



and Rose 2015) or Adyghe (P. Arkadiev, p.c.), (4). With Tseltal (2), these data show that PCC is dissociated from “double weakness” of both IO & DO (*pace* Bonet 1991): it arises in (2) despite the absence of DO morphology, but not in (4) despite weak realization of both IO & DO. This speaks against tying PCC tightly to properties of weak elements (e.g. Bonet 1991, Stegovec 2019, CK-18). Rather, *PCC arises from constraints on what a probe can Agree with.*

- (4) a. s-je-p-tə-š't  
1SG.ABS-3SG.IO-2SG.ERG-give-FUT  
You will give me to him. [Adyghe]
- b. ga-natʃ-ə-ŋə-ŋo  
3SBJ-give-PFV-1SG.OM-3SG.OM  
She gave me to him / him to me [Moro]

**Dynamic interaction.** A second locus of variation concerns interaction. I propose that interaction features are not fixed once and for all (*pace* Deal 2015); they may be changed in the course of cycles of Agree. In particular, *features may be copied to the interaction condition of the probe*, affecting Agree with subsequent targets. I mark such dynamic interaction features as  $\uparrow$ . In a weak PCC pattern (e.g. Italian, Monachesi 1998), Appl bears [INT: $\phi$ ,SAT:-] and participant features bear  $\uparrow$ . Like in Moro/Adyghe, the probe is insatiable. However, when the probe interacts with (i.e. copies) a [PART $\uparrow$ ] feature from DO, [PART] is copied to its interaction condition. The result is that only [PART]-bearing IOs can subsequently have their features copied to the probe. Accordingly, (5a), with a 3rd person IO clitic, cannot be generated. However (5b) is generated: DO interacts with Appl, Appl’s interaction condition becomes [PART], and Appl then interacts with the [PART]-bearing IO. (Idiolects ruling out (5b) are strong PCC grammars.) This derives weak PCC: 3>[PART] is ruled out, but [PART]>[PART] is ruled in.

- (5) a. \*Martina gli mi/ti presenta  
Martina 3SG.DAT 1SG/2SG introduces  
Martina introduces me/you to him
- b. %pro mi ti raccomanda  
3SG 1SG 2SG recommended.3SG  
He recommends you to me/me to you.

A final type of PCC pattern is the strictly descending or “ultrastrong” pattern, wherein IO must outrank DO on the hierarchy 1>2>3. This pattern (in some varieties of Spanish, Catalan, Arabic) is predicted as a combination of the Bulgarian and Italian patterns: Appl has [SAT:SPKR] (like Bulgarian) and [PART] has  $\uparrow$  (like Italian). If DO is 1st person, the probe is satisfied and no IO clitic is possible. If DO is 2nd person, dynamic interaction of [PART] kicks in: IO clitics must be [PART] as well, so only a 1st person IO clitic is possible. Finally, if DO is 3rd person, any person of IO clitic is possible. (Two other ways to derive this pattern are shown in (6).)

- (6) Typology of PCC effects by satisfaction condition and dynamic interaction feature

Dynamic interaction feature(s)	Satisfaction condition		
	[PART]	[SPKR]	[-] (i.e. none)
none	strong	me-first	no PCC
[PART] $\uparrow$	strong	strictly descending	weak
[SPKR] $\uparrow$	strong	me-first	me-first
[PART] $\uparrow$ , [SPKR] $\uparrow$	strong	strictly descending	strictly descending

**Conclusions.** The interaction/satisfaction theory is designed to account for cases where a probe Agrees with more than one goal, with its ability to Agree with a second goal dependent on properties of the first. PCC is typically modeled as exactly such a case. An interaction/satisfaction lens on PCC draws our understanding of this pattern in line with similar syntactic hierarchy effects in agreement of other types, e.g. Nez Perce C agreement (Deal 2015) or Tupí-Guarani hierarchical subject/object verb agreement (Deal 2019). The overall picture supports a treatment of probes that does away with uF features (Preminger 2009, 2014), and a treatment of person features that does away with special requirements of licensing (*pace* BR-03, PZ-18).

**Selected ref.** Deal, AR. 2015. Interaction and satisfaction in  $\phi$ -agreement. *NELS 45 proc.*