

***Interference from mediating languages
in translation: The case of the Lord's Prayer
in Chechen and Ingush***

***Влияние языка-посредника при переводе
(на примере переводов «Отче наш»
на чеченский и ингушский языки)***

Kotem E. R.

Bugenhagen R. D.

Комен Э. Р.

Бугенхаген Р. Д.

This paper presents the translation of the Lord's Prayer into Chechen, as published in the 2012 edition of the whole Bible, and the translation into Ingush, which has not yet been published. Both translations were drafted on the basis of a Russian translation, and then corrected by a translation team to ensure they correctly convey the meaning of the original Greek. This paper provides an analysis of the translation, focusing in particular on how grammatically implied participants in Greek passive-voice verbs have been handled in the Caucasian languages that lack a passive.

Key words: Chechen, Ingush, intermediate language, Bible translation, grammatical voice

В статье представлены переводы молитвы «Отче наш» на чеченский язык из издания полной Библии (2012) и на ингушский язык (не опубликовано). Черновики этих переводов были сделаны на основе русского перевода Библии. После этого переводческая группа отредактировала их на основании греческого оригинала. В статье дается анализ двух переводов, особое внимание уделяется

тому, как грамматически подразумеваемые участники пассивной конструкции в греческом языке были переданы в северокавказских языках, в которых страдательный залог отсутствует.

Ключевые слова: чеченский язык, ингушский язык, язык посредника, перевод Библии, грамматический залог

1. Introduction

This article presents the Chechen and Ingush¹ translations of the Lord's Prayer, addressing one vital aspect of translation in particular: possible interference due to mismatches between the voice systems of the languages that are involved. By 'voice' we mean the regular encoding in the verbal morphology of the mapping of semantic arguments onto syntactic functions [Kulikov 2013].

The Greek text of Matthew 6:9-13 contains nine verbs [Aland et al. 1983]. Two of these are in the passive voice, where the patient participants are overtly expressed, but the agents are implied. The Chechen and Ingush translations of these verbs use intransitives, which have only a single argument. This observation might lead one to conclude that the reflexives in the Russian translation have been interpreted as intransitives by the translation team. In order to test this hypothesis, we look at all main verbs in the Lord's Prayer, and examine the places where a difference in the encoding of participants occurs. Are these cases where the receptor language uses different constructions but gets the same underlying meaning across? Or are these situations where the grammatical voice system of Russian, the intermediate language in the translation process, influenced the Chechen and the Ingush translations?

¹ The authors would like to express their appreciation to Aleksandr Migunov for graciously providing Ingush data and some bibliographic references.

2. A comparison of the voice systems

This section briefly reviews the voice systems of the languages involved: Greek, Russian and the two Caucasian languages Chechen and Ingush. This is the background information that we need to have in order to evaluate the source text, the intermediate translation and the receptor translations.

2.1. The Greek voice system

The Greek source language has active, passive and middle voice, which are all marked morphologically on the verb forms (both finite as well as non-finite). Wallace [1996: 408] characterizes the basic functions of these forms as: “In general, the voice of the verb may indicate that the subject is doing the action (active), *receiving* the action (passive) or both doing and receiving (at least the results of) the action (middle).”

Active voice verbs typically have subjects exhibiting agent, experiencer, or causer semantic roles. Or, in descriptive and equative stative clauses, the Subject functions as the theme/topic about which the state or quality is predicated [Ibid: 411–413].

Middle voice verbs are more precisely characterized by Wallace in the following manner: “In general, in the middle voice the subject performs or experiences the action expressed by the verb in such a way that emphasizes the subject’s participation... [Ibid: 414], citing Robertson [1923: 804] “The middle calls special attention to the subject... the subject is acting in relation to himself somehow.” Wallace identifies a number of different uses of the middle voice in Greek:

1. Direct Middle / Reflexive / Direct Reflexive — where “the subject acts on himself or herself.” ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγγατο ‘he went away and hanged himself’ (Mt 27:5) [Wallace 1996: 416]. This use of the middle voice was more common in classical Greek, but is quite rare in the Greek of New Testament times, when it was largely replaced by the use of an active voice verb plus a reflexive pronoun. Wallace

notes that even in classical Greek, the active verb plus reflexive pronoun construction was more common.

2. Redundant Middle—the use of the middle voice in a reflexive manner along with an overt reflexive pronoun [*Ibid*: 418]. A clear example of this sort of double reflexive marking is ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς [εἶναι] νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ‘consider yourselves dead to sin’ (Romans 6:11).
3. Indirect Middle / Indirect Reflexive / Benefactive / Intensive / Dynamic Middle — Here, “the subject acts for (or sometimes by) himself or herself, or in his or her own interest” [*Ibid*: 419]. Acts 25:11 — Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι ‘I call upon Caesar [to judge my case]’, where the verb is present tense middle voice, is a good example of this kind of benefactive meaning for the middle voice. Neglecting the deponent middle verbs, this is the most common use of middle voice in the New Testament [*Ibid*].
4. Causative / Permissive Middle — the subject causes or allows something to be done for/to himself [*Ibid*: 423–426]: ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου ‘arise, be baptized and have your sins washed away (Acts 22:16).
5. Reciprocal Middle — This is used with subjects whose referents are plural in number and indicates that they interact among themselves or somehow act on each other. βουλευσάντο δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἵνα καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον ἀποκτείνωσιν ‘So the chief priests planned together among themselves to also kill Lazarus’ (John 12:10).
6. Deponent Middle — “A deponent middle is a middle voice verb that has no active form but is active in meaning” [*Ibid*: 428]. These are the most common type of middle voice verbs in the New Testament, because some of the most common verbs fall into this category: ἀποκρίνομαι ‘answer, reply’, βούλομαι ‘wish, be willing’, γίνομαι ‘become, happen’, δύναμαι ‘can, be able’, ἐργάζομαι

