Artykuły / Articles

IALQYN (IALA) IANBAY

(Jerusalem, Israel)

ORCID: 0000-0002-9354-2399 iD

The Krymchak Nominative
as One of the Indicators of Noun Indefiniteness
and the Cases of Unusual Use of it in the Biblical Translations

Abstract

The Turkic languages, including the Krymchak (=Krimchak) Jewish ethnolect of the Crimean Tatar, have no formal markers of the (in)definiteness of a noun, but a certain lexical and morphological set allow for linguists to determine the meaning of the definiteness / indefiniteness. However, also the Krymchak nominative case fulfils the role of the indefinite index in the functions of a direct object and of an attribute, which is argued in the first part of this article. Thus, the connection and opposition of the nominative with accusative and genitive cases are shown. After some remarks on the category of (in)definiteness in the Turkic languages we analyze the nominative form in the functions of subject, direct object and of attribute in comparison with accusative and genitive case forms used in the analogical functions. By comparison, their definite/indefinite meanings are revealed to be clear. Finally, we discuss the described material, and offer three tables as results. Some instances of the unusual use of the nominative case in the Krymchak Biblical translations is discussed in the second part of this paper. The cited examples are taken from written sources published during the last half century, including the Krymchak translations of Biblical books.

Keywords: Turkic languages, functional analysis, declension of nouns, the language of the Biblical translations

Part I
The Krymchak Nominative as one of the Indicators of Noun Indefiniteness

When I was compiling my index of suffixes and analytical forms which were used in the text of "The book of Ruth" in Krymchak (=Krimchak), I was sorry that it was impossible to reference the nominative case, because this case has no special morphological mark.[1] The nominative case is usually defined as an unmarked case. Here, we shall describe the Krymchak nominative case as an unmarked case form correlated with other cases in the declension system.

Before discussing the subject of this paper, I would like to remind the reader that Krymchak is one from the endangered languages. It was a language of the Krymchaks, the subethnic non-Ashkenazi Rabbinite Jewish group of the people of Crimea. Their Turkic language was the Jewish Krymchak ethnolect of the Crimean Tatar language. Before World War II, the Krymchaks lived mainly in the towns of the Crimea and then, in 1941–1942 most of them were annihilated by the Nazis, when they occupied the Crimea.[2] Today at least 2,000 Krymchaks are known to live in the Ukraine, Israel, in the Russian Federation and the United States.[3] We shall here deal with the Krymchak as it was written and published at the beginning of the 20th century in the Hebrew and Russian alphabets with a few diacritics.

Leaving other aspects of Krymchak grammar aside for further research, we will here limit ourselves to the nominative case as one of the indicators of noun indefiniteness. We will show the Krymchak nominative used as both object and as attribute for the designation of the indefinite meaning of a noun. I am aware of no study, to date, discussing the Krymchak nominative as one of the indicators of noun indefiniteness: both Maria Polinsky[4] and David Rebi at al.[5] wrote nothing on the category of (in)definiteness and the functions of the nominative case. There is no section on the (in)definiteness of a noun in the Nesrin Güllüdağ's Krymchak grammar but nevertheless the opposition of the definite / indefinite attributives are shown as expressed in Krymchak by genitive

---

[1]   Iala Ianbay, 'Affixes and analytical forms in the Krimchak text of "The book of Ruth"', in: *Trans-Turkic Studies. Festschrift in Honour of Marcel Erdal*, eds. Matthias Kappler, Mark Kirchner, Peter Zieme, and Raihan Muhamedowa, Istanbul 2010, pp. 417–429. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13173/medilangrevi.10.1998.0001>. I would like to extend my thanks to Igor Wojewódzki (Library of Russian Academy of Sciences) St. Petersburg, and to Ariel Turgeman (Hebrew University) Jerusalem for helpful conversations on the liturgical language of the Biblical books.

[2]   Iala Ianbay and Marcel Erdal, 'The Krimchak translation of A Targum *Šeni* of the book of Ruth', *Mediterranean Language Review* 10 (1998), pp. 1–53. With previous references.

[3]   Michael Zand, 'Krymchaks', in: *The Yivo Encyclopaedia of Jews in Eastern Europe I*, ed. Gershon David Hundert, Yale 2008, p. 951.

[4]   Maria S. Polinsky, 'Crimean Tatar and Krymchak: Classification and description', in: *The Non-Slavic languages of the USSR*, H. I. Aronson, Linguistic Studies. Second series, Chicago 1992, pp. 157–188.

[5]   David I. Rebi, Boris M. Ačkinazi, Igor V. Ačkinazi, 'Krymčakskij yazyk', in: *Yazyki mira. Tiurkskiye yazyki*, Bishkek 1997, pp. 309–319.

and nominative case forms respectively.[6] Marcel Erdal in his paper on the Krymchak relativization showed examples of the opposition between indefinite/definite meaning expressed in attributive phrases by using the nominative in the Krymchak text of *Nisim ve-Niflaot* with the use of the unspecific name and with use of the genitive case when it is a specific one.[7] Regarding to the question of the Crimean Tatar language, which Jewish ethnolect Krymchak belongs to, the new work of Henryk Jankowski's grammatical description contains a special section on this topic.[8] The author discusses the absence of the affix and shows two means for determination of the indefiniteness of the noun: with the help of the numeral *bir* 'one', and with the help of reduplication of the first syllable by replacing the consonant with *m-*. In addition, the differences in the affixes of the declension for the definite and indefinite nouns are shown.[9]

It is known that in Turkic languages the system of both personal pronouns, and possessive pronouns equally with possessive clitics, and the demonstrative pronouns are interpreted as indices of the definiteness of a noun. The combination of the indefinite pronouns alone or together with the numeral *bir* 'one' can show the indefiniteness of a noun. The numeral '*bir*' in such cases corresponds to the indefinite article of the Indo-European languages. In this function it can be regarded as an opposition to the demonstrative pronouns, corresponding to the definite article. The most characteristic meanings of the Turkish nominative case forms in combinations with postpositions *gibi* 'as, like' and *kadar* 'like, about', are mainly used with abstract/indefinite nouns but the combinations with the postpositions *için* 'to, for, because of' and *ile* 'with, together, by' have specific meanings.[10]

In the following, we describe the functions of nominative case form as the indicator of the indefiniteness in Krymchak. They are comparable to the indefinite nouns of the relative attributive constructions and of indefinite nouns of the direct object constructions of Indo-European languages.

