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1 Introduction

Morphological passives in Korean are formed by suffixation of the morpheme -hi- to verbal roots (hereafter, the HI passive). The HI passive has been given special attention in the literature since some verbs combined with -hi- have an argument structure that differs from prototypical passives; when a verb combines with the suffix -hi-, a surface subject is interpreted as an agent, and an oblique-marked NP (e.g., a dative-marked NP in Korean), is interpreted as a location, rather than an agent. Consider (1), for example.

(1)a. Inho-ka ai-lul ep-ess-ta.
    Inho-NOM child-ACC put.on.one's back-PST-DC
    'Inho put the child on his (=Inho's) back.'

    Child-NOM Inho-DAT put.on.one's back-PAS-PST-DC
    'The child got on Inho's back.'

*I would like to thank Satoshi Tomioka, Benjamin Bruening, and Julie Anne Legate for their valuable comments and suggestions on this topic. I have also benefited greatly from Henry Davis, Rose-Marie Déchaine, and Martina Wilschko at the University of British Columbia for their insightful comments and criticisms.

1The passive suffix in Korean is realized in four different forms, -i-, -hi-, -li-, and -ki-. The occurrence of these variants is conditioned by the stem-final sound. I will regard -hi- as the underlying form of these allomorphs, distinguished from the underlying form of a causative morpheme, i.e., -i-.

2Not all HI passives involve an argument structure that differs from prototypical passives. A number of predicates combined with -hi- show an argument structure pattern similar to that of prototypical passives, as shown in (i).

(i) Ku kenmwul-i (kwunin-tul-eykey) hel-li-ess-ta.
    The building-NOM · (soldier-PL-by) demolish-PAS-PST-DC
    'The building was demolished by the soldiers.'

In the HI passive with the prototypical argument structure the eykey-marked NP is interpreted as an agent, hence the agentive eykey, distinct from the locative eykey in (1b). Due to space limitations, the discussion of this paper is restricted to the HI passive with an atypical argument structure. For discussion of the HI passive with a prototypical argument structure, see Son (2005).
As seen above, the dative-marked NP, *Inho*, the agent of the active sentence in (1a), is no longer interpreted as an agent in (1b). Rather, it is understood to be a location where the subject ‘the child’ is situated at the end of the event. Furthermore, despite the passive morphology on the verb, the surface subject in (1b) is interpreted as a volitional agent, rather than a theme.

On the basis of the semantic difference between (1a) and (1b), it has often been argued (e.g., Hong 1992, Park 2001) that the combination of the verb and -hi- is formed in the lexicon and that the surface subject in (1b) is base-generated as an external argument, an unergative (lexical) approach.

In this paper, I argue against the unergative approach to the HI passive shown in (1b) by demonstrating that the surface subject may receive a theme interpretation in certain environments. I shall claim that the surface subject in (1b) must be base-generated as an internal argument of the verb and that the atypical argument structure shown in (1b) is attributable to the lexical-semantic properties of the base verb with which -hi- combines, not due to the morpheme itself.

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, I will provide more examples of the HI passive with an atypical argument structure. In Section 3, I demonstrate that the unergative approach to the HI passive cannot be maintained on the basis of the facts with respect to the acceptability of an agentive ‘by’ phrase and the compatibility with the result-state-denoting aspectual marker -a/e iss-. In Section 4, I present a main proposal. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Atypical Argument Structure of the HI Passive³

In prototypical passive constructions, thematic roles of the arguments are invariant regardless of whether the event involving them is expressed in the active or in the passive. However, as has been observed earlier, the HI passive in Korean involves arguments that bear thematic roles different from their active counterparts. More examples are illustrated in (2) and (3).

(2) a. Emma-ka ai-lul kikkei an-ass-ta.
    Mother-NOM child-ACC willingly put.on-PST-DC
    ‘Mother willingly put the child in her arms.’

