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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

There is, in fact, every reason to suspect that the poetic character of certain passages imposed on each translator a unique set of challenges relative to passages of a different, “unmarked” style. And in that case, one cannot presume to describe the comparative syntax of the target language versions without some reference to the peculiar features of the subgenre. Unfortunately, most treatments of the syntax of the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old
Church Slavic gospels assemble data without respect to subgenre. At best, a discussion of genre will appear in the analysis of a few outlying forms. However, as I will demonstrate in subsequent chapters, these analyses often proceed from unformed notions of what characterizes New Testament poetry, and offer explanations that misunderstand the significance of certain translation decisions reflected in the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic texts.

AIM OF THE STUDY

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

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

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

1. The Magnificat or Song of Mary (Lk. 1:46-58)
2. The Benedictus or Song of Zechariah (Lk. 1:68-79)
3. The Gloria fragment (Lk. 2:14)

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

I have selected these passages because a translator would have recognized their poetic character not only from (1) their linguistic presentation in the Greek, but also from (2) indications in the surrounding narrative that they are hymns or acts of praise, and (3) their historical performance as hymns in Christian ritual. For Byzantine Greek and Syriac-speaking Christians, as also for the Armenian, Slavic, and (in all likelihood1) Gothic peoples who inherited their traditions, pieces like the Nunc Dimittis (Lk. 2:29-32) were not merely portions of the biblical corpus but also poetic components of the divine office or liturgy. That is, they were performed more often than they were read within lections. Christian traditions of the first millennium typically configured these pieces within some modal system of chant, and in some cases, assigned them to melodies. On the other hand, other Gospel passages also employed poetically in Christian liturgy (e.g., the Beatitudes or Lord’s Prayer) are not overtly cast as hymns within the Gospels. It is precisely the canticles, then, that should form the basis of any study of marked language in these Gospel versions.

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

1 No extant records of the Arian liturgy or office exist. Still, one can safely presume that it would have preserved the liturgical use of canticles, attested for the rites with which it was in historical contact, especially the Byzantine and various Western rites.
Church Slavic translators. In subsequent chapters, it will at times be necessary to recover later
Greek readings underlying peculiarities of the target language versions. Nevertheless, as a
reconstruction of the Urtext, a critical edition is required when trying to determine the
original intentions and decisions of the author of the Greek text. In theory, it also provides a
neutral starting point for the study of later translations, and the textual traditions they
represent.

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

**PLAN OF THE STUDY**

To execute this sort of study, it will first be necessary to characterize the language of
these passages in the Greek text. I will take up this task in Chapter 2. This will require (1) a
general exploration of the features of biblical poetry from previous studies of the subject, and
(2) an exhaustive study of the Greek text of these passages, with a special interest in peculiar
forms and structures best explained as “poetic” in light of (1). If I have succeeded in this goal, I will be able to provide a catalogue of the marked language features found in each canticle.

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

1. Does the target language version retain the same marked language features as the Greek text?

2. Are certain marked language features of the Greek better preserved than others? And if so, are these differences due to the constraints of each language’s native syntax, the capacity of the translator to recognize a given feature as marked, or the translation method employed in each version?

3. Is it possible to outline the translator’s approach to the types of marked language features encountered in the Greek text? That is, can one summarize his approach to a feature like “compactness” or “vivid tense use?”
It may also be possible to introduce a fourth question from our study of each target language version:

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

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

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

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

Significant studies of the Greek text of the canticles appear in monographs devoted to the hymns themselves (Farris 1985), to the infancy narrative that contains them (Brown 1993), and most voluminously, to the gospel of Luke entire (including dozens cited in the References section). Numerous articles supplement these studies, some with a more narrow focus on the structure, language and poetry of individual canticles (Tannehill 1974, Dupont 1980, Buth 1984).
As noted earlier, this chapter will examine the critical edition of the Greek New Testament contained in the 28th edition of Nestle-Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece*.

**The Influence of Hebrew**

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

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

---

*Many early 20th century studies identified Aramaic as a significant influence on the language of the infancy narratives (e.g., Plummer 1902, Connolly 1936). This position rested partly on the assumption that Hebrew composition had died out by the first century C.E. (Laurentin 1956:452), an opinion laid to rest with the discovery of the Hebrew texts at Qumran. Rebuttals of the Aramaic view appear in: Sparks 1943, Horton 1978, Most 1982. Jung (2004:32) represents the modern consensus when he writes, "no clear example of Aramaisms is found in the infancy narrative."
These may directly reflect a Hebrew source via translation, the influence of Hebraized Greek texts (especially the Old Greek/LXX), or L1 interference in the author's own diction and style.³ In general, I will avoid choosing between these options, as each of these conclusions must take into account the peculiar linguistic features of Lk. 1-2 as a whole.

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

1. *The LXX Pastiche Theory:* Lk. 1-2 is an original Lukan composition deliberately written in a marked, hebraizing style (e.g., Cadbury 1968).

2. *The Translation Theory.* In this model, Lk. 1-2 is a redacted translation of an underlying Hebrew source (e.g., Laurentin 1956, 1957; Buth 1984; Farris 1985).

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

³ Many studies reserve the label “Hebraism” for expressions in the first and third categories, and prefer to identify expressions in the second category as “septuagintisms” (see survey in Jung 2004:45-58).
The difficulty of the problem can be more clearly appreciated when one remembers that the LXX itself is 'translation Greek'. Those who hold the linguistic character of the first two chapters of Luke is the result of deliberate imitation of the LXX are saying, therefore, that these chapters are 'imitation translation Greek'.

Translation Greek or imitation translation Greek? This is the choice that faces those who investigate the literary origins of Luke 1-2.

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

**CHAPTER OUTLINE**

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

---

*To pursue some of these questions would be to write a completely different dissertation. A limited treatment of the canticles themselves runs the risk of miscalculating the impact of later redactory activity on the hymns, even if they have a unique origin relative to surrounding material.*
Magnificat (1:46-55), 2.3. Benedictus (1:68-79), 2.4. Gloria (2:14), and 2.5. Nunc Dimittis (2:29-32). A reproduction of a canticle’s text will introduce each section, occasionally with text critical annotations in the footnotes.

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

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

A. Tense, Mood, Diathesis

B. Use of the Infinitive

C. Use of Participles

D. Verbless Clauses

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

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

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


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

TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

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

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

\[^5\] Buist Fanning (1990)'s model aptly illustrates this type of analysis. Fanning identifies two verbal aspects in Greek: the perfective (perfect, aorist, pluperfect) and the imperfective (present, imperfect). Tenses participating in this aspectual system have either a present (perfect, present) or past (aorist, pluperfect, imperfect) temporal reference. The perfect and imperfect are further marked as statives. According to Fanning, the future stands outside this aspectual system, but communicates future tense. In the case of non-indicative verbs (subjunctive, optative, participles, and infinitive), the aspectual value of the aorist, present, and perfect is determinative for the meaning of forms in each tense, while temporal reference plays, at best, a secondary role.
2008:6), and sees no difficulty in the lack of clear temporal reference in non-indicative verbs.⁶


**USE OF THE INFINITIVE**

Greek distinguishes between aorist, present, perfect, and future infinitives. Certain infinitives take a genitive article τὸ with no semantic impact (Burk 2006). Non-articular and articular infinitives appear to be interchangeable in the canticle, and indeed, the gospel (Farris 1985:338). The use of τὸ before an infinitive is common within Lukan texts, with 19 occurrences in Luke, and 17 in Acts (Zerwick 1963 § 386, Marshall 1978:92). In series of infinitival clauses, Luke generally omits τὸ before the first infinitive, but includes it before the others (Zerwick 1963 § 385). In these instances, the article probably indicates the complementary character of the second infinitive (cf. Marshall 1978:93). Significantly, BDF § 400.6 associates the phenomenon with “passages with an OT cast,” the style of the canticles.

⁶ Stanley E. Porter (1989) identifies three aspects in the indicative: the perfective (aorist), Imperfective (present, Imperfect), and Stative (perfect, Pluperfect). He distinguishes the Imperfect and Pluperfect tenses from the present and perfect by a semantic value of [+ remoteness]. Moreover, he identifies the future as “not fully aspectual,” grammaticalizing the semantic feature [+ expectation]. Constantine R. Campbell (2007, 2008), on the other hand, identifies only two aspects in the aspectual system of Greek: perfective (aorist, future) and Imperfective (perfect, present, Imperfect, Pluperfect). (Notably, Campbell’s data is collected primarily from Luke.) He distinguishes the tenses of the Imperfective by a four-way spatial distinction: heightened proximity (perfect), proximity (present), remoteness (Imperfect), and heightened remoteness (Pluperfect). Campbell believes the aorist participates in his spatial system (remoteness), but not the future, which encodes a true temporal reference (i.e., it is a true tense). An extended critique of Campbell’s views appears in Porter 2011:46-54.
Wifstrand 2005:40 identifies the use of τοῦ as an influence of the Old Greek, where it occurs with high frequency, often capturing Hebr. ℓ- + Inf. (as in Jer. 11:5 above).7

**USE OF PARTICIPLES**

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

**VERBLESS CLAUSES**

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

**USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE**

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

7 In fact, Jones 1968:32 identifies the τοῦ δόονατι of v. 73b with Hebr. ℓ- + Inf.
CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

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

WORD ORDER

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

§ Kwong 2005 is especially relevant as a study of the word order of Luke in particular.
predicates, except in embedded clauses. (Kwong 2004:60-62). Finally, word order can be affected by the presence of postpositives, including γὰρ, which characteristically occupy the second position in a clause or phrase (Porter 1992:288).

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

**USE OF CONJUNCTIONS**

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

---

9 Davison 1989 examines the word order of Luke-Acts in particular, making it especially relevant for our studies.
conjunction (in the canticles, καὶ). It primarily communicates the distinctive character of the clause in which it is set, vis-à-vis some element of the preceding clause. In this function, it can be contrastive, signal a shift in focus, but at times seems to express no more than a simple coordinating function. Lastly, γὰρ can function in either a coordinating or subordinating manner (Wallace 1996:669). Per Wackernagel's Law, this conjunction characteristically occupies the second position in a sentence (Comrie 1998:90).

**Complex Sentence Types**

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

**Relative Clause Syntax**

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

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

TEXT

Lk. 1:46b-55

46b Μεγαλώνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον,
καὶ ἡγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου,

48 δι’ ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ.

49 Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσιν με πᾶσιν οἱ γενεαὶ:

50 δι’ ἐποίησέν μοι μεγάλα ὁ δυνάτος,
καὶ ἄγιον τὸ ὅνομα αὐτοῦ,

51 καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεάς καὶ γενεάς
τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτῶν.

52 Ἐποίησεν κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ,

53 διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερηφάνους διανοίας καρδιάς αὐτῶν:

54 καθείλεν δυνάστας ἀπὸ θρόνων
καὶ ὑψώσεν ταπεινοῦς,

55 πεινώντας ἐνέπλησεν ἁγαθῶν
καὶ πλουτοῦντας ἐξαπέστειλεν κενοῦς.

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

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

MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

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

Parallelism

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

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

_______________

12 Brown 1993 arranges all these parallelisms as lines of poetry in his translation of the chapter. Fitzmyer 1981 does the same only in the case of v. 42.
πνεῦμά μου) periphrastically indicating a first singular personal subject (Marshall 1978:82). The two phrases are even construed identically, with a nominative article, nominative noun, and first singular possessive pronoun. Object phrases, both invoking God, conclude the two lines (τὸν κύριον || ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου). The next parallelism in the hymn is a synthetic parallelism, describing a divine action (v. 51a) and its consequence (v. 51b; Kugel 1981:4-5 labels this type “Sequence of Actions”). Following this verse are two antithetical couplets (vv. 52-53). Finally, the hymn concludes with a synonymous couplet, explored in greater detail in our examination of the canticle's Case and Number Syntax.

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

**Terseness**

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

---

13 The two nouns are also used synonymously in Job 12:10, Is 26:9. For “my soul” and “my spirit” used synonymously with a first person subject, see Ps. 57:4 [LXX Ps. 57:5] and Ps. 77:3 [LXX 76:4], respectively.
“compactness” is partly manifest in the use of a paratactic style throughout the psalms (“rarely is a subordinate relationship indicated on the surface of the text”; Berlin 1985:6). In the Magnificat, most clauses are loosely associated by the conjunction καὶ (vv. 47, 49b 52b, 53b), if they are associated at all. Absent, for instance, is the relative pronoun ὁ. This style is undoubtedly a marked language feature, as it departs from the Luke’s persistent rejection of parataxis in his sources. The compact style of the Magnificat is also evident in its avoidance of attributive adjectives and certain other adjuncts.

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

Chiasmus, Rhyme, Hypograms

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

14 Luke consistently “replaces Mark’s monotonous parataxis with hypotaxis (subordinate clauses)” in passages adapting Markan material (Bovon 2002:5), introducing genitive absolutes and relative clauses (Fitzmyer 1981:108)
chiastic arrangement of the themes of disfavor and favor into an ABBA tetracolon (cf. 1 Sam. 2:5; see discussion of type in Watson 1994:341). Within this chiasm, the theme of favor occupies the privileged, innermost position (B-B’):

Lk. 1:52-53

A καθεῖλεν δυνάστας ἀπὸ βρόντων
B καὶ ὑψωσεν ταπεινοὺς,
B’ πεινώντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν
A’ καὶ πλούτοντας ἐξαπέστειλεν κενοὺς.

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

In the above visual scheme, the chiasm seems to iconize the “casting down” and “lifting up” of the classes mentioned in v. 52.15

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

__________________________

15 In the Psalms, chiasms can also iconize the theme of reversal in general, or can heighten the contrast between the two classes (Watson 1994: 370-373).
ἐνέπλησεν (OV). Where vv. 52a,b share a common VO structure, the shift to OV in v. 53a continues into v. 53b. This shift creates another dimension to the chiastic structure, in which verb-object order interacts with the themes of favor and disfavor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>v. 52</th>
<th>v. 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[- favor V]</td>
<td>[+ privileged O]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[+ favor V]</td>
<td>[- privileged O]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[- privileged O]</td>
<td>[+ favor V]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[+ privileged O]</td>
<td>[- favor V]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

16 The juxtaposition of the innermost elements of a chiasm at the chiasm’s juncture is a feature of other ABBA tetracolons in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., boʾrōt / boʾrōt in Jer. 2:13: “they have dug their own cisterns / cisterns that cannot hold water”).
The unity of the two verses is consolidated by the appearance of an ABAB isoptoton in the tetracolon, with a rhyming effect. This isoptoton is determined by inflectional endings concluding every other line: masculine genitive plurals in -ων and masculine accusative plurals in -ος (Tannehill 1974:273):

Lk. 1:52-53

A καθείλεν δυνάστας ἀπὸ δρόμων
B καὶ ὑψωσεν ταπεινοὺς.
A' πεινώντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν
B' καὶ πλούτουντας ἐξαπέστειλεν κενοὺς.

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

TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

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

___________________________

17 Isoptoton refers to the alignment of identical case forms. See Klein 2002 for a discussion of related phenomena.
the canticle appear in the indicative mood. Most appear in the active voice, with the exception of the middle ἀντελάβετο in v. 54.

**vv. 46b-47**

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

---

Aorists appear in the first line of the Song of Hannah, an obvious template for the phrasing of Lk. 1:46a-47:

My heart has exulted in the Lord

My horn has been exalted in my God

My mouth has been enlarged against my enemies,

Because I have been gladdened in your salvation.

Three other possible models for Lk. 1:46-47 employ Hebr. imperfects. The Old Greek will translate as futures (LXX Ps. 68:31: μεγαλυνὼ αὐτόν; LXX Ps. 35:9: ἢ δὲ ψυχή μου ἀγαλλιάσται ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ; LXX Hab. 3:18: ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ ἀγαλλιάσομαι χαρῆσομαι ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτηρίῳ μου).

One must avoid models that absolutely require a Semitic original for the Magnificat, for which no convincing evidence exists. On this ground, Fitzmyer 1981:366 rejects the related proposal that aorist in v. 47 renders an original Hebr. perfect + waw-consecutive (as in Zerwick 1963 § 260, Joüon 2006 § 118r, Schürmann 1982:73, Marshall 1978:82).
This explanation is compelling, especially in light of 1 Sam. 2:1. However, it still fails to explain why a dramatic aorist should appear after the straightforward use of a present in Lk. 1:46b. Why not render both verbs as dramatic aorists, especially with 1 Sam. 2:1 as a model?

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

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

21 This point can be explored a different way. Klein 1992a, Brown 1993 focus on the peculiarity of the aorist. But if the Old Greek of 1 Sam. 2:1 (with its string of dramatic aorists) shapes Lk. 1:46b, which it certainly seems to at face value, the peculiar feature of vv. 46b-47 may be the present verb. (It certainly stands out in a canticle otherwise relying almost exclusively on dramatic and gnomic aorists.) Why then introduce a present verb here? To exclude associating Mary’s attitude of praise with the past event makes little sense.
between vv. 46b and 47 in other respects, Farris 1985:117-18, Fitzmyer 1981:366 conclude that the verbs in each line function in precisely the same manner. I am inclined to agree with them.

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

Ps. 26:4

loʾyāšabî ţîm-mʾtê-šāweʾ (QAL. PF. 1 SG.)

wʾim naʾlāmîm loʾrāb ô (QAL. IMPF. 1 SG.)

I have not sat with scoundrels,

And I do not go in with hypocrites.

Is. 60:16

wʾyānaqt ʾnęłabeth ʾgōyîm (QAL PF. 3 SG. FEM.)

wʾšōd mʾlākîm tʾnāqî (QAL IMPF. 3 SG. FEM.)

You have sucked the milk of nations,

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

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

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

καὶ ηθλάσεις γάλα ἑθνῶν  
καὶ πλοῦτον βασιλέων φάγεσαι

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

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

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

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

22 Porter 1989:131-132 illustrates the use of tense shifting in Hellenistic Greek poetry, cautioning that Luke’s use of the device may not necessarily represent a Semitic influence, “although Semitic enhancement on the basis of a Semitic source may remain a possibility.” At best, Porter’s examples indicate that a sudden shift in tense would not have done terrible violence to a Greek ear, at least in the marked language of poetry. However, he provides no examples of a tense alternation in a synonymous parallelism paralleling vv. 46b-47. Only Hebrew texts provide a precedent for this phenomenon, pointing unequivocally to a Semitic background for the tense alternation.
2005;58 finds it unlikely that the verb carries a different shade of meaning in these two instances. 1 Pet. 1:8 and Rev. 19:7 represent the only other active occurrences of the verb.

