

***Translating the Lord's Prayer
into Finnish and the Komi languages:
A construction analytic view***

***Перевод молитвы «Отче наш»
на финский и коми языки: анализ конструкций***

Ahlholm M., Kuosmanen A.

Алхольм М., Куосманен А.

This article presents translations of the Lord's Prayer in three Finno-Ugric languages with long literary traditions: Finnish, Komi-Zyrian, and Komi-Permyak, starting with a short overview of the history of the Prayer in the three languages. The theoretical framework combines semantic priming as defined by Anna Wierzbicka and construction analysis as presented by Adele Goldberg. The lexical and constructional choices of the translations are scrutinized phrase by phrase, placing the semantic exegesis alongside the history of translating the Prayer into the three languages. The results show a cross-analysis of the simple core message of the Prayer versus the oral and literal language-specific histories of prayer constructions in these three related but autonomous Finno-Ugric languages.

Keywords: Lord's Prayer translations, liturgical texts, Finnish, Komi-Zyrian, Komi-Permyak

В данной статье анализируются переводы молитвы «Отче наш» на три финно-угорских языка с давними литературными традициями: финский, коми-зырянский и коми-пермяцкий, делается их краткий исторический обзор. Теоретическая база исследования объединяет семантические примитивы, предложенные Анной Вежицкой, и анализ конструкций, представленный Аделью Голдбергер. Выбор лексики и конструкций в переводных текстах тщательно исследуется фраза за фразой, семантические толкования рассматриваются

параллельно с историей перевода молитвы на три языка. Результаты показывают кросс-анализ простого основного послания молитвы в сравнении с устными и буквальными лингвоспецифическими историями конструкций Молитвы в трех родственных, но самостоятельных финно-угорских языках.

Ключевые слова: перевод молитвы «Отче наш», богослужебные тексты, финский язык, коми-зырянский язык, коми-пермяцкий язык, молитва, переводы

1. Introduction

This article contributes to the understanding of how the body of central Christian concepts is established in three Finno-Ugric languages with long literary traditions. We present the Finnish, Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak translations of the Lord's Prayer side by side, complementing the presentation with systematic cross-linguistic comparisons to the Greek original and the Latin and Church Slavonic translations, as well as with short semantic excursions concerning central concepts. The analysis is linked to linguistic pragmatics, which derives from a usage-based and construction analytic view of grammar.

The Lord's Prayer is ostensibly the most cited Christian prayer. As such, it is regarded as a short introduction to Christianity, or even as a Christian parallel to the first commandment of the Old Testament. Throughout the history of literacy, the Lord's Prayer has been among the first biblical texts that churches translate into new languages. This Prayer is a fundamental part of oral Christian tradition, which — irrespective of the denomination — is evoked in chanting and hymns in church services weekly, in centuries past and present. Hence, it often takes shape orally in recipient languages even before the actual written translation. The extensive frequency of the Prayer's liturgical use, together with the fact that the oral translations preceded the literary ones, provide the Lord's Prayer with special characteristics, as part of a sacred text.

Our focus in this article is on lexical and constructional choices. To this end, we investigate what kind of choices the translators made concerning central religious concepts, such as *Father* — ‘God’, *heaven* — ‘God’s dwelling place’ (vs. earth), *holy/hallowed*, (God’s) *kingdom*, *daily bread*, *temptation*, and *debt* or *sin*; or the directive *be* in ‘*hallowed be your name*’, the negative-permissive verb construct *lead us not*, and the verb *forgive*. To some extent, we are also interested in the types of variation between the different versions of the Prayer within a named language (i. e. Finnish, Komi-Permyak, and Komi-Zyrian), and hence we comment on which features of the Prayer vary and which do not, as well as whether the variation is lexical and concerns central (religious) concepts such as those mentioned above, or whether it concerns word order, word formation, or orthography.

We aim to make visible the complex relationship between source language semantics and recipient language translations. Our method of analysis has two theoretical strands: one comprises linguistic analysis of the source language, namely *semantic exegesis*, and the other, recipient language analysis viewed through a *construction grammatical* lens.

Section 2 provides a short historical overview of the Finnish and Komi translations of the Lord’s Prayer. In section 3, we explain the theoretical framework, and provide theoretical justification for grounding our analysis in semantic exegesis and construction grammar in particular. Section 4 describes the method with which the theoretical premise is applied in our analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in section 5, divided into seven sub-sections.

2. Historical overview of Finnish and Komi translations of the Lord’s Prayer

The Finnish and Komi languages belong to the shared genealogy of the Finno-Ugric language family, but the tradition of biblical translations varies considerably in Finnish, Komi-Zyrian,

and Komi-Permyak. The first oral versions of Finnish biblical translations originate from the Middle Ages, but the literary tradition started in 1543 when Finnish Reformer Mikael Agricola published the primer catechism *Abckiria*, or 'ABC Book', which included the oldest printed Finnish version of the Lord's Prayer¹ [Häkkinen 2015: 18–30; Lavery 2016]. The written form of the Komi languages is even older than that, as the Abur 'alphabet' — the Old Permic script — was introduced by St. Stephen of Perm as early as 1372. The literary lines of Komi-Permyak and Komi-Zyrian parted at the end of the Old Permic era, by the 16th or 17th century [Stepanov 2009]. The oldest documented versions of the Lord's Prayer are the Nicolaes Witsen version of 1705 in Komi-Permyak, and the Ivan Lepekhin version of 1774 in Komi-Zyrian [both in Adelung Mithridates I].

The first liturgical texts in Finnish originate from the Catholic era prior to the Reformation, that is to say, earlier than the writing system in the Finnish language was established. The first layer in the history of *Isä meidän* — the Lord's Prayer — is the orally transmitted interpretation, which was based on the Catholic liturgy and thus chanted in Latin. The Latin *Pater Noster* is therefore the first "original source text" for the Finnish Lord's Prayer, but some parts of the liturgy were early on translated into local languages. As Finland was part of Swedish kingdom, the language was Swedish. However, according to the files from two synods in Söderköping in 1441 and Turku in 1492, priests were obliged to read *Isä meidän* aloud in Finnish every Sunday from the pulpit (along with Ave Maria, the Apostles' Creed and the confession). The instruction stated that these texts should always be repeated in the same form, so that it would be easier for the congregation to remember them [Ojansuu 1904: 130; Pirinen 1988: 9–13.] The pedagogical principle of preserving the prayer in the same form from

¹ A short history of Finnish religious texts can be found in [Mielikäinen 2003].

the beginning for the sake of learning succeeded well. Indeed, the prayer has conserved its traditional form throughout the centuries, with very few alterations, from the oral Catholic medieval era (c. 1000–1500) through the Reformation years [Agr 1543; Mün 1544; Agr 1544; Westh 1546; Agr 1548; Agr 1549; FinSB 1614], the Age of Enlightenment [FinB 1642, FinSB 1694, FinB 1776], through periods of industrialisation and the World Wars [FinSB 1886; FinB 1938], until the latest translations in modern times [FinEcu 1973, FinB 1992, FinSB 2000]. Table 1 presents the main sources of *Isä meidän* translations into Finnish.

Table 1: Main sources containing a Finnish translation of Isä meidän — the Lord's Prayer

Name of source	Abbreviation and year
Roman Catholic oral tradition	< 1543
Mikael Agricola: <i>Abckiria</i> — ‘ABC Book’	Agr 1543
Sebastian Münster: <i>Cosmographia: Beschreibung aller Lender</i>	Mün 1544
Mikael Agricola: <i>Rucouskiria</i> — Prayer Book	Agr 1544
Codex Westh	Westh 1546
Mikael Agricola: <i>Se Wsi Testamenti</i> — New Testament	Agr 1548
Mikael Agricola: <i>Käsikiria Castesta ja muista Christikunnan menoista</i> — Service book on baptism and other Christian ceremonies	Agr 1549
Eerik Sorolainen: <i>Käsikirja</i> — Service book	FinSB 1614
<i>Biblia. Se on: Coco Pyhä Ramattu, Suomexi</i> — Complete Holy Bible, in Finnish	FinB 1642

Name of source	Abbreviation and year
<i>Käsikirja</i> — Service book	FinSB 1694
<i>Biblia. Se on: Koko Pyhä Raamattu, Suomi</i> — Complete Holy Bible, in Finnish	FinB 1776
<i>Käsikirja</i> — Service book	FinSB 1886
<i>Pyhä Raamattu. Uusi testamentti</i> — Holy Bible. New Testament	FinB 1938
<i>Käsikirja</i> — Service book	FinSB 1968
Finnish Ecumenical Council	FinEcu 1973
<i>Pyhä Raamattu</i> — Holy Bible	FinB 1992
<i>Käsikirja</i> — Service book	FinSB 2000

Mikael Agricola's *Abckiria* was published in 1543, and Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia* in 1544. The latter is regarded as the closest to the medieval oral versions, and Agricola's translation represents the first known literary translation of the prayer [Pirinen 1988: 11]. The differences between these texts are dialectal, as the Lord's Prayer that appears in Münster's ethnography is based on the South-Eastern dialect, whereas Agricola based his literary work on the South-Western variety of Finnish [Ojansuu 1904: 131; Häkkinen 2015: 142–143]. It is worth noting that Agricola presents a total of nine slightly different versions of the Lord's Prayer in his works [Ojansuu 1904: 131–133], and not just a single canonised wording. This is in line with what we know about Agricola as a translator: he is regarded as an adaptable humanist, who was able to use and combine different translated versions instead of rigorously abiding by only one source [Heininen 1999, 2007: 51, 61; Tarkiainen & Tarkiainen 1985: 151]. Codex Westh, a liturgical compilation of manuscripts (such as prayers and church songs) in Finnish, Swedish and Latin, includes the Lord's Prayer that is by and large reminiscent of Agricola's texts [Häkkinen 2015: 29]. At present, Finnish Lutheran services use two liturgical versions of the Lord's Prayer [FinEcu 1973; FinSB 2000], both of which

differ slightly from each other and from the Biblical versions of *Isä meidän*. The Orthodox Church of Finland uses the Ecumenical version [FinEcu 1973]. The differences are both metric and lexical (see section 3).

The history of translating the Lord's Prayer into the Komi languages originates from the latter half of the 14th century when St. Stephen of Perm, an Orthodox missionary who became the first Bishop of Perm, created the first Komi alphabet — Abur — and translated some passages of the Bible into Old Permic, ostensibly including the most important Christian prayers and songs [Nekrasova 2014]. It is highly likely that the Lord's Prayer, being one of the most important prayers in Christianity, was one of these translated texts. Unfortunately, very few fragments of these translations have been preserved, and the Lord's Prayer is not among them. However, St. Stephen of Perm started the tradition of Bible translation and Christian prayer in both Komi languages. As a result, the Orthodox oral prayer tradition in Komi-Permyak and Komi-Zyrian is rooted in St. Stephen's work.

Since Christianity was introduced to the Komi people by the missionary work of the Russian Orthodox Church, all of the first Biblical texts in Komi were part of the Orthodox liturgy, which is traditionally sung or chanted. Hence, the Lord's Prayer in Komi has always been sung, which has had its own effect on the form of the prayer, its rhythm and wording (e.g. Komi-Zyrian NT 2008: *Батьой мяян, Тэ енэжъяс вылын олан* — 'Father our, You heavens on live', where the number of syllables is almost identical to the Church Slavonic *Отче наш, Иже еси на небесех*).

The first documented version of the Lord's Prayer — *Mian Aje* — in Komi-Permyak is found in the writings of Dutch statesman and amateur scholar Nicolaes Witsen, published in 1705 in his book *Noord en Oost Tartarye* — Northern and Eastern Tartaria. During his travels to Moscow in 1664–1665, Witsen wrote down valuable material from various languages spoken in the territory of Russia and was able to document the Komi-Permyak version

of the Lord's Prayer — *Mian Aje* [Wit 1705]². The second known version of the Lord's Prayer in Komi-Permyak was documented by the governor of Perm, Carl Friedrich Moderach, who sent the text to be published in Johann Christoph Adelung's work entitled *Mithridates IV* [KPMoD 1817].

