Evidence from Sason Arabic for Ā-movement feeding Case-licensing relations

Faruk Akkuş

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. These include wager-class verbs in English (Postal 1974, 1993; Pesetsky 1991; Bošković 1997, 2002; Richards 2001; Rezac 2013, i.a.), Romance infinitives (Kayne 1975, 1984; Rizzi 1982; Bošković 1997, i.a.), and Austronesian applicatives (Pearson 2001; Richards 2001; Rackowski and Richards 2005; Legate 2014).

This phenomenon has remained as a long-standing puzzle despite a large body of work. This squib introduces an indirect causative from Sason Arabic (SA) embedded under the verb ‘make’, and brings a new perspective to this puzzle. This construction embeds an infinitive, and the indefinite embedded agent cannot be pronounced in-situ, (1).

(1) *iya sat-te nes-ma / talaba-ma zāki karu odav.
    she made-3f person-a / student-a smart write.INF homework
    ‘She made someone / a smart student write the homework.’

On the other hand, Ā-movement (wh-question, relativization, focus) licenses the overt realization of the embedded agent, (2) (see below for examples of focus).
(2) a. *ande* iya sat-te karu odav?
   who she made-3F write.INF homework
   ‘Who did she make write the homework?’  (wh-question)

   b. sima-tu mı *nes-ma zāki* le iya sat-te karu odav.
   heard-1SG about person-a smart that she made-3F write.INF homework
   ‘I’ve heard of a smart person that she made write the homework.’  (relativization)

The ‘*make*’-causative (MC) embeds two additional structures. In (3), the indefinite embedded agent is left unpronounced.\(^2\) In (4), the embedded agent is realized as a ‘by’-phrase.

(3) iya sat-te karu odav.
    she made-3F write.INF homework
    ‘She made (someone) write the homework.’

(4) iya sat-te karu odav mı *talaba-ma zāki*.
    she made-3F write.INF homework by student-a smart
    ‘She had the homework written by a smart student.’

The contrast between (1) and (2), which is the focus of this squib along with (4), places the MC into the larger crosslinguistic pattern, in which certain positions cannot be occupied with overt material. The approaches attempting to account for this phenomenon fall into three categories: (i) locality restrictions, (ii) a PF-constraint, (iii) Exfoliation, i.e. deletion of projections from a full clause. The MC supports a locality-based analysis. To preview the analysis, while in (4) ‘*make*’ embeds a passive Voice, it embeds an active VoiceP in (1) and (2), dominated by FP whose head F is a phase-head. The embedded agent is not (Case)-licensed, and is separated from its licenser by the phase domain. Ā-movement places them in a local configuration, and thus making the licensing possible.\(^3\) The discussion also concludes that Ā-movement can feed Agree-based licensing, but cannot feed A-movement.


\(^3\) The discussion also concludes that Ā-movement can feed Agree-based licensing, but cannot feed A-movement.
2 Prominent analyses of Romance ECM type constructions

A main approach to wager- and Romance ECM-verbs revolves around locality restrictions which mainly concern the presence of an extra layer (e.g. Kayne 1984; Pesetsky 1991; Rochette 1988; Bošković 1997, 2002; Rezac 2013). For instance, Bošković (1997, 2002) argues that an additional VP shell in wager-verbs renders the accusative-checking position matrix [Spec, AgrOP] too far from the embedded clause-subject, thus (5) (adapted from Bošković 2002:(53)). He argues that the agentive shell, i.e. VP2, is not present with believe-verbs, thus (6).

(5) *John$_i$ wagered$_v$ [AgrOP the woman$_j$ t$_v$ [VP$_2$ t$_i$ t$_v$ [VP$_1$ t$_i$ t$_v$ [IP$_j$ t$_j$ to t$_j$ know French ]]]].

(6) John$_i$ believes$_v$ [AgrOP Peter$_k$ t$_v$ [VP$_1$ t$_i$ t$_v$ [IP$_k$ t$_k$ to t$_k$ be crazy]]]. (Bošković 1997:55:(11))

Rochette (1988:335), following Kayne (1984), assumes the French (and Italian) ‘propositional’ infinitives in (7)-(8) to be CPs, and thus barriers (or ‘phases’, as adopted by Moulton (2009)), preventing the embedded subject from getting Case from the matrix verb.

