

# Clitic Templates and Discourse Marker *ti* in Old Czech<sup>1</sup>

*Anton Zimmerling*

Sholokhov Moscow State University for the Humanities/  
Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences

## 1. Aims

This paper aims at solving two problems of Slavic syntax – a) to prove that Old Czech had a discourse clitic particle *ti1* attested in other Old Slavic languages, b) to describe Old Czech clitic template for the first time. Both problems are related: the proof that Old Czech *ti1* was a separate syntactic element is based on the claim that *ti1* was part of Old Czech clitic template and had a unique slot in it.

## 2. The data

Old Czech data are based on the corpus analysis of ‘Dalimil chronicle’ (XIVth century). In a comparative and typological perspective, Old Czech is compared to Old Novgorod Russian, Modern Czech to and three areal types of clitic systems, called West Slavic type, Old Russian type and Balcanic Slavic type.

## 3. Working hypothesis, framework

I adopt a template approach in clitic studies (cf. Zalizniak 1993; Franks and King 2000; Browne 2008; Zimmerling and Kosta 2013) and implement the methods of formal typology. The basic assumption is that if clitic system is stable, clitic-internal ordering can be described in terms of templates (matrices), with one-to-one correspondence between clitic classes and template slots, so that a Template Rule predicts linear ordering  $a > b$  (‘a precedes b’) for each pair of clusterizing clitics (a, b) if they stand contiguously. Languages with clitic clusters have parameters of clitic-external ordering, notably – parameters licensing different types of clitic hosts (single phonetic words, multi-word phrases etc.) and parameters

---

1 The paper is written with financial support from the Russian Foundation of Sciences, project RSCF 14-04-18-03270 ‘Word order typology, communicative-syntactic interface and information structure in world’s languages’. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer for the valuable comments.

responsible for late clitic placement and cluster splitting, called Barrier rules. I argue that Old Czech can be described by a Template Rule and classified with the West Slavic areal type, but the Old Czech Template Rule reflects a number of transitional processes, including clusterization of recent clitic layers and shifts in parameter settings.

#### 4. Previous research

Most Slavic languages have clitic systems with clause-internal clusterizing clitics which can be described in terms of Template Rules, (cf. Franks and King 2000; Zimmerling 2012b). This holds both for languages with Wackernagel clitics whose position is defined respective clausal left edge (Serbo-Croat, Slovene, Czech, Slovak, Old Novgorod Russian etc.) and for languages with verb-adjacent clitics like Bulgarian<sup>2</sup> (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999). Word order systems with Template Rules are attested in most modern literary Slavic languages and in some minor languages and dialects as Burgenland Croatian, Vojvodina Rusinsky (Browne 2008) and the Ukrainian Carpatian dialect of Sinevir (Tolstaya 2000; Tolstaya 2012). The first comprehensive description of an Old Slavic Template rule was given by Zalizniak (1993) for Old Novgorod Russian (hence – ONR). The clitic system of Old South Russian (hence – OSR) / Old Church Slavonic (hence – OCS) where particle clitics are in the Wackernagel position (2P) while auxiliary clitics tend to take verb-adjacent positions is analyzed in (Zalizniak 2008) as a result of syntactic evolution from a word order system close or identical to the ONR. A hypothetical evolution in the opposite direction (ONR → OCS) is less probable according to Zalizniak and Zimmerling (2009). However, Migdalski (2007) reconstructs for Old Polish parameter settings close to OCS – different placement of particle clitics vs auxiliary/pronominal clitics. Old Serbian clitic system is discussed by Tolstaya (1991) and Pavlović (2011). The syntax of Old Croatian clitics is discussed by Mihaljević (1997). An important source on Old Czech is Trávníček (1956), who however does not provide Old Czech Template Rule. Moreover, Trávníček's evasive formulations like 'the verb *jsem* usually precedes pronouns... but in some cases the pronouns come first' (id., 152) do not make it possible to check whether template approach is applicable here or not.

---

2 I leave out the question whether Wackernagel's law and clitic-and-verb adjacency are mutually excluding or compatible mechanisms of clitic placement. See Franks (2008), Zimmerling and Kosta (2013) and Zimmerling (2012a; 2012b) for discussion of Bulgarian data and similar clitic systems outside the Slavic area (Tagalog, Cebuano, Bikol).

Old Slavic clitic particles clusterized with clitic pronouns and auxiliaries<sup>3</sup>. In all known Slavic Template Rules clitics are arranged in blocks according to their category – the blocks of clusterizing particles, clusterizing pronouns and clusterizing auxiliaries in Old Slavic never intersected – a principle called Categorical ordering in (Zimmerling 2012a: 733). Formula (i) accounts for all areal variants of Slavic clitic template.

- (i)  $[_{\text{CliticPhrase}} [_{\text{A}} a^1 a^2 \dots a^n] [_{\text{C}} c^1] [_{\text{B}} b^1, b^2 \dots b^n] [_{\text{C}} c^2] \sim^* [_{\text{C}} c^1 [B b^n] C c^2]]$ .