In 1823, F. Lyubimov, who wrote one of the first grammars of the Komi-Permyak language, translated the Gospel of Matthew into Komi-Permyak [FL 1823; Greidan, Ponomareva 2010: 206]. It was never published, however. In 1866 a translation of the Gospel of Matthew by A. Popov, edited by F. I. Wiedemann, was published in Latin script [P-W 1866]. In 1882 the same translation (further edited by F. I. Wiedemann) was published in St. Petersburg in Cyrillic script [P-W 1882].

In 1899 the text of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (including the Lord's Prayer) was published by the Missionary Association of the Russian Orthodox Church, translated into Komi-Permyak by the priest Iakov Shestakov [Shes 1899]. After that, no new translations of the Lord's Prayer in Komi-Permyak were published for more than a hundred years.

In the 1990s the Finnish department of the Institute for Bible Translation (henceforth IBT) started working on a translation of the Bible into Komi-Permyak. As a result of that work, the Gospel of Matthew was published in 2001 [KP-Mat 2001] and a Children's Bible in 2003 [KPCB 2003]. The Komi-Permyak New Testament is ready to go to press and will be published in 2019 [KPNT 2019].

*Table 2: Main sources containing the Lord's Prayer
in Komi-Permyak*

Name of the source	Abbreviation and year
Orthodox oral Tradition	1400–1700
Nicolaes Witsen: <i>Noord en Oost Tartarye</i>	Wit 1705

² An interesting reconstruction of Witsen's *Mian Aje* is found in [Turkin 1993: 280–281].

Name of the source	Abbreviation and year
General Gouverneur Moderach: <i>Adelung Mithridates IV</i>	KPMod 1817
F. Lyubimov: <i>Ot Matfeya Svyatoe Blagovestvovanie = Matfejsyan' Vezha kyl</i> — The Holy Gospel of Matthew	FL 1823
A. Popov, F. I. Wiedemann: <i>Das Evangelium Matthai in den nordlichen Dialect des Permischen</i> — Gospel of Matthew in the Northern Dialect of Permic (Latin script)	P-W 1866
A. Popov, F. I. Wiedemann: <i>Mian Gospod'vön Iisus Kristosvön Vezha Bur-Yuör Matvejsyan'</i> — The Holy Good Message of Our Lord Jesus Christ from Matthew (Cyrillic script)	P-W 1882
I. Shestakov: <i>Bozhestvennaya sluzhba vo svyatyh' otca nashego Ioanna Zlatoustago na permjatskom yazyke</i> — Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Permic language	Shes 1899
IBT: <i>Mat'vej s'örti Bur Yuör</i> — Good Message according to Matthew	KPMat 2001
IBT: <i>Chelyad' ponda Bibliya</i> — The Bible for Children	KPCB 2003
IBT: <i>Bur Yuör</i> — Good Message (The New Testament)	KPNT 2019

When it comes to Komi-Zyrian, the first published version of the Lord's Prayer — *Ain mijan* — was written down by the famous botanist, explorer and medical doctor, Ivan Lepekhin.

The prayer was first published in the German version of his travel notes, *Tagebuch der Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reiches in den Jahren 1768 und 1769* in 1774 [Lep 1774]. The Russian version of the book was published six years later, in 1780. As in Komi-Permyak, the second version of the Prayer in Komi-Zyrian was published in 1817, and included in J. C. Adelung's *Mithridates IV* [KZMod 1817].

In the 19th century three important translations of the Lord's Prayer were produced in Komi-Zyrian: in clergyman A. Shergin's and linguist G. Lytkin's translations of the Gospel of Matthew [Sher 1823; Lyt 1882], and in A. Sakharov's Prayer Book, *Molitvoslov* [Sakh 1899].

In 1981 the founder of the Evangelical Komi Church, V. Popov, completed his lengthy and solo translation work, and the first complete Bible in Komi-Zyrian was duly self-published by the Evangelical Komi Church [Pop 1981]. He then handed his manuscript over to IBT so that the translation work could continue in the contemporary language. A preliminary version of the Gospel of Matthew was published in 1999 [KZMat 1999] by IBT (translated by the well-known Komi linguist E. A. Tsypanov), and the New Testament in 2008 [KZNT 2008].

Table 3: Main sources containing the Lord's Prayer in Komi-Zyrian

Name of source	Abbreviation and year
Orthodox oral Tradition	1400–1700
I. Lepekhin: <i>Tagebuch der Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reiches in den Jahren 1768 und 1769</i> / <i>Adelung Mithridates I</i> [1806]	Lep 1774
General Gouverneuer Moderach: <i>Adelung Mithridates IV</i>	KZMod 1817
A. Shergin: <i>Miyän Gospod'lon Iisus Khristoslön svyatöj Evangelie Matfejsyan'</i> — The Gospel of Matthew	Sher 1823

Name of source	Abbreviation and year
G. Lytkin: <i>Veža Buryuör</i>	Lyt 1882
<i>Matvejšaṅ</i> — The Gospel of Matthew	
A. Sakharov: <i>Molitvoslov</i> — Prayer Book	Sakh 1899
V. Popov: <i>Biblia</i> — The Bible (manuscript)	Pop 1981
IBT: <i>Mat'vej serti Bur Yuör</i> — The Gospel of Matthew	KZMat 1999
IBT: <i>Vyl' Kösjys'öm</i> — The New Testament	KZNT 2008

In the previous section, we have listed all the main versions of the Lord's Prayer in the Finnish and Komi languages. The three named languages (Finnish, Komi-Zyrian, and Komi-Permyak) all have distinct traditions of Biblical and liturgical translations (except for the early 14th-century oral tradition of both Komi languages). This is an essential point of departure for acknowledging the sociolinguistic realities of translation in these three languages. More than shared genealogy, translating the canonical religious text is due to the length of the liturgical tradition, the position of the Church(es) in society, and the extent to which the religious language is diffused in the cultural layers.

3. Construction grammar and semantic exegesis as theoretical frames of reference for Biblical text analysis

In his pioneering work on the theory of translation, Eugene A. Nida (1914–2011) presented a structuralist view on how to deconstruct and reconstruct meaning in translation [Nida 1964]. Nida — who is justifiably regarded as the father of modern translation studies — subsequently turned his attention to the sociolinguistics of translation, even before 'sociolinguistics' became known as a discipline in its own right [Watt 2005]. In his prolific output, which comprises over 40 publications

on translation [Porter 2005], Nida frequently highlighted that in Biblical translations, a good knowledge of language usage and practices is as important as mastery over the linguistic structures of the languages involved. He showed [e. g. Nida 1994: 191–193; 1996] how translating an ancient text with multiple oral and written layers is, after all, an art of making satisfactory compromises that involve selecting the original source and understanding its linguistic structures, and conveying the essential message into the recipient language system. However, in any translator's work, the focus is more on finding the right balance between the sociolinguistic poles of translation: what is the primary semantic value of the original, what was the context like, what connotations are indexed in the constructions — how to decode and encode them into the translation, and which other sociopragmatic values should be taken into consideration.

In general, sociolinguistic research studies the different ways in which various groups of people use language, and even linguistic structures and syntax are seen as subordinate to language usage [Spolsky 1998]. It is from this starting point that a usage-based account of grammar emerges. More precisely, usage-based grammar notions are presented in the cognitive grammar approach, which evolved in the 1980s [Lakoff 1987; Langacker 1987, 1991; Fillmore 1988] as a philologically reasoned linguistic theory. Cognitivists claimed that the generativist school (initiated by Chomsky in 1957) unnecessarily narrowed the scope of linguistic research. Instead, they wanted to include language usage and the pragmasemantic phenomena of communication and spoken interaction as relevant topics for linguistic research. Based on cognitive linguistics, Adele Goldberg [1995] articulated the principles of Construction Grammar (henceforth CG). Fundamentally speaking, the constructionist approach to grammar entails understanding form and meaning as inseparable. The unit of analysis is *a construction*, a linguistic pattern whose form and function are not predictable from its component parts [Goldberg 1995, 2003]. According to constructionist approaches,

even morphemes or single words can occasionally be defined as constructions, but more often the term refers to complex words, chunks, or formulas [Schmitt & Carter 2004; Wood 2015].

In this article, our focus is on constructions that are complex words (such as Fin *isä meidän* > *isämeidän* > *isämeitä*, ‘pater noster / father our’; KoZ *Батьёй мян*, ‘father our’, KoP *мян Ай*, ‘our father’), idioms (Fin *jokapäiväinen leipä*, ‘daily bread’) and linguistic patterns (Fin *olkoon X, tulkoon X*, ‘let be X, let come X’) (KoZ *мед воас X*, ‘let come X’, KoP *ась локтас X*, ‘let come X’). Some of the constructions observed here are ‘religious’ and originally occur in Biblical calques (Fin *isä meidän*), while some are used generally (KoP *мян ай*). The concepts are analysed as parts of phrases, or as constructions in the liturgical context, through the construction grammatical lens. For example, we consider that the semantic value of */isä meidän/* — ‘father our’ — does not equate with */isä/ + /meidän/*, but should be examined as a construction, a one-piece semantic unit. By means of construction analysis, we aim to highlight how concepts are indexed with specific meaning as they occur in a construction, and in the sacral context. The construction grammar frame of reference emphasises that the form and meaning always coincide. Therefore, remarks on information structure and word order are part of the semantic study of this paper.

Goldberg lists seven basic tenets for CG research, the second of which states that in CG, ‘(a)n emphasis is placed on subtle aspects of the way we conceive of events and states of affairs’ [Goldberg 2003: 219]. Bible translations, like the sacral genre in general, tend to conserve formulas, old vocabulary and archaic syntax, and they also preserve old calques that are transmitted from the source languages into the first versions of Biblical translations [Mielikäinen 2003]. Archaisms may prevail over time, irrespective of the linguistic changes in the surrounding secular world. This is a strong and universal tendency, as evidenced in the existence of languages or language varieties that are used only for sacral purposes, such as ancient Sanskrit, the Arabic of the Qur’an, or Old

Church Slavonic. Considering the five-hundred-year-old Finnish form of the Lord's Prayer, which is (almost) unchangeable overall, the most striking archaism is 'hidden' in the name of the Prayer, with the ungrammatical word order *isä meidän* — 'father our' — still prevailing in modern translations of the prayer. In Goldberg's terms, the reverse word order has become a 'subtle aspect' (see 3.1). We scrutinise this feature along with several other examples from the Lord's Prayer in section 5.

For this purpose, we also need a tool for grasping the source language semantics. Anna Wierzbicka [2001] has developed a tool called 'semantic exegesis', arguing that it is indeed relevant to be interested in the core meaning that seems to be hidden behind culturally varying elements in the biblical text. Wierzbicka [2001: 14, 237] shares Nida's concern about the universal intelligibility of cultural concepts. Semantic exegesis makes use of a hypothesis of semantic primes and Natural Semantic Metalanguage [see Wierzbicka 1993, 1999, 2001; Goddard 2018]. Natural Semantic Metalanguage suggests that all languages are equipped with certain universal semantic primes, that is, a handful — maybe 60 to 70 — of primary words or constructions that can effectively be used to convey approximated meanings for all human intentions [e. g. Wierzbicka 2016: 501–503.] This set of semantic primes would consist of, for example, 60 words in English, and 65 words in Finnish [Vanhatalo, Tissari & Idström 2014]. In her study on the Lord's Prayer, Wierzbicka [2001] aimed to show how the meaning of the central metaphors in the prayer can be explained in simple and universal human concepts that are comprehensible to people of all ages and cultures. As a semantic theory, Wierzbicka's semantic priming and NSM are extensions of Nida's [1975] semantic component analysis, which applied the structuralist way of describing syntax to a semantic field.

However, we are cautious when employing the idea of semantic priming and semantic exegesis, being aware of how the notion of a comprehensible translation is sometimes regarded as rivalling the idea of a culturally valuable and indexed translation.

