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Abstract: Analytic causatives have been of paramount interest in literature on Romance languages beginning with Kayne’s (1975) pioneering work on French faire a vs. faire par analytic causatives. This paper discusses the crosslinguistic variation of causatives in Romance and proposes a fine-grained analysis of them. I show that the (functional/lexical) status and the (non-)restructuring level of the causative verb/affix is a continuum within a language and across languages. Hence, causative expressions can be functional, lexical or ambiguous between restructuring (monoclausal) (cf. Cinque 2002, 2004, Wurmbrand 2003, Folli and Harley 2007, Pylkkänen 2002 and 2008) and non-restructuring in Spanish, Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese.
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1. Introduction

Causative constructions have been of paramount interest both in general and in Romance linguistics for the last three decades (Kayne 1975, Comrie 1975, 1976, Huber 1980, Burzio 1986, Bourdelois 1988, Li 1990, Guasti 1996, Cinque 2002, 2004 among others). Typologically, they are classified as either periphrastic (syntactic/analytic) or non-periphrastic (morphological) causative constructions. Periphrastic causatives are defined as biclausal with the causative matrix verb lacking lexical meaning.

(1) La rabbia fece rompere il tavolo a Gianni. (Italian)
the rage made break the table to Gianni
‘Rage made Gianni break the table.’ (Folli and Harley 2007: 217)

In contrast, non-periphrastic causatives are monoclausal and the expression of the causer’s action is represented by an affix or by a separate verb that lacks lexical meaning.

(2) ta ‑ni chaw aye ‑li ‑e ‑i ‑ew ta ‑malen (Mapudungun1)
DET POSS father laugh‑CAUS‑REL‑IND‑INV DET girl
‘The girl’s father made her laugh.’ (Golluscio 2007: 209)

This paper discusses the crosslinguistic variation of causatives in Romance and proposes a fine-grained analysis of them. I show that the (functional/lexical) status and the (non-) restructuring level of the causative verb/affix is a continuum within a language and across languages. Hence, causative expressions can be functional, lexical or ambiguous between restructuring (monoclausal) (cf. Cinque 2002, 2004, Wurmbrand 2003, Folli and Harley 2007, Pylkkänen 2008) and non-restructuring (biclausal) in Spanish, Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese. Crucially, non-restructuring analytic
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1 Mapudungun known also as Mapuche or Araucanian is spoken in southern Chile and Argentina.
causatives in these languages can be either raising or control depending on the selectional restrictions of the causative verb and, hence, are similar to the syntax of aspectual verbs (see Alexiadou et al. 2012).

2. Causatives across Romance

2.1 Analytic causatives in Italian and French

Kayne (1975) identified two types of analytic causatives e.g. *faire a* (FI) and *faire par* (FP) (cf. Kayne 1975, Huber 1980, Burzio 1986, Enzinger 2010, among others). In FI causatives the embedded verb has an active interpretation and does not imposes restrictions on the causer or the causee.

(3)  
\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a. Gianni ha fatto riparare la macchina a Mario. (FI)} & \quad \text{(Italian)} \\
\text{Gianni has made repair the car to Mario} & \\
\text{‘Gianni got Mario to repair the car.’} \\
\text{b. La rabbia fece rompere il tavolo a Gianni.} & \\
\text{the rage made break the table to Gianni} & \\
\text{‘Rage made Gianni break the table.’} & \quad \text{(Folli and Harley 2007: 217)}
\end{align*} \]

In FP causatives, on the other hand, the subject of the embedded transitive verb appears within a by phrase as in passives, the embedded vP is not active and the subject and the object of the causative verb must be agentive and [+animate].

(4)  
\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a. Gianni ha fatto riparare la macchina da Mario. (FP)} & \quad \text{(Italian)} \\
\text{Gianni has made repair the car by Mario} & \\
\text{‘Gianni got Mario to repair the car.’} \\
\text{b. *La rabbia fece rompere il tavolo par Gianni.} & \\
\text{the rage made break the table by Gianni.} & \\
\text{‘Rage made Gianni break the table.’} & \quad \text{(Folli and Harley 2007: 217)}
\end{align*} \]

Folli and Harley (2007) explain the distinction between Italian FI causatives and FP causatives by assuming that, *fare* in FP causatives is a lexical element while *fare* in FI causatives a functional element.

