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ABSTRACT: This article analyses the positioning of the particles Že, li, bo in Old Church Slavonic, attempting to demonstrate that their placement is not determined by a single syntactic rule (Wackernagel’s Law), but is a consequence of the different functions these three elements have. The fact that there is no class of enclitics syntactically placed in second position is a serious challenge to the validity of this law in Old Church Slavonic.
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1. Introduction

One of the few syntactic generalizations that is made for Old Church Slavonic is the validity of Wackernagel’s Law (WL) in this language, stating that enclitics occupy the second position in the sentence.

---

1 I would like to thank Paolo Di Giovine and Artemij Keidan, who kindly read preliminary drafts of this paper. As usual, the responsibility for any errors or deficiencies is mine. This work was supported by the project “Lingue antiche e sistemi scrittori in contatto: pietra di paragone del mutamento linguistico”, funded by the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (PRIN 2017, grant n. 2017JBFP9H).

2 It is unclear in the literature what is meant by enclitic: in particular, there does not seem to be a linguistic category ‘clitic,’ possibly divisible into enclitics and proclitics (see Haspelmath 2015).
Although the first to extend the validity of WL to Slavic languages was Nilsson (1904), reference is usually made to Jakobson’s (1935) influential paper presented in 1933 at the 3rd International Congress of Linguists held in Rome. In his paper, Jakobson starts from the observation that in Common Slavic the WL inherited from Proto-Indo-European was still operating. More precisely, in Common Slavic the enclitics, which could be inflected or not, invariably occupied the second position in the sentence, leaning on the element preceding them, whose accent they took. Since then, the (at least partial) validity of WL in Slavic languages has never been questioned.

While all modern Slavic languages possess enclitic particles that “habituellement” (‘on a regular basis;’ Jakobson 1935, p. 384) occupy the second position in the sentence, the group of languages that apply WL to inflected enclitic words is more restricted. In languages with free dynamic stress (East Slavic languages, Bulgarian, and Southwestern Ukrainian), WL does not extend to inflected enclitics, since, according to Jakobson, in languages with free dynamic stress it is impossible for an enclitic to lean on one word while being syntactically subordinate to another. Furthermore, Jakobson (1935, p. 386) claims that the oldest Russian and Bulgarian texts prove that these languages originally possessed enclitic pronominal forms and enclitic forms of the auxiliary verb and that “la position de ces mots dans la phrase était rée par la règle de Wackernagel” (‘the position of these words within the sentence was determined by Wackernagel’s Law’): this is because they still had a pitch accent, like Serbo-Croatian and Slovene.

As Benacchio (Benacchio, Renzi 1987, pp. 9–10) observes, each of the languages in which WL is still supposed to be operative presents irregularities, i.e. “in each language there are more or less frequent exceptions to the law in question,” exceptions that “do not emerge, or emerge insufficiently, from Jakobson’s work.” As far as Old Church Slavonic is concerned, in fact, Sławski (1946, pp. 14–22) noted that enclitic pronominal forms could appear as much in second position as in postverbal position with a verb not necessarily at the beginning of a sentence.

Zaliznjak (2008, p. 24) formulates WL for Old Russian as follows: “all these enclitics [sc. Connected to the verb] are part of the first phonological word

In Indo-European studies, and namely after Wackernagel’s groundbreaking paper (1892), it seems that this term traditionally denotes words that never appear in the first position in a syntactically defined domain (which may be the sentence, clause, colon or other), rather than unstressed words leaning on the preceding element. The literature on clitics is incredibly vast: for a bibliography see Nevis et al. (1994) and Janse (1994); for an overview in Indo-European languages, see Veksina (2008) and Walkden (2020). Much work has been devoted to this topic in the framework of formal syntax as well, particularly on Romance and Slavic languages (see respectively, e.g., Manzini 2022 and Franks, King 2000).
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of the clause”. Should several such enclitics be found in a clause, they would form a cluster that by virtue of Wackernagel’s Law would occupy the second position of the clause. Depending on the rigidity with which they follow WL, Zaliznjak divides Old Russian enclitics into strong (že, li, bo, ti, by) and weak (dative clitic pronouns, accusative clitic pronouns, auxiliaries), which correspond to Jakobson’s (1935) inflected enclitics. In Old Church Slavonic, only strong enclitics would follow WL. A third group is represented by local enclitics – connected not to the verb but to another word – that follow the word they are related to. As far as Old Church Slavonic is concerned, the main local enclitics are the dative personal pronouns used as possessives (mi, ti, si meaning ‘my, your, own’); že when used with negative pronouns, when coordinating lower order elements in the sentence (as in Lk 2, 16 i pridо podvigоše sе · obrеtо marijо že i osifa · i mladenеsцо vо ěsleсњо · ~ gr. Καὶ ἦλθον σπεύσαντες, καὶ ἀνεύρον τὴν τε Μαρίαμ καὶ τὸν Ἰωσήφ, καὶ τὸ βρέφος κείμενον ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ. ‘They went therefore without delay and found Mary and Joseph and the child lying in the manger’), and in an identifying function (Zaliznjak 2008, p. 29; see also Večerka 1989, p. 43).

