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His study deals with an issue of diachronic Spanish syntax in which there has been comparatively little previous research: the diachronic evolution of nonfinite complements of causative verbs or verbs of perception:

1.1 (1) a. la gran tormenta . . . hazia los arboles sallir de tierra (GrimGrad 430:1)
   b. mandó luego armar su yent por combater la cipdat (Ultramar 44:9)
   c. y la muerte que no me diste, dexa me la tomar (GrimGrad 407:1)
   d. esto digo porque de tu pena te veo gloriar (Cárcel 74:1)

It is surprising that the diachronic Spanish construction should have received so little attention, considering the great amount of research that has been done on the diachronic pan-Romance construction. Beyond several book-length studies such as those by Strong, Chamberlain, and Pearce, there have been important articles by Radford, St-Amour and Morin, Saltarelli, and Martineau. These recent works complement a number of
traditional studies like those by Muller, Gougenheim and Norberg.

Regarding the diachronic Spanish construction, standard reference grammars such as those by Hanssen, Menéndez Pidal, and García de Diego give only passing reference to causatives. The two studies dealing specifically with nonfinite complements in OSp (Beardsley and González-Muela) are marred by methodological shortcomings that make their data unreliable. The study by Cano Aguilar is the only one to look specifically at diachronic Spanish causatives, but he looks only at the period 1200–1500 and considers only a small portion of the causative phenomena that this study will address.

In view of the lack of previous research on Spanish, some researchers of the pan-Romance construction have overgeneralized their findings to include Spanish, without looking at actual diachronic data from the language. Therefore, one purpose of this study is to consider the Spanish constructions in their own right, and to show how the Spanish construction has evolved differently from some of the other Romance languages. This study is based on an extensive computer-based corpus of historical Spanish prose. The data base comprises 1.5 million words of text in the thirty texts from Old/Mid/Mod Spanish listed below. The corpus yielded nearly 3200 examples of causative-type constructions, which are

---

1 The texts utilized in this study include all or portions of:
- OSp (1200s). 8 texts. 430,100 words.
  - Estoria de España, General Estoria (both from the Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, U Wisconsin-Madison), Historia Troyana en prosa y verso, Gran Conquista de Ultramar, El Libro de los Engaños, Poridat de las Poridades, Castigos y Documentos, El Libro de los Cien Capítulos.
- MidSp (1438–1605). 10 texts. 454,800 words.
  - El Corbacho, La Celestina, Amadís de Gaula, Claros Varones de Castilla, Cárcel de Amor, Grimalte y Gradissa, Historia de Grisel y Mirabella, Guzmán de Alfarache, La Vida del Buscón, Don Quijote de la Mancha.
- ModSp (1950–). 13 texts. 619,200 words.
  - (All from J. Halvor Clegg, Dept. 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 Culta de Caracas; El Habla Popular de la Ciudad de México.
distributed among the lexical and syntactic categories in the following table:

**Table 1. Number of examples with each causative/verb of perception; and finite/nonfinite**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonfinite</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fazer</td>
<td>mandar</td>
<td>dexar</td>
<td>ver</td>
<td>Vperc</td>
<td>order</td>
<td>fazer</td>
<td>mandar</td>
<td>dexar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSp</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MidSp</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModSp</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vperc = oir, sentir; Order verbs = aconsejar, avisar, ayudar, consentir, constrernir, convencer, demandar, exigir, forzar, impedir, incitar, invitar, obligar, ordenar, permitir, persuadir, pregar, prohibir, recomendar, sugerir, suplicar.

The diachronic Romance/Spanish causative is of interest for two main reasons. The first is the unusual case marking, clitic placement, lower clause se, and word order facts that the construction has exhibited at certain stages in its development. This is represented in (2a–5a) below:

**CASE MARKING:**

(2) a. le hicieron comer el pastel DAT (w/transitives)
   a'. la hicieron venir
   b. la hicieron comer el pastel

**CLITIC PLACEMENT:**

(3) a. me lo vieron comer [cl + cl]
   b. me vieron comerlo [cl—cl]

**USE OF SE:**

(4) a. lo dejaron sentar [−se]
    b. lo dejaron sentarse [+se]

**WORD ORDER:**

(5) a. le hicieron comer el pastel a Pedro V(O)S
    b. le hicieron a Pedro comer el pastel SV(O)
Researchers working in several syntactic models have attempted to explain why case marking is often sensitive to the valency of the lower verb (2a–a'), why both clitics climb to the upper verb (3a), why the pronoun se is absent from verbs that would otherwise require it (4a), and why the lower clause subject is clause final (5a).

