THE SYNTAX OF ENGLISH AND FRENCH CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS*

ANDRÉ HANTSON

University of Namur

1. Causative constructions have been dealt with extensively in the recent linguistic literature. But, to my knowledge, little attempt has been made to apply the insights gained there to the teaching of English grammar to advanced foreign students. In this paper I want to make such an attempt in the form of a contrastive analysis of French and English causative constructions. As this study is intended as a help to French-speaking students of English, rather than English-speaking students of French, the emphasis will be more on the peculiarities of English than those of French. As can be gathered from Kayne's (1975) monumental work, the syntax of French causative constructions is exceedingly complex, and the type of student I have in mind need not have explicit knowledge of all its intricacies in order to be able to understand the syntax of their English counterparts. Yet some familiarity with the structure of this part of the grammar of his mother-tongue strikes me as indispensible.

The theoretical framework of the exposition will on the whole be that of the so-called standard transformational theory. It is true that this theory has now been abandoned by most theoretical linguists because of its theoretical shortcomings. Yet no one has so far been able to replace it by a more attractive model. Quite on the contrary, its abandonment seems to have led to a chaos of rivalling theories which threatens the very survival of generative transformational grammar. In spite of its theoretical shortcomings the standard theory can still be considered to offer a pedagogically attractive framework for our discussion. As is well-known, its basic assumption

^{*} I am indebted to the Belgian F.N.R.S. for a grant which enabled me to travel to Boszkowo (Poland) and read the present paper there. I am also grateful to the conference participants for their useful comments. In particular I want to thank Prof. W. Winter of Kiel University, who was so kind as to act, unofficially, as my disputant when my official disputant was unable to attend the conference.

is that a sentence has a deep structure, which determines its meaning, and a surface structure, which determines its phonetic form, the two being related by transformations that are not allowed to affect the meaning of the sentence. On the basis of this hypothesis it seems possible to come up with a coherent account of the similarities and differences between English and French causative constructions. Before going into these I should like to add that, as this is a study in applied, not theoretical linguistics, I have felt free to couch some explanations in relational rather than orthodox configurational terms when this has seemed to make for greater simplicity of exposition. Moreover I have attempted to achieve even greater simplicity by restricting the use of labelled bracketing to the indication of maximal structures. What I mean is this: in a sentence like I want him to come tomorrow the string him to come tomorrow can be considered as a clause (or (subordinate) sentence, symbol S), so that the sentence can be represented as: I want [him to come tomorrow]. I have not felt it necessary to indicate that within this subclause him is an NP and to come tomorrow a VP. Let us next assume that I want to come tomorrow derives from I want [me to come tomorrow] through the deletion of the subject of the subclause and that a clause that has lost its subject cannot be considered to be a clause any longer.1 Then we can represent the surface structure of I want to come tomorrow as I want [to come tomorrow].

2. Let us now turn to the topic under discussion and start by considering the following (nearly) synonymous pair of French sentences:

- (1) Elle a fait (en sorte) qu'il danse.
- (2) Elle l'a fait danser.

Whereas in (1) il functions as the subject of danser, the corresponding pronoun le is found as object in (2). Yet in (2), just as in (1), le must be considered as the semantic subject of danser. In the rest of this paper I shall not be concerned with finite clauses dependent on faire. Rather I shall concentrate on the infinitive construction and contrast it with the various English non-finite constructions that can be used to express causation. So, one or two words may be said about it here. Native speakers of French prefer the construction with en sorte, the one without it seeming strange, though perhaps not unacceptable. Conversely, sentences like

(3) Le retour du président a fait que la situation est redevenue normale. which, unlike (1) (which contains a subjunctive, cf. Elle a fait en sorte que nous

dansions), have an indicative in the subclause, sound quite normal but express result rather than causation, and can be translated as:

(4) The return of the president has resulted in the situation becoming normal again.

As for Elle a fait en sorte qu'il danse, it is worth adding that this sentence is not completely synonymous with Elle l'a fait danser in that the former invariably refers to indirect causation whereas the latter can express either direct or indirect causation.

- 3. Before leaving the finite faire construction it is important to point out that in both the finite and the nonfinite clause the pronoun il/le has the same function, which, simplifying a great deal, may be referred to as the semantic or deep structure function. The sentence Elle l'a fait danser will therefore be derived from a deep structure something like
 - (5) Elle a fait [il danser]

where il danser is a clause functioning as the direct object of faire. English has several equivalents of Elle l'a fait danser. We shall consider the following:

- (7) ??She caused him to dance. (t)
- (7) She got him to dance.(t)
- (8) She made him dance.(t)
- (9) (?)She had him dance.(t)

The bulk of this paper will be devoted to a discussion of the syntactic characteristics of these four English causative constructions and their French counterpart (5). More specifically, I shall concentrate on the behaviour of these constructions under main-clause and sub-clause passivization and, as far as the first type of passivization is concerned, the related problem of clause union, i.e. the conversion of a deep structure complex sentence into a surface structure simple sentence (cf. sections 4 and 5). Next I shall deal with the following related topics: subject and object deletion in French clauses embedded under faire (section 6); get, have, and cause+ing-clause (section 7); infinitive clauses functioning as the object of laisser and let (section 8) the see to it that construction and its French counterpart (section 9).

Before going into these syntactic problems it is worthwhile to have a look at the SEMANTIC AND STYLISTIC DIFFERENCES between them. The most current constructions in colloquial English are those with make and get. Make clearly refers to compulsion, whereas the meaning of get seems to be closer to that of persuade than to that of compel, even though its syntactic behaviour (like that of make) is different from that of either verb (see below). In the have sentence the reference would seem to be to arrangement or result,

¹ This is a pedagogical over-simplification that is justified, I think, as far as the constructions under discussion here are concerned. It stands to reason that imperatives and certain types of relative clauses should be considered to have sentential status, even in surface structure, in spite of having lost their subject.

the sentence being roughly paraphrasable as: She arranged for him to dance, the result of her intervention was that he danced. As for cause, this is a typically formal verb with a very general meaning.² It is most unlikely to occur in an informal sentence like She caused him to dance, which I have only used for ease of exposition. A typical example with cause would be: Raising the temperature of liquid compounds causes them to decompose into their elements (quoted by Van Ek (1966:41). If cause does occur in an everyday context, it would appear to express indirect, often unintentional, causation, as in Her continuous nagging caused her husband to start an affair with his secretary (t). But the verb is really typical of academic, scientific, technical English, where it expresses a direct or indirect causal relation between two phenomena.

