SQUIBS AND DISCUSSION

AGREEMENT WITHOUT A-
    POSITIONS: ANOTHER LOOK
    AT ALGONQUIAN
Elizabeth Ritter
    University of Calgary
Sara Thomas Rosen
    University of Kansas

1 Introduction

Branigan and MacKenzie (2000, 2002) argue that cross-clausal agreement (CCA) in Innu-aimûn (Central Algonquian) is an example of Ā-agreement. In this squib, we propose that all agreement in Innu-aimûn and other Algonquian languages is in fact Ā-agreement. As is well known, agreement targets are selected on the basis of relative animacy rather than grammatical relations in these languages. Following Bruening (2001), we assume that they have a designated position for the argument that is highest on the animacy hierarchy.[1] However, we argue that this is an Ā-position, given its function, position, and interaction with other syntactic processes.

We propose that the absence of A-agreement derives from a property that characterizes all Algonquian languages: either they lack TP altogether, or T is not specified for Case or D-features. The evidence for our claim comes from the lack of other A-syntax phenomena related to Spec,T, including Case, Case-motivated A-movement, and A-binding.[2] On our proposal, arguments are projected into the vP, licensed by familiar θ-relations. They do not move for Case agreement, but only for discourse purposes such as topic or focus, or for *wh*-questions. We suggest that in the absence of A-movement and A-checking, these languages rely instead on Ā-positions for agreement triggers and landing sites for movement.

2 Cross-Clausal Agreement Is Not Case Related

The presence of abstract Case is discernable in morphological case and in Case-motivated movement, but Algonquian languages appear to have neither.[3] In this section, we discuss one type of movement that is clearly not motivated by Case considerations. In section 3, we argue that Algonquian has no passive, though it may have a passivelike movement, which again is not Case related.

Glosses of Algonquian examples follow the original sources.

[1] For Algonquian, the person or animacy hierarchy that determines which argument the verb prefix agrees with is as follows (Branigan and MacKenzie 2000):

(i) 2nd > 1st > 3rd > (obviative 3rd) > inanimate (3rd)

As an anonymous reviewer and Goddard (1979) point out, the relation between first and second person may be more complex than this hierarchy indicates.

[2] Presumably, vP would also lack a Case-checking feature, but we have nothing to say about this here.

[3] See, for example, Dahlstrom 1991:9 for evidence that Plains Cree has no case morphology on DPs.

In the Algonquian languages, under certain circumstances, the verb can agree with an argument in a subordinate clause. This phenomenon is called cross-clausal agreement (CCA),[4] and one might be tempted to assume that it is analogous to exceptional Case marking (ECM; also known as copy/raising to object). In his original description of CCA in Blackfoot (Plains Algonquian), Frantz (1978) noted that the construction is reminiscent of English ECM, illustrated in (1).

(1) John wants [$_{IP}$ me to visit him].

We follow Branigan and MacKenzie, however, in analyzing CCA as an instance of Ā-agreement, and not raising. As described by Branigan and MacKenzie (2002), CCA occurs in Innu-aimûn when a verb that selects a clausal complement optionally agrees with an animate argument of that clausal complement. This is reflected in the form of the matrix verb but does not affect the morphology of the embedded verb. In particular, verbs that select clausal complements normally appear in the transitive inanimate (TI) form, but in CCA they are realized in their transitive animate (TA) form. The argument that triggers object agreement on the matrix verb is either the subject or the object of the embedded clause. This is illustrated in (2) and (3). In (2a) and (3a), there is no CCA, and the matrix verb appears in its TI form. In (2b), the matrix verb agrees with the embedded subject 'John and Marie'; in (3b), it agrees with the null embedded object 'you'. The CCA morphemes on the matrix verb are in bold; the overt trigger of CCA is underlined. Note that the form of the embedded verb is invariant in each pair of examples.

