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1. CED

It is widely held that movement operation should somehow be properly constrained. As is illustrated in (1), movement out of subject domain in English (1a) is severely worse than that of object domain (1b), which is known as Subject Condition.

(1) a. *Who did [move about J] tell John?
   b. Who did you hear [move about J]

Movement out of adjunct domain is not permitted in English either (~Adjunct Condition).

(2) *Who did you have the party before meeting J?

Having (1a) unified these two conditions into a single powerful principle which

1) This is an interim report on the on-going research. More substantial research is under construction. The content of the paper was presented at the Symposium on Diachronic and Synchronic Studies of Asian and East Asian Languages of University of Southern California during November 1992. To thank the subject there for their kindness and patience, I wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to Dr. Jeong Yang, Hankuk Publishing Co.
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1. CED

It is widely held that movement operation should somehow be properly constrained. As illustrated in (1), movement out of subject domain in English (1a) is severely worse than that of object domain (1b), which is known as Subject Condition.

(1) a. *Who did [stories about _ ] terrify John?
     b. Who did you hear [stories about _ ]?

Movement out of adjunct domain is not permitted in English, either (=Adjunct Condition).

(2) **Who did you leave the party [before meeting _ ]?

Huang 1982 unified these two conditions into a single powerful principle which

---

1) This is an interim report on the on-going research. More elaborated version is under construction. The content of this paper was presented at the Symposium on Diachronic and Synchronic Studies of Syntax of East Asian Languages at University of Southern California during November 6-8, 1998. I would like to thank the audiences there for their feedback. I will incorporate their comments into the revised version of this paper. I wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere respect and affection to Dr. In-Seok Yang. Thank You.
is now known as CED, as roughly described in (3).

(3) Condition on Extraction Domain (Huang 1982)
Extraction is possible only from the complement domain

The CED is an essential technology that I am going to utilize in this paper without further elaboration.

2. Move-F

Another important concept that is central to our analysis is the so-called feature movement or Move-F hypothesis recently advanced in Chomsky's 1995 Minimalist Program. The core concept is summarized in (4).

(4) i. When a movement is overt, the entire category moves
   ii. When a movement is covert, only the formal features move

Once we add feature movement to our new technology, a novel question immediately arises: namely, is Move-F also subject to the CED?

3. Move-F and CED

In Takahashi 1997, null operator movement is reanalyzed as an instance of Move-F, and the contrast in (5) is argued to be subsumed to the CED effects.

(5) a. John is easy to please
   b. *John is easy to believe kissed Mary

That is, moving operator feature out of object operator as shown in (6a) is predicted to be better than that of subject operator as depicted in (6b).
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(6) a. John is easy [F(Op) [PRO to please [op ... _ ...]]]
   <F(Op) = Operator feature>
   b. John is easy [F(Op) [PRO to believe [[op ... _ ...] kissed Mary]]

The coverage of CED can be further extended to the Ellipsis phenomena. Pesetsky 1992 analyzed phonomically null Comp in English as a zero bound morpheme. He further suggested that null Comp moves to the matrix verb. Adopting Move-F theory, null C movement can now be reinterpreted as simply another instance of "feature" movement of C. Then the contrasts in (7) automatically follow, since moving out of subject domain in (7b) and adjunct domain in (7c) are ruled out by the CED on a par with the operator movement in English as discussed in Takahashi 1997.

(7) a. Mary believes (that) the world is round
   b. *(That) the world is round was known to the ancient Greeks
   c. The army retreated, *(that) it might fight another day

4. Case Checking in Korean

So far, I have laid out some theoretical background for the main argument of this paper. Now let us get into the main theme of this paper: case deletion in Korean. The leading idea of case checking mechanism (a la Kim 1998a) that I will assume in this paper is summarized in (8).

(8) a. Case feature of phonetically covert D is checked via feature movement
   → Case drop effects are now subsumed under covert movement of case features
   b. Case feature of phonetically overt D is checked via category movement

If case drop is understood as invisible case-feature movement, numerous desirable consequences follow. I hereby consider them one by one (concerning case drop...
in Korean, see preliminary discussion in Ahn 1996).

