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1 Introduction

• A number of languages have constructions in which an argument cannot remain in its base-generated position, and needs to move to be ‘rescued’.
e.g. English *wager-class verbs, Romance ECM, (1), or Austronesian applicatives.

(1) 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)
c. Le garçon que je croyais _ être arrivé.
The boy that I believed (to) have arrived.
Rel-operator, (Rochette 1988:332:5a)

• Previous proposals include
  (i) those that revolve around locality restrictions, be it either CP as a barrier/phase, or extra silent projections (e.g. Postal 1974; Kayne 1975, 1984; Pesetsky 1991; Bošković 1997; Rezac 2013),
  (ii) an Exfoliation approach, in which projections are deleted from a full clause (Pesetsky 2019),
  (iii) a PF-based constraint, mainly for wager-verbs in English (Ito 2014).2

• An indirect causative construction from Sason Arabic (SA, eastern Turkey), embedded under the verb ‘make’ (MC) supports a locality-based analysis.
  (4) VP
     / \FP
     V ‘make’
     \F
     VoiceP
     Voice’
     T Agent
     DP
     Voice
     VP

- The MC embeds an agentive VoiceP, with active-passive alternation, despite the absence of morphological reflex.
- Á-movement brings the embedded agent into a local configuration with its licenser, the matrix Voice, from which it is otherwise separated by a phase domain, as in (4).

2See Appendix I for the discussion of the proposals (ii) and (iii) regarding the MC.

1 Many thanks to Julie Anne Legate, David Embick, David Pesetsky, Martin Salzmann and Florian Schwarz for invaluable comments and discussions. I would also like to thank Abbas Benmamoun, Kyle Johnson, Hamid Ouali, Usama Soltan, Gary Thoms, Einar Freyr Sigurðsson, Matt Barros, Jim Wood, Hadas Kotek, Alison Biggs and the audiences at ASAL 33, GLOW 42, CLS 55, NYU - Syntax Brown Bag, FMART for feedback and discussions. Usual disclaimers apply.

2See Akkuş (2019a,b) for the arguments that the null embedded agent in (2a) is available as a free variable on Voice head without a specifier position.

3 Crucially, the embedded agent is obligatorily null, (2b).3

(2) a. mafya sa qadıl hasm-u
   mafia made murder-INF enemy-his
   ‘The mafia leader made murder his enemy.’
b. *mafya sa _ qadıl hasm-u
   mafia made _ murder-INF enemy-his
   ‘The mafia leader made murder his enemy.’

c. nes-mа gbir mafya sa qadıl hasm-u
   person-a big mafia made murder-INF enemy-his
   ‘A big person, the mafia made murder his enemy (not a small one).’

The puzzle. Á-movement (wh-question, relativization, focus) licenses the overt re-alization of the embedded agent, (3).

(3) a. ande mafya sa qadıl hasm-u?
   who mafia made murder-INF enemy-his
   ‘Who did the mafia leader make murder his enemy?’
b. sıma-tu nes-mа gbir le mafya sa qadıl hasm-u
   heard-1sg by person-a big that mafia made murder-INF enemy-his
   ‘I’ve heard about some big person that the mafia leader made murder his enemy.’
c. nes-mа gbir mafya sa qadıl hasm-u
   (nes-mа ıstudi lа)
   person-a big mafia made murder enemy-his (person-a small no)
   ‘A big person, the mafia made murder his enemy (not a small one).’
2 Size of the embedded constituent

A variety of diagnostics demonstrate that ‘make’ does not embed AspP or higher projections.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>diagnostic</th>
<th>result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no CLLD, wh-phrase or complementizers to the right of ‘make’</td>
<td>→ *CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no negation on the infinitive</td>
<td>→ *NegP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no distinct temporal modification or auxiliaries</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, instruments, 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 MC complement

- no full TP

5) *ams aya sa hazd hasısh lome. yesterday landlord made cut.INF grass today

‘Yesterday the landlord made (someone) cut the grass today.’

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

6) a. bina m-faşş-e m işçiyad wara çakuçad building,F PASS.PFV-demolished-3F by employees with hammers

‘The building was demolished by the employees with hammers.’

b. *bina m-qalab-e m rua wara çakuçad building,F NACT-fell.over-3F by itself with hammers

‘The building fell over by itself with hammers.’

They are also grammatical in the MC, and can modify the embedded agent, (7).

7) kemal sa buay sir ghmboz-e wara sope. Kemal made.3M paint do.INF turtle-F with stick

‘Kemal, with the stick, had [someone paint the turtle].’

