

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-261-6-52>

**SYNTACTIC INTERPRETATION OF UNIVERSAL CONCESSION
CLAUSES IN GERMANIC LANGUAGES OF VIII-XI CENTURIES**

**СИНТАКСИЧНА ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЯ РЕЧЕНЬ УНІВЕРСАЛЬНОЇ
ПОСТУПКИ У ГЕРМАНСЬКИХ МОВАХ VIII-XI СТОЛІТЬ**

Tuhai O. M.

*Doctor of Philosophy in Philology,
Associate Professor at the Department
of Germanic Philology,
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University
Kyiv, Ukraine*

Турай О. М.

*доктор філософії з філології,
доцент кафедри германської
філології, Київський університет
імені Бориса Грінченка
м. Київ, Україна*

In XIX-XX centuries many scientific papers on historical and comparative studies were preferably focused on the reconstruction of phonological, morphological, lexical lingual changes of a particular language. Moreover, some works on syntactic reconstruction of Proto-Germanic and old languages, namely particular syntactic aspects of language changes, such as word order in a sentence, location of verbs, clitics functioning, etc. were conducted at the early stages of the research of particular languages syntactic reconstructions, especially by young grammarians [3, p. 343].

Presently, studies of Proto– and Old Germanic languages are focused on the reconstruction of phonological, morphological, lexical, pragmatic, syntactic aspects etc. in comparison between naturally related languages of a certain Indo-European branch and comprise both simple, compound and complex sentences of different meaning and discourse. Hence, they lack the relevant syntactic research of the particular semantic type of sentences in historical discourse, namely sentences or clauses of a pure or universal concessive action in Germanic languages of VIII-XI centuries. And this is the key relevant point of the issue under discussion.

Notably, SOV syntactic model of a sentence with verb-final position (V-final) was widely spread among Old Germanic languages for it originated from the Nostratic Indo-European proto-language and, moreover, it was inherited from the proto-Germanic language. Such syntactic SOV model was mostly realized in adverbial subordinate clauses of complex sentences, as well as in relative and simple sentences. However, in principal clauses of complex sentences, such constituent order as (X)(v)VS(...) was mainly used. This structural phenomenon was called as V-2 type of sentences or location of the

matrix verb in the second position of a sentence after any initial constituent (X), where the latter one could be realized as subject, adverb or an adverbial element, particle, exclamation, etc. [1, p. 7].

The Indo-European Germanic branch of languages is of rich linguistic potential with V-2 phenomenon, where German, Icelandic, Frisian, Norwegian, etc. languages are exclusively of V-2 structural type. And Old English was traditionally attributed to V-2 type, while Old High German belongs to V-1 structural type [7, p. 198].

As far as the study of clauses of concession, in English linguistics four basic semantic and syntactic types are distinguished, such as clauses of pure or universal concession, clauses of conditional concession, clauses of contrastive concession and clauses of causative concession with formation of the semantics of concessively oriented symbiosis [2, p. 287]. Our study is mainly focused on the syntactic structure of concessive clauses of universal concession in Old Germanic languages.

It is worth mentioning that in Old Germanic languages from West, North and East Germanic branch clauses of a universal concessive action were introduced by such conjunctions or correlative connectors as [5]:

– Old English – *(even) though – þeah (pe), although – al sholde, however – swaþeah / swa hwæþere, howsoever – swaþeah, nevertheless – hwæþere / swa hwæþere, nonetheless – natheloes, notwithstanding – hwæþere / swa hwæþere, unless – swa, yet – hwæþere;*

– Old High German – *(even) though – thoh / doh, although – thoh / doh, however – thoh / doh, not however – nalles (ni=alles) / nalas (nales), howsoever – so we so, unless – thoh / doh, yet – thoh / doh (ju / iu), neither ... nor – noh ... noh;*

– Old Frisian – *(even) though / although / however / yet / nonetheless – thāch, nevertheless – āc, unless – hit ne sē;*

– Old Icelandic (Norse) – *(even) though / although – poh / þōt / pō;*

– Old Saxon – *(even) though / although – thoh;*

– Gothic – *(even) though / although – þauh / thauh / jabái / aþ=þan / jabai / þauh-jabái, however – þan / ak(negative), still – þana-mais, still / yet – nauh.*

In our study, syntax of universal concessive clauses is witnessed in Old English vs. Old Icelandic (Norse) on the basis of the written works such as «Beowulf» and «Poetic Edda» in original language with its translated version:

(1) Old English: næs he (S) fæge (V) þa git, ac he (S) hryne gewyrpte (V), **þeah** (Conj) ðe him wund (O) hrine (V). – not doomed (V) was he yet, and well he (S) waxed (V), **though** (Conj) the wound (O) was sore (V) (Beowulf, 2975-2976) [4].

(2) Old Icelandic (Norse): *Ösnjallr maþr hyggsk munu ey lifa ef við vīg varask en (Conj) elli (S) gefr honum (V) engi friþ (O), þót (Conj) honum geirar (V) gefi (O). – The sluggard believes he shall live forever, If the fight he faces not; **But** (Conj) age (S) shall not grant (V) him the gift of peace (O), **Though** (Conj) spears (S) may spare (V) his life (O) (Poetic Edda, verse 16) [6, p. 51].*

In Old English from example (1) we testify V-2 structural type of the whole sentence with SV / OV word order and with the finite verbs in V-final positions in the principal / subordinate concessive clause. While in Old Icelandic (Norse) from example (2) we also witness V-2 structural type of the whole sentence with SVO / VO constituent order, but with V-second position of finite verbs in combination with additional verbs the principal / subordinate concessive clause.

So, we can testify the fact of syntactic similarities and differences in the syntactic structure of universal concessive clauses in Old Germanic languages: V-2 type signals about similarities in Old English and Old Icelandic (Norse) clauses of concessive semantics, while V-final and V-second verbal positions in, respectively, Old English and Old Icelandic (Norse) confirm the structural differences in constituent order of the universal concessive sentences under investigation.

Bibliography:

1. Семененко Г. М. Підрядні речення обставини причини в давньоанглійській мові: структура та функціонування: Автореф. дис... канд. філол. Наук: 10.02.04. Київ. нац. лінгв. ун-т. Київ, 2003. 19 с.
2. Тугай О. М. Типологічна парадигма концесивних клауз у сучасному фентезійному просторі. *Нова філологія*, (85), 2022. 283-291.
3. Barðdal J. New perspectives in historical linguistics. In Claire Bowers and Bethwyn Evans (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. London, New York: Taylor and Francis Group, 2015. 343-373.
4. Beowulf / trans. by F. B. Gummere. Harvard Classics. Vol. 49. Collier, 1910. URL: <https://rpo.library.utoronto.ca/content/beowulf-1> (last accessed: 31.10.2022).
5. Bosworth J. An Anglo-Saxon dictionary. Ed. by T. Northcote Toller. Manchester : Oxford University Press, 1898. 1302 p.
6. Hildebrand K., Gering H. & Bellows H. A. Poetic Edda. Old Norse – English diglot. Melbourne: Australia, 2011. 761 p.
7. Jouitteau M. A typology of V2 with regard to V1 and second position phenomena: an introduction to the V1/V2 volume. *Lingua*, 120(2), 2010. 197-209.