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Abstract
The present article is a continuation of 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 – 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). This paper, in turn, contains a linguistic description of the Haphtarah – in particular a critical edition of the Book of Ruth and its comparison (in the critical apparatus) with the Book of Ruth as printed in the Eupatorian Tanach in 1841. Importantly, the two parts of manuscript III-73, i.e. the Torah and the Haphtarah, as tentatively notified in NÉMETH (2014b), are very much different from a linguistic point of view, and for this reason they are presented separately. Finally, observations that stem from a comparison between the manuscript fragment edited here and the Eupatorian print will be presented in the third part of this series of articles, since they primarily concern the Eupatorian print rather than manuscript III-73.
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1. Preliminary remarks
This article is a continuation of NÉMETH (2014b), in which the oldest known Western Karaim translation of the Torah (from 1720) was presented. As was noted in that paper (see p. 110), the language of the manuscript is inconsistent: the linguistic features of the Torah copied on the first 341 folios is very much
different or, more precisely, much more archaic, than that of the Haphtarah copied on folios 342–385. The analysis performed in Németh (2014a, b) allowed us to say that the translation of the Pentateuch originates from a period prior to the so-called harmony shift, i.e. the process which transformed the original vowel harmony into a so-called consonant harmony (described also as syllabic harmony; see Csató 1995, 1999; Nevins & Vaux 2004; Stachowski 2009; for a detailed description based on philological data see Németh (2014a)), whereas the Haphtarah fragments – or more precisely: four books of Ketuvim, see below – were translated in the post-harmony-shift era. In other words, based on this manuscript we can say that 1720 is the terminus ad quem, marking the end of the above-mentioned process (see also Németh 2014a: 363–364).

The second part of the manuscript will be presented below.

2. The manuscript, the translator, and the copyist
The manuscript edited here is stored in a private collection in Warsaw, Poland, the owner of which wants to remain anonymous. Its catalogue number is III-73 and it was described in detail in Németh (2014b: 110–113). It should be repeated here that the translation of the Torah was copied by Simcha ben Chananiel1 in 5480 A.M., between the 15th of Adar Sheni and the 23rd of Iyar, i.e. between 25 March and 31 May 1720 A.D. This information is written in the colophon (folios 340 v° – 341 r°) that closes the translation of the Torah. This means manuscript III-73 contains the earliest known Western Karaim translation of the Torah, which is in compliance with Kowalski’s (1929: xx) experience, namely that the oldest Western Karaim manuscripts he had occasion to see were from the first half of the 18th century.2

---

1 As asserted by Kizilov (2009: 53, 378), Simcha ben Chananiel died in the 1720s. He officiated as hazzan in the community of Kukizów from 1709 until his demise.

2 According to A. Zajączkowski (1964: 793) and W. Zajączykowski (1980: 160) there has existed a Karaim tradition of translating Biblical texts orally since the “13th, 12th or even 11th centuries”, but this piece of information still needs to be verified. Additionally, W. Zajączykowski (1980: 160–161) mentions that the earliest South-Western Karaim Bible translations date back to the 16th century, which also must remain, for the time being, an unconfirmed piece of knowledge. Finally, W. Zajączykowski (1980: 161) mentioned that the oldest North-Western Karaim Bible translations date back to the first half of the 18th century, which is in compliance with the age of the sources we know of today.
The four books of Ketuvim in the second part of the manuscript were copied on folios that follow the colophon mentioned, which means they must have been copied somewhat later than the Torah. But since we know that the whole manuscript was copied by the same person using the same paper and ink, and that Simcha ben Chananiel passed away in the 1720s, this part of the manuscript cannot be much younger. The above also suggests that the copyist must have used different sources during his work, and that this is the reason for the manuscript’s linguistic heterogeneity.

However, we might find another explanation for this linguistic heterogeneity which was not mentioned in NÉMETH (2014b). We know that Simcha ben Chananiel was not only a prominent copyist but also a prolific translator of Hebrew religious texts into Karaim. For instance, I am aware of 18 religious hymns (so-called pijutim) translated by him. But, more importantly, he also prepared a translation of the Book of Lamentations, i.e. another book of Ketuvim besides those copied in the present manuscript, i.e. the Book of Ruth (342 ro – 347 vo), the Book of Jeremiah (348 ro – 358 ro), the Ecclesiastes (358 vo – 372 vo), and the Book of Esther (373 ro – 385 vo). In light of the latter, it seems very plausible that it was Simcha ben Chananiel who translated and copied the Haphtarah part in this manuscript, and that he – sit venia verbo – “specialized” in translating the books of Ketuvim, or, above all, The Five Megillot. For the time being, however, there is no firm evidence that would confirm this assumption.


4 The copy of the latter is stored in the Józef Sulimowicz Collection in Warsaw under the catalogue number JSul.I.11 (see folios 24 ro – 33 vo, 33 vo – 39 vo, 39 vo – 45 ro, 45 vo – 49 vo, and 49 vo – 52 ro; the information that Simcha ben Chananiel authored the translation is written in the Hebrew heading on folio 28 ro). The manuscript itself originates from 1878 and contains different types of texts copied by three persons. The Book of Lamentations was copied by Zecharia ben Chanania Rojecki (born 1851).

5 The manuscript does not contain the Song of Songs, which would be the fifth book of The Five Megillot translated by Simcha ben Chananiel.
3. Transcription used in the critical edition

3.1. Introductory remarks

Here, I will use a transcription system similar to that applied in Németh (2014b). The differences are minor and stem from the fact that the phonological system of the text of the Haphtarah is much closer to present-day Karaim than it was the case in the Torah translation described in the first part of this work.

Obviously, even though the language of the Haphtarah translation is less archaic, some phonetic features must still remain uncertain, and therefore I cannot use the phonetic transcription I used in editions of texts not older than the second half of the 19th century. The transcription applied here, in some of its aspects, must also remain conventional with some question marks left.

In the critical apparatus I will compare the analysed manuscript with the Crimean Karaim translation of the Book of Ruth printed in 1841 in Eupatoria in a complete Tanakh edition, the language of which is still little known (see also Jankowski 2015: 203). Where reasonable, in order to present the text in a bit larger comparative perspective I will compare it also with the Krymchak Targum edited by Ianbay & Erdal (1998) without, however, going into detail, for this would greatly lengthen the article and because a preliminary comparison was showed made by Shapira (2014). In order not to introduce three different transcription systems, I will use a unified one in which every symbol has one and the same phonetic value. In particular, I use $j$ to indicate the palatal approximant, $ä$ for the e-type vowel in non-first syllables in the Crimean Karaim texts written with $pattāh (\mathring{\circ})$ (cf. Jankowski 1994), and $\eta$ for the velar nasal consonant.

3.2. Open questions and the solutions chosen

3.2.1. Labial vowels: $ö$, $ü$ vs. $'o$, $'u$

We cannot be sure what was the actual phonetic value of the original front labials ($ö$ and $ü$) at the time the text was translated or copied. We know that,

---

6 The Tanakh printed in Eupatoria (Gözleve) in 1841 is the only printed edition of the whole Karaim Bible, for more details see Jankowski (2009: 505–506, 508). It is my pleasure to express my thanks to Prof. Dr. Piotr Muchowski (Poznań) for making me the digital copies of the relevant folios available.
generally speaking, in the north-western variant of Karaim, e, ö, and ü changed into a, o, and u, respectively, and the consonants that preceded them became palatalized (for the sake of simplicity I use the symbols 'a, 'o, and 'u to note a, o, and u in this position; for a detailed description of this process see NÉMETH 2014a: 364–366). Since in writing, Karaims did not distinguish between ö and 'o, and ü and 'u (both pairs were written with ‹וֹי› and ‹וּי›, respectively, with an additional aleph in word-initial position; the letter yodh was used to distinguish them from o and u), there is no certainty as to whether we are reconstructing ö and ü or 'o and 'u in this text in the place of the original *ö and *ü. However, given that in all four books of Ketuvim we see the e > 'a change has already taken place7 (except the first syllable, as is the case in Modern North-Western Karaim), there is some reason to assume that the same could have happened with ö and ü, i.e. that these processes occurred at roughly the same time. In the transcription below, therefore, 'o and 'u are used to note *ö and *ü in non-first syllables (as is the case, again, in Modern North-Western Karaim), which does not necessarily mean that this was their actual phonetic value at the time the text was translated or copied. The notation is phonemic.

3.2.2. The palatality of consonants

In the transcription below, the palatality of consonants is indicated only in the event that it is a phonemic feature, i.e. if the respective consonant stands before 'a, 'o, or 'u.

In Modern North-Western Karaim, according to consonant harmony, almost all consonants of a word form must agree with each other with respect to their palatality or lack thereof (see NÉMETH 2014a: 353–354 for exceptions). But as far as the language of the analysed Haphtarah translation goes, there is no evidence that would tell us whether in words affected by the harmony shift, if consonants in positions other than before 'a, 'o, and 'u were palatalized or not; in particular, we have no evidence to prove that in these words every consonant in word-final position, word-initial position before e, or in clusters was palatalized at the time the text was translated or copied. Moreover, indicating the palatality of those consonants that were most probably palatalized due to phonotactic rules (e.g. k, g, and l were most probably palatalized before e, i, *ö

7 In writing, the distinction between a and 'a, as well as between a and e is clear and consistent; for details see NÉMETH (2014b: 114–115).
and *ü according to general Turkic phonotactics) would result in a transcription system in which some features of a phonetic rather than phonological nature would have been indicated, while some would not. For this reason, a simplified phonemic transcription is used in this respect.

3.2.3. The phonetic value of *q
The original *q is transcribed as q in every position for the same reasons as presented in Németh (2014b: 116).

3.2.4. The value of the letter yodh in 1st and 2nd pl. person markers
In the transcription, the original forms -biz and -siz (not -byz ~ -biz and -syz ~ -siz) are used in the 1st and 2nd plural person markers, respectively, for the same reasons as presented in Németh (2014b: 116).

4. The sample linguistic material: the Book of Ruth

4.1. Introductory remarks
For the sample material presented below, I have chosen the shortest book – the Book of Ruth. Importantly, from a linguistic point of view, it is fully representative; I have not encountered any major linguistic differences between the four books of Ketuvim. The English translation is based on the King James Bible 2000 and on the English Standard Version, and follows the Karaim translation as closely as possible.

As it has been already mentioned, in the apparatus I also present an exhaustive comparison of the analysed text with a Crimean Karaim translation of the Book of Ruth to be found in the fourth volume of the Tanakh published in Eupatoria (Gözleve) in 1841 (see Walfish 2003: 936 [2.13]); I will indicate it with the abbreviation Eup. (1841) in the footnotes. Finally, in some instances, I will compare it with the Krymchak Targum edited by Ianbay & Erdal (1998); I will indicate with Targum the data taken from the latter source.

Observations that stem from a comparison of the language of the manuscript III-73 to the Eupatorian print will be presented in detail in a separate article (Németh 2015b).

I decided to refrain from an additional comparison with the transliteration of another Crimean Karaim translation of the first chapter of the Book of Ruth
presented by Shapira (2014), based on a manuscript that formerly belonged to the Elyashevich-Babadjan (Ельяшевич-Бабаджан) family (= indicated as E-P below) This is, first of all, because Shapira’s (2014: 167–170) source is very similar to the Eupatorian print – as asserted by Shapira (2014: 174) himself. Secondly, only the first chapter is transliterated by Shapira, without any detailed commentary, and the facsimile provided (the manuscript has been lost). Thirdly, the transliteration contains a number of misprints and erroneous readings.8

In this comparison, I will not indicate phonetic differences if they are the result of the regular historical diversification of dialects, including the difference in applying the rounded vs. unrounded vowel harmony. If a comment concerns a fragment longer than one single word, the respective fragment will be enclosed in half square brackets, i.e., ….

4.2. Transcription

Ruth 1:1–22
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{2} [2] דָּאֵדְיָה וּבִימְלְתַּרְיֶנֶּ-ָּרָא | olordın ol olorda etuv-

{3} [3] ţulärnin da edi aĉlyq10 jerda da bardy kışi Bet

{4} [4] Lýemindän Jehudanyn tırïlna tüşündä11 Moavnyn ol

8 Since Shapira could not provide a facsimile of the manuscript he worked on, and did not comment on any unusual phonetic features, I can merely suppose that the following forms are mistakenly quoted in the transliteration and are not clerical errors in the original manuscript (Shapira’s transliteration is quoted in angle quotation marks ‘…’): page 167: ‘Bet Lëhem-an-dan’ (= Bet Lýemindän), ‘ṭayralma’ (= tırïlmä); page 168: ‘danin’ (= dağyn), ‘alarna’ (= alarğa), ‘birnanjizga’ (= birgänjizgä), ‘birnama’ (= birgämä), ‘birgay’ (= bergäj), ‘tancliq’ (= tynčlyq), ‘yayladilar’ (= jyladylar), ‘birnaqa’ (= birgänä), ‘birnama’ (= birgämä), ‘bolanilar’ (= bolğaqlar), ‘dagnem’ (= dağnyny); page 169: ‘mosanirsiz’ (= musanırsyz), ‘keçenirsiz’ (= keçiğirsiz), ‘yayladilar’ (= jyladylar), ‘yalvarmaiń’ (= jalbarmağyn), ‘tayilde’ (= tyyjyldy or tijıldï), ‘karcä’ (= barčä).