**vv. 48-49**

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

**vv. 51-53**

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

For exegesis, much depends on the interpretation of the aorists. Are they ordinary observations of past history, or gnomic attestations of God’s usual conduct? Are they ingressive aorists, signaling the beginning of eschatological events? Or are they influenced by the prophetic perfect in Hebrew, and thus pictures of the future? In
sum, is this hymn a genuine praise to God for help granted, or a hidden prophecy of hoped-for salvation? (Bovon 2002:57)

From the outset, one must recognize that the infancy narrative already provides an instance of at least one of the divine acts celebrated in vv. 51-53. The hymn’s observation that God has “looked upon” Mary in her “lowness” (ταπείνωσιν; v. 48a) classes her among “the lowly” (ταπεινούς) “raised up” in v. 52b (Brown 1993:336, 361). One can thereby exclude the possibility that vv. 51-53 describe a strictly future state of affairs, whether concentrated in the death and resurrection of Jesus (so Brown 1993:36323), or in an eschatological point beyond (so Plummer 1902:33).24 Furthermore, the line immediately preceding and framing the unit suggests the validity of vv. 51-53 in all ages: “his mercy extends to those who fear him, to generations and generations” (v. 50; cf. Ps. 105:17). Reflective of this, the affirmations in vv. 51-53 parallel or adapt others throughout the Hebrew Bible (see Litwak 2005:108; Brown 1993:359; Marshall 1978:84-85). Consequently, Dupont 1980:331-35 is incorrect in identifying the aorists as ingressive, and Plummer 1902:33, Gunkel and Begrich 1998:55-56, and Fanning 1990:273 are

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

24 Many interpretations of the canticle read theological points into its grammatical features, when the context and content of the canticle sufficiently communicate them. So here, the eschatological thrust of the hymn is “provided not by the aorists themselves but by the entire argument of the hymn” (Porter 1989:133), especially the messianic theme of vv. 54-55.
incorrect in identifying them as the equivalent of Hebr. prophetic perfects (essentially, proleptic aorists). Per Luther, vv. 51-53 describe “the works of God that He always has done, always does, and always will do” (*Sermon on the Magnificat*).

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

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

\[τόξον δυνατών ἠσθένησεν\]\(^{26}\)

\[καί ἀσθενοῦντες περιεζώσαντο δύναμιν\] (AOR. MID. 3 PL.)

\[πλήρεις ἄρτων ἠλαττώθησαν\] (AOR. PAS. 3 PL.)

---

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

\(^{26}\) This verb is AOR. ACT. 3 SG., but translates a verbless construction in the Hebr.
καὶ οἱ πεινῶντες παρῆκαν γῆν

ὅτι στείρα ἔτεκεν ἑπτὰ

καὶ ἡ πολλὴ ἐν τέκνοις ἠσθένησεν

The bows of the mighty are shattered,

But the ones who stumbled gird on strength.

Those who were full hire themselves out for bread,

But those who were hungry cease to hunger.

Even the barren gives birth to seven,

But she who has many children languishes.

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

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

---

27 The comparison to 1 Sam. 2:4-5 supports the conclusion that vv. 51-53 should not be understood in a primarily predictive sense.
praises God’s enduring character, embracing instances far beyond the confines of her personal experience.

vv. 54-55

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

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

In context, then, the aorist in Lk. 1:54 has a definite past event in view: the arrival of the messiah (i.e., the Annunciation). Mary’s election is so intimately connected to the realization of the messianic promises that the hymn praises “God’s choice of the lowly mother
and his overturning of society as one act." This eschatological orientation may embrace vv. 51-53 as well, but not to the exclusion of their gnomic sense.

USE OF THE INFINITIVE

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

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


29 Absent in v. 54, for instance, is the ֵ which most frequently precedes infinitives of result (cf. Lk. 57), and the ֵ preceding infinitives of cause (cf. Lk. 2:4).
infinitival clauses (IQM, col. 14.6; text in Charlesworth 1994:124-125; Farris 1985:29, 80-81; see 3.2. for further discussion).

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

**USE OF PARTICIPLES**

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

**VERBLESS CLAUSES**

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

Seventeen definite articles appear in the hymn: ἡ ψυχή (v. 46b), τὸν κύριον (v. 46b), τὸ πνεῦμα (v. 47), τῷ θεῷ (v. 47), τῷ σωτῆρι (v. 47), τὴν ταπείνωσιν (v. 48a), τῆς δούλης (v. 48a), τοῦ νόν (v. 48b), αἱ γενεαὶ (v. 48b), ὁ δυνατός (v. 49a), τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (v. 49b), τὸ ἔλεος (v. 50a), τοῖς φοβομένοις (v. 50b), τοὺς πατέρας (v. 55a), τῷ Ἀβραάμ (v. 55b), τῷ σπέρματι (v. 55b), τὸν αἰὼν (v. 55b).

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

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

v. 50

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

v. 51

Two syntactic issues are concentrated in the phrase διανοίας καρδίας αὐτῶν (v. 51b). First, the construction καρδίας αὐτῶν (v. 51) is a false concord (singular-plural). Appearing throughout the New Testament and Old Greek, it reproduces a Hebrew expression (e.g., in Ps. 10:17 [9:38 LXX]: τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν for Hebr. libām; Jung 2004:106-08). Secondly, it is unclear whether the dative διανοία is an adjunct to the verb διεσκόρπισεν (the proud are “scattered... in the thoughts of their hearts”) or the substantive adjective ὑπερηφάνους (“those who are proud in the thoughts of their hearts” are scattered). Insofar as the former option is more often construed with a preposition (cf. Rom. 1:24), the latter is preferable (Bovon 2002:62).
It is unclear which verb governs the semantic datives in v. 55b. One explanation posits that the semantic datives are indirect objects of μνησθήναι (“to remember [his] mercy... to our fathers”). In this interpretation, v. 55b continues the thought of v. 54b, with v. 54a as a parenthetical statement (so RV; NEB; NIV; Marshall 1978:85). A comparison of Lk. 1:54b with Ps. 98 [LXX 97]:3 (ἐμνήσθη τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἴακωβ) recommends linking μνησθήναι ἐλέους with τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ (Bovon 2002:63). Similarly, a comparison with Mic. 7:20b (which Fitzmyer 1981:368 identifies as the likely model for the present passage) suggests understanding the promise to the fathers as a distinct notion differing from that of extending mercy to Abraham (Marshall 1978:85):

LXX Mic. 7:20

δώσεις ἀλήθειαν τῷ Ἴακωβ

ἐλεοῦ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ

καθότι ὁμοσάς τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν

κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἐμπροσθέν

You will give truth to Jacob,

mercy to Abraham,

As you promised our fathers,

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

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

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

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

32 Fitzmyer 1981:116 links the more frequent use of πρὸς + accusative in Luke-Acts to its frequent use in the Old Greek, where it translates Hebr. ℓ- or ʿel before a noun. In general, however, the use of simple case constructions has decreased relative to prepositional phrases in Hellenistic and New Testament Greek (Zerwick 1963 § 80a).
forms here. I submit that the alternation of πρὸς + accusative and the two datives in v. 55 represents another form of stylistic alternation and grammatical parallelism in the Magnificat.

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

Ps. 78:69

\[\text{wayyibhen k'me-rāmīn miqdāšō} \]

\[\text{k'ereš y'sādāh l'ōlām} \]

And he builds his sanctuary like high palaces

Like the earth, which he established forever

Job 40:21

\[\text{tāhat še'ālām yišqāh} \]

\[\text{b'setēr qānēh âhīssāh} \]

\(^{33}\) Compare this phenomenon to more general forms of prepositional or prepositional prefix alternation manifest in Hebrew poetry (Kugel 1981:22).
Under shady trees he lies,

Under the cover of reed and marsh.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebr. verb +ʾél</th>
<th>Hebr. verb + (prep. prefix) l-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ez. 37:11</td>
<td>1 Sam [LXX 1 Kgdms] 31:4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gk. verb
+ πρὸς + Acc.

Hebr. wayyoʾmer ʾelāy
Hebr. wayyoʾmer ἐνοσέʹ

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

**Word Order**

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

---

34 The presence of both may address a need to further compensate for the adverb + predicate (καθὼς ἐλάλησεν) introducing v. 55a. Of related interest, this verse seems to exemplify Behaghel’s Law, which observes that the longest item tends to occur towards the latter end of a series.
order to OV in v. 53a,b is stylistic, and has been explored in the section “Marked Language Features” within this chapter.

USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

As noted earlier, the marked language of biblical poetry prefers a paratactic style, employing coordinating conjunctions to link clauses (in Greek, καὶ) rather than subordinating conjunctions. Accordingly, most clauses of the Magnificat are loosely associated by the conjunction καὶ (vv. 47, 49b 52b, 53b), if they are associated at all. In vv. 49b-50, the canticle uses the conjunction καὶ to link two nominal sentences modifying ὁ δυνατὸς (v. 49a): ὁ δυνατὸς, καὶ ἄγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτὸν. BDF § 442.6 identifies the use of καὶ in this text as a Hebraism. In such instances, Greek syntax prefers a hypotactic structure, creating modifying relative clauses through the use of the relative pronoun τὸ. The conjunction ὅτι is used twice, each time to introduce causal subordinate clauses (vv. 48a, 49a). As noted earlier, the first of these is the initial motive clause of the canticle, identifying the divine acts that occasion Mary’s praise. In this light, the conjunction ὅτι is the counterpart of the Hebr. conjunction קִ, familiar in the Psalms (e.g., Ps. 30:1; Brown 1993:336).

The conjunction γὰρ also appears in the canticle (v. 48b) also in a subordinating, rather than coordinating, function. As expected, the conjunction occupies the second position, following the particle ἵδι. Brown (1993:333-334, 336) identifies the construction ἵδι γὰρ as “very Lukan,” appearing six times in Luke-Acts (1:44, 48; 2:10; 6:23; 17:21; Acts 9:11), but only once in the rest of the New Testament (2 Cor. 7:11). (By contrast, ὅτι ἵδι occurs only twice
in Luke-Acts [Lk. 23:29; Acts 5:25].) The expression ἰδοὺ γὰρ also appears in the Old Greek, where it renders such expressions as kî hinneh (e.g., Is. 66:15) and hinneh nā (e.g., Job 33:2). Its use in that corpus may account for its more frequent occurrence in the infancy narrative (three of six instances in Luke-Acts). In light of these facts, there is probably no semantic significance in the choice of ἰδοὺ γὰρ rather than ὅτι ἰδοὺ in this line. The choice and employment of the former conjunction simply reflects the diction of the infancy narrative in particular, and Luke as a whole. On this basis, one could read v. 48b (ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριωσῶιν με πᾶσαι ἡ γένεια) as a second motive clause, parallel to the preceding ὅτι clause (v. 48a).

**Complex Sentence Types**

Two causal subordinate clauses appear in the canticle, both employing the clause-initial conjunction ὅτι. The first clause occurs in v. 48a, and is subordinate to the opening two lines of the hymn (vv. 46b-47): μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον / καὶ ἡγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρι μου / ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ (v. 46b-48a). This is the first motive clause of the hymn, and identifies Mary’s visitation and conception as the cause of her rejoicing in the hymn. The second is subordinate to this line, and immediately follows it: ὅτι ἐποίησέν ὦι μεγάλα ὁ δυνατός (v. 49a). The verbs in all three clauses appear in the indicative mood.
No relative clauses appear in the canticle. As noted earlier, two instances where Greek syntax would have preferred relative clauses are instead rendered as nominative sentences introduced by coordinate conjunctions (vv. 49a-50a; Marshall 1978:83).

\[\text{In future sections, I will omit a discussion of syntactic categories irrelevant to the text of a particular canticle. In this instance, however, it is worth reviewing the reason for the absence of relative clauses in the Magnificat.}\]
2.3. Benedictus (Song of Zechariah)

Text

Lk. 1:68-79

68 εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεός τοῦ Ἰσραήλ,

69 ὃτι ἐπισκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ,

69 καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν

ἐν οίκῳ Δαυεὶδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ,

70 καθὼς ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’ αἰώνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ,

71 σωτηρίαν εἰς ἔχθρῶν ἡμῶν

καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισοῦντων ἡμᾶς. 36

72 ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν

καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ,

73 ἄρκον δὲ ὁμοσεν πρὸς Ἅβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν,

τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν 74 ἀφόβως ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν ὑποσθέντας

λατρεύειν αὐτῷ 75 ἐν ὑστοτητί καὶ δικαιοσύνη

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

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

καὶ σὺ δὲ παιδίον, προφήτης υψίστου κληθήσῃ:

τοῦ δούναι γνώσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ

ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν

διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν,

ἐν οἷς ἐπισκέψεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους

ἐπιφάναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ βανάτου καθημένοις,

τὸ κατευθύναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὅδον εἰρήνης.

Marked Language Character

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

38 A number of mss. show ἐπεσκέψατο. See discussion under “Tense, Mood, and Diathesis.”

39 Numerous citations appear in Gunkel and Begrich 1998:27. Gunkel and Begrich also note that the use of an introductory berakah formulae is rare in the Psalms (Ps. 144:1), but frequent in biblical prose and later apocryphal literature. The first example cited above is more consistent with the use of berakah formulae in the Psalms, which frequently open new strophes or conclude hymns.
Ps. 28 [LXX 27]:6

εὐλογητὸς κύριος

ὅτι εἰσήκουσέν τὴς φωνῆς τῆς δεήσεώς μου

Blessed is the Lord,

for he has heard the voice of my petitions.

Tobit 13:1-2a

εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ ζῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

καὶ ἡ βασίλεια αὐτοῦ

ὅτι αὐτὸς μαστιγοὶ καὶ ἐλέη... .

Blessed is the God who lives forever,

And [blessed] is his kingdom,

For he scourges and has mercy... .

Most lines of the hymn can be considered couplets, including: vv. 68, 69, 71, 72, 76, 77, 78, 79, and arguably, 74b-75. However, in striking contrast to the Magnificat, parallelism does not seem to characterize the majority of these couplets (vv. 71, 72, 79). Still, the loosely strung but interconnected clauses of the canticle create a pattern of “emphasis and enrichment,” evident in numerous appositive relationships (Tannehill 1991:33-34). A repetitive effect
emerges from the whole canticle, consistent with the spirit of parallelism. Repetition in the form of conduplicatio is also apparent in the reuse of various key or “theme” words in the canticle: σωτηρίας // σωτηρίαν (vv. 69a, 71); χειρὸς // χειρὸς (vv. 71, 74) ἔχθρων // ἔχθρων (vv. 71, 74); δῶς // δῶν (vv. 76b, 79b; Tannehill 1991:34).

**TENSE, MOOD, AND DIATHESIS**

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

**vv. 68-75**

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

40 Here, the verb “raise up” is used in the sense “to provide, prepare” (cf. Lk. 7:16; Acts. 13:22; Judg. 3:9; 1 Sam. 2:35; at times with undertones of “to conceive”: Gen. 38:8). Some read an additional, implicit reference to the resurrection (cf. Farris 1985:135). The language of this text compares to the fifteenth benediction of the Shemoneh Esreh (Marshall 1978:91; Brown 1993:386).
Accordingly, all three aorists in the unit share the same past point of reverence: the events of the infancy narratives. In the angelic messages, God has visited and delivered Israel.

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

vv. 76-79

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

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

42 Brown (1993:373) considers the aorist the lectio difficilior “since in the chronology of the infancy narrative Jesus has not yet ‘visited us,’” that is, he has not yet been born. This must
1978:94 identify the aorist variant ἐπεσκέψατο as the assimilation, reproducing the ἐπεσκέψατο in v. 68b and forming an inclusio. Farris 1985:128 appropriately calls the question “an almost insoluble one.”

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

**USE OF THE INFINITIVE**

The most outstanding syntactic feature of the canticle is its use of infinitives to introduce clauses in a series. As noted in 2.2, this feature appears in Qumranic literature, be, at best, a secondary concern, since the ἐπεσκέψατο in v. 68b has remained an aorist within a series of aorists. Furthermore, it is uncertain that one should identify the “visitation” of the Messiah with his birth rather than with his conception.
particularly in the War Scroll’s “Hymn of the Return” (1QM, col. 14.4ff.; text in Charlesworth 1994:124-125), which contains a string of Hebr. $\ell$- infinitival clauses\(^43\):

1QM, col. 14.6

\textit{wlptwh ph ln'lmym}

\textit{lrnm bgbr[t . . ]rpwt}

\textit{llmd mlhmn}

and to open the mouth of the mute

to sing the might of . . .

to teach war to the weak

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

\(^{43}\) The parallels between this hymn and the Benedictus have invited significant study and speculation (e.g., Flusser 1988:126-149).
Since τοῦ appears before the next infinitive in the canticle (τοῦ δοῦναι; v. 73b), Zerwick 1963 § 365, Farris 1985:138 suggest v. 73 continues the series of infinitival clauses in v. 72. However, it is more likely that τοῦ δοῦναι is appositional to the noun ὁρκον, divulging the content of the divine oath (Marshall 1978:92, Brown 1993:372). The Old Greek rendering of Jer. 11:5a uses the same infinitive and same noun in this fashion:

Jer. 11:5a

ὅπως στήσω τὸν ἡρξον μου δὲ ὡμοσά τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν

tοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς γῆν ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι

καθὼς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη

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

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

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

44 By contrast, Burk 2006:67 identifies it as an adverbial use of the genitive articular infinitive, encoding purpose.
purpose governed by ἐπισκέψεται (v. 78b; “[the Dawn] will visit us... to shine”; Marshall 1978:95). The second infinitive, τοῦ κατευθύνα (v. 79b), is parallel to the first, and also an infinitive of purpose following ἐπισκέψεται (“to shine in the darkness... to guide our feet...”). Both describe the mission of the Messiah. Notably, in both of these pairs, an articular infinitive follows a non-articular one, as expected in Luke.

USE OF PARTICIPLES

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

The opening line of the hymn (v. 68a) uses the adjective εὐλογητὸς rather than the participle εὐλογημένος. The adjective is characteristically reserved for divine subjects (Mk. 14:61; Lk. 1:68; Rom. 1:25; 9:5; 2 Cor. 1:12; 11:31; Eph. 1:3; 1 Pet. 1:3), while the participle is not so restricted (cf. Lk. 1:42; Bovon 2002:72).

