Wackernagel Enclitics in Non-Wackernagel Positions in the Rigveda

Götz Keydana

1. Introduction

To my knowledge Bartholomae (1886: 3) was the first to claim that "[a]uch bei oberflächlicher Betrachtung drängt sich die Wahrnehmung auf, dass im RV. die enklitischen Formen der Personalpronomina, sowie gewisse Partikeln, in den meisten Fällen die zweite Stelle innerhalb des Verses oder des Vers-Abschnitts einnehmen." Thus, the clitic pronouns of Vedic Sanskrit have long since been treated as clear cases of Wackernagel enclisis. While the general impression is certainly true, in this paper I take a look at the most extreme deviation from Bartholomae's generalization, clitic pronouns in verse- and sentence-final position.

1.1 The regular pattern

In Vedic Sanskrit, two types of so-called second position (2P) or Wackernagel clitics are attested.[1] While particles, which make up the first type, are always placed after the first word of a sentence, the placement of the second type, enclitic pronouns, is much more involved.[2] The most straightforward case is illustrated by ex. (1), where the clitic is hosted by the first word of the sentence:

(1) *t_uvā́ṃ no asyā́ uṣáso v_iuṣṭau*
t_uvā́ṃ sū́ra údite bodhi gopā́ḥ

1 In the literature, often a third type is assumed. However, particles of this type like e.g. *cid* are not Wackernagel clitics in the strict sense, as they are always immediately adjacent to the topic they scope over. The fact that they occur in the left periphery is thus merely a consequence of the fact that topics tend to surface sentence-initially.

2 Since the placement of particles is irrelevant for the purpose of this paper, I will not elaborate on this difference. It should, however, be noted that other than in Classical Greek it is not one between clausal and sentential clitics, a pattern called splaying by Goldstein (2016: 58).

Veröffentlicht in: Siglinde Dietz, Ines Fornell, Konrad Klaus (Hrsg.): *Vidyārādhanam. Festschrift zu Ehren von Thomas Oberlies.* Heidelberg: Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing, 2026.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11588/hasp.1699.c24818>

"You at the breaking of this dawn, you at the rising of the sun — become our herdsman!" RV 3.15.2ab[3]

Note that the position of the head, *gopā́ḥ*, is obviously irrelevant for the placement of the clitic. In ex. (1), the host, *tuvám*, is a constituent. It may, however, also be part of a larger constituent, as in ex. (2):

(2) *váriṣṭho asya dákṣiṇām iyarti*
índro maghónāṃ tuvikūrmítamaḥ
"Indra, the most excellent, the most powerfully ranging of the bounteous ones, sets in motion his priestly gift." RV 6.37.4ab

In this case the host is a fronted adjective modifying the subject, *índraḥ*, in b. While examples like (1) and (2) seem to corroborate the impression that type-1 clitics, too, are hosted by the first word, another two patterns are attested which challenge this view. On the one hand, there are rare instances where the clitic is placed after an uninterrupted complex constituent as in (3):[4]

(3) *víśve devā́ no adyā́ s$_u$astáye*
"Let all the gods be there today for our well-being." (my translation, GK) RV 5.51.13a

This pattern points to an interpretation of second position in terms of constituents, not simply words. Ex. (1) fits this revised interpretation easily. The case of ex. (2) is slightly less straightforward. However, hyperbaton implies that even under an analysis where *váriṣṭhaḥ* is assumed to be extracted from the *índraḥ*-NP it forms a proper constituent of its own. On the other hand, cases like (4) are attested. Here, the enclitic pronoun is preceded by two distinct syntactic constituents, in this case the nominative *índraḥ* and the accusative interrogative pronoun *kím*:

(4) *kím asya máde kím $_u$ asya pītā́v*
índraḥ kím asya sakh$_i$yé cakāra

3 All Rigvedic examples follow the metrically restored text of van Nooten & Holland 1994. Restored vowels are indicated by subscript characters. If not indicated otherwise, the translation is taken from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

4 See already Luraghi (1990: 44) for Vedic prose.

> "What did Indra create in the exhilaration of it [sc. Soma], what at its drinking? what in its fellowship?" RV 6.27.1ab

This pattern seems to indicate that the clitic is neither attached to the first word nor to the first syntactic constituent, but rather to the left periphery of a sentence. The left periphery consists of a slot for constituents with high discourse prominence (focal material as in the case of ex. (1) or topicalized material as in exx. (2)–(4)) plus an additional slot which, if filled, contains either a fronted pronoun as in ex. (4) or a complementizer as in ex. (11).[5]

Various proposals have been put forward to account for this pattern. See *inter alios* Lowe (2011) and Keydana (2011). In the latter paper, to which I will return briefly in section 3, it was argued that the placement of type-1 clitics can be accounted for by prosody alone.[6] The reasons for choosing a strictly phonological account are twofold: Firstly, we know from the Indian tradition that type-1 clitics were unaccented. Thus, cliticization must at least be triggered by phonological deficiency, a fact any model of type-1 placement has to reckon with. Secondly, a prosodic approach allows us to deal with cases like (3) and (4) in a unified fashion by proposing that type-1 clitics are hosted by the first phonological phrase (φ-phrase) of an intonation phrase (ι-phrase). This analysis is feasible since assuming a weak version of match theory (Selkirk 2011) it can be demonstrated that the initial φ-phrase corresponds to the left periphery in syntactic structure (Keydana 2011: 104). It is further strengthened by an observation made in Keydana (2018: 226–227) where evidence was presented that contrary to type-2 clitics clitic pronouns in Early Vedic are independent phonological words (ω's).[7]

As already observed by Delbrück (1878: 48), followed by Wackernagel (1892: 407), the patterns illustrated in this section prevail in Vedic prose.

