Since Case Theory was originally formulated as an explanatory principle (Veatch 1970; Chomsky 1981), it has been generally accepted that nominative Case in English—explored by morphological nominative case in the pronounal system—as a matter of fact, is restricted to a category of noun phrases that bear the functional projection of [NOM]. Specific restrictions on the use of nominative Case have been noted, however, by McFadden (2005), Sundaresan (2001b), and others. Similarly, the use of Case marking with non-verbal elements that are not nominative arguments has been noted by several scholars (e.g., Harley 1995, McFadden 2005).

Nominative Case in English is quite restricted in its distribution, and is typically assigned to subjects of verbs, and to the complements of certain other categories, such as infinitives and finite clauses. Although nominative Case is often used as a mark of subject identity, it is not always used in this way. For example, it is used to mark the subject of infinitival clauses, as in the following example:

(6) a. A preest men Hana called before I to leave [1402]
   b. Them eggs you couldn’t pick a daisy but it was a sin. Now, Aha. Although you couldn’t seem to like to live in Russia...They’re all tr

In contrast to other researchers, who used diachronic and non-standard experimental evidence of English essentially as primacy as challenges to the standard —Cf. Mourelle (1989), Malchukov (1993) attempts to find the possibility of nominative subjects in non-finite clauses in HE to the acceptability of two other phenomena observed in many HE varieties, both of which are difficult to explain in Standard-English: (a) NP subjects in non-finite clauses, illustrated in (7), and (b) ‘ Singular Consent’ with non-nominative subjects, in (8):

(7) a. ‘Tis a sin to the standard +Tns<...to the non-standard +Tns<
   b. ‘Tis a loss to the country, Michael to die...

In conclusion to other researchers, who used diachronic and non-standard experimental evidence of English essentially as primacy as challenges to the standard —Cf. Mourelle (1989), Malchukov (1993) attempts to find the possibility of nominative subjects in non-finite clauses in HE to the acceptability of two other phenomena observed in many HE varieties, both of which are difficult to explain in Standard-English: (a) NP subjects in non-finite clauses, illustrated in (7), and (b) ‘ Singular Consent’ with non-nominative subjects, in (8):

(8) a. I’m an in the age...to be married.
   b. I’m an in the country, Michael to die...
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(9) a. ‘Tis a sin to the standard +Tns<...to the non-standard +Tns<
   b. ‘Tis a loss to the country, Michael to die...
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