In all attested Old Slavic languages clusterizing particles precede clitic pronouns and auxiliaries. Therefore one can easily substitute the category A in formula (i) with ‘Particle <clitic>’, the taxonomic category B with ‘<clitic>Pronoun’ and the taxonomic category C with ‘Auxiliary <clitic>’. Two slots for auxiliary clitics – before and after the block of Slavic clitic pronouns are necessary, since different Slavic language put subsets of auxiliary clitics either before the block of pronouns or after it. In Zimmerling and Kosta (2013: 189), the two auxiliary slots are tagged AUX1 and AUX2 respectively. Note that in spite of the fact some Slavic languages make use both of AUX1 and AUX2, these positions cannot be filled simultaneously, so that the Categorical principle of clitic ordering is not violated.

The inventory of clitic particles is similar across Slavic languages. ONR has five clusterizing particles (*že* ‘focus/emphatic’, *li* ‘yes-no question marker’, *bo* ‘cause’, *ti*<sub>1</sub> ‘indeed’, *by* ‘optative’) all of which are attested in other Slavic languages. However, some of them survive outside East Slavic only as bound elements attached to complementizers, adverbs and other particles, not as free clause-level clusterizing clitics. ONR *by* is essentially the 3p. optative form of *byti*: it ends up in the particle block, because ONR and Old Russian do not clusterize other agreement optative forms of *byti*. The free clitic particle *bo* is frequent in OCS and OSR while the free clitic particle *ti*<sub>1</sub> according to Zalizniak (2008: 32) was especially characteristic of ONR but also occurred in OSR and in the West Slavic area. Discourse particle *ti*<sub>1</sub> ‘indeed’, ‘really’ is usually not recognized as separate syntactic element in the descriptions of West Slavic languages and treated as parasitic use (*dativus ethicus*) of the 2 p. person singular dative pronoun *ti*. For instance, Trávníček mentions non-governed *ti* in Old Czech, but treats it as *dativus ethicus* [Trávníček 1956: 65]. The dative clitic *ti* is indeed part of nearly all known

3 The late placement of Slavic auxiliary clitics in Old Polish discussed by Migdalski (2007) can be explained by two factors: a) auxiliary forms of ‘BE’ represent a more recent layer of cliticization than Slavic clitic particles and pronouns, cf. Zimmerling (2009: 274), b) OCS and Old Polish may have undergone syntactic evolution and departed from the principle of 2P clusterization.

Slavic clitic templates where it normally shares a slot with other dative clitics. Meanwhile, Zalizniak (1993: 298-304) proved that in ONR and OSR discourse particle  $ti_1$  with the meaning ‘indeed’, ‘really so’ and the argument clitic  $ti_2$  ‘2p. Dat.Sg’ took different slots in the ONR clitic template. ONR  $ti_1$  was placed in the block of clitic particles (*že, li, bo, ti\_1, by*) at the left edge of the clitic template while ONR  $ti_2$  was placed in the block of clitic pronouns. The sequence  $ti=by$  is analyzed in ONR as  $TI_1=BY$  (slot 4 + slot 5), and sequence  $by=ti$  is to be analyzed as  $BY=TI_2$  (slot 5 + slot 6). Moreover,  $ti_1$  combines in ONR with other dative clitics (id., 304) which is strictly impossible for clitics from the same slot. Therefore, the clitic  $ti_1$ , irrespective of its origin, must be treated as separate syntactic element in synchrony, at least for ONR and Old Russian. However, this analysis cannot be mechanically extended to other languages, since special ordering of  $ti$  in a clitic template does not prove by itself that  $ti$  is not a pronoun. An alternative explanation is that earlier placement of  $ti$  vs other dative pronouns is marker of prominence: it allegedly marks a prominent status of 2 p. sg. in communication. For instance, in Vojvodina Rusin Dat.2Sg.  $=ci$  comes before the reflexive clitic  $=še$  while all other dative clitics come after  $=še$  as shown by Browne (2008). The Rusin ordering can be explained as ‘person hierarchy’ or ‘person-and-number hierarchy’ in terms of functional grammar. Therefore, the analysis has to show, whether Zalizniak’s theory of  $ti_1$  vs  $ti_2$  homonymy fits Old Czech data better than Browne’s Person-and-number hierarchy. In order to get the answer one has to prove that a) Old Czech conformed to the template principle b) dative pronouns and particles had special slots in the Old Czech Template Rule. Reconstructing a Template Rule is by far a more ambitious task than analyzing a single particle, but on reasons specified above, we start with the former issue.

