On the emergence of argument encoding in causative constructions in Romance

Georg A. Kaiser
Universität Konstanz
georg.kaiser@uni-konstanz.de

Klaus von Heusinger
Universität zu Köln
klaus.vonheusinger@uni-koeln.de

How to cite: Kaiser, Georg A. & Klaus von Heusinger. 2024. On the emergence of argument encoding in causative constructions in Romance. In *New perspectives on the syntax of causative and restructuring verbs in Romance*, eds. Jan Casalicchio & Peter Herbeck. Special issue of *Isogloss. Open Journal of Romance Linguistics* 10(4)/2, 1–34.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/isogloss.324

Abstract

Causative constructions in Romance show complex variation regarding the case of the subject of the non-finite clause (causee) and to its position with respect to the main causative verb and the embedded non-finite verb. It has been argued that the variation reflects the diachronic evolution of the causative construction in Romance and also documents an ongoing process of further development. We present original empirical data from a comparative corpus of Bible translations that provide new insights into diachronic evolution as well as to the synchronic variation. Our comparative approach allows us to generalize over additional semantic and pragmatic parameters for the choice of a particular construction. Our data support the assumption of the extension

of ECM from clitic to nominal causee constructions in French, but they do not support this for Italian. For Spanish we see some ECM constructions in the most recent translation only.

Keywords: Romance, causative construction, diachronic evolution, Exceptional Case Marking (ECM), FAIRE-infinitive (FI).

1. Introduction

Romance languages have developed a conventionalized set of verbs which form syntactic constructions to express different causative relations. In contrast to lexical causatives, such as lexicalized causative verbs (e.g., *to kill*) or morphological causatives (such as the causative morpheme *-dür-* in Turkish *öl-dür-mek* 'to kill' on the intransitive verb *öl-mek* 'to die'), these verbs are called 'analytic(al) causatives' (Guasti 2006) or 'periphrastic causatives' (Jones 1996: 441). By forming a causative construction together with a "bare", i.e., non-prepositional non-finite clause, they get a causative or permissive reading in the sense that they indicate that one person, the *causer*, forces or permits another person, the *causee*, to do something. If both constructions are available, lexical causatives are generally assumed to express a direct causation, i.e., the *causer* is temporally and locationally very close to the causee and the caused event. Analytic causatives, on the other hand, tend to express an indirect causation, where the causer is more distant from the causee and does not get physically involved in the execution of the caused event (Shibatani & Pardeshi 2001; see also Guasti 2006, Martin & Schäfer 2014).

Causative constructions in Romance exhibit considerable variation and many peculiarities in both synchronic and diachronic aspects, especially with respect to the position and case of the causee, the embedded 'subject', but also concerning the position of the direct object of the embedded infinitive verb, when it is a clitic pronoun. We illustrate this variation with different translations from French, Italian and Spanish of one and the same verse taken from an extensive Bible parallel text corpus (see section 4 below). The translations document the diachronic development in each of these languages, as well as the synchronic variation between the languages and different translations of the same language. First, the comparison between the two French translations (1a) and (1b) shows that we do find alternations between a syntactic causative in (1a) and a lexical one in (1b). Second, the three Italian translations (1c-e) show the variation between embedded infinitives (1c, e) and embedded finite clauses (1d). Third, all translations document both synchronic and diachronic variation with respect to the position of the causee, preverbal in (1b), (1e) and (1h) versus postverbal in (1f) and (1g). And fourth, we also see variation in case marking: accusative in (1b), (1c), (1e), (1g) and (1h) versus dative in (1f).

(1)   Variation in the expression of causative relations (Josh 10:19)
        a. FR-1530[1]

       & ne   laissez point entrer es   fortresses de leurs citez ceulx q̃

           NEG let   not   enter in-the forts   of their cities those   that

---

[1]   The abbreviation FR-1530 refers to the language and the date of publication of the Bible translation, here French 1530; see Table 5 in section 4.

        le   Seigneur vous   a   livre   [...].
        the   Lord   CL.2PL has delivered

  b. FR-1997
    […] pour les   empêcher de rejoindre leurs villes
         to   CL.3PL.ACC prevent   to   attain   their cities

  c. IT-1471
    […] nõ laſſando quelli ĩtrare nelle forteze dele ſue   citade.
         not letting   those enter   in-the forts   of-the their cities

  d. IT-1641
    […] non laſciate ch'   entrino nelle   lor   città: […]
         not let   that   enter   in-the their cities

  e. IT-2006
    […] non li   lasciate entrare nelle loro città, […]
         not CL.3PL.M.ACC let   enter   in-the their cities

  f. SP-1602
    […] sin   dejarles   entrar en sus ciudades […]
         without let=CL.3PL.DAT   enter in   their cities

  g. SP-1995
    […] sin   dejarlos   entrar en sus ciudades, […]
         without let=CL.3PL.M.ACC enter in their cities

  h. SP-2015
    No los   dejen entrar en sus ciudades, […]
    not CL.3PL.M.ACC let   enter in   their cities
    'Do not allow them to enter their cities, [for the Lord has delivered them].'

In the following we provide new empirical evidence for the diachronic evolution and synchronic variation of causative constructions in the three Romance languages French, Italian and Spanish from our Bible parallel text corpus. This specialized corpus allows us to keep the semantic and pragmatic contexts always the same so that we can abstract across semantic parameters relevant for the use of causative constructions, such as the authority relation between causer and causee, the affectedness of the causee and the animacy of causer and causee. Our corpus also allows a close comparison between the three languages that enables us to detect differences that might be difficult to see in one language, such as the difference between accusative and dative marking for human arguments in Spanish (see below). We focus on the following: First, we can show that causative constructions with the specialized verbs MAKE and LET increase through time and become conventionalized, at the expense of alternative constructions, such as other verbs of ordering, preventing or permitting. Second, we evaluate the claim in the literature (Davies 1992, Sheehan 2020) that the so-called ECM construction is a more recent innovation that increasingly competes with the older so-called FI construction, first when the causee is a clitic and later when it is a noun. We test this hypothesis by analyzing the distinguishing characteristics for these two constructions, i.e., the position and case of the causee. Finally, we also investigate the position of the clitic direct object of the embedded verb, which can either cliticize onto the main causative verb together with the clitic causee as in (2a), or cliticize alone onto the embedded verb as in (2b). We

take this as an additional characteristic feature for the distinction between FI and ECM constructions.

(2)   a. FR-1997: 1 Sam 19:3
            [...] je *te*   *le*   ferai   savoir.
                I CL.2SG CL.3SG.ACC   make.FUT.1SG   know
            'I will let you know it.'
        b. FR-1997: Gen 20:6
            [...] je ne   *t'*   ai   pas laissé *la*   toucher
                I NEG CL.2SG=have not let   CL.3SG.F.ACC touch
            'I did not let you touch her.'

        The careful analysis of more than 2,100 causative constructions provides clear evidence that the specialized causative constructions with MAKE and LET have developed over the centuries. The data also suggests that ECM constructions are increasing in French and possibly in Spanish, but we do not see this in Italian. This is also supported by the additional characteristics of the position of the embedded object clitic.

2. Causative verbs and causative constructions: Some basic facts

Causative constructions have been primarily investigated under a typological perspective with respect to the form and function of such constructions (Shibatani 1976, Kulikov 2001). In Romance linguistics, however, one is more concerned with the structure of the complement of causative verbs such as MAKE and LET. Since Kayne's (1975) seminal work on French causatives, many generativists have dealt with causative constructions in various Romance languages (see e.g., Rouveret & Vergnaud 1980, Burzio 1986, Zubizarreta 1985, Bordelois 1988, Treviño 1994, Guasti 1993).
        The two most prominent causative verbs in Romance are MAKE and LET. Their forms in the main Romance languages are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. The causative verbs MAKE and LET in the main Romance languages

	Catalan	French	Italian	Portuguese	Rumanian	Spanish
MAKE 'to cause' (causative)	*fer*	*faire*	*fare*	*fazer*	*a face*	*hacer*
LET 'to let' (permissive)	*deixar*	*laisser*	*lasciare*	*deixar*	*a lăsa*	*dejar*

Source: Labelle (2017: 299) and Ciutescu (2015:25)

        Both verb types can form at least two kinds of causative constructions. The first type, labeled the FAIRE-*infinitive* construction (FI construction). (Kayne 1975), is characterized by the fact that the causee, when it is nominal, appears after the non-finite verb. The second type is called ECM (exceptional case marking) construction, where the nominal causee precedes the non-finite verb. The two constructions also

differ in the case of a causee of a transitive verb, in that in FI it carries dative case, while in ECM it is marked by accusative case.[2]

Contrary to what the term FI suggests, these constructions are not limited to the causative verb type MAKE, but also apply to the permissive verb type LET, as well as to other verb types, such as perception verbs, like *to see*. Examples (3)-(4) show such constructions in French and Italian where the infinitival complement contains either an intransitive verb or a transitive verb which is not accompanied by a direct object (Guasti 2006, Labelle 2017, Sheehan 2020).[3]

(3)   French
    a. Jean   *fait*   dormir / chanter **les enfants**.
       John   makes   sleep / sing   the children
    b. Jean   *laisse* dormir / chanter **les enfants**.
       John   lets   sleep / sing   the children
       'John makes/lets the children sleep/sing.'

(4)   Italian
    a. Gianni *fa*   dormire / cantare **i   bambini**.
       John   makes   sleep   / sing   the children
    b. Gianni *lascia* dormire / cantare **i   bambini**.
       John   lets   sleep   / sing   the children
       'John makes/lets the children sleep/sing.'

Spanish differs from French and Italian in that the causee, when human, is introduced by the preposition *a* which represents a differential object marker (DOM) (Ciutescu 2015: 26–29). The marker is obligatory here because the causee is human and functions not only as the logical subject of the embedded non-finite verb, but also as the direct object of the causative verb (Guasti 2006, Labelle 2017, Sheehan 2020).