9 Standard Hebr. שפט ‘when the judges’ (Ruth 1:1; King James 2000). Writing waw in place of the vowel point ḥōlām was a common practice among Karaims, also in translations into Eastern Karaim.


11 Eup. (1841): tüzlärindä.
da qatyn anyn\textsuperscript{12} da eki uvullary\textsuperscript{13} anyn\textsuperscript{14}. Da aty\textsuperscript{15} ol kişinin Elimeleχ da aty\textsuperscript{16} qatynynyn Naami da aty\textsuperscript{17} eki uvullarynyn\textsuperscript{18} Maχlon da Kilyon Efratlılar Bet Leşeminđan Jehudanyň da keldılar tuzuña\textsuperscript{19} Moavnyn da boldular anda. Da öldü Elimeleχ eri Naaminin da qaldy ol da eki uvullary\textsuperscript{20} anyn\textsuperscript{21}. Da aldylar özlıarińa Moavly qatynlar aty\textsuperscript{22} ol birisi\{nin\}\textsuperscript{23} Arfah da aty\textsuperscript{24} ol ekinčisinin Rut olturdular\textsuperscript{25} anda on jyllıχy\textsuperscript{126}. Da ölduler dağyn eksılarıda\textsuperscript{27} Maχlon da Kilyon da qaldy ol qatyn tuv eki uvullaryndan\textsuperscript{29} da tul\textsuperscript{30} erin. Da turdu ol da kelinleri anyn\textsuperscript{31} da qajtty tuzuńdan\textsuperscript{32} Moavnyn ki esitti tuzunda Moavnyn ki

\textsuperscript{12} Eup. (1841): this word is absent. Cf. \textit{Targum}: this word is absent (IANBAY \& ERDAL 1998: 15), see our commentary regarding the use of additional pronouns in III-73 in chapter 6.2.2 below.

\textsuperscript{13} Eup. (1841): oğlanlary.

\textsuperscript{14} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.

\textsuperscript{15} Eup. (1841): ady; E-P: aty, see SHAPIRA (2014: 167: 'aṭi').

\textsuperscript{16} Eup. (1841): ady; E-P: aty, see SHAPIRA (2014: 167: 'aṭi').

\textsuperscript{17} Eup. (1841): ady; E-P: aty, see SHAPIRA (2014: 167: 'aṭi').

\textsuperscript{18} Eup. (1841): oğlanlarynyň.

\textsuperscript{19} Eup. (1841): tüzlärină.

\textsuperscript{20} Eup. (1841): oğlanlary.

\textsuperscript{21} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.

\textsuperscript{22} Eup. (1841): ady; E-P: aty, see SHAPIRA (2014: 167: 'aṭi').

\textsuperscript{23} The form \textit{birisin} was amended by the copyist on the right margin. Eup. (1841): \textit{birsin}iŋ.

\textsuperscript{24} Eup. (1841): edi, i.e. probably a misprint; E-P: aty, see SHAPIRA (2014: 167: 'aṭi').

\textsuperscript{25} Eup. (1841): oturdylar.

\textsuperscript{26} Eup. (1841): jyl qadar; E-P: jyl tägli, see SHAPIRA (2014: 167: 'yil teğli'). For NWKAR. \textit{tägli} cf. Kar. tekli ~ Ekar. \textit{tägli} 'around, about' (KarRPS 560, 562); see also line 120 and chapter 5.4 below.

\textsuperscript{27} Eup. (1841): ekisi.

\textsuperscript{28} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.

\textsuperscript{29} Eup. (1841): oğlanlaryndan.

\textsuperscript{30} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.

\textsuperscript{31} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.

\textsuperscript{32} Eup. (1841): tüzlärindän.
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{18}  [18] sugyndy Adonaj ošol³³ ulusun özünü³³ berinña alarğa
{19}  [19] öțnâk³³. Ñztr. Da çyqty ol orundai³³ ki edi

33 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
34 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
35 Shapira (2014: 168) suggests a k > t shift here (cf. SWKar. ekmek 'bread') and attributes it, although not without reservation, to Halych Karaim. This supposition, however, lacks any grounds: there is no k > t shift in Halych Karaim.
36 Eup. (1841): jerdän.
37 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
38 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
39 Eup. (1841): evinä.
40 Eup. (1841): şagavat.
41 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
42 Missing in Shapira’s (2014: 168) transliteration of the E-B manuscript.
43 Eup. (1841): bilän.
44 Eup. (1841): birgämä.
45 Eup. (1841): evinä; E-P: evindä, see Shapira (2014: 168: ‹evinda›).
46 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
47 Eup. (1841): qajtyrmyz.
48 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
49 Eup. (1841): nućun.
50 Eup. (1841): dağynmy.
51 Eup. (1841): this word is missing.
52 Eup. (1841): oğlanlar qursaqymda da.
53 Eup. (1841): eränlärğä.
{33} [14] dym bolmaqtan erartyña54 ki ajtsajdym55 bardy56
{34} [15] maja umsun57 daqyn bolsajdym58 bu kečani59 erar-
{35} [16] tyna60 da daqyn tofaşajdim61 uvullar62, ḫel.
{36} [17] Alargamo ışangajdyyz63 neginča64 ki öşkajlar
{37} [18] alar üčunmo zabun bolqajdyyz65 bolmasqa erarty-
{38} [19] na qylmajyz bunu qylzarym ki aţiqaqty maja sizdan66
{39} [20] ki čyqty maja yuşşymy Adonajyn. ḥevi.
{40} [21] Da körtündär avazzaryn da jyladylar dagny da
{41} [22] {{catchword:}} öptu
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{43} [2]  Da ajtty „Naami Rutqa69 muna
{44} [3] qajtty kelin ulsunsa da qulluguna Tenris-
{46} [5] Da ajtty Rut jadatmağyn72 maja kemişiňa seni

54 Eup. (1841): ergä.
55 Eup. (1841): ajtqajymy; E-P: ajtqaj edim, see SHAPIRA (2014: 169: ‹aytkay edim›).
56 Eup. (1841): bardyr.
57 Eup. (1841): musanč.
58 Eup. (1841): bolymmyńy.
60 Eup. (1841): kişiģä.
61 Eup. (1841): doğuryrmyńy.
62 Eup. (1841): oğlanlar.
63 Eup. (1841): musanyrsyz.
64 Eup. (1841): deginčä. Cf. Targum: čaq ki (IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 16 [sentence 76])
65 For more information on this verb, see chapter 5.4 below.
66 Eup. (1841): ulğajğalär alargamy kečiģirsz bolmamaqqa ergä joq qyzlarym ki aţi boldy maja gajet sizdan artyq.
67 Eup. (1841): qajnąnasyn.
68 E-P: japtuşuşty, see SHAPIRA (2014: 169: ‹yapuşši›).
69 Eup. (1841): this fragment is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 1:15). Cf. Targ-
    gum: this fragment is absent (IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 17 [sentence 89]).
70 Eup. (1841): Taŋrysyna.
71 Eup. (1841): artynandan kelindaşynynñ.
72 Eup. (1841): jalbarmağyn.
{47} [6] qajtmaartyjdan kiančaq١٣٨٧ qajry٩٤ ki٩٥ barsaj baryr-
{48} [7] men٦٦ da qajda ki qonsaj qonarmenً ulusuj senin
{50} [9] ٓQajda ki ölśaj anda٧٨ ölärmen٧٩٩ da
{51} [10] anda astralyrmen٧٠ bulaj qylğaj Adonaj٨٦ da bulaj
{52} [11] arttyrğaj ki ančaq٨٢ ol ölüm ajyry arama
{53} [12] da araja. Ṣaw. Da korđu ki kučajdi
{55} [14] ٔDa bardylar eksilariđa٢٨٤ kelgänliña
{56} [15] dejin Bet Leχemđa da edi kelgänliרindaçoq١٨٥ Bet
{57} [16] Leχemđa da čuvlady١٨٧ ol šahar١٨٩ alar üçun
{58} [17] ajtadoğa١٨٨ bumodur Naami. ٢٨٣٢[20]
{59} [18] Da ajttyalar ça undañaj men١٨٩ Naami ça undajiz

٧٣ Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
٧٤ Eup. (1841): kajda.
٧٥ E-P: ta (if not a misprint in Shapira’s transliteration then perhaps used as an intensifying or generalizing particle), see Shapira (2014: 169: ›ta›).
٧٦ Eup. (1841): barymyn; E-P: vararmyn, see Shapira (2014: 169: ›vararmin›). The reduction of the -r- future tense marker in the abbreviated verbal forms appears in both South- and North-Western Karaim, too, see Németh (2011a: 33; 2013b: 272).
٧٨ Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
٧٩ Cf. Targum: žümle nege ki ölęŋ öleyim (Ianbay & Erdal 1998: 17 [sentence 121]).
٨٠ Eup. (1841): kömüfürmin.
٨١ Eup. (1841): YWY maŋa.
٨٢ Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
٨٣ Eup. (1841): tyjylly (or: tijildi) sözlä�; E-P: tyjylly (or: tijildi) sözlä�maktan, see Shapira (2014: 170: ›tayıldi [sic!] sozlamaıtan›).
٨٤ Eup. (1841): ekisî.
٨٥ For an exhaustive commentary on this form see 5.5 below. Eup. (1841): kelgänlärı gibi.
٨٦ Eup. (1841): munrady.
٨٧ Eup. (1841): žümłä, for this phonetic shape of this word see also Aqtay & Jankowski (2015: 107); E-P: barçâ, cf. Shapira (2014: 170: erroneously ›karča‹). Significantly, the form žümłä is characteristic of the Pentateuch translation printed in 1832–1835 in Istanbul (see Walfish 2003: 935), the language of which should rather be termed as Crimean Turkish, see Jankowski (2015: 207). Cf. Targum: žümle (Ianbay & Erdal 1998: 17 [sentence 135]).
٨٨ Eup. (1841): üstläринä da ajttïlar.
٨٩ Eup. (1841): atamanyz maŋa.
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Ruth 2:1–23

{67} [5] ... Da Naamiğa ḏi juvuq eri-
{68} [6] ṇa kişi tuvušlu bağa草y uruvundan104 Elimeleynin da
{69} [7] aty anyn105 Boaz. Ṇişiş. Da ajtty Rut ol Moav-
{70} [8] ly qatyn106 Naamiğa baraym endi ol tüzüg da Ĝıp-
{71} [9] Ľajim ǳoloslar kimartyna107 ki tapsa širinlik kozla-

---

90 Eup. (1841): atañyz maña Mara, cf. Hebr. קְּרֶאןָ לִי מָרָא ‘call to me Mara’ (Ruth 1:20); E-P: atañyz maña ačy, see SHAPIRA (2014: 170: ‘ataŋiz maŋa ači›). Cf. Targum: čaqyryńyz maña aźy ḏanly (IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 17 [sentence 139]).
93 Eup. (1841): tolu berdim da boš qajtardy.
94 Eup. (1841): nučun atarsyz mağa.
95 Eup. (1841): qyjnady.
96 Eup. (1841): qadir.
97 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
98 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
99 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
100 Eup. (1841): ki qajtty.
101 Eup. (1841): tüzlärindän.
102 Eup. (1841): ilkindä orağynyny.
103 Shapira’s (2014) transliteration ends here.
105 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
106 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
{72} [10] rinđa¹⁰⁸ anyn¹⁰⁹ da ajtty anar Naami¹¹⁰ barğyn qyzym.
{74} [12] artynadan ol¹¹² oruvčularductory¹¹³ da učraldy¹¹⁴ učuru anyn¹¹⁵
{75} [13] ,ki keldi ülüşuña ol tůznuñ ki Bozanyn ki uruvun-
{76} [14] dan¹¹⁶ Elimeleyñin. Da muna Boaz keldi¹¹⁷ Bet
{77} [15] Leýemðan da ajtty oruvčularþa¹¹⁸ ,boluþuluğu¹¹⁹ Adonaj-
{78} [16] nyn birgajizga da ajttıylar anar algýslağaj seni Adonaj.
{79} [17] ˪ ki keldi ǖlū uńa ol uńunu ki Bozanyn ki uruvun-
{80} [18] ýa oruvčular qatyna kimnindi ol jigit qatyn
{81} [19] oșpu¹²². ˪ Da qaruv berdi¹²³ ol ,negar ol turuvçu
{82} [20] ol oraqčylar qatyna¹²⁴ da ajtty Moavly qatyangy²²⁴ ol
{83} [21] ki ajtty Naami ,byla tůzündan¹²⁶ Moavnyn. ˪
{84} [22] {{catchword:}} Da ajtty
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{85} [1] Da ajtty ēoplañim endi ,da jyştyrajym kultälar
{86} [2] arasyna ol oruvcuł artyna¹²⁶ da keldi da turdu