1. Nominative as a subject

In the Turkic languages, noun in the nominative case can function as any constituent, but most commonly it is used as subject. A noun in the function of a subject can have equally both definite and indefinite meanings. Additionally, any nominal can be used in the function of the subject as well. Besides, the noun deputes the different pronouns, and the group of the nouns attached to the noun can appear in the role of a subject in the Turkic sentence including Krymchak.

As a subject, the Krymchak noun can be the noun in singular, and in plural as well as of abstract, common, or specific meanings, including proper names. This is the

---

[6] Nesrin Güllüdağ, 'Kırımçak Türkçesi grameri' (PhD diss., Firat University, Elazig 2005), p. 354.

[7] Marcel Erdal, 'Relativisation in Krymchak', in: *Scholarly depth and accuracy. A Festschrift to Lars Johanson*, eds. Nurettin Demir and Fikret Turan, Ankara 2002, p. 122.

[8] Henryk Jankowski, *Język krymskotatarski*, Warszawa 2010, p. 225.

[9] Ibidem, p. 208, 209.

[10] Sergej N. Ivanov, *Kurs tureckoj grammatiki. 2. Grammatičeskie kategorii glagola*, Leningrad 1975, Part I: 24.

characteristic feature of the nominative case in contrast to the other cases. The nominative is used solely in the function of a subject of the sentence, the distinction between the abstract and specific meaning of a noun is neutralized in this case. The examples below show the use of the indefinite-abstract nouns (1.1.) as well as of the definite-specific nouns (1.2.) as a subject. At the same time one can see the noun in plural and in singular; the proper names and the noun deputes as different pronouns, and the group of the nouns in the function of a subject, e.g.:

1.1.

(1)	*1904 seneda…*	*ades*	*šaarïna*	*xaber*	*geldï*
	1904 year-SG-LOC	Odessa	city-POSS3SG-DAT	news-SG-NOM	come-PST-SG

'A piece of news came to the city of Odessa at the… 1904 year' (S 1).[11]

(2)	*Gene*	*aldï*	*ğam*	*beni*
	again	take-PST3SG	grief-SG-NOM	I-ACC

'I came to grief again' (*lit*. 'a grief took me again') (F 4:1).

(3)	*Bir*	*ärkek*	*bala*	*doğaĵaqdïr*	*duŋyada*
	one-NUM	male	child-NOM	be.born-FUT3SG	world-LOC

'A boy will be born in the world' (NN 16).

(4)	*Čaq*	*ki*	*tanïmadï*	*kiši*	*yoldašïnï*	*ol*	*qaranlïqnïŋ*
	time	CONJ	recognize-NEG-PST3SG	man-SG-NOM	companion-POSS3SG-ACC	DEM	darkness-GEN

'At a time when a man could not recognize his companion of the darkness' (R 357).

(5)	*Erkez*	*murada*	*erdi*
	everyone-NOM	aim-DAT	achieve-PST3SG

'Everyone achieved [his] object' (MP 12:1).

In (1) the subject *xaber* is expressed by a singular noun which has no attribute, and which is mentioned for the first time in the text; in (2) we see the abstract noun *ğam* as a subject of the sentence; the sentence (3) shows the group of nouns *ärkek bala* in combination with the numeral *bir* as an indefinite article; in (4) the noun *kiši* is used in the abstract, generalized meaning; in (5) we see the indefinite pronoun *erkez* in the function of a subject.

---

[11]   Abbreviations in round brackets refer to the written sources the list of which is given at the end of the paper. Numbers designate the sentences in the texts.

1.2.

(6)	Čaq	ki	bu	sözler	Išitildiler	padïša-ğa
	time	CONJ	this	word-PL-NOM	hear-PASS-PST-PL	king-DAT

'When these words were heard by the king…' (NN 116).

(7)	Ekïnĵï	šïr-nï	ayttï	Mošä	oğullarï	ilen	Israel-nïŋ
	second	song-SG-ACC	recite-PST3SG	Moses-NOM	son-PL-POSS3	together-PPS	Israel-GEN

'Moses, together with the Children of Israel, has recited the second song' (SS 1:1).

(8)	Versin	Adonay	sizge	tügel	ayvaz
	give-IMP3SG	Lord-NOM	you-PL-DAT	perfect	reward-NOM

'May the Lord grant you a perfect reward' (R 58).

(9)	Bu	olmalïdïr	duŋyanïŋ	efändisi
	this-SG-NOM	be-IMP3SG	world-GEN	master-POSS3SG

'This must be the master of the world' (NN 47).

(10)	Oldï	Šimon	yuvunğanïŋ	čïq	endi	suvdan
	be-PST3SG	Shimon	wash-RFL-PART-POSS2SG-NOM	get out-IMP2SG	already	water-ABL

'Shimon, your bathing is over, already get out of the water' (K 10).

In (6) the subject *bu sözler* is expressed by the plural noun together with the demonstrative pronoun, and in that way the definite, specific noun as a subject is formed; in (7) we see the group of the subject *Mošä oğullarï ilen Israel-nïŋ* consists of the proper name together with the possessive construction of nouns (possessive izafet); (8) has the noun of the singleness meaning *Adonay* as a subject; in (9) demonstrative pronoun *bu* is as the definite subject; in (10) we see the past participle in -gAn in the nominative case with the 2nd personal possessive affix as the subject of the sentence.

2. Nominative as a direct object

The nominative case is one of two forms of a direct object. There are two different case forms which are used in the function of a direct object in the Turkic languages including Krymchak: the nominative case form is used for marking the indefinite direct object; and the accusative case for the marking definite direct object. These two forms of direct objects contrast one another. In other words, the nominative case is used when the direct object is indefinite, and non-specific, but the accusative case is used when the direct object is definite, and specific. The researchers of the Orkhon Turkic languages

hold that the accusative form does not appear when the object is non-specific.[12,13] The positions of the two forms of direct objects in the sentence are also different. In contrast with the noun in the accusative case, which can be in any place in the sentence, both the adjoining to its verb and the being away from it; the direct object of the nominative case form has only the adjoining, preverbal, or postverbal juxtaposition. The accusative case is used for marking the definite direct object which is expressed by the proper name or the term of relationship; by noun with the possessive pronoun or with the possessive enclitic; by personal or demonstrative pronoun; or by the noun in combination with possessive or demonstrative pronoun etc. Opposition and distinctions of the meanings between the indefinite direct object and the definite ones can be better seen when both cases are used in the same construction or context. The nominative form appears when the object is non-specific or/and when it is first mentioned. The accusative form of the direct object appears when the object is specific and/or was clearly mentioned earlier in the text. The direct object of the accusative of Krymchak is formed by the suffix *+nï /+ni*, and sometimes by *+ï/+i*.