5 In an explicit syntactic analysis this position can be identified with Spec,CP or C° respectively.

6 At first glance this choice might seem obvious, see already Wackernagel (1892: 406) or for a more recent account Janse (1993). However, in the recent literature on clitics syntactic or mixed approaches combining syntax and prosody have gained prominence. The most notable syntactic (or rather syntax-centered, since the author acknowledges the possibility of prosodic inversion) account of Vedic clitics is that of Hale, e.g. in Hale (1995).

7 In this paper I will not spell out a formal model of clitic placement. The ideas presented in section 3, however, are loosely based on the analysis of Keydana (2011) which can be captured in an optimality-theoretical ranking Align(WL1,r / φ-phrase,r) >> Align(WL1,l / ι-phrase,l) >> φ-phrase ≠ ω. The alignment constraints align the right and the left edge of a type-1 clitic respectively with the same edge of a phonological and an intonation phrase. φ-phrase ≠ ω is a constraint negatively defining the minimal shape of the phonological phrase.

However, the picture we are confronted with in the Rigveda is far less clear. While Bartholomae was right in claiming that there is an obvious tendency for clitic pronouns to be placed in the left periphery, they are actually attested in all conceivable positions within both verse and sentence.

1.2 Deviations from the standard pattern

As "in den meisten Fällen" in the quote from Bartholomae already indicates, exceptions to a placement of clitic pronouns in the left periphery are indeed attested. Actually, they are quite frequent. See e.g. exx. (5)–(7), all taken from the first book:

(5) *anarvā́ṇo abhí yé cákṣate no*
apīvṛtā aporṇuvánto asthuḥ
"The unassailable ones who watch over us have taken their stand, unclosing the enclosed (cows)." RV 1.190.6cd

(6) *sá vā́jeṣu prá no 'viṣat*
"When prizes (are set) he will help us." RV 1.81.1e

(7) *śakró yáthā sutéṣu ṇo*
rāráṇat sakhiyéṣu ca
"..., so that the able one will take pleasure in our soma-pressings and in our companionship." RV 1.10.5cd

In ex. (5), the enclitic pronoun *naḥ* stands in final position in the relative clause. Its host is the verb it is governed by. In ex. (6), *naḥ* is placed between preverb and verb which together form the complex predicate governing the pronoun,[8] while in ex. (7) it again follows its head, in this case a noun. Examples like these cannot be accounted for by any of the standard models. Obviously, these aberrant patterns are far too systematic to be regarded as mistakes. Also, we can hardly marginalize them by simply claiming that the strange placement is due to poetic license. As Jakobson & Bogatyrev have pointed out in their seminal paper from 1929, oral poetry is reigned in by what the authors call "preventive censure": the poets may stretch the possibilities their language

8 For the assumption that *prá* and *av*^{i}- form a complex verb see the frequent attestations of *prā́v*° in embedded sentences in the Rigveda.

allows for, but they cannot go beyond grammaticality. Thus, the following questions arise: Is the placement arbitrary or do we find identifiable patterns? And if so, how are these patterns related to the standard behaviour as attested in the majority of cases in the Rigveda and throughout Vedic prose?

2. Case study: *naḥ* in verse-final position

In a current ongoing project all instances of the type-1 clitic *naḥ* in the family books of the Rigveda (books 2–7) are collected and analysed. The pronoun *naḥ* was chosen because of its frequency and because of its polyvalence: Since it may be accusative, dative, or genitive, it occurs in a variety of syntactic constructions, both in the nominal and in the verbal domain.

As already argued by Bartholomae (1886) for Avestan, some of the exceptions to the placement of enclitic pronouns in the left periphery of the sentence can be explained by adopting his premise that "[i]n jeder dichtung nun, und wäre sie noch so waldursprünglich, müssen satz- und verszäsur zusammentreffen." (Bartholomae 1886: 14–15). Bartholomae's generalization thus correctly predicts cases like the following:

(8) *púruṣṭuta , krátvā naḥ śagdhi rāyáḥ*
"Much lauded! Help us with thy power to riches." RV 4.21.10c

In (8), the caesura after the fourth syllable coincides nicely with the syntactic boundary between the sentence-external vocative and the sentence itself and likewise most likely with a pause, because there is reason to believe that vocatives form ι-phrases of their own (Loewe 1923, Keydana 2021 [2023]). The match between intonation and metrical structure is less clear in cases like (9):

(9) *ā́ dhenávaḥ páyasā tū́rṇi arthā*
ámardhantīr , úpa no yantu mádhvā
"Let the milk cows, swift to their tasks, not neglectful, come close to us here with their milk, their honey." RV 5.43.1ab

Here too, the caesura coincides with a syntactic boundary, as *úpa naḥ* or more likely (*ā́*) *úpa no yantu* form a constituent. Thus, Bartholomae's conclusion, that "[d]ie enklitischen pronomina und partikeln lehnen sich an den ersten hochton im zeilenglied an" (1886: 31), still holds true. However, there is no evidence that this verbal complex formed an ι-phrase of its own. Rather, it

corresponds most likely to a φ-phrase inside a larger ι-phrase. We can conclude that it is unlikely that the caesura separating the break from the opening of the verse corresponds to a "satzzäsur" noticeable in speech.

