The derivation of an unsatisfiable probe: After partial intervention
Milan Rezac, CNRS-IKER

1 Iterative probes in the phi-case system

- Usual: Core phi/case dependencies (minimal clause, arguments):
  - do not iterate (1 phi/case locus : 1 argument – Sch97, Ch00)
  - NOM/ERG do not iterate (tiers, YMJ87, dependent, M91, B&H96).

(1) Noniterativity of core phi/case

a. NOM case does not iterate even when ACC seems to
   We made them invite her → They were made to invite her/*she

b. ACC arguably also does not iterate
   We showed (*them the proof) to be flawed

- Counterex: concord, feature sharing, extra phi/case, inherent case….

- Finnish puzzle:
  - classical system with NOM not iterative and ACC ambivalent
  - but NOM assigned in a PCC context iterates & skips

(2) Finnish puzzle (S, A, O abbreviate core arguments)

a. Agreeing NOM on A/S does not iterate into a restructuring INF
   \[ \text{NOM}_{S/A} \quad T_{φ-NOM} \quad t_{NOM} \quad [R \quad \text{INF} \quad \text{ACC}_O] \]

b. Nonagreing NOM on low-position S does not iterate
   \[ \ldots \quad T_{DFLT} \quad \text{NOM}_S \quad [R \quad \text{INF} \quad \text{ACC}_O] \]


---

1 Arg/pos abbreviations: S – nonoblique internal argument of unaccusative/passives as subject; O – nonoblique internal argument distinct from a subject; A – nonoblique external argument; R – “applicative” argument (e.g. high high indirect object, possessor, experiencer).
(A) Iterable match+delete+copy with the closest partial match undeleted features + "rootedness" of person (B&R09)

(B) Iterable match+delete+copy with the closest partial match for undeleted features (C&K19).

(C) Iterated match+copy with the closest match up to the closest match for a potentially distinct satisfaction condition (De15).

(D) Multiple Agree with all matching goals (Hir05) under parametrisable conditions of "harmony" (Nev07, A05).

- Why stop any person probe at the closest partial match (B&R09)? Cyclic Agree systems where A can value p- if O is 3rd still do not let p- be valued across R (indirective or secundative, whatever its features):2

(4) Closest partial match stops person modulo structure building

(Ex: Basque with quirky/indirective or transparent/secundative R)
A→1/2.O = 1/2 → O closest p-bearer in [v_p, V O])
A→R→3.O = 1/2/3 → As above, R like O in secund., R 3rd indirect.
A→R→1/2.O = * → R never agrees in person: PCC

- Take a cyclic Agree system with control by 1/2 O or if 3 O by 1/2 A
- We would expect such a system to allow control by 1/2 O past 3 R
- No cyclic Agree system seems to behave that way: all have strong PCC
- Includes indirective systems where R is quirky dative, and secundative system where R behaves as O [Bk96:c2, R08, Lochb12:c4]:

- Mechanics in B&R09:
  - Person probes rooted: no [part], only [[π] part]]
  - Searched halts at closest partial match/value: [[π] part]-probe at [π].
  - After A is added, it is closest to p- on (projected?) v.
  => O-to-A iteration but not R-to-O iteration of person match/value.

- Modulation: Stop of search by entailed person due to rootedness, perhaps b/c person values contextual, ";[part]" = [[x] x] &c. Hence not true of e.g. #, γ probes: PL can skip SG (q.v. B03:4.5; Nev11:s3, Pr14:c3).

- Finnish puzzle again:

2 R - "applicative" argument (e.g. high high indirect object, possessor, experiencer).
• NOM-assigning probe stopped by any direct-case nominal
• But upon crossing a defective intervener NOM iterates (NOM*)
• Odd on foregoing approaches

• Q: What does PCC do to a phi-probe that it iterates/skips matches?
• A: Interveners defective in phi can partly value a phi-probe in such a way that the remnant can match but not value and thus iterates.
  • \( \approx \) De15: unsatisfiable probe interacts iteratively.
  • \( \neq \) De15: same phi-set gives satisfaction and interaction conditions and unsatisfiability arises contextually, in "derivational history"
• Effect of intervener: just valuation combined with the mechanics of composite probes (no special valuation mechanics or probe structures).

