Gothic Syntax

7.1 Weak and strong adjectives

Adjectives in Germanic have a strong and weak inflection. In Gothic, strong forms are used in predicative constructions (1-2) and most attributive constructions (3-5):

1. \textit{braid daur jah rūms wigs} (Mt 7: 13)  
   ‘broad (is) the door and roomy the way’

2. \textit{huan aggwu pata daur} (Mt 7: 14)  
   ‘how narrow (is) that door’

3. \textit{inngaggaih pairh aggwu daur} (Mt 7: 13)  
   ‘go in through the narrow door’

4. \textit{galeiko ina waira frodamma} (Mt 7: 24)  
   ‘I liken him to the wise man’

5. \textit{izwara goda waurstwa} (Mt 5: 16)  
   ‘your good works’

Weak adjectives may have originated as -\textit{n}- stem nouns. Their primary use in Gothic is appositional (Harbert 2007: 130ff.). The following contrast is most informative:

6. \textit{Ik im hairdeis gods.}  
   I am shepherd good
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Hairdeis sa goda saiwalai seina lagijib … (Jn 10: 11)

shepherd the good soul his lays

‘I am the good shepherd. A shepherd, the good one, lays down his soul …’

The contrast is stark between attributive *gods* (strong) and appositional *goda* (weak). In both constructions, the Greek original has *ho poimēn ho kalōs* [the shepherd the good] ‘the good shepherd’. This implies that (i) the translator elected to interpret the passage rather than translate it directly, and therefore (ii) both Gothic constructions are native since neither is calqued on the corresponding Greek text.

The appositional context for weak adjectives is typical:

(7) sunus meins sa liuba (Lk 9: 35)

son mine the beloved
‘my beloved son’

Weak adjectival forms can also accompany a noun in the vocative (8) and when the noun head of the NP is null, as in (9) (Mossé 1956: 170).

(8) atta weih (Jn 17: 11)

‘holy father’

(9) sa usliha (Mk 2: 4)

‘the paralytic’

On participles in an agentive function see §7.7.

Quantifiers like all-s ‘all’ and deictic words like *jain-s* ‘that’ (distal) have only strong forms:

(10) pairh pana wig jainana (Mt 8: 28)

through that.ASG.MASC road.ASG yon.ASG.MASC

‘by that road’
7.2 Subject pronouns

Gothic belongs to a class of languages which omit overt subject pronouns. Such languages are Ancient Greek, Latin, and modern Spanish. These are generally referred to as NULL SUBJECT languages, but there are many subvarieties, including partial null subject languages like Old English, and non-null subject languages like English, where pronouns are obligatory (Miller 2010: i: 143ff., w. lit).

Gothic was the most null-subject of any Germanic language (Harbert 2007: 221f.), but most of the older languages omitted subject pronouns in varying degrees (Abraham 1991). The third person in Old English was frequently null (Miller 2010: ii. 104, w. lit), but in Gothic has a pronominal subject more often than the first two persons, especially in Luke and John (Mossé 1956: 171).

(11) a) *þ eis tauhun Iesu fram Kajafin* (Jn 18: 28) but they led Jesus from Caiaphas ‘they led Jesus from Caiaphas’

b) *þ eis qepunu hu du imma Judaieis* (Jn 18: 31) but they said.3PL to him.DSG Jews.NPL.MASC ‘and they, said to him, the Jews’ (i.e. ‘the Jews said to him’)

The pronouns in (11) are independent of the Greek text which has none. Moreover, in (11b), the pronoun may be an expletive in an agree relation (NPL.MASC) with Judaieis.

Even when the first person is ambiguous, the pronoun can be omitted:

(12) *naht jah dag in diupiþai was mareins* (2 Cor. 11: 25)

‘a night and a day (I) was on the deep of the sea’

That null subjects are genuine Gothic is guaranteed by the fact that sentences without overt pronouns can render Greek sentences with overt subjects. Another indication of native Gothic syntax is (13) which completely reverses the Greek passive construction *homoiøthøsetai* ‘(he) will be compared (to …)’:
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(13) \textit{galeiko ina waira frodamma} (Mt 7: 24)
\hspace{1em} liken.1SG him.ASG man.DSG wise.DSG.MASC
‘I (will) compare him to the wise man’

The flipside is the implication that when an overt subject pronoun is present, as in \textit{swa jah jūs taujāp im} ‘as also you do to them’, the pronoun \textit{jūs} ‘you’ (PL) is emphatic or contrastive, which is generally the case in Greek as well.

7.3 Anaphors

Gothic has a system of anaphors consisting of reflexive \textit{sik} ‘himself, herself, itself’ and the possessive adjective \textit{sein} ‘his, her, its (own)’. \textit{Sein-} can be reflexive or a DISCOURSE ANAPHOR — one that does not require a binder (Kiparsky 2011). A reflexive anaphor requires a binder, traditionally called an antecedent except that it need not precede the anaphor in linear order. Only the third person has a distinct anaphor. The first person \textit{mik} ‘me’, \textit{mein-} ‘my’, second \textit{puk} ‘you’, \textit{pein-} ‘your’, and the corresponding plural forms, are both anaphoric and non-anaphoric (pronominal). The same is true of the oblique case forms \textit{mis, pus,} etc., in contrast to exclusively anaphoric \textit{sis}, etc.

The pronoun – reflexive contrast is evident in the following example cited by Harbert (2007: 196):

(14) \textit{gup haubeip ina in sis} (Jn 13: 32)
\hspace{1em} ‘God, glorifies him, in him(self),’

Reflexive \textit{sik}, together with a form of the intensive predicate of identity \textit{silb-} ‘self’, occurs in the following examples, the first of which also has a possessive adjective:

(15) \textit{Saei seina qen frijōp, jah sik silban frijōp} (Eph. 5: 28)
\hspace{1em} he.that his.own woman loves and REFL self loves
\hspace{1em} ‘he who loves his (own) wife, (he) also loves himself’
Silban is most often used in translating (forms of) Gk. heautón ‘himself’ (reflexive he ‘himself’ plus intensive autón ‘self’), especially in contexts where the action is directed by the subject toward itself (Harbert 2007: 210). Despite exceptions and the possibility of Greek calques, e.g. as in (16) where sik silban translates (DAT) heautô(i) and sis silbin renders (GEN) heautoû, Harbert (p. 211) suggests that this may have been the beginning of the Germanic two-reflexive system, e.g. Dutch zich vs. zichzelf, Sw. sig vs. sig själv, etc., which is typologically widespread (Kiparsky 2011).

Unlike English, the anaphor can occur in a PP contained in a clause with a more local potential binder, and is thus strictly neither clause-bound nor long-distance.

