TRANSLATING THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW,

WITH A CASE STUDY OF LATIN AND ARMENIAN DEIXIS

by

ANOUSH HANA AGHABABIAN

(Under the Direction of Jared Klein)

ABSTRACT

This thesis is organized in two parts. The first is a linguistic analysis of the systems of deixis in Greek, Latin, and Armenian. The analyzed text is restricted to the Gospel of Matthew, and the extracted items are limited to the Latin and Armenian translations of Greek deictic forms. The study systematically canvases the Greek-Latin and Greek-Armenian correspondences to provide an overview of the usage of deixis in the respective languages. The second part contextualizes the first by examining the motives and methods of translation of each version. Diverging or anomalous translations observed in the case study are addressed in this section in order to illuminate the translators' techniques. The general trend observed is that although both translations are relatively consistent, the psychological values ascribed to medial deictic forms raises issues of translation ideology and expectations.

INDEX WORDS: deixis, Classical Armenian, Latin, Ancient Greek, New Testament, translation

TRANSLATING THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW,

WITH A CASE STUDY OF LATIN AND ARMENIAN DEIXIS

by

ANOUSH HANA AGHABABIAN

Bachelor of Arts, Gettysburg College, 2016

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2019

TRANSLATING THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW,

WITH A CASE STUDY OF LATIN AND ARMENIAN DEIXIS

by

ANOUSH HANA AGHABABIAN

Major Professor:	Jared Klein
Committee:	Wayne Coppins
	Erika Hermanowicz

DEDICATION

im əntanik^ci hamar

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

DEIXIS IN THE GOSPEL OF MATHEW:

A CASE STUDY OF THE LATIN AND ARMENIAN TRANSLATIONS

1.1 Introduction: Overview of Deixis

1.1.1 Linguistics of Deixis

Deixis is linguistic reference to a particular time (temporal deixis) or space (spatial deixis). The semantic values of deictic forms, such as pronouns, adjectives, and adverbs, are fixed, but their denotations vary depending on the context of the discourse or narration. All deictic expressions presuppose a deictic center or *origo* as the source of deictic perspective – normally the speaker (*ego*) in pronominal deixis. Deixis is most richly represented in conversations; the speaker and addressee(s) (speech-act participants) refer to themselves, each other, and actions or referents pertaining to each. Conversations also may often involve a third individual (non-speech-act participant), to which the speech-act participants refer. The third party may be nearby, at some distance, or completely absent. The unfixed position of this third party relative to the speaker and addressee necessitates a linguistic differentiation by degree of distance. This is commonly distinguished by 'this' (proximal or first person deixis, near me) and 'that' or 'it' (distal or zero deixis, far from me).[1]

Deixis may be divided into three distinct categories: ostensive deixis, introductory deixis, and textual deixis. Ostensive deixis is the role of literally pointing something out, often with a physical gesture. Introductory deixis is the role of establishing a topic to which reference may be

---

[1] Felson and Klein, "Deixis in Linguistics and Poetics," 430.

made later in the discourse. In textual deixis, the speaker and addressee are referring to something not in their presence. Thus the referential process is much more complex and requires some metaphorization; this may be based on psychological factors (degree of personal feelings toward the referent), the mentally visualized distance from a referent, or the textual distance.[2]

Deixis is opposed to anaphora and cataphora, though all three are closely related. Anaphora is the function of referring without localizing, wherein a referent previously introduced within the discourse is reactivated. This backward-referring role is distinguished from the forward-directed reference, cataphora, the "colon" function.

1.1.2 Deixis in Greek

Many grammar books describe a three-way system in Greek: ὅδε, οὗτος, and ἐκεῖνος, corresponding to proximal, medial, and distal deixis, respectively. Οὗτος and ὅδε are able to take on both deictic and anaphoric or cataphoric values: the distinction often made is that οὗτος as a deictic refers to something in the sphere of the addressee and as an anaphor refers to something already mentioned, whereas ὅδε as a deictic refers to something in the sphere of the speaker and as a cataphor refers to something subsequent. As seen below, however, the language of *Matthew* utilizes a two-way system, wherein οὗτος has assumed the semantic values of ὅδε.[3] Thus, for our purposes, the basic deictic forms in Greek are οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος, which are proximal and distal, respectively.

In 3:17 of Matthew, for example, after Jesus had been baptized by John, God tells Jesus from heaven, **οὗτός** ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός '*this* is my beloved son'.[4] God had only at that moment arrived on the scene, and the speech-act participants are only he and his son, although

---

[2] Klein, "Personal Deixis in Latin," 94.

[3] ὅδε appears in its adverbial form ὧδε, discussed below.

[4] All translations are my own.

John may still be present. Οὗτος here evidently does not point back to some referent from any previous discourse; the function of the pronoun, therefore, is deictic rather than anaphoric, pointing to the addressee, Jesus, and distinguishing him from John. The form in 3:9 (λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι δύναται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων **τούτων** ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ 'For I tell you, God is able to produce children for Abraham from *these* stones') is also deictic, where John, in his conversation with the Pharisees and Sadducees, is referring to 'these stones (close to us)'. Presumably this is also an example of ostensive deictic, where John is likely physically pointing to the stones near him. This form of οὗτος, however, is clearly referring to the speaker rather than the addressee of the speech-act. No forms of ὅδε are found in *Matthew*, and their use in other books of the New Testament is also scarce.[5] Instead we see the substitution of οὗτος: in 3:9 above, οὗτος is taking on the deictic value of ὅδε by referring to something in the sphere of the speaker; in 10:2 τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστιν **ταῦτα**· πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος… 'the names of the twelve apostles are *these*: first, Simon who was called Peter…', where ταῦτα points cataphorically forward to the list of names.

Contrasting with the proximal οὗτος is the distal and anaphoric ἐκεῖνος. In 3:1, the form is anaphoric, as the narrator is referring to the days that had already been mentioned, namely the early life of Jesus: Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις **ἐκείναις** παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς κηρύσσων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας 'in *those* days John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness of Judea'. The form in the ταῦτα…κἀκεῖνα structure of 23:23 simultaneously demonstrates the distal and anaphoric use of ἐκεῖνος (Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι

---

[5] Of all inflected forms of the pronoun, the neuter accusative plural is the only one used in all of the NT: Acts 21:11, Revelation 2:1, 2:8, 2:12, 2:18, 3:1, 3:7, 3:14. The cataphoric function is evident: **τάδε** λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· τὸν ἄνδρα οὗ ἐστιν ἡ ζώνη αὕτη, οὕτως δήσουσιν ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ παραδώσουσιν εἰς χεῖρας ἐθνῶν 'the holy spirit says the following: "so the Jews in Jerusalem shall bind the man who owns this girdle and shall give him over to the hands of the Gentiles"' (Acts 21:11).

ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον καὶ ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸ ἔλεος καὶ τὴν πίστιν· **ταῦτα** δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι **κἀκεῖνα** μὴ ἀφιέναι 'Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, you hypocrites! For you tithe mint, dill, and cumin and you've neglected the more important matters of the law: justice, mercy, and faithfulness. You should have practiced *these* things without neglecting *the others*'); it is anaphoric because it refers to something already mentioned in the past (ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον), but as a distal deictic, it also points to the terms mentioned earlier than those to which it is being compared (τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸ ἔλεος καὶ τὴν πίστιν). English speakers would say 'the former … the latter'; in Greek it is 'those I mentioned earlier … these I just mentioned'. Thus the Greek system of deixis can be organized as follows. The pronouns οὗτος, ὅδε, and (usually the non-oblique cases of) ἐκεῖνος all have deictic values. Οὗτος and ὅδε are specifically proximal, as opposed to the distal ἐκεῖνος. The uniquely cataphoric ὅδε, entirely unrepresented in *Matthew,* is replaced with forms of οὗτος.

1.1.3 Deixis in Latin

The medial deictic which has been collapsed with the proximal in Greek is strongly retained in Latin. Latin displays a clear three-way system: *hic, iste,* and *ille. Hic,* the proximal deictic, is used to describe referents that are physically, contextually, or textually close to the speaker. In 1:20 (**haec** *autem eo cogitante ecce angelus Domini in somni apparavit ei dicens* 'however, while he was thinking about *these things*, behold, an angel of the lord appeared to him in a dream, saying'), the deictic pronoun *haec* points back to the things that Joseph was considering, namely his wife's pregnancy. The deictic value of *hic* in 14:2 signals focus or heightened attention, demonstrating the contextual proximity of the referent, John the Baptist:

> (1) *in illo tempore audiit Herodes tetrarcha famam Iesu* (2) *et ait pueris suis* **hic** *est Iohannes Baptista ipse surrexit a mortuis et ideo virtutes inoperantur in eo* (3) *Herodes enim tenuit Iohannem et alligavit eum et posuit in carcere*
>
> 'at that time Herod the tetrarch heard the rumor about Jesus (2) and said to his men, *this* is John the Baptist. He has risen from the dead and therefore miraculous powers are at work within him (3) for Herod had seized, bound, and incarcerated John'

Having heard the rumors of Jesus in 14:1, Herod specifies to his men that it is 'this man I'm thinking about', John the Baptist, whom he had incarcerated (14:3), not Jesus, who had most recently been mentioned. *Hic* is also used to describe physical proximity: 8:23 *qualis est* **hic** *quia et venti et mare oboediunt ei* 'what kind of man is *this*, that both the winds and the sea obey him?', where the disciples are referring to Jesus, whom they had just seen move the winds and sea in their presence. Physical proximity is also expressed by the orthographically identical adverb: 12:6 *dico autem vobis quia templo maior est* **hic** [**hīc**] 'but I tell you, something greater than the temple is *here*'. Distance can be temporal, as well: 11:23 *quia si in Sodomis factae fuissent virtutes quae factae sunt in te forte mansissent usque in* **hunc** *diem* 'For if the miracles which were performed in you had been done in Sodom, it would have remained to *this* day'. Finally, as the first person deictic, *hic* may refer to objects, people, or actions pertaining to *ego*. It may appear with or without a first person possessive: 7:24 *omnis ergo qui audit verba mea* **haec** *et facit ea…* 'therefore everyone who hears *these* words of mine and does them…', and 13:51 *intellexistis* **haec** *omnia*, where implicit in *haec* is the meaning '*these* things (parables) that *I* have just said.'

The medial deictic *iste* is often associated with the second person. When asking Jesus to explain his parable, Peter says 15:15 *edissere nobis parabolam* **istam** 'explain to us *that parable (of yours)*', with *istam* linking the parable to the *tu* addressee of the conversation, Jesus. Similarly, Jesus asks in Galilee, 11:16 *cui autem similem aestimabo generationem* **istam** 'to what

should I compare *this generation (of yours)*'; the *generationem* here evidently is that of the townspeople, whom Jesus is addressing. An ostensive use of the pronoun can be seen in 4:3, where readers might imagine the devil pointing at the stones by Jesus' feet and saying *si Filius Dei es dic ut lapides **isti** panes fiant* 'if you are the Son of God, tell *these stones (by you)* to become bread'. A feature of *iste* is the often depreciatory or pejorative value attached to its referent. Klein writes, "it has often been suggested that the pejorative value of *iste* has its origins in the adversarial language of the courtroom, but its occurrence already in the *sermo quotidianus* of Plautine drama strongly indicates that its roots are more widely and deeply steeped in the general dialogic opposition of human interpersonal interaction."[6] The value is likely a result of the opposition and separation of speaker from addressee on an emotional axis. When Jesus arrives in his hometown and performs miracles, the people are amazed and ask, 13:56 *unde ergo huic omnia **ista*** 'where did he get all *these things*'. The pejorative value of *ista* is magnified in the following verse: *et scandalizabantur in eo* 'and they took offense in him'.

The final deictic *ille* refers to neither the speaker nor the addressees, but to the non-speech-act participants. In 7:23 *et tunc confitebor **illis*** 'and then I will declare *to them*', *illis* refers to the many (*multi*) who might prophesy, drive out demons, and perform miracles in Jesus' name (7:22 *in nomine tuo prophetavimus et in tuo nomine daemonia eiecimus et in tuo nomine virtutes multas fecimus*). The speaker, however, is Jesus, and his addressees are his disciples; these '(future) evil doers' (to whom, Jesus speculates, he might say, 7:23 *numquam novi vos discedite a me qui operamini iniquitatem* 'I never knew you; go away from me, you who do evil'), as part of Jesus' future, are non-speech-act participants. *Ille* can function as a pronoun as above, or as an adjectival determiner: 3:1 *in diebus autem **illis** venit Johannes Baptista* 'in *those*

---

[6] Klein, "Personal Deixis in Latin," 95.

days John the Baptist came'. The jarring dichotomy of *hic* and *ille* paired next to each other in

17:17 *adferte **huc illum** ad me* 'bring *him here* to me' is a simple use of the third person deictic

in reference to a non-speech-act participant (Jesus is speaking to a father about his absent son),

contrasted with the first person adverb *huc,* 'here to me' (emphasized with *ad me*). *Hic* and *ille*

are often used in opposition to each other in a distinction that has nothing to do with discourse

participants but rather with simple textual distance. Paralleling the employment of the Greek

deictics οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος in the corresponding passage cited earlier, *hic* and *ille* can also be

translated respectively as 'the latter (these things mentioned most recently) … the former (those

things mentioned further back)': 23:23 ***haec** oportuit facere et **illa** non omittere* 'you ought to

have done *the latter* without neglecting *the former*'.

      Ille is also often employed as a simple anaphoric. The irrelevance of the exact position of

the third person referent leads to a weakening of the deictic force of the pronoun until it becomes

a simple 'he/she/it,' equivalent to the commonly used *is*. In phrases like 2:5 *at **illi** dixerunt*, 4:7

*ait **illi** Iesus*, or 11:4 *et respondens Iesus ait **illis***, each form of *ille* refers back to individuals

previously mentioned in the discourse. The use of *ille* is virtually interchangeable with the third

person pronoun *is*: 15:18 *et **ea** coinquinant hominem* 'and *they* defile a person', although *ille* is

much more frequently used throughout *Matthew*. It is clear then that *ille* is by far the most

polyvalent of the three Latin deictic forms. Given its specificity and precise association with the

tu of most conversations, we may deduce that *iste* is the strongest, with *hic* occupying the middle

ground, given its wide range of associations within the sphere of *ego* and *hic et nunc*.

1.1.4 Deixis in Classical Armenian

      Similar to Latin, Armenian utilizes a threefold deictic distinction. However, the

Armenian system is richer, including not only pronouns, various adverbs, and pronominal

adjectives, but also articles. Because Armenian lacks any gender distinction in its nominal and most of its pronominal inflections, its system of deixis heavily relies on physical and metaphorical distances, with often personal or emotional values attached to each. The deictic forms are based on the elements *s, d,* and *n,* signifying proximal, medial, and distal deixis, respectively. *S* is generally accepted to have been derived from IE *-ḱ, as evidenced in Latin *-c* (*hic, haec, hoc; citra* 'on this side') and Russian сей 'this.' *D* is derived from IE *-t, as seen in the Greek neuter definite article τό, Lat. *is-te,* OHG *der* 'that,' and Lith. *tàs* 'that'. This neatly parallels the Latin deictic system outlined above; *- ḱ > Lat. (*hi*)*c* : Arm. *s* and *-t > Lat. (*is*)*te* : Arm. *d*. However, this violates the Armenian sound law which yields Arm. *t^c* rather than *d* from IE *t. IE *oḱtō 'eight,' for example, becomes *ut^c* in Armenian. Similar patterns of aspiration can be seen in Armenian: IE *k^w becomes Arm. *k^c* (Arm. *k^can*; cf. Lat. *quam* 'than') and IE *p becomes Arm. *h* (Arm. *hing*; cf. Skt. *páñca* 'five'). Meillet suggests a '*manière exceptionnelle*' of development, pointing to the Arm. *du* from IE *tu* 'you'. Finally, the Armenian *n* derives from IE *n; cf. Lith. *anàs* 'that,' OCS *onŭ* 'he,' and Hitt. *anniš* 'that'.[7]

   The simplest forms are the enclitics, *-s, -d,* and *-n.* The fuller, independent forms, upon which the shortened enclitics are likely based, are *sa, da, na*, with the following declension:

Table 1: Declension of Armenian Pronoun *na*

	NA	*na*
	G	*nora*
Sg.	DL	*nma*
	Ab	*nmanē*
	I	*novaw*

---

[7] Greppin questions these etymologies, asking if it is practical for the Armenian enclitics, which are all evidently of a unified system, to have been derived from separate sources. He further suggests that *-s* and *-d* may be taken as different than *–n,* pointing to the later development and increased function of the former two in late Classical Armenian and Middle Armenian: *-s* and *-d* are given possessive values (*girk^cs* 'my book' instead of 'this book') but *-n* is not. Positing that the "threefold unity of *-s, -d,* and *-n* is illusory," he suggests that *-s* and *-d* are derived from the directional particles IE *-ḱ and *-dh- (Grk. οἴκοθι 'at home,' οἰκόθεν 'from home,' ἔνθα 'there'; Skt. *kúha* 'where') respectively. This thesis follows the traditional etymologies outlined above in section 1.1.4.

	N	*nok^c a*
	AL	*nosa*
Pl.	GDAb	*noc^c a*
	Ab	*noc^c anē*
	I	*nok^c awk^c*

With a preceding **ay-,* the demonstrative adjectives and pronouns *ays, ayd,* and *ayn* are formed, which are declined according to a shorter or longer, emphatic form:

Table 2: Declension of Armenian Pronoun *ayn*

		shorter	longer
	NA	*ayn*	*ayn*
	G	*ayn-r*	*ayn-orik*
Sg.	DL	*ayn-m*	*ayn-mik*
	Ab	*ayn-m, ayn-manē*	*ayn-manē*
	I	*ayn-ow*	*ayn-owik*
	N	*ayn-k^c*	*ayn-ok^c ik*
	AL	*ayn-s*	*ayn-osik*
Pl.	GD	*ayn-c^c*	*ayn-oc^c ik*
	Ab	*ayn-c^c, ayn-c^c anē*	
	I	*ayn-owk^c*	*ayn-ok^c iwk^c*

From these are formed the adverbs *ayspēs, aydpēs,* and *aynpēs* 'in this/that way' and *aysč^c ap^c,* *aydč^c ap^c,* and *aynč^c ap^c* 'to this/that degree', as well as the adjectives *ayspisi, aydpisi,* and *aydpisi* 'of this/that sort'. With a preceding **a(y),* they are local adverbs *ast/aydr/and* 'X; here/there', *aysr/aydr/andr* 'to X', and *asti/ayti* (<*ayd-ti)/*anti* 'from X'.

As we have seen with the Greek and Latin systems, the Armenian deictic system can function on a variety of levels – anaphorically, cataphorically, personally, and emotionally. The proximal deictic based on *s* may be ostensive (27:54 *ardarew AY ordi ēr **sa*** 'truly *this [man here]* was the son of God'), temporal (28:15 *ew el hambaws ays ï hrēic^c minč^c ew c^c **ays**awr* 'and this story has gone out from the Jews until *this day*', where the adjective *ays* and noun *awr* 'day' are combined to form a single word *aysawr* 'today'), personal (26:26 ***ays** ē marmin im* '*this* is my

body'), and cataphoric (2.5 *zi **ayspēs** greal ē ï jeřn margarēin…* 'for it is written *in this way* by the prophet…,' where the deictic refers forward in the text to the prophecy).