Wierzbicka's [2001: 6] semantic priming strives to reveal how universal comprehensibility can be achieved. On the other hand, there may well be cultural and traditional reasons for preserving words, constructions and forms that are 'incomprehensible' from a universal point of view. For example, the use of a reverse, ungrammatical word order in the Finnish name for the Lord's Prayer, *Isä meidän*, can be justified by arguing that the reverse order in this particular case carries a specific, indexed meaning, and is not preserved merely as a monument of erroneous tradition, or as a relic. The indexed meaning could, for example, include intentional distancing: the Father addressed is not just any father, but God the Father, a metaphorical Father. Hence, it might be the appropriate choice for a liturgical version of the Prayer. Another index of the reverse order may be linked to the orality and habituation of the specific rhythmic and metric figure of the Prayer: what is learned by heart and chanted collectively becomes accepted as it is. Orality is a primary mode of language learning and, likewise, the power of liturgy is linked to its oral mode.³ The translator, on the other hand, has to stop at every construction to consider whether it conveys the intended meaning or not. In this sense, the text that is read and not chanted might leave more room for reformulation because in a literary text there is neither a 'phonological habit' to be endangered nor an oral mode to guide the translator's thoughts.

In the following section, we explicate how the theoretical ideas presented in this chapter are implemented in our analysis of translations of the Lord's Prayer into Finnish and Komi. Within the conceptual framework of CG, we investigate how the oral basis of the sacred text is echoed in the oldest constructions and preserved patterns of the translated prayers. Cross-linguistic comparisons

³ This is also meaningful when it comes to translating the Matthaean version of the Lord's Prayer because the Greek version elaborates intentional oral parallelism: the first five lines contain nine syllables each, and the last five lines follow a pattern of 15-12-15-12-12 syllables ([Nida 1994: 207]).

enable us to show which constructions in the prayer translations are (mono)culturally Finnish, Komi-Permyak or Komi-Zyrian, and which meanings are shared cross-culturally in multiple translations.

4. Method

Based on the theoretical framework presented in the previous section, we have formulated a tripartite method of analysis for this article. Section 5 is divided into subsections, following the phrases in Matthew 6:9–13, according to the *New King James Version* [NKJV 1982]. The doxology ending of the Prayer (*For Yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.*) is omitted from our analysis, as it does not belong to all versions of the Prayer. One of our focus translations, FinB 1992, adds the doxology in a footnote, with the information about its origin as part of “late manuscripts”. According to Heininen [2007: 52] here Agricola followed either Erasmus, who had added the doxology in his Latin translation from “poor source texts”, or Swedish and German translations, who had accepted the supplement made by Erasmus. First, we present the textual basis of the text: the Greek New Testament [UBS GNT, Fourth revised edition] and two translations, vital for the liturgical traditions in the three languages observed, namely the Latin *Vulgate* [Vulgate 405] and Old Church Slavonic [CHU]. The *Vulgate* has had a central role in the origin of Finnish liturgical and Biblical language. Similarly, the Biblical and Liturgical texts in Church Slavonic have had a great impact on Komi translations of the Prayer. After the textual basis, we present the focus texts: the currently used translation of the Finnish Bible [FinB 1992], the Komi-Zyrian New Testament [KZNT 2008], and the Komi-Permyak New Testament [KPNT 2019], followed by morphological glossing. The glossing follows the Leipzig glossing rules [2015].

Second, we present a short semantic exegesis of the Lord's Prayer text. The semantic exegesis is based on the Greek and Latin source texts, and it freely follows the framing provided in [Wierzbicka 2001]. As the Lord's Prayer is one of the most

researched texts in the New Testament, there is an abundance of materials to enrich the exegesis. We are forced to keep this part to a minimum, however.

The third step focuses on constructions, which include the lexical choices made in the translations. We scrutinise the central concepts, subjecting them to a short semantic analysis, and including some etymological remarks. As a part of the lexical choices, we also analyse the ‘syntactical’ features of the constructions, such as word order or case choice.

5. Constructions in the Lord’s Prayer in the Finnish and Komi languages

5.1 Our Father in heaven

UBS GNT Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς
 Vulgate Pater noster qui in caelis es
 CHU Ӗӹӥ нӓшъ, йӹже ӥсӓ на нбсӹӥхъ,

FinB 1992 Isä meidän, joka ole-t
 father we-GEN who be-2SG
 taiva-i-ssa
 heaven-PL-in.LOC

KZNT 2008 Бать-ӧй ми-ян, Тэ
 father-VOC we-GEN you
 енӧж-ъяс вылынола-н.
 heaven-PL on.LOC live-2SG

KPNT 2019 Ми-ян Ай, енӧж-ын Ол-ись!
 we-GEN father heaven-in.LOC living_one

Semantic exegesis

The ‘*God is father*’ metaphor is a distinctive feature in Jesus’s sermons and has become a foundation of Christianity. Wierzbicka [2001: 237] explains the metaphor of divine fatherhood as consisting of eleven semantic components. Essentially, ‘*God is father*’,

expressed in the vocative in the Lord's Prayer, includes components of divinity ('you are someone not like people'), goodness ('you are someone good'), life-giving power ('people exist because you want people to exist'), omnipresence ('when people say something to you, you hear it') and safety ('when I think about you like this, I feel something good'). The latter part in the vocative (*in heaven*) outlines the non-earthly and metaphorical dwelling place of God the Father.

Construction analysis of 'our father', 'in heaven'

The word *isä* — 'father' — belongs to a group of Proto-Uralic words in the Finnish language, like some other male family names [s. v. *isä*, SSA]. The old Proto-Uralic words belong to frequently used, ordinary words, and in this sense *isä* is a representative example of the ancient lexicon. Unlike the choice of lexical item, the word order *isä meidän* — 'father our' — is in no sense typical of the Finnish language. Instead, the word order follows Greek and Latin, as 'Pater noster' is literally translated as *isä meidän*. The conventional word order in Finnish would be [modifier] + [noun], but the inverted [noun] + [modifier] order *isä meidän* followed the Latin liturgy, and the first literary translation did not change the oral tradition that had already been formed [Agricola 1543; Pirinen 1988; Häkkinen 2007b: 90]. It has been preserved up to the latest translation [FinB 1992], with no exception in the official translations in the intervening years [MAT 1548; FinB 1642; FinB 1776; FinB 1938]. This is in contrast to the fact that Finnish complies with SVO order, including the fact that the grammatical modifier occurs pre-noun: *meidän* [genitive modifier] — 'our' + *isä* [noun] — 'father'. In a synchronic view, word order is one of the most distinctive features of any language, which does not change rapidly. In everyday language, it would be unthinkable to refer to one's own father as 'isä meidän' — only 'meidän isä' is grammatically acceptable. It is therefore peculiar that the inversion has been preserved through the centuries in the prayer, and hence the explanation must be sought in the traditions of language

usage, not in the syntactical features of the Finnish language. Mielikäinen [2003: 397] comments on this by pointing out that, ‘The word order of the formal Bible translation, non-typical for Finnish, often accentuates words in a peculiar way and gives the Biblical language its special, even enthusiastic rhythm’.

Interestingly enough, the earliest published Komi-Permyak translation of the Lord’s Prayer [Wit 1705] has the natural Komi word order: *mian* [genitive modifier] — ‘our’ + *Aje* [noun] — ‘father’. However, the reverse order *Ae mian* can be found in Moderach’s version about one hundred years later [KPMo 1817]. It seems that by the beginning of the 19th century, Komi-Permyaks started to attend church services more regularly and adopted the Church Slavonic word order *Отче наш* — ‘father our’. The same reversed word order *Айӧ менам, Аја мѣян* is retained in F. Lyubimov’s and Popov-Wiedemann’s translations of the Gospel of Matthew [FL 1823; W-P 1866, 1882], and in Shestakov’s Prayer Book [Shes 1899]. In the IBT editions [KP-Mat 2001; KP-CB 2003; KP-NT 2019], the translators have reverted to the natural word order: *Миян Ай*.

In the earliest Komi-Zyrian translations of the Prayer, the reverse word order *Ain mѣян* [IL 1774], *Bate mѣян / Бате мѣянь* [KZMo 1817; She 1823] is used, but G. Lytkin’s translation [Lyt 1882] makes an exception: he uses the natural word order *Мѣян Ајӧ* — ‘our father’. In our view, this might be due to the fact that G. Lytkin was a linguist, not a clergyman, and he was focusing more on the naturalness of the language rather than the Church Slavonic liturgical tradition. As expected, Sakharov’s Prayer Book version of the Prayer [Sakh 1899] follows the liturgical tradition of *Батьӧй мѣян*, as does the founder of the Evangelical Komi Church, V. Popov, in his translation of the Bible [Pop 1981]. The 1999 IBT version of the Gospel of Matthew is in keeping with the practice started by G. Lytkin: as a linguist, the main translator, E. Tsypanov, decided to adopt the *Миян Ай* word order (and even uses the Old Permic word *Ай*). The latest published versions of the Prayer in the Komi-Zyrian

New Testament and the Children's Bible [KZNT 2008; KZCB 2010] follow the liturgical tradition of *Батьёй мян*. The reason for this is sociolinguistic: Komi-Zyrian Christians had been saying and singing the Prayer with the reverse word order for as long as they can remember, and strongly resisted the change of word order when the Prayer was tested during the translation of the New Testament.

The prayer is a part of the oral tradition, which leads to specific consequences. As the vocative construct *isä meidän* has been chanted in the liturgy, the construct has condensed into a compound word, *isämeidän*. Since the order is inverted and ungrammatical, it is not found in any other context. Hence the construct *isämeidän* is a distinctive marker of the Lord's Prayer, and has developed into a proper noun referring to the oldest translated Christian prayer in Finnish. The actual colloquial form is *isämeitä*. According to the concise dictionary of Finnish, the meaning of *isämeitä* is either 'the Lord's Prayer' or, metonymically, 'a prayer' [s. v. *isämeitä*, NS]. The reverse word order enabled the lexicalisation of this [noun] + [genitive modifier] construct into the joint compound construct — *isämeitä* — that is used as a proper noun for the Lord's Prayer. Both *Isä meidän* and its shortened, colloquial form *isämeitä* are prototypical examples of constructions in the CG sense [Goldberg 1995].

The Komi-Zyrian *бать* — 'father' — is a loanword from Russian, derived from the word *батьа*, which also means 'father' [Lytkin, Gulyaev 1999: 37]. However, in the earliest Komi-Zyrian version of the Lord's Prayer, written down by I. Lepekhin [IL 1774], the Old Permic word *aï* — 'male, father'⁴ — is used. According to Lytkin and Gulyaev [Lytkin-Gulyaev 1999: 31], *aï* belongs to Proto-Permic vocabulary and is of the same root as the Finnish word *äijä* — 'old man, real man', and Udmurt айы — 'father, parent'. The reason why the original Permic word *aï* could not be

⁴ The word *aï* was also included in the Old Permic dictionary, compiled by I. Lepekhin [Lytkin 1952: 122].

written in the liturgical version of the Komi-Zyrian Lord's Prayer is that in several Komi-Zyrian dialects it is mainly understood as 'male' for male animals, such *аӱ норсь* — 'boar'. Hence, using that word for God would have amounted to blasphemy for many speakers of modern Komi-Zyrian. This is not the case in Komi-Permyak because *аӱ* is used primarily with the meaning of 'father' in the language. So the word *аӱ* is found in all Komi-Permyak translations of the Prayer.

In Finnish, the noun *taivas* refers both to 'sky' and to the religious 'heaven'. The alteration between the singular and the plural reflects the Greek and Latin versions of the prayer. The noun *taivas* may have drifted into the Finnish language from the Baltic languages, since in Proto-Baltic **deivas* (cf. Lithuanian *dievas*, Latvian *dievs*) refers to 'god'. Another explanation for the etymology is that the word originates from Germanic languages. In Proto-Germanic, the word **teiwaz* — 'god' — was later used as a Scandinavian name for the god Týr. Whether Baltic or Germanic, in both cases the process has included a metonymic shift whereby the noun for 'god' has been transferred to 'dwelling place of god'. Thus, it seems that *taivas* is originally a metonymic loanword from Baltic or Germanic languages, and its religious meaning of 'heaven' is older than the secular 'sky'. A third etymology shows that even in Indo-European languages there is a Proto-Indian *devá-*, which meant 'heavenly', and in Prakriti, *dēva-* means 'god, cloud, sky'. If we delve that far back, it should be remembered that the Latin *deus* — 'god' — originated in the same way [s. v. *taivas*, SSA].

