

## Recenzje

Iala Ianbay, *Krimchak Dictionary*, Ben-Zvi Institute, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2015, xxx+237 pp.

This dictionary, compiled by Iala Yanbay, one of the most eminent experts in Krimchak (also Krymchak), an extinct Turkic language of a small Jewish community spoken till World War II in the Crimea, is a long-awaited lexicographic tool. The dictionary is in fact a trilingual “Krimchak-English-Russian glossary”, as Ianbay writes in the introduction (p. ix), since all headwords and examples in each entry are translated into English and Russian. It consists of the preface (p. vii), the introduction in English (pp. ix–xiii) and Russian (pp. xiv–xix), the presentation of the structure of entries (pp. xx–xxi), the lists of English and Russian abbreviations (pp. xxii–xxiii), the bibliography (pp. xxiv–xxv), the list of sources (pp. xxvi–xxviii), the signs of transcription with a table showing the notation in Hebrew, Latin and Cyrillic alphabets once applied for Krimchak (pp. xxix–xxx), and the main body of the dictionary (pp. 1–237).

Ianbay, like some other researchers, is of the opinion that Krimchak is not an independent language, but an ethnolect of Crimean Tatar (p. ix). She says that before the Soviet time the Krimchaks, beyond their Turkic language, used Hebrew for the purpose of their religious life and correspondence, while later they became Krimchak-Russian bilingual speakers.

In the introduction (pp. x–xi) Ianbay discusses some characteristic features of Krimchak in comparison with Crimean Tatar as well as some properties of Hebrew writing. If we compare these features with the Hebrew writing used by Crimean Karaims, we see that most are identical, except for *gimel* with an over-stroke which in Crimean Karaim is often used for both front and back vocalic words, while in Krimchak only for back. Ianbay distinguishes *segol* (ä) from *tsere* (e), but she believes that there was no difference between their pronunciations (p. xi).

As for the phonetic variants of Krymchak words, Ianbay attributes them to the differences between Crimean Tatar dialects. In addition, Ianbay distinguishes two styles, a written with palatal harmony preserved and a spoken in which vowel harmony was not strictly observed. However, we have to note at this point that the cases of broken vowel harmony mostly include *i ~ ĭ* and these two vowels are not distinguished in Hebrew script.

Until presently, we have had a Krimchak-Russian glossary by David Rebi in his Krimchak manual<sup>1</sup>, which also comprises a sketch of Krimchak grammar and some Krimchak texts with Russian translations. None of these dictionaries provides the number of entries, but Rebi has approximately 4000, while Ianbay probably no more than 1800 entries. Despite this, Ianbay's dictionary is larger in size, it has 237 pages against Rebi's 167. This is because all Ianbay's entries are documented and exemplified, some being quite long with several quotations from the documents, whereas many entries in Rebi are just two words, one Krimchak, the other its Russian translation. Ianbay stresses that she had already completed the work on her dictionary when Rebi's publication appeared in print and she could not take it into account. Therefore, Ianbay's dictionary was published twelve years after the completion of its compilation.

The author employed 14 sources of various length, from a few words only to over a hundred pages, some consisting of more than one document. She applied a transcription widely used in Turkic studies with the following special letters: *ä* *ï* *ö* *ü*; *č*, *γ*, *η*, *š*, *ž*. The use of the letter *ğ* for [dž] is misleading, for this letter normally renders [ɣ], and the consonant [dž] is usually transcribed *ğ*. In addition, Ianbay makes use of the apostrophe to render a kind of glottal stop, being a reflex of Arabic 'ayn, and palatalisation of consonants, quite inconsistently. In my view, the notation of *ey* in such words as *beydava* 'for nothing', *beydäv* 'barren', *neyreyä* 'where', *veyzir* 'minister' or *zeyrä* 'for, because' is incorrect, since such a pronunciation is unlikely and this is probably how Ianbay renders *tsere* with *yod* which also stand for *e*. The correct forms should be *bedava*, *bedäv*, *nereyä*, *vezir* and *zerä*. In contrast, the pronunciation *medan* 'wide, roomy' [sic] quoted from Filonenko's texts is unlikely.<sup>2</sup>

Some words in Ianbay's transcription are odd, e.g. *qöq* 'sky, heaven', the other variants being *kök* and *kok*. She says that the letter *tsade* is always transcribed *č* except for Hebrew proper names when it is *s*. However, she applies this rule inconsistently, writing *čafon* 'north', but *hasadiq* and *masa*, instead of *hačadik* and *mača*, see below. In one case, Ianbay provides two readings, *mičva* and *misva* 'precept, commandment'.

