Tefsir Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego:
XVI-wieczny przekład Koranu na język polski
Wydanie krytyczne zabytku polskiej kultury narodowej. Komentarz
pod red. J. Kulwickiej-Kamińskiej i Cz. Łapicza, Toruń 2022

Joanna Kulwicka-Kamińska

Czesław Łapicz

The *Tefsir* project – a critical edition of the first translation of the Qur'an into a Slavic language (Polish). Commentary

This paper presents original results of the research on the manuscript *tefsir* of the Tatars of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It is shown that the *tefsir* is the first translation of the Qur'an into a Slavic language and the third translation of the Holy Book of Islam into a European language.[1] The study was conducted in the years 2013–2022, by an international interdisciplinary team of scholars from five countries, within the framework of two research projects funded by the National Programme for the Development of Humanities: „Tefsir – projekt filologiczno-historycznego opracowania oraz krytycznego wydania tzw. tefsiru Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego z 2. połowy XVI w. (pierwszego przekładu Koranu na język polski)" [„Tefsir – Philological and Historical Study and Critical Edition of the So-Called Tefsir of the Tatars of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the Second Half of the 16th Century (the First Translation of the Qur'an into Polish")].

The *Introduction* presents: the new academic discipline of Kitabistics,[2] as well as the subject and methods of the research conducted within its framework; the genesis and the types of Tatar religious manuscript literature as well as its significance for interdisciplinary research and the historical memory of the Muslim community; and, above all, the research and issues undertaken under the *Tefsir* project. These activities resulted in the establishment of, among other things, the place of origin, chronology, and the source of the *tefsir*; indicating the Slavic language into which the Qur'an was translated (Polish or Belarusian), as well as in the specification of detailed palaeographic, linguistic, and textological data of the Tatar manuscript. In conducting the analyses, the methods and research tools typically used in Linguistics (including the history of Polish and Belarusian

---

[1] It is known that a trilingual (Latin-Castilian-Aragonese) translation of the Qur'an, dated 1456, was produced on the initiative of Juan de Segovia. Unfortunately, the original has not been preserved. However, Segovia's handwritten notes in the margins were discovered in recent research (cf., *inter alia*, Roth, Scotto 2015: 181–218).

[2] See the next chapter to find out about the term.

languages, comprising Oriental-Slavic linguistic relations), Theolinguistics[3] (including Kitabistics), and the methodology used in Translation Studies were applied.

1. Kitabistics – a new academic discipline and the subject of its research

Kitabistics is a subfield of Theolinguistics, defined as: (a) an academic discipline arising from the interaction of language and religion (Greek *theos* 'God' and Latin *lingua* 'language') and (b) a branch of linguistics focused on the study of religious language and the analysis of religious phenomena occurring and preserved in the language (Gadomski, Łapicz 2009: 51). Thus, Kitabistics is a new philological discipline, combining Slavic (especially Polish and Belarusian) and Oriental (in particular, Arabic and Turkish) Linguistics with Cultural and Religious Studies, including Biblical and Qur'anic Studies. The principal area of research in Kitabistics is the material and immaterial cultural heritage of the Tatars of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania (mod. Lithuania, Belarus, as well as eastern Poland; in the past also central, partially eastern and southern Ukraine, the western frontier of Russia, and stretches of the Republic of Moldova), in particular, the original Muslim manuscript literature thereof. The academic foundations of Kitabistics were laid down by Anton K. Antonovich (1910–1980) of the Vilnius University. In Poland, research into Kitabistics was initiated in the mid-1980s by Czesław Łapicz from the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń.[4] Łapicz introduced the term *Kitabistics* and has outlined its principal tasks and research postulates (Łapicz 2008: 31–49). Research initiated and developed by Łapicz has led to the establishment of a research unit of the Faculty of Humanities at Nicolaus Copernicus University, the Centre for Kitab Studies (CKS) in 2015 (cf. https://www.human.umk.pl/centrum-badan-kitabistycznych/). Its tasks include interdisciplinary and international academic research, as well as editing and popularising activities in the field of Kitabistics.

2. Manuscript religious literature of the Tatars of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania

2.1. Genesis

It has been established that the GDL Tatars engaged in translation activities due to the loss of their mother tongue, i.e. the Kipchak dialects of the Turkic language used by the first

---

[3] As noted above.

[4] At the time, the first *kitabist* articles and a monograph of his authorship were published. They

foreign settlers, who arrived from the Volga region (and later from the Golden Horde) in the 14th century. Tatars acculturated to their Slavic environment and adopted languages spoken by the indigenous inhabitants, i.e. Belarusian and Polish. This process accelerated during the 15th century, culminating during the second half of the 16th century (Łapicz 1986: 33–60). This is established by numerous sources, e.g. *Risāle-i Tātār-i Leh* (1558),[5] in a later publication: "The memorial addressed by a Jesuit provincial of Lithuania to its general Claudius Aquaviva in 1611 explicitly stated that the local Muslim population could speak Polish, Russian (in fact, Ruthenian), and Lithuanian," (Tarelka, Temčinas 2014: 13) and by historians (17th century), e.g. Ibrahim Pasha and Alexander Guagnini (after: Антонович 1968: 10). Independently from linguistic assimilation, Tatars maintained their faith. The genesis of Tatar literature should also be associated with the Protestant Reformation, which emphasised the significance of religious individualism and the vernacular, as well as with the Counter-Reformation, the result of which were religious polemics connected with apologetics. Consequently, it has been determined that Tatar linguistic monuments originated in the second half of the 16th century.[6] The Tatars created texts of their own, adapted fragments of Old Polish literature to the canons and doctrines of Islam or translated into Polish and/or Belarusian religious texts imported from the Crimea and the Middle East, in particular from the Ottoman empire. They recorded them using the Arabic script. The preservation of the Arabic script for Muslim minorities is the general pattern around the globe during the last 1000 years.

2.2. Types of Tatar literature

One can distinguish several types of the monuments of Tatar literature that have survived to the present (for the division and classification see Drozd, Dziekan, Majda 2000:

---

addressed the orthography, spelling, as well as the inflection and lexis of the 18th-century manuscript (1782/1783) (Łapicz 1986).

[5] "Our people can speak neither Arabic, nor Turkish; still, they know two other languages: in our country everyone speaks two languages, which are commonly used there." (Muchliński 1858).

[6] During the field work in Raižai a *tefsir* from the late 16th century, copied by the GDL Tatars, was discovered. The date of origin was established on the basis of, among other things, a filigree: the Jelita coat of arms, in a Renaissance cartouche, with characters similar to those used in the 1580s. The *tefsir* contains a translation of the Qur'an into Turkish, recorded with the *nasḫī* script. Similar to the *Alytus Tefsir*, the headings of *surahs* 1 and 2 are framed. According to the family chronicle, at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, the manuscript belonged to the Bazarewski family of officers and land owners, who lived in Bazary, Winksznup parish (after: Drozd, Dziekan, Majda 2000: 48). It is worth adding that, dated to 1723, the *Alytus Tefsir* also belonged to a family from the Winksznup parish, namely, to the Ułan officer family from Wiłkobole.

12–16).[7] They include the core books: manuscripts of the Qur'an (from *Al-Qur'ān* 'Ko-ran'),[8] *tefsirs* (from *tafsīr* 'explanation, interpretation, clarification, or commentary – par-ticularly concerning the Qur'an'),[9] *kitabs* and *semi-kitabs* (from *kitāb* 'book'),[10] *chamails* (e.g. from *ḥamala* 'carry');[11] auxiliary books: *sufras* (from *sifr* 'book'), *tejvids* (from *taǧwīd* 'recitation of the Qurʾān'), glossaries; amulets: *hramotkas* (from Belarusian *грамота* 'text'), *dalavars* (from Arabic *duʿāʾ* and Turkish *dua* 'prayer' with the Turkish suffix of the plural *-lar* 'prayers, collection of prayers'), *nuskas* (from *nusḫa* 'copy, manuscript'), plaques, and *muhirs* (from Turkish *muhr* 'seal').[12] Connected with the criterion of form and content, the above division was intuitively adopted by the Tatars themselves. Moreover, one can enumerate: excerpts from *kitabs*, containing primarily the principles of religious practice as well as short coursebooks and glossaries of the Turkish language.

Henryk Jankowski postulates that the above typology should be complemented with epigraphic material (grave inscriptions) and documents, including legal and parochial documents, as well as private correspondence (Jankowski 2003: 114–115).

Tatar literary monuments vary with regard to their volume, genological classification (it is heterogeneous because the features of other genres are present even in one piece), and topics. Besides Arabic and Turkish (mostly Osman-Turkish) texts, they comprise of Belarusian (Old Belarusian), Polish (the north-eastern borderland variety), and – rarely – Russian ones.

> Translation activities required the persons undertaking this venture to display considerable erudition, primarily the knowledge of Oriental languages, in which the Muslim texts were written, i.e. Arabic, Turkish, and Persian. The translators had to know both languages into which they translated, that is Belarusian and Polish (Łapicz 1986: 61).

Tatars introduced these languages into their literature using the Arabic script.

---

[7] Moreover, see the typology and detailed description of Tatar literature in, among others, Szynkie-wicz (1935: 138–139), Łapicz (1986: 65–69), Suter (2004: 6–9), Radziszewska (2008: 138–143), Kono-packi (2010: 131–153).

[8] The opinion is shared that the Qur'an was rewritten until the early 20th century; however, there are examples of copies that originate later, e.g. the manuscript of the Qur'an from the 1970s, rewritten by imam Sulejman Rafałowicz from Iwye.

[9] This type of monument was comprehensively discussed by Suter (2004) and Kulwicka-Kamińska (2018).

[10] The topic of the oldest known *kitabs* was addressed by Konopacki (2010: 139–140). This type of literature was described in detail by Jankowski, Łapicz (2000: 13–20), Łapicz (1986), Dufala (2009: 205), Miškinienė (2000: 30–36; 2001), Akiner (2009).

[11] So far, the most comprehensive characteristics of manuscript *chamails* can be found in the thesis by Radziszewska (2010); cf. also Miškinienė (2001).

[12] Their comprehensive characteristic was presented by Łyszczarz (2013: 258–261).

2.3. Slavic *aljamiado*

Aljamiado literature (*al-'ğamiyya* 'foreign')[13] comprises of works written in the local language, recorded in an appropriately adapted Arabic script, and developed under the strong influence of Islamic culture and tradition. This type of literature includes, among others, the Muslim literature of Western and Southern Africa, as well as that of Southern and Eastern Asia, the *aljamiado* literature of the Iberian Peninsula, and the Muslim texts from the Balkans, such as the writings of the Albanian Bejtexhinj. The literature of GDL Tatars also meets the criteria of *aljamiado*: it was recorded in the local languages – Polish and Belarusian, set down by means of the Arabic script, which was appropriately adapted to the phonological system of these languages, and developed under the strong influence of the tradition and culture of Islam, professed by the GDL Muslim community. It also displays some distinctive features of its own. It combines cultural aspects of Islam with traditions of Muslim mysticism (Sufism), shamanism, Christian culture and the folk beliefs and traditions of the GDL peoples: Poles, Lithuanians, and Belarusians. This amalgam of various types of content significantly sets GDL Tatars apart from the rest of the Islamic world and constitutes a vital factor of their self-identification.

Moreover, most of the GDL Tatars' literary output was in the form of religious texts, created in the conditions of the diaspora, which unquestionably contributed to the translation of the Qur'an into a Slavic language, which was done for the first time, worldwide, by GDL Tatars, and which took the form of a *tefsir* (cf. Łapicz 2014: 59–70; Cychnerska, Kulwicka-Kamińska, Martínez de Castilla [in print]).

2.4. Significance

Tatar religious literature demonstrates the connections between the multifaceted culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the world of Islam. Moreover, it constitutes an essential source for conducting philological research, as it contains grammatical and lexical layers of the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish from the 16th to the 20th centuries, which have not yet been thoroughly studied. It also comprehensively illustrates the manners and methods of the Slavicisation – in terms of the Polish and Belaruthenian languages – of Oriental names (particularly Arabisms and Turkisms). Moreover, it provides invaluable material to observe interference and transference processes within the framework of Slavic languages and Slavic and Oriental contacts at all levels of the language: orthography and spelling, phonetics and phonology, lexis and semantics, and grammar, especially with regard to the Arabic, Turkish and Persian borrowings – semantically related to Islam – into Polish.

---

[13] See Hegyi 1979: 262–269.

In addition, Muslim religious literature provides material for studies of religious language, including diachronic lexicology. On this basis, one may – among others – demonstrate how Muslim religious terminology developed, becoming a part of the research into the phraseology and lexis of the Polish Reformation. It has been established that GDL Tatars' literature is connected with Western European Biblical Studies, including Renaissance translations of the Bible into Polish, and with the Qur'anic translation tradition, e.g. in the form of Turkish *tefsirs*. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that Tatar literature shares common features with biblical and psalter literature of the Old Polish period (cf. Drozd 1999; Kulwicka-Kamińska 2018).

3. The *Tefsir* project

A complementary and interdisciplinary publication of Tatar manuscript monuments whose immanent features include a multilayer structure as well as the multiplicity of sources and languages, requires cooperation between Slavists and Orientalists, knowledge about Polish and Belarusian diachronic linguistics, comprehensive competencies in Oriental – particularly Arabic and Turkological – studies, and the knowledge of the theory of the translation of holy books. Thus, it was concluded that the most essential, priority task for Kitabistics should be to introduce to public awareness and academic circulation the original philological source in the form of GDL Muslims' religious texts, with the first translation of the Qur'an into a Slavic language, rendered probably in the late 16th century. Appositely referred to as a *tefsir*, this translation is a source documenting the civilisational and cultural role of two Slavic languages, Polish and Belarusian, from which the so-called north-eastern borderland variety of Polish originated.[14]

The work involved the study of two complete *tefsir* manuscripts – one of the oldest and one of the most recent copies available: the *Alytus Tefsir* (TAL), dated 1723, and the *Józefów Tefsir* (TJW), dated 1890, held at the National Museum in Vilnius (reference num-

---

[14] Their prominent role and uniqueness were described by, among others, Szynkiewicz (1935: 138 and 140): "Nowadays, *tefsirs* have become always unique and are held by few families as relics. One may come across copies from the 18th century. The translation is very good, in the spirit of the best Muslim commentators" and "[…] very few *kitabs* have been left, one or two per parish, and, as regards *tefsirs*, no more than ten can be found in all Kingdom of Poland." This substantive opinion on *tefsirs* was confirmed after about 70 years by Suter (2004: 6): "Es gibt bis heute kein vollständiges Inventar der litauisch-tatarischen Handschriften. Die bekannten Manuskripte liegen verstreut in Museen und Bibliotheken in Wilna, Minsk, St. Petersburg, Kazan, Warschau, Leipzig oder London. Eine beträchtliche Anzahl von Handschriften befindet sich in Privatbesitz tatarischer Familien, wo sie von Generation zu Generation weitervererbt werden. Diese Manuskripte sind in der Regel der wissenschaftlichen Forschung nur beschränkt zugänglich. Immer wieder gehen Handschriften unwiederbringlich verloren, oft aus Unachtsamkeit oder Gleichgültigkeit dem islamisch-tatarischen Erbe gegenüber." Today, it is known that over twenty *tefsirs* have been preserved (*Tatariana* catalogues describe a total of 26 such manuscripts).

ber НМЛ R-13.012). In total, they comprise more than 2,000 pages of source text with rich glosses on their margins. Additionally, to conduct a more comprehensive study, we used fragments of several other *tefsirs* (as well as *kitabs* and *chamails*) as comparative material.

In the first part of the project, the most important research tasks included: developing the rules of the transliteration and transcription of Polish and Belarusian GDL Muslim texts written in the Arabic script into the Latin alphabet; reading *tefsir* manuscripts in compliance with the rules adopted; developing methodological tools for a multifaceted philological and historical description of GDL Tatar handwritten monuments, such as *kitabs*, *chamails*, *tejvids*, etc.

