

später, unabhängig von ihm und auf ganz andern Wegen, habe ich die selbe Entdeckung gemacht. Dies ist für mich der Beweis, dass wir beide recht haben. Das Martyrium Jesajae ergänzt die spärlichen Angaben, die wir in den Pescharim und den Hodayot über die essenische Geschichte haben, in trefflicher Weise. Orte und Zeiten werden greifbar. So ist die "Lehrer"-Gemeinde vor Qumran vermutlich in Betlehem gewesen, und zwei Jahre war sie auf "dem Berg in der Wüste" = Qumran... In einem Gespräch mit dem amerikanischen Journalisten Wilson hat Flusser ausdrücklich diese "Tyrus-Sidon"-Stelle im Martyrium mit der Nordemigration eines Gemeindeteils in Verbindung gebracht.

A b s t r a c t

The "Babylonian Thesis" /that the Essenes immigrated into Palestine during the Maccabean period/ is here rejected. In order for pious Jews to emigrate from the Holy Land of God into the heathen land of the North, they needed a justification. This justification was based on: 1/ the Amos Midrash, where "Damascus" is named. 2/ the word מַחֲנֶה "camp": during the 40 year period of wandering in the heathen wilderness, God guided his people from camp to camp. 3/ the Martyrium Jesajae: the "Man of God" bade his followers to emigrate to the land of "Tyre and Sidon", as did the prophet, Elijah. The date and cause for the emigration are explained in the Habbakkuk Pesher. The emigrants were pious and very conservative. They rejected the Teacher of Righteousness because he was an arrogant leader, and made rules which contravened the Torah /monastic existence/. The Teacher is not named in the main body of the emigrants' writing, the Damascus Document /CD/. Later-perhaps after a fusion of the two opposing communities - a teacher-friendly "prelude" and "postlude" were added. The emigrants lived in a heathen environment and under heathen jurisdiction /the death-penalty/. They were opposed to the community in the South. They married and owned property. They lived in closed camps and were called to prayer by a trumpet. It is completely impossible that this trumpet called all Essenes in Palestinian cities and villages to the house of prayer.

FOLIA ORIENTALIA
Tome XXVff 1991
PL ISSN 0015-5675

Tapani HARVIAINEN

ABRAHAM FIRKOVITSH, KARAITES IN HIT, AND THE PROVENANCE OF KARAITE TRANSCRIPTIONS OF BIBLICAL HEBREW TEXTS INTO ARABIC SCRIPT

The name of *Abraham Firkovitsh* (1787-1874)¹ is well known among Orientalists. It is public knowledge that his name has been connected with forgeries of Hebrew inscriptions and manuscripts.

The controversy was launched by *A. Harkavy* one year after Firkovitsh's death – Harkavy was the librarian in charge of the Firkovitsh Collections in the Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg, which acquired the Collections in three parts in 1862-1876.² As a consequence, Firkovitsh himself had no opportunity to react to the variety of accusations which were directed against the authenticity of his material for very multifarious reasons.³

With the aid of ultraviolet photographs it has been demonstrated by *V.V. Lebedev* that among the manuscripts in the Firkovitsh Collections in the Saltykov-Shchedrin Public Library in St. Petersburg there are a number of colophons in which the date has been "aged" by partly erasing Hebrew *taw* so as to form the letter *resh*. Nevertheless, even the oldest of the forged dates – 885 A.D. instead of 1093 or 1096 A.D. – are not conclusive with regard to the apologetic ideology of Karaism put forward by Firkovitsh, who is said to have attempted to prove that the Karaites had arrived in Eastern Europe sufficiently early to be innocent of the blood of Christ.⁴

No evidence has ever been proposed to the effect that Firkovitsh was the person who corrected the colophons. Although lacking academic education in the field of Oriental studies, Firkovitsh was a passionate collector of Karaite, Jewish and Samaritan antiquities. He would not be the first or last victim of forgers and cunning dealers in Oriental curiosities.⁵ Firkovitsh's lack of scientific education is the weakest point in the allegations which aim to brand him as a systematic falsifier; in this rôle he had surely made errors to such a degree that the plot would have been uncovered soon and undeniably.⁶

Since the material dealt with in this article is not connected with the suspicions of fakery, there is no need to go into the tangled details of the Firkovitsh affair. In fact, the question of authenticity may be brought up in respect of no more than a few dozens of approximately 15,000 manuscripts and fragments in the Firkovitsh Collections.⁷

Firkovitsh's methods of acquiring manuscripts and other antiquities have not been clarified to the extent they deserve. This topic has also been the object of claims of unjust policy.