## 5. Analysis

The reconstruction of a clitic template in an old written language must start from corpus analysis of a substantial bulk of homogeneous texts by a single author or a number of authors/scribes using the same genre forms and/or representing the same dialect or idiolect. We chose an important Old Czech original narrative text of the XIVth century, ‘Dalimil Chronicle’. Its protograph is dated with 1326 AD while the editions of its complete text (Dal.) represent later manuscripts of the second half of the XIVth century – mid XVth century. The use of clusterizing clitics proved to be consistent which made it possible to establish a Template Rule for Dal. In section 5.1., I briefly discuss three areal types of Slavic Clitic Templates. In section 5.2., I present the Old Czech Template rule and argue that it must be classified with the West Slavic type. In section 5.3., I focus on the block

of Common Slavic clitic particles in Dal. and prove that the discourse marker  $ti_1$  is a different element than dative clitic  $ti_2$ , though both of them are parts of a clitic template.

### 5.1. Areal types of Slavic clitic template

Let us repeat the formula (i) with variables A,B, C substituted with ‘Particle’, ‘Pronoun’ and ‘Auxiliary’ (AUX) and remind that the two auxiliary slots – AUX1 and AUX2 are complementary in the sense that they cannot be filled simultaneously in one sentence.

- (ii)  $[_{\text{CliticPhrase}} [_{\text{CliticParticles}} a^1 a^2 \dots a^n] [\text{AUX1}] [_{\text{CliticPronous}} b^1, b^2 \dots b^n] [\text{AUX2}].$

Note that AUX1 and AUX2 host single auxiliary clitics, not strings of clitics. If a language clusterizes new layers of auxiliary clitics, new slots AUX3 and AUX4 adjacent to the basic slots AUX1 vs AUX2 can be opened. This rare option is attested in late Old Russian (AUX2 + AUX4) and in the Sinevir Dialect (AUX3 + AUX1), whereby new clitics are placed in edge positions of the auxiliary block (Zimmerling and Kosta 2013: 187). That hints that expansion of the existing Template Rules in Slavic languages may be triggered by the Diachronical principle of clitic ordering which requires that new clitics are added to the left or right edge of the Template/Block of clitics (cf. Zimmerling 2012b: 24).

The three areal Slavic types of a Template Rule are distinguished by the behavior of 3p. present indicative BE-clitics from the stem *byti* as well as by the status of optative BE-clitics. In ONR/East Slavic overt 3p. BE-clitics are lacking<sup>4</sup> while the 1-2 p. present indicative BE-clitics take AUX2.

- (iii) East Slavic  $[_{\text{Clitic Phrase}} [_{\text{Particles}} \dots \textit{by}] [_{\text{Pronouns}} \dots]] [\text{AUX2}].$

This areal type is manifested by ONR and Old Russian. The Sinevir dialect historically belongs here, since it lacks overt 3 p. present indicative BE-clitics; at a later stage it has been influenced by clitic systems of the West Slavic type. In ONR and Old Russian the full optative paradigm of BE was not made part of the clitic cluster and the 3 p. optative BE-form *by* is treated as particle, not as auxiliary clitic, cf. example (1), where it combines with a present indicative form of 3 p.

- (1) ONR  $\textit{kupilŭ} = \textit{jesmŭ}$ <sub>CL.AUX.1SG.PRS.IND</sub>  $\textit{solŭ}$   $\textit{nemeckuju}$ .  
 To= $\textit{bŭ}$ <sub>CL.PCL.OPT</sub>= $\textit{esŭ}$ <sub>CL.AUX.2SG.PRS.IND</sub>  $\textit{čemŭ}$   $\textit{proprovadilŭ}$  (Birch bark letter 282r)  
 I have bought German salt. Could you *please deliver* it here?'

4 The corresponding forms *jestŭ*, *sutŭ* survive in Old Russian only as stressed elements (Zalizniak 1993: 285).

The West Slavic areal type in its canonic shape is displayed by Modern Czech, Upper and Lower Sorbian. Here overt 3p. present-indicative BE-clitics are present, the whole optative paradigm of BE is made part of the cluster and all BE-clitics take the same slot, AUX1. Therefore, examples like (1) with a combination optative marker + indicative BE-clitic are ruled out.

- (iv) West Slavic [<sub>Clitic Phrase</sub> ... [AUX1] [<sub>Pronouns</sub> ...]].

Modern Slovak places 1-2 p. present indicative BE-clitics in AUX1, but displays two East Slavic features – a) no overt 3 p. present indicative BE-clitics, b) the optative paradigm of BE is not made part of the cluster and the original 3 p. optative form *by* is treated as particle, therefore combinations optative marker + indicative BE-clitic (Svk. =*by=som*, =*by=sme*, =*by=sme*, =*by=ste*) are possible.

In the Balcanic Slavic areal type both AUX1 and AUX2 are active and attract subsets of clusterizing auxiliaries. In Modern Balcanic Slavic languages (Serbo-Croatian, Slovene, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Burgenland Croatian, Vojvodina Rusin) all present indicative BE-clitics, except for 3 p. singular *jest* (*je*) are placed in AUX1 while 3 p. singular *jest* (*je*) is placed in AUX2. This split is likely explained by the fact that *jest* (*je*) in the Balcanic Slavic area was clusterized considerably later than other forms of the present indicative BE-paradigm. If optative BE-forms are made part of the cluster, they take AUX1. AUX2 can be filled by later layer of clitics, such as future tense auxiliaries from the stems *byti* (in Slovene) and *xteti* (Old Serbian). Otherwise future tense auxiliaries from the stem *xteti* can also take AUX1 (Serbo-Croatian, Burgenland Croatian).

