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Ahn & Cho (2006a,b, 2007, 2009) suggest that non-Case-marked nominals are part of complex predicate or instances of left dislocation (LD). More specifically, the complex predicate option is available only when a bare NP takes place inside V domain. The other bare NPs are analyzed as LD. Ahn & Cho (2009) further propose that Korean has two types of LD: Hanging Topic LD (HTLD) and Clitic LD (CLLD). Given this analysis, we can resolve the puzzles on non-Case nominals pointed out by Bak (2008), Hong (2011) and Lee (2012). Clause-internal Caseless objects that Bak (2008) points out are analyzed as CLLDs that can be embedded. Clause-internal Caseless subjects that Lee (2012) indicates are also analyzed as embedded CLLDs. Finally, the examples Hong (2011) indicates are analyzed as HTLDs (crucially not CLLDs).
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1. Introduction


(1) a. Chelswu-ka ecey Yenghi-(lul) manna-ss-e.
   C-Nom yesterday Y.-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
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'Chelswu met Yenghi yesterday.'

b. Yenghi-lul ecey Chelswu-*ka) manna-ss-e.
Y.-Acc yesterday C.-Nom meet-Pst-Dec

'Chelswu met Yenghi yesterday.'

Accusative Case marker can be unpronounced when nominals are in complement positions as shown in (1a). Nominative Case marker in a "canonical" subject position, in contrast, must be pronounced as shown in (1b).¹ Ahn & Cho (2006a,b, 2007, 2009) suggest that non-occurrence of the nominative Case marker is an instance of Left-dislocation (LD) and the like.

In this paper we will reconsider Ahn & Cho's (2006a,b, 2007, 2009) analysis in more details, and explore questions raised by Bak (2008), Hong (2011), and Lee (2012). This paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we briefly review Ahn & Cho's (2006a,b, 2009) analysis of non-Case-marked nominals. In section 3-5, we discuss puzzles on non-Case-marked nominals pointed out by Bak (2008), Hong (2011) and Lee (2012) and resolve them. Concluding remarks are provided in section 6.


Ahn & Cho's (2006a,b, 2007, 2009) analysis is based on the following articulated structure of nominal projections in Korean.²

¹ A canonical subject position refers to Spec of T. An anonymous reviewer raises a question about the position of ecey 'yesterday' in (1). Although ecey has temporal information, its attached position doesn't seem to be restricted to TP only, as shown in (i).

(i) Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul seem-eyse ecey manna-ss-e.
C.-Nom Y.-Acc bookstore-at yesterday meet-Pst-Dec

'Chelswu met Yenghi at the bookstore yesterday.'

Note that the object Yenghi-lul 'Yenghi-Acc' and seem-eyse 'at the bookstore' precede ecey 'yesterday' in (i). The adjunct seem-eyse 'bookstore-at' doesn't seem to undergo scrambling, which may imply that ecey 'yesterday' isn't attached to TP or T.'

² See Déchaine & Wiltsko (2002) for further discussion of internal structure of DP in this regard.
There are three independent layers in (2): DP, ΦP, and NP. Suppose that these layers can be freely projected in Korean. Then, (2) may give rise to four possible nominal layouts: namely, NP, ΦP and DP with or without ΦP as an intermediate layer. Ahn & Cho propose that the first possibility, NP layout, can only arise in complement positions, and it undergoes syntactic complex predicate formation with the selecting verb. They further propose that the DP without ΦP is an instance of typical Case-marked nominals: NP-ka, NP-lul. The projection of the DP with ΦP and the bare ΦP received detailed discussions in Ahn & Cho’s proposal.3

Ahn & Cho’s (2006a,b, 2007, 2009) main proposal is summarized as three parts. First, let us look at Caseless objects in the canonical position as shown in (3).

(3) Chelswu-ka ecey Yenghi-(lul) manna-ss-e.
   C.-Nom yesterday Y.-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘Chelswu met Yenghi yesterday.’

