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Abstract
In this article, the author describes the nature of the 1840/1841 Turkic Karaim translation of the Bible, published at Gözleve / Jevpatorija, and especially, the translation of Nehemia, the last book in this publication. The author tries to identify the translator / copyist of Nehemia, who was working on the MS in 1672 in Mangup, having been based himself on the colophon, and surmised that the rest of the Bible translation may come from a MS copied by the same copyist. The author further speculates why the publisher of the Gözleve edition chose this particular MS. In order to define the Turkic language of the translation, the author goes in details about the earlier Jewish – both Rabbanite and Karaite – population of Çufut-Qaleh in the Crimea; his conclusion is that the earlier population was mostly immigrants from the North (the Duchy of Lithuania) and their language could not be originally any sorts of Crimean Turkic. In the article, the author publishes and republishes different Judeo-Turkic Karaite Biblical translations and tombstone inscriptions.
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Gözleve / T[1]rishqan Bible Translation

In 1840/1841 at Jevpatorija (formerly Gözleve, in the Crimean Peninsula), the rich Karaite merchant Mordechai T[1]rishqan, whose business activities included i.a., printing, sponsored the biggest Judeo-Turkic project ever – the publication in three volumes of a translation of the whole of the Bible (except Chronicles). This publication was formally dedicated to the wedding (to be taken place on 16.04.1841) of the future Russian Czar Alexander II (1818-1881, r. 1855-1881), but in fact it celebrated the newly gained administrative and religious independence of the Crimean Karaites, under the successful leadership of Šimḥah Babowicz (1790-1855).

Later authors designated the Turkic language of this translation as “Tatar” or “Judeo-Tatar”, and it was assumed that the publication testifies to a voluntary act of transfer by the Crimean Karaites to the Tatar language of their Muslim neighbors and of relinquishing their former – presumably Karaim – form of Turkic speech. Earlier, I had written (Shapira 2003c) that this assumption is wrong, and the so-called “Tirshqan translation” or “Gözleve Bible” was not a new translation, but rather a hasty attempt to Tatarize – or even vulgarize – earlier translations existing in manuscripts. I wrote that, lacking genuine manuscripts in the Crimean-Tatar language, the editors took the ones written in the Karaim language brought apparently from Luck and/or Kokizow, and changed some grammatical forms from Karaim to “Tatar”, whatever this ambiguous term might mean, while sometimes also substituting some Karaim words with their Tatar equivalents.

As stated, the Gözleve translation did not contain the Books of Chronicles, and the last book translated in it was Nehemia. The reason for my choice of a chapter from Nehemia (see APPENDIX II), in order to illustrate the language of the Gözleve translation by a sample, is twofold:

2. This is noteworthy that Avraham Firkowicz, who already had experience in editing Turkic Bible translations, and who was just travelling in 1840 in the Caucasus with the young son of Mordechai T[1]rishqan (cf. Shapira 2006b & 2010b), was not invited to join this project.
a) it is at the end of Nehemia that a colophon of the copyist is found, so one might assume that the text of the book of Nehemia as printed in 1840/1841 would be, hopefully, less changed by the printers;
b) the book of Nehemia is written in a very simple Late Biblical Hebrew standing half way to the later stage of Hebrew, for which we sometimes use the term “Mishnaic Hebrew” (which is a misnomer in a Karaite context); as such, it contains practically no interest for an interpreter or translator; though there are exegetical points of interest for the Jewish Law (including the Karaite Law), the book was not widely read, and thus not widely translated into the vernacular.

These points lead me to hope that the text of the translation of Nehemia as printed at Gözleve could be better preserved and less modernized than the other parts of the translation of the Bible. For the text of Nehemia chapter 13 see APPENDIX II.

The colophon to the manuscript, as printed in the Gözleve edition, says:

This means, Ya’aqov son of Mordechai copied this translation of the Prophets and Hagiographa on Wednesday 23 of the Second Adar of the year (see further) for Mordechai son of Menahem. The year is problematic, because of the too-much-sophisticated way of expressing it by a Biblical chronogram. According to Poznanski 1916:88, the manuscript was copied in 1672; another possibility is to explain the date as 1634 or 1632, and this what I did (Shapira 2003c: 697),

3 It is worth notice that this interesting material is partly absent from Baskakov, Zajončkovski, Šapšal (eds.) 1974.
without, however, much conviction, and in the following section I will demon-
strate why my earlier date is impossible, and Poznanski was right; I will do it
while using new evidence.

The place where the copy has been procured is not indicated, but it is gener-
ally surmised that it was done in the Crimea, and apparently, at Mangup.

Ya’aqov son of Mordechai seems to have been a relatively young man while
copying this translation, for he called himself ‘the youngest / the smallest
among the copyists’ (צעיר התutorsים), though the use of this expression was
sometimes rather formal. His father, Mordechai, was a sage (ḥākhām), and
was already dead, as indicated by the eulogy that follows his name.

Mordechai son of Menahem, Mordechai T[R]ishqan, and why this manu-
script?

First we should dwell upon Mordechai son of Menahem, the person who or-
dered the copy and paid for it; this person is known only as one for whom the
copy was made; he is flatteringly called ‘the learned one’ (ha-maskīl), and his
deceased father is called ‘the honored’ (but not ‘a sage’, ḥākhām); ordering of
such a big copy-work certainly did cost big money. We do not have much Tur-
kīc Karaite translations of the whole Bible, or of extensive parts of it, for the
precise reason that such copies had been expensive; the good knowledge of
the text of the Hebrew Bible was achieved by hard work at school, by learning
by heart, and not by reading from a translation into the vernacular, which was
simply an expensive aid to meet the need. These imply that Mordechai son of
Menahem was both a richman and frankly an ignoramus.

Nothing is known about this person, as already mentioned; the name of
his father, Menahem, is common among the Karaites of Constantinople in the
Late Byzantine / Early Ottoman periods (one of the sons of Caleb Ephendopoulo
was called thus⁴); one Menahem lived for a while in Cairo (PINSKER 1860):

⁴ The grandfather of Yoseph Rabisi and Eliyahu Babaşı, see FÜRST 1862-69: II:305;
there are many occurrences of this name among the Karaites of Istanbul, cf. DANON
1924-25 and DANON 1926-27.
47-53). The name is unattested at Troki and other Lithuanian communities (cf. Akhiezer & Dvorkin 2004).

At the cemetery of Mangup, there is no Menahem, while there are many Mordechais; at Çufut-Qal’eh, so closely connected by waves of immigration with Constantinople and Edirne, the name Menahem can be found at any stage of the existence of this cemetery, but was mostly used by people having some Constantinopolitan connections; there is no Mordechai son of Menahem, however. All this implies that the name Menahem was relatively rare and not typical of the whole of the Crimea and used mostly by Constantinople immigrants or by their descendants (like in the case of R. Menahem the young, son of R. Moshe Gibbor, who came from the country ‘Uz, that is, from Byzantium / Ottoman Empire, and who died at Çufut-Qal’eh in 1589;5 he was part of the massive mid-16th century immigration of the Greek-speaking Karaites6 from Constantinople to the Crimea, where the newcomers became, apparently, linguistically assimilated into the local Turkic speech of their Muslim and Christian neighbors).

The hunch is that this Mordechai son of Menahem was not living at Mangup or Çufut-Qal’eh, but rather at a more prosperous hub, such as Capha / Keffeh, Gözeleve, or even Constantinople.

The manuscript copied by Ya’aqov son of Mordechai for Mordechai son of Menahem was found, by 1840, in the hands of Mordechai T[irshqan, a rich

---

5 Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasyutinsky 2014 (in press), No. III 63 (=AZ 118).
6 On the Greek names among the womenfolk of Çufut-Qal’eh, cf. Shapira 2008: 274-275; cf. also Shapira 2008: 279-280. In Shapira 2003ab, I suggested that the mere fact that a Turkic translation of the Pentateuch was undertaken by Firkowicz and others in Istanbul in the early 1830s would indicated a partial transfer of thither Karaites from Greek to Turkish; now this suggestion is invalidated by a late 19th century Karaite manuscript that had been belonging to a Jafet, apparently, a Karaite from Istanbul. The manuscript contains translations into plain “Istanbuli” Turkish, in Hebrew characters, of eleven Biblical books: Proverbs, Song of Songs, Jonah, Esther, Ezra (in the middle of Ezra, chapter 7, there is a break with two pages of grammar rules), Megilat Ruth, Lamentations, Habbakuk, Malachi, Obadiah, Daniel. This manuscript proves that there were Karaites in Istanbul that were in need of a Turkish translation, implying that they spoke Turkish (in addition to Greek). I shall discuss this manuscript in my forthcoming “A New Karaite Manuscript from Germany in Istanbuli Turkish”.

merchant from Gözleve, who was known, as said, for his love of Karaite books, his philanthropy, and by his poor Karaite education. Though Mordechai T[1]rishqan lived at Gözleve, his father Yiṣḥaq Keffeli (or, of Capha / Keffeh) came there from Capha / Keffeh. The family had also a branch in Constantinople, Mordechai T[1]rishqan being a brother-in-law of Yiṣḥaq Kohen, the leader of Constantinople’s Karaite community, and had business connections there (SHAPIRA 2003ab).

The migration of Yiṣḥaq Keffeli (or, of Capha), Mordechai T[1]rishqan’s father, from Capha / Keffeh to Gözleve, should have occurred in the first decades of the Russian rule in the Crimea, which had begun, officially, in 1783; we know that till the Crimean War (1853-1856) there was much rivalry between the Karaite leaders of Gözleve, a vulgar nouveau-riche international hub now christened Jevpatorija, and those of Capha / Keffeh, once and again an historical capital-city full of memories and old books, now christened Feodosija. Historically, Çufut-Qal’eh and Capha were located in two different states with two different, though related, Turkic languages (a Crimean variety of Ottoman Turkish was spoken at the Ottoman city of Keffeh, while a local form of the so-called “Middle” Crimean-Tatar dialect was spoken at Bâhçe-Sarây and, apparently, its mixed Jewish-Armenian’ suburb Çufut-Qal’eh).

Moving from Feodosija, which was about to begin to cease operations as a port in competition to the noisy and still ugly Jevpatorija was a very smart decision to make in, say 1812-1826, and this decision of Mordechai T[1]rishqan’s father to move to Jevpatorija has contributed greatly to his son’s economic success in his new home. Although almost all the Karaites in Jevpatorija have been by then migrants born somewhere else, mostly from Çufut-Qal’eh, the desolated Mangup, Luck, Constantinople, etc., the great divisive line ran between those from Çufut-Qal’eh and those from Capha / Keffeh, now Feodosija. So, in order to assimilate completely in the new milieu, Mordechai T[1]rishqan had to pay to buy his respect; in 1835/1836 he donated 600 Rubles, a huge.

7 On Armenians at Çufut-Qal’eh prior to their exile in 1778, see SHAPIRA 2008d, Appendix III; for a broader discussion of the Karaite-Armenian relations, see SHAPIRA 2008: 449-457 [Hebrew].
sum, for printing 'Eškol haKkopher, and 1,000 Rubles for printing the Karaite Prayerbook; he bought the printing house in which Karaite books were printed, and had there the Hebrew Pentateuch with the Five Scrolls printed in 1839/1840; the next year he printed the whole Jewish Bible in a Turkic translation, the one we are discussing now, and he kept on printing Karaite books till his death in 1847.8

The question is why did Mordechai T[1]Irshqan use, for his edition of the Prophets and Hagiographa, this particular manuscript? The logical answers are:

a) because he did not have access to any other manuscript (or, to any other complete manuscript);

b) because he believed this manuscript to be the best / the oldest / the most clear linguistically / the most precise;

c) because he had some personal connection to this manuscript.

