

**ARCHEOLOGY OF LANGUAGE:
IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS**

**АРХЕОЛОГІЯ МОВИ:
ПИТАННЯ ІСТОРИЧНОЇ ЛІНГВІСТИКИ**

UDC 811.112.2'367'01

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-18>

Oleksandra TUHAI

*PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University (Ukraine)*
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9831-2288>

**MODELS OF SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES
IN OLD GERMANIC CONCESSIVE SENTENCES**

Пропонована стаття присвячена вивченню синтаксичного профілю давньогерманських мов, а саме особливостям функціонування синтаксису та граматичної рамкової структури речень із концесивною (поступальною) семантикою у германських мовах давнього періоду (давньоанглійська, давньоверхньонімецька, давньосаксонська, давньопівнічна (давньоісландська), готська, давньофризька). *Метою* статті є окреслення моделей синтаксичних структур складних речень з підрядною або сурядною поступальною дією у чотирьох типах речень поступки – з чистою (концесивною), кондиціональною, контрастивною, каузативною поступальною семантикою в шести давньогерманських мовах. Реалізація цієї *мети* передбачала опрацювання методики, що ґрунтується на застосуванні міждисциплінарного інструментарію шляхом залученням таких *методів*, як метод внутрішньої реконструкції, порівняльно-історичний, структурно-синтаксичний, семантичний, описовий методи, аналітичний і синтетичний аналіз, та метод суцільної вибірки.

На основі внутрішньої граматичної реконструкції давньогерманських речень поступки різних семантичних типів виокремлено *три провідні типи* їхньої внутрішньої рамкової структури із провідною позицією головного V-фінітного дієслова у головній та концесивній (або підрядній / сурядній) клаузі, а саме: 1) VXS- / VSX-модель із V-фінітним дієсловом в ініціальній позиції; 2) SVX- / XVS-модель із V-фінітним дієсловом у другорядній позиції; 3) SXV- / XSV-модель із V-фінітним дієсловом у фінальній позиції. Визначено, що синтаксис речень поступки із різною концесивною семантикою у синхронії демонструє функціонування виокремлених синтаксичних моделей у більшості семантичних типів речень поступки в залежності від конкретної давньогерманської мови.

Зафіксовано спільні, відмінні синтаксичні властивості давньогерманських клауз поступки у шести конфігураціях як SXV / XSV / VXS / VSX / SVX / XVS з акцентом на ініціальній / другорядній / фінальній позиціях слотів головних V-фінітних дієслів у принциповій та субординативній (координативній) клаузах. *Спільні синтаксичні властивості* детерміновано у наявності однакової синтаксичної слотової позиції головного фінітного дієслова – V-ініціальної, V-другорядної, V-фінальної – як обопільної сигнальної синтаксичної функції або ознаки в усіх або певних семантичних типах поступальної дії зазначених давніх мов. *Відмінні синтаксичні властивості* встановлено як відсутність певної синтаксичної слотової позиції головного фінітного дієслова – V-ініціальної, V-другорядної, V-фінальної – як відмінної сигнальної синтаксичної ознаки функціонування певного типу речення поступки у певній давньогерманській мові.

Окреслено рамкову структуру речень поступки в термінах *синтаксичної узгодженості* клауз чистої (концесивної), кондиціональної, контрастивної, каузативної поступки із відповідними головними клаузами в межах речень поступки як «контактна – дистантна» впорядкованість внутрішніх рамкових слотових позицій *клаузального сполучника* із «контактним – дистантним» аранжуванням локалізації зовнішньої рамкової клаузи всередині всього речення поступки. *Синтаксична узгодженість сполучників* поступки / підрядності в межах клауз речень поступки окреслена як «контактна – дистантна» впорядкованість слотових позицій внутрішньої рамкової *сполучникової послідовності* із «контактним – дистантним» аранжуванням позиції рамкового сполучника всередині рамки.

Виявлено, що слотові позиції *контактного клаузального сполучника* виявилися загальними для всіх давньогерманських мов у чотирьох семантичних типах речень чистої (концесивної), кондиціональної, контрастивної та каузативної поступки. Слотові позиції *дистантного клаузального сполучника* переважали у давньоверхньонімецьких реченнях чистої (концесивної), контрастивної поступки, та у готських реченнях кондиціональної, контрастивної, каузативної поступки. Позиції слотів *контактної сполучникової послідовності* засвідчено лише у готському кондиціональному та давньофризькому каузативному концесивних реченнях. Позиції слотів *дистантної сполучникової послідовності* були загальними для давньоверхньонімецьких кондиціональних, каузативних концесивних речень, готського контрастивного речення поступки, давньофризького контрастивного, каузативного концесивних речень, а також для давньоанглійського каузативного речення поступки.

Ключові слова: речення поступки, рамкова структура, реконструкція, синтаксична узгодженість, давньогерманські мови

For citation: Tuhai, O. (2025). Models of Syntactic Structures in Old Germanic Concessive Sentences. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, vol. 1, issue 29, pp. 305-327, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-18>

Introduction

Syntactic structures in languages play a crucial role in the differentiation of basic linguistic patterns, similarities, and differences of core constituents of a sentence, as well as in understanding the syntactic coherence of clauses and their compatibility with other sentence components. It is important not only to understand the SVO models and their configurations in any language but also to grasp the syntactic rules of functioning these elements in a particular sentence (simple, compound, complex).

Historical linguistics significantly contributes to our understanding of the development of certain languages, conveying the etymological, morphological, syntactic, lexical, pragmatic, and semantic peculiarities of various words, phrases, units, etc. Knowledge of these and many other features of linguistic analysis in old languages, especially from one branch of the language family (e.g., Old Germanic languages which come from the West Germanic branch of the Indo-European language family tree), helps one get involved deeply in historical evolutionary processes of the studied languages and figure out details of various syntactic models functioning at that synchronous stage of Germanic languages' growth.

As W. Humboldt claims [1988], language is the creative force; it is "energy" but not the provided work or "ergon". A successful linguistic structure is not simply a preliminary element that was initiated by predecessors, but this structure provides such advantages or virtues as: 1) power of intellectuality; 2) clarity of logical arrangement; 3) depth of thought analysis; 4) aspiration to understanding; 5) sign of (or inclination toward) the relationship between the mental and the sensory; 6) rhythmic melodiousness of the tone of speech. In our investigation of Old Germanic concessive sentences, it is the relevant arrangement of clauses in these sentences that makes the particular model a successful linguistic structure that corresponds to Humboldt's virtues of language.

The morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of concessive sentences are of significant importance among renowned modern philologists for studying the general typological paradigm of the sentences under discussion, along with defining the etymology and morphology of their conjunction relations in the paradigm of the modern English language principally, as well as in the aspect of the realization of concessive clauses in the synchrony in different languages (J.M. Burnham [1911]; M. Haspelmath and E. König [1998]; E. Couper-Kuhlen and B. Kortmann [2000]).

The present paper is therefore dedicated to the necessary task of describing the specific grammatical features of Old Germanic languages in terms of syntactic framework structure of complex sentences with concessive semantics in the studied Old Germanic period based on the reconstructed word order of the core sentence constituents, which was testified in the complete manuscripts and fragments of the Old Germanic languages.

Aim and Objectives

The *goal* of this article is to outline the models of syntactic structures in four types of complex concessive sentences with pure (concessive), conditional, contrastive, and causative semantics of concession across six Old Germanic languages (Old English, Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Norse, Gothic, and Old Frisian). The *object* of this study is Old Germanic complex sentences with concessive action. The *subject* of the study is syntactic patterns and typical general features and distinctive particularities of Old Germanic sentences **with concessive semantics in comparison**. The *research material* consists of **manuscripts and text fragments from Old Germanic languages**.

We pursue the following basic *objectives* under the research: 1) to conduct an internal grammatical reconstruction of Old Germanic concessive sentences of four semantic types; 2) to clarify the functioning of Old Germanic the syntactic models of Old Germanic concessive sentences in synchrony; 3) to determine the syntactic relationship between the Old Germanic languages; 4) to define similar and different syntactic features of concessive clauses in terms of their framework structure; 5) to analyze the syntactic coherence of the main and subordinate clauses, as well as the clausal conjunction paradigm in concessive clauses of different semantics.

Literature Overview

The importance of literature review is subdued to the necessity of the analysis of the previous results of the concessive clauses investigation, which was of main interest to scholars focusing on various Old and Modern languages in synchrony and diachrony, different linguistic aspects (syntactic, morphological, semantic, and pragmatic).

The first attempt to analyze concessive sentences from a historical linguistic perspective was made by J.M. Burnham [1911] in her PhD thesis, where she provided a detailed analysis of the basic typology of the concessive conjunctions, syntactic types, and concessive semantics of constructions in Old English prose. The full paradigm of concessive conjunctions was defined (simple – *ðeah*, *þeah*, *þeh*, *ðæh*, *þæh*, *þæah*, *swa*, *ðonne*, etc.; correlatives – *ðeah ðe*, *þeah ðe*, etc.; interrogative particles – *hwæðere*; compounds – *ðeah hwæðere*, etc.) along with a classification of syntactic concessive clauses into simple, disjunctive, inverted, and indefinite types, which were analyzed in detail with relevant examples from Old English prose. Dr. Burnham also analyzed other types of clauses, such as Old English relative, temporal, locative, conditional, correlated comparative, and definite expressions of degree, which she claimed to be the variants of concessive clauses from a semantic point of view. Coordination and juxtaposition of clauses, along with the concessive use of words and phrases in Old English, were also demonstrated with examples. Overall, it was the first full description of the functioning of sentences with concessive action provided by numerous examples and the list of coordinated and subordinate clauses with concessive semantics in historical linguistics.

Forty-three years later, Dr. Quirk [1954] also conducted a thorough study of concessive clauses in complex sentences of Old English verse, though with more limited material than Miss Burnham. Randolph Quirk thoroughly examined the use of the concessive conjunction *þeah* in principal and subordinate clauses of concession along with an analysis of other concessive conjunctions. Although he did not quote all the examples in full and gave only sporadic references to the exemplified material. However, the great value of his book lay in the full exploration of all other mediums or means of concessive expression in OE.

J. Haiman [1974] examined concessive clauses and conditionals in different languages (English, German, Hungarian, Latin, etc.) along with verbs of volition as unrelated syntactic categories that are subject to the same syntactic rules, thus proving that clauses of concession and condition in the investigated languages may be introduced by the same morpheme *-ever* in all possible variants (e.g., *however*, *whoever*, *whatever*, etc.) that carry similar semantic realizations. Dr. Haiman identified a similar syntactic and semantic functioning of concessive and conditional conjunctions in correlation with the particular verb of volition in all represented languages. In the aspectual realization, the author showed that if the main verb in the subordinate (or coordinate) clause functions as the potential action, it expresses the potential meaning actualizing both concessive and conditional semantic meaning of the whole complex sentence; in case the verb functions as the actual action, it expresses the actual sense and only concessive semantic meaning

of the whole sentence (e.g., in clauses with *-ever* morpheme; *if-* / *although-* / *when*-clauses. Our main interest in this work was to investigate exactly the semantic aspect between concessive, conditional, contrastive, and causative clauses, which proves our hypothesis of semantic symbiosis in the examined clauses as well as syntactic compatibility in terms of positional functioning.

E. König [1999] made a great contribution to the understanding of the particular difference between pure concessive, conditional, contrastive, and causative concessive clauses in terms of terminological inventory for the description and characterization of these kinds of adverbial clauses claiming that apart from the separate identification of pure concessive clauses, all other types of adverbial clauses may also have concessive use. Dr. König also examined in detail the meaning and syntactic particularities of various kinds of adverbial clauses with concessive semantics in Modern English, the leading paradigm of concessive connectives, and their positional realization, types of concessive clauses (temporal, comparative, and conditional) and their relationship between each other.

