

31	S-P/ obl-N	Et j'ai commencé avec mon père avant.
32	A-N/ O-N	Oui papa faisait du piano ,
33	A-P/ O-P	et alors il m'a commencé
34	A-P/ O-P	il m'a donné des leçons ,
35		mais pas régulièrement.
36	A-N/ O-P	Et quand maman a vu ça,
37		elle a dit,
38		"Allez hop,
39		un professeur
40	y'a-cleft	Et il y avait un monsieur
41		<i>qui</i> venait,
42		comme,
43		accorder le piano chez nous
44	X-N	et sa femme est aveugle.
45	X-P	Elle est aveugle,
46	X-P	Elle est aveugle,
47	X-P	et c'est un premier prix de Paris.

'I was 9 years old. And I began with my father before. Yes Dad played the piano, and so he started me, he gave me lessons but not regularly. And when Mom saw that, she said, "OK, a teacher!" And there was a man who came, uh, to tune our piano, and his wife is blind. She is blind and a 1st prize winner from Paris, she's a great musician.'

Discourse 5
Speaker 2:

48	y'a-cleft
49	
50	
51	y'a-cleft
52	

[about up-coming elections]:
Il y a Giscard
qui veut faire un pas vers la gauche,
à côté de lui par exemple,
il y a Michel Poniatowski
qui le tient plus vers la droite.
'There is Giscard who wants to take a step toward the left, beside him, for example, there is M. Poniatowski who keeps him more toward the right.'

A = subject of a two-argument verb
X = subject of a copulative verb
S = subject of a one-argument verb
O = direct object of two-argument verb
obl = oblique

avoir-simple presentative
avoir-cleft presentative
y'a-simple presentative
y'a-cleft presentative

THE EVOLUTION OF CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

MARK DAVIES
Illinois State University

0. Introduction

The past two decades have seen a number of important articles on the synchronic aspects of the Romance causative construction. Within the GB framework, there are studies such as Zubizarreta (1985), Burzio (1986), Goodall (1987), Bordelais (1988), Rosen (1989) and Pearce (1990). There were also insights from the RG framework, such as Aissen and Perlmutter (1983), Gibson and Raposo (1986), and Davies and Rosen (1988).

In terms of the diachronic evolution of these constructions, there have been a number of traditional descriptive studies, including Muller (1912), Gougenheim (1929), Norberg (1945), and Chamberlain (1986), as well as TG and RG studies such as Radford (1976), Saitarelli (1980), and Strong (1983). There have been a handful from within the GB framework, including Pearce (1990) and Martineau (1990). Most of these diachronic studies deal primarily with French.

What has been largely ignored, however, is the diachronic development of these constructions in Spanish and Portuguese, especially from within a coherent syntactic framework. Early descriptive studies include Beardsley (1921) and González Muñela (1954), which deal with infinitival complements in general, and make a few general comments on the causative constructions. There are no studies which deal with the historical aspects of the Portuguese causative construction.

The lack of research on the development of the Spanish and Portuguese causative is surprising given that (as I will claim) these are the two Romance languages in which the construction has evolved the most. Because even the most basic data is missing on the diachronic Spanish and Portuguese constructions, one major purpose in this study is simply to provide a working database of facts on the development of causatives in these two languages.

The data presented here is based on an examination of over three million words of Old/Middle/Modern Spanish and Portuguese prose, which yielded

nearly 7000 examples of causative constructions.¹ The texts were scanned into a computer and then indexed with *Word Cruncher*, which provided the means to extract nearly all of the relevant causative constructions.

1.1 *Uniclausal to biclausal complements* An examination of the data yields two major findings. The first and most important finding is that Spanish and Portuguese causatives have moved from being essentially uniclausal in the older stages of the languages to biclausal structures in the modern languages.

In very informal and atheoretical terms, uniclausal constructions can be represented as:

(1a) [MATRIX CLAUSE ::: EMBEDDED CLAUSE]

where there are no barriers or only weak barriers between the two clauses. Everything in the embedded clause (hereafter S2) acts as though it were part of the matrix clause (S1). In biclausal structures:

(1b) [MATRIX CLAUSE [EMBEDDED CLAUSE]]

the S2 is more independent from the S1. Therefore, grammatical relations in S2 are unaffected by S1, elements cannot as easily move out of the S2, the matrix verb (VERB1) cannot case mark S2 noun phrases, and word order in the S2 operates independently of the S1.