First of all, as shown in (9), nominative case drop in complement domain is expected to be acceptable since moving case features out of complement domain is lawful.

(9) Sue-ka Mary-(ka) cengmal silhesse (Multiple NOM clause)
    Sue-TOP Mary-(NOM) really disliked
    'Sue really disliked Mary.'

In contrast to Nom case drop in complement domain, Nom drop in subject domain is almost impossible since movement of case features from subject domain will result in Subject Condition violation. This is demonstrated in (10).

(10) John-ul Mary-?*(ka) poasse (Scrambled sentence)
    John-ACC Mary-(NOM) saw
    'Mary, John saw.'

Thus, (9) and (10) show the typical subject/object asymmetry of feature movement concerning CED.

Note further that accusative case deletion in Korean displays argument/adjunct asymmetry. As in (11), Acc case drop in complement domain is expected to be OK.

(11) Mary-ka John-(ul) ton-(ul) manhi cwuesse (Multiple ACC clause)
    Mary-NOM John-(ACC) money-(ACC) a lot gave
    'Mary gave John money a lot.'

Whereas, as in (12) Acc case drop in adjunct domain is marginal, as is independently pointed out in O'Grady 1998 and Kim 1998b.

(12) Mary-ka TV-lul SONY-??(lul) pissakey sasse (Multiple ACC clause)
    Mary-NOM TV-ACC SONY-(ACC) expensively bought
    'Mary bought SONY TV expensively.'
The marginality in (12) results from the Adjunct Condition violation since the case feature moves out of adjunct term $SONY$ in (12).

Genitive case deletion exhibits the full-fledged contrasts. First, Gen case can drop in complement domain, as is put forward in Hong 1994. This is illustrated in (13).

(13) cekkwun-uy tosi-(uy) phakoy
    enemy-GEN city-GEN destruction
    'the enemy's destruction of the city'

However, if genitive case drops in adjunct domain, it becomes marginal as shown in (14).

(14) LA-lopwute-??(uy) chwulpal
    LA-from-GEN departure
    'the departure from LA'

Furthermore, Gen case drop in subject domain is almost impossible.

(15) cekkwun-?*(uy) tosi-(uy) phakoy
    enemy-GEN city-GEN destruction
    'the enemy's destruction of the city'

In a nutshell, case drop in Korean exactly mirrors the essential properties of movement with respect to the CED, and hence, the treatment of case drop in terms of feature movement technology seems to be on the right tract.

5. Apparent NOM Drop

Now let us consider some apparent problems of the Move-F analysis of case deletion. Consider (16) where Nom appears to be able to drop contra our claim.
I would like to claim that apparent NOM drop DP is not a genuine NOM drop but is an instance of Presenting Topic or Left Dislocation in Korean (see Hong 1994 and Kim 1998a-b for related discussion).

In what follows, I will present some pieces of evidence to lend support to the claim that apparent Nom drop is in fact Left Dislocation in Korean.

First, only Left Dislocated DP, namely naked N (or caseless N), can license resumptive pronoun. This is shown in (17) where only Left Dislocated subject DP can license resumptive pronoun.

(17) a. Mary, na-nun kunye-ka yeypputa-ko saengkakhanta
   Mary, I-TOP she-NOM is pretty-COMP think
   'Mary, I think that she is pretty.'
   b. ??Mary-ka, na-nun kunye-ka yeypputa-ko saengkakhanta
   c. ??Mary-nun, na-nun kunye-ka yeypputa-ko saengkakhanta

(18) further illustrates the data that shows that only Left Dislocated Object DP licenses resumptive pronoun.

(18) a. ku chayk, Mary-ka kukel ilknunta
    that book, Mary-NOM it reads
    'that book, Mary reads it.'
   b. ??ku chayk-ul, Mary-ka kukel ilknunta
   c. ??ku chayk-un, Mary-ka kukel ilknunta

Returning to the example (16) repeated here, we can now regard this caseless Mary as Left Dislocated NP with null resumptive pronoun in original subject position.

(16) Mary pro ku chaek-(ul) ilkessni
    Mary that book-ACC read
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‘Did Mary read that book?’

Note further that NOM drop is not allowed in embedded contexts, as seen in (19).