(7) *Je croyais le garçon être arrivé.
   I believe the boy to have arrived
   *Raising-to-Object, (Rochette 1988:332:5a)

(8) Qui croyais-tu aimer Anne?
   Who believe-you to love Anne
   Q-operator, (Bošković 1997:129:103a)

On the other hand, Pesetsky’s (2019) Exfoliation hypothesis is built on the view that every embedded clause is built by Merge as a full finite CP (see also Pesetsky 2016). Infinitives are built by deleting the C and T layers, and only when movement has taken place from an embedded subject or subject-like position is infinitivization possible.

In contrast, Ito (2014) extends Lasnik’s (2002) account of a Condition B amelioration...
effect with ECM verbs under VP ellipsis to *wager*-verbs, and argues for a PF constraint for the defective paradigm in *wager/assure*-verbs. This approach suggests that when the embedded subject is a pronoun, it must raise in the syntax to cliticize onto the embedding verb at PF and become a ‘clause-mate’; hence the Condition B violation in (9a).

(9)  
   a. *John\textsubscript{i} affirmed him\textsubscript{i} to be a genius.
   b. ?Mary affirmed him\textsubscript{i} to be a genius and John\textsubscript{i} did too.  (Ito 2014:(9))

Under the VP ellipsis, the pronominal subject can remain in the embedded subject position, and the failure to cliticize (a PF violation) can be repaired by the VP ellipsis, as in (9b).

3 A brief background on the MC

This section gives a brief overview of the relevant properties of the MC: ‘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 structure with a ‘by’-phrase behaves like a canonical passive, whereas without the ‘by’-phrase, it behaves as active (see Akkuş To appear for discussion and relevant diagnostics).

   Furthermore, SA has a low focus position, FP, between the auxiliary and the participle, with active, (10), but not passive Voice, (11), indicating that active, but not passive VoiceP is dominated by FP. Focusing in-situ is disallowed (focus is in small caps, and FP is boxed).5

(10) (QAWA) ali (*QAWA) ku [(QAWA) i-xsel (*QAWA) (şurvan lâ)].
    shirt Ali shirt be.3M shirt 3M-wash shirt pants no
    ‘Ali is washing the shirt, (not the pants).’

(11) (MIL) ali (*MIL) ku [(MIL) in-y-adi (*MIL) (asal lâ)].
    salt Ali salt be.3M salt PASS.1PFV-3M-give salt honey no
    ‘Ali is being given the salt, (not the honey).’
The contrast between active versus passive VoiceP regarding the availability of FP also holds in MCs. With embedded active Voice, (12), FP is available between ‘make’ and ‘infinitive’. With an embedded passive Voice, FP is unavailable, (13).

(12) (QAWA) ali (*QAWA) ku (QAWA) i-si [(QAWA)] xassil (*QAWA).
    shirt Ali shirt be.3M shirt 3M-make shirt wash shirt
    ‘Ali is making someone wash the shirt (not the pillow).’

(13) (QAWA) ali (*QAWA) ku (QAWA) i-si [(*QAWA)] xassil (*QAWA) mi
    shirt Ali shirt be.3M shirt 3M-make shirt wash shirt by
    recel-ma pir, (balgife lā).
    man-a old.M pillow no
    ‘Ali had the shirt (not the pillow) washed by some old man.’

Moreover, the embedded theme, e.g. odav ‘homework’ in (2), 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 objects, but not subjects, may undergo CLLD to the CP domain (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, (14), thus patterning as a subject. Without a ‘by’-phrase associated with the embedded verb, (15), it can be CLLDed, thus patterning as an object.6

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

(15) gaste in-sa qaru-a.
    newspaper.F PASS.PFV-made.3M read.INF-it.F
    ‘The newspaper, it was made that someone read it.’