In terms of a more formal model of uni/biclausal constructions, we will follow the work of previous researchers in assuming that uniclausal

1 The texts utilized in this study include all or portions of:

- OPt** Crónica Geral de Espanha de 1344, Joseph de Arimatea, Barlaam e Josephat, Estória do my nobre Vespesiano, Vida de Tundalo, Vida de Santa Pelágia, A Demanda do Santo Gral
MidPt Crónica de D. Fernando, C. do Condestavel Nuno Alvarez, C. de D. Afonso Henriques, C. de D. Joao II, C. de D. Joao, Boosco Deleitoso, Orton de Esposo, Virgeu de Consolação, O Livro de Via Cristi, Itinerário, Peregrinação, O Soldado Prático
ModPt Selections from ten novels published in Portugal in the 1900s: O Conito Fantástico (a collection of Brazilian short stories), A Linguagem Falada da Cidade de São Paulo
OSP Estória de España, General Estória (both from the Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, Univ. Wisconsin-Madison), Historia Troyana en prosa y verso, Gran Conquista de Ultramar, El Libro de los Engaños, Portad de las Portidades, Castigos y Documentos, El Libro de los Cient Capítulos
MidSp El Cordero, La Celestina, Amadis de Gaula, Claros Varones de Castilla, Cárcel de Amor, Grimalte y Grandisa, Historia de Grisel y Mirabella, Guzman de Alfarache, La Vida del Buscón, Don Quijote de la Mancha
ModSp (All from J. Halvor Clegg, Dept. of Spanish and Portuguese, and Humanities Research Center, Brigham Young University): 128 newspaper articles from Latin America (1985-6); selections from nine Latin American and Spanish novels published 1950-1975; El Habla Culla de Caracas; El Habla Popular de la Ciudad de México.

constructions have reduced VP complements, while biclausal constructions have IP/CP complements (Zagona 1981, Zubizarreta 1985, Goodall 1987, Bordelais 1988, Rosen 1989 and Pearce 1990).²

Table 1 outlines the major shifts in causative syntax in Spanish and Portuguese, in terms of use of S2 *se*, clitic placement, case marking, and word order. In 2.1-5.1 that follow, we will discuss how each of these shifts indicates a move from uniclausal (VP) to biclausal (IP/CP) complements.

Table 1. Diachronic shifts with *se*, clitic placement, case marking, word order

UNICLAUSAL (OSP/OPt)	BICLAUSAL (ModSp/Pt)
2A. PRONOUN SE [- <i>se</i>] <i>e fez [alguém]s outra vez bautizar]</i> (Cron 1344 198:1) "and he had others (be) rebaptized"	3A. [+ <i>se</i>] <i>o sistema que faz [a raça humana se desenvolver]</i> (BrazFal 2:52:1409) "the system that makes the human race develop"
2B. CLITIC PLACEMENT [cl+cl] <i>non gelo dexaron [sacar del campo]</i> (HisTroy 170:2) "they didn't let them take him from the field of battle"	3B. [cl---cl] <i>nos iba a deixar [sacarlo]</i> (Gazapo 9:14) "he was going to let us take it out"
2C. CASE MARKING [DAT w/tran V] <i>eu lhe ffarey logo [negar a doutrina]</i> (Barlaam 74:1) "and then I will make him deny the doctrine"	3C. [ACC w/tran V] <i>o fazia [trocar o dia pela noite]</i> (Corça 187:2) "it made him confuse the day with the night"
2D. WORD ORDER [VS w/intl] <i>fez ante si [vir seu filho Recarredo]</i> (Cron1344 199:1) "he made his son R. come before him"	3D. [SV w/intl] <i>fazer [o país chegar aos destinos]</i> (BrazSS 227:2) "to make the nation rise to its destiny"

2 Pollock (1988) postulates a number of levels between VP and CP (=S'), which complicates the issue of giving a binary opposition between uniclausal and biclausal causative structures. To simplify the discussion and to correlate our findings with previous studies, we will hold that uniclausal = VP complements, and biclausal = IP/CP complements.

- (7) *e non fue ninguno que lo asy viese defender, que non asmasse que nunca fue onbre en el mundo que se podiese defender atanto como se el defendio* (HisTroy 85:1)
 “and there wasn’t anyone who saw him defend himself in that way, who wasn’t astounded that there was a man alive who could defend himself the way he did”

Notice that the verb is the reflexive *defenderse* everywhere except where it is embedded under the verb of perception.

It was these peripheral verbs that first allowed S2 *se* (about 1400 in both Spanish and Portuguese), as in the following example with *ver* from late OPt:

- (8) *porque o vi doer se bem de seus pecados* (Demanda 353:3)
 “because I saw him suffer quite severely, on account of his sins”

Se then became acceptable with *dexar*, and only later with *fazer*, mainly in ModPt, as in this example from a modern European Portuguese novel:

- (9) *o seu instinto... o fazia sentir-se um cavalo* (Homem 108:5)
 “his instincts made him feel like a horse”

The use of *se* has still not completely spread to *fazer* in ModSp, as evidenced by the following example, taken from a corpus of spoken Spanish in Caracas⁴:

- (10) *el peso... los puede hacer hundir* (Caracas 256:16)
 “the weight can make them sink”

The expectation is that, given more time, cases like (10) will also be completely acceptable with *se* in Spanish.

To summarize, we see the use of *se* spreading over time from the most peripheral verbs to the core verbs, and we see that it occurs faster in Portuguese than in Spanish.