I suggest that, in this case, all three options were involved: it is quite possibly that the manuscript was in the personal possession of the T[1]Irshqan’s family while still at Capha / Keffeh (we know that the copyist was working, i.e., there, see further); the person who sponsored the copy was called Mordechai – the name found in the T[1]Irshqan’s family (he, himself, was one) – and was rich enough to pay for the copy, but not learned enough in order to not need one –traits similar to those distinctive in the character of Mordechai T[1]Irshqan, himself – and he lived outside the major centers of Çufut-Qal’eh and Mangup (apparently, at Capha / Keffeh), like Mordechai T[1]Irshqan, himself. This Mordechai, the first owner of the manuscript, might well be an ancestor of the 19th century Gözeleve entrepreneur and printer. Printing such family relic like this manuscript, together with its colophon,9 would prompt the status of the T[1]Irshqan’s family

---


9 Apparently, printing the colophon was a statement.
in Jevpatorija, in the Crimea, and among the Karaites in general; after all, everyone who must have known that the procurer of the manuscript was an ancestor of the family and a patron of the learned – like Mordechai T[1]rshqan, himself – apparently knew it in Jevpatorija. Besides, the manuscript is, indeed, the oldest known manuscript of the Prophets and Hagiographa in any Turkic dialect used in the past by the Eastern European Karaites.

I am well aware of the speculative character of these suggestions of mine; at our present stage of knowledge they cannot be proven; we do not possess the original manuscript, only its printed version. Nevertheless, these speculative suggestions seem to me to make sense. Now we move to more safe ground.

**Who was the copyist, Ya‘aqov son of Mordechai?**

A

Ya‘aqov son of Mordechai is mentioned in Mordechai Sultaşński’s *Zekher Saddiqim* (POZNANSKI 1920) among the “first (meaning, “early”) Crimean sages”; according to the wide-spread notion among the learned “Northern”, or, “Polish-Lithuanian” Karaites in the 18th–19th centuries, prior to their own immigration into the Crimea, the land was void of learning and wisdom.10

By the second half of the 18th century, there appeared a new trend in the map of Karaite inter-community migrations: the better-educated, but poor, Karaites of Wolhynia11 began to emigrate *en masse* to the Crimea, especially to the rich community of Çufut-Qal’eh, looking for employment as teachers of Jewish subjects or as communal functionaries (cf. LASKER 2011; NOSONOVSKY 2011; SHAPIRA 2011b; AKHIEZER 2011; on the immigrants from the Karaite North at Çufut-Qal’eh, see AKHIEZER & SHAPIRA 2008); Mordechai Sultaşński, who described the Karaites of the Crimea as dependant on the learning of the

---

10 Cf. complains of Šimḥah-Yiṣḥaq Łucki in the mid 18th century Çufut-Qal’eh, who felt there as and exiled stranger (*sobel šam geruth we-galuth*, see LASKER 2011: 38).

11 On these communities and on their early history, see AKHIEZER & SHAPIRA 2001; cf. now KIZILOV 2008.
Northerners, was a part of this tendency, himself. But this process was much older than Sułtański’s times.

*Who were the Karaites who inhabited Çufut-Qal’eh?*

I

The late Zvi Ankori, in his *The Karaites of Byzantium*, argued that Karaite communities were able to exist only in a symbiosis with their Rabbanite brethren and that if we find a reference to a Karaite community elsewhere, we have to expect a Rabbanite community to coexist there. Because of their interpretation of the purity laws of the Bible, Karaites prefer to use Rabbanites (or, Muslims) for grave-digging and enterrement of their dead, avoiding this job, if possible. So, *apriori* we must presuppose coexistence of Rabbanites and Karaites in Çufut-Qal’eh and Mangup-Qal’eh.

Indeed, the very first evidence of the Karaites in the Crimea mentioned a dispute between the Karaites and the Rabbanites in Sulkhat in 1278, indicating thus that both groups coexisted in the same town. An indication of such co-existence in the Crimea is the the fact that there are two different Jewish family names indicating provenance from Mangup – the Rabbanite-Qrmchaq family name Mangupli and the Karaite family name Mangubi. The cave *miqveh*, discovered in the vicinity of the Mangup synagogue (the Karaite or Rabbanite one?) could also belong to the members of the local Rabbanite community (more in KZILOV 2003: 215). According to written sources, Rabbanites were still found in Mangup in 1642 (DEINARD 1879: 21-22).

Among the Rabbanites of Çufut-Qal’eh there were two Rabbanite sages, brothers Barukh and Mordechai Qal’i (meaning, “of Çufut-Qal’eh”). In the second half of the 17th century a family named *Izmirli* resided at Çufut-Qal’eh; it is almost certain that they have not been originally Karaite; the existence of Rabbanites in

---

12 Aharon son of Yoseph (1250-132), in his *Sepher haMibhar*, 12b.
13 First published in *haMaggid* 11:44.
14 Cf. MAGGID 1921; R. Barukh migrated to the Ottoman Empires and published his *Responsa* in Izmir in 1650.
Çufut-Qal’eh was acknowledged by Avraham Firkowicz, himself,\(^{15}\) and can be also deduced from the evidence he published in his \textit{Ahney Zikkaron} ([\cite{FIRKOWICZ1872}; henceforth: AZ]) and from an analysis of the actual situation in the Jewish cemetery of Çufut-Qal’eh: there can be little doubt that Rabbanite was the lady called Manushak, who died in 1608, and who was wife of Ya’aqov, the gravedigger, for gravedigging for Karaites and their burial of were performed by Rabbanites (AZ 149 = \cite{FEDORCHUKetal2014}, No. III 136 = 06C 048 in our Çufut-Qal’eh database);\(^{16}\) at least, Rabbanite was her husband the gravedigger.

AZ 339, who appears also on Firkowicz’s map of the Çufut-Qal’eh cemetery (AZ No. 25), was Nissim Rabban (=Rabbanite) who died in the year HTKB = 1662, “buried among the righteous” (\textit{saddiqim}; in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, a Karaite self-apellation; this is photo 03F 024 in our database).

Other Rabbanites in AZ are: Nos. AZ 98 (died in 1612; \cite{FEDORCHUKetal2014}, No. III 144 = 06C 026 in our Çufut-Qal’eh database); AZ 195 (widow of Moshe Pardo = \cite{FEDORCHUKetal2014}, No. IV 10 = 2F 023 in our database, who died in 1646;\(^{17}\) AZ 332 (died in 1627; \cite{FEDORCHUKetal2014}, No. IV 197 = 06E 056 in our database; his Rabbanite provenance is obvious from the explicit language of this tombstone inscription); AZ 367 (died in 1680; this inscription has been lost).

A Sephardi Rabbanite from Yanbolu (in the present day Bulgaria), Siman Tob s. of the late Ye’udah Sabbāgh, died in Çufut-Qal’eh in 1672 (AZ 228 = \cite{FEDORCHUKetal2014}, No. IV 39 = 02F 034 in the database).

Possibly to the same category of Rabbanite burials belongs an Ashkenaz-like tombstone of the wife of a man who had a non-Karaite family name

---

\(^{15}\) \cite{FIRKOWICZ1872}: 93, No. 353 (Joseph b. Moses ha-Paytan Meborakh, buried in Çufut-Qal’eh in 1669), Firkowicz’s note; he was said to be “one of the Crimean Rabbanites, a teacher of the Law in Qal’a”, apparently, in a Karaite midrash (\textit{yeshivah}).

\(^{16}\) On Rabbanites in the role of Karaites’ gravediggers and morticians in Luck in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, cf. \textit{Šabarovš'kyj} 2013: 83-84.

\(^{17}\) The meaning of the nickname was “one from the city of Prawody in modern Bulgaria, \textit{Pravod} s.; from this city was Shabbetai s. of Yosef haLevi, see \cite{HARKAVY1876}: 235 No. 42, and \cite{HARKAVY1876}: 257, No. 49.
An interesting case is the tombstone inscription of Rabbi R. Gershon the elder, descendant of learners (AZ 256, our number No. IV 62 4F 062), who died in 1737(?); probably, he was a Rabbanite (or, an immigrant from the Northern Karaite realms?). The type of this tombstone is, indeed, “Ashkenazi.” The name Gershon is extremely rare among Karaites, but is common among Askenazim (this Gershon is the only one in Samuel Poznanski’s [electronic] Karaite Encyclopaedia); there is no name of his father, a strange feature for a well-established Karaite society of Çufut-Qal’eh, and it is stressed that Gershon’s unnamed forefathers were people of learning; this Gershon was known for his religious virtues, but he was not *yaqar or hašub*, terms associated with social status. Next to Gershon is buried his son, Ḥayyim, 04F 063 in our database, who died in 1726. The name “Ḥayyim” is attested among the Karaites of Poswol in Lithuania, and there was another Ḥayyim in Çufut-Qal’eh (see FEDORCHUK, SHAPIRA, VASYUTINSKY 2014, No. IV 30).

**No. IV 62 4F 062**

This monument was put [for remembrance]
of a learned man [of dear character],
teacher, rabbi and also elder,
his service is with innocent and right heart.
His name is Gershon, [from the rac]e of the wise,
Prayin[g the Lord regularly.
Passed away on Shabbat, 4<sup>th</sup>
of Kislev, *5,498 > 898 counted.
His death will be for atonement,
his soul shall be bound in the bundle of life].<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> The underlined lines given according to AZ. HARKAVY 1876: 261, emended the date to HTSh. There is no way to check the date now: the tombstone is broken, only the upper part has survived.
Even in the late 18th / early 19th centuries there were amongst the Crimean Karaites people of Rabbanite extraction, possibly “converts” to Karaite Judaism, judging from such family names as Ashkenazi, Mizraḥi, Gurdži / Gurdzhi / Gurci; it appears that in 1793 there were among the residents of Čufut-Qal'eh Moshe Ashkenazi and David Ashkenazi, to whom a son was born and circumcised there, and whose other son was Eliyahu. In 1809, there was a wedding of Ya'aqov Pasha (from a well-known Karaite family) and Malkah daughter of Avraham Keffeli Gurci / Gurdzhi (a typical Rabbanite-Qrmchaq surname). However, in the early 19th century, Russian Imperial authorities prohibited the Crimean Karaites to accept “Rabbins” into their communities; in 1821 and in 1822 the Tavrida authorities reported that the Karaites, “having constituted separate communities, did not mix with the Jew-Rabbins”; nevertheless, documents recently found in the State Archive of the Autonomous Republic of the Crimea demonstrate that there were cases, exactly in the early twenties of the 19th century, of Rabbanites who joined Karaite communities, in order to escape legal discrimination.

II

It is in place to survey briefly the history of the Jewish community of Čufut-Qal'eh as reflected in the epigraphic evidence; we should note that the Jewish cemetery of Čufut-Qal'eh is both the oldest surviving Jewish cemetery in Eastern Europe and the biggest among the oldest ones:

1) The oldest inscription on the tombstones from the Jewish cemetery of Čufut-Qal'eh are from 1363/4 (Manush d. of Shabbethai, see Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 1); Firkowicz did not doctor this inscription, probably understanding, rightly, that this is the oldest of all. The tombstone is of the Seljuk type, with some older tombstones of a

---

19 According to metrical books of Yishaq ben Shelomoh, copied by B. Kokenaj, and recently studied in Kizilov 2004: Seraja Szapszal’s Personal Archive kept in the Manuscript Department of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences’ Library Fond 142 file 1519 fol. 18 & file 375 fol. 45-46.
20 To be edited and discussed by M. Kizilov.
similar Seljuk type, without any traceable inscriptions, found next to it. Several meters away is found the second-oldest inscription, from 1386/7 (Sarah d. of Avraham, see Fedorchuk, Shapiro, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 2), of a similar type (a variation of this type was current at Mangup between 1443/4-1454/5, Mangup Nos. 1-6). It seems that these two inscriptions represent the oldest Jewish community of Çufut-Qal'eh. The name “Manush” appearing on the oldest inscription, and its variant “Manushak”, appearing twice in this corpus, were probably Rabbanite:

21 This name does not appear on the long list of the traditional female names of the Crimean Karaites quoted in the Crimean-Tatar comedy written in the late 19th / early 20th centuries by A. Levi, Akhr Zeman, “The Last Times” (see Yalpachik 2004: 84; the names there are: Arzu, Sarra, Sedet, Sultan, Murat, Devlet, Biyana, Biyım, Khanse, Simit, Bikeţ, Akhpıqe, Gülüşh, Khaňsh, Toteke, Tötesh, Bodesh, Milke, Aytolu, Gečkey, Biçe, Totay, Bikenesh, Ragel [=Rahel], Kereće).

