*EN-PHRASES AND THEIR MORPHOSYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC PARTICULARS

OLGA THOMASON

University of Georgia

ABSTRACT

Prepositions constitute a problematic category because they tend to have complex semantic and syntagmatic properties, vary in case governance and are frequently in variation with each other. Reflexes of the Indo-European **en* are well attested and remain productive in Greek, Classical Armenian, Gothic and Old Church Slavic among other languages. Correspondences of Greek *en/eis* with Gothic *in*, Armenian *i* and Old Church Slavic *vŭ* occur in many instances in the canonical Gospels of the New Testament. However, Greek *en/eis* is frequently translated with other constructions in these languages that range from prepositional phrases that contain prepositions non-cognate with **en* and nominal constructions to clausal structures. This investigation examines such correlations and points out morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors that promote these correspondences. Case syncretism and changes in the prepositional governance are among the leading reasons that prompt translators to look for translational means other than the cognate constructions. As expected, differences in the inventory of prepositions available in the languages being examined and diversity in the division of semantic space by the prepositional phrases also add to the variety of possible renditions of Greek *en/eis*. Among pragmatic factors that influence the translation are the compositional marking of a certain concept, the complexity of an event/situation being marked, and the pragmatic appropriateness of a certain formation.

[1] INTRODUCTION

Prepositions (and adpositions in general) remain a controversial topic in linguistics. Their status as a syntactic category is not completely defined. While some researchers consider them a functional category, others prefer to analyze them as a lexical category (Cover & van Riemsdijk 2001). Furthermore, there is no agreement on which linguistic items should be considered as prepositions and which ones should not (Asbury et al. 2008, 3–5). Another problem is connected with prepositional governance, variations in possible case assignments by the same preposition and the role of case in the prepositional phrase (PP) (Creissels 2009, 609–13). PPs may carry out several syntactic functions: they can be predicates, arguments and

adjuncts. On the one hand, PPs serve as complements of another phrase (often a verbal or noun phrase); on the other hand, they assign a case to a phrase which is a complement of a preposition itself. Thus, in (1) below the PP *en têi Dekapólei* complements the verb *kērússein*. At the same time, the noun phrase *têi Dekapólei* complements the preposition *en*.

Due to the semantic richness of PPs, semantic labels are sometimes incorporated into the proposed syntactic (functional) structures of PPs (den Dikken 2006; Koopman 2000). Van Valin suggests that two types of syntactic structure exist: relational and nonrelational structure (Van Valin 1999, 150). Nonrelational structure specifies the hierarchical organization of various phrases, clauses, sentences. Relational structure is preoccupied with relations that exist among sentence constituents. These relations could be semantic (agent, patient, etc.), syntactic (subject, object, etc.) or pragmatic (topic, focus, presupposition). The focus of this article is primarily on relational structure.

IE **en* (Watkins 2000, 23) is one of the oldest and most frequent prepositions found in the IE language family. It has cognates in many IE languages including Greek (Gk) *en/eis* (< **ens*), Gothic (Goth) *in*, Classical Armenian (Arm) *i* and Old Church Slavonic (OCS) *vŭ*. If one examines the New Testament translations in these languages, it becomes clear that Gk *en/eis*, Goth *in*, Arm *i* and OCS *vŭ* are the most frequent counterparts. This outcome is not surprising given the fact that these prepositions have the same origin and are used within the same or similar contexts:¹

(1)	kai érksato kērússein <u>en têi Dekapólei</u>	[GK]
	jah dugann merjan <u>in Daikapaulein</u>	[GOTH]
	ew sksaw k'arozel <u>i Dekapólin</u>	[ARM]
	i načëtŭ propovĕdati <u>vŭ Dekapoli</u>	[OCS]
	'and he began to preach in Decapolis' (Mk 5:20)	

However, Goth *in*, Arm *i* and OCS *vŭ* are not the only equivalents of Gk *en/eis*. For example, in OCS Gk *en*+Dat is also translated with the help of phrases with prepositions which are not reflexes of IE **en*. Cf. the Gk correspondences with OCS *na* (governing the locative in (2a) and the accusative in (2b)) and *po* (governing the dative in (2c)) in the following examples:

(2)	a.	homoía estîn paidíois kathēménóis <u>en taís agoraís</u>	[GK]
		podobinŭ jestŭ dětištemŭ sĕdĕštemŭ <u>na trŭžištixŭ</u>	[OCS]
		'it is like children who sit in the markets' (Mt 11:16)	

[1] In a number of passages, just like in (1) PPs with **en* reflexes express spatial relations connected with Containment metaphor. This metaphor is understood as viewing a certain location (landmark) as a containment with boundaries and appears to be crucial for the development of the semantics of **en* reflexes in various languages including Gk, Goth, Arm, and OCS. See, for example, the discussion of the development of different semantic roles of **en* reflexes in Ancient Greek in Luraghi (2003, 82–94, 107–117).

