1 Introduction

SA has several causative constructions: (i) ablaut, (1), (ii) gemination, (iii) ‘give’ causatives, and (iv) ‘make’ causatives.

(1) ablaut
   a. lâke tal-e
       stain came.out-3F
       ‘The stain came out.’
   b. tel-tu lâke
       came.out.CAUS-1SG stain
       ‘I got the stain out.’

- Gemination allows the causee to be expressed either as a DP or a PP headed by (mı)şa ‘for, to’, as in (2).

(2) gemination
   a. kemal
       kemal
       ku
       3m
       i-qri
       3m
       -read.ipfv
       lala
       this.3m
       kitab
       book
       ‘Kemal is reading this book.’
   b. oretman
       teacher
       ki
       3f
       tı-qarr
       i
       3f
       -cause.read
       kemal
       kemal
       lala
       this.3m
       kitab
       book
       ﬁsz
       to
       kemal
       ‘The teacher is making Kemal read this book.’ (Yakut 2013:33a)
   c. oretman
       teacher
       ki
       3f
       tı-qarr
       i
       3f
       -cause.read
       lala
       this.3m
       kitab
       book
       ﬁsz
       to
       kemal
       ‘The teacher is making Kemal read this book.’ (Yakut 2013:33b)

- In contrast, in ‘give’ causatives, the causee is introduced only as a PP.

(3) ‘give’ causatives

   imm-a måş-a fatma şı adil-u adil
   mother-her to Fatma food gave-it fix.INF
   ‘Her mother had Fatma cook the food.’
   (Lit: The food, her mother gave it to Fatma to fixing) (Erguvanlı-Taylan 2017:221:30)
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- This strategy is a result of contact with Kurdish (Akkuş 2017; Akkuş and Benmamoun 2018; Erguvanlı-Taylan 2017).

- SA also has an indirect causative embedded under the verb ‘make/do’.

(4) ‘make’ causatives

   a. doxtor måş-a ali ku i-si f-iyu (le y-addel) sipor
      doctor to Ali be.3M 3M-make in-him (that 3M-do) sports
      ‘The doctor is making Ali do sports.’ (Erguvanlı-Taylan 2017:221)
   b. aya sa adil beyt-ma
      village.lord made.3M build.INF house-a
      ‘The village lord had a house built.’ (Akkuş forthcoming:13)

- Today’s focus is on (4b).

   - It is a construction with an overt embedded theme argument, but no overt embedded agent. The verb appears in infinitival form.
   - It maintains an agentive reading where the agent is interpreted as indefinite, non-specific ‘someone’ or ‘some people’.

- In this construction, the agent is obligatorily null unless A-moved.

(5) a. kemal sa (*nes-ma) faqz.
    Kemal made person-a run.INF
    ‘Kemal made someone run.’
   b. * kemal sa ande faqz?
      Kemal made who run.INF
      ‘Who did Kemal make run?’
   c. ande kemal sa faqz?
      who Kemal made run.INF
      ‘Who did Kemal make run?’

Proposal

- ‘make’ causatives embed an agentive VoiceP, in which the embedded agent may not remain in-situ, and needs to A-move.
- I develop a phase-based account to explain this restriction, which provides evidence for A-movement feeding licensing relations.
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2 The size of the embedded clause

A variety of diagnostics demonstrate that ‘make’ embeds a thematic VoiceP, but no higher projections.

⇝ The tests are summarized in Table 1 (see Appendix for the examples).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no CLLD to the right of ‘make’, no complementizers</td>
<td>→ *CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no negation on the infinitive</td>
<td>→ *NegP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no distinct temporal modification</td>
<td>→ *TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no agreement or portmanteau Aspect+Voice morphology</td>
<td>→ *AspP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent-oriented adverbs, comitatives, agentive by-phrases</td>
<td>→ ✓VoiceP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no stative predicates or unaccusatives</td>
<td>→ ✓VP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: size of the ‘make’ ICs

• Negation: The negative morpheme is disallowed on the infinitive, (6).

(6) iyen (mi)-i-s-o (*mi)-yanni
    they NEG-3-make-PL NEG-sing.INF
    ‘They don’t make anyone sing.’

