CAUSATIVES: FROM LEXICON TO SYNTAX*

0. Introduction

Because of their exceptionality, Romance Causatives justify the sustained interest they have received from Kayne (1975) to Rouveret and Vergnaud (1980), Burzio (1981) and Zubizarreta (1985). They are relevant to crucial topics in the present theory: Opacity, the relationship of lexicon to syntax, the role of government in case marking and assignment of thematic roles, the different theories about restructuring and complex predicates are all involved in the description of Causatives as in a rich microcosm.

The strategy I will follow in this article will be reductionist. It stems from the conviction that exceptions must be dealt with as phenomena which under closer scrutiny may prove to be, in fact, quite regular. It is possible to show that Causative complements are special only in that they exhibit a unique intersection of properties mostly found independently in other domains among the infinitival complements. In this sense they fall almost entirely within the domain of core grammar.

The only feature unique to Causative structures is the lack of INFL in their complements; from this most of their apparent idiosyncracies follow. Lack of INFL is responsible for aspects of word order in Causative complements and for some interesting contrasts noticed in the literature (for instance in Hyman and Zimmer, 1976; Morin, 1977; Cannings and Moody, 1978; Bailard, 1981), but hardly studied hitherto. These contrasts concern the distribution of theta roles in examples such as the following:

(1) Hicieron destruir la ciudad a los soldados.

(they) made destroy the city the soldiers

They made the soldiers destroy the city.
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(2) Hicieron **destruir** la ciudad **por** los soldados.

*(they) made destroy the city by the soldiers*

They had the city destroyed by the soldiers.

(3) Hicieron **ver** la ciudad **a** los turistas.

*(they) made see the city to the tourists*

They made the tourists see the city.

(4) *Hicieron **ver** la ciudad **por** los turistas.*

*(they) made see the city by the tourists*

They made the city seen by the tourists.

Under the hypothesis I am going to propose below, contrasts like that between (2) and (4) are explained once the distribution of agentive phrases under Causatives is shown to be parallel to the distribution of agentive phrases in nominal structures, the common feature being precisely the lack of INFL in both structures. The analysis of the contrast between (2) and (4), however, requires a study of the Causative structure as a whole, which is the purpose of this article.

In the first part of the paper I will present the data and the problem pertaining to Causative structures, together with a brief outline of its classical solution, the Predicate Raising analysis. Then I will introduce a new proposal, which consists of a double pattern:

(5) 

\[ A: \text{hacer } S \text{ NP}, \text{ where NP = dative controller} \]
\[ B: \text{hacer } S \]

For both patterns I will study successively the role and position of the subject in the complement, the case marking on the different arguments and the conditions under which clitics may move by Long Clitic Movement to the matrix sentence. I will introduce the notion of Extended Governing Category – as a modification of Opacity – which allows for Long Clitic Movement and other phenomena. Finally I will deal with the complementarity between patterns (A) and (B).

Central to this analysis are the Theta Criterion and the Projection Principle (Chomsky 1981). The Theta Criterion, in the version I will assume, requires that each argument bear one and only one theta role, and each theta role be assigned to one and only one argument. The Projection Principle makes the Theta Criterion valid at every grammatical level: D Structure, S Structure and Logical Form. In one way or another, the traditional analyses of Causative structures within generative grammar fail to satisfy the Projection Principle, a principle which