

An early North-Western Karaim
Bible translation from 1720.
Part 3. A contribution to the question of the *stemma
codicum* of the Eupatorian print from 1841

Michał Németh

Jagiellonian University in Krakow

Abstract

The present article is an addition to a description of manuscript III-73, which contains the earliest known Western Karaim Torah translation (from 1720) along with the North-Western Karaim translation of four books of Ketuvim (as a Haphtarach) – more precisely, the translation of the Book of Ruth, the Book of Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes and the Book of Esther. The linguistic peculiarities of the Torah were presented in NÉMETH (2014b). The linguistic peculiarities of the Haphtarach, based on an edition of the Book of Ruth, were presented in NÉMETH (2015). This paper, in turn, contains remarks that stem from a comparison of manuscript III-73 to the Eupatorian print – written in Crimean (Eastern) Karaim with some elements of Crimean Turkish – and serves to contribute to discussion concerning the *stemma codicum* of the latter.

Keywords

Karaim philology, earliest Bible translations, North-Western Karaim, Middle North-Western Karaim, the Book of Ruth, the harmony shift, consonant harmony

1. Preliminary remarks

This article is an addition to NÉMETH (2015), in which a manuscript containing the oldest known Western Karaim translation of four books of Ketuvim (from ca. 1720) has been presented¹ – based on the Book of Ruth. In that paper, in

¹ The manuscript in question is stored under the catalogue number III-73 in a private collection in Poland, the owner of which wishes to remain, for the time being, anonymous. It contains a translation of the Torah (1 r^o – 341 r^o) and a Haphtarach (four books

the critical apparatus attached to the North-Western Karaim text, a comparison to the Eupatorian print from 1841 written in Crimean (Eastern) Karaim² and partially also to the Krymchak *Targum* edited by Ianbay & Erdal (1998) has been offered. This paper contains additional remarks that stem from a comparison between manuscript III-73 and the Eupatorian print (referred to as Eup. 1841) and serves to contribute to discussion concerning the *stemma codicum* of the latter.

For the linguistic material, I redirect the reader to NÉMETH (2015), published in this very volume of Karaite Archives – in order to avoid unnecessary repetitions in this article.

2. The Eupatorian translation contrasted to manuscript III-73

2.1. Differences

2.1.1. Dialectal differences

The vast majority of differences constitute more-or-less regular dialectal discrepancies. The most conspicuous are the phonetic differences (in roots and suffixes) between Western and Eastern Karaim (partially being a result of Oghuzic influence, which makes the Eupatorian print and the Krymchak *Targum* presented by IANBAY & ERDAL 1998 more alike than the text in III-73 and the *Targum*), cf. e.g. *aty* ‘his name’ (6)³ vs. *ady* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), WKar. *-men* 1st sg. person marker vs. EKar. *-myn* ~ *-my* ‘id.’⁴, WKar. *-biz* 1st pl. person

of Ketuvim: Book of Ruth (342 r^o – 347 v^o), the Book of Jeremiah (348 r^o – 358 r^o), the Ecclesiastes (358 v^o – 372 v^o), and the Book of Esther (373 r^o – 385 v^o), both copied in Kukizów by Simcha ben Chananiel (died ca. 1720). The four books of Ketuvim could possibly have been translated by the copyist himself. For more information concerning this manuscript see NÉMETH (2014a: 354–355; 2014b: 110–113; 2015).

² See WALFISH (2003: 936 [2.13]). I would like to express my thanks to Prof. Dr. Piotr Muchowski (Poznań) for providing me with digital copies of the relevant folios.

³ Numbers in brackets provided after quoted data indicate line numbers in manuscript III-73. In most cases, only one line number is indicated, even if the word appears multiple times. More than one line number is indicated only if it is for some reason important. The line number allows the reader to identify the verse in which the respective word is attested. Based on the latter, the word or fragment in question can easily be identified in the Eupatorian print.

⁴ The variant *-my* of the latter is attested e.g. in *bolyrmy* ‘will I be?’ and *doguryrmy* ‘will I give birth?’ (Eup. 1841; both in Ruth 1:12) and is very frequent in QB, cf. e.g. *izlärmi* ‘I will seek’ (Proverbs 23:35 on folio 60 v^o).

marker vs. EKar. *-myz* ‘id.’, *bunda* ‘here’ (91) vs. *munda* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *bundan* ‘from this’ (90) vs. EKar. *mundan* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *bu kečani* ‘this evening’ (34, 147) vs. EKar. *bugäčä ~ bugäžä* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841)⁵, *byla* ‘with’ (24) vs. EKar. *bilän* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *ertan* ‘morning’ (174) vs. *ertä* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *jabuštu* ‘to clung to’ (42) vs. *japušty* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *kibik* ‘like, as if (postp.)’ (108) vs. *gibi ~ kibik* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841; the latter variant attested in Ruth 4:7), *oltur-* ‘to sit; to dwell’ (13) vs. *otur-* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *savut* ‘vessel’ (95) vs. *sagyt* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *syjyn-* ‘to take refuge’ (105) vs. *syğyn-* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *šavağat* ‘mercy’ (131) vs. *šagavat* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *tuv-* ‘to be born’ (245) vs. *doğ-* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *ulan* ‘child’ (243) vs. *oğlan* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *üv* ‘house’ (88) vs. *ev* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841). Despite of the Oghuzic features present in the Eupatorian text, the Crimean translation exhibits incomparably more inherited Kipchak features (than Oghuzic ones), cf. e.g. *ber-* ‘to give’ (Ruth 1:6), *bol-* ‘to be’ (Ruth 1:2), *kel-* ‘to come’ (Ruth 1:2) or the optative *-ğaj* presented in 6.2 below.