Firkovitsh's private letters also shed light on this aspect of his working habits; a great number of copies of the correspondence (written in Hebrew) are included in the manuscript collection Ф. 946, Фиркович А.С., Личный арх. (F. 946, Firkovitsh, A.S., personal archive) in the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library in St. Petersburg (Leningrad).⁸

In particular, the letters give a vivid picture of Firkovitsh's journeys in the Near East in 1863-1865. During these one and a half years he spent several periods in Jerusalem, whence he visited Aleppo, Nablus, and Cairo. In March 1864 Firkovitsh met with the famous traveller *Jacob Sappir* in Jerusalem and bought from him manuscripts and books which he enumerates in a letter to his son-in-law *Gabriel Firkovitsh*; according to Abraham Firkovitsh, these were brought by Sappir from "the land of Yemen". In the same letter he mentions again that two commissioners from the village of Hit, "from among our brethren the Karaites", had come to him (see below).⁹ Firkovitsh remained in contact with Sappir and sent him letters from Cairo.

During two visits to Cairo, Firkovitsh bought for one thousand roubles manuscripts preserved in the genizah of the Old Karaite Synagogue; it is this genizah which Firkovitsh calls *genizat miṣrayim*. The Rabbanite Ben

‘Ezra synagogue in Old Cairo (Fustat) was also known to Firkovitsh. Nevertheless, for one reason or another he obviously did not become acquainted with the manuscripts of this synagogue, the genizah of which was to become world-famous as *The Cairo Genizah*. However, a few texts in his collections may derive their origin from this place.¹⁰ Thus the common conception that the Firkovitsh Collections consist of material from the Cairo Genizah, in particular, is not based on fact.

Karaites in Hit and their Manuscripts

In a letter written from Jerusalem to Gabriel Firkovitsh,¹¹ Abraham Firkovitsh states: *we-hinneḥ ba'u šenayim šeluḥim peqidim mib-bene qh'h hit ke-pi biqqašti mehem me-‘ir ‘aram šobah* 'two emissaries, commissioners of the holy congregation in Hit, have arrived as I asked them when in Aleppo'.¹² The Karaites in Hit were inclined to leave their native town "for the waters have reached even to the soul" and to settle among their Karaite brethren in Jerusalem.¹³

Five days later, in the following letter to his son-in-law,¹⁴ Firkovitsh returns to the theme of the Karaite commissioners and the numerous manuscripts which according to these men are to be found in the homes and the genizah in Hit: *lo' 'arhiq nedod le-babel ki 'im miṣrayim*¹⁵ *ki b'h ba'u 'elay poh mik-kefar hit šenayim peqidim me-‘aḥenu bene miqra' ha-'obdim šam miz-zeman galut bet ri'šon wa-‘eš'al mip-pihem wa-ysapperu li ki yeš wa-yeš be-battehem u-bag-genizah harbe ketube yad.*

Firkovitsh gave the men 5,000 piastres (groush), equivalent to 250 Russian roubles, "for travelling expenses" on their way home. They should bring back to him "all the manuscripts, the complete and defective ones and even the torn and decomposed pages". With God's help the men had promised to bring the manuscripts to Jerusalem by the Feast of Weeks, and one day earlier they had set off on the long journey, "may G-d be with them".¹⁶ As mentioned above, Firkovitsh enumerates in the same letter the Yemenite books and manuscripts which he had bought from Jacob Sappir.

The archive also includes a copy of the letter sent with the emissaries to the Karaite congregation in Hit¹⁷ as well as a pencil draft of the letter.¹⁸ The congregation had estimated that 25,000 groush would be sufficient for the migration to Jerusalem. Firkovitsh reports that he has requested

financial support from the Karaite congregation in Constantinople and elsewhere; the rest he is willing to supply out of his own pocket. With the emissaries Firkovitsh sent the congregation books to be read before the move; others he promised to donate in Jerusalem.

