

Oleksandra Tuhai,

*Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Germanic Philology,
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9831-2288>
Kyiv, Ukraine*

Genesis of Indo-European syntax

Генеза індоєвропейського синтаксису

Summary. *The proposed article is devoted to highlighting the historical origin of Indo-European syntax in terms of grammatical features of Proto-Indo-European languages (Proto-Germanic, Proto-Indo-Iranian, Proto-Italian, Proto-Greek, Vedic Sanskrit, Early Latin) and ancient Germanic languages (Old English, Old High German, Gothic, Old Saxon, Old Norse, Old Frisian) in comparison. The aim of the study is to generalize the theoretical background of the basic linguistic aspects of sentence constituents of simple and complex clauses and compare their use in the languages under study with the determination of a common origin and distinctive features of functioning. The methodological basis of the study was the methods of general and theoretical analysis, the method of internal reconstruction, and structural analysis. This made it possible to conduct a thorough theoretical analysis of the syntax of the languages under study, to carry out an internal reconstruction of sentence structures, and to conduct a comparative analysis of Indo-European syntax.*

The main syntactic factors that influenced the evolution of the syntactic system of the Old Germanic languages have been identified and revealed. The crucial shifts in the Proto-Indo-European daughter languages occurred under the influence of three main syntactic rules of shift, such as scrambling, extraposition, and Wackernagel's law (the floating clitic rule) with the syntactic evolution from the SOV model to the SVO model not in all, but in some languages of the ancient period.

It has been witnessed that the Proto-Indo-European languages had syntactic compatibility and similarity with the Nostratic macrofamily due to their syntactic interpretation as one that contained the branching of secondary sentence elements to the left of the main ones, as well as the initial, secondary, or final positions of the core constituents, due to the leading syntactic rules of the "floating clitic" and "right control", which had already dominated in the syntax of the Proto-languages.

The reconstruction of various SVO models of Proto-Indo-European and Old Germanic languages, with their definition as basic syntactic constructions of ancient languages, has been carried out. In the reconstructed simple sentence constructions of the Proto-languages of the Proto-Indo-European language

family of the Nostratic macrofamily and in simple and complex sentences of Old Germanic languages, the basic syntactic arrangement of the core constituents of sentences as SOV/SVO/OVS has been revealed, which shows functional similarity of these elements between the reconstructed sentences of Proto-Indo-European and Old Germanic languages.

The origin of the Old Germanic languages from the Proto-Indo-European parent language and its daughter languages has been proven on the basis of the affinity syntactic use of the core elements of clauses in enclitic or proclitic functions, namely the location of the auxiliary or main verb in the second or final positions of the clause due to the basic rules of light elements shifting (nouns, pronouns, adverbs, adjectives) to the left/right of the verb.

Key words: reconstruction, historical origins, core constituents' arrangement, syntactic shifts, Proto-Indo-European languages, Old Germanic languages.

Анотація. Пропонована стаття присвячена висвітленню історичного походження індоєвропейського синтаксису в аспекті граматичних особливостей праіндоєвропейських мов (прагерманська, праіндоіранська, прайталійська, прагрецька, ведичний санскрит, рання латина) та давніх германських мов (давніоанглійська, давньоверхньонімецька, готська, давньосаксонська, давньопівнічна, давньофризька) у порівнянні. Метою дослідження є узагальнення теоретичного підґрунтя базових лінгвістичних аспектів реченнєвих одиниць простого та складного речення та порівняння їхнього вживання у досліджуваних мовах із визначенням спільного походження та відмінних рис функціонування. Методологічним підґрунтям дослідження слугували методи загального та теоретичного аналізу, метод внутрішньої реконструкції, структурний аналіз. Це уможливило провести ґрунтовний теоретичний аналіз синтаксису досліджуваних мов, здійснити внутрішню реконструкцію реченнєвих структур, провести компаративний аналіз індо-європейського синтаксису.

Виявлено та розкрито основні синтаксичні фактори, що вплинули на еволюцію синтаксичної системи давньогерманських мов. Вирішальні зміни в дочірніх праіндоєвропейських мовах відбулися під впливом трьох основних синтаксичних правил зсуву, таких як скремблінг, екстрапозиція, закон Вакерналеґа (правило плаваючого клітика) із синтаксичною еволюцією від SOV-моделі до SVO-моделі не в усіх, але в деяких мовах давнього періоду.

Засвідчено, що праіндоєвропейські мови мали синтаксичну сумісність і схожість з ностратичною макросім'єю через їхню синтаксичну інтерпретацію як таку, що містила розгалуження вторинних реченнєвих елементів ліворуч від головних, а також ініціальні, другорядні або кінцеві позиції провідних складових, завдяки провідним синтаксичним правилам «плаваючого клітика» та «правого керування», які вже домінували у синтаксисі прамов.

