Resultativity in Gothic:
The Resultative as a Model for Periphrastic Distribution in the Passive Voice

University of Georgia Working Papers in Linguistics
Moses Katz

Abstract: The Gothic language is unique among Germanic languages in several regards. It is the only one to retain a synthetic passive, an inheritance of the Indo-European medio-passive. It is also the only Germanic language to purportedly have no functional perfect tense, a tense that develops in full in all other Germanic languages in the form of various periphrastic constructions. Gothic does have periphrastic constructions that combine the verbs 'be' or 'become' and a perfective participle, but these forms are almost universally considered to be supplementary ways to express passive voice. My study examines the manifold semantics of these periphrases and seeks to show how things considered to be one type of entity make up separate parts of a passive system: one a regular passive, the other a perfect passive. By analyzing the complete number of these constructions in the Gothic corpus, I isolate separate axes of tense, aspect and voice. All three of these correspond to systematic modes of translation used to port the Greek New Testament into the Gothic one.

0.   Introduction

Gothic has two periphrastic constructions, each formed with a collocation of the preterite participle and a linking verb: either the referential stative *wisan* 'be' or the referential eventive *wairþan* 'become.' The scholarly consensus of what these constructions do is usually to form a type of compositional passive. The exact use and selective distribution of the two constructions, however, is not overtly clear, especially in terms of the optionality they show in conveying Greek passives and medio-passive forms. In particular are the instances when a single Greek form, such as a passive, is translated with the *wisan* periphrasis in some instances and with the *wairþan* in others. Explanations for this often center on the assumption that the Gothic represents perceived differences in lexical qualities, such as an aspectual perfectivity or imperfectivity imposed on the Gothic verb at the time of translation. Such an assumption is difficult (if not impossible) to prove. In contrast, my study examines the narrative contexts of an underlying Greek *Vorlage* and attempts to show that – while questions of verbal aspect are indeed relevant to translation – context plays the greater role in the distribution of the two periphrases. To this end, I argue that *all* periphrases are indeed perfective, but that the factor that determines their distribution is actually the way in which they express the resultant outcome of a given action. The syntactic model that informs such an analysis is that of the resultative.

1.   Previous Research
1.1   Two Periphrases: Passives or Resultatives?

Early Germanic grammars posed the *ist* + PP *periphrastic* as at least having a dual nature, designated as a *Doppelnatur* in German. For Wilmanns (1906:138) it could express a regular present passive, wherein an action is currently being done, or show a present tense *als Ergebnis einer fortlaufenden Handlung* (as the result of a continuous action). He provides these examples to illustrate the respective readings:

(1)   a.   2Cr 1:4   *gaþrafstidai sijum*   'we are consoled'
      b.   Php 1:23   *dishabaiþs <im>*   'I am held fast'
      c.   Eph 2:22   *miþgatimridai sijuþ*   'you are built together'   (apud Davis 1986)

For (1a-b), the action appears ongoing and either can be paraphrased in English by the present progressive: *being consoled* and *being held fast*. (1c) would facilitate a different reading wherein it is the result of the action that is emphasized instead of the action itself. This is the interpretation that best characterizes the German *Zustandspassiv*, otherwise known as the false passive because it is considered to be a pragmatic interpretation instead of a syntactic transformation performed on an active sentence. In the sentence *Das Haus ist gebaut*, the emphasis is on a completed state of the house. Contrast *Das Haus wird gebaut*, a true passive wherein an active base has undergone a transformation to express an ongoing condition: *the house is being built*.

   But the most apt translation for these examples is not clear; Wilmanns' interpretation is subject to nuance and as such is contested by Behaghel (1924: III: 206) who goes further in claiming that all of the above examples are best interpreted as results: *have been consoled, have been held fast, have been built together*.

1.2   Consensus of Lexical Aspect in Gothic

Both Elizabeth Leiss (1992) and Werner Abraham (1994) play out a similar hypothesis with different appeals to aspectual interpretation. For Leiss, the split between the two periphrases is mediated by the innate lexical aspect of a given verb. Verbs in Gothic that can be thought of as natively perfective pair with *wairþan*, and those that are natively imperfective with *wisan*. For Abraham, the breakdown is similar, with the added specification that a *wisan* periphrastic can be further split into interpretive readings, themselves perfective and imperfective. In this way, Abraham's analysis presents a tiered system: the first tier accommodates a split based purely on lexical aspect that looks like that of Leiss. The second tier exists solely within the *wisan* periphrastic and accommodates a split based on interpretive aspect, a choice left up to the reader as to whether a given predicate is expressing something that emphasizes a character that is more "passive" (an ongoing passive) or something that emphasizes a character that is more "perfect" (a result-state passive).