The tasks were completed in several stages. Firstly, we collected a corpus of monuments, particularly *tefsir*-type manuscripts. Our priority was to develop a universal system of the transliteration of Slavic source texts into the Latin alphabet as their original versions were recorded in the Arabic script on religious grounds. It was essential to propose a system that would be acceptable for the scholars because each researcher utilises a unique, often inconsistent, system of reading the Tatar monuments, frequently ignoring the prospective recipient and the linguistic features that can be crucial for academic exploration. We contrasted fragments of the oldest translations of the Qur'an into Polish (both manuscript and printed) and we concluded that a majority of the features (at all language levels) differing in manuscripts results from the ad hoc adopted transliteration systems.

With regard to the above, it was vital to establish who the prospective recipient of the edition was. It was assumed that the tasks undertaken should result in an academic publication in the form of a monograph. Thus, it must be faithful to the original to the maximum extent, i.e. it must preserve and reflect the grammatical and semantic properties therein. Consequently, it was postulated that the largest possible number of variants should be preserved (the record of letter sequences as well as word and lexical forms) that establish the origin of the monument, its dialectal basis (the indication of territorial and regional delineation, the writer's idiolect, the writer-copyist relationship, including the extent of text mutation). Once the origin of a monument is identified, i.e. the geographical context is considered, an attempt at phonological interpretation can be made. Therefore, the manner of notation used in the monuments was analysed.

Simultaneously, it has been established and confirmed that:

1. The immanent feature of Tatar literature is a distinctive notation system, i.e. the notation which takes full vocalisation into account, in contrast to Arabic texts, in which solely consonants, long vowels (*ā*, *ū*, *ī*), and diphthongs (*ay*, *aw*) are recorded, while short vowels (*a*, *u*, *i*) are marked sporadically in the texts that require this (for didactic or accuracy-oriented purposes) with the use of special vocalisation characters, which serve to record both short vowels as well as a lack of a vowel or the doubling of a consonant and which are placed either over or under a letter (Lewicka 2015: 110; previously written about, among others, by Drozd, Dziekan, Majda 2000; Radziszewska 2010).

2. The translators of religious texts were perfectly aware of the Arabic and Turkish pronunciation. It is possible that they also knew the pronunciation of other languages spoken in the countries sharing Arabic culture. The purpose of their work was to phonetically record the Slavic translations with the use of Arabic letters. Consequently, what dominates in the notation of texts are the phonetic, not orthographic, rules. Despite this, translators and copyists used their experience in Polish and Belarusian, as well as Arabic and Turkish orthography. Thus, next to the prevalent phonetic notation, the texts often feature annotations which comply with the rules of writing, typical of Polish and Belarusian, as well as Arabic and Turkish of the period (Łapicz 1986: 88).

The research has revealed that providing solely transliteration (simply replacing the characters of one alphabet with those of the other) is groundless and purposeless. The objective is to strive towards phonetic transcription, i.e. the interpretation of the sound hidden behind the graphemes, on the basis of the knowledge of the phonetic system of the language spoken in a given region during a specific period (cf. Bartula 2011: 27). It is crucial for Slavists as it proves useful while conducting historico-linguistic and dialectological research. It provides the basis to further render transcription, in which only selected features of the sound are added. Such edition will contribute to the study of the content, style, lexis, semantics, and word-formation. The solution adopted by the team was a hybrid of transliteration and transcription (semi-phonetic) phonological (serving to only approximately indicate the pronunciation of a given period and region). It was also acknowledged that systemic transliteration solutions should be determined by the Slavic layer.[15] Thus, the similarity of the transliteration systems adopted in the kitabistic tradition was emphasised, and the transliteration characters shared by these systems were accepted. A theoretical study of this issue, i.e. the system of the transliteration and transcription of Tatar writing, based on *grazhdanka*, was published in Vilnius (Антонович 1968). Academia owes the system of the transliteration and transcription of Tatar literature, based on the Latin alphabet, to Łapicz (1986). The basis was comprised of the systems developed in the 1960s and in the 1980s by Antonovich and Łapicz, respectively, and attempts were made to adapt them to provide structure for reading and transliterating the Tatar *tefsir*.[16] The reason for adopting such a transliteration system, and continuing this "kitabistic" tradition, was the fact that it overlaps to a high degree with the phonetic transcription. Thus, the implementation of the 1 : 1 rule could be pursued, but not at the

---

[15] The final version of the transliteration system was based on the opinions of reviewers: Bogdan Walczak – a scholar in Polish Studies, and Alla Kozhinova – a scholar in Belarusian Studies, as well as on consultations with historians of the Polish language: Tomasz Mika and Agnieszka Słoboda.

[16] It was concluded that publication instructions for *tefsirs*, *kitabs*, and *chamails* should vary within the GDL Tatar literature as each manuscript contains unique graphic features. Thus, the purpose of the text is a crucial issue. With regard to the *tefsir*, it was not used in liturgy, but it served to acquaint the believers with the Qur'anic text.

cost of simplifying or distorting the text. Moreover, it was concluded that the ISO system would be conducive to reading the Oriental layer present in the Tatar texts. It plays a vital auxiliary role as, among other things, it helps to determine which graphemes of the Arabic language were used to record the Polish phonemes. Initially, a transliteration table was developed, to which *Instrukcja do transliteracji rękopiśmiennych tefsirów z 1723 roku (Olita) i 1890 (Wilno)* [*An Instruction for the Transliteration of Manuscript Tefsirs from 1723 (Alytus) and 1890 (Vilnius)*] was added.[17] Consequently, a coherent, single system of the transliteration of the highest-ranking monument was developed – the first translation of the Qur'an into a Slavic language. Following this development, the results of the findings were broadly validated in transliteration practice. Several fragments (*surahs Al-Fātiḥa* and *Yā Sīn* as well as the final ones, ranging from 111 to 114) of the copies that were available to the researchers were selected for comparative analysis, which were meant to determine the scope of language evolution and the changes in the copying chain that happened over four centuries (16th to 19th) at every language level, both in the content and the form of subsequent copies, made not only at different times, but also in different places and by different copyists.

Selected fragments of several *tefsirs* were transliterated by these research team members who possessed relevant theoretical and practical competencies. During the transliteration process, the scholars faced a range of problems, which had to be discussed. For example, one issue concerned text division, i.e. the marking and numbering of *ayats*, as there are some text shifts, i.e. the Polish translation does not correspond with the overwritten fragment in Arabic (e.g. *surah* 114, verse 4, the equivalent of *ferej* 'evil spirit, mad' can be found under Arabic *ǧinn* in the *Alytus Tefsir*, while in *Józefów Tefsir* it is found under the sign marking *ayat* delimitation and in the *Minsk Tefsir* under Arabic *min*).[18] Such shifts result from the exegetic translation of the Qur'an or unversed copying of the Arabic text. It was agreed that the so-called frame of reference for the Oriental layer should be widely available Qur'an of Medina, while a different solution was adopted for the Slavic layer: the target text was compared with the Philomath translation published in 1858.

In the second part of the project, the work was continued and extended with new tasks: the standardisation and unification of the Slavic layer of the *tefsirs*, reading and conducting a philological and textological analysis of their Oriental layer, conducting a comparative textological analysis of Tatar and Turkic *tefsirs*, and developing research areas for a multifaceted description of Qur'anic manuscripts.

It has been established that the critical academic edition of a *tefsir*-type monument should comprise its facsimile and transliteration of the Slavic text. The transcription of

---

[17] See p. 231 of this study.

[18] After Dziekan; http://www.tefsir.umk.pl/pliki/dziekan_uwagi_arabistyczne.pdf (last accessed: 25 April, 2021).

texts in foreign languages could constitute a separate whole, which is provided with commentaries indicating the source text of the translation, the dependence on Eastern religious literature (including translations of the Qur'an into Turkish and Persian), and a translation of the Oriental layer, owing to which a broader textological perspective could be gained. In the philological study, the critical apparatus should be used and comprised of: a register of amendments in the text, introductions, descriptions and textological specification of sources, a register of emendations and conjectures, commentaries, bibliography, annexes, glossaries, concordance, and indices. It has been acknowledged that the whole will be provided with philological and historical commentaries, both Slavic (specifically, Polish and Belarusian) and Oriental (Arabic and Turkish) ones. Consequently, the notes include: an explanation of the words of Oriental origin; an explanation of terms which today are recognised as dated, but historically present in the lexical systems of Polish or Belarusian; hybrid forms; newly-created forms, which did not occur in Slavic languages (e.g. *rozpłaksić* 'burst out crying'), as well as the forms which were recorded as late as in 19th-century sources, but which were used in earlier-made copies of Tatar literary monuments; an explanation of the forms in which voiced and unvoiced or hard and soft consonants are used inconsistently, which affects their incorrect form; an indication of various manners of marking the softness – not only by selecting appropriate graphemes, but also by their shape; demonstration of the reasons why the writer and/or copyist chose particular letters, depending on their position in the word (including the neighbouring letters); an explanation of certain grammatical structures, etc.

3.1. Research areas

An essential part of the research undertaken was the development of the research areas for the multifaceted description of *tefsirs*.

The Slavic layer

3.1.1. Based on orthographic, linguistic, and palaeographic features, the chronology of the *tefsir* has been established, i.e. specifying the date of the first translation of the Qur'an into a Slavic language. It has been concluded that the translation of the Qur'an by the GDL Tatars originated no earlier than in the second half of the 16th century, and no later than in the early 17th century. It has been established that the unknown archetype that formed the basis for the chain of subsequent copies was Polish. This has also indicated that a Polish text was the basis of the world's first translation of the Qur'an into a Slavic language.

The watermarks of the manuscript were identified, one of which was *Ryba w wieńcu pod koroną* [*A Fish in Wreath under the Crown*] with the countermark featuring the letters THK and three lilies. Dated 1735–1739, a similar countermark was recorded under no. 4177 in Laucevičius's album, albeit without the lilies. The *Dąb* [*The Oak*] with countermark Jan Szulc Prenny no. 4 was featured as no. 648 in Laucevičius's album, pointing

to the year 1823 (Laucevičius 1967). Moreover, on card 478a, the countermark GHP was identified, without the filigree and there was a white date of [1]788 (?) and the letters БОФАУ on the upper cover sheet. In Klepikov's album the year 1786 can be seen under no. 90 (Клепиков 1978). This date points to at least a temporal relation between TAL with the *Vilnius Tefsir* (TW) from 1788. Moreover, further studies were made of direct *tefsir*-related data, i.e. the mode and manner of binding; the language of the monument, including older and more recent features, indicating when the copy was made; the certificate of ownership, and content design. These were used to prepare the manuscript data sheet.[19] Based on direct and indirect data, it was confirmed that the copy of the *tefsir* was completed in 1723, whereas corrections and additions were made in 1836, 113 years later.

In the monument studied, several graphic features were identified, indicating that TAL belongs to the group of the oldest *tefsir* copies, alongside such monuments as the *Minsk Tefsir* (TCNB), the *London Tefsir* (TL), and the *Vilnius Tefsir* (TW). They often show the features typical of Turkish orthography:[20]

1. Lack of distinction between the spelling of the sounds [*o*] and [*u*] and rendering them with the same grapheme – *ḍamma* or *wāw* with *ḍamma*.
2. The use of the soft phoneme [*s̱*] of the letter (پس),[21] which was characteristic of some of the earliest texts and which appears only exceptionally in more recent copies of the manuscripts.
3. The use of the letters *ḥā'* and *ḫā'* to denote the phoneme [*x*]. Moreover, the use of *ḫā'* in Tatar monuments is unique and concerns the earliest-dated manuscripts.

It was found that many peculiarities existed in TAL, such as:

1. The realisation of the phoneme [*a*] in the final position with *al-alif al-maqṣūra*, which is rare in Tatar monuments and reflects Arabic spelling rules (Łapicz 1986: 108).
2. The manner of marking the strong phoneme [*a*] with an *alif* with *fatḥa* – according to Łapicz, "this grapheme does not appear in the initial position, or it is rare or very rare" (Łapicz 1986: 107).
3. Writing the hard sound [*z*] with the letter meaning [*ż*], i.e. *zāy*. This is an extremely infrequent feature of Tatar monuments (Łapicz 1986: 148).

In TAL, features from different linguistic levels were also identified, which were typical of the borderland variety of Polish and the Belarusian language in the 16th and 17th centuries and, occasionally, in the 18th century.

---

[19] See pp. 335–339 of this study.

[20] We list only the most representative (three at the most) linguistic features. They concern, among other things, archaic graphemes, peculiarities, elements of Belarusian and the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish, and features of the biblical style. They are comprehensively studied in the following papers from this volume: Kulwicka-Kamińska, Łapicz 2022; Kożynowa, Kulwicka-Kamińska, Łapicz 2022ab; Kulwicka-Kamińska 2022b.

[21] This is how it was recorded in Arabic in manuscripts from the classical period.

With regard to phonetics, it has been determined that:

1. The pronunciation of etymological *ŕ* in the oldest textual layer was recorded as *r*, i.e. with the use of *rā'*, e.g. *grexi*, *priklad*, *rekl*, which is also characteristic of Old Belarusian texts from the 16th and 17th centuries.

2. Archaic forms of the nominative roots of the noun – cf. *barzdo* 'very', *blizu* 'close, near, around'; 'before long, soon', *pośnik* 'fasting meal', *dobrość* 'kindness', etc.

Also identified, with regard to inflection, there have been:

1. The use of nominative endings in the accusative singular of animate nouns, e.g. *wjedōmōśc prišla prez dūx ṡwentij*. The disruption of repartition may result from the overlap of the Polish and Belarusian systems or the creation of the *tefsir* before the 17th century (Łapicz 1986: 167).

2. The appearance of the zero ending in the genitive plural of masculine nouns, e.g. *testamentū dwox muṣulman*; *s tix dwox rōzlūčnix wepr*; *od cūd*. It was supplanted with the secondary ending *-ow* in Belarusian from the 14th to 17th centuries (Łapicz 1986: 165). In Polish, the zero ending in the masculine ceased to be used generally by the end of the 15th century, but was still present by the end of the 18th century in individual words and in the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish. However, Zofia Kurzowa found only a few words with *ø* in the period from the 16th to 18th centuries (Kurzowa 1993: 168–169).

3. The presence of three types of the ending *-ej* in the genitive plural, e.g. *nicej*, *bracej*. According to Kurzowa, this ending was used in the GDL from the late 16th to the late 17th centuries (Kurzowa 1993: 169).

With regard to syntax, the features typical of general Polish used in the 17th and 18th centuries have been identified in TAL (cf. Kurzowa 1993: 210; Kulwicka-Kamińska 2017: 85–110). Moreover, the archaic features include:

1. The presence of the Old Polish preposition *iz* (from Proto-Slavic **jьzъ*).

2. The use of pronoun enclitic forms after a preposition, e.g. *wicōngneš na me renke*; in Polish, these are relics from before the 17th century (Łapicz 1986: 175).

Hence, the monument contains linguistic elements which were confirmed in Belarusian and Polish sources and used until the 16th century, some also during the 17th and 18th centuries. These features were always used in parallel with more recent forms, demonstrating that successive generations of copyists continuously modernised these texts (Łapicz 1986: 219).

The analysis of the text has confirmed that TAL belongs to the oldest *tefsir* copies and has shown that the Qur'anic translation was first made into Polish, and later Ruthenised, which is particularly evident in the most recent copies from the 19th century. Sergejus Temčinas conducted the textological analysis based on over twenty sources, including 13 *tefsir* copies[22] and the fragments of *chamails* and *kitabs* containing a *tefsir* translation.

---

[22] Cf. the list of *tefsirs*, pp. 23–24 of the *Introduction*.