An object without a Case marker in its canonical position is a bare NP that is part of a syntactic complex predicate. The syntactic option is only available with bare NPs in Korean (but not DP, ΦP, for example) and is not available if a bare NP takes place outside of V domain.4 Bak (2008), however, doubts whether

3 In Korean, we assume that D is correlated with Case, following Ahn (1988). The correlation of D and Case is also found in other languages. For example, in German, the determiner alters its shape according to Case value: e.g. der(Nom)/den(Acc)/dem(Dat)/des(Gen) Tag ‘the day’. Ahn & Cho assume that bare NPs that don’t have functional layers don’t have formal features like phi-features and Case feature.

4 An anonymous reviewer points out the following contrasts.

(i) a. Chelswu-ka kuphi Yenghi-lul manna-si-ta.
      C.-Nom hurriedly Y.-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
all (clause-internal) Caseless objects can be analyzed as part of a syntactic complex predicate, and we will return to his objections with our replies in more details in section 3.

'Chelswu hurriedly met Yenghi.'
b. *Chelswu-ka kuphi Yenghi manna-ss-ta.
   C.-Nom hurried Y. meet-Pst-Dec
   'Chelswu hurriedly met Yenghi.'
(ii) a. Chelswu-ka sip nyen-ceney sakwi-ess-ten Yenghi-lul
      C.-Nom 10 year-ago date-Pst-REL Y.-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
      'Chelswu met Yenghi who Chelswu dated 10 years ago.
      C.-Nom 10 year-ago date-Pst-REL Y. meet-Pst-Dec
      'Chelswu met Yenghi who Chelswu dated 10 years ago.

According to the reviewer, (ib) and (iib) are degraded in grammaticality. Interestingly, without VP and NP adjuncts, the sentences become well-formed, as shown in (iii).

(iii) Chelswu-ka Yenghi manna-ss-ta.
   C.-Nom Y. meet-Pst-Dec
   'Chelswu met Yenghi.'

The syntactic complex predicate formation in (iii) occurs as shown in (iv) (cf. Marantz 1984, Larson 1988).

(iv) \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{NP} \\
   \text{Yenghi manna-ss-ta}
   \end{array}
   \rightarrow
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{V} \\
   \text{Yenghi manna-ss-ta}
   \end{array}
\]

If the contrasts are real, one might suggest that syntactic complex predicate formation is not possible with adjunction structure, as shown in (v).

(v) a. \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{adjunct} \\
   \text{NP}
   \end{array}
   \rightarrow
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{VP} \\
   \text{V}
   \end{array}
\]
   b. \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{NP} \\
   \text{VP}
   \end{array}
   \rightarrow
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{NP} \\
   \text{V}
   \end{array}
\]

If syntactic complex predicate formation occurs in (va), either the higher or the lower segment of VP will become a V. However, neither of them are syntactic terms since only "categories" can be terms according to Chomsky (1995). Since only terms can undergo syntactic operation, the VP structure of (va) cannot form a syntactic predicate formation. Likewise, in (vii), since the NP is a two-segment category, syntactic complex predicate formation isn't possible. However, we don't get the contrast as sharp as the reviewer, so we leave this problem open for both empirical and theoretical reconsideration.
Second, let us look at a Caseless subject in canonical position as in (4).

(4) “Yenghi-lul ecey Chelswu manna-ss-e.
   Y.-Acc yesterday C. meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘Chelswu met Yenghi yesterday.’

In (4), the bare NP subject Chelswu makes the sentence ill-formed. According to Ahn & Cho’s (2006a,b, 2009) analysis, bare NPs are lacking in functional projections, so they cannot participate in formal licensing requirement of T. As a result, T in (4) has an uninterpretable feature not checked, which makes (4) ill-formed.

Lee (2012) raises a non-trivial question concerning this observation. She indicates some examples which show that a bare NP subject occurs in OSV word order. We will come back to her observation with our replies in section 4.

Third, consider Caseless subjects/objects in non-canonical positions.

(5) a. [NP Chelswu], ecey pro Yenghi-lul manna-ss-e.
     C. yesterday Y.-Acc meet-Pst-Dec
     ‘Chelswu met Yenghi yesterday.’

b. [NP Yenghi], Chelswu-ka ecey pro manna-ss-e.
   Y. C.-Nom yesterday meet-Pst-Dec
   ‘Chelswu met Yenghi yesterday.’

