Introduction

1 The Antecedents of Manuscript ADub.III.73

The translation of the Torah into Karaim has rather a long history—the question remains, however, of how far this story goes back. In one of his articles, Seraya Shapshal (1873–1961), a well-educated leader of the Crimean and Polish Karaim communities, stated that the entire Tanakh was translated into Karaim around the 11th century (Šapšal 1918: 6). This opinion was for the most part shared by Musaev (1964: 8), who stated that the Bible was translated into Karaim in the 11th–14th centuries. A. Zajączkowski (1964: 793) and W. Zajączkowski (1980: 161), in turn, wrote that the oral—and thus, as should be made clear, unwritten—tradition of translating the Bible into Karaim dates back “ins 12. oder gar in das 11. Jahrhundert”. At the same time, the latter author stated that the oldest written translations of the Bible originate from the 16th century and that they were recorded in the south-western dialect of Karaim (the Halych dialect, as he termed it), whereas the oldest North-Western Karaim translations were made in the first half of the 18th-century, see W. Zajączkowski (1980: 162). Although the latter information is in accordance with our present-day knowledge, we have still no evidence of the 16th-century South-Western Karaim Biblical texts referred to by Włodzimierz Zajączkowski and Omeljan Pritsak (1959a: 323).¹

One important manuscript worthy of mention here is Evr I Bibl 143, which contains a (probably) 15th-century Kipchak Turkic translation of a large part of the Torah—from Exo 21:11 up till Num 28:15. Even though it contains a translation of the Torah into Kipchak Turkic written in Hebrew script and its Crimean provenance is very likely (as claimed by Harkavy & Strack 1875, see below), it still needs to be determined whether it was indeed written in Karaim and whether it belongs to the same translation tradition as the sources that are

1 It ought to be mentioned here that Grzegorzewski (1916–1918: 270–272, 279–287) published and commented on a copy of a South-Western Karaim translation of Psalms 142 and 143 (which are, obviously, not part of the Torah, but nevertheless are still a Biblical text) copied, so he claims, by Josef ha-Mashbir (born ca. 1650, died 13 Jan 1700, see JSul.II.02: 52 r^o). This, in theory, brings us closer to the 16th century. However, there are two circumstances that we must be aware of when reading Grzegorzewski's edition. Firstly, Grzegorzewski provides no information about the manuscript he used; what we see is the text reprinted in Hebrew characters, only. Secondly, the native dialect of Josef ha-Mashbir was actually North-Western Karaim, see the argumentation in Németh's (2018a) article in which a critical edition of one of his autographs is provided (along with facsimilia).

discussed below. We find Jankowski's (2018: 39–40) argumentation rather convincing, namely that there are grounds for classifying it as Chagatay. It was catalogued in Harkavy & Strack (1875: 167–168), but then remained almost completely overlooked for more than 140 years. In 2017, Aleksandra Soboleva from the Vinogradov Russian Language Institute (Moscow) carried out a palaeographic examination of this source and showed that the paper it was written on dates back to the 15th century (Grishchenko 2018b: 172). The Yevano-Karaite type, Mashait style Hebrew script used in it is very similar to the 14th-century sample published by Birnbaum (1954–1957, plate 391) and Birnbaum et alii (2007: 720, 726: figure 35). It was also briefly presented by Shapira (2006: 270; 2018: 309), although without any linguistic commentary.

In the last few years, the history of the translation of the Tanakh into Karaim and the state-of-the-art of current archival and philological research has been quite expertly addressed in a series of works by Jankowski (2009, 2018; 2019: x–xx), with special attention paid to the Eastern Karaim sources, and by Németh & Sulimowicz-Keruth (forthcoming in 2021) with special regard to Western Karaim texts. So as not to repeat the information presented in the above works, let us focus here on Western Karaim translations of the Torah.²

The first mention of the oldest translation of the Torah into Western Karaim comes from the German theologian and Hebraist Johann Buxtorf der Ältere (1564–1629). In the lexicon entry חומש *Chumafsh* found in the second, posthumous edition of his *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* printed in 1640, he mentions that the Karaites of Theodosia (Crimea) read the Pentateuch in a Turkic translation written in Hebrew script, see:

... & sunt Jerè Caraitæ: [...] In Taurica verò Cherfonejo Theodofiaë habitantes, Turcicè Sacros libros legunt, ut Arabifantes Arabicè, & in Perfide Perficè. Ubique tamen in peregrinis linguis exprimendis Hebraico caractere abuti confueverunt.

BUXTORF (1640: 444–445)³

This work has never been quoted precisely in the scholarly literature. Instead it was referred to on the basis of Schudt (1714: 208)—who reported in brief in German what Johannes Buxtorf had written in Latin—as well as other 17th-century

2 At the moment of writing we know of ca. 150 Karaim Biblical manuscripts. It is also for this reason that our focus is limited to the history of Western Karaim translations of the Torah only.

3 The first edition—i.e. Buxtorf (1613)—lacks this lexicon entry.

works, while in some descriptions on this topic it was overlooked entirely, see, for instance, A. Zajączkowski (1939: 93), Szyszman (1952: 215, 218), Dubiński (1959 [1994]: 64) or Jankowski (2009, 2018).

According to the present day knowledge, the first documentation of a portion of the Torah—and, at the same time of any Biblical text translated into Karaim in general—is the letter sent by a Swedish Orientalist Gustaf Peringer Lillieblad (1651–1710) to the German Ethiopist Hiob Ludolf (1624–1704), in which he presented, in Hebrew letters, the first three verses of the Torah (see Tentzel 1691: 572–575). This historical fact was frequently quoted in the scholarly literature and the relevant fragment was commented on by many authors, see, e.g., A. Zajączkowski (1939: 90–99), Szyszman (1952: 228), Dubiński (1991: 219), or Jankowski (2019: xii). Shortly after its publication, Peringer's letter was reprinted several times and all of its errors were flawlessly repeated by each publisher, see for instance Schupart (1701: 26) and Schudt (1714: 109–111). Given its importance, let us present the text and add a brief commentary to it:

Original text after Tentzel (1691)

- (1) [בראשית ברא] אֵינְךָ כְּשֶׁטֶן יִרְטִי טַגְרִי
- (2) אוֹשׁוֹל אוֹל כּוֹכְלָרְנִי רָא אוֹשׁוֹל יִרְנִי:
- (3) [והארץ] דָּאוֹל יִיר אֵי־דִי וְוִירְץ דְּנוֹש דְּקֶרְנְגִּילִיק
- (4) אֵי־דִי יוֹזו אוֹסְטוֹנָה דְּרִיִּנְן דְּכוּצְלִי יִיר שׁוֹבוֹל
- (5) דְּרִיִּדִיא יוֹזו אוֹסְטוֹנָה אוֹל סוֹכְלָרְנִין:
- (6) [ויאמר] דָּאֵי־טִי טַגְרִי בּוֹלְסוֹן יִירִיק דְּכוֹלְרוֹ
- (7) יִירִיק:

Transcription

- (1) [brēʕit bârâʕ] enk kaštan⁴ jaratty Tegri⁵
- (2) ošol ol köklarni ra⁶ ošol jerni.

4 A printing error instead of *baštan*; letters ב and כ were confused due to their similar shapes.

5 A printing error instead of *Tenri*; letters ט and נ were confused due to their similar shapes. In our opinion the letter *gimel* should not be read as *ŋ* here (as would be the case in Eastern Karaim texts): the available 17th-century North-Western Karaim linguistic material shows that *ŋ*, as a phoneme, has been eliminated from the sound system by that time (see footnote 34 below). This is supported also by Peringer's material itself, cf. the genitive suffix *-nyŋ* vs. OKar. **-nyŋ* in *derjanyn* and *su[ʋ]larnyn* (Gen 1:2), and *Tenri* in Gen 1:3.

6 A printing error instead of *da*; letters ד and ר were confused due to their similar shapes.

- (3) [whǎ'reš] Da ol jer edi veřac⁷ da noš⁸ da qarangylyq
- (4) edi jüzü üstüña derjanyn da küčli jel šuvul-
- (5) daredi jüzü üstüña ol suklarnyn⁹.
- (6) [wayyömer] Da ajtty Tenri bolsun jaryq da koldu¹⁰
- (7) jaryq.

These verses are almost identical to those we know from JSul.III.01 (= referenced as H in our apparatus below) and ADub.III.82 (see the facsimile of its first page in Sulimowicz 1999, ill. 18), i.e. from South-Western Karaim translations of Genesis, as well as to those quoted by Kowalski (1929: 289). The beginning of the Book of Genesis is missing from ADub.III.73 due to damage, but the 19th-century addition that contains it (see our edition below) is, again, almost identical to Peringer's material. A comprehensive critical edition and linguistic analysis of this short text was recently published by Németh (2020a).

2 Manuscript ADub.III.73

2.1 General Description

According to our current knowledge, manuscript ADub.III.73 contains the oldest datable Western Karaim translation of any Biblical text. Readers were first introduced to this translation by the present author in an article from 2014 (Németh 2014b) and the results of linguistic and philological analyses of the text have been presented over the years in a series of publications (see Németh 2014a, 2014b, 2015c, 2015d, 2016a, 2019; Stachowski 2015).

The main part of the manuscript is written in a historical variety of Karaim—Middle North-Western Karaim.¹¹ It consists of two parts: the first contains a translation of the Torah (folios 1 r^o–343 r^o),¹² whereas the second comprises the Karaim translation of four of the five books of The Five Megillot, namely:

-
- 7 A printing error instead of *veřan*; letters ʔ and ʔ were confused due to their similar shapes.
 - 8 A printing error instead of *boš*; letters ʔ and ʔ were confused due to their similar shapes.
 - 9 A printing error instead of *suvlarnyn*; letters ʔ and ʔ were confused due to their similar shapes. In Jankowski (2019: xii) it is mistakenly deciphered as *köklärnin*.
 - 10 A scribal error instead of *boldu*; letters ʔ and ʔ were confused due to their similar shapes.
 - 11 Our proposed periodisation of Karaim is based on phonological, morphonological, and historical criteria established over the course of several years. Philologically, it is grounded on a thorough examination of nearly forty manuscripts selected from a larger group of ca. 500 items copied in the 15th–20th centuries. It was first presented in Németh (2015b) and has been refined twice since: in Németh (2018b) and Németh (2020b: 57).
 - 12 Folio 343 v^o features a list of the incipits of the 54 parashot.

the Book of Ruth (344 r^o–349 v^o),¹³ the Book of Lamentations (350 r^o–360 r^o), Ecclesiastes (360 v^o–374 v^o), and the Book of Esther (375 r^o–388 v^o).¹⁴ The 388 folios are 175×140 mm in size and contain predominantly 21 lines of text. The text of the Torah and of The Five Megillot is preserved almost in its entirety.

The only passages of the original manuscript of the Torah that are missing (due to damage) are verses Gen 1:1–1:17, the final fragment of Gen 5:25, Gen 5:26–6:9, and the beginning of Gen 6:10. These passages were supplemented in the 19th century by another hand in South-Western Karaim and were added to the manuscript as folios 1 r^o–2 v^o. As far as the text of The Five Megillot is concerned, only the last folio of the original manuscript was damaged (Est 9:28–Est 10:3). It was reproduced most likely in the 20th century by another hand in Modern North-Western Karaim and was added to the manuscript as its last page. In autumn 2014, the present author managed to find this missing last page of the Book of Esther lying loose among other Karaim religious texts. I have catalogued this page as ADub.III.67.3 not knowing at the time it was added to the catalogue that it actually belongs to ADub.III.73.

