

On the Alleged Functions of Word-order in Wulfilian Gothic

Giuseppe Pagliarulo
University of Bari

Theories of a functional differentiation of Gothic passive periphrases depending on their members' position are examined by contrast with the textual data. The author argues that participles normally follow copulae in such cases and divergent instances cannot be regarded as having distinct functions of their own if not as emphatic variants.

It is commonly held that the language of Wulfila's Bible follows quite closely its Greek source, giving little room for its own syntactic features. As far as word order is concerned, in particular, Wulfilian Gothic seems to represent little more than a slavish reproduction of New Testament Greek, unlike what happens, as shown by Else Ebel¹, in the language of the so-called *Skeireins*. The latter, whether a translation or an original work, shows a syntax which is much freer, from this point of view, from the authority of the Greek model and essentially comes within the SOV type; biblical quotations in the *Skeireins*, as Ebel says, show a VO basic order instead, which should be regarded as due to the influence of New Testament Greek. The strict dependence of Gothic syntax on its Greek model was already pointed out by Mai and Castiglione² and reaffirmed by Gabelentz and Loebe³. This view was later criticized by Streitberg⁴, whose thesis is resumed and further elaborated by Schröder⁵. The latter's statement, which we will stick to, can be summarized thus: Wulfila never sacrifices his adherence to the holy text to stylistic caprice, but at the same time he prefers clear expression to respecting the Greek original's purely exterior features. As Stolzenburg put it, Wulfila's

¹Ebel 1978, pp. 49-82.

²Mai / Castiglione 1819, p. XX.

³Gabelentz / Loebe, 1836, p. XXVIII.

⁴Streitberg 1891, pp. 81 sg.

⁵Schröder 1957, p. 6.

translation is generally slavish but not so slavish as to exclude recourse to Gothic idiomatic structures when necessary⁶. As for word order in Wulfilian Gothic, scholars looking for a sound field of investigation basically have to content themselves with those cases in which the necessities of translation make a direct transposition from Greek into Gothic impossible or decidedly inelegant. Among these are all Greek synthetic forms for which Wulfila lacks any exact equivalent and has to resort to periphrastic renderings.

Koppitz was one of the first to note that Gothic verbs, if present, normally keep the last position in periphrastic renderings of single Greek terms⁷. In introducing his work, however, Koppitz makes it clear that general statements regarding the position of verbs in the Gothic sentence are excluded from it, as the available textual data do not seem sufficient to allow sound conclusions to be drawn⁸. He extensively considers the places where a single Greek term is translated by a verb-noun, verb-pronoun or verb-adverb syntagm. The only case, among these, where the verb does not regularly occupy the last position is the second.

The analysis is methodically resumed by Fourquet⁹ who reaffirms, even for the periphrastic passive and for adjective-verb syntagms in general, the verb's tendency to follow the predicate, a tendency occurring with almost perfect regularity except when the verb is an imperative form¹⁰ or the periphrasis is preceded by a negative particle. In this case the predicate-verb order is kept in crystallized expressions such as J 10:13 οὐ μέλει *ni kar-ist* (note the elision). Fourquet hypothesizes that locutions with predicate-verb order are to be taken as single logical units, while locutions with verb-predicate order as a fusion of two functionally distinct elements¹¹. The general principle he follows is: *la traduction d'un mot unique a nécessairement la valeur d'une seule unité sémantique*¹².

Such an attribution of different functions to periphrases

⁶Stolzenburg 1905, p. 385.

⁷Koppitz 1900, p. 458.

⁸*Ibidem*, p. 433.

⁹Fourquet 1938, pp. 234-284.

¹⁰This had already been pointed out in Meillet 1908, p. 97.

¹¹Fourquet 1938, p. 255.

¹²*Ibidem*, p. 259.

depending on their members' position is proposed again by Ambrosini in his study on Gothic modal verbs¹³ and by Benveniste in his article about the functions of «to be» and «to have»¹⁴. Benveniste's views are later adopted by Ramat¹⁵. These scholars do not just assume that periphrases with predicate-verb order are to be read as semantic units, while periphrases with verb-predicate order are to be read as a coming together of two distinct elements. Ambrosini recognizes a «prevalence of the temporal over the modal meaning» in periphrases showing the modal verb in second position; Benveniste states that periphrases with *wisan* and a past participle have a temporal value (they are to be read as a “perfect”, in Benveniste's own words) only when the copula follows the participle: otherwise what we have is predicative syntagms.