The first-person association of the *s*-deictics often yields translations with overt first person reference. In 25:8, for example, the first person possessive pronoun *mer* is hypercharacterized by -*s*: *šiǰanin lapterkᶜs **mer*** '*our* lanterns are dying out'.[8] The enclitic deictic marker may be used in conjunction with a demonstrative adjective (24:34 *amēn asem jez, etᶜe óčᶜ ancᶜcᶜē azg**s** **ays**, minčᶜew ays amenayn ełicᶜi* 'truly I say to you that *this generation* will not pass until all of these things happen,' where the enclitic -*s* is attached to the noun *azg* and reiterated with the adjective *ays*), it may be omitted (26:26 ***ays** ē marmin im* '*this* is my body') or even attached to parts of speech other than nouns: predicate adjectives (20:15 *kam tᶜe akn kᶜo čᶜar ē zi es ařát**s** em* 'or is your eye evil because I am good?'), substantivized adjectives (20:14 *kamim yetnoy**s** tal orpēs ew kᶜez* 'I choose to give to this last [worker] just as I gave to you'), and possessive pronouns (20:15 *etᶜe čᶜicᶜēˀ inj išxanowtᶜiwn yims**s** ařnel zinčᶜ ew kamim* 'do I not have the power to do whatever I choose with my own things?').

The medial deictic is strongly associated with the second person. Similar to the first person deictic above, often *d* can express second person possession. After the use of the second person possessive pronoun *kᶜo* in the protasis, the possessive-adjectival translation of -*d* here in the apodosis is natural: 6:22 *etᶜe akn **kᶜo** ařat ē, amenayn marmin**d** lowsawor ełicᶜi* 'if your eye is simple, your whole body will be radiant'. The enclitic -*d* need not necessarily be used together with a possessive adjective: 2:13 *arí ař zmanowk**d** ew zmayr iwr* 'come, take the child (of yours)

---

[8] Note that the enclitic does not distinguish number; *mer* is a first person plural possessive pronoun, but the -*s* merely conveys the first person quality. In other words, without *mer*, we are able to translate the noun phrase as either 'my lanterns' or 'our lanterns'.

and his mother,' where, despite the lack of any possessive pronoun, the reference to the *tu* addressee is unmistakable.

The medial deictic may also simply indicate a second person referent – something associated with the *tu* of the speech-act – rather than an explicit possession. In some examples, the reference to the second person, though still indisputable, is not quite equivalent to a possessive pronoun: 17:9 *mí owmek^c asic^{c}ēk^c ztesil***d*** 'do not relate to anybody *the vision (that you saw)*'; 9:24 *i bác^c gnac^{c}ēk^c zi oč^c et^{c}e mer̄eal ē ał̌ik***d*** *ayłl nnǰē* 'move away, for *that girl (among you)* is not dead but is sleeping'; 25:27 *part ēr k^{c}ez arkanel zarcat^c****d*** *im ï seławors* 'you should've placed my *money (that you had)* with moneylenders'. The clash of deixis here, with the first person possessive *im* immediately following the second person deixis *–d,* is noteworthy for its addition of meaning. *Im* specifies that it is 'my money', and it avoids any misinterpretation as 'your money' (cf. Grk. τὰ ἀργύριά μου 'my money'), but *–d* qualifies the money further as the money that was given to the addressee. In 16:22 (*ew ar̄eal zna mekowsi Petrosi, sksaw kagel ənd nma ew asel, k^{c}áw lic^{c}i k^{c}ez TR, mí ełic^{c}i k^{c}ez* **ayd** 'and Peter, having taken him aside, began to rebuke him saying, God spare you, Lord; may *that* never happen to you'), the pronoun *ayd* refers back to Jesus foretelling his death; thus it not only refers back anaphorically to a previously introduced thought, it becomes associated with the addressee of the speech-act, Jesus – 'may that (thing that you said) never happen.' The pejorative and negative overtones often attributed to the medial deictic may be at play here, as well – 'may that (evil thing; i.e. your death) never happen.' The pejorative use of the second person deictic is seen frequently: 9:3 *hayhoyē* ***da*** '*this man* is blaspheming'; 19:26 *ar̄ i mardkanē* **ayd** *ankar ē* 'with man, *this* is impossible' (with *ayd* referring to the distasteful idea of a rich man entering heaven [19:24 *diwrin ē malxoy mtanel ənd cak asłan k^{c}an mecatan yark^{c}ayowt^{c}iwn AY mtanel* 'it is

easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God']); 20:12 ***dokᶜa*** *yetinkᶜ**d** mi žam gorcecᶜin, ew hasarakords mez ararer **zdosa**, or zcanrowtᶜiwn awowrn barjakᶜ ew ztawtᶜ* '*these last men* worked only one hour, and you've made *them* equal to us who have borne the burden of the day and the heat'.

Because of the polyvalence of *n*-deixis, with its two-fold function as both distal deictic and anaphoric, it is much more frequently employed in the value of a simple definite article, neutral deictic, or anaphoric, than *s* or *d*. *N*-deixis is most commonly realized as anaphora. This can be generic, referring to things generally known. Klein categorizes seven generic types: aspects of nature, geographical names, groups of people, aspects of Jewish culture and history, generally known or common things, features of the emergent Christian culture, and terms associated with mystic or oracular symbols.[9] Most often, the anaphora is textual in nature, referring to someone or something already mentioned. Throughout the dialogue in chapter 20, for example, readers encounter the third person accusative constructions *cᶜna* and *cᶜnosa* frequently. Each time, the narrator is referring to the participants opposing the speaker; in the beginning of 20:7 *asen **cᶜna*** 'they say *to him*', the workers are speaking to Jesus, whereas later in the same verse (*asē **cᶜnosa*** 'he says *to them*'), Jesus is speaking to the workers. The weak deictic value of Armenian *n*-deixis, as we saw in Latin, allows it to function as a simple article which can be attached to nouns (*zvēm**n*** 'the stone,' *zkᶜałakᶜ**n*** 'the city,' *caṙaykᶜ**n*** 'the servants') or substantivized adjectives (*čᶜar**n*** 'the evil one [Satan]', *aṙakᶜealkᶜ**n*** 'the ones sent [the apostles]' [built from the participle *aṙakᶜeal,* a verbal adjective]). The ability of Armenian to definitize its adjectives is based on the principle that structures functioning syntactically as nouns – i.e. substantive adjectives – are to be treated as nouns. As a distal deictic, the *n*-form also points to

---

[9] Klein, *On Personal Deixis in Classical Armenian*, 10-11.

referents removed from the speech-act, both literally and metaphorically. For example, the days referred to in 3:1 (*yawowrs **yaynosik** gay Yovhannēs mkrtič^c k^carozel yanapatin Hrēastani* 'in *those days*, John the Baptist came to preach in the wilderness of Judea') are temporally distant from the 'here and now' of the narrator.[10]

1.2 Data Synthesis

1.2.1 Method

Given that this thesis is also a study of Latin and Armenian translation methods and ideologies, rather than simply a close examination of the deictic systems of the three languages, the data collection necessarily focused on Latin and Armenian correspondences to the Greek originals. In other words, all instances of the Greek deictic pronouns were gathered, to which the corresponding Latin and Armenian translations were then compared. Analysis of the comparisons is based on the deictic forms used and the choices Jerome and Mashtots made in their translations. The grammatical implications of these choices are treated in sections 1.2.4 and 1.2.7. What the choices reveal about the translators' techniques and principles will be discussed in chapter 2.

1.2.2 Greek-Latin: Correspondences

Of the 186 instances of Greek deictic pronouns in *Matthew*, 155 are translated with the expected correspondences in Latin; that is, 105 instances of οὗτος were translated with *hic*, and 50 of ἐκεῖνος were translated with *ille*. The remaining 31 pronouns are translated with the Latin *iste* (28 times, all corresponding to Greek οὗτος), or *ille* (once, where the Greek original was οὗτος), and one instance of Greek ἐκεῖνος and one of οὗτος were left untranslated in Latin. There

---

[10] Armenian also frequently uses the adverb *yaynžam* (*y-ayn-žam*) 'then,' a combination of *i,ayn,* and *žam* ('time') – lit. 'at that time.'

are an additional four instances in which Latin uses a deictic form where Greek has an anaphoric

pronoun or no corresponding form.

There are also several directional and locational adverbs with deictic value. Of the 60

total forms in Greek, 57 are translated with the expected form in Latin: ὧδε, the demonstrative

adverb of ὅδε, is often translated with the Latin proximal deictic adverb *hic*; the Greek distal

adverb ἐκεῖ is translated with Latin *illic* (derived from the pronoun *ille* and with further

derivatives *illo* ['to X'] and *illuc* ['to X']) or *ibi*; and Greek ἐκεῖθεν, a derivative of ἐκεῖ with the

inseparable ablatival particle -θεν as opposed to -δε, is translated with the Latin correlate *inde*.

The three mismatches are ὧδε with *illic* (once) and ἐκεῖ with no Latin adverb (twice).

1.2.3 Greek-Latin: Analysis

If we consider the following as correlates,

Table 3: Greek-Latin Correlates

	Greek	Latin
proximal, first person deixis	οὗτος, ὅδε (ὧδε)	*hic* (pronoun and adverb)
medial, second person deixis	---	*iste*
distal, third person/neutral deixis	ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖθεν	*ille, is,* *ibi, illuc, illic, inde, illo*

of the 246 collected instances of Greek deictic pronouns, adjectives, and adverbs, there are 212

matches with Latin. That is, 212 times out of 246, a Greek deictic was translated with the

equivalent form in Latin. Although this 86% correlation is indicative of great consistency in the

Latin rendering of Greek deictic forms, we cannot ignore the 34 mismatches; the purpose of this

study is to highlight and attempt to understand these unexpected translations.

1.2.3.1 Manuscript Issues

We may immediately ascribe four of these mismatches to inconsistencies in the manuscripts.[11] The genitive absolute of 11:7 (**τούτων** δὲ πορευομένων) is translated with an ablative absolute in Latin: ***illis*** *autem abeuntibus* 'when they went away'. The use of τούτων as an anaphor is unusual, but codex Z in fact has αὐτῶν.[12] In 20:23 τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν **τοῦτο** δοῦναι 'but to sit at my right and left, *this* isn't mine to grant', the pronoun τοῦτο is untranslated in the Latin (*sedere autem ad dexteram meam et sinistram non est meum dare vobis*). Codices אBLNOXZΓΘΠΣל however all omit τοῦτο and only the Latin version *q* has *hoc meum*.[13] Latin uses the pronoun *haec* in 24:6 *oportet enim **haec** fieri* 'for *these things* must happen', but the Greek has no pronoun: δεῖ γὰρ γενέσθαι. Codex Y however has ταῦτα, and several Latin versions (*e, ff¹, ff², g¹, h, l, q, r¹,* and *r²*) all follow this with *haec*. Finally, Greek does not have a direct object for the final verb in 26:61 δύναμαι καταλῦσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν οἰκοδομῆσαι 'I am able to destroy the temple of God and to rebuild (it) in three days', but the Latin inserts the pronoun *illud*: *possum destruere templum Dei et post triduum aedificare **illud***. Codices אCL contain αὐτόν.

1.2.3.2 Greek Distal Forms with Unexpected Latin Translations

The Greek distal deictic is translated 50 times with a corresponding Latin distal deictic, but there are two instances where Latin either omits the pronoun (18:32) or uses a proximal

---

[11] For the Greek original, I will be adhering to D, Codex Bezae, a 5th or 6th century manuscript, which is considered the closest to the Armenian (I am adhering to the Künzle edition), and which Metzger deems the "principal authority" (*The Text of the New Testament,* 50) of the Western text. Although א (Sinaitibus) and B (Vaticanus) are earlier (both are dated to the 4th century), D is supported by later manuscripts including Φ, the Old Latin, Syriac, and a few copies of the Vulgate. However, it is impossible to deem Jerome's translations entirely wrong or deviant without knowing his exact sources.

[12] The Armenian version also uses an anaphoric pronoun: *ew ibrew **nokᶜa** gnacᶜin* 'and as they went'.

[13] The Armenian version omits the pronoun as well: *baycᶜ nstowcᶜanel ənd ajmē ew ənd ahekē immē óčᶜ ē im tal* 'but to sit and my right and left is not mine to grant'.

pronoun instead (26:27). The Latin omission occurs at 18:32 within a short parable about a

master, his slave, and the slave's debt. The master requests that the slave pay his debt, but at the

slave's pleas, the master decides to forgive the debt. After this conversation, the slave meets

another fellow slave who owed him a sum of money. The first slave demands that the second pay

him, and despite his pleas, the second is thrown into jail for failing to pay. Word of this reaches

the master who rebukes the first slave: Δοῦλε πονηρέ, πᾶσαν τὴν ὀφειλὴν **ἐκείνην** ἀφῆκά σοι,

ἐπεὶ παρεκάλεσάς με (33) οὐκ ἔδει καὶ σὲ ἐλεῆσαι τὸν σύνδουλόν σου, ὡς κἀγὼ σὲ ἠλέησα; 'you

wicked slave, I cancelled all *that* debt for you because you begged me; shouldn't you have

forgiven your fellow servant just as I forgave you?' Here the Latin reads *serve nequam omne*

debitum Ø dimisi tibi quoniam rogasti me (33) *non ergo oportuit et te misereri conservi tui sicut*

et ego tui misertus sum. The use of the deictic in Greek is logical; as an adjective that modifies

τὴν ὀφειλὴν, it refers back to the beginning of the parable when the slave's debt was first

mentioned. It is strange that Latin omits this anaphoric deictic, especially given the one-to-one

translation of the rest of the clause, even preserving word order. The pronoun does not appear

integral to the meaning of the passage in Greek, however, and it is omitted in the *Vetus Latina*

versions (excluding *d* and *e*), as well.

      The Latin substitution of a proximal deictic for the Greek anaphoric pronoun at 26:27 is

noteworthy. When offering the cup of his blood to his disciples, Jesus says πίετε ἐξ **αὐτοῦ**

πάντες 'drink from *it*, all of you' but the Latin version has *bibite ex **hoc** omnes* 'drink from *this*,

all of you'. The ostensive deixis in Latin is obvious: Jesus is evidently handing his cup to his

disciples. Only two manuscripts (*d* and *ff²*) of the Latin versions translate ἐξ αὐτοῦ with a similar

anaphor *ex eo*, whereas eight use *ex hoc* (*b, f, ff¹, g¹, g², l, q, r¹*). In 19:25 the Latin version

similarly inserts a deictic element where there is none in the Greek: *auditis autem **his** discipuli*

mirabantur valde 'but when *these things* were heard, the disciples were very surprised' for

ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο σφόδρα 'but when the disciples heard (this), they were

very surprised'. The Latin is formatted as an ablative absolute, necessitating an object of the

hearing, which is specified as 'these things that Jesus just said'. The Vulgate follows many of the

Latin manuscripts (*f, g¹, g², l, m,* and *q*), and the only Greek variation is in ℵ where δὲ is omitted.

1.2.3.3 Latin Medial Forms Rendering Greek Proximal Forms

Of the 38 mismatches then, four can be ascribed to manuscript discrepancies, one is a

Latin omission of a nonessential anaphoric reference, and two are the result of Latin insertions of

deixis where there is none in the Greek. Twenty-eight of the remaining thirty-one are instances

where Latin translates Greek οὗτος with its medial deictic *iste*. The fact that Jerome eschewed

the use of a proximal deictic in these cases suggests that he was focusing on a factor other than

the distance between *ego* and the referent; by using a medial form rather than the expected

proximal one, Latin draws attention to an alternative aspect of the relationship.

1.2.3.3.1 A Second Person Referent

Many times, it seems that the Latin use of *iste* functions to highlight the second person

association of the referent. The devil asks Jesus, *dic ut lapides **isti** panes fiant* 'command *those*

stones (by your feet) to become bread' (4:3), Jesus asks *cui autem simile aestimabo*

*generationem **istam*** 'to what should I compare *this generation (of yours)*?' (11:16), and Jesus'

disciples ask him to *edissere nobis parabolam **istam*** 'explain *that parable (of yours)* to us'

(15:15), as discussed above. On the topic of marriage and divorce, the following dialogue

between Jesus and his disciples occurs (Jesus begins):

> 19:9 *dico autem vobis quia quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam nisi ob*
> *fornicationem et aliam duxerit moechatur et qui dimissam duxerit moechatur* (10)
> *dicunt ei discipuli eius si ita est causa homini cum uxore non expedit nubere* (11)
> *qui dixit non omnes capiunt verbum **istud** sed quibus datum est*

'(9) 'but I say to you that whoever divorces his wife, unless it was because of sexual immorality, and marries another is committing adultery, and whoever weds a divorced woman is also committing adultery.' (10) The disciples said to him, 'If it is so, it is better for man to not marry at all' (11) Jesus said, 'Not everyone receives *this word (that I gave to you)*, but only those to whom it has been given''

Nearly identical to 11:16 (*cui autem simile aestimabo generationem istam* 'to what should I compare *this generation [of yours]*', is Jesus' reference to his addressees with *iste* in 23:36: *amen dico vobis venient haec omnia super generationem **istam*** 'truly I say to you, all these things will come upon *this generation (of yours)*'. Finally, the high priest asks during Jesus' trial, 26:62 *nihil respondes ad ea quae **isti** adversum te testificantur* 'do you respond nothing to the things which *these men (you've just heard)* testify against you?'

1.2.3.3.2 A Pejorative Referent

There are also several uses of *iste* where the derogatory sense is emphasized. As discussed above, the people of Jesus' hometown are offended by his newly acquired powers and ask, 13:56 *unde ergo huic omnia **ista*** 'where did he get all *these things*?' In 3:9, John the Baptist rebukes the Pharisees and Sadducees who claim to be children of Abraham by saying, *potest Deus de lapidibus **istis** suscitare filios Abrahamae* 'God can create children for Abraham (even) out of *these stones*'; the stones are treated as insignificant and lowly, equivalent to John's addressees. In 10:23, Jesus tells his disciples, *cum autem persequentur vos in civitate **ista** fugite in aliam* 'if you are persecuted in *that* city, flee to another'; the city that rejects their teachings is given the pejorative adjective *iste*. The pejorative *iste* of 10:42 *quicumque potum dederit uni ex minimis **istis** calicem aquae frigidae tantum in nomine discipuli amen dico vobis non perdet mercedem suam* 'whoever gives only a cup of cold water to one of *these little ones* in the name of a disciple, truly I tell you, will not lose his reward' refers to the fact that even the smallest service done to the most insignificant of Christ's servants will be rewarded. A similar phrasing is

used in 5:19: *qui ergo solverit unum de mandatis **istis** minimis et docuerit sic homines minimus vocabitur in regno caelorum* 'whoever relaxes even one of *the most insignificant of these laws* and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven'. In 12:41 and 42, the *generatione ista* is a reference to the evil and unfaithful generation (12:39 *mala et adultera*) who are always seeking signs from Jesus; because of their unfaithfulness, they will be judged and condemned by the men of Nineveh and the queen of the South (12:41 *viri ninevitae surgent in iudicio cum generatione **ista** et condemnabunt eam*; 12:42 *regina austri surget in iudicio cum generatione **ista** et condemnabit eam*). The scribes and priests of 21:16 ask Jesus *audis quid **isti** dicant* 'do you hear what *those (children)* are saying?', indignant (21:15 *indignati sunt*) that the children had called 'Hosanna to the Son of David'. When a woman anoints Jesus with oil, his disciples rebuke her for the waste, saying 26:9 *potuit enim **istud** venundari multo et dari pauperibus* 'for *that (oil you wasted)* could have been sold for a large sum and given to the poor'. When speaking of the unfortunate event of all his disciples falling away, Jesus refers to the night when this will happen as ***ista** nocte* (26:31). Before his betrayal, Jesus laments: 26:39 *mi pater si possibile est transeat a me calix **iste*** 'My Father, if it is possible, let *this* cup pass from me'. The *calix* is used as a symbol of divine wrath in the Old Testament,[14] and its mention here is a reference to Jesus' crucifixion as he bears the sins of many. Jesus himself, because he is a criminal in the eyes of many, is given the pejorative *iste*; 27:47 *stantes et audientes dicebant Heliam vocat **iste*** 'the bystanders hearing him said, *This man* is calling Elijah' and 27:54 *timuerunt valde dicentes vere Dei Filius erat **iste*** 'very afraid, they said, *He* truly was the Son of God'.

