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1. Introduction

The Agree operation (Chomsky 2000, 2001) plays a central role in Minimalist syntax, but there is no consensus regarding exactly how Agree works and how much it can do. We focus here on one proposed extension: Multiple Agree, in which a single probe acquires features simultaneously from more than one goal (Hiraiwa 2001; Anagnostopoulou 2005; van Koppen 2005; Nevins 2007). Since Multiple Agree makes the theory of Agree less restrictive, it should be included in the theory only if empirically necessary. One empirical domain that seems to provide support for Multiple Agree is portmanteau agreement, in which a single agreement marker indexes features of two arguments. Syntactic analyses in which some instances of portmanteau agreement reflect Multiple Agree have been proposed (Georgi 2013; Woolford 2016), but there are also proposals that portmanteau agreement is always a purely morphological phenomenon. The leading morphological analysis takes portmanteau agreement to reflect contextual allomorphy (Trommer 2010; Fenger 2018), in which the realization of one agreement head is conditioned by the features of another agreement head. Since each head enters a syntactic Agree relation with only one nominal, the contextual allomorphy analysis eliminates portmanteau agreement as evidence for Multiple Agree.

This paper examines portmanteau agreement in the Algonquian language Kickapoo (Voorhis 1974) as well as its sister languages Passamaquoddy (Francis and Leavitt 2008) and Ojibwe (Nichols 1980). Although a morphological analysis of the Kickapoo portmanteau patterns cannot be completely ruled out, we argue that a syntactic analysis is simpler and less stipulative. We conclude that while portmanteau agreement may indeed reflect contextual allomorphy in many languages, Kickapoo portmanteau agreement is most likely a phenomenon of the syntax and thus does lend support to the existence of Multiple Agree.

2. Background

Most Algonquian languages have two parallel but formally distinct paradigms of verb inflection known as the INDEPENDENT and CONJUNCT, which generally correlate with
main and embedded clauses, respectively. It is the conjunct paradigm in which portmanteau agreement markers appear. The conjunct inflections for Kickapoo transitive verbs include two agreement suffixes, known by Algonquianists as the THEME SIGN (Bloomfield 1946:102) and CENTRAL ENDING (Goddard 1969:103), followed by a clause type suffix, as illustrated by the examples in (1). For clarity, the theme sign is underlined and the central ending is bolded here and in all subsequent examples.\(^1\)

\[(1)\]
\[
a. \text{waapamehki} \\
\underline{\text{waapam}} -\underline{\text{eh}} \quad \text{-k} \quad \text{-i} \\
\text{see} \quad \underline{\text{-2OBJ}} \quad \underline{\text{-3}} \quad \text{-IND} \\
\text{‘she sees you.SG’}
\]
\[
b. \text{waapamenakwe} \\
\underline{\text{waapam}} \quad \text{-en} \quad \underline{\text{-akw}} \quad \text{-e} \\
\text{see} \quad \underline{\text{-2OBJ}} \quad \underline{\text{21PL}} \quad \text{-IND} \\
\text{‘she sees us.INCL’}
\]
\[
c. \text{waapamiaake} \\
\underline{\text{waapam}} \quad \text{-i} \quad \underline{\text{-aak}} \quad \text{-e} \\
\text{see} \quad \underline{\text{-1OBJ}} \quad \underline{\text{1PL}} \quad \text{-IND} \\
\text{‘you see us.EXCL’}
\]
\[
d. \text{waapamiameci} \\
\underline{\text{waapam}} \quad \text{-i} \quad \underline{\text{-amet}} \quad \text{-i} \\
\text{see} \quad \underline{\text{-1OBJ}} \quad \underline{\text{3:1PL}} \quad \text{-IND} \\
\text{‘she sees us.EXCL’}
\]

The theme sign indexes the person of the object, except when replaced by an inverse marker that is not relevant in this paper. The patterning of the central ending is more complex. Some forms show a simple central ending that indexes one argument: the subject in (1a), the object in (1b,c). Other forms show a portmanteau central ending that indexes both arguments, as in (1d) (-amet ‘3:1PL’). For reference, the Kickapoo theme signs and central endings that index grammatically animate arguments are listed in (2), based on the paradigms in Voorhis 1974:78–83.\(^2\) The portmanteau central endings are the focus of this paper.

