

FOR WANT OF A BETTER WORD:
RELIGIOUS TERMS IN THE GOTHIC BIBLE
IN RELATION TO GREEK AND LATIN

Dr. Dragoş MÎRSANU
K. U. Leuven
dragos.mirsanu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT The Christianization of the Goths was initiated in the third century and completed toward the end of the fourth century in a Greek-Latin milieu. Alongside the literary or archaeo-logical sources, the historian of the Goths and of other barbarians of Gothic language and ethos might want to consider using philological evidence, such as the result of loanword studies, etymology and semantics, more. In this paper I make an attempt to explore this avenue by investigating the religious terms in the biblical translations and the other exegetical writings preserved in Gothic, in relation to the primary languages of Christianity of the era, Greek and Latin.

KEYWORDS The Gothic Bible, Greek, Latin, Gothic, religious terms

1. The Texts

A brief introduction of the texts in question is probably necessary. What we know of Gothic is almost entirely owing to biblical translations and a few other ecclesiastical/liturgical literary fragments that have survived¹. Historiographical evidence tells us that Bishop Wulfila (c. 307–382) created in the Balkans a Gothic alphabet (based on the Greek one, also using selected Latin characters) and translated, perhaps in collaboration,

¹ Generally on the conversion of the Goths, as well as the other Germanic peoples, see SCHÄFERDIEK (1997).

the whole Bible (or at least the New Testament and the Psalms) from the Greek. However, our extant manuscripts, which have preserved only parts of the translation, were written later, most probably by Ostrogothic scribes of early sixth-century Italy. It is important to note thus that what we have is in fact literary evidence of a particular phase of Gothic, which was a successor of both a primitive, pre-Wulfilan phase (sometimes called pre-Gothic) and a Wulfilan phase, when it had undergone the changes characteristic of Wulfila's scriptural language. The extant texts belong to a subsequent phase when there is little doubt that Gothic had been influenced by Latin, on account of the migration toward the West. Even though the linguist is not able to encompass today the full range of this development, the fact is certified by fifth-century sources such as Jerome or Salvianus mentioning that the Gothic biblical texts were being subject to change and adaptation in contact with the Latin translations.

The main manuscript for the Gothic Bible is the Codex Argenteus, of sixth-century Ostrogothic origin, containing most part of all four Gospels². Other parts of the New Testament, as well as very few fragments of the Old Testament, are preserved in palimpsest fragmentary manuscripts, sometimes as bilingual Latin and Gothic versions. Beside the biblical translations, these manuscripts also preserve a portion of a Gothic calendar and part of a commentary on the Gospel according to St. John. Scholars of these texts have most readily noted the presence of textual variants and annotations and the obviously strong interest in the Latin translations of the Bible that were being used by the communities among whom the Goths lived. As for the translation, it was remarked that the Gothic NT seems to be based on the Greek text known to the fourth-century Church Fathers, which would confirm its Wulfilan origin. The Gothic text is a very literal translation, where for each Greek word there is a Gothic one (and which is the same one as in previous occurrences). From a linguist's perspective, while the syntax of the Gothic

² Of the 330 original folios, 187 are extant. For the text of the Gothic Bible, see STREITBERG (1919); for studies on the Gothic texts, language and vocabulary, see, in the first place, FRIEDRICHSEN (1926); FRIEDRICHSEN (1939); MOSSÉ (1956); most conveniently, MATTHEWS, HEATHER (1991), p. 155-173; LEHMANN (1994); SCARDIGLI (1998); SCHÄFERDIEK (1998).

language can hardly be learned – as the Greek syntax is almost fully preserved in translation – the text certainly invites studies of morphology or vocabulary.

2. Travelling Words in Early Christianity

Two main elements have generally been said to play a determinant role in linguistic loan traffic: the need to fill blanks in the receiving language and the prestige that the source language enjoys. The linguistic need emerges as a result of the complex influence that a culture might have over another, leading thus to the loan traffic of concepts.

