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1 Introduction

A number of languages have constructions in which arguments cannot remain in their base-generated position, and need to move to be ‘rescued’. As such, certain positions cannot be occupied by overt material at Spell-Out. Such constructions include wager-class verbs in English (Postal 1974, 1993; Pesetsky 1991, 2016; Bošković 1997, 2002; Richards 2001; Rezac 2013, i.a.), Romance infinitives (Kayne 1975, 1984; Rizzi 1982; Bošković 1997, i.a.), and applicativized arguments in Malagasy (Pearson 2001) and Tagalog (Pearson 2001; Richards 2001; Rackowski and Richards 2005; Legate 2014).

The nature of this phenomenon has remained as a long-standing puzzle despite a large body of work. In this squib, we introduce an indirect causative construction from Sason Arabic (SA) embedded under the verb ‘make’, henceforth MC, which brings in a new perspective to this puzzle. The MC is a construction with an overt embedded theme, but no overt embedded agent, as in (1a). The embedded verb appears in infinitival form. It maintains an agentive reading where the embedded agent is interpreted as indefinite, non-specific ‘someone’ or ‘some people’. Crucially, the embedded agent is obligatorily null, (1b).

*Thanks to ...
(1) a. mafya sa qadîl hasm-u
mafia made murder.INF enemy-his
‘The mafia leader made someone murder his enemy.’

b. *mafya sa nes-ma gbir / nes-ma qadîl hasm-u
mafia made person-a big / person-a murder.INF enemy-his
‘The mafia leader made a big person / someone murder his enemy.’

Notably, A-movement (wh-question, relativization, focus) licenses the overt realization of the embedded agent, (2).

(2) a. ande mafya sa qadîl hasm-u?
who mafia made murder.INF enemy-his
‘Who did the mafia leader make murder his enemy?’

b. sıma-tu mi nes-ma gbir le mafya sa qadîl 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-ma gbir mafya sa qadîl hasm-u (nes-ma ıstudi lâ)
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).’

Therefore, the MC is part of a larger crosslinguistic pattern mentioned above, in which an argument cannot remain in-situ, and needs to move. The approaches attempting to account for this phenomenon can be classified into three main categories: (i) locality restrictions, (ii) a PF-constraint, (iii) Exfoliation, i.e. deletion of projections from a full clause. SA provides new evidence that supports a locality-based analysis.

2 Prominent analyses of Romance ECM type constructions

One main approach to wager-class and Romance ECM verbs revolves around locality restrictions which mainly concern the presence of an extra layer or projection, although the primary motivation for this varies (e.g. Kayne 1984; Pesetsky 1991; Rochette 1988; Bošković 1997,
For instance, Bošković (1997, 2002) argues that the generalization that agentive verbs cannot exceptionally case-mark lexical NPs can be captured from the proposal that such verbs have an additional VP shell. He argues that due to the presence of the additional VP layer, matrix [Spec, AgrOP], the accusative-checking position, is too far from the embedded clause-subject.

(3)  *John wagered [AgrOP the woman [VP t_i [VP t_i [IP t_j to t_j know French ]]]].

(Bošković 2002:(53))

He argues that the agentive shell, which is responsible for the ungrammaticality of (3), is not present in passives, which accounts for the contrast between (3) and (4).

(4)  The woman was wagered to know French. (Bošković 2002:ia)

Rezac (2013:313-315) suggests that in wager but not believe ECM, a silent N^0 in [v/V^Acc [N^0 Inf]] intervenes in v/V^Acc φ-Agree but becomes invisible by the time of T_Nom φ-Agree. The guiding intuition behind Rezac’s (2013) proposal is similar to that of Pesetsky (1991), Bošković (2002) in that wager has a structure richer than believe in such a way that a Case problem arises and is obviated by Ā-movement.

Rochette (1988:335), following Kayne (1984), assumes the French (and Italian) ‘propositional’ infinitives in (5) to be CPs, as such “CP will act as a barrier with respect to government of the embedded subject position by the matrix verb, therefore precluding the possibility for Case assignment of the subject by the matrix verb”. In today’s terms, the barrier roughly corresponds to phases, and Moulton (2009) adopts this approach for French wager-class verbs.