The second motivation for past research has been both the synchronic and diachronic variation between the (a) and (b) type of sentences in (2–5) above. A very important claim in most of the recent research on the Romance causative (such as the work by Zubizarreta, Goodall, Rosen, and Pearce) is that the (2a–5a) are necessarily related and are in contrast to (2b–5b), and that the opposition between the (a) and (b) sentences are due to one basic opposition in the underlying structure of these sentences. This is something that we will return to in section 6.

Most previous studies of the diachronic Romance causative have looked at either one or two of the four phenomena shown above. In sections 2–5 of our study, we will examine the diachronic shifts in all four of these phenomena in Spanish. We will find that there are parallel diachronic shifts from the (a) to the (b) type sentences, which in turn suggest a more basic underlying shift in the language. Section 6 will move beyond descriptive concerns and examine plausible motivation for this one underlying shift with the diachronic Spanish causative. Let us now consider in sections 2–5 the specific data that show the diachronic shifts in case marking, clitic placement, the use of lower clause se, and word order.

2. Case marking

In this section, we will discuss how data from our corpus give evidence for a shift in case marking of the S₂ subject (hereafter, S₂ = 'lower clause'), from unmarked DAT in OSp (6a) towards ACC in ModSp (6b):

(6) a. le hicieron comer el pastel DAT
   b. la hicieron comer el pastel ACC

In terms of past research on case marking with diachronic Spanish causatives, very little has been done. Beardsley (44), Hanssen (55), Keniston (506–8), and González-Muela all mention in passing that DAT was common in OSp, with Beardsley noting that ACC was
more common with verbs of perception (62–5). There is no discussion of general shifts from OSp to MidSp and ModSp.

As we turn to the data from our corpus, we find that a number of phenomena make it difficult to determine case marking. First, we noted above that only transitive S2 distinguish between DAT/ACC based on syntactic factors, and thus we do not consider intransitive S2:

(7) faziendole andar como bestia por los montes (Corbacho 271:30)

Second, unlike in French, Italian, and Portuguese, the presence of the Spanish ‘accusative a’ means that both DAT and ACC full noun phrases have the same form. In (8a–b), the S2 full noun phrase could either be DAT or it could be ACC with the ‘accusative a’:

(8) por fazer a las yentes perder la sospecha (EstEsp 80r)
The only potential marker of DAT/ACC are pronouns, and even here we must ignore first and second person pronouns, since they do not have different DAT/ACC forms:

(9) pues es menester que te haze buscar . . . otro más agudo cochillo (GrimGrad 407:1)

Only third person pronouns differentiate between DAT (le/les) and ACC (lo/la/los/las). Fortunately, the ambiguity caused by ‘leismo’ is not a problem for us, since it is the cases of the innovative ACC that interest us, not the conservative DAT. But even with third person pronouns, we often have problems in determining whether the pronoun refers to a lower clause subject, which is what interests us, or merely a S2 indirect object:

(10) si se fuesse ante que gelo fiziesse saber que le prisiessen (EstEsp 157r)
‘that they might take him, if he should leave before they [made it known to him/made him aware of it]’

As a result of all of these factors, only a very small fraction of all sentences with two S2 noun phrases clearly mark the subject for DAT/ACC. Even with these limitations, however, we find clear evidence for a diachronic shift from DAT to ACC with clear cases of third person pronouns referring to lower clause subjects. As the following examples indicate, DAT was clearly the norm with fazer in OSp and MidSp (11a–b), although in 3/32 cases in OSp and 4/40 in MidSp, ACC was used (12a–b):
(11)  
   a. la buena letra . . . fazele alcançar lo que quiere (Ciento 24:2)  
   b. el buen entendimiento y el coraçon grande . . . le fizieron poner tal diligencia (Varones 96:5)  

(12)  
   a. fizieronlos yurar . . . que non escusassen omne nin mugier (Ultramar 51:5)  
   b. la fazen forçosamente confessar el contrario de lo que sienten (Celestina 208:20)  

By ModSp, however, 7/19 were the innovative ACC (13a), as opposed to the conservative DAT (13b):  

(13)  
   a. lo hace tomar, de repente, un camino diferente (Caracas 42:1)  
   b. tratamos de hacerles sentir un poco de angustia (Caracas 110:1)  