(11)	*Bir*	*yaxšï*	*alğïš*	*vereyim*	*saŋa…*	*[o]*
	one-NUM	nice	blessing-SG-NOM	give-OPT1SG	you-DAT	[he]

ašar	*da*	*saŋa*	*verir*	*alğišïnï*
eat-AOR2SG	and	you-DAT	ver-AOR3SG	blessing-POSS3SG-ACC

‘I will give you a nice blessing…; [he] will eat and give you his blessing’ (NN 370, 377).

Both cases of the use of the word *alğïš* as two different objects are on the same page of the narrative about the blessing which Isaak was going to give to his son Esau, but their mother Rebeccah arranged it so that Isaak gave the blessing to his other son Jacob. In the first part of (11) we see the indefinite object mentioned for the first time in the text, it is in the nominative form but in the second part it is the definite object in the accusative; because it is mentioned here for the second time is therefore converted into the definite object.

(12)	*Ayïrdï*	*altï*	*yüz*	*Israel;*	*aydadï*	*mašïna-ğa*	*olarï*
	separate-PST3SG	six-NUM	hundred-NUM	Jew-NOM;	drive-PST3SG	car-SGDAT	they-ACC

‘He separated 600 Jews; (and) drove them to cars’ (S 83, 84).

---

[12] Marcel Erdal, *A Grammar of Old Turkic*, Leiden–Boston 2004, p. 360. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23658979>.

[13] The old Soviet school of study of the Turkic languages holds the strange standpoint that there are "marked" and "unmarked" oblique cases "which coincide with the nominative of a noun" (e.g., Elvira B. Fattakhova, 'Kategoriya Opredelionnosti-Neopredelionnosti w raznostrukturnyx yazykax: na materiale anglijskogo, kitajskogo i tatarskogo yazykov' (PhD diss. Kazanskij Universitet, Kazan 2015), 19). I share the Sergey Ivanov's opinion that the "unmarked" case is just the nominative case form (Ivanov, *Kurs tureckoj grammatiki I*, p. 19).

Example (12) is analogous to (11) solely because it shows the definite object formed by the affix *+ï/+i.*

In the following, we describe the meaning of groups of nouns in the nominative case as a marker of the indefinite direct object, expressed by the indefinite noun with no concrete definition.

2.1.1. Direct object refers to the family name of the class of items with no correlation to a concrete item of them. It may be expressed by a noun in singular.

(13)	*Fener*	*yaqïb*	*bakarlar*
	lantern-NOM	light-CVB	look-AOR-3PL

'They light a lantern and look [at me] (F 3:1).

2.1.2. Nominative in the function of a direct object in the construction with numeral *bir* 'one' as an indefinite article.

(14)	*Baxčidan*	*bïr*	*gül'*	*kopardïm*
	garden-ABL	one-NUM	flower-NOM	pick-PST1SG

'I've picked a flower in the garden' (F 9:1).

2.1.3. Indefinite direct object expressed by a noun in plural has the form of the nominative in the cases when it expresses the plurality as the whole complex of any variety of the class of articles.

(15)	*Sufatlar*	*yapar*	*edi*
	idol-PL-NOM	make-AOR	be-PST3SG

'He used to make idols' (NN 140).

(16)	*Yigitleriŋ*	*doğurayïrlar*	*oğullar*
	young man-PL-POSS2	bear-PRS3PL	son-PL-NOM

'Your young men…beget sons' (SS 4:13).

2.1.4. Noun in the form of the nominative case receives the numerical determinant as the indefinite direct object as well, when it describes some indefinite varieties of the same class of articles.

(17)	*Sayla*	*äki*	*danä*	*tazä*	*ulačïqlar,*	*alïp gel*	*maŋa*
	chose-IMP2SG	two-NUM	unit-SG-NOM	young	kid-PL-NOM	bring-IMP2SH	I-DAT

'Chose two young kids and bring them to me' (NN 374).

2.2. There are interesting instances of the use of the nominative as the definite (sic!) direct object by nouns with the meaning of the parts of the men's body which are formed with the 1st and 2nd personal possessive enclitics:

(18)	Čevir	yüziŋ	bana	Bak
	turn-IMP2SG	face-POSS2SG-NOM	I-DAT	look-IMP2SG

'Turn your face, look at me' (F 4:6).

(19)	Ellerim	ačtïm,	yalbardïm	Allahqa
	hand-PL-POSS1-NOM	open-PST1SG	beg-PST1SG	God-DAT

'I opened my hands [and] begged for God' (T-M 25).

(20)	Menim	sesim	šitmisin
	my	voice-POSS1SG-NOM	hear-NEG-PRS2SG

'You do not hear my voice!' (PlI 141).

In contrast to the examples above, the direct object in the accusative case form is used with the nouns which are formed by possessive affixes of the 3rd person, e.g.:

(21)	Anasï	qučaqladï	oğlunu	öptü	bašïndan
	mother-POSS3SG	embrace-PST3SG	son-POSS3SG-ACC	kiss-PST3SG	head-POSS3SG-ABL

'His mother embraced her son [and] kissed him on the head' (NN 108).

3. Nominative as an attribute

There are two different attributive constructions of two nouns (*izafet*) which are used in the Turkic languages including Krymchak: the nominative case construction for destination with the indefinite attributive meaning (i.e., relative *izafet*) and the genitive case construction for destination with the definite attributive meaning (i.e., possessive *izafet*). These two forms of the attributive constructions are opposite one another. The nominative construction consists of a noun in the nominative case as the first component, and the genitive construction consists of a noun in the genitive case as the first component. The second component of both constructions is a noun with the 3rd person possessive suffix *-ï/-i* or *-sï/-si*. The nominative construction is used for expression of the concept of belonging in a broad sense, and abstract senses, irrespective of something specific. As to the expression of the specific possessive meaning or belonging, of property, in this case the genitive attributive construction of two nouns with the first component in the genitive case, meaning possessor, are used. The correlation and opposition between the nominative and genitive cases consists of the difference of the unspecific (abstract) and specific meaning of the constructions.

