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1 Introduction

• Hierarchy effects
  A recurring restriction across languages and constructions is that configurations that contain two DPs internal to a certain domain may impose restrictions on possible feature values for the two DPs: The lower DP must be on the right of the hierarchy or the lower DP cannot be left of the higher DP on the hierarchy.

(1) Example: Person hierarchy
1/2 > 3

• Example: Person Case Constraint (PCC)
  An important example is the PCC (Perlmutter 1971, Bonet 1991), which constrains possible person features on the direct object (DO) and indirect object (IO) in ditransitive constructions:

(2) (Strong) PCC in Basque: DO cannot be 1st or 2nd person when under an IO

  a. Zu-k harakina-ri liburua saldu d-i-o-zu.
     you-erg butcher-dat book.abs sold 3ABS-AUX-3DAT-2ERG
     'You have sold the book to the butcher.' (*3DAT > 3ABS)

  b. *Zu-k harakina-ri ni saldu n-(a)i-o-zu.
     you-erg butcher-dat me.abs sold 1ABS-AUX-3DAT-2ERG
     intended: 'You have sold me to the butcher.' (*3DAT > 1ABS)
     [Laka 1993: 27]

• Two DPs – one probe
  Much previous work has argued that these restrictions arise in configurations in which two accessible DPs occur in the domain of a single agreeing probe (e.g.,


(3) [Probe0 [ … DP … [ … DP … ] ] ]

• Licensing failure?
  The traditional approach to such effects (due to Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005 and Béjar & Rezac 2003) ascribes the ungrammaticality to failures of nominal licensing or violations of the Case Filter.

  – 1st/2nd person DPs need to be licensed through Agree with a ϕ-probe.
  – In configurations like (4), the higher DP intervenes for such Agree.

    a 1st/2nd person lower DP remains unlicensed → ungrammaticality

  ❌ "Scarcity of resources"
  problem is too little Agree; problem is caused by an unlicensed DP

• Our proposal today: Feature gluttony (Coon & Keine 2019)
  Hierarchy effects are the result of too much Agree: A probe agrees with two DPs, “biting off more than it can chew.” We refer to such configurations as “feature gluttony.”


• Feature gluttony is not itself ungrammatical, but it can give rise to irresolvably conflicting requirements for subsequent operations and hence ineffability.

---

1 Basque examples not otherwise attributed are due to Jon Ander Mendia (p.c.).
**Shift in perspective**
- problem is caused by the probe, not an unlicensed DP
- problem is unrelated to (nominal) licensing
- problem is caused by too much Agree, rather than too little

**Motivation**
We show that in many cases, hierarchy effects display sensitivity to overt $\phi$-agreement (also see Preminger 2011b, 2019).

**Today: Three case studies**
We investigate three kinds of hierarchy effects:
1. PCC effects (primarily in Basque)
2. Person restrictions in Icelandic dative–nominative constructions
3. Person and number restrictions in certain types of copula constructions in Hindi-Urdu

* These case studies show that hierarchy effects are tied to overt $\phi$-agreement in at least four ways:
  1. They disappear in $\phi$-less nonfinite clauses.
  2. They disappear under gapping of the verb.
  3. They disappear if agreement with both DPs is syncretic.
  4. They are sensitive to passivization if it affects which DP is targeted by verb agreement.

An approach in terms of (nominal) licensing does not lend itself to these interactions; a feature-gluttony approach does.

2 Person Case Constraint

2.1 Background

* PCC effects
  Canonically described as a ban on certain person combinations of direct and indirect objects, typically involving pronominal clitics (see Anagnostopoulou 2017 for a recent overview).


### (6) Types of PCC discussed here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of PCC discussed here</th>
<th>IO</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong:</td>
<td>*1/2/3 &gt; 1/2</td>
<td>Basque (Laka 1993), Greek (Anagnostopoulou 2003), Kiowa (Adger &amp; Harbour 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak:</td>
<td>*3 &gt; 1/2</td>
<td>varieties of Catalan (Bonet 1991) and Italian (Bianchi 2006), Sambaa (Riedel 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultra-Strong:</td>
<td>*3 &gt; 1/2 &amp;</td>
<td>Classical Arabic (Fassi Fehri 1988, Nevis 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (7) Strong PCC in Basque: *1/2/3 > 1/2

a. Zu-k harakina-ri liburua saldu d-i-o-zu. 
   you-erg butcher-dat book.abs sold 3ABS-AUX-3DAT-2ERG
   ‘You have sold the book to the butcher.’
   (‘3DAT > 3ABS)

b. Zu-k ni-ri liburua saldu d-i-da-zu.
   you-erg me-dat book.abs sold 3ABS-AUX-1DAT-2ERG
   ‘You have sold the book to me.’
   (‘1DAT > 3ABS)

c. *Zu-k harakina-ri ni saldu n-(a)i-o-zu.
   you-erg butcher-dat me.abs sold 1ABS-AUX-3DAT-2ERG
   intended: ‘You have sold me the book.’
   (*3DAT > 1ABS)

d. *Haiek ni-ri zu saldu z-ai-da-te.
   they.erg me-dat yo.abs sold 2ABS-AUX-1DAT-3ERG
   intended: ‘They have sold you to me.’
   (*1DAT > 2ABS)

### (8) Weak PCC in Catalan: *3 > 1/2

a. En Josep, te 'l va recomenar la Mireia.
   the Josep, 2DAT.CLA 3ACC.CLA recommended the Mireia
   ‘She (Mireia) recommended him (Josep) to you.’
   (‘2DAT > 3ACC)
b. *A en Josep, te li va recomanar la Mireia. to the Josep, 2ACC.CL 3DAT.CL recommended the Mireia intended: ‘She (Mireia) recommended you to him (Josep).’

\[ (*3DAT > 2ACC) \]

c. Te’m van recoman per a la feina. 2CL.ICL recommended for the job

‘They recommended me to you for the job,’

‘They recommended you to me for the job.’

\[ (*2DAT > 1ACC) \]

\[ (*1DAT > 2ACC) \]

[Bonet 1991:178, 179]

2.2 PCC effects as failed nominal licensing

- **The PCC is not a morphological constraint**

  The PCC is not due to a morphological surface filter on clitic/agreement morphology because in various cases the ungrammatical verb+agreement combination is possible in other configurations (e.g., Perlmutter 1971, Albizu 1997, Rezac 2008).

