Second Position Without Movement:
Enclitic Particles in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy

Philip S. LeSourd
Indiana University

1. Second-position enclitics in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy

Like many other Algonquian languages, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy (MP, New Brunswick and Maine) employs a set of enclitic particles that are stationed in second position in a clause. These may follow the first word of the clause (1a): second word placement. Less often, they may follow the first phrase in the clause (1b): second daughter placement.[1]

(1) (a) [$_{AdvP}$ Kàt=**ona** qìn] cipok-eltù-wi-yol pskihq-ís-ol.
not=also really intense-be.much-NEG-IN.PL grass-DIM-IN.PL
'There is also not really a whole lot of grass.' (Maliseet)

(b) [$_{AdvP}$ Kàt qìn]=**yaq**=**ona** nokom-okil-ù.
not really=REPORT=also fairly-be.size-(3)-NEG
'And he was not really very big, they say.' (Maliseet)

Transformational analyses of second-position enclitics in languages such as Serbo-Croatian (see Diesing and Zec 2017 for a recent study) typically suppose that the clitic occupies a functional head in the left periphery of the clause and that either a word or a phrase is then moved into the specifier of the functional head. An analysis along these lines is proposed for the Algonquian language Menominee (Wisconsin) by Johnson and Rosen (2015). More on their approach shortly.

I will instead pursue a constraint-based analysis formulated within the framework of Sign-Based Construction Grammar (SBCG, Sag 2012).

Three constructions will be needed to account for the distribution of enclitics:

1. a ***clitic-second-daughter-construction*** that states that a clitic (or clitic group) may follow the first constituent in a clause;
2. a ***clitic-second-word-construction*** that states that a clitic or clitic group may follow the first (prosodic) word in a clause;
3. a ***clitic-compacting-construction*** that forms clitic groups consisting of one or more enclitics.

I formalize these construcitons below. But first, some preliminaries.

[1] *Notation:* c = /č/, q = /k^{w}/, o = /ə/, ' = word-initial /h/ before C. Acute and grave accents mark distinctively high- and low-pitched stressed syllables, respectively.

2. The enclitics

The full set of second-position particles of MP is given in (2). They are accented in utterance-final position, unaccented otherwise.

(2) =*àl* 'uncertain' =*lú* 'but, however'

=*éhta* 'indeed, in fact' =*ná* 'also, as for X'

=*kàhk* 'but, however, certainly' =*òc* ~ =*hc* 'future'

=*kàl* 'probably' =*òp* ~ =*hp* 'would'

=*kéte* 'for example, moreover, thus' =*tàhk* 'lo and behold, surprisingly'

=*yáka* 'afterward, furthermore' =*yàq* 'they say, it is said'

=*hk* (idiomatic)

Note that the items in (2) are semantically diverse: they include future and conditional markers, a reportative particle, a mirative marker, several adverbials, and particles indicating contrast and emphasis.

In addition, two conjunctions, *kenùk* 'but, however' and *cèl* 'and, moreover', may either introduce a clause or appear in second position, where they pattern like the items in (2).

Note that several of these items seem like semantically unlikely candidates to be functional heads.

3. Locating the left edge of the clause

Clitics are stationed with respect the left edge of the clause. But there may be more than one such edge in some structures. One or more phrases may be left-adjoined to the clause, so that there is more than one clausal boundary that can serve as a site for clitic placement.

An example with an adjoined AdvP:

(3) [$_S$ **Malom=ehta=cel** [$_S$ yùt=**yaq** mulahkepolásu ktáhkomiq]]

finally=indeed=moreover this.IN=report hole.be.trampled-(3) land

eli—kis-ká-hti-t.

thus—past-dance-PROX.PL-3AN

'Moreover, they danced there for so long in the end, they say, that a depression was trampled into the ground.' (Maliseet)

4. Discontinuous constituents: two analyses

Second-position particles freely occur between the words of constituents: an AdvP in (1a), an NP in (4).