Folios 3–387 were copied in dark brown iron gall ink. The additions on the first two folios are in light brown ink, whereas the last fragment on folio 388 is in black ink. Conservation work was carried out on the manuscript on two occasions: the first most probably took place in the latter half of the 20th century by unknown persons, while the second was performed in 2015 by Elżbieta Jabłońska and Małgorzata Pronobis-Gajdzis.¹⁵ The text is clearly legible despite the effects of ink corrosion (halted thanks to the conservation treatment) visible on most of the folios. The margins of the first 17 folios are damaged, which resulted in the loss of text. With the exception of a few passages, the entire text is vocalised.

The main part of the manuscript was copied by Simcha of Kukizów ben Chananel of Derażne. He was born most likely in Trakai in the light of the fact that he was among those migrants from Trakai who established the Karaim community of Kukizów in 1688. In a document edited by Mann (1931: 886) we

13 The Book of Ruth from this manuscript was critically edited in Németh (2015c).

14 The folio numbers presented in Németh (2014b: 110) and Németh (2015c: 51) differ from these here because the former were provided on the basis of the folio numbers added to the manuscript in pencil by one of its owners or readers. Today, after having read the whole manuscript page by page, we can say that three pages were skipped during the numbering process.

15 Elżbieta Jabłońska and Małgorzata Pronobis-Gajdzis are members of the Department of Paper and Leather Conservation of the Faculty of Fine Arts of the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Poland. For a report of the conservation treatment financed by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage of the Republic of Poland, see Pronobis-Gajdzis (2015).

see his statement that he received 100 Polish zlotys support from the king's treasury for the journey. In that document he refers to himself as הצעיר והזעיר 'young and small', which suggest that he was born not later than ca. 1670.¹⁶ We are also aware that Simcha came from a well-educated family: Chananel, his father, was the hazzan of the community in Derażne.¹⁷ Simcha had two children: Moshe (died 06 February 1738) and Deborah (died also in the 30-ies); his wife Chana passed away on 11 January 1717 (see JSul.II.02: 52 r^o). He became hazzan in Kukizów around 1709, succeeding in that office Mordechai ben Nisan (born ca. 1650, died ca. 1709),¹⁸ and is known for composing several *piyyutim* in Hebrew (see Mann 1931: 1270, fn. 645) as well as for writing numerous Karaim interpretations of Hebrew *piyyutim*: the present author has discovered 18 such works and critically edited them in Németh (2020b: 215–373). He was the creator of another copy of the Torah, namely ms. TKow.01 (see below) and, moreover, from ms. JSul.I.11 (copied in 1878) we know that he translated the Book of Lamentations into Karaim.¹⁹ He is known to have died on 20 Adar Sheni 5483 A.M.—ca. 27 March 1723 A.D. according to the Gregorian calendar—and was buried in Kukizów (see, JSul.II.02: 52 r^o, and JSul.III.05: 164 r^o).²⁰

The text was first written without vocalisation signs. The vocalisation was added to the text by the copyist, but the unvocalised fragments or amendments in Gen 37:8, Exo 38:12, Num 15 (237 r^o) show us that this was done after the respective portions of text were written. Additionally, in the unvocalised fragment in Exo 38:12 a cantillation sign was used, which suggests that cantillation signs were added to the text prior to its vocalisation.

16 The facsimile of this document was published by Muchowski & Tomal (2016: 381–382).

17 See, ms. JSul.I.45 (101 r^o) where in the introduction to the Karaim translation of the *piyyut* (religious song) starting with the words מְלֶכְרָם וְיַחֲדֵיךְ *melek rām wyāhīd* we read the following: ואם תרצה תאמר גם פשוט שתרגמו בוזך חכמתו אִמּוֹ הָיָו כְּמֹהָרֵר שְׂמִיחָה הַחַזֵּן דְּקֹהֶק יִפָּה: יַעַר נִבֵּת: בכמֶעַד חֲנָנָל הֶזֶקֶן מִתּוֹשְׁבֵי קֹהֶק דְּרֶאזְנִיעַ יַעֲמֹשׁ: [i.e., the *peshat* of the Hebrew original] which the pure hakham translated, our master, our teacher, the great and honourable sage, his honour, the Rav, Rabbi Simcha the hazzan of the holy community of Yefeh Ya'ar [i.e., of Kukizów], may his soul lodge in Eden, the son of Chananel, the aged, the hazzan of the holy community of Derażne, whose honourable repose is Eden, may he rest in peace'. The Karaim incipit of this *piyyut* is *Biji dunjanyyn bijik da jaljyz Tenri*, see Németh (2020b: 226).

18 Mordechai ben Nisan and his son, Nisan, were murdered probably in 1709 on their way to the Crimea, see Mann (1931: 739, fn. 1067b), Tuori (2013: 73).

19 The Biblical book in question was copied on folios 28 r^o–52 r^o and it is the introductory passage in Hebrew on folio 28 r^o which provides the information that Simcha ben Chananiel was its translator.

20 The fact that he was buried in Kukizów is also recorded in the manuscripts edited by Muchowski & Tomal & Sulimowicz & Witkowski & Yariv (2017: 33, 45).

As we learn from the colophon on folios 342 v^o–343 r^o, the main text was created by Simcha ben Chananel between 25 March and 31 May 1720, and in the colophons that close the translation of Exodus, Leviticus, Number and Deuteronomy—see folios 157 v^o (line 14), 207 v^o (line 5), 278 v^o (line 2), 342 v^o (line 5), respectively—he clearly states that the text of the Pentateuch he copied is his own translation (*peshat*). This explains why of all the many translators of *piyyutim* mentioned in 19th-century sources Simcha ben Chananel was the only individual assigned the title of *translator*, or *divine translator and ha-Torani*. In light of the above we may suppose that he was also the translator of the four books of Ketuvim on folios 344 r^o–388 v^o.²¹

Finally, he is also known to be a prominent copyist: in 1710, he copied *Appirion*, Shelomo ben Aharon's *opus magnum* (see, Poznański 1916: 98).

One of the other two copyists who contributed to the manuscript was the eminent clergymen and copyist Jeshua Josef Mordkowicz (1802–1884). We identify him as the copyist of folios 1 r^o–2 v^o based, firstly, on the handwriting: it is identical to that of the manuscripts whose authorship we know for certain, such as e.g. JSul.111.01 and ADub.111.82. Secondly, the additions in question are made in Mordkowicz's native dialect. Moreover, JSul.111.01 includes an annotation in which Mordkowicz quotes Simcha ben Chananel's translation, which suggests that the analysed manuscript, or perhaps ms. TKow.01, was in Mordkowicz's possession.²² The differences between Mordkowicz's additions to Genesis and the respective passages in TKow.01 suggest that Mordkowicz rather did not use TKow.01 in his work.

Several other individuals also contributed to the manuscript, yet their identity remains unknown. We do not know the name of the person who copied

21 In Németh (2020b), I have identified more than a hundred translators of Hebrew liturgical poetry. In the Hebrew headings that introduce each translation of a Hebrew literary work, the copyists usually tended to mention the name of the translators using all the honorifics they earned in their life. As far as Simcha ben Chananel is concerned, two such headings are worth mentioning here (the context is provided in Németh 2020b: 306, 342):

1. ואם תרצה תאמר גם פשוט שתרגמו החכם המתרגם כמוהרר שמחה הנל יעמש 'And, if you prefer, say its *peshat* [i.e., of the Hebrew *piyyut*] which the above-mentioned hakham, the translator, his honour, the Rav, Rabbi Simcha translated, may he rest in peace' (JSul.111.69: 295 v^o);
2. וזה הפשט לפיוט פרשת ראה אנכי תרגמו המתרגם האלהי והתורני הנל יעמש 'And this is the *peshat* of a *piyyut* for the parashat Re'eh which the above-mentioned divine translator and ha-Torani translated, may he rest in peace' (JSul.111.79: 179 v^o).

22 See: פשט אחר על מלת בָּדַד מִפְּשֵׁט הָרַר שְׂמֵחָה בְּכֵם חֲנָנֵאל וְצֹקֶל 'Another translation of the words *bad bhad* from the translation of the Rav, Rabbi Simcha, the son of the honourable Chananel may the memory of the righteous and holy be a blessing' (JSul.111.01: 93 v^o; Exo 30:34). I would like to thank Anna Sulimowicz-Keruth for drawing my attention to this annotation.

the text of folio 388 or who added the vocalisation to the last folios of Deuteronomy, but both were apparently speakers of North-Western Karaim. Furthermore, over the course of time, several people made their own marginal additions to the manuscript (in both North- and South-Western Karaim), but due to the brevity of these annotations, it is difficult to establish their authorship, too.

Naturally, the latter additions were very likely made by some of the owners of the manuscript. On folio 341 r^o we find a Hebrew annotation of Zecharia ben Shalom (died 1771?)²³ from which we learn that he bought the book on the 28th of Tevet 5528, i.e. on 18 January 1768 according to the Gregorian calendar, from a person called Josef ben Jehuda. Secondly, on text leaves 155 v^o, 156 r^o, 205 v^o, 206 r^o, and 276 v^o we see an oval seal with the Hebrew inscription, or rather *ex libris*, מרדכי בבר זכריה זל 'Mordechai, son of the honoured ribbi Zecharia of blessed memory' and, thirdly, the original folio 385 v^o (i.e., ADub.III.67.3) contains the signature of a person called Shalom ben Zecharia (the signature is introduced with Hebr. א'ני 'I'). The latter two individuals were very likely the sons of the above-mentioned Zecharia ben Shalom who bought the manuscript in 1768. On folio 205 v^o one of the unidentified owners listed the dates of birth of his children born between 1789 and 1795.

As we mentioned above, it is very likely that the manuscript later entered into the possession of Jeshua Josef Mordkowicz, hazzan in Kukizów until 1821 and in Halych in the years 1866–1884. This is all the more probable in light of Kowalski's (1929: XIX, 289) observation that some manuscripts from Kukizów ended up in Halych after the community's disappearance in 1831. Today, it is part of the private archive of the descendants of the prominent Polish turkologist Aleksander Dubiński (1924–2002).

2.2 *The Origins of Manuscript ADub.III.73*

The colophons enumerated above tell us that the Torah was translated in less than 70 days (including Sabbaths). There are no translations of the Torah for which we can give a precise date that are older than the analysed manuscript—in any of the Karaim dialects—which would allow us to perform a reliable analysis of whether Simcha ben Chananel made use of other existing translations in his work. However, it seems very probable that Simcha's translation

23 He was most likely the same Zecharia ben Shalom to whom a lament for the dead (so-called *kinah*) written on the 13th of Sivan 5531 A.M. (i.e. 26 May 1771) was dedicated. It was written by Jeshua ben Mordechai Mordkowicz (hazzan in Halych until 1796), see JSul.I.37.14.

was created on the basis of already existing texts. In fact, Peringer's report by itself is sufficient for us to hypothesise the existence of comprehensive Karaim translations of the Torah older than 1720 that our translator—who, after all, was a clergymen—had known or had at his disposal.²⁴ Moreover, the vast number of similarities between this manuscript and BSMS 288 copied in 18th-century Crimea is enough to demonstrate that a common tradition of Bible translation must have existed among the Karaims. Likewise, the Book of Ruth in ms. JSul.III.02 (the oldest datable Karaim Biblical translation copied in the Crimea several decades before ADub.III.73) which stands very close to the printed edition from 1841 (= referenced as E in our apparatus below) also shares a large number of textual similarities with the Book of Ruth as copied in the second part of ADub.III.73 (see Németh 2016a: 205–206). In contrast, the Krymchak *targum* of the Book of Ruth presented by Ianbay & Erdal (1998) is vastly different from the existing Karaim translations.

