The Syntax of Causatives in the Romance Languages

Fabienne Martin

1 Introduction

The present entry examines the expression of caused results in Romance, as in the Spanish example (1). The contrast between this sentence and its English translation shows that Romance languages very much differ in the way they express caused results (Talmy 1976, 1985). As Folli and Harley (2016) put it, English speakers hammer the dough *flat* and cut *off* the head of snakes. Instead, Romance speakers *flatten* the dough by hammering it and their *cut*-verbs already encode the result expressed by the English particle *off*.

(1) Galit aplastó   la   masa   martillándola. (Sp.)
     Galit flattened the dough hammering it

     'Galit hammered the dough flat.'

Verbs denoting causing events like Spanish *aplastar* in (1), French *couper* 'cut (off)', or Italian *aprire* 'open' are lexical causative verbs. Romance languages also have periphrastic causatives, with a causative verb embedding an infinitive as in It. fare *ridere* 'make laugh'.
This chapter offers an overview of recent research in Romance on lexical and periphrastic causative verbs. Section 2 looks at the building blocks of lexical causative verbs. It first focuses on the way the notion of cause is encoded and on the related question of whether both transitive and intransitive variants of causative verbs have causative semantics. It then turns to the differences between reflexively marked vs. unmarked anticausative verbs and between agentive and non-agentive uses of causative verbs, and examines the morphosyntactic make-up of verbs with causative semantics. Section 3 offers a typology of lexical causatives. Section 4 focuses on verbs with causative *uses* in some contexts but not in others. Section 5 is devoted to the causative alternation, section 6 to resultatives, and section 7 to periphrastic causatives.

2 The building blocks of causative and anticausative verbs

2.1 Where is CAUSE encoded?

Many lexical causative verbs undergo the causative alternation, appearing in transitive and intransitive constructions, as in (2a/b).

(2) a. Danna a refroidi le thé. (Fr.)   (causative)
         'Danna cooled the tea.'
     b. Le thé a refroidi.   (anticausative)
         'The tea cooled.'

This alternation raises the question whether one of the variants is basic or whether both are derived from a common stem (see Schäfer 2009, Tubino-Blanco 2020 for overviews). A related question is whether the anticausative (or inchoative) variant of causative verbs involves causative semantics. Lexical approaches typically assume that only the transitive use as in (2a) has causative semantics, while the intransitive use does not, as the label 'anti-causative' also suggests. In this view, the anticausative denotes a change-of-state and the transitive variant is roughly paraphrased as 'cause to V-intransitive/anticausative' (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995). On this view, the meaning of Fr. *refroidir* 'cool' can be represented as in (3a-b).

(3)   a.   causative *refroidir* 'cool':
           $[[x \text{ DO-SOMETHING}] \text{ CAUSE } [y \text{ BECOME } [\text{STATE}_{cool}]]]$
      b.   anticausative *refroidir* 'cool': $[y \text{ BECOME } [\text{STATE}_{cool}]]$

One problem of such analyses is that they predict too many scoping ambiguities for event modifiers (see Fodor 1970, Pylkkänen 2008, Neeleman and Van de Koot 2012, Martin and Schäfer 2014b, Alexiadou et al. 2015, Rapp and von Stechow 2019 for discussion).

Other analyses assume that both causative and anticausative uses of alternating verbs describe a single event (leading to some result state). Such approaches capture the causative alternation in two different ways. A first analysis (e.g., Harley 2012) posits different flavors of v (v_{cause} vs. v_{become}). This type of account shares the assumption that anticausatives do not have causative semantics. A second analysis posits that alternating verbs have causative semantics in both uses (Kratzer 2005, Schäfer 2008, Alexiadou et al. 2015). In this framework, the single difference between transitive and intransitive uses is that Voice is present in the former only. Schematized in representations *à la* Levin & Rappaport, the difference between causative and anticausative *refroidir* can then be translated as in (4).

(4)   a.   agentive causative *refroidir* 'cool': $[[\text{x}_{agent} [\text{EVENT}]] \text{ CAUSE } [y \text{ STATE}_{cool}]]$
      b.   anticausative *refroidir* 'cool': $[[\text{EVENT}] \text{ CAUSE } [y \text{ STATE}_{cool}]]$

2.2   Marked vs. unmarked anticausative verbs

In many Romance languages, verbs undergoing the causative alternation fall into three classes (Schäfer 2008, Tubino-Blanco 2020). For the first class, the anticausative is morphologically *unmarked* (see (5)). For a second class, the anticausative is *marked* with the reflexive clitic *se/si* (see (6)). The anticausative form of affixed verbs (e.g., *s'a-mocher* 'become ugly/damaged') very often needs to be reflexively marked in French (Labelle 1992, Heidinger 2015). For the third class, the anticausative allows *both markings*, see (7).

(5)   La   maison   (*se)   brûle. (Fr.)
      the   house   REFL   burns

      'The house is burning.'

(6)   Tout   *(s')amoche/   *(se) détruit   avec le   temps.
      everything   REFL damages   REFL destroys   with the   time

      'Everything gets damaged/destroyed with the passage of time.'

(7)   Le   vase   (se)   casse.
      the   vase   REFL   breaks

      'The vase is breaking.'

It has been proposed that the presence vs. absence of the reflexive clitic goes along with differences in meaning; see Zribi-Hertz (1987), Labelle (1992), Doron and Labelle (2011), Heidinger (2010, 2015, 2019) on French, Mendikoetxea (1999, 2012), Heidinger (2015) on Spanish, Folli (2002, 2014) on Italian. A first claim is that reflexively marked anticausatives express externally caused changes-of-state while unmarked ones express internally driven changes-of-state (see sections 3.1 and 5.2.1 on this distinction). This reasoning is motivated by the contrast between (8a) and (8b) (examples and judgments from Labelle 1992): a hand-kerchief cannot be held responsible for its becoming red, and thus the verb must be reflexively marked (external causation), while a human who is blushing is necessarily physiologically co-responsible for the change, thus the verb must remain unmarked (internal causation).

(8) a. Il vit le mouchoir #(se) rougir. (Fr.)   (externally caused)
         he saw the handkerchief REFL redden

         'He saw the handkerchief getting red.'
     b. Jeanne (#se) rougit.   (internally caused)
         Jean   REFL reddened

         'Jeanne blushed/reddened.'

A second claim is that reflexive anticausatives focus on the result state while unmarked ones are more process-oriented (see Zribi-Hertz 1987, Labelle 1992, Labelle and Doron 2010, Heidinger 2010 on French; Folli and Harley 2005: section 3.5, Manente 2009, Cennamo 2015 on Italian; Vivanco 2017 on Spanish). For instance, Folli and Harley (2005) claim that the reflexive form in (9) is unacceptable, because the variant with *si* encodes some result state which they take to be incompatible with a durative adverbial.

(9) Il cioccolato (*si) è fuso   per un'ora. (It.)
     the chocolate REFL is melted for an hour

     'The chocolate melted for an hour.'   (Folli and Harley 2005, ex. (32))

Several accounts have been proposed to account for these meaning differences. Legendre et al. (2016) adopt an optimality-theory approach. Labelle (1992) argues that reflexive anticausatives are unaccusative while unmarked ones are unergative. For Doron and Labelle (2011), both forms are unaccusative but differ in their event structure and the position in which the root is merged. For Schäfer (2008) and Martin and Schäfer (2014a), reflexively marked and unmarked anticausatives do not differ in meaning. In their approach, problems arise with animate subjects only; e.g., for them, (8a) and the French counterpart of (9), both with inanimate subjects, are good with or without the reflexive. But (8b), with an animate subject, is indeed marked with the reflexive. They derive these remaining differences within a pragmatic account in terms of competition between the different readings of the reflexive.
An alternative analysis of reflexively marked anticausatives is developed by Chierchia (2004) for Italian and Koontz-Garboden (2009) for Spanish. For them, Romance reflexively marked anticausatives are *semantically* reflexive, as the paraphrase in (10) illustrates.

(10) La porta si   è aperta. (It.)
      the door REFL is opened

      'The door opened.'
      ≈ some property of the door (or some state the door is in) caused it to open.   (Chierchia 2004)

For arguments in favor or against the reflexive analysis of marked anticausatives, see Horvath and Siloni (2013), Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2013) and Schäfer and Vivanco (2016).

2.3 Agentive vs. non-agentive uses of causative verbs

Many causative verbs can be used with animate (agent) or inanimate (causer) subjects. Examples of inanimate causers often involve an eventuality-denoting subject, as in (11b).

(11) a. Los extraterrestres mataron a los últimos humanos. (Sp.)
          'The aliens killed the last humans.'   (agent subject)
      b. El consumo de combustibles fósiles mató a los últimos humanos.
          'Consumption of fossil fuels killed the last humans.'   (causer subject)

Some authors assume an underspecified 'Initiator' or 'Effector' thematic role covering animate and inanimate subjects (Ramchand 2008), while others assume a difference in the syntax between agent subjects and causer subjects, see, e.g., Pylkkänen (2008), Alexiadou et al. (2015). For the latter authors, causer subjects denote an event which is identified with the verbal event (e.g., in (11b), the consumption of fossils *is* the killing event). For Martin (2018, 2020), this relation between the event denoted by causer subjects and the verbal event is in most cases understood as the causal relation. Based on evidence from temporal modification as in (12)-(13), Martin concludes that sentences such as (11b) express a more complex causal chain than those like (11a) and involve two (causing) events (e.g., in (11b), the consumption of fossils *causes* the killing event).

(12) El consumir *hoy* combustibles fósiles matará a los humanos *en un futuro cercano*. (Sp.)
      'Today's consumption of fossil fuels will kill humans in a close future.'

(13) Le scosse che quel bebè ha subito *tre mesi fa* alla fine l'hanno ucciso *martedì* scorso. (It.)
      'The shaking that this baby underwent three months ago eventually killed him on Tuesday.'

2.4 Morphosyntactic make-up of (anti-)causative verbs

Beavers et al. (2021) show that cross-linguistically, verbs derived from a predicate denoting a property concept (*red*, *fat*, *nice*) tend to have *marked* verbal forms, involving an overt affix (Spanish *en-gord-ar* 'fatten'), and *unmarked* stative forms (Spanish *gordo* 'fat'). Verbs that are not derived from a noun nor from an adjective (e.g., Portuguese *romper* 'break') show the opposite pattern; their stative form is derived with an affix (see, e.g., Portuguese *romp-ido* 'broken'). These observations raise the question of how affixes contribute to the syntactic and semantic profile of the verb.

Two main effects of affixes have been discussed, namely transitivization and causativization. In French, verbs prefixed with *a-*, *en-*, *dé-* or *é-* or suffixed with *-ifier/-iser* generally have a transitive and causative meaning (Corbin 1987, Junker 1987, see Boons 1987 on denominal verbs in *en-*). Junker (1987) claims that only non-affixed deadjectival verbs can be intransitive only (e.g., French *faiblir* 'become weak(er)', from *faible*), while affixed ones minimally have causative transitive uses (e.g., *af-faiblir* 'make weak(er)').

