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 [it to be here]
6a. The man [(who) [it seems [it is here]]]
b. *The man [(who) [it seems [it 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 ß-marking. K of L p.135

11. *I tried [PRO to be here] of, 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 [it to be here]
16. There is likely [it 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 [it, 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 *(of, I usually heard a man)
24. A car is not here

25. *I heard not a car
26. *Is a car here
27. *Heard 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 of, 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 ß-marks its subject. K of L p.138

50. Baletti 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 etc.

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 (it 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 wiseguy] 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 (it to be here)

75. There is certain (it 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

   c. LF: A man arrived t
       Nominative -Case

83a. *NP-t cf. 10.
   +Case

   b. Must Case assignment be stipulated as obligatory?

84a. *John, is believed (t, is intelligent)
   b. *Mary, is believed (Harry to like t.)
   c. *Mary, is believed (that Harry likes t.)
   d. *Mary, is believed (that she, likes t.)

85a. It strikes John that Mary is clever
   b. Mary strikes John as clever
   c. *John strikes t that Mary is clever

86a. *Mary, is believed (that she, glarfs t.) (where glarfs is just like like, except that it does not assign Case to an object)
   b. *Mary, is believed (that she, likes very much t.)

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

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. ??