

THE LANGUAGE OF THE PENTATEUCH TRANSLATION IN THE EUPATORIAN PRINTED EDITION FROM 1841

Murat Işık

Ph.D., Assistant Lecturer at the Department of Altaic Studies, University of Szeged
Postdoctoral Researcher at the Faculty of Philology, Jagiellonian University
isik.murat@szte.hu

Abstract. This paper provides an analysis of the language employed in the Pentateuch section of the Eupatorian print (Gözleve) edition, a comprehensive translation of the Old Testament into the Karaim language published in 1841. The objective of the study is to identify the specific Crimean Karaim variety employed in the translation through an examination of phonological, morphological, and lexical features. The analysis reveals that the translation displays features of both Crimean Kipchak Karaim and Crimean Turkish Karaim, and that the characteristics vary depending on the specific books and chapters of the edition.

Keywords: Karaim, Crimean Karaim, Bible translations, Gözleve Bible, Oghuzic, Kipchak

1. Preliminary Remarks

The so-called Eupatorian (Gözleve) Bible, is a full translation of the Old Testament (omitting the Chronicles) into Karaim in Hebrew letters. The translation was printed in four volumes in Gözleve/Kezlev (present-day Eupatoria) in 1841.

Recently, the language of this edition was discussed by some scholars, e.g., Shapira 2003, 2013; Németh 2015, 2016; Olach 2016; Işık 2018, 2020, 2021. Based on these studies, it is clear that the language of this edition is not homogenous though it is usually referred to as is written in some Crimean Karaim varieties. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the aforementioned studies were devoted only to certain limited parts of this edition. However, recently a full transcription of the edition's Pentateuch translation has become available online (see Işık 2022). Hereby, the present paper will briefly present the language of the Pentateuch translation of the Eupatorian print to determine its Crimean Karaim variety based on Jankowski's descrip-

tions (2008; 2015a). Considering that the syntax of Karaim Bible translations demonstrates a common characteristic as it mostly follows the syntax of Biblical Hebrew and therefore is not a distinctive feature to categorize Karaim dialects/varieties, the present paper will reveal only the features of the phonology, morphology, and lexicon of the text in brief.

2. Crimean Karaim Varieties

Based on the written sources, it is possible to divide Crimean Karaim into four varieties (Jankowski 2015b: 454):

- a. Crimean Kipchak Karaim
- b. Crimean Tatar Karaim
- c. Crimean Turkish Karaim (in the Crimea)
- d. Crimean Turkish Karaim (in the Ottoman Empire)

The demonstration of the exact nature of these dialects is quite difficult. However, based on Jankowski's descriptions (2008: 163–165; 2015a: 202–204), it is possible to list some main differences between the Crimean Karaim varieties. Most of these differences are usually based on the different characteristics of the Kipchak and Oghuz languages. It is worth noting that most of the Oghuzic features are common in both Crimean Tatar Karaim and Crimean Turkish Karaim. The main difference between these varieties appears only for some lexical elements. Therefore, in this paper, Oghuzic phonological and morphological features will be attributed to only Crimean Turkish Karaim for the sake of clarity.

3. The Language of the Pentateuch of the Eupatorian Print

3.1. Phonology

The voicing of the initial plosive *k-* is attested in the eastern dialect of Crimean Tatar (Kavitskaya 2010: 19) and Crimean Turkish (Doerfer 1959a: 274) and therefore is a Crimean Turkish Karaim feature (Jankowski 2015a: 204). However, the preservation of the initial *k-* is slightly predominant in the text as a Crimean Kipchak Karaim feature (Jankowski 2015a: 203).

Another feature is the voicing of the initial plosive *t-*, which is attested in the eastern dialects of Crimean Tatar (Kavitskaya 2010: 19) and Crimean Turkish (Doerfer 1959a: 275) and is also described as a feature of Crimean Turkish Karaim (Jankowski 2015a: 204). However, once again, the Kipchak counterpart of this Crimean Turkish Karaim feature is slightly predominant.