(5)   Spanish
    a. Juan   *hace* dormir / cantar **a   los niños**.
       John   makes sleep / sing   DOM the children
    b. Juan   *deja* cantar / cantar **a   los niños**
       John   lets   sleep / sing   DOM the children
       'John makes/lets the children sleep/sing.'

---

[2]   A third type of causative construction, which we do not discuss further here, is the *faire-par* construction, as illustrated in (i) (Kayne 1975: 234):

(i)   French
    Jean *fait*   chanter une chanson (par les enfants).
    John makes sing   a   song   by the children
    'John has a song sung (by the children)'

This construction differs from FI constructions where the infinitive contains an (obligatory) subject, while in *faire-par* constructions the infinitive does not have a subject, but an (optional) agent complement (*complément d'agent*) introduced by a preposition (*par* in French) (see also Sheehan 2020: 371f, as well as Folli & Harley 2007, Belletti 2017 and Sheehan & Cyrino 2016).

[3]   In the examples in this section, we indicate the causative verb in italics and the causee in bold.

In constructions where the non-finite verb is transitive and accompanied by a direct nominal object, all three languages, French, Italian and Spanish, require the causee to be introduced by a preposition which functions as a marker for dative case ((6)-(8)).[4] It should be noted here that, contrary to what is generally said, the differences between the constructions in (3)-(5) and those in (6)-(8) lie not only in the transitivity of the embedded verb, but in whether it is transitive *and* whether its direct object is realized.

(6)   French
        a. Jean *fait*   chanter une chanson **aux   enfants**.
           John   makes sing   a   song   PREP.DET children
        b. Jean *laisse* chanter une chanson **aux   enfants**.
           John   lets   sing   a   song   PREP.DET children
           'John makes/lets the children sing a song.'
(7)   Italian
        a. Gianni *fa*   cantare una canzone **ai   bambini**.
           John   makes   sing   a   song   PREP.DET children
        b. Gianni *lascia* cantare una canzone **ai   bambini**.
           John   lets   sing   a   song   PREP.DET children
           'John makes/lets the children sing a song.'

(8)   Spanish
        a. Juan *hace* cantar una canción **a   los niños**.
           John makes sing   a   song   PREP the children
        b. Juan *deja* cantar una canción **a   los niños**.
           John lets   sing   a   song   PREP the children
           'John makes/lets the children sing a song.'

The second type of causative construction, the ECM (exceptional case marking) construction, is considered to be representative of the so-called *accusativus cum infinitivo* (AcI), where the causee, when it is nominal, appears before the non-finite verb and is exceptionally marked with accusative case (Mensching 2017: 382–384). Romance languages exhibit a large amount of variation with respect to these constructions. As illustrated in (9)-(10), respectively, ECM constructions in French and Italian are only possible – at least for some speakers – with LET, and generally not allowed with MAKE (e.g., Burzio 1986: 287; Reed 1991; Labelle 2017: 303; Sheehan 2020: 379). This is independent of the class of the embedded verb and of the presence of a further argument of the non-finite verb.

(9)   French
        a. *Jean *fait*   **les enfants** dormir / chanter (une chanson).
            John makes   the children   sleep   sing   a   song
        b. Jean *laisse* **les enfants** dormir / chanter (une chanson).
           John lets   the children   sleep   sing   a   song
           'John makes/lets the children sleep/sing (a song).'

---

4   A common explanation for the use of the preposition is that it disambiguates the causee from the nominal object (Davies 1995a: 112; Vincent 2016: 306).

(10)   Italian
    a. *Gianni *fa*   **i**   **bambini** dormire / cantare (una canzone).
        John   makes the children sleep   sing   a   song
    b. ??Gianni *lascia* **i**   **bambini** dormire / cantare (una canzone).
        John   lets   the children sleep   sing   a   song
    'John makes/lets the children sleep/sing (a song).'

As far as Spanish is concerned, the data are even less clear, as in (11), since causative constructions generally exhibit "the highest degree of cross-dialectal variation in Spanish" (Franco & Landa 1995: 212, fn.14). While for most speakers preverbal causees are only possible with LET, some speakers also accept them in MAKE constructions under specific conditions or in certain dialects (Bordelois 1974: 90; Treviño 1992: 310; Torrego 1999: 1792, fn.22; Torrego 2010; Tubino Blanco 2011: 214f; Labelle 2017: 303f). A further peculiarity in Spanish is that the causee is obligatorily marked by the differential object marker *a* when it is human. This fact makes it difficult to distinguish this marking from dative marking, which is done with the very same preposition in Spanish. Comparing Spanish to French and Italian, we can assume that the Spanish form is accusative. Additional evidence comes from pronominal clitic causees (Ciutescu 2015: 26-29), as discussed below.

(11)   Spanish
    a. ?Juan *hace* **a   los niños**   dormir / cantar (una canción).
        John makes PREP the children sleep   sing   a   song
    b. Juan *deja* **a   los niños**   dormir / cantar (una canción).
        John lets PREP the children sleep   sing   a   song
    'John makes/lets the children sleep/sing (a song).'

In sum, in Romance languages, FI constructions differ from ECM constructions in that (i) a nominal causee follows the non-finite verb, while it is preverbal in ECM constructions, and that (ii) the causee is assigned dative case instead of accusative when the non-finite verb is transitive with a direct object. These differences are summarized in Table 2:

Table 2. Core syntax properties of nominal causees in infinitival complements of causative constructions in Romance[5]

Causative	Infinitival complement	FI	ECM
MAKE 'to cause' / LET 'to let'	intransitive / transitive verb without overt direct object	Causee follows the non-finite verb (VvS) (accusative)	Causee precedes the non-finite verb (SVv / VSv) (accusative)
	transitive verb with overt direct object	Causee follows the non-finite verb (VvPRS) (dative)	Causee precedes the non-finite verb (SVv / VSv) (accusative)

Source: Labelle (2017:327) and Sheehan (2020:374)

---

5   Explanations of the abbreviations: S = embedded subject (causee); PRS = embedded subject introduced with a preposition; V = causative verb; v = non-finite verb.

The differences between ECM and FI are to some extent reflected in Romance languages when the causee is a clitic pronoun. Here again we have to distinguish between intransitive and transitive embedded verbs. In the three Romance languages considered so far, clitic causees of intransitive verbs procliticize on the causative finite verb and show accusative case (Torrego 2011: 148).[6] Thus, these clitics do not show whether they represent an FI or an ECM construction (Ciutescu 2013a, 2013b; Sheehan 2020: 369; Guasti 2006: 149). This is illustrated for French and Italian in (12)-(13):[7]

(12)   French
        a. Jean **les**   *fait*   {dormir / chanter}.
           John CL.3PL.ACC makes   sleep   sing.
        b. Jean **les**   *laisse*   {dormir / chanter}.
           John CL.3PL.ACC lets   sleep   sing
           'John makes/lets them sleep/sing.'

(13)   Italian
        a. Gianni **li**   *fa*   {dormire / cantare}.
           John   CL.3PL.ACC makes   sleep   sing
        b. Gianni **li**   *lascia*   {dormire / cantare}.
           John   CL.3PL.ACC lets   sleep   sing
           'John makes/lets them sleep/sing.'

In the case of Spanish, the situation is more complex. Spanish shows case alternation because of the existence of the so-called *leísta* varieties (Treviño 1994: 53f; Ciutescu 2015: 26–29). In these dialects, mainly spoken in the north of the Iberian Peninsula, accusative pronouns are replaced by the forms of dative pronouns when referring to a (masculine) person (cf. Fernández-Ordoñez 1999). This also happens in

---

[6]   Note that in Modern (European) Portuguese, as well as in Old Spanish and Old Portuguese, the causee can also *en*cliticize on the causative verb:

(i)   Portuguese
        a. O   João *fá*-**los**   {dormir / cantar}.
           DET John makes=CL.3PL.ACC   sleep   sing
        b. O   João *deixe*-**os**   {dormir / cantar}.
           DET John lets=CL.3PL.ACC   sleep   sing
           'John makes/lets them sleep/sing.'

A further exception is the affirmative imperative in all Romance languages, where the embedded subject is usually in postverbal position as the example of French shows:

(ii)   French
        a. *Fais*-**les**   {dormir / chanter} !
           make=CL.3PL.ACC sleep   sing
        b. *Laisse*-**les**   {dormir / chanter} !
           let=CL.3PL.ACC   sleep   sing
           'Make/let them sleep/sing!'

[7]   Note that this case marking can only be observed when the embedded subject is in the third person, since first and second person pronouns do not morphologically distinguish between accusative and dative forms.

causative constructions when the causee is a pronominal clitic, illustrated in (14) by the forms in parentheses. In contrast, speakers of varieties where this replacement generally does not occur tend to use an accusative pronoun representing the causee (Ciutescu 2013a). Note, however, that if both constructions are available the contrast between the two clitic forms is not related to the difference between FI and ECM constructions, but seems to be related to the force that the causer uses towards the causee (Strozer 1976):

(14)   Spanish
        a. Juan **los**   (/les)   *hace*   {dormir / cantar}.
           John CL.3PL.M.ACC   CL.3PL.DAT   makes   sleep   sing
        b. Juan **los**   (/les)   *deja*   {dormir / cantar}.
           John CL.3PL.M.ACC   CL.3PL.DAT   lets   sleep   sing
           'John makes/lets them sleep/sing.'

The state of affairs changes when the infinitive verb is transitive and accompanied by a direct object. In this case, the pronominal causee is generally expressed by a dative clitic pronoun and the construction is generally assumed to be an FI construction:

(15)   French
        a. Jean **leur**   *fait*   chanter une   chanson.
           John CL.3PL.DAT   makes   sing   a   song
        b. Jean **leur**   *laisse* chanter une   chanson.
           John CL.3PL.DAT   lets   sing   a   song
           'John makes/lets them sing a song.'
(16)   Italian
        a. Gianni **gli**   *fa*   cantare una   canzone.
           John   CL.3PL.M.DAT makes   sing   a   song
        b. Gianni **gli**   *lascia* cantare una canzone.
           John   CL.3PL.M.DAT lets   sing   a   song
           'John makes/lets them sing a song.'