Ahn & Cho propose that the Caseless subject/object is a left-dislocated bare NP that undergoes SubMove out of ΦP, stranding a resumptive pronoun (here null pronoun pro) in Φ. The landing site of this NP is the Spec-Force position where it is assigned a generalized theta-role "aboutness". Then, (5a) has the derivational structure like (6).
Movement of the bare NP to Spec-Force is triggered by the theta-theoretic requirement because the NP cannot obtain a theta role in Spec-\(v\). Note that pro and its antecedent are distinct syntactic entities and they form a constituent upon First Merge. The movement of \(\Phi P\) to Spec-T is triggered by \(\Phi\)-features on T (Agree). Note further that the LDed NP undergoes SubMove to Spec-Force where it gets a theta-role "aboutness," so it fulfills the Full Interpretation.\(^5\)

\(^5\) The \(\Phi P\) structure depicted here, hosting NP and \(\Phi\), is reminiscent of doubling constituents independently advanced by Kayne (2005) for a unified analysis of clitic doubling (iia), and antecedent-pronoun relation (iiia).

(i) a. cela est-il vrai?
that is-it true
b. [cela il] est vrai \(\rightarrow\) verb movement est, [cela il] t, vrai
\(\rightarrow\) movement of the double: cela, est, [l il] t, vrai

(ii) a. John thinks he is smart.
    b. thinks [John he] is smart \(\rightarrow\) movement of the double: John, thinks [l he] is smart

As shown in (iiib), clitic and double are merged together underlyingly, and subsequently separated by the movement of the double. Similarly, the pronoun and its antecedent are merged together, as shown in (iiia) from the beginning to capture the coreference relation as agreement, and subsequently separated. The movement of John is motivated for a theta-theoretic reason since the theta role of the predicate smart is assigned to the larger constituent [John he], hence subsequently transferred.
There are some predictions under SubMove analysis of Caseless NPs in dislocated positions: One is that the fronted bare WH can give rise to only D-Linked interpretation.

(7) a. (i ćwungeyse) nwukwu ęcey Yenglish-lul manna-ss-ni?
    this among who yesterday Y.-Acc meet-Pst Q
    ‘Who is such that he/she met Yenglish yesterday?’
b. (i ćwungeyse) nwukwu ęcey Chelswu-ka manna-ss-ni?
    this among who yesterday C.-Nom meet-Pst Q
    ‘Who is such that Chelswu met him/her yesterday?’

WH nwukwu ‘who’ in (a-b) yields only D-linked reading for those who accept these sentences. Ahn & Cho claim that the D-linked property of LDed WH hinges on the nature of SubMove: the chain <nwukwu pro> induces only D-linked reading like many other wh-resumption or wh-clitic doubling constructions (Boeckx 2003, 2004, Boeckx & Grohmann 2004, Grohmann 2006, Hirose 2003, Jaeger 2003, 2004, Kallulli 2005). Hong (2011), however, points out that there are some examples problematic under Ahn & Cho’s SubMove analysis, and we will discuss his arguments with our replies in section 5.


Bak (2008) doubts whether all (clause-internal) Caseless objects can be analyzed as part of a syntactic complex predicate as shown in (8).

(8) a. Chelswu-ka ęcey secem-eyse soselchayk sa-ss-e.
    C.-Nom yesterday bookstore-at novel buy-Pst-Dec
    ‘Chelswu bought a novel at a bookstore yesterday.’
b. Chelswu-ka ęcęy soselchayk secem-eyse sa-ss-e.
    C.-Nom yesterday novel bookstore-at buy-Pst-Dec
    ‘Chelswu bought a novel at a bookstore.’
c. Chelswu-ka soselchayk ęcęy secem-eyse sa-ss-e.
    C.-Nom novel yesterday bookstore-at buy-Pst-Dec

To the head of doubling structure, he Given that the binder and the bindee start off as one constituent and split up in the course of derivation, the antecedent-pronoun relations are naturally captured without positng index convention that is independently barred by Inclusiveness Condition put forward in Chomsky (1995, 2000, 2001).
Hee-Don Ahn, Sungeun Cho

‘Chelswu bought a novel at a bookstore yesterday.’

(d) Soselchayk Chelswu-ka ecey secem-eyse sa-ss-e.
   novel C-Nom yesterday bookstore-at buy-Pst-Dec
   ‘Chelswu bought a novel at a bookstore yesterday.’