(4) [$_{NP}$ Yùkk**=yaq=olu** kótok-ik kukéc-ok]

these=REPORT=but other-PROX.PL game.warden-PROX.PL

etuci—palitahas-ultí-hti-t nemiy-á-hti-t

to.extent—be.pleased-MPL-PROX.PL-3AN see-DIR-PROX.PL-3AN

w-itapé-wa-l…

3-friend-PROX.PL-OBV.SG

'But, they say, these other game wardens were so happy when they saw their friend…'

(Passamaquoddy)

Alternatively, we might suppose that enclitics do not appear **within** constituents in such cases. Rather, the constituents they appear to interrupt might be **discontinuous**.

MP does, in fact, permit the discontinuous expression of a wide variety of constituents, independently of second-position phenomena.

(5) a. Mahkiyew-òss **[$_{NPa}$ nòt]** àpc mete-htéhsi-t **[$_{NPb}$ 'puwìn]**.

soon-dim that.prox again heard-fall-3an corpse

'After a little while **[the body]** was heard to fall again.' (Passamaquoddy)

Johnson and Rosen (2015) attribute all discontinuity in the expression of Algonquian phrases to movement, including cases in which a clitic is stationed between segments of a phrase. For Menominee, they assume that a second-position clitic occupies a functional head, typically the head of Topic Phrase or Focus Phrase, at the left periphery of the clause. One word or a single constituent may be moved into the specifier of this head to satisfy the enclitic's requirement for a host. This puts the clitic into second position. If a segment of a of constituent is left behind, a discontinuous constituent is the result. (Note that they allow TopP and FocP to be iterated.)

(6) a. [TopP . . . [FocP . . . [TopP . . .]]]

(Johnson and Rosen 2015: 142)

b. [$_{TopP}$ XPa [$_{Top°}$ = Clitic] [$_{FocP}$ . . . [$_{TopP}$ [$_{Top°}$ t_{XPa} XPb] …]]]

A Menominee example under J&R's analysis:

(7) [$_{TopP}$ [$_{D}$ **Ayom**] [$_{Top°}$ [$_{\&}$ =**taeh**]] [$_{FocP}$ [$_{Foc°}$ Ø] [$_{TopP}$ [$_{NP}$ [$_{D}$ t_{ayom}] **owōhnema** [$_{Top°}$ Ø]

this.AN and father

[$_{\&P}$ [$_{\&}$ t_{taeh}] [$_{TP}$'s osēqtahnacen

AOR prepare.3/3OBV.CONJ

onīcianaesan 's maek-mesāhkataewāēnet]]]]…

his.child.OBV AOR while.fast.3OBV.CONJ

'And as this father prepared for his child's fast…' (Menominee, Johnson and Rosen 2015: 145, simplified)

5. Against movement

Several problems arise if we try to adopt J&R's approach for MP. I will review just one here: **second-position clitics may be stationed in MP in two locations with respect to the same phrase.**

(8) a. [$_{NP}$ Yùkt**=olu** wasís-ok]**=yaq** 'totoli—tokom-á-wa-l.

these.PROX=but child-PROX.PL=REPORT (3)-ongoing=hit-DIR-PROX.PL-OBV.SG

'But the children, they say, were hitting him.' (Maliseet)

The reportative enclitic ***=yaq*** has been positioned after the clause-initial NP here by second-daughter placement. Thus, this NP must be intact: it cannot be discontinuous. It follows that ***=olu*** 'but' truly interrupts this NP. It is not attached to the first segment of a discontinuous NP that is located in the Specifier of a functional projection that is headed by ***=olu***. .

There is accordingly no reason to suppose that movement has taken place in the derivation of (8).

6. A non-movement analysis: background

Here I propose an analysis that makes no use of abstract underlying forms or of movement. Instead, I propose a set of three word-order constructions, adapting the mechanisms of Wetta's (2011, 2014) analysis of verb-second phenomena, which employs the mechanisms of Sign-Based Construction Grammar (SBCG, Sag 2012).

I extend SBCG to include the Linearization Theory of Reape 1996. Following Reape, I assume that each ***sign*** is specified for a feature **DOMAIN** (**DOM** or **D**), which is specified in turn for a list of **DOMAIN ITEMS**: the members of the domain. These are the sign's constituents.