---

[14] Isa 51:17, 22; Jer 25:15-17, 27-29

1.2.3.3.3 A Neutral Referent

There are nine remaining verses in which Latin medial deixis is used neither pejoratively nor in reference to the second person or addressee. The appearance of *iste* in 6:29, 13:53, and 19:1 suggests the neutrality of the pronoun, comparable to its Spanish derivative, the pronoun *este.* This is surprising given its highly specialized and specific use in all other instances. In 6:29 when Jesus tells his disciples not to worry about what clothes they ought to wear, he mentions flowers that grow without any care for clothes, and yet *nec Saloman in omni gloria sua coopertus est sicut unum ex **istis*** 'not even Solomon in all his glory is covered like one of *those (flowers)*'. The comparison with the flowers is an example which the disciples should emulate, so the reference is clearly not pejorative, and, as the flowers are hypothetical and only just mentioned, there is no reasonable way to associate them with the sphere of the addressees: it appears that *iste* here is simply neutral.

Similarly, *iste* appears in the narration of 13:53: *cum consummasset Iesus parabolas **istas** transiit inde* 'when Jesus finished *those* parables, he went from there'. Throughout chapter 13 (and the rest of *Matthew*), the narrator's reference to Jesus' parables is neutral: 13:2 *et locutus est eis multa in parabolis dicens,* 13:24 *aliam parabolam proposuit illis dicens,* 13:31 *aliam parabolam proposuit eis dicens,* 13:33 *aliam parabolam locutus est eis,* 13:34 *haec omnia locutus est Iesus in parabolis ad turbas* ('all these things [just now]'). It is possible that the strange specification with *istas* attempts to put distance between the two clauses. When Jesus *transiit inde*, he physically distances himself from the disciples to whom he was speaking, and the narrator simultaneously emphasizes the separation of the first clause, which pertains to all of the previous parables, dialogues, and events, from the next, where Jesus moves on to a different town and series of events – when he finished *those* parables (from *that,* now-complete part of the

story), he went *from there* and 13:54 *veniens in patriam suam docebat eos in synagogis eorum* 'arriving in his hometown, he taught the people [there] in their synagogues'.[15] More likely is the simple explanation that *istas* is functioning as a neutral deictic. It is of course unlikely that *istas* indicates some emotional coloring by the narrator; it is doubtful that the narrator has some opinion on the nature of the parables.

On the other hand, this may indeed be the case for the use of *iste* in the narration of 28:15: *divulgatum est verbum **istud** apud Iudaeos usque in hodiernum diem* '*this story* has been spread among the Jews to this day'. *Verbum istud* refers to the false story that Jesus' disciples stole him from the cave. The Jews' rejection of Jesus' resurrection evidently is unfavorable to the presumably Christian narrator, who has divulged his indignation to the readers by using this colored adjective.

1.2.3.3.4 Deictic Consistency

The final unexpected appearances of *iste* occur within a short series of verses. In chapter 18, when the disciples ask Jesus who is the greatest in the kingdom, he places a child among them and explains that *quicumque ergo humiliaverit se sicut parvulus **iste** hic est maior in regno caelorum* 'whoever humbles himself like *this child* is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven' (18:4). The use of *iste* here likely functions to emphasize the children in the disciples' (i.e. the *tu* of the speech-act) midst, rather than simply 'this child here' (οὗτος). This is extended to the following verses, where the discussion now involves hypothetical or metaphorical children,[16] but

---

[15] 19:1 is a near identical situation: *cum consummasset Iesus sermones **istos** migravit a Galilaea et venit in fines Iudaeae trans Iordanen* 'when Jesus finished those sermons, he left Galilee and came to the borders of Judea beyond the Jordan.'

[16] "The expression has been taken to refer to missionaries, catechumens, recent converts, young Christians, or lowly Christians – those lightly esteemed by others. A firm decision one way or the other is impossible" (Allison, *Matthew: A Shorter Commentary*, 297).

Jesus in the Latin version maintains the use of *iste*: 18:6 *qui autem scandalizaverit unum de pusillis **istis** qui in me credunt expedit ei ut suspendatur mola asinaria in collo eius et demergatur in profundum maris* 'but whoever tempts to evil one of *these children* who believe in me, it would be better for him that a heavy millstone be hung around his neck and that he be drowned in the depths of the sea'; 18:14 *non est voluntas ante Patrem vestrum ... ut pereat unus de pusillis **istis*** 'it is not the will of your Father that one of *these children* should perish'. Following the first reference to the child with *iste* in 18:4, each subsequent reference to both the specific child and to hypothetical children likened to the first are also made with *iste* (18:6 and 18:14). This is peculiar, given that the children mentioned in the later verses are not in the sphere of the addressees nor thought of negatively in any way. This may be an instance of a neutral *iste,* as discussed above, but the deliberate use of the first *iste* as a reference to something in the sphere of the addressees suggests that the subsequent appearances are somehow governed by the first. In fact, this may be a peculiar instance of deictic consistency, wherein deictic forms are retained throughout a discourse fragment so long as no change in discourse perspective intervenes. This occurs frequently in Classical Armenian. During the Last Supper, for example, when Jesus tells his disciples to drink from the cup, he says 26:27 *arbēkᶜ ï **dmanē** amenekᶜin* 'drink from *that (which I give to you)*, all of you'. The *d*-deictic here is clearly putting the cup within the sphere of the addressees, and each subsequent reference to the cup is also made with a *d*-deictic: 26:28 *zi **áyd** ē ariwn im noro owxti* 'for *this* is my blood of a new covenant' and 26:29 *yoržam arbicᶜ **zda** ənd jez nor yarkᶜayowtᶜean hawr imoy* 'when I drink *it* with you anew in my Father's kingdom'. The force of deictic consistency is especially evident in 26:28 where we might have expected the proximal *ays* with the first person possessive *im*. However, having been introduced with a *d*-deictic, the referent (the cup) must continue to be addressed with a *d*-deictic

for the rest of the discourse fragment. It appears that the retention of *iste* in chapter 18 above is governed by the same force of deictic consistency.

It is tempting to ascribe the peculiar *iste* in 21:42 to deictic consistency as well. Jesus quotes from the scriptures (Psalm 118:22-23) and asks, 21:42 *numquam legistis in scripturis lapidem quem reprobaverunt aedificantes hic factus est in caput anguli a Domino factum est istud et est mirabile in oculis nostris* 'have you never read in the scriptures, the stone that the builders rejected was made the cornerstone; this was done by God and *it* is marvelous in our eyes'. The stone here represents Jesus and the rejection of it foreshadows his crucifixion. With such negative connotations, the use of *istud* with the stone in 21:44 (*et qui ceciderit super lapidem istum confringetur* 'and whoever falls on *this stone* will be shattered') is not surprising. However, the referent for *istud* in 21:42 is not the stone, but rather the fact that the stone was made the cornerstone, hence the neuter singular. Therefore the two forms of *iste* – one a neuter and the other a masculine – are unrelated and cannot be attributed to deictic consistency. Because the neuter *istud* refers to an act that was in no way unfortunate or negative (as the masculine *istum* does), it must be taken as a neutral *iste*.

1.2.3.4 Adverbial Deixis

The discussion above focused on discrepancies in the Greek and Latin deictic pronouns and adjectives. The following discussion shifts to adverbial forms. There are only three instances where the Latin fails to match the Greek. In 24:23, Latin uses a distal deictic adverb in response to the Greek proximal ὧδε. When the disciples ask Jesus about his return, he warns them that many will claim to be the Messiah, saying, Τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· ἰδοὺ **ὧδε** ὁ χριστός, ἤ· **ὧδε**, μὴ πιστεύσητε 'then if anyone tells you, Look, *here* is Christ, or *Here*!, don't believe them'. The Latin translation is *tunc si quis vobis dixerit ecce **hic** Christus aut **illic** nolite credere*, an exact

word-for-word translation except for *illic*. The substitution of *illic* for the second ὧδε makes

sense, however, given the nature of the context. Jesus' point is that if anyone says "this is Christ"

anywhere, they should not be trusted; thus, the pairing of *hic* and *illic* aptly illustrates the need

for skepticism *everywhere*. In 17:20 and 27:36, the equivalent form for ἐκεῖ is missing in the

Latin translation. Both seem to be based on a matter of redundancy. One could argue that the

prepositional prefix of the verb in *transi hinc* 'move *from here*' (17:20) – or simply the fact that

when one moves *from X (to Y),* there must necessarily be a destination – is sufficient for

implying a destination, which is made explicit in Greek: μετάβα ἔνθεν **ἐκεῖ**. In 27:36, after

Jesus' crucifixion, the guards καθήμενοι ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν **ἐκεῖ** 'sitting down, kept watch over him

there'. The Latin simply reads *sedentes servabant eum*. *Illic* would be slightly redundant here,

especially given that the location was previously established, and no movement to or from there

had occurred; *venerunt in locum qui dicitur Golgotha* 'they [the guards] arrived in a place called

Golgotha' (27:33), after which the narration leading up to the verse in question is centered on the

guards and their actions. Clearly the guarding occurred in the same place that everything else had

been happening, rendering any adverb of place unnecessary.

1.2.4 Greek-Latin: Grammatical Implications

Generally speaking, the Latin translation of the Greek within the context of deixis is

fairly consistent. Out of the 246 total deictic pronouns and adverbs, 212 show expected matches,

and even where there are divergences – the biggest sample of this being the use of Latin *iste* for

which there is no Greek equivalent – the correspondences are mostly logical and consistent. Of

the 34 mismatches, 28 are due to *iste*, two are due to manuscript issues, and four are due to the

Latin omission of redundancies. These final four and the 28 instances of *iste* are perhaps the

most telling in terms of differences between the Greek and Latin versions. The Latin translation

generally keeps word order, vocabulary, and verb tense and voice consistent with the Greek, but where the Latin does deviate, it is in the employment of deixis.

The Latin use of *iste* has not only revealed that Jerome in many instances chose to focus on a relationship other than that of the Greek version, it has exposed the possibility of both deictic consistency and the neutrality of the pronoun in Latin. The neutrality of *iste* has been suggested by Palmer, who writes in his chapter on vulgar Latin, "noteworthy is the indiscriminate use of *hic, ille,* and *iste,* the use of *ipse* as an anaphoric pronoun replacing *is*, and the reduction of *ille* to the status of definite article and *unus* to that of indefinite article."[17] Palmer insists on the unmistakable "vulgar stamp" of Biblical Latin, which reflects the speech habits of the early Latin-speaking converts,[18] and asserts that Jerome's procedure of translation left the vulgarisms "untouched."[19] If this indeed is the case, it is clear that this vulgar neutral *iste* has seeped into the language of the Vulgate. However, its effects are evidently not felt fully in Jerome's *Matthew*; otherwise all deictic pronouns would have been used interchangeably and this study would be pointless. We may posit instead that the neutral use of *iste* in *Matthew* points to the beginning of the shift in the semantic values of this pronoun.

The possibility of deictic consistency has interesting implications for Latin syntax, as well. As Klein notes*,* deictic consistency is a feature prevalent in Classical Armenian syntax.[20] Its principles are enforced so rigidly that at times, it risks ambiguity. In the following verse, for example, there are two counts of the distal *n*-deictic, but they refer to two separate individuals:
27:32 *ew eleal artakᶜs gtin ayr mi Kiwrenacᶜi anown Simovn, **zna** kalan pahak zi barjcᶜē zxačᶜ**n***

---

[17] Palmer, 162.

[18] Ibid., 187

[19] Ibid., 190

[20] Klein, *On Personal Deixis in Classical Armenian,* 57.

nora 'as they went out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name; they compelled *that man* to carry *his* cross'. The first pronoun *na* (with prefix *z-*) refers to Simon, or 'a man (*ayr mi*)', but the second, *nora*, refers to Jesus, to whom reference had been made continuously with the *n*-deictic in the preceding verses (27:27 *nora*; 27:28 *zna, znovaw*; 27:29 *nora*; 27:30 *na, nora*; 27:31 *zna, nmanē*). The ambiguity of course is that the second pronoun *nora* could refer to Simon. There has been no account of such a principle playing any role in Latin syntax, nor is it seen in Greek. In Greek, subsequent references to an individual or event are generally expressed with an anaphoric αὐτός. For example, in 13:55-56 the crowd, when talking about Jesus who stands among them, refers to him first with the proximal deictic οὗτος, but every succeeding pronoun for Jesus is the anaphoric αὐτός: 13:55 οὐχ **οὗτός** ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός; οὐχ ἡ μήτηρ **αὐτοῦ** λέγεται Μαριὰμ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ **αὐτοῦ** Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας; 13:56 καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ **αὐτοῦ** οὐχὶ πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσιν; 'Is this one not the son of the carpenter? Is his mother not called Mariam, and his brothers Jacob and Joseph and Simon and Judas? And are his sisters not all with us?'[21] In Latin, too, Jesus is first referred to with *hic*, but later with *eius*. It is particularly strange then, that there is only the one example of deictic consistency in Latin, and that most of the Armenian cases of deictic consistency do not appear in the corresponding Latin. However, there seems to be no other logical explanation for the repeated *iste* in chapter 18.

Speculations regarding the reasons behind Jerome's choices and the ideological implications of his translation methods will be discussed in the following chapter, but we may conclude from a syntactic standpoint the following. The existence of a medial deictic in Latin naturally causes some inconsistencies between the Greek and Latin versions, and it highlights the varied focuses of the author and translator. Although the neutrality of *iste* is felt in some cases, it

---

[21] Armenian has an *s*-deictic throughout: *sa* for the first and *sora* for each subsequent genitive pronoun.

is relatively infrequent compared to the pejorative or second-person uses of the deictic. Palmer's neutrality of the Latin deictic pronouns evidently is not expressed fully in our text. The Latin version also offers a peculiar example of deictic consistency which has only been confirmed in Classical Armenian.

1.2.5 Greek-Armenian: Correspondences

Turning now to the Greek-Armenian relationships, of the 186 instances of Greek deictic pronouns in *Matthew*, 131 are translated with the expected correspondences in Armenian; that is, 80 instances of οὗτος are translated with an *s*-deictic, and 51 of ἐκεῖνος are translated with an *n*-deictic. The remaining 55 pronouns are translated with the Armenian *d*-deictic (30 times, all corresponding to Greek οὗτος), *n*-deictic (24 times, where Greek shows the proximal οὗτος), and once with Ø (with Greek οὗτος). Remarkably, every distal ἐκεῖνος is translated consistently with the corresponding *n*-deictic in Armenian.

Of the 60 adverbial forms in Greek, 52 are translated with the expected form in Armenian: ὧδε, the demonstrative adverb of ὅδε, is translated with the Armenian proximal deictic adverbs *ast, aysr,* or *asti*; the Greek distal adverb ἐκεῖ is translated with Armenian *and,* and Greek ἐκεῖθεν is translated with the Armenian correlate *anti*. The eight mismatches are ὧδε with *and* (once), ὧδε with the medial deictic *aydr* (twice), ὧδε with Ø (three times), and ἐκεῖ with Ø (twice).

1.2.6 Greek-Armenian: Analysis

As was done for the Greek-Latin correspondences, the following correlates are assumed for Greek-Armenian:

Table 4: Greek-Armenian Correlates

	Greek	Armenian

proximal, first person deixis	οὗτος, ὅδε (ὧδε)	(-)s(-)
medial, second person deixis	---	(-)d(-)
distal, third person/neutral deixis	ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖθεν	(-)n(-)

Of the 246 total number of Greek deictic forms collected, 182 fit the expected relationships from Table 4. This is a correlation of about 74%, significantly less than the Latin (86%). Many of these mismatches are at odds with the Latin translation, as well; there is not much agreement between the Latin and Armenian deviations. Of the 30 instances where Armenian uses a *d*-deictic for a Greek proximal form, for example, only five show Latin *iste* – the remaining 25 all use *hic*. On the other hand, of the 28 total instances of Latin *iste*, one shows an Armenian *n*-deictic, and 22 show an *s*-deictic. We may assume that in the five instances where Greek proximal deictic forms are translated with both Latin *iste* and Armenian *d*, Latin and Armenian translators are in agreement on what relationship within the context should be emphasized with the medial deictic form. Most other times, however, they make opposing choices.

1.2.6.1 Armenian Medial Forms Rendering Greek Proximal Forms

1.2.6.1.1 A Second Person Referent

Most occurrences of the Armenian *d*-deictic are used to highlight the *tu* addressee of the speech-act.[22] As we saw above, the pronoun in 3:17 **dá ē ordi im sireli** '*this* is my beloved son', refers to the addressee in the speech-act where God addresses Jesus (cf. 17:5 **dá ē ordi im sireli**). In 6:32, when the disciples question Jesus about their needs, Jesus replies *zi* **zayd** *amenayn hetᶜanóskᶜ xndren, kᶜanzi gitē hayrn jer erknawor tᶜe pitóy ē jez* **ayd** *amenayn* 'for the Gentiles

---

[22] For the sake of brevity and in order to avoid redundancies, instances where Latin and Armenian make identical choices are not addressed in the following Armenian sections. Thus, from this section pertaining to Armenian medial forms for second person referents I am omitting 19:11 (*óčᶜ amenekᶜin bawakan en* **aydm** *bani, ayl orocᶜ toweál ē* 'not all have the capacity for that word, except to whom it has been given') and 26:62 (*zinčᶜ* **dokᶜa** *ambastanden zkᶜēn* 'what these men are testifying against you').

ask for all *that (that you mention)*, because your heavenly father knows that you need all *that*', and repeats the anaphor again: 6:33 **ayd** *amenayn yawelcᶜi jez* 'all *these things (that you are asking about)* will be added to you'. When two blind men ask Jesus to heal them, he asks 9:28 *hawataykᶜʾ eᶜte karoł em ařnel jez* **zayd** 'do you believe that I'm able to do *this (thing you ask)* for you?' In 19:20, Jesus lists the ten commandments that a man must keep, to which his addressee replies, **zayd** *amenayn parhecᶜi* 'I've kept all *those things (that you just listed)*'. On faith, Jesus teaches that 21:21 *aył tᶜepēt ew lerin**d** asicᶜēkᶜ* 'even if you say to *this mountain (by you)* [to jump in the sea, it will, if you believe]'. When Jesus is teaching in a temple, the priests and elders ask him, 21:23 *orov išxanowtᶜeamb ařnes* **zayd**, *ew oʾ et kᶜez zišxanowtᶜiwn**d zayd*** 'by what authority are you doing *that*, and who gave you *this authority (of yours)* to you?' After his disciples point out the temple buildings to Jesus, he tells them, 24:2 *tesanēkᶜ* **zayd** *amenayn, amēn asem jez, óčᶜ mnascᶜē aydr kᶜar ï kᶜari veray, or očᶜ kᶜaktescᶜi* 'do you see all *these (stones from the buildings you mention)*? truly, I tell you, there won't remain one stone upon another there that won't be thrown down', and the disciples reply, 24:3 *asa mez érb linicᶜi* **ayd** 'tell us when *this (destruction of the temple that you mention)* will happen'. When the governor declares that he is not responsible for Jesus' death, he says 27:24 *kᶜaweál em es yarenē ardaroy**d aydorik*** 'I am innocent of *that* just man's blood.' The *d*-deictic here refers to the addressees – the crowd who wishes Jesus to be crucified – 'that man (whom you handed over to me)'. Finally, after the resurrection of Christ, the priests instruct the guards to tell the governor that Jesus' disciples had stolen the body from the cave, saying 28:14 *etᶜe lowr licᶜi* **ayd** *ař dataworn* 'if the governor hears *this (report of yours)*', he will be satisfied. Armenian also once uses an adverbial *d*-deictic form to describe a location pertaining to the addressees of the speech-act: 26:36 *nstarówkᶜ* **aydr**, *minčᶜew ertᶜaycᶜ kacᶜicᶜ yaławtᶜs* 'sit *there (where you are)*, while I go and pray'.