Like the Finnish word *taivas*, the Komi-Permyak *енӱж* and the Komi-Zyrian *енэж* refer to both 'sky' and 'heaven'. It is a compound word, consisting of *ен* — 'god, heaven', and *эж* — 'cover', literally meaning 'heavenly cover' [Lytkin, Gulyaev 1999: 7]. Hence, in both Komi languages the notions of 'heaven' and 'god' are closely connected. In Komi-Permyak translations of the Prayer, there is a great variety of words referring to 'heaven': in the earliest published version [Wit 1705],

the construction *vilin Olaniin* — ‘high living-place’, in Moderach’s version *kümeres*⁵ — ‘clouds’, and in Lyubimov’s, Popov-Wiedemann’s and Shestakov’s versions [FL 1823; P-W 1866; P-W 1882; Sh 1899] *еневт* (a compound word made up of the words *ен* — ‘god’ + *вевт* — ‘lid, cover’). The IBT versions [KP-Mat 2001; KP-CB 2003; KP-NT 2019] use the word *енӧж*, which was taken from Northern dialects of Komi-Permyak [KP-Dict 1985].

In the Finnish version, the latter part of the vocative is a relative clause, *joka olet taivaassa*. The translators of the modern Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak New Testaments have arrived at different solutions: while Komi-Zyrian has an affirmative main clause *тӧ энӧжъяс вылын олан* — ‘You heavens on live’, Komi-Permyak uses a participle construction *енӧжсын Олӧсь* — ‘in-heaven Living-One’. In his article, E. Tsypanov [Tsypanov 2004: 189] explains the avoidance of the subordinate clause structure by noting that the use of subordinate clauses is not an original feature of the Komi language. The use of subordinate clauses started to increase in the Komi language as late as the 1930s when much literature was translated into Komi from Russian. Another reason for the appearance of subordinate clauses in Komi is, according to Tsypanov, the literal translation style of liturgical texts in the 19th century. However, in the modern translations of the Lord’s Prayer in both Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak, there is a clear tendency to avoid using subordinate clauses.

5.2 Hallowed be Your name

UBS GNT ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου

Vulgate sanctificetur nomen tuum

CHU да сѣ́и́тсѧ ѿма твоѣ:

⁵ In Moderach’s transcription, the plural ending *-es* is erroneously written separately from the word *kümer*. The correction has been made by the authors of this article.

FinB 1992 *pyhite-tty* *ol-koon*
make.holy-PASS.2.PTCP.SG *be-JUSS.3SG*
sinu-n nime-si
you-GEN name-POSS.2SG

KZNT 2008 *Мед ло-ӧ вежа-ӧн Тэ-над*
let be-3SG holy-INSTR. you-GEN
ним-ыд.
name-POSS.2SG

KPNT 2019 *Тэн-чит вежа*
you-POSS.ACC. holy
ним-тӧ ась быд морп
name-POSS.2SG.ACC let every person
видз-ӧ сьӧлӧм-ас
keep-PREES.3SG heart-POSS.3SG.LOC

Semantic exegesis

Nida [1994: 199] doubts the lay person's ability to understand the first petition of the Lord's Prayer at all. The first part, *hallowing*, is even more complex than the metonymy (*name*) in the last part. The concept of 'holy' is almost as old as humankind, and has diverse variations in the cultures of the world. *Name pro person* is a metonymical figure of speech, typical of Old Hebrew and, as such, a clearly culture-specific figure. Wierzbicka [2001: 241] concludes that the semantic essence of hallowing God's name in the Christian and biblical sense is 'a matter of knowing God and acknowledging who and what he really is'.

Construction analysis of 'hallowed be (your name)'

There are also various ways to understand 'holy', 'consecrated', 'saint', and 'sacred' in the Finnish and Komi languages. The translator's task is to make a choice between various recipient language equivalents. The Finnish prayer makes use of the denominal verb *pyhittää* — 'make holy', with the root

pyhä — ‘holy’. There is no consensus among etymologists about the origin of *pyhä*, other than that the meaning is semantically multi-faceted. As a religious concept, ‘pyhä’ is older than the Christian tradition in Finno-Ugric languages. When the Bible is being translated, translators have to make a choice between different concepts with ultimately diverse semantic indexes. It is also an example of a concept that has undergone dramatic shifts in meaning when being borrowed by another language: the word meaning ‘holy’ may have become ‘unholy’ in a cognate. This type of meaning shift into an antonym is typical of emotive concepts. The Proto-Germanic **haila* means ‘whole, healthy’ > Engl. holy, Ger. heil, heilig, Swe. helig [Kroonen 2013]. In this sense, holiness relates to healthiness and wholeness. The Old Germanic **wiha* meant ‘inaugurated / consecrated’, and this has been suggested as a root form for the Finnish *pyhä* [s. v. *pyhä*, SSA]. However, Saarikivi [2007; 2017] considers this etymology unlikely since it is built on a rare phonological sound shift (**wi* > *pü*). Instead, he points to the Sami *bassi*; **pasē*, which has equivalents in Mordvinian (Mokša *peže*, Ersä *pežet* — ‘sin’, and Ersä and Mokša *pežedems* — ‘swear’). There are also parallel equivalents in the Permic languages (Komi-Zyrian *pež* — ‘heathen, unholy, dirty; dirt’, and Udmurt *pož* — ‘dirty; unclean’). This leads Saarikivi to suggest that all of these have their roots in the West-Uralic **püšä*- family.

According to Lytkin and Gulyaev [Lytkin, Gulyaev 1999: 50], the word *вежа* — ‘holy’, which is used in both the Komi-Zyrian and the Komi-Permyak prayer, is of Proto-Permic origin (Proto-Permic **veža* — ‘holy’) and is formed with the suffix *-a* from the word *vež* — ‘green, yellow’, which later received the meaning ‘greed, jealousy, anger’. Lytkin and Gulyaev state that the original meaning of **veža* is ‘sinful, causing anger, forbidden, prohibited’. Hence, this is another example of a semantical shift to an antonym in religious vocabulary.

In Finnish, the first petition of the Lord's Prayer is composed of the inverted VP [*pyhitetty olkoon*] + NP [*sinun nimesi*]. When

naturally ordered, imperative sentences start with a verb [VISK 2004: §889, §1653], so in this case it would be *olkoon pyhitetty*. In a complete sentence, the VP could be split into two and the NP would be embedded in the VP: [*olkoon [sinun nimesi] pyhitetty*], or it could follow the NP: [*sinun nimesi*] [*olkoon pyhitetty*]. Finnish is a SVO language [VISK 2004: §1366]. On the other hand, there are only few grammatical restrictions concerning clause-level constituent order variation, and sometimes Finnish word order is therefore considered “free” [Vilkuna 1995: 244]. To understand the variation, we need to recognize pragmatic and discourse-based factors, especially the theme-rheme structure of the clause: the shared, contextually valid theme is placed first in the sentence, and the new information, the rheme, follows [Vilkuna 1995: 244–247; VISK 2004: §1366, §1370]. Therefore, in the Prayer, when Father God is addressed in the previous verse (line 1), the default theme for the second verse would be the noun with reference to Father God, that is, *sinun nimesi* — ‘your name’. If the translation of the prayer followed this conventional theme-rheme structure, the second verse would conventionally use Father God’s *name* as a theme and add the new information (‘let-it-be-holy’) as a rheme to that. Once again, the recipient language syntax does not provide a clear enough answer to the design of words in the translated Lord’s Prayer.

For a more fruitful explanation, the construction *pyhitetty olkoon* is viewed here as part of a rhythmic constellation, and as part of the Biblical genre. The first, second and third petition of the Lord’s Prayer follow a similar structure in that a divine order is announced (more than requested) to become prevailing: hallowing of the Name, coming of the Kingdom, the will of God being done. The Finnish version makes the announcements in the jussive form, which is a rare morphosyntactic verb form in Finnish [VISK 2004: §889, §1666, §1667]: *olkoon, tulkoon, tapahtukoon*. The same form is used in Genesis 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, in the context of the creation of the universe. The form is distinctive in the Biblical context, as it is used in elevated genre. The difference

is in the subject who speaks: in Genesis, and in the original Biblical Lord's Prayer, the speaker is God/Jesus Himself, but in the liturgical Lord's Prayer the words are those of an ordinary person praying.

In Komi-Zyrian, the first petition of the Prayer consists of VP [modal particle *мед* + verb *лоӧ* + complement adjective *вежаӧн*] and NP [possessive pronoun *тэнад* + noun *нимыӧд*]. This kind of VP has been analysed in different ways, depending on the perspective of the analyst. Some researchers regard it as an imperative form, some as a modal structure with an incentive function [Tsypanov 2005: 39].

In Komi-Permyak, the translators have come up with a rather unconventional translation, which consists of NP [possessive pronoun *тэнчит* + modifier *вежа* + noun *нимтӧ*] and a split VP with an embedded NP [modal particle *ась* [modifier *быд* + noun *морт*] verb *видзӧ* + complement noun *сьӧлӧмас*]. The first NP *Тэнчит вежа нимтӧ* — 'Your holy name' — has proved to be an understandable notion for Komi-Permyak readers. They have been accustomed to the idea that everything that is connected with God is *вежа* — 'holy'; for example, Orthodox priests are traditionally called *вежа ай* — 'holy father'. The split VP expresses the action that is to be taken by everybody towards God's holy name: *видзӧ сьӧлӧмас* — 'keep in-his-heart'. This is an idiomatic construction that means 'regard as having great value, cherish'. This kind of idiomatic, unconventional and rather dynamic translation solution was possible in Komi-Permyak because the language is not yet in liturgical use in the churches of the area. The main concern of the translators was to communicate the meaning of the petition to Komi-Permyak readers as clearly and naturally as possible, leaving the traditional form of the petition aside.

5.3 Your kingdom come

<i>UBS GNT</i>	<i>ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·</i>
<i>Vulgate</i>	<i>veniat regnum tuum</i>
<i>CHU</i>	<i>да прїидетъ црѣтвїе твоє:</i>

FinB 1992 Tul-koon sinu-n
let.come-JUSS.3SG you-GEN.SG
valta=kunta-si
power=district-POSS.2SG

KZNT 2008 Мед во-ас Тэн-ад
let come-FUT.3SG you-GEN
Юрал-ӧм-ыд.
rule-PTCP-POSS.2SG

KPNT 2019 Ась лок-мас Тэн-ам
let come-FUT.3SG you-GEN
Юрал-ӧм-ым.
rule-PTCP-POSS.2SG

Semantic exegesis

The metaphor of God's 'kingdom' and 'coming of your kingdom' is culture-specific and polysemic. The wish here is for Father God to become the good ruler of an unseen reign, either at present or in the future. In the second petition, the speaker expresses his/her longing for God's reign and presence [see also Wierzbicka 2001: 243].

Construction analysis of 'your kingdom come'

In Finnish, the compound word *valta/kunta* — 'kingdom' (lit. 'power/area') was already used by Agricola. Its generic part *kunta* is polysemic as it may refer to 'area, district', but is frequently used in compounds meaning either social or administrative belonging; the word dates back to Uralic vocabulary [s. v. *kunta*, SSA]. The concept of *valtakunta* in modern Finnish is approximately the same as 'state'. As a word, *valtakunta* is not exclusively religious, but as a construct — *sinun valtakuntasi* — the unit is a distinctive part of the Lord's Prayer, with a medieval history.

In the two Komi languages, the word *юралӧм* — 'ruling' — is derivative of the Proto-Permic root **jur* — 'head'. In the modern

Komi languages, the word *юр* is polysemic, having the meanings 'head, top, main, eldest' [Lytkin, Gulyaev 1999: 335]. From the same root, one can also form the word *юраланин* — 'ruling-place, kingdom'. It is worth noting that in the Finnish version of the Prayer, the word *valtakunta* — 'power district' — refers to a place or an area, while the Komi translators have chosen a word referring to 'activity of ruling'. Hence, in Komi the petition is about the active ruling power of God coming to affect the world, whereas the Finnish petition announces God's ruling area descending to the earth.

