

# TURCOLOGICA

Herausgegeben von Lars Johanson

Band 119

2019

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Henryk Jankowski, Gulayhan Aqtay, Dorota Cegiołka,  
Tülay Çulha and Michał Németh

# The Crimean Karaim Bible

Volume 1

Critical Edition of the Pentateuch, Five Scrolls, Psalms,  
Proverbs, Job, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah

2019

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

This project was financed by the National Programme for the Development of Humanities (2012–2015) administered by the Polish Minister of Science and Higher Education.



**NATIONAL PROGRAMME  
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMANITIES**

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek  
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek  
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2019

This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printed on permanent/durable paper.

Printing and binding: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed in Germany

ISSN 0177-4743

ISBN 978-3-447-11196-6

# Table of Contents

## Volume 1

Preface .....	VII
Introduction	
1. The project for a critical edition of the Crimean Karaim Bible.....	IX
2. The Crimean Karaim Bible .....	X
3. The sources .....	XVI
4. The language of the translation.....	XX
5. Principles of edition .....	XXIII
6. Transcription.....	XXIV
7. Transliteration.....	XXVII
8. English translation .....	XXVIII
Editorial symbols .....	XXXI
Abbreviations .....	XXXIII
References .....	XXXV
Transcription	
The Book of Genesis.....	3
The Book of Exodus.....	91
The Book of Leviticus.....	165
The Book of Numbers.....	219
The Book of Deuteronomy .....	293
The Song of Songs .....	361
The Book of Ruth .....	367
The Book of Lamentations.....	373
The Book of Ecclesiastes.....	381
The Book of Esther .....	391
The Book of Psalms .....	403
The Book of Proverbs .....	507
The Book of Job .....	541
The Book of Daniel.....	581
The Book of Ezra .....	605
The Book of Nehemiah.....	623

## Volume 2

## Translation

The Book of Genesis .....	3
The Book of Exodus.....	71
The Book of Leviticus.....	129
The Book of Numbers.....	173
The Book of Deuteronomy .....	229
The Song of Songs .....	279
The Book of Ruth .....	285
The Book of Lamentations.....	291
The Book of Ecclesiastes.....	299
The Book of Esther .....	309
The Book of Psalms .....	321
The Book of Proverbs .....	405
The Book of Job .....	435
The Book of Daniel.....	469
The Book of Ezra .....	491
The Book of Nehemiah.....	507

## Preface

The present publication is a result of project 11H 12 0312 81 financed by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education in the frame of the National Programme for the Development of Humanities. For their help in bringing this project to fruition, we would like to express our gratitude to a number of people, including Rosemary Mathew for calling our attention to manuscript BSMS 288 in Cambridge; Prof. Tapani Harviainen for sharing his knowledge of Karaite Hebrew in the pronunciation of Hebrew proper names and for his help in reading some Hebrew passages; Prof. Dan Shapira for sharing fragments of various manuscripts with us and for a long, at times impassioned, but amiable and productive debate on Karaim and Karaim manuscripts; Leszek Kwiatkowski for his help in solving some problems with Hebrew; Olga Vasilieva for help during our work on Karaim manuscripts in the Russian Library of Petersburg; Dr Golda Akhiezer for her assistance in acquiring a copy of manuscript B 282; the reviewers of this book; Paweł Przybysz for his help in preparing the manuscript for publication; Prof. Lars Johanson for including this book in the series *Turcologica*; and two institutions, the John Rylands Library in Manchester and the Cambridge University Library, for copies of manuscripts H 170 and BSMS 288, respectively.

