

Relating the Predicate to Its Subject

Marcel den Dikken (MDen-Dikken@gc.cuny.edu) & Ana Longenecker (alongenecker32@yahoo.com)
Linguistics Program • CUNY Graduate Center • 365 Fifth Avenue • New York, NY 10016–4309 • USA

1 Introduction: The syntax of predication*

The primary goal of this paper is to develop a syntactic representation of subject–predication relationships as in (1), and to exploit this representation in a novel analysis of the familiar problems posed by the causative construction in the Romance languages. We start out from two core hypotheses: (i) that the semantics of predication uniformly involves set intersection, and (ii) that all semantic relationships of set intersection are syntactically represented in terms of a structure in which the constituents denoting the intersected sets are dependents of a connective or RELATOR which establishes the syntactic and semantic link between the two constituents — an idea that can be traced back to Aristotle but which figures particularly prominently in the Port Royal grammar.¹ The RELATOR’s function is, as its name suggests, to relate the predicate to its subject. Thus, the RELATOR is merely the facilitator of the establishment of the subject–predicate relationship — it is not itself a θ -role assigner. This in turn entails, given that *lexical* heads are quintessentially θ -role assigners, that the RELATOR is always a *functional* head.

- (1) a. [RP SUBJECT [R' RELATOR [PREDICATE]]]
b. [RP PREDICATE [R' RELATOR [SUBJECT]]]

The structures in (1) represent the relationship of predication as fundamentally *non-directional*. What is required in order for predication to succeed is for the predicate and its subject to be related to each other via a functional RELATOR in a structural configuration of one of the two types in (1). That is, one of the two relata must serve as the RELATOR’s complement and the other as its specifier. This is all that is required as far as the establishment of a predication relationship is concerned. Specifically, what our outlook on the syntax of predication does not decree is that the subject precede the predicate (in language X): on the contrary, we take the placement of the predicate and the subject *vis-à-vis* the RELATOR to be fundamentally unrestricted, as long as the resulting syntactic configuration matches either (1a) or (1b), which are both equally grammatical syntactic expressions of the semantic relationship of predication.

We will exploit the non-directionality of predication extensively in our account of the Romance causative construction in sections 4 and 5 of the paper, and also in the analysis of the active-passive diathesis alternation in section 3. But before we turn there, let us first of all provide some background on two core ideas encapsulated in (1): (i) the idea that all subject–predicate relationships in syntax involve the mediation of a RELATOR, and (ii) that this RELATOR is itself a meaningless functional category.

* This paper was prepared for the 27th GLOW Colloquium in Thessaloniki, Greece. It is based to a significant degree on a book manuscript by the first author of this paper that will appear in print with The MIT Press in due time. Queries about the outlook on the syntax of predication unfolded in these pages should be directed to the first author, who takes responsibility for this part of the paper; the sections on the Romance causative construction are the joint responsibility of both authors.

¹ Arnauld & Lancelot (1660), in their *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*, split up a proposition such as *the earth is round* into a subject, *the earth*, and a predicate, *round*, connected to each other by the copula *is*, and by the same token they represent a proposition such as *John walks* in terms of a subject, *John*, and a predicate, *walk*, connected by a RELATOR. For Arnauld & Lancelot, this RELATOR is systematically the copula *be* (cf. Arnauld & Lancelot 1660:91; Harris & Taylor 1997:96, 103). We will depart from this specific assumption, taking the RELATOR to be more abstract; but the core proposal is clearly in line with the Port Royal account.

2 On the nature of the RELATOR

‘RELATOR’ in (1) does not stand for a particular functional category — anything can be a RELATOR, as long as it is a functional element that finds itself in between the predicate and its subject, in a structure of the type in (1). It is here that our approach to the syntax of predication differs perhaps most profoundly from the structurally entirely parallel proposal in Bowers (1993). Bowers represents the syntax of predication in terms of a structure identical with (1a), and he has the functional head of (1a) perform precisely the same syntactic and semantic functions that I am ascribing to the RELATOR. But Bowers is explicit in recognising the mediator head as ‘a new functional category’ (Bowers 1993:593). He gives it the category label ‘Pr’, ‘a mnemonic for predication’ (Bowers 1993:595), and makes it clear that ‘Pr’ is present in the syntactic representation of all predication constructions and is never to be identified with any of the extant functional or lexical categories.

For us, by contrast, the RELATOR in the structure of predicational relationships in (1) is an *abstract* functional head — not a novel lexical category, not even a specific functional element (like T or D or some such), but a place-holder for *any* functional head in the structure that mediates a predication relation between two terms. That head can be the copula (as in *the earth must be round*) or a prepositional element (as in *they take him for a fool* or *they regard him as a strong president*; cf. also Aarts 1992, Bowers 1993, Starke 1995), but it can also be T (or Infl), as in *John walks*, or indeed any head that relates a predicate to its subject, including functional heads in the A'-domain of the sentence (such as Topic and Focus). So one thing that is important to bear in mind throughout the discussion to follow is that ‘RELATOR’ is not a designated category on our assumptions: the RP structures in (1) represent a *syntactic configuration* rather than a claim about the lexicon.

The choice between candidates for the RELATOR function is made on the basis of factors extraneous to the predication relationship to be established. Since topicalisation is a phenomenon of the left periphery (as the Italianate ‘cartographic’ literature has shown in great detail), the relationship between a topic (or ‘logical subject’) and the comment (its predicate) is established via a functional head in the left periphery, commonly referred to as Top⁰. But the predication relationship between a VP and its external argument is not a thing of the left periphery: it is established down low, via the mediation of what has come to be known as the ‘light verb’ *v*, as in (2b). That it is precisely *v* that is responsible for the establishment of the predication relationship between *Mary* and *reads scary fairy tales* is because (a) this relationship must be established low in the tree (hence cannot be mediated by a functional head in the left periphery) and (b) the verb root *read* needs to be identified as a *verbal* category (thinking of Marantz 1997 and subsequent work in Distributed Morphology), which it will be thanks to having its projection merge with the *verbal* light head *v*. The choice between, say, Top⁰ and *v* as the mediator of a particular subject–predicate relationship, then, is made entirely on the basis of considerations that do not in any obvious sense have anything directly to do with that relationship itself.

- (2) a. Mary reads scary fairy tales
 b. [_{RP} [_{DP} *Mary*] [RELATOR=*v* [_{VP} *reads scary fairy tales*]]]

In copular sentences such as (3a), *this butterfly is big*, the subject–predicate relationship is established with the aid of a copula as the RELATOR in a (1a)-type structure of the type, as depicted in (2b). Here, we need a copula to provide T with ‘support’; that the copula does not in any sense bring in a vital contribution to the semantics or even the syntax of this sentence is particularly clear from the fact that in scores of languages (including Semitic, Slavic and Hungarian), no copula will in fact be called upon in this context: in these languages, the RELATOR remains empty because there is nothing in the morphosyntax that forces any lexical material to appear under it. In English, too, we often find that the RELATOR remains unrealised. Thus, once the predication in (3) is embedded under a verb such as *consider* or *believe*, no copula is called for: *I consider this butterfly big* is perfectly fine, as is well known.

- (3) a. this butterfly is big
 b. $[_{RP} [_{DP} \textit{this butterfly}] [_{RELATOR=be} [_{AP} \textit{big}]]]$

In cases of attributive adjectival modification such as (4a), *this big butterfly*, the RELATOR connecting the adjectival predicate to its subject in the (1b)-type structure shown in (4b) once again remains abstract because there is nothing that forces it to be overt: in particular, *butterfly*, as the head of the complex noun phrase, is perfectly capable of getting its Case feature checked. But in the structure of (5a), *this butterfly is big for a butterfly*, we need an overt lexicalisation of the RELATOR that links the AP of *big* to its subject *a butterfly*: the prepositional element *for*. The microscopic difference between (3b) and the relevant part of (5b) is that in (3b) the predication relation between the AP and the projection of *butterfly* is established within a DP of which *butterfly* is the head, with the D-head ‘communicating’ to the external syntax and enabling *butterfly* to get its uninterpretable features checked in its syntactic environment (in (3a), against T); but in (5b), the subject of the AP is itself a full-fledged DP, in need, by the Case Filter, of a Case-feature check; and with feature checking being a local affair,² something inside the inner RP in (5b) needs to have the ability to get *a butterfly*’s uninterpretable Case feature checked. That ‘something’ is *for*, which lexicalises the RELATOR–head of the inner RP in the structure in (5b).

- (4) a. this big butterfly
 b. $[_{DP} \textit{this} [_{RP} [_{AP} \textit{big}] [_{RELATOR=\emptyset} [_{NP} \textit{butterfly}]]]]]$
 (5) a. this butterfly is big for a butterfly
 b. $[_{RP} [_{DP} \textit{this butterfly}] [_{RELATOR=be} [_{RP} [_{AP} \textit{big}] [_{R'} \textit{RELATOR=for} [_{DP} \textit{a butterfly}]]]]]]]$

So we see that, throughout, the surface realisation of the RELATOR depends, in each case, on factors (notably, the checking of morphosyntactic features) which are extraneous to the establishment of the subject–predicate relationship *per se*. But regardless of whether or not there is an *overt* reflex of the RELATOR, every predication relationship will systematically involve a syntactic structure in which this relation is mediated by a RELATOR, in one of the two ways in (1).

3 The non-directionality of predication

The two incarnations of the RELATOR phrase in (1a) and (1b) differ, as we pointed out before, with respect to whether the subject or the predicate takes the specifier position of the RELATOR phrase, with the other position (i.e., the complement of the RELATOR) being occupied by the other relatum. (1a) is a perfectly canonical, standard and uneventful case of the subject sitting in the specifier position; (1b) is a more unusual situation, with the hierarchical relation between the subject and the predicate reversed in comparison to (1a). Students of predication customarily include a directionality clause in their ‘predicate linking rule’ (Rothstein 1983), stipulating that (in English) the predicate must follow the subject and thereby outlawing (1b) (for English). But it should be plain that there is no *a priori* reason to expect there to be any directionality requirement on predication relationships in the base: both (1a) and (1b) are well-formed as far as syntax and semantics are concerned. We are convinced that (1a) and (1b) *are* indeed both grammatical, and we will make heavy use of this. But since (1b) is historically rather extraordinary, it is incumbent on us to spend a little more time motivating (1b) and expelling pre-conceived views on the kinds of examples that we take to instantiate it.