³Due to space limitations, I put aside HI passives whose active counterparts contain more than one accusative-marked NP with an inalienable possession relation. See Tomioka and Sim (2005) for an event-based analysis of the multiple accusative construction with inalienable possession structure and their passive counterparts.
As seen above, the nominative-marked NPs in the (b) sentences are interpreted as having agentive properties; the property of the agent-oriented adverb ‘willingly’ is attributed to the action performed by the subjects, the child in (2b) and the pickpocket in (3b). The (b) sentences are contrasted with the (a) sentences in (2) and (3), in which the property of ‘willingly’ is attributed to the action performed by the mother in (2a) and Inho in (3a). Furthermore, the dative-marked NPs, emma ‘the mother’ in (2b) and Inho in (3b), which are the agents of the active sentences, are understood to be the final locations where the subjects end up at the end of the event described by each verb.

The truth-conditional difference between the active and the passive observed in (2) and (3) has led a number of authors (e.g., Hong 1992, Park 2001) to conclude that the combination of the verb and the morpheme -hi- is derived in the lexicon as an unergative predicate and that the surface subject is base-generated as an external argument, an unergative (lexical) approach.

In the following section, however, I will show that the unergative approach to the HI passive is untenable by demonstrating constructions in which we should arguably posit the surface subject of the HI passive as an internal (theme) argument, rather than an external argument.

3 Counterexamples to the Unergative Approach

The unergative lexical approach to the HI passive shown in (1) through (3) predicts that subjects of the HI passive should always be interpreted as agents. Contrary to the prediction, surface subjects associated with the HI passive (e.g., (1b)) may retain a theme interpretation in certain environments (for example, in the presence of an agentive ‘by’ phrase and the aspectual marker -a/e iss-). Let us first consider examples in which the passive
sentences in (1b) and (2b) allow an agentive ‘by’ phrase.\footnote{\textsuperscript{4,5}}

(4) Ai-ka salam-tul-ey uyhay Inho-eykey ep-hi-ess-ta.
Child-NOM person-PL-by Inho-DAT put.on-PAS-PST-DC
‘The child was put on Inho’s back by people.’

(5) Ai-ka salam-tul-ey uyhay emma-eykey an-ki-ess-ta.
Child-NOM person-PL-by mother-DAT put.on-PAS-PST-DC
‘The child was put into Mother’s arms by people.’

(4) and (5) describe situations in which there exist some external individuals that bring about the event described by each verb; the child in both sentences has no control over the event: he/she is an individual simply affected by the action performed by salamul ‘people’. The non-agentive interpretation of the subject in the presence of an agentive ‘by’ phrase, therefore, provides evidence against the claim that the surface subject of the HI passive associated with an atypical argument structure is base-generated as an external argument.

Another source of evidence against the unergative approach to the HI passive comes from a construction with the aspectual marker -ale iss-. The aspectual marker -ale iss- in Korean expresses the continuation of a result state, as shown in (6).

(6)a. Kwail-i ssek-e iss-ta.
fruit-NOM rotten-E be-DC.
‘The fruit has rotted and is still in the state of being rotten.’
b. Elum-i nok-a iss-ta.
ice-NOM melt-A be-DC.
‘The ice has melted and is still in the state of being melted.’

It has often been noted (cf. Kim 1990, Nam 2004) that the type of predicate that is compatible with -ale iss- is mostly unaccusatives, as illustrated in (7).

\footnote{\textsuperscript{4}Agents in passive constructions can be marked in Korean by -eykey or -ey uyhay. The agentive -eykey is not allowed in (4) and (5) due to a restriction on the co-occurrence of two -eykey phrases in the same clause regardless of its meaning (cf. Ahn and Lee 1995).

\textsuperscript{5}When the agent is overtly expressed by an agentive ‘by’ phrase, some speakers prefer to use a syntactic passive construction formed by the auxiliary verb ci-‘become’. However, all of the Korean speakers whom I have consulted find these sentences grammatical.}
(7) Predicates compatible with -a/e iss-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tteleci-</td>
<td>'fall'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sos-</td>
<td>'rise, tower up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cwuk-</td>
<td>'die'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-</td>
<td>'freeze'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nathana-</td>
<td>'appear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say-</td>
<td>'leak'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha-</td>
<td>'burn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kkay-</td>
<td>'wake up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwneci-</td>
<td>'collapse'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phi-</td>
<td>'bloom'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nok-</td>
<td>'melt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nam-</td>
<td>'remain'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situl-</td>
<td>'wither'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ssek-</td>
<td>'rot'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cwul-</td>
<td>'decrease'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sokha-</td>
<td>'belong'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unergative and transitive verbs cannot occur in the -a/e iss- construction, as shown in (8).