Having compared *surah* 1 of the Qur'an in these documents, he concluded that all of them contained the same translation of *surah* 1, i.e. a text originally written in Polish that was basis for these translations. He also established that changes were made in the copies analysed with respect to the missing protograph. The *tefsirs* from the second half of the 19th century contain the largest number of textual changes in the translation of *surah* 1. They also differ considerably from the original. On the other hand, *tefsirs* as TAL, the *Tefsir from the 18th Century* (kept in the National Library of Belarus), TW, TUP, and TN comprise only few changes, and are close to the Polish original.

Therefore, the *tefsir* analysed is a copy of an original text that originated later, preserving some of its archaic features. The original text, i.e. the protograph, is not the source of material for academic exploration, as only its copies, dating back to the 17th to 20th centuries, have survived until the present. Some copies share a majority of common features, whereas others differ considerably. It may be proof of the so-called 'chain of copies.' Consequently, the researcher's task is to try to identify and provide a list of Tatar canonical texts.

3.1.2. It has been established that the *tefsirs* were quoted and used in other Muslim texts, especially in *kitabs* and *chamails*. The language of implementation depended on the translator and/or the copyist of the monument. Thus, these *tefsir* fragments were recorded in a combination of the Polish and Belarusian languages, in which the features of one language, or the other, predominate. Specific sources of these quotations were also validated.

With regard to the chronology of the Tatar monuments, it is accepted in kitabist research that the Qur'an was initially translated by the Tatars. This is confirmed by the content of other monuments, which quote *surahs* from the *tefsir* translation. The oldest Tatar monument, i.e. the *Kitab from Suchovola*, dates back to 1631 (see Kulwicka-Kamińska, Łapicz 2017: 79–96); therefore – as mentioned above – this Qur'an transla-tion must have been composed no later than 1650 and no earlier than 1550. The sources were supplemented with copies of other Tatar monuments, such as *kitabs* and *chamails*, serving as comparative material and enriching the overview of Tatar translations.[23] Placing them in the canon of sources also results in showing various sub-types of the religious language and the levels of communication within the framework of the religious style, as – in the textual layer – these texts are close to the colloquial variety of the general language, thus contrasting with the monuments representing the language of the rituals – the liturgy, with *tefsirs*.

---

[23] *Kitabs* comprise many quotations from the Qur'an, whereas *chamails* contain significant frag-ments of the Holy Book of Islam (cf. Suter 2004: 72–83). Analogous conclusions with regard to the *Lipsk chamails* were presented by Mihail Tarelka (2016: 121–149). Among other things, he paid attention to the presence of the phrase *wiárā 'ibrāhimowā* in this monument, an expression which clearly has its provenance in the *tefsir*.

In the paper written within the framework of the project, Sergejus Temčinas (2020: 53–60) demonstrates the relationship between the *kitab* text and the *tefsir* text, using verse 14 of *surah* 36 and the story of *Isa's message to Antioch* (from the *Kitab from the 19ᵗʰ Century*, held by the British Library under reference number OR 13020) as an example. He notes that the names of Jesus' apostles are not mentioned in the original Qur'an, but their names in the Christian variant, *i.e. Jan*, *Stefan*, and *Szymon* (with the gloss *Piotr*), are present in the *tefsir*. In contrast, in the *kitab*, these names appear in the Muslim variant: *Yahya*, *Šewban*, *Šeme'un*, and – in the form of a gloss – in the Christian variant adopted from the *tefsir*.

The Qur'anic commentators name the destination of the journey Antioch and call the messengers Jesus' apostles; however, they give them different names. Nevertheless, the monuments analysed are characterised by the use of the same apostle names, confirming that the GDL Tatars used a single source and demonstrating the relationship between the *tefsir* and the *kitab*. Temčinas (2019: 104–116) identifies this source in another article. His research proves that the text, which is present in the Tatar *kitabs* and written in the Arabic alphabet, is an abridged version of a chapter from the book *Lives of the Prophets* by Abū Isḥāq al-Ṯaʿlabī (d. 1035), a (Sunni) Muslim, theologian, historian, and Qur'an translator who worked in Nishapur (north-eastern Iran).

Temčinas also indicates fragments of the *tefsir* translation in *kitabs* and *chamails*, which are subjected to a textological analysis based on *surahs* 1 and 36. It should be added that the research indicates that *chamails* and *kitabs* typically contain: *surah* 1, fragments of *surah Al-Baqara* (e.g*.* 2: 255), 36, and the closing ones, especially 112.

3.1.3. It has been established that – varied in time and space and based mainly on phonetic rules – the literature of the GDL Tatars documents the process of the formation of the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish, based on the Belarusian substrate. Owing to the analysis of the language of this literature, new facts were indicated from the history of the Polish and Belarusian languages (mainly at the level of lexis, semantics, and grammar), concerning the evolution of Belarusian, Polish, and the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish. We also identified new lexical (including etymological), semantic, word-formation, formal (e.g. Polish-Belarusian and Slavic-Oriental hybrids), phraseological, and syntactic facts for the history of Belarusian and Polish, as well as for the research in the field of Belarusian-Polish relations. It was demonstrated that the manuscripts of the GDL Tatars also reflect the dialectal features of Belarusian.

In the manuscripts of the GDL Tatars, the Slavic language layer is co-formed by Old Belarusian and the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish. They are also the earliest dated manuscript sources to excerpt the linguistic material to study the history of the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish, from its onset to the formation of its systemic features.

Therefore, it is possible to indicate at each language level the features of the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish which are present in literature (cf. in particular Kurzowa

1993), as well as new linguistic facts in the field of the evolution of the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish and Belarusian-Polish relations. Some of these were described in detail in the paper by Kulwicka-Kamińska (2017). Following, are some descriptions.

At the level of phonetics:

1. The notation of close vowels, e.g. the rendering of *á* by *o*, which occur rarely in manuscripts – cf. *pon*.
2. The realisation of nasal vowels, e.g. the presence of split vowel forms before fricatives – cf. *ščenścem*; early evidence of the denasalisation of *ǫ* in the final position – cf. *z̧alalo śe wodo*, peculiar examples of the disappearance of the nasal *ǫ* before *-w* in the perfect adverbial participle – cf. *prijōwšī*, and the confirmation of secondary nasality – cf. *spōlenčnik*.
3. The confirmation of asynchronous pronunciation *r + ž*, *r + š* as a Belarusian influence, consolidating the Polish archaism – cf. *tržima*.

At the level of inflection:

1. The ending *-om* of Ruthenian origin in masculine singular nouns in the instrumental case, e.g. *za kūždim razōm*.
2. The ending *-u* in feminine singular nouns in the genitive case as a Ruthenian influence, e.g. *iź šiju*.
3. Archaic forms of the pronoun: *on(y)*, *ona*, *ono* 'this', e.g. *na ōnim şwece*; *ten/toj* from Proto-Slavic **tъ*, denoting a distant object, e.g. *nad tōj s̀wjet*, and a continuant of the pronoun **sь*, **se*, **si*, denoting a near object, which, according to historians of Old Belarusian, was already used to a limited extent in the 15th and 16th centuries, e.g. *śeju parsonūju*, and many others.

While describing the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish used in the Tatar *tefsirs*, it is important to analyse its lexical layer. Among the dictionary entries documenting the nature of this variety, the layer of Old Polish lexis can be identified and distinguished, as well as verified in the SPXVI and Re, including several names of agents, both those known in the Polish language of the time and those used rarely or as neologisms, e.g. *chlubliwy*, listed in this form only twice in OrzRozm[24] and in WujJudConf, and *chłubliwy,* listed six times (SPXVI III: 251–252); *jedynostwo*, confirmed only in one monument, i.e. in BN (SPXVI IX: 419–420); *karmiciel*, noted only four times by Skarga and in BN (SPXVI X: 143–144), and many others.

Moreover, TAL provides examples of lexis which was first recorded in the SWil. It includes, among others, words used in a specific sense in the north-eastern borderland variety of Polish, which do not occur in the lexical system of Polish or which occur in a different sense, e.g. *górnica* 'hill'; *poznak* 'sign, mark'; *pożycie* 'way of life'; *ugruntować się* 'to become stronger'; *utraktować* 'to treat'; *wyszka* 'highland'; *wzlewać* 'to flow upwards', etc.

---

[24] Abbreviations of the source texts after SPXVI.

In addition, the lexis collected comprises forms which differ from the vocabulary of formal literary Polish in respect of morphology and inflection. They include:

1. Formations with the ending *-ij*, *-yj* in masculine and neuter nouns in the singular – cf. *bezzakonnyj*, *burzystyj*, *chlubliwyj*, *żałościwyj*.[25]
2. Forms of numerals, e.g. *cztyry*, *cztyrdziesty*, *siedmidziesiąt*.
3. Verbs with case government which is different from that found in Polish, or which is a by-form, e.g. *domniemać* (accusative: who, what [Pl. kogo, co]), *nas* (accusative: who, what [Pl. kogo, co]), *nastąpić* (genitive: of who, of what [Pl. kogo, czego]), *pokrywać* (locative: about whom, about what [Pl. o kim, o czym]).
4. Words with dependent forms which are atypical in Polish, e.g. *kłamają*, *oszukiwają*.
5. Other prefixes, or a lack of prefix, e.g. *kłamać* 'zakłamywać', 'okłamywać' (to lie).
6. Verbs with reflexivity which are atypical in Polish, e.g. *nawrócić* 'to convert', *strawować się* 'to feed, to nourish'[26].
7. Verbs with a different infinitive, e.g. *ociężewać*, *wyświjedczać*.

3.1.4. While studying the Tatar *tefsir*, it was found that some lexical forms used in the translation are typical of north-western Ukrainian dialects, and are not used outside this territory, e.g. the lexeme *čimalō* (Ukr. чимало 'much').

Sergejus Temčinas formulated the thesis that the translation of the Qur'an could have been made in Volhynia, which belonged to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from the 16th to the 18th centuries.[27] Next, it 'travelled' northwards, through south-western Belarus,

---

[25] They can be treated as formations belonging to Polish of the north-eastern borderland, but also as hybrid forms.

[26] On the one hand, this phenomenon preserves a Polish archaism, while on the other, it is an example of the influence of eastern languages, specifically Belarusian.

[27] It is common knowledge that Tatar settlement developed also in Podolia and Volhynia, i.e. the lands that belong to modern Ukraine. It must be added that Turkic ethnic groups, i.e. the groups belonging to the community of Turkish languages, had lived in modern Ukraine since the early Middle Ages. They included the Pechenegs, the Cumans, and the Khazars, who shaped the ethnic landscape of the Black Sea steppes. The Turkic settlement is confirmed in the toponymy (names of towns, places, rivers, lakes, mountain summits, etc.). In the 14th and 15th centuries, the borderland of Slavic and Turkic settlement began to move south, reaching the line leading from Vinnytsia, through Bratslav, Cherkasy, and Kaniv, to Putyvl, i.e. the line dividing Ukraine into the northern and southern parts. It is worth remarking that in the Chernihiv and Severia lands of the mid-15th century, there existed a Tatar feudal state, a vassal of Casimir IV Jagiellon, so-called Jagoldai Tyumen, named after Jagoldai the Khan. It can be recognised as the only quasi-state of the Lithuanian Tatars. It is acknowledged that an important date for the Tatar settlement in Volhynia was the year 1512, when the Polish-Lithuanian army – under the command of Ukrainian magnate, Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski – defeated a unit of Crimean Tatars at the battle of Vyshnivets. Several hundred Tatar prisoners settled in Ostroh and other lands owned by the Ostrogski family. In the late 16th century the towns inhabited by the Tatars included Lutsk, Starokostiantyniv, Maidan-Labun', Yuvkivtsi, and Rozvazh as well as other small towns and villages in Volhynia. Records from the late 17th century

i.e. to more remote areas of Belarus and Lithuania. Mykhaylo Yakubovych quotes the research of Andriy Danylenko, according to whom, at least a part of old Tatar texts were written in an amalgam of the Polish, Belarusian, and Ukrainian languages (a language very close to the one spoken in Volhynia at the time). Thus, not only did the Muslims share the koiné with the residents of the Polesia region, but also (subconsciously) imitated the linguistic self-identification of their Slavic neighbors. Due to political (particularly after the Union of Lublin of 1569)[28] and linguistic (related to the later expansion of Polish) reasons, there were no major differences between the koiné used by the Muslims and other dialects used in the region (after Yakubovych [in print]). Several features of the Belarusian dialects, especially the south-western ones, can be distinguished in TAL, for example:

1. The pronunciation of [*o*] instead of /*a*/ in the syllable immediately before the stress (so-called *okanye*), e.g. *źnewagi ne wspōm**ō**gajce.*
2. The presence of the *n'j* group, e.g. *dla ūkaza**nj**a*; *ōd jeʒe**nj**a*; *zbawil īx spaṣe**nj**em*, as well as hesitation in the notation of unstressed endings *-o*, *-e*, *-a*, e.g. *rozka-zanj**e** – rōskazan**e**, spaśen**a** – spaśenj**e** – spaśen**e**, meškanj**ō** – meškan**e**.*
3. The presence of constructions with the preposition *da* (mainly towards a person), e.g. *da īx meškana*; *mōwi da dawida*, and others.

The lexical layer of TAL also contains borrowings from Eastern Slavic languages, including Polish-Eastern Slavic hybrids. With regard to the words of Belarusian origin, it is difficult to specify a concrete territory from which they are derived although some of them are suggestive of south-western and north-western Belarus, bordering with Lithuania, e.g. *strohi*, *szereng*, *pribolszyć się*, *nuszkać*, *targowla*, *trościany*. Another example is

---

mention that modern Khmelnytskyi Oblast (the villages of Labun' in the Polonne District and Yuvkivtsi in the Bilohiria District) and the towns of Polonne and Starokostiantyniv were densely populated by the Tatar communities. The 17th century saw Tatars arrive to Ukraine from the northern regions, i.e. Trakai and Vilnius Voievodeships. The reason for this migration were the wars fought by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the first half of the 17th century. The invasion of the army from Moscow caused the GDL Tatars to migrate to Volhynia, Ukraine, Podolia, and Red Ruthenia, where the above-mentioned Tatar settlements had already existed. In spring 1659, Tatar representatives from Volhynia and Ukraine – rittmeister Aleksander Kryczyński and mullah Milkamanowicz – submitted to the Sejm in Warsaw and to King John II Casimir Vasa the privilege which was issued by Władysław IV Vasa in 1634, which sustained all privileges and prerogatives of the Tatar nobility, knyazes, uhlans, mirzas, and standard-bearers in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and which repealed the articles in the Stautes of Lithuania and the acts passed by the Sejm in 1607 and 1616 which were harmful to Tatar nobility. The Sejm and the king confirmed this privilege and extended it to the Tatar nobility of Volhynia and Podolia. The evidence of the exodus of Tatars to Ukraine and Volhynia after 1660 was the considerable number of Tatar banners in the armies of Lithuania and the Crown (after https://www.podgorski.com/main/szlachta-tatarska-w-rzeczypospolite.html [last accessed: 13 March, 2021] and Yakubovych [in print]).

[28] This was an international agreement between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, entered into 1 July 1569 at the general assembly in Lublin. It gave rise to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, a federation which existed in the years 1569–1795.

the form *serco*. It was used in the south of the Brest Oblast and in the west of the Gomel Oblast – cf. *prilōžil pan bōg na sercō̄ jix.*

The lexical elements of Eastern Slavic (i.e. Belarusian as well as Ukrainian and Russian) origin did not always derive from dialects, e.g. *obezjana*, *opłoszenstwo*, *opłosznyj*, *powodir*, *strogość*. Moreover, the *tefsir* contains a layer of originally Old Church Slavonic vocabulary, e.g. *chram* 'church', *czerniec* 'monk', *kajeta* 'penance, atonement.'

