NEGATION AND POLARITY IN THE GREEK, GOTHIC, CLASSICAL ARMENIAN, AND OLD CHURCH SLAVIC GOSPELS: A PRELIMINARY STUDY

JARED S. KLEIN
University of Georgia

[1] INTRODUCTION

In the field of Indo-European syntax it is of course sound procedure to examine the earliest attested languages and texts, Hittite, Vedic Sanskrit, and Homeric Greek, in order to arrive at an assessment via reconstruction of the likely features of the syntax of the proto-language. But even in this seemingly straightforward procedure there lurks the difficulty that, whereas the texts of Homer and the Rigveda reflect archaic types of poetic production, the Hittite corpus consists overwhelmingly of prose. If we consider the syntax of prose and poetry to be in some degree incommensurate, then the circumstances of our comparison are not ideal. On the other hand, we find among a small group of middle attested Indo-European dialects exactly the opposite situation: in Germanic, Armenian, and Slavic the earliest (or sole) attested material consists of translations from the Greek New Testament. In these instances, then, we have the same text and hence the materials for a ready-made comparative syntax that simply awaits research in order to be made available as a component to be fed into the comparative method together with the results from other Indo-European dialects for the purpose of syntactic reconstruction. Despite these favorable circumstances, however, the comparative syntax of the Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavic gospels (for it is precisely these texts that they all share) has attracted exceedingly little attention. In fact, the only person to have devoted significant attention to this area prior to the twenty-first century was the Swiss scholar Cuendet, who wrote monographs on the use of the imperative and word order in these texts (1924 and 1929, respectively). Recognizing the obvious advantages for comparative syntax presented by this material, I conceived in 1987 a project to analyze these texts for comparative syntactic purposes and have pursued it ever since with many interruptions. My contributions have so far involved only Gothic and Classical Armenian (Klein 1992a, 1992b, 1994, 1996, 1997; Klein & Condon 1993). In addition, over the past twenty years a number of unpublished theses and dissertations have been produced under my direction at the

University of Georgia (in one instance elsewhere with me as co-director) as part of this project, mostly involving Gothic but with frequent inclusion of the Old English gospels (cf. Condon 1990, Kim 1992 [Old English], Tunkle 2000, Govberg-Afros 2002 [Gothic and Old English], Martin 2004 [Old English], Bucsko 2008, Pennington 2010 [Greek, Latin, Gothic, Old English]). In one instance (Thomason 2006) the material of Greek, Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavic has been utilized. In recent years Dag Haug has conceptualized a computerized European version of this project at Oslo University (called *Pragmatic Resources in Old Indo-European Languages* [PROIEL]) in which the Latin Vulgate also plays a prominent role.¹ It appears therefore that the comparative syntax of these languages is finally getting the attention it deserves.

[2] THE CORPUS

The first step which must be taken in the consummation of this project is the accumulation of a body of comparative data. Currently no quadrilateral discussion of this material exists in the scholarly literature, aside from the works of Cuendet and Thomason previously noted. The data for such a discussion must therefore be wrung from the texts themselves. Once this material has been gathered and categorized, real syntactic analysis can begin. Pursuant to this goal, I will present here a preliminary study of the comparative syntax of negation and the related issue of negative polarity items. Its modest goal is to expose the comparative facts descriptively and venture a few preliminary analyses across a range of construction types, focusing especially on the formal exponents of these, including modality. With regard to the associated issue of negative polarity, this is not the place to expatiate upon this topic, on which a substantial literature now exists (cf. *inter alios* Fauconnier 1975, Ladusaw 1980, Horn 1989, Zwarts 1995). In this paper we will understand negative polarity items to refer to certain pronominal or adverbial elements that occur in negative contexts, including items translatable in English as ‘nobody, never, nothing,’ etc. For an in-depth study of negative polarity in the Classical Armenian gospel text cf. Klein 1997.

The corpus on which this analysis is based encompasses the Gospels of Matthew 1:1–11:25 and Mark, chapters 1–9 or just under 20% of the Gospel text in its entirety. For the Greek text, I have used the 26th edition of Nestle & Aland (1979), for Gothic the sixth edition of Streitberg’s *Gotische Bibel* (1971), and for Old Church Slavic Jagič’s edition of the 11th century *Codex Marianus* (1960) with occasional variant readings taken from his edition of the *Codex Zographensis* (late 10th/early 11th century) (1954). For Classical Armenian I have used Künzle’s critical edition of the 10th century *Ējmiacin* manuscript (1984). The Armenian and Old Church Slavic texts are complete for the parts I have studied for this paper, although Jagič was forced to

[1] See <http://foni.uio.no:3000>.

use the 13th century *Dečani tetraevangelium* to provide the text of Matthew 1:1-5:24, which is lacking in both the Marianus and the Zographensis; but the Gothic text is lacking for Mt 1:1-5:15 with brief lacunae between 6:32-7:12 and again between 10:1-23. In Mark as well Gothic lacks 6:31-54. I have broken down the negation into eleven or so categories representing for the most part different clause types with special consideration given to various negative polarity markers.

[3] EXPONENTS OF NEGATION AND POLARITY

Before presenting the comparative data, we begin by enregistering the basic exponents of negation and polarity in the four languages we are investigating, followed by an overview of their systems of modality and expression of futurity. These are features which will characterize all the passages which we shall subsequently cite and discuss.

The basic exponents of negation in the four languages are as follows:

(1)	ou(k); modal <i>mē</i> ; sequential <i>ou̯te</i> , <i>oudé</i> ; <i>mēte</i> , <i>mēde</i>	[GK]
	ni; sequential <i>nih</i>	[GOTH]
	oč'; modal <i>mi</i>	[ARM]
	ne; sequential <i>ni</i>	[OCS]

While Greek and Classical Armenian retain the Indo-European distinction of indicative and modal negation, Gothic and Old Church Slavic employ a single form in both indicative and modal clauses.² In the case of sequential negation only Classical Armenian shows no univerbated form but simply employs *ew* 'and' plus the relevant negation.

We next list the basic negative polarity items found in our corpus. The most striking of these is the Armenian set, where a series in *-k* is opposed to a positive polarity series in *-mn* (*oč' ok* 'nobody' vs. *mi omn* 'a certain one, somebody'). The relationship between these two is exactly like that of English *any* vs. *some* (cf. Klein 1997). Only Slavic, as we shall see, shows a pure negation *ne* in certain non-overtly-negative classical negative polarity contexts:

(2)	'Nobody, nothing'	
	ou/ <i>mēdeís</i> , ou/ <i>mēdén</i>	[GK]
	ni... <i>manna</i> / <i>hvašun</i> , ni... <i>waiht</i>	[GOTH]
	oč' <i>ok</i> , oč' <i>inč</i> (contrast positive <i>mi omn</i> , <i>imn</i>)	[ARM]
	<i>niktože</i> , <i>ničtože</i>	[OCS]

[2] The modal negators of both Greek and Classical Armenian are direct avatars of PIE **mē* (cf. also Skt. *mā*). Similarly, Gothic *ni* and OCS *ne* both continue the PIE nonmodal negator **né*. According to the etymology of Warren Cowgill (1960), both Gk *ou(k)* and Classical Armenian *oč'* are also descended from a strengthened form of **né*, **né H₂óyu k^wid* 'not ever', with ellipsis of the original negator. If so, then both languages, like Sanskrit, originally opposed an indicative negator **né* to a modal negator **mē*.