(2) *Innu-aimûn*
  a. Ni-tshissenitamu-ânân mûpishtuât Shûshepa Tshân
     1PL-know-TI-1PL   visit   Joseph John
     mâk Mânî.
     and Marie
     'We know that John and Marie visited Joseph.'
  b. Ni-tshissenim-ânân-**at** mûpishtuât Shûshepa <u>Tshân</u>
     1-know-1PL-3PL   visit   Joseph John
     <u>mâk</u> <u>Mânî</u>.
     and Marie
     'We know that John and Marie visited Joseph.'
     (Branigan and MacKenzie 2002:388, (3))

(3) *Innu-aimûn*
  a. Ni-tshissît-en   kâ-uîtshi-shk   Pûn utâuia.
     1-remember-TI PRT-helped-3/2PL Paul father
     'I remember that Paul's father helped you.'

---

[4] This phenomenon is also called copy-to-object (see Frantz 1978, Dahlstrom 1991).

   b. **Tshi**-tshissît-**âtin** kâ-uîtshi-shk   Pûn utâuia.
      2-remember-1/2PL PRT-helped-3/2PL Paul father
      'I remember that Paul's father helped you.'
      (Branigan and MacKenzie 2002:388, (4))

    CCA differs from ECM in four ways. First, ECM is motivated by Case considerations; it occurs when an embedded infinitival verb is unable to check nominative Case of its subject. CCA, on the other hand, is discourse determined. Branigan and MacKenzie note, for example, that the trigger for matrix object agreement may be a *wh*-phrase (4a) or a focus DP (4b), both of which obligatorily raise to Spec,CP. CCA triggers that are neither focus DPs nor *wh*-operators are topicalized DPs. The latter may be realized either inside the embedded IP or to the left of a *wh*-phrase, perhaps in Spec,TopP (5). Second, in CCA the verb of the embedded clause bears the same tense and agreement morphology regardless of whether the matrix verb agrees with one of its arguments. Third, ECM targets only the subject of the embedded IP, whereas in CCA either the subject or the object of the embedded clause can trigger matrix object agreement (3).[5] Finally, the embedded clause in ECM is arguably a TP, but in CCA it is most definitely a CP ((4), (5)).

(4) *Innu-aimûn*
   a. Tshi-tshissenim-**âu**-â <u>auen</u> ka-pâpîtaka?
      2-know-3-Q   who is laughing
      'Do you know who is laughing?'
      (Branigan and MacKenzie 2002:394, (24a))
   b. Ni-tshissîtu-**âu** <u>Mânî</u> muk^u uîtsheipan Ânîua.
      1-remember-1/3 Marie only helped   Annie
      'I remember that only Marie helped Annie.'
      (Branigan and MacKenzie 2000:7, (17a))

(5) *Innu-aimûn*
   a. Ni-tshissîtu-**âu** tshekuânnû kuet itûtet Mûniânit <u>Mânî</u>.
      1-remember-1/3 why   go-3 Montreal Marie
      'I remember why Marie went to Montreal.'
   b. Ni-tshissîtu-**âu** <u>Mânî</u> tshekuânnû kuet itûtet Mûniânit.
      1-remember-1/3 Marie why   go-3 Montreal
      'I remember why Marie went to Montreal.'
      (Branigan and MacKenzie 2000:9, (29))

3 No A-Movement

3.1 No Passive

Passivization is another example of Case-motivated movement to an A-position. Algonquian languages display little to no evidence of a

---

[5] Actually, this is not true of all Algonquian languages. According to Dahlstrom (1991), CCA targets embedded subjects only. See section 3.1 for discussion.

passive construction: there is no passive morphology and, more importantly, no valence-changing operation. Only two constructions have been argued to be passivelike: (a) active transitive clauses with an obligatorily nonspecific or unspecified agent[6] and (b) transitive clauses with an inverse theme marker on the verb. In this section, we show that the evidence for a passive analysis of these constructions is not compelling.