‘Kemal had [someone paint the turtle with the stick].’

2.1 FP: A low focus position

- SA has a low focus position, FP, between the auxiliary and the participle, with active, (8), but not passive Voice, (9). Focusing in-situ is disallowed.

(8) active voice

(şurvan) kemal (*şurvan) ku (şurvan) i-xsel (*şurvan). pants kemal pants be.3M pants 3M-wash pants

‘Kemal is washing the pants, (not the shirt).’

(9) passive voice


‘Kemal is being given the book, (not the magazine).’

- The contrast between active versus passive VoiceP regarding the availability of FP holds in the MC as well.

10) MC embeds active voice

(şurvan) kemal (*şurvan) ku (şurvan) i-si (şurvan). pants Kemal pants be.3M pants 3M-make pants xassil (*şurvan). wash.INF pants

‘Kemal is making someone wash the pants, (not the shirt).’

11) MC embeds passive voice

(şurvan) kemal (*şurvan) ku (şurvan) i-si (*şurvan). pants Kemal pants be.3M pants 3M-make pants xassil (*şurvan) mi recel-ma pir. wash.INF pants by man-a old.m

‘Kemal had the pants (not the pillow) washed by some old man.’

- As such, the embedded active, but not passive, VoiceP is dominated by FP.

3 VoiceP with active-passive alternation

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

Generalization: An embedded clause with by-phrase behaves like a canonical passive, whereas without a by-phrase, the embedded clause behaves like a canonical active.4

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

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

(i) ala cam (mi kemal) m-qaraf bu-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)
3.1. (Impersonal) Passive

- An embedded clause with by-phrase behaves like a canonical passive:
  - 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, (12a-12b).
  - Raising is not possible without a by-phrase, (12c).

(12) 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.’

b. potad mı-so xassil mı mara-ma pir-e clothes PASS.PFV-made.3PL wash.INF by woman-a old-F
   ‘Clothes were made to be washed by some old woman.’

c. *potad mı-so xassil clothes PASS.PFV-made.3PL wash.INF
   Intended: ‘Clothes were made to be washed.’

- 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, (13).
  - 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.

(13) mı-sa addil bina. PASS.PFV-made.3M build.INF building.F
   ‘Someone, made someone build the building.’

Aside: SA does indeed independently allow impersonal passives, (14).

(14) lora mı-sa dans (mi misafir-ad).
then PASS.PFV-made dance (by guest-PL)
   ‘Then it was danced (by the guests).’

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

3.2. Sluicing

- While VP ellipsis may allow voice mismatching, sluicing does not (Merchant 2013); also true in SA.

(17) a. kemal kul çax i-xsel potad ta bad ma kmno. kemal made.3M wash.INF clothes by woman-a old-F
   ‘Kemal washes the clothes every time if they are not already.’
   b. ala bilgisayar itinx in-fide mı ande le irillu.
   this.M computer can PASS-open by who wants
   ‘This computer can be turned on by anyone who wants to.’

(18) sadqe le boş samaq m-qafal-o, hama m-arafe *(mi) believed.3F that many fish PASS-caught-3PL, but NEG-know.3F *(by)
   who
   ‘She believes many fish to have been caught, but she didn’t know *(by) who.’

- The embedded verb patterns as active for sluicing without a by-phrase.

(19) mafya sa qadal mara-du, hama m-ore *(mi) ande mafia made murder.INF wife-his but NEG-know.1SG *(by)
   who
   ‘The mafia boss made (sb.) murder his wife, but I don’t know *(by) who’

(20) a. mı-sa addil beyt, hama m-ore ande PASS-made build.INF house but NEG-know.1SG who
   ‘It was made (sb.) build the house, but I don’t know who’
   YES: who built the house
   NOT: who made somebody build the house
b. m-sa addil beyt, hama m-ore m ande
PASS-made build.INF house but NEG-know.1SG by who

‘It was made (sb.) build the house, but I don’t know by who’

YES: who made somebody build the house

NOT: who built the house

• With a ‘by’-phrase present, the embedded verb patterns as passive for sluicing.

(21) kemal sa xassil potad mi mara-ma pir-e, hama m-ore
Kemal made wash clothes by woman-a old-F, but NEG-know.1SG tam *(mu) ande.
exactly *(by) who

‘Kemal made the clothes be washed by an old woman, but I don’t know exactly *(by) who.’

(22) potad (mi mm-i) in-so xassil mi nes-ma, hama
clothes (by mother-my) PASS-made.3PL wash.INF by person-a but
m-ore *(mu) ande
NEG-know.1SG *(by) who

‘Clothes were made (by my mother) to be washed by a person, but I don’t know *(by) who.’