\[(2)\]
\[
a. \text{Theme signs:} \quad \underline{-i} \quad \text{‘1OBJ’}, \quad \text{-en} -\text{eh} \quad \text{‘2OBJ’}, \quad \text{-aa} -\varnothing \quad \text{‘3OBJ’}, \quad \text{-eko} \quad \text{‘INV’}
\]
\[
b. \text{Simple central endings:} \quad \text{-aan} \quad \text{‘1SG’}, \quad \text{-an} \quad \text{‘2SG’}, \quad \text{-aak} \quad \text{‘1PL’}, \quad \text{-akw} \quad \text{‘21PL’}, \quad \text{-eekw} \quad \text{‘2PL’}, \quad \text{-t} -\text{k} \quad \text{‘3’} \quad \text{(-t after vowel, -k after consonant)}
\]
\[
c. \text{Portmanteau central endings:} \quad \text{-ak} \quad \text{‘1SG:3’}, \quad \text{-at} \quad \text{‘2SG:3’}, \quad \text{-aket} \quad \text{‘1PL:3’}, \quad \text{-amet} \quad \text{‘3:1PL’}, \quad \text{-aakw} \quad \text{‘3:2PL’}, \quad \text{-ako} \quad \text{‘1SG:2PL’}
\]

Following existing work, we take the theme sign to realize Voice and the central ending to realize Infl (e.g. Coon and Bale 2014; Xu 2016; Hamilton 2017; Oxford 2019b). Within this framework, portmanteau central endings such as -amet ‘3:1PL’ can conceivably be given either a syntactic or a morphological analysis. Under both analyses, Voice must first

\(^1\)Glosses follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules, with the following additions: 21PL = inclusive first-person plural; 3 = grammatically animate third person; IMPERS = impersonal; IND = indicative; INV = inverse; PRET = preterit. Portmanteau affixes are glossed as “X:Y” when the afford indicates that X acts on Y and as “X&Y” when the afford indicates that X and Y are involved but does not specify their roles. The terms subject and object denote the external and internal argument, respectively. In English translations of Algonquian third-person singular forms, feminine gender is used as a default.

\(^2\)Some of the portmanteau central endings are tantalizingly close to being segmentable into smaller parts, such as -aket ‘1PL:3’ and -amet ‘3:1PL’, but the ostensible morphemes -am and -et that would result from this segmentation do not occur elsewhere in the inflectional system.
agree with the object, given the consistent pattern of object agreement shown by the theme sign; we assume that the 1PL object receives [ACC] case as a result. The analyses differ in regard to what happens next, on Infl. Under a syntactic analysis involving Multiple Agree, Infl agrees with both arguments in the syntax, and -amet ‘3:1PL’ is a true portmanteau that discharges features of both arguments on Infl. Under a morphological analysis involving contextual allomorphy, Infl agrees only with the subject in the syntax, and -amet ‘3:1PL’ is an allomorph of third-person subject agreement that realizes Infl when V oice has [1PL]. The vocabulary items for -amet under the two analyses are given in (3).

(3) Alternative vocabulary items for portmanteau Infl suffix -amet ‘3:1PL’
   a. Multiple Agree: -amet ↔ {[3], [1PL,ACC]}

The choice between the two analyses is not necessarily an all-or-nothing affair. The possibility of crosslinguistic variation in the syntactic or morphological status of portmanteau agreement is well-established (Woolford 2016), but it is conceivable that even within a single language, some portmanteau suffixes may have the derivation in (3a) while others have the derivation in (3b). In fact, Xu (2017) makes exactly this proposal for portmanteau central endings in Algonquin, another Algonquian language, arguing that portmanteaux involving an SAP object (Kickapoo -amet ‘3:1PL’) are derived by Multiple Agree while portmanteaux involving a third-person object (Kickapoo -aket ‘1PL:3’) are derived by contextual allomorphy. We abstract away from this issue in the current paper, as our goal is simply to show that at least some instances of Kickapoo portmanteau agreement appear to be derived in the syntax. The precise delineation between syntactic and morphological portmanteaux is a secondary question that we will not consider in detail here.