	Greek ¹	Gothic	Cl. Armenian	OCS
Indicative	+	+	+	+
Imperative	+	+	+	+ ²
Subjunctive	+	+ ³	+	-
Future	+	- ⁴	- ⁵	- ⁶

¹ The optative is moribund and is not represented in our subcorpus.   ² Etymologically optative.
³ Etymologically optative.
⁴ Present indicative serves as future.   ⁵ Subjunctive serves as future.   ⁶ Perfective present serves as future; periphrastic future with *imati* ‘have’ + infinitive.

TABLE 1: Modal categories

Finally, we note that although New Testament Greek, Classical Armenian, and Gothic all possess a subjunctive beside an indicative and imperative, OCS lacks this third modal category. NT Greek of course still employs the optative in reduced measure compared to its classical counterpart; but no examples of this mood occur in the negative clauses in our subcorpus. Although the Gothic subjunctive is etymologically an optative, we shall refer to it in this paper as a subjunctive. Of the four languages only Greek possesses a grammatical category called “future tense”. In Gothic the present indicative is capable of signaling future value, and the same is true of the perfective present in OCS. In Classical Armenian the subjunctive, in addition to signaling a range of values normally associated with this mood, signals the future as well. These facts are synopsized in Table 1.

[3.1] *Simple negative statement*

We turn now to the various contexts of negation in comparative perspective. The first of these is the simple negative statement showing nonmodal negation + indicative mood in all four languages (3a). In the case of a future statement (3b) Greek juxtaposes the indicative and modal negations *ou* and *mé* and uses the subjunctive mood. Gothic responds with a present in future value and Armenian with *oč’* + subjunctive qua future. In OCS the periphrastic verb *imati* + infinitive here signals future value:

- (3) a. Mt 6:24 ‘You cannot serve God and mammon’³
 ou dúnasthe theōî douleúein kai mamōnāî [GK]
 ni maguḅ guda skalkinon jah mammonin [GOTH]
 oč’ karēk’ AY caṙayel ew mamonai [ARM]
 ne možete bogu rabotati. i mamoně [OCS]
- b. Mt 5:20 ‘You shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven’
 ou mē eisélthēte eis tēn basileían tōn ouranōn [GK]
 ni ḅau qimiḅ in ḅudangardjai himine [GOTH]
 oč’ mtanic’ēk’ yark’ayowt’iwn erknic’ [ARM]
 ne imate vūniti vū cēsarīstvo nebesīnoje [OCS]

Example (3b) follows a negative conditional clause (‘if/unless your justice is greater than [that] of the scribes and Pharisees’) and only Gothic is sensitive to the apodotic nature of the context, employing its apodotic particle *ḅau* ‘then’.

Turning now to some typical negative polarity contexts, we find instances involving the meanings ‘nobody, nothing, no longer, and never’, together with combinations of these. Examples are seen in (4a)–(4g):

- (4) a. Mk 2:22 ‘And nobody puts new wine into old bottles’
 kai oudeis bállei oīnon néon eis askoûs palaioús [GK]
 ni manna giutiḅ wein juggata in balgins fairnjans [GOTH]
 Ew oč’ ok’ arkanē gini nor i tiks hins [ARM]
 i nikūtože ne vūlivaatū vina nova vī mēxy vetūxy [OCS]
- b. Mk 9:39 ‘For there is nobody who shall do a miracle in my name and straightway speak evil of me’
 oudeis gār estin hōs poiēsei dúnamin epì tōî onómatí mou kai dunésetai takhū kakologēsaí me [GK]
 ni mannahun auk ist saei taujiḅ maht in namin meinamma jah magi sprauto ubilwaurdjan mis [GOTH]
 zi oč’ ok’ ē or aṙnē zawrowt’iwns yanown im . ew karic’ē hayhoyel zis [ARM]
 niktože bo estū iže sūtvoritū silq o imeni moemī. i vūzmožetū vūskorě zūlosloviti mę [OCS]
- c. Mt 9:16 ‘Nobody puts a piece of unfulled cloth upon an old garment’
 oudeis dē epibállei epíblēma hrákous agnáprou epì himatíōi palaiōi [GK]
 aḅḅan ni ḅashun lagjiḅ du plata fanan ḅarihis ana snagan fairn-jana [GOTH]

[3] In presenting the texts I have made some simplifications driven in part by computer-related considerations. First, I have left off the line over holy names in Classical Armenian (e.g. AY, ILI) and have written out in full abbreviated words in OCS (e.g. *bogu*, *cēsarīstvo* *nebesīnoje*). I have also reduced the multiplicity of comma and period-like punctuations in Künzle’s Classical Armenian text to a single period with a space on both sides and have placed the raised dot in Greek on the line.

- oč' ok' arkanē kapert ant'ap' i veray hnac'eal jorjoy [ARM]
 niktože bo ne pristavlēatū pristavleniē plata ne bělena rizē
 vetūsē [OCS]
- d. Mt 10:26 'For nothing is hidden which will not be revealed'
 oudēn gār estin kekalummēnon hò ouk apokaluphtēsetai [GK]
 ni waiht auk ist gahuliþ þatei ni andhuljaidau [GOTH]
 zi oč' inč' ē i cacowk or oč' yaytnesc'i [ARM]
 Ničtože bo estū pokrūveno eže ne otūkrūveno bōdetū [OCS]
- e. Mt 7:23 'And then I will profess to them that I have never known you'
 kai tōte homologēsō autoîs hōti oudépote égnōn humās [GK]
 jah þan andhaita im þatei ni hvanhun kunþa izwis [GOTH]
 ew yaynžam asac'ic' c'nosa et'e oč' erbek' gitei zjez [ARM]
 i togda ispověmī imū ěko nikoliže znaxū vašū [OCS]
- f. Mt 9:33 'Never has such a thing appeared in Israel'
 oudépote ephánē hoútōs en tōî Israēl [GK]
 ni aiw swa uskunþ was in Israela [GOTH]
 ew oč' erbek' erewec'aw ayspisi inč' yIŁI [ARM]
 nikoliže avi sę tako vū Israeli [OCS]
- g. Mk 9:8 'And immediately looking around, they no longer saw anybody'
 kai eksápina periblepsámenoi oukéti oudéna eídon [GK]
 jah anaks insailvandans ni þanaseiþs ainohun gaseþun [GOTH]
 Ew yankarcaki hayec'eal aysr andr . oč' ews zok' owrek' tesin [ARM]
 i vūnezaapq vīžirēvūše nikogože ne viděšę (Zog: kŭ tomu) [OCS]

The greatest degree of variation here is seen in Gothic. Most basic is (4a), where Gk. *oudéis* 'nobody' corresponds to Goth. *ni manna*, Arm. *oč' ok'*, and OCS *niktože*. Notice here the OCS usage of a genitive object, *vina nova*, in a negative clause, as well as the double negative, *niktože ne*, seen in none of the other languages. Other Gothic options for this value include *ni mannahun* (4b) and *ni hvanhun* (4c). The contrast of (4b) and (4c) in OCS (*niktože* vs. *niktože...ne*) suggests that the double negative does not appear with the present tense of the verb *byti*, at least when the latter follows the negation. Another interesting feature of OCS seen here is that this language alone of the four we are investigating possesses no compositional negation or privative prefix but employs its independent negation *ne* in the phrase *ne bělena* 'unfulled' as opposed to Gk. *agnáphou* and Armenian *ant'ap'*. Gothic here uses a separate lexical item *þarihs*. In the meaning 'nothing' (4d) Gk. *oudén* corresponds to Goth. *ni wait*, Arm. *oč' inč'*, and OCS *ničtože*, again with single negation and present tense of *byti*. For 'never' Gk. *oudépote* shows two Gothic correspondences: *ni hvanhun* (4e) and *ni aiw* (4f). In both instances Arm. has *oč' erbek'* and OCS *nikoliže*. Finally, the double negative polarity combination 'no longer anybody' is seen in (4g), where Gk. *oukéti oudéna* goes with Goth. *ni þanaseiþs ainohun*, Arm. *oč' ews zok' owrek'* and

OCS *nikogože ne*. Here Armenian shows yet a third negative polarity item, the local *owrek* ‘anywhere’ not found in the other texts, whereas OCS of the Marianus, which again shows a double negative, does not capture the *oukéti* ‘no longer’ of Greek. (It is, however, captured by *kǔ tomu* in the Zographensis.)