- b. *hína héna apolúsō humîn en tōi páskha* [Gk]
da jedinogo vamŭ otŭpuštŭ na pasxŭ [OCS]
 ‘so that I will release to you one man at the Passover’ (Jn 18:39)
- c. *hupestrónnuon tà himátia heautôn en tēi hodōi* [Gk]
postilaaxŭ rizy svoŭe po pŭti [OCS]
 ‘they spread out their garments along the way’ (Lk 19:36)

In addition, Gk PPs with *en/eis* are sometimes rendered with nominal phrases (e.g., nouns in the dative, the accusative and the genitive in Goth), adjectival phrases (e.g., adjectives with a possessive suffix in OCS) and even clausal structures (e.g., clauses with the conjunctions *jegda* or *jako* in OCS and with the conjunctions *zi* and *andēr* in Arm). Such correspondences will be also exemplified and analyzed throughout the discussion.

This study concentrates on the examination of the correspondences where a Gk *en/eis* is matched with a non-PP in Goth, Arm and OCS. The aim of this investigation is to analyze an intricate mechanism and interrelations of different morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors that influence the translation of PPs and to show how they endorse correlations between Gk *en/eis* and a non-PP in Goth, Arm and OCS despite the genetic relatedness and morphosyntactic and semantic closeness of Gk *en/eis*, Goth *in*, Arm *i* and OCS *vŭ*. The examined corpus includes the canonical gospels of the New Testament in Biblical Greek and corresponding translations into Goth, Arm and OCS. The focus is on the internal relationship between syntax, morphology, semantics and pragmatics.

[2] MORPHOSYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS

Despite their relatedness Gk *en/eis*, Goth *in*, Arm *i* and OCS *vŭ* do not have the same syntactic, morphological or semantic loads in the languages in question. Let’s examine the variety of the semantic functions of PPs with Gk *en/eis*, Goth *in*, Arm *i* and OCS *vŭ* summarized in table 1 on page 192.²

Table 1 shows that there is a slight difference in case governance of *en reflexes in Gk, Goth, Arm and OCS. Namely, in Gk *en* governs Dat and *eis* is combined with nominals in Acc. In Goth and in Arm the case assignment for the *en reflexes is tripartite: Goth *in* governs Dat, Acc and Gen, while Arm *i* takes Loc, Acc and Abl. Finally, OCS *vŭ* governs two cases—Loc and Acc. The third case assignments in Goth and Arm are results of various changes of a different nature that took place in these languages. Goth *in*+Gen appears to be reserved for the designation of Beneficiary (Behalf) and it seems that it is this semantic function that is responsible for the existence of this construction. The origin of *i*+Abl has been variously explained. We

[2] In table 1 and henceforth the following abbreviations are used: Dat—the dative case, Acc—the accusative case, Gen—the genitive case, Abl—the ablative case, Loc—the locative case, Ins—the instrumental case, Voc—the vocative case. The symbol ++ marks the function with which a P is used most frequently.

		Gk <i>en</i> +Dat	Gk <i>eis</i> +Acc	Goth <i>in</i> +Dat	Goth <i>in</i> +Acc	Goth <i>in</i> +Gen	Arm <i>i</i> +Loc	Arm <i>i</i> +Acc	Arm <i>i</i> +Abl	OCS <i>vũ</i> +Loc	OCS <i>vũ</i> +Acc
space	location	++	+	++	+		++	+	+	++	+
	direction	+	++	+	++			++	+	+	++
	path	+		+			+				
	source							++			
time		+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+
comitative		+									
causal	agent/force	+							+		
	instrument	+	+	+			+	+	+	+	+
	cause	+	+	+					+	+	+
recipient		+	+	+			+	+			+
beneficiary		+				++		+			
possessor		+		+					+		
purpose			+		+	+	+	+		+	+
patient		+	+	+		+	+	+	+		
manner		+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+
topic		+	+	+		+	+	+		+	+

TABLE 1: Semantic load of various reflexes of **en* in Gk, Goth, Arm and OCS.

follow the proposal of Meillet who considered *i*+Abl to have the same origin as OCS *isŭ/izŭ* ‘from’, thus, the unification of *i*+Acc, *i*+Loc with *i*+Abl is a result of merger (Meillet 1936, 95–96).³ In this light, it is clear that the designation of Source by Arm *i*+Abl is not the result of an unusual semantic extension, but rather the preservation of the main meaning of the original. Synchronically, of course, Classical Arm *i* presents an intriguing case of the semantic merger of the three most significant spatial concepts – Location, Direction and Source.

It is not surprising that Gk *eis*+Acc, Goth *in*+Acc, Arm *i*+Acc and OCS *vũ*+Acc primarily designate Direction, since this meaning is primary for Acc (cf. data in table 2 on page 193). Note that in Gk the saliency of the concepts Location and Direction led to further disambiguation of these notions which resulted in lexicalization (Gk *en* vs. *eis*). Table 2 shows that the reflexes of **en* in Gk, Goth, Arm and OCS agree at least in regards to their spatial usages: their semantics remain concentrated on the denotation of Direction, however, all of them receive a semantic extension to mark Location.

The primary function of Gk *en*+Dat, Goth *in*+Dat, Arm *i*+Loc and OCS *vũ*+Loc is the denotation of Location (as seen in table 3 on page 194). Just like in the case of **en* reflexes governing Acc, this function goes in line with original meaning of Loc which mainly marks a space where an action takes place. The repetition and persistence with which PPs governing Acc refer to Direction and those governing Loc (and cases that the locative have merged into) mark Location are remarkable. This tendency provides valid grounds for typological conclusions about the saliency of these two functions for human cognition. At the same time, since languages tend to mark these notions using the same preposition one should keep in mind the closeness of these concepts. Note that Gk is the only language among the examined ones that attempts to produce a further distinction between Location and Direction on

[3] For a more detailed discussion of the origin of *i*+Abl see also Thomason (2005).

