Ireneusz Kida
Uniwersytet Śląski w Katowicach
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7611-810X
e-mail: ireneusz.kida@us.edu.pl

Comparison of the definite article in Gothic and Greek: a case study of the Gospel of Mark

Porównanie przedimka określonego w językach gockim i greckim: przypadek Ewangelii Marka

Abstract

This paper examines the usage of the definite article in the Gothic version of the Gospel of Mark and its parallel Greek counterpart, which served as the foundation for the Gothic translation. While the Gothic text is often considered a literal reflection of the Greek text, our analysis reveals significant differences between the two languages, particularly concerning the definite article. These disparities extend beyond mere quantity and encompass variations in grammatical cases, namely nominative, genitive, dative, and accusative. The analysis of the Gospel of Mark yields the following overall perspective. In 421 instances (equivalent to 20.83% of the total 2021 attested places of interest), Gothic mirrors Greek by employing definite articles in the same positions as Greek. Moreover, in 737 instances (equivalent to 36.46% of the total 2021 attested places of interest), Gothic aligns with Greek by omitting definite articles where Greek does not use them. Notably, out of the total 2021 instances of interest in the Gospel of Mark, Gothic omits the definite article 863 times where Greek includes it, accounting for 42.70% of the total instances. Specifically, at Gothic parts of speech (usually nouns) appearing in the nominative case, the article is omitted 241 times (27.92% out of 863), in the genitive case 117 times (13.55% out of 863), in the dative case 248 times (28.73% out of 863), and in the accusative case 257 times (29.77% out of 863). Taken together, in 1158 instances (57.29% of 2021) Gothic faithfully follows Greek, either by employing definite articles (421 instances) or by omitting them (737 instances) in corresponding positions, whereas in 863 instances (42.70% of 2021) Gothic deviates from Greek by not using definite articles in corresponding positions. To facilitate our study, we have created a manually annotated corpus of the Gothic Bible since existing corpora of Gothic do not adequately address this phenomenon. Thus, like our previous investigations, this empirical study relies on a corpus-based analysis.

Keywords: Gothic, Greek, definite article, grammatical cases, a corpus-based analysis, Gospel of Mark

Abstrakt

W niniejszym artykule analizujemy użycie przedimka określonego w gockiej wersji Ewangelii Marka oraz w równoległym greckim odpowiedniku, który służył jako podstawa dla gockiego przekładu. Choć gocki tekst często jest uważany za dosłowne odzwierciedlenie tekstu greckiego, nasze badania wykazują znaczące różnice pomiędzy tymi dwoma językami, zwłaszcza w kontekście przedimka określonego. Różnice te dotyczą zarówno ilości wystąpień, jak i przypadków gramatycznych, takich jak mianownik, dopełniacz, celownik i biernik. Analiza Ewangelii Marka ukazuje następującą ogólną perspektywę. W 421 przypadkach (co stanowi 20,83% wszystkich badanych miejsc, których jest 2021), gocki odzwierciedla grekę poprzez użycie przedimków określonych w tych samych pozycjach. Co więcej, w 737 przypadkach (co stanowi 36,46% tej samej całości), gocki odzwierciedla grekę poprzez pominięcie przedimków określonych. Szczególnie istotne jest, że spośród 2021 interesujących nas miejsc w Ewangelii Marka, gocki pomija przedimek określony aż 863 razy, gdzie grecki go używa, co stanowi 42,70% całości. Konkretnie, w przypadku gockich części mowy (zwykle rzeczowników) występujących w mianowniku, przedimek jest pominięty 241 razy (27,92% z 863), w dopełniaczu 117 razy (13,55% z 863), w celowniku 248 razy (28,73% z 863), a w bierniku 257 razy (29,77% z 863). Łącznie, w 1158 przypadkach (57,29% całości) gocki wiernie naśladuje język grecki albo poprzez użycie przedimków określonych (421 przypadków), albo poprzez ich pominięcie (737 przypadków) w odpowiednich pozycjach, natomiast w 863 przypadkach (42,70% całości) gocki odbiega od greckiego, gdyż nie używa przedimków określonych w odpowiednich pozycjach. W celu przeprowadzenia tych badań, stworzyliśmy własny korpus Biblii gockiej z ręcznymi adnotacjami, ponieważ nie istnieją korpusy języka gockiego, które umożliwiałyby badanie tego zjawiska. Zatem niniejsze empiryczne badanie, podobnie jak trzy poprzednie, opiera się na analizie korpusowej.

