Gothic Possessives, Adjectives, and Other Modifiers in *-ata*

Artūras Ratkus

University of Vilnius

The paradigm of some possessive pronouns, adjectives, and some other modifiers in Gothic contains an instance of morphological variation in the neuter nominative and accusative singular, where the bare stem of the modifier alternates with the pronominally inflected form in *-ata* (for example, *jugg* versus *juggata* 'young'). In an effort to account for this morphological variation, this paper examines the evidence for the competition between the bare stem and inflected forms in *-ata* attested in the Gothic New Testament. Further, it assesses the synchronic and diachronic implications of the variation with a view to gaining a better understanding of the development of the Germanic strong modifier inflection. It demonstrates that *-ata* is a stylistically charged form observed in specific contexts and grammatical environments. From a diachronic point of view, the evidence of *-ata* sheds light on the development of the Germanic strong modifier inflection, pointing toward a lexical diffusion-type development, with the inflection of demonstrative pronouns spreading across the lexicon of modifiers through possessive pronouns and quantifiers to adjectives and participles.[*]

---

1. The Background and the Problem.

This paper examines a peculiar case of morphological variation in the strong paradigm of Gothic modifiers—including possessive, demonstrative, and indefinite pronouns, adjectives, quantifiers, and past participles—where the bare stem of the modifier competes with its pronominally inflected form in *-ata.* A distinctive property of the strong (indefinite) adjective paradigm in older Germanic is that in about half of all paradigm slots, the inflectional material of the adjective coincides with that of the demonstrative pronoun (compare Gothic neuter dative singular *god-amma* 'good' and *þ-amma* 'that'). In the rest of the adjective paradigm, the inflections are the same as in vowel-stem nouns (compare Gothic feminine nominative singular *god-a* 'good' and *gib-a* 'gift', but *so* 'that'). In Gothic strong adjectives, 13 (54%) out of 24 paradigm slots have pronominal desinences. The same is true in principle of the other older Germanic languages, though in each given language the data and distribution of pronominal inflections in the adjective paradigm are different in details (see Žirmunskij 1966:56–58 for a comparative overview of strong adjectives across older Germanic and a discussion of the principal similarities and differences).

A comparative examination of adjective morphology in older Germanic and other Indo-European languages indicates that the pattern of pronominal inflections in the strong adjective paradigm is a Germanic innovation. This new inflectional pattern follows the paradigm of the demonstrative pronoun, whereas the original inflection of adjectives was the same as that of nouns.[1] However, this traditional account of the development of the strong adjective inflection has recently been challenged by McFadden (2004, 2009), whose view is reflected in Ringe 2006:169 and Speyer 2007:73. McFadden (2004:124–125, 2009:56–58)

[1] For a discussion of the structure and history of the strong adjective class in Germanic, see Curme 1910, Hirt 1932:85–98, Prokosch 1939:259–263, 275–275, Krahe 1969:76−80, Orr 1982:105−118, and Bammesberger 1990:217−229.

hypothesizes that the strong adjective inflection was entirely pronominal in Proto-Germanic, following in every form the inflection of pronominal adjectives such as Gothic *ains* 'one', *anþar* 'other, second', *meins* 'my' and the like, which, in his view, were originally completely pronominal in their inflection. The issue of the history of the strong inflection is taken up again in section 3.6.

As noted above, a peculiar, and potentially diachronically significant, property of the strong adjective paradigm in Gothic is morphological variation in the inflection of neuter nominative and accusative singular adjectives, where the nominal bare stem competes with pronominal forms in *-ata* in the same paradigm slots: *jugg* versus *juggata* 'young'. The discussion of this variation can be traced back at least to Jacob Grimm (1822:719), who notes that the use or nonuse of *-ata* is independent of the consonant that precedes it. Grimm (1837:470) further states that, whilst it is difficult to formulate a rule for the use of the two forms, the variation cannot be explained in terms of the original Greek, and the difference must be sought partly in the nature of the adjectives and partly in their "construction." In the ensuing discussion, Grimm (1837:470–472) surveys the evidence of neuter modifiers affected by *-ata* and attempts to explain the use and nonuse of the pronominal form in terms of the syntactic environment in which given modifiers occur, with *-ata* typically being observed in attributive environments and the bare stem having a wider syntactic distribution.

In their grammar, von der Gabelentz & Loebe (1846:74, note 5) note that *-ata* and the shortened bare-stem form ("abgekürzte Form") are used interchangeably. Besides additionally speculating that adjectives with short stems or stems ending in vowels can only have the pronominal inflection (1846:75, note 2c), they do not explore the issue further. In a dedicated study of the adjective in Germanic, Meyer (1863:2f.), surveying the evidence of the bare stem and *-ata,* concludes that the quantitative preponderance of the bare stem and the absence of a clear difference in use between the bare stem and *-ata* suggests that *-ata* was simply less favored, with no deeper significance. He also points out that, with a couple of exceptions, forms in *-ata* do not occur predicatively (1863:3).

The discussion of Gothic adjective morphology by 19th-century scholars seems to have laid the ground for much of the contemporary discourse on the variation between the bare stem and *-ata,* as it has

commonly been suggested in treatments of Gothic grammar that the pronominal form in *-ata* is confined to attributive contexts (see Wright 1954:187, Mossé 1956:108, Hempel 1966:58, Mastrelli 1967:170, Krause 1968:178, Durante 1974:81, Kubrjakova 1977:309, Braune & Heidermanns 2004:115, or Rauch 2011:74).[2] Consider the following evidence:[3]

(1) a. nist   **mikil**,   jabai andbahtos
      NEG.is great.NEUT.NOM.SG if   servant.MASC.NOM.PL

      is gagaleikond   sik
      his disguise.PRS.3PL REFL.ACC.PL

      'It is no great thing if his servants disguise themselves.'
      (2 Corinthians 11:15)

   b. jah sa izwis   taikneiþ
      and he you.DAT.PL   show.PRS.3SG

      [kelikn   **mikilata**]
      upper.dining.room.NEUT.ACC.SG large.NEUT.ACC.SG

      'And he will show you a large upper dining room.'   (Mark 14:15)

In these examples, the adjective *mikils* 'great, large' is inflected in two ways. In 1a, it appears in the predicative role after a copula and has the shape of a bare stem; in 1b, it is the attribute of the noun *kelikn* 'upper

---

[2] von Kienle (1969:212) makes a curious statement in this regard: "Diese pronominalen Formen sind im Got. ausschließlich prädikativ belegt." [These pronominal forms in Gothic are attested exclusively in the predicate.] Translation throughout the article is mine.

[3] All Gothic examples are cited from the online Wulfila Project (de Herdt & van Loon 2004/2006), which utilizes Streitberg's (1919) classic edition of Gothic texts. Any comparisons with Greek are made using the Majority Text version of the New Testament by Robinson & Pierpont (2005), which represents the Byzantine text type. In a few instances, problematic examples were additionally compared against the Latin Vulgate (Weber & Gryson 1994).

dining room' and appears in a morphologically complex form with the pronominal inflection -*ata*. Thus, on the traditional account, in these slots the bare stem of the adjective seems to be in complementary distribution with the pronominal inflection, and the two forms of the adjective represent syntactically conditioned allomorphs. The choice of one allomorph over the other is governed by the syntactic environment— attributive or predicative—in which the modifier occurs.

Zinder & Stroeva (1968:83, 92) and Braune & Reiffenstein (2004:218, 220) report evidence of similar alternations in Old High German, with competing forms attested in the singular nominative case across all genders (nominal bare stem versus pronominal masculine -*ēr,* neuter -*aʒ,* femenine -*iu*), as well as the neuter singular accusative (nominal bare stem versus pronominal -*aʒ*). Braune & Reiffenstein (2004:219) suggest that there is barely any functional difference between the variants and that both the bare stem and the pronominally inflected forms are equally to be expected ("gleichberechtigt") in attributive environments; in the predicative position the nominal form is preferred, though pronominally inflected forms are also attested. According to Zinder & Stroeva 1968:96–98, the "shorter" nominal bare stem is typical in predicative positions, but it also dominates in attributive positions, so much so that there are no attestations of the "full" masculine or neuter pronominally inflected forms in *Isidor*, where the bare stem forms prevail (39 masculine and 17 neuter), and where only one of the seven feminine adjectives is pronominal, the remaining six being bare stems. In other Old High German records, the bare stem is also very common, even if not as overwhelmingly dominant (Zinder & Stroeva 1968:98).

Following the introductory discussion in the present section, defining the problem of the variation and situating it within the domain of the history of Germanic nominal morphology, section 2 presents the data on -*ata* as it is attested in Gothic and discusses the syntax of the different types of modifier with which it occurs. Set against the background of traditional views on the use and functions of -*ata*, in section 3.1 the quantitative evidence for the syntax of -*ata* and its distribution across the modifier lexicon is summed up, and the frequency effects of its use are examined against the evidence for the use of the bare stem. Building on the implications of the quantitative assessment, section 3.2 sets out to investigate the possible semantic and contextual factors at work in the alternation between the bare stem and -*ata,* followed by a discussion of

grammatical factors in section 3.3 and metrical factors in section 3.4. Based on the knowledge that the surviving Gothic documents are the work of several hands, section 3.5 investigates whether the distribution of *-ata* across the Gothic corpus can be explained in terms of the individual preferences of different scribes. Section 3.6 introduces a diachronic dimension to the results discussed in the previous sections and offers an account of the development of the Germanic strong modifier inflection. Finally, section 4 sums up the discussion, reprising the main findings, and outlines some directions for further research.

2. The Data.

2.1. Prototypical Adjectives.

A search of Snædal's (2005) *Concordance to Biblical Gothic,* which represents a full collection of Gothic biblical texts and relevant smaller fragments, has revealed that the evidence for *-ata* in adjectives and other modifiers is confined to the material of the Gothic New Testament, including the Gospels and the Epistles. No evidence of *-ata* (with the exception of the demonstrative *þata* 'that') has been found in the new Gothic fragments, recently discovered in Bologna (see Finazzi & Tornaghi 2013; Falluomini 2014, 2015:42).

There are a total of 15 prototypical adjectives in *-ata,* including single attestations of the adjectives *daufs* 'hardened' (Mark 8:17), *hauhs* 'high' (Luke 4:5), *halbs* 'half' (Luke 19:8), *manwus* 'ready' (Mark 14:15), *mikils* 'large' (Mark 14:15), *swes* 'own, belonging' (Galatians 6:9), *wairþs* 'worthy' (Luke 3:8), *wans* 'lacking, wanting' (Titus 1:5), and *weihs* 'holy' (Romans 7:12), four attestations of the adjective *juggs* 'young' (Luke 5:38, Mark 2:22, Mark 2:22, Matthew 9:17), and two attestations of the adjective *niujis* 'new' (Matthew 9:17, Luke 5:37).[4] It does not seem possible either to group these adjectives into smaller semantic sets or to find a generic semantic label for the set as a whole. As a result, the choice of *-ata* does not seem to have been influenced by any semantic considerations relating to the meaning of the adjectives.

---

[4] Jellinek (1926:131, note 1) and Kieckers (1928:154) report the figure of 14 to 15, but no list is supplied. Additionally, the adjective *leitilata* 'little' from Mark 1:19 might be appended to the list, but the form is conjectural, the actual attestation being *leita* (see note 1 in Snædal 2005:326). As a result, it has not been counted toward the total.

Besides, any such semantic argument is ruled out by the fact that forms in -*ata* are not confined to adjectives, but are also found amongst quantifiers, pronouns, and participles.

Let us consider the evidence from the syntax of the adjectives. The 15 attestations form three groups in terms of the syntactic roles the adjectives perform: attributive, predicative, and substantivized.[5] However, the analysis of some examples is rather problematic. The largest group of -*ata* forms consists of adjectives in attributive positions, with a total of 11 attestations. Here belong examples such as 1b above and 2.

(2) jah ainshun ni   giutid
    and nobody NEG pour.PRS.3SG

    [wein   **niujata**]
    wine.NEUT.ACC.SG new.NEUT.ACC.SG

    in   balgins   fairnjans
    into wineskin.MASC.ACC.PL old.MASC.ACC.PL

    'and no one pours new wine into old wineskins'   (Luke 5:37)

The adjectives *mikilata* 'large' in example 1b and *niujata* 'new' in example 2 both occur in a modifier construction with their respective nouns (as indicated by the square brackets) with which they agree morphologically, and are hence their "attributes."

Predicative adjectives (and other modifiers) in -*ata* are perhaps the most problematic group. Not only are they relatively very few in relation to -*ata* in other syntactic positions, but their syntactic reading can be debated. Consider the following:

---

[5] For want of a better term, the terms *substantivized* and *substantivization* are used here to refer to what Payne & Huddleston (2002:410–425) refer to as "fused heads." In other words, substantivized forms are the traditional (syntactically dependent) modifiers used as heads of noun phrases.

(3) unte **daubata**   habaiþ
    for   hardened.NEUT.ACC.SG have.PRS.2PL

    hairto   izwar
    heart.NEUT.ACC.SG your.NEUT.ACC.SG

    'Do you have a hardened heart?'   (Mark 8:17)

In example 3, the status of the adjective *daubata* 'hardened' is ambiguous between attributive and predicative. A comparison of the example with the Greek version shows that the syntax of the clause and the pattern of agreement between the adjective and the noun *hairto* in Gothic are the same as in Greek, with the trivial difference that the Gothic adjective *daubata* translates into Greek as the participle *pepōrōmenēn* 'having been calloused'. Thus, there is nothing that can be gained from the comparison in terms of identifying what was idiomatic in Gothic. Meyer (1863:3), recognizing the possibility of a predicative reading, concludes that there is no predicative relation involved. Judging by his German translation of the example as *Ihr habt ein verstocktes Herz (eures)* 'You have a hardened heart (your)', his reasoning seems to be based on a preferential treatment of *daubata* 'hardened' to the exclusion of the possessive pronoun *izwar* 'your', and the surface linearization of the translation suggests an attributive reading. In theory it is possible, though unverifiable, that the same reasoning was followed by the Gothic translator, even if on the surface he was constrained by the necessity of following the word order of the original.

    Alternatively, *daubata* can be interpreted as predicative. What matters here is that syntactically the adjective seems to function outside the noun phrase *hairto izwar* 'your own heart', which appears as the object of the transitive verb *habaiþ* 'you have' (compare Modern English *I have* [*my heart*] *hard*, but not *I have [*my hard heart*]). As a result, it is a secondary predicate in an object complement construction, predicating a property of the object noun phrase *hairto izwar*. Thus, although the interpretation of *daubata* in example 3 is not straightforward, the most

reasonable way to read it is as predicative, a reading also favored by Krause (1968:178) and Braune & Heidermanns (2004:115, note 2).[6]

The second example of a predicatively used *-ata* adjective reported in the literature (Jellinek 1926:131, note 1; Krause 1968:178; Braune & Heidermanns 2004:115, note 2) is attested in Romans 7:12:

(4) aþþan nu sweþauh witoþ   **weihata**
    yet   so indeed   law.NEUT.NOM.SG holy.NEUT.NOM.SG

    jah anabusns   weiha
    and commandment.FEM.NOM.SG holy.FEM.NOM.SG

    jah garaihta   jah þiuþeiga
    and just.FEM.NOM.SG and good.FEM.NOM.SG

    'Therefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy and just, and good.'   (Romans 7:12)

The adjective *weihata* 'holy' in 4 is perhaps the most unequivocal example of *-ata* in a predicative position. Similar to the few previous examples, the Gothic rendering of this sentence is an accurate word-for-word representation of its Greek original. The predicate (copula) is not overtly realized either in Greek or in Gothic, and the predicative reading of *weihata,* as well as the sequence of three other coordinated feminine adjectives, is therefore a question of interpreting the verse in light of the context of chapter 7—a reading that is in agreement with the tradition of Bible exegesis and translation.[7]

Finally, adjectives in *-ata* can appear as substantivized, with a total of two attestations in this role: *halbs* 'half' (Luke 19:8) and *wans* 'lacking, wanting' (Titus 1:5):

---

[6] Jellinek (1926:131, note 1) refers to the adjective as a "predicative attribute" but makes no further comment. For a discussion of the syntax of *daubata*, see Andrason 2010:5–6.

[7] An anonymous reviewer points out that the Latin Vulgate clearly reads the adjective as predicative, as suggested by the sentential adverb it inserts: *Itaque lex **quidem** sancta* 'Therefore the law is **indeed** holy'.