K. Hengeveld [1998] also analyzed semantic types of adverbial clauses providing the basic semantic classification of adverbial clauses in terms of four interacting parameters. Dr. Hengeveld examined the distribution of dependent / independent forms of the verb in adverbial clauses in terms of four implicational hierarchies based on the defined semantic parameters, as well as the main systems of adverbial subordination and their distribution based on the interaction between these four hierarchies from an areal or genetic perspective.

E.I. Crevels [2000] focused her attention mainly on the semantic particularities of concessive clauses, defining four levels of concessive connection (content, epistemic, speech-act, textual), and analyzing the semantico-syntactic functioning of the clauses at these levels. Dr. Crevels also paid particular attention to the formal syntactic features of concessive clauses in terms of sentence structure (simple, multiple, finite, non-finite clauses), coordinate and subordinate clauses and their structural positions, as well as syntactic features of concessive conjunctions and signal operators.

E. Couper-Kuhlen and B. Kortmann [2000] presented contributions of different scholars on the topic of so-called C-relations or four-Cs (concession, condition, contrast, cause) in concessive, conditional, contrastive (**adversative**), and **causative sentences with their semantic relations** and syntactic interaction of clauses, as well as the functioning of their connectors at different discourse levels. All the authors proved the relevant background and analysis of the specific lexical and syntactic markers in the particular aspect of the relationship of adverbial clauses (concessive, conditional, contrastive, causative), providing the basic idea of mutual semantic and syntactic relations between these types of clauses in Modern English and other languages, and the interaction of their conjunctions semantically and syntactically.

C.J. Chan and J. Kim [2009] focused their investigation on peripheral concessive constructions within the framework of Construction Grammar, where they examined peripheral particularities of inverted concessive constructions introduced by the conjunctions *as though*, *although*, *even though*, *even if*, *while* in Modern English. From a syntactic perspective, the authors revealed basic syntactic positions of different inverted elements, namely in the middle of the sentence as the imbedded into the subordinate clause phrases (NP, AdjP, VP) and the fronting phrases (NP, AdjP, VP) which modify the main clause and form a head-filler constructions. In terms of the semantic and pragmatic aspects, they analyzed different semantic types of concessive clauses (e.g., pure concessive and causal ones), claiming the difference in concessive and circumstantial reading of the exemplified subordinate clauses.

Ole Schützler [2020] presented the investigation of concessive clauses introduced by conjunction *although* in terms of the positional location of clauses (initial, medial, final) based on the three basic factors or constraints (production-based, processing-based, semantic ones) involving the Iconicity Principle of word order and Hawkins' Performance Theory of Order and Constituency, and testing his results on different written and spoken data from British, Canadian, New Zealand, Nigerian, Indian, Philippine English corpora. Dr. Schützler claims that based on the mode of production (spoken or written) and the intra-constructional semantics (dialogic or anticausal) as two crucial constrained factors, subordinate clauses mainly follow matrix clauses in *although*-constructions in all the investigated languages as varieties of English. And this fact is universal. However, the

results of this research show the initial concessive clause position in case the internal semantic structure of a concessive construction corresponds to the sequence “cause – effect” or “new – given” that conforms to the Iconicity Principle; while the final concessive clause position occurs in complex concessive sentences as the general tendency of clausal arrangement that corresponds to the Hawkins’ Performance Theory of Order and Constituency.

D. Wiechmann and E. Kerz [2013] analyzed 2,000 concessive constructions derived from the written part of the British National Corpus (BNC), focusing on five basic factors (bridging – the strongest predictor, followed by subordinator, length, complexity, deranking – the weakest predictor) for the ordering choice (especially in non-final concessive clause position) of the main and subordinate clauses in adverbial concessive sentences. The scholars claim that “the presence or absence of an anaphoric item and the type of subordinator are the two strongest predictors for the clause order, and they are semantic or discourse organizational in nature”. It was also revealed that the semantic and discourse-pragmatic factors were much stronger predictors of clause position than processing-based, weight-related ones.

T. Bossuyt [2023] conducted the typological classification of three subtypes of concessive clauses in 17 languages of the world from a functional typological perspective – scalar, alternative, and universal concessive conditionals, which are analyzed according to four coding strategies used in the protasis of all three subtypes. The results show that each subtype of concessive clauses under investigation encodes its structure in a particular way that conforms to the relevant type of concessive conditionals in these languages. Dr. Bossuyt also revealed uniform and differential marking in concessive conditionals in all subtypes of all languages presenting each marker in a certain clausal position depending on the SVO order of a language.

Much work on the morphological and syntactic categories of adverbial clauses in Modern English has been carried out by R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik [1985], and by R.D. Huddleston, G.R. Pullum [2012]. Grammatical or derivational morphemes with their functioning in Modern English were depicted in the paper by C. Lehmann [2004]. Old English concessive clauses’ syntactic aspects in terms of coordination and subordination of adverbial clauses, semantics of adverbial concessive conjunctions and connective correlatives, as well as their functional use in Old English were presented in the works of B. Mitchell [1985] and J. Miller [2002]. The paradigm of Old English concessive conjunctions with full etymological characteristics was outlined in the work of B. Mitchell and F.C. Robinson [2012].

In terms of the different grammatical aspects of the Old Germanic languages under study, Gothic grammar with commentaries was fully presented in the works of J. Wright [1899; 1966] and W.H. Bennett [1960]. Old High German grammar was presented by J. Wright [1906]. Anglo-Saxon and Old Latin grammatical features can be traced in the works of L.F. Klipstein [1859], E.H. Warmington [1959]. The comparative, grammatical, and historical issues of different Old Germanic languages were presented in the works of F.A. March [1870] and J.S. Klein, B.D. Joseph, M. Fritz [2017].

As the literature review shows, simple and complex concessive sentences and their semantic equivalents have been thoroughly examined and discussed in numerous scientific papers both in Old and Modern English, with many linguistic and scientific aspects identified, substantiated, and examined from different perspectives. Despite the extensive literature on various facets of concessive clauses, there is a glaring deficiency in research devoted to the investigation of concessive sentences in the synchronic stage of the rise of Germanic syntax, that is, in Old Germanic languages.

In our research, we represent and analyze in detail the leading frame-structure models of concessive sentences with pure (concessive), conditional, contrast, and causative semantics across six Old Germanic languages (Old English, Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Norse, Gothic, Old Frisian) in comparison.

The *novelty* of this research lies in revealing the particular frame structures of complex concessive sentences of various mutual concessive semantics in six languages of the Old Germanic period, along with the comparison of the clausal coherence of basic syntactic models and their relevant use in certain Old Germanic language.

Materials, Steps, and Methods

The theoretical background for this research was primarily the works of different scholars who considered adverbial clauses of all types in Modern and Old English, syntactic coherence and semantic relationship of clauses, and positional characteristics of core constituents in concessive sentences. The main focus was on the papers on the conjunction paradigm of concessive clauses and their etymological and semantic features. For this purpose, we thoroughly examined specialized dictionaries such as: *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth* [Toller, 1898]; *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* [Onions, 1966]; *Dictionary of the Biblical Gothic Language* [Regan, 1974]; *A Concise Dictionary of Old Icelandic* [Zoëga, 1910]; *English-Old Norse Dictionary* [Arthur, 2002]. Applying to such specific literature helped compile our paradigm of conjunctions, which introduce concessive clauses of pure (concessive), conditional, contrastive, and causative semantics in all Old Germanic languages under study.

The methodology of our research was based on the appropriate methods, which we used in the following steps of study:

I. *The method of analytical and synthetic analysis* was used to select and conduct a thorough analysis of the relevant scientific works of linguists focused on concessive sentences from the 19th to 21st centuries. The study of different theoretical aspects related to the typological and semantic classifications, word order structure, positions of the elements of the concessive clause, and factors influencing the grammatical structure of concessive sentences. There were considered works related to the pragmatic-discourse aspect of the functioning and of the semantic coherence of concessive clauses in different ancient and modern languages of the world.

II. The use of *the semantic method* for the analysis of Old Germanic concessive sentences helped identify the semantic configurations of concessive conjunctions of four basic types and establish concessive sentences of pure (concessive), conditional, contrastive, and causative semantics. This method involved applying different Old dictionaries and specialized coursebooks to define particular semantics and etymology of concessive conjunctions in all six Old Germanic languages (Old English, Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Norse, Gothic, Old Frisian).

III. We applied *the continuous sampling method* to single out the relevant sentences of concession with different concessive semantics and verify their functioning in ancient Germanic languages. This method helped form the preliminary sampling basis of four types of complex concessive sentences across six Old Germanic languages, distinguish them from each other, and select 24 models for the analysis, representing possible syntactic configurations of concessive sentences in the available functional status at that period. The textual material was based on such written monuments of the Old Germanic period as: Old English – “*Beowulf*” [Gummere, 1910; Heaney, 2000]; Old High German – “*Evangelienbuch*” [Weißenburg, 1987]; “*Tatian*” [Sievers, 1982]; Old Saxon – “*Heliand*” [Sievers, 1878; Scott, 1966; Scott, Regan, 1969]; Old Norse – “*Poetic Edda*” [Hildebrand, Gering, Bellows, 2011]; Gothic – “*Wulfila Bible*” [Herdt, 2025]; Old Frisian – “*Freeska Landriucht*” (*Frisian Land Law*) [Nijdam, Hallebeek, Hylkje, 2023].

IV. *The method of internal reconstruction* of simple and complex sentences was used to identify the basic syntactic patterns of concessive sentences under analysis and their internal and external clause structure in Old Germanic languages. This method involved the reconstruction of SVO-patterns in concessive sentences and the relevant clauses within them based on the Old Germanic textual monuments. It helped to reconstruct the particular SVO-models of concessive clauses in each Old Germanic language. Based on this method, we focused our attention on the internal frame structure of each clause and the general external pattern of the concessive sentence discovering three basic SVX-types of sentences of concession with V-finite location in the initial / medial / final position.

V. *The comparative-historical method* was applied to the study of Old Germanic languages’ juxtaposition of different syntactic patterns, which made it possible to single out the basic resembling and different syntactic features of six Old Germanic concessive clauses in synchrony. This method concerned the functioning role of concessive clauses in the Old languages under study. It helped detect the presence or absence of functional use of the adverbial clauses with concessive semantics of four types in certain Old Germanic languages,

as well as sketch the **predominance or absence of the particular concessive type's functional use** in every examined language.

VI. The involvement of the *structural-syntactic method* of analysis made it possible to characterize basic particularities of syntax in the Old Germanic in a synchronic perspective. This method was based on detecting the slot positions (contact – distant) of the clausal conjunction concordance, the clausal concordance, and the clausal coherence of conjunctions in each studied language.

VII. The *descriptive method* of analysis helped generalize the basic historical aspects in terms of SVO word order and describe in detail the framework structure of Old Germanic concessive clauses with our particular view of analysis. This method enabled us to conduct our own unique characteristics of concessive clauses' framework structure internally and in a full way.

Concessive sentences in various aspects: theoretical background

In Modern English, concessive constructions are identified by such conjunctions as *although*, *though*, *even though*, by prepositions *in spite of* / *despite*, by conjunctive adverbs as *even so* / *nevertheless*, etc. These markers are used "to assert two propositions against the background assumption that the relevant situations do not normally go together (i.e., the situation depicted in one clause is an unfavourable condition for the situation described in the other one" [Haspelmath, König, 1998, p. 566]. Subordinate concessive clauses notice that the event in the principal clause is "contrary to expectation in the light of what is said in the concessive clause" [Quirk et al., 1985; Miller, 2002; Huddleston, Pullum, 2012].