I further assume (with Wetta) that each domain item is assigned one of two values of the feature **LIN** (for linearization): ***fixed*** (***fix***) or ***flexible*** (***flex***).

The second value is assigned by default: a sign is specified **[LIN *flex*]** unless some rule or principle states otherwise. Constructional statements may specify where a **[LIN *fix*]** element occurs in a structure. This is what our word-order constructions will do.

7. Putting all this to work…

A preliminary example: in (9), a single enclitic follows the first constituent in a clause.

(9) Nekòm**=ona** tol-ahsuwásu.

s/he=also ongoing-plan-(3)

'She also is making plans.' (Passamaquoddy)

Suppose for the moment that all of the enclitics of MP are lexically specified as [lin *fix*], while all other syntactic expressions are specified as [lin *flex*], by default. Further suppose that the grammar includes a constructional rule that states that one [lin *fix*] element may follow a single [lin *flex*] constituent at the beginning of a clause. This is the *clitic-second-daughter-construction* (*clitic-2D-cxt*), (10).

(10) *clitic-2D-cxt* ⇒

$$\left[\begin{array}{l}\text{MTR}\ \ [\text{SYN}\,[\text{CAT S}]\ ] \\ \text{DTRS} < [\text{D} < [\text{LIN}\ \textit{flex}\ ] >] \oplus [\text{D} < [\text{LIN}\ \textit{fix}] >] \oplus [\text{D} < [\text{LIN}\ \textit{flex}] >]_{0} >\end{array}\right]$$

This rule states that the mother (MTR) of the construction (of cat S, a clause) consists of a concatenation (⊕) of domain items (D). The first of these is specified as [LIN *flex*]: it can be a constituent of any kind other than an enclitic. But the second is specified as [LIN *fix*]: it **must** be an enclitic. Any number of non-enclitic items may follow the enclitic within the clause. Thus, (10) is a template for a clause in which a clitic occupies the position following a single initial constituent.

Example (9) is analyzed by the construction in (10) as shown in (11).

(11)	[DOM < [LIN *flex*] >]	[DOM < [LIN *fix*] >]	[DOM < [LIN *flex*] >]
	[S Nekòm	=**ona**	tol-ahsuwásu.]
	s/he	=also	ongoing-plan-(3)
	'She also is making plans.'		

The initial one-word phrase ***nekòm*** 'she' matches the initial [LIN *flex*] domain item specified in the construction. The enclitic **=*ona*** 'also' matches the specified [LIN *fix*] domain item. The verb ***tolahsuwásu*** 'she is making plans' is additional non-clitic material that the construction permits. Since this arrangement of material is sanctioned, the sentence as a whole is sanctioned.

8. Compaction: allowing for clitic groups

So far, we have allowed only for a single enclitic to appear in a clause. But combinations of several clitics routinely appear together in second position.

(12)	Yùkt**=kahk=al=lu**	tamà	l-apàsu-w-ok.
	these.an=emph=unc=but	somewhere	thus-pl.walk-3-prox.pl
	'But these (people) must surely be going somewhere.' (Maliseet)		

Compaction (Kathol 2000:100; Wetta 2011:59) is a mechanism for forming a single domain item from a set of constituent domain items. For our analysis of MP clitics, we will use compaction to create clitic groups: these are single domain items that have one or more clitics as their constituents.

I postulate a *clitic-compacting-construction* (*clitic-comp-cxt*), (13).

(13)

$$\textit{clitic-comp-cxt} \ \Rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{ll}\text{MTR} & \left[\text{DOM}\ \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{l}\text{LIN}\ \textit{fixed} \\ \text{FORM} < \Phi\,(\text{L}) >\end{array}\right] \right\rangle\right] \\ \text{DTRS} & < \text{L: list}\,([\textit{clitic} +]) >\end{array}\right]$$

Rule (13) states that the mother of the compacting construction (the compacted set of domain items) is itself a single domain item (the clitic group), that this is specified as [LIN *fixed*], and that it has as its constituents a set of (one or more) clitics that appear in the order specified by the function Φ.

