Obviation in Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey: Dependent case?*

Peter Grishin, Elise Newman, Giovanni Roversi (MIT)
grishin@mit.edu, esnewman@mit.edu, groversi@mit.edu

Understanding Obviation – October 6, 2024

1 Introduction

- There is **no consensus** on what the proximate/obviative distinction is in Algonquian languages.

  - ▸ It has **syntactic aspects**...   (Grafstein 1984, Rhodes 1990, Bruening 2001, 2005, Bliss 2017, a.o.)

    - » You can have at most **one proximate** per clause.

    - » Nominals possessed by third person animates **must be obviative**.

  - ▸ ...but also **semantic/pragmatic aspects**.
    (Grafstein 1984, Goddard 1990, Branigan and MacKenzie 1999, Thomason 2003, Oshima 2007, Muehlbauer 2008, Little and Moroney 2016, a.m.o.)

    - » There's an intuition that proximates are **pragmatically "prominent"** in some difficult-to-pin-down sense, especially in **narratives**.   (*not* the same as topic/focus; Dahlstrom 2017)

    - » Proximate/obviative assignment also seems to **correlate with coreference possibilities**:

      - – **Proximates must corefer** (within some domain).

      - – Proximates **cannot corefer with obviatives** (within some domain).

  - ▸ (cf. Will's talk which promises to unite some of these perhaps not-so-conflicting aspects!)

- We'd like to contribute to this discussion in the **following ways**:   (we might not get to all of them)

  - ▸ describe how nominal obviation works in **Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey**,

  - ▸ show that it seems to **strictly obey syntactic constraints** similar to **dependent ACC case**,

  - ▸ show that it **lacks many** (if not all) of the **semantic/pragmatic properties** of obviation reported for other Algonquian languages,

  - ▸ suggest that there is **significant variation** in the domain of obviation across Algonquian,

  - ▸ and discus some **theoretical consequences** for our understanding of **dependent case**.

2 Background

2.1 The language

- Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey is an **Eastern Algonquian** language spoken in eastern Maine and New Brunswick.   (590 L1 spkrs, per Ethnologue, all >60 y.o.; likely significantly less than that, Roger Paul, p.c.)

  ▸ **Passamaquoddy:** the variety spoken in Maine.

  ▸ **Wolastoqey** [wəɬʌstəgʷej]: the variety spoken in New Brunswick.   (exonym: Maliseet)

  ▸ Both are **mutually intelligible**, and only have a **few minor differences**.
  (primarily phonological and lexical)

- **The data** comes from ongoing work (2020–present) using standard context-based elicitation methodology (e.g. Matthewson 2004, Bochnak and Matthewson 2015, a.o.), carried out primarily over Zoom (and *in situ* in January 2023, January 2024, and August 2024), with **five speakers**: **Margaret Apt** (P; Sipayik), **Edwina Mitchell** (W; Tobique First Nation), **Grace Paul** (P; Sipayik), **Roger Paul** (W/P; Tobique First Nation/Motahkomikuk), and **Madonna Soctomah** (P; Sipayik).

  ▸ We also make use of **corpus data** taken from example sentences in the **online dictionary** (https://pmportal.org/), as well as a collection of **Passamaquody stories** (Newell and Leavitt 2020) and a collection of **Wolastoqey stories** (Teeter and LeSourd 2007).

- As far as we can tell, there's **no difference** in the grammar of obviation between dialects or between elicitation, narratives, and casual naturalistic speech.

2.2 Obviation morphology

- Obviation is morphologically marked on **nouns**, **nominal modifiers** (including determiners and numerals), and **verbs**.

- Only **third person animates** show evidence of an obviation contrast, whether with **nominal** obviation marking or with **verbal** obviation agreement.
  (in contrast to many Algonquian languages with obviative agreement with inanimates on intransitive verbs)

  ▸ We assume that only **third person animates** contrast proximate-obviative, but there isn't any very clear evidence for/against the idea that inanimates also participate in obviation.

- In glosses, we use **3** for *(i)* (general) third person or *(ii)* proximate third person, in contrastive contexts, and **3′** for obviative third person.

  ▸ This should hopefully not be too confusing, especially since proximate verb agreement is sometimes found with obviatives (in the right syntactic contexts).

- On **nouns** and **nominal modifiers** obviation is realized by a **suffix** in the **rightmost position**:[1]

  (for instance, it appears after possessor agreement)

(1) a. pesq-**Ø** emqan-**Ø**
         one-**3s** spoon-**3s**

         'one spoon (PX)'

     b. pesku-**wok** emqan-**ok**
         one-**3p**   spoon-**3p**

         'some spoons (PX)'

     c. pesku-**wol** emqan-**ol**
         one-**3′s**   spoon-**3′s**

         'one spoon (OBV)'

     d. pesku-**hu** emqan-`
         one-**3′p**   spoon-**3′p**

         'some spoons (OBV)'

  ▸ What we write as a **grave accent** is a floating **low pitch accent** that associates with the **final underlying vowel**, potentially bleeding final vowel syncope.

- Proximate/obviative is also tracked **on verb agreement** in certain cases; we'll **abstract from this here** and focus primarily on **nominal obviative marking**.

  ▸ Feel free to **ask about verbal agreement** if you're curious, though!

    (for Algonquianists: verbal obviative agreement is a bit attrited in Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey; there's no reflex of PA *-ema·* '3′OBJ', and the central suffix *-li* '3″' only appears with obviative subjects in AI subordinative, AI conjunct, and optionally in the TI conjunct)

- Throughout, we'll <u>underline proximates</u> and **bold obviatives**.

3   Basics: the c-command condition

- In this section, we'd like to establish the **basic properties** of nominal obviation, which can be captured by the **following rule**:   (see Bruening 2005:§4.1 and Richards 2010:136–137 for similar ideas)

  (see Rhodes 1976:Ch.8, 1990, 1994 for a similar idea implemented in RG)

  (2) **Obviation rule**

       An obviation competitor O is assigned obviative if and only if it is c-commanded by another obviation competitor P within the same obviation domain, and there is no (hard)[2] phase boundary separating O and P. Else, O is assigned proximate.

       i.   **Obviation competitor:** A nominal is an obviation competitor iff it is 3AN.

       ii. **Obviation domain:** A constituent is an obviation domain iff it is a phase.

       iii. **(Hard) phase heads** are (at least) D, P, and C.

---

[1]Abbreviations: 0 = inanimate, 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, ACC = accusative, ADD = additive, AI = animate intransitive, AI+O = animate intransitive with secondary object, AN = animate, APPL = applicative, C = complementizer, CAUS = causative, CF = counterfactual, CJ = conjunct, CTOP = contrastive topic, DIM = diminutive, DIR = direct, E = E preverb, EMPH = emphatic, ERG = ergative, FUT = future, IC = initial change, II = inanimate intransitive, IN = inanimate, INV = inverse, IPFV = imperfective, LOC = locative, N = N formative, NDIR = indirect, NEG = negative, NOM = nominative, OBJ = object, OBV = obviative, PFV = perfective, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PRET = preterit, PROG = progressive, PST = past, PX = proximate, REL = relational, SBJV = subjunctive, SG = singular, TA = transitive animate, TA+O = transitive animate with secondary object, TI = transitive inanimate, WH = *wh*.

[2]On the hard vs. soft phase distinction, see Baker (2015:149). We equivocate here slightly because the necessity of "hard" in this statement depends on whether all VP-internal arguments move out of the VP phase in Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey, or even whether there are VP phases at all. See Grishin (2023b:83) for some discussion.

▶ A 3AN nominal will be assigned obviative if it's **c-commanded by another 3AN nominal** in the **same obviation domain**. (≈what some might call a "proximate span")

▶ Otherwise, **it *must* be assigned proximate**. (different from other Algonquian languages?)
(similar to Meskwaki "informal" styles? Thomason 1995)
(similar to younger Odawa speakers? Rhodes 1976:200)

▶ Obviation generally **"resets" across domains**.
(we discuss restricted instances of cross-domain obviation in §5, suggesting they're derived by (potentially covert) movement to the phase edge)

3.1 The nominal domain

■ Within a DP, a noun possessed by an SAP **must be proximate** (in an intransitive clause), and a noun possessed by a 3AN **must be obviative**.

