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Abstract
In this article an early Bible translation into north-western Karaim is described. The manuscript, written in Hebrew script (in its Karaim semi-cursive variant), dates back to 1720, which makes it the oldest western Karaim Bible translation to be hitherto critically analysed. The manuscript was copied in Kukizów by Simcha ben Chananiel (who died in the 1720s). The language of the manuscript reveals archaic features, among others, consonant harmony in the process of emerging.
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1. Preliminary remarks
The present article presents a concise description of a manuscript that contains an early north-western Karaim Torah translation (so-called *Chumash*) from 1720, supplemented with a translation of the four books of Ketuvim. To my knowledge, this is the oldest translation of Bible fragments into Western Karaim hitherto described.¹

¹ For an overview of the existing editions of Karaim translations of Biblical texts, see Olach (2013: 6–10) and Jankowski (2009: 504–509).
The manuscript’s language is not consistent. The Torah translation reveals archaic linguistic peculiarities, whereas the language of the books of Ketuvim is closer to present-day Karaim. For this reason, I decided to present the manuscript in two separate articles. In the present one, I will concentrate on the language of the Torah translation. Given the archaic quality of its language, and hence, the presence of a number of linguistic features that are fundamental as far as the history of north-western Karaim is concerned, a representative sample material will be presented below. I have chosen the parashah Yitro for this purpose. A portion of the second, most probably somewhat younger part, will be presented in a separate article as a continuation of the present one.

2. The manuscript

The manuscript contains the Five Books of Moses (fo. 1 r° – 341 r°) and four other books of the Ketuvim, namely the Book of Ruth (342 r° – 347 v°), the Book of Jeremiah (348 r° – 358 r°), Ecclesiastes (358 v° – 372 v°) and the Book of Esther (373 r° – 385 v°). It is stored in a private archive in Warsaw under the catalogue number III-73. Its owner wants to remain, for the time being, anonymous.

Thus, the manuscript consists of 385 folios with a size of 175 × 140 mm and an approximate average of 21 lines per page. The original first two sheets are missing; folios 1 r° – 2 v° contain a 19th-century addition in light brown ink written in south-western Karaim (the handwriting and the ink is typical for copyists from Halych; the copyist was most probably Jeshua-Josef Mordkowicz (1802–1884), but I can only say that based on the features of the handwriting). Folios 3–384 are copied in dark brown ink in north-western Karaim and originate from the 18th century. The last fragment on folio 385 is in north-western Karaim, again, but was added much later, apparently in the 20th century, in black ink. I found the original folio 385 (containing Est. 9:28–10:3) severely damaged in a file stored in the same private archive (among a number of other different handwritten sheets), and have catalogued it under the number III-67-dok 3. The manuscript was subject to conservation in the latter half of the 20th century. The text is clearly legible despite the ink corrosion visible on most folios. The text was fully vocalized at the same time the “main” text was written.²

² Kowalski (1929: xix, 289) observed that some non-vocalized manuscripts from Kukizów ended up in Halych after the community’s fall in 1831 and received there a clearly
The translation of the Torah was copied in the period between 25 March and 31 May 1720 by Simcha ben Chananiel (died in the 1720s; see Kizilov 2009: 53, 378), a known copyist of Hebrew manuscripts and the hazzan in Kukizów from 1709 until his demise. The date is expressed in the colophon that ends the Torah translation (on folios 340 v° – 341 r°):

south-western type vocalization. This manuscript surely cannot be an example of such a practice even if we agree that the additions on folios 1–2 show that the manuscript must have ended up in the community of Halych.

3 I want to thank Prof. Piotr Muchowski (Poznań) for his invaluable help and suggestions in deciphering the date of the writing of the Torah translation. My thanks go also to prof. Tapani Harviainen (Helsinki) for his additional advices regarding the translation of the Hebrew colophon.

4 He was the second hazzan in this small community established in 1688 by six Karaim families, moving there from Trakai. The first to officiate there as hazzan was Mordechai ben Nisan (1688–1709).

5 to (the beginning of) the month’.

6 The first word of the quotation (see the translation below) indicates the date, i.e. letters waw + daleth + ayin + taw = 6 + 4 + 70 + 400 = A.M. (5)480, i.e, A.D. 1720.

7 ‘of the minor era’.

8 ‘of the weekly portion of the Torah’.

9 ‘the above-mentioned’.

10 ‘through this, by this’.

11 ‘the son of my master, my father’.

12 ‘the honourable sir’.

13 ‘may he rest in peace’.

14 ‘the prayer leader of the community’. According to Prof. Piotr Muchowski (personal communication), this title could have referred to hazzans, too. This means that the use of this title does not clash with the fact that Simcha officiated as hazzan in Kukizów from 1709 until the 1720s.

15 ‘for ever’.

16 ‘the holy community’.

17 ‘for ever Selah!’.
'And it started to be written on the first day of the seder Shemini, on the 15th of Adar Shen of the year 480 of the minor era. And it was completed on the 5th day of the seder Bechukotai, on the 23rd of the month Iyar, on the 33rd day of counting the Omer of the year mentioned above; by the performer of the holy enterprise is the young among the God-fearing and those who respect His name, by me, Simcha the son of my lord and my father, the honourable sir Chananiel may he rest in peace, the prayer leader of the community, for ever, here in the Holy Community of Kukizów may the Lord keep the community upright for ever Selah! Amen.'

This colophon is followed by the remaining 44 folios that contain the additional four books of Ketuvim mentioned above, which actually might suggest that these fragments were added somewhat later. However, there is no colophon or heading that would inform us when this happened.

A palaeographical examination clearly shows that the entire manuscript (except for the additions on the initial and the last folios) was copied by one person – Simcha ben Chananiel. This, in turn, suggests that the linguistic heterogeneity is a result of the copyist’s use of different sources.

The manuscript was owned by several persons. On folio 341 ro Zecharia ben Shalom (died 1771?) made an annotation in Hebrew saying that he bought the book on the 28th of Tevet 5528, i.e. on 18 January 1768 from a person called Josef ben Jehuda. On folios 155 vo, 156 ro, 205 vo, 206 ro, and 276 vo an oval seal has

---

18 The parashah is specified by a quotation read in this period, i.e. by a fragment from Leviticus (10:11): ‘And that you may teach the children of Israel all the statutes’ (King James 2000).

19 The year number is expressed by ודעת, i.e. the first word of a slightly altered quotation from Proverbs (2:5), namely: ודעת אלוהים תימצא ‘and [you will] find the knowledge of God’ (King James 2000) or Proverbs (9:10), cf. וידעתי קדשים בינה ‘and the knowledge of the holy One is understanding’ (King James 2000).

20 Again, this is specified by a quotation from Leviticus (26:46) read in the relevant period: אלהים החקים והמשפטים והחקים אשר נתן יהוה ‘These are the statutes and judgments and laws, which the Lord made’ (King James 2000).

21 Jehuda is mentioned as a deceased person with the abbreviation דה, standing for Hebr. והני יקומ דם ‘may the Lord revenge his blood’, which at first sight suggests that he must have been killed in Kotov (Pol. Kotów) or Derazhne (Pol. Derażne) during the Haidamak massacre in 1768. The book was, however, bought in January, whereas the Haidamak rebellion (the so-called Koliyivshchyna) broke out in spring of 1768. Ergo, Jehuda must have not necessarily been a citizen of Derazhne or Kotov.
been pressed with the Hebrew inscription ‘Mordechai the son of the honoured ribbi Zecharia of blessed memory’. On folio 205 v  one of the owners listed the dates of birth of his three children (between 1789 and 1795). Finally, the original folio 385 v (i.e. III-67-dok 3) contains the signature of a person called Shalom ben Zecharia (the signature is introduced with Hebr. אני ‘I’).22

3. The transcription

3.1. Introductory remarks

Since a number of phonetic features are hidden behind the Hebrew orthography and there are extremely modest subsidiary means that would help us establishing what was the actual phonetic value of the attested text, I could not use here a phonetic transcription, as I did so far in my editions of 19th-century Karaim texts.