Quite characteristic is the irregularly applied rounded vs. unrounded vowel harmony in the Eupatorian print, see e.g. *köñlü* ‘his heart’ (Eup 1841: Ruth 2:13), *qujunğun* ‘anoint yourself (imp.)’ (Eup. 1841: Ruth 3:3) vs. *boldy* ‘was’ (Eup. 1841: Ruth 2:17), *dostyn* ‘his friend (acc.)’ (Eup. 1841: Ruth 3:14), whereas it is very regular in III-73 (despite its archaisms), see NÉMETH (2015).

Another group of dissimilarities on dialectal grounds are those of a morphologic nature: we may encounter different uses of both derivative suffixes and grammatical categories, see e.g. so-called negative infinitive, i.e. WKar. *-mas-qa* vs. EKar. *-ma-maq-qa*⁶ attested in *bolmasqa* ‘not to be’ (37) vs. *bolmamaqqa* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841) and *barmasqa* ‘not to go’ (167) vs. *barmamaqqa* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), the inabilityive mood construction, i.e. *bolalma-* used in *bolalmanmen* (< *bolalmammen*) *juluma* ‘I cannot redeem’ (212–213, 215) vs. *al-mamdyr julma*⁷ (Eup. 1841), the comparative *-raq* avoided in the Eupatorian

⁵ Cf., however, *jarymysynda ol kečäniñ* ‘at midnight’ (Eup. 1841: Ruth 3:8).

⁶ Interestingly, according to PRIK (1976: 115) and CHAFUZ (1995: 46) the Eastern Karaim negative infinitive is *-ma-maq*. Perhaps the *-ma-maq-qa* suffix that appears in the Eupatorian translation is a result of a contamination between WKar. *-mas-qa* and EKar. *-ma-maq*?

⁷ Again, different means of expressing the inabilityive mood in Eastern Karaim are described in J. SULIMOWICZ (1972: 62), JANKOWSKI (1997: 17), PRIK (1976: 115) and CHAFUZ (1995: 46). The former two authors found the construction *-(a)j al-ma-* attested in texts they have critically edited, whereas in PRIK’s and CHAFUZ’s grammars the *-(y)p bol-ma-* construction mentioned is used in this role. The two latter categories (i.e. the

translation, see *ačyraqtı maja sizd'an* 'it grieves me much for your sakes' (38) vs. *ačy boldy maņa gajet sizdän artyq* 'id.' (Eup. 1841) or *jačšyraqtı saja* 'he is better to you' (242) vs. *jačšydyr saņa [...] artyq* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), the *-doğaç* converb in *ajtadoğaç* 'saying' (58, 115, 202, 245) replaced non-converbial forms in the Crimean print (in Ruth 1:19, 2:15, 4:4, 4:17), the *-uvču* participle in *turuvču* 'standing' (79) or *olturuvčular* 'those sitting' (203) "replaced" by the *-ğan* participle in *turğan* and *oturğanlar* (Eup. 1841), the *-(a)j + -dir* progressive used in three cases in the Eupatorian translation, see e.g. *da muna Boaz keldi* 'and, behold, Boaz came' (76) vs. *keläjdır* 'and, behold, Boaz is coming' (Eup. 1841), the different derivative suffixes e.g. in *oruvču* 'reaper' (74) vs. *oračy* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *ormaq* 'harvest' (136) vs. *oraq* 'id.', *ölčöv* 'measure' (183) vs. *ölčä* 'id.' (Eup. 1841)⁸ or *tuvdur-* 'to father, to beget' (248) vs. *doğur-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841).

There are also some syntactic differences that seem to reflect dialectal divergence, such as e.g. the different government of the verb *tap-* in the expression meaning 'to find favour in someone's eyes': in III-73 the verb is governed by the locative case, see *tabajym širinlik kozlarında bijimnın* 'let me find favour in the eyes of my Lord' (106–107), whereas in Eup. (1841) the dative case is used in this expression, see *tabajym širinlik közläriñä begim* 'id.'. Another similar example is the government in the expression meaning 'blessed be he' and 'blessed be you' (dat. vs. abl.), see *alğyšlydy ol Adonajğa* (130) vs. *alğyšlydyr YWY-dän* (Eup. 1841), and *alğyšlydyr sen Adonajğa* (166) vs. *alğyšlydyr sen YWY-dän* (Eup. 1841), as well as replacing the locative case with the dative case in *üstujd'a* (182) vs. *üstünä* (Eup. 1841), and the somewhat more frequent use of the indefinite accusative, e.g. in *öluşun [...] satty* 'she sold her share' (200–201) vs. *paj [...] satty* 'id.' (Eup. 1841).