In the linguistic literature the cause+infinitive clause construction is often found illustrated in colloquial-looking sentences like (6) She caused him to dance. It is important to warn foreign students of English syntax that many native speakers find such sentences unacceptable. As this is a very difficult area for non-natives, I have thought it indispensable to have my self-made instances checked by native speakers. Some have been checked by one or two native speakers only, but the majority have been submitted to as many as 18 informants. The latter type of sentences has been marked (t). The grammaticality judgments given in the text represent 'averages' of the informants' reactions, there often having been a considerable amount of variation.

4. Let us now concentrate on the syntax of English cause, get, make and have sentences and French faire sentences.

In each of the four sentences marked (6)-(9), the causative verb has an infinitive clause as its object. Their deep structures can be represented as follows:

It will be seen that the French sentence Elle l'a fait danser and the English sentences (6) to (9) have the same deep structure, i.e. roughly, the same semantic structure, but their surface structures are entirely different. One difference is that in the English sentences surface structure has the same word

order as deep structure, whereas in the French sentence the pronoun il is moved in front of faire and acquires the object form. I shall come to this problem presently, but before doing so I want to have a closer look at the English sentences. First it will be noticed that I have represented the subclause as having to in all cases. This to is kept in surface structure after cause and get but deleted after make and have. Next let us check how these sentences behave under PASSIVISATION OF THE MAIN-CLAUSE.

- (14) *? She was caused to dance.(t)
- (15) He was made to dance. (t) (to kept if make is passivised)
- (16) *He was got to dance.(t)
- (17) *He was had (to) dance. (t)

We see that passivisation is quite normal with make and totally impossible with have. With get and cause it seems to be virtually unacceptable. How is this difference in behaviour with regard to main clause passivisation to be accounted for? Notice first of all that the deep structures under (10-13) cannot be the structures to which the passive transformation applies. One of the things that the passive transformation does is change the direct object of the sentence into the subject. If we assume, correctly I think, that the clause him to dance is the deep structure (=semantic) object of the causative verb, then passivisation applied to this deep structure would yield:

All of these sentences are, of course, totally ungrammatical. From the fact that he functions as the subject of the passive sentence He was made to dance it can be inferred that prior to passivisation the pronoun him, which in deep structure functions as the subject of to dance, must have been changed into the object of make. Let us call this transformation subject-to-object raising. This transformation, then, promotes the subject of a nonfinite subclause to the object of its main clause. The structure resulting from it can be represented as follows:

We now relabel the brackets as VP because dance is no longer a clause, having no subject. So subject-to-object raising has resulted in an underlyingly complex sentence surfacing as a simple sentence. To this structure the passive transformation can now apply, yielding: He was made to dance. From the fact that the sentence *He was had (to) dance is ungrammatical, it can be inferred that in

² See also M. Shibatani (1976: 30 - 38) and McCawley (1976: 119-120).

³ I want to thank my colleague Peter Kelly, who, apart from acting as an informant himself, obliged me by sending lists of test-sentences to several of his friends in the U.K.

this case the pronoun him does not undergo subject-to-object raising but remains the subject of the infinitive, even in surface structure. As regards the sentences with get and cause passivisation seems to be most unusal, although grammar books do mention cause, as a verb that is construed with the so-called nominative+infinitive.4 It must however be added that formal sentences like (?) Liquid compounds may be caused to decompose into their elements (t) sound a good deal more natural, so that the very low degree of acceptability of *? He was caused to dance may be a matter of register rather than grammar. If in a sentence like She had him dance him is to be considered the subject even in surface structure, then the question arises why the pronoun is in the object rather than in the subject form. Why, in other words, do we not have *She had he dance? The easiest way, it seems to me, to account for the object form of the pronoun is to assume that English, unlike French, German and many other languages, increasingly tends to treat the object form of pronouns as the unmarked, neutral form, requiring a special transformation to account for the subject form, which tends to be more and more restricted to the function of subject of a finite verb.5

Let us now come back to the French sentence Elle l'a fait danser (=(2)). Also this sentence contains a pronounw hose case needs accounting for: le. As a first approximation it might reasonably be supposed that here, too, we have an instance of subject-to-object raising, yielding:

The unstressed pronoun le would then be moved in front of the finite verb a fait by the same rule as is needed for other unstressed pronominal objects (e.g. Il l'a vu from *Il a vu le, as contrasted with Il a vu Jean). But notice that if we replace le in Elle l'a fait danser by Jean, the correct sentence is not *Elle a fait Jean danser, as we would be led to expect, but rather: Elle a fait danser Jean. So if we were to apply subject-to-object raising in French, changing the subject of the infinitive clause into the object of the main clause, we would have to add some sort of inversion rule which inserts the infinitive

danser between the verb faire and its putative object Jean. But this is not the only complication. Matters get much worse in the event of the infinitive being a transitive verb. Let us consider the following deep structures:

In English there is no problem whatever: we get exactly the same thing as with an intransitive infinitive: there is subject-to-object raising with make, but not (normally) with get, which explains why we can have John was made to read that novel, but not *? John was got to read novel. In French, however, the picture is an entirely different one. Here the deep structure must be transformed into:

(23) Elle a fait lire ce roman à Jean.