Although there are fewer examples with other causatives, we see the same diachronic shift from DAT to ACC. With mandar, 4/4 OSP and 3/4 MidSp are DAT (14a–b), while in ModSp 2/2 are ACC (15):  

(14)  
   a. e nunca le mandava fazer cosa que la non fiziese (En-  
   gaños 33:3)  
   b. Calisto su amo, el cual le mandó abrir la puerta (Ce-  
   lestina 193:5)  

(15)  
   a los presos políticos los mandaban a hacer carreteras (Caracas 458:3)  

With dexar, 1/1 OSP and 11/11 MidSp are DAT (16a–b), while in ModSp 5/6 examples have the innovative ACC (17):  

(16)  
   a. e fueron ferir sobrel los sus uasallos, que non selo dex-  
   aron sacar del canpo (HisTroy 170:2)  
   b. la escuridad de la noche no les dejaba ver cosa alguna (Quijote 269:2)  

(17)  
   lo dejó clavar las cajas y poner sus iniciales (Cien 19:  
   10)  

Finally, as (18a) indicates, 1/6 MidSp examples with the verb of perception ver have DAT (there are no relevant examples from OSp), while 2/4 in ModSp are ACC (18b):  

(18)  
   a. quando le vee tomar armas e salir de casa (Corbacho 249:11)  
   b. nunca la había visto hacer eso con mayor entusiasmo (Hombre 375:10)
In addition to the data from our computer corpus, figures from other data-oriented studies of ModSp show the shift towards ACC in ModSp. Skydsgaard’s data show not uncommon ACC in ModSp, and even more important are the figures from Finnemann’s investigation of contemporary Spanish prose writings (222-42). He shows that 24% of (the 200) cases with hacer are ACC, 39% of (the 23 cases) with dejar, and nearly 60% (of 70 cases) with ver. Even more useful is Finnemann’s data from interviews with native speakers of ModSp, many of whom prefer DAT only with hacer and with masculine lower clause subjects. In most other cases ACC is preferred to DAT, which is seen as being more ‘elegant’, and more representative of a ‘formal, written’ register (243-89).

3. Clitic placement

In this section we will consider the diachronic shift in clitic placement, from [cl + cl] in OSp (19a) towards [cl—cl] in ModSp (19b):

(19) a. me lo dejaron comer [cl + cl]
b. me dejaron comerlo [cl—cl]

Although our corpus of texts gives clear evidence for [cl + cl] in OSp and MidSp, we will find that even a corpus of this size does not give us clear evidence for [cl—cl] in ModSp. For this we will turn to the generally overlooked data found in the studies by Skydsgaard and especially Finnemann. In addition, we will show not only a shift from the nonfinite [cl + cl] to [cl—cl], but also an increase in the use of finite complements at the expense of the older nonfinite option [cl + cl].

Previous research by Spaulding, Keniston, Wanner, and many others shows a general diachronic shift from [cl—] to [—cl] with all main verbs:

(20) a. lo quiero hacer [cl—]
b. quiero hacerlo [—cl]

Therefore, the OSp and MidSp situation is one in which the S₂ object clitic ‘climbs’ to the main verb. Applied specifically to causatives, this will give [cl + cl]. Menéndez Pidal (407), Keniston (108), and Wanner (141) all note in passing that this [cl + cl] is probably the norm with causatives in OSp. However, unlike the issue of the general S₂ object clitic placement seen in (20a–b), there is no discussion of the diachronic shifts between [cl + cl] and [cl—cl] with
causatives, or any details on the precise extent of [cl + cl] in OSp and MidSp.

Data from our corpus confirms that [cl + cl] was the only option with nearly all causative verbs in both OSp and MidSp. With *fazer*, 20/20 of nonfinite clauses were [cl + cl] in OSp, and 17/17 in MidSp. Unlike ModSp, there are cases with both inanimate and animate objects:

(21) a. *fizo gelo beuer por fuerça* (EstEsp 102v)
    b. *la necesidad me lo ha hecho complir* (Celestina 162: 1)

(22) a. . . . *Aquella muger, e rrogóle que ge la fiziesse aver* (Engaños 29:1)
    b. *la dueña se le fizo conocer, diziendole como ella era aquella que en mar lo echara* (Amadís 1063:2)

As noted earlier, we see an increase in finite S₂ at the expense of nonfinite S₂, from 5/25 total cases of S₂ in OSp to 9/26 in MidSp, and 2/2 in ModSp:

(23) a. *fizo que ellos mismos le tolliessen la porpora* (EstEsp 121v)
    b. *y vos hermano de Amadís, cómo se podia fazer que os amasse* (Amadís 1073:10)
    c. *y no te hacían la materia agradable, o sea, el mismo profesor hacía que tú le cogieras* (Caracas 63:9)

With *mandar*, the preference for finite over nonfinite S₂ with an object clitic is even more pronounced, being 20/25 cases in OSp and 20/20 in MidSp:

(24) a. *[la sortija] & mandar ledes que la guarde & que la non pierda* (EstEsp 92r)
    b. *el Rey mandó que le diessen de comer y le hiziessen mucha honra* (Amadís 1037:8)

The five OSp nonfinite S₂ are all [cl + cl]. By ModSp, there are virtually no examples of *mandar* with either finite or nonfinite S₂ in the case of a S₂ object clitic.

The shift from [cl + cl] to [cl—cl] is seen most clearly with *dejar*. Both OSp cases are [cl + cl], but by MidSp 2/5 are [cl—cl], and this increases to 5/5 of the nonfinite S₂ in ModSp (with one finite S₂). (25a–b) are cases of the conservative [cl + cl] from both OSp and MidSp, while (26a–b) are examples of the innovative [cl—cl] from MidSp and ModSp:
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(25)  a. mas trauo con ell El Conde Garci Fernandez & non
gelo dexo fazer (EstEsp 96v)
b. ¡Gracias a Dios, que te me dexo ver! (Celestina 60:10)

(26)  a. dexame mirarte toda, a mi voluntad, que me huelgo
(Celestina 249:1)
b. nos iba a dejar sacarlo (Gazapo 9:14)

The evolution towards [cl-cl] is also seen early on with the
'order' verbs, where there are cases of [cl-cl] already by OSp (27a),
and where they are the only nonfinite option by MidSp (12/12) and
ModSp (7/7) (27b-c):

(27)  a. les ayudauan de los uencer & los desbaratar (EstEsp
65r)
b. obligándome a decirte cosas mayores de mi vida (Guz-
mán 197:1)
c. y permítame darle un consejo (Peru 14:4)

The data from our corpus give clear evidence for increasing
[cl-cl] only with dejar and with the 'order' verbs. Nevertheless,
other corpora of ModSp such as Skydsgaard and Finnemann (319-
56) show that [cl-cl] is now possible with hacer in ModSp, and
that it is in fact on the increase. Finnemann's interviews show that
even with hacer, most speakers accept both [cl + cl] and [cl-cl]
and that for some, the innovative [cl-cl] is now the only option
(396). He also shows that many speakers avoid both the conserv-
ative and the innovative nonfinite options in favor of the neutral
finite S2 option.

4. Use of se

In this section we will show a diachronic shift in the use of the
pronoun se, in which se with S2 pronominal verbs was nearly always
deleted in Old/MidSp (28a), but is increasingly retained in ModSp
(28b):

(28)  a. lo dejaron sentar [-se]
b. lo dejaron sentarse [+se]

This is the aspect of causative syntax that has been studied the
least, especially with regard to the diachronic Spanish construction.
Menéndez Pidal (407-08) and Beardsley (72), both in passing re-
ference, note that fazer often took [-se], whereas ver sometimes
took [+se]. Cano Aguilar dedicates somewhat more attention to the
problem, and states that [-se] was generally the ruled from at least
1200–1500 (319). None of these researchers looks at the full diachronic scene from OSp to ModSp.

Turning to the data from our corpus we see that with fazer, [-se] has been the only nonfinite option in all periods (OSp 29/29, MidSp 6/6, ModSp 3/3):

(29) a. E santa Siluestre . . . fizo much adur callar todas las gentes que se estauan maravillando (EstEsp 116r)

b. la hizo sentar sobre la cama (Quijote 236:3)

c. el peso . . . los puede hacer hundir (Caracas 256:16)

Just as with clitic placement, however, the neutral finite option has since been increasingly substituted for the nonfinite S₂ option, at least since MidSp (OSp 0/29, MidSp 4/10, ModSp 5/8):

(30) a. o faze que se esconde por desgayre (Corbacho 247:23)

b. hace que todo el mundo se calle (Gazapo 170:26)

Similarly, all OSp and MidSp cases with mandar are either the conservative nonfinite [-se] (OSp 21 cases, MidSp 13, ModSp 0) or the substitute finite option (OSp 10, MidSp 9, ModSp 0):