   Within Gothic we find any number of cases for which no such definitive shading exists. In Abraham's example (reproduced here as (2)), he contrasts a *warþ* + PP periphrastic with a *was* + PP on such lines.

(2)   a.   gaswalt þan jah sa gabeiga jah **gafulhans *warþ*.**   (Lk 16:22)
         — ἀπέθανεν δὲ καὶ ὁ πλούσιος καὶ **ἐτάφη**.
         — the rich man also died, and **was buried**;
      b.   jah **tauhans was** in ahmin in auþidai   (Lk 4:1)
         — καὶ **ἤγετο** ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
         — and **was led** by the Spirit into the wilderness,

It may be that the act of burying has, to the Gothic speaker, a different *Aktionsart* than the act of leading. Here, the term *Aktionsart* refers to an inherent aspectual quality: lexical aspect that is not conditioned by grammatical features. In (2), it is impossible to tell from the semantics of the verbs alone if there is an inherent perfectivity in *gafulhans* that is not present in *tauhans*. What

bolsters Abraham's assessment are two factors. One is that (2a) translates a Greek aorist while (2b) an imperfective. It is not clear however to what degree aspectual conditions of the *Vorlage* can be mapped onto the Gothic. Another factor is the presence of the preverbal particle *ga-* in *gafulhans*. Preverbs in Gothic are generally accepted to be a marker of perfectivity. For the authoritative analysis of preverbal *ga-* in Gothic, see Lloyd (1979). Intrinsic to his analysis is the fact that, while preverbal particles may be firmly associated with perfective expression, it is difficult to say if predicates *lacking* such particles, like *tauhans*, are by default imperfective. In regard to Abraham's scheme then, (2a) would seem to represent a predicate with a firmer sense of completeness than that of (2b). Yet there is no evidence to validate a firm aspectual distinction at this stage in Gothic; *bury* and *lead* are both transitive activities with no overt difference in their expression of completeness.

2.   Goals of Analysis: A Model of the Gothic Passive

The assumptions posed above constitute ambiguities as to how the passive constructions in Gothic relate to each other. A comprehensive model for the passive system in Gothic should address these ambiguities, and it should do so in a way that can be readily validated by the distribution of the periphrases in question. My goal is to create a comprehensive model of the passive in Gothic, characterizing the way that passive constructions in Greek are distributed into separate categories.

1. ***Role of the past passive participle:*** Such a system should not rely on a prescriptive sense of lexical aspect. Because every passive periphrasis utilizes a past (perfective) participle, each contains an element that has been perfectivized. It is this element that must be input into the calculus of these constructions, and thereby determine what role a perfectivized entity contributes to a compositional semantics of Gothic periphrastic passives.

2. ***Why there are multiple passive types:*** The system should also create a frame that codifies the relationships between all four passive constructions. The first point of comparison is the relation between the synthetic (historical) passive and the passive expressed by a present-tense periphrasis, *ist* + PP, determining if the relationship of one to another is characterized by developmental redundancy. The other point of comparison is the relation between past tense *was* + PP and *warþ* + PP.

The problem with addressing these larger ambiguities is that it is impossible to determine internal senses of aspect in isolation. Furthermore, the fact that the Gothic corpus is limited to biblical language means that as a whole it cannot be readily compared to language data outside the translatory traditions pertaining to the New Testament.

The most obvious source of aspectual discernment then would be one based on the underlying Greek. The analysis presented here seeks to provide just such a comparison, interpreting the different periphrastic formations in Gothic by correlating them with certain predicate types in a Greek *Vorlage*. In order to do this, one must move forward with at least a reasonable picture of what an underlying *Vorlage* would look like. This is made all the more difficult given that the Greek source of the Gothic text is unknown. To mediate this, I rely on a composite translation, one made up of multiple critical texts, including the Nestle-Aland (1993) and Byzantine Majority Text (2005). In a given verse, the varying Greek substrate can be collated. In instances where there is variation, the Greek that most accurately corresponds to the

Gothic is given preference. In this way, a proposed *Vorlage* is one that is informed not by one text, but by a consensus of available Greek bases.