The language of the analysed Torah translation clearly shows that the consonant-harmony we know from north-western Karaim was not fully developed in the time the manuscript was copied or translated.23 In other words, the text originates from a transitional period when the harmony shift was still an ongoing process. Thus, in fact, such a transcription would be needed here that would cover two different sound systems (existing prior and after the

22 Mordechai and Shalom were most probably brothers and were the sons of Zecharia ben Shalom who bought the manuscript in 1768. The latter person, in turn, is most probably the same Zecharia ben Shalom to whom a kinah (lament for the dead) written the 13th of Sivan 5531 A.M. (i.e. 26 May 1771) was devoted, written by Jeshua ben Mordechai Mordkowicz (chazzan in Halych until 1796). The latter information is to be found in manuscript JSul.I.37–14 stored in the archive of Anna Sulimowicz. I shall thank Anna Sulimowicz (Warsaw) for this invaluable suggestion.

23 In north-western Karaim the front-back vowel harmony known, for instance, from other Middle Kipchak languages, was shifted towards palatal vs. non-palatal consonant harmony. I call this process harmony shift. To put it simply, from a synchronic point of view, we can say that this happened due to a process in which the palatal quality of the vowel has been shifted to the preceding consonant, namely due to the ö > ‘o, ü > ‘u and e > ‘a process (‘ indicates the palatality of the preceding consonant). Since this process could not have been described so far based on philological data in default of sources older than the late 18th century, I have prepared a very detailed description of it and submitted it for publication in a separate, extensive paper (see Németh 2014b).
harmony shift), which means that a phonological transcription would not be satisfactory enough either. Ergo, the transcription I use must have remained partially conventional with a number of questions left open.

I have presented a detailed discussion of the matters related to transcription in Németh (2014b). Below I summarize my reasoning.

3.2. Open questions and the solutions chosen

3.2.1. Labial vowels: ö, ü vs. ‚o, ‚u

We do not know what was the actual phonetic value of the original front labials, i.e. ö and ü in non-initial positions in the time the manuscript was written. Eventually, word-medially and word-finally these vowels evolved into o and u with the preceding consonant being palatalized. But there were no orthographical means to distinguish between ö and ‚o, or between ü and ‚u (the pairs were written with ‹יו› and ‹וי›, respectively, with an additional aleph if written word-initially). Moreover, we cannot determine whether there was any ö ~ ‚o and ü ~ ‚u alternation (similar to the widespread alternation of e ~ ‚a described below) in the time the text was translated and copied. In the interests of clarity, I will use ö and ü in the transcription, in every position. The use of these symbols, however, should not be considered to be my “auto-da-fé” regarding their phonetic value; I do not think that the original *ö and *ü must have necessarily been pronounced as front labials in all positions in the time this Torah translation was performed, even if I consider this to be highly possible.

3.2.2. The palatality of consonants

It was only the position in front of ‚a that originated from *e where the palatality of the preceding consonant was clearly noted by an additional yodh. Luckily for us, the orthography allows a clear distinction between a and e, as well as between a and ‚a: The sound e was noted with the vowel points tzere (ֵ) and (rarely) seghol (ֶ) usually combined with the letter yodh, i.e. ֵי and

---

24 In word-initial position these vowels have remained ö and ü until the present day; ö did not occur in non-initial syllable, and therefore its use was limited to word-initial and word-medial positions.

25 The vowels ö or ‚o and ü or ‚u were also noted with the letter yodh (and waw), but we cannot determine whether it indicated the frontness of ö, ü or the palatality of consonants in front of ‚o and ‚u.
‘א׳, whereas $a$ was written with a pattāḥ ($א$) and qāmātz ($א$). The distinction between $a$ and 'a, in turn, was marked with the letter yodh, i.e. the consonants with the vowel points pattāḥ ($א$) or qāmātz ($א$) were additionally followed by the letter yodh to denote 'a.

In front of front vowels (ö, ü, i and e) some of the consonants, for instance $k$, $g$ and $l$, were most probably palatalized in the time the analysed text was translated (the palatality of these consonants was not represented in writing). This feature, however, must have certainly been merely a phonetic one, and therefore I refrain from indicating this type of palatalization in the transcription.

To sum up, in order not to use a transcription that would suggest far-fetching phonological or phonetic interpretation, I will note the palatality only of those consonants that stand in front of 'a originating from *e. This solution seems reasonable for it does not obscure the difference between 'a and $a$ regularly represented in the writing.

26  Word-initially aleph was used as mater lectionis. Word-finally the notation of both $a$ and $e$ was “reinforced” with the letter aleph, i.e. $-e$ was indicated with $א-א$ and $א-א$, whereas $-a$ with $א-א$ and $א-א$. Due to space limitations, a complex orthographical analysis of the text cannot be performed here. This, however, definitely deserves a separate study; preferably as a complementary description to a complete critical edition of the text.

27  The palatal pronunciation of $k$, $g$ and $l$ is a well-known feature of Turkic phonotactics. Importantly, this feature is present in both dialects of Modern Western Karaim (see e.g. Kowalski 1929: xlvii; Zajączkowski 1931: 9), which allows us to presume that it is rather an inherited feature. Cf. our remarks in 5.1.

28  In fact, according to one of the acceptable and, in fact, highly probable scenarios modeling step by step the evolution of the harmony shift it may well be that it was the consonants that became palatalized first as a result of the already existing process of palatalization of $k$, $g$ and $l$ before front vowels, combined with the strong influence of Lithuanian and Slavonic (above all Polish and Russian) phonotactics, leading to an increase in the number of palatalized consonants preceding front vowels which, in turn, weakened the opposition between front and back vowels and made the backing of front vowels possible. According to this scenario, the front vowels were backed later, as a next step, starting with word-final syllables (see below), and this process gradually expanded towards the beginning of words without coming to an end: we know from present-day Karaim that $e$ remained unchanged in the first syllable, whereas ö and ü remained untouched in word initial position (for the overall model, see Németh 2014b). The hypothetical palatality of these consonants in the transitional period (i.e. after the strong palatalization process of consonants, but before the process of backing the front vowels) should, however, also be treated as a phonetic rather than phonological feature.
3.2.3. The phonetic value of $q$

Another question is what was the actual pronunciation of the sound represented by the letter $koph$ ($ך$) syllable-finally and suffix-initially? Eventually, it evolved into $[\chi]$ in these positions, but we do not know when this happened. In this respect, the spelling of north-western Karaim texts written or printed in Hebrew script could have been etymological, at least until the second half of the 19th century.\(^{29}\) I will use $q$ for the original *$q$* in every position.

3.2.4. The value of the letter $yodh$ in 1st and 2nd pl. person markers

In the Hebrew script no distinction can be made between the back unrounded vowel $y$ and its front counterpart $i$. For this reason, it remains an open question what was the phonetic value of the letter $yodh$ in the 1st and 2nd pl. person markers written as ‹בִיז› and ‹סִיז›. The original forms -biz and -siz\(^{30}\) evolved into -byz ~ -biz > -byz ~ -ביז and -syz ~ -siz > -syz ~ -סיז, but we cannot determine when this process exactly took place. In the transcription I use the original forms -biz and -siz. Cf. also 5.3 below.

4. The sample linguistic material

4.1 Introductory remarks

Below I present the transcription of the parashah Yitro. My English translation follows as close as possible the Karaim original and is based on the King James Bible 2000 and on the English Standard Version. In the footnotes, I also provide a brief comparison with another translation of the Torah, written in south-western Karaim with some archaic linguistic features being preserved, copied in the 19th century by Jeshua-Josef Mordkowicz (catalogue

\(^{29}\) Manuscripts from this period already show the letter $cheth$ ‹ח› and $koph$ with a $rake$, i.e. ‹ח›, in this position. For instance, I know of a manuscript from 1881/1882, stored under catalogue number III-68 in the same collection, which was written by the 14-year-old Simon Osipowicz Chorczenko (born 1868), in which the young author applied an orthography based on the actual pronunciation rather than philological tradition. For instance, on folio 1 vo we find the word $kullux$ ‘slavery; service’ < *$kulluk$ written as ‹קּולְלוּח› instead of the expected ‹קּולְלוּק› or the word $jyraχ$ ‘distant’ written as ‹ײִרַק› instead of ‹ײִרַק›, which informs us that the -$k > \chi$ change must have happened prior to the 1880s.

number JSul.III.01; folios 77 v° – 79 v°) and stored in another private archive in Warsaw. The English translation, however, corresponds to the north-western Karaim text in manuscript III-73 only. In this comparison, I will ignore differences that are merely phonetic in nature. If a comment concerns not a word, but a longer fragment, the text in question will be enclosed in half square brackets, i.e. [...].