Проведено реконструкцію різних SVO-моделей праіндоєвропейських та давньогерманських мов із їхнім визначенням як базових синтаксичних конструкцій цих мов. У реконструйованих простих реченнєвих конструкціях прамов праіндоєвропейської мовної сім'ї ностратичної макросім'ї та у простих та складних реченнях давніх германських мов виявлено базове синтаксичне аранжування провідних конституюєнтів речень як SOV/SVO/OVS, що демонструє функційну подібність цих елементів між

реконструйованими реченнями у праіндоєвропейських та давньогерманських мовах.

Доведено походження давніх германських мов від праіндоєвропейської мови основи та її дочірніх мов на підставі спорідненого синтаксичного вживання провідних елементів речень в енклітичній/проклітичній функціях, а саме розташування допоміжного або головного дієслова у другій або кінцевій позиціях речення за рахунок правил зсуву легких елементів (іменників, займенників, прислівників, прикметників) ліворуч/праворуч від дієслова.

Ключові слова: реконструкція, історичні витоки, аранжування провідних конститuentів, синтаксичні зрушення, праіндоєвропейські мови, давньогерманські мови.

Introduction. The historical syntax of the *Old Germanic languages* can be understood through both diachronic and synchronic approaches to analyzing language units and sentence structures. This understanding is rooted in the interpretation of changes that occurred within the open and dynamic systems of these languages, reflecting transformations of previously existing elements. The application of the principle of historicism to understand the variability of formal indicators in grammatical categories allows for a reconstruction of the historical origins of the formation, development of all Old Germanic languages [1; 4, p. 6; 21].

In historical linguistics, the study of the historical syntax of Old Germanic languages primarily focuses on their ethnolinguistic, cultural, syntactic, morphological, and phonological roots (B. Delbrück [14], W.P. Lehmann [25], A.R. Bomhard [8], D. Ringe [28]). Particular studies of the *Indo-European* and *Germanic languages* are focused on: the research of the general history of Germanic languages (W.W. Chambers & J.R. Wilkie [13]), the analysis and description of certain grammatical and semantic categories of complex sentences in the ancient languages within the Anglo-Saxon area in general and in comparison (L.F. Klipstein [23]; F.A. March [26]), the study of communicative, syntactic, typological aspects of the English complex sentence in diachrony and synchrony (І.Р. Буніятова [1]; I. Bunyatova [12]; О. Шапочкіна [4]), as well as on the comparative-historical aspect of Indo-European linguistics (J.S. Klein, B.D. Joseph, M. Fritz [22]).

In modern syntactic studies, the main concern of language researchers is chiefly focused on determining the function of morphological elements and categories of Germanic languages, such as the use of different case forms that differed significantly from the Greek language, for example [24, p. 34].

The *rationale* of our investigation is to represent the historical origin of Indo-European syntax in terms of syntactic particularities between the Proto-Indo-European and Old Germanic languages. The *aim* of the paper

is to generalize and compare basic linguistic features in the syntax of the Proto-Indo-European languages and Old Germanic languages.

The *objectives* of the study provided are: 1) to generalize the theoretical historical background and highlight basic syntactic aspects of Proto-Indo-European languages and Old Germanic languages in comparison; 2) to define the leading syntactic factors/rules that influenced the rise of the Old Germanic syntax; 3) to reconstruct SVO-patterns in Proto- and Old languages; 4) to find out the syntactic compatibility of Indo-European languages by way of identifying similarities and differences between the Proto-Indo-European languages and the Old Germanic languages under study; 5) to prove the genesis of Old Germanic languages from the Proto-Indo-European parent and daughter languages.

The *material* of the research consisted of text fragments from different Proto-Indo-European and Old Germanic languages.

Methodology. This research employs several relevant interrelated methods and approaches to examine the historical particularities of Indo-European syntax. *Generalizing theoretical* analysis is used to represent the general theoretical background of the syntax of Proto-Indo-European languages. *Structural* analysis examines the basic arrangement of the core constituents in the proto- and old languages under study. The method of *internal reconstruction* serves to define the basic SVO models from the samples of the reconstructed languages. *Comparative-historical* analysis enables an in-depth comparison of syntactic patterns, with a focus on highlighting similarities and differences of basic syntactic features in Proto- and Old Germanic languages.

Results and Discussion. Syntax of Proto-languages. Historical linguistics demonstrates the ability of any language to undergo gradual or sudden shifts in its evolutionary stage (synchronic or diachronic) with the identification of linguistic universals and typological generalizations of historical recursive processes [3, p. 147]. A comparative study of linguistic universals in the evolutionary progress of Germanic languages from the *Proto-base language* to the *Old Germanic languages* makes it possible to pursue the historical origin of their basic grammatical and syntactic paradigms and the reconstruction of genetically related common syntactic features of the Proto- and Old Germanic languages in their synchronic stages.