The bare NP in (8a) is part of syntactic complex predicate. Note that this option is not available if a bare NP takes place outside of V domain (cf. Im 2007). Hence, soselchayk ‘novel’ in (8b-d) doesn’t form a syntactic complex predicate.\(^6\)

Under the analysis of Ahn & Cho (2009), the bare NP in (8d) undergoes clitic left-dislocation (CLLD), as shown in (9).

(9) Soselchayk, Chelswu-ka ecey secem-eyse \([_{op} t, \text{pro}]\) sa-ss-e.

The contrast in (10B-B’) supports our claim.\(^7\)

\(^6\) Bak’s (2008) analysis is similar to ours in that the bare object in (8a) is in the base-generated position while the ones in (8b-c) undergo movement.

\(^7\) A reviewer raises one possibility that the awkwardness of the answers in (10) may stem from the fact that the answers are basically repeating what has been stated in the questions. He points out that if all the redundant portions of the answers are gotten rid of, it sounds more natural as shown in (B’).

(j) A: Chelswu-ka ecey secem-eyse mwe sa-ss-ri?
   C-Nom yesterday bookstore-at what buy-Pst-Q
   ‘What did Chelswu buy at a bookstore?’
B: Soselchayk sa-as-e.
   novel buy-Pst-Dec
   ‘Chelswu bought a novel at a bookstore.’
B': Soselchayk secem-eyse sa-as-e.
   novel bookstore-at buy-Pst-Dec
   ‘Chelswu bought a novel at a bookstore.’
B": Soselchayk secem-eyse sa-as-e.
   bookstore-at novel buy-Pst-Dec
   ‘Chelswu bought a novel at a bookstore.’

Note, however, that in the question-answer pair the redundant portion is often replaced by a pro form. The acceptability of the answers that contain a pro form, \textit{kekise ‘there’} seems to pattern with (B’) and (B’).
Notes on Non-occurrence of Case Markers

(10) A: Chelswu-ka ecey secem-eyse mwe sa-ss-ni?
   C.-Nom yesterday bookstore-at what buy-Pst-Q
   'What did Chelswu buy at a bookstore yesterday?'

B: Chelswu-ka ecey secem-eyse soselchayk sa-ss-e.
   C.-Nom yesterday bookstore-at novel buy-Pst-Dec
   'Chelswu bought a novel at a bookstore yesterday.'

B': #Soselchayk Chelswu-ka ecey secem-eyse sa-ss-e.
   novel C.-Nom yesterday bookstore-at buy-Pst-Dec
   'Chelswu bought a novel at a bookstore yesterday.'

An answer to a question should be an information focus. Soselchayk 'novel' in (10B) isn’t Topic, so it can be an answer to a question. However, soselchayk 'novel' in (10B') is an LDed topic, which cannot be part of focus or new information.

Regarding (8b-c), we suggest that the bare NP soselchayk 'novel' can also be analyzed as CLLD in a clause-internal position. Note that CLLD can be embedded cross-linguistically. Thus, (8b-c) can now be represented as (11).

(11) a. Chelswu-ka ecey soselchayk secem-eyse [Ø t, pro] sa-ss-e. (=8b)
    b. Chelswu-ka soselchayk ecey secem-eyse [Ø t, pro] sa-ss-e. (=8c)

Evidence for the topichood of the bare NP soselchayk 'novel' is observed in (12): They are marginal or degraded.8

(12) A: Chelswu-ka ecey secem-eyse mwe sa-ss-ni?
   C.-Nom yesterday bookstore-at what buy-Pst-Q
   'What did Chelswu buy at the bookstore yesterday?'

B: ??Chelswu-ka ecey soselchayk secem-eyse sa-ss-e.

B': ??Soselchayk kekise sa-ss-e.
   novel there buy-Pst-Dec
   'Chelswu bought a novel there.'

B": ?Kekise soselchayk sa-ss-e.
   novel there buy-Pst-Dec
   'Chelswu bought a novel there.'

Thus, the deviance of (10B') and (10B") seems to hinge on repeated materials in answers.