(19) a. na-nun ecey Mary-?*(ka) coaha-nun ye-ca-lul mannassta
   I-TOP yesterday Mary-NOM like-REL woman-ACC met
   ‘Yesterday I met the woman who Mary likes.’

   b. na-nun hakkyo-eyse Mary-?*(ka) John-ul ttaylyessta-ko saengkakhanta
   I-TOP school-at Mary-NOM John-ACC hit-COMP think
   ‘I think that Mary hit John at school.’

Since left Dislocation is generally barred in embedded contexts, impossible Nom drop in (19) can be naturally explained.

Another piece of evidence comes from the interaction with wh-words. Observe (20).

(20) a. nwukwu-?*(ka) ecey John-ul mannas-ni?
   who-NOM yesterday John-ACC met-Q
   ‘Who met John yesterday?’

   b. ne-nun ecey nwukwu-(Iul) mannas-ni?
   you-TOP yesterday who-ACC met-Q
   ‘Who did you meet yesterday?’

Here Nom drop in (20a) is not possible on a wh-word in wh-question in sharp contrast with Acc drop. Recall that case can drop only in object domain. That implies the fact that naked wh-subject is an instance of Left Dislocation.

In connection with (20), consider (21).

(21) Speaker A: nwukwu-ka nay chayk-ul ilkess-ni?
   who-NOM my book-ACC read-Q
   ‘Who read my book?’

Speaker B: Mary-?*(ka) akka kuke-lul ilkesseyo
   Mary-NOM a while ago it-ACC read
'Mary read it a while ago.'

Here Nom drop is not possible in reply to wh-question, too. If Left Dislocated phrase should be interpreted as definite or specific, ban on Left Dislocated wh-phrase in (20a), and ban on answer to wh-question in (21) are naturally accounted for.

(22) basically shows that Right Dislocation in Korean normally disallows case-marker drop in contrast to Left Dislocation.

(22) a. Mary-ka eyecy poassta, ku yengwha-??(lul)
   Mary-NOM yesterday saw, that movie-ACC
   'Mary saw yesterday, that movie.'

 b. chayksang-wiey pwunmyenghi issessta, ku kangaci-??(ka)
   desk-on clearly was that puppy-NOM
   '(There) was clearly on the desk, that puppy.'

  c. cekkwun-uy chimly ak:,
     tosi-??(uy)
   enemy-GEN invasion, city-GEN
   'the enemy's invasion, of the city'

Perhaps right dislocation in Korean creates "adjunction" structure, and hence feature movement (to check case features) is prohibited from this position.

6. Case Drop in Multiple Case Constructions

Now let us consider some unexpected symmetries in multiple case constructions in Korean in relation to case deletion. Case Drop in Multiple Case Constructions in Korean is particularly interesting since it doesn't display argument/adjunct asymmetry. Consider multiple Acc constructions, first.

(23) Mary-ka TV-lul SONY-??(lul) pissakey sasse (= (12))
Mary-NOM TV-ACC SONY-(ACC) expensively bought
'Mary bought SONY TV expensively.'
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(24) Mary-ka Sue-lul elkwal-??(lul) seykey ttaylyesse
Mary-NOM Sue-ACC face-(ACC) hard hit
'Mary hit Sue hard on the face.'

(25) Mary-ka Sue-lul meli-??(lul) manhi callasse
Mary-NOM Sue-ACC hair-(ACC) too a lot cut
'Mary cut Sue's hair a lot.'

(23) is an instance of Acc case drop from the adjunct since the verb sa- 'buy' doesn't directly θ-select case-deleted nominal SONY. (24) and (25), on the other hand, may be instances of Acc case deletion from the argument (or complement) because the verbs ttayli- 'hit' and calu- 'cut' θ-select the case-deleted nominals.

Here's my tentative solution to this unexpected symmetry of grammatical judgment, although the judgment itself is somewhat murky. Suppose that the structure of (23) is like (26) where SONY is base-generated as an adjunct (# indicates case drop).