4.2 Transcription

Exodus 18:1–27

Page 113 v°

{1} [1] ṭvšmm Jt̂ro q̂ara

{2} [2] ̲t̅l̲nsu̲ ̲Midjannyn qajnatašy Mošenin o̲š̲ol b̲r̲-

{3} [3] č̲a ne̲̲ ki q̲yldy tenri Mo̲še̲ge da Isra̲l̲ge ul̲̲usuna ı̲ızū̲-

{4} [4] ni̲n̲ ki ̲c̲yg̲ardy Adonaj̲̲ o̲š̲ol Isra̲l̲ni Mi̲c̲ri̲ן. Da

{5} [5] al̲dy Jt̂ro qajnatašy Mošenin o̲š̲ol Ciporany qatyny̲n Mošenin

{6} [6] uzatqany̲ndan sortun any. ̲J̲s̲ul.III.01: ošol eki uvu-

{7} [7] lary any̲n ki aty ol birisini̲n ̲Ger̲šom ki ajtty ̲ga̲rib boldum

{8} [8] jat jer̲d. ̲C̲i̲sh̲. Da aty ol birisini̲n ̲Eliezer ajtad̲o̲ğa̲č

{9} [9] ki tenrisi atamnyn boldu ̲b̲olu̲š̲łu̲ğ̲umda ̲da qutqardy

{10} [10] meni q̲y̲l̲y̲c̲y̲ndan paronun. ̲J̲s̲ul.III.01: a̲y̲a̲n. Da keldi Jt̂ro qajnatašy

31 My aim is not to perform a comparative critical edition but only to present the text of the manuscript from 1720 in a larger comparative perspective.

32 Standard Hebr. ‘When Jethro, the priest of Midian heard’ (Ex 18:1), King James 2000.

33 JSul.III.01: ägaraq̣ỵ.

34 JSul.III.01: nenî.

35 JSul.III.01: this word is absent.

36 JSul.III.01: Ha, i.e. ̀. I will not indicate this difference any more.

37 JSul.III.01: additionally: ol qonarlyqtan necik baryredi qajtma Micrige.

38 JSul.III.01: birin̲î̲n.

39 JSul.III.01: edim

40 Probably a clerical error, see my remark in the translation. JSul.III.01: ekincin̲î̲n.

41 JSul.III.01: this word is absent.

42 JSul.III.01: edi̲n.

43 JSul.III.01: bolu̲š̲łu̲ğ̲umda menim.

44 Standard Hebr. ̀b̲a̲w̲̲ and came’ (Ex 18:5). Writing waw in place of the vowel point hōlām was a common practice among Karaim copyists, also in translations into Eastern Karaim.
Mošenin da uvullary anyn\(^45\) da qatyny anyn\(^46\) Mošege ol midbaraga

ki ol tożalessly andra tavyna ol tenrinin. Da

ajtty Jitro, elči ašyra\(^47\) Mošega men qajnataji\(^48\) Jitro kelemen

saja da qatyny\(^49\) da eki uvullary anyn birgesińa\(^50\). Ẃv.

Da čyqty Moše uturusuna qajnatasynyn da başurdu da

öpti any da sordular kiši dostundan savluqnu\(^51\) da kel-

diler ol čatyrğa. Ẃv. Da qotardy Moše qajnatsby-

na ošol barča ne\(^52\) ki qylady Adonaj paroğa da Micriğa

Israel ücün\(^53\) ošol bar ol jadavny\(^54\) ki učrady alarny jolda ki\(^55\)

urusuť alar byla amalek\(^56\) da qutqardy alarny Adonaj. Ẃv.

Da bijendi Jitro bar ol jaχšylyq\(^57\) ücün ki qyldy Adonaj Israelge

{{catchwords:}} ki qutqardy

ki qutqardy any qolundan Micrinin. Ẃv. Da ajtty

Jitro maχtavludu\(^59\) Adonaj ki qutqardy sizni qolundan Micrinin da

qolundan paronun ki\(^60\) qutqardy ošol ol ulusnu erkitü-

vünkän Micrinin. Ẃv. Haligine bildim\(^61\) ki ulluraqty\(^62\)

---

\(^45\) JSul.III.01: this word is absent.

\(^46\) JSul.III.01: Mošenin.

\(^47\) JSul.III.01: this fragment is absent.

\(^48\) JSul.III.01: qajnatan senin.

\(^49\) JSul.III.01: qatynyn senin.

\(^50\) JSul.III.01: birgesine anyn.

\(^51\) JSul.III.01: bazlyqny.

\(^52\) JSul.III.01: neni.

\(^53\) JSul.III.01: islerü ićün Israelnin. The Torah translation copied by Jeshua-Josef Mordkowicz I use for comparison reflects traces of the transitional period in south-western Karaim when the ő > e, ü > i delabialization process was operating and ő ~ e and ü ~ i were alternating. This is why we have ićün (and not icin) here. This process took place most probably in the last decades of the 18th century, somewhat later than the ş > s change. For a detailed analysis of these changes based on philological data, see Németh (2014a).

\(^54\) JSul.III.01: ucurnu.

\(^55\) JSul.III.01: da ki.

\(^56\) Hebr. עֲמָלֵק ‘a wicked person’.

\(^57\) JSul.III.01: this fragment is absent.

\(^58\) JSul.III.01: jaχsy.

\(^59\) JSul.III.01: maχtavludur.

\(^60\) JSul.III.01: ki qutqardy sizni qolundan Micrinin da qolundan paronun ki.

\(^61\) JSul.III.01: bilemen.

\(^62\) JSul.III.01: ulluraqtyr.
{27} Adonaj bar ol malaqlardan⁶³ ki nendij iš byla ki čajalyq etti-
{28} ler alaq⁶⁴ qajtardy tölev⁶⁵ alarga. ḥa. Da aldy Jitro
{29} qajnatasy Mošenin ola⁶⁶ da debexalar tenriğa da keldi Aharon
{30} da bar qartlary Israelnin ašama ötmek qajnatasy byla Moše-
{31} nin alnynda ol tenrinin. ḥa. Da edi tanbyldan da
{32} olturdu Moše töre etnka ošol ol ulusnu da tur-
{33} du ol ulus ḥalnynda Mošenin⁶⁷ ol tandan⁶⁸ ol ingirgedejin.
{34} ḥa. Da kördu qajnatasy Mošenin ošol barča ḥe⁶⁹ ki ol
{35} qyldy ulusqa da ajtty nedir⁷⁰ ki sen ošpu⁷¹ ki sen quyla-
{36} sen ulusqa ne üçün sen olturasen jalgyz özüj ,töre
{37} etme⁷² da bar ol ulus ,köplügündan törelernin turady-
{38} lar alnyjda tandan ingirgedejin⁷³. ḥa. Da ajtty
{39} Moše qajnatasyna ki keledi maja qačaty⁷⁴ ol ulusun⁷⁵ sorna
{40} sözün tenrinin. ḥ. Alajoq⁷⁶ ki bolsa alarga töre sö-
{41} zü kelediler maja da töre etemen a{r}asyna kišinin da
{42} arasynda dostunun ,da ol soruvčularğa sözün tenrinin⁷⁷ da
{43} bildiremen alarga⁷⁸ ošol resimlerin ol tenrinin da ošol
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{44} üvretüvlerin anyn. ḥaymak. Da ajtty qajnatasy Moše-
{45} nin anar jağşy tůvüldü ol iš ki sen qylasen. ḥev. Upran-