The formal distinction between them is not difficult: the nominative is always adjacent to its head noun, but the genitive construction can be free. As to the semantic distinctions between them, they are not so simple. Being the first component of the attributive construction, a noun in the nominative form refers to the common name of the class of the things but a noun with the genitive affix refers to a specific object, or the owner. The differences in the meanings between the nominative attributive construction and the genitive possessive construction visually come out when using them in similar contexts and the differences are clear between the relative and possessive meanings, e.g.:

(22)	אלימלך	אש	ה	שם	ו	(Hebrew)
	Elimelech	man	the	name	And	
	Da	*adï*	*ol*	*kiši-niŋ*	*Elimelex*	(Krymchak)
	CONJ	name-POSS3SG	DEM	man-SG-GEN	Elimelex	

'And the name of the man is Elimelech' (R 22).

(23)	*Men*	*qaytmağa*	*isteyirim*	*Kanaan*	*topraqïna*
	I	go.back-INF	want-PRS-1SG	Canaan-NOM	land-POSS3SG-DAT

'I …would like to go back to the land of Canaan' (NN 434).

In instance (22) we recognize that a man has a name Elimelech, i.e., the name belongs to him; in (23) it is said about the land, which is called Canaan, which is its placename.

In the Krymchak texts the nominative structure has some distinct types regarding its use and can express different meanings. In the following, we can single out some meaning groups of the nominative case attributive structures according to these types: the group in singular nouns, meaning a generic determination; the group of the proper name, or of the geographical name; the group with the attribute denoting the place; and the groups with the verbal noun as the first component of the structures.

3.1.1. The group in singular nouns in the nominative referring to a generic determination, which is without any concrete definition or connection to an object:

(24)	*Qïš*	*küni*
	winter-NOM	day-POSS3SG

'A winter day' (K 101).

(25)	*Čïxsïn*	*šïr*	*dueline*
	come-IMP3SG	poem-NOM	duel-POSS3-DAT

'Let him come to [any] poetic duel' (MP 1:8).

(26)	*Päsax*	*geĵasïnda*	*mača*	*kesilgen*	*vaqtï*
	Passover-NOM	eve-POSS3-LOC	unleavened bread-NOM	cut-PASS-PRTCL.SG	time-POSS3.SG

'On Passover eve when unleavened bread is cut…' (NN 1).

3.1.2. The first member of the structure is a proper name of a man or a geographical name:

(27)	*Yosef*	*a-sadïq…*	*türküsü*
	Josef	the righteous-NOM	song-POSS3.SG

'A song of the Josef the righteous' (MP 2).

(28)	*Qïrïm*	*adasïnda*
	Crimea-NOM	peninsula-POSS3SG-LOC

'On the peninsula of Crimea' (F 11).

Additionally, the first members of the attributive structures, such as *1924 senesi* 'In 1924' (K 116) are regarding the name of the year.

3.1.3. The structure with the nominative as an attribute denoting the place is analogous to the proceeding group:

(29)	*Deŋiz*	*yalïsï*
	sea-NOM	shore-POSS3SG

'seashore' (K 10).

3.1.4. The use of a verbal noun in *-uv* as the first component of the nominative attributive construction:

(30)	*Sačuv*	*mašïnasïnda*	*bïr*	*balaban*	*yaščik*	*olay*
	sowing-SG-NOM	machine-POSS3SG-LOC	one-NUM	big	box-SG-NOM	be-PRS3.SG

'There is a big box on a sowing-machine' (K 153).

(31)	*Okuv*	*kitabï*
	reading-NOM	book-POSS3SG

'a textbook' (*lit*. a book for reading) (K 3).

4. Discussion of the Part I

Our short overview of the morpho-syntactic features of the Nominative shows that the nominative case of different nouns, nominal or noun groups, is used in the different Krymchak written sources as a marker of the indefinite direct object and of the indefinite attribute as well when it has no concrete semantics. In the object structures it may be various singular nouns, referring to a family name or class of items with no correlation with a concrete definition, or a noun with the numerical determinant when it refers to some indefinite varieties of the same class of the items. Additionally, it may be a noun in plural which uses the plurality as the whole complex of any variety of the class of items. As to the attributive structures, the nominative is used for giving the indefinite semantic for the nouns, regarding a generic determination, for the proper names and the geographical names, to nouns with the attribute denoting the place and to the verbal nouns in *-uv* and in *-ï* if they used as the first component of the attributive structures. Such structures are opposed with the constructions of the definite object and with the definite attribute. Below I offer the table which shows the nominative case of different semantic groups of nouns used as a marker of the indefinite direct object, and of the indefinite attribute as well (Table 1).

Table 1. A Key to Regular Types of Nouns in the Nominative Case as One of the Indicators of Noun Indefiniteness*

I. Direct Object:
A. Singular noun with the meaning of a family name of class of things with no correlation with a concrete definition: (13) *fener yaqïb* 'lighting a lantern' (F 3:1).
B. Combines a noun with the numeral *bïr* 'one' as an indefinite article: (14) *bïr gül' kopardïm* 'I've picked a flower' (F 9:1).
C. Noun in plural referring to the whole complex of any varieties of the class of items: (15) *Sufatlar yapar edi* 'He used to make idols' (NN 140).
D. Noun with the numerical determinant when it refers to some indefinite varieties of the same class of the items: (17) *Sayla äki danä tazä ulačïqlar* 'Chose two young kids' (NN 374).
II. Relative Attributive Structures:
E. Nouns referring to a generic determination: (24) *qïš küni* 'a winter day' (K 101).
F. The proper names or the geographical names: (27) *Yosef a-sadïq…türküsü* '…a song of the Josef the righteous' (MP 2).
G. Groups of nouns with the attribute denoting the place: (29) *deŋiz yalïsï* 'seashore' (K 10).
H. The verbal nouns in *-uv* and *-ï* which is used as the first component of the attributive structures: (30) *sačuv mašïnasï* 'a sowing-machine' (K 153).

* The numbers in round brackets refer to examples from the paper used as models for the table.

Here, we combine the Krymchak morpho-syntactical and lexical models of the expression of the noun (in)definiteness as generally opposite one another (Tables 2 and 3).

Table 2. Summary of Morpho-Syntactical Modes

Indefinite	Definite
Verbal nouns in -*maq*, -*uv* (e.g., *oqumaq yoq* 'there are no studies' (K 9), *okuv kitabï* 'the textbook' (K 3).	Possessive clitics (e.g., *balačïǧïm*! 'my little child!' (JS 189), *yüziŋ* 'your face' (F 4:6).
Nominative case form for expressing direct object (e.g., *fener yaqïb* 'lighting a lantern' (F 3:1).	Accusative form for expressing direct object (e.g., *verir alǧïšïnï* '[he] will give you his blessing' (NN 377).
Nominative case form for expressing attributive (e.g., *qïš küni* 'a winter day' (K 101).	Genitive case form for expressing attributive (e.g., *adï ol kiši-niŋ Elimelex* 'The name of the man is Elimelech' (R 22).