		Gk <i>eis</i> +Acc	Goth <i>in</i> +Acc	Arm <i>i</i> +Acc	OCS <i>vŭ</i> +Acc
space	location	+	+	+	+
	direction	++	++	++	++
	path				
	source				
time		+	+	+	+
comitative					
causal	agent/force				
	instrument	+		+	+
	cause	+			+
recipient		+		+	+
beneficiary				+	
possessor					
purpose		+	+	+	+
patient		+		+	
manner		+	+	+	+
topic		+		+	+

TABLE 2: Semantic load of *en reflexes governing Acc in Gk, Goth, Arm and OCS.

		Gk <i>en</i> +Dat	Goth <i>in</i> +Dat	Arm <i>i</i> +Loc	OCS <i>vŭ</i> +Loc
space	location	++	++	++	++
	direction	+	+		+
	path	+	+	+	
	source				
time		+	+	+	+
comitative		+			
causal	agent/force	+			
	instrument	+	+	+	+
	cause	+	+		+
recipient		+	+	+	
beneficiary		+			
possessor		+	+		
purpose				+	+
patient		+	+	+	
manner		+	+	+	+
topic		+	+	+	+

TABLE 3: Semantic load of **en* reflexes governing Dat in Gk and Goth and governing Loc in Arm and OCS

the level of form, since it makes *en*+Dat and *eis*+Acc synchronically distinct not only because of the case assignments, but also because of the different forms of the Ps (Luraghi 2009, 291–292).

Table 3 demonstrates the richness of the semantics of **en* reflexes governing Dat in Gk and Goth and governing Loc in Arm and OCS. Partially this diversity of the semantic function exists as a result of syncretism of case systems which leads to rearrangement of the functions of the cases. For example, it is a well-known fact that Dat in Gk and Goth is a result of multi-leveled syncretism. Thus, in Gk the IE Dat, Loc and Ins merged and in Goth the IE Dat, Loc, Ins and Abl merged. Therefore, the semantics of the Dat in Goth and Gk are enriched with meanings of these cases: Ins brings in the denotation of Means and Agent (and further Comitative), Dat—the meaning of Recipient, Loc marks Location and Abl tends to express Source (Meier-Brügger 2003, 261–73, Luraghi 2009, 286–288). Table 3 shows that the semantics of **en* reflexes governing Dat in Gk and Goth are extended to some of these functions as opposed to **en* reflexes governing Loc in Arm and OCS. For example, Gk *en*+Dat regularly marks Beneficiary (largely due to the input of the IE Dat), while its common counterparts Arm *i*+Loc and OCS *vŭ*+Loc do not receive such an extension and the

translators had to find other means to accommodate this meaning as exemplified in (3) below:

- (3) kalòn érgon ērgásato en emoí [GK]
 þannu goþ waurstw waurhta bi mis⁴ [GOTH]
 zi gorc bari gorceac' da yis⁵ [ARM]
 dobro bo dělo sūdēla o mīně [OCS]
 'for she did a good deed for me' (Mk 14:6)

Similarly, in the instances where Gk *en*+Dat regularly expresses a comitative function (due to the input of the IE Ins) Arm and OCS answer with PPs other than Arm *i*+Loc and OCS *vŭ*+Loc. Goth also has a P which is not cognate to Gk *en*+Dat, but this is because of the different distribution of the semantic space in this language (Goth *miþ*+Dat is the preferred construction in such passages):

- (4) ei dumatós estin en déka khiliásin hupantêsai [GK]
 siaiu mahteigs miþ taihun þusundjom gamotjan [GOTH]
 et'e karoł ic'ē tasn hazaraw zdēm ownel [ARM]
 ašte silinŭ jestŭ sŭ desętŭjŭ tysoštŭ sŭręstŭ [OCS]
 'if he is able with ten thousand to meet' (Lk 14:31)

Arm and OCS were not as greatly affected by syncretism as Gk and Goth. In OCS only the Abl merged with the Gen, whereas in Arm only the Voc has been lost (just as it was in Gk, Goth and OCS). Thus, it is not surprising that in a number of cases Gk *en*+Dat/*eis*+Acc are translated by nominal constructions (NPs) in OCS and Arm. In Goth one also finds instances of correspondences with NPs, however, they are not as frequent as in OCS and Arm and appear to be semantically limited. For example, Goth Dat renders Gk *en*+Dat in several passages, but in all of them this PP marks Location 'in'⁶ as a result of a metaphoric extension (connected with the vision of human bodies or clothes as Containment (shown in (5a) and (5b) respectively):

- (5) a. dialogízontai en heautoís [GK]
 mitodedun sis [GOTH]
 'they pondered within themselves' (Mk 2:8)
 b. ánthrōpon en malakoís ēmphiesménon [GK]
 mannan hnasqjaim wastjom gawasidana [GOTH]
 'a man clothed in soft raiment' (Mt 11:8)

[4] Note that Goth *in*+Dat is not extended to the denotation of Beneficiary either, but this instance is not parallel to those in Arm and OCS, because here Goth practically allocates *in*+Gen along with other PPs (e.g. *bi*+Dat in the example in (3) for the designation of Beneficiary).