The name “Manush” appearing on the oldest inscription, and its variant “Manushak”, appearing twice in this corpus, were probably Rabbanite:21 one Manushak, as mentioned above, was wife of the gravedigger (QBR; see Fedorchuk, Shapiro, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 136), and another (Fedorchuk, Shapiro, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 205) was daughter of Shekhu (an unusual name) Levi, the date of whose death was indicated on his own tombstone inscription (Fedorchuk, Shapiro, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 50) as BQBR (“in the grave”, 1579CE), probably referring thus to his gloomy trade.

2) The third-oldest is also that of a woman, Sarah d. of Moshe (see Fedorchuk, Shapiro, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 3), from the year 1419/20. The type of this inscription is totally different (“triangle with a niche”), and this type became predominant for the next fifty years, probably indicating a wave of newcomers. Next to her was buried Severgelin d. of Levi (Fedorchuk, Shapiro, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. II 2), who died in 1420/1. In the same 1420/1 died Eliya s. of Hillel (Fedorchuk, Shapiro, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 3), whose tombstone is of the same type. To the same type belongs also the tombstone of Mordechai (Fedorchuk, Shapiro, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 5), who died in 1424/5. Mordechai s. of Daniel died in 1429/30 (Fedorchuk, Shapiro, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 6), and his tombstone is also of the same type; this is the first
In the next year, 1430/31, died Eliyah s. of Yeshu'ah (Yeshu'ah being a typical Karaite name) (Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 7), with the dating “five thousands” written in words and with the tombstone of the same type.

A local variant of this type of tombstones is found also in Mangup between 1460/1-1470/1 and in 1501/2 (Mangup Nos. 8-10, 17).

3) Then there are two identical Ashkenazic-like tombstones from the same year (1456/7) put side by side in another segment of the cemetery (Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasyutinsky 2014, Nos. III 8 & 9). These two tombstones represent, possibly, an immigrant community from the North. On one of these inscriptions, the male name Simhah is found, which is typical for both Ashkenazim and the Eastern European Karaites.

4) Then there are five tombstone inscriptions (Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasyutinsky 2014, Nos. III 10-14) from the years 1472/3-1476/7, belonging to the type mentioned in 2), though they are located together with the tombstones mentioned in 3).

5) Beginning from the year 1483, a year after the Karaites of Kiev were brought to Çufut-Qal’eh as prisoners of war, the Ashkenazic-like tombstones become in the Çufut-Qal’eh cemetery the predominant type for seventy years 1483-1551 (Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasyutinsky 2014, Nos. III 15-28). These tombstones are of the so-called Rheinland-Ashkenazic type, known also from the early 16th century Jewish cemeteries from Eastern Poland. They became the only registered type of a grave monument at the cemetery of Çufut-Qal’eh for the period between 1483-1545. The first inscription of this type in this group, No. III 15, belonging to a Karaite refugee from Kiev, is also the oldest inscription which mentions the month in which the diseased has passed away. In the same year, not only the month of death, but also the exact date has begun to be used (Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 16), becoming the norm in the Çufut-Qal’eh cemetery (with the significant exception of Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 18, who died in 1485/6,
with the non-Ashkenazic type of the tombstone and with atypical location22). To compare, at Mangup, the use of the exact date of the death began to be used in 1548/9 (Mangup No. 21, Hanukkah son of the respected Moshe of blessed memory, passed away on the first day of Teveth, year 5,309 from the Creation).

It was this immigrant group that introduced new fashions of tombstones, of dating the death etc.; contrary to the Karaite “legends” from the 19th century about Karaite prisoners of war taken by Witold from the Crimea into Lithuania and founding there the first Karaite communities, the solid evidence we do have in Çufut-Qal’eh is that about Karaite prisoners of war taken from Lithuania (Kiev and Luck) to the Crimea and changing there the life of the existing Jewish communities.

Within this group of eleven tombstones, we have two belonging to former members of the Karaite community of Kiev (Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasutinsky 2014, Nos. III 15 & 20) and three belonging to former members of the Luck community (Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasutinsky 2014, Nos. III 16, 17, 19); there can be little doubt that the rest were also immigrants from the North, or locals trying to assimilate into the prestigious immigrant community (there are numerous examples of this phenomenon – of locals integrated by the newcomers – in other Jewish communities). It can be surmised that, at least partly, the Jewish community of Çufut-Qal’eh prior to this Karaite migration from the North was Rabbanite, though Karaite presence prior to 1482 cannot be denied (judging from such typically Karaite name as Yeshu’ah).

Then there is group of women with names such as Sarka, Anka, Manka, 1LVNDVSHFL¿FIRULPPLJUDQWVIURPWKH1RUWKHUQ.DUDLWHFRPPXQLWLHVWLHVOLIHRIWKHH[VWWDQGIRXQGLQJWKHUHWKH¿UVW.DUDLWHFRPPXQLWLHVWKHVROLGHYLGHQFHZHGRand others. Among these is Sarka d. of Eliyah, widow of Yoseph; on Firkowicz’s map: TŠLH=975; her husband (Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasutinsky 2014, No. III 40) died shortly earlier and she was buried next to him; see Shapira 2008: 183. The name “Sarka” is specific for immigrants from the Northern Karaite communities: Sarka d. of Berachah appears

22 Another example of the non-Ashkenazic type of the tombstone with atypical location (although with full date, of the day in the week and the date in the month, is Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasutinsky 2014, No. III 27, who died in 1549.

23 Sarka d. of the late Eliyah, widow of Yoseph; on Firkowicz’s map: TŠLH=975; her husband (Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasutinsky 2014, No. III 40) died shortly earlier and she was buried next to him; see Shapira 2008: 183. The name “Sarka” is specific for immigrants from the Northern Karaite communities: Sarka d. of Berachah appears
This is the monument of Ms. Sarka’, daughter of ‘Eli[yah] wife of the respected* R. Yoseph, the wise, may he rest in peace; passed away on 1st 24 of Tammuz, year *5,335>735 from the Creation, her* soul shall be bound in the bundle of life.

The oldest document of the Troki Karaites is a letter from Troki to Eliyahu Bashyasi,25 where the Troki Karaites state that they had a disagreement about the correct date of the molad of Tishrei 5,244=1483 CE with the local Rabbanites, among them Ya’aqov SWKY of Kaffa and ‘Ozer haRophe of Kraków, and that they, the Karaites of Troki, have three different types of prayerbooks: 1), one is ancient and they do not know who composed it, but the Book of Commandments of R. Aharon [son of Yoseph, the Elder, 1260?-1320?; DSh26 does not agree with this ancient prayerbook; 2), the one they, the Karaites of Trok[i], attribute to our master Yoseph father of our master Aharon; 3), that of R. Aharon, himself.

The prayerbook and the minhag associated with it etc. are what distinguish different Jewish sub-ethnic groups one from another. The minhag of the prayerbook is what makes Ashkenazim Ashkenazim, and Sepharadim Sepharadim, not the JH¿OWH¿VK or khaminados or the spoken language. If in 1483 among the Karaites of Troki there were three different variants of the prayerbook, this means only one thing: there were three different sub-groups

on Firkowicz’s map, TŠŠA 1001, A4; Sarka d. of Yišaq Cohen, died in 1690. Similar names are Anka, like Anka d. of Yehudah Levi, on Firkowicz’s map DTŠSZ=1007, A3, AZ 146 (A2); Anka d. of Šekhu Levi, died DTŠS=1030, A1, AZ 171 (there appears as Manka); Niska, AZ 210. Mordechai Yoffeh’s Lεuνkh ha-Bus we-Argaman, § 129, indicates the existence of similar female names among the Rabbanites of Poland-Lithuania, while discussing the correct spelling (in Hebrew letters) of the name Liubka: it is from *lubit, “to love”, not from *lupit, “to beat”, thus the name should be written with a B, not with a P.

24 In SHAPIRA 2008: 183, it appears, erroneously, as “11”.
26 Probably, his Seder Tephilloth (“Book of Prayers”) is meant, and not his Sepher haMibḥar. On Karaita prayerbooks, see NEMOY 1952: 273.
with three different ancestral histories. Nothing is known to me about the prayerbook attributed to “our master Yoseph father of our master Aharon”;27 Aharon was, possibly, born – at least, he lived there for a while in 1278 – in Sulkhat in the Crimea shortly after the Mongol expansion and the new prosperity this expansion had brought to international commerce; one might suggest that Yoseph father of Aharon moved there because of the new economic possibilities brought by the Pax Mongolica. However, we cannot know where from he came to Sulkhat – from the Byzantine Romania or from the Karaite “East”. Nevertheless, by attributing to Yoseph a prayerbook different from that of his son, the Karaites of Troki meant, in 1483, that this minhag was old, older than the widely accepted minhag of his son. Whatever this Yoseph’s minhag was, the Karaites of Troki, obviously, associated it with the Crimea and/or Romania/Constantinople.

The third minhag, thought by the Karaites of Troki in 1483 to be “ancient”, was at odds with widely-accepted minhag of Aharon the Elder. This “ancient” minhag was, obviously, brought to Troki from a locality other than the Crimea or Romania. And this proves that, at least, one group of the ancestors of the Troki Karaites came from a locality about which we know next to nothing. I believe this locality was in the Golden Horde whereto these ancestors of the 1483 Troki Karaites came from the Karaite “East” (in addition, as is well known, the Karaites of Deražno, of Luck in the last centuries,28 and of Kukizów (established in 1688/1692) are descendents of immigrants from Troki29).

27 Aharon the Elder mentioned his father in his commentary on Exodus 1:72.
28 Karaites were living in Luck, one of the two capitals of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, as early as the mid-15th century (Neubauer 1866: 71, described this demographic-geographic situation as “natürlich”); however, the Karaites who lived in the town in the 18th century were mostly newcomers from Troki and other towns in ethnic Lithuania.
29 It was claimed (Neubauer 1866: 70; Mann 1935: 558) that the oldest Karaite document from Troki was a Karaite kethubbah from 1400CE (NLR F. 946 Evr. I Doc II, no.1(3)); however, the date in the Karaite kethubbah from Troki was doctored and the name of Witold was inserted in, and this kethubbah is from the 16th or 17th centuries, see Kizilov 2008: 31 n. 72, and p. 40.
We have a tombstone inscription in Çufut-Qal'eh of a Karaite who died in 1614 “in the land of Lech” (Poland or Poland-Lithuania) while on business and his body was brought to his native town (No. III 150 = 06C 012 = AZ 318), but we have only a single attestation of a scholar going from the Crimea northwards, and not intentionally. The movement of migration was southwards, not northwards.

