A CASE STUDY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF DEFINITE ARTICLES: THE "ANAPHORIC ARTICLE" OF GOTHIC*

ION GIURGEA[1]

Abstract: In the historical development from demonstrative to definite article, the system goes through a series of stages in which only a sub-set of the contexts of uses of the definite article are marked by an overt determiner. In the first stage, it is assumed that the determiner is generalized to anaphoric and exophoric uses, being a marker of context-givenness (a so-called "anaphoric article"). Gothic provides a good opportunity for analyzing a system of this type, because most of its corpus consists of translations of the Bible from Greek, a language which had a fully developed definite article. This paper presents the results of a systematic investigation of the ways in which the Greek definite article was translated, in a part of the Gothic corpus (the extant parts of the Gospels of Matthew, Luke and John). The study shows that the analysis of the Gothic article as a marker of context-givenness is by and large confirmed, but there are a number of exceptions, for which various explanations are proposed. In particular, the article had already been generalized to definiteness in general in DPs without an overt N. Among context-new definites, the article may be used to indicate that specific shared knowledge is involved in the identification of the referent, a usage resembling recognitional demonstratives. Besides presenting the differences between the 'anaphoric article' system and the fully developed definite article of Greek, Modern Germanic or Romance, the paper also highlights the differences between the anaphoric article and demonstratives.

Keywords: article, definiteness, anaphoric, exophoric, recognitional, Gothic

1. INTRODUCTION. STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF DEFINITE ARTICLES AND THE IMPORTANCE OF GOTHIC

It is a well-established fact in historical linguistics that the emergence of definite articles is a gradual process, the article extending to more and more contexts over time. This process has been extensively studied for Romance and Germanic languages, in which the definite article originates in a demonstrative (see Trager 1932, Aebischer 1948, Leiss 2000, van Gelderen 2007, De Mulder & Carlier 2011, Sommerer 2011, Crisma 2011, Skrzypek 2012, Kraiss 2014, Hertzenberg 2015, Simonenko & Carlier 2020, Bernstein et al. 2021, among others). The developmental path demonstrative > definite article seems to be the most common crosslinguistically (Greenberg 1978, Hawkins 1978, Diessel 1999, Lyons 1999), although it is not the only one – possessive markers may develop into articles via the associative-anaphoric use (see Fraurud 2001, Nikolaeva 2003, Buren 2010, Etebari 2023 and references therein). During the evolution from a demonstrative to a fully developed definite article like that of modern Romance and Germanic languages, there are intermediate stages in which the demonstrative/article covers only some of the uses of a

[1] The "Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, giurgeaion@yahoo.com.

fully developed article. Another parameter of variation concerns the optionality vs obligatoriness of the article for the various uses.

The first stage in this development must obviously be searched in those uses that are common to demonstratives and definite articles – the anaphoric and exophoric use[2]. (Note that I use the term 'anaphoric' for nominals that are co-referent with an antecedent in the text or bound by it, not for the so-called 'indirect' or 'associative' anaphora as in *a car... the wheel*.) The increased use of demonstratives in Late Latin is the result of a higher frequency of overt marking of anaphoric noun phrases with a demonstrative, although this marking has not yet become obligatory (see Hertzenberg 2015). The 'increased use' means that in certain contexts where the antecedent is prominent enough so that no overt marking of anaphora would have been needed in Classical Latin, a demonstrative determiner nevertheless occurs. A putative intermediate stage would involve an *obligatory* use of the determiner for anaphoric and exophoric noun phrases. Demonstratives do not show such an obligatory use either in article-less Indo-European languages or in languages with fully developed articles. Therefore, such a determiner should not be called 'demonstrative'. A possible label is *anaphoric article*. Aebischer (1948) uses the term *articloid*, but applies it to Late Latin, where the determiner was not yet obligatory.

There are indeed attested languages where a special determiner is obligatory for anaphoric and exophoric DPs. In several West Germanic varieties – the Fering North Frisian dialect (Ebert 1971), the Rhineland dialect (Heinrichs 1954), the Mönchen Gladbach dialect (Hartmann 1982) – there are two definite articles, a so-called 'strong article', used in anaphoric and exophoric DPs, as well as in DPs with restrictive relative clauses, and a 'weak article', used for new definites in associative anaphora, in restricted or larger situation uses, for inherently unique definites and generics. This contrast between two series of forms also appears in Standard German in prepositional phrases, the weak D triggering P+D-contraction (see Hartmann 1982, Schwarz 2009). Lyons (1999:333-334), Hawkins (2004:84-85) and De Mulder & Carlier (2011) proposed that in the first stage in the development of definite articles, the article covered the area of use of the strong article – Lyons refers to anaphoric and exophoric uses, De Mulder & Carlier add the use in DPs with restrictive relative clauses.

There have been reports of languages showing a system of this type, where an overt determiner corresponds to the strong article of West Germanic and the NP occurs bare where West Germanic uses the weak article: Upper Sorbian, Upper Silesian (see Ortmann 2014), Akan (Arkoh & Matthewson 2013, Owusu 2022; see Schwarz 2019 for other putative cases). In some of these systems, the use of the overt article extends to certain situations where a demonstrative is clearly ruled out: when the referent of the definite is new, is not perceivable and is not familiar to the hearer, but its existence in the current situation can be inferred based on world knowledge. This is the so-called *bridging* or

_____

[2] I use the term 'exophoric' for expressions that refer to entities present in the immediate discourse situation but not mentioned in the preceding discourse. This use is also called 'deictic', but some authors prefer to use the term 'deictic' for the cases where pointing is crucial in establishing the referent, e.g. by distinguishing between several entities in the immediate situation that satisfy the descriptive content of the referring expression (see Cornish 1999, 2010, Grosz 2019) – the word *deictic* is indeed based on Greek δεικνύναι 'to show, to point'. The term *exophoric* highlights the similarity with anaphora (in both cases, the referent is contextually salient and no gesture is needed to distinguish it from other entities of the same type).

associative anaphora, see (1), which shows that demonstratives do not allow this use (cf. Hawkins 1978):[3]

(1)   We arrived in a village. {**The/#That} church** was on a hill. (Skrzypek 2012:47)

In Akan and Upper Silesian, the article is used in bridging contexts, except if the relation between the antecedent and the definite is part-whole (e.g. *a cup...the handle*, *a house...the roof*). Schwarz (2019) noticed that a strong article is also possible (but not obligatory) in German in bridging contexts that do not involve the part-whole relation (for instance, a strong article can occur in *a play... **the author**...*). Skrzypek (2012) hypothesizes that after the anaphoric stage, the article extends to bridging contexts (associative anaphora), before extending to all instances of uniqueness/maximality. In Akan, besides bridging, the article is used for referents that are discourse-new and absent from the immediate situation (not perceivable), but unique in a restricted situation, based on particular shared knowledge – i.e., entities familiar to the speaker and hearer, as in (2):

(2)   [Context: You and your spouse own one dog. While your spouse is away, someone breaks into your house and you are telling them about it on the phone. You say:]
        Luckily, the thief was chased away by **the dog** / **The dog** chased away the thief.

As noticed by Arkoh & Matthewson (2013), Akan must use the article here, whereas German cannot use the strong article.
        Akan does not use the article with 'globally' or 'inherently' unique descriptions such as *sun, moon* or NPs containing superlatives and, more generally, with what I will call 'description-based uniqueness/maximality'. I use the term *description-based maximality* for situations in which the domain on which maximality[4] is computed is based on the descriptive part of the DP alone, without the need of a further situational restriction. The referent may be unique in the world, e.g. *the sun, the moon*, *the fact that...*, or the descriptive part may contain the relevant restriction – for instance, in *the man's head* it is the possessor, *the man*, that is interpreted relative to a restricted situation; once the referent of *the man* is established, no further restriction is necessary; likewise, with superlatives, once the domain of comparison is set (e.g. the presidents that are compared for *the youngest president*), no further restriction of the domain applies for achieving maximality. By contrast, with *situation-based maximality*, the context provides a restricted situation in which the referent is the maximal entity that satisfies the NP-property[5]; this can be a

---

[3] There are however exceptions to the infelicity of demonstratives in associative anaphora, see Wolter (2006:51), Apothéloz & Reichler-Béguelin (1999).

[4] I use 'maximality' as the defining feature of definiteness (together with the existence presupposition), instead of 'uniqueness', in order to cover plural and mass definites (see Sharvy 1980, Link 1983); an equivalent term is 'inclusiveness', used by Hawkins (1978). Uniqueness is a particular instance of maximality, which obtains in the case of singular count nouns: when the NP property is a property of atoms, a maximal element only exists if the NP property is satisfied by a single entity, because, by the definition of maximality, any entity that satisfies the NP property must be a part of the maximal element (the part relation '≤' used in this definition is reflexive: for any x, x≤x).

[5] This distinction resembles Löbner's (1985, 2011) distinction between *semantic* and *pragmatic uniqueness*, but there are important differences. Löbner extends semantic uniqueness to larger situation uses and also certain cases of restricted situation uses, in order to capture the

contextually restricted situation, as in (1), or a larger situation, which includes the deictic center (the immediate situation of utterance) and extends as far as necessary for ensuring that the DP has a referent, e.g. *the president* will be the president of the country in which the conversation takes place, *the planet* will be Earth, and so on – see Hawkins's (1978) 'larger situation use'. According to Owusu (2022:17), Akan does not use the article in larger situation uses (e.g. with *the president*). It is an open issue whether there are languages which formally distinguish between description-based maximality and the larger situation type of situation-based maximality.

Gothic is a candidate for a language showing the first stage of development of the definite article: the determiner *sa* (MSG.NOM)*, so* (FSG.NOM)*, þata* (NSG.NOM) has been described as an 'anaphoric article' (Heine & Kuteva 2006, Pimenova 2017)[6]. Gothic is also a very fortunate case for the study of such an intermediate system in the development of definiteness marking because its corpus consists almost entirely in translations from Greek, a language that had a fully developed definite article – most of the Gothic material consists of parts of the translation of the Bible by the bishop Wulfila, which took place in the Lower Danube area in the mid 4th century (see Miller 2019:7-13 for details)[7]. This allows us to compare the use of the Greek article with the use of the Gothic determiner *sa*. In this article, I present a systematic investigation of the way of translating the Greek article into Gothic in a sample of the corpus (the gospels of Matthew, Luke and John).

Comparing the Greek original, the Gothic version and the Vulgate Latin version, it can easily be observed that the Greek article is systematically left untranslated in Latin, whereas in Gothic it is *sometimes* translated by the determiner *sa* and sometimes left untranslated. This is already an indication that *sa*, although not a 'full-fledged' definite article, is not merely a demonstrative. The determiner *sa*, which shows an initial *þ-* in all the forms of the paradigm except the masculine and feminine nominative singular, is cognate with German *der* (a definite article but also a demonstrative in Modern German), English *the* and *that*, Mainland Scandinavian *den, det* (which have demonstrative but also definite article uses), etc. The *s-/þ-* alternation is an irregularity that can be traced back to Proto-Indo-European[8].

The determiner *sa* may also correspond to Greek demonstratives (usually the proximal οὗτος, sometimes also the distal ἐκεῖνος and the intensifier αὐτός; cf. Streitberg 1920:187). It is likely that the article and demonstrative versions were differentiated by accent (compare Modern German *der*), but no formal differences between the two appear in writing. As a demonstrative, *sa* might be considered the unmarked form (like French *ce*). It

---

distribution of weak and strong articles in German. Moreover, he has a different theory of definiteness, analyzing the article as a marker of the functional status of the noun. I adopt the current analysis of definiteness as involving maximality (relativized to a situation) and presupposition of existence (see Heim & Kratzer 1998, Elbourne 2005, 2013, Schwarz 2009, Heim 2011).

[6] Traditional grammars also highlight the anaphoric use of this item, see Bernhardt (1874), Douse (1886), Streitberg (1920:188-189), Behaghel (1923), Miller (2019:63).

[7] Only parts of the Gothic bible are preserved, in copies from the 6th-8th centuries. The most comprehensive manuscript is Codex Argenteus, now in Uppsala, produced in Ravenna around 520 (Miller 2019:9).

[8] The alternation is also found in Greek, Indo-Iranian, and Albanian. The reconstructed Proto-Indo-European forms have **so-* in the nominative singular animate and **to-* elsewhere. The Greek cognate of this determiner is the definite article ὁ, ἡ, τό.

contrasts with a marked proximal form *sah* (formed by adding the particle *-uh* to the forms of *sa*) and the distal *jains* (cognate with German *jener* 'that').

By looking at the distribution of *sa* vs. zero in the rendering of the Greek article, I will try to establish how the system works. If *sa* is indeed an 'anaphoric article', the prediction is that it should be obligatory for anaphoric and exophoric definites. If it corresponds to the strong articles of West Germanic, it should also be obligatory with restrictive relative clauses or at least with Hawkins's (1978) 'establishing relative clauses', which introduce a new referent by anchoring it to old information (e.g. *the woman Bill met last night*; this use is called 'endophoric' by Löbner (1985) and 'autophoric' by Ortmann (2014)). It will also be interesting to see whether *sa* was extended to instances of situation-based maximality where demonstratives are not allowed, such as associative anaphora or larger situation uses. Summing up, my corpus study aims at checking the following hypotheses:

(i) *Sa* is obligatory for *context-given* referents, where 'context-given' includes discourse referents with an antecedent in the text (anaphoric, only 'direct anaphora', not associative anaphora) and referents present in the immediate situation (exophoric).

(ii) *Sa* is obligatory or possible with context-new referents in contexts in which modern West Germanic varieties use a strong article: with restrictive relative clauses and certain types of bridging (based on relations other than part-whole).

(iii) *Sa* with context-new referents indicates situation-based maximality (possibly excluding the larger-situation use, like the article of Akan).

The article is organized as follows: in section 2 I present the corpus and the methodology. Before addressing the semantic constraints on the use of *sa*, I present in section 3 contexts where *sa* is required for syntactic reasons. Section 4 discusses the use of *sa* with context-given definites. Section 5 examines context-new definites and description-based maximality. Section 6 presents the way in which Greek polydefinite structures are translated in Gothic. Section 7 contains the conclusions and a brief discussion of the theoretical implications of the system described.