2.1   Proposal: Periphrases Divided Based on Contextual Resultativity in Greek
I propose a model of the Gothic passive system that utilizes the resultative structure as a means of predicting the use of a given periphrasis. A resultative is a kind of argument structure that incorporates an event and, at minimum, two thematic roles: an underlying **theme** and a <u>state</u>. The example below typifies the resultative as it appears in English

(3)   a.   Intransitive: *The **shirt** irons flat*
       b.   Transitive: *John **irons** the shirt <u>flat</u>*

To follow this proposal, I will associate Gothic periphrases with different Greek predicates but not on a one-to-one basis. Instead, the diagnostic I will use to determine such aspect will be the interpretation of resultative argument structures in a given context. Presented with a perfective predicate in Greek, contextual features show consistently whether or not that predicate is being interpreted as an event that carries the narrative forward or as a state that is established before the action of the narrative begins. What is contextual in Greek can be expressed morphologically in Gothic by means of the periphrastic types. Both types constitute resultative argument structures, combining the diagnostic components of an event (in the form of a copula), and a state (in the form of a past participle). Respectively, my proposed dynamic is thus: the periphrasis in *wairþan* comes to express the first Greek context of a narrative event, and the periphrasis in *wisan* comes to express the second Greek context of a completed state. We can operate then on two proposed diagnostics:

(4)   i.   *warþ* + PP denotes a state-change that is part of the narrative sequence
            — preceding clauses can establish a sequence of cause and (resulting) effect
            — preceding clauses take place **before** the state-change denoted by *warþ* + PP

       ii.   *was* + PP denotes a state-change that is *not* part of the narrative sequence
            — *was* + PP denotes an event completed at the time of narrative
            — narrative clauses take place **after** the state-change denoted by *was* + PP

3.   Periphrastic Overviews
3.1   The *wisan* Periphrastic: Overview
Gothic *wisan* is the consummate stative verb and *wairþan* the consummate eventive verb. A *wisan* periphrasis denotes not only a completed event (specified by the past participle), but also some enduring relevance of the state that is brought about by the event's completion (specified by the imperfective copula.) The result then is a grammatical category that is not solely designated by tense or aspect, but a combinatory semantics. We can label the category an **entailed-state resultative**. Semantically it helps to denote a completed event that also entails a state resulting from that event.

3.2   The *wairþan* periphrastic: Overview
I take the meaning of a *wairþan* periphrastic to be composed of two elements, one an eventive copula with perfective force and the other an equally perfective past participle. In combination

the two forms should create a construction that denotes a telic event, specifically the initiation of a new state that is expressed by the past participle. For this reason, I will designate this type of resultative as an **attained-state resultative**. We can contrast it with the entailed-state resultative above in how it affects narrative sequencing. The entailed-state resultative is backwards looking. It enumerates an event that is completed before the time of the narrative. The attained-state resultative is forward looking. It enumerates an event that is part of the narrative and serves to move events forward.

4.   Evaluation of Past-Time Periphrases and Greek Predicates

The method I will employ is to list all instances of a periphrastic construction in Gothic and evaluate its context in the respective Greek (Table 1).

Table 1. Distribution of Gothic Past-Time Periphrases		
Greek Predicate Type	Number of *was* + PP	Number of *warþ* + PP
Perfect + Perfect Participle	**7** (7.69%)	**4** (5.19%)
Supplementary Perfect Participles	**9** (9.89%)	**0** (0.00%)
Aorist + Aorist Participle	**45** (50.55%)	**66** (85.71%)
Imperfect + Imperfect Participle	**13** (14.29%)	**3** (3.90%)
Present Participles	**5** (5.49%)	**0** (0.00%)
Other	**11** (12.09%)	**4** (5.19%)
Totals	**91** (100%)	77 (100%)

The diagnostics I have posted above in (4) set a predictable pattern in the Greek narrative sequencing that determines how a given predicate will be sorted into a given periphrasis. Because the eventuality expressed with the *wisan* periphrastic is completed before the time of narration, we can predict that the *wisan* periphrastic will never have an event preceding it that causes it to come about: a causal "trigger." Put another way, we can distinguish the translator's optionality as a contextually determined distinction: *wisan* periphrases denote actions completed at the time of the narrative, and *wairþan* periphrases denote actions that come about *because of* some event within the narrative.

While this characterization serves to regularly describe instances for which context is clear, it is still problematic when context may be lacking. For example, in the case of *warþ* + PP we can readily expect them to appear in verses with causal triggers, but such triggers are not universally overt. In (5) below, there is no discernible difference between the situations posed by the two periphrases, one *was* + PP and one *wairþan* + PP.