(17)   Spanish
        a. Juan **les**   *hace*   cantar una canción.
           John CL.3PL.DAT   makes   sing   a   song
        b. Juan **les**   *deja*   cantar una   canción.
           John CL.3PL.DAT   lets   sing   a   song
           'John makes/lets them sing a song.'

However, in these cases, we are dealing with relatively high variation. In all Romance languages considered so far there are speakers who would accept – at least under certain conditions – the use of an accusative clitic in these constructions and thus their treatment as ECM constructions. This is illustrated in (18)-(20) and represented by the use of the percentage symbol (see e.g., Hyman & Zimmer 1976; Rouveret & Vergnaud 1980: 155f; Authier & Reed 1991; Enzinger 2010: 236 for French; Burzio 1986: 232 for Italian; Treviño 1992; Ciutescu 2013a, 2013b for Spanish):

(18)   French
    a. %Jean **les**   *fait*   chanter une   chanson.
       John   CL.3PL.ACC makes   sing   a   song
    b. %Jean **les**   *laisse*   chanter une   chanson.
       John   CL.3PL.ACC lets   sing   a   song
    'John makes/lets them sing a song.'

(19)   Italian
    a. %Gianni **li**   *fa*   cantare una   canzone.
       John   CL.3PL.M.ACC makes sing   a   song
    b. %Gianni **li**   *lascia* cantare una   canzone.
       John   CL.3PL.M.ACC lets sing   a   song
    'John makes/lets them sing a song.'

(20)   Spanish
    a. %Juan **los**   *hace*   cantar una   canción.
       John   CL.3PL.ACC makes sing   a   song
    b. %Juan **los**   *deja*   cantar una   canción.
       John   3PL.ACC   lets sing   a   song
    'John makes/lets them sing a song.'

The contrast between the FI and ECM constructions does not only show up in the case of the clitic form, but also in the possibility of "clitic climbing" for the second argument of the embedded verb, if a clitic. The FI construction requires the second argument to "climb" to the causative verb to which it cliticizes. In ECM constructions, on the other hand, the clitic must remain with the non-finite verb. Still, observations are not straightforward and judgements vary to a great deal. The following examples illustrate this difference between FI constructions (21a-a') and ECM constructions (21b-b'), where the embedded object clitic is underlined (e.g., Labelle 2017; Sheehan 2020: 372f for French; Treviño 1992: 316 for Italian; Ciutescu 2013a, 2013b for Spanish):

(21)   French
    a. Jean <u>la</u>   *laisse* chanter **aux**   **enfants**.
       John CL.3SG.F.ACC lets   sing   PREP.DET   children
    a.' *Jean *laisse* <u>la</u>   chanter **aux**   **enfants**.
       John lets   CL.3SG.F.ACC sing   PREP.DET   children
    b. *Jean <u>la</u>   *laisse* **les enfants** chanter.
       John CL.3SG.F.ACC lets   the children   sing
    b.' Jean *laisse* **les enfants** <u>la</u>   chanter.
       John lets   the children CL.3SG.F.ACC   sing
    'John lets the children sing it.'

A common explanation for this contrast is that FI constructions form a single unit in which the object pronoun cliticizes to the finite verb. In other words, they are mono-clausal. ECM constructions, on the other hand, are assumed to have a (more) biclausal structure which blocks the embedded object clitic from climbing to the main verb. This explanation also accounts for dative assignment to the causee in FI constructions with a non-finite transitive verb and an embedded direct object. Given

that, in Romance, accusative can be assigned only once in a clause, the mono-clausal feature of FI constructions requires dative to be assigned to the causee, as the direct object of the non-finite verb has been assigned accusative.

Table 3 summarizes the typical differences between FI and ECM constructions with respect to the behavior of clitic pronouns.

Table 3. Core syntax properties of clitic pronouns in infinitival complements of causative constructions in Romance[8]

Causative verb	Infinitival complement	FI	ECM
MAKE 'to cause' / **LET** 'to let'	intransitive / transitive verb without overt direct object	Causee cliticizes to the finite verb (accusative) (ACCS=Vv / V=ACCSv)	Causee cliticizes to the finite verb (accusative) (ACCS=Vv / V=ACCSv)
	transitive verb with overt direct object	Causee cliticizes to the finite verb (dative) (DATS=Vv / V=DATSv)	Causee cliticizes to the finite verb (accusative) (ACCS=Vv / V=ACCSv)
		Embedded object clitic cliticizes to the finite verb (accusative) (ACCO=Vv / V=ACCOv)	Embedded object clitic cliticizes to the non-finite verb (accusative) (VACCO=v / Vv=ACCO)

Source: Labelle (2017:327) and Sheehan (2020: 374)

In sum, this brief overview shows that one can distinguish two types of causative constructions, namely FI and ECM, and that the availability of ECM in Romance is more restricted than is that of FI (Abeillé, Godard & Miller 1997, Guasti 2006, Kayne 1975, Labelle 2017, Mensching 2017, Sheehan 2020). The difference depends, among other factors, on the type of the causative verb and on whether or not the causee is nominal or a pronominal clitic. It is furthermore semantically conditioned in the sense that it is more felicitous with an agentive embedded verb where the causee is forced or coerced to act by the causer or the causee (Strozer 1976, Ackerman & Moore 1999, Pineda 2020, Pineda & Sheehan 2023).

3. Causative verbs and causative constructions: Some basic facts

The synchronic variation between FI and ECM constructions in Modern Romance calls for an explanation in terms of the diachronic development of these constructions in the history of Romance languages.[9] Various studies show that the FI construction

---

[8]   Explanations of the abbreviations: S = embedded subject (causee); DATS = embedded subject realized as dative clitic pronoun; ACCS = embedded subject realized as accusative clitic pronoun; V = causative verb; v = non-finite verb; ACCO = embedded direct object realized as accusative clitic pronoun.

[9]   Latin showed various types of causative constructions with a certain focus on lexical causatives (Lehmann 2016). Syntactic causatives with *facere* ('to make') and *sinere* ('to let') are less frequent, but if used they typically occur with subordination (Chamberlain 1986, Vincent 2016). In Vulgar and Late Latin, they appear more frequently with an AcI construction (*accusativus cum infinitivo*), maybe following the pattern of *iubere* ('to order'). At the same time, there is also evidence for the first emergence of FI constructions with a dative causee

was available in early Romance documents, while the ECM construction only appeared later or is still not available today (Davies 1992, 1995a, 1995b, Pearce 1990, Sheehan 2020). The development and competition of these two structures are described for a larger class of embedding verbs, including causative, perception and other types of verbs. In the following we are summarizing the studies of Davies (1992, 1995a, 1995b) for Spanish and Portuguese and of Pearce (1990) for Old French and their interpretation by Sheehan (2020). Davies (1992, 1995a, 1995b) collected 3,200 instances of "causative-like" structures including the causative verbs *hacer* 'to make'*, dejar* 'to let'*, mandar* 'to send', perception verbs and order verbs such as *avisar* 'to call'*, forzar* 'to force' or *pregar* 'to pray' for Old Spanish, Middle Spanish and Modern Spanish (and the corresponding expressions for Old Portuguese, Middle Portuguese and Modern Portuguese). Based on the assumption that FI constructions are typically mono-clausal while ECM constructions are bi-clausal, he describes the diachronic development of causative (and perception) verb constructions in Portuguese and Spanish as a continuous shift from mono-clausal (FI) to bi-clausal constructions (ECM). He investigates four grammatical characteristics that distinguish FI from ECM constructions. First, case marking: The subject of an embedded transitive verb (with overt direct object) is dative case marked (FI) or accusative case marked (ECM). Second, clitic climbing of the embedded object: A clitic direct object of an embedded transitive verb can and must cliticize to the main causative verb in FI constructions, while it must cliticize to the embedded verb in ECM constructions. Third, the use of *se*: The FI construction does not allow the use of *se*, while this is possible for ECM constructions. Fourth, word order: FI shows V(O)S order, and ECM shows SV(O) order. However, Davies (1995b: 68) notes that "by far the most common transitive [embedded clause] word order, with all causative verbs in all periods, is SVO."

Based on these four criteria he illustrates the development of ECM through time with particular examples and observations that certain constructions are missing from his corpus. He observes that this shift occurs more quickly in Portuguese than in Spanish, as illustrated by different arrows in Table 4, and that it first affects 'order' causative verbs, such as *to obligate*, then perception verbs, such as *to see*, and finally 'peripheral' causative verb, such as LET, and 'core' causative verbs, such as MAKE:

Table 4. General schema for the diachronic development of causative constructions in Portuguese and Spanish

MONOCLAUSAL	» » » » » » » » » » » » » » »	BICLAUSAL
FAZER 'to make' *DEXAR* 'to let' *VER* 'to see' *OBLIGAR* 'to obligate' *MANDAR* 'to send' *OIR* 'to hear' *AYUDAR* 'to help' etc.		
PORTUGUESE =============== > SPANISH ------------------- >		

Source: Davies (1995a: 108)

---

with intransitive non-finite verbs. It is, however, controversial how (Early) Romance languages developed FI constructions with a dative causee for transitive embedded verbs, just as it is unclear whether and how Latin AcI constructions, which have disappeared across the whole of Romance, have survived in (some) ECM constructions in Romance, especially in (Old) Portuguese (Martins 2018, Rinke 2023). However, since neither Latin nor Portuguese is the focus of our study, we do not address these questions further here.

