Applicative Voice: Geminate and ‘give’-causatives in Sason Arabic

Faruk Akkuş

University of Pennsylvania

akkusf@sas.upenn.edu

1 Introduction

Sason Arabic (SA) has four strategies of expressing causatives: (i) ablaut, (ii) ‘make’ causatives, (iii) gemination, and (iv) ‘give’ causatives.

- Ablaut applies to unaccusative verbs.

(1) ablaut

a. lāke tal-e

'the stain came out.'

b. tel-tu came.out.CAUS-1SG stain

‘I got the stain out.’

- Causatives embedded under ‘make’ (MC), (2), involve
  - overt embedded theme
  - infinitival verb
  - null embedded agent, interpreted as indefinite.

(2) ‘make’ causatives (MC)

a. aya sa nazf haydan.

‘The village lord made (someone) clean the wall.’ (Akkuş accepted:1)

b. aya sa nazf haydan mu res-ma tawwil.

‘The village lord had the wall cleaned by someone tall.’

- Gemination allows the causee to be expressed either as a DP or a PP headed by (m)şa ‘for, to’, as in (3).

(3) gemination

a. kemal ku i-qri lala kitab.

‘Kemal is reading this book.’

b. oretman ki ti-qärri kemal lala kitab.

‘The teacher is making Kemal read this book.’ (Yakut 2013:33a)

c. oretman ki ti-qärri lala kitab mışa 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.

(4) ‘give’ causatives (GiveC)

a. ado dolab-ad-en mışa tamirci addil
gave.3PL shelf-PL-their repairman fix.INF

‘They had the repairman fix their shelves.’

(Lit: They gave their shelves to the repairman to fixing)

b. ımm-a mışa fatma şi adid-u addil

mother-her gave-it fix.

‘Her mother had Fatma cook the food.’

(Lit: The food, her mother gave it to Fatma to fixing) (Erguvanlı-Taylan 2017:221:30)

- This strategy is a result of contact with Kurdish (Akkuş 2017; Akkuş and Benmamoun 2018; Erguvanlı-Taylan 2017).

- Today’s focus is on (3) and (4).

Proposal

- Gemination exhibits an active-passive alternation, whereas the GiveC manifests a passive structure.

- Both embed a distinct VoiceP, which assigns a causee θ-role as opposed to the canonical Initiator role of VoiceP.

- This VoiceP can be called applicative VoiceP (à la Legate 2014).
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2 Active-passive alternation

A variety of diagnostics demonstrate that geminates exhibit an active-passive alternation (as in MC; see Akkuş 2019) and that the GiveC behaves as passives.

- An initial clue with regard to the structure of geminates comes from passivization asymmetries.
  - With the DP causee, (6b), it is the DP causee that raises to become the grammatical subject, (6c).
  - Raising the theme leads to ungrammaticality, (6d).

(6) a. leyla qarr-e alu kitabad
   Leyla read.PST-3F these.M books
   'Leyla read these books.'

   b. qarr-tu leyla alu kitabad
      read.CAUS-1SG Leyla these.M books
      'I made Leyla read these books.'

   c. leyla m-qarr-e [alu kitabad] (mi oratman)
      Leyla PASS-read.CAUS-3F [these.M books] (by teacher)
      'Leyla was made to read these books by the teacher.'

   d. *alu kitabad m-qarr-o [leyla ] (mi oratman)
      these.M books PASS-read.CAUS-3PL [Leyla ] (by teacher)
      Intended: 'The books were made (by the teacher) to be read by Leyla.

- When the causee is a PP, (7a), the theme argument ends up as the grammatical subject, as such shows verbal agreement, (7b).

(7) a. qarr-tu alu kitabad mşa leyla
    read.CAUS-1SG these.M books to Leyla
    'I made Leyla read these books.'

   b. alu kitabad m-qarr-o [mşa leyla] (mi oratman)
      these.M books PASS-read.CAUS-3PL [ to Leyla] (by teacher)
      'These books were made (by the teacher) to be read by Leyla.'

- The GiveC patterns as like the geminates with a PP causee, thus (8).

