COMPARATIVE AND TYPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS

ON THE SYNTAX FROM PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN TO OLD GERMANIC LANGUAGES

ДО ПИТАННЯ СИНТАКСИСУ ВІД ПРАІНДОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОЇ ДО ДАВНІХ ГЕРМАНСЬКИХ МОВ

Tuhai O. M.
Doctor of Philosophy in Philology,
Associate Professor at the Department
of Germanic Philology
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University
Kyiv, Ukraine

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

During the time of Proto-Indo-European language, its syntactic reconstruction was still in its infancy, but the latter is considered indisputable, as the oldest daughter languages reveal syntactic consistency and resemblance with Indo-European parent language. Nominal morphology is greatly reconstructed as well, with the exception of the paradigm of pronouns, which still demonstrate their own particular interesting features by way of reconstruction. And only verbal inflections cause certain difficulties for Indo-European languages researchers [10, p. 4].

The Nostratic macro-family comprises such language families as: Indo-European, Altaic, Uralic, Dravidian, Kartvelian and Hamito-Semitic. According to the researches of Linus Brunner, Joseph H. Greenberg, Allan R. Bomhard, John C. Kerns, the Indo-European and other foreign families of the Nostratic macro-family had much in common, namely many resemblances in morphology (morphemes, roots, inflections), phonology (phonemes, sounds, consonants, vowels) and in some cases in syntax (floating word order) [2, p. 1–5].

Since, on the basis of comparative historical method, without resource to reconstruction, linguists could still reconstruct phonological correspondences of the Proto-Nostratic forms, they coped to reconstruct similarities and differences in Indo-European language family as well. Namely, the Proto-Indo-European language was reconstructed by way

of a direct comparison of the actual attested data from the individual Indo-European daughter languages without applying to reconstructed Proto-Celtic, Proto-Germanic, Proto-Italic, Proto-Indo-Iranian, Proto-Greek, etc. Reconstruction of languages intermediary levels enables us to claim powerfully about the (pre)historical evolution of any daughter language of the macro-family, emergence and extinction of its particular features, understanding of the subsequent historical processes from one daughter language into another one [2, p. 21–22].

In our research we focus on the syntactic reconstruction of Old Germanic languages on the basis of the evidenced Proto-Nostratic and Proto-Indo-European reconstructed syntactic word order of the core constituents.

Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Germanic languages demonstrated S-O-V-I (Subject – Object – Verb – Inflection) core word order as the leading one, but complementary elements (COMP) obtained left position from the verb or they were located in the initial sentence position, hence their right location was excluded. At this exact time, there is already observed the application of several rules of movement: 1) *scrambling*, which became a trigger in the formation of a large number of surface structures, 2) *raising* of interrogative and relative elements to a certain position within the complement phrase (CP), 3) *extraposition or movement* of core constituents to the right of the main verb [10, p. 64].

Syntactically, Proto-Indo-European seemed to have had many characteristics of the languages with SOV as the unmarked word order, but it must have been very flexible in the organization of its underlying word order [3, p. 89].

The syntactic structure of Proto-Indo-European sentence core is attested to be as SOV word order with the V-final after the shift of the accusative type of a sentence and the rise of the subject-object relations. V-final position is also evidenced in the Germanic languages in the most archaic poetry with the lost of lexical dominant position of the verb [7, p. 277–278].

Syntax of the Proto-Nostratic language family, which is the basis of the Proto-Indo-European language, was head-final (head-final) or left-branching (left-branching), where dependent constituents preceded their core elements in accordance with the so-called "rule of the right-hand control / ruling" ("rectum-regens rule"). Proto-Nostratic syntactic word order was unmarked or indirect such as SOV (subject-object-verb) [2, p. 504].

In our research we can testify SOV / SVO / OVS clausal syntax in the reconstructed forms from proto-languages subgroups of Proto-Indo-European language family of Nostratic macro-family.

Reconstruction of *Vedic Sanskrit* (originated from Proto-Indo-Iranian subgroup): Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (ŚB) 1.3.2.15. "víśaḥ (S) kṣatríyāya (O) balíṃ (O) haranti (V)". – ["villagers (S) to-prince (O) tax (O) they-pay (V)"]. = "The villagers (S) pay (V) taxes (O) to the prince (O)" [6, p. 17; 9, p. 30–31].

