Second position without movement: Enclitic particles in Passamaquoddy

Philip S. LeSourd 🆔

Indiana University

Abstract

Maliseet-Passamaquoddy (Algonquian, New Brunswick and Maine, MP) employs a set of enclitic particles to express tense, aspect, and various adverbial notions. These occupy second position in a clause: they follow either the first word in the clause or the first constituent. Johnson and Rosen (2015) propose an analysis of clitic placement in Menominee (Algonquian, Wisconsin) that takes clitics to occupy a functional head in the left periphery, postulating movement of one item into a specifier position to the left of this functional head, thus leaving the clitics in second position. Here I propose an alternative account for MP in the framework of Sign-Based Phrase Structure Grammar (Sag 2012) that makes no use of functional heads and postulates no movement operations. Instead, clitic positions are determined by a small number of maximally simple constructional statements.

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 follow the first phrase in the clause (1b): second daughter placement.[1]

(1) (a)   [AdvP   Kàt=**ona**   qìn]   cipok-eltù-wi-yol
               not=also   really   intense-be.much-NEG-IN.PL

---

[1] *Notation:* c = /č/, q = /kʷ/, o = /ə/, ' = word-initial /h/ before C. Acute and grave accents mark distinctively high- and low-pitched stressed syllables, respectively. An equals sign (=) marks a clitic boundary. An m-dash (–) marks the boundary between a preverb and the verb or preverb-verb complex that it modifies.

pskihq-ís-ol.
grass-DIM-IN.PL[2]
'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 Serbian and Croatian (see Diesing and Zec 2017 for a recent study) typically suppose that clitics occupy 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 this functional head. An analysis along these lines is proposed for several Algonquian languages, with a focus on Menominee (Wisconsin), by Johnson and Rosen (2015). More on their approach shortly.

I will instead pursue a constraint-based analysis formulated within Sign-Based Construction Grammar (SBCG, Sag 2012). Three constructions are needed to account for the distribution of enclitics:

---

[2] *Abbreviations used in glosses:* 1 first person; 3 third person; AN, an. animate; AOR aorist; COND conditional; CONJ conjunct; DIM diminutive; DIR direct; EMPH emphatic; exc. exclusive; IN inanimate; MPL multi-plural (the subject of the verb refers to three or more individuals); N suffix *-(o)n(e)-* (several functions); NEG negative; OBV obviative; PL, pl. plural; PROX proximate; REPORT reportative; SG singular; UNC uncertain. Glosses are given in parentheses for morphemes that have no surface segmental shape.

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

I formalize these constructions below. But first, some preliminaries require attention.

2   The enclitics

The second-position particles of MP are 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'
      =*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).

3   Locating the left edge of the clause

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

An example with an adjoined AdvP is given in (3).

(3) [s **Malom=ehta=cel**   [s yùt=**yaq**
      finally=indeed=moreover   this.IN=REPORT
      mulahkepolásu   ktáhkomiq
      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 very 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. In (5), for example, the demonstrative **nòt** 'that (an.)' is separated from the noun **'puwìn** 'corpse, body' that it modifies by an adverb and the verb of the clause.

(5) Mahkiyew-òss   [NPa **nòt**]   àpc   mete-htéhsi-t
      soon-DIM   that.PROX   again heard-fall-3AN
      [NPb **'puwìn**].
      corpse
      'After a little while **[the body]** was heard to fall again.'
      (Passamaquoddy)

49

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 constituent is left behind, a discontinuous constituent is the result. Note that they allow TopP and FocP to be iterated, as in (6a). The operations in question proceed as shown in (6b).

(6)   a. [TopP … [FocP … TopP …]]]
           (Johnson and Rosen 2015:142)
      b. [$_{TopP}$ XPa [$_{Top}$o = Clitic] [$_{FocP}$ … [$_{TopP}$ [$_{Top}$o t$_{XPa}$ XPb] …]]]

A Menominee example under Johnson and Rosen's analysis is shown in (7):

(7)   [$_{TopP}$ [$_D$ **Ayom**] [$_{Top°}$ [$_&$ **=taeh**]] [$_{FocP}$ [$_{Foc°}$ Ø] [$_{TopP}$ [$_{NP}$ [$_D$ t$_{ayom}$]
           this.AN   =and
      owōhnema [$_{Top°}$ Ø] [$_{&P}$ [$_&$ t$_{taeh}$] [$_{TP}$'s   osēqtahnacen
      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, Johnson and Rosen 2015:145, simplified)

On this analysis, the enclitic conjunction *=taeh* 'and' initially occupies the position of head of &P, low in the clausal spine. It undergoes raising to become the head of TopP in the left periphery. ***Ayom owōhnema*** 'this father' is raised from subject position (not shown) to specifier position in an inner TopP, then its determiner ***ayom*** 'this (an.)' is raised again to specifier postion in a second, higher TopP, providing a host for the enclitic conjunction.