In light of these considerations, the structures for active and passive embedded Voice are provided in (16) and (17) respectively.7
(16) **active embedded VoiceP**

```
(17) **passive embedded VoiceP**
```

Employing these configurations, we can account for why the overt argument in embedded Spec,VoiceP needs to move. Before proceeding with the proposal, I note that several arguments converge that the focus operation (also *wh*-questions and topicalization) in SA is necessarily the result of overt movement and not base-generation (or QR; cf. (19) and (20) given the clause-boundedness of QR). The ban against in-situ focusing holds for any focusable constituent, as illustrated for an object in (10). Secondly, focus obeys island conditions, as in (18), in which an embedded agent can cross clausal boundaries, but has to obey CNPC. This is in contrast to CLLD, which is island-insensitive in SA.

(18) a. **CINAR-MA** sima-tu le kemal sa faqz, (recel-ma pir lā) neighbor-a heard-1SG that Kemal made run man-a old no ‘A neighbor, I heard that Kemal made run (not an old man).’

b. *CINAR-MA* sima-tu Ḷiddā le kemal sa faqz, (recel-ma pir lā) neighbor-a heard-1SG claim that Kemal made run man-a old no ‘A neighbor, I heard the claim that Kemal made run (not an old man).’

Reconstruction effects also show that focus is movement-driven: in (19), the pronoun inside a focused embedded agent that precedes the matrix quantified subject can still be bound, indicating the reconstruction of the focused constituent. In (20) despite the reconstruction
of the focused embedded agent, the pronoun is still unbound since in its reconstructed position it is structurally higher than the binder, i.e. the embedded object.

(19) MARA-MAₖ WARA FUTURAF-Uᵢ/sₖ, saddīx-tu kul mayniᵢ sa xadu sāhne woman-a with picture-3M.POSS thought-1SG every singer.M made walk stage ‘Some womanᵢ with hisᵢ/sₖ picture, I thought that every singerᵢ made come to stage.

(20) MARA-MAₖ WARA ÇARCAVA-Uᵢ/sₖ, saddīx-tu le dāde sa-tte woman.F-a with frame-3M.POSS thought-1SG that mother.F made-3F xassil kul rasmᵢᵢ wash.INF every painting.M ‘Some womanᵢ with itsᵢ/sᵢ frame, I thought that mom made wash every painting.’

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

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 is not CP (unlike Romance), but a low focus position, FP. Secondly, the contrast between active vs. passive VoiceP in terms of FP is in line with, and provides a stronger argument for the presence of an extra projection. In previous literature, this projection is either silent or postulated to be an intermediate landing site. In SA, however, this projection can host overt material, and thus indicates that a potential prediction of this analysis is borne out.

In the spirit of these analyses, I identify the extra projection as the FP in (16), whose head F embedded under ‘make’ is a phase-head,⁸ and hosts Ā-features (e.g., Chomsky 2000, 2001; Abels 2012; also Van Urk 2015; Van Urk and Richards 2015).⁹ It is FP that causes the locality problem, and prevents the embedded agent from remaining in-situ in
Spec, VoiceP. SA has four possible configurations depending on the diathesis of matrix and embedded clauses: (i) passive > passive, (ii) active > passive, (iii) active > active, (iv) passive > active. The proposed analysis makes predictions for each of these configurations.

In configurations with embedded passive Voice, the FP is not projected. When both clauses have passive Voice, (21a), the embedded object is licensed by matrix NOM. It raises to become the grammatical subject and manifests subject-verb agreement (cf. restructuring of Wurmbrand 2001 et seq). The corresponding bracketing notation structure is in (21b).

(21) a. calabma potad in-so (mı Kemal) [xassil mi recel-ma pir ]
    some clothes PASS-made.3PL (by Kemal) [wash-INF by man-a old.M]
    ‘Some clothes were made (by Kemal) to be washed by some old man.’

    b. [TP Some clothes [VoicePASSP [VP make [VoicePASSP [VP wash ⟨some clothes ⟩ ]]]]]]

In the active > passive configuration, given that there is no intervening phase, the active matrix verb can license the embedded object, (22).

