

Issues in Case Theory
Howard Lasnik
University of Connecticut

- Part I**
1. the destruction *(of) Rome
 2. I am proud *(of) Mary
 3. *It seems [John to be here]
 4. *I tried [John to be here]
 5. *Who does it seem [t to be here]
 - 6a. The man [(who) [it seems [t is here]]]
 - b. *The man [(who) [it seems [t to be here]]]
 7. Wh-trace, though non-lexical, apparently requires Case.
 - 8a. John, I like him
 - b. John, I like his new book
 - c. *John's, I like his new book
 9. Topics, though lexical, apparently are not assigned Case.
 10. A CHAIN is Case-marked if it contains exactly one Case-marked position; a position in a Case-marked CHAIN is visible for θ -marking. K of L p.135
 11. I tried [PRO to be here] cf. 4.
 12. *It seems [there to be a man here]
 13. *I tried [there to be a man here]
 14. There' is a man' here
- Part II**
15. Someone is likely [t to be here]
 16. There is likely [t to be someone here]
 17. *There is likely [someone to be here]
 18. *We consider [there a man in the room] K of L p.92
 19. We consider [there to be a man in the room]
 20. We consider [there, likely [t, to be a man in the room]]
 21. There is no Case transmission. Case assignment is always direct. Be is a Case assigner.
 22. There is usually a car here
 23. *I heard usually a car (cf. I usually heard a man)
 24. A car is not here
 25. *I heard not a car
 26. Is a car here
 27. *Heard I a car
 28. [[There] [Tense be,] [usually t, a car here]]
 29. [[There] [Tense e] [usually be a car here]]
 30. [[A car] [Tense be,] [usually t, here]]
 31. [[A car] [Tense e] [not be here]]
 32. [[A car] [Tense will] [not be here]]
 33. *A car will be not here
 34. *A car will be usually here
 35. Will a car be here
 36. *Will be a car here
 37. *There will be usually a car here cf. 22.
 38. I believe [there to be a car here]
 39. *I believe [there to be usually a car here]
 40. ?There usually arrives a bus (at this time)
 41. *There arrives usually a bus (at this time)
 42. *There arrived not a bus [?There did not arrive a bus]
 43. *A bus arrived not [A bus did not arrive]
 44. *Arrived a bus [Did a bus arrive]
 45. 'Unaccusatives' are Case assigners too.
 46. When INFL is finite, an auxiliary verb (but not a main verb) may raise to it. When INFL is non-finite, neither an auxiliary verb nor a main verb may raise to it.
 - 47a. Do not hit Bill
 - b. *Hit not Bill
 - 48a. Do not be stubborn
 - b. *Be not stubborn
 - c. *Harry does not be stubborn
 - d. Harry is not stubborn
 49. A verb with a complement assigns Case if and only if it θ -marks its subject. K of L p.138
 50. Belletti proposes that 49. only holds for structural Case and that the Case assigned by unaccusatives and be is inherent (in the sense of K of L).

51. There is [a car here] (This sort of 'small clause' analysis would be precluded.)
52. The Case assigned is 'partitive' Case.
53. There is a car /*the car here
54. There arrived a man /*the man etc.
- Part III**
55. So why do expletives need Case? 'Traditional' Case filter (one last try): At S-structure, *NP that is lexical and lacks Case.
56. Who do you believe sincerely [t to be the best candidate]
57. *I believe sincerely [John to be the best candidate]
58. Wh-trace must be governed by a Case-assigner. Epstein (1987)
59. I consider Harry a wiseguy (cf. ex. 18)
60. [PRO to be a wiseguyl] is fun
61. At LF, all expletives must have been replaced, in conformity with 'Full Interpretation'. The expletive-argument S-structure CHAIN becomes an LF chain.
62. 'Visibility' constrains theta-assignment at both S-structure and LF (roughly in line with the Projection Principle). The S-structure requirement entails that arguments will be Case marked at S-structure. The LF requirement (almost) entails that expletives will be Case marked at S-structure.
63. A man's arrival
64. *There's arrival of a man
65. *Its likelihood that John will win
66. *Our belief of John to be intelligent
67. *Our proof of John to be intelligent
68. If α is an inherent Case-marker, then α Case-marks NP if and only if [α] theta-marks the chain headed by NP. K of L p.194
69. *There arrival of a man
70. The arrival of a man
71. To be visible as the target of NP movement, a position must have Case.
72. *Someone seems [there to be [t in the room]]
73. *Someone seems [there to have been arrested t]
74. Someone is certain [t to be here]

75. There is certain [t to be someone here]
76. *There is certain [there to be someone here]
77. *I tried [it to be likely [that Mary is a genius]]
78. I am happy [that Mary is a genius]
79. *I tried [[that Mary is a genius] to be likely]
80. I believe [[that Mary is a genius] to be likely]
- Part IV**
81. There arrived a man
- 82a. LF: A man arrived t
Nominative Partitive
- b. LF: A man arrived t
Nominative -Case
Partitive
- c. LF: A man arrived t
Nominative -Case
- 83a. *NP-t cf. 10.
+Case
- b. Must Case assignment be stipulated as obligatory?
- 84a. *John_i is believed [t_i is intelligent]
- b. *Mary_i is believed [Harry to like t_i]
- c. *Mary_i is believed [that Harry likes t_i]
- d. *Mary_i is believed [that she_i likes t_i]
- 85a. It strikes John that Mary is clever
- b. Mary strikes John as clever
- c. *John strikes t that Mary is clever
- 86a. *Mary_i is believed [that she_i glarfs t_i] (where glarf is just like like, except that it does not assign Case to an object)
- b. *Mary_i is believed [that she_i likes very much t_i]
- 87a. It clearly strikes John that Mary is clever
- b. *It strikes clearly John that Mary is clever
- c. *John strikes clearly t that Mary is clever Barss (1987)
88. NP-t must not be governed by a Case assigner. Epstein (1987) cf. 58.
89. John arrived t (If arrive assigns inherent Case, then 88. is not violated, assuming that inherent Case is only assignable at D-structure. Crucially, assignment of this Case must be optional, under Belletti's approach.)
- 90a. There is [someone here]
- b. Someone is [t here]
- c. Someone is here
- 91a. Why should be be the only 'exceptional' Case marker that assigns no θ -role to a subject?
- b. ??