2 In particular, no feature-checking relation can be established across a phase boundary; since RP, being propositional, is a quintessential phase (see Den Dikken, to appear, for detailed discussion), and since *a butterfly* is ‘trapped’ in the domain of the (inner) RP, nothing outside the (inner) RP in (5b) should ever be able to check *a butterfly*’s features.

3.1 Attribution is ‘reverse’ predication

We have already come across two examples to which we have assigned structures of the type in (1b): the examples in (4) and (5) each involve an instance of this structure. One may not be convinced at this point, however, that *a big butterfly* and *big for a butterfly* are indeed predication relationships. The standard approach to examples of the type in (5a) in the generative literature is doubtless the one proposed by Higginbotham (1985:564). He claims that in noun phrases like *a big butterfly*, the adjective’s external θ -role is θ -identified with the head noun’s θ -role; and he assumes further that the adjective’s θ -grid may include a second θ -role as well: the one realised by what he calls the ‘attribute’ in the *for*-phrase of (5a)). Thus, Higginbotham takes the *for*-phrase in (5a) to be an argument of the adjective, and he assigns the adjective’s second θ -role ‘to the very noun [*butterfly*] itself’ via what he calls ‘autonomous θ -marking’. But the invention of ‘autonomous θ -marking’ extends the already quite substantial inventory of thematic relations in Higginbotham’s (1985) theory. Moreover, any form of θ -marking of a lexical head (‘the very noun itself’, as Higginbotham put it) should raise suspicion. Besides, it is vanishingly likely that the attribute could indeed be accommodated as a θ -dependent of the adjective: it certainly could not be its internal argument, in the light of examples such as (6), where *at math* serves as the adjective’s internal argument already.

(6) she is good at math for a five-year-old

There is little to be gained in pursuing the ‘autonomous θ -marking’ approach to attributes, therefore. Our alternative in (5b) does not need any additional type of θ -marking: it simply assimilates the relationship between *big* and *a butterfly* to the familiar relationship of predication; the only ‘unusual’ thing about this particular predication relationship is that it has the subject and the predicate ‘in the reverse order’ — something which we might call ‘reverse predication’. But arguably, such ‘reverse predication’ is by no means rare in the grammar. We submit (although we do not have space to go into this here³) that so-called attributive modification is in fact a garden-variety case of predication; and so is Higginbotham’s ‘autonomous θ -marking’, as we just discussed.⁴ In addition, there are several cases of ‘reverse predication’ featuring nominal predicates, including for instance *we have a fool for a president*; and it is more than likely that adverbial modification in the clause involves ‘reverse predication’ as well — especially if Cinque (1999) is right that adverbial modifiers originate in designated specifier positions of functional heads, with those F-heads then serving as RELATORS of the predication relationship between the adverbial and the verbal extended projection that it is construed with.

3 See Den Dikken (to appear: chapter 2) for more detailed discussion of both the syntax and the semantics of ‘attributive modification’ and for a demonstration of the fact that it does indeed reduce to predication, even in cases (such as *a beautiful dancer* on its non-intersective reading) for which it has often been deemed not to. (See also Szabó 2001 for a purely semantically based argument to the same effect.)

4 By treating ‘autonomous θ -marking’ and attributive modification on a par as instances of ‘reverse predication’, we immediately accomplish the desired semantic equivalence relationship between the two phenomena. Higginbotham (1985:563) notes explicitly that *a big butterfly* and (*that butterfly is*) *big for a butterfly* have the same meaning, differing as a pair from *that butterfly is big*. Only the former two force ‘grading with respect to the attribute given in N’ (Higginbotham 1985:563) as part of their meaning. Let us take it, then, that *a big butterfly* and *big for a butterfly* are semantically equivalent when it comes to the relationship between *big* and *butterfly*. With the analysis in (5b) as the representation of sentences of the type in (5a), this helps confirm a structure for attributive adjectival modification as in (4b), in which, once again, the AP is generated as a predicate in the specifier position of the RELATOR phrase.

Suppose, now, that we raise the RELATOR in (7b) up to the RP–external copula. By Benveniste’s (1966) adage (cf. also Kayne 1993, Den Dikken 1995, Hoekstra 1996 etc.) that *have* is *be+P*, we then end up with *have* — a copular element with a P incorporated into it. The result of raising the prepositional RELATOR up to *be* in (7b) will hence be a *have+participle* construction: in other words, a periphrastic perfect (cf. (8)).

$$(8) \quad \begin{array}{l} [_{T'} be [_{RP} [_{VP} kissed John] [_{R'} [_{P} \emptyset] (=RELATOR) [_{DP} Mary]]]] \rightarrow \\ [_{TP} [_{DP} Mary]_j [_{T'} be+P_i=have [_{RP} [_{VP} kissed John] [_{R'} t_i t_j]]]] \end{array}$$

What the perfect shares with the passive is (i) the use of an auxiliary and (ii) the presence of a past participle in the complement of that auxiliary. The two differ, however, in the form of the auxiliary (*have* vs *be*) and, concomitantly, in the choice of noun phrase that raises to SpecTP. For passive (7b), we had just argued that *Mary* is ‘trapped’ inside the domain of the RP phase. But in *have*-perfects, the *head* of that RP phase itself raises up to the phase-external auxiliary, performing an operation which is sometimes referred to as ‘domain-extending head movement’. As a result of this movement operation, the specifier of the RELATOR’s base position (i.e., the participial VP) and the specifier of the RELATOR’s landing-site become *equidistant*, and movement of *Mary* across SpecRP into the specifier of the auxiliary *have* (= *be+P*) now becomes perfectly legitimate. In fact, it arguably becomes obligatory: with the auxiliary having turned into a Case checker (thanks to the incorporation of P into it), *have* will come to entertain a Case-checking Agree relationship with the object of the participle, *John*, which will now end up ‘frozen in place’; to get T’s uninterpretable features checked, the only option will then in fact be for *Mary* to raise up, exactly as desired. Again, therefore, the syntax falls out virtually automatically — the only substantive difference between passive and periphrastic perfective constructions turns out to be the fact that the RELATOR incorporates into the auxiliary in the latter; the rest just follows suit.⁶

4 The Romance causative construction (I): The transitive cases

Our central hypothesis that predication relationships are non-directional also affords us a novel perspective on the familiar alternation between (9a) and (9b): (9a) represents (1a), with the causee event as the DP–subject of a *vP* embedded in the complement of *laisser*, while (9b) realises (1b), with the causee base-generated as the complement of a dative \hat{a} , a prepositional incarnation of the RELATOR in a ‘reverse’ predication structure. We will revisit the details of the Romance causative construction in some detail against the background of this analysis, starting, naturally, with *transitive* causative constructions (for which the analysis is essentially picture-perfect) and then extending our reach gradually to *faire-par* and intransitive causatives.

$$(9) \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{a.} & \begin{array}{l} \text{Marie} \text{ laisse/*fait} \quad \text{Jean} \text{ manger la} \quad \text{soupe} \\ \text{Marie} \text{ lets/makes} \quad \text{Jean} \text{ eat} \quad \text{the} \quad \text{soup} \end{array} & \text{(French)} \\ & [_{VP2} [_{DP} CAUSER [_{VP} v_2 [_{VP} V_{CAUS} [_{TP} [_{DP} CAUSEE]_i T [_{VP1} t_i [_{VP} v_1 [_{VP} V_{Inf} OB]]]]]]]] \\ \text{b.} & \begin{array}{l} \text{Marie} \text{ laisse/fait} \quad \text{manger la} \quad \text{soupe} \quad \hat{a} \quad \text{Jean} \\ \text{Marie} \text{ lets/makes} \quad \text{eat} \quad \text{the} \quad \text{soup} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{Jean} \end{array} \\ & [_{VP} [_{DP} CAUSER [_{V'} v [_{VP} V_{CAUS} [_{RP} [_{VP} V_{Inf} OB] [_{R'} RELATOR=P(\hat{a}) [_{DP} CAUSEE]]]]]] \end{array}$$

6 This analysis is essentially parallel to Hoekstra’s (1996) approach to periphrastic perfects, also based on a structure of the type in (7b). Where Hoekstra’s proposal differs from ours is when it comes to the analysis of simple, non-perfective actives: Hoekstra derived those from a structure *à la* (7b) as well (see also Den Dikken 1996); but doing so incurs what seem to us to be insurmountable technical problems that are readily avoided if, for simple, non-perfective actives, one adopts a ‘straight’, canonical predication structure of the type in (7a).

4.1 Transitive causatives

Let us dig a little deeper into the pair in (9), and home in first of all on the fact that the light verb *v* and the VP must be adjacent — there can be no projection in between *v* and the root–VP. This is explicitly assumed, but not derived, in Chomsky (1995:Chapter 4). It can be made to fall out straightforwardly from the locality condition on predication stated in (10), which we have tacitly been assuming throughout.

- (10) *the locality of predication*
 a. the predicate is *locally linked* to the subject via a RELATOR
 b. the RELATOR accommodates the predicate and the subject in its MINIMAL DOMAIN

As a result of (10), the light verb *v* must take a *bare* predicate–VP as its complement. The verbal head of that VP will need to incorporate into *v* in order to be licensed — to ‘become’ a verb, in fact, on the assumption (made in Marantz 1997) that roots are category-neutral: the light verb *v* ‘makes’ a verb out of the lexical root. That *v*–V composite, now being explicitly verbal, depends on T for its licensing. Put differently, approaching the issue from the other direction, we can say that:

- (11) T identifies the RELATOR of the ‘causee’ and the infinitival VP in (9a) as a light verb *v*

So to legitimize the inclusion in the complement of *laisser* of the substructure in (9a), with the Chomskyan ‘light verb’ *v* as the RELATOR, we need to ensure that *laisser*’s complement includes a TP. The presence of the embedded T licenses the embedded *v*, and at the same time makes temporal adverbial modification and negation available inside the causative complement: the temporal adverbial modifiers can adjoin to TP (or be inserted in the specifier position of some TP–dependent functional projection of the Cinquean type), and sentential negation, which we know from Zanuttini’s (1997) work is dependent on tense, is legitimate as well. This is the desired result: the sentence in (12) is grammatical with *ne pas* included, and with *demain* modifying specifically the time of Jean’s eating his soup (not the time of Marie’s letting).