Sheehan (2020) provides an overview of the distribution of the FI and ECM constructions in Romance. She identifies the following characteristics that distinguish between these two constructions. First, word order: FI constructions have a post-verbal subject, while ECM constructions have a pre-verbal one. Second, case: FI constructions have dative case assignment to the subject of a transitive verb, while ECM constructions assign accusative. Third, clitic climbing: The direct object of an embedded transitive verb can climb to the main verb in FI constructions, but must cliticize to the embedded verb in ECM constructions. Fourth, the Person Case Constraint (PCC): PCC blocks dative case assignment to the subject in the presence of a local (1st/2nd person) embedded direct object in FI constructions, while dative is possible in ECM constructions. Sheehan (2020) reports on the corpus work of Pearce (1990) and Martineau (1990) and comes to the conclusion that in French the shift from FI to ECM occurs first with clitic causees (clitic ECM) and only later with nominal causees (full ECM), as summarized in (22):

(22)   Extension of ECM under causative verbs:
        FI > clitic ECM > full ECM

Both Davies (1992, 1995a, 1995b) and Sheehan (2020) investigated the diachronic development with larger corpora (see also Martineau 1990, 1992, Pearce 1990, Alfonso Vegas 2006 and Martins 2018). They searched for the forms of MAKE and LET causatives (as well as other causative and perceptive constructions) and analyzed the constructions as FI or ECM. This is the standard method and leads to important results.

However, despite the use of this method and of relatively large corpora, the concrete numbers of cases are relatively small. The reasons for this scarcity of empirical data are manifold. First, causative constructions with one of the designated specialized verbs MAKE or LET are quite rare. In addition, they often do not have a realized causee. Second, most causative constructions are not suitable for analysis (Davies 1995b: 61). As pointed out above, it is mainly sentences with a transitive non-finite verb and a realized direct object that allow a distinction between FI and ECM constructions. In the case of a nominal causee, the distinction can be made on the basis of its position before or after the infinitival verb or on the basis of the presence or absence of the preposition *a*, but the position of the causee might also be influenced by additional parameters (such as heaviness). Further restrictions are that only third person clitic pronouns exhibit a morphological distinction between dative and accusative case. Another problem is that for historical data it is often difficult to reconstruct the exact type of causative reading, as we often have only limited access to the linguistic and encyclopedic context of these constructions. We can also not always decide whether variation in the construction is due to a semantic and pragmatic parameter or whether it is rather a sign of evolution.

Therefore, we have created a different kind of synchronic and diachronic corpus. Based on a broad database of Romance Bible translations (Kaiser 2023), we have created a corpus of data from French, Italian and Spanish, which allows us to compare the evolution within one language as well as to make comparisons between the languages. As we are comparing Bible verses, the linguistic and encyclopedic context are clearly defined, which allows us to interpret the change of form as a diachronic evolution.

We analyze our data in order to prove the following hypotheses: First, the causative constructions with the specialized verbs MAKE and LET are becoming more frequent over time. Second, ECM constructions develop late in Romance, first with clitic causees and only later with nominal causees (Sheehan 2020). In order to provide support for the latter hypothesis we focus on the following characteristics that distinguish FI from ECM: i) word order, ii) case marking, and iii) clitic climbing of the embedded direct object clitic. We were not able to provide enough data to compare the use of *se* and the lack of *se*-marking in Spanish and the Person Case Constraint (PCC) in the given languages. In section 4.4, we will discuss whether our corpus provides additional evidence for the assumption (Davies 1992, 1995a, 1995b, Sheehan 2020) that the evolution of ECM starts with LET and only later goes over to MAKE.

4. A corpus study on causative constructions in Romance

4.1. A corpus study based on Bible translations

The data basis of our study comes from a parallel text corpus consisting of Bible translations. We are convinced, as expressed in the quote by Lerch (1937), that Bible translations are the most appropriate textual sources for diachronic and typological research (see also de Vries 2007, Enrique Arias 2013, Kaiser 2015):

> The best way to become aware of the change of language use is the comparison of two translations of the same text which are separated in time. The prerequisite, of course, is that both translations maintain a certain 'faithfulness' and are free from metrical or other influences. These conditions are generally fulfilled by the Bible translations.[10]
>
> (Lerch 1937: 610)

In fact, especially for diachronic research, translations of the Bible are particularly useful. They often represent the earliest (comprehensive) written texts (in prose) for many languages and have very often been retranslated at various times and therefore allow both comparisons between languages and within a given language across different periods of time. Most importantly for our purposes, they offer the possibility of comparing the different translations of specific constructions for which contextual conditions and the intended meaning are identical, or at least very similar. A further advantage is that the Bible is traditionally divided into books and verses, which helps to generate a consistent corpus for parallel text studies and to save the laborious step of sentence alignment. Furthermore, Bible translations are often easily accessible in electronic format, which can be converted into a digital corpus for automatic processing (without copyright restrictions). Finally, although the Bible is written in quite an archaic text style and has quite a specialized register, it also contains a considerable amount of natural-sounding direct speech.

---

[10]   Our translation. The original reads: "Es gibt kein besseres Mittel, sich und uns den Wandel des Sprachgebrauchs vor Augen zu führen, als den Vergleich zweier zeitlich auseinanderliegender Übersetzungen des gleichen Textes. Voraussetzung ist freilich, daß beide Übersetzungen eine gewisse ‚Treue' wahren und von metrischen oder sonstigen Einflüssen frei sind. Diese Bedingungen werden von den Bibelübersetzungen im allgemeinen erfüllt."

Given these advantages, we decided to rely on Bible translations for our study and to take as its basis eight translations into French, Italian and Spanish from different periods of time, listed in Table 5. The choice of the Bibles selected for our study is mainly related to their completeness and their (digital) accessibility. We excluded several older translations as they contain only (smaller) excerpts of the Bible and were not (completely) available to us in digital form. In the following we use, from our corpus, two French translations, one from 1530 representing Middle French (cf. Smith 2002), and one from 1997 representing Modern French. For Italian, we have three translations, two into Early Modern Italian from 1471 and from 1641 and one into Modern Italian from 2006. For Spanish we were able to include in our corpus a translation from 1602 (Early Modern Spanish) and two translations for Modern Spanish, one from 1995 and one from 2015. We included the latter in order to document very recent language changes.[11] We think that with this representative selection we can address the main question of the synchronic variation and the diachronic evolution of the causative construction in Romance.

Table 5. Bible translations used for the study

Language	Period	Acronym	Title and source
French	**Middle French** (1530)	FR-1530	*La Saincte Bible en francoys.* Lefèvre d'Étaples. 1530 <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k1512356p/f1.item>
	Modern French (1997)	FR-1997	*La Bible en français courant.* Alliance Biblique Universelle 1997 <https://www.bible.com/fr/versions/63-bfc-bible-en-francais-courant>
Italian	**Early Modern Italian** (1471)	IT-1471	*Bibbia Malmeri.* 1471 <https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/objects/492fe240-6937-411b-80a5-90bceed299fe/surfaces/cce5f7a2-e63e-4fe9-85f3-c62f02850347/>
	Early Modern Italian (1641)	IT-1641	*La Sacra Bibbia. Tradotta In lingua Italiana, e commentata da Giovanni Diodati, di nation lvcchese.* Geneua: 1641, seconda editione, migliorata, ed accreſciutata. <https://bibbia.sentierantichi.org/1641/1641_00_tavola.html>
	Modern Italian (2006)	IT-2006	*La Sacra Bibbia Nuova Riveduta.* Società Biblica di Ginevra 2006 <https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/Nuova-Riveduta-2006-NR2006/>
Spanish	**Early Modern Spanish** (1602)	SP-1602	*Biblia Reina-Valera Antigua.* Revised version 1602 <https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/Reina-Valera-Antigua-RVA-Biblia/>
	Modern Spanish (1995)	SP-1995	*Biblia Reina-Valera.* Socidades Bíblicas Unidas 1995 <https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/Reina-Valera-1995-RVR1995-Biblia/>

---

[11]   We did not include the other three major Romance languages listed in Table 1: Romanian does not have infinitive complements of causative verbs, while for Portuguese and Catalan we did not have extensive texts of historical translations. In addition, we have not included a Spanish translation from America, as we are focusing on the evolution of European Spanish.

	Modern Spanish (2015)	SP-2015	*Biblia Reina-Valera Actualizada.* Editorial Mundo Hispánico 2015 <https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/Reina-Valera-Actualizada-RVA2015-Biblia/>

For our analysis we have created a corpus consisting of the first ten books of the Old Testament (OT), i.e., from the book of Genesis (Gen) until the second book of Samuel (2 Sam). In our corpus search we started by searching for the use of LET and MAKE verbs in the contemporary French and Spanish Bible translations (FR-1997, SP-1995, SP-2015). To identify causative constructions with these verbs, our first step was to search for occurrences of the verbs *faire* and *laisser* in French, as well as *hacer* and *dejar* in Spanish, in all of their morphological forms. In order to do this, we searched for the following morphological forms, which capture all occurrences of these verbs:

(23)   a. French: *fai, fass, fer, fîmes, firent, fis, fit, font; lais*
       b. Spanish: *hac, hag, har, haz, hic, hiz, hech; dej*

On this basis, we extracted all sentences in which a causative construction is formed using one of these verbs. The basis of our corpus is thus, on the one hand, all verses where such a construction occurs in one of these three Bible translations and, on the other, the corresponding verses in the other translations, which often did not use a causative construction. Verses containing more than one causative construction were divided accordingly. In this way, we identified 970 verses in which, at least in one of the three Bible translations used for creating our corpus, a causative context is expressed by either LET or MAKE. Note that the sum of the analyzed verses for each of the translations varies, since the number of causative constructions per verse also differs between the translations.