Table 3. Lexical Modes

Indefinite	Definite
Indefinite pronouns (e.g., *ärkez* 'every' (NN 214), *kimse* 'somebody' (S 49), *ba'zï* 'some' (K 141).	Possessive pronouns 1, 2 persons (e.g., *menim* 'my' (S 269 etc), *bizim* 'our' (NN 21b12), *seniŋ* 'your' (NN 16b1).
Nouns in plural (e.g., *qašïxlar ve pičaxlar* 'spoons and knives' (MP 8:4).	Demonstrative pronouns (e.g., *u sufat* 'that model' (NN 175), *bu* 'this' (NN 47 etc.).
Numeral *bir* 'one' (e.g., *bir ärkek bala* 'a boy' (NN 16).	Collective numerals (e.g., *ekisi-de* 'they both' (NN 112).
Combination with postpositions *kïbïk/gibik* 'as, like' (*gül' kïbïk* 'like a rose' (SS 2:2) and *kadar/gadar* 'like, about' (*yüz elli evli adam kadar* 'about 150 families' (F 23).	Combinations with postpositions *ičün/üčün* 'to, for, because of' (*bu iš üčün* 'for this purpose' (NN 2b10) and *ilen/bilen* 'together' (*paro askeri ilen* 'Pharaoh with his army' (NN 29a1).

Part II
Some instances of the unusual use of the Nominative case in the Krymchak translations of the Biblical texts

Written in Hebrew script, the Krymchak translations of the books of the Bible are the constituent of the Turkic literature of the Krymchaks.[14] The Turkic language of these translations is the Jewish Krymchak ethnolect of Crimean Tatar and is also comparable to the language of the other works of the Krymchak literature. The texts, which were very popular for several centuries in the Krymchak community, were published at the beginning

---

[14] Iala Ianbay, 'New data on the literature and culture of the Krimchaks', *Manuscripta Orientalia* 6/4 (2000), pp. 4–13.

of the 20th century by the initiative of Rabbi Chaim Chizkiyahu Medini (1832–1904). Nissim N. Levi Chahchir was the only person to translate and arrange all the well-known texts into Krymchak. The Krymchak translations of the biblical texts are not translated in the modern interpretation of the literary works, but they are so-called copied translations of the texts. Therefore, in the Krymchak translations, one can see some interesting grammatical phenomena in the word order and syntactical constructions of the Hebrew holy texts. These are the results of the lack of coincidence of the two different linguistic models, Semitic, and Turkic.[15] In the following, we will examine some cases of the use of the nominative in combinations, which seem to be strange or even mistakes. It is necessary to try to understand the reasoning behind the use of such word-combinations, and how such expressions could be understood by the readers and audience.

1. The pronoun *o/ol* '(s)he' is used in the Krymchak copied translations of the biblical texts not only as the 3rd singular personal pronoun 'she, he, it' and as the demonstrative pronoun 'that', like in Turkic languages, but also as the translation of the Hebrew definite article ה as '*ol*', e.g., (22) above.[16]

2. Usually, in the Krymchak sources, the nominal groups with cardinal numerals are built according to the common Turkic rule "singular numeral + singular noun", e.g., (12) above: *ayïrdï altï yüz Israel.* 'He separated 600 Jews' (S 83). In the Krymchak translations of the Biblical texts there are many examples which are built according to the Hebrew grammar, where the nouns in the combination with the numerals from 'two' until 'ten' are used in the plural form in contrast to Krymchak,[17] e.g.:

(32)	*Anïxtïrlar*	*čïqmağa*	*ondan*	*altï*	*sadiq-leri*	*duŋyanïŋ*
	ready-PRS3PL	descend-INF	she-ABL	six-SG-NUM	sage-PL-POSS3	world-GEN

'There would descent from her the six righteous persons of the world (R 367).

(33)	*Eki*	*taš*	*taxtalar*	*yazïlğandïrlar*	*on*	*sïralarda*
	two SG-NUM	stone	table-PL	write-PASS-PART-PRS-PL	ten-SG-NUM	row-PL-LOC

'The two tables of stone which… written in ten rows' (SS 5:13).

---

[15] Marcel Erdal states the structural features of the Krimchak translations of holy scriptures as "the result of the bilinguality of the communities over the centuries" and "the result of the juxtaposition of codes by the translating individual", like it was in Yiddish, Ladino, Jewish-Persian etc. (Marcel Erdal, 'Relativisation in Krymchak', in: *Scholarly depth and accuracy. A Festschrift to Lars Johanson*, eds. Nurettin Demir and Fikret Turan, Ankara 2002, p. 119).

[16] Henryk Jankowski notes the use of the demonstrative pronoun *ol* to translate the Hebrew definite article into Crimean Karaim too (Henryk Jankowski, 'Translation of the Tanakh into Crimean Karaim: History, Manuscripts, and Language', in: *Jewish Languages in Historical Perspective*, ed. Lily Kahn, Leiden–Boston 2018, p. 55); also, Shermin Kalafat imparts the pronoun *ol* was used to translate the Arabic definite article *el* into the Old Anatolian Turkish texts (Şermin Kalafat, 'Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde Yalancı Tanımlık (Artikel) 'Ol' İşaret Sıfatı', in: *Ayagka Tegimlig Bahşı: Festschrift in Honor of Marcel Erdal*, eds. Cemal Karadar and Gönül A. Tekin, [Cambridge Mass.] 2021), pp. 188, 190, 192).

[17] Alexandra Yu. Aykhenvald, *Sovremennyj Ivrit*, Moskva 1990, p. 85.

It is interesting, that such instances appeared in the Old Turkic language, e.g., *üč ačarïlar* 'the three teachers', or *beš yüz tämir talkuklar* '500 iron pegs'.[18] Perhaps, therefore the use of the plural form of the numerals in the subject group of the Krymchak translations was understood by the audience as one of the correct variants of the construction.

3. Biblical Hebrew is characterized by the word order for the verbal sentences, which is as follows: Verb – Subject – Object.[19] This word order is kept exactly in the Krymchak copied translations, e.g.:

(34)	*Qazïlmïšdïr*	*olarda*	*on*	*ol*	*sözler*
	engrave-PASS-PERF3SG	it-PL-LOC	ten-SG-NUM??	DEM	word-NOM-PL

'Engraved on them are the ten words' (SS 1:11).