5 Against movement

Several problems arise if we try to adopt Johnson and Rosen's approach for MP. I will review just one here: second-position clics may be stationed in MP in two locations with respect to the same phrase. Consider (8) in this connection.

(8) [_{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.' (Maliseet)

The reportative enclitic *=yaq* has been positioned after the clause-initial NP in this example by second-daughter placement. Thus, this NP must be intact; IT CANNOT BE DISCONTINUOUS.

It follows that *=olu* 'but' truly interrupts the bracketed NP in (8). It is not attached to the first segment of a discontinuous NP, one 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): *yùkt* 'these' is not a separate constituent that has moved away from *wasísok* 'children' so as to constitute a host for *=olu*. An analysis in Johnson and Rosen's terms is excluded.

6 A non-movement analysis: background

I propose instead an analysis that makes use neither of abstract underlying forms nor of movement. We can account for clitic placement in MP if we adopt a set of three word-order constructions, adapting the mechanisms of Wetta's (2011, 2014) analysis of verb-second phenomena, which is stated in the framework of Sign-Based Construction Grammar (SBCG, Sag 2012).

I extend SBCG to include the Linearization Theory of Reape 1994. 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.

51

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 these tools 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* $\Rightarrow$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{MTR} \ [\text{SYN} \ [\text{CAT} \ \text{S}]] \\ \text{DTRS} < [\text{D} <[\text{LIN} \textit{flex}]>] \oplus [\text{D} <[\text{LIN} \textit{fix}]>] \oplus [\text{D} <[\text{LIN} \textit{flex}]>]_o > \end{bmatrix}$$

This rule states that the mother (MTR) of the construction (of category S, a clause) consists of a concatenation ($\oplus$) 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 two or more enclitics routinely appear together in second position, as illustrated in (12).

(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*), as shown in (13).

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

Rule (13) states that the mother of the compacting construction (the compacted set of domain items) is itself a single domain item (a 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 (such as Western Abenaki, LeSourd 2015:311–312), 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. The emphatic enclitic =*ote* equally requires a host, but 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* ⇒

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{MTR } [\text{SYN } [\text{CAT S}]] \\[4pt] \text{DTRS} < [\text{D} <[\text{LIN } \textit{flex}]>] \oplus [\text{D} <[\text{LIN } \textit{fix}]>] \oplus [\text{D} <[\text{LIN } \textit{flex}]>]_\circ > \end{array} \right]$$

9   The clitic-second-word-construction

Second-word clitic placement is 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* ⇒

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{MTR } [\text{SYN } [\text{CAT S}]] \\
\text{DTRS } < [\text{DOM } < [\text{PHON } < \omega >] >] \oplus [\text{DOM } < [\text{LIN } \textit{fix}] >] \\
\qquad \oplus [\text{D } < [\text{LIN } \textit{flex}] >]_o >]
\end{bmatrix}
$$

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**. The clitic group may be followed by any number of non-clitic constituents.

Evidence for this formulation of the *clitic-2D-cxt* comes from two idiomatic expressions that are based on adverbial particles that include enclitics that are not part of an ordinary clitic group, as shown in (15).

(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 the expressions in (15b), doubling the occurrence of this clitic that forms part of the idiom. Examples are given below in (16). Only in such cases are clitics ever repeated within a clitic sequence.

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 a base consisting of the adverb plus the inner enclitics. 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—formed by adding the inner enclitics to the adverb.

(16) *Clitic placement after the first phonological word in a clause*
　　a. [ω [ω Tàn=op=al]**=op=olu**]
　　　　　how=COND=UNC=COND=but
　　　　't-oli–kisi–'sotuw-á-ni-ya
　　　　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
      still=COND=UNC=COND 1-go–visit-DIR-N
   n-uhkomoss-òn?
   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) [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.' (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.

On one parse, the Clitic Second Word Construction (14) analyzes *yùkt* 'these' as the host for a second-position enclitic, here *=olu*. At the same time, the Clitic Second Daughter Construction (10) analyzes the entire initial NP *yùkt wasísok* 'these children' as a clitic host, here for *=yaq* 'reportative'. The two analyses are fully compatible, and both are licensed in the same structure.

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 (a clitic group) 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.

Newell of Indian Township, ME. With the exception of Margaret Apt, all of these language experts have now passed away.

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.

LeSourd, Philip S. 2015. Enclitic particles in Western Abenaki: Form and function. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 81: 301–335.

Reape, Mike. 1994. Domain union and word order variation in German. *In* John Nerbonne, Klaus Netter & Carl Pollard (eds.), German in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (CSLI Lecture Notes 46), 151–198. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Sag, Ivan A. 2012. Sign-Based Construction Grammar: An informal synopsis. *In* Hans C. Boas and Ivan A. Sag, eds., *Sign-Based Construction Grammar,* 61–197. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

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.