2. THE CORPUS. METHODOLOGY

I used the digital version of the Gothic Bible available at www.wulfila.be. This is a Gothic–Greek–English trilingual.[9] The Gothic version is based on Wilhelm Streitberg's edition (Wilhelm Streitberg, *Der gotische Text und seine griechische Vorlage. Mit Einleitung, Lesarten und Quellennachweisen sowie den kleineren Denkmälern als Anhang.* Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1919). The interlinear Greek text is an electronic version of Nestle-Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (26th/27th edition). Although this text does not perfectly correspond to the original used by Wulfila, which has not been established yet, the differences between the Greek versions are insignificant in what concerns the usage of the definite article. In the rare cases where the Greek text on the site did not match the Gothic text exactly, I consulted a philological edition of the New Testament: *The Greek New*

---

[9] The English version on this site is King James Bible, but I did not reproduce it in the translations of the examples. I consulted various modern translations (available at https://www.biblegateway.com), trying to offer a translation as close as possible to the Gothic text.

Testament, ed. by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1966.

I registered all the equivalences of Greek DPs with the definite article in Matthew's Gospel (from which chapters 5-11 and 25-27 are preserved in the Gothic version), classifying them into semantic classes (anaphoric, exophoric, discourse-deictic, associative anaphora, description-based maximality, etc.) and also taking into account the syntactic structure, where relevant (see DPs without an overt N and polydefiniteness in the discussion below). As the articleless translation of context-new definites and definites with description-based maximality proved to be quite regular and the examples were very numerous, in Luke's and John's gospels[10] I registered all the translations of Greek articles only for *anaphoric* and *exophoric* definites, while for context-new definites and definites with description-based maximality I registered all the *exceptions* to the articleless translation (in phrases with an overt N) and only a number of examples of articleless usages, for the types where the use of the article was more expected (associative anaphora, maximality in situations based on specific shared knowledge, phrases with restrictive relative clauses).

3. SYNTACTIC CONDITIONING

3.1. Phrases without an overt N

The differentiated translation of the Greek article only occurs with *overt* nouns. In DPs without an overt N, the Greek definite article is systematically translated by the Gothic article *sa*, see Table I (in the tables, I will notate the use of *sa* with +ART, and its absence with -ART):

Table I: the rendering of Greek THE in DPs without an overt N (in Matthew)

	+ART	-ART		+ART	-ART
total anaphoric	4	0	anaphoric (to an entity-expression)	3	0
			discourse-deictic	1	0
total new	50	6 (?)	maximal in the current situation	10	1 (?)
			description-based maximality	40	5 (?)
other renderings: by a 2nd person pronoun, in vocative contexts: 2					

The 6 exceptions may receive a syntactic account: (i) 3 of them contain the word *anþar* 'other', which may be assumed to function sometimes as a determiner, with the meaning 'the other'; (ii) the other 3 contain adjectives: *hailai* 'the healthy', *hleidumei þeina* 'your left hand', *taihswo þeina* 'your right hand'. It is possible that these adjectives are syntactically treated as nouns, in which case the exceptions are only apparent (see Streitberg 1920:183, Ratkus 2011 for a proposal of this type). I did not count examples with singular *anþar*, which is arguably a determiner meaning 'the other'.

Let us see some examples where *sa* occurs because there is no overt N head, although the definite is new (i.e., it is not anaphoric or exophoric). In the examples I

---

[10] These texts are also incomplete: the Gothic manuscripts preserve chapters 1-10 and 14-20 of Luke's Gospel and chapters 5-19 of John's Gospel.

provide the corresponding Greek words under the glosses and I mark the DP under discussion with boldface. In the particular case of DPs without an overt N, I will also provide the Latin version (Saint Jerome's Vulgate) as illustrative for an old Indo-European language without articles. In examples (3)-(5), the missing N is not interpreted anaphorically (there is no recovery of a nominal concept from the context) but has the general meaning +person. In (3) and (4) the modifier is an agreeing element, which allows the recovery of the gender, number, and case of the missing N – an adjective in (3), a participle in (4). The realization of these features licenses the null N in Latin. In (5), the modifier is a PP, which does not agree. Here, Greek and Gothic behave the same, marking the gender, number and case of the nominal projection on the determiner. Latin resorts to a different strategy – a demonstrative with a relative clause.

(3) qiþan ist **þaim**   **airizam**   (Mat. 5.21)
     said is   the.PL.DAT earlier.MP.DAT
     ἐρρέθη   **τοῖς**   **ἀρχαίοις**
  Lat.: dictum est **antiquis**   (Vulgate)
     said   is ancients.DAT
     'it was said to the ancients/to those of old time'

(4) bidjaiþ   bi **þans**   **usþriutandans**   **izwis** (Mat. 5.44)
     pray.2P   for the.MP.ACC persecuting.MP.ACC(WEAK) you.PL.ACC
     προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ **τῶν** [ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς καὶ] **διωκόντων ὑμᾶς**
  Lat. orate   pro **persequentibus** [et calumniantibus]   **vos**
     pray.2P   for persecuting.MP.DAT and calumniating.MP.DAT you.PL.ACC
     'pray for those who persecute you (and calumniate you)'

(5) þanuh qiþiþ jah **þaim**   **af** **hleidumein ferai**   (Mat. 26.71)
     then says and the.PL.DAT from left   part
     τότε ἐρεῖ καὶ **τοῖς**   **ἐξ** **εὐωνύμων**
  Lat. Tunc dicet   et **his**   **qui** **a sinistris erunt**
     then will-say.3S and these.PL.DAT which in left   will-be.3P
     'then he will say to those on the left'

Regarding the Latin strategy in (5), it should be noticed that demonstratives in general, not just in DPs without an overt N, have a special use in configurations with relative clauses, in which they are equivalent with a definite article. A new definite with description-based uniqueness, as *the inventor of the computer*, does not allow a demonstrative, see (6)a. However, if the same description is paraphrased by using a relative clause, the demonstrative becomes acceptable, see (6)b, which does not necessarily refer to a salient referent, but allows the paraphrase given in b´.

(6) [context: out-of-the-blue, no previous mention of the person referred to]
     a. * That inventor of the computer was a genius.
     b. That person who invented the computer was a genius.
     b´. Whoever invented the computer was a genius   (Wolter, 2006:115)

This use of demonstratives, called 'bleached' in Giurgea (2024b), was described for English by Diessel (1999:108, 135-137, who calls such demonstratives 'determinatives'), Wolter (2006), Nowak (2021), Ahn (2019, 2022) and appears to be found in other languages: Simonenko (forthc.) cites Dutch, French, Russian and Persian; Giurgea (2024b) attests it in Romanian (although with more restrictions than in English).

The Gothic determiner *sa* could be analyzed as a bleached demonstrative in the examples (3)-(5) only if we assume that the modifiers are reduced relative clauses (English indeed does allow the bleached use with reduced relatives, see Wolter 2006, but Romanian does not, see Giurgea 2024b) and that Gothic uses bleached demonstratives with reduced relatives (for some instances of non-anaphoric *sa* in DPs with full relatives, see 5.2 below). However, the contrast between Latin and Gothic is significant. Given the other article-like uses of *sa* that will be discussed below, it is likely that Gothic has already developed a definite D, which is overtly realized in certain conditions: whereas with overt nouns, in principle only definiteness associated with context-givenness triggers the overt realization (see sections 4-5 below), in configurations with a null N all types of definiteness are marked by the overt D spelled-out by *sa*. This proposal is supported by examples where the overt modifier is a genitive, in which case a reduced relative analysis is unlikely (see (7)-(8)) and by the existence of other environments where it appears that *sa* occurs with context-new definites and description-based maximality for syntactic reasons, such as with prenominal *anþar* 'other', see (9) (see 5.2 for further discussion):

(7) jabai hvopan skuld   sijai,   **þaim   siukeins   meinaizos** hvopau.
    if   boast.INF must.PTCP be.SBJV.3S the.P.DAT infirmity.GEN my.GEN   boast.1S
    εἰ   καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ,   **τὰ**   **τῆς ἀσθενείας μου**   καυχήσομαι
    'If I must boast, I will boast of the things which concern my weakness'
                                                                    (Corinthians II, 11.30)

(8) þai   þiudo   = οἱ   ἐθνικοί   (Mat. 6.7)
    the.MP.NOM nations.GEN   the.MP.NOM nation.ADJ.MP.NOM
    'the gentiles'

(9) jah **þaim   anþaraim baurgim** wailamerjan   ik skal bi
    also the.P.DAT other.P.DAT cities.DAT good-announce.INF I must about
    καὶ ταῖς   ἑτέραις   πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί   με δεῖ
    þiudangardja gudis   (Lk. 4.43)
    kingdom   God.GEN
    τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ
    'I must proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God also to the other cities'

In (7), the null N is interpreted as [-animate +abstract]. Other examples of this type, with description-based maximality, are given in (10)-(11) (in (11), *þai þiudo* 'the gentiles' is used for *οἱ τελῶναι* 'the tax collectors', and the reverse takes place in the following verse, Mat. 5.47, where *motarios* '(the) tax collectors' is used for *οἱ ἐθνικοί* 'the gentiles').

(10) ei   usfullnodedi   **þata   gamelido   þairh Esaïan praufetu**
     so-that should-be-fulfilled the.NS.NOM said.NS.NOM(W) by Esaias   prophet
     ὅπως   πληρωθῇ   **τὸ**   **ῥηθὲν**   **διὰ ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου**
 Lat. ut   adimpleretur   **quod dictum est per Isaiam prophetam** (Mat. 8.17)
     so-that should-be-fulfilled what said   is by Isaiah   prophet

'This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah'

(11) niu jah þai þiudo **þata samo** taujand? (Mat. 5.46)
not also the.MP nations.GEN the.NS.ACC same.NS.ACC(WEAK) do.3P
οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι **τὸ αὐτὸ** ποιοῦσιν;
'Don't even the gentiles/tax collectors do **the same**?'
  Lat. nonne et publicani **hoc** faciunt?
not.INTER also tax-collectors this.NS do.3P

The null N can also be anaphoric, being identified with a contextually salient noun (N-ellipsis) – see (12), where the antecedent of the null N is *kinnu* 'cheek':

(12) ak jabai hvas þuk stautai bi taihswon þeina
and if somebody you.S.DAT hit.SBJV.3S on right.FS.ACC your.FS.ACC
ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν
kinnu(F), wandei imma jah **þo anþara**. (Mat. 5.39)
cheek turn.IMPV.2S him.DAT also the.FS.ACC other.FS.ACC
σιαγόνα [σου], στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ **τὴν ἄλλην**
  Lat. si quis te percusserit in dexteram maxillam tuam, praebe illi et **alteram**
'and if somebody hits you on your right cheek, turn to him also the other one'

In one example in my corpus, the determiner appears to function as a definite D selecting a non-nominal constituent, a wh-clause, see (13); this may be explained by the influence of the Greek original, but the fact that the determiner *sa* could be employed to render this Greek structure supports the idea that *sa* already was a definite D in some contexts.

(13) galaiþ þan mitons in ins, **þata hvarjis þau ize maists wesi**.
came-out then deliberation in them the.NS.NOM hwo INTER they.GEN greatest was
εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, **τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν**.
came-out and deliberation in them the.NSG who IRR be.OPT.3S greater they.GEN
'Then they started to deliberate on which of them would be the greatest.' (Lk. 9.46)

Examples where *sa* selects an infinitive, following the Greek pattern, are also attested (not in the part of the Bible that I analyze in this article; I encountered this situation in Mark 9.10 and 12.33).

3.2 Phrases with postnominal demonstratives

The clearest piece of evidence that *sa* may sometimes be a definite article in D, rather than a demonstrative, is the possibility of co-occurrence with another demonstrative in the same DP. I found three examples in Matthew where the article *sa*, in DP-initial position, co-occurs with a postnominal distal demonstrative– (14) is one of them:

(14) jah bistugqun bi **þamma razna jainamma** (Mat. 7.25)
and stroke-against.3P at the.DAT house.DAT that.DAT
καὶ προσέπεσαν **τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ**
'(the winds blew) and beat against that house'

As two demonstratives cannot co-occur in one and the same DP, the DP-initial *sa* can only be analyzed as an article. Its use can be explained by a requirement to mark overtly the D of a context-given definite. This requirement is not strict – besides the three examples with an article, I also found two instances of postnominal *jains* without an article. In one of them the DP begins with the functional element *alls* 'all', which might license a null D, but in the other one, given in (15), there is no prenominal functional item. Examples of this type are very rare. Besides (15), I only found just one example in Matthew, with *sa* rendering Greek οὗτος 'this'.

(15)   haitans warþ **akrs**   **jains**   akrs bloþis   (Mat. 27.8)
         called became field   that   field blood.GEN
         ἐκλήθη   **ὁ ἀγρὸς ἐκεῖνος** ἀγρὸς αἵματος
         'That field was called the field of blood'

The postnominal position of the demonstrative is probably a consequence of the strive to preserve the word order of the original as much as possible. Indeed, besides these 6 examples where the Greek postnominal Dem is rendered by a Gothic postnominal Dem, I found 8 examples, in Matthew, where the demonstrative is postnominal in Greek but prenominal in Gothic (3 with *jains*, 5 with *sa*). This suggests that the normal position of demonstratives in Gothic was prenominal. With this word order, the requirement of overtly realizing the D of an anaphoric or exophoric definite is fulfilled by the demonstrative.

4. THE USE OF *SA* WITH CONTEXT-GIVEN REFERENTS

4.1. Anaphoric definites

I have examined all the instances of anaphoric DPs that have the definite article in the Greek original, in Matthew, Luke, and John. Besides anaphorics with a nominal antecedent, I include here the so-called 'discourse deictic' use (see Himmelmann 1996, Diessel 1999), i.e. reference to propositions or events introduced in the previous text by non-nominal constituents, such as clauses – see (16), where the previous text is given within brackets (the previous sentence introduces the scribes' thoughts by the verb phrase *qeþun in sis silbam* 'said to themselves' and the following sentence reproducing their thoughts in direct speech, *sa wajamereiþ* 'This (man) is blaspheming'). I also give the Latin version here and in other examples of the anaphorically used Greek definite article, in order to show that no demonstrative is necessary in an articleless language:

(16)   [Mat. 9.3: *þaruh sumai þize bokarje qeþun in sis silbam: sa wajamereiþ* 'some of
        the scribes said to themselves, "This man is blaspheming" ']
        jah witands Iesus **þos mitonins** **ize**   qaþ
        and knowing Jesus the thoughts   their   said.3S
        καὶ ἰδὼν   ὁ ἰησοῦς **τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν** εἶπεν   (Mat. 9.4)
        'And Jesus, knowing their thoughts, said (…)'
  Lat. Et cum   vidisset   Jesus **cogitationes eorum**, dixit
        and when had-seen.3S Jesus thoughts-the their   said.3S

An example of an event-referring discourse deictic is given in (17):

(17) [Mat. 27.51: *jah airþa inreiraida* 'and the earth shook' (..)]
      iþ   hundafaþs   jah þai   miþ imma witandans   Iesua,
      and centurion.NOM and the.MP.NOM with him   guarding.MP.NOM Jesus.DAT
      ὁ δὲ ἑκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ   μετ' αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες   τὸν Ἰησοῦν,
      gasaihvandans **þo**   **reiron** (...)   ohtedun   abraba. (Mat. 27.54)
      seeing.MP.NOM the.FS.ACC earthquake.ACC feared.3P   extremely
      ἰδόντες   **τὸν**   **σεισμὸν**   ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα
      'Now, when the centurion and those with him that were guarding Jesus saw the
      earthquake (...), they were terrified'
Lat. centurio autem et qui   cum eo erant custodientes   Iesum   viso
      centurion but   and who.MP with him were guarding.P.NOM Jesus.ACC seen.ABL
      terraemotu (...) timuerunt valde
      earthquake.ABL feared.3P strongly

In principle, I counted as anaphoric the examples in which the anaphoric link is crucial for identifying the referent, i.e. the referent is not unique/maximal based on the descriptive content (as in *the sun* or *her father*) or in a larger situation (such as *the king*). An illustrative example is (18), where the relevant previous text is given within brackets and the antecedents are underlined. The Latin version shows, again, that no demonstrative is needed in this case in an articleless language.