(31) a. et cuedando que se durmie, non le quiso mandar despertar (EstEsp 148r)

b. non gelo quisiese dar y le mandase quedarse en su camara (Varones 125:2)

(32) a. quel mando que se leuantasse (GenEst 71v)

b. mandar que se juntase con sus enbaxadores (Varones 131:2)

The first clear evidence that the corpus gives for a shift towards [+se] comes with the verb dexar. While all OSp and MidSp examples are [-se] (33a–b), there are three cases of [+se] by ModSp (34):

(33) a. e fuesse para la mar e dio con el fijo dentro e dexó affogar (Ultramar 54:4)

b. luego la Pobreza dexó a la Fortuna levantarse (Corbacho 333:4)

(34) habían dejado irse la tarde y la noche del domingo (Rayuela 28:1)

The clearest evidence for a shift from [-se] to [+se] comes with the verb of perception ver. In OSp, all of the examples are [-se]:

(35) e non fue ninguno que lo asy viese defender, que non asmase que nunca fue onbre en el mundo que se podiese defender atanto commo se el defendio (HisTroy 85:1)

This example is a particularly nice one. In all cases, the verb is
pronominal, **defenderse**, except when it is embedded under the verb of perception, where it becomes **defender**.

The first cases of the innovative [+se] with *ver* appear in the early 1400s (36a), and the last cases of the older [-se] are found soon after (36b). By ModSp, [+se] is the rule in 10/10 cases (36c):

(36)  a. veemos **levantarse** dende enemistades capitales (Corbacho 61:7)
    b. viéndome **quedar** sola (Cárcel 101:4)
    c. vieron **encenderse** dos triángulos amarillos (Cantantes 136:9)

The data with *ver* give a nice example of a causative/perception verb which triggered [-se] in the older stages of the language, but which has moved towards [+se] in the modern languages.

Turning finally to the 'order' verbs, all OSp (8/8) and MidSp examples are finite (17/17):

(37)  a. Et sus uasallos conseiaron le que se **tornasse** al Rey (EstEsp 152r)
    b. auísale que se aparte deste propósito (Celestina 180:5)

By ModSp, 13/28 cases take the innovative [+se]:

(38)  un sistema de unidades que nos permitió . . . **graduarnos** (Caracas 89:1)

Our corpus provides evidence of [+se] with *dejar* and *ver* in ModSp, but little evidence yet for [+se] with *hacer*. However, the possibility of [+se] with the complete range of causatives in ModSp is confirmed by other data-oriented studies. For example, Skydsgaard finds that *hacer* takes [+se] in 16/40 cases, and *dejar* (12/13) and *ver* (37/37) nearly always take [+se]. Finnemann finds nearly 50 cases of [+se] with just *hacer* in his corpus of written prose, and also finds acceptance of [+se] with *hacer* in spoken ModSp, although not to the same degree as with *dejar* or *ver*.

5. Word order

This section will consider the diachronic shifts in the word order, from unmarked V(OS) in OSp (39a) towards SV(O) in ModSp (39b):

(39)  a. (le) dejaron comer (el pastel) a **Pedro** V(OS)
    b. (le) dejaron a **Pedro** comer (el pastel) SV(O)

In terms of past research, Beardsley and González-Muela are the only two researchers to have looked at word order with OSp caus-
atives, and their research on this point is marred by methodological problems. For example, they group together clitics and full noun phrases, as well as lower clause subjects and objects. Therefore in their studies all of the following sentences are SV, although the three noun phrases have little in common:

(40) a. *et fizola uenir*
    b. *et fizola destruir*
    c. *et fizo la muger uenir*

As a result, the findings from our corpus represent the only data available on word order with the diachronic Spanish causative.

Turning first to word order with transitive S₂, we find that one problem in determining word order is deciding whether the S₂ noun phrase of transitive clauses is the subject or an indirect object:

(41) a. *fizo tomar cirios encendidos a todos, y hincados de rodillas rogavan a Dios que guardasse aquel cavallero*

    (Amadís 1140:1)

    'she had lighted candles passed out to everyone, and kneeling, they implored God to protect that knight'

    'she had everyone take some lighted candles'

b. *e que faga entender al torpe las cosas que yerra* (Cient 10:1)

    'and which [make known to the fool/make the fool understand] those things in which he errs'

For example, if the S₂ noun phrase in (41a) is a subject, then we have VOS word order; but if it is only an indirect object, then it is not relevant to our study of the position of the S₂ subject. The majority of cases in the corpus in which there are two S₂ noun phrases are ambiguous between subject and indirect object. However, in the following discussion of word order with transitive S₂, we deal only with those cases in which the S₂ noun phrase is clearly the subject.

