

The Journal of Humanities, Meiji Univ., Vol.14 (March 31, 2008),55-66

« **Individual Research** »

On the Rivalry between *Si* and *So* in Gothic

NAKAMURA Koichi

« Individual Research »

On the Rivalry between *Si* and *So* in Gothic

NAKAMURA Koichi

Introduction

The Gothic feminine pronoun *si* has no more than eight occurrences in the extant source. Considering the high frequency of Greek feminine pronouns and articles that would supposedly correspond to *si*, this is an anomaly that is worth investigation. The fact that masculine *is* and neuter *ita* have hundreds of examples make us conjecture that the scarcity of *si* might be concerned with grammatical gender itself. On the other hand, the oblique cases of feminine *si* have a little more examples: *izos* (gen.) has 26, *izai* (dat.) 52, and *ija* (acc.) 10, which are more numerous than the nominative and the scarcity of nominative *si* stands out.

Si is etymologically different from masculine and neuter, and from other cases of feminine as well. According to Lehmann (1986) *si* is “based on PIE 3rd person f *sī* ; OE *sēo* **the**, OHG *siu* ← PIE *syo-* (in Skt *syá* **she**), unless *-u* was not based on f noun ending¹”. But OE *seo* itself is problematic with no decisive etymological explanation and its late appearance in the history of English (in the middle of 12th century). The cognation of Goth *si* and OE *seo* is all the more disputable when Mayrhofer (1986-2001:781) says that “[d]as Suppletionsverhältnis von *syá-* zu *tyá-* ist dem von *sá-* zu *tá-* analog; *syá-* und *tyá-* sind wohl indoar. Neuerungen, die vom *sá-/tá-*Pronomen ausgehen.”

Since masculine *is* and neuter *ita* are without doubt the offspring of the prevalent PIE **i-* (Ved. (m) *ay-ám*, (f) *iy-ám*, (n) *i-d-ám*; Lat. *is*, *ea*, *id*, *ī-dem*, *ea-dem*, *id-em*; Gr. *μ-iv*, *ν-iv*, Myc. *min* (Meier-Brügger (2003:230)), feminine *si* is conspicuous in the paradigm:

	Masc.	Neut.	Fem.
Nom.	is	ita	si
Gen.	is	is	izos
Dat.	imma	imma	izai
Acc.	ina	ita	ija

NAKAMURA Koichi is Professor of English in the Department of Political Science and Economics at Meiji University. He is the co-editor of *The Ancrene Wisse: A Four-Manuscript Parallel Text* (Peter Lang).

1 What Corresponds to *Si*

The eight occurrences are only in Luke and Mark and lacking in the other Gospels, the Epistles and Skeireins, which is also an anomaly that beckons our attention:

Luke 1:29

ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα διαταράχθη ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἶη ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος.

ih si gasaihwandei gablahsnoda bi innatgahtai is jah þahta sis hweleika wesi so goleins [þatei swa þiupida izai].

Luke 7:12

ὡς δὲ ἤγγισεν τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκὼς υἱὸς μονογενῆς τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτῇ χήρα, καὶ ὄχλος τῆς πόλεως ἰκανὸς σὺν αὐτῇ. (=Aland)

biþeh þan nehwa was daura þizos baurgs, þaruh sai, utbaurans was naus, sunus ainaha aiþein seinai, jah si silbo widowo, jah managei þizos baurgs ganoha miþ izai.

Luke 7:44

εἰσῆλθὸν σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ὕδωρ μοι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας μου οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξέν μου τοὺς πόδας καὶ ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξεν. (=Aland)

atgaggandin in gard þeinana wato mis an fotuns meinans ni gaft; ih si tagram seinaim ganatida meinans fotuns jah skufta seinamma biswarb.

Luke 7:45

φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας, αὕτη δὲ ἀφ' ἧς εἰσῆλθον οὐ διέλειπεν καταφικουῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας (=Aland)

ni kukides mis; ih si, fram þammei innatiddja, ni swaif bikukjan fotuns meinans.