3. Clitic placement

3.1 We are concerned with the change from (11a) to (11b), in which in the modern languages the OBJ₂ clitic sometimes does not climb into S1:

- (11a) *non gelo dexaron [sacar del campo]* (HisTroy 170:2)
 “they didn’t let them take him from the field of battle”
 (11b) *nos iba a dejar [sacarlo]* (Gazapo 9:14)
 “he was going to let us take it out”

One explanation for both clitics climbing up is that clitics climb to INFL, at least in Spanish and Italian (Kayne 1989:240). In uniaxial constructions, there is only the S1 INFL, since the S2 is just a VP. As the S2 evolves towards a IP/CP structure, then clitic climbing will be blocked, because the OBJ₂ clitic cannot move past the new S2 INFL (Kayne 1989, Bordoilois 1988:69–75, Rosen 1989:102–16, Pearce 1990:280–7).

3.2 Let us examine how the innovative [cl--cl] clitic position arose at the expense of the older [cl+cl]. As to be expected, this change started first with the peripheral causative verbs, as in the following example with *ayudar* “to help” in OSP:

- (12) *les ayudauan [de los vencer & los desbaratar]* (EstEsp 65r)
 “they helped them to thwart and defeat them”

The data indicates that in the corpus, at least, the [cl--cl] placement was the norm with these peripheral verbs by the early 1500s (e.g. 15/15 cases in MidSp).

In about 1500, we find the first case of the innovative [cl--cl] clitic placement with *dexar*, a causative verb which occupies an intermediate position between the core and peripheral causative verbs, both synchronically and diachronically:

- (13) *dexame [mirarte] toda, a mi voluntad* (Celestina 249:1)
 “let me freely take a good look at you”

But even in the 1500s, approximately half of the cases with *dexar* still had the older [cl+cl]:

- (14) *¡Gracias a Dios, que te me dexó [ver]!* (Celestina 60:10)
 “thanks be to God, who let me see you!”

Turning to *fazer*, it is no surprise that all OSP/Pr examples (7/7 OPt, 20/20 OSP) have the original [cl+cl], as in the OSP:

⁴ While the number of cases with S2 [+/-se] in ModPt/Sp is rather small in the corpus, conversations with native speakers of ModPt/Sp, as well as the findings in Finneemann (1982), confirm the observation.

(15) *fizo gelo [beuer] por fuerça* (EstEsp 102v)

"he forced her to drink it"

The difference with *fazer* is that while the other causative verbs have evolved away from clitic climbing ([cl+cl]), this has happened only slightly with *fazer* in Spanish, and is still somewhat tentative in ModPt, at least as far as this corpus of mainly written prose goes.⁵ Finnenmann (1982:256–432) and others show, however, that the innovative [cl–cl] sequence is becoming more common in the spoken registers of the modern languages.

4. *Case marking*

4.1 Let us now look at the shift in case marking of the SUBJ₂ of transitive S₂, from DAT in the older stages (16a) to ACC in the modern languages (16b). We will not deal with intransitive verbs, where case marking has always been mainly ACC. It is with the subject of transitive S₂ that there has been a major change—from DAT to ACC.

(16a) *eu lhe farey logo [negar a doutrina]* (Barlaam 74:1)

"and then I will make him deny the doctrine"

(16b) *o fazia [trocar o dia pela noite]* (Corça 187:2)

"it made him confuse the day with the night"

A common explanation for the original DAT case marking is that in the unclausal constructions, both S₂ NPs become objects of VERB₁. By analogy with simplex constructions, some type of case template assigns ACC case to the first OBJ in the string, and DAT to the second OBJ. Assuming that the 'standard' Romance causative word order is [S₂ VOS] (see 5.1), the OBJ₂ will be assigned ACC case, and the SUBJ₂ will receive DAT case (Zubizarreta 1985:269, Burzio 1986:233–4, Goodall 1987:110–11, Rosen 1989:56–61, Pearce 1990:156–61).

Presumably, in biclausal structures the two S₂ NPs can be case marked independently, since they are not both objects of S₁. Therefore, the SUBJ₂ can be case marked ACC by the VERB₁, independent of the ACC marking of the S₂ DO by the VERB₂.

4.2 Looking at how the innovative ACC marking spread through the causative verbs, we expect that it started first with the peripheral causative verbs and verbs of perception, and only later spread to the core causatives. This is what we do in fact find. Starting with the verbs of perception, the corpus indicates that the modern languages normally take ACC case marking, and more so in Portuguese than in Spanish.⁶

(17) *viu-o enterrar as mãos nos cabelos* (Homem 134:4)

"she saw him bury his hands in his hair"

However, in OSp/OPt, even these verbs often took DAT⁷, as in this OPt example:

(18) *quando lhe viu seu doo fazer* (Demanda 383:1)

"when she saw him lamenting his bad fortune"

As early as the OSp/Pt period, these verbs of perception and the non-core causative verbs like *dexar* started taking ACC. Note the following example with *dexar* from late OPt:

(19) *o fez leixar a fe de Jhesu Cristo* (Cron1344 198:1)

"it made him abandon his faith in J.C."

