

A fine-grained analysis of analytic causatives in Romance

Mihaela Adriana Marchis
Hamburg University
mihaela.marchis@uni-hamburg.de

1. Introduction: This paper discusses the crosslinguistic variation of the analytic causatives *hacer/faire/fare/fare/fazer/mander* “make” in Spanish, Italian, Romanian & Brazilian Portuguese. Kayne (1975) identified two types of restructuring causatives for French, e.g., *faire a* (FI) and *faire par* (FP) (cf. Kayne 1975, Huber 1980, Burzio 1986, Enzinger 2010 among others). Folli & Harley (2007) explain the distinction between Italian FI and FP causatives by assuming that *fare* in FP causatives is a lexical element while *fare* in FI causatives is a functional element. In line with Wurmbrand (2003), Folli & Harley (2007) and Balza (2012), Torrego (2010) among others, I argue, on the basis of well-known tests such as clitic climbing, negation, event modifiers, that the causative verb *faire* within a language and across Romance is ambiguous between functional and lexical. Moreover, this paper provides evidence for a non-homogenous (non-)restructuring of analytic causatives in Romance: these constructions are ambiguous between restructuring and non-restructuring while non-restructuring analytic causatives can be both raising/ECM and object control depending on the agentiveness of the subject. Hence, this paper shows that analytic causatives should be analyzed on a par with aspectual verbs since they are also ambiguous between raising and control in Greek and Romanian (cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999).

2. The analysis of analytic causatives in Romance: This paper shows that Romance analytic causatives involve different degrees of restructuring and non-restructuring: i. functional restructuring when the causative verb is a functional verb that restructures a small verbal complement: either vP in unergative FI causatives or VP with unaccusatives or FP causatives (cf. López 2001); ii. lexical restructuring when the causative verb is a lexical verb that subcategorizes a vP or VP complement but has a complete argument structure; iii. non-restructuring when the causative verb is a control or a raising/ECM and is part of a biclausal structure. Hence, it subcategorizes at least a TP.

2.1. Functional Restructuring: Analytic causatives involve funct. restructuring in Italian FI causatives but also in Spanish and Romanian when there are selectional restrictions neither on the causer (-animate) nor on the causee or when the causee is absent. The test with the eventive modifiers show that the structure is mono-eventive and, hence, monoclausal. The event modifiers cannot modify the causative verb but only the embedded lexical verb:

(1) El buen clima hace las plantas crecer *cuatro veces* más rápido. Spanish
The favorable climate makes plants grow four times quicker.
The sole interpretation is that the plants grow four times quicker

(2) Maria gli fa lavare *quattro volte* la camicia. Italian
Maria them made wash four times the shirt.

Interpretation: ‘Maria made them wash the shirt four times’ (four washings not four makings)

2.2. Lexical Restructuring: The causative verb is a lexical verb that subcategorizes a vP or VP and has a complete argument structure. Note that unlike with FI, FP causatives in Italian & Spanish impose selectional (animacy/agentiveness) restrictions on the agent:

(3) La generosità fece donare la casa a/*da Gianni. Italian
The generosity made donate the house to/*by Gianni.

2.3. Raising & control non-restructuring: On the basis of negation and event modifier tests, all analytic FI causatives in Romanian, Br. Portuguese and *loísta* (with acc. clitics) and *leísta* Spanish variants (with dat. clitics) are non-restructuring (for Br. Portuguese Marchis 2012)

- (4) Maria **nu** l-a facut pe Ion sa **nu** gateasca. Romanian
 Maria not cl.acc-has made PE John subj not cook-3sg.
 Maria **no** lo hizo **no** cozinar. Spanish
 Maria no cl.acc made not cook.
 “Mary did not make him not cook.”

Negation can appear either on the matrix verb, or the embedded verb or on both verbs with different semantics. This shows that the embedded complement must be more than a bare VP. If NegP is present, then a TP must be present as well (cf. Haegeman 1995). Torrego (2010) illustrates that analytic causatives in *loísta* dialects (FI_{left}) have an agentive restriction on the subject on a par with FP causatives (see (3)) while *leísta* causatives (FI_{right}) with dative clitics in standard Spanish are grammatical with all types of subjects:

- (5) a. *La recesión **la** ha hecho (**a la atleta**) perder el trabajo. *loísta* Spanish
 The recession cl.acchas made to the athlete lose the job.
 b. La recesión **le** ha hecho perder el trabajo **a la atleta**. standard Spanish
 The recession cl.dat. has made lose the job to the athlete.

Interestingly, as Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese do not show the distinction between *loísta* and *leísta* causatives like Spanish, the ambiguity arises with FI_{left} causatives:

- (6) a. Recesiunea l-a facut pe sportiv sa-si piarda locul de munca. **ECM**
 The recession cl.acc-has made to the athlete subj-cl.dat lose the job.
 b. Maria **intentionat** l-a facut pe Ion sa-si dea demisia. **control**
 Mary intentionally cl.acc-has made PE.acc John subj-cl.dat quit.

The agentivity of the subject is tested by the agent-oriented adverbs like in (6b). On the basis of this, I argue that we have to do with different analyses for *leísta* and *loísta* causatives and for (6a) and (6b) in Romanian: raising for *leísta* causatives in (5b) and ECM for nonagentive causatives in Romanian (6a) and control for *loísta* causatives and agentive causatives in Romanian (6b). In line with López (2001), I argue that the causative control verb assigns an (+affected) theta-role to its causee. The contrast between raising and control (cf. Landau 2004, 2007) should be visible also in case assignment: Raising: DP_i DAT.....V.....[t_i.....V.....FQ_{DAT}] vs. Control: DP_i NOM.....V.....[PRO_i.....V.....FQ_{DAT}] (Landau 2007: 305). This distinction is visible in Spanish variants: control triggers structural case assignment like in Spanish *loísta* while raising like in *leísta* Spanish preserves the inherent case of the causee (that is assigned by the preposition *a*). Note that aspectual verbs are also ambiguous between raising and control in their agreement pattern (cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999).

All in all, restructuring causatives can be functional when they lack argument structure and subcategorize a bare VP/vP or lexical when they have argument structure. Non-restructuring causatives can be raising/ECM when they have just one argument: the caused event (see Romanian (6) for ECM the causee has acc. structural case) or control when they have three arguments the causer, the causee and the caused event (cf. Zubizarreta 1985, Alsina 1992 and Ippolito 2000).