In sum, adult English and child English display different behavior concerning subject drop in

unmarked

$\text{b + Where + does?}$
$q_{\text{b + Where + does?}}$

Adden, line 94

Note 1-a. Topic/Drop drop in Early English is not possible in the embedded contexts

is found in the child English utterances.

Note 1-a. Child subjects in (5) should be nominals since the data like "him is broken"

\begin{itemize}
  \item \text{b - went in the basement that we do after supper (Lye '91)}
  \item \text{q - is broken (Hyman's '88)}
\end{itemize}

1. Topic/Drop drop in Early Child English

(a) I can't find the letter that I need.
(b) I can't find the letter that I need.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \text{b - they went away} \text{ \hspace{1cm} \text{(a)}}
  \item \text{b - they went away} \text{ \hspace{1cm} \text{(b)}}
\end{itemize}

2. Topic/Drop drop in Early Child English

Note 1-b. Topic/Drop drop is not possible in the embedded contexts (Hyman's '99;)

in (1b), for example.

Note 1-a. If missing subjects are recovered, they should bear nominative case; namely, she,

(S. Park, Journals)

\begin{itemize}
  \item \text{b - feel a joy yesterday, soon ended}
  \item \text{q - felt a joy of skin, all my hands
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \text{b - went away for a while}
  \item \text{q - went away for a while}
\end{itemize}

3. What happened to Mary?

Bracketry & Workers 1989:22, below, indicates the subject dropped by Topic/Drop drop.

Note 1-a. If reordered to (1a), or in Early sentences exemplified in (2), examples taken from

\begin{itemize}
  \item \text{b - adult English can drop his subjects even in the "finite" contexts when they are topics, as in}
\end{itemize}

1. Topic/Drop drop in Early English

4. Further Problems and Implications

3. Declarative Case Drop in Korean

2. Pronoun drop in Early Child English

1. Topic/Drop drop in Early English
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 governed by grammatical-functional principles such as recoverability or economy conditions. Process: Definite is a P-Operation which undergoes after Spell-Out, and if P-Operation is Default, cases can defend since it is recoverable with the least efforts. I assume that the 

Answer 3: Why can only default NOM drop freely?

Question 3: Many really disliked Kim.
Many non-NOM non-NOM really disliked

b. Many-Korean (non-NOM) contained himself
I-NOM you-NOM disliked REL reason-ACC know-G
(13) a. [non-NOM rel-NOM] [rel-NOM know-G]
Default NOM in Korean, on the other hand, can freely delete even in the embedded contexts.

As in (11b), if structural NOM in Korean can denote in the beginning of matrix clauses.

c. na-ne com

 b. na-com

A. like you.
I-NOM non-NOM like

(11) a. na-com non-NOM

"Adjectival" in Korean is not a case assigner as in English and parts in other languages. By virtue INFLs, whereas the second -ed in is provided as a default case since the category

In the following adjunct Korean sentences, the first -ed is a structural case which is assigned high in the c-command of matrix clauses.

I-NOM non-NOM like

(10) I-NOM non-NOM like

... /Heig-NOM non-NOM

The details.

Second NP/ACC in dual Korean, in the following child Korean influence (see NoN 194). In Korean, second children produce only NOM case errors, that is, they use NOM in the nonphonological NOM in contrast to that in English, which is nonphonological ACC/Hicense, non-phonological ACC sentence. Here, non-phonological NOM in Korean is optional to any caseless NP, as a default case. Nom that default case in Korean is as follows: if any caseless NP is other is assigned to any caseless NP, and the

3. Default case drop in Korean
ped-dropping movement of [features]."

Why can only (definites) AC subject (in nominal contexts) undergo pro drop? (Q2)

Answer 2

assessed any (structural) case, default AC is morphologically realized on it.

How is an AC subject possible with nominal INFL? (Question 1)

in some, pro drop in child English is strongly correlated with AC subject and nominal INFL.

Note 2-A. In Early English, there are a few examples where even in the embedded contexts, pro drop is possible. (2b, 2f, 13)

In modern English, there are a few examples where even in the embedded contexts, pro drop is possible. (2b, 2f, 13)

Note 2-B. The overt counterparts of missing subjects have accusative cases.
Consider the following table given by them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>2012a</th>
<th>2012c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aPT</td>
<td>INF</td>
<td>aPT</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bPT</td>
<td>INF</td>
<td>bPT</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following hypothetical examples, AC subjects always occur only with INFL-[-Vtense], [-Vtense]. INFs occur in this format. AC subjects of INF can occur only with [-Vtense], [+Vtense]. INFs are shown.

Sentence 1: Waters 1996 and Schneider 1997's claims on AC subject in child English:

Schneider claims that null subjects in child English come from the topic/direct object.

Sentence 1997's proposal on subject drop in child English:

4. Further Problems and Implications

1996 for discussion, and propose an independent subject projection. In 1996, Chomsky & Style 1996 claim that an...

K. Therefore, case drop does not affect any other considerations. Since the case node is identical in both the

Korean (IIb, d) are not topic phrases, but are left-dislocated phrases in Korean.

Question 4

Answer 4

How is functional drop possible in some restricted contexts as in (IIb, d)?
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Table 1. Distribution of Noun's 1st person singular subject pronouns (Schachter 1997:20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Form</th>
<th>Past Tense</th>
<th>Present Tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person Singular</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person Singular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person Singular</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Distribution of Noun's 1st person singular subject pronouns (Schachter 1997:227).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Form</th>
<th>Past Tense</th>
<th>Present Tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person Singular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person Singular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person Singular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Distribution of Noun's 1st person singular subject pronouns (Schachter 1997:230).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Subject Form</th>
<th>Past Tense</th>
<th>Present Tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Person</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Distribution of Noun's 1st person singular subject pronouns (Schachter 1997:230).

In summary, Schachter 1996 and Schachter 1997's analysis is not conclusive, and the production of the multi-word utterances (Wexler 1995).
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