Poznań, May 2018

Henryk Jankowski

# Introduction

## 1. The project for a critical edition of the Crimean Karaim Bible

The project for a critical edition of the Crimean Karaim Bible with an English translation was carried out between 2013 and 2017 by Gulayhan (also Gülayhan) Aqtay (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland), Tülay Çulha (Kocaeli University, Turkey), Henryk Jankowski (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland), Michał Németh (Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland), and Dorota Cegiołka, formerly Dorota Smętek (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland). Approximately half of the Bible was transcribed, annotated and translated. The project was initiated and headed by Henryk Jankowski. The basic manuscript selected for the edition was a four-volume manuscript from the Cambridge University Library, of which volumes I and IV were chosen for this edition. These volumes contain the Pentateuch and the Five Scrolls, i.e. the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes and Esther (volume I), as well as Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah (volume IV). Volume I is larger, with 202 text leaves, while volume IV is smaller, with 117 text leaves; for a more detailed description of this manuscript and our project, see Aqtay (2016).

The work was assigned to the project participants in the following way:

1. Volume I – Genesis 1–20 G. Aqtay, 21–37 T. Çulha, 38–50 D. Cegiołka; Exodus 1–40 M. Németh; Leviticus 1–20 M. Németh, 21–27 D. Cegiołka; Numbers 1–6 D. Cegiołka, 7–36 G. Aqtay; Deuteronomy 1–34 T. Çulha; the Song of Songs 1–8, Ruth 1–4, the Lamentations 1–5 G. Aqtay; Ecclesiastes 1–12 T. Çulha; Esther 1–10 D. Cegiołka.

2. Volume IV – Psalms 1–40 G. Aqtay, 41–74 T. Çulha, 75–112 M. Németh, 113–150 D. Cegiołka; Proverbs 1–8 G. Aqtay, 9–16 T. Çulha, 17–23 M. Németh, 24–31 D. Cegiołka; Job 1–42 D. Cegiołka; Daniel 1–12 T. Çulha; Ezra 1–10 M. Németh; Nehemiah 1–13 G. Aqtay.

The text was afterwards compared with other manuscripts, annotated and commented on by the authors, and translated into English. However, the footnotes were not always written by the authors of the respective parts, for it was necessary to arrange them according to the first occurrence of a given word or phrase in the text. In a number of cases, two or more authors supplied notes on the same words, while it was only necessary to provide one.

The entire work was then checked, corrected and supplied with many new footnotes, comments and additions by Henryk Jankowski who also provided the translations of all metatext fragments. He also tried to bring a kind of unity to the

different styles of the individual team members. English proof-reading was performed by Thomas Anessi.

## 2. The Crimean Karaim Bible

### 2.1. The study

The first researcher who studied the Crimean Karaim Bible was Ebenezer Henderson. He was competent in Oriental languages, including Hebrew, Aramaic and Turkic, and visited the Karaite community in the Crimea. He studied our basic manuscript BSMS 288 (henceforth manuscript C or shortly C), which has been purchased by Robert Pinkerton. In Henderson's *Biblical researches and travels in Russia*, there is a chapter titled "The Karaite Targum" (1826: 331–339), in which he established some important facts relating to the translation and that particular manuscript, quoting the Hebrew incipit from the beginning of C and the first five verses of Genesis. He termed the language of the translation "Tatar", but at the same time, stressed that neither a Tatar nor Turk could understand it. As for the methods and sources of the translation, Henderson established some cases involving the impact of Aramaic targums and Rabbinical interpretations. For example, in Henderson's opinion (1826: 336) the Karaim rendering of "the Spirit of God" as *yeli Täjrinij* 'a wind of God' is based on the Rabbinical tradition. This claim requires further study. Although Aramaic targums are certainly earlier than the Karaite doctrine, some Karaite interpretations precede Rabbinical thought (Zajączkowski 1929: 12).