The order of enclitics in a clitic group is relatively free in MP. In some closely related languages, it is more nearly fixed. The feature [clitic+] that is employed here is simply shorthand for whatever property of the items in question causes them to require a host. (It should be noted that [clitic+] is not equivalent to a requirement that an item should appear in second position. There is an emphatic enclitic that equally requires a host but which may occur in any position in a clause.)

This formulation of compaction has a welcome consequence. We may now drop the assumption that clitics are lexically specified as [LIN *fix*]. It is the clitic group **as a whole** that is specified as [LIN *fix*]—and this assignment is made by the *clitic-compacting-construction* (13). Of course, the clitic group may consist of a single enclitic! But no lexical specifications for the feature LIN are required.

The *clitic-second-daughter-construction* (10), repeated below, now has the effect that the **entire clitic group** occurs as a unit after the first constituent in a clause.

(10) *clitic-2D-cxt* ⇒

$$\left[\begin{array}{l}\text{MTR}\ \ [\text{SYN}\,[\text{CAT S}]\,] \\ \text{DTRS} < [\text{D} < [\text{LIN}\ \textit{flex}\ ] >] \oplus [\text{D} < [\text{LIN}\ \textit{fix}] >] \oplus [\text{D} < [\text{LIN}\ \textit{flex}] >]_{o} >\end{array}\right]$$

9. The clitic-second-word-construction

Second-word clitic placement is actually considerably more common than second-daughter placement. Let us see how this mode of clitic placement may be formalized.

The evidence is not overwhelming, but second-word placement appears to be conditioned by prosody: the enclitic is stationed after the first **prosodic word** (**ω**) in the clause, as shown in (14).

(14) *clitic-2W-cxt* ⇒

$$\left[\begin{array}{l}\text{MTR}\ \ [\text{SYN}\,[\text{CAT S}]\,] \\ \text{DTRS} < [\text{DOM} < [\text{PHON} < \omega >] >] \oplus [\text{DOM} < [\text{LIN}\ \textit{fix}] >] \oplus [\text{D} < [\text{LIN}\ \textit{flex}] >]_{o} >]\end{array}\right]$$

This rule states that one [LIN *fix*] item (a clitic group) may follow a clause-initial domain item that is specified as consisting of a single prosodic word **ω**.

Two idiomatic expressions based on adverbial particles include enclitics that are not part of an ordinary clitic group.

(15) a. tàn ‘such, how’
mèc ‘still, yet’

b. tàn=op=al ‘however’
mèc=op=al ‘please; would it be possible?’

The conditional clitic **=*op*** may be repeated after these, doubling the occurrence of this clitic that forms part of the idiom. Examples below in (16). Only in these cases are clitics ever repeated in a clitic group.

This situation makes sense if the second set of enclitics are stationed not with respect to the apparent adverbial base, but rather with respect to the base plus the inner clitics. This is to say that the outer clitics do not follow the first syntactic word in the clause—the adverb. Rather, they follow the first **prosodic** word—the adverb plus the inner enclitics.

(16) *Clitic placement following first phonological word in the clause*

a. [ω [ω Tàn=op=al]**=op=olu**] 't-oli—kisi—'sotuw-á-ni-ya

how**=**COND**=**UNC**=**COND**=**BUT 3-thus—able—understand-DIR-N-PROX.PL

kecciya-lí-c-il skicinúw-ol?

pure-OBV-3AN-OBV.SG Indian-OBV.SG

'But how could they determine what a full-blooded Indian is?' (Passamaquoddy)

b. [ω [ω Mèc=op=al]=**op**] nt-api—wikuwamkóm-a-n n-uhkomoss-òn?

still=COND=UNC=COND 1-go—visit-DIR-N 1-grandmother-1PL

'Could we please go see our (exc.) grandmother?' (Passamaquoddy)

Diesing and Zec (2017) reach a similar conclusion in their analysis of Serbian: there is a phonological component to the placement of second-position enclitics in the language.

10. Combining constructions

We have seen that enclitics may occur both after the first word and after the first constituent in the same clause, as in example (8), repeated here.