(3) SAP possessor: proximate only

    a. Ckuh-qepu-Ø-Ø <u>n-temis-Ø</u> pemsokhasi-k.
       to.here-sit$_{AI}$-3-3s <u>1-dog-3s</u> floor-LOC
       '<u>My dog (PX)</u> sat on the floor (facing me).'

    b. *Ckuh-qepu-Ø-wol **n-temis-ol** pemsokhasi-k.
       to.here-sit$_{AI}$-3-3's **1-dog-3's** floor-LOC
       Intended: '**My dog (OBV)** sat on the floor (facing me).' (GP 2020.11.24;DP)

(4) 3AN possessor: **obviative only**

    a. Ckuh-qepu-Ø(-wol) <u>Laca-Ø</u> **'-temis-ol** pemsokhasi-k.[4]
       to.here-sit$_{AI}$-3(-3's) <u>Roger-3s</u> **3-dog-3's** floor-LOC
       '<u>Roger's (PX)</u> **dog (OBV)** sat on the floor (facing me).'

    b. *Ckuh-qepu-Ø-Ø <u>Laca-Ø</u> '-temis-Ø pemsokhasi-k.
       to.here-sit$_{AI}$-3-3s <u>Roger-3s</u> <u>3-dog-3s</u> floor-LOC
       Intended: '<u>Roger's (PX)</u> <u>dog (PX)</u> sat on the floor (facing me).' (GP 2020.12.08;DP)

■ **NB:** Proximate with SAP possessors can be **"overwritten" by clausal obviative** (discussed below), though there seems to be variation across speakers in whether this is **visible on the noun** (it's always visible on verbal agreement):

(5) *More conservative speakers* (Privoznov 2020:7)

    a. *Ø-Nomiy-a-l <u>Laca-Ø</u> k-posu-m-Ø.
       3-see$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3's <u>Roger-3s</u> 2-cat-POSS-3s
       Intended: '<u>Roger (PX)</u> sees.<u>3s</u>>3's your cat (PX).'

    b. Ø-Nomiy-a-l <u>Laca-Ø</u> **k-posu-m-ol.**
       3-see$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3's <u>Roger-3s</u> **2-cat-POSS-3's**
       '<u>Roger (PX)</u> sees.<u>3s</u>>3's your cat **(OBV)**.'

---

[4]Obviative verbal agreement here is optional. On intransitive verbs and TI conjunct verbs, obviative agreement with DP obviatives subjects is optional; in all other cases DP obviatives *must* be agreed-with as if they were proximate.

(6) *Innovative speakers*   (Privoznov 2020:7)

    a. <u>Laca-Ø</u>   't-otol-okehkim-a-**l**   <u>n-ikuwoss-Ø</u>.
        <u>Roger-3s</u> 3-PROG-teach$_{TA}$-3OBJ-**3′s** <u>1-mother-POSS-3s</u>
        '<u>Roger (PX)</u> is teaching.<u>3s</u>>**3′s** <u>my mother (PX)</u>.'

    b. *<u>Laca-Ø</u>   't-otol-okehkim-a-**l**   **n-ikuwoss-ol**.
        <u>Roger-3s</u> 3-PROG-teach$_{TA}$-3OBJ-**3′s** **1-mother-POSS-3′s**
        Intended: '<u>Roger (PX)</u> is teaching.<u>3s</u>>**3′s my mother (OBV)**.'

  ▸ We'll return to this in our discussion of **dependent case**, where we'll show how we can understand this phenomenon as different morphological outcomes of **case stacking/multiple case assignment**.

3.2   The clausal domain

- In a simple matrix clause, if there's **only one 3AN around**, then it **must be proximate**.

                                (this data replicates with 3AN↔IN, omitted for space)

(7) Intransitive: <u>proximate only</u>

    a. Nihtaw-intu-Ø-Ø   <u>Laca-Ø</u>.   b. *Nihtaw-intu-Ø-wol   **Lacaw-ol**.
        know.how-sing$_{AI}$-3-3s <u>Roger-3s</u>   know.how-sing$_{AI}$-3-3s **Roger-3′s**
        '<u>Roger (PX)</u> sings well.'   Intended: '**Roger (OBV)** sings well.'
                                                    (GP, RP 2020.11.10;DP)

(8) SAP→3AN: <u>proximate only</u>

    a. Ø-Nomiy-a-n-Ø   <u>olomuss-Ø</u>.   b. *Ø-Nomiy-a-nnu-l **olomuss-ol**.
        1-see$_{TA}$-3OBJ-1p-3s <u>dog-3s</u>   1-see$_{TA}$-3OBJ-1p-3′s **dog-3′s**
        'We saw <u>a dog (PX)</u>.'   Intended: 'We saw **a dog (OBV)**.'
                                                     (GP, RP 2020.11.24;DP)

(9) 3AN→SAP: <u>proximate only</u>

    a. Ø-Nomiy-uku-n-Ø <u>olomuss-Ø</u>.   b. *Ø-Nomiy-uku-nnu-l **olomuss-ol**.
        1-see$_{TA}$-INV-1p-3s <u>dog-3s</u>   1-see$_{TA}$-INV-1p-3′s   **dog-3′s**
         '<u>A dog (PX)</u> saw us.'   Intended: '**A dog (OBV)** saw us.'
                                                     (GP, RP 2020.11.24;DP)

  ▸ We've also never come across any instances of this in matrix clauses in narratives.

- This is **different** from some other Algonquian languages, like **Blackfoot**, where 3AN intransitive subjects of simple matrix clauses can be **either proximate or obviative**:

(10) *Blackfoot*

    a. Á-yissksimmaa-wa <u>om-a</u>   <u>imitáá-wa</u>.
        IPFV-carry.load$_{AI}$-3s <u>that-3s</u> <u>dog-3s</u>
        '<u>That dog (PX)</u> is a pack dog.'

    b. Á-yissksimmaa-yini **om-i**   **imitáá-yi**.
        IPFV-carry.load$_{AI}$-3′s **that-3′s** **dog-3′s**
        '**That dog (OBV)** is a pack dog.'   (Bliss 2013:20)

- In scenarios with **two obviation competitors**, we need to know **which c-commands the other**.

  - Fortunately, there's a **bunch of evidence** (from variable binding, weak crossover, quantifier scope, locality of LDA, and default word order) that:

    (Bruening 2001, 2005, 2009, Grishin 2023b, 2024b; see Oxford 2024 for a pan-Algonquian overview)

    » in the **3→3 direct**, the **EA c-commands the IA**;

    » in the **3→3 inverse**, the **IA A-moves over the EA**.

- **Accordingly,**

  - in the **3→3 direct** (EA ≫ IA), the <u>EA must be proximate</u> and the **IA must be obviative**;

  - in the **3→3 inverse** (IA ≫ EA), the **EA must be obviative** and the <u>IA must be proximate</u>.

(11) 3AN→3AN direct: <u>proximate</u> on **obviative** only

    a. <u>Psuwis</u> '-kisi= posokapen-a-l   **athusossi-yil**.
        <u>cat.3s</u>   3-PFV= scratch$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′s **snake-3′s**
        '<u>The cat (PX)</u> scratched **the snake (OBV)**.'

    b. *<u>Psuwis</u> '-kisi= posokapen-a-Ø   <u>athusoss</u>.
        <u>cat.3s</u>   3-PFV= scratch$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3s <u>snake-3s</u>
        Intended: '<u>The cat (PX)</u> scratched <u>the snake (PX)</u>.'

    c. ***Psuwis-ol** '-kisi= posokapen-a-Ø   <u>athusoss</u>.
        cat.3′s   3-PFV= scratch$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3s <u>snake-3s</u>
        Intended: '**The cat (OBV)** scratched <u>the snake (PX)</u>.'

    d. ***Psuwis-ol** '-kisi= posokapen-a-l   **athusossi-yil**.
        <u>cat.3′s</u>   3-PFV= scratch$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′s **snake-3′s**
        Intended: '**The cat (OBV)** scratched **the snake (OBV)**.'   (EM 2023.08.08)

(12) 3AN→3AN inverse: **obviative** on <u>proximate</u> only

    a. <u>Athusoss</u> '-kisi= posokapen-ku-l   **psuwis-ol**.
        <u>snake.3s</u>   3-PFV= scratch$_{TA}$-INV-3′s **cat-3′s**
        '**The cat (OBV)** scratched <u>the snake (PX)</u>.'

    b. *<u>Athusoss</u> '-kisi= posokapen-oq-Ø <u>psuwis</u>.
        <u>snake.3s</u>   3-PFV= scratch$_{TA}$-INV-3s <u>cat-3s</u>
        Intended: '<u>The cat (PX)</u> scratched <u>the snake (PX)</u>.'

    c. ***Athusossi-yil** '-kisi= posokapen-oq-Ø <u>psuwis</u>.
        snake.3′s   3-PFV= scratch$_{TA}$-INV-3s <u>cat-3s</u>
        Intended: '<u>The cat (PX)</u> scratched **the snake (OBV)**.'

    d. ***Athusossi-yil** '-kisi= posokapen-ku-l **psuwis-ol**.
        snake.3′s   3-PFV= scratch$_{TA}$-INV-3s **cat-3′s**
        Intended: '**The cat (OBV)** scratched **the snake (OBV)**.'   (EM 2023.08.08)

- In **ditransitives**, the **goal/recipient/applied object c-commands the theme**, and obviation patterns accordingly. We leave this data out for space. (see Bruening 2001 for discussion)

- All this data falls out naturally from the following **simplified version of the obviation rule**:[5]

(13) **Obviation rule** (simplified)

An obviation competitor O is assigned obviative if and only if it is c-commanded by another obviation competitor P. Else, O is assigned proximate.

    i.   **Obviation competitor:** A nominal is an obviation competitor iff it is 3AN.

