The production of Relative clauses and intervention locality with remarks on causatives, si-causative passive and reflexive passive

HO.5
Example of a way to elicit the production of SRs and ORs: Picture description

In these pictures there is an elephant and a lion. In one picture the elephant wets the lion in the other picture the lion wets the elephant. Which elephant is this? This is the elephant ....

Questo è l’elefante che bagna il leone
This is the elephant that wets the lion

Questo è lelefante che il leone bagna
This is the elephant that the lion wets

Questo è l’elefante che è bagnato dal leone
This is the elephant that is wet by the lion
Production 1.
SRs, ORs, PORs in adults’ productions (Italian)

(18 adults, from Belletti & Contemori 2010; comparable results reported in Contemori & Belletti 2013 with 10 adults more. Preference task, adapted from Novogrosky & Friedmann 2006)
### (Types of) PORs in children’s productions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORs</th>
<th>3:4-3:11</th>
<th>4-4:11</th>
<th>5-5:11</th>
<th>6-6:11</th>
<th>7-7:11</th>
<th>8-8:10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si-causative passive</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td><strong>40.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td><strong>31.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages of Passive Object Relatives produced by children in Picture description Task; adapted from Contemori & Belletti 2013

Interesting comparison to be made with adult’s types of PORs (from Preference task)
Crucial property of PORs: No intervention

Relativization step

Il bambino che [(__) è [vp pettinato <il bambino>] da [vp la mamma <VP>]]

Passivization step

The child that (__) is combed <the child> by the mother
No intervention in PORs because no intervention in passive. Movement of a verbal chunk in the derivation of passive 1. (adapating Collins 2005)
Movement of a verbal chunk in the derivation of passive 2.

The book is read <the book> (by Mary)
Types of PORs in adults’ productions

Results from 18 adults, from B&C 2010; comparable results reported in C&B 2013 with 10 adults more. Preference task, adapted from Novogrosky & Friedmann 2006

**POR with Si-causative passive:**
Il leone che si fa lavare dall’elefante
the lion that si-makes wash by the elephant
(the lion that makes the elephant wash him)

**POR with Copular passive:**
Il leone che è/viene lavato dall’elefante
the lion that is/comes washed by the elephant

**POR with Reduced Passive:**
Il leone lavato dall’elefante
the lion washed by the elephant
Types of PORs in children and adults

A U shape of the results emerges comparing children and adults:

- the intuitively “more complex” structure is the one that children access preferably and earlier (si-causative passive in the POR). The intuitively “simpler” (reduced relative) is virtually absent in children’s productions in contrast with adults.
- Similarly, S.Silleresi 2015, MA Thesis, University of Siena: si-causative PORs are the first ones (4;4-6;3) to appear and the preferred ones (7;3-7;11) in (early) child L2 Italian.
Si-causative passive in children’s PORs

First type of passive in relatives as a way to realize an Object Relative (Passive Object Relative/POR) is the si-causative passive (Belletti & Contemori 2010; data also holding cross-linguistically, e.g. French from Cost A/33 results):

**Il bambino che si fa pettinare dalla mamma**

the kid that si-makes comb by the mom

Contemori & Belletti 2013: POR with si-causative passive is also the type of POR best comprehended by children, compared to PORs with copula passive and reduced relatives, also at older ages (6:5-8;11). Cfr. Following slide.

This type of passive also appears to be overall preferred by children in their development also outside the domain of relative clauses/Ors-PORs. Cfr. Some production data in CLLD: Only type of passive produced by children in the few cases in which they produced passive instead of CLLD was the *si-causative* one.
Further indication from different elicitation task: CLLD

- The privileged status of the *si*-causative passive in children’s productions is a robust fact.
- The result is replicated in the different elicitation task discussed earlier (from Belletti & Manetti 2018), eliciting CLLD:
  - In the aim of eliciting passive and CLLD, the type of passive that children produced (few, but some were there) were all *si*-causative ones, in sharp contrast with the preferred options taken by adults

![Bar chart showing types of passives produced by children from B&M2018 results](chart.png)
Passives in Adult Italian.

*Si-causative* passive: Quantitative comparisons and input/frequency considerations

From a first counting of types of Passives used by Italian adult speakers in informal conversations in the same files (from LIP-database):

- *Copular* passive: 443
- *Venire* passive: 296
- *Si-fa* causative passive: 22

The *causative passive* is NOT a frequent structure in standard Italian

(as is intuitively clear to native speakers).