[3.2] Negative commands

The second clause type we shall investigate consists of negative commands. Here Greek shows both *mé* + impv. and *mé* + aor. subj. in simple commands as well as a separate category, often called “Gesetzessprache” in which Greek renders biblical commands from the Hebrew Bible via *ou* + future. The reason for this is that Biblical Hebrew employs the imperfect tense in these instances, and one usage of the Hebrew imperfect is future, the value which this verbal category assumes in all later stages of the language, including the Rabbinical Hebrew contemporaneous with the Greek NT. Since Hebrew employs its nonmodal negation in these constructions (*lo*’ rather than *’al*), Greek responds with *ou* rather than *mé* in these instances. In simple negative commands Gothic employs *ni* with either the subjunctive or the imperative, Armenian responds with *mi* + either subjunctive or imperative, and OCS generally shows *ne* + impv:

- (5) a. Mt 6.16 ‘Don’t be like the hypocrites, of sad countenance’
       mè gínesthe hósper hoi hupokritàì skuthrōpoí [GK]
       ni wairþiþ swaswe þai liutans gaurai [GOTH]
       mi linik’ ibrew zkełcaworsn trtmealk’ [ARM]
       ne bōdēte ěko i hūpokriti (Zog: sētujōšte) [OCS]
- b. Mt 6.13 ‘And do not lead us into temptation’
       kaì mè eisenégkēis hēmâs eis peirasmón [GK]
       jah ni briggais uns in fraistubnjai [GOTH]
       ew mi tanir zmez i p’orjowt’iwn [ARM]
       i ne wivedi nasŭ vŭ napastĭ [OCS]
- c. Mt 10.26 ‘Therefore do not fear them’
       mè oûn phobēthête autoús [GK]
       ni nunu ogeiþ izwis ins [GOTH]
       Mi aysohetew erknc’ic’ik’ i noc’anē [ARM]
       ne uboite sę ubo ixŭ [OCS]
- d. Mt 6.3 ‘Let your left hand not know what your right hand is doing’
       mè gnōtō hē aristerá sou tí poieî hē deksiá sou [GK]
       ni witi hleidumei þeina hwa taujiþ taihswō þeina [GOTH]
       mi gitasc’ē jax k’o zinč’ gorcē aĵ k’o [ARM]
       da ne čjuetŭ šjuica tvoě. čito tvoritŭ des’nica tvoě [OCS]

- e. Mt 5.33 ‘Do not swear falsely’
ouk epiorkéseis	[GK]
ni ufarswarais	[GOTH]
mi erdnowc’ows sowt	[ARM]
ne vŭ lŭžq klŭneši sę	[OCS]

Examples (5a) and (5b) show, respectively, an imperative and a subjunctive in Greek, and in each instance Armenian and OCS show imperatives. Gothic, however, apes the Greek mood in each case. In (5c), where Greek shows a subjunctive, Armenian shows a subjunctive as well. In this case the Gothic *ogeip* is a preterite present and therefore shows no opposition between subjunctive and imperative. In (5d) OCS shows *da ne* + indicative, even though OCS possesses a third person imperative, while Armenian must respond with a subjunctive because it lacks a third person imperative; and again the Gothic preterite present admits only a subjunctive qua imperative. An example of Gesetzessprache is seen in (5e). Here the pres. ind. is to be understood as a future in OCS; but the Armenian subjunctive must be modal because of its negation. In Gothic the present subjunctive is regularly employed in this usage category.

Polarity items within negative commands are seen in (6a)–(6b):

- (6) a. Mk 1.44 ‘See that you say nothing to anybody’
hóra mēdenì mēdèn eípēis	[GK]
saihv ei mannhun ni qipais waiht	[GOTH]
zgoyš ler mi owmek’ inč’ asic’es	[ARM]
bljudi sę nikomuže ničesože ne řci	[OCS]
- b. Mk 9.25 ‘I command you: go out from him and no longer enter into him’
egŏ soi epitássō, ékselthe eks autoŭ kaì mēkéti eisélthēis eis autón	[GK]
ik þus anabiuda: usgagg us þamma jah þanaseiþs ni galeiþais in ina	[GOTH]
es tam k’ez hraman . el i dmanē . ew ayl ews mi mtanic’es i da	[ARM]
azŭ ti veljŏ iziti iz nego. i k tomu ne vŭnidi vŭ nŭ	[OCS]

Example (6a) shows both animate and inanimate polarity in a context where the negative command is treated as a complement clause following an imperative. Gothic alone shows an overt complementizer *ei*, and Greek, Gothic and Armenian all show subjunctives in the complement clause. Lacking such a category, OCS employs an imperative. Notice again here in OCS the independent negation in addition to that in the polarity items. (6b) shows a “no longer/anymore” type of polarity, and Arm. shows *ayl ews mi*, lit. ‘not further other’, while OCS shows *k tomu*, lit. ‘henceforth’, not itself a negative polarity item.

[3.3] Questions

The next set of negative clause types we shall examine are questions. Greek has two types of non-*wh* negative question constructions: those expecting a positive reply and those expecting a negative reply. In the first type Greek shows *ou* or *oukhí* followed by the indicative, Gothic shows *niu* (with the Gothic interrogative particle *u*) + ind., Armenian shows either *oč'* or *oč' apak'ēn* + ind., and OCS shows *ne li* + ind. (with the OCS interrogative particle *li*):

(7) Negative questions expecting a positive reply

- a. Mt 5.46 'Do not the tax-collectors do the same?'
     oukhí kai hoi telônai tò autò poioûsin; [GK]
     niu jah þai þiudo þata samo taujand? [GOTH]
     oč' apak'ēn ew mak'sawork' znoyn gorcen [ARM]
     ne i mytare li tožde tvorētū [OCS]
- b. Mt 7.22 'Have we not prophesied in thy name?'
     ou tōi sōi onómati proephēteúsamen [GK]
     niu þeinamma namin praufetidedum [GOTH]
     oč' yanown k'o margarēac'ak'? [ARM]
     ne vū tvoe li imę proročistvovaxomū [OCS]

In the second question type Gk. *mē* or *mēti* + ind. corresponds to Goth. *ibai* + ind., Arm. *mit'e* or *mi et'e* + subj., and OCS *eda* + ind.:

(8) Negative questions expecting a negative reply

- a. Mt 9:15 'Can the sons of the bridal canopy weep so long as the bridegroom is with them?' (lit. The sons of the bridal canopy can't weep..., [can they]?)
     mē dúnantai hoi huoi toû numphônos pentheîn eph' hóson met' autôn
     estin ho numphíos; [GK]
     ibai magun sunjus bruþfadis qainon und þata hweilos þei miþ im ist
     bruþfaþs? [GOTH]
     mi et'e mart' inč' ic'ē mankanc' aṙagasti sowg aṙnowl . minč' p'esayn
     ənd nosa ic'ē [ARM]
     eda mogotū synove bračünii plakati sę. donideže sū nimi estū
     ženixū [OCS]
- b. Mt 7:16 'Do they collect grape clusters from thorns or figs from thistles?'
     (lit. They don't collect grape clusters...[do they]?)
     mēti sullégousin apò akanthôn staphulàs è apò tribólōn sūka; [GK]
     ibai lisanda af þaurnum weinabasja aiþþau af wigadeinom
     smakkans? [GOTH]

Mit'e k'alíc'en? i p'šoy xałoł kam i tataskē t'owz	[ARM]
eda obemljōtū otū trūniē grozny. li otū rēpiē smokūvi	[OCS]

In the second of these Gothic turns the Greek impersonal into a passive.

