# Seven Tatar translations of the Lord's Prayer (1803–2015) [Part 2]

## Teija Greed

*SIL International*
*Hollola, Finland*
*teija_greed@sil.org*

The Bible is the world's most translated book. Throughout history it has been translated into a great many languages, and these translations have in recent years begun to attract wider attention. This article investigates a selection of historical translations of the Lord's Prayer from the Gospel of Matthew in a language called Tatar, and one contemporary translation, Volga Tatar. The timespan of the translations extends to over two hundred years: from 1803 to 2015. The translations are compared on a variety of linguistic levels, with special attention given to the lexicon. Orthography presents a noteworthy challenge, since most are in the Arabic script, not reflecting the nuances of the vowels. Features common to the translations are described, and those distinctive to each text are analysed. I discovered that many of the translations adhere to strict norms of literary language, clearly differing from spoken variants. Up to the 20th century many Turkic literary languages were "transregional", that is, similar established literary norms extended over many Turkic peoples, whose spoken languages displayed a far greater variety. Interacting with the biblical text gives us a valuable glimpse of the multiple voices represented by the translations, and the circumstances in which they were created.

# Семь переводов молитвы «Отче наш» на татарский язык с 1803 г. по 2015 г. [Часть 2-я]

## Тейя Грид

*SIL*
*Холлола, Финляндия*
*teija_greed@sil.org*

Библия – самая переводимая книга в мире. На протяжении всей истории ее переводили на множество языков, и в последние годы эти переводы начали привлекать широкий интерес. В данной статье исследуется подборка исторических переводов молитвы «Отче наш» из Евангелия от Матфея на татарский язык и один современный перевод – волжско-татарский. Промежуток времени с самого раннего перевода до последнего охватывает более двухсот лет: с 1803 по 2015 год. Переводы сравниваются на разных лингвистических уровнях, особое внимание уделяется лексике. Орфография представляет собой особую проблему, поскольку большинство из переводов написано арабским шрифтом, не отражающим оттенки гласных. Описываются общие для переводов черты и анализируются отличительные особенности каждого текста. Я обнаружила, что многие переводы придерживаются строгих норм литературного языка и явно отличаются от устных вариантов. Вплоть до XX века многие тюркские литературные языки были «трансрегиональными», то есть сходные установленные литературные нормы распространялись на многие тюркские народы, чьи разговорные языки демонстрировали гораздо больше разнообразия. Взаимодействие с библейским текстом дает нам ценное представление о множестве голосов, представленных в переводах, и об обстоятельствах их создания.

The article is divided into two parts: Part I (published in the previous issue of this journal) discusses the background to the analysis and the history of the Volga (Kazan) Tatar literary language, and gives an outline of the Bible translation situation in the area as well as an overview of the seven translations of the Lord's Prayer. Part II is presented in the present issue. It offers an investigation into the pertinent features of each translation, followed by a summary table of the key distinguishing features of the texts, and concluding remarks.

## PART II

## 5. The texts: points of interest and distinctive features

In the following, I first outline some relevant background to the translation under investigation, which is followed by the text itself, either as a reproduction and/or my transcription from the original script. Each line of the translation is followed with an English gloss. In transcribing from the Arabic script my aim is to represent the underlying text as closely as possible (for example, unmarked vowels are not added). My phonological interpretation of the translations can be found in the synopsis of the translations which is available in Part I of this article (Table 3 of Section 4.2), and it is these interpreted forms that are used in the discussion of each translation, instead of the transcribed forms found below. The discussion itself mainly concerns questions of special interest in each text. For features occurring in all or most of the translations, I refer the reader to Part I of this article, sections 4.3 and 4.4, where observations and comments on shared features can be found.

### 5.1 The 1803 text from the Tatar Catechism (1817)

#### 5.1.1 The source: Adelung's *Mithridates*

The eminent German linguist Johann Christoph Adelung (1732–1806) played a significant role in the history of translations of the Lord's Prayer through his linguistic project the

*Mithridates* (Volumes I–IV), where his aim was to compare and classify all known languages of his time, primarily by using as language samples translations of the Lord's Prayer [Adam 2005: 43–44]. The *Mithridates* presents language samples with their German translations, as well as typological, grammatical and ethnographic information. Adelung chose the Lord's Prayer as the key language sample because it was "a text long enough to contain grammatical structures that was also available in numerous different languages around the world" [Adam 2005: 44]. Adelung, and after him Johann Severin Vater, who concluded Adelung's work, did not know most of the languages he analysed, but tried to represent the phonology of each sample in the transcription.

In *Mithridates I*, three texts of the Lord's Prayer are labelled "Tatar" (from page 477 onwards). *Mithridates IV* contains a number of samples classified as "Tatar" (pages 166–179), ranging from various Tatar versions from the Caucasus to "Tatar between Perm and Kazan" and "Orenburg Tatar". As discussed earlier, this is a clear indication that in those days the term "Tatar" was a cover term for many different Turkic-speaking ethnic groups (sometimes even for groups not speaking a Turkic language) and their languages.

The text chosen for investigation originates from a Catechism printed by the Moscow Synod in 1803 at the order of the Academy of Kazan, according to the brief introduction in *Mithridates IV* (page 174). We can assume that the original text printed in the Catechism was in Arabic script, as indicated in general comments below. Also, by this time documents were being printed in Tatar, and this was done using the Arabic script.

## 5.1.2 The text and the keyboarded reproduction

**Photograph 1.** The introduction to and the original transcription from *Mithridates IV*: 174.



In einem auf Veranstaltung der Akademie
zu Kasan im J. 1803 bey dem Synod in Moskau
gedruckten Tatarischen Katechismus befindet
sich folgende Tatarische Übersetzung des V. U.
mit der Doxologie, welche sonst bekanntlich
von der Griechischen Kirche nicht hinzu gefügt
wird.

37.
T a t a r i s c h.

Besüm Atamésdur sàn kuklardakìi sàn,
Ruschanlansùn sanúng isjumjung,
Kàlsùn sanúng schaglugùng,
Ulsùn ichtíar sanikìi kjukdà gám erdà,
Besjum garkjungìi naphakamesnìe bu jumdà
birgìl wesgà,
Gam kitschgjùl besjúm gunaglaremesnìi,
nitschjukdur uwà bès kitschámes
magìjublakmjusch kemsanalarnìi,
Gam dschasùwe itmagìl phasàd eschkà,
Emma kutkàr besnìi rialukdan,
Sira sanung schaglugùng gam kuwatung gam
danung abadìidur.   Amin.

Zu S. 480.
Z. 17. st. moribus, l. *majoribus.* — Z. 2. v. u.
Pray. *Dissertationes VI in Annales veteres Hungare.*

Below is a reproduction of the text with glosses.

| 9a-b | Besüm | Atamésdur | sàn | kuklardakìi | | | sàn, |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | our | father-our-is | you | in-skies-the-one-being | | | you (are) |

| 9c | Ruschanlansùn | sanúng | isjumjung, |
|---|---|---|---|
| | may-be-glorified | your | name-your |

| 10a | Kalsùn | sanúng | schaglugùng, |
|---|---|---|---|
| | may-remain | your | kingdom-your |

| 10b | Ulsùn | ichtíar | sanikìi, | kjukdà | gám | erdà |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | may-be | will | yours | in-sky | and | on-earth |

| 11a-b | Besjum | garkjungìi | naphakamesnìe, | bu | jumdà | birgìl | wesgà |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | our | every-daily | food-our-ACC | this | in-day | give-IMP | to-us |

| 12a | Gam | kitschgjùl | besjúm | gunaglaremesnìi, |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and | forgive-IMP | our | sins-our-ACC |

| 12b | nitschjukdur | uwà | bès | kitschámes, |
| | as-is | also | we | forgive-we |

| 12c | magijublakmjusch | | kemsanalarnii |
| | ?-doing | | anyone-PL-ACC |

| 13a | Gam | dschasùwe | itmagìl | phasàd | eschkà |
| | and | ? | do-not-IMP | corrupt | deed-DAT |

| 13b | Emma | kutkár | besnìi | rialukdan |
| | but | save | we-ACC | hypocritical.one-from |

| (13c-e) | Sira | sanung | schaglugùng | gam | kuwatung |
| | for | your | kingdom-your | and | strength-your |

| | gam | danung | abadìidur. | Amin. |
| | and | glory-your | eternal-is | amen |

### 5.1.3 Original transcription, scripts and phonology

The text differs from the other six, since it is not the original translation, but a transcription into Latin script of a translation in Arabic script. Did Adelung transcribe it while listening to a Tatar speaker reading it aloud? At least he would have needed a person to tell him how the vowel sounds not represented by the Arabic script would need to be transcribed. Be that as it may, the underlying script behind the Latin script is clearly Arabic. This is shown by the fluctuation of letters or combinations of letters representing the Arabic *waw* و: *ü*, *ju*, and *u*, as seen in the two different spellings of the same word, meaning 'our': *Besüm* on line 1 (9a-b) and *Besjum* on line 5 (11a-b), which I interpret as representing the underlying form *bezüm*. In my interpretation I endeavour to keep in mind how a German speaker might represent the sounds heard[1].

---

1    For example, some of the letters "s" I interpret as representing a voiced [z] sound, rather than a voiceless [s]. Therefore the word *Besüm* of the original transcription is represented by *Bezüm* 'our' in the interpretative Synopsis of Section 4.2. However, this does not extend to word-initial "s" letters (for example, *sanuŋ* 'your (singular)'.

The transcription contains some diacritics, including acute and grave accent marks, which usually fall on the last syllable of a given word. However, not all words contain an accent, and such words are primarily conjunctions and possessive pronouns. If the text displayed in Latin script were transcribed while someone was reading it from the original Arabic-script text, these accents could signal stress, or possibly intonation. Two of the cases where the accent falls on the penultimate rather than the final syllable have the verbal affix -*dur* (for example, *Atamésdur*, 9a): this would support the accent as representing stress, but it would also indicate that the person reading from the Arabic script knew the language, since the verb copula -*DYr* does not take the stress in these contexts [see Johanson 1998a: 45]. Additionally, some of the accents might indicate front vowels. For example, in *kjuk-dà* sky-in, 'in the sky', the vowel in the first syllable coincides with the last vowel of *Besjum* 'our', which is a variant of the spelling *Besüm*, clearly displaying a front vowel [ü]. Therefore, following the system of vowel harmony, the vowel of the second syllable *kjuk-dà* is also interpreted as a front vowel [ä], resulting in *kükdä*. However, from this limited data, the exact role of the accent marks cannot be definitively established.

It is interesting to note that the uvular consonants [ɣ] and [q], which are clearly represented in the other texts by separate letters, do not differ from their velar counterparts [g] and [k]. This can be seen when comparing the spelling of the initial consonant in *kuklardakìi* 'the-one-being-in-the-sky/heaven', which represents [k], with the initial consonant of the Arabic loan *kuwat(ung)* '(your) power', where in Arabic the word begins with ق *qaf*, but its pronunciation [q] is not represented in the transcription.