Jean is once again found to be separated from faire by the infinitive group lire ce roman, a fact which might be accounted for by the inversion transformation alluded to above. But, in addition, it is now in the indirect object form. So the subject of the infinitive appears to be promoted either to the direct or the indirect object of the main clause, depending on whether the infinitive is transitive or intransitive. This fact can be accounted for by setting up a faire-attraction transformation, which takes the verb-phrase out of the subclause and puts it after the main clause verb faire. If the subclause contains an intransitive verb like danser, this gives:

All that is left of the original object clause of faire is its former subject Jeanso that we can now relabel the brackets as NP. In other words, the original subject of the subclause Jean danser has become the object of faire danser. So we see that with an intransitive subclause faire-attraction has the same result as subject-to-object raising (i.e. it promotes the deep structure subject of the subclause to the object of the main clause, thereby changing the deep structure compound sentence into a surface structure simple sentence). But in addition it produces the correct word order and is therefore preferable to subject-to-object raising.

With a transitive verb like lire the derivation is more complicated. Faireattraction yields:

All that remains of the subclause is again its former subject Jean, which we would again expect to take over the function of the subclause and become the

⁴ Zandvoort (1965:16) and Leonhardi and Welsh (1968:51).

⁵ It would take us too far afield to go into this matter here. Suffice it to refer to forms like What, me do a thing like that!, He is taller than me, to indicate that English, unlike such other Germanic languages as German and Dutch, can use the object form for the subject provided it is not followed by a finite verb. The situation in French is rather more complex in that French uses emphatic pronouns, which are unmarked for case. Conversely, it is most implausible that all uses of the object form with subject function in English nonfinite clauses should be interpretable as emphatic uses of the pronoun. One case which could not be interpreted that way is the use of the form as the subject of a gorund, cf. I can't understand him doing a thing like that.

direct object of the main clause. But this is impossible for the very simple reason that, as a result of *faire*-attraction, the main clause already has a direct object, viz. ce roman. So Jean becomes the next best thing, viz. the indirect object, which necessitates \dot{a} -insertion. If the indirect object had been an unstressed pronoun a further transformation would have moved the indirect object in front of the finite verb, giving Elle lui a fait lire ce roman.

That ce roman must be regarded as the direct object of the main clause is shown by pronominalization, which yields (26), with le cliticizing in front of the verb of the main clause.

(26) Elle le lui a fait lire.

So in both (2) Elle l'a fait danser and (26) the surface structure direct object of the main clause can be looked upon as deriving from what is a subclause constituent in deep structure. In this respect French is similar to English. The two languages differ in that, as regards English, the subclause constituent under focus is always the subject, whereas in French it can be either the subject or the object, depending on whether the sentence is intransitive or transitive. But this is not the only difference. We have just seen that in English passivisation of the main clause is possible with some of the causative verbs (quite normally with make, marginally with cause and perhaps, even more marginally, with get) and impossible with have. By contrast, French faire never tolerates this sort of passivisation, cf. *Il a été fait danser, *Ce roman a été fait lire. It may, however, be worth adding that in 17-th century French sentences such as Il fut fait venir were apparently acceptable to some people.

5. Let us suppose next that instead of [Jean lire ce roman], as was the case in (22), we have [son amant tuer son mari] as the object of faire, as in:

The application of faire-attraction, followed by à-insertion before the former deep structure subject of the subclause, yields: *Elle a fait tuer son mari à son amant. But this is an ungrammatical sentence. Instead, we should have:

(28) Elle a fait tuer son mari par son amant.

This time the sentence contains an agent rather than an indirect object. Agents, of course, are associated with passive sentences. So let us assume that

the SUBCLAUSE has undergone PASSIVISATION. Obviously, this is not the usual sort of passivisation we would expect a clause to undergo: the verb tuer is still in the active voice and it is far from clear that the object (son mari) has become subject. More precisely, only one of the three operations which Chomsky (1967) refers to as constituting the passive transformation seems to have taken place. Applied to the sentence The enemy destroyed the city, these three operations are:

a) agent-postposing, which changes the subject into an agent, giving: *-destroyed the city by the enemy;

b) subject-preposing, which changes the object into the subject, giving:

*The city destroyed by the enemy;

c) passivisation of the verb, yielding, finally: The city was destroyed by the enemy.

To put a sentence into the passive all three of these operations are required, but, as Chomsky points out, something analogous to sentence passivisation can be observed to happen with English verbal noun groups. Thus a structure like

- (29) The enemy's destruction of the city.

 can have its subjective genitive replaced by an agent, thereby becoming
 - (30) The destruction of the city by the enemy.

Contrary to the sentence *destroyed the city by the enemy this string is quite acceptable. So is the sequence obtained by allowing the objective genitive to take the place of the subjective genitive, as in

(31) The city's destruction by the enemy (vs *The city destroyed by the enemy).

But of course it is impossible for the verbal noun destruction to be put into the passive voice, a step which was found to be compulsory with the verb destroy. How do these facts concerning the (partial) passivisability of verbal noun groups relate to the construction under discussion, viz. Elle a fait tuer son mari par son amant? The crucial fact is that infinitives may be looked upon as a special type of verbal nouns that is intermediate between ordinary verbal nouns like destruction and finite verbs; they are more verbal than verbal nouns of the destruction type but less so than finite verbs. This explains why it is possible for infinitive groups to be either partially or wholly passivised. In the French construction under consideration there may be assumed to be only partial passivisation, whereby the subject becomes the agent without either the object undergoing subject-preposing or the infinitive being put into the passive voice. This partial passivisation yields:

⁶ Cr. the following quotation from Grevisse (1969: 1066): "Le tour passif il fut fait mourir, il fut fait venir, qui a essayé, au XVIIo siécle, de s'introduire, a été condammé par Vaugelas".

(32) Elle a fait [tuer son mari par son amant]

At first sight it looks as if sentences of this type remain compound even in surface structure. But there is at least one bit of evidence against this view: pronominalisation, which requires the former object of tuer to eliticize in front of the verb of the main clause, cf. Elle l'a fait tuer par son amant. This would seem to indicate that also passive infinitive clauses under faire undergo VP raising, resulting in clause-union. Seeing that le may be regarded as the object of the main clause, we might again expect main clause passivisation to be possible. But as was the case with Elle l'a fait danser (with no passivisation in the subclause) passivisation of a main clause containing causative faire is again impossible, cf. *Il a été fait tuer par cet homme (par sa femme), where par cet homme and par sa femme are the agents belonging to tuer and fait or (fait tuer?), respectively.