The *Old Germanic languages* belong to the *Indo-European language family* and include such Germanic language areas as: Gothic-Scandinavian (Gothic, Old Saxon, Old Icelandic/Norse) and West Germanic (Old English, Old High German, Old Frisian). The most ancient Germanic written monuments refer to the Germanic-Scandinavian epic poems of the IV–XIII centuries, in which there had been depicted and reproduced

military martial ideals of that era – the fighting spirit of the Vikings, war campaigns, bloody massacres, warlords’ glorification, military honour, etc. [4, pp. 174–177; 12; 21].

Old Germanic languages under our investigation take their origins from a *Proto-Germanic language* of the Proto-Indo-European family. To solve the main tasks of our research, we will refer to the definition of such concepts as “Proto-Indo-European language”, “Proto-Germanic language”, and “syntactic reconstruction”.

Proto-Indo-European language or *Indo-European Proto-language* is the result of *language reconstruction* based on the linguistic data of Indo-European languages, where *Sanskrit* has always served as the classic model or standard for proto-language, despite numerous discussions on this issue [2, p. 72].

The syntax of the *Proto-Indo-European language* was still in its infancy at that time, but its reconstruction is considered to remain indisputable since the oldest witnessed languages that have been derived from this *Proto-Indo-European language* showed syntactic compatibility and resemblance with the latter. Nominal morphology has also been well reconstructed, except for pronouns, in which there have still been considerable distinctive features under their reconstruction. The only exceptional aspect that caused particular difficulties for researchers who pioneered Indo-European languages was the inflection of the verbs [28, p. 4].

But, without applying the resources for reconstruction, the comparative method from the historical perspective helped researchers reconstruct phonological matches in *Proto-Nostratic* word forms, as well as resemblances (similarities) and contrasts (dissimilarities) in the word forms of the Indo-European language family. To be specific, constituent and sentence reconstruction of the *Proto-Indo-European parent language* was conducted via direct juxtaposition of the truly confirmed and testified data of some *Indo-European daughter languages* without referring to the reconstructed word forms of *Proto-Germanic*, *Proto-Indo-Iranian*, *Proto-Italic*, *Proto-Greek*, etc. Thus, the reconstruction of transitional word forms of these languages signals the (pre)historical evolution of the daughter languages from the macro-family, its specific features’ emergence and extinction, as well as enables us to perceive profoundly successive historical processes in the daughter languages’ transition from one into another [7, pp. 21–22].

In the reconstruction of *Vedic Sanskrit* (originating from the Proto-Indo-Iranian language), we can witness the SO(O)V arrangement of the core constituents in a simple sentence or clause with the main verb in the V-final position and objects “*kṣatṛíyāya*”, “*balīm*” in the *enclitic* function according to the *scrambling* rule:

(1) Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (ŚB) 1.3.2.15.: [“*viśaḥ (S) kṣatriyāya (O) balim (O) haranti (V).*”] – [“*villagers (S) to-prince (O) tax (O) they-pay (V).*”] = “*The villagers (S) pay (V) taxes (O) to the prince (O).*”] [14, p. 17; 25, pp. 30–31].

In the reconstruction of an *Early Latin* simple clause (originating from the Proto-Italic language), we can also testify the OSV arrangement of core elements with the subject “*nequs*” in the *proclitic* function due to the rule of *scrambling*:

(2) [“*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).*”] [34, p. 154; 25, p. 35].

Proto-Nostratic syntax has always been regarded as the foundation of *Proto-Indo-European syntactic units* with head-final core constituents and left-branching secondary elements of the sentence, as well as with indirect or unmarked syntactic SOV-word order, hence following its “*rectum-regens rule*” (“*rule of the right-hand ruling/control*”) [7, p. 504; 9, p. 166].

In accordance with *Wackernagel’s law*, the prominent feature of *Proto-Indo-European syntax* had been the usage of the “*clitic floating rule*” (clitic – a weak/unstressed element) where pronominal and all other clitics had shifted to the right slot immediately after the initial element of the clause with its main location in the second slot of the sentence. The same “*clitic floating rule*” had been brightly implemented in *Old Greek* and continued operating in the *Proto-Germanic languages* that had been observed and witnessed, and in *Old Germanic languages*, particularly in *Gothic* [28, p. 64; 20].