VERBLESS CLAUSES

One verbless clause appears in the Benedictus: εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεός τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (v. 68a). This nominal sentence is nearly identical to the Old Greek translation of the verbless Hebr. formula bārûh yhwh ʾelōhē yišrāʾēl (1 Sam. 25:32; 1 Kgs. 1:48; Ps. 41:13 [LXX 40:14]). Accordingly, it should be understood as a Hebraic formula. Brown 1993:370 identifies an
implicit subjunctive value in the sentence (ἤ); Plummer 1902:40, on the other hand, supplies an optative (εἴη). In fact, the indicative is most appropriate here. When supplying verbs in nominal sentences of praise, the Old Greek prefers to use indicative forms, particularly in *berakah* formulae (cf. Ps. 119 [LXX 118]:12; Deichgräber 1967:30-32, Milling 1972). In turn, New Testament doxologies containing a verb always employ an indicative form—never an optative, for instance: ἐστιν εὐλογητός (Rom 1:25), ἐστιν ἡ ὄψα: (1 Pet. 4:11; cf. Gal. 1:5). In linking blessings or glory to God, these formulae extol “what is already a reality” (TDNT 2:248).

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

**USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE**

The Greek text of the Benedictus contains eleven definite articles, appearing in the following phrases: ὁ θεός (v. 68a), τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (v. 68a), τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ (v. 68b), τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’ αἰώνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (v. 70), τῶν μισοῦντων ἡμᾶς (pize hatandane; v. 71b), τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν (v. 72a), τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν (v. 73a), τὰς ἡμέρας ἡμῶν (v. 75b), τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ (v. 77b), and τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις (paim in riqiza jah skadau daupus sitandam; v. 79a), and τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν (v. 79b). The addition of a definite article τοῦ before Ἰσραήλ (v. 68a) alters the more familiar Old Greek formula, εὐλογητός χύριος ὁ θεός Ἰσραήλ (1 Sam. 25:32; 1 Kgs. 1:48; Ps. 41
[LXX 40:14]. A desire to reveal the case of the indeclinable noun likely inspires its addition (Wallace 1996:240-241).

Also of note, the article is absent before a number of nouns governing genitives in the Benedictus: ἐν οἴκῳ Δαοείδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ (v. 69b), ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν (v. 71a), διαθήκης ἀγίας αὐτοῦ (v. 72b), ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν (v. 74a), ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ (v. 76a), διά σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν (v. 78a).

BDF § 259.3 sees the high frequency of such omissions as an indication of "strong Semitic coloring." In Hebrew, the semantically definite head noun of a construct relation (equivalent to a genitive construction) is anarthrous. The Old Greek often omits the article when rendering these constructions (e.g., Ps. 34:15 [LXX 33:16]).

**CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX**

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

**vv. 68-71**

In my discussion of verbless clauses, I identified the clause-initial noun σωτηρίαν (v. 71a) as an abstract appositive to the phrase κέρας σωτηρίας (v. 69a), precisely on the basis of the lexical link between the two words. The reason for the polyptoton is that σωτηρίαν is in apposition to the head noun of the noun phrase κέρας σωτηρίας.
vv. 72-79

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

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

**Word Order**

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

The Benedictus departs from the starkly paratactic style of the Magnificat to include two relative clauses (vv. 73, 78b-79) and a single comparative clause (v. 70). The subordinating conjunction ὅτι also makes a single appearance in the canticle, occurring in v. 68b. Nevertheless, parataxis does frame much of the canticle, though not through the extensive use of clause-initial καὶ, as in the Magnificat (the conjunction καὶ introduces only three clauses of the canticle: vv. 68, 72b, 76a). Instead, as noted earlier, the Benedictus relies heavily on the use of unconjoned or appositive infinitival clauses (vv. 72, 73b, 74b, 77a, 79a,b).

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

COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

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

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

**Special Issues and Constructions**

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

wa"šeh hēṣed 'im "dōnî 'abrahām

καὶ ποίησον ἔλεος μετὰ τοῦ κυρίου μου Αβраαμ
2.4. Gloria (The Angelic Hymn)

TEXT

Lk. 2:14

δόξα ἐν υψίστοις θεῷ

καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας.45

SECTION NOTES

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

MARKED LANGUAGE FEATURES

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

45 The Byzantine MT and some patristic sources show ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. See discussion under “Special Issues and Constructions.”
Lk. 19:37b-38

tὸ πλήθος τῶν μαθητῶν χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεόν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ... λέγοντες,

Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου:

ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη

καὶ δόξα ἐν ψυστοῖς.

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

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

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

46 The phrase ἐν ψυστοῖς refers to the abode of God, and is a synonym for heaven (cf. Ps. 148:1). Accordingly, the phrase parallels ἐπὶ γῆς, a reference to the domain of humans (cf. Ps. 78:69 for a possible parallel).
δόξα (A) ἐν υψίστοις (B) θεῷ (C)
καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς (B’) εἰρήνη (A’) ἐν ἀνθρώποις
εὐδοκίας (C’).

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

**Verbless Clauses**

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

**Use of the Definite Article**

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

---

47 As Watson (1994:338) observes, in partial chiasms, it is also possible that the unchanged elements (C-C’) stand outside the chiasmus.
coda omits the article before a monadic noun as the object of a preposition (γῆς), an abstract noun (εἰρήνη), and a generic noun as the object of a preposition (ἀνθρώποις).

**CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX**

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

**WORD ORDER**

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

**USE OF CONJUNCTIONS**

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

**SPECIAL ISSUES AND CONSTRUCTIONS**

A textual critical issue appears in v. 14b, with two major attested variants: ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας (cited in our text) and ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκια. The first uses εὐδοκίας as a genitive modifier of ἀνθρώποις, and can be translated, “among men of favor” (i.e., among favored men). The second uses the nominative form εὐδοκία, with the meaning, “among men, favor” (or “favor among men”).
Each variant represents a different analysis of the structure of v. 14. The first reads the verse as a bicolon, the interpretation offered throughout this section. In this reading, outlined earlier, each coda containing a nominative noun (δόξα, εἰρήνη), a locative prepositional phrase (ἐν υψίστοις, ἐπὶ γῆς), and a reference to the divine or human (θεῷ, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας):

Glory in the highest to God
And on earth, peace among men of favor.

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

Glory in the highest to God
And on earth, peace
(And) among men, favor.

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

48 In Brown 1993:404 suggests a variant of this model, in which ἐν ἀνθρώποις is not a locative prepositional phrase, but an item paralleling θεῷ. In this model, the locative prepositional phrases (A) and references to the divine or human (B) are distributed in the three codas as follows: AB / A / B.
33:11:9), utilizing the Hebr. ḫāṣôn, a noun the Old Greek often translates as ἀγαθὸν (e.g., Ps. 51:18 [LXX 50:20]; (Marshall 1978:112, Bovon 2002:91). In Hebrew, ḫāṣôn refers to the favor or delight of a superior (so Pss. 5:12; 51:18; Prov. 14:35). It does not refer to the “good will” of men (as in the Vulgate: hominibus bonae voluntatis).
2.5. Nunc Dimittis (Song of Simeon)

TEXT

Lk. 2:29-32

εὐν ἀπολύεις τὸν δούλον σου, δέσποτα,

κατὰ τὸ ρήμα σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

δι εἴδον οἱ φθαλμοὶ μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου,

δ ήτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν,

φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἑθνῶν

καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ.

SECTION NOTES

No infinitives, participles, or verbless clauses appear in the Greek text of the canticle. Consequently, there is no need to include discussions of the “Use of the Infinitive,” the “Use of Participles,” and “Verbless Clauses” in this section. The canticle also contains no constructions that will require extraordinary discussion under the heading “Lexical Differences and Special Constructions.”
The first line of the canticle lacks an expression of praise, analogous to those in the previous three hymns (Lk. 1:46, 68; 2:14). Nevertheless, the preceding line (v. 28) records that Simeon “blessed God” with the words of the canticle (καὶ εὐλόγησεν τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἶπεν), an indication of its character as a hymn of praise. A strong parallel appears in Jubilees 45, which elaborates Jacob’s words to Joseph in Gen. 46:30 with explicit berakah formulae (Farris 1985:155):

Jub. 45:3-4

Now let me die since I have seen you,

and now may the Lord God of Israel be blessed,

the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac

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

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

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

Blessed is the Lord my God for ever and ever,

and blessed is His name.

Farris 1985:145 is too hopeful when he identifies v. 29 as a “Word of Praise” parallel to Lk. 1:46, 68. As Gunkel and Begrich 1998:29 observes, a number of psalms omit, or use looser forms of, the introductory words of praise typical of the biblical hymn. Such appears to be the case here.
One should consider the description of divine salvation in vv. 30-32 as an implicit act of praise in the canticle: extolling God’s glory precisely by recounting his acts. The line introducing that description (v. 30) is a motive clause, paralleling those of the Magnificat and Benedictus (Lk. 1:48a,b, 68b).

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

TENSE, MOOD, AND DIATHESIS

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

Two aorists also appear in the canticle: εἶδον (v. 30) and ἠτοίμασας (v. 31). Within the narrative, the first verb refers to Simeon’s experience of the Christ child (continuing through
his recitation of the hymn; v. 28). The second refers to the public manifestation (“before the face of all peoples”) of the Christ child (“the salvation”) through the events of the infancy narrative, especially his birth.

**USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE**

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

**CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX**

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

**WORD ORDER**

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

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

Complex Sentence Types

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

Relative Clause Syntax

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

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

**POETIC DEVICES**

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

*Line*

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

---

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

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

Stylistic Structures

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

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

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

Phonaesthetics

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

MAGNIFICAT

The Magnificat makes the most extensive use of parallelism in the development of poetic line (6/9 lines). It is also the only canticle to boast phonaesthetic effects and stylistic grammatical alterations.
Table 2.2. Marked Language Syntax of the Magnificat.

A. Line

A.1. Couplet Structure

A.1.1. Couplets

\[ (\text{vv. 46b-47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55}) \]

9

A.1.2. Other

\[ (\text{N/A}) \]

0

B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

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

\[ (\text{vv. 46b-47, 49, 52, 53}) \]

4

B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ

\[ (\text{vv. 51, 55}) \]

2

B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ

\[ (\text{N/A}) \]

0

B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ

\[ (\text{vv. 48, 50, 54}) \]

3

B.2. Loose infinitival syntax

\[ (\text{v. 54b}) \]

1

B.3. Verbless clauses⁵

\[ (\text{vv. 49b, 50}) \]

2

---

⁵ Although I analyzed the verbless clauses merely as a feature of Hebrew style, they certainly support the compactness of the hymn. Any translation that might insert verbs into these sentences might sacrifice at least some of the compactness of the hymn.
B.4. Limited use of relative constructions
(N/A)

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
(vv. 46b-47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55)

C.2. Chiasm
(thematic ABBA and verb-object ABAB//BABA; vv. 52-53)

D. Stylistic Grammatical Forms

D.1. Non-semantic Tense Alternation
(present // aorist; vv. 46b-47)

D.2. Non-semantic Case/Preposition Alternation
(πρὸς + accusative // dative; v. 55)

E. Phonaesthetics

E.1. Rhyme: Isoptoton
(ABAB; vv. 52-53)

E.2. Non-consecutive Partial Hypogram
(ταπεινοῦς / πεινῶντας – vv. 52-53)

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

53 Each rhyming pair is counted as a single instance of the phenomenon.
Benedictus

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

Table 2.2. Marked Language Syntax of the Benedictus.

A. Line

A.1. Couplet Structure

A.1.1. Couplets
   (vv. 68, 69, 71, 72, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78, 79) 9

A.1.2. Other
   (vv. 70, 73) 2

B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola
   (vv. 71, 72) 2

B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ
   (vv. 79) 1

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

B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ
   (vv. 68, 69, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78) 3

B.2. Loose infinitival syntax
   (vv. 72, 73b, 74b, 77a, 79a,b) 6
B.3. Appositive noun phrases
(vv. 71, 73a) 2

B.4. Verbless clauses
(vv. 68a) 1

B.5. Limited use of relative constructions
(EXCEPTIONS: vv. 73, 78b-79) -2

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
(vv. 71, 72, 79) 3

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

GLORIA

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

54 Negative values indicate the presence of relative clauses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.4. Marked Language Syntax of the Gloria.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Line</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1. Couplet Structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.1. Couplets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.2. Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Terseness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1. Parataxis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.2. Verbless Clauses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Stylistic Structures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1. Parallelisms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.2. Chiasm
(AB-C // BA-C; v. 14) 1

**NUNC DIMITTIS**

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

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

A. Line

A.1. Couplet Structure

A.1.1. Couplets
(vv. 29, 30-31, 32) 3

A.1.2. Other
(N/A) 0

B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola
(v. 32) 1

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

B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ
(N/A) 0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ
(vv. 29, 30-31)

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

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

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
(v. 32)

SUMMARY

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

Only 8/22 couplets employ καὶ to conjoin lines (34.7%). Notably, 8/11 parallelisms use καὶ in this fashion (72.7%), compared to 0/11 non-parallelisms (0.0%). Although our sample size is small, this relationship is nonetheless striking. It appears the Lukan canticles associate the paratactic use of καὶ with the construction of parallelisms. By contrast, 12/22 couplets
string clauses together without the use of coordinate conjunction (54.5%); this phenomenon is the most common means of supporting terseness in the canticles.
CHAPTER 3
GOTHIC

3.0. Introduction

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

SOURCE TEXT

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

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

CHAPTER OUTLINE

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

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

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

Tense, Mood, Diathesis

Gothic does not preserve the three-way aspecual oppositions still evident in Greek (imperfective-perfective-perfect). Furthermore, Gothic manifests only a two-way opposition of tense, distinguishing the present (present) and preterite (past). The latter generally renders synthetic aorists, imperfects, and perfects in the Greek text, though in certain examples, the
perfectivizing prefix *ga-* is added when translating aorists (Ramat 1998:403). Gothic also lacks a future tense; it renders Greek futures with either a present indicative or present optative (Klein 1992a:341).

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

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

*Use of the Infinitive*

As we will see below, Gothic often utilizes its own infinitive to render Greek infinitives, though not exclusively. However, where Greek distinguishes between aorist, present, perfect, and future infinitives, Gothic uses a single infinitival form. Gothic may also render Greek articular infinitives with either a plain infinitive or a (prepositional) *du* + infinitive construction (Callaway 1913:231).
The Gothic translator sometimes renders infinitives of purpose, especially those with τοῦ, with an ei + optative construction (Streitberg 1920:210). For example, in a non-poetic passage of the infancy narratives, he translates a Greek infinitive of purpose with ei + participle + optative: καὶ ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι // jah iddjedun allai, ei melidai weseina (Lk. 2:3).

Use of Participles

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

Verbless Clauses

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

Use of the Definite Article

Gothic does not possess obligatory definite or indefinite articles. Accordingly, the Gothic Bible fails to translate thousands of definite articles in the Greek New Testament. The peculiarity of any omission in the Gothic text is striking, and speaks to the considerable
distance between Greek and Gothic with respect to this syntactic category. Nevertheless, Gothic does possess a demonstrative adjective (*sa*/pa) with anaphoric and deictic functions before a noun. Under certain conditions, this demonstrative adjective can stand where a definite article appears in the Greek. When a demonstrative adjective determines a noun, any attributive adjectives governed by the same noun observe the weak inflection.

**Case and Number Syntax**

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

---

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

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

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

**Use of Conjunctions**

The Gothic text generally renders the coordinate conjunction καὶ as jah, and the subordinate clause-initial conjunction ὅτι with a variety of Gothic conjunctions, including unte and pande(i). The Greek particle δὲ only appears in the combination καὶ . . . δὲ; in these

---

56 In my study of individual canticles, I will omit discussions of word order where the target language text does not deviate from the word order of the Greek, unless that fact is particularly noteworthy in a given passage.
constructions, the Gothic Bible generally translates δὲ as pan (Lambdin 2006:59). Lastly, conjunctions translating γὰρ include: allis, auk, raihtis, and unte. The first three, like γὰρ, are postpositional; unte, by contrast, is clause-initial. Notably, it is unclear how the translator selected between allis, auk, and raihtis. However, he employs unte “when dealing with a simple action in the past” (Lambdin 2006:66). Only allis and auk appear in the canticles. All occurrences of allis, and nearly all occurrences of the postpositive auk, translate the Greek postpositive γὰρ (Lambdin 2006:67).

**Complex Sentence Types**

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

**Relative Clause Syntax**

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

Text

Lk. 1:46b-55\(^{57}\)

\(^{46}\)mikileid saiwała meina fraujan,

\(^{47}\)jah svegneid ahma meins du guda nasjand meinamma. \(^{48}\)unte insahv du hnaiveinai piujos seinaizos;

sai allis, fram himma nu audagjand mik alla kunja.

\(^{49}\)unte gatawida mis mikilein sa mahteiga,

jah weih namo is.

\(^{50}\)jah armahairtei is in aldins alde\(^{58}\)

paim ogandam ina.

\(^{51}\)gatawida swinpein in arma seinamma,

distahida mikilfuhtans gahugdai hairtins seinis; \(^{52}\)gadrausida mahteigans af stolam

jah ushauhida gahnaiwidans;

\(^{57}\) When presenting the target language texts, I will preserve the couplet format of the Greek text contained in Nestle-Aland 28.

\(^{58}\) The expression in aldins alde (in + accusative plural + genitive plural) does not reflect the reading reconstructed in our critical text. It instead corresponds to a Greek εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν (of the Byzantine/Majority Text and early codices, including A; cf. the Old Latin reading in saecula saeculorum [e.g., in the Veronensis]). This is also the reading Streitberg 2000:88 reconstructs for the Greek Vorlage.
By strictly following the word order of the Greek, the canticle preserves the parallelisms, paratactic style, and single chiasm (vv. 52-53) of the Greek text. However, the non-consecutive partial hypogram at the center of the chiasm (ταπεινούς / πεινῶντας; vv. 52b-53a) is lost, as the corresponding Gothic lexemes corresponding to these Greek have less similar sound shapes (gahnaiwidans / gredagans). Nevertheless, these two words do share like endings, unlike their Greek counterparts (which represent different declensions). A new and non-deliberate isoptoton at the heart of vv. 52-53 strengthens the impression of the larger chiasm.