Słowa kluczowe: gocki, grecki, przedimek określony, przypadki gramatyczne, analiza korpusowa, Ewangelia Marka

This empirical study, based on a corpus, is an essential component of a larger undertaking aimed at comparing the behavior of the definite article in Wulfila's Bible and its corresponding Greek source text, upon which the Gothic version relies. It needs to be mentioned that the question of the definite article in Gothic is rather problematic, unlike in Greek, which clearly had a distinct category of the definite article. It is enough to consider a number of opinions regarding this issue to see that. To start with, Falluoumini (2019) observes that since Gothic has no proper definite article, the translater of the Gothic Bible uses demonstrative pronouns to render Greek articles. Berard (1993) shows that the Gothic translator often chose to leave the Greek definite article untranslated, although when it seemed waranted, he often used the Gothic demonstrative pronominal to render the Greek definite article. Miller (2019: 518) observes that „[s]ince different demonstratives grammaticalized into definite articles in different areas, Proto-Germanic had no articles. Gothic D-words have only a few of the features associated with articles and for this reason rarely translate

Greek articles". According to Roberts (2021: 57; after Miller 2019: 63), „Gothic either lacks definite articles or has 'incipient' definite articles". Levin (1995: 357) claims that Gothic uses „cognate demonstrative forms also as the definite article, though not to nearly the same extent as in Greek". For example, Bauer (2017) says that the „Gothic *sa* functioned both as a demonstrative and definite article. Originally a demonstrative, it was used in the Bible translation to render both Greek definite article and the Greek demonstrative, which suggests that it had not completely lost its deictic value in Gothic". As regards indefinite articles, Roberts (2021: 57) states that „[n]one of the Old Germanic languages, Gothic included, had indefinite articles". Generally speaking, the opinions regarding the category of the definite article in Gothic are divided, as on the one hand it is claimed that Gothic did not have a separate category of this kind, whereas on the other it is believed that it did, at least to some extent; for further information concerning this problem also see Kida (2015a), Heinrichs (1954), Kotin (2019), Sternemann (1995) and Vilutis (1977). Although it is rather difficult to draw a clear dividing line between the demonstrative pronoun and the definite article in early Germanic languages, like Gothic, because the two initially had identical forms and at first there was even no such distinction yet, it seems that we can speak of the beginings of the category of the definite article in Biblical Gothic, which perhaps was artificially reinforced, and also accelerated, by Biblical Greek via the process of a faithful translation. The Gothic demonstrative pronouns, which in certain contexts can also be interpreted as definite articles, were quite successful in imitating the Greek definite articles because they also had four cases, two numbers, and three genders, like Greek. Whether in the Gothic Bible we are dealing only with demonstrative pronouns or already with definite articles in places where they imitate the Greek definite articles, for reasons of a unified comparative analysis we will refer to the them as definite articles henceforth.

In his previous works, Kida (2015a) examined the Gospel of Matthew, Kida (2019) focused on the Gospel of John, and Kida (2023) investigated the Gospel of Luke. This time, our focus is on a comparative analysis of the entire Gospel of Mark, specifically examining the occurrences of the definite article and its cases in both Gothic and Greek. Therefore, this current study serves as a continuation of our previous research. As mentioned in our earlier papers on this subject, our entire endeavor complements the work of Kovari (1984), who compared the text of the Gothic Bible with the parallel Greek source text concerning the definite article and various collocations, such as the article with a noun, article with a personal name, and article within a prepositional phrase. Our project, on the other hand, follows a distinct

analytical approach. We do not focus on collocations but instead concentrate on the different case forms of the definite article in both languages, namely nominative, genitive, dative, or accusative. It is worth noting that our current study builds upon several related articles, with the most pertinent ones being Kida (2009, 2014a, 2014b, 2015b), in addition to those mentioned earlier. Our research is based on a manually annotated corpus that we have developed ourselves. For this purpose, we rely on the official website of the Wulfila Project[1], which provides the Gothic Codex Argenteus alongside the Alexandrian text-type of Greek, specifically Streitberg's (1919) modified version.

Before engaging into a detailed analysis of the discussed problem, it is important to note that according to Falluomini (2013), the translation of the Gothic Bible from Greek by Wulfila (and possibly his disciples) likely commenced orally in Dacia and was completed in Moesia Inferior, after Wulfila settled near Nicopolis and Istrum. He resided there from 347 to 348. Since the original manuscript of the Gothic Bible has been lost, one must rely on (incomplete) manuscripts that were produced later based on the original. Several such incomplete manuscripts, most likely created in Italy during the first third of the 6th century, include Codex Argenteus, Codex Ambrosianus A, Codex Ambrosianus B, Codex Ambrosianus C, Codex Ambrosianus D, Codex Ambrosianus E, Codex Carolinus, Codex Gissensis, Codex Taurinensis, and Codex Vaticanus Latinus 5750. These manuscripts preserve part of the original text, accounting for approximately three-fifths of the Gospels, around two-thirds of the Pauline Epistles, and a small portion of the Old Testament (specifically Nehemiah 5–7).