Subsequent work on French confirms these tendencies (Zribi-Hertz 1987, Labelle 1992, Namer 2002, Mazziotta and Martin 2013) but also show that affixes exhibit differences in their syntactic/semantic profile. Verbs derived in *é-* are systematically transitive and causative, while verbs derived with *dé-* more often have intransitive uses (Aurnague and Plénat 2008, Mazziotta and Martin 2013). Prefixes *a-/en-/dé-* have a stronger causativizing/inchoativizing effect than suffixes *-is-* and *-ifi-* (Martin and Piñón 2020). The latter, but not the former, regularly yield (non-causative) activity verbs meaning: while *bêt-ifi-er* (from *bête* 'stupid') can mean 'become/cause to be stupid' (causative/ inchoative use) or 'behave in a stupid way' (non-causative/ non-inchoative use), the prefixed verb *a-bêt-ir* has the causative/anticausative use only. In Catalan, most *en-* verbs are causative transitive verbs (Padrosa Trias 2007). In Spanish, *a-/en-* prefixes

Table 1: Restrictions imposed by the morphosyntactic makeup of French verbal formations on their unergative, (anti-)causative and activity transitive uses (based on Martin and Piñón 2020)

morphosyntactic makeup	example	unergative	(anti-)causative
unaffixed verbs	*niais-er*	✓	✗
(unprefixed) verbs	*bêt-ifi-er*	✓	✓
suffixed with *-iser/-ifier*	*diplomat-is-er*	✓	✓
prefixed verbs	*a-bêt-i-r*	✗	✓
	en-niais-er	✗	✓

similarly form causative transitive verbs in the typical case (Mendivil 2003, Martínez Vera 2016, Sotelo and Payet 2015), allowing sometimes anticausative uses (Mendikoetxea 1999), but no unergative or activity readings. Like in French, Spanish *a-/en-* prefixes have a stronger causativizing effect than the suffix *-iz-* (Fábregas 2015). Only the latter yields not only causative but also non-causative verbs (e.g., *brutalizar a una víctima* 'act with a victim like a brute').

Table 1 recapitulates the generalizations with examples from French. First, *prefixed* verbal formations are never devoid of change-of-state semantics (see Acedo-Matellán 2006, Acedo-Matellán and Mateu 2013: section 4.2, Martínez Vera 2016 for some accounts). Secondly, *suffixed* verbal formations (Spanish *-iz*-verbs or French *-is/-ifi*-verbs) allow but do not require causative/change-of-state semantics.

3   Subtypes of causative verbs

Causative verbs are classified according to the type of external arguments they combine with, the type of causation events they denote and the presence of a sublexical modal operator. Existing classifications are discussed in turn, starting with causative verbs without modal semantics ('extensional causative verbs') in section 3.1, and turning to modal causative verbs in section 3.2.

3.1   Extensional causative verbs

Table 2: Grammatical classes of extensional change-of-state verbs

Example	Levin and Rappaport (1995)	Alexiadou et al. (2006, 2015)	Rappaport (2020)
assassiner 'assassinate'	externally caused	agentive	agentive
tuer 'kill'		external cause	external cause
ouvrir 'open'	cause unspecified	cause unspecified	cause unspecified
flétrir 'wilt'	internally caused	internal cause	

The difference between externally vs. internally caused change-of-state verbs goes back to Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: section 3.2.1). According to these authors, the two classes have distinct syntactic and semantic properties. Semantically, externally caused change-of-state verbs entail the existence of an external entity in control of the change. Internally caused change-of-state such as French *flétrir* 'wilt' are taken not to be controllable by an external entity; this property is taken to explain why these verbs often resist transitivisation. But this characterization has been criticized by Rappaport Hovav (2020) (see section 5.2.1). For her, these verbs do not form a grammatical class distinct from cause-unspecified verbs such as *open* (see Table 2).

Alexiadou et al. (2015) divide change-of-state verbs into three subclasses (beyond the class of internally caused change-of-state verbs). *Cause unspecified change-of-state verbs* express events that can be causally driven either by the theme itself or by an external argument (such as French *ouvrir* 'open'). *Agentive verbs* denote sets of events necessarily brought about by an agent (such as French *assassiner* 'assassinate'). Examples in Alexiadou et al. (2015) are all verbs requiring an intentional agent, but this class also includes predicates such as French *peindre* 'paint', which are inherently agentive but tolerate accidental agents (Martin and Schäfer 2014b). Agentive verbs are expected to be necessarily used transitively. This generalization holds in most languages, but Brazilian Portuguese presents an interesting exception in Romance (section 5.1.2). *Externally caused change-of-state verbs* also express events necessarily instigated by an argument different from the theme, but this time not necessarily an agent (such as French *tuer* 'kill'). These verbs are also expected not to alternate.

3.2   Modal causative verbs

A causal statement can be modalized, either overtly (as in *necessarily cause P*), or covertly. Sublexical modal operators in predicates that otherwise have the paradigmatic morphosyntactic properties of causative predicates were first investigated in Oehrle (1976) and Koenig and Davis (2001) and in research on non-culminating accomplishments (Martin and Schäfer 2012). A list of these verbs in French is given in (14). For instance, French *enseigner* 'teach' is ditransitive just like *apprendre* 'teach/learn' and therefore causative within the proposal that indirect objects are introduced by low applicative heads or stative/possessive event predicates (Pylkkänen 2008, Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2008). However, *enseigner*, unlike *apprendre*, does not entail a new state of knowledge, see (15).

(14)   *encourager* 'encourage', *enseigner* 'teach', *expliquer* 'explain', *inciter* 'incite, urge', *offrir* 'offer', *montrer* 'show', *prévenir* 'predict', *rassurer* 'reassure', *réparer* 'repair', *soigner* 'treat/cure', *suggérer* 'suggest'

(15)   Pierre a enseigné/#appris la règle à Marie, mais elle ne la connaît toujours pas. (Fr.)
       'Pierre taught the rule to Mary, but she still doesn't know it.'

As first observed by Oehrle (1976) for English, statements built with verbs like *teach* do not entail successful causation with an agentive subject (as in (15)), but do so in the presence of a causer (event-denoting) subject. The relevant contrast is illustrated for Spanish in (16) (see Martin 2020 and Fritz-Huechante et al. 2020 for experimental studies in French and Spanish). With a non-agentive subject, examples (16a/b) entail that the result state is obtained, while this inference is only defeasibly implicated when the subject is agentive. A continuation denying the occurrence of the expected result state yields a contradiction with non-agentive subjects, but not with agentive subjects.

(16)   a.   El   fontanero/#el   golpe   arregló   la   televisión, pero seguía   sin   funcionar. (Sp.)
            the plumber   the impact repaired the television but   continued without work

            'The plumber/the impact repaired the TV set, but it still wasn't working.'
       b.   El   presidente/#el   huracán   justificó   la   evacuación, pero nadie   se   lo   creyó.
            the president/   the hurricane justified the evacuation but   nobody REFL it believed

            'The president/the hurricane justified the evacuation, but nobody believed it.'

Martin and Schaefer (2013) provide diagnostics showing that these verbs do have the morphosyntax and bi-eventive event structure of causative verbs, despite the lack of causative entailment. To explain why some verbs do not entail the occurrence of the result state despite encoding it lexically, Koenig and Davis

(2001) introduce a covert sublexical modal component, which evaluates relations between participants and eventualities at various world indices. Their proposal is illustrated in the paraphrase given in (17) for the agentive version of (16a), where the part in italics indicates that successful causation occurs in a subset of possible worlds only. Since the real world is not necessarily such a world, the TV set may remain dysfunctional in this world.

(17)   The plumber caused the tv-set to be working *in all worlds where the goal of the repair is achieved.*

For a discussion about these verbs, see Martin and Schäfer (2017), Gyarmathy and Altshuler (2020), Martin (2020) and Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2020).

4   Verbs with manner and result uses

While causative verbs have causative semantics across all uses, some verbs display causative semantics in some contexts only. Morphologically simple verbs are standardly divided into two classes: result and manner verbs. Inherently causative verbs such as *break* denoting events yielding some result are *result* verbs, while activity verbs such as *hit* describing manners of doing or ways of happening are *manner* verbs (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995). Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2013) defend the manner/result complementarity hypothesis first proposed by Kiparsky (1997) that manner and result components are in complementary distribution, in that a verb *root* lexicalizes only one of them. Potential counter-examples such as *cut* or *climb* have been analyzed as ambiguous between manner or result uses, but do not allow both simultaneously. I call these verbs *manner-or-result* verbs.
Here I discuss three subtypes of manner-or-result verbs showing mixed behavior in Romance languages: optionally causative manner verbs, creation verbs and motion verbs.

4.1   Optionally causative manner verbs

A first class of manner-or-result verbs are transitive manner verbs like Fr. *laver* 'wash', which defeasibly implicate a result state that obtains when the event they describe is successful (Talmy 1991, Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998). The first clause of (18a) triggers the inference that the washing caused the car to be clean(er). But this inference is defeasible as the felicity of the continuation in the second clause in (18a) shows. The manner verb *laver* 'wash' contrasts with result verb like Fr. *récurer* 'scrub dirt out of' as in (18b), whose second clause is contradictory.

(18)   a.   Edouard a lavé la voiture, mais elle n'est pas du tout plus propre qu'avant. (Fr.)
              'Edouard washed the car, but it is not at all cleaner than before.'
        b.   Edouard a récuré la voiture, #mais elle n'est pas du tout plus propre qu'avant.
              'Edouard scrubbed dirt out of the car, but it is not at all cleaner than before.'

Example (18a) illustrates agentive contexts; Martin and Schäfer (2014b) observe that with a causer subject as in (19a) successful causation can no longer be denied. They take this to support Folli and Harley's (2005) and Schäfer's (2012) generalization according to which causer subjects require a VP whose event structure contains a result state. Alexiadou et al. (2017) label these verbs *optionally causative manner verbs.*

(19)   a.   La pluie a lavé la voiture, #mais elle n'est pas du tout plus propre qu'avant. (Fr.)
              'The rain washed the car, but it is not at all cleaner than before!'   (Martin and Schäfer 2014b)
        b.   Gustave/#la chaleur et l'humidité a/ont repassé ma chemise mais ce fut sans effet.
              'Gustave/ the heat and humidity ironed my skirt but it had no effect.'   (Alexiadou et al. 2017)

French *wash*-verbs display mixed syntactico-semantic behavior (Alexiadou et al. 2017). In some respects, they pattern with manner verbs. Firstly, they are often morphologically simple (*laver* 'wash') or derived from instrumental nouns (*balayer* 'sweep', from *balai* 'broom'), while result verbs are typically polymorphemic (e.g., *en-courager* 'encourage', *af-faiblir* 'weaken'), see section 2.4. Secondly, they allow object drop in non-generic contexts. Thirdly, they typically do not form anticausatives across Romance (except in Brazilian Portuguese, see Carvalho 2016a).

But in other respects, *laver*-verbs pattern with result verbs; in particular, with causer subjects, they entail a result state (cf. (19)). However, when they do so, they keep their manner component (e.g., the involvement of a dirt-removing fluid force). On this point, they differ from result verbs such as extensional causative verbs such as Fr. *ouvrir* 'open', or defeasible causative verbs such as Fr. *encourager* 'encourage'.

Laver-verbs and defeasible causatives form two subtypes of *implied-result verbs*, i.e. verbs that imply but do not entail successful causation when used agentively, see Table 3 (for further discussion of *wash*-verbs in Romance, see Mateu and Rigau 2010 and McNally and Spalek 2022).

Table 3: Typology of verbs with causative uses

IMPLIED-RESULT VERBS		ENTAILED-RESULT VERBS
optionally causative manner verbs	**defeasible causative result verbs**	**extensional causative result verbs**
laver 'wash'	*encourager* 'encourage'	*ouvrir* 'open'
gratter 'scratch'	*enseigner* 'teach'	*apprendre* 'teach/learn'

4.2   Creation verbs

A second type of manner-or-result verbs in Romance are verbs of creation such as Italian *intagliare* 'carve' (Folli and Harley 2016, 2020, Schirakowski 2022). Folli and Harley argue that *intagliare*-verbs name a manner of acting in (20a) and (20c), they name the result of the event in (20b).

(20)   a.   Maria ha intagliato una bambola. (It.)
             Maria has carved   a   doll

             'Maria carved a doll.'   (manner use)
       b.   Maria ha intagliato un pezzo di legno.
             Maria has carved   a   piece of wood

             'Maria carved a piece of wood.'   (result use)
       c.   *Maria ha intagliato un pezzo di legno in una bambola.
             Maria has carved   a   piece of wood in a   doll

             'Maria carved a piece of wood into a doll.'   (manner use)

Folli and Harley (2016, 2020) link the unavailability of (20c) to Talmy's (2000) distinction between verb-framed vs. satellite-framed languages: in verb-framed languages like Romance, if a complement to the verb describes a property of some result yielded by the verbal event, this result must be encoded in the verb. But Schirakowski (2022) offers experimental evidence that the French counterparts of sentences like (20c) are acceptable under certain conditions.