As a recompense for the pains which he has taken in favour of the people in Hīt and for their benefit, Firkovitsh asks that "at just the moment when they arrive home, your congregation will deliver into the hands of the aforementioned two commissioners all of the manuscripts, the remaining survivors found in your possession, written on parchment and on paper, the old and the ancient ones, the complete and defective ones, the torn and decomposed ones, even pieces of sheets, every single one; it will be my recompense, and they will bring and hand them over to me here."¹⁹

When the emissaries are back in Jerusalem with the manuscripts, Firkovitsh promises to supply the congregation with 25,000 grouch for the migration to Jerusalem - provided that they bring him the manuscripts. Otherwise, he will deduct 4,000 grouch given to the emissaries "for travelling expenses in the public needs of your community".²⁰

I do not have at my disposal any document demonstrating that Firkovitsh received the manuscripts from Hīt. However, we know that the whole Karaite community of Hīt moved to Jerusalem, where, however, they soon became disappointed and decided to return to their native town.²¹ On the other hand, Harkavy states that Firkovitsh acquired approximately 500 "numbers" from Damascus, Aleppo, Jerusalem, and Hīt.²² Thus it seems probable that Firkovitsh was able to carry through the deal, although the Karaite community of Jerusalem did not receive the permanent reinforcements which Firkovitsh had hoped for.

Hīt was one of the last strongholds of the Karaites in Mesopotamia. Because of this status we may assume that the town served as a kind of genizah for the whole of Karaite Mesopotamia. The population had been small in number over quite a long period - the emissaries told Firkovitsh that there were a total of 67 "souls" in their congregation.²³

Karaite Transcriptions of the Bible into Arabic Script

The Firkovitsh Collections contain at least eighty manuscripts which include Biblical texts transcribed into Arabic consonantal script; in general,

the vowels (and accents, in part) have been indicated with Tiberian punctuation signs. Similar material is kept in the British Library, Cambridge University Library and in a few other collections.²⁴

Until now only one colophon has been detected in these transcriptions (MS British Library Or. 2554); it indicates that the text was written in 1004/5 A.D. in Ramla, Palestine. Several manuscripts are written with the same form of script and orthography. In addition, a number of phonetic (Tiberian) details²⁵ imply that the transcriptions reflect pronunciation habits which were characteristic of reading traditions of Hebrew in Palestine. On the basis of these observations, *Geoffrey Khan* has concluded that "most of the Karaite Bible transcriptions in the British Library and in the Genizah were the work of scholarly circles in Palestine before the destruction of the Palestinian Karaite centre by the Crusaders in 1099 or of Karaites in Egypt who had close contacts with the Palestinian Karaite community."²⁶

Firkovitsh's correspondence (see above) renders improbable the conception that a significant part of the Second Firkovitsh Collection derived its origin from the (Rabbanite) Cairo Genizah. In regard to the transcriptions in the British Library, the provenance of the material also is unclear: the manuscripts were purchased by the Trustees of the British Museum from *M.W. Shapira*, "the well-known antiquarian bookseller of Jerusalem" who had obtained the collection "partly at Hīt ... and partly at Cairo".²⁷

In *Festschrift Tsereteli*, I have described a Karaite Bible transcription (Second Firkovitsh Collection Apa6.-esp. 48) in which the Tiberian *pataḥ* and *segol* vowel signs have been used indiscriminately. Admittedly, the phenomenon is a characteristic feature of Hebrew reading traditions in Mesopotamia (Babel, Babylonia). The interchange of *šəwa*, *ḥaṭef pataḥ*, and *pataḥ* occurs in the same transcription. Besides being typical of Tiberian Hebrew, the feature is found in the late phases of Babylonian pointing systems (*babli benoni* and *babli ša'ir*), in which the majority of Babylonian peculiarities have been replaced gradually by Tiberian forms.²⁸

Although to a lesser extent, parallel Babylonian features occur in the transcriptions Second Firkovitsh Collection Apa6.-esp. 2 and 9. They also appear in the British material (see Khan 1990, esp. MS 5, p. 109, and MS 15, p. 163, occasionally also in other manuscripts) as well as in many Karaite Bible manuscripts in Hebrew script.²⁹