(18) [Mat. 9.18: <u>*reiks ains*</u> *qimands inwait ina, qiþands þatei* <u>*dauhtar meina*</u> *nu gaswalt;*
     akei qimands atlagei handu þeina ana ija, jah libaiþ (...) '<u>a leader</u> came and payd
     homage to him and said, "<u>My daughter</u> has just died. But come and put your hand on
     her, and she will live." ']
     jah qimands Iesus   in garda   **þis**   **reikis** (...) qaþ   du im:
     and coming Jesus   in house   the.GEN leader.GEN said.3S to him
     καὶ ἐλθὼν   ὁ ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν **τοῦ**   **ἄρχοντος** ἔλεγεν,
     'And when Jesus came into **the leader's** house (…) he said to them:'
     afleiþiþ,   unte ni   gaswalt **so mawi**, ak   slepiþ
     go-away.2P for not   died   the girl   but sleeps
     ἀναχωρεῖτε,   οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν **τὸ κοράσιον** ἀλλὰ καθεύδει
     'Go away, for **the girl** did not die, but she's sleeping.'   (Mat. 9.23-9.24)
  Lat.: Et cum venisset   Jesus in domum **principis**, (…) dicebat: recedite
     and when had-come Jesus in house leader.GEN   said.3S step-away.IMPV.2P
     non est enim mortua **puella**, sed dormit.
     not is for   dead   girl   but sleeps

The example (19) shows that the Gothic article is compatible with possessives and may appear in donkey anaphora (the antecedent *aibr þein* is introduced in a hypothetical situation):

(19) [Mat. 5.23: *jabai nu bairais* <u>*aibr þein*</u> *du hunslastada jah jainar gamuneis þatei*
    broþar þeins habaiþ hva bi þuk 'if you are offering your gift at the altar and there
    you remember that your brother has something against you'],

aflet   jainar **þo giba þeina** in andwairþja hunslastadis   jah gagg
leave.IMPV.2S there the gift your   in space-before altar.GEN   and go.IMPV.2S
ἄφες   ἐκεῖ **τὸ δῶρόν σου**, ἔμπροσθεν   τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ ὕπαγε
faurþis gasibjon   broþr   þeinamma, jah biþe atgaggands atbair
first   make-peace.IMPV.2S brother your.DAT   and after coming   bring.IMPV.2S
πρῶτον διαλλάγηθι   τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου,   καὶ τότε ἐλθὼν   πρόσφερε
þo giba þeina   (Mat. 5.24)
the gift   your
τὸ δῶρόν σου
'leave **your gift** there, before the altar, and go, first be reconciled to your brother,
and then come and offer **your gift**.'

   Lat.: Si ergo offers   munus tuum ad altare, (...) relinque   ibi **munus tuum** ante
if thus offer.2S gift   your to altar   leave.IMPV.2S there gift   your before
altare, et vade   prius reconciliari fratri   tuo: et tunc veniens
altar   and go.IMPV.2S first reconcile.INF brother.DAT your and then coming
offeres   **munus tuum**
will-bring.2S gift   your

     Definites with descriptive-based maximality whose referent has been mentioned before were not counted as exceptions to the overt marking of anaphoric definites, because in their case the anaphoric link is not essential in establishing the reference; note that they do not display strong articles in the West Germanic varieties with two article series and do not take an overt article in Akan. Thus, *diabaulus* 'the devil', *þiudangardi himine* 'the kingdom of heaven', *atta meins* 'my father' or *siponjos is* 'his disciples' were not counted as unmarked anaphoric definites when they occurred repeatedly in the same text unit.

     However, *siponjos is* 'his disciples' does sometimes appear with the article when the referent was recently mentioned (in which case I did count this phrase among anaphoric definites), see (20). This behavior is not unexpected given that the denotation of the maximal sum of somebody's disciples may vary across situations, unlike the denotation of somebody's father, for instance.

(20) [Mat. 9.10: *jah sai,   managai motarjos jah frawaurhtai qimandans miþanakumbidedun Iesua jah siponjam is* 'behold, many tax collectors and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples.')
jah gaumjandans   Fareisaieis qeþun du **þaim   siponjam   is** (Mat. 9.11)
and noticing.MP.NOM Pharisees   said.3P to the.DAT disciples.DAT his
καὶ ἰδόντες   οἱ φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον **τοῖς   μαθηταῖς   αὐτοῦ**
'and noticing this, the Pharisees said to his disciples (...)'

For such DPs, which can be analyzed both as anaphoric and as maximal in a larger situation or based on description, I registered the examples with articles as anaphoric and I included the articleless examples in the category of description-based maximality. In a few examples of this type, the description includes a relative clause, see (21); I included this example under anaphorics because the event of the multiplication of the loaves occurs in the same chapter, and the place where this event took place is introduced in the text.

(21)   anþara þan skipa qemun us   Tibairiadau nehva **þamma stada þarei matidedun**
        other   then ships came from Tiberias   close   the   place where ate.3P
        hlaif   (J. 6.23)
        bread
        'Then there came other boats from Tiberias close to the place where they had eaten
        bread'

A few examples lie on the borderline between anaphoric and discourse-deictic
definites: they refer to entities, but the antecedent is provided by verbal material, being the
result of an event – see (22):

(22)   þata qiþands <u>gaspaiw</u> dalaþ, jah gawaurhta fani   us **þamma spaiskuldra** (J. 9.6)
        that saying spat.3S down and made.3S   clay of the   spittle
        ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἔπτυσεν χαμαὶ καὶ ἐποίησεν   πηλὸν ἐκ **τοῦ**   **πτύσματος**
        'after he said that he spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle'

I counted these examples as simply anaphoric, rather than discourse-deictic.
        The results are presented in Table II. We can see that Gothic uses the article in the
overwhelming majority of the examples, but there are exceptions. For a number of cases,
there are possible explanations for the absence of the article, which will be detailed below.
These cases have been counted separately, see the rows (iii)-(vi) of the table. If we exclude
these cases, the percentage of the article for anaphoric DPs is 95%.

Table II: the use of the article for Greek THE in anaphoric DPs (with overt N),
in Matthew, Luke and John

	+ART	-ART
(i) anaphoric (clear examples)	345	19
(ii) discourse-deictic (clear examples)	16	
(iii) remote antecedents: possibly unique in the current situation		9
(iv) close antecedents, but also possibly unique/maximal in the current situation		29
(v) close antecedents, but also possilby unique/maximal in a larger situation/the world		5
(vi) discourse-deictic but also possibly unique/maximal in the current situation		7
Total clear cases of anaphoric definites ((i)+(ii))	**361 (95%)**	**19 (5%)**
Total unclear cases ((iii)-(vi))		50
Total	**361 (84%)**	**69 (16%)**

In the following types of situations, the absence of the article can be accounted for by
assuming that the definite is construed as non-anaphoric (which would mean that the
exceptions are only apparent):
        (i) The antecedent is remote and the definite can be construed as unique/maximal in
the current situation; for instance, the governor Pilate was introduced in Matthew 27.2; in
27.11, the noun *kindins* 'governor, ruler' occurs without the article, see (23); between the
two mentions, another story intervenes, Juda's suicide:

(23) iþ Iesus stoþ faura **kindina** (Mat. 27.11)
but Jesus stood before governor.DAT
δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐστάθη ἔμπροσθεν **τοῦ ἡγεμόνος**
'And Jesus stood before the governor'

(ii) The antecedent is close, but the definite may also be construed as unique/maximal in the current situation. For instance, *alh* 'temple', referring to the temple of Jerusalem, the temple *par excellence* in the world of the Gospels (however, *alh* does sometimes occur with the article, see Lk. 1.21, Lk. 19.47). This type comprises:

(ii.1) landforms and names of places, which belong to the background, creating a spatial or temporal frame: *fairguni* 'mountain', *marei* 'sea', *baurgs* 'city';

(ii.2) meteorological phenomena: *winds* 'wind';

(ii.3) institutions: *alh* 'temple', *gudjans jah sinistans* 'the priests and elders';

(ii.4) plural or collective terms referring to the crowd or the people: *managei* 'crowd, people' (translating both Gr. ὄχλος 'crowd' and λαός 'people'), *Iudaieis* 'the Jews'.

Landforms are more often bare (see also Pimenova 2017): for *marei* 'sea', all 8 examples in my corpus which have an anaphoric antecedent are bare (6 are PPs, one is a subject and one a direct object); *fairguni* 'mountain' occurs 2 times bare and once with the article. For *managei* 'crowd; people' in contexts with an anaphoric antecedent, I found 10 bare occurrences and 17 with the article; for *Iudaieis* 'the Jews' – 4 bare occurrences and 7 with the article. *Winds* 'wind' was found only bare (2 occurrences).

(iii) The antecedent is close but the definite may also be analyzed as unique/maximal in the world or in a larger situation – see *hlaiwasnom* 'graves.DAT' in Mat. 27.53 (ex. (24)) and *asanais* 'harvest.GEN' in the phrase *fraujan asanais* 'the lord of the harvest', in Mat. 9.38 (ex. (25)) and Lk. 10.2, in a metaphoric context:

(24) [Mat. 27.52: *jah hlaiwasnos usluknodedun, jah managa leika þize ligandane weihaize urrisun*. 'And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints lying (there) arose']
jah usgaggandans us **hlaiwasnom** afar urrist is (...) (Mat. 27.53)
and coming-out.NOM.PL out-of graves.DAT after ressurection his
καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ **τῶν μνημείων** μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ
'and coming out of the graves after his resurrection, (...)'

(25) [Mat. 9.37: *þanuh qaþ du siponjam seinaim: asans raihtis managa, iþ waurstwjans fawai*. 'Then he said to his his disciples, "The harvest is plentiful but the workers are few" ']
bidjiþ nu fraujan **asanais** ei ussandjai waurstwjans in
pray.2P therefore lord.ACC harvest.GEN that send.SBJV.3S workers in
δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου **τοῦ θερισμοῦ** ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς
asan seina. (Mat. 9.38)
harvest POSS.REFL
τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.
'Therefore, pray earnestly to the Lord of the harvest to send out workers into his harvest."

The third example of this type involves the expression *sunus mans* 'the son of man' used by Jesus to refer to himself. This phrase occurs without the article, in a context with an

anaphoric antecedent, in J. 6.62; but sometimes it does take the article (see Mat. 9.6, 10.23, 11.19, 26.2). I also include here the kinship term modified by a possessive *broþr þeinamma* 'your.DAT brother.DAT' in the donkey anaphor context in (19) above (Mat. 5.24).

(iv) The exceptions to the use of the article with discourse-deictic definites all involve DPs with possessors, as in ex. (26). It is possible that the occurrence of the possessor in the restriction provided the grounds for a construal as unique in the current situation, making the indication of the anaphoric link superfluous.

(26) [*jah atiddja dalaþ rign jah qemun ahvos jah waiwoun windos jah bistugqun bi jainamma razna, jah gadraus*, 'and the rain came down, and the winds blew and bit against that house, and it fell,']
jah was **drus** **is** mikils. (Mat. 7.27)
and was fall its big
καὶ ἦν **ἡ πτῶσις αὐτῆς** μεγάλη
'and its fall was big'

If we eliminate these types of examples, we are left with 19 exceptions to the use of the article for anaphoric definites, which make 5% of the total number of clear anaphoric definites with an overt noun. In these examples I found the following types of noun phrases: (i) plural animates (6 examples): *siponjos* 'the disciples' (Lk. 9.16, Lk. 17.22, Lk. 18.15), *apaustauleis* 'the apostles' (Lk. 9.10), *wairos* 'the men' (J. 6.10), *andbahtos Iudaie* 'the officers of the Jews' (J. 18.12), (ii) collectives (2 ex.): *hansa* 'the band (squad)' (J. 18.12), *hairda sweine* 'the herd of swine' (Mat. 8.32), (iii) singular animates (3 ex.): *aggilus* 'the angel' (Lk. 1.30, 2.21), *staua inwindiþos* 'the judge of injustice' (Lk. 18.6), (iv) singular inanimates (5 ex.): *dulþs* 'the feast' (Lk. 2.42, J. 7.14), *skip* 'the ship' (J. 6.19, 6.21), *wein* 'the wine' (Mat. 9.17), (v) plural inanimates (3 ex.): *balgeis* 'the wineskins (leather bags)' (Mat. 9.17, twice), *skipa* 'the ships' (J. 6.24). Three of these noun phrases are donkey anaphors, occurring in the same sentence, see (27).

(27) Niþ~þan giutand wein niujata in balgins fairnjans, aiþþau
not-furthermore pour.3P wine new in wineskins old otherwise
οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε,
distaurnand **balgeis**, biþeh þan jah **wein** usgutniþ jah **balgeis**
burst.3P wineskins thereafter also wine is-spilled-out and wineskins
ῥήγνυνται **οἱ ἀσκοί**, καὶ **ὁ οἶνος** ἐκχεῖται καὶ **οἱ ἀσκοὶ**
fraqistnand. (Mat. 9.17)
are-destroyed
ἀπόλλυνται
'Neither do people put new wine into old wineskins. If they do, **the wineskins** will burst; **the wine** will run out and **the wineskins** will be destroyed.'