People from Troki, depicted in their tombstone inscriptions as great scholars, were buried at Çufut-Qal'eh in the early 17th century; in the early 18th century, Mordechai son of Nissan of Kokizow went there from the war-stricken Poland, but disappeared on the way (SHAPIRA 2002c). The Karaites of the North were immigrating from the North to the Crimea for centuries; beginning from the late 15th century, Karaites of Kiev, Luck and other so-called “Northern Karaites” had a decisive impact on forming new styles to write Jewish dates on

---

30 Binyamin s. of Eliyahu Duwan mentioned, in his description of his pilgrimage to the land of Israel in 1785/6, “a Jew (Yisrael ‘ehad) from the Holy Community of Litwa from the city of Troki”, Zaraḥ s. of the late Avraham ha-Rophe, who told Binyamin that the Karaites were brought to Lithuania from Sulkhat or Eski Qrum by a Polish king more than 500 years ago and that for forty year no Karaites from the Crimea visited Lithuania, until one ‘Azaryah s. of Yisḥaq from the Crimea found himself, by chance, in Lithuania; this makes the date of the Karaites’ coming to Lithuania prior to 1285/6, which is absolutely impossible, not to mention “the Polish king” (for the Hebrew original, see YA’ARI 1945/1946: 463-464; for a Karaim and a Polish translations, see ZAJACZKOWSKI 1930-31: 30-31, 35).

31 Shemuel the cantor s. of Daniel the cantor, of the race of the sages from Troki, No. III 107 = 03E 072 1605 AZ 88 (898); Noah of Trok was the author / engraver (hak-koteḥ) of the tombstone inscription Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasyutinsky 2014, No. III 136 = 08E 039, from the year 1601. Another immigrant from Troki was R. Moshe the learned s. of Yoseph of Troki (AZ: MRWQY) died in Çufut-Qal’eh in 12 of Elul 1606 (AZ 317, A6, 1607); in the Leipzig manuscript of Ḥizzuq Ḥemunah (composed in 1594), piyyuṭim, etc. (JNL microfilm 09996, f. 144a) there is a colophon, appearing after the piyyuṭim added after the Ḥizzuq Ḥemunah, copied from a manuscript written in 5,248=1488 in Qurṣ Yeri (Çufut-Qal’eh) by Moshe son of Yoseph Gabbaï from Trok, who [Yoseph Gabbaï: DSb] came with Moshe son of Eliya from Kustandina (Istanbul) to Trok, see FORGES 1907: 83. Thus, we have here the tomb of a scholar and copyist, whose father emigrated from Istanbul to Troki, apparently, Moshe his son was born in Troki and later emigrated to Çufut-Qal’eh, where he died.
the tombstone inscriptions at Çufut-Qal’eh in the Crimea; the impression one gets is that by the late 15th / the first half of the 16th centuries, quite a big part – maybe even the majority – of the Jewish community in the Crimea were recent Karaite immigrants from the Polish-Lithuanian North. And, with some intervals, this Northern-Karaite impact on the Karaites of the Crimea was executed for centuries, as was the case with the Krymchaks, one third of whose ancestors coming into the Crimea from Poland (Shapira 2007: 77). Though this tendency of the Northerners to immigrate into the Crimea is more vivid at Çufut-Qal’eh, there is one example of such an immigrant from Halicz buried at Mangup (# 151 = AZ M 60), who was a prominent copyist32 and passed away in 1705:

This monument was erected on the tomb of a learned man and one that feared God, the respected R. Yeshu’ah, the humble, son of the respected R. Shemuel the elder, of blessed memory, that came from Halicz to the holy community of Mangup, its Rock and its Redeemer shall preserve it. And he took a wife, and taught to the youth and made hazzanuth. And because of our great transgressions before the Lord he died in the epidemic of the plague on Sunday, 20 of Heshvan, the year 5,465 from the Creation.

This emigrant from Halicz came to the Crimea years before r. Mordechai of Kokizow made his mind to go there.33

32 E.g., he was said to have copied in 1704, at Mangup, a problematic historical chronicle, Toledoth Ya’aqov, later quoted by Avraham Firkowicz; see Poznanski 1918b: 15, N. 88.

33 After this Yeshu’ah son of Shemuel, the hazzanim of the Mangup Karaite community were Ya’aqov and his son Avraham (died in 1712, # 159), then, apparently, the brother of this Avraham, David, who died in the same year and was buried at Çufut-Qal’eh (Shapira in Ezer and Kashovskaya 2014, Appendix II # 6; AZ CQ 244).

In the 1780s, there was a copyist in Mangup, Yišaḥq son of Eliyahu the melammed, who has copied works relating to the history of Spanish Jews and the Crimean Khanate; he also penned a work on the Tatar grammar and the “Letter of Pries- ter John”. This copy (Opp. Add. 410, 65. Neubauer 1985 I: 460-461, no.1311; Beit-Arie 1994: 216-217) was made at Gözleve / Eupatoria / Jevpatorija, the newly built Crimean sea-port.
Thus, the Karaite community of Çufut-Qal’eh was made up, beginning with the late 15th till mid-16th centuries, mostly of the Karaite immigrants from the Polish-Lithuanian territories; though there was a large influx of the Karaites from the Ottoman Empire between the second half of the 16th century till the mid-18th centuries (see Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasyutinsky 2014-2015), the Polish-Lithuanian immigration never stopped.

It is quite possible that the Karaite immigrants of the late 15th century from the Polish-Lithuanian land brought their own Karaim speech into the Crimea.

It is absolutely impossible, however, that the presupposed “Crimean dialect of the Karaim language” had survived the impact of the Rabbanite inhabitants of the 14th century of Çufut-Qal’eh (whose language can hardly be dubbed “Karaim”), the Turkic Karaim speech of the 15th century’s Karaite immigrants from Luck and Kiev, the Greek speech of the mid-16th-mid-18th Karaite migrants from Constantinople, all of these to become supplanted by the Crimean-Tatar by the 17th-18th centuries.

In order to survive all these, the presupposed “Crimean dialect of the Karaim language” had to be a quite motivated language community defying all we think we know about the history of natural languages; one can get such a picture only if one is still subscribed to the Firkowiczian-Szapszalian image of an isolated “Karaim” society, dwelling on an impregnable mountain.34

After the destruction of the Mangup community, the hazzan was Yoseph Mangubi son of Shelomoh Mangubi; this Yoseph and his daughter Sa’âdet (1786) were buried at Çufut-Qal’eh in 1786 and 1805, respectively (Shapira in Ezer and Kashovskaya 2014, Appendix II # 616 & # 18).

34 Avraham Firkowicz coined the name Sela’ haYehudim, “the rock of the Jews”, as a clear Hebrew equivalent of Çufut-Qal’eh. Hebrew has, however, many words for “rock”, why this particular choice? The answer, it seems to me, is the frequency of toponyms with sala in the Crimea (see Jankowski 1995 and Jankowski 2006) and in the Northern Caucasus. Jegorov 1964: 176 surmised that the word would be of Khazar origin, quoting Chuvash sala, “sela, selenije, po preimuščestvu russkoje”, and Qazan Tatar sala, “derevnja”; the word is found in the 1333/1334 Turkic Qur’an translation, see Eckmann 1959: 73. I shall show elsewhere that the Slavic-Bulgarian selo / seló is derived from Turkic-Bulgarian, not from Common-Slavic for “settle”.
What is the Karaim language?

Albeit that we cannot state with certainty when the linguistic Turkification of the Crimean Karaites began, however, in the mid-14th century, to judge from the Turkic personal names, there certainly were speakers of Turkic amongst the Jews of Çufut-Qal‘eh in the Central Crimea, and certainly so in the 15th century; this is evident from both the use of Turkic personal names and from the fact that Caleb Ephendopoulo of Constantinople signaled their Turkic speech in the late 15th century, in his Pathshégen Kethah ha-Dath. Written material in Judeo-Turkic from the Crimea comes in variants of Crimean-Tatar, Crimean-Turkish and in different forms of mixture of both. This written material in Judeo-Turkic from the Crimea is no older than the mid-17th century; here it is worth noting that the oldest texts in both dialects of the Karaim language are dated by the mid-17th century, as well, with some of the oldest Derazno-Luck Karaim Turkic texts were written in the Crimea.

The material in Karaim language in its ancient Troki variety includes poems by Zarah b. Nathan ha-Rophe ha-Troki (1595-1663), and the material in Karaim language in its ancient Derazno-Luck variety includes poems by Yoseph b. Yešu’ah the Elder (c. 1630-1678) of Derażno and Luck (who lived

---

35 Manush d. of Shabbetai, 10B 044 1363-4 AZ 288 B10 (1364); Severgelin d. of Levi, 10C 086 1420-1 AZ 50 B10 (670); Tokhtamish the Elder, 13D 013 1428-9 AZ 54 B 12 (678).
36 See Danon 1926-27: 172.
37 Mizhul kallamyz (or, muzul kanlamyz), “Our sad bride”, printed apud Kowalski 1927: N. II; apud Markowicz 1930: 16-17; another old wedding song, Le-philah ha-rimmôn (see Wilna Prayerbook, ed. Szyszman, Vol. 4: 146-147), was published apud Kowalski 1927: N. IV; another old wedding song, by Shemuel (see the same Prayerbook, Vol. 4, p. 147), was published apud Kowalski 1927 as N. V. Compare also Bizikowcz & Firkowicz 1909: 78-79, where appears the well known piyyut by Aharon b. Yehudah ha-Troki, Biqiuin Sinaj tawga mindi Mosze (Ha-yom ‘alah Moshe le-har Sinay); cf. also Poznanski 1910: 41, and esp. Poznanski 1910: 31-36, where the list of the translators, with short biographical remarks, is given. See also Malecki 1927: 6-7.
also for a while in the Crimea and penned there some of his Karaim poems;\(^38\) cf. Shapira 2003c: 671, 685; on Yoseph b. Yešu’ah, cf. now Nosonovsky 2011; cf. also Zającowski 1939).

The Judeo-Turkic material from the Crimea consists of a very few fragments of private correspondence, notes, glosses, fragments of Hebrew dictionaries, etc.; it includes also a Karaite poem in Crimean-Turkish from the \(\text{pınqas}\) of Keffe now kept at the Ukrainian National Library named after Vernadskyj at Kiev/Kyïiv. Basically, the language of this poem is not different from another Karaite poem, coming also from the Ottoman part of the Peninsula, namely from Mangup-Qal’eh, a century something later (first published in Shapira 2001; two new variants were published in Shapira 2002b; three variants were published in Shapira 2008a). Both these poems come from the Ottoman territory, as already mentioned, and so does almost all the material prior to the 18th century available. We can guess that in the 16th-17th centuries, the language of the Karaites of Çufut-Qal’eh, as in the 18th century onwards, was slightly different and closer to Central Crimean Tatar rather than to Crimean-Turkish.

\(^38\) “Sad Soul” (Miskin dzan / Hebrew variant: \(Yebidāh \ mi-ṣerōr \ b̄a‘ayim \ ‘aṣūlāh\)), published in Karaj Awazy 10 (1936), pp. 6-7; “From the Darkness of Exile” (\(\text{Tarlyhyndan \ Galutmun}/\ Hebrew variant: \(Mi-na\’\ apheiłyath \ ha-gālāth\)), Published in Karaj Awazy 2.4 (1931), pp. 20-21, and in M. Nosonovsky & V. Shabarovsky, “Karaimy v Derazhno: Stixotvornoj rasskaz o razrushenii obshchiny”, http://www.coe.neu.edu/~mnosonov/kar/ (where the reference to the pagination in Karaj Awazy is wrong; the bibliographic reference, by Aleksander Dubinski, in the \(\text{Karaimsko-russko-polskij slovar’}/\ Słownik karaimsko-rosyjsko-polski, p. 19, is also erroneous). This poem refers to forced conversion of Qaraite children to Russian-Orthodox Christianity by the Cossacks of Chmielnicki, Neczaj and Zolotoruczko; the full Hebrew text was published in Nosonovsky 2011 and in the afore-mentioned publication by M. Nosonovsky & V. Shabarovsky (http://www.coe.neu.edu/~mnosonov/kar/; see now http://risu.org.ua/ua/index/studios/studies_of_religions/11489/ and Šabarov’skij 2013); some verses in Hebrew, from the same MS, were published by Neubauer 1866: 125; “King of Kings, until when Thou endurest” (\(\text{Bijler biji, nek \ cydaj\v{s}en}/\ Hebrew variant: \(Yāḥid, shma’-na \ ‘eth \ ‘anqath \ ‘emūnekhta\)), published in Karaj Awazy 10 (1936), pp. 19-20; “The Black Cloud” (\(\text{Karanhy bulut}\)), published in Grzegorzewski 1916-18: 268-270; Mardkowicz 1930: 20-21, with an extensive biographic commentary on pp. 21-23.
It was half a century ago that the prominent Karaite-Polish Turkologist, Prof. Ananiasz Zajączkowski, stated that the oldest literary monument of the Karaim language in its Crimea dialect is a piyyût found in the 1528/9 Venice edition of the Karaite Prayerbook; this statement is wrong, the piyyût in question is in New Greek, with some Turkish phrases, and not in Karaim of any sorts, not to mention the non-existing “Crimean dialect”. This mistake was repeated by almost all who has ever written on the Karaim language; in fact, this Greek piyyût, apparently unseen by the majority of those who mentioned it, served as one of the most serious testimonies for the very existence of the “Crimean dialect of the Karaim”.