- (v) Balcanic Slavic [<sub>Clitic Phrase</sub> ... [AUX1] [<sub>Pronouns</sub> ...][AUX2]].

The Balcanic Slavic areal type can be traced back to XIV-XV centuries. The clitic system of Old Serbian letters from this period had two slots, AUX1 and AUX2, but the distribution of auxiliary clitics was ruled out by a different principle than in Modern Serbo-Croatian. Optative BE-clitics {*bix*, *bi*, *bi*, *bismo*, *biste*, *bi*} took AUX1 while 3 p. singular present indicative BE-clitic *je(st)* and future tense auxiliaries from the stem *xteti* {*ħu*, *ħeš*, *ħe*, *ħemo*, *ħete*, *ħe*} took AUX2. The present indicative BE-forms, except for *je(st)* – {*sam*, *si*<sub>2</sub>, *sme*, *ste*, *su*} – could both take AUX1 and AUX2. The ambivalent behavior of present indicative BE-clitics of 1-2 p. and 3 p. plural, according to Tolstaya (1991) reflects a diachronic process – drifting of auxiliaries from AUX2 to AUX1 in Old Serbian. Nevertheless, a template analysis still seems operational even for such clitic systems of a transitional period, if a) alternations are restricted with given subsets of clitics, b) each slot

in Template Rule is associated with a diagnostic subset of clitics, the elements of which cannot take other slots (cf. Zimmerling 2013: 508). Both conditions are satisfied in Old Serbian.

Figure 1 shows another transitional feature of Old Serbian Template Rule – additional slots DAT2 and ACC2 for new, prosodically heavy clitic pronouns of 1-2 p. plural {*nam*<sub>1Pl.Dat</sub>, *vam*<sub>2Pl.Dat</sub>; *nas*<sub>1Pl.Acc</sub>, *vas*<sub>2Pl.Acc</sub>}, which clustered with other Old Serbian clitics. The same clitics could also take slots DAT1, ACC1, where earlier layers of clitic pronouns – prosodically light forms like *mi*<sub>1Sg.Dat</sub>, *ti*<sub>2Sg.Dat</sub>, *me*<sub>1Sg.Acc</sub>, *te*<sub>2Sg.Acc</sub> were placed. Again, this alternation does not undermine the Template principle, since the ambivalent status of new clitic pronouns {*nam*, *vam*; *nas*, *vas*} does not lead to chaotic placement of the earlier layers of clitic pronouns. Therefore, the Template Rule still provides a regular ordering in each pair of clusterizing clitics (a,b). These facts show that Slavic Template Rules can absorb new clitic elements not only if such elements fill in the existing slots, but also in the case they open new slots or alternate between a new slot and an existing one.

Figure 1: Old Serbian clitic template

| PART                        | AUX1   | DAT1  | ACC1  | REFL.ACC  | AUX2   | DAT2                       | ACC2                       |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|-----------|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Yes-no marker:<br><i>li</i> | Optative<br>BE-forms:<br><i>bix, bi,</i><br><i>bi, bismo,</i><br><i>biste, bi</i>  | <i>mi, ti, si</i> <sub>2</sub> ,<br><i>ni, vi,</i><br><i>mu, joj,</i><br><i>imū</i> | <i>me, te, ni,</i><br><i>vi, ga, ju,</i><br><i>ixū, je</i> <sub>1</sub> | <i>se</i> | Future tense auxiliaries:<br><i>hu, heš, he,</i><br><i>hemo, hete,</i><br><i>he</i>  | <i>*nam</i><br><i>*vam</i> | <i>*nas</i><br><i>*vas</i> |
|                             | Present indicative<br>BE –forms<br>1-2 p. sg.<br>and 1-3<br>p. pl:<br><i>sam, si</i> <sub>1</sub> ,<br><i>smo, ste, su</i> | <i>*nam,</i><br><i>*vam</i>   | <i>*nas,</i><br><i>*vas</i>   |           | Present indicative<br>BE-form 3<br>p. sg.:<br><i>je</i> <sub>2</sub> , <i>jest</i>   |                            |                            |
|                             |  |   |   |           | Present indicative<br>BE –forms<br>1-2 p. sg.<br>and 1-3<br>p. pl:<br><i>sam, si</i> <sub>1</sub> ,<br><i>smo, ste, su</i> |                            |                            |
| 1                           | 2  | 3   | 4   | 5         | 6  | 7                          | 8                          |

