Lela Tsikhelashvili
Tbilisi, Georgia

**The Influence of Septuagint Greek on the Means of Expression
of the Objective Version in Georgian Biblical Translations**

The formation of the literary Georgian language was largely influenced by Greek. Translation from Greek, which had a different grammatical system, was always problematic for Georgian translators-editors. The aim of the given paper is to find out which of the synthetic and analytical means of expression of possessive/benefactive relations was given priority by Georgian translators: the synthetic formation, which was natural for Georgian but alien to Greek, or the analytical one. Comparison of the translations/editions of the old and Hellenophile periods of the books of three prophets – Micah, Zechariah and Baruch – has proved that old translations (X-XI cc.) attach priority to synthetic formation, while the edition of the Hellenophile period (XII-XIII cc.) prefers analytical formation, similar to Greek.

Keywords: Septuagint LXX, translation, Georgian Bible, objective version, benefactive.

Introduction

Georgian is an agglutinative language and belongs to the group of morphologically rich languages (MRL). Georgian has a number of polyfunctional vocalic prefixes that stand immediately before verb roots. One of their functions is to outline for whom the action expressed by the verb is destined and to whom it belongs. The action either belongs to the subject (subjective version)[1], or the indirect object (objective version) or the meaning is not vivid altogether (neutral version). The neutral version markers are **a**- and **Ø**, the marker of the subjective version is **i**-, and the markers of the objective version are - **i**- (if O^ind. is 1st or 2nd person) and **u**- (if O^ind. is 3rd person) morphemes. The category of version (in Georgian – *kceva*) was introduced by A. Shanidze [1, pp. 323-357].

The Georgian language can express version both synthetically and analytically. However, the former is more natural. For instance, the semantics of the objective version (1) can be expressed by the verb in the neutral version[2] and the object with the postposition -tvis (`for') (2), or by

---

[1] When the agent and the benefactor are one and the same.

[2] In this case the benefactive indirect object, which always stands in the dative case, turns into the simple object with the postposition -**tvis** (`for').

adding the possessor in the genetive case (Adnominal Genitive) or possessive adjective/pronoun to the direct object (3):

(1) *davit-s*   *saxl-i*   *a-v-**u**-šen-e*
David-DAT   house-NOM   PREV-S1-**OV**-build-AOR
"I built **David** a house"   (benefactive/possessor)

(2) *davit-is-tvis*   *saxl-i*   *a-v-**a**-šen-e*
David-GEN-POST   house-NOM   PREV-S1-**NV**-build-AOR
"I built a house **for David"**   (benefactive)

(3) *davit-is*   *saxl-i*   *a-v-**a**-šen-e*
David-GEN   house-NOM   PREV-S1-**NV**-build-AOR
"I built **David`s** house"   (possessor)

In Georgian, there is no specific case expressing benefactive. This meaning is incorporated in the dative case, whereas, in the verb, it is expressed by means of prefixes **i**- and **u**-.

In Georgian, some verbs only coincide with the objective version in their form; therefore, prefixes **i-/u-** do not express the possessive / benefactive relation, but point to the existence of the indirect object in the dative case (e.g. *man mi-**u**-go mas* `he answered **him**'). Apart from the widespread opinion, in Georgian and foreign linguistic literature, there are different opinions regarding the category of version and the functions of the vocalic prefixes of the verb [2, 3, 4 a.o.]. I will abstain from discussing these opinions, as the aim of the paper is not to discuss the category of version in general, but to find out which of the synthetic and analytical means of expression of this category is more frequent in the Georgian translations of the Bible (based on the example of the objective version).

The Influence of the Biblical Greek on the formation of the Georgian Literary Language

Since the conversion of Georgia into Christianity in the first half of the 4th century, intense translation of the Christian literature into Georgian started. The translations were mostly made from the Greek language. Therefore, despite the fact that over the centuries Georgian has been affected by various languages (Persian, Syrian, Armenian...), the ancient literary Georgian language was mostly influenced by Greek. It has been formed in the process of translation of the Bible from Greek. What is most important, the Greek influence is traced not only in translations, but in the original texts as well.