In the reconstruction of an *Old Greek* complex sentence (originating from the Proto-Greek language), we can testify the OSV arrangement of core elements where objects “*hēssōn*” and “*phérteros*”, as the weak and unstressed elements, shifted to the right locations after the first stressed elements, obtaining second positions and the *enclitic* function due to the *clitic floating rule*:

(3) Iliad 16.722.: [[“*aíth’, hóson (O) hēssōn (ADJ/O) eimí (S-V), [tóson (O) séo (O) phérteros (ADJ/O) eíēn (S-V).*”]] – [[“*Oh, to-what-extent (O) weaker (ADJ/O) I-am (S-V) [to-that-extent (O) from-you (O) stronger (ADJ/O) I-might-be (S-V).*”]] = [[“*I (S) wish [I (S) were (V) as much stronger than you (ADJ/O)] [as I (S) am (V) weaker (ADJ/O).*”]] [30, pp. 98–101].

The core structure of any *Proto-Indo-European clause* was evidenced as SOV-word order with the main verb in the V-final slot as a result of the accusative sentence type shift, as well as subject-object relations rise [15, p. 277].

In *Proto-Indo-European* and *Proto-Germanic*, the leading core constituent order was asserted as Subject – Object – Verb – Inflection (S-O-V-I). However, complementary or secondary elements were located to the left slot from the verb, or they obtained the initial position of the sentence, but never the right slot from the verb. This historical period of that time was also marked by the application of some shifting rules as [28, p. 295]: 1) *the scrambling rule* as the trigger in the derivational formation and foundation of lots of surface syntactic structures, where elements could shift either to the left slot or right slot from the main verb; 2) *the raising rule*, according to which different relative, interrogative elements are raised to the particular slot (preferably to the right slot from the verb) in a CP complement phrase; 3) *the extraposition rule*, according to which some elements could move to the right slot from the verb.

The *Proto-Germanic languages* generally inherited from the *Proto-Indo-European languages* the “enclitic” position of the light verbs or particles (unstressed elements or auxiliary verbs) (“enclitic” location is the adjunction to the previous stressed or semantically strong element). But at the same time, like some particles, under unexpected circumstances, light verbs could occur in “proclitic” position to the first autonomous constituent of the sentences (“proclitic” location is the adjunction to the further stressed or semantically strong element). However, along with the fact, that certain particles functioned as unchangeable “enclitics” and never occurred in the “proclitic” position, particular Old Germanic verbs had the tendency to occupy the location after the first important element in a clause, hence they played the “enclitic function” in the V-2 sentence position [20, p. 58].

Proto-Germanic language was marked by lots of similar *Proto-Indo-European* syntactic features, including SOV clausal models, despite its great flexibility of principal constituents’ order [7, p. 34].

In the *Proto-Germanic sentence*, the verb slot position had included common features with *early* or *Old Germanic languages*, namely [20, pp. 20–21]: a) the finite verb-second slot position in the simple/main clause; b) the finite verb-final slot position in the subordinate clause; c) the finite/non-finite verb changeable slot position depending on the noun/pronoun; d) the finite verb-initial slot position in the interrogative/imperative clause.

In the comparison of languages during their development, we follow important postulates based on the universal concept of “Indo-European Comparative Grammar” [22, pp. 138–139]: 1) acceptance of the linguistic geographical model with linguistic regrouping of different languages; 2) lack of the “language internal changes” concept development, apart from the concept of “language changes in diachronic development”;

3) study of the versatile linguistic aspects taking into account historical, geographical, ethnological, theological, and philosophical views and considerations with the natural spread of linguistically relevant topics in various disciplines; 4) “recognized” or postulated genealogical relationships between languages had not included all well-known Indo-European languages at that time, nor had they only comprised Indo-European languages.

The above-mentioned postulated principles enabled us to put forward certain linguistic features of *Proto-Nostratic*, *Proto-Indo-European*, and *Proto-Germanic languages* in the aspect of Indo-European comparative grammar, under the next particular conditions: 1) unification of the studied languages by the geographical language area; 2) taking into account both language-internal changes (if available) and language changes in diachrony; 3) research of the various language aspects in historical, geographical, and philosophical dimensions; 4) symbiosis or overlap of the studied Indo-European languages, having been based on the recognized genealogical relationships.

Syntax of Old Germanic languages. Historical linguistics demonstrates the ability of any language among groups and subgroups of one language family to undergo basic syntactic rules and the tendency to establish them in those languages, along with revealing and identifying basic linguistic universals and typological generalizations of historical processes. The syntax of Old Germanic languages under study – Old English, Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Norse, Gothic, and Old Frisian has also revealed basic syntactic patterns with similar structural models by way of their mutual influence and common origin from one ancestor – the Proto-Indo-European parent language.

Germanic languages display notable similarities within *the West Germanic subgroup*, where a level of consistency and uniformity emerged across various dialects of Old Germanic languages [29, p. 223].

