

Chapter 1

Introduction

George Walkden

University of Konstanz

Not every linguist has a law named after them, but, even among those who do, Jacob Wackernagel is exceptional. First, his law is one of very few (especially from the nineteenth century) that are *syntactic* in nature, having to do with the relative ordering of words. Secondly, it differs from the commonly recognized sound laws (e.g. those of Grimm, Verner, Grassmann and Holtzmann; see Collinge 1985 for an overview) in that its scope is tremendous: far from being a single, punctual event as were the sound laws of history under the Neogrammarian conception (Osthoff & Brugmann 1878), Wackernagel's law (he argues) left its traces in pretty much all of the Indo-European languages, even if its status as a synchronic principle of grammatical organization varies substantially. Thirdly, and relatedly, Wackernagel's law is still the subject of active research today among specialists in various languages, far beyond the Indo-European family which provided the context for the original law. That this is the case can be seen from the nearly 700 Google Scholar citations that Wackernagel's (1892) hundred-page article has accrued by the date of writing. Wackernagel's law can safely be said to have entered the coveted realm of being "more cited than read".

This introduction has three aims. In the following section we provide a brief biographical sketch, along with a quick summary of the article and a concise statement of the law itself. Section 2 discusses the law's subsequent reception from publication until the present day, again without pretence of being exhaustive. Section 3 outlines our rationale for, and the decisions we have made during, the translation process.



George Walkden

1 Jacob Wackernagel and his law of Indo-European word order

1.1 Jacob Wackernagel (1853–1938)

Jacob Wackernagel was born in Basel, Switzerland, in 1853, to a wealthy and academically-inclined family. Between 1872 and 1874 he studied at Göttingen under the Indologist Theodor Benfey, arguably the figure with the most influence on Wackernagel's own views and scholarship. Like many of the philological luminaries of the time, his studies took him to Leipzig, where in 1874–75 he took classes with the prolific and powerful Georg Curtius and the Neogrammarian founder-figure August Leskien. Shortly after this he returned to Basel, where from 1876 he taught Greek and Sanskrit, and in 1879 he was appointed Professor of Greek, this chair having been vacated by the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. Basel was where he would spend the rest of his academic career, with the exception of the years 1902–1915, when he occupied the Chair of Comparative Philology at Göttingen.

Wackernagel's publications for the most part focused on ancient and historical Greek, especially in the first half of his career: these include two book-length works, *Über einige antike Anredeformen* ('On some forms of address in antiquity'; 1912) and *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* ('Linguistic investigations of Homer'; 1916). Sanskrit was by no means neglected, however: his Sanskrit grammar (*Altindische Grammatik*) was his magnum opus (Langslow 2009: x), though only the first volume (1896) and the first part of the second (1905) were published during his lifetime. In 1936 he retired, and two years later, in 1938, he died, at the age of eighty-four. More detailed biographical treatments of Wackernagel can be found in Schwyzer (1938), Schlerath (1990), Langslow (2009: viii–xviii), and in particular Schmitt (1990).

1.2 Wackernagel's scholarship

On the whole, Wackernagel's attention was focused on concrete problems in the history or prehistory of specific Indo-European languages. He seldom wrote on general linguistic issues, with the most important exception being his two-volume *Vorlesungen über Syntax* ('Lectures on Syntax'; 1920; 1924), recently translated into English (Langslow 2009). Despite its name, this work is more focused

on the nature and properties of morphological categories than on syntax proper.* Nor did he devote much attention to comparative Indo-European linguistics *per se*: only Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Iranian featured in the titles of his published works and the courses he taught (Langslow 2009: xi). The article featured in the present book (Wackernagel 1892) is thus quite exceptional in its scope and generality.

The article is heavily dominated by discussion of Greek data: the first seven sections and 70 of 104 pages are devoted almost exclusively to Greek. Wackernagel turns his attention to Indo-Iranian in section VIII, closing with some suggestive remarks on Germanic (modern German and Gothic). Section IX starts with some similarly tentative comments on Celtic, but quickly moves on to Latin, which also occupies sections X and XI. From a comparative or general linguistic perspective, however, section XII – the final section, comprising the last ten pages – is the most immediately rewarding. Here Wackernagel engages with the modern German evidence in more detail, and discusses the scope of his theory and the diachronic development of the Indo-European daughter languages, especially as regards the position of finite verbs.

1.3 Wackernagel’s law

Wackernagel’s law is given in (1).[†] For other overviews of the law, its scope and validity, see Collinge (1985: 218–219), Krisch (1990), and Goldstein (2014).

(1) **Wackernagel’s law**

Enclitics occupy second position.

This simple statement immediately raises a number of related issues: i) Which languages or varieties does the law in (1) apply to? ii) What elements count as enclitics in these varieties? iii) What does “second position” mean more precisely? iv) Why would such a law hold?

The article is devoted primarily to answering i) and ii). As regards i), Wackernagel is clear that the law’s effects can be found in Greek (particularly Homeric

* Delimiting the domain of syntax was a hot topic at the time Wackernagel was writing: Ries (1894) in particular had opened up controversy. Wackernagel was fully aware of the limitations of his treatment of syntax and planned to address it in a third volume, which unfortunately never saw the light of day. [†] Collinge (1985: 218) notes that Wackernagel himself did not claim credit for the law, instead crediting it in the first volume of his *Lectures* to Delbrück (1878) on Sanskrit (see Langslow 2009: 57). Collinge therefore suggests that the law should be called “the law of Delbrück and Wackernagel”. Since it was Wackernagel who established the wider validity of such a law outside Sanskrit alone, we have retained the traditional attribution here.

Greek, with traces of the law to be found at later stages too), Latin, and Sanskrit, and on this basis concludes that it must have held in the ancestor language, Proto-Indo-European, as well. On Germanic and Celtic he is more tentative. The answer to ii) is extensional: a non-exhaustive list made up primarily of particles and pronouns, some of which, Wackernagel notes, are more prototypical than others.

iii) would be seen as crucial by most present-day linguists,* but Wackernagel is not particularly explicit on this point (cf. Aziz Hanna 2015: 11). The obvious answer is that second position is counted in terms of words; however, though most of Wackernagel's examples can all be characterized in this way, not all of them can. Though not operating with anything like a modern constituency or dependency grammar, Wackernagel does employ the notion of *Wortgruppe* 'word group', and discusses relations between words. Yet 'constituent' or 'semantic unit' does not seem to be the appropriate way to understand the second-position requirement either. The waters are muddied still further by Wackernagel's discussion (at the end of section VIII) of examples from Gothic in which *word-internal* second position appears to be crucial, e.g. Gothic *ga-u-laubeis* 'do you believe?', with the interrogative morpheme *-u-* occurring after the first morpheme of the verbal form. Finally, Wackernagel is also not very clear about the *domain* over which the law holds: he most often uses the word *Satz* ('clause'), but he is flexible as to where clause boundaries actually lie, and this is one area in which later linguists (e.g. Fraenkel 1932; 1933; 1965; Ruijgh 1990) have sought to improve on Wackernagel's formulation. To some extent, then, second position for Wackernagel is a flexible notion.