(5)   a.   ᴮin snorjon **athahans was** and baurgswaddjau jah unþaþlauh handuns is.
            (2Cr 11:33)
        — ἐν σαργάνῃ **ἐχαλάσθην** διὰ τοῦ τείχους καὶ ἐξέφυγον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ.
        — in a basket I **was let down** by the wall, and escaped his hands.

    b.   ᴬAdam auk fruma **gadigans warþ**, þaþroh Aiwwa;   (1Tm 2:13)
        — ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος **ἐπλάσθη**, εἶτα εὔα:
        — For Adam **was** first **formed**, then Eve.

Both of these examples translate a Greek aorist with identical morphology (aorist and passive), yet the Gothic treats them with separate periphrases. Without mitigating context, it is impossible to discern incontrovertibly a single feature that directs the use of one periphrastic over another. If we are to justify the generalization of the two periphrases as we have, it is more productive to validate the readings in contexts where the two can be seen to interact in some meaningful way. In (6) below, we see the only verse with an unambiguous collocation of *was* + PP and *wairþ* + PP.

(6)   unte sa sunus meins dauþs was jah gaqiunoda, jah **fralusans was** jah **bigitans *warþ***;
                                                                                    (Lk 15:24)
        — ὅτι οὗτος ὁ υἱός μου νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἀνέζησεν, ἦν **ἀπολωλὼς** καὶ **εὑρέθη**.
        — For this my son was dead, and is revived; he **was/had been lost**, and **was/became** found.

The example in (6) does have the requisite context to test our hypothesis that the two periphrases are interpretations of two separate kinds of resultative expressions. Moreover, the verse shows a sensitivity to resultative context in striking terms. The clause containing *was* + PP definitively indicates a state, *being lost*, that is ended before the time of narration. The demarcation of that ending is the clause containing *warþ* + PP. The state of *being found* is a resulting state that is predicated on a causal trigger, the state of *being lost*.

      The sequence of the two periphrases together cleanly and unambiguously upholds our hypotheses and allows us to make further edification on the nature of the two periphrases. To wit, the difference between the two periphrastic categories can be shown as different expressions of resultativity.

      Both the *was* and *warþ* periphrases are perfective, but they express perfectivity in different ways. That is, both are telic because they denote an endpoint. *warþ* + PP focuses on the punctual transition of one state to another and so is accurately associated with the Vendlarian notion of the **achievement**. This is validated by its use in the text to express state-change scenarios in which a resulting state is brought about by some preceding event. *was* + PP keys on the state which has duration but which has obtained its end; it is most accurately associated with the Vendlarian notion of **accomplishment**. This is validated by its use in the text to express state terminations such that the action intrinsic to the state is completed at the time of the narrative.

      The following sections will examine my hypothesis via tokens. These tokens will be analyzed in reference to the various tense and aspect qualities of the Greek *Vorlage*, but inasmuch as those qualities inform the way a given narrative is structured.

4.1   The Past-Time Periphrases and the Greek Aorist
4.1.1   *warþ* + PP

(7)   ^A waurts allaize ubilaize *ist* faihugeiro, þizozei sumai gairnjandans **afairzidai waurþun**
        af galaubeinai jas –   (1Tm 6:10)
        — the root of all evils is money-lust, of which some, yearning after, **were/became**
        seduced away from faith –

In (7) the act of *becoming seduced* by the love of money is predicated directly on the act of *reaching out*. In this context, we can say that the periphrasis does not constitute a completed event but contributes a part of the narrative action.

4.1.2 *was* + PP

(8)   þatuþ ~ þan ni kunþedun siponjos is frumist; ak biþe **gasweraiþs was** Iesus, þanuh
        gamundedun þatei þata **was** du þamma **gameliþ**   (Jn 12:16)
        — (BYZ)Ταῦτα δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ πρῶτον· ἀλλ’ ὅτε **ἐδοξάσθη**
        Ἰησοῦς, τότε ἐμνήσθησαν ὅτι ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ **γεγραμμένα**,
        — These things understood not his disciples at first: but after Jesus **was/had been
        glorified**, then they remembered that these things **had been written** of him,

The translation with a pluperfect *had* is validated if it can be said that *was* + PP denotes an event
that is complete before the action in the main narrative. In the example, this is the case. In the
context of the narrative, the simple preterite follows the perfect expression such that the disciples
'remembered' only after Jesus had been 'glorified.'