Apart from the rich textual similarities between ADub.III.73 and translations made more or less at the same time (but separately, in distant Karaim communities), we also find many *errores significativi* that reveal its close relationship with other manuscripts. For example, one very interesting parallel between ADub.III.73 and BSMS 288 is that verses Lev 15:7 and Num 3:8 are (mistakenly?) missing from both manuscripts (Num 3:8 is missing from R, too). Not counting the damaged parts, there are altogether nine verses that were omitted by Simcha ben Chananel (Exo 14:18, Exo 37:15, Exo 39:17, Exo 40:34, Lev 15:7, Num 3:8, Num 32:41, Num 33:49, Deu 1:14), but all of them are present in ms. JSul.III.01. The latter information is very important in this case as we know that JSul.III.01 was copied in Halych by a person who, as we have shown above, used Simcha's translation in his work.

In fact, there are numerous facts suggesting that most of the Western Karaim Biblical manuscripts known to us—if not all of them—can be traced back to a

24 We know of two Crimean Karaim sources containing a translation of the Torah that date from as far back as the 18th century, but neither of them can be dated accurately: BSMS 288 (= referenced as C in our apparatus below), which Aqtay (2016: 38) assumes to have been copied in the second half of the 18th century, and Bachč. 116 of which all we know is that it dates from the 18th century (see Jankowski 2019: xix). All the other Crimean Karaim manuscripts Jankowski referred to in his works (2009, 2018; 2019: x–xx) as well as ms. F305-92 (not listed by Jankowski), are more recent than ADub.III.73. Poźnański (1916: 88) mentioned a Crimean manuscript from 1672 that contained the Prophets and Writings, but the fate of this source is unknown. Finally, the Eastern Karaim ms. JSul.III.02 (copied before 1687, but after 1648) does not contain any portions of the Torah, either.

common root. Scribal errors, mistranslations, all kinds of peculiarities repeated in numerous manuscripts show quite clearly that Karaim manuscripts draw from a common translation tradition. For instance, we have identified altogether eight mistranslations that are repeated in numerous manuscripts (or in at least one additional one), see: Gen 2:8, Gen 4:15, Gen 15:9, Exo 27:8, Lev 24:11, Lev 24:16, Deu 17:8, Deu 28:20.

It is very important to note that the translation edited in this book contains a great number of interpretative additions to the standard text of the Hebrew Bible as well as interpretative translations of certain passages or entire verses that were very likely authored by Simcha ben Chananel himself. This is especially evident in the poetic passages of the Torah, such as in the respective parts of Genesis 49, Exodus 15, Leviticus 26, Numbers 23–24, or Exodus 32–33. The ca. 90 verses that contain interpretative supplementations to the Hebrew Torah,²⁵ the 7 verses that were changed entirely, and the 16 verses in which certain passages have been translated interpretatively are potentially valuable source material for exegetes, see Table 1.²⁶ For instance, a very interesting phenomenon is the addition of the principle of the Golden Rule to Lev 19:18 and Lev 19:34.

Another feature shared by Karaim Biblical translations is the avoidance of anthropomorphisms in descriptions of God. A good illustration of this tendency is the use of the expression *boluřluęu Tenrinin* ‘God’s help’ to render BHeb. אֱלֹהִים ‘God’ (Gen 21:20), rendering BHeb. יְהוָה ‘Yahweh’ with *řehinasy Adonajnyń* ‘the divine Presence of the Lord’ (Gen 4:4) or with *hařgahasy Adonajnyń* ‘the providence of the Lord’ (Exo 17:7), replacing BHeb. פָּנִים ‘face’ with *aqyl* ‘mind’ or *qyblalar* ‘directions’ (Gen 32:31, Exo 33:14). We also see *bujruq* ‘command’ used to render BHeb. רֶגֶל ‘foot’, BHeb. אֶצְבָּע ‘finger’, or BHeb. כַּף ‘palm’ (Exo 24:10, Exo 31:18), *hyřřym* ‘wrath’ used to render BHeb. יָד ‘hand’ or BHeb. פָּנִים ‘face’ (Exo 3:20, Lev 17:10), and *on küč* ‘right strength’ used for BHeb. יָמִין ‘right hand [of God]’ (Exo 15:6). Although an exhaustive description of this particular translation technique was given by Zajączkowski (1929), based on

25 Furthermore, one addition to the text of the Torah is found in Gen 6:3, i.e. in the fragment originally damaged and supplemented by Jeshua Josef Mordkowicz. This interpretative translation was later taken into consideration by Mordkowicz in his JSul.111.01 (6 v^o): it is added to it as an alternative translation of the respective passage, but, interestingly, it is absent there in ADub.111.82 (7 r^o) which was also copied by Jeshua Josef.

26 In the available scholarly literature, only limited attention has been paid to the translation techniques applied by the Karaim translators and their exegetic implications. This topic has been touched upon in the following publications: Henderson (1826: 331–339), Zajączkowski (1929; 1931–1932: 191–292; 1947), Dubiński (1965a, 1965b), Altbauer (1979–1980), and Olach (2017: 235–238).

TABLE 1 Interpretative translation of Hebrew passages and additions to the original

Biblical book	Interpretative additions to the original text	Interpretative translations of entire verses	Interpretative translations of short passages
Genesis	15:1, 20:16, 27:13, 27:33, 27:45, 28:22, 31:32, 32:23, 37:2, 37:13, 37:27, 37:32, 38:29, 40:4, 42:1, 43:14, 45:12, 45:19, 46:4, 49:16	4:23, 4:24	
Exodus	12:42, 15:2, 15:4, 15:8, 15:13, 15:14, 15:15, 18:8, 19:13 (× 2), 19:19, 19:24, 20:22, 21:6, 32:5, 32:34, 33:13	15:11, 17:16, 24:11	9:30, 25:37, 33:13, 37:16
Leviticus	9:23, 10:1, 10:3, 13:45, 20:14, 23:17, 23:40, 24:8, 24:12, 26:34, 26:39, 27:34		8:6, 19:18, 19:34
Numbers	4:6, 9:13, 11:22, 20:12, 21:24, 23:22, 23:23 (× 2), 24:8, 25:4		
Deuteronomy	6:9, 7:9, 11:20, 12:7, 12:18, 15:17, 15:20, 16:10, 30:6, 30:14 (× 3), 30:20, 32:10 (× 4), 32:12, 32:37, 32:39, 32:41, 33:6, 33:9, 33:10, 33:18, 33:21, 33:24, 33:25, 33:26	32:5, 33:3	7:10 (× 2), 29:19, 30:3, 30:18, 33:2, 33:11, 33:12, 33:19, 33:21, 33:26, 33:27, 33:29

ms. ADub.111.73 we can supplement Zajączkowski's research with the following list of equivalents:

1. *ačuv* 'anger' = BHeb. אַף 'nose' (Exo 15:8);
2. *bujrugum* 'my command' = 'I, see: וְאֵרֵד 'and I have come down' (Exo 3:8);
3. *jeli Tenrinin* 'the wind of God' = BHeb. רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים 'Spirit of God' (Gen 1:2);
4. *qajjamlyq* 'eternity' = BHeb. כֶּף 'palm' (Exo 20:3, Deu 5:7);
5. *qulluğu Adonaj Tenrijnin* 'the service of Lord, your God' = BHeb. יְהוָה 'Yah-weh' (Deu 11:22);
6. *sondragı jaratylmyšlar* 'hindmost creation' = BHeb. אָחור 'back' (Exo 33:23).

Moreover, we have observed, albeit to a limited extent, the same tendency when it comes to descriptions of the prophet Moses, see:

7. *naviligi ašyra Mošenin* 'by/through the prophecy of Moses' = BHeb. בְּיַד־מֹשֶׁה 'by/under the hand of Moses' (Lev 8:36, Num 27:23, Num 33:1).

Given that this tendency is somewhat less pronounced, but still present, in the Crimean translations, the question arises of whether it is also characteristic of ms. Evr I Bibl 143, the provenance and language of which still awaits clarification. We see, for instance, BHeb. פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים 'face to face' (Exo 33:11) translated verbatim as *jüz jüzgä* 'face to face' in Evr I Bibl 143 (20 r^o) or BSMS 288 (86 r^o), but then BHeb. וְתַחַת רַגְלָיו 'and [there was] under the feet' (Exo 24:10) is rendered, on the one hand, as *ajagy tbinä* 'under his feet' in Evr I Bibl 143 (6 r^o) and, on the other, as *tbinä hörmätläriniñ* 'under his honours' in BSMS 288 (77 r^o). It seems, however, that the analysed tendency is at least as old as Evr I Bibl 143. Even though a thorough analysis of this linguistic monument is still to be prepared²⁷, we can also quote some examples where such anthropomorphisms from that source are avoided. See, for instance, BHeb. כָּתוּבִים בְּאֶצְבַּע אֱלֹהִים 'written with the finger of God' (Exo 31:18) translated as *jazyłğanlar Tanry küçibilä* 'written with the strength of God' (Evr I Bibl 143: 17 v^o) or the translation of verse Exo 33:23 in which the words 'hand', 'back', and 'face' are translated by means of similes, see: וְהִסְרֵתִי אֶת-פָּנַי וְרָאִיתָ אֶת-אֶחָרַי וּפָנַי לֹא יֵרָאוּ 'And I will turn my hand away, and you will see my back, but my face will not be seen' (English translation by Friedman 2003: 176) translated as: *Da ketirgäjmän bulutymny da körgäjsän artyndağylarymny da alyndağym körünmägäjläär* 'And I will take away my cloud, and you will see that which is behind me, and that which is in front of me will not be seen.' (Evr I Bibl 143: 20 v^o).

The translation technique presented above brings the Karaim translations textually and exegetically closer to the Septuagint (see Zajackowski 1929: 9–10). In this light, another interesting case is the translation of Heb. רָשָׁף 'flame = plague, pestilence' in Deu 32:24 with the word *quš* 'bird'. This point is worth mentioning because this is the way this word is rendered in the Septuagint—we find BGr. ὀρνέων 'birds' in the respective verse and this could have entered the Karaim text via Slavonic translations, cf. OCS. *nmuyz* 'birds (*gen.*)' in Deu 32:24. On the other hand, the Karaim translation may have well been influenced by Med.Heb. רָשָׁף '1. glow, flame, spark; 2. bird (of prey)' (Jastrow 1903: 1502; Klein 1987: 631) or, albeit less likely, it might also be a mistranslation: we find Kar. *učqun* 'spark' in this verse in other Karaim manuscripts, hence if Simcha ben Chananel used other Karaim manuscripts as a basis for his work, he could have (mis)interpreted *učqun* as 'bird', given that *učqun* is a *-qun* derivative of *uč-* 'to fly' (see A. Zajackowski 1932: 81; Berta 1996: 402).

27 The plan is for this to be done within the framework of the *KaraimBible* project referenced in the Acknowledgements.

3 Manuscript TKow.01

Chronologically speaking, the next Western Karaim Torah translation created after manuscript ADub.III.73 is that described by Kowalski (1929: 289) as a manuscript copied in 1723 in Derażne (referenced as TKow.01 in this book). Kowalski's claim that the manuscript was created in Derażne in 1723 was highly puzzling in the light of the fact that this community was destroyed during the Khmelnytsky Uprising (1648–1649) and the historical evidence proving the community's alleged existence way until the second half of the 18th century²⁸ is highly scarce and dubious (for a discussion, see Németh 2018a: 84–85). The re-discovery of this manuscript confirmed that our doubts were well founded:

In 1929 it was in the possession of Dr. Zacharjasz Nowachowicz (1883–1960), an inhabitant of Halych, but then the fate of this manuscript remained unknown for decades—until 15 November 2019 when it was re-discovered (among other manuscripts, further information is provided below) by the present author and Anna Sulimowicz-Keruth in the private archive of the inheritors of the late Polish orientalist Tadeusz Kowalski (1889–1948). Its analysis showed that also this manuscript was copied by Simcha ben Chananel: according to his annotation written on the inside of the front cover he finished copying this work on the first day of the parashat Vayeshev in the month Kislev 5483 A.M., i.e. on 7 December 1722 A.D. This allows us to state, in the light of the copyist's biography, that the manuscript was actually copied in 1722 in Kukizów, not in 1723 in Derażne. The place of the manuscript's creation was misinterpreted by Kowalski on the basis of the fact that, in the annotation mentioned above, Simcha referred to himself as “Simcha the son of Chananel of Derażne”, but it is Chananel who lived in Derażne, not the copyist.