⁶³ JSul.III.01: tenrilerden.
⁶⁴ JSul.III.01: Micrililer.
⁶⁵ JSul.III.01: this word is absent.
⁶⁶ Hebr. 'burnt offering'.
⁶⁷ JSul.III.01: Moše qatyna.
⁶⁸ JSul.III.01: erton byladan.
⁶⁹ JSul.III.01: neni.
⁷⁰ Sul.III.01: nedi.
⁷¹ JSul.III.01: ol ošpu.
⁷² JSul.III.01: this fragment is absent.
⁷³ JSul.III.01: turady senin katyna baslap erteden ingirgedejin.
⁷⁴ Perhaps < Hebr. 'part, a small part'.
⁷⁵ JSul.III.01: ol ulus.
⁷⁶ JSul.III.01: this word is absent.
⁷⁷ JSul.III.01: this fragment is absent.
⁷⁸ JSul.III.01: this word is absent.
ma upranyrsen dağyn ol79 ulus oşpu80 ki birgeje81 ki
avurdu sendan82 ol iš bolalmassen qylma any jalgyz özüj.
Haligine tynläğyn sözüme keneş bereşim saja da
bolsun bolušлугу tenrinin birgeje83 бол gün sen ،ulus üčün al-
ynda ol tenrinin84 da keltirgin sen ošol ol sözlerнй85 alny-
na ol tenrinin. ฎ ฎ . Da zynharläğyn alarqa ošol
ol resimlerni da ošol ol üvretüvlerni da bildirgin alar-
ğa ošol ol jolnu ki barğajlar86 anyn byla da ošol ol išni
ki qylğajlar. ฎ . Da sen baqqyn bar ol ulustan tuvuşlu
elni qorquvчularын tenrıdıan kerti , elni χορ etüvčülernи χαrım88
malny da qoil gün alar üstüне ağałyqlaryн89 minlernи ağałyq-
laryн, 90 jüzernen ağałyqlaryн91 enüllernи ağałyqlaryн92 onlarnyn.
Malny da qojğun alar üstüne ağaylaq-
laryн, 93 4 uştiýdan94 da költürsünler birgeja99. ฎ. Eger
išini oşpunu100 qylsaj da bujursa saja tenri da bolalyr-

79 JSul.III.01: sen dağyn ol.
80 JSul.III.01: ol ospu.
81 JSul.III.01: birgene senin.
82 JSul.III.01: senin {icin}.
83 JSul.III.01: birgene senin.
84 JSul.III.01: ulusqa üvretüve sarwлaryn tenrinin.
85 JSul.III.01: sözlerнй ki sorsalar senden.
86 JSul.III.01: jirigejler.
87 JSul.III.01: el qorquвular.
88 JSul.III.01: el χοр etυvчiler qynğyryq.
89 JSul.III.01: ağaɾaqlaryн.
90 JSul.III.01: ağaɾaqlaryн.
91 JSul.III.01: ağaɾaqlaryн.
92 JSul.III.01: ağaɾaqlaryн.
93 JSul.III.01: eterler.
94 JSul.III.01: vaχt.
95 JSul.III.01: sözni keltirirler.
96 JSul.III.01: sözni tere eterler.
97 JSul.III.01: jengil etkin.
98 JSul.III.01: özün istinden.
99 JSul.III.01: keltirirler birgene senin.
100 JSul.III.01: ošol ol isni ol uspu.
{63} [20] sen turma da dağyn bar ol uspu orununa kelir
{64} [21] bazlyq byla. Da tynlady Moše sözüne qajnatasyna
{65} [22] {{catchwords:}} da qyldy
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{66} [1] da qyldy barça ne ki ajty. Da sajlady Moše tuvuş-
{67} [2] lu elni bar Israelden da berdi alarny ağaraq ol us-
{68} [3] tiñe ağaqlaryn minlernin ağaqlaryn jüzlerini ağaqlaryn en-
{69} [4] vəsif. Da töre ete-
{70} [5] rediler oşol ol ulusnu har vaştta oşol ol qaty söznü
{71} [6] keltirirediler Mošege da bar ol kiči nerseni töre e-
{72} [7] terediler özleri. Da uzatty Moše oşol
{73} [8] qajnatasyn da bardy özüne jeriña ...

Exodus 19:1–25

{73} [8] ... ḫaṃ ḫu. Ol üčün-
{74} [9] či jaŋgajda čyqmağyna ulanlarynyn Israelnin jerin dan Micrinin
{75} [10] oşpu künde keldiler midbarya Synaj{nyn}. Da
{77} [12] toxtadylar midbarda da toxtady anda Israel qarşysyna
{78} [13] ol tavnyn. ḫaṃ ḫu. Da Moše mindi alnyna ol tenri-
{79} [14] nin da čaŋyrdy anar Adonaj ol tavdan ajtadoğac bulaj ajt-

---

101 JSul.III.01: ol uspu.
102 JSul.III.01: bazlyqa.
103 JSul.III.01: neni.
104 JSul.III.01: el.
105 JSul.III.01: ağaraqlar.
106 JSul.III.01: ağaqlaryn.
107 JSul.III.01: ağaqlaryn.
108 JSul.III.01: ağaqlaryn.
109 JSul.III.01: ağaqlaryn.
110 JSul.III.01: vaşt.
111 JSul.III.01: sözni.
112 JSul.III.01: iți.
113 JSul.III.01: ajda.
114 JSul.III.01: uvullarynyn Israelnin.
115 JSul.III.01: ol oşpu.
{81} [16] סְיָדָן. Siz kırdüjüz ošol ne₁₁₁ ki qyldym Micrige da
{82} [17] ָֽקְוּתְרֵדְוּמִי sızni qyjasa nešer qanatlary üstüne₁₁₂ da
{83} [18] keltirdim sizni özüme. Da haligine eger
{84} [19] tynlama tynlasajyz ünüme da saqlasajyz ošol şeritimni
{85} [20] da bolursiz maja onča bar ol uluslardan ki menimdi
{86} [21] bar ol jer. אתים. Da sız bolursiz maja bijligi kohen-
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{87} [1] lernin₁₁₉ da aziz čanlyq bulardylar ošol²₀₉ sözler ki sözlegenim ulanlary-
{89} [3] ol ulusnun da qojdu alynlarynda alarmyn ošol bar ol söz-
{90} [4] lerin oşpularyny ki şarydy any ašyra₁₃₅ Adonaj. Da
{91} [5] qaruv berdiler bar ol ulus {birge}₁₂₆ da ajttylar barča ne₁₂₇ ki sözledi
{92} [6] Adonaj qylarbız da qaruv qaqtardy Moše ošol sözlerin ol
{93} [7] ulusnun Adonajğa. דִּבְּרַם. Da ajtty Adonaj Moše-
{94} [8] ge muna ,kelir şeșinam menim¹²₈ saja ṣıyq bulut byla¹₂₉ anyn ü-
{95} [9] ーション ki³₀ eʃitkej ol ulus sözlegenimda birgeje¹₃¹ da dağyn
{96} [10] saja inanlyq bergejler¹₃₂ dunjağa dejin da anlatty Moše ošol