Table 1: The voicing and the preservation of the initial plosive k-

Biblical Books	k- ~ g- doublets
Genesis	[29:2] <i>gör-</i> ‘to see’ vs [32:31] <i>kör-</i> ‘id.’
Exodus	[10:4] <i>getir-</i> ‘to bring’ vs [18:19] <i>ketir</i> ‘id.’
Leviticus	[9:23] <i>gel-</i> ‘to come’ vs [14:46] <i>kel-</i> ‘id.’
Numbers	[3:48] <i>gümüš</i> ‘silver’ vs [3:51] <i>kümüš</i> ‘id.’
Deuteronomy	[1:46] <i>gün</i> ‘day’ vs [4:10] <i>kün</i> ‘id.’

Table 2: The voicing of the initial plosive t-

Biblical Books	t- ~ d- doublets
Genesis	[2:8] <i>dik-</i> ‘to plant’ vs [3:7] <i>tik-</i> ‘id.’
Exodus	[19:21] <i>düş-</i> ‘to fall’ vs [21:18] <i>tüş-</i> ‘id.’
Leviticus	[6:14] <i>dilim</i> ‘slice’ vs [12:6] <i>tilim</i> ‘id.’
Numbers	[31:15] <i>dışı</i> ‘female’ vs [5:3] <i>tişi</i> ‘id.’
Deuteronomy	[32:47] <i>dırlık</i> ‘life’ vs [4:9] <i>tırlık</i> ‘id.’

The next Crimean Turkish Karaim feature is the deletion of the initial *b-* in some certain lexical items (Jankowski 2015a: 204), which is also present in the eastern dialect of Crimean Tatar (Doerfer 1959b: 379), and Crimean Turkish (Doerfer 1959b: 275). However, the preservation of the initial *b-* is highly predominant in our text. Hereby, once again a Crimean Kipchak Karaim feature (Jankowski 2015a: 203) is predominant against its Crimean Turkish Karaim equivalent.

Table 3: The deletion and the preservation of the initial b-

Biblical Books	ol- vs bol- ‘to be; to become’	ilän vs bilän ‘with’
Genesis	[1:3] vs [31:44]	[12:8] vs [3:16]
Exodus	[21:4] vs [26:11]	[1:14] vs [9:35]
Leviticus	[7:20] vs [17:7]	[11:43] vs [4:2]
Numbers	[15:15] vs [13:33]	[12:13] vs [2:2]
Deuteronomy	[25:13] vs [9:16]	[5:11] vs [5:15]

The final phonological characteristic is the spirantization of the initial *b-* to initial *v-* in some lexical elements, which is present in the eastern dialect of Crimean Tatar (Doerfer 1959b: 379), Crimean Turkish (Doerfer

1959a: 275), and Crimean Karaim Turkish (Jankowski 2015a: 204). Note that, although as a Crimean Kipchak Karaim feature, the preservation of the initial *b-* can also be found, the Crimean Turkish Karaim feature is highly predominant against its Kipchak equivalent in the text.

Table 4: The spirantization of the initial *b-*

Biblical Books	<i>ver-</i> vs <i>ber-</i> 'to give'	<i>var-</i> vs <i>bar-</i> 'to go'	<i>var</i> vs <i>bar</i> 'there is/are'
Genesis	[31:9] vs [31:36]	[31:30] vs [31:30]	[44:26] vs [33:9]
Exodus	[13:9] vs [31:36]	[32:7] vs [31:30]	[15:11] vs [33:9]
Leviticus	[15:14] vs [-]	[-] vs [-]	[25:30] vs [-]
Numbers	[14:1] vs [31:16]	[22:7] vs [-]	[13:20] vs [-]
Deuteronomy	[5:20] vs [9:10]	[10:11] vs [14:25]	[29:14] vs [4:29]