(8) a. [NP Yùkt**=olu** wasís-ok]**=yaq** 'totoli—tokom-á-wa-l.

these.prox=but child-PROX.PL=REPORT (3)-ongoing=hit-DIR-PROX.PL-OBV.SG

'But the children, they say, were hitting him.' (Maliseet)

That this situation should be possible is in fact **predicted** by the analysis stated here: both of our clitic-placement constructions may be instantiated in the same clause. The way this works is set out in (17) and (18).

(17) [DOM < [PHON < ω >] [DOM <[LIN *fixed*]>] [DOM < [LIN *flex*] >]

[S [NP Yùkt =**olu** wasís-ok]=**yaq**

these.PROX =but child-PROX.PL=REPORT

'totoli—tokom-á-wa-l].

(3)-ongoing—hit—DIR-PROX.PL-OBV.SG

'But the children, they say, were hitting him.'

Note that the reportative clitic =*yaq* is included within the string of [LIN flex] material that the *clitic-2W-cxt* permits at the end of the clause in (17). This is possible because this enclitic is not a clause-level constituent, only part of one.

(18) [DOM <[LIN *flex*]>] [DOM <[LIN *fix*]>

[S [NP Yùkt=**olu** wasís-ok] =**yaq**

these.PROX=but child-PROX.PL =REPORT

[DOM < [LIN *flex*] >]o|

'totoli—tokom-á-wa-l.

(3)-ongoing—hit-DIR-PROX.PL-OBV.SG

'But the children, they say, were hitting him.'

Here, too, a [LIN *fix*] enclitic is included within a constituent that **as a whole**, is specified as [LIN *flex*]: the clause-initial NP in this sentence that hosts the reportative enclitic.

11. Conclusions

The proposed analysis accounts for the distribution of second-position enclitics in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy with a minimum number of constructional statements:

1) The ***clitic-second-word-construction*** (14): A clitic group may follow the first prosodic word in a clause.

2) The ***clitic-second-daughter-construction*** (10): A clitic group may follow the first constituent in a clause.

3) The ***clitic-compacting-construction*** (13): A single domain item may be formed from a (possibly singleton) set of enclitics. Clitic groups formed in this way are specified as [LIN *fixed*], the only items in the language with this property.

This account of second-position phenomena in MP is as spare as an account can be, since it corresponds directly to the observed facts: second-position particles may follow the first word of a clause, or they may follow the first constituent in the clause, and enclitics may occur in clitic groups.

The analysis makes no appeal to the properties or distribution of functional heads. It makes no appeal to movement operations of any kind.

It is worth noting as well that the theoretical devices that I have adapted from Wetta's (2011, 2014) work were not developed for the analysis of clitics, but for verb-second phenomena. Thus, my analysis of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy enclitics is appropriately seen as offering support for a larger research program that takes word-order constructions to play a central role in syntactic analysis.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in glosses:

1 first person; 2 second person; 3 third person; AN animate; AOR aorist; AUX auxiliary; COND conditional; CONJ conjunct; DIM diminutive; DIR direct; EMPH emphatic; IN inanimate; MIR mirative; MPL multi-plural (the subject of the verb refers to three or more individuals); N suffix *-(o)n(e)-* (with several functions); NEG negative); OBV obviative; PL plural; PRET preterite; PROX proximate; REPORT reportative; SG singular; UNC uncertain. Glosses are given in parentheses for morphemes that have no surface segmental shape.

References

Diesing, Molly, and Draga Zec. 2017. Getting in the first word: Prosody and predicate initial sentences in Serbian. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 2: 1–25.

Johnson, Meredith, and Bryan Rosen. 2015. The syntax of discontinuous noun phrases in Algonquian languages: Left branch extractions and focus movements. *In* Monica Macaulay and J. Randolph Valentine, eds., *Papers of the Forty-Third Algonquian Conference*, 135–153. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Kathol, Andreas. 2000. Linear Syntax. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wetta, Andrew C. 2011. A construction-based cross-linguistic analysis of V2 word order. *In* Stefan Müller, ed., *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, 248–268. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Wetta, Andrew C. 2014. Construction-based approaches to flexible word order. Ph.D. dissertation, University at Buffalo, State University of New York.