In our case, the Christianization of the gentiles required to a certain extent a baptism of their languages³. In particular, we must refer here to the special vocabulary that more known Oriental languages such as Syriac, Coptic or Armenian needed. While they occupied the same space as the standard language of Christianity, the Greek language, these Christianized languages obtained relatively quickly an independence not to be found in the West, where Latin quickly became the absolutely dominant language. Gothic has followed in the more commonly known path of the Latin language, which had molded its Christian terminology directly on the Greek.

In the first place, the study of the linguistic problems in early Christianity showed that the Greek language had itself reacted significantly to the impact of the new terms introduced by the new message⁴. In order to avoid contamination with the traditional Greek religion, words had been chosen from outside the pagan religious sphere or had been invented altogether. For the same reason, Latin borrowed at the beginning of its Christianization a good number of Greek words that had been already made holy in the Church. In the fourth century, when Christianity had become tolerated and less likely to be affected by paganism, Latin adopted pre-Christian terms as well.

³ The most useful and inspiring study is GREEN (1998); here, 281ff. See also two other contributions by the same author: GREEN (1995); GREEN (2007).

⁴ See MOHRMANN (1957).

Generally one can note that the Christian message was transmitted in two manners: polemically (in the sense of promoting indispensable news) and irenically (in the sense that mission accommodated to a certain degree and only temporarily, particulars of the pagan faith, with the hope of future remedy)⁵. Focusing on the language employed in such circumstances, one could observe different classes of linguistic loan traffic for the Christian terms communicated from Greek to Latin, and to Gothic. The “loanwords” represent a first class of terms created by means of a methodology that presented the advantage of preserving an international terminology (e.g. Heb. *pascha* > Gr. > Lat.; Gr. *ecclesia* > Lat.). Whereas it proved efficient for the objects that could not be seen (e.g. the Gospel, the sign of the cross etc.), the method could not work as well with terms designating impalpable objects (e.g. *angelus*). A second class consists of “loan-translations”, where a new word was formed in the recipient language by a part-for-part translation of the word in the Christianized language. The terms created by this rather artificial method (e.g. Gr. *dikaiōsis* > Lat. *iustificatio* [> Go. *mithwissei*]) were easier to comprehend but, because of their novelty, were harder to integrate. The third class contains “loan-meanings”, a method where a word in the recipient language was converted, in that it developed a wider semantic range to accommodate the Christian meaning of a word in the giving language. The conversion of the pagan religious terms already present in the recipient language is less artificial (e.g. Gr. *Kyrios* > Lat. *Dominus*; Gr. *sōteria* > Lat. *salus*) and presents the advantage of being readily understandable and also of facilitating easier accommodation of the Christian message. On the other hand, in such cases the danger of syncretism is never too far away, as it is hard to make sure that the new meaning will be given preference by a speaker accustomed to the old meanings⁶. A different solution was that of extending the semantics of secular terms in order to

⁵ I follow here GREEN (1998), 283ff. His categorizations of the “classes” of terms (described below) will be used throughout this paper.

⁶ On the difficulties of rendering a word carrying more than one meaning, such as the Christianized Lat. *anima*, with a word in the receiving language that could normally carry only one of the original meanings (e.g. with Go. *sainwala*), see GREEN (1995), 148. In such cases, the word selected out of two or more possibilities is a compromise that would require further pastoral instruction.

entirely avoid the terms contaminated by the old religion (e.g. Lat. *redemptio* that originally meant only “buying back” or “ransoming”; or Lat. *gentes*, originally meaning only peoples other than that of the Romans, but now also the “pagans”, people other than the people of God). The downside to this method was the difficult reception of such a semantic extension, as it ran the risk that the Christian text or missionary would not manage to convey the intended Christian meaning to common terms (e.g. to military terms).

To identify the linguistic loan traffic in the case of a language such as Gothic is difficult, as it was preceded by the loan traffic from Greek to Latin. Inhabiting a territory where both these languages had significant influence, it is often impossible to be certain whether the Christian loanwords came into Gothic directly from Greek (which may still be safely considered as the primary giving language unless proven different, for this or that word) or came from Latin (which in turn had taken them from Greek).

