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Like many languages of the Algonquian family, Maliseet-Passamaquoddy (MP, New Brunswick and Maine) has a set of enclitic particles that are usually stationed in second position in a clause: they follow the first word of the clause or, less often, the first phrase. There are thirteen of these enclitics in MP, plus two conjunctions that appear either initially in the clause or in second position. Included among the enclitics are future and conditional markers, a reportative particle, several adverbials, and particles indicating contrast and emphasis. Seven of these particles figure in the examples in this paper: =al ‘uncertain’, =(ō)lu ‘but, however’, =(ō)na ‘also’, =op ‘would’ (conditional), =tahk ‘surprisingly’ (mirative), =yaka ‘afterward, furthermore’, and =yaq ‘it is said, they say’ (reportative).

The examples in (1) and (2) illustrate the two modes of second-position placement that are characteristic of MP enclitics.

not=also really intense-be.much–(3)–NEG–IN–PL grass–DIM–IN–PL

‘There is also not really a whole lot of grass.’ (Mal., Paul 1963, no. 26)
In both examples in (1), the constituent negator kàt modifies the adverb qìn ‘really’.

(Sentence negation is usually expressed by kŏtáma ‘not’, or a reduced variant of this.)

The enclitic =(ď)na has been positioned after the first word of the clause in (1a), while both =yaq and =(ď)na have been placed after the entire clause-initial constituent in (1b).

The reportative enclitic =yaq follows the first word of the clause in (2a), with the result that it separates the possessor from the possessed noun in the expression ‘Mary Ann’s father’. In (2b), =yaka ‘afterward’ and =yaq appear together after the initial constituent of the clause, which again consists of a possessor and a possessed noun, ‘a child’s brain’.
In (1a) and (2a) above, second-position enclitics appear to occur within constituents. Johnson and Rosen (2015) analyze comparable examples in several Algonquian languages as involving discontinuous constituents with enclitics attached to an independent initial segment, thus avoiding having to postulate enclitics that actually interrupt constituents. My purpose in this paper is to show that an analysis along these lines cannot be carried out in general in MP.

**ENCLITICS INTERRUPTING CONSTITUENTS**

Second-position particles freely occur between the words of constituents. An Adverb Phrase (AdvP) is interrupted in this fashion in (1a) and a Noun Phrase (NP) in (2a). Additional examples illustrating NPs interrupted by enclitics are given in (3a) and (3b), while (3c) illustrates the same situation in the case of a Prepositional Phrase (PP). (For the structure of the PP, see LeSourd 2014. Note that the emphatic enclitic =ōte in (3c) is not restricted to second-position.)

(3a) \[ NP \ Yùkk=yaq=ōlu \ kótôk-ik \ kukéc-ok \]
\[
\text{these.PROX=REPORT=but other-PROX.PL game.warden-PROX.PL}
\]

\[
\text{etuci—palitahas-ultí-hti-t nemiy-á-hti-t}
\]
\[
\text{to.extent—be.pleased-MPL-PROX.PL-3AN see-DIR-PROX.PL-3AN}
\]

\[
\text{w-itapé-wa-l…}
\]
\[
\text{3-friend-PROX.PL-OBV.SG}
\]
‘But, they say, these other game wardens were so happy when they saw their friend…’ (Pass., W. Newell 1974:8)

(3b) Yùt=tahk=yaq éhtek mihkután-is qahqŏlunsq-éy,
here=MIRATIVE=REPORT be.located-3IN knife-DIM clay-NF

[NP 'tomákon=na qahqŏlunsq-éy].
pipe=also clay-NF

‘Sitting here was a clay knife, and there was a clay pipe as well.’ (Mal., Polchies et al. 2013:11.14)