- (12) Marie laisse Jean (ne pas) manger la soupe (demain) (French)
 Marie lets Jean NEG not eat the soup tomorrow
 ‘Marie lets Jean (not) eat his soup (tomorrow)’

While in (12) negation and temporal adverbial modification of the caused event are fine thanks to the presence of an embedded TP, in (13) negation and temporal adverbial modification of the caused event are impossible.⁷

7 For Italian, this claim is basically beyond dispute (see esp. Guasti 1993:36ff.). For French, this is actually a contentious issue: Reed (1991:330), for instance, cites (ia–c) as grammatical. Significant here is the fact that all examples involve a cliticised causee, and that, in (ib), we are dealing with a causative complement that itself hosts a clitic — something which, in a genuine *faire*-infinitive causative, would be out of the question. With Reed (1996), we suspect that (ia,b) are not genuine *faire*-infinitive constructions (but ‘concealed’ ECM constructions instead, grammatical only if the causee cliticises: cf. the ill-formedness of (ib) with *Marie*; see Reed 1996 for further discussion). For (ic), the fact that the causee clitic has dative case (*lui*) makes an ECM analysis unavailable. Here, we suspect (though future research should check this more carefully) that we are not in fact dealing with a genuine sentential negation under *faire*. As Guasti (1993:36ff.) points out, Italian sentences with a *non* embedded in a *fare*-infinitive causative are sometimes marginally acceptable, but only if the negation is *not* interpreted as a *sentential* negation. Thus, she notes that, to the extent that Italian (iia,b) are grammatical at all, it only supports a reading with the quantified causee/embedded object scoping over the negation; a wide-scope reading for the negation is systematically unavailable for (ii). For French (ic), our suspicion is that we are likewise dealing with a narrow-scope, non-sentential reading of the negation.

- (13) Marie laisse (?*ne pas) manger la soupe (*demain) à Jean
 Marie lets NEG not eat the soup tomorrow to Jean

This reliably indicates that there is no TP present in the complement of *laisser* in (13)/(9b). The entire causative construction in (9b) has precisely one TP — and, concomitantly, since every *v* has to be licensed by its own T, there is exactly one *vP* as well. This means that the causee of the causative construction in (9b) cannot be introduced by a light verb: the single light verb present in the structure introduces the causer. Instead, the causativised event (denoted by the VP projected by the causativised verb) is linked to its subject via the other route: in a ‘reverse’ predication structure featuring a *prepositional* RELATOR, as depicted in (9b). This prepositionally headed RELATOR phrase serves as the complement to *laisser*, which is itself embedded in the familiar light verb environment.

The important thing to note when it comes to (9b) is that the empirical fact that no temporal adverbial modification or negation is possible in the causativised VP tells us that there is no TP present in the complement of *laisser* here, and that this, in turn, excludes the selection of a structure of the (1a)-type, with a T-dependent light verb *v* as *laisser*’s complement. We are effectively *forced* down the other route, that of the ‘reverse’ predication structure in (1b). In transitive causative constructions of the type in (9b), the RELATOR–head of this structure is lexicalised by the dative preposition *à*, a spell-out the RELATOR that, thanks to its being a preposition, can check the Case feature of the causee in its complement under Agree. The RELATOR in (9b) *has to* be spelled out by a Case-checking preposition to help out the causee since *v* is already engaged in a Case-checking Agree relationship with the causativised verb’s object.

That the matrix *v* is indeed in the business of checking the case of the causativised verb’s object is easily verified by looking at the passive counterparts of *faire*-infinitive constructions. The clearest picture is offered by Italian, from which we will therefore take our initial exemplification. As is well known (cf. Burzio 1986), an Italian *fare*-infinitive causative such as (14a) can be ‘long-passivised’ as in (14b). Its Spanish counterpart can, too: cf. (15).

- (i) a. (par ses incantations,) le sorcier l’a fait ne pas
 by his incantations the sorcerer him-has made NEG not
 se sentir bien pendant des jours
 SE feel well during some days
 ‘(through his incantations,) the sorcerer made him not feel well for days’
 b. les doutes que j’ai à son égard <l’>ont fait ne pas
 the doubts that I-have to his respect her-have made NEG not
 lui parler <*Marie> pendant une semaine
 to-him speak Marie during a week
 ‘the doubts that I have about him made her/*Marie not speak to him for a week’
 c. ce genre d’attitude ne peut que leur faire ne pas
 this type of-attitude NEG can only to-them make NEG not
 prendre au sérieux une situation qui est cependant grave
 take to-the serious a situation which is nonetheless important
 ‘this kind of attitude can only make them not take seriously a situation which is nonetheless important’
- (ii) a. ?*quel professore ha fatto non superare l’esame a molti studenti
 that professor has made NEG pass the-exam to many students
 ‘that professor made many students not pass the exam’
 b. ?*quel professore ha fatto non superare molti esami a Gianni
 that professor has made NEG pass many exams to Gianni
 ‘that professor made Gianni not pass many exams’

- (14) a. Maria ha fatto riparare la macchina a Gianni (It.)
 Maria has made fix the car to Gianni
 ‘Maria made Gianni fix the car’
- b. la macchina è stata fatta riparare a Gianni
 the car is been made fix to Gianni
- (15) a. el Papa hizo construir la catedral (Sp.)
 the Pope made build the cathedral
 ‘the Pope had the cathedral built’
- b. la catedral fue hecha construir por el Papa
 the cathedral was made build by the Pope

But for French, it is routinely claimed in the literature (including Burzio 1986) that such long passives are ungrammatical (cf. (16b)). Bouvier (2000) points out, however, that they do in fact come out well-formed so long as the participle *fait* does not have to agree with the object — i.e., whenever the object does not raise or, if it does raise, is masculine. This is illustrated in (16b’,c).

- (16) a. Marie a fait faire {une jupe/un pantalon} (Fr.)
 Marie has made make a skirt/a pants
 ‘Marie had a skirt made’
- b. *une jupe a été fait(e) faire
 a skirt has been made-3SF make
- b’. un pantalon a été fait faire
 a pants has been made make
- c. il a été fait faire {une jupe/un pantalon}
 it_{EXPL} has been made make a skirt/a pants

It remains somewhat unclear exactly what is responsible for the restrictions on ‘long passivisation’ of *faire*-infinitive constructions in French. But it is plain that the phenomenon as such is not unattested in French; we take it to be a general property of *faire*-infinitive constructions across Romance.

To return to the point that these examples are supposed to make, let us remind ourselves that in the analysis of the *faire*-infinitive construction, the object of the causativised verb gets its Case feature checked against the matrix ‘light verb’ *v*. Passivisation of the matrix clause robs this *v* of its Case-assigning potential, on entirely standard assumptions. Hence it is immediately predicted that passivisation of the causative matrix clause in a *faire*-infinitive construction leads to ascension of the embedded object to matrix subject, which is indeed what we find.

Since the matrix *v* is engaged in the checking of the lower object’s Case feature, it will be impossible for the causee of a transitive causative to check its Case feature against the matrix *v*. And as we pointed out before, the immediate consequence of this is that a prepositional spell-out of the RELATOR head is called upon to take care of the Case-licensing of the causee. This is what gives rise to the familiar but hitherto unsatisfactorily explained fact that the causee is dative-marked in transitive causative constructions of the *faire*-infinitive type.

The alternation between (9a) and (9b), then, is very much like that between active and passive sentences: an alternation between ‘straight’ and ‘reverse’ predication constructions of types (1a) and (1b), respectively, with the RELATOR head of the ‘reverse’ structure being spelled out as a preposition. At this juncture, we are naturally led to say something about the analysis of *faire-par* causatives — variants of the transitive *faire*-infinitive construction that look deceptively similar to the *faire*-infinitive construction on the surface and which do indeed share an important structural chunk in their syntax, but which nonetheless have a structure that differs in non-trivial ways from that of the *faire*-infinitive construction.

4.2 Faire-par causatives

In the previous section, we likened the alternation between *laisser*+ECM and *laisser*+à causatives to the alternation between active and passive sentences: a choice, in effect, between the structures in (1a) and (1b); hence another piece of support for the general program that we are pursuing in this paper, the non-directionality of predication. Notice, however, that though both passive and *faire*-infinitive constructions have a prepositional RELATOR in a ‘reverse’ predication structure, the spell-out of the RELATOR is actually different in the two cases: French passives do not use the dative preposition *à* to introduce the external argument but instead employ *par* ‘by’. As is well known, that latter preposition can also be used in causative constructions to introduce the causee — in the so-called *faire-par* construction:

- (17) Marie laisse/fait manger la soupe par Jean
 Marie lets/makes eat the soup by Jean

Does this mean that there is simply a choice when it comes to how to spell out the RELATOR in the structure underneath (9b)? Or is there more to this alternation between *à* and *par*?

Let us start by making one thing perfectly clear from the outset: the preposition *par* in (17) is indeed the lexicalisation of the RELATOR in a ‘reverse’ predication structure whose specifier is the causativised VP and whose complement is *Jean*. This part of the structure the two causative constructions do indeed share. But we would not want to say that the two constructions have perfectly identical structures and that the difference between (9b) and (17) comes down to a lexical accident: the choice of preposition to spell out the RELATOR. The reasons for this are twofold: (i) there are reasons to believe that the choice of prepositional spell-out of the RELATOR is not, in fact, random but governed by selectional restrictions, and (ii) there are clear indications that the *faire-par* construction is subject to restrictions that are significantly different from those that the *faire*-infinitive causative is subject to.

Let us start with (i) — the fact that the choice of prepositional RELATOR is determined by selection. For the *faire*-infinitive construction, this point can be easily established. In the structure of the *faire*-infinitive construction (cf. (9b)), the RELATOR phrase that connects the causativised VP to the causee is the complement of the causative matrix verb *faire*. The properties of the RELATOR in this structure are therefore going to be determined by the selectional restrictions imposed by *faire*. And we know independently, from triadic constructions of the type in (18),⁸ that *faire* and its counterparts in the other Romance languages selects the preposition *à*.