4.2   The Past-Time Periphrases and the Greek Perfect
4.2.1 *warþ* + PP

(9)   ᴬXristau **miþushramiþs warþ**, iþ liba nu ni þanaseiþs ik, iþ libaiþ in mis Xristus.
                                                                    (Gl 2:20)
        — (BYZ)Χριστῷ **συνεσταύρωμαι**· ζῶ δέ, οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ χριστός·
        — With Christ **I was/became crucified**, but I still live; no longer I (alone), but Christ
        lives in me.

This example certainly holds the narrative context we have associated with the *wairþan*
periphrastic. In (9), there is no triggering causal event, but it is clear that the first clause poses an
initial transition that characterizes Paul's state at the time of narration, i.e. he *was/became
crucified* in the past.

4.2.2 *was* + PP

(10)   ᴮakei þan sa us þiujai bi leika **gabaurans was**, iþ sa us frijai bi gahaita; (Gl 4:23)
        — ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς **παιδίσκης** κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας δι’
        ἐπαγγελίας.
        — But he who was of the bondwoman **was/had been born** after the flesh; but he of the
        freewoman was by promise.

In (10) the stative act of *being of the bondwoman* is prefigured by the perfective one of *being
born after the flesh* (i.e. being born of carnal activity). By necessity then, the phrase *gabaurans
was* precedes the narration.

4.3   The Past-Time Periphrases and the Greek Supplemental Perfect Participle
Unlike a general (synthetic) perfect, a supplemental perfect participle is coupled with a
conjugated form of the verb *to be*. The participle carries a perfective aspect that denotes not only
a completed action but one that precipitates a state. The maintenance of that state is carried by
the verb *to be.* Like most participles, the supplementary participle coordinates its action with a
separate, finite verb to which it is subordinate. The role of the copula then is to link the action of

the participle with that of the verb in the main clause. This is why the form of *to be* matches the main verb in tense.

In the context of translating supplemental participles, we see the generalizations we've made carrying through to the strongest degree. There are no instances where this Greek predicate is translated with a *wairþan* periphrasis. This follows under the assumption that, in past-time predicates, the participles effect expressions such that the form of *to be* also conjugates in the past, and the reading of the periphrasis is readily comparable to the English past or pluperfect. The role of the participle in narrative sequencing then is comparable to any perfect: it indicates an action that is completed at the time of narration. Given this, we would expect this kind of expression to only occur with the *wisan* periphrastic, which can be shown to optionally carry this pluperfect expression.

(11)   infeinoda in ize, unte **wesun afdauidai** jah **frawaurpanai**   (Mt 9:36)
          — ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν ὅτι **ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι** καὶ **ἐρριμμένοι**
          — he became pitying on them, because they **had fainted** and **had been scattere**d abroad

In (11), I have translated the paired participles meaning 'fainted' and 'scattered' with the *had* auxiliary indicative of the English pluperfect, forgoing the copula *was* reading altogether. In these cases the resulting 'state of pity' is so preeminent of the completed events that it fosters a second resultative, this time the attained-state resultative embodied by the *-nan* verb, *infeinoda*.

4.4   The Past-Time Periphrases and the Greek Imperfect
What we have seen regarding the associations of the aorist are properly mirrored in the associations of the Greek imperfect. Due to the perfective character of the *wairþan* periphrastic, we would predict that its general association to a categorical imperfect would yield few tokens. This follows through with a marginal number of three representations. In order to account for even these few tokens, we'd surmise that the force that pushes them into this category is a strong verification of the narrative sequencing associated with this periphrasis. Indeed, in the tokens we find clausal triggers.

(12)   ^Bunte ju hvan gaþaihuþ du faur mik fraþjan, ana þammei jah froþuþ;
          aþþan **analatidai waurþuþ**.   (Ph 4:10)
          — ὅτι ἤδη ποτὲ ἀνεθάλετε τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν, ἐφ᾽ ᾧ καὶ ἐφρονεῖτε **ἠκαιρεῖσθε** δέ.
          — that at last (ju hvan) you.PL nurtured for me caring, about which also you.PL did care, but you.PL **became hindered**.
          — ^(ESV) *that now at length you have revived your concern for me. You were indeed concerned for me, but you had no opportunity (to show it).*

It is clear that the verse in (12) is expressing a durative predicate in Greek, namely an essive 'were hindered.' At the same time, the overt semantics manifest in the Gothic translations a strong state change. In (12) *ju* 'already' places a temporal demarcation on the action, indicating an established state wherein the audience has newly revived their concern for Paul. In this example, the result accounts for what did not happen, but the semantics are still clear. The choice of *warþ* + PP then indicates the contrast integral to the sentence: that the audience had

been concerned at one time, but something changed such that they were hindered in their expressing it.