3. Religious Terms in Christianized Gothic

What follows is an attempt to identify in the Gothic Bible a number of religious (ecclesiastical, liturgical etc.) terms in order to observe the manner in which they were borrowed, translated or converted, directly under the influence of Greek, or via Latin. This research is particularly encouraged on account of the very literal character of the Wulfilan translation of the NT⁷.

Some of the terms borrowed most likely from Latin are basic Christian words (e.g. *angel*, *apostle*, *gospel* etc.), therefore they may have entered Gothic before migrating West, during its Pontic and Danubian period, when the Goths shared a territory with local populations speaking that language. More abstract concepts such as **apaustulei* or **aipiskeaupei* were borrowed directly from Greek, as they needed a more mature stage of the Gothic language⁸. Furthermore, for a long while

⁷ The main reference works are DE GABELENTZ, LOEBE (1843-1846), STREITBERG (1910), FEIST (1939), largely superseded now by LEHMANN (1986).

⁸ CORAZZA (1969), p. 96-97.

already it has been reasonably assumed that some of the basic Christian terms in Gothic are pre-Wulfilanic, i.e. were borrowed from Christian populations encountered by the Goths before their own Christianization⁹. This assumption is based on what we know of the Cappadocian origin of the conversion of the Goths (hence the interaction with the Greek language), as well as of the Romanized populations of Danubian provinces (hence the interaction with Latin).

The Christianization of Gothic is also noticeable in the rendering of names, which I did not include in my list. A particular case is the theonym *Iesus Xristus*, which is likely to be a loan from Greek, via Latin¹⁰. Biblical place-names make also a case: it was noted that the names from the Holy Land, with which the Goths were not familiar before their contact with Christianity, have been rendered in a form closer to the Greek original (e.g. *Galeilaia*, *Iudaia* etc.), whereas the place-names from the Pontic, Danubian, or Asia Minor areas, which the Goths knew of, were rendered in a Gothicised, adopted form (e.g. *Galatija*, *Makidonija* etc.)¹¹. Finally, Greek, rather than Latin, influenced the Germanic languages spoken in Eastern-Central Europe, when it came to the loan of the names of the week. In order to avoid the names of the planets, which had been associated in the Hellenistic society with the “pagan” gods, the Greek speaking Christians had named the days as the first, the second, the third, etc., following the Hebraic model, except for Sunday (*kyriakehemera*, Lord’s Day). While the names of days in Gothic are not attested, we have the Bavarian names, which are likely loans from Gothic with the occasion of the “Gothic mission” in southeast Germany. In contrast to Germanic spoken beyond the Rhine (which had taken over the pagan Latin names, before Christianization), this eastern group reflects the Greek concern for avoiding the name of the pagan gods¹².

⁹ JELLINEK(1923), 443 ff.

¹⁰ JELLINEK (1923); CORAZZA (1969), p. 92.

¹¹ GREEN (1998), p. 286.

¹² GREEN (1998), p. 236-253; also, GREEN (2007), p. 145 and 158-159.

GREEK

LATIN

GOTHIC

LOANWORDS

<i>ἄγγελος</i>	<i>angelus</i>	aggilus/arkagillus, airus
----------------	----------------	--------------------------------------

“angel”, e.g. Luke 1:18 *Cod. Arg.*; < Lat. < Gr. – KLUGE (1909) 135; CORAZZA (1969) 87; LEHMANN (1986) A41, **arkagillus**, I Tim. 4:16, of the oldest stratum – **airus**, etymology unclear, possible relationship with LLat. *arrenda*, Romanian *arîndeș* (unless this is from Slavonic) – **airus**, “messenger”, is different from **aggilus**, in that it is a messenger on earth, not a heavenly one, even though it also appears as intercessor in the name of Christ, Gr. *προσβεύειν*, 2 Cor. 5:20; LEHMANN (1986) A87.

<i>ἀνάθεμα</i>	<i>anathema</i>	anapaima, anapema
----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

“anathema”, “curse”; Rom. 9:3; < Gr. – LEHMANN (1986) A158.