A large part of this manuscript is vocalised, see: Gen 1:1–Exo 4:4, Exo 15:1–9, Exo 15:19–25, Exo 21:1–25:12, Lev 16:1–18:30, Num 15:15–24, Num 15:41–17:3, Deu 1:1–2:10, Deu 2:5–12, Deu 3:23–4:5, Deu 4:19–8:15, Deu 27:15–28:1, Deu 28:16–44 (and a few more fragments of Lev 26, Deu 28 and Deu 32 vocalized selectively according to South-Western Karaim standards by another hand using different quill pen). On the basis of the originally vocalized fragments we can say that its vocalic system reflects precisely the same phonological phenomena that we see in ADub.III.73 (see our description below). Since we know that the copyist passed away three months after finishing copying the main text, it seems jus-

28 Three authors claimed so (based, mainly, on the very same arguments): Bałaban (1927: 50), Zajączkowski (1934a: 182), and Šabarovskýj (2013: 153–154).

tified to say Simcha ben Chananel was unable to add the vocalisation to the entire text because of his advanced age.

Although there are many differences between the two manuscripts copied by Simcha ben Chananel—see, e.g., *jaratty*, *jaratajyq* in ADub.III.73 vs. *qyl̥dy*, *qyl̥ajyq* in TKow.01 (Gen 1:25, Gen 1:26, respectively)—these discrepancies are not too significant. The presence of some of the scribal errors in these two manuscripts only (see, e.g., Gen 10:18, Gen 17:8, Gen 22:18, Gen 31:49, Exo 2:10; Exo 27:8) also speak in favour of treating these two manuscripts as texts going back to the same source. Importantly, altogether (or: *only*) 16 interpretative additions to the original text of ADub.III.73 were repeated, in an unaltered form, in TKow.01 (those in Gen 37:13, Gen 37:32, Exo 15:4, Exo 15:8, Exo 15:15, Lev 20:14, Num 23:23 (× 2), Num 24:8, Deu 12:7, Deu 12:18, Deu 30:14 (× 1), Deu 32:10 (× 4), Deu 32:41, Deu 33:18).

Given that ms. TKow.01 was re-discovered shortly after the submission of this volume to the publisher, I had no possibility to perform an in-depth comparison of manuscripts ADub.III.73 and TKow.01. Nevertheless, damaged passages, uncertain readings, possible mistranslations, and Jeshua Josef Mordkowicz's South-Western Karaim additions to Genesis were thoroughly compared with TKow.01. For more information on how this manuscript was utilized in our work, see our remarks on page 39.

4 Subsequent Western Karaim Translations of the Hebrew Bible

4.1 *Introductory Remarks*

Before we continue our discussion, it is ought to be said that at the moment of writing the present author is aware of the existence of ca. 150 Karaim Biblical sources (including Eastern Karaim texts which are not the primary focus of this work) kept in many collections all around Europe, the most important being Polish, and Lithuanian private archives of Karaim families, the Wroblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences in Vilnius, the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and the National Library of Russia in Saint Petersburg. A few other manuscripts are kept in the holdings of other institutions, such as the John Rylands Library in Manchester, the Cambridge University Library, and the Edinburgh University Library. There is, however, no comprehensive catalogue of these texts. The data presented in this volume is hence based on the present writer's archival research (for years conducted in close collaboration with Anna Sulimowicz-Keruth), personal correspondence, and the works of Steinschneider (1871), Harkavy & Strack (1875), Poznański (1909–1910; 1912–1919; 1916; 1918–1920), Kow-

alski (1929), A. Zajączkowski (1931; 1931–1932; 1964),²⁹ KarRPS (1974), Dubiński (1979; 1985), W. Zajączkowski (1980), Medvedeva (1988), Sklare (2003), Walfish (2003), Shapira (2006), Jankowski (2009), Walfish & Kizilov (2011), Olach (2013), Vasileva (2003, 2014), A. Sulimowicz (2015a; 2015b), Aqtay (2016), Işık (2018), and Jankowski (2018; 2019: x–xx). Additionally, there is a number of editions of Karaim Biblical texts, see the publications of Grzegorzewski (1916–1918), Danon (1921), Kowalski (1929), A. Zajączkowski (1931–1932; 1934b), J. Sulimowicz (1972; Daniel 9:9–11, only), Firkovičius (1994), Jankowski (1997), Firkovičius (2000), Csató (2011; Psalm 91, only), Olach (2013), Shapira (2013), Németh (2014b), Shapira (2014), Németh (2016a), Olach (2017), Jankowski & Aqtay & Cegiołka & Çulha & Németh (2019), and Kobeckaitė (2019). It should be also mentioned here that the process of emergence of the Western Karaim Bible translating tradition and its evolution in post-partition Poland was discussed in Németh & Sulimowicz-Keruth (forthcoming in 2021).

4.2 *Subsequent Western Karaim Translations of the Torah*

According to our current knowledge, chronologically the next manuscripts were created in mid-19th century Halych by the aforementioned Jeshua Josef Mordkowicz (born 1802 in Halych, died 1884 in Halych), the hazzan in Kukizów (from ca. 1821 until the destruction of that community around 1831) and later also in Halych (from 1866 until his death), a prominent teacher and copyist of dozens of manuscripts, including copies of the whole Tanakh. As far as the translations of the Torah are concerned, he was the creator of manuscripts ADub.III.82, JSul.III.01 (as we mentioned above), and of the manuscript partially edited and described by Olach (2013)—all of them being written in South Western Karaim.

Towards the turn of the 20th-century numerous copies of the Torah were produced in the territory of present-day Lithuania in Modern North-Western Karaim. For the time being, we can say that one of the most prolific copyists of those times was Zevulun ben Ananiah Rojecki (born between 1842 and 1844 probably in Naujamiestis, died 1923 probably in Panevėžys, buried at the Karaim cemetery in Naujamiestis), hazzan in Panevėžys from the end of the 19th century until the interwar period.³⁰ As far as translations of the Five Books

29 Wilhelm Radloff's edition of the Book of Job is most likely a ghost publication even though there is a reference made to it in Zajączkowski (1931: 31).

30 See him mentioned by Poznański (1916: 99), although his surname is mistakenly deciphered there as רױאַצקי, i.e. *Rawacki*. Briefly referred to by Kizilov (2015: 177) and Pilecka (2016: 8). His grave is located at the Karaim cemetery in Naujamiestis. His short biography, prepared by A. Sulimowicz-Keruth, is presented in Németh & Sulimowicz-Keruth (forthcoming in 2021).

of Moses are concerned, he copied manuscripts F305-01 (Torah, Former Prophets), F305-02 (Genesis, Haftarah), F305-74 (Genesis, Exodus), F305-03 (Exodus), F305-130 (Exodus, Leviticus), F305-04 (Leviticus), F305-05 (Numbers), F305-129 (Numbers), F305-06 (Deuteronomy), and F305-128 (Deuteronomy). Our preliminary analysis shows that the text of the Book of Genesis in F305-01 (= referenced as R in our apparatus below) stands very close to the printed edition of 1889 edited by Zacharjasz Mickiewicz and Elijahu Rojecki (= referenced as V in our apparatus below).

Lastly, Szymon Firkowicz (1897–1982) copied F305-127 in 1926–1927.

4.3 *Subsequent Western Karaim Manuscripts of the Nevi'im and Ketuvim*

Apart from the translations of the Torah, a few other Western Karaim Biblical manuscripts were created before the end of the 18th century. Besides the Haftarat copied in ADub.III.73, first to be listed here is the Book of Esther found in ms. JSul.III.65 (folios 5 r^o–12 r^o, 13 v^o–16 v^o), the oldest known Karaim text from Halych written in Middle South-Western Karaim (its linguistic and palaeographic characteristics suggests that the text was most likely written in the late 18th century). It was discovered in the form of handwritten additions bound together with the last volume of *Siddur* (1737). Secondly, to the latter group belong ms. F305-41, a collection of religious works partially copied in the 18th century (1 r^o–65 v^o). Among others, it contains a selection from various books of Nevi'im read during Pesach (30 r^o–47 v^o), the Book of Lamentations (48 r^o–55 v^o), and some passages from the Book of Hosea (48 r^o–55 v^o)—translated into North-Western Karaim. Finally, another 18th-century source to be mentioned here is the North-Western Karaim translation of the Book of Proverbs—created in Saločiai in 1798 by a person called Shelumiel ben Shemuel—which was presented by Firkovičius (2000).

Thanks to the activity of Jeshua Josef Mordkowicz, South-Western Karaim received a full textual coverage of the Hebrew Bible. Besides the above-mentioned translations of the Torah, he translated and copied the entire Nevi'im and Ketuvim: see manuscripts ADub.III.83 (Latter Prophets, Twelve Minor Prophets), ADub.III.84 (Ketuvim, except 1–2 Chronicles), F305-104 (Hallel), TKow.02 (Former Prophets, 1–2 Chronicles), TKow.03 (Ketuvim, except 1–2 Chronicles), and TKow.04 (Ketuvim, except 1–2 Chronicles). The latter three sources were discovered in the private archive of Tadeusz Kowalski in years 2019–2020. As far as our knowledge goes, TKow.02 contains the only existing South-Western Karaim copy of the Former Prophets and 1–2 Chronicles. Additionally, we should also say that the hectographed edition of the Book of Jeremiah mentioned by Kowalski (1929: lxxviii) was also based on one of Mordkowicz's autographs (see ADub.III.87) and was published in 28 copies in

Halych in 1927. In fact, we know of only a few South-Western Karaim Biblical texts that were not copied by Mordowicz, namely: JSul.I.04 (Book of Job) and JSul.I.50.06 (Book of Esther) which are, by the same token, the oldest known Lutsk Karaim texts, two other manuscripts that contain passages from the Books of Proverbs (JSul.I.38.13 and JSul.I.54.02), and six fragmentarily preserved translations of the Book of Psalms (mss. JSul.I.38.15, JSul.I.38.16, JSul.I.38.17, JSul.I.38.18, JSul.I.38.20, and JSul.I.40.05). Finally, in JSul.I.11 (28 r^o–52 r^o) we find the translation of the Book of Lamentations that we mentioned above, copied in South-Western Karaim by Zecharia ben Chanania Rojecki (born ca. 1849, died ca. 1902) who was, as a matter of fact, a native speaker of North-Western Karaim; he copied this work in South-Western Karaim probably to meet the needs of the members of the Karaim community of Lutsk—of which Zecharia Rojecki was the spiritual leader (probably in the years 1878–1902).

On the other hand, it was Zevulun Rojecki who translated and copied the entire Tanakh into North-Western Karaim. This was done most likely in the last decades of the 19th century. Apart from the works mentioned above, he created manuscripts F305-90 (Latter and Minor Prophets, Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Five Megillot), F305-34 (Jonah), F305-42 (Psalms, Proverbs), F305-79 (Psalms, Proverbs, Ruth, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes; one especially impressive example of Zevulun Rojecki's calligraphic skills), F305-75 (Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes), F305-07 (Five Megillot, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, 1–2 Chronicles), and F305-91 (Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, 1–2 Chronicles).

The contemporaries of Zevulun Rojecki have created several other copies of Biblical texts in the territory of present-day Lithuania. We should mention here, in approximate chronological order, manuscripts ADub.III.85 (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Psalms, Job, Proverbs), JSul.IV.20 (passages from the books of Psalms and Proverbs), ADub.III.88 (Isaiah), RAbk.IV.05 (Job, Song of Songs), JSul.I.51 (Esther), ADub.III.70 (Job), ADub.III.69 (Psalms), and JSul.I.54.01 (Proverbs).

