A number of languages have constructions in which an argument cannot remain in its base-generated position, and needs to move to be ‘rescued’, e.g. wager-class verbs in English, Romance ECM, or Austronesian applicatives. Previous proposals include: (i) those that revolve around locality restrictions, be it either CP as a barrier/phase, or extra silent projections (e.g. Kayne 1975, 1984, Pesetsky 1991, Bošković 1997, Rezac 2013), (ii) a PF-based constraint (Ito 2014), or (iii) an Exfoliation approach, in which projections are deleted from a full clause (Pesetsky 2019). With a phased-based account, this study demonstrates that ‘make’ causatives (MC) in Sason Arabic (SA) support a locality-based analysis, which also provides striking evidence for Â-movement feeds licensing relations. We also demonstrate that the MC embeds a thematic VoiceP with an active-passive alternation, and no AspP or higher projections. As such, it also adds to the typologies of Voice and of causatives (cf. Schäfer 2008, 2017, Alexiadou 2012, Harley 2013, Legate 2014, Pitteroff 2015).

**Background.** The MC contains an overt embedded theme (hasış ‘grass’), (1) with an infinitival verb (hazd ‘cut’), but no overt embedded agent, (1). The agent is interpreted as indefinite, non-specific ‘someone’ or ‘some people’ and is obligatorily null. Notably, Â-movement (wh-question, relativization, contrastive focus) licenses the overt realization of the embedded agent, (2).

**Size of the embedded clause.** The MC embeds a reduced structure, i.e. no AspP or higher projections (cf. Kayne 1984, Rochette 1988, Moulton 2009 for CP in Romance infinitives). The absence of CP and TP layers is shown by the fact that CLLD-ed elements cannot occur under ‘make’, and the complement cannot have distinct temporal modification. The impossibility of the passive prefix, which realizes the portmanteau Aspect+Voice morphology, indicates the absence of AspP. However, the MC embeds a thematic VoiceP, with an active-passive alternation. The evidence for a thematic Voice includes (i) agent-oriented adverbs associated with the embedded agent, (1), (ii) the availability of instrument phrases modifying the embedded agent, (iii) agent-oriented comitatives, (iv) thematic subject requirement (unaccusatives are disallowed).

**Active-passive VoiceP.** Without an embedded ‘by’-phrase, the embedded VoiceP behaves as active in licensing the theme as an object (as shown by definiteness effects and CLLD) independently of the matrix. With an embedded ‘by’-phrase, the embedded VoiceP behaves as passive in not licensing the theme. Instead, it is licensed as an object when ‘make’ is active, (3), but raises to become the grammatical subject when ‘make’ is passive, (4). Raising is not possible without a by-phrase, (5).

Further arguments are nonpassivizable idioms and sluicing (6) - (7). In SA, VP ellipsis may in some cases allow voice mismatching, whereas sluicing does not, in line with Merchant’s (2013) generalization.

(6) mafya sa qadd hasm-u, hama m-ore (*m) ande

‘The mafia leader made someone murder his enemy, but I don’t know (*by) who’

(7) kemal sa xassil potad m mara-ma pir-e, hama m-ore

Kemal made wash clothes by woman-a old-F

‘Kemal made the clothes be washed by an old woman, but I don’t know exactly *(by) who.’
As a general property of the language, SA has a low focus position, FP, above active VoiceP between the auxiliary and the participle, (8), but not above passive VoiceP, (9). In (Sason) Arabic, contrastive-focusing in-situ is disallowed, thus this operation indicates movement. The same property holds for the MC, (10-11), i.e. the intermediate position between ‘make’ and the infinitive becomes unavailable when the embedded VoiceP has a ‘by’-phrase. Thus, the MC embeds either an FP which dominates an active VoiceP, or a passive VoiceP.

(8) *kemal (ṣūrvan-i) kemal ku (ṣūrvan-i) i-xsel. pants-my Kemal be.3M pants-my 3M-wash
‘Kemal is washing my pants, (not my shirt).’

(9) (kitab-ma) kemal ku (’kitab-ma) book-a Kemal be.3M book-a in-y-adi.
PASS-3M-give
‘Kemal is being given a book, (not a paper).’

**Analysis.** The MC has the structure in (14). We argue that F is a phase head, thus FP intervenes in the licensing of the embedded agent by the matrix ‘make’/Voice. However, Â-movement (not A-mov’t) makes licensing possible. We suggest that this is because F can host Â-features, and the embedded agent can raise to its edge (cf. Rezac 2013), so the agent can be licensed by ‘make’ in a local configuration. Both versions of locality analyses, i.e. those with barrierhood/phasehood (e.g. Kayne 1984, Moulton 2009) and those with an extra projection (e.g. VP (Bošković 1997), NP (Rezac 2013)) are reconciled in SA. Despite being a phase-based account, the phase domain is not CP (unlike Romance), but the low focus position, FP, above active 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 pronouned material: it is the alternative landing site for the focus constituent, (12-13, also see (10)).

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

(13) (cinar-ma) kemal sa (cinar-ma) faqz neighbor-a Kemal made neighbor-a run.inf
‘Kemal made a neighbor run (not an old woman).’

This analysis correctly captures all four configurations based on the diathesis of matrix and embedded clauses. We also discuss various other diagnostics which show that a phase-based, Case-theoretic licensing approach fares better for the MC as opposed to a PF-constraint or an Exfoliation hypothesis.

For instance, in this account the licensing of the embedded subject, but not of the embedded object, hinges on a a higher licenser in the matrix domain since the latter is licensed by the embedded VoiceP. However, for Exfoliation, the presence or absence of a higher licenser should make no difference (Pesetsky 2019:23). Thus, the two approaches differ when the matrix-clause verb ‘make’ is passive, in that only the current account predicts a contrast between the embedded object, (15-16) and subject, (17-18).

(15) *iş kitab aya sa qaru? which book lord made read.inf
‘Which book did the lord make someone read?’

(16) *iş kitab in-sa qaru? which book PASS-made read.inf
‘Which book was someone made to read?’

(17) ande mafya sa qadul hasm-u? who mafia made murder.inf enemy-his
‘Who did the mafia make murder his enemy?’

(18) *ande in-sa xassil potad-na? who PASS-made wash.inf clothes-our
‘Who was to made wash our clothes?’

Bringing a new perspective to the crosslinguistic pattern in which some arguments cannot remain in-situ, the MC supports a locality-based approach, with evidence for Â-movement feeding licensing relations.