- **Example: Basque (Albizu 1997, Rezac 2008)**

  1. **Psych-verbs**

     \[ \text{DP.DAT} > \text{DP.ABS} \Rightarrow \text{PCC effect (9)} \]

  2. **Motion verbs**

     \[ \text{DP.ABS} > \text{DP.DAT} \Rightarrow \text{no PCC effect (10)} \]

- **identical surface agreement morphology**

\[ (9) \text{ Psych verbs} \rightarrow \text{PCC (DP.abs cannot be 1st or 2nd person)} \]

\[ \text{a.} \hspace{1em} [\ldots \text{DP.DAT} \ldots \text{[\ldots \text{DP.ABS} \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots} \] \]

\[ \text{b.} \hspace{1em} * \text{Ni Itxaso-ri gustatzen [n-atzai-o me.ABS Itxaso-DAT like.IMPF 1ABS-AUX-3DAT} \]

intended: ‘Itxaso likes me.’

\[ (*3DAT > 1ABS) \]

\[ (10) \text{ Motion verbs} \rightarrow \text{no PCC} \]

\[ \text{a.} \hspace{1em} [\ldots \text{DP.ABS} \ldots \text{[\ldots \text{DP.DAT} \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots} \] \]

\[ \text{b.} \hspace{1em} \text{Ni Itxaso-ri etortzen [n-atzai-o me.ABS Itxaso-DAT come.IMPF 1ABS-AUX-3DAT} \]

‘I am coming to Itxaso.’

\[ (*1ABS > 3DAT) \]

[Rezac 2008: 63]

\[ \Rightarrow \text{An account of PCC effects must make crucial reference to the syntactic relationship between the two DPs, which may be neutralized in the surface morphology.} \]

- **Standard approach: failed Agree**

  Since Anagnostopoulou’s (2003, 2005) and Béjar & Rezac’s (2003) seminal proposals, the standard approach to PCC effects attributes them to **failures of nominal licensing**. 1st and 2nd person DPs are subject to a special licensing condition, expressed here as Béjar & Rezac’s (2003) **Person Licensing Condition**.

\[ (11) \text{ Person Licensing Condition (PLC)} \]

A 1st or 2nd person DP must be licensed by entering into a \( \phi \)-Agree relation with a functional category.

[adapted from Béjar & Rezac 2003: 53]

- In a ditransitive configuration, the indirect object (IO) intervenes between the direct object (DO) and its licensing \( \phi \)-probe.

\[ \Rightarrow \text{If the DO is 1st or 2nd person, it remains unlicensed, and ungrammaticality results. This derives the Strong PCC.} \]

\[ \Rightarrow \text{More assumptions are needed for the Weak PCC (see, e.g., Anagnostopoulou 2005, Nevins 2007).} \]

\[ (12) \text{ Strong PCC as licensing failure} \]

\[ * \left[ \text{[Probe}^0 \left[ \ldots \text{DP}^{IO} \left[ \ldots \text{DP}^{DO} \right] \right] \right] \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\hline
\text{✓} \\
\text{✗} \\
\text{✗} \\
\text{✗}
\end{array} \]

Failed-licensing/Agree accounts (which do not necessarily subscribe to the exact syntactic configuration in (12)) have also been developed by, e.g., Adger & Harbour (2007), Nevins (2007), Baker (2008), Rezac (2008, 2011), Richards (2008), Kalin (2019), Preminger (2019), and Stegovec (2019).

2.3 Against a nominal-licensing account

- Based on evidence from Basque, we demonstrate that the PCC is crucially sensitive to **overt agreement morphology** (see also Preminger 2011b, 2019). An account in terms of nominal licensing or failed Agree does not readily extend to this sensitivity.

2.3.1 Clauses without \( \phi \)-agreement

The same IO-DO combination that is ungrammatical in the finite clause in (13a) is grammatical in nonfinite clauses (13b,c).

(13) Basque PCC effects disappear in nonfinite clauses: Ditransitives

a. Finite clause: PCC
*Zu-k \textit{harakina-ri} ni saldu n-(a)i-o-zu,
\textit{you-erg} \textit{butcher-dat} me.\textit{abs} sold 1ABS-AUX-3DAT-2\textit{erg}
‘You have sold me to the butcher.’
\[ (*3\text{DAT} > 1\text{ABS}) \]

b. Case-marked infinitival clause: No PCC
Gaizki iruditzen \textit{\textordmasculine{\textcircled{\textgreek{a}}}-zai-t} [zu-k \textit{harakina-ri} ni
wrong look.\textsc{imppf} 3ABS-AUX-1\textsc{dat} you-\textit{erg} \textit{butcher-dat} me.\textit{abs}
sell-\textsc{imppf-loc}]
‘It seems wrong to me for you to sell me to the butcher.’
\[ (*3\text{DAT} > 1\text{ABS}) \]
[\textit{based on} Laka 1993: 27]

c. Adpositional infinitival clause: No PCC
Zu-k [\textit{harakina-ri} ni sal-\textit{tze-n}] probatu
\textit{you-erg} \textit{butcher-dat} me.\textit{abs} sell-\textsc{imppf-loc} attempted
\textit{d-\textit{u-zu}}.
3ABS-AUX-\textsc{2erg}
‘You have attempted to sell me to the butcher.’
\[ (*3\text{DAT} > 1\text{ABS}) \]

- This effect is not limited to ditransitive configurations. (14) shows that it also holds for \textit{psych}-predicates (Arregi & Nevins 2012).