The translations of the notion 'kingdom' in the Komi versions of the Lord's Prayer have a somewhat multistage history. The earliest versions [IL 1774; Wit 1706] include the words *Kanalanyd* and *Canulni*, which are both derivatives of the Proto-Permic root **kan* — 'khan, state'. From this root, the Old Permic verb *kanalni* — 'govern, rule, reign' — was formed [Lytkin, Gulyaev 1999: 116]. The words derived from the root **kan* are no longer used in the modern Komi languages, except for the verb *каналны* — 'rule, reign' — in the Usol' dialect of Komi-Permyak [K-P dict 1985: 164]. Subsequently, in the Komi-Zyrian versions, the different forms of Russian loanwords (*zarstwo*, *царство*, *сарство*) prevail. However, in the Komi-Permyak version of the early 19th century [KPMoд 1817], there is an interesting choice of word — *wesküt*, in modern Komi *веськыд* (Komi-Zyrian) or *веськыт* (Komi-Permyak). According to Lytkin and Gulyaev, the word means 'straight, truthful, honest, right, right-hand' [Lytkin, Gulyaev 1999: 54]. In this translation, the focus seems to be on the quality of God's rule: truthful, right and honest. In the later 19th century, Komi-Permyak translations of the Prayer [P-W 1866, 1882] use the Russian loanwords *саритӧм*, *царитӧм*. As for modern translations, quite an exceptional version is the interpretation of 'kingdom' in V. Popov's Komi-Zyrian Bible [Pop 1981], namely *Помасьтӧм Олӧм* — 'eternal life', which (albeit a somewhat inadequate solution as a translation) focuses on the eternity of God's rule. In the trial version of the IBT Komi-Zyrian

Gospel of Matthew [KZMat 1999], E. A. Tsypanov chose the word *ыджыдалӧм*, a participle form from the verb *ыджыдавны* — ‘be in charge, manage a household, be bossy’, which in turn is derived from the word *ыджыд* — ‘great, large, big’. This choice of words, however, did not appeal to all Komi readers because of the negative connotation of ‘being bossy’. The translator of the trial version of the IBT Komi-Permyak Gospel of Matthew [KPMat 2001], L. A. Nikitina, followed Tsypanov’s version of ‘kingdom’ and wrote *ыджыталӧм*, which was not well received by many Komi-Permyak readers either. The next IBT version of the Prayer in Komi-Permyak was the translation of the Children’s Bible [KPCB 2003], where the translator came up with the word *веськӧтлӧм* — ‘leadership, guidance’. The latest stage for both Komi languages is the use of the word *юралӧм* — ‘ruling’ (see above), which in modern Komi often refers to government rule, namely the highest power in a state.

The jussive form in the Finnish translation was already analysed in subsection 5.2. The repetition of the jussive form in this line strengthens the majestic voice indexed in the jussive VP [*tulkoon*] together with NP [*sinun valtakuntasi*]. In the Komi languages, the use of the modal particles *мед* (‘let’ Komi-Zyrian) and *ась* (‘let’ Komi-Permyak) construction-initially (VP [modal particle *мед* / *ась* + verb] + NP [possessive pronoun + noun]) resemble the elevated style of festive Soviet-era slogans translated from Russian, such as *Мед олас май 1 лун!* — ‘let live May the 1st’. The construction is simple and slogan-like, but at the same time highly festive.

5.4 Your will be done on earth as it is in heaven

UBS GNT *γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*

Vulgate *fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra*

CHU *ДА ВЪДѢТЪ ВѢЛА ТВОА, ЯКЪ НА НБ҃СН, И НА ЗЕМЛИ:*

FinB 1992 *tapahtu-koon* *sinu-n*
let.be.done-JUSS.3SG *you-GEN.SG*
tahto-si
will-POSS.2SG

myös maa-n pää-llä niin kuin
also earth-GEN top-on.ADESS as as
taiva-i-ssa
heaven-s-in.INESS

KZNT 2008 *Мед ии-ас Тэн-ад*
let come.true- FUT.3SG you-GEN
кӧсӱӧм-ыд
will-POSS.2SG

му вылын енӧж-ын моз
earth on heaven-in.INESS as

KPNT 2019 *Быдӧс ась кер-сьӧ*
Everytyhing let be.done.-PASS.3SG
Тэ сьӧрті
you according.to

му вылас, кыдз и енӧж-ас
earth on as also heaven-in.INESS

Semantic exegesis

The third petition is based on an antonymic relationship between *earth* and *heaven*, where in the Greek and Latin texts, the order for the nouns is *as in heaven, so on earth*. The prayer implicitly states that ‘God’s will’ is happening where God lives, namely ‘in heaven’. This petition asks that God’s will happen also on earth, where the person praying himself/herself lives. In both the Greek and the Latin texts, the formula for the simile is [as Y is X], but the core idea of the petition is not in the order of the nouns but in the antonymic relationship between them.

Construction analysis of ‘your will’, ‘be done’, ‘on earth’, ‘in heaven’

In the Finnish translation, the jussive VP [*tapahtukoon*] together with the NP construct [*sinun tahtosi*] repeats the morphosyntactic form of the previous line, reinforcing the majestic power of these petitions (see the two previous subsections 5.3 and 5.4).

In Komi-Permyak, there is no one-word equivalent for ‘will’. In the New Testament version of the Lord’s Prayer [KPNT 2019] the notion of ‘will’ is expressed by the construction [personal pronoun *Tə* + postposition *сьөрми*] — ‘You according-to’. Another good example of the use of this Komi-Permyak construction can be found in Mat 26:42, where Jesus is praying: ‘Your will be done’. In the Komi-Permyak New Testament [KPNT 2019], Jesus says: ‘...ась лoас *Tə* *сьөрми*.’ — ‘let be You according-to’.

The Finnish equivalent for earth, *maa*, belongs to the original Proto-Uralic words [s. v. *maa*. SSA]. The polysemic *maa* refers to ‘earth’ but also to ‘soil’, ‘land’, or ‘country’. In the Komi languages, the equivalent for ‘earth’, *му*, is also polysemic, having the meanings of ‘earth, soil, field, land, country’ and ‘area’, such as *Кoми му* — ‘the Komi land’. In fact, the word has the same Uralic root as the Finnish *maa* [Lytkin, Gulyaev 1999: 177].

In Komi-Zyrian, the earlier versions of the Prayer have constructions with the clause-initial conjunction *кыдз* /*кыдзи* — ‘as’ in the phrase ‘as in heaven’ (cf. Church-Slavonic conjunction *яко* and Russian *как*), but the translators of the IBT Komi-Zyrian versions [KZMat 1999; KZNT 2008; KZCB 2010] use the original Komi construction [NP *енöжын* ‘in-heaven’ + postposition *моз* ‘as’]. However, during the process of translating the Komi-Permyak New Testament, it appeared that the construction with the postposition *моз* was hard for readers to understand, so the translation team had to return to using the clause-initial conjunction *кыдз* instead of the more literal earlier versions of the Prayer. This is due to the high level of Russification of the spoken language in Komi-Permyak, with syntactic features often borrowed from Russian [cf. Leinonen 2006].

Another interesting feature of this petition is the order of the phrases ‘on earth’ and ‘as it is in heaven’. In the Greek text, *ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ* — ‘as in heaven’ — comes first, and *καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς* — ‘also on earth’ — follows it. In all Finnish translations of the Prayer, the order of these phrases has been changed, obviously following the German and Swedish versions of the Prayer, but also consistent with the fact that in Finno-Ugric languages the natural construction of a simile is [*x* is as *y*], not [*as y* is *x*]. However, in the Komi translations the change of order was established much later: in Komi-Permyak the change was first made in Popov-Wiedemann’s version [P-W 1866], and in Komi-Zyrian even later, in V. Popov’s Bible translation [Pop 1981].

5.5 Give us this day our daily bread

UBS GNT τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον
Vulgate panem nostrum supersubstantialem da nobis
 hodie

CHU ХЛѢБЪ НАШЪ НАСЪЩНЫЙ ДАЖДЪ НАМЪ
 ДНЕСЬ:

FinB 1992 Anna me-i-lle tä-nä päivä-nä
 Give we-DAT this-ESS day-ESS
 jokapäiväinen leipä-mme.
 daily bread-POSS.IPL

KZNT 2008 Сем мян-лы талун кежлӧ
 give we-DAT today for
 нянь-ным-ӧс.
 bread-POSS.IPL.-ACC

KPNT 2019 Талун кежӧ вай мян-лӧ колан
 today for bring we-DAT necessary
 нянь-сӧ.
 bread-ACC

Semantic exegesis

The focus of the Lord's Prayer changes in the fourth petition, as the cosmic view suddenly comes down to the everyday level and the language changes into simple requests. Here, *bread* stands as a *pars pro toto* type of metonym for nourishment in general [Wierzbicka 2001: 244–247]. On the other hand, it also appears as a metaphor — '*bread is life*', which is not universal. Moreover, the petitioner is asking for nourishment for a present need, not for the rest of his/her life. This implies that the prayer is to be repeated on the following day, and that it has been successful previously. Wierzbicka [2001: 247] transfers even the trustful-repetitive component included in the petition into semantic primes: 'I can say this to you always / because You want to do good things for all people / all people can say this to You always'.

Construction analysis of 'give us', 'this day', 'our daily bread'

In the fourth petition, the majestic jussive changes into a simple imperative request, *anna meille*. Rhythmically, the petition is constructed by repeating *-päivä-* — 'day' — in two constructions, *tänä päivänä* — 'today', and *jokapäiväinen* — 'daily'. Although *tänä päivänä* has a more frequent equivalent in modern Finnish, *tänään*, this is not used even in the latest translations, for obvious rhythmic reasons.

The Finnish *leipä* originates from Germanic languages [s. v. *leipä*, SSA]. The equivalent of 'bread' in the Komi languages, *нянь* — 'bread, crops' — is a loanword from Iranian languages, comparable to the Persian *nān* [G. Lytkin 1999: 202]. The word *нянь* is used in both Komi languages as a metonym for livelihood in general, for example in the Komi-Zyrian expression *ас нянь вылö петны*, literally 'own bread onto to-go', which means 'start an independent life'. When wishing each other a good appetite, Komi people say: *Нянь-сов!*, literally 'bread-salt!'. Hence, we can conclude that the use of the word *нянь* in Komi versions of the Lord's Prayer is an adequate translation

solution, as it does not stand for the mere concrete substance of 'bread', but rather carries the meaning of the whole human livelihood.

The Komi-Zyrian construction [adverbial *талун* 'today'+ *postposition* *кежлӧ* 'for'] follows the same translation tradition as the Finnish version of the Prayer, where the Greek ἐπιούσιος is interpreted as 'daily', comparable to the Finnish *jokapäiväinen*. The Komi-Permyak construction [modifying verb *колан* 'needed' + noun *няньсӧ* 'bread'] follows the Eastern interpretation, where the Greek ἐπιούσιος is understood as 'necessary', comparable to the Church Slavonic *Хлеб наш насущный* — 'bread our necessary'.

5.6 And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors

UBS GNT *καὶ ἄφεες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν*

Vulgate *et dimitte nobis debita nostra sicut et nos dimisimus debitoribus nostris*

CHU *и ѡсп҃ави на́мъ до́лги на́ша, ꙗ́ко ѡ ми ѡсп҃авлѧемъ должникѡмъ на́шимъ:*

FinB 1992 *Ja anna mei-lle velka-mme
and give.IMP we-DAT debt-POSS.1.PL
anteeksi, niin kuin
forgive as
me-kin annamme anteeksi nii-lle,
we-too give.1.PL forgive them-DAT
jotka ovat mei-lle vela-ssa.
who are we-DAT debt-INNESS*

KZNT 2008 *И прѡстум мян-лысь
and forgive.IMP.2SG we-POSS.ACC
мыж-ъяс-ным-ѡс,
sin-PL-POSS.IPL-ACC*

кыдзи ми прōстит-ам ми-ян водзын
as we forgive-IPL we-GEN before
 мыжа-яс-ōс.
guilty-PL-ACC

КРNT 2019 Тэ прōстит мян-лісь
you.SG forgive.IMP.2SG we-POSS.ACC
 умōль керōм-мез-ным-ōс,
evil deed-PL-POSS.3PL-ACC

кыдз и мийō прōстит-ам
as also we forgive-IPL
 мян-лō умōль-ō кер-усс-ес-ō.
we-DAT evil-ACC do-PTCP-PL-ACC

Semantic exegesis

The concept of forgiving is central to the New Testament theology and to Jesus's teaching. In the Lord's Prayer, the forgiving subject can either be the divine God or a human person. Debt, or an abstraction of 'debt', *sin*, is the object of the forgiving act. In the eyes of God, the prayer allows one to identify oneself with the forgiven recipient, the 'debtor', and implicitly uses the earthly act as an analogy to one's relationship with God the Father. Either he/she makes a promise to act as a forgiver in earthly relationships because of God's forgiveness of sins, or he/she pleads to God to forgive his/her guilt because he/she also acts as a forgiver of debts.

