The aim of this paper is to examine the language of Karaite literature, mostly translations from Hebrew, developing in the 18th–19th centuries in the Crimea. Linguistic features of most works of this literature are typical of Crimean Turkish with many North-western Turkic or Kipchak properties. Among the most important authors and translators there were such distinguished intellectuals and spiritual leaders as Abraham Firkovich, Joseph Solomon Łucki, Abraham Łucki, Mordecai Qazaz, and Eliyahu Qazaz. Because of the mixed character of this language and the lack of strict standards, its definition and attribution is still debated. Until all works will be examined, it seems reasonable to speak of the individual language preferences of some leaders who created and practised it, rather than of the literary language of Crimean Karaites in general.

Key words: Turkish Karaim, Crimea, Turkey, Karaite intellectuals.

1. Turkic Languages of the Crimean and Turkish Karaites

There are various opinions of the language of Crimean Karaites (Karaims). Radloff (1896, p. xvi) claimed that it was identical to Crimean Tatar or Crimean Turkish according to the region they inhabit. This opinion was shared by Doerfer (1959a, p. 273, 1959b, p. 369). Musaev regarded the language of Crimean Karaites as fully assimilated to Crimean Tatar and did not include it in his grammars of Karaim (Musaev 1964, 1977, 2003). Pritsak (1959, p. 321), although he stressed that Crimean Karaim is unexplored and paid little attention to it in his article, observed that Crimean Karaim was closely related to Troki Karaim. Radloff’s opinion was first contested by Samojlović in 1917 who stressed methodological mistakes committed by Radloff. Samojlović said that much of the material recorded by Radloff does not represent Karaim literature and the available historical texts demonstrate that their language was older and different from Crimean Tatar (Samojlović 2000, pp. 116–119).
Two quite different opinions were pronounced in 2003. In Jankowski (2003) it was argued that the Crimean Karaites used a few language variants through the centuries. They certainly communicated with their overlords in Crimean Tatar or Turkish which was the most prestigious language in the Crimea or at least tried to adapt their Turkic language to Crimean Tatar and Turkish as was needed in a communicative situation. The Turkic language of their religious literature was also generally adapted to the current trends in the language use in the Crimea, though the translations of the Bible, which was the basic canonical literature of the Karaims, were more resistant to change. The secular folk literature also followed the basic trends in the Crimea. Popular literature is best known from the handwritten books called mejumas (Jankowski 2003, pp. 116–119).

In contrast, Shapira (2003, p. 662) denied the very existence of Crimean Karaim and claimed that such a language had never existed. Like Radloff and Doerfer he argued that the Crimean Karaites spoke the language of their Muslim and Christian neighbours and the Karaim texts known from the Crimea were in fact composed in the West and only copied in the peninsula. The arguments against this claim will be shown below.

Kipchak Karaim in the Crimea is first attested in the 18th century, though it certainly existed much earlier, as the archaic features of Bible translations from the Crimea demonstrate.

Our knowledge of the Turkish spoken by the Karaites in Turkey is even more limited. All we know are two short fragments of Turkish hymns from the 16th century in a Venice prayer book, the translation of the Pentateuch into Turkish printed in 1832–1835, though initiated by Abraham Firkovich from Luck who migrated to the Crimea,¹ and the translation of the Book of Obadiah, known from a 19th-century manuscript (Shapira 2014).

The first two 16th-century fragments are especially valuable and it is worth presenting them here. These fragments were included in the Karaite Hebrew prayer printed in 1528/1529 in Venice. Information about this publication was first delivered by Poznański (1913, p. 40), but he could not see the original printed book and referred to its later edition in Qale of 1741, titled Seder beraḥot (the date of publication was provided as 1742, but in his later article, see Poznanski 1918, p. 42, it was shown as 1741). Poznański pointed to two short Turkic fragments, one being hymn 92 in Hebrew and “Tatar” (hebräisch und tatarisch), the other being hymn 140 which he said was only “Tatar” (nur tatarisch abgefasste). Poznański quoted both relevant Turkic texts in Hebrew script. In the original Venice publication¹ the first fragment was wrongly set by a Jewish typesetter who did not know Turkish, and it was not corrected in the later publication in Qale:²

This text should be reconstructed as:

¹ Another printed book that appeared in Turkey came into being due to the efforts of Joseph Solomon Lucki, see below.
² This text was found on page 380, volume IV, available online at http://jnul.huji.ac.il/dl/books/djvu/1103403-4-5/index.djvu?djvuopts&thumbnails=yes&zoom=page). My thanks go to Prof. Piotr Muchowski for sharing this link with me.

Şahımın, ömrimin vafasız yar, safası çok. Ben yar boldum, şahum, şimden beri
‘Disloyal friend of my king, of my life, he enjoys much pleasure. O my king,
I have become a friend.’