2.2 Analytic causatives in Spanish

Similar to Italian, Torrego (2010) shows that the causative verb in Spanish can either be functional or lexical depending on the distribution, the case and the animacy of the causee: FP and the so-called *loista* FI causatives are lexical while the so-called *leista* FI causatives are functional. All Spanish variants employ a dative clitic that replaces or doubles the causee in FI causatives. However, only the *loista* variant of Spanish employs a full-fledged pre-infinitival dative DP with no clitic doubling and that can be replaced by an accusative clitic *lo.*
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(5)  

(a) Su buena forma *le* ha hecho ganar la carrera  
   his good form CL.DAT has made win the race  
   (standard Spanish)  
   (a la atleta).  
   ‘His good form made the athlete win the race.’

(b) El sargento hizo a su subordinado arreglar  
    the sergeant made his subordinate repair  
    el camión.  
    (loista Spanish)  
    ‘The sergeant made his subordinate repair the truck.’

(c) El sargento lo hizo arreglar el camión.  
    (loista Spanish)  
    ‘The sergeant made him repair the truck.’

d. *Su buena forma lo ha hecho (al atleta) ganar  
   his good form CL.ACC has made to the athlete  
   la carrera. (loista Spanish)  
   the race  
   ‘His good form made the athlete win the race.’

Since Fl*ext* causatives in *loista* Spanish behave like FP causatives in Italian with respect to the agentiveness restriction on the subject and the causee (see 5d), Torrego (2010) analyzed them on a par: as lexical verbs.

All in all, standard Spanish does not morphologically mark the distinction between the functional and lexical status of the causative verb. *Loista* Spanish disambiguates the lexical *hacer* from the functional light verb *hacer* through the morphosyntactic realization of the clitics: datives vs. accusatives.

2.3 Analytic causatives in Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese

Like in Spanish, the animacy of the causee in Romanian analytic causatives influences its distribution. If the causee is animate, it must obligatorily occur in the pre-infinitive position, it must be marked by the accusative preposition/Differential Object Marker *pe* and is doubled by an accusative clitic:

(6)  

(a) Maria l-*a* făcut **pe** Ion să repara radioul  
   Maria CL.ACC has made PE Ion SĂ repair radio-the  
   ‘Maria got ION to repair the radio.’

(b) Maria a făcut (**radioul**) să funcţioneze (**radioul**)  
    Maria has made radio-the SĂ work radio-the  
    ‘Maria made the radio work.’

Romanian has the option of a causative construction where no causee is available or needed:
The example in (6a) differs from (6b) and (7) in the following respects: in (6a), the causative verb semantically and syntactically subcategorizes a direct object and the structure can be paraphrased with a control construction: “Maria convinced/forced John to repair the radio”. According to Farell (1995), Brazilian Portuguese makes use of two causative verbs, e.g. *manda* and *fazer*. Unlike *fazer* causative, *manda* can occur only with animate objects:

(8) Eu *mandei/fiz a pedra cair.
I made /made the stone fall
‘I made the stone fall.’

3. The analysis of analytic causatives

The syntactic analysis of analytic causatives has been a matter of discussion and several analyses have been proposed: While most scholars regard analytic causatives as restructuring structures (Kayne 1975, Burzio 1986, Li 1990, Guasti 1993, Treviño 1994, Bourdelois 1988, López 2001, Folli and Harley 2007, Torrego 2010), they differ with respect to the argument structure of the analytic causative verb in Romance, e.g. whether the argument structure of the causative verbs has two or three slots.

In this paper, I focus on three main questions regarding the syntactic structure of analytic causatives in Romance: (i) are all analytic causatives restructuring or can we find crosslinguistic variation?; (ii) is the causative verb *faire* functional or lexical or it is both depending on the syntactic structure?; (iii) are analytic causatives instances of raising/ECM or control?