Although the process of translation/edition of the Biblical books from Greek lasted for centuries, the attitude of Georgian translators/editors to the translated texts differed through epochs. The translators of the Pre-Athonite and, partly, Athonite period (V-XI cc.) took into consideration the nature of the Georgian language and did not always preserve the formal equivalence

to the original text, whereas the translators of the 'Hellenophile' trend (XI-XIII cc.) tried their best to make an adequate, precise translation from Greek. Therefore, in the translations of this period, unnatural constructions, grammatical and lexical calques are frequently found [5, p. 4; 6].

Expression of the Objective Version in the Old (X-XI cc.) and 'Hellenophile' period (XII-XIII cc.) Georgian Translations of the Bible

In order to find out which of the means of expression of the objective version was preferred by the Georgian translators/editors at various stages, I compared the Old and 'Hellenophile' period translations of the Biblical Books of three prophets (Micah, Zechariah, Baruch). The old translation is preserved in the texts of so-called *Oshki* (978-979, Mount Athos, Ath-1 MS) and *Jerusalem* (XI c., Jer-11/7) Codexes. The new edition/translation, obtained as a result of comparison with the Septuagint text, is preserved in the so-called *Gelati* (XII-XIII cc., A-1108), *Mtskheta* (XVII-XVIII cc., A-51) and *Bakar* (The Georgian Bible issued in Moscow in 1743, A-455)[1] Bibles[2].

As the Old and *Gelati* versions of the Bible are derived from the originals of one and the same tradition, the changes made in *Gelati* Bible can be explained only by a different style and technique of the translator, and the different attitude of the latter to the Greek original text[3].

Georgian translators have always found it difficult to translate from Greek, which was a language with a completely different grammatical system. The category of version is not found in Greek, and, unlike Georgian, Greek is unable to express the possessive/benefactive relations between the arguments by means of vocalic verbal prefixes. Instead, these meanings are incorporated in the dative case (Dativus commodi and incommodi, Dativus possessivus). The Greek medial voice is also characterized by the semantics of reflexivity.[4] Such medial verbs are usually

---

[1] These two versions of the Bible almost exactly repeat the text of the *Gelati* version. Therefore, I will not focus on these versions.

[2] I have used the electronic edition of the critical text of the old Georgian versions of Georgian Bible [7]. All the three prophesies are also found in *Paris Lectionary* (X-XI cc., MS #3 of Paris National Library). This version is not based on some old Georgian edition. It is an independent translation, based on the Greek text of a completely different tradition [8]. *Micah* and *Zechariah* prophesies are also found in the so-called *Kali* and *Latali Lectionaries* (X c.). Only *Micah* prophesy is found in the *Sinai Lectionary* (Sin-37, 982). I will not focus on Lectionaries in the given paper.

[3] A-1108 represents an autographic manuscript. Therefore, the changes made in this edition cannot be considered as scribal errors.

[4] The reflexive forms are also used in the passive, because, with the exception of the aorist and the future forms, they borrow the forms from the medial voice.

translated into Georgian based on the forms of the subjective version [9][1] and autoactives. Apart from it, the semantics of possessive/benefactive relation in Greek is expressed analytically (by means of prepositions or adnominal genitives). Under the Greek influence, analytical expression of the semantics of the objective version was also found in the Georgian translations (as well as in the original literature, which was also influenced by the translations), albeit with different frequency: comparatively rarely in the manuscripts of the old translations of the Bible, and far more frequently in the translations of the 'Hellenophile' period.

Research Outcomes

Based on the research material, I have identified the type of morphosyntactic changes made by the translator/editor of *Gelati* Bible in the old translation represented in *Oshki* and *Jerusalem Codexes* with the aim of adequate representation of the Greek original text:

i) In the old translation, the indirect object taken by the verb corresponds to the Greek prepositional object in the dative or accusative case. In order to make a precise, adequate translation of the Greek syntactic construction, the translator/editor of *Gelati* version substituted the indirect object of the Old translation with a postpositional object (which, unlike the indirect object, does not reveal the object agreement affixes in the verb). In the Georgian edition/translation, **the change in the verbal syntactic construction leads to the change in the verb structure itself** (**and not vice versa**!): the form of the objective version is replaced by the neutral version form, lacking one argument capable of adding a person marker (a trivalent verb becomes bivalent, whereas a bivalent verb becomes monovalent).