3.3   Default behavior: obviation resets across domains

- Obviation often **resets** across **DP**, **PP**, and **CP** boundaries—in these cases the most common pattern (impressionistically) is to **have a new proximate**.

(14) Obviation resets across DP boundaries

    a.   Gracie   't-otoli= supuwah-a-l   [$_{DP}$ Natasha   '-posu-m-ol   ].
         Gracie.3s 3-PROG= smoothen$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′s   Natasha.3s **3-cat-POSS-3′s**
         'Gracie (PX) is petting [Natasha's (PX) **cat (OBV)**].'   (GP 2022.11.02)

    b.   Wahant [$_{DP}$ not   pilsqehsis] nit   elehl-a-t   [$_{DP}$ '-tatat-ol].
         devil.3s   that.3s girl.3s   that.0s IC.do.to$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3CJ   **3-dad-3′s**
         'It's the devil (PX) who did that to [that girl's (PX) **dad (OBV)**].'
         (<https://pmportal.org/dictionary/tatatol>)

(15) Obviation resets across PP boundaries

    a.   Koti=   qasku-Ø Kirk Francis   [$_{PP}$ 'ciw sakom].
         going.to= run$_{AI}$-3   Kirk Francis.3s   for   chief.3s
         'Kirk Francis (PX) is going to run [for chief (PX)].'   (EM 2022.08.15)

    b.   Kpahasu-Ø   [$_{PP}$ wiciw ehpic-ik   ].
         be.locked.up$_{AI}$-3   with   woman-3p
         'He (PX) is locked up [with the women (PX)].'
         (<https://pmportal.org/dictionary/kpahasu-1>)

(16) Obviation resets across CP boundaries

    a.   Litahasu-Ø Piyel   [$_{IND}$ psuwis-ok kotu-hp-ultu-Ø-wok].
         think$_{AI}$-3   Peter.3s   cat-3p   want-eat$_{AI}$-PL-3-3p
         'Peter (PX) thinks [the cats (PX) are hungry].' (EM 2024.05.20)

    b.   Espons   '-kocicihtu-n [$_{CJ}$ eli =hc   opos   kipiya-t   ]...
         Raccoon.3s 3-know$_{TI}$-N   IC.C =FUT tree.3s fall$_{AI}$-3CJ
         'Espons (PX) knows [that the tree (PX) will fall].'
         Lewis Mitchell, "Espons" (Newell and Leavitt 2020:141)

---

[5]Cf. Bruening (2005:21): " All we have to say is that, **in a certain domain where two third person NPs are present, the higher one obviates the lower one**. Hence, in the direct, the subject becomes proximate and the object becomes obviative; while in the inverse, where the object has crossed over the subject, the object, being highest, will become proximate, and the subject obviative. In contexts where no such crossover is possible, such as inside NPs, with AI+O verbs, and between the two objects of a ditransitive, one NP is doomed to always being obviative—the lower one."

- Compare to **Swampy Cree** (Cree-Innu-Naskapi), with **forced obviation across CP boundaries**:

  (also Plains Cree, Muehlbauer 2008:237)

  (17) *Swampy Cree*

  a. <u>cân</u>　　kiskênihtam-Ø-Ø [$_{CP}$ **mêrîw-a** ê= âhkosi-ni-t　　].
  　　<u>John.3s</u>　know$_{TI}$-3-3s　　　**Mary-3′** E= be.sick$_{AI}$-3′-3CJ
  　　'<u>John (PX)</u> knows [that **Mary (OBV)** is sick].'

  b. *?<u>cân</u>　　kiskênihtam-Ø-Ø [$_{CP}$ <u>mêrîy</u> ê= âhkosi-t　　].
  　　<u>John.3s</u>　know$_{TI}$-3-3s　　　<u>Mary.3s</u> E= be.sick$_{AI}$-3CJ
  　　Intended: '<u>John (PX)</u> knows [that <u>Mary (PX)</u> is sick].'　　(Long 1999:84)

- Similar data on **forced obviation across DP boundaries** in **Innu** (Cree-Innu-Naskapi):

  (NB: with disjoint reference)

  (18) *Innu*

  a. <u>Mânî$_i$</u>　　mûpishtu-ê-Ø-shapan　[$_{DP}$ ***pro.3′$_j$*** **Ø-utshimâ-m-inu-a**　].
  　　<u>Marie.3s</u>　visit$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3-NDIR.PST　　　**3-boss-POSS-3′POSS-3′**
  　　'<u>Marie$_i$ (PX)</u> visited [$_{DP}$ **her$_j$ (OBV) boss (OBV)**].'

  b. *<u>Mânî$_i$</u>　　mûpishtu-ê-Ø-shapan　[$_{DP}$ <u>*pro.3s$_i$*</u> **Ø-utshimâ-m-a**].
  　　<u>Marie.3s</u>　visit$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3-NDIR.PST　　　**3-boss-POSS-3′**
  　　Intended: '<u>Marie$_i$ (PX)</u> visited [$_{DP}$ <u>her$_j$ (PX)</u> **boss (OBV)**]'. (Branigan and MacKenzie 1999:476)

- So we need to modify our obviation rule to be **restricted to certain domains**.

- Given that DP, PP, and CP have all been claimed to be **phases**, it seems reasonable to modify the rule to be **phase-sensitive**.　　(see Citko 2014 for discussion and references on phases)

  (19) **Obviation rule**

  An obviation competitor O is assigned obviative if and only if it is c-commanded by another obviation competitor P within the same obviation domain, and there is no (hard) phase boundary separating O and P. Else, O is assigned proximate.

  i.　**Obviation competitor:** A nominal is an obviation competitor iff it is 3AN.

  ii.　**Obviation domain:** A constituent is an obviation domain iff it is a phase.

  iii.　**(Hard) phase heads** are (at least) D, P, and C.

  ‣ We'll get back to **(apparent) exceptions** in **§5**.

- This kind of rule is **extremely similar to dependent nominative/accusative**.　(Baker 2015, a.m.o.)

  ‣ **Dependent ACC** is assigned to a nominal c-commanded by another nominal within a phase;

  ‣ **NOM** is assigned by default to a nominal that doesn't yet have case.

  ‣ **Obviative ∼ dependent ACC, proximate ∼ default NOM**.

- The difference is that **all nominals are case competitors** for dependent case, whereas only **(animate) third persons** are obviation competitors—we discuss this issue more **in §6.1**.

4 Against coreference

- Much of the existing literature on obviation in Algonquian discusses how obviation regulates **coreference possibilities** and contributes to **reference tracking** in narratives.

- In this section we'd like to show that obviation in Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey **doesn't do that**— something that follows from our **dependent-case-like analysis**.

4.1 Coordination

- In clausal coordination, there doesn't seem to be **any pressure to preserve the proximate/ obviative status** of discourse referents:

(20)   <u>Wini</u>   't-otoli= 'tutomuw-a-l   **Paulaw-ol** 'ciw micuwakon...
       <u>Winnie.3s</u> 3-PROG= beg.from$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′s **Paula-3′s**   for   food

   '<u>Winnie$_i$ (PX)</u> is begging **Paula$_j$ (OBV)** for food...'

   a.   ...ma=te   kenu '-kotuw-ahsom-$\boxed{a}$-wi-yil.   <u>3s</u>→**3′s** (DIR)
          NEG=EMPH but   3-going.to-feed$_{TA}$-3OBJ-NEG-3′s

        '...but <u>she$_j$ (PX)</u> isn't going to feed **her$_i$ (OBV)**.'

   b.   ...ma=te   kenu '-kotuw-ahsom-$\boxed{ku}$-wi-yil.   **3′s**→<u>3s</u> (INV)
          NEG=EMPH but   3-going.to-feed$_{TA}$-INV-NEG-3′s

        '...but **she$_j$ (OBV)** isn't going to feed <u>her$_i$ (PX)</u>.'   (EM 2024.09.20)

        EM: "They both sound OK...depends on what you prefer to say."