This paper shows that a unified analysis of causative constructions that treats all analytic causatives either as restructuring or non-restructuring and proposes a sole argument structure for the causative verb *hacer* cannot do justice to the crosslinguistic variation presented in the previous sections.

3.1. A three-way distinction: Functional/lexical restructuring and non-restructuring

In line with Wurmbrand (2003) and Balza (2012), I propose the following distinction: causatives can be functional like Romance analytic causatives with non-agentive subjects; lexical like *fare* FP causatives in Italian or ambiguous between restructuring (monoclausal) and non-restructuring (biclausal) in Spanish, Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese.
3.1.1 Functional causatives (mono-clausal)

These are *fare* Italian causatives where the causative verb is a functional verb that restructures with a small verbal complement. This corresponds to the direct causation since it lacks intentional agentiveness. The causative verb is a functional element of \(v_{\text{CAUSE}}\) type.

(9) \(\text{La rabbia fece rompere il tavolo a Gianni.}\) *(Italian)*

the rage made break the table to Gianni

‘Rage made Gianni break the table.’ *(Folli and Harley 2007: 217)*

Moreover, in line with Cuervo (2003) and Schäfer (2008), I assume that the oblique causee *a Gianni* is not an argument of the verb but rather is applied via an applicative head:

(10) \[\begin{array}{c}
\text{AppIP} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{dat}} \text{ Appl'} \\
\text{App \ change-of-state}
\end{array}\]

Crucially, this kind of causative involves two direct causations in a nutshell: the first one morphologically marked by the causative verb *fare* and the second one by the canonical (non-morphological) causative verb *break* that involves a change-of-state. According to Dowty (1979) causatives are usually built up by the combination of two event predicates *CAUSE* and *BECOME*. In the light of Dowty’s combinations of operations *CAUSE* and *BECOME*, (11) represents the structure of functional causatives (see also Alexiadou et al. 2006)

(11) \[\text{[CAUSE [AppIP DP}_{\text{dat}} \text{ [ CAUSE [BECOME ]]\]}}\]

Functional causatives can be found also in Spanish, Brazilian and Romanian when the causative verb *hacer/fazer/fce* imposes animacy restrictions neither on the causer nor on the causee or when the causee is absent:

(12) a. \(\text{El buen clima hace crecer las plantas más rápido.}\) *(Spanish)*

the good climate makes grow the plants more quickly

‘The favourable climate makes grow the plants quicklier.’

b. \(\text{Ploaia a făcut plantele să crească mai repede.}\) *(Romanian)*

rain-the has made plants-the SĂ grow more quick.

‘The rain made the plants grow quicker.’

c. \(\text{A chuva fez as plantas crescerem mais rápido.}\) *(Brazilian Portuguese)*

the rain made the plants grow more quickly

‘The rain made the plants grow quicker.’
Further evidence for a functional causatives can be provided by Mapudungun where -(j)m causatives like in (13) are always functional since the causer of the causative verb is always not agentive and not animate (cf. Golluscio 2007). Moreover, this type of causatives is felicitous only with unaccusatives/anticausatives:

\[(13)\quad xwan\,ta\,piti\,ta\,wadki-im-i\,ta\,ko\quad (Mapudungun)\]

\[Juan\,the\,still\,det\,boil-\text{CAUS}1-\text{IND}3\,the\,water.\quad \text{(Golluscio 2007:209)}\]

We have learned so far that all languages under discussion have functional causation but what do these functional causatives have in common? They seem to be seem to be:

(i) direct causation whereby the higher “causer” directly causes the caused event without affecting a lower agent;
(ii) lack of agentiveness (neither the causer nor the causee are agents);
(iii) the caused event is usually an unaccusative predicate lacking an external argument;
(iv) they all have the universal feature of CAUSE realized in light verb of \(v_{\text{CAUSE}}\) type which according to Pylkkänen (1999) does not necessary introduces a causer argument; the relation between the causer and caused event is realized through an applicative head as proposed in Cuervo (2003);
(v) they all involve a monoclausal structure.