(14) Basque PCC effects disappear in nonfinite clauses: Psych-predicates

a. Finite clause: PCC
*\textit{Ni-ri zu} ondo jaus-\textit{ten} za-\textit{tze-a-t}
\textit{me-dat} \textit{you.abs} well \textsc{fall-\textsc{imppf} 2.abs-\textsc{aux-1\textsc{dat}}}
‘I like you.’
\[ (*1\text{DAT} > 2\text{ABS}) \]

b. Nonfinite clause: No PCC
[\textit{Ni-ri zu} ondo jaus-\textit{te-a}] nahi d-\textit{u-t}
\textit{me-dat} \textit{you.abs} well \textsc{fall-\textsc{imppf-art.abs} want} 3ABS-AUX-\textsc{1\textsc{erg}}
‘I want to like you.’
\[ (*1\text{DAT} > 2\text{ABS}) \]

\textbf{Crucial observation: No agreement}
What sets nonfinite clauses apart from finite clauses in Basque is that there is no agreement/cliticization in nonfinite clauses. This indicates that no \textit{\textordmasculine{\textgreek{a}}}-\textit{Agree} with DPs inside these nonfinite clauses takes place (also Anagnostopoulou 2003, Preminger 2011a, 2019).

\textit{Absence of \textit{\textordmasculine{\textgreek{a}}}-\textit{Agree} obviates PCC effects.}

- \textbf{Independent support}
Hierarchy-type effects also disappear in nonfinite (= non-agreeing) environments in Georgian (Bonet 1991; Béjar & Rezac 2003; Léa Nash, p.c.), German (Keine et al. 2019), and Icelandic (below).

- \textbf{The challenge for licensing accounts}
If hierarchy effects arise because there are not enough probes to license all of the DPs, then removing probes should exacerbate the problem, not resolve it.\textsuperscript{2}

\textit{The first person absolutive DO ni in (13b,c) does not have a head to license it—yet the derivation converges.}

(15) \[
[ \text{\ldots} \text{DP} [ \text{\ldots} \text{DP}\text{[1/2]} \text{\ldots} ] ]
\]

\subsection{2.3.2 Gapping and stripping}

- Basque PCC effects also disappear under gapping (16) and stripping (17).

(16) Basque PCC effects disappear with gapping

a. Ditransitive predicates
Jon-\textit{ek \textit{alkatea-ri} Mikel saldu d-i-o,} \textit{eta}
Jon-\textit{\textgreek{a}} \textit{mayor-dat} Mikel.\textit{abs} sold 3ABS-AUX-3\textit{dat} and
zu-k \textit{harakina-ri} ni
\textit{you-erg} \textit{butcher-dat} me.\textit{abs}
‘Jon sold Mikel to the mayor, and you me to the butcher.’

b. \textit{Psych-predicates}
\textit{ni-ri Mikel} ondo jaus-\textit{ten} za-i-t, \textit{eta} \textit{ni-ri}
me-\textit{dat} Mikel.\textit{abs} well \textsc{fall-\textsc{imppf} 3.abs-aux-1\textsc{dat} and me-\textit{dat}}
\textit{zu} \textit{ere}
\textit{you.abs} too
‘I like Mikel and I (like) you too.’

\textsuperscript{2} Preminger (2011b, 2019) proposes a revised version of PLC, which by stipulation exempts DPs inside clauses that do not contain a \textit{\textordmasculine{\textgreek{a}}}-probe from the licensing requirement. While this yields the right empirical results (though perhaps not for the gapping cases in §2.3.2), it is non-explanatory.
(17) Basque PCC effects disappear with stripping

a. Ditransitive predicates
   Zu-k harakina-ri Mikelsaldud-i-o-zu, eta
   you-erg butcher-dat Mikelsold 3ABS-AUX-3DAT-2ERG and
   ni __ ere bai
   me.abs too yes
   ‘You sold Mikel to the butcher, and me too.’

b. Psych-verbs
   Ni-ri Mikeloondo jaus-ten za-i-t, eta zu
   I-dat Mikelaowsell-IMPF 3ABS-AUX-1.DAT and you.abs
   __ ere bai
too yes
   ‘I like Mikel, and you too.’

- What is elided in all of these cases is the lexical verb plus the auxiliary that bears the agreement.
- This should not obviously affect the licensing need of DPs. On a licensing account, it is hence not clear why gapping the verb would ameliorate the PLC.

◆ The role of overt \( \phi \)-agreement

The PCC in Basque is tied to overtly realized \( \phi \)-agreement. An abstract licensing account does not lend itself to this restriction.

2.3.3 Interim summary

- PCC obviation if agreement is suppressed:
  - clauses without agreement
  - gapping of verb+agreement
- We conclude that the problem that underlies the PCC does not lie with nominal licensing or case, but rather with verb agreement and the \( \phi \)-probe that underlies it.

3 Feature gluttony

- Analytical intuition
  - PCC effects are due to too much Agree: a probe agrees with more DPs than it can handle.
  - Such Agree leads to conflicting requirements for subsequent operations \(~\) ineffability
- This account offers an explanation for PCC obviation in the environments above.

3.1 Assumptions

1. Feature geometries

Features are organized into hierarchical geometries (Harley & Ritter 2002, Béjar 2003, among many others), as shown for person in (18) and for number in (19).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{pers(on)} \\
\text{part(ike)ant} \\
\text{spkr (=speakee) addr(essee)}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{num(ber)} \\
\text{pl(ural)}
\end{array}
\]

(18) a. 3rd person: [pers]
b. 2nd person: [pers[part[addr]]]
c. singular: [num]
d. plural: [num[pl]]

(19)

2. Probe structure

Probes are structured as well, consisting of hierarchically-organized segments (e.g., Béjar 2003, Béjar & Rezac 2009, Preminger 2014, Oxford 2019).

- In Deal’s (2015) terms, all segments on a probe must be matched for this probe to be satisfied and stop probing.
(21) a. \([u\text{PERS}]_x\) — fully satisfied by any person-bearing DP
b. \([u\text{PERS}]_x\) — fully satisfied by 1st and 2nd person DPs
c. \([u\text{PART}]_x\) — fully satisfied by 1st person DPs

3. Segment-based Agree

Different probe segments of a probe can agree with different DPs (Béjar & Rezac 2009):

- If a probe encounters a DP bearing a segment of the probe, the probe agrees with the DP, copying over the entire feature geometry of the DP.
- Probing iterates until all potential goals are exhausted or the probe is satisfied (also see Deal 2015).