I firmly believe that no such dialect ever existed; there is simply no evidence, and the first claims to its former existence were made in the very late twenties of the twentieth century, when a native speaker of Crimean-Tatar, Seraja Szapszal, was elected / appointed as the spiritual chief of the Karaites of the

---

39 “...ist eine religiöse Hymne aufgenommen worden, die in der karaimischen Sprache (der Krimer Mundart) abgefaßt ist”, see ZAJĄCZKOWSKI 1964: 793; compare ZAJĄCZKOWSKI 1926: 8. This erroneous statement goes back to POZNANSKI 1910: 13 n. 2, for the reference to Poznanski’s article, with the pages cited, appears as the source of Zajączkowski’s information. However, Poznanski, who, unlike Zajączkowski, was not a Turkologist and knew no Turkic, was able to correct his own error in 1918 (POZNANSKI 1918a: 43). On the Venice Prayerbook, see POZNANSKI 1918a: 33-35; POZNANSKI 1910: 13. n. 2; for the description of existing copies, see VARTANOV 1996: 40-58. The same piyyût was reprinted in the Karaite Prayerbook Seder Berakhôth, Çhufut-Qal’e 1742, Part. II N. 92; cf. POZNANSKI 1912-13: 40.

40 It is strange how Zajączkowski failed to see that the language of the passages quoted in Poznanski’s earlier article (1910) cannot be Turkic. Nevertheless, the prestige of Zajączkowski as a Turkologist was so great that his mistake was repeated by many, cf. KAPLANOV 1985: 98; by the editors of the reform Karaite Prayerbook (FIRKOVIČIUS 1998: 216), sponsored by a Finnish mission, and by others. On the problem of the piyyût in question, see SHAPIRA 2002a: 477-479, n. 11.

41 Musajev, the author of the most authoritative research in this field acceptable even on the most nationalist-minded Karaim authors, denied the existence of such ghost dialect in the Crimea (MUSAJEVS 1964: 36-37); compare also PRITSNÄK 1959: 320.
Second Polish Republic; secondarily all of them were speakers or heritage-speakers of the Karaim Turkic language; the initial inability of Szapszal to speak this language, together with inter-war Polish politics, such as Szapszal’s involvement, though minor, in Prometheism (on which see Woytak 1984; Copeaux 1993) – all these factors created the political-psychological need for a “Crimean dialect of the Karaim language, though heavily assimilated by

---

42 Serâyîh b. Mordechai Shapshal / Seraja Marković Šapšal / Seraja Szapszal (1873-1961), was born in Bâğçe-Sarây into a family originating from Çufut-Qal’eh, completed his studies at the Oriental Department of the University of Saint-Petersburg, and was appointed as the educator of the heir to the Persian throne. After the coronation of his student he became his advisor, a court minister and a khan and, being a stout reactionary, gained his Persian nickname Şapšal-e xân (“bloody Şapšal,” a pun on xân [pronounce: xân], “khan”). Following the revolution in Iran in 1908 he was expelled as a Russian agent and an enemy of reforms. Back in Russia he served at the Foreign Office; in 1915 he became the spiritual leader (hakham) of the Karaites of the Crimea and Southern Russia. After the Bolshevik revolution he fled to Turkey and became close to Kamal Atatiirk. He published a Pan-Turkist composition on the Crimean Karaites (Şapšal-ogh 1928). In 1928 he was appointed to be head (hakham) of the Karaites in Poland and Lithuania, but in a couple of months upon his election he began to call himself hachan or gaxan, a hybrid word that he himself had invented combining Hebrew hâkhan, ha-khân (the Khan) and qagan, the title of the Khazar sacral kings. During the Nazi invasion he played a major role in the efforts aiming to prove the non-Jewishness of the East European Karaites who were indeed saved from destruction through the claim that they were “racially” Turkic. After the Soviet invasion he relinquished his clerical rank and ended his days, after such a stormy life, as a junior researcher in the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Soviet Lithuania. It was he, and not Firkowicz who made the claim that the East European Karaites were a Turkic people connected to the Khazars and the Qumans through language and blood, who adopted the “Mosaic” religion whilst in secret preserving relics of Turkic paganism. The ideological edifice that Szapszal constructed, despite being a cleric, was entirely secular and nationalistic. It was, apparently, the first attempt among the Turkic peoples to build a linguistic-ethnic-Turkic identity totally unconnected to religion. It was he who led, more than any other person, to the de-Judaization of the East-European Karaites and turned them into a new Turkic people, Karaims. In addition to Qırım Qaray Türkleri, his views were expressed in Şapşal 1896; Şapşal 1897; Şapşal 1918-1919. See Shapira 2005ab; Kızılöv 2002.
Crimean-Tatar” (thus, “eine religiöse Hymne in der karaimischen Sprache (der Krimer Mundart)”).

In fact, no evidence for such a variety was at hand. On the contrary, there was a need to make up such evidence, as we have seen in the case of the Judeo-Greek πιθυού proclaimed to be “eine religiöse Hymne in der karaimischen Sprache (der Krimer Mundart)”. And we know now that Szapszal, himself, was not a small forger of historical texts (Shapira 2005ab; Kizilov 2002).

In the last two centuries, some authors, among them Karaites, promoted a distorted picture of Karaite history in Eastern Europe; according to them, the “Northern”, or “Polish”, or “Polish-Lithuanian”, Karaites came to Poland (or, Galicia) and to Lithuania from the Crimea; ergo, the Turkic languages of these Northerners continue the Turkic speech of the Karaites of the Crimea; there used to be three dialects of the Turkic-Qipchaq Karaim language, that of Lithuania, that of Wolhynia-Galicia, and that of the Crimea, later assimilated by Crimean-Tatar. This picture has been challenged (Akheizer & Shapira 2001; Shapira 2003c, 2008b, 2008c) because there lacks any evidence for the Karaite emigration from the Crimea to Lithuania or Wolhynia. Karaites came to Lithuania and Galicia not from the Crimea, but from the Golden Horde.

Who was the copyist, Ya’aqov son of Mordechai?

As already mentioned, according to Samuel Poznański, Ya’aqov son of Mordechai has copied the Book of Nehemiah in 1672 – this is how he interpreted the date given in Hebrew by a Biblical chronostic; in this year, Ya’aqov son of Mordechai was working at Mangup, for in the same year and in the year that hereafter, he copied at Mangup Hebrew translations of works of the Judeo-Arabic-writing Yoseph ha-Ro’eh / Yousuf al- Başır and a Karaite book of polemics against the Rabbanites (Pinsker 1860: 98, 195), and in Sivan 1678/9 he copied in Capha / Keffeh the MS Bodl. 2386 (including one work by Caleb Ephendopoulos).

So, it is safe to surmise that the copy of the Turkic translation of parts of the Bible was made at Mangup, and then the copyist – apparently, an itinerant
scholar – moved to Capha, then to Çufut-Qal‘eh, as we shall see. Another copyist was at work at Mangup ten years later, Yišaq son of Eliyahu, who has copied the Hebrew translation of the Book of Tobit (Oxford – Bodleian Library MS Opp. Add. Qu. 65; cf. Neubauer 1886; Neubauer 1994).

Ya’aqov son of Mordechai also penned a Hebrew piyyuṭ printed in Mekabbes II I, Çufut-Qal‘eh 1736/1737, part b, 15ff.; this piyyuṭ is found also in a MS from the Firkowicz Collection (Old Number 787), where is said that the author died in 1700/1701 (נ”ז), though after his name there is said ירא, “Let His Rock preserve him”, in the manuscript, meaning that he was still alive when the manuscript was written (Gottlob 1865: 180; Neubauer 1886: 52, 140; Deinard 1878: 69). So, we have a riddle. It is quite possibly, in the absence of any better explanation so far, that the abbreviation “Let His Rock preserve him” was made by Avraham Firkowicz by a simple mistake; indeed, we have at Çufut-Qal‘eh a tombstone inscription made in remembrance of one Ya’aqov son of Mordechai from the year just mentioned in Firkowicz’s manuscript, 1701; it is highly important to observe, that while the deceased was described as a great scholar etc., there was no mention made of his Mangupian origin. Apparently, this person, who worked at Mangup, at Capha, and finally found his last rest at Çufut-Qal‘eh, was not native to the Crimea; apparently, he came from the Karaite North looking after an employment fitting his learning.

Again, we should remember that this pattern of sages immigrated from the North, that is, from Poland-Lithuania to the Crimea, was shared by the Rabbanites, as well (Shapira 2007).

The tombstone inscription of the copyist of the manuscript?

At Çufut-Qal‘eh, there is a tombstone inscription from the year 1701, with the acrostic running as Mordechai; it has been published by Avraham Firkowicz in his book, Ahney Zikkaron (Firkowicz 1872), under number 402 and dated by 1701.

Apparently, the inscription was ordered by the firstborn son of the deceased, also called Mordechai, whence the acrostic; the division into lines in AZ is slightly different from that in the original inscription, and is shown here by the
sign " / ", which does not exist in the original text. From the text it becomes apparent that by his death, the deceased served as a hazzān (at Çufut-Qal'eh?), he was regarded to possess the knowledge of all the traditional medieval sciences. The appellative hwbšy can be differently explained: it can be seen as an unusual poetic-looking form meaning something like “learning religious knowledge constantly”; there can be other possibilities, too; it can be seen as a crude mistake of the engraver for *qwdšy, “one who had performed the commandment of pilgrimage to Jerusalem”;43 however, if such, why did A. Firkowicz, the first editor of the inscription, not correct the scribal error, as he usually did? Apparently, the word had had a meaning for the early 19th century Karaites.

43 A Karaite pilgrim to Jerusalem was given the honorific Yerushalmi (abbreviated as Yeru’; amongst the Karaites of Egypt – Qudsí), or khadji; the term khadji as a honorific for Greek-Orthodox Christian pilgrims to Jerusalem was also in use among the Qaramanlis of Anatolia and the Serbs of Bosnia (and, possibly, in other localities, too).

44 AZ: ה.

45 AZ: כים.

46 AZ: ‘ו.
Who is this that lit the fire of my soul,
put my wreath and my golden crown upon my head?
He is my lord, my father, my teacher,
my chariot and cavallery, honor of my head.
He spoke in grand audience[s] and was proponent of the good
For his people, by his serving as a hazzan, smart at inner prayer
Like Daniel he possessed all the wisdoms,
A humble man who feared God, with good thoughts.
The dear, the honorable, his name is the respected* R.
Ya’aqov, son of R. Mordechai Ḥwbšy.