These exceptions are not lexical: most of these nouns also occur with the article in anaphoric contexts (*apaustauleis*, *andbahtos*, *wairos*, *hairda*, *aggilus*, *staua*, *dulþ*, *skip*, *wein*, *balgeis*); *hansa* has no other anaphoric occurrence in the Gothic corpus (words can be searched on the site www.wulfila.be). The donkey anaphor use in (27) does not explain the absence of the article, because donkey anaphors do take the article in other situations, see

(19) above and also the wineskins parable in Luke, where the very same nouns occur with the article, see (28):

(28) jah ainshun ni giutid wein niujata in balgins   fairnjans, aiþþau   distairid
      and nobody not pours wine new   in wineskins old   otherwise bursts
      þata niujo wein þans   balgins   jah silbo usgutniþ,   jah
      the   new   wine the.MP.ACC wineskins.ACC and itself is-spilled-out and
      þai balgeis   fraqistnand   (Lk. 5.37)
      the wineskins are-destroyed
      'and nobody pours new wine into old wineskins, otherwise the new wine will burst
      the bottles and will be itself spilled out and the wineskins will be destroyed'

No clear correlation could be detected between grammatical functions and these exceptions. Most of the examples involve subjects – 10 examples, 7 preverbal, 3 postverbal – but there are also PPs (7 examples), one dative indirect object and one adnominal genitives. The higher number of subjects is expected for anaphoric definites.

In spite of these exceptions, the very large number of occurrences of *sa* with anaphoric definites indicates that *sa* is no longer a 'normal' demonstrative. It has been observed that anaphoric demonstratives, both in languages with articles and in articleless languages, are used to resume newly introduced discourse referents; thus, they typically occur in second mentions, right after a new discourse referent has been introduced (see Himmelmann 1996:229, Comrie 1997, Diessel 1999:96-99 and references therein, Skrzypek 2012:102); more generally, they tend to occur when the anaphoric interpretation of the nominal is not obvious, otherwise DPs with the definite article or, in articleless languages, bare nouns being preferred, or, of course, pronouns (Gundel et al. 1993). The Gothic article, by contrast, often occurs with well-established discourse referents. For instance, in the last supper narrative in John, it occurs with *siponjos* 'the disciples', in J. 13.22 and J. 13.23 (see ex. (29)), although the disciples had already been constant companions of Jesus and their presence in the scene was already mentioned in the chapter, in J. 13.5. In this context, using a demonstrative would not be appropriate, see (30).

(29) (J. 13.22) þanuh   sehvun   du sis   misso **þai siponjos**, þagkjandans
                  and-then looked.3P to 3.REFL.DAT RECIPR the disciples thinking.NOM.PL
                  ἔβλεπον οὖν εἰς ἀλλήλους   οἱ μαθηταὶ ἀπορούμενοι
      bi   hvarjana qeþi.   (13.23) wasuh   þan anakumbjands ains **þize**
      about whom   spoke.SBJV.3S   was.3S-and then leaning   one the.P.GEN
      περὶ τίνος   λέγει   ἦν   δὲ ἀνακείμενος εἷς ἐκ τῶν
      siponje   **is** in barma   Iesuis, (...)
      disciples.GEN his   in bosom   Jesus'
      μαθητῶν   αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
      'and then the disciples looked to one another, wondering about whom he was
      speaking; and one of his disciples was leaning on Jesus's bosom'
(30) # Then **those/these disciples** looked to one another, wondering about whom he was
      speaking; and one of **those/these disciples (of his)** was leaning on Jesus's bosom'

Likewise, after the introduction of Joseph of Arimathea's tomb used for Jesus's burial, in Mat. 27.60, each mention of the tomb occurs with the article (in 27.60, 27.61, 27.66).

Repeating a demonstrative in such a manner would lead to infelicity. The article may also occur with anaphoric definites whose antecedent is unique in a larger situation, for instance the governor of Judea (Pilate): after being used without the article at the beginning of the trial, in Mat. 27.11 (see also (23) above), the noun *kindins* 'governor' occurs with the article in the following sentence, in Mat. 27.11, and also in 27.14 and 27.15:

(31)   iþ Iesus stoþ faura <u>kindina</u>,   jah frah   ina **sa kindins** qiþands (...)
        but Jesus stood before governor.DAT and asked.3S him the governor saying
        'Jesus stood before the governor, and the governor asked him:(...)' (Mat. 27.11)
        (...) jah ni andhof   imma wiþra ni ainhun waurde,   swaswe sildaleikida
          and not answered.3S him   against not one   words.GEN so-that marveled.3S
          sa kindins filu (Mat. 27.14)
          the governor much
        'and he gave no answer, so that the governor was very surprised'
        and dulþ   þan hvarjoh   biuhts   was **sa kindins** fraletan
        at feast.ACC then every.ACC accustomed was the governor release.INF
        ainana þizai   managein bandjan,   þanei   wildedun (Mat. 27.15)
        one.ACC the.DAT people.DAT prisoner.ACC whom.MS.ACC wanted.1P
        'and at every feast the governor had a custom of releasing to the crowd a prisoner whom they wanted'

Again, using a demonstrative in this case (*that/this governor asked... that/this governor was very surprised...that/this governor had a custom...*) would not be appropriate.

It can be concluded that the determiner *sa* has become almost obligatory for anaphoric definites. The few exceptions might represent instances of variation characteristic of language change, the absence of the article reflecting the older system, where the determiner was not obligatory for anaphoric uses.

4.2. Exophoric definites

As we have seen in section 1, in the first stage of the evolution from demonstrative to definite article, the determiner is supposed to be generalized not only for anaphoric, but also for exophoric definites, i.e., referents present in the immediate situation (see Lyons 1999:333-334, Hawkins 2004:84-85, De Mulder & Carlier 2011). The Gothic article is indeed used to translate the Greek article in exophoric uses – I found 26 examples in my corpus (5 in Matthew, 6 in Luke, 15 in John). I haven't found any clear exception, but it must be acknowledged that in this case, unlike for anaphorics, where the previous text must provide an antecedent, there is no clear textual criterion for distinguishing between exophoric and new definites unique/maximal in the current situation. A criterion for the exophoric use is direct speech, because the referent is supposed to be present in the current speech situation. But I also found a definite analyzable as exophoric in a narrative context: it is a definite referring to the place of the described situation, in which case a paraphrase with a demonstrative is acceptable – see (32).

(32)   wasuh   þan hawi manag ana **þamma stada**.   (J. 6.10)
        was.3S-and then grass much on the   place
        ἦν   δὲ χόρτος πολὺς ἐν **τῷ**   **τόπῳ**

'Now there was much grass in **the/that place**.'

In (33) and (34) I present examples of exophoric definites, in direct speech. Notice in (33) the different treatment of the two definites with a possessor, *your bed*, Greek *σου τὴν κλίνην* 'you.GEN **the** bed' and *your house*, Greek *τὸν οἶκόν σου* '**the** house you.GEN'. Both can be considered description-based uniques (due to the possessive). However, the first has a referent present and salient in the immediate situation, the bed on which the paralytic brought to Jesus is lying. This explains why in Gothic the definite referring to the bed receives the article and the one referring to the house does not. I provided the Latin translation in order to show that an articleless language does not need a demonstrative for this exophoric use.

(33)   þanuh   qaþ   du þamma usliþin: urreisands nim   **þana ligr þeinana**
       than-and said.3S to the   paralytic   standing-up take.IMPV.2S the   bed   your
       τότε   λέγει   τῷ   παραλυτικῷ, ἐγερθεὶς   ἆρόν   **σου τὴν κλίνην**
       jah gagg   in gard   þeinana.   (Mat. 9.6)
       and go.IMPV.2S in house   your
       καὶ ὕπαγε   εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.
       'He then said to the paralytic: «Stand up, take up **your bed** and go to your house.»'
 Lat.: Tunc ait   paralytico: Surge, tolle   **lectum tuum**, et   vade in domum tuam.
       then says paralytic.DAT rise   take-up bed   your   and go in house   your

In the example (34), the use of the article with the noun *galga* 'cross' is justifiable by the presence of the cross in the immediate situation – the priests were mocking Jesus while he was hanging on the cross (the first word of the sentence, as well as several previous paragraphs, are not preserved in the Gothic manuscripts).

(34)   [Mat. 27.41: 'Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and
       elders, said: (27.42) «He saved others; he cannot save himself.]
       ….   Israelis   ist,   atsteigadau   nu   af   **þamma galgin** (…)
       Israel.GEN is   come-down.IMPV.3S now from the.DAT   cross.DAT
       βασιλεὺς ἰσραήλ   ἐστιν, καταβάτω   νῦν ἀπὸ **τοῦ   σταυροῦ**
       'He is the King of Israel; let him come down now from **the cross**' (Mat. 27.42)

For certain instances that qualify as description-based maximality, I attributed the use of the article, unexpected in Gothic, to an exophoric construal, see *þizai baurg izwarai* 'your city' in (35):

(35)   [Lk. 10:10: *iþ in þoei baurge inngaggaiþ jah ni andnimaina izwis, usgaggandans
       ana fauradaurja izos qiþaiþ:* 'But into whatsoever city you enter, and they do not
       receive you, go out into its streets and say:']
       jah stubju   þana gahaftnandan unsis   us **þizai baurg izwarai** ana fotuns
       and dust   the   clinging   us.DAT of the   city   your(P) on feet
       καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν   κολληθέντα ἡμῖν   ἐκ **τῆς   πόλεως ὑμῶν** εἰς τοὺς πόδας
       unsarans afhrisjam   izwis   (Lk. 10.11)
       our   wipe-off.1P   you.P.DAT
       ἡμῶν   ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν

‘Even the dust of your city that clings to us we wipe off our feet against you’

Other examples of this type are ***þai*** *siponjos þeinai* ‘your disciples’ in Mat. 9.14 (where the Pharisees address Jesus, who is together with his disciples), ***sa*** *skatts þeins þanei habaida galagidana in fanin* ‘your money that I have kept laid up in a napkin’ in Lk. 19.20, which is preceded by *sai* ‘behold’, ***þo*** *augona* ‘the eyes’ with the external possessor *þus* ‘you.S.DAT’ in J. 9.10, ***þo*** *waurda þoei ik rodja izwis* ‘the words that I speak to you’ in J. 14.10, *þata waurd þatei hauseiþ* ‘the word that you are hearing’ in J. 14.24, ***þamma*** *reikistin gudjin* ‘the high priest’ in J. 18.22 (in the speech of a guard who scolded Jesus for the way he had spoken to the high priest).

Regarding the exophoric use, there may be differences between the West Germanic strong article and the Gothic article: while according to Ortmann (2014) ‘deictic reference uniqueness’ (i.e. the exophoric use) is marked with the strong article, Schwarz (2009:38-39) reports that Hawkins's (1978) immediate situation use, which includes exophorics, triggers the weak article. This claim is supported by the German translations of the Bible paragraph corresponding to ex. (34): both in Luther's Bible (available at https://www.bibleserver.com/bible/LUT) and in the modern translation *Neues Leben. Die Bibel*, available at https://www.bibleserver.com/bible/NLB, I found a weak article (manifested by preposition contraction): *vom Kreuz* ‘from-the$_{weak}$ cross’.[11]

Like in the case of anaphoric definites, the use of the Gothic article with exophoric definites goes beyond the exophoric use of demonstratives. It has been noticed that demonstratives are not normally used if the description guarantees uniqueness in the world or in a larger situation (see Hawkins 1978, Robinson 2005, Wolter 2006, Nowak 2019, Dayal & Jiang 2021); if they are used in such cases, they get an emotive reading, e.g. *that nose of yours* or *that Donald Trump* (see Lakoff 1974, Wolter 2006). Therefore, using *that bed of yours* in (33) above would sound derogatory, on the reasonable assumption that the paralytic does not have several beds. The same holds for (35). A demonstrative would also be infelicitous in (36) below, where the existence of the unborn child is known by the discourse participants (Elizabeth and Mary) but the child has not been mentioned before in the conversation:

(36)   [context: the pregnant Elizabeth is visited by Mary; Elizabeth is addressing Mary:]
        sai   allis, sunsei   warþ   stibna goleinais   þeinaizos in ausam meinaim,
        behold for   as-soon-as became.3S sound greeting.GEN your   in ears   my
        ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὡς   ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἀσπασμοῦ σου   εἰς τὰ ὦτά μου,
        lailaik   **þata barn**   in swigniþai in wambai   meinai. (Lk. 1.44)
        leaped   the child   in joy   in womb   my
        ἐσκίρτησεν **τὸ** **βρέφος** ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου.
        ‘For behold, the moment that the sound of your greeting reached my ears,
        the/#that/#this child leaped for joy in my womb.’

The demonstrative is infelicitous here because the referent is not perceptually salient to the hearer and it is clear from the context without necessitating the reactivation of specific

---

[11] In Luther's translation of the passage corresponding to (32), a strong form is found (no preposition contraction), *an dem Ort* ‘on the place’, but this may be a demonstrative, because the general terms *place* and *time* tend to use demonstratives in exophoric and anaphoric uses (see Hertzenberg 2015).

shared knowledge (such reactivation characterizes recognitional demonstratives, see Himmelmann 1996, Diessel 1999). The use of the article here can be explained by the presence of the referent in the immediate situation. Therefore, I included this example in the exophoric type.

In conclusion, the use of the article is almost obligatory in Gothic for context-given definites, except for cases of description-based maximality. In the latter case, as we have seen in section 4.1, the article is optional when the descriptive part comprises a situation-related definite, e.g. *siponjos is* 'his disciples'. With global uniques such as *guþ* 'god', *diabaulus* 'the devil', or *þiudangardi himine* 'the kingdom of heavens', the article does not occur irrespective of whether the referent was mentioned before or not.

5. THE USE OF *SA* WITH CONTEXT-NEW REFERENTS AND DESCRIPTION-BASED MAXIMALITY

5.1. Situation-based context-new definites

As explained in the previous section, the use of a bare NP for a Greek DP with a definite article may correlate, in principle, either with the referent being context-new or with description-based maximality, in the latter case the absence of the article being allowed even if the referent is present in the context (by previous mention or presence in the immediate situation – for the latter, see *himins* 'the sky', *airþa* 'the earth'). In the process of development of definiteness marking, we might expect that situation-based maximality should receive overt marking before description-based maximality, where the article is often redundant – it is clearly redundant with singulars; with plurals, the article can be argued to mark totality, but in a system with zero marking, for a plural/mass referent that satisfies the presupposition of existence (the only case where the issue of maximality marking arises), non-maximal interpretations may be indicated by partitive constructions (e.g. *some of the Jews*), leaving zero-marking (e.g. *Iudaieis* '(the) Jews') for the maximality interpretation. This type of gradual spread of definiteness marking was proposed by Skrzypek (2012) and Ortmann (2014), who envisage a stage where the article is extended to associative anaphora but not to description-based maximality ('semantic uniqueness' in Ortmann's terms, but see fn. 5 for some differences between the two notions). Therefore, I first address context-new definites with situation-based maximality, moving then to description-based maximality.