Finally, preliminary research shows that numerous other, most likely 19th- and 20th-century Western Karaim Biblical manuscripts are stored in The Wroblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences in Vilnius, but their exact content, age, place of creation, and the identity of their copyists is still to be determined, see, arranged by accession numbers, for instance, manuscripts F305-08 (some books of Ketuvim), F305-09 (Esther), F305-11 (Haftarot, Jonah), F305-18, F305-19, F305-20 (Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes), F305-31 (Proverbs), F305-36 (Psalms, Proverbs), F305-37, F305-38 (Hallel, Daniel), F305-39, F305-41 (second part: excerpts from Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes), F305-43, F305-44, F305-52, F305-56, F305-58, F305-60, F305-67 (Jeremiah, Song of

Songs), F305-84, F305-89, F305-94, F305-95, F305-131, F305-135 (excerpts from Leviticus), F305-136, F305-142, F305-146 (Ruth), F305-148 (Hallel), F305-149, F305-153, F305-154, and F305-157.

5 A Concise Linguistic Description of Manuscript ADub.III.73

5.1 *Introductory Remarks*

The language of the manuscript exhibits Kipchak Turkic linguistic features and should be classified as Late Middle North Western Karaim (except the syntax which is heavily influenced by Hebrew).³¹ Unlike many existing Eastern Karaim Biblical sources, ADub.III.73 shows no traces of Oghuzic influence.

5.2 *Sound System*

The phonological peculiarities of this manuscript have already been described in a series of earlier publications, see Németh (2014a, 2014b, 2015c, 2020b: 56–99). Here, only its most important features will be highlighted.

Eight vowel phonemes can be distinguished on the basis of the text, see Table 2. We have no philological evidence that would allow us to distinguish between open /e/ (or /ä/) and a closed /é/ in the transcription, although we can hypothesise the existence of the distinction between *é* used predominantly in word-initial syllables and *e* (*ä*) in non-first syllables in Early Middle Western Karaim, see our argumentation in Németh (2020b: 59–64). The lack of orthographic distinction between these two sounds (both *tzere* and *segol* were used to render both the first syllabic and the non-first syllabic E-type vowel) and the unknown extent of external linguistic influence on the Middle Western Karaim sound system (cf. the strong influence of Slavonic idioms which either did not distinguish between these sounds in the respective time period or had a different phonotactic distribution of E-type vowels) forces us to be more cautious in formulating decisive conclusions on this matter.³²

31 An excellent description of Hebrew influences on the syntax of Western Karaim Biblical texts can be found in Olach (2013: 50–212).

32 Examples of Ukrainian phonetic and phonotactic influence on Lutsk Karaim (spoken roughly in the same region where ms. ADub.III.73 was created) were presented by Németh (2011a). For the description of E-type vowels in the respective Slavonic languages, see, e.g., for Polish: Klemensiewicz & Lehr-Splawiński & Urbańczyk (1955: 85–90), Stieber (1962: 42), Smolińska (1983: 32–33), Sicińska (2013: 111–114); for Belarusian: Wexler (1977: 160, 178); for Ukrainian: Ševčuk (2002: 181–185, 713 ff.), Žovtobrych & Rusanivskyj & Skljarenko (1979: 310–311, 327–329).

TABLE 2 Late Middle North-Western Karaim vowels

Functionally front vowels				Functionally back vowels			
High vowels	i	ü		y	u		
Low vowels	e	ö		a	o		
	Unrounded	Rounded		Unrounded	Rounded		

TABLE 3 Late Middle North-Western Karaim consonants

	Bilabial		Labio-dental		Dental		Alveolar		Palatal/pre-velar		Velar/uvular		Laryngeal	
	–	+	–	+	–	+	–	+	–	+	–	+	–	+
Plos.	p <i>p</i>	b <i>b</i>			t <i>t</i>	d <i>d</i>			k	g	k, q	g		
Affr.					cʔ		č <i>č</i>	ž <i>ž</i>	ć	č̣				
Fric.			f <i>f</i> ʔ	vʔ <i>v</i> ʔ	s	z	š <i>š</i>	žʔ <i>ž</i> ʔ	ś	ž	ħ	ğ	ħʔ	h <i>h</i>
Nas.		m <i>m</i>				n				ń		ŋʔ		
Liqu.						l				ḷ				
Trill							r <i>r</i>							
Glide		w <i>w</i>								j				

Among the open questions we shall also mention that we do not know what was the actual phonetic value of the original front labials in non-initial positions in the time the manuscript was written. In word-initial position *ö* and *ü* remained unchanged until the present day, but in other positions these sounds evolved into *o* and *u* with the preceding consonant being palatalized (i.e., ‘*o*’ and ‘*u*’). There were, however, no clear orthographical means to distinguish between *ö* and ‘*o*’, or between *ü* and ‘*u*’. These pairs were written with ⟨*ı*⟩ and ⟨*ı̣*⟩, respectively, with an additional *aleph* if written word-initially, and we cannot determine with certainty whether the letter *yodh* indicated the frontness of *ö*, *ü* or the palatality of consonants in front of ‘*o*’ and ‘*u*’ (see, also, our remarks in Németh 2000b: 64–76). In the interests of clarity, we use *ö* and *ü* in the transcription, in every position, without saying anything conclusive regarding their phonetic value in non-initial position.

Additionally, it is only the position in front of ‘*a*’ (< **e*) where the palatality of the preceding consonant was distinctly indicated by an additional *yodh*. The writing system allows a clear distinction between *a* and *e*, as well as between *a*

written according to the rules of consonant harmony and with word forms in which we see traces of both vowel and consonant harmonies, see, for instance, *bedenelerden* (Lev 1:14) ~ *bedeňálarđan* (Lev 14:30) ‘of the turtledoves’ or *tōra-čílariňa* ‘to the judges’ (Num 25:5) ~ *tōrečilerijize* ‘to your judges’ (Deu 1:16). The manuscript is highly heterogeneous in this respect, which might have been due to the possible use of different manuscripts as references in the translator’s work, see, for instance, the second part of the manuscript, i.e. the Haftarah, which is consistently vocalised according to the regular consonant harmony known from Modern North-Western Karaim. Another interesting phenomenon to observe is the considerable difference between the way in which the text is vocalised before and after folio 280 v^o.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that some of the phonetic and phonotactic phenomena known from Modern Western Karaim are attested in the edited manuscript, which supplies us with valuable data on the chronology of these changes, see:

1. the dissimilation of geminated sonorants, e.g. in *arttyrmanmen* ‘I will not continue’ (Gen 8:21) < *arttyrmammen*, *enli* ‘fifty’ (Gen 6:15) < *elli*;
2. the syncope of high vowels, e.g. in *eksilerinede* ‘for the two of them’ (Exo 26:24) < *ekisilerinede*;
3. the spirantization of the *q* > *ħ* in syllable-closing position, which appears to be documented in the form קִרְבָּן *qyrħkün* ‘a period of forty days’ (Num 14:33): in Németh (2018b: 156) we referred to the use of the letter *qoph* with a *raphe* (ֿ) to indicate fricativeness based on late 18th-century passages of ms. RAbk.IV.15. This is the only example of its use in the manuscript edited in this volume.
4. the labialization of *e*, *i* > *ö*, *ü* in front of *ν*, see, e.g., *čöplöv* ‘gathering’ (Lev 19:9) < *čöplev*, *ölčöv* ‘measure, weight’ (Gen 24:22) < *ölčev*, the labialization of *y*, *i* > *u*, *ü* after *m*, see, e.g. *sajlanmuš* ‘chosen one’ (Num 11:28) < *sajlan-myš*, *tirilmüş* ‘sojourning’ (Gen 17:8) < *tirilmiš*, the labialization of *e* > *ö* in front of a syllable that contains *ö*, e.g. *on ökövlen* ‘(coll.) twelve’ (Gen 42:13) < *on ekövlen*, *ököv* ‘(coll.) two’ (Num 13:23) < *eköv*, *ökövlen* ‘(coll.) two’ (Deu 32:30) < *ekövlen*, *önökövlen* ‘(coll.) twelve’ (Gen 42:32) < *on ekövlen*.

5.3 Morphology

As far as the morphology is concerned, mention should first of all be made of those three Middle Western Karaim categories that became non-productive in Modern Western Karaim and received almost no attention in the scholarly literature.

Firstly, there is the *-p edi-* past tense, first described for Karaim by Németh (2015) as plusquamperfectum II on the basis of 7 examples. It consists of the

-*p* converbial form used with the -*dy* past tense form of *e*- 'to be'. ADub.III.73 includes an additional five more forms to be listed: *qjtybedi* 'had said' (Deu 9:25), *alybedim* 'lit. I had taken' (Gen 12:19), *barybedi* 'lit. had gone' (Gen 24:62), *beklebedi* 'had closed' (Gen 20:18), *qalybedi* 'lit. had ceased' (Gen 18:11). It is well-known from other Turkic languages, see, e.g., Juldašev (1963: 188–198).

Secondly, the manuscript contains 14 examples of -*a-d* ~ -*a-dyr*- verbal forms that express continuative present (conveying continuative, durative and iterative shades of meaning) used to denote an action that takes place at the moment of speech or immediately after it. It comprises the -*a* converbial form used with the -*dyr*- suffix and its abbreviated variant -*d*, which etymologically go back to TkC. *tur*- 'to stand'. This category was first described for Karaim in Németh (2019) based on a thorough morphological and semantic analysis of, among others, the following examples: *aladese* 'if he takes' (Gen 27:46), *arttyradešak* 'if we go on' (Deu 5:25), *biledesej* 'if you know' (Gen 47:6), *bošatmajdesej* 'if you will not forgive' (Exo 32:32), *čejpajdyr biz* 'we are destroying' (Gen 19:13), *ijedesej* 'if you are sending' (Gen 43:4), *ijmejdesej* 'if you are not sending' (Genesis 43:5, Exo 8:17), *klemejdesej* 'if you are not willing' (Exo 4:23, Exo 7:27, Exo 9:2, Exo 10:4), *körüñadi eša* 'if it seems' (Num 22:34), *qajtarmajdesej* 'if you do not give back' (Gen 20:7), *qyladešaj* 'if you deal' (Num 11:15), *tujaqlajdy esede* 'if it parts the hoof' (Deu 14:8). It is well-known from other Turkic languages, see, e.g., Tenišev (1988: 443).

Thirdly, we have found two examples of the -*a-jez*- approximative construction used to convey the meaning that an action is nearly or almost done. It is composed of the -*a* converbial form used with the auxiliary Turkic verb *jaz*- 'to miss (Germ. *verfehlen*)' which in both cases evolved into *jez*- (most probably as a result of an assimilative change), see *keltirejezdij* 'you have almost brought' (Gen 20:9) and *jatajezdi* 'has almost lain' (Gen 26:10). It is well-known from other Turkic languages (see, e.g., Juldašev 1965: 109–111), and its detailed description will appear in Németh (2021).

The following morphological peculiarities are also important to mention:

As far as the participial forms are concerned, the list of examples documenting the Mod.WKar. -*myš* suffix in Zajäckowski's study (1932: 101–102) can be supplemented with four more examples: *körmemüš* 'not seen' (Deu 22:1, Deu 22:4), *sajlanmuš* 'chosen' (Num 11:28), *ündalmiš* ~ *ündalmüš* '1. convocation; 2. representative' (Lev 23:3, Lev 23:27), *berilmüşlar* 'given' (Num 3:9). The use of the suffix suggests that it might have been a productive category at the time the text of the manuscript was composed. Additionally, we can add one further example to the list of words with the unproductive Mod.WKar. participial -*r* suffix presented by A. Zajäckowski (1932: 99–100), namely *bürkünür* 'purifying' (Num 8:7).