‘work, do, accomplish’, ἔρχομαι ‘come, go’, πορεύομαι ‘go, proceed, travel’, προσεύχομαι ‘pray’, χαρίζομαι ‘give/grant as a favour, show oneself to be gracious, remit/forgive, pardon’.

Passive voice verbs in Greek have subjects but no objects and are used to express situations where “the subject is acted upon or receives the action expressed by the verb.” [Ibid: 431]. Passive constructions in Greek can leave the agent bringing about the situation unexpressed, or identify him or her via various types of prepositional phrases. The individual *ultimately responsible* for the situation is expressed via a prepositional phrase headed by the preposition ὑπό ‘by’: ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ‘...they were baptized by him in the Jordan river’ (Mk 1:5). An intermediate agent, through whom the ultimate agent acts, is expressed by a prepositional phrase headed by the preposition διὰ ‘through’: ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου ‘so that which was spoken [by God] through the prophet Isaiah was fulfilled’ (Matthew 4:14). An impersonal means/instrument used by an agent to cause something to happen may be expressed in several ways:

1. preposition ἐν plus dative case: σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον ‘according to the law almost everything was cleansed by blood’ (Hebrews 9:22).
2. the dative case by itself with no preposition: λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου ‘we maintain that a person is justified by faith apart from the works of the law’ (Romans 3:28 NIV).
3. rarely other prepositional phrases headed by other prepositions like ἐκ ‘from, out of, away from, by’ (Ga 4:4, Ja 2:22), and ἀπὸ ‘from, away from, off of’ (2 Cor 3:18).

2.2. The Russian voice system

The Russian intermediate language also has active, passive and middle voice, but not all are expressed by inflections occurring on finite verbs.

The Russian verbal system distinguishes person and number of the Subject for non-past tenses, number and gender of the Subject for past tenses, aspect—imperfective versus perfective—and voice. The voice system distinguishes active, middle/reflexive, and passive voices. Active voice is the most unmarked morphologically. Middle/Reflexive voice is marked via the addition of the derivational ‘reflexive’ verbal suffix *-ся*. Middle/Reflexive verbs have a wide range of functions. Some of the principal ones identified by Timberlake [2004: 345–349] are:

1. Reflexive tantum (verbs like *бояться* ‘fear’, *смеяться* ‘laugh’, and *надеяться* ‘to hope’, which only occur as formally reflexive forms with no corresponding non-reflexive forms).
2. ‘True’ reflexives/Middle constructions, where an actor acts upon himself/herself (verbs like *мыться* ‘wash (oneself)’, *бриться* ‘shave (oneself)’, *одеваться* ‘dress oneself/get dressed’).
3. Reciprocal reflexives, where a number of different individuals act on each other, for example: *драться* ‘fight (each other)’, *мириться* ‘become reconciled with each other’.
4. Habitual reflexives, where the reflexive expresses a habitual/characteristic tendency, for example *Собака кусается* ‘The dog bites / has a tendency to bite (people).’
5. Somewhat similar to # 4 are modal impersonal reflexives expressing desire or inclination: *Мне не спится* ‘I.DAT don’t feel like sleeping.’
6. Intransitivized reflexives, where the actor argument of a transitive predication has been removed. Compare *Он начал работу* ‘He.NOM began the work.ACC’/ *Работа началась* ‘The work.NOM began.’ According to Timberlake [2004: 347], this is the most productive function of this suffix.

Russian has three different constructions that functionally correspond to passives in other languages:

1. Generic third person plural verbs with a fronted Object may be used when the actor is unknown or to avoid assigning responsibility for some action. *Его убили вчера* ‘He was murdered yesterday.’ (Literally, ‘Him.ACC they-killed yesterday.’) In such constructions, the object is normally highly topical.
2. Intransitivized reflexives (i. e. #6 above).
3. Past and present participles, for example *Всё будет сделано* ‘Everything.NOM will.be done.’ *Собрание было организовано студентами* ‘The meeting.NOM was organized by students.INS’ *Она любима всеми* She.NOM [is] loved [by] everyone.INS.’

2.3. The Chechen and Ingush voice systems

The two Northeast Caucasian receptor languages, Chechen and Ingush, have a different voice system. Basically, they have active voice, direct causative voice and indirect causative voice. They do not have a morphological inflection for a passive voice, but there is something like a middle voice for a restricted number of verbs.²

Since Chechen and Ingush are morphologically ergative languages there is agreement between the transitive verb and the direct object. The languages do *not* have any agreement marking on the transitive verb that links to the subject.