The data show that by far the most common transitive S₂ word order, with all causative verbs in all periods, is SVO:

(42) a. *la donzella fizo a sus escuderos desliar el lio* (Amadís 1038:8)

b. *mandara dios a Jheremias asconder las piedras* (GenEst 31v)

c. *dexaua al pueblo auer grand mengua* (EstEsp 72r)
The second most common word order is the hybrid VSO, which often occurs when the $S_2$ object is a sentential complement headed by *que*:

(43)  
   a. haciendo creer **a los frailes** que es más devoción que necesidad (Buscón 794:1)  
   b. que hacen sentir **a la gente** que están vivos y que (Caracas 326:5)

In cases where the $S_2$ noun phrase is clearly the subject and not the indirect object there are no examples of VOS word order.

Turning to word order with intransitive $S_p$, we find on the surface a very confusing diachronic picture. First, we discover that with nearly all causative verbs in all periods, there is a minority of SV among the dominant VS. With *fazer*, although VS is the norm in OSp and MidSp (44a–b), there are 5/42 cases in OSp and 6/35 in MidSp (44c–d) in which SV is the rule. By ModSp, however, all of the 21 cases have the dominant VS word order (45):

(45)  
   a. las mugeres fazen errar **al omne sabidor** (Castigos 78:1)  
   b. lo qual fizo crecer **la fama** que tenía de grand letrado (Varones 131:2)  
   c. la cobdicia faze **a omne** pedir (Cient 58:2)  
   d. la gran tormenta . . . hazia **los arboles** sallir de tierra (GrimGrad 430:1)

Likewise, with *dexar* VS is the norm in OSp and MidSp (46a–b), but 3/8 cases in OSp and 5/25 in MidSp are SV (46c–d). By ModSp, however, VS is the clear majority, occurring in 13/14 cases (47):

(47)  
   a. non dexaua subir **las oraciones** al cielo (Ultramar 47:5)  
   b. levántela, y deje dormir **a los demás** (Buscón 786:1)  
   c. non dexaua **a ninguno** estar quedo nin sin contienda (GenEst 9r)  
   d. cierra la ventana y dexa **la tiniebla** acompanar al triste (Celestina 35:5)

Finally, the situation is much the same with *ver*. Aside from
the normal VS of OSp and MidSp (48a–b), 12/34 cases in OSp and 13/69 in MidSp have SV word order (48c–d). But by ModSp, VS is the word order in 22/24 cases (49):

(48)  
   a. vio estar **vn rey muy noble** asentado sobre **vna silla**  
       (Castigos 82:1)  
   b. y jurasen al rey que vieron hablar **a Leriano** con Laureola  
       (Cárcel 86:1)  
   c. vio **al rey Menalao** andar tan acera (HisTroy 91:1)  
   d. quando veen **a algunos** salir de alguna casa do ay muger  
       (Corbacho 131:17)  

(49)  
   vieron pasar por encima **un enorme pájaro** (Camino 65:14)  

With the ‘order’ verbs, virtually all of the causatives in all periods take SV word order:

(50)  
   a. por ende, permite **los buenos** ser castigados (Corbacho 303:31)  
   b. obligaron a **los huéspedes** . . . a volver por mí (Buscón 754:4)  

If we go beyond our corpus and look at other data-oriented studies of ModSp, we find that in written prose VS is clearly the norm. Skydsgaard shows that 50/52 cases with hacer are VS, 26/27 with dejar, and somewhat less (65/79) with ver. Unlike with case marking, clitic placement, and S2 se, Finnemann does not have a chapter dedicated specifically to word order. But we note, quite significantly, that the word order of many, if not the majority, of intransitive S2 with even hacer produced by native speakers are SV:

(51)  
   a. el jefe hizo **a José** salir del despacho (267)  
   b. su padre hizo **a María** entrar en la sala (259)  

The possibility of SV in spoken registers of ModSp is also supported by grammarians like Cano Aguilar (249), Hernanz Carbó (266), Espinosa and Wonder (266), and others. In summary, while VS has been the main word order with intransitive S2, there have been cases of SV with all verbs in all periods. By ModSp, written prose has moved even more towards VS, while spoken Spanish still allows cases of SV.