Despite this uncertainty, Wackernagel's precision and level of detail when discussing the examples themselves can hardly be called into question. Sometimes (e.g. Harris & Campbell 1995: 24) Wackernagel's law is framed as a tendency. For Wackernagel himself, though, it was clearly not intended to be understood in this way. The close attention paid in every section to potential counterexamples – and the effort expended in trying to explain them away – is more reminiscent of the modern theoretical linguist's *modus operandi* than of the cataloguing and quantification usually associated with Wackernagel's contemporaries (e.g. Ries (1880), Behaghel (1923–1932)). Moreover, given the use of the word *Gesetz* 'law' in the article's title, and given that Wackernagel would have been well aware of how the term had been appropriated by the Neogrammarians for exceptionless generalizations (e.g. Osthoff & Brugmann 1878), it would have been bizarre for

* Cf. Zwicky (1977: 18–20) and Anderson (1993: 72–73). Halpern (1995), for instance, makes the case that there exist both 2W systems, in which enclitics follow the first word, and 2D systems, in which enclitics follow the first constituent.

Wackernagel to aim for anything else, even though he himself never identified as a Neogrammarian.* Clearly, though, Wackernagel is ready to concede that the law is not equally operative in all the diachronic stages of the languages in question, and this may be the reason why more recent linguists have attempted to water down his statement of the law.

Wackernagel also shares with the Neogrammarians (and with probably the majority of modern linguists) an approach to linguistic generalizations that is mentalist at its core. We see this, for instance, in his use of the term *Stellungsgefühl* ‘position-feeling’, with its echoes of Wundtian psychologism (see recently Fortis 2019 on the notion of *Formgefühl* ‘form-feeling’ and its use by Wundt 1874), even if this mentalism is rarely at the forefront of Wackernagel’s article. We also see Wackernagel’s mentalism, for instance, in his *Lectures on Syntax*, where in the first volume he distinguishes three types of linguistic relatedness: the first is “based on human nature, on general laws of the human psyche, fundamental relatedness” (Langslow 2009: 11), giving rise to syntactic features that are ‘best described precisely in terms of their universality’.

As to iv) – the “why”-question – Wackernagel hints at an answer without really spelling it out: enclitics are unstressed, and it was this property that led them to occupy the second position.† Wackernagel reaches this conclusion in section XII, where he aims to account for the disparity in modern German between verbs in main and subordinate clauses. The suggestion is that the basic position of the verb was final, and that at an earlier stage verbs in main clauses ‘moved’ (*rückten*) to second position in order to be unstressed.‡ Here Wackernagel also explores a more restrictive version of his law, in which only mono- or disyllabic verb forms were affected. (Later the rule became purely syntactic, and affected all verb forms in main clauses, whether stressed or not.)

If Wackernagel’s explanation for his law is fundamentally prosodic, then it differs in a crucial way from more recent proposals that have sought to build on Wackernagel’s insights. It is to the legacy of his law that we now turn.

* We thus fundamentally disagree with Aziz Hanna (2015: 250–251), who claims that Wackernagel never intended his law as a *Regel* ‘rule’. The fact that Wackernagel attempts to explain away counterexamples where possible, and the fact that he himself uses the term *Regel* ‘rule’ at several points in the article, both militate against this interpretation. † Hale (2017: 294–295) suggests that Wackernagel’s reasoning is based on Optimality-Theory-style competing motivations: there is a drive for enclitics to be initial, but they cannot occupy absolute initial position because that requires them to be stressed. Hence they occupy second position as a compromise. ‡ This movement-based account foreshadows early transformational proposals for German such as that of Bach (1962) by seventy years.

2 Reception and implications

Wackernagel's law has been described by Calvert Watkins – himself a key figure in the understanding of Indo-European syntax – as “[o]ne of the few generally accepted syntactic statements about I[ndo-]E[uropean]” (Watkins 1964: 1036). Writing in the early 1990s, Alice Harris & Lyle Campbell likewise call it “one of the firmest discoveries in the history of syntactic change” (Harris & Campbell 1995: 29), and Krisch (1990) describes it as “perhaps the only word order rule for Indo-European which has remained undisputed in its essentials since its discovery”.^{*} For more than a hundred years, Wackernagel's law was taken to be a robust generalization about the history of Indo-European syntax. Even more importantly, perhaps, the article triggered an outpouring of research into (en)clitics and the relation between syntax and prosody that has showed no signs of abating in recent years. An overview of the first century of this work can be found in the bibliography of Nevis et al. (1994), supplemented by Janse (1994), and the papers in Eichner & Rix (1990) and Halpern & Zwicky (1996). Particularly in the early 1980s, with the simultaneous flourishing of theoretical studies on the syntax-prosody interface (e.g. Klavans 1982; Kaisse 1985; Selkirk 1984; 1986; Nespor & Vogel 1986) and on cross-linguistic comparative syntax in the Principles and Parameters mould (e.g. Chomsky 1981; Rizzi 1982; Hale 1983), a cottage industry of clitic studies developed, which in the 21st century can safely be said to have lost its cottage status and developed into full-scale heavy industry. In this section we first detail the reception of Wackernagel's law within Indo-European studies, then discuss its more general relevance and implications during the latter part of the 20th century, before finishing with an examination of some more critical voices.

2.1 Wackernagel's Law in Indo-European (1892–1990)

The impact of Wackernagel's article within Indo-European studies and historical linguistics was tremendous from the beginning, and follow-up studies soon showed that other languages and varieties conformed to the same pattern that Wackernagel had identified.

Nilsson (1904) brings in Slavic varieties such as Old Bulgarian as well as varieties of modern Polish, aiming to show that Wackernagel's law applies here too. Ivanov (1958) argued that Wackernagel's law was relevant also to Lithuanian, and to Hittite and Tocharian, which had not yet been discovered at the time Wackernagel was writing (see also Carruba 1969; Hoffner 1973; Garrett 1990;

^{*} “Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz ist die vielleicht einzige in ihren Grundzügen von ihrer Entdeckung bis heute immer unumstrittene Wortstellungsregel für das Indogermanische” (Krisch 1990: 64–65).

Luraghi 1998 on Anatolian). As regards Celtic linguistics, the distinctive VSO order found in the Insular Celtic languages is explained by Watkins (1963), building on Vendryes (1912) and Dillon (1947), as closely linked to Wackernagel's law: certain enclitics had a close relationship with the verb, and drew it along to the beginning of the sentence as a host, resulting in verb-initial clauses.

Thurneysen (1892), who explicitly credits Wackernagel with the impetus to finish and publish his study, adduces word order evidence from Old French and connects its verb positioning to Wackernagel's law; this paper has itself been extremely influential within historical linguistics, spawning a substantial literature on clitic pronouns (see e.g. Wanner 1987 and Fontana 1993 for historical perspectives) and verb position (recently for instance Kaiser 2002; Wolfe 2018).