Hymn 140 (volume IV, 212) is in fact composed in Greek, only the refrain be-
ning Turkish Karaim:

İbadetlen baş urarım, şu ʿalemi yaradana; bir münaziʿ padişahdır, karar olmaz
akitna; evvel ahır ol gendidir; kimse ermez sırına; ancak ki az şeфаʿatın eyler
ese kuluna
‘I bow in prayer in front of the Creator of this world; no ruler may be equal in
wisdom to Him; He is the beginning and the end, nobody can understand His
secret, unless He Himself shows mercy upon His servant.’

The question of the original language of the Karaites and their ethnici
will not be discussed in this paper. However, it is worth stressing tha
Karaites most probably migrated to the Crimea from the Byzantine Empire after escaping Jerus-
lem in the aftermath of the Crusades and that their first homeland where Karais
emerged was the Abbasid Caliphate. Therefore, the most likely chain of their spoken
languages is Arabic → Greek → Kipchak Turkic → Crimean Turkish → Russian.

As far as their written language is concerned it must be said that the role of the
language of religious literature, community administration and personal correspond-
ence was fulfilled by Hebrew as long as the Karaite religion existed in the traditional
form, even long after the separatism from Judaism. Turkic literature of the Karaites
was supplementary to Hebrew in all areas.

Three papers have been devoted to the literature of Crimean Karaites so far,
Poznański (1913), Ṣapšal (1918) and Jankowski (2012). Information can also be found
in other studies, e.g. Zajączkowski (1926, pp. 7–17, 1964, pp. 793–801), Dubiński

In Jankowski (2012, pp. 57–61) twenty-eight works were demonstrated, both
printed and manuscripts. They include all kinds of literature, religious, translations
from folklore and bellettristic works, handbooks and textbooks, and occasional papers.
This list is not by far complete. It was noted that there is a need to examine the con-
tents of many extant manuscripts called mejuma in which new works will certainly
be found. For example, in addition to three theatre plays quoted in items 26–28, i.e.
Aḥah, Izebel and Meluḵat Šaʿul, we should add the biblical drama called Tiyatir ʿim
targum Išaʿiya ‘Theatre (play) with translation of Isaiah’ was identified in a mejuma

---

3 Zajączkowski (1926, p. 8; 1961, p. 89; 1964, p. 793) mistakenly defined this short frag-
ment as “Kipchak-Karaim”, which was corrected by Shapira (2003, pp. 691–692), more for this
see Aqtay (2009, pp. 19–20) and Jankowski (2012, pp. 53–54).
4 The Khazar theory put forward by some scholars (Ṣapšal, Zajączkowski) has been proved
neither historically nor linguistically.
5 Moreover, the list does not include a few poems and dramas published by Crimean Ka-
raites in Cyrillic script by such writers as Levi and Qatıq.
In the discussion of the Karaim languages and the attribution of a work to a language, a few restrictions should be made. Firstly, it is possible that a written work was linguistically changed or modified by a copyist. Secondly, language features cannot be established on geographical principle. In other words the fact that a book was written or published in Turkey, the Crimea or in Vilna does not necessarily mean that it was in Turkish Karaim, Crimean Karaim or Western Karaim, respectively. For example, as was demonstrated in Jankowski (2012, p. 68), the prayers Targum selihot of 1734 printed in Qale are translated into an archaic Crimean Karaim language, see below, while Isaac Sultanski’s translation published in Vilna in 1892 is Turkish Karaim:

(3) Adonay Tanrımyznyŋdyr ol raįmlar da ol bașatlyqlar ki tandyq aŋar (1734)

(4) Adonay Tañrımızıñdır ol raḥimler ve ol ’afu idmekler farzam ki assi olduk da ise oña (1892)

‘The mercy and forgiveness belong to our Lord God whom we defied’.

Thirdly, we should not trust in such labels as “Tatar” or “Karaim”. We can see how misleading it is from the case of a booklet called Molad qarayïmča ‘Calendar in Karaim’, present among nineteen pieces of Turkic literature in Poznański (1913, p. 43), which – as Poznański and Jankowski (2012. p. 56) demonstrated – is in Russian.

The attempt to create a national Karaim language should be linked to some external circumstances in the life of the Karaites. Such a circumstance is certainly the establishing of the Turkish printing house in Istanbul by İbrahim Müteferrika and the first known printed books in the 1720s. This event is related to the attempts of the first reforms in Turkey during the so-called Tulip Period 1718–1730, but probably also to the reforms in Europe, and in Russia during Tzar Peter I.