Baruch 1:3-4 *და აღმოუკითხნა ბარუქ სიტყუანი ესე ამის წიგნისანი ყურთა იექონიასთა, ძისა იოაკიმისთა, მეფისა იუდაესისა, და ყურთა ყოვლისა ერისათა, რომელნი მოვიდეს მის წიგნისა, და ყურთა ძლიერთასა და ძეთა მეფისათა, და ყურთა მოხუცებულთასა და ყოვლისა ერისათა კნინითგან მიდიდადმდე...* OJ. *და წარიკი[თხ]ნა ბარუხმან სიტყუანი წიგნისანი ყურთა მიმართ იექონიაე[სთა], ძისა იოაკიმისთა, მეფისა იუდაესისა, და ყურთა [მიმართ ყოვლისა ერისათა, რომელნი მოვიდოდეს მის წიგნისა, და ყურთა] ძლიერთა და ძეთა მეფეთაესა, და ყურთა მიმართ მ[ოხუც]ებულთაესა და ყურთა მიმართ ყოვლისა ერი[სათა კნინითგან] [v] ვიდრე დიდამდე...* GaSB *καὶ **ἀνέγνω** Βαρουχ τοὺς*

λόγους τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου **ἐν ὠσὶν** *Ιεχονίου υἱοῦ Ιωακιμ βασιλέως Ιουδα καὶ* **ἐν ὠσὶ** *παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν ἐρχομένων πρὸς τὴν βίβλον* ⁴*καὶ* **ἐν ὠσὶ** *τῶν δυνατῶν καὶ υἱῶν τῶν βασιλέων καὶ* **ἐν ὠσὶ** *τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ* **ἐν ὠσὶ** *παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου...* LXX[1]. *And Baruch* **read** *the words of this book* **in the hearing** *of Jeconi'ah the son of Jehoi'akim, king of Judah, and* **in the hearing** *of all the people who came to hear the book,* ⁴ *and* **in the hearing** *of the mighty men and the princes, and* **in the hearing** *of the elders, and in the hearing of all the people, small and great, all who dwelt in Babylon by the river Sud.*

(4) *aɣmo-**u**-ḳitx-n-a ... q`ur-t-a* **cf.** *çar-**i**- ḳitx-n-a*[2]  *... q`ur-t-a mimart*
PREV-**OV**- read-PL-S3 ear- PL/DAT- EMPH   PREV-**SV**[3]-read-PL-S3
ear- PL/GEN- EMPH to-POST

`(He) read (the words) to the ears…'

ii) An opposite phenomenon is extremely rare: in *Gelati* Codex, the verb of the neutral version with a simple postpositional object, found in the old translation, is substituted by objective version form of the verb and the indirect object, if in Septuagint there is an object in the dative case without a preposition. This fact proves that the aim of the translator/editor of the *Gelati* Codex was not a frequent use of constructions with postpositions, but precise, adequate translation of the original Greek text.

Zechariah 8:11 *და აწ მე* **ვყო** *პირველთა მათებრვე დღეთა* **ნეშტთა** *ამათთვის ერისა ჩემისათა…* OJ. *და აწ არა დღეთაებრ წინაპართა* **უყოფ** *მე* **ნეშტთა** *ამის ერისათა…* SB. *καὶ νῦν οὐ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν ἐγὼ* **ποιῶ** *τοῖς* **καταλοίποις** *τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου...* LXX. *But now I will not be unto the residue of this people as in the former days...* KJV.