(22) Agree

Given a probe P with a hierarchy of unchecked feature segments \([uF]\),

a. P searches the closest accessible DP in its domain such that this DP contains feature set [G], with \([G] \cap [F] \neq \emptyset\);

b. the feature hierarchy containing [G] is copied to P;

c. [G] is removed from \([uF]\);

d. iterate over steps a.–c. until \([uF] = \emptyset\) or search fails.

• Illustrations

1. Lower DP matches more segments of a probe than a higher DP

Here, the probe will agree with both DPs. We represent such a derivation as in (23). In line with (22b), the entire \(\pi\)-structure of both DPs is copied over to the probe, as represented in (24).

(24) \(P = \left\{ [u] \left[ \begin{array}{c} x \\ y \\ z \end{array} \right] \right\} \)

• Gluttony

The probe in (23) has agreed with two DPs and acquired two feature values. We call such probes gluttonous.

2. Lower DP matches fewer of the probe’s segments than the higher DP

Here, the probe will only agree with the higher DP, as in (25). The probe hence acquires only a single valued, as in (26).

(25) \(P = \left\{ [u] \left[ \begin{array}{c} x \\ y \\ z \end{array} \right] \right\} \)

(26) \(P = \left\{ [u] \left[ \begin{array}{c} x \\ y \\ z \end{array} \right] \right\} \Rightarrow \text{not gluttonous}

3. Higher DP matches only a subset of the probe’s segments, but the lower DP doesn't match more

Here, the probe again only agrees with the higher DP, as in (27).

(27) \(P = \left\{ [u] \left[ \begin{array}{c} x \\ y \\ z \end{array} \right] \right\} \)

• Consequence

Gluttony arises if and only if the lower DP has more feature segments sought by the probe than the higher DP.

Importantly, despite its algorithmic definition, (22) counts as a single step of the derivation. It is hence not possible to intersperse subprocedures of (22) with other operations.
3.2 Weak PCC (in Catalan)

- We first analyze the Weak PCC illustrated on the basis of Catalan, which involves pronominal clitics.

\[ \text{Weak PCC} \]

\[
^3 > 1/2
\]

Assumptions about cliticization

The PCC in Catalan arises with clitics. We therefore need to make some background assumptions about how cliticization works. For concreteness, we adopt here assumptions in Béjar & Rezac (2003) and other relevant literature. Our account is to some extent independent of these specific assumptions.

1. \( \pi \) vs. 

Person (\( \pi \)) and number (\( \# \)) are separate probes (see Laka 1993, Taraldsen 1995, Béjar 2003, Béjar & Rezac 2003, Rezac 2003, Sigurðsson 2004a, Sigurðsson & Holmberg 2008, Kalin 2019). These are universally ordered such that \( \pi \) probes before \( \# \), which we indicate as in (30):

\[ [\pi > \#] \]

2. Cliticization as head movement

Cliticization involves long head movement triggered by \( \Phi \)-Agree (see Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar & Rezac 2003, and Preminger 2009, 2019).

\[ [\text{Head movement}] \]

3. Cliticized DPs are invisible to subsequent probes

Cliticized DPs behave like traces of A-movement and are invisible to subsequent operations (see Chomsky 2000, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar & Rezac 2003, and Preminger 2009).

- \( \pi \) probes first
  - \( \pi \) agrees with the 2nd person DP\( _{IO} \), is fully satisfied, and stops probing.
  - As a result of \( \Phi \)-Agree with \( \pi \), DP\( _{IO} \) is clitic-doubled.

\[ [\pi-\text{Agree in 2>3 configuration (33)}] \]

\[ [\text{# probes second}] \]

- Because DP\( _{IO} \) has been clitic-doubled, it is invisible to probing by \#.
- \# agrees with DP\( _{DO} \) and clitic-doubles it.

3.2.1 PCC-obeying 2>3 configuration

(33) En Josep, te 'l va recomanar la Mireia. [=(8a)]

the Josep, 2cl 3cl recommended the Mireia

‘She (Mireia) recommended him (Josep) to you.’ (‘2DAT > 3ACC)

- \( \pi \) probes first
  - \( \pi \) agrees with the 2nd person DP\( _{IO} \), is fully satisfied, and stops probing.
  - As a result of Agree with \( \pi \), DP\( _{IO} \) is clitic-doubled.

\[ [\pi-\text{Agree in 2>3 configuration (33)}] \]

\[ [\text{# probes second}] \]

- Because DP\( _{IO} \) has been clitic-doubled, it is invisible to probing by \#.
- \# agrees with DP\( _{DO} \) and clitic-doubles it.
3.2.2 PCC-violating 3>2 configuration

(37) *A en Josep, te li va recomanar la Mireia. [=8(b)] to the Josep, 2ACC.CL 3DAT.CL recommended the Mireia intended: ‘She (Mireia) recommended you to him (Josep),’

(38) • Ineffability in clitic-doubling

- Having agreed with two DPs, π is gluttonous.

(39) Due to the clitic-doubling requirement of π, every DP that π has agreed with must cliticize onto v.

- But ...
  1. Cliticizing only one of the two DPs violates (39).
  2. Cliticizing neither DP also violates (39).
  3. Cliticizing both DPs sequentially is impossible because doing so would require not cliticizing one of them in the first step would violate (39).
  4. Cliticizing both DPs simultaneously is impossible because doing so would require Merge between v0 and two D0s. This is excluded by Merge being binary.

\[ \text{There is no way to satisfy (39) if the probe is gluttonous \to ineffability} \]

- Because Agree as defined in (22) counts as a single derivational step, it is not possible to clitic-double DP1O after π agrees with DP1O but before it agrees with DPDO.
3.2.3 PCC-obeying \textsc{part}$\!>$\!\textsc{part} configuration

(40) Te’m van recoman per a la feina. \quad \quad \text{([=8c])}
2cl.1cl recommended for the job

‘They recommended me to you for the job’/ \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \ quad
We assume a late-insertion model of morphology (such as Distributed Morphology; Halle & Marantz, 1993, 1994), where abstract syntactic heads are given overt specification through postsyntactic vocabulary insertion.

