

CANTICLES IN TRANSLATION:  
THE TREATMENT OF POETIC LANGUAGE IN THE GREEK,  
GOTHIC, CLASSICAL ARMENIAN, AND OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC GOSPELS

by

HUGO ENRIQUE MENDEZ

(Under the Direction of Jared S. Klein)

ABSTRACT

Biblical poetry is characterized by a marked syntax that prefers terseness and ambiguity of expression. These constraints imposed on later translators a unique set of challenges relative to passages of an unmarked style. For this reason, one cannot presume to describe the comparative syntax of the target language versions without some reference to the peculiar features of the poetry. Unfortunately, most treatments of the syntax of the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavic gospels assemble data without respect to subgenre. These analyses often proceed from unformed notions of what characterizes New Testament poetry, and offer explanations that misunderstand the significance of certain translation decisions reflected in the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic texts. In this study, I will model an alternative approach, providing a comparative descriptive syntax of passages within a single subgenre: poetry. I have limited my scope to the four Lukan canticles: the Magnificat (Lk. 1:46-58), the Benedictus (Lk. 1:68-79), the Gloria fragment (Lk. 2:14), and

the Nunc Dimittis or Song of Simeon (Lk. 2:29-32). This study will isolate the unique challenges imposed by the subgenre, and where possible, the subgenre-specific translation strategies of each target language version, specifically with respect to the treatment of individual marked language features. In certain places, the study is able to enrich or correct previous analyses of peculiar forms in these passages.

INDEX WORDS: Poetry, Canticles, Luke, Translation, Comparative syntax

CANTICLES IN TRANSLATION:  
THE TREATMENT OF POETIC LANGUAGE IN THE GREEK, GOTHIC,  
CLASSICAL ARMENIAN, AND OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC GOSPELS

by

HUGO ENRIQUE MENDEZ

B.A., Southern Adventist University, 2006

M.A. The University of Georgia, 2009

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree:

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2013

© 2013

Hugo Enrique Mendez

All Rights Reserved

CANTICLES IN TRANSLATION:  
THE TREATMENT OF LITURGICAL-POETIC LANGUAGE IN THE GREEK, GOTHIC,  
CLASSICAL ARMENIAN, AND OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC GOSPELS

by

HUGO ENRIQUE MENDEZ

Major Professor:	Jared S. Klein
Committee Members:	Keith Langston Jonathan Evans

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
August 2013

## DEDICATION

To my father and mother.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although many have shaped the final form of this study, I owe the greatest debt to seven individuals in particular. First and foremost, I would like to thank Jared Klein for his guidance over the past several years, and throughout the development of this study. His own reading of the Gothic Bible inspired this study, and I owe the final form and success of this dissertation to his willingness to read through drafts even during the summer months. But more to the point: no professor can ever command the respect and affection I feel for Jared. No other professor has required of me as much as he has.

Secondly, I owe a world of gratitude to Caylee Ott. Through months of research and writing, she has encouraged me, assisted me with editing, and patiently endured each day, week, and month of this project beside me. I owe her more than I could ever repay.

I must also thank the other members of my committee: Keith Langston and Jonathan Evans. In particular, I am grateful to Keith for his willingness to review and offer comments on my Old Church Slavonic chapter during the month of June. And of course, I cannot thank both enough for being willing to make a dissertation defense possible so late in the year. Special thanks are also due Frs. Adrian Pleus and Philip Scott, as well as Debbie Chisolm, all of whom have made outstanding efforts to support my education. Finally, and most of all, I must thank my mother and father. My Ph.D. is truly a gift of their generosity and sacrifices. For this gift, and innumerable others, I dedicate this study to them.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. GREEK.....	8
2.0. Introduction.....	8
2.1. Overview of Greek Syntax .....	15
2.2. Magnificat (Song of Mary).....	23
2.3. Benedictus (Song of Zechariah).....	54
2.4. Gloria (The Angelic Hymn).....	69
2.5. Nunc Dimittis (Song of Simeon).....	75
2.6. Conclusion.....	80
3. GOTHIC .....	91
3.0. Introduction .....	91
3.1. Overview of Gothic Syntax.....	93
3.2. Magnificat .....	99
3.3. Benedictus.....	111
3.4. Gloria.....	120

3.5. Nunc Dimittis.....	122
3.6. Conclusion.....	126
4. CLASSICAL ARMENIAN .....	138
4.0. Introduction.....	138
4.1. Overview of Classical Armenian Syntax.....	140
4.2. Magnificat.....	145
4.3. Benedictus .....	154
4.4. Gloria.....	164
4.5. Nunc Dimittis.....	167
4.6. Conclusion.....	171
5. OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC.....	182
5.0. Introduction.....	182
5.1. Overview of Old Church Slavonic Syntax .....	183
5.2. Magnificat.....	187
5.3. Benedictus.....	194
5.4. Gloria.....	202
5.5. Nunc Dimittis.....	205
5.6. Conclusion.....	208
6. CONCLUSION.....	218
REFERENCES.....	222

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Old Greek translations of Hebr. verb + preposition. ....	49
Table 2.2. Marked Language Syntax of the Magnificat.....	83
Table 2.2. Marked Language Syntax of the Benedictus.....	85
Table 2.4. Marked Language Syntax of the Gloria. ....	87
Table 2.5. Marked Language Syntax of the Nunc Dimittis. ....	88
Table 3.1. Gothic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Magnificat.....	127
Table 3.2. Novel poetic elements in the Gothic text of the Magnificat.....	130
Table 3.3. Gothic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Benedictus .....	131
Table 3.4. Gothic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Gloria.....	133
Table 3.5. Gothic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Nunc Dimittis.....	134
Table 3.6. Features Lost from the Marked Language of the Greek Canticles in the Gothic Canticles .....	136
Table 4.1. Categorical Equivalences between Classical Armenian and Greek Verbs.....	141
Table 4.2. Classical Armenian Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Magnificat .....	171
Table 4.3. Novel poetic elements in the Classical Armenian text of the Magnificat.....	174

Table 4.4. Classical Armenian Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Benedictus .....	175
Table 4.5. Classical Armenian Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Gloria.....	177
Table 4.6. Classical Armenian Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Nunc Dimittis .....	178
Table 4.7. Features Lost from the Marked Language of the Greek Canticles in the Classical Armenian Canticles .....	180
Table 5.1. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Magnificat .....	208
Table 5.2. Novel poetic elements in the Old Church Slavonic text of the Magnificat .....	210
Table 5.3. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Benedictus .....	211
Table 5.4. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Gloria ...	213
Table 5.5. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Nunc Dimittis .....	214
Table 5.6. Features Lost from the Marked Language of the Greek Canticles in the Old Church Slavonic Canticles .....	216

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, a number of theses and dissertations have been written at the University of Georgia that pursue a “comparative syntax of the three old Indo-European languages whose sole or major documentation at their earliest attested stages consists of Bible translations: Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavic” (Klein 1992a:340). Examples from recent years include Thomason 2006 and Pennington 2011. According to Jared S. Klein, the supervisor of these dissertations:

The thesis driving this project is that we have translations from the same original text, and therefore rather precise correspondence from language to language which can be used to produce a real, commensurate comparative syntax. Its antithesis is that the very nature of the translational mechanism, coupled with the sanctified status of the original Greek text, could lead to syntax which is slavishly imitative of the original and hence abnormal for the languages in question. The synthesis of these opposing positions involves a close internal study of the translations themselves in order to determine the validity of the original driving principle. (Klein 2012)

Of course, in the Greek text of the gospels, we find a variety of subgenres: most obviously narrative, but also others, including parable, prophecy, proverb, and aphorism. In a

number of passages, we also have pieces that are arguably an expression of “poetry,” including canticles, hymn fragments, and certain liturgical prayers. We identify this material as poetic because its linguistic presentation in the Greek text differs from that of the discourse that surrounds it (e.g., by structural peculiarities, phonaesthetics, etc.). Since that linguistic presentation is largely realized on the syntactic level, we say that the syntax of these passages is “marked” in one or more parameters. But if we identify a passage’s syntax as “marked” or “different,” we are suggesting that it cannot be described or treated in precisely the same manner as the language that surrounds it. We are admitting, for instance, that Greek’s use of complex sentence types or relative clauses may be constrained by a deliberate desire for compactness of style. But one cannot expect that every target language is capable of producing compactness of style in the same manner as the Greek. Likewise, we are admitting that the tense/aspectual choices of the Greek may be dictated by a variety of other genre-specific factors, including vividness of expression and non-semantic stylistic devices. But in that event, there is no guarantee that a translator could have captured these within the independent syntax of his own language or more narrowly, within his translation method (e.g., formal equivalence, functional equivalence, and possibilities between and beyond these).

There is, in fact, every reason to suspect that the poetic character of certain passages imposed on each translator a unique set of challenges relative to passages of a different, “unmarked” style. And in that case, one cannot presume to describe the comparative syntax of the target language versions without some reference to the peculiar features of the subgenre. Unfortunately, most treatments of the syntax of the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old

Church Slavic gospels assemble data without respect to subgenre. At best, a discussion of genre will appear in the analysis of a few outlying forms. However, as I will demonstrate in subsequent chapters, these analyses often proceed from unformed notions of what characterizes New Testament poetry, and offer explanations that misunderstand the significance of certain translation decisions reflected in the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic texts.

#### AIM OF THE STUDY

In this study, I will model an alternative approach, providing a comparative descriptive syntax of passages within a single subgenre: poetry. I hope to isolate the unique challenges imposed by the subgenre, and where possible, the subgenre-specific translation strategies of each target language version (specifically with respect to the treatment of individual marked language features). If successful, I expect I will be able to enrich or correct previous analyses of peculiar forms in these passages.

#### SCOPE OF THE STUDY

I have chosen to limit my analysis to the treatment of the so-called “canticles” of Luke. Concentrated in the infancy narrative of the gospel of Luke (chaps. 1-2), this set consists of:

1. The Magnificat or Song of Mary (Lk. 1:46-58)
2. The Benedictus or Song of Zechariah (Lk. 1:68-79)

3. The Gloria fragment (Lk. 2:14)
4. The Nunc Dimittis or Song of Simeon (Lk. 2:29-32)

I have selected these passages because a translator would have recognized their poetic character not only from (1) their linguistic presentation in the Greek, but also from (2) indications in the surrounding narrative that they are hymns or acts of praise, and (3) their historical performance as hymns in Christian ritual. For Byzantine Greek and Syriac-speaking Christians, as also for the Armenian, Slavic, and (in all likelihood<sup>1</sup>) Gothic peoples who inherited their traditions, pieces like the Nunc Dimittis (Lk. 2:29-32) were not merely portions of the biblical corpus but also poetic components of the divine office or liturgy. That is, they were performed more often than they were read within lections. Christian traditions of the first millennium typically configured these pieces within some modal system of chant, and in some cases, assigned them to melodies. On the other hand, other Gospel passages also employed poetically in Christian liturgy (e.g., the Beatitudes or Lord's Prayer) are not overtly cast as hymns within the Gospels. It is precisely the canticles, then, that should form the basis of any study of marked language in these Gospel versions.

For the Greek text, I have opted to use a modern critical edition: the 28<sup>th</sup> edition of Nestle-Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece*, released December 2012. Obviously, any critical edition is unlikely to represent the *Vorlage* available to the Classic Armenian, Gothic, and Old

---

<sup>1</sup> No extant records of the Arian liturgy or office exist. Still, one can safely presume that it would have preserved the liturgical use of canticles, attested for the rites with which it was in historical contact, especially the Byzantine and various Western rites.

Church Slavic translators. In subsequent chapters, it will at times be necessary to recover later Greek readings underlying peculiarities of the target language versions. Nevertheless, as a reconstruction of the *Urtext*, a critical edition is required when trying to determine the original intentions and decisions of the author of the Greek text. In theory, it also provides a neutral starting point for the study of later translations, and the textual traditions they represent.

Meanwhile, I have decided to reproduce the target language texts from manuscripts available online through PROIEL (Pragmatic Resources in Old Indo-European Languages), a project of the University of Oslo. PROIEL has developed a parallel corpus of the old Indo-European translations of the New Testament, precisely to facilitate their comparative syntactic and pragmatic study. In particular, I have opted to use the *Codex Argenteus* for the Gothic text, the Armenian Majority Text (Arm. 2) for my study of the Classical Armenian, and the *Codex Marianus* (compared to the *Codex Zographensis*) in my study of the Old Church Slavonic. These texts represent the most complete early editions of the Gospels in each language.

#### PLAN OF THE STUDY

To execute this sort of study, it will first be necessary to characterize the language of these passages in the Greek text. I will take up this task in Chapter 2. This will require (1) a general exploration of the features of biblical poetry from previous studies of the subject, and (2) an exhaustive study of the Greek text of these passages, with a special interest in peculiar

forms and structures best explained as “poetic” in light of (1). If I have succeeded in this goal, I will be able to provide a catalogue of the marked language features found in each canticle.

The impact of each feature on the translation syntax of the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic versions will occupy Chapters 3-5. I will begin by reviewing the categorical correspondences and deviations of the Greek and target language syntax. I will then proceed to an exhaustive study of the target language texts, with particular attention to their means of treating various points of Greek syntax, and most importantly, marked language forms and structures. (In practice, this phase will cast my study as a descriptive comparative syntax of the versions.) At the conclusion of each chapter, I will turn my attention exclusively to the treatment of marked language, addressing the following questions:

1. Does the target language version retain the same marked language features as the Greek text?
2. Are certain marked language features of the Greek better preserved than others? And if so, are these differences due to the constraints of each language’s native syntax, the capacity of the translator to recognize a given feature as marked, or the translation method employed in each version?
3. Is it possible to outline the translator’s approach to the types of marked language features encountered in the Greek text? That is, can one summarize his approach to a feature like “compactness” or “vivid tense use?”

It may also be possible to introduce a fourth question from our study of each target language version:

4. Are there instances where the translator has introduced new marked language features, perhaps reacting to the special character of these passages? For instance, are there instances where the translator has extended a poetic feature beyond its original scope, or deliberately increased the “vividness” of an expression by changing its grammatical form or position in the sentence?

These questions will allow me to identify the subgenre-specific translation strategies of each target language version.

Finally, a concluding chapter will summarize my findings, especially as regards: (1) the challenges of poetry as a subgenre, and (2) each translator’s treatment of this subgenre. I will conclude with an assessment of the benefits of a subgenre-specific analysis of the Gospels, and offer suggestions for future avenues of study.

## CHAPTER 2

### GREEK

#### 2.0. Introduction

In this chapter, I will explore the syntax of the Greek text of the canticles, with special attention to peculiar forms and structures best explained as “poetic.” I will thereby establish a point of reference in the source language for a comparative study of the Classical Armenian, Gothic, and Old Church Slavonic translations, developed in succeeding chapters. This will require a fairly exhaustive treatment of the syntax of the Greek text, which fortunately, is the most extensively studied of any of the versions. The latter fact is, of course, hardly surprising. Greek is the original language of Luke, and as such, the indispensable touchstone for the study of the canticles. Furthermore, a larger number of studies address the syntax of Greek than the syntax of Classical Armenian, Gothic, or Old Church Slavonic.

Significant studies of the Greek text of the canticles appear in monographs devoted to the hymns themselves (Farris 1985), to the infancy narrative that contains them (Brown 1993), and most voluminously, to the gospel of Luke entire (including dozens cited in the References section). Numerous articles supplement these studies, some with a more narrow focus on the structure, language and poetry of individual canticles (Tannehill 1974, Dupont 1980, Buth 1984).

#### SOURCE TEXT

As noted earlier, this chapter will examine the critical edition of the Greek New Testament contained in the 28<sup>th</sup> edition of Nestle-Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece*.

#### THE INFLUENCE OF HEBREW

As I will demonstrate below, the Greek and target language texts often differ in precisely those places where the Greek text shows unexpected forms and other syntactic peculiarities. One can explain most of these by reference to either: (1) the influence of the Hebrew<sup>2</sup> language on the Greek of the infancy canticles ("Hebraisms"), or (2) the marked language character of these passages as poetry. Peculiarities in the second category are of particular interest, since the marked language character of these passages is the basis for our interest in them. Nevertheless, few marked language features of the passages reflect known conventions of Hellenistic poetry. Rather, most are Semitic in origin, and in a certain sense, also represent a Hebraic influence on the Greek of the canticles.

In this chapter, the term "Hebraism" will embrace any and all expressions (1) mirroring features and constructions characteristic of the Hebrew language, and otherwise (2) abnormal, poorly attested, or unknown in Classical and non-Jewish Hellenistic Greek texts.

---

<sup>2</sup> Many early 20<sup>th</sup> century studies identified Aramaic as a significant influence on the language of the infancy narratives (e.g., Plummer 1902, Connolly 1936). This position rested partly on the assumption that Hebrew composition had died out by the first century C.E. (Laurentin 1956:452), an opinion laid to rest with the discovery of the Hebrew texts at Qumran. Rebuttals of the Aramaic view appear in: Sparks 1943, Horton 1978, Most 1982. Jung (2004:32) represents the modern consensus when he writes, "no clear example of Aramaisms is found in the infancy narrative."

These may directly reflect a Hebrew source via translation, the influence of Hebraized Greek texts (especially the Old Greek/LXX), or L1 interference in the author's own diction and style.<sup>3</sup> In general, I will avoid choosing between these options, as each of these conclusions must take into account the peculiar linguistic features of Lk. 1-2 as a whole.

Contemporary studies of the Infancy Narrative generally agree on two points. First, Lk. 1-2 conforms in many respects to the style and diction of Luke-Acts as a whole. Secondly, Lk. 1-2 contains a dramatically higher incidence of Hebraisms relative to the remaining material in Luke-Acts (Jung 2004:43). The following are the two most common interpretations of these features:

- (1) *The LXX Pastiche Theory*: Lk. 1-2 is an original Lukan composition deliberately written in a marked, hebraizing style (e.g., Cadbury 1968).
- (2) *The Translation Theory*. In this model, Lk. 1-2 is a redacted translation of an underlying Hebrew source (e.g., Laurentin 1956, 1957; Buth 1984; Farris 1985).

Excellent surveys of the arguments for each position exist in a number of sources, most especially: Jung 2004:5-44, Farris 1985:31-66. There is little need to duplicate them here. As the latter survey has succinctly stated:

---

<sup>3</sup> Many studies reserve the label "Hebraism" for expressions in the first and third categories, and prefer to identify expressions in the second category as "septuagintisms" (see survey in Jung 2004:45-58).

The difficulty of the problem can be more clearly appreciated when one remembers that the LXX itself is 'translation Greek'. Those who hold the linguistic character of the first two chapters of Luke is the result of deliberate imitation of the LXX are saying, therefore, that these chapters are 'imitation translation Greek'. Translation Greek or imitation translation Greek? This is the choice that faces those who investigate the literary origins of Luke 1-2.

It is impossible to address these questions solely from the limited passages of our study. A more comprehensive study of the language and sources of Lk. 1-2 is required, one necessarily outside the scope of this study.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, one should not interpret any comparisons I make between the language of the Old Greek and the language of the canticles as an affirmation of a literary relationship between the two. Nor do I mean to suggest direct translation activity when linking certain expressions to Semitic counterparts.

#### CHAPTER OUTLINE

At the outset of the chapter, I will provide an overview of the Greek syntax of the New Testament, and of Luke-Acts in particular (2.1). I will then discuss the Greek text of each canticle individually, in the order in which it appears in the infancy narrative of Luke: 2.2

---

<sup>4</sup>To pursue some of these questions would be to write a completely different dissertation. A limited treatment of the canticles themselves runs the risk of miscalculating the impact of later redactory activity on the hymns, even if they have a unique origin relative to surrounding material.

Magnificat (1:46-55), 2.3. Benedictus (1:68-79), 2.4. Gloria (2:14), and 2.5. Nunc Dimittis (2:29-32). A reproduction of a canticle's text will introduce each section, occasionally with text critical annotations in the footnotes.

At the outset of this analysis, it is important that I establish the marked language character of each canticle. To do this, I will first identify obvious poetic devices in the canticle (e.g., parallelism, rhyme, alliteration). This survey is not intended to be an exhaustive one. As we will see, other marked language features are evident upon a closer analysis of the syntax of each canticle, closely associated with such syntactic parameters as tense or word order. It is best to address those in our consideration of particular syntactic points in the hymns. Instead, in my preliminary discussion of the poetry of each canticle, I will focus singularly on marked language features that do not intersect with the syntactic categories I will review later in the hymn, but nevertheless establish beyond question the poetic character of each composition.

My treatment of particular syntactic points in each canticle will immediately follow, and thus, the descriptive syntax proper. I will address syntactic points within the canticles in the following order:

- A. Tense, Mood, Diathesis
- B. Use of the Infinitive
- C. Use of Participles
- D. Verbless Clauses
- E. Use of the Definite Article

- F. Case and Number Syntax
- G. Word Order
- H. Use of Conjunctions
- I. Complex Sentence Types
- J. Relative Clause Syntax
- K. Special Issues and Constructions

The sequence of topics moves roughly from a study of the verb (A, B, C), into a study of determiners and nominals (D, E, F), and concludes with miscellaneous topics, most related in one way or another to clausal construction (F, G, H, I, J, K).

Naturally, in this type of study, one is drawn to forms and constructions that receive disparate treatments in target language texts. Nevertheless, given the peculiarities and marked language of the canticles, areas of agreement between the translations can be at least as intriguing as areas of disagreement. Again, my aim is to provide a fairly exhaustive review of the syntax of the Greek text.

As a comparative study is not possible without a target language version, my discussion of certain categories will at times be more generalized than in later chapters devoted to the target language texts. In this chapter, I will offer only broad observations of the word order of each canticle, with some eye towards peculiarities in the Greek text. By contrast, discussions of “word order” in subsequent chapters will primarily focus on particular

instances in which the target languages deviate from the word order of the Greek (they generally imitate the word order of Greek).

## 2.1. Overview of Greek Syntax

Numerous studies provide comprehensive overviews of the Greek syntax of the New Testament, including: Moulton 1929, Dana 1955, Moule 1959, Blass and DeBrunner 1961 (hereafter, BDF), Zerwick 1963, Brooks and Winbery 1979, Porter 1992, Wallace 1996. Beyond these, one finds numerous publications devoted to some of the syntactic categories of interest to this study, including: Tense, Aspect, Mood, and Diathesis (Burton 1898, McKay 1994, Fanning 1990, Porter 1989, Decker 2001, Campbell 2007, 2008), the Use of Conjunctions (Bakker 1993), and Word Order (Radney 1984, Palmer 1995, Kwong 2005). Treatments of the Greek of Luke in particular are also plentiful, and include: Cadbury 1966, Argyle 1973-74, Delebecque 1976, Dawsey 1989, Davison 1989, Turner 1976, Kwong 2005.

In addition to these sources, one should not exclude studies of the syntax of the Old Greek/Septuagint. These provide a useful parallel to the hebraized Greek of the canticles. Conybeare and Stock 1905, Thackeray 1909 represent the classic overviews. Monographs or collections discussing the translation technique of, and particular syntactic issues within, the Old Greek are plentiful, and for illustration include: Soisalon-Soininen 1965, Aejmelaeus 1993, Sollamo 1995, Sipilä 1999, Evans 2001, Tjen 2010. Finally, devoted studies of the Old Greek psalter exist, potentially illuminating the Greek of the canticles (e.g., Pietersma 1976, Sailhammer 1991).

### TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

The Greek of Luke distinguishes three voices (active, middle, and passive), and four moods (indicative, subjunctive, optative, and imperative). Luke is, in fact, one of the few New

Testament writers to use the optative, if still rarely (Bovon 2002:5). Optatives appear in the infancy narrative in 1:29, 38, 62. The Greek of the New Testament also distinguishes six tenses: aorist, present, imperfect, future, perfect, and pluperfect. Only four of these tenses appear in non-indicative verbs (aorist, present, perfect, and rarely the future), and only three appear in the canticles (aorist, present, future).

Of these categories, tense has attracted the most significant attention in recent decades. Of particular interest is the importance of verbal aspect in the range and uses of Greek tenses, a field of study renewed by three significant studies: Porter 1989, Fanning 1990, and Campbell 2007, 2008. Where Fanning pursues a tense/aspect analysis of the Greek tenses, Porter and Campbell propose a spatial/aspectual analysis. The former approach sees tense as a means of encoding temporal reference or sequence. Distinctions are made in time: e.g., past, present, future.<sup>5</sup> By contrast, a spatial/aspectual analysis sees tense as a means of encoding a semantic value of remoteness or non-remoteness (i.e., proximate) relative to the speaker. Such a system communicates temporal reference only on the pragmatic level (Campbell

---

<sup>5</sup> Buist Fanning (1990)'s model aptly illustrates this type of analysis. Fanning identifies two verbal aspects in Greek: the perfective (perfect, aorist, pluperfect) and the imperfective (present, imperfect). Tenses participating in this aspectual system have either a present (perfect, present) or past (aorist, pluperfect, imperfect) temporal reference. The perfect and imperfect are further marked as statives. According to Fanning, the future stands outside this aspectual system, but communicates future tense. In the case of non-indicative verbs (subjunctive, optative, participles, and infinitive), the aspectual value of the aorist, present, and perfect is determinative for the meaning of forms in each tense, while temporal reference plays, at best, a secondary role.

2008:6), and sees no difficulty in the lack of clear temporal reference in non-indicative verbs.<sup>6</sup>

Additional discussions of the debate, and of verbal aspect in general, appear in the following essays: Carson 1993, Porter 1996, Fanning 1993, Silva 1993, Schmidt 1993.

#### USE OF THE INFINITIVE

Greek distinguishes between aorist, present, perfect, and future infinitives. Certain infinitives take a genitive article τῷ with no semantic impact (Burk 2006). Non-articular and articular infinitives appear to be interchangeable in the canticle, and indeed, the gospel (Farris 1985:138). The use of τῷ before an infinitive is common within Lukan texts, with 19 occurrences in Luke, and 17 in Acts (Zerwick 1963 § 386, Marshall 1978:92). In series of infinitival clauses, Luke generally omits τῷ before the first infinitive, but includes it before the others (Zerwick 1963 § 385). In these instances, the article probably indicates the complementary character of the second infinitive (cf. Marshall 1978:93). Significantly, BDF § 400.6 associates the phenomenon with “passages with an OT cast,” the style of the canticles.

---

<sup>6</sup> Stanley E. Porter (1989) identifies three aspects in the indicative: the perfective (aorist), Imperfective (present, Imperfect), and Stative (perfect, Pluperfect). He distinguishes the Imperfect and Pluperfect tenses from the present and perfect by a semantic value of [+ remoteness]. Moreover, he identifies the future as “not fully aspectual,” grammaticalizing the semantic feature [+ expectation]. Constantine R. Campbell (2007, 2008), on the other hand, identifies only two aspects in the aspectual system of Greek: perfective (aorist, future) and Imperfective (perfect, present, Imperfect, Pluperfect). (Notably, Campbell’s data is collected primarily from Luke.) He distinguishes the tenses of the Imperfective by a four-way spatial distinction: heightened proximity (perfect), proximity (present), remoteness (Imperfect), and heightened remoteness (Pluperfect). Campbell believes the aorist participates in his spatial system (remoteness), but not the future, which encodes a true temporal reference (i.e., it is a true tense). An extended critique of Campbell’s views appears in Porter 2011:46-54.

Wifstrand 2005:40 identifies the use of τοῦ as an influence of the Old Greek, where it occurs with high frequency, often capturing Hebr.  $\ell^- + \text{Inf}$ . (as in Jer. 11:5 above).<sup>7</sup>

#### USE OF PARTICIPLES

Greek participles appear in present, aorist, and perfect stems, and are inflected according to number, case, and gender. They can function as substantives, adjectives, or adverbs.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

Although they are especially frequent in Hebrew and Aramaic, verbless clauses are also legitimate and well-attested constructions of Greek (Porter 1992:287). One should not presume the influence of a Semitic language in the construction of a verbless clause except in instances in which the clauses parallel an attested formula in a Semitic language text or Greek translation of a Semitic language text (e.g., the Old Greek).

#### USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Most substantives take definite articles in the Greek text of the canticles. Anarthrous substantives can have either an indefinite, qualitative, or definite force, the latter value restricted to such instances as: proper names, prepositional objects, object complements, genitives to anarthrous nouns, as well as monadic, generic, and abstract nouns (Wallace 1996:243-254).

---

<sup>7</sup> In fact, Jones 1968:32 identifies the τοῦ δοῦναι of v. 73b with Hebr.  $\ell^- + \text{Inf}$ .

## CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

Case syntax is a feature of Greek nouns, pronouns, adjectives, determiners, and participles. Greek distinguishes five cases: nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, and vocative. The Greek genitive has absorbed the functions of the Proto-Indo-European ablative, while the Greek dative harbors the functions of the locative and instrumental (Woodard 2008:24). The Greek of the New Testament also distinguishes three genders (masculine, neuter, and feminine), and two numbers (singular and plural). The dual of the Classical language disappeared in the Hellenistic period; it is absent in both the Old Greek (Conybeare and Stock 1905:25) and the New Testament (Brooks and Winbery 1979:1). Finally, most proper names in the canticles are indeclinable.

## WORD ORDER

Greek is a pro-drop language, often lacking an expressed subject. The unmarked structure of Greek independent clauses with an expressed subject is Subject first (Porter 1992:295-97, Kwong 2004:48, 62<sup>8</sup>), though the flexibility of Greek syntax permits other arrangements. Dependent clauses are generally predicate-initial, except when they take complements, in which case they are often subject-initial (Kwong 2004:53-56, 62). Relative clauses with a relative pronoun for an expressed subject are subject-initial (Porter 1992:295). In infinitival clauses with an expressed subject, the clause structure is either (aorist) predicate + subject, or subject + (aorist) predicate (Kwong 2004:62). Complements generally follow their

---

<sup>8</sup> Kwong 2005 is especially relevant as a study of the word order of Luke in particular.

predicates, except in embedded clauses. (Kwong 2004:60-62). Finally, word order can be affected by the presence of postpositives, including γάρ, which characteristically occupy the second position in a clause or phrase (Porter 1992:288).

In New Testament Greek, “the governing (head) or main term has a definite tendency to precede its modifier” (Porter 1992:292) In Luke, this tendency is especially consistent with respect to the position of: a genitival modifier relative to its governing substantive (99%), a relative clause to its referent (96%), and a prepositional object to a preposition. Less consistency is observed in Luke’s arrangement of adjectival modifiers relative to substantives (75% head-initial), and demonstratives relative to substantives (78% head-initial; compare 85% for the Pauline epistles; Davison 1989:22-24).<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, determiners precede substantives in New Testament Greek (Porter 1992:288).

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

In the canticles we will encounter four conjunctions: καί, ὅτι, δέ, and γάρ. The first, καί, is a simple coordinating conjunction. It is used frequently in parataxis to introduce clauses, and is equivalent in that respect to the Hebrew *w<sup>e</sup>*- (*waw*). The second conjunction, ὅτι, is a clause-initial subordinating conjunction characteristically governing verbs in the indicative mood. The last two conjunctions are postpositionals (γάρ is an enclitic). The first, the particle δέ, is especially frequent in the New Testament, and can be used in association with another

---

<sup>9</sup> Davison 1989 examines the word order of Luke-Acts in particular, making it especially relevant for our studies.

conjunction (in the canticles,  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ). It primarily communicates the distinctive character of the clause in which it is set, vis-à-vis some element of the preceding clause. In this function, it can be contrastive, signal a shift in focus, but at times seems to express no more than a simple coordinating function. Lastly,  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  can function in either a coordinating or subordinating manner (Wallace 1996:669). Per Wackernagel's Law, this conjunction characteristically occupies the second position in a sentence (Comrie 1998:90).

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

As this heading largely embraces conjunctive subordinate clause types, it is only natural that it should follow a discussion of the conjunctions in the canticles. Only one of these types appears in the canticles: the causal clause ("for, since"), which in the instances utilizes  $\delta\tau\iota$  + an indicative verb.

#### RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

Relative clauses are subordinate clauses qualifying, and grammatically dependent upon, a referent in the main clause (typically, an noun or noun phrase). The Greek of the canticles only employs the definite relative pronoun  $\delta\varsigma$  when introducing such clauses. In Greek, the relative pronoun agrees with the number and gender of its main clause referent, but its case is determined by its syntactic function in the relative clause (Wallace 1996:335ff.).

## SPECIAL ISSUES AND CONSTRUCTIONS

This final category highlights additional syntactic issues that lie outside the purview of the other syntactic category headings. It is not, therefore, suited for a broad or general overview. In this chapter, it will explore a variety of peculiar constructions in the Greek text, which are not necessarily problematic in the Classical Armenian, Gothic, and Old Church Slavonic versions. In the target language chapters, it will also highlight a variety of special issues, including lexical differences and non-one-to-one relationships between the source and target language texts unexplored under other headings (e.g., idioms, free renderings, omissions, additions).

## 2.2. Magnificat (Song of Mary)

TEXT

Lk. 1:46b-55<sup>10</sup>

<sup>46b</sup>Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχὴ μου τὸν κύριον,

<sup>47</sup>καὶ ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνευμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτήρῳ μου,

<sup>48</sup>ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ.

Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριουσίην με πάσαι αἱ γενεαί:

<sup>49</sup>ὅτι ἐποίησέν μοι μεγάλα ὁ δυνατός,

καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,

<sup>50</sup>καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς

τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν.

<sup>51</sup>Ἐποίησεν κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ,

διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερηφάνους διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν:

<sup>52</sup>καθεῖλεν δυνάστας ἀπὸ θρόνων

καὶ ὑψώσεν ταπεινοὺς,

<sup>53</sup>πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν

καὶ πλουτοῦντας ἐξάπέστειλεν κενούς.

---

<sup>10</sup> Following the format of Nestle-Aland 28, this presentation of the canticle is broken into simple couplets. Note that this presentation makes no attempt to identify parallel or subordinate elements across couplets, nor does it recognize larger units in the text (i.e., strophes/stanzas).

<sup>54</sup>ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ,

μνησθῆναι ἐλέους,

<sup>55</sup>καθὼς ἐλάλησεν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν,

τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

#### SECTION NOTES

There are no constructions that will require additional discussion under the heading “Lexical Differences and Special Constructions.” Accordingly, we will omit that heading in our discussion of the canticle. Any extraordinary forms can and will be addressed under one of the other syntactic category headings included in this chapter.

#### MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

The canticle displays the characteristic features of a biblical “hymn” or “song of rejoicing” (Gunkel and Begrich 1998:22-23, 55). Its first line has clear parallels in poetic hymns throughout the Bible, most especially 1 Sam. 2:1. The second line of the canticle is a motive clause, “one of the most certain and easily recognizable characteristics” of the hymns of the Hebrew Bible (Gunkel and Begrich 1998:29, Westermann 1981:102ff.).<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> See Farris 1985:67-85 for a historical survey of the form criticism of the Lukan canticles.

### *Parallelism*

The most outstanding poetic device in the canticles, as in biblical psalmody as a whole, is parallelism. Of course, as noted earlier, the mere presence of parallelisms in a passage is not a sufficient basis to establish the “poetic” or marked language character of the entire piece. As Kugel 1981:63 observes, “the same traits that seem to characterize Hebrew ‘poetry’ also crop up in what is clearly not poetry” throughout biblical literature. “There is a continuum of elevated style in the Bible,” anchored at one extreme by truly poetic compositions, but also realized to a limited extent in prose material (Berlin 1985:5). Accordingly, one finds parallelisms even in ostensibly prose sections of the first chapter of the infancy narrative (e.g., 1:14, 17b, 35a, 42).<sup>12</sup> What distinguishes the Magnificat from these sections is, therefore, “not parallelism per se, but the predominance of parallelism, combined with terseness,” to borrow Adele Berlin’s definition of biblical poetry (1985:5).

The “predominance of parallelism” in the canticle is obvious; the bulk of its material is set in parallel lines (vv. 46b-47, 51-53, 55; full exploration in Tannehill 1974). The first of these parallelisms, a synonymous couplet (vv. 46b-47), introduces the hymn itself. This couplet is a useful illustration of the grammatical and semantic dimensions of biblical parallelism. Both of its codas observe a VSO word order, introduced by complementary verbs (μεγαλύνει || ἠγαλλίασεν). Following these verbs are equivocal synecdochic expressions (ἡ ψυχὴ μου || τὸ

---

<sup>12</sup> Brown 1993 arranges all these parallelisms as lines of poetry in his translation of the chapter. Fitzmyer 1981 does the same only in the case of v. 42.