- (18) a. Marie lui fait un cadeau/plaisir/baiser/sourire/... (Fr.)
 Marie to-him makes a present/pleasure/kiss/smile/...
 b. i ragazzi hanno fatto uno scherzo al professore (It.)
 the boys have made a prank to-the professor
 c. ho fatto un regalo a Gianni (It.)
 I-have made a present to Gianni
 d. hizo un regalo a Juan (Sp.)
 (s)he-made a present to Juan

To triadic constructions of this type, we assign a structure in which the direct and indirect objects are related to each other via a prepositional RELATOR, in much the same way as the caused event and the causee are connected in *faire*-infinitive constructions (a small-clause analysis that goes back in essence to Kayne 1984 but updates it from the perspective of the central hypothesis of this paper):

8 (18b,c) were taken from Guasti (1993:95,97).

- (19) $[_{VP} faire [_{RP} [_{DP} un\ cadeau/plaisir/baiser/sourire\dots] [RELATOR=\grave{a} [_{DP} Jean]]]]]$

The RELATOR in (19) must be spelled out as a Case-checking preposition, for otherwise its DP-complement fails to get its Case feature checked (the matrix *v* already being engaged in the checking of the Case feature of its closest ‘goal’, the indirect object in SpecRP). That much is guaranteed by the Case Filter. The specific choice of preposition is *not* guaranteed by the Case Filter: for all the Case Filter cares, *any* Case-checking preposition would do. But since the RELATOR in (19) is the head of *faire*’s complement, it is the verb that ends up having a say in the selection of the preposition: *faire* selects *\grave{a}*, so that is why the RELATOR is spelled out as *\grave{a}*. And by the same token, the choice of prepositional lexicalisation of the RELATOR in the *faire*-infinitive causative construction, where the RP is once again the complement of *faire*, is determined by the matrix verb under selection.

We are not saying anything particularly remarkable or ground-breaking here, obviously: the link between *faire*-infinitive causatives and triadic constructions with *faire* such as (18a) has a venerable tradition in the literature [give REFS]. What does bear stressing, though, is that this particular link falls out entirely naturally from the analysis of *faire*-infinitive and triadic *faire* constructions on the analysis that we are presenting here — there is no need for the *ad hoc* creation of a position for a preposition (at S-structure, which is where the Case Filter is traditionally taken to apply): the *position* is there all along, and it is needed for the purposes of relating the two major constituents of the small clause in the complement of *faire*; the fact that the position needs to be spelled out as a preposition in some cases (particularly, in ‘reverse’ predications in which the complement of the RELATOR is a Case-dependent DP) is straightforwardly recast as a function of Case, as on other approaches that take *\grave{a}* to be a Case-checking/assigning ‘dummy’ but without the complication incurred by previous analyses that the position for the preposition would have to be merged within a larger structure (thereby violating cyclicity).

This said, let us return to *faire-par* causatives, the actual topic of this subsection. Since we have just presented an argument leading to the conclusion that the RELATOR is spelled out as *\grave{a}* when it is selected by the verb *faire* (cf. (20a) for the *faire*-infinitive construction), it will be plain that we cannot assume, for the *faire-par* construction, that the RELATOR phrase whose head is spelled out as *par* is itself the complement of the causative verb: there are no counterparts to sentences of the type in (18a) featuring *par* instead of *\grave{a}* in French, nor are there any such sentences in the other Romance languages; *faire* and its ilk simply do not select *par*. So we cannot assign *faire-par* causatives a structure in which the RELATOR phrase linking the caused event to the causee originates as the complement of the causative matrix verb: (20b) must be ill-formed; we would minimally need one functional projection between the matrix verb and the RELATOR phrase, as in (20c), in order to ‘shield’ the RELATOR from the selectional restrictions imposed by the causative verb.

- (20) a. $[_{VP} faire [_{RP} [_{VP} manger\ la\ soupe] [RELATOR=\grave{a} [_{DP} Jean]]]]]$
 b. $*[_{VP} faire [_{RP} [_{VP} manger\ la\ soupe] [RELATOR=par [_{DP} Jean]]]]]$
 c. $[_{VP} faire [_{FP} F [_{RP} [_{VP} manger\ la\ soupe] [RELATOR=par [_{DP} Jean]]]]]]]$

Fortunately, it turns out that there is in fact independent evidence for the presence of a functional projection between the matrix causative verb and the RELATOR phrase in *faire-par* constructions — evidence which has the additional virtue of allowing us to pinpoint the nature of the functional projection in question. The evidence comes from the observation, going back in the literature on French causatives to Cannings & Moody (1978), that there are restrictions on the kinds of verbs that can be used in the complement of *faire* in the *faire-par* causative — restrictions which do not manifest themselves in the corresponding *faire*-infinitive causatives. Thus, while (21a) is grammatical with either *\grave{a}* or *par*, (21b) works only with *\grave{a}*.⁹

9 The contrast between (21a,b) was noted by Authier & Reed (2002:8–9).

- (21) a. j'ai fait examiner mon nouvel ordinateur à/par Jean (Fr.)
 I-have made examine my new computer to/by Jean
 'I had Jean examine my new computer'
- b. j'ai fait voir mon nouvel ordinateur à/*par Jean
 I-have made see my new computer to/by Jean

The difference between (21a) and (21b) resides entirely with the infinitival verb: *examiner* vs. *voir*. And that difference is routinely cast in terms of the semantic notion of 'affectedness': while *examiner* takes an affected object, *voir* does not. 'Affectedness' is a very tricky notion, being used in a variety of not necessarily compatible ways in the literature. But typically, an affected object is one that undergoes a change of state or location, and which, by virtue thereof, delimits the event (i.e., the event is complete when the change of state or location has come about).¹⁰ Clearly, the object of *voir* 'see' is not an affected object by this criterion: being seen does not involve a change of state or location; and the combination of *voir* and its object does not make a delimited event (cf. the awkwardness of modifying such an event with a time-frame adverbial of the *in x amount of time* type). By contrast, the object of *examiner* 'examine' can be an affected object: one can examine or check a computer *in x amount of time*, and as a result of checking a computer one can make that computer undergo a change of state (as Authier & Reed 2002:8 put it, 'its status changes from "unknown" to being in good condition' — or, at least, it *can* so change).

Guasti (1993:103) makes the case for an affectedness restriction on *faire-par* causatives in particular detail, on the basis of Italian facts.¹¹ We include some of Guasti's examples in (22).

- (22) a. il sindacato ha fatto perdere il lavoro agli/*dagli operai
 the union has made lose the work to-the/by-the workers (It.)
 'the union made the workers lose their job'
- b. quell'affare ha fatto guadagnare molto denaro a/*da Ugo
 that-deal has made earn much money to/by Ugo
 'that deal made Ugo earn a lot of money'
- c. Maria ha fatto vincere il premio a/*da Franco
 Maria has made win the prize to/by Franco
 'Maria made Franco win the prize'
- d. ho fatto credere quella storia a/*da Gianni
 I-have made believe that story to/by Gianni
 'I made Gianni believe that story'

Here again, the choice of infinitival verb is crucial, and it is the relationship between that verb and the embedded object that determines the fate of the variants with *da* 'by': in (22), the infinitive is not an 'affecting' verb, it does not take an 'affected' object;¹² as a result, *da* cannot be chosen as the link between the caused event and the causee.

10 On event delimitation as the key criterion for affectedness, see Tenny (1994).

11 She ascribes the observation to Seuren (1973) (not in her bibliography) and Marcantonio (1981), which we have not seen.

12 The notion of 'affectedness' needed to make this generalisation stick does not seem to be one in terms of event delimitation — it is certainly fine to add an *in x amount of time* adverbial to predications such as *lose their job* or *earn a lot of money*. But the fact that the object does not undergo a change of state or location in these cases makes it fail to qualify as an affected object. Guasti shows that the microscopic notion of 'affectedness' needed for the Romance *faire-par* construction appears to be the one that is also needed for 'passive nominals' (*the city's destruction*; cf. Anderson 1977) — see esp. her fn. 51 on p. 177 on certain asymmetries between middles (also subject to some notion of 'affectedness') and 'passive nominals', with *faire-par* siding with the latter.

A particularly interesting near-minimal pair that highlights the significance of affectedness in the domain of the *faire-par* causative is the French pair in (23), from Cannings & Moody (1978:343–44).

- (23) a. nous avons fait résoudre ce problème à nos étudiants
 we have made solve this problem by our students
 b. nous avons fait résoudre ce problème par nos collègues
 we have made solve this problem by our colleagues

As they discuss (see also Authier & Reed 2002:9), (23a) is appropriate in a context in which the problem may or may not have been previously solved, while (23b) is only felicitous in a context in which the problem had not been solved before. In other words, for (23b) to be acceptable, the object of *résoudre* ‘solve’ must be interpreted as undergoing a change of state, from unsolved to solved; no such requirement is operative in (23a).

We take it to have been established herewith, therefore, that the *faire-par* construction is subject to a restriction which the *faire*-infinitive causative is not subject to: the affectedness condition. How do we make this follow from the analysis? It seems to us that the fact that we saw ourselves forced to include a functional projection between the matrix causative verb and the RELATOR phrase leads us to a straightforward answer to this question. In particular, the fact that the object of the infinitive must be interpreted as an affected object can be blamed on the fact that there is a particular type of functional projection between *faire* and the infinitival VP — specifically, an *aspectual* functional projection. To set this up, we will allow ourselves a slight detour into the realm of so-called ‘take’ serial verb constructions (‘take’–SVCs for short).¹³

‘Take’–SVCs (found in languages, creoles and pidgins in West Africa, the Caribbean and the Far East; see e.g. Baker 1989 and references cited there) are constructions featuring multiple verbs in sequence, with a verb corresponding to English *take* in first position and with a noun phrase sandwiched between the ‘take’ verb and the second verb. These constructions receive a single-event interpretation generally rendered in languages such as English with the aid of a resultative secondary predication construction. Two examples are given in (24), with (24a) taken from Fongbè (a West African language; cf. Lefebvre 1988, 1991) and (24b) from Mandarin Chinese (cf. e.g. Sybesma 1992).

- (24) a. Kòkú só àsó dó távò-jí (Fongbè)
 Koku take crab put table-on
 ‘Koku put the crab on the table’
 b. Zhang San ba pangxie fang zai zhuozi-shang (Mandarin)
 Zhang San take crab put at table-top
 ‘Zhang San put the crab on the table’

What is relevant for our purposes in this subsection is that, as Lefebvre (1991:64) was the first to point out in detail for Fongbè, the noun phrase sandwiched between the ‘take’ verb and the second verb of a ‘take’–SVC must be an affected object.¹⁴ Thus, while (24a) is perfectly well-formed (since the sandwiched noun phrase, *àsó* ‘crab’ undergoes a change of location and hence qualifies as ‘affected’), (25) is not: ‘receive’ is not an affecting verb, as is also apparent from the fact that, in English, it resists middle and ‘passive nominal’ formation (cf. **money receives easily* and **the money’s receipt/reception*).