(8) a. ams adi-tu dolab-ad-i mşa tamirci adill
    yesterday gave.3PL shelf-PL-my to repairman fix.INF
    'Yesterday, I had my shelves fixed by the repairman.'

   b. ams dolab-ad-i m-ado mşa tamirci adill (mi-nni)
      yesterday shelf-PL-my PASS-gave.3PL to repairman fix.INF by-me
      'Yesterday I made the repairman fix my shelves.'

   c. *ams (msha) tamirci m-ada dolab-ad-i adill (mi-nni)
      yesterday (to) repairman PASS-gave.3M shelf-PL-my fix.INF by-me
      'I made the repairman fix my shelves yesterday.

      (Intended: 'Yesterday, the repairman was made fix my shelves by me')

- This contrast, however, does not necessarily indicate active-passive alternation (cf. double-object vs dative-shift in English).

The evidence for the active-passive alternation and the adjunct status of the PP comes from (i) the interpretation in the absence of the causee, (ii) sluicing, (iii) nonpassivizable idioms, and (iv) secondary predicates (see Appendix).

2.1 The interpretation of the null causee

- The causee is optional.
- The null causee is interpreted as existential (like a missing ‘by’-phrase) rather than pronominal (like a pro-dropped argument), (9).

(9) leyla qarr-e alu kitabad
    Leyla read.CAUS-3F these.M books
    YES: 'Leyla made someone read these books.'
    NO: 'Leyla made him/her/them read the books.'

- The interpretation of the null causee as existential also explains the grammaticality of (10a) only in the absence of a DP causee.
  - The absence of a DP causee indicates that it is not projected, which in turn allows the theme argument to be raised.
  - The raising of the theme is possible regardless of whether a PP causee is realized or not, (10b), in line with the adjuncthood status of the PP.\(^3\)

(10) a. alu kitabad m-qarr-o [ (*Leyla ) ] (mi oratman)
    these.M books PASS-read.CAUS-3PL [ (*Leyla ) ] (by teacher)
    'The books were made (by the teacher) to be read by Leyla.'

\(^2\)See e.g. Camilleri et al. 2014 for the same restriction in ditransitives in other Arabic varieties such as Egyptian Arabic, Hijazi Arabic and Maltese.

\(^3\)The adjuncthood status of the PP is also supported by clefting, in that similar to Turkish and Egyptian Arabic, only arguments can be clefted. Expectedly, the PP causee may not be.
b. alu kitab m-qarr-o | _ (müşa leyla) | (mu oratman) these.m books PASS-read.CAUS-3PL | (to Leyla) | (by teacher) ‘The books were made (by the teacher) to be read (by Leyla).’

The same interpretation is observed in the GiveC, as such the absence of the PP causee leads to an existential reading, (11).

(11) a. ams dolab-ad-i m-ado müşa tamirci addil m-nni yesterday shelf-PL-my PASS-gave.3PL to repairman fix-INF by-me ‘Yesterday my shelves were made by me to be fixed by the repairman.’

(12) VP ellipsis

(13) sluicing

(14) a. fada babe wara mifta. opened.3M door with key ‘(He) opened the door with a key.’ ← requires established topic

2.2 Sluicing

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

b. fada babe wara mifta. #hama m-arafe ande opened.3M door with key, but NEG-knew-3F who ‘(He) opened the door with a key, #but she didn’t know who.’

• Given that the null causee is interpreted as an existential (cf. sect 2.1), the following arguments also follow from an active-passive alternation, and not two different argument structures.4

• With a DP causee, the embedded structure behaves like a canonical active for sluicing, (15), such that the remnant cannot be headed by a preposition.

(15) leyla qarr-e nes-ma alu kitabad, hama m-o-re (*müşa) Leyla read.CAUS-3F person-a these.M books, but NEG-1SG-know to ande who ‘Leyla made someone read these books, but I don’t know who.’

• With a PP causee, the embedded clause behaves as passive for sluicing, (16).

(16) a. leyla xassal-e alu potad, hama m-o-re (*müşa) Leyla wash.CAUS-3F these.M clothes, but NEG-1SG-know to ande who ‘Leyla had these clothes washed, but I don’t know by who.’

b. leyla qarr-e alu kitabad müşa nes-ma, hama Leyla read.CAUS-3F these.M books to person-a, but m-o-re *(müşa) ande NEG-1SG-know to who ‘Leyla had these books read by someone, but I don’t know by who.’