2 PCC and PCC repairs

• Strong PCC in indirective (R=O) & secundative (R quirky) systems

(5) In the configuration \( P = \text{probe}, \ G = \text{goal} \)

a. PCC (indirective): \( P_{p-(#-)} \ldots X_{\varphi-\text{defective}} \ldots G \)

  Person: agreement & licensing * for "1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, marked 3\textsuperscript{rd}" G.
  Number: agreement */\sqrt{} for "3\textsuperscript{rd}" G, no effect on licensing.
  Repairs if present: case/phi unavailable in a given structure/derivation but available in a system, e.g. NOM\(\rightarrow\)ACC, ABS\(\rightarrow\)ERG, DAT\(\rightarrow\)PP.

b. PCC (secundative): \( P_{p-(#-)} \ldots X_{\varphi-\text{complete}} \ldots G \)

  Ditto, R controls person and number agreement, G licensed by special #-only probe, incorporation, inherent or "extraordinary" case...

• PCC reflects syntactic phi-dependencies: phi-features of G interact with phrase-structurally nonlocal X (R11).
  • The effect of PCC on case suggests that case is in the syntax as much as the phi-dependency: generally (R11); or for person-bearers (Kal18).
  • But if case is outside syntax and PCC in syntax (P14), PCC-conditioned case such as 3\textsuperscript{rd}-only NOM should still be evidence for sx. phi-dep.

• "Defective (person-only) intervention" story for PCC (A03, B&R03):
  • Secundative (R like O): phi-complete X values p-, #; no p- for G.
  • Indirective (R quirky): phi-defective X matches and halts p-, perhaps valuing it to something syncretic with "3\textsuperscript{rd}".
• Failure of p-match and/or value → failure of case and/or licensing.

• Example: Basque (R08, R11, Ar&Nev11):
  • DAT-*1/*2/√3.ABS ('like') and 1/2/3.ABS-DAT ('come')
  • Same morphology.
  • DAT-ABS: DAT > c-command ABS up to T; ABS-DAT: ABS > DAT.
  • *1/*2.ABS ineffable or repaired to ERG, probably with raising.

(6) **PCC in Basque in quirky [transparent] dative varieties**

**Base:** (3PL.A) (1SG.D) like/come 3PL.A-1SG.D-T [1SG.A-PL'-T]
  (haiek niri gustatzen/etortzen zaizkit [nauzki/nauzki])

**PCC:** (2PL.A) (1SG.D) *like/√come 2PL.A-1SG.D-T [-]
  (zu niri *gustatzen/√etortzen zatzaizkit [*nau*/-])

→ rep: ("2PL.E) (1SG.D) like/*come 2PL.E-1SG.D-T [2PL.E-1SG.A-PL'-T]
  (zu–zuk–N/A niri gustatzen/√etortzen didazu [nauzu/*nauzu])

• Example: Icelandic (close to Finnish modulo repairs: M93, R11)
  • DAT_{subj.-NOM}_{obj.} & NOM_{subj.-DAT}_{obj.} constructions.
  • NOM agrees whether high or low, save in DAT-NOM (Ta95, S96, Sch97: ch4, Sch03, S&H08, Bo08, Th08: 4.2.5, Ku16, Us17 a.o.)

**Variety "A":** 3.NOM must agree even across low DAT, 1/2.NOM *with agr., default, or # alone, and in nonagreeing clauses.

**Variety "B":** 3.NOM agrees/not across DAT under certain conditions, 1/2.NOM *with agr., def., # alone, less so in nonagr. clauses.

**Variety "C":** like "B" save 1/2.NOM not sharply barred with default.

• No repair, but a close counterpart with repair to ACC in Breton (R19).