**Morphological conflict**

Assuming that absolutive agreement in Basque is genuine agreement, not clitic-doubling, there is not conflict w.r.t. movement. But we suggest that a conflict arises for the morphological realization of the gluttonous probe.

### Constraints on vocabulary insertion

1. For a feature value α, insert the maximally specific vocabulary item that realizes α.
2. Only one vocabulary item may be inserted per head.

**Vocabulary insertion**

We assume a late-insertion model of morphology (such as Distributed Morphology; Halle & Marantz, 1993, 1994), where abstract syntactic heads are given overt specification through postsyntactic vocabulary insertion.

**Gluttonous π-probe in (48) (in context of singular agreement)**

\[
\pi = \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{PERS} [\text{PERS} [\text{SPKR}]] \\
\text{PART} \end{array} \right\} \text{CONFlict}
\]

- The person values of both DPs are copied over to π, yielding (51).

- **Independent evidence: Case mismatch in ATB movement**

  We proposed that in the case of agreement, feature gluttony can give rise to irresolvable competition between vocabulary items.

- Morphological conflicts of this sort are independently attested. One example is case-match effects in ATB movement (Citko 2005). She shows that ATB movement is possible only if the two gaps are associated with the same case form. Assuming a multidominance structure for ATB movement, Citko’s (2005) explanation is that the ATBed DP is assigned two case values. If they differ, they can give rise to morphological ineffability.

(52) Case-mismatch effects in Polish ATB movement

- **Other examples**
  - Kratzer (2009) on morphological restrictions on the availability of fake indelexicals in German,
  - Schütze (2003) on free relatives in German,
  - Asarina (2011) on Right Node Raising constructions in Russian

  - Our proposal connects Basque PCC effects to these restrictions.

3.3.3 Accounting for the Strong PCC

- Basque has the Strong PCC, meaning that 1>2 and 2>1 configurations are ungrammatical as well:

  (53) *Haiek ni-ri zu saldu z-ai-da-te. [=7d)]

  they.erg me-dAT you.abs sold 2ABS-aux-IDAT-3ERG

  intended: ‘They have sold you to me.’

  (**1DAT > 2ABS)**

- **Proposal: Representation of dative DPs in Basque**

  Dative DPs in Basque bear a dummy [PERS] specification and thus behave like 3rd-person DPs for external processes, regardless of their actual interpretation
(Boeckx 2000, Richards 2008, Sigurðsson & Holmberg 2008; also Taraldsen 1995, Anagnostopoulou 2003, and Atlamaz & Baker 2018 for other proposals that datives may be featurally deficient). To implement this, we assume that Basque datives are contained inside a KP shell, which bears a dummy [PERS] feature.

(54) Structure of dative DPs in Basque

\[\text{K[PERS]} \rightarrow \text{D} → \text{NP} \]

- **PCC-violating PART>PAR configurations**

Because of the dative’s [PERS] specification, 1>2 and 2>1 configurations result in gluttony.

(55) \[\nu\text{-Agree in }1>2 \text{ in Basque (44)}\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\nu [[u_{\text{PERS}} → [\text{PERS}]], [\text{DP}], [\text{PERS}]] \rightarrow [\text{DP}]
\end{array}\]

- **A prediction: ABS>DAT configurations**

The proposal that dative DP externally bear a [PERS] specification makes the prediction in (56). Based on motion verbs, (57) shows that this prediction is borne out.

(56) Because dat DPs are [PERS], a ABS>DAT configurations should never give rise to gluttony. Here, there should be no person restriction in ABS>DAT configurations.

(57) No person restriction with ABS>DAT motion verbs

\[\text{a. } \text{Ni Itxaso-ri etortzen n-atzai-o. me.ABS Itxaso-DAT come.IMPF 3ABS-AUX-3DAT ~I am coming to Itxaso.'} (\checkmark 1\text{ABS} > 3\text{DAT})\]

\[\text{b. Itxaso ni-ri etortzen } \varnothing \text{-zai-t. Itxaso.ABS 1SG-DAT come.IMPF 3ABS-AUX-1DAT ~Itxaso is coming to me.'} (\checkmark 3\text{ABS} > 1\text{DAT})\]

(58) Structure for (57b)

\[\begin{array}{c}
\nu [[u_{\text{PERS}} → [\text{PERS}]], [\text{DP}], [\text{PERS}]] \rightarrow [\text{DP}]
\end{array}\]

- **Summary: Datives as [PERS]**

1. **DAT>ABS configurations:**
   - gluttony if ABS is 1st or 2nd person → Strong PCC
2. **ABS>DAT configurations:**
   - no gluttony regardless of person specifications

3.3.4 **Sensitivity to overt φ-agreement**

- **PCC obviation in φ-less clauses**

We saw the PCC effects disappear in Basque in clauses whose arguments do not control φ-agreement. This now follows straightforwardly: without a φ-probe, there is no risk of gluttony. All DP combinations are therefore permitted.

(59) Gaizki iruditzen \(\varnothing\)-zai-t [zu-k harakina-ri ni wrong look.IMPF 3ABS-AUX-1DAT you-ERG butcher-DAT me.ABS sal-tze-a ].

sell-IMPF-ART.ABS

‘It seems wrong to me for you to sell me to the butcher.’

(\checkmark 3\text{DAT} > 1\text{ABS})

(60) Licit hierarchy configuration with no probe → no gluttony

\[\begin{array}{c}
\ldots [\text{DP}][\text{DP}][\text{DP}] \ldots [\text{DP}][\text{DP}][\text{DP}] \ldots [\text{DP}][\text{DP}] \ldots ]
\end{array}\]

- **PCC obviation under gapping/stripping**

Basque PCC effects also disappear under gapping and stripping – that is, when the verb agreement is not overtly realized.