8 An anonymous reviewer indicates that when the word order between question and answer is parallel, acceptability of the answer is improved and the effect might be shown in (12). The same reviewer further indicates that such effect isn’t observed in (17). We speculate that parallelism effects at work can be an instance of processing constraints that might affect acceptability for some speakers like anonymous reviewers. We set aside detailed analysis of this effect for future research.
C.-Nom yesterday novel bookstore-at buy-Pst-Dec
'Chelswu bought a novel at the bookstore yesterday.'
B': #Chelswu-ka soselchayk ecey secem-eyse sa-ss-e.
C.-Nom novel yesterday bookstore-at buy-Pst-Dec
'Chelswu bought a novel at the bookstore yesterday.'

Thus, the bare NP soselchayk 'novel' in (12B-B') indeed is a topic, which cannot be part of focus. This supports our CLLD analysis of embedded LD in (11).


Lee (2012) shows that the nominative Case marker can be absent in OSV word order, as shown in (13).

yesterday M.-Nom this house-Acc buy-to come-Pst-Dec
haciman na-nun ku salam-hanthey nay cip an phal-a.
but I-Top that person-to my house not sell-Dec
'Minsoo came (here) yesterday to buy this house. But I won’t sell my house to him.'
B: i cip-(ul) ku salam(-i) swipkey phoki an hay.
this house-Acc that person-Nom easily give up not do
'He won’t give up this house easily.'

In (13B), the nominative Case marker on ku salam 'that person' can be absent. The contrast between (1b) and (13B) raises a crucial question: In what environment, then, can nominative Case markers be absent?

When ku salam 'that person' is replaced by Minswu, the sentence is still well-formed.

yesterday Minsoo-Nom this house-Acc buy-to come-Pst-Dec
haciman na-nun Minswu-hanthey nay cip an phal-a.
but I-Top M.-to my house not sell
'Minsoo came (here) yesterday to buy this house. But I won’t sell my house to Minsoo.'
B: i cip-(ul) Minswu(-ka) swip-key phoki an hay.
this house-Acc M-Nom easily give up not do
'Minsoo won't give up this house easily.'

Compare (1b), repeated here as (15) with (16B).

(15) *Yenghi-lul ecey Chelswu manna-ss-e.
   Y.-Acc yesterday C. meet-Pst-Dec
   'Chelswu met Yenghi yesterday.'

(16) A: Ecey Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul manna-łe oa-ss-e,
    Yesterday C.-Nom Y.-Acc meet-to come-Past-Dec
    haciman nay-ka Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul manaci mos hakey ha-yss-e.
    but I-Nom C.-Nom Y.-Acc meet not make do-Pst-Dec
    'Chelswu came to see Yenghi yesterday, but I made Chelswu not see
    Yenghi.'

   B: Aniya. Yenghi-lul ecey Chelswu manna-ss-e.
      no Y.-Acc yesterday C. meet-Pst-Dec
      'No, Chelswu met Yenghi yesterday.'

In out of blue contexts, non-occurrence of nominative Case markers makes the
sentence unacceptable, as shown in (15). However, when a relevant context is
given, as shown in (13), (14), and (16), non-occurrence of nominative Case
markers is allowed.9

We propose that these Caseless NPs can also be analyzed as embedded
CLLD. We further suggest that Yenghi-lul 'Y-Acc' in (16B) is a topic that can
occupy a position higher than one occupied by CLLDed Chelswu. Thus,
functionally (16B) is in fact an instance of multiple topic constructions.

9 A reviewer indicates that (13B) and (14B) are still more natural to ears than (16B) and that
they are well-formed even without contexts. It seems that there is variation in acceptability of bare
NPs depending upon verb types. If (13B) and (14B) contain verbs like swul’hui ‘repair’ or chelke
‘demolish’, the sentences seem to be less natural to our ears.

(i) a. ?i cip-ul ku salam swipkey swuli/chelke an hay.
   this house-Acc that person easily repair/demolish not do
   'He won't repair/demolish this house easily.'

   b. ??i cip-(ul) Minswu swip-key swuli/chelke an hay.
      this house-Acc M. easily repair/demolish not do
      'Minsoo won't repair/demolish this house easily.'

It is not clear at this stage why these judgment variations hold. We leave this issue for future
research.
Evidence for a topichood of Chelswu comes from the fact that the bare NP Chelswu cannot occur as a reply to a question, which indicates that Chelswu indeed occupies a CLLDed topic position, but not a subject position.