A single example of a simple negative *wh*-question is found in our corpus:

(9) Mk 8:21 'How do you not yet understand?' pōs oúpō suníete; hwaiwa ni nauh fraþjip? isk ziard? oč' imanayk' kako ne razuměšte	[GK] [GOTH] [ARM] [OCS]

This also shows the Greek negative polarity item *oúpō* 'not yet'. Here all the translations show neg. + ind., but only Gothic is sensitive to the polarity item, rendering it as *ni nauh*. OCS alone among these passages renders the verb in the past: 'How have you not understood?'

[3.4] Negative purpose clauses

We now turn to negative purpose clauses. Here Gk. *hópōs mé* + subj. and *hína mé* + subj. correspond to Gothic *ei ni* + subj., Arm. *zi mi* + subj., and OCS *da ne* + ind. Examples are the following:

(10) a. Mt 6.18 'In order that you should not appear to men as fasting' hópōs mē phanēis tois anthrōpois nēsteúōn ei ni gasailvaizau mannam fastands zi mi erewesc'is mardkan ibrew zpahoł da ne aviši sę člověkomū postę sę	[GK] [GOTH] [ARM] [OCS]
b. Mk 3.9 'In order that they should not press upon him' hína mē thlfbōsin autón ei ni þraiheina ina zi mi nelesc'en zna da ne sūtōžajōtū emu	[GK] [GOTH] [ARM] [OCS]

Another type of negative purpose clause may be captured by the English rendition 'lest'. In this category Gk. *mépotē* + subj. corresponds to Goth. *ibai hvan* + subj., Arm. *gowc'ē* or *zi mi erbek'* + subj., and OCS *da ne* + ind. or *eda kogda* + ind.:

(11) a. Mt 5.25 'Lest your adversary give you over to the judge' mépotē se paradōi ho antídikos tōi kritēi ibai hvan atgibai þuk sa andastaua stauin gowc'ē matnic'ē zk'ez awsoxn dataworin da ne předastū tebe sōdii	[GK] [GOTH] [ARM] [OCS]

- b. Mk 4.12 ‘Lest they turn [from their ways] and [their] sins be forgiven them’
 m’épote epistrépsōsin kaì aphethēi autoîs tà hamartémata [GK]
 ibai hvan gawandjaina sik jah afletaindau im frawaurhteis [GOTH]
 zi mi erbek’ darjč’in ew t’olc’i noc’a [ARM]
 eda kogda obratętŭ sę i otŭpustętŭ sę imŭ gręsi [OCS]

The difference between (11a) and (11b) on the Armenian and OCS level is that both languages are in the second instance sensitive to the polarity value ‘ever’ (-pote) in Gk. *m’épote* (Arm. *erbek’*, OCS *kogda*). This is captured in both passages by the *hvan* of Gothic. Armenian *gowc’ē* of (11a) is the relexicalized 3rd pers. sg. subjunctive of the verb of existence *gol*, lit. ‘it may be, perhaps’. Gothic *ibai*, too, may originally have meant ‘it may be so’ (on which more below).

[3.5] Negative result clauses

Negative result clauses show Gk. *hóste mé* + infinitive matched by Goth. *swaswe ni* + ind., Arm. *orpēs zi (o)č’* + ind., and OCS *ěko ne* + ind. Cf. (12a), which also presents the polarity item ‘anyone’ and a double negation in OCS (*ne...niktože*). The polarity context ‘no longer’ is seen in (12b), where Gothic presents the item *juþan* not yet seen in any passages so far cited. Here the sense of Armenian *minč’* is something on the order of ‘to the point that’:

- (12) a. Mt 8.28 ‘So that nobody was able to pass through that way’
 hóste mē iskhúein tinà pareltheîn dià tēs hodoû ekeinēs [GK]
 swaswe ni mahta manna usleiþan þairh þana wig jainana [GOTH]
 orpēs zi č’ēr hnar anc’anel owmek’ and ayn čanaparh [ARM]
 ěko ne možaaše niktože minŭti pŭtemĭ těmĭ [OCS]
- b. Mk 1.45 ‘So that he was no longer able to enter into the city openly’
 hóste mēkéti autòn dúnasthai phanerôs eis pólin eiseltheîn [GK]
 swaswe is juþan ni mahta andaugjo in baurg galeiþan [GOTH]
 minč’ oč’ ews karoĭ linel nma yaytnapēs i k’alak’ mtanel [ARM]
 ěko k tomu ne možaaše ěvě vŭ gradŭ vŭniti [OCS]

[3.6] Negative conditional clauses

Negative conditional clauses involve Gk. *ei* or *eàn mé* + subj. The simplest case involves a protasis of a negative condition, where Gothic responds with either *nibai*, *niba*, or *jabai ni* + ind., Armenian with *et’e oč’* or *apa t’e oč’* + subj., and OCS with *ašte ne* + ind.:

- (13) a. Mt 5.20 ‘If your justice be not greater than [that] of the scribes and Pharisees, you will not enter into the kingdom of heaven’
 eàn mè perisseúsēi humôn hē dikaiosúnē pleíon tôn grammatéōn kai Pharisaíōn, ou mè eisélthēte eis tēn basileían tôn ouranôn [GK]
 nibai managizo wairþiþ izwaraizos garaihteins þau þize bokarje jah Farisaie, ni þau qimiþ in þiudangardjai himine [GOTH]
 et’e oč’ ařawelowc’ow ardarowt’iwn jer aweli k’an zdprac’n ew zP’arisec’woc’
 oč’ mtanic’ēk’ yark’ayowt’iwn erknic’ [ARM]
 ašte ne izbōdetŭ pravda vaša pače knižnikŭ i Farisei. ne imate vŭniti vŭ cēsarīstvo nebesinoje [OCS]
- b. Mk 7.3 ‘If they do not frequently wash their hands, they don’t eat’
 eàn mè puknà nípōntai tàs kheîras, ouk esthíousin [GK]
 niba ufta þwahand handuns, ni matjand [GOTH]
 et’e oč’ břnalir lowanan zjeřs . hac’ oč’ owten [ARM]
 ašte ne umyjotŭ řoku tŭřōšte ne ěĉetŭ [OCS]
- c. Mt 6.15 ‘If you do not forgive men their sins, neither will your father forgive your sins’
 eàn dè mè aphēte toîs anthrópois tà paraptómata autôn, oudè ho patēr humôn aphēsei tà paraptómata humôn [GK]
 iþ jabai ni afletip mannam missadedins ize, ni þau atta izwar afletip missadedins izwaros [GOTH]
 Apa t’e oč’ t’olowc’owk’ mardkan zyanc’ans noc’a . ew oč’ hayrn jer t’olc’ē jez zyanc’ans jer [ARM]
 ašte li ne otŭpuštaete člověkomŭ sŭgrěšeni ixŭ. ni oticŭ vašŭ otŭpustitŭ sŭgrěšenii vašixŭ [OCS]

It seems quite likely that the Gothic subordinators *jabai* and *nibai/niba* represent remnants of a thematized present optative of the ‘be’-verb (PIE **bhuH₂*) in the earliest Germanic⁴ with the original values ‘and it be’, ‘it not be’, respectively, with perhaps prosodic-based shortening in *niba*. The third of these passages follows a positive statement of the exact same condition with inverse result, and Gk. *dé*, Goth. *iþ*, and OCS *li* mark the nexus with the preceding material. In two other passages the negative condition follows a question or a positive universal statement where its value can be captured by English ‘except’. In these instances Armenian shows either *et’e oč’* or *bayc’ et’e*, respectively, ‘if not’ or ‘but if’. In both instances OCS responds with *tŭkŭmo* ‘only, except’:

[4] That is, to the same stem (probably **bhw[-e-]*) that appears as the base of the Latin future and imperfect in *-bit* and *-bat*, respectively.