Ambrosini, however, draws his conclusions from only five cases in which the modal verbs *haban* and *duginnan* + infinitive translate a Greek future, and this without taking into account the general behaviour of Gothic periphrases. The problem is further examined by Anna Martellotti, who notes that the modal verb *skulan* (which is never employed to translate a Greek future) appears after the infinitive it governs when the Greek text in turn postponed δεῖ or ὀφείλειν, which *skulan* translates¹⁶. *Duginnan* is similarly postponed in the only case¹⁷ in which προενάρχεσθαι, the verb it translates, is postponed in the Greek text. In all other cases the Greek text shows a modal-infinitive order and this is faithfully reproduced in Gothic. Of great significance is Mk 8:31,

δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι
 ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων
*skal sunus mans filu winnan jah uskiusan skulds ist fram þaim
 sinistam jah þaim auhumistam gudjam*

¹³Ambrosini 1965, pp. 87-101.

¹⁴Benveniste 1966, pp. 223-247.

¹⁵Ramat 1981, p. 233.

¹⁶Lk 4:43 εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ *wailamerjan ik skal bi þiudangardja gudis*; 2Thess 1:3 εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν τῷ θεῷ *awiliudon skulum guda*; 2Cor 5:10 τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ *allai weis ataugjan skuldai sijum faura stauastola Xristaus*.

¹⁷2Cor 8:10 τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν συμφέρει, οἵτινες οὐ μόνον τὸ ποιῆσαι ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θέλειν προενήρξασθε ἀπὸ πέρυσι *unte þata izwis batizo ist, juzei ni þatainei taujan, ak jah wiljan dugunnuþ af fairnin jera*.

where Wulfila, having the necessity to reintroduce *skulan* (in the locution *skulds ist*) to allow for a passive reading of the infinitive *uskiusan*, adds the modal verb after it independently of the Greek text, which makes both *παθεῖν* and *ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι* depend on the preceding *δεῖ*, translated by *skal* in the first instance; and surely there is no detectable functional difference of a temporal kind here between *skal winnan* and *uskiusan skulds ist*. Putting the Gothic modal verb after the infinitive it governs, therefore, seems to be a mechanical fact devoid of any semantic relevance¹⁸.

If such a functional distinction based on word order does not seem admissible for modal verbs, we may ask whether the position of passive auxiliaries *wisan* and *wairþan* is governed by simply mechanical principles or, as Benveniste and Ramat claim, it is indeed a sign of a distinction in meaning.

Ancient Greek has a synthetic mediopassive perfect, which is a typical feature of this language¹⁹, and a periphrastic perfect formed by juxtaposition of a perfect mediopassive participle and the present tense of εἰμί. This periphrasis is originally limited to all persons of the subjunctive and of the optative and to the third person plural indicative of consonant stems²⁰, but it is extended to all persons of the indicative in New Testament Greek²¹. The Greek mediopassive perfect indicative, in its synthetic as well as periphrastic forms, finds its most frequent rendering in the periphrasis with *wisan* and the preterite participle: we have counted 73 cases translated thus, against four cases translated by *wairþan* with a preterite participle and six cases translated by synthetic passive forms. In rendering the periphrastic perfect by means of a *wisan*-periphrasis Gothic unexceptionably follows the Greek word order:

Mt 10:26 ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον *ist gahulip*
 Mt 10:30 ἠριθμημένοι εἰσὶν *garaþana sind*
 J 6:31 ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον *ist gamelip*
 J 6:65 ἢ δεδομένον *ist atgiban*
 J 10:34 ἔστιν γεγραμμένον *ist gamelip*
 J 12:14 ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον *ist gamelip*

¹⁸Martellotti 1975, pp. 354-355.

¹⁹Watkins 1969, p. 131.

²⁰Basile 2001, p. 396.

²¹DeWitt Burton 1898, § 84.