(5) a. sai,   **halbata**   aiginis   meinis,
      INTRJ half.NEUT.ACC.SG property.NEUT.GEN.SG my.NEUT.GEN.SG

      frauja,   gadailja   unledaim
      lord.MASC.NOM.SG distribute.PRS.1SG poor.DAT.PL

      'Behold, Lord! I shall distribute half of my possessions to the poor.'   (Luke 19:8)

  b. in   þize   ei   **wanata**
      PREP REL.NEUT.GEN.SG PTL lacking.NEUT.ACC.SG

      atgaraihtjais
      set.in.order.OPT.PRS.2SG

      'that you should set in order the things that are wanting'
                                                          (Titus 1:5)

In the examples in 5, the adjectives *halbata* 'half' and *wanata* 'lacking, wanting' rather than modifying nouns, act as heads of noun phrases in their own right. In both cases, the substantivized adjectives appear as direct objects of transitive verbs. As the use of these substantivizations is not warranted by the previous context (that is, the reference of the adjectives is not anaphoric), they are to be considered as substantivized adjectives proper and discussed as a separate class, rather than merely a subclass of attributive *-ata* adjectives.

2.2. Quantifiers.
The only quantifier that has pronominal *-ata* forms is *alls* 'all', with a total of 38 examples: Mark 3:28, 10:27, 1 Corinthians 14:26, 2 Corinthians 4:15, 1 Corinthians 16:14, Luke 14:17, Matthew 5:29, 5:30, 6:22, 6:23, Mark 9:23, John 10:41, Mark 4:11, Matthew 5:18, Mark 13:23, Luke 2:39, 2 Corinthians 6:10, 1 Corinthians 10:31, Philippians 3:8, Luke 18:21, 1 Corinthians 13:7, Mark 7:37, Romans 14:2, 2 Corinthians 7:14, John 14:26, Luke 18:28, Mark 4:34, Ephesians 4:10, Mark 6:30, Luke 4:6, 5:11, 1 Corinthians 11:2, Mark 16:20, Luke 15:13, John 15:21, Ephesians 6:21, Mark 11:24, 1 Corinthians 13:7. In fact, the corpus of this quantifier has the greatest number of *-ata* forms of any

modifier. For reasons of descriptive accuracy, it has been treated apart from other modifiers, as quantifiers tend to display strong pronominal properties and may thus contribute to a biased descriptive picture of the data by exaggerating the figures for a given class of examples.

Perhaps the most apparent finding in the *allata* corpus is the high incidence of substantivized forms in relation to attributive ones, as they make up as many as 30 instances out of the 38; there are no predicative examples. Consider the following:

(6) a. **allata**   auk mahteig   ist
　　 all.NEUT.NOM.SG for possible.NEUT.NOM.SG be.PRS.3SG

　　 fram guda
　　 from God.MASC.DAT.SG

　　 'For with God all is possible.'   (Mark 10:27)

　　b. sums   raihtis galaubeiþ
　　 certain.one.MASC.NOM.SG namely believe.PRS.3SG

　　 matjan **allata**
　　 eat.INF all.NEUT.ACC.SG

　　 'For one believes that he may eat anything.'   (Romans 14:2)

The above examples illustrate the quantifier *allata* 'all' appearing as a head noun*,* albeit in different syntactic environments. In 6a, it acts as the subject of a clause, and in 6b, it performs the role of the object of a transitive verb. In the overwhelming majority of cases, the analysis of the data presents no difficulty; in a few instances, however, the reading of the examples is rather less straightforward. In particular, this applies to cases where the noun phrase is made up of a quantifier and a definite determiner. For the purposes of the present discussion, the important question concerns the syntactic status of the quantifier in relation to the determiner. Consider Mark 3:28:

(7) [**allata**   afletada   þata]
    all.NEUT.NOM.SG forgive.PRS.PASS.3SG that.NEUT.NOM.SG

    frawaurhte   sunum   manne
    sin.FEM.GEN.PL son.MASC.DAT.PL man.MASC.GEN.PL

    jah   naiteinos
    and   blasphemy.FEM.NOM.PL

    'all of the sins will be forgiven to the sons of men, and blasphemies'
                                          (Mark 3:28)

In 7, the quantifier *allata* and the demonstrative determiner *þata,* both of which agree morphologically, appear in the subject slot of the clause. Now consider Mark 3:28 in the original Greek:

(8) [**panta**   aphethēsetai
    all.NEUT.NOM.PL pardon.FUT.PASS.3SG

    ta   hamartēmata]
    the.NEUT.NOM.PL act.of.sin.NEUT.NOM.PL

    tois   huiois
    the.MASC.DAT.PL son.MASC.DAT.PL

    tōn   anthrōpōn   kai blasphēmiai
    the.MASC.GEN.PL human.MASC.GEN.PL and blasphemy.FEM.NOM.PL

    'all the sins will be forgiven to the sons of men, and blasphemies'
                                           (Mark 3:28)

As is evident from the pattern of morphological agreement between the quantifier *panta* 'all', the determiner *ta* 'the', and the noun *hamartēmata* 'mistakes, acts of sin', here the quantifier is attributive, and the noun *hamartēmata* is the head of the noun phrase.[8] In Gothic, however, this

---

[8] This analysis advocates what appears to be the most natural syntactic reading of the Greek as recorded in the Byzantine (Majority Text) version of the New

noun appears as a partitive genitive adjunct, and with the complicating factor of the neuter gender obscuring the reference of the subject, either constituent—the quantifier or the determiner—might in principle be argued to be the head. Similar problems of analysis arise with respect to the phrase *þata allata* 'that all' in Luke 18:21 and John 15:21. The solution adopted here follows the approach of Payne & Huddleston 2002:356, 373–376, developed for modern English, according to which the quantifier *allata* is to be understood as a modifier in a fused-head construction, or in other words, the attribute of a "substantivized" determiner acting as the head of a noun phrase. As a result, the attestations of *allata* in Mark 3:28, Luke 18:21, and John 15:21 are regarded here as modifiers used attributively.

The remaining eight examples in the *allata* corpus are used attributively, as illustrated in 9.

(9) jabai nu   augo   þein
    if   now   eye.NEUT.NOM.SG your.NEUT.NOM.SG

    ainfalþ   ist
    onefold.NEUT.NOM.SG be.PRS.3SG

    [**allata**   leik   þein]
     all.NEUT.NOM.SG body.NEUT.NOM.SG your.NEUT.NOM.SG

    liuhadein   wairþiþ
    bright.NEUT.NOM.SG become.PRS.3SG

    'If therefore your eye is single, your whole body will become bright.'
                                           (Matthew 6:22)

Testament. The different arrangement of constituents in the Alexandrian text (Nestle et al. 2001:97) may warrant a different interpretation: *panta aphethēsetai tois huiois tōn anthrōpōn ta hamartēmata kai hai blasphēmiai* 'all will be forgiven to the sons of men: the sins and the blasphemies'. In particular, in this example *panta* 'all' may be seen to form an apposition with the sequence *ta hamartēmata kai hai blasphēmiai* 'the sins and the blasphemies'.

The discussion of *alls* inevitably invites the question of whether the relatively high incidence of -*ata* forms of the quantifier was a consequence of the neuter nominative/accusative plural quantifier *panta* (or emphatic *hapanta*) 'all' being used in the original Greek; more specifically, whether the desinence of the Greek *panta* triggered the use of -*ata* on *alls* in Gothic. The evidence indicates that the Gothic *allata* translates the Greek *panta* (*hapanta*) in the majority, or 31 (82%), of the 38 attestations. The remaining seven (18%) instances of *allata* have four different Greek sources: the neuter nominative singular adjective *holon* 'whole' (Matthew 5:29, 5:30, 6:22, 6:23), the feminine accusative singular adjective *hapasan* 'every, all' (Luke 4:6), the adverb *pantachou* 'everywhere' (Mark 16:20), and a syntactic gap in Philippians 3:8, where Gothic innovates the quantifier, unattested either in Greek or in Latin. What is perhaps even more important is that there are a number of instances where the use of *panta* in Greek does not trigger *allata* in Gothic, the short form *all* being used instead (for example, John 16:15, Luke 4:13, 2 Corinthians 12:19, Luke 10:22, Philippians 4:7, Matthew 6:32, Colossians 3:20, 1 Thessalonians 5:21, John 15:15, etc.). The wide distribution of these examples across the Gothic corpus rules out any scribal preferences (see discussion in section 3.5), nor is there anything peculiar about the grammatical circumstances of these examples that would make them different from those where *panta* is translated as *allata*. Therefore, because the Gothic *allata* cannot be traced to the Greek *panta* to the exclusion of other forms and because *panta* does not translate into *allata* to the exclusion of *all,* a case for regular dependence between the Greek *panta* and the Gothic *allata* may not be posited with confidence. However, in view of the quantitative evidence, it is possible that the -*ta* of *panta* was a contributing perceptual factor in the high incidence of *allata*. Finally, it is noteworthy that the figures of syntactic distribution are equally compelling: 30 (79%) of the 38 attestations of *allata* are substantivized, which may have been the chief motivation behind the use of this pronominally inflected form (see section 3.1 for a more detailed discussion of quantitative evidence).

2.3. Other Attestations.
In addition to prototypical adjectives and the quantifier *alls,* the pronominal desinence -*ata* is attested four times with the demonstrative pronouns *jains* 'that' (Luke 15:14) and *swaleiks* 'such' (Mark 7:13, 7:8,

Matthew 9:8), 16 times with the possessive and indefinite pronouns *meins* 'my' (John 6:55, 1 Corinthians 9:1, John 7:8, Luke 7:46), *seins* 'his' (Luke 9:51, 15:13), *þeins* 'your, thy' (John 17:17, 17:6, Luke 5:24, Mark 2:9, John 17:26, 17:14, 17:6, 12:28), and *sums* 'some, a certain one' (Romans 11:25, 2 Corinthians 1:14), and once with the numeral/indefinite pronoun *ains* 'one, alone' (John 12:24).

The dominant group here is 16 attributive attestations, including all of the possessive pronouns, as well as two *-ata* forms in the demonstrative pronouns. Examples 10a and 10b illustrate the attributive use of a demonstrative and a possessive pronoun, respectively, albeit in different positions with respect to the head nouns they modify.

(10) a. warþ   huhrus   abrs
       happen.PST.3SG famine.MASC.NOM.SG great.MASC.NOM.SG

       and   [gawi   **jainata**]
       through   country.NEUT.ACC.SG   that.NEUT.ACC.SG

       'there arose a great famine in that country'   (Luke 15:14)

    b. unte [**meinata**   mel]   ni
       for   my.NEUT.NOM.SG   time.NEUT.NOM.SG   NEG

       nauh usfulliþ   ist
       yet   fulfil.PST.PTCP.NEUT.NOM.SG be.PRS.3SG

       'for my time has not yet fully come'[9]   (John 7:8)

There are four attestations of the substantivized use of indefinite and demonstrative *-ata* pronouns, two of which are illustrated in 11.

---

[9] An anonymous reviewer notes that the Greek original of this example is unusual in that it contains a possessive pronoun (*ho **emos** kairos* lit. 'the my season/time') rather than the usual genitive clitic (**ho kairos **mou*** lit. 'the season/time my').

(11) a. swaswe gakunnaideduþ   uns   bi **sumata**
 as   get.to.know.PST.2PL we.ACC by some.NEUT.ACC.SG

   'as you have understood us in part'   (2 Corinthians 1:14)

   b. jah anþar   galeik
    and other.NEUT.ACC.SG similar.NEUT.ACC.SG

   swaleikata   manag   taujiþ
    such.NEUT.ACC.SG many.NEUT.ACC.SG do.PRS.2PL

   'and many other such things you do'   (Mark 7:8)

Although the reading of *sumata* 'some' as a substantivized form in 11a is straightforward, the status of *swaleikata* 'such' in 11b, also attested in the same formula in Mark 7:13, is less clear. Because the noun phrase in 11b represents a string of four modifiers, all of which agree morphologically, it is unclear which one is to be regarded as the substantivized head. Semantically, the most likely candidates are the adjective *galeik* 'similar' and the demonstrative *swaleikata* 'such'. The former is, however, typically attested in predicative use, and the latter is commonly observed to head noun phrases. As a result, *swaleikata* is assumed to be a substantivized form acting as the head of the noun phrase.

 The only attestation of the numeral *ains* 'one' with the *-ata* inflection in John 12:24, illustrated in example 12, merits a separate discussion.

(12) nibai   kaurno   ƕaiteis
    unless grain.NEUT.NOM.SG wheat.MASC.GEN.SG

   gadriusando   in airþa   gaswiltiþ
   fall.PRS.PTCP.NEUT.NOM.SG to earth.FEM.ACC.SG die.PRS.3SG

   silbo   **ainata**   aflifniþ
   (it)self.NEUT.NOM.SG one.NEUT.NOM.SG   remain.PRS.3SG

   'unless a grain of wheat dies having fallen into the ground, it remains solitary'   (John 12:24)

Here the simplest and most obvious way to analyze the form *ainata* is as a predicative adjective that predicates a property of the subject *silbo* 'self' through the copular verb *aflifniþ* 'remains', thereby adding another scarce predicative *-ata* form to the corpus. However, in theory at least, the positioning of the constituents of the clause also makes it syntactically ambiguous, as it is possible to read *silbo ainata* as a single constituent in the clause, followed by an intransitive verb, where the meaning of the head *silbo* is restricted by the quantifier *ainata*: [[It alone] remains]. The original Greek is of little help here, as in Greek the clause *autos monos menei* 'It alone remains' is also ambiguous: *monos* 'alone' may be similarly argued to restrict the meaning of *autos* 'he'. However, the ambiguity may be resolved by the context of the situation: The focus is on the contrast between the grain being left on its own (fruitless) if it does not die, as opposed to the multiple fruit it will produce if it dies, but not on the ability of the grain to survive to the exclusion of others. As a result, the most reasonable way to interpret *ainata* in Gothic is as an adjective in predicative use.

In addition to adjectives, quantifiers, and pronouns, *-ata* forms are also attested amongst past participles. Jellinek (1926:131, note 131) points out two instances of *-ata* past participles: *uskijanata* (infinitival form *uskeinan* 'to spring up, to grow up') in Luke 8:6 and *wagidata* (infinitival form *wagjan* 'to move, to shake') in Matthew 11:7.[10] An additional search of Snædal's (2005) *Concordance* suggests that the two are, in fact, the only attested instances of participles in *-ata*. Jellinek (1926:131, note 1) labels *uskijanata* as a "predicative attribute," but offers no further discussion; no mention is made of the syntactic function of *wagidata*. Consider Luke 8:6:

---

[10] For a discussion of the morphology of *uskijanata* in Luke 8:6 versus *uskeinoda* in Luke 8:8, see Sturtevant 1945:373.

(13) jah anþar   gadraus   ana staina
    and other.NEUT.NOM.SG fall.PST.3SG on   stone.MASC.DAT.SG

    jah **uskijanata**   gaþaursnoda
    and sprout.PST.PTCP.NEUT.NOM.SG wither.PST.3SG

    'And another fell on a rock and, as soon as it sprouted, it withered.'
                                            (Luke 8:6)

In this example, the neuter subject *anþar* 'other' is an anaphoric substantivized quantifier that refers to the neuter noun *fraiw* 'seed' from the previous context in Luke 8:5 (*urrann saiands du saian fraiwa seinamma* 'A sower went out to sow his seed.') and has two predicates: *gadraus* 'fell' and *gaþaursnoda* 'withered'. The participle *uskijanata* replicates the morphosyntactic features of the subject whilst expressing a secondary predication. Thus, this participle is, in fact, predicative and forms a nonfinite clause. In theory, it may also be possible to interpret *uskijanata* as a substantivized participle acting as the subject of the verb that follows. In practice, however, the context of the sentence, coupled with the tradition of interpreting this verse as reflected in the history of Bible translation, speaks to the predicative reading. Now consider Matthew 11:7:

(14) ƕa   usiddjeduþ   ana auþida
    what.NEUT.ACC.SG go.out.PST.2PL to   wilderness.FEM.ACC.SG

    saiƕan? [raus   fram winda
    see.INF   reed.NEUT.ACC.SG by   wind.MASC.DAT.SG

    wagidata]
    shake.PST.PTCP.NEUT.ACC.SG

    'What did you go out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken by the wind?'
                                          (Matthew 11:7)

The bracketed phrase in example 14 is the object of the transitive verb *saiƕan* 'to see' in the previous interrogative clause—hence the use of the accusative case. The participle *wagidata* 'shaken' is functionally similar

to a relative clause in that both can be equivalent noun modifiers. On the surface, however, it appears in a modifier construction with the noun *raus* 'reed', with which it shares its morphosyntactic properties. It seems, then, that the simplest way to interpret the syntactic function of the participle *wagidata* is as a postnominal attribute to the subject *raus*.

Lastly, my material contains three attestations of neuter forms in -*atoh,* the ending representing a merger of the desinence -*ata* with the enclitic particle -*uh*.[11] The forms appear in the indefinite pronouns *ainƕarjizuh* 'everyone, each' (neuter accusative *ainƕarjatoh* in Mark 9:49) and *ƕarjizuh* 'each, every' (neuter nominative *ƕarjatoh* in Mark 9:49 and Skeireins 6:2). The three instances exhaust the attestation of these pronouns in the neuter, with no attested short (nonpronominal) variants. It is likely that, similar to the prototype demonstrative *þata* or the demonstrative *hita* 'this, that' (combining the pronominal stem *hi-* and -*ata*) and some others, the neuter forms of these pronouns were pronominal at all times and were not subject to variation. As a result, these attestations have not been counted toward the total of forms in -*ata*.

