

- (4) a. $\begin{array}{c} *[\text{ Proximate } \quad \text{ Obviative }] \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \text{ SBJ} \quad \quad \text{ PIP} \end{array}$ b. $\begin{array}{c} *[\text{ Proximate } \quad \text{ Obviative }] \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \text{ SBJ}[1/2] \quad \text{ OBJ+AGR / pron.} \quad \text{ PIP} \end{array}$

These patterns indicate that different grammatical elements have different default values w.r.t. obviation. Aissen (1997) analyses similar patterns in Algonquian and Mayan using participant and relational hierarchies. On the former, [prox] outranks (>) [obv], and on the latter, SBJ > OBJ, OBJ > OBL etc. When two hierarchies are not aligned harmonically, i.e. [prox] OBJ — [obv] SBJ, ungrammaticality arises unless certain repair strategies are used (inverse in Algonquian, passive in Mayan). For TN, we propose that **PIPs participate in the relational hierarchy**, shown in (5).

- (5) $\text{ SBJ} > \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ OBJ + AGR (agreeing object),} \\ \text{ 3rd non-SBJ pronoun} \end{array} \right\} > \text{ PIP} > \text{ OBJ, OBL...}$

The distribution of PIPs is as follows. PIPs are lexically specified as [prox]. This implies that to be licensed, PIPs must not be outranked by elements that are higher in (5), such as 3rd person SBJ, OBJ+AGR or pronominal. In case of a conflict, the non-agreeing possessor must be used. But PIPs are compatible with lower-ranked elements, i.e. non-agreeing OBJ and non-pronominal OBL.

Supporting evidence for this status of PIPs comes from their behaviour in the clause. First, TN has syntactic strategies that repair ungrammatical mappings. For example, (6a), with a PIP co-referential to the object pronoun, entails that OBJ is proximate, while SBJ must be obviative, violating (5). This can be repaired by extraposing the lexical NP corresponding to the PIP, i.e. removing it from the obviation span (the clause), as in (6b).

- (6) a. $*[\text{ Wera-h } \quad \acute{n}e^\circ ka\text{-}da \quad] \acute{s}ita \quad lad\acute{a}^\circ$
 Wera-GEN brother-3SG s/he.ACC hit
- b. $\text{ Wera-m } \acute{n}e^\circ ka\text{-}da \quad \acute{s}ita \quad lad\acute{a}^\circ$
 Wera-ACC brother3SG s/he.ACC hit
- ‘Wera_i’s brother hit him_i.’, lit. ‘As for Wera, his brother hit him.’

Second, PIPs behave like **clause-level** elements w.r.t. certain anaphoric processes. For example, they can serve as antecedents for possessive anaphors. In (7a), the possessive pronoun *pida* must be free. With the PIP in (7b), the possessive pronoun *can* be co-referent with the possessor *Mašah*. Similar behaviour is typical of clause-level non-subject arguments.

- (7) a. $[\text{ Maša-h } \quad w\acute{e}sako \quad] \text{ (pida) } x\acute{a}r^\circ\text{-}m\text{-}ta \quad xana^\circ$
 Masha-GEN husband s/he knife-ACC-3SG take.3SG
 ‘Masha_i’s husband_j took his/her_{i/*j/k} knife.’
- b. $[\text{ Maša-h } \quad w\acute{e}sako\text{-}da \quad] \text{ (pida) } x\acute{a}r^\circ\text{-}m\text{-}ta \quad xana^\circ$
 Masha-GEN husband-3SG s/he knife-ACC-3SG take.3SG
 ‘Masha_i’s husband_j took his/her_{i/*j/k} knife.’

PIPs also pattern with clause-level elements w.r.t. anaphoric relations across a clause boundary, but they are nevertheless NP-internal. We propose that this follows from their prominent position in the NP: PIPs are adjoined to DP, i.e. contained in but not dominated by DP (Chomsky 1995):

- (8) $[\text{ DP } \text{ Wera-h } \quad [\text{ DP } [\text{ D } \acute{t}uku^\circ \quad [\text{ POSSP } \text{ te-da} \quad]]]]$ ‘this reindeer of Wera’s’
 Wera-GEN this reindeer-3SG

3 Conclusions The distribution of 3rd person NPs in TN follows from the same principles that explain obviation in Algonquian and Mayan (Aissen 1997). What makes TN special is that it grammaticalises the proximate/obviative distinction in possessive NPs: PIPs are lexically

specified as proximate and thus compete with other 3rd person clause-level constituents. The clause-level syntactic properties of PIPs follow from their adjunction structure.

References Aissen, J. 1997. On the syntax of obviation. *Lg* 73. 705–750. Chomsky, N. 1995. *The minimalist program*. MIT Press. Nikolaeva, I. 2014. *A grammar of Tundra Nenets*. De Gruyter.