3.2. Morphology

The text presents highly predominant Kipchak morphological/morphonological features and thus shows Crimean Kipchak Karaim characteristics. Nevertheless, in some specific parts of the text we exceptionally encounter Crimean Turkish Karaim features as well. For example, although the text demonstrates Kipchak ACC markers as {+nI}, {+nU}, and after 3SG/3PL. POSS markers as {+n}, only in Chapter 11 of Lev, we encounter 10 different lexical items where the Oghuzic ACC marker {+(y)I} is attached to words, e.g., [Lev 11:3] *tirnakli*+*yī* 'unguiculate+ACC'; [Lev 11:45] *siz*+*i* 'you (2PL)+ACC', etc. There exist also only 6 examples in Chapters 6, 11, and 15 of Lev that show the Crimean Turkish Karaim DAT marker {+(y)A} instead of the Crimean Kipchak Karaim DAT marker {+GA}, e.g., [Lev 6:16] *ateš*+*ä* 'fire+DAT'; [Lev 11:24] *aḥšam*+*a* 'evening+DAT'; [Lev 11:39] *ye-me*+*ye* 'eat-VN+DAT'. Among the case markers, there also exists a limited Oghuzic-Kipchak opposition for GEN marker in the text as it appears as Oghuzic {+(n)In} only in four examples in Chapter 11 of Lev, e.g., [Lev 11:2] *Yisra*'*el*+*in* 'Israel+GEN'; [Lev 11:47] *Misir*+*in* 'Egypt+GEN', etc.

Another distinctive feature between Crimean Turkish Karaim and Crimean Kipchak Karaim is the opposition of the Kipchak participle {-GAn} and the Oghuzic {-(y)An}. Similar to the to previous examples, the Crimean Turkish Karaim feature is mostly attested in Chapter 11 of Lev throughout the Pentateuch translation of the Eupatorian print, e.g., [Lev 2:7] *piš-en* cook-PTCP; [Lev 11:25] *taši-yan* 'carry-PTCP'.

Finally, the Pentateuch translation of the edition also presents the optative marker {-QAY}, which is attested in Western Karaim dialects and listed for Crimean Kipchak Karaim (Jankowski 2015a: 203), e.g., [Gen 27:44] *kayt-kay-Ø* ‘return-OPT-3SG’; [Exo 5:21] *bak-kay-Ø* ‘to look-OPT-3SG’; [Lev 23:2] *čakür-ğay-siz* ‘to call-OPT-2PL’; [Num 27:20] *ešit-käy-lär* ‘listen-OPT-3PL2’; [Deu 1:11] *algışla-ğay-Ø* ‘bless-SUBJ-3SG’.

3.3. Lexicon

The main vocabulary of the corpus consists of a large number of Turkic lexical items. Some of these Turkic elements present Oghuzic-Kipchak opposition as well. Although the Kipchak lexical elements are highly predominant against the Oghuzic ones throughout the text, the corpus presents examples of Oghuzic lexicon as well, e.g., [Gen 9:23] *ört-* ‘to cover’; [Gen 26:1] *baška* ‘another, other’; [Exo 31:14] *gizli* ‘hidden’; [Exo 34:28] *gečä* ‘night’; [Lev 5:8] *ejšä* ‘back of the neck, nape’; [Lev 27:18] *eksil-* ‘to decrease; to disappear’. [Num 9:19] *çok* ‘many, much, a lot, often’; [Num 10:17] *en-* ‘to descend, to go down’. It should be noted that Chapter 11 of Lev presents many lexical copies from some Ottoman Bible translations and therefore demonstrates Ottoman Turkish characteristics (for more details, see Işık 2020; 2021) that were not used in Crimean Kipchak Karaim, e.g. [Lev 11:5] *ve* ‘and’; [Lev 11:13] *evlad* ‘son’; [Lev 11:13] *deñiz kartali* ‘sea eagle’ [Lev 11:14] *ağ baba* ‘vulture’; [Lev 11:29] *kaplı bağa* ‘turtle’. The rest of the vocabulary consists of many Arabic, and Persian words together with some Hebrew loanwords which are common in all three dialects of Karaim.