3. Discussion.
3.1. Quantitative Evidence and Methodological Issues.
The above discussion of the data of attested -*ata* forms in Gothic draws on a corpus of 76 examples across several word classes, including prototypical adjectives, the quantifier *alls,* demonstrative, possessive, and indefinite pronouns, a numeral and two past participles. Thus, the competition of the bare stem with the pronominal -*ata* form in the neuter nominative and accusative singular does not merely apply to adjectives, but in fact affects all types of modifier capable of taking the strong inflection. Table 1 contains a summary of the basic findings.

---

[11] See Streitberg 1974:266, note 1 on -*atoh,* where -*oh* < ⁺-*ōnƕe*.

	Attributive	Substantivized	Predicative	Total
Adjectives	11	2	2	15
Quantifier *alls*	8	30	–	38
Other — Demonstr. pronouns	2	2	–	4
Other — Possessive pronouns	14	–	–	14
Other — Indefinite pr. *sums*	–	2	–	2
Other — Numeral *ains*	–	–	1	1
Other — Participles	1	–	1	2
Other Total				23
Total	36	36	4	76

Table 1. Syntactic functions and quantitative distribution
of -*ata* forms in Gothic.

The figures in table 1 generalize upon two dimensions in the use of -*ata:* distribution across the affected word classes and distribution across different syntactic environments. The data reported in the table indicate that, although a fair share (20%) of the total of -*ata* forms are attested amongst adjectives, the bulk (76%) is found amongst the quantifier *alls* 'all'—a word that displays strong pronominal properties—and possessive, demonstrative, and indefinite pronouns.

At the same time, -*ata* forms are not the defining property of attributive modifiers to the exclusion of others: The evidence indicates that they are just as likely to become substantivized, the split being equal between 36 (47%) attributive and 36 (47%) substantivized forms. In addition, there are four attestations of what look like predicative -*ata* forms. It was suggested in the discussion of the data above that some examples—especially the predicative ones—may be analyzed as ambiguous. However, if the data are taken at face value, with the simplest and most obvious analyses assumed as correct, one must conclude that the attested -*ata* forms across all three syntactic environments suggest that they are not dependent on syntax and do not represent any syntactically conditioned allomorphy. Nor can they be predictably associated with attribution or substantivization in the sense

that the default form in these environments is the bare stem. So, if grammatical regularity is to be understood as the existence of a motivated and predictable pattern, it must be concluded that the appearance of *-ata* on modifiers is syntactically unpredictable and therefore irregular, even if there is a tendency for the inflection to appear more often in some environments than others.

So far the discussion has been centered on *-ata* forms alone. However, an informed appreciation of whether or not the forms under analysis are motivated semantically or functionally is impossible without comparing them against bare (nonpronominal) neuter forms in the same paradigm slots. However, this is where the matter gets complicated, as it is not readily apparent what methodological principles should define data selection, and consequently, what items constitute valid material for analysis. Let us consider the implications of the discussion of *-ata* as given in Wright 1954.

With regard to superlatives, Wright (1954:114) states that "the neut. nom. acc. sing in **-ata** does not occur, and perhaps was not in use." Regarding the ordinal numeral *anþar* 'second, other', he says that, while it is declined as strong, "the nom. acc. neut. never ends in **-ata**" (1954:117). Further, regarding possessive pronouns, it is noted that "the possessive pronouns are declined according to the strong declension" but that "the possessive pronouns ending in **-ar** do not have the form in **-ata** in the nom. acc. sing. neut." (1954:123–124).[12] The demonstrative pronoun *jains* 'that, yon' is said to follow the declension of *blinds* 'blind', a typical strong *a*-stem adjective, but its "nom. acc. sing. neut. is always **jáinata**" (1954:127). Lastly, the interrogative pronoun *ƕarjis* 'which (out of many)' follows the inflection of *midjis* 'middle', a typical strong *ja*-stem adjective, "except that the neut. nom. sing. always ends in **-ata**" (1954:129). The above can be restated in terms of the following three generalizations.

First, a grammatical category—the superlative—is exempted from the use of *-ata*. Second, some lexical items do not feature *-ata*. It is not clear whether this means that the inflection is simply not attested in such cases or that they are immune to it. However, if *-ar* is understood as a blocking factor, the latter is correct, and *-ar* should account for the

---

[12] See also Streitberg 1920:124, note 1, Sturtevant 1947:92, and Zadorožnyj 1960:189–190 for the same view.

absence of *-ata* not only in the possessive pronouns *unsar* 'our' and *izwar* 'your', but also in the numeral *anþar* 'second, other'. Third, with some lexical items *-ata* is obligatory. What follows from this is that any items or classes of items that are inflected as strong adjectives but are resistant to *-ata* should not feature in the corpus of neuter forms because their inclusion would obscure the quantitative assessment of the alternation of bare-stem forms and *-ata*. However, how much of Wright's discussion is actually foolproof?

There are a total of 18 attestations of superlative neuter forms in the nominative and accusative singular, including 14 attestations of the superlative adjective *frumists* 'first, foremost' and one of the superlative adjective *aftumists* 'last, aftermost', two superlative forms of the adjective *mikils* 'great', and one of the quantifier/adjective *leitils* 'little'. There are no attestations of *-ata* amongst the superlatives. Streitberg (1920:131, §189, note 1) suggests that the nonexistence of *-ata* in the superlative is due to the avoidance of the cluster **-tata*. However, as noted by Sturtevant (1947:92, note 4), the attested superlatives are used adverbially and therefore resist the attributive adjectival inflection. It must be pointed out that this proposal is based on an a priori assumption that *-ata* is inherently attributive—a notion that is in conflict with the evidence of substantivized and predicative use, as detailed above (see also section 3.3 for an explanation of the paucity of *-ata* in predicative environments). Although it is true that most of the 18 examples of superlatives, including all 14 instances of *frumist* 'first', are used adverbially, it is more important that there is not a single attributive instance of a superlative neuter nominative or accusative singular form.[13] Thus, there simply is no evidence upon which to conclude that the superlative as a category applicable to the adjective in every syntactic environment can be exempted from the pattern of alternations between the bare stem and *-ata*. In any case, 18 attestations of superlative

---

[13] The superlatives *minnist* 'smallest' in Mark 4:31 and *maist* 'greatest' in Mark 4:32 are unambiguously predicative; *maist* 'most' in 1 Corinthians 14:27 is used adverbially. The adjective *aftumist* 'last' in Mark 5:23 is probably also adverbial, as it translates the Greek adverb *eschatōs* 'last'. However, a substantivized reading is also conceivable because in Gothic the adjective *aftumist* may be understood as the accusative object of the transitive verb *habaiþ* 'has' that follows: *aftumist habaiþ* lit. 'is having (her) last (=is at the point of death)'.

adjectives, of which most are used adverbially and 14 are concentrated in one lexical item (*frumist* 'first'), would be insufficient even to suggest a tendency.

The same can be said in principle about *anþar* 'second, other', *unsar* 'our', and *izwar* 'your': The neuter forms of all three pronouns are relatively well attested in the nominative and accusative singular (20, 11, and 20 times, respectively), but -*ata* simply does not occur with them. In the case of *unsar* and *izwar*, a tendency may be inferred, as the two pronouns may be seen to form a morphological set that is unaffected by -*ata*, as different from *meins* 'my', *þeins* 'your', and *seins* 'his', in which -*ata* is well documented. *Anþar* might then be thought to resist -*ata* because of its desinence, by analogy with *unsar* and *izwar*. Of course, the hypothesis regarding -*ar* possessives is unverifiable, as it is possible that the nonoccurrence of -*ata* in all the attested examples of either word is due to sheer chance. However, if viewed in terms of relative likelihood dictated by the figures of attestation, it is plausible.[14]

The situation with the demonstrative *jains* 'that' and the interrogative *ƕarjis* 'which (out of many)' is even more problematic. There happens to be only one attestation of *jains* in the neuter accusative singular, there being no attestations in the nominative. Thus, no obligatory rule for the use of -*ata* can be inferred from the hapax accusative form *jainata*. The interrogative pronoun *ƕarjis* is not attested either in the neuter nominative or accusative, and Wright's (1954:129) assertion that its neuter nominative singular form always ends in -*ata* is therefore counterfactual. It is possible that Wright was mistakenly referring to the indefinite pronoun *ƕarjizuh* 'each, every', with only two attestations of neuter forms in the nominative (*ƕarjatoh*) and none in the accusative, as well as the hapax accusative form *ainƕarjatoh* 'everyone, each'

---

[14] Sturtevant's (1947:93) attempt to explain the absence of -*ata* amongst the possessives in -*ar* by appealing to the analogy of syncretism that defines the nominative singular in the masculine and neuter genders of these pronouns is lacking in substance. D. Gary Miller (personal communication) offers a more compelling explanation, namely, that the absence of -*ata* amongst forms in -*ar* may be due to rhythmic reasons. In particular, the difficulty in parsing forms like [+]*unsarata,* which represents a combination of either a dactylic foot and a defective monomoraic foot, or a trochaic foot and a dibrach, points to a violation of metrical foot structure. It is due to this circumstance that modifiers in -*ar* avoid augmentation with -*ata*. See section 3.4 on metrical conditioning factors.

(nominative *ainƕarjizuh*). As suggested above, these forms represent concretions of *-ata* and the enclitic *-uh,* and as such are not valid evidence of the alternation between the bare stem and *-ata.* In sum, then, the only verifiable generalization that can be gleaned from the Gothic evidence is that there are no attestations of *-ata* in the superlative; it is also probable that forms in *-ar* were incompatible with *-ata.* However, how does this relate to the problems involved in data selection?

Any discussion of *-ata* is normally predicated on the assumption that it is an exponent of the strong inflection, which is the system of inflection that encompasses adjectives in the positive and superlative degrees, some quantifiers, pronouns, etc. Surely then, in the interests of a full and consistent description, any item whose paradigm is affected by the strong inflection, including superlatives, the pronouns *anþar* 'second, other', *unsar* 'our', *izwar* 'your', and similar, should be unconditionally admitted into the corpus of data irrespective of whether or not they contain *-ata* in their attestation. However, this is where the question arises as to whether such a holistic approach is reasonable, because the existence of *anþar*, *unsar,* and *izwar* hints at the possibility that the (non)use of *-ata* may have been lexically or morphologically conditioned. Consider again Mark 14:15, illustrated in 1b above, and repeated here with more context:

(15) jah sa   izwis   taikneiþ
     and he.NOM you.DAT.PL show.PRS.3SG

    [kelikn   **mikilata,**
     upper.dining.room.NEUT.ACC.SG large.NEUT.ACC.SG

    gastrawiþ,   **manwjata**]
    furnish.PST.PTCP.NEUT.ACC.SG ready.NEUT.ACC.SG

    'And he will show you a large upper dining room, furnished and prepared.'   (Mark 14:15)

In this example, the head noun *kelikn* 'upper dining room' in the bracketed noun phrase is modified by a string of three attributes with the same morphosyntactic properties, including two adjectives and one past participle. It is surprising that the past participle *gastrawiþ* 'furnished',

surrounded by two adjectives in -*ata* with which it appears in the same environment*,* is a bare stem. The only possible explanations for this usage are that *gastrawiþ* was either simply incompatible with -*ata* (that is, was lexically conditioned not to be affected by the pronominal inflection), or perhaps -*ata* was in complementary distribution with the prefix *ga-* (though the prefix *us-* in the past participle *uskijanata* 'sprung up' does not prevent -*ata* from being used). Thus, example 15 suggests that lexical conditioning may be a factor to keep in mind in the assessment of the data.

In other words, it would probably be safe to assume that, because the interrogative pronoun *ƕas* 'who', documented only in the singular and inflected as a strong adjective, contains no -*ata* in its corpus of 174 neuter nominative and accusative singular attestations, it was lexically conditioned not to be augmented with -*ata* and could only appear as the bare stem *ƕa* in these paradigm slots. As a result, the absence of -*ata* in the neuter of *ƕas* is perhaps not an attestation gap, and the pronoun is irrelevant for the discussion of the alternation between the bare stem and -*ata*. In contrast, if the 174 instances of *ƕa* were to be counted toward the total number of neuter pronoun forms, it would have a serious impact on the quantitative assessment of the relative incidence of -*ata* in pronouns. It must also be pointed out that assuming the possibility of lexical or morphological conditioning is problematic for the treatment of adjectives, as the majority of attested adjectives in the neuter nominative and accusative singular are either hapax forms or are very poorly documented, making it impossible to judge whether the nonuse of -*ata* with them is motivated by any conditioning factors.

At the other extreme, it may be seen as "safer" to consider only the neuter forms of those items that contain -*ata* in their attestation. This, however, would be equally misguided methodologically: Given the very limited nature of the Gothic corpus, such an approach would at best generalize on the incidence of -*ata* within the attestation of individual lexemes, or small groups of lexemes, which would result in nonsensical or seriously distorted relative quantity values. For example, on this approach, the incidence of occurrence of -*ata* in participles would be 67%, where the percentage generalizes on the two attestations of -*ata* amongst three eligible tokens, but says nothing about the incidence of -*ata* in participles as a lexical class. This approach is therefore outright unacceptable.

Thus, there appears to be no single correct guiding principle for collecting data. As a result, in an effort to produce as accurate a description as possible given the nature and scope of the Gothic evidence, several practical decisions had to be made in assessing the suitability of data for quantitative analysis. The corpus of nominative and accusative neuter forms of adjectives and quantifiers only includes items in the positive degree; the superlatives were disqualified on the grounds that they are derived forms that make up paradigms of their own, including both strong and weak forms. The possessives in *-ar,* the numeral *anþar,* and the pronoun *hʋas* have similarly been excluded on the grounds discussed above. At the same time, items that cannot be ruled out on any formal grounds have been included irrespective of their frequency of occurrence.

As previously noted, a parallel discussion of occurrence of *-ata* on the one hand, and the incidence of bare neuter nominative and accusative adjectives and other modifiers on the other will help shed light on the regularity in the use of *-ata* in relation to the more common bare stem. In the following discussion, the modifiers under analysis have been grouped into four broad classes: adjectives, including all kinds of qualitative, classifying, multiplicative, and other types; quantifiers, including the quantifier *alls* 'all', the numeral *ains* 'one', as well as the quantifiers *leitils* 'little, few', and *manags* 'many', the latter two traditionally classified as adjectives; pronouns, including the demonstratives *jains* 'that' and *swaleiks* 'such', the possessives *meins* 'my', *þeins* 'your', and *seins* 'his', and the indefinite pronoun *sums* 'some'; and past participles. The results of the relative distribution of neuter forms are summed up in table 2 below.

NEUT.NOM./ACC.SG. modifiers		Distribution of tokens	Relative Distribution	Total
Adjectives	*-ata*	15	8%	190
	bare stems	175	92%	
Quantifiers	*-ata*	39	20%	199
	bare stems	160	80%	
Pronouns	*-ata*	20	19%	105
	bare stems	85	81%	
Participles	*-ata*	2	1%	150
	bare stems	148	99%	
Total	*-ata*	76	12%	644
	bare stems	568	88%	

Table 2. Relative distribution of neuter bare stems and *-ata*.

Table 2 collates the quantitative data for the four types of neuter modifiers. It is evident that each type is attested in the data sufficiently frequently for reliable generalizations about the relative share that *-ata* has alongside bare stems in the same paradigm slots. The results generally confirm the quantitative tendencies in the use of *-ata* across word classes reported in table 1. The difference is that pronouns and quantifiers can be seen to have a nearly identical rate of incidence and that, at 1%, *-ata* participles are not simply few but are, in fact, relatively uncommon. Thus, three groups of lexemes are identifiable on the basis of the relative frequency figures: quantifiers and pronouns, defined by the highest rate of incidence, followed by adjectives and, at the very outskirts of the corpus, past participles.

Perhaps the most important generalization that emerges from table 2 is that, at 12%, the share of *-ata* in the corpus of neuter forms is rather small, but not as insignificant as might otherwise be supposed. Of course, the overall figure for the distribution of *-ata* in relation to bare stems is higher on account of the high relative values for quantifiers and pronouns. However, at 8%, the relative share of *-ata* in adjectives is not far behind, indicating that its appearance is perhaps not a mere accident of usage—the more so in view of the assumption that *-ata* may be

applicable only to part of the attested lexemes within the heterogeneous adjective group, as suggested above with reference to lexical conditioning. If this were found to be the case, the actual relative figure for adjectives would be higher, though in reality the validity of this assumption cannot be ascertained. However, support for it may be sought in the fact that the much more homogeneous group of *-ata* quantifiers and pronouns has a significantly higher relative rate of incidence. Thus, an assessment of the distribution of *-ata* in relation to bare stems across different types of lexemes adds a quality dimension to Jellinek's (1926:130) and Kieckers's (1928:154) observation that "*-ata* forms are much rarer than endingless ones," indicating that the appearance of *-ata* on modifiers is not only less rare than it seems at first sight, but its occurrence is in some way meaningful.