A verb with an unspecified agent has the same agreement suffixes as a verb with a second person subject acting on first person object, but lacks the person prefixes normally associated with a specified second person subject. Thus, it is tempting to analyze the unspecified-agent constructions as passive, as Dahlstrom (1991) does for Plains Cree (Central Algonquian). Her argument for this approach is based on the interaction of unspecified-agent clauses like (6) with CCA. Dahlstrom reports that the trigger of CCA must be the subject of the embedded clause in Plains Cree, as illustrated by the contrast between (7a) and (7b).

(6) *Plains Cree*[7]
nikiskeʼyim-aʼwak eʼ=kiʼseʼkih-ihcik
knowTA 1-3P[DIR] PERF-scare-PASS/3P/CONJ
'I know they were scared.'
(Dahlstrom 1991:74, (36))

(7) *Plains Cree*
a. nikiskeʼyimaʼw <u>George</u> eʼ=saʼki-aʼt
knowTA 1-3[DIR] George love3-OBV/CONJ[DIR]
okosisa
his son OBV
'I know George loves his sons.'
(Dahlstrom 1991:72, (32))
b. *nikiskeyim**ima**ʼwa George eʼ=saʼkiaʼt
knowTA 1-OBV[DIR] George love3-OBV/CONJ[DIR]
<u>okosisa</u>
his son OBV
'I know George loves his sons.'
(Dahlstrom 1991:73, (33))

The only apparent exception to this generalization is embedded TA verbs with an unspecified agent, where the underlying object triggers CCA, as in (6). Dahlstrom argues that if the unspecified-agent construction is analyzed as passive, then the generalization is simply that CCA applies only to surface subjects.

---

[6] There is some inconsistency in the literature about whether the agent in examples such as (6) and (7a) is analyzed as unspecified or nonspecific. According to both Frantz (1991:52) and Dahlstrom (1991:62), such sentences are used when the speaker does not want to specify a subject.

[7] Throughout, we have substituted the conventional IPA diacritic (ʼ) for the raised period in Dahlstrom's examples to indicate distinctive vowel length in Plains Cree.

There are two problems with Dahlstrom's conclusion. First, she points out that CCA requires that the DP that triggers matrix object agreement be interpreted as the topic of the embedded clause in the CCA construction. This suggests another explanation for these apparent exceptions: Topics must be referring expressions (see Reinhart 1983, Prince 1998). Consequently, an unspecified agent would not qualify as a topic, leaving only the logical object as a potential topic in (6). The correct generalization for Plains Cree is that topics (or foci) undergo CCA. An unspecified agent cannot be a topic and cannot be focal.

Second, as Dryer (1997) points out, there are strong morphological arguments against a passive analysis of TA verb forms with an unspecified or nonspecific animate agent in Plains Cree. Dryer notes that the verb forms in question are morphologically like active transitive verbs. They have the suffix *-a'*, which is otherwise used as a direct theme suffix on TA verb forms with specific third person objects in the independent order;[8] and they may contain the suffix *-im*, which otherwise only marks third person obviative objects. Moreover, there is no dedicated passive morphology on the verbs, as illustrated in (6)–(8).

(8) *Plains Cree*
   a. sa'kih-a̲'-w
      love-(DIRECT?)-3
      'He is loved.'
      (Dryer 1997:5, (17), citing Dahlstrom 1991:51)
   b. sa'kih-**im**-a̲'-w-a
      love-OBV-(DIRECT?)-3-OBV
      'He [OBV] is loved.'
      (Dryer 1997:5, (19))

Overall, the evidence that this is a passive construction is at best equivocal.

Another construction with some passivelike properties consists of a TA verb with an inverse theme marker. An inverse theme suffix on the verb indicates that the internal argument is relatively more animate or more proximate than the external one. The person prefix on the verb agrees with the more animate argument, the internal argument in this case. If one were to analyze the person prefix as subject agreement, then plausibly the inverse theme marker could be considered a passive morpheme.