• The behavior of idioms is summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embedded clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With by-phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-passivizable idioms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passivizable idioms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Idioms in the MC

• The embedded active, (23), but not passive, (24), VoiceP is dominated by FP.

(23) active embedded VoiceP

(24) passive embedded VoiceP

4 Ā-extraction of embedded agent and phase-edge

The agent is obligatorily null, unless Ā-moved (see also (3)).

(25) * mafya sa nes-ma gbir qadıl hasm-u
mafia made person-a big murder.INF enemy-his

‘The mafia leader made a big person murder his enemy.’

(26) sıma-tu le nes-ma gbir ye le mafya sa qadıl hasm-u
heard-1SG that person-a big COP that mafia made murder.INF enemy-his

‘I’ve heard that it is a big person that the mafia made murder his enemy.’

• A line of analyses revolves around locality restrictions, which mainly concerns
the presence of an extra layer or projection (e.g. Kayne 1984; Pesetsky 1991;

  - e.g. Bošković (1997, 2002): an additional VP layer
Rezac (2013:313-315): a silent N

  - 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 these analyses, let’s identify the extra projection as the FP,
whose head F embedded under ‘make’ is a phase-head and hosts Ā-features.6

• Specifically, the embedded active, but not passive, VoiceP is dominated by this
projection. Compare (23) and (24).

• It is FP that causes the locality problem, and prevents the embedded agent
from remaining in-situ in Spec,VoiceP.

6See Kahnemuyipour and Megerdoomian (2011) who argue that the head of the low focus
position, F, is a phase head in Armenian.
• Logically and empirically, we have four possible configurations:
  (i) PASS > PASS, (ii) ACT > PASS, (iii) ACT > ACT, (iv) PASS > ACT

→ (i) **passive > passive**
  - The embedded object is licensed by matrix NOM, as such it raises to grammatical subject and manifests subject-verb agreement. See (27).

(27) a. potad in-so xassil mi mara-ma pir-e
   clothes PASS.PFV-made.3PL wash.INF by woman-a old-F
   ‘Clothes were made to be [washed by some old woman].’

b. [Diagram showing the structure of (27)]

→ (ii) **active > passive**

No intervening phase; the active matrix verb can license the embedded object.

(28) 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. [Diagram showing the structure of (28)]

→ (iii) **active > active**
  - FP is projected on top of the embedded active Voice, which explains why there cannot be a DP in embedded Spec,VoiceP, (29a).
  - Being a phasal domain, FP intervenes in the licensing of the embedded agent by the matrix Voice/’make’, (29b).

(29) a. *mafya sa nes-ma gbir qadıl hasm-u
   mafia made person-a big murder.INF enemy-his
   ‘The mafia leader made a big person murder his enemy.’

b. [Diagram showing the structure of (29)]

• Ā-movement makes the licensing possible (cf. Kayne 1984; Bošković 1997; Rezac 2013).

• F can host Ā-features, and the embedded agent can raise to its edge. As such, the agent can be licensed by ‘make’ in a local configuration (cf. Rezac 2013).

• The specifier of FP in SA can also host pronounced material: it is the alternative landing site for the focus constituent.

• As predicted, Spec,FP can also host the embedded agent when it is contrastively-focussed, (30).

(30) a. *kemal sa cinar-ma faqz
   Kemal made neighbor-a run.INF
   ‘Kemal made a neighbor run.’

b. (CINAR-MA) kemal sa (CINAR-MA) faqz, (recl-ma pir lā)
   neighbor-a Kemal made neighbor-a run (man-a old no)
   ‘Kemal made a neighbor run (not an old man).’

• The low focus position of (30b) is illustrated in (31):

The ‘saving’ effect of Ā-movement has been discussed more widely in the literature. For instance, Kayne (1984) and Pesetsky (1991) propose that Ā-movement allows Case licensing by establishing new Case relations. See also Dikken (2009) for Hungarian.
In this ‘impersonal passive’ configuration, we predict the availability of its edge for a focus constituent, given that FP is available, as in (33).

(32) ın-sa pass made xassil potad
PASS-made wash.INF clothes
‘It was made (by somebody) someone wash the clothes.’

(33) ın-sa (POTAD) xassil (*POTAD), (bulgife la),
PASS-made clothes wash.INF clothes pillow no
‘It was made (by somebody) someone wash the clothes, not the pillow.’