The Babylonian features testify that a certain group among the Karaites was accustomed to reading Hebrew in accordance with an eastern, Babylonian pronunciation in which there was a sole phoneme in place of Tiberian *pataḥ* and *segol*. Within Babylonian Hebrew there were different traditions and the influence of Tiberian Hebrew continued to increase. Alongside the interference of *pataḥ* and *segol* vowel signs, other Babylonian features are very few in the Karaite transcriptions. In regard to the provenance of this type of transcriptions, eastern communities of Karaites as well as immigrants from them to Palestine constitute the most natural solution – Mesopotamia and Persia were the principal areas of Karaite settlement in the early period of the movement in the 8th to the 11th centuries. Both Firkovitch and Shapira mention Hit as an important source of Karaite manuscripts. It is logical to presume that a great number of Karaite transcriptions with features of Babylonian Hebrew, in particular, come from the homes and genizah of Hit.

A Tiberian-Palestinian connection in a number of other transcriptions has been described above.

Besides these, however, we have to observe the transcriptions in which the vowels *šere* and *segol* are used indiscriminately. The manuscript British Library Or. 2555 is the most conspicuous proof of this type of reading tradition.³⁰ In MS Or. 2540 *šere* is represented by Arabic 'alif as well as by *yā'*, and in some words *šere* occurs in both spellings;³¹ the text seems to reflect a former stage of the loss of distinction between the vowels *šere* and *segol*. However, the distinction between *qameš* and *pataḥ* has been retained in both texts. As a consequence, these transcriptions can be compared with those Biblical texts with Palestinian pointing which reveal a parallel system of vocalism.³² Irrespective of date,³³ these two transcriptions testify that "Sephardized" reading traditions were also found among Karaites.

The Babylonian, Tiberian and "Sephardized" Palestinian features in Karaite transcriptions indicate that various reading traditions were accepted among the Karaite communities in the Near East in the 10th–13th centuries. In later periods, differences continued to exist between various language groups among the Karaites, while the differences between Karaites and their Rabbanite neighbours may have been levelled in areas inhabited by both groups.³⁴

The variety of pronunciation traditions in Hebrew can be interpreted to constitute the background for the discussion among Karaites of the authority of the text of the Bible. The "majority principle", consensus of the community, was argued by al-Qirḡisānī and his followers to guarantee the correctness of the original text and reading tradition as opposed to the "tradition principle" which derived the authority from the tradition of a small group of scholars.³⁵

The (obviously local) differences between Karaite reading traditions of Hebrew were more significant than has been thought. Thus the deliberation – although it did not result in a single reading tradition approved by the whole community of Karaites – was strongly motivated, and the decision could lead to practical results in the discussions of the reliability of the sacred scripts of different religions,³⁶ cf. Judah ha-Levi's *Kuzari* in which the harmony and uniformity of the Jewish reading tradition of Hebrew as well as the advantages of the Hebrew system of vowels and metrics have been referred to as strong arguments in favour of the adaptation of the Jewish religion before the King of the Khazars (II, 74–81, ed. Baneth, Jerusalem 1977, p. 82–89).

Karaite Transcriptions and Yemen

The Yemenite pronunciation traditions of biblical Hebrew resemble the eastern type of Karaite transcriptions³⁷ with regard of the majority of linguistic features. These include the lack of qualitative difference between *pataḥ* and *segol*, as well as between *ḥaṭef pataḥ* and *ḥaṭef segol*, all of which are realized as an [a] or [ä] vowel, the main realization of *šewa* as a vowel with an equal [a] or [ä] quality, the lengthening of *pataḥ* or *segol* which occurs in a stressed syllable³⁸ (in a number of traditions in *Šan'a* also in unstressed open syllables before a laryngeal, in a "strong syllable"),³⁹ the equal treatment of *qameš gadol* and *qameš qatan*, and the lengthening effect of *ga'ya* on vowels.⁴⁰ The preservation of all of the *begadkefat* distinctions seems also to be characteristic of Karaite transcriptions. In addition, it is important to observe that the typically Babylonian features are limited to the loss of distinction between *pataḥ* and *segol* in both types of biblical Hebrew.⁴¹