[5] Note that Arm responds with *i*+Acc and not *i*+Loc here, because, of course, for *i*+Acc the denotation of Beneficiary is an expected extension since it regularly marks Recipient and Purpose.

[6] Note once again the input of the IE Loc which has merged into Goth Dat (see the discussion earlier).

Gk *eis*+Acc is rarely matched with Acc in Goth. It occurs only in passages where the Gk PP is combined with a verb of speech and has a Malefactive function as in (6a) (directional accusative) or where the complement of the Gk *eis* was the noun *aiōn* ‘space of time, duration’ and the PP expresses the meaning ‘forever’ as in (6b) (temporal accusative):

- (6) a. hòs d’ àn blasphēmésēi eis tò pneûma tò hágion [GK]
 aþþan saei wajamereiþ ahman weihana [GOTH]
 ‘but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit’ (Mk 3:29)
- b. kaì ou mè apólōntai eis tòn aiōna [GK]
 jah ni fraqistnand aiw [GOTH]
 ‘and they will never perish’ (Jn 10:28)

As expected, in Arm and OCS correspondences of Gk *en*+Dat/ *eis*+Acc with NPs are more regular. Ins becomes an absolute leader among cases in Arm and OCS when it comes to render Gk *en*+Dat. NPs in this case correspond to Gk *en*+Dat not only in instances where the Gk construction has causal functions (Means, Agent), the original meaning of Ins, as exemplified by (7a), but also where the Gk PP expresses spatial notions (e.g., Path which is also expressed by the Ins as illustrated in (7b)). Note also how in (7a) the Goth variant agrees with the Gk original in rendering causal semantics. Such concurrence, of course, is due to the parallel case syncretism in these languages and it is not unexpected that the correspondence Gk *en*+Dat : Goth *in*+Dat : Arm Ins : OCS Ins with causal functions occurs repeatedly and becomes one of the most stable correspondences involving *en reflexes.

- (7) a. kaì égeto en tōi pneúmati en tēi erēmōi [GK]
 jah tauhans was in ahmin in auþidai [GOTH]
 ew varēr hogwovn yanapat [ARM]
 i veděaše sę duxomǐ vŭ pustynjo [OCS]
 ‘and he was led by the Spirit in the desert’ (Lk 4:1)
- b. êlthen gār Iōánnēs pròs humàs en hodōi dikaiosúnēs [GK]
 zi ekn Yovhannēs čanaparhaw ardarowt’ean [ARM]
 pride bo kŭ vamŭ Ioannŭ Krŭstitelŭ pŭtĭmŭ pravĭdĭnomŭ [OCS]
 ‘for John (OCS: John the Baptist) came to you (Arm: ø) through the righteous way’ (Mt 21:32)

Gk *eis*+Acc corresponds to the OCS and Arm Dat in a number of occurrences where this PP marks Beneficiary (or Malefactive), a regular function for Dat, as shown in (8a), or Goal, as illustrated in (8b). Note the closeness of these functions which differ primarily because the former is associated with the notion of animacy and the latter does not. These are not the only functions which the correspondence

set Gk *eis*+Acc : Arm Dat : OCS Dat covers,⁷ but they are the most frequent ones.

- (8) a. *ei méti poreuthéntes hēmeîs agorásōmen eis pánta tòn laòn toûton* [GK]
brómata
bayc' et'e ert'ic'owk' gnesc'owk' bawakan žoľovrdeand kerakowr [ARM]
 'unless we go and buy (Arm: sufficient) food for all these people' (Lk 9:13)
allà taûta pánta poiēsousin eis humâs [GK]
nũ si vîsja sũtvoreťũ vamũ [OCS]
 'but they will do all this to (=against) you' (Jn 15:21)
- b. *eis oudèn iskhúei* [GK]
oč' imik' azdic'ē [ARM]
 'it will be good for nothing' (Mt 5:13)
misthósasthai ergátas eis tòn ampelôna autoũ [GK]
najetũ dělatelũ vinogradu svojemu [OCS]
 'to hire workers for his vineyard' (Mt 20:1)

There are also instances where Gk *en*+Dat/ *eis*+Acc are rendered with constructions other than their prepositional cognates, but those are not due to specifics of the case systems in the languages in question. Consider the following examples:

- (9) a. *kaì zēteî autòs en parrēsia ênai* [GK]
jah sokeipsik uskunþana wisan [GOTH]
ew xndrē ink'n hamarjak linel [ARM]
i iřtetũ samũ avě byti [OCS]
 'and he himself seeks to be open (Goth: to be known)' (Jn 7:4)
- b. *kaì ho patēr humôn ho en toîs ouranoîs...* [GK]
ei atta izwar sa in himinam... [GOTH]
zi ew hayrn jer or yerkins ē... [ARM]
da i otičĩ vařĩ nebesĩskyi... [OCS]
 'and your Father who [is] in heaven (OCS: and your heavenly Father)' (Mk 11:25)

In (9a) *en*+Dat is rendered by an adverb in Arm and OCS and by an adjective in its strong masculine accusative singular form (derived from a preterit participle based on a preterit-present verb *kunnan*) in Goth. In (9b) the Gk relative clause construction is simplified in OCS (even though relative constructions are also used in OCS) and the whole clause is translated with the help of an adjective that contains a possessive suffix *-ĩsk-*. Such correspondences are common in the New Testament. Note that Arm and Goth follow the Gk original without any changes. Examples like these,

[7] Gk *eis*+Acc is matched with the Dat in Arm and OCS in a few instances where this Gk PP expresses directional notions, topic or has a temporal meaning.

showing interference of the lexical and grammatical means available in a given language are important parts of the text that demonstrate the creativity of translators and their attempts to deliver the meaning of the original passage, stay true to it, but not at the expense of the linguistic specifics of their own languages.