1.1. Crimean Kipchak Karaim

We know only three types of texts written in Crimean Kipchak Karaim. The first is the aforementioned translation of the prayers for forgiveness called Targum selihot in the first Karaim book printed in the Crimea in 1734 Sefer ha-haftarot u-še ār had-devarim ham-mequbbaṣim [...] Meqabbeṣ nidheṭ Tisra’el, probably translated, adapted

---

6 This was often the case with Poznański’s bibliographical descriptions who qualified the publications printed in Turkey Turkish and those from the Crimea Tatar. However, Poznański should not be blamed, for he admitted his incompetence in Turkic languages and his bibliographical contributions are invaluable. In practice, however, all later contributions (Zajączkowski 1926, Walfish 2003, Jankowski 2012) are largely based on Poznański’s articles.

7 According to El’jaševič (1993, pp. 181–182), Isaac Sultanski (1824–1899) was the son of Mordecai Sultanski who came to the Crimea from Łuck. Isaac was said to be a teacher in the religious school who raised many pupils and authors of many translations into Karaim of which all were lost except one mentioned here.

8 Sulimowicz’s transcription has been retained.

9 According to Poznanski (1918, pp. 35–37), the first three Karaite books published in Istanbul appeared in the 16th century, but they were written in Hebrew.
or initiated by Simha Isaac Łucki, edited by Sulimowicz (1972, 1973). According to Shapira, these prayers are copies from the Łuck manuscripts (2003, p. 693).

The second is the translation of the Passover Haggadah, Targum hallel haq-qatan, published in Gözleve (present-day Eupatoria) without date and the name of the translator (Poznański 1913, p. 46). Unfortunately, this publication was unavailable and I only know one verse of it (being Psalm 71:16) quoted by Poznański in Hebrew script and provided in a transcription in Jankowski (2012, p. 60):

(5) Keleyim bağattrıqlar bılen, ey Adonay Tañrı; sağındrayım doğrüłuğunı yalnız özünüñı

‘I will come courageously, O Lord God; I will make mention of your righteousness, of yours only’.

The third type of Crimean Kipchak Karaim literature are Bible translations, preserved in many manuscripts (Jankowski 2009, p. 507) and also known from the printed edition of the whole Bible of 1841 in Gözleve. The oldest extant manuscripts originated from the 18th century, although they were copied from much older translations. Only one manuscript of this type has been edited so far in fragments (Jankowski 1997). Another manuscript of the whole Bible except the Chronicles is found among the holdings of the University Library in Cambridge (Jankowski 2009, p. 506). The translation of this manuscript is very similar to the 1841 Bible11 (Poznański 1913, p. 45; Poznanski 1920, pp. 65–66). As for the latter, we know the name of a copyist who copied the Books of Prophets and Hagiography. He is Jacob b. Mordecai, who died in Qale in 1701, and who completed the copy in 1672 (Poznanski 1916, p. 88); according to Shapira (2003, pp. 696–697), he completed the translation or the copy of the Book of Nehemia in 1632 or 1634. Shapira (2013, pp. 157–160) has identified the grave of the copyist in the cemetery of Qale, but his claims that he was an immigrant from the West are not convincing. The Bible published in 1841 is still little known. There are only some short fragments quoted from it and discussed in various studies, the first more detailed discussion and a transliteration of Nehemia being presented in Shapira (2013, pp. 181–187).

Crimean Kipchak Karaim is relatively uniform. We encounter similar forms in most manuscripts of biblical translations. In the following, we shall present some typical North-western or Kipchak Turkic features of this language. In phonology, rounded-unrounded vowel harmony has some restrictions, e.g. qoyğın ‘put’; lenition of strong stops q k p is frequent in verbs between vowels, e.g. čïğaŋ ‘to push out, but not t, e.g. etär ‘(he) does’; initial t-, k- and b- in bol-, bar-, ber-, bar are mostly preserved. Among noun case suffixes we see the genitive -nIŋ, the accusative -nI, and the dative -GA. From verb suffixes we can point to the imperative -QIn, subjunctive -QAy, such actional forms as qïmïlday turġan ‘(he) is moving’, for notes on phonetics see Sulimo-
wicz (1972, p. 46), for a short grammatical description see Jankowski (1997, pp. 7–25); for the vocabulary, in addition to the afore-mentioned articles, see Gordlevskij (1928, pp. 88–90).

However, since many manuscripts were written or copied long after this language was adapted to Crimean Tatar and Crimean Turkish, the translators inevitably changed old forms with new ones, for the examples see Jankowski (1997, pp. 9, 24).

If we compare the language of these texts with the language of the contemporary Western Karaim as shown by Jankowski (2014) and Németh (2014) for North-western Karaim and Németh (2011) and Olach (2013) for South-western Karaim, we see that – although both Western and Eastern Karaim were very similar then – there are no typical Western Karaim features such as oltur- ‘to sit; to dwell’ (CKKar otor-), ošol ‘that over there’ (CKKar šol, Olach 2013, p. 78), -bila ~ -bile ‘with’ (CKKar bilän) or -doğač ‘when …’ in the Crimea.

