

UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS

MURAT IŞIK

**THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS OF THE GÖZLEVE BIBLE (1841):
A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS**

THESIS BOOKLET

Supervisor: Dr. Zsuzsanna Olach



Szeged, 2023

1.Introduction

This dissertation undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic features present in a biblical book found in the so-called Gözleve Bible, published in 1841 in what is now known as Eupatoria. The printed edition comprises translations of the entire Tanakh, with the exception of the Chronicles, and is divided into four volumes, all written in Hebrew script. The language of the edition is generally recognized as Crimean Karaim. However, its precise language, and even the very existence of the Crimean Karaim language itself, have stirred significant scholarly debates. Previous investigations addressing this linguistic conundrum have primarily focused on discrete sections of this edition, often analyzing short fragments and rarely a specific entire book. Therefore, the objective of this dissertation is to provide a comprehensive review of an unstudied book from this edition, namely the Book of Leviticus. This review will include its transcription and translation, as well as a faithful reproduction of the original text in facsimile form. This examination will carry out a detailed linguistic assessment, comparing equivalent features found in the text with those in Crimean Tatar, Crimean Turkish, Ottoman Turkish, and all three Karaim dialects since distinctions between Ottoman Turkish and Kipchak languages are crucial in discerning the variants of Crimean Karaim. Moreover, this comparison will also contribute to the discussion about whether the edition was written in a superficial language, as suggested by certain scholars.

This dissertation begins with a succinct overview of the ethno-religious background, history, language, and written sources of the Crimean Karaims. It engages with ongoing discussions concerning the existence of the Crimean Karaim language and debates associated with the language used in this edition. The subsequent chapters delve into an in-depth linguistic analysis of the data, encompassing phonology, morphology, morphophonology, syntax, morphosyntax, and lexicon. Following the conclusion, an appendix will be provided that includes the transcription and translation.

1.1. General Remarks on the Aim, Scope, and Methodology of the Study

The primary objective of this research is to undertake an exhaustive exploration of a book from a complete printed Tanakh translation (excluding the Chronicles), known as the Gözleve Bible or Eupatorian print (1841). While the language of this Bible translation is generally identified as Crimean Karaim, it continues to be a topic of debate due to its heterogeneous properties. A relatively small number of studies have investigated the language of the Gözleve Bible, typically focusing on selected portions. The analyses and conclusions regarding this edition

also raise skepticism from certain scholars about the existence of Crimean Karaim, which is usually considered an extinct Eastern dialect of Karaim. Analyzing the limited written resources available could prove valuable in the ongoing discourse about Crimean Karaim and the historical tradition of Bible translations in Karaim. Thus, this dissertation seeks to unveil a hitherto untranscribed¹ and thoroughly unstudied book of the Gözleve Bible, specifically, the third book of the Torah, commonly referred to as the Book of Leviticus. It should be noted that the outcomes of this research strictly relate to the linguistic attributes of this specific book and do not reflect the language of the entire edition.

This dissertation presents a comprehensive transcription of the Book of Leviticus, originally written in Hebrew. As detailed in Section 2.1.1., the differentiation of values among certain Karaim vowel pairs in non-Biblical Hebrew words is not denoted in Hebrew script due to orthographic complexities. In such instances, we have considered Karaim phonotactics and descriptions found in Karaim dictionaries and studies. In the transcription, which is included in the appendix, we carefully addressed specific errors or challenges, systematically comparing them with other Bible translations across the three different Karaim dialects and, occasionally, some Ottoman Bible translations when equivalent portions existed in such translations. A more detailed description of the transcription notes can be found in the relevant section of the appendix.