3.1.5. It has been established that there are essentially no Baltic, i.e. Lithuanian, language elements found in the GDL Tatars' monuments. This pertains to direct and indirect Lithuanianisms borrowed, for example, from the Belarusian or Polish languages and dialects. The research results of Sergejus Temčinas and Mihail Tarelka (2014: 11–22) are exceptional in this respect.

A linguistic and textological analysis of a *chamail* was conducted, a copy of which was made at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. The monument comes from a private collection in Minsk. It was used in the town of Pastavy, and probably Myadzyel, in Belarus, near the border with Lithuania. Interest was shown in the fragment of the manuscript containing a spell against snakebites (p. 37b), which was transliterated from the Arabic script into the Latin alphabet and whose content was compared to analogous spells found in Lithuanian folklore. It was concluded that the spell might have originated in the borderland of eastern Lithuania and western Belarus and that it was written by the Tatars inhabiting these lands. The text is written in Belarusian and Lithuanian: *žemā žimā 'abriwā peķtibā ẓāmān ġūṣ ẓewā ġeribā* ['oh, earth, great earth, your evilness will be destroyed by god's might!']. A similar spell was known in the Ignalina and Utena districts, close to the Pastavy settlement. On the basis of the linguistic analysis, it was determined that the protograph of the Lithuanian incantation could have originated as in the 17th century. Spells against snakebites are often found in *chamails*, but not in the Lithuanian language. Therefore, the manuscript found appears to be unique.

3.1.6. It has been concluded that – at the level of the language and translation techniques – the Tatar translators followed, or referred, to the rules adopted during the translation of Christian holy books, including the Bible.[29] Therefore, the *tefsir* is useful as an indicator of references to the tradition and methodology of translating Christian books into Slavic languages (more in Kulwicka-Kamińska 2018).

The Tatar translations show the influence of Western European biblical literature. The Bible translations refer, among other things, to the Protestant principle of *sola Scriptura* and to one of its objectives, which is comprised of making the content of the religious message more accessible to the contemporary recipient.

---

[29] The comparative analysis was based on Catholic and Protestant translations of the Bible into Polish, rendered in the 16th and 17th centuries: *Biblia brzeska* from 1563 (BB, 2003); *Biblia nieświeska*, also known as *Biblia Budnego* (BN, 1572); *Biblia* translated by Fr Jakub Wujek from 1599 (BW, 2000); *Biblia gdańska* from 1632 (BG, 1996 and 2004).

Thus, in the religious literature of the GDL Tatars, we can point out numerous features of free translation, which were already described in the Latin work of Petrus Comestor (cf. Kwilecka 2003: 157–171), and which are reflected in the oldest monuments of Polish religious literature. They consist of:

1. Introducing variant equivalents of the Arabic source text, e.g. the *tefsir* translator explains the meaning of Arabic etymon *rasūl* ('envoy, messenger')[30] using two synonymous equivalents – *pōsōl* [envoy], *prōrōk* [prophet]. The same principle is used with regard to phraseology, e.g. Ar. *bašar* means 1. 'man, human being,' while 'people, humankind' are referred to as 2. *lūʒe sinōwe člōweče* [people sons of man]. Thus, many Arabic words have several synonymous exponents in Polish translation, while the same Polish lexemes are equivalents of various Arabic words.

2. Supplementing the translations with various additions and details, which facilitate understanding of the meaning, e.g. by defining the subject or object more specifically than in the original – cf. Ar. *ašraka* 'to involve in (to participate in something)' + Ar. *šarīk* 'comrade, companion, partner'; 'companion, fellow participant' + Ar. *huwa* 'he', expressed as *kōlegi bōgu priznawali **kōlegi swoje ōbraʒi balwani*** [assigned comrades to God their comrades images idols], Ar. *šarīk* explicated by *rōwenniḱi **naše ōbraʒi*** [our equals images] or by providing a broader context, e.g. Ar. *allāh* – ***bōg wjedōmij ime jegō*** *allah* [God omniscient his name *allah* (allāh)], etc. The introduction of explanations is formally signalled with the use of conjunctions: *že*, *co*, *bo* ('that', 'which', 'because'), e.g. *xelal wam čiste jeʒene **co šeri'eť poʒwala*** [*xelal* (ḥalāl) for you ritually clean food which *šeri'eť* (šarīʿat) allows] or modifiers, e.g. *mī **pewne** pōmōcnicī 'īseji* [(we) must be the helpers of *'īsej* ('Īsā)].

3. Providing numerous explanations in the translated text, signalled with metalinguistic description *to jest*, *znači śe* ('that is', 'it means'), e.g. *do s̀rod śwjata do domu ixramu božego ḱabejū **bo to jest** kible* [to the interior of the world to the house to the *ixram* (Al-Masǧid al-Ḥarām) of God *ḱabej* (kaʿabat) because it is *kible* (qibla)] (gloss), and others. It should be noted that, although, at times, the Tatars translated the word or phrase found in the original, using a Slavic equivalent, they specified its meaning with an Arabic term that is not included in the original text. Consequently, the gloss, the explanation, or any further specification of the meaning was the Arabic religious lexis, rather than Slavic equivalents. These explanations were often derived from Turkish *tefsirs*, and their presence in the translated text expressed the translator's concern for the communicability of the Qur'anic style.

---

[30] The meanings of the Arabic words were established on the basis of Danecki, Kozłowska (1996).

The translator's Renaissance attitude towards translation is discernible in Tatar religious literature. It is, among other things, a continuation of the tradition of the Polish Psalter and Bible literature, as well as Polish Bible translations, which were intended for a broader audience, thus being an interpretation of, or a commentary, on the Holy Book, rather than an imitation of it, and trying to render the content of the Holy Scripture understandably, using the most communicative means of expression available.

The translators had to consider the reception of the content by the recipient, which was an immensely challenging task, especially when the first translations of religious texts were made into the vernacular. Consequently, these translations were a type of adaptation to the culture of a given period and to local conditions. An expression of the trends meant to make Muslim religious texts intelligible to the faithful was a reference to living, everyday speech, i.e. to colloquial language, e.g. by using diminutive forms that helped to shape the image of the persons mentioned – cf. *a jeʿkūb tež sinow swojix ūmirajonc aj **sinačkowe*** [and *jeʿkūb* (Yaʿqūb) also his sons dying *aj* (ay!) little sons!],[31] preceding forms of address with the interjection *ej* (cf. Turkish particles *ay! ey!*), and the presence of vocative denominations – cf. **aj** *sinačkowe* [*aj* little sons!].[32] The rhetoric function of the texts of Lithuanian-Polish Muslims explains the use of voluntative utterances, e.g. **nex tilkō pōmnōŋ** *ō kurʾane* [may they only remember about the *kurʾan* (Qurʾān)]; reaching for colloquial vocabulary and phraseology, which made the message more intelligible, communicative, and expressive, e.g. *bili **šidarami ī naȿmewcami*** [they were scoffers and mockers], and the concretisation of figurative words, i.e. the so-called modulation, e.g. *wiʒe cebe i **prijacōl** twojix* [I see you and your friends] (Ar. *qawm* 'people' is used in the original). The means making the Qurʾanic text intelligible, while, at the same time, being the exponents of *ad sensum* translation, are: personalisation of the translation, achieved – among others – by addressing the recipient directly, e.g. **weʒce** *jegō mōc i sōndī* [take his power and judgments], as well as the introduction of the second person singular, instead of plural (*pej! wiedz!*) [pray! know!], e.g. **weʒ** *jakō tō źle grexi nōsic cenžḱe* [know how bad it is to carry grave sings]. One can also list: the introduction of modulations to enliven the narration – cf. **jūž** *ōnī ne ūwerōŋ* [now they will not believe]; **xōc** *pan bōg wizwoli was* [even though Lord God will set you free]; *menka **barzō** gōrka* [suffering very bitter]; the strengthening of a statement with the particle *ż(e)* ('that') – *ni maš z inšix bōga tilkō bōg jedinij* [thou shall not have any other god but the only God]; emphasising the content with quantifiers: *nigdy* ('never'), *żaden* ('none'), *każdy* ('any'), *tylko* ('only'), *wszytcy* ('all'), e.g. *matke **wšitḱix** mast meḱḱe* [mother of all cities *meḱḱe* (makkat)]; syntactic and stylistic changes, e.g. the introduction of time reference sentences

---

[31] The lexeme *synaczek* [little son] with a frequency of 1 occurs in BB and BW, cf. Lisowski (2010: 144–145).

[32] Kwilecka (2003: 171) notes that this type of exclamation is another feature of the vernacular.

to sustain the narration, cf. **wšak** *prišed wam pṑsol prōrōk* [indeed came you an envoy prophet]; **ḱedi** *gō preklōl pan bōg* [when Lord God cursed him], among others.

The other features shared by Muslim religious texts and humanistic translations include:

1. Preserving the original form (translocation or Slavicisation) of terms that are important from the doctrinal point of view and relevant only to the Muslim religion, particularly proper names; frequently inflecting these names in conformity with the Slavic paradigm, and including them in regular derivation processes. This happens in BN, which provides proper names in the Hebrew form and, at the same time, makes certain that foreign names introduced into the text are inflected.[33]

2. Creating word-image terminology – cf. denominations of pagan gods in TAL, such as: **prijacele* [friends], *spōlečniḱi* [archaism 'companions'], **tōwariš* [companion], **zwōʒicel* [deceiver]; names of the Qur'an – **direkcijoŋ dla lūʒi* [direction for people]; *prawda* [truth]; *prōwaʒicel z blendū kū dōbremū* [the one who leads from mistake to good]; denominations of angels, specifying their role or appearance –**slūga bōžij* [servant of God]; names of prophets (particularly Mohammad) – **pomocnik do boga* [God's helper]; **s̀wjadek* [witness], etc.

3. Translators' bi- or multilingualism – compliant with, among others, Martin Luther's postulate that the translators of the Holy Bible should know both biblical languages and the vernacular – cf. *bōg – allāh* [God], *xram – koścel* [church], *prorok – prarok* [prophet], *tūrma – wenźene* [prison], *zbawene – s̀paśene* [salvation], *źeḱe< 't' >-ʒeśencine* [tithe], *īman – wjera* [belief].

Moreover, it has been concluded that the Tatar *tefsir* fits the biblical stylistic model. The most essential features of the biblical style include: typical lexis, phraseology, and syntax. On this basis, one can indicate the relations between particular translations of the Bible, as well as the influence of these translations on those made by the GDL Tatars in the 16th century, including the first translation of the Qur'an into a Slavic language in Europe. In terms of syntax, its exponents are:

1. Using conjunctions at the beginning of utterances. Drawn from the Semitic tradition, the so-called *kai* style is used in the Bible. The equivalents of the Latin *et* and the Greek *καί* in the Polish language are the conjunctions *a* [or] and *i* [and], which function mainly as references. It is similar to Arabic texts, in which the conjunction *wa* serves this function. Hence, another feature distinguishing Tatar translations is the occurrence of paratactical sequences of nominal groups, e.g. *a kto stal neprijacelem panū bogū* **i** *anolom jego* **i** *prorokom jego*

---

[33] It is worth adding that in the oldest translations of the Bible proper names were used in an assimilated, traditional, form, at the same time being uninflected. The authority of *The Vulgate* was respected in this aspect. Never can such forms be found in BN. In Catholic translations of the Bible, high frequency of the transcription of Latin words can be found in BW. To find out more, see Kwilecka (2003: 122–123).

i gebrijelowi i mixajelowi; ***a** na tix ktōre židami sōŋ xeramem ūčiniliśmi wšitḱe* [and who became enemy of Lord God and his angels and prophets and *gebrijel* (Gabriel) and *mixajel* (Michael)]. Similar syntaxes can be found in Old Polish religious literature of the 15th and 16th centuries, and in biblical translations (more in Szczepińska 2005; Wojciechowska 2006).

2. A higher frequency of combinations with the adjectival attribute describing the adjunct than those with the genitive attribute, which was also typical of 16th-century Polish. Consequently, possessive nouns derived from proper nouns, e.g. *syn* ***Dawidowy*** [son of David] in the Bible and *sīn **merjemin*** [son of Mary] in the *tefsir*. Thus, the *status constructus* (*iḏāfa*) was formed in the Tatar translations, mainly by means of the Polish adjectival attribute – cf. *až dō dna **sōndnegō*** [until doomsday]; *sinōwe **bōžži*** [sons of God]; *z wimislū **šetansḱegō*** [from satanic idea], etc. Conversely, the Greek Bible uses genitive nouns describing the adjunct, instead of adjectives, which is another distinctive feature of the biblical style (cf. Bieńkowska 2002). Therefore, Tatar translations use – albeit with lower frequency – structures with the genitive attribute in regimen with the noun described, e.g. *pewne ja bōjen śe pana bōge pana i karmicela **wšitḱix s̀wjetōw*** [I fear Lord God and the provider of all worlds].

3. Foreign syntactical structures being a faithful copy of the original,[34] e.g. Ar. nominal clauses, are rendered in Tatar translations by means of structures imitating the Arabic structure – cf. *že tī prōrōk* [that you prophet], and are often introduced with the particles *pewnie/zapewne* ('indeed/certainly'), e.g. *pewne pan bōg twardegō kerane* [surely Lord God of harsh punishment]; Ar. attributive clauses introduced with the relative pronoun *allaḏī* 'which' do not contain a demonstrative pronoun, e.g. *ten* [this], which Tatar translators render faithfully – cf. ***ōn jest ktōrij** ūčinil dla was gwjezdī* [he is who made the stars for you]– or they reduce the relative pronoun – cf. *pewne pan bōg **jest jegō** krōlewstwa nebesḱe i żemsḱe* [surely Lord God is his heavenly and earthly kingdoms]; Ar. adjectival attributive clauses are rendered as, among others, participial structures – cf. *zaplata dōbre činōncix* [payment for good-doing ones]; some excluding clauses, e.g. by means of the particle *illā* ('apart from') they are rendered with a prepositional clause containing excluding prepositions (*oprócz, poza, z wyjątkiem*) or by means of presupposition with an excluding function (*tylko, jedynie, wyłącznie*) ('apart from', 'besides', 'with the exception of'), preceding a given noun or pronoun – cf. *ne pōslaliṣmi pred tōbōŋ **tilkō** menžōw* [we did not send only men before you], and many others.

3.1.7. We demonstrated that the influence of Christian religious terminology on the Polish language of the Qur'an translation can be inferred from the *tefsirs* of the GDL

---

[34] Cf. syntactical structures in the Arabic language (Górska 2000).

Tatars (cf. Kulwicka-Kamińska 2018). Texts from Christian scriptures are woven into the *tefsirs* of the GDL Tatars, e.g. stories about king Solomon, David, and Daniel.[35] In some cases, it is possible to identify them, i.e. to determine from which Polish Bible translation they were taken and to what extent they were subject to adaptation in terms of form and content.

The writings analysed contain Christian vocabulary – usually of different intension or extension, as one lexical unit can be multifunctional in the conceptual systems of Islam and Christianity. Therefore, it is a translation analogy rather than the replacement of Muslim terms with those pertaining to Christian religion and culture, in a manner that is adequate, and compliant, with the Islamic doctrine. Consequently, GDL Tatars' religious manuscripts contain Christian terminology which was adapted to the needs of Islam as professed in a Christian cultural and religious environment (Łapicz 2007: 99–117). Numerous examples of the use of this translation analogy are indicated, e.g. with regard to the terms reflecting the notion of the one and only God – *pan bōg* [Lord God], ar. *waḥīd* – *jedinij* [sole, one, one and only, the only one], etc. Owing to the material collected, it is also possible to indicate many examples of the interaction between the Christian and Muslim religions, with respect to phraseology.