5.1.1. Recognitional definites

Among situation-based context-new definites, the type that has the most affinities with demonstratives is the one where the identification of the referent relies on specific shared knowledge. For instance, in (37), the existence of a particular place near Jerusalem called 'the potter's field' belongs to the shared knowledge of Jerusalem's inhabitants. The narrator relies on this knowledge for using the definite – note that the field and the potter are probably known as a pair; Greek marks both nouns with the article; in Gothic, a single article occurs on the matrix DP, in Mat. 27.7; when the same referent is mentioned in Jeremiah's prophecy, in Mat. 27.10, no article occurs (*atgebun ins und **akra kasjins*** 'gave.3P them for field potter.GEN').

(37) garuni   þan nimandans usbauhtedun us þaim **þana akr kasjins**. (Mat. 27.7)
      counsel   then taking   bought.3P from them the field potter.GEN
      συμβούλιον δὲ λαβόντες ἠγόρασαν ἐξ   αὐτῶν **τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως**
      'Then, after consultation, they bought with them **the potter's field**'

Likewise, in (38), 'the word' refers to God's word preached by Jesus:

(38) swaswe anafulhun   unsis þaiei   fram frumistin silbasiunjos jah
      as   transmitted.3P us.DAT who.MP.NOM from beginning eyewitnesses and
      καθὼς παρέδοσαν   ἡμῖν οἱ   ἀπ'ἀρχῆς   αὐτόπται καὶ
      andbahtos wesun   **þis   waurdis**   (Lk. 1.2)
      servants   were   the.GEN word.GEN
      ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι **τοῦ   λόγου**
      'just as they were transmitted to us by those who were eyewitnesses and servants of
      the word from the beginning'

Many examples of this type occur in direct speech, where they rely on specific shared
knowledge between the speaker and the addressee (a direct address to the readers can also
be noticed in (38) above). For instance, in (39), *the commandments* refer to the famous ten
commandments transmitted by Moses:

(39) **þos anabusnins**   kant: ni horinos;   ni maurþrjais; ni (...)
      the commandments know.2S not commit-adultery.SBJV.2S not kill.SBJV.2S no (...)
      τὰς ἐντολὰς   οἶδας: μὴ μοιχεύσῃς,   μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ
      'You know the commandments: do not commit adultery, do not kill (...) (Lk.18.20)

This type resembles the so-called *recognitional demonstratives* (Himmelmann 1996,
Diessel 1999), in which the referent has not been mentioned in the ongoing conversation
and is not present in the immediate situation, but was mentioned in previous conversations
or was present in a past experience shared by the speaker and the addressee or is assumed to
be familiar to the addressee:

(40) [context: out-of-the-blue, but the disturbing neighbor's dog was mentioned in
       conversations held one or several days before]
       I couldn't sleep last night. **That dog (next door)** kept me awake.
                                                              (Gundel et al. 1993:278)

I will use the term 'recognitional definites' for the definites that rely on specific shared
knowledge, illustrated in (37)-(39). Let us see an example where some of this shared
knowledge is overtly expressed, in an appositive relative:

(41) niu sa ist Iesus **sa sunus Iosefis**,   þizei weis kunþedum attan jah aiþein?
      not this is Jesus the son   Joseph.GEN whose we knew.1P   father and mother
      'Is this not Jesus, **the son of Joseph**, whose mother and father we knew?' (J. 6.42)

In Matthew, where I registered all context-new definites, there were few examples of this type – 3 with the article (out of which 2 were in direct speech) and 5 without the article (all in narration). But in the rest of the corpus, where I did not count all the instances of context-new definites with no article in Gothic, I encountered several more examples of recognitional definites with the article, especially in direct speech (John: 10 in direct speech, 3 in narration; Luke: 6 in direct speech). There are also some examples which satisfy description-based maximality but nevertheless have the article and for which a recognitional interpretation may explain the presence of the article, see (42), occurring in Jesus's speech addressed to God, where the relative clause makes reference to a past shared experience (for more examples, see section 5.2 below):

(42)   unte **þo waurda þoei atgaft mis**,   atgaf   im   (J. 17.8)
        since the words   which gave.2S me.DAT gave.1S them.DAT
        ὅτι   τὰ   ῥήματα ἃ   ἔδωκάς μοι   δέδωκα αὐτοῖς
        'For I gave them the words you gave me'

I found 4 examples of this type in Matthew and 11 in John. If we count these examples as recognitional, we arrive at a total number of 37 examples of the article marking the recognitional use. This is quite a lot, if we consider that the type mostly occurs in direct speech. It can thus be hypothesized that this type actually prefers the article in Gothic, in spite of being context-new.

Some examples of the use of the Gothic article that I included in this type involve specific knowledge which is not confined to the speaker-hearer previous interactions, see *so dulþs Iudaie* 'the feast of the Jews' in (43); as Jews do not have just one feast, this use of the article seems to highlight the fact that this is a well-known feast, the most important of all. It could be paraphrased with a recognitional demonstrative, but Greek uses the definite article:

(43)   wasuh   þan nehva pasxa,   **so**   **dulþs Iudaie**.   (J. 6.4)
        was.3S-and then near   passover.NOM the.FS.NOM feast(F) Jews.GEN
        ἦν   δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα,   **ἡ**   **ἑορτὴ τῶν ἰουδαίων**.
        'And the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was approaching.'

As is in the recognitional use the referent is not context-given, this use provides a context for reanalyzing a demonstrative into a maximality/uniqueness marker, as explained by de Mulder & Carlier (2011): the recognitional demonstrative signals that specific shared knowledge must be mobilized in order to identify the referent. The change from demonstrative to article takes place if instead of specific knowledge, the identification relies on general world knowledge, as in the associative anaphoric use.[12]

---

[12] As recognitional uses are confined to distal demonstratives in systems that do not have forms unmarked for distance, the development presented by De Mulder & Carlier (2011) may also explain why it is usually *distal* forms that develop into definite articles – see e.g. Latin *ille* or Old Norse *(h)inn*.

5.1.2 Associative anaphora

For some of the new referents that are presupposed to exist and unique/maximal in a restricted situation, the preceding context, which describes the situation, provides the grounds for assuming the existence of an entity of the relevant sort – this type is called *inferable* by Prince (1981). As the existence of the entity is inferred from specific features of the context, often involving other entities, this type of definite is also known as *associative anaphora*, *indirect anaphora*, or *bridging*. For this type, there are examples with the article, but the absence of the article appears to be more frequent. In Matthew I registered 5 examples with the article and 16 without. (44) and (45) illustrate the first type; in (44), the previous text introduces a generalization about lighting a candle; this situation suggests the interior of a house. This licenses the occurrence of a definite *the house* in the following sentence. In (45), the word *daimonarjans* 'demon-possessed.MP.ACC' does not introduce demons as a discourse referent but entails the presence of evil spirits, which licenses the definite *the spirits* in the following sentence.

(44)   [Mat. 5:15 'Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bowl, but they put it on
        a lampstand'[13]]
        jah liuteiþ   allaim þaim   in **þamma garda**.   (Mat. 5.15)
        and gives-light all.DAT the.P.DAT in the.DAT house.DAT
        καὶ λάμπει   πᾶσι τοῖς   ἐν **τῇ   οἰκίᾳ**
        'and it gives light to all (who are) in **the house**'
(45)   atberun   du imma daimonarjans   managans,   jah uswarp
        brought.3P   to him   demon-possessed.MP.ACC many.MP.ACC and drove-out.3S
        προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ   δαιμονιζομένους   πολλούς: καὶ ἐξέβαλεν
        þans   ahmans   waurda.   (Mat. 8.16)
        the.MP.ACC spirits.ACC word.DAT
        τὰ   πνεύματα λόγῳ,
        'They brought to him many (who were) demon-possessed, and he drove out **the
        spirits** with a word'

An example without the article is (46), which involves the same noun *daimonareis*.

(46)   [Mat. 9.32: *atberun imma mannan baudana daimonari* 'they brought to him a
        demon-possessed dumb man']
        jah biþe   usdribans warþ **unhulþo**,   rodida   sa dumba (Mat. 9.33)
        and as-soon-as driven-out became demon   spoke.3S the dumb
        καὶ   ἐκβληθέντος   **τοῦ δαιμονίου** ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός
        'And as soon as the demon was driven out, the dumb man spoke.'

The other examples where no article was used involve the following associative relations: adversary > way (to the trial), judge, officer (Mat. 5.25), person (man) > wife (Mat. 5.31), somebody's tunic > (his) coat (Mat. 5.40), sea > waves (Mat. 8.24), tempest > wind (Mat. 8.24), sea > water (Mat. 8.32), patch of cloth > its filling (Mat. 9.16), person > ear (Mat.

---

[13] The first part of this verse is not preserved in the Gothic manuscripts.

10.27), courtyard > gateway (Mat. 26.71), disciple > master (Mat. 10.24), Speaker and Speaker's servant > (Speaker's) house (Mat. 8.6: *in garda* 'in house' = Gr. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ 'in the house'), trial > judgment seat (Mat. 27.19). One can see that the examples are not restricted to part-whole relations, which are known to take the weak article in German and no article in certain partial definiteness-marking systems discussed in Ortmann (2014). In the other examples with the article (in addition to (44)-(45)), the relations involved are: preaching in cities > crowds (Mat. 9.35, Mat. 11.7) and feast > crowd (Mat. 27.1, under a generic operator).

Examples of the article with associative anaphora are found in the rest of the corpus – 5 examples in Luke, 6 examples in John. As in this part of the corpus I had not registered all the instances of absence of the article for context-new definites, I cannot provide the total number of articleless anaphoric definites, but this number is clearly higher than the number of examples with the article: only in John, between J.6 and J.18, I registered 17 examples without the article.

5.1.3 Other cases of situation-based maximality

In the remaining examples where the computation of maximality requires a contextual restriction (in addition to the descriptive part), lack of the article is predominant: in Matthew I found 35 examples without the article and only one with the article, which is unclear – the one given in (47), for which the context does not seem to provide a link for associative anaphora.

(47) [context: Jesus comes into his own city and heals a paralyzed man]
þaruh   sumai **þize**   **bokarje**   qeþun in sis silbam (...) (Mat. 9.3)
there-and some the.GEN scribes.GEN said.3P in themselves
καὶ ἰδού τινες τῶν   γραμματέων εἶπαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς
'and some of the scribes said to themselves'

The situation that provides the domain of the maximality operator can be more or less restricted, depending on the nominal description. I include here Hawkins's (1978) larger situation uses, e.g. *alh* in (48), which refers to the temple in Jerusalem. The situation can also be hypothetical, bound by a quantifier over situations, see (49), where the modal quantification is introduced by the hortative subjunctive.

(48) jah atwairpands þaim   silubr<ein>am in **alh**   aflaiþ. (Mat. 27.5)
and throwing   the.DAT silver-coins.DAT in temple   left.3S
καὶ ῥίψας   τὰ   ἀργύρια   εἰς **τὸν ναὸν** ἀνεχώρησεν
'And he threw the money into the temple and left."
(49) [*þatei qiþa izwis in riqiza, qiþaiþ in liuhada,* 'What I tell you in the dark, speak in the daylight']
jah þatei in auso gahauseiþ, merjaiþ   ana **hrotam**. (Mat. 10.27)
and what in year hear.2P   proclaim.SBJV.2P on roofs
καὶ ὃ εἰς τὸ οὖς ἀκούετε, κηρύξατε   ἐπὶ **τῶν δωμάτων**
'and what you hear in your ear, proclaim from the roofs'

In Luke and John, where I only registered the exceptions to the bare use of context-new definites, I found 6 examples of this type with the article, which makes, for the entire corpus, a total of 7 examples. In one of them (L. 4.43 *þaim anþaraim baurgim* 'the.P.DAT other.P.DAT cities.DAT', see ex. (9) in section 3), the article may be explained by the presence of a prenominal modifier (see 5.2 below for a discussion of this point).

In table III, I summarize the use of the article with the various types of new definites with situation-based maximality, discussed in 5.1.1-5.1.3.

Table III – new definites (Greek THE) with situation-based maximality, in Matthew
(in noun phrases with overt N)

	+ART	-ART
recognitional	3	5
associative anaphora	5	16
other cases	1	37
total	9 (13.4%)	58 (86.6%)

5.2 Definites with description-based maximality and generics

As explained in section 1, I include here all cases where no further restriction must be added to the descriptive part of the NP in order to establish the domain on which maximality is computed: if the NP contains the noun alone, it must be unique in the world (for count singulars), e.g. *the sun*, *(the) light*, or the NP refers to the totality of entities satisfying the nominal property (for plurals) or the entire amount of matter (for mass nouns); if the NP is complex, the relevant restrictions may occur inside adnominal constituents, such as genitives (*the center of the city*), relative clauses (*the film I saw last night*), etc. Generics also belong to this type, but given that some languages, such as English, treat them differently in terms of determiner use (see the generic bare plural and mass nouns), I counted them separately. I included in this section, as a separate category, definites that are maximal in a situation bound by a universal/generic quantifier over situations, possibly involving modality, see (50)-(51):

(50) jabai nu   bairais   **aibr**   þein du hunslastada (...)   (Mat. 5.23)
     if   therefore bring.SBJV.2S gift   your to altar
     ἐὰν οὖν   προσφέρῃς **τὸ δῶρόν σου** ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον
     'Therefore, if you bring your gift to the altar (...)'

(51) sijaiþ~þan   **waurd izwar**: ja, ja; ne, ne   (Mat. 5.32)
     be.SBJV.3S-then word   your   yes yes no no
     ἔστω δὲ   **ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν** ναὶ ναί, οὒ οὔ
     'Your word should be: yes, yes, no no'

As can be seen in Table IV, Gothic normally omits the article with description-based maximality and generics, but there are a few exceptions, which will be discussed later in this section. Some of the examples are polydefinites in Greek, i.e. constructions where a further article appears in front of one or more postnominal modifiers. In this case, Gothic normally uses an article before the modifier, but omits the DP-initial article (see section 6 below for discussion). This type is registered in the rightmost column of the table. As the first article is probably to be considered the determiner of the overall DP, these examples

can be counted as -ART. Furthermore, there are a few examples where, in spite of description-based maximality, Greek does not use THE. Likewise, Greek can omit THE with generics, although in the language of the Gospels, the use of the article predominates. These situations are presented on the penultimate two rows of the table.