While the number of imperfect predicates is statistically negligible within the larger group, their presence still warrants explanation. That explanation can be made by way of aspectual generalizations, ones that flatly associate perfectivity and imperfectivity with the *wairþan* and *wisan* periphrases respectively.

This assessment follows through in those tokens of the imperfect translated in the *wisan* periphrastic. As with the aorist, these examples show that the condition of their being treated with *was* + PP is contingent on an interpretation of resultativity and not necessarily tense. In this case, a deciding factor is also whether the state denoted by the periphrastic is completed *before* the course of action referenced in the narrative.

(13)   manag auk mel frawalw ina, jah **bundans was** eisarnabandjom jah fotubandjom
        fastaiþs was, jah dishniupands þos bandjos **draibiþs was** fram þamma unhulþin ana
        auþidos.   (Lk 8:29)
        — Indeed many times (it) caught him, and he **was/had bound** with ironbands, and *had
        been fastened* with fetters, and – breaking the bands – **was/had been driven** by the
        devil into the wilderness.

Example (13) is sequentially complex, but the same principle is clearly at play. At the time when he (Jesus) commands the unclean spirit to go out, the state has already been set by an elaborate narrative of completed events, namely the facts that the demoniac has been imprisoned multiple times and tormented by devils. Given a metric of translation that relies on interpreting resultativity in a given clause, we can better account for the distribution of *wisan* and *wairþan* periphrasis. In the case of the Greek imperfect, this metric becomes the key touchstone for determining what sort of periphrasis will be used.

5.   Present-Time Periphrases and Greek Predicates

Table 2. Distribution of the Gothic Present-Time Periphrasis	
Greek Predicate Type	Number of *ist* + **PP**
Present + Present Participle	**8** (5.93%)
Perfect + Perfect Participle	**62** (45.93%)
Supplementary Perfect Participles	**11** (8.15%)
Aorist + Aorist Participle	**47** (34.81%)
Imperfect	**0** (0.00%)
…Other	**7** (5.19%)
Totals	**135** (100.00%)

5.1   The Present-Time Periphrases and the Greek Present
The fact that the number of attestations of the *wisan* periphrasis translating the Greek present is small (Table 2) suggests that this is *not* the de-facto location for present-tense passives in

narration. The eight tokens constitute predicates that have more-or-less adjectival quality:

(14)   **afslauþiþs im**   I am/have been **made anxious**
       dishabaiþs <im>   I am/have been **pressed**
       miþgatimridai sijuþ   You.PL are/have been **built**
       galagiþs ist   there is/has been **laid up**
       wasidai sind   they are/have been **clothed**
       bimaitanai sind   (those who) are/have been **circumcised**

Two additional present-tense predicates are collocated with perfect predicates in Greek. This co-occurrence is telling, indicating that the two verbal types in Greek are contributing a single eventuality. Given that perfect expression in Greek is readily brought about by periphrasis, the sequencing of a present-tense verb after a perfect would only seem to strengthen the expression of the latter. That is, the role of the present-tense verb denotes overtly the state that is the result of the action expressed of the perfect predicate.

(15)   managa mis hvoftuli faur izwis, **usfulliþs im** gaþlaihtais, **ufarfulliþs im** fahedais in
       allaizos managons aglons unsaraizos.   (2Cr 7:4)
       — πολλή μοι καύχησις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν: **πεπλήρωμαι**PERF τῇ παρακλήσει,
       ὑπερπερισσεύομαιPRES τῇ χαρᾷ ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει ἡμῶν.
       — great to me (is) glorying of you: I **am/have been filled** with comfort, I **am/have
       been overfilled** in all our many tribulations.

Taken together, the examples above show a paucity of forms that tends more toward an interpretation of the Greek predicate as an out-and-out adjective. In (14), the adjectival quality of the tokens is overt. Tokens such as *afslauþiþs*, 'I am/have been made anxious', especially denote a condition representative of a pure state, with little to no indication of an accompanying event. In (15), the translated Greek perfect serves as a complementary element, clarifying a result state enumerated by the preceding perfect predicate.