The next hundred years are marked by studies conducted by Hebraists and bibliographers who focused on manuscripts with Crimean Karaim translations of the Tanakh. The first among them was Moritz Steinschneider, who described a four-volume manuscript and provided the first two verses of Genesis from it (1871: 38) with some minor mistakes that proved easy to correct. After C, this was the second manuscript with a translation of the entire Bible, and like C, it also lacks Chronicles. As we can see from Steinschneider's description, the structure of both manuscripts is similar. Volume I of Steinschneider's manuscript contains the Pentateuch and a single leaf with the final part of Lamentations and the rest of the Five Scrolls; volume II contains the Former Prophets; volume III – the Latter Prophets; and volume IV – Writings. There are two epigraphs in this manuscript, from which we know the name of the copyist, Baruch b. Moses, and the date of the completion of volumes II and III – 1814. While the manuscript from Manchester (henceforth manuscript M or shortly M) contains volume I, the whereabouts of the remaining three volumes are unknown.

The next researchers were Albert (Abraham) Harkavy and Hermann L. Strack. In their catalogue, they show five manuscripts with "Tatar" translations of the Bible: no. 143, 144, 145, 145a and 146 (1875: 167–170). In their opinion, four of these were copied in "Neue Krimsche Schrift", and one (143) in "Krimsche



Cursivschrift”. The authors provided a fragment of Lev 1:1–3 from manuscript 143 and 144 (1875: 168–169), also with some mistakes.

The last Hebraist and bibliographer of this period was Samuel Poznanski (also Poznański). In his numerous articles devoted to Karaite literature, manuscripts and copyists, he provided a few short fragments copied by him from Karaite manuscripts and books written in Turkic. A short fragment related to the Bible is Dan 9:9–10 from *Targum Seliḥot* (Poznański 1913: 40), later edited by Sulimowicz (1972).

In the 1920s, research started by Henderson was resumed by Turkologists. V. A. Gordlevskij (1928), with the help of El’jaševič, published an article on a Crimean Karaim Tanakh translation based on a manuscript they compared with the Gözleve (Gözlev/Gözlöv/Kezlev) edition of 1841. Tadeusz Kowalski (1929), although he focused on North-West Karaim, published a few short fragments of the Gözleve edition (1929: 287, 288). Ananjasz (later Ananiasz) Zajączkowski (1929) published an important article on eschewing anthropomorphisms in Karaim translations, including West and Crimean Karaim.

After this, another long period of seventy years passed when nearly nothing was done, except for Sulimowicz (1972), which, however, is not directly related to the study of the Tanakh. The new period is opened by Jankowski (1997), who published fragments of M along with a lexical and grammatical analysis and a glossary. A short paper on the features of the translation of the Decalogue in the 1841 Tanakh edition was published by Tirijaki (2004: 253–257). This paper is followed by Shapira’s article on linguistic adaptations in Crimean Karaim Bible translations based on existing printed editions, i.e. Gözleve 1841 and Ortaköy 1832–1835, as well as the existing studies starting with Henderson (Shapira 2006: 264–270). Some notes on Crimean Bible translations and Crimean Tatar manuscripts, their language and its relation to West Karaim are found in Shapira (2003). A study on general and particular questions related to translations into Karaim, not only Crimean, was presented by Jankowski (2009).

Compared with the preceding period, the 2010s have been especially productive. Shapira has examined the last chapter of Nehemiah from the Gözleve edition and tried to elucidate the personality of Jacob b. Mordecai, the translator or the copyist of the Latter Prophets and Writings in a manuscript on which the Gözleve edition of 1841 was based. Németh’s article (2016) is very important, since it provides a critical edition of the Book of Ruth from a newly discovered Crimean manuscript dated before 1687, which is the oldest Crimean manuscript with biblical translation known to date. The author studies this manuscript and presents his view on the translation and related issues.

Although the study of West Karaim Bible translation is beyond the scope of this overview, it is important to note certain issues, because research on West Karaim preceded that on Crimean Karaim and – especially in the remote past – these two branches cannot be separated from each other. Furthermore, attention also needs to be paid here to Turkish Karaim and Krymchak Bible translations.