### 3.1.2 Lexical causatives (mono-clausal)

Contrary to Folli and Harley (2007), I assume that not all FI causatives in Italian are functional. Kallulli (2005) shows that the presence of features such as [+intention] and [+cause] distinguishes between the agentive vs. the causative interpretation of the external argument. Hence, I analyse those causatives that do not have an agentive causer as functional causatives. Real causers are not agents but rather instruments. Hence, functional causatives occur only with unaccusative/anticausative embedded verbs.

FI causatives in Italian with agentive subjects: the lexical causative *fare* contains both the feature [+INTENT] and [+DO/COMMIT].

\[(14)\quad \text{Gianni ha fatto mangiare la pizza a Maria.}\quad \text{(Italian)}\]

\[\text{Gianni has made eat the pizza to Maria}\]

\[\text{‘Gianni made Maria eat pizza.’}\]

One can assume that fare FI causatives in Italian are also ambiguous between a lexical and a functional interpretation like their Romanian, Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese counterparts.

FP causatives in Italian: Folli and Harley (2007) explain the distinction between Italian FI causatives and FP causatives by assuming that different types of light verbs (applicatives) are involved in the structures of these two. Specifically, *fare* in FP causatives is a lexical element that modifies a null \(v_{\text{DO}}\).

\[(15)\quad \text{Gianni ha fatto riparare la macchina da Mario.}\quad \text{(Italian)}\]

\[\text{Gianni has made repair the car by Mario}\]

\[\text{‘Gianni got Mario to repair the car.’}\]
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Folli and Harley (2007) and Tubino Blanco (2011) argue that for FP causatives in Italian and Spanish, the matrix light verb is the agentive $v_{DO}$ and hence, the causative verb is lexical, being associated with the root $\sqrt{FAR}/\sqrt{HACER}$ that takes a nominalized VP “*riparare la macchina*”. The nominalized VP has been nominalised before VoiceP introduced a subject. Therefore, the embedded complement lacks a grammatical subject, this being recovered by an adjunct *da/por* (cf. Tubino Blanco 2011: 227).

3.1.3 Non-restructuring: Raising vs. control

I argue that in Spanish, Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese, analytic causative verbs are ambiguous between raising and control when they are non-restructured. In the following section i bring evidence for a non-restructuring analysis of analytic causatives in Brazilian Portuguese, Spanish and Romanian.

3.2 Arguments for a non-restructuring analysis in Romance

On the basis of several syntactic and semantic tests I show that the variation among Romance occurs due to several reasons: a. restructuring vs. non-restructuring b. control versus ECM/raising.

3.2.1 (not) (always) restructuring

When the subject of the causative is agentive, the causative constructions in Brazilian Portuguese, Romanian and Spanish are biclausal/non-restructured structures. Two separate negations are possible:
(16) a. Maria não mandou eles limpar(em) a casa. (Brazilian Portuguese)
   Maria not made they clean-INF the house
   ‘Maria didn’t make them clean house.’

b. Maria mandou eles não limpar(em) a casa.
   Maria made they not clean-INF the house
   ‘Maria made them not clean the house.’

c. Maria não mandou eles não limpar(em) a casa.
   Maria not made they not clean-INF the house
   ‘Maria didn’t order them not to clean the house.’

(17) a. Maria nu l- a făcut pe Ion să gătească.. (Romanian)
   Maria not CL.ACC has made PE Ion SĂ cook
   ‘Maria didn’t make Ion cook.’

b. Maria l- a făcut pe Ion să nu gătească.
   Maria CL.ACC has made PE Ion SĂ not cook
   ‘Mary made Ion not cook.’

c. Maria nu l- a făcut pe Ion să nu gătească.
   Maria not CL.ACC has made PE Ion SĂ not cook-3SG
   ‘Maria didn’t make Ion not cook.’

(18) a. Maria no lo hizo (a Juan) cocinar.(Spanish)
   Maria not CL.ACC made to Juan cook
   ‘Maria didn’t make him (Juan) cook.’

b. Maria lo hizo no cocinar.
   Maria CL.ACC made not cook
   ‘Maria made him not cook.’

c. Maria no lo hizo no cocinar.
   Maria no CL.ACC made not cook
   ‘Maria did not make him not cook.’