- (14) a. Mk 2.7 ‘who can forgive sins except the one God?’
 tís dúnatai aphiénai hamartías ei mè heís ho theós; [GK]
 lvas mag afletan frawaurhtins niba ains guþ? [GOTH]
 o? karē t’ōlowl zmels . et’e oč’ mi AC [ARM]
 kto možetū otūpuštati grěxy. tkmo edinū bogū [OCS]
- b. Mk 6.4 ‘No prophet is without honor except in his native land’
 ouk éstin prophētēs átimos ei mè en tēi patrídi autoû [GK]
 nist praufetus unswers niba in gabaurbai seinai [GOTH]
 oč’ ē margarē anarg . bayc’ et’e i gawaři iwrowm [ARM]
 něstū prorokū bečisti. tūkūmo vū svoemī otīčistvii [OCS]

In neither of these cases does the negative condition involve a full clause, and this is the reason Greek shows simply *ei* ‘if’ rather than *ean*, which almost always requires a subjunctive.

In two additional instances negative conditionals involving complete clauses are much more complex:

- (15) a. Mk 2.21 ‘otherwise it takes the fullness from it, the new from the old’
 ei dè mé, aírei tò plérōma ap’ autoû tò kainòn toû palaioû [GK]
 ibai afnimai fullon af þamma sa niuja þamma fairnjin [GOTH]
 apa t’e oč’ ařnow lrowt’eambn iwrov norn i hnoy anti [ARM]
 ašte li že ni vūžimetū konecū otū neję novoe. otū vetūxaago [OCS]
- b. Mt 6.1 ‘[Be careful not to perform your almsgiving before men, so as to be seen by them,] otherwise you do not have a reward from your father’
 ei dè mége, misthòn ouk ékhete parà tōi patrì humôn [GK]
 aiþþau laun ni habaiþ fram attin izwaramma [GOTH]
 gowc’ē ew varjs oč’ əndownic’ik’ i hawrē jermē [ARM]
 ašte li že ni mūzdy ne imate. otū otīca vašego [OCS]

The difficulties in these passages lie in the relationship between their underlying semantic structures and their formal expressions in Greek. In (15a) the preceding clause says ‘Nobody sews a patch of unfulled cloth upon an old garment’. The expected continuation of this would be ‘for if one does, the new takes the fullness from the old’. However, the first clause may be underlyingly analyzed as possessing two predicates: a higher predicate ‘It is not the case that X’ and a lower predicate ‘somebody sews a patch of unfulled cloth, etc.’ The Greek *ei dè mé* ‘and if not’ negates the higher predicate, producing a double negative (‘If it is not not the case that X’) and leaving the lower predicate unaffected. This structure is calqued by both Classical Armenian and OCS (the latter, however, with alternative conjunction *li*); but Gothic responds in its own idiomatic fashion by assuming the truth of the lower predicate via *ibai* ‘it be so’ (originally the affirmative antonym of *nibai* ‘it not be’).

In (15b) as well there are two predicates: higher ‘Be careful to X’ and lower ‘you do not perform your almsgiving...’ Here again Greek negates the higher predicate (‘If it is not the case that you are careful’). But in this instance Gothic too denies the higher predicate, not through negation but implicitly through the use of an alternative conjunction ‘or’ (*aiþþau*).⁵ OCS treats this passage just as it does (15a); but the Armenian of (15b) behaves exactly like the Gothic of (15a), assuming the truth of the lower predicate. In fact, the Armenian of (15b) and the Gothic of (15a) constitute an exact match in every regard but etymologically. We have already stated our view that the *-bai* of Gothic *ibai* represents an etymological thematic optative to **bhuH₂*, and we may here add that the initial *i-*, a proximal deictic in Indo-European terms, must represent a particle of assertion ‘thus, so’. Armenian *gowc’ē* is likewise a subjunctive of a verb of existence, here *gol* ‘be’, PIE **H₂wes* ‘spend the night, dwell’, cf. Gothic *wisan* ‘be’. Its original value is therefore ‘it be (so)’, just like that of Gothic *ibai*.

[3.7] Negative causal clauses

Negative causal clauses are seen in (16a)–(16d):

- (16) a. Mk 4.6 ‘And because it did not have a root, it dried out’
           kai dià tò mè ékhein hrízan eksēránthē [GK]
           jah unte ni habaida waurtins gaþaursnoda [GOTH]
           ew zi oč’ goyin armatk’ . c’amak’ec’aw [ARM]
           i zane ne iměše koreniě usűše [OCS]
- b. Mk 8.33 ‘Get behind me, Satan; for you do not ponder the matters of God’
           húpage opísō mou, satanâ, hótī ou phroneîs tà toû theoû [GK]
           gagg hindar mik, Satana, unte ni fraþjis þaim gudis [GOTH]
           ert’ yets im satanay . zi oč’ xorhis dow zAYsn [ARM]
           idi za mŭnojq Sotono. ěko ne mysliši ě (Zog. ěže) sqtŭ božěa [OCS]
- c. Mk 9.6 ‘for he did not know what he should answer’
           ou gàr ēidei tí apokrithēi (θ, etc. elálei ‘he was saying’; A, D, etc. lalēsei
           ‘he would say’; W, etc. lalēi ‘he is saying’) [GK]
           ni auk wissa hva rodidedi [GOTH]
           k’anzi oč’ gitēr zinč’ xawsēr [ARM]
           ne věděaše bo čto glagoletŭ [OCS]
- d. Mt 9.13 ‘For I have not come to call the just but sinners’
           ou gàr êlthon kalésai dikaíous all’ hamartōlóus [GK]
           niþ-þan qam laþon uswaurhtans ak frawaurhtans [GOTH]

[5] It should be noted that English ‘otherwise’, which we have employed to translate both (a) and (b), also denies the higher predicate in each instance.

zi oč' eki koč'el zardars . ayl zmeławors	[ARM]
ne pridū bo pravedīnikū prizūvatū. nū grěšūniky	[OCS]

These clauses seem to present a scale of strength from strongly to weakly causal, and all languages but Classical Armenian appear to be sensitive to this distinction. Clearly strongest is the type seen in (16a), where Gk. *dià tò mé* + inf. corresponds to Goth. *unte ni* + ind., Arm. *zi oč'* + ind., and OCS *zane ne* + ind. The Greek, Gothic, and OCS subordinating conjunctions just noted are the strongest causal conjunctions in their respective languages, and this strength is pragmatically indicated as well by the fronting of cause before result. Less strong is the causal value of (16b), where both Gk. *hóti ou* + ind. and OCS with *ěko ne* + ind. are sensitive to this gradation, but not Gothic and Armenian. Weakest of all is the causal value of Gk. *ou gár* + ind. seen in (16c) and (16d). The first of these passages, which shows an indirect question as the complement of the verb 'know', is preceded by the episode of the transfiguration of Jesus, after which Peter proposes to make booths for Jesus, Elijah, and Moses. None of the versions follow the text presented by Nestle-Aland, but Gothic and Armenian seem to preserve the reading *elálei* of θ , etc. and OCS the reading *lalése* of A, D, etc., less likely *lalei* of W, etc. The second example follows Jesus' adjuration to the disciples to go and learn the meaning of the biblical statement "I desire mercy and not sacrifice"; and in fact the parallel pericopes in Mark and Luke show no causal conjunction here at all. The weaker causal nexus of these passages is picked up by the Gothic and OCS translators. Gothic shows *ni auk* + ind. and *niþ-þan* + ind., the second of which is not causal but merely conjunctive. Similarly, OCS captures the Gk. *gár* by its own fairly weak conjunction *bo*. Peculiar is Classical Armenian, where *k'anzi* seen in (16c) is in fact the strongest causal conjunction in the language.