An English translation of our text is also provided in the appendix. During the translation process, we adopted a philological approach, prioritizing the conveyance of the intended meaning. Concurrently, we aimed to mirror the structural elements of the original text in our translated version, within the confines of the English language. This dual emphasis on meaning and structure defines our translation technique, which we term as ‘meaning-based structural equivalence’. This term is introduced to characterize an approach that strives to strike a balance between semantic fidelity and structural preservation. It should be noted that in various examples where required, footnotes have been used to illustrate the literal meaning of certain instances. While this dissertation does not aim to conduct a detailed, systematic comparison with the Hebrew Bible, the literal meanings noted in the footnotes are systematically compared to Biblical Hebrew only in cases where discernible similarities exist, in order to show readers

¹ It should be acknowledged that upon the completion of this dissertation, our transcription, along with the remaining books of the Torah translation from Göz. 1841, will be accessible through the following online portal: <https://middleturkic.lingfil.uu.se/manuscripts/middle-karaim/JSul.IV.02A>.

whether the discussed characteristics are possible calques from Biblical Hebrew or not. As for the translation notes, refer to the relevant part in the appendix.

This study employs a descriptive and comparative methodology for the linguistic analysis of the text. This involves a thorough examination of the phonological, morphological, morphophonological, syntactic, morphosyntactic, and lexical features of the text, with these categories being subsequently compared to their counterparts in Crimean Tatar, Crimean Turkish, Ottoman Turkish, and three dialects of Karaim (Crimean, Halich and Trakai), where available sources exhibit relevant features. In the course of our descriptive analysis, we highlight specific characteristics within the text, diligently selecting examples that represent these attributes. When relevant and needed, all instances embodying these features are included. However, only representative samples are cited in most sections, as the frequency of occurrence of such features does not hold substantial relevance to our investigation. Thus, only representative examples will be showcased in our description, unless specifically mentioned. Regarding the comparative aspect of this study, various sources were consulted. For Crimean Turkish, our resources were primarily limited to a short section written by Doerfer (1959a), and consequently, comparisons involving Crimean Turkish are sparse, as noted in the relevant sections. For linguistic features related to Crimean Tatar, primary sources included works by Kavitskaya (2010), Jankowski (2010), and Doerfer (1959b), and the KRUS dictionary was primarily used for lexical items. For Ottoman Turkish, which notably consists of three main phases - Old Ottoman (13th-15th century), Middle Ottoman (16th-18th century), and New Ottoman (19th century to 1928), as outlined by Kerslake (2022: 176) - descriptions pertaining to New Ottoman features by Kissling (1960) and Hagopian (1907) were predominantly employed. Dictionaries utilized included ETD, LET, and occasionally ÖTS and YTL, along with a dictionary pertaining to Middle Ottoman, TLO. In addition, an array of studies on Karaim was consulted, encompassing works by Prik (written in 1949 but published in 1976), Musaev (1964, 1977), Zajączkowski (1931), Gülsevin (2016), Çulha (2019), and Öztürk (2019). For lexical references, we primarily relied on two chief sources: CKED and KRPS. It is pivotal to note that when assessing the features of Crimean Karaim, our predominant reference was Prik's 1976 study, owing to its aptitude for comparing the Crimean Karaim Bible translations, which bear archaic features. This choice stands in contrast with Çulha's study, which is largely predicated on mejumas, and thereby predominantly showcases features heavily influenced by Crimean Turkish, often devoid of certain intrinsic Karaim properties. Moreover, in certain segments when needed, equivalent sections of the Crimean Karaim Bible translations (e.g.,

Jankowski 1997: 28–52, Németh 2016: 169–189, CrKB I: 165–217) and a Prayer Book from 1734 (e.g., Sulimowicz 1972: 56–64) were also utilized for comparative purposes.

It should be noted that in specific sections, selected examples from the Hebrew Bible and its translations in English, and occasionally Russian will be incorporated. These examples, collected from a software known as ‘Bible Works 9’, will be introduced where relevant. In addition, in syntax and morphosyntax section certain Bible translations from Crimean Tatar, Ottoman Turkish and Western Karaim were used in order to demonstrate the Karaim bible translation strategies which exhibit significant influence from Biblical Hebrew. However, while some of these influences are discussed in their respective sub-chapters, it is important to note, as mentioned earlier, that the study does not specifically focus on conducting an in-depth analysis of Hebrew influence. As a result, a separate section solely dedicated to this topic is not included.