Construction analysis of 'forgive', 'our debts'

In newer Finnish translations of the Matthaean Prayer, the equivalent of the source text τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν is *velkamme* — 'our debts', but originally, both in the old Münster text and Agriкола's ABC primer, the equivalent is *syntimme* — 'our sins'. Some researchers regard the Medieval choices [Mün 1544; Agr 1543] as early indications of 'biblical humanism' [Pirinen 1988: 11–12; Heininen 2007: 51].

The alteration between abstract and concrete renderings is even more diverse in Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak. The Komi-Zyrian *мыж* — ‘guilt, sin’ — was used in the earliest version of the Prayer [Lep 1774], but was changed to *уджйӧс* — ‘debt’ — in Moderach’s version [KZMod 1817]. The word *уджйӧс* was used in later versions [Sher 1823; Lyt 1882; Sakh 1899; Pop 1981] until the IBT versions [KZMat 1999; KZNT 2008; KZCB 2010], which then reverted to the translation *мыж*. According to Lytkin and Gulyaev [1999: 181], *мыж* belongs to the Proto-Permic vocabulary of Permic languages and its original meaning was ‘illness as a punishment from above’.

In Komi-Permyak translations of the Prayer, there are five different equivalents of ‘sin’. Firstly, in Witsen’s version the word *uzjek* appears, which, in spite of some problems in transcribing the speech, seems to be the same as the modern Komi-Permyak *одзӧс* — ‘debt’. As in Komi-Zyrian, this translation prevails in the 19th century versions [P-W 1866; P-W 1882; Sh 1899]. Only the version written down by Moderach [KPMod 1817] in the early 19th century makes an exception, where we can find the word *umeles* — ‘evil-things’. The translator of the first IBT version of the Prayer [KPMat 2001] adhered to the Komi-Zyrian translation of Matthew [KZMat 1999] and wrote the word *мыж*, which in Komi-Permyak does not carry the meaning of ‘guilt’, but rather ‘punishment’ [KPDict 1985]. Many Komi-Permyak readers of the IBT trial edition opposed this translation, which is why the later IBT versions [KPCB 2003; KPNT 2019] used a different word, resembling the word *umeles* in Moderach’s version [KPMod 1817], namely *умӧль керӧммез* — ‘evil deeds’.

In Finnish, ‘forgive’ was already established in Agricola’s translations as a compound verb *antaa anteeksi*, that exhibits a double use of the Finnish stem for ‘give’, *anta-*. The latter part *anteeksi*, is formally a translative case of *anne* (‘something that is given’, ‘gift’), which is a rare deverbal noun with an incomplete paradigm that occurs only in plural form, in some archaic phrases (e.g. in Kalevala *anopille antehiksi* ‘to the mother-in-law for a dowry

gift'). The Prayer has undoubtedly been a major reason for the early establishment of this concept. In modern Finnish, the elliptic *anteeksi* is a usual parallel for 'I am sorry'. [S. v. *anne*, NS, SSA.]

In Komi-Zyrian versions of the Prayer, there are several different translation solutions for 'forgive'. In Lepekhin's version [Lep 1774], we find the word *inelt* (modern Komi *эновт*) — 'leave, abandon', which was also used in Shergin's version [Sher 1823] in its modern form *эновт*. Semantically close to *эновт* is the translation in Moderach's version [KZMod 1817] *kol* — (modern Komi *коль*) 'leave, forsake'. G. Lytkin [Lyt 1882] chose the word *лэд'* — (modern Komi *лэдз*) 'let, allow, permit, set free', which has the same meaning as the Finnish *päästä* (see above). In the later Komi-Zyrian versions, we find the Russian loanword *прōстит* — 'forgive', apart from Tsypanov's suggestion [KZMat 1999] of *вешты* — 'move away, shift'. The latter term would have been an adequate solution but was not accepted by the local Christian community, which was accustomed to using the Russian loanword when praying. The alternatives are shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Komi-Zyrian translations of 'forgive us
our debts/sins'

Abbreviation and year of the version	Translation
Lep 1774	<i>Inelt mijanlu myshjasnymo</i> ⁶ — 'leave sins-our'
KZMod 1817	<i>Kol mianlü utschusäs miänlüs</i> — 'leave for-us debts our'
Sher 1823	<i>И эновтъ мянлы уджезъясъ</i> ⁷ <i>мианлысь</i> — 'and leave for-us debts our'

⁶ In the original text, the word *myshjasnymo* is erroneously written as two words: *mysh Jasnymo*. Correction made by authors.

⁷ Sakharov has added a footnote here: *уджйöзьяс* = грекьяс (Russian loanword — 'sins').

Lyt 1882	<i>Міѳан уджжјөзјасөс міѳанлы лед</i> — ‘Our debts for-us leave’
Sakh 1899	<i>и прөстит миянлы уджжјөзъяс миянлысь</i> — ‘and forgive us debts our’
Pop 1981	<i>и прөстит миянлы уджжјөзнымөс</i> — ‘and forgive us debts-our’
KZMat 1999	<i>миян моз мыжнымөс тэ веишты</i> — ‘we as sins-our you move-away’
KZNT 2008	<i>И прөстит миянлысь мыжнымөс</i> — ‘and forgive our sins-our’

As in Komi-Zyrian, Komi-Permyak versions of the Prayer have more than one equivalent of ‘forgive’. The very first version, Witsen’s *Mian Aje* [Wit 1705], has the verb *lez* — (modern Komi *лэдз*) ‘let, allow, permit, set free’ [cf. G. Lytkin’s Komi-Zyrian version]. The 19th century versions [FL 1823; KPMod 1817; P-W 1866, 1882; Shes 1899] use the verb *kol / kol’* — (modern Komi *коль*) ‘leave, forsake’. The version of the Prayer published in the trial version of the Gospel of Matthew [KPMat 2001] adheres word for word to the Komi-Zyrian Gospel of Matthew published in 1999 [KZMat 1999], and uses the verb *веишты* — ‘move away, shift’. As in Komi-Zyrian, the translators of the latest versions [KPCB 2003; KPNT 2019] have decided to use the Russian loanword *простит* — ‘forgive’. However, the reason for this decision was different. For Komi-Zyrian, the most salient reason was the opinion of the Christian community, who were accustomed to a certain form of the Prayer, but for Komi-Permyak the reason was simply the fact that the only expression that is used in everyday language for ‘forgive’ is the Russian loanword. The alternatives are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. *Komi-Permyak translations of
'forgive us our debts/sins'*

Abbreviation and year of the version	Translation
Wit 1705	<i>Lez mianlo Uzjek</i> — 'leave for-us debts'
KPMod 1817	<i>I kol mianlüs umelesnümes</i> ⁸ — 'and leave our bad-things-our'
FL 1823	<i>И коль мянлӧ одзӧссэзсӧ мян</i> — 'and leave for-us debts-our'
P-W 1866	<i>I kol mijanvö udžjesnymös</i> — 'and leave for-us debts-our'
P-W 1882	<i>И коль мянвӧ уджъеснымӧс</i> — 'and leave for-us debts-our'
Shes 1899	<i>и коль мянвӧ одзесаӧммесӧ (гръкес</i> ⁹) <i>мянвись</i> — 'and leave for-us debts-our (sins) our'
KPMat 2001	<i>мян моз мыжнымӧс тэ вешты</i> ¹⁰ — 'we as sins-our you move-away'
KPCB 2003	<i>Мян моз простит мянлись умӧль керӧммезнымӧс</i> — 'we as forgive our evil deeds-our'
KPNT 2019	<i>Тэ простит мянлись умӧль керӧммезнымӧс</i> — 'you forgive our evil deeds-our'

In the modern Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak translations of the Prayer, there are almost identical constructions in the first part of the petition: [verb (imperative) + NP (possessive + noun)]. In Komi-Zyrian: *И простит мянлись мыжъяснымӧс* — 'And

⁸ In the original text, the word *umelesnümes* is erroneously written as two words: *umel esnümes*. Correction made by the authors.

⁹ Shestakov has added an explanation here: *гръкес* (Russian loanword 'sins').

¹⁰ This translation is an exact copy of the Komi-Zyrian version in the Gospel of Matthew by E. A. Tsypanov.

forgive our sins', and in Komi-Permyak: *Тэ простит миянлись умӧль керӧммезнымӧс* — 'You forgive our evil deeds'. The only structural difference is that the Komi-Zyrian text copies the Greek (and Church Slavonic) sentence-initial conjunction *καί*, but the Komi-Permyak translators use the personal pronoun *Тэ* — 'You' — instead. This Komi-Permyak solution sounds more natural in the Komi language, but in Komi-Zyrian the need to preserve the traditional liturgical rhythm of the Prayer has probably been stronger than the urge for naturalness.

The last part of the petition — 'our debtors' — has different constructions in the two Komi languages. In Komi-Zyrian the construction is: [possessive *миян* 'our' + postposition *водзын* 'before'+ noun *мыжсаяс* 'guilty-ones'], whereas in Komi-Permyak the construction is: [personal pronoun *миянлӧ* 'to-us' + noun *умӧльӧ* 'evil' + verb (participle) *кериссес* 'doing-ones']. The Komi-Zyrian construction 'before someone guilty' is not part of spoken everyday language; it is used in poems and literature and sounds rather solemn. The Komi-Permyak construction 'to someone evil doing-one' also represents a somewhat elevated style, since in spoken language one would use a Russian-like relative clause *нылӧ, кӧдна керисӧ миянлӧ умӧльӧ* — 'to-those, who did to-us evil'. However, the construction with the participle form *кериссес*, in spite of its literary flair, happened to be well-understood by Komi-Permyak readers during the field-testing of the New Testament.

5.7 And do not lead us into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one

UBS GNT *καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.*

Vulgate *et ne inducas nos in temptationem sed libera nos a malo*

CHU *Ӣ не введи насъ въ напѣсть, но Ӣзбави насъ Ӧ лѣкѣвагѡ:*

FinB 1992 *Älä-kä anna meidän*
do.not-and let we-ACC
joutua kiusaukse-en, vaan päästä
be.taken temptation-ILL but deliver
meidä-t paha-sta.
we-ACC evil-ELAT

KZNT 2008 *Эн сет мян-лы ылав-ны,*
do.not let we-DAT go astray-INF
но видз мян-öс омöль-ысь.
but keep.IMP.2SG we-ACC evil-ELAT

KPNT 2019 *Видз мян-öс ылал-öм-ись,*
keep we-ACC go astray-PTCP-ELAT
ылöтл-ись дынись мян-öс
lead astray-PTCP from(ELAT) we-ACC
мезды.
save.IMP.2SG

Semantic exegesis

The text implies that God might *lead* people into temptation, and the petitioner asks for that condition to be avoided, pleading with God to save him/her from *the evil (one)* instead. The three concepts, *leading*, *temptation* and the *evil (one)* have generated much exegetical debate and varying interpretations. Following semantic priming, the idea of the divinity leading a human being to something bad — either wicked or dangerous — is figurative, and more accessible when expressed in ‘human concepts’ [Wierzbicka 2001: 252]. Every human being has a capacity for making bad decisions. The core idea of *do not lead us into temptation* is to remind those who are praying about this existing human tendency. In the latter part, *deliver us from the evil one*, the petitioner articulates his/her will not to subscribe to bad intentions or to pursue evil desires.