Also lost is the ABAB isoptoton in the same unit. The Greek text rhymes the genitive plural endings of ἰδαν and ἀγαθῶν in lines 52a, 53a (A-A'). However, whereas the Greek preposition ἀπό takes genitive objects (in this instance, ἰδαν; v. 52a), its corresponding Gothic preposition, af, takes dative objects (stolam). The dative ending of stolam does not rhyme with the genitive ending of ἱουφε (v. 53a).
At best, only a simpler ABCB rhyme is preserved in the tetracolon (vv. 52-53), pairing the masculine accusative plurals of *gahnaïwidans* (v. 52b) and *lausans* (v. 53b):

A  
\[ gandrausida mahteigans af stolam \]
\[ jah ushauhida gahnaïwidans; \]

A’  
\[ gredagans gasopida piupe \]
\[ jah gabignandans insandida lausans. \]

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

vv. 46b-47

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

mikileid saiwalana meina fraujan, (Pres. Act. Ind. 3 Sg.)
jah swegneid ahma meins du guda... (Pres. Act. Ind. 3 Sg.)

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

59 Neither the Byzantine nor Latin traditions witness a parallel reading. Instead, as Jared S. Klein (1992:368) notes, “we are dealing with an independent Sprachgefühl here on the part of the Gothic translator.”
did the translator rightly perceive, and attempt to capture, the actual sense of the Greek text (i.e., the semantic equivalency of the verbs)? Or, did he mean to correct the tense shift as an ostensible difficulty, inconsistency, or deficiency in the sense of the Greek text?

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

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

While it is surely true, as Klein points out . . . that the preterite would not as successfully convey the immediacy of Mary’s joy as the present does, it must also be noted that preterites are used in the following two lines to render aorists. Furthermore, aorists in the κοινή frequently expressed anterior meaning at this time as perfects and aorists began to fall together . . . so that a present translation, while rare,
would not be entirely unlicensed. In the last analysis, it seems best to recognize, with Klein, that some variability in the temporal-aspectual system did exist in the Gothic version, but that imitation of Greek syntactic patterns was far more common. (Drinka 2011:57).

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

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

---

60 It is unclear whether Drinka argues that at least some of the aorists in subsequent lines could also have been rendered as presents.
every reason to believe that the Gothic translator allowed \( \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda \omega \nu \varepsilon \) to determine the semantic sense of \( \eta \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \alpha \sigma \varepsilon \nu \) in this instance. In this, he apparently took a translation cue from the couplet structure and parallelism of the canticle itself (both marked language features). The peculiarity of his tense choice here fits the peculiar (i.e., marked) character of the passage as poetry.\(^6^1\)

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

**vv. 48-55**

Over the remainder of the canticle, the Gothic translator consistently renders finite aorists with Gothic preterites, three with the perfectivizing prefix \( ga-: \) \( \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \beta \varepsilon \psi \varepsilon \nu \) (\( insah; v. 48a \) \( \varepsilon \pi \o \iota \sigma \varepsilon \nu \) (\( gatawida; v. 49a, 51a \)), \( \delta \iota \iota \kappa \o \rho \pi \iota \sigma \varepsilon \nu \) (\( distahida; v. 51b \)), \( \kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \iota \varepsilon \nu \) (\( gadrausida; v. 52 \)), \( \dot{\upsilon} \psi \sigma \varepsilon \nu \) (\( ushauhida; v. 52b \)), \( \dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \iota \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \nu \) (\( gasohida; v. 53a \)), \( \dot{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \pi \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \iota \varepsilon \nu \) (\( insandida; v. 53b \)), \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \varepsilon \lambda \acute{\beta} \varepsilon \varepsilon \) (\( hleibida; v. 54 \)), and \( \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \nu \) (\( rodida; v. 55a \)). This includes the gnomic aorists of

\(^{61}\) In this study, we have sought to establish whether and where the marked language context of the canticles might have influenced translation decisions in the Classical Armenian, Gothic, and Church Slavonic versions. It most certainly has in this instance.
vv. 51-53. The one future verb in the Greek text of the canticle (μακαριοῦσιν; v. 48b) appears in the Gothic text as a present indicative. As v. 48b is not truly prospective (since Elizabeth has already called Mary “blessed”; Lk. 2:42-45), a present optative is inappropriate here. Finally, the Gothic text translates the one middle verb in the canticle (ἀντελάβετο; v. 54) as an active verb (hleibida). All of these choices fall within the regular translation pattern of the Gothic translator.

**Use of the Infinitive**

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

**Use of Participles**

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

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

USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

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

The Gothic text deviates from the cases of the Greek text in a number of places. Three instances reflect the translation of Greek genitive personal pronouns as Gothic pronominal possessive adjectives, which agree in case with their governing nouns. This includes two instances of the first person μου (v. 46b, 47), and one of the third person αὐτοῦ (v. 51a). A further four instances are due to differences in prepositional case governance. Greek ἀπό, for instance, exclusively governs genitive objects (τὸν νῦν [v. 48b]; ἰδρῶναν [v. 52a]). In the Gothic text, it corresponds in one instance to the Gothic fram, which exclusively governs the dative (himma nu [v. 48b]), and in the other to af, which also takes dative objects (stolam [v. 52a]).

Furthermore, the Gothic text twice translates the Greek preposition ἐπὶ as du (vv. 47, 48a). In the first instance, ἐπὶ governs a dative object (τῷ ἀγίῳ [v. 47]); in the second, it governs an accusative object (τὴν ταπείνωσιν [v. 48a]). However, the Gothic preposition du only takes dative objects: thus, du guda (v. 47), and du hnaïweinai (v. 48a). Gothic du also corresponds to the Greek preposition πρὸς, which always governs accusative objects. Thus, the accusative phrase τοῦς πατέρας (v. 55a) appears as a dative in the Gothic text: attam.

Notably, by using the preposition du, which assigns dative case to attam, the Gothic text eliminates the case disagreement of πρὸς τοῦς πατέρας ἡμῶν (v. 55a) and the string appositive to it, τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ (v. 55b). As noted in Chapter 2, this case disagreement is apparently another example of the stylistic alternation of grammatical forms in the Greek text. The verb ἐλάλησεν (v. 55a) governs both the πρὸς + accusative construction of v. 55a and the simple datives of v. 55b, a Greek expression of the “reversed ballast.
prepositions” found in Hebrew poetry. In the Gothic text, however, the substantives in both v. 55a and v. 55b are datives. Read together, they all appear to receive their case from the preposition *du* (*du attam unsairam / Abrahma jah fraiwa is und aiw* [v. 55a,b]). Yet again, if this time unintentionally, the Gothic translation has eliminated another form of stylistic grammatical alternation in the Magnificat.

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

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

**USE OF CONJUNCTIONS**

Five instances of the Greek coordinate conjunction *καὶ* are rendered with the corresponding Gothic conjunction *jah* (vv. 47, 49b, 50a, 52b, 53b). The only other occurrence of *καὶ* in our critical text appears in v. 50a, in the phrase εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς. However, as noted in note 51, this reading almost certainly does not represent the reading in the *Vorlage* of
the Gothic translation (which must have been εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν of the Byzantine/Majority Text tradition). Accordingly, the Gothic rendering *in aldins alde* does not represent a deliberate omission of the definite article.

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

**Complex Sentence Types**

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

Text

Lk. 1:68-79

68 piuhei g frauja guh Israelis,
   unte gaweisoda jah gawaurhta uslausein managein seinai,

69 jah urraisida haurn naseinais unsis
   in garda Daweidis ùiumagaus seinis

70 swaswe rodida þairh munþ weihaize þize fram anastodeinai
   aiwis praufete seinaize

71 giban63 nasein us fijandam unsaraim
   jah us handau allaize þize hatandane unsis

72 taajan armahairtipa bi attam unsaraim
   jah gamunan triggwos weihaizos seinaizos

73 aiþi þanai swor wiþra Abraham attan unsarana,
   ei gebi unsis74 unagein us handau fijande unsaraize64

63 This form reflects a variant reading τῶν ἀπ’ αἰῶνος, present in the Byzantine/Majority Text, and present in the reconstructed Vorlage of Streitberg (2000:90).

64 This form reflects the Byzantine/Majority Text reading ἐκ χειρὸς ἐξαρῶν ἡμῶν, indicated in note 35, and reconstructed in the Vorlage of Streitberg 2000:90.
The conservative word order of the Gothic text ensures that it preserves the loose, paratactic style of the Greek, as well as its three parallelisms (vv. 71, 72, 79). Furthermore, by its near one-to-one correspondence with the lexical items of the Greek text, the Gothic text succeeds at preserving the repetitive character of the canticle evident in the duplication of

---

65 The Gothic accusative allans reflects the accusative πάσας of the Byzantine/MT tradition. Our critical text reconstructs the dative πάσας.
certain theme words: *naseinains // nasein* (vv. 69a, 71); *handau // handau* (vv. 71, 74); *fijandam // fijande* (vv. 71, 74); *wigans // wig* (vv. 76b, 79b)

**TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS**

True to form, the Gothic translator consistently renders finite aorists with Gothic preterites, twice with the perfectivizing prefix *ga-*: ἐπεσκέψατο (*gaweisoda*; v. 68b), ἐποίησεν (*gawaurhta*; v. 68b), ἤγειρεν (*urraisida*; v. 69a), ἐλάλησεν (*rodida*; v. 70), ὤμοσεν (*swor*; v. 73a).

Three future verbs also appear in the Greek text of the canticle, translated in each instance with Gothic present indicatives. The first, a future (κληθήσει; v. 76a) appears as the present passive indicative *haitaza* in the Gothic. On the other hand, the future middle indicative προπορεύσῃ (v. 76b) is rendered with a present active indicative (*fauragaggis*). Finally, he renders the future verb ἐπισκέψεται with a present active indicative *gaweisoph* (evincing the reading found in our critical text).

**USE OF THE INFINITIVE**

All infinitives in the Greek text but one are rendered with Gothic infinitives. Five are anarthrous in the Greek, all of which are translated as bare infinitives: ποιήσαι (*taujan*; v. 72a), μνησθήναι (*gamunan*; v. 72b), λατρεύειν (*skalkinon*; v. 74), ἐτοιμάσαι (*manwjan*; v. 76b), ἐπιφάναι (*gabairhtjan*; 79a). Three infinitives, on the other hand, take the article τοῦ. Two are instances of δοῦναι. The second of these is rendered as an infinitive: *du giban* (v. 77a). The first, however, is rendered with the conjunction *ei* (“so that”) + the present optative *gebi* (v. 73b), where *ei* occupies the space of τοῦ, though not as a direct translation. In this instance, the Gothic
translator seems to have interpreted this appositional infinitive as an infinitive of purpose. He then independently selected the characteristic form of Gothic optative purpose clauses in its place (ei + optative) to better capture its sense. In so doing, he has undone one manifestation of the loose syntax characteristic of the Benedictus as poetry, prioritizing clarity of expression over grammatical fidelity. The final arthrous infinitive, τοῦ κατευθύναι, appears in the final line of the canticle (v. 79b), and is translated as du garaihtjan. The Gothic text also introduces a new infinitive to the canticle: giban (v. 71), which we will discuss in greater detail below.

**Use of Participles**

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

**Verbless Clauses**

Gothic does not supply a verb in the one nominal sentence of the Greek text of the canticle, preserving it intact: εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (piupeigs frauja guþ Israelis; v. 68a). On the other hand, as noted above, it does supply an infinitive verb before the loose
appositive noun phrase, ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς (v. 71), likely via Western influence. That Western reading misinterpreted the noun phrase as a verbless purpose clause, and supplied an infinitive verb to v. 71 parallel to those in subsequent lines (vv. 72a,b): gibæ nasein us fijandam unsaraim jah us handau allaize pièzë hatandane unsis (v. 71). In practice, this change tightens one instance of loose syntax in the hymn. It also consolidates the relationship between v. 71 and v. 72, casting the two verses as a series of like parallelisms, both introduced by infinitives.

USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

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

\textsuperscript{66} In this instance, the Gothic has selected a different expression than the Greek.
Case and Number Syntax

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

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

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

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

**USE OF CONJUNCTIONS**

As expected, the Gothic translator renders all instances of the coordinating conjunction καὶ (vv. 68b, 69a, 71, 72b, 75a, 76a, 79a) with the corresponding conjunction *jah.*
He also renders the Greek subordinating conjunction ὅτι (v. 68b) as untere. However, he leaves the particle δὲ in v. 76a untranslated.

**Complex Sentence Types**

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

**Relative Clause Syntax**

The Gothic text preserves both relative clauses of the Greek text. The first, located in v. 73, qualifies the genitive noun aiphis immediately preceding it: panei swor wihra Abraham attan unsarana. As in the Greek text, the Gothic relative pronoun panei takes the gender and number of its main clause referent aiphis, but the accusative case assigned it by the relative clause verb swor, a preterite indicative (v. 31). The second relative clause appears in the closing lines of the hymn, and modifies the noun armahairtein (v. 78a): in hammei gaweisoph unsara urruns us hauhipai / gabairhtjan þaim in riqiza jah skadau dafpus sitandam . . . (vv. 78b-79). As the object of the preposition in, the relative pronoun in this clause appears in the dative case.
Special Issues and Constructions

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

Text

Lk. 2:14

*wulþus in hauhistjam guda*

*jah ana airþai gawairþi in mannam godis wiljins.*

Marked Language Character

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

Verbless Clauses

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

Case and Number Syntax

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

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

**Use of Conjunctions**

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

**Special Issues and Constructions**

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

TEXT

Lk. 2:29-32

\[\text{nu fraleitais skalk } \text{peinana, frauja,}
\]

\[bi waurda } \text{peinamma in gawairfja;}
\]

\[\text{pande sehvun augona meina nasein } \text{peina,}
\]

\[\text{boei manwides in andwairfja allaizo manageino,}
\]

\[\text{liuha } \text{du andhuleinai } \text{piudom}
\]

\[\text{jah wulpu managein } \text{peinai } \text{Israelia.}
\]

MARKED LANGUAGE CHARACTER

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

TENSE, MOOD, AND DIATHESIS

The first verb of the Greek canticle, the present indicative \(\text{ἀπολύεις} \) (v. 29a), corresponds to a present optative in the Gothic text: \textit{fraleitais}. This form reflects the
imperative *dimitte* in Old Latin manuscripts, including the *Veronensis* and *Palatinus*. In this verse, it carries a precative sense (“now let your servant”). As Klein 1992a:267 notes, it appears “the Gothic translator has reacted, in an independent manner, to the sense of the Greek rather than the form” in this instance. As noted earlier, the Gothic imperative is highly marked, limited to direct commands. It would have been inappropriate to employ it in this supplicative context. Finally, the two aorist indicatives in the canticle, εἶδον (v. 30) and ἦτοίμασας (v. 31), are rendered with preterite indicatives (*sehun* and *manwides*, respectively).

**USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE**

All five instances of the Greek definite article in the canticle are left untranslated in the Gothic text: τὸν δοῦλον (*skalk*; v. 29a), τὸ ῥῆμα (*waurdada*; v. 29b), σι όφθαλμοι (*augona*; v. 30) and τὸ σωτῆριόν (*nasein*; v. 30), and τῶν λαῶν (*manageino*; v. 31). The canticle does not supply a demonstrative pronoun or adjective in these phrases.

**CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX**

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

---

67 In the *Palatinus*, the form is *dismitte*.

68 Strictly speaking, a predictive sense (“now you will let your servant”) is not out of the question. However, a precative better conforms to the force of the Lt. imperative.
(v.31). So also, the Greek εἰς only governs an accusative object (ἀποκάλυψιν; v. 32), where the Gothic du takes a dative object (andhuleinai). A further five instances reflect the translation of Greek genitive personal pronouns as Gothic pronominal possessive adjectives, which agree in case with their governing noun. These include four instances of σου (vv. 29a,b, 30, 32) and one instance of µου (v. 30).

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

USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

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

COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

In the Greek text, the only causal clause of the canticle employs the subordinating conjunction ὅτι + an indicative verb (ἐίδον; v. 30). The Gothic translator renders this clause
with the conjunction *pande* + the indicative *sēvun: nū fraleitaīs skalk pēīnana, frauja / . . . /

*pande sēvun augona meina nasein pēīna...* (vv. 29-30).

**RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX**

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

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

1. Does the target language version retain the same marked language features as the Greek text?

2. Are certain marked language features of the Greek better preserved than others? And if so, are these differences due to the constraints of each language's native syntax, the capacity of the translator to recognize a given feature as marked, or the translation method employed in each version?

3. Is it possible to outline each translator's approach to the types of marked language features encountered in the Greek text? That is, can we summarize his approach to a feature like "compactness" or "vivid tense use?"

4. Are there instances where the translator has introduced new marked language features, perhaps reacting to the special character of these passages?

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1. Couplet Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.1. Couplets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 46b-47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.2. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Terseness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1. Parataxis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.1. Parallelisms</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with use of καὶ to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>join cola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 46b-47, 49, 52, 53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.2. Parallelisms</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without καὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 51, 55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.3. Non-parallel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>couplets with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paratactic καὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.4. Non-parallel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>couplets without</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 48, 50, 54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.2. Loose infinitival syntax
   (ELIMINATED) -1

B.3. Verbless clauses
   (vv. 49b, 50) 0

B.4. Limited use of relative constructions
   (N/A) 0

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
   (vv. 46b-47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55) 0

C.2. Chiasm
   (thematic ABBA and verb-object ABAB//BABA; vv. 52-53) 0

D. Stylistic Grammatical Forms

D.1. Non-semantic Tense Alternation
   (ELIMINATED) -1

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

E. Phonaesthetics

E.1. Rhyme: Isoptoton
   (ABAB simplified to ABCB; vv. 52-53) -1

E.2. Non-consecutive partial hypogram
   (ELIMINATED) -1
The Gothic text of the Magnificat loses five marked language features of the Greek text (and with them, five subcategories and two categories of marked language). Two of these losses appear to be deliberate: the elimination of the tense alternation in v. 46, and the loose infinitival syntax of v. 54. In both cases, the Gothic translator has prioritized clarity of expression over grammatical fidelity to his source. Most often, the two were not competing interests; the flexibility of Gothic allowed the translator to remain broadly faithful to the tense choices and the infinitival uses of the Greek without sacrificing lucidity. In these instances, however, the resulting syntax would have apparently proved too jarring.