One of the features of Kypchak languages is the voicing of intervocalic [p], [k] and [q] to [b], [g] and [ɣ], respectively. This feature is visible in the spelling of the word *schaglugùng* 'your kingdom', which consists of a Persian loan word *šag* (or *šah*) 'king', a Turkic derivational affix -*luk* (or -*luq*) and the second-person possessive suffix -*ung*. The final consonant "k" of *šaglyk*, occurring intervocalically, becomes voiced into "g".

### 5.1.4 Morphology and lexicon

In terms of morphology, the Lord's Prayer follows many of the common features outlined in section 4.3. What appears to be idiosyncratic, though, is the first-person plural possessive suffix *-üm* visible in *besüm* (*bezüm*) 'our' (compare with Turkish *bizim*). Three other translations contain 'our', and of these, the 1820 has a comparable form *bezim*, whereas the 1870 text displays the form *bezneŋ*, where the possessive suffix is *-neŋ*, a form in use in contemporary Tatar.

At first glance, the lexicon of the translation appears fairly distant from contemporary Tatar. However, many common Turkic nouns are used: *ata* 'father' [see Tětimol 2015: *ama*], *kuk* 'sky (heaven)', *er* 'earth' and *kün* 'day'. Also some verbs having a long history in Turkic, such as *bir-* 'give', *kič-* 'forgive', *kutkar-* (*qutqar-*) 'save', are still in everyday use in contemporary Tatar, albeit nowadays the meaning 'forgive' is expressed in the causative form of *kič-*, namely *kičer-*. A number of the words listed above occur in Shcherbak's [1994: 111–115] lists of vocabulary of common Turkic lexical stock.

In personal pronouns there is fluctuation in the initial sound of the first-person plural pronoun, as both *bez* and *wez* 'we' (in *wezgä* 'to us') occur. The latter may be Oghuz influence, which was increasing at this time [see Bashirova et al. 2015: 387].

There are several Arabic loans in the text, mainly nouns. Interestingly, one of them, *nafaka* (*näfäqa*) is used for the common meaning of 'food, nourishment' (11a), whereas another Arabic loan *fasad* 'abominable deed; disorder' [see Nadelyaev et al. 1969: 193: FÄSAD] occurs in a theological context (13a). In addition to the Persian loan *šag* 'king' mentioned above, the word for 'sin' *gunag* is of Persian origin, as is one of the central theological terms of the prayer, the expression 'be hallowed' (ἁγιασθήτω in the original Greek, in the aorist imperative passive form). This has been translated with a verb of Persian origin: *rušan*[2]-. Many

---

[2]     I am indebted to a colleague (p. c.) for this information: "In Persian, the word روشن *ruʃan* has a wide range of meanings including 'bright, shining'. [In Persian] it can be used literally, or in the idiomatic expression *ruʃan kardan/ʃʊdan* 'to make/become bright', meaning 'to

of the loan words are from religious vocabulary, but standard Turkic words are also used for theological concepts, such as *kutkár* 'save' (13b).

One phenomenon visible in this early translation, as well as others, until the 1893 text, is the use of conjunctions to indicate inter-clausal relations. Turkic languages typically express (subordinating) syntactic relations with the help of non-finite verb forms, converbs, rather than conjunctions, and the clauses with the converbs usually precede the main clause containing a full finite verb. Thus it is understandable that the conjunctions used tend not to be originally Turkic but loan words. In the current text, *gam* (or *ham*) 'and' is of Persian origin, whereas *wä* 'and' and *emma* 'but' are of Arabic origin. Here, as in the 1820 and 1825 texts, the meaning 'because, for' is expressed using *zira* (*zirä*) (13c). In the later 1882/1884 text this is replaced by *čünki*, and the 1893 text contains no (extraneous) conjunctions.

The idiosyncratic reversed word order of this text has been discussed in section 4.4.3. The non-Turkic word order is likely to be due to the influence of another language or languages. If my interpretation is correct for the beginning of the prayer (9a and 9b), the translators have unpacked the concise expression "our Father (being) in the heavens" of the Greek original, into two verbal expressions: "our Father is, you are the one in the skies/heaven".

### 5.1.5 Unresolved expression

Line 9 in the (original) text, which is from verse 12, was the cause for major research effort, which in the end I was not able to resolve satisfactorily. In the following, the first line is the line from the prayer, the second line is my attempt for a possible interpretation, with glosses on the third line, and an incomplete translation on the fourth line.

magijublakmjusch          kemsanalarnii
magiüb-läk-müš             kemsänä-lär-ni

---

glorify/be glorified'… it usually collocates with 'name', e. g. 'May the name of the Lord become bright (be glorified)'."

flaws-?-past.participle                    anyone-plural-accusative
*any people(ACC) who cause? flaws*

This line is preceded by the meaning "And forgive our sins as we also forgive", and therefore the following line is expected to contain approximately "those who sin against us/those who are indebted to us". It is intriguing to observe that unlike all the other translations, where the key term for 'sin/debt' is the same for both parts of the sentence, in this case the word 'sins' of the first part is not repeated in the latter part. Another noteworthy detail is that, as far as I can see, there is no clear meaning to show that the sinning is directed against "us".

If the first word is an Arabic loan *mäɣaib* 'flaws'[3], even though the transcription does not fully coincide with this word, a question remains: what does the syllable *lak*/*läk* mean? I compared this translation and transcription with another text in *Mithridates IV* [173–174], labelled as "Tatar, between Perm and Kazan", since the translation is in many ways similar to the current translation under investigation. This is the simplified transcription of the expression in question:

besüm mägii blänmüšläremesni

This version contains the meaning 'our' (*besüm*), and the beginning of the third word could be interpreted as *belän* 'with'. However, again the verbal meaning remains unclear.

### 5.2 The 1820 text from the first Tatar New Testament

### 5.2.1 Background to the creation

This Lord's Prayer translation comes from the New Testament printed in 1820 in Arabic script. This is the first ever New Testament in the Tatar language, which preceded the first New Testament in Russian by one year. In his study of Bible translations into the languages of the former Soviet Union, Arapović [u. m.: 147] lists this particular translation under "Tatar" translations, defining such translations as those "which were specifically done in the Tatar people's spoken language".

---

3    See Gazizov et al. [1993: 290]. A similar word in contemporary Arabic appears to mean 'flawed'.

The translation is listed in Darlow and Moule's [1911: 1630–1631] system under the heading "Turkish-Kirghiz", followed by a more detailed explanation: "Kirguise, Kazak, Altai, Orenburg Russian Turki, Siberian Tatar"[4].

Darlow and Moule [1911: 1630] provide the following introduction:

"This dialect[5] is spoken, with trifling variations, by more than 2,000,000 Tatars in Russian Central Asia. The Kirghiz have been divided into two groups – Eastern and Western. The Eastern or Kara (i. e. 'black') Kirghiz are now highlanders in the Altai and Thian Shan mountain, while some live in Chinese Turkestan. The Western or Kazak (i. e. 'Cossack') Kirghiz are nomads roaming over the plains between the Lower Volga and Jungaria in the western corner of Mongolia. Under Russian rule are the three Hordes of Western Kirghiz – the 'Great', the 'Middle', and the 'Small' – in Asia, as well as the 'Inner' or Bukcieff Horde in the steppes of the Lower Volga in Europe. W. [Friedrich] Radloff gives Altai and Kirghiz as separate Turkish dialects."

The translation was prepared by Charles Fraser of the Scottish Missionary Society at Orenburg, and Matthew's Gospel had been printed separately two years previously. According to Darlow and Moule [1911: 1630–1631] the translation "was primarily intended for the Kirghiz in the neighbourhood of that town, the language has been sometimes called 'Orenburg Tatar'."

The Cambridge University Library database has further information about the Noghay New Testament translation on which this translation was based. The translator Henry Brunton used "the 1666 Seaman edition together with Greek, English, German and other versions" [Cambridge]. The Seaman edition was *İncil-i Mukaddes*, a translation of the New Testament into Turki/Turkish by William Seaman, a clergyman and a pioneer of Turkish studies in England, who lived a few years in Constanti-

---

[4]    In their system the index number is 9425.
[5]    In the archives of Cambridge University Library the book is catalogued as "New Testament in Kazakh".

nople [Privratsky 2014: 29]. In his translation into Noghay, Brunton avoided the Arabic and Persian words of the Seaman edition [Darlow & Moule 1911: 1683].

When looking at Darlow and Moule's description of the "dialect" into which the current version was translated, covering Russian Central Asia with over 2 million speakers, an area reaching from "Chinese Turkestan" to the Lower Volga, a natural question to ask is: Can one translation serve such a wide community of people? Flynn [2017: 309] addresses a similar issue when he discusses the type, and indirectly the extent, of the potential audience of the earlier Scripture translations by the Karass community of the Scottish Missionary Society, where the so-called "Tatar-Turkish" or "Noghay" translations were produced. He points out that these translations did not strictly represent one single dialect but were an "eclectic lingua franca version", or a "union version" created in the Tatar-Turkish/Noghay lingua franca of the area. Without having access to the creation process of the current translation, I would suggest that it also represents an eclectic version, combining features from different variants spoken in this vast area.

### 5.2.2 Text and transcription

The title page of the publication gives the following information (translated by me):

The Holy Inʒil,
that is, the New Covenant of Jesus Christ[6]
First composition
In the town of Astraxan
printed by Juxana Mitʒil
1820
in the year of Jesus Christ[7]

---

[6]  An interesting detail is that this shows in what form the names "Jesus" and "Christ" were in the days of the translations: *ɣisi* and *msix*. In contemporary Tatar the names are *Гайса* [ɣajsä] and *Мәсих* [mäsix].)

[7]  I am grateful to Dr Paul Lawrence for his help in deciphering this text.

In the publication there is no clue as to the language of the translation. Concerning the expression "First composition", the word I translated as "composition" is *tasnif*. This word might indicate that the New Testament is regarded as the first ever translation of it in this language.

Below is the transcription of the text from the Arabic script, followed by glosses.

| 9a-c[8] | asmanda | bulɣan | ātmz | asmŋ | mqds | bulsun |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | in-sky | being | father-our | name-your | holy | may-be |

| 10a, c | mmlktŋ | (j)itšsun | aradtŋ | zminda | bulsun |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | government-your | may-arrive | will-your | on-earth | may-be |

| 10b | asmanda | dxi | bulduɣy | kbi |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | sky-in | also | its-being | like |

| 11a-b | hr | kunki | nanmzni | bu | kun | bzkä | bir |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | every | daily | bread-our-ACC | this | day | we-DAT | give(IMP) |

| 12a | w | buručlarmzni | bzkä | bɣšla |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and | debts-our-ACC | we-DAT | forgive(IMP) |

| 12b-c | bzm | dxi | buručlylarmza | bɣšladuɣmz | kbi |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | our | also | debtors-our-DAT | forgiving-our | like |

| 13a | w | bzni | mxll | amtxanɣa | kturma |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and | we-ACC | position | testing-DAT | bring-in-not(IMP) |

| 13b | lkn | šrdan | bzni | nžat | qyl |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | but | evil-from | we-ACC | salvation | do(IMP) |

| (13c-e) | ziraka | mmlkt | w | qdrt | w | žlal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | for | government | and | power | and | greatness |
| | sinnkki | dr | daim | amin | | |
| | yours | is | eternally | amen | | |

---

8    The versification here follows the conventional versification, which differs from the one in the 1820 translation. I noticed that in chapter 6 this translation combines verses 3 and 4, which causes the prayer to begin in verse 8, rather than 9. In the prayer itself, verses 11-12 are combined into one verse 11.