(22) 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. [ ... [VoiceACTP [VP make [VoicePASSP [VP wash some clothes ]]]]]]

Turning to configurations with embedded active Voice, the projection of FP above VoiceP explains why the embedded agent may not remain in-situ, (e.g., (1)). Being a phasal domain, FP intervenes in the licensing of the embedded agent by the matrix Voice, as in (23).

On the other hand, Ā-movement makes the Case-licensing possible (cf. Kayne 1984; Ura 1993; Bošković 1997; Rezac 2013).10 I suggest that this is because F can host Ā-features, and the embedded agent can raise to its edge, ❶. As such, the agent can be licensed by matrix ‘make’/Voice in a local configuration, ❷, in the spirit of e.g., Rezac

8
Consider (24).

Example (12) has shown that the specifier of FP in SA can host pronounced material: it is the alternative landing site for the focused constituent, the embedded grammatical object in this case. As predicted by successive-cyclicity, Spec,FP can also host the contrastively-focused agent. Consider (25), which provides strong evidence for the phase-based account in that FP acts as a barrier for the matrix Voice to license the embedded agent in Spec,VoiceP, unless the agent raises to the phase edge, i.e. Spec,FP.

(25) \((\text{CINAR-MA})\) kemal sa \(\text{(CINAR-MA)}/\ast\text{cinar-ma faqz, (recel-ma pir lâ)}\) neighbor-a Kemal made neighbor-a \(\ast\text{neighbor-a run (man-a old no)}\) ‘Kemal made a neighbor run (not an old man).’

Looking at the (iv) passive > active, i.e. ‘impersonal passive’ configuration as in (26) (also (15)), the analysis correctly predicts the availability of FP for a focused constituent.

(26) \(\text{in-sa (POTAD) xassil (potad}/\ast\text{POTAD}) (balgife la).\) PASS-made clothes wash.INF clothes / clothes pillow no ‘It was made (by somebody) someone wash the clothes, not the pillow.’

As noted above, A-movement does not ‘rescue’ the embedded agent in SA, (27). I interpret this as an instance of improper movement, i.e. Ā-movement followed by A-movement (Chomsky 1973). The agent in the MC raises to Spec,FP, and then to Spec,TP, as in (28).
This also means that Ā-movement can feed Agree-based licensing, but cannot feed A-movement, i.e. Agree is a necessary but not sufficient condition for movement.

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

(28) * [TP calabma rıcel i inso [FP t_i [VoiceP t_i xassil potad ]]]

We might wonder if leaving the embedded agent in-situ would be grammatical in the MC. Let us start by establishing that in SA when T licenses a DP, it shows agreement with it whether the DP is an underlying subject or a derived subject (e.g. in passives). In addition, indefinite subjects can occupy a preverbal as well as a postverbal position, while definite subjects strongly prefer the preverbal position, (29), (Akkuş To appear).

(29) a. in-qafal-e baɣle-*?(ma).
    PASS.PFV-caught-3F horse-*?(a)
    ‘A/*?The horse was caught.’

b. baɣle-(ma) in-qafal-e.
    horse-(a) PASS.PFV-caught-3F
    ‘A/The horse was caught.’

(30) shows that even an agreeing indefinite embedded agent cannot be licensed in-situ in Spec, VoiceP (or in matrix Spec, TP); it can be licensed in Spec,FP for some speakers.

(30) [TP (*CALABMA CINARAD) in-so [FP (%CALABMA CINARAD)
    some neighbors PASS-made.3PL some neighbors
    [VoiceACTP (*calabma cinarad) xassil potad ]]]
    some neighbors wash.INF clothes
    ‘Some neighbors were made wash the clothes (not some big man).’

In the absence of agreement, (30) becomes ungrammatical for all speakers in any position.