There is also the famous example of Jesus referring to Peter as the stone on which he will build his church: 16:18 *ew es kᶜéz asem, zi dow és vēm, ew ï veray áydr vimi šinecᶜicᶜ zekełecᶜi im* 'and I tell you, you are the stone, and upon *this stone*, I will build my church.' In both the Greek original and the Latin translation, the first part is 'you are Peter' (σὺ εἶ Πέτρος; *tu es Petrus*). In the Armenian, however, the translators have chosen to take the word play (the Greek πέτρος is a noun meaning 'stone') literally, by using the noun *vēm* 'stone' rather than the proper name *Petros*. The Armenian translation further goes on to foreshadow the building of St. Peter's basilica over his burial site: 'upon this stone' (*veray áydr vimi*) with 'you' embedded within the adverb *aydr*. The Armenian version therefore embeds much into this simple verse; Jesus calls Peter a literal stone and tells him, 'upon you I will build my church'.

1.2.6.1.2 A Pejorative Referent[23]

The *d*-deictic is also used at times to refer to the addressee and to convey a pejorative sense at the same time. As discussed above, when Peter hears about Jesus' fate, he argues that 16:22 *mí ełicᶜi kᶜez* **ayd** 'may *that (terrible thing that you mention)* never happen to you'. Many are simply pejorative. The *d*-deictic in *hayhoyē* **da** '*this man* is blaspheming' (9:3), as mentioned before, is clearly meant to emphasize the vice of the man. When the Pharisees hear that Jesus has healed a demon-possessed man, they scoff 12:24 *óčᶜ iwikᶜ hanē* **da** *zdews, etᶜe očᶜ Beełzebowław išxanawn diwacᶜ* 'with nothing, if not with Beelzebul, the prince of demons, does *that man* cast out demons'. In 19:26 (*aṟ i mardkanē* **ayd** *ankar ē* 'with man, *this* is impossible'), as discussed above, *ayd* refers to the unpleasant notion of a rich man reaching heaven. In 20:12 the men complain that **dokᶜa** *yetinkᶜd mi žam gorcecᶜin, ew hasarakords mez ararer* **zdosa**, or

---

[23] Again, the following verses are omitted from discussion here to avoid repetition with section 1.2.3.3.2: 21:16 (*lses zinčᶜ asend* **dokᶜa** 'do you hear what they are saying?'), 26:9 (*zi mártᶜ ēr vačaṟel* **zda** *mecagni, ew tal ałkᶜatacᶜ* 'for someone could have sold it for a large price, and given [it] to the poor'), and 27:47 (*zĒłiá karday* **da** 'this man is calling Elijah').

zcanrowtᶜiwn awowrn barjakᶜ ew ztawtᶜ 'these last men worked only one hour, and you've made *them* equal to us who have borne the burden of the day and the heat.' And in response to the woman anointing Jesus, his disciples ask 26:8 *əndērˀ ē korowstd ayd iwłoyd* 'why *this waste* of oil?'.

1.2.6.1.3 Deictic Consistency

Deictic consistency, as discussed above (section 1.2.3.3.4), is a principle frequently seen in Classical Armenian. Because the rule so rigidly forces deixis to retain the form from its first appearance, it often yields forms that would otherwise be strange and unexpected. Of the 30 Armenian medial forms rendering Greek proximal forms, 17 are used for a second person referent, eight are used for a pejorative referent, and the remaining five can be explained by the principle of deictic consistency. For example, out of context, the *d*-deictic in 26:12 (*arkanel dora zewłd ï marmin im, aṟ tᶜałelóy zis nšanakeacᶜ* '[by] *her* pouring [of] that oil on my body, she has signaled me for burial') is surprising; the woman is not the addressee of the speech-act (Jesus is speaking to his disciples), and clearly Jesus does not see her actions or her oil as negative in any way. However, if we trace the referent to its first appearance, we are led all the way back to 26:8, where the disciples first describe it with the pejorative *ayd*: *əndērˀ ē korowstd ayd iwłoyd* 'why *this waste* of oil?'. In fact several subsequent forms of the *d*-deictic are governed by this *ayd* from 26:8. It first reappears as a pronoun referring to the oil in 26:9 (*zi mártᶜ ēr vačaṟel zda mecagni, ew tal ałkᶜatacᶜ* 'for someone could have sold *it* for a large price, and given [it] to the poor'). Then Jesus attaches the same *d*-deictic to the woman associated with the oil: 26:10 *ziˀ ašxat aṟnēkᶜ zkind, gorc mi bari gorceacᶜ da yis* 'why do you trouble *this woman*? *She*'s done a good deed for me'. He continues: 26:12 *arkanel dora zewłd ï marmin im, aṟ tᶜałelóy zis nšanakeacᶜ* (translation above) … 26:13 *xawsescᶜi ew zor arar da ï yišatak dora* 'what *this*

woman did will also be told in *her* memory'. In each of these verses, Greek and Latin use a

proximal form,[24] evidently as an ostensive deictic – 26:12 βαλοῦσα γὰρ **αὕτη** τὸ μύρον **τοῦτο**

ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματός μου… : *mittens enim **haec** unguentum **hoc** in corpus meum*… 'for *this woman*

(here), by pouring *this* oil on my body…'; 26:13 λαληθήσεται καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν **αὕτη** εἰς

μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς : *dicetur et quod **haec** fecit in memoriam eius* 'what *this woman here* did will

also be told in her memory' (with 'her' expressed with the anaphoric pronouns αὐτῆς and *eius*).

The *d*-deictic of 26:28 can also be explained by deictic consistency, as well. *Ayd* in this instance

(*zi **áyd** ē ariwn im noro owxti* 'for *this* is my blood of a new covenant') is clearly a continuation

of the first reference in 26:27 (*arbēk^c ï **dmanē** amenek^c in* 'drink from *that [which I give to you]*,

all of you'). Both Greek and Latin use the ostensive proximal deictic, τοῦτο and *hoc*

respectively.

The richness of Armenian deixis allows the principle of deictic consistency to extend to

adverbial forms, as well. We have already established above that *ayd* in 24:2 (*tesanēk^c **zayd***

amenayn 'do you see all *this [that you've just shown me]*') is used for a second person referent.

The medial deictic adverb *aydr* in the sentence immediately following simply maintains the

second person reference: *amēn asem jez, óč^c mnasc^c ē **aydr** k^c ar ï k^c ari veray, or oč^c k^c aktesc^c i*

'truly, I tell you, there won't remain one stone upon another *there (where you're standing)* that

won't be thrown down'.

1.2.6.2 *n*-Deixis as an Anaphor with Greek Proximal Forms

On the surface, the most peculiar of the Armenian deviations are where a distal *n*-deictic

is used where the original Greek uses a proximal one. This occurs 24 times, and once matches

---

[24] The only exception is the Latin use of *iste* in 26:9 for Greek τοῦτο: *potuit enim **istud** venundari multo et dari pauperibus* 'for it could have been sold for a large sum and given to the poor'.

the Latin (11:7, section 1.2.3.1). Most other instances show a form of *hic* in the Latin, except 6:29 where *iste* is used (section 1.2.3.3.3). The Armenian *n*-deictic can be used to refer to non-speech-act participants who are absent from the scene of discourse. When Jesus compares the splendor of Solomon's clothing to that of flowers, he refers to them with a distal deictic *noc^can̄ē* (6:29) because they are not physically present in his conversation with the disciples.

However, Armenian *n*-deixis should rather be considered primarily anaphoric. In fact, every instance of an Armenian *n*-deictic rendering a Greek proximal (excluding 11:7, whose discrepancy we may ascribe to manuscript issues, and 27:32, which shows an *n*-deictic on the basis of deictic consistency [see section 1.2.4]) is anaphoric in value. Often the anaphor is made obvious with the standard correlative *or* (*qui…is* in Latin): 10:22 *isk **or** hamberic^cē i spaṙ **na** kec^cc^cē* 'but *(he) who* endures to the end, *he* will live' (cf. 24:13); 15:11 *ayl **or** inč^c elanē ï beranoy, **áyn** płcē zmard* 'but *whatever* comes out from the mouth, *that* defiles a person'; 18:4 *ard **or** xonarhec^cowsc^cē zanjn ibrew zmanowks zays, **na** ē mec yark^cayowt^cean erknic^c* 'so *(he) who* humbles himself like this child, *he* is great in the kingdom of heaven'; 21:42 *zvēmn **zor** anargec^cin šinawłk^c **na** ełew glowx ankean* '*the stone that* the builders rejected, *this* has become the cornerstone'; 26:23 ***or** mxeac^c ənd is zjeṙn iwr i skawaṙak**s**, **ná** matneloc^c ē zis* '*(he) who* has dipped his hand in the dish with me, *that one* will betray me'. In the parable of the sower, seeds are sowed on the roadside, on rocks, and among thorns, with each scenario representing the reception of the gospel. Jesus explains this from 13:19 through 13:23, using the diptych *or…ayn* throughout:

> 13:19 *yamenaynē **or₁** lsē zbann ark^cayowt^cean, ew oč^c aṙnow ï mit, gay č^carn ew yap^cštakē zsermanealn ï sirt nora, **áyn₁** ē or aṙ čanaparhawn sermanec^caw* (20) *ew **or₂** yapaṙažin sermanec^caw, **áyn₂** ē or ibrew lsē zbann, ew vałvałaki xndowt^ceamb əndowni zna* […] (22) *isk **or₃** ï mēǰ p^cšoc^cn sermanec^caw, **ayn₃** ē or ibrew lsē zbann* […] (23) *isk **or₄** yerkirn bari sermanec^caw, **áyn₄** ē or ibrew lsē zbann …*

13:19 'from everyone *who* hears the word of the kingdom and doesn't understand it, the evil one comes and steals the thing sown in his heart. That is *the one* which was sown in the road (20) and *that which* was sown on a rocky place, that is *the one* who hears the word and immediately receives it with joy … (22) and *that which* was sown among thorns, that is *the one* who hears the word … (23) but *that which* was sown on good ground, that is *the one* who when he hears the word […]'

At other times, the pronoun simply refers back to a previously introduced individual or event. When teaching against swearing, Jesus says that a simple 'yes' or 'no' would suffice and that 5:37 *zi awelin kᶜan* **zayn** *ï čᶜarēn ē* 'anything more than *that* is from the evil one'. In 7:12 (*zamenayn* **or** *miangam kamiǰikᶜ tᶜe arascᶜen jez mardik,* **áynpēs** *ew dowkᶜ ararēkᶜ* **nocᶜa***, zi* **ayn** *isk en awrēnkᶜ ew margarēkᶜ* 'everything *that* you want people to do to you, also do *to them in that way*, for *that* is the Law and the Prophets'), the adverb *aynpēs* refers back to the relative clause, *nocᶜa* refers back to *mardik* 'people', and *ayn* refers to what was just said, namely, treat others as you want to be treated. The pronoun in 10:5 (**znosa** *erkotasanesín aṝakᶜeacᶜ YS* 'Jesus sent *those,* all twelve of them [disciples]') refers back to the disciples listed from 10:2 through 10:4. In Jesus' speech at 11:10 (**ná** *ē vasn oroy grealn ē* '*he is [the one]* about whom it has been written', the pronoun *na* refers back to John. When the crowd questions Jesus about healing on the Sabbath, he retorts, 12:11 *ov� ē ï jēnǰ mard oroy icᶜē očᶜxar mi, ew ankanicᶜi* **ayn** *ï xorxorat ï šabatᶜow, mitᶜe očᶜ� ownicᶜi ew yarowcᶜanicᶜē zna* 'which man of you who has a sheep, and *it* falls into a pit on the Sabbath, will not take it and lift it out?', where *ayn* points back to *očᶜxar mi* 'a sheep'. In a parable in chapter 13, when a farmer's servants ask him about the weeds in his fields, he answers, 13:28 *ayr tᶜšnamí arar* **zayn** 'an enemy did *this*', with *ayn* referring to the fact that an enemy planted weeds in his field (13:25 *ew ï kᶜown linel mardkan ekn tᶜšnami nora, ew cᶜaneácᶜ ï veray oromn ï mēǰ cᶜorenoyn* 'and while the man was asleep his enemy came and over sowed weeds among the wheat'). *Nokᶜa* redefines *sermn bari* 'good seed' from the previous clause: 13:38 *sermn bari,* **nokᶜa** *en or ordikᶜn arkᶜayowtᶜean* 'the good seed, *these* are the sons of

the kingdom'. With regard to the pronoun in 14:2, (**na** [οὗτος] *ē Yovhannēs mkrtičᶜ* 'he is John the Baptist'), if we consider the sequence from the beginning of the chapter (14:1 *yaynm žamanaki lowaw Hērovdēs čᶜorrordapet zlowr YI* [2] *ew asēcᶜ caṟays iwr **na** ē Yovhannēs mkrtičᶜ, **na** yareaw ï meṟelocᶜ ew vasn aynorik zawrowtᶜiwnkᶜ linin **novaw*** 'At that time Herod the tetrarch heard the report about Jesus [2] and said to his servants, *he* is John the Baptist, *he* arose from the dead, and thus these miracles come about through *him*'), it seems that Herod, who is convinced that the miracle worker is John the Baptist rather than Jesus, assigns anaphoric *na* to John, although textually it is referring to Jesus. In 23:36, Jesus prophesies that the Pharisees will be punished for killing and crucifying the prophets and teachers: *ekecᶜē **ayn** amenayn ï azgis aysorik* 'all *that* will come upon this generation', *ayn* referring to the fact 23:35 *zi ekecᶜē ï veray jer amenayn ariwn ardar hełeal yerkir* 'that on you may come all the just blood poured out on earth'. In another prophesy, Jesus warns his disciples about others claiming to be the Messiah, and that 24:6 *lselocᶜ ēkᶜ paterazmówns ew zhambaws paterazmacᶜ, zgóyš lerowkᶜ, mí xṟovesǰikᶜ, zi part ē linel aynm amenayni, aył čᶜéw ē katarac* (7) *yaricᶜē azg yazgi veray, ew tᶜagaworowtᶜiwn ï tᶜagaworowtᶜean, ew ełicᶜin sovkᶜ ew sracowtᶜiwnkᶜ ew sasanowtᶜiwnkᶜ ï tełis tełis* 'you will hear of wars and rumors of wars, be wary, don't be troubled, for all this must happen, but it's not yet the end (7) nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there will be famine and diseases and earthquakes from place to place'. All of this, he continues, are the beginnings of pain (24:8 ***ayn** amenayn skízbn ē erkancᶜ*). At the end of the chapter, Jesus refers to the servants from 25:41 (*asascᶜē ew cᶜaynosik or ənd ahekēn icᶜen* 'and he will say to those who will be at his left) and with whom the king continues dialogue until 25:45, with the anaphoric *nokᶜa*: 25:46 *ew ertᶜicᶜen **nokᶜa** ï tanǰansn yawitenakans* 'and *those (servants)* will go into eternal punishment'.

1.2.6.3 Manuscript Issues

Before turning to adverbial deixis, there remain two verses with Armenian deviations: 11:7 translates Greek οὗτος with an *n*-deictic, and in 20:23, the pronoun is omitted from the Armenian translation. However, both of these inconsistencies can be explained by manuscript issues. Codex Z shows αὐτῶν for τούτων in 11:7, which explains the anaphoric *nokʿa* in Armenian, and several manuscripts (BLNOXZΓΘΠΣℷ) omit τοῦτο in 20:23 (see section 1.2.3.1 for further detail).

1.2.6.4 Adverbial Deixis

Of the 60 Greek adverbs, 52 are translated with the expected correlate in Armenian. Of the eight deviations, two have already been discussed above.[25] Five of the remaining six are Armenian omissions of Greek proximal (three times) and distal deictic adverbs (twice): 8:29, 17:4, and 17:17 with ὧδε, and 5:24 and 27:36 with ἐκεῖ. In all five instances, Armenian is simply eliminating the redundancy of the Greek adverb.

When Jesus arrives among the Gergesenes to cure the demon-possessed men, they ask him 8:29 *ekir taražam tanǰel? zmez* 'did you come before the time to torture us?' (vs. ἦλθες **ὧδε** πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς;). The 'hither' adverb *aysr* would have been redundant, given the verb *ekir* 'you came'. In 17:4 too, the Armenian version eliminates the redundancy. Because the speaker has already established the location (*TR, barwókʿ ē mez* **ast** *linel* 'Lord, it is good for us to be *here*'), it is unnecessary to include an adverb of place again in the following clause (*etʿe kamis arascʿowkʿ eris taɫawars, mi kʿez, ew mi Movsēsi, ew mí Ēłiayi* 'if you wish, we will make three tents, one for you, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah' (vs. εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω **ὧδε** τρεῖς

---

[25] The *d-* adverbial deictic in 24:2 is the result of deictic consistency, and of a second person referent in 26:36 (section 1.2.6.1.1).

σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ Ἠλίᾳ μίαν). In 17:17 the Armenian version omits the adverb, as well: *ác zna aṙ is* 'bring him to me' (vs. φέρετέ μοι αὐτὸν **ὧδε**). Because the previous verse already establishes the location of the action, there is no need for an additional adverb in 5:24: 5:23 *eᶜte matowcᶜanicᶜes zpatarag kᶜo ï veray sełanoy, ew **and** yišicᶜes tᶜe ełbayr kᶜo ownicᶜi inčᶜ xētᶜ zkᶜēn*, (24) *tᶜół zpataragn kᶜo aṙaǰi sełanoyn* 'if you are offering your gift at the altar, and *there* you remember that your brother has something against you, (24) leave your gift before the altar' vs. ἐὰν οὖν προσφέρῃς τὸ δῶρόν σου ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κ**ἀκεῖ** μνησθῇς ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἔχει τι κατὰ σοῦ, ἄφες **ἐκεῖ** τὸ δῶρόν σου ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου. 27:36 shows the same elimination of redundancy as the Latin: *ew nsteal parhein zna* 'and sitting down, they kept watch over him', where no movement to or from the previously mentioned location occurs (section 1.2.3.4).

The final deviation occurs in 24:23: *yaynžam tᶜe okᶜ asicᶜē jez ahawasik **ast** ē KᶜSn, kam **and**, mí hawataycᶜēkᶜ* 'then if someone says to you, look *here* is Christ, or *there*, don't believe (them)' vs. τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· ἰδοὺ **ὧδε** ὁ χριστός, ἤ· **ὧδε**, μὴ πιστεύσητε. The Armenian deviation is identical to the Latin (section 1.2.3.4); both translators changed the second ὧδε to a distal adverb in order to convey the sense of "here and there" or "everywhere".

1.2.7 Greek-Armenian: Grammatical Implications

To summarize the general trends observed through section 1.2.6, half of the Armenian deviations are a direct result of the language's employment of medial deixis. Of the 64 mismatches, 30 show Greek proximal deixis with Armenian medial. Similar to the Latin distribution, most of the Armenian medial deictic forms are used to express a second person referent; others are pejorative. Still others are merely governed by the principle of deictic

consistency. This rule plays a much larger role in Armenian than it does in Latin, with five specific examples cited above to explain otherwise strange appearances of the medial deictic.[26]

These instances of medial deixis and of the adverbial deviations are not surprising. Given the nonexistence of medial deixis in Greek, it is inevitable that mismatches occur where Armenian chooses to insert a medial *d*-deictic, and given the semantic values of Armenian *d*-deixis and Armenian syntax, the appearances of the *d*-deictic are predictable and logical. In most of the deviations seen in adverbial deixis, the Armenian omission of certain adverbs to avoid redundancy is certainly valid on a semantic level. Of course, whether these discrepancies are valid on a translational and ideological level will be treated in the following chapter.