4.3 Motion verbs

Motion verbs are traditionally divided into two classes (Beavers et al. 2010). *Manner-of-motion* verbs like Sp. *bailar* 'dance' describe manners of moving, and may implicate, but do not entail, a change-of-location, as shown by its compatibility with *sin desplazarse* 'without displacement' (Bassa Vanrell 2013):

(21) Juan bailó sin   desplazarse. (Sp.)
     Juan danced without displace.REFL

     'Juan danced in place.'   (Bassa Vanrell 2013: 31)

Path verbs like Fr. *monter* 'go up' encode the path along which an entity moves but not the manner of movement, as in (22). These verbs always yield a *directional* interpretation.

(22) Julie est montée dans l'arbre en grimpant. (Fr.)
     Julie went up   in   the tree in climbing.

     'Julie climbed up into the tree.'   (Pourcel and Kopecka 2005)

Path verbs like Fr. *monter* 'go up' are often analyzed as a subtype of result verbs (see, e.g., Beavers et al. 2010: 3), as they denote events leading to some result state, namely, a state of being at the location defined by the VP.

Talmy observed that in Romance languages, combining a manner-of-motion verb with a morphologically simple preposition does not yield a directional interpretation, contrasting with Germanic. For instance, (24)-(25) receive a *locative* interpretation only, while the English counterpart (23) may (or must in the case of *into*) have a directional interpretation.

(23) The bottle floated into the cave/under the bridge. (Eng.)   (Talmy 1985)

(24) a. La barca galleggiò sotto il ponte. (It.)   (Folli and Ramchand 2005: 82)
         'The boat floated under the bridge.' (locative only)
     b. La bouteille a flotté dans la grotte. (Fr.)   (Troberg 2010: 128)
         'The bottle floated in (*to) the cave.' (locative only)

(25) Anne a marché à la plage. (Fr.)   (Cummins 1996: 34)
     'Anne walked at/*to the beach.'

Across Romance languages some motion verbs like It. *correre* 'run' can be used both as manner-of-motion verbs and path/result verbs (see Talmy 1985: 123, de Cuyper 2004, Fábregas 2007, Vázquez 2015 for Spanish, Cummins 1996, Sikora 2009 for French, Folli and Ramchand 2005 for Italian). Under the assumption that path verbs are a subtype of result verbs, this makes these 'elastic' motion verbs fall within the class of manner-or-result verbs.

In a directional context, with a PP verbal complement specifying a property of the result/path such as the *a/in*-PP in (26), *correre*-types verbs are acceptable, while *camminare*-verbs, which are 'rigid' manner-of-motion verbs, are ruled out. For Folli and Harley (2020), this difference reflects the fact that only *correre*-verbs can lexicalize a result and drop the manner component (observing that one can run to the hospital by car). For them, the verb must lexicalize the result/path in the presence of a complement specifying a property of this result/path, see also section 4.2.

(26) a. Corrió/#bailó a la habitación. (Sp.)
      'He ran/danced into the room.' (Lewandowski and Mateu 2019)
   b. J'ai couru/#marché au bar. (Fr.)
      'I ran/walked to the bar.' (Sikora 2009)
   c. Gianni è corso/#camminato in spiaggia (It.).
      'Gianni ran/walked to the beach.' (Folli and Ramchand 2005)

Romance languages also describe directed motion events with morphologically *complex* prepositions such as Fr. *jusqu'à* and Sp. *hasta*. With these prepositions, rigid manner-of-motion verbs are acceptable in directional contexts (see (27)). This is because the PPs headed by complex prepositions are adjuncts rather than complements (see Bonami 1999 for French, Bassa Vanrell 2013 for Spanish and Folli and Ramchand 2005 for Italian).

(27) Gianni ha camminato fino a casa. (It.)
     'Gianni walked up until (he was) home.' (Folli and Ramchand 2005: 99)

5 The causative alternation

An important question around the syntax of causatives concerns the conditions under which a predicate can alternate between transitive and intransitive frames (Mendikoetxea 1999 on Spanish; Schäfer 2008; Heidinger 2010, 2015, 2019 on French and Spanish; Folli 2014 on Italian, Carvalho 2016a on Brazilian Portuguese; Llabrés and Mateu 2018 on Catalan). The causative alternation raises two questions: (i) how can we characterize causative verbs which can be used in an intransitive frame (section 5.1)? and (ii) under what conditions can anticausative verbs be used in a transitive frame (section 5.2)?

5.1 Restrictions on the intransitive formation

5.1.1 Verbs of creation and destruction

A first view on the restrictions on the intransitive formation is that transitive verbs denoting events that do not necessarily involve an agent can be used intransitively (±AG TRANS→±INTR., see Piñón 2001, Reinhart 2002, see also Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 107 et seq. on the related condition that detransitivization is possible if the nature of the causing event is left unspecified). For English, counter-examples to this generalization are verbs of destruction such as *destroy* or *kill*, whose subject is not necessarily agentive and that do not allow intransitive formation.

For Romance, things are more complex, as the anticausative can be marked with a reflexive (section 2.2), and the ensuing reflexively marked form is formally identical to passive, middle and semantically reflexive formations. The study of Romance alternations therefore faces the additional challenge to establish whether a reflexively marked form is passive, middle, anticausative (AC) or semantically reflexive. The usual diagnostics are not always easy to manipulate. One of the main diagnostics for anticausativity is what Alexiadou et al. (2015: 21) call the 'no particular cause' reading of *by itself* phrases (*tout seul, de/par lui-même* in French, *a sí mismo/por sí solo* in Spanish, *da sé* in Italian; see Chierchia 2004, Koontz-Garboden 2009, Alexiadou et al. 2015, Schäfer and Vivanco 2016 for discussion). Under this reading diagnosing anticausativity, such adverbials indicate that nothing/nobody can be identified as the external cause of the event as in (28a). As shown in (28b), *de lui-même* is not compatible with the periphrastic passive, because the passive asserts exactly what *de lui-même* denies, namely the possible identification of an external cause. Crucially, *by itself*-phrases appear to be incompatible with reflexive passives, too, as in attested examples (28c-d), where inserting *de lui-même* is infelicitous.

(28) a. La branche s'est cassée   d'elle-même. (Fr.)
          the branch   REFL is broken from itself

          'The branch broke by itself.'   (✗*se*-passive, ✓AC)
      b. #La branche a   été   cassée d'elle-même.
          the branch   has been broken from itself

          Intended: 'The branch was broken by itself.'   (*be*-passive)
      c. Le temps se   tue doucement [#de lui-même].
          the time   REFL kills quietly   from itself

          'Time is getting killed quietly [by itself].'   (✓*se*-passive, ✗AC)
      d. Les appartements se   sont achetés [#d'eux-mêmes] (...) à 4850 euros le   m2.'
          the apartments   REFL are   bought by themselves   to 4850 euros the m2

          'The apartments were bought (by themselves) for 4850 euros per m2.' (✓*se*-passive, ✗AC)

The *by itself* diagnostic applied to French verbs of destruction shows that the strong transitivity of the equivalent English verbs does not always extend to Romance: *de lui-même* clearly indicates that no external cause can be identified in the attested example (29), leading to the conclusion that *se détruire* is used as an anticausative (see also Reinhart 2002: 281).

(29) Le papier-carton   se   recycle, ou se   détruit de   lui-même, parce qu'il est
      the paper-carboard REFL recycles, or REFL destroys from itself,   because it   is
      biodégradable. (Fr.)
      biodegradable

      'Cardboard paper is recycled or gets destroyed by itself, for it is biodegradable.'

English creation verbs such as *create* or *draw* are other examples of non-alternating predicates (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995). Again, it is unclear that their Romance reflexive counterparts inherit this property. Labelle and Doron (2010) collected natural occurrences of anticausative uses of the French verb *construire* 'build', describing spontaneous creation events that do not involve any external argument. Their examples are all generic, but episodic examples are also attested, see e.g. (30a-b), which contain *by itself*.

(30) a. L'univers   s'est créé   de   lui-même. (Fr.)
          the universe REFL is created from itself

          'The universe developed by itself.'
      b. Le bâtiment s'ouvre   sur un jardin   commun qui   se   dessine de   lui-même,
          the building   REFL opens on a   garden common which REFL draws   from itself,

          sans   haies   ni   clôtures.
          without hedges nor fences

          'The building opens on a common garden which takes shape by itself, without hedge nor fence.'

If creation verbs in Romance enter the transitive alternation more easily than Germanic creation verbs, it is arguably because they display manner and result uses in Romance (see section 4.2), but also because they accept non-agentive subjects more easily. For instance, the wind can build a snow wall in Romance,

but not so easily in Germanic, as illustrated by the contrast in (31). The German example (31b) is fully acceptable only with the result particle *auf*.[1]

(31) a. Le vent a construit un mur de neige. (Fr.)
  'The wind built a wall of snow.'
 b. Der Wind hat eine Schneewand aufgebaut/#gebaut.' (Ger.)
  Intended: 'The wind built a wall of snow.'

Under the assumption that causer subjects need a result state (Folli and Harley 2005, Schäfer 2012, see also section 4.1), examples like (30a) suggest that some creation verbs used non-agentively have a result use in Romance. This is further confirmed by the compatibility with the result-state oriented reading of durative adverbials (Piñón 1999), as shown in (32): this sentence asserts that the result state of the building event held for years, not that the building event lasted for years.[2]

(32) Cet événement a   construit son rapport aux   femmes pendant des   années. (Fr.)
  this event   has built   his relation at the women for   INDF. years

  'This event shaped [literally: built] his relation with women for years.'

5.1.2 Xerox-verbs

Under a second view on the intransitive formation for causative verbs, non-inherent agentivity is not only a sufficient but also a necessary condition for the intransitive formation (±AG TRANS⟺±INTR.). For instance, Alexiadou et al. (2015: 53) propose that transitive verbs that do not form anticausatives are those that restrict their subject to agents. A counter-example to this condition concerns so-called xerox-sentences illustrated in (33) that are possible in Brazilian Portuguese, but not in European Portuguese (Galves 1985, Cyrino 2013, Carvalho 2016b). Example (33a) shows that *xerocar* 'to xerox', although inherently agentive, can promote the internal argument in an unaccusative structure. The unacceptability of the *by*-phrase shows that the implicit agent is syntactically inactive in such sentences.

(33) a. O   livro está xerocando (*pelo aluno). (BrPt.)
  the book is   xeroxing   by the student

  Literally: 'The book is xeroxing (by the student).'   (Cyrino 2013: 286)
 b. O   relógio consertou.
  the watch   repaired

  Literally: 'The watch repaired.'   (Cyrino 2013: 288)

Whitaker-Franchi (1989) argues that only verbs presupposing the manipulation of an instrument are allowed in this construction. But J. Carvalho (p.c.) notes that some inherently agentive causative verbs entering this alternation do not fulfill this property, like *calçar* 'to put shoes on':

---

[1]Relatedly, German *aufbauen* forms an anticausative, but *bauen* does not, see, e.g., *Widerstand hat sich aufgebaut/ #gebaut.* 'Resistance took form.'

[2]By contrast, in Germanic where creation verbs are more strongly agentive, morphologically simple creation verbs are often analyzed as non-scalar/non-result verbs; see, e.g., Rappaport Hovav (2014a: section 12.6). Thus even if creation verbs obviously denote events yielding a certain state (i.e., a state of existence), they crucially do not *lexicalize* this state under this approach.

(34) a. João calçou os sapatos. (BrPt.)
          'João put the shoes on.'
      b. O sapato calçou.
          'The shoes put on.'