In *Old Germanic syntax*, the basic word order was reconstructed from Proto-Germanic and followed the structure of subject (S) – object (O) – verb (V), as evidenced by the earliest fixed written monuments. This SOV (subject-object-verb) order persisted for a long time in an isolated and peripheral dialect, specifically the English language, until the end of the first millennium AD. It was only after the Norman Conquest in 1066 that there was a significant shift to the SVO (subject-verb-object) structure. However, this transition to SVO was primarily absorbed by the Nordic dialects and the Gothic language, and it eventually spread to other Germanic languages [20, p. 95]. V-final location was also mentioned in the oldest archaic poems of the Germanic languages, where main verbs had already lost their primary lexical positions [15, pp. 277–278].

The rise of *Old Germanic languages* was significantly influenced by *Latin*. As a result, the early written texts in Old Germanic were often translated interpretations and adaptations of Latin originals, thanks to the advanced writing skills of the scribes and authors of that era [13, p. 148; 34]. The *Gothic* language has been significantly influenced by *Old Greek*, with some lesser influence from *Latin*. Despite incorporating a few non-Germanic syntactic features, Gothic predominantly follows the Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) pattern in both main and subordinate clauses [6, p. 19; 24, p. 35]. *Old Frisian* demonstrates the variation in word order patterns across different clausal types in complex sentences [11, pp. 105–106]. The basic *Latin* syntax follows an SOV order, which is very similar to the core constituent order of the Proto-Indo-European language [28, p. 64; 34].

In *Gothic* texts, the high-quality literary translation often retained word order patterns originating from Greek, primarily evident in the arrangement of nominal and verb groups. This pattern reveals that the Gothic language has preserved many object-verb (OV) structures, indicating its use of object-verb syntax with only minor deviations from Greek syntax [24, p. 34].

In the complex sentence from “Commentary on the Gospel of John”, we can evidence the reconstruction of the *Gothic* SOV core constituents’ order (originating from Proto-Germanic) in the subordinate part of the whole sentence as a participial construction, with the object “*in tweiþl*” in the *proclitic* function due to the *scrambling* rule, having been greatly influenced by *Old Greek* [6, p. 56]:

(4) “Commentary on the Gospel of John”: [*“injah pa leikinön us wambài munans [gabaurp (S) in tweiþl (O) atdräus (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).”]*] [24, p. 35].

In the reconstruction of the *Gothic* language from “Wulfila Bible”, we can attest the OV/OSVO-word order of the core constituents in the main and subordinate clauses of the complex sentence with their objects “*inu þein ragin*”, “*ni swaswe bi naupai*” in the *enclitic* function due to the *scrambling* and *clitic floating* rules:

(5) “Wulfila Bible”: [*“ip (CONJ) inu þein ragin (O) ni waiht (O) wilda (V) taujan (V), [ei (CONJ) ni swaswe bi naupai (O) þiup þein (S) sijai (V), ak us lustum (O).”]*] – [*“But (CONJ) without thy mind (O) would (V) I (S) do (V) nothing (O); [that thy (CONJ) benefit (O) should not be (V) as it were of necessity, but willingly (O).”]*] (Wulfila Bible, Philemon 1:14) [18].

In object-verb (OV) languages, such as Japanese and Turkish, controlling elements are positioned relative to the controlled elements in

the same way that the verb, the main controlling element, occupies its place in the sentence. As a result, like objects that appear before the verb, complements, which include object clauses and adverbial clauses, also precede the main clause in *Gothic* and other *Indo-European languages*. Similarly, relative clauses, adjectives, and genitive modifiers are found in front of the nouns they modify. The remnants of OV word order in verb-object (VO) languages reflect the earlier structure of a language and indicate its origin from a *Proto-language* [24, p. 34; 20].

As *Old Germanic languages* developed, there was a growing tendency to use finite verbs, and only occasionally non-finite verbs, in non-final positions within both main and subordinate clauses. This shift aimed to reduce exceptional usage as these languages progressed. A significant syntactic change in *Old Germanic sentences* was the transition from a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) word order to a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) structure, where the subject precedes the verb in the second position (V-2). However, this change did not occur uniformly across all Old Germanic languages at that time [29, p. 143].

In the reconstruction of an *Old English* complex sentence (originating from Proto-Germanic), we testify the S(V)OVO/OV arrangement of the core constituents in the principal and subordinate clauses with the objects “ende”, “worulde lifes”, “se wyrm somod” in the *proclitic* function according to the rules of *extraposition* and *scrambling*:

(6) “Beowulf”: [[“Sceolde lændaga æpeling (S) ærgod (V) ende (O) gebidan, (V) worulde lifes, (O) ond (CONJ) se wyrm somod, (O)]] [beah ðe (CONJ) hordwelan (O) heolde (V) lange.”]] (Old English) – [[“Atheling brave, he (S) was fated (V) to finish (V) this fleeting life, (O) his days on earth, (O) and (CONJ) the dragon with him, (O)]] [though (CONJ) long it (S) had watched (V) o’er (O) the wealth of the hoard! (O)”]] (Beowulf, 2341–2344) [16; 17; 10].