(7) **PCC in Icelandic A**

a. Henni leiddust/*leiddist þeir.
  3SGF.DAT bore.3PL/*3SG 3PLM.NOM
  They bore her. (Ta95 < Th p.c., cf. Th08)

b. *Henni leiðumst / leiðast / leiðist við.
  3SGF.DAT bore.1PL/3PL/3SG 1PLNOM.
  We bore her. (Th08)

c. Við vonumst til [að __ leiðast hún/*þið ekki]
  we hope to PRO.DAT bore.INF 3SGF/*2SG.NOM not
  We hope not to be bored with her/*you. (Bo08 < Th pc)
Some points of Icelandic:
- PCC: in (non)agreeing and default contexts in "A", better in "C".
- PCC+: number agreement can be blocked just in PCC contexts.
- Displacement of datives not needed for number agreement in "A", and also in "B" when no OS possible (S&H08, Ku16, Jo16, U17).
- No iteration of NOM/ABS, but no Case-transparent INFs to study it.

3 Finnish

3.1 PCC

- Finnish (esp. M93, K02)
- NOM is noniterative when:
  - agreeing A/S, in subject position but also lower (Ho05)
  - nonagreeing S, i-subject of existential construction (nonpronom.) (K02)
  - ≈ Fiorentino-Trentino type (Br&C89)

(8) Terminal (non)agreeing NOM in Finnish (schematic, cf. K02)³

a. Nonagreeing NOM i-subject
   Sinne tuli sukellusvene [Rx upottamaan laivan]
   there came submarine.NOM to.sink boat.ACC/*NOM
   There came a submarine to sink the boat.

b. Agreeing NOM canonical subject
   Sukellusveneet tulivat [Rx upottamaan laivan]
   submarine.NOM.PL came.3PL to.sink boat.ACC/*NOM
   There came a submarine to sink the boat.

- NOM also on objects under anomalous subjects, including the core PCC context of oblique-subject unaccusatives:

- NOM (NOM*) on objects:
  - PCC: restricted to unmarked 3rd person ≈ PCC in Icelandic
  - PCC+: nonagreeing in number = PCC in Icelandic "B", "C"
  - Repair: 1st, 2nd, marked 3rd (animate > logophoric) → ACC.
  - Call this 3.NOM~1/2.ACC simply NOM*.

³ Rx = reduced / restructuring, below.
(9) **Finnish PCC with quirky oblique subject unacc.** (sch.)

a. *Agreeing finite clause*

\[
\text{Heillä on se/*sen} \sim *\text{sinä→sinut}
\]

3PL.ADS be.DFLT 3SG.NOM/*ACC *2SG.NOM→ACC

They have it/you.

b. *Nonagreeing clause under ECM*

(Väitettiin …) [heillä oleva se/*sen \sim *\text{sinä→ sinut}]

One claimed [them to have it/you]

c. *Biclausal*

\[
\text{Sinun on helppo} \sim \text{Rx ampua karhu \sim minut}
\]

2SG.GEN is easy to.shoot bear.NOM 1SG.ACC

It is easy for you to shoot the bear/me.

- NOM* (3.NOM~1/2.ACC) iterates unlike NOM = NOM iterates in PCC

(10) **Iterative NOM* in PCC**

… heillä on kiire [ottamaan ilo …]

… 3PL.DAT be.DFLT hurry.NOM to.take joy.NOM

(for) they are in a hurry to get joy (out of youth)

### 3.2 Interveners

- How do interveners give rise to PCC:
  - Secundative R (=O): value probe and leaving no p- for S
  - Indirective R (quirky): person but not number: match p-, value to something syncretic with "3rd", but do not match # (T95-A03, R08)
  - **Supported by the range of interveners in Finnish.**

- PCC interveners in Finnish: subjects with anomalous morphosyntax including absence of NOM (K02), leaving it for O as in Icel. (M93), but restricted to 3rd by PCC (R11) due to person only on intervener (R19):

  - **Oblique subjects of unaccusatives** (Icel., Breton; Basque, Choctaw)
    - Some evidence for person, less for absence of number.
    - Selective hiding of inner phi: e.g. T95-A03, Bx03, R08, Atl&Bk18

  - **Arbitrary impersonals** (Italian, D’Al04, R04)

---

4 ADS – adessive "at X, to X".
• **Generic impersonal**: silent 3SG.NOM, including SG concord on secondary predicates (H10). O is ACC.

• **Arbitrary impersonal**: silent nominal (local anaphora, secondary predicates) but no number so concord of secondary predicates SG/PL (Vilk99, Ka&Vi06, R19). Human = person (Ml12). O is NOM*.

