

## Keiko Yamamoto

Ι.

Various attempts have been made to describe the distinctive characteristics of personal pronouns in earlier descendants of Proto-Germanic. Recent studies in this field are mainly concerned with theoretical issues of clitic movement the major premise of which is that Germanic personal pronouns are syntactic clitics. Authors part at whether Germanic pronouns should be into alignment with Modern Romance personal pronouns (see among others Haegeman 1993 and Zwart 1993) or the two of them should be assigned different categories and/or features (see Haverkort 1994, Koopman 1990, Cardinaletti and Starke 1996).

The aim of this paper is to present a philological analysis of the object personal pronouns in Biblical Greek, Latin and Old English(OE), checking their occurrences in the New Testament. Through lack of native informants of older languages, we are not to treat the older personal pronouns in the same manner as we analyse their modern counterparts. For example, clitic pronouns in the modern Romance have to be changed into a strong form when they are emphasized. We could then tell where strong

forms should appear, for example, in OE, if we knew where special emphasis is put. Emphatic positions, however, are not so evident in OE, partly because of its intricate word order. To avoid making a false step we should be cautiously examining dependable data. As full a knowledge of the facts as is possible must be acquired before rules can be erected.

II.

The basic word order in the New Testament Greek and Latin is distinctly SVO. This is also the case when the object is a pronoun. The following table shows how the [verb(...)object pronoun] order is dominant in both Greek and Latin in the Gospel of St. Mark.

Greek	+	+	_	+	+			_
Latin	+	+	+ .		_	+		_
OE	+	_	+	+	-	_	+	_
	104	137	1	3	18	5	9	22

The V-pronoun Order in Greek, Latin and OE

The sign + represents for the V(...) pronoun order in a given language, and the sign -, the pronoun(...) V order. In the table we take no notice of places of the subject, since pronominal subjects are quite regularly omitted in Greek and Latin. The precedence of the verb to the pronoun is remarkable in Greek, Latin, and also in OE. This order occurs here more often than in any other OE text, which suggests that the translation was affected by the Latin text, although it assuredly kept its native word order and never took on what was banned in the OE grammar. See Koopman (1990: 118). That the V-pronoun sequence was in no way rare is also

shown in the twelve examples in which OE changed Latin pronoun-V into V-pronoun<sup>(1)</sup>.

(1) Gr ταῦτά σοι πάντα δώσω (Mt 4:9)These to you all I will give Lt haec tibi omnia dabo OE Ealle pas ic sylle þе All these I will give to you

Since subject personal pronouns are regularly suppressed in Greek and Latin, OE reenact the pronouns in translation, when in most cases the subject pronoun is put before the verb. A different correspondence is seen in the sentence with the clause-initial adverb et (et VO) translated as "Pa VSO" in OE, though "and SVO" is also observed. Even when Greek and Latin have the inverted NP subject and the order is VOS, OE very often has the VSO order. When the object is a full NP, Greek (and Latin) tends to show VSO on the model of Hebrew. What is particularly noteworthy here is: the object pronoun comes closely after the verb in Greek and Latin, which generally ban the subject from intervening between the verb and the pronominal object<sup>(2)</sup>, whereas OE permits it and the VSO order is more often observed than the VOS when the object is a pronoun. The fact indicates that the object pronoun is more like a clitic in Greek and Latin than in OE, because it moves with the verb in the former, if we can assume that it is the verb that moves, not the subject. The object pronoun remains in its base position in OE.