5.2   The Present-Time Periphrases and the Greek Aorist

Surprisingly, there are a large portion of present-tense periphrases translating Greek aorists. This is odd because the aorist is a category for which past-time reference is a diagnostic feature. This seeming mismatch helps us draw a finer picture of how aspect does play some role in periphrastic categorization.

(16)   jah **insandiþs im** rodjan du þus jah wailamerjan þus þata.   (Lk 1:19)
       — καὶ **ἀπεστάλην** λαλῆσαι πρὸς σὲ καὶ εὐαγγελίσασθαί σοι ταῦτα:
       — and I **am/have been** sent to speak to you, and to show you that.

    The temporal quality of an indicative aorist is past time, but the aspectual quality of the aorist is not time specific. That is, the qualities of "completeness" can be said to be aoristic, whether or not they appear in the past, present, or future[1]. The instances of predicates in the

---

[1]   It is useful to view the aorist as a categorical "system" in Greek that has two domains of application: one is a tense marked for past time and perfective aspect. The other includes all other verbal forms like infinitives, participles, and non-indicative verbs which are only marked for perfective aspect. See Groton (2000: 109; 235).

aorist are distributed in a way that seems irrespective of tense. Hence, over a quarter of such tokens are sorted into the present-time periphrasis: 47 of the total 159 (30%). This reemphasizes the claim that there is some factor present in the aorists that supersedes tense in regard to sorting.

The factor that presents itself is clearly aspect, specifically the semantic quality of being categorically perfective. What falls out is a not-surprising disregard for temporality in the treatment of aorists across the board, such that, given a passive (or medio-passive) aorist, it is sorted into the periphrastic that best matches its narrative event structure. That event structure can be informed by the diagnostics of resultativity we have established thus far: either attained state or entailed state. But while the Greek imperfective (mentioned in §5.4) is locked to the past-time periphrasis because of its tense, the aorist can be evaluated solely on its quality of aspect. It can thereby be placed into any passive construction depending on its resultative quality. In the case of (16) above, Jesus' ability to *show you that*, is predicated on the act of *being sent* in the previous clause. Though the verb for 'sent' (ἀπεστάλην) is in the Greek aorist, only its perfective quality is relevant to evaluating it in the narrative context. Hence, the translator simply sorts it into the periphrasis that best fits that context, denoting its present-time relevance with a present-time construction: *insandiþs im*.

What we are left with is a perspective of the Gothic passive paradigm that takes into account what is clearly a sensitivity to aspect and the specific role it plays in arranging the sequence of actions in a narrative. As a consequence, we must evaluate the distribution of the periphrastic constructions with this sensitivity in mind.

The model required to characterize that distribution has to evaluate it not merely on some perceived level of emphasis, but on the knowing maintenance (or, in the case of the Greek imperfect, disregard) of a perfective expression. In those instances when there is an attained-state expression, the action of the periphrasis contributes to the sequential action of the narrative. In those instances when there is an entailed-state expression, the action of the periphrasis is completed at the time of narration.

6.   Conclusion: A Proposed Model of Gothic Passive System

The effects that these combined sensitivities have on functions, such as narrative sequencing, and on the expression of entailed states, give us a fuller sense of how the different entities work together. What emerges is an arrangement of the periphrases that implicates something in their distribution more regular than simple emphasis on a given state or event. Instead, what we find is a more complete and more functional verbal system in the passive voice. The following examples are verses showing full coordination of the resultative and passive entities we've distinguished thus far.

(17) ^{B}unte in imma **gaskapana waurþun** alla in himinam jah ana airþai, […], alla þairh ina jah in imma **gaskapana sind**.   (Ph 3:12)
— ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ **ἐκτίσθη** τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, […]: τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν **ἔκτισται**,
— For by him **were/became created** all things in heaven and on earth […]: all things through him and by him **are/have been created**.

In (17) the *creation of all things* in the first clause constitutes an event that is part of the narrative. It is what I have characterized as an attained-state resultative and serves to move the narrative sequence forward. The exact same sentiment is then rephrased as an entailed-state

perfect in Greek and a concordant entailed-state periphrasis in Gothic.

