



- (4) M'ha recomanat \*(a) tu per a la feina la subdirectora. *Catalan PCC repair; Bonet 2002*  
 1-has recommended P 2 for the job the deputy.director  
 'The deputy director has recommended you to me for the job.'
- (5) Bes-ó \*(a) María. *Spanish DOM "repair"; Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007*  
 kiss-3SG.PAST P Mary  
 'He kissed Mary.'

Second, the higher of the two implicated nominals is typically immune from the effect: subjects and indirect objects are not similarly restricted or differentiated the way the direct objects are in (1)/(4)/(5). In fact, if the higher nominal is removed, the effect disappears: removing the indirect object in a PCC configuration allows the direct object to be 1st/2nd person without a "repair", and removing the subject in a DOM configuration (e.g., via passivization) typically results in the object being promoted and no longer treated differentially. **DOM and the PCC arise due to intervention.**

Finally, different versions of DOM and the PCC surface based on language-specific choices about which features matter, giving rise to (e.g.) the super strong PCC (Kambera; Doliana 2013), the weak PCC (Sambaa; Riedel 2009), and DOM based on animacy (Kannada; Lidz 2006). Further, both DOM and the PCC appear outside of their "canonical" environments, e.g., DOM on the subjects of nominalizations (Kornfilt 2008), and the PCC affecting the direct object in transitives, (1c). **DOM and the PCC are general configurational effects triggered by valued features.**

**5. Proposal:** I propose that DOM and the PCC are conspiring to tell us that nominal features are what crucially matter for licensing, and that certain syntactic positions are inaccessible to "canonical" licensers (e.g., T, *v*). First, I reverse the burden of licensing: valued (phi-)features need licensing while abstract Case is an innocent bystander. Concretely, I propose that the feature [PARTICIPANT] universally needs licensing, following Béjar and Rezac (2003), *i.a.* Further, I propose that the crosslinguistic variability of DOM tells us that (i) other nominal features can require licensing, and (ii) which nominal features need licensing is a language-specific choice. (Note that there is a variety of evidence that features like [SPECIFIC] and [ANIMATE] can be generated on nominals; see e.g. Fodor and Sag 1982, Finer 1997, Cowper and Hall 2002.) When a nominal bears a feature that needs licensing, that nominal needs licensing. A feature is licensed (as traditional) via Agree.

The second piece of the puzzle is understanding the environments in which differential marking and person restrictions occur. Crucial are (i) a distinction between obligatory and secondary licensing loci (Levin and Massam 1985, Bobaljik 1993, *i.a.*), with secondary licensers activated only when a feature that needs licensing would otherwise go unlicensed (a global last-resort condition similar to that of Rezac 2011), and (ii) an account of defective intervention (Chomsky 2000, Béjar and Rezac 2003, Preminger 2011, *i.a.*), such that in certain contexts, Agree with [PARTICIPANT] is blocked, while Agree with other nominal features is possible. Combining these earlier proposals with my proposal can derive both DOM and PCC effects. In brief, DOM environments are those where a nominal cannot be reached by the obligatory licenser (e.g., T), and so requires activation of a secondary licenser (e.g., *v*, Appl, or P), (1a)/(5); unmarked objects in DOM systems are in fact unlicensed, (1b). PCC environments are those where a nominal is separated from a licenser by a defective intervener, and so [PARTICIPANT] cannot be licensed in this position, (1c); to license such a [PARTICIPANT], another secondary licenser must be activated, (4).

**6. Conclusion:** This proposal has done away with the proliferation of licensing conditions typically proposed for DOM and the PCC. Important questions remain: What about PRO, and different strengths of PCC? Why do valued features need licensing? I explore answers to these and more.