   Chelswu-NOM cry-E be-PST-DC
   'Chelswu has cried.'

b. *Inho-ka chayksang-ul kochi-e iss-ta.
   Inho-NOM desk-ACC fix-E be-DC
   'Inho has made the desk.'

The distinction between unaccusatives vs. unergatives/transitives is often argued to be the presence of an external argument in their syntactic configuration (e.g., Perlmuter 1978, Burzio 1986, and subsequent works). This would mean that predicates that are compatible with the result-state-denoting aspectual marker do not contain an external argument in their argument structure. The lack of an external argument as a condition for predicates to occur in the -a/e iss- construction is further evidenced by the fact that when the external argument in (8b) is syntactically suppressed by passivization, the sentence is compatible with the aspectual marker; the (syntactic) passive counterpart of (8b) can occur in the -a/e iss- construction, as shown in (9).7

---

6 The absence of an external argument is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the -a/e iss- construction. Among unaccusative predicates which roughly include inchoatives and statives, only inchoative predicates are compatible with -a/e iss-, the verbal meaning of which encodes a result state of a spontaneous event (e.g., melt, die, freeze, fall, etc.).

7 The verb kochi- 'fix' cannot undergo morphological passivization for independent reasons (see Sohn 1999).
The compatibility of the passive predicate with -a/e iss- thus further indicates that -a/e iss- can only combine with predicates that lack an external argument in the syntax. Verbs combined with the morpheme -hi- (e.g., (1b) and (2b)) show patterns parallel to unaccusatives (e.g., (6)) and passives (e.g., (9)), rather than unergatives (e.g., (8a)). As shown in (10), the HI passive predicates in (1) and (2) can co-occur with the result-state-denoting aspectual marker.

(10) a. Ai-ka Inho-eykey ep-hi-e iss-ta.
    Child-NOM Inho-DAT put.on-PAS-E be-DC
    ‘The child is on Inho’s back.’

b. Ai-ka emma-eykey an-ki-e iss-ta.
    Child-NOM mother-DAT put.on-PAS-E be-DC
    ‘The child is in her/his mother’s arms.’

The sentences in (10) express the continuation of the result states of the events described by the verbs; (10a), for instance, describes a situation in which there was some event that caused the child to be located on Inho’s back and the result state — ‘the child being on Inho’s back’ — continues at a reference time.8

On the basis of the fact that -a/e iss- is compatible only with unaccusative and passive predicates, we can conclude that the subjects in (10) must be derived from internal argument positions. The compatibility of the HI passive with the aspectual marker -a/e iss-, therefore, provides further evidence against the unergative approach to the HI passive.

We have seen thus far that the HI passive in Korean bears an argument structure that differs from prototypical passives; the subject of a passive verb derived by -hi- receives an agent interpretation, and a dative-marked NP is interpreted as a location. Contrary to the claim that the verb combined with -hi- is an unergative predicate derived in the lexicon, the facts associated with the acceptability of an agentive ‘by’ phrase and the aspectual marker -a/e iss- indicate that the surface subject of the HI passive should be posited as an underlying theme argument. This leaves us with a contradictory fact, namely, that the subject of the HI passive associated with an atypical argument argument.

---

8The causing event in this sentence is unspecified with respect to who initiated the event; it could be the child himself, Inho, or some other external individual.
structure can be either agentive (e.g., (2b)), or non-agentive in the presence of an additional 'by' phrase (e.g., (4)) and the aspectual marker -a/e iss- in a sentence (e.g., (10)).

On the basis of the facts described so far, the questions that arise are: 1) what gives rise to the atypical argument structure realization when -hi- combines with certain predicates?; why does the subject receive an agentive interpretation, and the agent of the active sentence is interpreted as a location in the passive? 2) why does the surface subject of the HI passive receive either an agent or a theme interpretation?