The concessive relationship is formally viewed as a specialized form of the conditional relation, in which the main proposition is considered as the conditioned one realized by the subordinate clause. When the conditional sentence includes a hypothesis and a conclusion dependent upon the truth of that hypothesis, a concessive sentence involves a fact or a hypothesis and an independent conclusion. But concessive and conditional sentences are semantically alike in terms of the affinity of the cause, i.e., the concession can be viewed as the inoperative or blocked reason or cause [Burnham, 1911; Quirk, 1954; Mitchell, 1985].

In a wide variety of languages, concessive clauses refer to one type of all the *adverbial clauses* (cf. temporal, instrumental, conditional, purposive, causal clauses) and "share numerous syntactic properties with conditional, temporal, causal, purposive clauses based on the semantic criteria" [König, 1999, pp. 81–83]:

- (1) [*Even though it is raining,*] *Fred is going out for a walk.*
- (2) *This house is no less comfortable,* [*although it dispenses with air conditioning.*]
- (3) [*Poor as he is,*] *he spends a lot of money on horses.*
- (4) [*If the aim seems ambitious,*] *it is not unrealistic.*

Modern English canonical concessive clauses can also appear as *inverted concessive clauses* where the inverted element in the form of the verbal, nominal, or adjectival phrase is fronted before the concessive conjunction. Such inverted concessive clauses typically occupy the initial position in a complex sentence, though middle and final positions are possible as well, as we can see in the next examples [Chang, Kim, 2009, pp. 39–41]:

- (5) [*Genius though she was,*] *she was quite unassuming.*
- (6) *That was why* [*weak as we were*] *they had invited us in.*
- (7) *The whole system will not halt within two years,* [*difficult as those years will be.*]

The systemic variation of *subordinate adverbial clause position* depends on factors such as production-based, process-based, and semantic constraints, where the latter involves intra-constructural relationships between propositions of clauses in concessive sentences that promote the internal arrangements of clauses (initial, medial, final) due to the Iconicity Principle or the word order iconicity and Hawkins' Performance Theory of Order and Constituency. The basic idea of iconicity is that "the order of clauses or phrases corresponds to the order of our thoughts". Iconicity is identified as "a close physical relationship between a linguistic sign [...] and the entity or process in the world to which it refers" [Schützler, 2020, pp. 444–447]:

(8) *Patience was [...] already greyer-haired than Miriam,* [*although she was eleven years her junior.*]

(9) *Patience, [although she was eleven years her sister's junior,] was already greyer-haired than Miriam.*

(10) *[Although she was eleven years her sister's junior,] Patience was already greyer-haired than Miriam.*

In Modern English concessive sentences, the *Iconicity Principle* is implemented in the internal sentence structure with the sequence of semantics as “cause – effect” / “new – given”, resulting in the initial position of a concessive clause as in (11). Hawkins' *Performance Theory of Order and Constituency* is applied for complex concessive sentences as the general tendency of clausal arrangement, resulting in the final position of a concessive clause as in (12) [Schützler, 2020, pp. 447–448]:

(11) *[Although Janet was shorter than Bill,] she was always noticed first.*

(12) *Janet was always noticed first, [although she was shorter than Bill.]*

H. Diessel [2008, p. 484] claims that “iconicity of sequence, which is commonly characterized as a semantic principle, can be interpreted as a processing principle that contributes to the overall processing load of a complex sentence construction because a non-iconic clause order is difficult to plan and interpret”. Concessive and conditional clauses formally overlap with each other in functional-conceptual and syntactic aspects as well based on the two basic semantic characteristics of conditionality and the multiplicity of antecedent values in the relevant context [Bossuyt, 2021, p. 17].

According to K. Hengeveld [1998], there is a systemic correlation between different semantic types of adverbial clauses and the way they are implemented in terms of four interacting parameters such as: “Entity Type”, “Time Dependency”, “Factuality” and “Presupposition”. The “Entity Type” parameter is applied to the analysis of the internal structural order of the adverbial clauses within complex sentences (e.g., zero, first, second, third, etc. order), while the last three parameters are applied for the relationship between the predicate and the subordinate clause as, respectively, *time reference dependency*, *truth-value (epistemic) dependency* and *discourse dependency*. Based on these parameters, adverbial clauses of various types (e.g., conditional, concessive, causal, etc.) represent mutual semantic interaction.

Morphological features of different unrelated languages only sporadically and inconsistently reflect universal semantic structures, which are also known as language-dependent ones. In different languages of the world (English, German, Latin, etc.), concessive and conditional clauses represent *similar resemblance* in terms of the semantic aspect where conjunctions *though, although, as though, if, even if*, etc. may semantically function as mutual operators in correlation with either potential or actual volitional verbs in the subordinate clauses [Haiman, 1974].

M. Haspelmath and E. König [1998] define *three basic types of conditional clauses* such as: scalar (*even if* clause), alternative (*whether / whatever* clause), universal (*no matter how much / however much* clause) conditional clauses claiming them as hypothetical concessive conditionals on the ground that they both express a conditional relationship between a protasis (adverbial subordinate clause) and apodosis (main clause) and as well share two basic semantic properties with pure concessive clauses in terms of “the inclusion of an unfavourable circumstance in the set of protasis related to an apodosis where the latter includes factuality”. Compare the following examples [Haspelmath, König, 1998, pp. 563–567]:

(13) *Even if you dislike ancient monuments, Warwick Castle is worth a visit.*

(14) *Whatever they offer her, she won't accept it.*

(15) *Whether you join me or not, I will go to the meeting.*

Conditional constructions share related meanings with *causal ones* in terms of mental space configurations where the lexical meaning of such conjunctions as *if, because, since*, etc., align to the contextual cognitive domain in which conditional and causative mental spaces are set up based on the function of predictivity, conditional and causal relations, and epistemic stance [Dancygier, Sweetser, 2000].

In English studies, instead of the term “concessive” there are often used such terms as “*anticausal*”, “*incausal*”, “*inoperant cause*”. The use of the latter terms is based on the concession as the negative counterpart of cause, i.e., the contents of *concessive* and *causal sentences* can be understood as the affinity semantic meanings in terms of “*interactive patterns of conceding*”, where the internal negation in concessive clauses is equivalent to the external negation in causal

clauses [König, Siemund, 2000]. Moreover, the relationship between “concessive vs. causal constructions” can be viewed in terms of mental spaces where the meanings of concession and negated causality are considered semantically equivalent [Verhagen, 2000].

The affinity between some *adversative* and *causal constructions* in Spanish, for example, lies in the pragmatic relationship in which the refutation in adversative clauses may serve as the counterpart of justification in causal clauses [Schwenter, 2000].

From a historical perspective, the *concessive marker* assumed new functions and lost the old, existing ones, but under the condition of forming contiguous categories at the semantic level of the hierarchical arrangement of the sentence or text [Crevels, 2000]. Like other languages, Old English also reflected in its texts the particular simple and complex sentences that rendered the close relationship between the notions of concession, condition, contrast, and cause in terms of the *conjunction paradigm* with the relevance of their functioning in the concessive meaning. In Old English, the affinity between *concessive* and *causal conjunctions* was demonstrated by the use of “*for*” in both senses, as well as by the use of causal adverbs in close combination with concessive clauses [Burnham, 1911; Quirk, 1954].

From a diachronic perspective, some respective concessive markers (e.g., interrogatives or free relatives) were *mutually recruited* into concessive conditional markers and vice versa, with concessive conditionals developing into pure concessive ones by way of the conceptually similar clause types [Bossuyt, 2021, p. 17].

In Early Modern English, the pure concessive conjunction “*though*” could be used in the concessive conditional sense as “*even if*”:

(16) *I'll speak to it though hell should gape and bid me hold my peace* (Shakespeare, Hamlet, I, ii) [Haspelmath, König, 1998, p. 568].

The Old English concessive relation was often marked by contrasting adverbs of time, demonstrative pronouns, emphatic adjectives, and other intensifying expressions. The most common Old English concessive constructions were the simple concessive sentences introduced by such adversative conjunctions as *ðeah* (*ðe*), *þeah* (*þe*), *swa*, *swa ðeah*, *hwæðere*, *ðeah-hwæðere*, *swa ðeah-hwæðere*, conveying the concessive and adversative meanings like *though*, *yet*, *still*, *however*, etc. Less commonly used in Old English were complex disjunctive and inverted concessive constructions with the fixed word order, but flexible clause placing before or after the principal clause [Burnham, 1911; Quirk, 1954].

Old English conditional particles were previously adopted for concessive meaning, but the spontaneous function of conditional conjunction “*gif*” in a concessive meaning was very rare at that period. Moreover, this conditional conjunction obtained the concessive use like “*even if*”, “*although*”, “*albeit*” under the influence of the Latin word “*si*”. Thus, “*gif*” was affected by “*si*” and attained the meaning of concessive action as “*even if*”, or “*although*”. Conversely, the Old English conjunction *ðeah* / *þeah* (though / although) also functioned conditionally, but extremely sporadically [Mitchell, 1985].

A particular difficulty of Old English was the syntax of subordinate clauses, where the order of the core constituents varied within such correlation as SVO / SOV / OVS. In most subordinate clauses, the most commonly used syntactic pattern was the SOV-model, where the verb occupied the final position of a sentence or clause. In Old English clauses of concession and condition, the preferred word order was the (O)VS pattern: e.g., (17) *Swelte* (V) *ic* (S), *libbe* (V) *ic* (S) (Old English) – *Whether I live or die* (Modern English) [Mitchell, 1985; Mitchell, Robinson, 2012].

As evidenced by the theoretical background, concessive sentences have been examined in Old and Modern English in different aspects: syntactic, functional, and morphological, but predominantly in the semantic aspect in terms of the pragmatics of concessive clauses and their counterparts. Our research contributes primarily to the syntax of Old Germanic concessive sentences in terms of the SVO word order configuration and clausal coherence between four types of concessive clauses.

Results and discussion. The framework structure of Old Germanic concessive sentences

Old Germanic languages show a progression from primarily syntactically paratactic or independent (main) clauses to syntactically hypotactic or dependent (subordinate) clauses, with introductory conjunctions (subordinators) that introduce hypotactic constructions [Robinson,

1992, p. 148]. The syntax of Anglo-Saxon complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession is defined by coordinated and subordinated connectives, which introduce particular independent and dependent clauses with different semantics or shades of concession (pure universal, conditional, contrastive, causative) [Klipstein, 1859, pp. 167–184; March, 1870, pp. 207–208].

This research examines *Old Germanic clausal syntax* with SOV / SVO / OVS clause patterns of concessive complex sentences, having been reconstructed from Old Germanic languages. The main attention is focused on the following conventionally adopted syntactic (grammatical) terms (abbreviations) as: subject (S), verb (V), object (O), conjunction (Conj / CNJ), concessive (CONC), adverb (Adv), adjective (Adj) [Lehmann, 2004, pp. 1844–1851; Klein, Joseph, Fritz, 2017].

Based on Old Germanic *concessive conjunctions* (each marked as [CONCConj]) and *non-concessive conjunctions* (each marked as [Non-CONCConj] or just [Conj]) as complex sentences' introducing markers, which had been studied and derived from various specialized sources (dictionaries, books), we identified and outlined a certain syntactic coherence of clauses inside the framework structure of concessive sentences of various semantics, including the slot positions of the principal finite verbs and the internal arrangement of core constituents within the framework structure in principal and subordinate clauses, according to the particular word order of SVO-patterns with different variations – across *six Old Germanic languages* (Old English – OE, Old High German – OHG, Old Saxon – OSax, Old Norse – ON, Gothic – G, Old Frisian – OFr).