Finally, there is a number of lexical discrepancies that are of dialectal origin, see e.g. *toća etuvču* 'judge' (2–3) vs. *šara'atčy* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *uvul* 'son' (5) vs. *oğlan* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *taxly* (or *taxli*) 'about, approximately' (13) vs. *qadar* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *nek* 'why' (30) vs. *nučun* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *umsunč* 'hope' (34) vs. *musanč* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *toća-* 'to bear' (35) vs. *doğur-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *išan-* 'to

negative infinitive and the inabilitive) are good examples of the linguistic heterogeneity of Crimean Karaim sources.

⁸ The *-a* deverbial nominal derivative suffix is unproductive in North Western Karaim, see ZAJĄCZKOWSKI (1932: 105–106).

hope' (36) vs. *musan-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *astral-* 'to be burried' (51) vs. *köml-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *čuvla-* 'to resound' (57) vs. *muŋra-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *bar* 'all' (57) and *barča* 'id.' (100) vs. *žümlä* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *kučlu* 'powerful, almighty' (60) vs. *qadir* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *tuz* 'field' (73) vs. *tarlov* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *neġar* 'servant' (79) and *qyrqyn* 'maid-servant' (91) vs. *χizmetkar* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *qaruw ber-* 'to answer' (81) vs. *žogap ber-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *juwu-* 'to come closer' (110) vs. *juvuqlaš-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *pražma* 'roasted grain' (112) vs. *ütkan ašlyq* '(?) id.' (Eup. 1841), *ajt-* 'to say' (114–115) vs. *de-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841, otherwise Kar. *ajt-* is used), *ju'aklan-* 'to rebuke with anger' (118; for more information see NÉMETH 2015, paragraph 5.4) vs. *qaqy-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *bu'unčak* 'cloak' (182) vs. *mešpar* 'a cloak-like garment' or 'head-scarf' (Eup. 1841; for more information see NÉMETH 2015, fn. 270), *alyšmaq* 'exchange' (217) vs. *deġiširmäk* 'id.' (Eup. 1841) or *östu'uwču* 'nurse' (244) vs. *daja* 'id.' (Eup. 1841).

2.1.2. Potentially preferential differences

A number of morphologic and syntactic differences are not necessarily dialectal, but may also be preferential.

Preferential, as it may seem, is the lexical difference in case both synonyms in each pair are known in both dialects, cf. e.g. *orun* 'place' (19) vs. *jer* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *hanuz* 'yet' (30) vs. *daġyn* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *er* 'husband, men' (31) vs. *erän* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *ös-* 'to grow' (36) vs. *ulġaj-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *ünd'a-* 'to call somebody' (59) vs. *ata-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *synyqtyr-* 'to harm' (63) vs. *qyjna-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *bašlyġynda* 'in the beginning' (66) vs. *ilkindä* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *uruv* 'family' (68) vs. *mišpaça* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *tan* 'morning' (177) vs. *ertä* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *tynda-* 'to hear' (89) vs. *ešit-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *bujur-* 'to order, to instruct' (93) vs. *symarla-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *özġa* 'another' (90, 139) vs. *özgä ~ öngä* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *ju'ak* 'heart' (157) vs. *könjül* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *uč* 'end, edge' (158) vs. *qyjyr* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *haligiña* 'now' (169) vs. *endi* 'id.' (Eup. 1841) or *erän* 'men' (197) vs. *kiši* 'id.' (Eup. 1841). How preferential these differences may be is visible in case of *tek tur-* 'to rest' (192) vs. *tyňč bol-* 'id.' (Eup. 1841): *tek tur-* is noted only for Eastern Karaim in KarRPS (561; s.v. *məκ*).

Possibly of a preferential nature is the wording and word order difference in e.g. *tuġanginča* 'until the end' (140–141) vs. *tavusylġanynda deġin* (Eup. 1841), *jarty ol kečäda* 'at midnight' (160–161) vs. *jarymysynda ol kečäniň* 'id.' (Eup. 1841), *kertiđan ki* 'it is true' (172) vs. *kerti ki* (Eup. 1841), and *Maxlonnun*

da Kilyonnun ‘of Mahlon and Chilion’ (223) vs. *Kilyonnyn da Maxlonny* ‘of Chilion and Mahlon’ (Eup. 1841).