Construction analysis of 'into temptation', 'from the evil (one)'

The Finnish *kiusaus*, *kiusaukseen* — 'temptation, into temptation' — is typically a religious concept. It is an Old Germanic loanword that occurs in Agricola's texts, and although the verb *kiusata* — 'tease' — is a frequent part of constructions in modern Finnish, its derivative *kiusaus*, a noun denoting quality, exclusively carries the religious or moral meaning of 'temptation, trial, seduction' [s. v. *kiusaus*, SSA, VKS, NS].

According to Lytkin and Gulyaev [1999: 329], the Komi-Zyrian *ылавны* — 'lose one's way, go astray' — is a derivate of the Proto-Permic root **ul-*, which has the meaning of 'far away, distance'. The verb is often used in modern standard language both in the concrete meaning of 'get lost' and in the abstract meaning of 'make a mistake, be mistaken'. The Komi-Permyak *ылалӧм* — 'going-astray' — is a participle form of the verb *ылавны*, as is the Komi-Permyak equivalent of 'evil one', *ылӧтлиць*, which literally means 'one-who-leads-astray', and is frequently used in standard language in the meaning of 'liar, deceiver'.

The Greek *πονηρός* is interpreted in some translations as a reference to a personified evil [e.g., NKJV *evil one*], but in some other translations is regarded as an abstraction of bad conditions. In the Finnish version of the Prayer, the word *paha* is part of an abstract construction: *päästä meidät pahasta* could be translated into English as 'deliver us from (inside) the evil (circumstance/place)'. The Komi-Permyak *ылӧтлиць*, literally 'one-who-leads-astray', clearly refers to the personified evil, whereas the Komi-Zyrian *омӧль* — 'bad, nasty, foul, wicked' — can mean either 'an evil circumstance' or 'the evil one'. Both words, *ылӧтлиць* and *омӧль*, are used in the Komi New Testaments [KZNT 2008; KPNT 2019] as terms referring to the devil (e.g. Komi-Permyak Mt 4:3 *ылӧтлиць* — 'tempter', Komi-Zyrian Mt.4:1 *омӧль* — 'the devil').

6. Discussion

The research setting for this analysis was constructed with the intention of making visible the problematic relationship between the source text (its semantic complexity) versus the recipient language translations (their linguistic constructions). The main features of the analysis are reported in section 5. Two reference points were used to organise the results: semantic exegesis and construction analysis. The semantic exegesis was kept concise, as it is a suggestion of what is expected to remain constant and universally shared in various translations. We suggest that Wierzbicka's ideas on semantic priming are a valuable tool for translators for facilitating cultural crossings. The second reference point, construction grammar, reflects the overall perspective on linguistic constructions as situationally organising systems that become vehicles for meaning only in context, in fixed morphological units.

In the vocative phrase '*our father*', all of the Finnish translations employ the unconventional reverse order *Isä meidän*, but in both Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak, there is variation. Komi-Zyrian translations mainly choose the reverse order *Ain mijan* / *Bate mijan* (with the exception of Lytkin's translation of 1882 and Tsypanov's translation of 1999), but in Komi Permyak, the idiomatic, natural order *mian Aje* is prevalent.

Inversion continues in the Finnish equivalent for 'hallowed be', *pyhitetty olkoon*, which together with the two following petitions ('your kingdom come' > *tulkoon sinun valtakuntasi*, 'your will be done' > *tapahtukoon sinun tahtosi*) forms a constellation of three majestic announcements, starting with jussive verb forms. Similar inversion is found in Komi-Zyrian translations, but the new Komi-Permyak translation differs in the first ('hallowed be your name' > *Тэнчит вежа нимтö ась быд морт видзö сьöлöмас*) and third ('your will be done' > *Быдöс ась керсьö Тэ сьöрми*) petition.

The source language word order may be transmitted even in figures of speech: the Greek simile formula follows the type [as Y, is X], but the Finno-Ugric languages naturally construct the

simile in the order [X is as Y]. In the latter part of the third petition, 'on earth as in heaven', the source language order is applied in Komi-Permyak translations before Popov-Wiedemann's version [1866], and in Komi-Zyrian the atypical order is preserved, until V. Popov's translation [1981] reformed the tradition.

The preservation of wording that is otherwise secondary in the recipient language can be justified on rhythmic grounds. To this end, the Finnish version of 'give us this day our daily bread' uses *tänä päivänä* instead of *tänään*, 'today'.

Although metaphors and metonyms are not universal, sometimes the recipient languages genuinely share the figures of speech employed in the source text. Such is the case with the *bread means livelihood* metonym in Komi-Zyrian, and the equivalent for *daily bread* in the Prayer is derived from an idiomatic phrase.

In Finnish, a central Christian concept, 'forgive', *antaa anteeksi*, had obviously already been established in the oral tradition before Agricola wrote it in his translations, and its occurrence and preservation are decisive until modern times. In Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak, the excursion towards the modern versions of *forgive* has been much more diverse (see Tables 4 and 5). The modern translations in both KoZ and KoP use a Russian loanword instead of an indigenous word. It is typical of religious concepts that they are borrowed from surrounding languages where a similar religious culture is practised [Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009].

Focusing on constructions also revealed that even if the dictionary form of a word largely belongs to standard language, it can be part of a construction that is distinctively religious or liturgical. Such examples are the Finnish '(lead) into temptation' — (*joutua*) *kiusaukseen*, and the Komi-Zyrian 'don't let us go astray' — *эн сет мянлы ылавны*.

As a concluding remark regarding the differences between these three languages, the Komi-Permyak translations show a reformative tendency towards more inclusive equivalents, the idiomatic usage of language, and universal intelligibility. Unlike

Finnish and Komi-Zyrian, Komi-Permyak has no established tradition of liturgy including an oral performance of the Lord's Prayer. It is striking that the Komi-Zyrian translations come closer to the Finnish translations, especially in cultivating unconventional word order and preserving wording for the sake of liturgy. The historical account is evident, since the Komi-Permyak translations have had less possibilities for liturgical usage. In contrast, the Finnish and Komi-Zyrian translations are actively used in liturgy.

Scrutinising the Finnish, Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak versions of the Lord's Prayer provides good grounds for concluding that one meaningful distinction lies in the oral versus literary modes of the tradition. It seems that finding fresh wording for an old text is unlikely if the version is established both as an oral liturgy and a literary text. Indeed, it is more likely that new generations of translators will be able to discover new ways of expressing the idea of the Prayer when the oral tradition is missing, or when it is not strong.

The rhythmic character and metrical patterns of the text are vital for maintaining the wording, however atypical of language usage in other contexts. For the same reason, the oral tradition is powerful in conserving ideas. The Finnish and Komi-Zyrian translations echo the liturgical tradition, which does not extend to the Komi-Permyak translations. It is therefore natural that its structures are more reminiscent of those of the idiomatic standard language of today's speakers.

A new translation of an old text includes an option for a slight reform. As Nida emphasises, languages with a long Biblical tradition will at some point face a situation whereby more than one translation will be needed. There might be varied denominational needs, but different age groups may also benefit from special types of translations. However, it is one challenge to create a literary translation that follows a certain translation principle, but another to try to change the liturgical parts of the services, especially the chanted parts, into a new form.

A prayer that crystallises into a poetic form and rhythm becomes an oral artefact. Reconstructing an *objet d'art* is naturally experienced as cultural violation. For example, transforming the Finnish *Isä meidän* into the more 'idiomatic' *Meidän isä* can therefore be questioned. Ultimately, it is a question of the tradition indexing additional semantic components into the text.

Textual sources

Abckiria 1543. See MAT.

Agricola 1548. See MAT.

CHU. SlavBible (Paratext). Old Church Slavonic Bible.

Fin 1642. Biblia. Se on: Koko Pyhä Raamattu, Suomexi. [Bible. That is: Complete Holy Bible, in Finnish.] Stockholm.

Fin 1776. Biblia. Se on: Koko Pyhä Raamattu, Suomexi. [Bible. That is: Complete Holy Bible, in Finnish.] Turku.

Fin 1938. Pyhä Raamattu. Uusi testamentti. XII yleisen Kirkolliskokouksen vuonna 1938 käytäntöön ottama suomennos. [Holy Bible. New Testament. Finnish translation authorised by the XII General Synod in 1938].

Fin 1992. Pyhä Raamattu. Suomen evankelis-luterilaisen kirkon kirkolliskokouksen vuonna 1992 käyttöön ottama suomennos. [Holy Bible. Finnish translation authorised by the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland in 1992].

FL 1823. Ot Matfeya Svyatoe Blagovestvovanie. Matfeisyan' Vezha kyl / per. F. Lyubimova, 1823 // Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Istoricheskij arkhiv v S-Peterburge. F.808 (Arkhiv Rossijskogo biblejskogo obshchestva), op. 1. ed.khr. 196, 1.8-94. (Отъ Матфея Святое Благовествование. Матѳейсянь Вѣжа кыль / пер. Ф. Любимова, 1823 // Российский Государственный Исторический архив в С-Петербурге. Ф. 808 (Архив Российского библейского общества), оп. 1. ед. хр. 196, л. 8–94.)

KPCB 2003. Chelyad' ponda Bibliya. Izhevsk, 2003. (Челядь понда Библия. Ижевск, 2003.)

KPMat 2001. Mat'vej s'orti bur yuör. Izhevsk, 2001. (Матвей сьорти бур юөр. Ижевск, 2001.)

KPMod 1817. Adelung J. Ch. Vater J. S. Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachen-Kunde mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in beynahe fünfhundert Sprachen und Mundarten. Bd. 1–4. Berlin, 1806–1817.

KPNT 2019. Bur Yuör. 2019. (Бур Юөр. 2019 (forthcoming)).

KZMat 1999. Mat’vej serti bur yuör. Syktyvkar, 1999. (Матьвей серти бур юөр. СЫКТЫВКАР, 1999).

KZMod 1817. Adelung J. Ch. Vater J. S. Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachen-Kunde mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in beynahe fünfhundert Sprachen und Mundarten. Bd. 1–4. Berlin, 1806–1817.

KZNT 2008. Vyl’ Kösjys’öm. Izhevsk, 2008. (ВЫЛЬ КÖСЙЫСЬÖМ. Ижевск, 2008.)

Lep 1774. *Lepokhin I*. Tagebuch der Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reiches in den Jahren 1768 und 1769 / Adelung Mithridates I. 1806.

Lyt 1882. *Lytkin G. S.* Vezha Buryuör Matvejsyan’. Svyatoe Evangelie ot Matfeya na komi-zyryanskom yazyke. Pitir, 1882. (*Лыткин Г. С.* Вежа Бурйюөр Матвейсаһ. Святое Евангелие от Матфея на коми-зырянском языке. Питир, 1882.)

MAT. Mikael Agricolan teokset I–III. [The works of Mikael Agricola I–III.] [I Abckiria 1543, Rucouskiria 1544; II Se Wsi Testamenti 1548; III Käsikiria Castesta ja muista Christikunnan menoista 1549; Messu eli Herran Ehtolinen 1549; Se meiden Herran Iesusen Christusen Pina 1549, Daudin Psaltari 1551; Weisut ja Ennustoxet 1551; Ne Prophetat. Haggaj. Sacharla. Maleachi 1552.] Porvoo, 1987.

NKJV. New King James Version. 1975. Online version: [<https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/New-King-James-Version-NKJV-Bible/>] (accessed 2019-03-10)

Pop 1981. Biblia. Kanonicheskøj. Syktyvkar, 1981. (Библиа. Каноническøj. СЫКТЫВКАР, 1981.)

P–W 1866. *Popov A., Wiedemann F. I.* Das Evangelium Matthai in den nordlichen Dialect des Permischen. London, 1866.

P–W 1882. *Popov A., Videman F. I.* Miyan Gospod’vön Iisus Kristusvön Vezha Bur-Yuör Matvejsyan’ komiön. S.-Peterburg, 1882.

(*Попов А., Видеманн Ф. И.* Миян Господьвон Исус Крестосвон Вежа Бур-Юөр Матвейсянь комиён. С.-Петербург, 1882.)