The structure of the entry is clear and in comparison with Rebi the reader gets more information on such matters as etymology, part of speech (sometimes information on grammar could be more exact, e.g. *dizil-*, *tizil-* is predominantly the passive, not the intransitive verb; grammar labels are often missing, e.g. *kesil-*, *kiši*, which is especially frequent with postpositions, adjectives and conjunctions; pronouns, numerals and modal words are not labelled at all). Some words are compared with their equivalents in other Turkic languages. As said above, there are also references to sources. Among etymological labels we see such languages as Hebrew, Arabic, Persian, Mongolian, Greek, Italian, and Russian. Incidentally they may be other languages as well, e.g. Fr. 'French', absent from the list of abbreviations (e.g. at *buket*). As for the method of comparison, in most

<sup>1</sup> Давид Реби., *Крымчакский язык. Крымчакско-русский словарь*, Доля, Симферополь 2004.

<sup>2</sup> By the way, many words in Filonenko's texts (В.И. Филоненко, *Крымчакские этюды*, "Rocznik Orientalistyczny" 1972, vol. 35, 1, pp. 5–35.) are unclear and obscure. Therefore, I think that at least the letter dated 1818 and song 10 should be revised and edited anew.

cases it is Kuman (after Grønbech's dictionary) and Armeno-Kipchak (after Tryjarski's dictionary), for Ianbay says that "the Krimchak ethnolect" is closest to those two languages and they have about "75% cognates" (xiii). There are also references to Karaim, Crimean Tatar, Tatar, and such well-known dictionaries as Budagov, Radloff, Räsänen, Baskakov's Noghay-Russian dictionary, the etymological dictionary of Turkic languages, initially written by Sevortyan.

Ianbay provides etymology in a differentiated way. In most cases she shows the first language, but in some cases she prefers the ultimate etymology, e.g. *vagon* 'fright car of the railroads' is shown as a Russian loanword, not Dutch or German. Incidentally a chain of etymological rout is shown, e.g. *ğonka* 'jonka' or *yubiley* 'jubilee'. As is evident from the dictionary, reference to the first etymology is often insufficient and arouses doubts. For instance, the forms of *efendi* 'lord, sir' and *pekismet* 'dried crust' clearly demonstrate that these words were borrowed from Turkish and not directly from Greek. As a rule, etymology is correctly indicated, but there are some debatable and doubtful cases, e.g. *pačavra* 'kitchen rag' is more likely Persian than Greek; *eynayet* (in addition to the main body, see p. xii) is not Hebrew, but Arabic;<sup>3</sup> there are two similar words that should be distinguished, one *tora* 'the Law; Torah', a Hebrew loanword, and *törä ~ töre* 'law', and this is what is evidenced in Armeno-Kypchak, not Hebrew (p. xiii). There are some other complicated cases, e.g. *davir* is really an Arabic loanword, but it occurs in the meaning of Hebrew *dor* 'generation'. Therefore, this Hebrew word was adapted to the shape of a similar word of Arabic origin. The same is true of Crimean Karaim. Ianbay rightly confirms that sometimes it is difficult to make difference between a Hebrew and an Arabic loanword (p. xii). This can be said of *nabilik* 'vision' which she takes for Arabic with the Turkic suffix. In fact, especially if there is a *raphe* above the letter *b*, this word can be read *navilik* and we can consider it to be a Hebrew borrowing. However, it is true that this word is normally written without the final *aleph* in the stem, as it should be in standard Hebrew.

There are also some minor things to correct, e.g. *abi-ayat* 'the water of life' is Persian-Arabic, not Persian. At some evident loanwords etymology is not indicated, e.g. at *ahza* 'part of body' Arabic etymon is not shown, but it is at its variant *a'za* 'member'; cross-references are also lacking at some evident Turkic variants, e.g. *yuqu* 'slumber' and *yuxu* 'sleep'; it is clear that we have to do with an identical word in two variants, therefore the meaning should also be the same. In addition to the historical languages that influenced Krimchak, the dictionary also includes many new borrowings from Russian, e.g. *adres*, *aftomobil*, *ambulatorya*, *arastant*, *artel*, *banka*, *barabul'ka*, *benzin*, *biblioteka*, *bukva* etc. It is unclear why the author once gives the original word in the original writing (e.g. Greek or Arabic), but in most cases only points to the respective language by a letter, e.g. Gr., Ar.