3.2. Semantic Factors and Contextual Variation.

In discussing the variation between the pronominal *-ata* and nominal bare-stem neuter forms, it is common to look for semantic factors that might affect the choice of one form over the other. For example, Kieckers (1928:154) suggests that there is no difference in meaning between the nominal and pronominal forms. In contrast, Braune & Heidermanns (2004:115, note 2) state that, where the two forms appear in competition, the pronominal form performs a determining or anaphoric function. They supply two examples in support of this claim: *halbata aiginis meinis* 'half of my goods' in Luke 19:8 (see example 5a for a fuller context) and *mel mein … meinata mel* 'my time' in John 7:6 and 7:8, as illustrated below:

(16) a. þaruh   qaþ   im   Iesus:
    then   say.PST.3SG they.DAT   Jesus.NOM

    mel   **mein**   ni   nauh ist
    time.NEUT.NOM.SG my.NEUT.NOM.SG NEG yet be.PRS.3SG
    'Then Jesus said to them: my time has not come yet.'   (John 7:6)

b. iþ   ik   ni   nauh   galeiþa
   but   I   NEG   yet   go.PRS.1SG

   in   þo   dulþ,
   in   the.FEM.ACC.SG   feast.FEM.ACC.SG

   unte   **meinata**   mel   ni   nauh
   because   my.NEUT.NOM.SG   time.NEUT.NOM.SG   NEG   yet

   usfulliþ   ist
   fulfil.PST.PTCP.NEUT.NOM.SG   be.PRS.3SG

   'I will not go up to this feast because my time has not yet been
   fulfilled.'   (John 7:8)

The form *halbata* 'half' in example 5a is one of only two attestations of
this adjective, the other one, in Mark 6:23, being feminine (*halba*). The
low occurrence of this adjective affords no room for discussion of
competing forms, and it is therefore unclear on what basis *halbata* may
be read as performing a determining function. In example 16b, the
pronominal form *meinata* 'my' does indeed have the appearance of
anaphoric use because it follows the nominal form *mein* 'my' from the
previous context. However, this arrangement may simply be due to pure
chance and therefore have nothing to do with anaphoric reference, as
there are examples of contexts such as John 6:54, 6:55, and 6:56, below,
in which no such regularities are observed:

(17) a. saei   matjiþ   **mein**   leik
       who.REL   eat.PRS.3SG   my.NEUT.ACC.SG   flesh.NEUT.ACC.SG

       jah   driggkiþ   **mein**   bloþ,
       and   drink.PRS.3SG   my.NEUT.ACC.SG   blood.NEUT.ACC.SG

       aih   libain   aiweinon
       have.PRS.3SG   life.FEM.ACC.SG   eternal.FEM.ACC.SG

       'He who eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, has eternal life.'
                                                           (John 6:54)

b. þata   auk leik   **meinata**
   that.NEUT.ACC.SG for flesh.NEUT.ACC.SG my.NEUT.ACC.SG

   bi sunjai   ist   mats,
   by truth.FEM.DAT.SG be.PRS.3SG meat.MASC.NOM.SG

   jah þata   bloþ   **mein**
   and that.NEUT.ACC.SG blood.NEUT.ACC.SG my.NEUT.ACC.SG

   bi sunjai   ist   draggk
   by truth.FEM.DAT.SG be.PRS.3SG drink.NEUT.NOM.SG

   'For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.'
                                                    (John 6:55)

c. saei   matjiþ   **mein**   leik
   who.REL eat.PRS.3SG my.NEUT.ACC.SG flesh.NEUT.ACC.SG

   jah driggkiþ   **mein**   bloþ,
   and drink.PRS.3SG my.NEUT.ACC.SG blood.NEUT.ACC.SG

   in mis   wisiþ   jah ik   in imma
   in I.DAT stay.PRS.3SG and I.NOM in he.DAT.SG

   'He who eats my flesh, and drinks my blood dwells in me, and I
   in him.'   (John 6:56)

Example 17b contains two neuter nominative singular instances of the
possessive pronoun *meins* that may be seen to refer anaphorically to the
previous context in 17a in the same way that *meinata* in 16b allegedly
refers to *mein* in 16a. However, of the two possessives in 17b only the
first one takes -*ata.* The possessives in 17c are a further counterexample,
as here both instances of the possessive pronoun are bare stems in spite
of any possible anaphoric reference to the two previous contexts, of
which 17a is almost entirely identical to 17c.

Thus, any such semantic or functional motivations for the use of *-ata* may be ruled out based on examples of variation in similar or identical contexts. Consider two further examples from Luke 4:5 and Mark 9:2:

(18) a. jah   ustiuhands   ina
     and   lead.up.PRS.PTCP.MASC.NOM.SG   he.MASC.ACC.SG

     diabulaus
     devil.MASC.NOM.SG

     ana   fairguni   **hauhata**,
     on   mountain.NEUT.ACC.SG   high.NEUT.ACC.SG

     ataugida   imma   allans
     show.PST.3SG   he.MASC.DAT.SG   all.MASC.ACC.PL

     þiudinassuns   þis   midjungardis
     kingdom.MASC.ACC.PL   this.MASC.GEN.SG   world.MASC.GEN.SG

     in stika   melis
     in point.MASC.DAT.SG   time.NEUT.GEN.SG

     'And the devil, taking him up into a high mountain, showed him
     all of the world's kingdoms in a moment of time.'   (Luke 4:5)

   b. jah   ustauh   ins   ana   fairguni
      and   lead.up.PST.3SG   he.ACC.PL   on   mountain.NEUT.ACC.SG

      hauh   sundro   ainans
      high.NEUT.ACC.SG   apart   one.MASC.ACC.PL

      'and he [Jesus] took them up into a high mountain apart by
      themselves'   (Mark 9:2)

Although the examples in 18 illustrate two different situations, they share the phrase *ana fairguni hauh(ata)* 'onto a high mountain', used in similar circumstances. In neither case does the phrase refer to the previous

context, so there does not seem to be any semantic or functional justification for the use of *-ata* in 18a over the bare form in 18b.

Similarly, the past participle *wagidata* 'shaken' from Matthew 11:7 in example 14 can be compared with the same context in Luke 7:24, in which the same participle appears as a bare stem *wagid*, with no evident semantic or functional difference: *raus fram winda* **wagid**? Perhaps an even more surprising instance of such vacillation involves the quantifier *alls* 'all' in substantivized use:

(19) **allata**   þulaiþ,   **allata**   galaubeiþ,
     all.NEUT.ACC.SG bear.PRS.3SG all.NEUT.ACC.SG believe.PRS.3SG

     all   weneiþ,   **all**   gabeidiþ
     all.NEUT.ACC.SG hope.PRS.3SG all.NEUT.ACC.SG endure.PRS.3SG

     'Bears all, believes all, hopes for all, endures all!'

(1 Corinthians 13:7)

The syntactic context involving the quantifier *alls* 'all' in this sentence is the same; yet in the first two instances the quantifier has the pronominal inflection, as opposed to the other two, which are bare stems. This example illustrates a reverse pattern to the one suggested for 16a and 16b, as the pronominal forms here precede rather than follow the nominal bare-stem ones. So, the competition between the forms in 19 clearly does not involve any anaphoric reference; nor is there any sense of definiteness or determination, as the substantivized quantifiers express abstract and generic concepts. As an interim conclusion it may therefore be suggested that the use of *-ata* with adjectives or other modifiers does not have any autosemantic or functional import.

So far, any discussion of the competition between the bare stem and *-ata* has drawn either upon individual examples or pairs/sets of individual examples, without reference to the context of the situation in which the examples occur. What emerges upon examining the distribution of examples across the Gothic corpus is that there is an unusual concentration of five instances of *-ata* in one chapter of the Gospel of John, namely, John 17:6, 6, 14, 17, 26. Consider the following:

(20) a. gabairhtida   **þeinata**   namo
　　　　show.PST.1SG   your.NEUT.ACC.SG   name.NEUT.ACC.SG

　　　　mannam   þanzei   atgaft
　　　　man.MASC.DAT.PL   who.MASC.ACC.PL   give.PST.2SG

　　　　mis   us   þamma   fairƕau …
　　　　1DAT.SG   from   the.MASC.DAT.SG   world.MASC.DAT.SG

　　　　jah   þata   waurd   **þeinata**
　　　　and   that.NEUT.ACC.SG   word.NEUT.ACC.SG   your.NEUT.ACC.SG

　　　　gafastaidedun
　　　　keep.PST.3PL

　　　　'I have manifested Your name to the men whom You gave me
　　　　out of the world … and they have kept Your word.'   (John 17:6)

　　b. weihai   ins   in   sunjai;
　　　　sanctify.IMP.2SG   they.MASC.ACC.PL   in   truth.FEM.DAT.SG

　　　　waurd   **þeinata**   sunja
　　　　word.NEUT.NOM.SG   your.NEUT.NOM.SG   truth.FEM.NOM.SG

　　　　ist
　　　　be.PRS.3SG

　　　　'Sanctify them in the truth; Your word is truth.'   (John 17:17)

Between examples 20a and 20b there are three instances of possessives
in *-ata*. What is distinctive about these forms, as well as the remaining
two *-ata* possessives in John 17:14 and 17:26, is that all of them appear
in a context where Jesus directly addresses God, referring either to the
name of God (*þeinata namo* 'your name'*, namo þeinata* 'your name') or
the word of God (*waurd þeinata* 'your word'). This set of examples
clearly illustrates that *-ata* is contextually motivated, as the Gothic
translator chooses the more iconic pronominal forms in direct address as
a more proper, or formal, or emphatic, elevated, archaic-sounding, and

perhaps, therefore, reverential mode of reference to what relates to God. This is further corroborated by the fact that, as a form that occurs in direct address to the actual or intended interlocutor, and one that therefore warrants a sense of formality, the 2nd person possessive *þeinata,* with eight examples, is better documented than either the 1st person possessive *meinata* (four examples) or the 3rd person possessive *seinata* (two examples). The latter form is also the least likely to have the pronominal inflection by virtue of its 3rd person address, devoid of the stylistic overtones of 2nd or 1st person reference.

This generalization regarding -*ata* being contextually motivated is confirmed by many examples in which it occurs within direct address, including Mark 8:17 in example 3 and Matthew 6:22 in 9, amongst others. The pattern in John 17 is in contrast to examples with bare-stem possessives such as *mein waurd* 'my word' and *waurd mein* 'my word' in John 8:37, 43, 51, 52, John 14:23, and John 15:20, where reference to one's own word does not warrant the use of the reverential form. To these could be added *namo mein* 'my name' in Mark 5:9 and Romans 9:17, as well as *namo þein* 'your name' in Mark 5:9 and Luke 8:30. The latter two are used in direct address to demons (Legion) rather than God, and the standard neutral form of the pronoun is therefore preferred.

As well as being associated with direct address, -*ata* is common in rhetorical contexts. Consider the following:

(21) niu waurstw   **meinata**   jus
     not work.NEUT.NOM.SG my.NEUT.NOM.SG you.NOM.PL

     sijuþ   in fraujin?
     be.PRS.2PL in lord.MASC.DAT.SG

     'Are you not my work in the Lord?'   (1 Corinthians 9:1)

In 21, the sentence has the form of a question. However, in this case the question is the last of a series of four questions that deliver an emphatic message rather than elicit a response. The highly charged rhetorical circumstances in which the question is posed may be seen to trigger the use of the stylistically distinctive -*ata* form of the possessive pronoun *meins* 'my'. The notion that -*ata* appears in stylistically charged rhetorical circumstances of various kinds is corroborated by contexts

such as Romans 7:12 in example 4, Mark 10:27 in 6a, John 7:8 in 10b, and many others.

Although the generalization regarding the stylistic motivations of *-ata* as detailed above is generally straightforward, it does not apply universally. Compare the following:

(22) a. atta,   hauhei
        father.MASC.VOC.SG   make.high.IMP.2SG

        namo   **þeinata**!
        name.NEUT.ACC.SG   your.NEUC.ACC.SG

        'Father, glorify Your name!'   (John 12:28)

   b. atta   unsar
        father.MASC.VOC.SG   our.MASC.NOM.SG

        þu   in himinam,
        you.NOM.SG   in heaven.MASC.DAT.PL

        weihnai   namo   **þein**
        hallow.OPT.PRS.3SG   name.NEUT.NOM.SG   your.NEUT.NOM.SG

        'O our Father in heaven, hallowed be Your name.'
                                                          (Matthew 6:9)

In 22a, the use of the reverential form *þeinata* is in line with the circumstances of direct address that define the use of *-ata* in John 17. However, contrary to one's expectations in light of John 17, the example from the Lord's Prayer in 22b has the bare-stem possessive *þein* in a context where the reverential form with *-ata* might seem equally justified. One possible way to explain the use of the bare stem in 22b is as a stylistic variant used at the discretion of the translator, who opts for the lighter neutral form in a context designed for habitual recitation. Perhaps more importantly, the choice of the stylistically lighter form may have theological underpinnings. In particular, in teaching his disciples the Lord's Prayer, where God is addressed as Father (a metaphor only rarely used in the Old Testament), Jesus fosters a more personal and

intimate relation with God than previously entertained. As a result, the more informal form *þein* is preferable in this context to the stylistically charged form *þeinata*.[15] In addition, a factor that may affect the form of the pronoun is the rhythmic composition of the opening to the Lord's Prayer, where the use of the short form *þein* helps avoid a cumbersome dactylic cadence and maintain symmetry between two pentasyllabic clauses (*þu in himinam* 'You in heaven' and *weihnai namo þein* 'hallowed be Your name'), as well as a structural parallel with the clause-final monosyllabic form *þeins* in the following clause: Matthew 6:10 *qimai þiudinassus þeins* 'Your kingdom come'.

Thus, in 22b the bare stem *þein* presents a divagation from the pattern observed in John 17. However, because this divagation can be explained in terms of individual circumstances of usage—whether theological, stylistic, or rhythmic—it does not undermine the generalization. As a result, although the set of examples in John 17 furnishes a robust generalization, the generalization does not translate into a prediction of where *-ata* forms should occur because they are not required by any rule in the grammar.

This, then, makes it clearer why there are instances of bare neuter forms competing with *-ata* in identical or similar contexts: Sometimes the translator feels the need to use the longer and more expressive form, but this does not mean that *-ata* has to be used in a similar context every time. Hence the vacillation between the bare stem and *-ata* in examples 17–18, *wagidata* in Matthew 11:7 (example 14), and *wagid* in Luke 7:24, and elsewhere. By the same token, Mark 2:9 (as well as the contextually similar Luke 5:24) is in contrast to Mark 2:11, as illustrated below:

(23) a. urreis   jah nim   þata
       rise.IMP.2SG and take.IMP.2SG that.NEUT.ACC.SG

       badi   **þeinata**   jah gagg
       bed.NEUT.ACC.SG your.NEUT.ACC.SG and walk.IMP.2SG

       'arise, take up your bed, and walk'   (Mark 2:9)

---

[15] I wish to thank an anonymous reviewer for this insight.

b. urreis   nim   -uh   þata
   rise.IMP.2SG take.IMP.2SG and.ENCL that.NEUT.ACC.SG

   badi   **þein**   jah gagg
   bed.NEUT.ACC.SG   your.NEUT.ACC.SG and walk.IMP.2SG

   du   garda   þeinamma
   into house.MASC.DAT.SG your.MASC.DAT.SG

   'arise, and take up your bed, and go into your house'

   (Mark 2:11)

Similar to the examples in John 17, *þeinata* in 23a (and Luke 5:24) appears within direct address. However, the contextually similar example in 23b has the bare stem in spite of the fact that both examples are located in close proximity in the Gospel of Mark (thereby also invalidating any claim to the anaphoric use of *-ata*). What is also interesting about example 23a is that the possessive pronoun *þeinata* 'your' postmodifies a noun already modified by the demonstrative *þata* (Greek *ton krabbaton sou* lit. 'the pallet your'). This use of *-ata* may therefore be seen to echo the demonstrative *þata* in the same phrase. This, however, is not borne out by the evidence from Mark 2:11 in 23b, or other examples of the bare stem of the adjective being used alongside *þata* (for instance, see John 6:55, Matthew 5:29, 2 Timothy 1:12, etc.).