Based on Zaliznjak’s (1993, 2008) analyses, Cimmerling (2013) observes how enclitics are arranged differently in the Old Novgorod dialect, and in Old Russian and Old Church Slavonic texts3: whereas in the former language the enclitics form a cluster that is placed4 in the second position (W-system, according to Cimmerling’s terminology), Old Russian and Old Church Slavonic have a W*-system, in which the particles form a cluster that is placed in the second position, while the auxiliaries are placed in adverbal position, and the clitic pronouns can be placed both with the particles in 2P and with the auxiliaries in adverbal position5 (Zimmerling, Kosta 2013, pp. 201–202).

As for Old Church Slavonic, the enclitics that would tend to form clusters in the second position are že, li, and bo. In particular, Migdalski (2018, p. 1567) believes that že, li, and bo form a natural class (operator clitics), which expresses the illocutionary force of the sentence.

Even from this concise summary, it is clear that the assumption that bo, že, and li constitute a homogeneous class, placed in the second position

---

3 Note that for Zaliznjak the difference between the two groups is more stylistic than geographical, i.e., it concerns the differences between literary and non-literary styles (Zaliznjak 2008, p. 84).


5 According to Pancheva (2005), clitic pronouns in Old Church Slavonic are in adverbal position; Zaliznjak (2008, pp. 128), on the other hand, believes that weak enclitics (i.e., dative and accusative clitic pronouns and auxiliaries) are treated in Old Church Slavonic texts as tonic words, and can occupy any place in the sentence.
of the sentence, has hardly ever been questioned in the literature. However, it is possible to note that only apparently do the three elements in question occupy the same structural position: indeed, in the remainder of this article, an attempt will be made to show how the sentential connectors *bo* (see Chapter 2.1) and *že* (see Chapter 2.2), as well as the interrogative particle *li* (see Chapter 2.3) are placed in different positions. Their placement, in fact, is not determined by a single syntactic rule (WL), but is a consequence of the different functions these three elements have. The fact that there is no class of enclitics syntactically placed in second position is a serious challenge to the validity of WL in Old Church Slavonic (see Chapter 3).

2. Data analysis

The analysis will be mainly based on data from *Codex Marianus* (Mar), *Codex Suprasliensis* (Supr) and *Psalterium Sinaiticum* (PS): the data were automatically extracted from the *TOROT Treebank* (Eckhoff, Berdicevskis 2015). In addition to these texts, *Codex Zographensis* (Zogr; Jagić 1879), *Codex Assemani* (Ass; Vajs, Kurz, 1929) and *Savvina Kniga* (SK; Ščepkin 1903) were consulted.

2.1. *Bo*

In Old Church Slavonic, the sentence connector *bo* ‘indeed, because’ follows the first word of the sentence, as in (1):

(1)

a. Mt 20,16 (Mar, Ass)

\[\text{μνονδζि bo sόη zьvанныи malо žе izbьгaнyичь} \cdot \text{πoллoи γάρ είσιν κλητοί, ολίγοι δέ ἐκλεκτοί.}\]

For many are invited, but few are chosen.

---

6 The only exception I am aware of is Vai (2018), where the different placement of *bo, že*, and *li* is briefly considered.

