

NORBERT OSTROWSKI
Jagiellonian University in Kraków
norbert.ostrowski@uj.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-9046-4981

IE *-k^we ‘AND; IF’ IN SLAVIC LANGUAGES

Keywords: Slavic languages, historical syntax, etymology, palatalizations

Abstract¹

The article examines the origin and functional development of the Slavic conjunction *ače* ‘if; although’ (OPol. *acz*). The marker of the protasis in conditional clauses was the enclitic *-če, which continues the function of IE *-k^we ‘and; if’. Thus, Sl. *-če ‘if’ is an archaism and may be compared with corresponding forms in Indo-Iranian, Hittite, and Latin. The concessive *ače* ‘although’ evolved from conditional concessive clauses. The proposed interpretation also sheds light on the genesis of OCz. *leč* ‘if only’.

1. Introduction²

The aim of the article is to identify traces of the IE enclitic *-k^we ‘and’ in Slavic languages and to describe the functional changes in the development of the conjunction *ače* ‘if; although’. In its primary function, the IE enclitic *-k^we ‘and’ was used to connect both phrases and clauses, with a preference, as demonstrated by Viti (2006), for what is known as “natural coordination”³ and for symmetric coordination, e.g.:

- (1) *pitáraṃ ca dṛśéyam mātáraṃ ca* (RV 1.24.1d; Viti 2006: 133)
‘May I see my father and my mother’

¹ The paper, including the quotations and paraphrases, has been rendered into English by a professional translator (Mateusz Urban) under a POB Heritage grant from the Jagiellonian University to *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*.

² I would like to express my gratitude to the anonymous reviewers whose comments on the earlier version of this article helped clarify several ambiguities and omissions. Of course, I take full responsibility for any errors that may remain.

³ On natural coordination see Wälchli (2005), and for Lithuanian, Ostrowski (2017).

A Slavic reflex of IE $*-k^we$ ‘and’ is the enclitic $-če$ in the adverb $ta-če$ ‘later’ (*Codex Suprasliensis*), whose functional equivalent is OCS $ta-že$ ‘later’ (*Codex Suprasliensis*). It should be borne in mind that the enclitic $-že$ was used in OCS and Old East Slavic, among others, as a clause connective in coordination, specifically as a “topic switch”, functionally identical to Sl. *a* (Ickler 1977). Furthermore, it is worth noting that even in Old Church Slavonic, the pronoun ta appeared as a copulative conjunction and this usage still persists today in Ukrainian. Describing the usage and reasons for the combination of both elements ($ta-$ + $-če$ and $ta-$ + $-že$) is a task for the future, but from a purely formal point of view, such sequences resemble combinations known from Hittite ($ta-kku$ ‘if’ < $*to-k^we$) and Gothic $sa-h$, masc., ‘and that one’ < $*so-k^we$, $so-h$ < $*sā-k^we$, fem., ‘and that one’ (Klein and Condon 1993: 22). Another example of IE $*-k^we$ ‘and’ is the OES adverb $oščē$ ‘still’ < PSI. $*ot-kē$, whose formal counterparts include Lat. $at-que$ ‘and what is more; and; and yet’ (Dunkel 2014: vol. 2: 11). For the treatment of the cluster $*-tke-$ in Proto-Slavic, see section 2.

Secondarily, as we learn from Old Indic, Hittite, and Latin, IE $*-k^we$ ‘and’ could also appear as a marker of the protasis in conditional sentences. Traces of such usage of IE $*-k^we$ ‘if’ are also found in Slavic languages in the conjunctions $ače$ ‘if; although’ and $*lěče$ > Old Czech $leč$ ‘if only’.

The article has the following structure. In the second section, I will discuss occurrences of copulative conjunctions in conditional sentences and elucidate the origin of Sl. $ače$ ‘if; although’ and $ašte$. The oldest function, still identifiable in texts, is that of a conditional conjunction, while the concessive function is a result of later changes. The development from a conditional to a concessive clause conjunction is the focus of section 3. The article also aims to demonstrate how historical syntax can contribute to a better etymological description of conjunctions and a fuller understanding of language change. Through syntax, it is possible to identify different chronological layers in the attested functions of sentence conjunctions, which is relevant for the etymology of West Slavic $*lěče$ > $leč$. It has long been observed that the semantic development of grammatical elements is not random, and this article provides additional arguments from the history of Slavic languages, data which are relatively infrequently utilized in studies on grammaticalization.

2. Copulative vs. conditional sentences, or the origin of Sl. $ače$ and $ašte$ ‘if’

Conditional clauses are traditionally described as adverbial clauses, which is, of course, a valid approach. However, some time ago, it was noted (e.g. Haiman 1986) that sentence coordination can convey conditional meanings too, e.g.:

- (2) *I go out at night, she’ll challenge me to a fight* (Haiman 1986: 218)
- (3) *Idź szybciej, (to) zdążysz.*
‘Walk faster, (and) you’ll make it in time’

Both examples feature asyndetic copulative coordination but convey conditional meanings. What is more important, however, is that copulative conjunctions can

also undergo reinterpretation and function secondarily as conjunctions in conditional sentences. As Haiman (1986: 219) observed, in Middle English, the conjunction *and* had, among others, the role of a conditional conjunction, e.g.:

- (4) *It were grete joye unto us all, and hit myghte please the kynge to make her his quene.*
(1485; *Le Morte Darthur*, by Syr Thomas Malory; MEC)
'It would be great joy for us all, **if** it might please the king to make her his queen.'