Luke 7:46

ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν μου οὐκ ἤλειψας, αὕτη δὲ μύρω ἤλειπεν τοὺς πόδας μου. (=Aland)

alewa haubid meinata ni salbodes; ih si balsana gasalboda fotuns meinans.

Mark 6:24

ἡ δὲ ἐξελθοῦσα εἶπεν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς· τί αἰτήσωμαι; ἡ δὲ εἶπεν· τὴν

κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ.

īþ si usgaggandei qab du aiþein seinai: hwis bidjau? īþ si qab: haubidis Iohannis þis daupjandins.

Mark 7:27-8

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ· ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τήκνα· οὐ γὰρ καλόν ἐστιν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ βαλεῖν τοῖς κυναρίοις. ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ναί, κύριε· καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων.

īþ Iesus qab du izai: let faurþis sada wairþan barna, unte ni goþ ist niman hlaib barne jah wairþan hundam. īþ si andhof imma jah qab du imma: jai frauja; jah auk hundos undaro biuda matjand af drauhsnom barne.

So we have

4 articles followed by δὲ (= ἡ δὲ)

3 demonstrative pronouns followed by δὲ (αὐτῇ δὲ)

1 reflexive pronoun (αὐτῇ)

for *si*.

2 ἡ = *so*

When we see how ἡ is translated in Matt., we sometimes find this article untranslated (cf. Sauvageot (1929:5): “[e]n principe, le gotique n’emploie pas d’article pour signaler le substantif”):

ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν· ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἐν ἡ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται.

amen auk qiþa izwis: und þatei usleiþiþ himins jah airþa, jota ains aiþþau ains striks ni usleiþiþ af witoda, unte allata wairþiþ. (5:18)

But in most cases it is rendered into *so/sa* :

Matt.

6:4

ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη

so armahairtiþa

7:14

ἡ ὁδὸς ἣ ἀπάγουσα

wigs sa brigganda

(The second ἣ cannot be omitted here since it is semantically equivalent to a relative pronoun, as can be seen from the Vulgate: uia quae ducit ad uitam)

8:32

καὶ ἰδοὺ ὤρμησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη τῶν χοίρων κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν

jah sai, run gawaurhtedun sis alla so hairda and driuson in marein

8:34

καὶ ἰδοὺ πᾶσα ἡ πόλις ἐξῆλθεν εἰς συνάντησιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ

jah sai, alla so baurgs usiddja wiþra Iesu

9:22

ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. καὶ ἐσώθη ἡ γυνὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.
galaubeins þeina ganasida þuk. jah ganas so qino fram þizai hweilai jainai.

27:56

ἐν αἷς ἦν Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ, καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσὴ μήτηρ

in þaimeis was Marja so Magdalene, jah Marja so Iakobis jah Ioseziz aiþei

But see 27:61 where the first article is omitted:

ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία, καθήμεναι ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου.

wasuh þan jainar Marja Magdalene jah so anþara Marja sitandeins andwairþis þamma hlaiwa.

Whether “jainar Marja so Magdalene” was acceptable or not we are not so sure. Of all the 12 examples of ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ, the Gothic text has 7 corresponding parts. Of those 7, five use *so Magdalene*. Then it seems that “Marja so Magdalene” is possible, but our example has a demonstrative “jainar” before Mary. Probably it is this “jainar” that made Wulfila cancel the *so* between Mary and Magdalene. The other ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ that does not have *so* uses a relative pronoun. This translation technique is very frequent, or rather, one is almost forced to resort to it

because of the Greek-proper preference for participles².

As we can see, the correspondence between *h̄* and *so* is the most common. The reason, then, why *si* rather than *so* is used four times (Luke 1:29, Mark 6:24 ×2, Mark 7:27-8) must be that in those cases *h̄* is followed by *de* and thus virtually functions as a personal pronoun.