₁₁₀ JSul.III.01: sözlegen anlatadoğac uvullaryna.
₁₁₁ JSul.III.01: nenı.
₁₁₂ JSul.III.01: elttim sizni qanatlary istine nešerlernin.
₁₁₃ JSul.III.01: ağaraqlarmyn.
₁₁₄ JSul.III.01: ol.
₁₁₅ JSul.III.01: sözlegejsen uvullarya.
₁₁₆ Standard Hebr. יִבְוא ‘and came’ (Ex 19:7).
₁₁₇ JSul.III.01: qayrydy.
₁₁₈ JSul.III.01: qartlaryna.
₁₁₉ JSul.III.01: bujurdı anar.
₁₂₀ JSul.III.01: birde.
₁₂₁ JSul.III.01: nenı.
₁₂₂ JSul.III.01: men kelimen sana; the form kelimen comes from kelirmen. For examples of eliminating the future tense marker in south-western Karaim non-abbreviated forms see NéMeth (2011a: 47). So far, this type of syncopation was thought to be characteristic only of secular texts reflecting the every-day language.
₁₂₃ JSul.III.01: qalynlyq byla ol bulutnun.
₁₂₄ JSul.III.01: this word is absent.
₁₂₅ JSul.III.01: birgene senin.
₁₂₆ JSul.III.01: naviligne senin inangajlar.
{97} [11] sözlerin ol ulusnun adonajğa. Da ajtty
{98} [12] Adonaj Mošege bargyn ol ulusqa da aziz\(^{133}\) etkin alarny
{99} [13] bügün da tanbyla da juvsunlar upraqlaryn özlerinin\(^{134}\).
{100} [14] ۋىرى. Da bolsunlar hadirler ol üçünčü künde ki
{101} [15] ol üçünčü künde ener şexinasy Adonajnyn közleriçe
{102} [16] bar ol ulusunun tavy üstüne Synajyn.
{103} [17] Da čeklegin ošol ol ulusnu čuivre ajtadoğaç saqlanıyjyz
{104} [18] özüüzge minmekten tavga da tijmekten ucuna anyn
{105} [19] bar ol tijuvčü tavga ölme öltürülüsün. ۋىرى.
{106} [20] Da kim ki čyqsa ol čektan tijmesin anar qol ki ançaq
{107} [21] eger juvuq bolsa ol tašbyla taşlanma taşlansyn a
{108} [22] {{catchword:}} eger
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{109} [1] eger jyraq bolsa oqbyla oqlanma oqlansyn hem kişi
{110} [2] hem tuvar tiri bolmasyn tartqanda ol şofar\(^{135}\) išlengen
{111} [3] qoçqar müvüzündən ol vaṛtxa barsynlar čatyrlyrändən tur-
{112} [4] ma ol tav tübünde\(^{136}\). Da endi Moše ol tavdan
{113} [5] ol ulusqa da aziz\(^{137}\) etti ošol ol ulusnu da juvdular
{114} [6] upraqlaryn özlerinin\(^{138}\). Da ajtty ol ulusqa
{116} [8] ۋىرى. Da edi ol üçünčü künde bolğanda ol tan
{117} [9] da boldu avazlar da jyldyrymlar da ,küčlü bulut\(^{139}\) ol tav üs-
{118} [10] tine da şofar avazy küčlü astry da qaltrady bar ol
{119} [11] ulus ki avulda. ۋىرى. Da čyğardy Moše oşol ol ulus-
{120} [12] nu alnyna\(^{140}\) ol tenrinin ol avuldan da turdlardı türbünde

\(^{133}\) JSul.III.01: ajryqsy.
\(^{134}\) JSul.III.01: this word is absent.
\(^{135}\) < Hebr. 'trumpet'.
\(^{136}\) JSul.III.01: different wording in the entire verse: *Da bulaj eltitilsin ol cyğuwcu cekten tijmesin anar qol ancaq tas byla taslansyn jyuq bolsa a eger jyraq bolsa og byla atylma atylsyn kle tuvar kle kisi tiri bolmasyn tartqanda ol joel şofary alar erkli bolurlar minme tavga.*
\(^{137}\) JSul.III.01: ajryqsy.
\(^{138}\) JSul.III.01: this word is absent.
\(^{139}\) JSul.III.01: bulut küčlü.
\(^{140}\) JSul.III.01: utrusuna.
{121} [13] ol tavyn{144}. 횟. Da tavy Synaj{1yn} tüütünlendi{12} barčasy{143} anyn
{122} [14] üčün ki endi anyn üstüne şexinasy Adonajyn ot-
{123} [15] byla da kötürüldü ,tüütüni kibik{144} ol kireč pečinin da
{124} [16] qaltyrady bar ol tav astry.  Diary. Da edi ,ol şofar
{125} [17] avazy{145} baryredi da küçejiredi astry Moše sözleredi
{126} [18] da ol tenri ņarttyryredi{146} anar ,küç avazynda ki ešit-
{127} [19] kejler ulanlary Israelin sözlerin Moşenin tartmaq vaçt-
{128} [20] ta ol şofar{147}. ޮ. Da endi şexinasy Adonajyn tavy
{129} [21] üstüne Synajnyn başyna ol tavyn da ündedi{148} Adonaj
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{130} [1] Mošen{149} başyna ol tavyn da mindi Moše.  Do
{131} [2] ajtty Adonaj Mošegе engin tanyq etkin ulusta mağat
{132} [3] buzarlar ol čekni alnynda Adonajyn baqma{150} da tüşer andan
{133} [4] köbüsü. 亜. Da dağyn ol kohenler ol juvuvcular alny-
{135} [6] sy. Da ajtty Moše Adonajğa bolalmasty ol ulus
{136} [7] minme tavyna Synajnyn ki sen tanyq ettib izde ajtadoğa
{137} [8] čeklegin ol{152} tavyn da aziz etkin any.  Do ajt-
{138} [9] ty{153} Adonaj anar bargyn engin da minersen{154} sen da Aharon birgeje
{139} [10] ol vaçtta ki necik bujursam sizge da ol kohenler da
{140} [11] ol ulus buzmasynlar čekni{155} minme alnyna Adonajyn mağat
{141} [12] buzqulq qylar alarda.  ޮ. Da endi Moše ol ulus-
{142} [13] qa da ajtty alarğa ...

143 JSul.III.01: titinlenen edi.
144 JSul.III.01: titini anyn titini kibik.
145 JSul.III.01: avazy ol şofarnyn.
146 JSul.III.01: qaruw beriredi.
147 JSul.III.01: bolusadogac avazyna anyn; the translation of the verse is much shorter.
148 JSul.III.01: caqyrdy.
149 JSul.III.01: Mošege.
150 JSul.III.01: buzqulq qylarlar baqma şexinasy H-yn.
151 JSul.III.01: qulluquna H-yn ajryqsy bolunsunlar.
152 JSul.III.01: osol ol.
153 JSul.III.01: ajtty anar.
154 JSul.III.01: mingen.
155 JSul.III.01: birgene senin vale ol kohenler da ol ulus buzqulq etmesinler.
Exodus 20:1–23

{142} [13] ... Da sözledi tenri oşol

{143} [14] bar ol sözlerini\textsuperscript{156} oşpularny ajtadogač. Mendir

{144} [15] men Adonaj tenrij seni ki ćygardym seni jerinçan Micrinin qullar

{145} [16] erkinden. ḉ. Bolmasyn saja özge tenriler menim

{146} [17] qajamlyğym alnyna. ḉ. Qylmağyn özüja jonma abaq

{147} [18] heç sufat\textsuperscript{157} byla ne ki körsej\textsuperscript{158} köklerde jögartyn da ne ki jer-

{148} [19] de aşağartyn da ne ki suvlarda aşağaraq jerge. ḉ.

{149} [20] Başurmağyn alarğa da\textsuperscript{159} qulluq etmegin alarğa ki menmen

{150} [21] Adonaj tenrij künülevčü tenri sağynuvçu güneçin atalarnyn

{151} [22] {{catchword:}} jaman
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{152} [1] jaman ulanlar üstüne üçünčü dorğadejin\textsuperscript{160} da dörtünčü

{153} [2] dorğadejin\textsuperscript{161} duşmanlaryma\textsuperscript{162}. ḉuş. Da\textsuperscript{163} qyluvčudur men

{154} [3] šağağat min dorlarğa\textsuperscript{164} süvvüçülerğa oχuma toramny da

{155} [4] saqavcılarğa micvalarymny. ḉ. Antetmegin şeminden\textsuperscript{165}

{156} [5] Adonaj tenrijin jalğanğa ki könü etmeşti\textsuperscript{166} Adonaj anynda

{157} [6] kim\textsuperscript{167} ki antetse şemindan anyn muftqada. ḉ.şor.

{158} [7] Sağynğyn oşol\textsuperscript{168} şabat künnü azizlikťa tutma any.


{160} [9] ni. şev. Da\textsuperscript{169} ol jedinči kün şabatty maχtavuna Adonaj

{161} [10] tenrijin\textsuperscript{170} qylmağyn heč iş sen da uvluy da qyzıy quluy da

\textsuperscript{156} JSul.III.01: on sözlerini.

\textsuperscript{157} JSul.III.01: tirsin.

\textsuperscript{158} JSul.III.01: this word is absent.

\textsuperscript{159} JSul.III.01: any.

\textsuperscript{160} JSul.III.01: dor istine.

\textsuperscript{161} JSul.III.01: dor istine

\textsuperscript{162} JSul.III.01: şor etivcilerge oχuma toramny.