In the reconstruction of an *Old High German* complex sentence (originating from Proto-Germanic), we can trace the diverse VSO/SV/SOV arrangement of the core elements both in the main and subordinate clauses with the subject “er” in the *enclitic* function according to the rule of *scrambling*:

(7) “Evangelienbuch”: [[“Ni wolt (V) er (S) fon niawihti (O)]] [(thoh (CONJ) er (S) so duan mohti (V),] [ob (CONJ) er (S) thes (O) wolti thenken (V)]] [then (CONJ) selbon (S) win (O) wirken (V);] [Suntar hiaz mit willen (O) thi u sehs faz (O) gifullen (V) Wazares thie sine (O),] [thaz (CONJ) woraht (V) er (S) thar zi wine (O),”] (Old High German) – [Christus (S) wollte (V) nicht] – [obwohl (CONJ) er (S) es (O) hätte tun können (V),] [wenn (CONJ) es (S) seinem Plan (O) entsprochen hätte (V)] – [den (CONJ) Wein (O) aus nichts (O) schaffen (V),] [sondern er

(S) ließ (V) ganz bewußt die sechs Gefäße (O) von den Seinen (O) mit Wasser (O) füllen (V);] [dieses (O) verwandelte (V) er (S) dann in Wein (O),] (German) (Evangelienebuch, Buch 11, Kapitel 10, 1-4) [35, p. 89]. – [Christ (S) did not want (V) to create (V) wine (O) out of nothing (O)] – [although (CONJ) he (S) could have done (V) so,] [had (V) it (S) been (V) in accordance with his plan (O)] – [but (CONJ) he (S) deliberately had (V) his followers (O) fill (V) the six vessels (O) with water (O);] [this (O) he (S) then transformed (V) into wine (O).]

In the reconstruction of an *Old Saxon* complex sentence (originating from Proto-Germanic), we can also witness different VSOVS/SVO(O) arrangement of the principal constituents in the main and subordinate clauses with subject “im [an]”, object “im thō” in the *enclitic* function due to *Wackernagel’s law*; subject “he” in the *enclitic* function due to the *scrambling rule*; object phrase “kraft mikil kûdien wolda weroda” in the *proclitic* function due to the *extraposition rule*:

(8) “Heliand”: [“Was (V) im [an] (ADJ/S) them sinweldi (O) sâlig (V) barn godes (S) lange hwîle (ADV),] [untthat (CONJ) im thō (O) [liobora] warð (O),] [that (CONJ) he (S) is (V) kraft mikil kûdien wolda weroda (O) te willion (O).”] (Old Saxon) – [“For a long while then, God’s Blessed Bairn (S) dwelt (V) in the wilderness (O),] [Till (CONJ) it (S) seemed (V) to Him (O) better for the benefit of all (O)] [That (CONJ) He (S) show (V) His great strength (O) to the folk (O).”] (Heliand, Capitulum XIV, 14:1121-1124) [33; 32, p. 37; 31; 10].

In the reconstruction of *Old Norse* simple, complex sentences (originating from Proto-Germanic), we can witness the various VO(O)(O)/SVOV syntactic arrangement of the core elements in different clauses with object “þēr” in the *proclitic* function due to the *scrambling rule*; subject phrase “alfroþull lȳsir” in the *enclitic* function due to the *clitic floating rule*; object “at mīnum” in the *enclitic* function according to the *scrambling rule*:

(9) *Freyr kvað*: [“Hvi (CONJ) of segjak (V) þēr (O), seggr enn ungi! (O) mikinn möptrega? (O)] [þvīt (CONJ) alfroþull lȳsir (S) of alla daga (V), ok þeygi (CONJ) at mīnum (O) munum (V).”] (Old Norse) – *Freyr spake*: [“How (CONJ) shall (V) I (S) tell (V) thee (O), thou hero young (O), Of all my grief so great? (O)] [Though (CONJ) every day the elfbeam (S) dawns (V), It (S) lights (V) my longing (O) never.”] (Poetic Edda, Skirnismol (The Ballad of Skirnir), 4) [19, p. 153; 5; 36].

In the reconstruction of *Old Frisian* simple/complex sentences (originating from the Proto-Germanic language), we can testify the diverse SVO-constituents’ orders depending on the clause type [11, pp. 105–106]:

1) SVO word order in the main declarative clause with object phrase “thene ɛresta menneska” in the *proclitic* function due to the *extraposition rule*:

(10) [“God (S) scop (V) thene ɛresta menneska (O).”] – [“God (S) created (V) the first human being (O).”]