² Ingush has a construction in which a suffix homophonous with the verb *dala* ‘to give’ is added to a verb yielding a new predicate whose exact function is somewhat disputed. It has been variously interpreted as a potential, inceptive or decausative construction. Such derived predicates do not take ergative subjects. Frequently the actor is omitted, but if one is present it will be in the dative case. For discussions of this construction see Nichols [2011:484, 491–496] and Барахоева *et al* [2012: 271–275].

- (1) a. [_{DO} ħa:ja] novq'a-v-æq:-ira [_{SBJ} as] [Maciev 1961: 317]
 guest road.on-V-bring-PST 1S.ERG

'Accompanied the guest on his way.'

- b. [_{DO} k'ant] dyejutjyra juq'ax-v-æq:-ina [Maciev 1961: 534]
 boy learn.PTC.PRS.ABL back-V-bring-PST

*'[Someone] tore the boy from learning //
 The boy was taken away from learning.'*

Consider the simple sentence in (1a). This uses the transitive verb *novq'adaq:a* 'put someone on the way'. Chechen and Ingush have noun class agreement, comparable to gender agreement, which is why the noun class prefix in the verb changes from default *d-* to *v-* so as to show agreement with the direct object.³ The verb in (1a) is transitive, and in this case both the ergative case subject *as* '1s. ERG' as well as the nominative case direct object *ħa:ja* 'guest' are visible in the sentence.

The sentence in (1b) uses the same transitive verb stem *daq:a* 'bring', though with a different preverb *juq'ax* 'backwards.' But this sentence only has one verbal argument specified, the direct object *k'ant* 'boy/son'. The subject is not overtly specified. There is no need to do so, grammatically speaking, since the only agreement is that between the verb and the direct object. But since the verb is transitive (this is visible from the verb form), the reader or hearer knows that some sort of subject/agent (the person or persons tearing the boy away from the learning) is implied.

In sum, while Chechen and Ingush do not have a separate morphological form of the verb to express passive voice, sentences like (1b) *functionally resemble* the passive in languages like Greek, Russian and English in that they allow

³ Each noun belongs to a particular noun class (comparable to masculine, feminine, neuter gender, except that Chechen and Ingush have six classes instead of three).

grammatically implying that there is an agent of an event, without needing to overtly identify that agent.⁴

(2) a. [_{SBJ} cuo] [_{DO} tʃietar] diel:ira [Maciev 1961: 139]
 3S.ERG umbrella D.open.PST
'He opened the umbrella.'

b. [_{SBJ} tʃietar] diel:adel:a [Maciev 1961: 139]
 umbrella open.DECAUS.PST
'The umbrella opened up.'

As for the middle voice, consider the examples in (2). The regular verb *diel:a* 'open' is transitive; it requires an ergative subject and a nominative direct object, as in (2a). The verb is one of a limited number of verbs that allows suffixing a verb stem *dala*, which as a separate verb would mean 'give'. But in this particular combination the suffixed verb stem functions as a decausativizer: it turns the transitive verb into an intransitive one. So (2b) is a situation where the umbrella opened up by itself. No agent for that event is in any way implied.

This, then, is the 'hint of a middle voice' that is present in Chechen and Ingush. It occurs with a limited number of verbs: *ajʔa* 'increase', *a:ta* 'crush', *diel:a* 'open', *lovsa* 'mix', *q'ovla* 'close'.⁵

3. Analyzing the translations

This section analyzes the Chechen and Ingush translations. Consider the side-by-side translation of the two versions (the word order has been adjusted to accommodate English).

⁴ The similarity stops when the 'long passive' is considered, e.g: *The boy was taken from class* [_{pp} *by his teacher*]. The long passive allows expressing the agent in a PP. Nothing similar to this exists in either Chechen or Ingush.

⁵ The verb stem *dala* can be attached as suffix to other verbs, but then its meaning is either inceptive or potential.

<i>Chechen</i>	<i>Ingush</i>
[9] Our.EXC Father from heaven! Let Your name be holy! [10] May Your Lordship come. May Your will happen in heavens just as on earth. [11] Please give us.EXC today food that suffices to eat! [12] Please forgive us.EXC, just as we.EXC forgive those who are in debt to us.EXC. [13] Please do not allow us.EXC to give in to forbidden desire and protect us.EXC against the devil.	[9] Our.EXC Father from heaven! Let Your name be holy and honorable among the people! [10] May Your Kingdom come. May Your will happen in heavens just as on earth. [11] Please give us.EXC today food that suffices to eat! [12] Please forgive our.EXC sins, just as we.EXC forgive those who are in debt to us. [13] Please do not allow us.EXC to give in to forbidden desire for the sake of testing and protect us against the devil.

The subsections below present the nine clauses in the prayer. Each of the clauses is structured around a verb. This verb has a particular grammatical voice in the original Greek and it has associated explicit and implicit arguments. We show how this has been conveyed in Russian, and then we look at how the resulting Chechen has conveyed the same clause. While there are many interesting things going on from a linguistic and exegetical point of view, the discussion focuses on the grammatical voice system, the associated argument structure and on the question of whether the Russian translation as the intermediate source text has influenced the resulting Chechen or Ingush in these areas.

3.1. When we pray

The first part of verse nine is not, strictly speaking, part of the prayer as such. It is the introduction that Jesus uses for the prayer as a whole. The text provides a Chechen (1a) and Ingush (1b) translation of Οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς ‘Pray, then, like this’ (Russian Молитесь же так ‘Pray then this way’).⁶

⁶ The Chechen and Ingush translations use a phonemic spelling based on the IPA.