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

It is less clear whether the Gothic translator recognized the tense shift in vv. 46b-47 as a marked language feature. Minimally, the Gothic translator understood that the leveling of the two tenses was contextually appropriate (consistent with the non-semantic nature of the Greek tense shift). He was evidently uninterested in exploring a possible semantic contrast between the present μεγαλύνει and the aorist γιγαλλίασεν. Challenged only by the tense of the latter, he rendered both verbs as presents. Still, it remains unclear whether the translator regarded his translation as a correction of the tense choice of v. 47, or as a dynamic translation.
of the aorist form. If he conceived of the change as a correction, it is safe to say he did not recognize the marked language character of the tense shift.

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

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

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

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

A. Phonaesthetics

B.1. Isoptoton

(adjacent words: v. 52b-53a)
Table 3.2. catalogues the retention or elimination of Greek marked language features in the Gothic text of the Benedictus:

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

A. Line

A.1. Couplet Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.1.1. Couplets (vv. 68, 69, 71, 72, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78, 79) 0

A.1.2. Other (vv. 70, 73) 0

B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of χαί to join cola (vv. 71, 72) 0

B.1.2. Parallelisms without χαί (vv. 79) 0

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

B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without χαί (vv. 68, 69, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78) 0

B.2. Loose infinitival syntax (vv. 72, 74b, 77a, 79a,b) -1
C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
(vv. 71, 72, 79) 0

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

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

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

---

69 An asterisk denotes any change that is rooted in an underlying textual variant rather than a translation decision of the target language version.
least demonstrates that a more literal translation of even the eliminated infinitives may well
have been intelligible in Gothic, if jarring enough to motivate correction.

**GLORIA**

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

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

A. Line

A.1. Couplet Structure

A.1.1. Couplets

(v. 14) 0

A.1.2. Other

(N/A) 0

B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

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

(v. 14) 0

B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ

(N/A) 0

B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ

(N/A) 0
The Gothic translator's insistence on preserving the word order of the Greek Gloria also guarantees the preservation of all its poetic features.

The Gothic text of the Nunc Dimittis also preserves every marked language feature of the Greek version:

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

A. Line

A.1. Couplet Structure

A.1.1. Couplets

(vv. 29, 30-31, 32)
A.1.2. Other
(N/A) 0

B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
(v. 32) 0

SUMMARY

Table 3.6 lists the types and number of marked language features lost in the Gothic translation of the Greek canticles:
Table 3.6. Features Lost from the Marked Language of the Greek Canticles in the Gothic

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

**Analysis**

Our study of the canticles as marked language has illumined the Gothic translator's tense choices in Lk. 1:46, previously misunderstood in the literature. It has also provided a fuller conception of the challenges inherent in Lk. 1:54b, 71, two texts in which the Gothic deviates from the Greek. At the conclusion of this chapter, it is clear that the most significant peculiarities of the Gothic text represent attempts to confront precisely those syntactic issues specific to biblical poetry.
How would one broadly outline the Gothic translator’s approach to the marked language of the Greek? As in prose passages, the translator sought to provide a fairly literal translation of these hymns, true to the word order of the Greek and generally maintaining a one-to-one correspondence between forms. These priorities allowed the translator to successfully preserve all instances of a number of structural poetic features, including: couplets, parataxis, verbless clauses, conduplicatio, and chiasm.

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

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

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

Source Text

As noted earlier, this discussion analyzes the canticles in the majority text of the Armenian New Testament (Arm. 2), hosted on PROIEL, and extracted from Beda Künzle 1984: Das altarmenische Evangelium-L’Évangile arménien ancien. Künzle’s edition of the Gospels uses the text of MS 2374 (E), with comparisons to MS 6200 (M) in its apparatus. E and M are tetraevangelia from the Matenadaran at Erevan, dating to the 7th-9th centuries.\footnote{See Metzger 1977:158-69 for additional details on the most ancient Classical Armenian gospels, including the above two manuscripts. Note: in Metzger’s discussion, MS. 6200 is identified as “Rhodes’ Annotated List, no. 991,” “the oldest dated manuscript” (Metzger 1977:158).}
The New Testament was first translated into Armenian from an Old Syriac source, sometime in the 5th century (Arm. 1). The Armenian majority text (Arm. 2) is a revision of this translation, begun after the council of Ephesus (430 CE) but not completed until the 12th century. This version sought to align the readings of Arm. 1 to those found in the Byzantine/MT Greek manuscript tradition (Aland and Aland 1995:205; Cowe 2013:265ff.), a point of consequence to our analysis of certain texts. What influence Arm. 2 still preserves from the Old Syriac is not nearly so relevant to this discussion.

71 In this period, Greek texts were contraband within the Sassanid empire, which occupied the greater part of Armenia (Metzger 1977:155).
4.1. Overview of Classical Armenian Syntax

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


Tense, Mood, Diathesis

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

Classical Armenian also distinguishes three moods: indicative, subjunctive, and imperative. The present imperative is used only prohibitively (i.e., negatively), in concert with the particle mi. The subjunctive harbors a number of values, including desire and potentiality,
and for that reason, can function as a future in the present and aorist. Finally, Classical Armenian preserves the two-way voice distinction of Proto-Indo-European, distinguishing between active and mediopassive forms.

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

Table 4.1. Categorical Equivalences between Classical Armenian and Greek Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical Armenian</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Indicative</td>
<td>Present Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Imperative</td>
<td>Present (Negative) or Aorist Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Subjunctive</td>
<td>Present or Aorist Subjunctive, Imperative, Future Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect Indicative</td>
<td>Imperfect Indicative, Present Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist Indicative</td>
<td>Aorist Indicative, Aorist Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist Imperative</td>
<td>Present or Aorist Imperative (Positive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist Subjunctive</td>
<td>Aorist or Present Subjunctive, Imperative, Future Indicative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, one must note that deponent verbs in Greek and Classical Armenian do not necessarily correspond to one another (for example, in Armenian, *xowsim* is deponent in all
its forms). Superficial “changes” in voice between active and mediopassive do not necessarily reflect elective decisions of the Classical Armenian translator.

*Use of the Infinitive*

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

*Use of Participles*

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

*Verbless Clauses*

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

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

Case and Number Syntax

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

Finally, like the Greek of the New Testament, Armenian has lost the dual number, utilizing only a singular and plural category. Notably, certain Classical Armenian words appear only in the plural (pluralia tantum; e.g., Armenian p’ark‘, which characteristically translates the Greek δόξα).
**Word Order**

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

**Use of Conjunctions**

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

**Complex Sentence Types**

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

**Relative Clause Syntax**

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

TEXT

Lk. 1:46b-55

46b mecac’owsći anjn im zTēr.

47 ew c’ncac’aw72 hogi im yAstowác p’rkičē53 im.

48 zi hayec’aw i xonarhowt’iwn ałaxnøy iwroy;

Zi aha yaysm hetē eranesc’ën74 inj amenayn azgk’;

49 zi arar inj mecamecs hzawrn;

ew sówrb ē anown nora,

50 oł ormowt’iwn nora azgac’ yazgs76

erkiwłac’iwrōc’;

51 Arăr zawrowt’iwn bazkaw iwrov;

c’roweāc’ zambartawans mtawk’ srtić’iwreanc’;

72 M shows the aorist subjunctive c’ncac’ē, evidently to match the tenses of the preceding verb, mecac’owsći (v. 46b), also leveling the grammatical shift apparent in the Greek.

73 M shows the instrumentals: A[stowaco]w p’rķaw imō (with the sense, “through God my savior”).

74 M shows the present subjunctive eranic’ēn.

75 Omitted in M.

76 The Armenian expression azgac’ yazgs may reflect an underlying reading γενεῶν εἰς γενεὰς, unattested in any Greek manuscript.
The Armenian preserves the parallelisms, paratactic style, and single chiasm (vv. 52-53) of the Greek text by imitating its word order. However, as was also the case with the Gothic, the non-consecutive partial hypogram at the center of the chiasm (ταπεινούς / πεινῶντας; vv. 52b-53a) is lost; the corresponding words in the Armenian (zxonarhs / zk’alc’eals) do not have similar sound shapes. Nevertheless, the appearance of a z- prefix

77 M shows the genitive iworm (cf. Greek αὐτοῦ). Israyeli could be taken as either genitive or dative. E takes it as dative, M as genitive.

78 M shows yišelov zolormowt’iwn, inflecting the infinitive as an instrumental (“by remembering his mercy”), and using the singular form of the noun. E may mistake the third declension value of the noun (genitive singular, assumed in this study) for its second declension value (accusative plural).

79 M omits ṭ and shows yawiteans.
before both forms, marking generic definiteness (“the humble,” “the hungry”), strengthens the impression of the chiasm and verb-object inversion.80

Also lost is any rhyme in the chiasm. Where the Greek text is able to pair genitive and accusative plural endings in an ABAB rhyme (δρόνων [A], ἄγαθῶν [B], ταπεινοὺς [A’], and κενοὺς [B’]), the line-final Armenian words do not rhyme (yat’oṛoc’, xzonarhs, barow’t’eamb, ownayns). The more extensive case system of the Armenian has disrupted the case unity of the first and third words, casting the former as an ablative and the latter as an instrumental. Furthermore, the reduction of the accusative plural ending to a mere –s all but eliminates any phonaesthetic effect in the remaining two.

**TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS**

**vv. 46b-47**

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

80 Both forms are ambitious for accusative or locative case. They lack the isoptoton since in principle they could mix accusative and locative, with homophonomous endings in the plural.
straightforwardly as an aorist indicative (cʿncacʿaw). (Note, however, that M shows the present cʿncacʿē instead of cʿncacʿaw, evidently to reconcile the tenses of the verbs in vv. 46b and 47.)

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

vv. 48-55

In the remaining verses of the canticle, the Armenian translator continues to render Greek finite aorists with Armenian aorists, including the gnomic aorists of vv. 51-53: ἐπέβλεψεν (hayecʿaw; v. 48a) ἐποίησέν (arar; vv. 49a, 51a), διεσκόρπισεν (cʿroweácʿ; v. 51b), καθεὶλεν (kʿakeacʿ; v. 52a), ὄψωσεν (barjracʿoycʿ; v. 52b), ἐνέπλησεν (lcʿoycʿ; v. 53a), ἐξαπέστειλεν (arjakeacʿ; v. 53b), ἀντελάβετο (pašpaneácʿ; v. 54), and ἐλάλησεν (xawsecʿaw; v. 55a).

The translator renders the one future verb of the canticle (μακαριοῦσίν; v. 48b) with an Armenian aorist subjunctive: eranescʿén (present subjunctive in M). Finally, he adds an additional finite verb, rendering the Greek verbless clause καὶ ἔγινον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (v. 49b) with a copula: ew sówrβ ἐ anown nora.
USE OF THE INFINITIVE

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

USE OF PARTICIPLES

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

VERBLESS CLAUSES

The Classical Armenian version retains only one of two nominal sentences in the canticle. It inserts a copula into the first, rendering the Greek καὶ ἔγινεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (v. 49b) as ew sówrbb ḡ anown nora. Nevertheless, it leaves the second intact, translating Greek καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεάς καὶ γενεάς (v. 50) as ew olormwt’iwn nora azgac’yazgs.
CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

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

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

Four more case variances also reflect the larger case system of Armenian. The Greek genitive γενεῶν (v. 50a) harbors ablative value. The Classical Armenian translator appropriately renders this noun in the ablative case available to him: azgac’ (v. 50a). Similarly, the Greek dative διανεῖξ (v. 51b), which harbors instrumental value, corresponds to an
Armenian instrumental (mtawk’). Finally, the ablative case of two objects of ἀπὸ are formally clarified: τοῦ νῦν (aysm hetē; v. 48b), and θρόνων (at’oroc’; v. 52a).

A few last discrepancies reflect differences in verbal case assignment. The verb μακαριοῦσιν licenses accusative case to the pronoun με (v. 48b), whereas the corresponding Armenian verb eranesc’én licenses dative case to the personal pronoun inj. Likewise, where the verb ἐνέπλησεν governs the genitive ἄγαθῶν (v. 53a), the Armenian verb lc’oyc’ governs an instrumental noun, barowt’eamb. The verb paštpaneác’ licenses dative case to the phrase Israyet ca’rayi iwrown (v. 54a), where the Greek verb assigns them genitive case (Ἰσραήλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ). Finally, where the infinitive μνησθῆναι governs a genitive ἔλεος (v. 54b), the corresponding Armenian infinitive yišel governs an accusative, plural in E (zolormowt’ıwns) and singular in M (zolormowt’ıwn).

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

---

81 N.B.: M has genitive iwroy.
USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Seventeen definite articles appear in the Greek text of the Magnificat. Fourteen of these correspond to no feature of the Classical Armenian text: ἡ ψυχή (anjn; v. 46b), τὸ πνεῦμα (hogi; v. 47), τῷ θεῷ (Astowác; v. 47), τῷ σωτήρι (p’rkič; v. 47), τὴν ταπείνωσιν (xonarhowt’iwn; v. 48a), τῆς δούλης (alaxnoy; v. 48a), αἱ γενεὰ (azgk; v. 48b), τὸ ὄνομα (anown; v. 49b), τὸ ἔλεος (otormowt’iwn; v. 50a), τοῖς φοβουμένοις (erkwłac; v. 50b), τοὺς πατέρας (hars; v. 55a), τῷ Ἄβραμ (Abrahamow; v. 55b), τῷ σπέρματι (sawaki; v. 55b), τὸν αἵωνα (yawitean; v. 55b). The definiteness of one noun in the Greek is captured by the use of the nota accusativi in the Armenian: τὸν χῦριον (zTēr; v. 46b). The definiteness of another is marked by the addition of an –n suffix: ὁ δυνατός (hzawrny; v. 49a). Finally, the Armenian expression aysm hetē evidently corresponds to the Greek expression τὸν νῦν (v. 48b).

USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

Five instances of the Greek coordinate conjunction καὶ are rendered with the corresponding Armenian conjunction ew (vv. 47, 49b, 50a, 52b, 53b). The only other occurrence of καὶ in our critical text appears in v. 50a, in the phrase εἰς γενεάς καὶ γενεάς.

However, the corresponding Armenian expression azgac’ yazgs reflects some other underlying reading, reconstructable as γενεῶν εἰς γενεάς.

As expected, the Armenian translator renders two instances of the subordinate conjunction ὅτι (vv. 48a, 49a), and one of the postpositive γὰρ (v. 48b), with a clause-initial zi.

The merging of ὅτι and γὰρ in translation creates a series of three consecutive zi- clauses (vv. 47b-48), and a repetitive, even poetic, effect unknown in the Greek:
In this instance, a straightforward translation of the Greek within the constraints of Armenian has created an additional, if non-deliberate, poetic effect: anaphora.

**Complex Sentence Types**

The Greek text contains two subordinate causal clauses, each introduced with the clause-initial conjunction ὅτι + an indicative verb (vv. 48b, 49b). The Armenian translator renders both of these clauses with զի and indicative verbs: զի հայեց ավ իխոնարհութ իզ ալանոյ իվրոյ / ինջ այս ես երանդես էն ինջ ամենայն ազգը; զի արար ինջ մեկամեքս հզավրն; (vv. 48b-49).
4.3. Benedictus

Text

Lk. 1:68-79

68 *Awhrneál Tēr Astowác Israyeli;*

\[ zi\ yayc^{'\prime} el\ mez\ e\ arar\ p\‘r\kowt\‘iwn^82\ źolovrdean\ iwrown^83, \]

69 *ew\ yaróyc^{'\prime} elfewr^84\ p\‘r\kowt\‘eann\ mez^85*

\[ ĵ\ tan^86\ Dawt\‘i\ ca\́ayi\ ìwroy; \]

70 *orpēs\ xawsec^{'\prime}aw\ beranov\ srboc^{'\prime}or^87\ yawitenic^{'\prime} margarēk\‘n\ nora^88\ ein; *

71 *p\‘rkowt\‘iwn\ ĵ\ t\‘šnameac^{'\prime} meroc^{'\prime}; *

\[ ew\ ĵe\́rae^{'\prime} amenayn\ ateleac^{'\prime} meroc^{'\prime}; \]

72 *a\́nél\ olormowt\‘iwn\ and^89\ hars\ mer.*

---

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

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

84 M adds the *nota accusativi* for definiteness here: *zelfewr* (cf. the Greek κέρας, which lacks an article).

85 M omits *mez* (cf. Greek ἡμῖν).

86 M shows *tanē*, with a clear ablative ending.

87 M shows *beranawk^{'\prime} srbovk^{'\prime} ork^{'\prime} (“through the holy mouths which. . .”*) instead of *beranov srboc^{'\prime} (“through the mouth of his holy ones which. . .”).

88 M omits *nora* (cf. Greek αὐτοῦ).
ew yišel zowxtnʷ iwr sowrb;

73zerdowmn⁸⁹ zor erdowaw Abrahamow hawr merowm,

tal mez⁹⁰ ʾarancʾ erkiwli, ī jejracʾ tʾšnameacʾ pʾrkeals

paštél zna⁹¹⁰⁵ srbowtʾeamb ew ardarowtʾeamb

arají norá zamenayn⁹⁴ awowrs konacʾ merocʾ.

76ʾEw dów manowk margaré barjreloy⁹⁵ kočʾesjür;

zi ertʾicʾes⁹⁶ arají eresac ⁹⁷ Tearn patrastel zčanaparhs⁹⁸ norá;

77ṭál gitowtʾiwn⁹⁹ pʾrkowtʾean žołovdean norá⁹⁹.

⁸⁸ M uses ař ("to," rather than "with").

⁹⁰ M shows zowxt, without the demonstrative and definitizing –n suffix.

⁹¹ M shows zerdowmn, without the demonstrative and definitizing –n suffix. This form compares more closely to the anarthrous Greek ὅρκον.

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

⁹³ M shows zpʾrkʾowtiwn iʾtʾšnameacʾ merocʾ pastel z𝑇[ē]. As above, this corrects the versification of the PROIEL text, where paštél zna (v. 74b) introduces v. 75.

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

⁹⁵ M shows barjreloyn, with the demonstrative and definitizing –n suffix (cf. anarthrous Greek υψίστου).

⁹⁶ M shows gnacʾes instead.

⁹⁷ M omits eresacʾ (cf. Greek ἐνώπιον), with the resulting sense "before the Lord" rather than "before the face of the Lord."