2. Findings

2.1. Phonology

Following a comprehensive analysis, it is evident that the phonemic inventory of the scrutinized text displays no marked disparities when contrasted with Crimean Tatar, Crimean Turkish, and Ottoman Turkish. In contrast, in line with expectations, the text does not incorporate the unique phonemes of Western Karaim, which demonstrate Slavonic influence. A deeper examination of the phonological attributes indicates that certain features, when juxtaposed with the aforementioned languages, do not exhibit a homogenous characteristic. These features predominantly hinge on chosen lexical items, complicating the identification of stable characteristic traits, e.g., fluctuations between the vowels /a/ ~ /ä/ in words [Lev 1:5 vs 26:5] *sač-* vs *säč-* ‘to sprinkle’ [Lev 24:7; 24:6] *yaraštirmaḵ* vs *yäräštirmäk* ‘arrangement’ [Lev 27:7 vs 27:6] *yaš* vs *yäš* ‘years; age’, addition of a vowel in [Lev 11:25] *umundar* (see [Lev 5:2] *mundar*) ‘unclean’ *irenk* (see [Lev 13:55] *renk*) ‘colour’, [Lev 11:23] *miḵruḥa* ‘abominable’ (see [Lev 11:11] *miḵruḥ*). Nonetheless, it is worthy of note that when comparisons are drawn, certain discrepancies become apparent between the studied languages. A number of features reveal instances of divergence from Ottoman Turkish characteristics while mirroring a recurring pattern discernible in Crimean Tatar, Crimean Turkish, and Western Karaim dialects in specific instances. These encompass the degree of openness in vowels, the adaptation of fronting harmony in some non-Turkic lexemes, the transformation of the velar voiceless plosive *-k* into the velar fricative *-h*, metathesis in some words, and the shifting of vowel-consonant pairs from [i̯y], [a̯y] to [uv] or [ov] (see sections 2.1.2.1. and 2.1.2.2.). In regard to the

interrelationships between our dataset and the Western Karaim dialects, it can be posited that, barring a few characteristics such as the alternation from $t- > \check{c}-$ and $t- > k-$, and the omission of consonants in certain Arabic words (see sections 2.1.2.2.2. and 2.1.2.2.4.), there is no significant association in features that diverge from Crimean Turkish, Crimean Tatar, and Ottoman Turkish. Notably, with regard to Crimean Tatar, we do not identify any distinctive phonological features that are exclusively present in both Crimean Tatar and our dataset.

In categorizing the phonological characteristics, the most salient features are those pertaining to Ottoman Turkish consonantal alternations (see section 2.1.2.2.1.), which fundamentally underpin the classification of Crimean Karaim variants. It is well-established that Bible translations penned in Crimean Karaim phonologically exhibit Kipchak traits, while secular texts, such as *mejumas*, frequently display Ottoman Turkish attributes. As alluded to previously, these distinctions are recognized in Jankowski's taxonomy (2015: 202–205), where the variant embodying Ottoman Turkish characteristics is designated as Crimean Turkish Karaim, and the one demonstrating Kipchak traits is labeled as Crimean Kipchak Karaim. Our text reveals some intriguing observations, as the influence of Ottoman Turkish phonological features is notably pronounced in a Crimean Karaim Bible translation. We classify such Ottoman Turkish consonantal features into seven subgroups. Among them certain Ottoman Turkish traits are dominant over the Kipchak counterparts, e.g., $k- \sim g-$ (8% vs 92%); $b- \sim v-$ (0% vs 100%), while others are not, e.g., $t- \sim d-$ (59% vs 41%); $b- \sim \emptyset$ (92% vs 8%); $b- \sim m-$ (7% vs 93%), $b- \sim p-$ (86% vs 14%), $ol \sim o$ (95% vs. 5%). It's important to underscore that the distribution of these features is characteristically heterogeneous. This can also be further corroborated by the occasional presence of both Ottoman Turkish and Kipchak equivalents within the same sentences in our dataset. However, in specific chapters, for instance, Chapter 11, such Ottoman Turkish features are highly predominant.