¹⁰⁸ Eup. (1841): közlärinä.
¹⁰⁹ Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
¹¹⁰ Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 2:2). Cf. Targum: this fragment is absent (IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 18 [sentence 161]).
¹¹¹ Eup. (1841): tarlovda, for this phonetic shape (i.e. for -o-) see also AQTAY & JANKOWSKI (2015: 386). Cf. also chapter 5.4 below (s.v. ölčou). Cf. Targum: tüzde (IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 18 [sentence 163]).
¹¹² Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
¹¹⁴ Eup. (1841): učrady.
¹¹⁵ Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
¹¹⁶ Eup. (1841): paj ol tarlovmyñ Boazññ ki mişpaçasyndan.
¹¹⁷ Eup. (1841): keläjdir.
¹¹⁸ Eup. (1841): oraqčylarlyga.
¹¹⁹ Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
¹²¹ Eup. (1841): turğan ol oraqčylar üstinä kimniydir ošbu qyz.
¹²³ Eup. (1841): oğlan ol turğan ol oraqčylar üstinä.
¹²⁴ Eup. (1841): quzdyr.
¹²⁵ Eup. (1841): bükün tüzlärindän.
¹²⁶ Eup. (1841): da toplajim kütälärädä artynadan ol oraqčylarññ.
{89} [5] Da ajtty Boaz Rutka muna tynlağyn[129] qyzym barmagyn
{97} [13] başurdu jerga da ajtty {anar}[139] ne üčun taptym
{98} [14] širinlik kožlarijda[140] tanyma meni da men jat qatyn
{100} [16] anlatyma anlatyldy maja barča ne[143] ki qyldyj qajnaj
{102} [18] anajny da tuvmuş jerijni[146] da bardyj ulusqa ki

127 The first letter of the word is covered by ink stain.
129 Eup. (1841): eşittiŋ.
130 Eup. (1841): tarlovda.
132 Eup. (1841): xizmetkarlarym bilän.
133 Eup. (1841): tarlovda.
134 Eup. (1841): artlaryndan.
136 Eup. (1841): susasaŋ, for this phonetic shape of EKar. suvs-a- ‘to get thirsty’ see also Aqtay & Jankowski (2015: 365).
137 Eup. (1841): sağytlarğa.
138 Eup. (1841): neden ki tartarlar ol oğlanlar.
139 Added by the copyist in the right margin.
140 Eup. (1841): közlärinjä.
141 Eup. (1841): this fragment is absent.
142 Eup. (1841): şoğap.
143 Eup. (1841): şümldä.
144 Eup. (1841): this fragment is absent.
145 Eup. (1841): ölgənindän sonra.
146 Eup. (1841): da jerin tuwuqyunuğ.
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{106} [1] ne anyn¹⁵². Da ajtty ḓ特派áal ³tabajym širinlik
{107} [2] ḓקזגלאקניאככ bijimmin¹⁵⁴ ki uvuttuj meni da ki şozladij
{108} [3] ḓזעיו unleash your heart da men ḓneq bolmajm¹⁵⁶ birisi kibik¹⁵⁷
{110} [5] aşamaq vaχtta juvuğun beri¹⁵⁸ da ašagyn ol öţñaak-
{111} [6] ḓץו da mančqyn tigimijnii sirkaça da ḓolturdu
{112} [7] janynda ol oruvčularnyn da orţu anar pražma¹⁵⁹
{113} [8] da aşady da tojdu da qaldyrđy. ḓםיד. Da
{114} [9] turdu ḓопләмäna da ḓбуจรرد Boaz neğarłariña aj-
{115} [10] tadoğač dağyn ol külţalar arasyna jyştyrsyn da

¹⁴⁸ Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
¹⁴⁹ Eup. (1841): tügäl qatyndan.
¹⁵⁰ Eup. (1841): YWY Taŋrysynynŋ.
¹⁵¹ Eup. (1841): syğynma.
¹⁵² Eup. (1841): tibinä şexinasynyn.
¹⁵³ Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 2:13). Cf. Targum: this word is absent (Ianbay & Erdal 1998: 19 [sentence 219]).
¹⁵⁴ Eup. (1841): közläriŋä beğiim.
¹⁵⁵ Eup. (1841): köŋlü üstunä.
¹⁵⁶ Eup. (1841): bolmamdyr.
¹⁵⁷ Eup. (1841): gibì.
¹⁵⁹ Eup. (1841): oturdy jandyndan oraçağlarńyn da sundy anar ütkän ašlyq; the form ütkän in Eup. (1841) is obscure; its equivalent in the Targum is qavurulan un ‘parched flour’ (Ianbay & Erdal 1998: 19 [sentence 233], 30) or ‘roasted flour’ (see Rebi 2004: 124 for the meaning ‘to roast’ qavur-). Cf. our commentary in 5.4 on pražma.
¹⁶⁰ Eup. (1841): symarlady Boaz (Border triggered arasy from another grabb) ol kültälärńiŋ çöpläsa da ujältmanyz any.
{117} [12] suvurujuz\textsuperscript{161} anar ol kultărđan\textsuperscript{162} da kemișijiz da
{118} [13] jyştyrsyn\textsuperscript{163} da juřaklanňajiz anyn üstüňa\textsuperscript{164}.
{119} [14] sıphilə. Da çoplədi tuzda\textsuperscript{165} ol ingırgedejin
{120} [15] da qaqtı ošol ne\textsuperscript{166} ki çoplədi da edi\textsuperscript{167} əfah təxly
{121} [16] arpalar\textsuperscript{168}. əşiňə. Da aldy\textsuperscript{169} da keldi ol şahar-
{122} [17] ǧa da ǭordu ąqjanasy ošol\textsuperscript{170} ne\textsuperscript{171} ki çoplədi da čyгар-
{123} [18] dy da berdi anar ąošol ne ki\textsuperscript{172} qaldyrdy tojmagyndan\textsuperscript{173}.
{124} [19] ńadij buğun da qajda jyştyrdyj\textsuperscript{174} bolğaj tanyvčuj\textsuperscript{175}.
{125} [20] algyşly da anlatty qajnasyna\textsuperscript{176} ošol\textsuperscript{177} ki jyştyrdy\textsuperscript{178}.
{127} [22] {{catchword:}} birgəsiňa
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{128} [1] birgəsiňa da ajtty aty ol kișiinin ki jyştyrdym\textsuperscript{181}
{129} [2] ąany qatyna\textsuperscript{182} {buğun}\textsuperscript{183} Boaz. əşiňə. Da ajtty Naami

\textsuperscript{163} Eup. (1841): çöpläsın.
\textsuperscript{164} Eup. (1841): qaqymaŋyz.
\textsuperscript{165} Eup. (1841): tarlovda.
\textsuperscript{166} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
\textsuperscript{167} Eup. (1841): boldy.
\textsuperscript{168} Eup. (1841): kebič teğli arpa.
\textsuperscript{169} Eup. (1841): kötär디.
\textsuperscript{170} Eup. (1841): qajnanasy ol.
\textsuperscript{171} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
\textsuperscript{172} Eup. (1841): ol ki.
\textsuperscript{173} Eup. (1841): tojganynndan.
\textsuperscript{174} Eup. (1841): qajnanasy.
\textsuperscript{175} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
\textsuperscript{176} Eup. (1841): qyldyn.
\textsuperscript{177} Eup. (1841): tanyşyn.
\textsuperscript{178} Eup. (1841): qajnanasya.
\textsuperscript{179} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
\textsuperscript{180} Eup. (1841): qyldy.
\textsuperscript{181} Eup. (1841): qyldym.
\textsuperscript{182} Eup. (1841): birgəsimä.
\textsuperscript{183} Added by the copyist in the right margin.
 keliniña alǵyšlydy 184 ol Adonajğa 185 ki kemišnadi

šavağatyn 186 da qyldy tirifärbyla da ölülar byla-

da 187 da ajtty anar Naami juvuqtu 188 bizğa ol

kişi geçegəlarımizdandır 189 ol. رطم. Da

ajtty Rut ol Moavly qatyn dağyn ki ajtty maja

ol 190 ki menim jabušqun ıneginčä ki tü-

gafiagaʃlar oʃol bar ol ormaqny 191 ki menim.

Da ajtty Naami Rutqa 192 keliniña

jayşydyr qyzym ki çyqqajsen ıqyrqynlary byla 193 anyn 194 da

ki jadatmaʃgalar 195 saja ıözğa tüzda 196. نعدبک.

Da jəbuştu qyrqynlaryna 197 Boazyn çoplaşına tü-

ganginčä ormaʃ 198 ol arpalarnyn da ormaʃ 199 ol

budajlarnyn da olturdu qajnasybyla 200.

Ruth 3:1–18

Da ajtty anar Naami qajnasy 201 anyn e 202 qyzym muna

184 Eup. (1841): alǵyšlydyr.
185 Eup. (1841): YIFY-dän.
186 Eup. (1841): šəğəvatyn.
188 Eup. (1841): juvuqtyr.
189 Eup. (1841): juluʃwəmyzdandyr. The word geceğə has been used in manuscript III-73 as a translation of Hebr. גָּאָל ‘redeemer, savior’; cf. SWKar. gecge ‘avenger’ (MARDKOWICZ 1935: 25); for the semantic shift, see our commentary in 5.4 below.
190 Eup. (1841): oğlanlar bilän.
191 Eup. (1841): deginčä ançaq tavusqajlar žumlə ol oraqny.
192 Eup. (1841): Rut.
193 Eup. (1841): ʃzymətkarlary bilän.
194 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
195 Eup. (1841): učramasynlar.
196 Eup. (1841): öŋgä tarlovda.
197 Eup. (1841): ʃzymətkarlyna.
198 Eup. (1841): tavusylğaʃyn da deʃın oraqy.
199 Eup. (1841): oraqy.
200 Eup. (1841): aʃlyglarnyn da oturdy qajnanasy bilän.
201 Eup. (1841): qajnanasy.
202 Eup. (1841): this fragment is absent.
{144} [17] izlärmin²⁰³ saja tynčlyq ki jaqşy bolğaj saja. ṭuo.
{145} [18] Da haligeña²⁰⁴ muna Boaz yjuvuğumuzdu ol ki edij
{146} [19] qyrqynlary qatyna anyn²⁰⁵ muna ol vejateti²⁰⁶ ošol²⁰⁷ yna-
{147} [20] dyryn ol arpalarınyn bu kečani²⁰⁸. ṭuqš. Da juvun-
{148} [21] şun da jaqynşyn²⁰⁹ da kojgün jaqşy²¹⁰ upraqlarynyñ üs-
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{149} [1] tujja da engin ol yndyrğa bilinmaγyn kişiğada²¹¹
{150} [2] tülalğağaniñadejin²¹² aşama da içına. ṭuqš. Da
{151} [3] bolğaj jatqanynda sortun²¹³ da bilgin ošol ol orunu
{152} [4] ki jatyr²¹⁴ anda da kelgin da ačqyn ajaqlarynda anyn²¹⁵
{154} [6] [Da ajtty²¹⁶ anar Rut²¹⁷ bårça²¹⁸] ne²¹⁹ ki ajtsaj maja qylarmen²²⁰.
{155} [7] ṭuqš. Da endi ol yndyrğa da qyldy
{156} [8] bårça ne ki bujurdu²²¹ anar qajnasyn²²² anyn. ṭaŋał.