Then we need to know how *h̄ de*'s are translated. In Mark there are 62 *h̄*'s, some of which, of course, have no counterparts in the Gothic version and out of those that do have counterparts, there is only one *h̄* that is followed by *de* (6:24), which we cited above already and saw rendered as *si*. Likewise in Luke there is one *h̄* followed by *de* (1:29) and this also we cited already. Both in Matt. and John we have no *h̄ de* (excluding those followed by a noun that is governed by *h̄*).

3 *av̄t̄h̄*

There are 73 examples of *av̄t̄h̄*, of which 27 are relevant for the Gothic text, i.e. of which corresponding text exists. Of those 27 *av̄t̄h̄*'s, 22 (81.5%) are translated into some sorts of definite articles/demonstrative pronouns (*sa*, *þata*, *so*, *þizai* . . .), all of which belong to the single category. We find that 23 examples are not followed by the particle *de*, whereas the other 4 have *de* after them.

3.1 Without *de*

We have three examples of *soh* :

Luke 2:2

av̄t̄h̄ *h̄* ἀπογραφῆ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου.

soh þan gilstrameleins frumista warþ at [wisandin kindina Swriais] raginondin Saurim Kwreinaiau.

(Haec descriptio prima facta est praeside Syriae Quirino: et ibant omnes ut profiterentur singuli in suam ciuitatem.)

Luke 2:36

av̄t̄h̄ προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς, ζήσασα μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἔτη ἑπτὰ ἀπὸ τῆς παρθενείας αὐτῆς

soh framaldra dage managaize libandei miþ abin jera sibun fram magapein seinai

(haec processerat in diebus multis, et uixerat cum uiro suo annis septem a

uirginitate sua)

The third example (John 17:3) is cited below in 3.2. The other 19 *αὕτη*'s have *so*'s :

Mark 12:31

καὶ δευτέρα ὁμοία *αὕτη* ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

jah anþara galeika *þizai*: frijos nehwundjan þeinana swe þuk silban.

(Secundum autem simile est *illi*: Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum.)

Rom. 11:27

καὶ *αὕτη* αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

jah *so* im fram mis triggwa, þan afnima frawaurhtins ize.

(Et *hoc* illis a me testamentum: cum abstulero peccata eorum.)

There is one example (3.7%) that seems left untranslated:

Rom. 7:10

ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον, καὶ εὐρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν, *αὕτη* εἰς θάνατον.

ip ik gadauþnoda jah bigitana warþ mis anabusns, sei was du libainai, wisan du dauþau.

(Ego autem mortuus sum: et inuentum est mihi mandatum quod erat ad uitam, *hoc* esse ad mortem.)

The sentence with the subject recapitulated “bigitana warþ mis anabusns, sei was du libainai, *so* wisan du dauþau” might have been felt redundant by Wulfila. The latter part may have been influenced by the Old Latin version or some exegesis on the Epistles. This is cited in Friedrichsen (1939:181) as one of more than 200 “latinizing renderings”, though he says “it is not often possible to cite a Chrysostomian comment from which the Gothic rendering may have been derived as well as from the Latin with which also it agrees.”

There are some dubious cases, e.g.:

Mark 8:12

καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει· τί ἡ γενεὰ *αὕτη* σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ;

jah ufswojgands ahmin seinamma qap: hwa þata kuni taikn sokeiþ?
(Et inemescens spiritu, ait: Quid generatio ista quaerit signum?)

One might wonder whether this *þata* comes from *ἡ* or *αὕτη* or both.

3.2 With *δέ*

There are four examples of *αὕτη δέ*, three of which we have already cited in 1 (Luke 7:44, 45 and 46). They are all rendered into *si*. We have one example in John that attracts our attention:

John 17:3

αὕτη δέ ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή, ἵνα γινώσκωσι σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

soh þan ist so aiweino libains, ei kunneina þuk ainana sunjana guþ jah þanei insandides, Iesu Xristu.