(17) A: Ecey nwu-ka Yenghi-lul manna-le oa-ss-ni?
     Yesterday who-Nom Y.-Acc meet-to come-Past-Q
     ‘Who came to meet Yenghi yesterday?’
B: Yenghi-lul ecey Chelswu*(ka) manna-le oa-ss-e.
     Y.-Acc yesterday C.-Nom meet-to come-Pst-Dec
     ‘Chelswu came to meet Yenghi yesterday.’

Our claim is also supported by the fact that non-pronunciation of Case markers in subject positions is not allowed in the following context where topicalized phrase is not allowed (Ahn 1999:7).

(18) Na-nun cip-eyse Mary-?*(ka) John-ul ttayly-esski itaymwuney
     I-Top home-at M.-Nom J.-Acc hit-Past because
     hwakana-ss-la.
     angry-Past-Dec
     ‘I got angry because Mary hit John at home.’

Since the topicalized phrase is barred inside an adjunct clause, impossible non-pronunciation of Case markers in (18) can be naturally explained. The prohibition of topic inside the adjunct clause is confirmed by the following dialogue (19B) where topic is buried in the adjunct fragment answer.10

(19) A: Ne way Mary-eykey hwa-na-ss-ni?

10 As indicated by an anonymous reviewer, when a possessive determiner occurs, a bare NP is possible even inside an adjunct clause, as shown in (iB).

(i) A: Ne-nun way hwa-ka na-ss-ni?
     You-Top why anger-Nom get-Pst-Q
     ‘Why did you get upset?’
B: Ecey nay chayk John-ri malepsi kacyeka-se hwa-na-ss-e.
     yesterday my book J-Nom mutely take-because upset-get-Pst-Dec
     ‘I got upset because John took my book mutely yesterday.’

It seems that the dislocated caseless object is possible inside the adjunct clause, while the dislocated caseless subject is not. It is not clear why this subject-object asymmetry holds inside adjunct clauses. We leave this issue for future research.
You why M-to angry-Pst-Q
'Why were you angry with Mary?'
B: Mary-?*(ka) John-ul ttaey-esski ttaymwuney.
M-Nom J-Acc hit-Past because
'I got angry because Mary hit John.'

Lee (2012) further indicates that the well-formedness of (20) cannot be captured under Ahn & Cho's (2006a,b, 2009) analysis since nonspecific subject *etten haksayng* 'a certain student' can be Caseless.

\[(20) \text{itta etten haksayng okiro hay-ss-ta-myense cikum naka?}
\text{later a certain student(-Nom) come do-Pst-Dec-QT now go out}
\text{'You told me that a certain student is supposed to come later. Are you going out?'}\]

Ahn & Cho (2007, 2009) claim that subjects modified by nonspecific modifiers like *han/etten* 'a certain' cannot be Caseless, as shown in (21).

\[(21) \text{(Oray cen-ey) han/etten namba-*(ka) sal-ss-ta.}
\text{Long time-ago a/certain man-(Nom) live-Pst-Dec}
\text{'(Long time ago) there was a man lived.'} \quad \text{(Ahn & Cho 2007:54)}\]

Caseless subject, which is treated as an instance of CLLD isn't compatible with nonspecific modifiers due to semantic incompatibility; i.e., CLLDed phrases are inherently specific.

However, as pointed out by Ahn & Cho (2007) the modifier *etten* is lexically ambiguous, and it might not always yield nonspecific interpretation. The modifier *han* 'a certain', by contrast, seems to always yield nonspecific reading, and hence the following sentence is far worse than (20).

\[(22) \text{?*Itta han haksayng-∅ okiro hay-ss-ta-myense cikum naka?}
\text{later one student come do-Pst-Dec-QT now go out}
\text{'You told me that a certain student is supposed to come later. Are you going out?'}\]
5. A Reply to Hong (2011)

Hong (2011) points out that the following resumption examples are problematic under Ahn & Cho’s SubMove analysis. In (23), the remnant of SubMove is a noun “phrase” that cannot head ΦP.