(16) Jabai <em>has</em> gatrawaiþ <em>sik</em> silban Xristaus <em>wisan</em>, if who trusts REFL self Christ.GSG be.INF

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{pata} & \text{pagkjai} \\
\text{aftra} & \text{af} \\
\text{sis} & \text{silbin} \\
\end{array} \]

DEM contemplate.3SG.OPT again from REFL.DAT self.DSG

‘if anyone confides himself to be of Christ, let him/her reflect on this again to him/herself’

In (17, 18), the object of the matrix verb is the more local potential binder, ignored by the anaphor, and in (19), cited by Harbert (2007: 198, 204), the more local potential
binder is the subject of its immediate clause [\text{who}_x \text{ not wanted} \ [\text{me}_y \text{ to rule over} \ \text{them}_z]]. \text{Harbert (p. 198) mentions that these constructions are genuine Gothic because the corresponding Greek texts have a pronoun rather than an anaphor.}\]

That binding is anaphoric and not logophoric (long distance) is suggested by \textit{that}-clauses in which an anaphor cannot refer to the matrix subject (\text{Harbert 2007: 197}):\]

\[(20) \ (\text{eis}) \ \text{bedun} \ \text{ina} \ \text{ei} \ (\text{is}) \ \text{uslabidedi} \ \text{im}/**\text{sis}/**\text{galeipan} \ (\text{Lk 8: 32})\]

\begin{verbatim}
(they) asked him that (he) allow.3SG.PRET.OPT them.DPL go.INF 'they asked him [that (he) allow them / (*themselves) to go]'
\end{verbatim}

Since Gothic is a null subject language, the binder of an anaphor can be a null subject mirrored in verbal agreement:

\[(21) \ \text{jabai} \ \text{has} \ \text{willi} \ \text{afar} \ \text{mis} \ \text{gaggan}, \ \text{afaikai} \ \text{sik} \ \text{silban} \ (\text{Lk 9: 23})\]

\begin{verbatim}
if who will.3SG after me.D go.INF deny.3SG.OPT reflex self.ASG
'if anyone is willing to come after me, let him deny himself'
\end{verbatim}

\[(22) \ \text{jah} \ \text{ni} \ \text{habands} \ \text{waurtins} \ \text{in} \ \text{sis}, \ \text{ak} \ \text{hveilahuairbai} \ \text{sind} \ (\text{Mk 4: 17})\]

\begin{verbatim}
and NEG having roots in reflex.D yet transitory be.3PL
'and (they) not having roots in themselves, yet they are ephemeral'
\end{verbatim}

\[(23) \ \text{ju} \ \text{gahorinoda} \ \text{izai} \ \text{in} \ \text{hairtin} \ \text{seinamma} \ (\text{Mt 5: 28})\]

\begin{verbatim}
already adultered her.DAT in heart his.REFL
'(he) has already committed adultery with her in his (own) heart'
\end{verbatim}

\[(24) \ \text{þugkeþ} \ \text{im} \ \text{auk} \ \text{ei} \ \text{in} \ \text{seem.3SG} \ \text{they.DPL for that in}\]

\begin{verbatim}
filuwaudein seinai andhausjaindau \ (Mt 6: 7) \ much-word-ness their.REFL.DSG heed.3PL.OPT.PASS
'for they think that in their excess verbiage they will be heeded'
\end{verbatim}
Especially interesting is (24) in which *pugkeip im* is impersonal (lit. ‘seems to them’) and *seinai* depends exclusively on the null plural subject of passive *andhausjaindau*.

The reciprocal anaphor (‘each other’, ‘one another’) is most often effected by means of a form of *sik* plus *misso* ‘mutually, reciprocally, interchangeably’:

(25) ḫanuh sehun du sis misso ḫai siponjos,
then.and saw.3PL to REFL RECIPR those disciples,

 ḫagkjandans bi haurjana qepi (Jn 13: 22)
deliberating.NPL about whom.ASG.MASC speak.3SG.PRET.OPT

‘and then the disciples looked at one another,
deliberating about whom he was speaking’

7.4 Pseudo-reflexives, passive replacements, and the ergative alternation

Gothic was in the process of replacing the IE mediopassive forms with pseudo-reflexive formations in a different function, as discussed by Ferraresi (2005: 109–23). Consider the following examples:

(26) nih Saulaumon in allamma wulpau seinamma
not.and S. in all.DSG.MASC glory.DSG his.DSG.MASC

gawasida sik swe ains ẑize (Mt 6: 29)
dressed.3SG REFL as one.NSG.MASC that.GPL.MASC

‘not even Solomon in all his glory dressed like one of those’

(27) galesun sik du imma manageins filu (Mk 4: 1)
gathered.3PL REFL to him.D multitude.GSG much

‘there gathered to him a great multitude’

Reflexive ‘dressed himself’ would be *gawasida sik* (*silban*) but the simple reflexive in (26) translates the Greek middle *periebáleto* ‘dressed’ [lit. ‘put around’]. *Galesun sik*
(silban) ‘gathered themselves’ contrasts with the simple reflexive in (27) which functions as an ergative verb, like the Greek middle sunágetai ‘gathers’.

An ergative verb is one with a causative – anticausative / inchoative alternation, like I broke the vase (‘I caused the vase to become broken’) beside anticausative / inchoative the vase broke (‘the vase became broken’). What is interesting about (27) is that it is a Gothic innovation for the inchoative -na- verbs; cf. gahailjan ‘heal’: gahailnan ‘become healed’, gadaújan ‘kill’: gadaúnan ‘die’, mikiljan ‘make great’: mikilnan ‘become great’, etc. (Ferraresi 2005: 114ff.; cf. §1.20.1).