Sure violations of Bartholomae's constraint are cases like (10) where the clitic is verse-final:

(10) *bhū́ridā bhū́ri dehi naḥ*
"O giver of much, give much to us." RV 4.32.20a

Obviously, *naḥ* is part of the cadence and thus not hosted by the first word bearing an *udātta* in its "zeilenglied". Also, it clearly does not form any syntactic constituent with its host; as usual, the cadence does not correspond to any linguistic unit. Verse-final clitic pronouns like this, which are not hosted by the first word or constituent of a sentence smaller than the verse, challenge the hypothesis that all type-1 clitics are placed according to some version of Wackernagel's Law since they are furthest away from their canonical position. For the pilot study reported in this paper, I zeroed in on exactly such cases.

The enclitic pronoun *naḥ* is attested 964 times in books 2 to 7. In 162 of these 964 attestations *naḥ* stands in verse-final position. In no more than 4 of these cases is the host part of the left periphery of a sentence smaller than the verse. In these instances, verse-final *naḥ* follows the complementizer *yáthā*:[9]

(11) *tásmā ukthā́ṃ janaye yáj jújoṣan*
nṛ́vān návīyaḥ śṛ́ṇávad yáthā naḥ
"For him I beget a hymn that he will enjoy, a newer manly one, so that he will listen to us." RV 7.26.1cd

In this example, it may be argued that *śṛ́ṇávad* is fronted to the discourse-functional slot in the left periphery of the Vedic sentence. The pattern is then similar to that of ex. (4) with both the DF-slot and C^0 filled. As type-1 clitics are regularly positioned at the right edge of the left periphery, the sentence matches our expectations. Slightly more complex is ex. (12):

9 Hettrich (1988: 284) observes that "[v]on den 64 Finalsätzen mit *yáthā* eröffnet die Konjunktion in 25 Fällen den NS, 39mal steht sie im Satzinneren", but does not account for this word order.

(12) *máma dvitā́ rāṣṭ$_a$ráṃ kṣatríyasya*
viśvā́yor víśve amṛ́tā yáthā naḥ
"Now as before, mine is the kingship of a lifelong ruler, so that all the immortals (are) ours." RV 4.42.1ab

Here, the complementizer is preceded by a full noun phrase, *víśve amṛ́tā*. Ex. (3) above illustrated the fact that full NPs are indeed attested in the DF slot. Ex. (12) thus allows for the same analysis as (11). Still, it is the only example in the corpus with such a complex left periphery.

While there are examples like (10) above where the placement of the pronoun does not seem to follow a recognizable pattern, such outliers are actually rare. Most cases of verse-final *naḥ* in the corpus fall into distinct patterns which, because of their systematicity, cannot be attributed to chance. The most important such pattern is the one where *naḥ* is hosted by its head.

2.1 *naḥ* hosted by its head

94 of the attestations with verse-final *naḥ* show a distinct pattern in that the host is at the same time the head syntactically governing the clitic pronoun. In 56 of these cases in books 2-7 the head is a verb. Frequently, it is an imperative as in (13). This, however, is simply due to the text sort and to the fact that the pronoun selected for this study is first person. Other finite verbs are attested. An example is (14). Note that in this example *naḥ* is a theme (and thus an object), while in most cases it is a beneficiary. This is the case of (15), an example with a verbal adjective.

(13) *áhā víśvā sumánā dīdihī naḥ*
"Through all the days, shine benevolently on us." RV 3.54.22d

(14) *ná yātáva ind$_a$ra jūjuvur naḥ*
"Sorcerers do not incite us, Indra." RV 7.21.5a

(15) *hásteva śaktím abhí saṃdadī́ naḥ*
"Like hands (clasping a spear) clasping power for us ..." RV 2.39.7a

With respect to the nature of clitichood in Vedic it should also be mentioned that in cases like (13) and (14) the host does not bear an *udātta*. While *pace* Wackernagel (1892) this does not imply that the verb itself is cliticised, it

nonetheless shows clearly that at least a prominent high tone is not a necessary prerequisite for hosts.[10]

Clitic pronouns may also be hosted within noun phrases. An example for this slightly rarer type is (16) with the collocation *pitā́ naḥ*, attested four times in books 2–7. In ex. (17), *naḥ* is hosted by a pronoun.

(16) *yā́ni mánur ávṛṇītā pitā́ naḥ*
"..., which our father Manu chose ..." RV 2.33.13c

(17) *mā́ no ví yauḥ sakhi̯yā́ viddhí tásya naḥ*
"Do not keep us far away from your companionship. Know this (speech?) of ours." RV 2.32.2c

Finally, *naḥ* may be hosted by a local particle. This pattern is attested three times with *úpa* (e.g. ex. 18) and once with *purás* (ex. 19).

(18) *ā́ vāyo bhūṣa śucipā úpa naḥ*
"O Vāyu, drinker of the clear (soma), attend upon us." RV 7.92.1a

(19) *pr$_{á}$ddho agne dīdihi puró naḥ*
"When you are kindled forth, Agni, shine in front for us."
Or with Geldner: "Entzündet leuchte uns voran, Agni." RV 7.1.3a

Cases like (18) are best analysed as prepositional phrases, while for ex. (19) such an analysis is possible but not mandatory (see the translation of Jamison & Brereton as against that of Geldner). To sum up: The most frequent pattern of verse- and sentence-final *naḥ* is such that the clitic is hosted inside the phrase it belongs to. See below 2.3. for parallels from other ancient IE languages and 3. for an analysis.