By ModSp/Pt, verbs such as *dexar* and *ver* take ACC in most cases⁸, again more so in ModPt than in ModSp.

The situation is somewhat different with *fazer*. While ACC case marking has spread to *fazer* in ModPt⁹ and is now almost the rule, as in (20),

(20) *faziam-na tomar o cavalo e seguir o marido* (BrazSS 153:3)

"they made her take her horse and follow her husband"

⁶ In the corpus, ACC with *ver* SUBJ₂ clitics is more common in ModPt (4/4) than in ModSp from non-Istia Latin American dialects (2/4). In addition, 8/8 Mid/ModPt full NP SUBJ₂ are ACC. In Spanish, the 'personal a' does not permit us to determine ACC/DAT marking with full NP SUBJ₂.

⁷ With *ver*, 4/4 O/MidPt SUBJ₂ clitics = DAT, but 4/4 full NP SUBJ₂ = ACC. In O/MidSp, 5/6 SUBJ₂ clitics with *ver* = DAT.

⁸ With *dexar*, 5/6 SUBJ₂ clitics are ACC in ModSp, and 6/6 are [–DAT] in ModPt, with 5 of them NOM.

(1) *não deixaram êle comprar um canal de televisão* (BrazFal 2:115:662)

"They didn't let him buy a TV channel"

⁹ With *fazer* clitics, only 1/29 = ACC in OPt, 0/8 in MidPt, but 10/20 in ModPt are ACC.

⁵ In written European Portuguese, the contracted forms (e.g. *mo=me+mo*, *lha=le+a*) are still acceptable. In some spoken registers of EP, however, they are now unacceptable, which thus prevents [cl+cl] sequences with causatives. In spoken Brazilian Portuguese, these contracted forms have died out, thus forcing [cl–cl] sequences, or else the deletion of the OBJ₂ clitic (cf. Wheeler 1981, Kata and Tarallo 1986).

a slim majority of the cases with *fazer* in the corpus in ModSp are still DAT 10. Once again, the expectation is that the innovation (this time ACC case marking) will eventually become the norm with *fazer* in Spanish, which has changed more slowly than has Portuguese.

5. *Word order*

5.1 Let us now examine the word order change from the OPt (21a), which has Verb-Subject (VS) word order, to the ModPt (21b), with SV:

(21a) *fez ante si [vir seu filho Recarredo]* (Cron1344 199:1)

‘he made his son R. come before him’

(21b) *fazer lo pais chegar aos destinos* (BrazSS 227:2)

‘to made the nation rise to its destiny’

A common view regarding word order with SUBJ₂ of causative sentences has to do with subject movement to INFL. In finite clauses the subject, which is base-generated postverbally, can move to [SPEC,INFL] and occur preverbally:

(22) [IP María; [VP comió el pastel e_i]]

In the S₂ of the uniclausal Romance causative construction, there is no INFL to move to, and the subject remains in clause-final position¹¹:

¹⁰ With *fazer* clitics, only 3/32 = ACC in OSp, 4/40 in MidSp, but nearly 40% ACC (7/19) in ModSp.

¹¹ The assumption that the SUBJ₂ is base-generated in postverbal position is a crucial one for most researchers. It is implicit in Zubizarreta (1985:283) and Goodall (1987:107), and is not elaborated on there. For Bordelouis, the NP is actually a DAT controller, which is postverbal by analogy with postverbal subjects in Spanish (1988:66). Rosen (1989:46–54) and Pearce (1990:50–64) are more explicit in their characterization of the internal constituency of the embedded VP. They suggest that the SUBJ₂ is base-generated in [SPEC, VP] position, following work such as Sportiche (1988). The only theory to assume base-generated SVO order is Burzio (1986:229).

Even with the [SPEC, VP] scenario, however, it is unclear why the [SPEC, VP] needs to be postverbal. Sportiche himself suggests that in French and Italian, it can in theory be either preverbal or postverbal. If we chose to base-generate it in preverbal position, then there would be no explanation for [S₂ VOS] word order with causatives. One explanation for postverbal [SPEC, VP] is that it naturally results from rightward case assignment in the Romance languages. But for some researchers (e.g. Pearce 1990:68) it is the VERB₁ which assigns Case to SUBJ₂, and either a pre- or postverbal (SPEC, VP) would be to the right of VERB₁.

(23a) *hicieron [VP trabajar a María]*

‘they made Mary work’

(23b) (le) *hicieron [VP comer el pastel a María]*

‘they made Mary eat the cake’

In diachronic terms, the evolution towards an IP creates a preverbal landing site for the SUBJ₂.