At the time, the phrasemes present in 16th-century translations of the Holy Bible had already been perceived as separate, characteristic of these texts, and different from the phraseology derived largely from colloquial and conversational styles (cf. Bieńkowska 2002). Most are word combinations, whose formation was influenced by the structures typically used in source texts. Thus, what distinguishes biblical phrasemes are tautological structures, characteristic of Tatar translations of the Qur'an, e.g. *benʒeš jix **sōnʒil sōnʒ***; *na **jeʒoncego jeʒene***; *s **cūdōw** od **cūd*** [you will be judging them judge them; for the one eating eatables; out of miracles from miracles], etc. One of the features of the biblical style is the occurrence of terms sharing the same root, in close vicinity to one another. It is typical of Semitic languages to repeat words with the same root, e.g. to combine a verb with a noun derived from the same root – cf. *dla tej **mōwī** cō **mowili*** [for the speech they spoke]; *dōbre **ūčinḱi** **činōŋ*** [good deeds they do]; ***ōfjerōwalō** wšitḱe **ōfjerī*** [sacrificed all sacrifices]; *i **pris̀engali** panu bōgu mōcnō **priśengōŋ*** [and swore to Lord God with strong oath].[36]

Parallels with Bible translations include: the introduction of the announcement of the content of chapters by analogy to BB and BW, which links these translations with an earlier translation tradition, and the presence of specific lexical and phraseological borrowings, particularly from BN, e.g. *trōjčane* [Trinitarians] (BN) and **trōječnik'i* [Trinitarians] (BN), *jedinōstwo [oneness] (BN), *prōžnije bogi [helpless gods] (BB), *spōlečnik

---

[35] This could be "contamination" by Muslim scholarly litterature, including exegetical sources – see point 3.1.14.

[36] It can be a faithful rendering of the Arabic structure – the absolute object (*maṣdar*).

[companion] (BN), *pričinca* [intercessor] (BB), **staršij* [older, elder] (BN, BG), **kaplan* [priest] (BN), **ōfarōwnik* and **ōfarnik* [offerer] (BN), *pamazanec* [the anointed one] (BB, BN, BG), or **maṣijaš 'eǰṣū sin merjemi* [messiah *'ejsa* ('Īsà) son of Mary]; *blōgōslawonas ti nad newjestī* [blessed are you above women].

The philological challenge is to determine which specific Bible translation GDL Tatars relied on. The research conducted leads to the conclusion that they must have used Protestant translations to a considerable extent – such as BB and BN as well as BG – whose authors shared with the Polish-Lithuanian Muslims views on such important issues as the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the divinity of Jesus Christ, and universal priesthood, cf. the following statement:

> Four polemical texts containing quotations from the Calvinist *Biblia Brzeska* as well as approximately 140 verses from the Old Testament and 20 verses from the New Testament taken from the Arian translation of the Bible, called *Biblia nieświeska*, were identified in the Polish *semi-kitab* from the collection of the Library of the Belarusian Academy of Sciences (Łapicz 2009: 304 after Tarelka, Synkova 2009).

Thus, the Tatars largely drew on the literature of Reformed Christianity – specifically, on Arian religious texts. Their most popular source was BN, whose author relied on original Hebrew and Greek sources, which ensured that the translation would be the closest, and the most faithful, to the original text. This was extremely important to the Tatars, who paid special attention to the purity of the message (cf. the *sola Scriptura* principle). In addition, Szymon Budny used Old Church Slavonic manuscripts to translate the Bible (cf. Kępińska 2015: 51), a probable explanation for the presence of Old Church Slavonic vocabulary in BN and Tatar *tefsirs*.

It has been concluded that the Reformation movement directly influenced these types of 'borrowings.' It is presumed that the Tatars did not necessarily rely on biblical translations, but that the quotations from the Old Testament and the New Testament reached them as echoes of the religious polemics and disputes held at the time. These presumptions are confirmed by, among other things, the research conducted by Paul Suter, who demonstrates that Tatars used religious polemics; listened to religious disputes in which extensive passages of the Old Testament and the New Testament were quoted; and relied on the New Testament from earlier translations on biblical and psalter literature (both pieces and complete versions) (cf. Suter 2004: 109). Researchers indicate that Tatar manuscripts contain, among others, *Historyja barzo cudna…* by Krzysztof Pussman from 1543 (Adamczyk 1980; Drozd 1996: 95–134), *Psalmy* (*Psalms*) translated by bishop Ignacy Krasicki (Radziszewska 2010: 129–130), *Legenda o św. Hiobie* (*The Legend of St. Job*) (Drozd 1995: 163–195), *Legenda o św. Grzegorzu* (*The Legend of St. Gregory*) (Dufala 2009: 205–220), and other sources from the Christian cultural sphere.

3.1.8. While implementing the project, internal and external glosses, notes, commentaries, etc. present in the *tefsir* were collected and examined. They were classified by

type of glosses and their role in the text, as well as their chronological relationship with the source text, were determined. References to the Bible and other Christian scriptures and contents in this context were also verified.

It is worth adding that including critical apparatus into translation, i.e. glosses, notes as well as meta- or extra-textual commentaries written in the margins, was common in all Renaissance translations of the Bible (Winiarska 2004). Even in the Middle Ages, literal translations of the Bible into French that did not consider the recipient's preparation were scarce. In the oldest unabridged translation of the Bible into French, dated at the mid-13th century, some books feature specially highlighted glosses and commentaries, while, in others, explanations are incorporated directly into the text and often preceded with the phrase *c'est a dire*, *c'est a savoir* – French for 'that is', 'it means.' (Kwilecka 2003: 158).

The following elements were distinguished in TAL:

1. Extratextual glosses. Created, either simultaneously with the copy or later, as a result of the work of Tatar readers and researchers. The glosses were made in Arabic, Polish, Turkish, Belarusian, and Russian, and recorded in Arabic, Latin, or *grazhdanka* scripts. In most cases, they were placed outside the translation text. The marginal notes in TAL are characterised by a high degree of erudition, including excellent knowledge of the Bible, scholarly style, and impeccable north-eastern borderland variety of Polish. The author of the glosses is thought to possibly have been Imam Januszewski. One of the glosses contained a fragment of the translation of the Qur'an (39: 46) made by Polish Philomaths (the insert between cards 141b and 142a). Such glosses are valuable material for philologists, or historians, since the transliteration of the Slavic language layer of the *tefsir* is recorded in the Latin alphabet. They also explain Qur'anic terms. To illustrate this, a heterogeneous example is provided: *munḱir jest* (written in the Arabic script) *neguiący prawde* (written in the Latin alphabet). Moreover, they enrich the context with content that facilitates understanding. Extra-textual glosses include organisational glosses. For example, pagination, the division of the Qur'an into thirty parts to facilitate its memorisation and recitation, and the division into *surahs*. Most of them are preceded with a title and information on the number of *ayats* of which a particular *surah* is composed, e.g. *rōzʒal darū nebesḱegō stō i dwaʒeśce ajeťew*. This type of glosses includes chronicle and family notes in Polish, a kind of specific *silva rerum*, or supplementary notes, e.g. prayers and prayer intentions or instructions. For example, there is the note after *surah* 114: *potim pej* ar. *ṣadaqa…* and its formula in Arabic, together with a fragment of the copyist's spontaneous prayer, called *duʿāʾ ḫatm al-Qurʾān*.

2. Intertextual glosses. These served to specify the Qur'anic content, and helped to interpret and explain it. They were often based on Muslim commentary literature, including the original Islamic *tafsirs* and Turkish *tefsirs*. An example is one of the marginal glosses, written in the Arabic script – cf. *mōwonc že raju ne maš*

pekla ne maš, but there are also glosses written in the Latin alphabet, informing the reader what a particular fragment of the *tefsir* is about – cf. *o czÿstosci myc ciała*. Intertextual glosses are also comprised of semantically and stylistically conditioned synonym series, as well as word definitions introduced in their place and elaborate interpretative notes based on the commentary literature known in a particular cultural sphere. Not only are intertextual glosses a feature of Old Polish translations of the Psalter, and later translations of the Holy Scripture, into Polish, but also a continuation of the tradition of glossing and translating texts, deriving from Ancient Greece. Understood in this context, glosses can be treated as immanent characteristics of free translation. Intertextual glosses include corrective glosses, the task of which is to correct the mistakes made by previous translators or to fill in gaps, etc. They confirm the linguistic awareness of the copyist. They concern both the Arabic and Slavic language layers. In TAL, numerous corrections were made by correcting the text in red ink along with the black in both the original and translation layers. Vocalisation marks were changed, and words were corrected or added, e.g. *pōtōpi was za newerenstwo waše **pōtim***. Nonetheless, the improved Arabic and Slavic layers of the *tefsir* are not themselves error-free.

Moreover, TAL contains the so-called meta-glosses, e.g. in the right outer margin of the text of *surah* 1 there are comments in Arabic, with explanations in Polish, e.g. *z̧nači s̀wjat jedeŋ drūgi raz̧ z̧nači wšistḱix s̀wjatew i okrengow božej moci z̧ostajoncix*.

Several extensive articles have addressed the issue of glosses in TAL (cf. Kulwicka--Kamińska 2015: 45–52; Kulwicka-Kamińska 2022a).

3.1.9. On the basis of the copies that originated at a different time and place, it can be concluded that the principles and techniques of copying the manuscripts of the GDL Tatars evolved. The comparison of several manuscript copies of various chronology – especially the textual gaps, copyists' errors, glosses, etc., therein – can be conducive in determining the sequence of links in the chain of interdependent copies.

We analysed *surah* 114 from the following Tatar *tefsirs*: TCNB, TAL (1st from 1723 and 2nd from 1836), TL, TW, TUP, TCHJ, TJW, and the *Hrodna Chamail* (ChG), which contains a translation of this *surah*. Owing to the comparison, we established the relationships between the *tefsirs*: TCNB and TUP. They also occur between the manuscripts copied in Lithuania: TAL1, TW, and TCHJ. Although TL differs from the other *tefsirs*, one can point to its relations with TCNB, TW, and TAL1 as well as certain similarity to ChG.

With regard to the development of recording techniques and the modernisation of subsequent copies of Tatar monuments, modifications, i.e. newer forms, occur in relation to – among other things – the graphemes used (e.g. the differentiation of the spelling of the phonemes *o-u* with *ḍamma* [*u*]*, wāw* with *ḍamma* [*ū*] and *wāw* with *fatḥa* [*o*]; the spelling of etymological *ŕ* as *ž* and, in the so-called transitional period, as a combination of *rž* or *rš*; the gradual displacement of the letter *ḍād* with *z̧ā'* until the latter predominated; the

replacement of the letter *ṣagīr-i-nūn* with *nūn*; the spelling of the soft phoneme [s] with the letters *ṯā'* (*ś*) or *sīn* (*ṡ*), combined with the abandonment of the use of the letter (ﭘﺱ) in this respect, which was typical of some of the earliest texts, and occurred only as an exception in later copies of manuscripts; the proliferation of the letter *ḥā'* (which replaced *ḫā'*) to mark the phoneme [x], inflectional forms (cf. old case endings coexisting with newer ones) or lexical forms (e.g. replacing the word *prowizor* with the forms *przeprowadziciel* [cf. TCHJ] and *pan* [TJW], where in earlier texts the word *prowizor* was glossed with the word *karmiciel* – cf. *imamem i powodirem {znači prodowniḱem}* in a 19th century gloss).

3.1.10. The source from which the Tatars derived their knowledge of the religion, history, and literature of the Christian environment has been established.

Tatar religious texts are distinguished by quoting – for the sake of apologetics – arguments from religious polemics, presented in original religious and moralising texts, including Arabic and Turkish writings, and by an extensive knowledge of Polish Christian literature, such as Bible translations, hagiographies of saints and prophets, Christian tales, and legends (e.g. apocryphal gospels – cf. the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*, the apocryphal *Gospel of Matthew*, and the *Protoevangelium of James*), reliably interpreted and confronted by the teachings of Islam. Their presence in Tatar monuments depends on: the religious and linguistic situation in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the education system at the time of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation, as well as religious polemics and disputes (Kulwicka-Kamińska 2018: 124–127).

3.1.11. It has been demonstrated that the authors of the so-called Philomath translation from the 1820s, Dionizy Chlewiński and Ignacy Domeyko, did not rely on Tatar *tefsirs* in their work.[37]

The research, in this respect, was conducted by Joanna Kulwicka-Kamińska and Aleksandra Walkiewicz (2019: 153–180), who compared selected verses of *surah* 69 from the *Alytus Tefsir* and from two variants of the Philomath translation of the Qur'an, namely the *Chambrova Manuscript* and its Warsaw edition. Moreover, the Philomath and Tatar translations were compared with the original Arabic Qur'an and its translation by Claude-Étienne Savary, published in Paris in 1821, as this translation was indicated as the source text by the researchers of the Philomath translation, and mentioned in the correspondence exchanged by the Vilnius Philomaths. The scholars concluded their research with the following statement: "The analyses conducted […] show the dependence of the Philomath translation on the translation of the Qur'an into French by Claude-Étienne Savary." (Kulwicka-Kamińska, Walkiewicz 2019: 174).

The authors also established that a comparison of the verses from *surah* 69 excludes a connection between the translations rendered by the Philomaths and GDL Tatars.

---

[37] In expert literature it is known as the Qur'an translated by Jan Murza Tarak-Buczacki, published in Warsaw in 1858. The research conducted by, among others, our team demonstrated that the authors of the translation are Fr Dionizy Chlewiński and Ignacy Domeyko.

However, with regard to the nature of the translation, a free approach to the original dominates in both translations, implying its transformation. Elements of philological and communicative translation are evident in all of them to a lesser extent. Nevertheless, in TAL, the translator faithfully reproduces the structure and meaning of the Arabic basis wherever it is required by the doctrine.[38]

3.1.12. Owing to the research conducted within the framework of the project, it was possible to determine that the Muslim catechism *Wykład wiary machometańskiej czyli iślamskiej…* [*Presentation of the Mohameddan Faith…*], written by Józef Sobolewski and published in Vilnius in 1830, contained fragments of the Philomath translation of the Qur'an into Polish, but not passages from the Tatar *tefsir*.

Scholars studying Muslim literature have long raised the question of the reception of Tatar literature in the religious and cultural life of the GDL community. It is unquestionable that, to an extent, it was used for instructional purposes, with communal readings organised in private homes; still, the Arabic alphabet did not facilitate, but rather prevented, common individual reading of these texts. Moreover, due to the non-liturgical language, Polish or Belarusian manuscript translations were not used in Muslim religious rituals. It has already been shown (see point 3.1.11) that the authors of the first literary translation of the Qur'an – the Philomaths Ignacy Domeyko and Dionizy Chlewiński – did not rely on the *tefsir* translation of the Holy Book into Polish from the late 16th century, although they most probably were aware of its existence.

Comparisons of the fragments of the Qur'an cited in *Wykład…* lead to an unambiguous conclusion: Sobolewski did not use either the manuscript *tefsirs* or the fragments of the *tefsir* translation of the Holy Book in his work, which were quoted, explained, and commented on in Muslim *kitabs* and *chamails*. On the other hand, it is strikingly apparent that the quotations from the Qur'an in Sobolewski's publication are similar to, or even identical with, their counterparts in the Philomath translation, which Sobolewski had at his disposal, and with regard to which he even pleaded with the Tsar for his consent to publish it under his name as the supposed translator (Kulwicka-Kamińska, Łapicz 2020).

3.1.13. Using the *Hrodna Tefsir*,[39] and other Tatar manuscripts (*kitabs*, *chamails*), guidelines for converting the Latin alphabet, used in the original texts, into the Arabic script were established.

---

[38] At this point, it should be noted that the translators of the 16th and 19th centuries did not translate from the original. The Philomaths relied on the work of a French translator, while the Tatars relied probably on the output of a Turkish one. The research carried out within the framework of the *Tefsir* project demonstrated that the exegetical commentaries in TAL, and probably also the subscript translation of the Qur'an, come from the *tefsirs* of the Western Turkish tradition (13th–15th centuries). With regard to amplification, TAL is most closely related to the *Cevāhirü'l-Esdāf tefsir* from the late 14th or the early 15th century.