2) OVS word order in main topicalized clauses with the subjects “*alle Fresa*”, “*ic*” in the *proclitic* function due to the *extraposition* rule:

(11) [“*Thisse riucht (O) keren (V) alle Fresa (S).*”] – [“*These rights (O) all Frisians (S) elected (V).*”]

(12) [“*thes greva bon (O) bonne (V) ic (S).*”] – [“*I (S) proclaim (V) the count’s proclamation (O).*”]

3) SOV word order in the dependent clause with the object phrase “*hire feitha*” in the *enclitic* function due to the *scrambling* rule:

(13) [“*Thet is thiū 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).*”]]

4) SOV/VSO word order in independent/dependent clauses with the subject phrase “*di frya Fresa*”, subject “*hy*” in the *enclitic* function due to *Wackernagel’s law*; subject “*hi*”, object phrase “*riuchta jelda*” in the *proclitic* function due to the *extraposition* and *scrambling* rules:

(14) [“*Dat (S) is (V) riucht (O).*”] [“*Aldeer (CONJ) di frya Fresa (S) ene oderne to dada (O) slacht (V) ende (CONJ) dat hine (S) jelda (O) schil (V), [soe (CONJ) aegh (V) hi (S) him (O) to biedane (V) twa pond toe (O) jaen (V), [dat (CONJ) hy (S) riuchta jelda (O) ontfaen wil (V).*”] (Old Frisian) – [“*This (S) is (V) the law (O).*”] [“*If (CONJ) one free Frisian (S) kills (V) another free Frisian (O) and (CONJ) he (S) has to pay (V) wergild (O) for it (O), [he (S) has to offer to give (V) the heir (O) two pounds (O), [so that (CONJ) he (S) will be willing to accept (V) the legal wergild (O).*”] (Frisian Land Law, The Younger Skelta Law, 1) [27, pp. 288–289].

Conclusions. The article reveals the basic theoretical background of the genesis and syntax of ancient Indo-European languages in comparison. The findings of the study represent similar syntactic aspects and the affinity functional use of the core sentence constituents in Proto-Indo-European and Old Germanic languages under study, which shows the common origin between these languages. Thus, the reconstructed simple and complex sentences demonstrate diverse SVO-patterns with the core elements in different positions of the clauses due to basic syntactic rules such as “clitic floating rule” (Wackernagel’s law), “scrambling”, “extraposition”, which influenced the evolution of the sentence constituents’ location from SOV model to SVO model, but not in all Old Germanic languages at that time. It has been revealed that the basic syntactic arrangement of sentence core constituents is SOV/SVO/OVS models with their own variations in Proto-Indo-European and Old Germanic languages under study.

The basic syntactic position functions of the core constituents of the clause have been described as subject/verb/object in different sentence slot positions (initial/medial/final) according to their enclitic and proclitic functions due to the main syntactic rules of shifting of the elements. The *enclitic* function of objects, subjects, and subject/object phrases has been identified and described in Vedic Sanskrit, Old Greek, Gothic, Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Norse, and Old Frisian according to the scrambling, clitic floating (Wackernagel's law) rules, with V-final/V-2 positions. The *proclitic* function of subjects, objects, and object phrases has been defined and featured in Early Latin, Gothic, Old English, Old Saxon, and Old Frisian due to the scrambling and extraposition rules, with V-2/V-final locations.

Both syntactic position and enclitic/proclitic functions of the core elements of the investigated clauses are crucial basic grounds for syntactic similarity and affinity use between the Proto-Indo-European parent language, its daughter languages and Old Germanic languages, which proves the historical genesis of the latter ones from Proto-languages, and the common origin of Indo-European language family.

Prospects for further investigation can be conducted in terms of the syntactic functions of the secondary elements, such as conjunctions, adverbs, and particles.

REFERENCES

1. Буніятова І. Р. Еволюція гіпотаксису в германських мовах (IV–XIII ст.) : монографія. Київ : Київ. нац. лінгв. ун-т, 2003. 328 с.
2. Капранов Я. В. Історико-генетичні витоки поняття «прамова» у порівняльно-історичному мовознавстві. *Вісник Київського національного лінгвістичного університету*. Серія Філологія : зб. наук. пр. [гол. ред. А. В. Корольова]. Київ : Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2015. Т. 18. № 2. С. 70–76.
3. Тугай О.М. Порядок конститuentів у реченнях поступки: давньоанглійська vs давньовірхньонімецька мови. *Львівський філологічний часопис*, № 12. Львів : Вид. дім «Гельветика», 2022. С. 146–154.
4. Шапочкіна О. Типологія категорії стану в германських мовах: монографія. Київ : Київ. ун-т ім. Б. Грінченка, 2022. 300 с.
5. Arthur R.G. *English-Old Norse Dictionary*. Cambridge – Ontario: Publications Linguistics Series, 2002. 166 p.
6. Bennett W.H. *The Gothic Commentary on the Gospel of John (Skeireins aiwageljons pairh iohannen, a decipherment, edition, and translation)*, New York : Modern Language Association, 1960. 144 p.
7. 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.
8. Bomhard A.R. *Indo-European and the Nostratic hypothesis*. Charleston : Signum Desktop Publishing, 1996. 265 p.

