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Proposal
Drawing on the fact that the light verb ha- ‘do’ in Korean may or may not be elided in certain negative contexts, it is argued that this deletion fact constitutes empirical evidence in support of the configurational theory of argument-introducing verbal heads in which the light verb ha- is an exponent of a range of verbal heads such as v°, Appl° and Voice° and the ellipsis of light verbs is sensitive to syntactic hierarchy.

Discussion
Examples (1) illustrate the light verb constructions in Korean, in which it is the elements preceding the ha- ‘do’ that bear all the theta-roles for the (internal) arguments in the sentences. In (2), the ha- behaves differently with respect to ellipsis in the negative sentences (light verb ellipsis (LVE)). Classifying ha- into subtypes in (3), the LVE fact in (2) attributes to categorically different kinds of ha- and their corresponding syntactic structures: Appl° and Voice° allow LVE, whereas Root and verbalizer v° resist it (double strikethrough), as illustrated in (4). This suggests that the LVE is sensitive to syntactic hierarchy.

Agentive ha- (3a) is a typical agentive verb, which is confirmed by agent-oriented adverb modification such as ‘on purpose’ in (5a). This suggests that Agentive ha- is a spell-out of Voice° introducing an agent argument in (5b) (Kratzer 1996). As in (5c), this Voice ha- can undergo the LVE. Stative ha- (3b) disallows agent-oriented adverbial modification (6a). This indicates that Stative ha- lacks agent-introducing Voice° and Chelswu is a typical experiencer. Following Koh 1996, Stative ha- belongs to “adjective” ha- and is thus an exponent of verbalizer v° (6c). In the negative context (6b), the LVE is illicit with this v° ha-. Ha- in (3c) combines with psychological state verbs. Choy (1973:218) argues that this ha- takes “subjective, psychological adjectives” (or intransitive verbs) and turns them into transitive verbs (7). Semantics-wise, this ha- adds “actionality” (hayngtongseng) to the derived verb (ibid., p. 221). In other words, the ha- turns non-actional intransitives into actional (or dynamic) transitives. In addition, Jeong (2010:315) also maintains that “although the subject [of the ha- on hand] is agentive, it is hard to confirm that it is a typical agent, because it is still an experiencer” that resists agent-oriented adverbial modification (8a). Bak (2014) and Kwon (2014) also argue that the subjects of ha-derived verbs are agentive but not full-fledged agents, still experiencers. Given this all, I label them as “actional experiencers (AEs)” distinct from a typical experiencer. Note that semantics-wise, AE ha- takes an actional experiencer. Kim (2011) argues that there are two different external argument-introducing heads in Korean, Voice° and Appl°. Given that agentivity is specific to Voice° and not to Appl°, an argument in SpecApplP is not a full-fledged agent, unlike agents in VoiceP. This leads to argue that Appl° is exponed as AE ha-, and that its Spec position is filled by actional experiencers (8b). AE ha- allows LVE (8c). In (9a), ha- can be replaced with another lexical verb ‘smoke’, which indicates that this ha- is a lexical verb. Given this, it is a Root (9c). The LVE is impossible with Root ha- (9b). It is interesting to notice that it is also possible to stack ha- of one type onto another. Stative ha- can be stacked up with AE ha- (10). A prediction to arise is that the outer AE ha- allows LVE whereas the inner Stative ha- resists it. The prediction is borne out in (11).

Conclusion
Distinct verbal heads such as v°, Appl° and Voice° can be exposed as ha-. This verb may or may not be LVE-ed (2). This suggests that the LVE is sensitive to syntactic hierarchy. Given that each verbal head adds a participant to events, the LVE fact observed above supports the configurational theory of argument structure which identifies theta-roles with syntactic configurations in a one-to-one fashion (Hale & Keyser 1993, Baker 1988, Pylkkänen 2008). Importantly, it argues against the “featural flavors of v” (Folli & Harley 2005) and the view that a range of verbal heads reduce to one single argument introducer f° (Wood & Marantz 2015). Those approaches fail to provide a principled, structural explanation for why
certain types of verbal heads may or may not undergo LVE, because there is no structural or hierarchical difference between a variety of interpretations of the single head.

Data

(1) a. Chelswu-nun nam il-ey kansepha-n-ta. ‘Chelswu minds other people’s business.’
b. Na-nun phikonha-yss-ta. ‘I was tired.’
c. Mina-ka sewelho chamsa-lul sulpheha-yss-ta. ‘Mina felt sad about the Sewol Ferry disaster.’
d. Mina-nun tampay-lul hanta. ‘Mina smokes a cigarette.’
(2) a. Nam il-ey kansep-Ø ma-la. ‘Don’t mind other people’s business.’
b. *Nemwu changphi-Ø ma-la. ‘Don’t be too ashamed.’
c. Nemwu sulph-Ø ma-la. ‘Don’t feel too sad.’
(3) a. Agentive ha-: [X-ha-]; cwucangha-‘argue’; phantanha-‘judge’; pyenmyengha ‘excuse’
b. Stative ha-: [X-ha-]; phikonha- ‘be tired’; changphiha- ‘be ashamed’
c. AE ha-: [V-e-ha-]; kippaha- ‘feel pleased’; olyoweha- ‘feel lonely’
d. Root ha-: [R ha-]; (‘tampay, pap’) ha- ‘smoke a cigarette, cook rice’
(4) [Voice° DP [Voice° [Appl° [Appl° [DP [Voice° [DP [Voice° ha-]]]]]]]]
(5) a. Chelswu-nun ilpwule ku il-ey kansepsyassta. ‘Chelswu interfered with that on purpose.’
b. [Voice° DP_Agent [Voice° [DP [Voice° [Voice° ha-]]]]]
c. Hyencil-ul waykokhayse phantan(ha-ci) ma-la. ‘Don’t judge the reality distortedly.’
   ‘Chelswu was ashamed of his exam result (*on purpose).’
b. Ni-ka na-uy mal-ey sesep*h(5a-ci) mal-aya halthynte.
   ‘I wish you should not be disappointed at me.’
c. [vP [vP [vP [vP ha-]]]]
   ‘The Sewol Ferry disaster was a pity for Chelswu.’
   ‘Chelswu felt very sad about the Sewol Ferry disaster.’
   ‘Chelswu felt sad about the Sewol Ferry disaster (*on purpose).’
b. [Appl° DP_AE [Appl° [vP [vP [vP ha-]]]]]
c. Silphayhayto sulpheha-ci ma-la. ‘Don’t be sad if you fail.’
(9) a. Mina-nun tampay-lul {hanta/phiwunta}. ‘Mina smokes a cigarette.’
b. Tampay-lul *(ha-ci) mal-a. ‘Don’t smoke a cigarette.’
c. [Voice° DP [Voice° [vP [DP [ha-] vP] Voice°]]]
    ‘Yengo showed shame about his failure.’
b. [Appl° DP [Appl° [vP [vP [vP ha-]]]]]
(11) a. Pwulhapkyek-ul nemwu changphi(hayha-ci) ma-la. ‘Don’t be so ashamed of the failure.’
   b. Pwulhapkyek-ul nemwu changphi(hayha-ci) ma-la. ‘Same as (11a)’
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