3. Evidence for the status of portmanteau agreement

This section describes the properties of portmanteau central endings in Kickapoo and related languages and considers how each property can be accounted for under morphological and syntactic analyses of portmanteau agreement.

3.1 Expression of object number

Some portmanteau central endings, such as -aket ‘1PL:3’ in (4a), express only the person of the object, while others, such as -amet ‘3:1PL’ in (4b), express both the person and number of the object. We will refer to the latter type as an “object number portmanteau.”

(4) a. waapamakeci
    waapam -Ø -aket -i
    see 3OBJ -1PL:3 -IND
    ‘we.EXCL see her’

b. waapamiameci
    waapam -i -amet -i
    see 1OBJ -3:1PL -IND
    ‘she sees us.EXCL’
Under a contextual allomorphy analysis, an object number portmanteau such as -amet ‘3:1PL’ is fundamentally a marker of third-person subject agreement, realizing Infl in contexts where Infl agrees with a third-person subject and Voice agrees with a 1PL object, as formalized by the rule in (3b) above. This analysis relies on the assumption that Voice agrees with the object for both person and number, since both the person and number features of the object on Voice are required to condition the realization of Infl. However, the realization of Voice itself only ever expresses the person of the object (e.g. -i ‘1OBJ’), not also its number, so there is no independent evidence that Voice actually does agree for number in the syntax. A contextual allomorphy analysis of object number portmanteaux such as -amet ‘3:1PL’ thus requires the realization of Infl to be conditioned by a hypothetical feature on Voice—number—that is never actually expressed on Voice itself.

Although this consideration does not rule out a contextual allomorphy analysis, it does introduce an element of circularity into the analysis: Infl expresses the number of the object because Voice agrees for number with the object, but the only evidence that Voice agrees for number with the object is the fact that Infl expresses the number of the object. Under a Multiple Agree analysis, this circularity does not arise: Infl expresses the number of the object because Infl agrees with the object (in addition to the subject).

### 3.2 Adjacency

This section considers data from Ojibwe, as a regular sound change has caused the relevant Kickapoo forms to become more opaque on the surface. The central ending (Infl) is often adjacent to the theme sign (Voice), as in the indicative forms in (5), but it is also possible for another morpheme to intervene, as in the corresponding negative forms in (6), where -ssiw ‘NEG’ appears between the theme sign and the central ending. The occurrence of an intervening morpheme does not disrupt portmanteau agreement: the same portmanteau central endings appear in (6) as in (5).

(5)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. waapamak</th>
<th>b. waapamiyankit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>waapam -Ø -ak -Ø</td>
<td>waapam -i -ankanit -Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see -OBJ -3SG:3 -IND</td>
<td>see -1OBJ -3:1PL -IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I see her’</td>
<td>‘she sees us.EXCL’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. waapamaasiwak</th>
<th>b. waapamissiwankit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>waapam -aa -ssiw -ak -Ø</td>
<td>waapam -i -ssiw -ankanit -Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see -OBJ -NEG -1SG:3 -IND</td>
<td>see -1OBJ -NEG -3:1PL -IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I do not see her’</td>
<td>‘she does not see us.EXCL’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If portmanteau central endings are contextual allomorphs of Infl conditioned by the features of Voice, the persistence of portmanteau central endings in forms like (6) indicates that this allomorphy can take place even when the trigger and target are not adjacent. This is problematic under models of contextual allomorphy that require adjacency (e.g. Embick

---

3The 3OBJ theme sign alternates between -Ø in (7a) and -aa in (6a). This alternation is phonologically conditioned: -aa ‘3OBJ’ is replaced by -Ø when the following suffix is vowel-initial (Rhodes 1976:176).
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2010). It is not problematic, however, under a Multiple Agree analysis in which Infl agrees with the object in addition to the subject: if Infl can agree with the object in affirmative clauses like (5), there is no reason why it could not do the same in negative clauses like (6).