Within Germanic linguistics in particular, the focus during this period was on something that Wackernagel himself had addressed only tentatively: verb-second and the position of the finite verb. Ries (1907: 315–318) investigates word order in *Beowulf* and finds some support for Wackernagel's claims about the position of unstressed verbs, at least for auxiliaries and modals, but does not accept his diachronic reconstruction of asymmetric verb positioning for Proto-Germanic or Proto-Indo-European.* Kuhn (1933) built on Wackernagel through an empirical investigation of poetic texts from Old English, Old Norse and Old Saxon. He proposed two further laws: the Germanic *Satzpartikelgesetz* (clausal particle law) states that “clausal particles occur in the first dip in the clause, proclitic to either its first or second stressed word” (Kuhn 1933: 8), and the Germanic *Satzspitzengesetz* (clause-initial law), stating that “there must be clausal particles in an initial dip” (Kuhn 1933: 43). While Kuhn's second law is nowadays mostly considered to have been falsified (Momma 1997; Mines 2002), Kuhn's first law remains influential. Dewey (2006), for instance, posits a stage of “intonational verb-second” during which the placement of the finite verb in Germanic was regulated primarily by prosodic considerations.

Among the languages that were Wackernagel's main focus – Greek, and to a lesser extent Latin and Sanskrit – research during this period primarily strove to make the law more precise and to test its predictions in different types of texts and grammatical contexts. Work in this vein includes Dover (1960), Marshall (1987) and Ruijgh (1990) for historical Greek, Marouzeau (1907; 1953) and Fraenkel (1932; 1933; 1965) for Latin, and Hale (1987a,b) and Krisch (1990) for Sanskrit.

Not everyone was uniformly positive. Delbrück (1900: 81–83), while accepting Wackernagel's findings on enclitic positioning in general, argued against Wack-

* Hopper (1975: 15–16) claims that Ries (1907) and Delbrück (1907) both supported Wackernagel's view. In fact, neither of them did, at least as regards the specifics of the diachronic development.

ernagel's view that the verb occupied second position in main clauses in Proto-Indo-European, since, he argued, verbs in Indo-European were in general weakly stressed rather than entirely unstressed.* In his review of Ries (1907), he takes a similar but not identical position: in Proto-Indo-European, verbs were unstressed in main clauses and stressed in subordinate clauses, but their basic position was final in both cases; the development of asymmetric verb positioning as in modern German belonged to Germanic times (Delbrück 1907: 75–76).

Work on Wackernagel's law in historically-attested Indo-European languages evidently did not stop with Watkins (1964) or with the papers in Eichner & Rix (1990). However, the 1970s and 1980s gave the law a new lease of life by extending its linguistic range, and it is to this development that we now turn.

2.2 Wackernagel, clitics, and the syntax-prosody interface (1977–present)

Although Wackernagel did have a concept of linguistic universals, it evidently did not occur to him to think of his law as universal, or as a reflex of universal pressures. This suggestion was first made much later, by Kuryłowicz (1958: 613), in a commentary on Ivanov (1958), and was not really taken seriously at the time (cf. Watkins 1964: 1036). It was not until the flowering of work on clitics and prosody in generative linguistics of the late 1970s and particularly the 1980s that this line of thinking came to be pursued more systematically.†

Important early work by Steele (1975) on constituent order typology identified a category of languages in which modals consistently occupy second position; Steele links this to Wackernagel's law. On the basis of Uto-Aztec data, Steele (1977) suggests a diachronic relation between Wackernagel's Law and topicalization (cf. also Hock 1982). In both cases, the forces at work must necessarily be active far beyond Indo-European.

The decisive push towards more explicit theorizing of clitics came from Zwicky (1977). During the 1970s, with the rise of morphology as a separate domain in generative theorizing, clitics were occasionally alluded to as a challenge due to their apparently intermediate nature between bound and free forms (Matthews 1974: 166–169, Aronoff 1976: 3–4), on the borderline between the morphological and syntactic components of the grammar. Zwicky (1977) draws a distinction between three types of clitic:

* Delbrück (1900: 81) somewhat mischaracterizes Wackernagel (1892) when he claims that the latter argued for a subject-verb word order: Wackernagel (1892) is silent on the issue of what element occupies first position. † Wackernagel (1892) nowhere uses the simple term “clitic”, referring only to enclitics (*Enklitika*). The generalization of the term “clitic” to refer to both proclitics and enclitics in the modern sense seems to be due to Nida (1946: 155) (Haspelmath 2015).

1. **Special clitics:** clitics that show unusual syntactic behaviour and unusual phonological alternations as compared to their stressed free-form counterparts
2. **Simple clitics:** clitics that behave syntactically like their stressed free-form counterparts and are related to them through a general phonological rule
3. **Bound words:** clitics with no stressed free-form counterparts, which can be associated with words of various morphosyntactic categories

Zwicky (1977: 9) is also responsible for introducing crucial terminology in the study of clitics such as **host** (the word to which a clitic is attached)* and **group** (the host plus all of its clitics). Second-position clitics and Wackernagel's law also receive discussion. In fact, virtually all of the theoretical issues that more recent research on clitics has addressed are raised – if only briefly – in Zwicky's relatively short paper, including clitic positioning with respect to the host (pro-, en- or endoclitic[†]), relative ordering of clitics within a group, the phonological relation of clitics to corresponding nonclitic forms, the phonological integration of clitics with their hosts, and more.

A few years later, Zwicky (1985: 283) is able to speak of a “recent flurry of work on clitics”. Important roughly contemporary contributions include Klavans (1979; 1982; 1985), Kaisse (1982; 1985), and Zwicky & Pullum (1983); the latter, for instance, provide a set of diagnostics for distinguishing clitics from inflectional affixes, while Zwicky (1985) addresses the problem of distinguishing clitics from independent words. This flurry informed, and was informed by, more general proposals about prosody and the nature of the interface between syntax and phonology such as Selkirk (1984; 1986) and Nespor & Vogel (1986).[‡] Klavans (1995) is a book-length treatment of clitics from the mid-1990s, contemporaneous with Halpern (1995), which deals with the placement of a set of second-position clitics through an operation of Prosodic Inversion at the syntax-prosody interface.

* Zwicky (1977: note 5) attributes the term to Hetzron (p.c.). † Zwicky uses the term ‘endoclititic’ to refer to clitics that are word-internal but placed at morpheme boundaries. In more recent research the usual term for this is ‘mesoclititic’, with endoclititic reserved for the much rarer phenomenon of clitics that disrupt the root of the host; see e.g. Smith (2013). ‡ This is still a lively field today. To take just a few examples, Dehé (2014) challenges prominent theories of the syntax-prosody interface using corpus data; Bögel (2015) presents a full theory of the syntax-prosody interface within Lexical-Functional Grammar; and Güneş (2015) develops a derivational approach to prosody that is compatible with Minimalist assumptions about syntactic structure-building and the interfaces.

Another factor pushing Wackernagel's law back into the spotlight, during roughly the same period, was the expansion of cross-linguistic work in generative syntactic theory. Hale (1973) on Warlpiri and Kayne (1975) on French were two early works in this vein that engaged with the clitic question; however, with the advent of the Principles and Parameters research programme (Chomsky 1981; 1982; Borer 1981; Rizzi 1982; see Roberts 1997 for an accessible introduction), comparative generative syntax expanded dramatically. In this approach, language can be characterized in terms of a set of universal, invariant cognitive principles alongside a set of discrete points of variation, the parameters. Hale (1983) influentially proposed a Configurationality Parameter regulating the relation between syntax and the lexicon: one setting of this parameter allowed for "nonconfigurational" languages exhibiting relatively flexible orderings of constituents. Since Hale's theory was built upon Warlpiri, a language with substantial constituent order flexibility and "Wackernagel" clitic auxiliaries, it is unsurprising that this kind of analysis has also been popular for early Indo-European languages (see Ledgeway 2012 for extensive discussion).^{*} Borer (1981), Rivero (1986) and the papers in Borer (1986) present parametric approaches to cliticization in various languages.