We first filtered out all verses for all translations according to whether they contain a causative construction with MAKE or LET or not. We further divided the verses with MAKE or LET into three groups, based on: a) whether they have an embedded infinitival complement with an overt nominal or clitic causee, b) whether they have an infinitival complement, but no overt causee[12], and c) whether they

---

[12]   Note that the omission of the causee is only possible with transitive and unergative verbs (cf. Sheehan 2020: 371). As already noted in footnote 2, causative constructions with transitive verbs without a causee, illustrated in (i) (from Gen 40:22), are instances of *faire par* constructions:

(i)   a. mais il *fit*   pendre le   second.   (FR-1997)
           but   he made hang   the   second
       b. Latro   *fece* appichare nelle forche: […].   (IT-1471)
           the-thief   makes hang   on-the gallows
       c. Ma *fece* appiccare il   panattier maggiore, […].   (IT-1641)
           but made hang   the   baker   major
       d. ma *fece* impiccare il   capo dei   panettieri, […].   (IT-2006)
           but made hang   the   chief of-the bakers
       e. Mas *hizo* ahorcar al   principal de los panaderos, […] (SP-1602)
           but   made hang   DOM-the chief   of the bakers
       f. Pero *hizo* ahorcar al   jefe de los panaderos, […] (SP-1995 / 2015)
           but made hang   DOM-the chief of the bakers

constitute a 'further construction', that is a construction with a finite embedded clause or with a relative or interrogative pronoun as a causee (see section 4.2):

Table 6. Items found and categorized in eight Romance Bible translations from the book of Genesis (Gen) until the second book of Samuel (2 Sam)

Bible	Causative construction with MAKE / LET[13]			No causative construction with MAKE / LET[14]	Sum
	with causee	without causee	further constructions		
FR-1530	109	16	11	740	**876**
FR-1997	456	147	10	311	**924**
IT-1471	55	9	20	844	**928**
IT-1641	274	42	21	610	**947**
IT-2006	413	56	25	461	**955**
SP-1602	304	45	20	562	**931**
SP-1995	305	54	42	520	**921**
SP-2015	299	51	61	509	**920**
all	**2215**	**420**	**210**	**4557**	**7402**

We see that situations involving causative actions can be lexicalized not only by the specialized causative verbs MAKE and LET, but also by other means such as a lexical causative verb, special verbal TMA features or a non-conventionalized periphrastic construction. Example (24) illustrates different ways of lexicalizing the action of killing. It shows the use of lexicalized causative verbs in the oldest translations from Italian and Spanish (24a and 24d), while the modern translations contain the analytic causative verb *fare* or *hacer* 'make' (24b-c and 24e-f):

(24)   Lexicalized causative verb versus causative construction (1 Sam 2:25)
        a. IT-1471
           Perche   il   ſignor   li   uolſe   *occidere*:
           because   the   Lord   CL.3PL.ACC   wanted   kill
        b. IT-1641
           perciochè   il   Signore   voleua   *far*gli   morire.
           because   the   Lord   wanted   make=CL.3PL.ACC   die

---

'But he let hang the chief baker.'

[13]   Verses containing more than one causative construction with MAKE / LET are counted more than once accordingly.

[14]   These are either no causative constructions at all or a causative construction using other verbs that indicate causation, such as *mandar* in Spanish or *mandare* in Italian.

   c. IT-2006
      perché il Signore li   voleva *far* morire.
      because the Lord   CL.3PL.ACC wanted make die
   d. SP-1606
      porque Jehová los   quería *matar.*
      because Jehovah CL.3PL.ACC wanted kill
   e. SP-1995
      porque Jehová había resuelto *hacer*los   morir.
      because Jehovah had decided make=CL.3PL.ACC die
   f. SP-2015
      porque el SEÑOR quería *hacer*los   morir.
      because the Lord   wanted make=CL.3PL.ACC die
      'because Jehovah was minded to slay them.'

Interestingly, lexical causatives are much more common in older translations than in newer ones. Table 6 shows that there is a continuous increase in the use of the specialized causative verbs MAKE and LET through time for French and Italian (FR-1530: 14%; FR-1997: 65%; IT-1471: 7%; IT-1641: 33%; IT-2006: 49%), but not for Spanish (SP-1620: 37%; SP-1995: 39%; SP-2015: 38%). Table 6 also shows that there is no decrease in constructions without an overt subject.

4.2. Annotation of the corpus data

We only analyzed constructions with the causative verbs MAKE or LET with infinitival complements and overt causees (nominal or clitic), but not constructions without causees or with finite complements. We furthermore excluded from these constructions all those in which the causee is a relative or an interrogative pronoun, since in these cases it always occupies a clause-initial preverbal position. This leaves us with 2217 causative constructions with MAKE or LET and an infinitival complement with an overt nominal or clitic causee; see Table 7 for the figures for each category, language and time period. We see that there is a considerable difference in frequency between LET (20-30%) and MAKE (70-80%) across languages and times. We also see that the relationship between nominal and clitic causees is quite balanced in all translations. In our analyses below we will generally take the instances of MAKE or LET together in order to get more reliable numbers. We will only look at the contrast between LET and MAKE in FR-1997, where we have enough instances of ECM constructions to do so.

Table 7. Number of causative constructions with MAKE or LET and infinitival complement with clitic or nominal subject in eight Romance Bible translation from the book of Genesis (Gen) until the second book of Samuel (2 Sam)[15]

Bible	LET + CL	LET + NP	MAKE + CL	MAKE + NP	sum
FR-1530	21	16	37	35	109
FR-1997	61	63	163	169	456
IT-1471	12	15	15	13	55
IT-1641	24	31	115	104	274
IT-2006	42	36	177	158	413
SP-1602	34	39	114	117	304
SP-1995	42	38	118	107	305
SP-2015	46	42	114	97	299
all	**282**	**280**	**853**	**800**	**2215**

We annotated each instance of these causative constructions for i) type of matrix verb (MAKE, LET) , ii) type of infinitival verb (intransitive, transitive with direct object, transitive without direct object), ditransitive, non-finite verb), iii) type of causee (noun phrase including strong personal pronouns, clitics, other pronouns, no overt subject), iv) position of the causee (SVv, VSv, VvS), v) case of causee (accusative, dative, underspecified, prepositional including DOM in Spanish, *faire-par* subject realization), vi) type of embedded object (proper noun, noun phrase, etc.) and vii) position of the embedded object (OVv, VOv, VvO); see appendix 1 for the full manual.

We illustrate the annotation schema in example (21a), repeated as (25):

(25)   French
        Jean la   *laisse* chanter **aux   enfants**.
        John CL.3SG.F.ACC lets   sing   PREP.DET   children
        'John lets the children sing it.'

        i)   type of matrix verb: let
        ii) type of infinitival verb: transitive (with direct object)
        iii) type of the causee: noun phrase
        iv) position of the causee: VvS
        v)   case of the causee: dative
        vi) type of embedded object   clitic
        vii) position of the embedded object: OVv

---

[15]   We have counted clitic doubling constructions under 'LET + NP' and 'MAKE + NP' respectively.

4.3. Results of our corpus study

In the following we present our results for i) position and case of nominal causees, ii) position of clitic causees, iii) position of the clitic direct object of the embedded verb, iv) difference between MAKE and LET for Modern French (FR-1997). In section 4.4 we will discuss the hypothesis that the ECM construction first emerged with LET and only later with MAKE.

4.3.1. Position and case of the nominal causee
As discussed in section 2 (see the summary in Table 2), we can detect the difference between the FI and the ECM construction in the position and case of the causee. For intransitive embedded verbs, the subject is assigned accusative case in both constructions, but we can detect the FI construction by the post-verbal position (26) and the ECM construction by the pre-verbal position of the subject (27). In Italian and Spanish, the great majority of subjects of intransitive verbs are post-verbal, signaling an FI construction. We find only single instances of pre-verbal subjects. In French, the majority of subjects of intransitive verbs are post-verbal, but we do find about 10% of pre-verbal subjects of intransitive verbs, in Middle French as well as in Modern French:[16]

(26)   FI: Post-verbal nominal subjects of embedded intransitive verbs (Gen 24:11)
      a. FR-1530
          Et   quant il   eut fait   *coucher* **les chameaulx** hors   de la
          and when he has made sleep   the camels   outside of the
          cite […]
          city
      b. FR-1997
          […]il   fit   *agenouiller* **les chameaux**.
             he   made kneel-down   the camels
      c. IT-1471
          &   facendo *giacere* **li camelli** fuora   del   caſtello […]
          and making lie   the camels outside of-the castel
      d. IT-1641
          E   fatti *poſare* in ſu le ginocchia **i camelli** fuor   della città, […].
          and made rest   in on the knees   the camels outside of the city
      e. IT-2006
          Dopo aver fatto *riposare* sulle ginocchia **i cammelli** fuori
          after have made rest   on-the knees   the camels   outside
          della   città
          of-the city
      f. SP-1602 / SP-2015
          E   hizo *arrodillar* **los camellos** fuera   de la   ciudad, […]
          and   made kneel-down the camels   outside of the city

---

[16]   In the following examples, we indicate the embedded verb in italics and the causee in bold.

g. SP-1995
Fuera   de   la   ciudad hizo   *arrodillar*   **a**   **los camellos** […]
outside of   the city   made kneel-down DOM the camels
'He made the camels kneel down outside the city'

(27)   ECM: Pre-verbal nominal subjects of embedded intransitive verbs
a. FR-1539: Ex 10:7
Laisse **les homes** *sacrifier* au   Seigner leur Dieu.
let   the men   sacrifice to-the Lord   their God
'Let the men sacrifice to the Lord their God'

b. FR-1997: Gen 24:59
Ils   laissèrent alors **Rébecca et sa nourrice** *partir* […].
they   let   then Rebekah and her nurse   leave
'They let Rebekah and her nurse go'

c. IT-1471: Ex 8:25
che non laſſi **il   populo** *ſacrificare* al   ſignore.
that not let   the people   sacrifice   to-the Lord
'that I do not let the people sacrifice to the Lord.'

d. SP-1602: 2 Sam 21:11
y   no dejó **á   ninguna ave del   cielo** *asentarse* sobre ellos
and not let DOM no   bird of-the sky sit-down   on   them
de día
at day
'and she did not allow any bird of the air to settle on them by day'

e. SP-1995: Gen 47:21
Y   **al   pueblo** lo   hizo   *pasar* a las ciudades, […]
and DOM-the   people   CL.3SG.M.ACC made   pass   to the cities
'and he caused the people to pass into the cities'

f. SP-2015: Num 21:29
A   sus hijos dejó *ir*   fugitivos
DOM his sons   let go   (as) fugitives
'He let his children go as fugitives'

For transitive embedded verbs, FI constructions are characterized by a post-verbal subject marked with dative case, while ECM constructions have pre-verbal subjects unmarked for case (except for DOM in Spanish). In general, we have very few nominal subjects of transitive sentences (28), and no ECM construction except for six in FR-1997 (29a-b) and one in SP-1602 (29c):[17]

---

[17]   There is one single instance of an unmarked post-verbal subject, found in Middle French:

(i)   FR-1530: Josh 7:7
poʳ quoy as   tu   voulu faire *paſſer* **ce people** icy le   fleuve de Iordain
why   has you wanted make pass   this people here the river   of Jordan
'why did you make this people cross the Jordan River here?'