One of the most important features of Greek and Armenian deixis that this study confirms is most clearly realized in the 24 verses where a Greek proximal form is translated with an Armenian distal form (section 1.2.6.2). The Greek and Armenian systems of deixis differ on two main points: the medial deixis (or lack thereof), the consequences of which we have discussed above, and the distinction between anaphora and deixis. As stated above in section 1.1.2, both οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος can have either deictic or anaphoric value. In fact, only occasionally does ἐκεῖνος ('that one') have deictic value, functioning much more frequently as an anaphor ('he'). In the Armenian system, there is no overlap (except in cases of deictic consistency): *s*- and *d*-forms are deictic and *n*-forms are strictly anaphoric. Given the preponderance of ἐκεῖνος as an anaphor, we would expect each occurrence of this pronoun to be translated with an Armenian *n*-form; and this study has indeed found the correspondence to be such, with 100% consistency. In the 24 verses with Greek οὗτος then, the anaphoric value of οὗτος meant that the Armenian

---

[26] Deictic consistency is much more prevalent than these figures might suggest. However, it is most often used where Greek writes the anaphoric pronoun αὐτός after the referent has been established in the discourse, and for the purposes of this study, Greek examples of anaphora were generally ignored and attention was given to Greek deixis.

could not use the expected proximal correlate in *s*, but was forced to use the anaphoric forms in *n*.

In regard to Greek anaphors, the question then becomes, what is the difference between the two pronouns? Why would the author of the text choose οὗτος over ἐκεῖνος if they have the same anaphoric value? In our corpus οὗτος occurs nearly three times as frequently as ἐκεῖνος (135:51), so evidently there is a preference for οὗτος. It appears that the preference is largely based on textual proximity. In the sequence "I saw a man. He was a poet," the anaphor is the third person pronoun "he" referring back to the "man". If we were to translate this into Greek with the caveat that we must use either οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος, we would most likely choose οὗτος because of the anaphor's proximity to its referent. This would be true even if there were some clauses between "I saw a man" and "he was a poet," as long as no other masculine singular intervened, until, after some distance, we would likely use ἐκεῖνος. Distance may not necessarily be textual; physical distance – real or metaphorical – can govern the use of ἐκεῖνος as well, as seen frequently in collocations such as ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις 'and in those days (long ago / at a time far removed from the realm of the narrator)'. Therefore the "proximal" vs. "distal" distinction between οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος can be applied in the context of anaphora as well as deixis.

1.3 Summary

As was noted above, the Latin translation, with a match rate of 85.2%, is more consistent with the Greek original than the Armenian translation, which has a match rate of 74.3%. Of the 246 collected Greek deictic forms, the Latin and Armenian translations were in agreement 168 times (68.3%). This means that when translating about two-thirds of the Greek forms, the Latin and Armenian translators were focusing on the same relational aspects of the item and its context. Although 68.3% is a high rate, I believe that it is not high enough for us to make any

conclusive remarks about the similarities between Latin and Armenian pronominal usage. 159 of these agreements are cases with matches across all three languages, and only nine of the 168 agreements occur where Latin and Armenian deviate in the same way. Because it is the deviations that are most telling in terms of a translator's choices and his language's syntax, the majority of these agreements must be ascribed to fidelity to the original, and the few Latin-Armenian agreements that are contradictory to the Greek must be attributed to simple coincidence.

Regarding the systems of deixis in the three languages, the following have been confirmed. The two-way system in Greek encompasses both deixis and anaphora; the consequent breadth of semantic range ascribed to each pronoun can complicate interpretation. The Armenian system, although by far the most complex, is limited by its rigid principle of deictic consistency and its assignment of deictic value to only its proximal (*s*) and medial (*d*) forms. Finally, although the Latin proved more consistent with the Greek, there are a number of instances where the deictic form used seems unexplainable. As a solution to these anomalous examples, I suggest the rise of *iste* as a neutral deictic, as well as the role of deictic consistency in Latin.

CHAPTER 2

CONTEXTUALIZING THE CASE STUDY

2.1 Introduction

The preceding case study has confirmed that the following are considered correlates in their respective languages: Grk. οὗτος : Lat. *hic*, Grk. οὗτος : Arm. (-)*s*(-), Grk. ἐκεῖνος : Lat. *ille*, and Grk. ἐκεῖνος : Arm. (-)*n*(-). Significant divergences from these correlations revealed various patterns and syntactic tendencies operative in each of the languages. However, whether or not these divergences are reflective of translation technique or ideology is difficult to say definitively. In the first place, the deictic pronouns (as well as adjectives, adverbs, and enclitics) examined in the case study occupy such a small aspect of the languages' vocabulary, morphology, and syntax that it would be quite far-fetched to make any grand generalizations about the differences between the three languages. In a similar vein, and more relevant for our purposes, because deixis is such a specific area within a language, it is difficult to use its divergences as concrete evidence for any translation technique. For example, ἐκεῖνος translated consistently with an Armenian form in *n* does not automatically suggest that the Armenian is more faithful to the original. A much broader study – incorporating a variety of syntactic considerations – would be necessary in order to draw any sufficiently supported conclusions about the translators' methods.[27] Most importantly, many of the Greek-Latin and Greek-

---

[27] Tov, for example, conducts a study for assessing the literalness of the translation units in the Septuagint by measuring the uses of certain particles, conjunctions, prepositions, and pronouns (*The Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 219-237).

Armenian divergences were due to syntactic idioms in each of the languages, and therefore irrelevant for any analysis concerning translation – they are still considered equivalents (e.g. Greek οὗτος with Armenian *n*).

However, there are some divergences where the translators were making deliberate choices in their translations, providing additional information or context to the passages. It is in these instances where we may suggest – albeit tentatively – that the translators are exposing their translation methods or ideologies. In order to study these specific instances, we must first examine the contexts in which each translation was produced. The principles of translation operating in each of the languages, the translators' motivations for translating, the social and religious climates during which they are translating, the literary tradition of their societies to which they are contributing, and any comments they make concerning their own works will all be discussed in order to address two broad questions in the final section: (1) how, if at all, do these factors explain the divergences, and the opposite, (2) how might the divergences reflect the motivations and methods of the translators?

While addressing such questions, issues of translation theory and the considerations of the modern discipline of Translation Studies will necessarily arise. However, as McElduff and Sciarrino warn, it is exceedingly difficult to apply models provided by translation studies to the ancient world.[28] Particularly problematic is modern theorists' tendency to group all ancient translation into one mold; in Venuti's list of ten of the most frequently cited translation theorists in literature, for example, the five Roman authors range across several centuries and genres.[29] McElduff and Sciarrino write, "when dealing with antiquity it is impossible to write a continuous

---

[28] McElduff and Sciarrino, *Complicating the History of Western Translation*, 2.

[29] Venuti, *The Translation Studies Reader,* 4: Cicero, Horace, Quintilian, Augustine, Jerome, Dryden, Goethe, Schleiermacher, Arnold, Nietzsche.

narrative of translation or understand translation in the ancient Mediterranean as a unified phenomenon. The resulting picture is more akin to stop-motion photography than a continuous film-like narrative."[30] Thus caution must be exercised when attempting to apply any theory to a particular instance of translation, and we must take into account the premises of the theory and the context of the translation.

2.2 The Context of the Latin Translation

2.2.1 Background Information

In 382 CE Jerome was commissioned by Pope Damascus for the revision of the Latin Bible. Several Latin translations had been circulating throughout Africa and Europe since the first century CE, but due to their usage in conjunction with the Greek text in early divine services, variations naturally arose. Metzger explains:

> [T]he roots of the Old Latin version(s) are doubtless to be found in the practice of the double reading of holy Scripture during divine services, first in the Greek text (the Septuagint [LXX] for the Old Testament), then in the vernacular tongue […] At first the Latin translation would have been oral, without book, but as part or all of it came to be written down and stereotyped, it was easier to take an existing text and to modify it to suit local requirements than to make an entirely new translation. For convenience the translation would at times have been interlinear; later on, manuscripts with two columns of text, sometimes arranged in cola and commata for ease of phrasing during the public reading of the lessons, were prepared. In some instances the Latin rendering, which may have been made earlier from a different Greek Vorlage, was accommodated to the Greek text to which it was now attached. The final stage came when the custom of reading the lesson in Greek died out, and thereafter copies would be made of the Latin texts alone.[31]

The resulting number of copies and variations necessitated a complete revision.[32] It is thought that Jerome compared these earlier Latin versions, collectively called Old Latin (*Vetus Latina*),

---

[30] McElduff and Sciarrino, *Complicating the History of Western Translation*, 5.

[31] Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 286.

[32] Augustine writes, *Contra ignota signa propria magnum remedium est linguarum cognitio. Et latinae quidem linguae homines, quos nunc instruendos suscepimus, duabus aliis ad Scripturarum divinarum cognitionem opus habent, hebraea scilicet et graeca, ut ad exemplaria praecedentia recurratur, si quam dubitationem attulerit*

with some Greek manuscripts and only made alterations where the true meaning of the passage had been obscured, although this will be discussed further below.[33] Although it is difficult to identify the Latin and Greek manuscripts to which Jerome was referring, Metzger speculates that the Latin manuscripts "belonged to the European form of the Old Latin (perhaps they were similar to *b*[34])" and that the Greek belonged to the Alexandrian type of text.[35] The Gospels were the first to be revised, and they were completed in 384 CE.

2.2.2 Romans on Translation

Cicero is often credited as the first translation theorist of the western world. He famously writes that he translated as an orator, rather than as an interpreter,[36] preserving the sense, rather than the words of the original:

> *nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiis isdem et earum formis tanquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. In quibus non verbum pro verbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi. Non enim ea me adnumerare lectori putavi oportere, sed tanquam appendere*
>
> Nor did I translate as an interpreter, but as an orator, with the same ideas and forms, or figures, so to speak, with words familiar to us. I did not find it necessary to translate word-for-word, but I preserved the whole style and sense of the words.

---

latinorum interpretum infinita varietas 'The great remedy against the ignorance of proper signs is the knowledge of languages. And those who speak the Latin language, whom I now teach, need two other languages to understand Scripture, Hebrew and Greek, of course, so that they may have recourse to the preceding copies, if the infinite variety of the Latin interpreters raise some doubt' (*De Doctrina Christina*, 2.16)

[33] Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, 243. Although Jerome is referring to his method for translating the Book of Judith, the following quote reflects this practice: *multorum codicum varietatem vitiosissimam amputavi: sola ea, quae intelligentia integra in verbis Chaldaeis invenire potui, Latinis expressi* 'I excluded the most faulty variations of many manuscripts: only those things for which I was able to find the meaning unchanged in the Chaldeans words did I express in Latin' (The Chaldean words here refer to a Syriac or Aramaic version which was translated into Hebrew for Jerome's usage [Gera, *Judith,* 14]).

[34] Codex Veronensis, a fifth century manuscript of the four Gospels.

[35] Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 76.

[36] Feeney distinguishes interpreting as oral and translating as textual: "giving an oral version in one language of what someone has just produced orally in another language is not a process we can transfer to what is happening when a written text undergoes a transformation into another, corresponding, written text" (*Beyond Greek*, 32-33).

> For I did not think it was necessary to count them out to the reader but to weight them out, so to speak.[37]

Roughly contemporaneously, Horace advised, *nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus interpres* 'nor should you care, as a faithful interpreter, to translate word-for-word'.[38] The neat dichotomy between word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation operative in Cicero and Horace's writings has been central to the foundations of western translation theory. It is tempting and in fact easy to place all translation within this simple paradigm of literary vs. non-literary methods. However, as discussed in Section 2.1, we must remind ourselves of the truism that translation occurs under various and unique circumstances; Cicero and Horace are writing about translation in a world much different than Jerome's.

Roman literature is traditionally thought to have begun with Livius Andronicus' translation of the *Odyssey* in the third century BCE. Following Livius, various writers – including Naevius (c. 270-199 BCE), Ennius (239-169 BCE), Pacuvius (c. 220-130 BCE), Plautus (d. 184 BCE), and Terence (c. 190-159 BCE) – strived to bring Greek literature into their own corpus with free translation and adaptation from the sources. The Romans' reliance on translation to build their own literature lends itself to a complex relationship based on transference and appropriation, and yet ultimately substitution and displacement. Translation for the Romans rests on their uneasy dependence on Greek culture, predicated on cultural difference and the recognition of cultural and linguistic disjunction.[39] Copeland asserts that Roman translation "emerges from a disturbing political agenda in which forcibly substituting Rome for Greece is a condition of acknowledging the fundamental status of Greek eloquence for *Latinitas*.

---

[37] Cicero, *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, 14.

[38] Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 133.

[39] Copeland, "Why Jerome is not a Ciceronian," 17.

Translation can scarcely be theorized without reference to conquest as a component of rivalry, or aggressive supremacy in the challenge to Greek hegemony."[40] Translation was also deeply engrained in Roman society as a major component of the orator's education. At the core of the discipline was imitation, the students' modeling of their public speaking on famous orations from the past. Robinson suggests that Cicero's famous remarks on translation simply "extend imitation from intralingual to interlingual modeling."[41] Cicero and Horace's proscription of literal (word-for-word) translation therefore rests on the notion that translation serves to reinvent, resignify, and reconstitute the original text.[42]

2.2.3 Early Christians on Translation

There has been a tendency to interpret Jerome's use of classical authorities[43] as evidence for a seamless continuation of the Ciceronian principles of translation into late antiquity. Copeland writes,

> This critical willingness to accept what seems at the surface to be a genuine continuity in the proscription of literalism may be a result of the way in which the historical problematics of translation have commonly been treated as a system separate from other discursive systems and practices. Thus the rhetorical grounding and application of translation theory in its early classical avatar has remained largely unexplored; and the transition from classical to early Christian and later medieval has been written as a history of dicta which can be extracted from their original frameworks and readily inserted into new contexts. But the discursive systems that govern ideas about translation are also subject to change. To understand how classical theory is received in medieval academic culture it is necessary to consider how the epistemological categories that carry these theories have themselves changed.[44]

---

[40] Copeland, "Why Jerome is not a Ciceronian," 17.

[41] Robinson, "Classical Theories of Translation," 20.

[42] Copeland, "Why Jerome is not a Ciceronian," 31.

[43] Recall Jerome's famous dream in which God accuses him of being a Ciceronian rather than a Christian (*Ep. 22*).

[44] Copeland, "Why Jerome is not a Ciceronian," 15.

Patristic translation theory, though it borrows the terminology of Cicero and Horace, effectively rejects the "rhetorical rationale inscribed in the Roman formulas that it uses," along with the motives of "contestation, displacement, and appropriation."[45] The patristic tradition of translation is decidedly uninterested in generating a distinct literary culture. Thus when Jerome formulated his theories on translation, he incorporates Ciceronian elements into a new framework that "stressed the accurate transmission of the meaning of the text rather than the budding orator's freely ranging imitation,"[46] and what the Christian West receives through Jerome as classical authority for translation is in fact a counter-rhetorical model.[47]

The problem of linguistic and literary difference is certainly central to both Roman and patristic theory. However, whereas Roman theory strives to erase difference and substitutes Latin for Greek, in patristic theory, where much of the discussion is with reference to the Bible and theological texts, "the question of displacement […] is naturally ruled out here as an ideal."[48] Instead, in sacred contexts, the idea of divine speech serves as a rationale for literal translation, and in fact becomes a requirement with the spread of heresy: "literal translation has thus become a double safeguard: for the reader, against the introduction of false or heretical views by the translator, and for the translator, against accusations by the reader of falsification of the thought of the original."[49]

---

[45] Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation*, 43.

[46] Robinson, *Western Translation Theory*, 23.

[47] Copeland, "Why Jerome is not a Ciceronian," 29.

[48] Ibid., 20.

[49] Brock, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," 78.

Robinson also suggests that early Christian asceticism had a profound effect philosophically and morally on the development of patristic theory – particularly those of Jerome and Augustine – and that it in fact has been naturalized in western ideology:

> Ascetic 'virtues' have become naturalized in Western society, inscribed in what we unthinkingly take to be human 'nature,' in a discipline that (we believe) it is only 'natural' for all humans to undertake […] it has been inscribed on our bodies, etched into the deepest strata of our being, so that it seems natural, for example, that 'maturity' be defined as the ability to delay the gratification of desires, or that leisure-oriented consumer society be portrayed as a decadent falling-off from an earlier work ethic – or that the translator be expected to empty him- or herself of personal desires in order to achieve the neutral, impersonal transfer of the author's meaning to a reader in another language.[50]

"Normal" translation is, according to Robinson, therefore hegemonically ascetic.[51] The ascetic values, which depended on the "systematic eradication of 'worldly' personality," as well as "self-discipline, stoic endurance, suppression of decadent emotionalism and individualism,"[52] encouraged translators to renounce personal biases, predilections, preferences, and opinions, and even now are coloring modern discussions of translation: "Consider the diatribes launched at 'word-for-word' and 'free' translations, and the temptation good translators feel and resist to indulge those pleasures: to cling 'too' closely to the source language text, to trace its contours lovingly in the target language, by translating word for word; or to strike off 'too' boldly in a new direction, to sever ideologically-controlled ties with source language meaning, by translating freely."[53]

---

[50] Robinson, "Ascetic Foundations," 5.

[51] How true this statement is, or to what extent we may ascribe Jerome's translation principles to his asceticism is a difficult question. I include Robinson's view as a simple suggestion.

[52] Ibid., 4.

[53] Ibid., 6.

2.2.4 Jerome on Translation

Jerome evidently faces a similar dilemma, and his declarations concerning it appear anything but uniform. Modern scholarship consistently notes Jerome's unpredictability. Kytzler writes, "the *ultima ratio* of Jerome is not a systematic theory; what we get are only occasional remarks and definitions which do not at all fall into a congruent picture. The contrast of theory and praxis, therefore, is not solved by Jerome, but it is put into a sharper light than before."[54] Weissbord and Eysteinsson add that Jerome rebukes the literalists, while at the same time affirming that "the actual words and even their order and significance are to be observed."[55] And yet Copeland observes, "he seems to equate word-for-word translation with sheer clumsiness, as Cicero does, and at other times, he equates it with an improper delight in reproducing verbal artifice" but "verbal fidelity is seen as textual betrayal and hence is proscribed."[56]

What much of the modern complaints often fail to recognize is the context in which Jerome is writing. Often these short comments on translation are taken at face value without considering the surrounding circumstance; these seemingly inconsistent remarks must be understood in context. One particular example will be discussed here. In Jerome's defense of his translation of Origen's *On First Principles,* he makes a comment at the end of his letter to Pammachius and Oceanus: *et mutare quippiam de Graeco non est vertentis, sed evertentis, et eadem ad verbum exprimere nequaquam eius, qui servare velit eloquii venustatem* 'and to change something from the Greek is not the work of translation, but of destruction, and to express it word-for-word is not the work of one who wishes to conserve the charm of the

---

[54] Kytzler, "Fidus Interpres," 48.

[55] Weissbord and Eysteinsson, *Translation – Theory and Practice*, 29.

