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Map: the word “woman” in different Algonquian languages (https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/6/6f/Femme_algoquien.png)
In Chomsky’s (2000, 2001) Probe-Goal (P&G) framework, agreement reflects the relation between a functional head and a DP when they satisfy these two criteria:

**Accessibility**: does the probe see the goal?

**Feature matching**: does the probe want the goal?

**Question**: what makes a probe see the goal?

Several mechanisms overlap on tackling the issue of *accessibility*:

- **Chomsky (2000, 2001)**
  - Goal’s F: active in the same phase

- **SCOPA** (Baker 2008, 2012)
  - probe’s type: person-agreement must be local; number/gender-agreement can be at distance

- **Horizons** (Keine 2019)
  - probe’s height: the higher, the more structures are accessible to it

Can these disparate mechanisms interact with each other in the same language?
Peripheral agreement (PerA, Goddard 1979) occurs at the right periphery of the indicative verb and usually indexes the $\phi$-features of the 3rd person object.

Variation: the ability of PerA to index different types of objects varies.

- ✓ object indexed by PerA
- X object unindexed by PerA
(*only for singular SAP subjects, the forms with plural SAP subjects don’t show PerA.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delaware</th>
<th>Ojibwe</th>
<th>Oji-Cree</th>
<th>Menominee</th>
<th>Cree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAP—IN</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAP— 3.IN**

**Menominee**

1-put.in-IN -1SG -IN.PL

*I put them*<sub>IN</sub> in the pot.'

✓PerA: IN.obj

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delaware</th>
<th>Ojibwe</th>
<th>Oji-Cree</th>
<th>Menominee</th>
<th>Cree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3—IN</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.AN— 3.IN**

**Ojibwe**

o-waaband-AA-naawaa-an

‘They see them’<sub>IN</sub>.

✓PerA: IN.obj

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delaware</th>
<th>Ojibwe</th>
<th>Oji-Cree</th>
<th>Menominee</th>
<th>Cree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—an—in</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAP—GOAL+THEME**

**Delaware**

nə-mí·l-a· -n -al

‘I gave them*<sub>IN</sub> to him.’

✓PerA: THEME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delaware</th>
<th>Ojibwe</th>
<th>Oji-Cree</th>
<th>Menominee</th>
<th>Cree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1-put.in-IN -1SG -IN.PL
| 3 -see -IN -3PL -IN.PL

**Menominee**

1 -put.in-<sub>IN</sub> -1SG -AN.PL

*I see it/them*<sub>IN</sub> in the pot.’

✓PerA: AN.subj; XIN.obj

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delaware</th>
<th>Ojibwe</th>
<th>Oji-Cree</th>
<th>Menominee</th>
<th>Cree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ni-miin-aa -ag
| 1 -tell -AN -AN.PL

**Cree**

ni-wâpaht-ê -n

‘I see it/them*<sub>IN</sub> in the pot.’

XPerA: IN.obj

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delaware</th>
<th>Ojibwe</th>
<th>Oji-Cree</th>
<th>Menominee</th>
<th>Cree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1-put.in-IN -3PL -AN.PL

**Ojibwe**

po:n -am-w -ak

‘They put it/them*<sub>IN</sub> in the pot.’

~PerA: ✓AN.subj; XIN.obj

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delaware</th>
<th>Ojibwe</th>
<th>Oji-Cree</th>
<th>Menominee</th>
<th>Cree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—an—in</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What determines accessibility for PerA

- **PIC (Chomsky 2000):** SAP and 3.AN object are both accessible as they are at the phase edge (Voice = Chomsky’s v)
- The delimiting edge isn’t a fixed boundary. Keine’s (2019) horizons allows flexibility to it.

### transitive clauses:

```latex
C [Infl [VoiceP SAP 3.AN [VP t ]]]
```

### ditransitive clauses:

Delaware: no horizons; Others: vP is a horizon.

```latex
C [Infl [VoiceP SAP [ApplP GOAL [VP THEME ]]]]
```

- How to explain the variation in 3-on-3 forms?

```latex
C [Infl Infl [VoiceP 3.AN 3.IN [VP t ]]]
```

AC explains that the 3.AN subj is inaccessible as it’s been valued by the probe on Infl.
Putting-it-together

**Accessibility**

Baker’s (2008, 2012) SCOPA explains that only 3\textsuperscript{rd} person goals are accessible for PerA as the probe on C looks for $\phi$-features but not person-features.