The first documentation of West Karaim, and at the same time, Karaim in general, was made by Gustaf Peringer (1691: 573), who provided two first verses

of the North-West Karaim Tanakh translation in Hebrew script, which will be quoted here in transcription: (1) *Enk baštan<sup>1</sup> jaratty Teŋri ošol ol köklärni <da><sup>2</sup> ošol jerni*. (2) *Da ol jer edi <veran><sup>3</sup> da boš da karanylyk edi jüzü üstünä derjanyn da küčli jel šuvuldaredi jüzü üstünä ol köklärnin*. (3) *Da ajty Tenri bolsun jaryk da boldu jaryk*.

The next to publish and the second to discuss Karaim translations after Henderson was Jan Grzegorzewski. He published psalms 142 and 143 as translated in the 17th century into Halich (South-West) Karaim by Joseph b. Shemuel, called ha-Mashbir (in the local pronunciation also Ha-Masbir and Ha-Mazbir), adding extensive commentary (Grzegorzewski 1918: 270–272, 279–287). Grzegorzewski did not provide details on the manuscript used. The psalms were published in Hebrew script, but many words were annotated with a transcription into Latin. The first critical edition of a longer and complete biblical book, Lamentations, was published by Zajączkowski (1932, 1934).

Biblical material is also available from earlier studies and editions, in particular, Kowalski (1929: 1–51, 285–287), Zajączkowski (1961: 101–102), and later by Firkovičius (1994, 2000) and Olach (2013). A few studies were published by Németh, e.g. three papers on a manuscript dated 1720 (2014, 2015a, 2015b). He edited and discussed fragments of Exodus and the whole of Ruth.

As for Turkish Karaim, there is a paper by Shapira (2014) in which he provides the translation of Obadiah and the first chapter of Ruth in comparison with modern Turkish and a Krymchak translation, respectively.

As for Krymchak, the study begins with Ianbay and Erdal's critical re-edition of a targum of Ruth (1998). The next step is the edition of Daniel from a late manuscript (Rebi 2010). In 2016 Shapira publishes a translation of Obadiah, compared with the relevant part of the Gözleve edition, and in 2017 Ianbay re-edits the Song of Songs with a targum, originally published in 1905.

As can be seen from this overview, great progress has been made in the study of Crimean Karaim since Henderson's seminal study in 1826. Many manuscripts have been examined and new ones discovered. However, no longer portion of the Bible has been published in a critical edition. This publication is intended to fill this gap.

## 2.2. Emergence of the first Karaim Tanakh translation; the first manuscripts, translators and copyists

While in 1929 Kowalski (1929: xx) said that the oldest manuscripts he saw were from the first half of the 18th century, in 2016 Németh edited fragments of a manuscript dated before 1687. Recently it has been established, that manuscript (Evr I) 143 from the Russian National Library has watermarks from the 1420s–1480s (Dan Shapira's personal communication on the basis of Aleksandra Soboleva's expertise), though there are doubts over its Crimean and Karaim

1 Mistakenly *kaštan*.

2 Mistakenly *ra*.

3 Mistakenly *wëwyrās*, the reading is tentative.

provenance and the text seems to be later. Therefore, further study is required to exclude a Rabbanite origin and even a Caucasian route (see footnote 4).

If a Crimean Karaim origin of (Evr I) 143 were to be confirmed, it will be an important argument to claim that the Crimean translation preceded the West translation and that the first written translation of at least the whole Pentateuch appeared in the Crimea, not in Poland-Lithuania. This is because in the Crimean Khanate there existed a chancellery that issued documents written in the Turkic language based on Khwarezmian Turkic with local Kipchak elements already in the 15th-century (cf. Vászary 1987: 12–13). Therefore, there existed a literary language in the Crimea, while in 15th-century Poland, literary Polish was still in an early stage of development. Polish underwent spectacular development somewhat later, in the 16th century, which is known for the rise of humanism, Protestantism and national languages across Europe. It was only in this century that Karaite scholars in Lithuania like Isaac b. Abraham Troki started to write in their spoken language, i.e. Turkic Karaim (Jankowski 2014). However, after the Turkish conquest of Caffa in 1475 and the capture of the South Crimea, the local literary Turkic language was gradually replaced by Turkish. Therefore, all Crimean Karaim translations and all manuscripts show Turkish influence. In most cases, this influence is not intended, and the copyists introduced Turkish equivalents to Crimean Karaim forms unintentionally, e.g. *M olurlar* ‘they will be’ for *C bolurlar* (I 39b,2). However, some Turkish words were used intentionally. For instance, in C, which is more archaic than innovative, there are twenty-nine occurrences of the Turkish (← Arabic) word *taraf* ‘side’. Phonetically, the Turkish influence is most evident in converting *k-* into *g-* and *t-* into *d-*, and replacing *-v-* (← *-ğ-*) with *-ğ-*. Lexically, it is manifested in replacing Turkic words with Turkish borrowings from Arabic and Persian.