In the concessive sentences studied from six Old Germanic languages, we defined their framework structures along with:

1) the general *similar* and *different syntactic features* of Old Germanic concessive clauses of pure (concessive), conditional, contrastive, causative semantics as SXV / XSV / VXS / VSX variations (taking into account only variations of subject (S), verb (V) object (O) slot positions);

2) the principal finite verbs (V) *initial* / *second* / *final* slot positions (very rarely third slot position) in the framework structure of concessive sentences;

3) the syntactic compatibility (coherence) of clauses inside the studied Old Germanic concessive sentences as: a) “contact – distant” *clausal conjunction* slot position with “contact – distant” *clausal* placement; b) “contact – distant” *conjunction concordance* slot position with “contact – distant” *conjunction* location; (based on the placement of concessive conjunction (CONC-Conj) and non-concessive conjunction (Non-CONCConj / Conj) in the framework structure of each clause).

Old Germanic clausal syntax of complex concessive sentences is represented in *four semantic types of concession* in terms of the framework structure as (see Table 1) [Arthur, 2002; Bennett, 1960; Bremmer, 2009; Onions, 1966; Regan, 1974; Toller, 1898; Wright, 1899, 1966; Zoëga, 1910]:

I. Concessive complex sentences with conjunctions of pure concessive semantics such as (**even**) **though** / **although** – *peah* / *ðeah* (OE); *thoh* / *doh* (OHG); *thoh* (OSax); *þo* / *þoh* / *þot* (ON); *pauh* / *pau* / *frauja* / *jabai* / *swaswe* (G); *thach* (OFr):

(18) **Old English**: *Beowulf Geata, ær he on bed stige: “No ic me an herewæsmun hnagan talige, gupgeweorca, þonne Grendel hine; [forþan (Non-CONCConj) ic (S) hine sweorde (O) [swebban (V) nelle (V)] (V), aldre (O) beneotan (V),] [þeah (CONCConj) ic (S) eal (Adj) mæge (O).”] – Beowulf Geat, ere the bed be sought: “Of force in fight no feebler I count me, in grim war-deeds, than Grendel deems him. [Not with the sword (O), **then**, (Non-CONCConj) to sleep (V) [of death (O) his life (O)] (O) will (V) I (S) give (V),] [though (CONCConj) it (S) lie (V) in my power (O).”]* (Beowulf, 676-680) [Gummere, 1910; Heaney, 2000].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the pure concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (18) is as follows: [ConjSOVOV] [CONCConjSAdjO] (OE) – [OConjVOVSV] [CONCConjSVO] (Modern English, hereafter ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *pure concessive sentence* (18) from Old English are as follows: SXV / SX – V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (18) as [ConjSX-VXV] [CONCConjSX] – identifies **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with two conjunctions *forþan* (Conj) and *þeah* (CONCConj) – placed initially in the principal and concessive clause, respectively, which predetermines and affects **contact clausal** placement inside a pure concessive sentence in the Old English language.

(19) **Old High German:** [*si* (S) *habet* (V) **thoh** (CONCConj) *thia rihti* (O) *in sconeru slihti* (O).] [*lli* (V) *thu* (S) *zi note* (Adv), *theiz* (Av) *scono thoh gilute* (O),] – [**und** (Non-CONCConj) **doch** (CONCConj) *gehohrt* (V) *sie* (S) *der Regel* (O) *in schöner Vollendung* (O):] [*bemühe* (V) *nur* (Adv) *du* (S) *dicht* (Adv) *mit allem Eifer* (O) *um ihren schönen Klang* (O),] (German) (Evangelienbuch, Liber Primus / Buch 1, Kapitel 1, 36-37) [Weißenburg, 1987, pp. 36-37]. – [**and** (Non-CONCConj) **though** (CONCConj) *she* (S) *obeys* (V) *the rule* (O) *with beautiful perfection* (O):] [*only* (Adv) *you* (S) *strive* (V) *closely* (Adv) *with all your zeal* (O) *for their beautiful sound* (O),] (translation into English – ours).

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the pure concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (19) is as follows: [SVCONCConjOO] [VSAAdvAdv] (OHG) – [ConjCONCConjVSOO] [VAdvSAAdvOO] (German) – [ConjCONCConjSVOO] [AdvSVAdvOO] (ModE).

The slot positions of the principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *pure concessive sentence* (19) from Old High German are as follows: SVX / VSX – V-second / V-initial slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (19) as [SVCONCConjX] [VS] – determines **distant clausal conjunction** slot position – with concessive conjunction *thoh* (CONCConj) in the third word-order place, which conditions and influences **distant clausal** location within an Old High German pure concessive sentence.

(20) **Old Saxon:** [**Thoh** (CONCConj) *thar than* [gihwilik] *hêlag man* (S) *Krist* (O) *antkendi* (V).] [*thoh ni warð it gio* (Adv) *te thes kuninges hoûe* (O) *them mannun* (O) *gimârid* (V).] [**thea** (Non-CONCConj/S) *im an iro môdseþon* (O) *holde* (V) *ni wârûn* (Adv),] – [**Although** (CONCConj) *all holy men* (S) *recognized* (V) *Christ* (O).] [*at the court of the king* (O) *It* (S) *was* (V) *not* (Neg) *yet* (Adv) *known* (V) *to the men* (O)] [**who** (Non-CONCConj/S) *in their minds* (O) *Were* (V) *not* (Neg) *rightly* (Av) *inclined* (V);] (Heliand, Capitulum VII, 7:537-540) [Scott, Regan, 1969; Sievers, 1878, p. 40; Scott, 1966, p. 18].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the pure concessive sentence* in the main and two subordinate clauses from sample (20) is as follows: [CONCConjSOV] [AdvOOV] [Conj/SOAdv] (OSax) – [CONCConjSVO] [OSVNegAdvVO] [Conj/SOVNegAdvV] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *pure concessive sentence* (20) from Old Saxon are as follows: SXV / XV / SXV – V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (20) as [CONCConjSXV] [XV] [Conj/SXV] – defines the **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *Thoh* (CONCConj), *thea* (Conj/S) in the initial places of concessive and subordinate clauses, accordingly, which stipulates and causes **contact clausal** placement inside a pure concessive sentence in the Old Saxon language.

(21) **Old Norse:** *Guprûn kvap:* [*“Lýgr* (V) *bû* (S) *nû, Atli!*] [**pôt** (CONCConj) *þat* (O) *litt røkjak* (V);] – *Guthrun spake:* [*“Thou* (S) *liest* (V) *now, Atli,*] [**though** (CONCConj) *little I* (S) *heed* (V) *it* (O);] (Poetic Edda, Atlamol en Grönlensku (The Greenland Ballad of Atli), 91) [Hildebrand, Gering, Bellows, 2011, p. 729].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the pure concessive sentence* in the main and two subordinate clauses from sample (21) is as follows: [VS] [CONCConjOV] (ON) – [SV] [CONCConjSOV] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *pure concessive sentence* (21) from Old Norse are as follows: VS / XV – V-initial / V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (21) as [VS] [CONCConjXV] – establishes **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with concessive conjunction *pôt* (CONCConj) in the first-order place, which predetermines and affects **contact clausal** placement in an Old Norse pure concessive sentence.

(22) **Gothic:** [*Apþan qiba* (V):] [*swalauð melis swe* (Non-CONCConj) *arbinumja* (S) *niuklahs* (O) *ist* (V).] [*ni* (Neg) **und** (CONCConj) *waiht* (Neg) *iusiza* (S) *ist* (V) *skalka* (O), *frauþa allaize* (O) *wisands* (V);] – [*Now I* (S) *say* (V).] [**That** (Non-CONCConj) *the heir* (S), [**as long as** (Non-CONCConj) *he* (S) *is* (V) *a child* (O),] *differeth* (V) *nothing* (Neg) *from a servant* (O),] [**though** (CONCConj) *he* (S) *be* (V) *lord of all* (O);] (Wulfila Bible, Galatians, 4:1) [Herdt, 2025].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the pure concessive sentence* in the main and two subordinate clauses from sample (22) is as follows: [V] [ConjSOV] [NegCONCConjNegSVOOV] (G) – [SV] [ConjS[ConjSVO]VNegO] [CONCConjSVO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *pure concessive sentence* (22) from Gothic are as follows: SXV / SVXV – V-final / V-second slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sentence (22) as [ConjSXV] [CONCConjSVXV] – determines **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with two conjunctions *swaloud melis swe* (Conj), *und* (CONCConj) in the initial places of two subordinate non-concessive and concessive clauses, respectively, which conditions and influences **contact clausal** location inside a pure concessive sentence in the Gothic language.

(23) **Old Frisian:** *Dat en man onder da galga stoed ende coemet1 him to moede dat hi op da Roemscha burgherschip teghe ende [hyt aller (CONCConj) wirdic (V) leghe (O),] [hi (S) moste wessa ontbonden (V) alont (Adj)] [hit (CONCConj) toe Roem (O) worde (S) onderfonden (V).] – When a man stood underneath the gallows and he suddenly remembered that he could invoke Roman citizenship, [even though (CONCConj) he (S) lied (V),] [he (S) should be set (V) free (Adj)] [until (CONCConj) the truth of the matter (S) had been ascertained (V) in Rome (O).]* (Frisian Land Law, What is a law?, How Saint Willibrord Converted the Frisians, 11) [Nijdam, Hallebeek, Hylkje, 2023, pp. 108–110].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the pure concessive sentence* in the main and two subordinate clauses from sample (23) is as follows: [CONCConjVO] [SVAdj] [CONCConjOSV] (Ofr) – [CONCConjSV] [SVAdj] [CONCConjSVO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *pure concessive sentence* (23) from Old Frisian are as follows: VX / SV / XSV – V-initial / V-second / V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sentence (23) as [CONCConjVX] [SV] [CONCConjXSV] – defines **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with two pure concessive conjunctions *hyt aller* (CONCConj), *hit* (CONCConj) in the first-order places of each concessive clause, which stipulates, and causes **contact clausal** placement within an Old Frisian pure concessive sentence.

II. Concessive complex sentences with conjunctions of conditional concessive semantics as (**even**) **if / whether** – *gif (gyf) / þeah / hweþer (hwæþer) (OE); ibu / oba / ube; (niba / noba / nube (if not)) / (h)wedat (OHG); ef / of / hweðar (OSax); ef / if / efan / ifan / hvaðarr / nema (if not) (ON); ibai / iba (jabai) / hwaþar (G); alset / eciam / jef (ef) / jof (of) / hwer / hwed(d) er (Ofr):*

(24) **Old English:** *[Swa (Adv) mæg (V) unfæge (S) eaðe (Adv) gedigan (V) wean ond wræcsið (O),] [se (CONCConj) ðe (Adv) waldendes (O) hyldo (O) gehealdeþ (V).] – [So (Adv) may (V) the undoomed (S) easily (Adv) flee (V) evils and exile (O),] [if (CONCConj) only (Adv) he (S) gain (V) the grace (O) of The Wielder! (O)]* (Beowulf, 2291-2293) [Gummere, 1910; Heaney, 2000].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the conditional concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (24) is as follows: [AdvVSAAdvVO] [CONCConjAdvOOV] (OE) – [AdvVSAAdvVO] [CONCConjAdvSVOO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *conditional concessive sentence* (24) from Old English are as follows: SVX / XV – V-second / V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (24) as [VSVX] [CONCConjXV] – establishes **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conditional conjunction *se* (CONCConj) in the initial place of the subordinate concessive clause, which predetermines and affects **contact clausal** placement inside a conditional concessive sentence in the Old English language.