(1) a.	tsunde:la	jaef	doʒa	detʃu	xe:naħ
	therefore	2P.RFL	prayer	do.PTCP.OBL	time.LOC
	hoqu	dieʃnaʃna	t'e	tidam	baxi:ta
	this.OBL	word.PL.DAT	on	attention	go.CAUS.INF
b.	ʃoai	la:mazatsa	ift:a	diexa	
	2P.RFL.GEN	prayer	thus	call/ask	

Jesus uses the imperative of the verb προσεύχομαι ‘to pray’. This is a deponent intransitive verb, which means that morphologically, it lacks an active form and instead exhibits middle/passive inflection, but it is interpreted as being active in meaning. The verb can take a prepositional phrase as an optional argument. Someone (the agent) ‘prays’ or ‘requests’ something (the patient) to or from someone else (God). The Russian Synodal translation, too, uses an imperative. Here the verb молиться ‘request’ morphologically exhibits middle voice (signalled by the reflexive suffix -ся), but it does not appear to convey any kind of reflexive meaning. The Chechen translation uses doʒa dan ‘make a prayer’, which consists of the noun doʒa ‘prayer’ and the transitive verb dan ‘do/make’. Likewise, the Ingush translation uses an active construction la:mazatsa diexa ‘call/ask with a prayer’.

This introductory clause, then, is a good example of a situation where the receptor translations (Chechen and Ingush) are *not* influenced by the morphological voice of the intermediate translation (Russian). The reason for this may be that the verb молиться is a high frequency one in Russian, which means that Russian L2 speakers will have had numerous examples of its use and meaning, so that they understand that the verb is not to be understood as a reflexive ‘request something of oneself.’ Besides, such a meaning would make no sense in the context.

3.2. To honour the name of the Father

The actual prayer starts in the second half of verse nine. The first words form a vocative Noun Phrase Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ‘our Father who is in the heavens’. The NP expresses to whom this prayer is directed.

- (2) a. Тҫан stigalara Da:!
 1P.EXC.GEN heaven.ABL father
- b. Тҫа Siglara Da:!
 1P.EXC.GEN heaven.ABL father

The renderings in Chechen (2a) and Ingush (2b) are relatively straightforward. One interesting phenomenon here is how ‘heavenly’ is formed: the ablative case of the nouns stigal ‘heaven’ (Chechen) and sigal ‘heaven’ (Ingush) functions as a suffix that transforms the noun into an adjective.⁷ Should the NP as a whole be inflected, an additional affix *-tʃu* will be added that is otherwise used for adjectives in any inflected (oblique) case.

What then follows is a series of three desires: may Your name be hallowed, may Your kingdom come and may Your will be done. The first of these desires is the last part of verse 9: ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου ‘may Your name be hallowed’. Its rendering in Chechen and Ingush is in (3).

- (3) a. ḥan tʃ'e si:laḥ ɣylda!
 2S.GEN name honorable be.OPT
- b. ḥa tʃ'i jeza a loarahaf a ɣi:la
 2S.GEN name valuable & honorable & be.OPT
- na:ɣa juq'e!
 people.DAT among

The Greek uses ἀγιασθήτω is a third person imperative passive voice of the verb ἀγιάζω ‘to sanctify/make holy.’ This is a transitive verb and occurs in the active voice in places such as Matthew 23:19 (the altar makes a gift sacred/holy). The object of the sanctification here is ‘the name’ of the Father. Newman & Stine [1988] explain in the UBS Translator’s Handbook that the *name* is a way of referring to God himself. This being the case, God

⁷ Nichols [2011: 230] calls this class of words ‘dephrasal adjectives’. These adjectives retain their ablative meaning.

the Father is the recipient of the action expressed by ἀγιάζω. The action of the verb is not, in this case, to ‘make someone holy’, but to ‘treat someone as holy’ [Gaebelein et al. 1984: 170]. The third person passive imperative, then, is a Greek way of expressing the desire that God would make sure people treat him as ‘holy’, that is recognizing Him as God.

The Chechen translation in (3a) appears to be much more literal, retaining ‘your *name*’, and it appears to be a petition that God’s name be (intransitive) ‘honorable’. There is no explicit mention of other participants. This may, at first glance, seem like a reduction of the original meaning, and one might argue that the Russian intermediate translation has functioned as a filter here: Да святится имя твоё ‘may your name be sanctified’. The Russian uses a 3rd person *reflexive* form of святить ‘make holy/sanctify.’ Could it be that the translators have simply understood this reflexive form as a middle voice that effectively conveys an intransitive idea, ‘to be holy’?

This is not the whole picture. Maciev [1961] tells us that Chechen т’е has two senses. The first sense is the literal ‘name’, used for instance in naming someone. When used of sentient beings, concepts like ‘popular’ and ‘famous’ include semantic components like: “Many people know about this person. Many people think/consider this person to be good or desirable.” Such semantic components *presuppose* a situation where people are knowing and thinking. These presupposed people are made overt in the Ingush translation in (3b), which adds на:ха жу’е ‘among people’. The Ingush translators were somewhat puzzled by the Russian translations да святится имя Твое (Synodal), пусть прославится Твое имя! (NRT), because they had difficulty understanding how God’s name could become holy, when it is already in itself perfectly holy [personal communication, August 20, 2019]. To convey the meaning ‘treat/regard as being holy’, it was necessary to add an actor. For this reason, the phrase ‘among people’ was added.

