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Following Kim (2011) for Korean and English, we present original data from Kashaya (Pomoan) arguing that both Voice and Appl can introduce an external argument. In Kashaya, Voice is phonologically null; Appl is realized as -hqa, previously assumed to be a causative (Oswalt, 1961, 1977). Our analysis also makes typological predications which are borne out for Raising-to-Object/ECM constructions.

**Proposal:** Superficially, the morpheme -hqa/(-qa) can be affixed to any transitive or intransitive verbal element and yield a causative or permissive reading, (1). In fact, -hqa is an Applicative head which selects for vP complements, while Voice, phonologically null, can select for vP or ApplP complements. Voice is semantically specified to license an Agent/Causer (building on (Kratzer, 1996; Harley, 2007)); Appl is semantically vacuous (Pylkkänen, 2002). Both heads may be merged without the other, or VoiceP may select for ApplP.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice} = \emptyset; \\
\text{Fluid-S:} \\
\text{For certain verbs, subjects not in control are Datives (2a), while subjects in control are Nominative (2b) (Mithun, 1991). First, the case alternation suggests that the arguments are being introduced in different projections. Dative Experiencer arguments receive an inherent case in spec-vP. Furthermore, the availability of Agent-oriented adverbs for subjects in control diagnoses the existence a Voice projection in (2b), which is unavailable in (2c). Crucially, there is no added morphology because Voice is phonologically null.} \\
\text{Transitivity:} \\
\text{Verbs can alternate in transitivity without an overt morphological change, (3). In the transitive constructions, (3b), null Voice licenses an external argument.} \\
\text{Appl = -hqa} \\
\text{Volitionality:} \\
\text{The addition of -hqa to a transitive verb produces a change in volitionality (4), but not a change in valency, or eventivity. These subjects are viewed as accidentally affecting the action, paralleling Applicatives in Spanish (Cuervo, 2003).} \\
\text{Eventivity:} \\
\text{Since causatives are always assumed to introduce an event (Levin and Hovav, 1999), we show using adverbial modification and selectional restrictions that -hqa cannot be construed as a causative since it does not introduce another event into the structure.} \\
\text{Psych-verbs:} \\
\text{Psych-verbs may alternate between a “plain” and -hqa form, (5). We first show using Binding tests that subjects introduced with -hqa are the highest argument in the phrase. Next, adverbial modification shows that the subjects associated with -hqa are introduced in a non-Agentive head, ApplP. Further, we demonstrate that a distinct (null) Voice head may be merged above ApplP. This results in different semantic interpretations, as well as produces different binding and morphophonological domains. In (6a) the subject is introduced in Voice, thus the reading is necessarily Agentive and the Subject-Oriented Reflexive (SOR) tito can be bound. In (6b), the subject is an ApplP. It cannot bind an SOR, only a morphological reflexive; the reading is non-Agentive.} \\
\text{Causatives:} \\
\text{The causative reading in (1) comes from merging an Agent/Causer in Voice and a Causee in Appl. Following Kim (2011), we demonstrate again using SORs that the Causee is not in a subject position, rather it is in spec-ApplP.} \\
\text{Raising-to-Object/ECM:} \\
\text{Raising-to-Object/ECM (RtoO) contexts may involve -hqa when the matrix subject differs from the subordinate subject, (7). Restricting ourselves to RtoO with tenseless, irrealis complements (want-class verbs (Pesetsky, 1992; Wurmbrand, 2001)), we propose that RtoO is derived straightforwardly by merging an Appl phrase as a complement to V – essentially a Low Applicative. In languages where Applicative heads may select for bare vPs (Kashaya, English (Kim, 2011)), RtoO structures will be allowed (with tenseless, irrealis complement infinitives). We describe a typology of RtoO languages: languages which disallow Double Object Constructions are predicted to not allow RtoO, which appears to be borne out (e.g., French, Hebrew, Russian). We further predict that only languages which allow both Low Applicatives and Applicatives above vP should allow RtoO (again, with irrealis complements). Lastly, we note other languages which display applicative/causative morphology in RtoO contexts (Passamaquoddy (Algonquian), Chuvash (Caucasian)).} \\
\text{Implications:} \\
\text{The analysis informs theories of argument structure, with syntactic and semantic consequences. It further motivates a renewed discussion of RtoO constructions.}
\end{array}
\]
(1) a. mo-ad -e man? run-DIR -NFV 3sg.Fem
'b. mo-ad -hqa -Ø -ya -e ma-dal run-DIR -APPL -VOICE -VIS -NFV 3sg.Fem
'mu-kini? 3sg.Masc_subj
'She is running along'

(2) a. John-to John-DAT c'e-lic'-bi-w fall-INFER-ABS
'John fell' (accidentally)

(3) a. pʰiʔ k'oʔem ball DET_nom fall-DIR-FACT
'm the ball is flying (hither)"

(4) a. John ca-shkaʔel thing be.afraid-NFV 1sg_dat
'I'm afraid'

(5) a. ?ama- cʰiya-c'-e thing be.afraid-NFV 1sg_dat
'I'm afraid'

(6) a. John tito duʔya-qad-hqa-Ø-w John SOR remember-APPL-VOICE-ABS
'John is thinking about himself'

(7) a. Anita / qom-ʔ / da-qa-ic'-Ø Anita swim-ABS want-APPL-REFL-ABS
'Anita wants to have a bath'