• VoiceP: Instrumentals are diagnostics for an external argument layer (i.e. Voice) (Bruening 2013; Alexiadou et al. 2015, also Fillmore 1968).

(7) a. bina m-faş-e mi işçiyad wara çağıçad apartment PASS-demolish-3F by employees with hammers
    ‘The apartment was demolished by the employees with hammers.’

b. *bina m-qalab-e mi rua wara çağıçad apartment PASS-fall.over-3F by itself with hammers
    ‘The apartment fell over by itself with hammers.’

They are also grammatical in SA ICs, and can modify the embedded agent, (8).

(8) a. si-to ayet şurvan waraibre made-2PL sew.INF pants with needles
    ‘You had someone [sew the pants with needles].’

b. kemal sa buay sir beyt wara sope. Kemal made.3M paint do.INF house with stick
    ‘Kemal, with the stick, had [someone paint the house].’

2.1 FP: A low focus position

• ‘make’ causatives have a low focus position, identical to the root clauses.

(9) a. (şurvan-i) ki (şurvan-i) t-ixsel (*şurvan-i) (qaway-i lâ). pants-my be.3F pants-my 3F-wash pants-my shirt-my no
    ‘She is washing my pants, (not my shirt).’

b. (şurvan-i) sa-t-te (şurvan-i) xassil (*şurvan-i) (qaway-i lâ). pants-my made-3F pants-my wash.INF pants-my shirt-my no
    ‘Mom made (someone) wash my pants, (not my shirt).’

– As such, a focussed constituent may raise to a position between ‘make’ and ‘infinitive’, FP, besides the default sentence initial position, (9b).

– Thus, no adjacency requirement or complex predicate relationship between ‘make’ and the infinitive.

3 VoiceP with active-passive alternation

• The embedded VoiceP manifests an active-passive alternation despite the absence of a morphological reflex.

    – (i) the (im)possibility of A-moving the embedded object when the matrix ‘make’ is passivized, (ii) sluicing, (iii) nonpassivizable idioms.

⇝ (Impersonal) Passive

• An embedded clause with by-phrase behaves like a canonical passive:3

    – The embedded verb does not license the object, instead behaves as licensed by the matrix ‘make’.

    – Therefore, when ‘make’ is passivized, the embedded theme raises to grammatical subject position and shows verbal agreement, (10a-10b).

    – Raising is not possible without a by-phrase, (10c).

(10) a. kemal sa xassil potad mı mara-ma pir-e. kemal made.3M wash.INF clothes by woman-a old-F
    ‘Kemal had the clothes washed by some old woman.’

2 In Standard and Lebanese Arabic, an in-situ focussed phrase functions as new information focus (see e.g. Montaouakil 2014, Ouhalla 1994, Aoun et al. 2010:202).

3cf. garden-variety passives, (i).

(i) ala cam (mı kemal) m-qaraf ba-l-qasti. this glass (by Kemal) PASS-broke.3M with-the-intention
    ‘This glass was broken (by Kemal) deliberately.’ (Yakut 2013:7; with slight modifications)
b. potad m-so xassil mí mara-ma pir-e clothes PASS-made.3PL wash.INF by woman-a old-F
‘Clothes were made to be washed by some old woman.’

c. *potad m-so xassil clothes PASS-made.3PL wash.INF

*Intended: ‘Clothes were made to be washed.’

(10b) can be represented as (11).

(11)

TP

DP1 ‘the clothes’

T' VoiceP

VoiceP vP

V ‘make’

VoiceP PP by DP2

V (DP1) ‘wash’ ‘the clothes’

Without a by-phrase, the embedded clause behaves like a canonical active:
- The embedded object behaves as though licensed by embedded verb.
- As such, it remains a grammatical object even when ‘make’ is passivized.

Passivization of ‘make’, when the embedded clause lacks a by-phrase, results in an impersonal passive, (12).
- The embedded theme does not raise to the subject position,
- no argument is associated with the grammatical subject position, as such ‘make’ is realized with the default third masculine agreement.

(12) m-sa addil bina.

PASS-made.3M build.INF building.F

‘Someone made (someone) build the building.’

Aside: SA does indeed independently allow impersonal passives, (13).