(61) Jon-ek alkatze-ri Mikel saltu d-i-o, eta zu-k Jon-ERG mayor-DAT Mikel.ABS sold 3ABS-AUX-3DAT and you-ERG harakina-ri ni ——— butcher-DAT me.ABS

‘Jon sold Mikel to the mayor, and you me to the butcher.’
• Ineffability in vocabulary insertion
  On our gluttony account, gluttonous probes themselves do not lead to ungrammaticality. Rather, they give rise to conflicting requirements for subsequent operations, leading to ineffability.
  – For Basque PCC, the conflict arises for the morphological realization of a probe.
  ➤ Gapping/stripping obviates the PCC because it suppresses the morphological realization of the gluttonous probe. Specifically, we adopt (62).

     (62) No vocabulary insertion applies to elided material.

• Gluttony and its aftermath
  Because it is not gluttony itself that leads to ungrammaticality, but rather its effect on subsequent operations, we gain a handle on why certain hierarchy effects should be suspended in the absence of overt φ-agreement.
  – Clauses without φ-probes and gapping/stripping are two configurations in which the detrimental effects of a gluttonous probe are circumvented.

3.4 Extension to Ultra-Strong PCC

• We have so far offered an analysis of the Weak PCC and the Strong PCC. Our proposal extends to the Ultra-Strong PCC (e.g., in Classical Arabic), which bans 2>1, but not 1>2.

     (63) Ultra-Strong PCC
         a. *3 > 1/2
         b. *2 > 1

     (64) [hpers]
         [hpart]
         [hspkr]

(65) π-Agree in 1>2 configurations

     [νr
         [hpers]
         [hpart] → [hspkr]
         ] > [hnum]
     … [DP
         [hpers12]
         [hpart12] → [hspkr12]
         ] > [hnum12]
     … [DP
         [hpers2]
         [hpart2] → [hspkr2]
         ] > [hnum2]
     ]

3.5 Section summary

• Feature gluttony may impose conflicting requirements on subsequent operations:
  1. Cliticization: conflicting demands on which DP to cliticize
  2. Agreement: conflicting demands on which vocabulary item to insert

• Gluttony can only arise if the lower DP is more specific than the higher DP and the higher DP doesn’t exhaust the probe.

• In the absence of a φ-probe or vocabulary insertion, the detrimental effects of gluttony are obviated.
  ➤ derives link between hierarchy effects and overt φ-agreement

• No need to appeal to (nominal) licensing.

• In several respects, gluttony is the opposite of a licensing account:
  – The problem is with (the realization of) the probe, not an unlicensed DP.
  – The restriction is due to too much Agree, rather than too little.

4 Icelandic dative–nominative constructions


³ See Boeckx (2000), Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005), Béjar & Rezac (2003), Richards (2008), and Walkow (2012) for other approaches that relate this restriction to PCC effects.
4.1 The person restriction

- But agreement with the nominative DP is subject to the person restriction in constructions, only 3rd person NOM may control agreement.

4.2 A gluttony analysis

- The Icelandic restriction bears a similarity to the Strong PCC: In the presence of agreement, a 1st/2nd person lower DP is ruled out. We therefore adapt our analysis for the Basque PCC to Icelandic.

1. \( \pi \)-probe
   We propose the \( \pi \)-probe in (72).

2. Datives as [PERS]
   We also assume, following Chomsky (2000), Boeckx (2000), Richards (2008), and Sigurðsson & Holmberg (2008), that Icelandic dative DPs externally carry only a [PERS] feature (just like datives in Basque).

- A 1st/2nd person nominative DP thus leads to gluttony, as in (73).
In line with our account of Basque, glutinous agreement in (74) results in a conflict in vocabulary insertion (see (77)). The relevant paradigm is given in (75) and the vocabulary items in (76).

**Past-tense mediopassive inflection for leidd `find boring`**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>leidd-ist</td>
<td>leidd-umst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>leidd-ist</td>
<td>leidd-ust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>leidd-ist</td>
<td>leidd-ust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gluttonous π-probe in (74) (in context of plural number agreement)**

\[
\pi = \{ \text{PERS} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \text{PART} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \end{bmatrix}, \text{SPKR} \begin{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \} \rightarrow \text{CONFLICT}
\]

**Rescue through non-agreement**

In configurations that lack a π-probe, no gluttony results, and all person combinations are allowed. This derives (70) and (71).

\[
[ \ldots \text{DP.DAT}^3 \ldots \text{DP.NOM}_{[1/2]} \ldots ]
\]

### 4.3 Rescue by syncretism

- **Syncretism**
  
  The hierarchy effect is also ameliorated if agreement with the 1st or 2nd person NOM DP is syncretic with 3rd person agreement in the same number (Sigurðsson 1991, 1996, Taraldsen 1995, Schütze 2003, Thráinsson 2007, Sigurðsson & Holmberg 2008).

\[
\text{Syncretism generalization}
\]

If agreement with a 1st or 2nd person NOM object is syncretic with 3rd person agreement in the same number, no person restriction arises.

[Sigurðsson & Holmberg 2008:272]

- **Syncretism fix**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Henri} & \quad \text{leiddist} & \quad \text{úg/bú} \\
\text{her.DAT} & \quad \text{found.boring.1/2/3sg} & \quad \text{I.NOM/you.SG.NOM} \\
\text{`She found me/you boring.'} & \quad \text{[Sigurðsson & Holmberg 2008:270]}
\end{align*}
\]

- In this case, the π-probe is glutinous (as before), but both feature values demand the same vocabulary item.

\[
\text{Agree in (80)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[ \text{DP.DAT} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{DP.NOM} & \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 \end{bmatrix} ] \rightarrow \text{CONFlict}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{Vocabulary items}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ist} & \leftrightarrow [ ] / \underline{[ \text{SG} ]} & \text{(underspecified)} \\
\text{ust} & \leftrightarrow [ ] / \underline{[ \text{PL} ]} & \text{(underspecified)} \\
\text{umst} & \leftrightarrow \{ \text{PERS} \begin{bmatrix} \text{PART} [\text{SPKR}] \end{bmatrix} \} & \underline{[ \text{PL} ]}
\end{align*}
\]

**Gluttonous π-probe in (81) (in context of singular number agreement)**

\[
\pi = \{ \text{PERS} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{PART} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \end{bmatrix}, \text{SPKR/ADDR} \begin{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \} \rightarrow \text{NO CONFLICT}
\]
The amelioration is achieved by the 2pl/3pl syncretism (84a). By contrast, 1pl demands a designated vocabulary item, and the person restriction re-emerges (84b).