---

1Rezac (2013) posits that in ECM+DOC, the indirect object intervenes in φ-Agree with the subject of the infinitive, and that Ā-movement relates the infinitival subject to v/V^Acc by [uCase] valuation as a free rider on Ā-Agree. Richards (2001:ch. 4) makes a similar point calling it “overcrowding”, in that in case of too many arguments in a particular position, one of them must move. Richards notes that an explanation based on ‘feature strength’, i.e. weak/strong features, is not enough, but leaves aside the exact nature of this phenomenon.
(5) 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) (Moulton 2009)

On the other hand, Pesetsky’s (2019) *Exfoliation* hypothesis is built on the view that infinitives are built by reducing/deleting the C and T layers of the clause, and only when movement has taken place from an embedded subject or subject-like position is infinitivization possible (see also Pesetsky 2016, 2018). In other words, every embedded clause is built by Merge as a full finite CP, and may be reduced to a less than full clause only as a consequence of later derivational processes.

In contrast, Ito (2014) argues that the defective paradigm exhibited by *wager/assure*-class verbs in English stems from a PF constraint rather than a syntactic Case-theoretic mechanism. The argument is based on Lasnik’s (2002) account of a Condition B amelioration effect with ECM verbs under the VP ellipsis. This approach suggests that when the ECM is a pronoun, it must raise in the syntax in order to cliticize onto the embedding verb at PF, and as a result of this it becomes a ‘clause-mate’, the relevant structural configuration relevant to Condition B based on (6), with the subject in the higher clause; hence the Condition B violation in (7a).


   b. *Mary injured him and John did too.

(7) 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 (7b).

In this squib, we adopt the locality-based approach, and demonstrate that neither Exfoliation nor a PF-constraint captures the full range of facts for the Sason Arabic ‘make’ causatives.

3 A quick background on MC

This section gives a brief overview of the relevant properties MC exhibits, which can be briefly summarized as follows: ‘make’ embeds a thematic VoiceP, but lacks AspP and higher projections, i.e. CP, NegP, TP. Moreover, embedded VoiceP exhibits an active-passive alternation despite the absence of any morphological reflex. An embedded clause with a by-phrase behaves like a canonical passive, whereas without the by-phrase, it behaves as active (see AUTHOR(S) for a detailed discussion and relevant diagnostics).

Moreover, the embedded theme, e.g. hasmu ‘his enemy’ in (1a), shows properties of a grammatical object of a transitive construction rather than those of a derived subject, i.e., a grammatical subject of passives. In Arabic grammatical (direct or indirect) objects, but not grammatical subjects may undergo CLLD to the CP domain, be it matrix or embedded CP (Benmamoun 2000; Aoun et al. 2010). When the matrix verb ‘make’ is passive, and there is a ‘by’-phrase associated with the embedded verb, the theme cannot undergo CLLD, (8), thus patterning as a grammatical subject. On the other hand, without a ‘by’-phrase associated with the embedded verb, CLLD of the embedded theme is licit, as in (9), thus patterning as a grammatical object.

---

\(^2\)Note that the ungrammaticality of (i) demonstrates that the interpretation of clauses without a by-phrase as active is not simply a matter of garden-path. Thanks to David Pesetsky (p.c.) for pointing this out.

(i) potad in-so xassil mi mara-ma pir-e, *u şurvan-i ce in-so xassil clothes PASS-made.3PL wash.INF by woman-a old-F, and pants-my also PASS-made.3PL wash.INF

Intended: ‘Clothes were made to be washed by some old woman, and pants were also made to be washed.’
grammatical object.\(^3\)

\[(8)\] gaste in-satt-e-(*a) qaru-(*a) mı nes-ma tawwil.
newspaper.F PASS.PFV-made-3F-3F read.INF-3F by person-a-tall
‘The newspaper, it was made [read by a tall person].’

\[(9)\] gaste in-sat qaru-a.
newspaper.F PASS-made.3M read.INF-3F
‘The newspaper, it was made that someone read it.’

AUTHOR(S) (2019) demonstrate that when the embedded agent is null, it is not present in the syntax, and therefore for example cannot license anaphors or depictives, (10).\(^4\)

\[(10)\] iya\(_i\) satte karu\(_k\) odav (*mışa rou\(_k\)/roen\(_k\)/bazen\(_k\)) sarxoš\(_i/\ast\_k\).
she made write.INF assignment for himself/themselves/each other drunk
‘She\(_i\) made (someone\(_k\) / some people\(_k\)) write the assignment (*for himself\(_k\)/themselves\(_k\)/each other\(_k\)) drunk\(_i/\ast\_k\).’