It appears, then, that the meaning of the original is conveyed, but it is done in a different way than one might expect. Culture and language combine in the expression of ideas.

3.3. The coming kingdom

The second of the three desires is ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου ‘may your kingdom come’. Its translation is in (4) (for the optative, see 13.5.9 in Nichols [2011]).

- | | | | |
|--------|--------|------------|---------------|
| (4) a. | ħan | o:lal:a | t'eqo:tʃi:la. |
| | 2S.GEN | lordship | come.PRS.OPT |
| b. | ħa | paʃ:aħalqe | t'aqoatʃi:la. |
| | 2S.GEN | kingdom | come.PRS.OPT |

The Greek verb's voice is active (it is a middle deponent verb; it conjugates like a middle voice, but its meaning is active). The verb used in the Russian intermediate translation да придет Царствие Твое ‘May Your Kingship come’ is in the active voice. The Chechen and Ingush verbs literally mean ‘reach’, as in ‘arrive’. They are both actives and it is clear that their active voice has not been changed in translation from the Greek, nor has a change in argument structure taken place in that process.

The difference between Chechen and Ingush is in the choice of how to translate ‘kingdom’. Chechen focuses more on the ‘ruling’ aspect of God's kingdom, while Ingush focuses more on its similarity with earthly kingdoms (compare the kingdom referred to in the Old Testament book of Daniel, chapters 7-8).

3.4. Do the Father's will

The third of the three desires focuses on the ‘will’ of the Father: γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ‘may your will be done/happen/be fulfilled, as in heaven, so on earth’. Here the passive verb form γενηθήτω is used to express the desire that the Father's will ‘be done’ or ‘happen’. Davies and Allison, in their

commentary on Matthew observe ‘Thy will be done’ seems to be the passive formulation for ποιέω ‘do’ + θέλημα σου ‘your will’, noting that “In the NT the passive of ποιέω is very rare.” [Davies & Allison 2004: 605]. This implies that there is an agent that needs to carry out the Father’s will.⁸ The most likely candidate for this agent can be derived from the immediate context ‘on earth as it is in heaven.’ Those who need to carry out the Father’s will on earth are the *people*.

- (5) a. Stigalʃkaḥ san:a, laet:aḥ a ḥan laʔam qo:tʃuʃχyli:la
 heaven.PL.LOC like earth.LOC & 2S.GEN will fulfill.PRS.OPT
 b. Siglenafkaḥ san:a, laet:a a ḥan laʔam qoatʃaʃχyli:la
 heaven.PL.LOC like earth.LOC & 2S.GEN will fulfill.PRS.OPT

While the Greek γενηθήτω ‘may be fulfilled’ uses the passive voice, the Russian Synodal translation uses a simple auxiliary да будет ‘may (it) be’, that is, an intransitive (and existential) verb. There is no grammatical implication of others doing the Father’s will in the Chechen and Ingush renderings in (5a,b) either. The verb that is used is a simple intransitive one that builds on the auxiliary хила ‘be/happen.’ The transitive variant of this verb would have been qo:tʃuʃ + dan ‘do/make.’

⁸ One of the authors has had extensive translation experience with several languages in Papua New Guinea, and there the implicit actor(s) in this petition have been made explicit:

‘2S.cause people 3P.follow 2S.GEN. insides/will/desires on earth as 3P-follow it in heaven.’ Like Chechen and Ingush, these languages of Papua New Guinea lack passive constructions, and there is no verb having the meaning ‘fulfill’. A third person plural form of the verb can function somewhat similarly to a passive, expressing a generic agent whose precise identity is not particularly relevant in the given context. Typically, however, such unexpressed agents are understood as being plural in number, and therefore such a construction was not appropriate where the actor is a single individual: God.

Like the honoring of God's name in 2.2, this, too, may be a place where the filtering influence of the Russian translation surfaces.

3.5. Providing for our needs

The second part of the prayer consists of three requests. The first request (verse 11) acknowledges that even the simplest things in life originate from the Father: τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον 'Give us the food that we need today'. Its translation is in (6).

- | | | | | | |
|--------|--------|----------|--------|----------|---------|
| (6) a. | Таχана | daʔ:al | нарха | luoħa | tχu:na! |
| | today | eat.ASMA | food | give.POL | 2S.DAT |
| b. | Тахан | daʔ:al | парава | da | tχo:na! |
| | today | eat.ASMA | food | give.POL | 2S.DAT |

Greek is a nominative-accusative language, and the Caucasian ones are morphologically ergative, but other than that, there is no difference in argument structure or voice between the Greek and the Caucasian translations.⁹ Both use a ditransitive 'give' in the active voice. The Russian Synodal has хлеб наш насущный дай нам на сей день 'give us our necessary bread for this day'. Russian too uses a ditransitive 'give' in the active voice.

Linguistically interesting is the form of daʔ:al 'eat.ASMA' (similar to Ingush daʔal). This form derives from the infinitive daʔa 'eat' combined with the suffix REDUP+I 'as much as'.¹⁰ Chechen and Ingush have a range of suffixes occurring

⁹ The language-system differences are visible in the cases of the direct object: Greek, being nominative-accusative, has the direct object ἄρτον 'food' in the accusative, whereas the two Caucasian translations have the corresponding нарха/парава in the nominative case (some label this the 'absolute' case).