As observed by Leppänen (2017: 36), "[d]ue to a relatively meager amount of preserved Gothic documents, understanding the linguistic environment of contemporary (i.e., fourth century AD) Greek is essential to the interpretation of that language, as Greek demonstrably had a great impact on the formation of the Gothic literary language." Falluomini (2013) suggests that the Gothic version of the Bible is a word-for-word translation of the Greek source text, a view supported by Snædal (2015: 87/8) who claims that "[a]lmost the entire Gothic corpus consists of translations from Greek. As a rule, they are of a verbatim kind." Axel (2007) similarly acknowledges that Wulfila's translation of the Bible closely follows the Greek text, while Bean (1983) adds that the Gothic Bible tends to be a rather literal translation of the Greek Bible. According to Andrews (2023: 132), Wulfila "used the Greek text of the New Testament as well as other early

---

[1] <http://www.wulfila.be>, accessed: 11.07.2023.

Christian writings as the basis for his translation and aimed to accurately convey the meaning and content of the original Greek text." However, the authors also recognize that the two languages diverge on numerous occasions. Leppänen (2017: 36) notes that "the Gothic script (at least for the most part) [is] a near-literal translation of the Greek Bible," while Falluomini (2013: 330) states that doubts can arise regarding the position of demonstrative, personal, and possessive pronouns in the Gothic translation from Greek. To be more precise, Bean (1983; after Fourquet 1938 and McKnight 1897) provides a list of discrepancies in the translation from Greek to Gothic, primarily concerning word order, as does Axel (2007; after Eythórsson 1995). According to Bean (1983: 51): Greek postpositive particles may be placed in the initial position in Gothic; object pronouns tend to follow the verb in Gothic; the possessive pronoun follows its noun; the demonstrative precedes its noun, as does the nominal genitive; the past participle precedes the finite verb; predicate nouns precede the copula; the verb occurs in the clause final position; the negative immediately precedes the verb; a copula is frequently added with the order being N Adj Copula; in other instances, a verb is added in the postposed position; Gothic predominantly employs the OV word order with the exception of placing the pronoun object after the verb in certain circumstances. On the other hand, Axel (2007; after Eythórsson 1995) lists the following characteristics of Gothic: verb fronting systematically occurs in Gothic imperative clauses; the (S)OV pattern appears to be the native base order; in imperatives and negated clauses the Gothic verb typically precedes its complements; Gothic often uses a combination of a verb and a (non-pronominal) complement in place of Greek intransitive verbs; and in *wh*-interrogatives there is a tendency for the finite verb to be placed directly after the *wh*-phrase at the left periphery. Additionally, in Kida (2015a, 2019), we enumerate a few supplementary points of difference between Gothic and Greek based on our own research: Gothic frequently omits definite articles where Greek employs them; Gothic often uses a different case for the definite article compared to Greek; when Gothic imitates Greek absolute structures, it employs the dative case (dative absolute structures), whereas Greek employs the genitive case (genitive absolute structures); Gothic often employs dependent clauses where Greek uses absolute structures; Gothic uses the present tense where Greek uses the future tense; Gothic often uses a reflexive verb where Greek uses an ordinary verb; and Gothic employs more analytical structures than Greek. These points primarily concern word order, but the first two are of particular interest in the present study as they address the frequent omission of definite articles in Gothic (where the parallel Greek text employs them at the corresponding parts of speech)

and the usage (or potential usage) of different cases for definite articles in both languages. In fact, Kovari (1984) demonstrates that Gothic often omits the definite article where Greek uses it. For example, depending on the analyzed texts, up to approximately 70%, 80%, or even 90% of the time, Gothic does not use the definite article where Greek does. However, Kovari does not address the issue of the case forms displayed by the definite articles in both languages. Therefore, it is primarily in this latter domain that our study is innovative and complementary to that of Kovari (1984), as it is not only concerned with the omission of the definite article in Gothic but also with the case forms assumed (or potentially assumed) by the definite article in both languages, which often differ.

The data we obtained for the Gospel of Mark, as well as for the previous three Gospels, were retrieved from our own manually annotated corpus. This corpus has been developed over time to investigate the different case forms of the definite articles in both Gothic and Greek for comparison purposes. Due to the lack of corpora that allow to explore the behavior of definite articles in terms of case forms in both languages, it was necessary to compile our own corpus of the Gothic Bible. The process of compiling the corpus involved the following steps: 1) copying the entire Gospel of Mark from the Wulfila Project, 2) pasting the copied text into a Word Office document, and 3) manually annotating the text by inserting appropriate tags created by us for computer-assisted retrieval of occurrences. The third step can be illustrated by the following fragments:

> Mark 12:30
> Gothic: jah frijos 2a-/fraujan 1a-/guþ þeinana us 2d-g/allamma 1d-g/hairtin þeinamma jah us 2d-g/allai 1d-g/saiwalai þeinai jah us 2d-g/allai 1d-g/gahugdai þeinai jah us 2d-g/allai 1d-g/mahtai þeinai. so frumista anabusns.
> Streitberg (1919): καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου.
> English translation: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment.
>
> Mark 12:31
> Gothic: jah anþara galeika þizai: frijos 1a-/nehvundjan þeinana swe þuk silban. Maizei þaim 2n-/anþara anabusns nist.
> Streitberg (1919): δευτέρα αὕτη, ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν.
> English translation: And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these.[2]

---

[2] <http://www.wulfila.be>, accessed: 24.02.2024.