If we compare the use of the demonstrative pronouns *ol* and *ošol* in the role of definite articles, we can observe that in the Eupatorian print they are very often omitted even if they are used in the Hebrew text. There are 28 instances of this syntactic category in III-73 being used in sentences in which the Eupatorian equivalents lack them. Moreover, based on OLACH’S (2013: 77) research, we know that in the Halych Karaim Bible Translation the construction *osol ol* + a noun in the accusative case appears to serve as an equivalent for a Hebrew word used with the Hebrew definite article ה prefixed with the accusative marker ך. Based on the material edited here, we may preliminarily say that the same is the case with the North-Western Karaim translation performed in Kukizów (see Table 1).⁹ The examples provided below show that in III-73 *ošol* is used to render the Hebr. accusative marker ך (with some exceptions as e.g. in line 131), whereas *ol* reflects the Hebrew definite article. In the Eupatorian print there is no such rule.¹⁰

Line	III.73	Eup. (1841)	Hebrew original
18	ošol ulusun	ulusun	ׁת־עמו (Ruth 1:6)
27	ošol avazlaryn	avazlaryn	קולן (Ruth 1:9)
74	ol oruvčularnyn	oraqčylarnyn	הקצרים (Ruth 2:3)
109	ol ašamaq vaχtta	aš vaχtyna	לַעֲת הָאֶבֶק (Ruth 2:14)
131	da qyldy tiril̄arbyla	ol tiril̄ar bil̄an	אֶת־הַחַיִּים (Ruth 2:20)
134	Rut ol Moavly	Rut ol Moavly	רוּת הַמּוֹאָבִיָּה (Ruth 2:21)
136	ošol bar ol ormaqny	žümlä ol oraqny	אֶת כָּל־הַקְצִיר (Ruth 2:21)

⁹ According to OLACH’S (2013: 77) investigation in Trakai Karaim Bible translations, the construction *ošol ol* never appears in the above-mentioned constructions. The question remains whether the term Trakai Karaim used in her work also covers the North-Western Karaim used in Kukizów.

¹⁰ May it remain only a preliminary supposition that the lack of correspondence between the Hebrew and the Karaim text in this respect in the Crimean print might be the result of different translating process, namely, that the Eupatorian text was created based on existing Karaim translations (in which there is no significant functional difference between *ošol ol* and *ol* in these constructions), rather than on the Hebrew original.

Line	III.73	Eup. (1841)	Hebrew original
146	ošol yndyrjn	yndyrjn	אָתֵּגְרִין (Ruth 3:2)
149	ol yndyrġa	ol yndyrġa	הַגְּרִין (Ruth 3:3)
151	ošol ol orunnu	ol jerni	אָתֵּהֶמְקִים (Ruth 3:4)
167	šavaġatyjn ol sondraġyny	sonraġy šaġavatynny	חֻסְדֵּי הָאֵהָרֹן (Ruth 3:10)
179	ošol dostun	dostyn	אָתֵּרֵעֵהוּ (Ruth 3:14)
187	ošol barča ne	žümlä ne	אֵת כָּל־אִשָּׁר (Ruth 3:16)
200	öľušun tuzñun	paj ol tarlovnyj	חֶלְקֵת הַשְּׂדֵה (Ruth 4:3)
221	qartlarġa	ol qartlarġa	לְקַנִּים (Ruth 4:9)
224	ošol Rutnu ol Moavly qatynny	Rut ol Moavlyny	אָתֵּרֹת הַמֹּאֲבִיָּה (Ruth 4:10)
229	Ošol ol qatynny	qatynny	אָתֵּהָאִשָּׁה (Ruth 4:11)
231	ošol üvün Israelnin	žama'atyn Israelniñ	אָתֵּבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל (Ruth 4:11)
235	ošol Rutnu	Rutnu	אָתֵּרֹת (Ruth 4:13)
241	ošol pirligijni	pirligijni	אָתֵּשִׁבְתֶּךָ (Ruth 4:15)
243	ošol ol ulanny	oġlanny	אָתֵּהַלְלֶךָ (Ruth 4:16)
248	ošol Xečronnu	Xečronnu	אָתֵּחַזְקֶנּוּ (Ruth 4:18)
249	ošol Ramny	Ramny	אָתֵּרְכֶם (Ruth 4:19)

Table 1. Examples of the use of the demonstrative pronouns *ol* and *ošol* in the role of definite articles in III.73 and Eup. (1841) – in comparison with the Hebrew original

In manuscript III-73, quite characteristic is the use of an additional personal, reflexive or demonstrative pronoun (above all in phrases in order to reinforce the use of the respective possessive suffix and, in some cases, to disambiguate the translation, which seems to be a result of Slavonic influences; see also NÉMETH 2015 for further details), see e.g. *qatyny anyn* ‘his wife’ (5) vs. *qatyny* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *kelinlari anyn* ‘her daughters-in-law’ (16) vs. *kelinläri* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841; the latter form theoretically also means ‘their daughter-in-law’), *jalyj senin* ‘your reward’ (104) vs. *jalyñ* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *ajtty Naami alarġa* ‘Naomi said them’ (29) vs. *ajtty Naami* ‘and Naomi said’ (Eup. 1841), *qajtyqyn*

senda ‘return you too’ (45) vs. *qajtqyn* ‘return’ (Eup. 1841), *ulusun özüñun* ‘his people’ (18) vs. *ulusyn* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841), *qajda ki ölsaj anda ölärmän* (50) ‘Where you die, there will I die’ vs. *qajda ki ölsäj ölärmän* ‘Where you die, will I die’ (Eup. 1841). The Krymchak *Targum* stands closer to Eup. (1841) in this respect, but the preferential nature of these differences seems to be supported by the fact that in a number of other cases the Krymchak *Targum* stands lexically closer to manuscript III-73 than to Eup. (1841), cf. e.g. *tuzd’a* ‘in the field’ vs. *tarlovda* ‘id.’ (Eup. 1841) and Krmch. *tüzde* ‘id.’ (IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 18 [sentence 163]).