(11) **Arbitrary impersonal iterative NOM* (schematic, cf. K02)**

a. He lähetivät sukellusveneen–sinut [Rx upottamaan laivan].
   3PL.N sent.3PL submarine.A~2SG.A to.sink boat.A

b. Sinne lähetettiin sukellusveneen–sinut [Rx upottamaan laiva]
thither send.IMP submarine.N~2SG.A to.sink boat.N

• **Imperative subjects** (Breton alongside oblique subjects, R19)
  
  • *Jussive* excludes speaker/addressee; regular subject morphosyntax; agreement morphology includes regular plural (-t); object ACC.
  
  • *True imperative* includes addressee; anomalous subject morphosyntax (K02); agreement morphology opaque (colloq.: 2SG ipv. -∅ vs. elsewhere -t, 2PL -kaa vs. -tte, 1PL IMP vs. -mme); object NOM.
  
  • When jussive → imperative in these respect, object → ACC (Timb75).
  
  • Imperative lacks number; we know another means for a similar distinction often limited to participants: **associativity** (Cantonese contrasting with number, Cys09:4.3.5, Ch&Syb99).

  • Person distinctions remain though opaque (1incl.-2).

(12) **Imperative iterative NOM* (schematic, cf. K02)**

a. Lähettäkööt sukellusveneen–minut [upottamaan laivan]
send.3PL.JUS submarine.ACC~1SG.ACC to.sink boat.ACC

b. Lähettäkää sukellusveneen–minut [upottamaan laiva]
send.2PL.IPV submarine.NOM~1SG.ACC to.sink boat.NOM

• **NOC PRO**: ≈ arbitrary impersonal.

  *(Why sink it? The right to sink it. Give (them) the right to sink it.)*

• So…:
  
  • Quirky interveners in PCC have person but not number
  
  • Absence of number ≠ whatever SG is in Finnish, Icelandic, German…, ditto for person: φ- halts at 3SG always.
  
  • "#" in these systems = number/gender/class probe: all nominals.
  
  • "p" in these systems = valuation entailed by #-valuation? (composites)
Some configurations where 3SG halts φ-probe in F/Icel/Ger...

a. $3SG.NOM$ help/see.$3SG/PL \ t_{NOM} \ 3PL.DAT/ACC$
b. came.$3SG \ 3SG.NOM \ [Ra \ to.sink \ 3PL.ACC/*/NOM]$  
3.3 Caseless infinitives

- Distinctive property of Finnish (and systems in Timb79):
  - infinitives transparent to upstairs case $\approx$ restructuring-like deficiency (V89, V&B11, B12, B14, Kosk18, K19).
  - Case-transparency $\approx$ assume lack of core NOM-ACC structural Case system (distinct from structural GEN on C, K19).

Finnish infinitive types (V89, V&B11, B12, B14, Kosk18, K19)

a. Case-opaque (clausal adjuncts, nominal modifiers): agreeing genitive subjects + accusative objects + own tense, polarity.

b. Case-transparent infinitives (subject raising or restructuring, subject control, object control complements; VP adjuncts): $t/PRO/\emptyset$ subjects + object NOM* under PCC, ACC otherwise + no own tense, polarity.

c. Case-transparent/opaque infinitives (ECM complement; purpose adjunct): subject-anaphoric possessive agreement or disjoint nonagreeing structural genitive + object local ACC also NOM* under PCC + own polarity.

d. Case-transparent/opaque infinitives (complements of nouns): PRO_{NOC} + object local NOM* also ACC under non-PCC.

- We may distinguish three configurations of iteration:

(A) Potential equidistance: Multiple NOM* without c-command (e.g. object + object in adjunct). Even here, NOM is only recursive in PCC contexts!

[All ex. above]

(B) Intervention: NOM* c-commands NOM*, e.g. (object + object in control/ECM complement). [Also cf.: NOM* past structural GEN subject.]

Iteration under c-command (schematic; V89, M93, K02)

a. Maija pyysi Jukan lukemaan kirjan.
M.$NOM$ asked.$3SG.J.ACC$ to.read $book.ACC$
b. Pyydä Jukka lukemaan kirja!
   ask.2SG.IPV J.NOM to.read book.NOM

c. Jukka pyydettiin lukemaan kirja!
   J.NOM asked.IPM to.read book.NOM

(C) Containment: NOM*/OBLQ contains NOM* (give right to sink). Hard to study NOM* since it can also be local, but useful for ACC.