[3.8] Negative relative clauses

Passages involving negative relative clauses are seen in (17a)–(17d):

- (17) a. Mt 10.26 'For nothing is hidden which will not be revealed'
oudèn gár estin kekalumménon hò ouk apokalupthésetai	[GK]
ni waiht auk is gahuliþ þatei ni andhuljaidau	[GOTH]
zi oč' inč' ē i cacowk or oč' yaytnesc'i	[ARM]
Ničtože bo estū pokrūveno eže ne otūkrūveno bōdetū	[OCS]
- b. Mk 4.22 'For there is not anything hidden which will not become clear'
ou gár estín ti kruptòn hò èàn mè phanerōthēi	[GK]
nih allis ist hva fulginis þatei ni gabairhtjaidau	[GOTH]
zi č'ē inč' i cacowk . or t'e oč' yaytnesc'i	[ARM]
něstū bo ničūtože taino eže ne avitū sę	[OCS]

- c. Mk 9.1 ‘There are some of those standing here who will not taste of death’
 eisín tines tôn hôde hestēkótōn hoítines ou mē geúsōntai thaná-
 tou [GK]
 sind sumai þize her standandane þai ize ni kausjand dauþaus [GOTH]
 en omank’ i soc’anē or ast kan . ork’ mi čašakesc’en zmah [ARM]
 sōtū edini otū sūde stoještiixū. iže ne imōtū vūkusiti sūmrūti [OCS]
- d. Mk 6.11 ‘And however many as don’t receive you ...’
 kai hósoi àn mē déksōntai humàs ... [GK]
 jah swa managai swe ni andnimaina izwis ... [GOTH]
 Ew or oč’ ənkalc’in zjez ... [ARM]
 i eliko ašte ne priimōtū vasū ... [OCS]

These passages show some subtleties in Greek depending on the degree of indefiniteness of the relative clause; and these are often not reflected in the translations. Thus, (17a) and (17b) differ in Greek in the fact that the first shows relative pronoun + *ou* + fut. and the second relative pronoun + *eàn mē* + subj. Presumably, the latter is to be understood as less definite than the former, an inference that is echoed also by a detail: in the first passage Greek shows the orthotonic *oudén* ‘nothing’ in the opening clause, while in the second it has the enclitic *ti* in the first clause. A hypothesis that immediately presents itself is that the enclitic signals a more indefinite value than the orthotonic. But Gothic alone of the translation languages is sensitive to this, opposing indefinite pronominal *hva* to nominal *waiht*. OCS here shows an interesting variation between (17a) and (17b) which may turn out to be significant: in (17a) *ničtože* precedes the copula without an independent negation, as seen earlier; but in (17b) *ničūtože* follows the present tense of *byti* in existential value, and an independent negation is soldered onto the verb in the form *něstū*. The difference appears to be like that of English ‘nothing is’ but ‘there is not anything’. But (4c) cited earlier had *niktože bo estū* in the value ‘there is nobody’, so we may be dealing with a syntactic feature related solely to the position of *estū* relative to the negative universal. Note that Gk. *eàn* in (17b) is not the same item as the conditional particle seen in (13), but is a substitute for *án*, as frequently in the NT. The Armenian translator alone feels obliged to capture this with *t’e*, a less frequent variant of its own conditional particle *et’e*. Related to these passages is (17c), which shows the typical Greek apparatus for signaling future negation (*ou mē* + subj.), here within a “qualifying” relative clause introduced by *hoítines* and following an indefinite clause. This clause in Greek is equivalent to a prediction and as such is matched by the Gothic present indicative qua future and OCS periphrastic future involving *imati* + infinitive. But Armenian with its modal negation treats this as falling short of a definite outcome. Here the Gothic *þai ize* (= *izei*) seems to be a calque on Gk. *hoítines*. Finally, (17d) shows the indefinite Greek relative *hósoi àn mē* + subj. The value of *hósoi* is cap-

tured in Gothic by *swa managai swe* and in OCS by *eliko ašte + ind.* Armenian, on the other hand, shows a simple headless relative *or* in indefinite value.

We include in this category several passages in which Greek shows *mé + ppl.*, but at least two of the translational versions show relative clauses:

- (18) a. Mt 7.19 ‘Every tree not producing good fruit is cut down’
 pâṇ déndron mē poioûn karpôn kalôn ekkóptetai [GK]
 all bagme ni taujandane akran god usmaitada [GOTH]
 Amenayn caṛ or oç’ aṛnē ptowł bari hatani [ARM]
 všěko drěvo eže ne tvoritŭ ploda dobra. posěkajotŭ [OCS]
- b. Mt 7.21 ‘Not everyone saying to me, “Lord, Lord” will enter the kingdom of heaven’
 ou pâs ho légōn moi . kúrie, kúrie, eiseleúsetai eis tēn basileían tōn ouranōn [GK]
 ni hvazuh saei qipip mis: frauja, frauja! inngaleipip in piudangardja himine [GOTH]
 Oç’ amenayn or asē c’is TR TR mtc’ē yark’ayowt’iwn erknic’ [ARM]
 Ne všěků glagolei mñě. gospodi gospodi vñidetŭ vŭ česaristvie nebesiskoe [OCS]

These passages show an interesting scope variation in the universal quantifier ‘every/everyone’. In (18a) Gk. *pân* has broad scope over the negation, and this is matched in the translation languages, of which Armenian and OCS show relative clauses. In (18b) Gk. *pâs* functions within the negation, and here, too, the translations place their universal quantifier after the negation. This results in a change in the form of negation in Greek and a change in the quantifier in Gothic.

[3.9] Sequential negation

We turn now to instances of sequential negation. A wide range of structures is represented, and these can be broken down into nominal, phrasal, and clausal types. Strictly nominal conjoined sequences are seen in (19a) and (19b):

- (19) a. Mt 6.20 ‘where neither moth nor corrosion [lit. consumption] ruins’
 hó pou ou té sēs ou té brōsis aphanízei [GK]
 þarei nih malo nih nidwa frawardeip [GOTH]
 owr oč’ c’ec’ ew oč’ owtič apakanen [ARM]
 ideže ni čřuvī ni tilě tilitŭ [OCS]
- b. Mt 9.13 ‘I desire mercy and not sacrifice’
 éleon thélō kai ou thusían [GK]
 armahairtipa wiljau jah ni hunsl [GOTH]
 zołormowt’iwn kamim ew oč’ zzoh [ARM]
 milostyni xoštŭ a ne žřutvě [OCS]

In the first of these the archaic Greek sequence *oúte* N₁ *oúte* N₂ is matched by Goth. *nih* N₁ *nih* N₂, Arm. *oč'* N₁ *ew oč'* N₂, and OCS *ni* N₁ *ni* N₂. The Gothic sequence represents PIE **ne k^we*, with the same enclitic conjunction reflected in Greek *te*. Classical Armenian has lost this old conjunction and therefore shows its only conjoined negation structure *oč'...ew oč'*. OCS shows its serial negation *ni*, ultimately *ne* + conjunction *i*, which we have seen in a number of passages already cited. This passage shows pure serial conjunction. The same is not true of (19b), which is implicitly oppositional with its positive/negative component. Here Greek shows the sequence N₁ *kai* ou N₂ with orthotonic, static (i.e. non-serial) conjunction; and this is matched by the equivalent orthotonic dyad N₁ *jah ni* N₂ in Gothic and the invariant sequential *ew oč'* in Armenian. OCS, on the other hand, captures the implicit nuance of this structure with the oppositional rather than serial *a ne*.