πνεῦμά μου) periphrastically indicating a first singular personal subject (Marshall 1978:82).<sup>13</sup>

The two phrases are even construed identically, with a nominative article, nominative noun, and first singular possessive pronoun. Object phrases, both invoking God, conclude the two lines (τὸν κύριον || ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτήρι μου). The next parallelism in the hymn is a synthetic parallelism, describing a divine action (v. 51a) and its consequence (v. 51b; Kugel 1981:4-5 labels this type “Sequence of Actions”). Following this verse are two antithetical couplets (vv. 52-53). Finally, the hymn concludes with a synonymous couplet, explored in greater detail in our examination of the canticle’s Case and Number Syntax.

Other (sometimes oblique) forms of “parallelism” exist in the hymn, beyond the couplet structures surveyed above. Two consecutive ὅτι clauses in the canticle parallel one another at least structurally (vv. 49, 50). Furthermore, the complementary character of vv. 49b, 50b, and 54b support the most fundamental notion of biblical parallelism as a means of expressing: “A is so, and what’s more, B” (Kugel 1981:23, 45). Once these verses are analyzed as distinct codas, the entire hymn breaks into an even number of lines of similar, though not identical, length (i.e., “balanced’ in length or rhythm”; Berlin 1985:7).

### *Terseness*

Returning to Berlin’s (1985:6) definition, biblical poetry is defined not only by “the predominance of parallelism,” but parallelism “combined with terseness.” This “terseness” or

---

<sup>13</sup> The two nouns are also used synonymously in Job 12:10, Is 26:9. For “my soul” and “my spirit” used synonymously with a first person subject, see Ps. 57:4 [LXX Ps. 57:5] and Ps. 77:3 [LXX 76:4], respectively.

“compactness” is partly manifest in the use of a paratactic style throughout the psalms (“rarely is a subordinate relationship indicated on the surface of the text”; Berlin 1985:6). In the Magnificat, most clauses are loosely associated by the conjunction *καὶ* (vv. 47, 49b-52b, 53b), if they are associated at all. Absent, for instance, is the relative pronoun *οὗ*. This style is undoubtedly a marked language feature, as it departs from the Luke’s persistent rejection of parataxis in his sources.<sup>14</sup> The compact style of the Magnificat is also evident in its avoidance of attributive adjectives and certain other adjuncts.

As we will see below, this compactness often produces ambiguity in the Greek text. A compact style forces “the reader to ‘consider the relations for himself’ and to ‘invent a variety of reasons’ to explain” them (Empson 1961, 25). In this light, some of the syntactic difficulties and peculiarities we will encounter in our study of the Greek text owe a great deal to the marked language character of each canticle.

#### *Chiasmus, Rhyme, Hypograms*

A number of additional poetic devices converge in vv. 52-53. As noted earlier, each of these two verses represents an antithetical couplet, contrasting divine favor and disfavor (favor upon: *ταπεινούς, πεινῶντας*; disfavor upon: *δυνάστας, πλουτοῦντας*). The resulting complementary relationship between vv. 52 and 53 creates a higher-level “synonymous parallelism between the two verses.” (Tannehill 1974:273). This parallelism is enriched by the

---

<sup>14</sup> Luke consistently “replaces Mark’s monotonous parataxis with hypotaxis (subordinate clauses)” in passages adapting Markan material (Bovon 2002:5), introducing genitive absolutes and relative clauses (Fitzmyer 1981:108)

chiastic arrangement of the themes of disfavor and favor into an ABBA tetracolon (cf. 1 Sam. 2:5; see discussion of type in Watson 1994:341). Within this chiasm, the theme of favor occupies the privileged, innermost position (B-B'):

Lk. 1:52-53

A      καθεῖλεν δυνάστας ἀπὸ θρόνων  
B              καὶ ὑψωσεν ταπεινούς,  
B'      πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν  
A'              καὶ πλουτοῦντας ἐξάπέστειλεν κενούς.

A      He casts down (-) the mighty from their thrones  
B              And he lifts up (+) the lowly.  
B'              The hungry he fills with good things (+),  
A'      And the rich he sends away (-) empty.

In the above visual scheme, the chiasm seems to iconize the “casting down” and “lifting up” of the classes mentioned in v. 52.<sup>15</sup>

Reinforcing this structure is the chiastic arrangement of verb and direct object in vv. 52b and 53a, that is, across the acme of the chiasm: ὑψωσεν ταπεινούς (VO) // πεινῶντας

---

<sup>15</sup> In the Psalms, chiasms can also iconize the theme of reversal in general, or can heighten the contrast between the two classes (Watson 1994: 370-373).

ἐνέπλησεν (OV). Where vv. 52a,b share a common VO structure, the shift to OV in v. 53a continues into v. 53b. This shift creates another dimension to the chiasmic structure, in which verb-object order interacts with the themes of favor and disfavor:

v. 52	[- favor V]	+	[+ privileged O]
	[+ favor V]	+	[- privileged O]
v. 53	[- privileged O]	+	[+ favor V]
	[+ privileged O]	+	[- favor V]

This alternation adds greater complexity to the ABBA presentation of the themes of favor and disfavor.

Significantly, the switch from VO to OV at the junction of vv. 52 and 53 also juxtaposes the two favored classes (ταπεινούς / πεινῶντας) at the center of the overall chiasm, heightening their prominence and unity.<sup>16</sup> An obvious alliterative effect is also realized in this arrangement, deepening the poetic effect of the structure (Tannehill 1974: 273). However, the similarity between the words ταπεινούς and πεινῶντας is far deeper than mere alliteration. The two are perhaps best considered a “non-consecutive partial hypogram,” in which one word contains limited elements of another word in non-consecutive sequence (Klein 2005:141-142).

---

<sup>16</sup> The juxtaposition of the innermost elements of a chiasm at the chiasm’s juncture is a feature of other ABBA tetracolons in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., *bo’rôṭ / bo’roṭ* in Jer. 2:13: “they have dug their own cisterns / cisterns that cannot hold water”).

The unity of the two verses is consolidated by the appearance of an ABAB isoptoton in the tetracolon, with a rhyming effect.<sup>17</sup> This isoptoton is determined by inflectional endings concluding every other line: masculine genitive plurals in -ων and masculine accusative plurals in -ούς (Tannehill 1974:273):

Lk. 1:52-53

- A       καθεῖλεν δυνάστας ἀπὸ θρόνων
- B               καὶ ὕψωσεν ταπεινούς,
- A'       πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν
- B'               καὶ πλουτοῦντας ἐξάπέστειλεν κενούς.

In a highly inflected language, there is some risk in identifying any isoptoton as deliberate. Nevertheless, (1) the concentration of two examples in one tetracolon, (2) the unusual ordering of objects supporting that isoptoton, and (3) the unity of the entire tetracolon (through such poetic features as parallelism and chiasm) suggests that a deliberate stylistic device is possible in this instance.

#### TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

At this point, we can begin our study of the syntax of the Greek text of the Magnificat, beginning with an analysis of the tense, mood, and diathesis of finite verbs. All finite verbs in

---

<sup>17</sup> Isoptoton refers to the alignment of identical case forms. See Klein 2002 for a discussion of related phenomena.

the canticle appear in the indicative mood. Most appear in the active voice, with the exception of the middle ἀντελάβετο in v. 54.

*vv. 46b-47*

In the first two lines of the hymn, a present verb (μεγαλύνει v. 46b) stands opposite an aorist (ἠγαλλίασεν; v. 47) in a synonymous parallelism.<sup>18</sup> Of these two verbs, the aorist attracts more attention in the literature. Fitzmyer 1981:366, following BDF § 333.2, misidentifies ἠγαλλίασεν as a gnomic aorist. This type, rare in Hellenistic Greek, appears in vv. 51-53 of the hymn (see below). Nevertheless, as Fanning 1990:279-80 notes, ἠγαλλίασεν “does not fit the features of the gnomic,” which embraces “universal occurrences of the event” and regularly appears with “features of proverbial statement, such as nouns with generic articles, indefinite noun or pronoun reference” (266; cf. vv. 51-53). Instead, Fanning 1990:278-80, Wallace 1996:565 identify ἠγαλλίασεν as one of the few New Testament examples of a dramatic aorist, or an “aorist of present state.” Per Fanning 1990:276-79; Black 1967:129, a dramatic aorist here would represent a Hebraism, capturing qualities of the stative perfect (a type emphasizing a present condition resulting from a past, completed action). The Old Greek translates some 47% of Hebr. perfects with a present or future value as aorists (Thompson 2005:37-40). Four such

---

<sup>18</sup> As De Long 2009:146 notes, “wherever μεγαλύνω conveys praise of God in the LXX, it shares the stage with joy” (with ἀγαλλιᾶω: LXX Pss. 19:6-8; 34:27; 39:17; 69:5; 91:5-6; 125:2-3).

aorists appear in the first line of the Song of Hannah, an obvious template for the phrasing of Lk. 1:46a-47<sup>19</sup>:

1 Sam [LXX 1 Kgdms] 2:1

στερεώθη ἡ καρδία μου ἐν κυρίῳ (AOR. PASS. 3 SG.)

ὑψώθη κέρας μου ἐν θεῷ μου (AOR. PASS. 3 SG.)

ἐπλατύνθη ἐπὶ ἐχθρούς τὸ στόμα μου (AOR. PASS. 3 SG.)

εὐφράνθη ἐν σωτηρίᾳ σου<sup>20</sup> (AOR. PASS. 1 SG.)

My heart has exulted in the Lord

My horn has been exalted in my God

My mouth has been enlarged against my enemies,

Because I have been gladdened in your salvation.

---

<sup>19</sup> Three other possible models for Lk. 1:46-47 employ Hebr. imperfects. The Old Greek will translate as futures (LXX Ps. 68:31: μεγαλυνῶ αὐτόν; LXX Ps. 35:9: ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ μου ἀγαλλιάσεται ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ; LXX Hab. 3:18: ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ ἀγαλλιάσομαι χαρήσομαι ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου).

<sup>20</sup> One must avoid models that absolutely require a Semitic original for the Magnificat, for which no convincing evidence exists. On this ground, Fitzmyer 1981:366 rejects the related proposal that aorist in v. 47 renders an original Hebr. perfect + *waw*-consecutive (as in Zerwick 1963 § 260, Joüon 2006 § 118r, Schürmann 1982:73, Marshall 1978:82).

This explanation is compelling, especially in light of 1 Sam. 2:1. However, it still fails to explain why a dramatic aorist should appear after the straightforward use of a present in Lk. 1:46b. Why not render both verbs as dramatic aorists, especially with 1 Sam. 2:1 as a model?

Brown 1993:336 interprets the tense shift as a means of contrasting the two verbs. Of course, in light of the joyful tone of the hymn, it is inconceivable that the aorist indicates a strictly past experience of rejoicing vis-à-vis the present praising in v. 46b (as Bovon 2002:60 suggests). Klein 1992a:368 suggests that the aorist “denotes a past so recent as to be directly contiguous with the present” (i.e., anterior). Nolland 1990:69, Brown 1993:336, on the other hand, speculate that the aorist may carry a distinct, ingressive value vis-à-vis the present verb, highlighting Mary’s past entrance into her current state of rejoicing. In both proposals, the choice of the aorist stresses a past event as the basis of Mary’s rejoicing: Mary now “praises” God, but continues to “rejoice” in, and after, the Annunciation (De Long 2009:146).

There is merit in one aspect of this approach. Like the Hebr. stative perfects in 1 Sam. 2:1 (and by extension, the Greek aorists that translate them), the aorist in v. 47 has some view towards a past event. (This is apparent even from the narrative context of the canticle.) But is this quality a point of contrast between ἠγαλλίασεν and μεγαλύνει? Is Mary’s attitude of praise not also rooted in the same past event as her rejoicing?<sup>21</sup> Given the significant parallelism

---

<sup>21</sup> This point can be explored a different way. Klein 1992a, Brown 1993 focus on the peculiarity of the aorist. But if the Old Greek of 1 Sam. 2:1 (with its string of dramatic aorists) shapes Lk. 1:46b, which it certainly seems to at face value, the peculiar feature of vv. 46b-47 may be the present verb. (It certainly stands out in a canticle otherwise relying almost exclusively on dramatic and gnomic aorists.) Why then introduce a present verb here? To exclude associating Mary’s attitude of praise with the past event makes little sense.

between vv. 46b and 47 in other respects, Farris 1985:117-18, Fitzmyer 1981:366 conclude that the verbs in each line function in precisely the same manner. I am inclined to agree with them.

Tense shifting within synonymous parallelisms is a well-documented phenomenon of Hebrew poetry (Berlin 1985:35-36, Kugel 1981:17ff., Dahood 1970:420-24), illustrated in the following examples:

Ps. 26:4

*lo' yāšabtî 'im-m<sup>e</sup> tē-šāwe'* (QAL PF. 1 SG.)

*w<sup>e</sup> 'im na<sup>a</sup> lāmîm lo' 'āb ô'* (QAL IMPF. 1 SG.)

I have not sat with scoundrels,

And I do not go in with hypocrites.

Is. 60:16

*w<sup>e</sup> yānaqt h<sup>a</sup> leb gôyim* (QAL PF. 3 SG. FEM.)

*w<sup>e</sup> šod m<sup>e</sup> lākîm tînāqî* (QAL IMPF. 3 SG. FEM.)

You have sucked the milk of nations,

And the breasts of royalty you will suck.

In these texts, the juxtaposition of Hebr. perfect (*qtl*) and imperfect (*yqtl*) verbs represents a form of grammatical parallelism, which “occurs not for semantic reasons (it does not indicate a real temporal sequence) but for what have been considered stylistic reasons” (Berlin 1985: 35-36), that is, a desire for “poetic beauty and embellishment” (Buth 1984:67, 69). Stylistic tense shifting is a feature of Hebrew poetry to the end of the Second Temple period, appearing in several Qumranic hymns (Buth 1984:71-73).

Notably, vv. 46b-47 juxtapose those tenses that characteristically translate the Hebr. *qtl* and *yqtl* in the Old Greek: the aorist and present, respectively. Accordingly, Randall Buth (1984) identifies the tense shift in Lk. 1:46b-47 as an example of stylistic tense shifting. Of all the solutions canvassed in this section, this explanation provides the most compelling interpretation of the phenomenon. It alone finds a precedent for the tense alternation in vv. 46b-47 within an identical construction and context (a poetic synonymous parallelism). The peculiarity of the shift is now explicable as a marked language feature of the passage as poetry.

Admittedly, the device does not appear in the Old Greek. Porter 1989:131, 133 assumes its presence there, but provides no examples of the phenomenon (a point of criticism in Jung 2004:43). Buth 1984:68-70, on the other hand, provides numerous examples of the Old Greek leveling tense alternations in the Hebrew, highlighting the semantic equivalency of the verbs. One need look no further than the Old Greek rendering of the texts cited in Hebrew above, for instance, Is. 60:16:

LXX Is. 60:16

καὶ θηλάσεις γάλα ἐθνῶν

(FUT. ACT. IND. = QAL PF.)

καὶ πλοῦτον βασιλέων φάγεσαι

(FUT. ACT. IND. = QAL IMPF.)

The canticle's rendering of a stylistic tense alternation in Greek is apparently novel.<sup>22</sup> It is not a Septuagintism; its inspiration must be found elsewhere. It may, on the one hand, represent a conscious imitation of the stylistic tense shifting in Hebrew poetry, but precisely from direct experience with some Hebrew text(s). On the other hand, it may represent a direct translation of an original Hebrew text, one more grammatically faithful to the tenses of the source language than the Old Greek. Buth 1984 leaps to the second conclusion, never considering the first.

Finally, with respect to diathesis, ἡγαλλίασεν is in the active voice, rather than in its more common middle voice. Farris 1985:186 believes this choice allows it to more readily parallel μεγαλύνει. The verb ἀγαλλιάω is used only one other time in Luke's gospel, there in the middle voice with reference to Jesus' rejoicing in the Spirit (Lk. 10:21). However, Voorwinde

---

<sup>22</sup> Porter 1989:131-132 illustrates the use of tense shifting in Hellenistic Greek poetry, cautioning that Luke's use of the device may not necessarily represent a Semitic influence, "although Semitic enhancement on the basis of a Semitic source may remain a possibility." At best, Porter's examples indicate that a sudden shift in tense would not have done terrible violence to a Greek ear, at least in the marked language of poetry. However, he provides no examples of a tense alternation in a synonymous parallelism paralleling vv. 46b-47. Only Hebrew texts provide a precedent for this phenomenon, pointing unequivocally to a Semitic background for the tense alternation.

2005:58 finds it unlikely that the verb carries a different shade of meaning in these two instances. 1 Pet. 1:8 and Rev. 19:7 represent the only other active occurrences of the verb.

*vv. 48-49*

The aorists in vv. 48a, 49a contribute to the parallelism of the two motive clauses (Reiling and Swellengrebel 1971:73). Both recall the same past event as the basis of Mary's rejoicing: her election and miraculous conception (cf. the aorist in v. 45). The only future in the Magnificat also appears in this unit (*μακαριοῦσίν*; v. 48b) predicting a state of affairs first realized in this pericope (*ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*). All succeeding generations will, with Elizabeth, bless the memory of Mary (cf. *μακαρία*; v. 45).

*vv. 51-53*

After v. 49a, all finite verbs appear in the aorist. The first of these appears in v. 51, the first in three pairs of parallel aorists (vv. 51-53). The meaning of these aorists may well represent "the most difficult point of interpretation in the psalm" (Farris 1985:114), directly relevant to reconstructions of the original occasion, speaker and purpose of the hymn:

For exegesis, much depends on the interpretation of the aorists. Are they ordinary observations of past history, or gnomic attestations of God's usual conduct? Are they ingressive aorists, signaling the beginning of eschatological events? Or are they influenced by the prophetic perfect in Hebrew, and thus pictures of the future? In

sum, is this hymn a genuine praise to God for help granted, or a hidden prophecy of hoped-for salvation? (Bovon 2002:57)

From the outset, one must recognize that the infancy narrative already provides an instance of at least one of the divine acts celebrated in vv. 51-53. The hymn's observation that God has "looked upon" Mary in her "lowliness" (ταπεινώσιν; v. 48a) classes her among "the lowly" (ταπεινούς) "raised up" in v. 52b (Brown 1993:336, 361). One can thereby exclude the possibility that vv. 51-53 describe a strictly future state of affairs, whether concentrated in the death and resurrection of Jesus (so Brown 1993:363<sup>23</sup>), or in an eschatological point beyond (so Plummer 1902:33).<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, the line immediately preceding and framing the unit suggests the validity of vv. 51-53 in all ages: "his mercy extends to those who fear him, to generations and generations" (v. 50; cf. Ps. 105:17). Reflective of this, the affirmations in vv. 51-53 parallel or adapt others throughout the Hebrew Bible (see Litwak 2005:108; Brown 1993:359; Marshall 1978:84-85). Consequently, Dupont 1980:331-35 is incorrect in identifying the aorists as ingressive, and Plummer 1902:33, Gunkel and Begrich 1998:55-56, and Fanning 1990:273 are

---

<sup>23</sup> More precisely, Brown believes the aorists refer to the death and resurrection of Jesus as "a definite action in the past" from the point of view of later Jewish Christians (Brown 1993:363). Porter 1989:132-33 criticizes this view, claiming Brown "overstresses the necessity for the aorist to refer to a specific past event."

<sup>24</sup> Many interpretations of the canticle read theological points into its grammatical features, when the context and content of the canticle sufficiently communicate them. So here, the eschatological thrust of the hymn is "provided not by the aorists themselves but by the entire argument of the hymn" (Porter 1989:133), especially the messianic theme of vv. 54-55.

incorrect in identifying them as the equivalent of Hebr. prophetic perfects (essentially, proleptic aorists). Per Luther, vv. 51-53 describe “the works of God that He always has done, always does, and always will do” (*Sermon on the Magnificat*).

Zerwick 1963 § 256 provides a more sensible explanation for the aorists in the unit, suggesting that each is gnomic insofar as it invokes a “fact of past experience as a guide to present or future judgment.” In this model, vv. 51-53 describe historical actions (hence, the employment of aorists), but precisely to communicate general principles. As the semanticist John Lyons writes (1977:681), humans “can often base our assertion of a general truth upon the evidence of our past experience: hence the use of the past, rather than the non-past, tense for the expression of gnomic propositions in certain languages.” Several studies attest a “gnomic” (BDF § 333.2, Zerwick 1963 § 259) or “global/general” (Rogland 2003:15-51) sense for certain perfects in the Hebrew Bible, including the five perfects rendered as aorists in the Old Greek of the Song of Hannah<sup>25</sup>:

1 Sam [LXX 2 Kgdms] 2:4-5

τόξον δυνατῶν ἠσθένησεν<sup>26</sup>

καὶ ἀσθενούντες περιεζώσαντο δύναμιν (AOR. MID. 3 PL.)

πλήρεις ἄρτων ἠλαττώθησαν (AOR. PAS. 3 PL.)

---

<sup>25</sup> Rogland 2003:10 does not study the perfects in 1 Sam 2:1-10, as “the precise relation of early or ‘archaic’ Hebrew texts to this system [including the Song of Hannah] is uncertain.”

<sup>26</sup> This verb is AOR. ACT. 3 SG., but translates a verbless construction in the Hebr.

καὶ οἱ πεινῶντες παρήκαν γῆν (AOR. ACT. 3 PL.)

ὅτι στείρα ἔτεκεν ἑπτὰ (AOR. ACT. 3 SG.)

καὶ ἡ πολλὴ ἐν τέκνοις ἠσθένησεν (AOR. ACT. 3 SG.)

The bows of the mighty are shattered,

But the ones who stumbled gird on strength.

Those who were full hire themselves out for bread,

But those who were hungry cease to hunger.

Even the barren gives birth to seven,

But she who has many children languishes.

The phrasing of vv. 51-53 of the Magnificat undoubtedly parallels this section of 1 Sam 2 (Fanning 1990:268-69).<sup>27</sup>

Like Hannah, Mary classes herself with those of low estate—the marginalized, oppressed, and needy. And like Hannah, she identifies the reversals in her own life with the interventions of God in every age on behalf of the devout in these strata. Thus, for all the hymn's personal characteristics (particularly from vv. 46-49), only one action listed in vv. 51-53 obviously applies to Mary. Within the hymn, Mary is an instance, a member of a class. She

---

<sup>27</sup> The comparison to 1 Sam. 2:4-5 supports the conclusion that vv. 51-53 should not be understood in a primarily predictive sense.

praises God's enduring character, embracing instances far beyond the confines of her personal experience.

*vv. 54-55*

The concluding lines of the hymn class Israel as a whole in the same strata (cf. Ps 136:23-24), and recall texts praising divine interventions in the history of Israel (Ps. 98[LXX 97]:3) or as a gnomic principle (Ps. Sol. 10:4). However, the emphasis here is not gnomic; the vocabulary of vv. 54-55 aligns the hymn to the overt messianic themes of the Benedictus, especially in vv. 68-74:

Lk. 1:54-55 (Magnificat)	Lk. 1:69-70, 72-73 (Benedictus)
<p>He has given help to Israel His servant,            In remembrance of His mercy,            As He spoke to our fathers            To Abraham and his descendants forever.</p>	<p>And has raised up a horn of salvation for us            In the house of David His servant            As He spoke by the mouth of His holy            prophets from of old. . .            To show mercy toward our fathers,            And to remember His holy covenant,            The oath which He swore to Abraham our            father. . . .</p>

In context, then, the aorist in Lk. 1:54 has a definite past event in view: the arrival of the messiah (i.e., the Annunciation). Mary's election is so intimately connected to the realization of the messianic promises that the hymn praises "God's choice of the lowly mother

and his overturning of society as one act.”<sup>28</sup> This eschatological orientation may embrace vv. 51-53 as well, but not to the exclusion of their gnomic sense.

#### USE OF THE INFINITIVE

The canticle’s only infinitive (μνησθήναι) appears in v. 54b, interrupting the series of finite verbs in vv. 51-54a in advance of the concluding line of the canticle (Bovon 2002:63). BDF § 391 classifies the verb as an infinitive of result (i.e., God has helped Israel with the effect that he has remembered his mercy); Fitzmyer prefers an infinitive of purpose (i.e., God has helped Israel in order to remember his mercy); Marshall 1978:85 identifies it as an infinitive of cause (i.e., remembering his mercy, God moves to help Israel). Obscuring the meaning of the infinitive is the loose construction of v. 54b-55,<sup>29</sup> analogous to the syntax of infinitival clauses in the Benedictus (Tannehill 1991:32), including one also using μνησθήναι (v. 72).

Given the concentration and preponderance of similar constructions in the Benedictus, it is easy to suspect that the syntax of v. 54b represents a Semitism. BDF § 391, Reiling and Swellengrebel 1971:79 detected the influence of the Hebr. infinitive in ℓ- in the line. This suspicion was confirmed with the discovery of the *War Scroll*, which contains a “Hymn of the Return” paralleling the form and style of the Benedictus, including a string of ℓ-

---

<sup>28</sup> Admittedly, Tannehill 1974:274 (cf. Farris 1985:115-16, Green 1997:104) reaches this conclusion from his analysis of vv. 51-53, which differs significantly from my own treatment of these verses. For a solid refutation of Farris 1985 and Tannehill 1974, see Porter 1989:132-133.

<sup>29</sup> Absent in v. 54, for instance, is the ὥστε which most frequently precedes infinitives of result (cf. Lk. 5:7), and the διὰ + τὸ preceding infinitives of cause (cf. Lk. 2:4).

infinitival clauses (1QM, col. 14.6; text in Charlesworth 1994:124-125; Farris 1985:29, 80-81; see 3.2. for further discussion).

The relationship of *μνησθήναι* (v. 54b) to the string of dative nouns in v. 55b will be taken up in our discussion of the case syntax of the canticle. As noted in that section, *μνησθήναι* does not govern the nouns in v. 55b (as if they were indirect objects of the infinitive).

#### USE OF PARTICIPLES

Three substantival participles appear in the canticle: *φοβουμένοις* (v. 50b), *πεινῶντας* (v. 53a), and *πλουτοῦντας* (v. 53b). All three are generic, describing classes of individuals, and all three are built to a present stem. Only the first of these receives the substantivizing definite article (cf. Wallace 1996:233). The latter two introduce clauses, and are contrasted in an antithetical parallelism (v. 53).

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

The canticle contains two verbless clauses: *καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* (v. 49b), *καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν* (v. 50). Native Greek syntax prefers the use of relative clauses in these instances, as both qualify *ὁ δυνατός* in v. 49a (Marshall 1978:83). The coordination of multiple nominal sentences to modify a noun imitates Hebrew style (Farris 1985:120; cf. LXX Ps. 135:1ff.).

## USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Seventeen definite articles appear in the hymn: ἡ ψυχὴ (v. 46b), τὸν κύριον (v. 46b), τὸ πνεῦμά (v. 47), τῷ θεῷ (v. 47), τῷ σωτήρῳ (v. 47), τὴν ταπεινώσιν (v. 48a), τῆς δούλης (v. 48a), τοῦ νῦν (v. 48b), αἱ γενεαί (v. 48b), ὁ δυνατός (v. 49a), τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (v. 49b), τὸ ἔλεος (v. 50a), τοῖς φοβουμένοις (v. 50b), τοὺς πατέρας (v. 55a), τῷ Ἀβραάμ (v. 55b), τῷ σπέρματι (v. 55b), τὸν αἰῶνα (v. 55b).

The absence of a definite article in several places is noteworthy. First, Reiling and Swellengrebel 1971:73 identifies the ἐν + an arthrous dative βραχίονι (v. 51a) as a Hebraism, capturing the use of a *b<sup>e</sup>*- prefix (with consequent absorption of the definite prefix *h-*) before a noun. Also noteworthy is the lack of a definite article before καρδίας αὐτῶν (v. 51b). Jung 2004:108 cites this text to demonstrate that the Greek of Luke 3-Acts 28 (which shows an article before all instances of the singular καρδία + a genitive plural) differs from the Greek of the infancy narrative, which can omit the article (cf. 1:17; 1:66). Finally, the definite article is absent before the substantives δυνάστας, ταπεινοὺς, πεινῶντας, and πλουτοῦντας (vv. 52-53). The generic or categorical quality of these substantives might explain the lack of a definite article (cf. Wallace 1996:253-54), but the canticle is inconsistent or free in this regard. For instance, another categorical substantive in the canticle, φοβουμένοις (v. 50b), takes the dative article in the dative case.

## CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

A number of case syntax peculiarities appear in the Greek text, which will receive varying treatments in the Classical Armenian, Gothic, and Old Church Slavonic translations. Most of these can be explained as Hebraisms.

### v. 50

The construction εἰς γενεάς καὶ γενεάς (“unto generations and generations”), attested in Test. Levi 18:8, captures a Semitic idiom (roughly Hebr. *l’dōr wādōr*). Certain witnesses read εἰς γενεάς γενεῶν (Hebr. *l’dōr dōrīm*). The Old Greek of Ps. 49:11 [48:12 LXX]; 89:1 [90:1 LXX], uses a variant with singular nouns, also attested for this verse: εἰς γενεάν καὶ γενεάν (Marshall 1978:83; Brown 1993:337), which more closely corresponds to Hebr. *l’dōr wādōr*.

### v. 51

Two syntactic issues are concentrated in the phrase διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν (v. 51b). First, the construction καρδίας αὐτῶν (v. 51) is a false concord (singular-plural). Appearing throughout the New Testament and Old Greek, it reproduces a Hebrew expression (e.g., in Ps. 10:17 [9:38 LXX]: τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν for Hebr. *libām*; Jung 2004:106-08). Secondly, it is unclear whether the dative διανοίᾳ is an adjunct to the verb διεσκόρπισεν (the proud are “scattered. . . in the thoughts of their hearts”) or the substantive adjective ὑπερηφάνους (“those who are proud in the thoughts of their hearts” are scattered). Insofar as the former option is more often construed with a preposition (cf. Rom. 1:24), the latter is preferable (Bovon 2002:62).

*vv. 54-55*

It is unclear which verb governs the semantic datives in v. 55b. One explanation posits that the semantic datives are indirect objects of μνησθήναι (“to remember [his] mercy. . . to our fathers”). In this interpretation, v. 55b continues the thought of v. 54b, with v. 54a as a parenthetical statement (so RV; NEB; NIV; Marshall 1978:85). A comparison of Lk. 1:54b with Ps. 98 [LXX 97]:3 (ἐμνήσθη τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰακωβ) recommends linking μνησθήναι ἐλέους with τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ (Bovon 2002:63). Similarly, a comparison with Mic. 7:20b (which Fitzmyer 1981:368 identifies as the likely model for the present passage) suggests understanding the promise to the fathers as a distinct notion differing from that of extending mercy to Abraham (Marshall 1978:85):

LXX Mic. 7:20

δώσεις ἀλήθειαν τῷ Ἰακωβ

ἔλεον τῷ Ἀβρααμ

καθότι ὤμοσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν

κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν

You will give truth to Jacob,

mercy to Abraham,

As you promised our fathers,

from former days.

More likely, however, the verb ἐλάλησεν governs the datives, so v. 55b is appositive to πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν in v. 55a (Creed 1930:24; Fitzmyer 1981:116; Reiling and Swellengrebel 1971:79; Brown 1993:338).<sup>30</sup> In this view, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα refers to “the length of time for which the spoken promise is valid” (Tannehill 1974:271).<sup>31</sup> In its defense, Tannehill 1974:271 notes that the phrases τοὺς πατέρας and τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ already seem to share a common reference (cf. Deut. 1:8; 29:13; Acts 3:25). Their synonymity would fit the structure of the Magnificat, which constructs couplet parallelisms (Brown 1993:338). Most importantly, from a grammatical standpoint, the verb λάλεω (and λεγω) and can take indirect objects either in the dative case or, less commonly, by the construction πρὸς + accusative.<sup>32</sup> Luke-Acts freely moves between these forms, even in the infancy narrative (e.g., Luke 2:15, 17, 18, 20; Tannehill 1974:271).

Nevertheless, the alternation in v. 55 is more peculiar than any other example in Luke-Acts, precisely because a single verb governs both constructions. That peculiarity, coupled with the marked language context of v. 55, strongly suggests a deliberate juxtaposition of

---

<sup>30</sup> A variant of this view agrees that the verb ἐλάλησεν governs the datives but identifies the nouns as datives of interest (Zerwick 1963 § 55).

<sup>31</sup> This adequately refutes the claim in Marshall 1978:85 that the prepositional phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is in an awkward position if v. 55b continues the thought of v. 55a. Appeals to texts linking the prepositional phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα with ἐλέους (e.g., Pss. 136 [LXX 135]; 100 [LXX 95]:5) also fall short, as none of them seem to directly inspire Lk. 1:54-55.

<sup>32</sup> Fitzmyer 1981:116 links the more frequent use of πρὸς + accusative in Luke-Acts to its frequent use in the Old Greek, where it translates Hebr. *l'* - or *'el* before a noun. In general, however, the use of simple case constructions has decreased relative to prepositional phrases in Hellenistic and New Testament Greek (Zerwick 1963 § 80a).

forms here. I submit that the alternation of  $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma$  + accusative and the two datives in v. 55 represents another form of stylistic alternation and grammatical parallelism in the Magnificat.

A particular device of Hebrew poetry, the “reversed ballast prepositions,” provides an analogy to the phenomenon observed in vv. 54-55. In this device, the first colon employs a “heavier” variant, or synonym, of a preposition in the second colon. To compensate, the second colon takes additional elements (see discussion and examples in Watson 1984:345; Kugel 1981:45-48).<sup>33</sup> In the following examples, a single verb in the first line governs two prepositions, one free, the other a prefix:

Ps. 78:69

*wayyibēn k mô-rāmîm miqdāšô*

*kʿerēṣ y<sup>e</sup> sādāh l<sup>e</sup> ʿôlām*

And he builds his sanctuary like high palaces

Like the earth, which he established forever

Job 40:21

*tāhat ṣe<sup>\*</sup> lîm yišqāb*

*bʿseteṣ qāneḥ ûbiššāh*

---

<sup>33</sup> Compare this phenomenon to more general forms of prepositional or prepositional prefix alternation manifest in Hebrew poetry (Kugel 1981:22).

Under shady trees he lies,

Under the cover of reed and marsh.

In each case, the second codas compensate for the shorter prepositional constructions in the first. Ps. 78:69b adds a relative clause, while Job 40:12 expands the object of the preposition.

It is possible that the canticle uses a similar device in v. 55, with ἐλάλησεν governing two synonymous (preposition/case) constructions available in the syntax of Luke-Acts. The Old Greek utilizes both πρὸς + accusative and simple datives as equivalents of both bound and free prepositions with Hebr. verbs of speaking (Table 3.1), though it never juxtaposes them in this manner. Still, an attempt to imitate or translate a reverse ballast construction could surely utilize both constructions.

Table 2.1. Old Greek translations of Hebr. verb + preposition.

	<u>Hebr. verb + 'el</u>	<u>Hebr. verb +</u> <u>(prep. prefix) l-</u>
	Ez. 37:11	1 Sam [LXX 1 Kgdms] 31:4
<u>Gk. verb</u> <u>+ πρὸς + ACC.</u>	Hebr. wayyo'mer 'elay	Hebr. wayyo'mer l'nośe'
	Gr. καὶ ἐλάλησεν. . . πρὸς με	Gr. καὶ εἶπεν. . . πρὸς τὸν αἴροντα

	Gen. 12:4	Is. 49:3
<u>Gk. verb</u> <u>+ simple DAT.</u>	Hebr. <i>dibber 'elāyw</i>	Hebr. <i>wayyo'mer lī</i>
	Gr. ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ	Gr. καὶ εἶπέν μοι

In v. 55, the second colon compensates for the brevity of a simple dative vis-à-vis a πρὸς + accusative by creating a more complex object (τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ) and/or by adding a final adverbial phrase (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα).<sup>34</sup> Notably, ballast variants are occasionally associated with the climactic lines of stanzas and poems (Watson 1984:346), consistent with the character of Lk. 1:55.