One problem for the passive account of the inverse, as observed by Wolfart (1991), is that verbs in the inverse show transitive agreement. In (9) below, for example, *sa'kihikwak* agrees with both the

---

[8] Algonquian verbs are traditionally classified into different orders (independent, conjunct, or imperative) on the basis of the number, form, and position of agreement and other morphemes relative to the verb stem (Campana 1996). For example, the affix *-a'* occurs only in the independent order.

obviative agent and the plural patient. Wolfart further observes that the choice between the direct and inverse forms of the verb is determined by the person/animacy of the agent and patient arguments, whereas voice alternations in other languages are determined by the relative salience of these two arguments. Overall, the evidence points to the conclusion that the inverse form is a transitive active form.

Dahlstrom (1991) also argues against the passive analysis of the inverse in Plains Cree, citing results from a diagnostic for objecthood.[9] She claims that in Plains Cree, a floating quantifier can only modify an internal argument. Even in the inverse form, a floating quantifier clearly modifies the internal argument, as illustrated in (9).[10]

[9] Dahlstrom (1991:72–74) presents another argument for this position that relies on the restriction against CCA of nonsubjects: she claims that even in the inverse, only subjects (external arguments) may trigger CCA, as shown in (i).

(i) *Plains Cree*
    a. nikiskeˀyim**a**ˀwa   George eˀ = saˀkihikot   <u>okosisa</u>
        knowTA 1-OBV[DIR] George love OBV-3/CONJ[INV] his son OBV
        'I know that his sons love George.'
    b. *nikiskeˀyim**a**ˀw   <u>George</u> eˀ = saˀkihikot   okosisa
        knowTA 1-3[DIR] George love OBV-3/CONJ[INV] his son OBV
        'I know that his sons love George.'
        (Dahlstrom 1991:72–73, (34), (35))

It should be noted that this restriction is language specific. Branigan and MacKenzie (2000, 2002) provide compelling evidence that CCA is an Ā-phenomenon in Innu-aimûn, where either subject or object triggers matrix agreement. If, as we suggested above, the restriction is to be characterized in terms of topic (or some other discourse-determined role) rather than subject, examples such as (ia–b) cannot be adduced as evidence against a passive analysis of the inverse. This leaves an interesting puzzle concerning the restriction on CCA triggers in Plains Cree.

[10] Two observations are in order here.

First, the English gloss of (9) constitutes a weak crossover violation. For the reader's convenience, Dahlstrom adds a passive version of the gloss, 'All women are loved by their daughters'. Since we are explicitly claiming (with Dahlstrom) that the inverse is not a passive construction, we omit this alternative gloss in the text; but see section 3.2 for discussion.

Second, the Plains Cree Q-float facts differ from those in English in a rather interesting way, in fact providing evidence for subject-object asymmetries within the vP, based upon the initial (θ-driven) Merge position of the arguments. In English, floating quantifiers can modify only the subject; in Plains Cree, however, they modify only the object. Bobaljik (2003 and references cited therein) discusses object Q-float in French, Dutch, and German and shows that it is licensed by an object in an Ā-position: a *wh*-phrase, a relative pronoun, a topic, or an object clitic. For example, French L-*tous*, discussed by Kayne (1975), is a type of floating quantifier that may occur with object clitics but not full DP objects (i)–(ii). It contrasts with Q-float from the subject (iii), which is possible with both full DP and pronominal subjects.