    If *-ata* is understood as an element exploited for stylistic effect and used at the discretion of the speaker, this also eliminates the need to look for any complex explanations of the variation between the bare stem and *-ata* within contexts like John 6:55 in example 17b and 1 Corinthians 13:7 in example 19. Both examples illustrate a switch from *-ata* to the bare stem within sequences of eligible modifiers: *leik meinata* 'my flesh' to *bloþ mein* 'my blood' and *allata* 'all' to *all* 'all'. The latter example, in particular, is peculiar because the switch occurs without any apparent conditioning factors. In all four instances of the variation, the forms *allata* and *all* appear in a repetitive sequence as direct objects of their respective verbs: *allata þulaiþ* 'bears all', *allata galaubeiþ* 'believes all', *all weneiþ* 'hopes for all', and *all gabeidiþ* 'endures all'. The original Greek has the accusative form *panta* 'all' in all four instances, yet in Gothic, two pronominal forms followed by two bare stems are attested. It

can only be speculated at this point that the Gothic translator is manipulating stylistic effects, and the emphatic nature of the repetitive structure in which the quantifiers occur calls for a stylistic contrast between the special pronominal and standard bare-stem forms. Finally, because in both John 6:55 (example 17b) and 1 Corinthians 13:7 (example 19) the *-ata* forms are sentence-initial, it may appear that the pronominal neuter forms are more likely to appear in sentence-initial positions. However, this is contradicted by the evidence from examples such as Luke 15:13 and 15:14, in which the forms *seinata* 'his' and *jainata* 'that' are sentence-final and clause-final, respectively.[16] At the same time, in Matthew 6:22 (example 9) *-ata* affects the second in a sequence of three eligible neuter modifiers. Consequently, *-ata* does not appear to be motivated by the position of the neuter modifier within the sentence.

In conclusion, it does not seem that the use of *-ata* with modifiers can be justified either on semantic or functional grounds. Instead, the evidence of the variation between the bare stem and *-ata* points toward the Gothic translator making individual stylistic choices.[17] These stylistic choices are manifest in possessive pronouns, and especially the second person possessive *þeins* 'your', whose use in direct verbal engagement warrants the use of the pronominal form. As suggested above, *-ata* may be associated with contexts such as reverential address, rhetorical declaration, and the like. This, however, should not be taken to mean that the inflection actually stands for the grammatical category of respect or is an exponent of any particular category or meaning. Rather, it is a form

---

[16] (Luke 15:13) *jah afar ni managans dagans brahta samana allata sa juhiza sunus jah aflaiþ in land fairra wisando jah jainar distahida þata swes **seinata** libands usstiuriba* 'And not many days later the younger son gathered all together, and left for a distant country, and there squandered **his** property in reckless living'. (Luke 15:14) *biþe þan frawas allamma, warþ huhrus abrs and gawi **jainata**, jah is dugann alaþarba wairþan* 'And when he had spent all, there arose a great famine in **that** land, and he began to be in want'.

[17] In Gothic, the competition between the forms *uns* and *unsis* '(to) us' in the dative and accusative plural paradigm slots of the first-person personal pronoun *ik* 'I' makes an interesting parallel. Snædal (2010:313) suggests that the longer form *unsis* is "the more formal or ceremonious (not to say pompous) variant of the two."

that tends to surface where the stylistic circumstances of the context, whether direct address, rhetoric, emphasis, formality, and the like, are such as to justify a higher degree of expressiveness. The main difficulty with *-ata,* especially in adjectives, is that in most cases the contexts and the words affected by it are different. Therefore, the words in which *-ata* occurs do not lend themselves to arrangement into a transparent pattern. As a result, the use of *-ata* appears erratic, and if each example is judged in isolation, there is indeed no apparent difference between the bare stem and *-ata*. What is important, however, is that the pattern in John 17 shows that *-ata* in possessive pronouns has contextual stylistic under-pinnings. By extension, this suggests that the use of *-ata* with adjectives and quantifiers is equally meaningful, even if as a non-native speaker of Gothic, one is insensitive to the inflection's stylistic coloring.

3.3. Grammatical Factors.

In addition to being motivated contextually, *-ata* also seems to be occasionally triggered by different factors in the grammar. Perhaps the most compelling example of *-ata* being grammatically motivated is found in Philippians 3:8. Compare the Gothic rendering in 24a with the original Greek version in 24b.

(24) a. Gothic

aþþan sweþauh all   domja
but   indeed   all.NEUT.ACC.SG deem.PRS.1SG

sleiþa   wisan
loss.FEM.ACC.SG be.INF

in ufarassaus   kunþjis
in abundance.MASC.GEN.SG knowledge.NEUT.GEN.SG

Xristaus   Iesuis   fraujins   meinis,
Christ.GEN.SG Jesus.GEN.SG lord.MASC.GEN.SG my.MASC.GEN.SG

in þizei   allamma
in who.MASC.GEN.SG all.NEUT.DAT.SG

gasleiþiþs   im   jah
cause.harm.PST.PTCP.MASC.NOM.SG be.PRS.1SG and

domja   smarnos   wisan   **allata**,
deem.PRS.1SG refuse.FEM.ACC.PL be.INF   all.NEUT.ACC.SG

ei   Xristau
that Christ.MASC.ACC.SG

du gawaurkja   habau
to   gain.NEUT.DAT.SG have.OPT.PRS.1SG

'Yet indeed I consider all to be a loss compared to the greatness of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have forfeited all and consider all to be refuse, so that I may have Christ as gain.'   (Philippians 3:8_A)

b. Greek

alla men   oun ge   kai hēgoumai
but indeed then surely and deem.PRS.MID.1SG

panta   zēmian   einai   dia
all.NEUT.ACC.PL loss.FEM.ACC.SG be.INF   through

to   huperechon
the.NEUT.ACC.SG surpass.PTCP.NEUT.ACC.SG

tēs   gnōseōs   Christou
the.FEM.GEN.SG knowledge.FEM.GEN.SG   Christ.MASC.GEN.SG

Iēsou   tou   kuriou
Jesus.MASC.GEN.SG the.MASC.GEN.SG   master.MASC.GEN.SG

mou   di   hon
my.GEN.SG through who.MASC.ACC.SG

ta   panta   ezēmiōthēn
the.NEUT.ACC.PL all.NEUT.ACC.PL inflict.loss.AOR.PASS.1SG

kai hēgoumai   skubala   einai
and deem.PRS.MID.1SG refuse.NEUT.ACC.PL be.INF

hina Christon   kerdēsō
that Christ.MASC.ACC.SG gain.AOR.SUBJ.ACT.1SG

'Yet indeed I also consider all to be a loss because of the surpassing value of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all and consider it refuse, so that I may gain Christ.'   (Philippians 3:8)

A comparison of the above Gothic and Greek examples indicates that Gothic innovates the quantifier *allata,* unattested in Greek (or Latin), as a way to clarify the reference of the phrase *domja smarnos wisan* lit. 'I deem rubbish to be', as it is obscured by the fact that the quantifier *alls* in the previous clause occurs in the dative. In contrast, in Greek both occurrences of the quantifier are in the accusative, with the second *panta* serving as the object of both the verb *ezēmiōthēn* 'I forfeited' and the phrase *hēgoumai skubala einai* lit. 'I am deeming refuse to be'. Thus, in translating the verse, Gothic inserts the object *allata* as a point of clarification, overtly realizing what in Greek is an object inferred from the previous clause.[18]

As suggested in section 3.2, *-ata* is commonly observed in contexts that are either syntactically awkward or difficult to interpret—see discussion of examples 3, 4, 7, 11b, and 12. Of these, Mark 7:8 in 11b, as well as an almost entirely identical example in Mark 7:13 (*jah galeik swaleikata manag taujiþ* 'And many such things you do'), illustrates *-ata* within a complex and potentially awkward string of modifiers, where it is hard to identify the head constituent. It is possible that the use of *-ata* here has a clarificational purpose, as the higher distinctiveness of the pronominal form marks it as the head. It is also possible that *-ata* identifies *swaleikata* as a substantivized form—after all, it is probably

---

[18] An anonymous reviewer points out that this is not an isolated occurrence of Gothic inserting material to clarify or disambiguate the Greek: see Eythórsson 1995:158–159 and Dewey & Syed 2009:15.

not an accident that substantivized modifiers amount to about half of the
-*ata* corpus (see table 1).

   The use of -*ata* in Luke 15:13, illustrated in example 25 below, is
reminiscent of Philippians 3:8 in 24a.

(25) brahta   samana   **allata**   sa
     bring.PST.3SG together all.NEUT.ACC.SG the.MASC.NOM.SG

     juhiza   sunus
     younger.MASC.NOM.SG son.MASC.NOM.SG

     'the younger son gathered all together'   (Luke 15:13)

In 25, Gothic uses the phrase *brahta samana* to translate the Greek
participle *sunagagōn* 'gathering together'. Similar to *allata* in
Philippians 3:8, here the quantifier takes -*ata* in order to make it clear
that it is the object of a transitive verb phrase, which is a more awkward
structure than the single participle in Greek. The use of the pronominal
inflection may additionally be motivated by the fact that here, too, *allata*
is a substantivized form, and possibly one that is uttered with an
emphasis on the completeness or inclusiveness of the notion denoted by
the quantifier. Consider also the following:

(26) iþ   jainai   usgaggandans
     but that.MASC.NOM.PL go.out.PRS.PTCP.MASC.NOM.PL

     meridedun   and   **allata**
     preach.PST.3PL over all.NEUT.ACC.SG

     'And they went forth and preached everywhere.'   (Mark 16:20)

Similar to 25, in the above example the phrase *and allata* lit. 'over all;
everywhere' translates the Greek adverb *pantachou* 'everywhere'. The
same logic as above might also in principle be applicable in 26, where
the preposition *and* governs the accusative case of its object marked by
-*ata*. However, Mark 16:20 is in contrast to Luke 9:6, in which Gothic
translates the Greek adverb *pantachou* as *and all*, that is, without -*ata,* in
a syntactically similar environment. In the absence of a clear formal

explanation of this variation, one can only speculate at this point that in 26 -*ata* is justified by the elevated tone of the context in which Mark 16:20—the final verse of the Gospel of Mark—occurs, as opposed to Luke 9:6, which is stylistically more neutral.

One more instance of -*ata* that may potentially be affected by considerations of grammatical transparency is in the translation of the Greek phrase *apo merous* 'from part'. In 2 Corinthians 1:14 (example 11a above), it is rendered as *bi sumata* 'in part'. Romans 11:25 has *<bi> sumata*, but the preposition *bi* here is an unattested editorial addition, suggesting a possible error of omission on the part of the Gothic translator. In contrast to these two renderings, 2 Corinthians 2:5 has the phrase *bi sum ain* lit. 'in some unit/one thing'. Thus, the same Greek structure has three different renderings in Gothic, indicating that it was an awkward structure to translate. If *ain* 'one' in *bi sum ain* 'in part' is to be perceived as the head modified by *sum* 'some', then the use of -*ata* as a substantivizer in *(bi) sumata* 'in part' speaks for itself. As a result, in the former two examples, the translator may be seen as choosing the morphologically better characterized pronominal form in substantivizing the pronoun, as on its own the phrase *bi sum* might be expected to be followed by a nominal head. Of course, this is just a speculation. However, it is perhaps significant that all of the attested bare neuter nominative and accusative examples of *sums* 'some' are modifiers, whereas the two examples of *sumata* are substantivized.

Finally, essential to the discussion of -*ata* as a grammatically motivated form is the issue of the inflection's quantitative distribution between the two paradigm slots with which it is associated. Although -*ata* is traditionally reported to occur in the neuter nominative and accusative singular, an examination of the 76 examples reveals that the pronominal form is actually relatively uncommon in the nominative, with only 21 (28%) examples, compared with 55 (72%) examples of the accusative. In light of the syncretism that generally defines the morphological realization of singular neuter forms in the nominative and accusative across Indo-European (Szemerényi 1996:159, Fortson 2010:114, Beekes 2011:215), the tendency for -*ata* to dominate in the accusative in Gothic is indicative not merely of its status as a special

form, but also of Gothic being unique in creating a distinction in the realization of these neuter case forms.[19]

In addition, the distribution of -*ata* between the nominative and accusative, and in particular its preference for the accusative, furnishes a useful insight into its syntactic patterning. The bulk of the nominative attestations of -*ata* (14 examples out of 21) are in the quantifier *alls* 'all', of which 10 are substantivized forms acting as syntactic subjects and four are attributive modifiers. Generally, the substantial corpus of 119 neuter nominative and accusative singular forms of *alls* (including 81 bare stems and 38 attestations of -*ata*) does not contain a single predicative example. The evidence shows a clear tendency for this neuter quantifier to be used substantively, with 98 (82%) substantivized attestations (principally acting as syntactic subjects or objects) and 21 (18%) attributive attestations. If one considers the evidence of -*ata* amongst adjectives alone, the ratio is one nominative to 14 accusative attestations. Because, as a rule, predicative adjectives typically appear in the nominative case (except, perhaps, object complement constructions and the like), predicative attestations of -*ata* forms are then naturally quite rare. Thus, if the quantitative evidence of case usage is taken into account, the low incidence of -*ata* in predicative contexts, reported in table 1, does not make these predicative attestations exceptional and is simply a consequence of -*ata* being uncommon in the nominative.

In conclusion, this section has presented evidence for -*ata* being triggered by different factors in the grammar. Amongst the most important factors are considerations of clarity in syntactically awkward environments, where the more iconic, and morphologically more distinctive, pronominal form is appealed to as a way to resolve any potential ambiguities.[20] In addition, the high proportion of substantiviza-

---

[19] For a discussion of nominative–accusative syncretism in Indo-European, see Wunderlich 2004:376–377; also compare Harbert 2007:104 and Baerman 2009:224.

[20] Sturtevant (1947:92) suggests that the use of -*ata* may sometimes be explained in terms of resolving structural ambiguity within the paradigm. In particular, he speculates that the two attestations of *niujata* 'new' (Mark 9:17 and Luke 5:37) may be motivated by the avoidance of the bare stem [+]*niw-i,* which would constitute a variation with *niu-j-* (where -*iu-* < -*iw-*) elsewhere in the paradigm, for instance, in the dative *n-iu-j-amma* and similar. The variation

tions in the -*ata* corpus suggests that the inflection may have been employed to mark substantivized forms. The inflection's prevalence in the accusative case corroborates its status as a special form; it also suggests that the rare occurrences of predicative -*ata* forms do not represent an exception. Naturally, these conclusions can only be presented as tentative, as there is no way to verify their accuracy from the point of view of a native speaker's intuitions. However, the collective attestation of potentially awkward contexts gives the appearance of being systematic rather than random.

3.4. Metrical Factors.

The variation between the bare stem and -*ata* generates not only different morphological forms but also different prosodic forms, suggesting the possibility that the former may correlate with the latter. Thus, the discussion of this alternation should make reference to prosodic morphology, namely, the notion that the output of form-affecting operations is linked to prosodic categories (Miller 2014:144). It is well known, for instance, that some aspects of Gothic noun and verb stem morphology were sensitive to the prosodic and structural properties of root syllables. In particular, the -*ja*- stems of nouns and verbs show variation between -*ji*- and -*ei*- in some paradigm slots depending on such variables as the length and openness of the root syllable (see Wright 1954:150, Guxman 1958:94, Jasanoff 2008:196). It is also well established that prosodic

---

is removed by leveling the radical -*w*- into -*iu*- in the paradigm and replacing [+]*niw-i* with the *ata*-form *niujata.*

It must be pointed out that the absence of bare stem attestations compared with only two augmented attestations of *niujata* does not allow one to consider this example on its merits. However, if the avoidance of the bare stem [+]*niwi* is indeed driven by avoidance of variation (that is, morphological regularization), the same principles should be applicable to the *u*-stems. That this is not the case is evident from the *u*-stem adjective *manwus* 'ready', which appears as both *manwu* and *manwjata* in the neuter, indicating that the paradigm is indifferent to the variation between -*u*- and -*j*-. Instead, the attestation of bare stems such as *manwu* or *hardu* 'hard' amongst the *u*-stems, whose paradigms show a strong tendency toward the more productive *ja*-stems and *i*-stems, would suggest that forms like [+]*niwi*, or perhaps even [+]*niui,* may also reasonably be expected in the neuter of *ja*-stems. This is further supported by the existence of variant forms such as *tauj*- : *tawi*- in *taujan* 'to do, make', *mauj*- : *mawi* 'girl', etc.

considerations may be an important factor in sound change and, by extension, morphological change. For example, Miller (2010a:238–269) argues that words optimally tend toward duple timing, and that words of two short or two long syllables are stable; short monosyllables have a predisposition toward lengthening; words of three beats tend to be shortened in favor of being duple-timed.[21] Miller (personal communication) emphasizes, however, that monosyllables generally lack optimality—except when they are clitics—and tend to be avoided, whether they are duple-timed or not. With this in mind, it is important to investigate whether or not the variation of the bare stem and *-ata* in Gothic is driven by the avoidance of, or preference for, a given prosodic model of the word. Table 3 compares the syllabic structures of bare-stem and *-ata* neuter forms and their distribution in the relevant lexemes.