Two simple reflexives occur in the following example:

(28) ni blandaiþ izwis mih imma,  
   NEG mix.IMPV.2PL you.APL.REFL with him.D
   ei gaskamai sik (2 Thess. 3: 14)
   that shame.3SG.OPT REFL
‘do not mingle with him, that he may be ashamed’

Blandan ‘mix, mingle’ can be causative or, with a simple reflexive, anticausative, a classic ergative alternation. The second verb, skaman, always occurs with a simple reflexive ‘shame oneself’, i.e. ‘be ashamed (of [+GEN])’:

(29) graban ni mag, bidjan skama mik (Lk 16: 3)
   dig.INF NEG can.1SG beg.INF shame.1SG me.ASG.REFL
   ‘I cannot dig, I am ashamed to beg’

(30) unte saei skamaþ sik meina jah waurde meinaize
   for he.that shame.3SG REFL me.G and word.GPL my.GPL.NT
   … jah sunus mans skamaþ sik is … (Mk 8: 38)
   … and son man.GSG shame.3SG REFL him.GSG
‘for he who is ashamed of me and my words,
   … also the son of man is ashamed of him’
7.5 Periphrastic passive formations

Gothic inherited a synthetic nonpast passive formation of the type *gibada* ‘is given’ and created a periphrastic past passive constructed with the past passive participle plus ‘be’: *gibans* was ‘was given’. To insist on inchoativity vs. state *wairpan* ‘become’ was used: *gibans warh* ‘got given’. By analogy, these formations were extended to the nonpast tense where they competed with *gibada: gibans ist* ‘is given’, *gibans wairpiþ* ‘gets given’. One of these contrasts is illustrated in the following example (Abraham 1992: 3; Ferraresi 2005: 122):

(31) *sa sunus meins … fralusans was jah bigitans warð* (Lk 15: 24)
that son my lost was and found became
‘my son was lost and got found’

_Fralusans was_ is stative (‘was in a lost state’) and _bigitans warð_ is inchoative (‘got to be in a found state’). The first translates a Greek perfect passive (_apolōlōs ēn_) and the second a Greek aorist passive (_heurēthē_). So far, the situation is much as in modern German: ‘mein Sohn … _war verloren und wurde gefunden_’.

Unlike German, however, where the ‘be’ passive is strictly stative, Abraham (1992) and Ferraresi (2005: 121–4) show that in Gothic the ‘be’ passive is more general:

(32) *etun jah drugkun, liugaidadun jah liugaidos wesun* (Lk 17: 27)
ate.3PL and drank.3PL married.3PL and married were.3PL
‘they ate and drank, married and were given in marriage’

(33) *jah daupihai wesun allai in Laurdane aluai fram imma* (Mk 1: 5)
andbaptized were all.PL in Jordan.GPL water.DSG by him.D
‘and they were all baptized by him in the water of the Jordan’

That both of these require a _werden_ passive in German illustrates the crucial difference. The _wairpan_ passive in Gothic is restricted to inchoative passives (one of the functions of the Greek aorist passive), while the ‘be’ passive is everything else. In
which translate the Greek imperfect passives _exegamízonto_ ‘were (being) married’ and _ebaptízonto_ ‘were (being) baptized’, the aspect is incompletive.

In summary, the German *werden* passive is the general one and the ‘be’ passive solely stative. In Gothic, the ‘be’ passive is both stative and general while the *wairpan* passive is inchoative. For the rest of Germanic, see Harbert (2007: 317–29).

### 7.6 Aspect

The aspectual system in Germanic was effected primarily by prefixes. This was true in Old English as well, but in Modern English aspectual particles prevail. Contrast, for instance, *drink* with telic *drink up*, or *fill* with completive *fill up*.

The main Germanic perfectivizing and telic prefix was *ga-. Two of the most important functions of Gothic *ga-* are (a) collective/sociative, (b) completive/telic:

(34)  
(a) _ga-qiman_ = Lat. _con-venire_ ‘come together’
(b) _ga-taujan_ = Lat. _cön-ficere_ ‘do up; complete; accomplish’


Etymologically, *ga-* is identical to Lat. *co(m)-* from PIE *ko(m)-* ‘beside, near, with’. The Verner’s Law reflex of *χa- to *γa- (>*ga-*) shows that the prefix was not stressed but occupied a pretonic position (Prokosch 1938: 119; Ivanov 1999).

For the sociative function, contrast *horinon* ‘commit adultery’ with *ga-horinon* ‘commit adultery together (with)’. *Miþ* ‘with’ is more productive as sociative, e.g. _miþ-qiman_ ‘come along with’, _miþ-rodjan_ ‘speak with’, _miþ-ga-daúphnan_ ‘perish (ga-daúphnan) along with’, _miþ-ga-timrjan_ ‘build together, construct as a constituent part’.

In contrast to the Germanic preterit, Greek had an aorist (perfective past) and an imperfect (incompletive past). The *ga-* forms in Gothic often translate a verb that is non-iterative/durative, non-progressive, instantaneous, or punctual. Many contrasts are found in the texts, e.g. *hausjan* ‘to hear’ vs. *ga-hausjan* ‘listen up; take heed; comprehend’, or *waurkjan* ‘do, work’ beside *ga-waurkjan* ‘effect’ (telic), *meljan* ‘write’ : *ga-meljan* ‘write down’ (telic):
(35) namna izwara gamelida sind (Lk 10: 20)
‘your names are written down’

**Ga-saihun** in the preterit **gasahu** can function as a past completive:

(36) jah froþun þammei siun gasahu (Lk 1: 22)
and realized.3PL that vision saw.3SG
‘and they realized that he had seen a vision’

For an example of instantaneous or punctual aspect, contrast **saihun** ‘to see’ with **ga-saihun** ‘to catch sight of’. **Gasitan** translates Gk. kathēsthai ‘sit down; take a seat’ (single event, telic) and contrasts with **sitan** ‘be (in the process of) sitting’ (non-completive, atelic). Similarly, **gadraus** translates épesen ‘fell’ in contrast to unprefixed **draus** ‘was falling’. **Gapaursnoda** ‘dried up’ renders a Greek aorist (exërántē) and would contrast with **paursnoda** ‘was / kept drying’.

Prefixes other than **ga**- could also be used for telicity or perfectivity. Contrast, for instance, **itan** ‘to eat’ with **fra-itan** ‘eat up, devour’ (Harbert 2007: 40, w. lit). In **jah in fon atlagjada** ‘and is laid upon the fire’, **at** ‘to, towards’ makes the verb telic.

Conversely, an unprefixed form like **laisida** translates a Greek imperfect edídasken ‘was / kept teaching, taught (repeatedly)’. A punctual / inchoative verb like **wairþan** ‘become’, on the other hand, has a simple past **warþ** translating egéneto ‘(it) got-to-be, happened, came to pass’, and sometimes occurs with an adjective where Greek has an inchoative aorist passive, e.g. **wairþ hraíns** (Mt 8: 3) ‘get clean’, translating IMPV katharísthēti ‘get cleaned’ (result state).

Some verbs, like **galeþan** ‘come, go’ are always prefixed, even when no other verb in the sentence is:

(37) land bauhta jah þarf galeþan jah saihun þata (Lk 14: 18)
land bought.1SG and need.1SG go.INF and see.INF that
‘I bought land and need to go and see it’
7.7 The present (incompletive) participle

So-called present participles (§6.9) have only weak forms except in the NOM SG MASC, e.g. to briggands (strong), there is weak brigganda (after sa ‘the one’), otherwise only weak forms: FEM briggandei, NT briggando, G briggandins (FEM briggandeins), etc. An additional complexity is that the strong form can contrast semantically with the weak when the strong form is agentive:

(38) sa saiands ‘the sower’ : sa saianda ‘the one (who happens to be) sowing’

This contrast is, however, rare. The two are often interchangeable, e.g. sa qimands ~ sa qimanda ‘the one coming’ (Braune-Ebbinghaus §133).