Passages where the complement of the Gk *en/eis* is an infinitive receive a discrete treatment in Goth, Arm and OCS. In all four languages there are examples of infinitives serving as a subject or as a complement of a finite verb, however, not all of them allow constructions where an infinitive becomes the complement of a P. Undoubtedly, this is connected with the nature of an infinitive as a category and its morphosyntactic specifics in each language.

Thus, in Gk infinitives are fully incorporated in the verbal stem system, they have voice and tense. Gk inflects not the infinitive itself, but the preceding article. Goth and Arm form their infinitives from the present stems, but Arm inflects its infinitives while Goth does not. In most cases OCS infinitives are formed directly from the roots and none of them are inflected. Morphological specifics of infinitives in Gk, Goth and Arm allow them to occur as a complement of Ps. These languages make use of such constructions with different frequencies. Gk PPs with an infinitive as a complement are used either to mark Purpose or to express temporal values. Thus, Gk *en*+infinitive denotes Time ‘while, during’ (Gk *pro*+infinitive expresses Time ‘before’), while Gk *eis*+infinitive designates Purpose (Gk *pros*+infinitive also has this function).

OCS does not allow an infinitive to be the complement of P and has to use other means to translate the Gk original in such cases. Thus, Gk *en*+infinitive is repeatedly translated into OCS with the dative absolute construction (consisting of a participle and a noun/pronoun, both in the dative case, and typically expressing accompanying circumstances) which is regularly used in this language to mark a period of time during which something happened:

- (10) ephobéthēsan dē en tōi eiseltheîn autoūs eis tēn nephélēn [Gk]
 ubojašę že sę vũšĩdũšemũ imũ vũ oblakũ [OCS]
 ‘they feared when they were entering the cloud’ (Lk 9:34)

Less frequently, Gk *en*+infinitive is matched with relative clauses introduced by the OCS conjunctions *jegda* as in (11a) or *jako* as in (11b):⁸

- (11) a. kai egéneto en tōi epaneltheîn autón [Gk]
 i bystũ jegda vũzvratĩ sę [OCS]
 ‘and when he came back’ (Lk 19:15)

[8] Gk *pro*+infinitive designating Time ‘before’ is translated in a similar fashion. It is matched in OCS with relative clauses introduced by the OCS conjunction *prěžde*.

- b. *kaí egéneto en tōi kataklithênai autón met' autôn* [GK]
i bystŭ jako vŭzleže sŭ nima [OCS]
 'and when he was at a table with them' (Lk 24:30)

Similarly, Gk *eis*+infinitive is rendered with the help of either OCS relative clauses of purpose with the conjunction *da* (cf. its cognate Gk *dē* 'when') as exemplified by (12a) or with the infinitive alone as shown in (12b):

- (12) a. *eis tò thanatōsai autón* [GK]
da i ubŭjotŭ [OCS]
 'to (OCS: so that they) kill him' (Mk 14:55)
 b. *kaí dúnamis kuríou ên eis tó iâsthai auton* [GK]
i sila gospodnja bě čěliti ję [OCS]
 'and the power of the Lord was to cure him' (Lk 5:17)

In Goth only one P is found with an infinitive as its complement—*du*. Therefore, it is not surprising that Goth *du*+infinitive becomes the only counterpart of Gk *eis*+infinitive marking Purpose:⁹

- (13) *kaí dúnamis kuríou ên eis tó iâsthai autón* [GK]
jah mahts frauġins was du hailjan ins [GOTH]
 'and the power of the Lord was to heal him' (Lk 5:17)

Gk *en*+infinitive is rendered with clausal structures with such conjunctions as *miþþanei*, as illustrated in (14a) or *biþe* (less frequently), as shown in (14b):¹⁰

- (14) a. *kai en tōi katēgoreîsthai autón hupò tôn arkhieréōn* [GK]
jah miþþanei wrohiþs was fram þaim gudjam [GOTH]
 'but when he was accused by the chief priests' (Mt 27:12)
 b. *kaí egéneto en tōi epaneltheîn autón* [GK]
jah warþ biþe atwandida sik aftra [GOTH]
 'when he returned' (Lk 19:15)

Arm tends to reply to Gk *en*+infinitive or *eis*+infinitive with the cognate set *i*+infinitive (in the locative case) and *i*+infinitive (in the accusative case) as exemplified in (15a) and (15b) respectively:

- (15) a. *ephobéthēsan dē en tōi eiseltheîn autóu eís tēn nephélēn* [GK]
ew erkean i mtaneln noc'a ænd ampov [ARM]
 'and they were afraid when they went into (Arm: under) the cloud' (Lk 9:34)

[9] Gk *pros*+infinitive designating Purpose is also translated into Goth with *du*+infinitive.