<i>ἀπόστολος</i>	<i>apostolus</i>	apaustaulus, apaustulus
------------------	------------------	------------------------------------

“apostle”; e.g. John 13:16; < Lat. – CORAZZA (1969) 88; LEHMANN (1986) A188; also spelled **apostolus**, Luke 6:13.

<i>ἀποστολή</i>	<i>apostolatus</i>	apaustaulei
-----------------	--------------------	--------------------

“apostolate”, Gal. 2:8; < Gr. – CORAZZA (1969) 97, LEHMANN (1986), A187.

<i>ἄζυμα (pl.)</i>	<i>azyma (pl.)</i>	azwme (pl.)
--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

“unleavened bread”, gen. pl. only: **daga azwme**, “on the day of the unleavened bread”, Mark 14:12; < Gr. – LEHMANN (1986) A246.

<i>δαμονίζεσθαι</i>	<i>daemonium habere</i>	daimonareis
---------------------	-------------------------	--------------------

“possessed by a demon”, Luke 8:36 *Cod. Arg.*; < Gr. – LEHMANN (1986) D6. CORAZZA (1969) 93 opts to choose between LLat. *daemonarius* (first in Jerome) and Gr. *δαμονιάριος* (first in Photius), giving preference to Lat. on account of older attestation and it being closer to the Gothic spelling (i.e. the lack of *ν*).

<i>διάβολος</i>	<i>diabolus</i>	diabaulus
“devil”, John 6:70; < Lat./< Gr. – LEHMANN (1986) D16; <i>diabula</i> , 1 Tim 3:11. See also unhulpa .		
<i>διάκονος</i>	<i>diaconus</i>	diakaunus
“deacon”, 1 Tim. 3:12; < Gr. + < Lat. – EBBINGHAUS (2003) 119 assumes < Gr. (a first loan), then < Lat. It is likely both were known: CORAZZA (1969) 90, LEHMANN (1986) D17.		
<i>ἐκκλησία</i>	<i>ecclesia</i>	aikklesjo
“congregation”, 1 Cor. 14:23; < Gr. (probably), but impossible to establish with any certainty on account of the perfect Gr.-Lat. correspondence – JELLINEK (1923) 443, CORAZZA (1969) 93; certainly pre-Wulfilanic. LEHMANN (1986) A68 notes that it does not appear to have meant also “church building”, such as in third-century Latin.		
<i>ἐπίσκοπος</i>	<i>episcopus</i>	aipiskaupus
“bishop”, 1 Tim 3:2, Titus 1:7; < Lat. (= Gr.) – CORAZZA (1969) 88, LEHMANN (1986) A81.		
<i>ἐπισκοπή</i>	<i>episcopatus</i>	aipiskaupei
“office of bishop”, 1 Tim 3:1; < Gr., probably post-Wulfilanic – CORAZZA (1969) 97, LEHMANN (1986) A80.		
<i>ἐπιστολή</i>	<i>epistula</i>	aipistaule/aipistula
“epistle”, aipistaule , 2 Cor 3:2 < Gr./ aipistula , Neh. 6:17 < Lat. – CORAZZA (1969) 90-91, EBBINGHAUS (2003) 117, LEHMANN (1986) A82.		
<i>εὐαγγέλιον</i>	<i>evangelium/evangelio</i>	aiwaggeli/aiwaggeljo
“gospel”, aiwaggeli , 1 Cor. 9:23 < Lat. (VLat.?) <i>evangelio</i> / aiwaggeljo , Mark 14:9 < Gr., hence pre-Wulfilanic – KLUGE (1909) 159. Also, aiwaggelista , Sk. 3:3 < Lat. <i>evangelista</i> and aiwaggelijan , “spread the gospel”, Gal. 4:13 < Gr./Lat. – LEHMANN (1986) A93-96.		
<i>εὐλογία</i>		aiwlaugia
“blessing”, “gift”, 2 Cor. 9:5; < Gr. – CORAZZA (1969) 86 n2, LEHMANN (1986) A98.		