Notably, when the embedded agent undergoes Á-movement and thus pronounced (cf. 2), this licensing becomes possible. Consider (11).

\[(11)\] a. ande\(_k\) iya\(_i\) sa-tte karu odav (*mışa roen\(_k\)) sarxoš\(_k\)?
who she made-3F write.INF assignment for themselves drunk
‘Who\(_k\) did she\(_i\) make do the assignment for themselves\(_k\) drunk\(_k\)?’

b. ande\(_k\) pro sa-tte\(_i\) bās baz-en\(_k\)?
who made-3F kiss.INF each other-3PL
‘Who\(_k\) did she\(_i\) make kiss each other\(_k\)?’

\(^3\) The contrast between (8) and (9) also illustrates the point about active-passive alternation of VoiceP. Other diagnostics discussed in AUTHOR(S) (2019) include sluicing and (non)-passivizable idioms. Briefly summarizing, the embedded VoiceP behaves as active for sluicing in the absence of a ‘by’-phrase, whereas as passive with a ‘by’-phrase. Similarly, nonpassivizable idioms are not possible in the complement of ‘make’ when there is a ‘by’-phrase associated with the embedded verb. Passivizable idioms show no such restriction.

\(^4\) Note also that the reflexive in SA is not subject-oriented, thus the ungrammaticality is not due to a ban against a potential oblique antecedent, as in (i). (thanks to Keny Chatain and Kyle Johnson for independently bringing this to our attention.)

\[(i)\] varrit-u kemal rou fi ayne
showed-1SG Kemal himself in mirror
‘I showed Kemal himself in the mirror.’
MC in SA resembles the embedded infinitives in French and Italian, where ECM/raising-to-object constructions from infinitives can be rescued by a subset of the English wager-class rescuers. As in Romance infinitives, (12), SA embedded agents are only licensed by Ā-movement, thus the ungrammaticality of (13).

(12) *Pierre était cru aimer Anne.
    Pierre was believed to-love Anne.

*Passive Raising (French; Bošković 1997:130)\(^5\)

(13) *calabma rcel in-so xassil potad.
some men PASS-made.3PL wash.INF clothes

‘Some men were made wash the clothes.’

The next section argues that SA MCs provide support for a locality-based analysis, followed by a comparison with alternative analyses.

4 Proposal: Ā-extraction of embedded agent and phase-edge

We propose that SA facts provide a new, strong piece of evidence for locality-based analyses. In fact, both versions of locality analyses, i.e. those with barrierhood/phasehood (e.g. Kayne 1984; Rochette 1988; Moulton 2009) and those with an extra projection (e.g. Pesetsky 1991; Bošković 1997, 2002; Rezac 2013), are reconciled in SA. MC can be explained via a phase-based account, yet the phase domain is not CP (unlike Romance), but a low focus position, FP, above VoiceP. Secondly, the contrast between active vs. passive VoiceP in terms of the projection of FP is in line with an extra projection. Indeed, FP provides a stronger argument for the presence of an extra projection: in previous literature, this extra projection is either silent or postulated to be an intermediate landing site. In SA, however, this projection can host overt material, thus indicates that a potential prediction of this analysis is borne out.

\(^5\)David Pesetsky informs us that certain variations of (12) are found to be acceptable by some French speakers, as noted in Pollock (1985:307). Two French speakers we have consulted share the judgment reported in Bošković (1997), thus we continue to assume so since the discussion in the squib barely depends on it.
As a first step, we establish that as a general property of the language, in SA with active VoiceP, a contrastively-focussed constituent can raise either to the sentence-initial position or to a low position, FP, between the auxiliary and the participle (focus is indicated via small caps, and FP is represented in a box). The focussed element cannot remain in-situ, thus contrastive focus indicates movement to a higher position. Consider (14).

(14) (SURVAN) kemal (*SURVAN) ku [SURVAN] i-xsel (*SURVAN) (qawa lā).
    pants kemal pants be.3M pants 3M-wash pants shirt no
    ‘Kemal is washing the pants, (not the shirt).’

On the other hand, with passive VoiceP, the low focus position is not projected, (15), as shown by the ungrammaticality of the focused element appearing in the low position. Therefore, in SA active VoiceP is dominated by FP, whereas passive VoiceP is not.