²⁰³ Eup. (1841): izlärmin.
²⁰⁴ Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
²⁰⁵ Eup. (1841): bilişimiz ki boldyn xizmätkarlary bilän.
²⁰⁶ Eup. (1841): suvuraqdyr.
²⁰⁷ Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
²⁰⁸ Eup. (1841): bugaćä.
²⁰⁹ Eup. (1841): qyjunγun.
²¹⁰ Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
²¹¹ Eup. (1841): kişigä.
²¹² Eup. (1841): tavusqanynan değin.
²¹³ Eup. (1841): jatqanynda.
²¹⁴ Eup. (1841): ol jerni ki jatsa.
²¹⁵ Eup. (1841): ajaqlaryn.
²¹⁶ This fragment was added by the copyist on the right margin.
²¹⁷ Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 3:5). Cf. Targum: this word is absent (IANNAY & ERDAL 1998: 20 [sentence 301]).
²¹⁸ Eup. (1841): žümľä.
²¹⁹ Added by the copyist on the left margin. Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
²²⁰ Eup. (1841): qylajym.
²²¹ Eup. (1841): žümľä nečiki syma[r] lady. In the latter word, the letter resh is not pressed probably due to a typesetting or printing error (there is a space left in the word); nečiki should probably be explained as nečik ‘as, in the same way as’ + ki, i.e. a subordinating conjunction introducing dependant clauses often used in compounds with pronouns. In KarRPS (419) it is attributed only to NWKar., but AQTAY & JANKOWSKI (2015: 251) also quote it based on Crimean sources.
²²² Eup. (1841): qajnasyn.
{157} [9] Da așady Boaz da ići da ḳatyrandy jufagi
{158} [10] anyn223 da keldi jatma ṭučunda ol kiši {da}224 da qaltrady ol kiši {da}225 qaŋryrajdy239 da muna
{162} [14] qaŋry jatady ajaqlarynda anyn231. ḳarən. Da
{166} [18] ajty mysynda ol kečäniŋ. 
{167} [19] ḳaŋry rajny ol sondragyny ol burunqudan barmasqa241

225 Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 3:7). Cf. Targum: Rut (IāNbay & Erdal 1998: 20 [sentence 311]).
226 Eup. (1841): aqrytnlyk bilän; ĖKar. aqrytnlyk is not noted in this shape in dictionaries (see KarRPS 60, ĖqaTay & JankoWSki 2015: 46).
227 Eup. (1841): ajalayrən.
228 Eup. (1841): jarymysynda ol kečäniŋ.
229 Added by the copyist in the left margin.
230 Eup. (1841): iləndy.
231 Eup. (1841): jatadyr ajaγy tibinä.
232 Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 3:9). Cf. Targum: this word is absent (IāNbay & Erdal 1998: 21 [sentence 326]).
233 Eup. (1841): kimdir sen.
234 Eup. (1841): men.
235 Eup. (1841): etäğıni, i.e. ‘your skirt, your corner of a garment (acc.)’, cf. Hebr. יְפִּי ‘1. wing; 2. skirt; corner, end’ used in the original; cf. also Ruth 2:12. In the Targum this word is omitted (see IāNbay & Erdal 1998: 21 [sentence 328]).
236 This word is most probably repeated mistakenly.
237 Eup. (1841): juluwydyr.
238 Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 3:10). Cf. Targum: this word is absent (IāNbay & Erdal 1998: 21 [sentence 331]).
239 Eup. (1841): YWY-dän.
240 Eup. (1841): jayšy.
242 Eup. (1841): egär.
243 Eup. (1841): da egär.
Da haligińa244 qyzym qorqmağıyn, barča ne245 ki ajtsaj
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171} [1] qylarmen246 {saja}247 ki biladi bar šahary248 ulusumnun ki tuvušlu249
172} [2] qatyndyr sen. รวง. Da haligińa250 ki kerti an ki
175} [5] eger julusa256 seni tov ǧindafadoğan juvuq257 julusun258
176} [6] da eger ǧlaınașa juluma259 da julusmen260 {seni}261 men qajjamdy262
177} [7] Adonaj jatqyn ol tāngadejin263. Da
178} [8] jatty264 ǧajaklarynda anyn265 ol tāngadejin266 da tur-
179} [9] du tanymastan burun kişi ǧosol dostun267 da ajty
180} [10] Boaz268 bilinmasın ki keldi ol qatyn ol yndyr-

---

244 Eup. (1841): endī.
245 Eup. (1841): ǧūmlā.
246 Eup. (1841): qylajym.
247 Added by the copyist in the upper margin.
248 Eup. (1841): bilīr ǧūmlā qabağy. Kar. qabaq is used also in III-73, see line 228.
249 Eup. (1841): qwatly.
250 Eup. (1841): endī.
251 Eup. (1841): kerti ki juluwashdyr.
252 Eup. (1841): juluwash juvuq.
253 Eup. (1841): gečā.
254 Eup. (1841): ertā bilān.
255 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
256 Eup. (1841): julsy.
257 Eup. (1841): this fragment is absent.
258 Eup. (1841): julsyn.
259 Eup. (1841): kilāmsās julma.
260 Eup. (1841): julaqym.
261 Added by the copyist in the left margin.
262 Eup. (1841): qajjamdyr.
263 Eup. (1841): ertāqā değin.
264 Eup. (1841): jetti; ja > je influenced by the j-.
265 Eup. (1841): ajāqy tībīnā.
266 Eup. (1841): ertāqā değin.
267 Eup. (1841): dostyn.
268 Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 3:14). Cf. Tar-
gum: this word is absent (Ilanbay & erdal 1998: 21 [sentence 358]).
{182} [12] ol šušunčakni ki üstüjda da tutqin any
{183} [13] da tuttu any da ülčadi alty, ülčov arpa-
{184} [14] lar da qojdu any ûstuña da keldi Boaz ol

269 Eup. (1841): this fragment is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 3:15). Cf. Targum: this fragment is absent (Ianbay & Erdal 1998: 21 [sentence 361]).

270 Eup. (1841): mešparny (i.e. mešpar with the accusative suffix); in Shoresh davar (1831: 98) the Hebr. יִמְצָפָרִים יָתְפָּשְׁתוֹ 'the festal robes, and the mantles' (Isaiah 3:22; King James 2000) is explained as אלをしている קאפרין ד אָלֶפֶרלפְּרִי Ol değişirmə upraqlarny da ol meşrafalarly 'Changing the clothes and the mešrafas', i.e. the Hebrew equivalents for the word are המ DeepCopy 'the veil' in Ruth 3:15 and המ DeepCopy 'the mantles' in Isaiah 3:22. In KarRPS (406) the word appears in another phonetic shape, namely as EKar. mašapa 'head-scarf' and is classified as an Arabic loanword (see also AqTay & JankoWSki 2015: 235) and Levi (2005: 69, v.v. næmok), whereas in Eup. (1841), in Isaiah 3:22, Hebr._ABORT 'leather' 'and the cloaks' is translated into Karaim as da ol mašpalarnyŋ (i.e. mašpa with the genitive case suffix). For more on the e - a alternation in Arabic loanwords cf. e.g. NWKar. savahat = SWKar ševahat 'mercy, kindness' (see KarRPS 649, Németh 2011: 315, respectively. The existence of metathetic variants, i.e. with p - r and r - p (> f), seems not unusual, cf. e.g. SWKar. savahat = NWKar. ševahat = EKar. šağavat 'mercy, kindness' (see KarRPS 454, 649; Suliwoci 1972: 50, 1973: 98, AqTay & Jankowski 2015: 370, Cambridge MS: 24 v°, 28 r°, 69 r° etc., respectively, cf. also Arm.-Kipch. šağavat in Tryjarski 1972: 719) or SWKar. maľ marathon 'ointment' = NWKar. maľem id. = EKar. meşlem 'balsam, medicine' (KarRPS 403, 416), EKar. čyrapqa = čyrapqa (AqTay & Jankowski 2015: 121; Cambridge MS: 78 r°, 79 v°). I would, therefore, treat mešpar and mešrafa as variants of the same word (e.g. by way of the following chain of changes: mešrafa ~ *mešrapa > *mešpara > mešpar), whereas mašapa ~ mašpa seem to have evolved from mešrafa ~ mešrapa by reducing the -ş- cluster.


271 Eup. (1841): üstüjda.
272 Cf. NWKar. ölčav 'measure' (KarRPS 440). Cf. our commentary in 5.4. below.
273 Eup. (1841): ölčav arpa.
274 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
275 Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 3:15). Cf. Targum: this word is absent (Ianbay & Erdal 1998: 21 [sentence 365]).
276 Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 3:16). Cf. Targum: this word is absent (Ianbay & Erdal 1998: 21 [sentence 372]).
277 Eup. (1841): qajnasyna.
{186} [16] ajtty qajnasy\textsuperscript{278} kim sen sen\textsuperscript{279} qyzym da anlatty anar
{187} [17] ošol barča\textsuperscript{280} ne ki qyldy anar ol kişi. ܣܘܒܬܐ
disappearance.
{188} [18] Da ajtty Rut\textsuperscript{281} alty očov ol arpalar ny oš-
{189} [19] pularny\textsuperscript{282} berdi maja ki ajtty maja kelənagin boš
{190} [20] qajnaja\textsuperscript{283}. רענַּה.  Da ajtty Naami\textsuperscript{284} olturgün\textsuperscript{285}
{191} [21] qyzym neginę\textsuperscript{286} ki bilgajsen nečik tuşar nerşə\textsuperscript{287}
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{192} [1] ki tek turmasty\textsuperscript{288} ol kişi ki ančaq tugaļlar ol ner-
{193} [2] šani\textsuperscript{289} buğun. ...

Ruth 4:1–22

{193} [2] ... ובו. Da Boaz bardy ol təra
{194} [3] üvqa da olturdu\textsuperscript{290} anda da muna ol gečeğa
{195} [4] ašady\textsuperscript{291} {ki}\textsuperscript{292} şozladi Boaz da ajtty qajrylgyn olturgün\textsuperscript{293}
{196} [5] bunda\textsuperscript{294} falan fastan da qajryldy da olturdu\textsuperscript{295}.
{197} [6] THEIR. Da aldy on eńlar\textsuperscript{296} qartlaryndan ol

\textsuperscript{278} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
\textsuperscript{279} Eup. (1841): kimdir sen.
\textsuperscript{280} Eup. (1841): this fragment is absent.
\textsuperscript{281} Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 3:17). Cf. Targum: this word is absent (\textsc{ianBay & erdal 1998}: 22 [sentence 378]).
\textsuperscript{282} Eup. (1841): ušbu ölčä arpany.
\textsuperscript{283} Eup. (1841): qajnanaŋa.
\textsuperscript{284} Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 3:18). Cf. Targum: this word is absent (\textsc{ianBay & erdal 1998}: 22 [sentence 381]).
\textsuperscript{285} Eup. (1841): oturğyn.
\textsuperscript{286} Eup. (1841): deşinčiä.
\textsuperscript{287} Eup. (1841): sőz.
\textsuperscript{288} Eup. (1841): tynč bolmastyr; tek tur– noted only for EKar. in KarRPS (561, s.v. мек).
\textsuperscript{289} Eup. (1841): tavusyr ol išni.
\textsuperscript{290} Eup. (1841): čyqty ol qabaqa da oturdy.
\textsuperscript{291} Eup. (1841): juluvčy kečijdir; in the latter progressive form an ā > -i change seems to have occurred in the second syllable due to the adjacent j.
\textsuperscript{292} Added by the copyist on the right margin.
\textsuperscript{293} Eup. (1841): oturğyn.
\textsuperscript{294} Eup. (1841): mundar.
\textsuperscript{295} Eup. (1841): oturdy.
\textsuperscript{296} Eup. (1841): kišilär.
{198} [7] šaharnyn da ajtty_olturujuz bunda_297 da oltur-
{200} [9]  olušün tužün ki qaryndaşımyzyn_300 Elimeleχ-
{201} [10] nin satty Naami ki qajtty tužündan Moavnyn.
{203} [12] satyn algyn özüja qarşysynda ol olturuvču-
{204} [13] larnyn_304 da qarşysyna qartlarynyň ulusumnun eger
{205} [14] julusaj juluğun_305 da eger julumasäh_306 anlatqyn maja
{206} [15] da {bilajim ki joxtur}_307 sendan başqa juluma_308 da
{207} [16] men şendan sortun_309 da ajtty men julumen_305.
{208} [17]  შარში Da ajtty Boaz satynalğan ქუნუ-
{209} [18] da ol tužnütı_311 qolundan Naaminin da_312 Rutnun ol
{210} [19] Moavly qatyndan_312 qatynyn ol ölunüň şayn aldy)_313
{212} [21]  აფხ. Da ajtyy ol _geçe _bolamanmen_315
{213} [22] {{catchword:}} juluma

297 Eup. (1841): oturuŋyz munda.
298 Eup. (1841): oturdylar.
299 Eup. (1841): this word is absent. It is not in the Hebrew original (Ruth 4:3). Cf. Targum: this word is absent (IARIAN & ERDAL 1998: 22 [sentence 395]).
300 Eup. (1841): juluwchyja paj ol tarlownyŋ ki qardaşımyz.
301 Added by the copyist on the right margin.
302 Medial ʃ- spelled with the letter kaph.
303 Eup. (1841): demä.
304 Eup. (1841): oturğanlarnyn.
305 Eup. (1841): julsaj julgün.
306 Eup. (1841): julmasaj.
307 This fragment is barely legible. Reconstructed based on Eup. (1841).
308 Eup. (1841): julma.
309 Eup. (1841): artyndan.
310 Eup. (1841): julaʃym.
311 Eup. (1841): tarlowny.
312 Eup. (1841): qatyndan ol Rut Moavlynyn.
313 Eup. (1841): satyn alyrsyn.
314 Added by the copyist on the left margin.
315 An inabilitive mood construction with a -mm- > -nm- dissimilative change, i.e. < bolal-mammen. See also line 215.
{214} [1] juluma\textsuperscript{316} özüňa mağat čajparmen ošol üluşumnu juluğun\textsuperscript{317}
{216} [3] Da bu kečinnak edי avaldan\textsuperscript{319} Israeldä ol julumaq\textsuperscript{320} üçün
{217} [4] da al Alyšmaq\textsuperscript{321} üçün qaýjam etňa bar\textsuperscript{322} şozți suvurure-
{218} [5] di kişi etigen da beriredi dostuna da bu edи {ol}\textsuperscript{323} şarajat\textsuperscript{324}
{219} [6] Israeldä. Da ajty ol geçeğä\textsuperscript{325} Boazğa
{220} [7] satyn algyn özüja da suvurdu etigin. şaaýar. Da
{221} [8] ajty Boaz qartlarğa\textsuperscript{326} da bar\textsuperscript{327} ol ulusqa tanyqlar\textsuperscript{328} siz ῦuğun
{222} [9] ki satyn aldym, ošol barça ne\textsuperscript{329} ki Elimelexünün da ošol barça
{223} [10] ne\textsuperscript{330} ki, Maχlonnun da Kilyonnun\textsuperscript{331} qolundan Naaminin. şa. Da
{224} [11] dağyn ošol Rutnu ol Moavly qaşyñyn\textsuperscript{332} qaşyñyn Maχlonnun satyn
{225} [12] aldyrm özüňa qaşyñlyq{q}a\textsuperscript{333} turğuzma atyn ol öülüňün
{226} [13] ölluštünün, ki eksilňaľa\textsuperscript{334} aty ol ölluňun qaşyryn-
{227} [14] daşlary arasyndan\textsuperscript{335} da qabağyndan ornunun\textsuperscript{336} tanyqlardyrsiz
{228} [15] ῦuğun. Da ajtylar bar\textsuperscript{337} ol ulus ki qabaq-