<i>εὐχαριστία</i>	<i>eucharistia</i>	aiwxaristia
“eucharist”, 2 Cor. 9:11; < Gr. – CORAZZA (1969) 86 n2, LEHMANN (1986) A100.		
<i>μαμμωνάς</i>	<i>mammona</i>	mammona
“money, wealth”, Matt. 6:24; < Gr., a loanword from Aramaic – LEHMANN (1986) M19.		
<i>παπᾶς</i>		papa
“old man”, “clergyman”, DeN. 1, 1; Cal. 1, 7; < Gr.; not <i>πάπας</i> = bishop – LEHMANN (1986) P3.		
<i>παράκλητος</i>	<i>paracletus</i>	parakletus
“Paracletus”, John 14:26; < Gr. – LEHMANN (1986) P4.		
<i>παρασκευή</i>	<i>parascene</i>	paraskaiwe
“preparation” [day], Mark 15:4, Matt. 27:62; < Gr. – CORAZZA (1969) 86 n2, LEHMANN (1986) P5.		
<i>πάσχα</i>	<i>pascha</i>	pascha
“Easter”, Lev. 2:41, pasxa , John 18:28; < Gr. – CORAZZA (1969) 86n2, LEHMANN (1986) P6.		
<i>Πεντεκοστή</i>	<i>pentecoste</i>	paintekuste
“Pentecost”, 1 Cor. 16:8; < Gr. – CORAZZA (1969) 86 n2, LEHMANN (1986) P2.		
<i>προφήτης, -τεύειν</i>	<i>propheta/-izare</i>	praufetus (es)/praufetja/(n)
“prophet”, Luke 2:36, also “prophetess”, praufeteis and “false prophet”, liugna-praufetus , *galiuga-profetus , calque of <i>ψευδοπροφήτης</i> ; < Gr. See also below, “prophecy”, praufetjaandi , e.g. 1 Cor. 13:8 and “to prophesy”, praufetjan , Matt. 7:22; < Lat. – CORAZZA (1969) 92-93, LEHMANN (1986) P17, P18.		
<i>σάββατον</i>	<i>sabbatum</i>	sabbato
“Sabbath” > “Saturday”, e.g. John 9:14; < Gr., itself a loanword from Hebrew/Aramaic (<i>shabbath</i>) – LEHMANN (1986) S3.		

<i>συναγωγή</i>	<i>synagogue</i>	swnagoge
“synagogue”, Mark 1:21; < Gr. – CORAZZA (1969) 86 n2, LEHMANN (1986) S190.		

<i>ψαλμός</i>	<i>psalmus</i>	psalmon/psalmo
“psalm”, 1 Cor. 14: 26; < Gr. – CORAZZA (1969) 86 n2, LEHMANN (1986) P19.		

LOAN- TRANSLATIONS

<i>ἄβυσσος</i>	<i>abyssus</i>	afgrundipa
“abyss”, af- grundus , e.g. Luke 8:31, Rom. 10:7 – FEIST (1939) 5, MEADER (1978) 29.		

<i>ἀναθεματίζειν</i>	<i>anathematizare</i>	afaikan
“deny”, “renounce” > “curse”, Matt. 10:33, John 18:25; etymology uncertain – LEHMANN (1986) A8.		

<i>ἀσέβης</i>	<i>impius</i>	afguþs
“impious”, “godless”, 1 Tim. 1:9 – LEHMANN (1986) A17.		

<i>βαπτίζειν, -ίσμα, -ιστής</i>	<i>baptizare, -isma, -ista</i>	daupyan, daupeins, daupjands; cf. ufdaupjan
“to baptize”, “baptism”, “[John] the Baptist”, e.g. Luke 3:7 (to baptize), John 13:26 (to dip in), Mark 1:9 (the Baptist), Luke 20:4 (washing) – LEHMANN (1986) D12.		