5.2 Most researchers assume (23b) to be the normal word order with transitive verbs. But this word order is virtually nonexistent in the corpus, in any period of either language, with any verb¹². The most common word order is subject before verb (SVO), as in the following examples from OPt and OSp:

(24a) *esta he aquella que fez a Deos perder sanha do home* (Virgeu 47:4)

‘this is the one that made God lose his anger towards men’

(24b) *dexaua al pueblo auer grand mengua* (EstEsp 72r)

‘this made the people be in dire need’

This suggests that there will be problems for any theory that tries to provide a rationale for word order change with both intransitive and transitive S₂, because the subject final word order has never been normal with transitive clauses, as it has been with intransitive ones.

Even with intransitive clauses, we do not find (at least in Spanish) the orderly syntactic shifts that we see with the other three syntactic phenomena. Portuguese had subject final (VS) word order with most verbs in OPt¹³:

¹² One problem in determining word order with transitive S₂ is deciding if the S₂ NP is an indirect object or a subject:

(1a) *te digo que no fagas perder a teu senhor tal causa como esta* (Barlaam 60:1)

‘I’m telling you to not have such a great thing as this slip by your master’

‘I’m telling you to not let your master lose such a great thing as this’

(1b) *E Achribal fez saber a Anybal ... os maãos aquecimentos* (Cron1344 95:1)

‘and A. made known to A./made A. aware of the sorry happenings’

The great majority of transitive S₂ in OSp/Pt and even MidSp/Pt are ambiguous in this way. But in those cases where the second S₂ NP is most likely a SUBJ, 10 cases with *fazer* are [S₂ SVO], somewhat less are [S₂ VSOL], and at most one is the supposedly common [S₂ VOS]. All clear examples with *dexar* (5/5) are [S₂ SVO]. In all cases with *ver* where the S₂ DO is not a relative pronoun (16/27), the word order is likewise [S₂ SVO].

¹³ With *fazer*, 20/28 cases with VINTR are subject final (VS) in OPt, as are 9/13 and 21/33 cases with *dexar* and *ver*, respectively. With all verbs, there is a split after OPt. Most prose texts move even more towards VS word order, while the spoken corpora and Brazilian prose (in general) rejects this trend. For example, 38/45 cases with *fazer*, 22/24 with *dexar*, and

- (25) *viram sair da arvore gotas de sangue* (Arimatheia 135r)
 "they saw drops of blood oozing out of the tree"

By ModPt there has been a shift towards nearly uniform subject first (SV) placement (even with *fazer*), at least in the spoken language:

- (26) *ele...faz a maquina funcionar* (BrazFal 2:75:603)
 "he makes the machine work"

As expected, this started first with the peripheral causative verbs and has only recently become common with *fazer*.

In Spanish, on the other hand, there is no such clear shift. The most common word order in all stages, with all verbs, is VS¹⁴, as in the following OSp example:

- (27) *las mugeres fazen errar al omne sabidor* (Castigos 78:1)
 "women make even wise men go astray"

This is in spite of the fact that there is a persistent minority of cases in all periods which are SV, as in MidSp (28). In Spanish, there has been no evolution towards SV word order with VINTR, as there has been in Portuguese¹⁵.

- (28) *la gran tormenta...hazia los arboles sallir de tierra*
 (GrinGrad 430:1)
 "the huge storm made the trees come out of the ground [be uprooted]"

In Portuguese, we again find the syntactic shift spreading through the causative verbs, beginning with verbs of perception and the peripheral causative verbs¹⁶, and only later reaching the core causatives *fazer* and *mandar*.

18/27 with *ver* in modern European Portuguese prose are VS. But in a corpus of spoken Brazilian Portuguese, only 5/8 with *fazer*, 1/5 with *dexar*, and 2/10 with *ver* are VS.

14 The percent of VS in Spanish has been OSp 37/42, MidSp 29/35, ModSp 21/21 with *fazer*; OSp 5/8, MidSp 20/25, ModSp 13/14 with *dexar*; and OSp 22/34, MidSp 56/69, ModSp 22/24 with *ver*. As with ModPt, the spoken language is more SV, as Finemann (1982) and others have noted.

15 This may simply be a result of a more pronounced general evolution towards standard SVO word order in Portuguese (especially spoken Brazilian Portuguese) than in Spanish.

16 With the exception of one or two questionable OSp/OPt cases, 86/86 cases of a peripheral causative verb (*permitir*, *ordenar*, *exigir*, etc.) with a S2 containing a full NP (both VINTR and VTRAN) take [S2 SV(O)] word order (e.g. *le permitio [a Pedro] leer [el libro]*).

Let us also note that the lack of [S2 VOS] word order with transitives, and the lack of word order shift toward SV in Spanish, may create problems for a theory in which word order change is necessarily linked to the use of *se*, clitic placement, and case marking, through one general parameter.

