

ANDREA DI MANNO

L'Orientale – Università di Napoli, Włochy

e-mail: [adimanno@unior.it](mailto:adimanno@unior.it)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6429-4517>

## THE INTERRELATION BETWEEN SYNTAX AND FUNCTION OF OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC *BO*, *ŽE*, *LI*

---

**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.

**KEYWORDS:** Old Church Slavonic, Wackernagel's Law, enclitics, textual connectors, information structure

---

### 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

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<sup>2</sup> occupy the second position in the sentence.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 scrittorî in contatto: pietra di paragone del mutamento linguistico", funded by the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (PRIN 2017, grant n. 2017JBF9H).

<sup>2</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 régie 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 J[akobson’s] work.” As far as Old Church Slavonic is concerned, in fact, Ślawski (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).

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 pridŏ podvigŏše sę · obręto marijo že i osifa · i mladenecŏ vŏ šlexŏ · ~ gr. Καὶ ἦλθον σπεύσαντες, καὶ ἀνεῦρον τὴν τε Μαριάμ 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 texts<sup>3</sup>: whereas in the former language the enclitics form a cluster that is placed<sup>4</sup> 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 adverbial position, and the clitic pronouns can be placed both with the particles in 2P and with the auxiliaries in adverbial position<sup>5</sup> (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

<sup>3</sup> 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).

<sup>4</sup> If the ‘barrier rule’ applies, for which see Zaliznjak (2008, pp. 47–57, 90–116) and Zimmerling, Kosta (2013, pp. 196–201).

<sup>5</sup> According to Pancheva (2005), clitic pronouns in Old Church Slavonic are in adverbial 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<sup>6</sup>. 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)<sup>7</sup>  
 мѣнодзи **bo** сѣтъ зъваніи мало же избъраніхъ ·

πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.

For many are invited, but few are chosen.

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

<sup>7</sup> 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

сѣ естѣ соудъ pride **bo** свѣтъ вѣ мирѣ · і възлюбихѣ °члвци раче тѣмю неже свѣтъ · бѣше  
**bo** ихъ дѣла зѣла · (Mar)

сѣ естѣ соудъ · ёко pride свѣтъ вѣ мирѣ · і възлюбихѣ °члвци раче тѣмю неже свѣтъ · бѣше  
**bo** ихъ дѣла зѣла · (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 *ёко* 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)

не отъ тръниѣ **bo** чеѣштѣ смокѣби · ни отъ корпiny grozda obemljotъ ·

Οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσιν σύκα, οὐδὲ ἐκ βάλτου τρυγῶσιν σταφυλὴν.

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

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

не **bo** рече ·

οὐ γὰρ 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)

°is že reče ostaněte eje po čyto jо truždaate · dobro **bo** дѣло ѕѣдѣла о мѣнѣ ·

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἄφετε αὐτήν · τί αὐτῇ κόπους παρέχετε; Καλὸν ἔργον εἰργάσατο ἐν ἐμοί.

“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 že poneže paraskevní bě · da ne ostanqť na křstě tělesa · vъ sobotq · bě **bo** velikъ denъ toje soboty · moliše pilata da přebijqť golěni ixъ · i vъzъmqť je ·

Οί οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι, ἵνα μὴ μείνη ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐπεὶ Παρασκευὴ ἦν · γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου · ἠρώτησαν τὸν Πιλάτον ἵνα κατεαγῶσιν 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 *že* (179r.10; 198r.27): probably in these cases *že* 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 ešte **bo** i poidq posředě sěni sъmrgъtmъiję · Ne ubojq sje sъla ěko ty so mnojq esi · (PS 22,4; f.27v. 2–3)

<22,3> (...) ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. <22,4> ἐὰν γὰρ καὶ πορευθῶ ἐν μέσῳ σκιᾶς θανάτου, οὐ φοβηθήσομαι κακά, ὅτι σὺ μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ-.

<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 mъnęť li ti sę bozi **bo** ti imže samodrъžecъ °сръ žrъtvу tvoritъ · (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 *ěšte*).

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> Сѣтѣнику *že* eteru rabъ болѣ зълѣ umiraaše · iže bě emu čъstenъ · <3> slyšavъ *že* o °isě · posъla къ nemu starъčę ijudeisky · molę i da prišedъ °spstъ raba ego · <4> oni *že* prišedъše къ °isvi · molĕaxq i tъštъno °gljōšte ěko dostoinъ estъ · eže ašte dasi emu · <5> ljubitъ bo jęzкъ našъ · i sъnъmište tъ sъzъda namъ · <6> °isъ *že* idĕaše sъ nimi · ešte *že* emu nedaleče sqštu otъ domu · posъla къ nemu drugy sѣtѣnikъ °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<sup>8</sup>. 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.