(i) a. Elle va lire <u>tous</u> **ces livres.**
    b. *Elle va <u>tous</u> lire **ces livres.**
       'She will read <u>all</u> **these books**.'
       (Kayne 1975:4)

(9) *Plains Cree*

[$_{V'}$ kahkiyaw sa'kih-ikwak]   ota'nisiwa'wa
   all   love OBV-3P[INV] their daughter OBV
iskwe'wak
woman PL
'Their daughters love all women.'
*'All their daughters love the women.'
(Dahlstrom 1991:87, (66))

3.2 Bruening's (2001) Passivelike Movement Is Not A-Movement

We have argued that inverse verb forms are not passive. However, Bruening (2001) argues that Passamaquoddy (Eastern Algonquian) inverse TA verbs are associated with a passivelike A-movement to a functional projection above vP, which he calls HP. According to Bruening, movement of a DP to Spec,HP is motivated by the need to check a reference-tracking feature [+P]. The value of a DP's [P] feature is determined by its relative position on the animacy hierarchy.

(10) • First and second person DPs are inherently [+P].
     • Third person inanimate DPs inherently cannot be [+P].
     • Third person animate DPs are not inherently valued for [P]; instead, they are valued through context, in comparison between DPs.

Bruening analyzes the Passamaquoddy agreement prefix as the morphological reflex of the checking relation in HP. If the DP bearing [+P] is the external argument, then the verb also has a direct theme suffix. If the DP bearing [+P] is the internal argument, then the verb has an inverse theme suffix. If both arguments are [+P] (first and second person), then both move to HP and form a double Spec,HP, where the features of both arguments are checked. Finally, if both are unvalued, then one becomes [+P] and moves to HP. The other is assigned the feature [obv], which is spelled out as the obviative mor-

---

(ii) a. Elle a voulu **les** lire <u>tous</u>.
    b. Elle a voulu <u>tous</u> **les** lire.
    c. Elle a <u>tous</u> voulu **les** lire.
      'She wanted to read **them** <u>all</u>.'

(iii) a. **Les garçons** iront <u>tous</u> au cinéma.
    b. **Ils** iront <u>tous</u> au cinéma.
      '**The boys/They** will <u>all</u> go to the movies.'
      (Kayne 1975:5)

If the Plains Cree object Q-float is like L-*tous* or object Q-float in general, then the floating quantifier is licensed either by the Ā-agreement or by the overt DP in Ā-position.

pheme. A DP with unvalued [P] will check all its features in vP, and will be spelled out in vP.

According to Bruening, the role of HP is to rank discourse participants through the checking of a reference-tracking feature [P]. We follow the approach to the tracking of discourse participants developed by Speas and Tenny (2003) in suggesting that HP is best analyzed as part of the CP layer, with its own Spec in the left periphery of the clause. If this is correct, then Spec,HP, like other Specs in the left periphery, is an Ā-position. The argument that agrees in HP is always a first or second person argument if there is one in the clause. If both arguments are third person, then one must be designated as the more proximate, and the H head agrees with this argument. Thus, it appears that H-agreement is restricted to the salient argument in the case of third person arguments. We suggest that Bruening's HP grammaticalizes point of view (POV), in the sense of Speas and Tenny, because of the restriction to sentient and proximate objects. Note that only sentient beings and proximate objects can assume POV roles. The argument in HP is the POV center of the clause.

Further evidence for the POVP is found in clauses with inanimate arguments. In Blackfoot, when the arguments are inanimate, there is no agreement prefix on the verb (Frantz 1991)—the TI forms of the verb have no agreement morpheme in the position equivalent to Bruening's HP. Interestingly, Frantz shows that the critical factor determining whether an argument triggers the verbal prefix is sentience or will rather than grammatical animate gender. For example, *istoáN* 'knife' is grammatically animate but does not trigger a prefixed pronominal on the verb (Frantz 1991:45). The restriction that the argument in HP must be sentient fits perfectly with the proposal that HP is POV.

Bruening's argument that movement to HP/POV constitutes A-movement relies on the fact that object *wh*-movement does not trigger a weak crossover (WCO) effect. This, Bruening argues, is because the object moves first to Spec,HP/POV (A-movement), and only then undergoes Ā-movement to Spec,CP; the critical Ā-movement does not ''cross over'' the coindexed argument.