7 The Greek text of Gospels is cited according to the Byzantine text-type, in the edition of Robinson and Pierpont, accessible on biblehub.com; the Greek text of the Psalms is cited according to the edition by Swete, accessible on biblehub.com; the English translation of the biblical texts is the New International Version (NIV), accessible on biblehub.com; the Greek text corresponding to the Old Church Slavonic text in *Codex Suprasliensis* is cited from the edition of Zaimov and Capaldo, accessible on www.suprasliensis.obdurodon.org. The translation into English is mine.
b. Jn. 3,19

sъ estъ sodъ pride bo světъ vъ mигъ · i vъzljubišъ očlvi pače tъmp neže světъ · běšę bo ixy děla zъla · (Mar)

sъ estъ sodъ · ěko pride světъ vъ mиgъ · i vъzljubišъ očlvi pače tъmp neže světъ · běšę bo ixy děla zъla · (Ass)

Αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις, ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς · ἦν γὰρ πονηρὰ αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα.

This is the verdict: Light has come into the world, but people loved darkness instead of light because their deeds were evil.

In (1a), bo follows the first word of the clause in both Marianus and Assemani. In (1b) one will notice how Assemani uses the ěko connector to translate Gr. ὅτι, while Marianus uses the bo connector.

In general, bo cannot separate a preposition from its complement, nor directly follow the negation (in the Gospel manuscripts and the Psalter, but see 3):

(2) Luke 6,44 (Mar, Zogr)

ne otъ tsнић bo česотъ smokъbi · ni otъ kopiny grozda obemljotъ ·

Oų γάρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσιν σύκα, οὐδὲ ἐκ βάτου τρυγῶσιν σταφυλῆν.

People do not pick figs from thornbushes, or grapes from briers.

Whereas in Marianus there are no examples of bo directly after the negation (in a usage that would conform with the Greek text), in Suprasliensis it is not difficult to find them, as for example in (3):

(3) Supr. 205v. 19

ne bo reče ·

Oų γάρ εἶπεν.

Indeed he did not say.

This tendency to follow the first word of the sentence is even clearer in cases where bo divides a noun from the adjective, as in (4):

(4) Mk 14,6 (Mar, Zogr)

οίσ źe reče ostaněte eję po čyto jǫ truľdaate · dobro bo dělo sъděla o mъně ·

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἀφετε αὐτήν · τί αὐτῆ ὁπόου παρέχετε; Καλὸν ἔργον εἰργάσατο ἐν ἐμοί.

“Leave her alone,” said Jesus. “Why are you bothering her? She has done a beautiful thing to me”.

"Leave her alone," said Jesus. “Why are you bothering her? She has done a beautiful thing to me".
A special case, finally, is the use of *bo* to signal parenthetical clauses, which often introduce comments or further explanations and clarifications by the narrator, as in (5):

(5) Jn 19,31

Ijudei że poneže paraskevň́gi bę · da ne ostanotę na krystě tělesa · vę sobotę · bę *bo* velikę
denj toję soboty · molišę pilata da prębįjotę golęni ixę · i vęzımıotę ję ·

Oι οὗν Ἰουδαίοι, ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαβάτῳ ἐπεὶ Παρασκευή


ην · γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου · ἡρώτησαν τὸν Πιλάτον ἵνα κατεαγώσιν


αὐτῶν σκέλη, καὶ ἀρθῶσιν.

The Jews, since it was the day of Preparation, in order to avoid bodies left on the crosses during the Sabbath – it was a great day, that Sabbath – asked Pilate to have the legs of the bodies broken and the bodies taken down.

In two cases in *Suprasliensis bo* follows *że* (179r.10; 198r.27): probably in these cases *że* should be interpreted as a local particle (see 2.2.).

Two cases appear to be problematic and can probably be traced back to errors made by the copyist:

(6)

a. Imeni ego radi česte *bo* i poidq posręđe sęni sъmṛgъčtъmįje · Ne ubojq sję sъla éko ty so


mnoję esı · (PS 22,4; f.27v. 2–3)

<22,3> (…) ēnekev tođ ónmqmatqos auctive · <22,4> ēqan gąr kai porenvqoq égn męsq sqiás


θανάτου, ouq foqbhqšqmaı qakqa, ọtı su met` émuq εi-.

<22,3> (…) because of his name. <22,4> Even though I walk through the darkest valley,


I will fear no evil, for you are with me.

b. ne mьńęć li ti sę bozi *bo* ti imže samodrъžecь ⁰crъ żrъtvy tvorıtę · (Supr. 80r. 1–3)

Do they not look like gods, then, those to whom the emperor makes sacrifices?