(15) a. kınna n-adi kemal kitab.
    be.IPfv.1pl 1pl-give.IPfv Kemal book
    ‘We are giving Kemal the book.’

b. kemal ku in-y-adi kitab.
    Kemal be.IPfv.3M pass.IPfv-3M-give.IPfv book
    ‘Kemal is being given the book.’

c. (KITAB) kemal (*KITAB) ku (*KITAB) in-y-adi (*KITAB)
    (gaste lā).
    magazine no
    ‘Kemal is being given the book, (not the magazine).’

We observe that the contrast between active versus passive VoiceP regarding the availability of FP also holds in MCs besides finite (root or embedded) clauses. When the embedded clause is active (indicated by the absence of a ‘by’-phrase), a focussed constituent can appear sentence initially as well as in a lower position between ‘make’ and ‘infinitive’, indicating that FP

---

6Ouwayda and Shlonsky (2016) notes a similar low-focus position for Lebanese Arabic.
is available embedded under ‘make’, (16). Similar to the situation in root clauses, the focus element may not remain in-situ.

(16) (ŠURVAN) kemal (*ŠURVAN) ku (ŠURVAN) i-si (ŠURVAN) xassil pants Kemal pants be.3M pants 3M-make pants wash.1INF
 (*ŠURVAN), (qawa lā), pants shirt no
 ‘Kemal is making someone wash the pants, (not the shirt).’

Likewise, with an embedded passive Voice (indicated by the presence of a ‘by’-phrase), FP is unavailable, (17).

(17) (ŠURVAN) kemal (*ŠURVAN) ku (ŠURVAN) i-si (ŠURVAN) xassil pants Kemal pants be.3M pants 3M-make pants wash.1INF
 (*ŠURVAN) mı recel-ma pir, (balgife lā), pants by man-a old.M pillow no
 ‘Kemal had the pants (not the pillow) washed by some old man.’

We propose that the embedded active, but not passive, VoiceP is dominated by FP, whose head F is a phase-head and hosts Ā-features (following e.g. Chomsky 2000, 2001; Abels 2012; also see Van Urk 2015; Van Urk and Richards 2015), including focus.\(^7\) Compare (18) and (19).\(^8\)

\(^{7}\)See Kahnemuyipour and Megerdoomian (2011, 2017) who argue that the head of the low focus position, F, is a phase head in Armenian (more explicitly in their latter work).

\(^{8}\)Throughout the squib, we leave out v since it is not central to the discussion and for space reasons.
It is this FP projection that causes the locality problem. This analysis explains the four possible configurations, based on the diathesis of matrix and embedded clauses: Logically and empirically, we have four possible configurations depending on the diathesis of matrix and embedded clauses: (i) active > passive, (ii) passive > passive, (iii) active > active, (iv) passive > active. The proposed analysis makes predictions for each of these configurations.

Let us start with the two configurations in which the embedded Voice is passive, and thus FP is not projected. Given that there is no intervening phase, when the matrix verb is active, the matrix verb can license the embedded object, e.g. (20a-20b).

(20) 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. 

\[ \text{VoiceP} \\
| \text{DP} | \text{Voice'} \\
| \text{Voice} | \text{VP} \\
| \theta \text{Agent} | \text{V} | \text{VoiceP} \\
| | \text{‘make’} | \text{VoiceP} \\
| | \text{PP} | \text{by DP2} \\
| | \text{V} | \text{DP} \]

When both clauses have passive Voice, the embedded object is licensed by matrix NOM, as in (21a), as such it raises to grammatical subject and manifests subject-verb agreement (note that the configurations are very similar to restructuring of Wurmbrand 2001 et seq). The corresponding tree structure is represented as (21b).

(21) a. potad mı-so (mı Kemal) [xassil mı mara-ma pir-e ]. clothes PASS.PFV-made.3PL (by Kemal) [wash.INF by woman-a old-F ]

‘Clothes were made (by Kemal) to be washed by some old woman.’
Turning to configurations with embedded active Voice, the projection of FP above VoiceP explains why the embedded agent may not remain in-situ, (22a). This is because, being a phasal domain, FP intervenes in the licensing of the embedded agent by the matrix Voice, as in (22b).

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

On the other hand, Ā-movement makes the licensing possible (cf. Kayne 1984; Ura 1993;
Bošković 1997; Rezac 2013). We suggest that this is because 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, in the spirit of e.g. Rezac (2013). This explains the grammaticality of for instance (23) as opposed to (22a).