4 From partial intervention to nonvaluability

- Mechanics of defective intervention so far:
  - person specification
  - person of quirky halts person probe even in systems where it can be revalued from 3.O to 1/2.A or 2.O to 1.A &c
  - person likely values -- imperative pro to 1, 2; arb. imp. pro to "human" 3\(^+\) syncretic with "3"; ditto quirky datives?
  - no number/gender specification
  - lack of number allows bypass to parametric (non)valuation of number-probe from lower goal (Icelandic A-B-C)
  - displacement not necessary for bypass (Icelandic A; cf. A18)

(16) Defective intervention in PCC (P probe, G goal, X intervener)

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{P} & \quad X_{\text{def}} & \quad \text{G} \\
  \text{p} & \quad \to & \quad \text{p} & \quad *1, *2, *3^+, 3/\emptyset \\
  \# & \quad \to & \quad \text{SG, PL (+ MASC, etc.)}
\end{align*}
\]

- What happens to \# in PCC+ (Icelandic "B", "C", Finnish)?
  [Seen as evidence of NOM w/o phi-Agree (P14). But agreement is an indirect reflex of phi-Agree: cf. match + valuation w/o realisation for agreement upon movement (D’Al&Ro08).]

- Hypothesis:
  (a) Pure PCC = match + valuation of \#, PCC+ = match but no valuation of \#, and match = case/licensing.
  (b) PCC vs. PCC+ = probes separate vs. interdependent

- Thus:
  - PCC contexts, all: p, \# probe capable of independent match.
  - PCC with \# agreement: p, \# separate, valued independently.
  - PCC+: \# probe cannot value because p has been valued
• Parameter: independent controllers of #, p indicate separate probes (Basque); independent #, p morphology favours it (Basque); rest in analytic limbo allowing microvariation (Icelandic, Finnish).

• Some options for interdependence, i.e. sensitivity of # valuation to p:

(A)p-, # - not valuable "after" other valued: p- valued from "closer" \(X_{\text{def}}\) "first" [halts]; # - not valued from G because p- "already" valued [iterates].

(A') p-, # - not valuable if other valued (global). Thus p- not valued from \(X_{\text{def}}\) = Ta95-A03 [so p- iterates to G where 1/2 licensing = valuation fails but case is assigned anyway, contrast repair by case, R11, Kal18].

(B) structure of \([p, #]\) such that # - valuation entails joint p- valuation, but not inversely (cf. \(p\#\) probing order, B&R03, P14, C&K19).

• In A (not A', B): What about "composite" \([p, #]\) probes prevents # - val?
  • Monotonicity: p valued from O can be revalued from A if monotonic increase on the order given by p-geometry (vel. sim.), e.g. \(3^+ \rightarrow 1/2\).
  • In composite \([p, #]\) (vel. sim.), no shared geometry, so no p, # order, so not monotonic increase "after" one of p, # is valued.

• In A (not A', B): What is "after" – why not # - val and p-unval.?
  • Locality: \(X_{\text{def}}\) as closest p- but not # - bearer and also phrase-structurally.
  • Take order of matches to be given by either:
    • (partial) match for any subprobe of composite probe; or
    • phrase-structural locality (cf., but more so: P&T01).

• So..: for p, # probes:
  • plain: p-, # match, value from [and halt at] closest \(G_{\text{phi-complete}}\).
  • PCC: \(X_{p} > G_{p, #} \) p matches, values from [and halts at] \(X_{p}\), # matches G, is valued [and halts] if separate but not if linked to p.

• Just what sense of "composite" is needed?

(17)  Landscape of "composite" probes:

(A) A'-movement feeds φ/case: Separate probes on phrase-structural atom + maximise matching at atoms (Brun01, R13, vUrk15, cf. P&T01).

(B) # - valuation dependent on p: possibly just (A): separate matching, no valuation if another valued (but possibly subterminal phi-structure, \([p, #]\)).
(C) \( p + \# \) fusion, e.g. 1+PL: partial matching for each of \( p \), \( \# \), preference for fuller matching, and value from preferred at-least-partial match (Co&Ba14).