2.1.3. Different translation

In some fragments, the differences are not based on synonymy or dialectal divergence, but reflect differences in translation strategies.

It is, for instance, very characteristic of the analysed manuscript III-73 that its author complemented the text with additional personal names (used in the role of subject and indirect object, altogether 12 times) in order to disambiguate the translation. In all these cases, the personal names are neither in the Hebrew original nor in the Eupatorian print, cf. e.g. *Da ajtty Naami Rutqa* ‘and Naomi said to Ruth’ (43) vs. *Da ajtty* ‘And she said’ (Eup. 1841), or *da ajjty anar Naami* ‘and Naomi said to her’ vs. *da ajjty anar* ‘and she said to her’ (Eup. 1841).

The ambiguity of the Hebrew source resulted in translating Hebr. כנף ‘1. wing; 2. skirt; corner, end’ differently, cf. *qanatyjny* ‘your wing’ (164) vs. *etäginni* ‘your skirt’ (Eup. 1841). This is the case most probably in Ruth (1:20), where Hebr. מרר ‘bitter’, is rendered *ačy žanly* ‘heavy-hearted; literally: bitter-hearted’ (60; the same is in the Krymchak *Targum*) vs. *Mara*, i.e. a personal name in Eup. (1841); cf. also *ačy* ‘bitter’ in E-P (see SHAPIRA 2014: 170).

In altogether 28 instances, words of slightly different meanings were used in the two translations, cf. e.g. *ačlyq* ‘famine’ (3) vs. *qytlyq* ‘crop failure’ (Eup. 1841), *juvuq er* ‘kinsman’ (67) vs. *biliš er* ‘acquaintance’ (Eup. 1841), *nerša* ‘matter’ (191) vs. *söz* ‘word’ (Eup. 1841), *bar-* ‘to go’ (193) vs. *čyqty* ‘to leave’ (Eup. 1841), *qatyn* ‘woman’ (235) vs. *qyz* ‘girl’ (Eup. 1841), etc.

2.2. Similarities and conclusions

If we expressed in numbers the differences between the translation of the Book of Ruth found in manuscript III-73 and the translation published in the

Eupatorian print, the total would be seemingly large.¹¹ But if we take a closer look at the structure of the two texts, it becomes clear that they are close enough to each other to say that the manuscript which constituted the base for the Eupatorian print must have been somewhat related to the analysed manuscript. In fact, the Eupatorian print gives the impression of its being a reworked Western Karaim translation in which those words, grammatical forms, or fragments that sounded unfamiliar were replaced by their Crimean Kipchak Karaim¹² equivalents (cf. e.g. such traces of Ottoman influence as e.g. *žümle*, *değişir-*, *doğur-*, etc.); nevertheless, the structure of the text remained mostly the same. The two verses presented below, Ruth (2:10) and (4:7), underpin this claim:

III.73	Eup. (1841)
Da tuštü jüzlari üstünä başurdu jergä da ajtty anar ne üçün taptym širinlik közlarijda tanyma meni da men jat <u>qatyn men</u> . (Ruth 2:10)	Da tüštü jüzlari üstünä başurdu jergä da ajtty anar ne uçun taptym širinlik közlariñä tanyma meni da men jat. (Ruth 2:10)
Da bu <u>kečimnäk</u> edi <u>avalđan</u> Israeldä ol <u>julu-maq</u> üçün da ol <u>alyšmaq</u> üçün qajjam etmä <u>bar</u> soznü suvururedi kiši etigin da beriredi dostuna da bu edi ol <u>šarajat</u> Israeldä. (Ruth 4:7)	Da bu <u>resim burun</u> Israeldä ol <u>julu</u> uçun da ol <u>değişirmäk</u> uçun qajjam etmä <u>žümlä</u> söznü suvururedi kiši etigin da beriredi dostuna da bu edi ol <u>tanyqlyq kibik</u> Israeldä. (Ruth 4:7)

Table 2. Ruth (2:10) and (4:7) in III.73 and Eup. (1841)¹³

¹¹ In my notes, I have listed more than 400 differences between the translations (without listing differences based on the application of rounded vs. unrounded vowel harmony or being the result of regular phonetic diversification).

¹² For this variety of Karaim, see e.g. JANKOWSKI (2015: 204ff.).

¹³ Cf. the very similar translation in the Krymchak *Targum*: *Da düštü jüzlari üstüne da baş urdu jerge, da ejtti oña, ne bu taptym širinlik közleriñde tanymağa meni, da men jabanžy [çalqan qyzlaryndan moavnyñ] (Ruth 2:10; see IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 18 [sentences 195–196]).* The second sample sentence, however, is constructed differently, cf. *Da bu adet kibik ol vaqta, ki evelden adetlenir edi Jisraelde vaqta ki [...] julularlar edi da değiş eterler edi [...], da qajjam eterler edi žümle bir šij, teşer edi kiši jenini oñ qolunuñ, da uzatyr edi onuñ ilen qinjan joldaşyna, da bulaj adetlenirler edi satyn almağa, žemaaty Jisraelniñ [...]* (Ruth 4:7; see IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 22–23 [sentences 425–434]).

