Second-Position Enclitics Occur within Constituents in

Maliseet-Passamaquoddy

Philip S. LeSourd

Indiana University, Bloomington

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.[1] 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', *=(ŏ)lu* 'but, however', *=(ŏ)na* 'also', *=op* 'would' (conditional), *=tahk* 'surprisingly' (mirative), *=yaka* 'afterward, furthermore', and *=yaq* 'it is said, they say' (reportative).[2]

The examples in (1) and (2) illustrate the two modes of second-position placement that are characteristic of MP enclitics.[3]

(1a) [AdvP **Kàt=ŏna** qìn]   cipŏk-elt-ùwĭ-yil   pskihq-ís-ol.

            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)

(1b) [_{AdvP} Kàt qìn]=**yaq**=**ŏna**   nokŏm-okil-ù.

     not really=REPORT=also fairly-be.size-(3)-NEG

     'And he was not really very big, they say.' (Mal., LeSourd 2007:4)

(2a) [_{NP} Malíyan=**yaq**   mihtáqs-ol]   kìs   api—punáwe.

     Mary.Ann=REPORT (3)-father-OBV.SG already go—set.traps-(3)

     'Mary Ann's father, they say, had already gone out to set traps.' (Pass.,

     Socobasin 1979:40)

(2b) [_{NP} *Wásis wilítpan*]=***yaka*=*yaq***   *pson-íkon*   *etucéyi-t*   *kamáhcin.*

     child   (3)-brain=after=REPORT full-grow-(3) be.so.old-3AN six

     'A child's brain will reach its full size, they say, when he or she is six.' (Pass.,

     Francis and Leavitt 2008:606)

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 =*(ŏ)na* has been positioned after the first word of the clause in (1a), while

both =*yaq* and =*(ŏ)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 =ŏte in (3c) is not restricted to second-position.)

(3a) [NP Yùkk=**yaq=ŏlu**   kótŏk-ik   kukéc-ok]

          these.PROX=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…' (Pass., W. Newell 1974:8)

(3b) Yùt=tahk=yaq   éhtek   mihkután-is qahqŏlunsq-èy,

here=MIRATIVE=REPORT   be.located-3IN   knife-DIM   clay-NF

[NP 'tomákon=**na**   qahqŏlunsq-èy].

    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=ŏte,   [PP tètt=**ŏna**   olŏqìw Wahsipekùsk]

finally=EMPH   that.way=also toward St.Lawrence.LOC

olŏq-apasi-htì-t   naci—qilŭwaht-à-q   wèn   salawèy,

toward-pl.walk-PROX.PL-3AN   go—look.for-TH-3AN   someone   salt

on   Muhàks   matŏn-okù-nĭ-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, *qahqŏlunsqèy* '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**]=**ŏlu**   wŏlíku   [NPb yùt   olŏqì   tol-èy   pilsqéhsis].

     this.PROX=but   be.pretty-(3)   here   toward   location-NF   girl

     'But the girl from over this way was pretty.' (Mal., LeSourd 2007:80)

(4b) [NPa **Psì**=**na**   **yùkt**]   pehkì   kisac-ultú-w-ok

     all=also   these.PROX   completely   be.ready-MPL-3-PROX.PL

[NPb somakŏnóss-ok] weci—peskhik-hotí-hti-t psì wiwŏnìw.

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 olŏqì tolèy pilsqéhsis 'the girl from over this way'; the verb *wŏlíku* '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 *=ŏlu* 'but'. In (4b), the second-position

enclitic *=na* 'also' follows the first word of *psì yùkt…* 'all these (prox.)', the first segment

of the discontinuous NP *psì yùkt… somakŏnóssok* '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.)

(5)   [TopP ... [FocP ... [TopP ...]]]

        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° $\emptyset$] [NP [D t$_{ayom}$] **owōhnemaw**] [Top° $\emptyset$]

        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)

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.

(8a) [NP [NP **Éhpit=ŏlu**]   naka   [NP skitàp]] nis-ikapŭwú-w-ok.

woman=but   and   man   together-stand-3-PROX.PL

'But a woman and a man are standing together.' (Mal., Paul 1963, no. 8)

(8b) [NP [NP **Wòt=yaq**   mahtoqèhs] naka [NP cŏqóls]] tamà=al[4]

this.PROX=REPORT rabbit   and   frog   somewhere=UNCERTAIN

kcíhk-uk   etŏl-akŏnutŏmá-hti-t.

forest-LOC   ongoing-tell.stories-PROX.PL-3AN

'This rabbit and a frog, they say, were telling stories somewhere in the woods.'

(Pass., E. Newell 1974:1)

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).[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).[6]

(10) How many lakes can we [destroy ___ 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), *éhpit* 'woman' is conjoined with *skitàp* 'man'. To move *éhpit* 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 *=ŏlu* 'but', assumed to be in the head position in such a projection, will violate the Conjunct Constraint. In (8b), movement of *wòt* 'this' leftward out of *wòt mahtoqèhs* 'this rabbit' so that *wòt* can pick up the enclitic *=yaq* will violate the Element Constraint, since *wòt mahtoqèhs* is conjoined with *cŏqóls* '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)   Mecimí=te   **Píyel naka Máli**   pŏm-íh-hik.

       always=EMPH Peter and   Mary   along-go-(3)-PROX.PL

       'Peter and Mary are always on the go.' (Pass.)