In (6a) it is evident, as much for sense as for textual reasons, how *imeni ego radi* belongs to the preceding verse <22,3>, as indeed it does in Greek. Being that the case, *bo* would occupy the second position, immediately after the subordinating conjunction *ašte* (in the text *česte*).

In (6b) both the position of *bo* and the meaning suggest that this is an error by the copyist, who either repeated the first two graphemes of the earlier *bozi* or, more likely, used *bo* instead of the expected (by meaning) *oubo* ‘therefore, hence’.
2.2. Že

According to Greenberg (2017, p. 544) and Migdalski (2018, p. 1567), Že would be a focus marker; for Ickler (1977), it would signal the change of topic (“marker of topic switch”). From examples such as (7) it is evident that its function is not the one pointed out by Ickler; rather, it is better understood as a marker of discontinuity. By discontinuity I mean a change of the topical referent, of the scene (i.e., the space and time in a universe of discourse) or of the perspective (i.e., the universe of discourse in which the assertion is valid among other possible universes of discourse) between one sentence and the following. It should be noted that this analysis is not in contrast with the one proposed in Klein (2022), where the role of Že in effectuating discourse continuity is emphasized: while signaling discontinuity in the restricted sense here proposed, it is also a means of achieving textual cohesion or, in the terms of Klein, discourse continuity.

(7) Lk 7,2–6

<7,2> Sътъniku Že eteru rabъ bolę umiraše · iže bě emu čъstenъ · <3> slyšavъ Že o °isě · posъla kъ nemu starъcę ijudeisky · molę i da prišedъ °spstъ raba ego · <4> oni Že prišedъše kъ °isvi · molěax ǫ Ĭi tъštъno °gljоšte Ėko dostoinъ estъ · eže ašte dasi emu · <5> ljubıtъ bo ježkъ našъ · i šъnъmİšte tъ sъzъda namъ · <6> °isъ Že idеаše tъ nimi · ešte Že emu nedaleče soštu otъ domu · posъla kъ nemu drugy sъtъnikъ °glę emu · (…)

<7,2> There a centurion's servant, whom his master valued highly, was sick and about to die. <3> The centurion heard of Jesus and sent some elders of the Jews to him, asking him to come and heal his servant. <4> When they came to Jesus, they pleaded earnestly with him, “This man deserves to have you do this, <5> because he loves our nation and has built our synagogue.” <6> So Jesus went with them. He was not far from the house when the centurion sent friends to say to him: (…).

The narrative section in (7) presents five Že (corresponding to as many δέ in the Greek text), only one of which (v. 6) is rendered in the NIV translation.8 The function performed by Že consists in segmenting the passage into five scenes (which roughly correspond to the segmentation achieved in the English translation by means of the full stop) that contribute to the formation of a unitary paragraph:

   a) there is a sick servant;
   b) the centurion sends for Jesus;
   c) the elders of the Jews speak with Jesus;
   d) Jesus walks with them;
   e) the centurion sends some friends to meet Jesus.

---

8 This fact seems to characterise Že as a “minimorph” in the sense of Haspelmath (2015).
Moreover, it may be noted that žе cannot be considered an indicator of topic change (in v. 3 there is no topic change; likewise in the second occurrence of v. 6): the frequent co-occurrence of žе in situations of topic change is only a corollary of its more general function as an indicator of discontinuity.

In dialogic situations, žе tends to signal the succession of speakers’ turns:

(8) Mt 15,22–27

A Canaanite woman from that vicinity came to him, crying out (...). <23> Jesus did not answer a word. So his disciples came to him and urged him (...). <24> He answered (...). <25> The woman came and knelt before him, saying (...). <26> He replied (...). <27> (...) she said.

In v. 23 we can observe that žе does not indicate a change of topic, let alone subject: if this were the function of žе, we would have had to find another one after učenici – the fact that i was used instead indicates that v. 23, as a whole, should be considered as a single scene. It should also be noted that the pronoun onъ is always followed by žе. The use of pronouns as contrastive topics is what led to an adversative reading of the connective, which seems to be under-specified for this function.