Mark 13:19
Gothic: wairþand auk 2n+/þai dagos jainai 2n-/aglo swaleika, swe ni was swaleika fram 2d-g/anastodeinai 2g-/gaskaftais þoei gaskop 1n-/guþ, und hita, jah ni wairþiþ.
Streitberg (1919): ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλῖψις οἵα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἣν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς ἕως τοῦ νῦν καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται.
English translation: For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be.

Mark 13:20
Gothic: jah ni 2n-/frauja gamaurgidedi 2a+/þans dagans, ni þauh ganesi ainhun 2g-n/leike; akei in 2g+a/þize gawalidane, þanzei gawalida, gamaurgida 2a+/þans dagans.
Streitberg (1919): καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν κύριος τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ. ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἐκολόβωσεν τὰς ἡμέρας.
English translation: And except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days.

Mark 13:21
Gothic: jah þan jabai hvas izwis qiþai: sai, her 1n-/Xristus, aiþþau sai, jainar, ni galaubjaiþ;
Streitberg (1919): καὶ τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ, ἴδε ὧδε ὁ χριστός, ἴδε ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύετε:
English translation: And then if any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ; or, lo, he is there; believe him not:

Mark 13:22
Gothic: unte urreisand 2n-/galiugaxristjus jah 2n-/galiugapraufeteis jah giband 2a-/taiknins jah 2a-/fauratanja du 1a-/afairzjan, jabai mahteig sijai, jah 2a+/þans gawalidans.
Streitberg (1919): ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ δώσουσιν σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾶν, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.
English translation: For false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect.[3]

The corpus consists of 220 pages and includes the Gothic text with its Greek parallel and an English translation. Additionally, since many verses of the Greek Bible differ depending on the text-type, we provided all the different textual variants in which they appear to identify the Greek text-type followed by Gothic. These differences encompass not only word order, vocabulary, and pronunciation but also the use of definite articles – this aspect is crucial in our study because in cases where definite articles appear in Gothic but not in the corresponding Alexandrian text-type suggested by Streitberg (1919), Gothic sometimes follows another Greek text-type, which we indicated through annotation. For example:

Mark 1:16
Gothic: … gasahv 2a-/Seimonu jah 2a-/Andraian 1a-/broþar **is**, 2g+/**þis Seimonis** …[4]

---

[3] <http://www.wulfila.be>, accessed: 24.02.2024.
[4] <http://www.wulfila.be>, accessed: 11.07.2023.

Lit. translation: … (he) saw Simon and Andrew brother **his**, **of-the Simon's** …

Byzantine Majority: … εἶδεν Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν **αὐτοῦ**, **τοῦ Σίμωνος** …[5]
Lit. translation: … '(he) saw Simon and Andrew the brother **his**, **of-the Simon's** …

Streitberg (1919): … εἶδεν σίμωνα καὶ ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν **σίμωνος** …[6]
Lit. translation: … (he) saw Simon and Andrew, the brother **Simon's** …

In this particular case, Gothic follows the Byzantine text-type rather than the Alexandrian one suggested by Streitberg (1919). Therefore, one must exercise caution when considering certain verses. Relying solely on the Wulfila Project to compare Gothic with Greek without taking into account the other Greek text-types may lead to incorrect conclusions about Gothic.

The gathered data for the Gospel of Mark are presented in tables. The first column displays different tags used for retrieving information about the case forms of definite articles in Gothic and Greek, while the second column contains the occurrences, i.e., the actual frequencies expressed in numbers for discussion. Additionally, for reasons of comparison, in the remaining three columns, we provide numerical data obtained for the previously analyzed Gospels of Luke, John, and Matthew in Kida (2023), Kida (2019) and Kida (2015a) respectively. This procedure aims to provide a broader understanding of the overall behavior of the definite article (actual or potential) in Gothic and Greek at the corresponding parts of speech it accompanies (basically nouns, proper names, participles, numerals, etc. in specific case forms) or potentially accompanies.

To begin with, in the first table there are all the possible configurations involving the nominative case of Gothic definite articles (actual or potential) in comparison with their Greek counterparts (not necessarily in the nominative case) at the corresponding parts of speech:

Table 1. Nominative (= n)

Tags	OCCURRENCES			
	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
1n-/	234	279	330	148
1n-g/	4	3	1	1
1n-d/	0	0	0	0
1n-a/	3	5	2	0
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
2n+/	153	171	168	72

---

[5] <https://biblehub.com>, accessed: 11.07.2023.
[6] <http://www.wulfila.be>, accessed: 11.07.2023.