5.2 Restrictions on the transitive formation

Two sets of change-of-state verbs resist causative formation: internally caused change-of-state verbs and 'pure' unaccusatives such as French *tomber* 'fall'.

5.2.1 Internally caused change-of-state verbs

Verbs in (35) are Catalan internally caused change-of-state verbs listed in Llabrés and Mateu (2018), ordered according to the percentage of occurrences of transitive uses found in the *Corpus Textual Informatitzat de la Llengua Catalana* by Abrines (2016).

(35) *germinar* 'sprout, germinate' (0%), *fermentar* 'ferment' (0%), *brostar* 'burgeon, germinate' (0%), *mustiar* 'wither, wilt, shrivel' (0%), *oxidar* 'rust, oxidate' (0%), *florir* 'blossom' (3,2%), *brotar* 'sprout, bud' (4,3%), *rovellar* 'rust, oxidise' (12,5%), *podrir* 'rot, decay' (15%), *marcir* 'wither, shrivel' (25%), *pansir* 'wither, wilt, shrivel' (30%), inflar 'inflate, pump up' (34%), *mudar* 'alter, vary, change' (34,6%), *descompondre* 'spoil, decay, go bad' (40%), *erosionar* 'erode' (50%), *corcar* 'eat away' (50%), *corrompre* 'spoil, go bad, decay' (69,4%)

English verbs categorized as internally caused change-of-state verbs do in fact occasionally appear in causative frames (Wright 2002). But used transitively, these verbs typically have a subject that specifies 'ambient conditions', see (36b). Agentive subjects are not acceptable, see (36a).

(36) a. *The farmer withered the crops. (Eng.)   (Rappaport Hovav 2020)
      b. Early summer heat blossomed fruit trees across the valley.   (Rappaport Hovav 2014b)

Llabrés and Mateu (2018) and Mendikoetxea (1999) observe that inanimate 'ambient condition' subjects facilitate the transitive use of these verbs in Catalan and Spanish too, see (37a/b).

(37) a. La humitat/*el fuster podreix la fusta. (Cat.)
          'Humidity/the carpenter rots the wood.'   (Llabrés and Mateu 2018)
      b. La humedad/??Juan oxidó les hierros de la verja. (Sp.)
          'Humidity/Juan rusted the irons.'   (Mendikoetxea 1999)

Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) argue that since these verbs denote spontaneous changes, they cannot enter a transitive structure implying the existence of an external cause. When they do transitivize, it is because the change is conceived as externally caused.
Rappaport Hovav (2020) emphasizes the circularity of this reasoning since the only evidence for the different conceptualizations is the participation of the verb in the alternation. Furthermore, as she points out, for many verbs classified as internally caused, it is clearly possible to identify external causes. When metal rusts, there are external causes for this — moisture, humidity, etc. Rappaport Hovav concludes that there is no grammatically encoded distinction between internally and externally caused change-of-state verbs, and argues that all change-of-state verbs can in principle combine with an external argument, in line with the English, Catalan and Spanish data just presented.

To explain why internally caused change-of-state verbs transitivize much less frequently and this mostly with ambient condition subjects, Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2012) and Rappaport Hovav (2014b) adopt 'the direct causation constraint' for lexical causatives. While periphrastic causatives (e.g., *cause to die*) may express *indirect* causation, lexical causatives (e.g., *kill*) express *direct* causation only (Ruwet 1972, Wolff 2003; see critical discussion in Neeleman and Van de Koot 2012 and Martin 2018). According to Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2012), in (36b), the ambient conditions are a direct cause while in (36a), the agent is not: ambient conditions form an intervening cause.

It is not obvious, however, that the subject of felicitous transitive uses of internally caused change-of-state verbs always is a direct cause so defined. For instance, in (36b), other factors than the summer heat must surely intervene, such as the watering of the plants. For an alternative pragmatic account of the difficulty to transitivize internally caused change-of-state verbs, see Rappaport Hovav (2020).

5.2.2 Pure unaccusative verbs

Romance languages all have a set of 'pure unaccusative' verbs (Schäfer 2008), that is, unaccusative verbs that normally do not have a transitive use, see (38)-(41).

(38) Catalan: *venir* 'come', *arribar* 'arrive', *entrar* 'enter', *pujar* 'go up', *baixar* 'go down' (Pineda 2018)

(39) Italian: *evaporare* 'evaporate', *appassire* 'fade', *esplodere* 'explode', *ritornare* 'return', *arrivare* 'arrive' (Pineda 2018)

(40) French (Ruwet 1989)

    a. *be*-verbs: *aller* 'go', *partir* 'leave', *tomber* 'fall', *arriver* 'arrive', *mourir* 'die', *naître* 'be born', *rester* 'remain'

    b. *be/have*-verbs: *(dis)-paraître* '(dis)appear'

    c. *have*-verbs: pleuvoir 'rain', *échapper* 'escape'

(41) Spanish: *aparecer* 'appear', *caer* 'fall', *llegar* 'arrive', *occurir* 'happen', *venir* 'come' (Mendikoetxea 1999: 1583)

In dialectal or colloquial varieties, however, the transitive variant of some of these verbs is attested (Pineda 2018 offers a cross-Romance overview; see Rohlfs 1954 and Ledgeway 2000 on the dialects of southern Italy, Lara Bermejo 2019 on Western Peninsular Spanish, Llorente Maldonado 1980, Jiménez-Fernández and Tubino 2019 on Spanish variants in Andalucía, Aragon and Avila, Séguy 1950 on Toulousain French, Labelle 1989 on Québec French, and Larjavaara 2000 on Hexagonal French). Furthermore, some pure unaccusatives (e.g., *chuter* 'fall' but not *tomber* 'fall' in French) can enter what Schäfer (2022) calls the 'transitive anticausative' construal, illustrated in the attested example (42a), which symmetrically entails the corresponding intransitive anticausative construal (see (42b)).

(42) a. Cette Smart TV chute [/*tombe] son prix. (Fr.)
        'This Smart TV is falling its price.'
        ⟺
    b. Le prix de cette Smart TV chute/tombe.
        'The price of this Smart TV is falling.'

6 Resultatives

The strong restrictions Romance languages impose on truly resultative constructions (i.e., complements of the verb with resultative semantics) are among the properties by which Romance languages clearly differ from Germanic languages. Talmy's (1985) foundational observation that resultative formation is much more restricted in Romance than in Germanic is still uncontroversial (see Merlo 1989, Napoli 1992, Folli and Ramchand 2005 on Italian, Mallén 1991, Mateu 2012, Bigolin and Ausensi 2021 on Spanish, Kaufmann and Wunderlich 1998 for a cross-linguistic overview, see also the discussion in Mateu and Rigau 2010, Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2019). But whether Romance languages allow resultatives in some corners of the language is still a lively debated question. Washio's (1997) distinction between weak, strong and spurious resultatives is here illuminating. Attested resultatives in Romance languages often turn out to be *weak* resultatives (e.g., English *break into pieces*), *spurious* resultatives (Kaufmann and Wunderlich 1998, Acedo-Matellán and Mateu 2015, e.g., English *tie his shoelaces tight*), or adjuncts, as argued by Bigolin and Ausensi (2021) (e.g., Spanish *golpear hasta la muerte 'beat to death'*).

In strong resultatives (e.g., (43)), "the meaning of the verb and the meaning of the adjective are completely independent of each other" in that "it is impossible to predict from the semantics of the verb what kind of state the patient comes to be in as the result of the action named by the verb" (Washio 1997).

(43) Hamida hammered the metal flat.   (manner verb, strong resultative)

By contrast, weak resultatives as in (44) further specify the result state licensed by the verb itself.

(44) Angeliek broke the glass into pieces.   (result verb, weak resultative)

Thus, the difference between the two types of resultatives correlates with the difference between manner and result verbs. If the verb is a result verb (as, e.g., Sp. *romper* 'break'), the resultative is weak as it modifies the result already encoded in the verb. If the verb is a manner verb (as, e.g., Eng. *hammer*), the resultative is strong for it augments the event structure with a result state.

Translations in (45b-c) of (45a) and (46), built with a manner verb and an adjective, show that strong resultative *adjectival* phrases (APs) are not possible in Romance.

(45) a.   Hannah hammered the metal flat. (Eng.)
      b. *Jean a martelé le métal plat. (Fr.)   (Washio 1997: 28)
      c. *Gianni ha martellato il metallo piatto. (It.)   (Merlo 1989: 30)
      d. *Maria martilleó el metal plano. (Sp.)   (Mateu 2012: 258)

(46) *Il a marché les jambes raide(s). (Fr.)   (Washio 1997: 27)
      'He walked his legs off (stiff).'

Examples (47)-(48), which all contain a result verb, illustrate that weak resultative APs are also impossible in Romance (see (47)), while weak resultative *prepositional* phrases (PPs) are acceptable (see (48)), as observed by Folli and Ramchand (2005) for Italian, Dagnac (2009) and Schirakowski (2022) for French, and Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (1991), Mallén (1991) and Acedo-Matellán (2012) for Spanish.

(47) a. *Gianni ha rotto il vaso aperto. (It.)   (Folli and Ramchand 2005: 101)
          'Gianni broke the vase open.'
      b. *Elle a teint ses rideaux bleus rouge(s). (Fr.)
          'She dyed her blue curtains red.'

(48) a. Gianni ha rotto il vaso in mille pezzi. (It.)   (Folli and Ramchand 2005)
          'Gianni broke the vase into thousand pieces.'
      b. Elle a teint ses rideaux en rouge. (Fr.)   (Dagnac 2009)
          'She dyed her curtains in red.'

But (49) below, built with a manner verb, show that *strong* resultative PPs are not acceptable:

(49) *Gianni ha martellato il vaso in mille pezzi. (It.)
          'Gianni hammered the vase into thousand pieces.'

However, it has been claimed that strong resultative PPs are in fact sometimes possible in Romance (see Rodríguez Arrizabalaga 2014 for Spanish, Celle 2003 for French), see the examples in (50), built with transitive manner verbs.

(50) a. Los torturaban hasta la muerte y los dejaban tirados entre los cascotes. (Sp.)
          'They tortured them to death and left them lying around among the pieces of rubble.
                            (Rodríguez Arrizabalaga 2014: 120, *apud* Bigolin and Ausensi 2021)
      b. Bertrand Cantat est maintenant accusé d'avoir battu à mort sa compagne. (Fr.)
          'Bertrand Cantat is now accused to have beaten her partner to death.'   (Celle 2003: 5)

But Bigolin and Ausensi (2021) provide arguments showing that in these examples, the PP behaves as an adjunct. As such they are not instances of Washio's (1997) strong resultatives (which are complement to the verb). Rather, they are what we could call 'delimiters', i.e. PPs merged as adjuncts and providing a boundary to the verbal event (Beavers 2008). Delimiters are not complements of the verb (thus not *syntactically* resultative), but may nevertheless be *semantically* resultative when they spell out some result of the verbal event, like the PP does in (50).

Examples (51) provide potential counter-examples to the generalization according to which resultative adjectival phrases are always banned from Romance languages (see Napoli 1992, Folli and Ramchand 2005 on Italian, Riegel et al. 1997 on French).

(51) a. Il a coupé mon veston trop court/*court. (Fr.)
          'He cut my jacket short/ too short.'   (Riegel et al. 1997: 241)
      b. Gianni ha cucito la camicia troppo stretta/*stretta. (It.)
          'Gianni sewed the dress tight/too tight.'   (Folli and Ramchand 2005: 102)

But Mateu (2012: 258, fn. 9) and Acedo-Matellán and Mateu (2015) argue that in these examples, the adjectival phrase does not occupy the inner small clause predicate and is rather adjoined to the verb. On this view, they are spurious resultatives (as *tight* in English *tied ones' shoelaces tight/loose*) (see Fábregas and Marín 2018 for similar observations about *cortar la cebolla fina* 'cut the onion thin' in Spanish).

