This paper examines morphological passives in Korean, the predicates of which are formed by attaching the suffix –hi- to verb roots (HI passive) [1b]. It has often been noted (e.g., Hong 1992) that the HI passive in Korean manifests patterns different from English passives in two respects: 1) the theme argument in the passive is agentive, given that the purpose clause in (2) is associated with the surface subject ‘the child’; 2) the dative-marked NP in (1b) is interpreted as a location, rather than an agent. On the basis of the facts shown in (1) and (2), Park (2001) has argued that the combination of the verb root plus –hi- in (1b) is formed in the lexicon and that the surface subject is base-generated as an external argument of the derived verb (i.e., an unergative approach). Although I share the intuition that the subject in (1b) has an agentive characteristic, I argue against the unergative analysis to (1b) and suggest that the surface subject should be base-generated as an underlying theme argument which receives an agentive interpretation in passives. I further demonstrate that not all HI passives display patterns different from English. (3), for example, shows the pattern similar to that of typical passive constructions in English; there is no sense of agentivity associated with the subject salinpem ‘the killer’ with respect to the chasing event, and the dative-marked NP kyengchal ‘the police’ must be understood as the agent of the event. This is evidenced by the unacceptability of the PP denoting an agent in (4a) with the intended meaning. (1b), in contrast, is natural with the agent-denoting PP in a situation where the event has occurred by some external causer. This is shown in (4b) with its active counterpart in (4c). The question that immediately arises then is how the underlying theme argument in (1a) receives an agentive interpretation in (1b), i.e., an agent-theme argument. Why is the agent argument of the base verb in the active [1a] interpreted as a location in the passive [1b]?

In this paper, I propose that the argument structure alternation observed in (1) is due to the reflexive nature of the base verb which is categorized as verbs of the ‘put-on’ class in Korean (Son 2004). These verbs include ep- ‘put someone on one’s back’, an- ‘put someone on one’s arm’, sin- ‘put shoes on (oneself)’, ip- ‘put clothes on (oneself)’, ssu- ‘put a hat on (one’s head), etc. The verbs of the ‘put-on’ class take an internal argument that undergoes a change of location. Therefore, these verbs are argued to involve an inherent locational endpoint introduced by APPL [5a] (cf. Pylkkänen 2002) and that the surface subject is underlyingly a location, not an agent. The ‘put-on’ verbs have a reflexive nature in the sense that the agent is also the terminal position of the theme that undergoes a change of location [1a], i.e., agent-goal verbs. In order to account for the reflexive nature of these verbs (i.e., a single NP bearing two thematic roles), I propose that APPL in (5a) merges with VoiceREF, which, like Voice, combines with a verbal projection. VoiceREF requires a predicate of type <e <s,t>> as its argument and returns a predicate of the same type [6a]. Therefore, as in (5b), VoiceREF selects APPL with an unsaturated individual argument which is identified with the agent selected by VoiceREF. This means that no argument is projected by APPL in transitives. Otherwise, this would result in a type mismatch between VoiceREF and APPL. The passive counterparts of these verbs [1b] then are derived by merging APPL with a passive VoiceREF, VoiceREF-PASS. VoiceREF-PASS contains only the semantic feature [AG] responsible for the agentive interpretation of the passive (Kratzer 1996); in the passive the external argument and the Case feature associated with the active VoiceREF are absent. Since the Case feature is absent, the theme moves to [Spec, TP] and checks the [NOM] Case feature of T’. The active and the passive version of VoiceREF differ only in the presence/absence of a Case feature, but their semantics remains constant, i.e., both require an open argument. In the passive, the open argument is created by NP movement, and VoiceREF-PASS takes an open predicate APPL with an unsaturated ‘theme’ argument as a result of λ-abstraction [5c]. This results in merging two thematic roles (agent/theme) into a single NP, which is saturated by the moved NP in [Spec, TP] later in the derivation. The structure proposed in (5c) further predicts that verbs of the ‘put-on’ class with inanimate theme arguments cannot undergo passivization due to the agentive feature of VoiceREF. This prediction is born out as shown in (8).