Let us now have a lock at the English equivalents of (29), viz:

(33) ?She caused her lover to kill her husband. (t) She got her lover to kill her husband. (t) She made her lover kill her husband. (t)

((?)) She had her lover kill her husband. (t)

In French (partial) passivisation of the subclause has been seen to be obligatory with an infinitive like tuer. In the English sentences under (33) there is obviously no passivisation. But is it possible? We now want to check this for each of the four causative verbs under discussion. As regards cause, a sentence like ? She caused her husband to be killed by her lover (t) seems to be doubtful. But, as was the case with the corresponding active sentence, this unacceptability may well be a matter of register rather than grammar. Anyway, the following sentence, which is meant as an example, appears to be acceptable.

- (34) Subject-raising causes the S-node to be deleted. (t)

 Now the question arises whether the S-node in (34) is to be considered as the subject of the infinitive or the object of cause in surface structure. Putting it differently, does subject-raising take place if the clause under cause has been passivised, so that the main clause, too, can undergo passivisation? No straightforward answer can be given, seeing that such sentences as (35), though admittedly very clumsy, cannot be absolutely ruled out.
 - (35) The S-node may be caused to be deleted by a variety of transformations: subject-raising, verb-raising, equi-NP delection, indefinite NP delection, etc. (t)

As for the get construction, passivisation of the subclause yields:

(36) She got [her husband to be killed by her lover] s

This does not sound like a grammatical sentence but it can easily be made so by deleting to be, which yields: She got her husband killed by her lover. In fact be-deletion is quite a current phenomenon in English and French nonfinite clauses, as is apparent from: I consider that man (to be) an honest man; l'homme que je considére (ètre) un homme honnête. This time, however, the ungrammaticality of *Her husband was got killed (t) shows passivisation of the main clause to be impossible. Correspondingly, her husband must be considered as the subject of the nonfinite clause even in surface structure. The same phenomenon can be observed with the causative verb have. Here, too, passivisation of the subclause yields an ungrammatical sentence (*She had her husband be killed (t)), which is again made grammatical by be-deletion (She had her husband killed). But again passivisation of the main clause verb (i.e. have) is excluded, as shown by the ungrammaticality of *Her husband was had killed (t).

Let us finally consider the make instances. Passivisation of the infinitive clause yields:

(37) She made [her husband be killed by her lover] s

But this time passivisation leads to an ungrammatical sentence, no matter whether it is followed by be-deletion or not: *She made her husband be killed (t) and *She made her husband killed (t) are equally ungrammatical. Indeed, sentences exemplifying the make+accusative+past participle pattern are nearly always ungrammatical. But there are a few verbs, including understand, know and fear, with which it is quite current. Thus the following sentences represent normal usage:

- (38) He made his views known/understood.
- (39) He made his name feared. (t)

According to Van Ek (1966:120), whose inventory is an invaluable source of information for a student of English nonfinite object clauses, the make+accusative+past participle construction "is limited to collocations denoting the exercise and recognition of influence in the widest sense". In his corpus the participle felt occurs five times, heard twice, respected once and understood and valued also once. As was the case with have and get, double passivisation (i.e. of both subclause and main clause) is impossible, of *His views were made understood (t) and *His name was made feared (t). It is true that His views were made known is grammatical, but known must be looked upon here as an adjectival rather than a verbal form, as is evident from a comparison of His

Syntax of causative constructions

161

views were made known TO all his friends (t) and *His views were made known BY all his friends (t) (where by is an agent belonging to known, not made). So it would seem that subject-to-object raising is impossible in the string make [NP+past participle]. Interestingly, this may be taken to be part of a quite general constraint on main clause passivisation (and hence subject-to-object raising) in strings of the type:

(where the past participle results from passivisation of a plain infinitive, followed by obligatory be-deletion).

Thus we have:

тция we цаve:

(40) a. I saw them blow up the bridge.

b. She heard them call her name just once.

(41) a. I saw the bridge blown up.

b. She heard her name called just once.

(42) a. They were seen to blow up the bridge.

b. They were heard to call her name just once.

but not:

(43) a. *The bridge was seen blown up.

b. *Her name was heard called just once.

This constraint does not seem to apply if the past participle clause results from the optional delection of to+be (as contrasted with just be, which may be assumed to occur in the passive transform of a plain infinitive clause), cf:

(44) He was reported/believed (to be) killed.

However, if we take the view that subject-raising is impossible in the string make [NP+past participle] we are in trouble as regards the derivation of

(45) I made myself understood.

This sentence may be taken to derive from

(46) I made [people understand me]

Passive +be-deletion applied to this underlying structure give

(47) I made [me understood]

But this is not a grammatical sentence. Instead of me we need myself. To account for the occurrence of the reflexive pronoun we must regard myself

as the object of the main clause, which shows that subject-raising is sometimes possible from a past participle clause embedded under make. One way of getting out of this dilemna, which was suggested to me by W. Winter, would be to consider understood in I made myself understood as not derivable from an active infinitive. This would, however, prevent us from setting up a systematic connection between this English sentence and its French counterpart Je me suis fait comprendre. On the other hand, the test that we have just applied to known does point to understood being an adjective, cf. Did I make myself understood TO all of you? It is true that (?) Did I make myself understood BY all of you is also marginally possible, but the important point is that the to construction, unlike the by form, seems to be associated with a specialised (adjectival) meaning: it is typically used in connection with instructions. But if understood is an adjective we may well wonder why *His views were made understood (t) is ungrammatical, whereas His views were made known (t) is acceptable.

There is one more causative verb that can occasionally have a past participle clause as its object which I have not dealt with so far. I mean the verb see in sentences like the following:

(48) I will see her avenged. (quoted by Zandvoort (1965:50))

(49) He named twelve executors to see his wishes carried out. (quoted by Scheurweghs (1959:169))

(50) They sent their children to school to see them educated. (idem)

However, as was the case with make, the construction appears to be possible with a very limited number of verbs only. Thus the following sentences are virtually unacceptable.

