He has also proved his knowledge of the relevant scholarly literature and his capability of making use of it.

Taking all these facts into consideration, my conclusion is that <u>the work of Mr. Zajączkowski fully complies with the requirements of a doctoral thesis and, based on this thesis, he may be allowed to take his doctoral exams as a Candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy</u>.

In Cracow, 9th June 1929.

Tadeusz Kowalski

Mr. Zajączkowski's work is a valuable contribution to the grammar of Turkic languages and will be of permanent value. Therefore, I agree completely with Prof. Kowalski's opinion.

Cracow, 12th June 1929.

Prof. Dr. Jan Rozwadowski

7. Facsimile (chapter 1, § 1)

– 25 –

3. i evan̕-či 'wstrętny'

od (osm.) järin- 'czuć wstręt', por.
(kum.) ügrän- (C.C. 164 ugren-)
'brzydzić' się. [Pierwotny temat czasow-
nikowy: (osm.) jär- 'czuć wstręt', (alt...
leb...) järi- 'nienawidzieć'].

4. oian-čy 'obudzony' [Występuje w starszym zabytku
liter. karaim., por. Kowalski, Teksty, s. 54
oraz 290] = (hal.) oian-cy [Grego-
rzewski, SWAW, CXLVI № 1. s. 63, 71]
od oian- 'obudzić' się.

5. suk̕an-čy 'nadobny, godny pożądania'

od suk̕an- 'upodobać sobie,
spodobać' się. [Pierwotny temat
czasown.: (tob.) suk̕a- 'pożądać' =
= (kum. C.C. 185) suhla-].

6. bu̕ʃan-čy 'mąciciel, wichrzyciel'

od bu̕ʃan- 'mącić się'.
[Pierwotny temat czasownik.:
bu̕ʃa- 'mącić', zamącić, pomieszać].

7. kam-ču 'bicz' może ⊂ *kym-ču? [niejako
'podpędzacz'?]
od (čag.) kym- 'zlekka poru-
szać, wprawiać w ruch' [Vámb.]
[Por. Vámbéry. Et. Wb. str. 92].

Ten sufiks -yǯy jest mam -26-
wowiem złożony z -y (< -yg) + ǯy, tak że gäčiǯi = Kar. käčüvčü ǯk

sufiks ten występuje dosyć często w grupie południowej
języków tureckich (zwłaszcza w osmańskim) i brzmi:

$$-yǯy, \quad -iǯi, \quad -uǯu, \quad -üǯü.$$

W połączeniu z tematami czasownikowemi tworzy imiona,
zbliżone znaczeniem do imiesłowów czasu teraźn.-przyszłego (partic. aoristi),
utworzonych od tych samych czasowników. Często imiona, urobione
przy pomocy tego sufiksu, oznaczają zawód [Por.:Rozdz. III, -čy].

Przykłady:

(osm.) gäč-iǯi 'który przechodzi, przelotny, znikomy:

"   käs-iǯi 'który wycina' (R.II.1164: jan käsiǯi 'złodziej kieszonkowy',

(krm.) bil-iǯi 'znachor':

(osm.) jyrt-yǯy 'drapieżny, mięsożerny'

"   bak-yǯy 'wróżbita' (R.IV: 'nadzorca, wychowawca').

(azer.) jyrł-yǯy 'śpiewak'

(osm.) ara-j-yǯy 'poszukujący (R.I: 'nurek, urzędnik celny').

(osm.) oku-j-uǯu 'obwoływacz, herold' (Por. Nǯ.Paša Z. Tarihi str.15).

(osm.) jürü-j-üǯü 'piechur' (R.III.605: jürüǯü).

"   dilän-ǯi (< st.osm. dilän-iǯi) 'żebrak'.

(kipč.H.) jügün-ǯi 'kalif':   čag. jabun-čy   śpiewak, ...
osm. jas-yǯy   pisarz   tał. katt an-čy   lepiej, ...
—   sat-yǯy   sprzedawca, handlarz   kipč. söklän-či   pieszyste.