Two separate event modifiers are also possible:

(19) a. Maria mandou/fez cuatro vezes eles enxaguar a camisa. (Brazilian Portuguese)
   Maria made four times they rinse the shirt.
   ‘There were four times that Maria ordered them to rinse the shirt.’ (four makings)

b. Maria mandou/fez eles enxaguar a camisa cuatro vezes.
   Maria made they rinse the shirt four times
   Also: ‘Maria ordered them to rinse the shirt four times.’
   Ambiguous between ‘four rinsings’ and ‘four makings’
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(20) a. Maria l-a făcut de *patru* ori pe Ion să tragă cu puşca. (Romanian)
   ‘Maria made John four times shoot with the gun.’ (*four makings*)
   Maria CL.ACC has made PE Ion SĂ shoot with gun-the
   b. Maria l-a făcut pe Ion să tragă cu puşca *de* *patru* ori.
   Maria CL.ACC has made PE Ion SĂ shoot with gun-the of four times
   Ambiguous between ‘four makings’ and ‘four shootings’

However, in Spanish and Romanian the test with event modifiers fails when the analytic causatives lack a causee or when the causee is inanimate (such as the climate):

(21) a. El buen clima hace *cuatro veces* las plantas crecer más rápido. (Spanish)
   The good climate makes four times the plants grow more quickly.
   ‘The favourable climate makes four times the plants grow quicklier.’
   The interpretation is that the plants grow four times quicklier. (*four makings*)
   b. El buen clima hace las plantas crecer *cuatro veces* más rápido.
   The good climate makes the plants grow four times more quickly
   The favourable climate makes plants grow four times quicker
   The interpretation is that the plants grow four times quicklier.

(22) a. Clima favorabilă face *de* *patru* ori să crească plantele mai repede. (Romanian)
   The favourable climate makes four times the plants grow more quickly
   The favourable climate makes four times the plants grow quicker
   The interpretation is that the plants grow four times quicklier. (*four makings*)
   b. Clima favorabilă face să crească plantele *de* *patru* ori mai repede.
   The favourable climate makes the plants grow four times more quickly
   The favourable climate makes the plants grow four times quicklier.
   ‘The favourable climate makes the plants grow four times quicklier.’
   The interpretation is that the plants grow four times quicklier.

This test clearly shows that there is a syntactic distinction between causative constructions with clitic doubling as in (20) and the same causative verb in (21) that does not subcategorize a causee. The causative constructions with an over causee are biclausal and bi-eventive while the other ones represent cases of restructuring. Like restructuring causatives in Spanish and Romanian (see (20) and (21)), Italian *fare* constructions are not
biclausal and bi-eventive structures shown by the fact that only one interpretation is available with event modifiers.

(23)  

a. Maria gli fa lavare quattro volte la camicia. (Italian)  
   Maria them makes wash four times the shirt  
   Interpretation: ‘Maria makes them wash the shirt four times’ (four washings)  

b. *Maria gli fa quattro volte lavare la camicia.  
   Maria them makes four times wash the shirt  
   Interpretation: ‘Maria makes them wash the shirt four times’ (four washings)  

Unlike in other Romance languages, the verb *fare in Italian can never be eventive, hence cannot be modified independently. I argue, therefore, that the causative structure with *fare in Italian involves a restructuring verbal complex, being hence, monoclausal.

3.2.2 No(t) (always) transparency effects

Rizzi (1982) and Cinque (2004) among others argue that a diagnostic for restructuring verbs is that they show transparency effects (clitic climbing/ object raising). Transparency effects can be obtained with restructuring causative verbs in Italian but not in Brazilian Portuguese, Romanian or Spanish:

(24)  

a. Maria la fa riparare a Giovanni. (Italian)  
   Mary it.ACC made repair to Giovanni  
   ‘Maria makes Giovanni repair it.’  

b. *Maria me mandou/fiz o João beijar. (Brazilian Portuguese)  
   Maria me.ACC made the João kiss-INF  
   ‘Maria made João kiss me.’  

c. *Maria m-a făcut să sărute Ion. (Romanian)  
   Maria CL has made SĂ kiss Ion  
   ‘Mary made Ion kiss me.’  

d. *Lo he hecho reparar a mi mecánico. (Spanish)  
   CL.ACC have made repair to my mechanic  
   ‘I had it repaired by my mechanic.’