• Expectedly, in the GiveC, the embedded clause behaves as passive.

(17) leyla ad-e alu kitabad (müşa nes-ma) qaru, hama Leyla gave.3F these.M books (to person-a) read-INF, but m-o-re *(müşa) ande NEG-1SG-know to who ‘Leyla had these books read by someone, but I don’t know by who.’

Sluicing demonstrates that geminates exhibit an active-passive alternation, whereas the GiveC behaves as passive for sluicing.

4Thanks also to a Tu+ 5 reviewer for pointing this out.
2.3 Nonpassivizable idioms

SA has a class of nonpassivizable idioms, as in (18). These idioms are another test for the active-passive alternation (cf. Kayne 1975; Follì and Harley 2007).

(18) a. kemal qaraf fayz le şeytan
Kemal broke.3M leg of devil
‘Kemal finally got lucky.’ (lit. broke the devil’s leg)

b. fayz le şeytan m-qaraf m kemal leg of devil PASS-broke.3M by Kemal
‘The devil’s leg was broken by Kemal.’

• Kemal finally got lucky."

These idioms may occur in geminates only in the case of a DP causee, (19a), but not a PP causee, (19b).

(19) a. nihayet qarj-tu kemal fayz le şeytan
finally broke.caus-1sg Kemal leg of devil
‘I finally made Kemal get lucky.’ (lit. broke the devil’s leg)

b. nihayet qarj-tu fayz le şeytan (mşא kemal)
finally broke.caus-1sg leg of devil to Kemal
‘I finally had the devil’s leg broken by Kemal.’

• Kemal finally got lucky."

These idioms are also not possible in the GiveC, (20).

(20) adi-tu fayz le şeytan (mşא kemal) qarj
gave.caus-1sg leg of devil to Kemal break.inf
‘I finally had the devil’s leg broken by Kemal.’

• Kemal finally got lucky."

Idioms of this sort contrast with passivizable idioms, (21).

(21) a. kemal hatarax ro-i
Kemal burned.3M heart-my
‘Kemal broke my heart.’

Lit: ‘Kemal burned my heart.’

b. ro-i m-hatarax m kemal
heart-my PASS-burned.3M by Kemal
‘My heart was broken by Kemal.’

• Unlike non-passivizable idioms, which require a DP causee, such idioms impose no restriction; (22) for geminates and (23) for the GiveC.

(22) a. mmm-u harray-e Leyla ro le Kemal mother-his burned.caus-3f Leyla heart of Kemal
‘His mother made Leyla break Kemal’s heart.’

b. mmm-u harray-e ro le Kemal (mşא Leyla)
mother-his burned.caus-3f heart of Kemal to Leyla
‘His mother had Kemal’s heart be broken (by Leyla).’

(23) mmm-u ad-e ro le Kemal (mşא Leyla) harx
mother-his gave-3f heart of Kemal to Leyla burn.inf
‘His mother had Kemal’s heart be broken (by Leyla).’

Interim Summary

• Geminates show an active-passive-like alternation, and the GiveC a passive structure.
• The DP causee in geminates is an argument.
• The PP causee in both geminates and the GiveC is an adjunct like a ‘by’-phrase.

3 Applicative VoiceP

Although the embedded event in geminates and the GiveC does contain a second VoiceP, it is not a canonical VoiceP, but an applicative VoiceP.

• This applicative VoiceP assigns a different 0-role (causee versus initiator);
  – (i) instrument phrases, (ii) agent-oriented adverbs, or (iii) agent-oriented comitatives cannot be associated with the embedded causee.
  – (iv) the causee is introduced with a different preposition than canonical agents are introduced with.

3.1 Instrument phrases

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

(24) a. bina m-faş-e m işçiyad wara çakuçad
apartment m-PFV-demolished-3F by employees with hammers
‘The apartment was demolished by the employees with hammers.’

b. *bina m-qalab-e m ruа wara çakuçad
apartment NACT-fell.over-3f by itself with hammers
‘The apartment fell over by itself with hammers.’

• They are also grammatical in the MC, and can modify the embedded agent, (25).
(25) a. si-to ayet şurvan wara ibre
   made-2PL sew.INF pants with needles
   ‘You had someone [sew the pants with needles].’

b. kemal sa buaş sir glimboz-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].’