The two apparent aspects that emerge from table 3 are that in the corpus of 21 modifiers affected by *-ata*, the attested bare stems are predominantly monosyllables, and that *-ata* forms are predominantly trisyllabic, of which the majority are dactylic trisyllables. Overall, *-ata* is observed to augment 15 monosyllables, out of which there is no attestation of the bare stems of *daubata, halbata, jainata,* and *swesata.* The 11 attested monosyllables are all duple-timed ♩ (two beats), including mostly trimoraic structures with either a long root vowel or a complex coda in the rhyme of the syllable such as *ain, all, jugg, mein, wairþ,* etc. and bimoraic ones such as *sum* and *wan*.

---

[21] Duple timing refers to a notion that words optimally have two beats (two short syllables ♩♩ or one heavy syllable ♩) or multiples of two (♩♩♩♩ or ♩♩♩ or ♩♩, etc.). I follow Miller (2010a:238–269) in my discussion of duple timing and the use of heuristic music notation.

Modifiers	Bare stems		-ata		Total
	Monosyllabic	Disyllabic	Trisyllabic	Tetrasyllabic	
ains	*ain* 37		*ainata* 1		38
alls	*all* 81		*allata* 38		119
⁺*daufs*	–		*daubata* 1		1
⁺*halbs*	–		*halbata* 1		1
⁺*hauhs*	*hauh* 1		*hauhata* 1		2
jains	–		*jainata* 1		1
⁺*juggs*	*jugg* 1		*juggata* 4		5
manwus		*manwu* 2	*manwjata* 1		3
meins	*mein* 37		*meinata* 4		41
mikils		*mikil* 6		*mikilata* 1	7
niujis		–	*niujata* 2		2
⁺*seins*	*sein* 16		*seinata* 2		18
sums	*sum* 8		*sumata* 2		10
swaleiks		*swaleik* 2		*swaleikata* 3	5
swes	–		*swesata* 1		1
þeins	*þein* 22		*þeinata* 8		30
⁺*uskijans*		–		*uskijanata* 1	1
⁺*wagids*		*wagid* 1		*wagidata* 1	2
wairþs	*wairþ* 4		*wairþata* 1		5
⁺*wans*	*wan* 2		*wanata* 1		3
weihs	*weih* 2		*weihata* 1		3
Total	211 (95%)	11 (5%)	70 (92%)	6 (8%)	298
	222 (74%)		76 (26%)		

Table 3. Syllabic structure of bare-stem and *-ata* modifiers.

The augmented output forms with *-ata* are mostly dactylic trisyllables ♩♩♩ (four beats): *ainata, meinata,* etc. In each of the bare-stem monosyllables, the augmentation of *-ata* occasions a shift of syllable boundary, with the coda consonant of the monosyllable becoming the onset of the following syllable. However, in most cases, except *sumata* and *wanata,* this repositioning of the (final) coda consonant has no impact on the metrical output of the augmented forms. The initial syllables in *al.lata, hau.hata, jug.gata, wair.þata*, etc. remain heavy, and the augmented forms are duple-timed dactyls ♩♩♩. Thus, duple timing is involved in both the heavy monosyllables and in their output forms in *-ata,* where the first long syllable counts two beats, followed by two beats of the two short syllables. The augmentation of *sum* and *wan*

causes a shift of syllable boundary, dissecting the source monosyllable, and in this case the output forms *su.mata* and *wa.nata* are tribrachs ♩♩♩. Such trisyllabic formations are inherently unstable and subject to shifting to triplets by word compression (Miller 2010a:239ff.), which renders them duple-timed.

The predominance of duple-timed dactylic forms in the *-ata* corpus raises the question of whether, in a morphologically ambiguous situation with two readily available alternatives, there was a preference for metrically sound dactylic forms in *-ata* over defective monosyllabic feet such as *ains, alls,* and the like.[22] Whereas the overall figures for the relative distribution of bare-stem and *-ata* tokens (74% versus 26%) indicate a clear preference for the bare stem, token frequency-based generalizations are too broad in that they presuppose compromising on control for possible confounding variables. For instance, the overall figures for token frequencies in table 3 generalize over such variables as attestations of *-ata* that have no bare-stem counterparts, as well as *-ata* trisyllables with unattested or attested disyllabic bare neuter counterparts. It would therefore seem more methodologically accurate to compare the figures for the better-attested lexemes, as laid out in table 4.

---

[22] It is important to point out that the understanding of what constitutes a defective foot is a matter of debate. For instance, for Riad (1992) feet are minimally and maximally bimoraic. As a result, in his system the verb [+]*dōmidō* 'I judged' is tripedal, in which *dō* in either position is a healthy bimoraic foot on account of the long vowel, and *-mi-* is a monomoraic (stressless) foot, hence defective. For the purposes of the present discussion, a "defective" monosyllabic foot is a (nonclitic) monosyllable of any structure that is inherently suboptimal and therefore likely to be avoided. For a recent discussion of syllable weight in Gothic, see Pierce 2013.

Modifiers	Neuter nominative/accusative forms						Total
	Monosyllabic bare stems			Trisyllabic forms in -*ata*			
ains	*ain*	37	(97%)	*ainata*	1	(3%)	38
alls	*all*	81	(68%)	*allata*	38	(32%)	119
sums	*sum*	8	(80%)	*sumata*	2	(20%)	10
meins	*mein*	37	(90%)	*meinata*	4	(10%)	41
[+]*seins*	*sein*	16	(89%)	*seinata*	2	(11%)	18
þeins	*þein*	22	(73%)	*þeinata*	8	(27%)	30

Table 4. Distribution of monosyllabic
and trisyllabic neuter forms in selected lexemes.

Table 4 reports two distinct tendencies in lexemes with a total of at least 10 attested tokens. The relative figures for monosyllabic bare stems and -*ata* suggest a clear preference for the bare stem—hardly a surprising finding in view of the fact that the bare stem is generally much more common than -*ata* (see also discussion in section 3.1 above). Far more important are the relative figures for trisyllabic modifier forms in -*ata.* The uneven distribution in the relative figures for the trisyllabics, with *ainata* at the bottom end and *allata* at the top end of the scale, presents a mixed picture of the use of -*ata,* highlighting an absence of internal consistency. The evidence from the possessive pronouns as a group of items with identical stem structures also shows a clear internal asymmetry between the pronouns *meins* and *seins* on the one hand, and *þeins* on the other, with *þeins* being nearly three times as likely to be affected by -*ata* as either *meins* or *seins.* This lack of alignment in the relative figures for -*ata* amongst items with the same metrical properties indicates that the use of -*ata* was unlikely to have been metrically conditioned, and some other factors were at work in the alternation.

As noted above, the concept of duple timing is applicable both to the dominant monosyllabic bare stems and their output dactylic -*ata* counterparts. In theory, if the duple timing of these monosyllabic bare stems were taken to suggest that they are stable forms that do not require lengthening, this would predict that they should not be subject to

pronominalization with *-ata*. However, while there is clearly no tendency for the use of dactylic forms to be inferred from the sole attestation of *ainata*, this prediction is not borne out due to the significant relative numbers for *allata* (32%) and *þeinata* (27%). As a result, and contrary to expectations, duple-timed monosyllabic feet (two beats) appear in some competition with balanced dactylic forms (four beats), even if there is no case for quantitative preference for *-ata* to avoid monosyllabic feet.

In contrast, if monosyllabicity is the only criterion that makes the bare-stem forms defective and liable to be avoided irrespective of the timing of the monosyllable, this might help explain the augmentation of *-ata* on most monosyllables in table 4. However, in this case the well-documented quantifier *ains* 'one' stands in contrast to the other examples because, contrary to expectations, there is only one instance of *ainata* compared with 37 examples of the bare stem *ain*. Thus, it seems that the application of neither criterion generates satisfactorily consistent results, and synchronically a metrical argument exclusive of other criteria cannot be constructed with much confidence.

The use of *-ata* on disyllabic bare stems results mostly in tetrasyllabic forms such as *mikilata* 'great, large', *swaleikata* 'such', *wagidata* 'shaken', and *uskijanata* 'sprouted'.[23] Disyllabic bare stems occasionally also generate trisyllabic forms such as *manwjata* 'ready'. The disyllabic bare stems represent different types of metrical form, including the iamb ♩♩ *swaleik* (three beats), the trochee ♩♩ *manwu* (three beats), and the dibrachs ♩♩ *mikil* and *wagid* (two beats). The output forms involve a dactyl ♩♩♩ *manwjata*, three tetrabrachs ♩♩♩♩ *mikilata, us-kijanata, wagidata,* and even the metrically complex structure *swaleikata* ♩♩♩♩, with five beats (a combination of a monosyllabic foot and a dactyl).

Thus, bare-stem disyllables generate different metrical types of output *-ata* forms. In general, the attestation of these forms is not reliable enough for quantitative generalizations, and no great significance should be attached either to the preference for the bare stem in *mikils* (six bare-stem forms versus one *-ata*) or the preference for *-ata* in *swaleiks* (two bare-stem forms versus three *-ata*). It is perhaps more important that, contrary to probability, *-ata* surfaces too frequently amongst such poorly

---

[23] This is contingent on ⁺*uskijan–uskijanata* fitting the pattern based on two assumptions: 1) the bare stem is *uskijan* and 2) the prefix *us-,* adjoined to the binary foot of *us-kijanata,* does not count toward its metrical properties.

attested forms, and that the metrical picture of the output forms is heterogeneous, with no preference for any given type of structure. This suggests that the appearance of -*ata* in Gothic is unlikely to be regulated by considerations of metrics or timing.

If there were a morphonological rule defined by metrical preference for dactylic forms over monosyllabic feet, the data would be expected to present evidence not only of alignment in the relative values generalizing on the use of -*ata* across different lexemes, but also of a quantitative preference for dactylic forms over monosyllables in the well-attested lexemes. The evidence discussed above seems to disagree with this hypothesis on both counts. In fact, the figures reported in table 4 suggest that in Gothic, monosyllables were the most stable and preferred forms, with 201 (79%) examples of monosyllabic bare stems compared with 55 (21%) trisyllables. Further, although bare-stem neuter forms are much more common than -*ata* neuter forms, both types represent heterogeneous groups in terms of the metrical and timing properties of their tokens. The bare stems are mostly duple-timed monosyllables, but they can also be duple-timed disyllables. At the same time, -*ata* is promiscuous in that it associates with different types of output: -*ata* forms are mostly dactyls, but they can also count four short beats, etc.

The incongruities in the relative figures for -*ata* highlight the absence of an internal pattern. It would therefore be reasonable to conclude that the evidence from variation between the bare stem and -*ata* in Gothic neuter nominative and accusative modifiers provides little basis for an argument that -*ata* was employed as a remedy in avoiding any metrically less adequate alternatives. It also does not suggest that the bare stem alternant is a remedy for avoiding the augmented -*ata* form. At the same time, the evidence from variation in identical contexts, as in example 19 and the like, and the stylistic/contextual motivations in the use of -*ata* as discussed above (see section 3.2) would seem to rule out the existence of a metrically motivated mechanism governing the alternation.

However, as pointed out to me by D. Gary Miller, even if the above evidence from metrics and timing does not help establish a regular and predictable morphological pattern of alternation as attested in Gothic, this does not preclude the possibility that metrical factors were at work in the development of the alternation. To put it simply, metrical factors may not explain the use of -*ata,* but they may explain its existence. The most

important piece of evidence here is the fact that *-ata* shows a clear preference for monosyllables: 15 (71%) out of 21 lexemes affected by *-ata* alternate between monosyllabic bases and dactylic trisyllables. These figures are unlikely to be accidental, and they should be factored in while plotting the development of the strong inflection (see section 3.6 for a discussion of diachronic implications).

Assuming the traditional starting point, where the original form in the neuter nominative and accusative singular is the bare stem, pronominal extensions are introduced into these paradigm slots as rhythmic variants, with a preference for defective monosyllabic bases. At the same time, the principles of increasing productivity and morphological regularization aid in the spread of *-ata* to bare-stem bases with other metrical properties. The eventual reanalysis of the longer pronominal variants as forms with specific stylistic applications reinforces the productivity of the bare stem as the stylistically neutral variant, preventing the pronominally extended forms from fully replacing the bare stem. Thus, the evidence from preference for dactylic forms in the *-ata* corpus suggests that metrics and timing may have been amongst several competing factors in the alternation of the bare stem and *-ata*, in addition to the ones discussed in the previous sections.

3.5. Scribal Preferences.

Although it is well known that the surviving Gothic manuscript of the four Gospels is not by Wulfila's hand, it was generally assumed up until the late 1920s that the writing of the Codex Argenteus was the work of one person. This was also the assumption made by Friedrichsen (1926) in his study of the Gospels. Interestingly, based on his rigorous philological investigation, Friedrichsen (1926:240–244) concludes that the four Gospels represent two different types of Gothic text, where the Gospel of Matthew allies with the Gospel of John, and the Gospel of Luke with the Gospel of Mark. It was not until a reproduction of the Codex Argenteus was undertaken by von Friesen & Grape (1927) and the individual pages were released from the binding and compared side by side, that it became clear that two scribes were involved in producing the Codex, one responsible for the Gospels of Matthew and John, and the other for Luke and Mark (see also Friedrichsen 1930:189–192, Metlen 1937:244–245, Friedrichsen 1939:259, Hunter 1969:343ff., Munkhammar 2011:126–127). It is especially striking in this regard that the pairing coincides with

Friedrichsen's earlier observations on the two types of Gothic text distinguished in the Gothic gospels, of which the pair Mathew–John represents "an older, more primitive, less developed text, and a more ingenuous workmanship," whereas "Luke and Mark have had a more adventurous career" and display a greater amount of variant readings, with Luke exhibiting an especially high degree of variation (Friedrichsen 1926:119, 241–242). The five Epistles containing attestations of *-ata* (Romans 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, and Titus) are chiefly confined to Codices Ambrosiani A and B, written by different scribes (Streitberg 2000:481–482; see also Marchand 1957).[24]

The fact that several different hands were at work in the production of the Codex Argenteus and the Codices Ambrosiani inevitably invites the question of whether the variation between the bare stem and *-ata* may be due to idiosyncrasies in the language of the individual scribes. The following is the distribution of *-ata* in relation to the bare stem across the four Gospels and the Epistles.

	Gospels				Epistles	Skr	Nhm	Total
	Scribe 1		Scribe 2					
	Matthew	John	Mark	Luke				
-ata	9 (15%)	12 (14%)	18 (17%)	18 (15%)	19 (7%)	–	–	76
Ø	51 (85%)	74 (86%)	87 (83%)	103 (85%)	239 (93%)	12	2	568
	60	86	105	121	258	12	2	644

Table 5. Distribution of *-ata* modifiers across the Gothic corpus.

The evidence in table 5 indicates that the incidence of *-ata* across the Gospels is virtually the same relative to the figures for the distribution of the bare stem. In particular, the figures for the Gospels of Matthew (15%) and Luke (15%), written by two different scribes, are identical. At the same time, the difference in the relative figures for *-ata* between scribe 1 (14.5%) and scribe 2 (16%) is too insignificant to postulate a case for a preference for *-ata* by scribe 2. The only figure that stands out

---

[24] For a discussion of scribal errors and their implications, see Marchand 1973:37–57.

is the incidence of *-ata* in the Epistles, which at 7% is roughly half that of either the pair Matthew–John (scribe 1) or Luke–Mark (scribe 2).

It follows from these data that the Gospels represent a more variable type of text than the Epistles, but the lack of internal variation amongst the four Gospels does not support Friedrichsen's (1926:241–242) notion that any one Gospel or pair of Gospels represented a more variable type of text. Consequently, the symmetrical distribution of *-ata* across the four Gospels indicates that the variation between it and the bare stem was not so much due to any idiosyncrasies of the individual scribes as it was a systematic and linguistically motivated phenomenon.

In view of the statistically reliable sample of the nominative and accusative singular neuter forms in the Epistles (258 examples, including the bare stem and *-ata*), the low relative figure of 7% for *-ata* is surprising. One may surmise that the explanation lies in the textual differences between the Gospels and the Epistles, as there may simply happen to be more contexts in the Gospels that warrant the use of *-ata*. An alternative argument, referring collectively to the linguistic differences observed between the Gospels and the Epistles, appeals to the problem of the authorship of the Gothic Bible translation, namely, the possibility that the surviving Gothic fragments may be the work of several original translators—a question that should be approached no less seriously than the mainstream Wulfilian dictum (see Friedrichsen 1939:144; Metzger 1977:383–384).[25]

---

[25] See Friedrichsen 1939:137ff. and 1961:107, 110 for a discussion of several other differences between the Gospels and the Epistles. Based on his own comparative study of Gothic and Greek, and referring to earlier scholarship (especially Jellinek 1926:10–11), Friedrichsen (1961:103–104) suggests that the Gothic Bible translation may have been carried out by a group of scholars, with Wulfila acting as the editor-in-chief (see Falluomini 2013:329, 2015:8). At the same time, while some instances of variation in the Gothic translation can be attributed to the original translator, some others can only be explained in terms of post-Wulfilian corruptions in the transmission of the Gothic text (Friedrichsen 1961:110–111). It goes without saying that in this context, the notion *scribe* is indeterminate, as it is impossible to establish whether the variation goes back to any particular stage in the production of the Gothic text. As a result, it may imply anyone that may have been responsible for the transmission of the Gothic text from its inception to its final record.