Importantly, this is not an isolated phenomenon. We can also observe it in Old Icelandic prose, where the copulative conjunction *ok* 'and' could also occur secondarily as a conditional conjunction:

- (5) *at ek fá þín mér til eiginkonu ok sé þat vili föður þins.* (Baetke 2006: 467)
'that I may take you as my wife **if** that is the will of your father.'

A similar process was observed by Klemensiewicz (1965: 471) in 15th-century Polish in connection with the conjunction *a*:

- (6) *co wam pomoże taka wielika tłuszcza, a wy leżycie porażeni.*
'what good will such a large crowd do for you **if** you are lying defeated.'

Harris and Campbell (1995: 290) described a similar development in Mingrelian *da* 'if', a conjunction which etymologically corresponds to Georgian *da* 'and' and Mingrelian *do* 'as soon as'. It is still unknown what exact conditions must be met for the reinterpretation of a copulative conjunction as a conditional conjunction to occur, but this precise change can also be observed in IE **-k^we* 'and; if',⁴ where the conditional meaning is, of course, secondary, see (1–3).

The structure of Sl. *ače* 'if; although' is transparent. It is a combination of the Slavic conjunction *a* with the enclitic *-če*, which continues the IE enclitic **-k^we* (see SP vol. 1: 149–150).⁵ However, it remains unclear how the combination of the conjunction *a* and the enclitic *-če* (< IE **-k^we*) became a conditional clause conjunction and a concessive clause conjunction. While *Słownik prasłowiański* suggests development from a deictic particle to a conditional and concessive conjunction,

⁴ It is possible that an intermediate stage in the development from 'and' to 'if' was a time clause conjunction 'and then; while; as soon as', which seems to be suggested by the Mingrelian example, but the details remain unclear to me. The change from a time clause conjunction to a conditional clause conjunction is common enough that I will not go into the specifics, see for example Traugott (1985).

⁵ Other explanations for the conjunction *ače* can also be found in the literature, but they do not withstand criticism. For example, the authors of ESSJa (vol. 1: 36) link *ače* with Lat. *at-que* 'and moreover; and too; as well as; yet'. The etymological counterpart of Lat. *at-* is Sl. *ot(ъ)* 'from'. Unfortunately, we have no evidence to confirm that the loss of the /t/ consonant in Slavic resulted in the lengthening of the preceding vowel. Furthermore, Lat. *at* functions as an adversative conjunction. The authors of ESSJa also fail to provide any parallel that would justify development along the path adversativity → conditionality (see Traugott, 1985). The development of Czech *leč* (see below) seems to suggest the opposite direction, that is, conditionality → concessiveness → adversativity. The only trace of a Slavic counterpart of Lat. *at-que* can be seen in OES *oščē* 'still' < PSl. **ot-ke*. For the treatment of the /t'k'/ cluster in Slavic, see *ašte*.

such an explanation is questionable for at least two reasons. Firstly, there are no typological parallels for the evolution of conditional conjunctions from deictic particles, see Traugott (1985). Secondly, in Old East Slavic, Old Czech, and Old Polish, *ač(e)* functions as a conditional and concessive conjunction, while its use as a particle meaning ‘indeed!; behold!; only’ is only attested later and exclusively in Russian and Ukrainian dialects (SP, *loc. cit.*).⁶ Therefore, in order to account for the functional development of Sl. *ače*, we need to begin with its earliest and best-attested functions as a conditional and concessive conjunction. The aforementioned sentences (1–3) indicate the possibility of a functional change from ‘and’ to ‘if’, and the same change should be assumed for the IE enclitic **-k^we* ‘and’, which has secondarily become an exponent of conditional clauses, cf. Old Indic *ced* ‘if’ < **ca id*; Latin *absque* ‘if not’ (Wackernagel 1942/1955); Old Avestan *-cā* (West 2011: 88); and finally Hittite *ta-ku* ‘if’, as well as the disjunctive conjunction *-(a)ku...-(a)ku...* ‘either ... or ...’ (Watkins 1985/1994). The relationship between conditional and disjunctive sentences is discussed in section 3. The functional connection between OCS *ašte* ‘if’ and Hitt. *ta-ku* was first noted by Eichner (1971: 27), and more recently by Dunkel, who included OCS *ašte* ‘if’ in his discussion of IE **-k^we* ‘if’ (2014: vol. 2: 705).⁷ However, Dunkel omits the Old Czech conjunction *leč* ‘if only’, which continues WSl. **lě-če* (or **le-če*). The dictionary of Old Czech by Jan Gebauer lists *leč* in the function of ‘if only’, which is exactly what we would expect as a result of the conflation of the Slavic restrictive particle **lě-/*le-* ‘only’ and the conjunction *-če* ‘if’ < IE **-k^we*. Interestingly, Gebauer’s dictionary does not list *leč* as an adversative conjunction, which suggests that the adversative function is a result of a later development. The same applies to Polish *lecz* ‘but’.