Obviously, there are verses that exhibit many more differences, cf.:

III.73	Eup. (1841)
<p>Alarǵamo <u>iřangajdyjyz neginča</u> ki <u>oškajlar</u> alar <u>üčünmo zabun bolǵajdyjyz bolmasqa er-artyna qylmajyz bunu qyzlarym ki ačyraqtı maja sizdan</u> ki čyqtı maja <u>xyřšymy Adonajyn</u>. (Ruth 1:13)</p>	<p>Alarǵamy <u>musanyrsyz deginča</u> ki <u>ulǵajǵajlar alarǵamy kečigirsiz bolmamaqqa ergä joq qyzlarym ki ačy boldy maña gajet sizdan ar-tyq</u> ki čyqtı maña maja <u>xyřšymy YWY-nyñ</u> (Ruth 1:13)</p>
<p>Da ajtty Rut <u>jadatmaǵyn</u> maja kemiřma seni qajtma artyndan ki <u>anča qajry</u> ki barsaj <u>bar-yrmen</u> da qajda ki qonsaj qonarmen <u>ulusuj senin ol bolur ulusum da Tenrij senin ol bolur Tenrim</u>. (Ruth 1:16)</p>	<p>Da ajtty Rut <u>jalbarmaǵyn</u> maña kemiřmä seni qajtma artyndan ki <u>qajda</u> ki barsaj <u>barymyn</u> da qajda ki qonsaj qonarmen <u>ulusyn ulusym da Tanryñ Tanrym</u>. (Ruth 1:16)</p>

Table 3. Ruth (1:13) and (1:16) in III.73 and Eup. (1841)¹⁴

Still, the differences in the great majority of cases are can be reduced to common dialectal differences (see 2.1.1) or are simply preferential (see 2.1.2). Discrepancies that would allow us to assign the two sources to two different translation traditions, i.e. differences constituting distinct translation strategies, are not numerous (see 2.1.3). Finally, it must be remembered that these two translations were prepared almost 120 years apart, and the Eupatorian translation must have been adjusted to the requirements of what was then the current tempora.

Obviously, we must also keep in mind that the relatively small linguistic distance between these two translations might be also explained by the fact that both translators could have been working on the same Hebrew source.

¹⁴ Interestingly, the Krymchak versions of Ruth (1:13) and (1:16) are much different, too, cf. *Belki olarǵa siz toqtajyrsyz čaq ki öseler, [...] eger olar üčün siz oturumusyz baǵlylar, olmamaq üčün evlengenler erge, ažytmegejsiz žanymny, ki ažydir maña artyq sizden, ki čyqtı mende xyřšym alyndan yeya-nyñ* (Ruth 1:13; IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 16 [sentence 76–84]) and *Da ajtty Rut qaherletmegejsin meni, tařlamaǵa seni qajtmaǵa ardyndan [...] žümle nege ki varsaj varajym [...] žümle jerde ki qonsaj qonajym [...] řalqyñ olajym [...] Tanryñ oldyr Tenrym* (Ruth 1:16; IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 16 [sentence 93–113]).

This is especially visible if we compare both of them with the Krymchak *Targum* edited by IANBAY & ERDAL (1998).¹⁵ The latter exhibits different linguistic solutions, but mostly with reference to the commentaries added to the original text – otherwise the structure of the text is in many cases very similar to the Karaim translations. The reason for this structural closeness still awaits a thorough investigation, even if we admit that there are obviously verses which are almost completely different from the translation we see in the other two Karaim versions, see e.g. Ruth 1:13, 1:16, 2:7, 2:12, etc. It might be, for instance, very interesting to compare the Krymchak *Targum* with some of the early translations of the Bible into Ottoman Turkish (on these, see e.g. KNÜPPEL 1999, 2000–2002, 2002) – this might cast some additional, valuable light onto the way Biblical texts were translated.

As we said, however, the relatively small linguistic distance between the two Karaim versions of the Book of Ruth and the large number of typically Western Karaim features we find in the print (see below) rather suggest that the Eupatorian translation of the Book of Ruth was prepared based on an earlier Western Karaim version or an Eastern Karaim manuscript that was, again, patterned on a Western Karaim original (e.g. based on the one copied by Jaakov ben Mordechai in 1672 as claimed by POZNAŃSKI 1916: 88 and SHAPIRA 2013: 134–141; 157–158). Western Karaim pattern might be the explanation of the “archaisms” noticed by GORDLEVSKIJ (1928: 87–88) in the Eupatorian print (he contrasted it with some other Eastern Karaim manuscripts). In this case, the Book of Ruth would be another portion of the Eupatorian edition linked with Western Karaim sources after SHAPIRA’S (2013) attempt to prove a similar point with reference to the Book of Nehemiah (see SHAPIRA 2013: 134–141; 157–158). He claims that the language of the Eupatorian edition was “not a new translation, but rather a hasty attempt to Tatarize – or even vulgarize – earlier translations existing in manuscripts” and that the editors “took the ones written in Karaim language brought apparently from Łuck and/or Kozow” (SHAPIRA 2003: 696; 2013: 134). Our view is basically the same, even if I see a lack of decisive philological evidence that would support the idea