\textsuperscript{163} JSul.III.01: vale.

\textsuperscript{164} JSul.III.01: minde dorlarga.

\textsuperscript{165} JSul.III.01: osol şeminden.

\textsuperscript{166} JSul.III.01: boş qojmasty.

\textsuperscript{167} JSul.III.01: osol kimgede.

\textsuperscript{168} JSul.III.01: osol ol.

\textsuperscript{169} JSul.III.01: vale.

\textsuperscript{170} JSul.III.01: H-ga tenrine.
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{168} [12] alty künlerin ičinda\(^{172}\) jaratty Adonaj ošol ol köklerni
{169} [13] da ošol ol jerni ošol ol tengizni da ošol barça ne\(^{173}\) ki
{170} [14] alarda da tynč etti\(^{174}\) ol jedinči künde anyn üčün
{172} [16] 🅱️. Syjlagyn ošol atajny da ošol anajny anyn üčün
{173} [17] uzaryrlar\(^{175}\) künlerij\(^{176}\) ol jer üstüne ki Adonaj tenrij\(^{177}\) beredi
{174} [18] saja. Qaraqčylyq etmegin. لا تنافر. Niuf-
{175} [19] luq\(^{178}\) etmegin. ولا تنافر. Tanyq-
{176} [20] lyq čyqmağyn , dostuj üičünde\(^{181}\) bolma jalgan tanyq. لا.
{177} [21] Suqlanmağyn üvüne dostujnun suqlanmağyn qatynyna dostuj-

\(^{171}\) JSul.III.01: garibin.
\(^{172}\) JSul.III.01: künlerde.
\(^{173}\) JSul.III.01: neni.
\(^{174}\) JSul.III.01: qaldy.
\(^{175}\) JSul.III.01: uzargajlar.
\(^{176}\) JSul.III.01: künlerin senin.
\(^{177}\) JSul.III.01: tenrin senin.
\(^{178}\) < Hebr. נאף ‘adultery, prostitution’ used with the -luk suffix. JSul.III.01: Ani niufluq (ani < Pol. ani ‘neither, nor’).
\(^{179}\) Standard Hebr. נאף ל ‘do not steal’ (Ex 20:15).
\(^{180}\) JSul.III.01: Ani urlamağyn.
\(^{181}\) JSul.III.01: dostunda.
\(^{182}\) JSul.III.01: qaravasyna anyn.
\(^{183}\) JSul.III.01: da barça nege ki dostuna.
\(^{184}\) JSul.III.01: titinlengenni.
\(^{185}\) JSul.III.01: galgydylar.
\(^{186}\) JSul.III.01: jyraqtan.
\(^{187}\) JSul.III.01: birgemizge biznin.
\(^{188}\) JSul.III.01: esitejik.
4.3. Translation

Exodus 18:1–27
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1. And Jethro, the priest
2. of Midian, Moses’ father-in-law, heard of all
3. that God had done for Moses, and for Israel his people,
4. that the Lord had brought Israel out of Egypt; (2) and
5. Jethro, Moses’ father in law, took Zipporah, Moses’ wife,
6. after he had sent her away, (3) and her two sons;
7. of which the name of the one was Gershom; for he said, I have been alone
8. in a strange land: (4) and the name of the one was Eliezer, who said

---

189 JSul.III.01: tenri birgemizge.
190 JSul.III.01: synamaq.
191 JSul.III.01: this fragment is absent.
192 JSul.III.01: anyn üčün bolgaj.
193 JSul.III.01: alnyuzda siznin.
194 JSul.III.01: jyraqtan.
195 JSul.III.01: uvullaryna.
196 JSul.III.01: ol köklerden sözledim birgenizge siznin.
197 JSul.III.01: this fragment is absent.
198 JSul.III.01: birgeme menim.
199 The last three verses of this chapter (i.e. Exodus 20:24–26) belong to the parashah Mishpatim.
200 Instead of ‘the other’, probably a clerical error in the Karaim copy; cf. the translation in JSul.III.01.
that “The God of my father was my help, and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh.” (5) and Jethro, father-in-law of Moses, and his sons and his wife came unto Moses into the wilderness, where he rested at the mount of God; (6) and he said unto Moses by a messenger, I your father-in-law Jethro am come unto you, and your wife, and her two sons with her. (7)

And Moses went out to meet his father-in-law, and bowed, and kissed him; and they asked each other of their health; and they came into the tent. (8) And Moses told his father-in-law all that the Lord had done unto Pharaoh and to the Egyptians for Israel’s sake, and all the torment that had come upon them by the way, and how the wicked fought with them and how the Lord delivered them. (9)

And Jethro rejoiced for all the goodness which the Lord had done to Israel, in that he had delivered out of the hand of the Egyptians. (10) And Jethro said, “Blessed be the Lord, who has delivered you out of the hand of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of Pharaoh, who has delivered the people from under the reign of the Egyptians. (11) Now I know that the Lord is greater than all gods: for in the the way they plotted their works, so did he pay them back.” (12) And Jethro, Moses’ father-in-law, took a burnt offering and sacrifices for God: and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses’ father-in-law before God. (13) And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses sat to judge the people: and the people stood before Moses from the morning unto the evening.

And when Moses’ father-in-law saw all that he did to the people, he said, “What is this thing that you do to the people? why do you alone sit to judge the people, and all the people stand due to the great number of the judgements before you from morning unto evening?” (15) And Moses said unto his father-in-law, “Because a part of the people come unto me to inquire of

---

201 Literally: ‘angels’.
202 Uncertain translation, see our remark in the transcription.
the words of God: (16) and so, when there is a word of judgement for them,
they come unto me; and I judge between one and another, and
between friends, and for those who inquire about the words of God
I do make them know the statutes of God, and
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his teachings.” (17) And Moses’ father-in-law
said unto him, “The thing that you do is not good. (18)
You will surely wear away, both you, and this people that is with you: for
this thing is too heavy for you; you are not able to perform it yourself alone.
(19) Hearken now unto my voice, I will give you counsel, and
God’s help shall be with you: Represent the people
before God, that you may bring the causes
unto God: (20) And you shall order them
statutes and teachings, and shall make them know
the way in which they must walk, and the work that they
must do. (21) Moreover, you shall watch to provide out of all the people brave
men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating stolen
gain; and place such over them, to be the rulers of thousands, and rulers
of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens:
and let them judge the people at all
times: and it shall be, that every great matter they shall bring unto you,
but every small matter they shall judge by their own: so shall it be easier
for yourself, and they shall bear [the burden] with you. (23) If
you shall do this thing, and God command you so, then you shall be able
to endure, and all this people shall also go to their place
in peace. (24) So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law,
and did
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and did all that he had said. (25) And Moses chose brave
men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people,
rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of
fifties, and rulers of tens. (26) And they judged
the people at all times: they brought hard judgements

Literally: ‘words’.
unto Moses, but every small matter they judged themselves. (27) And Moses let his father-in-law depart; and he went his way into his own land. ...