7 Periphrastic causatives

Romance languages other than Romanian have a class of causative verbs taking non-finite complements, see (52a-c).

(52) a. Itamar hizo llorar a Benjamin. (Sp.)
      Itamar made cry   to Benjamin

   b. (Li)   he   fet   comprar un cotxe a la   meva mare.   (Cat.)
      her.DAT have made buy   a car   to the my   mother

      'I've made my mother buy a car.'   (Ciutescu 2015: 22)

   c. A   mulher fez   o   nenê dormir. (BrPt.)
      The woman made the baby sleep

      'The woman made the baby sleep.'   (Farrell 1995: 116)

Romanian always requires a finite (subjunctive) clausal complement in constructions with *face* 'make' or other causative verbs, see (53) (see Ciutescu 2018 on Romanian causative constructions in a cross-Romance perspective).

(53) Mama a   făcut-o să   le   spele.   (Ro.)
     mother has made her COMP them wash.SBJV

     'Mother made her wash them.'   (Ciutescu 2015: 25)

7.1 Transparency effects in *faire*-constructions

Faire-constructions show several properties of restructuring configurations. The contrast between (54a/b) and (54c/d) shows that in French and Italian, the infinitive must be adjacent to *faire*, while its subject must be in sentence-final position.[3] (54e/f) show that *faire* must host the clitic although it is an argument of the infinitive. Constructions with a pre-infinitival (non-cliticized) subject as in (54b/d) are forbidden in standard French, Italian and Catalan, but possible in other Romance languages such as Spanish, see (55) (Labelle 2017, Ciutescu 2018: 15-18). Example (55) further shows that clitic climbing is optional in Spanish, by contrast with French or Italian. Clitic climbing is also optional in Catalan (Labelle 2017: 317-318), indicating that the option of leaving clitics *in situ* and the licensing of a pre-infinitival subject in the embedded domain do not necessarily go hand in hand.

(54) a. Marie a   fait   pleurer Jean. (Fr.)
        Marie has made cry   Jean

    b. *Marie a   fait   Jean pleurer.
        Marie has fait Jean cry

    c. Maria fece   cadere Gianni. (It.)
       Maria made fall   Gianni   (Ledgeway 2020: 372)

    d. *Maria fece   Gianni cadere.
        Maria made Gianni fall

    e. Marie **l**'a   fait pleurer/*a   fait **le** pleurer. (Fr.)
       Marie him has made cry   has made him cry

    f. Maria **lo**   fece cadere/*fece   cader**lo**. (It.)
       Maria him made fall   made fall him   (Ledgeway 2020: 372)

---

[3]See Frei (1929) and Vinet (2021: §4.2.1) for French non-standard varieties allowing the Causee to be placed between *faire* and the infinitive.

(55) El río se torna cada vez más torrontoso (…) provocando el estrépito que hace a
the river REFL turns each time more torrential provoking the racket that makes to

los indígenas llamar**le** el Gran Gritón. (Sp.)
the natives call.it the Gran Gritón

'The river is becoming each time more torrential (…) provoking the loud racket that makes natives
call it the Gran Gritón.' (A. Granado, *Con el Che por Sudamérica*)

The 'transparency effects' illustrated through (54) are often taken to mark a clear deviation from a bi-clausal structure. For Zubizarreta (1985) or Di Sciullo and Rosen (1991), *faire* and the infinitive together form a single complex verb. Kayne (1977) rejects this approach because enclitics and adverbials may separate the two verbs. On an alternative view, the causative verb and the embedded verb in (54) are two independent lexical heads, but transparency effects take place because the complement of the former is reduced, not bigger than VP or vP, yielding a monoclausal structure. On the other hand, the use of a pre-infinitival subject in the embedded complement and the possibility to leave clitics *in situ* as in (55) are often taken to indicate the selection of a more complex complement, yielding a structure similar to Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) or control configurations (Guasti 1993, Labelle 1996, Rowlett 2007, Torrego 2010).

7.2 *Faire à, faire par* and ECM-type causatives

The case on the infinitival subject is mainly determined by the transitivity of the embedded verb. When the infinitive is intransitive, its argument receives accusative case in standard variants, as can be seen when it is cliticized as in (54e/f).[4] When the infinitive is transitive, the embedded object receives accusative case, and the embedded subject receives dative case, see (56a). Another possibility is to express the embedded subject with a *par/da*-marked phrase, as in (56b). The referent of the matrix subject is called the Causer, and the external argument of the embedded verb is called the Causee. Since Kayne (1977), the construction in (56a) is called *faire-infinitive* (FI) and the one in (56b) is called *faire-par* (FP).

(56) a. J'ai fait nettoyer les toilettes au général. (Fr.) (FI)
       I have made clean the toilets to the general

       'I made the general clean the toilets.' (Hyman and Zimmer 1976)

   b. J'ai fait nettoyer les toilettes par le général. (FP)
       I have made clean the toilets by the general

       'I had the toilets cleaned (by the general).' (Hyman and Zimmer 1976)

There are two ways to cliticize the Causee of FI. The standard one is to have a dative clitic appearing on *faire*, see (57a). Another one, sometimes considered ungrammatical (Kayne 1977) but found in non-canonical varieties of French (Vinet 2021: §4.2.2), expresses the Causee with an accusative clitic on *faire*, see (57b). In the latter (double accusative) structure, the Causee receives accusative case from the causative verb, as in ECM configurations. Such configurations are possible only when the Causee is cliticized in French (Abeillé et al. 1997, Labelle 2017: 303), Italian (Burzio 1986: 232, Sheehan 2020: 378-379) and Catalan (Sheehan 2020: 380-382). In Spanish or Portuguese, these constructions (F-ECM for short) are possible with non-cliticized, full DP Causees, too (recall (55)).

---

[4]See Abeillé et al. (1997), Lamiroy (2013) and Vinet (2021) on the use of a dative clitic instead of the expected accusative clitic in non-canonical French varieties, and Fernández-Ordóñez (1999), Ciutescu (2018: 159) for the same phenomenon (*leísmo*) in Spanish.

(57) a. Je lui   ai   fait   nettoyer les toilettes. (Fr.)   (FI)
          I   him.DAT have made clean   the toilets

          'I had him clean the toilets.'
      b. Je l'ai   fait   nettoyer les toilettes. (Fr.)   (F-ECM)
          I   him.ACC have made clean   the toilets

          'I had him clean the toilets.'

7.2.1 Semantic differences between *faire*-constructions

There are semantic differences between FP and FI as well as between FI and F-ECM, but the structures are generally compared two by two only, leading to a confusing picture calling for clarification.

On the one hand, Hyman and Zimmer (1976) rightly point out that the accusative case in F-ECM (see (57b)) conveys a lower degree of control of the Causee, and thus a more direct causal relation between matrix and embedded events, while the dative clitic as in (57a) indicates higher control or autonomy of the Causee and a more indirect causation (see Strozer 1976 for a similar characterization of the accusative-dative clitic alternation with Spanish *hacer*, and Ciutescu 2018: 147-149 for a critical review). On the other hand, Folli and Harley (2007) argue that in FI, independently of whether the Causee is cliticized or not, the causal relation is more direct than in FP, in that the Causer *obliges* the Causee to be involved in the embedded event (the 'obligation effect' of FI).

The descriptions of FI by the authors just cited are not compatible: for Hyman and Zimmer (1976), FI with cliticized Causee conveys indirect causation/autonomy of the Causee, while for Folli and Harley (2007), FI conveys direct causation/lack of control of the Causee, independently of whether the Causee is cliticized or not (for a critique of the latter claim, see Vecchiato 2011:121 and Ciutescu 2018:152). The strongest argument Folli and Harley put forward in favor of the obligation effect in FI is that FI seems to come with an animacy restriction on the Causee, as in (58). The reasoning is that obligations can be exerted on animates only. FP does not have this animacy restriction.

(58) Gianni ha   fatto disinfettare il   computer al   tecnico/ #al   programma. (It.)
      Gianni has made disinfect   the computer to the technician to the program

      'Gianni made the technician/the program disinfect the computer.'   (Folli and Harley 2007: 212)

But as Vecchiato (2011: 132) notices, the problem raised by *al programma* in (58) may also reflect a competition effect between *al* and the instrumental preposition *con*. Vecchiato argues that in context in which the inanimate is clearly not instrumental, the Causee of FI can also be inanimate in Italian. Indeed, Kayne (1977: 240) already provides many examples of French FI with inanimate Causee, see e.g., (59).

(59) Il   a   fait prendre l'air   à   ses vêtements. (Fr.)
      he has made take   the air to his clothes

      'He made his clothes take some fresh air.'   (Kayne 1977)

Another view on the difference between FI and FP goes back to Spang-Hanssen (1963), and is compatible with Hyman and Zimmer's (1976) insights on the differences between FI and F-ECM (see Table 5). The idea is that *in FI, the Causee is affected, while in FP, the object of the infinitive is affected*. Thus for instance, Hyman and Zimmer (1976) argue that in (56a), the speaker aims to affect the general, while in (56b), the speaker aims to get the toilets affected. Assuming a 'Causee affected' inference for FI also accounts for the

Table 4: Semantic effects characterizing FI, FP and F-ECM

Effect	FI	FP	F-ECM
Causee affected	+		
Theme affected		+	
Animate Causer		+	
Causee lacks control			+

contrast between FI in (58) and (59): the clothes are affected in (59), but the program is not in (58) (see also Guasti 1996, Guasti 2017: 28). Furthermore, Folli and Harley's obligation effect can easily be reanalyzed as a by-product of a 'Causee affected' inference, since 'Obligees' are often conceived as negatively affected. The 'Causee affected' inference of FI has been traced back to the dative marking (characteristic of Male-factive/Benefactive roles in Romance) on the Causee (Hyman and Zimmer 1976, Pitteroff and Campanini 2013, Guasti 2017). The 'Theme affected' inference of FP (the *Affectedness Constraint*) has been linked to the lexical restrictions imposed by FP, which hosts verbs entailing affectedness on their object only. Verbs like *voir* 'see', *perdre* 'lose', *gagner* 'win' thus tend to select FI only (Guasti 1993, 1996, 2017).
Another robust semantic difference between the two constructions is that FI, but not FP, is compatible with inanimate Causers (Kayne 1977: 230, Burzio 1986: 268, Guasti 2017: 12, Folli and Harley 2007: 217); see (60).

(60) La famine a   fait   manger des   rats aux/ #par les habitants   de la   ville. (Fr.)
       the famine has made eat   some rats to the by   the inhabitants of the city

      'The famine made the inhabitants of the city eat rats.'   (Kayne 1977: 240)

Table 4 recaps the main semantic effects of FI, FP and F-ECM. In summary, FP is about affecting the embedded theme in some way, and this must be initiated by an animate Causer. FI is about affecting the Causee, and this can be initiated by an animate or inanimate Causer. F-ECM conveys the Causee's lack of control.

7.2.2 Syntactic differences and similarities between *faire*-constructions

FP and FI also differ syntactically with regard to (A) the possibility of omitting the Causer, (B) the argumental vs. adverbial status of the Causee and (C) the selectional restrictions on the embedded verb.
A. The Causee must be realized in FI but can be omitted in FP (Burzio 1986: 228, Guasti 1996, Folli and Harley 2007: 200). This is taken to reflect that the Causee is an adjunct in FP, while it is a Case-marked argument in FI (see point B below). Counter-examples have been reported and are easy to find in corpora, especially in generic contexts. For instance, there are verbs compatible with FI only (for they do not entail affectedness on their object) which allow the omission of the Causee, as shown in (61). See also Ruwet (1989: 318-320) for French examples, and Folli and Harley (2007: 218) for Italian ones.