The day when a decree came from the heaven of the sky
The light of my moon and my shining sun have much darkened,
They were taken away, because they cried upon
the righteous, the joy of my soul, who was gathered unto his people.
Passed away on the 5th day of Elul 5461,
Buried on the next day, which was Friday.
His soul shall be bound in the bundle of life, with the Lord
(let be present) the desire of my soul until Resurrection.

It is possible that Ya’aqov son of Mordechai came to the Crimea as a very young man, together with his father (exactly the way Mordechai son of Nissan Kokizow will try to do about a century later, 1709? - and quite few years after Ya’aqov son of Mordechai has died at Çufut-Qal’eh, 1701); it is not impossible that Ya’aqov’s father was buried at the cemetery of Mangup in 1620 (see APPENDIX I).

47 AZ: ™.
Now we can turn to define the character of the language of the Nehemiah translation copied by Ya’aqov son of Mordechai, apparently, a Northern-Karaite immigrant scholar, somewhere in the Crimea by about the last quarter of the 17th century.

The context of the Nehemiah translation

First of all, the text is a copy, made, apparently, from an older copy. Thus, the text in question represented a specimen of the language older than that used by both the copyist and the person who has ordered the copy to be made. The language of the Nehemia translation is by no means Crimean-Tatar; on the contrary, it has many grammatical similarities (and even a peculiar phonetic one) with the Karaim language, as I indicated in my notes to the text (see Appendix II). I tend to believe now that the language, in fact, is an archaic form of Karaim. Of course, it does not mean that this is in “the Crimean dialect of the Karaim language”; as far as I know, there are no Karaite manuscripts from the former Polish-Lithuanian territories, in any language, that have survived the events of the religious war fought by the Greek-Orthodox Cossacks (called yawan by the Karaites) against the Catholic “Poles” and the Jews in 1648/1649. Most of the linguistic material we have in the Karaim language comes from later times, after the Karaim-speaking communities in Poland-Lithuania had dwindled numerically as a result of the 1648/1649 war and as a result of tragic events of the Northern War (1700-1721), especially, the plague of 1710/1711. It was after these Karaim-speaking communities had so diminished in numbers, on the brink of extinction, that the phonetics of their Karaim speech became so heavily Slavicized (I mean, especially, the palatalization), a feature that became their trademark.

Comparison of two Karaim translations of Psalm 1

Let us compare two translations of the same Hebrew text, one printed in the Gözleve edition (thus coming, presumably, from the same manuscript as the Nehemia translation), and other made approximately one hundred years later
than the afore-mentioned manuscript has been copied, namely, after 1710/1711, translated into the Luck Karaim dialect by the most brilliant Karaite scholar of the eighteenth century, R. Śimḥah-Yišḥaq b. Moše Łucki, who lived for a considerable period of his life in Çufut-Qal‘eh and was buried there.\footnote{I would like to add that five compositions by Śimḥah-Yišḥaq Łucki have been edited by Daniel Lasker and are to be published by the Ben-Zvi Institute, Jerusalem.}

Śimḥah-Yišḥaq b. Moše Łucki was a native of Łuck, but his family, as many other Karaite families at the town, hailed from Troki (see about him LASKER 2011). The literary and public activities of this highly prolific author embodied the peak of the intra-Jewish rapprochement of the Karaite minority and the Rabbanite majority; he was held in high esteem by his Karaite contemporaries and became known as ‘the Karaite Raš“i’ and ‘Olam Şa’ir, ‘the Microcosm’. His renowned historical-bibliographical work ‘Oraḥ Saddiḥim had been published first in Vienna in 1830, and then in Israel by the Karaite community.

In the mid-50s of the eighteenth century Śimḥah-Yišḥaq moved to Çufut-Qal‘eh, a Jewish suburb of Bâğçe-Sarây, the capital of the Crimean Girây Khans, wherein he served as the Karaite hakham until his death in 1760. As mentioned above, he felt alienated there by the mores of the local Karaites and felt like an exiled stranger (sohel šam geruth we-galuth (LASKER 2011: 38), thus demonstrating this pattern of intellectual and religious superiority of the learned Northern Karaites towards their Tatar-speaking Crimean coreligionists.

A copy of his translation of parts of the Bible into his Luck-Karaim mother-tongue is kept in the Institute for Oriental Studies (Saint-Peterburg), Firk I B113 (old N 1935-335); the manuscript is a copy, fully vocalized in the Turkece text (SHAPIRA 2002a: 482-484). The phonetics of both Karaim dialects, that of Halicz-Luck and that of Troki, were heavily Slavicized, and the palatalization so typical of Slavic languages, is throughout in the manuscript (it is marked by using a Polish-derived orthography, KYWN / kiun). The text of the manuscript affirms that in the mid-eighteenth century the shift ș>s, so typical of this Halicz-Luck dialect, had already taken place, at least partly, cf. olturusunda, “in the sitting” (Troki: olturush), but cf. k’iš ‘eg ‘e, “to the man;” however, in the
last case we may have an example of traditional orthography, especially in this most frequent word.

I used a Turkish-based transcription for the Luck translation, but with š and q, and with a below-dotted t for the Teth and a below-dotted H for the Heth; the palatalized written in the text as K\&YWN are transcribed as in k’un. Hebrew words stand in Italics and in the normal Hebrew transliteration, with no distinction of the long and short vowels.

For the Gözleve Edition I used transliteration; I did not distinct between i and i / y; as the printed text did not distinct between g and η using gimel for both, I did not this distinction either. As there is no distinction between the front and back vowels, I do not discern either, though it is obvious that ɾozdirir must be ɾozdirir. The rest of the characters are self-evident. The texts of two translations of Psalm 1 to follow:49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English (the translation is mine)</th>
<th>The mid-18th century Luck-Karaim</th>
<th>The Gözleve Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Honor/fame is to such a man, who does not walk with the counsel of the wicked ones, and does not stand in the way of the sinners, and does not sit in the sitting(-place) of mockers.</td>
<td>1. sandir andiy k'iš'eg'e ki yûr'um'es'e k'en'es'i bila raša’larnın da yolunda yaziqlarının tüyrmasa da oltýurusunda eliqcılarnın oltýrmasa.</td>
<td>1. san ol kışiga ki yurumadi kegaši bilan raša’larnığ da yolinda yaziqlilarnığ tûrmadi da-oṯurašinda eriklavčılarnığa oṯurmdi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49 In the copy of the Gözleve edition I had used, it is handwritten under the title Targum Tehillim: “Shelomoh ben Šimḥah Mišri z”I”. This Karaite dignitary accompained Šimḥah Babowicz, the political leader of Karaites of Gözleve / Jevpatorija, and later, of the whole of the Crimea, on his lobbying trip to Sankt-Peterburg in 1828; Shelomoh ben Šimḥah Mišri was still alive in 1840/1841. Aparently, he was the owner of this copy; it is known that his son sold many Karaite MSs to European collectors; this is how this copy ended up in Schocken Library in Jerusalem.

a Baskakov, Zajončkovskij, Šapšal (eds.) 1974: 658: the Halicz form; p. 659: the Troki form; p. 665b: the Crimean form, like here. Note that the “North-Western” Karaim form did already have the r>l shift, in this verb, by the 18th century.
2. But his desire shall be in the Torah of God only, and he shall read in His Torah day and night.
3. And he shall be like a planted tree, on the brooks of waters, that gives its fruit in its time, and its leaf does not wither, so that everything shall prosper that a good man shall do.
4. Not so are the wicked ones, who were merely like chaff that the wind drives it away.

5. Therefore the wicked ones do not stand in the court of law and (=nor) the sinners in the community of the righteous.

6. Because God loved the righteous ones because of their walking on the good path, and the wicked ones are destroyed because of their walking on the bad path.

---

In the text of the Gözleve translation there is one Slavic word, the one for "chaff", which is not a word one would expect to be borrowed from Slavic by Steppe-dwellers, the contrary being expected.50

---

b “on the brooks of waters” not translated or omitted while copying.

c BASKAKOV, ZAJONČKOVSKIJ, ŠAPŠAL (eds.) 1974: 629, 638: three Crimean variants.

d A Slavicism.

e Note the causative verbal form, which is pseudo-calque of the original Hebrew; the Hebrew verb used in Ps. 1 here is not causative in meaning, only in form.
One has not to be a Turcologist in order to realize that what we have here

\[f\] A misprint for *f’vv’uldir.

\[g\] A misprint for *duguldir.

\[h\] The translation is different and paraphrastical: “Because God knows the path of the righteous ones and the path of the wicked ones will be destroyed”. For *tas bol-, see JANKOWSKI 1997: 74.

\[s\] BASKAKOV, ZAJONČKOVSKI, ŠAPŠAL (eds.) 1974: 448: *polov* (Crimean), p. 449: *pulov* (Crimean). JANKOWSKI 1997: 256-72 has noted Slavicisms in the text he published, and JANKOWSKI 2008: 166-167 (with bibliography) mentioned two Slavic words known in Middle Turkic languages of the pre-Mongol Central Asia; according to him, this invalidates my point about the occurrence of Slavic words in Karaim texts from the Crimea (compare MUSAJEV 1964: 11). However, the words Jankowski brought up are *samala* ‘pitch’ and *tögut* ‘birth tar’. These are not loanwords in the stricter sense, but rather borrowed words or trademarks of typical Eastern European exports from the regions of the woods into the woodless Steppe: birth tar was sometimes called in the lands where it was brought from Eastern Europe / Muscovy / Russian Empire as “Russian oil”; it was widely used in medieval and early modern cosmetics, folk-medicine, candy-making, spicery, etc., not to mention its many uses in the navy and hide industry (Lithuanian *deg tiné* is “vodka”, and in Russian as used in the 19th century Malorossia the expression “ukrainskij diogot’” referred to the same beverage).

It is here the place to observe that the Crimean form *qatran* (BASKAKOV, ZAJONČKOVSKI, ŠAPŠAL (eds.) 1974: 366) is translated as both “smola; diogot’ / smola; dziegeč”; not the Slavic word was used, but the Arabic-from-Middle-Iranian. On the contrary, the Slavic-from-Baltic for birth tar is attested in Hebrew letters in the 12th century France as *dīq模板, similarly to the usage of the word in Middle Turkic Turkic from Central Asia, where the word traveled with the product it denominates.

As to the chaff (the “Crimean-Karaim” *polov / pulov / polov; Turkish Bible translation has *saman uşan hihi* there, and the Northern Azeri Bible has *saman çöpino hünvar*), it would be weird to expect a language spoken in the Steppe populated by Turkic nomads (as was the case in the Northern Crimea, just some thirty kilometres northwards from Çufut-Qal’eh) to borrow a Slavic word for such a common object in the steppe as “chaff”. In Troki or Luck, on the contrary, chaff was not so common and it would be quite forgivable if the native Turkic word would be replaced by the Slavic term; I hope that no one would argue that we have here a case of perseverance of some memory of the Polovtians, who spoke a Qipçaq language (Karaim belongs to this Turkic sub-group) and whose (Slavic) name was connected to the Slavic word for “pale, blond”, see GOLDEN 1992: 270ff. (esp. pp. 271-272; cf. also GOLDEN 1979-80). In fact, Turkic *saman* is known in Russian and Ukrainian.
are two stages of the same language, the younger one being heavily Slavicized phonetically. The difference between the two linguistic samples is not geographical, but chronological.

Moreover, linguistically the language of Psalm 1 and that of the Nehemia is one and the same, and this observation leads us to conclude that the information provided in the colophon of the copyist as printed in the Gözleve translation seems to be trusted, namely, the copyist of Nehemia had copied also all of the Prophets and Hagiographa, possibly, from the same manuscript. We have thus to re-examine the Gözleve Bible translation at whole; it might be that we have here the oldest known Karaite-Turkic Bible translation (cf. HARKAVY & STRACK 1875: 167-169 (I Evr Bibl 143 & I Evr Bibl 144).