Cross-pollination from Principles and Parameters can also be seen in contemporaneous theorizing about the typology of clitics. Klavans (1985) develops a theory of clitic positioning based on three parameters: dominance (initial/final), precedence (before/after), and phonological liaison (proclitic/enclitic).[†] This theory derives a version of Wackernagel's law (Klavans 1985: 117).

Work in the 1990s and 2000s, by generative linguists and others, explored the morphology, phonology and syntax of clitics in a very wide range of languages (see e.g. Halpern & Zwicky 1996; Beukema & den Dikken 2000; Franks & King 2000; Gerlach & Grijzenhout 2000; Bošković 2001; Anderson 2005; Roberts 2010; Spencer & Luís 2012; Salvesen & Helland 2013 for book-length treatments). Mention must be made of the now vast literature on clitics in Slavic (particularly South Slavic) languages (Radanović-Kocić 1988; 1996; Nevis & Joseph 1993; Schütze 1994; Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1995; 1998; Progovac 1996; 2000; Tomić 1996; 2000; Franks 1997; 2000; 2008; Franks & Bošković 2001; Franks & King 2000;

^{*} For Warlpiri, in the meantime, the idea of nonconfigurationality has been debunked (Legate 2002), and at the current state of research it is not clear whether nonconfigurationality remains a useful notion in linguistic theory. See also Legate (2008), who shows, *pace* Hale, that the notion of second position is not relevant to the Warlpiri clitic system, and that clitic placement is not conditioned by syllable structure, instead being best viewed as syntactic. [†] Klavans (1979; 1985) denies the existence of endocclisis in the sense of Zwicky (1977). The present consensus seems to be that endocclisis is cross-linguistically rare but possible (Harris 2002; Smith 2013).

Bošković 2000; 2001; 2002; 2016; Pancheva 2005; Migdalski 2010; 2012; 2016; Diesing & Zec 2011; Harizanov 2014; Despić 2017) and in other languages of the Balkans (e.g. Frâncu 2009 and Alboiu & Hill 2012 on Romanian).*

The modern understanding of Wackernagel and his insights has been shaped substantially by Anderson's (1993) influential paper *Wackernagel's revenge*. Here, Anderson picks up on the notion that there is a deep connection between clitic placement and verb-second constituent order. Since (he argues) clitic placement cannot be accounted for using syntactic approaches to verb-second, the picture ought to be reversed: verb-second should be accounted for using a technical apparatus developed for clitic phenomena. Following the morphological theory developed in Anderson (1992), he proposes that (special) clitics are phrasal affixes, i.e. the reflex of word-formation rules applying to phrases. Verb-second is then derived using exactly such a rule, realizing the inflectional features of a clause in the position after its first constituent: movement of the verb is a byproduct of the need for these features to be spelled out affixally in second position (cf. recently Bayer & Freitag 2020).† As Anderson acknowledges, his take on verb-second is substantially different from Wackernagel's in that he locates the explanatory action in morphology rather than in prosody, and substantially different from the consensus among generative syntacticians in that he locates the explanatory action in morphology rather than in syntax.

In Anderson (2005) this perspective is further developed, along with a new typology of clitics, building on and replacing that of Zwicky (1977). For Anderson, the crucial distinction is between **simple** and **special** clitics: Zwicky's category of bound words plays no role. Special clitics are those whose positioning is governed by a set of principles distinct from those regulating free forms. Crucially, for Anderson (unlike Zwicky), special clitics are purely morphosyntactically defined, and may or may not be phonological clitics. Simple clitics then are those phonological clitics that do *not* display any aberrant morphosyntactic behaviour. This dichotomy has been adopted in a variety of subsequent work (see e.g. Bögel 2015: 95).‡

Clitics and Wackernagel's findings also become relevant to general linguistics during the same period as part of grammaticalization theory. Givón (1971), in making the case that bound morphemes originate diachronically via cliticization

* Frâncu (2009) proposes that Wackernagel's law was operative in historical Romanian; Alboiu & Hill (2012) make the case that it wasn't. † More recently the relation between second-position clitic systems and verb-second has also been explored in depth by Migdalski (2010; 2016). Bošković (2019) argues against a unification of verb-second and second-position clitics. ‡ Special clitics, although perhaps the most interesting type of clitics theoretically, are not uncontroversial: see Spencer & Luís (2012) and particularly Bermúdez-Otero & Payne (2011) for critical discussion.

of originally independent words, had effectively rediscovered the phenomenon of grammaticalization (Meillet 1912; cf. also Kuryłowicz 1965). Lehmann (2015), first published in working-paper form in 1982 and in wider circulation from 1995 onwards, gave the programmatic impetus to researchers in this area. Lehmann describes the increase in bondedness that grammaticalizing items undergo as the first step of coalescence: “the subordination of the grammaticalized item under an adjacent accent, called cliticization” (Lehmann 2015: 157). Though the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization remain better studied than its phonological and morphological aspects, there are several works within grammaticalization theory on the cline FREE WORD > CLITIC > AFFIX: Schiering (2006; 2010), for instance, presents a cross-linguistic study of the process, showing that the overall phonological profile of the language significantly influences the ultimate fate of individual words and clitics.

The development from affix to clitic has also been taken as evidence for the existence of degrammaticalization. Norde (2001), for instance, discusses the Swedish possessive *-s* in this connection. This *-s* originated as a well-behaved morphological genitive case ending, but in the Early Modern Swedish period appears to be a clitic marking possession, as it attaches at the end of a phrase, e.g. *konungen i Danmarcks krigzfolck* ‘the king of Denmark’s army’. In response, Börjars (2003) argues that the placement of an element must be distinguished from its attachment: Swedish *-s* is still an affix rather than a clitic, because it is attached as an affix, even though it is placed with respect to a phrase (cf. Anderson (1993) on phrasal affixes, discussed above). Börjars observes that true group genitives in which the *-s* ending is found on an element other than a noun are few and far between, suggesting that the ending still has a strong preference to be attached to nouns. If *-s* is not a clitic, then its development since Old Swedish is not an instance of degrammaticalization.* This is not the only purported instance of the development clitic > affix, however: Kiparsky (2012) lists many more, including the Setu and Võru (South Estonian) abessive case suffix *-lta*, which has become an abessive clitic. Debonding seems to exist, then, though the question remains why this direction of change appears to be rarer than the alternative. Kiparsky (2012) suggests that such instances of degrammaticalization only occur under strong analogical pressure (cf. Plank 1995).