Unfortunately, to date we know of no Crimean Turkic Karaim manuscript from the 16th century. The oldest manuscript known so far is the Pinkas of Caffa from 1653–1663 (El’jaševič 2016: 43). Basing on the copy of folio 6b reproduced in El’jaševič (2016: 46), we see that at least some portions of this manuscripts were written in Crimean Turkish Karaim (in El’jaševič’s opinion in Crimean Tatar), with a typical of this language admixture of North-West Turkic forms, e.g. *kün* ‘day’ (beside *gün*) and *däftärni* ‘notebook-ACC’. The next in terms of chronology is the aforementioned manuscript from before 1687. In the following century, the first datable trace is the translation of Pro 28:13. This verse is included in *Targum Selihot* of 1734 (Sulimowicz 1972: 57) and is identical to C and QB. Another fragment of the Bible included in this *Targum*, Dan 9:9–11, is also very similar, with only two differences. Since we know the date of the printing of *Targum Selihot*, we can say that this short quotation was copied from a manuscript no later than 1734.

The next question to answer is whether the Bible translations we know of go back to a single proto-translation or to multiple ones. It is very likely that all manuscripts are based on a proto-text, and naturally, one of them must have been the first. How, then, can we explain important differences between the language and even translation strategies in various manuscripts? The answer is not difficult.

A few hundred years are sufficient to change many typical North-West Turkic features to South-West Turkic, i.e. Turkish. This was fostered by the growing prestige of Turkish, and this process continued till the end of the manuscript culture in the Crimea and the copying of Bible translations in the 19th century.

On the other hand, there is some evidence that individual copies were translated from the original, not copied. For instance, QB מקדשן has both the Heb. preposition *mi-* and the CKar. ablative case suffix *-tān* ‘from the sanctuary’ (QB in Psa 20:3); this interesting word is not found in the corresponding place in other manuscripts checked. This may indicate that educated Karaites mastered a technique of translation and were able to provide the Turkic equivalents of the canonical text quite easily, which some researchers attributed to the oral tradition of translation known among the Jews (Knudsen 1981: 1) and practised by the Karaites (Šapšal 1918: 6, Zajaczkowski 1964: 793).

There are also different opinions on the “homeland” of the Karaim Tanakh translation. Shapira (2003: 662) maintains that no Crimean Karaim language existed at all, and tries to prove that all Karaim manuscripts came to the Crimea from the West or were copied from earlier western manuscripts (2003: 696, 2013: 176), including Jacob b. Mordecai’s translation or copy. Jankowski (2009: 508) and Németh (2015b: 110–114; 2016: 209–211) take a less radical stance, admitting the relationship of the Gözleve edition to Western Karaim translations.

The question of the relationship between North-West (Troki), South-West (Łuck-Halicz) and East (Crimean) Karaim translations is an object of study and debate (see also point 4.2. Lexicon, below). When we compare late North-West translations with early North-West translations, we see that the latter are more similar to the Crimean ones. However, many phonetic and morphological forms, as well as function words characteristic of West Karaim, are not encountered in Crimean Karaim Bible translations at all, e.g. the postposition *byla* ‘with’,<sup>4</sup> the participle *-Adoyon*, the converb *-Adoyoč*, etc.

