**Generalization 1: SC suffixal agreement is rigid**
- If a locus of agreement (templatic slot) always tracks features of a particular argument, call it **rigid**.
  - Example: TAM suffixes in South Caucasian, which always track the highest non-dative argument. Data from Georgian [1]:

  ![Diagram of rigid agreement](image)

- Simple to account for. This pattern follows from Locality.
- \( T^0 \) Agrees with the subject, unless it’s encased in a phasal PP [2].

**Why invoke postsyntactic competition?**
- In **Locals** configurations, Prefix Blocking obtains.

  ![Diagram of Prefix Blocking](image)

**Probe flexibility via the PMC, filtered**
- \( T^0 \) has three ordered probes: \( \varphi_{1} \), \( \varphi_{2} \), & \( \varphi_{3} \).
  - \( \varphi_{1} \) is constrained by Locality, as in (3–4). But the **PMC** [10] exempts later probes (\( \varphi_{2} \) & \( \varphi_{3} \)) from these constraints.
  - Derivational indeterminacy may result (11–11'). Alternative outputs compete postsyntactically, filtered by **Expressiveness** [11].

  ![Diagram of PMC filtering](image)

**Background on the PMC**
- The **PMC** lifts constraints (e.g., Locality) if they’ve been obeyed once. Take Bulgarian multiple \( wh \)-Qs [10].

  ![Diagram of PMC](image)

- A **key parallel** with South Caucasian agreement:
  - In Bulgarian, one \( wh \)-“slot” is rigid (must be filled by the highest \( wh \)P); the rest are flexible (can be filled by any lower \( wh \)P).
  - In South Caucasian, one agreement slot is rigid, while the rest are promiscuous.
  - No free variation in SC agreement — flexibility emerges only across a paradigm.

**Comparison to alternative accounts**
- **There is one rigid locus, and multiple promiscuous ones.**
  - This fact is **predicted** by the PMC.
  - No need to stipulate that different probes use different Agree mechanics [12].
- **There is only ever one agreement prefix.**
  - Per syntactic output, the relevant probe (\( \varphi_{3} \)) only ever interacts with one DP [cf. 4, 8].
  - No need to delete the features of the other DP.
  - Prefixes that **maximize morphological expressiveness** win.
  - Captured by postsyntactic filters that weed out alternatives.
  - No way to characterize blocking in syntactic or featural terms.
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**Research Question:** How broadly does the Principle of Minimal Compliance apply? **Proposal:** It shapes \( \varphi \)-agreement in South Caucasian.
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1. If an agreement locus sometimes tracks one argument, call it **rigid**.
2. Simple to account for. This pattern follows from Locality.
3. \( T^0 \) Agrees with the subject, unless it’s encased in a phasal PP [2].
4. If an agreement locus sometimes tracks one argument, and sometimes another, call it **promiscuous** [3].
5. Example 1: Plural agreement in Georgian [4, cf. 5].
6. Example 2: South Caucasian agr. prefixes. Data from Svan [6].
7. The generalization is **morphological**, not syntactic.
8. In Blocking configurations, the prefix and suffix always end up tracking different arguments [12]. This maximizes morphological Expressiveness & Economy [11].
9. Prioritize agreement with the first argument lower than \( VP \) [cf. 3, 7]. Not quite: some DSCs are passivizable, so it can’t be that all DAT subjects are in Spec-AppP.
10. The **PMC** lifts constraints (e.g., Locality) if they’ve been obeyed once. Take Bulgarian multiple \( wh \)-Qs [10].
11. A **key parallel** with South Caucasian agreement:
12. In Bulgarian, one \( wh \)-“slot” is rigid (must be filled by the highest \( wh \)P); the rest are flexible (can be filled by any lower \( wh \)P).
13. In South Caucasian, one agreement slot is rigid, while the rest are promiscuous.
14. No free variation in SC agreement — flexibility emerges only across a paradigm.