- (51) *?I shall see that suit cleaned next week. (t)
- (52) *? We should see our house painted. (t)

At the moment I am unable to put forward any suggestions as to the nature of the semantic constraints on the use of past participle clauses as the object of the causative verb see. Whatever these may turn out to be, it is worth emphasizing that this construction can only very occasionally be used instead of the have/get+past participle clause or the see (to it) that construction (see below under 9.).

Two further remarks about this causative see are in order: (1) it differs from have and get in that the object clause cannot occur in the active, cf. *They sent their children to that school to see excellent teachers educate them (t); (2) it is like have and get in not tolerating passivisation of the main clause, cf. *She was seen averaged.

To sum up: we have seen that sub-clause passivisation is possible in English with clauses dependent on *get* and *have*, provided passivisation is followed by be-deletion. As regards infinitive clauses functioning as the object of the verb

Syntax of causative constructions

cause, passivisation seems to be quite possible in formal, academic English, but virtually impossible in colloquial English. It is obligatory with see, which, like get and have, requires be-deletion. On the other hand it is as a general rule impossible with infinitive complements of the verb make, although there are a handful of verbs, which, when occurring in the subclause, do allow it. When passivisation takes place in English subclauses dependent on one of the causative verbs, it is full passivisation involving not only agent postposing but also subject preposing and passivisation of the verb itself. In this respect English causative constructions contrast sharply with the French faire construction, where the infinitive cannot be put into the passive voice. Thus it is impossible in English to say *I caused/got/had/made that man (to) kill by John, whereas in French it is just as impossible to say *Elle a fait (être) abattu son mari par son amant. It may be worth pointing out that partial passivisation is not unknown with English nonfinite verbs either: we probably have it in You need your toe looking at by a chiropodist (quoted by Ryadford (1977:59)). But with the causative verbs under study this type of construction is totally im possible.

In French the active and the (partly) passive forms can hardly ever be regarded as free alternatives, mostly only one being possible in a given context. By contrast, English nearly always has the choice between an active and a (fully) passive subclause, that choice being, as a rule, a matter of style rather than grammatical constraints.

- 6. We have noticed that in English the agent in a passive sentence is often omitted. This is of course also frequently the case in French syntences. This explains why we may come across such homonymous pairs of sentences as
 - (53) Il a fait chanter la chanson.
 - (54) Il a fait chanter les garçons.

In (53) an agent like par les garçons may be said to be understood, whereas in (54) there is no agent understood but perhaps an indefinite object like quelque chose. If this view is taken it will be clear that this indefinite object needs deleting prior to the transformation that changes the subject of a transitive infinitive clause into an indirect object. If this were not the case we would derive *Il a fait chanter aux garçons. After the deletion of its indefinite object chanter behaves as if it were an intransitive verb, thus enabling its subject to become the direct object of the main clause.

Agent deletion and indefinite object deletion are apt to give rise to ambiquous sentences of the type

- (55) Je ferai manger vos chèvres.
- (56) Il a fait brûler le papier lentement.

which, respectively, derive either from

- (57) a. Je ferai [vos chèvres manger quelque chose] s
 - b. Il a fait [le papier brûler lentement]

or

- (58) a. Je ferai [(les lions) manger vos chèvres] s
 - b. Il a fait [quelqu'un brûler le papier lentement]

If the subject of the subclauses were not deleted as either indefinite or predictable from the context they would surface as agents in sentences like:

- (59) a. (Si vous ne suivez pas mes ordres,) je ferai manger vos chèvres par mes lions.
 - b. Il a fait brûler le papier par son secrétaire.

The reason why such ambiguities are possible in French is that the infinitive clause under faire is only partly passivised: its subject becomes the agent, but the infinitive is not put into the passive voice. If the agent is subsequently deleted, surface structure no longer contains any indication as to whether passivisation has taken place or not. In English ambiguities of this type are ruled out because subclause passivisation requires the infinitive to be put into the passive voice. Compare the above French instances with the following:

- (60) a. I'll make your goats eat.
 - b. I'll have your goats eaten (by my lions, if you don't obey my orders).
- (61) a. I'll make the paper burn slowly.
 - b. I had the paper burnt slowly.

In Je ferai manger vos chèvres, in the sense of I'll have your goats eaten, the infinitive no longer has a subject. In this particular sentence the absence of a subject could, of course, be looked upon as the result of partial passivisation, involving agent postposing but not subject preposing. But notice that also intransitive clauses embedded under faire can have their subject deleted, as for instance in Cela fait rire, from

It is important to emphasize that deletion is impossible in the corresponding sentence in English, where we will have something like It makes you/one/people laugh. If it is felt that no subject should be expressed a different construction

is required, for instance one containing a derived verbal noun or a nominal gerund functioning as the object of cause, as in This may cause some laughter/giggling. It is worth adding that this difference between French and English as regards the delection of the notional subject of the infinitive is also found with other verbs. Compare:

- (63) a. Cela (nous) obligera à étudier ce problème:
 - b. This will so blige force compel us to study that problem.
- (64) a. Cela (nous) permettra de résoudre le problème.
 - b. This will {enable} us to solve the problem. {allow } the problem to be solved.
- (65) a. Il (nous) a ordonné d'étudier ce problème.
 - b. He ordered us to study that problem.
 - ((?))He ordered that problem to be studied (t)
- 7. In what precedes our concern has been with the properties of infinitive clauses under cause, make, get and have. It should be added, however, that the verbs get and have, but not cause and make can also take a present participle clause as their object. Compare:
 - (66) They had us work hard.
 - (67) They had us working hard.
 - (68) I'll get him to work for you
 - (69) I'll get him working for you.