## 5.2. Old Czech Template Rule: Auxiliary slots and clitic pronouns

The data of ‘Dalimil chronicle’ was analyzed according to the following procedure. Clauses containing free clusterizing clause-level clitics were classified into two sub-corpora: CLUSTER, containing 730 clusters in 350 clauses and SINGLE, containing 1067 clauses with a single free clusterizing clause-level clitic. The sets of clitics in both sub-corpora were identical, and the clitics/clusters in both sub-corpora were used in the same syntactic environment (clitic-external ordering) in Old Czech clauses. We counted only clause-internal clitics and clitic clusters, not clitic-like elements at the clausal left-edge<sup>5</sup>. Most elements that were used in Old Czech clitic clusters clause-internally did not occur clause-initially. Optative BE-forms (*bych, bis, bi, bisme, biste, by*) could also take the clause-initial position and serve as enclitic hosts. On obvious reasons, clause-initial optative BE-forms (*#bych...*, *#bys...*), which did not obey any Template rules and were not part of the cluster and clause-internal optative BE-forms (*#...=bych*, *#...=bys*), which were part of clitics clusters were treated as homonyms in syntax<sup>6</sup>. It is plausible that clause-initial optative BE-forms retained stress, since Old Czech generally did not attach to initial proclitics. Clause-internal optative BE-forms behaved as enclitics and likely were unstressed. The examination of all combinations of clause-internal enclitics in the subcorpus CLUSTER proved they were ordered by a Template Rule. It can be classified with the West Slavic type, though two features indicate that the Old Czech Template Rule reflect a transitional, not a stable state of a clitic system

- Old Czech Template has an unusually large number of slots – 12, with special slots for clitics clusterized recently. Such slots are located at the right periphery of the Template, see slots 8-12 on fig.2 below.
- There are instances of across-a-category splits in the placement of auxiliary and pronoun clitics: more recent clitics stand farther to the right and open new slots or alternate between a slot that existed earlier and a new one while clitics with a longer clusterization history do not shift for new slots.

---

5 Old Czech did not have a constraint on the placement of clitics at the clausal right edge.

6 Trávníček (1956: 77) mentions that in other Old Czech texts present indicative forms of BE (*#jsem, #jsi*) could stand in the clause-initial position as well. In Dal. this is not attested outside the contexts where forms with emphatic stress are used. Such stressed forms are, of course, non-clitic counterparts of clause-internal enclitics = *(j)sem, =(j)si*.

- (iv) Old Czech [<sub>CliticP</sub> PART1 AUX1 [<sub>ArgP</sub> DAT1 ACC1] REFL [<sub>ArgP</sub> to] PART2 AUX2 [<sub>ArgP</sub> DAT2 ACC2].

Figure 2: Old Czech Template Rule, based on the ‘Dalimil Chronicle’

| 1         | 2         | 3                                      | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7         | 8                                   | 9                                       | 10  | 11  | 12                          |
|-----------|-----------|--|---|---|---|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Part 1    |           |  | Aux1  | Dat 1   | Acc1  | Refl      | Nom-<br>Acc.<br>Sg.N                | Part2                                   | Aux2  | Dat2  | Acc2                        |
| <i>že</i> | <i>li</i> | <i>ti</i> <sub>1</sub><br>( <i>t</i> ) | Present<br>indicative<br>Be-foms<br>1-2 p. sg.<br>and<br>1-3 p. pl.:<br><i>sem, si</i><br>(-s), <i>sme</i><br>(-my), <i>ste,</i><br><i>sú</i> | <i>mi, ti</i> <sub>2</sub> ( <i>t</i> )<br><i>mu, jěj,</i><br><i>nem</i><br>( <i>nám</i> )<br><i>vem</i><br>( <i>vám</i> ),<br><i>jim,</i><br><i>jima</i> | <i>mě, tě,</i><br><i>jej, ho,</i><br><i>ji,</i><br><i>ny</i><br>( <i>nás</i> ),<br><i>vy</i><br>( <i>vás</i> ),<br><i>ječ<sub>2</sub>, ny,</i><br><i>vy</i> | <i>sě</i> | <i>to</i> <sub>1</sub><br><i>co</i> | <i>tu,</i><br><i>tam,</i><br><i>pak</i> | Present<br>indicative<br>3 p. sg.<br>BE-form:<br><i>jest, je</i>      | <i>mne,</i><br><i>tobe,</i><br><i>jemu</i><br><i>jiej</i> | <i>jeho,</i><br><i>jich</i> |
|           |           |  | Present<br>Indicative<br>3 p. sg.<br>Be-fom:<br><i>je jest, (-j)</i>  |   |   |           |                                     |   |   |   |                             |
|           |           |  | Optative<br>Be-forms:<br><i>bych, bys,</i><br><i>by, bysme,</i><br><i>byste, by,</i><br><i>bysta</i>  |   |   |           |                                     |   | Past tense<br>BE-<br>forms:<br><i>byl, byla,</i><br><i>bylo, byli</i> |   |                             |