The robustness of portmanteau central endings illustrated for Ojibwe in (6) holds in most Algonquian languages for which the relevant data is available (Oxford 2017:25). However, as pointed out to us by Tanya Bondarenko (p.c.), there is one Algonquian language, Passamaquoddy, in which certain portmanteau central endings do disappear when another morpheme intervenes between the central ending and the theme sign. In the Passamaquoddy forms in (7), the central ending is realized as a portmanteau (-uk ‘1SG:3’) when immediately adjacent to the (null) theme sign in (7a), but as a simple suffix indexing only the subject (-an ‘1SG’) when a negative marker intervenes in (7b).

(7) a. punuk
   pun -Ø -uk -Ø
   put -3OBJ -1SG:3 -IND
   ‘I place her’

b. punawan
   pun -a -w -an -Ø
   put -3OBJ -NEG -1SG -IND
   ‘I do not place her’

The fragility of the Passamaquoddy portmanteau central ending -uk ‘1SG:3’ indicates that a morphological analysis involving allomorphy or fusion may be appropriate here. But the contrast provided by the Passamaquoddy data also strengthens the case for a syntactic analysis of portmanteau agreement in languages where portmanteau central endings are robust: if the Passamaquoddy portmanteau central ending -uk ‘1SG:3’ in (7a) is fragile because it is derived in the morphology, then the fact that its Ojibwe cognate -ak ‘1SG:3’ in (6a) is not fragile suggests that it must not be derived in the morphology.

3.3 Inward-sensitivity

Bobaljik (2000) argues that allomorphy conditioned by morphosyntactic features must be outward-sensitive: the realization of a lower head can be conditioned by morphosyntactic features of a higher head but not vice versa. Fenger (2018) claims that portmanteau agreement always shows this pattern, appearing only on the lower of two agreement heads. In Kickapoo, however, it is instead the higher agreement head, Infl, rather than the lower head, Voice, that has portmanteau realizations. A contextual allomorphy analysis is still possible, but only if we allow inward-sensitive allomorphy for morphosyntactic features, which Bobaljik (2000) and others have argued to be undesirable. Under an analysis in which Infl acquires the features of both arguments in the syntax, this issue does not arise.

3.4 Distribution of portmanteaux

Fenger (2018) points out that languages often have portmanteau agreement morphemes only for a random subset of the logically possible subject-object combinations, a fact that favors a shallow morphological analysis in which the distribution of contextual allomorphy is an accident of diachrony. In Kickapoo, however, the distribution of portmanteaux is not entirely random: as shown by the inventory of vocabulary items in (2c), there are no
portmanteau central endings for combinations of two referential third-person arguments. The same is true of all Algonquian languages. This is a systematic gap and thus cannot be explained as a diachronic accident. A syntactic analysis can easily explain the gap. The key lies in the special “obviative” marking (Bloomfield 1946:94) that obligatorily applies to the less topical of two clausemate third persons. If we assume that obviative marking makes a DP less accessible as a goal of the Agree operation, perhaps due to the addition of an extra layer of structure to the DP (Richards 2010:136–137), it follows that Infl will agree only with the non-obviative DP in 3-on-3 forms rather than agreeing with both DPs as it usually does (Oxford 2019b). The absence of portmanteaux in 3-on-3 forms is thus a direct consequence of the absence of Multiple Agree in such forms.

It is harder to imagine an equally systematic morphological analysis of the same facts. In a 3-on-3 clause with an obviative object, as in (8), Voice does agree with the object, as indicated by the realization of Voice as a third-person object marker (\textit{-aa ‘3OBJ’}).\footnote{In the preceding paragraph we posited that obviation makes a DP less accessible as a goal of the Agree operation. This restriction is relevant for a probe such as Infl that c-commands two potential goals; in such contexts, the presence of obviative marking on one potential goal will favor agreement with the other goal. However, when a probe c-commands only one potential goal—as with Voice and the object—then it appears that the probe will agree with that goal even if the goal is obviative.} The features of the object on Voice thus ought to be available to condition a portmanteau realization of Infl—and yet such portmanteaux exist in no Algonquian language.

(8) waapamaaci
\begin{verbatim}
waapam -aa -t -i
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
see -3OBJ -3SG -IND
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
‘she sees her.OBV’
\end{verbatim}

A morphological explanation for the absence of 3-on-3 portmanteaux could be sought in the fact that both arguments in a 3-on-3 form have the same person feature. Perhaps, then, portmanteau agreement morphology is possible only when the two arguments contrast in person. A general restriction such as this is not viable, however, as 3-on-3 portmanteaux are attested in other languages (e.g. Chukchi \textit{-nin ‘3SG:3’}; Bobaljik and Branigan 2006:56).