6. Explaining change

6.1 We have now demonstrated that there were parallel shifts in the four phenomena of case marking, clitic placement, use of
lower clause se, and word order. In addition, we find that these four shifts occur in a parallel fashion even at the level of individual main verbs. Hence our task is to describe and motivate this one underlying change in the syntax of the Spanish causative.

As suggested in section 1, recent syntactic research on the Romance causative suggests that two opposing structures are responsible for the two different sets of features for case marking, clitic placement, use of se, and word order. The consensus of the research by Zubizarreta, Goodall, Rosen, Pearce, and others is that the basic opposition is between so-called 'reduced' and 'non-reduced' S2. In a very simplified and atheoretical sense, 'non-reduced' S2 contain certain syntactic material that is lacking in the 'reduced' structure. In most recent research, the syntactic material in question is roughly equivalent to a lower clause subject, or at least the syntactic node in which this subject could be placed (see (52) below).

Although we will not discuss the particular mechanisms that are involved, the claim in most recent research is that reduced structures (those without lower clause subjects) naturally lead to DAT case marking, [cl + cl] clitic placement, the absence of lower clause se, and V(O)S word order. The nature of non-reduced structures, on the other hand, leads to ACC case marking, [cl—cl] clitic placement, [+se], and SV(O) word order:

(52) a. [Main clause [---- [embedded clause]] REDUCED STRUCTURE
DAT (case), [cl + cl] (clitics), [−se] (use of se), V(O)S (word order)

b. [Main clause [SUBJ [embedded clause]] NONREDUCED STRUCTURE
ACC, [cl—cl], [+se], SV(O)

The data from our corpus shows four parallel shifts, from DAT case marking, [cl + cl] clitic placement, lack of lower clause se, and V(O)S word order in OSp to ACC case marking, [cl—cl] clitic placement, presence of lower clause se, and SV(O) word order in ModSp. In the syntactic model just presented, these shifts provide evidence for the more basic shift from reduced to nonreduced S2, and also the shift from S2 without subjects to S2 with subjects. Our task is to now identify the motivation for this basic diachronic shift in the lower clauses of Spanish causatives.

6.2 We propose that the shifts in complement types in the history of Spanish find their roots in a simple Late Latin morphological
merger. Latin had two infinitives, an active form that ended in /e/, and a passive form that ended in /i/:

(53) a. qui [mihi domum aedificare] fecit \[ACTIVE\]
    'who made me build a house' + [Lower clause subject]

    b. [domum aedificari] fecit \[PASSIVE\]
    'he had a house built' - [Lower clause subject]

As indicated, in the active (53a) there is a lower clause subject, while in the passive (53b) there is no such subject.

As Muller and others have noted, a Late Latin phonological merger of final /e/ and /i/ reduced the active and passive infinitives to just one form. The active form survived, while the passive form was lost:

(54) ACTIVE: aedificare  \(\rightarrow\) aedificari

PASSIVE: aedificari

As a result, the active infinitive now had two potential meanings attached to it, both an active and a passive sense (i.e. either having or not having a S₂ subject). Although it was conceivable that one form could carry two different meanings equally as well, this is not what happened. Evidence shows that the active form (aedificare) in large part lost the active sense, and took on a primarily passive sense.

Research by Chamberlain shows that already by Late Latin, nearly 70% of the nonfinite S₂ with causatives lacked subjects, and that figure may in fact be much higher. Moving to the Old Romance languages, Pearce (205–6) shows that by OFr nearly 60% of all S₂ lacked subjects, and Cano Aguilar (318–19) shows the same thing for OSp. The data from our corpus support these findings. Over 50% of all cases with fazer in OSp lack S₂ subjects, and in conservative historical writings the figure is as high as 73% (55a). With the causative mandar, the figure increases to 86% of S₂ without subject in the OSp texts (55b):

(55) a. e don Hector fizo traer sus armas (HisTroy 127:1)

    b. le gradeciessen de que los no mandaua matar (EstEsp 110v)

Thus in OSp we have a strange situation in which infinitives that are active in form did not normally have S₂ with subjects.
Diachronically, the natural tendency would be to have an increasing percentage of $S_2$ with subjects with this active infinitive, or in other words a shift from mainly sentences like (56a) to more like (56b) and (56c):

(56)  
   a. fizo destruir el castillo  
   b. hizo trabajar a María  
   c. le hizo a María comer el pastel

The data from our corpus indicate that this is precisely what happened. With *fazer*, the percentage of $S_2$ with subjects increased from 50% in OSp to 70% in MidSp and 92% by ModSp, where $S_2$ with subjects is now the rule (57a), and lower clauses without subjects are now the exception (57b):