#### WORD ORDER

In general, the word order parameters of Luke are observed through the canticle. However, the canticle shows a significant tendency to construct verb-initial independent clauses. This trait is likely a Hebraism, reflecting the VSO typology of many Semitic languages (Moulton 1929:417). The clause structures of this canticle include: VO (vv. 48a, 51a,b, 52a,b, 54a,b, 55), VOS (vv. 48b, 49), VSO (vv. 46b, 47), and OV (vv. 53a,b). The shift in verb-object

---

<sup>34</sup> The presence of both may address a need to further compensate for the adverb + predicate (καθὼς ἐλάλησεν) introducing v. 55a. Of related interest, this verse seems to exemplify Behaghel's Law, which observes that the longest item tends to occur towards the latter end of a series.

order to OV in v. 53a,b is stylistic, and has been explored in the section “Marked Language Features” within this chapter.

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

As noted earlier, the marked language of biblical poetry prefers a paratactic style, employing coordinating conjunctions to link clauses (in Greek, *καί*) rather than subordinating conjunctions. Accordingly, most clauses of the Magnificat are loosely associated by the conjunction *καί* (vv. 47, 49b 52b, 53b), if they are associated at all. In vv. 49b-50, the canticle uses the conjunction *καί* to link two nominal sentences modifying *ὁ δυνατός* (v. 49a): *ὁ δυνατός, καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεάς καὶ γενεάς τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν*. BDF § 442.6 identifies the use of *καί* in this text as a Hebraism. In such instances, Greek syntax prefers a hypotactic structure, creating modifying relative clauses through the use of the relative pronoun *οὗ*.

The conjunction *ὅτι* is used twice, each time to introduce causal subordinate clauses (vv. 48a, 49a). As noted earlier, the first of these is the initial motive clause of the canticle, identifying the divine acts that occasion Mary’s praise. In this light, the conjunction *ὅτι* is the counterpart of the Hebr. conjunction *kī*, familiar in the Psalms (e.g., Ps. 30:1; Brown 1993:336).

The conjunction *γάρ* also appears in the canticle (v. 48b) also in a subordinating, rather than coordinating, function. As expected, the conjunction occupies the second position, following the particle *ἰδοὺ*. Brown (1993:333-334, 336) identifies the construction *ἰδοὺ γάρ* as “very Lukan,” appearing six times in Luke-Acts (1:44, 48; 2:10; 6:23; 17:21; Acts 9:11), but only once in the rest of the New Testament (2 Cor. 7:11). (By contrast, *ὅτι ἰδοὺ* occurs only twice

in Luke-Acts [Lk. 23:29; Acts 5:25].) The expression ἰδοὺ γάρ also appears in the Old Greek, where it renders such expressions as *kî hinneh* (e.g., Is. 66:15) and *hinneh nā* (e.g., Job 33:2). Its use in that corpus may account for its more frequent occurrence in the infancy narrative (three of six instances in Luke-Acts). In light of these facts, there is probably no semantic significance in the choice of ἰδοὺ γάρ rather than ὅτι ἰδοὺ in this line. The choice and employment of the former conjunction simply reflects the diction of the infancy narrative in particular, and Luke as a whole. On this basis, one could read v. 48b (ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσίν με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί) as a second motive clause, parallel to the preceding ὅτι clause (v. 48a).

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

Two causal subordinate clauses appear in the canticle, both employing the clause-initial conjunction ὅτι. The first clause occurs in v. 48a, and is subordinate to the opening two lines of the hymn (vv. 46b-47): μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχὴ μου τὸν κύριον / καὶ ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτήρῳ μου / ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ (v. 46b-48a). This is the first motive clause of the hymn, and identifies Mary's visitation and conception as the cause of her rejoicing in the hymn. The second is subordinate to this line, and immediately follows it: ὅτι ἐποίησέν μοι μέγαρα ὁ δυνατός (v. 49a). The verbs in all three clauses appear in the indicative mood.

## RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX<sup>35</sup>

No relative clauses appear in the canticle. As noted earlier, two instances where Greek syntax would have preferred relative clauses are instead rendered as nominative sentences introduced by coordinate conjunctions (vv. 49a-50a; Marshall 1978:83).

---

<sup>35</sup> In future sections, I will omit a discussion of syntactic categories irrelevant to the text of a particular canticle. In this instance, however, it is worth reviewing the reason for the absence of relative clauses in the Magnificat.

### 2.3. Benedictus (Song of Zechariah)

TEXT

Lk. 1:68-79

<sup>68</sup>εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ,

ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ,

<sup>69</sup>καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρασ σωτηρίας ἡμῖν

ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυεὶδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ,

<sup>70</sup>καθὼς ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ,

<sup>71</sup>σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν

καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>72</sup>ποιήσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν

καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ,

<sup>73</sup>ὄρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν,

τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν <sup>74</sup>ἀφόβως ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν<sup>37</sup> ῥυσθέντας

λατρεύειν αὐτῷ <sup>75</sup>ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ

---

<sup>36</sup> I have altered the structure of NA 27 in this place to better capture what I see as an additional parallelism.

<sup>37</sup> Instead of ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν, the Byzantine/Majority Text, Vulgate, Syriac, and Coptic traditions supply an article and poss. pronoun: ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν. See “Use of the Definite Article” for a discussion of anarthrous genitive constructions in the canticle, including the one reconstructed here.

ένώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν.

<sup>76</sup>καὶ σὺ δὲ παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ·

προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ένώπιον κυρίου έτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ,

<sup>77</sup>τοῦ δοῦναι γνώσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ

έν ἀφέσει ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν

<sup>78</sup>διὰ σπλάγχχνα έλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν,

έν οἷς έπισκέπεται<sup>38</sup> ἡμᾶς ἀνατολή έξ ὕψους

<sup>79</sup>έπιφᾶναι τοῖς έν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις,

τοῦ κατευθῦναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν είς ὁδόν εἰρήνης.

#### MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

Contextually, the canticle appears to represent the words of Zechariah's "praising" at the birth of John (Lk. 1:64). In form, the passage is a hymn (Gunkel and Begrich 1998:23). Its opening lines recall the *berakah* formulae and motive clauses of Jewish thanksgiving prayers<sup>39</sup>:

---

<sup>38</sup> A number of mss. show *έπεσκέφατο*. See discussion under "Tense, Mood, and Diathesis."

<sup>39</sup> Numerous citations appear in Gunkel and Begrich 1998:27. Gunkel and Begrich also note that the use of an introductory *berakah* formulae is rare in the Psalms (Ps. 144:1), but frequent in biblical prose and later apocryphal literature. The first example cited above is more consistent with the use of *berakah* formulae in the Psalms, which frequently open new strophes or conclude hymns.

Ps. 28 [LXX 27]:6

εὐλογητὸς κύριος

ὅτι εἰσήκουσεν τῆς φωνῆς τῆς δεήσεώς μου

Blessed is the Lord,

for he has heard the voice of my petitions.

Tobit 13:1-2a

εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ ζῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ

ὅτι αὐτὸς μαστιγοῖ καὶ ἐλεᾷ. . . .

Blessed is the God who lives forever,

And [blessed] is his kingdom,

For he scourges and has mercy. . . .

Most lines of the hymn can be considered couplets, including: vv. 68, 69, 71, 72, 76, 77, 78, 79, and arguably, 74b-75. However, in striking contrast to the Magnificat, parallelism does not seem to characterize the majority of these couplets (vv. 71, 72, 79). Still, the loosely strung but interconnected clauses of the canticle create a pattern of “emphasis and enrichment,” evident in numerous appositive relationships (Tannehill 1991:33-34). A repetitive effect

emerges from the whole canticle, consistent with the spirit of parallelism. Repetition in the form of conduplicatio is also apparent in the reuse of various key or “theme” words in the canticle: σωτηρίας // σωτηρίαν (vv. 69a, 71); χειρὸς // χειρὸς (vv. 71, 74) ἐχθρῶν // ἐχθρῶν (vv. 71, 74); ὁδοὺς // ὁδὸν (vv. 76b, 79b; Tannehill 1991:34).

#### TENSE, MOOD, AND DIATHESIS

The indicative verbs in this canticle present fewer interpretive difficulties than those in the Magnificat.

#### vv. 68-75

Aorists pervade the opening verses of the canticle. The first three appear in a causal (ὅτι) sentence (vv. 68b-69), and identify the occasion for the hymn: God has “visited” and “accomplished salvation” for his people (v. 68b), and has “raised up a horn of salvation in the house of David” (v. 69). The last clause, by its overtly messianic language (cf. Ps. 132:17), specifically invokes the conception of Jesus (Marshall 1978:91; Farris 1985:135-136).<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Here, the verb “raise up” is used in the sense “to provide, prepare” (cf. Lk. 7:16; Acts. 13:22; Judg. 3:9; 1 Sam. 2:35; at times with undertones of “to conceive”: Gen. 38:8). Some read an additional, implicit reference to the resurrection (cf. Farris 1985:135). The language of this text compares to the fifteenth benediction of the *Shemoneh Esreh* (Marshall 1978:91; Brown 1993:386).

Accordingly, all three aorists in the unit share the same past point of reverence: the events of the infancy narratives.<sup>41</sup> In the angelic messages, God has visited and delivered Israel.

The aorist in v. 70 also looks to the past, embracing all ancient prophecies of the messianic age (the adverb *καθώς* links this clause to the messianic themes of the previous line). Acts. 3:21ff. closely parallels this verse, identifying particular prophets in the Israelite tradition. The relationship of this verb to the infinitives in vv. 71-73 will be taken up in our discussion of the latter. Another aorist, *ᾤμωσεν* (v. 73a), interrupts that series of infinitives. That verb refers to the ancient ratification of the covenant (*διαθήκης*) referenced in the previous line (v. 72b), to which *ῥηκον* is appositive (Marshall 1978:92, Brown 1993:372).

#### *vv. 76-79*

The second half of the canticle predicts the destiny of the infant John; as expected, it opens with a string of futures (at v. 76a, b). NA28, our source text, adds one more at v. 78b: *ἐπισκέψεται*. This reading follows an uncorrected *κ*, as well as B, and the Syriac and Coptic traditions. Other Greek manuscripts (most notably A), as well as the Latin tradition, attest the aorist form *ἐπεσκέψατο*, previously seen in v. 68b. Benoit 1968:186, Brown 1993:373 reject the reading of Nestle-Aland 28, speculating that the future *ἐπισκέψεται* is an assimilation to the future tense of the verbs in v. 76.<sup>42</sup> By contrast, Lagrange 1921:62, Metzger 1971:132, Marshall

---

<sup>41</sup> If not for the unity of v. 68b-69, one could have interpreted the content of v. 68b as a reference to unspecified divine interventions in history (cf. the similar Ps. 111 [LXX 110]:9).

<sup>42</sup> Brown (1993:373) considers the aorist the *lectio difficilior* “since in the chronology of the infancy narrative Jesus has not yet ‘visited us,’” that is, he has not yet been born. This must

1978:94 identify the aorist variant ἐπεσκέψατο as the assimilation, reproducing the ἐπεσκέψατο in v. 68b and forming an inclusio. Farris 1985:128 appropriately calls the question “an almost insoluble one.”

Accepting the reading in our source text, the question arises: why is the verb ἐπισκέπτομαι rendered in two different tenses in vv. 68b and 78b? One must interpret the future ἐπισκέψεται in light of the future verbs in v. 76. The canticle predicts that John “will go before the Lord to prepare his ways”; this decision forces the canticle to situate the coming of the Lord in the future as well. Consequently, one must read “raised [him] up” (v. 69a) as a reference to the conception of the Messiah, and the verb “will visit” as a reference to his birth, future ministry, or redemptive work. In the alternative reading, the Messiah “has visited us” in his conception, paralleling vv. 68b-69a. The canticle thereby leaves behind predictions of John’s future (the futures in v. 76) to describe the “tender mercy of our God” manifest in the recent conception of the Messiah.

#### USE OF THE INFINITIVE

The most outstanding syntactic feature of the canticle is its use of infinitives to introduce clauses in a series. As noted in 2.2, this feature appears in Qumranic literature,

---

be, at best, a secondary concern, since the ἐπεσκέψατο in v. 68b has remained an aorist within a series of aorists. Furthermore, it is uncertain that one should identify the “visitation” of the Messiah with his birth rather than with his conception.

particularly in the War Scroll's "Hymn of the Return" (1QM, col. 14.4ff.; text in Charlesworth 1994:124-125), which contains a string of Hebr. *l'*- infinitival clauses<sup>43</sup>:

1QM, col. 14.6

*wlptwh ph ln'lmym*

*lrnn bgbr[t. . . ]rpwt*

*llmd mlh'mh*

and to open the mouth of the mute

to sing the might of. . .

to teach war to the weak

Infinitives introduce two clauses in v. 72 of the Benedictus: ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἀγίας αὐτοῦ. Both verbs are infinitives of purpose (Marshall 1978:92, Bovon 2002:73), identifying the intent of the divine action in v. 71, and by extension, v. 69. It is also possible to identify the verbs as infinitives of result (Marshall 1978:92). (As Farris 1985:137 observes, there may be little difference between purpose and result in the conceptualization of divine activity.) Notably, the second infinitive in the series lacks the τοῦ expected in such instances (Zerwick 1963 § 365; see 3.1).

---

<sup>43</sup> The parallels between this hymn and the Benedictus have invited significant study and speculation (e.g., Flusser 1988:126-149).

Since τοῦ appears before the next infinitive in the canticle (τοῦ δοῦναι; v. 73b), Zerwick 1963 § 365, Farris 1985:138 suggest v. 73 continues the series of infinitival clauses in v. 72. However, it is more likely that τοῦ δοῦναι is appositional to the noun ὄρκον, divulging the content of the divine oath (Marshall 1978:92, Brown 1993:372).<sup>44</sup> The Old Greek rendering of Jer. 11:5a uses the same infinitive and same noun in this fashion:

Jer. 11:5a

ὅπως στήσω τὸν ὄρκον μου ὃν ὤμοσα τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν  
τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς γῆν ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι  
καθὼς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη

The direct object of τοῦ δοῦναι in v. 73 is another infinitive: λατρεύειν (v. 74b), giving the translation: “to grant us. . . to worship him.”

Two pairs of infinitives appear in the second half of the canticle, vv. 76-79. The first pair consists of the infinitives ἐτοιμάσαι (v. 76b) and a reappearance of τοῦ δοῦναι (v. 77). ἐτοιμάσαι is an infinitive of purpose elaborating the verb προπορεύσει; the second infinitive parallels ἐτοιμάσαι (Marshall 1978:93; Farris 1985:139). Both predict the mission of John.

The second pair frames the final verse of the canticle. The first infinitive in this pair, ἐπιφάναι (v. 79a), evokes the light imagery of ἀνατολή (v. 78b), and is therefore an infinitive of

---

<sup>44</sup> By contrast, Burk 2006:67 identifies it as an adverbial use of the genitive articular infinitive, encoding purpose.

purpose governed by ἐπισκέψεται (v. 78b; “[the Dawn] will visit us . . . to shine”; Marshall 1978:95). The second infinitive, τοῦ κατευθῆναι (v. 79b), is parallel to the first, and also an infinitive of purpose following ἐπισκέψεται (“to shine in the darkness . . . to guide our feet . . .”). Both describe the mission of the Messiah. Notably, in both of these pairs, an articular infinitive follows a non-articular one, as expected in Luke.

#### USE OF PARTICIPLES

The canticle contains three participles: μισούντων (v. 71), ῥυσθέντας (v. 74), and καθημένοις (v. 79a). The first and third are substantival; of these, only μισούντων takes a definite article. The participle ῥυσθέντας, on the other hand, modifies the implicit first plural subject of the infinitive λατρεύειν (Brown 1993:372), i.e., ἡμῖν from v. 73b. (See a discussion of its accusative case in the section on “Case Syntax,” below.)

The opening line of the hymn (v. 68a) uses the adjective εὐλογητός rather than the participle εὐλογημένος. The adjective is characteristically reserved for divine subjects (Mk. 14:61; Lk. 1:68; Rom. 1:25; 9:5; 2 Cor. 1:2; 11:31; Eph. 1:3; 1 Pet. 1:3), while the participle is not so restricted (cf. Lk. 1:42; Bovon 2002:72).

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

One verbless clause appears in the Benedictus: εὐλογητός κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (v. 68a). This nominal sentence is nearly identical to the Old Greek translation of the verbless Hebr. formula *bārûh yhw̄h \*lohê yisrā’el* (1 Sam. 25:32; 1 Kgs. 1:48; Ps. 41:13 [LXX 40:14]). Accordingly, it should be understood as a Hebraic formula. Brown 1993:370 identifies an

implicit subjunctive value in the sentence (ἦ); Plummer 1902:40, on the other hand, supplies an optative (εἴη). In fact, the indicative is most appropriate here. When supplying verbs in nominal sentences of praise, the Old Greek prefers to use indicative forms, particularly in *berakah* formulae (cf. Ps. 119 [LXX 118]:12; Deichgräber 1967:30-32, Milling 1972). In turn, New Testament doxologies containing a verb always employ an indicative form—never an optative, for instance: ἐστὶν εὐλογητὸς (Rom 1:25), ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα: (1 Pet. 4:11; cf. Gal. 1:5). In linking blessings or glory to God, these formulae extol “what is already a reality” (TDNT 2:248).

One might be inclined to read an implicit infinitive before the verbless v. 71 (σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶνμισούντων ἡμᾶς) given its position immediately before the infinitival clauses of v. 72. In fact, σωτηρίαν is an abstract appositive to κέρασ σωτηρίας in v. 69a, as suggested by the proximity between them (with the sense: “he has raised for us a horn of salvation. . . salvation from our enemies”; Fitzmyer 1981:384). Accordingly, v. 71 constitutes a single, appositional noun phrase and not a nominal sentence.

#### USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

The Greek text of the Benedictus contains eleven definite articles, appearing in the following phrases: ὁ θεὸς (v. 68a), τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (v. 68a), τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ (v. 68b), τῶν ἀγίων ἀπ’ αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (v. 70), τῶνμισούντων ἡμᾶς (*bize hatandane*; v. 71b), τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν (v. 72a), τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν (v. 73a), τὰς ἡμέρας ἡμῶν (v. 75b), τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ (v. 77b), and τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις (*paim in riqiza jah skadau daubus sitandam*; v. 79a), and τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν (v. 79b). The addition of a definite article τοῦ before Ἰσραήλ (v. 68a) alters the more familiar Old Greek formula, εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ (1 Sam. 25:32; 1 Kgs. 1:48; Ps. 41

[LXX 40]:14). A desire to reveal the case of the indeclinable noun likely inspires its addition (Wallace 1996:240-241).

Also of note, the article is absent before a number of nouns governing genitives in the Benedictus: ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυεὶδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ (v. 69b), ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν (v. 71a), διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ (v. 72b), ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν (v. 74a), ὁδοῦς αὐτοῦ (v. 76a), διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν (v. 78a). BDF § 259.3 sees the high frequency of such omissions as an indication of “strong Semitic coloring.” In Hebrew, the semantically definite head noun of a construct relation (equivalent to a genitive construction) is anarthrous. The Old Greek often omits the article when rendering these constructions (e.g., Ps. 34:15 [LXX 33:16]).

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

I will highlight only three case syntax issues in the Benedictus. All will prove significant in our study of the target language texts.

##### *vv. 68-71*

In my discussion of verbless clauses, I identified the clause-initial noun *σωτηρίαν* (v.71a) as an abstract appositive to the phrase *κέρας σωτηρίας* (v. 69a), precisely on the basis of the lexical link between the two words. The reason for the polyptoton is that *σωτηρίαν* is in apposition to the head noun of the noun phrase *κέρας σωτηρίας*.

vv. 72-79

The verb *μνησθήναι* (v. 72b) takes genitive direct objects (BDF § 175) (here, it governs the genitive *διαθήκης*). However, its apposition, *ῥρκον* (v. 73a), appears in the accusative case. In this instance, *ῥρκον* has assimilated to the case of the relative pronoun grammatically dependent upon it (*ὄν*), which receives accusative marking from the verb *ᾤμωσεν* (v. 73a; BDF § 295, Marshall 1978:92).

Lastly, the accusative participle *ῥυσθέντας* modifies the implicit first plural subject of the infinitive *λατρεύειν* (Brown 1993:372), i.e., *ἡμῶν* from v. 73b. A case discrepancy appears here insofar as *ἡμῶν* is an actual dative while *ῥυσθέντας* is the implicit subject of the infinitive. In New Testament Greek, participles as adjuncts are typically in the accusative case insofar as the subject of the infinitive “generally is, or is thought of as being, in the acc.” (BDF § 410).

#### WORD ORDER

Like the Magnificat, various lines of the Benedictus display a Semitic tendency towards a verb-initial clause structure (v. 68b, 69, 72, 79a, b). Brown (1993:371) cites the distribution of modifiers in the phrase *διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’ αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ* (v. 70) as an example of Luke’s mastery of Greek style. A parallel phrase appears in Acts. 3:21 with a nearly identical distribution, reordering only the final noun and possessive pronoun: *διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’ αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν*. Of all the gospel writers, only Luke regularly attempts noun phrases of this complexity (Harnack 1909:50).

## USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

The Benedictus departs from the starkly paratactic style of the Magnificat to include two relative clauses (vv. 73, 78b-79) and a single comparative clause (v. 70). The subordinating conjunction ὅτι also makes a single appearance in the canticle, occurring in v. 68b.

Nevertheless, parataxis does frame much of the canticle, though not through the extensive use of clause-initial καί, as in the Magnificat (the conjunction καί introduces only three clauses of the canticle: vv. 68, 72b, 76a). Instead, as noted earlier, the Benedictus relies heavily on the use of unconjoined or appositive infinitival clauses (vv. 72, 73b, 74b, 77a, 79a,b).

In one line of the canticle, καί is associated with the conjunctive particle δέ (v. 76a). The two together signal a transition between the canticle's early focus on the future ministry of the Messiah (vv. 68-75) and the future ministry of John (v. 76ff.). In this respect, it also has a shade of contrastive meaning (with the sense, "but you, O child"). The canticle also hosts one comparative clause in ὅτι (v. 68b).

## COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

Only one causal clause appears in the Benedictus (v. 68b-69), employing the subordinating conjunction ὅτι clause-initially with two conjoined verbs in the indicative mood: εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ / ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ / καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρασ σωτηρίας ἡμῖν . . . (v. 68-69). This line is the formal motive clause of the canticle (Farris 1985:135; Brown 1993:371).

## RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

Two relative clauses appear in the hymn. The first, located in v. 73, qualifies the noun ὄρκον in the same line: ὃν ὤμοσεν πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν. The pronoun ὃν receives the accusative case as the direct object of ὤμοσεν. As noted earlier, it imparts that case to its main clause referent ὄρκον via attraction. The second appears in the closing lines of the hymn, modifying the noun ἐλέους in the noun phrase σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν (v. 78a): ἐν οἷς ἐπισκέπεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους / ἐπιφάναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει. . . . (vv. 78b-79). As the object of the preposition ἐν, the relative pronoun in this clause appears in the dative.

## SPECIAL ISSUES AND CONSTRUCTIONS

The expression ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν (v. 68b; lit. “he has made redemption”) is unprecedented in the Old Greek and New Testament (cf. λύτρωσιν ἀπέστειλεν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ [Ps. 111 (LXX 109):9]; or the non-periphrastic verb: λυτροῦσθαι [Lk. 24:21; cf. other forms in Tit. 2:14; 1 Pet. 1:18]). It is likely a Hebraism (Brown 1993:371), mirroring the expression ποιῆσαι ἔλεος later in the hymn (v. 72), itself a Hebraism. That expression appears in the Old Greek of Ps. 109 [LXX 108]:16 (τοῦ ποιῆσαι ἔλεος), where it translates Hebr. “*sôt hāsēd*. (Other forms appear in Gen. 24:12; Jdg. 1:24; 8:35; 1 Sam. 20:8; 2 Sam. 3:8; and in the New Testament: Lk. 10:37; Acts 24:17). The particular construction in v. 72 parallels the LXX of Gen. 24:12, which closely follows the Hebrew text (Delebecque 1976:10):

Gen. 24:12

*wa<sup>a</sup>śeh ḥeṣeḏ 'im <sup>x</sup>donî 'abrāhām*

καὶ ποιήσον ἔλεος μετὰ τοῦ κυρίου μου Αβρααμ.

## 2.4. Gloria (The Angelic Hymn)

TEXT

Lk. 2:14

δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ

καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας.<sup>45</sup>

SECTION NOTES

The construction and brevity of this canticle fragment leaves several syntactic points unrepresented. It is best to simply exclude them from our discussion here. For instance, as the fragment contains no verbs, this section will contain no discussion of “Tense, Mood, and Diathesis,” the “Use of the Infinitive,” and the “Use of Participles.” Similarly, the fragment contains no complex sentence types, precluding our discussion of that syntactic category.

MARKED LANGUAGE FEATURES

The verse preceding this fragment establishes its character as a hymn, identifying it as an act of praise by a multitude of the celestial hosts (v. 13; καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἐγένετο . . . πλῆθος στρατιᾶς οὐρανοῦ αἰνούντων τὸν θεὸν καὶ λεγόντων). A fragment later in the gospel with striking parallels to the Gloria is similarly introduced as an instance of loud, joyful praise of God:

---

<sup>45</sup> The Byzantine MT and some patristic sources show ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. See discussion under “Special Issues and Constructions.”

Lk. 19:37b-38

τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. . . λέγοντες,

Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου:

ἐν οὐρανῶ εἰρήνῃ

καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις.

The Benedictus is the only other canticle to be externally identified with praise in the infancy narrative (cf. Lk. 1:64).

The Gloria itself is a single couplet, with two codas attached by a single καὶ (Bovon 2002:90). (This structure is defended under “Special Issues and Constructions.”) Its two lines are set in a complementary parallelism: one line oriented towards the divine domain of heaven (ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῶ<sup>46</sup>), the other towards the earth as the domain of humans (ἐπὶ γῆς. . . ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας). Celestial-terrestrial parallelisms are common in the Psalms (e.g., Pss. 57:11).

The fragment also boasts an AB-C // BA-C partial chiasm (cf. Watson 1994:338-39), reversing the order of the nominative nouns (δόξα, εἰρήνῃ) and locative prepositional phrases (ἐν ὑψίστοις, ἐπὶ γῆς) at the beginning of each line (Fitzmyer 1981:410; Bovon 2002:90-91):

---

<sup>46</sup> The phrase ἐν ὑψίστοις refers to the abode of God, and is a synonym for heaven (cf. Ps. 148:1). Accordingly, the phrase parallels ἐπὶ γῆς, a reference to the domain of humans (cf. Ps. 78:69 for a possible parallel).

δόξα (A) ἐν ὑψίστοις (B) θεῶ (C)

καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς (B') εἰρήνη (A') ἐν ἀνθρώποις

εὐδοκίας (C').

This type of chiasm reinforces the larger complementary parallelism by aligning references to the divine (θεῶ) and human (ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας) at the end of each coda.<sup>47</sup> In so doing, it lends greater prominence to both.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

The Gloria contains no verbs. Instead, the entire fragment consists of two nominal sentences, again, in a likely sign of Hebraic influence (Brown 1993:404). The verb implicit in each of these sentences is the indicative ἐστίν (with the sense, “glory is God’s/belongs to God”), not the optative εἴη (with the sense: “may glory be God’s”). As I noted in my discussion of the verbless clause in Lk. 1:68, New Testament doxological formulae supplying a verb always select an indicative form—never an optative (see discussion in 2.3).

#### USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

No definite articles appear in the fragment. In all instances, the absence of the article is consistent with the possibilities of Greek syntax. The first coda omits the article before abstract noun (δόξα), a prepositional object (ὑψίστοις), and a monadic noun (θεῶ). The second

---

<sup>47</sup> As Watson (1994:338) observes, in partial chiasms, it is also possible that the unchanged elements (C-C') stand outside the chiasmus.

coda omits the article before a monadic noun as the object of a preposition (γῆς), an abstract noun (εἰρήνη), and a generic noun as the object of a preposition (ἀνθρώποις).

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

One point of case syntax will prove relevant in our study of the target language texts. In the second coda of the fragment (v. 14b), ἐν, a preposition of location, takes the dative object ὑψίστοις: “in the heights” (i.e., the heavens).

#### WORD ORDER

The relative order of the nominative subjects (δόξα, εἰρήνη) and locative prepositional phrases (ἐν ὑψίστοις, ἐπὶ γῆς) is inverted across the couplet for stylistic reasons, explored above (“Marked Language Features”).

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

The coordinating conjunction καὶ is the only conjunction in the canticle. It supports the simple paratactic style of the fragment, uniting two codas into a simple couplet.

#### SPECIAL ISSUES AND CONSTRUCTIONS

A textual critical issue appears in v. 14b, with two major attested variants: ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας (cited in our text) and ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. The first uses εὐδοκίας as a genitive modifier of ἀνθρώποις, and can be translated, “among men of favor” (i.e., among favored men). The second uses the nominative form εὐδοκία, with the meaning, “among men, favor” (or “favor among men”).

Each variant represents a different analysis of the structure of v. 14. The first reads the verse as a bicolon, the interpretation offered throughout this section. In this reading, outlined earlier, each coda containing a nominative noun (δόξα, εἰρήνη), a locative prepositional phrase (ἐν ὑψίστοις, ἐπὶ γῆς), and a reference to the divine or human (θεῶ, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας):

Glory in the highest to God

And on earth, peace among men of favor.

The second model interprets the verse as a tricolon, with each coda containing a nominative noun (δόξα, εἰρήνη, and the nominative εὐδοκία), and a locative prepositional phrase (ἐν ὑψίστοις, ἐπὶ γῆς, ἐν ἀνθρώποις). The first coda takes an additional dative noun (θεῶ)<sup>48</sup>:

Glory in the highest to God

And on earth, peace

(And) among men, favor.

The oldest Greek codices, including A, as well as the Latin text tradition, support the reading εὐδοκίας. Parallel constructions appear in Qumranic texts (“sons of favor” in 1 QH 4:32-

---

<sup>48</sup> In Brown 1993:404 suggests a variant of this model, in which ἐν ἀνθρώποις is not a locative prepositional phrase, but an item paralleling θεῶ. In this model, the locative prepositional phrases (A) and references to the divine or human (B) are distributed in the three codas as follows: AB / A / B.

33; 11:9), utilizing the Hebr. *rāṣôn*, a noun the Old Greek often translates as εὐδοκία (e.g., Ps. 51:18 [LXX 50:20]; (Marshall 1978:112, Bovon 2002:91). In Hebrew, *rāṣôn* refers to the favor or delight of a superior (so Pss. 5:12; 51:18; Prov. 14:35). It does not refer to the “good will” of men (as in the Vulgate: *hominibus bonae voluntatis*).

## 2.5. Nunc Dimittis (Song of Simeon)

TEXT

Lk. 2:29-32

<sup>29</sup>νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα,

κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ·

<sup>30</sup>ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου,

<sup>31</sup>ὃ ἠτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν,

<sup>32</sup>φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν

καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ.

SECTION NOTES

No infinitives, participles, or verbless clauses appear in the Greek text of the canticle.

Consequently, there is no need to include discussions of the “Use of the Infinitive,” the “Use of Participles,” and “Verbless Clauses” in this section. The canticle also contains no constructions that will require extraordinary discussion under the heading “Lexical Differences and Special Constructions.”

## MARKED LANGUAGE FEATURES

The first line of the canticle lacks an expression of praise, analogous to those in the previous three hymns (Lk. 1:46, 68; 2:14).<sup>49</sup> Nevertheless, the preceding line (v. 28) records that Simeon “blessed God” with the words of the canticle (καὶ εὐλόγησεν τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἶπεν), an indication of its character as a hymn of praise. A strong parallel appears in Jubilees 45, which elaborates Jacob’s words to Joseph in Gen. 46:30 with explicit *berakah* formulae (Farris 1985:155):

Jub. 45:3-4

Now let me die since I have seen you,

and now may the Lord God of Israel be blessed,

the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac

who did not withhold His mercy and kindness from His servant Jacob.

It is enough for me that I have seen your face while I am yet alive;

indeed, true is the vision which I saw at Bethel.

Blessed is the Lord my God for ever and ever,

and blessed is His name.

---

<sup>49</sup> Farris 1985:145 is too hopeful when he identifies v. 29 as a “Word of Praise” parallel to Lk. 1:46, 68. As Gunkel and Begrich 1998:29 observes, a number of psalms omit, or use looser forms of, the introductory words of praise typical of the biblical hymn. Such appears to be the case here.

One should consider the description of divine salvation in vv. 30-32 as an implicit act of praise in the canticle: extolling God's glory precisely by recounting his acts. The line introducing that description (v. 30) is a motive clause, paralleling those of the Magnificat and Benedictus (Lk. 1:48a,b, 68b).

Structurally, the canticle consists of three couplets, only the last of which represents a parallelism (Farris 1985:144, Brown 1993:456-57). That couplet consists of two complementary noun phrases (v. 32). The first is in loose apposition to τὸ σωτήριόν σου (v. 30; Marshall 1978:121); the second in loose apposition to the first. (Compare the linkage of φῶς and δόξα in LXX Is. 60:1, within a passage thematically related to the Nunc Dimittis by its association of "light" and the "gentiles" [ἔθνη; LXX Is. 60:3]). Anchoring the end of the two lines are complementary references to the gentiles (v. 32a) and Israel (v. 32b).

#### TENSE, MOOD, AND DIATHESIS

Three finite verbs appear in the canticle. The first is a present indicative: ἀπολύεις (v. 29a). Most recent studies consider it a declarative indicative (Marshall 1978:119-120, Fitzmyer 1981:428, Farris 1985:146, Brown 1993:439), which in the present tense underscores Simeon's anticipation of an impending death (Bovon 2002:102). For Simeon, the fulfillment of the condition of his death (the experience of the "the Lord's Christ"; v. 26) is the sign and first movement of his departure from life. (Notably, the Old Greek of Gen. 49:30, a possible model for this text, uses a future indicative: ἀποθανοῦμαι ["I will die"].)

Two aorists also appear in the canticle: εἶδον (v. 30) and ἤτοιμασας (v. 31). Within the narrative, the first verb refers to Simeon's experience of the Christ child (continuing through

his recitation of the hymn; v. 28). The second refers to the public manifestation (“before the face of all peoples”) of the Christ child (“the salvation”) through the events of the infancy narrative, especially his birth.

#### USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Five instances of the Greek definite article appear in the canticle: τὸν δοῦλόν (v. 29a), τὸ ῥήμά (v. 29b), οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (v. 30) and τὸ σωτήριόν (v. 30), and τῶν λαῶν (v. 31). The article is absent before the indefinite noun φῶς (v. 32a). It is also absent in the following prepositional phrases: ἐν εἰρήνῃ (v. 29b), κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν (v. 31), and εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν (v. 32; cf. εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν LXX Is. 42:6; 49:6). Finally, the definite article is absent in the genitive construction δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ (v. 32b), perhaps through the influence of the Hebrew construct state.

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

That ἐθνῶν (v. 32a) appears in the genitive case, rather than the dative, is peculiar. This use of the genitive case mirrors the expression εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν in two Old Greek texts linguistically and thematically related to the present hymn (Is. 42:6; 49:6; Farris 1985:14).

#### WORD ORDER

No significant deviations from the word order parameters of Luke appear in the hymn. The first line of the hymn is VO (v. 29). The ὅτι clause that follows is VSO (v. 30). Finally, the relative clause is OV (v. 31).

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

The coordinate conjunction *καί* occurs once in the canticle, linking appositive noun phrases in a single couplet (v. 32b). In this capacity, it supports the paratactic style of the hymn. The conjunction *ὅτι* is also used once, introducing a causal subordinate clause (v. 30).

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

Only one causal clause appears in the *Nunc Dimittis* (v. 30), introduced by the subordinating conjunction *ὅτι*: *νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα / . . . / ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου* (vv. 29-30). It identifies the event that occasions or justifies the dismissal of Simeon from his earthly life.

#### RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

One relative clause appears in the hymn (v. 31): *. . . τὸ σωτήριόν σου / ᾧ ἠτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν*, (vv. 31-32). The relative pronoun takes the gender and number of its main clause referent, but the accusative case assigned it by relative clause verb *ἠτοίμασας*.