6. Motivations for the change in complement types

6.1 The preceding data clearly shows a uniaxial (VP) to biclausal (IP/CP) shift in both Spanish and Portuguese. The one complication is a lack of word order change in Spanish with intransitive S2. For some researchers, merely stating that there was a VP to IP/CP parametric shift is sufficient to explain the change. Others, however, prefer to look for underlying motivations for shifts in parameter settings. Let us follow this second path, and consider two possible motivations for the VP to IP/CP shift in Spanish and Portuguese.

6.2 The first possible motivation relies on the work of Kayne (1989), who deals with the relationship between null subjects and complements types. Kayne suggests that as languages lose the possibility of having null subjects, then the S2 INFL fails to I-mark the embedded VP. In the spirit of Chomsky (1986), he suggests that this creates a barrier between the matrix and embedded clauses, and biclausal structures arise. It is true that Brazilian Portuguese has been moving away from null subjects, because of a loss in verbal inflection (Lemle and Naro 1977, Tarallo 1985). According to Kayne, this would explain the rise in biclausal structures. But European Portuguese and all of the Spanish dialects still have null subjects, and yet they have also developed biclausal structures.

6.3 A second hypothesis might be based on the inflected infinitive which Portuguese possesses:

- (29) *e não deixava eles sairem* (BrazFal 2:57:1653)
 "and didn't let them leave"

Speaking in very general terms, the agreement on the infinitive indicates the presence of AGR in Portuguese causative S2, which in turn suggests some type of IP/(CP) clause structure. This contrasts with the reduced VP clauses which have been postulated for Spanish.

Important evidence for the role of AGR in the evolution of the causative construction in Portuguese comes from our corpus of examples. In OPt, there is no evidence of the inflected infinitive with causative verbs in the 13 examples where it should be visible (with 2sg, 1-2-3pl S2 subjects):

- (30) *não deixa os seus espercecer antes lhes ajuda* (Arimatea 149v)
 "he doesn't let his own perish without first giving them aid"

It is only after OPt that the inflected infinitive becomes common with causative verbs, and this is the very time that we see a sharp increase in the biclausal features ([+sel], [cl--cl], ACC) of the causative in Portuguese. In ModPt, where causatives are clearly biclausal, the inflected infinitive is used in 16/17 cases:

- (31) *deixa eles irem para a frente* (BrazFal 2:52:1423)
 "he lets them go ahead"

Because of the inflected infinitive, we would expect the Portuguese causative construction to evolve towards biclausal characteristics ([+sel], [cl--cl], ACC SUBj₂, SV(O)) faster than Spanish. In nearly every case, it does. We are still left, however, with the question of why Spanish, which does not have inflected infinitives, has also evolved (albeit more slowly) towards IP/CP S₂.

A possible solution may take the following form. Although Spanish does not have an inflected infinitive, it has diachronically evolved towards 'lexical subject + infinitive' more than French and Italian (Harris 1978:197):

- (32) *después de salir ellos, volvimos a nuestra ciudad*
 "after they left, we returned to our city"

In some dialects of Spanish, there has even been an evolution towards 'infinitive + preverbal lexical subject':

- (33) *pasó antes de yo mudarme para acá*
 "that happened before I moved here"

Sentences (32) and especially (33) represent an intermediate stage between 'no lexical subjects with infinitive' to the Portuguese 'inflected infinitive'. Suñer (1986) suggests that the S₂ in sentences like (33) have an IP node, but that AGR is set to [-AGR]. Lipski (1991) claims, however, that there is an abstract [+AGR]_I but that AGR marking on the infinitive is nonovert. For Lipski, the only difference between Portuguese and the Spanish dialects that allow (31) would be the surface realization of AGR.

From a less theoretical standpoint, Maurer (1969) shows how sentences like (32)–(33) were important in the historical evolution of the Portuguese inflected infinitive. Brakel (1980) suggests the same thing synchronically. All of this is evidence for a VP to IP/CP shift in both Portuguese and Spanish, and

suggests why the Portuguese causative has evolved more quickly than in Spanish.

6.4 We are still left with the problem of explaining why the syntactic shift slowly spread through the verbs, from the peripheral to the core causatives *fazer* and *mandar*. If there was one general parameter shift in the grammar, then it should have affected all of these verbs at the same time.

The explanation may have to do with what Givón (1980) refers to as the 'binding hierarchy of complements'. He suggests that there is an iconic relationship between the semantics of the causative verb and its complement type. A causative verb such as *fazer* 'to make' has a higher degree of 'intended/controlled' causation than peripheral verbs like *pedir/suggerir/permitir* 'to ask/suggest/permit', which have 'unintended/uncontrolled' causation. He argues that:

the higher a verb is on the binding scale, the less would its complement tend to be syntactically encoded as an independent clause.

Applying this to our diachronic facts, we see that the VP to IP/CP shift started first with those verbs which had the most independent S₂ to begin with, and gradually spread towards the verbs which were higher on the binding scale.