From a formal perspective, an analysis of the conjunction *ače* does not pose any problems either. In Slavic languages, there is an entire series of conjunctions constructed according to the following rule: the Slavic conjunction *a* + enclitic occupying a position in line with Wackernagel’s Law, for example, *ali* ‘but; or; whether?’ (: *li* ‘whether?’), *abo* ‘or’ (: *bo* ‘because; and’), *alě* ‘but’ (: *lě* ‘but; only’), *aže* ‘until; if; in order to; so that’ (: *-že* ‘and’). However, the OCS conjunction *ašte* ‘if’ remains problematic. It seems to originate from an older **atje*, but what would the puzzling

⁶ According to Snoj (2015), the Slovene conjunction *če* ‘if’ also belongs within this group, which continues an archaic *ečē* (spelt ‘ecce’) ‘if’, presumably etymologically related to *ače*.

⁷ Dunkel reconstructs **-(s)k^we*, but does not explain the puzzling disappearance of the initial *s*- (there are no examples of *s*-mobile in enclitics). Given the existence of OCS *ašte*, such a reconstruction seems appealing, but as I will attempt to demonstrate below, the sequence *ščē* could be a regular development from an older **t^ke*. Dunkel (2014: vol. 2: 703⁴) also allows for the possibility that the conditional meaning of *ašte* should be attributed to the conjunction *a*. However, contrary to what Dunkel himself writes on page 706, the conjunction *a* does not have a conditional meaning in OCS. The combinations *a by* / *a bi* (*Codex Suprasliensis*) should be understood as *a ješliby* ‘and if’, where the irrealis meaning is introduced by the enclitics *-byl/-bi*, similarly to Old Polish, see Klemensiewicz (1965: 495), e.g. [...] *by nie był złodziejca, nie przywiedlibyśmy go do ciebie* (15th century) ‘[...] if he were not a criminal, we would not have brought him to you’. On page 706, Dunkel (op. cit.) also mentions the Lithuanian conjunction *be* ‘and; if’ as an example of the change ‘and’ → ‘if’, although the *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* does not record *be* in the sense ‘if’.

postposition *-je* be in such a scenario? Meillet and Vaillant (1965: 92) believed *ašte* 'if' to be due to the regular development from **ād-/ōd-k^we*.⁸ I agree with this opinion, but it requires further elaboration. The challenge certainly lies in explaining the change /tke/ > /šte/. It should be noted that in Slavic languages, we find instances of *k' : t'* and *g' : d'* variation. Let us list a few examples taken from Otrębski (1958: 356): *Евдокія : Овдотія* (16th century, Киевский Помянник); Lith. *Žygimantas* 'Sigismund' : *Жидимонтъ* (15th–17th centuries); Lith. *stirta* 'pile': Ukr. *скупта* / Br. *сцїрта*; *Гюрзіій : Дюрзіій, Дюрдіій*. Similar alternations are also attested in some Lithuanian dialects from southern and eastern Lithuania, for example: *ratēlis* 'spinning wheel' > *rakēlis*; *žōdis* 'word' > *žōgis*; *kēlias* 'road' > *tēlias*; *giliai* 'deeply' > *diliai* (Otrębski 1958: 355). As demonstrated by Girdenis (1979), from a synchronic point of view, the observed variations in the dialects of southern Lithuania (known as Dzūkian dialects) are a result of the lack of a phonological opposition between /k'/ and /t'/ (and correspondingly /g'/ and /d'/). In other words, the consonants [k'], [t'] and [g'], [d'] are VARIANTS OF THE PHONEMES /K'/ and /G'/. The palatalized phonemes /k'/ and /g'/ did not have correlates in /t'/ and /d'/ because the old /t'/ and /d'/ (from the original **/tj/, */dj/, */ti/, */di/, */tie/, */die/*) underwent affrication, e.g. dialectal acc.pl. *svecius* 'guests' (: standard *svečius* < **/tj/*), nom.pl. *gaidziai* 'roosters' (: standard *gaidžiai* < **/dj/*), dialectal *cikras* 'true' (: *tikras*), dialectal *dievas* 'God' (: *dievas*), but dial. *t'æ-ka* 'flows' (: *teka*), *su-d'ē.d'i* 'with uncle' (: *su dēde*). This gave rise to an asymmetrical phonological system with empty slots, in which the realizations of the phonemes /k'/ and /g'/ expanded their range to include coronal articulations. When /t/ and /d/ underwent secondary palatalization before the front vowels /e/, /e̞/, and /i:/ < **/en/*, the newly formed [t'] and [d'] became allophones of the phonemes /k'/ and /g'/ (or /K'/ and /G'/ in Girdenis's notation). In other words, the phonemes /K'/ and /G'/ could be realized as [k'] and [g'], or [t'] and [d']. Thus, we observe alternations such as nom.sg. *b'i/Ḳ/ē* 'bee', gen.pl. *b'ic'u* < **bitjun* (: standard *bitė* 'bee', gen.pl. *bičių* < **bitjun*).