## 2.6. Conclusion

At the conclusion of this chapter, I can now catalogue the marked language features of the Greek syntax of each canticle. I will use this catalogue as the basis for describing the translation strategies of each target language version with respect to particular marked language features in the Greek. Since the limited size of these passages is probably too small to support a percentage-based statistical survey, I will simply enumerate and cite specific instances of each feature.

### POETIC DEVICES

I have decided to limit this survey to stylistic devices directly or indirectly relevant to translation syntax: i.e., phonetically-, morphologically-, and syntactically-based devices in the Greek. Excluded are content-based poetic tropes (e.g., metaphor, allusion) and modes of vivid semantic expression (e.g., metonymy, polysemy). These marked language features can be grouped into the following five categories:

#### *Line*

Line is the fundamental unit of poetic expression in the Bible, most often arranged into more complex but definable units (especially, couplets).<sup>50</sup> One would generally expect that a word-for-word translation would preserve these structures intact.

---

<sup>50</sup> Due to substantial disagreement in the literature as to the strophe/stanza structure of the Magnificat and Benedictus (see Farris 1985:132-133), it is best to avoid an analysis of stanza. In any case, stanza is not a feature of the smaller hymns (the Gloria and Nunc

### *Terseness*

As noted earlier, this category includes any phenomenon that promotes a “compact” or “loose” syntactic style. In general, a “compact style” avoids subordinate or relative constructions, strings clauses or phrases to one another with little indication of their interrelatedness (e.g., parataxis, loose infinitival syntax, appositive noun phrase), or otherwise omits elements. This category will be of special interest in our discussion, as the preservation of such features may not be possible in all languages without sacrificing clarity of expression, or worse, intelligibility.

### *Stylistic Structures*

This category focuses on the stylistic or patterned arrangement of clausal, phrasal, or lexical elements. The most common form of stylistic structuring in the canticles is parallelism, which unites lines of associated ideas into a single couplet. In this syntactic study, parallelism can include any structures meeting this criterion, regardless of their semantic nuances (e.g., synonymous, antithetical, staircase, etc.). This category also includes a related phenomenon: chiasms, which arrange ideas in a more complex, but symmetrical pattern. Anaphora, where present, belongs under this heading as well. One would expect a literal translation to preserve the word order essential to all three of these phenomena. I will also include conduplicatio, or the repetition of theme words, under this heading.

---

Dimittis), and any stanza breaks in the Magnificat and Benedictus would coincide with line breaks, which are included in this study.

### *Stylistic Grammatical Forms*

Included here are any phenomena that manipulate grammatical form or inflection for stylistic purposes. This would include non-semantic tense alternation and non-semantic preposition/case alternation. Once again, the possibility exists that the transmission of these devices could sacrifice clarity of expression.

### *Phonaesthetics*

Phonaesthetics concerns the sound shapes of textual elements, and includes phenomena that exploit similarity of sound shape, or the repetition of sounds. In this study I will narrow the focus of this category to phonaesthetic phenomena with an indirect influence on morphology and syntax. These phenomena include sound repetitions that rely upon the likeness of inflectional ending or are in any way dependent upon the sound shape of the morphological ending. Insofar as these phenomena can dictate morphology, they may also be relevant to translation syntax.

### MAGNIFICAT

The Magnificat makes the most extensive use of parallelism in the development of poetic line (6/9 lines). It is also the only canticle to boast phonaesthetic effects and stylistic grammatical alterations.

Table 2.2. Marked Language Syntax of the Magnificat.

A. Line	
A.1. Couplet Structure	
A.1.1. Couplets (vv. 46b-47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55)	9
A.1.2. Other (N/A)	0
B. Terseness	
B.1. Parataxis	
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (vv. 46b-47, 49, 52, 53)	4
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (vv. 51, 55)	2
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)	0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (vv. 48, 50, 54)	3
B.2. Loose infinitival syntax (v. 54b)	1
B.3. Verbless clauses <sup>51</sup> (vv. 49b, 50)	2

---

<sup>51</sup> Although I analyzed the verbless clauses merely as a feature of Hebrew style, they certainly support the compactness of the hymn. Any translation that might insert verbs into these sentences might sacrifice at least some of the compactness of the hymn.

B.4. Limited use of relative constructions (N/A)	0 <sup>52</sup>
---	-----------------

### C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms (vv. 46b-47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55)	6
C.2. Chiasm (thematic ABBA and verb-object ABAB//BABA; vv. 52-53)	2

### D. Stylistic Grammatical Forms

D.1. Non-semantic Tense Alternation (present // aorist; vv. 46b-47)	1
D.2. Non-semantic Case/Preposition Alternation (πρὸς + accusative // dative; v. 55)	1

### E. Phonaesthetics

E.1. Rhyme: Isoptoton (ABAB; vv. 52-53)	2 <sup>53</sup>
E.2. Non-consecutive Partial Hypogram (ταπεινούς / πεινῶντας – vv. 52-53)	1

---

<sup>52</sup> A negative value will appear for each additional subordinate clause in the target language versions.

<sup>53</sup> Each rhyming pair is counted as a single instance of the phenomenon.

## BENEDICTUS

Among the canticles, the Benedictus alone contains lines that are not arranged within couplet structures (2/9 lines). It is also distinguished by its use of conduplicatio.

Table 2.2. Marked Language Syntax of the Benedictus.

A. Line	
A.1. Couplet Structure	
A.1.1. Couplets (vv. 68, 69, 71, 72, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78, 79)	9
A.1.2. Other (vv. 70, 73)	2
B. Terseness	
B.1. Parataxis	
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (vv. 71, 72)	2
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (vv. 79)	1
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)	0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (vv. 68, 69, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78)	3
B.2. Loose infinitival syntax (vv. 72, 73b, 74b, 77a, 79a,b)	6

B.3. Appositive noun phrases (vv. 71, 73a)	2
B.4. Verbless clauses (vv. 68a)	1
B.5. Limited use of relative constructions (EXCEPTIONS: vv. 73, 78b-79)	-2 <sup>54</sup>

### C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms (vv. 71, 72, 79)	3
C.2. Conduplicatio (vv. 69a, 71; vv. 71, 74; vv. 71, 74; vv. 76b, 79b)	4

#### GLORIA

Though limited to a single verse, the language of the Gloria fragment manifests the same types of features as the Benedictus: line, terseness, and stylistic structures. Like the Magnificat, the fragment also employs a chiasm.

---

<sup>54</sup> Negative values indicate the presence of relative clauses.

Table 2.4. Marked Language Syntax of the Gloria.

A. Line	
A.1. Couplet Structure	
A.1.1. Couplets (v. 14)	1
A.1.2. Other (N/A)	0
B. Terseness	
B.1. Parataxis	
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (v. 14)	1
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (N/A)	0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)	0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (N/A)	0
B.2. Verbless Clauses (v. 14)	2
C. Stylistic Structures	
C.1. Parallelisms (v. 14)	1

## C.2. Chiasm

(AB-C // BA-C; v. 14)

1

## NUNC DIMITTIS

The marked language of the Nunc Dimittis is limited to the same categories as the Benedictus and Gloria. It compares closely to the Benedictus in its use of appositive noun phrases, but keeps a more consistent couplet structure throughout.

### Table 2.5. Marked Language Syntax of the Nunc Dimittis.

#### A. Line

##### A.1. Couplet Structure

###### A.1.1. Couplets

(vv. 29, 30-31, 32)

3

###### A.1.2. Other

(N/A)

0

#### B. Terseness

##### B.1. Parataxis

###### B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola

(v. 32)

1

###### B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ

(N/A)

0

###### B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ

(N/A)

0

B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (vv. 29, 30-31)	3
B.2. Appositive noun phrases (v. 32)	2
B.3. Limited use of relative constructions (v. 31)	-1
C. Stylistic Structures	
C.1. Parallelisms (v. 32)	1

#### SUMMARY

Before concluding this chapter, I would like to offer a few brief observations on the language of the four canticles as a whole. First, it is worth noting that the most outstanding poetic feature in these passages is the use of couplet structures. Some 44/46 lines of the canticles form couplets (95.7%). Of these, only 22 form parallelisms (50.0% of the couplets; 47.8% of the total text).

Only 8/22 couplets employ καὶ to conjoin lines (34.7%). Notably, 8/11 parallelisms use καὶ in this fashion (72.7%), compared to 0/11 non-parallelisms (0.0%). Although our sample size is small, this relationship is nonetheless striking. It appears the Lukan canticles associate the paratactic use of καὶ with the construction of parallelisms. By contrast, 12/22 couplets

string clauses together without the use of coordinate conjunction (54.5%); this phenomenon is the most common means of supporting terseness in the canticles.

## CHAPTER 3

### GOTHIC

#### 3.0. Introduction

Having thoroughly canvassed the Greek syntax of the canticles, I am now prepared to engage in a comparative study of the Greek and target language texts, beginning with Gothic. No dedicated study of the Gothic syntax of the canticles exists, though a number of syntactic studies with broader scopes and concerns cite examples from the hymns.

#### SOURCE TEXT

As noted earlier, this study will utilize the text of the canticles contained in the sixth century *Codex Argenteus* and hosted on PROIEL. This codex preserves the Gothic Bible translated by the fourth century Arian bishop Wulfila. 188 of 336 folios of the *Argenteus* survive, making it the most complete collection of the Gothic gospels (Metzger 2001:39-40). Given the scarcity of Gothic-language liturgical texts in general, we have no copies of the text in liturgical sources, nor evidence that the Lukan canticles were utilized in the liturgies or hours of the Arian church.

## THE INFLUENCE OF THE OLD LATIN

Various studies identify the influence of Western readings on the text of the Gothic Bible (Streitberg 2000, Jülicher 1910, Lietzmann 1919, Friedrichsen 1926, 1959, and Griepentrog 1990), especially Old Latin witnesses (Falluomini 2013:339). We will identify two such influences in our study of the canticles. Various explanations for this phenomenon exist, including: (1) the translator's use of a Latin text as an aid when rendering the Greek text (so Lietzmann 1919, Falluomini 2013:341-4), and (2) the intrusion of Western readings familiar to the Goths at a later stage of transmission (Friedrichsen 1926).

## CHAPTER OUTLINE

At the outset of the chapter, I will provide an overview of Gothic syntax, with a special interest in the categorical deviations between New Testament Greek and Gothic grammar (3.1). I will then discuss the Gothic text of each canticle individually, according to the same syntactic categories examined in the Greek chapter. In my discussion of each, I will specifically highlight: (1) general tendencies in the Gothic rendering of the Greek text, (2) particular disparities between the Greek and Gothic texts, and (3) interesting, even peculiar, areas of agreement. I am not interested in exploring every point of Gothic syntax to the same detail I explored the Greek syntax. Nor is it my intention to discuss the Gothic translation of every particular Greek construction highlighted in Chapter 2.

### 3.1. Overview of Gothic Syntax

In this chapter, I hope to isolate the peculiar impact of marked language on the Gothic translation. To do this, I must first review the Gothic treatment of the unmarked Greek. In this section, then, I will outline the syntax of the Gothic language below with a constant eye towards categorical equivalences and discrepancies between New Testament Greek and Gothic syntax. I will also highlight the Gothic categories that characteristically translate certain Greek categories across the Gothic Bible. In both cases, I will try to limit my observations to points of syntax relevant to the study of the canticles, eschewing a more exhaustive survey.

Most grammars of Gothic provide more complete overviews of Gothic syntax, including: Brauge 1883, Douse 1886, Streitberg 1920, Mossé 1956, and to some extent, Lambdin 2006. Beyond these, one can find numerous studies devoted to specific categories of Gothic syntax, including studies of Tense and Aspect (Scherer 1954, Lloyd 1979) Word Order (Eyþórsson 1996, Ferraresi 2005), and Relative Clause syntax (Harbert 1992). Also relevant to this study are a number of studies that address the independence of Gothic syntax vis-à-vis the Greek text, including: Curme 1911, Metlen 1933, Greiner 1992, Klein 1992a, Dawson 2002.

#### *Tense, Mood, Diathesis*

Gothic does not preserve the three-way aspectual oppositions still evident in Greek (imperfective-perfective-perfect). Furthermore, Gothic manifests only a two-way opposition of tense, distinguishing the present (present) and preterite (past). The latter generally renders synthetic aorists, imperfects, and perfects in the Greek text, though in certain examples, the

perfectivizing prefix *ga-* is added when translating aorists (Ramat 1998:403). Gothic also lacks a future tense; it renders Greek futures with either a present indicative or present optative (Klein 1992a:341).

Gothic also evinces a two-way opposition in mood between the indicative and optative (or subjunctive), roughly corresponding to a dichotomy between the real and unreal (the latter category embracing desires, instructions, potentialities, etc.; Streitberg 1920:204, Ramat 1998:403). Gothic also boasts an imperative mood, though this mood is highly marked, being limited to direct commands. Both the Gothic indicative and optative can render the Greek subjunctive. The Gothic optative translates the Greek optative (Klein 1992a:342-43), a mood absent in the canticles.

Finally, Gothic distinguishes between only two voices: an active and a passive. The Greek middle can be captured by the use of Gothic reflexive pronouns. The preterite passive does not exist as a distinct form, but can be realized through a passive participle + *wisan* (“to be”) construction, a passive participle + *wairþan* (“to become”) construction, or a preterite of a Class VI weak verb (Klein 1992a:341).

#### *Use of the Infinitive*

As we will see below, Gothic often utilizes its own infinitive to render Greek infinitives, though not exclusively. However, where Greek distinguishes between aorist, present, perfect, and future infinitives, Gothic uses a single infinitival form. Gothic may also render Greek articular infinitives with either a plain infinitive or a (prepositional) *du* + infinitive construction (Callaway 1913:231).

The Gothic translator sometimes renders infinitives of purpose, especially those with τοῦ, with an *ei* + optative construction (Streitberg 1920:210). For example, in a non-poetic passage of the infancy narratives, he translates a Greek infinitive of purpose with *ei* + participle + optative: καὶ ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι // *jah iddjedun allai, ei melidai weseina* (Lk. 2:3).

#### *Use of Participles*

Present active, present middle, and aorist active participles in the Greek text are characteristically rendered with present participles in the Gothic (Greiner 1992:103). Additionally, preterite passive participles can translate Greek aorist passive participles. In many instances, however, the Gothic text translates substantival participles with nouns or substantival adjectives.

#### *Verbless Clauses*

The syntax of Gothic accommodates nominal sentences. The translator supplies a verb in only one such sentence in the canticles (Lk. 1:71).

#### *Use of the Definite Article*

Gothic does not possess obligatory definite or indefinite articles. Accordingly, the Gothic Bible fails to translate thousands of definite articles in the Greek New Testament. The peculiarity of any omission in the Gothic text is striking, and speaks to the considerable

distance between Greek and Gothic with respect to this syntactic category.<sup>55</sup> Nevertheless, Gothic does possess a demonstrative adjective (*sa/þa*) with anaphoric and deictic functions before a noun. Under certain conditions, this demonstrative adjective can stand where a definite article appears in the Greek. When a demonstrative adjective determines a noun, any attributive adjectives governed by the same noun observe the weak inflection.

### *Case and Number Syntax*

Greek and Gothic have analogous case systems, both distinguishing nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, and vocative cases. This opens the possibility for direct correspondences between Greek and Gothic cases (e.g., accusative for accusative). However, certain variations upset this similarity. First, the Gothic dative subsumes the functions of the Proto-Indo-European ablative, whereas the Greek genitive case harbors these. Secondly, the case governance of corresponding prepositions in the Greek and Gothic texts can differ (see full discussion in Klein 1992b). Thirdly, Gothic pronominal possessive adjectives agree in case with their governing nouns, unlike the Greek genitive personal pronouns they often translate. Finally, with respect to number, it is worth noting that Gothic utilizes a category absent in New Testament Greek: the dual.

---

<sup>55</sup> As Friedrichsen (1936:15) notes: “No other feature of the Gothic Version is more characteristic of the translator’s style than this. Every word of the Greek text, excepting the definite article, is normally represented in the Gothic, even particles like μέν, δέ, ἄν, and others.”

### *Word Order*<sup>56</sup>

As a general rule, the Gothic text follows the word order of Greek. This fidelity is at times so strict that the Gothic has been caricatured as an “interlinear” of the Greek Bible (Metlen 1933:548). The Gothic canticles certainly observe this rule, consistently following the relative ordering of words in the Greek text, excluding omitted items and non-one-to-one correspondences.

This fidelity suggests that Gothic had a fairly free or flexible word order, not unlike other languages rich in inflectional morphemes, including Greek. However, there were apparent limits to this flexibility. The Gothic text systematically deviates from the word order of the Greek in a number of instances. For example, in certain passages, the Gothic text independently renders Greek intransitive verbs as a verb + non-pronominal complement. From those instances, it appears that the unmarked clause structure of Gothic is OV (SOV with an expressed subject), parallel to the typology of other early Germanic languages (Eyþórsson 1996:109-10).

### *Use of Conjunctions*

The Gothic text generally renders the coordinate conjunction  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  as *jah*, and the subordinate clause-initial conjunction  $\delta\tau\iota$  with a variety of Gothic conjunctions, including *unte* and *þande(i)*. The Greek particle  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  only appears in the combination  $\kappa\alpha\iota \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ; in these

---

<sup>56</sup> In my study of individual canticles, I will omit discussions of word order where the target language text does not deviate from the word order of the Greek, unless that fact is particularly noteworthy in a given passage.

constructions, the Gothic Bible generally translates δέ as *þan* (Lambdin 2006:59). Lastly, conjunctions translating γάρ include: *allis*, *auk*, *raihtis*, and *unte*. The first three, like γάρ, are postpositional; *unte*, by contrast, is clause-initial. Notably, it is unclear how the translator selected between *allis*, *auk*, and *raihtis*. However, he employs *unte* “when dealing with a simple action in the past” (Lambdin 2006:66). Only *allis* and *auk* appear in the canticles. All occurrences of *allis*, and nearly all occurrences of the postpositive *auk*, translate the Greek postpositive γάρ (Lambdin 2006:67).

#### *Complex Sentence Types*

As noted earlier, the only complex sentence type in the canticles is the causal clause. The Gothic translator builds such clauses with a clause-initial Gothic subordinating conjunction (typically *unte* for Greek ὅτι), and an indicative verb (Klein 1992a:356-57).

#### *Relative Clause Syntax*

As in Greek, the Gothic relative pronoun (*saei*) generally takes the gender and number of its main clause referent, but the case assigned it by the relative clause verb. In certain passages, this creates a difference in the case of the relative pronoun and its main clause referent. Many of these instances are further complicated by the syntactic ambiguity of the nominative/accusative neuter relative pronouns *þatei* and *þoei* (Lambdin 2006:53-54).

### 3.2. Magnificat

TEXT

Lk. 1:46b-55<sup>57</sup>

<sup>46b</sup>*mikileid saiwala meina fraujan,*

*<sup>47</sup>jah swegneid ahma meins du guda nasjand meinamma. <sup>48</sup>unte insah du*

*hnaiweinai piujos seinaihos;*

*sai allis, fram himma nu audagjand mik alla kunja.*

<sup>49</sup>*unte gatawida mis mikilein sa mahteiga,*

*jah weih namo is.*

<sup>50</sup>*jah armahairtei is in aldins alde*<sup>58</sup>

*paim ogandam ina.*

<sup>51</sup>*gatawida swinpein in arma seinamma,*

*distahida mikilpuhtans gahugdai hairtins seinis; <sup>52</sup>gadrausida mahteigans af*

*stolam*

*jah ushauhida gahnaiwidans;*

---

<sup>57</sup> When presenting the target language texts, I will preserve the couplet format of the Greek text contained in Nestle-Aland 28.

<sup>58</sup> The expression *in aldins alde* (*in* + accusative plural + genitive plural) does not reflect the reading reconstructed in our critical text. It instead corresponds to a Greek εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν (of the Byzantine/Majority Text and early codices, including A; cf. the Old Latin reading *in saecula saeculorum* [e.g., in the *Veronensis*]). This is also the reading Streitberg 2000:88 reconstructs for the Greek Vorlage.

<sup>53</sup>*gredagans gasopida þiuþe*

*jah gabignandans insandida lausans.*

<sup>54</sup>*hleibida Israela þiumagu seinamma,*

*gamunands armahairteins,*

<sup>55</sup>*swaswe rodida du attam unsaraim*

*Abrahama jah fraiwa is und aiw.*

#### MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

By strictly following the word order of the Greek, the canticle preserves the parallelisms, paratactic style, and single chiasm (vv. 52-53) of the Greek text. However, the non-consecutive partial hypogram at the center of the chiasm (ταπεινός / πεινῶνας; vv. 52b-53a) is lost, as the corresponding Gothic lexemes corresponding to these Greek have less similar sound shapes (*gahnaiwidans* / *gredagans*). Nevertheless, these two words do share like endings, unlike their Greek counterparts (which represent different declensions). A new and non-deliberate isoptoton at the heart of vv. 52-53 strengthens the impression of the larger chiasm.

Also lost is the ABAB isoptoton in the same unit. The Greek text rhymes the genitive plural endings of θρόνων and ἀγαθῶν in lines 52a, 53a (A-A'). However, whereas the Greek preposition ἀπὸ takes genitive objects (in this instance, θρόνων; v. 52a), its corresponding Gothic preposition, *af*, takes dative objects (*stolam*). The dative ending of *stolam* does not rhyme with the genitive ending of *þiuþe* (v. 53a).

At best, only a simpler ABCB rhyme is preserved in the tetracolon (vv. 52-53), pairing the masculine accusative plurals of *gahnaiwidans* (v. 52b) and *lausans* (v. 53b):

A     *gadrausida mahteigans afstolam*

*jah ushauhida gahnaiwidans;*

A'    *gredagans gasopida þiuþe*

*jah gabignandans insandida lausans.*

Still, it is unclear whether this simple identity in inflectional endings would have registered as rhyme at all to a Gothic ear. I first defended the presence of a deliberate rhyme in the Greek text of the tetracolon on the basis of the concentration of two rhymes in vv. 52-53 (in a unit with other obvious poetic features). The Gothic text obviously differs from the Greek text in this respect. Although the rhyme between the accusative plurals *gahnaiwidans* (v. 52b) and *lausans* (v. 53b) residually reflects the ABBA rhyme of the original Greek (which paired the accusative plurals *ταπεινούς* and *κενούς*), it is probably not an overt feature of the Gothic text. Rather, the rhyme is an accident of the Gothic translator's insistence on preserving the word order of the Greek text, and where possible, its case syntax as well.

*vv. 46b-47*

Most remarkably, the Gothic translator has independently eliminated the stylistic tense shift between the present verb *μεγαλύνει* (v. 46b) and the aorist *ἠγαλλίασεν* (v. 47).<sup>59</sup> Rather than translate the first verb with a present and the second with a preterite, consistent with his treatment of these tenses in other texts, he has rendered both with simple present indicatives. In so doing, the translator succeeds in capturing the semantic equivalency of the two verbs in the Greek text. By leveling the grammatical tense of these clause-initial verbs, he also strengthens the parallelism between the two codas of the canticle's opening couplet, (vv. 46b-47):

*mikileid saiwala meina fraujan,* (PRES. ACT. IND. 3 SG.)

*jah swegneid ahma meins du guda. . .* (PRES. ACT. IND. 3 SG.)

It seems there were limits to the Gothic translator's desire to imitate the tense choices of the Greek with analogous categories in his own language. Apparently, the translator prioritized grammatical fidelity to the Greek text in his translation except when such fidelity might violate the logic of the narrative, or otherwise confuse his readers. But in this instance,

---

<sup>59</sup> Neither the Byzantine nor Latin traditions witness a parallel reading. Instead, as Jared S. Klein (1992:368) notes, "we are dealing with an independent Sprachgefühl here on the part of the Gothic translator."

did the translator rightly perceive, and attempt to capture, the actual sense of the Greek text (i.e., the semantic equivalency of the verbs)? Or, did he mean to correct the tense shift as an ostensible difficulty, inconsistency, or deficiency in the sense of the Greek text?

In his analysis of the text, Jared S. Klein suggests the latter. Beginning with the premise that the aorist verb in the Greek text “denotes a past so recent as to be directly contiguous with the present,” he concludes, “the translator found the Gothic preterite too remote and too impersonal and colorless to render both the temporal nuance and the wonder and ecstasy of the speakers” (Klein 1992a:368). It is certainly possible that the Gothic translator interpreted the Greek verb in a similar manner, misperceiving its semantic force. Dissatisfied with the tense choice of the Greek, he could then have elected to employ a present form in its stead.

Bridget Drinka (2011), in a recent discussion of the translation technique of the Gothic Bible, agrees with Klein that the Gothic translator recognized an anterior nuance in the aorist ἡγαλλίασεν. However, she speculates that the translator did not so much improve or correct the tense choice of the Greek as employ a translation strategy that, though rarer, still lay within the breadth of his possible approaches to such a form:

While it is surely true, as Klein points out. . . that the preterite would not as successfully convey the immediacy of Mary’s joy as the present does, it must also be noted that preterites are used in the following two lines to render aorists.

Furthermore, aorists in the *κοινή* frequently expressed anterior meaning at this time as perfects and aorists began to fall together. . . so that a present translation, while rare,

would not be entirely unlicensed. In the last analysis, it seems best to recognize, with Klein, that some variability in the temporal-aspectual system did exist in the Gothic version, but that imitation of Greek syntactic patterns was far more common. (Drinka 2011:57).<sup>60</sup>

Like Klein, Drinka works from the premise that the aorist ἠγαλλίασεν is semantically past, albeit with an anterior nuance. From this premise, both infer that the Gothic translator prioritized the anterior nuance of the verb over its past character.

The principal weakness of both views is their narrow interest in the particular form altered in the Gothic text (ἠγαλλίασεν). It is startling that neither discussion mentions the couplet structure and parallelism of vv. 46b-47, or explores the pairing of the aorist ἠγαλλίασεν with the present μεγαλύνει in the preceding line. Both studies work from the assumption that the aorist ἠγαλλίασεν has a distinct tense/aspectual value, independent from that of the present μεγαλύνει. They then focus exclusively on that value, determining it with reference to the logic of the surrounding narrative (e.g., the starting point of Mary's joy, and her ecstatic state), rather than the structural position of ἠγαλλίασεν in the canticle. It is surely no coincidence that ἠγαλλίασεν has assimilated to the tense of precisely that verb with which it is set in a parallelism (the only present verb in the Greek text). Even if one does not agree that the tense shift between the two Greek verbs is merely stylistic and non-semantic, there is

---

<sup>60</sup> It is unclear whether Drinka argues that at least some of the aorists in subsequent lines could also have been rendered as presents.

every reason to believe that the Gothic translator allowed *μεγαλύνει* to determine the semantic sense of *ἡγαλλίασεν* in this instance. In this, he apparently took a translation cue from the couplet structure and parallelism of the canticle itself (both marked language features). The peculiarity of his tense choice here fits the peculiar (i.e., marked) character of the passage as poetry.<sup>61</sup>

The translator's position was not unlike that of translators of the Old Greek, Aramaic Targum, and Syriac Peshitta when confronted with the same poetic device in the Psalms. Each of these translations eliminated stylistic tense shifts in poetic texts (Buth 1984:69-70), recognizing the semantic equivalency of verbs precisely in light of their pairing within parallelisms. These translators did not require a formal understanding of the poetic device of stylistic tense shifting to understand the actual sense of these texts—neither did the Gothic translator studying vv. 46b-47.

*vv. 48-55*

Over the remainder of the canticle, the Gothic translator consistently renders finite aorists with Gothic preterites, three with the perfectivizing prefix *ga-*: *ἐπέβλεψεν* (*insahv*; v. 48a) *ἐποίησέν* (*gatawida*; vv. 49a, 51a), *διεσκόρπισεν* (*distahida*; v. 51b), *καθεῖλεν* (*gadrausida*; v. 52a), *ὑψωσεν* (*ushauhida*; v. 52b), *ἐνέπλησεν* (*gasopida*; v. 53a), *ἐξάπέστειλεν* (*insandida*; v. 53b), *ἀντελάβετο* (*hleibida*; v. 54), and *ἐλάλησεν* (*rodida*; v. 55a). This includes the gnomic aorists of

---

<sup>61</sup> In this study, we have sought to establish whether and where the marked language context of the canticles might have influenced translation decisions in the Classical Armenian, Gothic, and Church Slavonic versions. It most certainly has in this instance.

vv. 51-53. The one future verb in the Greek text of the canticle (μακαριοῦσίν; v. 48b) appears in the Gothic text as a present indicative. As v. 48b is not truly prospective (since Elizabeth has already called Mary “blessed”; Lk. 2:42-45), a present optative is inappropriate here. Finally, the Gothic text translates the one middle verb in the canticle (ἀντελάβετο; v. 54) as an active verb (*hleibida*). All of these choices fall within the regular translation pattern of the Gothic translator.

#### USE OF THE INFINITIVE

Intriguingly, the Gothic text translates the canticle’s sole infinitive (the aorist passive infinitive μνησθῆναι [“to remember”]; v. 54b) with a participle (the present active *gamunands* [“remembering”]). Apparently, the Gothic translator felt uncomfortable with the loose construction of the infinitive in the Greek text, a marked construction consistent with the paratactic style of the canticles, and of the infinitive-rich Benedictus in particular (which we will visit in the next section).

#### USE OF PARTICIPLES

Gothic translates two of three Greek substantival participles in the canticle as Gothic substantival participles. The first is the present middle participle φοβουμένοις (v. 50b), which in the Gothic text appears as present active participle *ogandam*. The second is the present active participle πλουτοῦντας (v. 53b), corresponding to the Gothic present active participle *gabignandans*. The Gothic translator renders the third substantival participle in the canticle, πεινῶντας (v. 53a), with a substantival adjective: *gredagans*.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

Gothic retains both nominal sentences in the canticle: *καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* (*jah weih namo is*; v. 49b), and *καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς* (*jah armahairtei is in aldins alde*; v. 50). In neither instance does the Gothic text supply a verb, or recast the lines as relative clauses. As noted earlier, both sentences appear to qualify ὁ δυνατός (Gothic: *sa mahteiga*) in v. 49.

#### USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

The Gothic text does not translate fifteen definite articles in the Greek text: ἡ ψυχὴ (*saiwala*; v. 46b), τὸν κύριον (*fraujan*; v. 46b), τὸ πνεῦμά (*ahma*; v. 47), τῷ θεῷ (*guda*; v. 47), τῷ σωτήρῃ (*nasjand*; v. 47), τὴν ταπείνωσιν (*hnaiweinai*; v. 48a), τῆς δούλης (*biujos*; v. 48a), ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (*fram himma nu*; v. 48b), αἱ γενεαί (*kunja*; v. 48b), τὸ ὄνομα (*namo*; v. 49b), τὸ ἔλεος (*armahairtei*; v. 50a), τοὺς πατέρας (*attam*; v. 55a), τῷ Ἀβραάμ (*Abrahama*; v. 55b), τῷ σπέρματι (*fraiwa*; v. 55b), τὸν αἰῶνα (*aiw*; v. 55b). It does, however, supply the *sa/ha* demonstrative adjective in two instances: ὁ δυνατός (*sa mahteiga*; v. 49a) and τοῖς φοβουμένοις (*haim ogandam*; v. 50b). In the former instance, the demonstrative adjective is specifying, recalling previous references to “the Mighty One” (that is, God) in the canticle by different names or titles (vv. 46b-48a). In the latter instance, it is substantivizing (with the sense “those/the ones [that are fearing him]”).

## CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

The Gothic text deviates from the cases of the Greek text in a number of places. Three instances reflect the translation of Greek genitive personal pronouns as Gothic pronominal possessive adjectives, which agree in case with their governing nouns. This includes two instances of the first person μου (v. 46b, 47), and one of the third person αὐτοῦ (v. 51a). A further four instances are due to differences in prepositional case governance. Greek ἀπό, for instance, exclusively governs genitive objects (τοῦ νόου [v. 48b]; θρόνων [v. 52a]). In the Gothic text, it corresponds in one instance to the Gothic *fram*, which exclusively governs the dative (*himma nu* [v. 48b]), and in the other to *af*, which also takes dative objects (*stolam* [v. 52a]). Furthermore, the Gothic text twice translates the Greek preposition ἐπὶ as *du* (vv. 47, 48a). In the first instance, ἐπὶ governs a dative object (τῷ θεῷ [v. 47]); in the second, it governs an accusative object (τὴν ταπείνωσιν [v. 48a]). However, the Gothic preposition *du* only takes dative objects: thus, *du guda* (v. 47), and *du hnaiweinai* (v. 48a). Gothic *du* also corresponds to the Greek preposition πρὸς, which always governs accusative objects. Thus, the accusative phrase τοὺς πατέρας (v. 55a) appears as a dative in the Gothic text: *attam*.

Notably, by using the preposition *du*, which assigns dative case to *attam*, the Gothic text eliminates the case disagreement of πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν (v. 55a) and the string appositive to it, τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ (v. 55b). As noted in Chapter 2, this case disagreement is apparently another example of the stylistic alternation of grammatical forms in the Greek text. The verb ἐλάλησεν (v. 55a) governs both the πρὸς + accusative construction of v. 55a and the simple datives of v. 55b, a Greek expression of the “reversed ballast

prepositions” found in Hebrew poetry. In the Gothic text, however, the substantives in both v. 55a and v. 55b are datives. Read together, they all appear to receive their case from the preposition *du* (*du attam unsairam / Abrahamaja jah fraiwa is und aiw* [v. 55a,b]). Yet again, if this time unintentionally, the Gothic translation has eliminated another form of stylistic grammatical alternation in the Magnificat.

One last deviation in case is created by a difference in the case governance of the Greek verb ἀντέλαβετο and its corresponding Gothic verb, *hleibida* (v. 54a). Where ἀντέλαβετο licenses genitive case in its objects (thus, παιδός [v. 54a]), *hleibida* licenses dative case (so *þiumagu*). Notably, the same Gothic verb introduces case to the indeclinable Greek proper noun Ἰσραήλ, which appears as the dative *Israela*, to which *þiumagu seinamma* is appositive.

Notably, the Gothic text translates the Greek genitive plural pronoun αὐτῶν (v. 51b) with a genitive singular possessive pronominal adjective: *seinis*. In this instance, it appears the number of the pronominal adjective has assimilated to that of its governing noun, *hairtins*. However, the pronominal adjective now disagrees with the plural number of its referent: *mikilþuhtans* (“the proud ones”; also v. 51b). This phenomenon has parallels elsewhere in the canticles (1:70), and in the larger gospel (the next instance being Lk. 4:16).

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

Five instances of the Greek coordinate conjunction καὶ are rendered with the corresponding Gothic conjunction *jah* (vv. 47, 49b, 50a, 52b, 53b). The only other occurrence of καὶ in our critical text appears in v. 50a, in the phrase εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς. However, as noted in note 51, this reading almost certainly does not represent the reading in the *Vorlage* of

the Gothic translation (which must have been εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν of the Byzantine/Majority Text tradition). Accordingly, the Gothic rendering *in aldins alde* does not represent a deliberate omission of the definite article.

The Gothic translates two instances of the subordinate conjunction ὅτι (vv. 48a, 49a) as *unte*. Additionally, it renders the postpositive γὰρ (v. 48b) with the genitive adverb *allis*. This adverb is also used postpositively in all but one verse in the Gothic Bible (Mk. 12:25; Lehmann 1986:29).

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

As noted in Chapter 2, the Greek text contains two subordinate causal clauses, each introduced with the clause-initial conjunction ὅτι + an indicative verb (vv. 48b, 49b). True to form, the Gothic renders both of these clauses with *unte* + an indicative verb: *unte insah du hnaiweinai þiujos seinaizos / . . . / unte gatawida mis mikilein sa mahteiga*.

### 3.3. Benedictus

TEXT

Lk. 1:68-79

<sup>68</sup>*þiuþeigs frauja guþ Israelis,*

*unte gaweisoda jah gawaurhta uslausein managein seinai,*

<sup>69</sup>*jah urraisida haurn naseinai unsis*

*in garda Daweidis þiumagaus seinis*

<sup>70</sup>*swaswe rodida þairh munþ weihaize þize<sup>62</sup> fram anastodeinai*

*aiwis praufete seinai*

<sup>71</sup>*giban<sup>63</sup> nasein us fijandam unsaraim*

*jah us handau allaize þize hatandane unsis*

<sup>72</sup>*tauþan armahairþa bi attam unsaraim*

*jah gamunan triggwos weihaizos seinai*

<sup>73</sup>*aiþis þanei swor wiþra Abraham attan unsarana,*

*ei gebi unsis<sup>74</sup> unagein us handau fjande unsaraize<sup>64</sup>*

---

<sup>62</sup> This form reflects a variant reading τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος, present in the Byzantine/Majority Text, and present in the reconstructed *Vorlage* of Streitberg (2000:90).