This section has shown that research on clitics and on the relationship between syntax, phonology and morphology has blossomed beyond anything that Wackernagel could have foreseen in 1892 – both in terms of theoretical directions

* In response, Norde (2010) downplays the importance of change in morphological status (“debonding”), arguing that other aspects also indicate that degrammaticalization has taken place.

and in terms of languages investigated. Jacob Wackernagel undoubtedly deserves pride of place as progenitor of a large and fertile family of investigations. Closer to home, however, Wackernagel's law has been called into question for the very languages for which it was proposed, and this is the topic of the next subsection.

2.3 The clitics and the critics (1990–present)

As we have seen, in summaries as late as the 1980s and 1990s Wackernagel's law is still presented as a robust generalization about early Indo-European languages (cf. also Collinge 1985). However, writing in the early 2000s, Clackson (2007: 168) observes that Wackernagel's Law "now looks more problematic than it did forty years ago".

The most robust challenge to Wackernagel's law is presented in a pair of works by Adams (1994a,b). Noting that Wackernagel's own treatment of the Latin evidence was less than systematic, Adams starts by arguing, following Fraenkel (1932; 1933; 1965), that the proper domain for evaluation of Wackernagel's law is the 'colon', not the clause, and that this allows a number of apparent exceptions to the law to be explained away.* Even with this corrective, however, a striking number of exceptions are still found, leading Adams to propose that what has traditionally been viewed as Wackernagel's law (i.e. a second position requirement) in Latin is in fact better viewed as an epiphenomenon of a different law requiring enclitics to be placed after a focalized or emphasized constituent, which itself may or may not be in first position. Adams (1994a) explores this in relation to the Latin enclitic copula *esse*, while Adams (1994b) presents a parallel study on unstressed personal pronouns. Adams draws his material from classical Latin prose texts; Kruschwitz (2004) shows that Adams's conclusions also hold for the corpus of Latin inscriptions.

For Indo-Iranian, too, the empirical picture that has emerged is substantially more complex than section VIII of Wackernagel (1892) suggests. Hale (1987a,b; 1996), Krisch (1990), and Hock (1996) do not (like Adams) aim to supplant Wackernagel's law entirely, but their work has nevertheless led to a picture in which the law must be relativized to particular syntactic positions or configurations. More recent contributions to the debate on clitics in Sanskrit include Keydana (2011), Lowe (2014) and Hale (2017), the latter stating that "the empirical data for

* The colon (plural *cola*), a semantico-syntactico-phonologically independent unit, has never been particularly easy to define or to identify in historical texts. Scheppers (2011) (on Ancient Greek) suggests that cola correspond to the intonation unit (IU) of discourse analysis. Ledgeway (2012: 259–262) suggests that cola correspond to the phases of Minimalist syntax: CP, vP, PP and DP.

these languages is relatively poorly understood ... even in the specialist literature” (2017: 290). Keydana (2011), for instance, argues that Wackernagel clitics are not a homogeneous bunch, and can be split into three different classes:

1. WL1: enclitics that follow a *wh*-word if one is present, but otherwise occupy second position in a sentence.
2. WL2: clitics that always follow the first word of a sentence.
3. WL3: clitics hosted by the element they take scope over.

While WL1 clitics and WL2 clitics can in some sense be said to be “true” second-position clitics, WL3 clitics behave like the elements Adams (1994a,b) identified in that they are always enclitic to a particular constituent with a particular information-structural role, which does not have to be clause-initial. Moreover, following Hale (1987a,b), most authors working on Sanskrit clitics and second position have acknowledged that there is a discourse-functional syntactic position in the clausal left periphery that is somehow “outside” the clause proper and hence “does not count” for the positioning of certain enclitics (Keydana’s WL1 elements). The literature on Wackernagel’s law in Indo-Iranian is by now too large to be done justice to here, but it is worth noting that some of this work is explicitly concerned with the implications of these facts for the architecture of the grammar, and with finding the right division of labour between prosodic mechanisms, syntactic mechanisms, and brute-force stipulation, rather than simply describing the facts. Were Wackernagel alive today, it might well take him some time to see the connection between his simple law and the theoretically and empirically far more nuanced picture found in this recent work. In this sense, Wackernagel’s law in its narrow sense can be said to have been falsified for Indo-Iranian too.

Even in Ancient Greek, the variety most intensively investigated by Wackernagel, complexities arise that are not obviously captured in terms of a single second-position law. Taylor (1990) argues that Wackernagel’s law in its usual formulation does not account for Ancient Greek: unlike e.g. Dover (1960) and Marshall (1987), it is necessary to take syntactic (constituent) structure into account in order to arrive at the correct statement of the generalizations. Moreover, once again, different clitics exhibit different behaviours. Goldstein (2016: 80–84) shows, for instance, that the discourse particles *de* ‘but, and’ and *gar* ‘for’, both described as “sentence-domain” clitics, do not occur in the usual position following the first *prosodic* word, but instead show up after the first *morphosyntactic* word, where other clitics such as the unstressed personal pronouns behave more canonically. He also shows that there are instances in which *de* and *gar* appear

to follow the first *constituent*, rather than the first word. In one respect, though, Goldstein (2016) actually maintains Wackernagel's law in a stronger form than Wackernagel himself: *contra* e.g. Wackernagel (1892) and Taylor (1990), Goldstein argues that the law was fully operative in the Classical Greek period (6th–5th centuries BCE), and had not undergone a weakening since Homeric times.

The Kuhn-Thurneysen-Wackernagel hypothesis that Germanic and Romance verb-second order has its origins in Wackernagel's law applied to finite verbs has also largely fallen out of favour in recent years. Ries (1907: 23–24, 315–318) had already expressed scepticism, claiming that in the earliest texts there was no asymmetry between main and subordinate clauses, and Fourquet (1938) had been very critical about Kuhn's supposed laws. Kiparsky (1995: 159) notes that finite verbs in second position in early Germanic texts were (or at least could be) accented, thus rendering it unlikely that they were clitic elements. Getty (1997: 158) goes further, arguing that “the Wackernagel/Kuhn framework makes all the wrong predictions with respect to the behavior of finite verbs one can actually observe”, and that the crucial distinction instead seems to be between grammatical verbs (e.g. auxiliaries) and lexical verbs. Moreover, the question of how Germanic moved from a 2W system, in Halpern's (1995) terms – in which the verb followed the first word – to a 2D system in which it followed the first constituent is crucial, and has nowhere been addressed; there is no robust evidence for 2W verb-second anywhere in Germanic. More recent accounts of the emergence of verb-second (e.g. Hinterhölzl & Petrova (2010); Walkden (2012; 2014; 2015; 2017)) propose scenarios in which prosody plays no role, and in which the interplay between narrow syntax and information structure are central. As for Romance, it has been debated whether the historically-attested languages are adequately characterized as verb-second at all. Kaiser (2002) makes the case that they are not, while Wolfe (2018) argues that they are. Neither author connects verb placement to prosody, however, and neither author argues for a strict linear second-position requirement.

Strictly speaking, then, even given an appropriate definition of second position and the domain to which it applies, Wackernagel's law does not seem to hold at face value for *any* of the Indo-European languages for which it was originally motivated. This hardly means that the proposal was a failure, though. On the contrary, Wackernagel (1892) has been tremendously successful in stimulating research into clitics and second-position effects – within and beyond the Indo-European languages – even if an elegant, unified treatment is still lacking. At the very least, any theory of the prosody-syntax interface worth its salt will have to provide an account of the facts adduced by Jacob Wackernagel well over a century ago.