Old Czech makes use of both AUX1 and AUX2, albeit differently than Old Serbian. Optative BE-enclitics {=*bych*, =*bys*...} take AUX1 (slot 4), while the most recent layer of auxiliaries, past tense BE-enclitics {=*byl*, =*byla*, =*bylo*, =*byli*}<sup>7</sup> stand in AUX2 (slot 10). The diagnostics comes from the person-and-number split of present indicative BE-forms. Contrary to the Old Serbian clitic system,

7 Clause-internal past tense BE-enclitics =*byl*, =*byla*... have stressed counterparts which can stand clause-initially: #*byl*..., #*byla*... The same holds for other Slavic languages, so the segmental structure of past tense BE-forms in Old Slavic written languages does not tell whether these elements are clitics or not.

where the 3 p. singular =*je(st)* invariably takes AUX2, Old Czech =*je(st)* is the only mobile element of the present indicative paradigm, it can alternate between AUX1 and AUX2, see Figure 3.

Figure 3: Distribution of auxiliary clitics in Old Czech

| Template slots | AUX1   | AUX2   |
|----------------|--|--|
| Clitic subsets | <u>Optative BE-forms:</u><br><i>bych, bys, by, bysme, byšte, by</i>  | <u>Past tense BE-forms.:</u><br><i>byl, byla, bylo, byli</i> |
|                | <u>Present indicative BE-forms of</u><br><u>1-2 p. sg. and 1-3 p. pl.:</u><br><i>sem/jsem, si/s/jsi, sme/jsme, ste/</i><br><i>jste, sú/jsú</i> |  |
|                | Present indicative BE-forms of 3 p. sg.: <i>jest/je</i>  |  |

That suffices to conclude that Old Serbian and Old Czech represent different types of Template Rules. Old Czech had a clitic system of the West Slavic type, where the 3 p. singular present indicative form *je(st)* lacks a unique slot. Still, the distance between the West Slavic and Balcanic Slavic types in XIV-XV centuries was shorter than between Modern Serbo-Croatian and Modern Czech: the present-day West Slavic languages do not have the AUX2 slot at all.

As for Old Czech clitic pronouns, the analysis helped to correct a mistake made by Trávníček who asserts (ibid., § 114.1) that Old Czech accusative and dative clitics could stand in either order in a cluster. This statement does not hold for Dal. Trávníček's mistake is probably explained by the fact that he does not distinguish the positions of argument accusative forms and the reflexive accusative *sě*, which had a special slot. The order of slots for Common Slavic clitic pronouns in Dal. is DAT1 – ACC1 – REFL.ACC (*sě*)<sup>8</sup>. The data of Dal. prompt that an extra slot for the Nom.-Acc. inanimate pronoun *to* 'it', 'that' and wh-word *co* 'what' should be added, since these elements combine with accusative and reflexive pronouns, cf. Auvech, *kako*=*mě*<sub>Cl.1.Acc.Sg</sub>=*to*<sub>Cl.Nom.Sg,N</sub> *velmi rudí*, *že naši zemi žena súdí*. (Dal., kap. 3), *Mníte*, *#by*=*sě*<sub>Cl.Refl</sub>=*to*<sub>Cl.Nom.Sg,N</sub> *mohlo utajiti*. (Dal.,

8 This does not exclude the possibility that other Old Czech texts of XIV-XVII th. centuries had different clitic systems, with a different number of template slots or even deviated from the template principle, but such systems should be analyzed on an individual basis and statements like 'clitics of categories a and b can stand in either order in the period X' make little sense before these texts are analyzed by methods of corpus linguistics.

kap. 55). Prosodically heavy dative {*mne*<sub>1Dat.Sg.</sub>, *tobe*<sub>2Dat.Sg.</sub>, *jemu*<sub>3Dat.Sg.M.</sub>, *jiej*<sub>3Dat.Sg.F.</sub>} and accusative {*jeho*<sub>3Acc.Sg.M.</sub>, *jich*<sub>3Pl.Acc.</sub>} pronouns opened special slots Dat2 and Acc2 to the right from AUX2. Actually, there is no independent proof that these forms were fully grammaticalized clitics, but their linear combinations in clause-internal positions do not give grounds to exclude them from Old Czech clusters. All pronouns that took Dat1 and Acc2, i.e., stand before a reflexive clitic and *to/co*, are safely diagnosed as clitics. It is worth mentioning that in the language of ‘Dalimil chronicle’ there is no correlation between the choice of a short vs long pronoun and their clitic behavior. There are double forms of 1.Pl.Dat. *nem/nám*), 2.Pl.Dat. *vem/vám*, 1.Pl.Acc *ny/nás*), 2.Pl.Acc *vy/vás*, where both elements in a pair take Dat1 or Acc1.

