

Linking the event to its instigator

A study of Spanish causative constructions

1 On Chomsky's (1995:Chapter 4) assumption that lexical VPs do not themselves include a position for the external argument, the event denoted by the lexical VP must be associated to its instigator via some intermediary. For Chomsky, that intermediary is *v*, a light verb that takes the lexical VP as its complement and introduces the instigator of the event in its specifier (cf. (1)). The geometric inverse of (1) is a structure in which the connection between the event denoted by the VP and its instigator is established by a go-between that takes the instigator as its complement and the lexical VP as its specifier. With that go-between identified as a preposition, this gives rise to the structure in (2). This paper argues that (1) and (2) both exist and live side by side in the syntax of Romance causative constructions: French (3a) represents (1) (with the instigator of the caused event surfacing as a DP–subject) while (3b) realizes (2) (with the instigator of the lower VP contained in a dative PP as the complement of *à* 'to'). We take our specific cue from the facts of *hacer*+infinitive causatives in Spanish, and analyze their properties in detail from this perspective.

- (1) [_{VP} [_{DP} INSTIGATOR] [_v *v*_{RELATOR} [_{VP} EVENT]]]
- (2) [_{PP} [_{VP} EVENT] [_P *P*_{RELATOR} [_{DP} INSTIGATOR]]]
- (3) a. Jean laisse Marie manger la soupe
Jean lets Marie eat the soup
- b. Jean laisse manger la soupe à Marie
Jean lets eat the soup to Marie

2 In Iberian Spanish, *hacer*+infinitive causatives have three possible surface realizations; cf. (4)–(6).

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| (4) | [CAUSER | <i>hacer</i> | CAUSEE | <i>V</i> _{Infinitive} | (Object)] |
| a. | Mary | made | <i>a</i> John | repair | the car |
| b. | Mary | made | <i>a</i> John | work | |
| (5) | [CAUSER | <i>hacer</i> | <i>V</i> _{Infinitive} | (Object) | CAUSEE] |
| a. | Mary | made | repair | the car | <i>a</i> John |
| b. | Mary | made | work | | <i>a</i> John |
| (6) | [CAUSER | <i>hacer</i> | <i>V</i> _{Infinitive} | CAUSEE | Object] |
| | Mary | made | repair | <i>a</i> John | the car |

In all three constructions, the causee — whenever animate — is adorned with *a* 'to'; the surface realization of the causee thus gives us no immediate clue when it comes to the choice between (1) and (2). But the fact that in (4) *hacer* is separated from the infinitive by the causee while in (5) and (6) the two verbs are adjacent allows us to make a first cut: (4) instantiates an ECM construction utilizing the structure in (1) while (5) and (6) are built on the template in (2). In the latter, the causativized infinitive is *incorporated* into the causative verb (cf. Guasti 1993, Den Dikken 1990); in the *hacer*–ECM construction in (4) such

incorporation is blocked by the presence of functional structure between *hacer* and the lower infinitive (cf. Li 1990), the presence of which can be diagnosed by the possibility of including temporal adverbial modifiers and negation in the infinitival complement in (4). In (5) and (6) no temporal modification or negation of the infinitival projection is possible: the causativized infinitive projects a bare VP; the prepositional small clause in (2), which harbors the causativized bare VP as its specifier, is directly base-generated as the complement of a matrix *v*, with no functional structure intervening. Consider (7) and (8):

- (7) $[_{vP2} [_{DP} \text{CAUSER } [_{v'} v2 [_{VP} V2=hacer [_{TP} [_{DP} \text{CAUSEE}]_i T [_{vP1} t_i [_{v'} v1 [_{VP1} V1_{Inf} (\text{OB})]]]]]]]]]]]$
 (8) $[_{vP} [_{DP} \text{CAUSER } [_{v'} v=hacer [_{PP} [_{VP} V_{Inf} (\text{OB})] [_{P'} P=a [_{DP} \text{CAUSEE}]]]]]]]]]$

In (7), the causative verb *hacer* is a full-fledged lexical verb (V2), its subject (the causer) being introduced by its own *v2*; *hacer* selects a TP complement containing another *v*-VP constellation, projected by the causativized infinitive. The accusative Case feature of the embedded object (when present) is checked by *v1*; the accusative Case feature of the causee (whose *a* is a mark of animacy, not a prepositional head) is checked by *v2*, in the familiar way. In (8), on the other hand, the causativized infinitive is not linked to the instigator of the event that its VP denotes via a light verb *v*, but via a preposition (*a*) instead; the causee is introduced by a preposition and is Case-licensed by it, and since the causativized infinitive is not associated with any inflectional structure, it *must* incorporate into *v* in order to be licensed as a verb. Causative *hacer* in (8) is itself the lexicalization of *v* — it functions as a light verb in the same way that it does in the Spanish counterparts to English light verb constructions like *do good work* (cf. *hacer un buen trabajo* ‘do a good work’, equivalent to *trabajar bien* ‘work well’). In (7), by contrast, causative *hacer* is a lexical verb (as in *hacer un pastel* ‘make a cake’). Lexical *hacer* cannot take the structure in (2) as its complement since the causativized infinitive would fail to be licensed: it has no functional structure to license it nor is there a *v* into which it can incorporate; lexical verbs do not incorporate into lexical verbs. Light verb *hacer*, in its turn, cannot take a TP as its complement: *v* needs to incorporate a lexical V, but such incorporation is impossible if a TP intervenes between *v* and the lexical VP. There are principled theoretical reasons, therefore, why the two incarnations of *hacer* in (7) and (8) distribute the way they do.

3 The structure in (8) contains a *single* light verb *v*. This means (i) that passivization of the matrix clause will lead to promotion of the lower object to subject (in ‘long passives’ like *La catedral fue hecha construir por el Papa* ‘the cathedral was made build by the Pope’), and (ii) that when the lower infinitive takes no object that could check *v*’s uninterpretable Case feature (cf. (5b)), the causee must be promoted to object via *Dative Shift*. Thus, Spanish (and Romance in general) does have Dative Shift — in fact, in *hacer*-causatives whose infinitive is unergative, Dative Shift is forced, to ensure that *v* gets its Case feature checked. The consequences of the Dative Shift approach to (5b) for triadic constructions with ‘give’-type verbs will be discussed in the paper.

4 The word order in (6) is specific to Spanish, within the Romance language family. It is built on (8) via ‘extraposition’ of the object around the causee. We will discuss the pragmatic contexts in which this word order arises (having to do with focus), and suggest an analysis of the word order in (6) which is in keeping with the general ban on rightward movement (Kayne’s 1994 LCA).