¹⁰ What is reduplicated (redup) is the last consonant of the verb stem. In this case the stem is daʔ-, so that the glottal stop that ends the stem gets reduplicated when the ending -I is added to the infinitive form daʔa, resulting in daʔ:al.

on verb forms that turn them into converbs. These can be adverbial or, as in this case, adjectival (attributive) in nature.¹¹ Some of these suffixes combine with an obligatory duplication of the last stem consonant (as the glottal stop here). For a fuller treatment, see Good [2003].

3.6. Receiving and granting forgiveness

The second request consists of two clauses, where we ask God to forgive us (7), just as we forgive others (8): και ἄφεσις ἡμῶν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς και ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν ‘And forgive us our sins/offenses, as we, too, forgive our debtors/offenders’.

- (7) a. Dieha tχu:na getʃ,
 forgive.POL.2S 1P.EXC.DAT RP
- b. Tχa q'inofta getʃde ʒa,
 1P.EXC.GEN sin.PL forgive.IMV.2S 2S.ERG
- (8) a. tχajna dieqari:lah boltʃa:rna o:χa
 1P.EXC.RFL.DAT debt.LOC REL.PL.DAT 1P.EXC.ERG
 ma-getʃdar:a
 forgive.JUST.AS
- b. tχoafta de:qari:la boltʃa:rna oaxa geft
 1P.EXC.RFL.DAT debt.LOC REL.PL.DAT 1P.EXC.ERG forgive.RP
 ma dar:a.
 JUST.AS do.PRS

Both times the Greek uses the active and ditransitive verb ἀφίημι ‘forgive’. The Russian Synodal also uses a ditransitive verb. The Chechen and Ingush verbs are transitive. The Chechen verb getʃdan ‘forgive’ combines a preverb getʃ with a main verb dan ‘do/make’,

¹¹ These suffixes include: -tʃa ‘when’, -lc ‘until’, -lie ‘before’, -tʃuoʃ ‘during’.

and it treats the preverb as if it were an object of this main verb.¹² This is why Chechen only has room for an ergative subject and a dative object. This dative object can be either (a) the thing that is being forgiven (e.g. ‘sins’) or (b) it can be the recipient of the forgiveness. But it cannot be both at the same time.

In sum, there is no difference in grammatical voice between the source, the intermediate and the receptor translations: all three use an active voice. But there is a difference in the verbal arguments. Greek stipulates the recipient of the forgiveness as well as the thing that is forgiven in the first clause, as does the Russian Synodal translation (прости нам долги наши ‘forgive us our sins’). Chechen makes the recipient of the forgiveness (tχu:na ‘us’) explicit, while it does not specify *what* exactly is forgiven. Ingush expresses the thing that is forgiven (tχa q’inofta ‘our sins’), but it does not make the recipient explicit (though the recipient can be implied from the possessive pronoun tχa ‘our’).

3.7. No falling into temptation

The penultimate request is for the Father to protect us from everything that might cause us to stray from being faithful to His will—either our own sinful desires or difficult circumstances that test our faith: καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν ‘and do not lead us into temptation’.

- (9) a. ɸa:ram laʔamna k’el a ma daχi:taɸa:ra Aɸ
 sinful desire.DAT under & NEG.PRT go.CAUS.OPT 2S.ERG

¹² While syntax is not the topic of this paper, note what happens to the preverb *getɸ*: it takes up a position in the clause on its own, while the verb to which it belongs ends up clause-initially. This kind of separation of preverb from its main verb (the technical term for this is ‘tmesis’) is reminiscent of Germanic, verb-second, languages. The separation of the preverb *getɸ* from its main verb is attested in numerous texts in Chechen, e.g. san q’uonal:a dojla ɸu:na getɸ a ‘may my youth forgive you.’ [Curuev 2013].

b.	Тхo	zera	dyħa	ħa:ramtʃa	loʃama	k'ala	ma
	1P	testing	for.sake	sinful	desire.DAT	under	NEG.PRT
	daħi:talaħ	ħa	tħo				
	go.CAUS.IMV	2S.ERG	1P				

The Greek verb used is εἰσφέρω ‘lead into.’ This is a transitive verb used in the active voice (though morphologically in subjunctive mood). The Russian Synodal translates this as не введи нас в искушение ‘do not lead us into temptation’, using the verb ввести ‘lead into’, which semantically is a direct causative (‘lead’ = ‘make someone go’). The Chechen has a different rendering, one that is closer to NRT Не дай нам поддаться искушению ‘Don’t allow us to give into temptation.’ This presupposes an indirect causative (‘allow someone to go’). Instead of the Synodal’s plain transitive or the NRT’s causative + middle voice, Chechen and Ingush use an indirect causative. The verb k’eldaxi:taħa:ra ‘please cause to save’ combines the intransitive k’eldaxa ‘go under = become subjected to’ with an indirect causative suffix -i:t and the suffix -ħa:ra, which expresses a desire (Ingush has opted to use a more straightforward imperative suffix -laħ). The combination means something like ‘would that you cause us not to become subjected to.’