[10] Gk *pro*+infinitive is also translated into Goth with the help of subordinate clauses with the conjunction *faurþizei*.

- b. *kaì dúnamis kuríou ēn eis tò iâsthai autón* [GK]
ew zawrowt'iwn TÑ ēr i bžškel znosa [ARM]
 'and the power of the Lord was to heal him (Arm: them)' (Lk 5:17)

But other means are also available and, as in the case with OCS, the Arm translator sometimes uses clausal structure or infinitive alone to render the meaning of the Gk *en/eis*+infinitive. But in addition to that, Arm has Ps other than *i* that can take an infinitive as a complement. Thus, Gk *en*+infinitive in several passages is translated with Arm *and*+infinitive (in its accusative form) as shown in (16a). It is also sometimes rendered with a temporal clause introduced by the conjunctions *minč'*(*ew*) or *ibrew* as illustrated in (16b) and (16c) respectively:

- (16) a. *en dé tōi hupágein autón* [GK]
ew and ert'aln nora [ARM]
 'and when he was leaving...' (Lk 8:42)
- b. *kaí egéneto en tōi poreu'esthai eis Ierousalēm* [GK]
ew ešew minč'ew ert'ay na yĒM [ARM]
 'and when he went to Jerusalem' (Lk 17:11)
- c. *kaí en tōi eisagageîn toús goneîs tó paidíon* [GK]
ew ibrew acin cnawlk'n zmanowkn [ARM]
 'and when the parents brought in the child' (Lk 2:27)

Gk *eis*+infinitive is occasionally translated with the infinitive alone in Arm:

- (17) *kaí paradósousin autón toîs éthnesin eis tó empaízai* [GK]
ew matnesc'en zna het'anosac' aypanel [ARM]
 'and they will give him to the Gentiles to be mocked' (Mt 20:19)

From the examined instances we see that the translators in Goth, Arm and OCS strived to remain true to the text of the original and preserve the clausal meaning of the constructions *en/eis*+infinitive. The fact that we find a different set of correspondences in examples where an infinitive becomes a complement of a P supports the propositions of those linguists that argue that infinitival constructions are sentential and not just a type of a simple VP (Koster & May 1982).

[3] SEMANTIC CONSTRAINTS

In a number of passages Gk *en*+Dat and *eis*+Acc are rendered with non-cognate PPs in Goth, Arm and OCS due to semantics factors. Having examined all such instances in the canonical gospels of the New Testament we can argue with certainty that in such cases no matter what kind of semantics Gk *en*+Dat and *eis*+Acc may have, they can be translated by the non-cognate PPs which may be of different kinds, but all of them will have one thing in common: the function expressed by Gk *en*+Dat and

eis+Acc will be either their primary semantic role or at least a frequent one.

[3.1] *Gk en+Dat/eis+Acc: primary function translated by primary function*

In the instances Gk *en*+Dat and *eis*+Acc are used with their primary functions (the denotation of Location ‘in’ and Direction ‘into’ respectively) they are translated with non-cognate PPs in Goth, Arm and OCS which also have the designation of Location ‘in’ and Direction ‘into’ as their main/recurrent semantic roles. These are the passages where Gk *en*+Dat is rendered with Goth *ana*+Dat, Arm *and*+Acc/Loc and OCS *na*+Loc (as exemplified in (18a)–(18c)) and Gk *eis*+Acc is translated with Goth *du*+Dat, Arm *z*+Acc and OCS *na*+Acc¹¹ (as illustrated by (18d)–(18f)).

(18)	a.	oi patéres hēmôn tò máнна éphagon <u>en têi erēmōi</u>	[GK]
		attans unsarai manna matidedun <u>ana auþidai</u>	[GOTH]
		‘our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness’ (Jn 6:31)	
	b.	kai èn hólēi têi oreinēi tēs Ioudaías	[GK]
		ew <u>and amenayn leṛnakolmnn</u> Hrēastani	[ARM]
		‘and in (=throughout) the whole mountain region of Judea’ (Lk 1:65)	
	c.	hóti ho mishtòs humôn polùs <u>en tois ouranois</u>	[GK]
		jako mǐzda vaša mǔnoga <u>na nebesǔxǔ</u>	[OCS]
		‘for your reward is great in heaven’ (Mt 5:12)	
	d.	húpage <u>eis tòn oĩkón sou</u>	[GK]
		gagg du garda þeinamma	[GOTH]
		‘go to your house’ (Mk 5:19)	
	e.	kai pás <u>eis autēn</u> biázetai	[GK]
		ew amenayn ok’ zna bṛnabarē	[ARM]
		‘and everyone rushes into it’ (Lk 16:16)	
	f.	hópōs ekbálēi ergátas <u>eis tòn therismòn autoû</u>	[GK]
		da izvedetǔ dēlatelǔ <u>na žetvǔ svojǔ</u>	[OCS]
		‘so that he send out workers into his harvest’ (Mt 9:38)	

For example, in (18d) and (18e) Gk *eis*+Acc corresponds to Goth *du*+Dat (another regular marker of Direction in Goth) and Arm *z*+Acc only because these constructions are in free variation with the respective *en cognates. The factor that sponsors the correspondence Gk *en cognate : Goth/Arm/OCS non-cognate is of a purely semantic nature and connected with differences in the inventory of the prepositional systems in the respective languages. This disparity gives rise to different assignments of semantic functions to the members of the prepositional systems in these languages. These types of correspondences support the idea of the idiomatic nature of the Goth, Arm and OCS translations since the translators seem to make the

[11] There are some other factors that influence the choice of P in this kind of correspondences. They are discussed in section [4] below.

choice of the constructions that they use not only based on the text of the original, but also on the basis of the resources available to them in the languages with which they are working.