I published more examples from different Karaim translations elsewhere, while I had called this process of creating an artificial koine “linguistic adaptation” (SHAPIRA 2006a).

ADDITION MADE ON THE LATEST STAGE OF PREPARATION THIS ARTICLE:

Now I realize that this manuscript served as the source for the Gözleve edition, and it was why Boris Eliaszewicz and his family treasured it so much. The text of the Torah was Tatarized only slightly.

In passing, Jankowski 1997: 25 referred to the word aqlap, “uncircumcised man”, used in the text he published as to a word “of unknown or unclear origin”; in fact, this is the Arabic ‘aghlaf, the normal word for “uncircumcised one”.

To add, in a text Firkowicz wrote in Russian (Vernadsky Ukrainian National Library, Jewish MSS OPI 1210) he referred to Slavic words in Jewish texts he had found “in the Khazar city of Mangup.” It is unclear from Firkowicz’ notes if he meant Karaim Turkic translations like those under consideration here, or some other texts. What is interesting is that Firkowicz brought up these Slavic words in Hebrew characters as evidence of the common ancestry of Jews and the inhabitants of Southern Russia (Ukraine) and this short text reveals Firkowicz’s interest in Sarmatism, which was characteristic of Polish Szlachta’s ideas, and argued for non-Slavic origins of the population of what had been Poland. He also stated that the present inhabitants of Southern Russia have more in common physically with the Semites than with the Japhetides, so the Malorossians (Ukrainians) should be Semitic (cf. (SHAPIRA 2009).
A 18th century MS in private possession (was belonging to Yišaqa ben Ya'qov Koknay?):
Eliaszewicz-Babadzhan family MS, Moscow:
The version published in Jankowski 1997 (pp. 43-44):
Firkowicz’ 1833 version:
T[r]ışqan Translation, Gözleve, 1840:
It can easily be seen – and is commonly known – that practically all the examples of Karaite Turkic of the Bible follow the same pattern and are very close each to the other linguistically; what is important to observe is that this holds true even for the weirdest attempt, by Avraham Firkowicz, to translate the Pentateuch, in the early 1830s, into an artificial and mixed half-Luck-Karaïm / half-Constantinople-Turkish vernacular (SHAPIRA 2003a: 34; more in SHAPIRA 2003b [Hebrew]). This translation was prepared less than a decade prior to the publication of the Gözleve translation, for the Greek-speaking Karaites of Constantinople and for Karaites elsewhere; still, the Luck-Karaïm-thinking translator considered impossible translating the Biblical text into other than an imitation of the artificial language of the peshât-lar. This extreme example demonstrates better than everything else the patterns of the Karaite translations of a Biblical text into their Turkic language of the educated élite.

51 Samples: da dişmanlık qorum arança da arasına ol qarışq da arasına zür ’etinin da arasına zür ’etinin, ol varur seni başa da sen dişlersin onu topluğun dan, “And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; it shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel”, (Genesis 3:15), rendered into Modern Turkish as follows: ve seninle kadın arasına ve senin zürriyetinle onun zürriyeti arasına dişmanlık kayaca-im; o senin başına saldıracak, ve sen onun topu-una saldıracaksın; me’arah-da ki tarlasında o Makhpelah-nin ki yüzü üzerine Mamre-nin verinde Ken’an-nin ki satın aldı ’Abraham o tarlayı yarından ’Ephron o ıittilinin zaftına mezerin, “In the cave that is in the field of Machpelah, which is before Mamre, in the land of Canaan, which Abraham bought with the field of Ephron the Hittite for a possession of a burying-place” (Genesis 49:30), rendered into Modern Turkish by a combination of two verses: beni babalarıma beraber Hittî Efroûn tarlasında olan ma-araya, Kenân diyarında Mamre karısiında, Makpela tarlasında olan İbrahimin kabir için mülk olarak Hittî Efroûndan satın aldı-1 ma-araya güümîn; almayı kitabın bu ol Torah-nin ve qoyayınm onu tarafından şart sandı-in H’Tan’rîinizin ve olsun orada sana şahadîğa. “Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness for you” (Deuteronomy 31:26), Modern Turkish: bu şeriat kitabım alın, ve onu Allahınız Rabbin ahit sandı-inin yanna, sana karşı orada şahit olsun diye koyun.

52 No one would argue that the Crimean Rabbinate, the Qrmchaqs, spoke “a form of Crimean Karaïm”; still, the language of their books followed closely the Karaïm models – this was how an educated Jew in the Crimea should write in Turkic to other educated Jews. Compare a random sample from the late 19th century
Thus, when the first printing house in the Crimean Peninsula was set up (which was Karaite with an Ashkenazi setter) in the early 18th century, texts in Hebrew and Karaim were printed, not in Hebrew and Crimean-Tatar. These were the Seliḥa-lar, or Boşatlıx, to be found in some copies of Part II, pp. 13-18, of Megabbeş Niddeḥei Yisraeł or ‘Iggereth Hōʾil.\(^{53}\) These texts were edited in facsimile and transcription, with a good vocabulary (SULIMOWICZ 1972-1973); the editor, Sulimowicz, considered them as representing the 18th-century Crimean-Tatar close to Karaim, but, in fact, the print was made from the copies made in the Crimea from Luck manuscripts, and the language of these texts is Karaim (I am preparing now a paper on these texts).

In 1776 the Swedish traveler Biörnstahl saw in Constantinople a “Turkish” version of the Bible kept with the Karaites of Hāşkōy, which probably was in Karaim. After the Crimea was annexed to Russia a few years later, the Scottish Dr. Pinkerton acquired at Çufut-Qalʾeh, in 1816, a bound translation of the whole Bible and transferred it to Saint-Peterburg with the intention of having

\(^{53}\) However, not found in many other known copies, cf. POZNANSKI 1918: 40 n. 1.
it printed there in Arabic characters in order to spread Christianity among the Russian Tatars.\cite{HENDERSON 1826: 331-332} The Russian Bible Society sent the text transcribed into Arabic characters to Astrakhan, then an important Tatar center, wishing to find out whether the version met the Society’s goals, but the language of the translation was found incomprehensible to the local Muslims. In 1824, the Scottish Hebraist and missionary Henderson checked the manuscript still kept at Astrakhan and he quoted many verses, passages and separate words in his book which appeared in 1826 (HENDERSON 1826: 331-339). From his citations, it appears that the language of this Bible translation was Karaim, not Tatar of any sorts; apparently, the book was brought to the Crimea from the Northern Karaite communities or copied in the Peninsula from a Karaim translation.

In 1928, Gordlevskij collected in his article (GORDLEVSKIJ 1928) some archaic and rare words from the copy prepared by Binyamin b. Mordechai Pembek; Gordlevskij shared his feeling that there are common traits between this manuscript and the “Turkish translation”, but he failed to realize that the MS of Binyamin b. Mordechai Pembek was copied only a century before Gordlevskij was writing his article, and that the language of the manuscript, although the copy was made in the Crimea, does represent a Turkic language.

\cite{HENDERSON 1826: 331-332} Scottish missionaries were active in Southern Russia (Astrakhan, since 1815, and Karass, near Beshtau, North Caucasus, since 1802), during the reign of Alexander I, looking there for their ancestral heritage and working among the Karaites (their success in converting Muslims was meagre, and one of the very few to convert was Alexandre Kazem Bek, see HENDERSON 1826: 431; for the story of further success of these Scottish missionaries to gain Muslim converts, see KIRIMLI 2004. One of the impulses for the Scottish missionary work in Southern Russia were the writings of John Pinkerton (1758-1826), who had published in 1787 “Dissertation on the Origin and Progress of the Scythians or Goths, being an Introduction to the Ancient and Modern History of Europe” (republished in 1814 together with “Inquiry into the History of Scotland”) and was also known as forger of “older Anglo-Scottish literature”; in the early 1820s, John Pinkerton was in contact with these Scottish missionaries in Southern Russia, and received from them a Karaim translation of Biblical texts. However, John Pinkerton was not a “Dr.”, as far as I know. It is unclear to me whether this “Dr. Pinkerton” was John Pinkerton, or the missionary Alexander Pinkerton who was active in Southern Russia about the same period; cf. KIRIMLI 2004: 82 & n. 102.
from outside the Peninsula. Rather similar to the “Tirshqan translation”, sometimes up to the finest details, are MSS B 440 (Prophets), B 227 (historical books), and B 368 (Prophets). The same holds for a translation of the Pentateuch and Lamentations kept in Manchester, UK, which was edited by Henryk Jankowski (JANKOWSKI 1997); back in 1997, the editor stated that this translation is “in the Northern Crimean dialect of Karaim standing between the Oğuz and the Qypçaq”, though not having checked the text against the Gözleve translation which was by then inaccessible to him. However, the text published by JANKOWSKI 1997 is almost identical, including the copyist’s errors, to that of the Gözleve translation. It is noteworthy that the text edited by JANKOWSKI 1997 contains at least one Slavic word, which is hardly possible in a Turkic Crimean text from the early 18th century, and there are many forms and words characteristic of the Halicz-Łuck Karaim. Collation of the text of Jankowski against the Gözleve translation and the manuscripts of the Bible translations from the late 18th / early 19th centuries has shown that we have here another case of a Karaim manuscript copied, through casual Tatarization, in the Crimea, and from my notes to the last chapter of Nehemia is clear how similar linguistically is the translation copied in the Crimea in 1672 and the texts published in JANKOWSKI 1997.

Summing up

The old Turkic Biblical translations of the Karaites can teach us a great deal about their vernaculars in distant historical periods; however, this valuable information should be collected with tweezers, dwelling upon small distortions.

55 Among the differences: q of the “Tirshqan translation” = g in the MSs; hei at the end of the word in the “Tirshqan translation,” but aleph in the MSs; Tatar cümle, ‘all’, in the printed text, but Karaim berçe in the MSs; ver-, ‘to give’, in the printed text, but ber- in the MSs; deniz, ‘sea’, in the printed text, but teniz in the MS; guyaş, ‘sun’, in the printed text, but guyaşq in the MSs (cf. MUSAJEV 1964: 23); sol, the vota accusativa of the Karaim MSs (cf. JANKOWSKI 1997: 73), is absent, in many cases, from the printed text.

56 Compare objections in JANKOWSKI 2007: 166-167.
from the language the copyists tried to write in, or from their mistakes. After all, the translators wrote not in their own vernacular, but in the artificial language tailored for a hallowed purpose. The situation is very similar to this found in Ivri-Taytsch or Ladino translations of the Bible written in unnatural languages distinct from Yiddish or Judezmo. On the more Polish side, a good parallel is the written Polonized Old-Bielorussian language of the Lithuanian Tatars: people wrote Old-Bielorussian, but imagined they were writing Polish, while genially trying to do so (KARSKIJ 1922; DEMIDČIK 1987); another example would be the Germanized Yiddish of the mid-19th century’s maskîlim (KERLER 1999, Introduction).

The predominance, especially after 1482 (the Crimean-Tatar sack of Kiev), 1495 (expulsion of Jews from Lithuania), and 1648/9 (Chmielnicki’s War), of the Northern-Karaite teachers and scholars in the Crimea, their higher levels of education, their traditions of schooling brought about the notion of the “skeleton translation” of a Biblical verse and – as in many other Jewish diasporas – a special archaic “language of translation” came in existence. This language was unnatural, copying Hebrew modes and syntax, but enjoyed a high status. Among the Karaites, the translation of the Bible became tantamount with Bible exegesis, and the translators (the melammedîm mostly) enjoyed the high standing kept with the Rabbanite commentators. Several grammatical features of Hebrew, such as calques of the Hebrew Genitive form, the *vota accusativa* *eth*, and the definite article rendered as *ol* – all of them totally foreign to Turkic – became characteristic marks of this learned “language of translation”, 57 which we can designate as Old-Literary-Turkic-Karaite. Some of these elements became the trademarks of both dialects of the Karaim language, partly, because of their linguistic isolation, but they remain totally foreign to the vernacular of the Crimean Karaites. All these elements are seen in the translations given in this paper.