1.2. Crimean Turkish Karaim

In contrast to Crimean Kipchak Karaim, Crimean Turkish Karaim is less standardised. This is because the former went through an old literary tradition, whereas the latter is attested in a relatively short period of time when the writers were trying to establish a literary norm.

In the domain of phonetics and phonology, initial t-, k- normally → d-, g- and bol-, bar-, ber-, bar → ol-, var-, yer-, var; lenition of q k p in verbs between vowels does not normally occur, but lenition of t in some verbs does, as in standard Turkish, e.g. eder ‘(he) does’. Noun case suffixes are most variable, they can be, like in Crimean Kipchak Karaim, mixed with South-western forms, or predominantly South-western, i.e. the genitive -nIŋ only after a vowel, the accusative -(y)I, and the dative -(y)A. Verb suffixes are almost entirely South-western with such typical forms as perfect -mIš, sometimes progressive -yUr-. The postposition bilän ‘with’ was replaced with ilen, kibik ‘like; as’ with gibik.

The lexicon of Crimean Turkish Karaim is also quite different from Kipchak Karaim. Some characteristic North-western words were replaced with South-western ones, e.g. köp ‘much, many’ with çog; ešik ‘door’ with qapu, yašïr- ‘to hide’ with gzle-, some with Arabo-Persian words typical of Turkish, e.g. ulus ‘nation’ with millet, kerti ‘truly’ with ḥaqqa etc.

However, some specific words and forms are evidenced only in the Crimea and are known in neither Western Karaim nor Turkish, e.g. olturas ‘residence; dwelling (place)’, cf. HKar. olturas ‘krzesło, siedzenie | Sitz, Stuhl’ (Mardkowicz 1935, p. 52), TKar. olturüş ‘id’ (KRPS, pp. 427–428); hüşte ‘well’, cf. Tur. ışte.

In the following, some typical irregularities and deviations from the norm will be shown. In phonology, there are such features as (1) incidental retention of b- in bol- ‘to be, to become’, ber- ‘to give’, bar- ‘to go’, bar ‘there is’; (2) incidental retention of t-, e.g. tur- ‘to stand’. In morphology, there is (1) frequent use of North-western postpositions, e.g. uçun, birge, soň, incidentally ilen; (2) use of the participle and past -QAn,
e.g. vergen ‘gave’, qoyğan ‘put’. In lexicon, some North-western words such as keñesh ‘counsel’, orun ‘place’, burun ‘before’, burunğı ‘being before’ and mağa ‘to praise’ frequently occur. Incidentally Crimean Tatar words such as cayav ‘on foot’, cuvur- ‘to run’ are also encountered.

It should be noted that Crimean Turkish was different from contemporary Standard Turkish. We shall point to some typical differentiating features below. In phonology, (1) t- → d-; k- → g- in those words in which this change has not taken place in Standard Turkish, e.g. tut- → dut- ‘to hold, to grasp’, taş → daş ‘stone’; kendi → gendi ‘-self’; (2) q → χ (mostly noted as ḥ), e.g. qaçan → χaçan ‘when’, yaqın → yaχın ‘near’. In morphology, there are: (1) use of the converb -DIQçAz, e.g. bir ışı dütüçaz Haq kerimdir | gěriye qalmaz meclisdе bulummadıçaz (Aqtay 2009, p. 203) ‘God will be gracious as long as we do anything | there will be nothing without us until we do not join the meeting’; this converb is not mentioned by Doerfer (1959a), but it is present in some isolated Turkish dialects, e.g. that of Rize (Günay 2003, p. 186); (2) use of the converb -huç-dz, e.g. olुnçez ‘until (I) live’ (Aqtay 2009, p. 45); (3) use of the converb -(y)AndA, e.g. ben mektebde oquyanda (Aqtay 2009, p. 94) ‘when I was studying at school’; (4) present or progressive -AyIr, -Uyır, e.g. baqayırım ‘I am looking’, gelmeyirisz ‘you are not coming’, duruyr ‘(God) is standing’ (Aqtay 2009, pp. 37–38).