(9) Mt 5,27–34

“You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall not commit adultery.’ <28> But I tell you that anyone who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart. <29> If your right eye causes you to stumble, gouge it out and throw it away. It is better for you to lose one part of your body than for your whole body to be thrown into hell. <30> And if your right hand causes you to stumble, cut it off and throw it away. It is better for you to lose one part of your body than for your whole body to go into hell.
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<31> “It has been said, ‘Anyone who divorces his wife must give her a certificate of divorce.’ <32> But I tell you that anyone who divorces his wife, except for sexual immorality, makes her the victim of adultery, and anyone who marries a divorced woman commits adultery. <33> “Again, you have heard that it was said to the people long ago, ‘Do not break your oath, but fulfill to the Lord the vows you have made.’ <34> But I tell you, do not swear an oath at all: either by heaven, for it is God’s throne.

In (9) a fragment of the Sermon on the Mount is presented, a long sermon by Jesus stretching from Mt 5,1 to Mt 7,29. In the monologue sections, the subdivision of the text by že helps to organise the discourse, marking the breaks between the different issues. Note in particular the adversative nuance deriving from the use of the first person pronoun (vv. 28, 32, 34), the use of paky ‘again’ instead of že in v. 33, and how vv. 29 and 30 (which together constitute a single textual segment where a casuistry of the ways in which, according to Jesus, adultery can be committed is proposed as an example) are linked by the connective i.

By virtue of its signaling a change of scene or perspective, it often follows an adverbial expression; Večerka (1989, p. 43) notes how it can sometimes follow an adverb even within the sentence (10):

(10) Mk 4,28 (Mar, Zogr)

o sebě bo zemlě ploditъ sę · prěžde trěv po tomь že klasь · po tomь že i pьšenixo vъ klasě · Aўтоматъ гάр ἢ γή кαρποφορεί, πρώτων χόρτων, εἴτα στάχυν, εἴτα πλήρη σῖτον ἐν τῷ στάχυι.
As the earth produces spontaneously, first the stem, then the ear, then the full grain in the ear.

Actually, in this case it would appear to be more a series of clauses coordinated with ellipses of the verb, than a single sentence.

In some contexts, however, it is undoubtedly grammaticalized in all the manuscripts examined and functions as a local particle\(^9\): together with the anaphoric pronoun i as a relative pronoun iže (but see 11); as part of negative indefinite pronouns and adverbs; perhaps together with the connector i to coordinate two elements within the sentence (že i = gr. τε). In Suprasliensis it may have an identifying function (‘this very one,’ ‘this same one’) in two instances (179r.10; 198r.27), although the particle žde is usually found in this function.

(11) Mt 27,55–56 (Mar, Zogr, Ass)

<27.55> Běaxo že tu ženy мьногы iz daleče звърштě · jěže idq po °isě · оть галилење служе-ště emu · <56> вь níхь že bě marię magdalyňi i marię iěkolvě i osii mati · mati °snovu zevedeovu ·

\(^9\) It is not clear, in fact, whether it should be considered as a separate element in these cases.
Many women were there, watching from a distance. They had followed Jesus from Galilee to care for his needs. Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of Zebedee’s sons.

From this example, it is clear that sometimes the choice between an anaphoric pronoun (not in the nominative) + že and a relative pronoun is based on the editor’s interpretation (whether or not the univerbated form is given). In (11), the distance between antecedent and relative pronoun probably had to play a role.

Apart from cases where it is used as a local particle, in the remaining cases it regularly occupies the position after the first word of the sentence and, just like bo, cannot separate a preposition from its complement:

(12) Mt 14,25

Shortly before dawn Jesus went out to them, walking on the lake.

2.3. **Li**

Old Church Slavonic li has three main functions. In all manuscripts it is used as a disjunctive conjunction and in this case occupies the initial position in the clause; in this function it competes with the form ili.

It is used together with the subjunction ašte: although the semantics of the complex is not very clear, in this case it is consistently in the second position; it is used in the complex ašte li že ni ‘otherwise’; in Suprasliensis and in Savvina Kniga it is also used together with the conjunction egda (Kurz, Hauptová...
1958–1997, II:117) and in Suprasliensis it is possible to find the combination *egda že li* (e.g., in 188r.9; 190r.14).

Finally, it functions as an interrogative particle: in this case, it is traditionally considered an enclitic and it follows the word about which the question is, and which is consequently emphasized, as in (13) (underlined is *li* in disjunctive function).