(3c) Am=ôte, [PP tètt=ôna olôqiw Wahsipekûsk]
finally=EMPH that.way=also toward St.Lawrence.LOC

olôq-apasi-hti-t naci—qilūwaht-à-q wèn salawèy,
toward-pl.walk-PROX.PL-3AN go—look.for-TH-3AN someone salt

on Muhàks matôn-okù-nî-ya…
and Mohawk-(OBV.PL) (3)-fight-INV-N-PROX.PL

‘And in the end, if they traveled over to the St. Lawrence country so that someone could look for salt, then the Mohawks would fight them…’ (Mal., LeSourd 2007:128)
The material that precedes an enclitic or enclitic sequence in an interrupted phrase may bear any kind of structural relationship to the remainder of the phrase. Thus, the enclitics in (3a) follow the initial demonstrative yùkk ‘these (prox.)’ in the NP ‘these other game wardens’, which consists of this demonstrative, a modifier, and a head noun. In (2a) above, the enclitic separates the possessor ‘Mary Ann’ from the possessed head ‘her father’. But in (3b), the head noun ‘tomákon ‘pipe’ is initial in the bracketed NP, so the second-position enclitic =na ‘also’ is stationed between this head noun and the following modifier, qahqōlunsgēy ‘made of clay’.

DISCONTINUOUS CONSTITUENTS

Like many other Algonquian languages, MP permits discontinuous expression for a variety of types of constituents. When it is initial in a clause, the first segment of a discontinuous constituent may host a second-position enclitic. The examples in (4) illustrate. (Subscripts “a” and “b” indicate the segments of the discontinuous NPs.)

\[(4a) \ [NPa \ Wòt=ôlu \ wŏlíku \ [NPb \ yùt \ olôqi \ tol-èy \ pilsqéhsis]. \]
\[\text{this.PROX=but be.pretty-(3) here toward location-NF girl} \]
\[\text{‘But the girl from over this way was pretty.’ (Mal., LeSourd 2007:80)} \]

\[(4b) \ [NPa \ Psi=na \ yùkt] \ pehki \ kisac-ultú-w-ok \]
\[\text{all=also these.PROX completely be.ready-MPL-3-PROX.PL} \]
[NP₅ somakōnōss-ok] weci—peskhik-hoti-hti-t psi wiwōniw.
soldier-PROX.PL so.that—shoot-MPL-PROX.PL-3AN all around

‘And all these soldiers were fully prepared to shoot, all around (the church).’ (Mal., LeSourd 2007:118)

In (4a), the demonstrative wòt ‘this (prox.)’ is the first segment of the discontinuous NP wòt... yùt olōqi toley pilsgéhsis ‘the girl from over this way’; the verb wōliku ‘she is pretty’ intervenes between the segments of this NP. Note that the first segment of the NP serves as the host for the second-position enclitic =ōlu ‘but’. In (4b), the second-position enclitic =na ‘also’ follows the first word of psi yùkt... ‘all these (prox.)’, the first segment of the discontinuous NP psi yùkt... somakōnōssok ‘all these soldiers’.

Johnson and Rosen (2015) analyze constituents that include second-position clitics in Menominee and several other Algonquian languages. They propose that all examples in which an enclitic appears to interrupt a constituent in fact involve discontinuous phrases, with the enclitic attached to the first segment of the phrase.

They take NPs involved in this construction to be uniformly either topics or foci. On their account, these NPs become discontinuous through a sequence of movement operations that target the positions of functional heads in the hierarchical structure of the left periphery of the clause. This structure may contain more than one instance of Topic Phrase (TopcP) or Focus Phrase (FocP) nodes. For example, structures along the lines of (5) are permitted. (I omit labeling for potentially distinct categories such as External Topic Phrase and Internal Topic Phrase.)
The derivations of discontinuous NPs proceed in steps. First, either Topic or Focus Movement fronts an NP into the position of Specifier (Spec) of TopP or FocP. Then a second application of the same type of movement operation fronts just an initial segment of the NP into the Spec position of a second, higher TopP or FocP. The result for a Menominee sentence like (6) is a structure like (7), adapting Johnson and Rosen’s example (18) (2015:145). (I have added marking of the clitic boundary before =taeh ‘and’.)