J 16:24 ἡ πεπληρωμένη *sijai usfullida*
 J 17:23 ὧσιν τετελειωμένοι *sijaina ustauhanai*
 Rm 13:1 τεταγμένοι εἰσὶν *gasatida sind*
 2Cor 4:3 ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον *ist gahulida* (two times)
 2Cor 9:3 παρεσκευασμένοι ἦτε *gamanwidai sijaiþ*
 Eph 2:5 ἔστε σεσφωσμένοι *sijuh ganasidai*
 Eph 2:8 ἔστε σεσφωσμένοι *siuh ganasidai*.

When rendering synthetic mediopassive perfect forms, *wisan* always follows the participle, with only two exceptions out of 62 occurrences:

J 8:41 γεγεννήμεθα *sijum gabauranai*
 1Cor 7:15 οὐ δεδούλωται *nist gabriwaidis*

and in the latter the auxiliary's position seems to be conditioned by the negative particle *ni*²², so that Benveniste appears to be justified in saying that the reverse order, with «to be» preceding the adjective, designates a predicative syntagm, not a perfect: he compares *was gadraban* to its Greek model ἦν λελατομημένον²³; moreover, he compares Gothic to Latin, which, having a periphrastic passive perfect structurally similar to the Gothic *wisan* + preterite participle periphrasis, similarly puts the auxiliary before the participle when the periphrasis is a descriptive form, not a true perfect²⁴:

J 20:30-31 πολλὰ μὲν νοῦν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα
 ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν
 [αὐτοῦ], ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ
 βιβλίῳ τούτῳ· ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα
 πιστεύ[σ]ητε
*multa quidem et alia signa fecit Iesus in conspectu
 discipulorum suorum quae non sunt scripta in
 libro hoc haec autem scripta sunt ut credatis.*

Just like Ambrosini, however, Benveniste does not consider this phenomenon in the wider perspective of the behaviour of Gothic periphrases and, in general, of Gothic predicative syntagms.

If Gothic regularly follows Greek word order when

²²Fourquet 1938, p. 253.

²³The example is taken from Mk 15:46.

²⁴Benveniste 1966, p. 242.

rendering periphrases, putting the auxiliary, however, after the participle with the same regularity when translating Greek synthetic forms, we have good reason to suspect that the former fact, too, may represent a mere reproduction of Greek syntactic features – and in any case it seems highly doubtful that we are dealing with Gothic idiomatic structures here. We must remember that modal verbs show identical behaviour, as does the *wairþan*-passive. This has a predicate-verb order in no more than two renderings of synthetic Greek forms:

Mk 2:27 τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο
sabbato in mans warþ gaskarþans
 1Tm 2:14 Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη *Adam ni warþ uslutops*

and in the second case the auxiliary's position seems influenced by the negative particle *ni*. The *wairþan* + preterite participle periphrasis, unlike *wisan*-periphrases, translates almost exclusively synthetic Greek forms and thus appears almost always with a predicate-verb order. In the (rare) renderings of γίνομαι or εἰμί-periphrases it unexceptionably follows Greek word order:

J 12:42 ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται *uswaurþanai waurþeina*
 Lk 6:40 κατηρτισμένος δὲ πῶς ἔσται *gamanwids*
harjizuh wairþai
 Lk 10:21 ἐγένετο εὐδοκία *warþ galeikaiþ*
 Lk 14:12 γένηται ἀνταπόδομά σοι *wairþiþ þus usguldān*
 Mk 9:50 ἀναλον γένηται *unsaltan wairþiþ*
 1Cor 9:27 ἀδόκιμος γένομαι *uskusans wairþau*
 1Tm 2:14 ἐξαπατηθεῖσα ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν
uslutoda in missadedai warþ
 Neh 6:16 ἐγενήθη τελειωθῆναι τὸ ἔργον *warþ*
usfulliþ þata waurstw.

In like manner the *wisan*-periphrasis follows Greek word order when translating εἰμί-syntagms which cannot be classified as periphrastic perfect forms.