As a Greek calque, agentive participles can take a complement (Mossé 1956: 186), e.g. with sa galewjands ‘the betrayer’:

(39) Iūdās sa galewjands ina ‘Judas, the one betraying him’ (Jn 18: 2)
[= Gk. Ioúdās ho paradidoùs autòn ‘id.’]

Another Greek calque, ultimately of Hebrew origin, features the strong form with ‘be’ to insist on durativity in a past time-frame (Mossé 1938: i. 21–30; 1956: 179f., 273):

(40) Ip Seimon Paitrus was standands jah warmjands sik (Jn 18: 25)
‘but Simon Peter was standing and warming himself’
[= Gk. ēn dè Símōn Pētros hestōs kai thermainómenos ‘id.’]

Adjunct clauses in various cases occur with the participle, e.g. dative absolute:

(41) ṭata qipandin imma (Jn 18: 22)
that saying.DSG he.DSG
‘him saying that’
For the construction, cf. Gk. *taûta dê autoû eipóntos* ‘him saying those things’, with a genitive absolute. The dative absolute is common in Old English, especially Bede. Gothic and Old High German also use it, except for the *Heliand* which lacks absolute constructions. More frequently, however, the absolute construction is rendered very differently, e.g. with a nominative participial construction (Lühr 2005: 352–8). Lühr concludes that the absolute construction was alien to Germanic but was able to be calqued because of uses of the dative already current in Germanic.

Participles can occur as complements to perception predicates (Mossé 1956: 186):

(42) *gasaihīþ wulf qimandan* (Jn 10: 12)

‘(he) catches sight of a wolf coming’

This is a calque on the Greek construction *thēōrei tôn lúkon erkhómenon* ‘(he) observes the wolf coming’.

One frequent function of participles is as relative clause replacements. However, this is a common construction in Greek and a calque cannot be excluded, as possibly in the following:

(43) *þana gaggardan du mis ni huggreîþ*

DEM.ASG.MASC coming.ASG.MASC to me.D NEG hunger.3SG

*jah þana galaubjandan du mis ni þurseîþ* (Jn 6: 35)

and the.one believing to me NEG thirst.3SG

‘the one coming (he who comes) to me will not hunger

and the one believing (he who believes) in me will not thirst’

The verbs *huggrijan* ‘hunger’ and *þursejan* ‘thirst’ are impersonal and take an accusative of the experiencer. This is genuine Gothic and differs from the Greek personal construction.

Finally, the participle seems rarely to function purposively:
(44) *saei habai ausona hausjandona, gahausjai* (Mk 4: 9)

‘he that have ears [for] hearing, let him heed’

Alternatively, it is possible to construe this literally as ‘hearing ears’.

### 7.8 Infinitives

One of the main functions of the infinitive in Gothic is complement to verbs of various classes. Infinitival complements are particularly common when the subject of the infinitive and that of the main verb are coreferential (identical). Switch reference is normally expressed by a finite (‘that’) clause (§7.9).

Following are examples of infinitival complements to verbs of motion, volition, capacity (‘be able’), inception (‘begin’), and ‘need’:

(45) *ni qam gatairan, ak usfulljan* (Mt 5: 17)

> NEG came.1SG abolish.INF but fulfill.INF

‘I did not come to abolish but to fulfill’

(46) *þai-ei ni wildedun mik biudanon ufar sis* (Lk 19: 27)

> they-that NEG wanted.3PL me rule.INF over REFL

‘they who did not want me to rule over them’

(47) *izwara has raihtis wiljands kelikn timbrjan...* (Lk 14: 28)

> you.GPL who indeed willing tower build.INF

‘who of you indeed, willing to build a tower …’

(48) a) *ni mag qiman* (Lk 14: 20)

> NEG can.1SG come.INF

‘I cannot come’
b) \textit{ni magup guda skalkinon} (Lk 16: 13)  
\textit{NEG can.2PL God.DSG serve.INF}  
‘you cannot serve God’

(49) a) \textit{Iesus dugann laisjan} (Mk 4: 1)  
‘Jesus began to teach’

b) \textit{jah dugunnun suns faurqiban allai} (Lk 14: 18)  
and begun.3PL at.once excuse.INF all.NPL.MASC  
‘and all began at once to decline’

(50) \textit{land bauhta jah porf galeipan jah saihan pata} (Lk 14: 18)  
land bought.1SG and need.1SG go.INF and see.INF that  
‘I bought land and need to go and see it’

The last example is important for native Gothic because the Greek text uses a participle for the first verb: \textit{ékhō anágkēn exelthōn ideīn autón}, literally ‘I have need going out to see it’.

Another verb that takes infinitival complements is ‘shame’:

(51) \textit{bidjan skama mik} (Lk 16: 3)  
beg.INF shame.1SG me.ASG.REFL  
‘I am ashamed to beg’

Beyond complement structures, infinitives are used in purposive constructions:

(52) \textit{jah insandida skalk seinana… giban paim haitanam…} (Lk 14: 17)  
and sent.3SG slave his.own say.INF those.DPL called.DPL  
‘and he sent his slave to tell the invitees …’
Purposives in many instances are introduced by *du* ‘to, in order to’ plus (undeclined) infinitive (cf. Mossé 1956: 185):

(54) a) *urrann sa saiands du saian* (Mk 4: 4)

up.rose.3SG DEM sowing.STR.NOM to sow.INF

‘that sower rose up to sow’

b) *hazuh saei saihip qinon du luston izos* (Mt 5: 28)

each who see.3SG woman.Asg to lust.INF her.Gsg

‘each (man) who sees a woman (with the intent) to lust after her’

Other ways of expressing purposives are mentioned in the appropriate places.

Finally, *du* with an infinitive often has the properties of an English gerundial:

(55) *ei insandidedi ins merjan | jah haban waldfni*

that send.PRET.OPT.3SG them preach.INF and have.INF power

*du hailjan sauhtins jah uswarzpan unhulpuns* (Mk 3: 14f.)

to heal sickness.APL and out.cast.INF she-devil.APL

‘that he may send them them to preach and to have the power

of/for healing sicknesses and (for) cast(ing) out she-devils’

In (54b) and (55) the *du* clause is an adjunct to a noun. In (54a), it is more clearly a purposive adjunct to a matrix activity.