(6)  

Ayom=taeh owōhnemaw  ’s  osēqtahnacen  
this.AN=and father  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)

(7)  

[TopP [D Ayom] [Top° [& =taeh]] [FocP [Foc° ∅] [NP [D tayom] owōhnemaw] [Top° ∅]

this.AN  and  father

[&P [ & ttaeh] [TP ’s  osēqtahnacen  
AOR  prepare.3/3OBV.CONJ]
The second-position enclitic =taeh ‘and’ is assumed to be generated at the outset as the head of a Conjunction Phrase (&P) in a position below TopP and FocP. It is raised from there to the head of the upper TopP: this places it in second position in the clause as a whole. The clause-initial position is filled by the demonstrative segment of the NP ayom owōhnemaw ‘this father’: first this NP is moved as a unit to the Spec position within the lower TopP, then ayom ‘this’ is moved by itself into the Spec position in the upper TopP.

Whatever the merits of this analysis may be for Menominee, I argue in the sections that follow that an analogous treatment for MP finds no support. I conclude instead that enclitics that interrupt constituents are located exactly where they appear to be: in the interior of those constituents.

**AGAINST THE MOVEMENT ANALYSIS FOR MP: COORDINATE STRUCTURES**

Examples involving coordinate structures provide evidence against a movement analysis for MP of the kind that Johnson and Rosen (2015) have proposed for Menominee. Consider in this connection the examples in (8). Moving the element that bears the enclitic in these examples into a Spec position in a superordinate TopP or FocP would require violating the Coordinate Structure Constraint of Ross 1967.
To see what is at issue here, we need to consider just how the Coordinate Structure Constraint works. The formulation of the Coordinate Structure Constraint given in (9) is due to Pollard and Sag (1994:201). The principle has two parts: the Conjunct Constraint (9a) and the Element Constraint (9b), cf. Grosu 1973.

(9) Coordinate Structure Constraint

In a coordinate structure,

a. no conjunct may be moved,

b. nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct.
The Conjunct Constraint (9a) appears to hold of extraction operations across languages without exception (although we will see in the following section that MP in fact allows coordinate structures, like other phrases, to be discontinuously expressed).\textsuperscript{5} The Element Constraint (9b), on the other hand, is known to permit certain types of exceptions in cases involving extraction (Goldsmith 1985, Lakoff 1986), such as the acceptable extraction out of just one of two coordinated Verb Phrases (VPs) seen in (10).\textsuperscript{6}

(10) How many lakes can we [destroy \underline{___} and not arouse public antipathy]?

(Pollard and Sag 1994:201)

Such exceptions have been attributed to semantic and pragmatic factors that do not seem relevant to our MP examples, such as the degree to which conjoined VPs like those in (10) jointly constitute a narrative structure (Deane 1991).

An analysis of MP enclitics along the lines proposed by Johnson and Rosen will yield violations of both the Conjunct Constraint and the Element Constraint in the examples in (8). In (8a), \textit{éhpít} ‘woman’ is conjoined with \textit{skítàp} ‘man’. To move \textit{éhpít} to the left out of the coordinate structure and into Spec of TopP (or FocP) in order to make it the host of the clitic =\textit{ôlu} ‘but’, assumed to be in the head position in such a projection, will violate the Conjunct Constraint. In (8b), movement of \textit{wót} ‘this’ leftward out of \textit{wót mahtogèhs} ‘this rabbit’ so that \textit{wót} can pick up the enclitic =\textit{yaq} will violate the Element Constraint, since \textit{wót mahtogèhs} is conjoined with \textit{côgòl}s ‘frog’. I conclude that a
movement analysis of examples in which an enclitic interrupts a constituent is not viable in general for MP.

**More on Coordination**

The argument just advanced against a movement account of MP clitic placement relies on the claim that the Coordinate Structure Constraint is applicable in this language. It should be noted, however, that coordinate NPs formed with *naka* ‘and’, like that in (11a), may receive discontinuous expression. A discontinuously expressed conjoined subject in which both conjuncts are singular may trigger plural agreement, as in (11b). Alternatively, agreement may be singular, as in (11c), which I take to reflect agreement with the first conjunct alone; compare example (12c) below.7

\[(11a) \quad \text{Mecimi-te } \text{Pi'yel naka Māli pōm-ih-hik.} \]
\[
\text{always=EMPH Peter and Mary along-go-(3)-PROX.PL} \\
\text{‘Peter and Mary are always on the go.’ (Pass.)} \\
\]