- What's more, if one of the clauses is **intransitive**, the (3AN) subject **must be proximate**, *even if it's obviative in the other clause*:

(21)   *Context: Elise was dancing with Peter at the gathering, but then Peter got a phonecall and left.*
       <u>Sapet</u>   '-kisi= nis-kam-a-l   **Piyel-ol**...
       <u>Elise.3s</u> 3-PFV= two-dance.with$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′s **Peter-3′s**

   '<u>Elise (PX)</u> danced with **Peter$_i$ (OBV)**...'

   a.   ...nit   =te   =na   <u>'t-ahcuwi=</u> <u>macaha-n.</u>
          then =EMPH =ADD <u>3-must=</u>   <u>leave$_{AI}$-N</u>

        '...but then <u>he$_i$ (PX)</u> had to leave.'

   b.   *...nit   =te   =na   **'t-ahcuwi= macaha-li-n.**
          then =EMPH =ADD **3-must=   leave$_{AI}$-3′-N**

        Intended: '...but then **he$_i$ (OBV)** had to leave.'   (MA 2024.09.27)

   ▸ **NB:** (21a) would also be good in a context where it was **Elise** that left.

   ▸ **The result:** the second conjunct in this example **is ambiguous**! The only way to disambiguate is to use full DP (e.g. a name).

- Compare this to closely-related **Mi'gmaq** (Eastern Algonquian), where the proximate/obviative distinction can be **exploited for reference tracking** in coordination:

(22) *Mi'gmaq*   (Little and Moroney 2016:72)

<u>Susan</u>   gejgapa'l-a-Ø-pn-n   **Mali-al**...
<u>Susan.3s</u>   scratch_{TA}-3OBJ-3-PRET-3′s   **Mali-3′s**

'<u>Susan_i (PX)</u> scratched **Mali_j (OBV)**...'

a.   ...toqo   <u>enmie-Ø-p-Ø</u>.
     then   <u>go.home_{AI}-3-PRET-3s</u>

'...then <u>she_i (PX)</u> went home.'

b.   ...toqo   **enmie-ni-Ø-pn-n**.
     then   **go.home_{AI}-3′-3-PRET-3′s**

'...then **she_j (OBV)** went home.'

4.2   Adjuncts

- We find similar behavior in **adjuncts**: there's **no pressure** to preserve the **proximate/obviative status** of referents:

(23)   [Qeni=   <u>Sapet</u>   kakalum-a-t   **Piyel-ol**]...
       IC.so.long=   <u>Elise.3s</u>   call.to_{TA}-3OBJ-3CJ   **Peter-3′s**

'[When <u>Elise_i (PX)</u> was calling out for **Peter_j (OBV)**]...'

a.   ...ma=te   Ø-nutuw-$\boxed{a}$-wi-yil.   3s→3′s (DIR)
     NEG=EMPH   3-hear_{TA}-3OBJ-NEG-3′s

'...**he_j (PX)** wasn't hearing **her_i (OBV)**.'

b.   ...ma=te   Ø-nuta-$\boxed{ku}$-wi-yil.   3′s→3s (INV)
     NEG=EMPH   3-hear_{TA}-INV-NEG-3′s

'...**he_j (OBV)** wasn't hearing <u>her_i (PX)</u>.'   (MA 2024.09.27)

- Here are some similar **corpus examples**:

(24) a.   Ma=te   '-ciksotuw-a-wi-yil   **w-ikuwoss-ol**   toke   [kehsi=
           NEG=EMPH   3-listen.to_{TA}-3OBJ-NEG-3′s   **3-mother-3′s**   now   IC.so.much=

           wapol-okehkim-a-t   ].
           wrong-teach_{TA}-3OBJ-3CJ

'<u>He_i (PX)</u> doesn't obey <u>his_i (PX)</u> **mother_j (OBV)** now, [because <u>she_j (PX)</u> taught **him_i (OBV)** improperly].'   (https://pmportal.org/dictionary/uwapolokehkimal)

      b.   [Apc   **w-ikuwoss-ol**   qelop-apessi-li-t   ], '-keskuwapom-a-n...
           again   **3-mother-3′s**   IC.around-glance_{AI}-3′-3CJ   3-catch.sight.of_{TA}-3OBJ-N

'[When <u>his_i (PX)</u> **mother_j (OBV)** looks back], <u>she_j (PX)</u> catches sight of **him_i (OBV)**...'
                                Lewis Mitchell, "Pukcinsqehs" (Newell and Leavitt 2020:126)

4.3   Complementation

- And again, we get similar data in **clausal complementation**:

(25) a. <u>Psuwis</u> '-kocicihtu-n [_{CJ} eli <u>Cora</u> koselom-a-t].
    <u>cat.3s</u> 3-know_{TI}-N   IC.C <u>Cora.3s</u> love_{TA}-3OBJ-3CJ
    '<u>The cat_i (PX)</u> knows [that <u>Cora_j (PX)</u> loves **him_i (OBV)**].'

    b. <u>Psuwis</u> '-kocicihtu-n [_{CJ} eli koselom-iht **Coraw-ol**].
      <u>cat.3s</u> 3-know_{TI}-N   IC.C love_{TA}-INV.3sCJ **Cora-3's**
      '<u>The cat_i (PX)</u> knows [that **Cora_j (OBV)** loves <u>him_i (PX)</u>].'   (GP, MA 2024.03.04)
      MA: "Just a different way of saying it."

(26) <u>Sapet</u> '-kisi= mihkuluwem-a-l **Piyel-ol** [_{CP} eli skat kisi= mesq wesuwe=
    <u>Elise.3s</u> 3-PFV= remind_{TA}-3OBJ-3's **Peter-3's**   IC.C NEG PFV= not.yet back=
    apenkuw-a-h-q.
    pay_{TA}-3OBJ-NEG-3CJ
    '<u>Elise_i (PX)</u> reminded **Peter_j (OBV)** [that <u>he_j (PX)</u> hasn't paid **her_i (OBV)** back yet].'

                    (MA 2024.09.27)

- And some **examples from narratives**:

(27) a. 'T-oqecimul-a-n **Ø-muhsums-ol** [_{CJ} keq weci= tuci= metsi= yaliya-t].
    3-ask_{TA}-3OBJ-N **3-grandfather-3's**   what IC.for= much= late= wander_{AI}-3CJ
    '[<u>Mary Ann (PX)</u>] asks her **grandfather_i (OBV)** [why <u>he_i (PX)</u> is out so late].'
               Mary Ellen Stevens Socobasin, "Maliyan" (Newell and Leavitt 2020:8)

    b. Sesolahki=te Ø-mihqitahatom-on [_{CJ} eli keq <u>Koluskap</u> kisi=
      suddenly=EMPH 3-remember_{TI}-N   IC.C what <u>Koluskap.3s</u> PFV=
      mil-a-t-pon].
      give_{TA+O}-3OBJ-3CJ-PRET
      'All of a sudden <u>he_i (PX)</u> remembers [that <u>Koluskap_j (PX)</u> has given **him_i (OBV)** something].'   Lewis Mitchell, "Koluskap Nekotok Skitkomiq" (Newell and Leavitt 2020:183)

4.4 Possessor constraint inoperative (or weakened)

- Rhodes (1976:114, 1990:112, 2017:205) notes that the **distribution of direct/inverse marking** seems to be regulated by a principle that ends up ensuring that, if an argument is coreferent with the possessor of the other argument, **the argument and the possessor are both proximate**.

(28) **Possessor Constraint**   (Rhodes 2017:205)

    No sentence is good in which the syntax requires that a clausemate coreferent of a possessor be obviated by its possessee.

  ▸ Put differently, this is a kind of **"extended" weak crossover effect**: if an argument A is coindexed with the possessor of its coargument B, then **A must c-command B**.

            (it's "extended" because this rule applies to not-obviously-quantificational As)

(29) *Odawa* (Rhodes 1990:111)

    a. W-gii= noondaw-⟨aa⟩-n **w-wiidgemaagn-an**.
        3-PST= hear$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′   **3-wife-3′**

        (i) '<u>He$_i$ (PX)</u> heard [<u>his$_i$ (PX)</u> **wife (OBV)**]$_j$.'   A → [A's B]
        (ii) *'[<u>His$_i$ (PX)</u> **wife (OBV)**]$_j$ heard **him$_i$ (OBV)**.'   *[A's B] → A

    b. W-gii= noondaa-⟨go⟩-on **w-wiidgemaagn-an**.
        3-PST= hear$_{TA}$-INV-3′   **3-wife-3′**

        (i) *'[<u>His$_i$ (PX)</u> **wife (OBV)**]$_j$ was heard by **him$_i$ (OBV)**.'   *A → [A's B]
        (ii) '<u>He$_i$ (PX)</u> was heard by [<u>his$_i$ (PX)</u> **wife$_j$ (OBV)**]$_j$.' [A's B] → <u>A</u>

▸ This constraint has been reported to be operative in (at least) **Blackfoot** (Frantz 1966), **Plains Cree** (Wolfart 1973), **Odawa** (Rhodes 1976 *et seq.*), and **Oji-Cree** (Oxford 2024).