Infinitives could also be sentential subjects (Berard 1995), as in (56) and (57).
(56) *waila wisan jah faginon skuld* was (Lk 15: 32) well be.INF and rejoice.INF proper.NT was ‘to be well and rejoice was proper’

(57) *azitizo ist ulbandau þairh þairko neþlos galeþpan* (Mk 10: 25) easier.NT is camel.DAT through hole needlE.GEN go.INF ‘for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle is easier …’

7.9 **Subordination**

Germanic had finite and nonfinite means of subordinating one clause to another. The nonfinite structures include infinitives and participles (discussed above). The main finite structures involve a finite complementizer (a ‘that’ clause) and relative clauses.

Following is an example with both types of subordinate clauses, infinitives being used when their subject is coreferential with the matrix subject, finite clauses when the subjects differ.

(58) *Ni hugajiþ e† gemja† gaitairan witoþ aiþbau praufetuns;* NEG think.2PL that came.1SG.OPT abolish.INF law or profit.APL

*ni qam gaitairan, ak usful†jan. Amen auk qiþa izwis:* NEG came.1SG abolish.INF but fulfill.INF truly for say.1SG you.DPL

*und hatei usleþip himins jah air†a, jota ains† aiþbau ains striks* until that disappear.3SG heaven and earth, iota one or one stroke

*ni usleþip af witoda, unte allata wairþip* (Mt 5: 17–18) NEG disappear.3SG from law.DSG until all.NSG.NT happen.3SG

---

1 The masculine gender of *ains* shows that *jota* had to be masculine, which suggests that Gothic, like the rest of Germanic, had the word *stafs* (MASC -a-) ‘letter’ (Ammann 1948).
Gothic Syntax

‘Do not think that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. Truly I say to you, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will disappear from the law until everything comes to pass.’

Another important detail is that both *batei* and *ei* translate as ‘that’. Since there are other complementizers as well, these require discussion.

*batei* ‘that’ derives from the pronoun *pata* ‘that’ plus relative complementizer *ei* (cf. OCS *i* ‘and’, Gk. *ei* ‘thus; if’ GED E1). For *ei* as a relativizing particle, cf. *faur-piz-ei* [before this that] ‘before’, *ik-ei* ‘I who’, etc. Especially frequent is *sa-ei* ‘he that/who’, as in (59). Note that *huzuh* ‘each’ derives from *huz-(u)* lit. ‘who-and’ (see ch. 20).

(59) *huzuh* nu *sa-ei* hausep waurda meina
everyone now who hear.3SG word.ACC.PL.NT mine.ACC.PL.NT

*jah taujib* bo galeiko ina waira frodamma
and do.3SG them liken.1SG him man.DAT wise.DAT.SG.M

*sa-ei* gatimrida razn sein ana staina (Mt 7: 24)
who build.PST.1SG house.ACC.SG.NT his.ACC.SG.NT on stone.DAT.SG

‘now whosoever hears my words and does them, I shall liken him to the wise man who built his house on stone’

*batei* has a dative counterpart *hammei* ‘(in) that’, from dative pronoun *hamma* + *ei*. Both *batei* and *hammei* evolved from a correlative structure of the type in (60) and (61).² Compare the NP-adjoined relative in (62).

Bare *ei* in (60, 61) seems to be a complementizer to a right-adjoined clause that is indexed with the matrix complement *þata, þamma*. In (62), *þamma* has lexical dative specified by the verb *uswaurpun*. The structure in a Complementizer Phrase (CP) is [CP *þamma* [...]]. More details in Harbert (2012).

The structures in (61) are unparalleled in the Greek original, where the equivalent passage has simply *khaírete hóti* ‘rejoice that’ both times. In its first occurrence, *þamma* ... *ei* is correlative, i.e. *þamma* is a determiner and *ei* a complementizer. The second occurrence is less clear: *in þamma* (< *þamma* *ei*) is supposedly either ‘in this that’ or ‘in that’, i.e. a compound complementizer. The last structure prevails when *þamma* is a verb complementizer:

(63) Gothic *þamma* as compound clausal complementizer

```
jah froþun þamma siun gasah (Lk 1: 22)
```

‘and they realized that he had seen a vision’
Although dative ʻammm- appears to be dependent on the matrix verb, which was doubtless true in pre-Gothic, ʻammei is in fact rare and the same verb ʻrahjan ‘realize’ also takes ʻatei complements. Apart from relatives like (62), ʻammei is calcified. Not all verbs that take dative case admit ʻammei. For instance, ʻalaubjan ‘believe’ takes dative NP complements but only ʻatei clauses (11x in the Gospel of John alone), never ʻammei. A few verbs must be lexically marked to trigger ʻammei. Since these verbs also admit ʻatei (some also ei) and other complement constructions, there is evidence against a productive synchronic case-driven derivation, except in relatives like (62). For at least some Goths, then, ʻatei and ʻammei were compound complementizers.

Epistemic and declarative predicates select propositional complements which allow predication of the truth or falsity of the complement, and do not assert or presuppose anything about the embedded event. They select propositions with a time frame independent of the matrix tense (but not necessarily distinct from it). Consequently, factive, epistemic (including pseudo-perception verbs), and declarative predicates (combined as REFLECTIVE verbs in Miller 2002), normally take a complement clause with ʻatei (or ei) plus the indicative:

(64) qah du imma ʻatei bropar ʻeins qam (Lk 15: 27)
    said to him that brother your came
    ‘told him that your brother came’

(65) hausidedu ʻatei qipan ist (Mt 5: 21, 27, 33, 38, 43, etc.)
    heard.2PL that said is
    ‘you heard that it is said’

3 Verbs that take ʻammei: ʻrahjan ‘realize’ (Mk 7: 18), ʻaumjan ‘see’ (Lk 17: 15, Mk 16: 4, Jn 6: 5), ʻatrauan ‘trust’ (Philip. 2: 24; 2 Timothy 1: 12), faginon ‘rejoice’ (Lk 15: 6). Verbs of this class with ʻatei: ʻatrauan (2 Corinthians 2: 3, Romans 8: 38), ʻrahjan (Jn 8: 27), ʻaumjan (Sk. VII. d 5f.).
Gothic Syntax

(66) gasaihvands jah patei in galaubeinai peihan habaida (Sk II. c 10ff.)
seeing also that in faith thrive had.3SG
‘and realizing also that he was to progress in the faith’

(67) iþ Jesus wissuh patei wildedun ina fraihnan (Jn 16: 19)
yet Jesus knew. and that wanted.3PL him question.INF
‘and yet Jesus knew that they wanted to question him’

(68) nu witum ei þu kant alla (Jn 16: 30)
now know.1PL that you know.2SG all.APL.NT
‘now we know that you know all things’

(69) galaubidedup patei ik fram guda urrann (Jn 16: 27)
believed.2PL that I from God.DSG out.ran.1SG
‘you believed that I stemmed from God’

Finite clauses with the optative are discussed in the next section.