In conclusion, while it is arduous to categorize the variant of Crimean Karaim utilized in our text, given its amalgamation of both Crimean Kipchak Karaim and Crimean Turkish Karaim traits, it should be underscored that pronounced Crimean Turkish features are unusual for Crimean Karaim Bible translations. This aspect renders our text distinct among other Crimean Karaim Bible translations². Accordingly, it can be convincingly proposed that, despite

² An exception exists with the so-called Ortaköy 1832-1835 edition, which was not published in Crimea, and its language is occasionally referred to solely as Turkish while it also presents some Karaim features (Jankowski 2018: 52–53).

preserving fundamental Kipchak traits, the text also mirrors the phonological tendencies prevalent during the linguistic epoch of its publication.

2.2. Morphology and Morphophonology

The morphological and morphophonological attributes observed in our dataset once more showcase a fusion of characteristics. Primarily, in terms of general tendencies of morphophonological traits, numerous analogous patterns emerge. These are identifiable in our dataset and within the other Turkic languages explored in this current analysis, such as intersyllabic vowel harmony, consonant harmony, intervocalic lenition, and vowel deletion (refer to section 2.2.1.). Nonetheless, our text reveals certain unique characteristics specific to our dataset, which are absent in other languages. These include metathesis in a single inflected lexical item and a consonant deletion mostly in the aorist marker (refer to sections 2.2.1.5. and 2.2.1.6.). Yet, the most notable difference lies in the presence of rounded forms of particular suffixes which are absent in Crimean Tatar, Crimean Karaim Bible translations or as depicted in Prik's (1976) account for Crimean Karaim. Examples of these distinctions include the following: denominal nominal derivative markers {+IU}, {+IUK}; the deverbal nominal derivative markers {-U}, {-(U)K}, {-(U)m}, {-(U)š}, {-(u)včĭ}, {-(U)v}; the possessive markers {+(u)m}, {+(U)ŋ}, {+U}, {+(U)ŋUz}; the accusative case marker {+nu}; the ordinal marker {+(U)nžI}; the passive voice marker {-UI}; the causative voice marker {-Ur}, {-dUr}, {-yuz}; the reflexive voice marker {-un}, the definite past tense marker {-Du}; the aorist marker {-(U)r}; the imperative mood markers {-(U)ŋUz}, {-(U)ŋIz}; the voluntative mood marker {-sUn}; the converb marker {-up}; and the participle marker {-(u)včĭ} (see sections 2.2.2. and 2.2.3.). It's crucial to acknowledge that these rounded variants also have unrounded counterparts, which are significantly more prevalent compared to the rounded versions. In addition, these characteristics should not be ascribed to the influence of Western Karaim. Instead, they seem to faintly echo an Ottoman Turkish morphophonological process which was also, albeit scarcely, prevalent in Crimean Turkish. Indeed, apart from the presence of the present tense marker {-AydIr} (see section 2.2.3.3.2.), our dataset does not exhibit any distinct Western Karaim features pertaining to this category.

In regard to the morphological dimension, the text uncovers a series of Ottoman Turkish markers that are not found in Prik's description of Crimean Karaim or Crimean Karaim Bible translations. Examples include the participle markers {-(y)An}, {-ižĭ}, {-Dik}; the first person voluntative mood marker {-(A)IIm}; the third person singular optative mood marker {-(y)A};

and the future tense marker {-AžAK} (see sections 2.2.3.6., 2.2.3.4.2., and 2.2.3.3.4.). It's crucial to highlight that, except for the 1PL.VOL marker {-(A)IIm}, all the markers introduced have Kipchak equivalents within our text. Remarkably, these Kipchak variants predominate over their Ottoman Turkish counterparts (88% vs 12%). However, it is only in specific chapters, such as Chapter 11, that Ottoman Turkish characteristics are more prevalent. Nevertheless, the overarching conclusion is that while our text does display Ottoman Turkish morphophonological and morphological characteristics, they do not exhibit predominance. This stands in contrast to certain phonological characteristics discussed in the preceding subsection.