                                                    (and likely more)

▸ The same kind of constraint is also familiar from **Mayan**!

                   (a connection first made, to my knowledge, by Aissen 1997)

■ In **Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey**, people in general seem to be quite happy to produce sentences that **violate the possessor constraint** and also judge such sentences **acceptable**:

(30) a. [**W-ikuwoss-uwa-l** <u>wasis-ok</u>] '-kinoluw-a-`.
         3-mother-PL-3′s <u>kid-3p</u>   3-praise$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′p

        '[<u>The children's$_i$ (PX)</u> **mother (OBV)**] praised **them$_i$**.'   (GP, MA, RP 2022.04.18)

    b. **W-ikuwoss-uwa-l** '-kisi= kospahl-a-` **nican-`**.
        3-mother-PL-3′s   3-PFV= wash$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′p **child-3′p**

        '[<u>Their$_i$ (PX)</u> **mother (OBV)**] bathed **the children$_i$ (OBV)**.'   (MA 2023.09.18)

    c. [<u>Piyel</u>   **w-itapi-`**] '-kisi= mil-a-ni-ya   wikhikon.
         <u>Peter.3s</u> **3-friend-3′p**   3-PFV= give$_{TA+O}$-3OBJ-N-PL book

        '[<u>Peter's$_i$ (PX)</u> **friends (OBV)**] gave **him$_i$ (OBV)** a book.'   (EM 2023.09.25)

    d. Ma=te   [<u>wot</u>   **w-ikuwoss-ol**] sesomi=te '-koti=   wollum-a-wi-yil
        NEG=EMPH   <u>this.3s</u> **3-mother-3′s**   ever=EMPH 3-want= praise$_{TA}$-3OBJ-NEG-3′s
        Sapet-ol.
        Elise-3′s

        '[<u>Her$_i$ (PX)</u> **mother (OBV)**]$_j$ never wants to praise **Elise$_i$**.'   (MS 2024.08.15)

    e. Peciya-t   w-ik-uwa-k,   't-iy-a-l   **w-ikuwoss-ol**, "Tan =olu   opan,
        IC.come$_{AI}$-3CJ 3-home-3p-LOC 3-tell$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′s **3-mother-3′s** WH =CTOP bread
        Susehp?"
        Joseph

        'When <u>he$_i$ (PX)</u> got home, [<u>his$_i$ (PX)</u> **mother (OBV)**] told **him$_i$ (OBV)**, "Where is the bread, Joseph?"   Solomon Polchies, "Joseph and Hesi" (Teeter and LeSour 2007:144)

■ When comparing possessor-constraint-obeying sentences to possessor-constraint-disobeying sentences, speakers either say they **both sound acceptable**, or that the possessor-constraint-obeying sentence only sounds **slightly better**.

▸ For instance, when discussing the following two sentences (both of which she produced herself), one consultant initially judged them **both natural**:

(31) a. [(?)] Etut-oluhke-t <u>wot</u> <u>Sapet</u> [weci= **w-ikuwoss-ol** wollum-a-t].
  IC.much-work$_{AI}$-3CJ <u>this.3s</u> <u>Elise.3s</u> IC.for= **3-mother-3′s** praise$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3CJ

  '<u>Elise$_i$ (PX)</u> works really hard [so [<u>her$_i$</u> **mother (OBV)**]$_j$ will praise **her$_i$ (OBV)**].'

  b. Etut-oluhke-t <u>wot</u> <u>Sapet</u> [weci= **w-ikuwoss-ol** wollum-iht].
  IC.much-work$_{AI}$-3CJ <u>this.3s</u> <u>Elise.3s</u> IC.for= **3-mother-3′s** praise$_{TA}$-INV.3sCJ

  '<u>Elise$_i$ (PX)</u> works really hard [so <u>she$_i$ (PX)</u> will be praised by [<u>her$_i$ (PX)</u> **mother (OBV)**]$_j$].' (MS 2024.08.15)

  MS: "*Ii*, one or the other."
  PG: "Do they both sound very natural?"
  MS: "Yeah."

▸ After some more discussion and thought, she finally decided that (31b) perhaps sounded **only a bit better**. Nothing like a categorical judgment of ungrammaticality/unacceptability.

■ The **absence of a categorical Possessor Constraint** in Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey follows naturally from our analysis, since our obviation rule **has no bearing on coreference relations**.

(modulo independent principles like Condition B)

5 Cross-domain obviation

■ Our obviation rule predicts that, all else being equal, obviation **should "reset"** across phase boundaries (at least DP, PP, and CP).

■ However, sometimes we get **"unexpected obviatives"** in these domains—we'll call these **cross-domain obviatives**.

■ We'd like to **say the following** about cross-domain obviatives:

▸ Cross-domain obviation **still requires a c-commanding obviation competitor** in the higher domain.

▸ We suggest that cross-domain obviation is licensed by **movement to the edge of the phase**, putting an obviation competitor into a **higher domain**.

5.1 Obviation into DPs

■ Both of the following are possible:

(32) a. <u>Piyel</u> '-kis-ayyem-a-l [$_{DP}$ <u>Laca</u> '-temis-ol].
  <u>Peter.3s</u> 3-PFV-play.with$_{TA}$-3OBV-3′s <u>Roger.3s</u> **3-dog-3′s**

  '<u>Peter (PX)</u> played with [<u>Roger's (PX)</u> **dog (OBV)**].'

  b. <u>Piyel</u> '-kis-ayyem-a-l [$_{DP}$ **Lacaw-ol** '-temis-ol].
  <u>Peter.3s</u> 3-PFV-play.with$_{TA}$-3OBV-3′s **Roger.3′s** **3-dog-3′s**

  '<u>Peter (PX)</u> played with [**Roger's (OBV)** **dog (OBV)**].' (MA 2023.10.02)
  MA: "You can use both."

- (32a) is **predicted** by our rule; (32b) **is not**—in (32b) it seems like *Lacawol* 'Roger.3′s' is being **obviated by the c-commanding subject**.

- Evidence that this is the **right way of viewing things** comes from the following facts:

  ▸ If we make the c-commanding subject **not an obviation competitor** (e.g. an SAP), then **obviative is no longer possible** on *Laca* 'Roger.3s'.

    (33) a. N-kis-ayyem-a　　　　　　[$_{DP}$ <u>Laca</u>　　　'-temis-ol].
    　　　　1-PFV-play.with$_{TA}$-3OBV　　<u>Roger.3s</u> **3-dog-3′s**
    　　　　'I played with [<u>Roger's (PX)</u> **dog (OBV)**].'

    b. *N-kis-ayyem-a　　　　　　[$_{DP}$ **Lacaw-ol** '-temis-ol].
    　　　1-PFV-play.with$_{TA}$-3OBV　　**Roger.3′s 3-dog-3′s**
    　　　Intended: 'I played with [**Roger's (OBV) dog (OBV)**].'　　　　　　　(MA 2023.10.02)

  ▸ If we ensure that *Laca* 'Roger.3s' **isn't c-commanded by an obviation competitor**, e.g. by making 'Roger's dog' the subject, then **obviative is no longer possible** on *Laca* 'Roger.3s'.

    (34) a. [$_{DP}$ <u>Laca</u>　　　'-temis-ol] '-kisi= pkehl-a-l　　　**Piyel-ol.**
    　　　　　<u>Roger.3s</u> **3-dog-3′s**　　3-PFV= bite$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′s **Peter-3′s**
    　　　　'[<u>Roger's (PX)</u> **dog (OBV)**] bit **Peter (OBV)**.'

    b. *[$_{DP}$ **Lacaw-ol** '-temis-ol] '-kisi= pkehl-a-l　　　**Piyel-ol.**
    　　　　Roger.3′s 3-dog-3′s　　3-PFV= bite$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3′s **Peter-3′s**
    　　　Intended: '[**Roger's (OBV) dog (OBV)**] bit **Peter (OBV)**.'　　　(MA 2023.10.02)

- We tie **obviation domains to phases**, which have **edges** that are visible to the "outside world"—predicting that **cross-domain obviation should be possible**, as long as the relevant 3AN **moves to the phase edge**.

  ⇒ We suggest that this is **exactly what's happening here**: the possessor is **moving to Spec,DP**.