In sum, the original Greek active voice is conveyed in the Caucasian languages with an indirect causative voice. No arguments are added or removed.

3.8. Keep us from evil

The final request is for the Father to keep us from the influence of the evil one: ἀλλὰ ρῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ ‘but save/rescue us from the evil one’.¹³ The Greek verb ρύομαι

¹³ There is ambiguity in interpreting the Greek τοῦ πονηροῦ: it can be taken to mean ‘evil’ (generic) or ‘the evil one’ (specific, personal). The Russian, Chechen and Ingush translations have all opted for the specific meaning.

may, as the Translator's Handbook says, either be translated as 'rescue from' or as 'protect against' (Newman & Stine 1988). The Russian Synodal uses the former: *но избавь нас от лукавого* 'but deliver us from the evil one'. The Chechen and Ingush translations in (10) use the latter.

- (10) a. *iblisax* a *larðaħa:ra*
 devil.ABL & guard.2S.OPT
- b. *iblisax* a *lorade* ζ a $\tau\chi$ o
 devil.ABL & guard.2S.IMV 2S.ERG 1P

Here, the Greek text has an active transitive construction with three arguments: a deliverer (the Father), someone that needs deliverance or protection (the person praying), and that from which the person needs to be delivered (the Evil one). This model remains the same both in the Russian Synodal as in the receptor language translations (Chechen and Ingush). No filtering effects of the intermediate language are seen here.

4. The global picture

This section summarizes the way in which the different voices of the Greek verbs in the passage have been translated. Table 1 offers a simplistic comparison between voices. It compares the grammatical voices used in the source (Greek) and the receptor (Chechen and Ingush) with the 'filters' that may have played a role in the translation (Russian Synodal, New Russian Translation).¹⁴ One English translation (the New English Translation of 2008) is added for comparison.

¹⁴ We use the term 'grammatical voice' in a wider sense here: the pattern of the verb's argument structure [Williams 1981].

Table 1 Grammatical voice and transitivity for the verbs in Matthew 6:9-13

#	vs		SOURCE	POSSIBLE FILTERS		RECEPTOR		ENGLISH	
			Greek	SYN	NRT	CHE	ING	NET08	
1	6:9	προσεύχομαι	MP (dep)	M	M	A	A	A	pray
2	6:9	ἀγιάζω	P	M	M	A	A	P	sanctify
3	6:10	ἔρχομαι	M (dep)	A	A	A	A	A	come
4	6:10	γίνομαι	P	A	M	A	A	P	do
5	6:11	δίδωμι	A	A	A	A	A	A	give
6	6:12	ἀφίημι	A	A	A	A	A	A	forgive
7	6:12	ἀφίημι	A	A	A	A	A	A	forgive
8	6:13	εἰσφέρω	A	A	M	C	C	A	lead
9	6:13	ῥύομαι	M (dep)	A	A	A	A	A	deliver

Legend. SYN – Russian Synodal translation, NRT – New Russian Translation, CHE – Chechen translation, ING – Ingush translation, NET08 – New English Translation 2008. *Voice:* A – Active, M – Middle, M – Middle, MP (dep) – Middle/Passive (deponent), P – Passive, P (dep) – Passive deponent, C – Causative.

What Table 1 reveals first of all, is that there are quite a few differences between the voices used in the source and the receptor languages. Part of the reason why some changes are inevitable is that the different languages have different voice systems. Greek has active, middle and passive, and some of its verbs are deponent (morphologically middle or passive, but active in meaning). Russian has a similar system, though the borders between the divisions are different. Chechen and Ingush, being Northeast Caucasian languages are morphologically ergative, hence they lack a proper passive voice. They do have a rich system of causatives, however, with a number of simple verb roots being inherently intransitive [Nichols 2011: 11]. Thus, a verb like εἰσφέρω ‘lead’, is translated in

both Chechen and Ingush with derived causative verb stems that literally mean ‘cause to go.’ And English (NET08), taken up for comparison, does not have a morphologically marked middle voice.

While voice alterations are, as it seems, inevitable when a translation is being done, the translator should be aware of the semantic implications of the choice of one particular voice in the source language, and these should be reflected in the receptor language. There is one component of grammatical voice in particular that this paper focuses on, and that is the number of the original participants and their thematic roles.

Table 2 Verbal arguments in Matthew 6:9-13

#	vs	SOURCE	POSSIBLE FILTERS		RECEPTOR		ENGLISH	
			Greek	SYN	NRT	CHE		ING
1	6:9	προσεύχομαι	A [P] [Ad]	[A] [P]	[A] [P]	A P	A P	[A] [P] pray
2	6:9	ἀγιάζω	[A] P	(A) P	(A) P	P	[A P P]	[A] P sanctify
3	6:10	ἔρχομαι	A	A	A	A	A	A come
4	6:10	γίνομαι	[A] P	P	(A) P	P	P	[A] P do
5	6:11	δίδωμι	[A] P [R]	[A] P R	[A] P R	[A] P R	[A] P R	[A] P R give
6	6:12	ἀφίημι	[A] R P	[A] R P	[A] R P	[A] R [P]	[A] R [P]	[A] R P forgive
7	6:12	ἀφίημι	A R P	A R [P]	A R [P]	A R [P]	A R [P]	A R [P] forgive
8	6:13	εἰσφέρω	[A] P G	[A] P G	[C] P G	C P G	C P G	[A] P G lead
9	6:13	ῥύομαι	[A] P O	[A] P O	[A] P O	[A] P O	[A] P O	[A] P O deliver

Legend. SYN – Russian Synodal translation, NRT – New Russian Translation, CHE – Chechen translation, ING – Ingush translation, NET08 – New English Translation 2008. A – explicit agent, [A] – grammatically implied agent, [Ad] – grammatically implied addressee, [A P P] – implied agent introduced as postpositional adjunct, (A) optional agent, C – explicit causer, [C] – grammatically implied causer, G – explicit goal, O – origin, P – explicit patient, [P] – grammatically implied patient, R – explicit recipient, [R] – grammatically implied recipient.