⁹⁸ M shows čanaparhs without the nota accusativi (cf. anarthrous Greek ὅδοὺς).
The Armenian text of the Benedictus is characterized by the same loose syntax as the Greek text, though it makes greater use of relative constructions. It also bears the same repetitive feel of its source text, manifest in the duplication of four theme words: p’rkowt’iwn

// p’rkowt’ean (vv. 69a, 71); jeṙac’ // jeṙac’ (vv. 71, 74); t’šnameac’ // t’šnameac’ (vv. 71, 74);

99 M shows the nota accusativi: zgitowt’iwn (cf. Greek γνῶσιν, which lacks an article).

100 M omits nora (cf. Greek αὐτῶν).

101 M shows zt’olowt’iwn, with the nota accusativi.

102 M shows the possessive adjective meroy instead of the demonstrative noc’a.

103 M shows olormowt’eanc’ Tearn Astowacoy meroc’, dropping gt’owt’eanc’ (corresponding to a metaphor of the Greek), adding Tearn, and shifting two items to the plural.

104 M shows oroc’, influenced by its alternate reading of v. 78a.

105 This translation appears to capture the aorist ἐπισκέπται found in the Byzantine/MT text tradition.

106 M has the participle nstalk’ rather than the imperfect nstein (cf. the Greek participle καθημένος).

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

TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

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

ἐπεσκέψατο (the noun aycʿ + el; v. 68b [see “Special Issues and Constructions”]), ἐποίησεν (arar; v. 68b), ἤγειρεν (yaróye; v. 69a), ἐλάλησεν (xawsecʿaw; v. 70), ὤμοσεν (erdowaw; v. 73a). Finally, two futures in the Greek text of the canticle appear as aorist subjunctives in the Classical Armenian (κληθήσῃ [kočʿesir; v. 76a], προπορεύσῃ [ertʿicʿes; v. 76b]), as does a third from the Byzantine/MT text tradition: ἐπισκέψεται (the noun aycʿ + arascʿe; 78b).

USE OF THE INFINITIVE

The translator renders all eight infinitives in the Greek text of the Benedictus with Armenian infinitives: ποιῆσαι (aṙnel; v. 72a), μνησθήνω (yišel; v. 72b), τοῦ δοῦναι (tał; v. 73b), λατρεύειν (paštel; v. 74), ἔτοιμᾶσαι (pastrastel; v. 76b), τοῦ δοῦναι (тал; v. 77a), ἐπιφάναι (erewel; 79a), τοῦ κατευθύναι (owttlél; v. 79b).

USE OF PARTICIPLES

Our Classical Armenian source text renders only one of three Greek participles in the canticle with a participle. In v. 74, the Greek aorist passive participle ῥυσθέντας (v. 74) corresponds to the Armenian participle pʿrkeals. Another participle in the Greek text, the present active participle μισούντων (v. 71), appears as a substantive adjective in the Armenian:
ateleac’ (a quasi-participle). Finally, our Armenian text translates the phrase containing the present middle participle καθημένος (v. 79a) with the relative pronoun, oroc’ + an imperfect active indicative verb, nstein (v. 79a), though M shows the participle nstealk’.

**VERBLESS CLAUSES**

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

**USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE**

As previously noted, eleven definite articles appear in the Greek text of the Benedictus. Seven of these correspond to no morphological feature of the Armenian text: ὁ θεὸς (Tēr; v. 68a), τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (Israyeli; v. 68a), τῷ λαῷ (žolovrdean; v. 68b), τῶν μισοῦντων (ateleac’; v. 71b), τῶν πατέρων (hars; v. 72a), τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν (hawr; v. 73a), and τῷ λαῷ (žolovrdean; v. 77a). The definiteness of two others is captured by the use of the *nota accusativi*, which prefixes a noun in one instance (τοῦς πόδας [žots; v. 79b]), and a phrase-initial quantifier in the other (πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἡμῶν [žamenayn awowrs kenac n8 meroc’; v. 75b]). A *nota accusativi* also appears in translation of two indefinites: žćanaparhs in the E of v. 76b (cf. anarthrous Greek ὅδεις), and žt’olowt’iwn in the M of v. 77b (cf. anarthrous Greek ἁφέσει).

---

n8 As discussed below, the Armenian expression differs from the Greek (non-one-to-one): “all the days of our life.”
One definite Greek noun is translated with an –n suffix: τῶν...προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (srbc’...margarēk’n nor; v. 70). The –n demonstrative suffix is also applied before the translations of certain indefinite nouns in the Greek text: two in E (διαθῆκης [xowstn; v. 72b]; ὑρκὼν [zerdwnnn; v. 73a]), and one in M (ψήστου [barjrelony; v. 76a]). Finally, the Armenian reforms the phrase τοῖς...καθῆκεν (v. 79a), translating it as a relative clause (oroc’ixawari ewi stowers mahow nstein; v. 79a).

CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

In the Classical Armenian text of the Benedictus, we are confronted with the same types of case discrepancies we saw in the Armenian Magnificat. Three of these discrepancies are caused by the rendering of Greek genitive personal pronouns with Armenian possessive pronouns, the latter of which must agree in case with their governing nouns. Two of these involve the Greek ἡµῶν (vv. 71a, 73a), and one involves the Greek αὐτοῦ (vv. 68b; genitive in M).

In another verse, the Armenian translates the accusative object of a quasi-participle with a genitive: τῶν μισούντων ἡµᾶς (ateleac’ meroc’; 71b). (By consequence, both v. 71a, b end in meroc’, strengthening the parallelism between them.)

Another set of instances is due to differences in prepositional case governance. In one place, Armenian ἰ takes an accusative object (t’olowtw’wn; v. 77b) where Greek ἐν takes a dative (ἀφέσει). Similarly, in v. 79, ἰ takes locative objects (ixawari ewi stowers; v. 77b) where ἐν takes dative objects (ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ). The Armenian translates Greek διὰ once as vasn (vv. 78a).

Where the Greek preposition takes an accusative object (σπλάγχνα), the Armenian takes a genitive object (gt’owteane’). Finally, the Greek preposition μετὰ takes a genitive object in v.
whereas the corresponding Armenian preposition անդ takes an accusative or locative object (հարս). In four places, the Classical Armenian text omits the preposition altogether, utilizing the instrumental case instead. This creates the following discrepancies in case: διὰ στόµατος (beranov; v. 70), πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα (Abrahamow hawr; v. 73), ἐν ὀσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη (srbowt’æmb ew ardarowt’æmb; v. 75), and ἐν οἷς (orovk’; v. 78b).

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

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

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

**Use of Conjunctions**

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

**Complex Sentence Types**

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

εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ / ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ / καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν . . . (vv. 68-69). The Classical Armenian translator renders this sentence with a clause-initial zi + two indicative verbs: Awhrneál Tēr Astowác Israyeli / zi yayc el mez ew arar p’rkot’iwn žolovrdian iwrowm / ew yaróyc eljewr p’rkot’eann mez . . . . (vv. 68-69).
RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

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

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

The Classical Armenian also introduces two new relative clauses relative to the Greek text. First, the Armenian uses a relative clause in place of a prepositional phrase modifying the noun τῶν ἁγίων in the Greek of v. 70. Thus, τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰώνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (“his holy prophets \textit{from ages [past]}”) appears as \textit{srboc' or yawitenic' margarék'n noran ein} in the Armenian (“his holy ones, \textit{who from ages [past] were} his prophets”). Secondly, as noted twice before, a new relative clause also appears in v. 79a, replacing a determiner phrase in the Greek. Thus, the Greek phrase, τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ δανάτου καθημένοις (“[to shine] upon those sitting in darkness and the shadow of death”) appears as the Armenian, \textit{oroc' ī xawari ew ī stowers mahow nstein} (“[to shine] upon those who who sat in darkness and the shadow of darkness”
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death”). In both instances, it appears the Armenian translator has attempted to simplify complex phrasal constructions of the Greek. (Recall that the first, the prepositional phase δια στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’ αἰώνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ, is a particularly complicated construction from the standpoint of New Testament Greek.)

Special Issues and Constructions

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

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

Text

Lk. 2:14

*p'arkin' ḫarjouns Astowacoyn.

 ew yerkir xaṭalowt'īwn.

ī mardik ḫačowt'īwn.\(^{109}\)\(^{110}\)

Marked Language Character

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

Glory in the highest to God

And on earth, peace

(And) unto men, favor.

\(^{109}\) This reading reflects the Greek reading εὐδοκία (v. 14b), attested in the Byzantine/MT tradition.

\(^{110}\) In this instance, I alter the bicolon presentation of Nestle-Aland 28 to capture the tricolon structure of the Classical Armenian text. I will mark such changes with an underline.
Each of the three codas is constructed with a nominative noun (pʿark, xatalowtʿiwn, and hačowtʿiwn) and a prepositional phrase (i barjowns, yerkir, i mardik). (The first coda takes an additional dative noun: Astowaco.) Notably, a tricolon structure excludes the AB-C // BA-C chiasm evident in the critical text and Gothic versions.

**Verbless Clauses**

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

**Case and Number Syntax**

Most case deviations between the Greek and Classical Armenian versions (3/6 total transmitted instances) reflect differences in prepositional case governance. First, the Greek preposition ἐν exclusively governs dative objects in the canticle (ὑψίστοις [v. 14a]; ἀνθρώποις [v. 14b/c\[iii\]]). The Classical Armenian translator renders both prepositions with the corresponding Armenian preposition i. However, in the first instance, he is able to clarify the formal ambiguity of the Greek dative and locative cases, rendering the object barjowns in the locative (v. 14a; though strictly speaking, barjowns is ambiguous as to accusative or locative). In the second instance, i governs the accusative mardik (v. 14b/c) with the sense “to.” This alters the sense of the last line relative to the underlying Greek (Byzantine/MT Gk. “favor among men” v. 111).

\[iii\] The slash captures the possibility of either a bicolon (so the Greek critical text) or tricolon (the Classical Armenian text and its Vorlage).
Arm. “favor to men”). Lastly, where the Greek preposition ἐπὶ governs a genitive object (γῆς; v. 14b), the Classical Armenian translator again utilizes the preposition ṭ (Sandhi y-) with an accusative object (in this case, ἐρκίρ). On a final note, the Classical Armenian noun ʿaṙʿ, which appears only in the plural, translates the Greek singular noun δόξα.

**Word Order**

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

**Use of Conjunctions**

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

Text

Lk. 2:29-32

29 Ard arjakés ẓcařay m k’o Tēr

əst bani ʾk’ōm ʾxalałot’iwn;

30 zi tesin ač’k’ im zp’anowt’iwn k’o.

31 zor patrastec’er ařaįį amenayn žolovrd(; 32 lóys ţy yaytnowt’iwn het’anosac;

ew p’arsזז žolovrdæn ʾk’ōm Israyelī.

Marked Language Character

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

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

113 M also shows a different word order here: Tēr cařays k’o (cf. τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα, reflected in E).

114 M omits ţ (cf. Greek είς).

115 M shows nominative p’ark (cf. Gk. accusative Δόξαν).
TENSE, MOOD, AND DIATHESIS

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

USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Two arthrous Greek nouns in the Nunc Dimittis correspond to Armenian nouns with z- prefixes: τὸν δοῦλον (zcaṙay; v. 29a) and τὸ σωτηρίον (zp’rkowt’iw; v. 30). (The former is unprefixed in M.) A third (τὸ ῥῆμά; v. 29b) is translated with a simple dative, and is not marked for definiteness. No other noun in the Classical Armenian text is marked for definiteness, including renderings of οἱ ὄπθαλμοί (ač’k’; v. 30) and τῶν λαῶν (žolovrdoc’; v. 31).

CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

The cases of the Classical Armenian text deviate from those of the Greek in 7/19 transmitted instances. One deviation reflects differences in prepositional case governance. Where Greek κατὰ governs an accusative object (τὸ ῥήμα σου [v. 29b]), the Classical Armenian preposition əst takes a dative object, in this case, bani. Another two deviations are caused by the translation of the genitive Greek personal pronoun σου as the Armenian possessive adjective k’owm, which agrees in case with its head noun (vv. 29b, 32b). In one instance, the Armenian renders Greek ἐν + the dative εἰρήνη, with a different sense, using i + the accusative xalalowt’iw (“into peace”).
Intriguingly, the Armenian interprets the genitive modifiers of δόξαν (λαοῦ . . . Ἰσραήλ; v. 32b) as datives, yielding the translation žolovrdean . . . Israyeli (where the latter noun is appositional to the first). Finally, it is worth noting that the Greek text contains one vocative, δέσποτα (v. 31), corresponding here with the nominative Tēr (v. 29a).

**Word Order**

The Classical Armenian manuscript E does not deviate from the word order of the Greek. M, however, reorders the elements of v. 29a, attesting zcaṙay k’o Tēr with Tēr caṙays k’o (cf. Greek τὸν δοῦλον σου, δέσποτα).

**Use of Conjunctions**

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

**Complex Sentence Types**

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

---

16 M shows caṙays here, with the first person demonstrative suffix (effectively, “now let me your servant,” identifying the speaker as the “servant”).
RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

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

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

**MAGNIFICAT**

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

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

A. Line

A.1. Couplet Structure

A.1.1. Couplets

(vv. 46b-47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55)  0

A.1.2. Other

(N/A)  0

B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of ξαί to join cola

(vv. 46b-47, 49, 52, 53)  0

B.1.2. Parallelisms without ξαί

(vv. 51, 55)  0

B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic ξαί

(N/A)  0
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (vv. 48, 50, 54) 0

B.2. Loose infinitival syntax (ELIMINATED) 0

B.3. Verbless clauses (v. 50) -1

B.4. Limited use of relative constructions (N/A) 0

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms (vv. 46b-47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55) 0

C.2. Chiasm (thematic ABBA and verb-object ABAB//BABA; vv. 52-53) 0

D. Stylistic Grammatical Forms

D.1. Non-semantic Tense Alternation (ALTERED) X\textsuperscript{17}

D.2. Non-semantic Case/Preposition Alternation (ELIMINATED) 0

\textsuperscript{17} An X indicates instances in which a particular poetic feature has not been gained or lost so much as transformed into another.
E. Phonaesthetics

E.1. Rhyme: Isoptoton
(ELIMINATED)

E.2. Non-consecutive partial hypogram
(ELIMINATED)

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

Undoubtedly, the peculiar translation is a reaction to the marked tense alternation in vv. 46b-47. Like the Gothic translator, the Armenian translator felt compelled to clarify the confusing forms of this couplet. However, unlike the Gothic translator, who chose to simply level the two tense forms, the Armenian translator recast the canticle's opening verb as an exhortative, drawing on other marked language precedents. From beginning to end then, the Classical Armenian translation of vv. 46b-47 is a reaction to poetic expression. Notably, the
resulting translation indicates that the Armenian translator did not recognize the tense shift as a non-semantic stylistic device. His translation seeks to actively contrast the verbs in the two lines.

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

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

A. Stylistic Structures

A.1. Anaphora
   (v. 48-49a) 1

B. Stylistic Grammatical Forms

B.1. Use of exhortative for simple present
   (v. 46b; except in M) 1

C. Phonaesthetics

C.1. Isoptoton
   (v. 52b-53a; prefixes) 1
Only the second of these features is a deliberate poetic embellishment of the Classical Armenian author. The first and third are dictated by the independent syntax of Classical Armenian.

Benedictus

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Line</th>
<th>Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1. Couplet Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.1. Couplets</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 68, 69, 71, 72, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78, 79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.2. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 70, 73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Terseness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1. Parataxis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 71, 72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ
(vv. 68, 69, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78) 0

B.2. Loose infinitival syntax
(vv. 72, 73b, 74b, 77a, 79a,b) 0

B.3. Appositive noun phrases
(vv. 73a) 0

B.4. Verbless clauses
(vv. 68a) 0

B.5. Limited use of relative constructions
(EXCEPTIONS: vv. 70, 73, 78b-79, 79a) -2

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
(vv. 71, 72, 79) 0

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

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

GLORIA

The Classical Armenian of the Gloria fragment shows only two marked language
divergences relative to the Greek text:
Table 4.5. Classical Armenian Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Gloria

A. Line

A.1. Couplet Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1.1. Couplets (v. 14)</td>
<td>+1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.2. Other (N/A)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola (v. 14)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ (N/A)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ (N/A)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ (N/A)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.2. Verbless Clauses (v. 14) 0

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms (v. 14) 0
C.2. Chiasm
(ELIMINATED)

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

NUNC DIMITTIS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1.1. Couplets (vv. 29, 30-31, 32)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.2. Other (N/A)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
   (v. 32)  
   0

SUMMARY

Table 4.7 lists the types and number of marked language features lost in the Classical Armenian translation of the Greek canticles:
Table 4.7. Features Lost from the Marked Language of the Greek Canticles in the Classical Armenian Canticles

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

**Analysis**

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

The Classical Armenian translator also appears to have been conscious of the marked language character of these passages, at one point embellishing his translation for poetic effect. The Classical Armenian is also distinguished by a greater number of non-deliberate poetic features in the canticles that further underscore their marked character within the Gospels.
CHAPTER 5

OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC

5.0. Introduction

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

SOURCE TEXT

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

Rather than mark every orthographic difference between the two codices, I will limit my observations to significant differences in inflection, or added/omitted items.
5.1. Overview of Old Church Slavonic Syntax

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

TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS

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

Furthermore, Old Church Slavonic distinguishes between three moods: the indicative, the conditional (for hypothetical or contrary to fact statements), and the imperative. The language also makes use of two unambiguous voices: the active and a periphrastic passive, only the former of which directly continues a Proto-Indo-European category. Nevertheless, it
bears noting that verbs construed with the reflexive pronoun se are effectively middle voice in certain uses.

**Use of the Infinitive**

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

**Use of Participles**

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

**Verbless Clauses**

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

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

CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

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

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

USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

Throughout the canticles, as in the Gospels more broadly, the Slavonic coordinating conjunction i corresponds to the Greek καὶ. Furthermore, the Old Church Slavonic translator uses ἐκο to translate Greek ὅτι. The enclitic bo renders the postpositive γὰρ, especially with a causative sense. Finally, the Greek particle δὲ is left untranslated in the Slavonic.

COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

Old Church Slavonic employs the clause-initial subordinating conjunction ἐκο to introduce causal sentences, mirroring the Greek use of ὅτι.

RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

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

Text

Lk. 1:46b-55

46b veličitú dša moé gña.

47 i vůzdradova sę dźù moí o bźé sźpsě moemí.