6.5 In their articles dealing with 'lexical subjects + infinitives', both Suñer and Lipski combine a rather formal account of clausal types with a more typological approach (general surface structure word order rules / marked vs. unmarked NPs and verb forms) to explain the Caribbean infinitival constructions. I suggest that such an approach can likewise explain the evolution of Spanish and Portuguese causatives. The formal change is a VP to IP/CP shift, motivated by emergence of AGR in the S₂. The typological insight is that the change spread from peripheral to core causative verbs in accordance with an iconically motivated 'binding hierarchy'. The approach we have presented here explains 1) why Spanish and Portuguese have evolved at all (rise in S₂ AGR), 2) the gradual (vs. abrupt) nature of the change, 3) the direction of the evolution (VP to IP/CP), 4) why Portuguese has evolved quicker than Spanish (inflected infinitive), and 5) why the change has gradually spread through the various verbs of perception and causative verbs in the way that it has (binding hierarchy).

REFERENCES

- Aissen, Judith and David Perlmutter. 1983. "Clause Reduction in Spanish". *Studies in Relational Grammar*, ed. by David Perlmutter, 360-303. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Beardsley, Wilfred A. 1921. *Infinitive Constructions in Old Spanish*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Bordelais, Ivonne. 1988. "Causatives: From Lexicon to Syntax". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6:57-93.
- Brakel, Arthur. 1980. "Infinitives, Subjects, Word Order, and Case in Portuguese and Spanish". *Hispania* 63:85-91.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax: A Government and Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chamberlain, Jeffrey T. 1986. *Latin Antecedents of French Causative faire*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Davies, William and Carol Rosen. 1988. "Unions as Multi-predicate Clauses". *Language* 64:52-88.
- Finemann, David A. 1982. *Aspects of the Spanish Causative Construction*. Unpublished dissertation. Univ. of Minnesota.
- González Muñela, Joaquín. 1954. *El infinitivo en El Corbacho del Arcipreste de Talavera*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Gibson, Jeanne and Eduardo Raposo. 1986. "Clause Union, the Stratal Uniqueness Law, and the Chômeur Relation". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 4:295-331.
- Givón, Talmy. 1980. "The Binding Hierarchy and the Typology of Complements". *Studies in Language* 4:33-77.
- Goodall, Grant T. 1987. *Parallel Structures in Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Gougenheim, Georges. 1929. *Etude sur les périphrases verbales de la langue française*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Harris, Martin. 1978. *The Evolution of French Syntax: A Comparative Approach*. London: Longmans.
- Kato, Mary A. and Fernando Tarallo. 1986. "Anything YOU Can Do in Brazilian Portuguese". *Studies in Romance Linguistics*, ed. by Osvaldo Jaeggli and Carmen Silva-Corvalán, 343-58. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kayne, Richard. 1989. "Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing". *The Null Subject Parameter*, ed. O. Jaeggli and K. Safir. 239-61. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Lemle, Miriam, and Anthony J. Naro. 1977. *Competências básicas do português*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Movimento Brasileiro de Alfabetização.
- Lipski, John. 1991. "In Search of the Spanish Personal Infinitive". *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the XVIII Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, ed. by Dieter Wanner and Douglas Kibbee. 201-20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Martineau, Frances. 1990. "La construction 'accusatif avec infinitif' avec les verbes causatifs et de perception en moyen français". *Revue Québécoise de la Linguistique* 19:77-100.
- Maurer, Theodoro. 1968. *O infinitivo flexionado em português*. São Paulo: Editora Nacional.
- Muller, Henri-François. 1912. "Origine et histoire de la preposition 'à' dans les locutions du type 'faire faire quelque chose à quelqu'un'". Poitiers: Masson.
- Norberg, Dag. 1945. "'Faire faire quelque chose à quelqu'un': recherches sur l'origine latine de la construction romane". Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift 12:65-106.
- Pearce, Elizabeth. 1990. *Parameters in Old French syntax: Infinitival Complements*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Pollock, J.-Y. 1988. "Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP". *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:365-424.
- Radford, Andrew. 1976. "On the Non-transformational Nature of Syntax: Synchronic and Diachronic Evidence from Romance Causatives". *Romance Syntax*, ed. by Martin Harris. 69-95. Salford: U Salford P.
- Rosen, Sara Thomas. 1989. *Argument Structure and Complex Predicates*. Unpublished dissertation. Brandeis University.
- Saltarelli, Mario. 1980. "Syntactic Diffusion". *Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. by Elizabeth C. Traugott. 183-91. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sporiche, D. 1988. "A Theory of Floating Quantifiers and its Corollaries for Constituent Structure". *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:425-49.
- Strong, David R. 1983. *Aspects of the Diachrony of the Italian Causative Construction*. Unpublished dissertation. Univ. of Michigan.
- Suñer, Margarita. 1986. "Lexical Subjects of Infinitives in Caribbean Spanish". *Studies in Romance Linguistics*, ed. by Osvaldo Jaeggli and Carmen Silva-Corvalán. 189-204. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Tarallo, Fernando. 1985. "Filling the Gap: Pro-drop Rules in Brazilian Portuguese". *Selected Papers from the XIIIth Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, ed. by Larry King and Catherine A. Maley. 355-75. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1985.