By contrast, the quantitative distinction between short and ultrashort (*ḥaṭef* and *ṣəwa*) vowels has been preserved in Yemen, while the use of "full" vowels in place of *ḥaṭafim* (and *ṣəwa*) is one of the peculiarities of Karaite transcriptions. With regard of the Babylonian-Yemenite realization of *holem* as an [ō] or [œ] vowel,⁴² the Hebrew pointing of transcriptions cannot express slighter degrees of centralization; there is no safe evidence of interference of *holem* and *šere* in these texts.

If there had been Karaite centres in Yemen, it is probable that at least some of the Karaite transcriptions with Babylonian features would have been written in that country. To the best of my knowledge, however, Karaism has never been an important movement in Yemen.

Thus, we must conclude that both traditions derive their origin from common sources. It is most natural to conclude that these were various forms of the late Babylonian reading tradition of biblical Hebrew. In this type of Hebrew, the majority of Babylonian peculiarities were replaced by their Tiberian counterparts with the exception of the *pataḥ* - *segol* interference. By contrast, the Sephardization of Hebrew reading traditions which was also to reach Mesopotamia had not yet affected either the Karaite writers of transcriptions in the East or the ancestors of Yemenite transmitters of biblical Hebrew.

Notes

¹ The date of birth of Abraham Firkovitsh (Elul 19, 5547 A.M., i.e. Sunday, September 2, 1787 A.D.) is now attested on the basis of his own note, see Lebedev 1990, p. 43 and n. 77.

² The First Firkovitsh Collection in 1862-1863, the Samaritan Collection in 1870, and the Second Firkovitsh Collection in 1876. Lebedev 1989, p. 154. The present name of the library is the M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library in St. Petersburg (Leningrad).

³ There should be no reason to hide the facts that while Firkovitsh was a Karaite, Harkavy was a rabbanite Jew, his main opponent Prof. David Chwolson (1819-1911) a Jew converted to the Russian Orthodox Church, and Hermann Strack, Harkavy's supporter in the beginning of the controversy, a Protestant Christian with missionary aspirations; Chwolson had been connected with accusations of plagiarism against Harkavy; Harkavy's nomination for a lectureship at the University of St. Petersburg was

cancelled; Harkavy and Deinard, a former Jewish assistant of Firkovitsh's, widened the controversy to a general anti-Karaite level. This kind of atmosphere was not very favourable to an unbiased search for truth in that period in Czarist Russia. Strangely enough, agitated sentiments can be perceived in the entries on these persons in the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* one hundred years later (1971). For Harkavy, his life (1839-1919) and literary output, see lastly Vikhnovits and Lebedev 1991.

Harkavy obviously compiled a monumental description of Arabic and Arabic-Hebrew manuscripts in the Firkovitsh Collections; the catalogue is said to contain 4000 or 6000 pages in manuscript form. The fate of the manuscript is unknown; the traces disappear together with the library of the Society for the Promotion of Culture among the Jews in Russia (Общество по распространению просвещения среди евреев в России) in the archives of the Ukrainian Academy of Science in the 1930's. For details, see the reports of Vikhnovits 1989 and 1991.

⁴ The irate description of Firkovitsh's ideology presented by Roman Freund in a recent doctoral dissertation on the basis of very few references (1990, p. 64-65) is instructive in respect of the evil reputation of Firkovitsh and his activity.

⁵ Cf. Lebedev 1987. Nissim Babalikašvili has published a preliminary study of the gravestones in the Karaite graveyard in Tshufut-Kale in the Crimea. According to him the oldest datings on the stones go back to the second half of the 10th century (956, 975 and 977 A.D.), see Babalikašvili 1987 (includes nine plates).

⁶ Without being excessively impartial, Szyszman (1975) has described the controversy from one viewpoint and aroused numerous questions [e.g. the contradictory studies of the Karaite cemetery in Tshufut-Kale in the Crimea (p. 202-204), common use of reagent liquids for reading the faded passages of manuscript texts (p. 207-208), peculiar actions by Harkavy as the person in charge of the Collections (p. 208-210) as well as Firkovitsh's lack of academic education) which demand arguments from those who consider the case settled.