Semantically, the difference between the two types of construction seems to be that the infinitive refers to the factual aspect of the activity, whereas the ing-form, being more descriptive, focuses attention on the way the activity is performed. Thus (66) just states that is is a fact that we (regularly) worked for him, whereas (67) draws attention to the way the activity is performed (mostly, though not necessarily, in one particular case). (68) means that I shall persuade him to work for you (and not for somebody clse), whereas in (69) the emphasis is on the nature of the work that I shall require him to do: even though the adverb harder is not added, the reference may be taken to be to an intensification of the work.

Turning to syntax, there appears to be little difference between present participle and infinitive clauses under have and get as far as main clause passivisation is concerned. Once again this transformation is impossible, as is apparent from the following instances:

- (70) *We were had working hard.
- (71) *He was got working for you.

But there is a clear difference between the two types of construction with respect to subclause passivisation. While this transformation has been seen to be quite normal with infinitive clauses provided it is followed by be-deletion, it is impossible with present participle clauses, cf.

- (72) *I had that door being painted, when it started raining.
- (73) *I got him being cross-examined when the terrorists burst into the room and liberated him.

Double possivisation is, predictably, totally impossible, ef.

- (74) *That door was had being painted when it started raining.
- (75) *He was got being cross-examined when the terrorists burst into the room and liberated him.

As for cause, Leonhardi & Welsh (1969, 51) have the following example:

(76) A road accident caused my being late.

This instance might be taken to indicate that cause can have a gerund clause as its object. However, my informants regard this sentence as either ungrammatical or only marginally possible. Those who take the latter view tend to agree with my comment that (76) differs from A road accident caused me to be late in that it presupposes that the addressee is familiar with the fact of my being late, no such presupposition being required for the felicitous use of the infinitive construction.

- 8. So far we have considered only one French causative verb, viz. faire. Semantically related to faire is the verb laisser, which can be used in the same paradigms as faire, cf.
 - (77) a. Elle a laissé danser son mari.
 - b. Elle a laissé lire ce roman à son mari.
 - c. Elle a laissé tuer son mari par son amant.
 - d. Elle l'a laissé danser.
 - e. Elle lui a laissé lire ce roman.
 - f. Elle lui a laissé tuer son mari.

But in addition we also have:

- (78) a. Elle a laissé son mari danser.
 - b. Elle a laissé son mari lire ce roman.
 - c. Elle a laissé son amant tuer son mari.
 - d. Elle l'a laissé lire ce roman.
 - e. Elle l'a laissé tuer son mari.

So, with laisser we can have either the same construction as with faire or that found with the English verb make, where the subject of the infinitive clause

becomes the direct object of the main clause as a result of subject-to-object raising. Putting it differently, laisser allows of either the verb phrase or the subject of the infinitive clause being raised into the main clause. Interestingly, the English equivalent of laisser, viz. let seems, at first sight at least, to exhibit the same sort of behaviour. As regards subject-to-object raising the possibility of applying this transformation with let is demonstrated by instances like the following.

(79) (?) We were let know that he was ill.

It should, however, be added that passivisation of the main clause is presumably rare and that many native speakers reject sentences like (79) as ungrammatical. There is no doubt that (?) He was not let marry that girl' is far less current than He was not allowed to marry that girl. So, though main clause passivisation is not impossible with let, it is certainly unusual. By contrast, subclause passivisation is quite current. It is found in (80), derived from (81).

- (80) She let her husband be killed.
- (81) She let [somebody kill her husband] s

This time, however, be must be retained. In fact, let seems to be the only English verb that can take a passive object clause with a plain infinitive as its verbal.

Let us next see whether there is any evidence that also the verb may be raised out of the subclause under let. Such evidence might be taken to be provided by instances like He let slip the opportunity, where, contrary to what we have in He let the reins slip out of his hand, the infinitive is not separated from the verb let. This unit might be looked upon as the result of the application of an English counterpart of the French faire-attraction transformation, applying to a deep structure something like

(82) He let [the opportunity slip] s

A similar analysis might be applied to sentences like

- (83) He let fall/drop a hint.
- (84) He let go his hold.

There are, however, two objections to this analysis: a) in French faire can be followed by almost any verb, whereas let only combines with a handful of

verbs; b) in French the subclause in the deep structure of Elle l'a fait danser, viz.

can of course also occur independently (as in *Il danse*), whereas the subclauses that we would need to set up in English cannot occur independently. As a matter of fact we cannot have:

- (86) *The opportunity slipped.
- (87) *The hint fell/dropped.
- (88) ??His hold went.

On account of these facts it is better to consider let slip, let fall, let drop and let go as compound verbs which do not allow of any further synchronic syntactic analysis. It stands to reason that on this view such rather rare passive sentences as The opportunity was let slip cannot be regarded as examples of of nominative + plain infinitive construction, as is suggested by Zandvoort (1965:19; fnt 1). Considering that sentences like The opportunity was let slip apparently constitute the only evidence for the existence of the nominative + plain infinitive construction in English, it may be assumed that the construction does not occur in English at all.

- 9. In section 5 I discussed sentences of the type He saw her avenged, pointing out that there appear to be very severe semantic constraints on the construction. Thus a sentence like *I shall see this suit cleaned by next week is felt to be ungrammatical. Instead one has to say
 - (89) I shall see (to it) that this suit is cleaned by next week.

This brings us back to finite clauses as the object of causative verbs. In section 2 I observed that faire can have a (en sorte) que clause as its object. As for English, finite clauses do not occur as the object of the verbs cause, make, get and have, cf.

By contrast, the verb see to is very current with a finite clause, which may, needless to say, also be active, as in:

(91) I shall see (to it) that he comes tomorrow.

It is worth emphasizing that the verb in question is the prepositional verb see to, not just see. This is evident from sentences such a I'll see to the execution

⁷ For textual instances of this construction, see Van Ek (1966: 115) and especially Jespresen (1940: 318), who also quotes instances of the type *I was ever let TO go*, which strike some native speakers as even more odd than the construction without to.

of your orders, I'll see to that right away. In this connection it is interesting to note that in English it is impossible for a that-clause to function as the object of a preposition. In this respect English differs sharply from a language like Norwegian, whose syntax is otherwise closely related to that of English. Thus in Norwegian sentences like Jeg var sikker på at han var et farligt menneske 'I was certain of that he was a dangerous man' are extremely current. In English, on the other hand, either the preposition must be deleted or a gerund clause must be used instead of a that-clause. Compare:

(92) I was surprised at the news.