Interestingly, the construction comprising the *-ġan* participle of the verb used with the possessive suffix and the *-da* locative—which was used to express an action taking place simultaneously with the action expressed by the verbal stem—is often used in this manuscript in combination with the segment *-čōq*, the exact role of which needs clarification, see, for instance, *čyġarġanlaryndačōq* ‘as they were bringing them out’ (Gen 19:17). This phenomenon was briefly discussed in Németh (2015c: 91–92) on the basis of one form attested in Rut (1:19). Our interpretation was that MNWKar. *-čōq* is a segment which was believed by the copyist to be a particle as a result of misinterpreting the morphologic boundaries of the converbial suff. *-ġačōq*. The latter category forms transgressives indicating an action that ended immediately before or exactly at the moment the action expressed by the main verb took place and it is also abundantly used in manuscript ADub.111.73, see, for example, *kelgečōq* ‘as he came; having come’ (Gen 12:14). We know that the suffix *-ġačōq* is a complex suffix consisting of the segment *-ġač* and the intensifying particle *-oq*,³⁵ but given the fact that both *-ġač* and *-oq* were already non-productive in Middle Western Karaim, it is very likely that the copyist misinterpreted *-ġač-oq* as the dative *-ġa* used with *čōq* and that in his idiolect the latter segment acquired the meaning of an intensifying or corroborative particle (importantly, Simcha ben Chananel is the only user of this construction we know of). As a result, he used this segment with the above-mentioned temporal constructions, i.e. *čyġarġanlarynda* ‘as they were bringing them out’ > *čyġarġanlaryndačōq* ‘(precisely at that moment) as they were bringing them out’. Regardless of the etymology, the context in which the examples listed below appear supports the semantic interpretation of this construction, see: *čyġarġanlaryndačōq* ‘as they were bringing them out’ (Gen 19:17), *čyqqanymdačōq* ‘as I go out’ (Exo 9:29), *ešitkenindečōq* ‘when he heard’ (Gen 24:30, Gen 39:15), *ešitkenlerindečōq* ‘when they heard’ (Gen 34:7), *ešitkanijizdačōq* ‘when you heard’ (Deu 5:23), *ijgenindečōq* ‘when he will let you go’ (Exo 11:1), *juvuġanyjyzdačōq* ‘when you come near’ (Deu 20:2), *kelgenimdečōq* ‘as soon as I come’ (Gen 44:30), *körġenindečōq* ‘when she/he

35 The component *-ġač* is thought to be present in the WKar. *-a-dogoč* < **-a-dur-ġač* converbial suffix (for A. Zajaczkowski’s opinion on this issue, see Németh 2013: 140). The existence of the WKar. specifying particle *-oq* should not be doubted, cf. NWKar. *alajoq* ‘in the same way, by the same token’ < *alaj* ‘thus, this way’ + the particle *-oq* (Lev 10:10, Lev 10:11), SWKar. *אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ alajoqze* ‘in the same way’ (ADub.111.61: 115 r°), and SWKar. *אֵלֶּיךָ oloq* ‘exactly that’ (JSul.111.03: 108 v°; see the glossary in Németh 2020b: 453). In addition, it remains to be seen whether the particle *-oq* is etymologically a part of *andoq* ‘though’ (Num 12:13). For Turkic comparative data and further etymological commentaries see, e.g., Räsänen (1957: 8, 248); Džanmavov (1967: 187–188), Bodrogligeti (2001: 327), and Németh (2013: 131–132, 139–140).

saw' (Gen 39:13, Gen 44:31), *kötürgenimdeçoq* 'when I raised' (Gen 39:18), *olturganyndaçoq* 'when he sits' (Deu 17:18), *sözlegenindäçoq* 'when she spoke' (Gen 39:10), *sözlaşanijizdäçoq* 'when you were speaking' (Deu 5:28), *tügellegenindeçoq* 'when he finished' (Exo 31:18), *tügallağanindäçoq* 'as he was finishing speaking' (Num 16:31).

Also worthy of mention are the perfect conditional mood forms used in the text. Etymologically speaking, it is expressed by the conditional *-sa* forms used with the past tense finite forms of the auxiliary verb *e-* 'to be', i.e. by *-sa edi-*. In Karaim, however, these forms underwent a *-sa edi-* > **-sajedi* > *-sajdy* ~ *-syjdy* shortening process, see e.g. *qyjnasajdylyar* 'lit. if they had oppressed' (Exo 1:12). In the edited manuscript, however, we also find *-sajedi* forms attested that have not been described so far (see, e.g., Musaev 1964: 291–293), see, for instance, *ajtsajedi* 'lit. if he had said' (Gen 31:8), *bersejedi* 'lit. if he had given' (Exo 16:3), *bolsajedi* 'lit. if it had been' (Num 22:28), *bujurulsajedi* 'lit. if it had been commanded' (Exo 34:34), *ölsejedi* 'lit. if he had died' (Gen 38:29), *tyñlasajedij* 'lit. if you had listened' (Gen 23:13), &c. This allows us to interpret the emerging glide *-j-* as an epentetic sound employed to avoid hiatus (*a.e* and *e.e*).

The interrogative particle appears in the forms *-mu* ~ *-mo* ~ *-mö*—the latter variant having been hitherto not documented, see *כיוציומיו küčümö* 'is it his strength?' (Num 11:23) and *טייביולמיו tiivülmö* 'is it not?' (Gen 29:25).

The syncope of the future tense marker *-r-* is very frequent, see, e.g., *arttyrymen* (Gen 3:16) ~ *arttyryrymen* 'I will multiply' (Gen 17:20).

The 1st and 2nd person markers are documented in the form *-men* ~ *-mán* ~ *-min* ~ *-myn* and *-sen* ~ *-śan* ~ *-sin* ~ *-syn*, see, e.g. *etemen* 'I do' (Exo 13:15), *etermán* 'I will do' (Gen 17:21), *eťamin* 'I do' (Deu 8:19), *bošatyrmyn* 'I will forgive' (Gen 18:28), *eteśan* 'lit. you are doing' (Exo 14:15). This shows that the evolution of these morphemes in North-Western Karaim was most likely twofold. On the one hand, as we see here, the MNWKar. *-men*, *-sen* evolved into *-men* ~ *-mán*, *-sen* ~ *-śan*, on the other, however, the personal markers known from present-day Western Karaim evolved as a result of the *-men*, *-sen* > *-myn* ~ *-mín*, *-syn* ~ *-śín* process. The latter set of person markers can hardly be explained phonetically by an evolution from *-men* ~ *-sen* via a *-mán* ~ *-śan* stage.

5.4 Lexicon

The text is rich in Hebrew terms, loanwords, calques, and collocations. These are predominantly religious terms characteristic of Biblical texts (or other religious works textually based on the Tanakh), although there is also a small group of words that are known to appear in other religious (or even secular) works, too. This can be illustrated by the following material (only those Hebraisms are enumerated below that are not listed in KarRPS): *'aceret* 'solemn assembly'

(Num 29:35),³⁶ *aḥbar* 'mouse' (Lev 11:29), *aḥlama* 'amethyst' (Exo 28:19), *aja* 'a bird of prey (probably the falcon)' (Lev 11:14), *anaḥfa* 'heron' (Lev 11:19), *anaqa* 'gecko' (Lev 11:30), *arbe* 'a kind of locust' (Lev 11:22), *aron* '1. Ark; 2. coffin' (Exo 25:21), *ašam* 'guilt offering' (Lev 6:10), *ašera* 'Asherah, idol pole' (Exo 34:13), *avnet* 'girdle' (Exo 28:4), *azniya* 'black vulture' (Lev 11:13), *bet hamiqdaš* 'temple' (Deu 33:19), *bikur(im)* 'firstfruit' (Lev 2:14, Lev 23:17), *bohaq* 'a kind of skin-disease' (Lev 13:39), *cadiq* 'just, righteous' (Gen 18:25), *cara'at* 'leprosy' (Lev 13:12), *cav* 'a kind of a lizard' (Lev 11:29), *cicit* 'tassel' (Num 15:38), *čylčal* 'a species of locust or cricket' (Deu 28:42), *da'a* 'a bird of prey' (Lev 11:14), *daja* 'a bird of prey' (Deu 14:13), *dišon* 'antelope' (Deu 14:5), *duḥifat* 'hoopoe' (Lev 11:19), *efa* 'ephah (a grain measure)' (Lev 19:36), *efod* 'ephod' (Exo 28:4), *El Šadaj* 'God Almighty' (Exo 6:3), *erez* 'cedar' (Lev 14:4), *esron* 'one tenth, tenth part' (Lev 14:10; used as a plural of *isaron*, see Lev 14:21), *galgal* 'globe, celestial sphere' (Gen 10:7; from Medieval Hebrew), *gibeah* 'bald on the forehead' (Lev 13:41), *gid hanaše* 'sinew of the thigh' (Gen 32:33), *hagav* 'grasshopper (?)' (Lev 11:22), *hala* 'cake' (Exo 29:23), *halaf* 'slaughtering knife' (Gen 22:6), *hargol* 'a kind of locust; cricket (?)' (Lev 11:22), *hasid* 'pious' (Deu 33:8), *hasida* 'stork' (Lev 11:19), *hatat* 'sin offering' (Exo 30:10), *hazir* 'pig' (Lev 11:7), *herem* 'thing devoted' (Lev 27:28), *hin* 'hin (a liquid measure)' (Exo 30:24), *holed* 'mole' (Lev 11:29), *homer* 'homer (a name of a dry measure)' (Lev 27:16), *homot* 'a kind of lizard' (Lev 11:30), *hošen* 'breast-plate' (Exo 28:22), *hošen mišpat* 'breastplate of judgement' (Exo 28:15), *janšuf* 'long-eared owl' (Lev 11:17), *jašfe* 'jasper' (Exo 28:20), *jecer* 'character; inclination' (Gen 8:21), *jecer hara* 'evil inclination' (Deu 30:6), *jovel* 'jubilee' (Lev 25:12), *kaporet* 'Kaporet (the cover of the Holy Ark)' (Exo 25:17), *keruv* 'cherub' (Exo 25:19), *kipurim* 'atonement' (Exo 30:10), *kohen gadol* 'High Priest' (Exo 29:30), *kos* 'little owl' (Lev 11:17), *kovaḥ* 'a kind of lizard' (Lev 11:30), *lešem* 'jacinth' (Exo 39:12), *leta'a* 'lizard (?)' (Lev 11:30), *levona* 'frankincense' (Exo 30:34), *log* 'log (a liquid measure)' (Lev 14:10), *ma'arav* 'west' (Gen 12:8), *maca* 'unleavened bread' (Lev 2:5), *maceva* '1. pillar; 2. tombstone' (Gen 28:18), *mamzer* 'bastard' (Deu 23:3), *maror* 'bitter herb' (Exo 12:8), *mašijah* 'Messiah' (Gen 49:10), *micnefet* 'turban' (Exo 28:4), *miḥnesajim* 'dual trousers' (Exo 28:42), *milu'im* 'to be set' (Exo 25:7), *milu'im* 'of ordination' (Lev 8:28), *miqlat* 'refuge' (Num 35:11), *mispaḥat* 'scab' (Lev 13:7), *miškan* 'tabernacle' (Exo 26:7), *mišne* 'copy' (Deu 17:18), *musaf* 'addition, additional thing' (Num 29:39), *nahar* 'Euphrates' (Gen 36:37), *nasi* 'prince' (Gen 17:20), *navi* 'prophet' (Exo 11:3), *navi'a* 'prophetess' (Exo 15:20), *nazir* 'nazirite; consecrated person' (Num 6:2), *neqeva* 'female' (Deu 4:16), *nes* 'sign' (Num 26:10), *neseḥ* 'drink offering' (Gen 35:14), *neteq* 'scab' (Lev 13:32),