Table IV – definites with description-based maximality in Matthew
(in noun phrases with overt N)

	+ART	-ART	NP–Art–XP
description-based maximality, non-generic (Greek THE)	8	192	22
maximal in a sit. bound by a universal (Greek THE)	1	7	0
generic (Greek THE)	1	57	0
total (percentage – excluding polydefinites)	10 (3.8%)	256 (96.2%)	22
total including polydefinites	**10(3.5%)**	**278 (96.5%)**	
description-based max. where Greek also lacks THE	0	4	0
generic where Greek also lacks THE	0	8	0
overall total	10(3.3%)	290(96.7%)	

Some examples illustrating the normal situation in Gothic, i.e. absence of the article, are given in (52)-(54); in (52), the definite is non-specific, due to the possessive it contains, which is bound by an existential. In (53), both the embedded genitive and the overall DP are globally unique. Example (54) illustrates generic plurals.

(52) jah hvazuh saei hauseiþ waurda meina jah ni taujiþ þo,
and everyone who hears words my and not does them
καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτοὺς
galeikoda mann dwalamma, saei gatimrida **razn sein** ana malmin.
resembles man.DAT foolish.DAT who built house 3REFL.POSS on sand
ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ μωρῷ, ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν **αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν** ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον
'and everyone who hears my words and does not put them into practice is like a foolish man who built **his house** on sand' (Mat. 7.26)

(53) in þiudangardjai himine (Mat. 5.20)
in kingdom skies.GEN
εἰς **τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν**
'into the kingdom of heaven (of the skies)'

(54) **fauhons** grobos aigun jah **fuglos himinis** sitlans (...) (Mat. 8.20)
foxes holes have.3P and birds sky.GEN nests
αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ **τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ** κατασκηνώσεις (...)
'foxes have holes and the birds of the sky have nests (...)'

The four non-generic examples where Greek also omitted the article involve coordination[14] (ὡς ἐν **οὐρανῷ** καὶ ἐπὶ **γῆς** 'as in sky also on earth') or ordinals (ἀπὸ ἕκτης ὥρας 'from sixth hour', ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης 'until hour ninth').

---

[14] Definite article omission in coordination is attested in some modern languages – English, French, Italian – see Heycock & Zamparelli (2003).

Let us now examine the exceptions to the absence of article for description-based maximality. For a better understanding of the facts, I also registered the exceptions in Luke and John. I identified the following factors that may explain the presence of the article:

(i) Prenominal modifiers (adjectives, participles, adverbials, PPs) are often found with the article (as also noticed by Streitberg 1920:189), with the exception of prenominal possessives, which never occur with the article in this type of definites:

(55) anakumbei   ana **þamma aftumistin stada** (Lk. 14.10)
sit-down.IMPV.2S on the   lowest   place
'Sit down on the lowest place!'

(56) swa   all bagme   godaize   akrana goda   gataujiþ, iþ **sa ubila**
thus all trees.GEN good.P.GEN fruits good.NP.ACC makes   but the   bad
οὕτως πᾶν δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς   ποιεῖ,   τὸ δὲ σαπρὸν
bagms akrana ubila   gataujiþ   (Mat. 7.17)
tree   fruits bad.NP.ACC makes
δένδρον καρποὺς πονηροὺς   ποιεῖ
'Likewise, every good tree bears good fruit, but the bad tree bears bad fruit.'

(57) in **þos   bisunjane haimos jah weihsa**   (Lk. 9.12)
in the.FP.ACC around   villages and rural-areas
εἰς τὰς   κύκλω   κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς
'into the surrounding villages and countryside'

(58) wandjands sik   du **þizai afarlaistjandein sis   managein** qaþ (Lk. 7.9)
turning   himself to the   following   himself.DAT crowd   said.3S
στραφεὶς   **τῷ   ἀκολουθοῦντι αὐτῷ   ὄχλῳ**   εἶπεν
'turning to the crowd following him, he said'

However, situations of prenominal adjectives without the article, translating Greek definites, can be found, see (59):

(59) a. inngaggaiþ þairh **aggwu   daur**   (Mat. 7.13)
enter.IMPV.2P through narrow   gate
εἰσέλθετε   διὰ   **τῆς στενῆς πύλης**
'Enter through the narrow gate.'
b. bi **taihswon   þeina kinnu**   (Mat. 5.39)
on right   your cheek
εἰς **τὴν δεξιὰν   σιαγόνα** [σου]
'on your right cheek'
c. gaqemun **auhumistans gudjans** jah Fareisaieis du   Peilatau (Mat. 27.62)
came.3P   highest   priests   and Pharisees   to   Pilate
συνήχθησαν **οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς**   καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι πρὸς Πιλᾶτον
'The high priests and Pharisees came to Pilate.'

The presence of the article is probably required if the prenominal modifier is a finite relative clause, as in (60); it is likely that this word order, unusual for Germanic, is due to the Greek original, and an overt article signals the beginning of the DP:

(60) ei   gakunnais **þize bi þoei galaisiþs is   waurde** [a]staþ.
      so-that know.SBJV.2S the.GEN about which learned are.2S words.GEN certainty
      ἵνα   ἐπιγνῷς   **περὶ ὧν   κατηχήθης   λόγων** τὴν ἀσφάλειαν
      'so that you may know the certainty of the things you have been taught' (Lk. 1.4)

(ii) The description resorts to specific shared knowledge. In this case, the article can have a recognitional interpretation (see 5.1.1 above). For instance, in (61), the article signals the fact that a specific epistemic model is required for the interpretation of the description: it is only for the Jewish tradition that Jews are 'the sons of the kingdom'.

(61) iþ **þai sunjus þiudangardjos** uswairpanda   in riqis   þata hindumisto
      and the sons   kingdom.GEN   are-thrown-out in darkness the outermost
         οἱ δὲ **υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας** ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον
      'but the sons of the kingdom will be thrown out into the outermost darkness'
                                                                    (Mat.8.12)

Certain examples with prenominal modifiers can also be included in this type. For instance, in (62), the use of the description 'holy city' to refer to Jerusalem is specific to the epistemic model of the Jewish tradition. The same holds for the expression 'the great king' referring to God in (63).

(62) in þo weihon baurg   (Mat. 27.53)
      in the holy   city
(63) nih bi Iairusaulwmai, unte baurgs ist **þis   mikilins þiudanis** (Mat. 5.35)
      nor by Jerusalem   for city   is the.GEN great.GEN king.GEN
      '[Do not swear at all, neither by....] nor by Jerusalem; for it is the city of **the great king**'

Examples of this type may occur in direct speech, in which case the article may be used to highlight specific shared knowledge of the speaker and hearer about the referent – see (64), where Jesus addresses God:

(64) jah nu hauhei   mik, þu atta,   at þus silbin **þamma wulþau   þanei**
      and now glorify.IMPV.2S me you father at you self   the.DAT glory.DAT which.ACC
      καὶ νῦν δόξασόν   με σύ, πάτερ, παρὰ σεαυτῷ **τῇ   δόξῃ   ῇ̄**
      habaida at þus, faurþizei sa fairhvus wesi.   (J. 17.5)
      had.1S   at you before   the world   was.SBJV.3S
      εἶχον   πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον   εἶναι   παρὰ σοί.
      'and now, Father, glorify me with Thee with the glory which I had with Thee before the world existed'

(iii) The referent is present in the immediate situation, in which case the article can have an exophoric interpretation. A test for this interpretation is the possibility of a paraphrase with *this* or *that*. For instance, in (65), the use of the article for 'the days of the Son of Man' may serve to stress the fact that these days belong to the present (note that the phrase occurs in direct speech, where most exophoric examples are found):

(65) qaþ þan du siponjam: aþþan qimand   dagos, þan gairneiþ   ainana
said than to disciples   but   come.3P   days, when wish.2P   one
εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς   ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ὅτε ἐπιθυμήσετε μίαν
þize   dage   sunaus mans   gasaihvan jah ni gasaihviþ. (Lk. 17.22)
the.GEN days.GEN son.GEN man.GEN   see.INF and not see.2P
τῶν   ἡμερῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἰδεῖν   καὶ οὐκ ὄψεσθε
'He said to the disciples: «But days will come when you will long to see one of **the
days of the Son of man**, and you will not see (it).»'

Likewise, in (66) the article might be used to highlight the presence of the grass of the field
in the immediate situation, an interpretation which is supported by the adverb 'today' which
occurs in the postnominal participial clause:

(66) jah þande **þata   hawi haiþjos himma daga   wisando   jah**
and if   the.NS.ACC grass field.GEN this.DAT day.DAT being.NS.ACC and
gistradagis in auhn galagiþ   guþ swa wasjiþ, (...)   (Mat. 6.30)
tomorrow in oven thrown.NS.ACC God so   clothes
 Now if that is the way God clothes the grass of the field, which is here today and
tomorrow is thrown into an oven, (...)'

The existence of a proximal demonstrative inside the description supports an exophoric
interpretation of the overall DP, see (67) (in this example, the determiner *þis* before the
noun *kunjis* was treated as a demonstrative, because the DP translates a Greek phrase with a
postnominal proximal demonstrative, *τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης* 'the.GEN generation.GEN this.GEN'):

(67) hve   nu galeiko **þans mans   þis   kunjis** (...) ?   (Lk. 7.31)
what.INST now liken.1S the people   this.GEN generation.GEN
τίνι   οὖν ὁμοιώσω **τοὺς ἀνθρώπους   τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης** (...);
'To what can I compare the people of this generation (...)?'

This interpretation may explain why the words for 'world', *manaseþs* and *fairhvus* (both
translating the Greek *κόσμος*), usually occur with the article, in spite of their global
uniqueness. In the New Testament theology, the *world* is the realm of the everyday life and
of perception and is opposed to heaven and to the afterlife, or, as the totality of the living
people, is opposed to the divine beings. The article may be used to mark this 'here and
now' that characterizes the world – see e.g. (68), which occurs in Jesus's speech.

(68) nauh leitil, jah **so manaseiþs** mik ni þanaseiþs   saihviþ   (J. 14.19)
still little and the world   me not from-then-on sees
ἔτι μικρὸν καὶ **ὁ κόσμος**   με οὐκέτι   θεωρεῖ
'In a little while, the world will no longer see me'

The world for the 'inhabited world/mankind', *midjungards*, translating the Greek
οἰκουμένη, also occurs with the article in the place where the devil shows Jesus all the
kingdoms of the world (Lk. 4.5). In the other place where it occurs, it does not have the
article but the context is not religious – it is about Augustus's decree that a census should
be taken throughout the entire population of the Roman Empire (Lk. 2.1).

(iv) Regarding licensing of the article by the presence of a postnominal finite relative clause, which would resemble the use of the strong articles of West Germanic, I could not find compelling evidence in my corpus. There are three examples in Luke where no other reason can be assumed for the presence of the article (i.e., (i)-(iii) above do not apply) – (69) is one of these examples. In six other cases, the presence of the article may be justified by a recognitional interpretation, like, for instance, in (64) above. On the other hand, there are many examples of definites with restrictive relative clauses that do not have the article – I counted 6 in Mat. and 10 in John, see e.g. (70). This shows that the presence of a restrictive relative clause does not require the article. The Gothic article differs, in this respect, from the strong article of modern West Germanic varieties.

(69) jah usstandans uskusun   imma ut us baurg jah brahtedun ina und auhmisto
      and standing-up drove-out.3P him out from city and brought.3P him to top
      þis   fairgunjis   ana þammei so baurgs ize gatimrida was (...) (Lk. 4.29)
      the.GEN mountain.GEN on which the city   their built   was
      'And they stood up and drove him out of the city and brought him to the top of **the mountain on which the city was built**'
(70) sa   ist **hlaifs saei us himina atstaig**   (J. 6.58)
      this is   bread   which from heaven descended.3S
      οὗτός ἐστιν **ὁ ἄρτος ὁ   ἐξ   οὐρανοῦ καταβάς**
      'This is **the bread that came down from heaven**.'

Table V shows the numbers of examples of description-based maximality with the article that belong to each of the types in (i)-(iv) above and of those that do not fit in any of these patterns, in Matthew, Luke and John.

Table V – description-based maximality and generics with ART
in Matthew, Luke and John (in noun phrases with overt N)

(i) prenominal modifiers		19
(ii) possibly recognitional	with prenominal modifiers: 2	15
	others: 13	
(iii) possibly exophoric	(other than with *world*): 7	50
	with worlds for *world*: 43	
(iv) with restrictive relatives (not covered by (i)-(iii) above)		3
others		8

Among the 8 examples that do not fit into the types listed above, two contain the phrase *in þamma afardaga* 'the day after', lit. 'in the.DAT after-day.DAT'. If *afar* 'after' is analyzed as a prenominal modifier, these examples will be included in type (i). In two examples, the same noun or a noun with a similar meaning occurs in the preceding text, which might have triggered an anaphoric use of the article, although the examples are not really anaphoric. For one of them, see (71), there is another possible explanation: the Greek string ὁ δὲ δοῦλος 'the but slave' may have been understood as containing the demonstrative ὅδε, which explains the use of the determiner *sah*, formed by reinforcing *sa* with -*h*, which is in principle restricted to the demonstrative use.

(71) [J. 8.34 *andhof im Iesus: amen amen, qiþa izwis þatei hvazuh saei taujiþ frawaurht,*
       skalks ist frawaurhtai 'Jesus answered them, "Amen, amen, I say to you, whoever
       commits sin is the slave of sin."]
       sah þan **skalks** ni wisiþ   in garda   du aiwa,   sunus wisiþ   du aiwa
       the-*h* then slave not remains in house   forever   son   remains forever
       ὁ   δὲ   **δοῦλος** οὐ μένει   ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα: ὁ υἱὸς μένει   εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα
       'But the slave does not remain in the house forever. The son does' (J. 8.35)

          In another example, the article occurs with a generically used 'body' (*þata leik*),
which is contrasted to the spirit (*ahma*), which does not take the article (J. 6.63). Maybe
this occurrence of the article belongs to the exophoric type, indicating that the corporal
nature (Greek has ἡ σάρξ '(the) flesh') belongs to the realm of the immediately perceivable.
          In the sixth example, *nibai managizo wairþiþ izwaraizos garaihteins þau **þize**
bokarje jah Fareisaie* 'unless your righteousness exceeds that of **the scribes and
Pharisees**' (Mat. 5.20), the definite plurals might have been understood as referring to the
specific scribes and Pharisees the audience was acquainted to, being a recognitional. The
remaining two examples have particular referents, which might have been treated as
context-given (Mat. 27.58: *sah atgaggands du Peilatau baþ **þis leikis Iesuis*** 'He (Joseph of
Arimathea), going to Pilate, asked for **Jesus's corpse**'; J. 9.21: *hvas uslauk imma **þo
augona** weis ni witum* 'who opened his eyes (lit. him **the eyes**) we do not know').
          Summarizing, for context-new definites, description-based maximality and generics,
the (sporadic) presence of the article may have a syntactic explanation, the overt realization
of a definite D in the presence of a prenominal modifier. Otherwise, the occurrences of the
article may be analyzed as due to an exophoric or a recognitional interpretation.