3.2.3 Semantic arguments

Furthermore, there is a semantic argument for a control construction with causative verbs in Spanish, Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese. Unlike in the case of ECM/raising construction, the passivization of the complement of hacer causatives in these languages does affect the interpretation of the entire construction.
(25) a. I wanted [the doctor to examine my daughter].
   b. I wanted [the daughter to be examined by the doctor].
   a = b  
   (Farrell 1995: 119)

(26) a. Eu mandei/fiz o médico examinar a minha filha.
   I made the doctor examine my daughter.  (Brazilian Portuguese)

   'I made the doctor examine my daughter.'

   b. Eu mandei/fiz a minha filha ser examinada pelo médico.
   I made the my daughter be examined by the doctor
   'I made my daughter be examined by the doctor.'
   a ≠ b

(27) a. Eu l-am facut pe medic să examineze fiica mea.
   I have made PE doctor  SĂ examine my daughter.  (Romanian)

   'I made the doctor examine my daughter.'

   b. Eu am făcut-o pe fiica mea să fie examinată de acest doctor.
   I have made-CL.ACC PE daughter the my SĂ be examined by this doctor.
   'I made my daughter be examined by the doctor.'
   a ≠ b

(28) a. Yo lo hice (al doctor) examinar a mi hija.  (Spanish)
   I CL.ACC made to doctor examine to my daughter.
   'I made the doctor examine my daughter.'

   b. Yo la hice (a mi hija) ser examinada por el doctor.
   I CL.ACC made to my daughter be examined by the doctor.
   'I made my daughter be examined by the doctor.'
   a ≠ b

As Farrell (1995) argues, the causee is affected in the action denoted by the causatives verbs fazer and mandar and, therefore, unlike in (25), the active and passive sentences are not synonymous. Hence, these examples can be analyzed as involving control.

As expected, Italian allows only one interpretation: I make the daughter visit the doctor or be examined by the doctor.

(29) Faccio visitare mia figlia al medico/dal medico.  (Italian)
    make visit my daughter to the doctor /by the doctor
    'I make the daughter be examined by the doctor.'  (p.c. Ivana Bianchini)
In the light of these tests, I argue that the causative verb in Romanian, Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese is an object control verb if and only if the subject is agentive and the object is affected by the event denoted by the causative verb.

3.3. Control vs. raising

The *loista* variant of Spanish disambiguates the dual status of the analytic causative verb *hacer* through the use of clitics *lo* and *le*. Specifically, the causative verb occurring with the accusative *lo* (that triggers animacy restriction both on the object and the subject of *hacer*) marks the control reading of the analytic causative:

(30)  a. *La recesión* *lo* ha hecho perder el trabajo a *María.* (*loista* Spanish)  
the recession ACCCL has made lose the job to Maria  
‘Recession has made Maria lose her job.’

b. *La recesión* *le* ha hecho perder el trabajo a *María.*  
the recession ACCCL has made lose the job to Maria  
‘Recession has made Maria lose her job.’

On the basis of this, I propose two different analyses for *leista*\(^2\) and *loista* causatives: Raising occurs with the causative *hacer* when the subject is not agentive and the causative verb *hacer* does not subcategorizes a causee. The sole argument of the causative *hacer* is the caused event. Almost all Romance languages discussed here allow the raising construction with the causative verb *hacer* when the caused event is realized as a CP embedded sentence. The following constructions are clear cases of non-restructuring raising on a par with the verb *pare* ‘seem’ (the embedded clause is introduced by the complementizer *ca* that is the marker of a CP layer in Romanian, cf. Alboiu 2007).

(31)  *Uraganul* a făcut ca mulţi oameni să-şi piardă casele.  
*hurricane-CL has made that many people lose houses*  
‘The hurricane caused many people to lose their houses.’