7.10 The optative

As mentioned in §1.13, the terminology differs for this set of forms with separate present and preterit paradigms. Some scholars prefer subjunctive (e.g. Harbert 2007: 278ff.), but formally it corresponds to the IE optative. Since it conflates the functions of the IE subjunctive and optative, either term can be used. This work uses the latter.

There are dependent (subordinate) uses of the optative and independent (matrix clause) uses. Consider the former first.

Volitional complements are unrealized (inherently irrealis), and the time frame of the complement is at least partly dependent on the matrix time frame. Consequently, volitional complements in Gothic require the optative:
Verbs of the asking class do not allow a full range of tenses in the subordinate clause independent of those in the matrix clause, and also take the optative. Note the tense harmony in the following example, where both bedun and uslaubidedi are preterit but the latter has no temporal value.

(71) bedun ina ei uslaubidedi im ... galeipan (Lk 8: 32)
    asked.3PL him that allow.3SG.PRET.OPT them.DPL go-INF
    ‘they asked him that he allow them to go’

Although verbs of thinking are epistemic, there are situations in which an optative is used. In (72), the complement is unrealized / potential, and in (73) the verb actually means ‘reflect on’ and the topic of discussion is in doubt.

(72) þugkeiþ im auk ei in
    seem.3SG they.DPL for that in
    filuwaurdein seinai andhausjaindau (Mt 6: 7)
    much-word-ness their.DSG heed.3PL.OPT.PASS
    ‘for they think that in their excess verbiage they will be listened to’

(73) þagkjandans bi huarjana qeþi (Jn 13: 22)
    deliberating.NPL about whom.ASG.MASC speak.3SG.PRET.OPT
    ‘deliberating about whom he was speaking’

In fact, any epistemic verb can have its complement clause verb in the optative when unrealized or potential. In the following, the Greek original has IND ménei ‘remains’:
weis hausidedum … þatei Xristus sijai du aiwa (Jn 12: 34)
we heard.1PL that Christ be.3SG.OPT for ever
‘we heard that Christ would be for ever’

As stated by Harbert (2007: 279), the choice between indicative and optative involves the “degree of potentiality for the proposition to be(come) true.”

Complements of certain adjectives set up a potential situation or eventuality which entails a shift to the optative.

batizo ist izwis ei ik galeipau (Jn 16: 7)
better.NT is you.DPL that I go.1SG.OPT
‘it is better for you that I (eventually) go’

A negated matrix verb alters the implication and sets up a question as to the actuality of the realization, hence the optative (cf. Mossé 1956: 195):

ni hugaiþ ei qemjau … (Mt 5: 17)
NEG think.2PL that come.1SG.PRET.OPT
‘do not think that I came …’

iþ sunus mans ni habaiþ har haubiþ galagjai (Lk 9: 58)
but son man.GEN NEG has where head lay.3SG.OPT
[but the son of man does not have anywhere he may (eventually) lay his head]
‘but the son of man does not have anywhere to lay his head’

ni im wairþs ei haitaidau sunus þeins (Lk 15: 19)
NEG be.1SG worthy that call.1SG.OPT.PASS son your
‘I am not worthy that I be called your son’

In (77) the optative states a potential eventuality, which may be the bridge to use of the optative with matrix negatives in general.
In (78), the corresponding Greek text has an infinitive *klēthēnai* ‘to be called’ rather than a ‘that’ clause. Gothic can use infinitives with *wairps* (1 Cor. 16: 4; 2 Cor. 3: 5; etc.), especially when the subjects of the infinitive and the matrix verb are identical, but the negated phrase *ni im wairps* ‘I am not worthy’ followed by *ei* and the optative is a common construction (e.g. Mt 8: 8).

Indirect questions use the indicative when direct observation is at issue, even after a matrix negator:

(79) *ni witum haq qīpīp* (Jn 16: 18)
    neg  know.1pl what  say.3sg
    ‘we do not know what he is saying’

A purposive is inherently unrealized and therefore motivates the optative when the subject of the matrix clause differs from that of the subordinate clause.

(80) *ni blandai̇p izwis mīp imma,*
    neg  mix.impv.2pl you.apl.refl with  him.d

    *ei gaskamai sik* (2 Thess. 3: 14)
    that  shame.3sg.opt refl

    ‘do not mingle with him, that he may be ashamed’

Independent functions of the optative include deontic or agent-oriented modalities (obligation etc.), illocution operators of reinforcing mode (imperative, admonitive), proposition operators of subjective mode, including doubt / uncertainty, conditionality, possibility/potentiality, and boulomaic modalities, i.e. wishing (volitive / desiderative) and hoping (optative / hortative). So-called fulfillable wishes are expressed with the present optative. Those less likely of fulfillment are expressed with preterit optative.

The following examples belong to the category of true optatives. The first translates a sequence of Greek aorist 3sg imperatives, e.g. *hagiasthētō* ‘let be sanctified’. 

---

**Gothic Syntax**

---
(81) *weihna* *namo* *bein, qimai* *piudinassu* *beins*,
become.holy.3SG.OPT name your come.3SG.OPT kingdom your

\[\text{\underline{wairp}}\text{ai}\]
\[\text{\underline{wija}}\text{ beins}\] (Mt 6: 9-10)

\[\text{come.to.pass. 3SG.OPT will your}\]

‘may your name become holy, may your kingdom come,
may your will come to pass’

(82) *pta* *bagkjai* *aftra* (2 Cor. 10: 7)
DEM contemplate.3SG.OPT again

‘let him/her contemplate this again’

(83) *jabai* *has wili* *afar mis gaggan, afaikai* *sik silban* (Lk 9: 23)
if who will.3SG after me.D go.INF deny.3SG.OPT REFL self.ASG

‘if anyone will come after me, let him deny himself’

In (83), *wili* seems to express conditionality but *wiljan* has only optative forms.

To the category of reinforcing mode belong imperative substitutes, which are more polite (less abrupt) than imperatives. Comparable are Latin polite commands in the subjunctive like *(fac) scribas* ‘(do) write’.

(84) *inngaggaih* *\underline{pairh} aggwu daur* (Mt 7: 13)
in.go.2PL.OPT through narrow door

‘go in through the narrow door’

The following examples belong to the category of potentiality or eventuality (Mossé 1956: 194):

(85) *saei* *habai* *ausona hausjandona, gahausjai* (Mk 4: 9)
he-that have.3SG.OPT ears hearing heed.3SG.OPT

‘he who have hearing ears, let him listen up’
Gothic Syntax

(86) \textit{pata hua sijai patei qipib} (Jn 16: 18)
\begin{itemize}
  \item that what be.3sg.opt that say.3sg
\end{itemize}
‘what may \textit{that} be that he is saying?’