cont. Table 1

2n+g/	1	0	0	0
2n+d/	0	1	0	0
2n+a/	0	3	2	1
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
1n+/	0	1	1	0
1n+g/	0	0	0	0
1n+d/	0	0	0	0
1n+a/	0	0	0	0
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
2n-/	154	257	182	71
2n-g/	3	1	0	0
2n-d/	0	0	0	0
2n-a/	1	3	0	0

As shown above, in the Gospel of Mark, there are 234 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the nominative case while Greek does at the corresponding parts of speech. There are 4 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the nominative case and Greek uses a definite article in the genitive case at the corresponding parts of speech. Additionally, there are 3 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the nominative case, while Greek uses a definite article in the accusative case at the corresponding parts of speech. In 153 instances, both Gothic and Greek use a definite article in the nominative case at the corresponding parts of speech. There is 1 instance where both Gothic and Greek use a definite article, in the nominative case and in the genitive case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. In 154 instances, neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article in the nominative case at the corresponding parts of speech. There are 3 instances where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article, in the nominative case and in the genitive case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. Finally, there is 1 instance where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article, in the nominative case and in the accusative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. No occurrences have been attested for the remaining tags, which are marked as zero, as in the subsequent tables.

The next table presents all the possible occurrences involving the genitive case of Gothic definite articles (actual or potential) in comparison with their Greek counterparts (not necessarily in the genitive case) at the corresponding parts of speech:

Table 2. Genitive (= g)

Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
	OCCURRENCES			
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
1g-/	108	202	80	61
1g-n/	0	0	0	0
1g-d/	2	4	0	0
1g-a/	7	2	5	0
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
2g+/	36	34	46	11
2g+n/	0	0	0	0
2g+d/	2	1	0	0
2g+a/	3	0	3	0
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
1g+/	0	0	0	0
1g+n/	0	0	0	0
1g+d/	0	0	0	0
1g+a/	0	0	0	0
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
2g-/	98	157	40	36
2g-n/	2	12	1	0
2g-d/	2	9	1	0
2g-a/	12	23	11	7

According to this table, there are 108 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the genitive case while Greek does at the corresponding parts of speech. Additionally, there are 2 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the genitive case, while Greek uses a definite article in the dative case at the corresponding parts of speech. There are also 7 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the genitive case, while Greek uses a definite article in the accusative case at the corresponding parts of speech. In 36 instances, both Gothic and Greek use a definite article in the genitive case at the corresponding parts of speech. There are 2 instances where both Gothic and Greek use a definite article, in the genitive case and in the dative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. In 3 instances, both Gothic and Greek use a definite article, in the genitive case and in the accusative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. In 98 instances, neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article in the genitive case at the corresponding parts of speech. There are 2 instances where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article, in the genitive case and in the nominative case respectively, at the corresponding

parts of speech. There are 2 instances where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article, in the genitive case and in the dative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. Finally, there are 12 instances where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article, in the genitive case and in the accusative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech.

The third table displays all the possible occurrences involving the dative case of Gothic definite articles (actual or potential) in comparison with their Greek counterparts (not necessarily in the dative case) at the corresponding parts of speech:

Table 3. Dative (= d)

	OCCURRENCES			
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
1d-/	127	182	99	96
1d-g/	67	49	64	28
1d-n/	0	1	0	0
1d-a/	54	90	34	26
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
2d+/	49	65	27	26
2d+g/	30	25	25	12
2d+n/	0	2	0	0
2d+a/	19	21	16	3
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
1d+/	0	0	0	0
1d+g/	0	0	0	0
1d+n/	0	0	0	0
1d+a/	0	0	0	0
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
2d-/	81	148	28	33
2d-g/	74	85	23	20
2d-n/	0	1	1	0
2d-a/	46	49	17	14

According to the table, there are 127 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the dative case while Greek does at the corresponding parts of speech. There are 67 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the dative case, while Greek uses a definite article in the genitive case at the corresponding parts of speech. Additionally, there are 54 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the dative case, while Greek uses a definite article in the accusative case at the corresponding parts

of speech. In 49 instances, both Gothic and Greek use a definite article in the dative case at the corresponding parts of speech. There are 30 instances where both Gothic and Greek use a definite article, in the dative case and in the genitive case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. In 19 instances, both Gothic and Greek use a definite article, in the dative case and in the accusative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. In 81 instances, neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article in the dative case at the corresponding parts of speech. There are 74 instances where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article, in the dative case and in the genitive case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. Finally, there are 46 instances where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article, in the dative case and in the accusative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech.

