

Dear editors and reviewers,

After careful consideration of the reviews, we are pleased to resubmit our revised manuscript “*Passives, impersonals and Voice in Sakha*” to Proceedings of Tu+7. Thank you for your thoughtful comments and helpful suggestions. We have incorporated virtually all of the suggested revisions and we believe that they have significantly strengthened our manuscript. Below we list each of the comments and indicate how we have responded.

Reviewer 1’s comments

General Comments

E1.0 The author discusses a Sakha variety and argues that passives and impersonals should have different syntactic structures. Evidence is: ACC marking, agreement, wh-slucing, human restriction, etc. The contrast between passives/impersonals suggests that the subject in passivization is not syntactically present.

I generally agree with author’s reasoning, but I have some questions:

Thank you.

E1.1 Does the author want to explain why impersonals (unaccusative, unergative, oblique) share the same morpheme with passive?

We have added footnote 2: In the current project we do not have the necessary historical data to answer this, but we have also pointed out that cross-linguistically, it is not uncommon for impersonals to bear passive morphology, and it has been argued for some languages that the impersonal develops out of the original passive (see Malchukov & Siewierska 2011). It’s an interesting open question whether this is also true in Sakha.

E1.2 How can we test the existence/position of the null impersonal pronoun? Is it a *pro*? Can it undergo raising/ECM, etc.?

We have added footnote 6: In the present analysis, the null impersonal pronoun belongs to a variety of pronominals (including *pro* and PRO) that bear interpretable but unvalued features that must be valued in the course of the derivation (MINIMAL PRONOUNS, in the sense of Kratzer 2009). Unfortunately, given the limited duration of the current project, we haven’t got the opportunity to apply more tests such as ECM, but Tan and Köhler 2020 reported that impersonals do allow ECM in Sakha, and our analysis also predicts so. It will be worthwhile to test it in the future.

E1.3 The stacking data in (41)-(42): it is not immediately clear what the semantics of *impersonal of passive* is (perhaps some background is needed). Second, how will the stacking data fit the discussion on continuation test in (27-30)?

We have added some background for the impersonal of passive in Section 2.1, when the construction was introduced for the first time in this paper: It is a passive construction where the

theme is syntactically projected as an impersonal pronoun, while the agent is demoted through passive (e.g., Legate et al. 2020). For the continuation test, we have added footnote 5: We haven't got the opportunity to test with our consultants whether the continuation test is allowed in the impersonal of passive, but the prediction is it will be fine to add the continuation, since the continuation test only concerns the agent, whereas the impersonal pronoun is the theme instead of the agent in the impersonal of passive construction.

E1.4 Agreement: the structure that the author provides (Fig. 5) does not seem to explain why in impersonal verbal agreement is not achievable. The post-verbal NP will not receive an unaccusative case because the Voice cannot assign such a case, then it should move to a place to receive case without triggering agreement – where?

We are not completely clear with this comment. In this paper we argue that impersonals in this Sakha variety are only allowed for verbs without ACC objects, so there is no post-verbal NP that needs to move to receive case.

Specific Expressions

E1.5 P7. Discussion paragraph above (25): “However, this is not true in the current variety” The expression is misleading. It implies that the impersonal test does not apply to the current variety.

We have adjusted the wording to avoid the ambiguity.

R1.6 P8. 4.2.2. Paragraph 2 – line 2 “... yet the sentence is grammatical,...” might be less confusing if *yet* is deleted.

We have deleted ‘yet’ as suggested.

Reviewer 2

E2.1 Say something about your sources.

In the first footnote, we have added information about our consultants.

E2.2 P2: Add an example with -nIIIIn.

We have added such an example (example 8).

E2.3 Example (13a) is not a valid test. (In the revised manuscript it's (14a))

We agree this unaccusative example is not so clear without a contrasting unergative example. In the T&K paper where this example comes from, the authors claimed that unergative verbs can be passivized whereas unaccusative verbs cannot, but no example of passivized unergative was provided to compare with the unaccusative example we cite. We did not have the opportunity to further test this because the Sakha variety we work with behaves quite differently from the one T&K worked with (in the present variety, unergative verbs do not allow passives), so we just cited the claim and example as they are in the original T&K paper.

E2.4 Why does example (15) have an imperative meaning?(In the revised manuscript it's (16))

We cited this example, including the translation, from T&K paper. But our consultants agree it's not imperative, so we have changed the translation in our revised manuscript.

E2.5 P5: Is “one” generic or indefinite?

We agree “generic” is the more accurate term. We have changed the term throughout the manuscript and added citations.

E2.6 Example (40): The embedded structure is not a CP. (In the revised manuscript it's (41))

Thank you for pointing this out. We have deleted the ACC, and our consultants agree the example is still grammatical.

E2.7 P10: “must” vs. “can”.

We have added footnote 4 to explain this: We did not use “must” because the impersonal pronoun sometimes can also have an arbitrary reading.

E2.8 Is the analysis the same as in Legate et al. 2020?

Yes, and we've made this clear in the revised manuscript.

In addition to the content feedback above, reviewer 2 has also provided helpful feedback on grammar and style, and we have incorporated all those comments.

Finally, after revising the manuscript based on the review, the manuscript exceeded the 15-page limit, so we have cut some of the data for the discussion on ‘remaining questions’ in Section 6. We hope this will not not undermine the argument and coherence of the manuscript.