(13) lora m-sa dans (mu misafir-ad).

then PASS-made dance (by guest-PL)

‘Then it was danced (by the guests).’

- Crucially, under the active embedded analysis, this is expected.

- The behaviors of the other two diagnostics are summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>embedded clause</th>
<th>with by-phrase</th>
<th>without by-phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-passivizable idioms</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passivizable idioms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sluicing remnant</td>
<td>by whom</td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: active-passive embedded VoiceP

3.1 Theme as the grammatical object

The embedded theme is licensed in the embedded clause, thus behaves as a grammatical object independently of whether ‘make’ is active or passive.
- (i) Definiteness effect, (ii) Clitic Left-Dislocation (CLLD), and (iii) agreement asymmetry compel us to reach this conclusion.

- CLLD

Direct or indirect objects in Arabic may normally be CLLD-ed to the CP domain, be it matrix or embedded CP, (Benmamoun 2000; Aoun et al. 2010), as in (14).

(14) a. gaste ams qari-tu-a

newspaper.F yesterday read-1SG-3F

‘The newspaper, I read it yesterday.’

b. m-i-qbel le gaste ams qari-tu-a

NEG-3M-accept that newspaper.F yesterday read-1SG-3F

‘He doesn’t accept that the newspaper, I read it yesterday.’

The subject cannot be CLLD-ed. True for both the thematic subjects, (15a), as well as the underlying objects raised to become the grammatical subject, (15b).
(15) a. kemal qa-ra-(*u) gaste.
   Kemal.M read-3M newspaper.F
   ‘Kemal, he read the newspaper.’

b. kemal in-qı-del-(*u).
   Kemal.M PASS-kill-3M
   ‘Kemal, he is killed.’

When the matrix verb is passive, and there is a ‘by’-phrase associated with the embedded verb, the theme cannot undergo CLLD.

(16) gaste in-sat-t-e-(*a) qaru-(*a) m nes-ma tawwil.
    newspaper.F PASS-make-3F-3F read.INF-3F by person-a tall
    ‘The newspaper, it was made [read by a tall person].’

(17) pot-ad (mı mi-m-i) in-sa-o-(*en) xassil-(*en) m nes-ma cloths-PL (by mother-my) PASS-make-3PL-PL wash.INF-PL by person-a
    ‘Clothes were made (by my mother) washed by a person.’

Interim Summary
- ‘make’ embeds an agentive VoiceP, but lacks CP, TP, NegP and AspP.
  - The embedded VoiceP exhibits an active-passive alternation.
- The theme in the ‘make’ ICs lacks properties of a derived theme, but it exhibits properties of a grammatical object of a transitive.
- no embedded projection to license the embedded agent.

4 ʌ-extraction of embedded agent and phase-edge

(i) Reflexives, (ii) reciprocals, and (iii) depictives are licensed in the active, but not in the passive clause.

- Reflexives

Reflexives need a projected binder; not licensed in passives

(18) a. zıyrət adlo odav (mıṣa roen). 
   children did.3PL homework.M for themselves
   ‘The children did the homework (for themselves).’

b. odav in-adal (*mıṣa roen/rou).
   homework PASS-did.3M *for themselves/himself
   ‘The homework was done (*for themselves/himself).’

Not licensed by the embedded agent

(19) *iya sat-te addilₘₙ odav mıṣa rouₘₙ / roenₘₙ.
    she made-3F do.INF homework for himself / themselves
    ‘She made (some personₘₙ/peopleₘₙ) do the homework for himselfₘₙ/theirsevesₘₙ.’

- Pronunciation

The agent is obligatorily null, unless A’-moved (see also (5)).

(20) * mafya sa nes-ma gbir qadıl mara-du
    mafia made person-a big murder.INF wife-his
    ‘The mafia leader made a big person murder his wife.’

(21) sıma-tu le nes-ma gbir ye le mafya sa qadıl
    heard-1SG that person-a big COP.3 that mafia made murder.INF
    mafa-du
    wife-his
    ‘I’ve heard that it is a big person that the mafia made murder his wife.’