(26) a. ım-mu mother-his xass le washad.
   caus.3f Hasan clothes wash with brush big-F
   ‘His mother made Hasan wash the clothes with a big brush.’
   YES: His mother used the brush [to force Hasan to do washing possibly with another instrument].
   NOT: Hasan used the brush.

b. ım-mu mother-his ade lalu potad müşa xassil wash.
   3f these clothes wash with patience
   ‘His mother made Kemal wash these clothes patiently.’
   YES: His mother was patient.
   NOT: Kemal was patient.

3.2 Agent-oriented adverbs

Agent-oriented adverbs in SA provide another testing ground wrt the θ-role the external argument of the embedded event bears (Ernst 2001; Matsuoka 2013, i.a.).

- In the MC, these adverbs can modify the action of the embedded agent, (27).

(27) 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].’

- Agent-oriented adverbs cannot be associated with the causee in either geminates, (28a), or the GiveC, (28b); they exclusively target the causer.5

(28) a. oratman ki ti-qarrı kemal lala kitab müşa kemal.
   teacher be.3f 3f-read.CAUS this.M book to Kemal
   ‘The teacher is making Kemal read this book.’
   YES: The teacher is patient.
   NOT: Kemal is patient.

b. m-mu ade lalu potad müşa kemal xassil bi sabır
   mother-his gave.3f these clothes to Kemal wash.INF with patience
   ‘His mother made Kemal wash these clothes patiently.’
   YES: His mother was patient.
   NOT: Kemal was patient.

3.3 Choice of the preposition

The causee differs from the canonical VoiceP Initiator in terms of the preposition heading the PP adjunct.

- The PP adjunct in both short passives and the MC are headed by the preposition mu ‘by, from’, (29).

(29) a. ala cam mı kemal m-qaraf bi-l-qasti.
   this glass by Kemal pass.broke.3M with-the-intention
   ‘This glass was broken by Kemal deliberately.’

b. 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.’

- The PP adjunct causee in both geminates, (30a), and the GiveC, (30b), is headed by preposition müşa ‘to, for’.

(30) a. oretman ki ti-qarrı lala kitab müşa kemal.
   teacher be.3f 3f-read.CAUS this.M book to Kemal
   ‘The teacher is making Kemal read this book.’

b. ams adi-tu dolab-ad-i müşa tamirci addil
   yesterday gave.3pl shelf-pl-my to repairman fix.INF
   ‘Yesterday, I had my shelves fixed by the repairman.’

Summary

- Geminates show an active-passive-like alternation, and the GiveC a passive structure.
- This embedded VoiceP assigns a different θ-role (causee versus initiator) than the canonical VoiceP.

4 Structures for geminates and the GiveC

- Legate’s (2014) analysis of passive:
  - The passive is a variant of a functional head that introduces a DP in its specifier,

---

5 Agent-oriented commitatives behave identically. See Appendix.
- This configuration could be common to both VoiceP and ApplP (see also Anagnostopoulou 2003, Alexiadou et al. 2006, Schäfer 2012 for the suggestion that an applicative head introduces the non-canonical external arguments, i.e. oblique causers. cf. Pykkänen 2008).

- One prediction of this analysis is that an active-passive-like alternation should be possible on Appl.
  - True in Acehnese.

- Similar to its Voice counterpart, this passivization does not necessarily end up with a morphological reflex (e.g. Harley 2017b; Pitteroff 2014, 2015).

(31) **Active ApplP**

a. qarri-tu leyla alu kitabad
   read.CAUS-1SG Leyla these.M books
   'I made Leyla read these books.'

b. VoiceP
   DP
   Voice’
   Voice (Initiator)
   ... ...
   VoiceAPPL
   DP
   VoiceAPPL’
   DP
   VoiceAPPL
   VP
   θ
   V
   DP

- VoicePass has two associated semantic denotations (see also Bruening 2013; Alexiadou et al. 2015; Legate 2014; Legate and Akkuş 2017).  
  - In the first one, which does not combine with a ‘to’-phrase, the initiator is existentially bound on the ApplPass head.