[56] Copeland, "Why Jerome is not a Ciceronian," 28.

speech'.[57] Although Jerome appears to be criticizing word-for-word translation and deliberate deviations from an original text, he is actually writing about a specific case regarding his and Rufinus' translations of Origen's work. In the midst of the First Origenist Crisis, Rufinus translated Origen's *On First Principles* with the distinct intention of countering the accusations of heresy against Origen. Rufinus deliberately omitted and altered the text where it was in opposition to contemporary Christian orthodoxy, and implied in his introduction that Jerome was also a follower of Origen. As a response, Jerome produced his own translation of *On First Principles,* vowing to expose Origen's heresies by translating every word exactly as it was written. Earlier in the same letter Jerome had written,

> *Nisi forte accusare debui, cujus rogatu opuscula transferebam, et dicere in prologo: Hic cuius interpretor libros haereticus est, cave lector, ne legas: fuge viperam: aut si legere volueris, scito a malis hominibus et haereticis corrupta esse, quae transtuli; quanquam timere non debeas; ego enim omnia, quae vitiata fuerant, correxi. Hoc est aliis verbis dicere: ego, qui interpretor, catholicus sum; hic, quem interpretor, haereticus est.* […] *Ego callidus, qui emendavi, silens quod volui, et dissimulans crimina, non feci invidiam criminoso.*

> Unless perhaps I should have accused him whose works I was translating by request, and said in my prologue: "This man whose books I am translating is a heretic; beware reader, don't read him: flee from the viper: or if you wish to read him, know that the works that I've translated have been corrupted by evil men and heretics; you don't have to fear anything; for I've corrected everything that has been corrupted." That is to say in other words: "I, the translator, am a Catholic; this man, whom I translated, is a heretic." […] Wisely I silently emended what I wished, and by ignoring the crimes, I did not incite hatred from the criminal.

Clearly then Jerome's words at the end of his letter serve to criticize Rufinus' translation while defending his own literal translation.

I agree with Weissbord and Eysteinsson's conclusion therefore, that "the apparent contradictions, however, appear less marked if one bears in mind the distinction Jerome himself

---

[57] Jerome, *Ep.* 84.11

makes between translation of Holy Scriptures and that of non-sacred texts"[58]; Jerome in fact is

being very clear and consistent about his views on translation. When he writes that a word-for-

word translation would sound absurd (*si ad verbum interpretor, absurde resonat*) or that a literal

translation of Homer into Latin would be laughable (*quod si cui non videtur linguae gratiam*

interpretatione mutari, Homerum ad verbum exprimat in Latinum. Plus aliquid dicam, eumdem

in sua lingua prosae verbis interpretetur, videbit ordinem ridiculum, et poetam eloquentissimum

vix loquentem 'if there's someone to whom the power of language doesn't seem to change during

translation, let him translate Homer literally into Latin. Rather, I should say, let him translate

Homer into his language in prose. He will see a ridiculous series of words, and he will see that

the most eloquent poet is scarcely able to speak'[59]), he is talking about his translation of

Eusebius' *Chronicles*, a decidedly non-sacred text. And his remark in his famous letter to

Pammachius is very explicit: *ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera voce profiteor, me in*

interpretatione Graecorum, absque Scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est, non

verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu 'for, not only do I admit, but I freely profess that

in translating Greek, except in the case of sacred Scripture, where even the order of the words is

a mystery, I translate not word-for-word, but sense-for-sense'.[60] He even openly discusses his

methodology in some of the prefaces of his biblical translations, *e.g. Librum Esther variis*

translatoribus constat esse vitiatum, quem ego de archivis Hebraeorum relevans, verbum e verbo

pressius transtuli 'The book of Esther stands corrupted by various translators. Lifting it from the

---

[58] Weissbord and Eysteinsson, *Translation – Theory and Practice*, 18.

[59] Preface to *Chronicles*; Migne, *PL* vol. XXVII "Sancti Hieronymi Praefatio in Librum II Chronicorum Eusebii," col. 223-224.

[60] *Ep.* 57.5

archives of the Hebrews, I have translated it more accurately word-for-word'.[61] In order not to

appear hypocritical, Jerome also provides the caveat that even in word-for-word translations,

small additions or omissions are permissible insofar as the meaning is unchanged; he provides

several examples in *Ep.* 57, one of which is extracted here:

> *vicesimi primi Psalmi juxta Hebraeos idipsum exordium est, quod Dominus locutus est in cruce:* Eli eli lama azabthani*: quod interpretatur, "Deus meus, Deus meus, quare me dereliquisti?" Reddant rationem, cur Septuaginta translatores interposuerint "respice me" [al. in me]. Ita enim verterunt: "Deus meus, Deus meus, respice me, quare me dereliquisti?" Respondebunt utique nihil damni in sensu esse, si duo verba sint addita. Audiant et a me non periclitari Ecclesiarum statum, si celeritate dictandi, aliqua verba dimiserim*

> The very beginning of the Hebrew text of Psalm XXI are that which the Lord spoke on the cross: *Eli eli lama azabthani*: which is translated, "My God, my God, why have you abandoned me?" Let them give the reason why the Septuagint translators intercalated "look back at me." For they translated thus: "My God, my God, look back at me, why have you abandoned me?" They will certainly respond that there is no distortion in the meaning, if two words are added. Let them also realize that the stability of the Church is not put in danger by me, if because of my speedy dictation, I omit some words.[62]

Regarding the Gospel of Matthew, unfortunately Jerome does not state directly whether

he translated word-for-word or not. Because the work is formally a revision, the circumstances

are necessarily slightly different than if it were a full retranslation. It is not unreasonable to

---

[61] Migne, *PL* vol. XXVIII, col. 1433. Schwarz notes Jerome's inconsistency by citing his preface to the Book of Judith, where Jerome admits that he translated "more for sense than word-for-word" (*magis sensum e sensu, quam ex verbo verbum transferrens*; Migne, *PL* vol. XXIX, col. 39) (*Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation,* 35). This accusation may be dismissed, however, on the grounds that Jerome did not personally consider the Book to be of holy scripture, and that his translation was a rushed job: *Apud Hebraeos liber Judith inter apocrypha legitur: cuius auctoritas ad roboranda illa quae in contentionem veniunt, minus idonea iudicatur. Chaldeo tamen sermone conscriptus, inter historias computatur. sed quia hunc librum Synodus Nicaena in numero sanctarum Scripturarum legitur computasse, acquievi postulationi vestrae, immo exactioni: et sepositis occupationibus, quibus vehementer arctabar, huic unam lucubratiunculam dedi* 'Among the Hebrews the Book of Judith is read among the Hagiographa, whose authority regarding the investigation of contentious things is judged to be less suitable. Nevertheless, having been written in the Chaldean speech, it is numbered among the histories. But because the Nicene Council chooses to count this book among the number of the sacred Scriptures, I have assented to your request, or really, your demand: and after putting aside my affairs, by which I was exceedingly constrained, I have given this book one short night's work'.

[62] *Ep.* 57.10

assume, however, that where Jerome was forced to refer to the original Greek, in keeping with his own principles, he translated word-for-word. In the preface to his commentary (addressed to Pope Damascus) he voices his concerns on the difficulties of translation and his dissatisfaction with the earlier Latin versions and their need for revision:

> *Novum opus facere me cogis ex veteri, ut post exemplaria Scripturarum toto orbe dispersa, quasi quidam arbiter sedeam: et quia inter se variant, quae sint illa quae cum Graeca consentiant veritate, decernam. Pius labor, sed periculosa praesumptio, judicare de caeteris, ipsum ab omnibus judicandum: senis mutare linguam, et canescentem iam mundum ad initia retrahere parvulorum. Quis enim doctus pariter vel indoctus, cum in manus volumen assumpserit, et a saliva, quam semel imbibit, viderit discrepare quod lectitat, non statim erumpat in vocem, me falsarium, me clamans esse sacrilegum, qui audeam aliquid in veteribus libris addere, mutare, corrigere? Adversus quam invidiam duplex causa me consolatur: quoad et tu, qui summus Sacerdos es, fieri jubes: et verum non esse quod variat, etiam maledicorum tetimonio comprobatur. Si enim Latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant, quibus: tot enim sunt exemplaria pene quod codices. Sin autem veritas est quaerenda de pluribus: cur non ad Graecam originem revertentes, ea quae vel a vitiosis interpretibus male edita, vel a praesumptoribus imperitis emendada perversius, vel a librariis dormitantibus addita sunt, aut mutata, corrigimus? […] Igitur haec praesens praefatiuncula pollicetur quatuor tantum Evangelia, quorum ordo est iste, Matthaeus, Marcus, Lucas, Joannes, codicum Graecorum emendata collatione, sed Veterum. Quae ne multum a lectionis Latinae consuetudine discreparent, ita calamo temperavimus, ut his tantum quae sensum videbantur mutare, correctis, reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant.*

You urge me to make a new work from the old, so that I might sit like a sort of judge over the versions of Scripture dispersed in the whole world: and because they vary among themselves that I might decide which are the ones that truly agree with the Greek. It is pious work, but perilous presumption; to judge others for oneself is to be judged by others: to change the language of an old text, and to bring back the world now aging to the beginnings of its infancy. For who – learned or not – when he takes up a volume into his hands, and, from a little taste, which he takes in once, sees that what he reads differs, would not immediately raise his voice, exclaiming that I'm a falsifier, a sacrilegious man, who dares to add something in the ancient books – or to change, or to correct? Against such hate, two reasons console me: first, because it is you, who are the highest priest, who order it to happen, and second, because truth is not something varies, as even the testimony of slanderers confirm. For if faith is to be accorded to the latin versions, they [the slanderers] might respond "on which ones?": for there are nearly as many versions as there are books. However, if truth is to be sought from the many: why don't we turn to the original Greek, and correct those things that were wrongly set forth by bad translators, or wrongly revised by confident but unskilled men, or added or changed

> by sleeping scribes? […] Therefore this little preface promises only the four Gospels, of which the order is this: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, corrected with comparison of the old Greek books. They do not disagree much from the normal state of the Latin reading, since we have controlled the pen, so, having corrected only things that seemed to change the meaning (*sensum*), we let the rest stay as they have been.[63]

His sentiments are clear and remain consistent: revising what has been regarded as standard will invite criticism, but in translation one must always refer to the original in order to render the text correctly. Throughout his commentary too, Jerome persistently advises that the translator remain rooted (*haerere*) in the original context in order to avoid erroneous or heterodox interpretations: *haeret sibi sermo Dominicus, et sequentia pendent ex superioribus. Prudens lector, cave semper superstitiosam intelligentiam; ut non tuo sensui attemperes Scripturas, sed Scripturis iungas sensum tuum, et intelligas quid sequatur* 'the Lord's speech is rooted in itself, and the following words depend on the preceding words. Prudent reader, always beware of a superstitious interpretation; don't accommodate the Scriptures to your meaning, but link your meaning to the Scriptures, and understand what follows', and similarly, *prudentum semper admoneo lectorem, ut non superstitiosis acquiescat interpretationibus, et quae commatice pro fingentium dicuntur arbitrio, sed consideret priora, media, et sequentia, et nectat sibi universa quae scripta sunt* 'I always warn the prudent reader to not give in to superstitious interpretations and those which are spoken line by line by the free-will of fabricators, but to consider the prior, middle, and following words, and to connect with one another everything that was written'.[64]

It is very clear, therefore, that Jerome's views on translation, although they may differ depending on the occasion, are consistent and regular. As Robinson summarizes, Jerome insists

---

[63] Migne, *PL* vol. XXIX, col. 526-528.

[64] 10:29-31 and 25:13; Migne, *PL* vol. XXVI "Commentariorum in Evangelium Matthaei Lib. I Cap. X," col. 66 (cf. 5:19, 5:25-26, 12:30, 12:35-36, 12:43, 16:15-16, 18:21-22, 20:1-2).

that the source language text be conceived of in terms of its transcendental meaning, he cautions the translator against insufficient knowledge of the source language and reading individual words out of context, and he teaches the translator piety toward the source text and submission to the authority of the institution that maintains it.[65] In the case of sacred texts, he clearly advocates word-for-word translation that does not distort the original meaning.

2.3 The Context of the Armenian Translation

2.3.1 Background Information

Despite the fact that Armenia had declared itself a Christian nation before Constantine Christianized the Roman Empire, the Armenian translation of the Bible was published about half a century after the Vulgate Latin. Similar to the Roman and much of the Near Eastern world at the time, Armenian religion originated in animism and nature-worshipping, which eventually evolved to a polytheistic worship, heavily influenced by Persian Zoroastrianism.[66] The fourth century BCE eastward expansion of the Hellenistic empire under Alexander the Great brought Greek gods to the Armenian pantheon, which were simply assimilated and renamed; Zeus became Aramazd, Artemis became Anahita, Aphrodite Astghik, and Hercules Vahagn,[67] while Mihr was equated with Hephaestus, Tir with Apollo, and Nane with Athena.[68] Tradition states that in the beginning of the first century CE, Thaddeus, one of the Seventy from the Septuagint translation, and Bartholomew the Apostle became the founders of southern and northern Armenian Christianity, respectively.[69] Persecutions of the Armenians continued until the very

---

[65] Robinson, "Ascetic Foundations," 8.

[66] Arpee, *A History of Armenian Christianity*, 2-5.

[67] Ibid., 6.

[68] Der Nersessian, *The Armenians*, 73.

[69] Arpee, *A History of Armenian Christianity*, 9.

Christianization of Armenia in 314 CE; major persecutions occurred in 110 CE, 230 CE, and 287

CE, by kings Artashes, Khosrov, and Tiridates.[70] St. Gregory the Illuminator converted King

Tiridates, however, who soon made Christianity the state religion, preceding the Romans by a

few decades.[71] By adopting the new religion, Armenia broke with its Eastern and Persian-

influenced past, established a distinct Christian character of its own, and could be identified with

the Western world.[72] The fact that their strongest ally, the Roman Empire, tolerated their

religion was advantageous in countering the Persian religious influences.[73]

In 387 CE, the two neighboring empires – the Romans and the Persians – partitioned

Armenia so that commercial correspondences, government operations, and religious services

were conducted in Greek in the western, and in Syriac in the eastern portions of the country.[74]

These languages were incomprehensible to the common people; the Armenian historian Moses

of Khoren wrote that a missionary "experienced no few difficulties, for he was at the same time

both reader and interpreter. If anyone else read and he was not present, then the people

understood nothing for lack of an interpreter."[75] Historian Ghazar P'arpetsi (d. 500 CE) also

wrote, "the congregations of such a large country were quite unable to comprehend or profit

from it because they did not understand the Syrian tongue."[76]

---

[70] Arpee, *A History of Armenian Christianity*, 9.

[71] Constantine's decree of 313 CE was only an edict of tolerance and Emperor Theodosius declared Christianity the religion of the Empire in 380 CE.

[72] Der Nersessian, *The Armenians,* 62.

[73] Bournoutian, *A History of the Armenian People*, 64.

[74] Nersessian, *The Bible in the Armenian Tradition*, 13.

[75] Khorenatsi 1990, vol. 3, p. 47, translation from Ter-Sarkisiants, "Sixteen Hundred Years of Armenian Writing," 78.

[76] Translation from Nersessian, *The Bible in the Armenian Tradition*, 14.

Although there was a dire need for an Armenian Bible, the people first had to invent a

writing system. [77] A Syrian bishop known as Daniel had designed a script earlier, but it consisted

of only twenty-two letters and was borrowed from one of the Semitic languages in which only

consonants are represented.[78] The task to completely revise this system fell to the cleric Mesrop

Mashtots (ca. 361-440 CE); in collaboration with the Catholicos of the time, Sahak I Partex (ca.

350-439 CE), and with the support of King Vramshapouh,[79] he sent students to Edessa and

Samosata to study the Syriac and Greek languages and letters.[80] In 405 CE, the calligrapher

Rufinus in Samosata gave the letters their final form, which consisted of thirty-six letters and has

remained in use until the present day, with the addition of a mere three letters.[81]

With a complete writing system, the Armenians could now set out to translate the Bible.

The base text for the translation is heavily debated; the general understanding is that the first

phase (ca. 406-414 CE) was based on the Syriac text, itself a translation of the Greek,[82] and that

the second phase was a thorough retranslation based on the Greek after the translators acquired

manuscripts in Constantinople (ca. 432 CE).[83] There is conflicting information regarding the

---

[77] "It appears that Mesrop had to invent an alphabet because Armenian had never been written before that time. At least, there is no positive evidence to the contrary. Armenian historians never refer to documents or chronicles written in the national language, prior the Mesropian period. They would hardly have ignored them, had there been any" (Godel, *An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian*, 2).

[78] Ter-Sarkisiants, "Armenian Writing," 79-80.

[79] Ibid., 79.

[80] Nersessian, *The Bible in the Armenian Tradition*, 84.

[81] Debates on the initial models of the Armenian alphabet continue: Abramian 1959 and 1973, Acharian 1928 pg. 177-277, Agaian 1986 pg. 85-95, Diringer 1963 pg. 379, Iuzbashian 1987 pg. 146, Markvart 1918 pg. 43, Perikhanian 1966 pg. 111, Sevak 1962 pg. 30-38, Tumanian 1968 pg. 446-48, cited in Ter-Sarkisiants pg. 80; Der Nersessian pg. 85; Arpee pg. 26-27; Godel pg. 3. However, it is generally agreed upon that the Greek alphabet inspired the forms and ordering of many of the letters.

[82] Nersessian, *The Bible in the Armenian Tradition*, 13; Jinbachian, "History, Base Text(s), and Translation Techniques," 366.

[83] Nersessian, *The Bible in the Armenian Tradition,* 14 and *Armenian Christianity*, 28; Peters, "Why Study the Septuagint," 180; Godel, *Classical Armenian*, 1; Alexanian, "Armenian Version of the New Testament," 157.

source text(s) and the phases of translation. The historian Koriwn (d. 450 CE) attests that Sahak undertook the "retranslation of the once hastily done translation on the bases of the authentic copies,"[84] with the "authentic copies" referring to the Greek. P'arpesti agrees that Sahak was responsible for the Greek-Armenian translation ("the blessed Mashtots and the honorable priests with him were unable to undertake such a difficult and important task – the translation of the Bible from Greek into Armenian – because they were not sufficiently skilled in the study of Greek, so they began to beg the holy Catholicos Sahak to set himself to the spiritual labor of translating the divinely inspired testaments from Greek into Armenian"[85]), but he also "willfully suppresses all knowledge of the existence of a first translation," which Nersessian attributes to the fact that he clearly "disliked the Syriac language and culture."[86] Yet another historian, Moses of Khoren (a nephew and disciple of Mesrop), however, suggests that both Sahak and Mesrop "zealously translated again what had already been translated and made with them a new version,"[87] but that the base text was Syriac.[88] Metzger lists some of the participants in the Syriac vs. Greek origin discussion,[89] but following Colwell's and Lyonnet's arguments, this thesis takes the side of the Greek originists. Definitively Greek elements include the size of the pages, the use of two columns, the uncial appearance of the Armenian script, the enlarged initials, the division by groups of letters, the abbreviations of *nomina sacra*, the super- and

---

[84] Translation from Nersessian, *The Bible in the Armenian Tradition*, 14.

[85] Ibid.

[86] Nersessian, *The Bible in the Armenian Tradition,* 17.

[87] Translation from Nersessian, *The Bible in the Armenian Tradition*, 14.

[88] Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament,* 83.