(11) *Passamaquoddy*

    a. Wen pihce   w-itapihi-l   nekol-iht   kcihku-k?
       who long.ago 3-friend-OBV IC.leave-3CONJ.INV forest-LOC
       'Who$_i$ did his$_i$ friend abandon in the forest a long time ago?'
       (Bruening 2001:114, (259a))

    b. [$_{CP}$ who$_i$ [+Q] [$_{HP}$ t$_i$ [+P] [$_{vP}$ his friend [v] [$_{VP}$ abandon [t$_i$]]]]]

              Ā-movement   A-movement

However, the lack of a WCO effect in the inverse is an argument that HP/POV is an A-position only if the internal argument *moves* to this position. If instead the overt DP is merged directly in HP/POV, then the lack of a WCO effect is expected because the internal argument never actually moves across the external argument. A WCO

effect would be predicted only across clauses because the *wh*-element would Ā-move from the embedded clause across the argument base-generated in HP/POV. The direct merger of the overt DP into Spec,HP/POV would be natural if the arguments inside vP are realized as pro (see Baker 1996 for an analysis along these lines for polysynthetic languages). The overt DP associated with the most proximate argument merges directly into Spec,HP/POV (when it appears overtly at all).

Another approach to the lack of a WCO effect in the inverse relies on the approach to WCO taken by Hornstein (1995). Hornstein suggests that the principle responsible for WCO effects is a restriction against linking of a bound pronoun with a variable to its left rather than coindexation. He shows, for example, that clitic doubling in Spanish and Modern Greek can eliminate a WCO effect. The doubled clitic provides an element for the variable and the pronoun to link to independently.

(12) *Spanish*
    a. ¿A quien$_i$ (*lo$_i$) sorprende su$_i$ actitud t$_i$?
        to whom   him surprises his attitude
        'Who does his attitude surprise?'

    b. a quien lo sorprende su actitud vbl

        (Hornstein 1995:104–105, (23a), (24))

If movement to HP/POV is more akin to cliticization, then it follows that the DP in HP/POV (or the agreement morpheme in the head of HP/POV) allows a linking relation between the element in H/POV and the bound pronoun and between the same element in H/POV and the variable.

Further support for our claim that HP/POV is an Ā-position comes from the cooccurrence of inverse marking and CCA, as shown in (13).

(13) *Passamaquoddy*
    Psi = te   **wen**   '-kosiciy-uku-l   Maliw-ol eli
    all = EMPH someone 3-know.TA-INV-OBV Mary-OBV C
    nucitqonket nomiy-at.
    policeman   see-3CONJ
    'Everyone is known by Mary that a policeman saw.'
    (Bruening 2001:256, (662))

Like Branigan and MacKenzie, Bruening analyzes CCA and the related movement of the embedded argument to the periphery of the embedded clause as movement to an Ā-position. For Bruening, the combination of CCA and the inverse means that the embedded argument not only moves to a position at the left periphery of the embedded CP, but can subsequently move to HP/POV, for him an A-position. The latter movement should be ungrammatical because it is improper movement (i.e., movement from an Ā-position to an A-position). But if Spec,HP/

POV is an Ā-position, then CCA and the subsequent movement to HP/POV should pose no problem.[11]

4 No A-Binding

Chomsky's (1981) formulation of Principle A of binding theory requires that reflexives and reciprocals be bound by an antecedent in an A-position. However, A-positions are irrelevant to the characterization of reflexive and reciprocal predicates in Algonquian, because these languages use a head-marking strategy for reflexivization and reciprocalization. Both involve the addition of a detransitivizing suffix to a transitive verb stem. In Blackfoot, for example, the reflexive suffix *-o:hsi* is added to a transitive animate (TA) verb stem to derive an intransitive animate (IA) one.