4. Conclusion

The language of the Pentateuch translation of the Eupatorian print shows many similarities to other Karaim Bible translations. Due to the linguistic trends of the period, the text presents many Crimean Turkish Karaim phonological adaptations together with the expected Crimean Kipchak Karaim equivalents. However, most of the morphological and lexical features are only present in some limited chapters (mostly/solely Chapter 11 of Lev). Thus, as for the language of the Pentateuch translation of the printed edition, it is possible to state that it was written in Crimean Kipchak Karaim consisting of strong Crimean Turkish phonological characteristics.

Acknowledgements



European Research Council
Established by the European Commission

The research upon which this publication is based has been awarded funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement number 802645).

Abbreviations

2PL = second person plural; 3SG = third person singular; 3PL = third person plural
ABL = ablative case; ACC = accusative case; Deu = Book of Deuteronomy; Exo = Book of Exodus; GEN = genitive case ; Gen = Book of Genesis; Lev = Book of Leviticus; Num = Book of Numbers; PTCP = participle; POSS = possessive marker; OPT = optative mood; VN = verbal noun.

References

- Doerfer, Gerhard 1959a. 'Das Krimosmanische'. In: Jean Deny (et al. eds.) *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 272–280.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1959b. 'Das Krimtatarische'. In: Jean Deny (et al. eds.) *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 369–390.
- Işık, Murat 2018. 'Oghuzic and Kipchak Characteristics in the Book of Leviticus, Gözleve Bible (1841).' *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*. LXXI/2: 66–76.
- Işık, Murat 2020. 'The Animal Names in the Book of Leviticus of the Gözleve Bible (1841). Part I: Mammal, Insect and Reptile Species.' In: István Zimonyi (ed.) *Ottomans – Crimea – Jochids. Studies in Honour of Mária Ivanics*. Szeged: University of Szeged, Department of Altaic Studies, 145–163.
- Işık, Murat 2021. 'The Animal Names in the Book of Leviticus of the Gözleve Bible (1841). Part II: Bird Species' *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. 74 (2): 345–372.
- Işık, Murat 2022. 'A digital edition of the Gözleve Bible (1841)'. In: László Károly & Michał Németh (eds.) *A database of Middle Turkic documents. Uppsala: Department of Linguistics and Philology*. <https://middleturkic.lingfil.uu.se/manuscripts/middle-karaim/JSul.IV.02A>
- Jankowski, Henryk 2008. 'The question of the existence of Crimean Karaim and its relation to Western Karaim' In: Bairašauskaite Tamara, Halina Kobeckaite, and Galina Miškinienė (eds) *Orientas Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos visuomenės tradicijoje: totoriai ir karaimai. Orient in the Social*

Tradition of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: Tatars and Karaims. Orient w tradycji społeczeństwa litewskiego: Tatarzy i Karaimi. Vilnius: Uniwersyte-to Leidykla, 161–168.

Jankowski, Henryk 2015a. 'Crimean Turkish Karaim and the old north-western Turkic tradition of the Karaites'. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 68/2: 199–214.

Jankowski, Henryk 2015b. 'Karaim and Krymchak'. In: Lily Kahn & Aaron Rubin (eds.) *Handbook of Jewish Languages*. Leiden, Boston: 45–488.

Kavitskaya, Darya 2010. *Crimean Tatar*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.

Németh, Michał. 2015. 'An Early North-Western Karaim Bible Translation from 1720. Part 3. A contribution to the question of the stemma codicum of the Eupatorian print from 1841'. *Karaite Archives* 3: 103–118.

Németh, Michał. 2016. 'A Crimean Handwritten Translation of the Book of Ruth Dating from before 1678'. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 26 (2): 161–226.

Olach, Zsuzsanna 2016. 'A karaim nyelvű Gözlevei Biblia nyelvészeti tanulságai.' *Keletkutatás ősz: 29–52*.

Shapira, Dan 2003. 'The Turkic Languages And Literatures of the east European Karaites.' In: Meira Polliack (ed.) *Karaite Judaism. A Guide to its History and Literary Sources*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 657–707.

Shapira, Dan 2013. 'The Karaim translation of the Book of Nehemia copied in the 17th century's Crimea and printed in 1840/1841 at Gözleve, on the copyist of the manuscript, and some related issues'. *Karaite Archives* 1, 133–198.