(13) Mk 3,4

dostoiť *li* vů sobotq dobro tvoriti *li* zylo tvoriti · ἐστὶν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθοποιήσαι, η κακοποιήσαι; Ψυχήν σώσαι, ἡ ἀποκτείναι;

Which is lawful on the Sabbath: to do good or to do evil, to save life or to kill?

Crucially, the focus can be preceded by a topicalized element; *li*, invariably following the focus, is placed after it, thus appearing linearly not in the second position:

(14) a. Mk 12,26 (Mar, Zogr)

a o mrtvyixъ ěko vêstanqč · nêste *li* čqli vů kõnigaxъ moseovaxъ · pri kõpinê kako reče emu ṑbъ ṑgle · Περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν, ὅτι ἐγείρονται, οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ Μωσέως, ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου, ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός, λέγων-

Now about the dead rising – have you not read in the Book of Moses, in the account of the burning bush, how God said to him.

b. Mt 17,24 (Mar, Ass; SK omits *li*)

učitelь vašъ ne datъ *li* didragma · Ὄ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν οὐ τελεῖ τὰ δίδραχμα;

Doesn’t your teacher pay the temple tax?

c. Supr. 4v.17–19

a °xc vašъ jegože glagolete vy krõstijani byti bogu nebesьskuumu · ne otъ ženy *li* rodi sé ·

---

14 For the relationship between interrogative and disjunctive elements, see Morpurgo Davies (1975; in particular, the discussion on pp. 162–167).

15 There are rare cases (Supr. 4x, Mar. 1x) where it appears linearly after the conjunctions *i* and *a*: it is not clear whether it already constitutes a complex conjunction *ili, ali* (Old Church Slavonic texts are in scriptio continua and in such cases it is difficult to establish word boundaries). Usually the tradition is not consistent in reporting this order, as in the case of Mk 14,31 where Zogr, Mar, Sav have *ini sëpase · a li sebe ne možëtъ sëpasti* · while Ass has a *sebe li*. Less rare are the cases (Supr. 8x, Mar. 4x) in which it appears linearly after the negation *ni*; in these cases it would seem that it is the negation itself that is focused (see Večerka 1989, p. 46).
οὐχὶ καὶ ὁ ὑμέτερος Χριστός, ὃν λέγετε ὑμεῖς οἱ Χριστιανοὶ εἶναι θεὸν οὐράνιον ἐκ γυναικός ἐγεννήθη;
And your Christ, whom you Christians say is the heavenly God, was he not born of a woman?

It may also appear after the first member of alternative questions: in these cases, it appears in an even more inward linear position:

(15) Mt 21,25

κρϊστενιε ιοανον ετθ κρϊστενιε καλεβολκε ετθ λειε Ιιε ετθ ετθ λειε Εε ετθ άνθρωπον;
Τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου πόθεν ἦν; Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;
John’s baptism—where did it come from? Was it from heaven, or of human origin?

Table 1 demonstrates the occurrences of *li* with an interrogative function in Codex Marianus, Psalterium Sinaiticum, and Codex Suprasliensis: 2P indicates cases where it follows the first word of the sentence; Alt indicates cases of alternative questions, while Topic indicates cases where a topicalized element precedes the host of *li*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2P</th>
<th>Alt</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalt. Sin.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supr</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Occurrences of *li* as interrogative particle

Notwithstanding the traditional analysis that sees *li* as a sentential clitic on a par with *bo* and *że*, it appears from the examples given that it is rather analyzable as a focus marker with scope on the preceding word. The fact that it often appears in second position is merely fortuitous, given the fact that it precisely follows the focal element, which, in the case where there are no topicalized elements, is placed in the first position, at the beginning of the sentence.

3. Conclusions

The different syntactic behavior, as well as the different scope that the two connectors *że* and *bo* and the interrogative *li* have, make the hypothesis that the three constitute a unitary class implausible: while the first two are never preceded by topicalized elements, the latter consistently appears after them.
Particularly interesting in this respect are the cases where že, bo, and li appear in the same sentence. According to the literature, they should form a cluster, but this is not the case.

(16) a. Lk 14,28
Καὶ τὸ bo ὑπὸ τοῦ δὲ φιλοτιμεῖται, ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν ἐμπερισταθῇ. ὥστε δὲ χρὴ ὑπὸ τῆς σκέψεως τῆς συναντήσεως τῆς ἀνάγκης, ὁ ἀπεργός ἄνενθε τῇ χρήσει ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, λέγοντος.