<i>βλασφημεῖν, -ία</i>	<i>blasphemare, -ia</i>	wajamerjan, wajamereins
“to blaspheme”, 1 Tim. 1:20, Mark 7:22, from wai , “woe” and merjan , “to proclaim”, “to let know” – LEHMANN (1986) W8, M53; infrequently, naiteins , e.g. Mark 3:28 – LEHMANN (1986) N3; cf. ganaitjan , “to insult”, “to treat with dishonor” – LEHMANN (1986) G49.		

<i>δαιμόνιον, δαίμων</i>	<i>daemonium/daemon</i>	unhulþo/unhulpa; skohsl
“evil spirit”, unhulþo , appears frequently, e.g. Matt. 9:33; also skohsl , “demon”, Matt. 8:31 (etymology uncertain) and woþs for Gr. <i>δαιμονισθείς</i> , “possessed by demons”, Mark 5:18; Mark 5:15, 16 (wods , wodan) – LEHMANN (1986) S93. Gothic has both loanwords and loan-translations for “demon” and “devil”.		
<i>διάβολος</i>	<i>diabolus</i>	unhulpa
See above.		
<i>ἐγκαίνια</i>	<i>encenia</i>	innuijþa
“Feast of the Dedication”, John 10:22; from niujis , “new”, niujþa , “newness” (“consecration”) – LEHMANN (1986) N23.		
<i>ἐλεμσύνη</i>	<i>eleemosyna</i>	armaio
“mercy”, “almsgiving”, Gal. 6:16, calque after Gr. <i>ἐλεος</i> , “mercy”, “alms”, cf. arman , “to have pity” – LEHMANN (1986) A199-A200.		
<i>εὐαγγελίζειν,</i> <i>-ιζέσθαι</i>	<i>evangelizare</i>	wailamerjan
“to preach good news”, e.g. Luke 1, 19, from waila , “well” and merjan , “to proclaim”, “to announce” – LEHMANN (1986) M53.		
<i>μαμμωνάς</i>	<i>mammona</i>	faihuþraihna
“riches”, e.g. Luke 16:9, from faihu , “property”, “possessions” and *þraihns , “heap”, cf. þreihan , “crowd” – LEHMANN (1986) F7.		
<i>μυστήριον</i>	<i>mysterium</i>	runa
“mystery”, “counsel”, Luke 2:10, “mystery” or “secret”, 1 Cor. 13:2, “counsel”, Matt. 27:1, Mark 3:6 – LEHMANN (1986) R32.		
<i>όλοκαύστωμα</i>	<i>holocaustoma</i>	alabrunsts
“burnt offering”, Mark 12: 33, from alls , “all”, and brinnan , “to burn” – LEHMANN (1986) A109.		
<i>παραβολή</i>	<i>parabola</i>	gajuko
“parable”, Phil. 4:3; cf. gajuk , “pair”, “companion” – LEHMANN		

(1986) G28.

<i>προφητεύειν</i>	<i>prophetare</i>	fauraqipan
“to tell beforehand”, “to prophesy”, Matt. 11:13, from faura , “in front of” + qipan , “to say” – LEHMANN (1986) Q9.		

<i>σκηνοπηγία</i>	<i>scenopegia</i>	hleprastakeins
“Feast of Tabernacles”, John 7:2; hleipra , “tent”, and stikan , “to stick” – LEHMANN (1986) H79.		

<i>συναγωγή</i>	<i>synagoga</i>	gaqumþs
“synagogue”, Mark 5:26, “assembly”, 2 Thess. 2:1 – LEHMANN (1986) G54; cf. qiman , “to come”, “to become”, “to arrive” – LEHMANN (1986) Q6.		

<i>σινείδησις</i>	<i>conscientia</i>	mipwissei
“conscience”, “consciousness”, 1 Cor. 8:10; cf. witan , “to know” – LEHMANN (1986) M74, GREEN (1995) 148.		

<i>σχίσμα</i>	<i>schisma</i>	missaqiss
“schism”, “difference of opinion”, John 7:43, missa , “false”, “different” + *qiss , from qipan , “to say”; cf. ana-qiss – LEHMANN (1986) M70.		