<sup>3</sup> See Ananiasz Zajączkowski, *Unikanie wyrażeń antropomorficznych w przykładach karaimskich*, „Myśl Karaimska” 1929, 2, 2 (7), p. 15.

When we compare Ianbay's dictionary with Rebi, we see that these two dictionaries complement one another. The basic difference in sources quoted is that Rebi included material of two manuscripts called *jönk* (*jonka*) with their popular stories and poems of Turkish descent, while Ianbay included more material of religious provenance with a stronger Hebrew impact, though there are some Hebrew words in Rebi absent from Ianbay, e.g. *avel* 'mourning' (p. 53). Therefore, some words which are inaccurate in Rebi appear in Ianbay correctly, e.g. *avoda-zara* (Rebi, p. 53) 'homeland', is glossed in Ianbay 'idolatry, paganism' (p. 15). However, in some other instances it is Rebi that is more correct, e.g. *abra-* is translated by Rebi (p. 52–53) as '1. to rob. 2. to elaborate, to separate, to clean', while Ianbay translates it 'to lock'. The two authors provide totally different translations of a sentence from Kaya's primer, Rebi being seemingly correct.

In the following, there is a list of corrections I would like to offer to Ianbay's dictionary. They can be considered at the subsequent editions. However, before it is done one circumstance should be stressed. Ianbay does not gloss the Krimchak words as they normally appear in Turkic languages, but as they come up in the texts she used. Therefore, some words in her dictionary appear in secondary meanings, e.g. *oraq* which is predominantly 'sickle' and which in Rebi's dictionary appears in the meanings '1. sickle. 2. harvest' (p. 158), in Ianbay comes up only as 'harvest', because both courses she quotes point to this meaning. Therefore, when assessing her dictionary one has to keep this in mind.

- (1) Words which comes up in the examples, but are absent from the entries, e.g. *mäšīax* (p. 37) 'Messiah', should be taken for the entries.
- (2) The translations of some words should be revised:
  - ačuv* 'malice, fury', a more exact translation is 'anger, wrath';
  - adaš-*; 'astray' in the English translation is not a verb, the English translation should be changed into 'to go astray' or 'to stray';
  - adät* 'usual' should be 'usage';
  - amanlīx* 'always, forever' is almost certainly 'prosperity, well-being';
  - čäk-*, *ček-* does not mean 'to suffer', but 'to draw'; the meaning 'to suffer' is only correct with a noun when the whole phrase is an expression;
  - čīm-čiq* is not 'through', but 'completely wet; all wet', and this is reduplication of Turkic *čiq* 'dew'; the same inaccuracy is found in Rebi (p. 206);
  - čekmen* is rather a kind of jacket, not 'woollen shawl' (cf. Rebi, p. 203);
  - dürüsle-* 'proclaim, declare' should be 'to proclaim righteous; to confirm';
  - esirge-* 'to considerate' should be provided in the normal Turkish meaning 'to spare; to protect; to be compassionate';
  - fesilgon*, *fesilgun*, the English meaning 'basil' does not correspond to the Russian meaning provided as *nezabudka*, for it is 'forget-me-not'; the correct one is 'basil', so in Russian it should be *bazilik*;
  - gozet-* is rather '1. to observe. 2. to take care' than 'to trace; to track';
  - ğav* is 'enemy' is correct, but not 'side';

*ğonka*- ‘collected manuscripts’ should be ‘manuscript containing collection of various literary works’;

*kerekmiy* ‘don’t’ should be ‘it is not needed; it does not need’;

*maşalla* is not ‘approval’, but an exclamation expressing approval, similar to English ‘well done!’

*meydana çıq-* ‘to come to light’; probably a better and simpler translation of this expression is ‘to appear’;

*qaz* should be translated ‘goose’, not with the more specific word ‘gander’;

*tekerançix* is not ‘due; proper’, but ‘a little’, as Ianbay writes in the entry referring to Polinsky;

*zofra* is not ‘appetite’, but ‘bile, gall’, as Rebi correctly translates it (p. 98); Ianbay incorrectly distracted this meaning from Filonenko’s *zofra bastürmaga* (p. 20), which is a well-known Turkish idiom ‘to have a snack’, in which *zofra* means ‘bile, gall’, which Filonenko explains in the remarks.