(31) [CP (*CALABMA CINARAD) in-sa [FP (*CALABMA CINARAD)
    some neighbors PASS-made.3M some neighbors
    [VoiceACTP (*calabma cinarad) xassil potad ]]].
    some neighbors wash.INF clothes
    ‘It was made some neighbors wash the clothes (not some big man).’
Long passives further support the interaction between T-licensing and movement, showing that the licensed argument cannot remain in-situ. (32) minimally contrasts with (21a): both are long, personal passives, i.e. the matrix and embedded Voice are passive, and FP is not available. The embedded theme becomes the grammatical subject, and is licensed by T (indicated by agreement). Crucially in the grammatical (21a), the derived subject undergoes overt movement to Spec;TP, whereas in (32) it remains in the low position.\footnote{Akkuş, Faruk. 2020. Evidence from Sason Arabic for Ā-Movement Feeding Case-Licensing Relations. *Linguistic Inquiry*. Advance publication. https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00415}

\begin{verbatim}
(32) *ın-so (mi Kemal) [VOICEPASS xassil calabma potad \( mı \) recel-ma pir].

PASS-made.3PL (by Kemal) [ wash some clothes by man-a old]

‘Some clothes were made (by Kemal) to be washed by some old man.’
\end{verbatim}

These patterns reveal that a T-licensed argument cannot remain in-situ in ‘make’-passives and (if possible) triggers raising to its licensing position, whereas the intermediate position is possible for some speakers. A Case-licensing account coupled with the interaction of T-licensing and movement is able to capture the facts. The next section investigates the alternative hypotheses, arguing that they cannot fully explain the MC facts.

\section*{4.1 Exfoliation}

In this approach, every embedded clause is built as a full finite CP, and some layers may be reduced as a consequence of later derivational processes. Thus, *Sue believes Mary to have solved the problem* would be derived from *Sue believes that Mary has solved the problem*.

SA has the causative in (33), in which ‘make’ embeds a finite clause, henceforth FM.

\begin{verbatim}
(33) bınad₁, (mıša) sabiyad₂ so f-innenᵱᵸᵽ₁ \( \in \) pro \( / \) innenᵱᵸᵽ₁ᵸᵽ m inam-o .

girls to boys made.3PL in-them \( [ \) that \( / \) they sleep-3PL \( ] \)

‘The girls made the boys sleep.’ (‘The girls made the boys in them that they slept.’)
\end{verbatim}

In (33), the causee ‘the boys’ is realized in the matrix clause, either as a PP or a DP (in free variation). It is also connected to a resumptive pronoun contained inside a PP, ‘in them’ in
the matrix clause. The causee may be realized as a pro or reduced pronoun in the embedded clause. The MC does not have any of these properties. The obligatory co-reference between the embedded subject and the causee corroborates the causative interpretation. Unlike the MC, FM also lacks the indefiniteness condition on the causee. Several other issues challenge a derivational relation between FM and MC.

MC allows matrix causer subjects such as ‘earthquake’, ‘fear’, (34a), but not inanimate subjects, e.g., ‘stone’. FM, however, disallows both, (34b). This is unexpected from a derivational perspective. This difference, however, is not an issue for the current analysis since it does not hypothesize a relation between the two configurations.

(34) a. zelzele sa-tte møş buyud.  
earthquake made-3F leave.INF houses  
‘The earthquake made (some people) leave houses.’

b. *zelzele (mişa) kemal sa-tte f-iyu le pro i-mme beyt.  
earthquake (to) Kemal made-3F in-him that 3M-leave house  
‘The earthquake made Kemal leave home.’

For the Case-theoretic licensing approach, the absence of a higher licenser should lead to a difference for the embedded subject, but the not embedded object, since the former relies on a higher licenser, whereas the latter has an embedded licenser. Exfoliation predicts no difference due to the presence or absence of a higher licenser since the embedded argument is licensed in the lower clause prior to Exfoliation. Making the matrix verb passive, we can test this prediction. We already saw this contrast for the (un)availability of Spec,FP for impersonal passives. Whereas this position is available for the embedded object, (26), it is not for the embedded agent, (31). The contrast between (35)-(36) and (37)-(38) in terms of wh-movement further supports a licensing approach for the MC. Questioning an embedded object is grammatical independently of the diathesis of the matrix clause, as in (35)-(36). However, questioning the embedded subject is grammatical when the matrix
Voice is active, (37), but not passive, (38).

(35) iş kitab iya sa-tte qaru?  (37) ande iya sa-tte xassil potad?  
‘Which book did she make sb. read?’  ‘Who did she make wash clothes?’