13 The discussion to follow is based on Den Dikken & Sybesma (1998).

14 Lefebvre actually says specifically that the second verb requires a Theme of change of location, but in several of her grammatical examples of *take*–SVCs in Fongbè, classifying the sandwiched noun phrase as a Theme of change of location would be a major stretch. DaCruz (1992) reports that the sandwiched noun phrase in Fongbè can also be a Theme of change of state. Claire Lefebvre (p.c.) tells us that there is apparently systematic speaker variation on this score.

- (25) *Kòkú só àkwé yi Àsíbá (Fongbè)
 Koku take money receive Asiba

Den Dikken & Sybesma (1998) point out that the Mandarin *ba*-construction (illustrated in (24b)) is like Fongbè ‘take’–SVCs with respect to the affectedness requirement. The Mandarin facts are particularly helpful when it comes to the analysis of this affectedness effect. In Mandarin *ba*-constructions whose second verb takes a resultative secondary predicate that is *incorporated* into the verb (as in (26a,b)), we invariably see the aspectual particle *le* (glossed as ‘PRF’) show up to the immediate right of the incorporated secondary predicate.

- (26) a. wo ba tang he-guang-le (Mandarin)
 I take soup drink-up-PRF
 ‘I finished the soup’
 b. wo ba Zhang San gan-zou-le
 I take Zhang San chase-away-PRF
 ‘I chased Zhang San away’

This particle *le* marks completion or delimitation of the event, and is plausibly analysed as an overt representative of the functional category Asp (see Den Dikken & Sybesma 1998:12 and references cited there). Now, since this particle *le* occurs on the *second* verb in (26a,b) and forms a morphological unit with it, one is led to postulate a structure for *ba*-constructions of this type involving an AspP *below* the matrix ‘take’ verb *ba* — in other words, one is led to assign these constructions a structure of the type in (27). It is this AspP between the ‘take’ verb and the embedded VP that will now take care of the particle *le* in (26). And it can also be held responsible for the affectedness effect found in ‘take’–SVCs. In particular, with this AspP in place, we can derive the affectedness effect by saying that the object of the second verb must raise into the specifier position of this AspP in the course of the derivation, and that by establishing this relationship with Asp, the object of the second verb ends up being interpreted as an affected object. This ensures the affectedness condition on ‘take’–SVCs in a straightforward fashion. Notice that this analysis has the additional advantage of delivering the desired surface word order of ‘take’–SVCs as well: by raising to SpecAspP in the overt syntax, the object of the second verb comes to be sandwiched between the ‘take’ verb and the downstairs verb.

- (27) [‘take’_{[AspP DP_i [Asp(=le)_[VP V t_i (...)]]]]]}

We adopt this configurational approach to affectedness, and assume (updating the Spec–Head based account of Den Dikken & Sybesma 1998) that affected objects are noun phrases that establish an Agree relationship with the aspectual head Asp (raising overtly to SpecAspP iff Asp has an ‘EPP–property’, which it does in serialising languages). And with this approach to affectedness in place, we may then return to the fact that in *faire-par* causatives, the object of the infinitival verb must be interpreted as an affected object. The account of this fact should now be straightforward. We had already been led to adopt a gross structure for *faire-par* causatives in which the causative verb and the RELATOR phrase linking the caused event to the causee are separated by a functional projection. If we now identify this functional projection as AspP, we derive the affectedness condition on *faire-par* constructions in a way that is entirely parallel to the account of the affectedness condition on ‘take’–SVCs: there is an Asp–head in the matrix verb’s complement, and this Asp–head engages in an Agree relationship with the embedded object (the only noun phrase that it can actually ‘see’: the causee is embedded in the domain of the RP phase in Asp’s complement), thereby forcing the embedded object to be interpreted as an affected object. We thus update the structure of *faire-par* causatives as in (28) (which now replaces our tentative (20c), above).

(28) $[_{VP} faire [_{AspP} Asp [_{RP} [_{VP} manger la soupe] [RELATOR=par [_{DP} Jean]]]]]$

The postulation of an aspectual projection AspP below *faire* in the *faire-par* construction has the additional advantage of shedding light on the specific choice of preposition lexicalising the RELATOR head: *par*.¹⁵ It is surely not an accident that the RELATOR is spelled out as *par* ‘by’ precisely in the complement of the aspectual head Asp — arguably, this aspectual head is also present in the structure of *passive* constructions to license the *participial* form of the main verb. This is something we had suppressed in our earlier discussion of the passive from the perspective of the structures in (1): all that mattered at that point in the paper was that the subject and the predicate are linked in a ‘reverse’ predication structure in passives, with the RELATOR perforce being spelled out overtly as a Case-checking preposition. We did not comment there on (i) the choice of preposition or (ii) the fact that the main verb in passives is a past participle. The two are intrinsically related, we believe: it is the presence of Asp outside the RELATOR phrase of a passive sentence that checks the past-participial feature of the main verb and which, at the same time, puts its stamp on the choice of spell-out of the RELATOR. The analysis of passives can now be updated as in (29) (which replaces (7b)).

(29) $[be [_{AspP} Asp [_{RP} [_{VP} kissed John] [RELATOR=by [_{DP} Mary]]]]]$

The generalisation that presents itself at this point is that *by* and its ilk will spell out the RELATOR head of a ‘reverse’ predication of type (1b) whenever the RELATOR phrase is the complement of the aspectual head Asp — a simple generalisation that covers both passive and *faire-par* causative constructions, but interestingly, *without* making the latter actually involve passivisation, which is a good result. After all, despite surface appearances, *faire-par* causatives do *not* behave like passives in (i) not featuring a past-participial verb and (ii) being subject to the affectedness condition. The fact that there is no past-participial morphology in the *faire-par* causative is a consequence of the fact that the particular Asp-head embedded under *faire* lacks this feature, while the Asp-head in passives does have this feature. Apparently concomitantly, the Asp-head of passives does not cause the underlying object to be an affected object, while the Asp of *faire-par* causatives does. We conjecture (though we hasten to add that we cannot *prove* this idea at this time) that it is indeed no accident that the Asp-head does either of two things: (a) check participial morphology or (b) trigger affectedness — we suspect that this is because Asp⁰ is maximally endowed with *one* set of formal features, either [+participle] or [+affected].¹⁶

Two more things need to be addressed before we can leave *faire-par* causatives behind. One is the question of what the embedded object of such causatives checks its case against, and the other concerns the (im)possibility of additional functional structure between the causative matrix verb and the AspP for which we have just presented an extended argument. We will address these two points in turn — dwelling on them in a little bit of detail because, to our knowledge, these points have not received due attention in the literature to date.

15 Authier & Reed’s (2002) analysis, which is similar in spirit to our proposal overall, does not have this benefit. They try to tie the affectedness effect to the presence in their structure of *faire-par* constructions of an *applicative* functional head; but this choice of functional head seems particularly ill-suited: it does not get the choice of preposition right (applicative constructions in Romance being dative constructions, not constructions featuring *par* ‘by’), and it does not actually seem to deliver the affectedness effect either since the relationship between applicatives and affectedness is less than straightforward: applied objects, while eligible for NP-raising in passives, robustly resist raising in middle and ‘passive nominal’ constructions, for instance (*children were given books* vs. **children give books easily*, **the children’s gift of books*).

16 The Asp-head of ‘take’-SVCs is like the Asp-head of *faire-par* constructions in not checking participial morphology and, instead, triggering an affectedness effect.

Now that we have isolated, outside the causativised VP, a functional projection for aspect, an interesting question that presents itself is whether or not the head of that projection plays a role in checking the embedded object’s Case feature. The question is plainly not a straightforward one. The literature is not in agreement on whether aspect is or should not be responsible for the checking of accusative Case. There are proposals in the literature that equate *v* with Asp, and take Asp/*v* to be the checker of accusative Case; but there are also caveats: Asp can clearly be present in contexts in which no accusative Case is being checked (such as passive and unaccusative/ergative constructions: in the former we need Asp for the checking of the main verb’s [+participle] feature; in the latter, the fact that the deep object is typically interpreted as an affected object implicates Asp). From our point of view, which takes the Chomskyan ‘light verb’ *v* to be a RELATOR while it does not assign Asp this function (clearly, in (28) and (29) Asp is not a RELATOR of a predicate and its subject), it makes no sense to equate *v* and Asp: the two are quintessentially different entities. But that in and of itself does not settle the score on whether Asp could or could not check accusative Case. That is plainly a separate question — an empirical one, and, moreover, one which *faire-par* causatives have the power to settle in principle.

To probe into the question of whether the Asp-head in the structure in (28) takes care of the checking of the embedded object’s accusative Case feature, what we need to do is construct *faire-par* causatives whose matrix clause is *passive*. We know that passivisation ‘annulls’ *v*’s Case-checking potential; but it cannot affect whatever Case-checking capabilities the Asp-head in *faire*’s complement might have. So if we find that ‘long passives’ are grammatical in *faire-par* causatives, that tells us that the matrix *v* and not the embedded Asp-head is responsible for the checking of the embedded object’s Case feature; if, on the other hand, we find that ‘long passives’ are impossible with *faire-par*, while we know that they *are* in fact grammatical in *faire*-infinitive constructions (recall (14)–(16)), this suggests that the embedded object checks Case against Asp, a Case-checking relationship that is unaffected by passivisation of the matrix clause and which hence prevents the embedded object from being promoted to matrix subject. This is the logic of the argument. Now let us see what the facts are.