[39] Known in the literature as the *Hrodna Tefsir*, this manuscript is held in the Hrodna State Museum of the History of Religion. To learn more about the manuscript, see Łapicz, Radziszewska (2019: 191–207).

Not only do Tatar manuscripts contain Muslim Arabic texts referring to Islam, translated into Slavic languages (Polish or Belarusian), and written in the Arabic script, but they also contain many Christian texts, which were originally written and printed in Polish, using the Latin alphabet. The Tatars relied on Christian religious literature, inserting into their books either passages from the Bible (e.g. from BN), especially from the Old Testament, or Bible-related fragments, such as legends or hagiographies of Christian saints, etc. In so doing, the copyists applied two typical formal procedures: firstly, they transliterated Christian texts from the Latin alphabet into the Arabic one; secondly, they adapted Christian content to avoid contradicting the Qur'anic message and the doctrine of Islam (Jankowski, Łapicz 2000: 187–192).

One example of such a transformation is, among others, the Polish translation of the Qur'an signed Jan Murza Tarak-Buczacki. Printed in the standard Latin alphabet, the Polish translation of the Holy Book of Islam was re-transliterated, in the form of a manuscript, into the Arabic script by an anonymous author and placed in a left-slanted arrangement synchronously under the lines of the added Arabic original. In this way, the Polish translation of the Qur'an, printed in Latin, was formally transformed into the traditional manuscript *tefsir* of the GDL Tatars. It retained the basic rules of writing known from other manuscripts: there is no demarcation of the text into lexemes, the word boundaries were marked in line with the nature of the Arabic alphabet, the progression of the text was maintained from right to left, etc. However, unlike in other traditional Tatar manuscripts, a short horizontal stroke was used to transfer a part of a word to the next line of the oblique interlinear poem of the Polish translation. In principle, punctuation was also retained, as in Buczacki's printed text; thus, full stops, commas, colons, semi-colons, and even exclamation marks were introduced. The text is divided with decorative elements (a dot, a circle, a crescent, a flower, a frame, a horizontal line), which were additionally highlighted with coloured ink. With regard to phonetics, the author follows the pronunciation, rather than the spelling, and reproduces the devoicing in both the initial and middle positions, e.g. *spraf*, *anoluf – kšik*, *powetše*. The nasal vowels, both in the middle and the final positions, are uniformly realised in asynchronous spelling as *-en-*, *-on*. The person who retransliterated the *Hrodna Tefsir* also introduced minor changes to the Polish translation, attributed to either simple errors or hypercorrectness on the author's part, e.g. *Ah, jakże nie wielu…* was written as *ax jakże ne newelu…*

The author of the *tefsir* had difficulty with the vowel recorded in the Polish orthography as *ó* (i.e. etymological *u < *ō*); he rendered it either with the Arabic grapheme *ḍamma* or *wāw* with *ḍamma* (as etymological *u*), e.g. *ktūži*, *krulem…*, and with *o*, i.e. the Arabic vowel sign *wāw* with *fatḥa*, e.g. *ktorix*, *krol…*

The author of the manuscript distinguished, and correctly realised, the graphemes *r*, *rz*, and *ż*, e.g. *ktorix*, but *ktūži*, *zaslūžili…*

In the Oriental layer:

3.1.14. In the Oriental layer on the basis of GDL Tatars' *tefsirs*, an attempt has been made to determine from which language, Turkish or Arabic, the first translation of the Qur'an into the Slavic language was rendered.

It is hypothesised that the first translation of the Holy Book of Islam, the Qur'an, into a Slavic language had the form of a Tatar *tefsir* and, most likely, was made directly from the Arabic original, though not without Turkish influence.[40] It cannot be excluded that it was translated from Turkish, albeit in comparison with the Arabic basis (cf. the *sola Scriptura* principle).[41] For example, in the oldest preserved copy of the *Tefsir of 1686*, the first 18 *surahs* are interlinear translations into Turkish, while the others are translations into Polish, specifically into the north-eastern borderland variety of the language.[42]

In order to determine whether Turkish *tefsirs* could constitute the basis of the translation for the Tatars, the following were examined: the translation technique, the degree of relatedness, the repetition of similar errors, the influence of Shia or Sunni scholarship on the translation, and the presence of sources in Turkish. The distinctive features of the Turkish *tefsirs*, for which analogies with the Tatar *tefsirs* could be drawn, include:

1. The availability of copies, which originated in later centuries rather than originals – i.e. dated from the 14th to the 16th centuries, preserving archaic – 12th and 13th-century – linguistic features.

---

[40] Drozd (1999: 49) concludes that – besides the Arabic source text – sometimes the translators might have relied on a Turkish medium as a basis for the translation. Suter believes that the translation was based on the Arabic text, at the same time pointing to Turkish (Osman-Turkish) and Persian manuscripts of the Qur'an upon which the Tatar *tefsirs* were modelled. Eventually, he states that the translation of the Qur'an into Polish, rendered in the GDL, relied on an Arabic source text (direct translation from Arabic). Nevertheless, external Turkish and Persian influences are visible. It has not been confirmed that Turkish texts were 'intermediaries' for the translation (Suter 2004: 9–10; 29–31; 126). Konopacki concludes that "There are many premises, including linguistic ones, demonstrating that the original version of the text, which later became a model for the other *tefsirs* that were copied, was translated and developed in the late 16th century directly from Arabic" (Konopacki 2010: 138). However, the researchers strive to establish the basis of the translation: was it the original Qur'an or an Arabic *tafsir* or both, or was it only a Turkish *tefsir*?

[41] See the philological analysis of the Turkish layer of the monuments in the study by Jankowski (2015: 152–162; http://www.tefsir.umk.pl/pliki/tefsir_tatarow_wkl2019.pdf [last accessed: 28 May, 2020]).

[42] This fact drew the attention of a Turkologist: "As a matter of fact, several not fully preserved manuscripts of the translation of the Qur'an, apparently independently of one another, start or end with *surah* 18: it is from *surah* 18 that the *Qarshi Manuscript*; in the manuscript of the *tefsir* from the Library of the Belarusian Academy of Sciences in Minsk *surahs* 2–18 are translated into Turkish, while the remaining ones (19–114) are rendered into Polish; one of the three manuscripts of the translation discussed by Zajączkowski, then held in the collection of the University of Warsaw and dated 1499, contains *surahs* 1–18. Is there a regularity or dependence? Certainly, it does not depend on the division into parts (Ar. *aǧzā'*), for *surah* 18 can be found in part 16, which ends with *surah* 21. The possible relationship is that *surah* 18 falls – more or less – in the middle of the Qur'an. Thus, even if the Qur'an was not bound in two volumes, comprising two approximately equally big parts, it is probable that the copyists and the translators divided the work over this *surah* into two parts" (Jankowski 2015: 146). The research

2. The mingling of linguistic features typical of various dialects. The Turkish *tef-sirs* available to the researchers are heterogeneous – grammatical and lexical characteristics of various Turkish language groups can be identified therein: the language of the Oghuz Turks, Uyghur as well as Karluksky and Kipchak dialects.
3. Literality of the translation.
4. Numerous errors made by the copyists, resulting from the lack of the familiarity with Old Arabic grammar, for example (see Уста 2014: 154–165).

Although Arabic is accepted as the language of Arab-Muslim culture, it should be noted that the GDL Tatars, who inhabited Slavic lands and spoke Slavic languages, also recognised Turkish as a language of worship, but positioned it in a subordinate position to Arabic. As such, a more significant influence of Turkish is visible in types of monuments other than the *tefsir*. One translator, Hodyna (*Kazan Kitab*), specifically affirmed that he had translated the book from both Persian and Turkish (after Антонович 1968: 125).

The Turkish influences present in the Tatar translation literature are two-fold. On the one hand, it is the impact of Turkish – a language known and used by the Tatars – on the language of Muslim manuscripts, while, on the other hand, it is the influence of Turkish translation texts on Tatar translations (including the choice of certain lexical and semantic representations). Thus, Turkish translations either supplemented, or constituted the basis of, the translation.[43]

The influence of the Turkish language is apparent at all levels of the linguistic structure of the Muslim translation: graphic-orthographic, phonetic-phonological, lexical-semantic, and grammatical.

For example, it is manifested through the graphic realisation of specific phonemes:
1. The vowel [*a*] is recorded with *alif* with *madda*; an analogical solution can be found in Turkic monuments from the 13th and 14th centuries, which may have had a direct influence on the Persian-Turkish originals (Łapicz 1986: 107–108).
2. The original functional identity of the letters *ḍād* and *ẓā'* was adopted from Turkic monuments (Łapicz 1986: 146).
3. The marking of the sound [*j*] in the final position with the letter *yā'* and *alif maqṣūra*. The 14th-century Turkic monuments document the same condition (Łapicz 1986: 133).

Furthermore, these influences are present in: borrowings from the Turkish language of Arabic provenance, which were later translocated or Slavicised (e.g. *xelal*, *xeram*, *šeri'et*); the alternation of voiced and voiceless consonants in the final position (e.g. *bal-*

---

conducted by Galina Miškinienė within the framework of the *Tefsir* project demonstrated that *surah* 16 of the *Minsk Tefsir* contains a translation of verse 114 into Polish.

[43] Therefore, from the point of view of developing European, including Polish, Qur'anic translation tradition, it is essential to establish the role of Arabic and Turkish sources in the genesis of the Polish--Lithuanian Tatars' literary monuments.

wan – palwan); the placement of the noun modifier, especially in proper names (e.g. *sīn merjemin*; *sinōwe bōžži pōkalena 'uźejirōwegō*), and in several other forms.

In the case of the Tatars, the acquisition of Arabic was closely linked with the knowledge of Turkish. According to Drozd (1999: 34): "This fact was of considerable importance in the translation of Arabic texts into Polish, as Turkish language habits could be included as mediators."

Thus, the influence of Turkish translations is recognisable in the choice of certain equivalents for Arabic etymons, e.g. the term **jedinōstwo* (TAL), used in reference to Allah, corresponds with Turkish *birligine* 'unity.' The influence of Turkish translations also provides an explanation for why the Tatar translators retained untranslated names of original and doctrinally significant terms, e.g. Ar. *mursal*: *s prōrōkōw welḱix* **murs̀elōw**, Ar. *imām*: *ja učine cebe lūʒom* **imamem** *i powodirem*, Ar. *qur'ān*: *meʒonc remazan ktūri ẕeslano w nim* **kur'an**. Moreover, Turkish translations contain two-component nouns, with one translated and the other left in the original language, thus limiting the scope of reference (*e.g. *lūʒe ḱe'bejni*; **lūʒe* **meḱḱejśḱe**; *zekezane* **xerami** *i* **xelali**). The Tatars also used this model willingly, to maintain the precision and unambiguity of the message. The spelling of Ar. *iḍāfa*, frequently structured with an adjectival modifier (e.g. **ōbiwateli rajśḱe*; *fūrti nebeske*), is also indicated.

However, the questions of the routes by which the Turkic manuscripts reached the Tatars, where the Muslim mullahs came from, or where the Tatars travelled to extend their education have not yet been thoroughly investigated. It is commonly accepted that the closest contacts were maintained with Turkey and Crimea, a testimony to which is found in the two eldest translations of the Qur'an that are Turkish in the Oriental layer, i.e. the *Lithuanian Tefsir* from the late 16th century and the *Minsk Tefsir* from 1686 (cf. Jankowski 2015).

The conclusions drawn by Mykhaylo Yakubovych in this respect are important, as he points to possible contacts between the Volhynia Tatars and Muslims from the Middle East. Due to the geographical location of Volhynia, the Tatars were a group that maintained close relations with the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Empire. According to this scholar, the Polish Tatars were even able to make the mandatory pilgrimage (Ar. *ḥaǧǧ*). Their family relationships also were strong, considering that in the 16th century, after the establishment of the Union of Lublin, the Tatars from western Belarus, Poland, and Lithuania became citizens of one country. Thus, they were active participants of intercultural transfer and could pass on some vernacular Islamic traditions, and texts, from Volhynia to the East or the West.

Interestingly enough, the texts from Volhynia may provide a basis for later copies of Tatar monuments. Mykhaylo Yakubovych points to this while referring to the prayer read after the recitation of the Qu'ran. The researcher quotes its version found in the Qur'an from Ostroh, which contains some extensiosn, which demonstrates that the manuscript from Volhynia is a copy of an earlier and more comprehensive prayer, which originated in

the Ottoman Empire or the Crimean Khanate. This proves that the oldest Middle Eastern and Ottoman traditions were contiued and that the Volhynian Tatars maintained strong cultural relationships with Muslims from these regions (after Yakubovych [in print]).

In the project, Jankowski pointed out the similarities between TAL and the Turkish *tefsirs*, and, using *surah An-Naḥl* as an example, attempted to identify the source text for TAL. The translations of the Qur'an into Turkish originated later than the eastern ones; they were made from the 13th to the mid-15th century, i.e. in the Old Turkic period. The GDL Tatars probably relied on them. Thus, selected western translations can be provided as comparative texts: *Cevāhirü'l-Esdāf*[44] (CEZ), the *Tefsir of Muhammed bin Hamza*[45] (TTS), as well as the *Turkish Tefsir from Bursa* (see Küçük 2014) of 1401 (TTB), the *Turkish Tefsir from Damascus* (see Toker 2011–2012) (TTD), and the *Turkish Tefsir from Manisa* (see Karabacak 1994–1999) (TTM).

The debate over whether all Turkic translations derive from one, two, or more archetypes continues. İnan (1960: 20) was an advocate of the common archetype, while other authors are more circumspect and refer to at least two sources: the *tafsir* of Aṭ-Ṭabari in the East and the *tafsir* of As-Samarqandī in the West. As stated by Ananiasz Zajączkowski (1937: VII), Turkish Turkologists claim that there are 20 known translations of the Qur'an into Turkish. However, he emphasised that some of the manuscripts are very similar to one another and are most probably copies of the same translations. Most of them date from the 15th century, or later.

On the basis of the comparison of *surah* 16 from TAL with the Turkish translations of this *surah* found in two available Qur'anic translations, i.e. the literal and the *tefsir* one, it can be concluded that TAL does not fully correlate with any of them. The translator relied solely on one translation, adding his own comments in the form of short additions. In any case, he could also have changed the translation used, depending on his own needs as an author.

When considering the aforementioned translations, it is CEZ that bears the closest resemblance to the TAL amplification. Thus, it can be inferred that the translator, who translated the Qur'an into Polish, used one of the copies of the Turkish translation of *Cevāhirü'l-Esdāf*, by an unknown author, penned during the reign of Isfendiyar (1392–1440). According to Zajączkowski (1937: XV), CEZ originated in the late 14th or the early 15th century, between 1385 or 1392 and 1440, or between 1392 and 1439, as claimed by *Tarama Sözlüğü* dictionary (1963–1972). The dictionary points to manuscript no. 278 from the Nuruosmaniye Library. The manuscript features 1499 as the date of the copy, and contains the first 18 *surahs*, including *surah* 18. It combines interlinear (often literal) translation with the *tefsir* translation, i.e. the translation in which a verse of the Arabic Qur'an is followed with the Turkic, exegetical, translation.

---

[44] The monument was published by Ananiasz Zajączkowski (1937).
[45] The manuscript is held at the Turkish and Islamic Arts Museum in Istanbul (No. 40).