2.3. Syntax and Morphosyntax

The syntactic and morphosyntactic characteristics observed in the text yield anticipated results, as all Karaim Bible translations exhibit various influences from Biblical Hebrew features. These include the inverse order in genitive constructions, systematic renderings of Biblical Hebrew conjunctions such as *ki* and *wa*, the Hebrew definite article, repetition of certain nominals and postpositional structures, and the use of infinitival paronomasia by certain Karaim equivalents. Furthermore, these influences pervasively shape the structures and word order in both simple and complex sentences, elements that are atypical for Turkic languages. Perhaps the most common influence in complex sentences is the rendering of the Hebrew relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר ['ăšer] by certain pronouns. This presents an atypical relative clause structure that is common in Karaim and also existed in written Ottoman sources due to Persian influence. On the other hand, the text also exhibits some Turkic characteristics, as we observe the use of participles in relative clauses, the usage of specific conjunctions, and verbal noun markers in adverbial clauses, which bear similarities to aspects of Crimean Tatar, Ottoman Turkish, and other Karaim dialects. Furthermore, an analysis of case marker functions reveals that out of 43 different functions, only three of them demonstrate atypical Turkic usages, likely the result of Biblical Hebrew influence. Additionally, with respect to a specific Biblical Hebrew influence, such as the reduplication of specific nominals and postpositional constructions, e.g., [Lev 6:5] *ertä bilän ertä bilän* 'every morning'; [Lev 17:3] *kiši kiši* 'every man', our text diverges from the previously examined Western Karaim Bible translations. Instead, it exhibits similarities with another Crimean Karaim Bible translation (specifically, the manuscript BSMS 288). In conclusion, our text adheres closely to the parameters of Karaim Bible translation, reflecting an age-old canonical tradition along with certain Turkic characteristics which cannot be attributed to a specific Turkic language.

2.4. Lexicon

Within our dataset, we identify a total of 1075 unique lexical elements, 939 of which are documented in Karaim dictionaries. Upon evaluating the representation of these words in the languages exhibited in our text, it is frequently observed that a majority of the words are prevalent across all languages, albeit with differing phonological adaptations. In examining the lexical content of Western Karaim dialects, it is notable that, barring two verbs showing the Western Karaim phonological adaptations (see section 2.4.1.), our dataset displays no discernible influence from such Karaim dialects. Interestingly, our data also lacks any specific Crimean Tatar words. However, the situation is markedly different with respect to Ottoman Turkish. According to the CKED, 209 of the 939 listed examples originate from Ottoman Turkish as adopted in Crimean Karaim. In addition, our investigation reveals that this number increases to 286 out of 1075 total items when unlisted lexical items are taken into account. Thus, Ottoman Turkish served as a donor language for approximately 27% of the lexical elements in our dataset, contributing words of Turkic, Arabic, Persian, Greek, Italian and Armenian origin. The influence of Ottoman Turkish within the chapters is not uniformly distributed. Notably, Chapter 11 evidences a pronounced use of Ottoman Turkish lexicon and a systematic replacement of two Karaim words with their Arabic-origin Ottoman Turkish equivalents.

In relation to Biblical Hebrew, our dataset includes 38 words that, while absent in dictionaries, are present in Karaim Bible translations. Additionally, there exist twenty unique lexical items within our data that do not appear in any other sources. These items are primarily derived from common Turkic verb and nominal stems.