Let us begin by noting that there is nothing wrong with (30), the counterpart of (14b), above, with *da* replacing *a*. But the grammaticality of (30) actually tells us very little: by just looking at the surface form, we cannot tell whether the *da*-phrase in this example belongs ‘upstairs’ or ‘downstairs’. As a consequence, we cannot be sure that (30) is the passive of a *faire-par* causative: it could perfectly well be the passive of a *faire*-infinitive construction whose causee remains unexpressed. We know independently that such *faire*-infinitive constructions exist: (31) is one. The fact that the infinitive in this example is an unaffecting verb tells us unequivocally that this cannot be a *faire-par* causative with an implicit causee; it must instead be a *faire*-infinitive construction (see Authier & Reed 2002:10 for this argument). So (30) is ambiguous, *a priori*, between a parse in which we are dealing with a *faire-par* causative that is passivised (and lacks a ‘by’-phrase upstairs) and one in which, instead, we are dealing with a passive *faire*-infinitive causative that lacks an overt expression of the causee.

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---|----------|----|-----------|-------|----------|-----|---------|-----------|
| (30) | la | macchina | è | stata | fatta | riparare | da | Gianni | (It.) |
| | the | car | is | been | made | fix | by | Gianni | |
| (31) | ce | genre | de | symphonie | fait | aimer | la | musique | classique |
| | this | kind | of | symphony | makes | love | the | music | classical |
| | ‘this kind of symphony makes one/people love classical music’ | | | | | | | | |

So to ascertain whether or not (30) can be the passive of a *faire-par* causative, one could either ask native speakers to introspect and see whether *Gianni* can be interpreted as the causee or must instead be taken to be the causer, or one could settle the issue in syntax by constructing a variant of (30) that has *two* ‘by’-phrases — one for the causee and one for the causer. (32) is such a sentence (provided to us by Raffaella Zanuttini, p.c.).

- (32) la macchina è stata fatta riparare da Gianni (It.)
 the car is been made fix by Gianni
 dal suo meccanica di fiducia
 by-the his mechanic of trust

Though the status of (32) is a little delicate due to the simultaneous presence of two agentive ‘by’-phrases, it is clearly grammatical, with the mechanic as the causee and *Gianni* as the causer.¹⁷ It turns out, therefore, that *faire-par* causatives *can* indeed undergo ‘long passivisation’. This is further confirmed by the fact that (30) is ambiguous, supporting a reading in which *Gianni* is interpreted as the causee.¹⁸ We conclude, therefore, that, since ‘long passivisation’ of *faire-par* constructions is grammatical, the embedded object of such causatives gets its Case feature checked ‘upstairs’, in the matrix clause, against a matching accusative Case feature of the ‘light verb’ *v* in the extended projection of *faire*. The facts are incompatible with an analysis that takes the Asp-head in the complement of *faire* in (28) to be an accusative Case checker. This result is significant since it further undermines the idea that accusative Case is essentially tied to aspect: if it were, then Asp in the structure in (28) would be the checker of the object’s Case feature and the object would never raise to the matrix subject position in passives, contrary to fact.

Finally, let us ask whether there could be additional functional structure between the matrix causative verb and AspP in the structure of *faire-par* constructions. So far, we have confined our attention to demonstrating that there is an AspP in the causative verb’s complement; but once we include one functional projection downstairs, we open the door potentially to a much larger array of functional projections, including NegP and TP. The question that arises, therefore, is whether NegP and TP are licensed under *faire* in the *faire-par* causative. For *faire*-infinitive causatives, we know that they are not: sentences of the type in (33) (cf. (13), above) are ungrammatical.

- (33) Marie fait (?*ne pas) manger la soupe (*demain) à Jean
 Marie makes NEG not eat the soup tomorrow to Jean

For *faire-par* causatives, the facts turn out to be exactly the same: here, too, embedded negation and temporal adverbial modification are impossible:¹⁹

- (34) Marie fait (?*ne pas) manger la soupe (*demain) par Jean
 Marie makes NEG not eat the soup tomorrow by Jean

So the conclusion that presents itself is that there can be no NegP and TP in the complement of *faire*, period — regardless of whether it partakes in the *faire*-infinitive or the *faire-par* construction. This is arguably a reflex of a selectional restriction on the part of *faire*-type verbs: they can select small clauses (RELATOR phrases, on our assumptions) and AspPs, but nothing larger than that. Whether there is a ‘deep’ cause for this selectional restriction is a question we cannot address here.

17 The fact that the *da*-phrase harbouring the causee is peripheral to the *da*-phrase harbouring the causer in (32) is an effect of weight; when the two are equally heavy/light, the causee’s *da*-phrase will indeed precede the causer’s *da*-phrase, as expected: in *la macchina è stata fatta riparare da Gianni da Giorgio*, Gianni is the one who fixes the car and Giorgio the one who makes it happen.

18 This interpretation can be pragmatically enhanced by replacing *da Gianni* with *dal meccanico di fiducia di mio padre* ‘by my father’s trusted mechanic’, as Raffaella Zanuttini (p.c.) points out. We thank Paola Benincà, Maria Teresa Guasti and Raffaella Zanuttini for their help with the examples in (30) and (32).

19 Paola Benincà, Maria Teresa Guasti and Raffaella Zanuttini (p.c.) confirm this for Italian as well.

4.3 Conclusions on transitive causatives

After this lengthy exposé on the syntax of *faire-par* causatives (which we decided to spell out in considerable detail because the literature on Romance causatives tends to pay much less attention to *faire-par* than to *faire-infinitive*), let us draw some conclusions on the syntax of *faire-causatives* in the Romance languages.

We have seen that the *faire-infinitive* construction involves a syntax in which the matrix causative verb selects a RELATOR phrase as its complement within which a ‘reverse’ predication relationship is established between the causativised VP and the causee, with the latter surfacing in the complement of the RELATOR. The *v* of the matrix clause checks the Case feature of the embedded object (which hence will ascend to subject in the passive counterparts of *faire-infinitive* constructions, as desired), leaving the causee to depend on a Case-checking dative preposition spelling out the RELATOR head. The fact that the preposition lexicalising the RELATOR is the dative preposition (*à* in French, *a* in Italian and Spanish) is not an accident: it can in fact be viewed as a reflex of a selectional restriction on the part of the matrix causative verb — whenever *faire* selects a small clause involving a ‘reverse’ predication, it will have the RELATOR spelled out as the dative preposition, not just in analytical causative constructions but throughout.

The fact that in *faire-par* constructions, we see the causee related to the causativised VP via the preposition *par* then tells us that in these causatives, the small clause within which this ‘reverse’ predication relationship is established is *not* the complement of *faire* itself. Instead, it is the complement of an aspectual functional head, Asp — a head whose presence is successfully diagnosed by the existence of an affectedness condition on the embedded object in *faire-par* constructions, an affectedness effect that these constructions share with ‘take’ serial verb constructions, with which they have much of their syntax in common. The aspectual head embedded under *faire* in the *faire-par* construction is arguably the same as the aspectual head in passive constructions; as a result, the two constructions share the preposition *par* as the lexicalisation of the RELATOR. But beyond this, *faire-par* and passive constructions have very little in common; *faire-par* constructions do not, in fact, involve a passivised causative complement at all.

With these conclusions in place, we now proceed to an investigation of intransitive causative constructions — i.e., causatives whose embedded verb is intransitive (in particular, unergative). These will lead us somewhat beyond the confines of our central objectives in this paper, which revolve around the establishment of (1a) and (1b) as the two structures underlying predication relationships. But it will nonetheless be helpful to address the properties of intransitive causatives in some detail.

5 The Romance causative construction (II): The intransitive cases, and control

In unergative-based *faire-infinitive* causative constructions, the relationship between the causativised VP and the causee is established, just as in transitive *faire-infinitive* causatives, with the aid of a RELATOR in a ‘reverse’ predication construction. After all, the subject of an unergative verb is an *external* argument: it does not originate as the complement of the verb, inside the VP, but is instead introduced outside the VP predicate. Underlyingly, therefore, unergative causatives and transitive causatives are basically the same as far as their structure is concerned. But on the surface they are quite different. While in transitive *faire-infinitive* causative constructions the causee, when it is a full noun phrase, must be introduced by a dative preposition (cf. (35a) for a reminder), in unergative causatives it cannot be (cf. (35b)).

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|----|-------------------------------|-----|------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|-------|
| (35) | a. | ça | a | fait | manger | la | soupe | *(à) | Jean | (Fr.) |
| | | that | has | made | eat | the | soup | to | Jean | |
| | | ‘that made Jean eat the soup’ | | | | | | | | |
| | b. | ça | a | fait | patienter | (*à) | Jean | | | |
| | | that | has | made | wait | to | Jean | | | |
| | | ‘that made Jean wait’ | | | | | | | | |

And when the causee is realised as a (clitic) pronoun, it is standardly realised as a *dative* clitic in transitive *faire*-infinitive causatives, whereas in their unergative counterparts, it standardly surfaces as an *accusative* clitic. Here, however, the facts are less categorical than they were with full-DP causees: for as Hyman & Zimmer (1976) point out, there are dialects of French in which (37a) is grammatical; and Authier & Reed (1991) add to this that there are also dialects in which (36b) is.

- (36) a. ça lui a fait manger la soupe
 that to-him has made eat the soup
 ‘that made him eat the soup’
 b. %ça lui a fait patienter
 that to-him has made wait
 ‘that made him wait’
- (37) a. %ça l’ a fait manger la soupe
 that him has made eat the soup
 ‘that made him eat the soup’
 b. ça l’ a fait patienter
 that him has made wait
 ‘that made him wait’

The ‘%’ sign in front of (36b) and (37a) does not just indicate dialectal variation: even in dialects where (36b) and (37a) are possible in principle, they are still restricted to special contexts. Hyman & Zimmer (1976) point out that the use of the *accusative* clitic in (37a) indicates *lack of control* of the causee over the caused event: the causee had no choice but to eat the soup. Conversely, Authier & Reed (1991) note that the use of a *dative* clitic in the unergative-based *faire*-infinitive causative in (36b) signals the fact that the causee *has some degree of control* over the caused event: there is something about the goings-on that lead the causee to take the conscious decision to wait, but he could, in principle, have decided not to wait as well; in (37b), on the other hand, the causee has no choice but to wait: he is literally *forced* to wait, and has no control over it whatsoever.

What we see, then, is that (in dialects in which there is a choice of case in principle) *faire*-infinitive causatives with a *dative clitic* causee mark *control* on the part of the causee over the caused event, and *faire*-infinitive causatives with an *accusative clitic* causee mark *lack of control*. It is important to bear in mind that this generalisation, while accurate in and of itself, holds only for *faire*-infinitive constructions with a *clitic* causee: as we pointed out in (35) already, there is absolutely no choice when it comes to the distribution the dative preposition *à* in *faire*-infinitive causatives with a full-DP causee. The task that we are facing, therefore, is (i) to make sense of the semantic effect of *clitic case*, and (ii) the absence of a counterpart to this effect for full-DP causees. In the next subsection, we will concentrate on the unergative-based examples, leaving the transitive cases for section 5.2, where we discuss ECM causatives.