### 5.2.3 Key terms and other lexicon

When compared with the first 1803 translation, all the key terms are different. Even though both make use of Arabic and Persian loans for the nouns, the choices do not coincide. This translation employs several words acquired through Persian as its key terms. The most striking ones, unique to this text, are words which one would expect to be in everyday use: *nan* for 'bread' (11a-b), *zämin*[9] for 'earth' (10a-b), and *asman* for 'sky (heaven)' (9a-c). The other texts make use of the different variants of the Turkic *ikmäk* for 'bread', and the Turkic words *jir*/ *ǯir* for 'earth' and *kük* for 'sky'. The translation being based on Brunton's Noghay translation, which for its part was based on Seaman's 1666 translation into Turki/Turkish, the number of remaining loan words is somewhat unexpected, if Brunton was indeed avoiding Persian and Arabic loans.

Other nominal key terms are Arabic loans: for example, *mämläkät* for 'kingdom', which is again a unique choice. The Arabic *šär* used here for 'evil, wicked(ness)' has a counterpart in the 1870 translation, which uses the form *šärir* for a similar meaning.

Of the verbs many are ordinary-looking words with no distinct religious or high-language overtones, such as *bir-* 'give' and *ketür-* 'bring into'. However, one verb is striking in this text. Turkic languages are well-known for their ability to combine abstract nouns (often loan words) with auxiliary verbs, such as 'do', which in contemporary Tatar are *it-* and the more literary *qyl-*. In this text the latter type is employed to form a transitive verb together with an Arabic noun *näǯat* 'salvation, redemption': *näǯat qyl-* 'save'. This choice for the theological key term 'save' is unique to the current text.

Some theological concepts, represented by both nouns and verbs, are expressed with terms which could etymologically be defined as Turkic. The meaning of the Greek ὀφείλημα 'debt; offence', conveyed by the 1803 translation with 'sin', is translated here as *buruč* 'debt', commonly used in many (Kypchak) Turkic

---

9    Incidentally, the Russian word for 'earth' *zemlja* (*земля*) derives etymologically from the same root [see Têtimol 2015: *зэмин*].

languages [see Tětimol 2015: *бурыч*], but in the literal meaning, rather than with the figurative theological extension. Interestingly, of the seven translations investigated, only the first one and the contemporary 2015 translation spell out explicitly the theological meaning of the Greek term: 'sin; evil deed'. All the others retain a literal translation.

### 5.2.4 Morphological observations

The translation contains a verbal suffix not used in the other texts: the suffix *-dUQ*[10]. This suffix is attested already in Old Turkic [Erdal 1998: 147]. Along with another suffix *-mIš* it forms a participle and can also function as a noun, taking possessive suffixes. In our text the word *bulduɣy* (in 10c) can be parsed into *bul-duɣ-y* be-dUQ-3POSS, and the meaning is 'its being'. Both *-dUQ* and *-mIš* were in use in the prestigious literary language Chaghatay, whose influence spread over Turkic-speaking Central Asia from the 1400s and lasted in many places until the late 1800s. Chaghatay, "a multilayered literary idiom" [Bodrogligeti 2001: 1], was influential in such cultural centres as Samarkand, Herat, and Kashghar, and also in Kazan. With time, the two participle suffixes began to be replaced by the Kypchak *-GAn* form [see Boeschoten & Vandamme 1998: 167, 175]. It is noteworthy that in a translation displaying a number of features linking it with (Volga) Tatar, such an archaic participle suffix is used, presumably indicating Chaghatay influence.

Another morphological feature which can be linked with Chaghatay are the different forms of the dative-case suffix. The dative suffix attested in Old Turkic was *-GA* [see Erdal 1998: 142], and this form demonstrates the stability of the Turkic case forms as it has been retained throughout the centuries. For example, in Middle Kypchak sources (13th–16th centuries) the standard dative form attested was *-GA*, while the suffix *-A* occurred sporadically [Berta 1998: 161]. It also appears that in Chaghatay the standard suffix was *-GA*, but the variant *-A* occurred in a specific environment following possessive suffixes

---

10    *-DUK/DIK* occurs in modern Turkish [Kerslake 1998: 195], and in Azerbaijani [Schönig 1998: 256].

[Bodrogligeti 2001: 33–34]. We can note the same phenomenon in this 1820 translation: in the pronoun *bezkä* 'to us' the dative suffix is *-kä* (see 11b), whereas in *buručlylarymyza* (see 12b) the noun *buručlylar* 'those-who-are-indebted' is followed by a first-person plural possessive suffix *-myz* and the dative suffix in *-A*, following the Chaghatay convention.

It is intriguing to follow the fluctuation of the first-person plural possessive pronoun, consisting of the pronoun *bez*/*biz* 'we' and the suffix, in the different texts. The 1803 translation has the form *bezüm* (9a), which is similar to the form in Ottoman Turkish *bizüm* [Kerslake 1998: 189]. In the current text the suffix is *-im* (see 12b), which is still the standard suffix, for example, in Turkish and Noghay, with the resulting form *bizim* [Csató & Karakoç 1998: 337]. Contrary to this, the equivalent possessive pronoun of Middle Kypchak, an ancestor of contemporary Tatar, was formed with the (genitive) suffix *-(n)iŋ*, resulting in the form *biz(n)iŋ* [Berta 1998: 170]. In our texts, this form can be observed in the 1870 (12a) and the 2015 (12c) texts.

### 5.3 The 1825 enigmatic translation

The next translation to be investigated was printed in Astrakhan in 1825, only five years after the 1820 translation saw light in the same city. Both translations were printed by the same Juxana Mitʒil. Therefore it is in order to briefly investigate whether the two texts could have been connected in some way.

If there is plenty of background data available for the 1820 text, the 1825 text is more of an enigma, as it appears not to have been registered at any of the sources I have investigated. The copy used in this study was discovered in the Scientific Library of Kazan State University named after N. I. Lobachevsky, and it originates from the collection of Galimzhan Barudi (1857–1920), Mufti of Kazan [Marianne Beerle-Moor, p. c.]. The only further information is conveyed on the title page[11] (my translation):

---

[11]    Darlow and Moule [1911: 1684] list a New Testament printed in Astrakhan in 1825 under the heading "Turkish-Nogai", indexed as 9444. The number of pages (268) does not, however, coincide with the number of pages of the text of the study, which is 588 pages.

The Holy Inʒil,
that is
the New Covenant of Jesus Christ [ɣisi almsix]
In the town of Astraxan
printed by Juxanna[12] Mitʒil
1825

٩ كوكلرده اولان آتامز آدڭ مقدّس اولسون *

١٠ بادشاهلغڭ كلسون كوكده مرادڭ نيجه ايسه يرده

دخى بويله اولسون *

١١ هر كونكي ا تمكمزي بزه بو كون وير *

١٢ و بزه بورجلرمزي باغشله نيجه كه بز دخي بزه بورجلو اولانلره

باغشلارز *

١٣ هم بزي امتحانه سالمه امّا بزي يرامزدن قورتار

زيرا بادشاهلق و قدرت و جلال ابدا سنگَدر آمين *

## 5.3.1 Keyboarded reproduction, transcription and glosses

**Photograph 2.** Reproduction of the 1825 translation.

| 9a-c | kuklrdä | ulan | ātamz | ādŋ | | mqdds | ulsun |
|------|---------|------|-------|-----|---|-------|-------|
| | in-skies | being | father-our | name-your | | holy | may-be |

| 10a-b | badšahlɣŋ | klsun | kwkdä | mradŋ | | ničä | aisä |
|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|---|------|------|
| | kingdom-your | may-come | in-sky | purpose-your | | as | would-be |

| 10c | jirdä | dxi | bu | ilä | ulsun |
|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | on-earth | also | this | with | may-be |

| 11a-b | (h)är | kunki | atmkmzi | bzä | | bu | kun | wir |
|-------|-------|-------|---------|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|
| | every | daily | bread-our-ACC | we-DAT | | this | day | give(IMP) |

---

[12]   In the 1820 version the first name is spelled with a single "n", in the 1825 version with a double "n".

| 12a | w | bzä | burčlrmzi | baɣšlä | ničä kä |
| | and | we-DAT | debts-our-ACC | forgive(IMP) | as |

| 12b-c | bz | dxi | bzä | burčlu | ulanlrä | baɣšlarz |
| | we | also | we-DAT | indebted | being-ones-DAT | forgive-we |

| 13a | (h)äm | bzi | amtxanä | salmä |
| | and | we-ACC | testing-DAT | put-not(IMP) |

| 13b | amma | bzi | jiramzdn | qurtar |
| | but | we-ACC | (the)worthless-from | save(IMP) |

| (13c-e) | zira | badšahlq | w | qdrt |
| | for | kingdom | and | power |

| | w | ǯlal | abda | snŋdr | āmin |
| | and | greatness | eternally | yours-is | amen |

## 5.3.2 Oghuz influence

Volga Tatar belongs to the north-western or Kypchak Turkic branch of the Turkic languages. In addition to the Kypchak branch in Johanson's [1998b: 82] classification, Turkic has a further five branches: south-western or Oghuz Turkic, south-eastern or Uyghur Turkic, north-eastern or Siberian Turkic, Oghur/Bulghar Turkic, represented by Chuvash, and Arghu Turkic, represented by Khalaj. Of these, Oghuz Turkic is further divided into three, the western group being represented, among others, by Turkish, the eastern group by Turkmen, and the southern group by dialects in Iran and Afghanistan.

In the development of the Tatar literary language, the early 19th century was a time of debate as to what type of language was appropriate for religious texts (see section 2.1). Some influential people advocated the use of classical Turki instead of a literary language more accessible to the common people, and this demand was reflected in the literature produced. In the current text, an influence different from that in, for example, the 1820 translation, is evident. However, it is impossible to say how the influence came about.

The current text displays a number of clear indications of Oghuz influence. These are both phonological[13] and morphological. The past participle form *ul-an* 'be-ing' of 9a contains both a phonological and a morphological feature. The verb 'be, become' was *bol-* in Old Turkic [Johanson 1998a: 43]. Later, in the literary Chaghatay, both forms *bol-* and its Oghuz variant *ol-* were used, but the latter was limited in its use [Bodrogligeti 2001: 170]. The current text follows the Oghuz tradition, perhaps through Chaghatay.