(Haec est autem uita aeterna: ut cognoscant te, solum uerum Deum, et quam misisti, Iesum Christum.)

Soh is a composite pronoun with an enclitic particle *-uh*. Since three examples of *αὕτη δέ* are translated as *si*, “*si ist so aiweino libains*” might also seem possible. There are 8 *soh*’s (John 17:3, Luke 2:2, 36, 37×2, 38, Mark 16:10, Skeireins 8:7), which we find rendered from various words (*αὕτη, ἡ, ἐκείνη . . .*) but only John 17:3 above includes *δέ* among them. It is probable that “*þan*” is the rendering of “*δέ*” here and corresponds semantically to Latin “*autem*”. In fact for all the four examples of *αὕτη δέ*, the Vulgate has *haec autem*. We might presumably consider here a euphonic effect the choice of *soh* brings.

4 *αὐτή*

There are 11 examples of nominative *αὐτή* (hence not serving as a personal pronoun as its oblique cases do) in the entire Bible. None of those are followed by *δέ*. They are rendered in three ways, *so*, *soh* and *si silbo*.

Luke 1:36

καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἐλισάβετ ἡ συγγενής σου καὶ αὐτή συνειληφυῖα υἱὸν ἐν γήρει αὐτῆς, καὶ οὗτος μὴν ἕκτος ἐστὶν αὐτῇ τῇ καλουμένη στείρα
jah sai, Aileisabaþ niþro þeina, jah so inkilþo sunau in aldoin seinamma,
jah sa menoþ saihsta ist izai sei haitada stairo

(Et ecce Elizabeth cognata tua, et ipsa concepit filium in senecta sua . . .)

One might wonder if this *so* could not have been *si*, since we know there is one example of *si* used for *αὐτή* in Luke 7:12. But when we see the Vulgate use *ipsa*, we find that *so* here means not simply “she” but “she herself”, which *si* alone could not express.

Luke 2:37

καὶ αὐτή χήρα ὡς ἐτῶν ὀγδοήκοντα τεσσάρων, ἢ οὐκ ἀφίστατο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ νηστείας καὶ δεήσεσι λατρεύουσα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν.

soh þan widuwo jere ahtautehund jah fidwor, soh ni afiddja fairra alh fastubnjam jah bidom blotande frauþan nahtam jah dagam.

(Et haec uidia usque ad annos octoginta quattuor: quae non discedebat de templo, ieiuniis et obsecrationibus seruiens nocte ac die.)

Luke 7:12

ὡς δὲ ἤγγισεν τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔξεκομίζετο τεθνηκῶς υἱὸς μονογενῆς τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτή χήρα, καὶ ὄχλος τῆς πόλεως ἱκανὸς σὺν αὐτῇ.

bipeh þan nehwa was daura þizos baurgs, þaruh sai, utbaurans was naus, sunus ainaha aiþein seinai, jah si silbo widuwo, jah managei þizos baurgs ganoþa miþ izai.

(Cum autem adpropinquaret portae ciuitatis, et ecce defunctus efferebatur, filius unicus matri suae: et haec uidia erat: et turba ciuitatis multa cum illa.)

Streitberg’s Greek text of Luke 8:42 is crucially different from Aland’s:

ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενῆς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐτῶν δώδεκα, καὶ αὐτή ἀπέθνησκεν (Streitberg)

ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενῆς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐτῶν δώδεκα καὶ αὐτῇ ἀπέθνησκεν (Aland)

unte dauhtar ainoho was imma swe wintriwe twalibe, jah so swalt.

(quia filia unica erat illi fere annorum duodecim, et haec moriebatur)

Whether *αὐτή* “this (woman)” or *αὐτῇ* “she (herself)” lay under Gothic *so* remains uncertain. If *αὐτή* had been Streitberg’s own emendation despite nonexistence of variants (Aland at least offers none), that might have been unnecessary since *so* could be used for both of these two pronouns, as we have observed in section one of this article (one of the eight examples of *si* was the translation of *αὐτή* (Luke 7:12), three were from *αὐτῇ δέ*).