3.6. Diachronic Implications.

A number of the points discussed above and conclusions regarding the use and properties of -*ata* in Gothic translate into diachronically valuable generalizations, with much of the evidence pointing toward -*ata* being a form in specialized use. Amongst the most important considerations in support of this claim are the relatively low occurrence of -*ata* in relation to the bare stem of modifiers (12% versus 88%), its use in specific stylistic and rhetorical environments, the tendency for -*ata* to appear with the less commonly used lexemes, as well as grammatical considerations such as the use of -*ata* in grammatically awkward environments, its common occurrence in substantivization or in marking modifiers in the accusative case.

The evidence of the quantitative distribution of -*ata* across different types of modifier is especially interesting. The figures presented in table 2 (section 3.1 above) indicate that -*ata* shows a stronger preference for some types of modifier than others. In particular, -*ata* tends to occur mostly with pronouns and quantifiers (20% and 19%, respectively), is considerably less frequent with adjectives (8%), and is only marginally attested with past participles (1%). This gradualness in the percolation of -*ata* across the modifier lexicon furnishes a diachronic dimension to the development of the strong inflection. If the paradigm of the demonstrative pronoun (Gothic *sa, sō, þata*) is assumed to have been the original source of pronominal endings in the strong modifier inflection, it makes sense to say that Gothic supplies evidence of a LEXICAL DIFFUSION-type development, where the pronominal endings spread from the demonstrative through other types of pronouns and quantifiers with strong pronominal properties to adjectives.[26]

Based on this evidence from variation between two elements, the bare-stem and -*ata* forms of neuter nominative and accusative modifiers present in themselves a correspondence set. In accordance with the customary procedure of internal reconstruction, the alternants that make

---

[26] For a discussion of the etymology of -*ata* and its relation to the demonstrative *þata* 'that', see Voyles 1992:240 and Kotin 2012:185–186. Kuryłowicz (1964:209) makes the following remark in a brief note on the influence of demonstratives on the inflection of adjectives in Germanic and Baltic: "It seems certain that the intermediate link must be looked for among pronominal adjectives."

up a correspondence set can be reduced to a single "original" prestructure (Fox 1995:187, Bauer 2009:18–19). In particular, based on the fact that *-ata* is a relatively rare form used in stylistically charged environments and appealed to in contexts where a higher degree of semantic and morphological expressiveness is required, it is to be regarded as a residual (relic) form in attested Gothic and can be preliminarily reconstructed as the dominant form in the neuter nominative and accusative singular of modifiers at the very least in pre-Gothic (compare van Loon 2005:98).

It is also worth pointing out in this connection that all of the Gothic attestations come from the Gothic Bible, and none are found in the *Skeireins,* which is a later text.[27] It is therefore conceivable that, as a residual form observed in specialized use, *-ata* had fallen out of use by the time the *Skeireins* was recorded. However, it is equally possible that the absence of such forms in the *Skeireins* is due to its relatively small size. As mentioned in section 2.3, the *Skeireins* contains the form *ƕarjatoh* 'each, every', which combines the *-ata* inflection and the enclitic particle *-uh.* As this pronoun (as well as the form *ainƕarjatoh* 'everyone, each') represents a concretion in which the *-ata* inflection does not alternate with the bare stem, it is to be regarded as a form that preserves evidence of older usage, where the pronominal inflection has been fixed in the word thanks to the enclitic that follows. As a result, such examples suggest that the use of the *-ata* form in the neuter nominative and accusative singular may have been more widespread before written Gothic.

It is a good question, though, whether—either in Gothic or Proto-Germanic—the pronominal form was ever the dominant or only form. As suggested in section 3.4 with reference to metrical factors, the clear preference for dactylic forms over other metrical types in the *-ata* corpus indicates that *-ata* never became productive enough to replace the bare stem completely. It should also be borne in mind that the reduction of

---

[27] Zadorožnyj (1960:214) compares the (16th century) Crimean Gothic forms *wichgata* 'white', *gadeltha* 'beautiful', and *atochta* 'bad' with the Gothic adjectives in *-ata*, citing respectively ⁺*ƕeitata,* ⁺*gatilata,* and ⁺*hatugata.* Similarly, Ganina (2011:226), referring to Stearns 1978:118–119, suggests that this correlation represents a Gothic–Crimean Gothic isogloss. See also Lehmann 1986:46, 135, 402.

variant forms to one "original" form as suggested above, resulting in a simpler and variation-free system, is a well-known limitation of the method of reconstruction. If at some point -*ata* was indeed the default form, it is unclear what could have motivated its gradual fall into disuse in favor of the bare stem, given the existence of its source neuter demonstrative *þata* 'that' and the morphological parallel of pronominally inflected forms elsewhere in the paradigm. It is equally strange that an erstwhile fully established pronominally inflected form should develop double exponence by severing the pronominal inflection at the morpheme boundary, as opposed to the inflection being gradually eroded in a word-final environment (-*ata* > [+]-*ate* > [+]-*at*, and so on).

In other words, the morphological nature of the variation between the bare stem and -*ata* is evidence of a development that was in progress for some time but never reached completion, with the neuter nominative and accusative forms never stabilized as pronominal. D. Gary Miller (personal communication) offers a possible explanation for the two outstanding forms: Pronominalization was completed in some paradigm slots earlier than others, with the most ambiguous forms fixed first, the important criterion being that animate (that is, masculine and feminine) forms take priority over inanimates (that is, neuters).[28] Forms in -*ata* never became productive enough to displace the bare stem (as suggested by the evidence of their diffusion in the Gothic modifier lexicon) because the relatively slower pace of their penetration into the modifier inflection led to their reanalysis as stylistically specific or formal. The newly acquired stylistic value of the morphologically heavier pronominal forms slowed down their productivity, and the bare stem was kept as the colloquial or neutral form. As a result, and contrary to recent convention, the reconstruction of these forms in Proto-Germanic should reflect competition between the nominal and pronominal variants (compare Bammesberger 1990:223, Ringe 2006:281, Hogg & Fulk 2011:150).

Ringe (2006:282) considers evidence of a similar alternation in Old High German (*guot* versus *guotaʒ* 'good') along with the fact that in Old Norse only the longer neuter form *gott* 'good' was attested (masculine *góðr* 'good'; compare masculine *hár* versus neuter *hátt* 'high'). He concludes that the difficulty of tracing the forms in the different

---

[28] See Miller 2010b:245–248 on the role of animacy in the development of English infinitive structures.

languages to the same source, posed by the final vowel in -*ata* ([+]-*atō*), suggests that the development of the pronominal ending proceeded independently in the different branches of Germanic (see also McFadden 2004:130–131 and 2009:66ff.).[29]

However, the collective evidence from the older Germanic languages in which some form of the pronominal ending is attested can suggest a different scenario of development. In particular, these pronominal forms can be seen to go back to an older protoform in the protolanguage; the differences between the attested forms in the daughters provide evidence of a later split whereby the forms were aligned with the individual developments in each given language. In any case, the final vowel in -*ata* being problematic does not necessarily mean that the reflexes of the inflection in the different Germanic languages have to be independent phenomena. As Jay H. Jasanoff (personal communication) points out, the difference between the Gothic masculine singular accusative form *god*-*ana* 'good' and Old High German *guot*-*an* has exactly the same status as -*ata* versus -*aʒ,* but this does not imply that the inflections result from independent developments.

All of the above considerations represent useful material in plotting the development of the strong inflection. As noted in section 1, the traditional account of the development of the strong adjective inflection has recently been brought into question by McFadden (2004, 2009). On his reasoning, the strong adjective inflection does not come directly from the demonstrative (whose accretions it is generally believed to contain) or any other single pronoun, but rather pronominal adjectives, which originally followed some regular pronominal declension in the Proto-Indo-European system (McFadden 2004:124–125, 2009:57). These pronominal adjectives comprise words such as Gothic *ains* 'one', *anþar* 'other, second', *alls* 'all' and possessives such as *meins* 'my', *unsar* 'our', etc., their crucial feature being that they never take the weak inflection, with their inflection being identical to that of the strong adjectives. McFadden (2004:125, 2009:57) hypothesizes that following

---

[29] That the alternating forms in Gothic and Old High German may be independent of one another was suggested already by Sievers (1876:120) on the basis that pronominal forms such as the Gothic -*ata* are lacking in Old Saxon and Old English. As a result, he proposes that the attested pronominal forms are likely to be idiosyncratic developments of the individual Germanic languages.

the pronominal adjectives, which were originally completely pronominal in their morphology, the "Germanic strong adjectives adopted the **fully** pronominal inflection of the P-As **wholesale**, in every form" (emphasis in the original).

The main weakness of McFadden's hypothesis, interesting as it may be, is that it lacks comparative credibility. The assumption that the pronominal adjectives were originally (that is, originally in Proto-Indo-European) completely pronominal must be supported by evidence from the Indo-European daughter languages. However, although some forms such as Proto-Indo-European [+]*ályod* 'all' (Lat. *aliud*) are pronominal in the inflection (McFadden 2004:124, 2009:55; Ringe 2006:144), the pronominal argument does not apply to the possessive pronouns. Nor is there any evidence that the inflection of adjectives was either completely, or even partly (that is, to the same degree that it is in Germanic), pronominal in Proto-Indo-European. As a result, the hypothesis founded on the transition Proto-Indo-European pronominal adjectives→ Germanic completely pronominal adjectives → Germanic strong adjectives pronominal in every form involves a series of unverifiable assumptions, and the lack of consistent comparative evidence for completely pronominal adjectives in Proto-Indo-European seriously undermines McFadden's hypothesis. It is also not very clear on what basis McFadden draws a borderline between demonstratives and pronominal adjectives in claiming that the demonstratives were not the original source of pronominal endings for the strong inflection, as the inflections of the pronominal adjectives are uncontroversially the original inflections of the demonstratives.[30]

By comparing adjective, nominal, and pronominal paradigms Schwink (2004:83–84) similarly proposes that the Germanic strong adjective inflection was pronominal from the start, thereby strongly diverging from the classical Indo-European languages and serving as "evidence of Germanic having gone its own way from an early period."

---

[30] Some scholars (for example, Birkhan 1974, Haudry 1981; see also Ramat 1981:77) have invoked the parallel with the Balto-Slavic definite adjective, whose inflection contains suffixed elements of personal pronouns, in arguing for a similar development in the Germanic strong inflection—a theory whose arguments are, however, unpersuasive. For a critique of the basic arguments, see Bammesberger 1990:226–227.

Schwink attempts to explain the existence of nominal inflections in the adjective paradigm as innovations either motivated by homophony avoidance (the nominal -*s* in the masculine nominative singular replacing the potentially ambiguous pronominal -*a*) or by simply losing out to the nominal inflections, where the nominal and pronominal inflections are each a single phoneme (hence the nominal -*a,* but not pronominal -*o,* in the feminine and neuter nominative singular). The only outlier that does not fit in with these explanations is the nominal -*ai,* rather than pronominal [+]-*aizai,* in the feminine dative singular, which, according to Schwink (2004:84), does not get in the way of the general argument because this slot is pronominal in the other older Germanic languages. As regards -*ata,* in Schwink's (2004:83) opinion it represents an older layer that is being replaced by the newer nominal bare stem, which may have been analogically motivated by the nominal forms of the masculine and feminine nominative singular.

Similar to McFadden's hypothesis, Schwink's proposal appeals to the significant pronominal element in the attested adjective paradigm in contemplating a theoretical possibility that the original paradigm may have been fully pronominal. However, the lack of comparative support for such a hypothesis makes it similarly unsustainable. Futhermore, Schwink's proposal is uneconomical in that it targets the few different obstacles (that is, nominally inflected paradigm slots) to his hypothesis individually.

By contrast, assuming an originally nominal state in the inflection of the strong paradigm is not only comparatively legitimate, but all that is left to be explained in this case is the few unambiguously nominal slots in the paradigm. These admit a simple and natural explanation in terms of the single-phoneme desinences of the demonstrative in these slots not being sufficiently well characterized to replace the original nominal desinences, rather than the opposite, that is, the "newer" single-phoneme nominal desinences win over the "older" single-phoneme ones for inexplicable reasons. Nor does the proposal that the analogy between two nominally inflected paradigm slots motivated the severing of an established pronominal form at the morpheme boundary present a compelling explanation for the variation between the bare stem and -*ata.* Finally, it is conceivable that the feminine dative singular inflection -*ai* in the Gothic adjective is a simplification of the older pronominal form in

+*-aizai,* the evidence of which is well preserved in the Germanic daughter languages.

As an alternative to McFadden's and Schwink's hypotheses, some useful evidence for understanding the development of the strong inflection comes from the Gothic data as discussed above. The evidence from Gothic *-ata* forms indicates that they occur more commonly amongst quantifiers and possessives (that is, "pronominal adjectives"), which suggests that, by virtue of having pronominal properties, these word classes were more susceptible to pronominalization. It is possible, then, that adjectives acquired their inflections from demonstratives via pronominal adjectives by lexical diffusion, but it is doubtful that the spread of pronominal desinences in the strong inflection was as neat as demonstratives → pronominal adjectives → adjectives.

Instead, it would make more sense to develop a hypothesis founded on multiple motivations and propose that a large-scale analogical process of pronominalization was underway in Proto-Germanic. The morphologically more iconic (that is, better characterized) inflections of the demonstrative pronouns were passed on to other modifiers (all word classes at the same time), with some word classes affected more strongly than others (see also Bahnick 1973:82 and Žirmunskij 1976:216).[31] Even if it is true that the pronominal adjectives were the first to be pronominalized, it was the tandem of the demonstratives and pronominal adjectives, boosting the productivity of the new pronominal system of inflection, that affected the inflection of regular strong adjectives but not the pronominal adjectives on their own. The alternation between the bare

---

[31] The introduction of pronominal inflections into modifier paradigms relies on Germanic recycling its own morphological material, and in this sense it is remotely similar to EXAPTATION, defined by Lass (1997:316) as the conceptual renovation of existing material originally developed for other purposes. However, the fundamental difference between the Germanic pronominalization on the one hand and exaptation on the other is that the former refers to an analogical spread across the modifier system of morphological elements that are fully functional, while the latter implies the reviving of defunct elements. Thus, van Loon (2005:195–196) refers to the Germanic pronominalization as morpheme transplantation. For a discussion of exaptation, see Lass 1990, 1997:316–324, Janda 1996, 1999, and de Cuypere 2005. Croft (2000, chapter 5) refers to exaptation as hypoanalysis or regrammaticalization, and Willis (2006) concludes that exaptation is in reality a type of reanalysis.

stem and *-ata* as it is attested in Gothic is testament to a process of pronominalization of the strong modifier inflection early in the development of Germanic that never reached completion (in this regard, compare Zadorožnyj 1960:203 and Burobin 2011:192).

To conclude, the variation between the bare stem and *-ata* in Gothic presents in itself a historically significant artifact, whose main value resides in capturing a change in progress. The particulars that define the variation, coupled with the evidence for related developments in Old High German and Old Norse, allow the reconstruction of an earlier stage before or around the break-up of Proto-Germanic. According to the reconstructed scenario, during that stage the demonstrative pronoun started encroaching upon the inflection of other modifiers, with possessive pronouns and quantifiers serving as a bridge in the spread of pronominal inflections across the modifier lexicon.[32]

4. Conclusion.

Not much is left of the traditional hypothesis explaining the variation between the bare stem and *-ata* in the neuter nominative and accusative singular set out at the beginning of this paper. Not only is the variation not confined to any one conditioning factor, but it also cuts across a number of domains, including morphology, syntax, stylistics, prosody, etc. Let us review some of the basic arguments and findings.

The research reported in this paper set out with a dual goal of examining the circumstances that condition the variation between the bare stem and *-ata* in the Gothic data and assessing the historical value of the synchronic findings and generalizations. The corpus of 644 Gothic neuter nominative and accusative singular adjectives, quantifiers, possessive, demonstrative, indefinite pronouns, and past participles examined in this paper contains 76 (12%) examples of pronominally inflected forms in *-ata,* confined to the text of the Gothic New Testament. Although the relative figure of 12% does confirm that *-ata* was less common than the bare stem, it is statistically significant as it indicates a one-in-ten rate of appearance, suggesting a degree of regularity. The distribution of *-ata* across the modifier lexicon shows a

---

[32] An anonymous reviewer points out that there is evidence for a similar development in Semitic—see Pat-El 2009.

preference for "pronominal" word classes, with 58 (76%) examples of different types of pronoun as well as the quantifier *alls* 'all'. With a total of 15 (20%) examples, adjectives are a minority group. The taxonomic generalization that follows from this is that the strong modifier inflection in Germanic is not so much the "adjective inflection" as it is the inflection of pronominal classes of modifiers. A comparison of the Gothic evidence with Greek and Latin texts indicates that the variation attested in Gothic is independent of either Greek or Latin; nor can any of the scribes be implicated in showing a stronger preference for one form over the other. Judging by quantitative tendencies, it is possible, however, that the desinence of the Greek form *panta* 'all' is responsible for the higher occurrence of *-ata* with the quantifier *all* 'all'.