<sup>8</sup> This fact seems to characterise *že* as a “minimorph” in the sense of Haspelmath (2015).

Moreover, it may be noted that *že* 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 *že* in situations of topic change is only a corollary of its more general function as an indicator of discontinuity.

In dialogic situations, *že* tends to signal the succession of speakers' turns:

(8) Mt 15,22–27

<15,22> i se žena xananeiska oтъ рѣдѣль тѣхъ ішедѣши · вѣзъри °gljōšti (...) · <23> онъ **že** ne oтвѣшта ei slovese · I prisōrѣse učenici ego molēxq i °gljōšte (...) · <24> онъ **že** oтвѣstavъ reče (...) · <25> она **že** prišedѣši pokloni sę emu °glšti (...) · <26> онъ **že** oтвѣstavъ reče (...) · <27> она **že** reče (...)

<15,22> 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 *že* does not indicate a change of topic, let alone subject: if this were the function of *že*, 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 *онъ* is always followed by *že*. 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

<5,27> Slyšaste ěko rečeno °bys drevъnimъ · ne prĕljuby sѣtvoriši - <28> azъ **že** °gljq vamъ · ěko vъsĕkъ iže vъzъritъ na ženq sѣ roxotijq · juže ljuby sѣtvori sѣ nejq vъ °srdci svoemъ · <29> ašte **že** oko tvoe desnoe sѣblažnaatъ tę · izъmi e i vъzъzi oтъ tebe · unĕe bo ti estъ da rogybletъ edinъ udъ tvoixъ · a ne vъse tĕlo tvoe vъvъrъženo bōdetъ vъ ģeonq · <30> i ašte desna tvoĕ rōka sѣblažnaatъ tę usĕci jq · i vъzъzi oтъ tebe · unĕe bo ti estъ da rogybletъ edinъ udъ tvoixъ · a ne vъse tĕlo tvoe vъvъrъženo bōdetъ vъ ģeonq ∴ <31> rečeno **že** bystъ · iže ašte pustitъ ženq svojq · da dastъ ei kъnigy raspustъnyę · <32> azъ **že** °gljq vamъ · ěko vъsĕkъ ruštajĕi ženq svojq razvĕ slovese ljubodĕinaago · tvoritъ jq prĕljuby dĕati · iže rosъrĕĝq roemletъ prĕljuby tvoritъ · <33> raky slyšaste · ěko rečeno °bys drevъnimъ · ne vъ lъžq klъneši sę · vъzdasi **že** °gvi klĕtvу tvoę · <34> azъ **že** gljq vamъ · ne klĕti sę oтъnōdъ · ni °nbmъ ěko prĕstoľ estъ bžii ·

<5,27> “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.



<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 · přēzde trěvq po tomъ **že** klasъ · po tomъ **že** i rъšenixъ vъ klasě ·  
 Αὐτομάτη γὰρ ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτα στάχυν, εἶτα πλήρη σίτον ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ.  
 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<sup>9</sup>: 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> Вѣаxq že tu ženy mъnogy iz daleče zъręštę · **jěže** idq po °isě · otъ galileję služę-  
 štę emu · <56> **vъ nixъ že** bě mariě magdalyni i mariě iěkovlě i osii mati · mati °snovu  
 zevedeovu ·

<sup>9</sup> It is not clear, in fact, whether it should be considered as a separate element in these cases.

<27.55> Ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ γυναῖκες πολλαὶ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, αἵτινες ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, διακονοῦσαι αὐτῷ- <56> ἐν αἷς ἦν Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆ μητήρ, καὶ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου.

<27,55> Many women were there, watching from a distance. They had followed Jesus from Galilee to care for his needs. <56> 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 unverbated 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

въ четврѣтојѣ же страѣ пошти иде къ нимъ °исъ ходѣ ро морју ·

τετάρτη δὲ φυλακῆ τῆς νυκτὸς ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.

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

### 2.3. *Li*

Old Church Slavonic *li* has three main functions<sup>10</sup>. In all manuscripts it is used as a disjunctive conjunction and in this case occupies the initial position in the clause<sup>11</sup>; in this function it competes with the form *ili*.

It is used together with the subjunction *ašte*: although the semantics of the complex<sup>12</sup> is not very clear, in this case it is consistently in the second position<sup>13</sup>; 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

<sup>10</sup> In one case in *Marianus* and *Zographensis* (Mt 26,53), it seems to be used as a comparative conjunction, used to introduce the second term of comparison; *Assemani* and *Savvina Kniga*, on the other hand, present the expected *neželi*.

<sup>11</sup> Traditionally, it is considered a proclitic in this function.