Conclusion

Most of *αὐτή*'s are translated as *so*'s and so are *αὐτή*'s and *ή*'s. When *αὐτή*'s and *ή*'s are followed by *δέ*, they are very much likely to be *si* in Gothic with almost no exception but *ή δέ*'s followed by adjectivized (rather than adverbial) participles are rendered into (*ib*) *so*. The scarcity of *si* is due not so much to the scarcity of the original feminine pronouns or articles as to the *so*'s intrusion into the realm of *si*. Whether this intrusion of *so* is related to the etymological isolation of *si* or not remains to be ascertained.

Notes

- 1 In spite of Lehmann's description "si anaphoric prn *αὐτή, ἐκείνη she* L 1.29", there is no *si* (nominative) used for *ἐκείνη*, though *αὐτός* frequently is.
- 2 See Nakamura (1989). The use of a personal pronoun in translating a Greek phrase with a definite article followed by a participle is rare; usually a relative pronoun (*saei*) or a definite pronoun (*sa*) is used, e.g.

Matt. 10:37

ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος
saei frijor attan aiþþau aiþein ufar mik, nist meina wairþs

Matt. 10:40

ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.
sa andnimands izwis mik andnimip, jah sa mik andnimands andnimip þana sandjandan mik.

Luke 1:45

καὶ μακαρία ἡ πιστεύουσα ὅτι ἔσται τελείωσις τοῖς λελαλημένοις αὐτῇ παρὰ κυρίου.
jah audaga so glaubjandei þatei wairþiþ ustauhts þize rodidane izai fram frauþin.

Mark 6:2

πόθεν τούτω ταῦτα, καὶ τίς ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεῖσα αὐτῷ, ὅτι δυνάμεις τοιαῦται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνονται;
hwabro þamma þata, jah hwo so handugeino so gibano imma, ei

mahteis swaleikos þairh handuns in wairþand?

1 Tim. 5:6

ἡ δὲ σπαταλώσα ζῶσα τέθνηκεν.

ih so wizondei in azetjam jah libandei daþa ist.

(Nam quae in deliciis est, uiuens mortua est.)

References

- Aland, Ward S. and Edward C. Jacob. 1995. *The Greek New Testament*. The United Bible Societies.
- Friedrichsen, G.W.S. 1926. *The Gothic Version of the Gospels: A Study of its Style and Textual History*. OUP.
- , 1939. *The Gothic Version of the Epistles: A Study of its Style and Textual History*. OUP.
- Lehmann, Winfred. P. 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary Based on the Third Edition of Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Gotischen Sprache by Sigmund Feist*. E.J.Brill, Leiden.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael. 2003. *Indo-European Linguistics*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.
- Nakamura, Koichi. 1989. "On Saei-Clause in the Gothic Gospels", *Linguistic Research: Working Paper in English Linguistics* 7: 49-63.
- , 1995. "Notes on Reduplicated Perfect in Latin and Gothic", *Festschrift for Professor Kinsuke Hasegawa on his 60th Birthday*. Kenkyusha, Tokyo.
- , 1998. "Relative Clauses in the Gospel according to St. John in the King James Bible and their Corresponding Greek Constructions", *The Bulletin of Arts and Science, Meiji University* 311 : 55-72.
- Sauvageot, Aurélien. 1929. *L'emploi de l'article en gotique*. Honoré Champion, Paris.
- Streitberg, Wilhelm. (ed.) 1908, 1919², 2000⁷. *Die gotische Bibel*. Carl Winter, Heidelberg.
- Tollenaere, Felicien de and Randall L. Jones. 1976. *Word-Indices and Word-Lists to the Gothic Bible and Minor Fragments*. E.J.Brill, Leiden.