(32) **Passive ApplP without ‘to’-phrase**

a. qarri-tu alu kitabad
   read.CAUS-1SG these.M books
   'I had these books read.'

b. VoiceP
   DP
   Voice’
   Voice (Initiator)
   ... ...
   VoiceAPPLP
   θ
   VP
   V
   DP
   PP
   VoiceAPPL
   θ
   V
   DP

- The causee may be generated as a DP in Spec,ApplP, and must become the grammatical subject when passivized (see e.g. Rackowski and Richards (2005); Legate (2014) for high ApplP in Austronesian languages).

- It receives a causee θ-role from the Appl head, as in (31b).
• Alternatively, the causee may be introduced like the initiator in the canonical passive:
  – in a PP adjunct, in which the P assigns a causee 0-role to its DP complement, this causee being tied semantically to the causee 0-role introduced by Appl, as in (32b).
  – without a PP adjunct, the causee is interpreted existentially on the Appl head.

4.1 SA as a high applicative language

• Haddad (2014) shows that non-argumental attitude datives in Lebanese Arabic may occur with unergative predicates (see also Al-Zahre and Boneh (2010, 2016) for the same argument in Syrian Arabic and Hebrew).

(34) a. Na:dya štavala: ši nis șe:ța
   Nadia worked-her.DAT some half hour
   ‘Nadia worked [her] for about a half hour.’ (Haddad 2014:66)

(35) a. kemal, šarab-bu j/k mayn
   Kemal drank-him water
   ‘Kemal drank [him] water.’

• These datives merge as high applicatives in Lebanese Arabic (Haddad 2014).

• SA also has such affected datives, (35), thus SA is also independently a high applicative language.

5 Conclusions

• Geminate causatives in SA manifest an active-passive alternation, whereas ‘give’ causatives exhibit a passive configuration.
• Both embed a second VoiceP, however this VoiceP exhibits distinct behavior from the canonical, agentive VoiceP, which warrants identifying it as a distinct category.
• The causee in both constructions is generated in applicative Voice.
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6 Appendix

- Sluicing

Different interpretations in the GiveC depending on whether sluicing targets the main clause or the embedded clause, (36).

- In (36a), the remnant mu ande "by who" indicates that the sluice can only target the matrix clause, an impersonal passive, not the caused event "build".

- In (36b), the remnant müsa ande "to who" indicates that it can only target the caused event "build" in the complement of "give".

- In either interpretation, leaving out the preposition on the remnant results in ungrammaticality, (36c).

(36) a. m-ada beyt müsa nes-ma addil, hama m-ore m-ade

pass-gave house to person-a build-INF but NEG-know.1SG to

who

‘It was made someone build the house, but I don’t know by who’

YES: who made somebody build the house

NO: who built the house

b. m-ada beyt müsa nes-ma addil, hama m-ore müsa

pass-gave house to person-a build-INF but NEG-know.1SG to

who

‘It was made someone build the house, but I don’t know by who’

YES: who built the house

NO: who made somebody build the house

c. m-ada beyt müsa nes-ma addil, hama m-ore *müsa

pass-gave house to person-a build-INF but NEG-know.1SG *(to /

mi) ande

by) who

- Secondary Predicate Licensing

Depictives require projection in SA: not allowed in passives even when the agent is realized as a PP.

(37) a. nes-ma₁ amal araba (sarxoš₁)

person-a drove car drunk

‘Someone₁ drove the car (drunk₁).’

b. araba m-amal-e (??sarxoš)

car.F PASS-drove-F (??drunk)

‘The car was driven (??drunk).’

(38) a. kemal₁ kar-a xanni (sarxoš₁).

Kemal wrote-3M song (drunk)

‘Kemal composed the song drunk.’

b. xanni m-kara (??sarxoš) (m nes-ma).

song.M PASS-wrote.M (??drunk) by someone

‘The song was composed drunk by someone.’

- Secondary predicates are not licensed with the GiveC, (39), but are compatible with geminates only when the causee is a DP, (40).

(39) GiveC: Depictives Impossible

a. nanaᵽ mu-na-di daq ziyar-na eₖ (sarxošᵽ/??k).

we NEG-1PL-give beat.Inf children-our (drunk)

‘We don’t let anyone beat our children drunk.’

b. beaqıl ye dar hamıl haşiş (?bitkin).

unwise cop.3SG give carry.Inf grass (?tired)

‘It would be unwise to make someone carry the grass tired.’