(D) interaction+satisfaction: potentially unrelated conditions on match and value, matched phi-sets copied up to valuer if any (De15).

5 Iterativity

- So far:
  - Canonical phi/case dependecies (incl. PCC with secundative R): closest phi-bearer is phi-complete, values and halts phi-probe(s), gets case.
  - PCC context (indirective R): closest phi-bearer is phi-incomplete, matches-values \( p \)-, parametric valuation/nonvaluability of \( \# \)- thereafter.

- Hypothesis: nonvaluable probe iterates = iteration.
  - Match does not halt search, valuation does (contra B&R09).
  - Unvaluable probe matches iteratively (with D15).
  - Match alone includes case assignment (R03, R19; cf. Yoon96).

- Initial puzzle, interpreted:
  - phi-probe of \( T_{\text{NOM}} \) is terminal if the closest goal is phi-complete (plain context), iterates if phi-defective (PCC context).
  - partial valuation prevents further valuation but not search for unvalued content (still subject to rootedness)

- Iterative probes:
  - B&R09: iterate match-value up to valuation but partial match halts.
  - C&K19: iterate match-value up to valuation.
  - A05-N07: iterate match while harmonic.
  - D15: iterate match up to match for independent satisfaction condition.
  - Here: B&R09 if probe can be valued, D15 otherwise – but probe is born with a single match-value condition that becomes unsatisfiable "after" partial match – "a certain point in the derivational history".

- Finnish is then PCC+ with Case-transparent infinitives.

---

5 For Nez Perce, cf. PCC in B&R03: \( p > \# \) Agree + \( p \) stops at closest partial match, valued from it, and so is \( \# \) by ASAP if possible + intervention of this match voided + \( \# \) if still unvalued sees past it. Replace \( p \) by a phi-probe partially matched by any phi-bearer, e.g. \( \phi \), \( \pi \), or \( \pi \)-part-spkr probe of the C-domain; relace \( \# \) by \( \pi \)-part-addr probe of the C-domain.
6 Extension: Accusative

- Is ACC/ABS generally iterative?
  - Yes: Case-in-tiers (YMJ97, M93) and dependent-case (M91 postsyntactic, cf. P14, Bk15, Bk&Bo17; syntactic B&H96):

  (18) **ECM: iterable ACC, noniterable NOM**

  I made/saw them ask her → They were made/seen to ask her/*she

  - No: phi/Case (Sch97, Ch00). ECM has matrix and embedded v_{ACC}. No adding DP if structural ACC: no iteration (R13):

  (19) **ECM + DOC: noniterable ACC like NOM**

  a. We showed (*you) the proof to have a flaw (to you)
  b. The proof was shown (*you) to have a flaw (to you).
  c. *You were shown the proof to have a flaw.

  - Consistent with evidence of secundative systems: when R has primary object phi/case, O/S needs extra #-agr (Bk96, R08), incorporation (Bk96), inherent case (Pes95), "extraordinary" case (Ha&Ho18) without.

  (20) See Basque opaque vs transparent dative above.

- Distinct: dependent case "emergent" (R11) – as in caseless restructuring infinitives under unaccusatives with own NOM.

  (21) **O in restructuring INF: → NOM if no matrix NOM, ACC otherwise**

  Schematic: they.NOM are being finished to paint __.  
  we came them.ACC_{clitic} to paint __.

  Šel jsem (ji_{3}) s Katkou [zapsat (ji_{3}) na soutěž]  
  went AUX.1SG 3SGF.ACC with Kate [sign.up 3SGF.ACC on contest]  
  I went with Kate to sign her up for the competition. (Czech, cf. R01)  
  [Note: climbing→disjoint = restructuring, W01:c3]

- Iteration of ACC in Finnish: Almost all structures ambivalent as in English ECM, given dependent-like activation as needed:

  (22) **"Iterative" ACC in Finnish**

  NOM V (ACC) [INF ACC]
a. Sinne tuli sukellusvene [Rx upottamaan laivan]
there came submarine to.sink boat.ACC/*NOM
There came a submarine to sink the boat. (K02)

b. He lähetivät sukellusveneen [Rx upottamaan laivan].
3PL.NOM sent submarine to.sink boat.ACC
They sent a submarine to sink the boat. (K02)