(36) iş kitab in-sa qaru?  (38) *ande in-sa xassil potad?  
‘Which book was sb. made to read?’  ‘Who was to made wash the clothes?’

4.2 PF-constraint

Finally, I demonstrate that a PF-constraint suggested for English ECM-verbs (or its versions) 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 whether it is a full or reduced pronominal clitic. Consider (39).

(39) *mafya sa innen / sa-(l)en qadil hasm-u.  
mafia made.3M them / made.3M-them murder.INF enemy-his  
‘The mafia leader made them murder his enemy.’

An obligatory PF-adjacency between ‘make’ and the ‘infinitive’ cannot be at work. Light verb constructions, which have the “make - nonverbal element - light verb” order, indicate that a phonological-level adjacency is not required. Consider (40).

(40) kemal [sa buay 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 obligatory PF adjacency is also not tenable, as evinced by instances of contrastive focus throughout the squib. Moreover, the contrast between (i) and (ii) in footnote 2 in terms of anaphor binding or depictive licensing also speaks against a PF constraint, as Ito
(2014) argues for English wager-class verbs. This is because SA is a pro-drop language, and anaphors/depictives are expected to be possible under a PF approach, 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 overt 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. I also have demonstrated that alternative analyses face certain challenges in this construction.

Notes
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2 This agent in (3) cannot license anaphors or depictives, (i), thus is not present as a DP in the syntax.
(i) iyaₖ satte karuₖ o dav (*mısa rouₖ/roenₖ/bazenₖ) sarxoṣₖ/*ₙₖ.
She made write.INF homework for himself/themselves/each other drunk
‘Sheₖ made (someoneₖ / some peopleₖ) write the homework (*for himselfₖ/themselvesₖ/each otherₖ) drunkₖ/*ₙₖ.’

This is in contrast to (2), in which licensing of anaphors and depictives is possible. Consider (ii).

(ii) andeₖ iyaᵢ sa-tte karu o dav (mısa roenₖ / baz-enₖ)
who she made-3F write.INF homework for themselves / each other-3PL
sarxoṣₖ? drunk
‘Whoₖ did sheᵢ make do the homework for themselvesₖ drunkₖ?’

The implicit argument in (3) is neither pro (as also noted by a reviewer) nor existential (like a missing ‘by’-phrase), nor φP (Williams 1985; Rizzi 1986; Roeper 1987; Bhatt and Pancheva 2006; Landau 2010; Legate 2014, i.a.) It is available as a free variable (à la Heim’s (1982) analysis of indefinites) on the active Voice head. The free variable gets bound in one of two ways: either by being under the scope of an (unselective) quantifier in the sentence, e.g. if-clauses, adverbs, or in their absence by an operation of existential closure, which puts an implicit unselective ∃ on texts. See Akkuş To appear for details.

The possibility of (3) with an unexpressed agent shows that the MC embeds several structures, and the investigation of (3) falls outside the scope of this squib. The periphrastic causative with ‘give’ in SA also embeds an infinitive, but disallows the unexpressed agent, suggesting that the properties of MC might be tied to the selectional requirements of ‘make’. Recent studies have discovered languages with a wide range of possibilities regarding the properties of voice (see Legate To appear for an overview) and causatives.

In a similar vein, Rezac (2013:313-315) suggests that in wager but not believe ECM,
a silent N⁰ is visible to Agree. This N⁰ which otherwise intervenes in Agree between accusative-licensing v/V becomes invisible via incorporation into v/V by the time of Agree between nominative-licensing T and the embedded subject. Also see Richards (2001:part. ch. 4), which calls this phenomenon “overcrowding”, whereby in the presence of too many arguments in a particular position, one of them must move.

5 Ouwayda and Shlonsky (2016) notes a similar low-focus position for Lebanese Arabic.

6 The contrast between (14) and (15) is also informative about the active-passive alternation of VoiceP. Other diagnostics 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 (Akkuş To appear).