<sup>12</sup> See Zaliznjak (2008, p. 29): "сложный союз (старославянский и церковнославянский) *аще ли* в большинстве случаев ведет себя как единое слово (подобно *али, или, нежели, уже ли* и др.)". Next to a subordinating conjunction *ašte* there would be a complex subordinating conjunction *ašteli*, which, however, is traditionally reported as *ašte li* (with a space between the two elements) in editions and dictionaries (as opposed to *ili, ali, neželi*).

<sup>13</sup> Note that Migdalski (2013) cites only one example of this type to demonstrate how *li* consistently appears in second position and is thus part of a natural class together with the two connectors mentioned above.

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<sup>14</sup>: 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)<sup>15</sup>.

(13) Mk 3,4

dostoitъ **li** въ sobotъ dobro tvoriti li zъlo tvoriti · °dšq sъpasti li rogubiti ·

Ἐξεστι τοῖς σάββασι ἀγαθοποιῆσαι, ἢ κακοποιῆσαι; Ψυχὴν σῶσαι, ἢ ἀποκτεῖναι;

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 mrъtvыixъ ёko vъstanqтъ · nёste **li** чъli въ kъnigaxъ moseovaxъ · pri kqpinё kako reče emu °bъ °glę ·

Περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν, ὅτι ἐγείρονται, οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ 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*)

učitelъ vašъ ne datъ **li** didragma ·

Ὁ 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 krъstijani byti bogu nebesъskuumu · ne otъ ženу **li** rodi se ·

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

<sup>15</sup> 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 sъpase · a li sebe ne možetъ sъpasti* · 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  
 γυναικὸς 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

κτῷštenie ioanono oṭṭ kqđq bē · sṭ °nbse **li** ili oṭṭ °člvkṭ ·

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*.

	2P	Alt	Topic
Mar	133	8	25
Psalt. Sin.	9	0	3
Supr	295	6	31

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 *že*, 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 con-  
 nectors *že* 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

Къто **bo** отъ васъ хотѣи стлѣрѣ созъдати · не прѣжде **li** сѣдѣ раштѣтетъ доволѣ ·

Τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν, ὁ θέλων πύργον οἰκοδομῆσαι, οὐχὶ πρῶτον καθίσας ψηφίζει τὴν δαπάνην.  
Suppose one of you wants to build a tower. Won't you first sit down and estimate the cost?

b. Mt 22,31

о вѣскрѣсени же мртвѣи · нѣсте **li** чѣли · реचनाаго вамъ °бгмъ °гльжѣтемъ ·

Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν, οὐκ 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 marcáyād ánāgasah (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:

(18) Hdt. 1.126.4 [τὴν μὲν γὰρ προτέρην ἡμέρην] πάντα σφι κακὰ ἔχειν. [τὴν δὲ τότε παρεούσαν] πάντα ἀγαθὰ.

[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.

## References

- Adams, J.N. (1994a). *Wackernagel’s law and the placement of the copula esse in Classical Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Adams, J.N. (1994b). Wackernagel’s law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Classical Latin, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 92, 103–178.

- Benacchio, R., Renzi, L. (1987). *Clitici slavi e romanza*. Padova: CLESP.
- Cimmerling, A. (2013). *Sistemy porjadka slov slavjanskich jazykov v tipologičeskom aspekte*. Moskva: Jazyki Slavjanskix Kul'tur.
- Eckhoff, H.M., Berdicevskis, A. (2015). Linguistics vs digital editions: The Tromsø Old Russian and OCS Treebank, *Scripta & e-Scripta*, 14–15, 9–25.
- Fraenkel, E. (1932). Kolon und Satz, I: Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes, *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 197–213.
- Franks, S., King, T.H. (2000). *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldstein, D.M. (2016). *Classical Greek syntax: Wackernagel's law in Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Greenberg, M.L. (2017). Slavic. In: M. Kapović (ed.), *The Indo-European Languages* (517–549). London: Routledge.
- Hale, M.R. (1987). Notes on Wackernagel's law in the language of the Rigveda. In: C. Watkins (ed.), *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985): Papers from the fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985* (38–50). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hale, M.R. (2008). Avestan. In: R.D. Woodard (ed.), *The ancient languages of Asia and the Americas* (101–122). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, M. (2015). Defining vs. diagnosing linguistic categories: A case study of clitic phenomena. In: J. Blaszczak, D. Klimek-Jankowska, K. Migdalski (eds.), *How Categorical are Categories? New Approaches to the Old Questions of Noun, Verb, and Adjective* (273–304). Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Ickler, N.L. (1977). Topicalization and Relativization in Old Russian, *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 3, 656–669.
- Jagić, V. (1879). *Quattuor Evangeliorum Codex Glagoliticus, olim Zographensis, nunc Petropolitanus. Characteribus Cyrillicis transcriptum notis criticis prolegomenis appendicibus auctum*. Berlin.
- Jakobson, R. (1935). Les enclitiques slaves. In: B. Migliorini, V. Pisani (eds.), *Atti del III Congresso internazionale dei linguisti: Roma, 19–26 settembre 1933* (384–390). Firenze: Le Monnier.
- Janse, M. (1994). Clitics and word order since Wackernagel, *Orbis*, 39, 389–410.
- Klein, J.S. (2022). Adversative Conjunction and Neighboring Discourse Features in Old Church Slavic (Codex Marianus), with Comparative Notes on the Same Phenomena in Greek, Gothic and Classical Armenian, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 120, 128–183.
- Kruschwitz, P. (2004). *Römische Inschriften und Wackernagels Gesetz: Untersuchungen zur Syntax epigraphischer Texte aus republikanischer Zeit*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Kurz, J., Hauptová, Z. (eds.). (1958–1997). *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. Praha: Academia. [= *Slovar' Staroslavjanskogo Jazyka*, I–IV (2006). SPb: SPbGU.]