- "Containment" structures suggest ACC iterates (A&K17)
  - N + NOC/pseudocontrol INF, N structural or oblique
  - INF has NOC PRO subject & assigns locally NOM* to O (as in Icel.)
  - ACC on O from matrix if ACC-assigner, i.e. has terminal NOM
    (containing N is also ACC if structural)
  - Limitation of ACC in INF to when matrix has NOM suggests iter…
  - But ACC needs "closely knit" locutions analogous to simple verbs, give permission ≈ permit (N unstressed), vs. cause significant difficult (N stressed), suggesting "reanalysis" (cf. A&K17). Then "containing" N might not intervene through e.g. pseudo-incorporation.

(23) Schematic of Ikola structures (A&K17) (same if higher O is oblique!)

A.NOM V [O.ACC [PRO NOC INF O.NOM*–ACC]]
X_def V [O.NOM* [PRO NOC INF O.NOM*]]

(C) 1/2.ACC from PCC repair: combines with lower 3.NOM/*ACC, so:
- ACC fails to iterate
- or repair is bounded
- or NOM* overwrites iteratedACC:

(24) Schematic of repair iteration

X_def V O.3.NOM–1/2.ACC [V O.3.NOM–1/2.ACC [ditto …

Sinut–Matti pakotettiin [Rx ampumaan karhu]
2SG.ACC–M.NOM forced.IMP to.shoot bear.NOM
One forced you/M. to shoot the bear (K02)

(D) Other evidence: no double-ACC verbs; evidence from adverbs can be interpreted in different ways.
- So we have two options:
- Option 1: ACC is iterative: works out nicely here:
• Finnish has PCC in unacc. but not trans., like Icelandic.
• General intuition: pronouns immune to PCC if in domain without person probe on the core Agree/Case locus (T,v) (cf. R11, P14, P18).
• Posit a #-only probe, derived from complete p,# probe of Agree/Case loci by lexically specified expletive value on p.
• Then # cannot be valued and iterates.
• Tension: p missing to derive no PCC, but present to derive iteration.
• Alternative: ACC probe is of a sort that cannot be valued from a nominal in a given system (gender in Finnish).
• Option 2: ACC is not iterative: fine here too:
  • #-only probe, valued, and since p-probe is absent, no PCC.
  • Iterativity in Ikola structures through nonintervention.

7 Extension: Partitive

• PART (henceforth: partitive of negation): replaces ACC and NOM* on O (and S under ECM) but also terminal nonagreeing NOM on i-subject S (and so not a variant of ACC as frequently taken to be).
• Confers no meaning difference, ≠ NPI partitive of Basque (DeR08:13.1), but covers same domains as NPI in Finnish (B12:sec3).
• Hard to study without further evidence (for all we can tell, could be a NEG-concord unrealised on obliques, cf. Ri13 on case-stacking).

8 Note on Adverbs

• Roughly: certain adverbs get NOM*/PART where O/S would get NOM*/PART if there isn't one, else ACC/PART.
• Case-in-tiers / Dependent case: if the subject is inaccessible to structural case, NOM goes on object, but it does not iterate, and the rest is ACC.
• M93: Finnish iterates NOM over multiple objects across caseless domains, but the prediction shows up with adverbs:

(25) Adverb predictions (Case-in-tiers)

\[
X_{\text{def} \ V_{\text{fin}} \ O/ADV.NOM} \text{ versus } X_{\text{def} \ V_{\text{fin}} \ O.NOM \ ADV.ACC} \\
X_{\text{def} \ V_{\text{fin}} \ O.NOM \ [INF \ O.NOM \negADV.ACC \ (ADV.ACC)]}
\]

• But counterexamples (M93), natural (V03, V&B09:3.7), common (G)!
• ACC adverbs found often when NOM allowed, including for adverbs that prefer NOM in contexts were O must be NOM (M93). So ACC might be adverbial case (→ PART\text{\_Neg} → ADV\text{\_ACC} → GEN\text{\_Neg} in Russian, M93).