2.2 Framing

In an interesting pattern which is again too frequent to dismiss, verse- and sentence-final *naḥ* is governed by a sentence-initial head. This pattern occurs 44 times in books 2–7 (17 of which are identical, see ex. (21)). It is most frequently attested with verbs. Cf. ex. (20):

10 See Keydana 2021 [2023] for an analysis of main verb tone patterns in terms of intonation.

(20) *rā́si kṣáyaṃ rā́si mitrám asmé*
rā́si śárdha indra mā́rutaṃ naḥ
"Grant us peaceful dwelling. Grant us alliance. Grant us a Marutian warrior band, o Indra." RV 2.11.14ab

This example is especially remarkable since the poet alternates between tonal *asmé* and clitic *naḥ* depending on metrical demands. Note that both the clitic and the tonal dative occur frequently in this position, the latter 43 times in books 2–7.

Ex. (21), a sentence occurring 17 times in book 7, illustrates a slight extension of the same pattern, as in this case the sentence is framed by a tonal subject pronoun followed by the verb at the left edge and *naḥ* at the right edge.

(21) *yūyám pāta s$_u$astíbhiḥ sádā naḥ*
"Do you protect us always with your blessings." RV 7.1.20d

The framing pattern is also attested with a filled C^0. This is the case of ex. (22), where the verb is preceded by *kuvíd*.

(22) *kuvín náṃsante marútaḥ púnar naḥ*
"Surely the Maruts will bow to us again?" RV 7.58.5b

The framing constituent is not necessarily verbal. Noun phrases as in ex. (23) are also attested, and rarely even what might be analysed as a prepositional phrase (ex. 24):

(23) *imáṃ yajñáṃ nayata devátā naḥ*
"Lead this sacrifice here to the divinities for us."
Or with Geldner: "Führt dieses Opfer von uns zu den Göttern." RV 4.58.10c

(24) *áti vā yó maruto mányate naḥ*
"Whoever disdains us, Maruts ..." RV 6.52.2a

In two instances, both in dimeter verse, framing encompasses a whole stanza. An example is (25):

(25) *dhānā́vantaṃ karambhíṇam*
apūpávantam ukthínam
índra prātár juṣasva naḥ
"Indra, enjoy [the soma] of ours accompanied by roasted grain, by gruel, by cakes, by hymns, early in the morning." (adapted from Jamison & Brereton) RV 3.52.1

Placement within its constituent and framing constitute the bulk of attestations of verse-final *naḥ*. Other cases exist, but they are rare and they do not seem to follow any particular pattern.

2.3 Comparanda from outside Vedic

The most frequent deviant type, that of Wackernagel placement inside a constituent smaller than the sentence, finds an exact parallel in various other ancient IE languages.

Wackernagel himself was certainly right to claim that clitic pronouns are typically placed in second position in Ancient Greek. However, there are exceptions, which Luraghi (1990: 43) explains as resulting from 2P in "il margine sinistro per l'ambito di collocazione". As an amendment to Wackernagel's survey of votive inscriptions (1892: 346-349) see e.g. the following examples from Athens:

(26) *Ὀνέσιμος : μ' ἀνέθεκεν : ἀπαρχὲν | τἀθεναίαι : ho Σμικύθο hυιός*
"Onesimos dedicated me as a primal offering for Athene, the son of Smikythos." IG I³ 699, ca. 500-480

(27) *Φρυγία : ἀνέθεκέ με ̣τἀθεναίαι | hε ἀρτόπολ*[*ις*]
"Phrygia dedicated me to Athene, the bread-seller." IG I³ 546, ca. 500

The type represented by (27) is extremely rare. It should also be noted that here the subject is separated by <:> from verb plus enclitic pronoun – this punctuation may reflect prosodic constituency (Keydana 2023). Luraghi (1990: 43) explains the possibility of phrase-internal 2P by the "ordine puramente pragmatico" of

Greek.[11] Actual placement is then according to her due to "le varie possibilità di collocazione dei pronomi enclitici per scopi pragmatici" (1990: 58). With respect to this proposition, exx. (26) and (27) are revealing, since from the point of view of information structure and pragmatics both inscriptions are, as far as we know, exactly identical. Still, the placement of the clitic differs.

While in Greek 2P in constituents smaller than the sentence is rare, the pattern is the dominant one in Old Lithuanian. Proper 2P, on the other hand, is exceedingly rare. An example of the latter is (28) with the clitic reflexive *=si* attached to *dėl*:

(28) *neturedamas wietos ant žiames delsi rangiančiu zmoniu*
"not having place on earth because of the crowding people" $KnN^{1}{}_{3}$ 159_{15}

This pattern is only attested with complementizers and relative pronouns (see Hermann 1926: 90, Sommer 2021: 65).[12]

Ex. (29) is an example of clitic reflexive pronouns in the verbal domain:

(29) *Jeib gerybe ir wiernybe ſu=ſi=tiktu=s*
"So that goodness and faithfulness meet each other" CII_{593} (Psalms 85:11)

Since in (29) the clitic is doubled, the example exemplifies nicely both types of clitic placement typical for Old Lithuanian. One clitic, *=s*, is an enclitic, which is typical for simplex verbs. The other one, *=si=*, is an endoclitic placed between preverb and verb. Endoclisis is best explained by assuming a prehistoric state of affairs where the preverb was still an autonomous word (like in Vedic matric clauses). From a historical point of view, thus, the clitic was hosted

11 As Luraghi herself acknowledges, this tenet does not hold for Vedic: *Pace* Viti (2007) and Reinöhl (2016) the language is underlyingly head-final; see especially the insightful work of Gunkel & Ryan (2011) on swappable bigrams.