- άπεκρίθη αύτῷ ò άσθενῶν (Jn 5:7)(2) Gr answered him the ailing
  - Lt respondit ei languidus
  - andswarode se seoca him OE Then answered the ailing him

- - Lt tunc assumpsit eum diabolus in sanctam ciuitatem
  - OE pa gebrohte se deofol hine on pa halgan ceastre
- (4) Gr καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν  $\underline{\alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\varphi}}$  οὶ  $\mu \alpha \theta \eta \tau \alpha \dot{i}$  αὐτοῦ (Mk 8 : 4)

  And answered him the disciples his
  - Lt et responderunt ei discipuli sui
  - OE pa andswarodan <u>him</u> his leorning-cnihtas

    Then answered him his disciples
- (5) Gr  $\kappa\alpha$ i έπερωτῶσιν  $\alpha$ ὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι and questioned him the Pharisees  $\kappa\alpha$ i οἱ  $\gamma$ ραμματεῖς (Mk 7 : 5) and the scribes
  - Lt Et interrogant eum pharisaei et scribae
- OE And pa axodon <u>hine</u> pharisei J pa boceras OE adopts the native order in (2) and (3), and retains the original in (4) and (5) with heavier subjects here.

In the subordinate clause OE has a tendency to eschew having the verb immediately after the complementizer, though it is structurally possible when the subject is postposed. Inversion<sup>(3)</sup> is retracted in OE in (6).

- - Lt exurgens autem ioseph á somno fecit sicut precepit ei angelus domini

OE of swefene. Da aras iosep J dyde Then arose Joseph from sleep and did swa drihtnes engel him bebead angel him bade Lord's

 $\mathbb{I}$ .

That the pron(...)V order is predominant in OE is represented by 142 examples in which OE changed Latin V(...)O into O(...)V as in (7) below.

- ζηλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεταί με (7)(Jn 2: 17)of house your will consume me
  - Lt zelus domus tuae comedit me
  - OE pines huses anda me et your of-house zeal me consume

The object pronoun can be set further forward to follow the conjunction as in the next example.

- καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ (Mk 1: 13) and the angels ministered to him
  - Lt et angeli ministrabant illi
  - him englas enodon OE J and him angels ministered

One fact requires our notice here. OE object ponouns have a far stronger tendency to come close to the beginning of a clause than their Greek and Latin counterparts. Even when Greek and Latin take an unusual order pronoun-V, the OE pronoun is sometimes put closer to the first place of the clause:

- (9) Gr καὶ οὐδὲ ἀλύσει οὐκέτι οὐδεὶ ς ἐδύνατο and not with a chain no longer no one was able  $\underline{\alpha \dot{\nu} \dot{\tau} \dot{o} \dot{v}} \quad \delta \widehat{\eta} \sigma \alpha i \qquad \qquad (Mk 5: 3)$  him to bind
  - Lt neque catenis iam quisquam <u>eum</u> poterat ligare not-and with chains no longer anyone him might bind
  - OE J <u>hine</u> nán man mid racenteagum ne mihte gebindan and him no man with chains not might bind
- (10) Gr  $\check{\delta}$ π έποίησέν μοι μεγάλα  $\check{\delta}$  δυνατός (Lk 1 : 49) because did to me great things the Mighty
  - Lt quia fecit mihi magna qui potens est for did to me great things who mighty is
  - OE forðam pe  $\underline{me}$  micele ping dyde seðe mihtig is for me great thing did who mighty is

Two factors are working in (10): to avoid V-first in the subordinate clause; to put the pronoun forward. Sometimes OE restores the unexpressed pronoun in the clause-initial position.

- (11) Gr  $\kappa \alpha i$   $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \rho i \theta \eta$   $\alpha \dot{v} t \hat{\varphi}$   $\epsilon \hat{i} \varsigma$   $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$   $\tau o \hat{v}$   $\ddot{o} \chi \lambda o v$  (Mk 9 : 17)

  And answered him one of the crowd
  - Lt Et respondens unus de turba

    And answering one of crowd
  - OE <u>Him</u> andswarode án of pære menigu him answered one of the crowd

Hence our prediction should be: when Latin (and Greek) has a clause-initial object pronoun, OE is to retain the order. This is regularly borne out. It is also noteworthy here that the clause-initial object pronoun invariably indicates contrast:

(12) Gr ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται της βασιλείας To you the mystery has been given the kingdom's τοῦ θεοῦ (Mk 4: 11) of God's

έκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω έν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται to those but the outside in parables the all 'To you the secret of the kingdom of God has been given, but for those outside everything is in parables'

- Lt uobis datum est scire misterium regni dei To you given is to know mystery of kingdom of God Illis autem qui foris sunt in parabolis omnia fiunt To those but who outside are in parables all
- OE is geseald to witanne godes rices To you is given to know God's kingdom's secret úte synt ealle ping to those who outside are all thing on bigspellum gewurþað in parables will be
- (13) Gr πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν... Always for the poor you have with yourselves έμε δε ού πάντοτε έχετε (Mk 14: 7) me but not always you have
  - semper enim pauperes habetis uobis-cum... Lt me autem no semper habetis
  - OE Sodlice symble ge habbad pearfan mid eow... me ge symble nabbað

Complications arise with the following variants in the Gospels describing just the same setting. In (14) the Greek example puts both objects before the verb. Latin, on the other hand, keeps the first  $\underline{uos}$  after the verb and the second one before the verb. OE in its turn does not reflect this contrivance in Latin. It takes the most common order for OE. When we turn to Mark in (15), the situation is quite different. Greek and Latin take their base, SVO order, for the both second person pronouns. OE shifts one of them. In Luke we find Greek and Latin in the same arrangement: the first  $\dot{\nu}\mu\hat{\alpha}\varsigma$  / uos after the verb, the second, before the verb. Again OE does not reflect it; it keeps both objects before the verb.

- (14) Gr  $\dot{}$   $\dot{$ 
  - Lt Ego quidem baptizo <u>uos</u> in aqua in paenitentiam... ipse <u>uos</u> baptizabit in spiritu sancto et igni
  - OE Witodlice ic <u>eow</u> fullige on wætere to dæd-bote; ...

    Indeed I you baptize in water to repentance

    He <u>eow</u> fullað on halgum gaste J on fyre

    He you baptize in Holy Spirit and on fire

    'I baptize you with water for repentance, but...

    he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire.'

- (15) Gr  $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omega}$   $\dot{\epsilon}\beta\dot{\alpha}\pi\pi\sigma\alpha$   $\dot{\underline{v}}\mu\dot{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\dot{v}\delta\alpha\pi$ ,

  I will baptize you in water  $\alpha\dot{v}\dot{\tau}\dot{o}\varsigma$   $\delta\dot{\epsilon}$   $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\dot{\omega}$   $\dot{c}v$   $\dot{c$ 
  - Lt Ego baptizaui <u>uos</u> aqua ille uero baptizabit uos spiritu sancto
  - OE ic fullige <u>eow</u> on wætere,

    he <u>eow</u> fullað on halgum gaste
    he you baptize in Holy Spirit
- (16) Gr  $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omega}$   $\mu\dot{\epsilon}v$   $\check{v}\delta\alpha\tau$   $\beta\alpha\pi\dot{\tau}(\zeta\omega)\underline{\dot{v}\mu\dot{\alpha}\varsigma}$ ...

  I indeed in water baptize you  $\alpha\dot{v}\dot{\tau}\dot{o}\varsigma\,\underline{\dot{v}\mu\dot{\alpha}\varsigma}\,\,\beta\alpha\pi\dot{\tau}i\sigma\varepsilon$   $\dot{\epsilon}v$   $\pi v\dot{\epsilon}\dot{v}\mu\alpha\tau$   $\dot{\alpha}\dot{\gamma}\dot{\omega}$ he you will baptize in Spirit Holy  $\kappa\alpha\dot{\imath}\,\,\pi v\dot{\rho}\dot{\imath}$  (Lk 3: 16)
  and fire
  - Lt Ego quidem aqua baptizo <u>uos...</u>
    ipse uos baptizabit in spiritu sancto et igni
  - OE Witodlice ic  $\underline{eow}$  on wætere fullige; ...