\textsuperscript{316} Eup. (1841): juluvčy bulaj almamdyr julma.
\textsuperscript{317} Eup. (1841): bolnağaj čajpağajmyn ülişiňni juluşyn.
\textsuperscript{318} Eup. (1841): ol juluvymny ki bulaj almamdyr julma.
\textsuperscript{319} Eup. (1841): resim burun.
\textsuperscript{320} Eup. (1841): juluv.
\textsuperscript{321} Eup. (1841): değişirmäk.
\textsuperscript{322} Added by the copyist in the left margin.
\textsuperscript{323} Eup. (1841): tanyqlyq kibik.
\textsuperscript{324} Eup. (1841): juluvčy.
\textsuperscript{325} Eup. (1841): ol qartlarğa.
\textsuperscript{326} Eup. (1841): şuľmä.
\textsuperscript{327} Eup. (1841): tanyqlardyr.
\textsuperscript{328} Eup. (1841): şuľmä.
\textsuperscript{329} Eup. (1841): şuľmä.
\textsuperscript{330} Eup. (1841): şuľmä.
\textsuperscript{331} Eup. (1841): Kilyonnnun da Maχlonnnun. In the Hebrew original there is л全媒体 of Chilion and Mahlon’ (Ruth 4:9). Cf. Târûm: Kiljonğa da maχlonğa (Iânbay & Erdal 1998: 23 [sentence 442]).
\textsuperscript{332} Eup. (1841): Rut ol Moawlyňu.
\textsuperscript{333} A medial -q- is missing due to a clerical error; cf. line 236; Eup. (1841): şatynlyqqa.
\textsuperscript{334} Eup. (1841): da kesilmäğäj. 
\textsuperscript{335} Eup. (1841): qaşyndan qardaşlarynyşyn.
\textsuperscript{336} Eup. (1841): jeriniş.
\textsuperscript{337} Eup. (1841): şuľmä.
\{229\} [16] ta da ol qartlar tanyqlar biz\textsuperscript{338} bergaj Adonaj ošol ol\textsuperscript{339} qatyn-
\{230\} [17] nny\textsuperscript{340} ol kelğanni\textsuperscript{341} uvuja Raχelni kibik da Leahny kibik\textsuperscript{342} ki
\{231\} [18] qondardylar ekşiärída ošol uvuń Israelnin\textsuperscript{343} da qylğyn
\{232\} [19] tuvüşluq Efṛatta da atağyn\textsuperscript{344} at Bet Leχemda. am.
\{233\} [20] Da bolğaj uvuń senin\textsuperscript{345} uvu kibik\textsuperscript{346} Perecnin ki töradi\textsuperscript{347}
\{234\} [21] Tamar Jehudağa ol urluqtan ki berşa\textsuperscript{348} Adonaj saja oł
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\{235\} [1] qatyndan oşpu\textsuperscript{349}. Da aldy Boaz ošol\textsuperscript{350} Rut\{nu\}\textsuperscript{351} da boldu
\{236\} [2] anar qatynlyqqa da kelda anar da berdi anar Adonaj\textsuperscript{352} čamila-
\{237\} [3] lyq da töradi\textsuperscript{353} uvul. Da ajttylar ol
\{238\} [4] qatynlar Naamiğa maxtavlydy\textsuperscript{354} Adonaj ki eksitńadi
\{239\} [5] saja geče\textsuperscript{355} buń da atalsyn\textsuperscript{356} aty anyn\textsuperscript{357} Israeldä.
\{240\} [6] ḫay. Da bolğaj saja qajtaruvčuğa žanny da besläña
\{241\} [7] ošol\textsuperscript{358} pirligijni ki kelinij ki şuvdu seni töradi\textsuperscript{359} any ki

\textsuperscript{338} Eup. (1841): tanyqlar.
\textsuperscript{339} Eup. (1841): this fragment is absent. Cf. Targum: bu ol (IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 23 [sentence 449]).
\textsuperscript{340} The third letter nun is a clerical error.
\textsuperscript{341} Eup. (1841): kelgän.
\textsuperscript{342} Eup. (1841): Raχel gibi da Leah gibi.
\textsuperscript{343} Eup. (1841): ekşi żama'atyn Israelniń.
\textsuperscript{344} Eup. (1841): qylğajsyn čeriv Efṛatda da aşağajsyn; aşağajsyn is possibly a misprint pro atağajsyn. Cf. Targum: etkin asker efratda da olğun čaqyrğan (IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 23 [sentences 452–453])
\textsuperscript{345} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
\textsuperscript{346} Eup. (1841): gibi.
\textsuperscript{347} Eup. (1841): doğurdy. Cf. Targum: doğurdu (IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 23 [sentence 455]).
\textsuperscript{348} Eup. (1841): bergaj.
\textsuperscript{349} Eup. (1841): uşbu qyzdan. Cf. Targum: bu ol genčten (IANBAY & ERDAL 1998: 23 [sentence 457]).
\textsuperscript{350} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
\textsuperscript{351} The suffix was added by the copyist in the upper margin.
\textsuperscript{352} Eup. (1841): YWY anar.
\textsuperscript{353} Eup. (1841): doğurdy.
\textsuperscript{354} Eup. (1841): maχtavlydyr.
\textsuperscript{355} Eup. (1841): juluwyčy.
\textsuperscript{356} Eup. (1841): atalğaj.
\textsuperscript{357} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
\textsuperscript{358} Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
\textsuperscript{359} Eup. (1841): doğurdy.
ol jaχšyraqtŷ saja jedi uvullardan. Da aldy
Naami, oşol ol ulanny da qojdu any qojnunda da
boldu anar östürvuxta. Da atadylar
anar ol qo(n)šular at aqtadoğač tuvdun uvul Naamiğa
da atadylar atyn any Oved oldu atasy Jişajyn atasynyn
Davidnin. Naami ol ulannyn da qojdu anyn
boldu anar ösrův gaa.
Da atadylar anar ol qo{n}şular atajotgü tuvdun Naami gaa
da atadylar atyn anyn Oved oldu atasy Jişajyn atasynyn
Davidnin. Naami ol ulannyn da qojdu anyn
boldu anar qojnuna.
Da bulardylar tuvmuşlar Perecnin Perek
tuvduru Xečronnu. Da Xečron tuv-
duru Ramny da Ram tuvduru oşol Aminadav-
y. Da Aminadav tuvduru oşol Xaʁʃon-
u da Xaʁʃon tuvduru oşol Šalmany. Da
Şalmon tuvduru Ram oşol Ram tuvduru oşol Amin-
u. Da Ovedni. Da Oved tuvduru oşol Jişaj
Da Jişaj tuvduru oşol Davidni.

360 Eup. (1841): jaχšydyr.
361 Eup. (1841): oğlanlardan artyq.
362 Eup. (1841): oğlannya.
363 Eup. (1841): gojnuna.
365 The letter nun has been added later to the word interlinearly.
366 Eup. (1841): demä doğdy.
367 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
368 Eup. (1841): oldyr.
369 Eup. (1841): atasy.
372 Eup. (1841): this word is absent. Cf. Targum: this word is absent (Ianbay & Erald 1998: 24 [sentence 478]).
373 Eup. (1841): doğurdy.
374 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
375 Eup. (1841): doğurdy.
376 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
377 Eup. (1841): doğurdy.
378 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
379 Eup. (1841): doğurdy.
380 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
381 Eup. (1841): doğurdy.
382 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
383 Eup. (1841): doğurdy.
384 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
385 Eup. (1841): doğurdy.
386 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
387 Eup. (1841): doğurdy.
388 Eup. (1841): this word is absent.
4.3. Translation

Ruth 1:1–22
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\{1\}  
(1) Now it came to pass in the days
\{2\}  
(2) when the judges ruled,
\{3\}  
(3) that there was a famine in the land, and a man of Beth-
\{4\}  
(4) lehemjudah went to sojourn in the plain of Moab, he,
\{5\}  
(5) and his wife, and his two sons. (2) And
\{6\}  
(6) the name of the man was Elimelech, and the name of his wife Naomi, and
\{7\}  
(7) the name of his two sons Mahlon and Chilion, Ephrathites of Beth-
\{8\}  
(8) lehemjudah, and they came into the plain of Moab, and
\{9\}  
(9) remained there. (3) And Elimelech the husband
\{10\}  
(10) of Naomi died; and she was left, and her two sons.
\{11\}  
(11) (4) And they took them wives of the women of Moab;
\{12\}  
(12) the name of the one was Orpah, and the name of the other Ruth:
\{13\}  
(13) and they dwelled there about ten years. (5)
\{14\}  
(14) And Mahlon and Chilion died also both of them; and
\{15\}  
(15) the woman was left without her two sons and her husband.
\{16\}  
(16) Then she arose with her daughters-in-law, to return
\{17\}  
(17) from the plain of Moab: for she had heard in the plain of Moab how
\{18\}  
(18) that the Lord had remembered his people in giving them
\{19\}  
(19) food. (7) So she set out from the place where she was
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\{20\}  
(1) with her two daughters-in-law, and they went
\{21\}  
(2) on the way to return to the land of Judah. (8) And
\{22\}  
(3) Naomi said to her two daughters-in-law, ‘Go, return each
\{23\}  
(4) of you to her mother’s house: May the Lord deal kindly
\{24\}  
(5) as you have dealt with the dead, and with me. (9)
\{25\}  
(6) The Lord grant you that you may find rest,
\{26\}  
(7) each of you in the house of her husband.’ Then she kissed them; and
\{27\}  
(8) they lifted up their voices, and wept. (10)
\{28\}  
(9) And they said to her, ‘We will return with you to your people.
\{29\}  
(10) (11) And Naomi said them, ‘Turn back, my daughters:
\{30\}  
(11) why will you go with me? Are there yet any more
\{31\}  
(12) sons in my womb, that they may become your husbands?
\{32\}  
(12) Turn back, my daughters, go your way; for I am too old
to have a husband. If I should say, I have
hope, if I should have a husband also tonight,
and should also bear sons; (13)
Would you have hope for them till they were grown?
Would you be helpless being not behind a [i.e. having no] husband?
Do not do that, my daughters; for it grieves me much for your sakes
that the hand of the Lord has gone out against me.’ (14)
And they lifted up their voices, and wept again: and
{{catchword:}} [Orphah] kissed

Orphah kissed her mother-in-law; but Ruth clung to her.
(15) And Naomi said to Rut, ‘Behold,
your sister-in-law has gone back to her people, and to serve her gods:
return you after your sister-in-law.’ (16)
But Ruth said, ‘Do not tire me [by asking] to leave you
or to return from following after you. For where you go I will
go, and where you lodge I will lodge: your people
shall be my people, and your God my God.
(17) Where you die, there will I die, and
there will I be buried: the Lord do so to me, and
more also, if anything but death parts me
and you.’ (18) And she saw that she became strong
in her will] to go with her, she ceased speaking to her.
(19) And the two of them went on until they came
to Bethlehem. And when they were come
to Bethlehem, the whole town resounded because of them,
saying: ‘Is this Naomi?’ (20)
And she said unto them, ‘Call me not Naomi, call
me heavy-hearted; for the Almighty has troubled me
much. (21) I went away full with goods, and
the Lord has brought me back empty: why call me Naomi,

In III-73: zabun bol-: the word’s meaning is reconstructed based on Pers. zabūn ‘weak, infirm, helpless’ (JOHNSON 1852: 649; STEINGASS 1892: 610).
Literally: bitter-hearted.
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{63}  [1] when the Lord has harmed me and the Almighty has been bad for me?’
{64}  [2] (22) So Naomi returned, and Ruth the Moabitess,
{65}  [3] her daughter-in-law, with her, who returned out of the plain of Moab: and
{66}  [4] they came to Bethlehem in the beginning of
{67}  [5] barley harvest. ...