(84) Syncretism fix in the plural

a. Henni virtúst þið eittvað einkennilegir.
   her.DAT seemed.2pl/3pl you.PL.NOM somewhat strange
   ‘You seemed somewhat strange to her.’

b. *Henni virtumst við eittvað einkennilegir.
   her.DAT seemed.1pl we.NOM somewhat strange
   [Sigurðsson & Holmberg 2008: 270]

- Rescue by syncretism also holds in cases of ATB extraction (Citko 2005), fake indexicals in German (Kratzer 2009), and Russian Right Node Raising (Asarina 2011).

- Gluttony and its aftermath
  The rescuing effect of syncretism is derived because gluttony itself does not lead to ungrammaticality, but rather can give rise to conflicting requirements for subsequent operations. Syncretism is one way of circumventing such conflicts.

4.4 Grammatical-function changing

- Icelandic has no person restriction in regular ditransitives (85a), but if the dat DP becomes the subject as the result of passivization, the person restriction pops up (85b); see Sigurðsson (1996) and Schütze (1997).

(85) a. dat>acc
   Ég gaf honum þig í jólajöf
   I.NOM gave him.DAT you.ACC as Xmas gift
   ‘I gave him you as a Christmas present.’

b. dat>nom
   *Honum var/varst gefinn þú
   him.DAT was.3sg/was.2sg given you.NOM
   [Schütze 1997: 117, citing Thráinsson p.c.]

- This follows straightforwardly from our account. While the acc pronoun in (85a) is inaccessible to the probe, the nom pronoun in (85b) has its full set of φ-features visible, leading to gluttony.

(86) a. π-Agree in (85a)
   [T
   [dpers − → ]
   [dpart − → ]
   [dnom [1sg] ]
   ...
   [dp.dat ... [dp.accc]]]

b. π-Agree in (85b)
   [T
   [dpers − → ]
   [dpart − → ]
   [dnom [2sg] ]
   ...
   [dp.dat [3] ]
   ...
   [dp.accc]]

- Additional evidence for the role of overt φ-agreement.
  - The same base configuration does or does not give rise to person restrictions depending on whether it is associated with overt φ-agreement.

4.5 Section summary

- The Icelandic person restriction shows sensitivity to overt φ-agreement in a number of ways:
  1. It disappears in nonfinite clauses.
  2. It disappears under syncretism.
  3. It is sensitive to passivization (which affects which DP is targeted by verb agreement).

- Gluttony enables an account of these interactions because it locates the restriction in the morphological realization of a gluttonous probe.
5 Hindi-Urdu copula constructions

- We investigate hierarchy effects in a specific type of copula construction, originally observed for German by Coon et al. (2017) and Keine et al. (2019). Bhatia & Bhatt (2019a,b) observe a similar effect in Hindi-Urdu (henceforth Hindi) and propose a gluttony analysis. We provide evidence that the person restriction in these constructions is accompanied by a number restriction. This indicates that gluttony is not limited to person probes. unclear).

5.1 The person restriction

- Coon et al. (2017) and Keine et al. (2019) observe hierarchy effects in so-called "assumed-identity sentences." Such sentences convey that one person is assigned the role of another person in a play or game of charades. Bhatia & Bhatt (2019a,b) observe an analogous person restriction in Hindi.

(87) Person hierarchy
*3 > 1/2

(88) Person-hierarchy effect in Hindi assumed-identity sentences
a. [Context: A Bollywood movie where two people are swapping identities]
   aaj-se māi Rames ḍ hūū (∗1 > 3)
today-from I Ramesh be.prs.1sg
   'From today onwards, I am Ramesh.' (i.e. 'I am taking on the role of a 3rd person."

b. [Context: A Bollywood movie where someone is swapping identities with me]
   *aaj-se Rames ṭ māi hāi/hūū (∗3 > 1)
today-from Ramesh I be.prs.3sg/be.prs.1sg
   intended: 'From today onwards, Ramesh is me.'

- See Coon et al. (2017), Keine et al. (2019), and Bhatia & Bhatt (2019a,b) for evidence that this is not merely a semantic constraint.

- Repair through gapping
  Bhatia & Bhatt (2019a,b) observe that gapping obviates this restriction (89).

(89) Gapping obviates person restriction
   aaj-se māi Ravi hūū aur Ravi māi ___ (∗3 > 1)
today-from I Ravi be.prs.1sg and Ravi I
   'From today, I am Ravi and Ravi me.' [Bhatia & Bhatt 2019a: 8]

5.2 The number restriction

- In addition, there is evidence for an analogous number-hierarchy effect (also see Coon et al. 2017 and Keine et al. 2019 for German):

(90) Obviation under syncretism
   us din māi Rames ṭ thaa aur Ramesh māi thaa
   that day I Ramesh be.pst.m.sg and Ramesh I be.pst.m.sg
   'That day I was Ramesh and Ramesh was me.' [Bhatia & Bhatt 2019a: 7]

- Repair through syncretism
  Additionally, Bhatia & Bhatt (2019a,b) observe that the restriction disappears under syncretism (also see Keine et al. 2019). In Hindi, the past tense copula does not distinguish person values. In this case, the person restriction is lifted:

(92) a. is naṭak-mē do log Ram hāi (∗pl > sg)
   this play-in two people Ram be.prs.3pl
   'In this play, two people are Ram.'

b. ??is naṭak-mē Ram do paatr hāi (∗sg > pl)
   this play-in Ram two characters be.prs.3sg
   'In this play, Ram is two characters.' [Rajesh Bhatt, p.c.]
• **Repair through gapping**
Like the person restriction, the number effect is obviated under gapping:

(93) *Gappping obviates number restriction

is naaṭak-mē Anu sīr ek paatr hai aur Ram do
this play-in Anu only one character be.prs.3sg and Ram two
paatr —

(‘SG > PL)
characters

‘In this play, Anu is only one character and Ram two characters.’