[3.2] *Gk en+Dat/eis+Acc: secondary function translated by primary function*

As expected, we find a number of passages where Gk *en+Dat/eis+Acc* used with their secondary functions are translated into Goth, Arm and OCS with the help of phrases with non-cognate Ps. As it is stated in section [3], in such instances the Gk constructions are rendered with non-cognate PPs for which the semantics expressed by the Gk counterpart are primary or as a minimum frequent. Examples of this type once again support the idea of the idiomatic nature of Goth, Arm and OCS translations. Compare the following passages:

- (19) a. *ei dunatós estin en déka khiliásin* [GK]
           siaiu mahteigs miþ taihun þusundjom [GOTH]
           ‘whether he is able with ten thousand’ (Lk 14:31)
- b. *kai periêgen en hólēi tēi Galiláiai* [GK]
       ew šrjēr ȲS and amenayn kołmn Galileac’woc’ [ARM]
       ‘and he (Arm: Jesus) went throughout the whole region of Galilee’ (Mt 4:23)
- c. *en gār toutōi ho lógos estin alēthinòs* [GK]
       o semī bo slovo jestū istinīnoje [OCS]
       ‘for about this the word is true’ (Jn 4:37)

In (19a) the comitative function of Gk *en+Dat* is rendered with Goth *miþ+Dat* for which this meaning is primary. The Gk passage in (19b) where *eis+Acc* denotes Path (a less frequent function for this construction) is translated in Arm with *and+Acc* (a regular marker of Path in this language). OCS regularly designates topic with *o+Loc* and that is why this PP becomes a counterpart of Gk *en+Dat* in (19b). All these instances in (19) exemplify how synchronic peculiarities in the distribution of the semantic load in each of these languages increase the number of possible counterparts for Gk *en+Dat/eis+Acc*, in other words, how internal content affects the external form.

[4] PRAGMATIC FACTORS

Reasons for translation of Gk *en+Dat/eis+Acc* by means other than their cognates could be not only purely grammatical (which were illustrated earlier), but could also reflect personal preferences, the interpretations of a translator and the pragmatic complexity of a concept and the translator’s vision of the notion which is being discussed in a certain passage. Consider (20) where Gk *eis+Acc* is rendered with OCS *na+Acc*:

the whole picture. Thus, the meaning is inferred not just from one particular component of a passage, but from a combination of sentence members whose meaning is restrained by such factors as context and the conceptualization of the event in question. In our case the conceptual pair Surface–Containment could be marked not only by the PPs mentioned above, but also, of course, by NPs or prefixes (for example, in (20) Surface is signaled by the Gk prefix *an-*) and then a translator is given a choice in his selection of a P since the concept is already marked by something else.

While rendering a passage, a translator analyzes the text based on his own prior experiences of the surrounding world and communications. Thus, using the semantic complexity and relativity of the concept in question, a translator has the option of choosing a point of view (rendition). This is another reason why in spite of a high frequency of correspondences between Gk *en/eis* and their cognates in the languages under consideration, one finds a number of correspondences between Gk *en/ eis* and non-cognate PPs. Factors related to the conceptualization of situation/event/entity also influence the translation. Compare the following correspondences:

- (21) a. *kathísas dé en tōi ploíōi edídasken toùs ókhλους* [GK]
           jah gasitands laisida us þamma skipa manageins [GOTH]
           ‘and sitting he taught people in (Goth: from) the boat’ (Lk 5:3)
- b. *hóti tò en anthrópōis hupsēlōn* [GK]
       zi or aŕaji mardkan barjr ē [ARM]
       ‘for what is high among (Arm: before) men’ (Lk 16:15)
- c. *outhèn heûron en tōi anthrópōi toutōi aítion* [GK]
       ne obrětŭ ni jedinojě o člověčě semŭ viny [OCS]
       ‘I have not found a single fault in (OCS: about) this man’ (Lk 23:14)

In (21a)–(21c) the original Greek text receives different renditions which occur not because of some grammatical particular of a language into which the manuscript is being translated. The reason is of a pragmatic nature connected with the complexity of the conceptualization of the situation in question and the fact that many situations can be viewed from different perspectives. These perspectives are made possible by contiguity of ideas, events, and experiences. And it is for this reason that translators reinterpret the original Gk passages, thus increasing the level of variation in means used to translate Gk *en+Dat/ eis+Acc*. Going back to (20), here we can also find an instance of such a rendition. The general conceptualization of an event is also at play here, since going up the hill will result in being on its top (Surface), however, a person/object which is moving up the hill is comparatively small and (especially from the distance) could be viewed as being a part/inside of the hill (Containment). The passages in (20) and (21) show that pragmatic and semantic factors are closely interconnected and it is difficult at times to draw strict

boundaries between them.