Early access to causative passive by children is then NOT an effect of frequency of the structure in the input.
(Types of) PORs in children’s comprehension

Percentages of types of PORs correctly comprehended by children in three (older) age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POR Type</th>
<th>6:5-6:11</th>
<th>7-7:11</th>
<th>8-8:10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR Si causative passive</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR Copular passive</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR Reduced passive</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Contemori & Belletti 2013
Derivation of Si-causative passive

Il bambino si fa pettinare dalla mamma
the child SI-cl makes comb by the mother

The diagram illustrates the syntactic structure of the sentence, showing the relationships between the words and their roles in the sentence.
Summary

- PORs instead of ORs in both adults and children (correlating with development); clear results from production. No intervention in PORs.

- Differences between adults and children: Types of passives resorted to differ

- Further considerations suggested by these results:
  - Passive used by (young) children looks ‘complex’ in an intuitive sense (*Si-causative* passive)
  - (Reduced) Passive used by adults looks ‘simple’ (certainly shorter) in an intuitive sense

- Both these ‘intuitive’ considerations do not appear to play any role in accounting for the shape of the results discussed.
Optimal locality: no (Relativized) intervention in productions

\[ X \ldots Z \ldots Y \]

Disjunction of the relevant feature sets of X and Z can be interpreted as the optimal way to neutralize intervention for the RM grammatical principle as it amounts to lack of intervention.

Under the assumed analysis of passive through movement of verbal chunk/smuggling, passive qualifies as a direct way to eliminate the intervention problem altogether (Belletti 2014).

Hence, passive (hence PORs) allows for an optimal satisfaction of locality in the relevant sense.

The adults’ and children’s behavior in production - overwhelming production of passive in object relatives/PORs for adults and development in the same direction for children – follows from this conclusion.
Development

In line with the proposals discussed, formulated in terms of fRM:

\[
X \quad \ldots \quad Z \quad \ldots \quad Y
\]

according to which, given the four set theoretic relations:

- identity
- Inclusion
- intersection
- disjunction

  - Identity in relevant features between X and Z is excluded by both children and adults, whereas intersection is properly computed by both.
  - There appears to be development in the proper computation of the intermediate relation, inclusion (cfr. of NP feature)
  - Disjunction may be seen as ‘optimal’ as no relevant features involved, which amounts to lack of intervention.

➢ Lack of intervention, as in the case of passive, **optimal**.
Some reflexive passives in children’s productions: route to passive, in comparison with generic plural subject in the active, the other ‘alternative’ to passive discussed. Comparing reflexive passive and *si*-causative passive
Zooming on: Some Reflexive passive in children’s productions. Same status of SI as EA, but..

Picture: Bear washing Elephant

Q: Che cosa succede al mio amico l’elefante?

*what happens to my friend the elephant*

A: Si lava

*it washes itself*

(Olmo, 4;1 y.o.)

(from some of Belletti and Manetti’s 2018 results.)

- Role of Bear taken up by SI

Reflexive passive

Reflexive passive (si):

Q: *Che cosa succede al mio amico l’elefante?*
   *What is happening to my friend the elephant*

A: *Si lava*
   *It washes itself* (Olmo, 4;1 y.o.)

Q: *Che cosa succede ai miei amici il cane e l’orso?*
   *What is happening to my friends the dog and the bear*

A: *Il cane si lava e l’orso si sta asciugando*
   *The dog is washing itself the bear is drying itself* (Leonardo, 4;2 y.o.)

Up to 9% in 4 y.o. (describing a transitive action). Describing a transitive action
Si-causative passive

>> *Si-causative passive:*

Q: *Che cosa succede al mio amico il cane?*
   *what is happening to my friend the dog*

A: *Il cane si fa lavare (dal gatto)*
   *the dog - makes itself - wash - by the cat* (Neri, 5 y.o.)

Up to 11% in 5y.o. (In fact, the only type of passive produced, as seen earlier).

Virtually no reflexive passive anymore (2%) to describe a transitive action.
Reflexive passive and then *Si*-causative passive

Proposal:

Reflexive passive is a first route to the passive in young children

(Belletti 2019)
Going deeper: From reflexive passive to si-causative passive. Manipulating animacy of the topic.