Sakh 1899. Sakharov A. Molitvoslov. Velikij-Ustyug, 1899. Отпечатано с original-макета в Коми республиканской типографии. Сыктывкар, 1994. (*Сахаровъ А.* Молитвословъ. Великій-Устюгъ, 1899. Отпечатано с оригинал-макета в Коми республиканской типографии. Сыктывкар, 1994.)

Sher 1823. Shergin A. V. Miyan Gospod'lon Iisus Khristoslön svyatöij Evangelie Matfejsyan'. Sanktpeterburg, 1823. (*Шергин А. В.* Миянь Господьлөнъ Исус Христослөнъ святой Эвангэлиэ Матфейсянь. Санктпэтербургъ, 1823.)

Shes 1899. Shestakov I. Bozhestvennaya sluzhba vo svyatykh otca nashego Ioanna Zlatoustago na permyackom yazyke. Kazan, 1899. (*Шестаков I.* Божественная служба во святыхъ отца нашего Иоанна Златоустаго на пермяцкомъ языкѣ. Казань, 1899.)

UBS GNT. UBS Greek New Testament (Paratext), Fourth revised edition, United Bible Societies.

Vulgate. Biblia Sacra Vulgata. 405. Online version: [<https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/Biblia-Sacra-Vulgata-VULGATE/>] (accessed 2019-03-10.)

Wit 1705. *Witsen N.* 1705. Noord en Oost Tartarye. Amsterdam. Online version: [<http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/retroboeken/witsen/>] (accessed 2019-03-10.)

References

Chomsky N. Syntactic structures. The Hague, 1957.

Fillmore C. J. et al. Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of let alone // *Language*, 1988, 64, 501–53.

Goddard C. Ten lectures on Natural Semantic Metalanguage: Exploring language, thought and culture using simple, translatable words. Leiden, 2018.

Goldberg A. E. Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure. Chicago, 1995.

Goldberg A. E. Constructions: A new theoretical approach to language // *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 2003, 7, 219–224.

Greidan A. V. Kratkij obzor dukhovnoj perevodcheskoj literatury na komi-permyackom yazyke. Nacional'nye yazyki Rossii: regional'nyj aspekt: materialy mezhdunar. nauch. konf., Perm, 2005, 167–169. (*Грейдан А. В.* Краткий обзор духовной переводческой литературы на коми-пермяцком языке. Национальные языки России: региональный аспект: материалы междунар. науч.-практ. конф. Пермь, 2005, 167–169.) (In Russ.)

Greidan A., Ponomareva L. G. Vliyanie biblejskogo perevoda na razvitie komi-permackogo yazyka. Perevod Biblii kak faktor razvitiya i sokhraneniya yazykov narodov Rossii i stran SNG: problemy i resheniya. Moscow, 2010. (*Грейдан А., Пономарева Л. Г.* Влияние библейского перевода на развитие коми-пермяцкого языка. Перевод Библии как фактор развития и сохранения языков народов России и стран СНГ: проблемы и решения. Москва, 2010.) (In Russ.)

Haspelmath M., Tadmor U. Loanwords in the world's languages. A comparative handbook. New York, 2009.

Heininen S. Mikael Agricola raamatusuomentajana [Mikael Agricola as a Bible translator]. Helsinki, 1999. (In Finn.)

Heininen S. ABCkirian sisältö ja lähteet [The contents and sources of the ABC Book] // *K. Häkkinen* (ed.) Mikael Agricolan Abckiria: Kriittinen editio [Mikael Agricola's ABC Book: Critical edition]. Helsinki, 2007, 42–61. (In Finn.)

Häkkinen K. Alkusanat [Forewords]. // *K. Häkkinen* (ed.) Mikael Agricolan Abckiria. Kriittinen editio [Mikael Agricola's ABC Book: Critical edition]. Helsinki, 2007a, 7–9. (In Finn.)

Häkkinen K. Suomen kieli Mikael Agricolan Abckiriassa [Finnish language in Mikael Agricola's ABC Book]. // *K. Häkkinen* (ed.) Mikael Agricolan Abckiria. Kriittinen editio [Mikael Agricola's ABC Book: Critical edition]. Helsinki, 2007b, 62–92. (In Finn.)

Häkkinen K. Spreading the written word. Mikael Agricola and the birth of literary Finnish. *Studia Fennica Linguistica* 19. Helsinki, 2015.

КР Dict. Komi-permyacko-russkij slovar'. Moscow, 1985. (Коми-пермяцко-русский словарь. Москва, 1985.) (In Russ.)

Kroonen G. Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic. Leiden, 2013.

Lakoff G. Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind. Chicago, 1987.

Langacker R. W. Foundations of cognitive grammar I. Theoretical prerequisites. Stanford, 1987.

Langacker R. W. Foundations of cognitive grammar II. Descriptive application. Stanford, 1991.

Lavery J. Mikael Agricola: Father of the Finnish language, builder of the Swedish state // *R. M. Toivo, S. Katajala-Peltomaa* (eds.) Lived religion and the long reformation in Northern Europe c. 1300–1700. Brill, 2016, 205–229. Online version: [<https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004328877>] (accessed 2019-04-09).

Leinonen M. The Russification of Komi // *Slavica Helsingiensia*, 2006, 27, 234–245.

Leipzig Glossing Rules. Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses. Online version: [<https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf>] (accessed 2019-19-05).

Lytkin V. I. Drevnepermskij yazyk. Moscow, 1952. (*Лыткин В. И.* Древнепермский язык. Москва, 1952.)

Lytkin V. I., Gulyaev E. S. Kratkij etimologicheskij slovar' komi yazika. Syktyvkar, 1999. (*Лыткин В. И., Гуляев Е. С.* Краткий этимологический словарь коми языка. Сыктывкар, 1999.) (In Russ.)

Mielikäinen A. Yazyk Biblii i finskij literaturnyj yazyk // *Perevod Biblii v literaturakh narodov SNG i Baltii*. Moscow, 2003, 391–402. (*Миелikäинен А.* Язык Библии и финский литературный язык. // *Перевод Библии в литературах народов России, стран СНГ и Балтии*. Москва, 2003, 391–402.) (In Russ.)

Nekrasova G. A. Rol' pervykh perevodov Biblii v razvitii i sokhranении komi yazika // *Ezhegodnik finno-ugorskikh issledovanii*, 2014, 8 (3). (*Некрасова Г. А.* Роль первых переводов Библии в развитии и сохранении коми языка // *Ежегодник финно-угорских исследований*, 2014, 8 (3).) (In Russ.)

Nida E. A. Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating. Leiden, 1964.

Nida E. A. A componential analysis of meaning: An introduction to semantic structures. The Hague, 1975.

Nida E. A. The sociolinguistics of translating canonical religious texts // TTR: traduction, terminologie, redaction, 1994, 7, 191–217.

Nida E. A. The sociolinguistics of interlingual communication. Brussels, 1996.

NS. Nykysuomen Sanakirja: Lyhentämätön kansanpainos [Dictionary of modern Finnish: An unabridged popular edition]. Porvoo, 1965. (In Finn.)

Ojansuu H. Vanhimmat Isämeidän rukoukset suomen kielellä [The oldest versions of the Lord's Prayer in Finnish] // *Virittäjä*. 1904, 8, 130–134. (In Finn.)

Pirinen K. Suomenkielisen liturgisen kirjallisuuden synty [The birth of Finnish liturgical literature] // *E. Koivusalo* (ed.) *Mikael Agricolan kieli* [Mikael Agricola's language]. Helsinki, 1988, 9–24. (In Finn.)

Porter W. A brief look at the life and works of Eugene Albert Nida // *The Bible Translator*, 2005, 56, 1–7.

Saarikivi J. Uusia vanhoja sanoja [New old words] // *A. Aikio, J. Ylikoski* (eds.) *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit*. Helsinki, 2007, 325–347. (In Finn.)

Saarikivi J. Pyhän käsitteestä ja alkuperästä [About the concept and origin of holy] // *Elore*. 2017, 24, 1–11. (In Finn.)

Schmitt N., Carter R. Formulaic sequences in action. An introduction // *N. Schmitt* (ed.) *Formulaic Sequences. Acquisition, processing and use*. Amsterdam, 2004, 1–22.

Spolsky B. Sociolinguistics. Oxford, 1998.

SSA. Suomen sanojen alkuperä: Etymologinen sanakirja [The origin of Finnish words: An etymological dictionary]. Helsinki, 1992. (In Finn.)

Stepanov V. A. Opyt periodizacii donacional'noj epokhi v istorii komi-permyackogo literaturnogo yazika // *Vestnik Chuvashskogo*

universiteta, 2009. (*Степанов В. А.* Опыт периодизации донациональной эпохи в истории коми-пермяцкого литературного языка // Вестник Чувашского университета, 2009.) (In Russ.)

Tarkiainen V., Tarkiainen K. Mikael Agricola: Suomen uskonpuhdistaja [Mikael Agricola: The reformer of Finland]. Helsinki, 1985. (In Finn.)

Tsypanov E. A. Sposoby peredachi russkikh pridatochnykh predlozhenij vremeni v komi perevodakh Evangeliya ot Matfeya // *Linguistica Uralica*, 2004, 188–196. (*Цыпанов Е. А.* Способы передачи русских придаточных предложений времени в коми переводах Евангелия от Матфея // *Linguistica Uralica*, 2004, 188–196.) (In Russ.)

Tsypanov E. A. Grammaticheskie kategorii glagola v komi yazike. Syktyvkar, 2005. (*Цыпанов Е. А.* Грамматические категории глагола в коми языке. Сыктывкар, 2005.)

Turkin A. Ob odnom maloizvestnom pamyatnike drevnepermskoj pis'mennosti // *U.-M. Kulonen* (red.) Festschrift für Raija Bartens. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne. 1993, 215, 277–281. (*Туркин А.* Об одном малоизвестном памятнике древнепермской письменности // *U.-M. Kulonen* (red.) Festschrift für Raija Bartens. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne. 1993, 215, 277–281.) (In Russ.)

Vanhatalo U., Tissari H., Idström A. Revisiting the universality of Natural Semantic Metalanguage: A view through Finnish // *SKY Journal of Linguistics*, 2014, 27, 67–94.

Vilkuna M. Discourse configurationality in Finnish // *K. É. Kiss* (ed.) Discourse configurational languages. New York, Oxford, 1995, 244–268.

VISK. *Hakulinen A., Vilkuna M., Korhonen R., Koivisto V., Heinonen T. R., Alho I.* Iso suomen kielioppi [Large Finnish Grammar]. Helsinki, 2004. Online version: [<http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk/etusivu.php>.] (accessed 27.2.2019.) (In Finn.)

VKS. Vanhan kirjasuomen sanakirja: Toinen osa J–K [The dictionary of old literary Finnish: Second volume J–K]. Helsinki, 1994. (In Finn.)

Watt J. M. The contributions of Eugene A. Nida to sociolinguistics. // *The Bible Translator*, 2005, 56, 19–29.

Wierzbicka A. What is Prayer? In search of a definition // *L. B. Brown* (ed.) *The Human Side of Prayer: The Psychology of Praying*. Birmingham, 1993, 25–46.

Wierzbicka A. What Did Jesus Mean? The Lord's Prayer translated into universal human concepts // *R. Bisschops, J. Francis* (eds.) *Metaphor, Canon and Community: Jewish, Christian and Islamic approaches*. Canterbury, 1999, 180–216.

Wierzbicka A. What did Jesus mean? Explaining the Sermon on the Mount and the parables in simple and universal human concepts. New York, 2001.

Wierzbicka A. Making sense of terms of address in European languages through the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) // *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2016, 13, 499–527.

Wood D. *Fundamentals of formulaic language. An introduction*. London, 2015.

Ahlholm Maria

University of Helsinki

Finland

Алхольм Мария

Университет Хельсинки

Финляндия

maria.ahlholm@helsinki.fi

Kuosmanen Anne

Institute for Bible Translation

Finland

Анна Куосманен

Институт перевода Библии

Финляндия

anne.kuosmanen@kolumbus.fi