The other feature revealing Oghuz influence is the past participle suffix of the word in *ul-an* 'be-ing'. In the classification of Turkic languages, the phonological form of the past-participle suffix separates Oghuz from other Turkic language branches: in Oghuz the participle has lost the suffix-initial *-G*, resulting in the suffix *-An*, whereas the other languages have retained the initial *-G* [see Johanson 1998b: 83]. This difference can be clearly seen when comparing the forms of 1825: 9a and 1820: 9b, where, as already mentioned, the 1825 word displays two elements of Oghuz influence whereas the 1820 looks Kypchak in form.

1825     ul-an
1820     bul-ɣan

Two other morphological details display Oghuz influence: the dative suffix, more commonly being *-GA*, is in this text in the form of *-A*, without the initial *-G-*, as seen in 1825: 12a: *bez-ä* we-DAT 'to us'. This can be compared with the 1882/1884 version: 12a *bez-gä* 'to us', containing the non-Oghuz dative suffix *-GA*. A clear difference can also be seen in the form of the accusative suffix. In Old Turkic [Erdal 1998: 142] it was formed with a suffix consisting of a vowel and *-G*, whereas in Middle Kypchak of the 13th to the 16th centuries the suffix had developed into *-nI* [Berta 1998: 158]. This form was also used in Chaghatay, whereas in West Oghuz, represented, for example, by Ottoman Turkish, the accusative was formed without the "n", through *-(y)I*. This type

---

[13]   See also 1825: 11b, where the imperative form *wir* 'give' begins with /w/, whereas the standard is *bir*.

of accusative is visible in the 1825 version: 11a: *etmäkemez-i* 'our bread-ACC'.

### 5.3.3 Comparison of the 1825 and the 1820 translations

In what follows I compare some features of the 1825 translation with the 1820 text. We have already noted the differences in the past participle forms in the two texts, representing Oghuz vs. Kypchak forms.

In the area of lexicon, the majority of the key nouns differ in the two texts. Interestingly, while the 1820 text uses words of Persian origin for such everyday concepts as 'sky' (*asman*) in 9a, 'earth' (*zämin*) in 10b and 'bread' (*nan*) in 11a, the 1825 text has Turkic *kük*, *jir* and *etmäk* for these meanings. For the terms 'debt' and 'testing' both opt for the Turkic *buruč* in 12a and the Arabic *imtixan* in 13a, whereas for the temporal adverb 'forever' the 1825 text has selected *äbdä* and the 1820 text *daim*, both of Arabic origin. The verbal phrase 'do not lead us into testing' in 13a shows both similarity and difference: both versions use the Arabic *imtixan* for 'testing', but the verb in the 1825 text is 'do not put' (*salma*), whereas in the 1820 text it is 'do not put-into' (*ketürmä*).

In two instances the syntactic structures differ. Both cases contain a main clause and a clause with a comparative construction. In the following, 10b and 10c are compared:

1825 10b kükdä moradyŋ ničä isä     10c jirdä däxi bu ilä ulsun
     in-sky purpose-your as would-be  on-earth also this with may-be
     *As your purpose would be in the sky/in heaven, may it also be on earth.*

1820 10c iradäteŋ zämindä bulsun     10b asmanda däxi bulduyy kebi
     will-your on earth may-be          in-sky also being-its like
     *May your will be on earth, as it is in the sky/heaven.*

The immediate difference visible is the clause order: in the 1825 text it follows the regular order with the subordinate clause preceding the main clause, whereas the 1820 translation reverses the order, and the comparative connector *kebi* 'as, like', occurs, untypically, sentence finally. A somewhat similar

phenomenon is evident in 12a-12c, with the subordinate clause with *kebi* again following the main clause in the 1820 text.

Let us compare 10b-10c with the Greek text:

*γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου,*
may-happen the will yours
*May your will happen,*

*ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς·*
as in sky also on earth
*as in heaven, also (thus) on earth.*

Neither translation fully follows the Greek structure. Nevertheless, without knowing the exact form of the source text followed, it is not possible to gauge how major a contribution the translator(s) gave to these translation choices. In any case, both texts show a certain endeavour for naturalness of rendition.

The two texts compared show some similarities in lexicon, phonology and morphology, but also quite a number of differences, especially in the two more complex syntactic structures investigated. In conclusion I would suggest that they were translated independently of each other, but while they both represent some variant of the language called Tatar, they in all likelihood represent different literary traditions.

### 5.4 The 1870 translation from Dalton

The 1870 text comes from the book *Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands* by Hermann Dalton [1870], which is a collection of translations of the Lord's Prayer of the late 19th century in over 100 languages spoken in the Russian Empire, with descriptions of the speakers of these languages. The text under consideration has the German title "Tatarisch" [Dalton 1870: 58], but in the separate descriptive part [Dalton 1870: 13–14], albeit coming under a more general title "Tatar family", it is categorised as "Siberian Tatar". The description places the speakers of this variant in the Tobolsk and Tomsk Governorates, and states that contact with the surrounding peoples has significantly influenced the language: "No Tatar branch shows in their speech so many alien/foreign elements as this" [Dal-

ton 1870: 14, translation from German mine]. However, when studying the text in more detail, it does not display features typical to Siberian Tatar. In his Description XV Dalton combines this text with another text called "Tatarisch (Dialekt der Altai Tataren)", which is in Cyrillic script and shows some characteristics of Siberian Tatar, for example, in phonology[14].

I suggest that the text under consideration represents more general literary Tatar, rather than a specific narrower spoken language variant. A couple of pages later in Dalton's book there is another text in Cyrillic script, whose title is "Kazan (Tatar)" (the text itself is on page 60, the description on page 16). I will comment on this below (5.6.6) in conjunction with the 1893 text.

### 5.4.1 Transcription and glosses

| 9a-c | ai | kuklardaki | | ātamz | snnk | asmnk | | mqds | bulsun |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | o | in-skies-the-one-being | | father-our | your | name-your | | holy | may-be |

| 10a-b | snnk | mlkutnk | | kilsun | snnk | aradänk | kukdä | bulɣan | tik |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | your | dominion-your | | may-come | your | will-your | in-sky | being | as |

| 10c | jirdä | dxi | bulsun |
|---|---|---|---|
| | on-earth | also | may-be |

| 11a-b | bznnk | rzq | aikmkmzni | bukun | bzka | birkil |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | our | food | bread-our-ACC | today | we-DAT | give-IMP |

| 12a | w | bznnk | burčlarmzni | baɣšlaɣil | bzlarka | ntak | km |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and | our | debts-our-ACC | forgive-IMP | we-PL-DAT | such | as |

| 12b-c | bzlar | burčlularimzɣa | baɣšlaimz |
|---|---|---|---|
| | we-PL | debtors-our-DAT | forgive-we |

| 13a | w | bzlarni | amtxanɣä | mbtla | qilmaɣil |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and | we-PL-ACC | testing-DAT | one_exposed | make-not-IMP |

| 13b | blkä | bzlarni | šrirdn | qutqarɣil |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | but | we-PL-ACC | evil-from | save-IMP |

---

14  Use of /s/ instead of /z/ in 1st -person plural suffix; /p/ instead of /b/ in word-initial position, for example, *pis* 'we'.

(13c-e) ānnkčunkm      snnkdr      mlkut      w
        therefore as     your-is     dominion   and

        quut       w      ʒĺal        abdkačä        āmin
        strength   and    greatness   until-eternity amen

## 5.4.2 Distinguishing features of phonology, lexicon, morphology and syntax

The phonological feature of front vs. back harmony is common in many Turkic languages, including Tatar. In this phenomenon, with regard to suffixes, "the quality of the last syllable determines the quality of the following suffix with respect to front vs. back" [Johanson 1998a: 33]. For vowels, such harmony is not just a phonetic phenomenon where assimilation happens in terms of palatal vs. velar, and labial vs. non-labial environments. Some linguists have postulated that vowel harmony plays a role in the agglutinative mechanism of Turkic languages. Together with other phonological features, such as stress and assimilation of consonants, "vowel harmony unites an extended chain of morphological elements into a single whole" [Shcherbak 1994: 58–59].

In this text, although the vowel sounds are not fully orthographically represented, the front vs. back harmony finds a clear reflection in the way the orthography differentiates between the velar/uvular consonant sounds. In 12a in the word *bayšlaɣyl* 'forgive(IMP)', the consonant sounds following the vowel *alif* (/A/) are uvular [ɣ], represented by the equivalent Arabic letter *ghayn*, which indicates that the vowels are back vowels. The imperative suffix -*ɣyl* follows this sound pattern with a uvular consonant and a back vowel. In another word with velar/uvular consonant sounds, in 11b, the occurrence of the velar [k] in *birkil* 'give(IMP)', marked with the letter *kaf*, points to a front-vowel environment.

In the lexicon, many words which are used for key terms are different from the earlier texts. Amongst these are 'kingdom', represented by the word *mölköt* (10a). It is an Arabic loan with the meaning 'right of rule' (in contemporary Tatar its meaning is 'property'). Further Arabic loans differing from the other texts

are *arada* 'will, purpose' (10b) and *šärir* – 'evil; doer of evil' (13b). Also some new connecting words are introduced: *antaɣ*[15] 'such; thus' occurs in 12b, and *anŋčun* 'therefore' (13c) is used instead of the earlier *zirä* 'for'. *Anŋčun* resembles the contemporary Tatar *anyŋ öčen* 'because of it', and would seem to be Turkic in origin.

One further conjunction is introduced: *bälkä* 'but' (13b), originally being perhaps a combination of the Arabic *bäl* and Persian *ki* [see Tétimol 2015: балки]. In contemporary Tatar this conjunction typically follows the main clause containing a negation, and it appears to have such a function in this translation as well.

With regard to morphology, we note that the standard accusative and dative suffixes *-NI* and *-GA* (see 12a for both) are used. What is special about the current text is that the first-person plural personal pronoun takes a plural suffix *-lar* (13a), which does not occur in any of the other translations. This appears to be Chaghatay influence, where both the form *biz* and the form with a plural suffix *bizlär* were used synonymously for 'we' [Eckmann 1966: 112]. In verbs, the imperative is formed with the suffix *-GIl* (11b, 12a, 13a, 13b) as in the 1803 and 1882/1884 texts.

The current translation introduces a morphosyntactic feature, common in contemporary Tatar but not seen in the previous texts: the equative suffix *-čA*. This suffix, already known in Old Turkic [see Erdal 2004: 177], brings about an adverbial meaning of 'equal to'. Our example is in 13d with the temporal meaning *äbädkäčä*[16] 'until eternity' (literally 'equal to until eternity'). The equative suffix appears also in the 1882/1884 text.

---

[15]   The word resembles the contemporary Tatar word *andyj* 'such, that type of', and looks Turkic both in terms of its core morpheme *an* – an oblique stem of the third-person singular pronoun *Ul* – and the adjectival suffix *-taɣ*. This word has been attested as early as in the Orkhon inscriptions, see Erdal [2004: 336].

[16]   The word *äbädkäčä* appears to consist of the Arabic loan *äbäd* 'eternity' with a dative suffix *-kä* + the equative suffix *-čä*.