36 Only one place of occurrence is indicated for each word, not all of them.

ohel mo'ed 'ten of meeting' (Exo 27:21), *'omer omer* (a dry measure)' (Exo 16:16), *paroḥet* 'curtain, veil' (Exo 26:31), *peḥetet* 'sunken spot (in leprosy)' (Lev 13:55), *peres* 'bearded vulture' (Lev 11:13), *qa'at* 'pelican' (Deu 14:17), *qadašim* 'holy things, holies' (Lev 22:4), *qadeš* 'temple prostitute' (Deu 23:18), *qahal* 'assembly; community' (Lev 4:14), *qarban* 'offering, sacrifice' (Exo 29:18), *qereah* 'bald' (Lev 13:40), *qešita* 'qesitah (old weight of unknown value)' (Gen 31:19), *qodeš* '1. holy; 2. sanctity' (Exo 26:33), *ra'a* 'a bird of prey' (Deu 14:13), *raḥam(a)* 'carrion vulture' (Lev 11:18, Deu 14:17), *raqia'* 'firmament' (Gen 1:20), *sa'a* 'seah, a dry and liquid measure' (Gen 18:6), *saḥir* 'sapphire' (Exo 24:10), *sak* 'amount' (Lev 27:23), *sal'am* 'a kind of locust' (Lev 11:22), *sefer* '1. book; 2. scroll' (Deu 17:8), *sukot* 'booths' (Lev 23:40), *Sukot* 'Sukkot' (Lev 23:34), *ša'atnez* 'shaatnez (cloth woven of wool and linen)' (Lev 19:19), *šabat* 'Sabbath' (Exo 16:23), *šabaton* 'the day of complete rest; complete rest' (Exo 16:23), *šaḥaf* 'seagull' (Lev 11:16), *šalah* *'cormorant' (Lev 11:17), *šatan* 'adversary' (Num 22:32), *Šavu'ot* 'Shavuot' (Exo 34:22), *šeḥela* 'lowland' (Deu 1:7), *šeḥina* 'divine Presence (of God)' (Gen 18:3), *šelamim* '(pl. t.) peace offering' (Exo 24:5), *ševo* 'agate' (Exo 28:19), *šitim* 'acacia' (Exo 25:5), *šmita* 'remission' (Deu 15:2), *šofar* 'trumpet' (Exo 19:13), *šoham* 'onyx' (Gen 2:12), *taḥas* *'porpoise' (Exo 25:5), *taḥmas* 'nighthawk (?)' (Lev 11:16), *tame* 'unclean' (Lev 13:45), *taršiš* *'beryl' (Exo 28:20), *temarim* 'palm trees' (Deu 34:3), *tenufa* 'wave offering' (Exo 29:24), *teruma* 'heave offering, terumah' (Exo 25:2), *tinšamet* 'chameleon' (Lev 11:30), *tinšemet* 'white owl' (Lev 11:18), *totafot* 'frontlet' (Exo 13:16), *tumim* 'Thummim' (Exo 28:30), *urim* 'Urim' (Exo 28:30), and *vadaj* 'surely, certainly' (Num 22:11).

Additionally, an interesting phenomenon to observe is that the meaning of a number of Karaim words has been influenced by the semantic scope of their Hebrew equivalents, see NWKar. *avaz* 'voice' → '1. voice, sound; 2. thunder; 3. rumour' under the influence of BHeb. קוֹל '1. voice, sound; 2. thunder; 3. rumour', NWKar. *avlamaq* 'hunting' → Kar. *avlamaq* '1. hunting; 2. game, quarry' under the influence of Heb. צֹדֵד '1. hunting; 2. game', NWKar. *ber-* 'to give' → '1. to give; 2. to set, to put, to place; 3. to make; 4. to allow' under the influence of Heb. בָּרַךְ '1. to give; 2. to permit; 3. to deliver; 4. to put, to set; 5. to make', NWKar. *čeriv* 'army, troops' → '1. army, troops; 2. war; battle; 3. military service' influenced by BHeb. צָבָה '1. military service; 2. host, fighting men', NWKar. *dunja* '1. world; 2. people' → '1. world; 2. people; 3. eternity, everlastingness' as a calque of Heb. עוֹלָם '1. eternity; 2. world', NWKar. *issin-* '1. to get hot, to warm oneself' → '1. to get hot, to warm oneself; 2. to conceive (said of animals), to copulate' under the influence of Heb. יָחַם 'to be hot; to conceive, to breed', NWKar. *jaman* 'evil' → '1. evil; 2. wretchedness' motivated by BHeb. רָעָה '1. evil, 2. wickedness; 3. misery, trouble', NWKar. *jyjn* 'crowd, gathering; group; host' → '1. crowd, gathering; group; host; 2. army; 3. military service' influenced by BHeb. צָבָה '1. military service; 2. host,

fighting men', NWKar. *qoj-* 'to put' → '1. to put; to make' influenced by Heb. נָתַן '1. to give; 2. to permit; 3. to deliver; 4. to put, to set; 5. to make', NWKar. *quš* 'bird' → '1. bird; 2. (any) flying creature' which is a calque of BHeb. עוֹף '1. fowl, bird; 2. flying creature: fowl, insects', NWKar. *qyl-* 'to do' → '1. to do; 2. to work' influenced by Heb. עָשָׂה '1. to do, to make; 2. to work; 3. to act', and NWKar. *söz* 'word' → '1. word; 2. matter; thing' influenced by Heb. דְּבַר '1. word, speech; 2. matter, affair; 3. business'. The semantic changes shown above were, however, limited to Biblical texts, only.

Good examples of entire expressions being calqued are NWKar. *eki ingirler arasyna* 'at twilight', lit. 'between two twilights' < Heb. בֵּין הַעֲרֵבִים 'at twilight', or *ješillik* 'a kind of fungal disease; probably mildew, mould', lit. 'greenness' < BHeb. יֶרֶקוֹן '1. paleness; 2. mildew' (a derivative of Heb. יֶרֶק '1. (PBHeb.) to become yellow, pale; 2. (Mod.Heb.) to become green').

Finally, there is a group of Karaim derivatives that are based on Hebrew roots, see: *efodla-* 'to put on the *ephod* (on a person)' (Lev 8:7), *hanot et-* 'to enbalm' (Gen 50:2), *haskama qyl-* 'to make an agreement, to agree' (Deu 1:41), *heremli* 'destroyed' (Exo 22:19), *herem et-* 'to devote' (Num 21:2), *maskim bol-* 'to consent' (Deu 13:9), *nīufluq et-* 'to commit adultery' (Exo 20:14), *qodeš et-* 'to sanctify, to consecrate' (Exo 28:38), *šabat tut-* 'to rest; to keep a Sabbath' (Lev 26:34), *šmita qyl-* '1. to let lie fallow; 2. to make a remission' (Exo 23:11), and *zavhy* 'a person that has a discharge' (Lev 15:4).

In addition, there are a relatively large number of Western Slavonic (Polish) and Eastern Slavonic loanwords in the translation, see (in alphabetic order): *ani* 'neither' (Exo 33:20), *belma* 'cataract' (Lev 21:20), *bleha ~ blaha* 'metal sheet' (Exo 39:3, Num 17:3), *bohon* 'loaf' (Exo 29:23), *cynamon* 'cinnamon' (Exo 30:23), *čara* 'cup' (Gen 44:2), *čerep ~ čerepli* 'earthen' (Lev 6:21, Lev 14:50), *dijament* 'diamond' (Exo 28:18), *farst* '(wood-beamed) ceiling; 2. (wood-beamed) wall, side' (Exo 30:3), *fartuh* 'apron' (Gen 3:7), *fleške ~ fleška* 'bottle' (Gen 21:14, Gen 21:15), *galban* 'galbanum' (Exo 30:34), *grunt* 'floor' (Num 5:17), *hote* 'even though' (Gen 48:14), *jovšem* 'all the more' (Gen 3:24), *kajaccet-* 'to repent' (Deu 30:14), *kapusta* 'cabbage' (Num 11:5), *karanja* 'punishment' (Gen 18:29), *karatet-* 'to punish' (Gen 8:21), *kaštan* 'chestnut' (Gen 30:37), *kölendra ~ kölandra* 'coriander' (Exo 16:31, Num 11:7), *kolos* 'ear (of the grain)' (Gen 41:5), *koreń* 'root' (Deu 29:17), *koryta* 'gutter' (Gen 30:38), *krolik* 'rabbit' (Lev 11:5), *krovat* 'bed' (Gen 49:33), *kruh* 'ledge' (Exo 27:5), *kubok* 'cup' (Exo 27:3), *kurpa* 'groats' (Lev 2:14), *lipa* 'linden' (Gen 30:37), *lokot* 'cubit' (Gen 6:15), *loś* 'moose' (Deu 14:5), *mastik* 'mastic' (Gen 37:25), *moroz* 'frost' (Exo 16:14), *myhla* 'mist' (Gen 2:6), *odverja* '1. lintel; 2. pl. side posts; 3. upper door post' (Exo 12:23), *osnova* 'warp' (Lev 13:48), *ozera* 'lake' (Exo 7:19), *pan'va* '(frying) pan' (Lev 2:7), *peč* 'oven' (Lev 2:4), *pečora* 'cave' (Gen 50:13), *perepelice ~ perepelića* 'quail' (Exo 16:13, Gen 15:9), *pole* 'field' (Deu 14:5), *polk*

'company' (Gen 37:25), *polnyj* '(adj.) field' (Lev 14:4), *praunuk* 'great-grandson' (Gen 21:23), *pražma* 'roasted grain' (Rut 2:14), *pripečka* 'stove' (Lev 11:35), *pusta et-* 'to desolate' (Lev 26:31), *pusta jer* 'desert' (Lev 16:22), *qasja* 'cassia' (?) (Exo 30:24), *qoš* 'basket' (Lev 6:8), *quma* 'concubine' (?) (Gen 22:24), *revent* 'willowherb' (Exo 30:34), *rubin* 'ruby' (Exo 28:17), *skala* 'rock' (Exo 17:6), *slavalj* 'renown' (Num 16:2), *smarak* ~ *šmarak* 'emerald' (Exo 28:17, Exo 39:10), *smola* 'pitch' (Gen 6:14), *šnur* 'cord' (Num 3:37), *stol* 'table' (Exo 25:23), *stolp* 'pole, pillar' (Gen 19:26), *stolpec* *'tablecloth' (Exo 25:29), *stupeň* 'step' (Exo 20:26), *sturlap* 'household idol' (Gen 31:19), *styrta* 'stack; heap (of grain)' (Exo 22:5; Rut 3:7), *šipšin* 'prickle' (Num 33:55), *tanec* 'dance' (Exo 32:19), *tôte* 'aunt' (Exo 6:20), *unuk* 'grandson' (Gen 21:23), *utok* 'woof' (Lev 13:48), *véjatet-* 'to winnow' (Rut 3:2), *vina* 'wine' (Num 6:3), *vole* '(anat.) crop' (Lev 11:16), *žalle-* 'to regret; to sympathise' (Deu 13:9), *zasek* 'abatis' (Deu 28:8), *žubrany* 'wisent' (Deu 14:5), *đada* 'uncle' (Lev 10:4). These loanwords are a sign of considerable adstratal influence, which is especially noteworthy in light of the fact that Biblical translations usually tend to be resistant to external influence—except the impact of the language of the original.