This is the case with the periphrastic pluperfect:

Mt 9:36 ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἔρριμμένοι *wesun*
afidawidai jah frawaurþanai
 J 12:16 ἦν γεγραμμένον *was gamelid*
 J 19:11 ἦν δεδομένον σοι *wesi þus atgiban*
 Lk 2:26 ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον *was imma gataihan*

- Lk 4:16 ἦν τεθραμμένος *was fodīps*
 Lk 4:17 ἦν γεγραμμένον *was gamelid*
 Lk 5:17 ἦσαν συνεληλυθότες *wesun gaqumanai*
 Lk 8:2 ἦσαν τεθεραπευμένοι *wesun galeikinodos*
 Lk 9:32 ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι *wesun kawridai*
 Lk 9:45 ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον *was gahulīp*
 Lk 15:24 ἀπολωλώς ἦν *fralusans was*
 Mk 1:6 ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος *wasuþ-þan*
Iohannes gawasīps
 Mk 1:33 ἐπισυνηγμένη ἦν *garunnana was*
 Mk 15:7 ἦν δὲ ὁ λεγόμενος Βαραββᾶς μετὰ τῶν
 στασιαστῶν δεδεμένος *wasuh þan sa haitana*
Barabbas miþ þaim miþ imma drobjandam
gabundans
 Mk 15:26 ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ
 ἐπιγεγραμμένη *jah was ufarmeli fairinos is*
ufarmeliþ
 Mk 15:46 ἦν λελατομημένον *was gadraban*
 Gal 2:11 κατεγνωσμένος ἦν *gatarhiþs was*

with the only exception of J 3:24 ἦν βεβλημένος *galagiþs was*, which is, however, unattested in Wulfila's Bible and known to us only by indirect tradition (*Skeireins* 3:2)²⁵.

This is also the case with εἰμί and aorist or present participles:

- Lk 4:38 ἦν συνεχομένη *was anahabaida*
 Mk 5:41 ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον *ist gaskeiriþ*
 Mk 15:22 ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον *ist gaskeiriþ*
 Mk 15:34 ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον *ist gaskeiriþ*
 Rm 7:3 εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα γενομένην *sijai*
horinondei waurþana
 1Cor 5:11 ὀνομαζόμενος ἦ *namnids sijai*
 Gal 1:22 ἦμην δὲ ἀγνοούμενος *wasuþ-þan unkuþs*
 Gal 4:24 ἐστὶν ἀλληγορούμενα *sind aljaleikodos*
 Neh 5:18 ἦν γινόμενον *was fraquman*

and with predicative syntagms or other periphrastic Greek expressions:

- J 7:49 ἐπάρατοί εἰσιν *fraqiþanai sind*
 J 9:21 ἡλικίαν ἔχει *uswahsans ist*

²⁵See Del Pezzo 1973, p. 9.

J 9:23 ἡλικίαν ἔχει *uswahsans ist*
 J 18:15 ἦν γνωστός *was kunþs*
 Mk 9:6 ἦσαν γὰρ ἔκφοβοι *wesun auk usagidai*
 1Cor 5:7 ἔστε ἄζυμοι *sijaiþ unbeistjodai*
 1Cor 10:28 ἱερόθυτόν ἐστιν *gasaliþ ist*
 1Cor 7:11 μενέτω ἄγαμος *wisan unliugaidai*
 2Cor 13:5 ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε *ungakusanai sijup*
 2Cor 13:6 ἐσμὲν ἀδόκιμοι *sijum ungakusanai*
 Col 3:20 εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν²⁶ *waila galeikaiþ ist*
 Eph 5:10 ἐστιν εὐάρεστον *sijai waila galeikaiþ*
 Phil 4:11 ἀντάρκης εἶναι *ganohiþs wisan*
 1Thess 4:9 θεοδίδακτοί ἐστε *uslaisidai sijup*
 1Tm 5:7 ἀνεπίλημπτοι ὧσιν *ungafairinodos sijaina*
 2Tm 3:17 ἄρτιος ἦ *ustauhans sijai*
 Tt 1:7 ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι *ungafairinohs wisan.*

In order to reach sound conclusions in this field it seems preferable to draw our attention to those places where Gothic is forced to show a certain autonomy from its source, translating synthetic expressions by means of predicative syntagms. A first possibility worth considering is the rendering of synthetic forms by threefold syntagms, i. e. syntagms made up of a periphrastic passive and a predicative adjective. This is the case with the passive forms of τελειόω and δικαιοώ, which are translated by threefold syntagms in three instances:

Mt 11:19 ἐδικαιώθη *uswaurhta gadomida warþ*
 Phil 3:12 τετελείωμαι *garaihts gadomiþs sijau*
 1Tm 3:16 ἐδικαιώθη *garaihts gadomiþs warþ.*

In all three cases – undeniably representing predicative syntagms – Gothic puts the adjective in the first position, followed by the customary participle-auxiliary complex. A similar behaviour is shown by twofold predicative syntagms (*wisan* or *wairþan* + predicate). When translating synthetic forms, *wairþan*-syntagms regularly put the verb in final position²⁷:

Mt 8:3 ἐκαθαρίσθη *hrain warþ*
 J 6:12 ἐνεπλήσθησαν *sadaï waurþun*

²⁶This order in Nestle-Aland 2001, p. 529, the reverse in Streitberg 2000, p. 388.

²⁷Only preterital instances are quoted as sample-cases.

J 6:26 ἐχορτάσθητε *sadai waurþuþ*
 J 12:3 ἐπληρώθη *fulls warþ*
 Lk 1:24 συνέλαβεν *inkilþo warþ*
 Lk 4:2 ἐπείνασεν *gredags warþ*
 Lk 4:28 ἐπλήσθησαν *fullai waurþun*
 Lk 5:26 ἐπλήσθησαν *fullai waurþun*
 Lk 6:11 ἐπλήσθησαν *fullai waurþun*
 Lk 8:23 ἐκινδύνευον *birekjai waurþun*
 Lk 9:17 ἐχορτάσθησαν *sadai waurþun*
 Lk 9:43 ἐξεπλήσσοντο *usfilmans þan waurþun*
 Lk 15:28 ὠργίσθη *modags warþ*
 Lk 17:15 ἰάθη *hrains warþ*
 Mk 1:22 ἐξεπλήσσοντο *usfilmans waurþun*
 Mk 1:36 κατεδίωξεν *galaistans waurþun*
 Mk 1:42 ἐκαθαρίσθη *hrains warþ*
 Mk 8:8 ἐχορτάσθησαν *sadai waurþun*
 Mk 10:32 ἐφοβοῦντο *faurhtai waurþun*
 1Cor 4:8 ἐπλούτησατε *gabigai waurþuþ*
 1Tm 1:19 ἐναυάγησαν *naqadai waurþun.*

When periphrastic expressions are translated Greek word order is again strictly followed:

Lk 2:42 ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα *warþ twalibwintrus*
 Lk 6:16 ἐγένετο προδότης *warþ galewjands*
 Lk 6:49 ἐγένετο τὸ ῥήγμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης μέγα
 warþ so uswalteins þis raznis mikila
 Lk 16:11 πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε *triggwai ni waurþuþ*
 Lk 16:12 πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε *triggwai ni waurþuþ*
 Lk 18:23 περίλυπος ἐγενήθη *gaurs warþ*
 Mk 4:22 ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον *warþ analaugn*
 Mk 6:14 φανερόν γὰρ ἐγένετο *swikunþ allis warþ*
 Mk 9:3 ἐγένετο στίλβοντα *waurþun glitmunjandeins*
 Rm 10:20 ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην *swikunþs warþ*
 1Cor 15:10 οὐ κενὴ ἐγενήθη *halka ni warþ*
 2Cor 3:7 ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ *warþ wulþag*
 2Cor 5:17 γέγονεν καινὰ *waurþun niuja*
 1Thess 2:14 μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε *galeikondans waurþuþ.*

The only noticeable exceptions to this are imperative and negative forms²⁸. Note threefold Gothic syntagms translating twofold Greek ones:

²⁸Fourquet 1938, pp. 253 sg.

J 9:2 τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ *blinds gabaurans warþ*
 J 9:20 τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη *blinds gabaurans warþ*.

Wisn shows an analogous behaviour²⁹.

