



probe on the clitic, which is specified for a plural ([PL]) feature. After participant object shift takes place, both subject and object are in the search domain of said probe, so plurality of either one can satisfy it.

(7) ... \*#:□\*<sub>[PL]</sub> π [<sub>vP</sub> DP.OBJ [<sub>vP</sub> DP.SUBJ ... [<sub>VP</sub> ...

The number probe on the clitic searches for any DP that bears plural ([PL]). If an object that has undergone object shift is plural, it will value the probe's plural feature, since it is the structurally closest goal. If, however, the shifted object is singular, the probe will bypass it and continue the search for a suitable goal. If the lower subject is plural, it values the probe's feature (7).

**Exceptional 3rd-person Objects.** We assume *vP* is a phase and therefore VP-internal arguments are inaccessible to probes higher than *vP*. Given this assumption, our analysis predicts that clitic probes, whose specification derives object preference and omnivorous number, cannot access 3rd-person objects. This prediction is borne out: unlike participant objects, 3rd-person objects do not participate in omnivorous number (and are in fact not agreed with at all by the clitic).

(8) Ima=∅      x-aa-s-ti.                      (9) Ima=ks      xe-s-ti.  
 3.DEM=3SG see-3PL:OBJ-PST-3SUBJ      3.DEM=3PL see-PST-3SUBJ  
 'He saw them.'                                      'They saw him.'

If omnivorous number agreement surfaced in (8-9), the clitic forms would be identical, contrary to evidence. Thus, the same feature that creates the configuration for object preference (the structure-building feature which attracts participant objects to Spec,*vP*) also explains the distribution of omnivorous number. Under a Cyclic Agree analysis, the probe on *v* would always find the object first, making it unclear why the clitic preferentially agrees with the subject's [PL] feature when the object is 3rd-person.

**Object Agreement.** 3rd-person objects are inaccessible to the clitic probes because they are separated by the *vP* phase. Conversely, if there were an agreement probe on *v* itself, we would predict it can *only* agree with 3rd-person objects, never with participant objects, which vacate *vP*: this prediction is borne out.

(10) Ima=∅      x-**aa**-s-ti.                      (11) Inde=tsin      xe-s-ti.  
 3.DEM=3SG see-3PL:OBJ-PST-3SUBJ      3.DEM=1OBJ:PL see-PST-3SUBJ  
 'He saw them.'                                      'They saw me, He saw us, They saw us.'

The verb displays object agreement (the suffix in bold) but *only* with 3rd-person objects, never participants. We argue verbal object agreement diagnoses the position of the object: the low (linearly before tense and subject agreement) object agreement probe can only find a goal if the object has not undergone object shift.

(12) [<sub>vP</sub> DP.SUBJ *v*<sub>[•D•, •PART•]</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> ... [ DP.OBJ<sub>3</sub>]]      (13) \*#:□\* \*π : □\* [<sub>vP</sub> DP.SUBJ *v* [<sub>VP</sub> ... DP.OBJ<sub>3</sub>]]

*v* satisfies its [•D•] feature by triggering the external merger of the subject, but its [PART] feature remains unvalued because the object is 3rd person and no object shift occurs (12). We assume unsatisfied features do not cause a crash (Preminger 2014). *v* then probes for a #-goal, which it finds in the 3rd-person object that remains in its base position. We argue if the number probe on *v* is valued by [PL] on the object, it is exponed as the -aa suffix in (10). Verbs never display object agreement with participant objects because they are never potential goals for the number probe (having moved out of the c-command domain of *v* before the relevant probe begins its search).

**Conclusion.** Patterns of participant object preference and omnivorous number in Georgian and Algonquian have been fruitfully analyzed through the Cyclic Agree framework. Uniquely, Phorhépecha omnivorous number does not extend to 3rd-person objects. We propose languages like Phorhépecha instantiate a different route to omnivorous number and object preference, one that involves object-over-subject movement restricted to participant objects. The analysis also explains the unusual complementary distribution of omnivorous number and object agreement in the language. As long as Merge can be ordered before Agree on the same head (Müller 2010, Georgi 2017), participant objects can vacate *vP* before the number probe on *v* begins its search.