Exodus 19:1–25

... (1) In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai. (2) And they had departed from Rephidim, and had come to the desert of Sinai, and had camped in the wilderness; and there Israel camped before the mount. (3) And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, “Thus shall you say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel:

(4) ‘You have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bore you like on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto myself. (5) Now therefore, if you listen to my voice, and keep my covenant, then you shall be the chosen one unto me above all people: for mine is all the earth; (6) And you shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy kingdom’. These are the words which you shall speak unto the children of Israel.” (7) And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord conveyed through him. (8) And all the people answered together, and said, “All that the Lord has spoken we will do.” And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord. (9) And the Lord said unto Moses, “Lo, my Divine Presence will come unto you in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with you, and believe you forever.” And Moses told the words of the people unto the Lord. (10) And the Lord said unto Moses, “Go unto the people, and sanctify them today and tomorrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready by the third day: for the third day the Lord will come his Divine Presence down in the sight
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and a holy kingdom’. These are the words which you shall speak unto the children of Israel.” (7) And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord conveyed through him. (8) And all the people answered together, and said, “All that the Lord has spoken we will do.” And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord. (9) And the Lord said unto Moses, “Lo, my Divine Presence will come unto you in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with you, and believe you forever.” And Moses told the words of the people unto the Lord. (10) And the Lord said unto Moses, “Go unto the people, and sanctify them today and tomorrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready by the third day: for the third day the Lord will come his Divine Presence down in the sight
of all the people upon mount Sinai. (12)
And you shall set bounds unto the people round about, saying, “Take heed
to yourselves, that you go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it:
whosoever touches the mount shall be put to death: (13)
And whosoever leaves the bounds there shall not a hand touch it, but
if he will be close he shall surely be stoned, or
{{catchword:}} if
he will be far, shot through with an arrow; whether it be man
or beast, it shall not live: when the trumpet made of
ram’s horn sounds long, they shall come after standing up from their tents
up to the mount. (14) And Moses went down from the mount
unto the people, and sanctified the people; and they washed
their own clothes. (15) And he said unto the people,
“Be ready by the third day: come not near your wives.”
(16) And it came to pass on the third day in the morning,
that there were thunders\textsuperscript{204} and lightnings, and a thick\textsuperscript{205} cloud upon the mount,
and the voice of the trumpet very loud; so that all the people trembled
who were in the camp. (17) And Moses brought forth the people
out of the camp before God; and they stood at the lower part
of the mount. (18) And mount Sinai was completely in smoke, because
the Lord’s Divine Presence descended upon it in fire:
and the smoke of it ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and
the whole mount quaked greatly. (19) And when the voice of the trumpet
sounded long, and grew louder and louder, Moses spoke,
and God answered\textsuperscript{206} him by a voice of strength that
the children of Israel shall hearken unto the words of Moses when
the trumpet sounds long. (20) And the Divine Presence of Lord came down
upon mount Sinai, on the top of the mount: and the Lord called

\begin{footnotes}
\item[204] Literally: ‘noises’.
\item[205] Literally: ‘strong’.
\item[206] Literally: ‘repeated’.
\end{footnotes}
they break through the border unto the Lord to gaze, and perish
many of them. (22) And let the priests also, who come before
the Lord, sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break forth upon them.”
(23) And Moses said unto the Lord, “The people cannot
come up to mount Sinai: for you charged us, saying,
‘Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it.’” (24) And the Lord said
unto him, “Go, get down, and then you shall come up, you, and Aaron with you:
but then, as I ordered you, let not the priests and
the people break through the border to come up before the Lord, lest
he break forth upon them.” (25) And Moses went down unto the people,
and spoke unto them ...

Exodus 20:1–23

(1) And God spoke
(2) “I am
the Lord your God, who has brought you out of the land of Egypt,
out of the power of slaves. (3) You shall have no other gods
before my power. (4) You shall not make unto yourself any graven image,
or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth
beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: (5)
you shall not bow down yourself to them, nor serve them: for I
the Lord your God am a jealous God, remembering the iniquity of the
fathers upon the
{{catchword:}} evil
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(1) evil children unto the third generation and fourth
generation of them that hate me; (6) and showing
mercy unto thousands of them that love reading my law, and
keep my commandments. (7) You shall not swear to the name
of the Lord your God falsely; for the Lord will not justify him
that swear to his name in vain. (8)
Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.
(9) Six days shall you labour, and do all your work.
(10) But the seventh day is the Sabbath for praising the Lord
133

{161} [10] your God: in it you shall not do any work, you, nor your son, nor your daughter, your manservant, nor

{162} [11] your maidservant, nor your cattle, nor your stranger that is within your cities: (11) For

{163} [12] in six days the Lord made heaven

{164} [13] and earth, the sea, and all that

{165} [14] is in them, and rested the seventh day: therefore

{166} [15] the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

{167} [16] (12) Honor your father and your mother: that your

{168} [17] days may be long upon the land which the Lord your God gives

{169} [18] you. (13) You shall not kill. (14) You shall not commit

{170} [19] adultery. (15) You shall not steal. (16) You shall not bear

{171} [20] false witness against your neighbor. (17)

{172} [21] You shall not covet your neighbour’s house, you shall not covet your neighbour’s wife,
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{173} [1] nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his donkey,

{174} [2] nor any thing that is your neighbour’s. (18) And all the

{175} [3] people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings,

{176} [4] and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking:

{177} [5] and when the people saw it, they moved, and stood far off. (19)

{178} [6] And they said unto Moses, “Speak you with us, and we will hear:

{179} [7] but let not God speak with us, lest we die.” (20)

{180} [8] And Moses said unto the people, “Fear not: for to accustom

{181} [9] you to his fear God’s Divine Presence has come

{182} [10] and that his fear may be before your faces,

{183} [11] that you sin not.” (21) And the

{184} [12] people stood far off, and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where

{185} [13] God’s Divine Presence was. (22) And the Lord said unto Moses,

{186} [14] “Thus you shall say unto the children of Israel, ‘You have seen that

{187} [15] I have talked with you from heaven and you have not seen any

{188} [16] figure.’” (23) Therefore you shall not make before me gods of silver,

{189} [17] or gods of gold for yourselves.

207 Literally: ‘friend’s’, consequently in the whole sentence.

208 Literally: ‘the noises and the torches’.
5. Linguistic remarks

5.1. The e > 'a shift

From the above sample it is clear that the Torah translation originates from a period when the harmony shift was still an ongoing process. If we take, however, a closer look at the forms that exhibit the e > 'a change (see Table 1), i.e. the only element of the harmony shift that was reflected in writing, the following additional observations are valid.

The e > 'a change occurs in the following words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No</th>
<th>In manuscript III-73</th>
<th>In original orthography</th>
<th>The form prior to harmony shift</th>
<th>Present-day form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Micriğan</td>
<td>מִצְרִידָין</td>
<td>Micriden</td>
<td>[Mićřidăn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jerda</td>
<td>יֶרדָא</td>
<td>Jerde</td>
<td>[Jerda]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Birgesiña</td>
<td>בִירְגֵיסִינָא</td>
<td>Birgesine</td>
<td>[Bīgaśiña]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Micriga</td>
<td>מִצְרִיגָיא</td>
<td>Micrige</td>
<td>[Mićřiga]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–6</td>
<td>Erkitüvündan</td>
<td>אֵרְכִיטיוּביוּנְדָין</td>
<td>Erkitüvünden</td>
<td>[Erkiťuvundań]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tenriga</td>
<td>תֶנְרִיגָיא</td>
<td>Tenrige</td>
<td>[Teńřiga]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Etna</td>
<td>אֶטְנִה</td>
<td>Etme</td>
<td>[Etńa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Köplügündan</td>
<td>קוֹפְלוּגיוּנְדָין</td>
<td>Köplügünden</td>
<td>[Kopļugundań]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Sendan</td>
<td>סֵנְדָין</td>
<td>Senden</td>
<td>[Śeńdań]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Tenridan</td>
<td>תֶנְרִידָין</td>
<td>Tenriden</td>
<td>[Teńřidăn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Üstüijdan</td>
<td>Ü스ְטַיָעְדָין</td>
<td>Üstĳdan</td>
<td>[Ŭstüjdań]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Birgeja</td>
<td>בִירְגֶײָא</td>
<td>Birgeja</td>
<td>[Bīrjeja]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Jerína</td>
<td>יֶרִין</td>
<td>Jerine</td>
<td>[Jerína]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Jerinden</td>
<td>יֶרְדָיָא</td>
<td>Jerinden</td>
<td>[Jeríndań]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Sözlegenimda</td>
<td>סֻזְלֶגֶנְיָמְדָא</td>
<td>Sözlegenimda</td>
<td>[Śozļańgańmda]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Ėctan</td>
<td>Ėכָטָן</td>
<td>Ėcten</td>
<td>[Ěchtăn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Müvüzündan</td>
<td>מְוָעְזֵעְוְנָדָין</td>
<td>Müvüzünđan</td>
<td>[Muwünsńdań]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Künlerga</td>
<td>קְנְלֶרָגָא</td>
<td>Künlerge</td>
<td>[Kuńlańda]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Azizlensinlar</td>
<td>אַצְייָלֶזֶנְסִינְלֶר</td>
<td>Azizlensinler</td>
<td>[Aziľańšińlär]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Jerinden</td>
<td>יֶרְדְיָא</td>
<td>Jerinden</td>
<td>[Jeríndań]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Özüja</td>
<td>אוֹזְעָיָא</td>
<td>Özüje</td>
<td>[Oźuja]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Süvüvçülerga</td>
<td>סֻוְװּוּווּצָעְלֶרָגָא</td>
<td>Süvüvçülerge</td>
<td>[Șuvuvčulańga]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These forms are clearly outnumbered by forms built according to the original vowel harmony. The ratio of the original e to ‘a is 176 to 25, i.e. only 12.5% of the relevant word forms is shifted toward partial consonant harmony. Such pairs as e.g. birgeje בִירְגֵײֵא, בִירְגֶײֵא (line 46, 49, 95, 138) vs. birgeja בִירְגֶײָא (61), etme אֵיטְמֵיא (37) vs. etmeja אֵיטְמָיא (32), šemindenשְמִינְדֵין (155) vs. šemindanשְמִינְדָין (157) prove that the innovative forms were alternating with the original ones.