¹⁵ A comparison of the text of two Eastern Karaim translations of the Book of Ruth with the Krymchak *Targum* was presented by SHAPIRA (2013: 165–170). One of the referential manuscripts is termed “a MS from Troki (?)” in SHAPIRA’S article (2013), which gives the deceptive impression that the text might be written in North-Western Karaim, which is not the case.

hidden behind “Tatarizing”, the “hasty attempts” and the “artificial language tailored for a hallowed purpose” (see SHAPIRA 2013: 178) he mentions. I find JANKOWSKI’S (2009: 508) opinion, i.e. that “at least some manuscripts employed by the editors [of the Eupatoria Bible] were written in North-Western Turkic Karaim, but the editors ‘modernized’ the language in many passages, bringing it closer to Crimean Turkish” much more balanced or at least better formulated.

Proving the North-Western roots of the translation of the Book of Ruth in Eup. (1841) seems feasible in light of the linguistic data. Besides the far-reaching structural similarity mentioned above, we also see that in Eup. (1841) a number of North-Western Karaim lexemes and morphemes occur that are not recorded in Eastern Karaim texts or are rather not characteristic of them, cf. e.g. WKar. *bašaq* ‘ear of a grain’ (Ruth 2:2; see *kolos* of Slavonic origin in line 71 of III-73; see also KarRPS 109), absent from the reliable Eastern Karaim dictionaries I know of, i.e. from AQTAY & JANKOWSKI (2015), ÇULHA (2006), LEVI (1996), and CHAFUZ (1995)¹⁶, or the 3rd person present optative *-ğaj* suffix (being rather not characteristic of Eastern Karaim, see e.g. PRIK 1976: 145–146; CHAFUZ 1995: 61–62; JANKOWSKI 1997: 16) used even if there is an imperative or perfect conditional mood form in the respective place in III-73, see e.g. *qylğyn* ‘do’ (231) vs. *qylğajsyn* ‘may you do’ (Eup. 1841), *atağyn* at ‘be famous’ (232) vs. *atağajsyn* at ‘may you be famous’ (Eup. 1841), *atalsyn aty* ‘his name be famous’ (239) vs. *atalğaj aty* ‘may his name be famous’ (Eup. 1841), *ki ajtsajdym* ‘if I should say’ (33) vs. *ki ajtqajmyn* ‘in order me to say’ (Eup. 1841).

All in all, the stemma codicum of the Eupatorian edition deserves a detailed and meticulous investigation, especially since we know that its language is not homogeneous (see e.g. JANKOWSKI 2009: 508). I hope, however, that this humble contribution will bring us at least one small step closer to final conclusions.

Abbreviations

abl. = ablative; **acc.** = accusative; **dat.** = dative; **Hebr.** = Hebrew; **imp.** = imperative; **Kar.** = Karaim; **Krmch.** = Krymchak; **pl.** = plural; **postp.** = postposition; **sg.** = singular; **WKar.** = Western Karaim.

¹⁶ I have no access to Sinani (1970, 2007).

References

- AQTAY, Gulayhan & JANKOWSKI, Henryk. 2015. *A Crimean Karaim–English Dictionary* (= *Prace Karaimoznawcze* 2). Poznań.
- CHAFUZ, Mark Èzrovič. 1995. *Russko-karaimskij slovař. Krymskij dialekt*. Moskva.
- ÇULHA, Tülay. 2006. *Karaycamın Kısa Sözcükleri. Karayca–Türkçe Kısa Sözlük* (= *Dil ve Edebiyat Dizisi* 6). İstanbul.
- GORDLEVSKIJ, Vladimir Aleksandrovič. 1928. Leksika karaimskogo perevoda Biblii. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR* [Leningrad], 87–91.
- IANBAY, Iala & ERDAL, Marcel. 1998. The Krimchak Translation of a *Targum Šeni* of the Book of Ruth. *Mediterranean Language Review* 10, 1–53.
- JANKOWSKI, Henryk. 1997. A Bible translation into the northern Crimean dialect of Karaim. *Studia Orientalia* 82, 1–82.
- JANKOWSKI, Henryk. 2009. Translations of the Bible into Karaim. *Religion Compass* 3/4, 502–523.
- JANKOWSKI, Henryk. 2015. Crimean Turkish Karaim and the old north-western Turkic tradition of the Karaites. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 68/2, 199–214.
- KARPS = BASKAKOV, N.A., ŠAPŠAL, S.M., ZAJONČOVSKIJ, A. (eds.). 1974. *Karaimsko-russko-poľskij slovař. Słownik karaimsko-rosyjsko-polski*. Moskva.
- KNÜPPEL, Michael. 1999. A(da)lbert Bobowski und seine osmanisch-türkische Bibelübersetzung. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 110, 251–259.
- KNÜPPEL, Michael. 2000–2002. Zum Problem der türkischen Bibelübersetzung des Hans Ungnad von Sonneck (1493–1564). *Journal of Oriental and African Studies* 11, 150–168.
- KNÜPPEL, Michael. 2002. Die christlich-türkischen Transkriptionstexte bei Hieronymus Megiser (um 1553–1619). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der türkischen Bibelübersetzung. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 113, 237–245.
- LEVI, Boris Zacharovič. 2005. *Russko-karaimskij slovař. Krymskij dialekt. Urus-qaraj sözlük*. Simferopol.
- NÉMETH, Michał. 2014a. A historical phonology of Western Karaim. The evolution of consonant harmony in the north-western dialect. *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis* 131/4, 353–369.
- NÉMETH, Michał. 2014b. An Early North-Western Karaim Bible Translation from 1720. Part 1. The Torah. *Karaite Archives* 2, 109–141.