(3) Some words appear in incorrect or doubtful forms or are inexactly referred to others:

*aqay* ‘man; uncle’ should be taken separately from *ağa*;

*ağimek* ‘pity’ (cf. Rebi’s *ağimax*, p. 68), perhaps *ägimek* is better;

*bay* glossed as ‘song’, is a mistake copied from Filonenko (p. 21); this mistake is evident, since in Filonenko’s remarks this word is written *bayat* and explained as an adaptation of the Arabic *beyt* (p. 23), cf. the correct form in Rebi (p. 71);

*bulan-* must not be shown as a variant of *bulun-*, for the latter is the verb ‘to be found’, while the former ‘to become turbid, cloudy’;

*çarah*, a variant of *çıraq* ‘candle’ (not evidenced among the examples), seems to be wrong;

*çixir-*, a variant of *çiqar-*, *çixar-* ‘to take out’ is unlikely, the quoted evidence must be a mistake;

*hasadiq* ‘the righteous’; since this is not a proper name, according to Ianbay’s own rules of transcription it should be transcribed *hačadiq*; also: *sadäqät*, *sadeqät*, *sadeqet*, *sadäqätlik*, *sadiq* and *sidqenu*;

*koks* as a variant of *kokus*, *köküs* ‘breast, chest’ is an incorrectly established stem from the form *koksi*;

*masa* ‘unleavened bread’ should be *mača*, see *hasadiq*;

*ozet*, *uzet*, *üzär*, *uset* ‘on, upon, above’; these forms should be written with a hyphen, for none of them is a free morpheme;

*qzen* ‘autumnal’; the word is unclear and its identification with ‘autumn’ may only be tentative;

*yeya* ‘the Lord’, i.e. *Yahve*; it is unlikely that this word was pronounced, as is known, the Jews and Krimchaks normally pronounced it *adonay*.

(4) Some words are unnecessarily introduced:

*Äkisirä* ‘both’ should not be taken for an entry separate from *äki*.

- (5) There is a range of doubtful words, either semantically or phonetically; they need further study:

*alik* ‘now’, *ayala-* ‘to disgrace’, *bejizät ver-* ‘to be like’, *boγoz* ‘neck’, *boyin* etc. in the meaning ‘throat’, *ehiya* ‘necessary’, *eñiř* ‘downwards’, *gubur-* ‘to move, to flock’, *ğänlat* ‘slaughterer’, *kiriř* ‘roof’, *kügürčün* ‘dove’ (cf. Rebi *kögürčün*, p. 117), *oturux* ‘inhabitant’, *qisti* ‘necklace’, *sehabu* ‘truth’, *ud* ‘calamus’, *yipelek* ‘silk’.

- (6) Other remarks:

*melek* is not translated;

*pikata*, *pkata* ‘grandfather’; an etymology alternative to that proposed by Ianbay (< *pek*, *päk* < *bäg*, *bik* ‘strong’ + *ata* ‘father’) is from *büyük* ‘big, great and *ata* ‘father’, i.e. similar to English ‘grandfather’; the same is valid for *pkana* ‘grandmother’.

Ianbay’s dictionary enriches our knowledge of Krimchak and the fascinating ethnic group of the Crimea who once spoke this language. Krimchak vocabulary is similar to Crimean Tatar, Crimean Turkish and Crimean Karaim, but incidentally it may bring new, interesting evidence. For example, there are such unusual forms as *dombuz* ‘pig’, quoted from Rebi, if it is correct, and such archaic words as *axtxe* ‘grandson, granddaughter’. In general, the question of correctness is an issue to discuss in the case of a language whose speakers are on the way of language shift and when they do not normally use that language in communication.

No doubt Ianbay’s *Krimchak dictionary* is an important publication which complements the dictionary formerly published by Rebi. Her *Krimchak dictionary* will be better available for the international reader and being a trilingual Krimchak-English-Russian lexicographic tool, will be very useful to everybody interested in Krimchak, the Jewish languages of the Crimea, and the spiritual culture of the Turkic people of this region.

*Henryk Jankowski*

Jan Dvořáček, Linda Pinkerová, Jan Záhořík, *A History of Czechoslovak Involvement in Africa. Studies from the Colonial Through the Soviet Eras*, with a Foreword by István Tarrósy, The Edwin Mellen Press, Lewinston Lampeter 2014, 188 pp.

The history of relations between former socialist countries and Africa, both in historical and contemporary context is little known in the literature written in Western languages. Eastern European countries (excluding Russia) till now are, unfortunately, treated as a periphery of Europe, not only in geographical terms. In each of these countries, e.g. Hungary, Poland or Czech Republic we have a great number of books and studies devoted to abovementioned theme, but only a little amount of them are known for Western scholars and readers. For this reason the reviewed book by three Czech authors, Jan Dvořáček