Notably, when the agent is A’-moved, reflexive binding, reciprocal binding, and depictives become possible:

(22) a. andeₖ iyaₖ sat-te addilₘₙ odav (mıṣa roenₘₙ).
    who she made-3F do.INF homework for themselves
    ‘Who made the homework for themselvesₘₙ.’

b. andeₖ si-t karu xanni (sar xoş) ?
    who made-2SG write song (drunk) ?
    ‘Who did you make compose the song drunk?’

- Thus, SA resembles the embedded infinitives in French (or Italian), where raising-to-object (R-to-O) from infinitives can be rescued by a subset of the English wager-class rescuers (Moulton 2009).

(23) a. *Je croyais le garçon être arrivé.
    I believe the boy (to) have arrived.
*R-to-O, (Rochette 1988:332:5a)
b. Qui croyais-tu aimer Anne?
Who believe-you to-love Anne
Q-operator, (Bošković 1997:129:103a)

(24) *Pierre était cru aimer Anne.
Pierre was believed to-love Anne.
*Passive Raising, (Bošković 1997:130:105)

(25) *calabma rıcel in-so xassil potad.
some men PASS-made.3PL wash-INF clothes
'Some men were made wash the clothes.'

• Analyses revolve around locality restrictions, which mainly concerns the presence of an extra layer or projection (e.g. Kayne 1984; Pesetsky 1991; Rochette 1988; Bošković 1997, 2002; Rezac 2013).
  – e.g. Bošković (1997, 2002): an additonal VP layer
  Rezac (2013:313-315): a silent N^0

• Rochette (1988:335): French (and Italian) ‘propositional’ infinitives are CPs, as such “act as a barrier with respect to government of the embedded subject position by the matrix verb...”.
  – In modern terms, the barrier corresponds to phases, and Moulton (2009) adopts this approach for French wager-class verbs.

• In the spirit of previous analyses, let’s identify the extra projection as the FP, whose head F is a phase-head and hosts Á-features.4

• Specifically, the embedded active, but not passive, VoiceP is dominated by this projection. Compare (26) and (27).

• This contrast will be crucial in explaining why the embedded VoiceP cannot have an embedded DP in its specifier.

4See Kahnemuyipour and Megerdichian (2011) who argue that the head of the low focus position, F, is a phase head in Armenian.
(30) a. kemal sa [xassil potad mi mara-ma pir-e].
   kemal made.3M [wash.INF clothes by woman-a old-F]
   'Kemal had the clothes washed by some old woman.'

b. 
   VoiceP
   Voice
   VP
   'make'
   VoiceP
   PP by DP2
   VoiceP
   VoiceP
   DP
   V
   DP

to (ii) passive > passive
- The embedded object is licensed by matrix NOM, as such it raises to grammatical subject and manifests subject-verb agreement. See (11).

≈ (iii) active > active, (iv) passive > active
- FP is projected on top of the embedded active Voice, which explains why there cannot be a DP in embedded Spec.VoiceP, (31a).
- Being a phasal domain, FP intervenes in the licensing of the embedded agent by the matrix ‘make’, (31b).

(31) a. *mafya sa nes-ma qadıl mara-du
   mafia made.person-a big murder.INF wife-his
   'The mafia leader made a big person murder his wife.'

b. 
   VoiceP
   Voice
   VP
   'make'
   VoiceP
   VoiceP
   F
   VoiceP
   VoiceP
   DP
   F
   VoiceP
   Voice
   0 Agent
   <DP>
   VoiceP
   Voice
   0 Agent
   VP

b. cinar-ma sa faqz,
   neighbor-a  faqz,
   V
   'make'
   VoiceP
   F
   VoiceP
   Voice
   0 Agent
   DP
   F
   VoiceP
   Voice
   0 Agent
   VP

(32) a. *kemal sa cinar-ma faqz
   Kemal made neighbor-a run-INF
   'Kemal made a neighbor run.'

b. cinar-ma kemal sa faqz, (mara-ma pir-e la)
   neighbor-a Kemal made run-INF (woman-a old-F no)
   'Kemal made a NEIGHBOR run (not an old woman).'

c. kemal sa cinar-ma faqz,
   kemal Kemal made neighbor-a run-INF (woman-a old-F no)
   'Kemal made a NEIGHBOR run (not an old woman).'