    Indeed I you in water baptize

    He  $\underline{eow}$  fullað on halgum gaste J on fyre

    He you baptize in Holy Spirit and on fire

What determines the positions of object pronouns? These examples show minor differences in, for example, the positions of adverbials, but they are certainly not the determining factor because a heap of examples can be observed in which the pronoun is in a different position in relation to the verb, though the adverbial is fixed. Pronoun-V / V-pronoun alternation does not seem to represent contrast here, because the contrast is between I and He, which is denoted by the subject personal pronouns usually sup-

pressed in Greek and Latin; not between the former you and the latter you. It is also a doubtful conclusion at least in OE to assert that what is at work here is simply emphasis. Even if we are to assume that it is not the pronoun itself but the whole predicate that is emphasized, OE in (15) is by no means certain about whether one of the two clauses is emphatic. If either one of them is emphatic, the context tells us the latter one should be. It is, however, in the most common OE order, which should produce no emphatic effect. When we turn to (17), OE seems to emphasize the last predicate correctly with the less-common, V-pronoun order. But this is not always the case.

- (17) Gr καὶ ἐμπαίξουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐμπτύσουσιν (Mk 10: 34) and they will mock him and will spit at αὐτῷ καὶ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν him and will scourge him and will kill
  - Lt Et inludent ei et conspuent eum et flagellabunt eum interficient eum
  - OE J he <u>hine</u> bysmriað J hi <u>hine</u> on spætað J and they him mock and they him on spit and <u>hine</u> swingað J of-sleað <u>hine</u> him scourge and kill him

Greek has so-called enclitic personal pronouns:  $\mu ov$  for the first person genitive strong pronoun  $\dot{\epsilon}\mu ov$ ;  $\mu o\iota$  for the dative  $\dot{\epsilon}\mu o\iota$ ;  $\mu\epsilon$  for the accusative  $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\dot{\epsilon}$ ; the second person also has  $\sigma ov$ ,  $\sigma o\iota$  and  $\sigma\epsilon$ . The other persons and cases lack their weak forms. It should be noted how the strong forms which have weak correspondents appear regularly before the verb as in (17) and (18).

(18) Gr  $\delta \sigma \ \alpha v \ \epsilon v \ \tau \hat{\omega} v \ \tau o i o v \tau \omega v \ \sigma \alpha i \delta i \omega v \ \delta \epsilon \xi \eta \tau \alpha i \ \epsilon \pi i \ \tau \hat{\omega} \ \delta v \delta \mu \alpha \tau i$  whoever one of such children receives on the name

μου, έμὲ δέχεται. καὶ ὄς ἄν έμὲ δέχηται ούχ έμὲ of me me receives and whoever me receives not me δέχεται άλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. receives but the having sent me (Mk 9: 37) 'Whoever receives one of such children in my name receives me; and whoever receives me, receives not me but the one

- Lt quisquis unum ex huismodi pueris receperit in nominae meo me recipit Et quiscumque me susciperit non me suscipit sed eum qui me misit.
- OE Swa hwylc swa anne of pus geradum cnapum on minum one of such children on my naman on fehð. se on fehð me; And se þe me on fehð name receives he revceives me And the one me receives he ne onfehð me. ac pone pe me sende; he not receives me but him who me sent
- (19) Gr 'Ο ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν The hearing you me hears and the rejecting ύμᾶς έμὲ άθετει you me rejects 'He who hears you hears me and he who rejects you rejects (Lk 10: 16) me'

They do not exclude weak forms from this position.

who sent me.'

(20) Gr ἴνα γινώσκη ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας καὶ that may know the world that you me sent ήγάπησας αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἐμὲ ἡγάπησας. (Jo 17: 23) them me vou loved as 'that the world may know that you did send me and did love

120 Placement of Object Personal Pronouns in the New Testament Greek, Latin and Old English

them as you did love me'

(21) Gr εἰ οὖν με ἔχεις κοινωνόν (Phm 17)
If therefore me you have a partner
'So if you consider me your partner...'