In line with López (2001), I argue that the *loista* causative *hacer* assigns an [+affected] theta-role to its causee. Control *loista* *hacer* verbs have three arguments: the causer, the causee and the caused event (Zubizarreta 1985, Ippolito 2000). On the basis of the semantic and syntactic tests provided above, I argue that *loista* *hacer* causatives are object control verbs and have the structure in (32). I assume that Voice is responsible for introducing the external argument (see also Kratzer 1996 and Pylkkänen 1999).

(32)  *hacer* and similar control verbs [ _____ DP TP]

---

\(^2\) I use the term *leista* to differentiate the use of dative *le* clitics from the accusative *lo* clitics in *loista* Spanish.
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Hence, the object control construction proposed for *loista* Spanish differs in several respects from the one proposed for the monoclausal functional causatives and for the biclausal raising causative. First, *hacer* verbs in control constructions in Spanish are not restructuring functional verbs, rather they are lexical verbs embedded by a functional \( v_{DO} \) (cf. Guasti 1996, Folli and Harley 2007, Pylkkänen 2008). Second, due to the selectional restrictions on the causer and causee, a \( \text{VoiceP} \) is necessary both in the matrix and in the embedded clause. Crucially, the real internal argument (the affected cause) behaves like a quirky dative that is assigned structural case (see also Torrego 2010).

Moreover, the contrast between raising and control (cf. Landa 2007) is visible not only on thematic terms but also in case assignment.

\[(33) \quad \text{Icelandic} \]

- a. Raising
  \[ \text{DP}_{\text{1DAT}} \ldots V \ldots \text{[i] \ldots V \ldots \text{FQ}_{\text{DAT}}} \]

- b. Control
  \[ \text{DP}_{\text{1NOM}} \ldots V \ldots \text{[PRO} \ldots V \ldots \text{FQ}_{\text{DAT}}} \]  
  \hspace{1cm} \text{(Landau 2007: 305)}

Thus, control triggers structural case assignment like in Spanish *loista* causatives while raising like in Standard Spanish preserves the quirky case of the causee (see Torrego 2010 for a quirky dative analysis of causees in Spanish). However, analytic causatives seem not to be the only verbs that are ambiguous between raising and control. Crucially, Alexiadou et al (2010, 2011) show that aspectual verbs in Greek, Romanian and Spanish are nonrestructuring and are ambiguous between control and raising, manifesting itself
most clearly on agreement rather than Case. In these languages, aspectual verbs ‘begin’ and ‘stop’ are ambiguous between obligatory control and raising. When a quirky subject construction is embedded under such verbs, control aspectuals agree in person and number with the embedded quirky dative subject:

(34) ?Arxisena min tis ksefvgun tis Marias polla
started-3SG SUBJ not CL-GEN escape-3PL the Maria-GEN many
mistakes
‘Maria started not to miss so many mistakes.’ (Alexiadou et al. 2010)

On the other hand, raising aspectuals agree in person and number with the embedded nominative theme argument:

(35) Arxisan na min tis ksefvgun tis Marias
started-3PL SUBJ not CL-GEN escape-3PL the Maria-GEN
polla lathi
many mistakes-pl
‘Maria started not to miss so many mistakes.’ (Alexiadou et al. 2010)

4. Conclusions

This paper proposes a fine-grained analysis of analytic causatives within a language and across languages: In functional restructuring, the causative verb is a functional verb like Italian fare FI causatives with non-agentive subjects or an incorporated affix like the –ase affix with non-agentive predicates in Japanese or the -(i)m verbal affix in Mapudungun. Lexical restructuring involves a lexical verb and has a complete argument structure like Italian fare FP causatives or affixes like -(e)l and -al suffixes in Mapudungun (cf. Golluscio 2007). Moreover, there are languages that permit non-restructuring whereby the causative verb is a control or a raising and is part of a biclausal structure. Crucially, causative verbs are not the only verbs that show such a dual behavior. Alexiadou et al. (2010, 2011, 2012), for instance, argue that aspectual verbs in Greek, Romanian and Spanish are nonrestructuring verbs and also ambiguous between control and raising, the ambiguity manifesting itself most clearly on agreement rather than case.
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