(26) \[\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{TV-lul} \quad \text{SONY-#}
\end{array}\]

Further, suppose that the structure of (25) is like (27) which indicates possessor(Sue) raising structure (# indicates case drop):

(27) \[\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Sue-lul} \quad \text{meli-#}
\end{array}\]
Then, movement of Acc case features of SONY in (23) violates Adjunct Condition, while that of meli ‘hair’ in (25) violates some version of Freezing Principle, or they both violate Subjacency—namely, crossing 2 bounding (DP) nodes in one hop. The structure of (24) can be either (26) or (27). In any event, moving Acc feature of elkwul ‘face’ will yield mild Subjacency violation.

Consider further that multiple Nom constructions in Korean exhibit similar symmetries. Observe the following examples:

(28) TV-ka SONY-??(ka) cengmal pissata  
TV-NOM SONY-NOM really expensive  
‘As for the TV, SONY is really expensive.’

(29) Mary-ka elkwul-??(i) cengmal yeppputa  
Mary-NOM face-NOM really pretty  
‘As for Mary, her face is really pretty.’

(30) Mary-ka apeci-??(ka) cengmal pwucata  
Mary-NOM father-NOM really rich  
‘Mary's father is really rich. (As for Mary, her father is really rich.)’

(28) may be an instance of Nom deletion from the adjunct. In contrast, (29) and (30) presumably are all instances of Nom deletion out of (argument) subject. Here, too, Nom drop is “uniformly” marginal—they are all two ?s to my ear.

Let us assume (31) for the structure of (28) in which SONY is a base-generated adjunct.

(31)

```
        IP
       /   \  
      DP    T'
    / |  \ 
   DP  DP  
 TV-ka SONY-
```

Assume, further, the structure of (30) as (32) which indicates possessor (Mary) raising structure:
The second DP$s in multiple NOM constructions cannot drop case since the movement of case feature from the second DP will violate Subjacency on a par with multiple ACC constructions in Korean.

One might wonder how Nom deletion in this context does not yield Subject Condition violation. If so, Nom deletion here should be completely ruled out. One possible speculation is that Nom feature in second DP of (28)-(30) are directly checked by the verb; i.e. the subject DP$s in these data are all in the complement domain unlike genuine subjects. Therefore, these sentences only give rise to mild Subjacency violation.\(^2\)

7. Scrambling and Acc Drop

Now let us consider how ACC-caseless DP can undergo scrambling, as in (33).

(33) a. ne-nun [ku chayk-(ul) [Mary-ka Bill-eykey _ cwun]] sasil-ul alkoiss-ni?
    You-TOP that book-ACC Mary-NOM Bill-DAT gave fact-ACC know-Q
    'Do you know the fact that Mary gave the book to Bill?'

    b. Sue-ka [Mary-(Iul) [maeil _ mannanta]]
    Sue-NOM Mary-ACC everyday meet
    'Sue meets Mary everyday.'

2) Case deletion of genuine subjects in multiple Nom constructions is pretty much degraded, in contrast with the data in (28)-(30). Witness:

(i) Mary-ka apeci-*'(ka) John-ul ttaylyessta
    Mary-NOM father-(NOM) John-ACC hit
    'Mary's father hit John. (As for Mary, her father hit John.)'
Here caseless DPs appear to have nothing to do with Left Dislocation since they all take place in embedded contexts. Several speculations to solution are in order:

i) Scrambled position is L-marked, or

ii) Scrambling is freely undone at LF, and case-feature movement applies, or

iii) Scrambling is in fact a substitution operation

Any of these speculations may fit in the current analysis of licensing the scrambled Acc-deleted DPs.

Note in passing that case adjacency effect in English can be derived from the CED effects of feature movement, too. Consider (34).

(34) a. John sees Mary recently
    b. ??John [[sees _ recently] Mary]

(35) a. John knocked on it recently
    b. John [[knocked _ recently] on it]

In (34b) adverb cannot position between verb and its DP complement. However, adverb-intervening is permitted between verb and its PP complement in English. Given that main verb in English doesn't move, V-Adv-DP order can only be obtained by rightward movement of Mary in (34b). Assuming that rightward moved Mary is in an “adjoined” position, moving Acc case feature of Mary will result in the CED violation (if Acc case checking is covert in English). Rightward moved PP on it in (35b), on the other hand, does not necessarily enter into further checking relation—namely, case feature movement, thus, case adjacency condition doesn’t hold here (See Ahn 1994 for further details).