The usual word order in the Turkic languages is Subject- Object- Predicate or Subject – Predicate – Object. However, for example, in Karaim the sentence is built freely.[20] Furthermore, Henryk Jankowski following Gerhard Doerfer, writes that Crimean Tatar allows a different sequence of members of the sentence, even as Predicate – Object – Subject.[21] Therefore, I believe, such Krymchak sentences, copying the Biblical sequence of members of the sentence are understood by the readers and the audience as being specific, but only through the intonation.

4. As to the agreement of the subject and predicate by number, it is well-known that in the Turkic languages and therefore almost in all cases of the Krymchak translations of the biblical texts, the number of the subject of a sentence agrees with the number of the predicate, i.e.: the singular predicate is used with the singular subject and the plural number predicate is used with the plural subject. Additionally, in the Hebrew grammars it is written, that "in the predicative syntagma the subject is agreed with the predicate in number".[22] However, there are some cases of the Krymchak translations which show the use of the singular subject together with the plural predicate, these appear to be exceptions to the rules of the native Turkic languages, e.g.:

(35)	ישראל	בית	עם	ראו	(Hebrew)
	Israel	house	people	looked (pl)	
	Kördüler	*xalqï*	*ĵeymaatï*	*Israel-nïŋ*	(Krymchak)
	see-PST3PL	people-POSS3SG	congregation-POSS3SG	Israel-SG-GEN	

'Look the people of the House of Israel' (SS 3:11).

---

[18] Erdal, *Grammar of Old Turkic*, p. 358, 384.

[19] Yitzhak Oren (Nadel) and Michael Zand (eds.) *The Shorter Jewish Encyclopedia (SJE)*, Jerusalem 1982, Vol. 2, p. 845.

[20] Kenesbay M. Musayev, *Kratkii grammatičeskii očerk karaimskogo yazyka*, Moskva 1977, p. 69, 74.

[21] Jankowski, *Język krymskotatarski*, p. 279.

[22] Aykhenvald, *Sovremennyj ivrit*, p. 84; Lewis Glinert, *Modern Hebrew: An Essential Grammar*, London 2015, p. 185.

(36)	ישראל	כנסת	אמרה	(Hebrew)
	Israel	Congregation	said	
	Ayttï	*ĵemaatï*	*Israel-niŋ*	(Krymchak)
	say-PST3SG	congregation-SG-POSS	Israel-SG-GEN	

'The Congregation of Israel said' (SS 2:4).

It should be noted that the use of the cases of the singular subject together with the plural predicate is only used with these nouns as a subject: *xalïq* 'people' and *ĵemaat* 'congregation'. Because of the high frequency of the occurrence of these word-combinations, the impression is gathered that such instances are many. The researchers of the Academy of the Hebrew Language of Israel note that as distinct from the common rule of the agreement of the subject and predicate, there is the difference between singular and plural in the translation of the Biblical texts: when the text refers to Israel, the people of Israel and the children of Israel in different phrases, like in (35), a plural predicate is used; that the people of Israel are addressed in plural; on the other hand, when the text refers to the Knesset of Israel, like in (36), a singular form of predicate is used. The Academy of the Hebrew Language of Israel writes that the Knesset of Israel, according to various commentators, is the spiritual representation of the people of Israel or the 'soul' of the people of Israel and not the people themselves. Therefore, the singular form is used in the text.[23] In the Indo-European translations of the Biblical texts the rule of agreement of the subject and predicate is kept strictly and thus this linguistic feature of the Biblical texts is neutralized. However, in the Krymchak spoken language, not in the Biblical translations, there are occasionally instances of the use of the word *xalïq* 'people' as a subject together with the plural predicate, e.g.:

(37)	*Qaal*	*ičinde*	*olğan*	*xalïq*	*bašladïlar*	*yiğlamaya*
	synagogue	inside-PPS-LOC	be-PART-SG	people-NOM-SG	begin-PST3.PL	weep-INF

'The people present in the synagogue began to weep' (S 6).

(38)	*Putperiz*	*ediler*	*o*	*vaqïtnïŋ*	*xalqï*
	idolater	be-PST.PL	DEM	age-GEN	people-POSS-SG

'The people of the age were idolaters' (NN 7).

---

[23] Anonymous, 'Ha-Am Hehlit oh Ha-Am Hehlitu Het'em l_shemot Kibbuziim', *The Academy of The Hebrew Language*, 1st March 2016, Viewed 1st July 2022, <https://hebrew-academy.org.il /2016/03/01/קיבוציים-לשמות-התאם/#>.

For the Turkic languages, like for Hebrew too, it is typical for the singular form to express not only the meaning of singleness but also the meaning of the collective plural, as can be seen above.[24] Therefore, one may suppose such sentences of the Krymchak translations of the Biblical texts reflected this for readers well.

5. Attributive constructions

5.1. Krymchak like other Turkic languages have no special affix for marking adjectives. They are united into a separate part of speech according to their lexical meaning of quality as size, strength, colour, etc. The normal Turkic attributive construction is "attribute + head" and never vice versa, e.g., *gara taš* 'black stone' (PlI 143), *baqïr aqča* 'coper money' (K 105), *aqqan suvlar* 'flowing current' (F 1/7) etc. However, the reverse construction "head + attribute" in Turkic is the nominal sentence, e.g., *taš gara* 'the stone is black', *aqča baqïr* 'money is coper', *suvlar aqqan* 'the current flowed away'. In Hebrew, the attributive constructions are built "head + attribute".[25] In the Krymchak translations such cases constitute the attributive groups, consisting of the noun in nominative + adjective, in which the targumist switched places of the members of the construction, e.g.:

(39)	יחודה	מבית לחם	גדול	יש	יצא	(Hebrew)
	Judah'	from Bethlehem	great	man	went out	
	Čïqtï	*büyük*	*kiši*	*Beyt lexem*	*Yehuda-dan*	(Krymchak)
	go out-PST3SG	great	man-SG-NOM	Bethlehem	Judah-ABL	

'A great man went out from Bethlehem, Judah' (R 19).

This instance shows that the Hebrew attributive construction "noun + adjective" *iš gadol* is translated into Krymchak as *büyük kiši* where the construction is turned into "adjective + noun in nominative". This example reflects such instances which are common.[26] It is the first attributive group in the Krymchak translations of the Biblical texts which is different in the text-source from the Turkic attributive groups.

5.2. The second group is the structure as "noun + noun" where both are in the nominative. According to the Hebrew grammar there are two sub-groups: the attributive nominal structures and the subordinative nominal structures.