- Wheeler, Dana. 1981. "Object Deletion in Portuguese". *Current Researches in Romance Languages*, ed. by James P. Lanfolf and Gregory B. Stone. 207-20. Bloomington, IN: IUJLC.
- Zagona, Karen. 1980. "Evidence for VP Complements in Spanish". *Papers in Romance*. Vol 3. Supp 2. 185-93.
- Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa. 1985. "The Relation between Morphophonology and Morphosyntax: The Case of the Romance Causatives". *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:247-89.

IS THERE AN INDIAN SPANISH?

YOLANDA LASTRA
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

0. Introduction

It has always seemed interesting to me to find out to what extent Indian languages have influenced Spanish. Hispanicists often refuse to see the obvious influence of some of these languages upon Spanish. A typical statement is one found in a paper by Lope Blanch on Yucatecan Spanish:

Ante cualquier fenómeno lingüístico anómalo debe comenzarse por buscarle una explicación interna sistemática. Sólo cuando la innovación o desviación no puede explicarse dentro de las posibilidades propias del sistema castellano, deberán volverse los ojos en otra dirección. Sólo entonces podrá buscarse una raíz en la lengua de susurro o adstrato (1987:8).

If this dictum is carried to its logical conclusions, if a variety of Spanish is in contact with another language and they both share a feature, it cannot be attributed to language contact if in some other remote Spanish area the same feature happens to exist as well.

In the Andean area the influence of Quechua and Aymara upon Spanish has been studied by Nardi (1976-77), Lozano (1975), and Escobar (1978). Guaraní influence on monolingual speakers of Spanish in Resistencia has been studied by Quant and Irigoyen (1980). In Mexico, Lope himself has been interested in studying the influence of Mayan in Yucatecan Spanish. There are also some articles by Alvar (1969) and Cassano (1977). Dora Pellicer (in press) has been interested in Mazahua Spanish, but not from the point of view of language contact, but noticing rather the successful way in which Mazahua women communicate in Spanish. Zimmerman (1986) has an article on Otomí Spanish, and I have published two articles on the subject. However, to my knowledge, there have not been any large scale studies in areas where it would obviously be fruitful to undertake them, that is, in areas where the Indian language is spoken by a proportionately large number of people such as the Huasteca area, where there are many speakers of Nahuatl, or the Tehuantepec area where surely there must be Zapotec influence.

Table of Contents

PHONOLOGY

- On the status of sequences of liquids in Romance
Gorka Elortzieta and Jon Franco 1
S. J. Hannahs
- Glide formation, prefixation, and the phonological word in French
Jean-Pierre Y. Montreuil 13
Alfonso Morales
- Coda weight and vowel length in Quebec French
Bernard Tranel 25
- On deletion rules in Catalan
Mark Davies 37
- The representation of French final consonants and related issues
Yolanda Lasra 53

LANGUAGE VARIATION AND CONTACT

- On Old French genitive constructions
Carlos Otero 79
Deborah Ariaga
- French presentational structures
Peter R. Perucci 91
William J. Ashby
- The evolution of causative constructions in Spanish and Portuguese
Edward J. Rubin and Almeida J. Toribio 105
Mark Davies
- Is there an Indian Spanish?
Margarita Suárez and Carmen Lizardi 123
Yolanda Lasra
- From Leibniz's Grammar to Cartesian language theory: A retrojective view
Denis Bouchard 135
Carlos Otero
- The historical development of Rumanian /i/
- Feature-checking and the syntax of language contact
Michel A.F. DeGraff 167
Edward J. Rubin and Almeida J. Toribio
- Dialectal variation in an argumental/non-argumental asymmetry in Spanish
Denis Bouchard 177
Margarita Suárez and Carmen Lizardi 187

SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS

- Primitives, metaphor and grammar
Denis Bouchard 205
- On certain differences between Haitian and French predicative constructions
Michel A.F. DeGraff 237

Distinguishing copular and aspectual auxiliaries <i>José Lema</i>	257
The VP-internal Subject hypothesis and Spanish sentence structure <i>Errapel Mejías-Bikkandi</i>	275
The word order of constructions with a Verb, a Subject, and a Direct Object in spoken Spanish <i>Francisco Ocampo</i>	291
Verb incorporation and the HMC in XVIIth-century Spanish <i>Claudia Parodi</i>	307
Non-thematic datives in Spanish <i>Mariana Pool</i>	319
Restricting relativized minimality: the case of Romance clitics <i>Johan Kooyck</i>	333
On the nature of SPEC/IP and its relevance for scope asymmetries in Spanish and English <i>María Uribe Extebarría</i>	355
The verbal component in Italian compounds <i>Irene Vogel and Donna Jo Napoli</i>	367