The amplification found in verse 81 can serve to demonstrate that CEZ was the source of expansions for TAL: ***tenže bōg ūčinil dla was s tego cō stworil cen ōd drew i ūčinil dla was z gōr i skal dōmi pečōri** i wčinil dla was ōʒeže ze **lnū i z welni** stregōŋ was ōd goronca i ōʒeže **z želaza** stregōŋ was pōdčas wojni ōtō tak spelna pōžitḱi swoje nad wami azalibiśce bilī mus̀ulmanmi **dōbremi*** – cf. ***ōd drew** – aġaclar gibi* 'like trees'; *dōmi pečōri – evler maġāralar gibi* 'like houses and caves'; ***lnū i z welni** – ketenden yüŋden* 'same.' Another essential addition, which could not be found in any other translation, is the marginal note next to verse 92 *ime jej bilō rejxa* (mistake – rather than *rejta*) 'the name of this woman was Rejta.' The only passage in which this woman's name is spelt correctly is *adı bu ʿavratuŋ Reyṭa idiz* in CEZ.[46] This conclusively demonstrates the connection between TAL and CEZ.

With regard to indicating the relationship between TAL and Arabic *tafsirs*, several sources are identified, e.g. Aṭ-Ṭabari, Al-Ḫāzin, Al-Baġawī, Al-Ǧalālayn, As-Samarqandī, Ibn Kaṯīr, Ibn Ǧuzayy[47]. However, some of the commentaries present in TAL can only be identified in Al-Ḫāzin or As-Samarqandī. They are not repeated in any other *tafsir*, a fundamental conclusion. Examples:

C 16: 53
K: *wa-mā bi-kum min niʿmatin fa-min allāh*
TAL: *bō ōn wam jest i cōkōlwek daje wam riźku tō ōd bōga jest*
Ar. *niʿma as rizq/riźk* is explained only by Al-Ḫāzin (2004, vol. 3: 81).

C 16: 93
K: *wa-la-tusʾalunna ʿammā taʿmalūna*
TAL: *i zapewne benʒece pitani ō tō cō wī činice pris̀engi lamōnc*
Addition: *pris̀engi lamōnc* – cf. As-Samarqandī (1993, vol. 2: 248): *yasʾalukum mā kuntum taʿmalūna min al-wafāʾ wa-naqḍ bi-l-ʿahd*. Other commentaries analysed do not contain such an explanation (according to the findings of Marek Dziekan, presented within the framework of the *Tefsir* project).

3.1.15. It has been established that – relying on the limited (representative) material – it is possible to identify the Arabic (or Turkish?) basis for the translation of the Qurʾan into Polish. At issue is assessment of the accuracy of the copyists' spelling of the Arabic original of the Book in horizontal lines. Marek Dziekan endeavoured to compare three *tefsirs* (TAL, TL, and TJW) as well as one *chamail* (ChG) containing the text of *surah* 36 from the Qurʾan with the Arabic, Turkish, and Persian *tefsirs*. One of his conclusions was that, out of the conspicuous spelling peculiarities found in the *tefsir*, two are particularly distinctive: the spelling (و) instead of (او) in various forms of verbs, in

---

[46] Obviously, this example is known from Arabic tafsirs, on which Turkish *tefsirs*, including CEZ, were based – see Rayta bint ʿAmr history.

[47] See Arabic sources in vol. 3 of this publication.

the third person masculine plural, and the spelling *tā 'marbūṭa* instead of *tā' maftūḥa*, including the verbal forms. Neither of these peculiarities was found in any of the Middle--Eastern manuscripts that were subjects of comparison. In the other places, what could be understood as mistakes are usually the *lapsus calami*, such as no dots above or below the letter, letter rearrangement, or missing letters. Apart from this, Dziekan found the existence of one more type of difference, beyond spelling, in the *tefsir*. In the manuscript, the *ayats* are not numbered, but separated from, one another with red circles. An analogical solution can be found in the Turkish manuscript, as the subject of comparison. The lack of numbering is typical of ancient handwritten Qur'ans. However, marking thus occurs in the *tefsir*, much more frequently than in the Turkish manuscript and more frequently than the verse separators in the other manuscripts.

Mykhaylo Yakubovych compared the accuracy of the notation of *surahs* 1, 36, and 112–114 in the following *tefsirs*: TAL, TL, TUP, TCHJ, and TJW and, by means of comparative analysis, identified two main types of peculiarities. The first is the transfer of individual letters and words to subsequent verses, which does not occur in classical Arabic calligraphy, while the other is mistaking the functions of the letters *tā 'marbūṭa* and *tā' maftūḥa*. Significantly, typical of the Tatar monuments, the mixing of the letters *tā 'marbūṭa* and *tā' maftūḥa* does not occur in TL. Other errors (presence or absence of individual letters, especially the *hamza*, and the lack of dots above or below the letters) can be classified as the writers' *lapsus calami*, which has occurred in other traditions.

Magdalena Lewicka (2015: 107–132) analysed the copyists' peculiarities. She detailed the following features of the spelling:

1. Both copyists consistently fail to use the notation of *hamza* in the initial position (above or below the *alif*).
2. The letter *alif* is written without vocalisation marks, while it should bear the *waṣla* mark above the *alif*, which has lost the *hamza*, e.g. in the case of the definite article *al-*.
3. Jzmael Jabłoński consistently uses the long vowel *ī* in the final position with the letter *alif maqṣūra* (instead of *yā'*). Although this spelling dominates in the Qur'anic text, Jbrahim Januszewski corrects it by replacing the *alif maqṣūra* with the letter *yā'*.
4. The long vowel *ī*, in the final position, is written with the letter *alif maqṣūra*, preceded by a vocalisation mark similar to the so-called short *alif*, but placed below the preceding letter, while the so-called short *alif* is placed above the letter.
5. Both copyists place the name of the subsequent *surah* and the information about the number of *ayats* in the last line of the previous *surah*, as is the case in Arabic Qur'anic manuscripts, e.g.: *sūrt al-nās sidin iḏā ḥasada w-hy sitt āyāt mkyt* [*surah "People," the envier when they envy, comprising of six verses, Meccan*].

In turn, Henryk Jankowski analysed the so-called virtues of the *surahs*. Enumerating the virtues of *surahs*, notes were added in the margins of some Turkish *tefsirs*, at the be-

115

ginning of the *surahs*. In literature, they are known as *Fażāʾil al-Quraʾān* 'virtues of the Qur'an' or Tur. *Surelerin Faziletleri* 'virtues of the *surahs*', the latter being the popular term. An example of this can be found in the *Tefsir of Muhammed bin Hamza*, in which such notes were made next to each *surah*, albeit in Arabic. It can therefore be concluded that such notes were featured in Arabic *tefsirs*, used by Turkish translators. However, the comparison of many manuscripts of *Cevāhirüʾl-Esdāf* leads to the conjecture that the virtues were provided by the copyists as they vary in terms of number, place, and content.[48]

In TAL, Turkic entries extolling the virtues of the Qur'anic chapters, and indicating their practical application, e.g. for the prevention of disease, misfortune, crop failure, hostile acts, or the arbitrariness of the ruler, are found in the first lines of the following *surahs*: 37–42, 49–60, 64–67, 69–71. However, they are not present in *surahs*: 1–36,[49] 43–48, 57, 61–63, 68, 72–114. For reasons unknown, the copyist of TAL listed the virtues of the *surahs* in specific sequences, i.e. certain subsequent *surahs* have their virtues described, while other sequences of *surahs* do not. It is likely that the translator, or the copyist, did not find the virtues in other sources, but copied them from the manuscript that served him as the basis for the translation or the copy. Turkish translators did this as well.

Since the virtues of the *surahs* were added by the translator, the low degree of the accuracy of Turkish notes leads to the conclusion that the translator of the Qur'an into Polish did not possess a good command of Turkish. However, it is possible that the errors were made by the copyist, or copyists, if the number of copies in the sequence exceeds one. It is also probable that the author of the virtues and some other annotations in the manuscript is not the translator, but the copyist, i.e. Jsmail Jabłoński. Similar as in *chamails*, Turkish and Turkic texts were generally not translated into Polish or Belarusian – as opposed to Arabic prayers – although there are cases of *dhikrs* and other translated prayers. The translator probably decided that Turkish texts did not have to be translated, as the recipients of the translations knew Turkish well, contrary to the later copyist. If it was indeed so, the lack of translation makes text reconstruction difficult, with regard to occasional significant contamination of the Turkish texts.

Spelling peculiarities in the Turkish fragments are typical of those made by Polish--Tatar copyists. Consequently, it was rare for the translator to change the meaning completely. Usually, if he was not able to understand or read a Turkish word, he replaced it with a similar one, which was known to him from numerous, often formulaic, Turkish passages contained in Polish-Turkish manuscripts. For example, in the case of the postposition *içün* 'for, in order to', which was used totally out of place, he would write similar words that were frequently used and familiar to him instead of the appropriate ones.

3.1.16. On the basis of the Tatar manuscripts, conclusions can be drawn, concerning interference and transference, with regard to Slavic-Oriental linguistic relations.

---

[48] They vary probably because the scribes were refereing to different traditions.

[49] At the beginning of *surah* 11, there is some black ink in the margin, but it is very blurred and illegible.

Having analysed the vocabulary of Oriental origin, including that present in the literature of the GDL Tatars, it has been determined that:

1. Most Islamicisms, recorded in both the dictionaries of the Polish language and the literature of the GDL Tatars, derive from Arabic and were lent to Polish, mainly via Turkic languages.
2. The Islamicisms present in the Tatar *tefsirs* are characteristic of not only the Tatar ethnolect, as some of them entered the Polish lexical system, demonstrating the influence of national minorities on the general language.
3. The terms referring to the Muslim religion are rather (genetically Oriental) foreign words, used in a specific context in Polish, rather than genuine borrowings.
4. Islamic scholary terms are used in Polish regularly, representing marginal parts of the Polish vocabulary, but regular and usual in Muslim Polish scholarship.
5. Most Islamicisms listed in Polish lexicographic studies and the GDL Tatars' monuments were adapted to the Polish grammatical and lexical system, i.e. they underwent a Slavicisation processes.

As such, the Tatars, who had lived in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania since the 14th century, influenced the language of their Slavic neighbours, as a large group of Islamicisms, listed in Polish lexicographical studies, also occurs in the monuments of Polish-Lithuanian Muslims. However, these Islamicisms are primarily found in the dictionaries recording the borderland variety of Polish from the 19th century. However, SPXVI usually lists as source texts the works of writers, historians, etc., who came from, or temporarily resided in, the borderland[50] (mainly the south-eastern borderlands and, specifically, Red Ruthenia), or who addressed borderland-related topics – cf. ActReg, LibLeg, MetrKor.[51] To a considerable extent, the documents comprised in these monuments refer to issues of the south-eastern borderlands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.[52]

The *Tefsir* project involved long-term, interdisciplinary team research and documentation (archives, museums, libraries, private collections), analyses (philological and textological), and editorial work, which are of fundamental significance for not only national, but also European heritage and culture. Its purpose was to prepare a critical edition of the world's third translation of the Qur'an into a European language and the first translation into a Slavic one (Polish). This translation is influenced by the Oriental translation and commentary tradition, including the Turkish *tefsirs*, and the European biblical translation tradition. Consequently, not only is it in relation to the heritage of the Tatar ethnic group, uniquely forming its identity, and serving its self-identification purposes, but it is also a testimony to an unusual phenomenon in the history of Europe,

---

[50] We present the monuments containing words from Arabic, Turkish and Persian (except Latin and Greek).

[51] Abbreviations after SPXVI.

[52] This issue is discussed in detail by Kulwicka-Kamińska (2004).

namely the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Moreover, the GDL Tatars' *tefsirs* are a hitherto unknown, new, and original source in the history of the translation of religious books in the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and the history of the regional and the north-eastern borderland varieties of Polish. Having analysed the Turkish texts, it is confidently concluded that Lithuanian Tatars literature is equally valuable for Turkish culture. In their manuscripts, the Tatars preserved relics of the Turkic language from at least as early as the first half of the 15th century. Moreover, in its original Oriental linguistic layer, the *Lithuanian Tefsir* is a hitherto unknown monument of the Old Turkic language, also of significance for Turkish philology and culture.

Bibliography

Sources and abbreviations

BB/BRadz – *Biblia brzeska 1563*, 2003, Clifton–Kraków.

BN/Bud – *Biblia nieświeska*, 1572, Nieśwież: old print from the collection of Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego [University of Warsaw Library].

BW – *Biblia w przekładzie ks. Jakuba Wujka z 1599 r.*, 2000, B-type transcription of the original text from the 16th century, Warszawa.

BG – *Biblia gdańska* (1632), [New Testament], Kraków 1996; Stary Testament [Old Testament], Kraków 2004.

BT – *Biblia Tysiąclecia*, 1980, Poznań–Warszawa.

Studies

Антонович А. К., 1968, *Белорусские тексты, писанные арабским письмом, и их графико-орфографическая система*, Вильнюс.

Клепиков С. А., 1978, *Филиграни на бумаге русского производства XVIII–XX века*, Москва.

Уста Х. И., 2014, *Исторический обзор первых подстрочных переводов корана (на материале тюрских языков)*, [in:] T. Bairašauskaitė, G. Miškinienė (eds.), *Tiurkų Istorija ir Kultūra Lietuvoje. Turks' History and Culture in Lithuania. История и Культура Тюрков в Литве*, Vilnius, pp. 154–165.

Abū al-Layṯ As-Samarqandī, 1993, *Tafsir al-musammā Baḥr al-Ulum*, vol. 2, ʿA. M. Muʿawwad, ʿĀ. A. ʿAbd al-Mawǧūd, Z. ʿA. M. an-Nūtī (eds.), Bayrūt.

Al-Wāḥidī an-Naysābūrī A. Ḥ. (ed.), 1994, *Al-Wasīṭ fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-Maǧīd*, Bayrūt.

Adamczyk M., 1980, *Biblijno-apokryficzne narracje w literaturze staropolskiej do końca XVI wieku*, Poznań.

Akiner S., 2009, *Religious Language of a Belarusian Tatar Kitab: A Cultural Monument of Islam in Europe. With a Latin-Script Transliteration of the BL Tatar Belarusian Kitab (Or. 13020)' on CD-ROM*, Wiesbaden.

Al-Ḫāzin ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn al-Baġdādī, 2004, *Lubāb at-taʾwīl fī maʿānī at-tanzīl*, vol. 3, ʿA. S. Šāhīn (ed.), Bayrūt.

Bartula C., 2011, *Podstawowe wiadomości z gramatyki staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiej*, Warszawa.

Bieńkowska D., 1992, *Styl językowy przekładu Nowego Testamentu Jakuba Wujka. (Na materiale czterech Ewangelii)*, Łódź.

Bieńkowska D., 1999, *Słownictwo i frazeologia w Psałterzu przełożonym przez ks. Jakuba Wujka (1594)*, vols. 1–2, Łódź.

Bieńkowska D., 2002, *Polski styl biblijny*, Łódź.

Bieńkowska D., 2009, *Wzorzec stylistyczny polszczyzny biblijnej w pierwszej połowie XVI wieku*, „Studia Językoznawcze. Synchroniczne i diachroniczne aspekty badań polszczyzny", vol. 8, pp. 29–38.

Cychnerska A., Kulwicka-Kamińska J., Martínez de Castilla N., [in print], *Aljamiado Literature in Renaissance Europe. A Comparative Study*.

Czerniatowicz J., 1969, *Niektóre problemy naukowe grecystyki w pracach biblistów polskich XVI i XVII w. Teksty greckie a polskie przekłady*, Wrocław.

Danecki J., 2007, *Podstawowe wiadomości o islamie*, Warszawa.

Danecki J., Kozłowska J., 1996, *Słownik arabsko-polski*, Warszawa.

Drozd A., 1995, *Tatarska wersja pieśni-legendy o św. Hiobie*, „Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne", Seria Literacka, vol. 2, pp. 163–195.

Drozd A., 1996, *Staropolski apokryf w muzułmańskich księgach. (Tatarska adaptacja Historyji barzo cudnej o stworzeniu nieba i ziemie Krzysztofa Pussmana)*, „Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne", Seria Literacka, vol. 3, pp. 95–134.

Drozd A., 1997, *Wpływy chrześcijańskie na literaturę Tatarów w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej. Między antagonizmem a symbiozą*, „Pamiętnik Literacki", vol. 88, book 3, pp. 3–34.