⁷ See Lebedev 1987, p. 61. In the first place, the controversy focused on the epigraphic material from Tshufut-Kale and a number of colophons in Biblical manuscripts of the First Firkovitsh Collection, cf. Harkavy-Strack 1875, p. xix-xxiii, and Chwolson 1882, c. 37-54; the contents of manuscripts have been dealt with in scholarly discussion to a very small extent.

⁸ Lebedev's important article (1990) on the collecting activities of Firkovitsh is based on these letters as well as on the material kept in the State Archives of the Crimean District (Крымский областной государственный архив).

⁹ Ф. 946, No. 605, л. 21a-b; yom g' k' 'adar šeni trk'd (= March 29, 1864).

¹⁰ For details and sources, see Lebedev 1990, p. 35-41. Vilsker (1988, p. 391) quotes an enigmatic statement of Firkovitsh's: "hinneh 'elleh šeššet he-'alim 'ašer hoše'ti mim-maḥašakke ham-me'arah 'ašer be-bet ha-ḥayyim le-'aḥenu ha-rabbanim 'ašer be-miṣrayim ha-ḥadašah has-semukah le-šo'an miṣrayim" 'these are the six leaves which I

brought out of the dark places of the cave which is located in the graveyard of our brethren the Rabbanites in New Cairo, close to Egyptian Zoan (= Fustat). Thus there still remains to be solved the question of which were all the places whence Firkovitsh "brought out" manuscripts in Cairo.

11 Φ . 946, No. 605, л. 19a-b; yom h' yw' 'adar šeni trk"d (= March 24, 1864).

12 Firkovitsh had sent a letter from Aleppo to Hit (Φ . 946, No. 605, л. 20, in the letter to Hit: "šamaḥti ... bi-r'oti šeq-qibbaltem 'et 'iggarti").

13 In the same letter Firkovitsh tells his son-in-law that he had visited the place of the Temple (bet ham-miqdaš) and had entered the Dome of the Rock (ḥaram šarif), together with the commissioners of the Pasha in Jerusalem and the Russian consul as well as the commissioners from Hit.

14 Φ . 946, No. 605, л. 21a-b; yom g' k' 'adar šeni trk"d (= March 29, 1864).

15 'I shall not wander farther off to Mesopotamia but to Egypt.' The statement alludes to Firkovitsh's having given up his former plan to visit Baghdad, cf. Lebedev 1990, p. 43.

16 wa-'etten le-yadam ḥameššet 'alapim pi'aštere r'l gerušot we-li-m'ot rus r'n ruble kesep le-ḥoša'ot had-derek li-nsoa' le-betam le-habi' 'elay 'et kol ketube yad haš-šelemim we-ha-ḥaserim wa-'apillu had-dappim haq-qeru'im we-han-nirqabim u-mubṭaḥ 'elay ki be-'ezrat haš-šem, yebi'um poh yeru' le-ḥag haš-šabu'o' we-hem be-yom 'emol yaše'u mip-poh le-darkam ha-'arukkah yehi h' 'immam.

17 Φ . 946, No. 605, л. 20a-21a; yom " y' 'adar šeni trk"d (= Sunday, March 27, 1864). In this letter Firkovitsh mentions the names of these two men, Shelomo Lewi and Shabbetai Lewi; they had arrived in Jerusalem on Adar Rishon 5 (February 12).

18 Φ . 946, No. 554.

19 'ani mebaqqeš miq-qehilatkem šet-tittenu li-yde šene peqidim han-nal miy-yad wa-tekep be-haggi'am le-betam 'et kol ketube yad yeter hap-peleṭaḥ han-nimša'im bi-ydekem hak-ketubim 'al qelap we-'al neyar hay-yešanim we-han-nošanim haš-šelemim we-ha-ḥaserim han-niqra'im we-han-nirqabim 'apillu ḥatikot had-dappim 'ad 'eḥad we-hayah šekari, we-hem yabi'u 'otam we-yimseru poh le-yaday.