However, the strong forms which have weak counterparts do not appear after the verb. The pre-V position can therefore be assumed to be for emphatic object pronouns in Greek, and very probably in Latin, which basically follows Greek in its word order. OE does not always translate emphasis. In (21) the Latin example clearly marks the emphatic object pronoun, but OE takes on the pron-V order, not less common V-pron or Comp-pron.

- (22) Gr  $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha$   $\dot{\delta}\sigma\pi\varsigma$   $\underline{\sigma\epsilon}$   $\dot{\rho}\alpha\pi\dot{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota$   $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\varsigma$   $\dot{\tau}\dot{\eta}\nu$   $\delta\epsilon\dot{\xi}\iota\dot{\alpha}\nu$   $\sigma\iota\alpha\gamma\dot{\delta}\nu\alpha$  but who you hit on the right cheek [ $\sigma\sigma\nu$ ] (Mt 5: 39) your
  - Lt Sed si quis <u>té</u> percusserit in dextera maxilla but if anyone you should hit in right cheek

    OE ac gyf hwa pe slea on pin swypre wenge

V

The sort of problems which await solution can be illustrated by the fact that as yet I have recorded no example of [S...V Aux pronoun]. To show the lack of it is not accidental will indicate that the pattern V-pronoun is not a simple postposition as assumed in Koopman (1990).

## Notes

(1) Imperative environments are counted out, since personal pronouns are put

- immediately after the finite verb with no exception.
- (2)  $\delta \hat{\varepsilon}$  or  $o \hat{v}$  sometimes intrudes into the V-O sequence.
- (3) This is not precise enough because V-first itself was prevailing in Biblical Greek. On the whole NT is closer not only to the subsequent tendency of Modern Greek SVO, but towards the Hebraic order VSO.
- (4) This is not true of the pattern where the pronoun appears immediately after the conjunction or the complementizer in Latin (and Greek).
  - Gr  $iva \underline{\alpha\dot{v}\tau o \hat{v}}$   $iva \underline{\alpha\dot{v}}$   $iva \underline{\alpha\dot{v}}$   $iva \underline{\alpha\dot{v}\tau o \hat{v}}$   $iva \underline{\alpha\dot{v}}$   $iva \underline{\alpha\dot{v}}$  iva
  - Lt ut <u>illum</u> tangerent quotquot autem habebant plagas so that him touched as many as and had plagues
  - OE Swa p he æt-hrinon  $\underline{\text{his}}\ J$  swa fela swa untrumnessa So that they touched him and as many as illness

## Texts

- Nestle-Aland. 1993. Novum Testamentum Graece. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft
- Skeat, W. W. 1970. The Gospel according to Saint Matthew and Saint Mark.

  Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- . The Gospel according to Saint Luke and Saint John.

Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

## References

- Cardinaletti, A. and Starke, M. 1996 "Deficient Pronouns: A View from Germanic. A Study in the Unified Description of Germanic and Romance." Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax. Vol. II. Eds. H. Thráinsson, S. D. Epstein and S. Peter. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.
- Haverkort, M. 1994. "Germanic Clitics and the Theory of Parameters." CLS 30 Vol. 2: 169–183.
- Haegeman, L. 1993. "The Distribution of Object Pronouns in West Flemish." *Clitics in Romance and Germanic*. Ed. L. Rizzi. Eurotyp Working Papers.
- Koopman, W. 1990. Word Order in Old English, with Special Reference to the Verb Phrase. Amsterdam Studies in Generative Grammar.
- Lehmann, W. P. 1974. Proto-Indo-European Syntax. Austin: University of Texas Press.

122 Placement of Object Personal Pronouns in the New Testament Greek, Latin and Old English

Woodcock, M. C. 1959. A New Latin Syntax. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press. Zwart, J. 1993. Dutch Syntax: A Minimalist Approach. Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen.

----文学部助教授----