The fourth table examines all the possible occurrences involving the accusative case of Gothic definite articles (actual or potential) in comparison with their Greek counterparts (not necessarily in the accusative case) at the corresponding parts of speech:

Table 4. Accusative (= a)

Tags	OCCURRENCES			
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
1a-/	232	255	198	95
1a-g/	20	17	20	12
1a-d/	5	6	4	3
1a-n/	0	1	0	0
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
2a+/	116	118	80	47
2a+g/	9	8	10	5
2a+d/	2	3	0	1
2a+n/	1	0	3	0
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
1a+/	0	0	0	0
1a+g/	0	0	0	0
1a+d/	0	0	0	0
1a+n/	0	0	0	0
Tags	Mark	Luke	John	Matthew
2a-/	251	329	108	82
2a-g/	7	22	9	8
2a-d/	5	4	1	2
2a-n/	1	0	1	0

According to this table, there are 232 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the accusative case while Greek does at the corresponding parts of speech. Additionally, there are 20 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the accusative case, while Greek uses a definite article in the genitive case at the corresponding parts of speech. Moreover, there are 5 instances where Gothic does not use a definite article in the accusative case, while Greek uses a definite article in the dative case at the corresponding parts of speech. In 116 instances, both Gothic and Greek use a definite article in the accusative case at the corresponding parts of speech. There are 9 instances where both Gothic and Greek use a definite article, in the accusative case and in the genitive case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. Furthermore, there are 2 instances where both Gothic and Greek use a definite article, in the accusative case and in the dative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. In addition, there is 1 instance where both Gothic and Greek use a definite article, in the accusative case and in the nominative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. On the other hand, there are 251 instances where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article in the accusative case at the corresponding parts of speech. Furthermore, there are 7 instances where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article, in the accusative case and in the genitive case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. Additionally, there are 5 instances where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article, in the accusative case and in the dative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech. Finally, there is 1 instance where neither Gothic nor Greek uses a definite article, in the accusative case and in the nominative case respectively, at the corresponding parts of speech.

In the final table, all the data presented above regarding the behavior of Gothic in the Gospel of Mark with respect to the parallel Greek in the area of the definite article in all cases (nominative, genitive, dative, and accusative) are compiled, including the percentages for the individual cases. This allows us to draw further conclusions and observe tendencies on a broader scale:

Table 5. Nominative (n), Genitive (g), Dative (d), Accusative (a)

	n		g		d		a		Total:		
1n-/	234	1g-/	108	1d-/	127		1a-/	232	701		
1n-g/	4	1g-n/	0	1d-g/	67		1a-g/	20	91		
1n-d/	0	7	1g-d/	2	9	1d-n/	0	121	1a-d/	5	25	7	162
1n-a/	3	1g-a/	7	1d-a/	54		1a-n/	0	64		
	241	117			248		257	863		42.70%	
	27.92%	13.55%			28.73%		29.77%	100%			

cont. Table 5

	n			g			d			a		Total:		
1n+/	0		1g+/	0		1d+/	0		1a+/	0		0		
1n+g/	0		1g+n/	0		1d+g/	0		1a+g/	0		0		
1n+d/	0	0	1g+d/	0	0	1d+n/	0	0	1a+d/	0	0	0	0	
1n+a/	0		1g+a/	0		1d+a/	0		1a+n/	0		0		
	0			0			0			0		0		0%
	0%			0%			0%			0%		100%		
	n			g			d			a		Total:		
2n-/	154		2g-/	98		2d-/	81		2a-/	251		584		
2n-g/	3		2g-n/	2		2d-g/	74		2a-g/	7		86		
2n-d/	0	4	2g-d/	2	16	2d-n/	0	120	2a-d/	5	13	7	153	
2n-a/	1		2g-a/	12		2d-a/	46		2a-n/	1		60		
	158			114			201			264		737		36.46%
	21.43%			15.46%			27.27%			35.82%		100%		
	n			g			d			a		Total:		
2n+/	153		2g+/	36		2d+/	49		2a+/	116		354		
2n+g/	1		2g+n/	0		2d+g/	30		2a+g/	9		40		
2n+d/	0	1	2g+d/	2	5	2d+n/	0	49	2a+d/	2	12	4	67	
2n+a/	0		2g+a/	3		2d+a/	19		2a+n/	1		23		
	154			41			98			128		421		20.83%
	36.57%			9.73%			23.27%			30.40%		100%		
	n			g			d			a				
Total:	553			272			547			649		2021		100%
	27.36%			13.45%			27.06%			32.11%		100%		

The analysis of the Gospel of Mark yields an overall perspective that allows us to draw the following general conclusions:

- Gothic follows Greek in 421 instances (equivalent to 20.83% of the total 2021 attested places of interest) by using definite articles where Greek uses them at the corresponding parts of speech.
- Gothic follows Greek in 737 instances (equivalent to 36.46% of the total 2021 attested places of interest) by not using definite articles where Greek does not use them at the corresponding parts of speech.
- Gothic does not follow Greek in 863 instances (equivalent to 42.70% of the total 2021 attested places of interest), as it does not use definite articles where Greek uses them at the corresponding parts of speech.

Taken together, there are 1158 instances (equivalent to 57.29% of 2021) where Gothic faithfully mirrors Greek, either by employing definite articles

(421 instances) or by omitting them (737 instances) in corresponding positions. Conversely, there are 863 instances (equivalent to 42.70% of 2021) where Gothic deviates from Greek by not using definite articles in corresponding positions.