In concluding the examination of this category, we can revisit the insights derived from the previous subchapter. Although the text prominently features lexical elements intrinsic to Crimean Kipchak Karaim, a substantial presence of Crimean Turkish Karaim features is also observed, attributed to the influence of Ottoman Turkish. Notably, such an intensive level of Ottoman Turkish lexical influence is yet to be observed in other Crimean Karaim Bible translations, except for the so-called Ortaköy 1835 edition, the language of which is sometimes referred to as Turkish.

2.5. Final Remarks

This study meticulously scrutinizes the linguistic properties of a section of the printed edition known as the Gözleve Bible, the language of which has sparked scholarly discourse. Our

exhaustive investigation delineates these linguistic elements in detail, providing a comprehensive comparison with Crimean Tatar, Ottoman Turkish, all three Karaim dialects, and occasionally, Crimean Turkish. It is clear that the text exemplifies translation strategies typically found in all Karaim translations. This includes a literal translation approach, such as reflecting Biblical Hebrew syntax or replicating various linguistic characteristics of Biblical Hebrew that are atypical in Turkic languages. However, in a wide array of categories, the text appears to undergo Ottomanization across phonological, morphophonological, morphological, and lexical dimensions, sporadically incorporating direct borrowings from Ottoman Bible translations. Simultaneously, the text reveals pronounced Kipchak traits in these categories, which predominantly outweigh the Ottoman Turkish equivalents in general. Notably, the text intermittently showcases specific phonological features and lexical elements which, while not atypical for Turkic languages, are absent in other languages that have been compared with our dataset. In light of these findings, Shapira's assertion (2003: 696; 2013: 134) that this edition represents a hasty attempt to Tatarize or vulgarize older Łuck editions, resulting in superficial Tatarization, does not align with our results. Quite the contrary, the text does not display any features that are solely characteristic of Crimean Tatar. Rather, it manifests common Karaim traits alongside non-dominant Ottoman Turkish features, which were prevalent in both Crimean Turkish and Crimean Tatar. Therefore, based on Jankowski's descriptions (2015: 202–205) of Crimean Karaim variants, the language of the Lev of Göz. 1841 encompasses a blend of Crimean Kipchak Karaim and Crimean Turkish Karaim. Undoubtedly, a more comprehensive analysis is required to provide an accurate portrayal of the entire edition.

REFERENCES

- CKED = AQTAY Gülayhan and JANKOWSKI Henryk 2015. *A Crimean Karaim-English Dictionary*. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. Katedra Studiów Azjatyckich. Wydział Neofilologii.
- CrKB = JANKOWSKI Henryk, AQTAY Gülayhan, CEGIOŁKA Dorota, ÇULHA Tülay and NÉMETH Michał 2019. *The Crimean Karaim Bible*. Vol. I-II. Wiesbaden: Harrossowitz Verlag.
- ÇULHA, Tülay 2019. *Karaycanın Karşılaştırmalı Grameri. Fonetik-Morfoloji (Kırım Ağzı Esasında)*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- 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.