Q: *Che cosa succede a questa cosa, la torta?*  
What is happening to this thing, the cake?

- Complete absence of *si*-causative passives
- In sharp contrast with the condition with animate topic discussed, where the only clear passive was the *si*-causative one (B&M 2018, cfr. slide 12 ho 5a)

- Ample production of reflexive passive $\Rightarrow$ up to 16%
  
  1. *Il libro si legge*  
     the book *si-*CL reads  
     (Olivia, 5;3)
  2. *E lo taglia (exp: che cosa?) Il foglio si taglia*  
     and it.Cl cuts it. (exp: What?) The paper *si-*Cl cuts  
     (Olivia, 5;3)

(Recall: Absent in 5 y.o. of B&M 2018. Present in younger 4y.o. (up to 9%)
Reflexive passive and si-causative passive

**Animacy:**

- It appears to be a relevant factor inducing the production of *Si*-causative passives.

- In contrast with reflexive reflexive passives (up to 16%)
Comparing the derivation of reflexive passive and Si-causative passive

\[ SI = \text{EA of } v \text{ (lexical verb, lavare/wash)} \]

\[ SI = \text{EA of } v \text{ (semifunctional verb fare)} \]
Reflexive passive

- The proposed derivation, inspired by some early proposals by Kayne on the analysis of reflexive Si, shares two crucial properties with passive:
  - lack of Accusative for the direct object/IA
  - The promotion of the IA as subject (a preverbal subject in the derivation illustrated)

- If Si is co-indexed with the DP subject, with which it enters agreement, this yields the reflexive interpretation as in the adult grammar in Italian.

- In the young children’s early productions of the type in (1)A and (2)A this interpretation is not necessarily triggered, as children appear to understand the pictures proposed to them, in which the depicted action is transitive and not reflexive.
  - Possibly, the coindexation may just not be operative in the children’s grammar, due to lack of overt agreement features on si. Which in turn may be the realization of a silent generic Agent/EA. On this see below.
Reflexive passive

According to this analysis:

- *Si* eliminates the role of the EA of the lexical verb as well as and the availability of Accusative case for the object/IA; both are taken up by *Si*.
- The analysis assumes the same derivational mechanism at work in structures involving Burzio’s (1986) so called ‘ergative’ *si* (as in e.g. *La luce *si* è spenta/the light went off), and more generally in structures involving so called ‘middle’ *si* (as in e.g. *Questo vestito *si* lava facilmente/this suit washes easily, Cinque 1986: 87a; Belletti 1982; Ruwet 1972 for French)

- Crucially, no intervention problem created by presence of *Si* in the movement of the internal argument crossing over it. Why?
Reflexive passive

- **Hypothesis:** *Si* does not count as an intervener for movement of DP/IA as it has a reduced internal structure, lacking e.g. a D layer (Holmberg and Roberts 2013). The reduced structure makes it *dissimilar* in the sense relevant for the computation of intervention for the moved full DP/IA (since the attracted element in the A-chain is a DP, only an intervening DP would determine a locality violation).

- No movement of verbal chunk assumed in this derivation (no locality problem anyway, see above). Possibly, this may contribute to a somewhat reduced computational complexity, a relevant factor at the youngest ages (though not categorical, see access to passive and causatives under *priming*).
From reflexive passive to *si*-causative passive

The assumed derivation of the *Si*-causative passive has the pronominal marker *Si* as the EA of the semi-functional causative verb *fare*. Its role is the *Initiator* role, given adopted assumptions.

The EA of the lexical verb is thus not taken up by *Si* in this case. Whence the whole argument structure of the lexical verb is realized and the transitive action is correctly expressed by children through the *Si-causative* passive.
On the animacy of the *Initiator*

**Hypothesis:**

- It is natural to assume that the role of *Initiator* is most typically carried by an animate argument.