2. Language Preferences of Crimean Karaim Intellectuals and Spiritual Leaders

The Karaite population in the Crimea was always low in number, according to Kupoveckij’s estimates (1983, p. 77), it amounted to approximately 2600 in 1783. The most influential figures who formed the linguistic attitudes were teachers (erbı) and spiritual leaders (hazzan), later also publishers.12 Karaim was not a language of study, but a language to which pupils were taught how to translate Hebrew canonical and liturgical literature. It can be assumed that Karaim was also the medium of instruction through which young Karaîtes studied Hebrew. Quite interestingly, many teachers, spiritual leaders and publishers13 were not Crimean, but western Karaim, mostly from Łuck. One of the first known Karaite sages who migrated from Łuck was Simha Isaac b. Moses Łucki (died 1761 or 1766 in Qale). They had to decide which language and which standard may be the most suitable for the Karaites. The most essential aspect was the question which variant of Turkic was the best for all communities, Western Karaim, Crimean Karaim or Turkish. After Russia had brought a kind of integrity to the Karaite communities in Lithuania, Wolhynia and the Crimea at the end of the

12 However, it is to be noted that the first Karaim printing house established by Isaac Sinani in Qale (1734–1741) was operated, among others, by the printers brought from Turkey, namely Afeda and Shabbetai Yeraqa (Poznanski 1918, p. 39).
13 We know at least three Karaim printing houses that worked in Gözleve between 1833 and 1914 with some interruptions, owned or operated by Mordecai Tiraşan, David Kukizov (1777–1855) and Abraham Firkovich (El’jaševič 1993, p. 189, Jankowski 2012, p. 55).
18th century, the most useful was Turkish which was spoken by all educated people in the Crimea, but was also comprehensible to the Western Karaites intellectuals. Another reason for choosing Turkish in its Crimean variant as a common language for the Turkic-speaking Karaites was Abraham Firkovich’s interests in the Middle East and Turkey. Shapira (2013, p. 174) considers this language to be “an artificial and mixed half-Luck-Karaim / half-Constantinople-Turkish vernacular”. Shapira is certainly right when he stresses Firkovich’s impact and a kind of artificial character of this language, but we cannot agree with some details. Firstly, as the linguistic features of the publications printed in Turkey and initiated by Firkovich (Zeḵer rav, Šoreš davar, Petah hat-teva, the Pentateuch of 1832–1835) show, there is hardly any Luck Karaim stratum in the language, which in addition is not uniform; the language of the Pentateuch is undoubtedly Turkish Karaim which we can term “Karaeo-Turkish” with very few North-western features; the language of Zeḵer rav, Šoreš davar, Petah hat-teva is mixed. Even the language of Firkovich’s another translation, Kelalei hadiqduq bi-lešon Qedar, is different from the 1832–1835 Pentateuch translation, see below. Secondly, as the specialists of Crimean Tatar and Crimean Turkish demonstrate (e.g. Doerfer 1959b, p. 371), all Crimean dialects were mixed and contained both South-western and North-western elements, which was a very favourable circumstance to create a “mixed” language for the Turkic-speaking Karaites. Another point which must be modified in Shapira’s statement is that Crimean Turkish is not based on the dialect of Istanbul (see such forms as daş, gendi, geliñiz, ilen).

It is still a question to answer if the efforts of Abraham Firkovich and his followers can be considered what modern linguistics terms language planning and language policy or just their individual endeavours to develop education and literacy. The answer to this question needs further examination. It is possible that some Karaite intellectuals, being aware of lexical and structural differences between Standard Ottoman Turkish, Crimean Turkish and Crimean Tatar, just tried to create a middle standard that would incorporate some North-western features into Turkish and used Turkish in a simple variant without Persian syntactic structures and sophisticated Ottoman lexicon. It is hard to tell if the North-western elements that they transferred into Turkish were employed purposely or unintentionally. Since the local Turkic languages in the Crimea were not codified, but regulated by tradition and common consensus, the writers, editors and publishers were not compelled to any strict regulations, as was needed in the case of Hebrew.

The selection of Crimean Turkish as a common language was also optimal because the Crimea was in a way central and the most populated region by the Turkic-speaking Karaites. However, there were a few problems. One was the competence of western intellectuals in Turkish. The fact that they all understood Turkish does not imply that they could use it perfectly in writing and translate Hebrew literature into it.

14 Abraham Firkovich’s inclination to Turkey and Turkish probably started with his first travel to Turkey and the Middle East in 1830 (Harviainen 2003, pp. 878–879) where he stayed until 1832.

15 For the term “Karaeo-Turkic” see Wexler (1983, p. 29).
Unfortunately, we do not have access to documents showing the linguistic views of the creators of Karaim literature, whereby conclusions will be drawn basing on linguistic features of their works. In the following we present some titles of the Turkic works – mostly translations – of the following prominent Karaite intellectuals: Abraham Firkovich, Joseph Solomon Łucki (Yašar), Abraham b. Joseph Solomon Łucki (Aben Yašar), Mordecai Qazaz, and Eliyahu Qazaz with short samples, wherever possible.