5.3 Weak definites

          Five of the examples of context-new definites in the Greek text of Matthew can be
analyzed as 'weak definites' in the sense of Carlson & Sussman (2005): the referent is new
and there is no clear situation where it can be identified as unique/maximal, having an
interpretation close to an indefinite. Weak definites are restricted to entities involved in
stereotypical activities, e.g. *go to the hospital, read the newspaper, go to the beach, listen
to the radio* (see Aguilar-Guevara 2014 for a detailed description). The examples I
identified as weak definites in Matthew involve the activities of building (*to build on (the)
rock/sand*, *to hew out (a grave) in the rock*) and navigation (*to get on a ship/boat*). As
expected given the fact that the referent is new and non-specific, Gothic does not use the
article in these examples, see e.g. (72):

(72) galeiko   ina   waira frodamma, saei gatimrida   razn sein   **ana staina**
      liken.1S   him   man.DAT wise   who built   house 3.POSS.REFL on stone
      ὁμοιώσω αὐτὸν ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν **ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν**
      'I will liken him to a wise man, who built his house **on the rock**'   (Mat. 7.24)

          The total numbers of article-marked and articleless phrases corresponding to the
Greek types of definites discussed in 5.1-5.3 are presented in Table VI.

Table VI: context-new definites and definites with description-based maximality in Matthew

	+ART	-ART
number	19	340
percentage	5.29 %	94.71 %

6. THE WAYS OF TRANSLATING GREEK POLYDEFINITES

Greek has structures of the type THE-NP-THE-XP. In Modern Greek, the modifier can also be prenominal and the definite can be repeated more than once – hence the terms *polydefiniteness* and *polydefinites* (proposed by Lekakou & Szendröi 2012; for a detailed treatment of the phenomenon, see Alexiadou 2014). In my corpus I only found the definite-marked modifier *postnominally* and only one example had more than two articles. Gothic usually has the article only before the second member (see last column of Table IV above), see examples (73), which show various types of modifiers (PPs, adjectives, participles, finite relative clauses).

(73) a. atta   izwar **sa** ufar   himinam = **ὁ** πατὴρ ὑμῶν **ὁ** οὐράνιος   (Mat. 6.26)
        father your the above skies   the father your the celestial
     b. hlaif unsarana **þana** sinteinan = **τὸν** ἄρτον ἡμῶν **τὸν** ἐπιούσιον (Mat. 6.11)
         bread our   the   daily   the bread our   the daily
     c. wigs **sa** brigganda in fralustai = **ἡ** ὁδὸς **ἡ** ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν (M.7.13)
        road the bringing   in destruction the road the leading   to the destruction
     d. attins   meinis **þis** saei in himinam ist = **τοῦ** πατρός μου **τοῦ** ἐν οὐρανοῖς
        father.GEN my   the who in skies   is the.GEN father my the in skies (M. 10.33)

In Matthew I never found an article before the first member, but I found 4 examples with two articles in the rest of the corpus: three in Luke, where the definite is anaphoric (in one of them, it is discourse-deictic), and one in John, which has an anaphoric link at the kind-level – the antecedent exemplifies the kind denoted by the DP, see (74)[15] (in this example we can also see a Greek polydefinite translated without the article in the first member, because it has no anaphoric link):

(74) [J. 6.26: *andhof im Iesus jah qaþ: amen amen qiþa izwis, sokeiþ mik, ni þatei sehvuþ taiknins jah fauratanja, ak þatei matideduþ þize hlaibe jah sadai waurþuþ* 'Jesus answered them: «Very truly I tell you, you are looking for me, not because you saw the signs I performed but because you ate the loaves and had your fill.» ']
     waurkjaiþ   ni **þana mat þana fralusanan**, ak   mat   þana wisandan
     work.SBJV.2P not the   food the   perished   but food   the   being
     ἐργάζεσθε   μὴ **τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην** ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν

---

[15] The article here may also be analyzed as exophoric, occcuring in a contrast between corporal/visible and spiritual, see the discussions in section 5.2 above about *fairþus* and *manaseþs* 'world' and about *þata leik* 'the body' vs. *ahma* 'the spirit' in the paragraph below the ex. (71).

du libainai aiweinon   (J. 6.27)
to life   eternal
εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον
'Do not work for the food that perishes, but for the food that endures to eternal life'

There are also situations when Gothic uses no article at all. In most of the examples the postnominal modifier is a possessive (19 out of 23). As I have not found the article before a possessive, we can hypothesize that the use of the article with a postnominal possessive was not grammatical in Gothic. Moreover, as I will show below, the Greek pattern might represent a different structure in the case of possessives.

There are also 4 examples where the Gothic article only occurs before the first member, see (75). The first article is explained by the fact that the definite is anaphoric or exophoric (in (75), it is an instance of donkey anaphora). As for the absence of the second article, in two examples it is due to the fact that the postnominal modifier is a possessive (see (75)). In the other two, the modifier is a participial or adjective phrase in Greek but a finite relative clause in Gothic, which appears to facilitate the absence of the second article (we will come back later to this issue).

(75)   jabai mis   hvas   andbahtjai, mik   laistjai: jah þarei im ik,
       if   me.DAT somebody.NOM serves   me.DAT follows.SBJV and where am I
       ἐὰν ἐμοί   τις   διακονῇ,   ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθείτω, καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ
       þaruh   **sa andbahts meins** wisan habaiþ.   (J. 12.26)
       there-and the servant   my   be.INF has
       ἐκεῖ καὶ **ὁ   διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς** ἔσται
       'If somebody serves me, he should follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be.'

In one example, in which the DP is a vocative, the second article is rendered by the 2ⁿᵈ person singular pronoun:

(76)   atta   unsar **þu** in himinam = πάτερ   ἡμῶν **ὁ** ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Mat. 6.9)
       father our   you in skies   father.VOC our   the in the skies

The example with three definite articles in Greek conforms to the Gothic pattern where only the article before the modifier is translated; we thus find two articles in Gothic:

(77)   in fon   **þata** aiweino **þata** manwido   unhulþin   jah aggilum   is
       in fire   the eternal the prepared   devil.DAT   and angels.DAT his
       εἰς **τὸ** πῦρ **τὸ** αἰώνιον **τὸ** ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ
       'into the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels'   (Mat. 25.41)

The number of examples that follow each of these patterns is presented in Table VII (the pattern -ART NP +ART XP +ART YP was included in the type -ART NP +ART XP).

Table VII – the use of the article for Greek polydefinites, in Matthew, Luke, and John

	normal cases	XP=possessive	XP= finite relative	total
-ART NP +ART XP	55	0	1	56
-ART NP -ART XP	3	19	1	23
+ART NP +ART XP	4 (anaphoric)	0	0	4
+ART NP -ART XP	0	2 (1 anaphoric, 1 exophoric)	2 (anaphoric)	4
-ART *you* XP	1	0	0	1
total -ART XP	3	22	3	28
total +ART XP	59	0	1	60

The use of the first article follows the generalizations presented in sections 4-5: it occurs in anaphoric and exophoric uses. Most examples have description-based maximality (the rich descriptive material, which includes the XP, is sufficient for identifying the referent), which explains the predominance of omission of the first article (81 examples vs. 8). As for the second article, its presence can be accounted for by the generalizations presented so far if the structure involves 'close apposition', as proposed for Greek polydefinites by Lekakou & Szendrői (2012). Close appositions are definite DPs that are not separated by comma and are interpreted as intersective (restrictive) modifiers: for example, in *your friend the doctor*, there is no unique doctor in the context, but there is a unique individual that is both the addressee's friend and a doctor (see also Ackema & Neeleman 2018). If the postnominal modifier is a definite DP in close apposition, the presence of the article follows from the obligatory overt realization of definite D in DPs without an overt N, discussed in section 3.

This account implies that in the cases where no article occurs before the modifier, the construction was not translated by a close apposition structure. We have seen that this mostly happens with possessives (21 out of 27 ex., see Table VI). It is likely that in this case the Greek pattern did not always represent a close apposition structure. Note that the postnominal possessives preceded by the article in Greek can express argumental relations, e.g. *ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ* 'my judgment' (lit. 'the judgment the my') (J. 8.16), where the possessive is the agent of the judgment, or *τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ* 'my love' (J. 15.9), where the possessive is the experiencer. It is reasonable to assume that such possessives are part of the NP, rather than DPs adjoined to another DP, and the article represents a linker rather than a definite D. This proposal is supported by the fact that all instances of Greek postnominal agreeing possessors in my corpus are preceded by the definite article (without the article only genitive enclitic pronominal possessors are found). If postnominal possessors preceded by the article do not instantiate the close apposition pattern, the absence of the article in Gothic is expected.

In three of the remaining 6 examples, Gothic uses a finite relative clause to translate a PP, a participial and an adjectival phrase, respectively, so the structure is changed anyway. It is possible that the Greek construction was interpreted as a relativization structure (which is, in fact, the analysis of Modern Greek polydefinites according to Alexiadou and Wilder 1998, Campos and Stavrou 2004, Alexiadou, 2014), and the relative pronoun, which consists of forms of the paradigm of *sa* + a morpheme -*ei*, might have been seen as a counterpart of the Greek pre-modifier article. Note that the finite relative does not exclude the article – there is an example in my corpus where a finite relative, which translates a Greek PP, is preceded by the article, see (73)d above.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

The hypothesis that the Gothic article is a marker of context-given definites is by and large confirmed by my corpus study. Although some exceptions remain, the percentage of the article for anaphoric definites is very high, 95% if we treat certain examples as instances of situation-based maximality. The article is also obligatory for exophoric definites. The anaphoric use of the determiner *sa* goes beyond the anaphoric use of demonstratives, occurring with repeated mentions of well-established discourse referents, where a demonstrative would not be felicitous. The article also occurs as a marker of definiteness in general in DPs without an overt N. Prenominal modification by participials, relatives and certain adjectives also seems to license the presence of the article independently of context-givenness. Moreover, the article occurs for syntactic reasons in DPs with postnominal demonstratives. This shows that Gothic already has a definite D, but in DPs with overt nouns, the overtly realized D is limited to a sub-type of definites. Context-new definites normally do not take the article. Moreover, definites with description-based maximality normally lack the article, even if they are context-given – but the article occasionally does appear in cases of context-givenness.

Among context-new definites, the article may be used to signal that the identification of the referent relies on specific shared knowledge, particular to a certain community or to the discourse participants. This use resembles the recognitional use of demonstratives (see Himmelmann 1996), but, like for the anaphoric and exophoric cases, it should not be concluded that the determiner *sa* in these occurrences is actually a demonstrative: it is used to translate the Greek definite article and it also occurs in some cases of description-based maximality, in which the use of a demonstrative does not seem appropriate: for instance, in (61) above, reproduced in (78), a demonstrative might induce a non-maximality interpretation, in which some 'sons of the kingdom' are contrasted with others. If my analysis is correct, the article here signals the fact that a specific epistemic model (here, the Jewish tradition) is required for the interpretation of the description.

(78) iþ **þai sunjus þiudangardjos** uswairpanda in riqis þata hindumisto
and the sons kingdom.GEN are-thrown-out in darkness the outermost
οἱ δὲ **υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας** ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον
'but the sons of the kingdom will be thrown out into the outermost darkness'

(Mat.8.12)

In associative anaphora, the article does appear sometimes, but examples without the article are more numerous. If the definite is maximal in a contextually restricted situation but has no associative-anaphoric link, the absence of the article predominates. This shows that the article is not used to signal situation-based maximality as opposed to description-based maximality.

The system revealed by my corpus study raises some interesting theoretical issues that cannot be treated in the space of this article. I will just put forth some suggestions:

(i) *The difference between the article in a 'partial-article' system such as the Gothic one and a demonstrative*. We have seen that the main uses of the article – anaphoric, exophoric, recognitional – are also found with demonstratives; even in associative anaphora demonstratives do sometimes appear (see Apothéloz & Reichler-Béguelin 1999, Wolter 2006). However, the use of the article goes beyond that of demonstratives, extending to

contexts where demonstratives would not be felicitous. What exactly is the reason why demonstratives are excluded from these uses? In other words, what is the difference between an anaphoric definite article and an anaphoric demonstrative, or between a recognitional definite article and a recognitional demonstrative? Demonstratives appear to involve some contrast, which several researchers have described as an anti-uniqueness presupposition – the demonstrative would require that there be other entities satisfying the NP description (Robinson 2005, Nowak 2021, Dayal & Jiang 2021, Dayal 2024). This proposal has been shown to be too strong (Blumberg 2020, Ahn 2022, see also the examples of demonstratives with superlatives in Giurgea 2024a). A possible solution is to describe the difference between demonstratives and the definite article at the level of the situation argument, which plays the role of contextual domain restrictions. This line of research was opened by Wolter (2006) and further developed in Giurgea (2024b), who proposes that demonstratives introduce an additional situation, where maximality is computed, characterized as being a sub-situation of the situation saturated by D and as being accessible to the hearer via a cognitive mechanism. The existence of a more complex structure is what rules out demonstratives in cases where the definite would be sufficient for identifying the referent, along the lines proposed by Blumberg (2020), who builds on Schlenker's (2005) 'Minimize Restrictors!' principle. Under this approach, the Gothic-type article would differ from demonstratives by the absence of this sub-situation layer.

(ii) *The consequences of this type of article system for the analysis of definiteness in articleless languages*. In the current semantic literature there is a debate on whether bare nominals in articleless languages are ambiguous between definite and indefinite readings (see Dayal 2004, Geist 2010) or are rather underspecified, in the sense that the presuppositions of existence and maximality characteristic of the definite article are not associated to a determiner in the language and, therefore, noun phrases with mere existential import are not blocked in contexts of presupposition + maximality (see Heim 2011, Šimík & Demian 2020, Srinivas 2022). While I find the underspecification analysis preferable on theoretical grounds, I believe that the existence of an intermediate 'anaphoric' or rather context-given stage in the development of the article sheds some new light on what is ambiguous in articleless languages. I would contend that while the issue of maximality may be left unspecified in the final representation of a sentence, the possible anaphoric links must be decided upon. For instance, take (79)-(80) in an articleless language – I use English words, because I do not want to refer to a language in particular and I'm setting aside the specific morpho-syntactic issues that may arise in a language or another. In (79), whether the speaker has one or more friends, for the singular, or whether the speaker invited all his/her friends, are arguably left open. The addressee does not need to decide on these issues in order to get a complete interpretation of the sentence. In (80), on the other hand, on the assumption that John is a boy, *boy* in the second sentence may refer to John (the *anaphoric* interpretation) or may introduce a new discourse referent – for instance, I want to ask John what happens at his school, because a boy was sick yesterday. I consider that the addressee must decide between these two possibilities in order to achieve a complete and adequate interpretation of the second sentence.