[89] Supporters of the Syriac origin include Moses of Khoren (5th c.), J. Armitage Robinson, Conybeare, Merk ("Die Armenischen Evangelien und ihre Vorlage'), R.P. Blake ("The Caesarean Text of Mark"), Baumstark ("Zum georgischen Evangelientext"), C.S.C. Williams ("Syriacisms in the Armenian Text of the Gospels"), and proponents for a Greek origin include Macler, Lyonnet ("La version arménienne des évangiles et son modèle grec; l'évangile selon saint Matthieu"), and Colwell ("The Caesarean Readings of Armenian Gospel Manuscripts" and "Slandered or Ignored"), cited in Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 165.

subscription of the Gospels, and the method of noting Old Testament quotes.[90] Kenyon,

Metzger, and Colwell (based on Lyonnet's arguments) all suggest that Syriacisms in the

Armenian text[91] can be attributed to unconscious influence of the language and its idioms on the

translator and the use of the Syriac version as a reference where the Greek was obscure or

especially difficult.[92] Colwell points to further evidence: the Armenian closely resembles the

Greek manuscript Θ but not any type of text peculiar to the Syriac versions; several readings in

the Armenian version can be explained as mistranslations of Greek (in Matt. 5:18, for example,

Greek ἤ is translated as ἤ with the Armenian relative pronoun *or*); Semitic words are

transliterated as they occur in the Greek text instead of agreeing with Syriac forms; the

orthography of proper names is Greek not Syriac; and Moses of Khoren's testimony is never

explicit on the translation "of the Bible" – Colwell concludes that the historian must have been

referring to translations of other Syriac texts.[93] We can conclude with a certain degree of

confidence, therefore, that even if there was a prior phase based on the Syriac version, the final

form of the Armenian version was a thorough (re)translation based on the Greek.[94]

2.3.2 Understanding Armenian Translation Practices[95]

The primary motivation for the Armenian translation of the Bible was the need for a

comprehensible liturgy. As discussed above, the Greek and Syriac languages were

---

[90] Colwell, "Slandered or Ignored," 54.

[91] The Armenian New Testament also includes the apocryphal Third Epistle to the Corinthians and omits Philemon, as did the fourth century Syriac canon (Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, 236).

[92] Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, 236; Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 165; Colwell, "Slandered or Ignored," 55.

[93] Colwell, "Slandered or Ignored," 54-55.

[94] Of all the scholarship consulted, one suggested that the Vulgate also could have served as a reference for the Armenian translation (Baker et al., *Routledge Encyclopedia*, 22). Based on the lack of any Armenian affinities for Latin and its literature, however, this hypothesis may be dismissed.

[95] McElduff and Sciarrino write, "Even where we cannot recover the translator's experience in depth (or sometimes at all), we can still see their translation as a window to uncovering cultural needs and issues in a particular cultural

incomprehensible to the Armenians, and with the constant threat of Persian religious influences especially in the eastern parts, the need for an Armenian Bible became critical. As Ter-Sarkisiants notes, the invention of the alphabet and the Bible translation were "not simply of enormous cultural-historical significance for the Armenian people, enabling them to join the family of cultured ancient peoples. They played another very important role: under conditions of political fragmentation and forced assimilation, they made it possible for the Armenians to preserve their ethnocultural identity and bring their age-old culture into our modern world."[96] The initiation of the translation project led by Mashtots and Sahak inaugurated a program of translation that enriched and consolidated Armenian culture,[97] and as Alexanian views it, became part of a "historic struggle to unify the Armenian people and preserve their religion and culture from destruction in the battles between the Persian Empire on the east and the Byzantine Empire on the west."[98] Following the Bible, countless translation projects were initiated by the Armenians, eager to "build up [their] own intellectual capital."[99] Over the centuries, the widespread translation of (mostly) Greek texts into Armenian not only helped to preserve and transmit the texts,[100] it importantly contributed to the formation of a distinctive Armenian *cursus*

---

moment, rather than as part of one continuous stream of thoughts or theoretical models." This is particularly relevant in this section, where many details of the translation project are obscure and difficult to infer from later techniques.

[96] Ter-Sarkisiants, "Armenian Writing," 89.

[97] Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 156.

[98] Alexanian, "The Armenian Version of the New Testament," 157.

[99] Delisle et al., *Translators through History*, 7.

[100] Many of the Greek texts only survive because of the Armenian translations; Religious works included the first part of the *Chronicle* by Eusebius, *Commentaries on the Benediction of Moses* by Hippolytus, *Refutation of the Definition of the Council of Calcedon* by Timothy Aelurus, the Patriarch of Alexandria (Bournoutian, *A History of the Armenian People*, 72), and secular works included *The Romance of Alexander the Great* by Pseudo-Callisthenes, *Grammar* by Dionysius Thrax, the treatises of Philo Judaeus, and *Categories, Metaphysics, Analytics, and De Interpretatione* of Aristotle (Der Nersessian, *The Armenians*, 86).

studiorum.[101] Armenians attended several Greek schools throughout the Mediterranean world – including the school of rhetoric in Athens (4th c.), in Antioch (4th c.), the Neoplatonic school of Alexandria (6th c.), and in Byzantium (8th c.)[102] – where they gained familiarity with the textbooks and proceeded to translate them. This period of Armenian literature (late 5th and early 6th c. to the 8th) is generally called the "Hellenizing School," where the use of the term "school" aims at "indicating the main common – or supposed common – translation technique and vocabulary of the translations dating from this epoch, more than a localization or the name of some teachers, which remains mostly unknown."[103]

This "translation technique" is decidedly literal, but any comparisons between the translations of different texts must of course be made cautiously. Morani writes,

> The ancient Armenian translation of Greek texts display certain curious characteristics by virtue of which, in a sense, they can be conceived as mysterious objects, because they raise many questions to which we can give no answer: who were they for, and what purpose did they serve? What tools did the translators have at their disposal? Given the slavish character of these translated texts, in which the technique of *verbum e verbo* is often pushed to the limits – so much so that it is replaced by a most singular technique of *morpheme e morphemate* – to the point of making the translated text difficult to grasp for those unable to resort to the aid of the Greek text, they seem to defy the most elementary principles of the theory of translation: for what useful purpose can a translation serve if it fails to enable a foreign reader to gain a proper understanding of a work written in a different language?[104]

Calzolari's observations confirm Morani's: "unlike a number of other works of the Hellenizing School, the translations of the *Prolegomena* and the *Commentary on Porphyry's Isagoge*, for example, are less verbatim."[105] However, the implication here of course is that not all

---

[101] Calzolari, "The Armenian Translations of the Greek Neoplatonic Works," 48.

[102] Ibid., 48-51.

[103] Ibid., 51.

[104] Morani, "Ancient Armenian Translation from Greek Texts," 6.

[105] Calzolari, "The Armenian Translations of the Greek Neoplatonic Works," 59.

translations of the Hellenizing School were so literal. These remarks on Armenian translation of Greek texts are challenging and in fact problematic because we often lack the original from which the translations were made. Without a base text, it is difficult to draw many conclusions about the nature of the translation. The Hellenizing School, although it grew from Mesrop and Sahak's translation of the Bible, occurs several generations after the Bible translation. We may also only tentatively infer that their techniques are reflective of earlier methods.

The Armenian Bible translation project, with which we are mainly concerned, is generally thought to be characterized by its extreme literalism and precision. Rhodes notes its "fidelity as a literal translation," Lyonnet writes that the translators were able to remain "scrupulously faithful,"[106] and with his investigation of two versions of the Armenian Chronicles, Cowe concludes, "from the perspective of the Greek text our overall impression is of a careful translation executed with fidelity and insight."[107] At the same time, the same scholars have recognized the translator's ability to provide an idiomatic and smooth rendering: Rhodes comments on the translation's "idiomatic ease and graceful authority," and Lyonnet too on its "elegance which has made it a model of the classical language."[108] There are several instances where the Armenian translation reflects more the language's idioms instead of staying true to the literal meaning of the Greek. In Mark 7:25, for example, the little daughter who had (εἶχεν) an unclean spirit is said to be pressed (*meɫeal ēr*) by the spirit in the Armenian; in John 7:49 ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος 'this crowd' is *ayn xažamuž ambox* 'this riotous crowd' in Armenian; and peoples' names are commonly used to describe places – Egypt and Galilee are regularly expressed as "the land of the Egyptians" and the "regions of the Galileans." Rhodes also observes that the Armenian

---

[106] Both cited by Metzger (*Early Versions of the New Testament*, 180).

[107] Cowe, "Two Armenian Versions of Chronicles," 62.

[108] Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 180.

articles, although they are commonly identified as equivalent to the definite article, are also roughly associated with the first, second, and third persons: τὸ βρέφος is *manuks* in Luke 1:44, and τὸ παίδιον is *manukd* in Matthew 2:13 and *manukn* in Matthew 2:14, and although οἱ ἄγγελοι is regularly translated with the *n* suffix in Luke, it is not in Matthew or Mark.[109] It seems contradictory to say in one breath that the Armenian translation is both literal and true to its language's idiom. Metzger concludes, "in any case, the version, by introducing in some degree the work of commentator as well as that of translator, provides the reader with a generally faithful and idiomatic rendering praised for its clarity and dignity of expression,"[110] and Morani writes, "despite the attempt by the Armenian translators to achieve a rendering that would reproduce the Greek text as literally as possible, it should not be overlooked that Armenian and Greek have rather different language systems, and these divergences cannot be masked even by a rendering that seeks to be as literal and blindly imitative as possible."[111] What must be emphasized therefore is the Armenian version's fidelity to the Greek's meaning and words *as well as,* where appropriate, the language's idiom and style. However, the question now becomes, do the differences in the language systems ever cause the Armenian version to stray from or add to the meaning of the original? It is inevitable that a translation is forced to abandon its adherence to strict literalism when there is no exact equivalence to the original in its language; slight deviations in wording and phrasing are defensible. It only becomes problematic if the new version distorts the original meaning. The following section returns to the case study in order to analyze the unexplainable deviations in both Latin and Armenian and discuss their significance.

---

[109] Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 174.

[110] Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 163.

[111] Morani, "Ancient Armenian Translation from Greek Texts," 9.

2.4 Conclusion: Explaining the Case Study

To reiterate the conclusions from the case study, significant divergences from the expected correspondences (Grk. οὗτος : Lat. *hic*, Grk. οὗτος : Arm. [-]*s*[-], Grk. ἐκεῖνος : Lat. *ille*, and Grk. ἐκεῖνος : Arm. [-]*n*[-]) have revealed various structural patterns in each of the languages. We have learned that (1) medial deixis, operative only in Latin and Armenian, can be used to express a second person or pejorative referent in both languages, (2) the two pronouns in Greek can be used both deictically and anaphorically, (3) *iste* may encompass the sphere of neutral deixis or simple anaphora, (4) deictic consistency, certainly prevalent in Armenian and possibly playing a role in Latin, explains several anomalous divergences from the Greek, and (5) the strict assignment of deictic value to only proximal (*s*) and medial (*d*) forms in Armenian leads to compulsory deviations from the expected forms. These five points served sufficiently well in explaining Latin or Armenian divergences from the Greek. However, there are a few instances where the deviations occur outside of the realm of these five explanations. These examples, unexplainable on the basis of syntax or simply the unique structures of the languages, give us insight into the translators' deliberate choices and techniques.

There are three distinct types of divergences: (1) unavoidable changes due to the constraints of the language, (2) omissions of redundant information, and (3) the insertion of medial deixis. Type 1 is appropriate as long as the change does not distort the original meaning. We have found that this occurs particularly where Latin or Armenian is bound by the principle of deictic consistency (Sections 1.2.3.3.4 and 1.2.6.1.3) or where Armenian is forced to use the anaphoric *n* with Greek οὗτος (Section 1.2.6.2).

Type 2 may also be permissible on the grounds that the meaning is never changed. This occurs frequently in the instances of adverbial deixis. However, it is slightly problematic that the

Latin and Armenian translators, who are otherwise very faithful to the vocabulary and even word order of the original, chose to omit certain words. Given that there is no change in meaning with or without the redundant adverb (cf. 27:36 καὶ καθήμενοι ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν **ἐκεῖ** : *et sedentes servabant eum Ø* : *ew nsteal parhein zna Ø*), why did Jerome and Mashtots choose to omit it? Their – in Jerome's case avowed – adherence to literalism would suggest that changes to the original should only be made where strictly necessary, but these omissions are not necessary. It seems arbitrary of the translators to declare one adverb redundant but not another (cf. 14:8 δός μοι, φησίν, **ὧδε** ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ : *da mihi inquit* **hic** *in disco caput Iohannis Baptistae* : *tówr inj asē* **aysr** *ï veray skteł, zglowxn Yovhannow mkrtči* 'give me, she said, the head of John the Baptist *here* on a platter' where one might deem the adverb redundant after 'give me', but it is retained in both translations). In the interest of producing a translation that is concise and clear, perhaps eliminating redundancies such as these adverbs was considered acceptable to the translators. However, the inconsistency of their decision[112] speaks to their unpredictability.

Type 3 is extremely difficult. On the one hand, we may ascribe the Latin and Armenian use of medial deixis to linguistic idiom and permit its insertion. To take it one step further, to forbid the use of *iste* or *d*-forms on the grounds that there is no Greek equivalent would cause the forms to disappear entirely from any literal translation of a Greek text. Given Jerome's declarations on the matter and the evidence from Armenian translations, it is clear that both the Vulgate and the Armenian version of the Gospel of Matthew are conceptualized as literal translations. But evidently they are not so literal as to reject entirely a whole set of pronouns (as

---

[112] Cf. 2:13, 2:15. 5:23, 14:17, 14:18, 15:29, 22:11, 27:47 for places where neither translator chose to omit a possibly redundant adverb.

well as adjectives, adverbs, and enclitics). Excluding their use within the parameters of deictic consistency, medial deixis is used when the translator is focusing on a relational value either different from or only implicit in the Greek. In 26:62 for example, both the Latin and Armenian versions emphasize the second person referent with a medial form (οὐδὲν ἀποκρίνῃ τί **οὗτοί** σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν; : *nihil respondes ad ea quae **isti** adversum te testificantur* : *čᶜtasˀ inčᶜ patasxani zinčᶜ **dokᶜa** ambastanden zkᶜēn* 'do you respond nothing to the things which *these men [you've just heard]* testify against you?'), and in 21:16 they use it for its pejorative connotations (ἀκούεις τί **οὗτοι** λέγουσιν; : *audis quid **isti** dicant* : *lses zinčᶜ asend **dokᶜa*** 'do you hear what *those [bad children]* are saying?').

One might say that the insertion of medial deixis in the two languages is permissible; they might argue that the translators are simply observing the idioms and style of their own language and that no new meaning is introduced as a result. And they might further assert that the reference to the second person of the speech-act or to a negatively perceived referent is implicit, that the translators were simply expressing what was inexpressible but implied in the Greek. The first issue with this is that there is rarely anything implied in the Greek; if there were a clear implication in the Greek text, we would expect the Armenian and Latin versions to agree on when and where they insert the medial deixis. For example, in 23:36 Jerome focused on the second person referent of the pronoun (ἥξει ταῦτα πάντα ἐπὶ τὴν γενεὰν **ταύτην** : *venient haec omnia super generationem **istam*** 'all these things will come upon *this generation [of yours]*'), but evidently the Armenian translator did not pick up on the relationship, evidenced by his retention of the proximal deictic (*ekecᶜē ayn amenayn ï azgis **aysorik***). In fact in their application of medial deixis, the Latin and Armenian versions agree only five times out of a total of nearly 30 instances of medial deixis in both languages. Clearly the translators' decisions are not based

on anything indicated in the Greek, but on non-regularized personal perceptions of the relationships described in the text.

The second issue is that there are instances where the inserted medial form does in fact add significant meaning to the text, particularly in the Armenian version. One classic example of this is occurs at 16:18. Although the passage has been treated once in Section 1.2.6.1.1, let us reexamine the text:

> κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ **ταύτῃ** τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν

> *ew es kᶜéz asem, zi dow és vēm, ew ï veray **áydr** vimi šinecᶜicᶜ zekełecᶜi im*
> [& I to you I say, that you are stone, & on over this rock I'll build the church my]

The subtle word play with Peter's name and the "rock" in the original Greek famously becomes the basis for the Roman Catholic tradition that St. Peter's basilica was built over his burial site.[113] In the Armenian version, however, because the word "rock" (*vēm*) does not sound like Peter's name, the pun cannot be replicated. Instead, the Armenian uses *vēm* and creates wordplay with the second person medial deictic adjective. Jesus tells his disciple that "you are a rock" (*dow es vēm*), as opposed to Greek and Latin "you are Peter." By calling Peter a rock, Jesus makes very explicit the connection between the two clauses: the Armenian says "you're a rock; and on *this* rock – namely you, the rock – I'll build my church." The connection is much weaker in Greek and Latin: "you're Peter; and on this rock I'll build my church." The changes made in Armenian, although the text remains very nearly lexically identical to the Greek (πέτρος does mean 'rock', and the only other difference is the use of the second person deictic adjective *aydr*), is able to add exegetically significant meaning that was only weakly implied in the Greek.

---

[113] "This line has been the object of much heated debate and much wasted ingenuity. 'This rock' has been identified variously with Peter's faith or confession, with his preaching office, with the truth revealed to him, with the twelve apostles, with Jesus, with Jesus' teaching, and even with God himself. All this is special pleading. The most natural interpretation of the Greek is that of Roman Catholic tradition: the rock is Peter" (Allison, *Matthew*, 269).

The overwhelming pejorative values of *d*-deixis pervasive throughout Jesus' trial, condemnation, and crucifixion, however, are not at all implied in the Greek text. In the following passage, Armenian uses *d*-deixis six times. Three of them correspond with αὐτός, one with οὗτος, and twice with no deictic form in Greek:

27:41 ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἔλεγον · (42) Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι · βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ ἐστιν, καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ Ø, καὶ πιστεύσομεν ἐπ' **αὐτόν**. (43) πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω Ø νῦν, εἰ θέλει **αὐτόν** · εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι Θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός. (44) τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ λησταὶ οἱ συσταυρωθέντες σὺν αὐτῷ ὠνείδιζον αὐτόν. […] (47) τινὲς δὲ τῶν ἐκεῖ ἑστηκότων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἠλίαν φωνεῖ **οὗτος**. (48) καὶ εὐθέως δραμὼν εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ λαβὼν σπόγγον πλήσας τε ὄξους καὶ περιθεὶς καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν. (49) οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἔλεγον · Ἄφες ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἠλίας σώσων **αὐτόν**.