9. Bomhard A.R., Kerns J.C. The Nostratic macrofamily: a study in distant linguistic relationship. Berlin – New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 1994. 932 p.
10. Bosworth J. An Anglo-Saxon dictionary. Ed. by T. Northcote Toller. Manchester : Oxford University Press, 1898. 1302 p.
11. Bremmer R.H. An Introduction to Old Frisian: History, Grammar, Reader, Glossary. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2009. 237 p.
12. Bunyatova I. Elimination of grammatical redundancy in the history of English: The case of negative constructions. *Studies in linguistics, anglophone literature and cultures: Studies in the evolution of the English language*, Vol. 32. Berlin : Peter Lang, 2021. P. 97–109.
13. 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.
14. Delbrück B. Altindische Syntax. Syntaktische Forschungen 5. Halle : Waisenhauss. Reprint. 1888. Darmstadt : Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968. 634 p.
15. 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.
16. Gummere F.B. (Trans.). Beowulf. Harvard Classics, 49. Collier, 1910. Retrieved from <https://rpo.library.utoronto.ca/content/beowulf-1>
17. Heaney S. (Trans.). Beowulf: A new verse translation. New York – London : W.W. Norton & Company, 2000. 221 p.
18. Herdt T. de (Ed.). Wulfila Bible. Wulfila Project. 2025. Retrieved from <http://www.wulfila.be/gothic/browse/>
19. Hildebrand K., Gering H., Bellows H. A. Poetic Edda. Old Norse – English Diglot. Melbourne : Australia, 2011. 761 p.
20. Hopper P. J. The syntax of the simple sentence in Proto-Germanic. Berlin – Boston : De Gruyter Mouton, 1975. 104 p.
21. Horodilova, T.M. (2022). Negative constructions in the history of German: the case of multiple negation. *Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philological Sciences*, Vol. 1 (96), 2022. P. 75–86.
22. Klein, J.S., Joseph, B.D., Fritz, M. (Eds.); in cooperation with Wenthe, M. Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics: an International Handbook. HSK 41.1. Berlin – Boston : De Gruyter Mouton, 2017. 732 p.
23. Klipstein L.F. A Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language. Revised and Enlarged Edition. New York : Geo P. Putman. 1859. 276 p.
24. Lehmann W.P. Gothic and the Reconstruction of Proto-Germanic. Ekkehard König, Auwera, van der J. (Eds.), The Germanic Languages. London – New York : Routledge, 1994. 19–37.
25. Lehmann W.P. Proto-Indo-European Syntax. Austin : University of Texas Press, 1974. 278 p.
26. March F.A. A Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language; in which its Forms are Illustrated by those of the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Gothic, Old Saxon, Old Friesic, Old Norse, and Old High-German. London : Sampson Low, Son, and Marston, 1870. 253 p.
27. Nijdam H., Hallebeek J., Hylkje de J. Frisian Land Law. A Critical Edition and Translation of the Freeska Landriucht. Leiden – Boston : Koninklijke Brill N.V., 2023. 449 p.

28. Ringe D. From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2006. 355 p.
29. Robinson O.W. Old English and Its Closest Relatives: A Survey of the Earliest Germanic Languages. London : Routledge, 1992. 259 p.
30. Schwyzer E. Griechische Grammatik Bd. 2: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik. 6. Auflage, XXIII. Munich : C. H. Beck, 2013. 714 S.
31. Scott M., Regan B.T. (Eds.). Heliand. Old Saxon Accidence. Translations. 1969. Retrieved from <https://www.hieronymus.us.com/latinweb/Mediaevum/Heliand.htm#top>
32. Scott M. (Trans.). The Heliand: Translated from the Old Saxon. Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina Press, 1966. 216 p.
33. Sievers E. Heliand. Titelaufgabe vermehrt um das Prager Fragment des Heliand und die Vaticanischen Fragmente von Heliand und Genesis. Halle (Saale) – Berlin : Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses G.M.B.H., 1878. 542 p.
34. Warmington E. H. Remains of Old Latin. *Archaic Inscriptions*. Vol. 4. Loeb Classics. Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1959. 544 p.
35. Weißenburg O. von. Evangelienbuch. Althochdeutsch / Neuhochdeutsch. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 1987. 271 S.
36. Zoëga G.T. A concise dictionary of Old Icelandic. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1910. 354 p.