A third case worth considering is that of Greek nominal clauses translated by Gothic sentences containing a participle-governing copula:

Lk 8:29 καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος *jah fotubandjom fastaiþs was*
 Rm 11:33 ὡς ἀνεξεραύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ *hwaiwa unussþilloda sind stauos is jah unbilaistidai wigos is*
 Rm 14:18 εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ καὶ δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις *waila galeikairþ guda jah gakusans ist mannam*
 Phil 3:10 συμμορφιζόμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ *mihkauriþs was dauþau is*
 Col 4:6 ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος *waurd izwar sinteino in anstai salta gasuþoþ sijai*.

Again, no difference can be found between these and other renderings of elliptical clauses by copulae with non-verbal adjectives. The only exception to this seems to be Lk 2:25 ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής *sa manna was garaihts jah gudafaurhts*. Gothic renderings not showing a predicate-copula order or not following Greek word order generally lack predicative adjectives and have a copula governing various other predicative forms. The copula may precede the predicate if the subject is a pronoun. Some examples:

J 1:29 ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ *sai, sa ist wiþrus gudis*
 J 19:5 ἴδου ὁ ἄνθρωπος *sa ist sa manna*
 Lk 8:30 τί σοι ἐστὶν ὄνομα *hwa ist namo þein*
 1Thess 5:18 τοῦτο γὰρ θέλημα θεοῦ *þata auk ist wilja gudis*
 Eph 5:17 τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου *hwa sijai wilja frauþins*
 Neh 7:2 αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ ἀληθής *sa was wair sunþeins*.

We cannot exclude that, at least in some cases, the

²⁹*Ibidem*, p. 252.

copula is put before the predicate in order to avoid ambiguities: e. g. *sa wair sunjeins was* could also mean “that man was true”, and *sa wiþrus gudis ist* could also mean “this goat is God’s”. In the last instance, *wiþrus gudis* also needs to stand undivided close to the following anaphoric *saei*.

Such a pronoun-copula attraction is perhaps also involved when Gothic has a relative clause with copula-predicate order where Greek has an attributive syntagm:

Rm 7:10 καὶ εὐρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἢ εἰς ζωὴν αὐτῆ
εἰς θάνατον *bigitana warþ mis anabusns, sei was*
du libainai, wisan du dauþau
J 9:13 τὸν ποτε τυφλὸν *þana saei was blinds*
1Tm 5:3 τὰς ὄντως χήρας *þozei bi sunjai sijaina*
widuwons.

Similarly 2Tm 1:1, Gal 5:24, 1Tm 1:11, Col 4:13, 4:16, where the copula never governs an adjective but a genitive (*Xristaus*, Gal 5:24) or one or more predicative complexes of various kinds³⁰. Here, again, the necessity to unambiguously keep two terms together is perhaps at work. It should also be noted that, as Adams has shown, copulae tend to attach themselves not to the predicate but to the relative pronoun *qui* in Latin and a similar phenomenon can be observed in Greek, which suggests a special status for the relative pronoun as a host of clitic elements in these languages³¹. This may well be the case with Gothic too.

It is clear that Wulfila normally has the copula follow the predicate, even when there is a possibility to autonomously translate a nominal clause by means of a predicative syntagm consisting of *wisan* + preterite participle: cases like Mt 11:19, Phil 3:12, 1Tm 3:16 represent independent examples, or independent models with non-verbal adjectives, of the adjective-verb order in Gothic predicative syntagms. The same holds true of the many instances of twofold syntagms translating synthetic Greek forms. If Gothic indeed shows an adjective-verb order in an almost exceptionless fashion even in autonomous predicative syntagms, the hypothesis of a double function for participial periphrases depending on their members’ position seems unjustified. In such cases as J 9:21,

³⁰Fourquet (*op. cit.*, p. 258) considers all quoted instances as emphatic.

³¹Adams 1994, p. 49.