Ruth 2:1–23

{67}  [5] ... (1) And Naomi had a kinsman of her husband’s,
{68}  [6] a mighty man of wealth, of the family of Elimelech; and
{69}  [7] his name was Boaz. (2) And Ruth the Moabitess said
{70}  [8] to Naomi, ‘Let me now go to the field, and
{71}  [9] glean ears of grain after him in whose sight I shall find grace.’
{72}  [10] And Naomi said to her, ‘Go, my daughter.’
{73}  [11] (3) And she went, and came, and gleaned in the field
{74}  [12] after the reapers: and she happened
{75}  [13] to come to a part of the field belonging unto Boaz, who was
{76}  [14] of the family of Elimelech. (4) And, behold, Boaz came from Bethlehem,
{77}  [15] and said unto the reapers, ‘The Lord’s help
{78}  [16] be with you.’ And they answered him, ‘The Lord bless you.’
{79}  [17] (5) Then said Boaz to his servant standing
{80}  [18] over the reapers, ‘Whose young woman is
{81}  [19] this?’ (6) And answered the servant that was set over the
{82}  [20] reapers and said, ‘It is the Moabite woman
{83}  [21] that came back with Naomi out of the plain of Moab. (7)
{84}  [22] {{catchword:}} And she said,
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{85}  [1] And she said, “Let me glean and gather among the sheaves
{86}  [2] after the reapers”. And she came and has continued
{87}  [3] from early morning until now except that she
{88}  [4] sat a little in the house.’ (8)
{89}  [5] And Boaz said to Ruth, ‘Behold, listen, my daughter, do not go
{90}  [6] to glean in another field or leave this one,
{91}  [7] but keep close to my maid-servants. (9)
Let your eyes be on the field that they are reaping, and go after them. Behold, I have instructed the servants not to touch you. And when you are thirsty, go to the vessels and drink of that which the servants would say.’

Then she fell on her face, and bowed to the ground, and said to him, ‘Why have I found grace in your eyes, that you should take knowledge of me, since I am a foreigner?’

And Boaz answered her, ‘It has fully been told to me, all that you have done unto your mother-in-law since the death of your husband: and how you have left your father and your mother, and your native land and came to a people that you did not know before. (12) May the Lord pay your reward for what you have done, and may a full reward be given you by the Lord, the God of Israel, under whose providence you have come to take refuge!’

Then Rut said, ‘Let me find favour in the eyes of my Lord; for you have comforted me, and you have spoken to the hearts of your handmaids, though I am not one of your servants. (14) And Boaz said unto her at mealtime, ‘Come closer, and eat of the bread, and dip your morsel in the vinegar.’ And she sat beside the reapers: and he passed to her roasted grain, and she did eat, and was satisfied, and left. (15) And she rose to glean, and Boaz instructed his servants, saying, ‘Let her gather even among the sheaves, and do not put her to shame. (16) And also pull out some from the sheaves for her and leave it.

In III–73: pražma. The meaning is reconstructed based on the Hebrew original where we have קָלִי ‘roasted grain’ or ‘parched corn’ (Ruth 2:14), see Klein (1987: 579), and based on the meaning of the Slavonic etymon of the word, i.e. ESlav. прашити ‘to roast’, cf. прашити in the 17th–18th-century Russian (SRJa XI–XVIII, vol. XXI: 25).
for her to gather, and rebuke her not with anger."

(17) And she gleaned in the field until evening,

and she beat out what she had gleaned, and it was about an ephah

of barley. (18) And she took it up and went into the city,

and her mother-in-law saw what she had gleaned and she also brought

out and gave to her what she had reserved after she was satisfied.

(19) And her mother-in-law said to her, ‘Where did you glean

today? And where did you gather? May the man who took notice of you

be blessed.’ So she told her mother-in-law whom she had gathered

with and said, ‘The man’s name with whom I gathered

today is Boaz.’ (20) And Naomi said

to her daughter-in-law, ‘May he be blessed by the Lord, who has not left off

his kindness to the living or the dead!’

Naomi also said to her, ‘A close relative of ours

is the man, one of our redeemers.’ (21) And

Ruth the Moabite said, ‘Besides, he said to me,

“You shall keep close by my servants until

they have completed all my harvest.”’

(22) And Naomi said to Ruth, her daughter-in-law,

‘It is good, my daughter, that you go out with his maid-servants,

lest in another field you be troubled.’ (23)

And she kept close to the maid-servants of Boaz, gleaning

until the end of the barley harvest and

wheat harvest; and she dwelt with her mother-in-law. ...

Ruth 3:1–18

... (1)

And Naomi her mother-in-law said to her, ‘My daughter, behold,

392 Reconstructed meaning; expressed with WKar. juřakłan- (a derivative of juřak ‘heart’) used with the postposition üst standing in the dative case. The word is not present in Karaim dictionaries, see chapter 5.4 below.
should I not seek rest for you, that it may be well with you? (2)

And now is not Boaz of our kindred, with

whose maid-servants you were? Behold, he winnows barley tonight in the threshing-floor. (3) And wash therefore and anoint yourself, and put on your best clothes

and go down to the threshing-floor, but do not make yourself known to the man until he has finished eating and drinking. (4) And it shall be, when he lies down, get know the place where he lies, and then go in, and uncover feet, and lay down; and he will tell you what you shall do.

(5) And Rut replied her, ‘All that you would say to me I will do.’

(6) And she went down to the threshing-floor and did all that her mother-in-law commanded her. (7)

And Boaz ate and drank, and his heart was merry, he went to lie down at the end of the heap [of grain]: and Rut came softly and uncovered his feet and lay down. (8) And it was at midnight, that the man was startled, and turned himself: and, behold, a woman lay at his feet. (9) And Boaz said, ‘Who are you?’ And she answered, ‘I am Ruth, your maid-servant: spread therefore your wings over your servant, for you are a redeemer.’ (10) And Boaz said, ‘Blessed be you of the Lord, my daughter: you have made this last kindness greater than the first in that you have not gone after young men, whether poor or rich. (11)

And now, my daughter, do not fear; all that you ask I will do for you

I will do for you for all the city of my people does know that you are a worthy woman. (12) And now it is true that I am a redeemer; yet there is a redeemer nearer than I. (13) Tarry this night, and it shall be in the morning, that if he will redeem, fine, may he redeem you calling you his kinsman,
but if he is not willing to redeem you then will I redeem you, as
the Lord lives, lie down until the morning.’ (14) And
she lay at his feet until the morning: and
she rose up before one could recognize another, and Boaz said,
‘Let it not be known that a woman came into the threshing-floor.’
(15) And Boaz said to Rut, ‘Give me
the cloak that you have on you and hold it.’
And she held it, and he measured out six measures of barley
and put it on her, and Boaz went
into the city. (16) And Ruth came to her mother-in-law, and
she said, ‘You are my daughter’, and she told her
all that the man had done for her. (17)
And Ruth said, ‘These six measures of barley
he gave me; for he said to me, “Go not empty
to your mother-in-law.”’ (18) Then said Naomi, ‘Sit still,
my daughter, until you know how the matter will fall:
for the man will not rest, until he has finished the
matter today.’ ...

Ruth 4:1–22

... (1) Now Boaz had gone up to the court
house and sat down there; and behold, the redeemer,
of whom Boaz had spoken, came by; and Boaz said, ‘Turn aside interrogator,
sit down
here.’; and he turned aside and sat down.
And he took ten men of the elders of the
city and said, ‘Sit down here’; and they
sat down. (3) And Boaz said to the redeemer,

Cf. Hebr. וַיֹֽאמֶר הָבִי הַמִּטְפַּחַת אֲשֶֽר־עָלַ֛יִךְ וְׁאֶֽחֳזִי־בָ֖הּ וַתֹ֣אחֶז בָ֑הּ וַיָ֤מָד שֵש־שְׁעֹרִים וַיָּבֹ֖א הָעִֽיר
‘Also he said, Bring the cloak that you have upon you, and hold it. And when she held it, he measured six measures of barley, and laid it on her: and she went into the city’ (Ruth 3:15; King James 2000). In the translation in the Krymchak Targum is ambiguous.
Her share in the land which was our brother Elimelech’s
sold Naomi, who has come back from the plain of Moab.
(4) So I said [to myself] I would reveal it to your ears, saying,
‘Buy it before of those sitting here
and before the elders of my people.’ If
you will redeem it, redeem it; but if you will not redeem it, tell me,
that I may know, for there is no one besides you to redeem it, and
I am after you.’ And he said, ‘I will redeem it.’
(5) And Boaz said, ‘The day you buy
the field from the hand of Naomi and Ruth the
Moabite, you also acquire Ruth the widow of the dead,
in order to raise up the name of the dead in his inheritance.’
(6) And the redeemer said, ‘I cannot
redeem you my right to yourself, for I cannot redeem it. (7)
And this was the custom in former times in Israel concerning redeeming
and exchanging: to confirm a [given] word, the one drew off
his sandal and gave it to his friend, and this was the rule
in Israel. (8) And the redeemer said to Boaz,
‘Buy it for yourself,’ he drew off his sandal. (9) And
Boaz said to the elders and all the people, ‘You are witnesses today
that I have bought all that belonged to Elimelech and all that
belonged to Chilion and to Mahlon from the hand of Naomi. (10) And
also Ruth the Moabite, the widow of Mahlon, I have bought
to be my wife, to raise up the name of the dead
in his inheritance, that the name of the dead may not be cut off from among
his brethren

---

Cf. Hebr. מכרת ‘sells’ (Ruth 4:3, King James 2000).
Interestingly, in the Krymchak Targum this fragment goes as follows Tešer edi kişi jenini oŋ qolunuŋ ‘A man untied the sleeve of his right hand’ (see Ianbay & Erdal 1998: 23, 34 [sentence 430]; see also the commentary of Ianbay & Erdal on page 4).
Again, in the Krymchak Targum there is Da tešti Boaz jenini oŋ qolu-nyŋ ‘And Boaz untied his right-hand sleeve’ (see Ianbay & Erdal 1998: 34 [sentence 438]).
and from the gate of his native place: you are witnesses

today.' (11) And all the people that were at the gate,

and the elders, said, ‘We are witnesses. May the Lord make the woman

who is coming into your house like Rachel and like Leah, which
two did build the house of Israel: and may you act

worthily in Ephrathah, and be famous in Bethlehem. (12)
And may your house be like the house of Perez, whom Tamar bore
to Judah, because of the offspring that the Lord shall give you

by this woman.’ (13) And Boaz took Ruth, and she became
his wife, and he went in to her, and the Lord gave her conception,
and she bore a son. (14) And the
women said to Naomi, ‘Praised be the Lord, who has not left
you today without a redeemer, and may his name be famous in Israel!
(15) And He shall be to you a restorer of life and a nourisher
of your old age, for your daughter-in-law who loves you, has borne him, who
is better to you than seven sons.’ (16) And Naomi took
the child, and laid it in her bosom, and
became nurse to it. (17) And the
women of the neighborhood gave him a name, saying, ‘A son has been born
to Naomi’, and they named him Obed, he was the father of Jesse, the father
of David. (18) Now these are the descendants\textsuperscript{397} of Perez: Perez
begat Hezron. (19) And Hezron begat
Ram, and Ram begat Amminadab.
(20) And Amminadab begat Nahshon, and Nahshon begat Salmon. (21) And
Salmon begat Boaz, and Boaz begat
Obed. (22) And Obed begat Jesse,
and Jesse begat David.

\textsuperscript{397} Expressed with the word \textit{tuvmuš} ‘child’ (KarRPS 543).
5. Conclusions: The language of the manuscript III-73

The language of the manuscript III-73 is typically Middle North-Western Karaim (some singular cases discussed below being the only exceptions), cf. the features listed below.398

5.1. Sound system and sound changes in roots and suffixes

The initial Kipchak *t-, *k- and *b- are retained, cf. e.g. tul ‘widow’ (15), tur- ‘to stand’ (16), kel- ‘to come’ (8), koz ‘eye’ (71), bar- ‘to go’ (20), or ber- ‘to give’ (18). The lenition of q, k, p takes place in intervocalic position, see e.g. ormaq → ormaqynyn ‘its harvest (gen.)’ (66), tap- → tabajym ‘may I find’ (106). The original *η evolved twofold: into n and j with the distribution known from Modern North-Western Karaim, i.e. there is a j that stems from *η in the 2nd person (sg. and pl.) markers of the simple past tense (e.g. in qylďyjyz ‘you (pl.) did’ (24)) and of the conditional mood (e.g. in barsaj ‘if you go’ (47)), as well as in those complex verbal constructions that contain the above-mentioned forms (e.g. in the perfect optative, see bolğajdyjyz ‘if you (pl.) was’ (37)), in the 2nd plural person marker of the imperative mood (e.g. baryjyz ‘go! (pl.)’ (22)), in the dative case forms of the 1st and 2nd sg. personal pronouns (i.e. maja ‘to me’ (30) and saja ‘to you’ (94)), and, finally, in the 2nd person (sg. and pl.) possessive suffixes (e.g. qajnaj ‘your mother-in-law’ (100)), whereas in every other position there is an n that continues *η. The syllable-closing and suffix-initial q is retained, and there is no trace of its subsequent shift into χ.