12 The only exception to this rule is MgT_{4} $2_{5\text{-}6}$, *Neſſa kadangel wiſe=ſi tur iſchpaßinti, iog...* "Because everyone has to recognize for themselves that ...". This example is remarkable since it seems to be a case of clitic climbing, as the clitic reflexive is positioned outside its syntactic domain, the embedded infinitival phrase. What sets it even more apart is the fact that the clitic is hosted by a quantifier positioned after the complementizer(s). In a recent paper, Sommer (2021: 66) argued quite convincingly for the "Möglichkeit eines Druckfehlers".

by the first word inside the verbal complex (for a striking Vedic parallel see ex. (33) below). See Hermann (1926), Petit (2010) and Razanovaitė (2014) for more data.

A similar pattern is attested in Gothic. However, since Gothic does not have special clitic pronouns, it only occurs with particles. It is attested mostly with sentence-initial verbs, but there are exceptions, as e.g. in ex. (30):

(30) *iþ Iesus uz=uh=hof augona iup jah qaþ: ...*
ὁ δὲ ἰησοῦς ἦρεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω καὶ εἶπεν, ...
"And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said ..." John 11:41 CA

Here, too, the clitic, *=uh=*, is placed between preverb and verb. As with Old Lithuanian, this seems to presuppose a Vedic-like situation where preverb and verb did not yet form one (recursive) prosodic word. For more examples and analyses see Eythórsson (1995), (1996), Buzzoni (2009) and Miller (2019).

2P placement in the verbal domain is fully grammaticalized in Old Irish, the pronouns or argument indexes no longer being clitics, but rather infixes as e.g. in *no-m-ísligur* "I abase myself", Wb. p.17d22. See Griffith (2011). A similar development is attested in Tocharian (Peyrot 2019: 97–98).

It is difficult to interpret these data from a diachronic perspective. While proper 2P placement is most likely IE heritage, 2P in smaller domains may be inherited, but it may likewise be due to innovations in the individual subphyla. Except for Old Irish, Tocharian and Lithuanian, where the pattern became fully grammaticalized (in the latter case with reflexive verbs only), 2P in smaller domains is extremely rare. It should also be noted that outside of Vedic it is restricted to the verbal domain. Its infrequent attestation may point to an archaism. However, as is known from Romance, clitic placement in the verbal domain may also develop out of older Wackernagel patterns.

3. Towards a model for noncanonical clitic placement

In this section an attempt is made to sketch a way of integrating the patterns discussed above into the model of clitic placement laid out in Keydana (2011). As sketched above in section 1.1., in this paper I argued for a strictly prosodic approach to 2P.

In section 3.1. an extension of this model is developed to cover head-adjacent clitic placement, in section 3.2. sentence-final placement is dealt with.

3.1 Head-adjacent *naḥ*

The largest group of sentence-final *naḥ*-attestations comprises those where the clitic is hosted by its head. This pattern allows for two possible explanations: Firstly, it could be interpreted as obligatory head-adjacency, a pattern generally called the Tobler-Mussafia effect (see e.g. Billings 2002: 56 for a detailed exposition). If this analysis were on the right track, the pattern could not be derived from 2P, since for the latter head-adjacency is obviously irrelevant (see e.g. ex. (1) above). Thus, we would need two distinct mechanisms accounting for 2P on the one hand and head-adjacency on the other – a rather undesirable outcome since both occur side by side. Plausible evidence against the Tobler-Mussafia effect comes from five examples of noun phrases in my corpus where the clitic is not hosted by its head, but rather by an attributive adjective.[13] While the number is hardly compelling, they seem to confirm that the host is actually the first ω in the φ-phrase, not necessarily the syntactic head. See e.g. (31), to which the similar *priyó no átithiḥ* "our dear guest", RV 6.2.7b, can be compared:

(31) *susaṃsán mitró átithiḥ śivó naḥ*
"Mitra of good fellowship and our kind guest ..." RV 7.9.3b

I thus conclude that it is more likely that the frequently attested head-adjacency is simply an epiphenomenon of placement of the clitic in second position within its constituent.[14] Such an analysis has the advantage that it is fully compatible with 2P placement: the pattern would still be analysable as 2P, but 2P in the next-smaller domain. In this downgraded version of Wackernagel placement, the domain is the φ-phrase corresponding to the syntactic phrase headed by the syntactic object governing the clitic pronoun.[15] To illustrate

13 The fact that I abstained from looking for comparable data with the clitic hosted by a sub-constituent of a VP other than the verb is due to my ignorance as to the exact nature of the verbal complex. The most detailed account I am aware of is that of Hale (1995: chapter 2). However, his treatment of Vedic syntax relies heavily on theory-driven premises which cannot be tested empirically.

14 Thus, *pace* an idea pondered tentatively by Hale (1995: 202), cliticization within the clitic's constituent is neither restricted to VPs nor to the position following its head.