We assume this to be a residue of Old French, where DPs often failed to be overtly marked for dative case (Herslund 1980; Pearce 1990:152). Therefore, we do not analyze this sentence as ECM, but rather as an instance of a FI construction (cf. Sheehan 2020: 392f).

(28)   FI: Post-verbal nominal subjects in dative of embedded transitive verbs
       a. FR-1530: 1 Sam 14:1
          Mais ne   le   feist   poĩt *ſcavoir* **a son pere**.
          but NEG CL.3SG.M.ACC made   not   know   to the father
          'But he did not let his father know.'
       b. FR-1997: Ex 32:20
          et   mit cette poudre dans de l'   eau   qu' il fit   *boire* **aux**
          and put this   powder in   of the water that he made   drink   to-the
          Israélites.
          Israelites
          'and he put the powder in water which he made the Israelites drink.'
       c. IT-1641: Ex 32:20
          e   fece   *bere* quell'acqua **a' figliuoli d' Iſrael**.
          and   made   drink   that water to sons   of Israel
          'and he made that water drink to the children of Israel'
       d. IT-2006: Ex 32:20
          e   la   fece *bere* **ai**   **figli d' Israele**.
          and CL.3SG.F.ACC   made drink   to-the sons of Israel
          'and he made the children of Israel drink it'
       e. SP-1602 / SP-1995: Josh 7:7
          ¿Por qué hiciste   *pasar* **a este pueblo** el   Jordán, […]?
           why   made-2SG   pass   to this people   the Jordan
          'why did you make this people cross the Jordan?'
       f. SP-2015: Josh 7:7
          ¿Por qué hiciste   *cruzar* el   Jordán **a este pueblo**, […]?
           why   made-2SG   cross   the Jordan to this   people
          'why did you make this people cross the Jordan?'

(29)   ECM: Pre-verbal unmarked nominal subjects of embedded transitive verbs
       a. FR-1997: Gen 43:4
          Si donc tu laisses **Benjamin** nous   *accompagner*, […].
          if then you let   Benjamin   CL.1PL   accompany
          'If you let Benjamin accompany us,'
       b. FR-1997: 1 Sam 4:3
          Pourquoi le   Seigneur a-t-il   laissé **les Philistins** nous   *écraser*
          why   the Lord   has-he   let   the Philistines   CL.1PL destroy
          aujourd'hui ?
          today
          'Why did the Lord let the Philistines crush us?'
       c. SP-1602: 2 Sam 14:11
          […] que no dejes **á**   **los cercanos de la   sangre** *aumentar* el
              that not let   DOM the avengers of the blood   enlarge   the
          daño   […].
          damage
          'that you do not let the blood avengers increase the damage'

       Table 8 summarizes our observations: We see that all languages in all time
spans realize causative constructions with the FI construction. There are very few

ECM constructions in Italian and Spanish. Only Modern French shows a higher number of ECM constructions, about 10% ECM constructions with intransitive verbs and 50% (6/12) with transitive verbs, but still with very low figures.[18]

Table 8. Nominal causees in French, Italian and Spanish causative constructions[19]

Bible	INTRANSITIVE		TRANSITIVE	
	FI (VvS)	**ECM** (SVv / VSv)	**FI** (VvPRS)	**ECM** (SVv / VSv)
FR-1530	43	5	3	0
FR-1997	200	20	6	6
IT-1471	25	3	0	0
IT-1641	123	1	11	0
IT-2006	184	0	10	0
SP-1602	134	3	18	1
SP-1995	125	1	19	0
SP-2015	130	2	7	0
all	**963**	**35**	**74**	**7**

4.3.2. Case of the clitic causee

In section 2 (see summary in Table 3), we showed that the clitic causee in causative constructions always cliticizes to the finite verb. When the non-finite verb is intransitive, there is no difference between FI and ECM constructions, since the causee is always marked with accusative case. It is only with embedded transitive verbs that FI and ECM constructions differ from each other in that the clitic causee is dative, while in ECM constructions, it is assigned accusative case. These differences are morphologically visible only in connection with 3rd person clitics that formally distinguish between dative and accusative in Romance languages.

In causative constructions with clitic causees, we see a very similar pattern to that found with embedded nominal ones, as summarized in Table 8: There are only few occurrences with transitive verbs and in most cases the causee is unspecified for case, being either first or second person pronouns (singular or plural). All Bible translations – except IT-1471 – display instances of FI constructions, as illustrated in (30):

(30)   FI: Dative causees of embedded transitive verbs
        a. FR-1530: Deut 32:13
           pour **luy**   faire *mengier* les fruictz des   chaps.
           for   CL.3SG.M.DAT   make eat   the fruits of-the fields
           'to let hom eat the fruits of the field.'

---

[18]   A reviewer suggested that we should distinguish in Spanish between preverbal causees as in (27d) and (29c), and "topicalized" causees as in (27e-f). We have merged both types of non post-verbal instances under the label ECM in our Table 8 with (SVv / VSv).
[19]   We also considered here nominal causees occurring in clitic doubling constructions.
        Explanations of the abbreviations: S = embedded subject (causee); PRS = embedded subject introduced with a preposition; V = causative verb; v = non-finite verb.

b. FR-1997: Josh 5:6
[…] de ne   pas   **leur**   laisser *voir* le   pays […].
    to NEG NEG CL.3PL.DAT make   see   the land
'not to let them see the land'

c. IT-1641: Josh 5:6
[…] che non farebbe   **lor**   *vedere* il paeſe, […]
    that not make-3SG.COND CL.3PL.DAT see   the land
'that he would not let them see the land'

d. IT-2006: Josh 5:6
[…] che non avrebbe   fatto **loro**   *vedere* il paese […]
    that not have.3SG.COND made CL.3PL.DAT see   the land
'that he would not let them see the land'

e. SP-1602 / SP-1995: Josh 5:6
[…] que no **les**   dejaría   *ver* la tierra, […]
    that not CL.3PL.DAT let.3SG.COND see   the land
'that he would not let them see the land'

f. SP-2015: 2 Sam 12:18
Los siervos de David temían   hacer**le**   *saber* que el   niño
the servants of David feared   make=CL.3SG.DAT know that the child
había   muerto, […]
had   died
'David's servants were afraid to let him know that the child was dead,'

ECM constructions with clitic causees exhibiting overt case marking are extremely rare. For Italian we do not find a single instance. And for French and Spanish we only find examples in the modern Bible translations; see the examples in (31). This supports the assumption that ECM constructions are of more recent date. This assumption is further supported by example (31d). It is the translation of the same verse as in (30e) (SP-1995), where the causee is a dative pronoun. In the newer translation from SP-2015, an accusative pronoun is used instead, representing an ECM construction. This example provides evidence for the assumption, mentioned above, that ECM constructions are gradually emerging as alternative constructions, which eventually can replace FI constructions, first with clitic causees and then with nominal ones.

(31)   ECM: Accusative causees of embedded transitive verbs
a. FR-1997: Gen 31:7
Mais Dieu ne **l'**   a   pas laissé me   *faire* du tort.
but   God NEG CL.3SG.M.ACC=has not let   CL.1SG make DET wrong
'But God didn't let him harm me'

b. FR-1997: Gen 41:42
il **le**   fit   *habiller* de   fins vêtements de lin […]
he CL.3SG.M.ACC made dress   PREP fine garments   of linen
'he had him dressed in fine linen clothing'

c. SP-1995: 2 Sam 19:15
[…] y   hacer**lo**   *pasar* el Jordán […]
    and make=CL.3SG.M.ACC pass   the Jordan
'and make him cross the Jordan'

d. SP-2015: Josh 5:6

[…] que no	**los**	dejaría	*ver*	la	tierra […].
that not	CL.3PL.M.ACC	let.3SG.COND	see	the	land

'that he would not let them see the land'

Table 9 summarizes our observations for clitic causees, which show only an alternation between dative and accusative with transitive verbs, which have a low number. All translations, except IT-1471, have dative clitics, indicating FI constructions. But only FR-1997 and SP-2015 have the accusative, signalizing an ECM construction. FR-1997 has 27% (5 from 18) and SP-2015 has 45% (5 from 11) ECM constructions.

Table 9. Clitic causees in French, Italian and Spanish causative constructions[20]

Bible	INTRANSITIVE	TRANSITIVE		
	Unspecified (SVv / VSv)	FI (DATSVv / VDATSv)	ECM (ACCSVv / VACCSv)	Unspecified (UNSPECSVv / VUNSPECSv)
FR-1530	49	2	0	7
FR-1997	165	13	5	41
IT-1471	24	0	0	4
IT-1641	108	6	1	26
IT-2006	177	13	0	29
SP-1602	122	6	0	24
SP-1995	130	10	1	26
SP-2015	134	6	5	16
all	**908**	**56**	**12**	**173**

4.3.3 Position of the embedded clitic direct object

As discussed in section 2 (see summary in Table 3), the position and the cliticization of the embedded clitic direct object can also serve as a hint to distinguish between FI and ECM constructions. When the embedded object pronoun cliticizes to the main verb, we are dealing with a mono-clausal FI construction which allows it to climb to the main verb of the sentence. In an ECM construction, this climbing is not possible due to the bi-clausal feature of the sentence, which requires the object clitic to cliticize to the non-finite verb.