**Horizons**

Overall, accessibility is captured by horizons (Keine 2019). Delaware: no horizons; Others: goal lower than $\nu P$ is inaccessible.

**Activity Condition**

The probe favors the active object over the inactive subject but the AC can be violated in Menominee and Cree.

---

**Specification of the probes**

Flat probe $[u\phi]$ for the rest; The probe is more specified in Cree: $[uD, uProx]$ (cf. Oxford 2015)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAP—3.AN transitive</th>
<th>SAP—3.IN transitive</th>
<th>3—IN/OBV transitive</th>
<th>Theme ditransitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojibwe</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oji-Cree</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cree</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The PerA cline indicating varying degrees of robustness in indexing the object reflects the interaction of both syntactic and morphological mechanisms.

Accessibility

- **does the probe see the goal?**

Matching

- **does the probe want the goal?**

Morphology

- post-syntactic adjustments

**SCOPA** (types of probes)
- only 3rd DPs are accessible

**Horizons** (height of probes)
- parameters of the delimiting edge

**AC** (status of goal's features)
- parameters in “3-on-3” forms

Cree SAP-3.IN form: the probe is specified for \([uProx]\)

Menonimee plural SAP blocking:
- impoverishment by -menaw
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The Oji-Cree data are from the fieldwork. The rest are drawn from reference grammar books:

- Delaware: the Munsee dialect (Goddard 1979)
- Ojibwe: the Southwestern dialect (Nichols 1980) unless stated otherwise (e.g., Rhodes 1990).
- Menominee: Bloomfield (1946, 1953)
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Appendix: pseudo-transitive verbs

Unlike previous transitive verbs, the pseudotransitives lack the theme marker (Voice⁰).

Delaware

\[ na\text{-waní} -n -a\cdot k \]

1 -see -1SG-AN.PL

‘I forgot them\textsubscript{AN}.’

Ojibwe (Rhodes 1990)

\[ o\text{-gii-adaawe} -n -\emptyset \text{ adoopowin} \]

3-PST-sell -3SG-IN.SG table\textsubscript{IN.SG}

‘He sold the table.’

Menominee

\[ čaan \text{ ne-tooweemate-m} \]

John 1-have.friend -1s

‘I have John as a friend.’

Oji-Cree

\[ ataawe-w -\emptyset \text{ wapikoniin} \]

buy -3SG-AN.SG flower\textsubscript{IN.PL}

‘He buys flowers\textsubscript{IN}.’

Variations of pseudotransitives provide further support in favor of the horizons.

- in Ojibwe, vP isn’t a horizon when lacking VoiceP.

\[ C \text{ [Infl Infl [vP 3.AN \text{ v 3.IN} ]] \]

\[ \checkmark \text{D, Ojb} \quad \xmark \text{OjC, M, C} \]

Themes

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Delaware} & \checkmark \\
\text{Ojibwe} & \checkmark \\
\text{Oji-Cree} & \xmark \\
\text{Menominee} & \xmark \\
\text{Cree} & \xmark \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]
Appendix: plurality of the SAP subject

In Menominee, the distribution of PerA can be affected by plurality of the SAP subject.

- Question: why is the IN.object accessible when the SAP subject is singular but becomes inaccessible when the SAP subject is plural?
- The blocking of PerA is a result of **impoverishment** (cf. Halle & Marantz 1993).
- That is, the VI -menaw 1PL deletes the PerA, -an IN.PL, post-syntactically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delaware</th>
<th>Ojibwe</th>
<th>Oji-Cree</th>
<th>Menominee</th>
<th>Cree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s—IN</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p—IN</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix: PerA cline (complete)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAP—3.AN transitive</th>
<th>SAP—3.IN transitive</th>
<th>3—IN/OBV transitive</th>
<th>Theme pseudo-tran</th>
<th>Theme ditransitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojibwe</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oji-Cree</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cree</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓: PerA appears, indexing the relevant object  
X: PerA does not appear at all  
~: PerA appears but indexes the other 3rd argument