Suppose one of you wants to build a tower. Won’t you first sit down and estimate the cost?

b. Mt 22,31
ο νυκτίον ἔρχεται τὸ ὄρος πᾶσι ἀπὸ τῇ ἐναρμονίᾳ τῆς καθήμενος ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, λέγοντος.

But about the resurrection of the dead—have you not read what God said to you.

Sentential connectors, marking relations between sentences, tend to appear earlier in the sentence (in second position, in the case of bo and že), and are not sensitive to the presence of topicalized elements (as in 16). The interrogative particle li, on the other hand, follows the word that constitutes the focus of the question: this focus, as we have seen, is in initial position, unless it is preceded by a topicalized element.

Thus, the placement of the sentential connectors bo and že does not interact with the syntactic-pragmatic articulation of the sentence, as they appear after the first word of the sentence, regardless of whether a topicalized element is present or not. On the contrary, the interrogative particle li is postposed to the focal element and is thus susceptible to the pragmatic articulation of the sentence, occupying a different structural position in comparison to bo and že.

These facts, however, are not confined to Old Church Slavonic. In particular, Hale (1987 on Vedic; 2008, pp. 118–120 on Avestan) observes how it is necessary to distinguish three classes of clitics: sentential clitics (which include sentential connectors and sentential adverbs); emphatic clitics (which indicate the focus on the element they adjoin to); and finally pronominal clitics, unaccented allotropes of personal pronouns. The clitics belonging to these three classes occupy different positions in the sentence: thus in (17) the disjunctive connective vā appears in the second position from the beginning of the sentence, while the personal pronoun nas (no) follows the relative pronoun:

(17) RV 2.23.7a utá vā yó no marcāyād ánāgasal (Hale 1987, p. 45)
Or also who would harm innocent us.
From this example it is clear that clitics do not form a cluster, internally organized according to the rank of the clitics, as would seem from examples such as RV 1.76.1d kéna vā te mánasā dāśema ‘by what intent would we worship you?’ (Hale 1987, p. 39), but that they occupy structurally different positions: in sentences with a conjunction or a topicalized element and a complementizer, sentential clitics follow the first element of the sentence, while pronominal clitics follow the complementizer, as is the case in (17).

Similar observations apply to Ancient Greek. According to Goldstein (2016, p. 88), the elements placed in square brackets in (18) are topicalized. The sentential clitic γάρ ‘because, indeed’ appears within the topicalized element, while the pronominal clitic σφι ‘to them’ has as its host the first prosodic word after the topicalized element:


[For on the previous day], everything was bad for them. [During the present (day)], however, everything (has been) good.

With regard to Latin, Adams (1994a, 1994b) notes that, even defining the domain of application of WL as a “colon” (Fraenkel 1932), a significant number of exceptions fail to be explained. In fact, Adams argues that WL is merely the epiphenomenon of another law, which requires enclitics to be positioned after a focused or emphasized constituent, which in turn may (but need not) occupy the first position. While the material used by Adams came from the prose texts of Classical Latin, Kruschwitz (2004) demonstrated that Adams’ conclusions are also valid for the epigraphic corpus.

In conclusion, it seems from the data here presented that the current formulation of WL should be questioned for Old Church Slavonic as well. As has been observed for other ancient Indo-European languages, in fact, WL is not to be understood as a single mechanism that places a block of clitics in second position, but rather as a set of mechanisms, linked to the semantic and functional aspect of the individual elements, that, by chance, makes a non-homogeneous set of elements appear in second position.
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Streszczenie

O powiązaniach między własnościami składniowymi a funkcjami staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskich wyrażeń bo, że, li

Autor artykułu przedstawia analizę pozycji zajmowanych przez partykuły że, li, bo w tekstach staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskich. Ma na celu ukazanie, że umiejscowienie tych cząstek nie zależy od jednej reguły składniowej (prawa Wackernagla), ale jest konsekwencją różnych funkcji pełnionych przez te trzy elementy. Fakt, że nie istnieje klasa enklityk zajmujących drugą pozycję składniową, każe podać w wątpliwość słuszność tego prawa w odniesieniu do języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego.

Słowa kluczowe: język staro-cerkiewno-słowiański, prawo Wackernagla, enklityki, konektory tekstowe, struktura informacyjna
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