As in the case of the occurrence of causees in connection with transitive embedded verbs, the overall figures for the occurrence of embedded object clitics are very low (see Table 10). And here again, too, the figures for FI constructions are higher than for ECM constructions. More precisely, we find evidence for ECM constructions

---

[20]   We also considered here clitic causees occurring in clitic doubling constructions.

Explanations of the abbreviations: S = embedded subject (causee); DATS = embedded subject realized as dative clitic pronoun; ACCS = embedded subject realized as accusative clitic pronoun; UNSPECS = embedded subject unspecified for case; V = causative verb; v = non-finite verb.

almost only for Modern French (32a-d), with only one example in the Modern Spanish Bible translation SP-2015 (32e).

(32) ECM: Object clitic cliticized to the embedded transitive verb
       a. FR-1997: Gen 20:6
           voilà pourquoi je ne   t'   ai   pas laissé *la*
           that's why   I NEG CL.2SG have not let   CL.3PL.F.ACC
           toucher
           touch
           'therefore I did not let you touch her.'
       b. FR-1997: Gen 43:4
           Si donc tu laisses Benjamin *nous*   accompagner, […]
           if so   you let   Benjamin CL.1PL   accompany
           'If you let Benjamin accompany us,'
       c. FR-1997: Ex 21:8
           il doit laisser le père *la*   racheter
           he must let   the father CL.3PL.F.ACC buy-back
           'then he shall let the father ransom her'
       d. FR-1997: 1 Sam 4:3
           Pourquoi le Seigneur a-t-il laissé les Philistins *nous*   écraser
           why   the Lord   has-he let   the Philistines CL.1PL   destroy
           aujourd'hui ?
           today
           'Why did the Lord let the Philistines crush us?'
       e. SP-2015: 1 Sam 15:16
           Déjame   declarar*te*   lo que el SEÑOR me   dijo anoche
           let=CL.1SG declare=CL.2SG that what the Lord   CL.1SG said tonight
           'let me tell you what the Lord said to me last night'

    Table 10 shows that there are not very many instances of embedded clitic direct objects. Most of them are cliticized to the causative verb (see, for instance, (2a) for French). Only in FR-1997 do 70% (7/10) of the clitic direct objects cliticize to the embedded verb, and 9% in SP-2015 (1/11).

Table 10. Embedded clitic direct objects in French, Italian and Spanish causative constructions[21]

Bible	TRANSITIVE	
	FI (O=Vv / V=Ov)	**ECM** (VO=v / Vv=O)
FR-1530	4	0
FR-1997	3	7
IT-1471	1	0
IT-1641	11	0
IT-2006	10	0
SP-1602	9	0
SP-1995	18	0
SP-2015	10	1
all	**66**	**8**

4.4 Discussion

We have analyzed more than 2,200 causative constructions with MAKE or LET from our corpus of eight Romance Bible translations. About 90% of the constructions have an intransitive embedded verb, such that the difference between an FI and an ECM construction can only be detected by the position of a nominal subject; see Table 8. Only French has about 10% of pre-verbal nominal causees, indicating an ECM construction, in both translations (FR-1530 5/48 and FR-1997 20/220). All other languages show only single instances of ECM constructions (about 1-2%). The remaining 10% of our analyzed data are constructions with embedded transitive verbs, which allow for a characterization according to the position of the nominal subject and the case of the nominal or clitic causee. For nominal causees we observe that all translations show FI constructions, but only Modern French shows 50% of ECM constructions (6/12). For clitic causees we see that besides Modern French (28%, namely 5/18), the latest Spanish translation has some ECM constructions (SP-2015: 45%, namely 5/11); see Table 9. Our final test for ECM constructions was the position of the clitic direct object. Here we see that only Modern French shows the direct object cliticizing to the embedded verb (ECM construction) in 70% of the cases (7/10); see Table 9.

We can summarize these observations in the following way. French shows an increasing use of the ECM construction from Old French to Modern French for transitive verbs. This clearly supports the hypothesis that ECM is developing through time (see (22) above). Second, Italian does not show any sign of ECM constructions, not even in the modern translation. For Spanish, we see only in the most recent translation that 45% of the clitic causees are accusative marked, i.e. indicating an ECM construction. This might provide some support for the assumption of Sheehan (2020)

---

[21]   Explanations of the abbreviations: O = embedded direct clitic object; V = causative verb; v = non-finite verb.

that the change starts with clitic causees and then goes over to nominal ones. Our data show that there is evolution of ECM constructions, but due to the scarce data for transitive embedded verbs, the picture is not so clear.

We can additionally test the assumption (Davies 1992, 1995a, 1995b, Sheehan 2020) that the evolution of ECM starts with LET and only later goes over to MAKE. We therefore split the data for FR-1997, the only translation that shows a considerable number of ECM constructions. In Table 11 we summarized the FR-1997 data from Table 8 and Table 9 (only the data that indicate a particular construction), split between MAKE and LET. This allows us to see that for nominal subjects of intransitive and transitive verbs, all instances of ECM constructions are only found with LET, but not with MAKE (only one instance). The situation for clitic causees of transitive verbs is different: as we have only three instances of LET, we cannot make any strong generalization for LET (66% ECM), but of the 15 instances of clitic causees with MAKE, only 3 (20%) are accusative, i.e., showing an ECM construction. This clearly signals that for LET the evolution has already affected nominal causees, but for MAKE the evolution has only just started with clitic causees.

Table 11 Nominal and clitic causees in Modern French causative constructions (MAKE vs. LET) [22]

FR-1997	NOMINAL CAUSEE				CLITIC CAUSEE	
	INTRANSITIVE		TRANSITIVE		TRANSITIVE	
	FI (VvS)	ECM (SVv / VSv)	FI (VvPRS)	ECM (SVv / VSv)	FI (DATSVv)	ECM (ACCSVv/ VACCSv)
LET	38	19	0	6	1	2
MAKE	162	1	6	0	12	3
SUM	**200**	**20**	**6**	**6**	**13**	**5**

As we can see from Table 8 and Table 9, there are very few ECM instances in the other translations, such that a split into LET vs. MAKE does not provide enough instances for us to draw substantial conclusions. For Middle French, we see that nominal causees are at 20% (4/16) for LET and at only 3% (1/32) for MAKE as part of an ECM construction. For Italian, we do not see any ECM constructions, but we do see some interesting patterns in the most recent Spanish translation (SP-2015). In SP-1995 we see only two ECM constructions across conditions. However, for SP-2015 we see in the clitic causee condition nearly 45% (5/11) of ECM constructions with MAKE, but only one case with LET (1/1). Thus, we cannot draw any conclusion with respect to the hypothesis that ECM constructions start first with LET and then develop to the MAKE construction. But the observation from SP-2015 supports the hypothesis that ECM starts with clitic causees and then develops in nominal causees.

We think that the translation into Modern French (FR-1997) and the most recent Spanish translation (SP-2015) support the hypothesis that ECM starts with clitic

---

[22]   Explanations of the abbreviations: S = embedded subject (causee); DATS = embedded subject realized as dative clitic pronoun; ACCS = embedded subject realized as accusative clitic pronoun; PRS = embedded subject introduced with a preposition; V = causative verb; v = non-finite verb.

causees and then goes to nominal causees, which we see if we only look at MAKE. The French data also support the hypothesis of Davies (1992, 1995a, 1995b) and Sheehan (2020) that the evolution of ECM has to be seen in a broader perspective. They argue that it starts with independent causative verbs, then goes over to perception verbs like *see* and then to LET, and only in a final step to MAKE.

5. Summary and conclusion

With our special parallel corpus of Romance Bible translations from French, Italian and Spanish and from different centuries, we were able to develop a comparative view of the development of causative constructions in Romance languages. This comparative method allows analyses of diachronic data in a well-known and established context. We built a corpus of more than 2,200 causative constructions, which was annotated according to various grammatical criteria. We first observed that causative constructions with the specialized verbs LET and MAKE become more frequent over time, with a much higher increase of MAKE than of LET in all of the languages studied. Second, our fine-grained analysis allowed us to evaluate the hypothesis that FI is the general construction and that the ECM construction is more recent and evolving over time. In order to test this hypothesis, we searched for three grammatical configurations that distinguish these two constructions: i) the position of the nominal subject of the embedded verb (post-verbal for FI and pre-verbal for ECM constructions), ii) the case of the nominal or clitic causee of transitive verbs (dative for FI and accusative for ECM constructions), and iii) the position of the clitic direct object of the embedded transitive verb (cliticizing to the causative verb for FI and to the embedded verb for ECM). The review of our data with respect to these three criteria shows that only French shows an ECM construction evolving through time. Interestingly, this construction is quite frequent with nominal subjects in LET causatives, and only found with clitic causees in MAKE causatives. This observation supports the hypothesis that ECM develops first for LET and only later for MAKE, and second that it is found first with clitics, and only later with nominals. We see also some effect in the most recent Spanish translation, but we think that these data are not informative enough to make a general statement. For Italian, we do not find any evolution of the ECM construction. Thus, we can conclude that there are two prominent types of causative constructions, but they have not spread in the same way across Romance languages. We believe that these findings can be used to describe the differences between the Romance languages investigated even on a more general level. And we also hope that our study will initiate further research.

Acknowledgments

References

Abeillé, Anne, Godard, Danièle, & Philip H. Miller. 1997. Les causatives en français, un cas de compétition syntaxique. *Langue française* 115: 62–74. https://doi.org/10.3406/lfr.1997.6222

Ackerman, Farrell, & John Moore. 1999. Syntagmatic and paradigmatic dimensions of causee encodings. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22: 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005462027684

Alfonso Vega, Milagros. 2006. Verbos causativos. In C.C. Company (ed.), *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española. Primera parte: La frase verbal. Volumen II*, 969–1052. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México / Fondo de cultura económica.