The e > ‘a change occurs only in final syllables, more precisely in suffixes and in the primary postposition köre attested as körə (or kořa).\footnote{This primary postposition *kőre is the only one that contained *e in Karaim, see e.g. NÉMETH (2011b: 103–104). It is not attested in the parashah Yitro, but it is used in the form körə קורא in other fragments, see e.g. parashah Bo, line 201.} There is no word longer than two syllables that would be fully assimilated with regard to this change. The e > ‘a change operated irrespective of the accent, which is basically oxytonic in Karaim, given that in the manuscript we find negative verb forms, as e.g. körmejdiĺar כוֹרְמֵיְדִילָיר (Bo 18), in which the word final *-ler evolved into -ĺar whereas the accent falls on the syllable preceding the negative suffix -me (i.e. in this example on the initial syllable).

The e > ‘a change operated less intensively after consonants that were already palatalized before the harmony shift stared to operate, cf. the frequency of the occurrence of the segments /de/ i.e. [de] vs. /da/ i.e. [da] which is 17 to 14 – juxtaposed with the ratio of /ge/ i.e. [ge] to /ga/ i.e. [ga] which is 45 to 4.\footnote{For a complex interpretation of this phenomenon see NÉMETH (2014b).}

These word forms show that the harmony shift operated most probably around the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries after the η > j change (for an attempt to chronologize the latter change see JANKOWSKI 2014, in this volume). In certain idiolects or areas it must have ended before the 1720s; otherwise Simcha ben Chananiel could not have copied the fragments on folios 342 v° – 385 v°, which exhibit fully operational consonant harmony. Needless
to say, further investigation is needed to establish the time-frame of this phenomenon with greater accuracy.

5.2. Rounded vs. unrounded vowel harmony

Rounded vs. unrounded vowel harmony is fully developed in the text, cf. e.g. boldu bolušłuğumda bolušlygymda (9). There are no traces of disharmonized forms like *boldy or *bolušlygymda known from Crimean Karaim texts (even from the 19th c.).

5.3. The segment *aj

There are no traces of the aj > ej change we know from Modern North-Western Karaim, see e.g. qajnataj (13), alaj (28), bolgaj (59), tynlasajyz (84), etc. in place of MNWKar. qajnatej, alej, bolgej, tynlasejyz, respectively. Instead, sporadically the segment aj evolved into yj, which has hitherto been observed only in south-western Karaim texts (see GRZEGORZEWSKI 1916–1918: 258; MUSAEV 1964: 289; NÉMETH 2011a: 49–50). The only example for the aj > yj change in parashah Yitro is the word bolmağyjsiz (183).

5.4. The person markers

The 1st and 2nd sg. person markers -men and -sen are attested in the manuscript in their original forms unaffected by the later process of -men >> -myn ~ -mín and -sen >> -syn ~ -śiń change, cf. e.g. etemen אטמן (41), bildiremen בילדרמן (43), qylasen קילסן (35–36), olturasen אוולטרסן (36), etc. The four books of Ketuvim exhibit the same feature (i.e. -men and -sen). The evolution of these person markers took place much later than the e > 'a change: we still encounter them in manuscripts from the late 19th century, like e.g. in JSul.III.31 where we find forms like bilāmeņ ‘I know’ (22 р°), beřašeņ ‘you give’ (22 р°), etc.

211 This change occurred only on morphologic boundaries and in suffixes.
212 This item contains handwritten additions in north-western Karaim added to a printed siddur published in two parts in 1868 and 1872.
5.5. Slavonic loanwords

Based on a brief preliminary analysis, we can say that the analysed Torah translation contains a certain number of Slavonic loanwords, which shows that the influence of the surrounding Slavonic languages must have been strong already at the time the Torah was translated (this corresponds with the idea that the harmony shift was triggered by the influence of Slavonic and Lithuanian phonotactics). This is especially true given the fact that the translations of Biblical texts were usually much more resistant to external influence – except Hebrew, of course. It might be therefore an interesting addition to its description that it contains words like odverja אֹדְװֵרְײָא 'lintel'\textsuperscript{213} (see parashah Bo 128, 173) ~ odverjalar אֹדְװֵרְײָלָר 'side posts' (Bo 127, 173, 177) or karanja כַּרַנְײָא (Bo 86) ~ karanjalar כַּרַנְײָלָר (145) 'punishment'; for their possible etymons cf. e.g. Russ. arch. одверье (sg.), одверьа ‘door-frame’ (SRJa XII 265) and Russ. arch. каранье (sg.), каранья ‘punishment’ (SRJa VII 73). The editors of KarRPS (292, 424) qualified both words as Polish, and so does Musaev (2003: 60) in respect to odverja, even though the Polish origin of both words is improbable for phonetic and semantic reasons; cf. the Polish metathetic form odrzwia ‘door-frame’ on the one hand, and, on the other hand, Pol. karanie ‘punishing’ with final -e and slightly different meaning.

6. Final remarks

It is obvious that based on such a concise and preliminary comparison of the two Torah translations as it was presented above, the question of the relation of these manuscripts cannot be appropriately answered. On the one hand, there is a number of similarities that brings them closer (the lexicon is mostly the same with certain diverging tendencies, and there are only minor morphological and syntactic differences), but on the other hand, there are no major differences between them.\textsuperscript{214}

\textsuperscript{213} KarRPS (424) records the word only for south-western Karaim.

\textsuperscript{214} For instance, in the translation copied by Jeshua-Josef Mordkowicz words with possessive suffixes are often additionally reinforced by the respective possessive pronouns, see e.g. künlerij (168) vs. künlerin senin (JSul.III.01) ‘your days’, tenrij (168) vs. tenrin senin (JSul.III.01) ‘your God’, birgemizge (178) vs. birgemizge biznin ‘with us’, birgesińa (14) vs. birgesine anyn ‘with him’ (JSul.III.01), jüzlerijiz üstünde (182) vs. alnynyzda siznin (JSul.III.01) ‘before your faces’, etc. Also, occasionally, different is the use of the
And thus, although there are verses that are exactly the same in the two translations (cf. e.g. Ex 18:12, 19:11, etc.), in the vast majority of verses there are some minor differences, some of which are completely different (see e.g. Ex 19:13). It still seems therefore valid to say that there must have been a common translating tradition that shaped Bible translations (the same observation follows from Jankowski’s (2009: 514) analysis), but the question remains where do the differences come from? Are they induced by the idiolect of the copyist or are they rather dialect-dependant? In other words, did the copyists interpret the translations by introducing preferential changes and amendments into the copied originals or were these changes essential for better understanding by those who read them?

Further research, above all, critical editions and comparative critical editions are needed to better understand the way Biblical texts were translated.

**Abbreviations**
arch. = archaic; Hebr. = Hebrew; Kipch. = The language of the Codex Comanicus; pl. = plural; sg. = singular; MNWKar. = Modern North-Western Karaim; Pol. = Polish; Russ. = Russian; SWKar. = south-western Karaim
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genitive attributives in noun phrases, cf. *nešer qanatlary üstüne* (82) vs. *qanatlary istine nešerlerinin*, the latter word order being shaped by Slavonic structural influence.
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