(61) a. Arrêtez de vous excuser chaque fois. Ça fait perdre du temps. (Fr.)
          'Stop apologizing each time. It makes [one/us] lose time.' (Anne-Marie Garat, *Aden*)
      b. Ce matin j'ai fait lire Aristote en classe et ils ont beaucoup aimé.
          'This morning I made [students] read Aristotle during the lesson and they liked it a lot'.

B. The Causee is an argument in FI and an adjunct in FP. For Zubizarreta (1985: 270), this accounts for the contrast in (62) observed by Kayne (1977) (see also Burzio 1986: 250). The idea is that *à*, a case marker, does not block c-command and binding into the VP, while *par*, a full preposition, blocks it.

(62) Elles ont fait peindre sa$_i$ maison à Jean$_i$/ par Jean$_{*i}$. (Fr.)
they have made paint his house to Jean/ by Jean

'They made Jean paint his house.'

C. Verbs that do not passivize (such as, e.g., the VP *casser la croûte* on its idiomatic use 'have a snack') can enter FI, but not FP (Kayne 1977, Zubizarreta 1985):

(63) Il a fait casser la croûte à sa famille/*par sa famille. (Fr.)
He has made break the crust to his family/ by his family.

'He made his family have a snack.' (Kayne 1977: 225)

But FI and FP are syntactically similar in their disallowing embedded periphrastic passives in French, Italian or Spanish; see (64) from Zubizarreta (1985: 278).

(64) *Piero fece (essere) letti quei brani (da Giovanni). (It.)
Piero made be read those passages by Giovanni

'Piero made these passages be read (by Giovanni).'

Numerous analyses of FI and FP implementing these syntactic differences and similarities have been proposed (see Santorini and Heycock 1988, Pitteroff and Campanini 2013, Folli and Harley 2007, Guasti 2017, Labelle 2017 for careful comparisons between the main approaches). These syntactic properties follow from Kayne's treatment of FP as involving the removal of the external argument out of the embedded predicate, just like passivization. Since FP *is* passivization, it requires a passivable verb, involves *par*-marked adjuncts just as passives, and rejects already passivized verbs. For Guasti (1996), there are two verbs *fare*; FI-*fare* takes one argument more than FP-*fare* (the benefactive/malefactive), and the embedded subject is suppressed in FP, but not in FI. Like Guasti, Folli and Harley (2007) posit an ambiguity between two *fare*. They analyze FP-*fare* as the full lexical verb denoting actions, also found in the creation use of *fare* with nominals (*fare una torta* 'make a cake'). This is how they account for why FP rejects inanimate subjects (recall (60)). A related claim of Folli and Harley (2007) is that the embedded VP selected by FP-*fare* is nominal (see also Guasti 1990). Following Guasti (1996), Folli and Harley suggest that the nominal property of the embedded VP in FP can account for the 'Causee-affected' inference (the Affectedness constraint), for this effect is also observed in passive nominalizations.[5]

7.3 Periphrastic causatives across Romance

Periphrastic *faire*-causatives present an array of intricated differences across Romance languages (overviewed in Sheehan and Cyrino 2016, Labelle 2017, Guasti 2017, Ciutescu 2018), that still need to be fully understood. A first difference concerns passivization of *faire* (see Labelle 2017: 304–305). In Italian, it is indubitably acceptable when the embedded verb is unaccusative, see (65), and not acceptable when it is unergative. Judgments differ when the embedded verb is transitive. Burzio (1986: 232) claims such passives to be possible; but Vecchiato (2011: 114) such examples very marked.

---

[5]See for instance the unacceptability of *the job's loss (by John)* (Guasti 1996: 308). See Labelle (2017: 324-325) for counterarguments to the claim that VP is a nominal complement in FP.

(65) Marco è stato fatto partire. (It.)
      Marco is been made leave

      'Gianni was made to leave.' (Folli and Harley 2007: 226, ex (45a))

There is no consensus as to whether Spanish allows passivization of *hacer* at all. Zubizarreta (1985) claims it to be unacceptable, but Treviño (1992: 312) provides examples with the embedded verb *construir* 'build'; in fact, Torrego (1998) considers that *hacer* can passivize with transitive infinitives only if the embedded verb is *construir* 'build'. It is not possible in Catalan, nor in French (Kayne 1977, Koenig 2021: §4.1.1). The few reported counter-examples are very marked and intriguingly almost always contain the creation verbs *faire* 'make' or *construire* 'build' as embedded verbs. It is unclear when *faire* passivization is possible and what the relevant factors are.

A second difference concerns passives in the structure embedded under the causative verb. As mentioned in the previous section, embedded passives are unacceptable in French, Spanish or Italian. But Brazilian Portuguese is exceptional in that it has lost FI and disallows FP of the French/Italian type (see Sheehan and Cyrino 2016), and allows embedded passives, as in (66a). Farrell (1995: 119) points out that embedded passivization affects the interpretation: while (66a) describes an event in which my actions affected my daughter, (66b) describes an event in which they affect the doctor.

(66) a. Eu fiz   a   minha filha   ser examinada pelo   médico. (BrPt.)
          I   made the my   daughter be   examined   by the doctor
      b. Eu fiz   o   médico examinar a   minha filha.   (BrPt.)
          I   made the doctor examine   the my   daughter

A third difference relates to weak reflexives (reflexive clitics *se/si*) on the embedded verb. Contrary to non-reflexive clitics, the reflexive clitic does not climb on *faire* as seen in (67)-(68) (Kayne 1977: section 6.2; see Labelle 2017: 317, Marty and Oikonomou 2017 for discussion).

(67) Marie a   fait se   laver Paul [*s'est fait laver Paul]. (Fr.)
      Marie has made REFL wash Paul REFL is made wash Paul

      'Marie made Paul wash himself.'

(68) Marie a   fait se   réveiller Paul [*s'est fait   réveiller Paul].
      Marie has made REFL wake up   Paul REFL is made wake up   Paul

      'Marie made Paul wake up.'

Weak reflexives on the embedded verb are acceptable in Spanish (Kempchinsky 2004, Cuervo 2021), but impossible in Italian. In Italian, when verbs are reflexively marked in non-embedded contexts appear under *fare*, the reflexive clitic must be dropped, as seen in (69) (Burzio 1981: 384, Zubizarreta 1985: 267-268). Resulting sentences such as (69) (without the problematic reflexive clitic) are therefore ambiguous since they can yield a reflexive or passive semantics for the embedded structure. Forcing the reflexive interpretation is possible with the non-clitic reflexive *se stesso*, with variability across speakers (Burzio 1986: 264, see discussion in Santorini and Heycock 1988: 45).

(69) Maria ha   fatto lavare/*lavarsi   Gianni. (It.)
      Maria has made wash   wash.REFL Gianni

      'Maria made Gianni wash himself.' (OR 'Maria made someone wash Gianni.')

(70) Il vento ha fatto dissipare/*dissiparsi le nubi. (It.)
      the wind has made disperse disperse.REFL the clouds

      'The wind made the clouds disperse.'

French shows the opposite pattern: when a verb is reflexively marked under a specific interpretation in French, it must keep the reflexive under *faire* to obtain this interpretation. For instance, *se* cannot be dropped in (67) if the target meaning of *laver* 'wash' is reflexive nor in (68) if the target meaning of *réveiller* 'wake up' is anticausative. However, with some French verbs (e.g., *taire* 'shut up'), dropping the reflexive is possible while keeping the meaning conveyed by the reflexive (Ruwet 1973: 191, Danell 1979: chapter 3, Everaert 1986: chapter 7, Creissels 2003: section 3.3.2). French still remains drastically different from Italian since it never allows reflexive drop with grooming verbs (e.g., *se laver* 'wash'), see (Ruwet 1973: 191), as well as under reciprocal construals.

Spanish offers a third picture. Reflexive drop under *hacer* is traditionally taken not to be possible in Spanish (Zubizarreta 1985). But it has been noticed that optional omission of *se* for otherwise reflexively marked verbs is possible in Spanish, too (Kempchinsky 2004, Cuervo 2017). Based on corpus data, Cuervo (2021) identified verb types allowing reflexive drop in Spanish. Verb types allowing it in French are strikingly similar, although Spanish seems more permissive. For instance, Kempchinsky (2004) reports it to be possible with Spanish grooming verbs, with some variability across speakers (see, e.g., (71)). Spanish still differs from Italian in that it does not require reflexive drop.

(71) La madre hizo bañar al niño. (Sp.)
      the mother made bathe to the child

      'The mother made the child bathe' (OR 'The mother made someone bathe the child.')

A full account of the cross-linguistic variation between these three language types is still missing. Further research has to establish the range of verbs that allow reflexive drop in the complement of periphrastic causatives in French and Spanish and the impact of *se* omission on the syntactic/semantic properties of the construction (see Danell 1979 for French, Cuervo 2021 for Spanish).

References

Abeillé, A., D. Godard, and P. Miller (1997). Les causatives en français : Un cas de compétition syntaxique. *Langue française 115*, 62–74.

Abrines, B. L. (2016). *Els verbs de canvi d'estat i l'alternança causativa en català*. Ph. D. thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona.

Acedo-Matellán, V. (2006). Una aproximació sintàctica als verbs prefixats en català. *Estudios Catalanes 4*, 41–78.

Acedo-Matellán, V. (2012). Adjectival resultatives cross-linguistically: A morphophonological account. In C. Constantinescu, B. L. Bruyn, and K. Linke (Eds.), *Proceedings of ConSOLE XVII*, pp. 1–25.

Acedo-Matellán, V. and J. Mateu (2013). Satellite-framed latin vs. verb-framed Romance: A syntactic approach. *Probus 25*(2), 227–265.

Acedo-Matellán, V. and J. Mateu (2015). Parameters and argument structure I: Motion predicates and resultatives. In A. Fábregas, J. Mateu, and M. Putnam (Eds.), *Contemporary linguistic parameters*, pp. 99–122. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Alexiadou, A. and E. Anagnostopoulou (2020). Experiencers and causation. In E. Bar-Asher Siegal and N. Boneh (Eds.), *Perspectives on causation*, pp. 297–318. Berlin: Springer.

Alexiadou, A., E. Anagnostopoulou, and F. Schäfer (2015). *External arguments in transitivity alternations: A layering approach.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alexiadou, A., F. Martin, and F. Schäfer (2017). Optionally causative manner verbs. Paper presented at the conference *Roots V*, London.

Aurnague, M. and M. Plénat (2008). Sémantique de l'espace et morphologie: Le cas de la préfixation en *é-*. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris CIII*(fasc. 1), 201–236.

Bassa Vanrell, M. d. M. (2013). Preposition typology with manner of motion verbs in Spanish. Master's thesis, University of Texas at Austin, Austin.

Beavers, J. (2008). On the nature of goal marking and delimitation: Evidence from Japanese. *Journal of Linguistics 44*, 283–316.

Beavers, J., M. Everdell, K. Jerro, H. Kauhanen, A. Koontz-Garboden, E. LeBovidge, and S. Nichols (2021). States and changes of state: A cross-linguistic study of the roots of verbal meaning. *Language 97*(3), 439–484.

Beavers, J. and A. Koontz-Garboden (2013). Complications in diagnosing lexical meaning: A rejoinder to Horvath and Siloni (2013). *Lingua 134*, 210–218.

Beavers, J., B. Levin, and S. W. Tham (2010). The typology of motion expressions revisited. *Journal of Linguistics 46*(3), 331–377.

Bigolin, A. and J. Ausensi (2021). A new resultative construction in Spanish? A reply to Rodríguez Arrizabalaga. *Folia Linguistica 55*(2), 1–30.

Bonami, O. (1999). *Les constructions du verbe: le cas des groupes prépositionnels argumentaux. Analyse syntaxique, sémantique et lexicale.* Ph. D. thesis, Université de Paris VII, Paris.

Boons, J.-P. (1987). La notion sémantique de déplacement dans une classification syntaxique des verbes locatifs. *Langue française 76*, 5–40.