1Cor 10:28, 1Thess 4:9, Col 3:20, on the other hand, it is impossible to discern precisely whether the periphrasis is to be read as a predicative syntagm or as a “perfect”, to use Benveniste’s words, if not by looking at the Greek text and projecting its meaning onto the Gothic translation, a method that teaches us nothing concrete about the syntactic peculiarities of Wulfila’s language. No appreciable semantic difference can be detected between the Greek εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν (Col 3:20) and ἐστιν εὐάρεστον (Eph 5:10), and there is no reason to think that the difference in word order between *waila galeikaiþ ist* and *sijai waila galeikaiþ* represents anything else than a syntactic calque. The same may be said of 2Cor 13:5 and 13:6. The strenuous regularity with which the adjective-verb order is applied in translating Greek synthetic forms also makes it unlikely that Wulfilian Gothic offers any clue about variations in word order in subordinate clauses, contrary to Ramat’s claims³².

Similarly there seem to be no grounds for Fourquet’s thesis that the adjective-verb order is typical of a semantic unit. We have seen that predicative syntagms normally follow Greek word order and keep the verb in final position when translating synthetic Greek forms, with very few exceptions in emphatic contexts and none with participles: the only contrary instance would seem to be Col 3:20, where the Gothic word order, however, finds an exact equivalence in a Greek variant that Streitberg has not adopted. The participle-copula order seems thus to be the unmarked order for periphrastic passive forms as well as predicative syntagms: the reverse order, which is never directly attested with participles, seems to have a merely emphatic value and is a stylistic variant rather than a functionally independent form. It is, therefore, consistently with Schröder’s criterion, hardly given priority over the adherence to the Greek text.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. N.
 1994 *Wackernagel’s Law and the placement of the copula esse in Classical Latin*, Cambridge.
- Ambrosini, R.
 1965 “Perifrasi gotiche con l’infinito”, *Studi e saggi linguistici* 5.

³²Ramat 1981, p. 225.

- Basile, N.
2001 *Sintassi storica del greco antico*, Bari.
- Benveniste, E.
1966 “«Etre» et «avoir» dans leurs fonctions linguistiques”, in *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, Paris; Italian ed. “«Essere» e «avere» nelle loro funzioni linguistiche”, in *Problemi di linguistica generale*, Milano 1971.
- Del Pezzo, R.
1973 “Le citazioni bibliche nella *Skeireins*”, *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 16:1.
- DeWitt Burton, E.
1898 *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, Chicago.
- Ebel, E.
1978 “Zur Folge SOV in der *Skeireins*”, *Sprachwissenschaft* 3.
- Fourquet, J.
1938 *L'ordre des éléments de la phrase en germanique ancien*, Paris.
- von der Gabelentz, H. C. / Loebe, J.
1836 *Ulfilas. Veteris et novi testamenti versionis gothicae fragmenta quae supersunt ad fidem codd. castigata, latinitate donata, adnotatione critica instructa, cum glossario et grammatica linguae gothicae conjunctis curis ediderunt*, Altenburg/Leipzig.
- Koppitz, A.
1900 “Gotische Wortstellung”, *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 32.
- Mai, A. / Castiglione, C. O.
1819 *Ulfilae partium ineditarum in Ambrosianis palimpsestis ab Angelo Maio repertarum Specimen, conjunctis curis ejusdem Maii et Caroli Octavii Castillionaei editum*, Milano.
- Martellotti, A.
1975 “Sulla presunta espressione perifrastica del futuro in gotico”, *Annali della Facoltà di Lingue e Letterature Straniere dell'Università di Bari* 6.
- Meillet, A.
1908 “Sur la place du prédicat”, *Mémoires de la société de linguistique de Paris* 15.
- Nestle, E. / Aland, K.
2001 *Novum testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart.
- Ramat, P.
1981 *Einführung in das Germanische*, Tübingen; Italian ed. *Introduzione alla linguistica germanica*, Bologna 1988.

Schröder, W.

- 1957 "Die Gliederung des gotischen Passivs", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 79.

Stolzenburg, H.

- 1905 "Die Uebersetzungstechnik des Wulfila untersucht auf Grund der Bibelfragmente des Codex Argenteus", *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 37.

Streitberg, W.

- 1891 "Perfective und imperfective Actionsart im Germanischen", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 15.
2000 *Die gotische Bibel, I. Der gotische Text und seine griechische Vorlage. Mit Einleitung, Lesarten und Quellennachweisen sowie den kleineren Denkmälern als Anhang*, Heidelberg.

Watkins, C.

- 1969 *Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion*, Heidelberg.