- This would account for why children do not resort to the *Si*-causative passive when animacy of the object topic is manipulated and the IA is inanimate.
- The inanimate derived subject could not be coindexed with the animate *Si*. 
On the animacy of the *Initiator*

- New questions are opened by this hypothesis, in particular:
  - *Animacy* may be a too coarse characterization of the relevant feature, as inanimates can be Initiators in causatives. Possibly animacy identifies the core case of a feature related to some form of human or more generally biological/natural activity.
  - This is visible in active causatives like:
    - *Il vento ha fatto scoperchiare i tetti delle case*
      - the wind has made uncover the roofs of the houses
    - *La vitamina B12 fa rinforzare le ossa*
      - the vitamin B12 makes strengthen the bones
On the animacy of the *Initiator*

- However, *Si*-causative passive would be completely impossible in these cases, suggesting that *Si* is always a necessarily animate *Initiator*. (Hence, the coindexing with the derived subject due to its reflexive status yields ungrammaticality).

  *I tetti delle case si sono fatti scoperchiare dal vento*

  the roofs of the house *Si* are made uncover by the wind

  *Le ossa si fanno rinforzare dalla vitamina B12*

  the bones *Si* make strengthen by the vitamin B12

- Children have yet to be tested on structures of this type, where both the EA and the IA are inanimate.

- However, when the IA/derived subject is inanimate, they opt for the reflexive passive, which does not implicate any (animate) *Initiator* role (*si* is EA of the vP) nor coindexing with the derived subject., as proposed earlier (with reflexive *si* interpreted as a route to passive).
Generic plural null subject instead of passive

Generic plural null subject in active clause:
Robust findings in children’s productions of CILD, emerged with both animate and inanimate object topic:

Q: *Che cosa succede* al mio amico il cane?
   *what is happening to my friend the dog*
A. ((a) *Il cane*), *pro*$_{pi}$ lo lavano
   (To the dog,) (they) *him$_{cl}$* wash

Q: *Che cosa succede a questa cosa il foglio?*
   *what is happening to this thing. the paper*
Il foglio, *pro*$_{pi}$ lo tagliano
the paper, (they) *it$_{cl}$* cut
Ways of being impersonal/generic and alternative routes to passive

We have proposed that

**In Reflexive passive:**
1. The coindexation between *Si* and the derived subject may just not be operative in the children’s grammar (due to lack of overt agreement features on *si*). *Si* in turn may be the realization of a silent generic Agent/EA.

2. *Si* does not count as an intervener for movement of DP/IA as it has a reduced internal structure, lacking e.g. a D layer (Holmberg and Roberts 2013). The reduced structure makes it *dissimilar* in the sense relevant for the computation of intervention for the moved full DP/IA (since the attracted element in the A-chain is a DP, only an intervening DP would determine a locality violation).
Ways of being impersonal/generic and alternative routes to passive

**Hypothesis:**
Assume D to be the head in which the referential person feature is realized. In the lack of D, the person value can be:

i. Acquired through agreement yielding the reflexive reading

Or

ii. Left unspecified yielding the generic impersonal reading (one of the crucial readings of Italian *Si*, French *Se*)

In young children ii. is a favored option, leading to production of a reflexive passive without any reflexive reading (ongoing thesis is testing this hypothesis).

Reflexive is parasitically used as a route to passive.
Reflexive morphology in passive is in turn known to be a crosslinguistics robust fact.

Such option is thus close to the alternative one in which a generic plural null subject, i.e. another kind of impersonal, is used in an active clause (in contexts where passive would be felicitous).
Ways of being impersonal/generic and alternative routes to passive complying with locality

Two previously unexpected conclusions.

On the empirical side:
- Resort to reflexive morphology and generic plural subject appear to be two close analogues, as the developmental facts indicate.

On the theoretical side:
- The same property, lack of D in Si, leads to a kind of passive – the reflexive passive – and to the lack of violation of intervention locality in its derivation.
Zooming on si-causative passive and its robust appearance in children’s productions
Outline of derivation of causatives: *Fare- a*

*Fare* as a (semi-)functional verb/v, selected by the causative voice

Ex: Maria. *farà* mangiare il gelato *al bambino*

Maria will make eat the ice cream to the kid

Outline of derivation of causatives: *Fare* - *da*

Expletive preposition *by* in the selective spine of the causative voice

Maria farà mangiare il gelato dal bambino

*Maria will make eat the ice cream by the kid*

---

By being in the functional selective spine of the causative voice, *by* gets a causative/agentive meaning. Whence the more ‘agentive’ interpretation of *fare-da* causatives.