6 Orthography, Transcription, and Transliteration

6.1 The Karaim Content

The orthography applied by the copyist is very consistent and complies with the rules and main tendencies described in detail in Németh (2011b: 101–130; 2013c: 260–263).³⁷ It is evident that the edited manuscript was created by a well-educated person trained in the art of copying and calligraphy. Unconventional orthographic solutions are thus quite rare: in fact, the only examples of unusual notation we might mention is the use of the letter *taw* (ת) for /t/ in several words, see, for instance, תַּף *taf* (Gen 31:27), תִּזְדָּא *tüzda* (Gen 4:8), תוּבְדוּגוּ *tuvduğu* (Lev 18:18), אֶכְסִיתִרְמֵן *eksitirmen* (Lev 20:6), יוּבֻטְסָלָר *juvutsalar* (Lev 22:18), תֻּרְגֻן *turgun* (Num 23:18) or כִּוְתִּירִיּוֹלָדִי *kötürüldi* (Num 23:24),³⁸ the use of four letters *yodh* in a row in the words סַאֲיִינִי *sajjyny* (Deu 11:14) and סַאֲיִינִי

37 The orthographical standard applied in this manuscript and the discussion regarding its most important aspects is presented in three works: Németh (2014a: 355–359), Németh (2014b: 113–115), and Németh (2020b: 59–106).

38 In fact, the somewhat strange shape of the letter *taw* in some of these examples suggests that the copyist was forced to correct spelling errors: it seems that in some cases he initially wrote the letter *daleth* (ד) and it was easier for him to alter it into *taw* (ת) than into the expected *teth* (ט).

(Deu 12:17, Deu 14:23)³⁹, the infrequent use of the letter *qof* with *rafe* to denote *h*, e.g. קִרְקִיבֹן *qyrhkkün* ‘fourty days’ (Num 13:34), and the very rare use of *qubutz*, e.g. in צִוְרִימֹן *žurumun* (Num 14:32).

In our edition we have used a uniform phonological transcription that is a suitable system for presenting the linguistic material of three Karaim dialects with markedly different sound systems and linguistic data from markedly different time periods (17th–20th centuries). The transcription employed here reconciles the phonological peculiarities of five historical varieties of Karaim (Middle North-Western, Middle South-Western, Modern North-Western, Modern South-Western, and Eastern Karaim) being, at the same time, convenient for transcribing the Slavonic linguistic data and the content of manuscript Evr I Bibl 143, too. We applied the same transcription in Németh (2020b).

Table 4 below presents the relationship between our phonological transcription and the main orthographical tendencies followed by copyists in the analysed Biblical texts. The following brief explanatory remarks are due here:

We have not distinguished the labial sounds *w* (*w*) and *v* (*v*) in the transcription (see Table 3) given that there is no certainty as to the exact distribution and phonetic status of these sounds. The dental *t* and alveolar *l* are not distinguished in the transcription, either, for the reason that these sounds were positional allophones. For the same reason the velar nasal *ŋ* (the positional allophone of /n/) is not marked in the transcription. We decided to follow the orthography and to distinguish between *h* and *h* in the transcription, but we cannot be certain of the phonemic status of *h* in Middle Karaim: the latter sound appears in Hebrew loanwords only, and it may well be that it served merely an orthographic function. Hence, it is valid to speculate that *h* and *h* merged into *h* in Karaim. Likewise, we decided to distinguish between *q* and *k* in the transcription (as it is differentiated in writing) so as to better understand various phonetic phenomena (especially the phonetics of non-Hebrew loanwords).

Finally, it ought to be mentioned that those North-Western Karaim palatal and palatalized consonants that emerged as a result of the harmony shift were recorded with the same letter with which their non-palatalized equivalents were noted. In these cases, the palatality was marked with an additional *yodh* after the respective letter. However, given that the manuscript contains portions of text reflecting phonological systems from before, after, and during the harmony shift, and since we wished to avoid introducing three different tran-

39 The tendency to avoid (even) three identical letters in a row was described in Németh (2011b: 119–122).

scription systems, we decided to denote the palatality of these consonants only in the following cases:

- 1. if the palatalisation is phonological and
- 2. if the palatal or palatalised nature of the consonant is philologically demonstrable, i.e.: only in the position before *ʾa < e*.

The corollary of the above is that palatality is not indicated before *ö* and *ü*. This is because the manner in which these vowels were written does not give us reliable philological evidence to determine unambiguously whether it is the original front labial *ö* and *ü* or the post-harmony-shift *ʾo* and *ʾu* that we see written in a certain word (see Németh 2020b: 64–76). In other words, the use of *ö* and *ü* in the transcription below does not necessarily mean that the present author, let us emphasize this again, phonetically speaking, reconstructs front labials throughout the manuscript and forgets about the possibility of interpreting them as *ʾo* and *ʾu*, respectively.⁴⁰

TABLE 4 Transcription of the analysed Biblical texts

Transcription	North-Western Karaim	South-Western Karaim	Eastern Karaim
<i>a</i>	init.: Ɑ, Ɱ, Ɐ med.: –, Ɱ, Ɒ, ⱱ, ⱮⱰ, Ɱⱱ fin.: Ɱ, ⱮⱰ, Ɱⱱ, ⱮⱰ, Ɱⱱ		
<i>ä</i>			init.: Ɱ, Ɱ med.: –, Ɱ, Ɒ, ⱮⱰ fin.: Ɱ, ⱮⱰ, ⱮⱰ
<i>b</i>	init.: Ɱ med.: Ɱ fin.: Ɱ		
<i>ḅ</i>	init.: Ɱⱱ med.: Ɱⱱ fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		

40 For an exhaustive discussion on the evolution of Middle Western Karaim front labials see Németh (2020b: 64–76). The treatment of MNWKar. *ö, ü* in this manuscript has also been discussed in Németh (2014a: 356–359; 2014b: 114–115). Finally, it ought to be said that the continuant of the non-first syllabic *ʾa (< *e)* is consistently written with the same vowel points as those used for recording the sound *a (< *a)*, i.e. interchangeably with both *patach* and *qamatz*.

TABLE 4 Transcription of the analysed Biblical texts (*cont.*)

Transcription	North-Western Karaim	South-Western Karaim	Eastern Karaim
<i>c</i>	init.: צ med.: צ fin.: ץ		
<i>ć</i>	init.: צי med.: צי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		
<i>č</i>	init.: צ med.: צ fin.: ץ		
<i>č̣</i>	init.: צי med.: צי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		
<i>d</i>	init.: ד med.: ד fin.: ד		
<i>đ</i>	init.: די med.: די fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		
<i>ǵ</i>		init.: צ, צי med.: צ, צי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>	
<i>ǵ̣</i>	init.: צ, צי med.: צ, צי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		
<i>ǵ̣̣</i>	init.: צ, צי med.: צ, צי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		init.: ג med.: ג fin.: ג
<i>ǵ̣̣̣</i>	init.: צ, צי med.: צ, צי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		
<i>e</i>	init.: א, א, א med.: א, א, א, א, א fin.: א, א, א, א, א, א, א		

TABLE 4 Transcription of the analysed Biblical texts (*cont.*)

Transcription	North-Western Karaim	South-Western Karaim	Eastern Karaim
<i>f</i>	init.: פ, פ med.: פ, פ fin.: פ, פ, ף		
<i>g</i>	init.: ג med.: ג fin.: ג		
<i>ǵ</i>	init.: גי med.: גי fin.: n.d.		
<i>ǧ</i>	init.: ג̃, ג med.: ג̃, ג fin.: ג̃, ג		
<i>h</i>	init.: ה med.: ה fin.: ה		
<i>ḥ</i>	init.: ה med.: ה fin.: n.d.		
<i>ḥ</i>	init.: ח med.: ח, ק̃ fin.: ח		
<i>ḥ</i>	init.: כ med.: כ, כ fin.: כ, ך		
<i>i</i>	init.: אי, אי med.: י, יֵ fin.: י, יֵ		
<i>j</i>	init.: יי, י med.: יי, י fin.: יי, י		
<i>k</i>	init.: כ med.: כ, ק fin.: כ, ק		

TABLE 4 Transcription of the analysed Biblical texts (cont.)

Transcription	North-Western Karaim	South-Western Karaim	Eastern Karaim
<i>k</i>	init.: כִּי med.: כִּי fin.: n.d.		
<i>l</i>	init.: לִי med.: לִי fin.: לִי		
<i>l̃</i>	init.: לִי med.: לִי fin.: n.d.		
<i>m</i>	init.: מִי med.: מִי fin.: מִי		
<i>m̃</i>	init.: מִי med.: מִי fin.: n.d.		
<i>n</i>	init.: נִי med.: נִי fin.: נִי		
<i>ñ</i>	init.: נִי med.: נִי fin.: n.d.		
<i>ŋ</i>			init.: n.d. med.: נִי, נִי fin.: נִי, נִי
<i>o</i>	init.: וִי, וִי med.: וִי, וִי fin.: וִי		
<i>ö</i>	init.: וִי, וִי, וִי med.: וִי, וִי, וִי fin.: וִי		
<i>p</i>	init.: פִּי med.: פִּי fin.: פִּי, פִּי		

TABLE 4 Transcription of the analysed Biblical texts (*cont.*)

Transcription	North-Western Karaim	South-Western Karaim	Eastern Karaim
<i>p</i>	init.: פי med.: פי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		
<i>q</i>	init.: ק med.: ק, כ fin.: ק		
<i>r</i>	init.: ר med.: ר fin.: ר		
<i>r'</i>	init.: רי med.: רי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		
<i>s</i>	init.: ש, ש med.: ש, ש fin.: ס		
<i>s'</i>	init.: שי, סי med.: שי, סי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		
<i>š</i>	init.: ש med.: ש fin.: ש		
<i>š'</i>	init.: שי med.: שי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		
<i>t</i>	init.: ת, ט med.: ת, ט fin.: ט		
<i>t'</i>	init.: תי, טי med.: תי, טי fin.: <i>n.d.</i>		
<i>u</i>	init.: או, אא med.: ו, ו, ֿ fin.: ו, ו		

TABLE 4 Transcription of the analysed Biblical texts (cont.)

Transcription	North-Western Karaim	South-Western Karaim	Eastern Karaim
ü	init.: וי, וי, וי, וי, וי med.: וי, וי, וי, וי, וי fin.: וי, וי		
у	init.: וי, וי, וי med.: וי, וי, וי, וי, וי fin.: וי, וי, וי, וי, וי		
ý	init.: וי, וי, וי med.: וי, וי, וי, וי, וי fin.: n.d.		
y	init.: וי, וי med.: וי, וי fin.: וי, וי		
z	init.: ז med.: ז fin.: ז		
ž	init.: ז med.: ז fin.: n.d.		
ẓ	init.: ז med.: ז fin.: n.d.		
ẓ̣	init.: ז med.: ז fin.: n.d.		

6.2 The Hebrew Content

The Hebrew content of the Torah translation has been transcribed according to the guidelines published by Harviainen (2013), Machcińska (2015), Muchowski (2017), and Khan (2020) even though the conclusions presented in those works primarily concern 19th- and 20th-century standards. Those Hebrew passages that supplement the Karaim translation—i.e., the incipits, the names of *parashot*, the titles of Biblical books, and the colophons—are reproduced in Hebrew letters. In those cases where our commentary required a Hebrew word to be transliterated, it was done according to the system presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5 Transliteration of Hebrew

Letter	א	ב	ב	ג	ג	ד	ד	ה	ו	ז	ח	ט	י	כ	ך	כ	ל
Transcription	ʾ	b̥	b	ḡ	g	d̥	d	h	w	z	ḥ	ṭ	y	k̥	k	l	
Letter	מ	ם	נ	ן	ס	ע	פ	ף	פ	צ	ץ	ק	ר	שׁ	שׂ	ת	ת
Transcription	m		n		s	ʿ	p̄	p		ṣ	ṣ	q	r	š̥	ś	t̥	t
Vowel point	◌ִ	◌ִי	◌ֵ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ	◌ֶ
Transcription	i	ī	e	ě	ē	a	ă	ǎ	ǒ	o	ō	u	ū	—			