In syntax, this translation contains the only instance of an Izafet construction[17] in the texts studied. Originally being a Persian feature, it was already in use in Old Turkic. Erdal [2004: 381–382] discusses Izafet as one of the types of "nominal phrases with [a] possessive satellite" of Old Turkic. In this type of construction two nouns are combined through the third-person possessive suffix -*I* on the head noun, which is preceded by the modifying noun in the nominative. Thus the modifying noun is unmarked and differs from a case of a standard possession construction, which would contain a genitive suffix on the modifying noun. The Izafet construction of our text can be found in 11a: *rizyq ikmäkemezni*, where *rizyq* 'food' modifies the head noun *ikmäk* 'bread', which is followed by the Izafet suffix -*e* and the first-person plural possessive suffix -*mez*. The following parsing shows the different morphological parts of the expression:

rizyq ikmäk-e-mez-ni
food bread-IZAFET-our-ACC
*our food-bread(ACC)*

In this case the first word 'food' specifies the word 'bread' as being "foody", a type of food.

### 5.4.3 Identity of the language variant; translation choices and style

In his description of the language represented by the current text, Dalton [1870: 14] makes a comment on the Siberian Tatar dialect, that it has more contact-induced foreign elements than any other branch of Tatar. However, in addition to a number of Arabic and Persian loans I could not detect any other influences in the text which differ from the other six texts studied. This, for its part, supports the idea that the text in question does not represent the Siberian Tatar dialect, but is of more general nature.

The Greek source text of verse 9a addresses "Our Father" using a vocative form *Πάτερ* '(O) Father'. The three translations

---

17    See [Zakiev et al. 1993: 35] for this type of Izafet in contemporary Tatar.

preceding the current translation do not explicitly reflect the vocative, with their simple address 'our Father'. The current text, however, contains a vocative interjection *i* 'O' (9a): *i kük-lärdäki atamyz* 'O our father (who are) in the heavens'. The vocative interjection is also visible in the 1882/1884 and 1893 texts. The translators may have been influenced by the first New Testament published in Russian in 1821, or by the Church-Slavonic Bible of 1751, both containing a vocative form *Otče/Ošče*[18], if not by the original Greek text.

Turkic languages typically use possessive suffixes on possessed nouns to indicate the possessee. There is no need to add a separate possessive pronoun to specify ownership, and it would in most cases be redundant. However, unlike the earlier texts, the 1870 translation adds possessive pronouns in front of their head nouns. These occur both with the second-person singular (10a) and the first-person plural (12a) forms. Adding a seemingly superfluous possessive pronoun could be seen as a device of special emphasis, for example, in 12a there might be a comparison with an emphasis between us forgiving others and God forgiving **our** sins. However, for 11a "our food-bread give us today" the explanation of emphasis is not valid. I suggest that the source text used, be it the Russian translation or the Greek original, both containing explicit possessive pronouns, has caused this addition.

In conclusion, this translation displays features of the other translations studied, in retaining many key terms of Arabic origin. Unlike the previous translations, it contains seemingly redundant possessive pronouns, presumably influenced by the source text, which decreases the naturalness of the translation. Nevertheless, there are features, especially the introduction of new conjunctions, which bring the translation closer to the common people's language.

---

18    See https://kp.rusneb.ru/item/reader/gospoda-nashego-iisusa-hris-ta-novyy-zavet-na-slavyanskom-i-ruskom-yazyke-3; page 16, accessed 16 November 2022.

## 5.5 The 1882/1884 translation of the Gospel of Matthew

### 5.5.1 The source text

The 1882/1884[19] translation of the Lord's Prayer is taken from the Gospel of Matthew published in 1884 in Kazan. In their book *Historical Catalogue of the printed editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society,* Darlow and Moule [1911: 1629–1630] discuss this publication amongst twelve different translations of parts of the Bible/Apocrypha for a "dialect" called Kazan Tatar. They describe the dialect as being "Western Turkish" Kazan Tatar, spoken in Kazan, Russia. It is spoken by "perhaps 200,000 descendants of the Tatars who once formed a powerful Khanate on the Volga" [Darlow & Moule 1911: 1629].

The first publication mentioned is Ecclesiasticus (or the Book of Sirach) in 1864 in "Russian" script, and the first translation containing the Lord's Prayer is the Gospel of Matthew from 1866 in "Russian" script.

The copy of the 1882/1884 translation[20] studied here is in Arabic script, and it is housed at the Cambridge University Library in the collections of the Bible Society. The publication was also printed in Cyrillic script, and it has no pagination. The Gospel of Matthew was translated by Professor C. Salemann of the University of St Petersburg. He had been employed by the British and Foreign Bible Society to work on the Kirghiz version, and after taking a tour to the Kazan district he undertook the preparation of the Kazan Tatar version. The translation was revised for press locally in Kazan by Professor J. M. E. Gottwald of Kazan University, who was also the director of the university printing office [Darlow & Moule 1911: 1629].

### 5.5.2 Transcription and glosses

| 9a-c | ai | kuklrdagi | | ātamz | asmnk | mqds | bulsun |
|------|----|-----------|--|-------|-------|------|--------|
|      | o  | in-skies-the-one-being | | father-our | name-your | holy | may-be |

---

[19]   The year 1882 refers to the Russian censor's license to print, but the book was in the end published two years later.

[20]   In Darlow and Moule's classification no. 9419.

| 10a-b | mlkutnk | kilsun | mradnk | kukda | ničuk | aisä |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | dominion-your | may-come | purpose-your | in-sky | as | would-be |

| 10c | jirdäda | šulaj | bulsun |
|---|---|---|---|
| | on-earth also | thus | may-be |

| 11a-b | (h)är | kungi | aikmagmzni | bugun | bzga | birkl |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | every | daily | bread-our-ACC | today | we-DAT | give-IMP |

| 12a | (h)äm | bzga | buručlarmzni | kičur | ntak | km |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and | we-DAT | debts-our-ACC | forgive(IMP) | such | as |

| 12b-c | bez | dä | auzmzga | buručli | bulɣanlarɣa | kičuramz |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | we | also | ourselves-DAT | indebted | those-being-DAT | forgive-we |

| 13a | (h)äm | bzni | amtxanɣa | tušurma |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | and | we-ACC | testing-DAT | put-down-not(IMP) |

| 13b | lkn | jamandan | bzni | qutqar |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | but | evil-from | we-ACC | save(IMP) |

| (13c-e) | čunkä | snnkdr | mlkut | w | qdrt |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | for | your-is | dominion | and | power |
| | w | auluɣlq | mnkučä | āmin | |
| | and | greatness | until-eternity | amen | |

### 5.5.3 Phonology and morphology

In this translation orthography reflects the sounds more explicitly. In 11 there are several examples of the sound [g] represented orthographically by the letter *kaf* with three dots above: for example, *bügün* 'today'. In morphology, the first-person plural suffix is still -*mYz*, for example, in 9a: *atamyz* 'our Father'. In verbs, the imperative retains the additional suffix -*GIl*, as in 11b *birkil* 'give.IMP'. However, this is not obligatory, as *kičür* 'forgive(IMP)' in 12a does not contain the suffix.

This translation introduces a pronoun common in contemporary Tatar, but not seen in the previous texts: the reflexive pronoun. In 12b the first-person plural reflexive pronoun *üzemez*(*gä*) '(to) ourselves' is used in a context where it refers

back to the first-person plural subject *bez* 'we': **bez** *dä* **üzemezgä** *buručly bulɣanlarɣa kičürämez* 'also we forgive to those being indebted to us'. As in the 1870 text, this translation also contains the equative suffix *-čA*. The suffix is used in both texts in 13b for the same meaning 'until eternity', but the Arabic loan words to which the suffix attaches itself are different. In this text the word is *mänküčä* 'until eternity' (literally 'equal to eternally').

### 5.5.4 Lexicon

This translation has a selection of Arabic or Persian loans encountered in the earlier translations, such as *mölküt*, *morad* and *imtixan*. However, the overall impression is that there are an increasing number of words of Turkic origin. Amongst verbs, while all the previous translations, except the first one from 1803, use *baɣɣšla-* for the central key term 'forgive', this translation utilises the Turkic verb *kičür-*, as in 12a: *kičür* 'forgive(IMP)'. The verb is commonly used in contemporary Tatar in the form *kičer-*, as is visible from the newest 2015 translation (see 12c). Another Turkic-origin verb is *tüšür-*, which incidentally is a causative verb by form, like *kičer-*. It occurs as an auxiliary verb attached to the Arabic-origin noun *imtixanɣa tüšürmä* 'do not put down into testing'. The verb is one of most used verbs in Turkic languages [Tėtimol 2015: *mɵɯ-ɣ*], occurring both as a full lexical verb and as an auxiliary, and it is widely used in contemporary Tatar in the form *töšer-*, where it means 'lower, bring down'.

In nouns, the Arabic *ǯälal* common in the previous translations has been replaced by the Turkic equivalent *oloɣlyq* 'greatness' (see 13d). *Oloɣlyq* is formed from an adjective *oloɣ* 'great' and the Turkic nominaliser suffix *-lYQ*, thus being transparent in its meaning and more accessible to the common people.

The word used for 'evil' in 13b is *jaman*. It is known from Common Turkic, and it is enlightening to compare it with the equivalent word in the 1893 version: *ǯaman*. The sound [ǯ] is characteristic of the central dialect, spoken in area of Kazan, whereas the sound [j] is commonly used in the western Mishar dialect [see Safiullina & Zakiev 1994: 197]. This is the only evidence of dialect differences within one language variant found in these texts.

As for conjunctions, the standard *zirä* with the meaning 'for' is replaced by *čünki*. The word is known from Common Kypchak [see Tėtimol 2015: *чөнки*], and is in use in contemporary Tatar. 10c displays another new demonstrative connective: *šulaj* 'thus', which is a Turkic word, replacing the loan word *däxi* seen in most of the previous texts.

### 5.5.5 Translation style: gentle introduction of common language

The current translation is aimed at a certain audience, namely people speaking the Kazan Tatar variant of Turkic. When compared with the previous translations studied, even though a few elements are similar to them, for example, the retention of Arabic loans for key nouns, other lexical choices and morphological details display an orientation away from "religious" language and towards more contemporary use, perhaps even spoken language.

### 5.6 The 1893 text in Cyrillic, 3rd edition 1908

The sixth translation was originally published in 1893, and the version we investigate is from its third edition, printed in 1908. The translation was overseen by N. Bobrodnikov, Nikolai Ilminsky's successor in the post of director of the teacher training school in Kazan [Arapović, u. m.: 149]. Unlike the other translations already investigated, the translation is in Cyrillic script. In the following I first present the Cyrillic-script text, followed by its transcription. The text in Cyrillic script can be compared with the 1870 "Kazan Tatar" text discussed below in section 5.6.6.