**Abraham Firkovich**

1. Translation of the Pentateuch with the parallel Hebrew text (Istanbul, 1832–1835), carried out by Abraham Firkovich, Simha Egiz and Isaac b. Samuel Kohen (Poznański 1913, p. 45, Walfish 2003, p. 935, Shapira 2003, p. 695, Jankowski 2012, p. 58). The language of this translation is typically Turkish, the most similar to Standard Turkish from all Karaim works analysed, but even in it there are some Kipchak elements indicated in Jankowski (2009, pp. 514, 516), e.g. *Yeli Ta‘rım* ‘the Spirit of God’, *yarıq* ‘light’, *suv* ‘water’. In the samples quoted below there is an occurrence of the suffix *-nIñ* after a consonant, *Yarden’nin* ‘of Jordan’.

Samples:

**Gen 6:10** Da doğurdu Novaḥ üç oğlanlar (p. 21) ‘And Noah begat three sons’.

**Exod 1:1** Bunlar adları evladlarının Yisraʾel el’in ol gelenler Mısır’a Yaʿqub ilen her kişi da evi geldiler (p. 178) ‘These are the names of the children of Israel who came to Egypt; every man and his household came with Jacob’.

**Lev 1:1** Da çağırdı Moše’ge əhəl moʿedden da sevledi H ona dene (p. 327) ‘And the Lord called unto Moses, and spoke unto him out of the tabernacle of meeting, saying’.

**Num 1:2** Sayınız sayımın cümle cema’atının evladlarını Yisraʾel el’in soylarına evine babalarının hesabı ilen (p. 439) ‘You shall calculate the number of all communities of the children of Israel according to the number of families and households of your fathers’.

**Deut 1:1** Bunlardır o cevablar ki söyledi Moše cümle Yisraʾel’e beri yağasında o Yarden’nin beriyede sehrada (p. 588) ‘These are the words which Moses spoke unto all Israel on this side of Jordan in the wilderness’.

---

16 Abraham Firkovich (1787–1874), a well-known Karaim scholar “of a mediaeval type”, born in Łuck, was invited to the Crimea in 1822. There is much literature on him, see e.g. Harviainen (2003).

17 The translator of this Pentateuch is unknown (Poznanski 1918, p. 71). It may be assumed that most work was done by those correctors who placed their names in the acrostics added to the publication, i.e. all three in the Genesis, Abraham Firkovich in the Exodus, Isaac ben Samuel Kohen in the Numbers, and Abraham Firkovich in the Deuteronomy, Leviticus being without any acrostic.

18 *Lit.* ‘the answers’.

*Acta Orient. Hung. 68, 2015*
2. *Iggeret tešuʿat Yisraʾel* ‘Testimony of freeing the Israelites’ (Gözleve, 1840), Firko-
vich’s translation of Joseph Solomon Łucki’s work (Poznański 1913, pp. 41–42, Poz-

of Hebrew (Gözleve, undated, probably 1840), (Poznański 1913, p. 43, Poznanski 1920,
pp. 64–65, Zajączkowski 1926, p. 11, Jankowski 2012, p. 59). Walfish’s “Kar-
aim (Łuck dialect)” (2003, p. 939) language assignment in the light of the sample be-
low must be inexact. Like Firkovich’s other works in Turkic, this is Crimean Turkish
Karaim with some Kipchak features, basically noun case suffixes.

Sample:

*Yod ħireq*len niqudlenmekten ġayri tenu ʿalarin birilen geldikte o yoddan evvel gelen
şevaniň oğuması tebdil olur da ħireqniň oğumasina beňzer, mesela […] ‘If a shwa
comes before the vocalised *yod* except for a *ḥireq*, the pronunciation of it changes to
the pronunciation similar to a *ḥireq*, for example […]’. This printing was unavailable
and the sample is a transcription from a short fragment quoted in the Hebrew alpha-

*Tzker rav* 19 ‘The memory of the great’ (cf. Psalm 145), printed in Istanbul in 1831,
translation of a Hebrew story by Benjamin Musafia of the creation of the world
(Poznański 1913, p. 43, Jankowski 2012, p. 57). According to Poznański and Walfish
(2003, p. 935), it was intended as a textbook for schoolchildren. The language is pre-
dominantly Crimean Turkish Karaim with many Kipchak elements.

Sample

*Sensen ol yalıñız bir, tek yalıñız sen da yoqtır senden başka. Önce senini bilen da yoq-
tır yat birgeñe. Evvel yarattıñ evvelden da burundan günde ol burunğı da ilkünde se-
bebi uçun adınıñ. Gendiñ uçun ḥabar vermek qadirligiñni ve qudretini. Verandan
boşdan hicden yoqdan nemeden deqil varınıñ gendisini ve halqini da binyat ittiñ (11)
*‘You are only one and there is no one else apart from You. There is no other beside
You. It is You who created and brought about (the heavens and the earth); the first
day and the beginning is due to Your name. It is up to you to proclaim your power.
You formed the universe and mankind from voidness, nothing and nihilility’.*

19 Joseph Solomon Łucki, known under his pen name Yašar, was born in Luck in 1768, and
died in 1844. He moved to the Crimea in 1803 where he acted as the teacher and counsellor of Solo-
mon and Simha Babovich (El’jaševič 1993, pp. 126–130). He published and probably personally
adapted various works which appeared together with *Zeker rav* in one volume.

