

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 indispensable.

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*

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.

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,

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.³ 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:

- (10) She caused [him to dance]
 s s
- (11) She got [him to dance]
 s s
- (12) She made [him to dance]
 s s
- (13) She had [him to dance]
 s s

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

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.

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:

- (18) *Him to dance was

}	caused
	got
	made
	had

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:

- (19) She made him [dance]
 VP VP

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

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 *à*-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.⁶

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:

(27) Elle a fait [_s son amant tuer son mari]_s

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

⁶ Cf. the following quotation from Grevisse (1969: 1066): "Le tour passif *il fut fait mourir, il fut fait venir*, qui a essayé, au XVII^e siècle, de s'introduire, a été condamné par Vaugelas".

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:

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

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 cliticize 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 look 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 deletion, indefinite NP deletion, 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 considère (être) 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, cf. **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*

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 deletion 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

}	oblige
	force
	compel

 us to study that problem.

- (64) a. Cela (nous) permettra de résoudre le problème.
 b. This will

}	enable
	allow

 us to solve the problem.
 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 it 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 else), 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 passivisation is, predictably, totally impossible, cf.

- (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

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.⁸ As regards English, the construction seems

⁸ 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*).

to be limited to the verbs *see* and *depend* and one or two more (cf. Hornby (1954:76)). 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 Zerstörung 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) ?Des Feindes Zerstörung der Stadt.
?'s Vijands 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

ring 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. Press.
- 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. 1965². *A handbook of English grammar*. London: Longmans Green and Co.