Using this division as a model, we can group the passive constructions like this: the synthetic passive and the *warþ* + PP constitute an attained-state resultative which does not have the option to be interpreted as a result-state perfect. The best evidence that supports this is as follows:

(18)   a.   the contextual analysis of the two periphrases shows a clear discernment between two kinds of scenarios, one in which a result state is entailed of a preceding event, and one in which it is not

        b.   the overwhelming and consistent association of result-state expressions in Greek (Greek perfect and supplemental participle) with the *wisan* periphrasis

        c.   the paucity of Greek present medio-passives appearing in the *ist* + PP periphrasis

        d.   the apparent disregard for tense consideration of the Greek aorist tense.

Comparatively, the *wisan* periphrasis is more dynamic. It maintains those generalizations so that this category has at least the potential to denote perfect expression. This generalization is codified by the Greek which shows not only a general association between perfect expressions, but an overwhelming one where even Greek presents are coordinated with perfects and supplementary participles to effect resultative models. These are regularly funneled into the *wisan* group. The determining context for these is not an event that acts as "triggering" causal event, but the coordination of a narrative state and some preceding event that established that state.

Following a track that a resultative model contributes two models for passive expression, we can then pose a paradigm for the Gothic passive expression (Table 3). We find that the *wisan* periphrases consistently have the option to convey a result-state expression, and the *wairþan* periphrasis can be contrasted inasmuch as it consistently lacks that optional expression. The fact that it appears systematically only in the past tense then would suggest that it plays a role that does not need representation in the present tense. The obvious explanation is that that role would be taken up by the already existing synthetic passive. This conjecture holds if we note that the synthetic passive and the *warþ* + PP periphrases both operate with the option to express quantified events, that is, events that denote sequences of events.

Table 3. The Passive Paradigm of Gothic		
	Doppelnatur: marked for perfect expression	No *Doppelnatur*: unmarked for perfect expression
non-past	*ist* + PP unte mis atgiban ist • for it has been given to me • ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται (Lk 4:6)	synthetic passive in dauþu atgibanda • in death (we) are given • εἰς θάνατον παραδιδόμεθα (2Cr 4:11)
past	*was* + PP atgibanos wesun imma • they had been given to him • ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ (Lk 4:17)	*warþ* + PP atgibana warþ ansts • grace was/became given • ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις (Eph 3:8)

7.   Further Research

The validation for this model has been supported through cursory examples. What is required to bolster this conclusion is a more exhaustive analysis: one that takes into account the narrative context of each periphrasis as it appears in coordination with a Greek predicate. By assessing more tokens, we can create a more statistically meaningful line of association between the two predicate types in the two languages.

Furthermore, this model for a passive relies on the implementation of a kind of argument structure. This is the resultative: a structure that involves an event and the dual-argument arrangement of an object and a state. Given this, what is called for is a model for how the two periphrastic resultatives are formally constructed. This model can be of varying types, but a generative one presents itself as a means to illustrate how an underlying optionality may manifest in Gothic: a calculus that shows how a simple parameter of copula choice, *wairþan* or *wisan*, serves to create the two resultative types used to render the many types of Greek predicate.

8.   References

Abraham, Werner. 1992. The emergence of the periphrastic passive in Gothic. *Leuvensche Bijdragen*, 81(1-3). 1-15.

Behaghel, Otto. 1924. *Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung. Germanische Bibliothek 1. Sammlung germanischer Elementar - und Handbücher, 1.10*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Davis, Garry W. 1986. *The origin of the 'to be' + preterite participle perfect periphrase in Germanic*. Ann Arbor, MI: Unpublished University of Michigan doctoral dissertation.

Groton, Anne H. 2000. *From Alpha to Omega: A beginning course in classical Greek*. Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing.

Leiss, Elisabeth. 1992. *Die Verbalkategorien des Deutschen: Ein Beitrag zur Theorie der sprachlichen Kategorisierung*. Berlin, New York: W. de Gruyter.

Lloyd, Albert L. 1979. *Anatomy of the verb: The Gothic verb as a model for a unified theory of aspect, actional types, and verbal velocity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nestle, Eberhard & Kurt Aland. (eds.). 1993. *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*, *27th edn*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Paul, Hermann. 1905. *Die Umschreibung des Perfektums in Deutschen mit haben und sein. Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Klasses der königlich Bayerischen der Wissenschaften, 22*. Munich: Verlag der Königlichen Akademie.

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

Vendler, Zeno. 1957. Verbs and times. *The Philosophical Review*. 66 (2). 143-160.

Wilmanns, Wilhelm. 1906. *Deutsche Grammatic, vol. III*. Strassburg: Trübner.