(23) sima-tu le nes-ma gbir ye le mafya sa qadı̈l hasm-u
heard-1SG that person-a big COP.3 that mafia made murder.INF enemy-his
‘I’ve heard that it is a big person that the mafia leader made murder his enemy.’

Example (16) has shown that the specifier of FP in SA can host pronounced material: it is the alternative landing site for the focused constituent, in this case the embedded grammatical object. As predicted by successive-cyclicity, Spec,FP can also host the embedded agent when it is contrastively-focussed. Consider (24), which provides strong evidence for the phase-based account in that FP acts as a barrier for ‘make’/Voice to license the embedded agent, unless the agent raises to the edge of the phase head.

(24) 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, (recel-ma pir là)
       neighbor-a Kemal made neighbor-a run (man-a old no)
    ‘Kemal made a neighbor run (not an old man).’

The tree in (25) is an illustration of the embedded agent raising to the low focus position, Spec,FP, in (24b), as such the embedded agent is in a local configuration to be licensed by the matrix verb ‘make’/Voice.

---

9The ‘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 e.g. Dikken (2009), Lipták (1998) for the same idea implemented for Hungarian. Similar arguments for object case/agreement through Ā-movement have been made on the basis of topicalization in Norwegian (Taraldsen 1984) and Ā-movement in Passamaquoddy (Bruening 2001).
Finally, we illustrate the instance in which the matrix Voice is passive, but the embedded Voice is active. This is an impersonal passive configuration in SA (see AUTHOR(S)). Given that FP is available, we predict the availability of its edge for a focus constituent. This is illustrated to be the case in (27).

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

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

This account provides striking evidence for Ā-movement feeding licensing relationships, thus explains the contrast between (10) and (11). In (10), the in-situ embedded agent is itself not licensed, and hence cannot be projected, in turn it cannot license anaphors or depictives. On the other hand, in (11), the embedded agent has been Ā-moved and licensed by matrix Voice,\(^\text{10}\)

\(^\text{10}\)as such also overtly realized. This is reminiscent of Pesetsky’s (2019) exposure, in which the overt realization of an element is dependent on it satisfying certain requirements. The requirements for overtness, however, seem to be different. Whereas for Pesetsky (2019:46), the overtness of to in infinitives depends on it becoming a phase head after Exfoliation and not retaining a specifier; in our case, it is the result of being licensed.
which makes it possible for it to license anaphors and depictives.\textsuperscript{11} The proposed analysis captures the full range of facts. In the next section, we investigate the alternative hypotheses, i.e. an Exfoliation approach and a PF-constraint, and argue that neither approach can fully explain the MC facts.

4.1 Exfoliation

This hypothesis requires a transformation from an underlying full clause to an infinitive, and this derivation is possible only when movement has taken place from an embedded subject or subject-like position.\textsuperscript{12} According to this approach, every embedded clause is built by Merge as a full finite CP, and may be reduced to a less than full clause only as a consequence of later derivational processes. The Exfoliation hypothesis comes along with several implications, one of which is the alternation of infinitives with finite clauses, out of which they are derived. For instance, in English believe-verbs alternate with full finite CP, (28).

(28) a. Sue believes Mary to have solved the problem.

\textsuperscript{11}This account also straightforwardly explains the ungrammaticality of (i) in SA. This is because the landing site of the embedded agent would be the result of improper movement, in that it would need to raise to Spec,FP, an instance of $\bar{\text{A}}$-movement, followed by raising to Spec,TP, an instance of A-movement (see fn. 16 for an alternative explanation).

(i) *calabma rceł m-so xassil potad, some men PASS-made.3PL wash.INF clothes

‘Some men were made wash the clothes.’

This approach would also explain the same restriction observed for Romance infinitives. In Romance, the embedded subject would undergo successive cyclic movement through an embedded specifier of CP of the infinitival clause, an $\bar{\text{A}}$-position, and then to matrix TP, an A-position. One issue left open with this approach is the status of FP in matrix clauses vs. when it is selected by ‘make’. It seems that whether FP is selected by ‘make’, thus is obligatorily projected, or it is optionally projected in non-embedded clauses makes a difference. This squib captures the contrast by suggesting that only FP embedded under ‘make’ is a phase, in a similar vein to Deal (2016), who argues that TP is a phase only in relative clauses in Nez Perce. This approach would also not, however, extend to English, where passivization of the embedded agent is licit, (4). One could potentially conjure two paths of explanation: first, English may lack such an $\bar{\text{A}}$-position as an intermediate landing site, as such improper movement is not an issue. Second, Moulton (2009) has contended that the passive in English wager-class verbs may not be verbal, but adjectival passives. If Moulton is right, then English passives would be of a different nature (though the compatibility wager-class verbs with progressive aspect in the passive speaks against their treatment as adjectival passives; thanks to David Pesetsky (p.c.) for alerting us to this). We leave it for future study a comprehensive investigation of this phenomenon in other languages.