<i>σπένδειν</i>		hunsljan
“to sacrifice”, 2 Tim. 4:6; cf. hunsl , n. “sacrifice” – LEHMANN (1986) H109.		

<i>σώσαι, σωτέρ, σωτερία</i>	<i>salvo, salvator, salus</i>	nasjan, nasjands, naseins
“to save”, Luke 9:24; “saviour”, Luke 2:11; “salvation”, Luke 19:9 – LEHMANN (1986) N7.		

<i>ὑποκριτής</i>	<i>hypocrita</i>	liuta (“hypocrite”)
“deceiver”, “hypocrite”, Luke 5:42; cf. liutei , “hypocrisy”, “treachery”, Mark 7:22; liuts , “deceitful” – LEHMANN (1986) L53.		

<i>ψευδοπροφήτης</i>	<i>pseudopropheta</i>	liugnapraufetus, galiugapraufetus
“lying prophet”, Matt. 7:15; cf. liugan , “to tell a lie” – LEHMANN (1986) L51.		

LOAN-MEANINGS

<i>ἅγιος/ἱερός</i>	<i>sanctus/sacer</i>	weihs
“holy”, “sanctified”, Titus 1:8 – LEHMANN (1986) W46. Wulfila probably avoided deliberately the use of the other word that existed in his time, hailags , attested on the “pagan” ring of Pietroasa (unless the notoriously difficult interpretation of the inscription gives us false evidence – LEHMANN, 1986, H11), which he resented for its common use alongside hailagaz , the divine protection against the foes (by means of helmets or amulets, for instance) bestowed on the rulers and the pagan priests. For Wulfila, the Christian understanding of blessing should not imply that Christ, like the pagan gods, presides over warfare – see SCARDIGLI (1973) 219-223, GREEN (1998) 360-362.		

<i>σέβεσθαι/λατρεύειν</i>	blotan
“to serve”, “honor”, 1 Tim. 2:10, Mark 7:7, Luke 2:37 – LEHMANN (1986) B83; originally meant to sacrifice (in pagan practices), but Wulfila uses it for “to serve” or “to worship”, in general reference to fasting, prayer and good deeds. The meaning “to sacrifice” (i.e. by pagans or Jews) was rendered instead using hunsljan – GREEN (1998) 208.	

<i>στοιχεῖα</i>	<i>elementa</i>	stabeis
“elements”, Gal. 4:3; the Greek and Latin terms belong to Roman and Hellenistic astrology, denoting the powers of fate (the elements of the world) dictating over man’s life. A pagan Germanic word for fate, stabeis was probably used by Wulfila with the intention to oppose the belief in fate of the pagan Goths – see GREEN (1998) 382-383, EBBINGHAUS (2003), 105-108.		

<i>ψυχή</i>	<i>anima</i>	saiwala
“soul”, Matt. 6:25, etymology unknown – LEHMANN (1986) L51;		

originally stood for the spirit of the dead only but Christianization had its semantics expanded to include the spirit of life, which had been previously rendered by *ferh – GREEN (1995) 148.