5 Conclusions
• The ‘make’ causatives in SA embed an agentive VoiceP, which exhibits an active-passive alternation without any morphological reflex.
• ‘Make’ does not embed AspP or higher projections. It selects either a passive VoiceP or an FP, which dominates an active VoiceP.
• The embedded agent may not remain in-situ in Spec,VoiceP, 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.

6 Appendix I: Alternative accounts
6.1 Exfoliation
• This hypothesis requires a transformation from an underlying full clause to an infinitive, which is possible only when movement has taken place from an embedded subject or subject-like position (Pesetsky 2019).8
• e.g. In English believe-verbs alternate with full finite CP, (34).

(34) a. Sue believes Mary to have solved the problem.
    b. Sue believes that Mary has solved the problem.
• The licensing and Exfoliation approaches differ in their prediction regarding the necessity of a licenser in the higher clausal domain.
  – Licensing approach: the absence of a higher licenser should lead to a difference for the embedded subject, but not embedded object.
  – Exfoliation: no difference since the embedded argument is licensed in the lower clause prior to Exfoliation.
• This can be tested by making the matrix verb passive, e.g. (35) and (36).

(35) Questioning the embedded object
a. ız kitab aya sa qaru?
    which book village.lord made read.INF
‘Which book did the village lord make someone read?’

b. ız kitab m-sa qaru?
    which book PASS-made read.INF
‘Which book was someone made to read?’

(36) Questioning the embedded subject
a. ande mafya sa qadıl hasm-u?
    who mafia made murder.INF enemy-his
‘Who did the mafia leader make murder his enemy?’

b. *ande m-sa xassil potad-na?
    who PASS-made wash.INF clothes-our
‘Who was to made wash our clothes?’

• The current approach also correctly predicts the unavailability of an embedded, focused agent with a passive matrix clause and active embedded clause, as in (37) (cf. 33 for the contrast).

(37) ın-sa (*CALABMA CINARAD) xassil potad, (recel-ma tawwil lā). 
PASS-made some neighbors wash.INF clothes-man-a tall no
‘It was made some neighbors wash the clothes, not some tall man.’

8Thanks to David Pesetsky for the discussion of this section.
Exfoliation would also predict a full clause counterpart of the infinitive, as in (34) in English.

- SA indeed does have a full clause causative construction embedded under ‘make’, (38), call it FC.

(38) a. büşra (muşa) kemal sa-tte f-iyu le pro ya-yez hadiya Büşra (to) Kemal made-3F in-him that 3M-buy present ‘Büşra made Kemal buy a present.’ (Yakut 2013:7)

b. ams ayadı (muşa) sabiyadı so f-innen le yesterday village.lords to boys made.3pl in-them that pro-dropped argument in the embedded clause, but it can also be realized as a reduced pronoun, (38b).9

Properties of the FC:

- The causee is realized in the matrix clause, as a PP or DP (in free variation).
- It is connected to a resumptive pronoun, itself contained inside a PP, i.e. f-iyu ‘in him’ in the matrix clause.
- The causee is realized as pro-dropped argument in the embedded clause, but it can also be realized as a reduced pronoun, (38b).9

FC and MC differ in several respects.

- The FC lacks the indefiniteness condition on the causee, unlike the MC.
- Causer such as ‘earthquake, fear’ are allowed as matrix subjects in the MC, but not the FC, (39).

(39) a. *zelzele kemal sa-tte f-iyu le pro m-i-xxel beyt earthquake Kemal made-3F in-him that NEG-3M-enter house ‘The earthquake made Kemal not enter home.’

b. zelzele sa-tte maş buyud earthquake made-3F leave.INF houses ‘The earthquake made (some people) leave the houses.’

- Furthermore, in case of a truncation, Exfoliation might predict the possibility of (40), contrary to fact.

9The obligatory co-reference between the embedded subject and the causee in the matrix clause corroborates the causative relationship of this construction.

6.2 A PF-constraint


- When the ECM is a pronoun, it must raise in the syntax in order to cliticize onto the embedding verb at PF.
- As such, it becomes a ‘clause-mate’, leading to a violation of Condition B, (41); hence the Condition B violation also in (42a).

(41) a. *John injured him.

b. *Mary injured him and John did too.

(42) a. *John believes him to be a genius.

b. ?Mary believes him to be a genius and John does too.


- Crucially, under the VP ellipsis, the pronominal ECM subject can remain in the embedded subject position because the concomitant failure to cliticize (a PF violation) can be repaired by the VP ellipsis, as in (42b).
- The primary motivation, i.e. the availability of pronouns as embedded subjects, is not available in the MC.