≈ (32c) is illustrated in (33):

≈ The ‘saving’ effect of A-movement has been discussed more widely in the literature. For instance, Kayne (1984) and Pesetsky (1991) propose that A-movement allows Case licensing by establishing new Case relations. See also Dikken (2009) for Hungarian.
5 Conclusions

- The ‘make’ causatives in SA embed an agentive VoiceP, which exhibits an active-passive alternation.
- The embedded agent may be introduced in the specifier of VoiceP.
  - However, when projected in Spec,VoiceP, it may not remain in-situ, and needs to be rescued by A-movement.
  - Thus, this construction in SA is part of a larger crosslinguistic pattern (Tagalog, Richards (2001), Rackowski and Richards (2005); Malagasy, Pearson (2001); French, Kayne (1975), i.a).
- A phase-based account both explains this restriction, and provides evidence for A-movement feeding licensing relations.

References


Dikken, Marcel den. 2009. On the nature and distribution of successive cyclicity. Ms, CUNY Graduate Center.


6 Appendix

• no full CP

(34) a. gaste ams qari-tu-a newspaper yesterday read-1SG-3F
   ‘The newspaper, I read it yesterday.’

b. *ams dâde sa-tte gaste qaru-a. yesterday mom made-3F newspaper read-3F
   ‘Yesterday mom made the newspaper (someone) read it.’

(35) *ams dâde sa-tte le/te hazd haşiş. yesterday mom made-3F that/to cut grass
   Intended: ‘Yesterday mom made that (someone) cuts the grass.’ OR ‘Yesterday mom made that (someone) cut the grass.’

• no full TP

(36) *ams aya sa hazd haşiş lome. yesterday landlord made cut.INF grass today
   ‘Yesterday the landlord made (someone) cut the grass today.’

• no AspP

In SA, the passive prefix is sensitive to aspect, as in (37), and realizes the combination of Aspect+Voice heads.

(37) a. potad in-xısl-o kil-lom
   clothes PASS.IMPF-wash.IMPF-3PL every-day
   ‘Clothes are washed every day.’

b. potad m-xasal-o ams
   clothes PASS.PFV-wash.PFV-3PL yesterday
   ‘Clothes were washed yesterday.’

The impossibility of the passive prefix on the infinitivals also indicates the lack of the aspect projection.

(38) beaqıl ye isi *in-/*m-addil musluq m unwise cop.3SG make PASS.IMPF/PASS.PFV-repair.INF tap by tamirci-ma hęki. repairman-a slow
   ‘It would be unwise to make the tap repaired by a slow repairman.’

• Another argument for VoiceP: lack of unaccusatives

(39) *kemal sa var mı mardivan-ad
   Kemal made.3M fall.INF from stair-PL
   Intended: ‘Kemal made (someone) fall from the stairs.’

(40) cf: ams cinar-i sa faqz mbala sabap yesterday neighbor-my made run.INF without reason
   ‘Yesterday my neighbor made (someone) run for no reason.’

expected, given unaccusatives lack thematic VoiceP.

• VP is available

(41) aya xıxef sa hazd haşiş hęki. landlord quickly made cut.INF grass slowly
   ‘The landlord quickly made (someone) cut the grass slowly.’

• An alternative hypothesis: nominal complement

→ Folli and Harley (2007:19) argue that if a v takes a nominal complement (including for faire infinitif vs faire par (Kayne 1975)), it requires an agent external argument - thus disallows causers.

• (42) shows that ‘make’ does not take a nominal complement in SA.

(42) a. zelzele sa-tte maş buyud-en earthquake made-3F leave.INF houses-their
   ‘The earthquake made (some people) leave their houses.’

b. bazu isi adu qararad kotti-n m calabma insanad fear 3M.make give.INF decisions bad-PL by some people
   ‘Fear makes bad decisions made by some people.’

• Also, note the contrast between (43a) and (43b).

(43) a. xasıl *(le) potad in-yaddel fi sake m ricel wash.GRND of clothes PASS-DO in lake by men
   ‘Washing of clothes is done in the lake by men.’

b. aya sa xassil *(le) potad village.lord made wash.INF of clothes
   ‘The village lord made (someone) was the clothes.’