The pragmatic appropriateness/inappropriateness of a certain construction in a particular context is another factor that affects translation. Compare the following correspondence set:

- (22) ouaì dè taís en gastrì ekhouísais [Gk]
 gore že neprazďnyimŭ [OCS]
 ‘and alas to those who are with child’ (Mt 24:19)

The Gk *en*+Dat expressing the meaning ‘with child’ is rendered with the OCS adjective ‘pregnant’ (lit. ‘not empty’) not because OCS does not have a construction structurally parallel to that of Gk. In fact it does and we find Gk *en*+Dat translated with a construction with OCS *vŭ* in several passages, cf. (23):

- (23) sullémpsēi en gastrì [Gk]
 začíneši vŭ čřěvě [OCS]
 ‘you shall conceive in the womb’ (Lk 1:31)

However, it is likely that the translator chose the rendition with the adjective because a literal interpretation of the Gk phrase is seen by him as culturally inappropriate. Apparently, only Northern Slavic languages demonstrate the semantic extension ‘(with) a stomach’ > ‘pregnant’ and Old Russian *brjuxataja* ‘pregnant’ is considered to be a rude term (Trubachev 1976).

[5] CONCLUSIONS

As we have seen, Gk *en*+Dat/*eis*+Acc receives an abundant selection of correspondences in Goth, Arm and OCS despite the fact that there exist cognate Ps in these languages that have relatively similar grammatical functions. The assortment of correlations ranges from phrases with Ps which are non-cognate with Gk *en*+Dat/*eis*+Acc and NPs in a variety of case forms to clausal structures. This variety is made possible for a number of reasons which are morphological, syntactic, semantic or pragmatic in nature. As it is demonstrated in this article, it is not uncommon to find instances where several of these factors influence the translation at the same time, demonstrating the complexity of the interrelations among them. The main factors that affect the translation include discrepancies in prepositional case governance and results of syncretism, differences in the inventory of prepositions available in a given language and as its outcome diversity in division of semantic space by PPs. Several pragmatic aspects that sometimes affect the choice of translational means, such as the possibility of a compositional marking of a certain concept, the complexity of an event/situation being marked, and the pragmatic appropriateness of a certain construction should also be taken into account.

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Jagich, I. V. (ed.). 1954. *Quattuor evangeliorum Codex Glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt.
- Jagich, I. V. (ed.). 1960. *Mariinskoe chetveroevangelie s primiechaniiami i prilozheniiami*. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt.
- Künzle, Beda O. (ed.). 1984. *Das altarmenische Evangelium*. Bern-New York: P. Lang.
- Nestle, E. & K. Aland (eds.). 1969. *Novum Testamentum graece: cum apparatu critico*. London: United Bible Societies.
- Streitberg, W. (ed.). 2000. *Die gotische Bibel*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Vajs, J. 1935a. *Evangelium sv. Marka: text rekonstruovaný*. Prague.
- Vajs, J. 1935b. *Evangelium sv. Matouse: text rekonstruovaný*. Prague.
- Vajs, J. 1936a. *Evangelium sv. Lukáše: text rekonstruovaný*. Prague.
- Vajs, J. 1936b. *Evangelium sv. Jana: text rekonstruovaný*. Prague.

WORKS CITED

- Asbury, A., B. Gehrke, van Riemsdijk H. & J. Zwarts. 2008. Introduction: Syntax and semantics of prepositions. In Asbury A., J. Dotlačil, B. Gehrke & R. Nouwen (eds.), *Syntax and semantics of spatial P*, 1–32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cover, N. & H. van Riemsdijk. 2001. *Semi-lexical categories*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Creissels, D. 2009. Spatial cases. In Malchukov A. & A. Spencer (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of case*, 609–625. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- den Dikken, M. 2006. On the functional structure of locative and directional PPs. Manuscript.
- Koopman, H. 2000. Prepositions, postpositions, circumpositions and particles. In Koopman H. (ed.), *The syntax of specifiers and heads*, 204–260. London: Routledge.
- Koster, J. & R. May. 1982. On the constituency of infinitives. *Language* 58(1). 116–143.
- Luraghi, S. 2003. *On the maning of prepositions and cases: The expression of semantic roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Luraghi, S. 2009. The evolution of local cases and their grammatical equivalent in Greek and Latin. In J. Barðdal & Sh. L. Chelliah (eds.), *The role of semantic, pragmatic, and discourse factors in the development of case*, 283–305. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Meier-Brügger, M. 2003. *Indo-European linguistics*. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Meillet, A. 1936. *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparee de l'armenien classique*. 2nd ed. Vienna.
- Nikitina, T. 2008. Variation in the expression of spatial goals. In A. Asbury, J. Dotlačil, B. Gehrke & R. Nouwen (eds.), *Syntax and semantics of spatial P*, 175–195. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Thomason, O. 2005. Location, Direction, Source in Biblical Greek, Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavic. In *Proceedings of The 16th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, 235–242. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Trubachev, O. N. (ed.). 1976. *Etimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov*. vol. 3. Moskva: Nauka.
- Van Valin, R. D. Jr. 1999. Functional relations. In K. Brown & J. Miller (eds.), *Concise encyclopedia of grammatical categories*, 150–62. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Watkins, C. (ed.). 2000. *The American heritage dictionary of Indo-European roots*. 2nd ed. Boston-New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION

Olga Thomason
University of Georgia
Germanic and Slavic Studies
201 Joseph E Brown Hall
Athens, GA 30601
USA
olgath@uga.edu