3 Notes on the translation and edition

Our aim with this translation is to enable today's linguists to understand Wackernagel's argumentation without prior knowledge of any language other than English. To that end, we've prioritized clarity over faithfulness, so that the translation is rather free. For instance, some of the English linguistic terms used in the translation would not have been current in the English of Wackernagel's time. Where possible we've tried to convey a sense of Wackernagel's rather idiosyncratic style, which jumps from stiffly legalistic to playful and back again within the space of a page. But this goal is secondary to conveying the linguistic point that he was trying to make. Those readers who are more interested in the history of language science or of philology should use this translation with care, and in conjunction with the German original, which is also provided in Section 3 of this book.

Wackernagel's original paper consisted of twelve numbered sections without names. For ease of navigation, we've added titles to these sections in the English translation. We also indicate, both in the translation and in the original text, where the page boundaries were, and link between the two; in the translated version the positions of these markers are necessarily approximate given the free nature of the translation.

Referencing norms in Wackernagel's day were substantially looser than they are now, and Wackernagel in his paper took for granted the existence of a canon of texts in classical philology that all his intended readers would have been familiar with. A major part of preparing this translated edition consisted in tracking down these references, in the versions that Wackernagel himself would have had access to, and referencing them in the text according to modern norms (author, year, and – where possible – page). The availability of many nineteenth-century books and journals via the Internet Archive and Google Books greatly facilitated this task. Where it is ambiguous which edition of a given text Wackernagel was intending to reference, we have assumed the most recent pre-1892 edition. All references from both the original and this introduction are given in full in the bibliography at the end of the volume.

The edition of the German text provided attempts to be as faithful to the original typesetting as possible. Where the original contains something ungrammatical or questionable, we have marked this with a following [sic].

I (George) initially started this translation as a solo project, but it quickly became clear that the translation of the German on its own, without glosses and translations for Wackernagel's many examples, would be about as useful as a chocolate teapot. Christina came on board at this point, and later also Morgan,

and the decision was made to gloss and translate all examples of four words or more, except in particularly repetitive sections. None of us have Wackernagel's compendious knowledge of the early Indo-European languages, and so substantial help was needed here. Morgan and Christina prepared the Greek examples, of which there are well over a thousand. In translating the Greek examples, we have made reference to the previous translations available through the Perseus site (<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>), and where necessary other sources such as Lobel & Page (1968); while we accept full responsibility for the translations presented here, in some cases it was not considered possible to improve upon the wording of an earlier translation. When Wackernagel's rendition of an example differs from that found in modern editions, this is mentioned in a footnote.

I'd like to thank Morgan and Christina for joining the team and putting in so much of their time and effort. We also offer profuse thanks to Moreno Mitrović for help with the Sanskrit examples, to Robin Meyer for the Old Persian examples, and to Christoph Dreier and Thomas Konrad for the Latin examples. Tina Bögel provided valuable comments on this introduction. For help with tracking down rare books, we also gratefully acknowledge the help of Samuel Anderson, Lieven Danckaert, Deepthi Gopal, and Bettelou Los; Lieven also helped out with a number of translations of Latin quotations from secondary literature, and Laura Grestenberger provided useful feedback on part of the translation. The new edition of the original text was prepared and typeset by Anabel Roschmann. Thanks to everyone for the team effort!

This book is dedicated to my dad, Bob Walkden – I've learned more about what it means to be a translator from him than from anyone else, and long before that he was helping me to learn how to be a person. Thanks, Dad!

References

- Adams, James N. 1994a. *Wackernagel's law and the placement of the copula esse in Classical Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Adams, James N. 1994b. Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Classical Latin. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92. 103–178.
- Alboiu, Gabriela & Virginia Hill. 2012. Early Modern Romanian and Wackernagel's law. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 25. 7–28.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1993. Wackernagel's revenge: Clitics, morphology, and the syntax of second position. *Language* 69. 68–98.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 2005. *Aspects of the theory of clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1976. *Word formation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Aziz Hanna, Patrizia Noel. 2015. *Wackernagels Gesetz im Deutschen: Zur Interaktion von Syntax, Phonologie und Informationsstruktur*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bach, Emmon. 1962. The order of elements in a transformational grammar of German. *Language* 38. 263–269.
- Bayer, Josef & Constantin Freitag. 2020. How much verb moves to second position? In Horst Lohnstein & Antonios Tsiknakis (eds.), *Verb second: Grammar internal and grammar external interfaces*, 77–122. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Behaghel, Otto (ed.). 1923–1932. *Deutsche Syntax*. 4 volumes. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo & John Payne. 2011. There are no special clitics. In Alexandra Galani, Glyn Hicks & George Tsoulas (eds.), *Morphology and its interfaces*, 57–96. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Beukema, Frits & Marcel den Dikken (eds.). 2000. *Clitic phenomena in the languages of Europe*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bögel, Tina. 2015. *The syntax-prosody interface in Lexical-Functional Grammar*. Universität Konstanz. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Borer, Hagit. 1981. *Parametric variation in clitic constructions*. MIT. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Borer, Hagit (ed.). 1986. *The syntax of pronominal clitics*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Börjars, Kersti. 2003. Morphological status and (de)grammaticalisation: The Swedish possessive. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26. 133–163.
- Bošković, Željko. 2000. Second position cliticization: Syntax and/or phonology? In Frits Beukema & Marcel den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic phenomena in the languages of Europe*, 71–120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Bošković, Željko. 2002. Clitics as non-branching elements and the Linear Correspondence Axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33. 329–340.
- Bošković, Željko. 2016. On second position clitics crosslinguistically. In Franc Lanko Marušič & Rok Žaucer (eds.), *Formal studies in Slovenian syntax: In honor of Janez Orešnik*, 23–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Bošković, Željko. 2019. On the syntax and prosody of verb second and clitic second. In Rebecca Woods & Sam Wolfe (eds.), *Rethinking verb second*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198844303.001.0001.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1969. *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding: The Pisa lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of Government and Binding*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Clackson, James. 2007. *Indo-European linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collinge, N. E. 1985. *The laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dehé, Nicole. 2014. *Parentheticals in spoken English: The syntax-prosody relation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1878. *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Çatapathabrāhmaṇa* (Syntaktische Forschungen 3). Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1900. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 3. Strasbourg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1907. Review of John Ries (1907), 'Die Wortstellung im Beowulf'. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 49. 65–76.
- Despić, Miloje. 2017. Suspended morphology in Serbian: Clitics vs. affixes. *Glossa* 2. 1–43.
- Dewey, Tonya Kim. 2006. *The origins and development of Germanic V2*. UC Berkeley. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Diesing, Molly & Draga Zec. 2011. Interface effects: Serbian clitics. *Syntax and Semantics* 37. 1–30.
- Dillon, Myles. 1947. Celtic and the other Indo-European languages. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 46. 15–24.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila. 1995. Clitics in Slavic. *Studia Linguistica* 49. 54–92.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila. 1998. Are Bulgarian pronominal clitics in the Wackernagel position? In Karen Gammelgaard, Audun J. Mørch & Ole Michael Selberg (eds.), *Norwegian contributions to the Twelfth International Congress of Slavists*, 7–32. Oslo: Universitetet i Oslo.
- Dover, Kenneth J. 1960. *Greek word order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eichner, Heiner & Helmut Rix (eds.). 1990. *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.