The original palato-velar vowel harmony is transposed into a consonant harmony, which transpires from orthography with the reservations expressed

398 Only mentioned here are those features the existence or absence of which is important in regard to Western Karaim historical phonology, morphology, morphonology, and syntax, and, finally, dialectal affiliation.

Importantly, in this article my aim is above all to provide a brief description of the second part of manuscript III-73. Matters connected with the relation of the Karaim translation to the Hebrew original will not be discussed in detail.

399 Numbers in brackets after quoted data indicate line numbers. In most cases only one line number is indicated (usually the line of the word’s first occurrence), even if the word appears several times in the text. More line numbers are indicated in cases in which it is important for some reason.

400 The velar *η evolved into j in some lexemes, too, see e.g. *janaj > NWKar. jajaj ~ janaj ‘cheek’ (Kowalski 1929: 197; KarRPS: 225), but the sample text does not contain such examples.
in 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 above. The original non-first-syllabic *e standing after a palatal consonant regularly changed into a, with the sole exception of gečėğa ‘redeemer’ (130), a phonetic variant of gečağa (173), that might be an inter-dialectal loan (vide infra in 5.4). The rounded vs. unrounded vowel harmony is fully operative and regularly applied, see e.g. olturdular ‘they sat’ (13), ulusuj ‘your people’ (48), bolur ‘it will be’ (49), buyurdum ‘I ordered’ (93), qajtaruvčuğa ‘restorer (dat.)’ (240) – the only counterexample is maχtavlydy ‘is praised’ (238).

The apocope of -r of the -dyr 3rd person copula suffix and 3rd person marker is frequent, although the number of the shortened and not shortened forms is very much comparable, cf. jatady ‘lies’ (162), algyšlydy ‘he is blessed’ (130), bulardylar ‘these are’ (247), juvuğumuızdu ‘he is our kindred’ (145), kimnindi ‘whose is she?’ (80), maχtavlydy ‘he is praised’ (238), qajjamdy ‘he is alive, he is living’ (176), qatytndy ‘she is a woman’ (82) vs. algyšlydyr ‘he is blessed’ (166), bumodur ‘is this that?’ (58), gečağaδir men ‘I am a redeemer’ (173), gečėğaδir sen ‘you are a redeemer’ (165), gečaγaļarimizδandir ‘he is one of our redeemers’ (133), jaχšydyr ‘it is good’ (138), qatytndyr ‘she is a woman’ (172), and tanyqlardyrsiz ‘you are witnesses’ (227).

There are some examples of the so called Mittelsilbenschwund, see e.g. eksilariδa ‘both of them’ (14, 55, 231).

The 1st and 2nd singular person markers -sen and -men have the original -e-, see e.g. baryrmen ‘I will go’ (47–48), čyqqajsen ‘may you go out’ (138) and there is no trace of the Mod.NWKar. -myn ~ -minya and -syn ~ -şiŋ that seem to have displaced the original forms not earlier than the late 19th century (see Němeth 2015a: forthcoming).

The syllable-closing aj on morphologic boundaries and in suffixes remains unmerged (there is no trace of its subsequent evolution into ej; this process also took place most probably in the late 19th century, see Němeth 2015a: forthcoming). There is no example of the dissimilation process of geminated liquids and -ji-, either, see e.g. tuğaļlağaľaniñejejin ‘until he has finished, until he has completed’ (150). The question remains whether the -mm- > -nm- change in bolalmanmen ‘I cannot’ (212, 215) should be associated with the above-mentioned process known from Modern North-Western Karaim (see Němeth 2015a: forthcoming).
5.2. Morphology and syntax

Case suffixes and postpositions are characteristic of North-Western Karaim, cf. e.g. the accusative case suffix -ny (e.g. alarny ‘them’ (26)), the dative case suffix -ğa ~ -ga (alarğa ‘to them’ (18)) or the postposition byla ‘with’ (21). Typical of Western Karaim is also the comparative adjective marker -raq used e.g. in jayšyraqty ‘it is better’ (242). The verbal morphology is clearly Western Karaim, too, cf. the imperative, optative mood markers -qyn and -qaj (see qajtqyn ‘return (imp.)’ (45), tapqajysz ‘may you find’ (25), respectively), the future tense marker -r (e.g. bolur ‘will be’ (49)), the negative infinitive suffix -masqa attested twice in bolmasqa ‘not to be’ (37) and barmasqa ‘not to go’ (167), the inabilitive mood marker attested to twice in bolalmanmen ‘I cannot’ (212, 215), the converbial -doğaç in ajtadoğaç ‘saying’ (58), the -doğan participle attested to in undaladoğan ‘calling’ (175), and the -uvču participle attested e.g. in the substantivized form oruwčular ‘reapers’ (80). The interrogative particle is mo, see e.g. alarğamo ‘form them?’ (36). As an influence of Hebrew we find a number of instances of using a noun in the plural after a numeral bigger than 1, see e.g. eki uvullary ‘his two sons’ (5), on jyllar taqly ‘about ten years’ (13; cf. on jyl kadar (Eup. 1841) and Krmch. on jyllar qadar in the Targum (Ianbay & Erdal 1998: 15)), alty ölčä arpa ‘six measures of barley’ (183; cf. alty ölčä arpa in Eup. 1841), on eńanlar ‘ten men’ (197), jedi uvullardan (242) ‘than seven sons’, etc.401

5.3. Syntax: phrases

Similar to what we see in the translation of the Torah (see Németh 2014b), genitive attributives in noun phrases are used postpositionally, cf. e.g. qyrqyn-laryna Boazyn ‘to the maid-servants of Boaz’ (140), i.e. the word order is inverted compared to what we commonly have in the Turkic languages. This well-known Karaim phenomenon is to be attributed to Slavonic influences – for more information, see Csató (2011: 9–10), Németh (2010: 202; 2011a: 73–74).

In phrases in which genitive attributives are expressed by a personal pronoun, the personal pronouns are used postpositionally, see e.g. da qatyny

anyн ‘and his wife’ (5), juɾәgi anyн ‘his heart’ (157–158), jәlyj senin ‘your reward’ (104), üвүj senin ‘your house’ (233), etc. There is, however, an interesting feature as far as the phrases in this manuscript are concerned. In younger, 19th-century texts written in colloquial South-Western Karaim, the genitive attributives expressed by a personal pronoun were predominantly used prepositionally, e.g. Mod.SWKar. sizнin tirliɡiniz ‘your life’ (NÉMETH 2011a: 196), i.e. the word order in these two types of constructions agreed with what we have today in the Slavonic languages that influenced Karaim, and what we predominantly had in the colloquial Polish or Ukrainian in the 19th century.

Previously, having no access to older sources, it seemed that in phrases with genitive attributives expressed by a personal pronoun “the original Turkic word order has been preserved owing to its conformity with the Slavonic syntax” (NÉMETH 2011a: 73). We may, however, refine the above statement. It seems that the differences we see in this respect between the 19th-century colloquial texts and the 18th-century Bible translation reflect the differences that we observe in the respective Polish standards, cf. Middle Polish Bible translations from the 17th–18th centuries in which an inverted (compared to the present-day or 19th-century standard) word order was also used402, see e.g. qatyny anyн ‘and his wife’ (5) = MPol. z żoną swoją ‘with his wife’ (Ruth 1:1, Biblia Gdańska)403, juɾәgi anyн ‘his heart’ (157–158) = MPol. serce jego ‘id.’ (Ruth 3:7), jәlyj senin ‘your reward’ (104) = MPol. zapłata swoja ‘id.’ (Ruth 2:12), üвүj senin ‘your house’ = MPol. dom twój ‘id.’ (233), cf. also e.g. MPol. (17th–18th c.) w szkołach naszych ‘in our schools’, czas życia naʃego ‘the time of our life’, wáʁtownikowiʃwemu ‘to his own guard’, rękami moiemi ‘with my hands’ (BajeroWA 1964: 129, 147, 163; KurzoWA 1993: 187, respectively; examples not taken from Bible translations).404

5.4. Lexicon
The lexicon used in the translation is typical of North-Western Karaim, both phonetically and lexically, cf. e.g. аt ‘name’ (6), бar- ‘to go’ (20), bol- ‘to be’
(9), bolušluq ‘help’ (77), burun ‘before’ (179), byla ‘with’ (21), čajpa- ‘to impair’ (214), ingir ‘evening’ (119), kemiš- ‘to leave somebody’ (46), kerti ‘truth’ (172), oltur- ‘to sit; to dwell’ (13, 198–199), orun ‘place’ (19), qaruv ‘answer’ (81), ulus ‘nation, people’ (18), uvul ‘son’ (5). Worth mentioning is the use of demonstrative pronouns ol and ošol in the role of definite articles that follows Hebrew syntax: ol renders the Hebrew definite article ה, whereas ošol reflects the Hebrew accusative marker אֵת in the translation (for this observation see Olach 2013: 77; for further details see Nemeth 2015b), see e.g. ki saqyndy Adonaj ošol ulusun ‘that the Lord had remembered his people’ (18), janynda ol oruvčularнyn ‘beside the reapers’ (112), bilgin ošol ol orunnu ‘get know the place’ (151) juxtaposed with Hebr. כִּֽי־פָּקַד יְׁהוָה אֶת־עַמ ‘for the Lord had visited his people’ (Ruth 1:6), Hebr. אַחֲרֵי הַקֹצְׁרִים ‘after the reapers’ (Ruth 2:3), Hebr. וְׁיָדַעַתְׁ אֶת־הַמָקוֹם ‘and you shall mark the place’ (Ruth 3:4).

Interestingly, the translation contains four Slavonic loanwords – all of them connected with crops (cf. poluv ‘chaff’ in the Eupatorian print in Shapira 2013: 166–167).

These are words that have not been noted so far in dictionaries (including the Slavonic loanwords mentioned):

juřaklán- ‘to rebuke with anger’. A -la-n- derivative built from NWKar. juřak ‘heart’; the suffix -la builds denominal verbs, -n builds reflexive verbs in Karaim, see Zajączkowski (1932: 147–148, 149–150). The word has most probably the meaning ‘to be angry on someone; to rebuke with anger’ or, perhaps, ‘to reproach’. It is attested in the phrase juřaklänmajoju anyn üstwa ‘rebuke her not with anger’ or ‘do not reproach her’ (118). In the Hebrew original there is לְאֹלָה תונְבִר ‘and rebuke her not’ (King James 2000) or ‘do not reproach her’ (English Standard Version) (Ruth 2:16). For the semantic closeness of the ‘heart’ and ‘being anger’ cf. e.g. Pol. arch. sierdzić się ‘to explode with anger, to be angry’ < PSlav. *sfditi sę ‘id.’ ← PSlav. sfdby ‘1. heart; 2. anger’ (see e.g. Boryś 2005: 522, s.v. rozsierdzić).


gečega ~ gećaga ‘redeemer’, cf. SWKar. gecege ‘avenger’ (Mardkowicz 1935: 25; KarRPS 159). The word has been used in the manuscript altogether nine times as a translation of Hebr. יושב יושב > יושב ‘redeemer, savior’. For the ‘savior’ > ‘avenger’ semantic shift cf. Hebr. יושב יושב > יושב ‘avenger of blood (who by
killing the manslayer of his relative redeems the guilt of the manslaughter’)
(KOEHLER & BAUMGARTNER 1985: 162–163). Conspicuous is the lack of the e > 'a change in gečeğa: the rightly expected gečağa appears only once in line (173). The preponderance of forms with -e- in the second syllable might suggest that the word is an interdialectal loanword from SWKar. gecege (which could have easily taken place in Kukizów), used perhaps for the purpose of this translation only.