(23) a. Chelswu, ku chakhan ai-ka, i cis-ul hay-as-ullika C, the good boy-Nom this thing-Acc do-Pst-can
    not-Dec
    'Chelswu, the good boy, cannot do things like this.'

b. Ney-ka ecey manna-n yeca, ku yeppun yeca-ka
    You-Nom yesterday meet-Mod woman the pretty girl-Nom
    C-Acc like-Dec
    'The woman, you met yesterday, the pretty woman, likes Chelswu.'

c. Chelswu, Yenghi-ka ku chakhan ai-lul, uysimha-koiss-e.
    C, Y.-Nom the good boy-Nom mistrust-Pres-Dec
    'Chelswu, Yenghi mistrusts the good boy.'

Ahn & Cho (2009) propose that Korean has two types of LD: Hanging Topic LD (HTLD) and Clitic LD (CLLD) which are found in many other languages such as German, Greek, and Spanish. HTLD is a base-generated topic while CLLD involves SubMove.

Further, for CLLD in Korean, Φ must not be pronounced (hence Φ is equivalent to pro). For HTLD in Korean, the construction involves overt resumption. Thus, (24a) is CLLD, while (24b) is HTLD.11

---

11 An anonymous reviewer raises a question about non-occurrence of case markers on objects in (i).

(i) a. Ne [Chelswu ku chakhan ay] tto soki-Iswu iss-ni?
    You C. the good boy again cheat-can Pres-Q
    'Can you cheat Chelswu, the good boy again?'

(ii) Ne [Chelswu ku papo] totaychey whay an ccochanyenke-ni?
    you C. the fool the.hell why not drive-out-Q
    'Why do you not drive Chelswu, the fool out?'

We assume that the objects in (i) undergo CLLD. Hence, pros occur in their base-generated positions, as shown in (ii).
(24) a. Chelswu Yenghi-ka pro uysimha-koiss-e. CLLD  
C. Y.-Nom mistrust-Pres-Dec  
‘Chelswu, Yenghi mistrusts’. 

b. Chelswu Yenghi-ka ku chakhan ai-lul uysimha-koiss-e. HTLD  
C. Y.-Nom the good boy-Acc mistrust-Pres-Dec  
‘Chelswu, Yenghi mistrusts the good boy.’

As evidence for the difference between CLLD and HTLD, for example, only HTLD resists WH-LD (see Ahn & Cho 2009 for further differences).

(25) a. i cwungeyse nwukwu Yenghi-ka pro uysimha-koiss-ni?  
this among who Y.-Nom mistrust-Pres-Q  
‘Who is such that Yenghi mistrusts him/her?’ CLLD  

b. *i cwungeyse nwukwu Yenghi-ka ku chakhan ai-lul uysimha-koiss-ni?  
mistrust-Pres-Q?  
‘Who is such that Yenghi mistrusts the good boy?’ HTLD

In sum, the apparent counter-examples pointed out by Hong (2011) are all base-generated topics, namely HTLD. Therefore, they are not problematic for the SubMove analysis of Ahn & Cho (2006a,b, 2009).

6. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have shown that Ahn & Cho’s (2006a,b, 2009) proposal captures close relation between non-occurrence of Case markers on nominals and interpretation. Following Ahn & Cho (2006a,b, 2009), we suggest that non-Case-marked nominals are part of complex predicate or CLLDe d nominal. Under the analysis advanced here, we have resolved the puzzles on non-Case

(iii) a. Ne [Chelswu ku chakhan ay], to [t, aren] soki-lawu iss-ni?  
       b. Ne [Chelswu ku papo], totaychey an [t, aren] cochanymunke-ni?  
In (iii) Chelswu ‘Chelswu’ and ku chakhan ay ‘the good boy’ are appositive. The whole constituent is an NP, which doesn’t have a Case feature. Similarly, in (iii) Chelswu ‘Chelswu’ and ku papo ‘the fool’ are appositive. The whole constituent is an NP, which doesn’t have a Case feature. We leave Case licensing on the appositive nominals for future research.
nominals pointed out by Bak (2008), Hong (2011), and Lee (2012). Clause-internal Caseless objects that Bak (2008) points out are analyzed as CLLDs that can be embedded. Clause-internal subjects that Lee (2012) indicates are also analyzed as CLLDs, embedded LDs. The examples Hong (2011) indicates are analyzed as Hanging Topic LDs. Further, for CLLD in Korean, Φ should not be pronounced (hence Φ is equivalent to pro). For HTLD in Korean, the construction involves overt resumption.
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