(25) **Old High German:** *[Oba (CONCConj) ir (Adv) thie (S) minnot (V) thie (O) iuuih (Non-CONCConj/S) minnont (V),] [uuelihha (Non-CONCConj) mieta (O) habet (V) ir (Adv) thanne (Non-CONCConj/S) nonne et publicani hoc faciunt? – [si (CONCConj) enim (Adv) diligatis (V) eoa (O) qui (Non-CONCConj/S) vos (O) diligunt (V),] [quam (Non-CONCConj) mercedem (O) habebitis (V)?] nonne et publicani hoc faciunt? (Latin) (Tatian, De diligendo proximum, β, 32:4) [Sievers, 1982, p. 53]. – [for if (CONCConj) you (S) love (V) those (O) who (Non-CONCConj/S) love (V) you (O),] [how (Non-CONCConj) will (V) you (S) get (V) paid (V)?] Don't even publicans do this? (translation into English – ours).*

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of the *conditional concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (25) is as follows: [CONCConjAdvSVOCConj/SO] [ConjOVAdvConj] (OHG) – [CONCConjAdvVOConj/SOV] [ConjOV] (Latin) – [CONCConjSVOCConj/SVO] [ConjVSVV] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *conditional concessive sentence* (25) from Old High German are as: SVX / XV – V-second / V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sentence (25) as [CONCConjSVXConj/SX] [ConjXVConj] – defines **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *Oba* (CONCConj), *uuelihha* (Conj) in the first-order places of each subordinate clause; **distant conjunction concordance** slot position – with conjunctions *Oba* (CONCConj), *iuiih* (Conj/S) in the first and fifth places, respectively, detached from each other by other elements of the same conditional concessive clause, and conjunctions *uuelihha* (Conj), *thanne* (Conj) in the first and fourth places, respectively, detached from each other by other elements of the same subordinate clause: which conditions and influences **contact clausal** placement and **distant conjunction** location within an Old High German conditional concessive sentence.

(26) **Old Saxon:** [*Ef* (CONCConj) *thu* (S) *than gebogean* (V) *wili* (V) *gōdun mannan* (O) *fagare fehaskattos* (O), [*thar* (Non-CONCConj) *thu* (S) [*eft*] *frumono* (V) *hugis* (Adv) *mēr* (O) *antfāhan* (V),] [*te hwī* (Non-CONCConj) *habas* (V) *thu* (S) *thes* (Adv) *êniga mēda* (O) *fon gode* (O) *ettha* (Adv) *lôn* (O) *an* [*themu*] *is liothe* (O)?] – [*If* (CONCConj) *thou* (S) *wouldest* (V) *give* (V) *to good men* (O) *all Fair shining coins* (O), [*and* (Non-CONCConj) *thinkest* (V) *thereby* (Adv) *To reap* (V) *a reward* (O),] [*how* (Non-CONCConj) *wilt* (V) *thou* (S) *then* (Adv) *have* (V) *return* (O) *from God* (O), *Or* (Conj) *largess* (O) *here* (Adv) *in the light* (O)?] (Heliand, Capitulum XVIII, 18:1545–1548) [Scott, Regan, 1969; Sievers, 1878, pp. 108–111; Scott, 1966, p. 52].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of the *conditional concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (26) is as follows: [CONCConjSVVVOO[ConjSVAdvOV]] [ConjVSAAdvOOAdvOO] (OSax) – [CONCConjSVVVOO[ConjVAdvVO]] [ConjVSAAdvVOOConjOAdvO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *conditional concessive sentence* (26) from Old Saxon are as follows: SVX / SVXV / VSX – V-second / V-final / V-initial slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (26) as [CONCConjSVX[ConjSVXV]] [ConjVSX] – defines **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *Ef* (CONCConj), *thar* (Conj), *hwī* (Conj) in the initial places of subordinate and principal clauses, which stipulates and causes **contact clausal** placement inside a conditional concessive sentence in the Old Saxon language.

(27) **Old Norse:** [*margr* (S) *bā* (Adv) *frōþr* (Adj) *þykkisk* (V),] [*ef* (CONCConj) *hann* (S) *freginn* (V) *esat* (Adv),] [*ok* (Non-CONCConj) *naï* (V) *hann* (S) *þurffjallr* (V) *þruma* (Adv).] – [*Wise* (Adj) *seems* (V) *one* (S) *oft* (Adv),] [*if* (CONCConj) *nought* (Adv) *he* (S) *is asked* (V),] [*And* (Non-CONCConj) *safely* (Adv) *he* (S) *sits* (V) *dry-skinned* (V).] (Poetic Edda, Hovamol (The Ballad of the High One), 30) [Hildebrand, Gering, Bellows, 2011, p. 55].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of the *conditional concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (27) is as follows: [SAdvAdjV] [CONCConjSVAdv] [ConjVSVAdv] (ON) – [AdjVSAAdv] [CONCConjAdvSV] [ConjAdvSVV] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of the *conditional concessive sentence* (27) from Old Norse are as follows: SV / SV / VSV – V-final / V-initial slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (27) as [SV] [CONCConjSV] [ConjVSV] – establishes the **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *ef* (CONCConj), *ok* (Conj) in the first-order places of concessive and main clauses, which predetermines and affects the **contact clausal** location within an Old Norse conditional concessive sentence.

(28) **Gothic:** [*apþan* (CONCConj) *jabai* (CONCConj) *huas* (S) *swesaim* (V) *bishun* (Adv) *ingardjam* (O) *ni* (Neg) *gablaihip* (O),] [*galaubein* (O) *inwidib* (V) *jah* (Non-CONCConj) *ist* (V) *ungalaubjandin* (O) *wairsiza* (Adj).] – [*But* (CONCConj) *if* (CONCConj) *any* (S) *provide* (V) *not* (Neg) *for his own* (O), *and* (Non-CONCConj) *specially* (Adv) *for those of his own house* (O),] [*he* (S) *hath denied* (V) *the faith* (O), *and* (Cj) *is* (V) *worse* (Adj) *than an infidel* (O).] (Wulfila Bible, 1 Timothy, 5:8) [Herd, 2025].

Note: *apþan* (Gothic), *but* (English) are concessive contrastive conjunctions, but not conditional concessive conjunctions; so, in schemas, they are marked as *Conj*.

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the conditional concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (28) is as follows: [ConjCONCConjSVAdvONegO] [OVConjVOAdj] (G) – [ConjCONCConjSVNegOConjAdvO] [SVOConjV-AdjO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of the *conditional concessive sentence* (28) from Gothic are as follows: SVX / VX – V-second slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (28) as [ConjCONCConjSVX] [XVConjVX] – determines the **contact conjunction concordance** slot position – with conjunctions *apþan* (Conj), *jabai* (CONCConj) in the first and second places within the concessive clause, respectively, located in their sequential coherence immediately one after another; **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunction *apþan* (Conj) in the initial place of the subordinate concessive clause; **distant clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunction *jah* (Conj) in the third-order place of the principal clause: which conditions and influences the **contact conjunction** location, **contact** and **distant clausal** placement inside a conditional concessive sentence in the Gothic language.

(29) **Old Frisian:** *Dyo x seec is: [hwer (CONCConj) so een riuchter (S) onriuchte (V) riucht (O) jef fynde (O),] [dy (S) urbert (V) xx merka (O).] – The 10th clause is: [if (CONCConj) a judge (S) passes (V) an unlawful sentence (O) or (Non-CONCConj) decrees (V) unjustly (O),] [he (S) has to pay (V) a fine of 10 marks (O).]* (Frisian Land Law, The Statutes of Opstalsbam, 11) [Nijdam, Hallebeek, Hylkje, 2023, pp. 432–433].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the conditional concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (29) is as follows: [CONCConjS-VOO] [SVO] (Ofr) – [CONCConjSVOConjVO] [SVO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *conditional concessive sentence* (29) from Old Frisian are as follows: SVX / SVX – V-second slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (29) as [CONCConjSVX] [SVX] – defines **contact clausal** conjunction slot – with conjunction *hwer* (CONCConj) in the initial place of the concessive clause, which stipulates and causes **contact clausal** location within an Old Frisian conditional concessive sentence.

III. Concessive complex sentences with conjunctions of contrastive concessive semantics as **while (wilst) / until / but** – *þa hwile þe / hwil / hwile / ða hwile / þenden / būtan (beūtan, bū(ton, būta, būte) (OE); unz / dia wila so / (h)wila / biūzan (OHG); ak, hwil(a) (newan) / biūtan (būtan) (OSax); nū / ok / hvila / eða (en) (ON); hweila / akei (iþ / þan / apþan / þar-uh) (G); hwile / ac (buta) (Ofr):*

(30) **Old English:** *[swa he (S) manna (O) wæs (V) wigend weorðfullost (O) wide geond eorðan (O),] [þenden (CONCConj) he (S) burhwelan (O) brucan (V) moste (O).] – [Of men (O) was (V) he (S) worthiest warrior (O) wide earth o'er (O)] [the while (CONCConj) he (S) had (V) joy (O) of his jewels and burg (O).]* (Beowulf, 3099-3100) [Gummere, 1910; Heaney, 2000].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the contrastive concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (30) is as: [SOVOO] [CONCConjSOVO] (OE) – [OVSOO] [CONCConjSVOO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *contrastive concessive sentence* (30) from Old English are as follows: SXV(X) / SXV(X) – V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (30) as [SXV(X)] [CONCConjSXVX] – identifies **contact clausal** conjunction slot position – with conjunction *þenden* (CONCConj) in the first-order place of the contrastive concessive clause, which predetermines and affects **contact clausal** placement inside a contrastive concessive sentence in the Old English language.

(31) **Old High German:** *[Tho (Non-CONCConj) sie (S) gihortun (V)] [then (Non-CONCConj) cuning (O), fuorun (V);] [senu thö (Interj) sterro (S) [then (Non-CONCConj) sie (S) gisahun (V) in ostarlante (O)] forafuor (V) sie (O),] [unz (CONCConj) her (S) [quementi (V) stuont (V)] (V)] [oba (Non-CONCConj) thar thie (Adv) kneht (S) uuas (V).] – [Qui (S) cum (Non-CONCConj) audissent (V) regem (O) abierunt (V),] [et (Non-CONCConj) ecce (Interj) Stella (S) [quam (Non-CONCConj) vider-*

ant (V) in Oriente (O)] *antecedebat* (V) eos (O),] [**usque dum** (CONCCConj) [*veniens* (V) *staret* (V)] (V) *supra* (Adv)] [**ubi** (Non-CONCCConj) *erat* (V) *puer* (S).] (Latin) (Tatian, De magis qui venerunt ab oriente, α, 8:5) [Sievers, 1982, p. 28]. – [**When** (Non-CONCCConj) *they* (S) *heard* (V) *the king* (O),] [*they* (S) *went away* (V);] [**and** (Non-CONCCConj) *behold* (Interj), *the Star* (S) [**which** (Non-CONCCConj) *they* (S) *had seen* (V) *in the East* (O)] *preceded* (V) *them* (O),] [**until** (CONCCConj) *he* (S) [*came* (V) *and stood* (V)] (V) *above* (Adv)] [**where** (Non-CONCCConj) *the boy* (S) *was* (V)] (English translation – ours).

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the contrastive concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (31) is as: [ConjSV] [ConjOV] [InterjS[ConjSVO]VO] [CONCCConjSV] [ConjAdvSV] (OHG) – [SConjVOV] [ConjInterjS[ConjVO]VO] [CONCCConjVAdv] [ConjVS] (Latin) – [ConjSVOSV] [ConjInterjS[ConjSVO]VO] [CONCCConjSVAdv] [ConjSV] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *contrastive concessive sentence* (31) from Old High German are as: SV / XV / SVX – V-second / V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sentence (31) as [ConjSV] [ConjXV] [InterjS[ConjSVX]VX] [CONCCConjSV] [ConjSV] – determines **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *Tho* (Conj), *then* (Conj), *unz* (CONCCConj), *oba* (Conj) in the first-order places of the subordinate clauses; **distant clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunction *then* (Conj) in the third-order place of the principal clause: which conditions and influences **contact** and **distant clausal** location within an Old High German contrastive concessive sentence.