A problem with the authors of translations is that we often cannot distinguish between translators and copyists, as in the case of Jacob b. Mordecai. As established by Poznanski (1916: 88), his name appears in the colophon written in 1672, which was included in the fourth volume of the Gözleve edition of 1841, after the Book of Nehemiah (for a modern quotation see Walfish, Kizilov (2011: 387)). We also know the name of the copyist of the West Karaim manuscript of 1720, edited by Németh (2015a, 2015b). It is Simcha b. Chananel, died 1723. The name of another copyist, Baruch b. Moses, is known from the colophon of 1814 (see below).

It is beyond doubt that the translators were very competent in Biblical Hebrew.<sup>5</sup> We know this from how they translated meaningful proper names and

4 If (Evr I) 143, in which this postposition occurs in the form *bl̥* i.e. *bla* ~ *blä* will be established as Crimean, this will mean that it could once have existed in the Crimea. However, now this form of the postposition *birlä* ~ *bilä* ~ *birlän* ~ *ilän*, *ile* → *-lAn* → *-lA*, *mAn*, *menen* etc. is only evidenced in Karachai and Malkar spoken in the Caucasus.

5 Also Aramaic, since some short passages of the Bible, i.e. Dan 2:4–7:28 and Ezr 4:8–6:18,

some rare words, such as ‘sceptre’, rendered with *yaziĭ* (I 141b, 4), from Heb. מַחֲקֶה (Num 21:18), which calques the Heb. verb ‘to cut in, to engrave, to decree’ (Klein 1987: 230). Naturally, there are some mistakes, but most of them should be attributed to later copyists. A typical mistake is the form *kiyiš* (many occurrences) for *kiyit* ‘garment, attire, clothing’. It is also possible that the original \**yilim* ‘destruction; disappearance; loss’ was wrongly read as *yilis*, due to the similarity of the final *mem* to *sameh* (see e.g. I 37a,1, Psa 109:14), for *yilis* and *yilim* see AJ (464). Although the etymology of this word is not clear, *yilim* can be easier explained from Turkic (← \**yil-* ‘to loot, to take away’ ← *yul-* ‘to pluck’, cf. *yılma* ‘kidnap, looting; taking away’, AJ 464 ← *yulma*). The repeating or skipping of words or attaching them to others, and other mistakes committed due to a lack of concentration should be attributed to the copyists, not the translators.

Both the translators and the copyists also had a good intuition in treating loanwords. While in Turkic words the vowel of the first syllable is *e*, in loanwords it is normally *ä*, e.g. *täräzü* ‘scales’, *äškärä* ‘overt’, both of Persian origin, or *täfärič* ‘trip’, of Arabic origin. Open *ä* in the first syllable appears in Turkic words exceptionally, e.g. *täkä* ‘ram’. Because this vowel is marked with a *pataḥ*, in some cases it is unknown whether a vowel should be read *a* or *ä*, e.g. *kapara et-* or *käpärä et-* ‘to forgive’ ← Heb. The same holds true of the Turkic word for ‘God’, which may be read both *Taḡri* or *Täḡri*. However, there are also cases of vowel instability in some loanwords, e.g. *šara‘atkä*, QB *šara‘atka* ‘for justice’ (C I 2b,28).

The question of translation procedures has been raised in a number of recent publications. There is also a separate study devoted to this issue (Olach 2013). Although Olach examines Halicz Karaim, she often makes reference to other dialects, including Crimean Karaim. We must reiterate here a long-established fact – Karaim translators copied the syntactic rules of Hebrew into Karaim. However, the Hebrew impact has not influenced Karaim morphology; the order of all suffixes and enclitics is intact, including function words such as the postpositions *kibik* ‘as; like’, *učün* ‘for’ and auxiliary verbs, e.g. *kimilday turğan* ‘which is/was moving’ (Jankowski 1997: 13, 18).