Let us return to the Slavic languages. The sequences **stj*, **skj*, and **ske*, **ski* are preserved in all Slavic languages as *š'č'*. Following Kuryłowicz (1957/1987: 371–375), I assume that the palatalization of consonants by yod was a Balto-Slavic phenomenon and occurred before a back vowel, i.e. CjV_{back} > C'V_{back}. However, before a front vowel, what was phonologically perceived as a palatalized phoneme was phonetically realized as hard (see Holvoet 2005), so that the opposition between /C/ and /C'/ was neutralized. This state has been preserved in the Baltic languages, for example:

1sg. **jautju* > **jaut'u* > Lith. *jaučiu*, Latv. *jaušu* 'I feel'

2sg. **jautji* > Lith. *jauti*, Latv. *jaut* 'you feel'

⁸ **ād-* (**ōd-?*) > Sl. *a* is usually associated with Vedic **t* 'then; and' and Avestan *āaṭ* 'then; and, but', considering it as a continuation of the IE ablative of the pronoun **h₁o-* (e.g. EWA: vol. 1: 163; SP: vol. 1: 145; ESSJa: vol. 1: 33). The length of the vowel is a result of contraction with the ablative ending **-ed*. Sometimes Sl. *a* is compared to the Ved. adverb *ā* 'near; towards; from' and Avestan *ā* 'to, in, on; from' (e.g. ALEW: vol. 2: 719), but in the light of the explanation of *ašte* presented here, the connection seems less likely.

In the Slavic context, this state of affairs was secondarily modified by inserting yod also before front vowels, e.g. *češp* ‘I comb’ : *češetv* ‘(s)he combs’, instead of **česetv*. The status of back consonants was slightly different because they underwent palatalization not only before yod but also before front vowels, cf. 1sg. *pláčp* ‘I cry’ \Leftarrow **plākjp* and *rečēt* ‘(s)he speaks’ \Leftarrow **reketi*. A similar situation must be assumed for Baltic based on Latvian, e.g. Latv. *liecu* ‘I bend’ (: Lith. *lenkiu*) alongside Latv. *luocīt* (: Lith. *lankyti*), see Kuryłowicz (1957/1987: 375). The picture becomes more complicated when considering phonotactics. Yod palatalized the entire consonant cluster, e.g. **pustjā* > **pus’tā* > Pol. *puszcza* ‘wilderness; forest’, but *pustiti* : Pol. *puścić* ‘to let go’. Similarly in Latvian, e.g. the cluster /sl/ in *pūslis* ‘bladder’ : gen.sg. *pūšļa* < **pūsljā*; /š/ < **/s’/*, cf. Latv. *šūt* < **s’ūti* < **sjūti* (: Lith. *siūti* ‘to sew’). Another example is the group /st/ in Latv. *riksste* ‘twig; rod’, which alternates with /š/ < **/stj/*, cf. the gen.pl. form *riksšu* < **ri(k)s’t’u* < **ristjun* (the /k/ is a secondary insertion). However, a problem emerges in the clusters **/ske/*, **/ski/* because in this context only /k/ could undergo palatalization (see above), resulting in a phonotactically difficult CC’ cluster. Latvian solved this problem by introducing the palatal plosive /k̟/ (= /c/ in IPA), e.g. Latv. *šķelt* ‘to split’ instead of **scelt/šcelt* (= Lith. *skelti*), Latv. *šķirt* ‘to separate’ instead of **scirt/šcirt* (= Lith. *skirti*). As a result the entire cluster was palatal (i.e. C’C’), which made the palatalization **/s’/* > /š/ possible. Due to morphological processes, the /šk̟/ cluster emerged as a palatal alternant of /st/, cf. *riksste* ‘twig’ : gen.pl. *riksšku* (alongside the older *riksšu* < **ristjun*). Consequently, in Latvian, the /šk̟/ cluster alternates with both /st/ and /sk/, cf. Latv. *šķelt* : *skaldīt* ‘to chop’. The Latvian situation is thus similar to the Slavic one, where /šč/ alternates with both /st/ (e.g. Pol. *pusty* ‘empty’ : *puszcza* ‘wilderness; forest’) and /sk/ (e.g. Pol. *wrzask* ‘scream’ : *wrzeszcze* ‘I scream’). The Latvian parallel also sheds light on the Slavic development. In Slavic, the consonant clusters /sk/ could be either CC or C’C’, but in early Proto-Slavic combinations **/ske/* and **/ski/*, only /k/ could undergo palatalization, resulting in the phonotactic problem of CC’ analogous to the one illustrated above with Latv. *šķelt* ‘to split’. At this point, I must assume that the shift of Proto-Slavic **/tj/* > /k̟/ (= /c/ in IPA, i.e. a voiceless palatal plosive or /t̟/), i.e. a voiceless alveolo-palatal plosive) occurred even before the Slavic first palatalization. As a parallel to the change **/tj/* > /k̟/, we can mention Latv. *ķurmīs* ‘prison’ < Ru. *tjurьма* (Endzelin 1922: 113). The idea itself is of course not new, see Vermeer (2014: 199) and the earlier works cited therein (Trubetzkoy, Mareš, Kortlandt), but the difference lies in that I move this change to an earlier stage than the Slavic second palatalization. With this assumption, we can postulate that in the clusters **/ske/* and **/ski/*, the opposition **/k’/* : **/k̟/* < **/tj/* was neutralized in favour of **/k̟/*, which in this position could be both the realization of **/k’/* and a former **/tj/*. This explains why the /šč/ cluster alternates with both /st/ and /sk/. A similar phonotactic problem arose in the sequence **/t-k̟e/* (CC’), which was treated similarly to **/ske/*, i.e. **/t’-k̟e/*, where **/k̟/* was the soft counterpart of /t/. In other words, the **/t’k̟/* cluster was the palatal alternant of /st/ < **/t-t/*, e.g. *město* ‘city’ < **mět-to* and followed the same dissimilation rules as **/t-t/*. The process itself must be old because it precedes the change **pisjomū* → *pisjemū* ‘we write’, which made the /Cj/ sequence phonotactically acceptable again