(5) *v-q`-o ... nešṭ-t-a      ama-t-tvis* **cf.** *ara... **u**-q`-op   nešṭ-t-a*
S1- do- SUBJ   rest- PL/GEN- EMPH DEM**-** PL/GEN-POST PART **OV**-do-
THEM   rest- PL/DAT- EMPH

`I will not do (this) for the rest (of the people)'

iii) As I have mentioned above, during the analytical formation in Georgian, the verb in the objective version is substituted by the form in the neutral version, expressing the possessive/benefactive relation by means of the object with the postposition -**tvis** (`for') (2) or by means of Adnominal

---

[1] For Greek I have used the critical text of LXX [10, 11] and the computer program `Bible Works' [12].

[2] *aɣmo**u**ḳitxna* is a trivalent verb, whereas *çari**ḳ**itxna* is a bivalent one.

[3] If the verb does not have the neutral version form, the subjective version form is used with the function of the neutral one.

Genitive (3). If, in Georgian, the structure of the verb remains unchanged (and valency is not decreased) and the verb is not adjusted to the Greek syntactic construction with a preposition or the genitive case for the purpose of adequate translation, we have the case of the so-called **syntactic contamination** [5, pp. 7-18], which can be briefly characterized as follows: the structure of the Georgian verb + a foreign syntactic construction.

Micah 2:8 *და წინაშე ერი ჩემი აღუდგა მტერად წინაშე მშჳდობისა მისისა* OJ. *და წინაშე ერი ჩემი მტერად აღუდგა წინაშე მშჳდობისა მისისა* GS. καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ὁ λαός μου εἰς ἔχθραν **ἀντέστη κατέναντι τῆς εἰρήνης** αὐτου… LXX. *Even of late my people is risen up as an enemy…* KJV.

(6) *aɣ-**u**-dg-a* … *çinaše mšvidob-is-a*
PREV-**OV**- arise-S3 PREP peace-GEN-EMPH
`(My people) have risen up against peace'

Both in the old translation and *Gelati* Codex, instead of the indirect object, like Greek, there is a prepositional object in the genitive case, but the verb retains the form of the objective version.

iv) If the Greek equivalent of the indirect object is the object in the dative case, which, as a rule, is translated into Georgian as an indirect object in the dative case, in *Gelati* Codex the change does not affect either the syntactic construction or the verb.

Zechariah 1:6 … *ეჰრეთ მიყო ჩუენ* OJ. … *ეჰრეთ გიყო თქუენ* SB. … οὕτως **ἐποίησεν ὑμῖν** LXX. ... *so hath he dealt with us* KJV.

(7) *g-**i**-q`-o tquen*
O2- **OV**-do-S3 you/ DAT
`(He) did … to you'

v) If already in *Oshki* and *Jerusalem* MSS of the Bible there are adequate, precise translations from Greek and, instead of the objective version, which is more natural for Georgian, there is a neutral version of the verb with a postpositional object or direct object, followed by Adnominal Genitive, the construction remains unchanged, i.e. both versions of the Bible represent an analytical formation of the objective version.

Zechariah 7:9 *…და მოწყალებასა ჰყოფდით კაცად-კაცადი მოყუსისა მიმართ თჳსისა* OJ. … *და მშჳარსა იქმოდეთ კაცნი მოყუსისა მიმართ თჳსისა* GSB. καὶ οἰκτιρμὸν **ποιεῖτε** ἕκαστος **πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν** αὐτοῦ LXX. *and shew mercy and compassions every man to his brother* KJV.

(8) *i- qm-od-e-t …. moq`us-is-a mimart*
Sv-do-SUF-IMP-PL brother -GEN-EMPH to/POST
`Do (it) for (his) brother'

Zechariah 9:13 ... და **აღვადგინნე შვილნი შენნი**, სიონ... OJ. ...**აღვადგენ შვლთა შენთა**, სიონ... SB. ... καὶ ἐπεγερῶ τὰ τέκνα σου Σιων LXX. *and raised up thy sons, O Zion...* KJV.