4 Proposal

4.1 Reflexive Nature of Verbs of 'putting on'

In order to resolve the problems identified above, I argue that the atypical argument structure of the HI passive is due to the lexical-semantic properties of the base predicate with which -hi-combines, not due to the morpheme per se; the atypical argument structure of the HI passive is attributable to the reflexive specification of the base verb.

The base verbs of the HI passive shown in (1) through (3) are classified as members of the verbs of the 'put on' class in Korean (see Son 2004b). The event of 'putting x on' is expressed in Korean by different lexical verbs depending on which body part is involved. These verbs include ep- 'put x on one's back', an- 'put x in one's arms', sin- 'put shoes on (one's feet)', ip- 'put clothes on (oneself)', ssu- 'put a hat/glasses on one's head/face', etc. The verbs of the 'put on' class take an internal argument that undergoes a change from one location to another. Therefore, they are argued to have an underlying representation shown in (11), which involves an inherent locational endpoint introduced by APPL in the sense of Pylkkänen (2002).9

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{APPL} \\
&\text{LOC} \\
&\text{VP} \\
&\text{APPL} \lambda x. \text{LOC} (e, y) &\text{& Theme (e, the child)} \\
&\text{\textla}. \text{LOC} (e, y) &\text{& Theme (e, the child)} \\
&\text{\textla}. [\text{LOC} (e, y) &\text{& Theme (e, the child)}] \\
&\text{\textla}. [\text{LOC} (e, y) &\text{& Theme (e, the child)}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

9Adopting Kratzer (1996), I assume that external arguments are introduced by a separate functional head, Voice (= v), which is also responsible for licensing an internal argument of the verb.
The APPL head denotes a relation between an entity expressing a location and an eventuality denoted by the verb. LOC is a positional endpoint of the theme that undergoes a change of location. It is further argued that the surface subjects of these verbs are underlyingly locations, not agents. The verbs of the 'put on' class are lexically reflexive in the sense that the locational endpoint of the theme is also the agent that initiates the event (cf. Kim 2002, Nam 2004). In order to account for the reflexive nature of these verbs (i.e., a single NP bearing two thematic roles, agent and location), I propose that APPLP merges with VoiceRFL, which, like Voice, combines with a verbal projection (e.g., APPLP) (cf. Bruening 2004). What is particular to VoiceRFL is that its semantics selects an open predicate with an unsaturated individual argument and states that the agent introduced by VoiceRFL is identified with this argument. This is formally represented in (12).

(12) VoiceRFL (with verbs of the 'put on' class)
\[ \lambda P_e \langle e, s, t \rangle \lambda x. \lambda e. \{ P_e, x \} \& \text{Agent}(e, x) \]

VoiceRFL requires a predicate of type \( \langle e, s, t \rangle \) as its argument and returns a predicate of the same type (i.e., \( \langle e, s, t \rangle \)). Due to this semantic specification, when it merges with APPLP in (11), VoiceRFL enforces syntactic detransitivization of the APPLP, as shown in (13).

(13) VoiceRFLP \( \langle e, s, t \rangle \)

\[ \text{VP APPL} \lambda x. \lambda e. \{ \text{put-on}(e) \& \text{Theme}(e, \text{child}) \& \text{LOC}(e, y) \} \]

As seen above, no syntactic argument is projected by APPL in transitives. If

---

10 The analysis presented here is based on the assumption that there are different flavors of Voice with different semantics assigned: Voice\_CAUSE, Voice\_BECOME, Voice\_DO, and Voice\_RFL (cf. different flavors of v: Folli & Harley 2002). Under this assumption, I assume that the argument structure of a verb is determined by the type of Voice head with which the verb combines along the lines of Folli and Harley (2002). The choice of Voice type depends on the lexical meaning of verbs. See Son (2005) for details regarding how different types of Voice determine the argument structure of a verb in Korean.
it were projected, this would result in a type mismatch between VoiceRFL and APPLP; if the locative argument is saturated within the domain of APPLP, the APPLP ends up with type \(<s,t>\), a function from an event to a truth value. However, VoiceRFL requires an argument with type \(<e,s,t>\).

A fully specified syntactic and semantic representation of transitive verbs of the 'put on' class (e.g., (1a)), is given in (14).