---

a) Tutti temono il terremoto

*Everybody fears the earthquake*

b) Il terremoto è temuto da tutti

*The earthquake is feared by everybody*

c) *Le vittime fanno temere il terremoto da tutti*

*The victims make everybody fear the earthquake by everybody*
Derivation of *Si*-causative passive

Il bambino si fa pettinare dalla mamma
the child SI-cl makes comb by the mother
And *get-causative* passive

The book got read <the book>
An extra role in *Si*-causative passive

Through presence of the causative semi-functional \( v=fare \) verb, *si*-causative passive involves an extra role compared to copular and *venire* passive: e.g. Initiator (Ramchand 2008), taken up by SI

Through the co-indexing between SI and the derived subject, the subject of a *si*-causative passive is directly implicated, as an Initiator, in the occurrence of the overall event

Since there is no need to introduce the further Initiator role in a purely descriptive task (such as e.g. picture description), this may account for why *si*-causative passive is virtually absent in adults productions
Si-causative passive
Comparison: Children vs Adults

The question then is:

why is *si*-causative passive present in children’s (elicited) productions? Some relevant considerations follow

**Hypothesis 1:**

There is a tendency by (young) children to identify themselves with the Initiator of the event (possibly they become more involved in the story)

Hence: *si*-causative passive is significantly present in children’s productions, also in the purely descriptive task (such as in the Picture description task for relatives – similar results also from priming study), in contrast with adults.

**Hypothesis 2:**

Alternatively, children access a different type of passive in the causative voice than the one present in the target language Italian. E.g.: The one which is active in French. Later in development they abandon this analysis.
Comparison: Italian vs French

*Si*-causative passive is present in other Romance languages, most notably French.

According to Labelle’s 2002 description: there is no element of “causation” in the so called *se*-faire passive in French:

*Jean s'est fait écraser par une voiture*

Jean *se* is made run-over by a car

*Jean made himself run over by a car*
SUISSE
Au volant, elle se fait faucher par un avion
Google search: *Italian*

*Si è fatto* ammazzare per salvare la sorella

(he) *si* made(himself) kill to save the sister

He directly provoked(/initiated) the event
Comparison:
Italian vs French – Children vs Adults

- Italian Si-causative passive is generally different from French se-faire passive. The Italian equivalent of the French example tends to have a different interpretation.

- Possible line of interpretation: the Initiator role of the (semi) functional v= fare/faire appears to be (more) active in Italian, and (almost) inert in French.

Also (possibly): some kind of modal modification implicitly (empty position) involved >> “voluntarily (/or not)”.
Italian. Children

**Whence H1 or H2:** Italian speaking (young) children either
- directly converge to the Italian setting, and are just “more involved” in the story to be described whence their preferential access to Si-causative passive (H1),
- or
- they first entertain the French-type setting (H2).

**H2** more likely to be on the right track

**Further descriptive doubts for H1:** One would expect use of first person (...*mi faccio pettinare*).

Never found in the description of the pictures (neither in the elicitation of Object relatives yielding to PORs through Picture description nor in the priming experiment. For Preference task some production of his type found, but the task invited identification).
French. Children

Preferred structure produced in place of OR: POR with se faire passive (Délage 2008, PhD diss.). Task: Picture description

TD-children, aged 6, 75.3% OR are produced as PORs; of which,

71.6% as se faire passives, and (only) 3.7% as copular passive.

Note that also in young children there is a higher production in French than in Italian >> around 20% at age 6 and 40% at age 8 in the Picture description task (Contenori & Belletti 2013).

No results directly available on adults but author’s comment:
French: Adults (preliminary speculations)

Comment:

« ... ex : c’est la fille qui se fait laver par la girafe à la place d’une relative objet (ex : c’est la fille que la girafe lave) tout en conservant un énoncé qui est sémantiquement, pragmatiquement et grammaticalement correct. Ce type de réponse serait même, à notre avis, préférable pour un locuteur natif. » (H.D, p.328)

No such comment would ever apply to adult Italian. Recall: No si-caus passive in the PORs produced by adult Italian speakers.

New data now available: Karen Martini’s results.
PORs in French and Italian
(Karen Martini, 2016, Preference task)

**PORs en français**
- 44% POR
- 22% Reduced POR
- 15% Si-caus POR

**PORs en italien**
- 39% POR
- 42% Reduced POR
- 0% Si-caus POR
Further differences between French and Italian in the domain of causatives

French and Italian appear to differ in the domain of causatives in a more general way:

The causative voice also appears to be possibly less “strongly causative” in French than it is in Italian, as is visible also in active causatives.