- Manzini, M. (2022). Romance pronominal clitics as pure heads, *Journal of Linguistics*, 59(1), 89–119.
- Migdalski, K. (2013). Diachronic Source of Two Cliticization Patterns in Slavic. In: C.M. Salvesen, H.P. Helland (eds.), *Challenging Clitics* (135–158). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Migdalski, K. (2018). The syntax of Slavic. In: J. Klein, M. Fritz, M. Wenthe (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics: An International Handbook. Volume 3 (1557–1571)*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1975). Negation and Disjunction in Anatolian and elsewhere, *Anatolian Studies*, 25, 157–168.
- Nevis, J.A., Joseph, B.D., Wanner, D., Zwicky A.M. (eds.). (1994). *Clitics: A comprehensive bibliography 1892–1991*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nilsson, E. (1904). Wackernagel's Gesetz im Slavischen, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 37, 261–264.
- Pancheva, R. (2005). The rise and fall of second-position clitics, *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 23/1, 103–167.
- Ščepkin, V.N. (1903). *Savvina kniga*. SPb.
- Sławski, F. (1946). *Miejsce enklityki odmiennej w dziejach języka bułgarskiego*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Vai, M. (2018). Osservazioni a margine di «les enclitiques slaves» di Roman Jakobson. In: E. Esposito, S. Sini, M. Castagneto (eds.), *Roman Jakobson, Linguistica e Poetica* (421–439). Milano: Ledizioni.
- Vajs, J., Kurz, J. (1929). *Evangeliiř Assemanův, Kodex vatikánský 3. slovanský. 2 vv.* Praga: ČSAV.
- Večerka, R. (1989). *Altkirchenslavische (Altbulgarische) Syntax. I. Die Lineare Satzorganisation*. Freiburg: Weiher.
- Veksina, M. (2008). Zakon Wackernagelja (obzor), *Social'nye i gumanitarnye nauki. Otečestvennaja i zarubežnaja literatura (Serija 6, Jazykoznanie)*, 3, 33–65.
- Wackernagel, J. (1892). Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 1, 333–436.
- Walkden, G. (2020). Introduction. In: J. Wackernagel, *On a law of Indo-European word order: Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung* (Classics in Linguistics 7) (3–29). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Zaliznjak, A.A. (1993). K izučeniju jazyka berestjanyx gramot. In: V.L. Yanin, A.A. Zaliznjak (eds.), *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste iz raskopok 1984–1989* (191–319). Moskva: Nauka.
- Zaliznjak, A.A. (2008). *Drevnerusskie ènklitiki*. Moskva: Jazyki Slavjanskix Kul'tur.
- Zimmerling, A., Kosta, P. (2013). Slavic clitics: A typology, *Language Typology and Universals/Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF)*, 66, 178–214.



## STRESZCZENIE

O POWIĄZANIACH MIĘDZY WŁASNOŚCIAMI SKŁADNIOWYMI A FUNKCJAMI  
STARO-CERKIEWNO-SŁOWIAŃSKICH WYRAŻEŃ *BO*, *ŽE*, *LI*

Autor artykułu przedstawia analizę pozycji zajmowanych przez partykuły *že*, *li*, *bo* w tekstach staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskich. Ma na celu ukazanie, że umiejscowienie tych części 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

ANDREA DI MANNO  
Dipartimento Asia, Africa e Mediterraneo  
L'Orientale – Università di Napoli  
P.za S. Domenico Maggiore, 12  
80134 Napoli NA  
Italy