- ETD = REDHOUSE, J. W. 1856. *English and Turkish Dictionary*. London: Bernard Quaritch.
- GÜLSEVİN, Selma 2016. *Karay Türklerinin Dili (Troki Diyalekti)*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- HAGOPIAN, V. H. 1907. *Ottoman-Turkish Conversation*. London: Samson Loro Marston.
- JANKOWSKI, Henryk 1997. 'A Bible Translation into the Northern Crimean Dialect of Karaim'. *Studia Orientalia* 82: 1–84.
- JANKOWSKI, Henryk 2010. *Język krymskotatarski*. Warszawa: Dialog.
- JANKOWSKI, Henryk 2015. 'Crimean Turkish Karaim and the Old North-western Turkic Tradition of the Karaites'. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 68/2: 199–214.
- KAVITSKAYA, Darya 2010. *Crimean Tatar*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.
- KERSLAKE, Celia 2022. 'Ottoman Turkish'. In: Lars JOHANSON and Éva Á. CSATÓ (eds.) *The Turkic Languages*. London and New York: Routledge, 174–194.
- KISSLING, Hans Joachim 1960. *Osmanisch-Türkische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- KRPS = BASKAKOV N. A., ZAJĄCZKOWSKI A., SHAPSHAL S. M. 1974. *Karaimsko-Russko-Pol'skij Slovar'*. Moskva: Russkij Jazyk.
- KRUS = Useinov, S. M. 2008. *Krymskotatarsko-Russko-Ukrainskiy Slovar'*. Aqmescit: Tezis Neshriyat Evi.
- LET = REDHOUSE, J. W. 1884. *A Lexicon, English and Turkish*. Constantinople: A. H. Boyajian.
- MUSAEV, Kenesbaj Musaeviç 1964. *Grammatika karaimskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.
- MUSAEV, Kenesbaj Musaeviç 1977. *Kratkiy grammaticheskiy ocherk karaimskogoyazyka*. Moscow: Nauka.
- NÉMETH, Michał 2016. 'A Crimean Handwritten Translation of the Book of Ruth Dating from before 1678'. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 26 (2): 161–226.
- ÖTS = ÇAĞBAYIR, Yaşar 2007. *Ötüken Türkçe Sözlük*. Vol. 1–5. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.
- ÖZTÜRK, Abdulkadir 2019. *Karay Türkçesinde İsim*. Ankara: Fenomen Yayınları.
- PRİK, Olga Ja 1976. *Očerki grammatiki karaimskogo jazyka (krymskij dialekt)*. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe Učebno-Pedagogičeskoe Izdatel'stvo.
- SULIMOWICZ, Józef 1972. 'Materiał leksykalny krymskokaraimskiego zabytku językowego (druk z 1734 r.) I'. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 35, 1: 37–76.

TLO = MENINSKI, Franciscus à Mesgnien 1680. *Thesaurus Linguarum Orientalium Turcicae-Arabicae-Persicae: Lexicon*. Vol. I–IV. Viennæ.

YTL = BAHAEDDİN, M. 1927. *Yeni Türkçe Lügat*. İstanbul: Evkaf-ı İslamiye Matbaası.

ZAJĄCZKOWSKI, Ananiasz 1932. *Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodniokaraimskim (przyczynek do morfologii języków tureckich)*. *Les suffixes nominaux et verbaux dans la langue des Karaims occidentaux (contribution à la morphologie des langues turques)* [Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności 15]. Kraków: Nakładem Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności.

PUBLICATIONS PERTAINING TO THE TOPIC OF THE DISSERTATION

- 1-) IŞIK, Murat 2018a. ‘Oghuzic and Kipchak Characteristics in the Book of Leviticus, Gözleve Bible (1841).’ *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* LXXI/2: 66–76.
- 2-) IŞIK, Murat 2018b. ‘The History of Bible Translations as Part of the Karaim Cultural Heritage.’ In: Taner MURAT (ed.) *The 1st Annual Kurultai of the Endangered Cultural Heritage*. Constanta: Anticus Press, 41–51.
- 3-) IŞIK, Murat 2020a. ‘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.
- 4-) IŞIK, Murat 2020b. ‘Some Biblical Hebrew Influence on the Karaim Bible Translations: The Book of Leviticus, Gözleve Bible (1841). In: Balázs BALATONI and Dorottya MIHÁLYI *Mediterrán Tanulmányok XXX*. Szeged: University of Szeged, Department of Modern History and Mediterranean Studies, 115–130.
- 5-) IŞIK, Murat 2021a. ‘Some Unlisted Lexical Materials of the Gözleve Bible 1841’. In: István ZIMONYI (ed.) *Altaic and Chagatay Lectures : Studies in Honour of Éva Kincses-Nagy*. Szeged: University of Szeged, Department of Altaic Studies, 231–239.
- 6-) IŞIK, Murat 2021b. ‘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.