(9) *aγ- v-**a**-dg-en   švil-t-a   šen-t-a*
PREV-S1-**NV**-arouse- CAUS child-PL/DAT- EMPH your-PL/DAT- EMPH
`I will stir up your children'

Conclusion

Thus, the analysis of the Books of the three prophets has proved that the old translators tried to make precise translation of "God's Words" and treated this work with special humbleness. However, unlike the translations of *Gelati* type, the older versions took into account the nature of the Georgian language and style; hence, they did not always stick to the principle of formal equivalence to the original text. These versions are a kind of synthetic translations, occupying an intermediate position between the formal and dynamic translations [5, p. 471]. Meanwhile, *Gelati* translation chiefly focuses on the stylistics of the original language, and the translator tries hard to preserve formal-structural or semantic equivalence with the Greek language (albeit using the style and grammatical constructions that are unnatural for Georgian).

The difference between the old and *Gelati* versions of the Books of the Prophets is caused not by the original texts belonging to different traditions, but the difference in the styles and techniques of the translators and the different principles of selection of the Georgian equivalents of the original texts.

References
1. Šaniʒe, Aḳaḳi. Kartuli enis gramaṭiḳis sapuʒvlebi [Foundations of the Grammar of the Georgian language]. Vol III. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press. 1980. 656 pp. **2.** Boeder, Winfried. Über die Versionen des georgischen Verbs. *Folia Linguistica, Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae. Tomus II, 1/* 2. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 1968. Pp. 82-152. **3.** Jorbenaʒe, Besarion. Zmnis xmovanp`repiksuli çarmoeba kartulši [Formation of the Verbs with Vocalic Prefixes in Georgian]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press. 1983. 247 pp. **4.** Melikišvili, Damana. Kartuli zmnis uγlebis sisṭema [Conjugation System of Georgian Verb]. Tbilisi: Logos. 2001. 362 pp. **5.** Danelia, ḳorneli. Narḳvevebi Kartuli samçerlobo enis isṭoriidan [Essays on the History of the Literary Georgian Language]. I. Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University Press. 1998. 537 pp. **6.** Melikišvili, Damana. Gelatis aḳademia. Gelatis saγvtismeṭq`velo-pilologiuri sḳola – šua sauḳuneebis saganmanatleblo ḳera [Gelati Theological-philosophical School – a Mediaval Educational Center]. Tbilisi: Logos. 2019. 244 pp. **7.** The electronic edition of the critical text of Old Georgian versions of the Georgian Bible: http://www.bible.ge/Manuscript/2win.htm. **8.** Danelia, ḳorneli. Kartuli lekcionaris p`arizuli xelnaçeri (ʒveli da axali aγtkmis saḳitxavebi). [The Paris Manuscript of the Georgian Lectionary (The Old and New Testament)].Vol I. Part II. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press. 1997. 541 pp. **9.** Giorgobiani, Tina. Gvaris ḳaṭegoriisatvis ʒvel berʒnulši [On the Category of Voice in Old Greek]. Matsne. 3. Tbilisi: Metsniereba. 1972. Pp. 157-165. **10.** Ziegler, Joseph (ed). Jeremias – Baruch – Threni – Epistula Jeremiae. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1976. 504 pp. **11.** Ziegler, Joseph (ed). Duodecim Prophetae. Vol XIII. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1984. **12.** The Computer program Bible Works . Version 10.0.4.216. https://www.bibleworks.com/

Abbreviations
O – Ath-1, *Oshki Codex* (978-979); **J –** Jer-11/7, *Jerusalem Codex* (XI c.); **G –** A-1108, *Gelati Codex* (XII-XIII cc.); **S –** A-51, *Mtskheta Codex* (XVII-XVIII cc.); **B –** A-455, *Bakar Codex* , the published version (1743); **LXX –** *Septuagint.* **KJM** – *King James Version English Bible.*
AOR – aorist; CAUS – causative; DAT – dative case; DEM-demonstrative pronoun; EMPH – emphatic vowel; GEN – genitive case; IMP – imperative; MS – manuscript; NV – neutral version; O2 – marker of the 2nd objective person; OV – objective version; PART – particle; PL – plural; POST – postposition; PREP – preposition; PREV – preverb; S1 – marker of the 1st subjective person; SUBJ – subjunctive; SV – subjective version; THEM – thematic suffix.