- Fontana, Josep. 1993. *Phrase structure and the syntax of clitics in the history of Spanish*. University of Pennsylvania. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Fortis, Jean-Michel. 2019. On Sapir's notion of form/pattern and its aesthetic background. In James McElvenny (ed.), *Form and formalism in linguistics*, 59–88. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Fourquet, Jean. 1938. *L'ordre des éléments de la phrase en germanique ancien: études de syntaxe de position*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. 1932. Kolon und Satz: Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes I. In *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 197–213.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. 1933. Kolon und Satz: Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes II. In *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 319–354.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. 1965. Noch einmal Kolon und Satz. In *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, vol. 2, 1–73.
- Frâncu, Constantin. 2009. *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521–1780)*. Iași: Demiurg.
- Franks, Steven. 1997. South Slavic clitic placement is *still* syntactic. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 4. 111–126.
- Franks, Steven. 2000. Clitics at the interface. In Frits Beukema & Marcel den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic phenomena in the languages of Europe*, 1–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Franks, Steven. 2008. Clitic placement, prosody, and the Bulgarian verbal complex. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 16. 91–137.
- Franks, Steven & Željko Bošković. 2001. An argument for multiple spell-out. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32. 174–183.
- Franks, Steven & Tracy Holloway King (eds.). 2000. *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1990. Hittite enclitic subjects and transitive verbs. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42. 227–242.
- Gerlach, Birgit & Janet Grijzenhout (eds.). 2000. *Clitics in phonology, morphology and syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Getty, Michael. 1997. Was finite verb placement in Germanic prosodically conditioned?: Evidence from *Beowulf* and *Heliand*. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 96. 155–181.
- Givón, Talmy. 1971. Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: An archeologist's field trip. In *Papers from the seventh Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, April 16–18, 1971*, 394–415. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- Goldstein, David M. 2014. Wackernagel's Law I. In Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek language and linguistics*, vol. 3, 508–513. Leiden: Brill.
- Goldstein, David M. 2016. *Classical Greek syntax: Wackernagel's law in Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Güneş, Güliz. 2015. *Deriving prosodic structures*. University of Groningen. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Hale, Ken. 1973. Person marking in Walbiri. In Stephen R. Anderson & Paul Kiparsky (eds.), *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, 308–344. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hale, Ken. 1983. Warlpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1. 5–47.
- Hale, Mark. 1987a. *Studies in the comparative syntax of the oldest Indo-Iranian languages*. Harvard University. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Hale, Mark. 1987b. Wackernagel's law in the language of the Rigveda. In Calvert Watkins (ed.), *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill*, 38–50. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hale, Mark. 1996. Deriving Wackernagel's law: Prosodic and syntactic factors determining clitic placement in the language of the Rigveda. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, 165–197. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hale, Mark. 2017. Preliminaries to the investigation of clitic sequencing in Greek and Indo-Iranian. In Claire Bower, Laurence Horn & Raffaella Zanuttini (eds.), *On looking into words (and beyond)*, 289–310. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Halpern, Aaron L. (ed.). 1995. *On the placement and morphology of clitics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Halpern, Aaron L. & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.). 1996. *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Harizanov, Boris. 2014. Clitic doubling at the syntax-morphophonology interface. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32. 1033–1088.
- Harris, Alice C. 2002. *Endoclitics and the origins of Udi Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, Alice C. & Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2015. Defining vs. diagnosing linguistic categories: A case study of clitic phenomena. In Joanna Błaszczak, Dorota Klimek-Jankowska & Krzysztof Migdalski (eds.), *How categorical are categories?*, 273–303. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Hinterhölzl, Roland & Svetlana Petrova. 2010. From V1 to V2 in West Germanic. *Lingua* 120. 315–328.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1982. AUX-cliticization as a motivation for word order change. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 12. 91–101.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1996. Who's on first? Towards a prosodic account of P2 clitics. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, 199–270. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hoffner, Harry A. 1973. Studies of the Hittite particles, I. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93. 520–526.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1975. *The syntax of the simple sentence in Proto-Germanic*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. 1958. The importance of new data concerning Hittite and Tocharian languages for the comparative historical grammar of Indo-European languages. In Eva Sivertsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists*, 611–614. Oslo: Oslo University Press.
- Janse, Mark. 1994. Clitics and word order since Wackernagel: One hundred years of research into clitics and related phenomena. *Orbis* 37. 389–410.
- Kaiser, Georg. 2002. *Verbstellung und Verbstellungswandel in den romanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Kaisse, Ellen M. 1982. Sentential clitics and Wackernagel's law. In *Proceedings of the First West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 1–14.
- Kaisse, Ellen M. 1985. *Connected speech: The interaction of syntax and phonology*. London: Academic Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1975. *French syntax: The transformational cycle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Keydana, Götz. 2011. Wackernagel in the language of the Rigveda: A reassessment. *Historische Sprachforschung* 124. 106–133.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1995. Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax. In Adrian Battye & Ian Roberts (eds.), *Clause structure and language change*, 140–169. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2012. Grammaticalization as optimization. In Dianne Jonas, John Whitman & Andrew Garrett (eds.), *Grammatical change: Origins, nature, outcomes*, 15–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klavans, Judith L. 1979. On clitics as words. *Chicago Linguistics Society* 15. 68–80.
- Klavans, Judith L. 1982. *Some problems in a theory of clitics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Klavans, Judith L. 1985. The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Language* 61. 95–120.