If this is an appropriate characterization, it would seem reasonable to relate the “weaker causative strength” to the less prominent/active role of the Initiator.
An aside consideration: Further differences between French and Italian in the domain of (active) causatives

Same contextual situation.

Somebody’s scarf falls on the floor without the owner noticing it. So, he/she would have lost it. Luckily, a person sees the scarf (falling?) on the floor, takes it and brings it back to the owner saying:

French: Vous avez fait tomber votre echarpe

Italian: Le è caduta la sciarpa
New questions for development and comparative syntax

Assuming **Hypothesis 2**: the fact of converging first to the French setting despite lack or anyway different evidence from the Italian-type input may suggest an even clearer/stronger preference to access passive through the causative voice.

This is an interesting and challenging issue for comparative syntax and comparative acquisition studies.

It opens up the new research question as to why it should be so.

From the perspective of complexity, we should conclude that the passive in the causative voice should count as **less complex** in the relevant sense.
Hypotheses on the factors favoring si-causative passive.
Toward a possible interpretation: Movement of verbal chunk overt in Italian/Romance type causatives
Toward a possible interpretation: overt trigger for movement of verbal chunk in Italian/Romance type causatives

Moreover: A possible indirect factor favoring access to fare causatives and hence to si-causative passive is the overtness of the trigger of movement of verbal chunk: i.e. the verb fare (Manetti & Belletti 2015 make the latter speculation). In fact both presence of overt trigger of movement of verbal chunk and presence of (reflexive) si (Belletti 2019 on the role of si-), the ingredient of the si-causative passive construction.

These considerations interestingly converge with recent findings from corpus study of CHILDES (discussed in MA thesis of 2018, Zimbardi): fare (active) causative is present in children early spontaneous productions (whereas no passive is present in the same age range in the same corpora).

A further related indication comes from adults’ child directed speech: in the same corpora investigated, next to 32 passives, adults produced 742 active causatives. Hence the ratio is 4% of passives vs 96% of active causatives. The role of the overt trigger of movement of verbal chunk (smuggling) thus seems relevant.

The previously noted relative rarity in the input of of si-causative passive is also confirmed through child directed speech: 75% of adults’ passives were copular or venire passives vs 25% of si-causative passives. Hence indeed not the effect of frequency in the input.
Passives and causatives in child directed input in Italian

Causatives and passives in child directed speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child-directed speech (CHILDES)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passives (Copular/venire, si-causative)</td>
<td>32 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active causative structures</td>
<td>742 (96%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Toward a possible interpretation: Labeling (Romance) Causatives

Consider:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha \\
\text{Phrase}_1 \quad \text{Phrase}_2 \\
\text{H}_1 \quad \text{H}_2
\end{array}
\]

In this situation of Phrase-Phrase Merge, \( \alpha \) cannot be labeled (Chomsky 2013, 2015, Rizzi 2014). One phrase has to move, in order for \( \alpha \) to have the label of the remaining Phrase (and be interpretable at the interfaces; syntactic relations are asymmetric or antisymmetric cfr. Kayne 1994, Moro 2000).

Any vP-shell instantiates this situation.

The symmetry has to be broken. One has to move. EA/DP generally does.
Labeling (Romance) Causatives

- Caus Parameter: Caus may have different movement attracting property:
  - the attracted phrase is DP (/EA) >> English-type causatives
  - the attracted phrase is vP(-chunk) >> Italian-type causatives
Make like Fare

Mary made the kid eat the ice cream

Maria farà mangiare il gelato al bambino
Maria will make the kid eat the ice cream

Movement of chunk of verb phrase / smuggling
Development and comparative syntax

Main factors:

1. Overtness

– Easy identification of the head triggering movement of verbal chunk may play a role: Independent morpheme *fare*. This combines with *overtness of moved verbal chunk* (as in the active causative) + *overt marker SI*.

2. Labeling

– Indirect reflex of a fundamental general property, ultimately deriving from *labeling* requirements: the movement attracting property of the causative voice is early identified. Again, probably its overtness helps (confirmed by presence of causatives in child spontaneous productions, see preceding slides).

– And: The possibly weaker Initiator role attested in French may be a first UG option for children, even if it is not widely exploited in adult Italian. An option possibly also favored by presence of SI.