(85) is a Gothic interpretation of the Greek text which has an indicative: \textit{h\`{o}s \`{e}khe\`{i} `ota akou\`{e}in akou\'{e}t\={o} ‘who has ears to hear, let him hear’. In (86), likewise, the Gothic text differs from the Greek which has both verbs in the indicative.

Potentiality is a major function of the Gothic optative:

(87) \textit{tauja\textquotesingle ina izwis mans, swa jah jus tauja\textquotesingle ib im} (Mt 7: 12)
\begin{itemize}
  \item do.3pl.opt you.dpl men as also you do.2pl.opt they.dpl
\end{itemize}
‘let men do to you as you would do to them’

(88) \textit{jah aflet uns patei skulans sijain} (Mt 6: 12)
\begin{itemize}
  \item and forgive us that debtors be.1pl.opt
\end{itemize}
‘and forgive us that we be debtors’

This construction differs markedly from the corresponding Greek text: \textit{kai \`{a}phes h\={e}m\={o}n t\={a} opheil\textquotesingle emata h\={e}m\={o}n ‘and forgive us our transgressions’. There are several variant readings but none close to the Gothic construction.

7.11 Constituent structure in the Parable of the Sower and the Seed (§8.5)

The order Quantifier – Determiner – N is frequent (Mossé 1956: 176), e.g. \textit{alla so managei} ‘all the crowd’ but it may well be a Greek calque (= \textit{p\`{a}s ho \={o}khlos ‘id.’), especially in light of the scarce use of determiners.

Adjectives generally follow nouns, but occasionally they can precede, e.g. \textit{diupaizos air\textquotesingle pos} ‘of deep earth’, which is not a literal translation of Gk. \textit{b\={a}thos g\={e}s ‘depth of earth’, but nouns typically precede possessive (anaphoric) adjectives:
(89) \*in laiseïnai seinai \(*\(= \) en tēi didakhēi autoi\) \‘in teaching his\’

(90) fraiwa seinamma \‘with seed his’

This is not likely to be a Greek calque since the second example is not in the Greek text at all, which ends with speîrai ‘to sow’.

When used attributively, adjectives follow nouns and take strong inflection in Gothic (Mossé 1956: 169f.), e.g. air̄a goda (cf. eis tēn gēn tēn kalēn ‘onto the earth the good’). There are also rare Greek N–A calques like air̄a managa \(*\(= \) gēn pollēn\) ‘earth much’.

Participles generally follow nouns in several different constructions:

(91) akran urrinando jah wahsjando
‘fruit springing up and growing’

(92) ausona hausjandona
‘hearing ears’ (‘ears (for) hearing?’)

Example (91) could be a calque on the Greek karpōn anabaīonta kai auxanōmena ‘id.’, but (92) is not similar in any way to the Greek construction ōta akoūein ‘ears to hear’, which contains an infinitive.

Prepositional phrases are genuine Gothic syntax in containing no articles, e.g. at marein, in marein, wiþra marein, ana staþa, faur wig, in air̄a, in þaurnuns, etc. This contrasts absolutely with the corresponding Greek construction: parā tēn thalassan ‘by the sea’, en tēi thalassēi ‘on the sea’, parā tēn hodōn ‘by the road’, epi tēs gēs ‘on the earth’, etc. — all with an article.

Since nouns normally precede genitives, a rather forced construction is the partitive genitive – noun manageins filu ‘of multitude much’, a partial calque on Gk. ókhlos pleiσtōs ‘crowd most’ or ‘crowd very large’.
While it is possible that the title deeds originally from Ravenna were composed in Gothic initially, it cannot be ruled out that they were translations since they coexist with Latin versions. However, they have certain consistent properties that differ from the Biblical texts translated from Greek, as the following comparison illustrates.

### I. Title deeds (A = Arezzo, N = Naples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P–N</strong> (no articles)</td>
<td>fram mis ‘from me’ (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þairh kwatsjon ‘through (a) bond’ (N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miþ gahlaib[a]jm ‘with companions’ (N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Num–N</strong></td>
<td>fidwor unjkjane ‘four (of) uncias’ (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N–(Poss.)Adj.</strong></td>
<td>handau meinai ‘with my hand’ (N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diakona Alamoda unsaramma ‘with our deacon Alamoûps’ (N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gahlaib[a]jm unsaraim ‘with our companions’ (N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N–Gen</strong></td>
<td>wairþ þize saiwe ‘the cost of these marshlands’ (N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fidwor unjkjane hugin ‘four (of) uncias of land’ (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N–D</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D–N</strong></td>
<td>po frabauhtaboka ‘the salesdeed’ (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þize saiwe ‘of the marshlands’ (N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V–O</strong></td>
<td>andnemum skilliggans .rk. …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘we received 120 shillings’ (N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O–V</strong></td>
<td>skilliggans .rlg. andnam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘133 shillings I received’ (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O-V-IO

‘po frabauhtaboka ... gawaurhta þus ...
‘the salesdeed I prepared ...
for you ...’ (A)

II. Bible translation (S = Sower and Seed; Mt = Matthew)

P–N (no articles)
in himinam ‘in (the) heavens’ (Mt 7:21)
[en toïs ouranoïs ‘in the heavens’]
ana staina ‘on (the) stone’ (Mt 7:24)
[epi tên pétrân ‘upon the rock’]

N–Poss. Adj.
fraiwa seinamma ‘(with) his seed’ (S)
[not in Gk. text: Mk 4: 3]
waurda meina ‘my words’ (Mt 7:24)
 [= mou toïs lógoïs (of.me the words)]
razn sein ‘his house’ (Mt 7:24)
 [= autoï tên oikïân ‘of.him the house’]

N–Adj. (attributive)
akran god ‘good fruit’ (Mt 7:19)
[karpôn kalôn ‘id.’]
mahtins mikilos ‘great miracles’ (Mt 7:22)
[dunâmeis pollas ‘id.’]
mann dwalamma ‘to foolish man’ (Mt 7:26)
[andrì môrôî ‘(to) moron man’]

N–Adj. (predicative): none

N–P: none

Poss. Adj.–N: rare
peïnamma namin ‘(in) thy name’ (Mt 7:21)
[ tôi sôi onômati ‘(in) the your name’]

Adj. (attributive)–N: rare
aggwu daur ‘narrow door’ (Mt 7:13)
[tês stênes pûlês ‘the narrow door’]
diupaïzos airbõs ‘of deep earth’ (S)
[cf. bâthos gês ‘depth of earth’]