(43) *mafya sa iyen qadıl hasm-u mafia made.3M them murder.INF enemy-his

‘The mafia leader made them murder his enemy.’

- Secondly, a constraint of obligatory PF adjacency between ‘make’ and the ‘infinitive’ cannot be at work.

(44) kemal [sa bucay sir | beyt wara furça-d gbar Kemal [made.3M paint do.INF | house with brush-PL big.PL

‘Kemal had someone paint the house with big paint brushes.’

- The complex predicate analysis is also not tenable, as evinced by instances of contrastive focus throughout.
- The contrast between (58) and (59) in terms of anaphor binding or depictive licensing also suggests that it cannot be a pure PF constraint (see Appendix 2).

- SA is a pro-drop language. If it were just a PF issue, we would expect them to be possible in the complements of ‘make’.
7 Appendix II: Size of the ‘make’ complement

- no full CP

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

    yesterday mom made-3f newspaper read-3f  
    ‘Yesterday mom made the newspaper (someone) read it.’

Neither the finite complementizer le nor the subjunctive te/ta are possible.

(46) *ams yesterday dàdê mom sa-tte made-3f gaste qaru-a.  
    yesterday mom made-3f that/to hâzî cut hâşiş.  
    ‘Yesterday mom made that (someone) cut the grass.’  
    OR ‘Yesterday mom made (someone) cut the grass.’

- no NegP: Negation is also disallowed on the infinitive. (47).

(47) iyen (mı)-i-s-o (*mı)-yânni  
    they NEG-3-make-PL NEG-sing.INF  
    ‘They don’t make anyone sing.’

- AspP: In SA, the passive prefix is sensitive to aspect, (48), and realizes the combination of Aspect+Voice heads.

(48) potad in-xasl-o / m-xasal-o  
    clothes PASS.IMPF-wash.IMPF-3PL / PASS.PVF-wash.PVF-3PL  
    ‘Clothes are/were washed.’

The passive prefix is disallowed on the infinitive.

(49) beaqıl ye i-si *in/-*m-addil mushuq mı  
    unwise cop.3SG 3M-make PASS.IMPF/PASS.PVF-repair.INF tap by  
    tamirci-ma hêdi. repairman-a slow  
    ‘It would be unwise to make the tap repaired by a slow repairman.’

- VoiceP: lack of unaccusatives

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

(51) cf: ams cinar-i sa fâqz 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.

(52) Agent-oriented adverbs

bolum ti-si mez snavad le qabul wara diqqat.  
    department 3f-make look.INF tests of acceptance with care  
    ‘The department makes (someone) [check acceptance tests carefully].’

(53) Agent-oriented comitatives

aya sa hâziş hârî wara cinarad.  
    village.lord made cut.INF grass with neighbors  
    ‘The village lord made [(someone) cut the grass with the neighbors].’  
    ‘The village lord, with the neighbors, made [(someone) cut the grass].’

- VP is available

(54) aya xifef sa hâziş hêdi.  
    village.lord quickly made cut.INF grass slowly  
    ‘The village lord quickly made (someone) cut the grass slowly.’

- An alternative hypothesis: nominal complement

 رسّ 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.

- (55) shows that ‘make’ does not take a nominal complement in SA (also 39b).

(55) bazu isi aду qararád kotti-n m calamb 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 (56a) and (56b).

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

b. aya sa xassîl / *xasîl *(le) potad  
    village.lord made wash.INF / wash.GRNDF of clothes  
    ‘The village lord made (someone) wash the clothes.’
8 Appendix III: Licensing properties

(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

(57) a. ziɾar_i adl-o odaɾ (mɯsa roen_i),
    children did-3PL homework.M for themselves
    ‘The children did the homework (for themselves).’

b. odaɾ m-adal (*mɯsa roen/roʊ).
    homework PASS.PPFV-did.3M *for themselves/himself
    ‘The homework was done (*for themselves/himself).’

Not licensed by the embedded agent

(58) *iya_i sat-te addil_k odaɾ mɯsa roeŋ_k / roen_k.
    she made-3F do.INF homework for himself / themselves
    ‘She made (some person_k/people_k) do the homework
    for himself_k/themselves_k.’

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

(59) a. ande_k iya_i sat-te addil odaɾ (mɯsa roen_k),
    who she made-3F do.INF homework for themselves
    ‘Who_k did she make do the homework for themselves_k.’

b. ande_k si-t karu xamı (sarxoʃ_k)?
    who made-2SG write song (drunk)
    ‘Who_k did you make compose the song drunk_k?’
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