(41) *similiter et principes sacerdotum inludentes cum scribis et senioribus dicentes* (42) *alios salvos fecit, se ipsum non potest salvum facere, si rex Israhel est, descendat nunc de cruce Ø et credemus **ei*** (43) *confidet in Deo, liberet nunc **eum**, si Ø vult, dixit enim quia Dei Filius sum* (44) *id ipsum autem et latrones qui fixi erant cum eo inproperabant ei* […] (47) *quidam autem illic stantes et audientes dicebant Heliam vocat **iste*** (48) *et continuo currens unus ex eis acceptam spongiam implevit aceto et inposuit harundini et dabat ei bibere* (49) *ceteri vero dicebant sine videamus an veniat Helias liberans **eum***

(41) *noynpēs ew kᶜahanayapetkᶜ jałēin handerj dprōkᶜn ew cerovkᶜ ew asein* (42) *zayls aprecᶜojcᶜ, zinkᶜn očᶜ karē aprecᶜowcᶜanel, etᶜe tᶜagawor ē IŁI, ijᶜē ayžm i xačᶜēd, ew hawatascᶜowkᶜ **dma*** (43) *etᶜe yowsacᶜaw yAC, pᶜrkescᶜē ayžm **zda**, etᶜe kami **zda**. kᶜanzi asacᶜ etᶜe AY ordi em* (44) *znoyn ew awazakkᶜn or xačᶜeal ein ənd nma naxatēin zna* […] (47) *omankᶜ yayncᶜanē or andn kayin ibrew lowan asein, zĒlia karday **da*** (48) *ew vałvałaki əntᶜacᶜaw mi omn i nocᶜanē. aṝ spowng li kᶜacᶜaxov hareal yełegan. et əmpel nma* (49) *ew kēskᶜn asein, tᶜoł, tescᶜowkᶜ etᶜe gay Ēlia pᶜrkel **zda***

'(41) In the same way the chief priests with the scribes and elders mocked [him] and said (42) He saved others; he can't save himself; if he is the King of Israel, let him descend from *that cross,* and we will believe *him* (43) If he trusted in God, let God deliver *him,* if he desires *him*. For he said "I am the son of God" (44) and in the same way the robbers who were crucified with him reproached him […] (47) Some of those who were there, when they heard [him], said, "*This man* is calling Elijah" (48) and immediately one of them ran, took a sponge full of vinegar, sticking it on a reed, [and] gave it [to him] to drink (49) and the others said, 'Leave [him], let us see if Elijah comes to save *him*'

The derogatory and negative connotations of this passage begin with the verb *jaɫein* 'they mocked' and are first picked up by the enclitic *-d* with *i xačʽēd* 'from that cross'. Greek has no deictic marker with the prepositional phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ; this is the first major Armenian innovation of the passage, where pejorative value is ascribed to not only Jesus, but to his cross, as well. The mockery and ridicule is manifestly overt: an English translation that incorporates some of the emotional coloring provided by the Armenian might be something like, "he can't even save himself! If he really is the King of Israel, shouldn't he be able to come down from the damned cross? If he did, we'd believe the guy." Each subsequent reference to Jesus, excluding those of the narrative, is also made with a pejorative form in *d*. Apart from the verb of mockery (the participle ἐμπαίζοντες), however, there is no indication of any negative connotations in the Greek, and even in Latin, the pejorative *iste* is used only once in 27:47, all other pronominal referents being anaphoric *is*. It is true that some of the *d*-forms with Jesus are governed by deictic consistency and may therefore be considered coincidental. However, the first form in 27:42 is most certainly an Armenian embellishment (as is the enclitic with "the cross," although it does not reappear) that attaches pejorative value to Jesus. *Da* in 27:47 also reveals the deliberate choice of the Armenian translator to insert disparagement, given that it appears in a new discourse fragment that is not bound by deictic consistency. What is remarkable is that Armenian is able to add such a blatant layer of ridicule and scorn while still adhering to the vocabulary and word order of the Greek. Therefore, the Armenian version is extraordinary in its ability to translate literally while simultaneously functioning as a subtle commentary on the text.

This all must answer to the rebuttal, however, that, although there is no suggestion of a negative context (at Jesus' crucifixion) or a second person reference (in 16:18) in the Greek syntax, one could certainly argue that it is implied in the Greek text overall. In modern

translation theory, this is referred to as simply "explication" and is considered an acceptable feature of translation.[114] The Armenian language allows the translator to assess and express aspects of the narrative where the Greek is unable to do so, and the translation is therefore based on the interpreter's decision of how best to render the text as a whole. From this standpoint, one could easily argue that, for example, the Greek verb of mockery in 27:41 and the larger context of Jesus' condemnation and crucifixion serve to clearly indicate the negative connotations of the passage, and that the Armenian rendering is in fact no different from the original. However, the Latin language offers the same option to the translator, and yet Jerome rarely makes the same choices as Mashtots. This seems to suggest that, even if the translators are interpreting with an eye to the relational values that Greek is unable to express, the urge to explicate them is felt on an individual basis with no concrete or tangible foundation in the Greek text.

It is an unavoidable fact that the linguistic means at one's disposal will govern the nature and contents of one's translation. The use of different pronouns makes a difference not on a lexical level but on the psychological level. Given the three-way system in Latin and Armenian which differs from the two-way system in Greek, the two translators had available the stylistic option of adding psychological meaning. On the one hand, Jerome's approbation of a literal translation that preserves the original meaning is upheld; the deviations in his translation, as far as deictic forms are concerned, are acceptable with minimal additions of meaning or context where it is implicit in the Greek. Metzger agrees: when Jerome chooses a variant, it is "usually for reasons that would be recognized today as valid and persuasive."[115] On the other hand, the

---

[114] Pym *Exploring Translation Theories,* 13. However, as noted above, it is often risky to impose modern theory on ancient practices. Pym also notes as a "universal of translations," for example, that unique linguistic elements of a target language that cannot be replicated in the source language tend not to appear in translations, which of course we have found not to be the case.

[115] Metzger, *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic*, 207.

Armenian translation at times provides extra context or commentary that goes beyond what is explicitly or implicitly indicated in the Greek. At the same time, however, it also remains extremely literal: "The differences are quite minimal and very definite. If they are kept in mind, the model followed by the translator can be reconstructed: for the same care which he took in rendering precisely the nuances of an expression prevented him from ignoring details, and also led him to model his sentence structure on that of his exemplar whenever possible. This is what makes the Armenian version so valuable for the exegete, and what makes it possible to identify clearly the nature of his exemplar."[116] Compare this statement with Bonifatius Fischer's observation: "as concerns all the peculiarities and variants of sound and accidence of the Greek *New Testament* […] nothing can be concluded from the Latin versions […] Although the Latin language is in general very suitable for use in making a translation from Greek, there will remain certain features which cannot be expressed in Latin."[117] It is impossible to deem one version a better translation than the other from this, but the purpose of this study is not to rank the two translations. It is to investigate the systems of deixis in the two languages with the hope that the translation of the Greek deictic forms may reveal something about the techniques of the two translators. We have found that, true to his words, Jerome produces an extremely literal and faithful translation of the Greek. And we have found that the Armenian version, often called the "Queen of the versions," has the extraordinary ability to function occasionally as a commentary while remaining faithfully literal.

---

[116] Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 180.

[117] Ibid., 365.

WORKS CITED

Ajello, Robert. "Armenian." In *The Indo-European Languages,* edited by Anna Giacalone Ramat and Paolo Ramat, 197-227. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Alexanian, Joseph. "Armenian Version of the New Testament." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research,* edited by Bart Ehrman and Michael Holmes, 157-172. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.

Allison, Dale. *Matthew: A Shorter Commentary*. London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.

Arpee, Leon. *A History of Armenian Christianity from the Beginning to Our Own Time*. New York: The Armenian Missionary Association of America, Inc., 1946.

Baker, Mona, and Gabriela Saldanha, eds. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Bournoutian, George A. *A History of the Armenian People: Volume I, Pre-History to 1500 AD*. Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers, 1993.

Brock, Sebastian. "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20, no. 1 (1979): 69-87.

Calzolari, Valentina. "The Transmission and Reception of the Greek Cultural Heritage in Late Antique Armenia: The Armenian Translations of the Greek Neoplatonic Works." In *Greek Tests and Armenian Traditions: An Interdisciplinary Approach,* edited by Francesca Gazzano, Lara Pagani, and Giusto Traina, 47-70. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2016.

Colwell, Ernest Cadman. "Slandered or Ignored: The Armenian Gospels." *The Journal of Religion* 17, no. 1 (1937): 48-61.

Copeland, Rita. "The Fortunes of 'non verbum pro verbo': or, Why Jerome is not a Ciceronian." In *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*, edited by Roger Ellis, 15-36. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1989.

---. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Cowe, P.S. "Two Armenian Versions of Chronicles, their Origin and Translation Technique." *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 22 (1990-1991): 53-96.

Danielyan, Eduard L. "The Historical Significance of Armenian Writing: Original and Translated Literature as an Aspect of the Dialogue of Civilizations." *21st Century* 1, no. 7 (2010): 25-35.

Delisle, Jean, and Judith Woodsworth. *Translators through History*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1995.

Der Nersessian, Sirarpie. *The Armenians*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1969.

Ewert, David. *From Ancient Tablets to Modern Translations: A General Introduction to the Bible*. Grand Rapids: The Zondervan Corporation, 1983.

Feeney, Denis. *Beyond Greek: The Beginnings of Latin Literature*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2016.

Felson, Nancy, and Jared Klein. "Deixis in Linguistics and Poetics." *Encyclopedia of Greek Linguistics and Language*: 429-433, 2013.

Gera, Deborah Levine. *Judith (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature)*. Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter, 2014.

Godel, Robert. *An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian*. Belgium: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1975.

Greppin, John. "The Particles –s, -d, and –n in Classical and Middle Armenian." *Historical Linguistics* 106, no. 2 (1993): 285-287.

Greppin, John, and I. M. Diakonoff. "Some Effects of the Hurro-Urartian People and Their Language upon the Earliest Armenians." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 111, no. 4 (1991): 720-730.

Jinbachian, Manuel. "The History, Base Text(s), and Translation Techniques of the Armenian Bible." *The Bible Translator* 55, no. 3 (2004): 364-375.

Kenyon, Frederic G. *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts; Being a History of the Text and Its Translations*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1895.

Klein, Jared. *On Personal Deixis in Classical Armenian*. Dettelbach: Verlag Dr. Josef H. Röll, 1996.

---. "Personal Deixis in Latin." *The Classical Outlook* 77, no. 3 (2000): 93-99.

Kytzler, B. "Fidus Interpres: The Theory and Practice of Translation in Classical Antiquity." *Antichthon* 23 (1989): 42-50.

McElduff, Siobhán, and Enrica Sciarrino, eds. *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Manchester, Kinderhook, NY: St. Jerome Publishing, 2011.

Metzger, Bruce M. "A Survey of Recent Research on the Ancient Versions of the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955): 1-16.

---. *Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

---. *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980.

---. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Migne, Jacques-Paul. *Patrologia Latina, Vols. XXVI-XXIX.* 1844-1846. http://www.docume ntacatholicaomnia.eu/20_40_0347-0420-_Hieronymus,_Sanctus.html

Morani, Moreno. "Ancient Armenian Translation from Greek Texts: Questions of Method." In *Greek Tests and Armenian Traditions: An Interdisciplinary Approach,* edited by Francesca Gazzano, Lara Pagani, and Giusto Traina, 3-22. Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter, 2016.

Nersessian, Vrej. *The Bible in the Armenian Tradition*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2001.

---. "Armenian Christianity." In *The Blackwell Companion to Eastern Christianity*, edited by Ken Parry, 23-46. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, 2010.

Palmer, L.R. *The Latin Language*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1954.

Peters, Melvin K. H. "Why Study the Septuagint?" *The Biblical Archaeologist* 49, no. 3 (1986): 174-181.

Pym, Anthony. *Exploring Translation Theories.* London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Robinson, Douglas. "Classical Theories of Translation from Cicero to Aulus Gellius." *TcT* 7 (1992): 15-55.

---. "Ascetic Foundations of Western Translatology: Jerome and Augustine." *Translation and Literature* 1 (1992): 3-25.

---. *Western Translation Theory: from Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester and Northampton, MA: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997.

Schwarz, W. *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation: Some Reformation Controversies and Their Background*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.

Stertz, Stephen A. "Armenia in the Ancient World." *Salem Press Encyclopedia* (2014): 1-2.

Ter-Sarkisiants. "Sixteen Hundred Years of Armenian Writing." *Anthropology & Archaeology of Eurasia* 46, no. 1 (2007): 75-94.

Tov, Emanuel. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill: 1999.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Weissbord, Daniel, and Astradur Eysteinsson, eds. *Translation – Theory and Practice: A Historical Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

APPENDICES

A. Greek-Latin Correspondences at a Glance

	combinations	total occurrences
matches	Grk proximal, Lat proximal	105
	Grk distal, Lat distal	50
Grk proximal pronoun or adjective	with Lat medial	28
	with Lat distal	1
	with no Lat deictic	1
Grk distal pronoun or adjective	with no Lat deictic	1
Grk anaphoric pronoun	with Lat proximal	1
Grk no deictic pronoun	no Grk deictic, with Lat proximal	2
	no Grk deictic, with Lat distal	1
adverbs	Grk proximal, Lat proximal	19
	Grk proximal, Lat distal	1
	Grk distal, Lat distal	38
	Grk distal, with no Lat deictic adv.	2

B. Greek-Armenian Correspondences at a Glance

	combinations	total occurrences
matches	Grk proximal, Arm proximal	80
	Grk distal, Arm distal	51
Grk proximal pronoun or adjective	with Arm medial	30
	with Arm distal	24
	with no Arm deictic	1
adverbs	Grk proximal, Arm proximal	14
	Grk proximal, Arm medial	2
	Grk proximal, Arm distal	1
	Grk proximal, with no Arm deictic adv.	3
	Grk distal, Arm distal	38
	Grk distal, with no Arm deictic adv.	2

C. Greek-Latin-Armenian Correspondences at a Glance

1 = proximal; 2 = medial; 3 = distal deictic forms

	combinations	total occurrences
Grk 1	Grk 1, BOTH 1	58
	Grk-Lat 1 match, Arm 2	25
	Grk-Lat 1 match, Arm 3	22
	Grk-Arm 1 match, Lat 2	22
	Grk 1, BOTH 2	5
	Grk 1, BOTH 3	1
	Grk 1, BOTH Ø	1
	Grk 1, Lat 2, Arm 3	1
Grk 3	Grk 3, BOTH 3	50
	Grk-Arm 3 match, Lat Ø	1
adverbs	Grk 1, BOTH 1	14
	Grk 1, BOTH 3	1
	Grk-Lat 1 match, Arm 2	2
	Grk-Lat 1 match, Arm Ø	3
	Grk 3, BOTH 3	37
	Grk 3, BOTH Ø	1
	Grk-Lat 3 match, Arm Ø	1
	Grk-Arm 3 match, Lat Ø	1

D. Greek-Latin Correspondences by Chapter and Verse

	combinations	chapter	verse	total occurrences
matches	Grk proximal, Lat proximal	1	20	105
			22	
		3	3	
			17	
		4	9	
		5	37	
		6	32	
			32	
			33	
		7	12	
			24	
			26	
			28	
		8	9	
			9	
			27	

		9	3	
			18	
			26	
			28	
		10	2	
			5	
			22	
		11	10	
			25	
		12	11	
			23	
			24	
			32	
			45	
		13	15	
			19	
			20	
			22	
			23	
			28	
			34	
			38	
			51	
			54	
			54	
			55	
			56	
		14	2	
		15	8	
			11	
			20	
		16	18	
			22	
		17	5	
			20	
		18	4	
			10	
		19	5	
			20	
			26	
		20	12	
			14	
			21	
		21	4	
			10	
			11	

			21	
			23	
			23	
			24	
			27	
			38	
			42	
		22	20	
			38	
			40	
		23	23	
			36	
		24	2	
			3	
			8	
			13	
			14	
			33	
			34	
			34	
		25	45	
			46	
		26	1	
			8	
			12	
			12	
			13	
			13	
			23	
			26	
			28	
			29	
			34	
			42	
			56	
			61	
			71	
		27	24	
			32	
			37	
			46	
			58	
		28	14	
		3	1	
	Grk distal, Lat distal	7	22	50
			25	

			27	
		8	13	
			28	
		9	22	
			26	
			31	
		10	15	
			19	
		11	25	
		12	1	
			45	
		13	1	
			11	
			44	
		14	1	
			35	
			35	
		15	22	
		17	18	
			28	
		18	1	
			27	
			28	
		20	4	
		21	40	
		22	7	
			23	
			46	
		23	23	
		24	19	
			22	
			22	
			29	
			36	
			43	
			46	
			48	
			50	
		25	7	
			19	
		26	24	
			24	
			29	
			55	
		27	8	
			19	

			63	
Grk proximal pronoun or adjective	with Lat medial	3	9	28
		4	3	
		5	19	
		6	29	
		10	23	
			42	
		11	16	
		12	41	
			42	
		13	53	
			56	
		15	15	
		18	4	
			6	
			14	
		19	1	
			11	
		21	16	
			42	
			44	
		23	36	
		26	9	
			31	
			39	
			62	
		27	47	
			54	
		28	15	
	with Lat distal	11	7	1
	with no Lat deictic	20	23	1
Grk distal pronoun or adjective	with no Lat deictic	18	32	1
Grk anaphoric pronoun	with Lat proximal	26	27	1
Grk no deictic pronoun	no Grk deictic, with Lat proximal	19	25	2
		24	6	
	no Grk deictic, with Lat distal	26	61	1
adverbs	Grk proximal, Lat proximal	8	29	19
		12	6	
			41	
			42	
		14	8	
			17	
			18	
		16	28	

		17	4	
			4	
			17	
			20	
		20	6	
		22	12	
		24	2	
			23	
		26	36	
			38	
		28	6	
	Grk proximal, Lat distal	24	23	1
		2	13	
			15	
			22	
		4	21	
		5	23	
			24	
		8	12	
		9	9	
			27	
		10	11	
		11	1	
		12	9	
			15	
			45	
		13	42	
			50	
	Grk distal, Lat distal		53	38
			58	
		14	13	
			23	
		15	21	
			29	
		18	20	
		19	2	
			15	
		21	17	
		22	11	
			13	
		24	28	
			51	
		25	30	
		26	36	
			71	
		27	47	

			55	
			61	
		28	7	
			10	
	Grk distal, with no Lat deictic adv.	17	20	2
		27	36	

E. Greek-Armenian Correspondences by Chapter and Verse

	combinations	chapter	verse	total occurrences
matches	Grk proximal, Arm proximal	1	20	80
			22	
		3	3	
			9	
		4	3	
			9	
		5	19	
		7	24	
			26	
			28	
		8	9	
			9	
			27	
		9	18	
			26	
		10	2	
			23	
			42	
		11	16	
			25	
		12	23	
			32	
			41	
			42	
			45	
		13	15	
			34	
			51	
			53	
			54	
			54	
			55	
			56	
			56	

		15	8	
			15	
			20	
		17	20	
		18	4	
			6	
			10	
			14	
		19	1	
			5	
		20	14	
			21	
		21	4	
			10	
			11	
			24	
			27	
			38	
			42	
			44	
		22	20	
			38	
			40	
		23	23	
			36	
		24	14	
			33	
			34	
			34	
		25	45	
		26	1	
			13	
			26	
			29	
			31	
			34	
			39	
			42	
			56	
			61	
			71	
		27	37	
			46	
			54	
			58	
		28	15	

	Grk distal, Arm distal	3	1	51
		7	22	
			25	
			27	
		8	13	
			28	
		9	22	
			26	
			31	
		10	15	
			19	
		11	25	
		12	1	
			45	
		13	1	
			11	
			44	
		14	1	
			35	
			35	
		15	22	
			28	
		17	18	
			28	
		18	1	
			27	
			28	
		20	4	
		21	40	
		22	7	
			23	
			46	
		23	23	
		24	19	
			22	
			22	
			29	
			36	
			43	
			46	
			48	
			50	
		25	7	
			19	
		26	24	
			24	

		27	29 55 8 19 63	
Grk proximal pronoun or adjective	with Arm medial	3 6 9 12 16 17 19 20 21 24 26 27 28	17 32 32 33 3 28 24 18 22 5 11 20 26 12 16 21 23 23 2 3 8 9 12 12 13 28 62 24 47 14	30

	with Arm distal	5 6 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 18 21 23 24 25 26 27	37 29 12 5 22 7 10 11 19 20 22 23 28 38 2 11 4 42 36 8 13 46 23 32	24
	with no Arm deictic	20	23	1
adverbs	Grk proximal, Arm proximal	12 14 16 17 20 22 24 26 28	6 41 42 8 17 18 28 4 20 6 12 23 38 6	14
	Grk proximal, Arm medial	24 26	2 36	2
	Grk proximal, Arm distal	24	23	1
	Grk proximal, with no Arm deictic adv.	8 17	29 4 17	3
	Grk distal, Arm distal	2	13	38

			15	
			22	
		4	21	
		5	23	
		8	12	
		9	9	
			27	
		10	11	
		11	1	
		12	9	
			15	
			45	
		13	42	
			50	
			53	
			58	
		14	13	
			23	
		15	21	
			29	
		17	20	
		18	20	
		19	2	
			15	
		21	17	
		22	11	
			13	
		24	28	
			51	
		25	30	
		26	36	
			71	
		27	47	
			55	
			61	
		28	7	
			10	
	Grk distal, with no Arm deictic adv.	5	24	2
		27	36	