- NÉMETH, Michał. 2015. An Early North-Western Karaim Bible Translation from 1720. Part 2. The Book of Ruth. *Karaite Archives* 3, 49–102.
- OLACH, Zsuzsanna. 2013. *A Halich Karaim translation of Hebrew biblical texts* (= *Turcologica* 98). Wiesbaden.
- POZNAŃSKI, Samuel. 1916. Karäische Kopisten und Besitzer von Handschriften. *Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliographie* 19, 79–122.
- PRIK, Ołga Jakovlevna. 1976. *Očerok grammatiki karaimskogo jazyka. Krymskij dialekt*. Machačkala.
- SHAPIRA, Dan. 2003. The Turkic languages and literatures of the East European Karaites. In: Polliack, M. (ed.). *Karaite Judaism. A guide to its history and literary sources*. Leiden, Boston, 657–728.
- SHAPIRA, Dan. 2013. The Karaim translation of the Book of Nehemia copied in the 17th century's Crimea and printed in 1840/1841 at Gözleve, on the copyist of the manuscript, and some related issues. *Karaite Archives* 1, 133–198.
- SHAPIRA, Dan. 2014. A New Karaite-Turkish Manuscript from Germany: New Light on Genre and Language in Karaite and Rabbanite Turkic Bible Translations in the Crimea, Constantinople and Elsewhere. *Karaite Archives* 2, 143–176.
- SINANI, Zacharij Osipovič. 1970. *Kratkij slovař razgovornogo jazyka krymskich karaimov [rukopiš]*. Simferopol [non vidi].
- SINANI, Zacharij Osipovič. 2007. *Karaimsko-russkij i russko-karaimskij slovař razgovornogo jazyka*. Simferopol [non vidi].
- SULIMOWICZ, Józef. 1972. Materiał leksykalny krymskokaraimskiego zabytku językowego (druk z 1734 r.). I. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 35/1, 37–76.
- Targum* see IANBAY, Iala & ERDAL, Marcel.
- WALFISH, Barty Dov. 2003. Karaite Press and Printing. In: Polliack, M. (ed.). *Karaite Judaism. A Guide to its History and Literary Sources*. Leiden, Boston, 925–962.
- ZAJĄCZKOWSKI, Ananjasz. 1932. *Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodniokaraimskim. Przyczynek do morfologii języków tureckich. Les suffixes nominaux et verbaux dans la langue des Karaims occidentaux. Contribution à la morphologie des langues turques* (= *Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej* 15). Kraków.

Handwritten sources and old prints

III-73 = Handwritten, vocalised translation of the Torah, the Book of Ruth, the Book of Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes, and the Book of Esther into north-western Karaim from Kukizów from 1720 (the Torah) and ca. the 1720s (the other books). Written in North-Western Karaim. Kept in a private archive whose owner wishes to remain anonymous.

E-P = A manuscript that formerly belonged to the Elyashevich-Babadjan (*Ельясевич-Бабаджан*) family. The manuscript is lost. A fragment of it is edited in SHAPIRA (2014).

Eup. = A four-volume edition of the Tanakh in Crimean Karaim (with some elements of Crimean Turkish); printed in Eupatoria (Gözleve) in 1841.

QB = A manuscript that contains the translation of the Psalms, the Proverbs, the Book of Job, the Book of Daniel, the Book of Ezra, and the Book of Nehemiah; held formerly by the Karaim Library (so called Qaraj Bitikligi) in Eupatoria under the shelf number 1084.

Acknowledgement

This project was financed by the National Science Centre (Poland), grant number 2011/03/D/HS2/00618.

Michał Németh, PhD, assistant professor at the Institute of Linguistics, Jagiellonian University in Kraków, currently an Alexander von Humboldt Research Fellow at the Seminar für Orientkunde, Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz. His main interests lie in historical linguistics and etymology. He authored more than 30 articles and 3 books, including *Unknown Lutsk Karaim Letters in Hebrew Script (19th–20th Centuries). A Critical Edition* (Kraków, 2011) and *Zwięzła gramatyka języka zachodniokaraïmskiego z ćwiczeniami* [= A Concise Grammar of Western Karaim with Exercises] (Poznań, 2011). His recent research concentrates on Karaim historical phonology and morphology, critical editions of Karaim handwritten sources, and the history of the Hungarian lexicon.