(14) Underlying Representation of 'put on' Verbs (e.g., (1a))

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Inho} & \quad \text{APPLP} \rightarrow \text{VoiceRFL} \rightarrow \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{APPL} \\
& \quad \text{the child} \rightarrow \text{put-on one’s back} \\
& \quad (\text{Inho put the child on his (=Inho’s) back.})
\end{align*}
\]

Since no NP is projected by APPL, the locative argument in the semantics of APPL remains unsaturated when we get to the interpretation of APPLP. By combining APPLP with VoiceRFL, the unsaturated argument (i.e., location) is identified with the agent selected by VoiceRFL. These two semantic arguments are then saturated by the NP projected by Voice, Inho, and we arrive at the intended reading that Inho is both the agent and the location of the event. Therefore, the effect of merging two thematic roles into a single NP arises from the semantics of VoiceRFL.

The passive counterpart of (14) (e.g., (1b)) is derived by merging APPLP with a passive counterpart of VoiceRFL, as briefly schematized in (15).

(15)
I argue that the suffix -hi- is a realization of Voice that lacks an [ACC] case feature. The lack of a case feature associated with Voice, therefore, triggers movement of an internal argument to the subject position (e.g., [Spec, TP]). I further assume that when Voice cannot license an internal argument (i.e., lacks an [ACC] case feature), no external argument position is projected in the syntax (cf. Burzio's generalization: Burzio 1986).

The active and the passive versions of VoiceRFL differ only in the presence/absence of a case feature, but their semantics remains constant; both have an [AG(ent)] semantic feature and require an open argument. Due to the lack of a case feature on the passive VoiceRFL, no external argument position is projected in the syntax; VoiceRFL does not project an external argument but has an [AG] semantic feature. I further assume that an open predicate that VoiceRFL requires can be produced in two different ways: 1) detransitivization of APPLP and 2) NP movement. In the active, the open argument is created by detransitivizing APPLP. This results in creating an unsaturated locative argument (e.g., (13)). Thus, the agent introduced by VoiceRFL is identified with the locative argument, which yields a transitive sentence (e.g., 'Inho put the child on his back'). In the passive, the open argument is created by NP movement due to the absence of a case feature associated with a passive VoiceRFL, as shown in (16), a fully specified semantic and syntactic representation of (15).

(16) Underlying Structure for (1b) ('The child got on Inho’s back')

As seen above, VoiceRFL in the passive takes the open predicate APPLP with the unsaturated theme argument as a result of $\lambda$-abstraction. This results in merging two thematic roles, the agent and the theme, into a single NP. The
two semantic arguments, the agent and the theme, are saturated by the moved NP in [Spec, TP] (i.e., the child) later in the derivation. Therefore, the agentivity of the theme arguments in the HI passive (as shown in (1) through (3)) is attributable to the semantics of VoiceRFL.

The structure proposed for the HI passive with verbs of the 'put on' class also provides a straightforward explanation for the semantics of a dative-marked NP as a location in the (b) sentences of (1) through (3). (1b) is repeated as (17) below.

(17) Ai-ka Inho-eykey ep-hi-ess-ta.
     Child-NOM Inho-DAT put.on.one's back-PAS-PST-DC
     'The child got on Inho('s back).'

According to the underlying representation of verbs of the 'put on' class (e.g., (11)), these verbs take two arguments, a theme projected by the lexical V and a location projected by the abstract verbal head APPL. When APPL merges with VoiceRFL, the locative argument is not syntactically projected due to the type mismatch between VoiceRFL and APPL (e.g., (13)). However, in the passive, the semantic requirement of VoiceRFL is satisfied by NP movement, and hence the locative argument is syntactically projected. Therefore, the locative interpretation of the dative-marked NP in (17) is what we would predict.11,12

4.2 Acceptability of an Additional 'by' Phrase

The acceptability of an additional 'by' phrase shown in (4) and (5) can be explained by assuming that their active counterparts are causative sentences in which there exist external causer arguments introduced by VoiceCAUSE. Example (4) is repeated as (18) with its active counterpart in (19).