\[(11b) \quad \text{Mecimi-te } \text{Pi'yel pōm-ih-hik naka Māli.} \]
\[
\text{always=EMPH Peter along-go-(3)-PROX.PL and Mary} \\
\text{‘Peter and Mary are always on the go.’ (Pass.)} \\
\]

\[(11c) \quad \text{Mecimi-te } \text{Pi'yel pōm-iye naka Māli.} \]
\[
\text{always=EMPH Peter along-go-(3) and Mary} \\
\text{‘Peter and Mary are (lit., is) always on the go.’ (Pass.)} \\
\]
The two discontinuous constructions are distinguished by their treatment in extraction, as shown in (12).

(12a) Wèn macáha-t naka Píyel?

who leave-3AN and Peter

‘Who is leaving with Peter?’ (lit., ‘Who is leaving and Peter?’) (Pass.)

(12b) *Wèn macahá-htí-t naka Píyel?

who leave-PROX.PL-3AN and Peter

‘Who (sg.) are leaving and Peter?’ (Pass.)

(12c) Wén-ik macahá-htí-t naka Píyel?

who-PROX.PL leave-PROX.PL-3AN and Peter

‘Who (pl.) are leaving with Peter?’ (Pass.)

In (12a), the verb macáha ‘he or she leaves’ agrees only with the first of the two NPs that are understood as constituting its subject: this is the question word wèn ‘who’. In this case, it seems reasonable to suppose that naka Píyel ‘and Peter’ is actually an independent phrase, rather than a true part of a conjunction structure. If this hypothesis is correct, then the extraction of wèn in this example (by Wh-Movement) does not violate the Coordinate Structure Constraint.

In (12b), on the other hand, agreement is with the two conjuncts together, showing that they constitute a unified conjunction structure. In this case, extracting wèn
yields an ungrammatical sentence. This result follows if the Coordinate Structure
Constraint—in particular the Conjunct Constraint (9a)—is applicable in MP, as expected.
Compare (12c), where the apparent first conjunct is wénik ‘who (pl.)’, which can control
plural agreement on the verb on its own. Extraction proceeds without obstacle in this
case, since naka Piyel can once again be analyzed as an independent phrase.

I conclude that the segments of a discontinuously expressed conjunction structure
with naka ‘and’ may jointly form a constituent. When they do, they also jointly control
subject agreement in examples like (11b). The Coordinate Structure Constraint is obeyed
in such structures, because they are true coordinate structures.

As a final point, we may note that the fact that the Coordinate Structure
Constraint holds in MP strongly suggests that the discontinuous expression of
conjunction structures (and, by extension, other NPs) is not achieved through the
application of one or more movement operations, since any such process would have to
violate this constraint. An alternative approach to the derivation of discontinuous
constituents is the linearization theory of Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar
(HPSG). Donohue and Sag 1999 provide a non-movement analysis of discontinuous NPs
in Warlpiri (Pama-Nyungan, Australia) in this framework that may offer an instructive
model.

AGAINST THE MOVEMENT ANALYSIS FOR MP: CLITICS IN TWO POSITIONS

We observed at the outset of this discussion that second-position enclitics in MP
may follow either the first word in a clause or the first constituent phrase in a clause. In
fact, both modes of clitic placement may obtain in the same structure. The examples in (13) illustrate.

(13a) \[\text{[NP Yùkt}=\overset{\text{ôlu}}{\text{wasís-}}\text{-ok]=}\overset{\text{yaq}}{\text{totōli}}\text{—tokōm-á-}\text{wa-l.}\]

\[\text{these.PROX=but child-PROX.PL=REPORT (3)-ongoing—hit-DIR-PROX.PL-OBV.SG}\]

‘But the children, they say, were hitting him.’ (Mal., Polchies et al. 2013:10.16)

(13b) \[\text{[NP Wòt}=\overset{\text{ôlu}}{\text{mihkomūwēhs]}=}\overset{\text{yaq}}{\text{sōlahkiw unakēssi-n.}\]

\[\text{this.PROX=but little.person=REPORT suddenly (3)-stand.up-N}\]

‘But the little person, they say, suddenly stood up.’ (Mal., Polchies et al. 2013:10.17)

The fact that the reportative particle \(=\text{yaq}\) has been positioned after the bracketed expressions in these examples shows that these are phrases, namely NPs. Only clitic placement after a clause-initial constituent can account for the fact that \(=\text{yaq}\) does not occur together with \(=\overset{\text{ôlu}}{\text{but}}\) ‘but’ after the clause-initial word in these examples.