- Klavans, Judith L. 1995. *On clitics and cliticization: The interaction of morphology, phonology, and syntax*. New York, NY: Garland.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1990. Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutiger Sicht. In Heiner Eichner & Helmut Rix (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, 64–81. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Kruschwitz, Peter. 2004. *Römische Inschriften und Wackernagels Gesetz: Untersuchungen zur Syntax epigraphischer Texte aus republikanischer Zeit*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Kuhn, Hans. 1933. Zur Wortstellung und -betonung im Altgermanischen. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 57. 1–109.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1958. Remarks on Ivanov. In Eva Sivertsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists*, 613. Oslo: Oslo University Press.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1965. The evolution of grammatical categories. *Diogenes* 13. 55–71.
- Langslow, David (ed.). 2009. *Jacob Wackernagel, lectures on syntax, with special reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2002. *Warlpiri: Theoretical implications*. MIT. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2008. Warlpiri and the theory of second position clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26. 3–60.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2015. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. 3rd edn. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Lobel, Edgar & Denys Page (eds.). 1968. *Poetarum lesbiorum fragmenta*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lowe, John. 2014. Accented clitics in the Ṛgveda. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 112. 5–43.
- Luraghi, Sylvia. 1998. The grammaticalization of the left sentence periphery in Hittite. In Anna Giacalone Ramat & Paul Hopper (eds.), *The limits of grammaticalization*, 189–210. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Marouzeau, Jules. 1907. *Place du pronom personnel sujet en latin*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Marouzeau, Jules. 1953. *L'ordre des mots en latin: Volume complémentaire*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Marshall, Marlene H. B. 1987. *Verbs, nouns, and postpositives in Attic prose*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Matthews, Peter H. 1974. *Morphology: An introduction to the theory of word-structure*. 1st edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Meillet, Antoine. 1912. L'évolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia (Rivista di Scienza)* 12. 384–400.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2010. On the relation between V2 and the second position cliticization. *Lingua* 120. 329–353.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2012. Against a uniform treatment of second position effects as force markers. In Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman & Rachel Nye (eds.), *Main clause phenomena: New horizons*, 345–364. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2016. *Second position effects in the syntax of Germanic and Slavic languages*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Mines, Rachel. 2002. An examination of Kuhn's second law and its validity as a metrical-syntactical rule. *Studies in Philology* 99. 337–355.
- Momma, Haruko. 1997. *The composition of Old English poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nespor, Marina & Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Nevis, Joel A. & Brian D. Joseph. 1993. Wackernagel affixes: Evidence from Balto-Slavic. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1992*, 93–111. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Nevis, Joel A., Brian D. Joseph, Dieter Wanner & Arnold M. Zwicky. 1994. *Clitics: A comprehensive bibliography 1892–1991*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nida, Eugene A. 1946. *Morphology: The descriptive analysis of words*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Nilsson, Elof. 1904. Wackernagel's gesetz im Slavischen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 37. 261–264.
- Norde, Muriel. 2001. Deflexion as a counterdirectional factor in grammatical change. *Language Sciences* 23. 231–264.
- Norde, Muriel. 2010. Degrammaticalization: Three common controversies. In Katerina Stathi, Elke Gehweiler & Ekkehard König (eds.), *Grammaticalization: Current views and issues*, 123–150. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Osthoff, Hermann & Karl Brugmann. 1878. *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Pancheva, Roumyana. 2005. The rise and fall of second-position clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23. 103–167.
- Plank, Frans. 1995. Entgrammatikalisierung – Spiegelbild der Grammatikalisierung? In Norbert Boretzky & Andreas Bittner (eds.), *Natürlichkeitstheorie und Sprachwandel: Beiträge zum Internationalen Symposium über "Natürlichkeitstheorie und Sprachwandel" an der Universität Maribor*

- vom 13.5.–15.5.1993 = *Teorija naravnosti in jezikovno spreminjanje*, 199–219. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1996. Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, 411–428. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 2000. Where do clitics cluster? In Frits Beukema & Marcel den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic phenomena in the languages of Europe*, 249–258. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Radanović-Kocić, Vesna. 1996. Placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics: A prosodic approach. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, 429–445. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Radanović-Kocić, Vesna. 1988. *The grammar of Serbo-Croatian clitics: A synchronic and diachronic perspective*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Ries, John. 1880. *Die Stellung von Subject und Prädicatsverbum im Heliand*. University of Strasbourg. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Ries, John. 1894. *Was ist Syntax? Ein kritischer Versuch*. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Buchhandlung.
- Ries, John. 1907. *Die Wortstellung im Beowulf*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Rivero, María-Luisa. 1986. Parameters in the typology of clitics in Romance and Old Spanish. *Language* 62. 774–807.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Roberts, Ian. 1997. *Comparative syntax*. London: Arnold.
- Roberts, Ian. 2010. *Agreement and head movement: Clitics, incorporation and defective goals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ruijgh, Cornelis J. 1990. La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel. In Heiner Eichner & Helmut Rix (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, 213–233. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Salvesen, Christine Meklenborg & Hans Petter Helland (eds.). 2013. *Challenging clitics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Scheppers, Frank. 2011. *The colon hypothesis: Word order, discourse segmentation and discourse coherence in Ancient Greek*. Brussels: Brussels University Press.
- Schiering, René. 2006. *Cliticization and the evolution of morphology: A cross-linguistic study on phonology in grammaticalization*. Universität Konstanz. (Doctoral dissertation).

- Schiering, René. 2010. Reconsidering erosion in grammaticalization: Evidence from cliticization. In Katerina Stathi, Elke Gehweiler & Ekkehard König (eds.), *Grammaticalization: Current views and issues*, 73–100. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schlerath, Bernfried. 1990. Jacob Wackernagel und die indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft. In Heiner Eichner & Helmut Rix (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, 10–32. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1990. Jacob Wackernagel. In Ward W. Briggs & William M. Calder (eds.), *Classical scholarship: A biographical encyclopedia*, 479–488. New York: Garland.
- Schütze, Carson T. 1994. Serbo-Croatian second position clitic placement and the phonology-syntax interface. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 21. 373–473.
- Schwyzler, Eduard. 1938. Jacob Wackernagel. *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 14. 227–228.
- Selkirk, Elizabeth. 1984. *Phonology and syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Selkirk, Elizabeth. 1986. On derived domains in sentence phonology. *Phonology Yearbook* 3. 371–405.
- Smith, Peter W. 2013. On the cross-linguistic rarity of endoclitisis. In *Proceedings of Berkeley Linguistics Society* 39, 227–244.
- Spencer, Andrew & Ana R. Luís. 2012. *Clitics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steele, Susan M. 1975. On some factors that affect and effect word order. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Word order and word order change*, 197–268. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Steele, Susan M. 1977. Clisis and diachrony. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Mechanisms of syntactic change*, 539–579. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Taylor, Ann. 1990. *Clitics and configurationality in Ancient Greek*. University of Pennsylvania. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1892. Zur Stellung des Verbuns im Altfranzösischen. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 16. 289–307.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeška. 1996. The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14. 811–872.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeška. 2000. On clitic sites. In Frits Beukema & Marcel den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic phenomena in the languages of Europe*, 293–316. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vendryes, Joseph. 1912. La place du verbe en celtique. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 17. 337–351.

- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1. 333–436.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1896. *Lautlehre* (Altindische Grammatik 1). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1905. *Einleitung zur Wortlehre; Nominalkomposition* (Altindische Grammatik 2, part 1). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1912. *Über einige antike anredeformen*. Göttingen: Dieterich.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1916. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1920. *Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Vol. 1. Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1924. *Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Vol. 2. Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Walkden, George. 2012. *Syntactic reconstruction and Proto-Germanic*. University of Cambridge. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Walkden, George. 2014. *Syntactic reconstruction and Proto-Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walkden, George. 2015. Verb-third in early West Germanic: A comparative perspective. In Theresa Biberauer & George Walkden (eds.), *Syntax over time: Lexical, morphological, and information-structural interactions*, 236–248. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walkden, George. 2017. Language contact and V3 in Germanic varieties new and old. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 20(1). 49–81.
- Wanner, Dieter. 1987. *The development of Romance clitic pronouns*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1963. Preliminaries to a historical and comparative reconstruction of the Old Irish verb. *Celtica* 6. 1–49.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1964. Preliminaries to the reconstruction of Indo-European sentence structure. In Horace G. Lunt (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*, 1035–1045. The Hague: Mouton.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2018. *Verb second in medieval Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wundt, Wilhelm. 1874. *Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie*. Leipzig: Engelmann.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1977. *On clitics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1985. Clitics and particles. *Language* 61. 283–305.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. & Geoffrey Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't*. *Language* 59. 502–513.