    ▸ **Help:** Is there a way to test this?

5.2　Obviation into PPs

- We can find **similar data** in the domain of **PPs**:

    (35) a. <u>N-muhsums</u>　　nt-akonutom-a-ku-n-ol　　　atkuhkakon-ol [$_{PP}$ 'ciw
    　　　　<u>1-grandfather</u>　1-tell.story$_{TI}$-APPL-INV-N-0p　story-0p　　　　　　about
    　　　　　motewolonu-`.].
    　　　　　motewolon-3′p
    　　　　'<u>My grandfather (PX)</u> told me stories [about **the motewolons (OBV)**].' (GP, MA 2022.11.20)

    b. ...**kuhus-is-ol**　=op Ø-miluwa-n-ol　　　　[$_{PP}$ 'ciw **nisu-`　wapi= kilahq-`**].
    　　　cow-DIM-3′s =CF 3-give.away$_{AI+O}$-N-3′s　　for　**two-3′p white= oose-3′p**
    　　　'...and <u>he (PX)</u> would give **a calf (OBV)** [for **two geese (OBV)**].'
    　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Peter Lewis Paul, "Trading" (Teeter and LeSourd 2007:190)

- This data is amenable to **the same analysis**—here, the object of the preposition would have to be **moving to Spec,PP**.

  ▸ In these examples this would have to be **covert**.

    » Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey has (optionally) **covert raising-to-object**,   (Grishin 2023a)

    » as well as (optionally) **covert Ā movement to Spec,CP** that feeds **long-distance agreement**.   (Bruening 2001, Grishin 2023b, 2024a)

    » So this shouldn't discomfort us too much...

- **Help:** Is there a way to test this?

5.3   Obviation into CPs

- We find **similar data** in the domain of **CPs**, both into **complement clauses** and **adjunct clauses**.

  (36)   Obviation into adjunct clauses

  a.   <u>Piyel</u>   Ø-mace= eksqi-n   [$_{CP}$ (etoki=te) <u>psuwis</u> tuciya-t   ].
       <u>Peter.3s</u> 3-start= sneeze$_{AI}$-N   (if=EMPH) <u>cat.3s</u> go.by$_{AI}$-3CJ
       '<u>Peter (PX)</u> will start sneezing [if <u>a cat (PX)</u> walks by].

  b.   <u>Piyel</u>   Ø-mace= eksqi-n   [$_{CP}$ (etoki=te) **psuwis-ol** tuciya-li-t   ].
       <u>Peter.3s</u> 3-start= sneeze$_{AI}$-N   (if=EMPH) **cat-3′s**   go.by$_{AI}$-3′-3CJ
       '<u>Peter (PX)</u> will start sneezing [if **a cat (OBV)** walks by].   (GP 2023.01.25)

  (37)   Obviation in complement clauses

  a.   <u>Cora</u>   assokitahasu-Ø [$_{CP}$ eli   totol-ayyekta-q   <u>psuwis</u> Ø-motqap].
       <u>Cora.3s</u> be.surprised$_{AI}$-3   IC.C PROG-play.with$_{TI}$-3CJ <u>cat</u>   3-bag
       '<u>Cora (PX)</u> is surprised [that <u>the cat (PX)</u> is playing with her bag].'

  b.   <u>Cora</u>   assokitahasu-Ø [$_{CP}$ eli   totol-ayyektu-li-t   **psuwis-ol** Ø-motqap].
       <u>Cora.3s</u> be.surprised$_{AI}$-3   IC.C PROG-play.with$_{TI}$-3′-3CJ **cat-3′s**   3-bag
       '<u>Cora (PX)</u> is surprised [that **the cat (OBV)** is playing with her bag].'   (EM 2023.08.08;NR)

  ▸ Again, this is (presumably) licensed by the **matrix 3AN subject**.

- Note that a 3AN inside an adjunct clause **cannot trigger obviation in the matrix clause**:

  (38)   a.   [Peciya-t   <u>Taniya</u>   ], nit   =te   =na   Ø-mace-kila-n   <u>olomuss</u>.
             IC.come$_{AI}$-3CJ <u>Taniya.3s</u>   then =EMPH =ADD 3-start-bark$_{AI}$-N <u>dog</u>.
             '[When <u>Taniya (PX)</u> arrived], then <u>the dog (PX)</u> started barking.'   (GP, MA 2022.12.14)

  b.   *[Peciya-t   <u>Taniya</u>   ], nit   =te   =na   Ø-mace-kila-li-n   **olomuss-ol**.
             IC.come$_{AI}$-3CJ <u>Taniya.3s</u>   then =EMPH =ADD 3-start-bark$_{AI}$-3′-N **dog-3′s**.
             Intended: '[When <u>Taniya (PX)</u> arrived], then **the dog (OBV)** started barking.'

                                                                              (GP, MA 2022.12.14)

- Compare **Innu** (Cree-Innu-Naskapi), which behaves differently here:

(39) [<u>Mânî</u>   pîkutitâ-u-â-t-i   **Ânîu-a   ut-ishkîtû-m-inû**]...
     <u>Marie.3s</u> wreck_{AI+O}-REL-3OBJ-3CJ-SBJV **Annie-3′   3-skidoo-POSS-0′**

   '[If <u>Marie (PX)</u> wrecks **Annie's (OBV) skidoo (OBV)**]...'

   a. ...<u>Pûn</u> tsika= uâuêshtâ-u.
      <u>Paul</u> FUT= fix_{AI+O}-3

      '...<u>Paul (PX)</u> will fix **it (OBV)**. '

   b. ...**Pûn-a** tsika= uâuêshtâ-n-u-a.
      Paul-3′ FUT=   fix_{AI+O}-3′-3-3′

      '...**Paul (OBV)** will fix **it (OBV)**. '   (Branigan and MacKenzie 1999:477)

- We'd again like to tentatively suggest that this behavior is driven by **(potentially covert) movement to the CP edge**, putting the relevant 3AN into the higher obviation domain.

- Some suggestive evidence from this comes from speaker comments that suggest **cross-clausal obviatives are aboutness topics**:

(40) <u>Cora</u>   litahasu-Ø [_{CP} **Piyel-ol** '-kis-onuhm-on kinkihqah-k wikuwam].
     <u>Cora.3s</u> thinks_{AI}-3   **Peter-3′s** 3-PFV-buy_{TI}-N IC.be.big_{II}-CJ house

   '<u>Cora (PX)</u> thinks [**Peter (OBV)** bought a big house].'   (GP 2023.02.01)

   GP: "I would've said *Piyelol*, 'cause I'm talking about him."

⇒ May suggest that **topic movement** feeds cross-clausal obviation.

- Another piece of suggestive evidence for this comes from the fact that **sometimes (but not always) word order matters**, and only **preverbal DPs** can get cross-clausal obviative:

(41) a. Ø-Unitahasi-n <u>Piyel</u> [_{CP} eli kisi= pokehl-i-t   <u>Tiga</u>(*-**wol**)].
        3-forget_{AI+O}-N <u>Peter</u>   IC.C PFV= bite_{TA}-1OBJ-3CJ <u>Tiger</u>-(***3′s**)

        '<u>Peter (PX)</u> forgot [that <u>Tiger (PX)</u> bit me].'

   b. Ø-Unitahasi-n <u>Piyel</u> [_{CP} eli <u>Tiga</u>(-**wol**) kisi= pokehl-i-t   ].
        3-forget_{AI+O}-N <u>Peter</u>   IC.C <u>Tiger</u>-(**3′s**) PFV= bite_{TA}-1OBJ-3CJ

        '<u>Peter (PX)</u> forgot [that <u>Tiger (PX)</u>/**Tiger (OBV)** bit me].'   (GP, MA 2023.02.07)

(42) a. <u>Piyel</u>   litahasu-Ø [_{CP} Ø-nomiy-uku-n <u>Sapet</u>(***-ol**)].
        <u>Peter.3s</u> think-3   1-see_{TA}-INV-1p <u>Elise</u>(-**3′s**)

        '<u>Peter (PX)</u> thinks [<u>Elise (PX)</u> saw us].' (GP 2023.01.30)

   b. <u>Piyel</u>   litahasu-Ø [_{CP} <u>Sapet</u>(-**ol**) Ø-nomiy-uku-n].
        <u>Peter.3s</u> think-3   <u>Elise</u>(-**3′s**) 1-see_{TA}-INV-1p

        '<u>Peter (PX)</u> thinks [<u>Elise (PX)</u>/**Elise (OBV)** saw us].'   (GP 2023.01.30)

⇒ Maybe suggests that **(overt) movement matters** in deriving cross-clausal obviation...