\textsuperscript{12}We are thankful to David Pesetsky for the discussion of this section.
b. Sue believes that Mary has solved the problem.

SA indeed has another causative construction with ‘make’ and an embedded finite clause, henceforth FM, as illustrated in (29). The question is whether there is a derivational relation between the causative construction in (29) and MC.

(29) a. büşra (mıșa) 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. doxtor (mıșa) ali ku i-si f-iyu (le pro y-addel) sipor
doctor to Ali be.3M 3M-make in-him (that 3M-make) sports
‘The doctor is making Ali do sports.’ (Erguvanlı-Taylan 2017:221, with slight modifications)

c. ams ayadı (mıșa) sabiyadı so f-innen le pro si/k/sm /
yesterday villagelords to boys made.3PL in-them that /
innen si/k/sm ixsıl-o potad lome.
they wash-3PL clothes today
‘Yesterday the village lords made the boys wash the clothes today.’

Lit: ‘Yesterday the village lords made the boys in them that they washed the clothes today.’

Looking at this construction, we can note the following: the causee, e.g. kemal in (29a), itself is realized in the matrix clause, in the form of a PP or DP (in free variation). Moreover, the causee is connected to a resumptive pronoun, itself contained inside a PP, i.e. f-iyu ‘in him’ in the matrix clause. Moreover, the causee is realized as pro-dropped argument in the embedded clause, but it can also be realized as a reduced pronoun, as indicated in (29c). The MC does not have any of these properties. The obligatory co-reference between the embedded subject and the causee in the matrix clause corroborates the causative relationship of this construction. Note

---

13 The optionality was not indicated in Erguvanlı-Taylan (2017), but our native speaker intuitions are in the same direction as other examples, thus we modified the original example.

14 The position of the resumptive pronoun in the matrix clause is supported by the fact that adverbs such as kasılıkla ‘definitely’, wara kul kalb-a ‘with all her heart’ typically occur between this resumptive pronoun and the complementizer le ‘that’.
also that this construction lacks the indefiniteness condition on the causee, which is available for MC.

In addition to these properties, several issues challenge a derivational relation between FM and MC, such that MC is derived from FM via the truncation of CP and TP layers of the embedded clause. Given that Exfoliation is predicated on the movement of the embedded subject, we might expect to have a clause of the sort in (30) to be possible, contrary to fact. Note that placing the embedded subject \textit{innen} ‘they’ anywhere else in the matrix clause makes no difference.

(30) *ams aya müşa sabiyad sa f-innen \textit{innen} [xassil potad].
\hspace{1cm} yesterday landlord to boys made in-them they [wash.1NF clothes]
\hspace{1cm} ‘Yesterday the landlord made the boys to wash the clothes.’

One could argue that we would not expect a sentence like (30) simply because Exfoliation would not apply. This reasoning, however, would amount to saying that there is no derivational relationship between FM and MC.

A more serious challenge for the Exfoliation approach comes from the contrast between (31) and (32). The Case-theoretic licensing and Exfoliation approaches make a clear prediction regarding the necessity of a licenser in the higher clausal domain. For the Case-theoretic licensing approach, the absence of a higher licenser should lead to a difference for the embedded subject, but not embedded object, since the former relies on a higher licenser, whereas the latter has an embedded licenser. However, for the Exfoliation approach, there should be no difference regardless of the presence or absence of a higher licenser because the embedded argument is licensed in the lower clause prior to Exfoliation. Making the matrix verb passive, we can test this prediction. The contrast between (31) and (32) is informative, and suggests that a licensing approach is the right one for MC in SA. (31) shows that forming a question out of the embedded object is grammatical independently of the diathesis of the matrix clause. On the other hand, questioning the embedded subject is grammatical when the matrix Voice is active, as in (32a), but not passive, as in (32b). This is because although in both (32a) and (32b), FP is projected on
top of embedded active VoiceP, only in the former is the embedded agent licensed by the matrix
Voice. In (32b), the embedded subject may still raise to Spec.FP, but the higher licenser is not
available since the matrix-clause predicate is passive.