15 Hale (1995: 130–131), too, argues for the possibility that clitics are hosted within their syntactic constituent. If I understand him correctly, he seems to restrict this possibility to topicalized phrases. An alternative to phrase-internal placement would be to assume that the

this idea, I would like to take a new look at *pitā́ naḥ* from ex. (16). *pitā́ naḥ* is a noun phrase, the pronoun a genitive licensed within the phrase by the subcategorization frame of *pitár-*. Being postverbal, the phrase functions as an amendment to the subject *mánuḥ*. Both typological generalizations like match theory mentioned above and Early Vedic sandhi point to the fact that syntactic phrases correspond to prosodic constituents larger than the prosodic word and smaller than the ι-phrase, i.e. φ-phrases (Keydana 2018). In the case of verse-final *pitā́ naḥ*, this phrase, being positioned to the right of the verb, has most likely even an enhanced prosodic autonomy. Thus, we can assume that the noun phrase [$_{NP}$ *pitā́ naḥ*] is matched to a φ-phrase [$_{φ}$ [$_{ω}$ *pitā́*] [$_{ω}$ *naḥ*]].[16] However, this is where the downgrading ends: At least in cases where the clitic occupies the last position in the phrase, its host still seems to be the φ-phrase, not the preceding ω: this is evident from the fact that the final vowel of words preceding the clitic are regularly lengthened, a process restricted to the right edge of ω's (Keydana 2018). Cf. exx. (13) above and (32):

(32) *suvā́cam bhāgáṃ yaśásaṃ kṛdhī naḥ*
"Make a share for us that brings beautiful speech and glory."
RV 3.1.19d

In cases like that of the noun phrase [$_{NP}$ *pitā́ naḥ*], the placement of the pronoun immediately adjacent to its head may have been favoured by the fact that cross-linguistically φ-phrases identical in extension to ω's are avoided if possible (Inkelas & Zec 1995).

Before ending this subsection it seems worth pointing out that an up to now rather unsystematic look into sentence-internal *naḥ* reveals that 2P in φ-phrases is certainly not restricted to sentence-final placement. See exx. (33) with a noun phrase [$_{NP}$ *āśíṣo naḥ*] and (6), repeated here as (34), with a verbal complex [*prá no 'viṣat*]:

(33) *satyā́ bhavant$_{u}$, āśíṣo no adyá*
"... and let our hopes come true today." RV 7.17.5b

domain is a phase. This idea, for which see Roberts (2012), will not be pursued here because the assumption of phases is not so much motivated by empirical observations but rather by theory-internal premises.

16 The idea that units smaller than the clause play a role in clitic placement is not new. Fraenkel in a series of works beginning with his seminal paper from 1932 introduced the colon which can be equated with the φ-phrase or its syntactic equivalent.

(34) *sá vā́jeṣu prá no 'viṣat*
"When prizes (are set) he will help us." RV 1.81.1e

(34) is of special interest as it looks like the pre-stage of the Lithuanian (and Old Irish) pattern discussed above. Staying with sentence-internal *naḥ* for the moment, a complication arises due to examples like (35):

(35) *bhávā samátsu no vṛdhé*
"Be there to strengthen us in the combats." RV 6.46.3d

Here, the head follows the clitic which is either proclitic or hosted by a word within the same hemistich but outside its constituent. The latter option, introduced by Cysouw (2005) and assumed for Germanic verbal particles by Hill, Kölligan, Scheungraber & Frotscher (2019), may at first glance be preferable since it allows for a unified account of Vedic clitics as *en*clitics. However, further evidence for the possibility of proclisis comes from cases where *naḥ* is preceded by a vocative:

(36) *dadhikrā́m u sū́danam márt$_i$yāya*
dadáthur mitrāvaruṇā no áśvam
"Dadhikrā, who makes sweetness for the mortal, have you, o Mitra and Varuṇa, given to us as our horse." RV 4.39.5cd

In cases like (36), enclisis can be excluded with high confidence. As pointed out by Loewe (1923) and Keydana (2021[2023]), the so-called deaccentuation of non-initial vocatives in Early Vedic is best analysed as low tone intonation typical for a parenthesis. If this assumption, which is corroborated by cross-linguistic evidence, is correct, vocatives or vocative phrases form ι-phrases of their own, often accompanied by a pause at their boundary. Thus, in cases like (36) the clitic is positioned at the left edge of an ι-phrase. As a consequence, its only accessible host is *áśvam* to its right. I thus conclude that in cases like (35) the clitic is most likely hosted within its φ-phrase, albeit as a proclitic.[17]

The proposal given so far has an evident shortcoming: While it may account for the possibility of head-adjacent clitic placement, it has nothing to say about

17 Proclisis is also attested with Ancient Greek clitic pronouns, cf. Devine & Stephens (1994: 367) and Janse (2000: 246).

the reason why this option is chosen. I have no answer to this question. As mentioned above, Luraghi (1990) argued that in Greek this type of placement is triggered by pragmatic factors. In a similar vein, Adams (1994: 112) argues for Latin that in those cases where a weak pronoun is in second position in a constituent smaller than the clause, its host is typically a focal element. The same applies if the 2P requirement is not fulfilled at all. Now, while it is conceivable that information structure does play a role in clitic placement in Early Vedic as well, this hypothesis cannot be verified. Due to the very specific text sort of Rigvedic hymns, it is hardly ever possible to make testable claims about information structure. For head-adjacent sentence- and verse-final *naḥ*, I found only one instance in the corpus where the host is clearly prominent from the point of view of information structure: This is ex. (17) with verse-final *tásya naḥ*. The tonal pronoun is convincing evidence of emphasis; however, this isolated example hardly points to a rule.[18]