### 5.3. Clusterising particles in Old Czech

There are two blocks for particles – Part1, hosting clitic particles of Common Slavic origin {*že*, *li*, *ti*, (*t*)} and Part2, hosting later particle clitics {*tu*, *tam*, *pak*} that end up in between the *to/co* (slot 8) and AUX2 (slot 10). Late particle clitics from Part2 have low frequency in Dal., whereas Common Slavic particles from Part1 are frequent both in SINGLE and in CLUSTER, where they precede all clitic auxiliaries and pronouns. All three elements *že*, *li*, *ti* are strict enclitics. If used as clusterizing elements, they are invariably placed in Dal. after the first phonetic word, while clusterizing clitic auxiliaries and pronouns can be both placed in Old Czech after the first phonetic word and the first maximal projection, (Zimmerling 2013: 488). Clusterizing enclitic *že* is a focus marker/ marker of clause-linking and often marks the first clause in a polypredicate structure<sup>9</sup>. *Li* is a yes-no marker, and *ti* is a confirmation marker with the meaning ‘indeed’, ‘really so’. The semantics of these particles suggest that they may combine with each other. Indeed, there are 12 examples of *že* + *ti* combination and 2 examples of *li* + *ti* combination, cf. *Nebudú=li=t’ svých milovati*, *nerodíte* o nich nitce tbatí, (Dal., 68). The combination of free clusterizing clause-level clitics *že* + *li* is not attested in Dal. Basing only on that text, one could otherwise locate *že* + *li* in one and the same template slot. Meanwhile, the sequence of free elements *že* + *li* is known from another Old Czech text:

- (2) OCz. Každý nás své hoře vida, (p)roch=z=*’mu* (Alexandrovi) živu býti kdy (da),  
(p)roch=z=*li* juž meškati vie(ce)? (AlxH. 10, 34)

9 The particle *že* had numerous non-clusterizing uses as a bound element and as local free clitic used as identification marker (X *že* < but not Y>) or conjunction marker (X *že* Y ‘X & Y’), (cf. Zalazniak 1993: 282).

An alternative analysis of =*že* in (2) as a bound element, part of the complementizer *proč* <proch> *že* is unlikely, since *proč* in the same function occurs without =*že* and can host =*li*, cf. (3).

- (3) OCz. *Pověz=mi, zcemu=jest Ježůš smutek plodil, procz-ly=je=sě otci modlil?* t. 47<sup>a</sup>

The combination of free clause-level *že* + *li*, in that order, is also attested in ONR and Old Russian, cf. (4).

- (4) ORu. *Jegda= že=li paky kogo slyšaše besedujušča* (Feod. 38r).

The reversed order of free clause-level clitics \**li* + *že* does not occur in any Old Slavic language.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, one can assume that Old Czech of XIV-XV centuries still retained the Common Slavic order *že=li*, though this combination was infrequent and required special contexts.

The particle clitic *ti*<sub>1</sub> ‘indeed’, ‘really so’ is normally realized in its non-syllabic variant =*t*<sub>1</sub> and is frequent both in CLUSTER (57 occurrences) and in SINGLE (45 occurrences). That *ti*<sub>1</sub> is a different syntactic element than the dative pronoun 2 p. sg. *ti*<sub>2</sub> ‘to you’ is verified by the following tests:

- The particle *t*<sub>1</sub> is located in the Template Rule before the slot AUX1 which gives the order = *t*<sub>1</sub> = **AUX1**.

Examples (5a-b) are remarkable by the fact that they use this particle in adjacent clauses, one of them – in a cluster = *t*<sub>1</sub> = AUX1, another one – as a single clustering particle clitic.

- (5a) OCz. *Pozval= t*<sub>1 CL,PCL</sub> = *je*<sub>CL,AUX,3SG,PRS,IND</sub> *král na hody svého děda.*  
 ‘The king *has indeed invited* his grandfather to join his campaign.’  
*Bude=t*<sub>1 CL,PCL</sub> *i malým i velikým do čas běda.* (Dal, kap. 56)  
 ‘Both the little ones and the great ones *will indeed* be in trouble soon.’
- (5b) *Povědě=t*<sub>1 CL,PCL</sub> *kak=t*<sub>1 CL,PCL</sub> = *je*<sub>CL,AUX,3SG,PRS,IND</sub> *ta země k Čechám přišla.*  
 (Dal, kap. 26)  
 ‘It is *indeed* right time *to tell* how that country *really made a part* of the Czech rule.’ <lit. arrived to Czech people>.

- The particle *t*<sub>1</sub> freely combines with dative clitics of different numbers and persons which gives the order =*t*<sub>1</sub>=**DAT 1**.

10 Zalizniak (2008: 29) justly warns against treating sequences like ORu. *ašče li že* as counterexamples, since in such cases =*li* is a bound element, part of the complementizer [Ašče=*li*], so adjacent *li* and *že* are elements of a different level, and the structure is [Ašče=*li*]= *že*.

The form = $t_1$  in example (6) cannot be analyzed as an argument clitic governed by povědě since the Addressee expressed by =*vem* is in 2 p.plural.

(6) OCz. To=  $t_1$ <sub>CL.PCL</sub> =*vem*<sub>CL.2PL.DAT</sub> beze lsti povědě. (Dal, kap. 4)  
'I'll *indeed* tell you that without deception.'