3.5 Portmanteaux with ambiguous subject

The Kickapoo portmanteau central ending \textit{-aakw} appears in two contexts: (i) forms with a third-person subject and a second-person plural object (‘she sees you’) and (ii) second-person plural passive/impersonal forms (‘you are seen’/‘people see you’). Under a syntactic analysis in which Infl agrees with both the subject and the [2PL, ACC] object, \textit{-aakw} can be analyzed simply as discharging the features that Infl gained from the object, as in (9). This vocabulary item accounts for both of the contexts in which \textit{-aakw} appears.

(9) \textit{-aakw} \leftrightarrow [2PL, ACC].
Under a contextual allomorphy analysis in which Infl agrees only with the subject, -aakw would instead have to be analyzed as an allomorph of subject agreement that is conditioned by 2PL object features on Voice. But since -aakw appears with two kinds of subjects, a unified analysis is not possible: -aakw must be an allomorph of third-person subject agreement in forms like ‘she sees you’ and an allomorph of impersonal subject agreement in forms like ‘you are seen’, as indicated in the vocabulary items in (10).\(^5\)

\[
(10) \begin{align*}
&\text{a. } -aakw \leftrightarrow [3] / \text{Voice}_{[2\text{PL}]} \\
&\text{b. } -aakw \leftrightarrow [\text{IMPERS}] / \text{Voice}_{[2\text{PL}]} 
\end{align*}
\]

By requiring -aakw to be analyzed as an allomorph of third-person and impersonal subject agreement, the allomorphy approach is forced to posit unwarranted homophony and fails to capture the true nature of -aakw as a 2PL object marker.

### 3.6 Unidirectional and bidirectional portmanteaux

Kickapoo has the distinct portmanteau central endings -aket ‘1PL:3’ and -amet ‘3:1PL’, illustrated in (4) above. In Ojibwe, however, a single “bidirectional” portmanteau central ending -ankit is used in both 1PL:3 and 3:1PL contexts, as illustrated in (11).

\[
(11) \begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \text{waapamankit} \\
&\quad \text{waapam -Ø} \quad -\text{ankit} \quad -Ø \quad \text{see} \quad -\text{3OBJ} \quad -\text{1PL&3-IND} \quad \text{‘we.EXCL see her’}
&\text{b. } \text{waapamiyankit} \\
&\quad \text{waapam -i} \quad -\text{ankit} \quad -Ø \quad \text{see} \quad -\text{1OBJ} \quad -\text{1PL&3-IND} \quad \text{‘she sees us.EXCL’}
\end{align*}
\]

If Infl collects the features of both arguments in the syntax, the difference between Kickapoo and Ojibwe can be captured by positing case features in the vocabulary items for Kickapoo -aket and -amet but not for Ojibwe -ankit, as indicated in (12). The case features force the Kickapoo portmanteaux to be unidirectional, each occurring only when a certain person is the object, while the lack of case features allows the Ojibwe portmanteau to be bidirectional, occurring whenever Infl agrees with a 1PL DP and a third-person DP.

\[
(12) \begin{align*}
&\text{a. Kickapoo: } -\text{aket} \leftrightarrow \{[1\text{PL}], [3, \text{ACC}]\}; -\text{amet} \leftrightarrow \{[3], [1\text{PL,ACC}]\} \\
&\text{b. Ojibwe: } -\text{ankit} \leftrightarrow \{[1\text{PL}], [3]\}
\end{align*}
\]

In contrast to this simple account, a morphological analysis in which portmanteau central endings are actually contextual allomorphs of subject agreement provides no unified way to capture the bidirectional distribution of Ojibwe -ankit. In a 1PL→3 form, -ankit would have to be analyzed as an allomorph of 1PL subject agreement conditioned by third-person object features on Voice, while in a 3→1PL form, -ankit would have to be analyzed as an allomorph of third-person subject agreement conditioned by 1PL features on Voice.