### 5.6.1 Text in Cyrillic and its transcription with glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| 9a-c | эй кюктяге Атабыз, данны булыб торсон исемеҥ Синеҥ. |
| 10a-c | Килсен падшалыгыҥ Синеҥ; жирдя дя кюктягечя булсын иркеҥ Синеҥ. |
| 11a-b | Бөгөн көннөк икмягебезне бир безгя. |
| 12a-c | Бурычларыбызны кичер, без дя безгя бурычлы булганнарга кичергян кюк. |

13a-e   Безне алданырга ирек жибярмя;
        жаманнан коткар безне.
        Падшалык, кыуат, ололок гумергя
        Синеке шул. Аминь.

| 9a-c | ej | küktäge | Atabyz, | danny |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | o | in-sky-the-one-being | Father-our | glorious |

| | bulyb torson | isemeŋ | Sineŋ. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | may-be.continuously | name-your | Your |

| 10a-b | Kilsen | padšalyɣɣyŋ | Sineŋ; | žirdä | dä |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | may-come | kingdom-your | Your; | on-earth | also |

| 10c | küktägečä | bulsyn | irkeŋ | Sineŋ. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | as-(being-)in-sky | may-be | will-your | Your. |

| 11a-b | Bögön | könnök | ikmägebezne | bir | bezgä. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | today | daily | bread-our-ACC | give(IMP) | we-DAT |

| 12a | Buryčlarybyzny | kičer, |
|---|---|---|
| | debts-our-ACC | forgive(IMP) |

| 12b-c | bez | dä | bezgä | buryčly | bulɣanlarɣa | kičergän | kük. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | we | also | we-DAT | indebted | those-being-DAT | have-forgiven | like. |

| 13a | Bezne | aldanyrɣa | irek žibärmä; |
|---|---|---|---|
| | we-ACC | be-deceived | allow-not(IMP); |

| 13b | žamannan | qotqar | bezne. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | evil-from | save(IMP) | we-ACC |

| (13c-e) | Padšalyq, | qyuat, | ololoq | ɣumergä | Sineke | šul. | Amin'. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | kingdom, | strength, | greatness | eternally | Yours | indeed (is). | Amen. |

### 5.6.2 Representation of sounds

The Cyrillic script allows for a fuller representation of the sound repertoire of the Tatar language than the Arabic script, particularly in the vowel sounds. The orthography used in the translation appears to follow the system devised by Ilminsky[21],

---

[21]   See Nurieva [2015: 68–69] for more details on Ilminsky's alphabet, originally devised in 1862 for use for the Kerashen (Christened) Tatars.

where the special Tatar sounds not in existence in Russian are represented by modifications in the letters, such as the n-with-a-tail (*ң*) representing the [ŋ] sound, and by reallocation of some letters for another sound: *я* (Russian *ja*) represents the Tatar front vowel *ä*, and *ю* (Russian *ju*) the front vowel *ü*. However, in the area of velar/uvular consonant sounds a differentiation is not made, but it is the front or back environment which guides the reader to pronounce the letter "k" or "g" as a velar sound, or the equivalent uvular sound. For ease of comparison with the other texts, the above transcription reflects the phonetics of these sounds, but looking at the Cyrillic, both *kičer* (*ки-чер*, 12a) and *qotqar* (*котқар*, 13b) begin in Cyrillic script with "k", but while the first one, being in a front-vowel environment, is pronounced [k], the second one receives a uvular pronunciation [q] due to its back-vowel environment.

### 5.6.3 Orientation to spoken language

In the area of morphology, there is an obvious change in the form of the first-person plural possessive suffix. Until now, *-myz* had been the norm, but this text has *-byz*, the same form that is used in contemporary Tatar. This must be a reflection on translation style: no longer is the prestigious tradition of literary Chaghatay being followed [see Eckmann 1966: 79], but it is the living spoken language which comes to the forefront.

The lexicon used is on average more "Turkic" than in the previous texts. In 9c four out of five of the previous texts used the Arabic loan word *möqad(d)as* 'holy' in the expression 'hallowed be/holy be (your name)'. This translation uses instead a common word *dan* 'glory, honour' with a Turkic adjectival suffix *-LY*: *danny* 'glorious'. Interestingly, the very first 1803 translation also used the word *dan*, but as a translation for a different word, 'glory', in 13b. The one clear Arabic loan remaining in the text is in 13c: *qyuat* 'strength', which coincides only with the 1870 text – other translations had chosen another Arabic loan *qodrät* 'power' for this concept.

### 5.6.4 Word order

An intriguing difference with the earlier texts has to do with word order. The unmarked neutral word order in Tatar is Subject-Object-Verb, and the modifier (such as a possessive pronoun) usually precedes its head word (for example, a noun). If the word order is inverted, this can be an indication of pragmatic marking, for example special emphasis, or of a register differing from the literary, written register. The current text contains three cases of "unusual" word order. Firstly, in all second-person addresses to God which contain a possessive construction (9c, 10a and 10c) the word order has been reversed: *isemeŋ Sineŋ* 'name.2POSS Your'. The possessive pronoun *Sineŋ* itself is redundant, because the head word *isemeŋ* contains a possessive suffix *-eŋ* 'your', and none of the previous texts have added an explicit possessive pronoun in these places. Would the extra pronoun be for emphasis? Or to show respect, since it occurs only in conjunction with an address to God? I would suggest it is the influence of the Greek and/or the Russian Synodal source text, both of which have the noun preceding the modifying possessive pronoun.

The second example of non-standard word order can be seen in the clause *bulsyn irkeŋ Sineŋ* 'may.be will.2POSS Your' (10c). The word order Subject-Verb has been reversed into Verb-Subject. Again, this might be an indication of special emphasis, but I suggest that it is influence of the source text. The third case of reversed word order takes place in 11b: *bir bezgä* 'give we.DAT; give to us'. The indirect object *bezgä* follows the imperative verb. The previous texts, except for that of 1803, have the word order Object-Verb. Freer word order is characteristic of spoken language, so this inverted word order may be an indication of spoken register influencing the translation.

### 5.6.5 Interpretation, dialect and discourse

Some of the further differences that can be detected in the text seem to reflect both a register closer to the spoken language and a more meaning-based translation style. In 9c, the clause

we have already investigated, the expression *danny*[22] *bulyb torson* (*isemeŋ Sineŋ*) 'may (Your name) be constantly glorious' represents a unique interpretation of the source text. The Greek original has, *ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·* 'may your name be made holy/be honoured', and the Russian Synodal text reads, *да святится имя Твое* 'may Your name be sanctified'. The previous translations – the 1803 translation again being an exception – render this consistently as 'may (your name) be holy', using an Arabic loan word *möqad(d)as* 'holy', as mentioned above. The translation team's choice to go for an explanatory translation, even using an aspectual verb form *torson* to show the continuity of the action, indicates a deeper understanding of the language.

Another case of an unique interpretation is in 13a. The Greek original has *μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν* 'do not lead us into temptation'. The current text unpacks this meaning with the interpretation: *Bezne aldanyrɣa irek ʒibärmä* 'Do not allow us to be deceived'.

For 'evil' the text has the word *ʒaman* (13b). As discussed in conjunction with the 1882/1884 text, which contains *jaman* (see 5.5), this is an indication of a dialect difference, and would suggest that the current translation was prepared with speakers of the central dialect, spoken in the area of Kazan.

We also note that unlike the other texts, which use a (sourcetext influenced) conjunction 'and' at the beginning 13a, this translation has no conjunction here. This is a further indication of an orientation towards natural spoken discourse, as Tatar (and Turkic languages in general) prefer simple juxtaposing of coordinating clauses, without conjunctions.

In their thorough research into Nikolai Ilminsky's translation practice and educational activities, Nurieva et al. [2016: 118–119] describe the way Ilminsky and the Translation Commission

---

[22] This word contains an interesting assimilation of the adjectival suffix *-LY* to the final nasal [n] of the noun *dan*, resulting in *danny*, while the norm would be *danly*. Whether this is a dialect influencing this text, or something else, is not currently clear. Interestingly, the same form is used in the 1870 Kazan Tatar version. Also the word *könnök* (< *kön-lök*) in 11a-b displays a similar nasal assimilation.

of the Saint Guria Brotherhood, whose head he became in 1868, worked to make translations available for indigenous peoples of Russia. The Tatar translations served as "scripts" for other languages, so special care was taken to clear up any errors of understanding. This was done by testing the translations with fluent speakers of Tatar. It was only after they were made perfect "in terms of the language, accuracy and edification" [Nurieva et al. 2016: 119] that the translations were recommended for publication. The translation investigated here reflects these principles, which were ahead of their time in that they involved fluent mother-tongue speakers in the work of comprehension testing.

In conclusion, the ways in which the 1893 differs from the earlier texts show that its audience has been more clearly defined, and there is an orientation for the spoken register. The text represents a particular dialect or language variant, and thus it differs from the other texts, which appear to be in a more general, lingua franca style of language. There is also an evident aim for naturalness, and creative ways have been employed in interpretation to unpack the meaning of the biblical text.

### 5.6.6 Comparison with "Kazan Tatar" of Dalton 1870

As mentioned in section 5.4, Dalton's [1870] selection of different versions of the Lord's Prayer also contains one to which he gives the title "Kazan (Tatar)" (No. XXI; page 60). Dalton's description [1870: 16] contains the following:

"The Kazan people are often called Tatars, and they form the remnant of the once so powerful Tatar state Kapchak on the Volga. They number over a million and live in the Kazan, Orenburg, Samara, and Stavropol Governorates, and in the surrounding areas. They see the city of Kazan as their capital, and occupy a respected position as industrialists. They follow the precepts of the Qur'an strictly. No translation of the holy Scriptures in this particular dialect exists yet. The Lord's Prayer was mentioned by Mr Lerch."

Dalton's 1870 translation is presented below in its Cyrillic-script form.

| | |
|---|---|
| 9a-c | Эй кюктяги Атабызъ, данны булыбъ |
| | турсынъ исиминъ Сининъ, |
| 10a-c | килсинь падшалыгынъ Сининъ, жирдя дя |
| | кюктягичя булсынъ иркинъ Сининъ. |
| 11a-b | Бугюнь кюннюкь икмягибизни бирь безгя. |
| 12a-c | Бурычларыбызны кичирь, без дя безгя |
| | бурылчы булганнарга кичиргянь кюкь. |
| 13a-e | Безни алдатырга ирикь бирмя; жаманнанъ |
| | безни куткаръ. Синики падшалыкъ кувать |
| | улулыкъ та, гумирдянь гумиргя. Аминь. |
| | [Dalton 1870: 60] |

It is very close to the 1893 translation discussed in section 5.6–5.6.5. Since Ilminsky was active in Bible translation work well before the publication of Dalton's book in 1870, it is likely that this translation is also following Ilminsky's principles. The main difference between the two texts is in orthography/phonology: the letter/sound "e" of the 1893 text is often "i" in the 1870 translation; and occasionally instead of an "o", the letter "u" occurs in the 1870 text. Does this seeming fluctuation in the representation of those sounds reflect the transferral process from one script to another? This looks especially likely, since the Arabic script may not indicate these vowels, and when it does it uses the same letter for both [i] and [e] sounds[23]; and the same is true of "o" and "u", which are both represented in the Arabic script with *waw*. Another feature of the earlier 1870 text is the use of the Cyrillic soft (ь) and hard signs (ъ) word-finally, if the word ends in a consonant. Examples are *Atabyzъ* 'our Father' of the 1870 text vs. *Atabyz* of the 1893 text, and *kilsinь* 'may come' vs. *kilsen*. It appears that the soft and hard signs indicate front- and back-vowel environments, which is relevant in the context

---

[23] Perhaps this fluctuation has something to do with the systematic vowel shift observed in Tatar and Bashkir where, compared with other Turkic languages, the high vowels have been centralised and further shortened, with [i] becoming [ĕ] and [u] becoming [ŏ] (see [Johanson 1998a: 92] about vowel developments). It may reflect the process of this change, or the orthography developers wrestling with questions of how to display the Tatar vowels appropriately.

of the plosive consonants "k" and "g". When following the letter "n" the hard sign may also have a secondary function to show that the letter should be pronounced as [ŋ]. In the 1893 text this letter combination has been refined into one symbol *ң*. It would seem that in the 1870 text we are witnessing the process of development of the Cyrillic-based orthography for Tatar, and the 1893 text displays the orthography in its established form.