(14) *Blackfoot*
    a. Isskonákatohsiwa.
       i-sskonákat-o:hsi-wa
       past-shoot(TA)-REFL(IA)-3s
       'He shot himself.'
    b. Nitáínoohsspinnaan.
       nit-á-Ino-o:hsi-hpinnaan
       1-DUR-see(TA)-REFL(IA)-1P
       'We(excl.) see ourselves.'
    c. Oma   imitááwa siiksípohsiwa.
       om-wa imitáá-wa siiksip-o:hsi-wa
       that-3s dog-3s   PAST:bite(TA)-REFL(IA)-3s
       'That dog bit himself.'
    d. Sstsipísoohsit!
       sstsipísi-o:hsi-t
       whip(TA)-REFL(IA)-2s(IMPER)
       'Punish (whip) yourself!'
       (Frantz 1991:107)

Standard binding theory is not applicable because these examples have no anaphor. Reinhart and Reuland's (1993) alternative approach to binding theory would analyze this kind of head-marking strategy as an intrinsic reflexivization process that operates on the verb's θ-grid to absorb a θ-role. The claim that this is a lexical process rather than a syntactic one is supported by the observation that Blackfoot

---

[11] An anonymous reviewer points out that if Spec,HP/POV is an Ā-position, we might expect to find reconstruction effects of movement to this position. Bruening (2001:131) reports that this movement in fact does show reconstruction effects. However, his examples involve reconstruction of quantifiers, and it is not clear that these have the same restrictions as reconstructed anaphors. Since Algonquian languages lack independent reflexives (see section 4), it is not clear how this prediction could be tested.

reflexive *-o:hsi* requires that the reflexive and its antecedent be coarguments. As Frantz (1978) observes, CCA, a syntactic operation, does not feed reflexivization.

(15) *Blackfoot*
    a.   nits-îksstaa n-áxks-oy'-ssi   (no CCA)
         1-want   1-might-eat-CONJ
         'I want to eat.'
    b. *nits-îksstat-oxsi n-áxks-oy'-ssi   (*CCA)
         1-want-REFL   1-might-eat-CONJ
         (Frantz 1978:94, (13), (16))

There appear to be no reflexive or pronominal anaphors in Algonquian. Assuming that these items have to be universally licensed by a Case-marked antecedent, or an antecedent in an A-position, the absence of such anaphors in Algonquian might be explained by the lack of Case or A-positions in these languages.

5 Conclusion

We have shown that Algonquian languages lack A-bound anaphors, passive, and other Case-related movement. All of these are operations and elements that crucially involve A-positions. Following Branigan and MacKenzie (2000, 2002), we analyze CCA as Ā-agreement, but we extend this treatment to all agreement phenomena in Algonquian. We propose that verb agreement in these languages serves to identify a POV role, or in the case of CCA, a topic or focus, but not a particular grammatical relation. Given this cluster of properties, we conclude that Algonquian languages lack movement to A-positions.

Most familiar languages make extensive use of Spec,T and Spec,v, though the evidence for Case, movement, binding, and agreement varies widely. In fact, many languages lack one or more of the syntactic operations considered here. What kind of evidence might signal to children learning Algonquian that the absence of case morphology or reflexive anaphors is more than a coincidence? We suggest that they are informed by the fact that these languages have an animacy-based agreement system. Animacy-based agreement does not make reference to grammatical relations such as subject and object, and we speculate that this is an indicator that in fact no syntactic operation makes crucial use of these notions.

Branigan and MacKenzie (2002) show that CCA cannot supplant agreement with a local argument. They also show that when the external argument is first or second person and the internal argument is obviative, a ''further obviative'' morpheme appears suffixed to the verb. CCA, they say, does not trigger the ''further obviative'' morpheme. They conclude that for these reasons, local agreement must be Case/agreement related (A-agreement), at least sometimes. However, it seems to us that CCA is unable to supplant local agreement simply because arguments must be licensed through agreement, not because the agreement must be A-agreement. The behavior of CCA

and further obviative simply points to the local nature of further obviative, not the A/Ā-properties of agreement.