Abbreviations

Balk. = Balkar || **Chag.** = Chagatay || **Com.** = Coman || **Kar.** = Karaim || **KarH.** = south-western (Halych) Karaim || **KarT.** = north-western (Trakai) dialect of Karaim || **Kklp.** = Karakalpak || **Krč.-Balk.** = Karachay-Balkar || **Kaz.** = Kazakh || **OT** = Old Turkic || **Tuv.** = Tuvan || **Uyg.** = Uyghur

References

A.Z. DoctFile = Ananiasz Zajączkowski's doctoral file stored in the Archive of the Jagiellonian University (Cracow, Poland), catalogue number WF II 504, 31 pages.

Bang, W., 1930, Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. V. Brief. Lautliches — allzu Lautliches. – *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 10: 16–26.

Baskakov, N.A., 1952, *Karakalpakskij jazyk. II. Fonetika i morfologija. Časť 1. Časti reči i slovoobrazovanie*, Moskva.

Berta, Á., 1996, Deverbale Wortbildung im Mittelkiptschakisch-Türkischen (= *Turcologica* 24), Wiesbaden.

DTS = Nadeljaev, V.M., Nasilov, D.M., Tenišev, È.R., Ščerbak, A.M., 1969, *Drevnetjurkskij slovaŕ*, Leningrad.

Dubiński, A., 1971, Prace karaimoznawcze prof. Ananiasza Zajączkowskiego. – *Przegląd Orientalistyczny* 79/3: 282–285.

Dziurzyńska, E., 2007, Tadeusz Kowalski (1889–1948). – Korespondencja Tadeusza Kowalskiego z Janem Rypką i Bedřichem Hroznym, Kraków: 7–14.

Džanmavov, Ju.D., 1967, *Deepričastija v kumykskom literaturnom jazyke (sravniteľno s drugimi tjurkskimi jazykami*, Moskva.

Em, A.R., 1935, rev. of Zajączkowski (1932). – *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 42: 161.

Erdal, M., 2004, *A Grammar of Old Turkic*, Leiden – Boston.

ÈSTJa III = Gadžieva, N.Z., 1978, *Ètimologičeskij slovaŕ tjurkskich jazykov. Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na bukvu "V", "G" i "D"*, Moskva.

ÈSTJa IV = Levitskaja, L.S. (ed.), 1989, *Ètimologičeskij slovaŕ tjurkskich jazykov. Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na bukvu "Dž", "Ž", "J"*, Moskva.

[Firkowicz, Z.], [1932], Galwianiń kyryinda. – *Dostu Karajnyn* 2: 7–8.

von Gabain, A., ²1950, *Alltürkische Grammatik*, Leipzig.

von Gabain, A., 1959, Das Alttürkische. – Deny, J. et al. (eds.): *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, Wiesbaden: 21–45.

Grunin, T.I., 1967, *Dokumenty na poloveckom jazyke XVI v. (sudebnye akty kamenec-podoľskoj armjanskoj obščiny)* (= *Pamjatniki piśmennosti Vostoka* III), Moskva.

Hensel, M.E., 1971, Bibliografia prac prof. Ananiasza Zajączkowskiego ogłoszonych drukiem w latach 1964–1970. – *Przegląd Orientalistyczny* 79/3: 286–288.

Kowalski, T., 1929a, *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki* (= *Prace Komisji Orjentalistycznej Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności* 11), Kraków.

Kowalski, T., 1929b, Przyczynki do etnografji i dialektologji karaimskiej. – *Rocznik Orjentalistyczny* 5: 216–254.

Kowalski, T., 1932–1934, rev. of Zajączkowski (1932). – *Myśl Karaimska* 10: 113–114.