8. What’s Wrong with Naked Anaphors

Finally, let us consider some peculiar property of case deletion of anaphors in Korean which is illustrated in (36) (See Yoon 1998 for related discussion).
(36) a. Mary-ka casin-?*(ul) simhakeynamwulaessta  
Mary-NOM self-ACC severely blamed  
'Mary blamed herself severely.'

b. Mary-ka casin-*{(i) cikcep wassta  
Mary-NOM self-NOM in person came  
'Mary herself came in person.'

In (36a) Acc case drop is marginal, whereas Nom case drop in (36b) is totally impossible.

Two puzzles come up immediately:

i) Why can't we delete case with Korean anaphor casin?

ii) Why is dropping case in (36b) much worse than that in (36a)?

Here's the possible answer to the first puzzle i):

I'd like to suggest that the antecedent Mary in (36) moves from the [Mary casin] complex structure in (37) where the anaphor is base-generated as an adjunct, and hence the casin in (36) is a residue of the antecedent movement.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Mary-ka} \\
\text{casin-#} \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus, the feature movement out of casin will first of all result in Adjunct Condition violation. Hence, mild Subjacency violation in (36a).

Now let us answer the second puzzle ii):

The Move-F out of casin in (36b) will cause additional Subject Condition violation unlike that in (36a). Thus, the deviance in (36b) is expected to be much stronger than that in (36a). Hence, strong Subjacency violation in (36b).

Note incidentally that if anaphor movement in English is also a species of (anaphoric) feature movement, anaphoric Move-F in the following (38) would end
up with Subject Condition violation. Hence ungrammatical.

(38) a. *Mary thinks that [[a herself] likes John]
   b. *Mary considers [[a herself's brother] a genius]

Anaphors in specifier position sharply contrast with those in adjoined position, as shown in (39).

(39) a. ??Mary thinks that herself, John likes
   b. ??Who do you wonder [how many pictures of t₁]₂ John saw t₂

Perhaps moving out of subject domain in general is more severely restricted than moving out of adjoined position. Hence, the contrast between (38) and (39) follows.

9. In Lieu of Conclusion: Further Implications

In this last section, I would like to provide some further implications of the theory of feature movement in correlation with CED.

Consider, for example, wanna-contraction in (40).

(40) a. They want [PRO to kiss Mary]
   b. They wanna kiss Mary

One well-known question is: Why PRO doesn't block wanna-contraction.

Perhaps one might argue that PRO-movement can be either feature movement as depicted in (41a), or covert "head" movement of all the formal features of PRO, adjoining to nonfinite INFL to, as shown in (41b).

(41) a. They want [F-to [[PRO...]] kiss Mary]]
   b. They want [PRO-to [ₜPRO kiss Mary]]
Interestingly however, quantifier stranding fact in (42) shows that feature movement analysis might be more appropriate solution, given the assumption that quantifiers should be sister to their licensors.

(42) a. *They want all to kiss Mary
   b. They want to all kiss Mary

In other words, if only the case feature of PRO raises to INFL leaving behind other semantic features in-situ, the quantifier all is predicted to remain below the embedded INFL. Then, the another novel question arises: How can the feature movement out of categories in specifier positions be immune to the CED violation?

Similar question arises with respect to the following there-construction:

(43) There are [a students waiting for you]

If a certain formal feature inside the DP students should move to the expletive there, how this process can successfully circumvent the CED violation (note: the DP students is in SPEC of a).

Here's a quote from Takahashi (1997: 194-5):

One possibility is to assume that the Subjacency Condition constrains only non-L-related movement (that is, movement to non-L-related positions such as SpecCP and Comp). At least empirically, this is not so implausible, because, as far as I know, no case of L-related movement (namely, movement to L-related positions such as SpecIP and Infl) that has been reported is ungrammatical only due to violation of the Subjacency Condition. [emphasis mine]

In fact, this paper has been solely concerned with "L-related"-type feature movement with a good amount of empirical data from case deletion phenomena in Korean. Then, numerous genuine problems (including the ones which we have witnessed in this section) call for deeper explanation.
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