(40) Geminates

a. Depictives Possible with DP causee

nanaᵽ qarri-na kemal₁ kitab-na (sarxoš₁/).k.

we read.CAUS-1PL Kemal book-our (drunk)

‘We made Kemal read our book drunk.’

b. Depictives Impossible with null causee

haşiş nanaᵽ hammul-na-u eₖ (sarxošᵽ/??k).

glass we carried.CAUS-1PL-3M (drunk)

‘The grass, we made someone carry it drunk.’

c. Depictives Impossible with PP causee

nanaᵽ hammul-na haşiş müsa işçiyad (sarxošᵽ/??k).

we carried.CAUS-1PL grass to workersₚ (drunk)

‘We made the workers carry the grass drunk.’

- Agent-oriented comitatives

They tend to pattern with instrument phrases and agent-oriented adverbs in picking out an external argument layer (Bruening 2013; Alexiadou et al. 2015).

(41) a. bina m-faşş-e wara surray fi-ya

apartment PASS-demolish-3F with burglar in-it.F

‘The apartment was demolished with the burglar inside.’
Akkuş – geminate causatives in SA

Tu+ 5; February 8-9, 2020

b. bina in-qalab-e wara sirraya fi-ya
   apartment NACT-fall over-3f with burglar in-it.f
   ‘The apartment fell over with the burglar inside.’
   (the burglar was inside when the building fell over)

• The comitative reading is also available in the MC, (42).

(42) kemal sa hamil mase wara hasan
  Kemal made carry.INF table with Hasan
  ‘Kemal made someone carry the table with Hasan.’
  (Hasan helped carry the table)

• In the case of geminates and the GiveC, however, the comitative reading is not
  available with the causee, but only with the matrix causer.

(43) a. leyla hamml-e kemal mase wara hasan
    Leyla carried.CAUS-3f Kemal table with Hasan
    ‘Leyla made Kemal carry the table with Hasan.’
    YES: Leyla and Hasan made Kemal carry the table.
    NO: Kemal made Hasan carry the table

b. leyla ade mase ñasha kemal hamil wara hasan
   Leyla gave table to Kemal carry.INF with Hasan
   ‘Leyla made Kemal carry the table with Hasan.’
   YES: Leyla and Hasan made Kemal carry the table.
   NO: Kemal and Hasan carried the table

• **On θ-role, applicatives and causatives**

A Tu+ 5 reviewer questions the connection between the θ-role in the embedded structure and the type of VoiceP, citing Bruening and Tran (2015).

(44) a. The sentient, talking door opened wide deliberately.
   b. The sentient, talking door slammed shut deliberately.
   c. The Iceman froze solid deliberately.
   d. The robot broke open deliberately. (Bruening and Tran 2015:40)

• Bruening and Tran (2015) cite these examples to argue that adverbs such as
  ‘deliberately’ do not require an agent.

• However, I believe it is not as simple or innocuous an assumption as they suggest.

• First, it could indeed be that clauses with ‘deliberately’ (or other adverbs expressing volitionality) have a different structure.

• It is hard to find an import of this in NOM-ACC languages, yet ergative languages are useful.

→ In Tsova-Tush, where a single intransitive verb can appear with either nominative or ergative marking.

• Holisky (1987:105) points out that “the nominative and the ergative can be used
  with one and the same intransitive verb, depending on the responsibility or activeness of the subject”?

(45) a. (as) vuiž-n-as
    1SG.ERG fell.AOR-1SG.ERG
    ‘I fell down, on purpose.’

b. so vož-en-sO
    1SG.NOM fell.AOR-1SG.NOM
    ‘I fell down, by accident.’ (Tsova-Tush; Holisky 1987:105)

→ Creek (Muskogean) uses three types of agreement, I, II, and III ~ Agent, Patient, Dative. Depending on the thematic roles/volitionality, fluid verbs get marked either I or II (Munro and Gordon 1982).