(31) a. ı$ kitab aya sa qaru?
which book village.lord made read.INF
‘Which book did the village lord make someone read?’

b. ı$ kitab in-sa qaru’?
which book PASS-made read.INF
‘Which book was someone made to read?’

(32) a. ande mafya sa qadıl hasm-u? (repeated from (2a))
who mafia made murder.INF enemy-his
‘Who did the mafia leader make murder his enemy?’

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

This approach also correctly predicts the unavailability of an embedded, focused agent with a
passive matrix clause and active embedded clause. Contrast this with (27), in which the same
position is available for the embedded object.¹⁶

¹⁵Note that the embedded agent can be questioned when realized as a by-phrase, similar to by whom were the
clothes washed in English. This also indicates that there is not a general ban against questioning the subject when
clause is passive.

(i) a. mı ande potad in-xasal-o?
   by whom clothes PASS-washed-3PL
   ‘By whom were the clothes washed?’

b. (?)mı ande potad in-so xassil _?
   by whom clothes PASS-made.3PL wash.INF _
   ‘By whom were the clothes made wash?’

Note also that leaving the wh-phrase in-situ is disallowed in both (31a) and (31b).

¹⁶This explanation could be an alternative account of the ungrammaticality of (11). As such, the agent is not
licensed in Spec.FP, (cannot be overtly realized), leading to the crash of the derivation at that stage; thus, the
embedded agents cannot move further.
Another difference between FM and MC relates to the requirement regarding the external argument. As shown in AUTHOR(S), MC allows causers such as ‘earthquake, fear’ to be matrix subjects, (33a, adapted from AUTHOR(S) (2019), although it disallows inanimate arguments such as ‘stone’. In FM as well inanimate subjects are disallowed, yet causers are also out, (33b). This difference is unexpected if we assume a derivational relationship between FM and MC.\

(33) a. zelzele sa-tte ma¸ s buyud
earthquake made-3F leave.INF houses
‘The earthquake made (some people) leave houses.’

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

This difference, on the other hand, is not an issue for the current analysis since it does not hypothesize a relation between the two configurations.

4.2 PF-constraint

Finally, we look at another alternative approach, i.e. a PF-constraint (and its versions), to this phenomenon. We demonstrate that a PF-constraint suggested for English ECM-verbs cannot carry over to MC for several reasons: First, the primary motivation Lasnik (2002) and Ito (2014) use to propose a PF-constraint for English, i.e. the availability of pronouns as embedded subjects, is not possible in MC.

Another argument not discussed here relates to a point Pesetsky (2019:14) makes about licensing. He suggests that the presence of finite T prior to Exfoliation is sufficient to case-license the subject in specifier of toP. Carrying this view to MC, we would predict that the embedded subject to be able to license anaphors or depictives since it was licensed prior to Exfoliation. However, as seen in (10), this is not borne out.
(34) *mafya sa iyen qadıl hasm-en mafia made.3M them murder-INF enemy-their

‘The mafia leader made them murder his enemy.’

Secondly, a constraint of obligatory PF adjacency between ‘make’ and the ‘infinitive’ cannot be at work. Light verb constructions indicate at least that at the phonological level adjacency is not required. SA has developed the light verb construction as a result of contact with Turkish and Kurdish (Akkuş and Benmamoun 2018; Erguvanlı-Taylan 2017), in which the non-verbal element precedes the light verb, thus resulting in the order “make - nonverbal element - light verb”. Consider (35).

(35) kemal [sa buaç 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 squib. Moreover, the contrast between (10) and (11) in terms of anaphor binding or depictive licensing also suggests that it cannot be a pure PF constraint, as Ito (2014) argues for English wager-class verbs. This is because SA is a pro-drop language. If it were just a PF issue, we would expect anaphor binding or depictive licensing to be possible in the complements of ‘make’, contrary to fact.

5 Conclusion

This squib has presented novel data from an indirect causative construction embedded under ‘make’ from Sason Arabic that sheds light on the long-standing discussion about constructions in which arguments cannot remain in situ, but need to move.

The investigation of MC and another ‘related’ construction FM, reveals that MC facts can be straightforwardly captured via a reconciliation of two versions of locality-based approaches. A phase-based analysis with an extra projection, FP, correctly covers the attested patterns, and
rules out the ungrammatical ones. We also have demonstrated that alternative analyses face certain challenges in this construction.
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