Burzio, L. (1981). *Intransitive verbs and Italian auxiliaries.* Ph. D. thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Burzio, L. (1986). *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Carvalho, J. (2016a). *A morfossintaxe do português brasileiro e sua estrutura argumental: uma investigação sobre anticausativas, médias, impessoais e a alternância agentiva.* Ph. D. thesis, University of São Paulo, São Paulo.

Carvalho, J. (2016b). What causes the alternation of agentive verbs in Brazilian Portuguese? *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 22(1)*, 60–69.

Celle, A. (2003). Constructions résultatives et identification du résultat. *Cycnos 21*(1).

Cennamo, M. (2015). Valency patterns in Italian. In A. Malchukov and B. Comrie (Eds.), *Valency Classes in the World's Languages*, Volume 1, pp. 417–481. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chierchia, G. (2004). A semantics for unaccusatives and its syntactic consequences. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, and M. Everaert (Eds.), *The Unaccusativity Puzzle: Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*, pp. 22–59. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ciutescu, E. (2015). Romance causatives and object shift. In E. Aboh, J. Schaeffer, and P. Sleeman (Eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2013. Selected papers from 'Going Romance'*, pp. 21–38. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Ciutescu, E. (2018). *Defective causative and perception verb constructions in Romance. A minimalist approach to infinitival and subjunctive clauses.* Ph. D. thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona.

Corbin, D. (1987). *Morphologie dérivationnelle et structuration du lexique.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Creissels, D. (2003). Réflexivisation, transitivité et agent affecté. In A. Rousseau, D. Bottineau, and D. Roulland (Eds.), *L'énoncé réfléchi*, pp. 83–106. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Cuervo, M. C. (2017). Optional *se* under light causative verbs. Paper presented at the 2017 CLA Meeting.

Cuervo, M. C. (2021). Disappearing *se* under light causative verbs. Manuscript, University of Toronto.

Cummins, S. (1996). Movement and direction in French and English. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics 15*, 31–54.

24

Cyrino, S. (2013). Argument promotion and SE-constructions in Brazilian Portuguese. In E. van Gelderen, M. Cennamo, and J. Baral (Eds.), *Argument structure in Flux: The Naples-Capri Papers*, pp. 285–306. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Dagnac, A. (2009). Elle a teint ses rideaux en rouge: Entre manière et résultativité. *Langages 145*(3), 67–84.

Danell, K. J. (1979). *Remarques sur la construction dite causative: faire (laisser, voir, entendre, sentir)+ infinitif.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

de Cuyper, G. (2004). *La estructura léxica de la resultatividad y su expresíon en las lenguas germánicas y románicas.* Ph. D. thesis, Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen.

Di Sciullo, A.-M. and S. Rosen (1991). Constructions à prédicats légers et quasi-légers. *Revue québécoise de linguistique 20*(1), 13–36.

Doron, E. and M. Labelle (2011). An ergative analysis of French valency alternation. In J. Herschensohn (Ed.), *Romance Linguistics 2010 : Selected Papers from the 40th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, pp. 137–154. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Everaert, M. (1986). *The syntax of reflexivization.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Fábregas, A. (2007). The exhaustive lexicalisation principle. *Nordlyd 34*(2), 165–199.

Fábregas, A. (2015). Sobre el sufijo *-iza(r)* y sus propiedades internas. *Lengua y Habla 19*, 166–187.

Fábregas, A. and R. Marín (2018). Spanish adjectives are PathPs. In J. Berns, H. Jacobs, and D. Nouveau (Eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 13*, pp. 111–126. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Farrell, P. (1995). Backward control in Brazilian Portuguese. In J.-M. Fuller, H. Han, and D. Parkinson (Eds.), *Proceedings of ESCOL 94*, pp. 116–127. Ithaca, NY: DMLL Publications.

Fernández-Ordóñez, I. (1999). Leísmo, laísmo y loísmo. In V. Demonte and I. Bosque (Eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, Volume 1, pp. 1317–1398. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Fodor, J. (1970). Three reasons for not deriving *kill* from *cause to die. Linguistic Inquiry 1*(4), 429–438.

Folli, R. (2002). *Constructing telicity in English and Italian.* Ph. D. thesis, University of Oxford, Oxford.

Folli, R. (2014). Causatives and inchoatives in the lexicon and in the syntax. In B. Copley and F. Martin (Eds.), *Causation in Grammatical Structures*, pp. 351–371. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Folli, R. and H. Harley (2005). Consuming Results in Italian and English: Flavours of v. In P. Kempchinsky and R. Slabakova (Eds.), *Aspectual Enquiries*, pp. 95–120. Dordrecht: Springer.

Folli, R. and H. Harley (2007). Causation, obligation, and argument structure: On the nature of little v. *Linguistic Inquiry 38*(2), 197–238.

Folli, R. and H. Harley (2016). Against deficiency-based typologies: Manner-alternation parameters in Italian and English. In E. Carrilho, A. Fiéis, M. Lobo, and S. Pereira (Eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 10: Selected papers from* Going Romance *28*, pp. 103–120. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Folli, R. and H. Harley (2020). A head movement approach to Talmy's typology. *Linguistic Inquiry 41*(3), 425–470.

Folli, R. and G. Ramchand (2005). Prepositions and results in Italian and English: An analysis from event decomposition. In H. Verkuyl, H. de Swart, and A. van Hout (Eds.), *Perspectives on Aspect*, pp. 81–105. Dordrecht: Springer.

Frei, H. (1929). *La grammaire des fautes.* Paris: P. Geuthner.

Fritz-Huechante, P., E. Verhoeven, and J. Rott (2020). Agentivity and non-culminating causation in the psych domain: Cross-linguistic evidence from Spanish and Korean. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics 5*(1), 128.

Galves, C. (1985). A sintaxe do português brasileiro. *Cadernos de Linguística e Teoria da Literatura 13*, 31–50.

Guasti, M. T. (1990). The 'faire-par' construction in Romance and in Germanic. In *Proceedings of the Ninth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Stanford, pp. 205–218. CSLI Publications.

Guasti, M. T. (1993). *Causative and Perception Verbs: A Comparative Study.* Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Guasti, M. T. (1996). Semantic Restrictions in Romance Causatives and the Incorporation Approach. *Linguistic Inquiry 27*(2), 294–313.

Guasti, M. T. (2017). Analytical causatives. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Gyarmathy, Zs. and D. Altshuler (2020). (Non-)culmination by abduction. *Linguistics 58*(5), 1373–1411.

Harley, H. (2012). Lexical decomposition in modern generative grammar. In W. Hinzen, M. Werning, and E. Machery (Eds.), *Handbook of Compositionality*, pp. 328–350. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heidinger, S. (2010). *French Anticausatives: A Diachronic Perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Heidinger, S. (2015). Causalness and the encoding of the causative–anticausative alternation in French and Spanish. *Journal of Linguistics 51*(3), 562–594.

Heidinger, S. (2019). Reflexive and unmarked anticausatives in French and Spanish: Frequency of transitive use and undergoer overlap. *Langages 4*(216), 53–69.

Horvath, J. and T. Siloni (2013). Anticausatives have no cause(r): A rejoinder to Beavers and Koontz-Garboden. *Lingua 131*, 217–230.

Hyman, L. and K. Zimmer (1976). Embedded topic in French. In C. Li (Ed.), *Subject and Topic*, pp. 189–211. New-York: Academic Press.

Jiménez-Fernández, A. and M. Tubino (2019). Causativity in Southern Peninsular Spanish. In A. Gallego (Ed.), *The Syntactic Variation of Spanish Dialects*, pp. 181–211. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Junker, M.-O. (1987). Transitive, intransitive and reflexive uses of adjectival verbs in French. In J.-P. Montreuil (Ed.), *Advances in Romance Linguistics*, pp. 189–199. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Kaufmann, I. and D. Wunderlich (1998). Cross-linguistic patterns of resultatives. In *Working Papers 'Theory of the Lexicon', SFB 282*. Düsseldorf: University of Düsseldorf.

Kayne, R. (1977). *Syntaxe du français: Le cycle transformationnel*. Paris: Seuil.

Kempchinsky, P. (2004). Romance *se* as an aspectual element. In J. Auger, C. Clements, and B. Vance (Eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Romance Linguistics*, pp. 239–256. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Kiparsky, P. (1997). Remarks on denominal verbs. In A. Alsina, J. Bresnan, and P. Sells (Eds.), *Complex predicates*, pp. 473–499. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Koenig, J.-P. (2021). Les constructions de *faire* avec un infinitif. In A. Abeillé and D. Godard (Eds.), *Grande grammaire du français*. Paris: Actes Sud.

Koenig, J.-P. and A. R. Davis (2001). Sublexical modality and the structure of lexical semantic representations. *Linguistics & Philosophy 24*(1), 71–124.

Koontz-Garboden, A. (2009). Anticausativization. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 1*(27), 77–138.

Kratzer, A. (2005). Building resultatives. In C. Maienborn and A. Wöllstein-Leisten (Eds.), *Event arguments in syntax, semantics and discourse*, pp. 178–212. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Labelle, J. (1989). Norms and variants in French. *Lingvisticæ Investigationes 2*(13), 281–305.

Labelle, M. (1992). Change of state and valency. *Journal of Linguistics 28*, 375–414.

Labelle, M. (1996). Remarques sur les verbes de perception et la sous-catégorisation. *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes 25*, 83–106.

Labelle, M. (2017). Causative and perception verbs. In E. Stark and A. Dufter (Eds.), *Manual of Romance morphosyntax and syntax*, pp. 299–331. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Labelle, M. and E. Doron (2010). Anticausative derivations (and other valency alternations) in French. *Probus 22*(2), 303–316.

Lamiroy, B. (2013). La construction causative en *faire* et le marquage différentiel de l'objet en français. In K. Ogata (Ed.), *Autour des verbes. Constructions et interprétations*, pp. 3–18. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Lara Bermejo, V. (2019). Lability in Western Peninsular Spanish. *Studia Linguistica 2*(72), 203–247.

Larjavaara, M. (2000). *Présence ou absence de l'objet*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Helsinki, Helsinki.

Ledgeway, A. (2000). *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: A Minimalist Approach*. Oxford:

Blackwell.

Ledgeway, A. (2020). The causative construction in the dialects of southern Italy and the phonology-syntax interface. In L. Franco and P. Lorusso (Eds.), *Linguistic Variation: Structure and Interpretation*, pp. 371–400. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Legendre, G., P. Smolensky, and J. Culbertson (2016). Blocking effects at the lexicon/semantics interface and bidirectional optimization in French. In G. Legendre, M. Putnam, H. de Swart, and E. Zaroukian (Eds.), *Optimality-Theoretic Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics*, pp. 276–299. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leonetti, M. and V. Escandell-Vidal (1991). Complementos predicativos en sintagmas nominales. *Verba 18*, 431–450.

Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (1995). *Unaccusativity : at the syntax-lexical semantics interface.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (2013). Lexicalized meaning and manner/result complementarity. In B. Arsenijevic, B. Gehrke, and R. Marín (Eds.), *Studies in the composition and decomposition of event predicates*, pp. 49–70. Berlin: Springer.

Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (2019). Lexicalization patterns. In R. Truswell (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Event Structure.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lewandowski, W. and J. Mateu (2019). Motion events again: Delimiting constructional patterns. *Lingua 247*, 1–26.

Llabrés, B. A. and J. Mateu (2018). Els verbs de canvi d'estat del català i l'alternança causativa: una proposta sintàctica. *Etudes romanes de Brno 39*(1), 139–161.

Llorente Maldonado, A. (1980). Consideraciones sobre el español actual. *Anuario de Letras XVIII*, 5–61.

Mallén, E. (1991). A syntactic analysis of secondary predication in Spanish. *Journal of Linguistics 27*(2), 375–403.

Manente, M. (2009). *L'aspect, les auxiliaires 'être' et 'avoir' et l'hypothèse inaccusative dans une perspective comparative français/italien.* Ph. D. thesis, Université de Paris 8 & Università Ca'Foscari di Venezia, Paris & Venice.