7 Throughout the squib, I leave out v since it is not central to the discussion and for space reasons.

8 Note that I take FP whose head F embedded under ‘make’ as a phase-head, thus serving as an edge and intermediate landing site for further movement if available. The FP in the MC differs from FP in root clauses, whose head is not a phase head. In a clause such as Kemal is washing THE PANTS (not the shirt), the object focus-moves to Spec,FP, and the subject raises from Spec,VoiceP to Spec,TP. This sentence would be predicted to be ungrammatical if the subject stopped by Spec,FP on its way.

This is straightforwardly accounted by the contextual phasehood of Bošković (2014), in which the highest phrase in an extended projection counts as phase (also Wurmbrand 2017). Accordingly, FP in the embedded structure is the highest projection of the lower
domain. On the other hand, in the higher clausal domain that starts with the verb ‘make’, FP is not the highest projection, it is dominated by other functional projections, e.g. AspP, TP and CP. Therefore FP in the matrix clause does not serve as a phase. See also Deal (2016), who argues that TP is a phase only in relative clauses in Nez Perce, thus advocates a contextual view of phasehood.

9 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).

10 The interaction between Ā-movement and Case is a significant issue, and despite the common assumption that a DP does not get case after Ā-movement, quite a few languages have been argued to exhibit this. Kayne (1984) and Pesetsky (1991) propose that Ā-movement allows Case licensing by establishing new Case relations. Dikken (2009) and Lipták (1998) make the same argument for Hungarian, in that Ā-movement past v/V_{Acc} assigns the otherwise unavailable accusative case (Rezac 2013:sect. 5). Similar arguments for object case/agreement through Ā-movement have been made on the basis of topicalization in Norwegian (Taraldsen 1984), Turkish (Șener 2011) and Passamaquoddy (Bruening 2001), and for ‘Case attraction’ in Swiss German (Georgi and Salzmann 2017). Abramovitz (2020) argues for an interaction between case and successive-cyclic wh-movement in which nouns along the path of wh-phrase’s movement path bear case-marking they would not otherwise have. These examples suggest that further research is needed to better understand the interaction between Ā-movement and Case.

Note that in most of these examples the DP is already Case-licensed prior to movement (in a finite clause) and may receive another case post-movement. In the MC, the DP is not Case-licensed prior to movement. This straightforwardly follows from the size of the embedded constituent in the MC. Unlike other examples, in the MC the reduced structure
lacks a licenser for the embedded agent; this is what distinguishes the MC. Yet, receiving case post-movement is identical.

Note that there is a subject/object asymmetry only in that if the object needs licensing, there is no embedded FP, whereas if the subject needs licensing, there is. When the matrix licenser is Voice, the subject can raise to FP and be licensed from there. The object can also remain in FP, but in this case it is licensed in the embedded structure anyways. The object being licensed in FP by matrix Voice does not arise because if the object needs licensing, then the embedded VoiceP is passive, so FP is not present. When the licenser is T, the subject can raise to FP and be licensed from there for some speakers. Again, if the object needs licensing, then there is no embedded FP and so the question can’t be asked. For all speakers, when the matrix licenser is T, the subject/object can’t stay in situ, e.g. long passives (see also German, Wurmbrand 2001, 2007). The object can raise to TP, but the subject cannot due to improper movement. There is also a licenser asymmetry. When an embedded argument is licensed by matrix Voice, that argument can stay in FP. (Again subject is the only test case.) When an embedded argument is licensed by T, it can stay in FP only for some people. This is probably related to the absence of a higher grammatical object position with movement triggered by Voice, but the presence of a higher grammatical subject position with movement triggered by Voice.

Pesetsky (2019:14) suggests that the presence of finite T prior to Exfoliation is sufficient to Case-license the subject at the left edge of the embedded infinitive. This predicts that the embedded subject in the MC will be able to license anaphors or depictives since it was licensed prior to Exfoliation. As seen in fn. 2, this is not borne out. Thank you to a reviewer for pointing this out to me.

Interestingly, (38) and (i) are out even for speakers that allow (30). This shows that
movement of the embedded subject cannot skip the matrix TP position.

(i) *ı¸ s sabiyad in-so xassil potad?
which kids PASS-made.3PL wash.INF clothes
‘Which kids were to made wash the clothes?’
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