Adj. (predicative)–N
braid daur ‘broad [is] (the) door’ (Mt 7:13)
[plateïa hê pûlê ‘broad the door’]
rûms wigs ‘roomy [is] (the) way’ (Mt 7:13)
[eurûkhôros hê hodôs ‘spacious the way’]
aggwu ūta daur ‘narrow [is] the door’ (Mt
[stenê hê pûlê ‘narrow the door’ 7:14)
N–participle (attibutive)
akran urrinando ‘fruit springing up’ (S)
[karpòn anabaïnonta ‘id.’ Mk 4:8]
wulfos wilwandans ‘ravaging wolves’ (Mt 7:15)
[cf. lúkoi hárpages ‘rapacious wolves’]

Participle–N (predicative)
þraitans wigs ‘constricted [is] way’ (Mt7:14)
[tethlimmēnē hē hodōs ‘compressed [is] the way’]

N–Q
manageins filu ‘much of crowd’ (S)
[cf. ókhlos pleístos ‘crowd most’]

N–Dem
bi þamma razna jainamma (Mt 7:25)
[against the house that]
[tēi oikīai ekeinēi ‘id.’]

Other: none

N–Determiner: none

N–Gen
bi akranam ize ‘by fruits of.them’ (Mt 7:20)
[apò tõn karpõn autõn ‘from the fruits of.them’]
in wastjom lambe ‘in clothes of.lambs’ (Mt 7:15)
[en endúmasi probátōn ‘id.’]
wiljan attins meinis ‘will of my father’ (Mt 7:21)
[tò thēlēma tou patrōs mou ‘the will of the father of.me’]
in þiudangardja himine

[despite numerous Greek prompts]
‘in(to) kingdom of heavens’ (Mt 7:21)
[eis tên basileiân tôn ouranôn
‘into the kingdom of the heavens’]

**Aux–Verb:** none

**V–O:** most of the corpus

*ufkunaih ins* (Mt 7:20)
‘you (will) recognize them’
[epignôsesthe autoús ‘id.’]

**O–V–IO:** none

**V–O–IO**

*galeîko ina waira frodamma* (Mt 7:24)
‘I (will) liken him to the wise man’
[≠ homoiôthésestai andrì phronímôi
‘(he) will be compared to the wise man’]

**Verb–Aux**

*qiîpan ist* ‘is said’ (Mt 5:27) [Gk. erréthê]
gasulûp was ‘was founded’ (Mt 7:25)
[Gk. tethemêlôto PLUPF PASS 3SG]

**O–V:** rare

*mahtíns mikîlos gatawidedum*
‘great miracles we accomplished’ (Mt 7:22)
[dunámeis pollàs epoiêsamen ‘id.’]

**V1 or V2**

*ni mag bagms…ubîla gataujan* (Mt 7:18)
not can tree.NOM bad.ACC yield.INF
[ou dûnatai déndron … enegkeîn ‘id.’]
*jah qemun ahvos jah waiwoun windos* (Mt 7:27)
‘and came waters and blew winds’
[kai ðîlthon hoi potamoî kai épneusam
hoi ánemoi ‘id.’]

### 7.13 Conclusion

In all documents, prepositional phrases are native Gothic in permitting no determiners, in strong contrast to Greek, where determiners were normal in PPs. In general, articles in Gothic are rare except in the context of the weak adjective (§7.1).⁴ There is another possibility in a title deed, unless *po frâbauhtaboka* means ‘this sales document’. In Biblical passages, they are rare and possibly always have some demonstrative value (even with weak adjectives?). In any case, they invariably precede the noun.

---

⁴ Van de Velde (2009) claims that determiners did not develop before Old Dutch.
In most documents possessive adjectives follow the noun. The only exceptions are direct calques on Greek. Consistent with the normal N – Possessive Adjective order, genitives follow nouns despite countless Greek prompts for the opposite order. In fact, genitives are consistently right-branching, as in the following, for which the Greek text has the same linearization (line 3):

\[O\ diupi\(\omicron\)a\ gabeins\ handugeins\ jah\ witubnjis\ gu\(\upsilon\)s\ (Rom. 11:33)\]
\[O\ b\alpha\thetaos\ plou\(\omicron\)tou\ (kai)\ sophi\(\alpha\)s\ kai\ gn\(\omicron\)\(\omicron\\omicron\)se\(\omicron\)s\ theo\(\omicron\)u\]

‘O the profundity of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God!’

Certain preceding numerals can behave like quantifiers. Especially informative is the contrast in the later documents between \(\text{\textit{fidwor unkjane}}\) ‘four (of) uncias’ and \(\text{\textit{skilliggans}}\) ‘sixty shillings’. The partitive construction \(\text{\textit{all bagme}}\) ‘all of trees’ (GPL) is likely native, since it renders Gk. \(\text{\textit{p\=an d\=endron}}\) ‘every tree’ (NSG).

In most Biblical Gothic documents the verb precedes its direct object. OV order is more rare, especially in main clauses. A negative particle and certain other words attract the verb to second position, e.g. \(\text{\textit{ni mag bagms piu\=heigs ubila gataujan}}\) [not can tree perfect bad (fruit) yield] ‘a perfect tree cannot yield bad fruit’. For additional discussion, see Harbert (2007: 405ff.), Miller (2010: ii. 217–20).

Auxiliaries follow verbs. Periphrastic constructions like \(\text{\textit{gasuli\=p was}}\) ‘was founded’ are native Gothic and formally very different from the corresponding Greek synthetic passive formation. The major exception to auxiliary position obtains when the auxiliary is a sentence-initial host for so-called Wackernagel clitics (Wackernagel 1892; Hale 2007: ch. 9), as in the following example:

\[\text{\textit{was-up\-pan Iohannes gawasi\=ps taglam ulbanda\=us}}\ (Mk 1:6)\]
\[\text{\textit{was-and-then John dressed hair.DPL camel.GSG}}\]
\[\text{\textit{\=en \=d\=e ho l\=o\=ann\=\=e endedum\=\=e\=n tri\=k\=\=h\=a kam\=\=e\=lou}}\]

‘and at that time John wore camel’s hair clothes’
While the sequence of enclitics (\textit{uh, þan}) adjoined to \textit{was} is genuine Gothic (Ivanov 1999), the sentence as a whole can be a word-for-word calque on the Greek text (third line), in which the only differences are the definite article with the name in Greek and the accusative plural (instead of dative) of the word for ‘hair’.

Additional details and discussion of Gothic syntax and linearization can be found in Ferraresi (2005) and Harbert (2007).