The data in Table 2 show that there is a high agreement in the numbers and roles of the participants between the source, the intermediate and the receptor languages, provided the unexpressed participants are taken into account that are grammatically implied. The first row in the table, for example, shows that the Greek has participants **A [P] [Ad]**, the Russian Synodal **[A] [P]** and the receptor language translations both have **A P**. All three languages have an agent and a patient—although some have them grammatically implied. The Greek προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς ‘pray you’ specifies the agent ‘you’, but not the object of ‘pray’. The Russian Synodal Молитесь ‘pray’ only specifies the action ‘pray’, but it does not make the agent more explicit than the verbal ending (the verbal ending is 2P). And the recipient languages make explicit both the agent *jaef* ‘you’ and the object *doša* ‘prayer, as shown in (1).

There are only two places (#2, #4) where there is a clear reduction in the number of participants, and there is one place (#8) where the grammatical role of one of the participants has changed.

5. Conclusions

This article has provided insight into the way the Lord’s Prayer has been translated from Greek into two Northeast Caucasian languages, Chechen and Ingush. It has also shown that there are some traces of using a Russian translation (the Synodal) as an intermediate. We have looked at how the translation of grammatical voices in the Greek original has been ‘filtered’ by Russian, resulting in change or loss of originally implied participants. Two of the nine verbs have, indeed, lost their originally implied Agentive argument. While the meaning of the original is still derivable from the larger context, our findings do show that translations need to take the filtering influence of the intermediate language seriously, especially where the grammatical voice systems differ between the source, intermediate and receptor languages.

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
1P	first person plural
2P	second person plural
2S	second person singular
ABL	ablative case
ASMA	as much as
CAUS	causative
DAT	dative case
EXC	exclusive
GEN	genitive case
IMV	simple imperative
INF	infinitive
JUST.AS	just as
LOC	locative case
NEG	negation
OBL	oblique (non-nominative case)
OPT	optative
PL	plural
POL	polite imperative
PRS	present tense
PRT	particle
PTCP	participial
REL	relativizer
RFL	reflexive
RP	preverb

References

Aland K., Black M., Martini C. M., Metzger B. M., Wikgren A. (eds.) *The Greek New Testament*. Third (corrected) edition. Stuttgart, 1983.

Barakhoeva, N. M., Ilieva F. M., Kieva Z. Kh., Ozdoeva F. G., Sulygova M. M., Tarijeva L. U., Khairova R. R. *Sovremennyi ingushskii yazyk. Morfologiya. Nal'chik, 2012. (Баряхоева Н. М., Илиева Ф. М., Киева З. Х., Оздоева Ф. Г., Султыгова М. М., Тариева Л. У., Хайрова Р. Р. Современный ингушский язык. Морфология. Нальчик, 2012.)* (In Russ.)

Curuev Sh. *Noxchiin muott. Orga zhurnal, 2013.* Online version: [<http://orga-journal.ru/index.php?view=article&id=66:2013-02-21-09-55-47>] (accessed 10.10.2019.)

Davies W. D., Allison D. C. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew. Vol. 1.* London, New York, 2004.

Gaebelein F. E., Carson D. A., Wessel W. W., Liefeld W. L. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Volume 8: Matthew, Mark, and Luke.* Grand Rapids, 1984.

Good J. C. *Clause combining in Chechen. Studies in language, 2003, 27(1), 113–170.*

Kulikov L. *Voice typology // Jae Jung Song (ed.) The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology. Oxford, 2013, 368–398*

Maciev Ah. G. *Chechensko-russkij slovar (Chechen-Russian dictionary). Moscow, 1961. (Мациев А. Г. Чеченско-русский словарь. Москва, 1961.)* (In Russ.)

Newman B. M., Stine Ph. C. *A handbook on the Gospel of Matthew.* New York, 1988.

Nichols J. *Ingush grammar.* Berkeley, 2011.

Robertson A. T. *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research.* New York, 1923.

Timberlake A. *A reference grammar of Russian.* Cambridge, 2004.

Wallace D. B. Greek grammar beyond the basics: An exegetical syntax of the New Testament. Grand Rapids, 1996.

Williams Ed. Argument structure and morphology. The linguistic review 1981, 1(1), 81–114.

Komen Erwin R.
SIL International
Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands
Комен Эрвин Р.
SIL International
Радбоуд Университет Неймеген, Нидерланды
erwin_komen@sil.org

Bugenhagen Robert D.
SIL International
Бугенхаген Роберт Д.
SIL International
robert.bugenhagen@svk.fi