Our account of Algonquian animacy-based agreement leaves us with an interesting puzzle. As Bruening (2001) shows, Passamaquoddy in particular (and Algonquian in general) gives evidence of the more familiar Ā-operations, such as *wh*-question formation. Bruening shows, for example, that *wh*-question formation is successive cyclic in that it triggers an agreement morpheme in each clause it moves through. Successive-cyclic operations appear to have scope effects as well. If Algonquian animacy agreement is correctly analyzed as an Ā-phenomenon, then why does it not follow the pattern of other Ā-phenomena? Specifically, Algonquian agreement is not successive cyclic; it is local and appears to license arguments. Although this is an interesting puzzle, it does not undermine our claim that animacy agreement in Algonquian is not Case related. We have argued that agreement in Algonquian is discourse related. We claim that discourse-based agreement is not a part of the Case/agreement system, but a part of the Ā-system (in the CP layer). In light of the different characteristics of *wh*-type Ā-relations and animacy agreement, the consequence of our claim about animacy agreement is that there are (at least) two different types of Ā-relations in the grammars of the world's languages. A lack of uniformity of agreement is not particularly surprising. A-agreement is known not to be uniform. For example, agreement in Hebrew is not uniform across the tenses, and this has syntactic consequences (e.g., for pro-drop). The consequence of our inquiry into Algonquian is that Ā-agreement is not uniform either. It appears that some Ā-positions in Algonquian are scope positions while some are not, and some have long-distance effects while some are purely local.

References

Baker, Mark C. 1996. *The polysynthesis parameter*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2003. Floating quantifiers: Handle with care. In *The second* Glot International *state-of-the-article book: The latest in linguistics*, ed. by Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Rint Sybesma, 107–148. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Branigan, Phil, and Marguerite MacKenzie. 2000. How much syntax can you fit into a word? Late insertion and verbal agreement in Innu-aimûn. Paper presented at Workshop on Structure and Constituency in Languages of the Americas 5, University of Toronto.

Branigan, Phil, and Marguerite MacKenzie. 2002. Altruism, Ā-movement, and object agreement in Innu-aimûn. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:385–407.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. Syntax at the edge: Cross-clausal phenomena and the syntax of Passamaquoddy. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Campana, Mark. 1996. The conjunct order in Algonquian. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 41:201–234.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 1991. *Plains Cree morphosyntax*. New York: Garland.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1997. Passive vs. indefinite actor construction in Plains Cree. In *Papers of the Twenty-sixth Algonquian Conference*, ed. by David H. Pentland. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, Department of Linguistics.

Frantz, Donald G. 1978. Copying from complements in Blackfoot. In *Linguistic studies of native Canada*, ed. by Eung-Do Cook and Jonathan Kaye, 89–109. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Frantz, Donald G. 1991. *Blackfoot grammar*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Goddard, Ives. 1979. *Delaware verbal morphology: A descriptive and comparative study*. New York: Garland.

Hornstein, Norbert. 1995. *Logical Form: From GB to minimalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kayne, Richard S. 1975. *French syntax: The transformational cycle*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Prince, Ellen. 1998. On the limits of syntax, with reference to left-dislocation and topicalization. In *The limits of syntax*, ed. by Peter Culicover and Louise McNally, 281–302. Syntax and Semantics 29. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1983. *Anaphora and semantic interpretation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657–720.

Speas, Margaret, and Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In *Asymmetry in grammar*. Vol. 1, *Syntax and semantics*, ed. by Anna Maria Di Sciullo, 315–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wolfart, H. C. 1991. Passives with and without agents. In *Linguistic studies presented to John L. Finlay: Algonquian and Iroquoian linguistics*, ed. by H. C. Wolfart, 171–190. Memoir 8. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, Department of Linguistics.