20 Pages 1–96; there are three different works with separate pagination published in one
volume.
This text is incomprehensible without the basic Hebrew text. For example, *Sensen of yaliñız bir* is a literal translation of Heb. יַעֲשֶׂנָה תִּירְשָׁנָה יִתְרוּפָה ‘You are unique and one’.

2. **Soreš davar** ‘The roots of words’ (Istanbul, 1831), published in one volume with *Zeḵer rav* with separate pagination (pp. 1–342); this work is basically in Crimean Kipchak Karaim, though with many Turkish phonetical adaptations; according to Shapira (2003, p. 695) the language is “Tatarized and Turkicized Karaim” and the author of this work is Abraham Firkovich.

Sample

Yıltırmaği qılıçını ‘the flashing of your sword’; da büyük boldılar öktemligi gibi tüttünini ‘the pride of the smoke has grown great’ (p. 1).

3. Turkish translation of *Sefer toḥaḵot musar* with the Turkish title *Nesiʿat terbiyye* ‘Teaching good manners’ (pp. 18–21), published in one volume with *Zeḵer rav* under the general name *Hamṣaʾa ḥadaša midbar sin* in the part titled *Petaḥ hat-teva*. The text of *Nesiʿat terbiyye* is provided in two columns, the right column contains the original Hebrew (*ʿivri*), the left one the Turkish (*turqi*) translation. The language is Crimean Turkish Karaim with many Kipchak elements.

Samples:

Sevle dayım doğru, hiç bir vaqıt yalan sevleme, zira sen insanını aldatmaq elinden gelse de, lakin Allahı hiç olmaz (p. 19) ‘Tell always the truth, never tell lies, since you can deceive man, but you cannot deceive God’.

As can be seen, the Turkish of this sentence, which is the beginning of the respective text, is quite clumsy.

4. *Petaḥ hat-teva* ‘The gates of the nature’ and other texts (pp. 21–56). This part of the publication which also contains the item above is composed of various short texts. One is the principles of the religion of which a short fragment will be shown below. The language is Crimean Turkish Karaim.

Samples:

Yisrael dinine mutlıq on temel ‘Ten absolute principles of the Israeli religion’

1. Beninandım tamam inamlıq ilen ki vardır Allah bir evvelki da ömürlük. Gendi gendini yaradı ve şairi kimseden dañlı yaradılmadı. Aslıdan var edi ve şimdi dañlı var ömürdek olur (p. 26) ‘I have believed with my full belief that there is one God, from the very beginning and he will be forever. He has created himself and has not been created by anybody else. He existed from the origin, he exists at present and will exist forever’.
Abraham b. Joseph Solomon Łucki (Aben Yašar)\textsuperscript{21}

1. Abraham Łucki’s introduction to \textit{Pinnat yiqrat} ‘Precious cornerstone’, cf. Isayah 28:16 (Gözleve, 1834) to the work of Isaac b. Solomon of Qale, see Poznański (1913, p. 44; 1920, p. 67).

2. \textit{Mišlei musar} ‘Moralistic stories’ (Gözleve, undated), see Poznański (1913, pp. 43–44, Walfish 2003, p. 939); according to Shapira (2003, p. 696), the author of this work is Joseph Solomon, Abraham’s son. As for the language, Poznański (2003, p. 939) calls it Tatar and Walfish “Karaim (Łuck dialect)”, which is unlikely owing to the fact that Abraham’s Łucki’s another translation, \textit{Meluğaţ Ša’ul}, see below, is Crimean Turkish Karaim.\textsuperscript{22}

3. \textit{Meluğaţ Ša’ul} ‘Shaul’s kingdom’, the translation of a historical Hebrew drama by Joseph Tropalovitz into Crimean Turkish Karaim; identified in a manuscript in Eupatoria dated 1875 or 1876, shelf number VI-3/22. The critical edition of this drama, written in Crimean Turkish Karaim, has been prepared by Smętek (2012).

Sample

(Šaul) Daha qaharım yüregimde alevli ateş gibi yanayır. Bu ʿAmeleq qavmunı qırdıqdan sonra, daẖı raḥatlıq bulamayırım. Milletim Mısır’dan çıqtıqları vaqş onlara haşımlik göstürücünü ‘(Saul) The anger is still burning in my heart like a flaming fire. Even after destroying the tribe of Amalekites I cannot find peace of mind. When my nation was leaving Egypt, (Amalekites) acted hostile towards the m’ (quoted from Smętek 2012, pp. 104–105, with her translation into English).