(11b)   Mecimí=te   **Píyel**   pŏm-íh-hik   **naka Máli**.

       always=EMPH   Peter   along-go-(3)-PROX.PL   and   Mary

       'Peter and Mary are always on the go.' (Pass.)

(11c)   Mecimí=te   **Píyel** pŏm-íye   **naka Máli**.

       always=EMPH Peter along-go-(3) and   Mary

       '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-hti-t   naka   Píyel?

who   leave-PROX.PL-3AN   and   Peter

'Who (sg.) are leaving and Peter?' (Pass.)

(12c) Wén-ik   macahá-hti-t   naka   Píyel?

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

'Who (pl.) are leaving with Peter?' (Pass.)

In (12a), the verb *macáhat* '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 Píyel* 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) [NP Yùkt=**ŏlu**   wasís-ok]=**yaq**   'totŏli—tokŏm-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.' (Mal., Polchies et al. 2013:10.16)

(13b) [NP Wòt=**ŏlu**   mihkomŭwèhs]=**yaq**   sŏlahkiw   unakéssi-n.

             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 *=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 *=yaq* does not occur together with *=ŏlu* '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 *=ŏlu* 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.[9] 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 *tàn=op=al* 'would somehow; how would?' and *mèc=op=al* 'please; would it be possible?' These are based on the independently occurring adverbs *tàn* '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-ŏnúh-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

15

'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 "ω" indicates a prosodic word.

(15) [ω [ω Tàn=**op**=al]=**op**=ŏlu]   't-oli=kisi='sotŭw-á-nĭ-ya

         how=COND=UNC=COND=but   3-thus=able=understand-DIR-N-PROX.PL

            kecciya-lí-c-il   skicinúw-ol?

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

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

(15b) [ω [ω Mèc=**op**=al]=**op**]   nt-api—wikŭwamkóm-a-n   n-uhkomoss-òn?

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

'Could we 0.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*=*ŏlu* 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

17

are stationed without regard to phrase boundaries because their position is not determined on the basis of syntactic structure.

REFERENCES

Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface: Cliticization and Related Phenomena.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Deane, Paul D. 1991. Limits to Attention: A Cognitive Theory of Island Constraints. *Cognitive Linguistics* 2:1–63.

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.

Donohue, Cathryn, and Ivan A. Sag. 1999. Domains in Warlpiri. Paper Presented at the Sixth International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Edinburgh, August 4–6. (http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~gpenn/csc2517/donohue-sag99.pdf)

Francis, David A., and Robert M. Leavitt. 2008. *Peskotomuhkati Wolastoqewi Latuwewakon / Passamaquoddy-Maliseet Dictionary*. Orono, ME: University of Maine Press.

Goldsmith, John J. 1985. A Principled Exception to the Coordinate Structure Constraint. In William Eilfort, Paul Kroeber, and Karen Peterson (eds.), *Papers from the Twenty-First Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 133–143. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Grosu, Alexander. 1973. On the Nonunitary Nature of the Coordinate Structure Constraint. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4:88–92.

18

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.

Lakoff, George. 1986. Frame Semantic Control of the Coordinate Structure Constraint. In
Anne M. Farley, Peter T. Farley, and Karl-Erik McCullough (eds.), *Chicago
Linguistic Society 22: Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory*, 152–
167. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

LeSourd, Philip S. 2007. *Tales from Maliseet Country: The Maliseet Texts of Karl V.
Teeter.* Linclon, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

LeSourd, Philip S. 2014. Prepositional Phrases in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. *International
Journal of American Linguistics* 80:209–240.

[Newell, Elizabeth.] 1974. *Mahtoqehs naka Malsom* [Rabbit and Wolf]. Indian
Township, ME: Wabnaki Bilingual Education Program.

[Newell, Wayne.] 1974. *Kukec* [Game warden]. Indian Township, ME: Wabnaki
Bilingual Education Program.

Francis, David A., Robert M. Leavitt, and Margaret Apt. 2016. *Passamaquoddy-Maliseet
Language Portal.* Fredericton, NB: University of New Brunswick.
http://pmportal.org/

Paul, Peter. 1963. Text number 1, Maliseet Texts 1963. Audiotaped interview with Karl
V. Teeter, Woodstock, NB. [Original tape is deposited with the Papers of Karl V.
Teeter in the Harvard University Archives, Cambridge, MA.]

Penn, Gerald. 1999. A Generalized-Domain-Based Approach to Serbo-Croatian Second-

Position Clitic Placement. In Gosse Bouma (ed.), *Constraints and Resources in Natural Language Syntax and Semantics*, 119–136. Stanford: CSLI.

Polchies, Margaret, Archie Polchies, Madeleine Tomah, and John Sacoby. 2013. *Kəloskapeyal naka Kansohseyal Atkohkakənəl* [Stories of Koluskap and Ancient Things]. Fredericton, NB: St. Thomas University.

Pollard, Carl, and Ivan A. Sag. 1994. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Postal, Paul M. 1998. *Three Investigations of Extraction.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ross, John R. 1967. Constraints on Variables in Syntax. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Socobasin, Mary Ellen. 1979. *Maliyan / Mary Ann*. Indian Township, ME: Wabnaki Bilingual Education Program.

Stjepanović, Sandra. 2013. Left-Branch Extraction and the Coordinate Structure Constraint. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society* 44, vol. 2, 157–170. Amherst, MA: Graduate Linguistic Student Association.

[2] The practical orthography used here employs the following conventions: <c> is /č/, <q> is /kʷ/, <o> is /ə/, 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 *-(ŏ)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 =(ŏ)*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.