REFERENCES

- CORAZZA, Vittoria, 1969, *Le parole latine in gotico*, Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.
- DE GABELENTZ, H. C., LOEBE, J., 1843-1846, *Ulfilas: Veteris et Novi Testamenti versionis Gothicae fragmenta quae super sunt ad fidem codd. castigata Latinitate donata adnotatione critica instructa cum glossario et grammatica linguae Gothicae*, vol II.1, Brockhaus [reprinted, *Glossarium gothicum-latinitum* (PL 18)].
- EBBINGHAUS, Ernst A., 2003, *Gotica: kleine Schriften zur gotischen Philologie*, Innsbruck.
- FEIST, Sigmund, 1939, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Gotischen Sprache*, 3ed., Leiden: Brill.
- FRIEDRICHSEN, G. W. S., 1926, *The Gothic Version of the Gospels. A Study of its Style and Textual History*, Oxford University Press.
- FRIEDRICHSEN, G. W. S., 1939, *The Gothic Version of the Epistles. A Study of its Style and Textual History*, Oxford University Press.
- GREEN, Dennis H., 1995, *The Rise of Germania in the Light of Linguistic Evidence*, in Giorgio Ausenda (ed.), *After Empire. Towards an Ethnology of Europe's Barbarians*, p. 143-162, Woodbridge: Boydell Press [reprinted 2002].
- GREEN, Dennis H., 1998, *Language and History in the Early Germanic World*, Cambridge University Press.
- GREEN, Dennis H., 2007, *Linguistic and Literary Traces of the Ostrogoths*, in Samuel Barnish, Federico Marazzi (eds.), *The Ostrogoths From the Migration Period to the Sixth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective*, p. 387-416, Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
- HEATHER, Peter and MATTHEWS, John, 1991, *The Goths in the Fourth Century*, Liverpool University Press.
- JELLINEK, Max H., 1923, "Zur christlichen terminologie im gotischen", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 47: 434-47.
- KLUGE, F., 1909, "Gotische Lehnworte im Althochdeutschen", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 35: 124-60.
- LEHMANN, Winfred P., 1986, *A Gothic etymological dictionary: based on the third edition of Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Gotischen Sprache by Sigmund Feist*, Leiden: Brill.

- LEHMANN, Winfred P., 1994, *Gothic and the Reconstruction of Proto-Germanic*, in E. Koenig and J. van der Auwera (eds.), *The Germanic Languages*, p. 19-37, London and New York: Routledge.
- MEADER, Clark D., Jr., 1978, *A Gothic-Greek-English Dictionary of the Gothic Version of Paul's Letter to the Romans*, Pennsylvania State Univ. diss.
- MÎRȘANU, Dragoș, 2009a, *The Aesthetic 'Shadow' of Gothic Arianism: Archaeology, Architecture and Art in the Age of Heresies*, in Mihail Neamțu and Bogdan Tătaru-Cazaban (eds.), *Memory, Humanity, and Meaning. Selected Essays in Honor of Andrei Pleșu's Sixtieth Anniversary*, 397-418, Bucharest: Zeta Books.
- MÎRȘANU, Dragoș, 2009b, "Further Notes on the Aesthetic 'Shadow' of Gothic Arianism in Ravenna", in *Studii Teologice* 5 (n.s), no. 4, p. 199-212, Bucharest.
- MORHMANN, Christinne, 1957, "Linguistic Problems in the Early Christian Church", in *Vigiliae Christianae* 1, no. 1, p. 1-36.
- MOSSE, Fernand, 1956, *Manuel de la langue gothique. Grammaire, textes, notes, glossaire*, Paris: Aubier, éditions Montaigne (nouvelle éd.).
- SCARDIGLI, Piergiuseppe, 1973, *Die Goten: Sprache und Kultur*, trans. B. Vollmann, München: C. H. Beck.
- SCARDIGLI, Piergiuseppe, 1998, *Gotische Bibel. Philologische und gotische Schrift*, in *Reallexicon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, 2ed., XII, p. 448-450; p. 455-458, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- SCHÄFERDIEK, Knut, 1997, *L'arianisme germaniques et ses conséquences*, in Michel Rouche (ed.), *Clovis histoire et mémoire 1. Clovis et son temps, l'événement*, p. 185-198, Paris.
- SCHÄFERDIEK, Knut, 1998, *Gotische Bibel. Kirchengeschichtliches und Skeirens*, in *Reallexicon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, 2ed., XII, p. 445-448; p. 450-453, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- STREITBERG, Wilhelm, 1910, *Die gotische Bibel II. Gotisch-Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- STREITBERG, Wilhelm, 1919, *Die gotische Bibel I (text)*, Heidelberg.

ABBREVIATIONS

Aram. = Aramaic; Cal. = *Gothic Calendar*; Cod. Arg. = *Codex Argentens*; DeN. = *Deed of Naples*; Go. = Gothic; LLat. = Late Latin; VLat. = Vulgar Latin; Sk. = *Skeireins*.