48 ęko prizūrě na sūměrenie raby svoje.

se bo oti selé blażętú mę viši rodi.

49 ęko sūtvori mǐně veličičě sílùny.

i svęto imę ego.

50 ę milostǐ ego vù rodã¹⁹⁸ i rodã

bojęštimumę sę ego.

51 sūtvori drùžavę myśùceję svojeję.

rastači grùdyję mysliję srdca ixù.

52 nizùloži sílùnyję sù prēstolù.

i vōznese sūměrenyüę.

53 alčoštęę isplűni blagã.

i bogateštęę sę otūpusti tūstę.

54 prijętũ ilé otroka svoego

¹⁹⁸This expression probably translates an underlying Greek eίς γενεάν καί γενεάν. Zographensis shows rody (accusative plural) in place of the first rodu.
Marked Language Character

By following the word order of the Greek, the Old Church Slavonic version preserves the parallelisms, paratactic style, and single chiasm (vv. 52-53) of the Greek text. However, like the Gothic and Armenian texts, the non-consecutive partial hypogram at the center of the chiasm (ταπεινούς / πεινῶντας; vv. 52b-53a) is lost; the corresponding words in the Slavonic have no striking phonetic similarities (съмърьняђ / алъъшђеђе). They do, however, have like endings, appropriate for their syntactic functions. In this correspondence, one can recognize a new and non-deliberate instance of isoptoton.

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

Lk. 1:52-53

A nizůložи silъnyђ sъ prěstolъ.
B i vůzне sъmъrъnyђ.
A’ alъштеђе isplъni blagъ.
B’ i bogатъштеђе се otъpustи tъštъ.
The effect aligns the Slavonic version more closely to the phonaesthetic patterning of the Greek tetracolon than either the Gothic or Armenian.

**TENSE, MOOD, DIATHESIS**

The tense choices of the Old Church Slavonic mirror those of the Greek. The sole present active indicative verb in the Greek text of the canticle (μεγαλύει; v. 46b) corresponds to a Slavonic present active indicative (veličitě). Similarly, every aorist indicative in the Greek corresponds to an aorist indicative in the Slavonic: ἡγαλλίασεν (vůzradova sě; v. 47), ἐπέβλεψεν (prizêtre; v. 48a) ἐποίησέν (sǔtvori; vv. 49a, 51a), διεσκόρπισέν (rastacı; v. 51b), καθείλεν (nizůloži; v. 52a), ὁψώσεν (vůznese; v. 52b), ἐνέπλησέν (isplůně; v. 53a), ἐξαπέστειλεν (otúpusti; v. 53b), ἀντελάβετο (prijetě; v. 54), and ἐλάλησεν (glagola; v. 55a). Notably, by preserving the tense values of the Greek intact, the Slavonic also reproduces the tense shift observed in the Greek of vv. 46b-47. Finally, the one future verb in the Greek text of the canticle (μαχαρισύσιν; v. 48b) appears as a present indicative (blažetě).

**USE OF THE INFINITIVE**

The Old Church Slavonic translator renders the canticle’s sole infinitive (the aorist passive infinitive μνησθῆναι (“to remember”; v. 54b) with an infinitive: poměňotì. In so doing, the translator preserves the loose syntax of the entire verse, consistent with the paratactic style of the hymn.
USE OF PARTICIPLES

Every substantival participle in the Greek text corresponds to a substantival participle in the Old Church Slavonic text. The first, the present active *bojěštůmě* (definite in form), translates the Greek present middle participle τοῖς φοβουμένοις (v. 50b), and as in all other instances of this verb in Slavonic, appears with the *se* personal reflexive pronoun. The second, the present active *alčoštejě*, translates the present active πεινῶντας (v. 53a). Finally, the present active *bogatěštějě + se* translates the present active πλουτοῦντας (v. 53b), with the additional reflexive pronoun signalling a change in voice.

VERBLESS CLAUSES

The Old Church Slavonic version of the Magnificat retains both nominal sentences of the canticle. The first corresponds to Greek καὶ ἰγιόν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (v. 49b), and reads: *i světo ime ego*. The second translates an underlying Greek καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν (v. 50) as: *milostě ego víu rodů i rodů*.

USE OF DEFINITE ADJECTIVES

Six participles and adjectives are grammatically marked for definiteness in the Slavonic: *bojěštůmě* (τοῖς φοβουμένοις; v. 50b), *grúdyje* (ὑπερηφάνους; v. 51b), *silůmyje* (δυνάστας; v. 52a), *sůměrenyje* (ταπεινούς; v. 52b), *alčoštejě* (πεινῶντας; v. 53a), *bogatěštějě* (πλουτοῦντας; v. 53b).
The Old Church Slavonic deviates from the cases of the Greek in expected instances. In two places, masculine animate objects appear in the functionally accusative genitive case form, per the Slavonic convention: κύριον (gũ; v. 46b), αὐτόν (ego; 50b). Another deviation represents a difference in verbal case assignment. Where the infinitive μνησθῆναι governs a genitive ἐλέους (v. 54b), the corresponding Slavonic infinitive poměňti governs an accusative milosti. A further three instances are caused by the rendering of the Greek genitive personal pronoun μου with the Slavonic possessive adjective moi, which agrees in case with its governing noun: vv. 46b (nominative), 47 (nominative and locative). Analogously, the Greek genitive personal pronoun αὐτοῦ corresponds to a Slavonic possessive adjective in the instrumental case (v. 51a), and the Greek genitive personal pronoun ἡμῶν corresponds to the Slavonic possessive adjective in the dative (v. 55a).

Only two deviations are due to differences in prepositional case governance. Both are localized in vv. 55. In one, the Greek preposition εἰς + accusative object (τὸν αἰώνα; v. 55b) corresponds to Slavonic do + the genitive věka. In the other, the Greek preposition πρὸς governs an accusative object (τοὺς πατέρας; v. 55a) where the corresponding Slavonic preposition kǔ takes a dative object (oclému). This change is especially relevant to the Slavonic treatment of marked language in the canticle as it obscures the case disagreement of the underlying Greek πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν (v. 55a) and the string appositive to it, τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ (v. 55b). As noted in Chapter 2, this case disagreement across lines is another example of the stylistic alternation of grammatical forms in the Greek. Now, in the
Slavonic text, the substantives in both v. 55a and v. 55b are datives. Read together, they all appear to receive their case from the preposition kū (kū őlcmű našimű / avramu i sëmeni ego [v. 55a,b]). In this instance then, the Slavonic translation has eliminated a stylistic feature of the Magnificat (cf. its careful preservation of the stylistic tense shift in vv. 46b-47). In one verse, the Old Church Slavonic text lacks a preposition, relying on its distinct instrumental case alone: ἐν ὑπαχίον (myšúcej; v. 51a). Three more case variances are also a consequence of the more extensive case system of Slavonic. Two involve a clarification of locative case for dative forms in the Greek: τῷ θεῷ (o bźe; v. 47), τῷ σωτῆρ (sĕpsē; v. 47). One other clarifies the instrumental sense of a Greek dative: διανοια (myslij; v. 51b).

**WORD ORDER**

Excepting non-one-to-one correspondences (e.g., periphrastic translations, new additions), the Old Church Slavonic text is consistent with the word order of the Greek text.

**USE OF CONJUNCTIONS**

Six instances of the Greek coordinate conjunction καὶ are rendered with the corresponding Slavonic conjunction i (vv. 47, 49b, 50a [x2], 52b, 53b). As expected, the Slavonic translator renders two instances of the subordinate conjunction ὅτι (vv. 48a, 49a) with clause-initial ἐκο. Finally, he renders the one instance of the postpositive γὰρ (v. 48b) as νο.
The Greek text contains two subordinate causal clauses, each introduced with the clause-initial conjunction ὅτι + an indicative verb (vv. 48b, 49b). As expected, the Slavonic translator renders each of these (vv. 48a, 49a) with a clause-initial ēko. Finally, he renders the one instance of the postpositive γὰρ (v. 48b) as bo.
5.3. Benedictus

Text

Lk. 1:68-79

68 †blagoslovenu gů bů želvů.

ĕko posěti i sůtvoři izbavlenie ljudemů svoimů.

69 i vizdviže rogu špniě našego.

vů domu dāvda220 otroka svoego.

70 ěkože glagola usť svetytyxă spštiixă otů věka prků [ ěgo221].

71 špnie otů vragů našixă.

i iz-d-rŏků vůsēxŭ nēnāvĕştšiixă nasŭ.

72 sūtvořiti milostĕ sŭ ŏći našimi.

i pomenoți zavĕtů světoi svoi.

73 [klětvo jejože212] klětû sę. kû avraamu ŏício našemu
dati namû 74 be-straxa. iz-d-rŏky vragû našixû izbavlišemû sę.

služiti emû75 přešodobiemî i pravădojô

120 Where Marianus has a genitive of possession, the Zographensis shows a possessive adjective: dāvĕ.

121 Absent in the Marianus text, but included in the Zographensis.2

122 In this instance, I have preferred the reading of Zographensis over the Marianus’ klětvojô ejože. The Marianus’ reading is an unparsable copyist’s error, in which the scribe has anticipated the je of jejože and transferred it to the preceding word.
prědů nimi víš díni života našego

76 i ty otroče prorku vyššeněago narečeši se.

prědůdeši bo prědů licemě ěnemě ugotovati pště³⁴³ ego.

77 dati razumě špšně ljudemě ego

vů otůpuštenie grěxově ixů.

78 milosrđei radi bů našego.

vě nixuže posětílů estů²⁴⁴ nasů vůstoků sů vyše

79 prosvětí sěděštejš vě tůmě: i sění sůmрутинě²⁵⁵.

napravití nošy našě na pště mirenů.

Marked Language Character

By remaining consistent with the verbal forms and word order of the Greek, the Old Church Slavonic text of the Benedictus can also be characterized as syntactically loose. The Slavonic version also shares the repetitive feel of its source text, duplicating four theme words: špšně // špšnie (vv. 69a, 71); ῥόκυ // ῥόky (vv. 71, 74); ῥάγα // ῥάγα (vv. 71, 74); pště // pště (vv. 76b, 79b). Lastly, three parallelisms appear in the Slavonic text of the canticle, as they also do in the Greek text (vv. 71, 72, 79).

---

³⁴³ Zographensis shows the singular pště.

³⁴⁴ This form appears to reflect the Byzantine/MT reading ἐπεσκέψεται. Zographensis has posětí nasů, aligning the verb with the aorist form in v. 68b.

³⁵⁵ Zographensis has všění sůmрутинě, repeating the preposition vě and definitizing sůmрутинě.
As expected, the Old Church Slavonic uses aorists to translate Greek aorists: ἐπεσκέψατο (posěti; v. 68b), ἐποίησεν (sūtvorit; v. 68b), ἐγέρνε (vězdvěže; v. 69a), ἐλάλησεν (gla; v. 70), ὁμοσεν (kletu se; v. 73a). However, the Slavonic uses the compound perfect tense to render a second instance of the aorist ἐπεσκέψατο, in that instance embedded within a relative clause: posětili esti (v. 78b). Lastly, both future indicatives in the Greek text correspond to present perfective verbs in the Slavonic: the passive χληθήσῃ (narečesė sė; v. 76a), and the middle προπορεύσῃ (prědūideši; v. 76b).

Notably, the Greek verb ἐπεσκέψατο [v. 68b] is in the middle voice, where posěti is active. On the other hand, where the Greek ὁμοσεν (v. 73a) is active voice, the Slavonic kletu se is effectively middle.

Use of the Infinitive

The Old Church Slavonic translator renders all eight infinitives in the Greek text with Slavonic infinitives: ποιῆσαι (sūtvoriti; v. 72a), μνησθῆναι (pomenqti; v. 72b), τοῦ δούναι (dati; v. 73b), λατρεύειν (sluštiti; v. 74), ἐτοιμάσαι (ugotovati; v. 76b), τοῦ δούναι (dati; v. 77a), ἐπιφάναι (prosvētiti; 79a), and τοῦ κατευθῦναι (napraviti; v. 79b).

Use of Participles

The Old Church Slavonic also renders all three participles in the Greek text of the canticle with Slavonic participles. The first, the present active participle μνησόντων (v. 71b), appears as the Slavonic present active participle nenavideštixu. Secondly, in v. 74, the Greek
aorist passive participle ῥυσθέντας (v. 74) corresponds to the Slavonic past active participle
izbavlšemi (+ se). Finally, the Slavonic translates the Greek present middle participle
καθηκένοις (v. 79a) as the present active participle sèdešteje.

The Slavonic also adds two participles to the text. The first of these is spštiixû (v. 70),
rendering the stylistically challenging Greek phrase διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’ αἰῶνος
προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (lit. “by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old”) as usty sňhxû spštiixû otû
vêka pîkû (lit. “by the mouths of those being holy prophets from the beginning”). In this
instance, the Slavonic has reformed the syntax of the phrase of the Greek to be more
intelligible to a Slavic ear, employing the participle spštiixû like a relative. The Slavonic also
introduces a resultative participle in v. 78b (posêtilû) to build a compound perfect tense.

**VERBLESS CLAUSES**

The Old Church Slavonic does not supply a verb when translating the sole nominal
sentence of the Benedictus: εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (blgnû gû bu ĭslvû; v. 68a).

**USE OF DEFINITE ADJECTIVES**

The Slavonic marks several participles and adjectives as definite: sňhxû, spštiixû (τῶν
ἀγίων ἀπ’ αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ; v. 70), nenavideštiixû (τῶν μισοῦντων; v. 71b), νυšînêago
(ψîstou; v. 76a), sèdešteje (τοῖς ... καθηκένοις; v. 79a). To these, Zographensis also adds the
definite sûmrûtînéî (v. 79a).
CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX

In the Old Church Slavonic text of the Benedictus, three deviations in case are caused by the rendering of the genitive personal pronoun ἡµῶν with the Slavonic possessive adjective našū, which agrees in case with its governing noun: vv. 72a (instrumental), 73a (dative), 79b (accusative). Another two represent the translations of Greek αὐτοῦ by the Slavonic reflexive possessive adjective svoi: vv. 68b (dative), 72b (accusative). In another three places, Slavonic translates a Greek genitive with an adjective agreeing with the case of its head noun: Ἰσραήλ (izlvū; v. 68a), δοξάτω (sümrutańě; v. 79a), and εἰρήνης (mirenū; v. 79b). A single participle (izbavlišemĭ se; Greek ἡµῶν v. 74a) is also made to agree with the case of its head noun (namū; Greek ἡµῦν). In another instance (v. 69a), the Slavonic translator loosely renders a dative Greek personal pronoun as a genitive possessive adjective: κέρας σωτηρίας ἡµῖν (hogū špsniē našego). This creates a subtle difference in sense between Greek “horn of salvation for us” and the Slavonic “horn of our salvation.”

Over a dozen more instances represent differences in prepositional case governance. Where Greek ἐν takes dative objects (σῶμα [v. 69b], ἀφέσει [v. 77b], σῖς [v. 78b], σκότει καὶ σκιᾶ [v. 79b]), the Slavonic vū takes a locative object in three instances (domu [v. 69b], nixūže [v. 78b], tūmē: i sēni [v. 79a]), and an accusative in another (otūpuštenie [v. 77b]). In the latter instance, the accusative case of otūpuštenie marks it as the goal of the verbal action (“to give his people the knowledge of salvation / unto the forgiveness of their sins”; v. 77), a distinct nuance from the Greek. Furthermore, where Greek μετὰ takes the genitive object τῶν πατέρων (v. 72a), Slavonic uses the preposition sū with the instrumental ὅ与时俱. Thirdly, Greek πρὸς with
accusative objects Λβραψυ τυν πατέρα (v. 73) becomes kǔ with the datives avraamu oćeju našemu. Two instances of Greek ἐνώπιον with genitives (χυτοῦ [v. 75b], χυρίου [v. 76b]) become Slavonic prědũ with instrumental objects (nim and [licemũ] ġńemũ, respectively). Greek διὰ and its accusative object σπλάγχνα ἐλέους become Slavonic postpositive radi with the genitive mílosrdei (v. 78a). Also, the Slavonic replaces a Greek prepositional phrase with a bare instrumental in two places. Greek διὰ στόματος appears as Slavonic usty (v. 70a). Similarly, Greek ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη appears as прěpodobiemũ і прavitydojũ (v. 75a).

Two more discrepancies reflect differences in verbal case assignment. Where Greek μνησθήναι takes a genitive object διαθήκης ἁγίας (v. 72b), the Slavonic equivalent поменоти takes accusative objects: zavětũ šloj. Secondly, the Greek infinitive ἐπιφάναι takes a dative object (τοῖς καθήμενοις; v. 79a) where the Slavonic просвěтiti takes an accusative sěděštějě.

Finally, the Slavonic eliminates the appositive use of ἐρχον + relative clause in ὅν (v. 73a), a feature of the loose syntax of the canticle. The Slavonic instead casts these as instrumentals (kletvojo ejože. . . ; lit. “by the oath, by which. . .”). In this instance, the Slavonic reacts to the terseness of the passage as poetry.

**Word Order**

The word order of the Old Church Slavonic generally approaches that of the Greek text. In one instance, the Old Church Slavonic preserves Greek word order even though the resulting utterance breaks up phrasal constituents: dati namũ be-straxa. iz-d-rky vragũ našixũ izbavlšemũ sę (vv. 73b-74a). The resulting construction is uncharacteristic of Slavic syntax. Nevertheless, three striking deviations from the word order of the Greek appear in the canticle,
all concentrated in vv. 78-79. First, the translation of the Greek preposition διὰ as a postpositive radi requires a shift in the word order of v. 78a (Greek: διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν; Slavonic: mílosrdei radi bů našego). Secondly, in v. 79a the participle corresponding to the clause-final Greek καθημένοις appears immediately after the infinitive that governs it and before the prepositional phrase that qualifies it (Greek: ἐπιφάνεια τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις; Slavonic: просвети седештете ви туме: ι сени съмртине). In this instance, it appears the participle has been brought forward to be head-initial in the substantival phrase.

**USE OF CONJUNCTIONS**

As expected, the Old Church Slavonic translator renders all instances of the Greek coordinating conjunction καὶ (vv. 68b, 69a, 71, 72b, 75a, 76a, 79a) with the corresponding conjunction i. He also translates the Greek subordinating conjunction ὅτι (v. 68b) as êko. However, all trace of the particle δέ (v. 76a) is lost.