(32) **Old Saxon**: [*ni* (Neg) [*he* (S) *thô* (Adv) *mid* (Adv) *wordun* (V) [*strîd*] (O) [*ni afhôf*] *wið* *that folk* (O) *furður* (Adv),] [**ak** (CONCCConj) *fôr* (V) *imu* (S) *thô* (Adv), [**thar** (Non-CONCCConj) *he* (S) *welde* (V),] *an ên gebirgi uppan* (O);] – [Therefore (Adv) *He* (S) *began* (V) *no* (Neg) *further* (Adv) *word-strife* (O) *With these people* (O) *there* (Adv);] [**but** (CONCCConj) *He* (S) *went* (V) **where** (Non-CONCCConj) *He* (S) *willed* (V) *Up on a mountain* (O);] (Heliand, Capitulum XXXIV, 34:2893-2895) [Scott, Regan, 1969; Sievers, 1878, p. 198; Scott, 1966, p. 99].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the contrastive concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (32) is as follows: [NegSAdvVOOAdv] [CONCCConjVAdv[ConjSV]O] (OSax) – [AdvSVNegAdvOOAv] [CONCCConjSVConjSV] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *contrastive concessive sentence* (32) from Old Saxon are: SVX / VSX / SV – V-second / V-initial / V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (32) as [SVX] [CONCCConjVSX] [ConjSV] – defines **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *ak* (CONCCConj), *thar* (Conj) in the initial places of the concessive and subordinate clauses, which stipulates and causes **contact clausal** placement inside a contrastive concessive sentence in the Old Saxon language.

(33) **Old Norse**: [**Ok** (Non-CONCCConj) *þeir* (S) *af tōku* (V)] [**ok** (CONCCConj) *þeir* (S) *ā lētu* (V) *fyr einn* (O) *ūtan* (Av),] [**es** (Non-CONCCConj) *þeir* (S) *af lētu* (V);] – [Off they (S) took (V) them (O),] [**but** (CONCCConj) *all* (Adv) *they* (S) *left* (V) *Save* (Adj) *one alone* (O)] [**which** (Non-CONCCConj) *they* (S) *bore away* (V).] (Poetic Edda, Völundarkvitha (The Lay of Völund), 11) [Hildebrand, Gering, Bellows, 2011, p. 355].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the contrastive concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (33) is as follows: [ConjSV] [CONCCConjSVOAdv] [ConjSV] (ON). – [SVO] [CONCCConjAdvSVAdjO] [ConjSV] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *contrastive concessive sentence* (33) from Old Norse are as follows: SV / SVX – V-final / V-second slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (33) as [ConjSV] [CONCCConjSVX] [ConjSV] – establishes **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *Ok* (Conj), *ok* (CONCCConj), *es* (Conj) in the initial places of principal and subordinate clause, which predetermines and affects **contact clausal** location within an Old Norse contrastive concessive sentence.

(34) **Gothic**: [*ikei* (S) *faura* (Adv) *was* (V) *wajamerjands* (O) **jah** (Non-CONCCConj) *wraks* (O) **jah** (Non-CONCCConj) *ufbrikands* (O),] [**akei** (CONCCConj) *gaarmaips* (O) *was* (V),] [**unte** (CONCCConj) *unwitands* (Adv) *gatawida* (V) *in ungalaubeinai* (O).] – [Who (S) *was* (V) *before* (Adv) *a blasphem-*

er (O), **and** (Non-CONCConj) a persecutor (O), **and** (Non-CONCConj) injurious (O):] [**but** (CONCCConj) I (S) obtained (V) mercy (O),] [**because** (CONCCConj) I (S) did (V) it (O) ignorantly (Adv) in unbelief (O).] (Wulfila Bible, 1 Timothy, 1:13) [Herdt, 2025].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the contrastive concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (34) is as follows: [SAdvVO-ConjOConjO] [CONCCConjOV] [CONCCConjAdvVO] (G) – [SVAdvOConjOConjO] [CONCCConjSVO] [CONCCConjSVOAdvO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *contrastive concessive sentence* (34) from Gothic are as: SVX / XV / VO – V-second / V-final / V-initial slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (34) as [SVXConjXConjX] [CONCCConjXV] [CONCCConjVX] – determines **distant clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunction *jah* (Conj) in the fourth-order place of the main clause; **distant conjunction concordance** slot position – with conjunctions *jah* (Conj), *jah* (Conj) in the fourth and sixth places of the principal clause, respectively, detached from each other by only one element; **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *akei* (CONCCConj), *unte* (CONCCConj) in the initial places of two concessive clauses: which conditions and influences **distant** and **contact clausal** placement, **distant conjunction** location inside a contrastive concessive sentence in the Gothic language.

(35) **Old Frisian**: [Dit (S) is (V) riucht (O),] [**dat** (Non-CONCCConj) [dae schelten (S) **deer** (Non-CONCCConj) bodtingh (O) haldet (V)] (S) toe middey (O) eer unden (O) [bannes bigonnen habba schillet] (V)] [**om dat** (Non-CONCCConj) stryd (O) deer ma (S) aldeer greta schil (V)] [**bi** (CONCCConj) sonnaopgongh (S/V).] – [This (S) is (V) the law (O),] [**that** (Non-CONCCConj) [the skeltas (S) **who** (Non-CONCCConj) are holding (V) the bodthing (O)] (S) shall open (V) court (O) before noon (O)] [**because** (Non-CONCCConj) a lawsuit (S) is to be initiated (V)] [**while** (CONCCConj) the sun (S) is climbing (V).] (Frisian Land Law, The Older Skelta Law: That the Bodthing of the Skelta Should Begin in the Morning, 27) [Nijdam, Hallebeek, Hylkje, 2023, pp. 128–129].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the contrastive concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (35) is as follows: [SVO] [Conj[SConjOV]SOOV] [ConjOSV] [CONCCConjS/V] (OFr) – [SVO] [Conj[SConjVO]SVOO] [ConjSV] [CONCCConjSV] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *contrastive concessive sentence* (35) from Old Frisian are as: SVX / SXV / XSV – V-second / V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (35) as [Conj[SConjXV]SXV] [ConjXSV] [CONCCConjS/V] – defines **distant conjunction concordance** slot position – with conjunctions *dat* (Conj), *deer* (Conj) in the first and third places, detached from each other by one element – subject *dae schelten* (S) of the same subordinate clause; **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *om dat* (Conj), *bi* (CONCCConj) in the initial places of subordinate clauses: which stipulates and causes **distant conjunction** location and **contact clausal** placement within an Old Frisian contrastive concessive sentence.

IV. Concessive complex sentences with conjunctions of causative concessive semantics as **because / since / for** – *forþan* (þe) / þe / *sibþon / sibþan / sib þam* (OE); *bidthiu huuanta / bithiu uuanta / sid* (OHG); *that, thes, sið* (OSax); *at / siðan / sizt / siz* (ON); *allis / auk / raihtis / unte / þande* (G); *hwand(e), (h)want(e), hvanne / as, als / nū thēr* (OFr):

(36) **Old English**: [**Heo þa** (Non-CONCCConj) *fæhðe* (O) *wræc* (V) *þe þu gystranniht* (O) *Grendel* (O) *cwealde* (V) *þurh hæstne* (O) *had* (S) *heardum clammum* (O),] [**forþan** (CONCCConj) *he* (S) *to lange leode mine* (O) *wanode* (V) **and** (Non-CONCCConj) *wyrde* (V).] – [The feud (O) she (S) avenged (V) that yesternight (O), unyieldingly (Adv), Grendel (O) in grimmest grasp (O) thou (S) killedst (V),] [**because** (CONCCConj) *seeing* (V) *how long these liegemen mine* (O) *he* (S) *ruined* (V) **and** (Non-CONCCConj) *ravaged* (V).] (translation into English – ours) (Beowulf, 1333–1337) [Gummere, 1910; Heaney, 2000].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the causative concessive sentence* in main and subordinate clauses from (36) is as follows: [ConjOVOOVOSO] [CONCCConjSOVConjV] (OE) – [OSVOAdvOOSV] [CONCCConjVOSVConjV] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *causative concessive sentence* (36) from Old English are as: XVXXSX / SXV – V-second / V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (36) as [ConjX-VXVXSX] [CONCConjSXVConjV] – identifies **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *Heo þa* (Conj), *forþan* (CONCConj) in the first-order places of the principal and concessive clauses; **distant conjunction concordance** slot position – with conjunctions *forþan* (CONCConj), *ond* (Conj) in the first and fifth places, detached by other elements of the same concessive clause: which predetermines and affects **contact clausal** placement and **distant conjunction** location inside a causative concessive sentence in the Old English language.

(37) **Old High German:** [*Inti* (Non-CONCConj) *Zacharias sin fater* (S) *uuard gifullit* (V) *heilages geistes* (O)] [*inti* (Non-CONCConj) *uulzagota* (O) *sus quedanti* (V):] [*“Giuuihit* (V) *si* (V) *truhtin got Israhelo* (O),] [*bithiu uuanta* (CONCConj) *uuisota* (V) *inti* (Non-CONCConj) *teta* (V) *losunga* (O) *sinemo folke* (O) *inti* (Non-CONCConj) *arrihta* (V) *horn heili* (O) *uns* (O) *in huse* (O) *Dauides sines knehtes* (O)”]. – [*Et* (Non-CONCConj) *Zacharias pater eius* (S) *impletus* (V) *est spiritu sancto* (O)] [*et* (Non-CONCConj) *prophetavit* (V) *icens* (V):] [*benedictus* (V) *dominus deus Israhel* (O),] [*quia* (CONCConj) *visitavit* (V) *et* (Non-CONCConj) *fecit* (V) *redemptionem* (O) *plebi suae* (O), *et* (Non-CONCConj) *erexit* (V) *cornu salutis* (O) *nobis* (O) *in domo* (O) *David pueri sui* (O)] (Latin) (Tatian, De magis qui venerunt ab oriente, α, 4:14) [Sievers, 1982, p. 19; Wright, 1906, p. 97]. – [*And* (Non-CONCConj) *Zacharias his father He* (S) *was filled* (V) *with the Holy Spirit* (O)] [*and* (Non-CONCConj) *he* (S) *prophesied* (V) *saying* (V):] [*blessed* (V) *be* (V) *the Lord God of Israel* (O)] [*because* (CONCConj) *he* (S) *visited* (V) *and* (Non-CONCConj) *redeemed* (V) *his people* (O) *and* (Non-CONCConj) *raised up* (V) *the horn of salvation* (O) *for us* (O) *in the house* (O) *of his son David* (O)] (translation into English – ours).

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the causative concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (37) is as follows: [ConjSVO] [ConjOV] [VVO] [CONCConjVConjVOOConjVOOOO] (OHG) – [ConjSVO] [ConjVV] [VO] [CONCConjVConjVOOConjVOOOO] (Latin) – [ConjSVO] [ConjSVV] [VVO] [CONCConjSVConjVOOConjVOOOO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *causative concessive sentence* (37) from Old High German are as follows: SVX / XV / VX – V-second / V-final / V-initial slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (37) as [ConjS-VX] [ConjXV] [CONCConjVConjVXConjVX] – determines **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *Inti* (Conj), *inti* (Conj), *bithiu uuanta* (CONCConj) in the initial places of the principal and subordinate clauses; **distant conjunction concordance** slot position – with conjunctions *bithiu uuanta* (CONCConj), *inti* (Conj), *inti* (Conj) in the first, third and sixth places, respectively, detached from each other by other elements of the same causative concessive clause: which conditions and influences **contact clausal** placement, **distant conjunction** location within an Old High German causative concessive sentence.