Reconstruction of *Early Latin* (originated from Proto-Italic subgroup): "Honce loucom (O) nequs (S) violatod (V)". – ["this grove (O) no-one (S) he-should-violate (V)"]. = "No one (S) should violate (V) this grove (O)" [11, p. 154; 9, p. 35].

In a similar way, the Old German primary written monuments, especially prose, consisted mainly of translations and adaptations of Latin texts, which were carefully studied by writers / scribers of the time with constant improvement of their skills and abilities. Hence, we can observe that the Latin language had a significant influence on the development of Old Germanic languages [5, p. 148].

Proto-Indo-European language had many traits of an SOV language as well, with a great deal of flexibility in the order patterning of basic words [2, p. 34].

In reconstruction of *Old Frisian* (originated from Proto-Germanic subgroup) we can testify diverse word order depending on the clause type [4, p. 105–106]:

1) SVO word order in main declarative clauses: "God (S) scop (V) thene eresta menneska" (O). – "God (S) created (V) the first human being (O)";

2) OVS word order in main topicalized clauses: "Thisse riucht (O) keren (V) alle Fresa (S)". – "These rights (O) all Frisians (S) elected (V)"; "thes greva bon (O) bonne (V) ic (S)". – "I (S) proclaim (V) the count's proclamation (O)";

3) SOV word order in dependent clauses: "Thet is thiu sextendesta kest, [thet alle Fresa (S) hire feitha (O) mith hira fia felle (V)"]. – "This is the sixteenth statute, [that all Frisians (S) should redeem (V) their feuds with their money (O)"].

In the "Commentary on the Gospel of John" we can observe reconstruction of *Gothic* (originated from Proto-Germanic subgroup) SOV core constituents order in the subordinate part of the sentence as participial construction, having been greatly influenced by Old Greek [1, p. 56; 8, p. 35]: "injah þa leikinön us wambài munans [gabaurþ (S) in tweifl (O) atdrâus (V)"] (lit.). – "and the corporeal from womb thinking [birth (S) into doubt (O) fell (V)"]. = "and thinking of the corporeal birth from the womb, [he (S) fell (V) into doubt (O)"].

Hence, we can prove the SOV (SVO / OVS) syntactic resemblance of Old Germanic languages with other languages of Proto-Indo-European subgroup which take their origin from the latter one and have distant similarities with Proto-Nostratic language of Nostratic macro-family.

Bibliography:

1. Bennett W. H. The Gothic Commentary on the Gospel of John (Skeireins aiwaggeljons pairh iohannen, a decipherment, edition, and translation), New York : Modern Language Association, 1960. 144 p.

2. Bomhard A. R. A Comprehensive introduction to Nostratic comparative linguistics: with special reference to Indo-European. Vol. 1. 4th ed. Florence : SC, 2021. 825 p.

3. Bomhard A. R. Indo-European and the Nostratic hypothesis. Charleston : Signum Desktop Publishing, 1996. 265 p.

4. Bremmer R. H. An Introduction to Old Frisian: History, Grammar, Reader, Glossary. Amsterdam – Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2009. 237 p.

5. Chambers W. W. & Wilkie J.R. A short history of the German language. 2nd ed. London – New York : Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2014. 180 p.

6. Delbrück B. 1888. Altindische Syntax. Syntaktische Forschungen 5. Halle: Waisenhaus. Reprint. Darmstadt : Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968. 634 p.

7. Gamkrelidze T. V. & Ivanov V. V. Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture. Ed. by W. Winter. Berlin – New-York : Mouton de Gruyter, 1995. 864 p.

8. Lehmann W. P. Gothic and the reconstruction of Proto-Germanic. In Ekkehard König and Johan van der Auwera (eds.) *The Germanic languages.* London – New York : Routledge, 1994. 19–37.

9. Lehmann W. P. Proto-Indo-European syntax. Austin : University of Texas Press, 1974. 278 p.

10. Ringe D. From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2006. 355 p.

11. Warmington E. H. Remains of Old Latin. Archaic Inscriptions. Vol. 4. Loeb Classics. Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1959. 544 p.