* at that he was ill.
that he was ill.
at his being ill.

With one or two verbs, however, another pattern is possible: one with *it* inserted between the preposition and the *that*-clause. One such verb is precisely the causative verb *see*, another is *depend*, as in:

- (93) I shall see to it that he comes tomorrow.
- (94) You may depend upon it that every member of the Committee will support your proposal. (quoted by Hornby (1954:76)).

But see, unlike depend, allows of another construction where both the preposition and it are left out, yielding:

(95) I shall see that he comes tomorrow.

It is worthwhile observing that French has a syntactically analogous construction, as exemplified in:

(96) Je veillerai à ce qu'il vienne demain.

Like see to, veiller à is a prepositional verb, cf. Je veillerai à l'exécution de vos ordres. Both with veiller and with see the verbal noun groups can be replaced by finite clauses provided the latter are separated from the preposition by a pronoun, ce in French, it in English. In French this type of construction is very frequent, being mainly found with the prepositions à and de. Gross (1968) quotes numerous examples of it. As regards English, the construction seems

to be limited to the verbs see and depend and one or two more (cf. Hornby (1954:76))r. The reason for this difference in frequency between the two languages probably lies in the fact that English, unlike French, can, and very often does, use gerund clauses with an overt subject as the object of prepositional verbs. As is the case with English see, but not depend, the preposition may sometimes be deleted in French as in Je m'étonne (de ce) qu'il soit venu, but this sort of deletion is impossible with the causative verb veiller, cf. *Je veillerai qu'il vienne demain.

APPENDIX

- 1. In section 5 I followed Chomsky (1967) in deriving the destruction of the city by the enemy from the enemy's destruction of the city. However, this analysis works much better for English than for French, which has only the former type of construction. If we want to apply Chomsky's analysis to French, we see that agent-postposing becomes obligatory and subject-preposing is impossible. A comparison with a few other languages, such as German, Dutch, Russian and Polish shows that all these languages have the construction that corresponds to the one that is the only possible in French, whereas constructions of the type the enemy's destruction of the city, which Chomsky takes to be basic, are all but inexistent. Compare (97) with (98).
 - (97) Die Zestörung der Stadt durch den Feind. De verwoesting van de stad door de vijand. Razrušenie goroda vragom (Comrie (1976:182)). Zniszczenie miasta przez nieprzyjaciela (Comrie (1976:190)).
 - (98) Pes Feindes Zerstörung der Stadt.
 Programme Verwoesting van de stad.
 - *Vraga razrušenia goroda (Comrie (1976:182)).
 - *Nieprzyjaciela zniszczenie miasta.

If we are to construct a maximally simple grammar that applies to a variety of languages making use of a maximum of universal rules and a minimum of language specific rules, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that the basic form should be the destruction of the city by the enemy rather than the enemy's destruction of the city. Moreover, the form which Chomsky considers to be basic is often impossible even in English, where the Saxon genitive is, as a rule, restricted to nouns with the feature [+animate]. If we consider such derived verbal noun groups as the destruction of the city by the enemy as basic, then there would, on the face of it, no longer be any parallelism with the structure of sentences, which would obviously be a considerable setback. But there is in fact a very simple way of saving this parallelism. Rather than modelling the deep structure of verbal noun groups on that of sentences we can try to derive sentences from underlying structures which closely resemble the surface structure of

^{*} It is worth pointing out that in German and Dutch, too, dass/dat clauses can easily be made to depend on prepositions provided the groups Prep+es/Prep+het are transformed into da+Prep/er+Prep, respectively. Thus, corresponding to I saw to it that he was warned we have Ich sorgte dafür, dass er gewarnt wurde (from* Ich sorgte für es, dass er gewarnt wurde) and Ik zorgde ervoor dat hij gewaarschuwd werd (from* Ik zorgde voor het dat hij gewaarschuwd werd).

verbal noun groups. On this hypothesis the deep structure of the enemy destroyed the city and the city was destroyed by the enemy would be something like:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{Past} & \{\text{Active} \\ \text{Passive} \} \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \text{destroy the city by the enemy} \\ \text{Prop} \end{bmatrix}$$

This would be a deep structure along the lines of Fillmore (1968), but, unlike what Fillmore proposes, active and passive sentences would have a common voice-neutral nucleus, which would resemble the deep structure of verbal noun groups very closely. On this proposal sentences like *Elle a fait tuer son mari par son amant* would immediately reflect deep structure. This would also be the case with sentences like (99), which might be taken to derive from (100).

(99) Elle a fait voir ce roman à son amant.

(100) Elle a fait [voir ce roman à son amant]

In this deep structure à son amant could be interpreted as Fillmore's underlying dative which, he suggests, occurs in the deep structure of sentences containing stative sense perception verbs like see, feel and hear. This dative would then be kept in the surface structure of infinitive clauses embedded under faire and no ad hoc à insertion transformation would be required. Although it is impossible to give hard and fast rules as regards the choice between the à and the par construction in an infinitive clause functioning as the object of faire, it is crucial that the à construction is typically found with such stative verbs as voir, entendre, sentir and connaître. Quite revealingly, Seuren (1973:48) points out that lire "occurs in the active as well as in the passive under faire, although, if passive, it means 'check on mistakes' or the like, rather than 'take cognizance of', which is what the active means".