Martin, F. (2018). Time in probabilistic causation: Direct vs. indirect uses of lexical causative verbs. In U. Sauerland and S. Solt (Eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 22*, Volume 60-61, Berlin, pp. 107–124. ZAS Papers in Linguistics.

Martin, F. (2020). Aspectual differences between agentive and non-agentive uses of causative predicates. In E. Bar-Asher Siegal and N. Boneh (Eds.), *Perspectives on causation*, pp. 257–296. Berlin: Springer.

Martin, F. and C. Piñón (2020). Verbalizing nouns and adjectives: The case of behavior-related verbs. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics 5*(1), 29.

Martin, F. and F. Schaefer (2013). On the argument structure of verbs with bi- and mono-eventive uses. In S. Keine and S. Sloggett (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS) 42*, pp. 297–308. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Martin, F. and F. Schäfer (2012). The modality of 'offer' and other defeasible causative verbs. In N. Arnett and R. Bennett (Eds.), *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL) 30*, Somerville, MA, pp. 248–258. Cascadilla Press.

Martin, F. and F. Schäfer (2014a). Anticausatives compete but do not differ in meaning: A French case study. In *SHS web of conferences. 4e Congrès mondial de Linguistique Française*, Volume 8, pp. 2485–2500. EDP Sciences.

Martin, F. and F. Schäfer (2014b). Causation at the syntax/semantics interface. In B. Copley and F. Martin (Eds.), *Causation in Grammatical Structures*, pp. 209–244. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, F. and F. Schäfer (2017). Sublexical modality in defeasible causative verbs. In A. Arregui, M. L. Rivero, and A. Salanova (Eds.), *Modality across Syntactic Categories*, pp. 87–108. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martínez Vera, G. (2016). Syntactic structure of Spanish parasynthesis: towards a split little-v via affectedness. *Isogloss 2*(2), 63–94.

Marty, P. and D. Oikonomou (2017). French causatives: The reflexivity puzzle. In *A Pesky Set: Papers for David Pesetsky*, pp. 477–486. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working papers in Linguistics.

Mateu, J. (2012). Conflation and incorporation processes in resultative constructions. In V. Demonte and L. McNally (Eds.), *Telicity, Change and State*, pp. 252–278. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mateu, J. and G. Rigau (2010). Verb-particle constructions in Romance: A lexical-syntactic account. *Probus 22*, 241–269.

Mazziotta, N. and F. Martin (2013). Affixes transitivisants en français. Approche statistique exploratoire à partir de la base de données Les verbes français. In F. Rainer, M. Russo, and F. Sanchez Miret (Eds.), *Actes Du XXVIIe Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes (Nancy, 15-20 Juillet 2013)*.

McNally, L. and A. Spalek (2022). Grammatically relevant aspects of meaning and verbal polysemy. *Linguistics 60*(6), 1943–1987.

Mendikoetxea, A. (1999). Construcciones inacusativas y pasivas. In I. Bosque and V. Demonte (Eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, Volume 2, pp. 1575–1629. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Mendikoetxea, A. (2012). Passives and *se* constructions. In J. I. Hualde, A. Olarrea, and E. O'Rourke (Eds.), *The handbook of Hispanic linguistics*, pp. 477–502. Malden, MA: Wiley.

Mendivil, J. (2003). Construcciones resultativas y gramática universal. *Revista española de lingüística 33*(1), 1–28.

Merlo, P. (1989). Risultative in Italiano e Inglese. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa 14*, 29–53.

Namer, F. (2002). Acquisition automatique de sens à partir d'opérations morphologiques en français : études de cas. In *Actes de la 9ème conférence sur le Traitement Automatique des Langues Naturelles*, pp. 237–246. ATALA.

Napoli, D. (1992). Secondary resultative predicates in Italian. *Journal of Linguistics 28*(1), 53–90.

Neeleman, A. and H. Van de Koot (2012). The linguistic expression of causation. In M. Everaert, M. Marelj, and T. Siloni (Eds.), *The Theta System: Argument Structure at the Interface*, pp. 20–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oehrle, R. (1976). *The Grammatical Status of the English Dative Alternation*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Padrosa Trias, S. (2007). Argument structure and morphology. The case of *en-* prefixation revisited. *Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca Julio de Urquijo. International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology 41*(2), 225–266.

Piñón, C. (1999). Durative adverbials for result states. In S. Bird, A. Carnie, J. Haugen D., and P. Norquest (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th West Coast Conference in Formal Linguistics*, pp. 420–433. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Piñón, C. (2001). A finer look at the causative-inchoative alternation. In R. Hastings, B. Jackson, and Z. Zvolenszky (Eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 11*. Ithaca, New-York: CLC Publications, Cornell University.

Pineda, A. (2018). Causativisation of verbs of directed motion in Romance languages. In L. Repetti and F. Ordóñez (Eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 14. Selected papers from the 46th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, pp. 245–262. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Pitteroff, M. and C. Campanini (2013). Variation in analytic causative constructions: a view on German and Romance. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics 16*(2-3), 209–230.

Pourcel, S. and A. Kopecka (2005). Motion expression in French: Typological diversity. *Durham & Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics 11*, 139–153.

Pylkkänen, L. (2008). *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ramchand, G. (2008). *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon. A First Phase Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rapp, I. and A. von Stechow (2019). Open the door again. In D. Gutzmann, L. Matthewson, C. Meier, H. Rullman, and T. E. Zimmermann (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Semantics*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Rappaport Hovav, M. (2014a). Building scalar changes. In A. Alexiadou, H. Borer, and F. Schäfer (Eds.), *The Syntax of Roots and the Roots of Syntax*, pp. 259–281. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rappaport Hovav, M. (2014b). Lexical content and context: The causative alternation in English revisited. *Lingua 78*, 8–29.

Rappaport Hovav, M. (2020). Deconstructing internal causation. In E. Bar-Asher Siegal and N. Boneh (Eds.), *Perspectives on causation*, pp. 219–256. Berlin: Springer.

Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (1998). Building verb meanings. In M. Butt and W. Geuder (Eds.), *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*, pp. 97–134. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (2008). The English Dative Alternation: The Case for Verb Sensitivity. *Journal of Linguistics 44*, 129–167.

Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (2012). Lexicon uniformity and the causative alternation. In M. Everaert, M. Marelj, and T. Siloni (Eds.), *The Theta system: Argument structure at the interface*, pp. 150–176. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reinhart, T. (2002). The Theta system. *Theoretical Linguistics 28*(3), 229–290.

Riegel, M., P. J.-C., and R. Rioul (1997). *Grammaire méthodique du français*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Rodríguez Arrizabalaga, B. (2014). The birth of a new resultative construction in Spanish. A corpus-based description. *Folia Linguistica 48*(1), 119–167.

Rohlfs, G. (1954). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Vol. 2. Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Turin: Einaudi.

Rowlett, P. (2007). Cinque's functional verbs in French. *Language Sciences 29*(6), 755–786.

Ruwet, N. (1972). *Théorie syntaxique et syntaxe du français*. Paris: Seuil.

Ruwet, N. (1973). Restrictions de sélection, transformations et règles de redondance: Les constructions pronominales en français. In M. Gross, M. Halle, and M.-P. Schützenberger (Eds.), *The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages: Proceedings of the First International Conference, Paris, April 27–29, 1970*, pp. 180–202. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Ruwet, N. (1989). Weather-verbs and the unaccusative hypothesis. In C. Kirschner and J. DeCesaris (Eds.), *Studies in Romance Linguistics. Selected papers from the Seventeenth Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, pp. 313–345. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Santorini, B. and C. Heycock (1988). Remarks on Causatives and Passive. Technical Report, Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Pennsylvania.

Schäfer, F. (2008). *The Syntax of (Anti-)Causatives. External arguments in change-of-state contexts*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Schäfer, F. (2009). The causative alternation. *Language and Linguistics Compass 3*(2), 641–681.

Schäfer, F. (2012). Two types of external argument licensing–the case of causers. *Studia Linguistica 66*(2), 128–180.

Schäfer, F. (2022). Transitive anticausatives. In B. Pratley, Özge Bakay, E. Neu, and P. Deal (Eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 52*, Volume 2, Amherst, MA. GLSA Publications.

Schäfer, F. and M. Vivanco (2016). Anticausatives are weak scalar expressions, not reflexive expressions. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics 1*(1).

Schirakowski, B. (2022). Satellite-framed lexicalization of creation verbs in French? a view on effected objects and satellite PPs. *Isogloss 8*(5), 1–32.

Sheehan, M. (2020). The development of Exceptional Case Marking in Romance with a particular focus on French. *Probus 32*(2), 367–400.

Sheehan, M. and S. Cyrino (2016). Variation and change in the Romance faire-par causative. In E. Carrilho,

A. Fieis, M. Lobo, and S. Pereira (Eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory*, pp. 279–304. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Sikora, D. (2009). *Les verbes de manière de mouvement en polonais et en français: éléments pour une étude comparée des propriétés structurelles des prédicats.* Ph. D. thesis, Nancy 2, Nancy.

Sotelo, E. G. and I. P. Payet (2015). Semantic approaches to the study of denominal parasynthetic verbs in Spanish. *Morphology 25*(4), 439–472.

Spang-Hanssen, E. (1963). *Les prépositions incolores du français moderne.* Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gads Forlag.

Strozer, J. (1976). *Clitics in Spanish.* Ph. D. thesis, UCLA, Los Angeles.

Séguy, J. (1950). *Le français parlé à Toulouse.* Toulouse: Privat.

Talmy, L. (1976). Semantics and syntax of motion. In J. Kimball (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics 4*, pp. 181–238. New-York: Academic Press.

Talmy, L. (1985). Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical form. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description III*, pp. 51–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, L. (1991). Path to realization: A typology of event conflation. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Volume 17, pp. 480–519.

Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Volume I: Concept Structuring Systems.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Torrego, E. (1998). *The dependencies of objects.* Ph. D. thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Torrego, E. (2010). Variability in the case patterns of causative formation in Romance and its implications. *Linguistic Inquiry 41*(3), 445–470.

Treviño, E. (1992). Subjects in Spanish causative constructions. In P. Hirschbüler and E. F. Koerner (Eds.), *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory*, pp. 309–324. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Troberg, M. (2010). Directed motion in Medieval French. In J. Herschensohn (Ed.), *Romance Linguistics 2010 : Selected Papers from the 40th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, pp. 118–135. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Tubino-Blanco, M. (2020). Causative/inchoative in morphology. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vázquez, M. M. (2015). Satellite-framed patterns in Romance languages: A corpus-based study. *Languages in Contrast 15*(2), 181–207.

Vecchiato, A. (2011). *Events in the grammar of direct and indirect causation.* Ph. D. thesis, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Vinet, M.-T. (2021). La variation concernant *faire* et l'infinitif. In A. Abeillé and D. Godard (Eds.), *Grande grammaire du français*. Paris: Actes Sud.

Vivanco, M. (2017). *La conceptualización de los eventos de cambio de estado y la alternancia lábil en español.* Ph. D. thesis, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid.

Washio, R. (1997). Resultatives, compositionality and language variation. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics 6*, 1–49.

Whitaker-Franchi, R. C. (1989). As construções ergativas. Um estudo semântico e sintático. Master's thesis, UNICAMP.

Wolff, P. (2003). Direct causation in the linguistic coding and individuation of causal events. *Cognition 88*(1), 1–48.

Wright, S. (2002). Transitivity and change of state verbs. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Volume 28, pp. 339–350.

Zribi-Hertz, A. (1987). La réflexivité ergative en français moderne. *Le Français moderne 55*, 23–54.

Zubizarreta, M. L. (1985). The Relation between Morphophonology and Morphosyntax: The Case of Romance Causatives. *Linguistic Inquiry 16*(2), 247–289.