Since the bracketed expressions in (13) are thus shown to be intact constituents, it follows that \(=\overset{\text{ôlu}}{\text{but}}\) can only be located within an NP in each example, not between the segments of a discontinuous phrase. I conclude that second-position particles can and do quite literally interrupt phrases in MP. When they do, their location is internal to the phrases in question.

Penn (1999) and Diesing and Zec (2017) have reached a similar conclusion in analyzing second-position enclitics in Serbian and Croatian.\(^8\) Like MP enclitics, these
may either follow the first word of a clause ("second word" placement) or follow the first constituent ("second daughter placement"). The cited works demonstrate in detail that second word placement is determined by prosodic structure: a second-word clitic is attached to the first prosodic word within the domain of clitic placement (usually the clause), which may include a proclitic preposition. Because second word placement is determined by prosodic structure, rather than syntactic constituency, it may station an enclitic within a phrase. Second daughter placement, by contrast, is determined by syntactic constituent structure and places an enclitic at a phrase boundary.

An analysis of clitic placement in MP along the same lines appears promising. In particular, there is evidence that second word enclitics in MP are placed after the first prosodic word in a clause, rather than after the first syntactic word. These conditions diverge in the case of certain idiosyncratic expressions that themselves include clitics that are not part of an ordinary clitic sequence. Two such expressions are tân=op=al ‘would somehow; how would?’ and mèc=op=al ‘please; would it be possible?’ These are based on the independently occurring adverbs tân ‘how’ and mèc ‘still’. Both expressions include the enclitics =op ‘would’ and =al ‘uncertain’. Examples are given in (14).

(14a) Tàn=op=al kt-oli=kis- tôn–m-on?
how=COND=UNC 2-thus=able-buy-TH-N

‘How can you (sg.) possibly buy it?’ (Mal., LeSourd 2007:112)

(14b) Mèc=op=al k-kisi— anku-hqè-p kekèsk?
still=COND=UNC 2-able— farther-body-sit a.little
‘Can you please move over a little?’ (Pass., Francis et al. 2016, v. ankuhqepu ‘he or she moves over’)

What makes these expressions unusual is the fact that the conditional clitic \( =op \) may be repeated after them, doubling the occurrence of this clitic that forms part of the item, as shown in (15), where the symbol “\( \omega \)” indicates a prosodic word.

(15) \[ \omega \ [ \omega \ Tàn=op=al]=op=ōlu \ ] \ 't-oli=kisi='sotūw-á-nī-ya

\[ \text{how}=\text{COND}=\text{UNC}=\text{COND}=\text{but} \ 3-\text{thus}=\text{able}=\text{understand}-\text{DIR-N}-\text{PROX.PL} \]

\[ \text{kecciya-li-c-il} \ \text{skicinúw-ol}? \]

\[ \text{be.pure-OBV-3AN-OBV.SG} \ \text{Indian-OBV.SG} \]

‘But how could they determine what a full-blooded Indian is? (Pass., Francis and Leavitt 2008:160)

\[ \omega \ [ \omega \ Mèc=op=al]=op \ ] \ nt-api—wikūwamkóm-a-n \ n-uhkomoss-ôn?

\[ \text{still}=\text{COND}=\text{UNC}=\text{COND} \ 1-\text{go}=\text{visit}-\text{DIR-N} \ 1\text{-grandmother-1PL} \]

‘Could we go see our grandmother?’ (Pass., Francis et al. 2016, v. api- ‘go and return’)

This property, together with the idiosyncratic sense of \( mèc=op=al \) as ‘please’, suggests that we are dealing here with idioms, that is, with lexically listed expressions that include enclitics in their basic forms. These idiomatic enclitics form a prosodic word with their hosts. The ordinary clitic sequences \( =op=ōlu \) in (15a) and \( =op \) in (15b) are
stationed after the whole idiomatic expression in each of these examples, not after its initial word. This is expected if clitics are positioned with respect to prosodic, rather than syntactic words, since the base for the insertion of the productively placed clitics will naturally include the whole lexically specified prosodic word that appears in first position in each clause in the examples, as indicated by the bracketing. If we were to suppose instead that clitic sequences are positioned after the first syntactic word in a clause, we would expect the productively added enclitics to intervene between the base word of the idiom in each example and its lexically specified enclitics.