before a front vowel (see Holvoet 2005: 271). Consequently, we should assume the following development proposed by Meillet: PSl. **āt-ke⁹* > **at’kē* > **as’kē* > OCS *ašte* ‘if’. In the same way, we can explain the origin of the continuative adverb *ješčē* ‘still’ (OCS *ješte*), which Meillet (1902: 155) derived from the combination **et-k^we*, where **et-* is equivalent to, among others, the ancient Gr. *ēti* ‘still’: **h₁eti-k^we* > PSl. **et’kē* > **es’kē* > OCS *ješte*. The explanation proposed for *ašte* can also be applied to clarify OCS *tožde* ‘in the same way, also’ < **tod-ġe* < **tod-ge*, where /ġ/ (= /j/ in IPA). OCS *tožde* is to OCS *to-že* ‘also’ as OCS *ašte* is to *a-če*.

3. From conditional to concessive clauses: The case of *ačē* ‘although’

The most frequent functions of the conjunction *ač(e)* in Old Polish, Old Czech, and Old East Slavic are those of a conditional conjunction (‘if’) and a concessive conjunction (‘although’). To comprehend the semantic shift ‘if’ → ‘although’, we need to make some introductory remarks about the third type of clause, known as concessive conditional clauses. These have been extensively studied by Ekkehard König (e.g. König 1985, 1986; Haspelmath and König 1998). According to the model proposed by König, there are three kinds of concessive conditional sentences: scalar concessive conditionals (7), alternative concessive conditionals (8), and universal concessive conditionals (9). These can be illustrated as follows:

- (7) *Nawet jeśli nie lubisz zabytków, ten zamek ci się spodoba.*
‘Even if you don’t like monuments, you will like this castle.’
- (8) *Chcesz czy nie chcesz, pomogę ci.*
‘Whether you want me to or not, I’ll help you.’
- (9) *Cokolwiek im powiesz, nie posłuchają cię.*
‘Whatever you tell them, they won’t listen to you.’

In each of these sentences, the protasis (*p*) presents two or more possibilities, and for each of them, the statement in the apodosis (*q*) is true. As König (1985: 3) notes, “In contrast to simple conditionals, irrelevance (concessive) conditionals relate a series of antecedent conditions to a consequent”. For example, in (8), the protasis introduces two possibilities, linked by disjunction (“whether you want me to or not”). The statement in the apodosis (*q*), “I will help you” is true for both possibilities. Such sentences, known as alternative concessive conditionals, explain why some languages have seen the reinterpretation of the conditional conjunction as a disjunctive conjunction, e.g. Lat. *sive* ‘or’ : *sī* ‘if’ and Latv. *jeb* ‘or’ < ‘if’ (Ostrowski 2010). This elucidates the disjunctive nature of Hitt. *(a)ku...-(a)ku...* ‘either ... or’ and OCz. *leč* ‘or’ derived from the earlier ‘if only’. In contrast, in (9), a universal quantifier can be used in the protasis, so that for any *x*, what the apodosis states is true. In other words, “You can tell them *a*, *b*, *c*, etc., but they won’t listen to you.” Conditional concessive sentences combine the semantic features of conditional and concessive sentences.

⁹ /t/ arose from the devoicing of /d/ before /k/.

The examples in (7–9) are so-called semi-factive sentences, with the protasis (*p*) expressing hypotheses and the apodosis (*q*) stating facts. Compare (10–10b):

- (10) *Jeśli świeci słońce, idę na spacer.* (conditional sentence)
 ‘If the sun is shining, I’m going for a walk.’
- (10a) *Nawet jeśli pada deszcz, idę na spacer.* (conditional concessive sentence)
 ‘Even if it rains, I’m going for a walk.’
- (10b) *Chociaż pada deszcz, idę na spacer.* (concessive sentence)
 ‘Although it is raining, I’m going for a walk.’

