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The *koiné* theory of nominative case has three tenets: (1) that T comes from the lexicon pre-equipped or unequipped to agree in φ-features with the subject; (2) that nom is assigned or valued through the process of agreement with T; and (3) that nominals must be licensed by case assignment. The general predictions of this theory include:

1. a nominal whose only possible source of licensing is φ-feature agreement with T must undergo movement such as Raising (or be licensed by some later-merged head), or else the result is "star";
2. only nominals will show the effects in 1.

The possibility of nominative objects in Icelandic infinitivals and similar phenomena in other languages poses a famous challenge to the first prediction. The second prediction faces equally severe, if less famous, challenges.

The best-known response to challenge (a) is the stream of research that includes Yip et al. (1987), Marantz (1991 "Case & Licensing"), and Bobaljik (2008). This response blames tenets (2) and (3) for the problem, and jettisons these assumptions, while retaining (1). I will argue against this response, and in favor of an alternative that retains (2) and (3), but jettisons (1).

In particular, I will argue that all clauses, finite and nonfinite alike, are generated as full finite CPs with the same potential for φ-agreement with the subject. As a consequence, case-licensing in general and nom assignment in particular are available to the subject of any clause, no matter whether it ends up finite or non-finite. I will propose that it is the extraction of a subject from its clause that may render the clause non-finite, rather than the non-finiteness of a clause that forces the subject to move. The rule that accomplishes this is *Exfoliation*, which strips away the outer layers of a clause if and only if the result permits a subject contacted by a clause-external probe to end up occupying the edge of its (newly pared-down) clause.

This is a strongly derivational theory of finiteness, and predicts a variety of opaque interactions concerning nom case ("nominative memories of a past life"). I will argue that these predictions are correct. Arguments include:

* infinitival clauses only acceptable when their subject has been extracted by Ā-movement (discovered by Kayne 1980)
* anaphor-agreement effects on nominative objects in Icelandic infinitives that are not agreed with on the surface, but were — before Exfoliation deleted the TP layer (narrowing down the space of hypotheses that account for anaphor-agreement effects in the first place)
* participant-related agreement effects under the same circumstances
* *possibly:* syncretism effects involving agreement morphology that never surfaces
* a new account of complementizer-trace effects, cross-cutting A and Ā movement