CONCLUSION

The evidence reviewed here suggests that second-position enclitics in MP that appear to have been stationed within a constituent are in fact so located, contrary to the claims of Johnson and Rosen (2015), who have analyzed examples of this kind in several Algonquian languages as involving the attachment of enclitics to the first segment of a discontinuous phrase.

Clitic placement after the first word of a clause is plausibly analyzed in MP in prosodic terms. Note further that this analysis provides a clear rationale for analyzing the second-position particles of MP as enclitics in the first place, that is, as components of a single prosodic word with their hosts.

We are left with a picture of clitic placement in MP as a dual process: part prosodically based and part syntactically based, just as in Serbian and Croatian. Given that second word placement is stated in terms of prosodic structure, the conclusion that clitics may occur within syntactic constituents in MP is unsurprising: second word clitics
are stationed without regard to phrase boundaries because their position is not determined on the basis of syntactic structure.
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NOTES

1 The comments of two reviewers and the editors of these Proceedings, as well as the questions of members of the audience at the conference, have been invaluable in helping me to sharpen and clarify the ideas presented in this paper. Naturally, remaining errors are my own.

2 The practical orthography used here employs the following conventions: <c> is /č/, <q> is /kw/, <o> is /ǝ/, and a word-initial /h/ before a consonant is written as an apostrophe <’. Acute and grave accents mark distinctively high and low pitched stressed syllables, respectively. The breve <’> marks phonologically “weak” vowels, which are ignored in stress assignment (which yields non-distinctive alternating stress to the left of the distinctively accented syllable). The double hyphen (=) marks the boundary between an enclitic and its host. The boundary between a preverb (prior member in a verbal compound) and the verb or compound that it modifies is indicated by a short dash (—).

3 The following abbreviations are used in glosses: 1 first person; 2 second person; 3 third person; AN animate; AOR aorist; COND conditional; CONJ conjunct; DIM diminutive; DIR direct; EMPH emphasis; IN inanimate; INV inverse; LOC locative; MPL multi-plural (the subject of the verb refers to three or more individuals); N suffix -(o)n(e)- (with several functions); NEG negative; NF noun final (noun-forming suffix); OBV obviative; PL plural; PROX proximate; REPORT reportative; SG singular; TH thematic suffix, UNC uncertain. Glosses are given in parentheses for morphemes that have no surface segmental shape.

4 The enclitic =al ‘uncertain’ is added to indefinite pronouns to indicate approximation. In this use, the enclitic is not restricted to second position.

5 See Stjepanović 2013 for some potentially problematic cases in Serbian and Croatian.
6 See Postal (1998:51–95) for an attempt to provide syntactic analyses for cases of extraction out of apparent coordinate structures in English that would make it unnecessary to recognize exceptions to the Element Constraint.

7 Recall that the emphatic clitic (=ō)te is not restricted to second position.

8 There is an extensive literature on clitic placement in Serbian and Croatian; see Bošković 2001 for a good overview. Both Bošković (2001) and Diesing and Zec (2017) analyze clitic placement in terms of movement operations. Penn (1999), on the other hand, develops a non-movement analysis in the HPSG framework.

9 Penn (1999:3) and Diesing and Zec (2017:13–14) report that a second-position enclitic may be stationed after the prosodic unit formed by a proclitic preposition and an attributive modifier of a following noun, even where these do not form a syntactic constituent together. Diesing and Zec (2017:10–11) also note that it is possible to place a second-position enclitic after the first of two conjoined predicate nouns or adjectives. As in comparable cases in MP, the clitic host in such examples cannot have been separated from the remainder of the conjunction structure without violating the Coordinate Structure Constraint.