Iterativity in Grammar, Leipzig, Dec. 3-4 2019:

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)[1]

a. *Agreeing NOM on A/S does not iterate into a restructuring INF*
   $\text{NOM}_{\text{S/A}}$ $\text{T}_{\varphi=\text{NOM}}$ t_{NOM} [$_\text{R}$ __ INF ACC_O]

b. *Nonagreeing NOM on low-position S does not interate*
   … T_{DFLT} NOM_S [$_\text{R}$ __ INF ACC_O]

c. *Nonagreeing NOM on O/S (NOM*) in an Icelandic-like PCC context does*
   $\text{OBLQ}_{\text{subj}}$ T_{DFLT} t_{OBLQ} NOM_O [$_\text{R}$ __/GEN_A INF NOM*_O]
   $\text{OBLQ}_{\text{subj}}$ T_{DFLT} t_{OBLQ} NOM_O [$_\text{R}$ (NOM*_S) INF (NOM*_S)]

- Iterated phi-interactions in phi-hierarchic interaction (competition)?

(3) *Phi-interaction ex*: A→1/2.O = 1/2, 1/2.A→3.O = 1/2

---

[1] Arg/pos abbreviations: S – nonoblique internal argument of unaccusative/passives <u>as subject</u> ;
O – nonoblique internal argument <u>distinct from a subject</u>; 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)
$A \rightarrow 1/2.O$ $= 1/2$ $\rightarrow$ O closest p-bearer in $[v_{p-} \text{ V O}]$)
$1/2.A \rightarrow 3.O$ $= 1/2$ $\rightarrow$ A closest p-bearer in $[(v_{p-}) \text{ } [A \text{ } [v_{p-} \text{ V O}]]]$)
$A \rightarrow R \rightarrow 3.O$ $= 1/2/3 \rightarrow$ As above, R like O in secund., R 3rd indirect.
$A \rightarrow R \rightarrow 1/2.O = *$ $\rightarrow$ 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/valuer: [[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.
  - ≈ De15: unsatisfiable probe interacts iteratively.
  - ≠ 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 = probe, G = goal)*

a. **PCC (indirective):** $\mathbf{P_{p\text{-}(,\#\text{-})} \dots X_{\varphi\text{-defective}} \dots G}$

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

b. **PCC (secundative):** $\mathbf{P_{p\text{-}(,\#\text{-})} \dots X_{\varphi\text{-complete}} \dots G}$

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

- PCC reflects syntactic phi-dependencies: <u>phi-features</u> of G interact with <u>phrase-structurally nonlocal</u> X (R11).
  - The effect of PCC on case suggests that case is in the syntax as much as the phi-dependency: generaly (R11); or for person-bearers (Kal18).
  - But if case is outside syntax and PCC in syntax (P14), PCC-conditioned case such as 3rd-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 "3rd".

- 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 $>_{c\text{-commad}}$ 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 contruction (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.**DFLT** 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*[4]
Heillä   on   se/*sen   ~   *sinä→sinut
3PL.ADS be.DFLT 3SG.NOM/*ACC   *2SG.NOM→ACC
They have it/you.

b. *Nonagreeing clause under ECM*
(Väitettiin …) [heillä olevan se/*sen ~ *sinä→ sinut]
One claimed [them to have it/you]

c. *Biclausal*
Sinun   on helppo [$_{Rx}$ ampua   karhu   ~   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   <u>Interveners</u>

- 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 (Mlm12). **O is NOM***.

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

a.   He   lähettivät sukellusveneen~sinut [$_{Rx}$ upottamaan   laivan].
     3PL.**N**   sent.**3PL** submarine.**A**~2SG.**A**   to.sink   boat.**A**

b.   Sinne   lähetettiin sukellusvene~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. -$\varnothing$ 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   sukellusvene~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)

(13)   *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 [$_{Rx}$ to.sink 3PL.ACC/*NOM]

3.3   <u>Caseless infinitives</u>

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

(14)   *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/∅* 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.]

(15)   *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)*

P X_{def} G
p   → p   *1, *2, *3^+, 3/∅
→   SG, PL (+ MASC, etc.)

- 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_{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_{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. $3^+\rightarrow1/2$.
  - 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_{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 $G_{phi\text{-}complete}$.
  - 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]

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 #- therafter.

- **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_{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. φ, π, or π-part-spkr probe of the C-domain; relace # by π-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**$_{*i}$)   s Katkou [zapsat (ji$_i$)   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.**DFLT** submarine.**NOM**   to.sink   boat.**ACC/*NOM**
There came a submarine to sink the boat. (K02)

b. He   lähettivät **sukellusveneen**[$_{Rx}$ upottamaan   **laivan**].
3PL.**NOM** sent.**3PL** submarine.**ACC**   to.sink   boat.**ACC**
Theu sdent 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.shohot   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:

13

- 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, $\neq$ 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_{def} V_{fin} O/ADV.NOM versus X_{def} V_{fin} O.NOM ADV.ACC
X_{def} V_{fin} O.NOM [INF **O.NOM$\neq$ADV.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 contxts were O must be NOM (M93). So ACC might be adverbial case ($\rightarrow$ PART$_{NEG}$ –as ADV$_{ACC}$ $\rightarrow$ GEN$_{NEG}$ in Russian, M93).