Both Zajaczkowski (1932: 191) and (Németh 2015b: 110) demonstrate the tendency to amplify the original text in some Western translations. In contrast, early Crimean Karaim manuscripts evidence care taken to render Hebrew words and meanings exactly, which results in a high degree of equivalency. In Crimean Karaim manuscripts amplification is mostly applied for exegetical reasons, e.g. rendering the name of God by *mal’aḡi Täḡriniḡ* ‘God’s angel’ (Zajaczkowski 1929: 12) or *kavodī H-niḡ* ‘the countenance of God’ (IV 21a,17).

It may be argued that Karaim Tanakh translations, in contrast to Turkic translations of the Qur’an, had an independent status. While a typical Qur’an translation is interlinear and closely dependent on the original Arabic text, the Karaim Tanakh translation is an independent Turkic text written without the original Hebrew text. However, as Henderson (1826: 335) first observed, this

---

7:12–26, were written in Aramaic.

translation cannot be understood by anybody who is not acquainted with the Tanakh.

### 3. The sources

#### 3.1. Manuscripts

The number of manuscripts with the translations of the Bible is unknown. In his guide, Sklare (2003: 914) indicates only one, “a translation of Chronicles into Judeo-Tatar” in the Edinburgh University Library. The largest number of manuscripts, at least twenty-eight, are held at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts (formerly Institute of Oriental Studies) of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St Petersburg (Medvedeva 1988, Baskakow, Zajączkowski, Szapszał 1974: 28–29, Jankowski 2009: 507). There are at least six manuscripts in the Russian National Library in St Petersburg, five of them described in Harkavy and Strack’s catalogue and an additional one, Baxč. 116 (see below). In the following paragraphs there is a list of the manuscripts we used in our work. Some manuscripts with Tanakh translations into Crimean Karaim are probably preserved among the holdings of the Russian State Library in Moscow in Guenzburg collection (No. 1653–1654 and 1655); for more on the bibliographies, catalogues and other works related to manuscripts see Walfish and Kizilov (2011: 3–20).

1. BSMS 288 in the Cambridge University Library (among the holdings of the British and Foreign Bible Society) in four volumes; volume I – 203 text leaves (Pentateuch and Five Scrolls), volume II – 144 text leaves (Former Prophets), volume III – 155 text leaves (Latter Prophets), and volume IV – 118 text leaves (Writings), contains the whole Tanakh without Chronicles. There were two owners of this manuscript, as shown in the metatext, Nachamu Levi and Yehuda Levi (I,1a); Robert Pinkerton was given access to the manuscript by the Karaites in Qale in 1816, which was also reported by Henderson (1826: 332). As mentioned above, only volumes I and IV have been included in the present edition. This manuscript was selected as the principal one for our edition.

In volume I, the basic text begins on 7a, preceded by the Hebrew formula ‘(1) Blessed be God! My help is from the Lord who created heaven and earth. (2) In the name of him who is found in adversities and who created the world (3) by his word. Here begins the writing of the Targum of the Law’.

Leaves 1b, 2b, 3a–3b, 4b–5b are blank. There are some scratches on 6a and the note – *nišan budir* ‘this is the stamp’ on the front endpaper. The other notes are:

1a (1) נאם ‘uttered by’ (2) בנימוס זה הספר בן עמוס (3) אבגד הוזהט ‘I shall test the pen whether it goes politely. This is the book by Ben Amos’<sup>6</sup> (4) אצלך חפץ גור השם טוב מכסף קנין דעת<sup>7</sup> ‘To you God

6 As is clear from the meaning, this was a formula used by the copyists to test their writing instruments, the pen and ink, before they started their job.

7 I.e. אצלך חפץ גור השם טוב מכסף קנין דעת; see Shulamit Elitzur ([http://hebrew-academy.org.il/wp-content/uploads/Elizur\\_LXIII.pdf](http://hebrew-academy.org.il/wp-content/uploads/Elizur_LXIII.pdf), p. 147); this formula containing twenty-two Hebrew letters