In (10), both the protasis and apodosis express hypotheses, describing what I’m going to do if the sun is shining. In other words, the condition that the weather is sunny must be met for me to go for a walk. In (10a), the apodosis (*q*) deals with facts (‘I’m going for a walk regardless of the weather’), while the protasis (*p*) discusses hypotheses. Finally, in (10b), the main clause and the subordinate clause both deal with facts, stating ‘It’s raining’ (fact 1) and ‘I’m going for a walk’ (fact 2). What (10a) and (10b) have in common is that they describe atypical situations in comparison with general tendencies in the world (presupposition: ‘if *p*, then normally not *q*’). In other words, usually no one goes for a walk, when it rains (König and Siemund 2000: 342).

The history of languages is replete with shifts in meaning between concessive conditional sentences and concessive sentences. For instance, Lat. *etsi* ‘even if; although’ structurally corresponds to MoE *even if*; Lat. *et* ‘and’ also functioned as a scalar additive particle ‘even’. Furthermore, in Shakespeare’s times, E *though* meant ‘even if’ (Haspelmath and König 1998: 568). Finally, Pol. *jakkolwiek* ‘although’ is etymologically linked to the indefinite pronoun *jakikolwiek* ‘whichever’.

König (1986) discusses several contexts in which conditional sentences can be interpreted as concessive or conditional concessive sentences. For instance, if the protasis of a conditional sentence contains an expression that denotes an extreme value on a scale, such a sentence can easily be interpreted as a concessive conditional sentence. One example is the aforementioned Lat. conjunction *etsi* ‘even if; although’, where *et* ‘even’ indicates such an extreme value. The semantic shift from ‘even if’ to ‘although’ is determined by two factors. First, the protasis contains a scalar additive particle ‘even’, indicating the least likely option on the scale. Second, in concessive conditional sentences, the statement in the apodosis (*q*) is true for each possibility in the protasis (*p*). Since *q* is also true for the least likely possibility in *p* (indicated by ‘even’), and if we know that the protasis (*p*) does not normally co-occur with the apodosis (*q*), it becomes possible to reinterpret a scalar concessive conditional sentence (‘even if *p*, then *q*’) as a concessive sentence (‘although *p*, *q*’), that is, a sentence with the presupposition ‘normally if *p*, then not *q*’. Below I list the contexts discussed by König (1986: 236–237) which favour such changes, along with examples:

- “(i) all focus particles (*but, just, only, even, so much as*) which may evaluate their focus value as ranking low on some scale, e.g.:
- (11) *If you drink (but/only/just/so much as/even) a drop of alcohol, your boss will fire you.*
 [= (24a) in König’s paper]

- (ii) all expressions specifying extreme values in a certain propositional schema (e.g. *not drink a drop, drink a whole bottle*), e.g.:
- (12) *If I drink a bottle of alcohol, my boss won't fire me.* [= (24b) in König's paper]
- (iii) all superlatives and pseudo-superlatives like the following:
- (13) *If I were Rockefeller, I would not be able to pay for this.* [= (23) in König's paper]
- (iv) free-choice quantifiers like *any*."

These observations made by König are valuable for the analysis of Old Polish and Old East Slavic data. All the examples below are taken from *Słownik staropolski* (vol. 1) and Sreznevskij's dictionary. In the earliest Polish texts, the conjunction *acz* was most frequently used as a conditional conjunction. However, in (14), we encounter it in combination with the restrictive particle *jedno*, 'acz gyedno' 'if only' and the result is a conditional concessive sentence, see König's example given in (11) above (*If you drink only...*):

- (14) *Poth wszchodem gy naydzecz/e, acz go gyedno szykacz chczecze.*
(*The Legend of Saint Alexius*, l. 208; 15th century)
'You will find him at the entrance if only you wish to look for him.'

Let us compare sentence (14) with sentence (15), in which the conjunction *acz* is combined with the enclitic restrictive particle *-le* 'only'. In this case, *aczle* is a concessive conjunction ('although').

- (15) *Vbodzi duchem są nawyączzey czy, gisch gymyeny a tego swyata czczy ny zacz nye wazq, aczle ge mayq.*
(*Ewangelia ś. Mateusza r. V 1–12. Kazanie na dzień Wszech Świętych*. 15th century. Here cited after: *Słownik staropolski* vol. 1: 19)¹⁰
'The meekest are those for whom possessions and honours of this world are nothing, although they have them.'

In (16), we have an example of a sentence with an extreme value (cf. König's *If I drink a bottle of alcohol...*). It can be interpreted as a conditional concessive ('even if') or as concessive ('although') sentence. If we make the presupposition 'normally if *p*, then not *q*', then we have a concessive sentence, and this is the interpretation I have adopted following the *Old Polish Dictionary*.

- (16) *Acz (si) vstawø przeciwò mne grodi, ne bødze se bacz serce moie.*
(*Saint Florian Psalter*, Psalm 27:3, late 14th century)
'Though an army may stand against me, my heart shall not fear.'