As regards finite clauses the occurrence of par in passives (cf. Ce roman a été lu par son amant) might be accounted for by a rule that substitutes par for the dative marker prior to subject-selection. At first sight this hypothesis seems to lose a great deal of its plausibility when confronted with a sentence such as Elle lui a fait tuer son mari, which requires the inverse type of rule: one substituting a dative for an underlying par phrase (which is found if there is no pronominalisation, as in Elle a fait tuer son mari par son amant). But the point is that the dative in this type of sentence must be regarded as very superficial, as is shown by the fact that it is not allowed to occur in cleft sentences, cf. C'est $\begin{Bmatrix} *a \\ par \end{Bmatrix}$ bui qu'elle a fait tuer son mari. So whatever the underlying form of lui, it cannot be a dative. Therefore we do not have the impossible derivation dative $\rightarrow par$ -phrase \rightarrow dative.

Although the proposal being made here, according to which the surface structure found with infinitive clauses embedded under faire is very close to

deep structure, is certainly not without its problems, it does seem to be more in keeping with the facts of French syntax than an analysis that involves partial passivisation.

2. We have seen that the facts concerning main clause passivisation suggest that *make* is a raising verb whereas *have* is not. It is tempting to quote instances like the following as further evidence for this view.

(101) Why did you run so fact? Because she
$$\begin{Bmatrix} made \\ *had \end{Bmatrix}$$
 me.

It might be assumed that this construction is possible only if the subject has been raised out of a plain infinitive clause and transformed into the object of the main clause. But as it appears to occur with a few verbs only, it is hard to come up with any generalizations. Moreover, one of the verbs with which it does occur presents a serious problem: many speakers who find He wouldn't let me perfectly normal, do not seem to like (?)He was let leave early, which we would expect them to do if let was a raising verb.

Verbs that require a to-infinitive complement cannot occur in the pattern under discussion (cf. *Because she got me), but they do occur in the pattern Because she got me to, which involves the use of anaphoric to (which refers to a previously mentioned VP, which may be taken to be repeated after to in deep structure and deleted subsequently). At first sight also the occurrence of this pattern might be taken to be relatable to subject-to-object raising. Compare Why are you running so fast! - Because she wants/likes me to (t) with Is he an honest man? - *Well, I believe/imagine/suppose him to. Verbs like want and like do not allow subject-to-object raising (cf. the ungrammaticality of the passives *He is wanted/liked to go othere), whereas verbs of the helieve type do (cf. He is believed to be an honest man). So the anaphoric to-construction would appear to be possible only with such verbs as do not allow subject-to-object raising. In Because she got me to me to might be taken to still consitute a subclause, with me functioning as the subject and to representing the predicate. However, matters are more complicated. Thus it is possible to say ((?)) Because he meant/allowed me to (t), even though mean and allow are raising verbs (cf. the passives He was meant/allowed to meet her). Moreover, we can also have Because he persuaded/forced/compelled/obliged me to (t), although it can be argued that me is the object of persuade/force/compel/oblige both in deep and in surface structure, so that all that remains of the deep structure infinitive clause is the particle to. Accordingly, rather than being an automatic consequence of the syntactic structure of the sentence in question, the (un-)grammaticality of the anaphoric to-construction seems to be primarily a function of the semantics of the main clause verb, the construction being found mainly with verbs of volition (want, hate, but also mean, allow and force, compel, etc.) but not occurring with opinion verbs like believe and suppose. Moreover, being a typically colloquial construction, it tends to be restricted to verbs that are current in everyday speech. As pointed out above, the verb get, though syntactically different from it, appears to be pretty close in meaning to the verb persuade. Hence there is nothing surprising about it agreeing with that verb in taking the anaphoric to-construction.

As for the verb cause, both *Because he caused me and *Because he caused me to appear to be unacceptable, although the latter is perhaps slightly better than the former. The former is out because cause is a) not used with a plain infinitive complement, b) not current in colloquial English and, moreover, not a raising verb, if used at all, in that type of English. As for *? Because he caused me to, we saw just now that cause, unlike make and get, refers to an abstract, often indirect type of causation which has little to do with the exertion of will power on the part of the grammatical subject. In addition, it is a typically formal verb. These facts may be held to account for the quasi-ungrammaticality of the construction.

REFERENCES

- Bach, E. and Harms, R. (eds). 1968. Universals in linguistic theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bresnan, J. 1972. The theory of complementation in English. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T.
- Chomsky, N. 1967. "Remarks on nominalization". In Jacobs, R. A. and Rosenbaum, P. S. (eds). 1970, 184-221.
- Comrie, D. 1976. "The syntax of action nominals: a cross language study". Lingua 40. No 2/3, 177 - 201.
- Fillmore, C. 1968. "The case for case". In Bach, E. and Harms, R. (eds). 1968. 1-90. Grevisse, M. 1969. Le Bon Usage. Gembloux: Deculot.
- Gross, M. 1968. Grammaire transformationnelle du français. Paris: Librairie Larousse. Hornby, A. S. 1954. A guide to patterns and usage in English. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobs, R. A. and Rosenbaum, P.S. (eds). 1970. Readings in English transformational grammar. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn and Co.
- Jaspersen, O. 1940. A modern English grammar. Part V. Volume 4. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Kayne, R. 1975. French syntax, the transformational cycle. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T.
- Leonhardi, A. and Welsh, B. 1968. Grammaticaal Woordenboek Engels. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- McCawley, N. 1976. "Remarks on What can cause What". In Shibatani, M. (ed.). 1976. 117 - 129.
- Postal, P. 1974. On raising. Cambridge, Mass.: The M. I.T. Press.
- Radford, A. 1977. Italian syntax, transformational and relational grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenbaum, P. 1967. The grammar of English predicate complement constructions. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press.

Scheurweghs, G. 1959. Present-day English syntax. A survey of sentence patterns. London:

Longmans.

Seuren, P. 1973. Predicate raising and dative in French and Sundry languages. Trier: LAUT.

Shibatani, M. 1976, "The grammar of causative constructions: a conspectus". In Shibatani, M. (ed.). 1976. 1-40.

Shibatani, M. (ed.). 1976. Syntax and semantics. Vol. 6. New York: Academic Press. Van Ek, J. 1966. Four complementary structures of predication in contemporary British English. Groningen: J. B. Wolters.

Zandvoort, R. 1965. A handbook of English grammar. London: Longmans Green and

Co.