Mordecai Qazaz\textsuperscript{23}

1. Šuf devaş ‘Honeycomb’ or \textit{Balınıñ solaği} (Gözleve, 1935); a poem inspired by the Pentateuch, printed together with two other works (Poznański 1913, p. 44, Walfish 2003, p. 939, Jankowski 2012, pp. 56, 58). The language is a blend of Crimean Kipchak Karaim and Turkish.

Sample

Yarattıñ worldın yoqdan | Yerni köni canlarnı | Cennetni ve ceheñemni | qaranğulını ve o nurnı | Malaḫlarnı kavodlarnı | Ol ‘aziz dünyalarnı | Comartlığınını çağımdan | İhsan edip qılmüşsın ‘You have created the world from nothing; by your generosity,

\textsuperscript{21} Born in Luck 1793, died 1855 in Ekaterinoslav (El’jaševič 1993, p. 125).

\textsuperscript{22} Even if we suppose that the copyist has changed some forms, it is very unlikely that he could completely convert it into Turkish from South-west Karaim.

\textsuperscript{23} Died 1835 in Qale. According to El’jaševič (1993, p. 85), beyond the two works shown here, he also wrote a Hebrew grammar and a catechism.
you have endowed us with the earth, the heavens and the living creatures; with the paradise and the hell; with the darkness and the light; with the angels and the dignities; with these nice worlds’. This initial fragment is quoted from manuscript A 126 (fol. 5a) held at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, St. Petersburg.

2. Ṭuv ṭaʿam ‘Good taste’ (Gözleve, 1935); a catechism, printed together with two other works (Poznański 1913, p. 44, Walfish 2003, p. 939, Jankowski 2012, p. 58). The language is Crimean Turkish Karaim with a few Kipchak features.

Samples:
(Question 4:) Sen ḥangi milletensin ve diliñ ḥangidir? ‘What is your nationality and what is your language?’ (Reply:) ʿIvri toqumdanımın, Avrahamnıñ oğlı İchaq, İchaq-niñ oğlı Yaʾqov, Yaʾqovıñ evladlarındannım ‘I am a descendant of Hebrews, from the offspring of Jacob, Isaac’s son, the son of Abraham’. Milletıne İsrael derler ve dilimiz leşon qodeşdir ‘My nation is called Israel and our language is the Holy Language’ (fol. 1b).

3. Adam oğlu ‘Man’s son’; a short moralistic poem, attributed by Şapşal to Mordecai Qazaz, copied in the mejuma published by Aqtay (2009, pp. 102–113); a poem inspired by the Pentateuch. Despite some suppositions, it probably has never been published and the researchers could confuse it with another work shown by Poznański (1913, p. 44), see Jankowski (2012, pp. 56, 58). The language is Crimean Turkish Karaim with many Kipchak elements.

Sample

Hey adam oğlu ne uçun yuḫlarsın | Aç gözüñi baq, balçıq topraqsın | Neçe yaşarsıñ bir gün göçersin | Binyatıñ yoqdır adam oğlanı ‘Why are you sleeping, man’s son | Open your eyes, your are from clay and soil | However long you will live, you will pass away one day | You have no support’ (Aqtay 2009, p. 102).

Eliyahu Qazaz

Le-regel ha-jeladim ‘Textbook for children’ (Odessa, 1869); this is a Hebrew textbook for children consisting of lessons, a chrestomathy and a Hebrew–Karaim dictionary (Poznański 1913, p. 43, Walfish 2003, p. 939, Jankowski 2012, p. 60).

Samples

Ögüzi kim çaldi? ‘Who has stolen the ox?’; atni çaldı? ‘who has stolen the horse?’; bugün bahçaya kim gitti? ‘who went to the garden today?’ (p. 4).

Word order is frequently copied from Hebrew, e.g. *babam satđi* at ‘my father has sold a horse’ ← Heb. אָבִי מָכַר סוּס.

**Conclusion**

Due to unavailability of many Karaite printings it is premature to draw the final conclusion. For instance, works of such Karaite writers and activists as Firkovich’s son Jacob, his grandson Moses, Samuel Pigit and some others must be examined. Nevertheless a general tendency to write in Crimean Turkish mixed with many Crimean Kipchak features is evident. This tendency is clear when we look at the Łucki family who moved to the Crimea. While the founder of the Crimean branch of this family, Simha Isaac b. Moses Łucki – if the attribution of *Targum selḥot* to him is correct – translated Hebrew works into Crimean Kipchak Karaim, close to his Łuck Karaim, his son Joseph Solomon preferred Turkish with Kipchak elements; Joseph Solomon’s son, in turn, Abraham preferred a language very similar to standard Turkish.

**Abbreviations**

CKKar – Crimean Kipchak Karaim
HKar – Halicz Karaim
TKar – Troki Karaim
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