5.1 Unergative-based causatives

Let us start by returning to the fact that the underlying representation of unergative-based *faire*-infinitive causatives is essentially the same as that of their transitive counterparts: a RELATOR phrase in the complement of *faire*, with the causee introduced as the complement of the RELATOR. Now, in *faire*-infinitive causatives whose embedded verb is transitive, there is an embedded object that is in need of getting its Case feature checked; and it gets it checked under Agree with the matrix *v*, which cannot engage in an Agree relationship with the causee, which is trapped in the domain of the RP phase; this forces the spell-out of the RELATOR as a Case-checking preposition. When we now move over into the realm of unergative-based *faire*-infinitive constructions, we realise that in these cases, the causativised verb does not take an object that is in

need of Case. The causative *v*, which is equipped with a Case feature, is therefore free in principle to engage in a Case-checking relationship with the causee. The only problem is that the causee is invisible to *v*. But something can be done about that: the (null) RELATOR can raise up to the causative verb, which itself forms a chain with *v*. Via this extension of the RP phase up to *v*P (cf. Den Dikken, to appear, for further discussion of the technical details, which we have no space to elaborate on here) thanks to the incorporation of the (null) RELATOR into *v*, we then get *v* in a position to Agree with the causee and check accusative Case in the process. Incorporation of a *null* RELATOR into the causative verb is arguably ‘cheaper’ than the insertion of a ‘dummy’ lexical item underneath the RELATOR — in essence, we are dealing here with a ‘P-support’ *vs* the application of UG mechanisms, a stand-off that, according to Chomsky (1995:Chapter 2), is decided in favour of the latter whenever the latter delivers a converging derivation. In *transitive* causatives, the incorporation scenario does not yield a converging output: with only one Case-checker for two Case-dependent noun phrases, we inevitably get a violation of the Case Filter. But in *unergative* causatives, the result of incorporation of the (null) RELATOR into the verb is entirely grammatical, and gets the causee’s Case feature checked into the bargain. There is no need, therefore, for a dative preposition under the RELATOR; on the contrary, not incorporating the RELATOR and having it spelled out as a ‘dummy’ preposition is arguably a more costly thing to do than leaving the RELATOR empty and incorporating it. We therefore correctly expect unergative-based *faire*-infinitive causatives not to feature a prepositional spell-out of the RELATOR.

When the causee of an unergative-based *faire*-infinitive is a *clitic*, things change in interesting ways, empirically as well as theoretically. We assume as a base-line (though we realise that this is a contentious issue; the efficacy of the analysis to follow may in fact be taken to further underpin this assumption) that the clitic originates in the θ -position of the causee — i.e., in the complement of the RELATOR. From there, the clitic needs to make its way up to its surface position, adjoined to a functional head in the extended projection of the matrix verb. Doing so will involve movement, which leaves behind a trace. And the question is how this trace is going to be licensed. It is here that the differences between *faire*-infinitives with a full-DP causee (which does not move) and a clitic causee (which has to move) can be pinpointed.

No dialect of French (or Romance, more generally) allows movement to strand prepositions: P-stranding is categorically disallowed. We therefore expect that when the RELATOR head is spelled out as a dative preposition, moving the causee by itself, stranding \bar{a} , is strictly forbidden. Instead, cliticisation in such cases must affect the cluster [P-RELATOR + CL], which is realised as a *dative* clitic (cf. Kayne 1975). This straightforwardly takes care of the dative clitic in (36a). For unergative-based *faire*-infinitive constructions, the selection of a dative clitic for the causee is not grammatical in the standard language; but (36b) is grammatical in many varieties of French, and then signals control of the causee over the embedded event. Suppose that, in the dialects in question, the ban on stranding extends to the *incorporated* RELATOR — that is, even the trace of the incorporated RELATOR of unergative-based *faire*-infinitive constructions obstructs the movement of the clitic causee, in the dialects in which (36b) is grammatical. In those dialects, therefore, the *only* way of cliticising the causee of an unergative-based *faire*-infinitive causative is by not incorporating the RELATOR (which then turns it into a dative preposition, Case-licensing the causee) and having the cluster [P-RELATOR + CL] cliticise as a unit. This results, as in transitive *faire*-infinitive cases, in a *dative* clitic, as seen in (36b). In the standard language, by contrast, there is apparently nothing that prevents the complement of the *incorporated* RELATOR from cliticising on its own, stranding the trace of the RELATOR.²⁰ The result, for the standard language, is (37b), with an *accusative* clitic. Notice that (37b), in the standard language, is derivable from the same structure that underlies (36b) in the dialects — and in this structure, the causee is projected as an *agent* (see below for more discussion) of the causativised VP, hence has a relatively high degree of control over that event. In the standard language, therefore, (37b) is perfectly compatible with an interpretation which, in the dialects in which (36b) is grammatical, is the privilege of the dative-clitic example.

20 It is not entirely clear to us what the postulated difference between standard French and its dialects allowing (36b) is rooted in. Standard French is plainly the expected case: Bakerian ‘government transparency’ turns the causee into the derived object of *faire*.

Before proceeding to a discussion of why (37b), in all dialects, also supports a ‘lack of control’ reading, let us be a little more precise about the roots of the fact that in a ‘reverse’ predication structure in which the causee is introduced as the complement of the RELATOR, the causee is typically interpreted as having some degree of control over the caused event — in other words, is interpreted ‘agentively’. We know independently, from ‘passive nominals’ (which, as Den Dikken & Sybesma 1998 argue at length, are not actually passive but middle-like), that external arguments introduced as the complement of the RELATOR in tenseless ‘reverse’ predication structures have a very strong tendency to be *agents* — thus, (38a) is perfect while (38b), where the external argument is a causer rather than an agent (cf. *the stock market crash* (**intentionally*/**deliberately*) *destroyed their careers*), is impossible.

- (38) a. the city’s destruction by the enemy
 b. *their careers’ destruction by the stock market crash

There is no general ‘agentivity effect’ in passives, of course: *their careers were destroyed by the stock market crash* is impeccable. But in *tenseless* contexts, it does indeed seem to be the case that ‘reverse’ predication relationships between a VP and an external argument lead to an agentive interpretation for the external argument. We do not profess to understand why this is the case. But given that it does indeed appear to be the case, we take this to support the conclusion that the high-control interpretation for the causee in (36b) is a result of its being introduced in a tenseless ‘reverse’ predication structure. The fact that, in the standard language, even (37b) has the causee introduced in this fashion then accommodates the compatibility of (37b) with a ‘high control’ reading in standard French.

But now recall that for all dialects, (37b) also supports a reading in which the causee has no control over the caused event whatsoever. For dialects in which (36b) is grammatical, that is in fact the *only* reading for (37b): the reading that gives the causee control over the caused event is exclusively signalled with the aid of (36b), so (37b), in those dialects, signals lack of control. How is this ‘lack of control’ reading for (37b) syntactically represented and derived?

If we take a structure in which the causee is introduced by a RELATOR in a ‘reverse’ predication structure of the type employed by transitive *faire*-infinitive causatives to give the causee a relatively high degree of control over the caused event (as we did two paragraphs back), then lack of control on the part of the causee must indicate that it is *not* being introduced this way. Two possibilities now present themselves, in principle: either (i) the causee, in ‘lack of control’ (37b), is introduced as the *internal argument* of the causativised verb, or (ii) it is still being introduced as an external argument, but not in a ‘reverse’ predication but instead in a ‘straight’ predication, by a ‘light verb’ *v*. We took the former tack in Den Dikken & Longenecker (2004–*GLOW Newsletter*). And it seems to us that this line of thought is indeed worth pursuing. However, it will not give us a window on the fact that (37a), grammatical in certain dialects, likewise has a ‘lack of control’ interpretation: plainly, no ‘ergative shift’ can be at work in (37a) since the embedded infinitive is in fact transitive. We therefore leave the ‘ergative shift’ approach aside for now as insufficiently general (though not necessarily *wrong* for cases of the (37b) type), and pursue instead the alternative approach in terms of an embedded ‘light verb’ *v* — one which will generalise over (37a) and (37b) on the ‘lack of control’ reading. That analysis will effectively involve an ECM analysis of the relevant examples.

5.2 ECM causatives

If the causee in (37a) and (37b) (the latter on its ‘lack of control’ reading only) is introduced by a ‘light verb’ *v*, then that means that these examples must involve an ECM structure, featuring (at least) a TP in the complement of the causative matrix verb. A TP is needed underneath *faire* in order to get the *v* outside the embedded verb’s projection to be licensed: *v* is dependent on T (see above). In other words, we are dealing with a structure of the type in (9a), repeated here as (39).

(39) $[_{VP2} [_{DP} \text{CAUSER} [_{VP} v_2 [_{VP} V_{\text{CAUS}} [_{TP} [_{DP} \text{CAUSEE}]_i \text{T} [_{VP1} t_i [_{VP} v_1 [_{VP} V_{\text{Inf}} \text{OB}]]]]]]]]]]]$

We know that in the standard language (39) comes out grammatical in French with *laisser* but not with *faire* — but there are dialects, apparently, in which (39) comes out fine with *faire* as well, provided that the causee is *cliticised*.²¹ This effect is reminiscent of the behaviour of other ECM verbs as well. Thus, *croire* ‘believe’ does not allow ECM with full-DP embedded subjects, but does allow this (at least marginally) when the embedded subject is cliticised (cf. Kayne 1984:111, 122 and references cited there):

(40)	a.	*je	crois	Jean	être	le	plus	intelligent	de	tous	(Fr.)
		I	believe	Jean	be	the	most	intelligent	of	all	
	b.	?je	le	crois	être	le	plus	intelligent	de	tous	
		I	him	believe	be	the	most	intelligent	of	all	

We will not be concerned in this paper with the roots of the contrast between (40a) and (40b) (nor with the question of why (40b), while significantly better than (40a), is still worse than a sentence in which the ECM-subject is *wh*-extracted). What is relevant for our purposes here is that cliticisation may lift otherwise heavy restrictions on ECM. The fact that (37a), in dialects where it is grammatical to begin with, is grammatical only if the causee cliticises thus by no means stands on its own. And the fact that (37a) is not *generally* deemed grammatical presumably fits in with the fact that native speakers vary on the status of (40b) as well (though this is something that further research should look into more fully).