(57)  
   a. lo hicieron actuar de una forma totalmente violenta  
       (Caracas 334:7)  
   b. estableciera un lista de precios justos si no hay maneras  
       de hacerla respetar (Venezuela 9:21)

The important point is that this increase in $S_2$ subjects is synonymous with the shift from reduced to nonreduced structures, which then motivated the shifts in case marking, clitic placement, use of *se*, and word order. As $S_2$ subjects became more common with a given causative verb, then so did the accompanying ACC case marking, [cl—cl] clitic placement, presence of lower clause *se*, and SV(O) word order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. [Main clause [---- [embedded clause]] ]</td>
<td>$-[S_2$ subject$]$ /REDUCED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAT (case), [cl + cl] (clitics), $-[se]$ (use of se), V(O)S (word order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. [Main clause [SUBJ [embedded clause]] ]</td>
<td>$+[S_2$ subject$]$ /NONREDUCED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC, [cl—cl], $+[se]$, SV(O)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our claim that the presence or absence of a $S_2$ subject is related to case marking, clitic placement, use of *se*, and word order is a new one. Some past researchers like Pearce have simply ignored the question of the presence or absence of $S_2$ subjects. Other researchers of the diachronic Romance causative, like Norberg, Saltarelli, and Chamberlain, have rejected an active/passive explanation because it is impossible to prove that clauses without subjects are actually passive in meaning. It might simply be a case of an active sentence with an unspecified subject:
Our explanation, however, does not rest on the active/passive semantic distinction per se, but simply on the presence or absence of a $S_2$ subject, which directly translates into a difference in the complement type.

6.3 Now that we have established the shift from $S_2$ without subjects to those with subjects as the motivating factor behind shifts in case marking, clitic placement, use of *se*, and word order, let us examine the issue of why these shifts gradually spread across the range of causatives. We have seen that in nearly all cases the four shifts in causative syntax that we are investigating originated with the 'order' verbs and the verbs of perception, then spread to *dejar* and finally to *fazer/hacer*, where they are still in progress in ModSp. Therefore we see that in ModSp, the verbs of perception and the 'order' verbs have become almost completely biclausal, *dejar* is mostly there, and (most noticeably in the spoken registers) the innovative features are on the rise with *hacer*.

How is the semantic nature of the causative verb related to the presence or absence of $S_2$ subjects, and thus case marking, clitic placement, use of *se*, and word order? We will apply Givón's argument that there is a universal of causative type constructions which states that the degree to which a potential $S_2$ noun phrase is seen as a subject is iconically related to the semantic 'binding force' that the particular causative or verb of perception exerts on that $S_2$ noun phrase. Consider:

(60)  
  a. **hicieron** a María trabajar  
  b. **dejaron** a María trabajar  
  c. **vieron** a María trabajar

The degree of influence exerted on the $S_2$ noun phrase ("María") in (60a) is greater than in (60b), which is in turn greater than in (60c). This means that the $S_2$ noun phrase with *ver* is semantically more independent than with *hacer*, and according to Givón's theory, more likely an independent $S_2$ subject.

The diachronic predictions should be obvious. As Spanish evolved towards $S_2$ with subjects, these subjects would first have been possible with those verbs in which there was the least binding of the $S_2$ noun phrase by the main verb, such as many of the order
verbs and the verbs of perception. Since the binding is strongest with *fazer* and *mandar*, the S2 noun phrase would less likely have been seen as an independent subject, and thus the evolution towards S2 with subjects would be slower with these verbs. In addition, the fact that the ‘binding’ is non-discrete and semantic suggests that its effect on the diachronic evolution with Spanish causatives should be gradual, as it in fact is.

6.4 In summary, we have sought to provide a comprehensive account of the diachronic evolution of causatives in Spanish. We have provided extensive data on case marking, clitic placement, use of lower clause *se*, and word order, which is something that has been lacking for Spanish. We have shown parallel and roughly simultaneous shifts in these four phenomena, which argue for a more basic and underlying shift in complement types. We have provided a motivation for this basic shift in complement types, which is based on a simple morphological merger in Late Latin, and the subsequent effect that this had on the presence or absence of a lower clause subject. If we have been successful in all of these points, we will have provided valuable descriptive and explanatory insight into one important issue of diachronic Spanish syntax that has been largely neglected, vis-à-vis the other Romance languages.
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