(38) **Old Saxon:** [*Thô* (Non-CONCConj) *was* (V) [*them Judiun, the imu* (S) *êr grame* (O) *wârun* (V),] (S) *unholde an hugi* (O), *harm an môde* (O),] [*that* (CONCConj) *imu thea* (S) [*liudi sô filu*] *lofsang* (O) *warhtun* (V), *diurdun* (O) *iro drohtin* (V).] – [*Then* (Non-CONCConj) [*the Jews, who* (Non-CONCConj/S) *had* (V) *a grudge against Him already* (O),] (S) *Became* (V) *hate-filled of heart* (O) *and* (Non-CONCConj) *hurting of spirit* (O),] [*Because* (CONCConj) *the people* (S) *did give* (V) *unto Him* (O) *so much praise* (O), *Did love* (V) *so their Master* (O).] (Heliand, Capitulum XLV, 45:3719-3722) [Scott, Regan, 1969; Sievers, 1878, p. 254; Scott, 1966, p. 127].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the causative concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (38) is as follows: [ConjV[SOV] SOO] [CONCConjSOVOV] (OSax) – [Conj[Conj/SVO]SVOConjO] [CONCConjSVOOVO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *causative concessive sentence* (38) from Old Saxon are as follows: VSX / SXV – V-initial / V-final slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (38) as [ConjV[SXV] SX] [CONCConjSXVXV] – defines **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *Thô* (Conj), *that* (CONCConj) in the initial places of principal and concessive clauses, which stipulates and causes **contact clausal** placement inside a causative concessive sentence in the Old Saxon language.

(39) **Old Norse:** [*Oddrûn* (S) *kvap* (V):] [*“Hnēkat* (V) *af þvī* (Adv) *til hjalpar* (V) *þēr* (O),] [*at* (CONCConj) *værir* (O) *þess* (Adv) *verþ* (V) *aldrigi* (Adv);”] – [*Oddrun* (S) *spake* (V):] [*“I* (S) *came* (V)

not (Neg) hither (Adv) to help (V) thee thus (O)] [Because (CONCConj) thou (S) ever (Adv) my aid (O) didst earn (V);” (Poetic Edda, Oddrunargratr (The Lament of Oddrun), 9) [Hildebrand, Ger- ing, Bellows, 2011, p. 651].

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the causative concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (39) is as follows: [SV] [VAdvVO] [CONCConjOAdvVAdv] (ON) – [SV] [SVNegAdvVO] [CONCConjSAdvOV] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *causative concessive sentence* (39) from Old Norse are as follows: SV / VX / XV – V-final / V-initial slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (39) as [SV] [VX] [CONCConjXV] – identifies **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunction *at* (CONC- Conj) in the first-order place of the subordinate concessive clause, which predetermines and af- fects **contact clausal** location within an Old Norse causative concessive sentence.

(40) **Gothic:** *[managai (O) auk (Non-CONCConj) in ludaia (O) ufaibjai (O) weisun (V) imma (O),] [unte (CONCConj) megs (S) was (V) Saixaineiins (O), sunaus Aieirins (O),] [jah (Non-CONCCo- nj) loanan sunus (S) is (V) nam dauhtar Maisaullamis (O), sunaus Barakeiins (O), du qenai (O).] – [For (Non-CONCConj) there were (V) many (O) in Judah (O) sworn (V) unto him (O),] [because (CONCConj) he (S) was (V) the son in law of Shechaniah (O) the son of Arah (O),] [and (Non-CONC- Conj) his son Johanan (S) had taken (V) the daughter of Meshullam (O) the son of Berechiah (O).] (Wulfila Bible, Nehemiah, 6:18) [Herdt, 2025].*

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the causative concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (40) is as follows: [OConjOOVO] [CONCConjSVOO] [ConjSVOOO] (G) – [ConjVOOVO] [CONCConjSVOO] [ConjSVOO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *causative concessive sentence* (40) from Gothic are as follows: VXV / SVX – V-second slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (40) as [XConjVX] [CONCConjSVX] [ConjSVX] – determines **distant clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunc- tion *auk* (Conj) in the second-order place of the subordinate clause; **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *unte* (CONCConj), *jah* (Conj) in the initial places of subordinate concessive and principal clauses: which conditions and influences **distant clausal** location and **contact clausal** placement inside a causative concessive sentence in the Gothic language.

(41) **Old Frisian:** *Dit is riucht: [als (CONCConj) di jonghera broder (S) een wyf (O) halle (V),] [so (Non-CONCConj) schel (V) syn wyf (S) syn jeldera broeder (O) jaen (V) fyff schillinghen (O),] [ende (Non-CONCConj) dat deerum (CONCConj) dat hy (S) dat bed (O) reme (V) syn jong- hera broeder (O) ende (Non-CONCConj) syne wive (O).] Dat is takeris jefta. – This is the law: [if (CONCConj) a younger brother (S) takes (V) a wife (O),] [then (Non-CONCConj) his wife (S) shall give (V) the older brother (O) five shillings (O)] [because (CONCConj) he (S) yields (V) the bed (O) to his younger brother (O) and (Non-CONCConj) his wife (O).] This is called the gift to the brother-in-law. (Frisian Land Law, The Older Skelta Law: On the Payment of the Younger Brother to the Older Brother When He Brings His Bride Home, 13) [Nijdam, Hallebeek, Hylkje, 2023, pp. 122–123].*

Note: *als* (Old Frisian), *if* (English) are concessive conditional conjunctions, but not caus- ative concessive conjunctions; so, in the next schemas, they are marked as *Conj*.

The internal arrangement of core elements within the constituent clauses of *the causative concessive sentence* in the main and subordinate clauses from (41) is as follows: [ConjSOV] [ConjVSOVO] [ConjCONCConjSOVOConjO] (OFr) – [ConjSVO] [ConjSVOO] [CONCConjSVOOConjO] (ModE).

Slot positions of principal finite verbs (V) in clauses of *causative concessive sentence* (41) from Old Frisian are as follows: SXV / SXVX – V-final / V-third slot.

Syntactic coherence of clauses within the framework structure of sample (41) as [ConjSXV] [ConjVSXVX] [ConjCONCConjSXVXConjX] – establishes **contact clausal conjunction** slot position – with conjunctions *als* (Conj), *so* (Conj), *ende* (Conj) in the initial places of the subordinate and principal clauses; **contact conjunction concordance** slot position – with conjunctions *ende* (Conj), *dat deerum* (CONCConj) in the first and second places of the same causative concessive clause, not detached from each other, but located in their sequential coherence immediately one af- ter another; **distant conjunction concordance** conjunction slot position – with conjunctions *dat*

deerum (CONCConj), *ende* (Conj) in the second and seventh places, accordingly, detached from each other by other elements of the same causative concessive clause: which stipulates and causes **contact** clausal location, **contact** conjunction location and **distant** conjunction placement within an Old Frisian causative concessive sentence.

Therefore, according to Old Germanic clausal syntax of complex concessive sentences, a slot position of a principal finite verb in a concessive clause of different semantics is represented in Table 1 on the basis of six Old Germanic languages:

Table 1

**Principal finite verb slot position in clauses of concessive semantics
in the Old Germanic period in IV – XIII centuries**

Old Germanic languages	Concessive clauses of pure concession			Concessive clauses of conditional concession			Concessive clauses of contrastive concession			Concessive clauses of causative concession		
	V-initial slot position	V-second slot position	V-final slot position	V-initial slot position	V-second slot position	V-final slot position	V-initial slot position	V-second slot position	V-final slot position	V-initial slot position	V-second (third*) slot position	V-final slot position
Old English			+		+	+			+		+	+
Old High German	+	+			+	+		+	+	+	+	+
Old Saxon			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+
Old Norse	+		+	+		+		+	+	+		+
Gothic		+	+		+		+	+	+		+	
Old Frisian	+	+	+		+			+	+		+	+

A common syntactic feature in four Old Germanic semantic types of concessive sentences is witnessed in terms of the functioning of a certain slot position of the main finite verb in a certain language and semantic type as:

1. The *V-initial* slot position of the main finite verb functioned in *Old Saxon* mainly in concessive sentences of conditional, contrastive, and causative semantics; *Old Norse* demonstrates the V-initial slot position of the finite verb in concessive sentences of pure (concessive), conditional, and causative semantics; *Old High German* represents the functioning of the main finite verb in the V-initial slot position only in concessive sentences of pure (concessive) and causative semantics; in *Gothic* and *Old Frisian*, the use of the main finite verb in the V-initial slot position is witnessed only in concessive clauses of contrastive and pure (concessive) semantics, respectively; *Old English* does not provide a V-initial slot for the main finite verb in any of the specified semantic types of concessive sentences.

2. The *V-secondary* finite slot position prevailed in concessive sentences of all semantic types of clauses in *Old High German*, *Gothic*, and *Old Frisian*; *Old English* represents the V-secondary slot position of finite verbs in concessive sentences of conditional and causative semantics; *Old Saxon* evidences V-secondary finite slot in concessive sentences of conditional and contrastive semantics; *Old Norse* has revealed the V-secondary finite slot position in concessive sentences of contrastive semantics; *Old Frisian* also demonstrates the V-3 finite slot position in concessive clauses of causative semantics;

3. The *V-final* slot position predominated mainly in concessive clauses of all semantic types of *Old English*, *Old Saxon*, and *Old Frisian*; in *Old High German*, the functioning of the V-final finite slot position in concessive clauses of conditional, contrastive, causative semantics has been witnessed; *Gothic* also demonstrates V-final slot position of finite verb in concessive clauses of

pure (concessive) and contrastive semantics; *Old Frisian* reveals the V-final finite slot in concessive clauses of pure (concessive), contrastive and causative semantics.

A *distinctive syntactic feature* in four Old Germanic semantic types of concessive sentences is evidenced in terms of the functioning of a certain slot position of the main finite verb in a certain language and semantic type as:

1. The *V-initial* slot position: *Old English* – all semantic types of concessive clauses; *Old Saxon* – pure (concessive); *Gothic* – pure (concessive), conditional, causative; *Old Frisian* – conditional, contrastive, causative concession.

2. The *V-secondary* slot position: *Old English* – pure (concessive), contrastive; *Old Saxon* – pure (concessive), causative; *Old Norse* – pure (concessive), conditional, causative concession.

3. The *V-final* slot position: *Old High German* – pure (concessive); *Gothic* – conditional and causative; *Old Frisian* – conditional concession.

Conclusion

The research findings show that by way of internal grammatical reconstruction of Old Germanic concessive sentences of various semantic types, *three basic types* of the internal framework structure of concessive sentences in the studied Old Germanic languages were identified with a focus on V-finite clausal allocation in such SVX-configurational models as: 1) VXS- / VSX-model with a V-finite verb in the initial position; 2) SVX- / XVS-model with a V-finite verb in the secondary position; 3) SXV- / XSV-model with a V-finite verb in final position.

The syntax of Old Germanic concessive clauses with various semantics of concession in dynamic synchrony is outlined, demonstrating the following *syntactic structural models*: the SXV- / XSV-model functions in all semantic types of concessive sentences of Old English, Old Saxon, and Old Norse; the SVX- / XVS-model is witnessed in all syntactic types of sentences of concession in Gothic, Old High German, and Old Frisian; the VXS- / VSX-model is realized in most semantic types, mainly in concessive sentences of Old Saxon and Old Norse languages.