<sup>63</sup> The same infinitive is attested in the 6<sup>th</sup> century *Brixianus purpureus* (Old Latin).

<sup>64</sup> This form reflects the Byzantine/Majority Text reading ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν, indicated in **note 35**, and reconstructed in the *Vorlage* of Streitberg 2000:90.

*galausidaim*

*skalkinon imma*<sup>75</sup>*in sunjai jah garaihtein*

*in andwairþja is allans*<sup>65</sup>*dagans unsarans.*

<sup>76</sup>*jah þu, barnilo, praufetus hauhistins haitaza;*

*fauragaggis auk faura andwairþja frauþins,*

*manwjan wigans imma,*

<sup>77</sup>*du giban kunþi naseinai managein is*

*in aþleta frawaurhte ize,*

<sup>78</sup>*þairh infeinanderin armahairtein gudis unsaris,*

*in þammei gaweisop unsara urruns us hauþpai*<sup>79</sup>*gabairhtjan þaim in riqiza jah*

*skadau daupus sitandam,*

*du garaihtjan fotuns unsarans in wig gawairþjis.*

#### MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

The conservative word order of the Gothic text ensures that it preserves the loose, paratactic style of the Greek, as well as its three parallelisms (vv. 71, 72, 79). Furthermore, by its near one-to-one correspondence with the lexical items of the Greek text, the Gothic text succeeds at preserving the repetitive character of the canticle evident in the duplication of

---

<sup>65</sup> The Gothic accusative *allans* reflects the accusative *πάσας* of the Byzantine/MT tradition. Our critical text reconstructs the dative *πάσαις*.

certain theme words: *naseinains* // *nasein* (vv. 69a, 71); *handau* // *handau* (vv. 71, 74); *fjandam* // *fjande* (vv. 71, 74); *wigans* // *wig* (vv. 76b, 79b)

#### TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

True to form, the Gothic translator consistently renders finite aorists with Gothic preterites, twice with the perfectivizing prefix *ga-*: ἐπεσκέψατο (*gaweisoda*; v. 68b), ἐποίησεν (*gawaurhta*; v. 68b), ἤγειρεν (*urraisida*; v. 69a), ἐλάλησεν (*rodida*; v. 70), ὤμοσεν (*swor*; v. 73a). Three future verbs also appear in the Greek text of the canticle, translated in each instance with Gothic present indicatives. The first, a future (κληθήσῃ; v. 76a) appears as the present passive indicative *haitaza* in the Gothic. On the other hand, the future middle indicative προπορεύσῃ (v. 76b) is rendered with a present active indicative (*fauragaggis*). Finally, he renders the future verb ἐπισκέψεται with a present active indicative *gaweisop* (evincing the reading found in our critical text).

#### USE OF THE INFINITIVE

All infinitives in the Greek text but one are rendered with Gothic infinitives. Five are anarthrous in the Greek, all of which are translated as bare infinitives: ποιῆσαι (*taujan*; v. 72a), μνησθῆναι (*gamunan*; v. 72b), λατρεύειν (*skalkinon*; v. 74), ἐτοιμάσαι (*manwjan*; v. 76b), ἐπιφάναι (*gabairhtjan*; 79a). Three infinitives, on the other hand, take the article τοῦ. Two are instances of δοῦναι. The second of these is rendered as an infinitive: *du giban* (v. 77a). The first, however, is rendered with the conjunction *ei* (“so that”) + the present optative *gebi* (v. 73b), where *ei* occupies the space of τοῦ, though not as a direct translation. In this instance, the Gothic

translator seems to have interpreted this appositional infinitive as an infinitive of purpose. He then independently selected the characteristic form of Gothic optative purpose clauses in its place (*ei* + optative) to better capture its sense. In so doing, he has undone one manifestation of the loose syntax characteristic of the Benedictus as poetry, prioritizing clarity of expression over grammatical fidelity. The final arthrous infinitive, τοῦ κατευθῆναι, appears in the final line of the canticle (v. 79b), and is translated as *du garaihtjan*. The Gothic text also introduces a new infinitive to the canticle: *giban* (v. 71), which we will discuss in greater detail below.

#### USE OF PARTICIPLES

The Gothic translates all three participles in the Greek text as participles. Two of these are present participles, which the Gothic translator captures with present participles. The first, the present active participle μισούντων (v. 71), appears as the present active *hatandane* in the Gothic. The second, the present middle participle καθημένοις (v. 79a) becomes the Gothic present active participle *sitandam*. By contrast, the aorist passive participle ῥυσθέντας (v. 74) is rendered as a preterite passive participle: *galausidaim*. The Gothic also introduces a participle to the text, rendering the Greek adjective σπλάγχνα (v. 78a) with the present active participle *infeinanderin*.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

Gothic does not supply a verb in the one nominal sentence of the Greek text of the canticle, preserving it intact: εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (*biuþeigs frauja gub Israelis*; v. 68a). On the other hand, as noted above, it does supply an infinitive verb before the loose

appositive noun phrase, ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς (v. 71), likely via Western influence. That Western reading misinterpreted the noun phrase as a verbless purpose clause, and supplied an infinitive verb to v. 71 parallel to those in subsequent lines (vv. 72a,b): *giban nasein us fijandam unsaraim jah us handau allaize pize hatandane unsis* (v. 71). In practice, this change tightens one instance of loose syntax in the hymn. It also consolidates the relationship between v. 71 and v. 72, casting the two verses as a series of like parallelisms, both introduced by infinitives.

#### USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

The Gothic text does not translate nine definite articles from its *Vorlage*: ὁ θεὸς (*gub*; v. 68a), τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (*Israelis*; v. 68a), τῷ λαῷ (*managein*; v. 68b), τῶν πατέρων (*attam*; v. 72a), τὸν πατέρα (*attan*; v. 73a), τὰς ἡμέρας ἡμῶν (*dagans*; v. 75b), τῷ λαῷ (*managein*; v. 77b), τοὺς πόδας (*fotuns unsarans*; v. 79b). However, the Gothic text does supply the *sa/þa* demonstrative adjective in three instances. The first reflects a Greek textual variant that includes the article but is not reconstructed in our critical text: τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (*pize fram anastodeinai aiwis* [“from the beginning of time”<sup>66</sup>]; v. 70). The other two reflect our critical text: τῶν μισούντων (*pize hatandane*; v. 71b) and τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις (*þaim in riqiza jah skadau daupus sitandam*; v. 79a). In all three instances, the demonstrative adjectives are substantivizing.

---

<sup>66</sup> In this instance, the Gothic has selected a different expression than the Greek.

## CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

For all the complexities of this composition, the Gothic text shows a surprising degree of consistency with the case choices of the source language. Nevertheless, a variety of case disparities do appear in the canticle. One instance is due simply to a textual variant. Our critical text shows the dative *πάσαις* in v. 75b, where Gothic accusative *allans* reflects the accusative *πάσας* of the Byzantine/MT tradition. Another discrepancy is due to a difference in verbal case assignment. Where the Greek verb *ἐπισκέπεται* takes accusative objects (*ἡμᾶς*; v. 78b), the corresponding Gothic verb *gaweisob* takes genitive objects (*unsara*).

Another set of instances reflects the translation of Greek genitive personal pronouns as Gothic pronominal possessive adjectives, which agree in case with their governing noun. This includes six instances of the first person plural possessive adjective (vv. 71a,b, 72a, 73a, 75b, 79b), and three of the third person singular (vv. 68b, 70, 76b). A further five instances are due to differences in prepositional case governance. In the first place, the Gothic text twice translates the Greek preposition *διὰ* as *pairh* (vv. 70, 78a). Only the first instance creates a case disparity. In v. 70, *διὰ* governs a genitive object (*στόματος*); however, the corresponding Gothic preposition *pairh* only takes accusative objects (*munþ*). Similarly, Greek *ἀπὸ* exclusively governs genitive objects (*αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ* [v. 70]), but corresponds in the canticle to the Gothic *fram*, which exclusively governs the dative (in this instance, the head noun of the phrase, *anastodeinai aiwis*). Gothic *us* translates the Greek *ἐκ/ἐξ* on two occasions in the hymn (vv. 71b, 74, 78b). The former exclusively governs dative objects (*handau* [vv. 71b, 74]; *hauhiþai* [v. 78b]), while the latter exclusively governs genitives (the corresponding *χειρὸς* [vv. 71b, 74];

ὑψους [v. 78b]). Lastly, Greek μετὰ can take genitive objects (τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν [v. 72a]), but is rendered with *bi* + dative in this instance (*attam*).

More remarkable is the translation of the accusative ὄρκον (v. 73a) with the genitive *aipis*. As observed in Chapter 2, the accusative case of ὄρκον is peculiar, as the noun is appositive to the genitive διαθήκης (v. 72b). Apparently, ὄρκον assimilated to the case of the relative pronoun grammatically dependent upon it (ὃν), the accusative case of which is licensed by ὤμοσεν (v. 73a). The Gothic translator eliminates this case disagreement, rendering both *triggwos* (v. 72b) and *aipis* (v. 73a) in the genitive case, clarifying the appositive character of the latter.

Also noteworthy is the translation of the accusative participle ῥυσθέντας (v. 74) with the dative *galausidaim*. As noted in Chapter 2, the participle ῥυσθέντας in v. 74 modifies the implicit first plural subject of the infinitive that follows it: λατρεύειν (Brown 1993:372), i.e., ἡμῖν from v. 73b. In New Testament Greek, the subject of the infinitive is generally conceived of as an accusative (so ῥυσθέντας). The Gothic translator, however, appears to have interpreted ῥυσθέντας not as the subject of the infinitive that follows it, but as a modifier to the dative pronoun ἡμῖν, the object of the infinitive τοῦ δοῦναι (v. 73b). Accordingly, the case of *galausidaim* corresponds to the dative case of the pronominal adjective that translates ἡμῖν, *unsis*.

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

As expected, the Gothic translator renders all instances of the coordinating conjunction καὶ (vv. 68b, 69a, 71, 72b, 75a, 76a, 79a) with the corresponding conjunction *jah*.

He also renders the Greek subordinating conjunction ὅτι (v. 68b) as *unte*. However, he leaves the particle δέ in v. 76a untranslated.

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

As noted in Chapter 2, only one causal clause appears in the Greek text of the Benedictus (v. 68b-69), employing the subordinating conjunction ὅτι clause-initially and two conjoined verbs in the indicative mood: εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ / ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ / καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρασ σωτηρίας ἡμῖν . . . (vv. 68-69). Gothic renders this sentence with a clause-initial *unte* + two indicative verbs: *unte gaweisoda jah gawaurhta uslausein managein seinai / jah urraisida haur̥n naseinai unsis / in garda Daweidis þiumagaus seinis* (vv. 68-69).

#### RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

The Gothic text preserves both relative clauses of the Greek text. The first, located in v. 73, qualifies the genitive noun *aipis* immediately preceding it: *þanei swor wiþra Abraham attan unsarana*. As in the Greek text, the Gothic relative pronoun *þanei* takes the gender and number of its main clause referent *aipis*, but the accusative case assigned it by the relative clause verb *swor*, a preterite indicative (v. 31). The second relative clause appears in the closing lines of the hymn, and modifies the noun *armahairtein* (v. 78a): *in þammei gaweisop unsara urruns us hauþpai | gabairhtjan þaim in riqiza jah skadau dauþus sitandam. . .* (vv. 78b-79). As the object of the preposition *in*, the relative pronoun in this clause appears in the dative case.

#### SPECIAL ISSUES AND CONSTRUCTIONS

Gothic translates the Greek preposition ἐνώπιον + genitive object (v. 75, 76b) with the expression, *in andwairþja* + genitive object. The two phrases are semantically equivalent, but create a non-one-to-one correspondence between the Greek and Gothic language texts.

### 3.4. Gloria

#### TEXT

Lk. 2:14

*wulþus in hauhistjam guda*

*jah ana airþai gawairþi in mannam godis wiljins.*

#### MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

The Gothic text renders the Greek genitive noun εὐδοκίας (v. 14a) with the genitive phrase *godis wiljins*. This translation preserves the bicolon structure and parallelism of the Greek text, with the prepositional phrase *in mannam godis wiljins* modifying *gawairþi* in the second line. It also preserves the internal AB-C // BA-C chiasm of the Greek text.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

In line with both the Greek and Latin texts, the Gothic does not supply a verb in either of the verbless clauses of the canticle.

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

The only deviation in case between the Greek and Gothic texts reflects a disparity in prepositional case governance between the Greek ἐπὶ and the Gothic *ana*. Whereas the Greek preposition ἐπὶ governs a genitive object (γῆς; v. 14b), the corresponding Gothic preposition *ana* assigns dative case to its objects (in this case, *airþai*).

#### WORD ORDER

The Gothic text parallels the word order of the Greek in every respect, with the exception of the phrasal translation of εὐδοκίας, addressed below.

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

The Gothic renders the Greek coordinating conjunction καὶ with the conjunction *jah*. As in the earlier canticles, the conjunction *jah* supports the paratactic style of the hymn.

#### SPECIAL ISSUES AND CONSTRUCTIONS

The choice of *godis wiljins* for Gr. εὐδοκίας appears to be modeled on the Latin reading *bonae voluntatis* (Friedrichsen 1926:252). The choice of this phrase imbues the Gothic with a different meaning than that of the Greek text. Whereas the Greek expression ἄνθρωποις εὐδοκίας identifies a set of human beings chosen or favored by the divine will, the Gothic expression *mannam godis wiljins* instead identifies a set of human beings characterized by good will towards one another. Where the Greek characterizes humans by their relationship with the divine, the Gothic characterizes humans by their relationship with one another.

### 3.5. Nunc Dimittis

TEXT

Lk. 2:29-32

<sup>29</sup>*nu fraleitais skalk þeinana, frauja,*

*bi waurda þeinamma in gawairþja;*

<sup>30</sup>*þande sehun augona meina nasein þeina,*

<sup>31</sup>*þoei manwides in andwairþja allaizo manageino,*

<sup>32</sup>*liuhap du andhuleinai þiudom*

*jah wulþu managein þeinai Israela.*

MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

Like the Greek text, the Gothic text of the canticle consists of a series of three couplets. The third couplet represents a parallelism, uniting two noun phrases with complementary references to the gentiles (v. 32a) and Israel (v. 32b). The simple coordination of these noun phrases with the conjunction *jah* also reflects the paratactic style characteristic of the canticles.

TENSE, MOOD, AND DIATHESIS

The first verb of the Greek canticle, the present indicative *ἀπολύεις* (v. 29a), corresponds to a present optative in the Gothic text: *fraleitais*. This form reflects the

imperative *dimitte* in Old Latin manuscripts, including the *Veronensis* and *Palatinus*.<sup>67</sup> In this verse, it carries a precative sense (“now let your servant”).<sup>68</sup> As Klein 1992a:267 notes, it appears “the Gothic translator has reacted, in an independent manner, to the sense of the Greek rather than the form” in this instance. As noted earlier, the Gothic imperative is highly marked, limited to direct commands. It would have been inappropriate to employ it in this supplicative context. Finally, the two aorist indicatives in the canticle, εἶδον (v. 30) and ἡτοίμασας (v. 31), are rendered with preterite indicatives (*sehun* and *manwides*, respectively).

#### USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

All five instances of the Greek definite article in the canticle are left untranslated in the Gothic text: τὸν δοῦλόν (*skalk*; v. 29a), τὸ ῥῆμά (*waurda*; v. 29b), οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (*augona*; v. 30) and τὸ σωτήριόν (*nasein*; v. 30), and τῶν λαῶν (*manageino*; v. 31). The canticle does not supply a demonstrative pronoun or adjective in these phrases.

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

The Gothic text deviates from the cases of the Greek text in a variety of places. Three instances are due to differences in prepositional case governance. Where Greek *κατά* governs accusative objects (τὸ ῥῆμά [v. 29b]; πρόσωπον [v. 31]), the Gothic prepositions that translate *κατά* in the canticle both govern dative objects: thus, *bi waurda* (v. 29), and *in andwairþja*

---

<sup>67</sup> In the *Palatinus*, the form is *dismitte*.

<sup>68</sup> Strictly speaking, a predictive sense (“now you will let your servant”) is not out of the question. However, a precative better conforms to the force of the Lt. imperative.

(v.31). So also, the Greek εἰς only governs an accusative object (ἀποκάλυψιν; v. 32), where the Gothic *du* takes a dative object (*andhuleinai*). A further five instances reflect the translation of Greek genitive personal pronouns as Gothic pronominal possessive adjectives, which agree in case with their governing noun. These include four instances of σου (vv. 29a,b, 30, 32) and one instance of μου (v. 30).

A final case syntax deviation resolves a peculiarity of the Greek text. As noted in Chapter 2, the Greek genitive ἐθνῶν (v. 32a) seems to carry a sense more consistent with the use of the dative case (“revelation for the gentiles”). In the Gothic text, the translator independently selected a form appropriate to its sense: the dative (*piudom*).

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

As expected, the Gothic translator renders the coordinate conjunction καὶ, which links parallel lines in v. 32, with the corresponding Gothic conjunction *jah*. On the other hand, he renders the subordinate conjunction ὅτι, which introduces a causal clause (v. 30), with the conjunction *þande*. This is the only instance of *þande* in the canticles; elsewhere in the canticles, *unte* translates ὅτι. Nevertheless, the conjunction *þande* does appear in one other passage of the infancy narrative: Luke 1:34.

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

In the Greek text, the only causal clause of the canticle employs the subordinating conjunction ὅτι + an indicative verb (εἶδον; v. 30). The Gothic translator renders this clause

with the conjunction *þande* + the indicative *sehun*: *nu fraleitais skalk þeinana, frauja | . . . | þande sehun augona meina nasein þeina. . .* (vv. 29-30).

#### RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

The gothic preserves the one relative clause of the Greek at v. 31: *þoei manwides in andwairþja allaizo manageino*. As in the Greek text, the Gothic relative pronoun *þoei* (v. 31) takes the gender and number of its main clause referent: in this instance, *nasein* (v. 30). The relative pronoun also takes the accusative case assigned it by the relative clause verb *manwides*, a preterite indicative (v. 31).

### 3.6. Conclusion

Having carefully canvassed the syntax of the Gothic canticles, I am now in a position to characterize the marked language of these hymns relative to the marked language of the Greek originals. Throughout this section, and especially at its conclusion, I will keep the following questions at the fore (reproduced from the introduction):

1. Does the target language version retain the same marked language features as the Greek text?
2. Are certain marked language features of the Greek better preserved than others? And if so, are these differences due to the constraints of each language's native syntax, the capacity of the translator to recognize a given feature as marked, or the translation method employed in each version?
3. Is it possible to outline each translator's approach to the types of marked language features encountered in the Greek text? That is, can we summarize his approach to a feature like "compactness" or "vivid tense use?"
4. Are there instances where the translator has introduced new marked language features, perhaps reacting to the special character of these passages?

These questions will allow me to identify the subgenre-specific translation strategies of each target language version.

## MAGNIFICAT

To catalogue the retention of the Magnificat's marked language features, I will revisit my original tabulation of its poetic devices. In Table 3.1. below, I enumerate the number of times the Gothic text deviates from the Greek text ("Chg.") with respect to some facet of marked language:

Table 3.1. Gothic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Magnificat

A. Line	
	<u>Chg.</u>
A.1. Couplet Structure	
A.1.1. Couplets (vv. 46b-47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55)	0
A.1.2. Other (N/A)	0
B. Terseness	
B.1. Parataxis	
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (vv. 46b-47, 49, 52, 53)	0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (vv. 51, 55)	0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)	0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (vv. 48, 50, 54)	0

B.2. Loose infinitival syntax (ELIMINATED)	-1
B.3. Verbless clauses (vv. 49b, 50)	0
B.4. Limited use of relative constructions (N/A)	0

### C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms (vv. 46b-47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55)	0
C.2. Chiasm (thematic ABBA and verb-object ABAB//BABA; vv. 52-53)	0

### D. Stylistic Grammatical Forms

D.1. Non-semantic Tense Alternation (ELIMINATED)	-1
D.2. Non-semantic Case/Preposition Alternation (ELIMINATED)	-1

### E. Phonaesthetics

E.1. Rhyme: Isoptoton (ABAB simplified to ABCB; vv. 52-53)	-1
E.2. Non-consecutive partial hypogram (ELIMINATED)	-1

The Gothic text of the Magnificat loses five marked language features of the Greek text (and with them, five subcategories and two categories of marked language). Two of these losses appear to be deliberate: the elimination of the tense alternation in v. 46, and the loose infinitival syntax of v. 54. In both cases, the Gothic translator has prioritized clarity of expression over grammatical fidelity to his source. Most often, the two were not competing interests; the flexibility of Gothic allowed the translator to remain broadly faithful to the tense choices and the infinitival uses of the Greek without sacrificing lucidity. In these instances, however, the resulting syntax would have apparently proved too jarring.

It seems very likely that the Gothic translator recognized the loose infinitival syntax of v. 54b as a marked language feature. The Benedictus has a high concentration of these constructions, suggesting they are characteristic of Lukan poetry. Furthermore, two other couplets of the canticle show compact second cola (vv. 49, 50); the phrase *μνησθῆναι ἐλέους* seems to suit the style of the Magnificat's couplet structures. If this assessment is accurate, it appears the Gothic translator was willing to challenge poetic style for clarity of expression.

It is less clear whether the Gothic translator recognized the tense shift in vv. 46b-47 as a marked language feature. Minimally, the Gothic translator understood that the leveling of the two tenses was contextually appropriate (consistent with the non-semantic nature of the Greek tense shift). He was evidently uninterested in exploring a possible semantic contrast between the present *μεγαλύνει* and the aorist *ἠγαλλίασεν*. Challenged only by the tense of the latter, he rendered both verbs as presents. Still, it remains unclear whether the translator regarded his translation as a correction of the tense choice of v. 47, or as a dynamic translation

of the aorist form. If he conceived of the change as a correction, it is safe to say he did not recognize the marked language character of the tense shift.

The loss of two other marked language features is directly due to the constraints of the native morphology and syntax of Gothic. Unsurprisingly, the Gothic language has failed to reproduce the arbitrary sound shapes of the alliterative Greek words in vv. 52-53. Moreover, differences in the case governance of the prepositions *ἀπὸ* and *af* have at least simplified the isoptoton in vv. 52-53, if not outrightly eliminated it.

One final loss (the elimination of Non-semantic Case/Preposition Alternation) appears to be accidental, and indirectly due to the independence of Gothic syntax. However, given the translator's elimination of the only other non-semantic stylistic alternation in the hymn, the end result suits the translator's apparent intolerance of such shifts.

Finally, the Gothic introduces a new and non-deliberate marked language feature, cited in Table 3.2:

Table 3.2. Novel poetic elements in the Gothic text of the Magnificat

A. Phonaesthetics

B.1. Isoptoton

(adjacent words: v. 52b-53a)

1

## BENEDICTUS

Table 3.2. catalogues the retention or elimination of Greek marked language features in the Gothic text of the Benedictus:

### Table 3.3. Gothic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Benedictus

A. Line		
A.1. Couplet Structure		<u>Chg.</u>
A.1.1. Couplets (vv. 68, 69, 71, 72, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78, 79)		0
A.1.2. Other (vv. 70, 73)		0
B. Terseness		
B.1. Parataxis		
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (vv. 71, 72)		0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (vv. 79)		0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)		0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (vv. 68, 69, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78)		0
B.2. Loose infinitival syntax (vv. 72, 74b, 77a, 79a,b)		-1

B.3. Appositive noun phrases (vv. 73a)	-1* <sup>69</sup>
B.4. Verbless clauses (vv. 68a)	0
B.5. Limited use of relative constructions (EXCEPTIONS: vv. 73, 78b-79)	0

### C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms (vv. 71, 72, 79)	0
C.2. Conducipatio (vv. 69a, 71; vv. 71, 74; vv. 71, 74; vv. 76b, 79b)	0

The Gothic's most significant departure from the Greek text—the addition of the infinitive *giban* to v. 71—reflects a Western reading. It is not, strictly speaking, an example of the Gothic's treatment of marked language in the Greek.

Notably, the Gothic translator only reforms one instance of loose infinitival syntax in this hymn (v. 73b). This change is surprising given the straightforward translation of the same infinitive later in the hymn (v. 77a), and the similarity of the eliminated infinitive to other infinitival constructions preserved in the Gothic. The preservation of these other forms at

---

<sup>69</sup> An asterisk denotes any change that is rooted in an underlying textual variant rather than a translation decision of the target language version.

least demonstrates that a more literal translation of even the eliminated infinitives may well have been intelligible in Gothic, if jarring enough to motivate correction.

#### GLORIA

Like the Gothic text of the Benedictus, the Gothic of the Gloria fragment shows no marked language divergences vis-à-vis the Greek text:

Table 3.4. Gothic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Gloria

A. Line		
A.1. Couplet Structure		<u>Chg.</u>
A.1.1. Couplets (v. 14)		0
A.1.2. Other (N/A)		0
B. Terseness		
B.1. Parataxis		
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (v. 14)		0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (N/A)		0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)		0

B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (N/A)	0
B.2. Verbless Clauses (v. 14)	0
C. Stylistic Structures	
C.1. Parallelisms (v. 14)	0
C.2. Chiasm (AB-C // BA-C; v. 14)	0

The Gothic translator's insistence on preserving the word order of the Greek Gloria also guarantees the preservation of all its poetic features.

#### NUNC DIMITTIS

Finally, as evident in Table 3.4 below, the Gothic text of the Nunc Dimittis also preserves every marked language feature of the Greek version:

Table 3.5. Gothic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Nunc Dimittis

A. Line	
A.1. Couplet Structure	<u>Chg.</u>
A.1.1. Couplets (vv. 29, 30-31, 32)	0

A.1.2. Other (N/A)	0
-----------------------	---

## B. Terseness

### B.1. Parataxis

B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (v. 32)	0
---	---

B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (N/A)	0
--	---

B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)	0
---	---

B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (vv. 29, 30-31)	0
---	---

B.2. Appositive noun phrases (v. 32)	0
---	---

B.3. Limited use of relative constructions (v. 31)	0
---	---

## C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms (v. 32)	0
------------------------------	---

### SUMMARY

Table 3.6 lists the types and number of marked language features lost in the Gothic translation of the Greek canticles:

Table 3.6. Features Lost from the Marked Language of the Greek Canticles in the Gothic

Canticles

<u>Features Lost</u>	<u>Losses/ Total Instances</u>
A. Terseness	
Loose infinitival syntax	2/9
B. Stylistic Grammatical Forms	
Non-semantic Tense Alternation	1/1
Non-semantic Case/Preposition Alternation	1/1
C. Phonaesthetics	
Rhyme: Isoptoton	1/2
Non-consecutive partial hypogram	1/1

*Analysis*

Our study of the canticles as marked language has illuminated the Gothic translator's tense choices in Lk. 1:46, previously misunderstood in the literature. It has also provided a fuller conception of the challenges inherent in Lk. 1:54b, 71, two texts in which the Gothic deviates from the Greek. At the conclusion of this chapter, it is clear that the most significant peculiarities of the Gothic text represent attempts to confront precisely those syntactic issues specific to biblical poetry.

How would one broadly outline the Gothic translator's approach to the marked language of the Greek? As in prose passages, the translator sought to provide a fairly literal translation of these hymns, true to the word order of the Greek and generally maintaining a one-to-one correspondence between forms. These priorities allowed the translator to successfully preserve all instances of a number of structural poetic features, including: couplets, parataxis, verbless clauses, conduplicatio, and chiasm.

However, the Gothic translator prioritized clarity of expression in a handful of instances where fidelity to the marked language might have produced especially ambiguous, confusing, or jarring expressions in the Gothic. The translator was especially intolerant of non-semantic stylistic shifts, preserving none in his translation (having deliberately eliminated at least one of the two). The translator also found infinitival clauses challenging, if tolerable, eliminating two instances of the phenomenon.

Finally, the unique lexicon, morphology, and syntax of the Gothic language made it impossible for the translator to preserve most of the phonaesthetic effects of the Greek text. The Gothic lacks alliterative effects in vv. 52-53, for instance. It has also lost part of the isoptoton characterizing the same unit, and perhaps, the entire poetic impression of these features.

## CHAPTER 4

### CLASSICAL ARMENIAN

#### 4.0. Introduction

Having completed my discussion of the Gothic text, I will now turn my attention to the Classical Armenian. The introduction of a third language into this study allows for a comparison between target language versions, and of their respective translation techniques. As is true of all the target language versions, no dedicated study of the Classical Armenian canticles exists, though syntactic overviews of the language cite examples from the hymns.

#### SOURCE TEXT

As noted earlier, this discussion analyzes the canticles in the majority text of the Armenian New Testament (Arm. 2), hosted on PROIEL, and extracted from Beda Künzle 1984: *Das altarmenische Evangelium-L'Évangile arménien ancien*. Künzle's edition of the Gospels uses the text of MS 2374 (E), with comparisons to MS 6200 (M) in its apparatus. E and M are tetraevangelia from the Matenadaran at Erevan, dating to the 7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> See Metzger 1977:158-69 for additional details on the most ancient Classical Armenian gospels, including the above two manuscripts. Note: in Metzger's discussion, MS. 6200 is identified as "Rhodes' *Annotated List*, no. 991," "the oldest dated manuscript" (Metzger 1977:158).

The New Testament was first translated into Armenian from an Old Syriac source, sometime in the 5<sup>th</sup> century (Arm. 1).<sup>71</sup> The Armenian majority text (Arm. 2) is a revision of this translation, begun after the council of Ephesus (430 CE) but not completed until the 12<sup>th</sup> century. This version sought to align the readings of Arm. 1 to those found in the Byzantine/MT Greek manuscript tradition (Aland and Aland 1995:205; Cowe 2013:265ff.), a point of consequence to our analysis of certain texts. What influence Arm. 2 still preserves from the Old Syriac is not nearly so relevant to this discussion.

---

<sup>71</sup> In this period, Greek texts were contraband within the Sassanid empire, which occupied the greater part of Armenia (Metzger 1977:155).

#### 4.1. Overview of Classical Armenian Syntax

As in previous chapters, this section will outline the categorical equivalences and differences between New Testament Greek and Armenian syntax. It will also identify the Armenian categories used to translate Greek categories. I will again limit my observations to points of relevance to the study of the Lukan canticles, avoiding a more exhaustive and lengthy discussion of the Classical Armenian language.

Most grammars of Classical Armenian provide overviews of the language's morphology and syntax. More extensive treatments appear in French and German sources (Meillet 1913, Schmitt 1981), especially Jensen 1959, though good treatments also exist in English (Godel 1975, Thomson 1989). When creating this outline, I have also relied on contributions to composite works, especially Rhodes 1977, Ajello 1998, Clackson 2004, Klein 2007.

##### *Tense, Mood, Diathesis*

Classical Armenian preserves two of the three aspects found in Proto-Indo-European, distinguishing between the imperfective and the perfective. These aspects correspond to the present and aorist stems, respectively. The imperfective embraces two tenses: a past tense (the imperfect) and a non-past tense (the present indicative). The perfective, on the other hand, functions only as a past (the aorist tense).

Classical Armenian also distinguishes three moods: indicative, subjunctive, and imperative. The present imperative is used only prohibitively (i.e., negatively), in concert with the particle *mi*. The subjunctive harbors a number of values, including desire and potentiality,

and for that reason, can function as a future in the present and aorist. Finally, Classical Armenian preserves the two-way voice distinction of Proto-Indo-European, distinguishing between active and mediopassive forms.

In Table 4.1, below, I will list general equivalences between the verbal categories of Classical Armenian and New Testament Greek (a chart inspired by Rhodes 1977:180-181):

Table 4.1. Categorical Equivalences between Classical Armenian and Greek Verbs

<u>Classical Armenian</u>	<u>Greek</u>
Present Indicative	Present Indicative
Present Imperative	Present (Negative) or Aorist Imperative
Present Subjunctive	Present or Aorist Subjunctive, Imperative, Future Indicative
Imperfect Indicative	Imperfect Indicative, Present Participle
Aorist Indicative	Aorist Indicative, Aorist Participle
Aorist Imperative	Present or Aorist Imperative (Positive)
Aorist Subjunctive	Aorist or Present Subjunctive, Imperative, Future Indicative

Finally, one must note that deponent verbs in Greek and Classical Armenian do not necessarily correspond to one another (for example, in Armenian, *xowsim* is deponent in all

its forms). Superficial “changes” in voice between active and mediopassive do not necessarily reflect elective decisions of the Classical Armenian translator.

#### *Use of the Infinitive*

Armenian translates Greek infinitives of any tense or voice with its own, unitary infinitive, built to the present stem and ending in *-l*. When used substantively, the infinitive may appear in any case, conjugated as an o-stem noun. Notably, no Classical Armenian form corresponds to the τὸ of the Greek arthrous infinitive.

#### *Use of Participles*

Classical Armenian possesses a single participle, ending in *-eal*. Although it commonly translates the Greek participle, it is quite different from its counterpart: the Classical Armenian participle, appearing in past, passive, and intransitive forms. Because of these limitations, the Classical Armenian translator will often utilize other constructions to translate Greek participles, including: prepositional phrases, indicative verbs, relative clauses, noun phrases, and infinitive + participle constructions. It also uses a number of substantival adjectives more or less as quasi-participles.

#### *Verbless Clauses*

Like Greek and Gothic, the syntax of Classical Armenian tolerates nominal sentences, though on a more limited scale. We will see Armenian supply a verb in two verbless clauses in the canticles.

### *Use of the Definite Article*

Unlike Greek, Classical Armenian does not utilize free articles, definite or indefinite. Classical Armenian does, however, distinguish definite direct objects with a *z-* prefix (known as the *nota accusativi* in the literature). Furthermore, a definite sense is inherent in all three demonstrative suffixes available in Armenian: *-s*, *-d*, and *-n*, corresponding to the first, second, and third persons, respectively. Nevertheless, of these, only the third person *-n* “serves as a true (neutral-anaphoric) article” without “additional demonstrative function” (Klein 2007:1073).

### *Case and Number Syntax*

Where Greek uses five morphologically distinct cases (nominative, accusative, dative, genitive, vocative), and harbors the values of three other cases (i.e., ablative, instrumental, and locative) within these, Classical Armenian retains seven of the eight cases reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European. These are: nominative, accusative, instrumental, dative, locative, genitive, and ablative. Unfortunately, no nominal in the language morphologically distinguishes all seven cases. The formal syncretism of cases differs by declension, but rarely does a given paradigm exceed four forms. Classical Armenian has no gender in its nominal system, and an animacy distinction only appears in interrogative and indefinite pronouns.

Finally, like the Greek of the New Testament, Armenian has lost the dual number, utilizing only a singular and plural category. Notably, certain Classical Armenian words appear only in the plural (*pluralia tantum*; e.g., Armenian *p'ark'*, which characteristically translates the Greek  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ ).

### *Word Order*

In general, the Classical Armenian text of the Gospels follows the word order of the Greek. However, limits to this principle are observed in the ordering of elements within certain phrasal units (e.g., attributive adjectival phrases), and the translation of certain Greek expressions with clear Armenian counterparts.

### *Use of Conjunctions*

Notably, the Classical Armenian language does not possess postpositive conjunctions. Thus, the Armenian coordinate conjunction *ew* translates both *καὶ* and *δέ*. (However, where the two occur together [*καὶ* . . . *δέ*], *δέ* is left untranslated, leaving only a single *ew* in the Armenian text). Similarly, the Classical Armenian subordinating conjunction *zi* translates both Greek *ὅτι* and *γὰρ*, eliminating surface evidence of their distinction.

### *Complex Sentence Types*

Classical Armenian employs the subordinating conjunction *zi* for Greek *ὅτι* when translating causal sentences. The indicative mood is used in the subordinate clause when the cause is considered factual.

### *Relative Clause Syntax*

As in the Greek and Gothic texts, the Armenian relative pronoun *or* (sometimes appearing with the *nota accusativi* v. 31: *zor*) takes the number of its main clause referent, but the case assigned it by the relative clause verb.