Regarding the sequence in which a conditional conjunction is followed by a focusing particle, a good illustration is the Old East Slavic combination *ače i* 'although'

¹⁰ Malinowski L. (ed.) 1895. *Ewangelia ś. Mateusza r. V 1–12. Kazanie na dzień Wszech Świętych. Zabytki języka polskiego z wieku XV, z rękopisu DLII Biblioteki Kapitulnej w Pradze.* [= *Rozprawy i Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń Wydziału Filologicznego Akademii Umiejętności*. Kraków 1874–1891]. Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności.

(Sreznevskij 1893, vol. 1: 34). Since the Slavic conjunction *i* ‘and’ could also function in Old East Slavic as an additive scalar particle ‘even’, OES *ače i* ‘although’ (< literally *‘if even’) in (17) can be easily explained through parallels such as MoE *even if* or Lat. *etsi* ‘even if; although’.

- (17) *Davydъ аче i naslалъ былъ Mъstislava na moja synovcę... to jazъ Mъstislava daju tobě bezъ iskupa.* (Hypatian Codex, year 6704)
 ‘Although David had sent Mstislav against my nephew... I give you Mstislav without any ransom.’

The shift from a conditional conjunction to a concessive conjunction also helps us to understand the semantic change in the case of the West Slavic conjunction **lěče* > *leč*. The expected meaning of **lěče* is ‘if only’ (**lě-* ‘only’, *-če* ‘if’), and this is the meaning attributed to Old Czech *leč* in Gebauer’s dictionary. From the conditional meaning, it is easy to derive Old Czech *leč* ‘or’. The concessive meaning in Lower Sorbian *lěc/lec* should be considered secondary to the conditional use attested in Old Czech. The most recent is the adversative meaning of *leč*, not attested in Old Czech texts. Describing the conditions under which *leč* was reinterpreted as an adversative conjunction goes beyond the scope of this article and requires a meticulous analysis of Czech material.¹¹

4. Conclusions

- a) The article aimed to justify, from a functional perspective, the traditional etymology according to which the Slavic conjunction *ače* ‘if’ continues the combination of the Slavic conjunction *a* with the IE enclitic **-k^we* ‘and’. The Slavic conditional enclitic *-če* ‘if’ < IE **-k^we* is an Indo-European archaism, whose conditional function is also attested in Indo-Iranian, Hittite, and Latin. Secondarily, from a conditional conjunction it evolved into a concessive conjunction. The article identified contexts that favoured this change. It appears that the change from a conditional conjunction to a concessive conjunction is unidirectional and should be considered an example of grammaticalization. The article also provided new material for a future description of the reasons for the functional change from a connective conjunction to a conditional conjunction.
- b) The proposed explanation also sheds light on the origin of the West Slavic conjunction **lěče* > *leč* (e.g. Pol. *lecz* ‘but’). The expected meaning of **lěče* is ‘if only’ (*lě-* ‘only’, *-če* ‘if’), and this is precisely the function given for Old Czech *leč*

¹¹ As a working hypothesis, I suggest that the adversative function evolved from the concessive function because in both cases, we are dealing with what has been referred to as *denial of expectations*, e.g. *Kupilem dobry, ale/chociaz tani samochód* ‘I bought a good, but/albeit cheap car’. In other words, I expect that a good car cannot be cheap, but my expectations were not met. For further information on the concept of denial of expectations, see Sweetser (1990) and Malchukov (2004).

in Gebauer's dictionary. The conditional conjunction *leč* developed the following meanings: disjunctive (in Old Czech and Old Polish), negative conditional (in Old Czech and in 16th-century Polish),¹² and finally, concessive (in Lower Sorbian). Interestingly, Gebauer's dictionary does not list *leč* as an adversative conjunction. Therefore, it should be assumed that an adversative *leč* is a result of later changes that are still awaiting description. However, this already enables us to indicate different chronological layers in the inventory of the attested functions of West Slavic **lěče* > *leč* 'if only; unless; or; although; but'.

References

- ALEW = Hock W. et al. 2015. *Altltauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. [3 volumes]. Hamburg: Baar.
- Baetke W. 2006. *Wörterbuch zur altnordischen Prosaliteratur* (digital). *Vollständiges Faksimile der 1. Auflage (Berlin 1965–1968) zusammen mit Titelei und beiden Vorwörtern der zweiten, durchgesehenen Auflage (Darmstadt 1976) samt Korrekturen, erweitert um einen alphabetischen Stichwortindex aller im Wörterbuch verzeichneten altnordischen Wörter mit Flexions- und Wortklassenangaben*. Greifswald: Akademie Verlag.
- Dunkel, G.E. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstamme. Teil 1: Einleitung, Terminologie, Lautgesetze, Bibliographie. Teil 2: Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Eichner H. 1971. Urindogermanisch *-kwe* 'wenn' im Hethitischen. – *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 29: 27–46.
- Endzelin J. 1922. *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga: Kommissionsverlag A. Gulbis.
- ESSJa = Trubačev O.N. (ed.). 1974–. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- EWA = Mayrhofer M. 1992–2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. [3 volumes]. Heidelberg: Verlag C. Winter.
- Gebauer J. 1970. *Slovník staročeský. Druhé, nezměněné vydání*. Praha: Academia. [available at: <https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/informace.aspx?t=GbSlov&o=slovníky>, accessed: 2 February 2024]
- Girdenis A. 1979. Dėl nelūpinių sprogstamųjų priebalsių “maišymo” pietinėse lietuvių šnekose. *Baltistica* 15.1: 23–30.
- Haiman J. 1978. Conditionals are topics. – *Language* 54: 564–589.
- Haiman J. 1986. Constraints on the form and meaning of the protasis. – Traugott E.C., ter Meulen A., Snitzer Reilly J., Ferguson Ch.A. (eds.). *On conditionals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 215–227.
- Harris C.A., Campbell L. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath M., König E. 1998: Concessive conditionals in the languages of Europe. – van der Auwera J. (ed.). *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 563–640.
- Holvoet A. 2005. Nochmals zur Verallgemeinerung des o-Vokalismus in der thematischen Konjugation des Baltischen. – *Indogermanische Forschungen* 110: 267–272.