The current analysis, therefore, accounts not only for the agentivity of the theme argument but also for the semantics of the dative NP as a location in (1b). The facts associated with HI-passives further provide supporting evidence in favor of the argument that the subject of ‘put-on’ verbs [1a & 8a] in Korean is underlyingly a location, and agentivity of the subject is derived by merging APPL with VoiceREF.
   Bill-NOM child-ACC put.on-PST-DC  
   ‘Bill put/carry the child on his back.’

   Child-NOM Bill-DAT put.on-PASS-PST-DC  
   ‘The child got on Bill’s back.’

(2) Ai-ka Mary-lul hwana-key ha-lyeko Bill-eykey ep-hi-ess-ta.  
   Child-NOM Mary-ACC angry-KEY do-in order to Bill-DAT put.on-PASS-PST-DC  
   ‘The child got on Bill’s back in order to make Mary angry.’

(3) salinpem-i kyengchal-tul-eykey ccoc-ki-ess-ta.  
   Killer-NOM police-PL-DAT chase-PASS-PST-DC  
   ‘The killer was chased by the police.’

   Killer-ACC Bill-by police-PL-DAT chase-PASS-PST-DC  
   ‘The killer was chased by the police by Bill (Bill-AGENT).’

   *‘The killer was chased by the police because of Bill (Bill-Source).’

   Child-NOM many person-PL-by Bill-DAT put.on.one’s back-PASS-PST-DC  
   ‘The child was put on Bill’s back by many people.’

   Many person-PL-NOM Bill-DA T child-ACC put.on.one’s back-CAUSE-PST-DC  
   ‘Many people put the child on Bill’s back.’

(5) a. Base (verbs of ‘put-on’)  

   APPLP  
   \[ \text{Loc} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{APPL} \quad \text{Voice} \text{REFP} \]

   Theme \[ \sqrt{\text{put-on}} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{APPL} \]

b. Transitive  

   APPLP  
   \[ \text{Loc} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{APPL} \quad \text{Voice} \text{REFP} \]

   Theme \[ \sqrt{\text{put-on}} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{APPL} \]

   Voice \[ \text{REF-PASSP} \]
   \[ \text{T}_{[\text{NOM}]} \]

   Bill-DAT \[ \text{Inherent Case} \]

   Voice \[ \text{REF-PASSP} \]
   \[ \text{APPL}_{[\text{AG}]} \]

   \[ \lambda \text{e} \cdot [\text{put-on} (e) & \text{Theme} (e, z) & \text{LOC} (e, \text{Bill})] \]

   \[ \text{t}_1 \text{Root} \]
   \[ \lambda \text{e} \cdot [\text{put-on} (e) & \text{Theme} (e, g(1)) & \text{LOC} (e, \text{Bill})] \]

(6) a. Voice \text{REF}: \lambda P <e, s, t, r, x> \lambda x. \lambda e. \quad [P (e, x) & \text{Agent} (e, x)]

b. APPLP: \lambda y. \lambda e. \ [\text{put-on} (e) & \text{Theme} (e, y) & \text{LOC} (e, x)]

c. Voice \text{REF-PASSP}: \lambda x. \lambda e. \ [\text{put-on} (e) & \text{Theme} (e, y) & \text{LOC} (e, x) & \text{Agent} (e, x)]

(7) Voice \text{REF-PASSP}: \lambda x. \lambda e. \ [\text{put-on} (e) & \text{Theme} (e, x) & \text{LOC} (e, \text{Bill}) & \text{Agent} (e, x)]

   John-NOM sneakers-ACC put.on-PST-DC  
   ‘John put the sneakers on (himself).’

   *sneakers-NOM John-DAT put.on-PASS-PST-DC  
   ‘The sneakers are put on John.’
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