Going into further detail, it can be observed that out of the 421 instances in which Gothic aligns with Greek by using definite articles where Greek uses them at the corresponding parts of speech, both languages employ identical case forms (nominative, genitive, dative, or accusative) of the definite articles in 354 places (equivalent to 84.08% of 421). This is because the corresponding parts of speech that the respective definite articles accompany are in the same cases (nominative, genitive, dative, or accusative) in both languages. However, in 67 places (equivalent to 15.91% of 421), the case forms of the definite articles differ in both languages because the corresponding parts of speech that the respective definite articles accompany are in different cases. Regarding the instances where both languages use the same case forms of the definite articles at the corresponding parts of speech, 153 instances (equivalent to 36.34% of 421) involve the nominative case, 36 instances (equivalent to 8.55% of 421) involve the genitive case, 49 instances (equivalent to 11.63% of 421) involve the dative case, and 116 instances (equivalent to 27.55% of 421) involve the accusative case. On the other hand, in cases where both languages use different case forms of the definite articles at the corresponding parts of speech, Gothic employs the nominative case in 1 instance (equivalent to 0.23% of 421), the genitive case in 5 instances (equivalent to 1.18% of 421), the dative case in 49 instances (equivalent to 11.63% of 421), and the accusative case in 12 instances (equivalent to 2.85% of 421). Greek, in contrast, uses different case forms (other than the nominative) of the definite articles at the corresponding parts of speech.

Furthermore, within the 737 instances where Gothic mirrors Greek by omitting definite articles where Greek does not use them at the corresponding parts of speech, neither language employs the same case forms of the definite articles in 584 instances (equivalent to 79.24% of 737), whereas in 153 instances (equivalent to 20.75% of 737) neither of the two languages employs different case forms of the definite articles at the corresponding parts of speech. Regarding the former scenario, namely when in both languages the potential definite articles would have the same case forms, 154 instances (equivalent to 20.89% of 737) concern the nominative case, 98 instances (equivalent to 13.29% of 737) the genitive case, 81 instances (equivalent to 10.99% of 737) the dative case, and 251 instances (equivalent to 34.05% of 737) the accusative case. In the latter scenario, namely when in both languages the potential definite articles would have different case

forms, in 4 instances (equivalent to 0.54% of 737) Gothic would employ the nominative case, in 16 instances (equivalent to 2.17% of 737) the genitive case, in 120 instances (equivalent to 16.28% of 737) the dative case, and in 13 instances (equivalent to 1.76% of 737) the accusative case, whereas Greek would employ different case forms (i.e. other than the nominative) of the definite articles at the corresponding parts of speech.

Perhaps most importantly, as regards the 863 places in which Gothic does not use definite articles where Greek uses them at the corresponding parts of speech, in 701 instances (equivalent to 81.22% of 863), if Gothic were to use them, it would employ the same case forms of the definite articles as Greek, whereas in 162 instances (equivalent to 18.77% of 863) it would employ different case forms in them. In the former scenario, namely when in Gothic the potential definite articles would have the same case forms as the corresponding Greek ones actually used, 234 instances (equivalent to 27.11% of 863) concern the nominative case, 108 instances (equivalent to 12.51% of 863) the genitive case, 127 instances (equivalent to 14.71% of 863) the dative case, and 232 instances (equivalent to 26.88% of 863) the accusative case, whereas in the latter scenario, namely when in Gothic the potential definite articles would have different case forms than the corresponding Greek ones actually used, in 7 instances (equivalent to 0.81% of 863) Gothic would employ the nominative case, in 9 places (equivalent to 1.04% of 863) the genitive case, in 121 instances (equivalent to 14.02% of 863) the dative case, and in 25 instances (equivalent to 2.89% of 863) the accusative case of the definite article at the corresponding parts of speech.

In the Gospel of Mark, as with the previously analyzed Gospels (John, Matthew, and Luke), Gothic and Greek not only differ significantly in the quantitative usage of definite articles but also in their formal aspect, often employing or potentially employing different case forms in them, which is determined by the case forms of the corresponding parts of speech that they accompany. It can be generally concluded that in places where the Gothic case forms of the definite articles (actual or potential) differ from their Greek counterparts, and where Gothic does not use definite articles in locations where the corresponding Greek 'Vorlage' employs them, the inherent Germanic character of Gothic becomes evident. This character might otherwise be obscured by its tendency to faithfully follow Greek. As part of our "Gothic project," further investigation is required into the behavior of the definite article in the Pauline Epistles. We are currently engaged in the manual annotation of this section of the Gothic Bible to obtain additional data, which is likely to be similar to that of the four already analyzed Gospels. However, the accuracy of this prediction will only be confirmed in the future.

Literature

Andrews E.D. (2023): *The history of how we got the Bible*. Cambridge, Ohio.

Axel K. (2007): *Studies in Old High German syntax*. Amsterdam.