## 5.7 The contemporary translation of 2015 from the complete Bible

The last text in our study comes from the first ever complete Tatar Bible, published in 2015. The translation process began in the 1970s at the initiative of the Institute for Bible Translation. The first tangible fruit of this undertaking was the publication of *Jaxšy xäbär* 'The Good News', with the four Gospels and Acts published in one volume in 1985. This was followed by *Inǯil*, the New Testament, in 2001. In the Preface to the full Bible, the translation team shared background information about the process of the translation, and about the different organisations and people involved in the work, including scholars from the Language, Literature and Art Institute of the Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, and the University of Kazan. They also defined their aim as: "the correspondence of the translation from the point of view of meaning with the original [Hebrew or Greek texts] and at the same time its understandability" [*Izge Jazma* 2015: 6–7]. In addition, the source texts are clearly defined, with the *Novum Testamentum Graece (Nestle-Aland)* as the source for the New Testament.

The current text differs from the other six in that it does not contain the latter part of verse 13, which is included in the other versions, since those are following a different manuscript tradition.

### 5.7.1 Transcription from Cyrillic script and glosses

| 9a-b | Küktäge | | Atabyz! | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | in-sky-the-one-being | | Father-our! | |

| 9c | Isemeŋ | izge | dip | iqrar itelsen, |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | name-your | holy | as | may-be-declared, |

| 10a | Sineŋ | Patšalyɣyŋ | kilsen. |
|-----|-------|-----------|---------|
|     | your  | Kingdom-your | may-come. |

| 10b | Küktäge | kebek, | žirdä | dä |
|-----|---------|--------|-------|-----|
|     | in-sky(-being) | like | on-earth | also |

| 10c | Sineŋ | ixtyjaryŋ | ɣamälgä ašsyn. |
|-----|-------|-----------|-----------------|
|     | your  | will-your | may-become-realised. |

| 11a-b | Köndälek | ikmägebezne | bezgä | bügen | bir. |
|-------|----------|-------------|-------|-------|------|
|       | daily    | bread-our-ACC | we-DAT | today | give(IMP). |

| 12b-c | Bez dä | üzebezgä | jawyzlyq | qylučylarny | kičergändäj, |
|-------|--------|----------|----------|-------------|--------------|
|       | we  also | ourselves-DAT | evil | doers-ACC | as-have-forgiven, |

| 12a | beznen | jawyz | ešlärne | Sin | kičer. |
|-----|--------|-------|---------|-----|--------|
|     | our    | evil  | deeds-ACC | You | forgive(IMP). |

| 13a | Bezne | synauɣa | dučar itmä, |
|-----|-------|---------|-------------|
|     | we-ACC | testing-DAT | subject-not(IMP), |

| 13b | ä | jawyzdan | saqla. |
|-----|---|----------|--------|
|     | but | evil-from | protect(IMP). |

### 5.7.2 Lexicon

The translation corresponds in style with contemporary literary Tatar. In verbs, there is a range from those in regular everyday use to more literary, higher-style verbs. The former belong mainly to the common Turkic lexical layer, as identified by Shcherbak [1994: 113–115], being *kil-* 'come' (10a), and *bir-* 'give' (11b). Also the key term for 'forgive', *kičer-* (12) belongs to an old Turkic stock, and it can be seen as a causative of the verb *kič-* 'cross, wade' [see Tětimol 2015: кичер] (also found in Shcherbak's [1994] list). Examples of the latter – the literary, higher-style verbs – are compound verbs consisting of a noun or an adjective of Arabic or Persian origin and a Turkic auxiliary verb *it-* 'do' (also in Shcherbak's list): *iqrar it-* 'declare' (9c) and *dučar it-* 'subject (to something)'.

The nouns used are for the most part Turkic (*kük* 'sky, heaven', *žir* 'earth', *kön* 'day', and *eš* 'deed'). Like the 1882/1884

text, the reflexive pronoun *üz* is used in 12a. The only connectives used are a new contrastive conjunction *ä* 'but' and the additive clitic *DÄ*, common in other texts as well: *ǯirdä dä* 'also on earth' (10b).

### 5.7.3 Syntax, word order and pragmatics

Syntactically the Lord's Prayer is not complex. However, verse 12 is a slightly more complex sentence consisting of two clauses, the second of which modifies the preceding main clause through a comparative structure (see also the discussion in 5.3.3). In the original Greek it reads *καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν* 'and forgive us our debts, as also we have forgiven/forgive our debtors'. The seven translations have each found their own solution for the modifying clause – only the 1870 and the 1882/1884 texts have made use of a similar structure. The contemporary translation differs from the others most significantly, since it has reversed the order of the clauses, with the modifying clause preceding the main clause. Such an order is typical of Turkic languages: the modifier precedes the head. The general structure of the sentence is the following: '(The same way) as we forgive/have forgiven those who do evil to us [literally: to ourselves], forgive You our evil deeds.'

In the main clause the subject *Sin* 'You' of the imperative verb form *kičer* 'forgive', which is usually redundant, has been made explicit and placed to a non-standard position following the direct object and immediately preceding the verb: *bezneŋ jawyz ešlärne Sin kičer* 'You forgive(IMP) our evil deeds'. This position is pragmatically marked in Tatar, and it indicates that the subject is in focus; it receives special emphasis.

### 5.7.4 Interpretation

The translation has two interpretations which are not visible in the other texts. For reasons of clarity and intelligibility, in 9c the Greek 'hallowed be/holy may be made' has been rendered with 'may Your name be declared holy', which unpacks the concise meaning of the Greek. Another distinctive interpretation occurs in 10c where the Greek has 'may your will happen'.

All the other six texts have consistently translated this as 'may (your will) be', perhaps some of them influenced by the Russian *да будет* 'let be', but the contemporary translation has again unpacked the meaning into 'may Your will become realised'.

To conclude, it seems that through the use of both common and higher literary vocabulary the translation team aimed to reach a balanced, mid-level register for the language used so as to cater to a wide readership. An echo of religious style, which was more evident in the earlier translations, can be seen in the Arabic (and Persian) loan words retained in the text. The desire for the text to be understandable is clearly more evident than in the previous translations, especially in the two examples of interpretation given above. At the same time, accuracy in relation to the source text has been retained. The naturalness of the text is demonstrated both by the pragmatic choices made in clause order and by the positioning of a focal element.

# 6. Conclusion

## 6.1 Summary tables of key distinguishing features

The following five tables display in summary format the main distinguishing features of the seven translations. The right-hand column shows the "default", most common, terms used, and the columns allocated for each translation indicate the specific choices made in each individual text. If the choice is the default, the cell is left empty.

**Tables 4A-E.** The main distinguishing features of the seven translations.

### Table 4A

| LEXICON | 1803 | 1820 | 1825 | 1870 | 1882/1884 | 1893 | 2015 | "Default" |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Key nouns* | | | | | | | | |
| sky/heaven 9b | | asman | | | | | | kük |
| name 9c | | | ad | | | | | isem |
| kingdom 10a | šaglug | mämläkät | badšalyk | mölköt | mölköt | padšalyk | patšalyq | |
| will 10b/10c | ixtiar | iradät | morad | arad | morad | irek (irke) | ixtyjar | |
| earth 10b/10c | er | zämin | jir | jir | jir | ǯir | ǯir | er/jir/ǯir |

| | 1803 | 1820 | 1825 | 1870 | 1882/1884 | 1893 | 2015 | "Default" |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| day 11a | kün/jüm | | | | | | | kün/kön |
| bread 11a | nafaka | nan | etmäk | (rizyq) ikmäk | | | | ikmäk |
| debt, offense 12a | gunag | | | | | | jawyz eš jawyzlyq | buruč |
| temptation 13a | fasad eš | | | | | aldan- | synau | imtixan |
| evil 13b | rialuk | šär | jiramyz | šärir | jaman | žaman | jawyz | |
| power (13c) | kuwat | qodrät | qodrät | quut | qodrät | qyuat | – | |
| glory (13d) | dan | žäläl | žäläl | žäläl | oloγlyq | ololoq | – | |
| *Adjectives and adverbs* | | | | | | | | |
| daily 11a | | | | – | | könnök | köndälek | här küngi |
| for ever and ever (13d) | abadi | daim | äbdä | abdakača | mänkečä | γumergä | – | |
| *Conjunctions* | | | | | | | | |
| and 12a | gäm | wä | wä | wä | häm | – | – | |
| because/for 13c, 13d | zira | ziräki | zirä | anyŋčun | čönki | ...šul (discourse) 'indeed' | – | |
| *Verbs* | | | | | | | | |
| be hallowed 9c | rušanlan- | | mqadas ul- | | | danny bulyp tor- | izge dip iqrar itel- | möqadas bul- |
| forgive 12a, 12c | kič- | baγyšla- | baγyšla- | baγyšla- | kičer- | kičer- | kičer- | |
| save 13b | kutkar- | näžät qyl- | qurtar- | qotqar- | qotqar- | qotqar- | saqla- | |
| come 10a | kal- [= kil-] | jiteš- | | | | | | kil- |
| *Verbal phrase* lead into temptation/testing 13a | fasad eškä džasuwe it- | imtixanγa ketür- | imtixana sal- | imtixanγa mbtla qyl- | imtixanγa tošör- | aldanyrγa irek žibär- | synauγa dučar it- | |

## Table 4B

| PHONOLOGY | 1803 | 1820 | 1825 | 1870 | 1882/1884 | 1893 | 2015 | "Default" |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| initial "w" 11b | wez 'we' | | wir 'give' | | | | | bez; bir |
| nasal assimilation 9c | | | | | | danny | | |

## Table 4C

| MORPHOLOGY | 1803 | 1820 | 1825 | 1870 | 1882/1884 | 1893 | 2015 | "Default" |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1st plural verb suffix 9a | -mez | -myz | -yz | -myz | -myz | -byz | -byz | |
| reflexive prn 12a, 12b | | | | | üz | üz | | |
| imperative 11b | 0+GIl | | | 0+GIl | 0+GIl | | | 0 |
| 1st plural prn + DAT sfx | wezgä | | bezä | bezlärkä | | | | bezgä |
| 2nd singular prn | sän | sin | sVn | sVn | sVn | sin | sin | sVn |
| plural sfx for pl prn 12a | | | | bezlär | | | | bez |