The *mutual syntactic relationship* between the Old Germanic languages under study has been clarified from the viewpoint of SOV-models and their core constituents' configurations. *Common* and *distinctive syntactic particularities* of complex clausal concessive constructions were established in six Old Germanic configurations, such as SXV / XSV / VXS / VSX / SVX / XVS. Common syntactic similarities and distinctive features of Old Germanic concessive clauses were defined with an emphasis on the initial / secondary / final slot position of the main V-finite verb in principal and subordinate (coordinative) clauses.

The syntactic profile of concessive sentences' framework structure is based on the *syntactic coherence* of: 1) the principal and pure (concessive), conditional, contrastive, and causative concessive clauses as: "contact – distant" arrangement of the internal framework slot positions of the *clausal conjunction* with "contact – distant" arrangement of the external framework clause allocation within the whole concessive sentence; 2) the concessive or non-concessive conjunctions as: "contact – distant" arrangement of internal framework *conjunction concordance* slot positions with "contact – distant" arrangement of internal framework *conjunction* position in a frame.

The *contact clausal conjunction* slot positions were observed as the common ones for all Old Germanic languages in all four semantic types of pure (concessive), conditional, contrastive, and causative concessive sentences. The *distant clausal conjunction* slot positions were evidenced as the prevailing ones in Old High German pure (concessive) and contrastive, Gothic conditional, contrastive, and causative concessive sentences. The *contact conjunction concordance* slot positions were fixed in Gothic conditional and Old Frisian causative clauses of concession. The *distant conjunction concordance* slot positions were common for Old High German conditional, causative, Gothic contrastive, Old Frisian contrastive, causative, and Old English causative concessive sentences.

References

Arthur, R.G. (2002). *English-Old Norse Dictionary*. Cambridge – Ontario: Publications Linguistics Series.

Bennett, W.H. (1960). *The Gothic Commentary on the Gospel of John: Skeireins Aiwaggeljons Pairh Iohannen, a Decipherment, Edition, and Translation*. New York: Modern Language Association. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19306962.1962.11787090>

- Bossuyt, T. (2023). Concessive conditionals beyond Europe. A typological survey. *Studies in Language*, 47 (1), 1-31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.20068.bos>
- Bremmer, R.H. (2009). *An Introduction to Old Frisian: History, Grammar, Reader, Glossary*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.147>
- Burnham, J.M. (1911). *Concessive Constructions in OE Prose*. PhD thesis. New York: Holt.
- Chan, C.J., Kim, J. (2009). Inverted English Concessive Constructions: A Construction-Based Approach. *Studies in Modern Grammar*, 58, 39-58.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., Kortmann, B. (Eds.). (2000). *Cause – Condition – Concession – Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219043>
- Crevels, E.I. (2000). *Concession. A Typological Study*. PhD Thesis. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Dancygier, B., Sweetser, E. (2000). Constructions with *if*, *since*, and *because*: Causality, epistemic stance, and clause order. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & B. Kortmann (Eds.), *Cause – Condition – Concession – Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives* (pp. 111-142). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219043-006>
- Diessel, H. (2008). Iconicity of sequence. A corpus-based analysis of the positioning of temporal adverbial clauses in English. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 193 (3), 465-490. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/COGL.2008.018>
- Gummere, F.B. (Trans.). (1910). *Beowulf*. *Harvard Classics*, 49. Collier. Retrieved from <https://rpo.library.utoronto.ca/content/beowulf-1>
- Haiman, J. (1974). Concessives, Conditionals, and Verbs of Volition. *Foundations of Language*, 11 (3), 341-359.
- Haspelmath, M., König, E. (1998). 9 Concessive Conditionals in the Languages of Europe. In J. van der Auwera (Ed.), *3 Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe* (pp. 563-640). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110802610.563>
- Heaney, S. (Trans.). (2000). *Beowulf: A new verse translation*. New York – London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Hengeveld, K. (1998). 6 Adverbial clauses in the languages of Europe. In J. van der Auwera (Ed.), *3 Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe* (pp. 335-420). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110802610.335>
- Herdt, T. de (Ed.). (2025). *Wulfila Bible*. *Wulfila Project*. Retrieved from <http://www.wulfila.be/gothic/browse/>
- Hildebrand, K., Gering, H., Bellows, H.A. (2011). *Poetic Edda. Old Norse – English Diglot*. Melbourne: Australia.
- Huddleston, R.D., Pullum, G.K. (2012). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. 5th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Humboldt, W. (1988). *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-structure and Its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, J.S., Joseph, B.D., Fritz, M. & Wenthe, M. (Eds.). (2017). *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics: an International Handbook*. HSK 41.1. Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110542431>
- Klipstein, L.F. (1859). *A Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language*. Revised and Enlarged Edition. New York: Geo P. Putman.
- König, E., Siemund, P. (2000). Causal and concessive clauses: Formal and semantic relations. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & B. Kortmann (Eds.), *Cause – Condition – Concession – Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives* (pp. 341-360). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: doi.org/10.1515/9783110219043-014
- König, E. (1999). Concessive Clauses. In K. Brown, J. Miller (Eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories* (pp. 81-84). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Lehmann, C. (2004). Interlinear morphemic glossing. In G. Booij, C. Lehmann, J. Mugdan, S. Skopeteas, (Eds.), *Morphologie: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung*. *Morphology: an international handbook on inflection and word-formation (Handbücher zur Sprach-*

und Kommunikationswissenschaft. *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science, Band 17.2*) (pp. 1834-1857). Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.

March, F.A. (1870). *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.

Miller, J. (2002). *An Introduction to English Syntax*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Mitchell, B., Robinson, F.C. (2012). *A Guide to Old English*. 8th ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mitchell, B. (1985). *Old English Syntax. Volume II. Subordination, independent elements, and element order*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Nijdam, H., Hallebeek, J., Hylkje, de J. (2023). *Frisian Land Law. A Critical Edition and Translation of the Freeska Landriucht*. Leiden – Boston: Koninklijke Brill N.V. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004526419>

Onions, C.T. (1966). *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, New York: Longman Group Limited.

Quirk, R. (1954). *The Concessive Relation in Old English Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Regan, B.T. (1974). *Dictionary of the Biblical Gothic Language*. Phoenix: Wellspring Books.

Robinson, O.W. (1992). *Old English and its Closest Relatives: A Survey of the Earliest Germanic Languages*. London: Routledge.

Schützler, O. (2020). Although-constructions in varieties of English. *World Englishes*, 39, 443-461. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12484>

Schwenter, S.A. (2000). Viewpoints and polysemy: Linking adversative and causal meanings of discourse markers. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & B. Kortmann (Eds.), *Cause – Condition – Concession – Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives* (pp. 257-281). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: doi.org/10.1515/9783110219043-011

Scott, M., Regan, B.T. (Eds.). (1969). *Heliand. Old Saxon Accidence. Translations*. Retrieved from <https://www.hieronymus.us.com/latinweb/Mediaevum/Heliand.htm#top>

Scott, M. (Trans.). (1966). *The Heliand: Translated from the Old Saxon*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5149/9781469658346_Scott

Sievers, E. (1878). *Heliand. Titelaufage 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.

Sievers, E. (1982). *Tatian: Lateinisch und altdeutsch mit ausführlichem Glossar*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Toller, T.N. (Ed.). (1898). *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Verhagen, A. (2000). Concession implies causality, though in some other space. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & B. Kortmann (Eds.), *Cause – Condition – Concession – Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives* (pp. 361-380). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: doi.org/10.1515/9783110219043-015

Warmington, E.H. (Ed.). (1959). *Remains of Old Latin. Archaic Inscriptions*, 4. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Weißenburg, O. von (1987). *Evangelienbuch. Althochdeutsch / Neuhochdeutsch*. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam.

Wiechmann, D., Kerz, E. (2013). The positioning of concessive adverbial clauses in English: assessing the importance of discourse-pragmatic and processing-based constraints. *English Language and Linguistics*, 17 (1), 1-23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674312000305>

Wright, J. (1966). *Grammar of the Gothic Language*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wright, J. (1906). *An Old High German Primer with Grammar, Notes and Glossary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wright, J. (1899). *An Primer of the Gothic Language with Grammar, Notes and Glossary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Zoëga, G.T. (1910). *A Concise Dictionary of Old Icelandic*. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press.

MODELS OF SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES IN OLD GERMANIC CONCESSIVE SENTENCES

Oleksandra M. Tuhai, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University (Ukraine)

e-mail: o.tuhai@kubg.edu.ua

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-18>

Key words: *concessive sentence, framework structure, reconstruction, syntactic relationship, Old Germanic languages*

The proposed article deals with revealing the syntactic profile of the Old Germanic languages, namely, the particularities of the functioning of the syntax and grammatical framework structure of sentences with concessive semantics in the Germanic languages of the ancient period (Old English, Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Norse (Old Icelandic), Gothic, Old Frisian). The study *aims* to outline the models of syntactic structures of complex sentences with a subordinate / coordinate concessive action in four semantic types of concessive sentences with pure (concessive), conditional, contrastive, and causative semantics of concession across six Old Germanic languages. To meet this objective, a *seven-stage methodology* was developed based on the use of interdisciplinary tools involving such methods as the method of internal reconstruction, comparative-historical, structural-syntactic, semantic, descriptive methods, analytical and synthetic analysis, and the method of continuous sampling.

Based on the internal grammatical reconstruction of Old Germanic concessive sentences of various semantic types, *three basic types* of their internal framework structure with the governing position of the main V-finite verb in the principal and concessive (or subordinate / coordinate) clauses have been identified as: 1) VXS- / VSX-model with a V-finite verb in the initial position; 2) SVX- / XVS-model with a V-finite verb in the secondary position; 3) SXV- / XSV-model with a V-finite verb in the final position. It has been determined that the syntax of concessive sentences with various semantics of concession in the dynamic synchrony demonstrates the functioning of the identified syntactic models in most semantic types of concessive clauses depending on the specific Old Germanic language.

Common and distinctive syntactic particularities of Old Germanic concessive clauses are observed in six configurations as SXV / XSV / VXS / VSX / SVX / XVS with an emphasis on the initial / secondary / final slot positions of the main V-finite verbs in the principal and subordinate (coordinative) clauses. *Common syntactic particularities* are identified by way of the presence of the same syntactic slot position of the main finite verb – V-initial, V-secondary, V-final as a mutual signal syntactic function or feature in all or certain semantic types of the concessive action in the ancient languages under study. *Distinctive syntactic particularities* are established by the absence of a certain syntactic slot position of the main finite verb – V-initial, V-secondary, V-final as a unique signal syntactic feature of the functioning of a certain type of a concessive clause in a certain Old Germanic language.

The framework structure of concessive sentences is outlined in terms of the *syntactic coherence* between pure (concessive), conditional, contrastive, and causative concessive clauses and their corresponding main clauses within the concessive sentences as: “contact – distant” arrangement of the internal framework slot positions of the *clausal conjunction* with “contact – distant” arrangement of the external framework clause allocation within the whole concessive sentence. *The syntactic coherence* of concessive / non-concessive conjunctions within clauses of concessive sentences is established as: “contact – distant” arrangement of internal framework *conjunction concordance* slot positions with “contact – distant” arrangement of internal framework *conjunction* position within the frame.

It was found that the *contact clausal conjunction* slot positions were common across all Old Germanic languages in four semantic types of sentences with pure (concessive), conditional, contrastive, and causative concession. The *distant clausal conjunction* slot positions prevailed in Old High German sentences of pure (concessive), contrastive concession; in Gothic sentences of conditional, contrastive, and causative concession. The *contact conjunction concordance* slot positions are witnessed only in Gothic conditional and Old Frisian causative concessive clauses. The *distant conjunction concordance slot positions* were common in Old High German conditional, causative concessive clauses, Gothic contrastive concessive clauses, Old Frisian contrastive, causative concessive clauses, and Old English causative concessive clauses.