   » ...but not always? And this movement can land to the right of the complementizer?

- The data is **extremely messy**—in addition to **word order** sometimes but not always mattering, the availability of cross-clausal obviation **also depends on**:

  - The **constellation of arguments** you have downstairs—for instance, **intransitives** *always* allow for cross-clausal obviation, but other scenarios are often **more restricted**:

    (and SAP→3 almost never allows cross-domain OBV)

    (43) a. *Intransitive, conditional antecedent*

Cu	Tiga	eksku-Ø	[CJ	Piyel(**-ol**)	eksqi(-li)-t	].
FUT	Tiger.3s	sneeze$_{AI}$-3		Peter(**-3′**)	sneeze$_{AI}$(-3′)-3CJ	

    'Tiger (PX) will sneeze [if Peter (PX)/**Peter (OBV)** sneezes].'   (GP, MA 2023.02.01)

    b. *3AN→0, conditional antecedent*

Mehqihtuwa-t		cu	ksehe-Ø	[CJ	Piyel(***-ol**)	kisi=	pehkihta-q
IC.have.red.beard$_{AI}$-3CJ	FUT	go.out$_{AI}$-3		Peter.3s(***-3′s**)	PFV=	clean$_{TI}$-3CJ

    pemsokhasik].
    floor

    'Norvin (PX) will leave [if Peter (PX) cleans the floor].'   (GP, MA 2023.03.07)

  - The **identity of the embedded CP**: adjunct CPs are **more restrictive** in general than CP complements...

    (44) a. *Complement clause, 3AN→3AN direct*

Ø-Unitahasi-n	Piyel	[CP	eli	Sapet(**-ol**)	kis-om-a-t		**sukolopan-ol**].
3-forget$_{AI+O}$-N	Peter.3s		IC.C	Elise(**-3′s**)	PFV-eat$_{TA}$-3OBJ-3CJ	**cake-3′s**	

    'Peter (PX) forgot [that Elise (PX)/**Elise (OBV)** ate the cake (OBV)].'

    b. *Adjunct clause (conditional antecedent), 3AN→3AN direct*   (GP, MA 2023.02.07)

Nit	=te	=hc	Pihcihtuwa-t		Ø-nutiyuta-n	[CP	Piyel(***-ol**)
then	=EMPH	=FUT	IC.have.long.beard$_{AI}$-3CJ	3-move.out$_{AI}$-N		Peter(***-3′s**)	

    ksiyute-kh-a-t **psuwis-ol**].
    move.in$_{AI}$-CAUS-3OBJ-3CJ **cat-3′s**

    'Norvin (PX) will move out [if Peter (PX) adopts **a cat (OBV)**].'   (GP 2023.01.25)

  - ...and **because clauses** are more restrictive than **if clauses** and **temporal adjuncts**:

    (45) a. *Because clause, 3→SAP*

Tiga	etuci=	eksqi-t	[CP	'sami	Piyel(***-ol**)	n-kis-pekehl-oq	].
Tiger.3s	IC.so.much=	sneeze$_{AI}$-3CJ		b/c	Peter(***-3′s**)	1-PFV-spray$_{TA}$-INV	

    'Tiger (PX) sneezed a lot [because Peter (PX) sprayed me].'   (GP 2023.01.31)

    b. *Temporal adjunct, 3→SAP*

Cu	mitsu-Ø	Tiga	[CP	Mehqihtuwa-t/**Mehqihtuwa-li-c-il**
FUT	eat$_{AI}$-3	Tiger.3s		IC.have.red.beard$_{AI}$-3CJ/...-3′-3CJ-3′s

    ehq-iluwehehtuw-i-nokot].
    IC.stop-be.angry.at$_{TA}$-1OBJ-3:1pCJ

    'Tiger (PX) will eat [once Norvin (PX)/**Norvin (OBV)** stops being grumpy at us].'

    (GP, MA 2023.02.01)

c. *Conditional antecedent, 3→SAP*

Cu   wisokiluwehe-Ø <u>Tiga</u>   [_{CP} <u>Mehqihtuwa-t</u>/**Mehqihtuwa-li-c-il**
FUT   be.angry_{AI}-3   <u>Tiger.3s</u>   IC.have.red.beard_{AI}-3CJ/...-**3′-3CJ-3′s**

mocahkomiksuwihtuw-i-nokot].
be.mean.to_{TA}-1OBJ-3:1pCJ

'<u>Tiger (PX)</u> will get mad [if <u>Norvin (PX)</u>/**Norvin (OBV)** is mean to us].'

(GP 2023.02.01)

▸ And (of course) there seems to be **inter-speaker variation**:

(46) %<u>Cora</u>   litahasu-Ø [_{CP} **Piyel-ol** '-kis-onuhm-on kinkihqah-k wikuwam].
<u>Cora.3s</u> thinks_{AI}-3   **Peter-3′s** 3-PFV-buy_{TI}-N IC.be.big_{II}-CJ house

'<u>Cora (PX)</u> thinks [**Peter (OBV) bought a big house**].'   (GP, MA 2023.02.01)

GP: ✓, MA: *
GP: "I would've said *Piyelol*, 'cause I'm talking about him.'
MA: "*Piyelol* bugs me."

- So there's clearly **much more to do** to figure out what's going on with **cross-clausal obviation**.

- The hope is that there will be some way to make sense of this morass of data with the idea that cross-clausal obviation is driven by **movement to Spec,CP**, + perhaps a way of getting better/ more reliable judgments.   *(help!)*

6 Consequences and conclusions

- We argued that the following **obviation rule** neatly accounts for **proximate-obviative assignment** in Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey:

(47) **Obviation rule**

An obviation competitor O is assigned obviative if and only if it is c-commanded by another obviation competitor P within the same obviation domain, and there is no (hard) phase boundary separating O and P. Else, O is assigned proximate.

i. **Obviation competitor:** A nominal is an obviation competitor iff it is 3AN.

ii. **Obviation domain:** A constituent is an obviation domain iff it is a phase.

iii. **(Hard) phase heads** are (at least) D, P, and C.

- We showed how the deeply syntactic nature of this rule results in **obviation lacking the semantic effects of obviation systems** found in other Algonquian languages, like coreference/reference tracking.

▸ Along the way, we discovered that Algonquian obviation is **not a unified phenomenon**!

- We also suggested that **cross-domain obviation** could be derived by **movement to the phase edge** into a higher obviation domain.

- Here, we'd like to briefly discuss some **broader consequences** of our investigation.

6.1 Dependent case

6.1.1 Case stacking

- We analogized **proximate-obviative marking** to **dependent case**.

- If this analogy is real, and if one DP can receive **multiple dependent cases** over the course of the derivation, then we expect a single 3AN to be able to receive **multiple proximate/obviative statuses** as well. (e.g. Levin 2017)

- **For instance:** a nominal might get **DP obviative** but **CP proximate**:

(48) a. Ø-Nomiy-a-hpon-<u>Ø</u> [$_{DP}$ <u>Laca</u> '-kisis-ol].
     1-see$_{TA}$-3OBJ-PRET-<u>3s</u> <u>Roger.3s</u> **3-maternal.aunt-3′s**
     'I saw.1s><u>3s</u> [Roger's (PX) **maternal aunt (OBV)**].'

   b. ??Ø-Nomiy-a-poni-**l** [$_{DP}$ <u>Laca</u> '-kisis-ol].
     1-see$_{TA}$-3OBJ-PRET-**3′s** <u>Roger.3s</u> **3-maternal.aunt-3′s**
     Intended: 'I saw.1s>**3′s** [Roger's (PX) **maternal aunt (OBV)**].' (GP, MA, RP 2022.04.04)

  ▸ The **PX.SG agreement** might suggest that *'kisisol* 'his maternal aunt' is getting **CP proximate**, together with **DP obviative**—this results in **obviative morphology** on the noun.

  ▸ (We embarrassingly don't have the relevant negative example with proximate *'kisis*, but we would bet a lot of money on it being ungrammatical...)

- Or a nominal might get **DP proximate** but **CP obviative**, in which case there seems to be **two classes of speakers**: (no variation in (48)-type examples, as far as we know)

(49) *More conservative speakers* (Privoznov 2020:7)

   a. *Ø-Nomiy-a-**l** <u>Laca-Ø</u> <u>k-posu-m-Ø</u>.
     3-see$_{TA}$-3OBJ-**3′s** <u>Roger-3s</u> <u>2-cat-POSS-3s</u>
     Intended: '<u>Roger (PX)</u> sees.3s>**3′s** <u>your cat (PX)</u>.'

   b. Ø-Nomiy-a-**l** <u>Laca-Ø</u> **k-posu-m-ol**.
     3-see$_{TA}$-3OBJ-**3′s** <u>Roger-3s</u> **2-cat-POSS-3′s**
     '<u>Roger (PX)</u> sees.3s>**3′s your cat (OBV)**.'