Bauer B.L.M. (2017): *Nominal apposition in Indo-European. Its forms and functions, and its evolution in Latin-Romance*. Berlin.

Bean M. (1983): *The development of word order patterns in Old English*. Totowa, New Jersey.

Berard S.A. (1993): *Biblical Gothic and the configurationality parameter*. "American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures" 5–2, pp. 111–162.

Eythórsson Th. (1995): *Verbal Syntax in the early Germanic languages*. A doctoral dissertation available at:

http://www.academia.edu/1836851/Verbal_Syntax_in_the_Early_Germanic_Languages

Falluomini C. (2013): *The Gothic version of the New Testament*. [In:] *The text of the New Testament in contemporary research. Essays on the status quaestionis*. B.D. Ehrman and M.W. Holmes (eds). Leiden, pp. 329–350.

Falluomini C. (2019): *The longer ending of Mark in Gothic*. [In:] *The New Testament in Antiquity and Byzantium. Traditional and digital approaches to its texts and editing. A Festschrift for Klaus Wachtel*. H.A.G. Houghton, D.C. Parker and H. Strutwolf (eds). Berlin.

Fourquet J. (1938): *L'ordre des éléments de la phrase en germanique ancien. Études de syntaxe de position*. Strasbourg.

Heinrichs H.M. (1954): *Studien zum bestimmten Artikel in den germanischen Sprachen*. Gießen.

Kida I. (2009): *Syntactic differences between Gothic and Greek in Wulfila's translation of the Bible*. [In:] *Studia językoznawcze dedykowane Profesorowi Kazimierzowi Polańskiemu. W kręgu teorii*. H. Fontański et al. (eds). Katowice, pp. 117–124.

Kida I. (2014a): *Gothic analytic structures in place of Greek synthetic ones*. [In:] *Slovenski jezik na stičišču več kultur*. M. Jesenšek (ed.). Maribor, pp. 329–343.

Kida I. (2014b): *Greek New Testament text types and earliest translations*. "Studia Methodologica" 36, pp. 5–9.

Kida I. (2015a): *Differences between Gothic and Greek in terms of the definite article – the case of the Gospel of Matthew*. [In:] *Inność/Różnorodność w języku, interakcji i kulturze*. E. Bogdanowska-Jakubowska (ed.). Katowice, pp. 29–42.

Kida I. (2015b): *A history of the Greek New Testament – from the beginnings to the invention of printing*. "Linguistica Silesiana" 36, pp. 57–66.

Kida I. (2019): *Differences and similarities between Gothic and Greek in the area of the definite article – the case of the Gospel of John*. "Linguistica Silesiana" 40, pp. 55–71.

Kida I. (2023): *Differences and similarities between Gothic and Greek in the domain of the definite article – the case of the Gospel of Luke*. "Linguistica Silesiana" 44, pp. 7–24.

Kotin M.L. (2019): *Die Ausbildung der Artikelfunktion im Gotischen aus der Sicht der Theorien des kontaktbedingten Sprachwandels*. "Bulletin de la Société Polonaise de Linguistique" 75, pp. 59–71.

Kovari G. (1984): *Studien zum germanischen Artikel. Entstehung und Verwendung des Artikels im Gotischen*. Wien.

Leppänen V. (2017): *Gothic evidence for Greek historical phonology*. [In:] *Ancient Greek linguistics. New approaches, insights, perspectives*. F. Logozzo and P. Poccetti (eds). Berlin, pp. 35–56.

Levin S. (1995): *Semitic and Indo-European*. Vol. I: *The Principal Etymologies with Observations on Afro-Asiatic*. Amsterdam.

McKnight G. (1897): *The primitive Teutonic order of words*. "Journal of English and Germanic Philology" 1, pp. 136–219.

Miller G. (2019): *The Oxford Gothic Grammar*. Oxford.

Roberts I. (2021): *Diachronic Syntax.* New York.

Snædal M. (2015): *Gothic contacts with Greek. Loan translations and a translation problem.* [In:] *Early Germanic languages in contact.* J.O. Askedal and H.F. Nielsen (eds). Amsterdam, pp. 75–90.

Sternemann R. (1995): *Gedanken zum "Artikel" im Gotischen.* [In:] *Wie redet der Deudsche man inn solchem fall? Festschrift anläßlich des 65. Geburtstages von Erwin Arndt.* G. Brandt and R. Hünecke (eds). Stuttgart, pp. 151–172.

Streitberg W. (1919): *Der gotische Text und seine griechische Vorlage. Mit Einleitung, Lesarten und Quellennachweisen sowie den kleineren Denkmälern als Anhang.* Heidelberg.

Vilutis J. (1977): *Zum Problem des (bestimmten) Artikels im Gotischen.* "Kalbotyra" 28(4), pp. 50–56.

Internet resources

Wulfila Project. The Gothic Bible, available at: http://www.wulfila.be/gothic/browse/
Greek text-types, available at: https://biblehub.com