## 4.2. Magnificat

TEXT

Lk. 1:46b-55

<sup>46b</sup>*mecac'owsc'é anjn im zTēr.*

<sup>47</sup>*ew c'ncac'aw<sup>72</sup> hogi im yAstowác p'rkíč<sup>73</sup> im.*

<sup>48</sup>*zi hayec'aw i xonarhowt'iwn ataxnoy iwroy;*

*Zi aha yaysm hetē eranesc'én<sup>74</sup> inj amenayn azgk';*

<sup>49</sup>*zi arar inj mecamecs hzawrn;*

*ew sówrb ē anown nora,*

<sup>50</sup>*ew<sup>75</sup> otormowt'iwn nora azgac'yazgs<sup>76</sup>*

*erkiwłacac' iwroc';*

<sup>51</sup>*Arár zawrowt'iwn bazkaw iwrov;*

*c'roweác' zambartawans mtawk'srtic' iwreanc';*

---

<sup>72</sup> M shows the aorist subjunctive *c'ncac'ē*, evidently to match the tenses of the preceding verb, *mecac'owsc'é* (v. 46b), also leveling the grammatical shift apparent in the Greek.

<sup>73</sup> M shows the instrumentals: A[stowaco]w *p'rkčaw im<sup>ov</sup>* (with the sense, “through God my savior”).

<sup>74</sup> M shows the present subjunctive *eranic'én*.

<sup>75</sup> Omitted in M.

<sup>76</sup> The Armenian expression *azgac'yazgs* may reflect an underlying reading  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\omega\nu$  εἰς  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , unattested in any Greek manuscript.

<sup>52</sup>*k'akeac' zhzawrs yat'oroc'.*

*ew barjrac'oyc' zxonarhs;*

<sup>53</sup>*zk'alc'eals lc'oyc' barowt'eamb.*

*ew zmecatowns arjakeac'ownayns;*

<sup>54</sup>*paštpaneac' Israyeli carayi iwrowm<sup>77</sup>;*

*yišel zotormowt'iwns<sup>78</sup>;*

<sup>55</sup>*orpēs xawsec'aw ar hars mer.*

*Abrahamow ew zawaki nora iyawitean.<sup>79</sup>*

#### MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

The Armenian preserves the parallelisms, paratactic style, and single chiasm (vv. 52-53) of the Greek text by imitating its word order. However, as was also the case with the Gothic, the non-consecutive partial hypogram at the center of the chiasm (ταπεινούς / πεινώντας; vv. 52b-53a) is lost; the corresponding words in the Armenian (*zxonarhs* / *zk'alc'eals*) do not have similar sound shapes. Nevertheless, the appearance of a *z-* prefix

---

<sup>77</sup> M shows the genitive *iwroy* (cf. Greek *αὐτοῦ*). *Israyeli* could be taken as either genitive or dative. E takes it as dative, M as genitive.

<sup>78</sup> M shows *yišelov zotormowt'awn*, inflecting the infinitive as an instrumental (“by remembering his mercy”), and using the singular form of the noun. E may mistake the third declension value of the noun (genitive singular, assumed in this study) for its second declension value (accusative plural).

<sup>79</sup> M omits *i* and shows *yawiteans*.

before both forms, marking generic definiteness (“the humble,” “the hungry”), strengthens the impression of the chiasm and verb-object inversion.<sup>80</sup>

Also lost is any rhyme in the chiasm. Where the Greek text is able to pair genitive and accusative plural endings in an ABAB rhyme (θρόνων [A], ἀγαθῶν [B], ταπεινούς [A'], and κενούς [B']), the line-final Armenian words do not rhyme (*yat'oroc'*, *zxonarhs*, *barowt'eamb*, *ownayns*). The more extensive case system of the Armenian has disrupted the case unity of the first and third words, casting the former as an ablative and the latter as an instrumental. Furthermore, the reduction of the accusative plural ending to a mere –s all but eliminates any phonaesthetic effect in the remaining two.

#### TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

##### *vv. 46b-47*

The Armenian treatment of the stylistic tense shift in vv. 46b-47 is more difficult to understand than that of Gothic. In effect, the Armenian translator replaces the Greek tense shift with a mood shift. The Armenian translator uncharacteristically renders the present *μεγαλύνει* (v. 46b) with an aorist subjunctive (*mecac'owsc'é*), an inflection typically used to capture the Greek future. However, he translates the aorist indicative *ἠγαλλίασεν* (v. 47)

---

<sup>80</sup> Both forms are ambitious for accusative or locative case. They lack the isoptoton since in principle they could mix accusative and locative, with homophonous endings in the plural.

straightforwardly as an aorist indicative (*c'ncac'aw*). (Note, however, that M shows the present *c'ncac'ē* instead of *c'ncac'aw*, evidently to reconcile the tenses of the verbs in vv. 46b and 47.)

It is unlikely that the aorist subjunctive in v. 46b is future. Rather, this aorist subjunctive is exhortative, with the sense, “let my soul magnify the Lord.” The Armenian subjunctive can express exhortative value, even in the third person (Klein 2007:1073; cf. the aorist subjunctive *aprec'owsc'ē* in Lk. 23:35). The choice of an exhortative here adds to the vividness of the text vis-à-vis a simple present, and recalls exhortative introductory formulae in the Psalms (e.g., Ps. 95:1). In this instance, the translator has reacted to the marked language character of the passage and embellished his translation of this verb.

#### *vv. 48-55*

In the remaining verses of the canticle, the Armenian translator continues to render Greek finite aorists with Armenian aorists, including the gnomic aorists of vv. 51-53; *ἐπέβλεψεν* (*hayec'aw*; v. 48a) *ἐποίησέν* (*arar*; vv. 49a, 51a), *διεσκόρπισεν* (*c'roweác'*; v. 51b), *καθειλεν* (*k'akeac'*; v. 52a), *ὑψωσεν* (*barjrac'oyc'*; v. 52b), *ἐνέπλησεν* (*lc'oyc'*; v. 53a), *ἐξάπέστειλεν* (*arjakeác'*; v. 53b), *ἀντελάβετο* (*paštpaneác'*; v. 54), and *ἐλάλησεν* (*xawsec'aw*; v. 55a).

The translator renders the one future verb of the canticle (*μακαριοῦσίν*; v. 48b) with an Armenian aorist subjunctive: *eranesc'ēn* (present subjunctive in M). Finally, he adds an additional finite verb, rendering the Greek verbless clause *καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* (v. 49b) with a copula: *ew sówrb ē anown nora*.

#### USE OF THE INFINITIVE

The Classical Armenian translator renders the canticle's sole infinitive (the aorist passive infinitive *μνησθήναι* ["to remember"]; v. 54b) with an infinitive (*yišel*). He thereby preserves the loose attachment of v. 54b to v. 54a, and supports the paratactic style of the larger hymn.

#### USE OF PARTICIPLES

The Armenian translates one of three Greek substantival participles as a participle: the Greek *πεινῶντας* (v. 53a) corresponds to the participle *zk'atc'eals* (with accusative prefix). The other two substantival participles are translated with substantival adjectives. The first is the present middle participle *φοβούμενοις* (v. 50b), which in the Armenian text appears as *erkiwtacac'*. The second is the present active participle *πλουτοῦντας* (v. 53b), corresponding to the Armenian *zmecatowns*, with accusative prefix.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

The Classical Armenian version retains only one of two nominal sentences in the canticle. It inserts a copula into the first, rendering the Greek *καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* (v. 49b) as *ew sówrb ē anown nora*. Nevertheless, it leaves the second intact, translating Greek *καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς* (v. 50) as *ew oformowt'íwn nora azgac' yazgs*.

The case choices of the Classical Armenian text deviate from those of the Greek in 15/51 transmitted instances. Two deviations reflect the translation of the Greek genitive personal pronoun *αὐτοῦ* with Armenian possessive pronouns. Though built to genitive personal pronouns, Armenian possessive pronouns are declined, and agree in case with their governing noun. Thus, the Greek *αὐτοῦ* corresponds to an Armenian instrumental in one instance (v. 51b), and a dative in the other (v. 54a; genitive in M). The Armenian also translates the accusative personal pronoun in the phrase *τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν* (v. 50b) as a reflexive possessive pronoun, agreeing with the dative case of its head: *erkiwtacac' iwroc'*.

Another set of instances is due to differences in prepositional case governance, sometimes reflecting the larger case inventory of Classical Armenian. First, the Greek preposition *ἐπὶ* assigns dative case to its objects: *τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτήρῳ* (v. 47). However, the corresponding Armenian preposition (here in its sandhi form: *y-*) governs accusative objects: *Astowác p'ркиč'*. In one more instance, the Classical Armenian omits the preposition altogether, relying on its distinct instrumental case alone. Thus, *ἐν* + dative *βραχίονι* corresponds to Armenian *bazkaw* (v. 51a).

Four more case variances also reflect the larger case system of Armenian. The Greek genitive *γενεῶν* (v. 50a) harbors ablative value. The Classical Armenian translator appropriately renders this noun in the ablative case available to him: *azgac'* (v. 50a). Similarly, the Greek dative *διανοίᾳ* (v. 51b), which harbors instrumental value, corresponds to an

Armenian instrumental (*mtawk*). Finally, the ablative case of two objects of ἀπό are formally clarified: τοῦ νῦν (*aysm hetē*; v. 48b), and θρόνων (*at'ōroc*; v. 52a).

A few last discrepancies reflect differences in verbal case assignment. The verb μακαριοῦσίν licenses accusative case to the pronoun με (v. 48b), whereas the corresponding Armenian verb *eranesc'én* licenses dative case to the personal pronoun *inj*. Likewise, where the verb ἐνέπλησεν governs the genitive ἀγαθῶν (v. 53a), the Armenian verb *lc'oyc'* governs an instrumental noun, *barowt'eamb*. The verb *paštpaneác'* licenses dative case to the phrase *Israyeli carayi iwrowm* (v. 54a), where the Greek verb assigns them genitive case (Ἰσραήλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ).<sup>81</sup> Finally, where the infinitive μνησθῆναι governs a genitive ἐλέους (v. 54b), the corresponding Armenian infinitive *yišel* governs an accusative, plural in E (*zotormowt'iwns*) and singular in M (*zotormowt'iwñ*).

On a final note, the Classical Armenian text preserves the prepositional/case shift in v. 55. Greek πρὸς + accusative τοὺς πατέρας (v. 55a) corresponds to the Classical Armenian *ar* + accusative *hars*; meanwhile, the Greek datives τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι correspond to a set of Classical Armenian datives: *Abrahamow ew zawaki*. The preservation of this peculiar construction demonstrates the translator's general fidelity to the grammar of the Greek, limited only by the constraints of Classical Armenian syntax.

---

<sup>81</sup> N.B.: M has genitive *iwroy*.

#### USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Seventeen definite articles appear in the Greek text of the Magnificat. Fourteen of these correspond to no feature of the Classical Armenian text: ἡ ψυχὴ (*anjn*; v. 46b), τὸ πνεῦμά (*hogi*; v. 47), τῷ θεῷ (*Astowác*; v. 47), τῷ σωτήρῃ (*p'rkic'*; v. 47), τὴν ταπείνωσιν (*xonarhowt'íwn*; v. 48a), τῆς δούλης (*ataxnoy*; v. 48a), αἱ γενεαί (*azgk'*; v. 48b), τὸ ὄνομα (*anown*; v. 49b), τὸ ἔλεος (*otormowt'íwn*; v. 50a), τοῖς φοβουμένοις (*erkiwtacac'*; v. 50b), τοὺς πατέρας (*hars*; v. 55a), τῷ Ἀβραάμ (*Abrahamow*; v. 55b), τῷ σπέρματι (*zawaki*; v. 55b), τὸν αἰῶνα (*yawitean*; v. 55b). The definiteness of one noun in the Greek is captured by the use of the *nota accusativi* in the Armenian: τὸν κύριον (*zTēr*; v. 46b). The definiteness of another is marked by the addition of an *-n* suffix: ὁ δυνατός (*hzawrn*; v. 49a). Finally, the Armenian expression *aysm hetē* evidently corresponds to the Greek expression τοῦ νῦν (v. 48b).

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

Five instances of the Greek coordinate conjunction καὶ are rendered with the corresponding Armenian conjunction *ew* (vv. 47, 49b, 50a, 52b, 53b). The only other occurrence of καὶ in our critical text appears in v. 50a, in the phrase εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς. However, the corresponding Armenian expression *azgac' yazgs* reflects some other underlying reading, reconstructable as *γενεῶν εἰς γενεὰς*.

As expected, the Armenian translator renders two instances of the subordinate conjunction ὅτι (vv. 48a, 49a), and one of the postpositive γὰρ (v. 48b), with a clause-initial *zi*. The merging of ὅτι and γὰρ in translation creates a series of three consecutive *zi*-clauses (vv. 47b-48), and a repetitive, even poetic, effect unknown in the Greek:

Lk. 1:46b-48

*mecac'owsc'é anjn im zTēr.*

*ew c'ncac'aw hogi im yAstowác p'rkič' im.*

*zi hayec'aw i xonarhowt'iwn ałaxnoy iwroy;*

*zi aha yaysm hetē eranesc'én inj amenayn azgk';*

*zi arar inj mecamecs hzawrn;*

In this instance, a straightforward translation of the Greek within the constraints of Armenian has created an additional, if non-deliberate, poetic effect: anaphora.

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

The Greek text contains two subordinate causal clauses, each introduced with the clause-initial conjunction ὅτι + an indicative verb (vv. 48b, 49b). The Armenian translator renders both of these clauses with *zi* and indicative verbs: *zi hayec'aw i xonarhowt'iwn ałaxnoy iwroy | ... | zi arar inj mecamecs hzawrn* (vv. 48b-49).

### 4.3. Benedictus

TEXT

Lk. 1:68-79

<sup>68</sup>*Awhrneál Tēr Astowác Israyeli;*

*zi yayc' el mez ew arar p'rkowt'íwn<sup>82</sup> žotovrdean iwrowm<sup>83</sup>,*

<sup>69</sup>*ew yaróyc' eljēwr<sup>84</sup> p'rkowt'eann mez<sup>85</sup>*

*ī tan<sup>86</sup> Dawt'ī carayi iwroy;*

<sup>70</sup>*orpēs xawsec'aw beranov srboc' or<sup>87</sup> yawitenic' margarēk'n nora<sup>88</sup> ein;*

<sup>71</sup>*p'rkowt'íwn ī t'snameac' meroc',*

*ew ī jeřac' amenayn ateleac' meroc';*

<sup>72</sup>*arnél otormowt'íwn and<sup>89</sup> hars mer.*

---

<sup>82</sup> M text shows a relative pronoun instead of a *zi* in this line, and proceeds with an anakolouthic syntax (“who visiting made salvation”).

<sup>83</sup> M shows the genitive *iwroy* (cf. Greek αὐτοῦ), interpreting *žotovrdean* as a genitive (where E interprets the noun as a dative). The sense of M is “made the salvation of his people.”

<sup>84</sup> M adds the *nota accusativi* for definiteness here: *zeljēwr* (cf. the Greek κέρας, which lacks an article).

<sup>85</sup> M omits *mez* (cf. Greek ἡμῖν).

<sup>86</sup> M shows *tanē*, with a clear ablative ending.

<sup>87</sup> M shows *beranawk' srbovk' ork'* (“through the holy mouths which. . .”) instead of *beranov srboc'* (“through the mouth of his holy ones which. . .”).

<sup>88</sup> M omits *nora* (cf. Greek αὐτοῦ).

*ew yišel zowxtn<sup>90</sup> iwr sowrb;*

<sup>73</sup>*zerdownmn<sup>91</sup> zor erdownaw Abrahamow hawr merowm,*

*tal mez<sup>92</sup> 74 aranc<sup>93</sup> erkiwli, i jerac<sup>94</sup> t<sup>95</sup>šnameac<sup>96</sup> p<sup>97</sup>rkeals*

*paštél zna<sup>98</sup> 75 srbowt<sup>99</sup> eamb ew ardarowt<sup>100</sup> eamb*

*araji nora zamenayn<sup>101</sup> awowrs kenac<sup>102</sup> meroc<sup>103</sup>.*

<sup>76</sup>*Ew dów manowk margarē barjreloy<sup>104</sup> koč<sup>105</sup> esjir;*

*zi ert<sup>106</sup> ic<sup>107</sup> es<sup>108</sup> araji eresac<sup>109</sup> Tearn patrastel zčanaparhs<sup>110</sup> nora;*

<sup>77</sup>*tál gitowt<sup>111</sup> iwn<sup>112</sup> p<sup>113</sup>rkowt<sup>114</sup> ean žoťovrdean nora<sup>115</sup>.*

---

<sup>89</sup> M uses *ar* (“to,” rather than “with”).

<sup>90</sup> M shows *zowxt*, without the demonstrative and definitizing *-n* suffix.

<sup>91</sup> M shows *zerdownm*, without the demonstrative and definitizing *-n* suffix. This form compares more closely to the anarthrous Greek ὄρκον.

<sup>92</sup> I here correct the versification of the PROIEL text. In that text, *tal mez* (v. 73b) opens v. 74.

<sup>93</sup> M shows *zp<sup>94</sup>rk<sup>95</sup>owtiwn i t<sup>96</sup>šnameac<sup>97</sup> meroc<sup>98</sup> pastel zT[ē]r*. As above, this corrects the versification of the PROIEL text, where *paštél zna* (v. 74b) introduces v. 75.

<sup>94</sup> The accusative *zamenayn* (marked with the *nota accusativi*) reflects the accusative πάσας of the Byzantine/MT tradition. Our critical text reconstructs the dative form πάσαις in this position.

<sup>95</sup> M shows *barjreloyn*, with the demonstrative and definitizing *-n* suffix (cf. anarthrous Greek ὑψίστου).

<sup>96</sup> M shows *gnac<sup>97</sup>es* instead.

<sup>97</sup> M omits *eresac<sup>98</sup>* (cf. Greek ἐνώπιον), with the resulting sense “before the Lord” rather than “before the face of the Lord.”

<sup>98</sup> M shows *čanaparhs* without the *nota accusativi* (cf. anarthrous Greek ὁδοῦς).

*ï t'otowt'ïwn<sup>101</sup> metac' noc'a<sup>102</sup>;*

<sup>78</sup>*vasn gt'owt'eanc' otormowt'ean Astowacoy meroy<sup>103</sup>;*

*orovk<sup>104</sup> áyc' arasc'e<sup>105</sup> mez aregakn ï barjanc';*

<sup>79</sup>*erewel oroc' ï xawari ew ï stowers mahow nstein<sup>106</sup>.*

*owtél zots mer ï čanaparh<sup>107</sup> xałatowt'ean.*

#### MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

The Armenian text of the Benedictus is characterized by the same loose syntax as the Greek text, though it makes greater use of relative constructions. It also bears the same repetitive feel of its source text, manifest in the duplication of four theme words: *p'rkowt'ïwn* // *p'rkowt'ean* (vv. 69a, 71); *jeřac' // jeřac'* (vv. 71, 74); *t'snameac' // t'snameac'* (vv. 71, 74);

---

<sup>99</sup> M shows the *nota accusativi*: *zgitowt'ïwn* (cf. Greek γνῶσιν, which lacks an article).

<sup>100</sup> M omits *nora* (cf. Greek αὐτῶν).

<sup>101</sup> M shows *zt'otowt'ïwn*, with the *nota accusativi*.

<sup>102</sup> M shows the possessive adjective *meroy* instead of the demonstrative *noc'a*.

<sup>103</sup> M shows *otormowt'eanc' Tearñ Astowacoy meroc'*, dropping *gt'owt'eanc'* (corresponding to a metaphor of the Greek), adding *Tearñ*, and shifting two items to the plural.

<sup>104</sup> M shows *oroc'*, influenced by its alternate reading of v. 78a.

<sup>105</sup> This translation appears to capture the aorist ἐπισκέπεται found in the Byzantine/MT text tradition.

<sup>106</sup> M has the participle *nstealk'* rather than the imperfect *nstein* (cf. the Greek participle καθημένους).

<sup>107</sup> M shows the plural *čanaparhs*.

*čanaparhs* // *čanaparh* (vv. 76b, 79b). Lastly, as in the Greek, three parallelisms appear in the Armenian text of the canticle (vv. 71, 72, 79).

#### TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

As expected, the Classical Armenian uses aorists to translate Greek aorists:

ἐπεσκέψατο (the noun *ayc<sup>ʿ</sup> + el*; v. 68b [see “Special Issues and Constructions”]), ἐποίησεν (*arar*; v. 68b), ἤγειρεν (*yaróyc<sup>ʿ</sup>*; v. 69a), ἐλάλησεν (*xawsec<sup>ʿ</sup>aw*; v. 70), ὤμοσεν (*erdowaw*; v. 73a). Finally, two futures in the Greek text of the canticle appear as aorist subjunctives in the Classical Armenian (*κληθήσῃ* [*koč<sup>ʿ</sup>esjir*; v. 76a], *προπορεύσῃ* [*ert<sup>ʿ</sup>ic<sup>ʿ</sup>és*; v. 76b]), as does a third from the Byzantine/MT text tradition: ἐπισκέπεται (the noun *ayc<sup>ʿ</sup> + arasc<sup>ʿ</sup>ē*; 78b).

#### USE OF THE INFINITIVE

The translator renders all eight infinitives in the Greek text of the Benedictus with Armenian infinitives: ποιῆσαι (*arnél*; v. 72a), μνησθῆναι (*yišel*; v. 72b), τοῦ δοῦναι (*tál*; v. 73b), λατρεύειν (*paštél*; v. 74), ἐτοιμάσαι (*pastrastel*; v. 76b), τοῦ δοῦναι (*tál*; v. 77a), ἐπιφάναι (*erewel*; 79a), τοῦ κατευθῆναι (*owtlél*; v. 79b).

#### USE OF PARTICIPLES

Our Classical Armenian source text renders only one of three Greek participles in the canticle with a participle. In v. 74, the Greek aorist passive participle ῥυθθέντας (v. 74) corresponds to the Armenian participle *p<sup>ʿ</sup>rkeals*. Another participle in the Greek text, the present active participle μισούντων (v. 71), appears as a substantive adjective in the Armenian:

*ateleac*<sup>6</sup> (a quasi-participle). Finally, our Armenian text translates the phrase containing the present middle participle *καθημένοις* (v. 79a) with the relative pronoun, *oroc*<sup>6</sup> + an imperfect active indicative verb, *nstein* (v. 79a), though M shows the participle *nstealk*<sup>6</sup>.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

The Classical Armenian does not supply a verb when rendering the one nominal sentence of the Greek text of the Benedictus: *εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ* (*Awhrneál Tēr Astowác Israyeli*; v. 68a).

#### USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

As previously noted, eleven definite articles appear in the Greek text of the Benedictus. Seven of these correspond to no morphological feature of the Armenian text: *ὁ θεὸς* (*Tēr*; v. 68a), *τοῦ Ἰσραήλ* (*Israyeli*; v. 68a), *τῷ λαῷ* (*žotovrdean*; v. 68b), *τῶν μισούντων* (*ateleac*<sup>6</sup>; v. 71b), *τῶν πατέρων* (*hars*; v. 72a), *τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν* (*hawr*; v. 73a), and *τῷ λαῷ* (*žotovrdean*; v. 77a). The definiteness of two others is captured by the use of the *nota accusativi*, which prefixes a noun in one instance (*τοὺς πόδας* [*zots*; v. 79b]), and a phrase-initial quantifier in the other (*πάσαις τὰς ἡμέρας ἡμῶν* [*zamenayn awowrs kenac*<sup>108</sup> *meroc*<sup>6</sup>; v. 75b]). A *nota accusativi* also appears in translation of two indefinites: *zčanaparhs* in the E of v. 76b (cf. anarthrous Greek *ὁδοὺς*), and *zt'otowt'iwn* in the M of v. 77b (cf. anarthrous Greek *ἀφέσει*).

---

<sup>108</sup> As discussed below, the Armenian expression differs from the Greek (non-one-to-one): “all the days of our life.”

One definite Greek noun is translated with an *-n* suffix: τῶν . . . προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (*srboč' . . . margarēk'ē nora*; v. 70). The *-n* demonstrative suffix is also applied before the translations of certain indefinite nouns in the Greek text: two in E (διαθήκης [*xowstn*; v. 72b]; ὄρκον [*zerdownn*; v. 73a]), and one in M (ὑψίστου [*barjreloyn*; v. 76a]). Finally, the Armenian reforms the phrase τοῖς . . . καθημένοις (v. 79a), translating it as a relative clause (*oroc' i xawari ew i stowers mahow nstein*; v. 79a).

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

In the Classical Armenian text of the Benedictus, we are confronted with the same types of case discrepancies we saw in the Armenian Magnificat. Three of these discrepancies are caused by the rendering of Greek genitive personal pronouns with Armenian possessive pronouns, the latter of which must agree in case with their governing nouns. Two of these involve the Greek ἡμῶν (vv. 71a, 73a), and one involves the Greek αὐτοῦ (vv. 68b; genitive in M). In another verse, the Armenian translates the accusative object of a quasi-participle with a genitive: τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς (*ateleac' meroc'*; 71b). (By consequence, both v. 71a,b end in *meroc'*, strengthening the parallelism between them.)

Another set of instances is due to differences in prepositional case governance. In one place, Armenian *i* takes an accusative object (*t'otowt'own*; v. 77b) where Greek ἐν takes a dative (ἀφέσει). Similarly, in v. 79, *i* takes locative objects (*i xawari ew i stowers*; v. 77b) where ἐν takes dative objects (ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ). The Armenian translates Greek διὰ once as *vasn* (vv. 78a). Where the Greek preposition takes an accusative object (σπλάγχνα), the Armenian takes a genitive object (*gt'owt'eanc'*). Finally, the Greek preposition μετὰ takes a genitive object in v.

72 (πατέρων), whereas the corresponding Armenian preposition *and* takes an accusative or locative object (*hars*). In four places, the Classical Armenian text omits the preposition altogether, utilizing the instrumental case instead. This creates the following discrepancies in case: διὰ στόματος (*beranon*; v. 70), πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα (*Abrahamow hawr*; v. 73), ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη (*srbowt'eamb ew ardarowt'eamb*; v. 75), and ἐν οἷς (*orovk'*; v. 78b).

Two more discrepancies are due to differences in verbal case assignment. Whereas the Greek infinitive μνησθήναι takes a genitive noun + adjective direct object (διαθήκης ἀγίας; v. 72), the Armenian equivalent *yışel* assigns accusative case to its direct object (*zowxtn . . . sowrb*). Likewise, where the Greek infinitive λατρεύειν takes a dative object αὐτῷ (v. 74b), the corresponding Armenian noun *paštél* licenses accusative case to its object, the prefixed *zna*.

Three final situations produce one discrepancy each. First, the loss of the vocative case in Armenian requires the translation of the Greek vocative παιδίον (v. 76b) as a nominative qua vocative noun (*manowk*). Secondly, a change in sentence role creates the case discrepancy between the Greek personal pronoun ἡμᾶς and the Armenian *mez* (v. 78b). As the direct object of the Greek verb ἐπισκέπεται, ἡμᾶς takes the accusative case. However, the Armenian translates the future ἐπισκέπεται with a periphrastic expression that already includes an accusative object: *áyc' arasc'ē*. The equivalent form, as the indirect object (lit. “he shall make a visit to us”), takes the dative case instead: *mez*. Finally, the insertion of the verb *ein* into the rendering of the Greek genitive noun phrase τῶν ἀγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (*srboč' or yawitenic' margarēk'n nora ein*) recasts προφητῶν as a nominative subject (*margarēk'n*).

## WORD ORDER

Ignoring non-one-to-one correspondences, the Classical Armenian text of the Benedictus is generally consistent with the word order of the Greek. However, in v. 72b, the translator reverses the relative positions of a possessive pronoun and attributive adjective in the same noun phrase, apparently to conform to native Armenian syntax. Thus, the Greek *διαθήκης ἀγίας αὐτοῦ* (v. 72b) corresponds to the Armenian *zowxtn iwr sowrb*.

## USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

As expected, the Classical Armenian translator renders all instances of the Greek coordinating conjunction *καὶ* (vv. 68b, 69a, 71, 72b, 75a, 76a, 79a) with the corresponding Armenian conjunction *ew*. He also translates the Greek subordinating conjunction *ὅτι* (v. 68b) as *zi*. Any trace of the particle *δέ* (v. 76a), however, is lost.

## COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

One causal clause appears in the Greek of the Benedictus (v. 68b-69), uniting a clause-initial subordinating conjunction *ὅτι* and two conjoined verbs in the indicative mood:

*εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ / ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ / καὶ*

*ἤγειρεν κέρασ σωτηρίας ἡμῖν . . .* (vv. 68-69). The Classical Armenian translator renders this

sentence with a clause-initial *zi* + two indicative verbs: *Awhrneál Tēr Astowác Israyeli / zi yacyc*

*el mez ew arar p'rkowt'wn žotovrdean iwrowm / ew yaróyc' ełjewr p'rkowt'eann mez . . .* (vv. 68-

69).

## RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

The Classical Armenian preserves both relative clauses found in the Greek text of the Benedictus. The first, located in v. 73, qualifies the accusative *zerdownmn* immediately preceding it: *zor erdownaw Abrahamow hawr merowm*. Recall that the Greek shows a case disagreement between ὄρκον and the noun διαθήκης, to which it is appositive; in that text, the case of ὄρκον assimilated to the relative pronoun following it. In the Armenian text, however, the cases of *zowxtn*, *zerdownmn*, and the relative pronoun *zor* are all consistent, as indicated by the *nota accusativi* before each.

The second relative clause appears in the closing lines of the hymn, and modifies the noun *olormowt'ean* (v. 78a). The relative pronoun in this case, which corresponds to the entire expression ἐν οἷς in the Greek (i.e., ἐν + dative), takes the instrumental case: *orovk' ayč' arasc'ē mez aregakn i barjanc' | erewel oroc' i xawari ew i stowers mahow nstein. . .* (vv. 78b-79).

The Classical Armenian also introduces two new relative clauses relative to the Greek text. First, the Armenian uses a relative clause in place of a prepositional phrase modifying the noun τῶν ἁγίων in the Greek of v. 70. Thus, τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (“his holy prophets from ages [past]”) appears as *srhoc' or yawitenic' margarēk'n nora ein* in the Armenian (“his holy ones, who from ages [past] were his prophets”). Secondly, as noted twice before, a new relative clause also appears in v. 79a, replacing a determiner phrase in the Greek. Thus, the Greek phrase, τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις (“[to shine] upon those sitting in darkness and the shadow of death”) appears as the Armenian, *oroc' i xawari ew i stowers mahow nstein* (“[to shine] upon those who who sat in darkness and the shadow of

death”). In both instances, it appears the Armenian translator has attempted to simplify complex phrasal constructions of the Greek. (Recall that the first, the prepositional phrase *διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’ αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ*, is a particularly complicated construction from the standpoint of New Testament Greek.)

#### SPECIAL ISSUES AND CONSTRUCTIONS

Several non-one-to-one correspondences appear in the Armenian text of the canticle. First, the Greek adverb *ἀφόβως* (v. 74) is rendered with the semantically equivalent phrase *aranc’erkiwli*. Secondly, the translator captures the sense of the Greek *ἐπεσκέψατο* (v. 68b) with the phrase *yayc’elmez* (lit. “in visit he has come to us”), which notably introduces an object not found in the original Greek. The later *ἐπισκέπεται* is rendered with a periphrastic construction, as we noted earlier: *áyc’arasc’ē* (lit. “he shall make a visit”; v. 78b). Thirdly, the Armenian translates the Greek phrase *πάσαις τὰς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν* (“all our days”) idiomatically, as *zamenayn awowrs kenac’meroc’* (lit. “all the days of our life”), where the possessive pronoun qualifies “life” and not “days.”

Finally, as we partly discussed in our study of “Case and Number Syntax,” the Classical Armenian text chooses to render certain Greek prepositional phrases with simple nouns of a semantically-equivalent case: *διὰ στόματος* (*beranov*; v. 70), *ἀπ’ αἰῶνος* (*yawitenic’*, with no change in case; v. 70), *πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα* (*Abrahamow hawr*; v. 73), *ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη* (*srbowt’eamb ew ardarowt’eamb*; v. 75). The translator also adds a preposition in one instance where the Greek uses a single preposition to govern two conjoined verbs: *ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ* (*i xawari ew i stowers*; v. 79a).

#### 4.4. Gloria

TEXT

Lk. 2:14

*p'ark' i barjowns Astowacoy.*

*ew yerkir xatətowt'wn.*

*i mardik hačowt'wn<sup>109 110</sup>.*

MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

The nominative *hačowt'wn* reflects the Byzantine/MT reading εὐδοκία (v. 14b), rather than the εὐδοκίας found in our critical text. The faithful translation of this alternate reading recasts the canticle fragment as a tricolon:

Glory in the highest to God

And on earth, peace

(And) unto men, favor.

---

<sup>109</sup> This reading reflects the Greek reading εὐδοκία (v. 14b), attested in the Byzantine/MT tradition.

<sup>110</sup> In this instance, I alter the bicolon presentation of Nestle-Aland 28 to capture the tricolon structure of the Classical Armenian text. I will mark such changes with an underline.

Each of the three codas is constructed with a nominative noun (*p'ark'*, *xatəlowt'awn*, and *hačowt'awn*) and a prepositional phrase (*i barjowns*, *yerkir*, *i mardik*). (The first coda takes an additional dative noun: *Astowacoy*.) Notably, a tricolon structure excludes the AB-C // BA-C chiasm evident in the critical text and Gothic versions.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

As a tricolon, the Classical Armenian text of the canticle contains one more verbless clause than the critical Greek and Gothic versions. However, like the Gothic, the Classical Armenian does not supply a verb in the verbless clauses of the canticle fragment.

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

Most case deviations between the Greek and Classical Armenian versions (3/6 total transmitted instances) reflect differences in prepositional case governance. First, the Greek preposition ἐν exclusively governs dative objects in the canticle (ὕψιστοις [v. 14a]; ἀνθρώποις [v. 14b/c<sup>m</sup>]). The Classical Armenian translator renders both prepositions with the corresponding Armenian preposition *i*. However, in the first instance, he is able to clarify the formal ambiguity of the Greek dative and locative cases, rendering the object *barjowns* in the locative (v. 14a; though strictly speaking, *barjowns* is ambiguous as to accusative or locative). In the second instance, *i* governs the accusative *mardik* (v. 14b/c) with the sense “to.” This alters the sense of the last line relative to the underlying Greek (Byzantine/MT Gk. “favor among men” v.

---

<sup>m</sup> The slash captures the possibility of either a bicolon (so the Greek critical text) or tricolon (the Classical Armenian text and its *Vorlage*).

Arm. “favor to men”). Lastly, where the Greek preposition ἐπὶ governs a genitive object (γῆς; v. 14b), the Classical Armenian translator again utilizes the preposition *i* (Sandhi *y-*) with an accusative object (in this case, *erkir*). On a final note, the Classical Armenian noun *p'ark'*, which appears only in the plural, translates the Greek singular noun δόξα.

#### WORD ORDER

The Classical Armenian text of the Gloria parallels the word order of the Greek in every respect. Only the affixation of the preposition *i* (Sandhi *y-*) to the noun *erkir* disrupts the visual force of that fidelity, reducing the words in v. 14b by one.

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

The Classical Armenian renders the Greek coordinating conjunction καὶ, which supports the paratactic style of the fragment, with the conjunction *ew*.

#### 4.5. Nunc Dimittis

TEXT

Lk. 2:29-32

<sup>29</sup>*Ard arjakés zcařay*<sup>112</sup> *k'o Tēr*<sup>113</sup>

*əst bani k'owm i xatətowt'iwñ;*

<sup>30</sup>*zi tesin ač'k' im zp'rkowt'iwñ k'o.*

<sup>31</sup>*zor patrastec'er ařaji amenayn žotovrdoc';*

<sup>32</sup>*lóys i*<sup>114</sup> *yaytnowt'iwñ het'anosac'.*

*ew p'ařs*<sup>115</sup> *žotovrdean k'owm Israyeli.*

MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

The couplet structure and single parallelism (v. 32a,b) of the Greek text of the canticle is reflected in the Armenian. The simple coordination of the two noun phrases of v. 32 with the conjunction *ew* also preserves the paratactic style of this final couplet.

---

<sup>112</sup> M shows *cařays* here, with the first person demonstrative suffix (effectively, “now let me your servant,” identifying the speaker as the “servant”).