Phrasal conjunction involving four conjoined prepositional phrases following a negative infinitival clause is seen in (20), where Gk. *méte* is iterated across every conjoined member, but Gothic shows the enclitic conjunction only in members 2-4. Similar in format is Armenian, whereas OCS shows four iterations of *ni*:

- (20) Mt 5.34-36 'But I say to you not to swear at all: neither by heaven...nor by earth...nor by Jerusalem; nor should you swear by your head'
 egò dè légō humîn mē omósai hólōs, méte en tōi ouranōi...méte en tēi gēi...
 méte eis Hierosóluma...méte en tēi kephalēi sou omósēis [GK]
 aþþan ik qīþa izwis ni swaran allis, ni bi himina...nih bi airþai...nih bi Iairu-
 saulwmai...nih bi haubida þeinamma swarais [GOTH]
 Ayl es asem jez . amenewin mi erdnowl . mi yerkins... Ew mi yerkir...ew mi
 yĔM...ew mi i glowx k'o erdnowc'ows [ARM]
 azŭ že glagoljō vamŭ. ne klēti sę otŭnōdŭ ni nebesemŭ...ni zemlejō...ni Ieru-
 salemŭmŭ...ni glavojo svoejō klŭni sę [OCS]

Word-level conjunction involving verbs is seen in (21a)–(21b):

- (21) a. Mt 6.20 'where thieves do not dig through and steal'
 hópou kléptai ou diorússousin oudè kléptousin [GK]
 þarei þiubos ni ufgraband nih stiland [GOTH]
 ew oč' gołk' akan hatanen ew gołanan [ARM]
 ideže tatie ne podŭkopavajōtŭ. ni kradōtŭ [OCS]
 b. Mt 6.28 'they do not toil nor spin'
 ou kopiāi oudè nēthei [GK]
 nih arbaidjand nih spinnand [GOTH]
 oč' janay ew oč' niwt'ē [ARM]
 ne truždajōtŭ sę ni prędōtŭ [OCS]

In the first of these passages Greek shows the structure *ou...oudé* with the quasi-enclitic *dé* which is a vibrantly living conjunction in the NT, whereas *te* is largely moribund in this text. Gothic responds exactly with its *ni...nih*, and OCS equivalently with *ne...ni*. The Armenian rendition is independent with its single negation. This passage is a continuation of (19a) and suggests that perhaps on its way to obsolescence Gk. *te* was first reduced to nominal conjunctive value. We cite (21b) because of its contrast with (21a) on the Gothic level, showing that the Goths had their own intuitions about where serial negation was appropriate (*nih...nih* : *ou...oudé* [b] vs. *ni...nih* : *ou...oudé* [a]).

A more complex sequence is the following:

- (22) Mk 8.18 ‘Having eyes, do you not see and having ears, do you not hear? And you do not remember...
 ophthalmou̓s ékhontes ou blépete kai̓ ôta ékhontes ouk akoúete; kai̓ ou mnēmoneúete... [GK]
 augona habandans ni gasailviþ, jah ausona habandans ni gahauseiþ jah ni gamunuþ... [GOTH]
 ač’k’ gon ew oč’? tesanēk’ . akanĵk’ en ew oč’ lsēk’ . ew oč’ imanayk’ takawin ew oč’ yišēk’... [ARM]
 oči imošte ne vidite. i uši imošte ne slyšite. i ne pomĩnite li... [OCS]

In this passage Greek shows the structure O_1 ppl₁ ou V₁ kai̓ O₂ ppl₁ ou V₂ kai̓ ou V₃. Gothic exactly follows the Greek here, as does OCS, which therefore does not treat the verbs as serial but rather as three completely independent clauses, hence *ne* rather than *ni*. OCS also understands the last part of the structure as a question (note the particle *li*). Armenian shows multiple variations from the other versions, including the rendition of both participles by finite verbs, the addition of the verb *imanal* ‘understand’, and the introduction of the negative polarity item *takawin* ‘yet’.⁶

We complete our discussion of sequential negation by citing three passages in which the negation is not straightforwardly sequential, but rather adverbial:

[6] The final part of this structure is confusing when presented in isolation from its following verse. The King James Version does indeed treat the last clause as a question. But in Greek it is possible to take the question as continuing into the next verse, in which case the *wh*-word *pósous* ‘how many?’ would have to be understood as posing an indirect question: ‘And do you not remember, when I broke the five [pieces of] bread into five thousand, how many baskets full of fragments you picked up?’ Nestle-Aland’s text punctuates the Greek in precisely this way, as does Streitberg’s Gothic text, at least for the stretch ‘when I broke...you picked up?’ [Streitberg treats *jah ni gamunuþ* as part of the prior sentence and hence as standing outside the question]. But both the Armenian and OCS texts show a full stop after ‘five thousand’, continuing with a conjunction ‘and’ followed by a direct *wh*-word (*kani?*, *koliko*). The Armenian text is in any event deficient in not translating Greek *ékla* ‘I broke’. Consequently, the OCS best captures the pragmatic value of the phrase ‘And do you not remember’, while going its own way in assessing the relationship between this clause and the indirect question which follows.

- (23) a. Mk 5.3 ‘who had his dwelling in the tombs, and nobody was able to bind him even with chains’
 hòs tèn katoíkēsín eíkhen en toís mnémasin, kai oudè halúsesin oudèis edúnato autòn dēsai [GK]
 saei bauain habaida in aurahjom: jah ni naudibandjom eisarneinain manna mahta ina gabindan [GOTH]
 oro ew bnakowt’iwn iwr isk i gerezmans ēr. ew oč’ šłt’ayiwk’ ok’ ews karēr kapel zna [ARM]
 iže žilište iměaše vŭ groběxŭ. i ni želěznomŭ ožemŭ ego niktože ne možaaše sŭvęzati [OCS]
- b. Mk 2.2 ‘And straightway many gathered, so that there was no longer any room, even by the door’
 kai euthéōs sunékhthēsan polloí, hóste mēkēti khōreîn mēdè tà pròs tèn thúran [GK]
 jah suns gaqemun managai, swaswe juþan ni gamostedun nih at daura [GOTH]
 ew žołovec’an bazowmk’ . minč’ew teħi ews oč’ linel ew oč’ aŗ drann [ARM]
 i abĭe sŭbŭrašę sę mŭnodzi. ěko kŭ tomu ne vĭměštaaxo sę ni přědŭ dverĭmi [OCS]
- c. Mt 6.15 ‘If you do not forgive men their sins, neither will your father forgive your sins’
 eàn dè mè aphēte toís anthrópois tà paraptómata autôn, oudè ho patēr humôn aphēsei tà paraptómata humôn [GK]
 iþ jabai ni afletip mannam missadedins ize, ni þau atta izwar afletip missadedins izwaros [GOTH]
 Apa t’e oč’ t’ołowc’owk’ mardkan zyanc’ans noc’a . ew oč’ hayrn jer t’ołc’ē jez zyanc’ans jer [ARM]
 ašte li ne otŭpuštaete člověkomŭ sŭgrěšeni ixŭ. ni otĭcŭ vašŭ otŭ-pustitŭ sŭgrěšenii vašixŭ [OCS]