Drozd A., 1999, *Arabskie teksty liturgiczne w przekładzie na język polski XVII wieku. Zagadnienia gramatyczne na materiale chutb świątecznych*, Warszawa.

Drozd A., Dziekan M. M., Majda T., 2000, *Piśmiennictwo i muhiry Tatarów polsko-litewskich*, „Katalog Zabytków Tatarskich", t. 3, Warszawa.

Dufala K., 2009, *Legenda o św. Grzegorzu w kitabie Tatarów – muzułmanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, [in:] A. Gadomski, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Chrestomatia teolingwistyki*, Symferopol, pp. 205–220.

Dziekan M. M., *Transliteracja tefsirów Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Uwagi arabistyczne na podstawie sur 1, 36, 110–114*, http://www.tefsir.umk.pl/pliki/dziekan_uwagi_arabistyczne.pdf (last accessed: 25 April, 2021).

Gadomski A., Łapicz C., 2009, *Teolingwistyka: historia, stan współczesny, perspektywy…*, [in:] A. Gadomski, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Chrestomatia teolingwistyki*, Symferopol, pp. 33–58.

Górska E., 2000, *Studium kontrastywne składni arabskich i polskich współczesnych tekstów literackich*, Kraków.

Hegyi O., 1979, *Minority and Restricted Uses of the Arabic Alphabet: The Aljamiado Phenomenon*, "Journal of the American Oriental Society", vol. 99, no. 2, pp. 262–269.

http://www.tefsir.umk.pl/ (last accessed: 24 May, 2021)

https://www.human.umk.pl/centrum-badan-kitabistycznych/ (last accessed: 25 May, 2020)

https://www.podgorski.com/main/szlachta-tatarska-w-rzeczypospolite.html (last accessed: 13 March, 2021)

İnan A., 1960, *Kur'an'ın Eski Türkçe ve Oğuz-Osmanlıca Çevirileri Üzerine Notlar*, „Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belletenı", vol. 8, pp. 79–94.

Jankowski H., 2003, *Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian Tatar Documents*, „Materialia Turcica", vol. 24, pp. 113–144.

Jankowski H., 2015, *Cechy graficzne i językowe tekstów turkijskich w zapisie kopistów polsko-tatarskich* [*Graphic and Linguistic Features of Turkic Texts Copied by Polish Tatar Copyists*], [in:] J. Kulwicka-Kamińska, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Tefsir Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Teoria i praktyka badawcza*, Toruń, s. 139–171, http://www.tefsir.umk.pl/pliki/tefsir_tatarow_wkl2019.pdf (last accessed: 28 May, 2020).

Jankowski H., Łapicz C., 2000, *Klucz do raju. Księga Tatarów litewsko-polskich z XVIII wieku*, Warszawa.

Karabacak E., 1994–1999, *An Inter-Linear Translation of the Qur'an into Old Anatolian Turkish. Introduction, Text, Glossary and Facsimile. Part I: Introduction and Text* (1994); *Part II: Glossary* (1995); *Part III: Facsimile of the MS Manisa İl Halk Library No 931. Section One: 1ᵃ–224ᵃ* (1997); *Part III: Facsimile of the MS Manisa İl Halk Library No 931. Section Two: 224ᵇ–451ᵃ* (1999), Cambridge MA [= Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 22, 28, 40, 47].

Kępińska A., 2015, *Z problematyki opisu składni XVI-wiecznych przekładów Ewangelii na język polski*, [in:] T. Mika, D. Rojszczak-Robińska, O. Stramczewska (eds.), *Staropolskie spotkania językoznawcze*, vol. 1: *Jak badać teksty staropolskie?*, Poznań, pp. 51–62.

Konopacki A., 2010, *Życie religijne Tatarów na ziemiach Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI––XIX wieku*, Warszawa.

Koran (Al-Koran), 1858, z arabskiego przekład polski Jana Murzy Tarak-Buczackiego, Tatara z Podlasia [translation from Arabic into Polish, rendered by Jan Murza Tarak-Buczacki, a Tatar from the Podlasie region], Warszawa.

Koziara S., 2009, *Frazeologia biblijna w języku polskim*, Łask.

Kożynowa A., Kulwicka-Kamińska J., Łapicz C., 2022a, *Cechy białoruskie w tefsirze z Olity*, [in:] J. Kulwicka-Kamińska, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Tefsir Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego: XVI-wieczny przekład Koranu na język polski. Wydanie krytyczne zabytku polskiej kultury narodowej*, Toruń, pp. 383–391.

Kożynowa A., Kulwicka-Kamińska J., Łapicz C., 2022b, *Polszczyzna północnokresowa w tefsirze z Olity*, [in:] J. Kulwicka-Kamińska, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Tefsir Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego: XVI-wieczny przekład Koranu na język polski. Wydanie krytyczne zabytku polskiej kultury narodowej*, Toruń, pp. 359–382.

Küçük M., 2014, *Eski Anadolu Türkçesi Dönemine Ait Satır Arası İlk Kur'an Tercümesi*, Ankara.

Kulwicka-Kamińska J., 2004, *Kształtowanie się polskiej terminologii muzułmańskiej*, Toruń.

Kulwicka-Kamińska J., 2015, *O czym informują glosy w tatarskiej literaturze przekładowej? (Na przykładzie tefsiru z Olity)*, „Rocznik Tatarów Polskich", vol. 2, pp. 45–52.

Kulwicka-Kamińska J., 2017, *Piśmiennictwo religijne Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego jako oryginalne źródło do badań polszczyzny północnokresowej*, „Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne", Seria Językoznawcza, vol. 24/2, pp. 85–110.

Kulwicka-Kamińska J., 2018, *Dialogue of Scriptures: The Tatar Tefsir in the Context of Biblical and Qur'anic Interpretations*, Berlin–New York.

Kulwicka-Kamińska J., 2022a, *Glosy, dopiski, komentarze w tefsirze z Olity*, [in:] J. Kulwicka--Kamińska, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Tefsir Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego: XVI-wieczny przekład Koranu na język polski. Wydanie krytyczne zabytku polskiej kultury narodowej*, Toruń, pp. 433–442.

Kulwicka-Kamińska J., 2022b, *Tatarski tefsir w nurcie zachodnioeuropejskiej literatury biblijnej*, [in:] J. Kulwicka-Kamińska, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Tefsir Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego: XVI-wieczny przekład Koranu na język polski. Wydanie krytyczne zabytku polskiej kultury narodowej*, Toruń, pp. 411–430.

Kulwicka-Kamińska J., Łapicz C., 2017, *Co wiemy o najstarszym datowanym rękopisie Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego? (Kitab z 1631 r. – transliteracja, ortografia, przekład, komentarze)*, „Slavistica Vilnensis", vol. 62, pp. 79–96.

Kulwicka-Kamińska J., Łapicz C., 2020, *Interdyscyplinarne studia nad filomackim przekładem Koranu na język polski*, [in:] A. Konopacki (ed.), *Pomiędzy Wschodem a Zachodem. Dzieje Tatarów wpisane w Europę Środkowo-Wschodnią*, Warszawa, pp. 11–25.

Kulwicka-Kamińska J., Łapicz C., 2022, *Tefsir z Olity. Paleografia. Grafia. Język*, [in:] J. Kulwicka--Kamińska, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Tefsir Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego: XVI-wieczny przekład Koranu na język polski. Wydanie krytyczne zabytku polskiej kultury narodowej*, Toruń, pp. 347–358.

Kulwicka-Kamińska J., Walkiewicz A., 2019, *Dwa warianty filomackiego tłumaczenia Koranu w relacji do podstawy źródłowej*, [in:] J. Kulwicka-Kamińska, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Rękopis z Czombrowa. Filomacki przekład Koranu – edycja i studium historyczno-filologiczne zabytku*, Toruń, pp. 153–180.

Kurzowa Z., 1993, *Język polski Wileńszczyzny i kresów północno-wschodnich XVI–XX w.*, Warszawa–Kraków.

Kwilecka I., 2003, *Studia nad staropolskimi przekładami Biblii*, Poznań.

Laucevičius E., 1967, *Popierius Lietuvoje XV–XVIII*, Vilnius.

Lewaszkiewicz T., 2017, *Język powojennych przesiedleńców z Nowogródka i okolicy*, Poznań.

Lewicka M., 2015, *Identyfikacja i analiza tekstologiczno-filologiczna arabskiej warstwy językowej s. 478–485 Tefsiru z Olity (1723 r.)*, [in:] G. Czerwiński, A. Konopacki (eds.), *Estetyczne aspekty literatury polskich, białoruskich i litewskich Tatarów (XVI–XXI w.)*, Białystok, pp. 107–132.

Lisowski T., 2010, *Sola Scriptura. Leksyka Nowego Testamentu Biblii Gdańskiej (1632) na tle porównawczym. Ujęcie kwantytatywno-dystrybucyjne*, Poznań.

Łapicz C., 1986, *Kitab Tatarów litewsko-polskich (Paleografia. Grafia. Język)*, Toruń.

Łapicz C., 2007, *Z zagadnień przekładu muzułmańskiej terminologii modlitewnej na język polski i białoruski*, [in:] J. Kamper-Warejko, J. Kulwicka-Kamińska, K. Nowakowska (eds.), *Z przeszłości i teraźniejszości języka polskiego. Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana Teresie Friedelównie*, Toruń, pp. 99–117.

Łapicz C., 2008, *Kitabistyka a historia języka polskiego i białoruskiego. Wybrane zagadnienia*, „Rocznik Slawistyczny", vol. 57, pp. 31–49.

Łapicz C., 2009, *Chrześcijańsko-muzułmańska interferencja religijna w rękopisach Tatarów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, [in:] *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystes kalbos, kultūros ir raštijos tradicijos*, Vilnius, pp. 293–310.

Łapicz C., 2014, *Czy piśmiennictwo Tatarów – muzułmanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego jest słowiańskim aljamiado?*, [in:] M. Warchał (ed.), *W podróży za słowem: księga pamiątkowa z okazji jubileuszu 70-lecia urodzin profesora Emila Tokarza*, Bielsko-Biała, pp. 59–70.

Łapicz C., Radziszewska I., 2019, *Tefsir z Grodna a Koran Jana Murzy Tarak Buczackiego (studium porównawcze na przykładzie sury 69)*, [in:] J. Kulwicka-Kamińska, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Rękopis z Czombrowa. Filomacki przekład Koranu – edycja i studium historyczno-filologiczne zabytku*, Toruń, pp. 191–207.

Łyszczarz M., 2013, *Młode pokolenie polskich Tatarów. Studium przemian generacyjnych młodzieży w kontekście religijności muzułmańskiej oraz tożsamości etnicznej*, Olsztyn––Białystok.

Mika T., Twardzik W., 2011, *Jak zagadkowe cztery tytuły rozdziałów w Rozmyślaniu przemyskim pozwalają wyobrażać sobie jego zagubiony autograf*, „Język Polski", vol. 91, pp. 321–334.

Miškinienė G., 2000, *O zawartości treściowej najstarszych rękopisów Tatarów litewskich*, „Rocznik Tatarów Polskich", vol. 6, pp. 30–36.

Miškinienė G., 2001, *Sieniausi lietuvos totorių rankraščiai. Grafika. Transliteracija. Vertimas. Tekstų struktūra ir turinys*, Vilnius.

Muchliński A., 1858, *Zdanie sprawy o Tatarach litewskich, przez jednego z tych Tatarów złożone sułtanowi Sulejmanowi w r. 1558. Z języka Tureckiego przełożył, objaśnił i materyałami historycznemi uzupełnił A. Muchliński, professor zwyczajny literatury Tureckiéj w Cesarskim St. Petersburskim uniwersytecie*, „Teka Wileńska", vol. 1 (4), pp. 241–272; vol. 2 (5), pp. 121–179; vol. 3 (6), pp. 139–183.

Radziszewska I., 2008, *Rękopisy tatarskie na Podlasiu*, [in:] T. Bairašauskaitė, H. Kobeckaitė, G. Miškinienė (eds.), *Orientas Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos Visuomenės Tradicijoje: Totoriai ir Karaimai*, Vilnius, pp. 138–143.

Radziszewska I., 2010, „Chamaiły jako typ piśmiennictwa religijnego muzułmanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego (na podstawie słowiańskiej warstwy językowej)", doctoral dissertation, Toruń.

Roth U., Scotto D., 2015, *Auf der Suche nach der Erbsünde im Koran Die 'Allegationes de peccatis primi parentis' des Juan de Segovia*, „Neulateinisches Jahrbuch", vol. 17, pp. 181–218.

Siatkowska E., 2004, *Samodzielność przekładu Nowego Testamentu przez Jakuba Wujka, Jana Blahoslava i Michała Frencla (na przykładzie konstrukcji imiesłowowych)*, [in:] S. Mikołajczak, T. Węcławski (eds.), *Język religijny dawniej i dziś*, Poznań, pp. 73–80.

Sobolewski J., 1830, *Wykład wiary machometańskiej, czyli iślamskiej*, Wilno.

Suter P., 2004, *Alfurkan Tatarski. Der litauisch-tatarische Koran-Tefsir*, Cologne–Weimar–Vienna.

Szczepińska B., 2005, *Ewangelie tylekroć tłumaczone… Studia o przekładach i przekładaniu*, Gdańsk.

Szynkiewicz J., 1935, *Literatura religijna Tatarów litewskich i jej pochodzenie*, „Rocznik Tatarski", vol. 2, pp. 138–143.

Tarama Sözlüğü, 1963–1972, vols. 1–4, Ankara.

Tarelka M., 2016, *Рэлігійна-палемічны тэкст з лейпцыгскага канвалюта*, [in:] M. Krajewska, J. Kulwicka-Kamińska, A. Szulc (eds.), *Święte księgi judaizmu, chrześcijaństwa i islamu w słowiańskim kręgu kulturowym*, vol. 1: *Księgi wyznawców islamu. Kitabistyka*, Toruń, pp. 121–149.

Tarelka M., Synkova I., 2009, *Адкуль пайшлі ідалы*, Мінск.

Tarelka M., Temčinas S., 2014, *Lithuanian Incantation in Arabic Script from a Tatar Manuscript*, „Acta Linguistica Lithuanica", vol. 71, pp. 11–22.

Temčinas S., 2019, *«Жития пророков» Абу Исхака ас-Салаби как источник статьи «Посольство Исы в Антиохию» славяноязычных литовско-татарских китабов*, „Slavistica Vilnensis", vol. 64/1, pp. 104–116.

Temčinas S., 2020, *Взаимосвязь польскоготефсирного перевода Корана с китабами литовских татар: сура 36-я (Йа Син) и «Посольство Исы в Антиохию»*, „Litteraria Copernicana", vol. 1, pp. 53–60.

Toker M., 2011–2012, *Anonim Satır Altı Kur'an Tercümesi (İnceleme–Metin–Tıpkıbasım Örnekleri) I* (2011), *II Dizin* (2012), Konya.

Winiarska-Górska I., 2009, *Język, styl i kulturowa rola szesnastowiecznych protestanckich przekładów Nowego Testamentu na język polski: między nowatorstwem a tradycją*, [in:] A. Gadomski, C. Łapicz (eds.), *Chrestomatia teolingwistyki*, Symferopol, pp. 289–318.

Wojciechowska K., 2006, *Odpowiadam wam jak Piotr. Elementy stylu i stylizacji w Ewangelii Marka*, Warszawa.

Yakubovych M., [in print], *Tatarskie dziedzictwo kulturowe na Wołyniu (1512–1939): kitaby*.

Zajączkowski A., 1937, *Studia nad językiem staroosmańskim II. Wybrane rozdziały ze staroanatolijskotureckiego przekładu Koranu. Études sur la langue vieille-osmanlie II. Chapitres choisis de la traduction turque-anatolienne du Qorân. Z 3 tablicami*, Kraków.