3.2 Sentence-final *naḥ*

Sentence-final clitics in framing contexts are the inverse of the standard 2P pattern: The host is not the first φ-phrase within an ι-phrase, but rather the last. In both the standard and the deviant case, the positioning is independent of that of the clitic's head. Accounting for this pattern on a technical level is rather straightforward: Based on an optimality-theoretical account of 2P one would simply have to invert the values of the constraint Align(WL1,l / ι-phrase,l) which forces the clitic to surface as far left in the ι-phrase as possible. Alternatively, one might start from the account of head-adjacent placement developed above: While with head-adjacent type-1 clitics the domain and the host are both the φ-phrase, sentence-final placement could be modelled by allowing for a variant where domain and host are still identical, but actually the ι-phrase itself. As far as I can see, the predictive power of both solutions is equal. However, even if the pattern can be modelled one way or the other, it still eludes a satisfying explanation. A tentative idea would be to start from the observation that Early Vedic assertive sentences ended in a

18 It should also be noted that the Vedic evidence contradicts a trend observable in the development of various IE languages: As shown e.g. in Janse (2000), Ancient Greek and Latin were rather canonical Wackernagel languages, deviations being explicable on pragmatic grounds. When the pattern became more grammaticalized in later stages of Greek and in the Romance languages clitics gravitated towards their respective head. Tighter grammaticalization from Early to Late Vedic on the other hand, makes canonical 2P the sole surviving pattern.

low boundary tone (see Loewe 1923). Since clitics are *anudātta*, it is tempting to propose that the right edge of the ι-phrase, bearing low tone itself, could quite naturally be extended by an additional low tone syllable, *viz.* the clitic. However, pending further evidence, this assumption remains *ad hoc*.

4. Conclusion

The study of verse- and sentence-final *naḥ* revealed first and foremost that such aberrations from the expected pattern are not random. The overwhelming majority falls into two classes, those following the 2P pattern in a domain smaller than the sentence, and those used in framing configurations. Due to this systematicity we can thus conclude that these patterns were fully grammatical and have to be accounted for by any model of clitic placement in Early Vedic.

2P in a smaller domain is most frequently attested with verbs. The pattern has clear parallels in other ancient IE languages like Greek or, more notably, Gothic, Old Lithuanian, and (the prehistory of) Old Irish and Tocharian. Despite these similarities it remains an open question if 2P in phrases (at least in certain pragmatically triggered contexts) is common heritage from PIE or rather a trivial recent development arising independently in the various subphyla. Notably, 2P in phrases is not restricted to the verbal complex in Early Vedic: there is clear evidence for 2P in noun phrases and most likely also in prepositional phrases. Phrasal 2P is not due to the Tobler-Mussafia effect.[19] While in most cases the clitic is hosted by its head, there are clear instances of *naḥ* hosted by an attributive adjective inside an NP. Thus, the pattern is best explained as a downgraded version of standard Wackernagel placement, the domain being a φ-phrase instead of an ι-phrase. Interestingly, there are attestations of *naḥ* preceded by a vocative and thus at the left edge of an ι-phrase. In such cases, it is inevitable to assume that the pronoun is proclitic.

Framing, i.e. the positioning of the head in verse-initial position and that of the dependent clitic in verse-final position, is again attested with various heads, verbs, nouns, and local particles. Framing is clearly a stylistic device, but the fact that the poets made regular use of it implies that it was acceptable to speakers of Early Vedic. The pattern can be modelled as a special case of 2P by assuming that in rare cases ι-phrases were admissible hosts.

19 Thus, the findings presented here do not contradict the alleged unidirectionality in the development from 2P to verb-adjacent clitics assumed e.g. by Viti (2016).

Thus, we may conclude that at least the dominant patterns of the placement of type-1 clitics are instantiations of the same underlying grammar, the only variable being the category of the host. While the picture emerging so far reveals more regularity than expected, it should be pointed out that this study sidestepped the discussion of exceptions to the two patterns identified. While being infrequent, they still need to be accounted for. I reserve this to a follow-up study which will also extend the investigation to a systematic treatment of verse- and sentence-internal clitic placement.

Bibliography

Adams, J. N. 1994. "Wackernagel's Law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Classical Latin", in: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92(2), 103–178.

Bartholomae, Christian 1886. *Arische Forschungen.* Zweites Heft. Halle: Niemeyer.

Billings, Loren A. 2002. "Phrasal clitics", in: *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10, 53–104.

Buzzoni, Marina 2009. "Ibai mag blinds blindana tiuhan? (Luke 6,39): Pragmatic functions and syntactic strategies in the Gothic left sentence periphery", in: *Filologia Germanica / Germanic Philology* 1, 29–62.

Cysouw, Michael 2005. "Morphology in the Wrong Place: A Survey of Preposed Enclitics", in: Wolfgang U. Dressler (ed.): *Morphology and its Demarcations*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins, 17–37.

Delbrück, Berthold 1878. *Die altindische Wortfolge, aus dem Satapathabrahmana dargestellt*. Halle a.d.S.: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

Devine, Andrew M. & Laurence D. Stephens 1994. *The Prosody of Greek Speech*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eythórsson, Thórhallur 1995. *Verbal syntax in the early Germanic languages*. PhD thesis. Cornell: Cornell University.

— 1996. "Functional categories, cliticization, and verb movement in the early Germanic languages", in: Höskuldur Thráinsson, Samuel David Epstein & Steve Peter (eds.): *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax.* Vol. II. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 109–139.