\textbf{5}It is unlikely that the two VIs in (10) can be collapsed into one by analyzing [3] and [IMPERS] as a natural class, since referential third persons and impersonal agents in Algonquian languages pattern quite distinctly from each other with respect to agreement, person-hierarchy effects, and obviation.
This split analysis misses the simple generalization that -ankit appears whenever the verb’s arguments are 1PL and 3, regardless of which is the subject.

### 3.7 Fissioned realization of object plurality

This final point involves data from Ojibwe rather than Kickapoo. When Infl indexes a 3PL nominal, the typical third-person central ending -t~k ‘3’ is augmented by a plural marker -waa ‘(3)PL’. The two suffixes are always immediately adjacent and their relative order varies, as illustrated by the 3PL forms in (14), which contrast with the 3SG forms in (13).

(13) a. waapamit
   waapam -i -t -Ø
   see -1OBJ -3 -IND
   ‘she sees me’

 b. waapamikk
   waapam -iN -k -Ø
   see -2OBJ -3 -IND
   ‘she sees you.SG’

(14) a. waapamiwaat
   waapam -i -waa -t -Ø
   see -1OBJ -PL -3 -IND
   ‘they see me’

 b. waapamikkwaa
   waapam -iN -k -waa -Ø
   see -2OBJ -3 -PL -Ø
   ‘they see you.SG’

The adjacency of the central ending -t~k and its augment -waa is not a coincidental property of the forms in (14). The central ending and its augment are always adjacent, occurring in what is otherwise a single morphological slot. The systematic adjacency of the two suffixes becomes especially clear in more complex constructions such as the negative preterit form in (15), in which the central ending slot occupied by -k ‘3’ + -waa ‘(3)PL’ is bracketed by a preceding negative suffix -ssiw and a following preterit suffix -pan.

(15) waapamissikwaapan
   waapam -i -ssiw -k -waa -pan
   see -1OBJ -NEG -3 -PL -PRET
   ‘they did not see me’

To account for the fact that the augment -waa ‘(3)PL’ is both featurally dependent on and linearly adjacent to the central ending, we regard -waa as the product of fission: -waa discharges the [PL] feature that was left undischarged by -t~k ‘3’ (Oxford 2019a).

Augmentation by -waa applies not only to the simple third-person central ending -t~k ‘3’ but also to portmanteau central endings such as -ankit ‘1PL&3’, which indexes a 1PL subject and a third-person object in (16a). When the third-person object is plural, the augment -waa ‘(3)PL’ is added alongside -ankit, as shown in (16b).

(16) a. waapamankit
   waapam -Ø -ankit -Ø
   see -3OBJ -1PL&3 -IND
   ‘we.EXCL see her’

 b. waapamankitwaa
   waapam -Ø -ankit -waa -Ø
   see -3OBJ -1PL&3 -PL -Ø
   ‘we.EXCL see them’
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How can the realization of Infl as -ankit-waa be accounted for? Under a Multiple Agree analysis, the explanation is simple: Infl agrees with [1PL] and [3PL], the primary central ending -ankit discharges [1PL] and [3], and the secondary central ending -waa discharges the remaining [PL] feature. In contrast, an allomorphy analysis in which Infl agrees only with the 1PL subject cannot easily explain why -waa ‘(3)PL’ appears as part of the realization of Infl. Although the third-person object features on Voice can trigger the spellout of a special allomorph of Infl (-ankit ‘1PL:3’), it would be a stretch to propose that the features of Voice can also trigger the spellout of an additional secondary exponent of Infl, -waa ‘(3)PL’, solely to realize a feature that is found only on Voice. If Infl is specified only as [1PL], and these features are discharged fully by -ankit ‘1PL:3’, there is no way to trigger the additional spellout of Infl as -waa ‘(3)PL’.

4. Conclusion

Portmanteau agreement morphology can, in principle, be analyzed as either (i) realizing a head that has the features of two arguments or (ii) realizing a head that has the features of one argument, conditioned allomorphically by a nearby head that has the features of another argument. We have argued that many properties of portmanteau agreement in Kickapoo find a more satisfactory explanation under the first analysis. Although much of the evidence is suggestive rather than conclusive, the overall picture appears to be more compatible with an account in which at least some portmanteaux reflect Multiple Agree in the syntax.
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