- The particle  $t_1$  is used in contexts, where the verbal argument is an NP in the dative case.

For example, in (7) the NP **bratru mému** to my brother stands in the dative case and has the role of Recipient. It is not coreferent to the Addressee of the sentence.

(7) OCz. Já= $t_1$ <sub>CL.PCL</sub> biskupstva<sub>GEN.SG</sub> přeji [<sub>NP</sub> **bratru mému**]<sub>DAT.SG</sub>. (Dal, kap. 51)  
'I *really* wish the bishopdom **to my brother**.'

I conclude that the hypothesis that the particle  $ti_1$  and the pronoun  $ti_2$  are syntactic homonyms in Old Czech satisfactory explains all contexts of  $ti_1$  placement in Dal., and in many contexts the interpretation of the clitic element  $ti$  as a pronoun is impossible: inserting a pronoun in these contexts would both violate constraints on clitic-internal ordering and the predicate-argument structure. The alternative hypothesis that  $ti$  gets a special template slot because of the prominent status of 2p. singular in the person-and-number hierarchy does not work out.

## 6. Conclusions

The analysis proved that Old Czech in XIV-XV centuries still used a Common Slavic discourse marker  $ti_1$  'indeed', 'really so' as a free clause-level clusterizing clitic. The particle  $ti_1$  and the dative pronoun  $ti_2$  were syntactic homonyms. The hypothesis that clitic-internal ordering in Old Czech conformed to a template principle was successfully verified. The theory of three Slavic areal types of Clitic Templates is applicable to Old Slavic languages of XIV-XV centuries. Old Czech classifies with the West Slavic type of a Template rule, but its clitic system had features typical for a transitional period – additional template slots for recent layers of clitics, across-a-category splits in sets of auxiliary and pronominal clitics.

## References

- Dal. – Nejstarší česká rýmovaná kronika tak řečeného Dalimila. Ed. by Bohuslav Havránek – Jiří Daňhelka, Ed. by Zdeněk Kristen. 2. vyd. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1958.

- Browne, W. 2008. "Porjadok Klitikox u Vojvodjanskim Rusinskim". *Švetlost* 3, 351-362.
- Franks, S. 2008. "Clitic placement, Prosody and the Bulgarian verbal complex". *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 16(1): 91-137.
- Franks, S. and T. King. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Migdalski, K. 2007. "On the emergence of the second position cliticization in Slavic". *Formal Description of Slavic Languages FDSL-7*, 69-71.
- Mihaljević, M. 1997. "The interaction of *li* and negation in Croatian Church Slavonic". In: Junghanns, U. and G. Zybatow (eds.): *Formale Slavistik*. Frankfurt a.M.: Vervuert, 87-92.
- Pavlovih, S. 2011. "Distribucija enklitika u starosrpskim poveljama i pismima XII i XIII veka". *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* LIV(2), 31-52.
- Tolstaya, M. 1991. "Sistema enklitik v serbskix gramotah XIV- XV". *Slavistika, indoeuropeistika, nostratika. K 6-letiju so dnja roždenija V. A. Dybo*. Moscow, 201-205.
- Tolstaya, M. 2000. "Forma pluskvamperfekta v ukrajskix zakarpatskix govorax v predloženi". *Balto-slavyanskije issledovania* 1988-1999 (XIV), 134-143.
- Tolstaya, M. 2012. "Karpatokrajskije enklitiki v južnoslavyanskoj perspektive". *Balto-slavyanskije issledovania*, 190-211.
- Trávníček, F. 1956. *Historická mluvnice česká*, III. Praha: Skladba.
- Zalizniak, A. A. 1993. "K izučeniju jazyka berestyanyx gramot". In: Janin, V. L. and A. A. Zalizniak. *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste iz raskopok* 1984-1989. Moskva: Nauka, 191-319.
- Zaliznjak, A. A. 2008. *Drevnerusskije enklitiki*. Moskva: Jazyki slavyanskoj kultury.
- Zimmerling, A. 2009. "Klitiki v drevnerusskom prostranstve: po povodu knigi A. A. Zalizniaka "Drevnerusskije enklitiki"". *Russkij jazyk v naučnom osveščeni* 1(17), 259-277.
- Zimmerling, A. 2012a. "A unified analysis of clitic clusters in world's languages". *Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies* 11(18), 726-738.
- Zimmerling, A. 2012b. "Sistemy porjadka slov s klitikami v slavyanskix jazykax". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5, 3-37.

- Zimmerling, A. and P. Kosta. 2013. "Slavic Clitics: a Typology". *Language Typology and Universals (STUF)* 66(2), 178-214.
- Zimmerling, A. 2013. *Sistemy porjadka slov slavyanskix yazykov v tipologicheskom aspekte*. Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoj kultury.
- Zimmerling, A. 2014. "Klitiki i informacionnaja struktura v drevnečešskom yazyke". *Vestnik MGGU. Serija filologija*.