20 "le-ḥoša'ot had-derek be-šorke haš-šibbur šellakem." In the letter to Gabriel Firkovitsh quoted above, A. Firkovitsh mentions 5,000 grouch "for travelling expenses" given by him to the emissaries. Apparently the differences are intentional, according to genuine Oriental custom: the emissaries could make a profit of one thousand grouch in any case and the remaining 4,000 was now declared to be communal property.

21 According to Wolf Šur (Schur, *Maḥazot ha-ḥayyim*, Wien 1884, p. 66) quoted by Ben-Ya'aqob 1965, p. cccxix-cccxx.

22 Quoted by Lebedev 1990, p. 32-33.

23 Φ . 946, No. 605, л. 20a, cf. above, note 17. In 1869 there were twenty Karaite families in the town, in 1881 and in 1933 only ten families; the congregation obviously faded in the

1940's, see Ben-Ya'aqob 1965, p. cccxviii-cccxx; during the Talmudic period the town was called 'Iḥi dā-Qīrā, the inhabitants were Gentiles, see Oppenheimer 1983, p. 164-168.

24 For details, see Hoerning 1889, esp. p. i-ix, and Khan 1990, esp. p. 177-179.

25 Hoerning (1889) gives long lists of occurrences in which the accentuation (esp. *ga'yot*) of the transcriptions deviates from the Tiberian text. However, it is important to take note of the fact that Hoerning compared the transcriptions with the *textus receptus* edited by Baer and Delitzsch. Compared with the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Codex Leningradensis) the number of deviations is considerably more restricted.

26 Khan 1990, p. 16-19.

27 Hoerning 1889, p. i.

28 For details of the transcription, see Harviainen 1992.

29 Khan 1987, p. 27-28 and n. 13; Khan interprets the phenomenon as "the result of occasional interchange from the 'substrate' Eastern pronunciation of the scribe".

30 E.g. *kæ'n* as the counterpart of Tiberian *ken* and *hyowreydeṭ* = Tib. *hay-yoræḏæṭ*, see Khan 1990, p. 17-19.

31 E.g. *k'n* and *kyn* as the counterpart of Tib. *ken*, see Hoerning 1889, p. 7-8.

32 Revell, Classes 1 and 2, see Revell 1970, p. 73-82. In contrast to Tiberian North Palestine, these traditions could be located in Southern Palestine; in the process of "Sephardization" the distinction between *gameš* and *pataḥ* is more permanent than that of *šere* and *segol*; see Harviainen 1977, p. 109-125, and Khan 1990, p. 19 and n. 64.

33 Hoerning (1889, p. viii) and Khan (1990, p. 18-19) consider the MS Or. 2555 to be later than the other transcriptions.

34 In Egypt both groups follow a similar Sephardic reading tradition. Among Lithuanian Karaites the pronunciation of Hebrew deviates from the local Ashkenazi tradition decisively; it reveals interesting contacts with Tiberian Hebrew. See Khan 1990, 19 and n. 64, and Harviainen 1989-1990; I am grateful to Mr. Rami Saari for recording specimens of Egyptian Karaite Hebrew for me in Ramla.

35 See Khan 1990a.

36 The rise of the Tiberian Masoretic text as well as its rapid adoption among the entire Jewish population can be explained as resulting from a former stage of a similar "majority principle": the qualitatively superior Tiberian punctuation system and the completed Aleppo Codex constituted symbols which could be approved by the majority of Jewish readers as the unifying Holy Scriptures, see Harviainen 1977, p. 218-228.

37 In particular, I compare the Yemenite traditions with the manuscript Second Firkovitsh Collection Apa6. -esp. 48, see Harviainen 1992.

38 See Morag 1963, p. 119-127, 154-159, 178-182.

39 "habarah ḥazaqah", for details, see *ibid.*, p. 125-126.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 100-107, 193-205.

⁴¹ In Yemen post-biblical Hebrew discloses numerous other features which originate from Babylonian Hebrew.

⁴² See Morag 1963, p. 92-99.