Authier, Marc, & Lisa A. Reed. 1991. Ergative predicates and dative cliticization in French causatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 197–205. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178714

Belletti, Adriana. 2017. Labeling (Romance) causatives. In E.O. Aboh, E. Haeberli, G. Puskás, & M. Schönenberger (eds), *Elements of Comparative Syntax. Theory and Description*, 13–46. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501504037-002

Bordelois, Ivonne A. 1974. *The Grammar of Spanish Causative Complements*. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Bordelois, Ivonne. 1988. Causatives: from lexicon to syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 57–93. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01791592

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Chamberlain, Jeffrey T. 1986. *Latin Antecedents of French Causative Faire*. New York: Lang.

Ciutescu, Elena. 2013a. Micro-parametric variation in Romance causative constructions. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 15: 45–60. http://bwpl.unibuc.ro/vol-xv-nr-2/

Ciutescu, Elena. 2013b. Remarks on the infinitival subject of perception verb complements: evidence from two syntactic configurations. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 58(3): 299–312.

Ciutescu, Elena. 2015. Romance causatives and object shift. In E.O. Aboh, J.C. Schaeffer &, P. Sleeman (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2013. Selected Papers from "Going Romance" Amsterdam 2013*, 21–38. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.8.02ciu

Davies, Mark Edward. 1992. *The diachronic evolution of causative constructions in Spanish and Portuguese.* Ph.D. thesis, University of Texas at Austin.

Davies, Mark. 1995a. The evolution of causative constructions in Spanish and Portuguese. In J. Amastae, G. Goodall, M. Montalbetti, & M. Phinney (eds), *Contemporary Research in Romance Linguistics: Papers from the 22nd Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, El Paso/Cd. Juarez. February 1992*, 105–122. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.123.10dav

Davies, Mark E. 1995b. The evolution of the Spanish causative construction. *Hispanic Review* 63: 57–77. https://doi.org/10.2307/474378

Enrique-Arias, Andrés. 2013. On the usefulness of using parallel texts in diachronic investigations. Insights from a parallel corpus of Spanish medieval Bible translations. In P. Bennett, M. Durrell, S. Scheible, & R.J. Whitt (eds), *New Methods in Historical Corpora,* 105–115. Tübingen: Narr.

Enzinger, Stefan. 2010. *Kausative und perzeptive Infinitivkonstruktionen. Syntaktische Variation und semantischer Aspekt.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1524/9783050062310

Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés. 1999. Leísmo, laísmo y loísmo. In I. Bosque, & V. Demonte (eds), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española. Vol. 1: Sintaxis de la clases de palabras*, 1317–1397. Madrid: Espasa.

Folli, Raffaella, & Heidi Harley. 2007. Causation, obligation, and argument structure: on the nature of little v. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 197–238. https://doi.org/10.1162/ling.2007.38.2.197

Franco, Jon, & Alazne Landa. 1995. An analysis of AGR_o projections for Spanish causatives. *Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca 'Julio de Urquijo'* 29: 199–218.

Guasti, Maria Teresa. 1993. *Causative and perception verbs: a comparative study*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Guasti, Maria Teresa. 2006. Analytic causatives. In M. Everaert, & H. van Riemsdijk (eds), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax. Volume I*, 142–172. Malden: Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996591.ch6

Herslund, Michael. 1980. *Problèmes de l'ancien français. Compléments datifs et génitifs.* Copenhagen: Romansk Institut.

Hyman, Larry M., & Karl Zimmer. 1976. Embedded topics in French. In C.N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic,* 191–211. New York: Academic Press.

Jones, Michael Allan. 1996. *Foundations of French Syntax.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620591

Kaiser, Georg A. 2015. Zur Verwendung von Bibelübersetzungen in der (romanistischen) Sprachwissenschaft. *Biblicum Jassyense* 6: 5–18.

Kaiser, Georg A. 2023. Konstanz parallel text corpus. Bible translations. To appear in G.A. Kaiser, A. Weingart, N. Cordes & S. Krieger, *KonCAT. Konstanz Corpus Annotation Tool*. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz, Fachbereich Linguistik.

Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Kulikov, Leonid. 2001. Causatives. In M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher, & W. Raible (eds), *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook*, vol. 2, 886–898. Berlin: de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110194265-003

Labelle, Marie. 2017. Causative and perception verbs. In A. Dufter, & E. Stark (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*, 299–231. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110377088-008

Lehmann, Christian. 2016. Latin causativization in typological perspective. In P. Poccetti (ed.), *Latinitatis Rationes. Descriptive and Historical Accounts for the Latin Language*, 917–941. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431896-057

Lerch, Eugen. 1937. Review of Horst Kunze, *Die Bibelübersetzungen von Lefèvre d'Étaples und von P.R. Olivetan*, *verglichen mit ihrem Wortschatz*. Leipziger Roman. Studien, hrsg. von W. v. Wartburg, Reihe I, Heft 11. Leipzig 1935. Selbstverlag des Roman. Seminars; Paris, E. Droz. 236 S. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 57: 610–616.

Martin, Fabienne, & Florian Schäfer. 2014. Causation at the syntax-semantics interface. In B. Copley, & F. Martin (eds), *Causation in Grammatical Structures*, 209–244. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199672073.003.0009

Martineau, France. 1990. La construction «accusatif avec infinitif» avec les verbes causatifs et de perception en moyen français. *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 19: 77–100. https://doi.org/10.7202/602666ar

Martineau, France. 1992. The evolution of complements of French causative and perception verbs. In P. Hirschbühler, & K. Koerner (eds), *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory. Papers from the 20th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL XX), Ottawa, 10-14 April 1990*, 161–174. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.91.12mar

Martins, Ana Maria. 2018. Infinitival complements of causative/perception verbs in a diachronic perspective. In A.L. Santos, & A. Gonçalves (eds), *Complement Clauses in Portuguese. Syntax and Acquisition*, 101–128. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ihll.17.04mar

Mensching, Guido. 2017. Infinitival clauses. In A. Dufter, & E. Stark (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*, 369–396. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110377088-010

Pearce, Elizabeth. 1990. *Parameters in Old French Syntax. Infinitival Complements*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Pineda, Anna. 2020. From dative to accusative. An ongoing syntactic change in Romance. *Probus* 32: 129–173. https://doi.org/10.1515/probus-2019-0001

Pineda, Anna, & Michelle Sheehan. 2023. A Cyclic Agree account of the Romance faire-infinitive: New evidence from Catalan. *Syntax* 26 (2): 183–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/synt.12247

Reed, Lisa. 1991. The thematic and syntactic structure of French causatives. *Probus* 3: 317–360. https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.1991.3.3.317

Rinke, Esther. 2023. The emergence of the Portuguese inflected infinitive as a complement of causative verbs: structural enrichment or independent development? In N. Pomino, E.-M. Remberger, & J. Zwink (eds), *From Formal Linguistic Theory to the Art of Historical Editions. The Multifaceted Dimensions of Romance Linguistics*, 147–166. Wien: V&R unipress | Brill.

Rouveret, Alain, & Jean-Roger Vergnaud. 1980. Specifying reference to the subject: French causative constructions and conditions on representations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11(1): 97–202. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178152

Sheehan, Michelle 2020. The development of exceptional case marking in Romance with a particular focus on French. *Probus* 32: 367–400. https://doi.org/10.1515/probus-2020-0002

Sheehan, Michelle, & Sonia Cyrino. 2016. Variation and change in the Romance *faire-par* causative. In E. Carrilho, A. Fiéis, M. Lobo, & S. Pereira (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 10. Selected Papers from 'Going Romance' 28, Lisbon,* 279–303. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.10.14she

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1976. The grammar of causative constructions: A conspectus. In M. Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causative constructions*, 1–40. Leiden: Brill.

Shibatani, Masayoshi, & Prashant Pardeshi. 2001. The causative continuum. In M. Shibatani (eds), *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 85–126. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.48.07shi

Smith, John Charles. 2002. Middle French: When? What? Why? *Language Sciences* 24: 423–445.

Strozer, Judith. 1976. *Clitics in Spanish.* Ph.D. thesis, Ann Arbor University Microfilms.
Torrego, Esther. 1999. El complemento directo preposicional. In I. Bosque, & V. Demonte (eds), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española. Vol. 2: Las construcciones sintácticas fundamentales. Relaciones temporales, aspectuales y modales,* 1779–1805. Madrid: Espasa.

Torrego, Esther. 2010. Variability in the case patterns of causative formation in Romance and its implications. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41(3): 445–470. https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00004

Torrego, Esther. 2011. Oraciones causativas. In M.V. Escandell Vidal, M. Leonetti, & C.S. López (eds), *60 problemas de gramática dedicados a Ignacio Bosque,* 147–151. Madrid: Akal.

Treviño, Esthela. 1992. Subjects in Spanish causative constructions. In P. Hirschbühler, & K. Koerner (eds), *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory. Papers from the 20th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL XX), Ottawa, 10–14 April 1990*, 309–324. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.91

Treviño, Esthela. 1994. *Las causativas del español con complemento infinitivo.* Ciudad de México: El Colegio de México.

Tubino Blanco, Mercedes. 2011. *Causatives in Minimalism.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.179

Vincent, Nigel. 2016. Causatives in Latin and Romance. In J. Adams, & N. Vincent (eds), *Early and Late Latin. Continuity or Change?*, 294–312. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316450826.014

de Vries, Lourens. 2007. Some remarks on the use of Bible translations as parallel texts in linguistic research. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 60: 148–157. https://doi.org/10.1524/stuf.2007.60.2.148

Zubizarreta, María Luisa. 1985. The relation between morphophonology and morphosyntax: the case of Romance causatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16(2): 247–289. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178431