---

[24] Ivanov, *Kurs turetskoj grammatiki*, p. 5; Aykhenvald, *Sovremennyj ivrit*, p. 85; Erdal, *Grammar of Old Turkic*, p. 158; Mirfatyx Z. Zakiyev, *Sovremennyj tatarskij literaturnyj yazyk: sintaksis*, Moskva 1971, pp. 35.

[25] Aykhenvald, *Sovremennyj ivrit*, p. 85–88.

[26] Jankowski, 'Translation of the Tanakh', p. 55.

5.2.1. The first sub-group consists of the constructions which have the proper name as the first component of it, e.g., *Išay sadïq* 'Jesse the righteous' (R 509), *Iosef hasadïq* 'Josef the righteous' (NN 553), *Yaqov avinu* 'Jacob our father' (NN 589, 596). Such Hebrew noun phrases are preserved in the Krymchak text without translation. The understanding of these instances was not difficult for the Krymchaks, because there are similar structures in Krymchak as well. These are the structures which consist of the proper name along with one of the terms of the relationship, e.g.:

(40)	*Avram*	*aqay*	*xasta-xanede*	*čok*	*yatmadï*
	Avram	uncle	hospital-LOC	long	lie-NEG-PST3.SG

'Uncle Avram was in hospital not long' (K 90).

(41)	*Qaranfillernï*	*Malkapay*	*filǰandakï*	*suvǧa*	*tašladï*
	clove-PL-ACC	aunt Malka	cup-LOC-being	water-DAT	put-PST-SG

'Aunt Malka put the cloves into the water in the cup' (K 91).

The use of this structure is narrowly adopted because it relates only to persons, however it is used often.

5.2.2. According to the Hebrew grammars the second sub-group of the subordinative nominal structures is that the constituents of which are relate to each other by possessive relations in the broad sense of the word. In contrast to the Modern Turkic languages including Krymchak ethnolect, where the relative and possessive relationships are expressed grammatically differently and are opposed semantically to each other (see 3 of the present work), the grammatical expression of these relationships in the language of the Krymchak copied translations of the Biblical books are not different. Thus, both the structures without marked constituents, and the structures with marked constituents are included into this second group. Therefore, the so-called Turkic *izafet* has conditional meaning in the texts. Both the relative constructions (A) and possessive constructions (B) together are translated into the Krymchak language of the Biblical translations as genitive attributive noun structures:

A.

(42)	דורא	בבקעת	(Hebrew)
	Dura	In the Plain of	
	Yïlǧasïnda	*Dura-nïŋ*	(Krymchak)
	plain-POSS3SG-LOC	dura-GEN	

'…in the Plain of Dura' (SS 7:10).
In Turkic it must be "*Dura yïlǧasïnda*".

(43)	ירדתי	גנת-אגוז	אל	(Hebrew)
	I have come	the nut-garden	Into	
	Baxčïsïna	*ĵoiz-nïŋ*	*düštüm*	(Krymchak)
	garden-POSS3-DAT	nut-GEN	come-PST1SG	

'I have come into the nut-garden' (SS 6:11).
In Turkic it must be "*ĵoiz baxčïsïna düštüm*".

(44)	הרחלים	כעדר			שניך		(Hebrew)
	of ewes	like a flock			your teeth		
	Dišleriŋ	*sürüvü*	*kïbïk*	*ol*	*dïšï*	*qoy-lar-nïŋ*	(Krymchak)
	teeth-PL-POSS2	floch-POSS3SG	like-PPS	DDEM	female	sheep-PL-GEN	

'Your teeth are like a flock of ewes' (SS 6:6).
In Turkic it must be "*dišleriŋ o diši qoy-lar-nïŋ sürüvü kïbïk*".

In Hebrew there is no possessor or owner in (42), (43) and (44). In the Krymchak translations it is obvious that every word of the sentences was translated separately, but not in connection with other words within the phrase. These examples show that the translator kept the Hebrew words order and added the genitive affix to the second term of a construction in Krymchak. By doing this the relative attributive construction was converted into the possessive one. Such translations were most likely understood as the specific character of the texts.

   B.

(45)	לשלמה	אשר	השירים	שיר		(Hebrew)
	is for Solomon	which	of songs	song		
	yïrï	*ol*	*širler-niŋ*	*ki*	*šelomo-ğa*	(Krymchak)
	song-POSS3SG	DEM	song-PL-GEN	CONJ	Solomon-DAT	

'The song of songs, which is Solomon's' (SS 1:1).

The first part of instance (45) demonstrates the structure as "noun + noun" where one of nouns is a grammatically definite one. Hence, the structure is formed like the genitive possessive structure but there is no possessor or an owner. We see the structure with the meaning of emphasis translated as the possessive structures, which does not contradict the rules of the Turkic grammar.

6. Discussion of the Part II

In the Krymchak copied translations of the Biblical texts there are some morpho-syntactic instances with a noun in the nominative case of particular interest. Majority of them were probably perceived as the specific character of the Biblical texts, e.g., the differences in concords of noun with cardinal numerals, the use of the demonstrative pronoun *ol* as the definite article, and the violation of the agreement between subject and predicate when a noun denoting collective like the noun *xalïq* 'people' is used as a subject. The replacement of the relative *izafet* by the genitive one is especially difficult for the native speakers of Turkic. Regarding the nouns in the nominative case, these have an abstract meaning both in the functions of an attribute and of a direct object function it is the characteristic feature of all Krymchak written sources.

Abbreviations

ABL	– Ablative	NEG	– Negation
ACC	– Accusative	NOM	– Nominative
AOR	– Aorist	NUM	– Numeral
CONJ	– Conjunction	OPT	– Optative
CVB	– Converb	PART	– Participle
DAT	– Dative	PASS	– Passive
DEM	– Demonstrative pronoun	PL	– Plural
FUT	– Future	POSS	– Possessive
GEN	– Genitive	PPS	– Postposition
IMP	– Imperative	PRS	– Present
INF	– Infinitive	PST	– Past
LOC	– Locative	SG	– Singular

The written sources and its abbreviations

F – Filonenko Viktor I., 'Krymčakskie ètiudy', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* XXXV/1 (1972), pp. 5–35.

JS – Jankowski Henryk, 'Krymchak language samples', *Turkic Languages* 22 (2018a), pp. 175–193.

K – Kaja Isaac S., *Qrьmčak mektebleriniŋ ekinci sьnьfьna maxsus oquv kitabь*, Simferipol' 1930.

MP – Ianbay Iala, 'Marcel Perich Poems', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* LIV/2 (2002), pp. 5–37.