(50) *Innovative speakers* (Privoznov 2020:7)

   a. <u>Laca-Ø</u> 't-otol-okehkim-a-**l** <u>n-ikuwoss-Ø</u>.
     <u>Roger-3s</u> 3-PROG-teach$_{TA}$-3OBJ-**3′s** <u>1-mother-POSS-3s</u>
     '<u>Roger (PX)</u> is teaching.3s>**3′s** <u>my mother (PX)</u>.'

   b. *<u>Laca-Ø</u> 't-otol-okehkim-a-**l** **n-ikuwoss-ol**.
     <u>Roger-3s</u> 3-PROG-teach$_{TA}$-3OBJ-**3′s** **1-mother-POSS-3′s**
     Intended: '<u>Roger (PX)</u> is teaching.<u>3s</u>>**3′s my mother (OBV)**.'

- These two grammars can be **described as follows:**

- ▸ **Conservative speakers**: **obviative** always wins out.

- ▸ **Innovative speakers**: whatever's **first assigned** wins out ("innermost").

- These have **straightforward(ish) analogues** in the domain of **case**:

  - ▸ In **free relatives** in Gothic (Germanic), the **more marked case** always wins out. (Harbert 1992)

  - ▸ In **Korean case stacking**, pronouncing **only the first-assigned case** is one of the possible morphological outcomes. (Levin 2017)

    (hard to find clear examples of obligatory "innermost"...)

6.1.2 DP-domain dependent accusative?

- Baker (2015:171) notes that there don't seem to be any examples of **dependent ACC in the DP domain**. (though see Jenks and Sande 2017 for a potential counterexample)

  - ▸ Compare **dependent ERG**, which is found DP-internally on **possessors** in many languages.

- If the obviation-dependent case parallel is correct, then **DP obviative** might be an example of **DP-internal dependent ACC**.

6.1.3 Consequences for dependent case: Distinctness?

- One crucial difference between (classic) **dependent case** and **obviation** is which constituents count as **case/obviation competitors**: **all nominals** for dependent case, vs. only **third persons** for obviation.

- However, if dependent case is just **a subclass of Distinctness effects**, as proposed by Richards (2010), then we expect **dependent-case-like effects** between constituents **that aren't (just) nominals**—just like we find for obviation in Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey.

  (in fact, Richards 2010:136–137 makes this exact same point)

6.2 Variation in obviation across Algonquian

- Finally, we'd like to end with a **plea**: obviation across Algonquian **is not the same**!

  - ▸ Our investigation has uncovered **interesting points of variation** across the family—but we have no idea **what the full range of variation** is!

  - ▸ Please, if you work on an Algonquian language: **carefully out how obviation works** in comparison to other Algonquian languages!

    - » How **obligatory** is proximate/obviative assignment? How available is **cross-clausal obviation**? Does obviation track **coreference**? If so, across **what kinds of domains**? Can you get obviatives **without a c-commanding obviation competitor**? etc.

  - ▸ This will give us more insight not only into **what obviation phenomena are** in the first place, but also the **full range of different structures** that might give rise to the surface phenomenon of "obviation".

References

Aissen, Judith. 1997. On the syntax of obviation. *Language* 73:705–750.

Baker, Mark. 2015. *Case: Its Principles and its Parameters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bliss, Heather. 2013. The Blackfoot configurationality conspiracy: Parallels and differences in clausal and nominal structures. Doctoral Dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

Bliss, Heather. 2017. Dependencies in Syntax and Discourse: Obviation in Blackfoot and Beyond. *Working Papers of the Linguistics Circle of the University of Victoria* 27:1–26.

Bochnak, Ryan, and Lisa Matthewson. 2015. *Methodologies in Semantic Fieldwork*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Branigan, Phil, and Marguerite MacKenzie. 1999. Binding relations and the nature of *pro* in Innu-aimun. In *Proceedings of NELS 29*, ed. Pius Tamanji, Masako Hirotani, and Nancy Hall, volume 1, 475–485. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. Syntax at the Edge: Cross-Clausal Phenomena and the Syntax of Passamaquoddy. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2005. The Algonquian Inverse is Syntactic: Binding in Passamaquoddy. Manuscript, University of Delaware.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2009. Algonquian Languages Have A-movement and A-Agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:427–445.

Citko, Barbara. 2014. *Phase Theory: An Introduction*. Number 8 in Research Surveys in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 2017. Obviation and Information Structure in Meskwaki. In *Papers of the 46th Algonquian Conference*, ed. Monica Macaulay and Margaret Noodin, 39–54. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Frantz, Donald G. 1966. Person Indexing in Blackfoot. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 32:50–58.

Goddard, Ives. 1990. Aspects of the Topic Structure of Fox Narratives: Proximate Shifts and the Use of Overt and Inflectional NPs. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 56:317–340.

Grafstein, Ann. 1984. Argument structure and the syntax of a non-configurational language. Doctoral Dissertation, McGill University.

Grishin, Peter. 2023a. How to covertly move: Evidence from Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey. In *Proceedings of NELS 53*, ed. Suet-Ying Lam and Satoru Ozaki, volume 2, 1–10. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Grishin, Peter. 2023b. Lessons from CP in Passamaquoddy and beyond. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Grishin, Peter. 2024a. Clause size, cross-clausal dependencies, and the left periphery. To appear in *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*.

Grishin, Peter. 2024b. Subordinative Long-Distance Agreement in Passamaquoddy-Wolastoqey and the Syntax of the Inverse. To appear in *Papers of the 54th Algonquian Conference*.

Harbert, Wayne. 1992. Gothic relative clauses and syntactic theory. In *On Germanic Linguistics: Issues and Methods*, ed. Irmengard Rauch, Gerald F. Carr, and Robert L. Kyes, number 68 in Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 109–146. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jenks, Peter, and Hannah Sande. 2017. Dependent accusative case and caselessness in Moro. In *Proceedings of NELS 47*, volume 2, 109–118. UMass Amherst: GLSA.

Levin, Theodore. 2017. Successive-cyclic case assignment: Korean nominative-nominative case-

stacking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 35:447–498.

Little, Carol-Rose, and Mary Moroney. 2016. Modeling obviation in Algonquian. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on the Semantics of Under-Represented Languages in the Americas*, ed. Thuy Bui and Rudmila-Rodica Ivan, 71–86. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Long, Michelle. 1999. Adverbial and Argument-Doubling Clauses in Cree. Master's thesis, University of Manitoba.

Matthewson, Lisa. 2004. On the Methodology of Semantic Fieldwork. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 70:369–415.

Muehlbauer, Jeffrey. 2008. *kâ-yôskâtahk ôma nêhiyawêwin*: The Representation of Intentionality in Plains Cree. Doctoral Dissertation, UBC.

Newell, Wayne A., and Robert M. Leavitt, ed. 2020. *Kuhkomossonuk Akonutomuwinokot: Stories Our Grandmothers Told Us.* Robbiston, ME: Resolute Bear Press.

Oshima, David Y. 2007. Syntactic direction and obviation as empathy-based phenomena: a typological approach. *Linguistics* 45:727–763.

Oxford, Will. 2024. *The Algonquian Inverse.* Number 9 in Oxford Studies of Endangered Languages. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Privoznov, Dmitry. 2020. Obviation in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. Handout, Passamaquoddy Workshop, MIT.

Rhodes, Richard A. 1976. The Morphosyntax of the Central Ojibwa Verb. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan.

Rhodes, Richard A. 1990. Obviation, Inversion, and Topic Rank in Ojibwa. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: Special Session on General Topics in American Indian Linguistics*, ed. David J. Costa, 101–115. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Rhodes, Richard A. 1994. Agency, inversion, and thematic alignment in Ojibwe. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, ed. Susanne Gahl, Andy Dolbey, and Christopher Johnson, 431–446. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Rhodes, Richard A. 2017. Obviation, inversion, and the notion of Topic in Algonquian. In *Papers of the 46th Algonquian Conference*, ed. Monica Macaulay and Margaret Noodin, 197–211. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Richards, Norvin. 2010. *Uttering Trees.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

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

Thomason, Lucy. 1995. The Assignment of Proximate and Obviative in Informal Fox Narrative. In *Papers of the 26th Algonquian Conference*, ed. David H. Pentland, 462–496. Winnipeg: Univerisity of Manitoba.

Thomason, Lucy. 2003. The Proximate and Obviative Contrast in Meskwaki. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Wolfart, H. C. 1973. Plains Cree: A grammatical study. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 63:1–90.