Majda, T. (ed.), 2013, *Urzeczeni Orientem. Listy Ananiasza Zajączkowskiego do Tadeusza Kowalskiego*, Warszawa.

Menges, K., 1933, rev. of Zajączkowski (1932). – *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 13: 168.

Menzel, Th., 1934, rev. of Zajączkowski (1932). – *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 7: 436–438.

Munkácsi, B., 1909, Karäisch-tatarische Hymnen aus Polen. – *Keleti Szemle* 10: 185–210.

Musaev, K.M., 1964, *Grammatika karaimskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*, Moskva.

Nadžip, È.N., 1960, *Sovremennyj ujgurskij jazyk*, Moskva.

Németh, M., 2011, *Unknown Lutsk Karaim Letters in Hebrew Script (19ᵗʰ–20ᵗʰ Centuries). A Critical Edition* (= *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 12), Kraków.

Pekarskij, È.K., 1907–1930, *Slovaŕ jakutskogo jazyka*, vol. 1–13, St. Peterburg, Leningrad.

Pomorska, M., *Middle Chulym Noun Formation* (= *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 9), Kraków.

Poppe, N., 1923–1927, Die Nominalstammbildungssuffixe im Mongolischen. – *Keleti Szemle* 20: 89–126.

Pritsak, O., 1959, Das Kiptschakische. – Deny, J. et al. (eds.): *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, Wiesbaden: 73–87.

Pritsak, O., 1965, Schriftenverzeichnis Ananiasz Zajączkowski 1925–1963. – Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher 36/3–4: 234–251.

Radloff, W., 1887, *Das türkische Sprachmaterial des Codex Comanicus*, St.-Pétersbourg.

Radloff, W., 1893–1911, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*, vol. 1–4, St. Petersburg.

Ramstedt, G.J., 1912, Zur Verbstammbildungslehre der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachen. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 28: 1–86.

Räsänen, M., 1957, *Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen* (= *Studia Orientalia* 21), Helsinki.

Räsänen, M., 1969, *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen* (= *Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XVII/1*), Helsinki.

Sevortjan, È.V., 1966, *Affiksy imennogo slovoobrazovanija v azerbajdžanskom jazyke. Opyt sravniteĺnogo issledovanija*, Moskva.

Siemieniec-Gołaś, E., 1998, Tadeusz Kowalski (1889–1948). – Stachowski, M. (ed.): Languages and Culture of Turkic Peoples (= *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 5): 9–11.

Stachowski, M., 1998, Kowalski, Caferoğlu und die Universität Stambul. – *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 8: 211–228

Stachowski, M., 2010, Tadeusz Kowalski a sprawa jego niedoszłego wyjazdu na Uniwersytet Stambulski. – *LingVaria* 9: 149–168.

Tekin, T., 1968, *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic* (= *Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series* 69), Bloomington.

Tryjarski, E., 1971, Główne prace turkologiczne prof. Ananiasza Zajączkowskiego. – *Przegląd Orientalistyczny* 79/3: 271–276.

Yoshitaka, S., rev. of Zajączkowski (1932). – *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Languages* 7: 417–419.

Zaborski, A., 2000, *Tadeusz Kowalski (1889–1948)*. – Michalik, J., Walecki, W. (eds.), *Uniwersytet Jagielloński. Złota Księga Wydziału Filologicznego*, Kraków: 409–417.

Zajączkowski, A., 1931, *Krótki wykład gramatyki języka zachodnio-karaimskiego (narzecze łucko-halickie)*, Łuck.

Zajączkowski, A., 1932, *Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodniokaraimskim (przyczynek do morfologji języków tureckich). Les suffixes nominaux et verbaux dans la langue des Karaïms occidentaux (contribution à la morphologie des langues turques)* (= *Prace Komisji Orjentalistycznej Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności* 15), Kraków.

Zajączkowski, W., 1953, Bibliografia Tadeusza Kowalskiego. – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 17: xvii–xxxvi.