<sup>113</sup> M also shows a different word order here: *Tēr cařays k'o* (cf. τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα, reflected in E).

<sup>114</sup> M omits *i* (cf. Greek εἰς).

<sup>115</sup> M shows nominative *p'ařk'* (cf. Gk. accusative Δόξαν).

#### TENSE, MOOD, AND DIATHESIS

The Classical Armenian translator renders the present indicative ἀπολύεις (v. 29a) with the present indicative *arjakés*. He also renders the two aorist indicatives in the canticle, εἶδον (v. 30) and ἠτοίμασας (v. 31) as aorist indicatives (*tesin* and *patrastec'er*, respectively).

#### USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Two arthrous Greek nouns in the Nunc Dimittis correspond to Armenian nouns with *z-* prefixes: τὸν δοῦλόν (*zcaray*; v. 29a) and τὸ σωτήριόν (*zpr'kownt'iw*; v. 30). (The former is unprefixed in M.) A third (τὸ ῥῆμά; v. 29b) is translated with a simple dative, and is not marked for definiteness. No other noun in the Classical Armenian text is marked for definiteness, including renderings of οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (*ač'k'*; v. 30) and τῶν λαῶν (*žotovrdoc'*; v. 31).

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

The cases of the Classical Armenian text deviate from those of the Greek in 7/19 transmitted instances. One deviation reflects differences in prepositional case governance. Where Greek κατὰ governs an accusative object (τὸ ῥῆμά σου [v. 29b]), the Classical Armenian preposition *ast* takes a dative object, in this case, *bani*. Another two deviations are caused by the translation of the genitive Greek personal pronoun σου as the Armenian possessive adjective *k'owm*, which agrees in case with its head noun (vv. 29b, 32b). In one instance, the Armenian renders Greek ἐν + the dative εἰρήνη, with a different sense, using *i* + the accusative *xatətowt'iw* ("into peace").

Intriguingly, the Armenian interprets the genitive modifiers of *δόξαν* (λαοῦ . . . Ἰσραήλ; v. 32b) as datives, yielding the translation *žotovrdean . . . Israyeti* (where the latter noun is appositional to the first). Finally, it is worth noting that the Greek text contains one vocative, *δέσποτα* (v. 31), corresponding here with the nominative *Tēr* (v. 29a).

#### WORD ORDER

The Classical Armenian manuscript E does not deviate from the word order of the Greek. M, however, reorders the elements of v. 29a, attesting *zcaray*<sup>116</sup> *k'o Tēr* with *Tēr carays k'o* (cf. Greek τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα).

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

As expected, the Classical Armenian renders the coordinate conjunction *καὶ* (v. 32), here used to join parallel lines (vv. 31, 32), with the corresponding conjunction *ew*. It also renders the subordinate conjunction *ὅτι* (v. 30) with the conjunction *zi*.

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

In the Greek text, the only causal clause of the canticle employs the subordinating conjunction *ὅτι* + an indicative verb (*εἶδον*; v. 30). The Classical Armenian translates this clause with *zi* + the indicative *tesin*: *Ard arjakés zcaray k'o Tēr | . . . | zi tesin ač'k' im zp'rkowt'iw n k'o . . .* (vv. 29-30).

---

<sup>116</sup> M shows *carays* here, with the first person demonstrative suffix (effectively, “now let me your servant,” identifying the speaker as the “servant”).

#### RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

As in the Greek and Gothic texts, the Armenian relative pronoun *or* (appearing with the *nota accusativi* in v. 31: *zor*) takes the singular number of its main clause referent (*zprkowl'wn*; v. 30). However, it takes the accusative case assigned it by the relative clause verb *patrastec'er*, an aorist indicative (v. 31).

#### 4.6. Conclusion

It is time to consolidate my findings, and describe the subgenre-specific translation strategies of the Classical Armenian.

#### MAGNIFICAT

Table 4.2. enumerates those instances in which the marked language of the Classical Armenian Magnificat deviates from that of the Greek Magnificat (“Chg.”):

Table 4.2. Classical Armenian Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Magnificat

A. Line	
A.1. Couplet Structure	<u>Chg.</u>
A.1.1. Couplets (vv. 46b-47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55)	0
A.1.2. Other (N/A)	0
B. Terseness	
B.1. Parataxis	
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (vv. 46b-47, 49, 52, 53)	0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (vv. 51, 55)	0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)	0

B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καί (vv. 48, 50, 54)	0
B.2. Loose infinitival syntax (ELIMINATED)	0
B.3. Verbless clauses (v. 50)	-1
B.4. Limited use of relative constructions (N/A)	0
C. Stylistic Structures	
C.1. Parallelisms (vv. 46b-47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55)	0
C.2. Chiasm (thematic ABBA and verb-object ABAB//BABA; vv. 52-53)	0
D. Stylistic Grammatical Forms	
D.1. Non-semantic Tense Alternation (ALTERED)	X <sup>17</sup>
D.2. Non-semantic Case/Preposition Alternation (ELIMINATED)	0

---

<sup>17</sup> An X indicates instances in which a particular poetic feature has not been gained or lost so much as transformed into another.

## E. Phonaesthetics

E.1. Rhyme: Isoptoton (ELIMINATED)	-2
E.2. Non-consecutive partial hypogram (ELIMINATED)	-1

The most intriguing facet of the Classical Armenian Magnificat is its treatment of the grammatical alternations in the Greek canticle. The Classical Armenian translator faithfully reproduced the preposition/case shift of vv. 55a,b, making no attempt to clarify or reshape the resulting ambiguous syntax. Similarly, in v. 46b-47, the translator preserves an alternation of forms where the Greek shows a tense shift. However, in the later instance, the translator took extraordinary license in his translation of the first verb of the tense shift, rendering the simple present *μεγαλύνει* with an exhortative aorist subjunctive. In practice, he has replaced the tense shift of the Greek (present-aorist) with a mood shift in the Armenian (aorist subjunctive-aorist indicative).

Undoubtedly, the peculiar translation is a reaction to the marked tense alternation in vv. 46b-47. Like the Gothic translator, the Armenian translator felt compelled to clarify the confusing forms of this couplet. However, unlike the Gothic translator, who chose to simply level the two tense forms, the Armenian translator recast the canticle's opening verb as an exhortative, drawing on other marked language precedents. From beginning to end then, the Classical Armenian translation of vv. 46b-47 is a reaction to poetic expression. Notably, the

resulting translation indicates that the Armenian translator did not recognize the tense shift as a non-semantic stylistic device. His translation seeks to actively contrast the verbs in the two lines.

Finally, the Classical Armenian introduces three new marked language features, cited in Table 4.3:

Table 4.3. Novel poetic elements in the Classical Armenian text of the Magnificat

A. Stylistic Structures	
A.1. Anaphora (v. 48-49a)	1
B. Stylistic Grammatical Forms	
B.1. Use of exhortative for simple present (v. 46b; except in M)	1
C. Phonaesthetics	
C.1. Isoptoton (v. 52b-53a; prefixes)	1

Only the second of these features is a deliberate poetic embellishment of the Classical Armenian author. The first and third are dictated by the independent syntax of Classical Armenian.

#### BENEDICTUS

Table 4.4. catalogues the retention or elimination of Greek marked language features in the Classical Armenian text of the Benedictus:

Table 4.4. Classical Armenian Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Benedictus

A. Line		
A.1. Couplet Structure		<u>Chg.</u>
A.1.1. Couplets		
(vv. 68, 69, 71, 72, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78, 79)		0
A.1.2. Other		
(vv. 70, 73)		0
B. Terseness		
B.1. Parataxis		
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ to join cola		
(vv. 71, 72)		0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without $\kappa\alpha\iota$		
(vv. 79)		0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic $\kappa\alpha\iota$		
(N/A)		0

B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without <i>καὶ</i> (vv. 68, 69, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78)	0
B.2. Loose infinitival syntax (vv. 72, 73b, 74b, 77a, 79a,b)	0
B.3. Appositive noun phrases (vv. 73a)	0
B.4. Verbless clauses (vv. 68a)	0
B.5. Limited use of relative constructions (EXCEPTIONS: vv. 70, 73, 78b-79, 79a)	-2

### C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms (vv. 71, 72, 79)	0
C.2. Conduplicatio (vv. 69a, 71; vv. 71, 74; vv. 71, 74; vv. 76b, 79b)	0

Most notably, the Classical Armenian Benedictus introduces two new relative clauses in an obvious attempt to resolve instances of loose or compact syntax in the canticle.

#### GLORIA

The Classical Armenian of the Gloria fragment shows only two marked language divergences relative to the Greek text:

Table 4.5. Classical Armenian Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Gloria

A. Line		<u>Chg.</u>
A.1. Couplet Structure		
A.1.1. Couplets (v. 14)		+1*
A.1.2. Other (N/A)		0
B. Terseness		
B.1. Parataxis		
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ to join cola (v. 14)		0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (N/A)		0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (N/A)		0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (N/A)		0
B.2. Verbless Clauses (v. 14)		0
C. Stylistic Structures		
C.1. Parallelisms (v. 14)		0

C.2. Chiasm  
(ELIMINATED)

-1\*

Both divergences are caused by the faithful translation of the Byzantine/MT reading εὐδοκία (v. 14b as Armenian *hačowt'iwñ*). The underlying Greek already recast the Gloria fragment as a tricolon, and eliminated the AB-C // BA-C chiasm of v. 14a,b. Consequently, the Classical Armenian translator is not directly responsible for either deviation.

NUNC DIMITTIS

Finally, as evident in Table 4.6 below, the Classical Armenian text of the Nunc Dimittis preserves every marked language feature of the Greek version:

Table 4.6. Classical Armenian Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Nunc Dimittis

A. Line		
A.1. Couplet Structure		<u>Chg.</u>
A.1.1. Couplets (vv. 29, 30-31, 32)		0
A.1.2. Other (N/A)		0

## B. Terseness

### B.1. Parataxis

B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (v. 32)	0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (N/A)	0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)	0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (vv. 29, 30-31)	0

### B.2. Appositive noun phrases

(v. 32)	0
---------	---

### B.3. Limited use of relative constructions

(v. 31)	0
---------	---

## C. Stylistic Structures

### C.1. Parallelisms

(v. 32)	0
---------	---

## SUMMARY

Table 4.7 lists the types and number of marked language features lost in the Classical

Armenian translation of the Greek canticles:

Table 4.7. Features Lost from the Marked Language of the Greek Canticles in the Classical Armenian Canticles

<u>Features Lost</u>	<u>Losses/ Total Instances</u>
A. Terseness	
Verbless clauses	1/6
Limited use of relative constructions (losses preferred)	2 gains (5 total)
B. Phonaesthetics	
Rhyme: Isoptoton	2/2
Non-consecutive partial hypogram	1/1

*Analysis*

The literal translation method of the Classical Armenian text protected a number of structural poetic features in the canticles, including: couplet structure, parataxis, chiasm, and conduplicatio. Unfortunately, differences in the lexicon, morphology, and syntax of the source and target languages precluded the preservation of the phonaesthetic effects of the Greek text. The same basic observations held true for the Gothic. Still, the Armenian treatment of the marked language of the canticles differs in several respects from that of Gothic. On the one hand, the Armenian departs from some of the compactness of the Greek, making greater use of relative clauses and eliminating one verbless clause. However, the Armenian text shows a

greater tolerance for the Greek's loose infinitival syntax than the Gothic, as well as its grammatical alternations.

The Classical Armenian translator also appears to have been conscious of the marked language character of these passages, at one point embellishing his translation for poetic effect. The Classical Armenian is also distinguished by a greater number of non-deliberate poetic features in the canticles that further underscore their marked character within the Gospels.

## CHAPTER 5

### OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC

#### 5.0. Introduction

I will now explore the third and final target language translation: the Old Church Slavonic. This chapter will follow the same format as preceding chapters, and should require little introductory comment.

#### SOURCE TEXT

This chapter will examine the PROIEL text of the *Codex Marianus*, compared to, or corrected by, the text of the *Codex Zographensis* in select instances.<sup>118</sup> These two codices represent the oldest extant versions of the Gospels in Old Church Slavonic. The Marianus was written in Glagolitic characters in the late tenth or early eleventh century CE (Metzger 1977:405-06), and was discovered at Mt. Athos in the 19th century. Although it may descend from the ninth century translation work of Sts. Cyril and Methodius (see *Vita Methodii* 15), the Marianus shows dialectical variations betraying a Macedonian provenance (Metzger 1977:403-05). The *Zographensis* is a slightly older manuscript dating to the late tenth or early eleventh century, also written in Glagolitic characters and of Macedonian origin.

---

<sup>118</sup> Rather than mark every orthographic difference between the two codices, I will limit my observations to significant differences in inflection, or added/omitted items.

## 5.1. Overview of Old Church Slavonic Syntax

In this section, I will briefly outline the syntax of Old Church Slavonic with special attention to categorical equivalences and deviations between New Testament Greek and Slavonic syntax. Most grammars of Old Church Slavonic provide surveys of the language's morphology and syntax. I have consulted Schmalstieg 1982, Lunt 1977, 2001, and Huntley 1993 in the creation of this overview.

### TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

Most Old Church Slavonic verbs are either imperfective or perfective, with certain verbs in the two aspects forming complementary pairs. Verbs appear in three tenses, not necessarily a direct morphological continuation of the corresponding tenses of Proto-Indo-European: a present (which can also be used with future value, particularly with perfective verbs), an imperfect, and an aorist. In general, these align with the analogous tenses of the Greek in the translation. Slavonic can also build three compound tenses with the resultative participle: pluperfect, perfect, future perfect. Surprisingly, the Slavonic perfect and pluperfects do not characteristically translate their Greek counterparts; they are used only rarely in the Gospels. This may reflect a characteristic of Slavonic morphosyntax at this stage, since they are used less often than the aorist and imperfect in all early Old Church Slavonic texts.

Furthermore, Old Church Slavonic distinguishes between three moods: the indicative, the conditional (for hypothetical or contrary to fact statements), and the imperative. The language also makes use of two unambiguous voices: the active and a periphrastic passive, only the former of which directly continues a Proto-Indo-European category. Nevertheless, it

bears noting that verbs construed with the reflexive pronoun *se* are effectively middle voice in certain uses.

#### USE OF THE INFINITIVE

Old Church Slavonic forms infinitives in *-ti*. These infinitives generally translate the infinitives of the Greek text of the Gospels, and can complement certain verbs to indicate purpose, goal, etc. Following verbs of motion, the Slavonic prefers to utilize its supine. Infinitives are also used to form futures with auxiliary verbs, though this is uncommon in Old Church Slavonic manuscripts. Finally, given the absence of a definite article in Old Church Slavonic (see below), all arthrous infinitives are translated as bare infinitives.

#### USE OF PARTICIPLES

Old Church Slavonic utilizes both present and past participles, each with active and passive forms, along with a resultative participle also used in the formation of compound tenses. The Slavonic participle is the preferred equivalent of the Greek participle in translation syntax.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

Like the syntax of the Greek, Gothic, and Classical Armenian texts, the syntax of Old Church Slavonic accommodates nominal sentences.

#### USE OF DEFINITE ADJECTIVES

Proto-Slavic lacked a definite article, a situation continued in most attested Slavic languages. Postposed definite articles, such as appear in Bulgarian and Macedonian, date to a later period. Insofar as nouns and proper names are not morphologically marked for definiteness in Old Church Slavonic, we will not include a section discussing the definite article. However, participles and adjectives can be marked as definite by distinct, longer endings, historically derived from the affixation of a \**ǰi* pronoun. This fact will be discussed under a corresponding heading, "Use of Definite Adjectives."

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

Old Church Slavonic preserves seven cases from Proto-Indo-European: nominative, accusative, instrumental, dative, genitive, locative, and vocative. The genitive continues the ablative in Slavonic o-stem nouns. Significantly, the language marks masculine o-stem nouns for animacy (originally distinguishing male persons from animals and inanimate objects), with consequences on case distinction and use. For example, in Old Church Slavonic, the animate accusative form is (synchronically) syncretic with the genitive. Slavonic also utilizes three numbers, including the dual absent from biblical Greek. According to Lunt 1977:433, "the native character of the translation is guaranteed by the appropriate use of the dual in all possible conjugated and declined forms." Also of relevance to this study, Slavonic extensively translates Greek genitives as possessive adjectives, which agree in case with their head nouns.

#### WORD ORDER

Like the Gothic and Classical Armenian versions, the Old Church Slavonic generally imitates the word order of the Greek. I will treat this fact as unremarkable, except where it creates a syntax peculiar for the Slavonic, for instance, when constituents of a single phrase are broken up.

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

Throughout the canticles, as in the Gospels more broadly, the Slavonic coordinating conjunction *i* corresponds to the Greek  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ . Furthermore, the Old Church Slavonic translator uses *ěko* to translate Greek  $\text{\textit{\textepsilon}}\tau\iota$ . The enclitic *bo* renders the postpositive  $\gamma\alpha\rho$ , especially with a causative sense. Finally, the Greek particle  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  is left untranslated in the Slavonic.

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

Old Church Slavonic employs the clause-initial subordinating conjunction *ěko* to introduce causal sentences, mirroring the Greek use of  $\text{\textit{\textepsilon}}\tau\iota$ .

#### RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

The Old Church Slavonic relative pronoun is formed by the addition of a *-že* particle to the third person pronoun. The pronoun agrees in gender and number with its antecedent, but its case is licensed by the relative clause verb.

## 5.2. Magnificat

TEXT

Lk. 1:46b-55

<sup>46b</sup>*veličitů dša moě gā.*

<sup>47</sup>*i vūzdradova se đxů moi o bžě špsě moemí.*

<sup>48</sup>*ěko prizūrě na sůměrenie raby svoeje.*

*se bo otů selě blažětů me vši rodi.*

<sup>49</sup>*ěko sůtvori mīně veličě silůny.*

*i světo imě ego.*

<sup>50</sup>*i milostě ego vů rodů<sup>119</sup> i rodů*

*boještīmů se ego.*

<sup>51</sup>*sůtvori družavq myšůcejq svoeje.*

*rastači grůdyje myslijq šrdca ixů.*

<sup>52</sup>*nizůložī silůnyje sů přestolů.*

*i vūznese sůměrenyje.*

<sup>53</sup>*alčqšteje isplūni blagů.*

*i bogatěšteje se otūpusti tůšte.*

<sup>54</sup>*prijětů ilě otroka svoego*

---

<sup>119</sup>This expression probably translates an underlying Greek εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν. Zographensis shows *rody* (accusative plural) in place of the first *rodů*.

*poměňoti milostĭ.*

<sup>55</sup>*ěkože glagola kŭ otcŭ našimŭ*

*avramu i sěmeni ego do věka ∴*

#### MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

By following the word order of the Greek, the Old Church Slavonic version preserves the parallelisms, paratactic style, and single chiasm (vv. 52-53) of the Greek text. However, like the Gothic and Armenian texts, the non-consecutive partial hypogram at the center of the chiasm ( $\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$  /  $\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ ; vv. 52b-53a) is lost; the corresponding words in the Slavonic have no striking phonetic similarities (*sŭměrenyję* / *alčŏštegę*). They do, however, have like endings, appropriate for their syntactic functions. In this correspondence, one can recognize a new and non-deliberate instance of isoptoton.

Also like the Greek, the Slavonic text contains an ABAB rhyme pattern across vv. 52-53 (i.e., genitive plurals in *-ŭ* [A, A'], and masculine accusative plurals in *-ę/ję* [B, B']):

Lk. 1:52-53

A       *nizŭloži silŭnyję sŭ přestolŭ.*

B               *i vŭznese sŭměrenyję.*

A'       *alčŏštegę isplŭni blagŭ.*

B'               *i bogatęštegę sę otŭpusti tŭštegę.*

The effect aligns the Slavonic version more closely to the phonaesthetic patterning of the Greek tetracolon than either the Gothic or Armenian.

#### TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

The tense choices of the Old Church Slavonic mirror those of the Greek. The sole present active indicative verb in the Greek text of the canticle (μεγαλύνει; v. 46b) corresponds to a Slavonic present active indicative (*veličitŭ*). Similarly, every aorist indicative in the Greek corresponds to an aorist indicative in the Slavonic: ἠγαλλίασεν (*vŭzdradova se*; v. 47), ἐπέβλεψεν (*prizŭrě*; v. 48a) ἐποίησέν (*sŭtvori*; vv. 49a, 51a), διεσκόρπισεν (*rastačŭ*; v. 51b), καθείλεν (*nizŭloži*; v. 52a), ὕψωσεν (*vŭznese*; v. 52b), ἐνέπλησεν (*isplŭni*; v. 53a), ἐξάπεστειλεν (*otŭpusti*; v. 53b), ἀντελάβετο (*prijetŭ*; v. 54), and ἐλάλησεν (*glagola*; v. 55a). Notably, by preserving the tense values of the Greek intact, the Slavonic also reproduces the tense shift observed in the Greek of vv. 46b-47. Finally, the one future verb in the Greek text of the canticle (μακαριοῦσίν; v. 48b) appears as a present indicative (*blažetŭ*).

#### USE OF THE INFINITIVE

The Old Church Slavonic translator renders the canticle's sole infinitive (the aorist passive infinitive μνησθήναι ("to remember"; v. 54b) with an infinitive: *poměnŭti*. In so doing, the translator preserves the loose syntax of the entire verse, consistent with the paratactic style of the hymn.

#### USE OF PARTICIPLES

Every substantival participle in the Greek text corresponds to a substantival participle in the Old Church Slavonic text. The first, the present active *boještīmŭ* (definite in form), translates the Greek present middle participle τοῖς φοβουμένοις (v. 50b), and as in all other instances of this verb in Slavonic, appears with the *se* personal reflexive pronoun. The second, the present active *alčŕšteje*, translates the present active πεινῶντας (v. 53a). Finally, the present active *bogatęšteje* + *se* translates the present active πλουτοῦντας (v. 53b), with the additional reflexive pronoun signalling a change in voice.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

The Old Church Slavonic version of the Magnificat retains both nominal sentences of the canticle. The first corresponds to Greek καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (v. 49b), and reads: *i svęto ime ego*. The second translates an underlying Greek καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεάν καὶ γενεάν (v. 50) as: *milostĭ ego vŭ rodŭ i rodŭ*.

#### USE OF DEFINITE ADJECTIVES

Six participles and adjectives are grammatically marked for definiteness in the Slavonic: *boještīmŭ* (τοῖς φοβουμένοις; v. 50b), *grŭdyje* (ὑπερηφάνους; v. 51b), *silŭnyje* (δυνάστας; v. 52a), *sŭměrenyje* (ταπεινούς; v. 52b), *alčŕšteje* (πεινῶντας; v. 53a), *bogatęšteje* (πλουτοῦντας; v. 53b).

The Old Church Slavonic deviates from the cases of the Greek in expected instances. In two places, masculine animate objects appear in the functionally accusative genitive case form, per the Slavonic convention: κύριον (*gā*; v. 46b), αὐτόν (*ego*; 50b). Another deviation represents a difference in verbal case assignment. Where the infinitive μνησθήναι governs a genitive ἐλέους (v. 54b), the corresponding Slavonic infinitive *poměniti* governs an accusative *milostī*. A further three instances are caused by the rendering of the Greek genitive personal pronoun μου with the Slavonic possessive adjective *moi*, which agrees in case with its governing noun: vv. 46b (nominative), 47 (nominative and locative). Analogously, the Greek genitive personal pronoun αὐτοῦ corresponds to a Slavonic possessive adjective in the instrumental case (v. 51a), and the Greek genitive personal pronoun ἡμῶν corresponds to the Slavonic possessive adjective in the dative (v. 55a).

Only two deviations are due to differences in prepositional case governance. Both are localized in vv. 55. In one, the Greek preposition εἰς + accusative object (τὸν αἰῶνα; v. 55b) corresponds to Slavonic *do* + the genitive *věka*. In the other, the Greek preposition πρὸς governs an accusative object (τοὺς πατέρας; v. 55a) where the corresponding Slavonic preposition *kŭ* takes a dative object (*otcmŭ*). This change is especially relevant to the Slavonic treatment of marked language in the canticle as it obscures the case disagreement of the underlying Greek πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν (v. 55a) and the string appositive to it, τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ (v. 55b). As noted in Chapter 2, this case disagreement across lines is another example of the stylistic alternation of grammatical forms in the Greek. Now, in the

Slavonic text, the substantives in both v. 55a and v. 55b are datives. Read together, they all appear to receive their case from the preposition *kŭ* (*kŭ otcimŭ našimŭ* | *avramu i sěmeni ego* [v. 55a,b]). In this instance then, the Slavonic translation has eliminated a stylistic feature of the Magnificat (cf. its careful preservation of the stylistic tense shift in vv. 46b-47). In one verse, the Old Church Slavonic text lacks a preposition, relying on its distinct instrumental case alone: ἐν βραχίονι (*mysŭcejo*; v. 51a). Three more case variances are also a consequence of the more extensive case system of Slavonic. Two involve a clarification of locative case for dative forms in the Greek: τῷ θεῷ (*o bŭžě*; v. 47), τῷ σωτηρὶ (*sŭsě*; v. 47). One other clarifies the instrumental sense of a Greek dative: δianoίᾳ (*mysljo*; v. 51b).

#### WORD ORDER

Excepting non-one-to-one correspondences (e.g., periphrastic translations, new additions), the Old Church Slavonic text is consistent with the word order of the Greek text.

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

Six instances of the Greek coordinate conjunction καὶ are rendered with the corresponding Slavonic conjunction *i* (vv. 47, 49b, 50a [x2], 52b, 53b). As expected, the Slavonic translator renders two instances of the subordinate conjunction ὅτι (vv. 48a, 49a) with clause-initial *ěko*. Finally, he renders the one instance of the postpositive γὰρ (v. 48b) as *vo*.

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

The Greek text contains two subordinate causal clauses, each introduced with the clause-initial conjunction ὅτι + an indicative verb (vv. 48b, 49b). As expected, the Slavonic translator renders each of these (vv. 48a, 49a) with a clause-initial *ěko*. Finally, he renders the one instance of the postpositive γὰρ (v. 48b) as *bo*.

### 5.3. Benedictus

TEXT

Lk. 1:68-79

<sup>68</sup>*blagoslovenŭ gŭ bŭ ťzlvŭ.*

*ěko posěti i sŭtvori izbavlenie ljudemŭ svoimŭ.*

<sup>69</sup>*i vŭzdviže rogŭ špsniě našego.*

*vŭ domu đavda<sup>120</sup> otroka svoego.*

<sup>70</sup>*ěkože glagola usty svetytyxŭ sŭštiixŭ otŭ vėka pŕkŭ [ėgo<sup>121</sup>].*

<sup>71</sup>*špsnie otŭ vragŭ našixŭ.*

*i iz-d-rŕkŭ vŭsěxŭ nenaviděštiixŭ nasŭ.*

<sup>72</sup>*sŭtvoriti milostŭ sŭ oči našimi.*

*i pomęnŕti zavětŭ svętoi svoi.*

<sup>73</sup>*[kľetvo jejože<sup>122</sup>] kľetŭ sę. kŭ avraamu oťcju našemu*

*dati namŭ <sup>74</sup>be-straxa. iz-d-rŕky vragŭ našixŭ izbavlišemŭ sę.*

*služitŭ emu <sup>75</sup> přępodobiemŭ i pravŭdojŕ*

---

<sup>120</sup> Where Marianus has a genitive of possession, the Zographensis shows a possessive adjective: *đavě*.

<sup>121</sup> Absent in the Marianus text, but included in the Zographensis.2

<sup>122</sup> In this instance, I have preferred the reading of Zographensis over the Marianus' *kľetvojŕ ejŕže*. The Marianus' reading is an unparseable copyist's error, in which the scribe has anticipated the *je* of *jejože* and transferred it to the preceding word.

*předů nimŭ všę dñi života našęgo*

<sup>76</sup>*i ty otročę prorkŭ vyšněago narečęši sę.*

*předůideši bo předů licemŭ ģnemŭ ugotovati pŕti<sup>23</sup> ego.*

<sup>77</sup>*dati razumŭ špsnię ljudemŭ ego*

*vŭ otŭpuštenie gręxovŭ ixŭ.*

<sup>78</sup>*mŭlosrdei radi bŭ našęgo.*

*vŭ nixŭže posętilŭ estŭ<sup>24</sup> nasŭ vŭstokŭ sŭ vyše*

<sup>79</sup>*prosvętiti sędęstęę vŭ tŭmę: i sęni sŭmrŭtñę<sup>25</sup>.*

*napraviti nogy našę na pŕti mirenŭ.*

#### MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

By remaining consistent with the verbal forms and word order of the Greek, the Old Church Slavonic text of the Benedictus can also be characterized as syntactically loose. The Slavonic version also shares the repetitive feel of its source text, duplicating four theme words: *špsnię* // *špsnie* (vv. 69a, 71); *rŕkŭ* // *rŕky* (vv. 71, 74); *vragŭ* // *vragŭ* (vv. 71, 74); *pŕti* // *pŕti* (vv. 76b, 79b). Lastly, three parallelisms appear in the Slavonic text of the canticle, as they also do in the Greek text (vv. 71, 72, 79).

---

<sup>123</sup> Zographensis shows the singular *pŕti*.

<sup>124</sup> This form appears to reflect the Byzantine/MT reading *ἐπεσκέψεται*. Zographensis has *posęti nasŭ*, aligning the verb with the aorist form in v. 68b.

<sup>125</sup> Zographensis has *v'sęni sŭmrŭtñęi*, repeating the preposition *vŭ* and definitizing *sŭmrŭtñę*.

#### TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

As expected, the Old Church Slavonic uses aorists to translate Greek aorists:

ἐπεσκέψατο (*posěti*; v. 68b), ἐποίησεν (*sŭtvori*; v. 68b), ἤγειρεν (*vŭzdviže*; v. 69a), ἐλάλησεν (*gla*; v. 70), ὤμοσεν (*kletŭ se*; v. 73a). However, the Slavonic uses the compound perfect tense to render a second instance of the aorist ἐπεσκέψατο, in that instance embedded within a relative clause: *posětilŭ estŭ* (v. 78b). Lastly, both future indicatives in the Greek text correspond to present perfective verbs in the Slavonic: the passive κληθήσῃ (*narečeši se*; v. 76a), and the middle προπορεύσῃ (*prědŭideši*; v. 76b).

Notably, the Greek verb ἐπεσκέψατο [v. 68b] is in the middle voice, where *posěti* is active. On the other hand, where the Greek ὤμοσεν (v. 73a) is active voice, the Slavonic *kletŭ se* is effectively middle.

#### USE OF THE INFINITIVE

The Old Church Slavonic translator renders all eight infinitives in the Greek text with Slavonic infinitives: ποιῆσαι (*sŭtvoriti*; v. 72a), μνησθήναι (*pomenziti*; v. 72b), τοῦ δοῦναι (*dati*; v. 73b), λατρεύειν (*služitŭ*; v. 74), ἐτοιμάσαι (*ugotovati*; v. 76b), τοῦ δοῦναι (*dati*; v. 77a), ἐπιφάναι (*prosvětiti*; 79a), and τοῦ κατευθῆναι (*napraviti*; v. 79b).

#### USE OF PARTICIPLES

The Old Church Slavonic also renders all three participles in the Greek text of the canticle with Slavonic participles. The first, the present active participle μισούντων (v. 71b), appears as the Slavonic present active participle *nenaviděštiixŭ*. Secondly, in v. 74, the Greek

aorist passive participle ῥυσθέντας (v. 74) corresponds to the Slavonic past active participle *izbavlišemī* (+ *sę*). Finally, the Slavonic translates the Greek present middle participle καθημένοις (v. 79a) as the present active participle *sědešteje*.

The Slavonic also adds two participles to the text. The first of these is *sqštiixŭ* (v. 70), rendering the stylistically challenging Greek phrase διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (lit. "by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old") as *usty sŭyxŭ sqštiixŭ otŭ vĕka pŕkŭ* (lit. "by the mouths of those being holy prophets from the beginning"). In this instance, the Slavonic has reformed the syntax of the phrase of the Greek to be more intelligible to a Slavic ear, employing the participle *sqštiixŭ* like a relative. The Slavonic also introduces a resultative participle in v. 78b (*posětilŭ*) to build a compound perfect tense.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

The Old Church Slavonic does not supply a verb when translating the sole nominal sentence of the Benedictus: εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (*blgnŭ gŭ bŭ ŭzlvŭ*; v. 68a).

#### USE OF DEFINITE ADJECTIVES

The Slavonic marks several participles and adjectives as definite: *sŭyxŭ*, *sqštiixŭ* (τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ; v. 70), *nenaviděštixŭ* (τῶν μισούντων; v. 71b), *vyšněago* (ὑψίστου; v. 76a), *sědešteje* (τοῖς . . . καθημένοις; v. 79a). To these, Zographensis also adds the definite *sŭmrŭtiněi* (v. 79a).

In the Old Church Slavonic text of the Benedictus, three deviations in case are caused by the rendering of the genitive personal pronoun ἡμῶν with the Slavonic possessive adjective *našŭ*, which agrees in case with its governing noun: vv. 72a (instrumental), 73a (dative), 79b (accusative). Another two represent the translations of Greek αὐτοῦ by the Slavonic reflexive possessive adjective *svoi*: vv. 68b (dative), 72b (accusative). In another three places, Slavonic translates a Greek genitive with an adjective agreeing with the case of its head noun: Ἰσραήλ (*izlvŭ*; v. 68a), θανάτου (*sŭmrŭtŭně*; v. 79a), and ειρήνης (*mirenŭ*; v. 79b). A single participle (*izbavlišemŭ se*; Greek ῥυθέντας v. 74a) is also made to agree with the case of its head noun (*namŭ*; Greek ἡμῖν). In another instance (v. 69a), the Slavonic translator loosely renders a dative Greek personal pronoun as a genitive possessive adjective: κέρασ σωτηρίας ἡμῖν (*rogŭ špsniě našego*). This creates a subtle difference in sense between Greek “horn of salvation for us” and the Slavonic “horn of our salvation.”

Over a dozen more instances represent differences in prepositional case governance. Where Greek ἐν takes dative objects (οἴκῳ [v. 69b], ἀφέσει [v. 77b], οἷς [v. 78b], σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ [v. 79b]), the Slavonic *vŭ* takes a locative object in three instances (*domu* [v. 69b], *nixŭže* [v. 78b], *tŭmě: i sěni* [v. 79a]), and an accusative in another (*otŭpuštenie* [v. 77b]). In the latter instance, the accusative case of *otŭpuštenie* marks it as the goal of the verbal action (“to give his people the knowledge of salvation / unto the forgiveness of their sins”; v. 77), a distinct nuance from the Greek. Furthermore, where Greek μετὰ takes the genitive object τῶν πατέρων (v. 72a), Slavonic uses the preposition *sŭ* with the instrumental *oči*. Thirdly, Greek πρὸς with

accusative objects Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα (v. 73) becomes *kŭ* with the datives *avraamu otcju našemu*. Two instances of Greek ἐνώπιον with genitives (αὐτοῦ [v. 75b], κυρίου [v. 76b]) become Slavonic *prědŭ* with instrumental objects (*nimŭ* and [*licemŭ*] *gñemŭ*, respectively). Greek διὰ and its accusative object σπλάγχνα ἐλέους become Slavonic postpositive *radi* with the genitive *mīlosrdei* (v. 78a). Also, the Slavonic replaces a Greek prepositional phrase with a bare instrumental in two places. Greek διὰ στόματος appears as Slavonic *usty* (v. 70a). Similarly, Greek ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη appears as *prěpodobiemŭ i pravŭdojŭ* (v. 75a).

Two more discrepancies reflect differences in verbal case assignment. Where Greek μνησθῆναι takes a genitive object διαθήκης ἀγίας (v. 72b), the Slavonic equivalent *pomenŭti* takes accusative objects: *zavětŭ sŭtoi*. Secondly, the Greek infinitive ἐπιφᾶναι takes a dative object (τοῖς καθημένοις; v. 79a) where the Slavonic *prosvětiti* takes an accusative *sěděštjĕ*.

Finally, the Slavonic eliminates the appositive use of ὄρκον + relative clause in δὲν (v. 73a), a feature of the loose syntax of the canticle. The Slavonic instead casts these as instrumentals (*klětvojŭ ejŭže. . .*; lit. “by the oath, by which. . .”). In this instance, the Slavonic reacts to the terseness of the passage as poetry.