NN – Erdal Marcel and Iala Ianbay, 'The Krimchak book of Miracles and Wonders', *Mediterranean Language Review* 12 (2000), pp. 39–141.

PLI – Polinsky Maria S., 'The Krymchaks: history and texts', *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 63 (1991), pp. 123–154.

R – Ianbay Iala and Marcel Erdal, 'The Krimchak translation of A Targum *Šeni* of the book of Ruth', *Mediterranean Language Review* 10 (1998), pp. 1–53.

S – Ianbay Iala, 'A Krimchak memoirs of the Russo-Japanese War', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* LXXIX/1 (2021), pp. 114–140.

SS – Ianbay Iala, *Pesn' pesnej tsaria Solomona i Targum na yazyke Krymčakov*, Klik, Jerusalem 2017.

T-M – Tyshchenko-Monastirska Oksana O., 'Peculiar features of the Krymchak dzhonk script and the Krymchak written language tradition', *Movoznavstvo* 6 (2020), p. 25. <DOI 10.33190/0027-2833-315-2020-6-002>.

References

Aykhenvald Alexandra Yu., *Sovremennyj Ivrit*, Nauka, Moskva 1990.

Anonymous, 'Ha-Am Hehlit oh Ha-Am Hehlitu Het'em le_shemot Kibbuziim', *The Academy of The Hebrew Language*, 1st March 2016, Viewed 1st July 2022, <https://hebrew-academy.org.il /2016/03/01/ התאם-לשמות-קיבוציים/#>.

Erdal Marcel, *A Grammar of Old Turkic*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2004. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23658979

Erdal Marcel, 'Relativisation in Krymchak', in: *Scholarly depth and accuracy. A Festschrift to Lars Johanson*, eds. Nurettin Demir and Fikret Turan, Grafiker Yayıncılık, Ankara 2002, pp. 117–136.

Erdal Marcel and Iala Ianbay, 'The Krimchak book of Miracles and Wonders', *Mediterranean Language Review* 12 (2000), pp. 39–141. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13173/medilangrevi.12.2000.0039>.

Fattakhova Elvira B., 'Kategoria Opredelionnosti-Neopredelionnosti w raznostrukturnyx yazykax: na materiale anglijskogo, kitajskogo i tatarskogo yazykov' (PhD diss. Kazanskij Universitet, Kazan 2015).

Filonenko Viktor I., 'Krymčakskie ètiudy', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* XXXV/1 (1972), pp. 5–35.

Glinert Lewis, *Modern Hebrew: An Essential Grammar*, 4th ed., Routledge, London 2015.

Güllüdağ Nesrin, 'Kırımçak Türkçesi grameri' (PhD diss., Firat University, Elazig 2005).

Ianbay Iala, 'A Krimchak memoirs of the Russo-Japanese War', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* LXXIX/1 (2021), pp. 114–140. <DOI 10.24425/ro.2021.137248>.

Ianbay Iala, *Pesn' pesnej tsaria Solomona i Targum na yazyke Krymčakov*, Klik, Jerusalem 2017.

Ianbay Iala, 'Affixes and analytical forms in the Krimchak text of "The book of Ruth"', in: *Trans-Turkic Studies. Festschrift in Honour of Marcel Erdal*, eds. Matthias Kappler, Mark Kirchner, Peter Zieme, and Raihan Muhamedowa, Istanbul 2010, pp. 417–429. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13173/ medilangrevi.10.1998.0001>.

Ianbay Iala, 'Marcel Perich poems', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* LIV/2 (2002), pp. 5–37. <DOI 10.24425/ ro.2021.137248>.

Ianbay Iala, 'New data on the literature and culture of the Krimchaks', *Manuscripta Orientalia* 6/4 (2000), pp. 4–13.

Ianbay Iala and Marcel Erdal, 'The Krimchak translation of A Targum *Šeni* of the book of Ruth', *Mediterranean Language Review* 10 (1998), pp. 1–53.

Ivanov Sergej N., *Kurs Turetskoj Grammatiki. 1. Grammatičeskie kategorii imieni suchchestvitel'nogo*, Leningradskij Universitet, Leningrad 1975.

Ivanov Sergej N., *Kurs Turetskoj Grammatiki. 2. Grammatičeskie kategorii glagola*, Leningradskij Universitet, Leningrad 1975.

Jankowski Henryk, 'Krymchak language samples', *Turkic Languages* 22 (2018), pp. 175–193.

Jankowski Henryk, 'Translation of the Tanakh into Crimean Karaim: History, Manuscripts, and Language', in: *Jewish Languages in Historical Perspective*, ed. Lily Kahn, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2018, pp. 39–61.

Jankowski Henryk, *Język krymskotatarski*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie DIALOG, Warszawa 2010.

Jankowski Henryk, *Gramatyka języka krymskotatarskiego*, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań 1992.

Kaja Isaac S., *Qrьmčak mektebleriniŋ ekinci sьnьfьna maxsus oquv kitabь*, Simferipol' 1930.

Kalafat Şermin, 'Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde Yalancı Tanımlık (Artikel) 'Ol' İşaret Sıfatı', in: *Ayagka Tegimlig Bahşı: Festschrift in Honor of Marcel Erdal*, eds. Cemal Karadar and Gönül A. Tekin, Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. 2021, pp. 185–208.

Musaev Kenesbay M., *Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk karaimskogo yazyka*, Nauka, Moskva 1977.

Oren Yitzhak (Nadel) and Zand Michael (eds.), *The Shorter Jewish Encyclopedia (SJE)*, Qeter, Jerusalem 1982.

Polinsky Maria S., 'Crimean Tatar and Krymchak: Classification and description', in: *The Non-Slavic languages of the USSR*, H. I. Aronson, Linguistic Studies. Second series, Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago 1992, pp. 157–188.

Polinsky Maria S., 'The Krymchaks: history and texts', *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 63 (1991), pp. 123–154.

Rebi David I., Boris M. Ačkinazi, Igor V. Ačkinazi, 'Krymčakskij yazyk', in: *Yazyki Mira. Tiurkskiye yazyki*, Bishkek 1997, pp. 309–319.

Zand Michael, 'Krymchaks', in: *The Yivo Encyclopaedia of Jews in Eastern Europe I*, ed. Gershon David Hundert, Yale University Press, Yale 2008, pp. 948–951.

Zakiyev Mirfatyx Z., *Sovremennyj tatarskiy literaturnyi Yazyk. Sintaksis*, Nauka, Moskva 1971.