Fraenkel, Eduard 1932. "Kolon und Satz: Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes; I", in: *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, *Philologisch-Historische Klasse*, 1932, 197–213.

Geldner, Karl Friedrich 1951. *Der Rig-Veda. Aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Goldstein, David 2016. "Variation versus Change. Clausal Clitics between Homer and Herodotus", in: *Indo-European Linguistics* 4, 53–97.

Griffith, Aaron 2011. "Old Irish Pronouns: Agreement Affixes vs. Clitic Arguments", in: Andrew Carnie (ed.): *Formal Approaches to Celtic Linguistics*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 65–93.

Gunkel, Dieter & Kevin M. Ryan 2011. "Hiatus avoidance and metrification in the Rigveda", in: Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert & Brent Vine (eds.): *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen: Hempen, 53–68.

Hale, Mark 1995. *Wackernagel's Law. Phonology & Syntax in the Rigveda*. Montréal: Concordia University.

Hermann, Eduard 1926. *Litauische Studien. Eine historische Untersuchung schwachbetonter Wörter im Litauischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Hettrich, Heinrich 1988. *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe des Vedischen*. Berlin; New York: de Gruyter.

Hill, Eugen, Daniel Kölligan, Corinna Scheungraber & Michael Frotscher 2019. "The development of prefixation in Time and Space – Ditropic Clitics and Prosodic Realignment in Dialects of Indo-European", in: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 117(2), 157–198.

Inkelas, Sharon & Draga Zec 1995. "Syntax-Phonology Interface", in: John A. Goldsmith (ed.): *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 535–549.

Jakobson, Roman & Petr Bogatyrev 1929. "Die Folklore als eine besondere Form des Schaffens", in: *Verzameling van Opstellen door Oud-Leertingen en Befriende Vakgenooten opgedragen aan Mgr. Prof. Dr. Jos. Schrijnen bei gelegenheid van zijn zestigsten verjaardag, 3 Mei 1929 (Donum Natalicum Schrijnen)*. Nijmegen & Utrecht: Dekker en Van de Vegt, 900–913.

Jamison, Stephanie W. & Joel P. Brereton 2014. *The Rigveda*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Janse, Mark 1993. "The Prosodic Basis of Wackernagel's Law", in: *Le langues menacées. Actes du VX^e congrès international des linguistes, Québec, Université Laval, 9–14 Août 1992*. Sainte-Foy: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 19–22.

Keydana, Götz 2000. “Convergence and divergence in the development of the Greek and Latin clitic pronouns”, in: Rosanna Sornicola, Erich Poppe & Ariel Shisha-Halevy (ed.): *Stability, Variation and Change of Word Order Patterns over Time*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins, 231–258.

— 2011. “Wackernagel in the language of the Rigveda. A Reassessment”, in: *Historische Sprachforschung* 124, 106–133.

— 2018. “Word-final lengthening in Early Vedic”, in: *Journal of South Asian Languages and Linguistics* 5(2), 211–240.

— 2021 [2023]. “Accent or intonation? The vocative in Vedic. With an excursus to Greek”. *Historische Sprachforschung* 134, 196–213.

— 2023. „Constituent structure in non-informant languages: Evidence from inscriptions“, in: Theresa Roth, Emmanuel Dupraz & Valentina Belfiore (eds.): *Schriftkonventionen in pragmatischer Perspektive. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (Brüssel, 13.–14. September 2018)*. Leuven: Peeters, 268–294.

Loewe, Richard 1923. “Die indogermanische Vokativbetonung”, in: *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 51, 67–108, 161–220.

Lowe, John J. 2011. “Rgvedic clitics and ‘Prosodic Movement’”, in: Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.): *Proceedings of the LFG11 Conference*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 360–380.

Luraghi, Silvia 1990. “Osservazione sulla Legge di Wackernagel e la posizione del verbo nelle lingue indoeuropee”, in: Maria-Elisabeth Conte, Anna Giacalone Ramat & Paolo Ramat (eds.): *Dimensioni della Linguistica*. Milano: Franco Angeli, 31–60.

Miller, D. Gary 2019. *The Oxford Gothic Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nooten, Barend A. van & Gary B. Holland 1994. *Rig Veda. A metrically restored text.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Petit, Daniel 2010. *Untersuchungen zu den baltischen Sprachen*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Razanovaitė, Auksė 2014. *Lietuvių senųjų raštų klitiniai įvardžiai (XVI–XVIIIa)*. PhD thesis. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.

Reinöhl, Uta 2016. *Grammaticalization and the Rise of Configurationality in Indo-Aryan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Ian G. 2012. “Phases, head movement and second-position effects”, in: Ángel J. Gallego (ed.): *Phases: Developing the framework*. Berlin; Boston, Mass.: de Gruyter Mouton, 385–440.

Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 2011. “The syntax-phonology interface”, in: John A. Goldsmith, J. Riggle & Allen C.L. Yu (eds.): *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 435–485.

Sommer, Florian 2021. “Das litauische Reflexivum und das indogermanische Wort. Skizze einer Typologie”, in: *Historische Sprachforschung* 131, 58–95.

Viti, Carlotta 2007. *Strategies of Subordination in Vedic*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

— 2016. “Null objects and clitics in some early IE languages”, in: Rosemarie Lühr (ed.): *Idiosynkrasie. Neue Wege ihrer Beschreibung*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 13–32.

Wackernagel, Jakob 1892. “Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung”, in: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1, 333–436.