[Rajesh Bhatt, p.c.]

* The effect of syncretism cannot be tested for number because singular and plural are never syncretic.

5.3 A gluttony analysis

• In Hindi, copula clauses involve two φ-accessible DPs in the domain of a single φ-probe.

¬ potential for gluttony

• **The probes**

We propose the π-probe and #-probe in (94).

(94) \[ T^0 \left[ \frac{u_{PERS}}{u_{PART}} \right] > \left[ \frac{u_{NUM}}{u_{PL}} \right] \]

• **Person restriction**

Hierarchy-violating 3>part configurations lead to a gluttonous probe (96). This results in an irresolvable conflict in vocabulary insertion if the two values demand items (97).

(95) *aaj-se Ramesh māī hai/hāū

today-from Ramesh I be.prs.3sg/be.prs.1sg intended: ‘From today onwards, Ramesh is me.’

(96) π-Agree in (95)

\[ \left[ T \left[ \frac{u_{PERS}}{u_{PART}} \right] > \left[ \frac{u_{NUM}}{u_{PL}} \right] \right] \left[ \text{DP.NOM} \right] \]...

(97) Gluttonous π-probe in (96)

\[ \pi = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{PERS} (3s) & \text{PERS} (2) \\ \text{PART} & \text{SPKR} \end{array} \right\} \implies \text{CONFLICT} \]

• **Number restriction**

The number effect is derived analogously. Due to the specification of #, a SG>PL configuration results in gluttony and a morphological conflict.

(98) ??is naaṭak-mē Ram do paatr hai

this play-in Ram two characters be.prs.3sg

‘In this play, Ram is two characters.’

(99) #-Agree in (98)

\[ \left[ T \left[ \frac{u_{PERS}}{u_{PART}} \right] > \left[ \frac{u_{NUM}}{u_{PL}} \right] \right] \left[ \text{DP.NOM} \left[ \text{NP} \right] \right] \]

(100) Gluttonous #-probe in (99)

\[ # = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{NUM} & \text{NUM} \\ \text{PL} & \text{PL} \end{array} \right\} \implies \text{CONFLICT} \]

• **Gapping**

The rescuing effect of gapping is accounted for in the same way as for Basque above: vocabulary insertion does not apply to elided heads, hence no conflict arises.

• **Syncretism**

In gluttony configurations in which the feature values copied over from the two goals demand the same VI, no morphological conflict arises.
(101) us din māĩ Ramesh thaa aur Ramesh māĩ thaa
that day I Ramesh be.pst.m.sg and Ramesh I be.pst.m.sg
‘That day I was Ramesh and Ramesh was me.’

- Because the past-tense copula does not morphologically distinguish person values, both values demand the same underspecified VI thaa.

(102) Gluttonous π-probe in (101)

\[
\pi = \begin{bmatrix}
\text{PERS} & 1 \\
\text{PART} & \text{thaa} \\
\text{SPKR} & \text{MASC, SG}
\end{bmatrix}
\implies \text{NO CONFLICT}
\]

5.4 Section summary

- While hierarchy effects are typically observed for person features, analogous effects arise for number as well.
  - Because gluttony is not specific to person features (unlike, e.g., the PLC), it extends to number effects.
- In addition, the Hindi pattern displays the by-now familiar sensitivity to surface φ-morphology:
  - disappearance under gapping
  - disappearance under syncretism of agreement morphology

6 Summary and outlook

- Across three case studies (Basque PCC, Icelandic DAT–NOM constructions, Hindi copula constructions), we saw that hierarchy effects are crucially modulated by the presence/absence of overt agreement/clitic morphology.
  1. They disappear in φ-less nonfinite clauses.
  2. They disappear under gapping of the verb.
  3. They disappear if agreement with both DPs is syncretic.
  4. They are sensitive to grammatical-function changing operations if they affect agreement.
- This is unexpected under an abstract nominal-licensing/failed-Agree account:
  - If hierarchy effects are due to not enough Agree, then it is unclear why removing probes should salvage these configurations.
  - Properties of the morphological realization of φ-agreement do not affect abstract nominal licensing.
- We instead suggested that the problem is located in the probe. We proposed that these effects arise as a result of feature gluttony: a single probe agreeing with more than one DP.
  - Cliticization: conflicting demands on which DP to cliticize
  - Agreement: conflicting demands on which vocabulary item to insert

For gluttony to occur:

1. the probe must have access to at least two DPs
2. the probe must be articulated (i.e. picky) enough to not be completely satisfied by the first DP it encounters
3. the lower DP must have a more articulated feature structure than the higher DP
4. systematic predictions about the configurations that give rise to such effects

- Sensitivity to overt cliticization/φ-agreement
  - Because the problem is caused by an oversaturated probe, it follows that the restrictions disappear in configurations that lack the probe.
  - disappearance in φ-less nonfinite clauses
  - sensitivity to grammatical-function changing operations
  - Because it is not double Agree itself, but rather the possible aftermath that causes hierarchy effects, we gain handle on the role of overt agreement:
    - obviation by gapping \(\rightarrow\) no morphological realization of gluttonous head
    - obviation by syncretism \(\rightarrow\) no conflict between vocabulary items

Role of nominal licensing

Our account does not invoke a nominal-licensing condition. The problems that arose for it in the account of the PCC are therefore dispersed.
Our approach is in line with other recent work that has questioned the role of nominal licensing/case in other syntactic domains (e.g., McFadden 2004, Preminger 2014, Keine 2018).

**Extensions**

We might imagine that some languages have more systematic ways of dealing with gluttonous probes, e.g.:

- fission of a gluttonous probe
- portmanteau realization of a gluttonous probe

See Coon & Keine (2019) for some comments on possible extensions of the account along these lines and Coon et al. (2019) for a gluttony account for Mayan Agent Focus.
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