#### WORD ORDER

The word order of the Old Church Slavonic generally approaches that of the Greek text. In one instance, the Old Church Slavonic preserves Greek word order even though the resulting utterance breaks up phrasal constituents: *dati namŭ be-straxa. iz-d-rŭky vragŭ našixŭ izbavlišemŭ sĕ* (vv. 73b-74a). The resulting construction is uncharacteristic of Slavic syntax. Nevertheless, three striking deviations from the word order of the Greek appear in the canticle,

all concentrated in vv. 78-79. First, the translation of the Greek preposition διὰ as a postpositive *radi* requires a shift in the word order of v. 78a (Greek: διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν; Slavonic: *mīlosrdei radi bā našego*). Secondly, in v. 79a the participle corresponding to the clause-final Greek καθημένοις appears immediately after the infinitive that governs it and before the prepositional phrase that qualifies it (Greek: ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκοτει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις; Slavonic: *prosvētiti sēdēšteje vī tūmē: i sēni sūmrūtīnē*). In this instance, it appears the participle has been brought forward to be head-initial in the substantival phrase.

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

As expected, the Old Church Slavonic translator renders all instances of the Greek coordinating conjunction καὶ (vv. 68b, 69a, 71, 72b, 75a, 76a, 79a) with the corresponding conjunction *i*. He also translates the Greek subordinating conjunction ὅτι (v. 68b) as *ěko*. However, all trace of the particle δέ (v. 76a) is lost.

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

One causal clause appears in the Greek of the Benedictus (v. 68b-69), uniting a clause-initial subordinating conjunction ὅτι and two conjoined verbs in the indicative mood: εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ / ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ / καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρασ σωτηρίας ἡμῖν . . . (vv. 68-69). The Old Church Slavonic translator renders this sentence with a clause-initial *ěko*: *blagoslovenŭ gŭ bŭ izlvŭ. / ěko posēti i sŭtvori izbavlenie ljudemŭ svoimŭ. / i vŭzdviže rogŭ sŭpsniē našego. . .* (vv. 68-69).

#### RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

The Old Church Slavonic preserves both relative clauses of the Greek text of the Benedictus. The second of these is found in v. 78b, and is introduced by ἐν + οἶς (where ἐν licenses the dative case of οἶς). The Slavonic matches this construction with νѣ + the locative *nixŭže*. The first appears in v. 73.

#### SPECIAL ISSUES AND CONSTRUCTIONS

A number of non-one-to-one correspondences appear in the Slavonic text. In v. 74a, the Slavonic translates Greek ἀφόβως as a prepositional phrase: *be-straxa*. The Slavonic also introduces a new substantive to v. 75, rendering Greek πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἡμῶν (“all our days”) as *všę dñni života našego* (“all the days of our life”), where the pronoun qualifies “life,” and not “days” (as in the Greek). Finally, the Slavonic translates the Greek phrase σπλάγχνα ἐλέους as a single noun: *mīlosrdei*.

## 5.4. Gloria

TEXT

Lk. 2:14

*slava vŭ vyšŭnixŭ bŭ.*

*i na zemi mirŭ.<sup>126</sup> vŭ člvcxŭ blagovolenie.<sup>127</sup>*

MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

The nominative *blagovolenie* (v. 14b) appears to translate the Byzantine/MT reading εὐδοκία, rather than the εὐδοκίας reconstructed in our critical text. As indicated in our discussion of the Greek and Armenian texts, this reading recasts Lk. 2:14 as a tricolon:

Glory in the highest to God

And on earth, peace

(And) among men, favor.

The parallelism of these three codas is obvious: each features a nominative noun (*slava*, *mirŭ*, *blagovolenie*, respectively) and a prepositional phrase (*vŭ vyšŭnixŭ*, *na zemi*, *vŭ člvcxŭ*). Of

---

<sup>126</sup> This period in the PROIEL text accurately captures the tricolon structure of this text.

<sup>127</sup> This form captures the Byzantine/MT reading εὐδοκία.

course, the first coda takes an additional dative object: *bū*. Unfortunately, the introduction of a third colon to the parallelism excludes the appearance of the AB-C // BA-C chiasm attested in the critical text and Gothic versions.

#### VERBLESS CLAUSES

Like the Gothic and Classical Armenian translators, the Old Church Slavonic translator does not supply a verb in either verbless clause of the Gloria. This approach supports the paratactic style of the fragment.

#### USE OF DEFINITE ADJECTIVES

One adjective in the Slavonic text is marked for definiteness: *vyšūniixŭ* (v. 14a). As noted earlier, the corresponding ὑψίστοις lacks the article in Greek as a prepositional object.

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

The Old Church Slavonic departs from the case choices of the Greek in 3/6 transmitted instances, all within prepositional phrases. In fact, every prepositional object in the Slavonic text disagrees in case with its counterpart in the Greek text. First, the Greek preposition ἐν exclusively governs dative objects in the canticle (ὑψίστοις [v. 14a]; ἀνθρώποις [v. 14b/c<sup>128</sup>]). The Slavonic translator, on the other hand, renders both prepositions with the preposition *νŭ*, and their objects as locatives, consistent with the more extensive case system of Slavonic: *vyšūniixŭ*, *člvcxŭ*. Finally, where the Greek preposition ἐπὶ governs a genitive

---

<sup>128</sup>The slash captures the possibility of either a bicolon (so the Greek critical text) or tricolon (the Classical Armenian text and its Vorlage).

object (γῆς; v. 14b), the Slavonic translator utilizes the preposition *na*, once again with a locative object: *zemi*.

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

The Old Church Slavonic renders the one instance of the Greek coordinating conjunction *καὶ* with the conjunction *i*.

## 5.5. Nunc Dimittis

TEXT

Lk. 2:29-32

<sup>29</sup>*nyně otŭpustiši<sup>29</sup> raba tvoego vladyko.*

*po glagolu tvoemu sŭ miromŭ.*

<sup>30</sup>*ěko viděste ocŭ moi sŭpasenie tvoe.*

<sup>31</sup>*eže esi ugotovalŭ předŭ licemŭ všěxŭ ljudii.*

<sup>32</sup>*světŭ vŭ okrŭvenie jězykŭ.*

*i slavŭ ljudii tvoixŭ ŭlě.*

MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

The Slavonic preserves the couplet structure and single parallelism (v. 32a,b) of the Greek text of the canticle. The paratactic style of the Slavonic is evident in that final parallelism, which unites two noun phrases of v. 32 with the simple coordinating conjunction *i*.

TENSE, MOOD, AND DIATHESIS

The Old Church Slavonic translator renders the Greek present active indicative ἀπολύεις (v. 29a) with a Slavonic present active indicative: *otŭpustiši*. Furthermore, he renders

---

<sup>129</sup> Zographensis shows the unprefixd *pustiši*.

the canticle's one aorist active indicative, εἶδον (v. 30), as a Slavonic aorist active indicative (*viděste*). Where the former is third person plural, the latter is third person dual, accommodating the dual number assigned to *oči* in the same line. Finally, the translator opts to translate the Greek aorist ἡτοίμασας (“you prepared”; v. 31) as the compound Slavonic perfect: *esi ugotovalǔ* (lit. “you have prepared”).

#### CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

In two instances, masculine substantives referring to male persons appear in a functionally accusative genitive case form, per the Slavonic convention: τὸν δοῦλόν (*raba*; v. 29a). Two more instances are caused by the rendering of the Greek genitive personal pronoun σου with the Slavonic possessive adjective *tvoi*, which agrees in case with its governing noun: v. 29b (dative), 30 (accusative). One more represents the translation of the genitive personal pronoun μου with the Slavonic possessive adjective *moi*: v. 30 (nominative).

Two more deviations are due to differences in prepositional case governance. Where Greek κατὰ governs an accusative object (τὸ ῥήμά [v. 29b]), the corresponding Old Church Slavonic preposition *po* takes a dative object *glagolu*. Secondly, Greek κατὰ takes the accusative object πρόσωπον, where Slavonic *prědŭ* takes an instrumental object: *licemŭ*. Also of interest, the Slavonic translates the Greek preposition ἐν (v. 29b) with the less expected *sŭ*, imbuing it with a slightly different sense: “with peace.” Where ἐν takes a dative object (εἰρήνη), *sŭ* requires an instrumental object with this sense (*miromŭ*). Finally, with respect to number, the Greek plural οἱ ὀφθαλμοί is rendered with a Slavonic dual, *oči*. Here, the more extensive number system of Slavonic finds a more appropriate number for paired organs.

#### USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

As expected, the Slavonic text renders the Greek coordinate conjunction  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  (v. 32) with the corresponding conjunction *i*. It also renders the Greek subordinate conjunction  $\delta\tau\iota$  (v. 30) with the characteristic *ěko*.

#### COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

In the Greek text, the only causal clause of the canticle employs the subordinating conjunction  $\delta\tau\iota$  + an indicative verb ( $\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\nu$ ; v. 30). The Old Church Slavonic matches this construction with a clause-initial *ěko* + indicative (*viděste*): *nyně otŭpustiši raba tvoego vladyko* / ... / *ěko viděste oči moi sŭpasenie tvoe...* (vv. 29-30). (I have addressed this verb earlier in this section.)

#### RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

Like the Greek  $\acute{\omicron}$ , the Slavonic relative pronoun *eže* takes the singular number of its main clause referent (*sŭpasenie*; v. 30), but the accusative case assigned it by *esi ugotovalŭ* in the relative clause (v. 31).

## 5.6. Conclusion

Concluding this chapter, I will at last characterize the treatment of poetic language in the Old Church Slavonic version.

### MAGNIFICAT

Table 5.1. catalogues deviations between the marked language of the Greek and Old Church Slavonic versions of the Magnificat (“Chg.”):

Table 5.1. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Magnificat

A. Line		
A.1. Couplet Structure		<u>Chg.</u>
A.1.1. Couplets (vv. 46b-47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55)		0
A.1.2. Other (N/A)		0
B. Terseness		
B.1. Parataxis		
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (vv. 46b-47, 49, 52, 53)		0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (vv. 51, 55)		0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)		0

B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (vv. 48, 50, 54)	0
B.2. Loose infinitival syntax (ELIMINATED)	0
B.3. Verbless clauses (v. 50)	0
B.4. Limited use of relative constructions (N/A)	0

### C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms (vv. 46b-47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55)	0
C.2. Chiasm (thematic ABBA and verb-object ABAB//BABA; vv. 52-53)	0

### D. Stylistic Grammatical Forms

D.1. Non-semantic Tense Alternation (v. 46b-47)	0
D.2. Non-semantic Case/Preposition Alternation (v. 55a,b)	0

### E. Phonaesthetics

E.1. Rhyme: Isoptoton (vv. 52-53)	0
--------------------------------------	---

E.2. Non-consecutive partial hypogram  
(ELIMINATED)

-1

By a stricter grammatical fidelity to the Greek text, the Old Church Slavonic text successfully preserves all but one marked feature of the Greek text—more than any other target language version. Most notably, the Slavonic translator leaves both grammatical alternations of the Greek untouched, and by some measure of chance, preserves a isoptoton in vv. 52-53. Finally, the Old Church Slavonic introduces one non-deliberate marked language feature, cited in Table 5.2:

Table 5.2. Novel poetic elements in the Old Church Slavonic text of the Magnificat

A. Phonaesthetics

A.1. Isoptoton  
(v. 52b-53a)

1

BENEDICTUS

Table 5.3. tabulates the retention or elimination of Greek marked language features in the Old Church Slavonic text of the Benedictus:

Table 5.3. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Benedictus

A. Line		
A.1. Couplet Structure		<u>Chg.</u>
A.1.1. Couplets		
(vv. 68, 69, 71, 72, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78, 79)		0
A.1.2. Other		
(vv. 70, 73)		0
B. Terseness		
B.1. Parataxis		
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola		
(vv. 71, 72)		0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ		
(vv. 79)		0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ		
(N/A)		0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ		
(vv. 68, 69, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78)		0
B.2. Loose infinitival syntax		
(vv. 72, 73b, 74b, 77a, 79a,b)		0
B.3. Appositive noun phrases		
(v. 71)		-1
B.4. Verbless clauses		
(vv. 68a)		0

B.5. Limited use of relative(-like) constructions (EXCEPTIONS: vv. 70 <sup>130</sup> , 73, 78b-79)	-1
---	----

### C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms (vv. 71, 72, 79)	0
C.2. Conduplicatio (vv. 69a, 71; vv. 71, 74; vv. 71, 74; vv. 76b, 79b)	0

The Slavonic translation eliminates one instance of compactness in the hymn. It eliminates another with the translation of the stylistically challenging Greek phrase διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ as: *usty svetytyxŭ sqštiixŭ otŭ věka pŕkŭ* (lit. “by the mouths of the holy ones, being of old prophets”). As this change is comparable to a relative construction, I have cited it in row B.5. of Table 5.3 with qualification.

#### GLORIA

The Old Church Slavonic of the Gloria fragment shows the same two marked language divergences evident in the Classical Armenian translation:

---

<sup>130</sup> In v. 70, a participial clause functions in an analogous manner to a relative construction. For this reason, I have expanded the subcategory title to “Limited use of relative(-like) constructions,” and listed v. 70 as an instance of this phenomenon.

Table 5.4. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Gloria

A. Line		<u>Chg.</u>
A.1. Couplet Structure		
A.1.1. Couplets (v. 14)		+1*
A.1.2. Other (N/A)		0
B. Terseness		
B.1. Parataxis		
B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (v. 14)		0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (N/A)		0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)		0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (N/A)		0
B.2. Verbless Clauses		
(v. 14)		0
C. Stylistic Structures		
C.1. Parallelisms		
(v. 14)		0

C.2. Chiasm  
(ELIMINATED)

-1\*

Like the Classical Armenian translator, the Old Church Slavonic translator is not directly responsible for either deviation. Rather, both reflect the faithful translation of the Byzantine/MT variant reading εὐδοκία (Slavonic *blagovolenie*; v, 14b).

NUNC DIMITTIS

Lastly, the Old Church Slavonic text of the Nunc Dimittis preserves every marked language feature found in the Greek:

Table 5.5. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Nunc Dimittis

		A. Line
A.1. Couplet Structure		<u>Chg.</u>
A.1.1. Couplets		
	(vv. 29, 30-31, 32)	0
A.1.2. Other		
	(N/A)	0

## B. Terseness

### B.1. Parataxis

B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (v. 32)	0
B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (N/A)	0
B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)	0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (vv. 29, 30-31)	0

### B.2. Appositive noun phrases

(v. 32)	0
---------	---

### B.3. Limited use of relative constructions

(v. 31)	0
---------	---

## C. Stylistic Structures

### C.1. Parallelisms

(v. 32)	0
---------	---

## SUMMARY

Table 5.6 lists the types and number of marked language features lost in the Old Church Slavonic translation of the Greek canticles:

Table 5.6. Features Lost from the Marked Language of the Greek Canticles in the Old Church Slavonic Canticles

<u>Features Lost</u>	<u>Losses/ Total Instances</u>
A. Terseness	
Appositive noun phrases	1/4
Limited use of relative(-like) constructions (losses preferred)	1 gain (4 total <sup>131</sup> )

B. Phonaesthetics

Non-consecutive partial hypogram	1/1
----------------------------------	-----

*Analysis*

Though prone to occasional deviations from the word order of the Greek, the Old Church Slavonic preserves the poetic features of the Greek better than the Gothic and Classical Armenian versions. It intentionally deviates from the compact syntax of poetic Greek in one instance, employing a participle into a stylistically challenging noun phrase at v. 70 of the Benedictus.

Of course, the Slavonic also fails to represent the non-consecutive partial hypogram in vv. 52b-53a of the Magnificat due to its unique lexical and morphological constraints. Still, the

---

<sup>131</sup> Counting relative constructions and the additional relative-like construction at v. 70 of the Benedictus.

Slavonic captures every remaining marked language feature of the Greek, including a few subcategories treated with greater inconsistency by the Gothic and Classical Armenian versions: non-semantic grammatical alternations, isoptoton, and loose infinitival syntax. In these instances, the Slavonic text shows a dramatic willingness to remain grammatically faithful to its source, despite the ambiguity of the resulting syntax.

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION

In general, the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic Gospels represent literal translations of the Greek. These translations are generally faithful to the word order and clause structure of the Greek and generally follow its tense and case choices within the parameters of target language syntax. In this light, the characterization of these versions as “interlinears” is not without merit, so long as one recognizes the syntactic integrity of the final products. Indeed, the translators were more than willing to reassert the target language syntax wherever a literal rendering might have proved ungrammatical in translation.

The challenge of biblical poetry lies at the intersection of these multiple and sometimes conflicting concerns. Specifically, in biblical poetry, each translator encountered a syntax especially open to, if not outrightly exploitative of, ambiguity. For example, the terse style of the subgenre favors the creation of loosely associated clauses rather than subordinate clauses, and appositive noun phrases with unclear antecedents rather than relative clauses. Furthermore, biblical poetry utilizes a class of non-semantic grammatical alternations that divorced form and meaning in a few instances. These features tested the limits of grammaticality and clarity in each target language. Unsurprisingly, a number of them forced deviations from the literal translation method employed elsewhere. In so limited a data set,

our instances of such changes are few. Nevertheless, they represent some of the most peculiar forms and constructions in these passages.

#### TREATMENT OF POETRY

When describing the subgenre-specific translation strategies of each target language version, it is best to consider each category of marked language separately. First, the literal translation method employed by the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic translators easily captured the line peculiarities of biblical poetry (e.g., couplet structures) as well as the stylistic structural devices of the subgenre (e.g., parallelism, chiasm, *conduplicatio*). 100% of these phenomena were transmitted into the translations, excepting those unrepresented in the *Vorlage* of each version.

This literal translation method was also able to capture the terse and compact syntax of the canticles. However, each translator reshaped this syntax in a minority of instances, apparently to clarify ambiguous expressions or eliminate structures considered ungrammatical within the target language. From so small a sample size as our canticles, it is impossible to see larger trends dictating precisely which of these structures was inherently intolerable, and why. Nevertheless, it is clear that they proved challenging, and were evaluated on an individual basis by the target language translator. Even so, no translation makes more than three deliberate changes to this compact syntax, and no two make precisely the same changes.

A still wider disparity is seen in each language's approach to the stylistic grammatical alternations of the Greek, however limited in number (two examples occur in the canticles,

both in the Magnificat). Only the Old Church Slavonic successfully reproduces the impression of these devices. The Gothic, by contrast, levels both alternations (in at least one instance deliberately). The Classical Armenian takes the most intriguing approach, preserving both instances, but altering one for the sake of clarity and poetic embellishment. That change is the only example of a deliberate reaction to the marked language character of these hymns for poetic effect.

Finally, no aspect of biblical poetry proved a greater challenge to the target language versions than phonaesthetic devices. Differences in the case systems of the source and target languages, as well as differences in the sound shapes of corresponding words and inflectional endings, conspired to make transmission impossible in most cases. Thus, both the Gothic and Classical Armenian versions lost the line-final isoptoton of vv. 52-53 of the Magnificat in whole or in part. Furthermore, all three versions lost the non-consecutive partial hypogram in vv. 52b-53a of the Magnificat, though the Gothic and Old Church Slavonic achieved a like effect in the emergence of a non-deliberate isoptoton in its place. However few the instances of either feature, this high rate of loss speaks to the challenge of reproducing this phenomenon in translation. Of course, insofar as this is a sacred text, the translator might have well been unwilling to take the necessary liberties to reproduce these effects, even if this occurred to them at all.

#### FUTURE AVENUES OF STUDY

As a dedicated study of biblical poetry in the Gospels, our analysis has been able to anticipate a number of the most striking peculiarities of the target language texts. Our study

has also been able to correct previous analyses of at least a couple of peculiar forms, and clarify numerous other translation decisions of each target language version. Although the translators did not alter their fundamental translation approaches when confronting this language, their responses can be collectively characterized, and are to some extent comparable to one another. Finally, in one instance (the Armenian treatment of Lk.1:46b), our study has even isolated the conscious impression poetry seems to have made on a particular translator. From all these facts, it is clear: an eye towards subgenre can yield significant benefits within a study of the translation syntax of the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic Gospels.

Happily, this study has not exhausted even the subgenre of poetry in the Gospels. Although it embraces all the most overt poetic hymns of the Gospels, it is worth recalling that biblical “poetry” is something of a continuum. Though anchored on one end by the canticles, it is nonetheless manifest in other passages, including those with an obvious stylistic character (e.g., the Beatitudes), those reflecting the devotional traditions of Judaism (e.g., the Lord’s Prayer), and apothegms or proverbs in the teachings of Jesus. (Of course, it is overtly present in the majority of quotations from the Psalms.) An analysis of each of these Gospel passages as poetry, to the extent they are poetry, may prove fruitful in clarifying other translation decisions in the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic versions. Of course, a similar analysis could be executed for passages in the Pauline epistles with a possible liturgical background (e.g., the so-called “Kenosis Hymn” of Philippians 2). A desire for further study into all these areas is indicated.

## REFERENCES

- AEJMELAEUS, ANNELI. 1993. *On the trail of the Septuagint translators*. Leuven: Peeters.
- AJELLO, ROBERTO. 1998. Armenian. *The Indo-European languages*, ed. A. G. Ramat and P. Ramat. New York: Routledge, pp. 197-227.
- ALAND, KURT AND BARBARA ALAND. 1995. *The text of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- ARGYLE, A. W. 1973-74. The Greek of Luke and Acts. *New Testament Studies* 20.441-445.
- BENOIT, PIERRE. 1968. *Exégèse et théologie*, vol. 3. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf.
- BERLIN, ADELE. 1985. *The dynamics of biblical parallelism*. Bloomington, ID: Indiana University Press.
- BLACK, MATTHEW. 1967. *An Aramaic approach to the Gospel and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- BLOSS, F.; A. DEBRUNNER (BDF). 1961. *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*, tr. by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- BOVON, FRANÇOIS C. 2002. *Luke 1*, ed. by Helmut Koester, tr. by Christine M. Thomas. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- BROOKS, JAMES A. AND CARLTON L. WINBERRY. 1979. *Syntax of New Testament Greek*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- BROWN, RAYMOND E. 1993. *The birth of the Messiah*. New York: Doubleday.

- BURK, DENNY. 2006. *Articular infinitives in the Greek of the New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.
- BURTON, ERNEST DE WITT. 1898. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of New Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- BUTH, R. 1984. Hebrew poetic tenses and the Magnificat. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 21.67-83.
- CADBURY, H.J. 1920. *The style and literary method of Luke*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- CALLAWAY, MORGAN. 1913. *The infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington.
- CAMPBELL, CONSTANTINE R. 2007. Verbal aspect, the indicative mood, and narrative: soundings in the Greek of the New Testament. New York: Peter Lang.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. Verbal aspect and non-indicative verbs: further soundings in the Greek of the New Testament. New York: Peter Lang.
- CARSON, D. A. 1993. An introduction to the Porter/Fanning Debate. *Biblical Greek language and linguistics: open questions in current research*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- CHARLESWORTH, JAMES H. (ED.). 1994. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, Damascus document, War scroll, and related documents. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- CLACKSON, JAMES P. T. 2004. Classical Armenian. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, ed. by Roger D. Woodard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 922-42.

- COMRIE, BERNARD. 1998. The Indo-European linguistic family: genetic and typological perspectives. *The Indo-European languages*, ed. by Anna Giacalone Ramat, Paolo Ramat. London: Routledge, pp. 74-97.
- CONNOLLY, R. H. 1936. Syriacisms in St. Luke. *Journal for Theological Studies* 37.374-85.
- CONYBEARE, F. C. AND G. STOCK. 1905. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Boston: Ginn.
- COWE, S. PETER. 2013. The Armenian version of the New Testament. *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, ed. by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill.
- CREED, JOHN MARTIN. 1930. *The gospel according to St. Luke*. London: Macmillan & Co.
- CURME, GEORGE O. 1911. Is the Gothic Bible Gothic? *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 10.335-377.
- DAHOOD, MITCHELL. 1970. Psalms III: 101-150. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- DANA, H. E. AND JULIUS R. MANTEY. 1955. *A manual grammar of the Greek New Testament*. New York: Macmillan.
- DAVISON, M. E. 1989. New Testament Greek word order. *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 4.19-28.
- DAWSEY, JAMES M. 1989. The literary unity of Luke-Acts: questions of style: A task for literary critics. *New Testament Studies* 35.48-66.
- DAWSON, HOPE. 2002. Deviations from the Greek in the Gothic New Testament. *Indo-European Perspectives*, ed. Mark R. V. Southern. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, pp. 9-18.

- DE LONG, KINDALEE PFREMMER. 2009. *Surprised by God: praise responses in the narrative of Luke-Acts*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- DECKER, RODNEY. 2001. *Temporal deixis of the Greek verb in the Gospel of Mark with reference to verbal aspect*. New York: Peter Lang.
- DEICHGRÄBER, REINHARD. 1967. *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- DELEBECQUE, E. 1976. *Études grecques sur L'évangile de Luc*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- DOUSE, T. LE MARCHANT. 1886. *An introduction, phonological, morphological, syntactic, to the Gothic language*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- DRINKA, BRIDGET S. 2011. Indo-European syntax and pragmatics: contrastive approaches. *Oslo Studies in Language* 3.41–73.
- DUPONT, JACQUES. 1980. "Le Magnificat comme discours sur Dieu." *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 102.321–43.
- EMPSON, WILLIAM. 1961. *Seven types of Ambiguity*. Edinburgh: Peregrine Books.
- EVANS, TREVOR VIVIAN. 2001. *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch*. New York: Oxford University.
- EYTHÓRSSON, THÓRHALLUR. 1996. Functional categories, cliticization, and verb movement in the early Germanic languages. *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax II*, ed. H. Thráinsson, S. Epstein and S. Peter. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 109-139.
- FALLUOMINI, CARLA. 2013. The Gothic Version of the New Testament. *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D.

- Ehrman, Michael W. Holmes. Second Edition. Leiden: the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, pp. 329-350
- FANNING, BUIST M. 1990. *Verbal aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. Approaches to Verbal Aspect in the New Testament: Issues in Definition and Method. *Biblical Greek language and linguistics: open questions in current research*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- FARRIS, STEPHEN. 1985. *The hymns of Luke's infancy narratives*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- FERRARESI, GISELLA. 2005. *Word order and phrase structure in Gothic*. Leuven: Peeters.
- FITZMYER, JOSEPH A. 1981. *The gospel according to Luke I-IX*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- FLUSSER, DAVID. 1988. *Judaism and the origins of Christianity*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- FORTSON, BENJAMIN W. 2010. *Indo-European language and culture: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- FRIEDRICHSEN, G. W. S. 1926. *The Gothic version of the Gospels: a study of its style and textual history*. London: H. Milford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1959. The Greek text underlying the Gothic version of the New Testament: the Gospel of St. Luke. *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie: Fernand Mossé in Memoriam*. Paris: Didier. pp. 161-84.
- GODEL, ROBERT. 1975. *An introduction to the study of classical Armenian*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- GREEN, JOEL B. 1997. *The gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans.

- GREINER, PAUL. 1992. Tempted by original syntax: Luther, Wulfila, and the Greek New Testament. *On Germanic Linguistics*. ed. Irmengard Rauch, Gerald F. Carr, and Robert Lange Kyes. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 97-107.
- GUNKEL, HERMANN; JOACHIM BEGRICH. 1998. *Introduction to Psalms: the genres of the religious lyric of Israel*, tr. by James D. Nogalski. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- HARBERT, WAYNE. 1992. Gothic relative clauses and syntactic theory. *On Germanic Linguistics: Issues and Methods I*, ed. by Irmengard Rauch. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- HORTON, FRED JR. 1978. Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke-Acts. *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. by Charles Talbert. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, pp. 1-23.
- HUNTLEY, DAVID. 1993. *The Slavonic languages*, ed. by Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett. London: Routledge, pp. 455-532.
- JAGIĆ, V. 1883. *Quattuor Evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenicae Codex Marianus Glagoliticus*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- JENSEN, HANS. 1959. *Altarmenische Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- JONES, D. R. 1968. The background and character of the Lukan psalms. *Journal of Theological Studies* 19.19-50.
- JOÛON, PAUL; T. MURAOKA. 2006. *A grammar of biblical Hebrew*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- JÜLICHER, ADOLF. 1910. Die griechische Vorlage der gotischen Bibel. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 52.365-387.

JUNG, CHANG-WOOK. 2004. *The original language of the Lukan infancy narrative*. New York: T & T Clark.

KLEIN, JARED S. 1992a. On the independence of Gothic syntax I: interrogativity, complex sentence types, tense, mood, and diathesis. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 20.339-379.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1992b. Idiomatic Nature of the Gothic New Testament. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 90.1-80.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1997. *On personal deixis in Classical Armenian. A study of the syntax and semantics of the n-, s-, and d- demonstratives in manuscripts E and M of the Old Armenian Gospels*. Dettelbach: J.H. Röhl.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2002. Homoioteleuton in the Rigveda. *Indo-European Perspectives*, ed. by Mark R. V. Southern. *Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph* 43. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, pp. 199-222.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2005. Categories and Subtypes of Phonological Repetition in the Rig Veda. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, ed. Karlene Jones-Bley; Martin E. Huld; Angela Della Volpe; Miriam Robbins Dexter. *Journal of Indo-European Monograph* 50. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, pp. 133-152.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *Classical Armenian Morphology. Morphologies of Asia and Africa*, ed. by Alan B. Kaye. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, pp. 1051-86.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Jared Klein: The Rigveda and the Greek New Testament. Online:  
<http://classics.uga.edu/research/jared-klein-rigveda-and-greek-new-testament>.
- KUGEL, JAMES L. 1981. *The idea of biblical poetry*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- KÜNZLE, BEDA O. 1984. *Das altarmenische Evangelium = L'Évangile arménien ancien*. Bern: Lang.
- KWONG, IVAN SHING CHUNG. 2005. *The word order of the Gospel of Luke*. New York: T & T Clark.
- LAGRANGE, M. J. 1921. *Évangile selon Saint Luc*. Paris: Gabalda.
- LAMBdin, THOMAS O. 2006. *An introduction to the Gothic language*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.
- LAURENTIN, R. 1956. Traces d'allusions étymologiques en Luc 1-2. *Biblia* 37.435-56.
- LEHMANN, WINFRED P. 1986. *A Gothic etymological dictionary*. Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill.
- LEHMANN, WINFRED P. 1994. Gothic and the reconstruction of Proto-Germanic. *The Germanic Languages*, ed. by Johan Van Der Auwera, Eckard König. New York: Routledge.
- LIETZMANN, HANS. 1919. Die Vorlage der gotischen Bibel. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 56.249-78.
- LITWAK, KENNETH DUNCAN. 2005. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. New York: T & T Clark.
- LLOYD, ALBERT L. 1979. *Anatomy of the verb: The Gothic verb as a model for a unified theory of aspect, actional types, and verbal velocity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- LUNT, HORACE G. Limitations of Old Church Slavonic in representing Greek. *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 431-442.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Lunt, Horace G. 2001. *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- LYONS, JOHN. 1977. *Semantics*, 2. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- MARSHALL, I. HOWARD. 1978. *The gospel of Luke*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans.
- MCKAY, K. L. 1994. *A new syntax of the verb in New Testament Greek: an aspectual approach*.  
New York: Peter Lang.
- MEILLET, A. 1913. *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- METLEN, MICHAEL. 1933. What a Greek interlinear of the Gothic Bible Text can teach us. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 32.530-548.
- METZGER, BRUCE M. 1971. *A textual commentary on the Greek New Testament*. New York: United Bible Societies.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. *The Early Versions of the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. *The Bible in translation: ancient and English versions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- MILLING, D. H. 1972. *The origin and character of the New Testament doxology*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Cambridge.
- MOSSÉ, FERNAND. 1956. *Manuel de la langue gotique: grammaire, textes, notes, glossaire*. Paris: Aubier.
- MOST, WILLIAM G. 1982. Did St. Luke imitate the Septuagint? *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 15.30-41.
- MOULE, C. D. F. 1959. *An idiom book of New Testament Greek*. New York: Cambridge University.
- MOULTON, JAMES HOPE. 1929. *A grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 2. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- NOLLAND, JOHN. 1996. *Luke 1-9-20*. Dallas: Word.

- PALMER, MICHAEL W. 1995. *Levels of constituent structure in New Testament Greek*. New York: Peter Lang.
- PIETERSMA, A. 1976. The Greek Psalter: A question of methodology and syntax. *Vetus Testamentum* 26.60-69.
- PLUMMER, ALFRED. 1902. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the gospel according to St. Luke*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- PORTER, STANLEY E. 1989. *Verbal aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with reference to tense and mood*. New York: Peter Lang.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: JSOT.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. *Studies in the Greek New Testament*. New York: Peter Lang.
- RADNEY, J. RANDOLPH. Some factors that influence fronting in Koine clauses. *Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics* 2.1-79.
- RAMAT, PAOLO. 1998. The Germanic Languages. *The Indo-European Languages*, ed. by Anna Giacalone Ramat, Paolo Ramat. London: Routledge, pp. 380-414.
- REILING J.; J. L. SWELLENGREBEL. 1971. *A translator's handbook on the gospel of Luke*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- RHODES, ERROL F. Limitations of Armenian in Representing Greek. *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 171-181.
- ROGLAND, MAX. 2003. *Alleged non-past uses of Qatal in Classical Hebrew*. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum.

- SAILHAMER, JOHN H. 1991. *The Translational Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3-41*. New York: Peter Lang.
- SCHERER, PHILIP. 1954. Aspect in Gothic. *Language* 30.211-223.
- SCHMALSTIEG, WILLIAM R. 1982. *An introduction to Old Church Slavic*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
- SCHMIDT, DARYL D. 1993. Verbal aspect in Greek: Two approaches. *Biblical Greek language and linguistics: open questions in current research*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- SCHMITT, RÜDIGER. 1981. *Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.
- SCHÜRMAN, HEINZ. 1982. *Das Lukasevangelium*, vol. 1. Freiburg: Herder.
- SILVA, MOISÉS. 1993. A Response to Fanning and Porter on Verbal Aspect. *Biblical Greek language and linguistics: open questions in current research*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- SIPILÄ, SEPPÖ. 1999. *Between Literalness and Freedom*. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society.
- SOISALON-SOININEN, ILMARI. 1965. *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- SOLLAMO, RAIJA. 1995. *Repetition of the possessive pronouns in the Septuagint*. Atlanta: Scholar's Press.
- SPARKS, H. F. D. 1943. The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel. *Journal for Theological Studies* 44.129-38.
- STREITBERG, WILHELM. 1920. *Gotisches elementarbuch: fünfte und sechste neubearbeitete Auflage*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- STREITBERG, WILHELM. 2000. *Die Gotische Bibel*. Band 1. 7. Auflage. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

- TANNEHILL, ROBERT C. 1974. The Magnificat as poem. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93.263-275.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *The narrative unity of Luke-Acts*, vol. 1. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- THACKERAY, H. ST. J. 1909. A grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- THOMSON, ROBERT W. 1989. *An introduction to Classical Armenian*. Delmar, NY: Caravan Books.
- THOMPSON, STEVEN. 2005. *The Apocalypse and Semitic syntax*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- TJEN, ANWAR. 2005. *On conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: a study of translation syntax*. New York: T & T Clark.
- TURNER, NIGEL. 1976. The quality of the Greek of Luke-Acts. *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, ed. by J. K. Elliot. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- VOORWINDE, STEPHEN. 2005. *Jesus' emotions in the fourth gospel*. New York: T & T Clark.
- WALLACE, DANIEL B. 1996. *Greek grammar beyond the basics: An exegetical syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- WATSON, WILFRED G. E. 1984. *Classical Hebrew poetry*. Sheffield: JSOT.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. *Traditional techniques in Classical Hebrew verse*. Sheffield: JSOT.
- WESTERMANN, CLAUS. 1981. *Praise and lament in the Psalms*, tr. by Richard N. Soulen. Atlanta, GA: Westminster John Knox.
- WIFSTRAND, ALFRED; DENIS SEARBY. 2005. *Epochs and styles*, ed. by Lars Rydbeck and Stanley E. Porter. Tübingen: Mors Siebeck.

WOODARD, ROGER D. 2008. Attic Greek. *The ancient languages of Europe*, ed. R. D. Woodard.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 14-49.

ZERWICK, MAX. 1963. *Biblical Greek: illustrated by examples*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto

Biblico.