Let us take the above remarks to be a reasonable base-line for the idea that (37a) is based on an ECM structure. How, then, does this manage to make sense of the fact that (37a) signals lack of control on the part of the causee? A couple of things are important in this connection. First, recall that in tenseless ‘reverse’ predication structures, external arguments introduced as the complement of the RELATOR have a very strong tendency to be *agents*. In ‘straight’ verbal predications, on the other hand, where *v* is doing the job of linking the verbal predicate to its subject, there will be no agentivity effect — most particularly because ‘straight’ verbal predications cannot be tenseless: the ‘light verb’ that relates the verbal predicate to its subject is dependent for its licensing on a local T. So in ECM-causatives, we expect there to be no particular inclination to interpret the causee as an *agent*. That is the first step towards an understanding of the ‘lack of control’ interpretation for (37a).

The second step involves the realisation that (37a), in the dialects in which it is grammatical, alternates with (36a), where the causee is realised as a dative clitic. In dialects in which both these sentences are grammatical, (36a) signals a relatively high degree of control on the part of the causee, in line with what was said above. That, in conjunction with the fact that it alternates with (37a), now gives (37a) ‘right of way’ in the complement case, where the causee lacks control over the embedded event: interlocutors well-versed in the dialects in question will know (basically on the basis of Gricean pragmatics) that if the speaker had wanted to indicate that the causee has control over the caused event, (s)he would have used (36a); but since the speaker elected to use (37a) instead, that must indicate lack of control.²² The same story applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the b-examples in (36) and (37), in the dialects in which there is an alternation between the two. Again, the dative-clitic example is based on a *faire*-infinitive structure (as discussed in section 5.1) while the accusative-clitic example signalling lack of control derives from an ECM structure.

21 Reed (1991) notes, however, that some Canadian speakers of French, from the Ottawa area, allow full-DP ECM with *faire*.

22 In the standard language, there is no choice between (36a) and (37a): only the former comes out grammatical. That means that no pragmatic inferences can be drawn from the use of (36a), which will then perforce allow (36a) to be compatible with both lack of control and relatively high control on the part of the causee. It is not a hard and fast rule, therefore, that ‘reverse’ verbal predications in tenseless contexts do not allow non-agentive readings for the external argument. We admit that we have not managed to get to the bottom of the regularity quite yet; future research should look into this more.

Note that, with (37a) and (37b) derived from an ECM structure of the type in (38), that makes space available in the causative verb's complement for temporal adverbial modifiers and sentential negation. We therefore predict that these should in fact be possible in the causative complement in dialects in which (37) alternates with (36) and signals lack of control. We have not been able to verify this prediction since we do not happen to know any speakers of the relevant dialects. But the prediction is clearly verifiable; if it is borne out, it lends strong support to an ECM-based approach to the 'lack of control' cases with accusative clitics.

5.3 Conclusion

To sum up the discussion in this section, what we set out to do was to provide an analysis of the facts in (35)–(37), and we did so by capitalising on a couple of basic points: (i) the fact that, in transitive *faire*-infinitive causatives, the causee must be introduced as the complement of the RELATOR in a 'reverse' predication construction, (ii) the fact that Case-theoretic considerations force the RELATOR to be spelled out as a preposition in transitive *faire*-infinitive causatives because the matrix *v* is already engaged in the checking of the embedded object's Case feature, (iii) the fact that, in unergative-based *faire*-infinitive causatives, the RELATOR introducing the causee, by incorporating into the causative verb (which itself raises up to *v*), establishes a Case-checking Agree relationship between the causee and the matrix *v*, thereby making the causee accusative-marked, and (iv) the fact that cliticisation of the causee presents special restrictions as well as opportunities not shared by *faire*-infinitive causatives with a full-DP causee. The special restrictions on clitic causees manifest themselves in connection with the ban on P-stranding, and are responsible for the fact that, in dialects of French, the clitic causee of an unergative-based *faire*-infinitive causative has dative case. The special opportunities for clitic causees, on the other hand, come to the fore in ECM contexts, where cliticisation of the causee, again in certain dialects, eliminates the otherwise robust ban on ECM with *faire* and its ilk. Finally, we presented an account of the case-related control facts of *faire*-infinitive causatives which capitalises on the independently established fact that the external argument of tenseless 'reverse' predications tends to be *agentive*, while no such restriction holds of the external argument of verbal predications mediated by *v* qua RELATOR. That last point thus leads us back to the central hypothesis of the paper and further confirms that there are indeed two ways of relating a predicate to its external argument, the two having demonstrably different repercussions for the interpretation of the external argument in identifiable contexts.

6 Concluding remarks

In closing, what we have tried to show in this paper is that a perspective on the ways in which the predicate can be related to its subject throws new light on the classic questions posed by causative constructions in the Romance languages. Our basic hypothesis is that predicate is systematically related to its subject via the mediation of a RELATOR, and that the relationship between the two major constituents can be established in either of two 'directions': one featuring the predicate in the complement of the RELATOR and the subject in its specifier (1a), and the other having the two major constituents change places (1b). The 'reverse' predication structure in (1b) has proved particularly useful in the analysis of the Romance *faire*-infinitive causative — but it was shown to play a role in other constructions as well, including the passive construction. Along the way, the analysis has elucidated the relationship between passives and *faire-par* causatives (showing that they share the same core structure involving an Asp-head taking a 'reverse' verbal predication as its complement, but that they differ completely beyond that point), and has cast light on the 'control'-related alternation between dative and accusative causee clitics. The overall result is a strong endorsement of the central hypothesis that predication relationships are fundamentally non-directional.

References

- Aarts, Bas (1992). *Small clauses in English. The nonverbal types*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Arnauld, Antoine & Claude Lancelot (1660). *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*. Port Royal.
- Authier, J.-Marc & Lisa Reed (1991). Ergative predicates and dative cliticization in French causatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22. 197–205.
- Authier, J.-Marc & Lisa Reed (2002). Scope freezing and the *faire-par* construction. Paper presented at LSRL XXXII, University of Toronto, April 2002.
- Baker, Mark (1989). Object sharing and projection in serial verb constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20. 513–53.
- Benveniste, Émile (1966). *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Bouvier, Yves-Ferdinand (2000). How to passivize French causatives. *Snippets* 2. 6–7.
- Bowers, John (1993). The syntax of predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24. 591–656.
- Burzio, Luigi (1986). *Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Cannings, Peter & Marvin Moody (1978). A semantic approach to causation in French. *Linguisticae Investigationes* II. 331–62.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- DaCruz, Maxime (1992). Semantic restrictions on serial verb constructions with *só* ‘take’ and *hèn* ‘hold’ in Fòn. In Chris Collins & Victor Manfredi (eds), *Proceedings of the Kwa comparative syntax workshop*. MITWPL 17. 71–94.
- Dikken, Marcel den (1995). *Particles. On the syntax of verb–particle, triadic and causative constructions*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dikken, Marcel den (1996). How external is the external argument? Ms., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam/HIL.
- Dikken, Marcel den (to appear). *Relators and linkers: A study of predication, predicate inversion and copulas*. Ms., CUNY Graduate Center; to appear, MIT Press.
- Dikken, Marcel den & Rint Sybesma (1998). *Take* serials light up the middle. Paper presented at the GLOW Colloquium, Tilburg University, 15 April 1998; ms., CUNY Graduate Center & University of Leiden.
- Guasti, Maria Teresa (1993). *Causative and perception verbs: A comparative study*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Harris, Roy & Talbot Taylor (1997). *Landmarks of linguistic thought I. The Western tradition from Socrates to Saussure* (2nd edition). London: Routledge.
- Higginbotham, James (1985). On semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16. 547–93.
- Hoekstra, Teun (1996). The active-passive configuration. In A.-M. DiSciullo (ed.), *Configurations. Essays on structure and interpretation*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. 41–51.
- Hyman, Larry & K. Zimmer (1976). Embedded topic in French. In Charles Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kayne, Richard (1975). *French syntax. The transformational cycle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard (1984). *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kayne, Richard (1993). Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection. *Studia Linguistica* 47. 3–31.
- Lefebvre, Claire (1988). *Take* serial constructions: please. In C. Tenny (ed.), *Lexicon Project Working Papers* 30. MIT. 1–33.
- Lefebvre, Claire (1991). *Take* serial verb constructions in Fon. In Claire Lefebvre (ed.), *Serial verbs: Grammatical, comparative and cognitive approaches*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 37–78.
- Marantz, Alec (1997). No escape from syntax: Don’t try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. In A. Dimitriadis et al. (eds), *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 4. 201–25.

- Marcantonio, A. (1981). The distribution of *a* and *da* in Italian causative constructions. *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 6. 1–33.
- Reed, Lisa (1991). The thematic and syntactic structure of French causatives. *Probus* 3. 317–60.
- Reed, Lisa (1996). On the unincorporated character of the French cohesive infinitive construction. In Claudia Parodi, Carlos Quicoli, Mario Santarelli & María Luisa Zubizarreta (eds), *Aspects of Romance linguistics. Selected papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages XXIV*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Rothstein, Susan (1983). *The syntactic forms of predication*. Diss., MIT; distributed by IULC in 1985.
- Starke, Michal (1995). On the format of small clauses. In Anna Cardinaletti & Maria Teresa Guasti (eds), *Small clauses. Syntax and Semantics* 28. New York: Academic Press. 237–69.
- Sybesma, Rint (1992). *Causatives and accomplishments: The case of Chinese ba*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Leiden/HIL.
- Szabó, Zoltán (2001). Adjectives in context. In R. Harnish & I. Kenesei (eds), *Perspectives on semantics, pragmatics, and discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 119–46.
- Tenny, Carol. *Aspectual roles and the syntax-semantics interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella (1997). *Negation and clausal structure: A comparative study of Romance languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.

first draft • April 2004

Marcel den Dikken
MDen-Dikken@gc.cuny.edu

Ana Longenecker
alongenecker32@yahoo.com

Linguistics Program
CUNY Graduate Center
365 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10016–4309