(79)   *I invited **friend/friends**.*
(80)   *I wanted to talk to John. Yesterday, **boy** was sick.*

The existence of such a requirement comes as a natural consequence in a dynamic semantic framework, such as DRT (Kamp 1981, Kamp & Reyle 1993). Now, the fact that in the first stage of definite article development the article marks context-givenness, disambiguating anaphoric relations, supports the idea that this need of disambiguation exists in articleless languages. Whether this ambiguity should be posited in the structure or not is a complex issue that largely depends on theoretical assumptions about the syntax-semantic interface (regarding the use of covert structure motivated only by semantic considerations). Schwarz (2009) proposes an index as a covert argument of D for anaphoric definites (an idea adopted in various studies, see Simonenko 2014, Hanink 2017, 2021, Jenks 2018). An alternative is to use situations, which are independently assumed for the contextual domain restrictions and the modal and temporal interpretation of nominal descriptions (see Srinivas 2022, Simonenko 2023; for the use of situations for donkey anaphora, see Elbourne 2013, 2016). If the situation with respect to which the nominal description is evaluated is restricted to the one described in the previous sentence, we will obtain an anaphoric interpretation in examples such as (80). But note that in Elbourne's framework, as well as in Schwarz (2009), situations are represented in syntax, as arguments of D, albeit covert. The consequence for articleless languages is that ambiguity and underspecification are combined: the determiner itself or the operator that plays its role are underspecified, but there are covert elements that distinguish between anaphoric and non-anaphoric readings – either indices, or situations.

(iii) Finally, regarding *the analysis of anaphoric definites as containing a covert index argument*: the type of system illustrated by Gothic, which is, of course, analyzable in this way, indicates that indices are not restricted to discourse referents already introduced by the previous text and variables bound by other DPs in the sentence, but can also be set to refer to salient entities in the extralinguistic context, as shown by the exophoric use of the article. For the recognitional use of the article, a weaker condition of *familiarity* of the referent (as opposed to salience or activation) can be adopted (see Gundel et al. 1993).

REFERENCES

Ackema, P., A. Neeleman, 2018, *Features of Person. From the Inventory of Persons to Their Morphological Realization*, Cambridge, MA, London, MIT Press.

Aebischer, P., 1948, "Contribution à la protohistoire des articles *ille* et *ipse* dans les langues romanes", *Cultura neolatina* 8, 181–203.

Ahn, D., 2022, "Indirectly direct: An account of demonstratives and pointing", *Linguistics and Philosophy* 45, 1345–1393.

Alexiadou, A., 2014, *Multiple Determiners and the Structure of DPs*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Alexiadou, A., C. Wilder, 1998, "Adjectival modification and multiple determiners", in: A. Alexiadou, C. Wilder (eds.), *Possessors, predicates and movement in the DP*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 303–332.

Apothéloz, D., M.-J. Reichler-Béguelin, 1999, "Interpretations and functions of demonstrative NPs in indirect anaphora", *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 3, 363-397.

Arkoh, R., L. Matthewson, 2013, "A familiar definite article in Akan", *Lingua* 123, 1–30.

Behaghel, O., 1923, *Deutsche Syntax. I: Die Wortklassen und Wortformen ; A: Nomen, Pronomen*, Heidelberg, Winter.

Bernhardt, E., 1874, *Der Artikel im Gotischen*, Erfurt, Gerhardt & Schreiber.

Bernstein, J., F. Ordóñez, F. Roca, 2021, "Emphatic elements and the development of definite articles: evidence for a layered DP in Early Romance", *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 5, Article 22: 1-32, https://doi.org/10.18148/hs/2021.v5i16-25.63.

Blumberg, K., 2020, "Demonstratives, definite descriptions and non-redundancy", *Philosophical Studies* 177, 39–64.

Buren, A. D., 2010, "The development of the Amharic definite article and an Indonesian parallel", *Journal of Semitic Studies* 55, 1, 103–114.

Campos, H., M. Stavrou, 2004, "Polydefinites in Greek and Aromanian", in: O. Tomic (ed.), *Balkan syntax and semantics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 137–173.

Comrie, B., 1997, "Pragmatic Binding: Demonstratives as Anaphors in Dutch", *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 50-61, the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform, https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v23i1.1281

Cornish, F., 1999, *Anaphora, discourse and understanding. Evidence from English and French*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Cornish, F., 2010, "Anaphora: Text-based or discourse-dependent? Functionalist vs. formalist accounts", *Functions of Language* 17, 207–241.

Crisma, P., 2011, "The emergence of the definite article in English", in: P. Sleeman, H. Perridon (eds.), *The Noun Phrase in Romance and Germanic. Structure, variation, and change*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 175–192.

Dayal, V., 2004, "Number marking and (in)definiteness in kind terms", *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 393–450.

Dayal, V., 2024, "Demonstratives to Definites: What Changes and What Stays the Same", handout of a talk given at Randolf Quirk Fellow Workshop, Queen Mary University of London, May 20.

De Mulder, W., A. Carlier, 2011, "Definite Articles", in: H. Bernd, N. Heiko (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford, DOI: 0.1093/oxfordhb/9780199586783.013.0032

Diessel, H., 1999, *Demonstratives. Form, function and grammaticalization*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Douse, T., 1886, *An Introduction, Phonological, Morphological, Syntactic, to the Gothic of Ulfilas*, London, Taylor & Francis.

Ebert, K., 1971, *Referenz, Sprechsituation und die bestimmten Artikel in einem Nordfriesischen Dialekt (Fering)*, doctoral dissertation, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel.

Elbourne, P., 2005, *Situations and Individuals*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Elbourne, P., 2013, *Definite descriptions*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Elbourne, P., 2016, "Incomplete descriptions and indistinguishable participants", *Natural Language Semantics* 24, 1–43.

Etebari, Z., 2023, "Possessives as source of definite articles? New evidence from the Iranian family", talk given at the workshop "Issues in the Syntax and Semantics of Definiteness", University of Bucharest, December 8-9.

Fraurud, K., 2001, "Possessives with extensive use: a source of definite articles?", in: I. Baron, M. Herslund, F. Sorensen (eds.), *Dimensions of Possession*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 243–267.

Geist, L., 2010, "Bare singular NPs in argument positions: Restrictions on indefiniteness", *International Review of Pragmatics* 2, 2, 191–227.

van Gelderen, E., 2007, "The definiteness cycle in Germanic", *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 19, 4, 275–308.

Giurgea, I., 2024a, "Superlatives and definiteness: Lessons from Romance", in: A. Gavarró, J. Mateu, J. A. Mendia, F. Torres-Tamarit, *RLLT 22, Special Issue of Isogloss. Open Journal of Romance Linguistics* 10 (3)/12, 1-32.

Giurgea, I., 2024b, "Romanian double definites: The view from demonstratives", *Lingua* 307, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2024.103728.

Greenberg, J. H., 1978, "How does a language acquire gender markers?", in: J. H. Greenberg, C. A. Ferguson, E. A. Morawcsik (eds.), *Universals of Human Language*, *III: Word Structure*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 47–82.

Grosz, P. G., 2019, "Pronominal Typology and Reference to the External World", in: J. Schlöder, D. McHugh, F. Roelofsen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd Amsterdam Colloquium*, 563-573, https://archive.illc.uva.nl/AC/AC2019/uploaded_files/inlineitem/1AC2019_Proceedings.pdf.

Gundel, J. K., N. Hedberg, R. Zacharski, 1993, "Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse", *Language* 69, 2, 274–307.

Hanink, E., 2017, "The German definite article and the 'sameness' of indices", *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 23, 1, 63–72.

Hartmann, D., 1982, "Deixis and anaphora in German dialects: The semantics and pragmatics of two definite articles in dialectal varieties", in: J. Weissenborn, W. Klein (eds), *Here and There: Cross-linguistic studies on deixis and demonstration*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 187–207.

Hawkins, J. A., 1978, *Definiteness and indefiniteness: a study in reference and grammaticality prediction*, London, Croom Helm.

Hawkins, J. A., 2004, *Efficiency and complexity in grammars*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Heim, I., 2011, "Definiteness and determinacy", in: C. Maienborn, K. von Heusinger, P. Portner (eds.), *Semantics. An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*, Berlin, Boston, Walter de Gruyter, 996–1025.

Heim, I., A. Kratzer, 1998, *Semantics in generative grammar*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Heinrichs, H. M., 1954, *Studien zum bestimmten Artikel in den germanischen Sprachen*, Gießen, Wilhelm Schmitz Verlag.

Heycock, C., R. Zamparelli, 2003, "Coordinated bare definites", *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 443–469.

Hertzenberg, M. J. B., 2015, *Third person reference in Late Latin: Demonstratives, definite articles and personal pronouns in the Itinerarium Egeriae*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.

Himmelmann, N., 1996, "Demonstratives in Narrative Discourse: A Taxonomy of Universal Uses", in: B. Fox (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 205-254.

Jenks, P., 2018. "Articulated Definiteness without Articles", *Linguistic Inquiry* 49, 3, 501–536.

Kamp, H., 1981, "A Theory of Truth and Semantic Representation", in: J. Groenendijk, T. Janssen, M. Stokhof (eds.), *Formal Methods in the Study of Language*, Amsterdam, Mathematisch Centrum, 277–322.

Kamp, H., U. Reyle, 1993, *From Discourse to Logic: Introduction to Modeltheoretic Semantics of Natural Language, Formal Logic and Discourse Representation Theory*, Dordrecht, Kluwer.

Kraiss, A., 2014, "The Evolution of the Definite Article in Old High German", *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 26, 2, 127–155.

Lakoff, R., 1974, "Remarks on *this* and *that*", *Chicago Linguistic Society* 10, 345–356.

Leiss, E., 2000, *Artikel und Aspekt: die grammatischen Muster von Definitheit*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

Lekakou, M., K. Szendrői, 2012, "Polydefinites in Greek: Ellipsis, close apposition and expletive determiners", *Journal of Linguistics* 48, 107–149.

Link, G., 1983, "The logical analysis of plurals and mass terms: A lattice-theoretical approach", in: R. Bäuerle, C. Schwarze, A. von Stechow (eds.), *Meaning, Use, and Interpretation of Language*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 303–323.

Löbner, S., 1985, "Definites", *Journal of Semantics* 4, 279–326.

Löbner, S., 2011, "Concept Types and Determination", *Journal of Semantics* 28, 279–333.

Lyons, Christopher, 1999, *Definiteness*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Miller, D. G., 2019, *The Oxford Gothic Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Nikolaeva, I., 2003, "Possessive affixes in the pragmatic structuring of the utterance: evidence from Uralic", in: P. M. Suihkonen, B. Comrie (eds.), *International symposium on deictic systems and quantification in languages spoken in Europe and North and Central Asia (Collection of papers)*, Izhevsk and Leipzig, Udmurt State University and Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, 130–145.

Nowak, E., 2021, "Complex demonstratives, hidden arguments, and presupposition", *Synthese* 198, 2865–2900.

Ortmann, A., 2014, "Definite article asymmetries and concept types: Semantic and pragmatic uniqueness", in: Thomas Gamerschlag, Doris Gerland, Rainer Osswald & Wiebke Petersen (eds.), *Frames and concept types: Applications in linguistics and philosophy*. Berlin: Springer, 293-321.

Owusu, A., 2022, *Cross-categorial Definiteness/Familiarity*, doctoral dissertation, New Brunswick University.

Prince, E., 1981b, "Toward a taxonomy of given-new information", in: P. Cole, *Radical pragmatics*. New York, Academic Press, 223–256.

Robinson, H. M., 2005, *Unexpected (in)definiteness: plural generic expressions in Romance*, doctoral dissertation, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

Schlenker, P., 2005, "Minimize restrictors! (Notes on definite descriptions, condition C and epithets)", in: E. Maier, C. Bary, J. Huitink (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 9*, 385–416.

Schwarz, F., 2009, *Two types of definites in natural language*, doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Schwarz, F., 2019, "Weak vs. strong definite articles: Meaning and form across languages", in: A. Aguilar-Guevara, J. Pozas Loyo, V. Vázquez-Rojas Maldonado (eds.), *Definiteness across languages*, Berlin, Language Science Press, 1–37.

Sharvy, R., 1980, "A more general theory of definite descriptions", *The Philosophical Review* 89, 607–624.

Šimík, R., C. Demian, 2020, "Definiteness, Uniqueness, and Maximality in Languages With and Without Articles", *Journal of Semantics* 37, 3, 311-366.

Simonenko, A., 2014, *Grammatical ingredients of definiteness*, doctoral dissertation, McGill University, Montreal.

Simonenko, A., 2023, "Mappings between context sets and definite forms: variation and stability", talk given at the Workshop *Issues in the Syntax and Semantics of Definiteness*, University of Bucharest, December 8-9.

Simonenko, A., forthc., "Full vs. clitic vs. bound determiners", to appear in: M. Wiltschko, S. Armoskaite (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Determiners*, Oxford, Oxford University Press (draft available at https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004519).

Simonenko, A., A. Carlier, 2020, "Between demonstrative and definite: A grammar competition model of the evolution of French l-determiners", *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/ Revue canadienne de linguistique*, 65, 3, 393–437.

Srinivas, S., 2022, "Bare nominals are underspecified for (in)definite meanings, not ambiguous between them", in: M. Degano, T. Roberts, G. Sbardolini, M. Schouwstra (eds.), *Proceedings of the 23rd Amsterdam Colloquium*, https://events.illc.uva.nl/AC/AC2022/Proceedings/.

Streitberg, W. A., 1920, *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg, Winter.

Skrzypek, D., 2012, *Grammaticalization of (in)definiteness in Swedish*, Poznan, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Sommerer, L., 2011, *Old English se: from demonstrative to article. A usage-based study of nominal determination and category emergence*, doctoral dissertation, University of Vienna.

Trager, G. L., 1932, *The use of the latin demonstratives (especially ILLE and IPSE) up to 600 A.D., as the source of the Romance article*, New York, Institute of French Studies.

Wolter, L. K., 2006, *That's that: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Demonstrative Noun Phrases*, doctoral dissertation, University of California – Santa Cruz.