In (23a) the second conjunct in Greek shows *kai oudè...oudeís*, where *oudè* is to be understood as adverbial ‘(not) even’. Hence, the Greek shows a double negation from an English perspective. In OCS this value is captured translationally by *ni*, while *niktože ne mogaaše* shows the usual double negation we have learned to expect in these cases. Gothic shows *jah ni...mann*, ignoring the Greek *oudè*, and Armenian, instead of repeating *ew*, the usual way of saying ‘even’ in this language, employs *ews*, as if to say ‘and nobody was able anymore’. In (23b) and (23c) one finds adverbial negation following a result clause which in the first instance contains negative polarity *mēkēti* ‘no longer’. Here Gk. *mēdè tà pròs tèn thúran* is translated in Gothic as *niħ at daura*, in Armenian as *ew oč’ aŗ drann*, and in OCS as *ni přědŭ dverĭmi*, all of which

say ‘not even at the door’. Finally, in (23c) the two clauses are not coordinated but rather the first is the protasis of a negative condition and the second is the apodosis. Gk. *oudé* can be understood as meaning ‘neither’ here; and to this Gothic rather reacts with *ni* + the apodotic particle *þau* signaling resultative ‘then’ and Armenian with the calque *ew oč*, here probably to be understood adverbially as ‘also not’, as is OCS *ni*.

[3.10] *Minor categories*

There remain only three sparsely attested negative categories that we shall now address. The first of these is the bare negative used in a reply (24). Here Gothic alone shows a special negation *ne*, while OCS employs its serial negator *ni*. Armenian in this passage shows a special use of its postposed definite article *-n* in quotative value:

- (24) Mt 5.37 ‘Let your word be “aye, aye; nay, nay”’
éstō dè ho lógos humôn naí naí, ou ou	[GK]
sijaiþ-þan waurd izwar: ja, ja; ne, ne	[GOTH]
Ayl elic’i jer ban . ayon . ayo . ew oč’ n . oč’	[ARM]
bqdi že slovo vaše ei ei. i ni ni	[OCS]

Finally, it is well known that both complements of comparatives and clauses of prior circumstance are negative polarity contexts. Cf. English *John is smarter than anybody (else) I know* or *The police apprehended the suspect before he could harm anybody* with negative polarity *anybody* rather than positive *somebody*. Similarly, with actual negation, French *Il est plus riche qu’on ne pense* or *Il existait un monde où l’artiste trouve avant qu’il ne cherche* (J. Cocteau). Of the languages in our study, OCS alone shows an overt polarity negation in these contexts, either freestanding or in univerbation with a following morpheme (25a)–(25b). Cf. the use of *nor* for *than* in some English dialects (*He is taller nor I am*):

- (25) a. Mk 9.45 ‘It is better for you to enter into life lame than having two feet, to be cast into Gehenna’
kalón estín se eiseltheîn eis tèn zōèn khōlón, è toùs dúo pódas ékhonta blēthēnai eis tèn géennan	[GK]
dobrěa (Zog.: -ěe) ti estū vūniti vū životū xromu. neže dvě nodžě imošte (Zog.: imoštju). vūvrūženu byti vū heonq	[OCS]
- b. Mt 1.18 ‘Before the two had come together, she was found to be pregnant by the holy spirit’
prìn è suneltheîn autoùs heurēthē en gastrì ékhousa ek pneúmatos hagíou	[GK]
prěžde daže ne sūnidosta sę obrěte sę imoštii vū čřěvě bě otū duxa svęta	[OCS]

[4] CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, I must emphasize that although the material presented in this article is comprehensive for the parts of the text it has covered, some 80% of the text has yet to be canvassed. This will no doubt yield some additional categories and perhaps some new relationships among the means employed to express negation in the various languages of our survey. However, it is unlikely to change greatly the picture presented here, which is remarkable for its consistency from language to language. Once the total range of data concerning negation and polarity in the entire extant text of the Gospels in all four languages has been gathered, analyzed, and presented, an important chapter in the comparative grammars of these languages will have been achieved.

REFERENCES

- Bucsko, John M. 2008. *Preverbs and idiomatization in Gothic*: University of Georgia dissertation.
- Condon, Nancy L. 1990. *A distributional and discourse analysis of -(u)h and other conjunctions in the Gothic Bible*. University of Georgia MA thesis.
- Cowgill, Warren. 1960. Greek *ou* and Armenian *oč'*. *Language* 36. 347–50.
- Cuendet, Georges. 1924. *L'impératif dans le texte grec et dans les versions gotique, arménienne et vieux slave des Évangiles*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Cuendet, Georges. 1929. *L'ordre des mots dans le texte grec et dans les versions gotique, arménienne et vieux slave des Évangiles. Première partie. Les groupes nominaux*. Paris: Champion.
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1975. Polarity and the scale principle. *PCLS* 11. 188–99.
- Govberg-Afros, Elena. 2002. *Aspects of old Germanic hypotaxis: the relative clause in focus*: Hebrew University of Jerusalem dissertation.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jagič, V. (ed.). 1954. *Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus, olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus. Characteribus cyrillicis transcriptum notis criticis prolegomenis appendicibus auctum*. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt.
- Jagič, V. (ed.). 1960. *Quattuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslavenicae codex Marianus glagoliticus. Characteribus cyrillicis transcriptum*. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt.

- Kim, Taejin. 1992. *The particle þa in the West-Saxon Gospels: A discourse-level analysis*: University of Georgia dissertation.
- Klein, J. S. 1992a. On the independence of Gothic syntax, I: Interrogativity, complex sentence types, tense, mood, and diathesis. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 20. 339–79.
- Klein, J. S. 1992b. On the idiomatic nature of the Gothic New Testament: A comparative study of prepositional usage in Gothic and New Testament Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 90. 1–80.
- Klein, J. S. 1994. Gothic þaruh, þanuh, and -(u)h þan. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 99. 253–76.
- Klein, J. S. 1996. *On personal deixis in Classical Armenian. A study of the syntax and semantics of the n-, s-, and d- demonstratives in manuscripts E and M of the Old Armenian Gospels*. Dettelbach: J. H. Röhl.
- Klein, J. S. 1997. Indefinite pronouns, polarity, and related phenomena in Classical Armenian: A study based on the Old Armenian Gospels. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 95. 189–245.
- Klein, J. S. & Nancy L. Condon. 1993. Gothic -(u)h: A synchronic and comparative study. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 91. 1–62.
- Künzle, Beda (ed.). 1984. *Das altarmenische Evangelium/L'Evangile arménien ancien. Teil I/lère partie: Edition*. Bern-Frankfurt am Main-New York: Peter Lang.
- Ladusaw, William A. 1980. *Polarity sensitivity as inherent scope relations*. New York-London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Martin, Chris. 2004. *The syntax of the verb in Old English relative clauses: An analysis of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels*: University of Georgia dissertation.
- Nestle, Erwin & Kurt Aland (eds.). 1979. *Novum Testamentum graece*. 26. neu bearbeitete Auflage. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Pennington, Joseph A. 2010. *A study of purpose, result, and causal hypotaxis in early Indo-European Gospel versions*: University of Georgia dissertation.
- Streitberg, W. (ed.). 1971. *Die gotische Bibel*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Thomason, Olga A. 2006. *Prepositional systems in Biblical Greek, Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavic*: University of Georgia dissertation.
- Tunkle, Eph Herbert. 2000. *Gothic forefield syntax: Focus, repair, and Wackernagel's law*: University of Georgia dissertation.

Zwarts, Frans. 1995. Nonveridical contexts. *Linguistic Analysis* 25. 286–312.

AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION

Jared S. Klein
Department of Classics
Park Hall
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
U.S.A.
jklein@uga.edu