57 One should observe that similar features were characteristic also of the Old Anatolian Turkish (“Old Ottoman”), esp. in the Qur’an translations, and of the Turkish as written by Sabbataeans in the 18th century onwards.
Such gaps between the spoken and the written languages are, of course, characteristic of many other languages, but the difference between the language of the Bible translation and other forms of spoken and written expression is typical of the Jewish languages, such as Ivri-Taytsch or Ladino (as opposed to Yiddish and Judezmo, as said), or different genre-based strata of Judeo-Arabic and Judeo-Persian. This difference is expressed not only in the archaic or archaized vocabulary (more purely Turkic than in most Turkic written languages in the written Karaim, abundant in Slavic borrowings in the Karaim vernacular), but also in syntactic calques from Hebrew (entirely strange to any Turkic language), and in different morphology, esp. in the choice of verbal forms. This profound impact executed by the Northern Karaites on the literature and spiritual life of their Crimean coreligionists, the striking similarities with the Judeo-Persian and Judeo-Arabic civilizations, demonstrate why the Eastern-European Karaites should be studied in their Oriental-Jewish context (Ben-Shammai 2001).

Contrary to Karaite “legends” from the 19th-20th centuries about Karaite prisoners of war taken from the Crimea into Lithuania and founding there the first Karaite communities, the evidence we do have in Çufut-Qal’eh is that about Karaite prisoners of war taken from Lithuania (Kiev and Luck) into the Crimea and changing there the life of the existing Jewish communities. Thus, the Karaite community of Çufut-Qal’eh was made up, beginning with the late 15th till mid-16th centuries, mostly of the Karaite immigrants from the Polish-Lithuanian territories; though there was a large influx of the Karaites from the Ottoman Empire between the second half of the 16th century till the mid-18th centuries into the Crimea (see Fedorchuk, Shapira, Vasutinsky 2014-2015), the Polish-Lithuanian immigration into the Crimea never stopped, exactly the way it was with the Rabbanite immigration from the Poland-Lithuania into the Crimea, which resulted in formation of the Qrmchaq community.

---

58 Again, a similar phenomenon, namely a different set of verbal forms used in the Qur’an translations, is characteristic also of the Old Anatolian Turkish as opposed to Ottoman Turkish.
59 The present author considers Yiddish, too, as “an Oriental language” (Shapira 2010c).
APPENDIX I

As previously stated, it is possible that the father of our copyist, Ya’aqov, was buried at the cemetery of Mangup in 1620s; the first editor, Avraham Firkowicz, has published his tombstone inscription twice under different dates, making thus both “doublets”, as he did not so infrequently, in order to forge historical evidence; the real inscription is N. 88 in Ezer & Kashovskaya 2014; in Abney Zikkaron (=AZ), the Mangup part, Firkowicz 1872 published it as (AZ M[angup]) N. 18, from the year 1026, and N/ 50, from the year 1620:

1619 AZ 18 (6201) =AZ 50(0261)

This is the tombstone of the respected* R. Mordechai
the elder, of blessed* memory*, son* of the respected* R. Ya’aqov, of blessed* memory*. Passed away on the Tuesday,
2 of Teveth, year 5,380 (For dust thou art – Gen. 3:19),60
by the abbreviated* era*, from the Creation, his* soul* shall be bound* in the bundle* of life*

More than a year later, in the early Fall 1621, Mordechai’s daughter has died (Ezer & Kashovskaya 2014, N. 94):

60 The inscription published in Firkowicz 1872: Çufut-Qal’eh N. 125, has the same date, but it was calculated by Firkowicz as being from the year 996 CE.
And this is the tombstone monument of Ms. Esther, daughter of the respected R. Mordechai, may he rest in peace. Passed away on Sunday, 3 of Tishrei, 5382 from the Creation, her soul shall dwell at ease.

APPENDIX II

Karaite translation of Nehemia chapter 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>וְיִשְׂרָאֵל</th>
<th>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</th>
<th>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה نַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּלְטִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td>אֲשֵׁר פָּلְתִיָּה נַעֲרֵי וֹא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. On that day they read in the book of Moses in the audience of the people; and therein was found written, that the Ammonite and the Moabite should not come into the congregation of God for ever;

2. Because they met not the children of Israel with bread and with water, but hired Balaam against them, that he should curse them: howbeit our God turned the curse into a blessing.

1. ol kunda oxuldi bitiginda moše nig qulaqlarinda ol ulus nig da-tabuldi yazilgan anda ki kelmagay ‘amonli da mo’abli qahalinda ol tağrinig dünýaga degin’. 

2. ki qarşilamadılar oğlanların yısra’ el nig qıtın 3 bilan da-suv bilan da-yalga şuṭtını aniq üçün bil’am ni qargamın 3 anı da-değişirdi tağrimiz qargışını algişqa.
3. Now it came to pass, when they had heard the law, that they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude.

4. And before this, Eliashib the priest, having the oversight of the chamber of the house of our God, was allied unto Tobiah:

5. And he had prepared for him a great chamber, where aforetime they laid the meat offerings, the frankincense, and the vessels, and the tithes of the corn, the new wine, and the oil, which was commanded to be given to the Levites, and the singers, and the porters; and the offerings of the priests.

6. But in all this time was not I at Jerusalem: for in the two and thirtieth year of Artaxerxes king of Babylon came I unto the king, and after certain days obtained I leave of the king:

7. And I came to Jerusalem, and understood of the evil that Eliashib did for Tobiah, in preparing him a chamber in the courts of the house of God.

8. And it grieved me sore: therefore I cast forth all the household stuff of Tobiah out of the chamber.
9. Then I commanded, and they cleansed the chambers: and thither brought I again the vessels of the house of God, with the meat offering and the frankincense.

10. And I perceived that the portions of the Levites had not been given them: for the Levites and the singers, that did the work, were fled every one to his field.

11. Then contended I with the rulers, and said, Why is the house of God forsaken? And I gathered them together, and set them in their place.

12. Then brought all Judah the tithe of the corn and the new wine and the oil unto the treasuries.

13. And I made treasurers over the treasuries, Shelemiah the priest, and Zadok the scribe, and of the Levites, Pedaiiah: and next to them was Hanan the son of Zaccur, the son of Mattaniah: for they were counted faithful, and their office was to distribute unto their brethren.

9. da-aṭṭīṭim da-ṭemīz eṭṭīlār
ol huɾjālārni da-qayṭārdim
andā sağiṭlārni evinig ol
taginig ol mīnḥāh ni da-ol
ṭīmynānī.

10. da-bīlīdim ki paylārni ol
lewī lermig belimādi19 da-
qaḍtīlaɾ har kiṣi tāɾloɾ dévelop
ol lewī ler da-ol yīɾlāvčīlār
qīlīvčīlāɾ19 ol ɾiɾnī.

11. da-ṭalașṭīm20 ol ɾiɾnlār
bilan da-ɑṭṭīṭim nuɾcūn
kemīʃīdī21 evi ol ɾaɾɡī niɾ
da-çuplaɾdim22 alarni
da-ṭurguzdum23 alarni ɾuɾɡaɾnlar
uɾstunā.

12. da-ɾumla yehudah
ketiɾdier ondasin ol tɑxılñig
da-ol tɑtli ɾɑɾiɾımig da-ol
zaytun ɣaŋnig xaznalarā.

13. da-xazn达尔 eฑtīm
xaznalar uɾstunā ɾeɬemiyor ol
kohen ni da-สาdoq ol yaxiʃiŋi
da-pedayh ni ol lewī lardan
da-qlalar uɾstunā ɾanən ogli
zāxūɾ24 niɾ ogli mɑttnanyah
niɾ ki ɾiɾmlalar saqisɬandilalar
da-ʊstlarinə ɾuɬəməɾ25
qardaʃlariga.
14. Remember me, O my God, concerning this, and wipe not out my good deeds that I have done for the house of my God, and for the offices thereof.

15. In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine presses on the sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the sabbath day: and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals.

16. There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem.

17. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the sabbath day?

18. Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the sabbath.

19. Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the sabbath.
19. And it came to pass, that when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the sabbath, I commanded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the sabbath: and some of my servants set I at the gates, that there should no burden be brought in on the sabbath day.

20. So the merchants and sellers of all kind of ware lodged without Jerusalem once or twice.

21. Then I testified against them, and said unto them, Why lodge ye about the wall? if ye do so again, I will lay hands on you. From that time forth came they no more on the sabbath.

22. And I commanded the Levites that they should cleanse themselves, and that they should come and keep the gates, to sanctify the sabbath day. Remember me, O my God, concerning this also, and spare me according to the greatness of thy mercy.

23. In those days also saw I Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab:


20. da-qondılar ol amarlar da-satuvçılar jumla satuv eňärtин yerusalem ga bir kerat da-eki kerat.


23. dagın ol kunlarda kordım yisraʾ el66 larnı türgzidizlar ʾašdodlı ʾaćınlar ʾamollılar moʿalılar.
24. And their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people.

25. And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves.

26. Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these things? yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel: nevertheless even him did outlandish women cause to sin.

27. Shall we then hearken unto you to do all this great evil, to transgress against our God in marrying strange wives?

28. And one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the high priest, was son in law to Sanballat the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me.
29. Remember them, O my God, because they have defiled the priesthood, and the covenant of the priesthood, and of the Levites.

30. Thus cleansed I them from all strangers, and appointed the wards of the priests and the Levites, every one in his business;

31. And for the wood offering, at times appointed, and for the first fruits. Remember me, O my God, for good.

---

10 mà’aser. According to Baskakov, Zajončkovskij, Šapšal (eds.) 1974: 429, the form is attested in the Crimean only.
11 According to Baskakov, Zajončkovskij, Šapšal (eds.) 1974: 518, taxyl [there: taxil / tachil], is attested in Halicz and in the Crimea.
13 yishar.
Ma of belimadi stands, apparently, for ä. Using the same vowel sign, patah, for both e and ä. is a common feature in the Gölzele translation and – as I have learnt at the latest stage of sending off this article – in the manuscript from which the Gölzele edition was printed.


22 A Karaim form of Turkic toplan.


24 The Massoretic text has zakkūr.


27 Read maŋa.


29 From Arabic šahawāt, ‘passion’. Cf. Baskakov, Zajončkovski, Šapšal (eds.) 1974: 454, for the Halicz form with the š₂-s shift. It stands frequently for Hebrew hesed in older Karaim texts. The use of this word in the translation under scrutiny points in the direction of the Karaim-speaking North, and I am thankful to an anonymous reviewer who had called my attention to the Halicz form. I will return to this issue in another paper.

30 For this and the following two Present forms, cf. Musajev 1964: 278.


34 A misprint for *qlayyālār.

35 “And these gates have been watched”; for ešik, “door”, see Jankowski 1997: 62.


37 Not in Baskakov, Zajončkovski, Šapšal (eds.) 1974. A Persian word?

38 Note that at Çufut-Qal’eh, the word qal’eh, ‘a fortress’, was frequently translated, in the 17th-18th centuries, by Hebrew homah, ‘wall’


41 yehudith. Compare the Qrymčaq usage *Israel = a Jew, Jews.


45 Non-Masorethic vocalization; possibly, a misprint.
46 Read horunlîgah; it is Dative, rendering Hebrew le-.
47 wâabreihehu.
48 go’oley hakehunnah, a hapax in the Bible.
49 u-brith hakehunnah omitted?
50 nekhar.
51 wâa’amidah.
52 mišmaroth.
53 Sic!
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