¹² As a parallel, cf. Lat. *nisi* 'if not, unless' (: *si* 'if').

- Ickler N. 1977. Topicalization and relativization in Old Russian. – *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*: 656–669.
- Klein J.S., Condon N.L. 1993. Gothic *-(u)h*: A synchronic and comparative study. – *Transactions of the Philological Society* 91.1: 1–62.
- Klemensiewicz Z. 1965. Składnia. – Klemensiewicz Z., Lehr-Spławiński T., Urbańczyk S. *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe: 393–508.
- König E. 1985. On the history of concessive connectives in English. Diachronic and synchronic evidence. – *Lingua* 66: 1–19.
- König E. 1986. Conditionals, concessive conditionals and concessives: Areas of contrast, overlap and neutralization. – Traugott E.C., ter Meulen A., Snitzer Reilly J., Ferguson Ch.A. (eds.). *On conditionals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 220–246.
- König E., Siemund P. 2000. Causal and concessive clauses: Formal and semantic relations. – Couper-Kuhlen E., Kortmann B. (eds.). *Cause – Condition – Concession – Contrast. Cognitive and discourse perspectives*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 341–360.
- Kuryłowicz J. 1957/1987. O jedności językowej bałtosłowiańskiej. – *Biuletyn PTJ* 16: 71–113. [Here cited after: Kuryłowicz J. 1987. *Studia językoznawcze. Wybór prac opublikowanych w języku polskim*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe: 355–397.
- Malchukov A.L. 2004. Towards a semantic typology of adversative and contrast marking. – *Journal of Semantics* 21: 177–198.
- MEC: Middle English compendium [available at: <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary>, accessed: 2 February 2024].
- Meillet A. 1902. *Études sur l'étymologie & le vocabulaire du vieux Slave*. Paris: Librairie Émile Bouillon.
- Meillet A., Vaillant A. 1965. *Le slave commun*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Ostrowski N. 2010. Latvian jeb 'or' – from conditional to disjunctive conjunction. – Nau N., Ostrowski N. (eds.). *Particles and connectives in Baltic*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Asociacija „Academia Salensis“: 135–150.
- Ostrowski N. 2017. “Natural coordination” and the origin of the Lithuanian conjunction *bei* ‘and’, with comments on Old Prussian-Lithuanian language contact. – *Baltistica* 52.1: 47–64.
- Otrębski J. 1958. *Gramatyka języka litewskiego. Tom 1: Wiadomości wstępne. Nauka o głoskach*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Snoj M. 2015. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša. SP: *Słownik prasłowiański*. [vol. 1]. 1974. Sławski F. (ed.). Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Sreznevsky I. 1893. *Materials for a dictionary of Ancient Russian per written records*. Vol. 1: A–K. Sankt Petersburg: Akademiia Nauk.
- SStp: *Słownik staropolski*. 1953–1987. [vol. 1–9]. Urbańczyk S. (ed.). Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. 1988–2002. [vol. 10–11]. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Sweetser E. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott E.C. 1985. Conditional markers. – Haiman J. (ed.). *Iconicity in syntax*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 289–307.
- Vermeer W. 2014. Early Slavic dialect differences involving the consonant system. – *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 40: 181–228.

- Viti C. 2006. *And* in the Early Indo-European languages. – *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* XCI.2: 129–165.
- Wackernagel J. 1942/1955. Indogermanisch $*-q^u e$ als alte Nebensatzleitende Konjunktion. *KZ* 67, 1–5. [Here cited after: Wackernagel J. 1955. *Kleine Schriften*. [vol. 1]. Göttingen: Kommissionsverlag Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht: 257–261].
- Watkins C. 1985/1994. Indo-European $*-k^w e$ 'and' in Hittite. – Ölberg H. M., Schmidt G. (eds.). *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen. Festschrift für Johann Knobloch*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft: 491–497. [Here cited after: Watkins C. 1994. *Selected Writings. Vol. 1: Language and Linguistics*. ed. by L. Oliver. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft: 200–206.]
- Wälchli B. 2005. *Co-compounds and natural coordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- West M.L. 2011. *Old Avestan syntax and stylistics. With an edition of the texts*. Berlin: De Gruyter.