Bibliography

- Babalikašvili, N.I., "О нескольких еврейскоязычных караимских эпиграфических памятниках из Чуфут-Кале." *Semit'ologiuri dziebani - Семитологические штудии*, III, Tbilisi 1987, pp. 5-12.
- Ben-Ya'acob (Ben-Jacob), Abraham, *Yehude Babel mis-sof tequmat hag-ge'onim 'ad yamenu*. Jerusalem 5725 / 1965.
- Chwolson, D., *Corpus inscriptionum hebraicarum*. St. Petersburg 1882.
- Freund, Roman, *Karaites and Dejudatization. A Historical Review of an Endogenous and Exogenous Paradigm*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis – Stockholm Studies in Comparative Religion, No.30. Stockholm 1991.
- Harkavy, A. – Strack, H.L., *Catalog der hebräischen Bibelhandschriften der Kaiserlichen Öffentlichen Bibliothek in St. Petersburg*. St. Petersburg 1875.
- Harviainen, Tapani, *On the vocalism of the closed unstressed syllables in Hebrew*. Studia Orientalia, 48:1. Helsinki 1977.
- Idem*, "De Karaitis Lithuaniae: Transcriptions of Recited Biblical Texts, Description of the Pronunciation Tradition, and Peculiarities of Shewa." *Orientalia Suecana*, XXXVIII-XXXIX, 1989-1990, pp. 36-44.
- Idem*, "A Karaite Bible Transcription with Indiscriminate Use of Tiberian pataḥ and segol Vowel Signs." *Serta Semitica et Philologica Constantino G. Tsereteli dicata*, ed. by Fabrizio A. Pennacchietti, Riccardo Contini and Mauro Tosco, Dipartimento di Orientalistica dell'Università di Torino (forthcoming 1992).
- Hoerning, Reinhart, *Six Karaite manuscripts of portions of the Hebrew Bible in Arabic characters*. London-Edinburgh 1889.
- Khan, Geoffrey, "Vowel length and syllabic structure in the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Vol. 32, 1987, pp. 23-82.
- Idem*, *Karaite Bible Manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah*. Cambridge University Library Genizah Series 9. Cambridge 1990.
- Idem*, "Al-Qirḡisānī's opinions concerning the text of the Bible and parallel Muslim attitudes towards the text of the Qur'ān." *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. LXXXI, 1990, pp. 59-73 (= Khan 1990a).
- Lebedev, V.V., "К источниковедческой оценке некоторых рукописей собрания А.С. Фирковича." *Палестинский сборник*, выпуск 29 (92), Leningrad 1987, pp. 57-63.

Idem, "Jidishe ksavjaden in der leningrader efentlekher bibliotek." *Sovetish hejmland*, 11/1989, Moskve 1989, pp. 154-158.

Idem, "Новые данные о собирательской деятельности А.С. Фирковича." *Восточный сборник ГПБ*, Выпуск 4, Leningrad 1990, pp. 32-44.

Morag, Shelomo, *ha-'Ibrit šeb-be-pi yehude Teman*. Jerusalem 1963.

Oppenheimer, Aharon, *Babylonia Judaica in the Talmudic Period*. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Reihe B (Geisteswissenschaften) Nr. 47. Wiesbaden 1983.

Revell, E.J., *Hebrew Texts with Palestinian Vocalization*. Toronto and Buffalo 1970.

Szyszman, Simon, "Centenaire de la mort de Firkowicz." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* (Congress Volume, Edinburgh 1974), Vol. XXVIII, 1975, pp. 196-216.

Vikhnovištš, V., "Vu gefint zikh Harkavis vikhtikste verk?" *Sovetiš Hejmland*, 3/1989, pp. 132-134.

Idem, "Где находится главный труд Гаркави?" *Sovetiš Hejmland - Советиш геймланд - Советская родина*, 2/1991, pp. 36-38.

Vikhnovištš, V.L. – Lebedev, V.V., "Avrom Jakovlevištš Harkavi." *Sovetiš Hejmland*, 4/1991, pp. 119-124.

Vilsker, L.H., "Неизвестные мēšālīm meḥōrāzīm (рифмованные притчи) или «Сёфер ха-хоумā» (книга мудрости) Са'ида бен Бабшада в Государственной публичной библиотеке им. М. Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина в Ленинграде." *Occident and Orient. A Tribute to the Memory of A. Scheiber*. Budapest-Leiden 1988, pp. 391-419.