---

11 The underlying representation of verbs of the 'put on' class proposed in (11) would predict that, unless APPL merges with VoiceRFL, the locative argument must be visible in the syntax. This prediction seems to be borne out since in a number of constructions (e.g., morphological causatives) the agent of the transitive sentence is always realized as a goal/location of the event, rather than an agent. See Son (2004a) and (2004b) for the discussion of other constructions in connection with verbs of the 'put on' class.

12 I assume that the dative case -eykey is a realization of inherent case assigned by APPL.
Child-NOM person-PL-by Inho-DAT put.on-PASS-PST-DC
'The child was put on Inho's back by people.'

person-PL-NOM Inho-DAT child-ACC put.on-CAUSE-PST-DC
'People put the child on Inho's back.'

I assume that the morpheme -i- in (19) is an overt instantiation of the Voice head that introduces an external argument with a causative meaning, i.e., Voice\textsubscript{CAUSE} (see Son 2004a). Therefore, (19) has the structural representation in (20a) under the current assumption that VP can combine with different Voice types.

(20) (a) Active

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}

\begin{scope}[level distance=1.5cm, sibling distance=10mm]

  \node (vp) {\textsc{vp}}
    child {node {\textsc{appl}}} % Application node
    child {node {\textsc{appl}}} % Application node
    child {node {\textsc{appl}}} % Application node

  \end{scope}

\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

(b) Passive

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}

\begin{scope}[level distance=1.5cm, sibling distance=10mm]

  \node (tp) {\textsc{tp}}
    child {node {\textsc{appl}}} % Application node
    child {node {\textsc{appl}}} % Application node

  \end{scope}

\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

(18) is the passive counterpart of (19) and has the syntactic representation in (20b); \textsc{appl} merges with a passive Voice\textsubscript{CAUSE} which bears no case feature.\footnote{A causative and a passive morpheme cannot co-occur, presumably due to morpho-phonological constraints active in Korean. One could also argue that -i- is an overt instantiation of a Voice head that bears a bundle of features composed of CAUSE, AGENT and CASE. These features must come as a package for the morpheme to be realized based on the theory of Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1994). Although the two features, CAUSE and AGENT, may be invariant, the passive version of Voice\textsubscript{CAUSE} lacks a case feature. For this reason, -i- cannot have an overt realization in the passive context.} The theme, therefore, moves to \textsc{[spec, tp]} to get case. The agent argument introduced by Voice\textsubscript{CAUSE} can be realized as an optional 'by' phrase (as seen in (18)) or it can be existentially closed (e.g., Embick 2004).
Therefore, the agentivity and non-agentivity of the surface subject in the HI
passive is attributable to the difference in the underlying structure. When the
surface subject is agentive in the passive, APPLP merges with a passive Voice_RFL, as seen in (16). When the surface subject is non-agentive (i.e., it is a theme), APPLP merges with a passive Voice_CAUSE.

5 Conclusion

I have shown that the peculiar argument structure realization of the HI-
passive is due to the lexical-semantic properties of the base verb with which
-hi- combines. The base verb of the HI passive associated with an atypical
argument structure is categorized as one of the verbs of the ‘put on’ class
which have lexical reflexive specification in their verbal meaning. The
lexical reflexive nature of the verbs of the ‘put on’ class has been argued to
be reflected in the semantics of Voice_RFL with which these verbs merge. I
have further claimed that it is the semantics of Voice_RFL that gives rise to an
agentive interpretation of the surface subject, regardless of whether the verbs
take active or passive morphology; the semantics of Voice_RFL has been
argued to remain constant, irrespective of its case feature.

The proposed underlying structure of the verbs of the ‘put on’ class has
further provided an explanation for the locative interpretation of an eykey-
marked DP; the underlying representation of these verbs contains an abstract
APPL head that introduces a locative argument. In the active, the locative
NP introduced by APPL is not syntactically realized but it merges with the
agent argument projected by Voice_RFL. In the passive, in contrast, the
locative argument is syntactically projected, and hence the presence of an NP
denoting a location is predicted by the proposed underlying structure.

The contradictory fact associated with the interpretation of the surface
subject in the HI passive has also been accounted for; the agentive and non-
agentive interpretations of the subject arise from different underlying
structures that are available for active sentences, i.e., APPLP merging with Voice_RFL vs. APPLP merging with Voice_CAUSE.
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