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I. Introduction

Causative alternation: the same verb stem alternates between:
- Causative: NP1 V{(+affix)} NP2 construction
- Inchoative: NP2 V{(+affix)} construction

where NP1 is the causer and NP2 undergoes a change of state due to that causer.

(1) a. Alice broke the glass. (causative)
   b. The glass broke. (inchoative)

Systematic semantic and morphological connections between Korean causatives and inchoatives. However, have so far been analyzed separately or only in partial pairings ([5]; cf. [8], [1]).

Questions & Hypotheses

1. What causative and inchoative constructions are available in Korean when each is used?
   - 0-inchoative paired with i-causative
   - 0-causative paired with i-inchoative

2. Is a unified account possible?
   - Yes; the -i morpheme indicates relative markedness of causatives and inchoatives (cf. [3]).

II. Observations

In Korean, either the causative form or the inchoative form is morphologically marked (whereas its associated inchoative/causative form is bare), depending on the verb type.

(2) 0-inchoative, i-causative
   a. hosu-ga eol-eoss-da. (l.i, i) The lake froze.

(3) 0-causative, i-inchoative
   a. Alice-ga moon-ul yeol-eoss-da. Alice opened the door.
   b. moon-i yeol-li-eoss-da. The door opened.

The suffix -i can be given a unified meaning: set complementation operation (SC), applied to a given domain of base.

The affixes on causatives and inchoatives are identical: -i and its allomorphs (cf. [5]).

Table 1. Two types of Korean causatives and inchoatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb class 1</th>
<th>Verb class 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchoative</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Previous work

Focuses on the 0-causative and the 2 types of inchoatives; different syntactic structures posited for the latter ([5], cf. [1]).

- 0-inchoatives: no VoiceP; just bare VP [ VP [ DP; v ] v root ]
- i-inchoatives: VoiceP with defective Voice head, marked with -external argument [ VoiceP [ DP;2 ] Voice ]

No mention of i-causatives.

IV. Externally-caused vs. internally-caused (spontaneous) change of state verbs

A typological study [4]: connects marked vs. unmarked form with marked vs. unmarked causal properties (see also [6] and [7]).

V. A unified semantic analysis of the Korean causative/inchoative suffix -i

The suffix -i can be given a unified meaning: set complementation operation (SC), applied to a given domain of base.

VI. The syntax of Korean causatives and inchoatives

The affix -i occupies the Voice head (cf. [1]) in both causatives and inchoatives, and carries out the same SC operation to VP: if the output set of events is causative, the specifier position is filled with the causer.

VII. Re-examining the diagnostics

Apart from affixes, 0-forms and -i forms hypothesized to share the same syntactic structure: expected to pattern in the same way for a variety of diagnostics. An acceptability judgement survey verifies this prediction (cf. [5], see also [2]).

Table 3. Acceptability judgements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i-caus 0-caus</th>
<th>i-incho 0-incho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ by (true) PP</td>
<td>O O ? ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ by itself (ecce)</td>
<td>NA NA O OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ by agent PP</td>
<td>NA NA OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent subject</td>
<td>O O NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no-agent subject</td>
<td>OK OK NA NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. Advantages of the analysis

- Provides a unified semantics for the morpheme -i.
- Explains why the Korean causative alternation always pairs -i forms with -i forms and vice versa.
- Captures the parallel syntactic behaviors of 0 and i-causatives (likewise, 0 and i-inchoatives).

Discussion & Conclusion

1. The Korean causative/inchoative affix -i can be given a unified semantic treatment:
   - It encodes an abstract meaning that the referent event deviates from its canonical properties.
   - It does not directly encode causativity or inchoativity.
2. More generally, certain affixes contribute abstract meanings that are sensitive to markedness of the referent, creating an efficient morphological system.
3. This mechanism seems to exist both in the nominal [3] and verbal domain: the markedness targets boundedness on the one hand, and telicity on the other.
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