

The Case of Expletives, and Related Mysteries
Howard Lasnik
University of Connecticut

Part I

1. What is the Case Filter?
2. There are well-known difficulties for a morphological interpretation.
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. 'LF Visibility': 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. Case "transmission" via a CHAIN: 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 car)
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 (as they must be if there is no Case transmission).
 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.
- Part III
47. A verb with a complement assigns Case if and only if it θ -marks its subject. K of L p.138
 48. Belletti proposes that 47. only holds for structural Case and that the Case assigned by unaccusatives and be is partitive, an inherent Case (in the sense of K of L).
 49. There is a car /*the car here
 50. There arrived a man /*the man etc.
 51. There is [a car here] (This sort of 'small clause' analysis would be precluded.)

Part IV

52. So why do expletives need Case?
53. At LF, all expletives must have been replaced, in conformity with 'Full Interpretation'. The expletive-argument S-structure CHAIN becomes an LF chain.
54. '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.
55. There is certain [t to be someone here]
56. *There is certain [there to be someone here]
57. To be visible as the target of NP movement, a position must have Case.
58. John is likely [t to be arrested t]
59. e was arrested John (A problem for 54?)
60. Case is relevant for visibility only where it could be relevant, i.e., S-structure or later, assuming S-structure assignment of Case
61. *I tried [it to be likely [that Mary is a genius]]
62. I am happy [that Mary is a genius]
63. *I tried [[that Mary is a genius] to be likely]
64. I believe [[that Mary is a genius] to be likely]

Part V

65. There arrived a man
- 66a. LF: A man arrived t
Nominative Partitive
- b. LF: A man arrived t
Nominative -Case
Partitive
- c. LF: A man arrived t
Nominative -Case
- 67a. *NP-t cf. 10.
+Case
- b. Must Case assignment be stipulated as obligatory?
- 68a. *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]
- 69a. It strikes John that Mary is clever
b. Mary strikes John as clever
c. *John strikes t that Mary is clever

- 70a. *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]
- 71a. 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)
72. NP-t must not be governed by a Case assigner. Epstein (1987)
73. John arrived t (If arrive assigns inherent Case, then 72. 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.)
- 74a. There is [someone here]
b. Someone is [t here]
c. Someone is here
- 75a. Why should be be the only 'exceptional' Case marker that assigns no θ -role to a subject?
b. ??