(46) a. transitive
    ca-likpaal-ick-is
    1SII-turn.LG-2SII-IND
    ‘You are turning me over.’

b. unergative
    iimoomiit nocaay-ey-s.
    on.purpose yawn-1SIND
    ‘I am yawning on purpose.’

b. unaccusative
    moyheys ca-nocaay-is.
    not.meaning.to 1SII-yawn-IND
    ‘Not meaning to, I am yawning.’

→ Secondly, even for English, the speakers I have consulted all prefer to have ‘itself’
   in the examples in (44), pointing to an unergative structure. As such,

(47) a. *Dora shouted hoarse.

b. Dora shouted herself hoarse.

7In Tsova-Tush, 3rd person is always ergative, and only for 1st/2nd person, this alternation with
   the adverb is attested. Transitive clauses pattern like 3rd person. This property indicates that this
   can’t be because we are dealing with different language types; it is the same language using this
   morphology.
(48) a. The river froze solid. (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995:39)
   b. *The river froze itself solid.

   This might mean that even for speakers who accept (44), they might have a null reflexive.

Moreover, clauses with strictly unaccusative syntax are infelicitous with such adverbs.
• Deal (2009) shows that there-insertion rules out transitives, unergatives and inchoatives.

   Only a subset of unaccusatives are possible with there-insertion in (49).

(49) There appeared a shadowy figure in the doorway.
likewise: accumulate, coexist, emerge, hover, ... (Deal 2009:1a)
• Speakers find a contrast regarding the availability of ‘deliberately’ in clauses with and without there.

(50) a. A shadowy figure deliberately appeared in the doorway.\(^8\)
   b. *There appeared deliberately a shadowy figure in the doorway.

   This contrast indicates that in truly unaccusative structures, certain adverbs are indeed disallowed.

Furthermore, in SA, there is a sharp contrast between the availability of adverbs such as ‘deliberately’ and the predicate type.
- Unaccusative verbs are not compatible with agentive adverbs even when coerced.

(51) a. # nahar bil-qasti tala ala sari.
   sun with-purpose appeared.3M this morning
   ‘The sun appeared deliberately this morning.’
   b. # şelç/bayling bil-qasti hedi zab.
   snow/Iceman with-purpose slow melted.3M
   ‘The snow / Iceman melted slowly deliberately.’

- On the other hand, unergatives are licit with such adverbs.

(52) a. bayling bil-qasti zay.
   Iceman with-purpose laughed.3M
   ‘Iceman laughed deliberately.’

b. kelp bil-qasti faqaz.
   dog with-purpose ran.3M
   ‘The dog ran deliberately.’

Icelandic provides another testing ground for the role of agentivity: in general, the Impersonal Passive is grammatical with unergatives only, not unaccusatives.
• However, various examples of unaccusatives are found. As suggested in Thráinsson (2007:268), “semantic features like agentivity or volition may play a role in licensing the impersonal passive in Icelandic” (see also Sigurðsson 2017:366).

(53) a. þa D expl var farið snemma af stað.
   was gone early from place
   ‘People left early.’
   b. Enn er barist og dáið fyrir fóðurlandið.
   still is fought and died for the fatherland
   ‘People are still fighting and dying for their fatherland.’ (Sigurðsson 2017:(249))

   Sigurðsson (2017) argues that such configurations involve a weak object position, as such they also require a reflexive (thus patterning like unergatives again).

   Moreover, they involve additional agent role, and an agent position.

   Moreover, the connection between θ-role and the phrase hosting the causee has already been argued for in the context of other languages.

   Key (2013) and Harley (2017a) argue that in Turkish the productive causatives are headed by a dedicated CausP (or an AppIP with a null applicative head, e.g. Jung 2014).

   This argument has been used to explain why agent-oriented adverbs cannot pick the causee, (54).

(54) anne çocuğ-a kitab-ı isteksizce oku-t-tu.
   mother child-DAT book-ACC reluctantly read-CAUS-PST
   ‘The mother reluctantly made [the child read the book].’
   NOT: ‘The mother made [the baby read the book reluctantly].’

   This could also explain why the causative of a passive is impossible.

   woman meat-ACC butcher by cut-PASS-CAUS-PST
   ‘The woman had the meat be cut by the butcher.’ (Aissen and Hankamer 1980:239)

\(^8\) The adverb is placed before the verb to avoid the confound Deal calls ‘outside verbals’.