**Table 4D**

| SYNTAX | 1803 | 1820 | 1825 | 1870 | 1882/1884 | 1893 | 2015 | "Default" |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| sentence/ clause with forgiveness 12a-c | 1. separate clause, 2. co-ordinated clauses | verbal rel. construction 2nd post main clause | verbal rel. clause 2nd pre main clause | noun +sfx 2nd pre main clause | noun +sfx 2nd pre main clause | noun +sfx 2nd pre main clause | noun +sfx 2nd pre main clause | |
| *Copula* (13d) | -dur (added to adverb) | -der (added to prn) | -der (added to prn) | -der (added to prn) | -der (added to prn) | (šul) | – | |
| *Word order* | frequently verb-initial; coordination | | | | | | | SOV |

**Table 4E**

| INTERPRETATION | 1803 | 1820 | 1825 | 1870 | 1882/1884 | 1893 | 2015 | "Default" |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| offense, debt, sin 12a, 12c | gunag 'sin' – | | | | | | jawyzlyq 'wickedness' jawyz eš 'wicked deed' | buruč, buryč 'debt' |
| (may) be 10c | | | | | | | ɣamälgä aš- | bul- |
| lead into testing 13a | | | | | | aldany-rɣa irek žibär- | | imtixan-DAT + verb-IMP |

## 6.2 Concluding remarks

This study investigated seven translations of the Lord's Prayer in language variants labelled as "Tatar". The earlier translations represent a set hand-picked for the purposes of this study on the basis of their label as "Tatar". During the course of this study a number of further translations with the same designation also came to light. This indicates the breath of the field of study awaiting researchers of historical translations of the Scriptures into Turkic languages/variants.

It is evident from this study that only the most recent texts can be explicitly connected with the specific language which has its roots in Bolghar-Kypchak and is spoken by Volga Tatars. The exact audience, or ethnic group or groups, for whom the

earlier translations were intended, remains obscure. The transregional nature of the Turkic literary languages in the centuries past is reflected in these earlier translations. However, the study of their phonological and morphological expression indicates certain tendencies and features which place the translations in the sphere of Kypchak Turkic. For the two newest translations Volga Tatars are clearly the intended audience.

Due to the prestige of transregional literary languages, such as Chaghatay, writers and translators were likely to follow the traditional conventions they offered, without much influence from their spoken variant. This is also evident from our study: the earlier translations display characteristics of a "lingua franca", a transregional written language. The level of variation is also restricted by the fact that the Arabic script was unable to reflect the full phonological system of each language variant, due to the lack of letters for the vowel sounds, which are important in distinguishing between different variants. Despite this, some more specific regional variation is detectable in some of the texts. This is especially visible when comparing the 1820 and 1825 texts, where the 1825 translation clearly displayed stronger Oghuz and, perhaps, Chaghatay influence in its morphophonology, whereas the 1820 text showed Kypchak characteristics, which can be a reflection of the original linguistic context where the translation was created.

The two main morphological elements where fluctuation between different norms is evident in the translations are the dative suffix, represented either by -*GA* or -*A*, and the first-person plural possessive suffix -*mYz* vs. -*bYz*, where the latter becomes the established form in Volga Tatar only in the late 1870s, continuing till the current day.

In the translations of the Lord's Prayer the features of the literary language of previous centuries are reflected in a variety of ways. With the early translations, there does not seem to be much continuity; rather, each translation represents an isolated accomplishment, although quite likely influenced by translations into other Turkic variants, as evidenced by the translation activities of the Karass mission, both in Karass it-

self, and later in Astrakhan and Orenburg. Also, the adoption of certain morphological forms or syntactic structures does not follow any clear pattern. Each early translation has been influenced by circumstances and factors difficult to reconstruct. These include purely linguistic factors, but also sociolinguistic and cultural aspects, with the norms and conventions of religious language also playing a part.

Studying the seven translations of the Lord's Prayer has been an engaging task. The more one discovers, the clearer it becomes that major work still awaits the researcher. A key topic for future study would be an investigation of language use in religious contexts. A particularly relevant angle would be the influence of religious norms of Islam: its influence on the translation of Christian texts, and whether the translating of Christian texts follows a pattern different from the conventions of Islamic religious texts.

The seven translations are each in their own way true to the original biblical text and message. Extending over a two-hundred-year time span, they offer multiple voices and reflect different cultural and social circumstances in the way they have reached us in this time and age. Each offers a viewpoint which enriches the understanding of the world in which they were created, and also the way the biblical message can be translated for different audiences.

## Abbreviations used

ACC = accusative
DAT = dative
IMP = imperative
PL = plural
POSS = possessive suffix
prn = pronoun
sfx = suffix
SOV = Subject-Object-Verb (word order)
V = vowel

## References to Part II

Adam 2005 — Adam Th., ed. *Germany and the Americas. Culture, Politics, and History. A Multidisciplinary Encyclopedia*. Volume I. Santa Barbara; Denver; Oxford, 2005.

Adelung 1806 — Adelung J. Chr., Vater J. S. *Mithridates*. Volume I. Berlin, 1806. URL: https://archive.org/details/mithridates-01adelgoog/page/n567/mode/2up (Public Domain) (In German)

Adelung 1817 — Adelung J. Chr., Vater J. S. *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in bey nahe fünf hundert Sprachen und Mundarten*. Volume IV. Berlin, 1817. URL: https://archive.org/details/mithridates02adel-goog/page/n7/mode/2up (In German)

Arapović, u. m. — Arapović B. Unpublished manuscript.

Bashirova et al. 2015 — Bashirova I. B., Nurieva F. Sh., Kadyirova E. Kh. *Tatar ädäbi tele tarixy (XIII γasyr – XX jöz bashy)*. I tom. *Fonetika. Grafika. Jazma tradicijalär, norma häm variantlylyq* [History of the Tatar literary language (13th – beginning of 20th century. Volume I. Phonetics. Graphs. Written traditions, norms and variation]. Kazan, 2015. (In Tatar)

Berta 1998 — Berta Á. Middle Kipchak. *The Turkic Languages*. L. Johanson, É. Á. Csató (eds.). New York, 1998, 158–165.

Bodrogligeti 2001 — Bodrogligeti A. J. E. *A Grammar of Chagatay*. München, 2001.

Boeschoten & Vandamme 1998 — Boeschoten H., Vandamme M. Chaghatay. *The Turkic Languages*. L. Johanson, É. Á. Csató (eds.). New York, 1998, 166–178.

Csató & Karakoç 1998 — Csató É. A., Karakoç B. Noghay. *The Turkic Languages*. L. Johanson, É. Á. Csató (eds.). New York, 1998, 333–343.

Dalton 1870 — Dalton H. *Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands*. St. Petersburg, 1870. URL: https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=9RhAAAAAYAAJ&pg=GBS.PA60&hl=en_GB (In German)

Darlow & Moule 1911 — Darlow T. H., Moule H. F. *Historical Catalogue of the printed editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society*. London, 1903–1911.

Eckmann 1966 — Eckmann J. *Chagatay Manual.* Blooming-ton; The Hague, 1966.

Erdal 1998 — Erdal M. Old Turkic. *The Turkic Languages.* L. Johanson, É. Á. Csató (eds.). New York, 1998, 138–157.

Erdal 2004 — Erdal M. A *Grammar of Old Turkic.* Leiden, 2004.

Flynn 2017 — Flynn Th. O. *The Western Christian Presence in the Russias and Qājār Persia, c. 1760 – c. 1870.* Studies in Christian Mission, Volume 47. Leiden; Boston, 2017.

Gazizov et al. 1993 — Gazizov R. S., Gyimadiev M. G., Gyil-fanov I. G. (eds.). *Garäpčä-tatarča-rusča alynmalar süzlege* [Dictionary of loan words: Arabic-Tatar-Russian]. Volumes I and II. Kazan, 1993. (In Tatar)

Inžil — *Inžil* [New Testament]. Moscow, 2001. (In Tatar)

Izge Jazma 2015 — *Izge Jazma* [Holy Scriptures, The Bible]. Moscow, 2015. (In Tatar)

Jaxšy Xäbär — *Jaxšy Xäbär* [Good News]. Biblijane täržemä itü instituty näšrijaty, 1985. (In Tatar)

Johanson 1998a — Johanson L. The Structure of Turkic. *The Turkic Languages.* L. Johanson, É. Á. Csató (eds.). New York, 1998, 30–66.

Johanson 1998b — Johanson L. The History of Turkic. *The Turkic Languages.* L. Johanson, É. Á. Csató (eds.). New York, 1998, 81–125.

Kerslake 1998 — Kerslake C. Ottoman Turkish. *The Turkic Languages.* L. Johanson, É. Á. Csató (eds.). New York, 1998.

Nadelyaev et al. 1969 — Nadelyaev V. M., Nasilov D. M., Teni-shev E. R, Shcherbak A. M. (eds) *Drevnetyurkskiy slovar'* [Old Russian Dictionary]. Leningrad, 1969. (In Russ.)

Nurieva 2015 — Nurieva F. The dialectal base of the books written in "christened Tatar" in the latter half of the 19th centu-ry. *Ural-Altaic Studies*, 2015, 2 (17): 67–73

Nurieva et al. 2016 — Nurieva F. Sh. et al. Translation prac-tice and educational activities of the Christian Missionary N. I. Il-minsky. *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 2016, 12 (6): 113–121.

Privratsky 2014 — Privratsky B. G. *A History of Turkish Bible Translations*. Annotated chronology with historical notes and suggestions for further research, 2014. URL: https://historyofturkishbible.files.wordpress.com/2014/03/turkish-bible-history-version-s-in-preparation.pdf

Safiullina & Zakiev 1994 — Safiullina F. S., Zakiev M. Z. *Xäzerge tatar ädäbi tele* [Contemporary Tatar Literary Language]. Kazan, 1994. (In Tatar)

Schönig 1998 — Schönig C. Azerbaijanian. *The Turkic Languages*. L. Johanson, É. Á. Csató (eds.). New York, 1998, 248–260.

Shcherbak 1994 — Shcherbak A. M. *Vvedenie v sravnitel'noe izuchenie tyurkskikh yazykov* [Introduction to the comparative study of Turkic languages]. St. Petersburg, 1994. (In Russ.)

Tėtimol 2015 — Akhmetyanov R. G. *Tatar teleneŋ ėtimologik süzlege. Ike tomda* [Etymological dictionary of the Tatar language in two volumes]. Kazan, 2015. URL: https://suzlek.antat.ru/indexR.php (In Tatar)

Zakiev et al. 1993 — Zakiev, M. Z., Ganiev F. A., & Zinnatullina K. Z. *Tatarskaya grammatika*. Tom II. *Morfologiya* [Tatar Grammar. Vol. 2. Morphology]. Kazan, 1993. (In Russ.)