**Complex Sentence Types**

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

εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεός τοῦ Ἰσραήλ / ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ / καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν . . . (vv. 68-69). The Old Church Slavonic translator renders this sentence with a clause-initial êko: blagoslovenu gů bů izvů. / êko posěti i sůtvori izbavlenie ljudemů svoímů. / i vízdvíže rogů špsně našego . . . (vv. 68-69).
RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

The Old Church Slavonic preserves both relative clauses of the Greek text of the Benedictus. The second of these is found in v. 78b, and is introduced by ἐν + ὦς (where ἐν licenses the dative case of ὦς). The Slavonic matches this construction with νῖ + the locative nixūže. The first appears in v. 73.

SPECIAL ISSUES AND CONSTRUCTIONS

A number of non-one-to-one correspondences appear in the Slavonic text. In v. 74a, the Slavonic translates Greek ἀφόβως as a prepositional phrase: be-straxa. The Slavonic also introduces a new substantive to v. 75, rendering Greek πᾶσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἡμῶν (“all our days”) as više dini života našego (“all the days of our life”), where the pronoun qualifies “life,” and not “days” (as in the Greek). Finally, the Slavonic translates the Greek phrase σπλάγχνα ἐλέους as a single noun: mïlosrdei.
5.4. Gloria

Text

Lk. 2:14

*slava vŭ v'yšŭniixŭ bů.*

*i na zemi mirŭ.*126 *vŭ člvcxŭ blagovolenie!*127

Marked Language Character

The nominative *blagovolenie* (v. 14b) appears to translate the Byzantine/MT reading εὐδοκία, rather than the εὐδοκίας reconstructed in our critical text. As indicated in our discussion of the Greek and Armenian texts, this reading recasts Lk. 2:14 as a tricolon:

Glory in the highest to God

And on earth, peace

(And) among men, favor.

The parallelism of these three codas is obvious: each features a nominative noun (*slava, mirŭ, blagovolenie*, respectively) and a prepositional phrase (*vŭ v'yšŭniixŭ, na zemi, vŭ člvcxŭ*). Of

126 This period in the PROIEL text accurately captures the tricolon structure of this text.

127 This form captures the Byzantine/MT reading εὐδοκία.
course, the first coda takes an additional dative object: \( b\u{u}. \) Unfortunately, the introduction of a third colon to the parallelism excludes the appearance of the AB-C // BA-C chiasm attested in the critical text and Gothic versions.

**Verbless Clauses**

Like the Gothic and Classical Armenian translators, the Old Church Slavonic translator does not supply a verb in either verbless clause of the Gloria. This approach supports the paratactic style of the fragment.

**Use of Definite Adjectives**

One adjective in the Slavonic text is marked for definiteness: \( vyšunixù \) (v. 14a). As noted earlier, the corresponding \( ψιστοίς \) lacks the article in Greek as a prepositional object.

**Case and Number Syntax**

The Old Church Slavonic departs from the case choices of the Greek in 3/6 transmitted instances, all within prepositional phrases. In fact, every prepositional object in the Slavonic text disagrees in case with its counterpart in the Greek text. First, the Greek preposition \( ἐν \) exclusively governs dative objects in the canticle (\( ψιστοίς \) [v. 14a]; \( ἀνθρώποις \) [v. 14b/c\(^{128}\)]). The Slavonic translator, on the other hand, renders both prepositions with the preposition \( ν\u{a} \), and their objects as locatives, consistent with the more extensive case system of Slavonic: \( vyšunixù \), \( člvcxù \). Finally, where the Greek preposition \( ἐπί \) governs a genitive

\[^{128}\)The slash captures the possibility of either a bicolon (so the Greek critical text) or tricolon (the Classical Armenian text and its Vorlage).
object (γῆς; v. 14b), the Slavonic translator utilizes the preposition *na*, once again with a locative object: *zemë*.

**USE OF CONJUNCTIONS**

The Old Church Slavonic renders the one instance of the Greek coordinating conjunction *καὶ* with the conjunction *i*. 
5.5. Nunc Dimittis

**Text**

Lk. 2:29-32

29 *nynė otūpūstis* raba tvoego vladyko.

*po glagolu tvoemu sū miromū.*

30 ėko vidēste ocī moi sūpasenie tvoe.

*eže esi ugotovalū prēdū licemū vīšēxū ljudii.*

31 svētū vū okrūvenie językū.

*i slavō ljudii tvoixū īlē.*

**Marked Language Character**

The Slavonic preserves the couplet structure and single parallelism (v. 32a,b) of the Greek text of the canticle. The paratactic style of the Slavonic is evident in that final parallelism, which unites two noun phrases of v. 32 with the simple coordinating conjunction i.

**Tense, Mood, and Diathesis**

The Old Church Slavonic translator renders the Greek present active indicative ἀπολύεις (v. 29a) with a Slavonic present active indicative: *otūpūstiši*. Furthermore, he renders

---

129 Zographensis shows the unprefixed *pustiši*.
the canticle’s one aorist active indicative, ἔδω (v. 30), as a Slavonic aorist active indicative (vidêste). Where the former is third person plural, the latter is third person dual, accommodating the dual number assigned to oči in the same line. Finally, the translator opts to translate the Greek aorist ἥτοίμασας (“you prepared”; v. 31) as the compound Slavonic perfect: esi ugotovalû (lit. “you have prepared”).

**CASE AND NUMBER SYNTAX**

In two instances, masculine substantives referring to male persons appear in a functionally accusative genitive case form, per the Slavonic convention: τὸν δοῦλον (raba; v. 29a). Two more instances are caused by the rendering of the Greek genitive personal pronoun σου with the Slavonic possessive adjective tvoi, which agrees in case with its governing noun: v. 29b (dative), 30 (accusative). One more represents the translation of the genitive personal pronoun µου with the Slavonic possessive adjective moî: v. 30 (nominative).

Two more deviations are due to differences in prepositional case governance. Where Greek κατὰ governs an accusative object (τὸ ρῆµα [v. 29b]), the corresponding Old Church Slavonic preposition po takes a dative object glagolu. Secondly, Greek κατὰ takes the accusative object πρὸςωπον, where Slavonic prêdû takes an instrumental object: licemû. Also of interest, the Slavonic translates the Greek preposition ἐν (v. 29b) with the less expected sù, imbuing it with a slightly different sense: “with peace.” Where ἐν takes a dative object (εἰρήνη), sù requires an instrumental object with this sense (miromû). Finally, with respect to number, the Greek plural οἱ ὑπὸλµοὶ is rendered with a Slavonic dual, oči. Here, the more extensive number system of Slavonic finds a more appropriate number for paired organs.
USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

As expected, the Slavonic text renders the Greek coordinate conjunction καὶ (v. 32) with the corresponding conjunction и. It also renders the Greek subordinate conjunction ὅτι (v. 30) with the characteristic еко.

COMPLEX SENTENCE TYPES

In the Greek text, the only causal clause of the canticle employs the subordinating conjunction ὅτι + an indicative verb (εἶδον; v. 30). The Old Church Slavonic matches this construction with a clause-initial еко + indicative (vidêste): nyně otůpustiši raba tvoego vladyko / . . . / еко vidêste oči moi súpasenie tvoe. . . (vv. 29-30). (I have addressed this verb earlier in this section.)

RELATIVE CLAUSE SYNTAX

Like the Greek ὅ, the Slavonic relative pronoun еže takes the singular number of its main clause referent (súpasenie; v. 30), but the accusative case assigned it by еси ugotovalу in the relative clause (v. 31).
5.6. Conclusion

Concluding this chapter, I will at last characterize the treatment of poetic language in the Old Church Slavonic version.

MAGNIFICAT

Table 5.1. catalogues deviations between the marked language of the Greek and Old Church Slavonic versions of the Magnificat (“Chg.”):

Table 5.1. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Magnificat

A. Line

A.1. Couplet Structure

A.1.1. Couplets

\( (v. 46b-47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55) \)

A.1.2. Other

\( (N/A) \)

B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of \( \kappa\alpha\iota \) to join cola

\( (v. 46b-47, 49, 52, 53) \)

B.1.2. Parallelisms without \( \kappa\alpha\iota \)

\( (v. 51, 55) \)

B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic \( \kappa\alpha\iota \)

\( (N/A) \)
B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ
(vv. 48, 50, 54)

B.2. Loose infinitival syntax
(ELIMINATED)

B.3. Verbless clauses
(v. 50)

B.4. Limited use of relative constructions
(N/A)

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
(vv. 46b-47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55)

C.2. Chiasm
(thermic ABBA and verb-object ABAB//BABA; vv. 52-53)

D. Stylistic Grammatical Forms

D.1. Non-semantic Tense Alternation
(v. 46b-47)

D.2. Non-semantic Case/Preposition Alternation
(v. 55a,b)

E. Phonaesthetics

E.1. Rhyme: Isoptoton
(vv. 52-53)
By a stricter grammatical fidelity to the Greek text, the Old Church Slavonic text successfully preserves all but one marked feature of the Greek text—more than any other target language version. Most notably, the Slavonic translator leaves both grammatical alternations of the Greek untouched, and by some measure of chance, preserves a isoptoton in vv. 52-53. Finally, the Old Church Slavonic introduces one non-deliberate marked language feature, cited in Table 5.2:

Table 5.2. Novel poetic elements in the Old Church Slavonic text of the Magnificat

A. Phonaesthetics

A.1. Isoptoton
(v. 52b-53a)

BENEDICTUS

Table 5.3. tabulates the retention or elimination of Greek marked language features in the Old Church Slavonic text of the Benedictus:
### Table 5.3: Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Benedictus

#### A. Line

##### A.1. Couplet Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1.1. Couplets</td>
<td>(vv. 68, 69, 71, 72, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78, 79)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.2. Other</td>
<td>(vv. 70, 73)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Terseness

##### B.1. Parataxis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola</td>
<td>(vv. 71, 72)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ</td>
<td>(vv. 79)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ</td>
<td>(vv. 68, 69, 74b-75, 76, 77, 78)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### B.2. Loose infinitival syntax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 72, 73b, 74b, 77a, 79a,b)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### B.3. Appositive noun phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(v. 71)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### B.4. Verbless clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 68a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.5. Limited use of relative(-like) constructions
(EXCEPTIONS: vv. 70\textsuperscript{130}, 73, 78b-79)

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
(vv. 71, 72, 79) 0

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

The Slavonic translation eliminates one instance of compactness in the hymn. It eliminates another with the translation of the stylistically challenging Greek phrase διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπʼ αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ as: usty svetytyxu spštixu otu vēka pēkū (lit. “by the mouths of the holy ones, being of old prophets”). As this change is comparable to a relative construction, I have cited it in row B.5 of Table 5.3 with qualification.

GLORIA

The Old Church Slavonic of the Gloria fragment shows the same two marked language divergences evident in the Classical Armenian translation:

\textsuperscript{130} In v. 70, a participial clause functions in an analagous manner to a relative construction. For this reason, I have expanded the subcategory title to “Limited use of relative(-like) constructions,” and listed v. 70 as an instance of this phenomenon.
Table 5.4. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Gloria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Line</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1.1. Couplets</td>
<td>+1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v. 14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.2. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Terseness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1. Parataxis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.1. Parallelisms with use of καὶ to join cola</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v. 14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.3. Non-parallel couplets with paratactic καὶ</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.4. Non-parallel couplets without καὶ</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B.2. Verbless Clauses | 0 |
| (v. 14) | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Stylistic Structures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1. Parallelisms</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v. 14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.2. Chiasm
   (ELIMINATED)

Like the Classical Armenian translator, the Old Church Slavonic translator is not directly responsible for either deviation. Rather, both reflect the faithful translation of the Byzantine/MT variant reading εὐδοκία (Slavonic blagovolenie; v, 14b).

**NUNC DIMITTIS**

Lastly, the Old Church Slavonic text of the Nunc Dimittis preserves every marked language feature found in the Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.5. Old Church Slavonic Deviations from the Marked Language of the Greek Nunc Dimittis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Line</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1. Couplet Structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.1. Couplets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vv. 29, 30-31, 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.2. Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Terseness

B.1. Parataxis

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

B.1.2. Parallelisms without καὶ
  (N/A) o

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

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

B.2. Appositive noun phrases
  (v. 32) o

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

C. Stylistic Structures

C.1. Parallelisms
  (v. 32) o

SUMMARY

Table 5.6 lists the types and number of marked language features lost in the Old Church Slavonic translation of the Greek canticles:
Table 5.6. Features Lost from the Marked Language of the Greek Canticles in the Old Church Slavonic Canticles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Lost</th>
<th>Losses/ Total Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Terseness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appositive noun phrases</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited use of relative(-like) constructions</td>
<td>1 gain with losses preferred (4 total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Phonaesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-consecutive partial hypogram</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

Though prone to occasional deviations from the word order of the Greek, the Old Church Slavonic preserves the poetic features of the Greek better than the Gothic and Classical Armenian versions. It intentionally deviates from the compact syntax of poetic Greek in one instance, employing a participle into a stylistically challenging noun phrase at v. 70 of the Benedictus.

Of course, the Slavonic also fails to represent the non-consecutive partial hypogram in vv. 52b-53a of the Magnificat due to its unique lexical and morphological constraints. Still, the

13 Counting relative constructions and the additional relative-like construction at v. 70 of the Benedictus.
Slavonic captures every remaining marked language feature of the Greek, including a few subcategories treated with greater inconsistency by the Gothic and Classical Armenian versions: non-semantic grammatical alternations, isoptoton, and loose infinitival syntax. In these instances, the Slavonic text shows a dramatic willingness to remain grammatically faithful to its source, despite the ambiguity of the resulting syntax.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In general, the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic Gospels represent literal translations of the Greek. These translations are generally faithful to the word order and clause structure of the Greek and generally follow its tense and case choices within the parameters of target language syntax. In this light, the characterization of these versions as “interlinears” is not without merit, so long as one recognizes the syntactic integrity of the final products. Indeed, the translators were more than willing to reassert the target language syntax wherever a literal rendering might have proved ungrammatical in translation.

The challenge of biblical poetry lies at the intersection of these multiple and sometimes conflicting concerns. Specifically, in biblical poetry, each translator encountered a syntax especially open to, if not outrightly exploitative of, ambiguity. For example, the terse style of the subgenre favors the creation of loosely associated clauses rather than subordinate clauses, and appositive noun phrases with unclear antecedents rather than relative clauses. Furthermore, biblical poetry utilizes a class of non-semantic grammatical alternations that divorced form and meaning in a few instances. These features tested the limits of grammaticality and clarity in each target language. Unsurprisingly, a number of them forced deviations from the literal translation method employed elsewhere. In so limited a data set,
our instances of such changes are few. Nevertheless, they represent some of the most peculiar forms and constructions in these passages.

TREATMENT OF POETRY

When describing the subgenre-specific translation strategies of each target language version, it is best to consider each category of marked language separately. First, the literal translation method employed by the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic translators easily captured the line peculiarities of biblical poetry (e.g., couplet structures) as well as the stylistic structural devices of the subgenre (e.g., parallelism, chiasm, conduplicatio). 100% of these phenomena were transmitted into the translations, excepting those unrepresented in the Vorlage of each version.

This literal translation method was also able to capture the terse and compact syntax of the canticles. However, each translator reshaped this syntax in a minority of instances, apparently to clarify ambiguous expressions or eliminate structures considered ungrammatical within the target language. From so small a sample size as our canticles, it is impossible to see larger trends dictating precisely which of these structures was inherently intolerable, and why. Nevertheless, it is clear that they proved challenging, and were evaluated on an individual basis by the target language translator. Even so, no translation makes more than three deliberate changes to this compact syntax, and no two make precisely the same changes.

A still wider disparity is seen in each language’s approach to the stylistic grammatical alternations of the Greek, however limited in number (two examples occur in the canticles,
both in the Magnificat). Only the Old Church Slavonic successfully reproduces the impression of these devices. The Gothic, by contrast, levels both alternations (in at least one instance deliberately). The Classical Armenian takes the most intriguing approach, preserving both instances, but altering one for the sake of clarity and poetic embellishment. That change is the only example of a deliberate reaction to the marked language character of these hymns for poetic effect.

Finally, no aspect of biblical poetry proved a greater challenge to the target language versions than phonaesthetic devices. Differences in the case systems of the source and target languages, as well as differences in the sound shapes of corresponding words and inflectional endings, conspired to make transmission impossible in most cases. Thus, both the Gothic and Classical Armenian versions lost the line-final isoptoton of vv. 52-53 of the Magnificat in whole or in part. Furthermore, all three versions lost the non-consecutive partial hypogram in vv. 52b-53a of the Magnificat, though the Gothic and Old Church Slavonic achieved a like effect in the emergence of a non-deliberate isoptoton in its place. However few the instances of either feature, this high rate of loss speaks to the challenge of reproducing this phenomenon in translation. Of course, insofar as this is a sacred text, the translator might have well been unwilling to take the necessary liberties to reproduce these effects, even if this occurred to them at all.

**Future Avenues of Study**

As a dedicated study of biblical poetry in the Gospels, our analysis has been able to anticipate a number of the most striking peculiarities of the target language texts. Our study
has also been able to correct previous analyses of at least a couple of peculiar forms, and clarify numerous other translation decisions of each target language version. Although the translators did not alter their fundamental translation approaches when confronting this language, their responses can be collectively characterized, and are to some extent comparable to one another. Finally, in one instance (the Armenian treatment of Lk.1:46b), our study has even isolated the conscious impression poetry seems to have made on a particular translator. From all these facts, it is clear: an eye towards subgenre can yield significant benefits within a study of the translation syntax of the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic Gospels.

Happily, this study has not exhausted even the subgenre of poetry in the Gospels. Although it embraces all the most overt poetic hymns of the Gospels, it is worth recalling that biblical “poetry” is something of a continuum. Though anchored on one end by the canticles, it is nonetheless manifest in other passages, including those with an obvious stylistic character (e.g., the Beatitudes), those reflecting the devotional traditions of Judaism (e.g., the Lord’s Prayer), and apothegms or proverbs in the teachings of Jesus. (Of course, it is overtly present in the majority of quotations from the Psalms.) An analysis of each of these Gospel passages as poetry, to the extent they are poetry, may prove fruitful in clarifying other translation decisions in the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavonic versions. Of course, a similar analysis could be executed for passages in the Pauline epistles with a possible liturgical background (e.g., the so-called “Kenosis Hymn” of Philippians 2). A desire for further study into all these areas is indicated.
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