ölčov ‘measure’, cf. NWKar. ölčav id. (KOWALSKI 1929: 242; KarRPS 440). The word is attested twice in line 183 and 188. An -(u)v derivative built from ölča- ‘to measure’ (ZAJĄCZKOWSKI 1932: 74) the phonetic shape of which changed most probably by a subsequent *-ev > '-av > '-ov labialization triggered by the adjacent labial (or even bilabial) v or, perhaps, as a result of an öv > 'ov change in order to eliminate the *ö alien to Western Karaim phonotactics in non-first syllables. The latter sound appears rather rarely in non-first syllables in Turkic, see, however, EKar. bilör ‘crystal’ (KarRPS 118) or EKar. bilöv ‘knowledge’ cited also below, which may suggest that in case of the latter scenario a borrowing from other Turkic language or, perhaps, between Karaim dialects could have taken place, i.e. e.g. EKar. *ölčöv > WKar. ölčov. Nota bene, the idea that ölčov is a loanword seems to be supported by the fact that North-Western Karaim words ending in Mod.NWKar. -ov ~ -óú (i.e. in the derivative suffix -v ~ -ú that is attached to stems ending in -o ~ -o) are etymologically isolated in Karaim, but have etymological equivalents in other Kipchak languages (above all in the language of the Codex Comanicus in which the denominal nominal derivative suffix -ayu changed into -ov ~ -óú, see VONGABAIN 1959: 54–55, 56). These isolated Karaim words are Kar. buğov ‘1. bridle; 2. shackles, irons’, WKar. buzov ‘calf’, WKar. qonğurov ~ qunğurov ‘bell’, and NWKar. kušov ‘torch’ (see ZAJĄCZKOWSKI 1932: 74–75, where the Kipch.CC equivalents are provided). Whichever explanation is more probable, the -ov form is characteristic above all of Eastern Karaim, cf. e.g. EKar. bilov ~ bilöv ~ bilüv ‘knowledge’ vs. NWKar. bilüv id. (KarRPS 118; AQTAY & JANKOWSKI 2015: 84–85; Cambridge MS: 58 r°: bilov); EKar. maχtov ~ maχtuv ‘praise’ vs. WKar. maχtav ‘id.’ (KarRPS 405; AQTAY & JANKOWSKI 2015: 232–233), EKar. talav ~ talav ~ taluv ‘plunder’ vs. WKar. talav ‘id.’ (KarRPS 507, 508; AQTAY & JANKOWSKI 2015: 380; Cambridge MS: 105 r°: talov), EKar. tarlav ~ tarlav ~ tarluv ‘field’ vs. WKar. tarlav ‘id.’ (KarRPS 515; AQTAY & JANKOWSKI 2015: 386). The suffix has nothing in
common with the WKar. -ou that builds collective numerals and pronouns (ZAJACZKOWSKI 1932: 52–53), but the existence of the latter could have facilitated its appearance from morphotactic point of view.


**styrta** ‘heap (of grain)’, cf. OPol. sterta ~ styrtə ‘heap of grain; haystack’ (STstp., vol. VIII: 440–441).

**tαχλь** (or тaχlъ) ‘about, approximately’, cf. WKar. tekli ‘id.’ and EKar. tegli ~ tekli (AQTAY & JANKOWSKI 2015: 391, 392; KarRPS 520, 562). Apparently, the form tαχlъ (or тaχlъ) evolved due to an irregular sound change or is perhaps a loanword, cf. the typically Ottoman velar -a- in EKar. Tagry ‘God’ (KarRPS 512; SCHÖNIG 2010: 110; AQTAY & JANKOWSKI 2015: 383), occasionally used also in SWKar. texts (see NEMETH 2011a: 213, 319; NEMETH 2013b: 266), vs. EKar. Tenři (KarRPS 565; AQTAY & JANKOWSKI 2015: 395) and WKar. Tenři ~ Tendři (KarRPS 521, 564).

**vejatet**- ‘to winnow’ (146), a compound verb built with the auxiliary verb et- ‘to do’ based on Slavonic infinitive form; see zabun bol- below for a similar example, cf. Russ. вѣяти ‘to winnow’ (SRJa XI–XVII: vol. II: 138).

**zabun bol**- ‘to be helpless, to be infirm’, cf. Pers. زبون zabūn ‘weak, infirm, helpless’ (JOHNSON 1852: 649; STEINGASS 1892: 610), attested in line 37 in the sentence Alar üčunmo zabun bolğajdyjyz bolmasqa erartyna? ‘Would you be helpless being not behind a [i.e. having no] husband?’ (Ruth 1:13), cf. also zabun bol- in the title of a piyut authored by Mordechai the son of Nisan of Troki the incipit of which is Jasly da zabun bolgjan ‘Being bewailing and helpless’ (see JSul.I.01: 132 v°; JSul.I.45: 122 v°; JSul.III.03: 99 r°; JSul.III.69: 218 v°; JSul.III.79: 268 r°; III.61: 111 v°).

The word is most probably not related to Mod.NWKar. *zabum* et- ‘to forget’ (KarRPS 186). In fact, the latter word seems to be non-existent. It appears in Karaim texts only once, or more precisely: it is taken by the authors of KarRPS from MALECKI (1939: 16), where it is attested in the form zabumětiadohon, i.e. in a -dohon conversival form of a compound verb built with the auxiliary verb et- ‘to do’ (mentioned above). The case is that the derivative base of this type of compound verbs is always a loanword, very characteristically a Slavonic loanword.\footnote{A detailed description of the mechanism of building Karaim compound verbs based on Slavonic infinitive forms is presented in NEMETH (2011a: 91–94).}
or Turkic, or Arabic, let alone Persian stem that could serve as an etymon for zabum “oblivion”, it seems very probable that the stem zabum we find in Malecki is a result of typesetting error based on confusion of the Cyrillic hadwritten ‹ит›, i.e. ‹um›, with the handwritten ‹um› in the Latin script – i.e. ‹um›. If this is true, the form zabumëtiadohon is in fact Russ. забыть ‘to forget’ morphologically adapted in Karaim by adding the auxiliary verb et- to it, i.e. it should be deciphered as zabitëtiadohon and it is the verb zabitet- that should have been included into KarRPS.406 This is in compliance with the meaning provided by the authors of latter dictionary (which fits in also well with the meaning of the sentence it appears in in Malecki 1939).

5.5. The particle -čoq?

A quite interesting data is the word form keljanlaringačoq ‘when they were come, in the moment of their arrival’ attested in line 56 in Ruth (1:19) in the sentence Da bardylar eksilariňa keljanlariniňa dejin Bet Lëxemga da edi keljanlaringačoq Bet Lëxemga da čuvlady bar ol şahar alar üéun ajtadoğač bumodur Naami ‘And the two of them went on until they came to Bethlehem, and when they were come to Bethlehem, the whole town resounded because of them, saying: ‘Is this Naomi?’.

Morphologically, it can be parsed thus: it consists of keljanlari ‘their arrival’, a construction build up from the perfect participle -gan of WKar. kel- ‘to come’ used with the respective (in this case the 3rd pl.) possessive suffix which expresses by whom an action has been performed supplemented with the locative suffix -da (with the epenthetic -n- usual for possessive forms) to assign the construction an additional temporal meaning and express an action in the course of which another action takes place.407

The last segment is, however, obscure.

The meaning of the construction resembles the role of Mod.NWKar. -haçoχ (< *-gačoq) converb that builds transgressive forms that indicate an action that

406 Since we know that Russian loanwords were adopted in Modern North-Western Karaim according to the consonant-harmony (see Németh 2013b: 274–275), the -yf infinitive ending always evolved into -i in loanwords (because it was difficult for Karaims to combine the pronunciation of the furthest back vowel y with a palatal consonant – for more information on this phenomenon see Németh 2014a: 354).

407 In the Targum the equivalent of this expression is: qačan ki keldiler ‘when they came’ (Iänbay & Erdał 1998: 17 [sentence 134]), in the English Standard Version the relevant fragment is translated as and when they came to Bethlehem, whereas in King James 2000 as when they were come to Bethlehem (Ruth 1:19).
ended exactly in the moment or immediately before another action expressed by the main verb took place or started, see e.g. Németh (2011b: 126; 2013a: 131–132, 139–140). Thus, the -gačoq converb of the verb kel-, i.e. *keljačoq in Middle North-Western Karaim, would have meant something similar we have in the analysed sentence, i.e. ‘having come; in the moment of having come’. Conspicuously, a preliminary analysis of these two forms, i.e. of the analysed keljanlarindjačoq and *keljačoq, may suggest that they contain the one and the same morpheme -čoq.

This, however, does not agree with what we know about the structure of the Mod.NWKar. -hačoχ. Zajączkowski interpreted it as a rarely used complex suffix used in the literary language that consists of the suffix -hač that forms transgressives (and compares it with the morpheme -hač in the Karaim converbial suffix -a-dohoc < *-a-dur-jač) and the particle -oχ, not affected by vowel harmony and being not stressed, which “specifies the time of the action performed” (see Németh 2013a: 139). The same interpretation has been proposed by Räsänen (1957: 189–190) with some Turkic cognates of the intensifying particle -ok provided (see Räsänen 1957: 248) and this view is supported also by the data collected by Džanmavov (1967: 187–188). It is too early to say anything decisive in this matter (we have only one word at our disposal), but it seems likely, that -čoq appeared in keljanlarindjačoq by analogy with NWKar. *-qačoq due to misinterpreting the morphologic boundaries of the latter suffix and treating it as a composition of -qa and -čaχ. Additionally, it seems that it was viewed as an intensifying particle for it looks not to have any specific grammatical meaning.

---

408 The latter category has been presented by A. Zajączkowski in the original manuscript of his work on Karaim derivation published in 1932, but eventually it has been not included in its printed version (the removed fragments were critically edited in Németh 2013a).

409 As a comparative data A. Zajączkowski quotes Tuvan, Kazan Tatar and Chagatai converbial forms (see Németh 2013a: 140), cf. e.g. Chag. körğač ‘having looked, as soon as having seen’ (BodrogligeT 2001: 276–277), Tuv. bargas ‘having entered’ (Ischakov & Palmbach 1961: 316, 318, 330–336).

410 The only case this suffix was described in another way is Musaev’s (1964: 301) attempt to explain it as a composition of -ka(n) and -čaχ, but there are no further comparative data or explanation provided.
Abbreviations

acc. = accusative; Arm.-Kipch. = Armeno-Kipchak; Chag. = Chagatai; comp. = comparative; cond. = conditional; conv. = converb; dat. = dative; def. = definite; deriv. = derivation; EKar. = Eastern (Crimean) Karaim; fut. = future; gen. = genitive; Hebr. = Hebrew; imp. = imperative; inf. = infinite verb form; int. = intensifying; Kar. = Karaim; Kipch.CC = the language of the Codex Comanicus; Krmch. = Krymchak; loc. = locative; Mod.NWKar. = Modern North-Western Karaim; Mod.SWKar. = Modern South-Western Karaim; MPol. = Middle Polish; neg. inf. = negative infinitive; nom. = nominative; NWKar. = North-Western (Trakai) Karaim; OPol. = Old Polish; opt. = optative; part. = participle; perf. cond. = perfect conditional; perf. opt. = perfect optative mood; pl. = plural; poss. = possessive form; prep. = preposition (i.e. prepositionally used postposition); pres. = present tense; progr. = progressive; pron. = pronoun; PSlav. = Proto-Slavonic; sg. = singular; Slav. = Slavonic; suf. = suffix; SWKar. = South-Western (Lutsk and Halych) Karaim; Tuv. = Tuvan; WKar. = Western Karaim.
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**Handwritten sources and old prints**

III-61 = Handwritten, vocalised additions in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim from Halych from 1850/1851 added to a prayer book printed in Hebrew in Qale in 1736/1737. Kept in a private archive whose owner wishes to remain anonymous.

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.

Cambridge MS = A manuscript that contains a four-volume translation of the Tanach into Eastern (Crimean) Karaim; held by the Cambridge University Library under the shelf number BSMS 288.

E-P = A manuscript that formerly belonged to the Elyashevich-Babadjan (Ельяшевич-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.

JSul. = The private archive of Anna Sulimowicz.

JSul.I.01 = Handwritten, vocalised prayer book containing folios from Halych, Kukizów and Lutsk from the 18th–19th centuries. Written in Hebrew and South- and North-Western Karaim.

JSul.I.11 = Handwritten, vocalised prayer book from Lutsk from 1878. Written in Hebrew and North-Western Karaim.

JSul.I.38-9 = A manuscript from the first half of the 19th century containing religious poems written in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim.

JSul.I.45 = Handwritten, vocalised additions in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim from Halych from the 19th century added to a prayer book printed in Hebrew in 1528 in Venice.

JSul.I.46 = Handwritten, vocalised additions in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim from the 19th century added to a prayer book printed in Hebrew in 1528 in Venice.
JSul.I.54-03 = A manuscript from the 19th century containing religious hymns. Written most probably in Halych in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim.
JSul.I.54-12 = A manuscript from Halych from the first half of the 19th century containing religious poems. Written in South-Western Karaim.
JSul.I.54-15 = A manuscript from Halych from the turn of 19th and 20th centuries containing religious poems. Written in South-Western Karaim.
JSul.III.01 = Handwritten, vocalised translation of the Torah from Halych from the 19th century. Written in South-Western Karaim.
JSul.III.03 = Handwritten, vocalised additions in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim from Halych from ca. 1778 added to a prayer book printed in Qale in Hebrew in 1736/1737.
JSul.III.67 = Handwritten, vocalised prayer book from Halych from the first half of the 19th century (before 1851). Written in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim.
JSul.III.69 = Handwritten, vocalised prayer book from Halych from the period between 1851–1866. Written in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim.
JSul.III.72 = Handwritten, vocalised prayer book from Halych from the first half of the 19th century (not older than 1851). Written in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim.
JSul.III.76 = Handwritten, vocalised prayer book from Halych from the 19th century. Written in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim.
JSul.III.79 = Handwritten, vocalised prayer book from Halych from the period between 1851–1866. Written in Hebrew and South-Western Karaim.
JSul.VII.22-02-13 = A manuscript from the 19th century containing a religious poems written South-Western Karaim.
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