The examination of the syntax of *-ata* modifiers helps dispel another traditional dictum, namely, that the variation between the bare stem and *-ata* is regulated by syntactic criteria, and that *-ata* is impossible or exceptional in predicative environments. The quantitative evidence indicates that *-ata* is equally likely to be found in attributive and substantivized environments, even if the evidence for the latter is mostly based on the copious attestation of substantivized forms in the quantifier *alls* 'all'. Three of the four predicative examples of *-ata* may pose difficulties of interpretation and be analyzed as ambiguous, but the criteria of internal structure, semantics, and context of the sentences lend strong support to their predicative reading. In addition, the scarcity of these predicative examples is explained by the tendency of *-ata* to occur in the accusative case. Thus, the (non-)use of *-ata* in Gothic is not dependent on syntax to the exclusion of other criteria, and the variation between the bare stem and *-ata* is not subject to syntactically-conditioned allomorphy.

Perhaps the most compelling explanatory piece of evidence comes from the distribution of *-ata* in texts, and especially the clustering of the second person possessive pronoun *þeins* 'your' in John 17. On this evidence, the morphologically complex *-ata* form is shown to be stylistically charged and is observed in contexts that warrant a higher degree of expressiveness, as opposed to the shorter bare stem, which is stylistically neutral and therefore more common. The special scope of application of *-ata* is further confirmed by its use in grammatically awkward environments: By virtue of being better characterized, *-ata* aids in resolving syntactic ambiguity. It is perhaps this higher degree of

characterization that also explains the tendency of *-ata* to appear in substantivized use.

   The most important benefit of the variation between the bare stem and *-ata* is the diachronic insights it affords into the development of the Germanic strong modifier inflection. The different parameters that define the variation in Gothic, as discussed above, coupled with comparative Germanic evidence, suggest that *-ata* in Gothic is a relic form that can be traced back to pre-Gothic and, ultimately, to Proto-Germanic. The application of internal reconstruction to the forms in variation recovers a prehistoric stage of invariance, recommending the pronominal allomorph as the earlier default form—a reconstruction that can be corrected and refined by recourse to the specifics of the attested Gothic data. In particular, the evidence indicates that pronominal inflections spread from the demonstrative pronoun to other types of pronouns by lexical diffusion, activating an analogical mechanism of change, which eventually led to the pronominalization of the paradigms of adjectives and past participles. The process was never brought to completion, as suggested by the gradual percolation of *-ata* through the lexicon of affected modifiers and the metrical selectiveness of *-ata*. Additionally, the morphological nature of the variation between an inflectionless form and a well-characterized inflected form indicates that *-ata* is a residual element that was once gaining ascendancy but failed to completely displace the bare stem, rather than being a relic of a fully established older pronominal form that was truncated at the morpheme boundary.

   The evidence of variation between the bare stem and *-ata* in Gothic presents a compelling case against the view that the Germanic adjective inflection may have been fully pronominal at some point in Proto-Germanic, helping to coherently place the morphologically innovative evidence of Germanic strong modifiers in the broader context of Indo-European. The results reported also suggest that the traditional view of the history of the strong modifier inflection is in need of some revision. In particular, a comparative examination of paradigm morphology across Germanic may further our understanding of the mechanics and timing issues in the development of the strong inflection. Ultimately, a fuller appreciation of the variation between the bare stem and *-ata* in Gothic, as well as the development of the strong inflection, requires a careful study of inflectional variation in the Old High German strong modifier

paradigm—an issue which so far seems to have been largely confined to cursory statements of syntactically motivated variation in the grammars.

REFERENCES

Andrason, Alexander. 2010. Resultative predicative adjunct constructions in the Gothic Bible. *Interlingüistica* 20. 1–12.

Baerman, Matthew. 2009. Case syncretism. *The Oxford handbook of case,* ed. by Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer, 219–230. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bahnick, Karen R. 1973. *The determination of stages in the historical development of the Germanic languages by morphological criteria: An evaluation.* The Hague: Mouton.

Bammesberger, Alfred. 1990. *Die Morphologie des urgermanischen Nomens.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Bauer, Brigitte L. M. 2009. Residues as an aid in internal reconstruction. *Internal reconstruction in Indo-European: Methods, results, and problems,* ed. by Jens Elmengård Rasmussen & Thomas Olander, 17–31. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen.

Beekes, Robert S. P. 2011. *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: An introduction.* 2nd edn. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Birkhan, Helmut. 1974. Das germanische starke Adjektiv. *Strukturen und Interpretationen: Studien zur deutschen Philologie gewidmet Blanka Horacek zum 60. Geburtstag,* ed. by Alfred Ebenbauer, Fritz Peter Knapp, & Peter Krämer in collaboration with Klaus Zatloukal, 1–24. Vienna: Wilhelm Braunmüller Universitäts-Verlagsbuchhandlung GmbH.

Braune, Wilhelm, & Ingo Reiffenstein. 2004. *Althochdeutsche Grammatik I.* 15th edn. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Braune, Wilhelm, & Frank Heidermanns. 2004. *Gotische Grammatik.* 20th edn. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Burobin, Rostislav V. 2011. Sopostavitelʹnyj analiz atributivnyx soglasovatelʹnyx modelej v gotskom, drevneanglijskom i drevneislandskom jazykax. *Lingua Gotica* 2, ed. by Ekaterina B. Yakovenko & Aleksandr L. Zeleneckij, 189–198. Moscow: Ejdos, Institut jazykoznanija RAN.

Croft, William. 2000. *Explaining language change: An evolutionary approach.* Harlow: Longman.

Curme, George. 1910. The origin and growth of the adjective declension in Germanic. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 9. 439–482.

Cuypere, Ludovic de. 2005. Exploring exaptation in language change. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 26. 13–26.

Dewey, Tonya Kim, & Yasmin Syed. 2009. Case variation in Gothic absolute constructions. *The role of semantic, pragmatic, and discourse factors in the development of case,* ed. by Jóhanna Barðdal & Shobhana L. Chelliah, 3–21. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Durante, Elio. 1974. *Grammatica gotica.* Firenze: G. C. Sansoni.

Eythórsson, Thórhallur. 1995. *Verbal syntax in the early Germanic languages.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University dissertation.

Falluomini, Carla. 2013. The Gothic version of the New Testament. *The text of the New Testament in contemporary research: Essays on the status Quaestionis*, ed. by Bart D. Ehrman. 2nd edn. 329–350. Leiden: Brill.

Falluomini, Carla. 2014. Zum gotischen Fragment aus Bologna. *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum und Deutsche Literatur* 143. 281–305.

Falluomini, Carla. 2015. *The Gothic version of the Gospels and Pauline epistles: Cultural background, transmission and character.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Finazzi, Rosa Bianca, & Paola Tornaghi. 2013. Gothica Bononiensia: Analisi linguistica e filologica di un nuovo documento. *Aevum* 87. 113–155.

Fortson, Benjamin W. 2010. *Indo-European language and culture: An introduction*. 2nd edn. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Fox, Anthony. 1995. *Linguistic reconstruction: An introduction to theory and method.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Friedrichsen, George Washington Salibury. 1926. *The Gothic version of the Gospels: A study of its style and textual history.* London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford.

Friedrichsen, George Washington Salibury. 1930. The silver ink of the Codex Argenteus. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 31. 189–192.

Friedrichsen, George Washington Salibury. 1939. *The Gothic version of the Epistles: A study of its style and textual history.* London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford.

Friedrichsen, George Washington Salibury. 1961. *Gothic studies.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Friesen, Otto von, & Anders Grape. 1927. *Codex Argenteus Upsaliensis jussu senatus universitatis phototypice editus.* Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Gabelentz, Hans Conon von der, & Julius Loebe. 1846. *Grammatik der gotischen Sprache.* Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.

Ganina, Natalija A. 2011. *Krymsko-gotskij jazyk.* St. Petersburg: Aletejja.

Grimm, Jacob. 1822. *Deutsche Grammatik,* vol. 1. 2nd edn. Göttingen: Dieterische Buchhandlung.

Grimm, Jacob. 1837. *Deutsche Grammatik,* vol. 4. Göttingen: Dieterische Buchhandlung.

Guxman, Mirra M. 1958. *Gotskij jazyk.* Moscow: Izdatel′stvo literatury na inostrannyx jazykax.

Harbert, Wayne. 2007. *The Germanic languages*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Haudry, Jean. 1981. Les deux flexions de l'adjectif en germanique. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 76. 191–200.

Hempel, Heinrich. 1966. *Gotisches Elementarbuch*. 4th edn. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Herdt, Tom de, & Joseph van Loon. 2004/2006. *The Wulfila Project*. University of Antwerp online resource: http://www.wulfila.be, accessed between June 15, 2013 and August 18, 2014.

Hirt, Hermann. 1932. *Handbuch des Urgermanischen. Teil II: Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Hogg, Richard M., & Robert D. Fulk. 2011. *A grammar of Old English,* vol. 2: Morphology. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hunter, M. J. 1969. The Gothic Bible. *The Cambridge history of the Bible, vol. 2: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation,* ed. by G. W. H. Lampe, 338–362. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janda, Laura A. 1996. *Back from the brink: A study of how relic forms in languages serve as source material for analogical extension.* Munich: Lincom Europa.

Janda, Laura A. 1999. Categorization and analogical change: The case of athematic 1sg *-m* in the Slavic languages. *Issues in cognitive linguistics: 1993 proceedings of the International Cognitive Linguistics Conference,* ed. by Leon de Stadler & Chrystoph Eyrich, 75–95. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jasanoff, Jay H. 2008. Gothic. *The ancient languages of Europe,* ed. by Roger D. Woodard, 189–214. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Jellinek, Max H. 1926. *Geschichte der gotischen Sprache*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kieckers, Ernst. 1928. *Handbuch der vergleichenden gotischen Grammatik.* München: Max Hueber Verlag.

Kienle, Richard von. 1969. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Deutschen.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Kotin, Michail L. 2012. *Gotisch: im (diachronischen und typologischen) Vergleich.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Krahe, Hans. 1969. *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft,* vol. 2. *Formenlehre.* 7th edn. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Krause, Wolfgang. 1968. *Handbuch des Gotischen.* 3rd edn. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Kubrjakova, Elena S. 1977. Prilagatel′noe. *Istoriko-tipologičeskaja morfologija germanskix jazykov,* ed. by Mirra M. Guxman, 286–343. Moscow: Nauka.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1964. *The inflectional categories of Indo-European.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Lass, Roger.1990. How to do things with junk: Exaptation in language evolution. *Journal of Linguistics* 26. 79–102.

Lass, Roger. 1997. *Historical linguistics and language change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1986. *A Gothic etymological dictionary.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Loon, Jozef van. 2005. *Principles of historical morphology.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag.

Marchand, James W. 1957. Notes on Gothic manuscripts. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 56. 213–224.

Marchand, James W. 1973. *The sounds and phonemes of Wulfila's Gothic.* The Hague: Mouton.

Mastrelli, Carlo Alberto. 1967. *Grammatica gotica.* Milano: Mursia.

McFadden, Thomas. 2004. On the pronominal inflection of the Germanic strong adjective. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 10. 123–136.

McFadden, Thomas. 2009/2003. On the pronominal origins of the Germanic strong adjective inflection. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 63. 53–82.

Metlen, Michael. 1937. The silver ink of the Codex Argenteus. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 36. 244–245.

Metzger, Bruce. 1977. *The early versions of the New Testament: Their origin, transmission, and limitations.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Meyer, Leo. 1863. *Über die Flexion der Adjektiva im Deutschen.* Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Miller, D. Gary. 2010a. *Language change and linguistic theory* I. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Miller, D. Gary. 2010b. *Language change and linguistic theory* II. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Miller, D. Gary. 2014. *English lexicogenesis.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mossé, Fernand. 1956. *Manuel del la langue gotique: Grammaire, textes, notes, glossaire.* 2nd edn. Paris: Aubier, Éditions montaigne.

Munkhammar, Lars. 2011. *The Silver Bible: Origins and history of the Codex Argenteus*. Uppsala: Selenas.

Nestle, Eberhard, Erwin Nestle, Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, & Bruce M. Metzger (eds.). 2001. *Greek-English New Testament.* 9th edn. [*Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th edn.] Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Orr, Robert. 1982. The twofold adjective declension in Germanic and Slavic (with some reference to Baltic): A contrastive/comparative analysis. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96. 104–118.

Pat-El, Na'ama. 2009. The development of the Semitic definite article: A syntactic approach. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 54. 19–50.

Payne, John, & Rodney Huddleston. 2002. Nouns and noun phrases. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*, ed. by Rodney Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum, 323–523. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pierce, Marc. 2013. Syllable weight in Gothic. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118. 213–226.

Prokosch, Eduard. 1939. *A comparative Germanic grammar.* Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.

Ramat, Paolo. 1981. *Einführung in das Germanische.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Rauch, Irmengard. 2011. *The Gothic language: Grammar, genetic provenance and typology, readings.* 2nd edn. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Riad, Tomas. 1992. *Structures in Germanic prosody: A diachronic study with special reference to the Nordic languages.* Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm University dissertation.

Ringe, Don. 2006. *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, Maurice A., & William G. Pierpont. 2005. *The New Testament in the original Greek: Byzantine textform 2005*. Southborough, MA: Chilton Book Publishing.

Schwink, Frederick. 2004. *The third gender: Studies in the origins and history of Germanic grammatical gender.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Sievers, Eduard. 1876. Kleine Beiträge zur deutschen Grammatik. III. Die starke Adjectivdeclination. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 2. 98–124.

Snædal, Magnús. 2005. *A concordance to biblical Gothic II: Concordance.* 2nd edn. Reykjavík: University of Iceland Press.

Snædal, Magnús. 2010. *Uns/unsis* and colloquial Gothic. *The Gothic language: A symposium (NOWELE 58/59),* ed. by Hans Frede Nielsen & Flemming Talbo Stubkjær in collaboration with Mette Bruus & Erik W. Hansen, 301–322. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.

Speyer, Augustin. 2007. *Germanische Sprachen.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Stearns, MacDonald. 1978. *Crimean Gothic: An analysis and etymology of the corpus.* Saratoga, CA: Anma Libri.

Streitberg, Wilhelm. 1919. *Die gotische Bibel.* 2nd edn. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Streitberg, Wilhelm. 1920. *Gotisches Elementarbuch.* 5th edn. and 6th edn. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Streitberg, Wilhelm. 1974. *Urgermanische Grammatik.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Streitberg, Wilhelm. 2000. *Die gotische Bibel.* 7th edn. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.

Sturtevant, Albert M. 1945. Concerning irregular forms in Gothic. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 44. 370–377.

Sturtevant, Albert M. 1947. Gothic morphological notes. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 46. 92–97.

Szemerényi, Oswald J. L. 1996. *Introduction to Indo-European linguistics.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Voyles, Joseph B. 1992. *Early Germanic grammar: pre-, proto-, and post-Germanic languages.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Weber, Robert, & Roger Gryson (eds.). 1994. *Biblia Sacra Vulgata.* 4th edn. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Willis, David. 2006. Degrammaticalization, exaptation and loss of inflection: Evidence from Slavonic. Unpublished manuscript, University of Cambridge. Available at http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.123.6796&rep=rep1&type=pdf, accessed April 15, 2014.

Wright, Joseph. 1954. *Grammar of the Gothic language.* 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wunderlich, Dieter. 2004. Is there any need for the concept of directional syncretism? *Explorations in nominal inflection,* ed. by Gereon Müller, Lutz Gunkel, & Gisela Zifonun, 373–395. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Zadorožnyj, Bohdan M. 1960. *Porivnjal'na fonetyka i morfolohija hots'koï movy.* Lviv: Vydavnyctvo l'vivs'koho universytetu.

Zinder, Lev R., & Tat'jana V. Stroeva. 1968. *Istoričeskaja morfologija nemeckogo jazyka.* Leningrad: Prosveščenie.

Žirmunskij, Viktor M. 1966. Prilagatel'nye i narečija v germanskix jazykax. *Sravnitel'naja grammatika germanskix jazykov,* vol. 4, ed. by Enver A. Makaev, 8–122. Moscow: Nauka.

Žirmunskij, Viktor M. 1976 [1946]. Proisxoždenie kategorii prilagatel'nyx v indoevropejskix jazykax v sravnitel'no-grammatičeskom osveščenii. *Obščee i germanskoe jazykoznanie,* ed. by Agnija V. Desnickaja, Mirra M. Guxman, & Solomon D. Kacnel'son, 209–235. Leningrad: Nauka.

Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies
University of Vilnius
Universiteto St. 5
LT–01513 Vilnius
Lithuania
[arturas.ratkus@gmail.com]