

広島大学学術情報リポジトリ
Hiroshima University Institutional Repository

Title	Docomposition of Clitic Movement in the French Causative Construction
Author(s)	Ishioka, Seizo
Citation	NIDABA , 22 : 93 - 102
Issue Date	1993-03-31
DOI	
Self DOI	
URL	https://ir.lib.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/00047243
Right	
Relation	



Decomposition of Clitic Movement in the French Causative Construction

Seizo ISHIOKA

0. INTRODUCTION

The French causative construction has long been one of the topics of interest to syntacticians: one of the main reasons for it being that the lexical embedded (embd.) subject appears in an accusative or dative form after the embd. predicate, as is illustrated in the following sentences (1a-d). As discussed extensively in the past, the placement of the lexical embd. subject in causatives sharply contrasts with the usual SVO order observed in complement clauses in French in that the subject always follows the embd. verb. Besides this problem, the placement of this subject NP varies with the transitivity of the embd. verb. Concretely, when the embd. verb is intransitive, the embd. lexical subject immediately follows the embd. verb and is assigned accusative Case, as in (1c). In contrast, when the embd. verb is transitive, as in (1a), the subject follows any complements of the verb and is assigned dative Case.

- (1) a. Jean fait lire la lettre à Marie
 b. *Jean fait Marie lire la lettre 'Jean makes Marie read the letter'
 c. Jean fait rire Marie
 d. *Jean fait Marie rire 'Jean makes Marie laugh'
 e. Jean laisse lire la lettre à Marie/ Marie lire la lettre
 'Jean lets Marie read the letter'
 f. Jean laisse rire Marie/ Marie rire 'Jean lets Marie laugh'

In contrast to the FAIRE causative construction, the sentences (1e-1f) indicate that the LAISSER construction allows the embd. subject to appear both before and after the predicate.^{1>} Another puzzling phenomenon found in the FAIRE construction is the landing site of clitic movement and the dialectal variation in Case-marking of the clitic. As is shown in the following examples, the clitic generated in the embd. predicate adjoins to the matrix functional X⁰ category, and is Case-marked in the same way as the case of an embd. lexical subject (2a-2c).^{2>} However, Case-assignment of the clitic (lui) in the example (2d) cannot

be treated in the same way as that which correctly explains the examples (2a-2c). This will make it necessary to search for a novel strategy to elucidate Case-assignment of a clitic which is different from that of a lexical NP.

- (2) a. Jean lui a fait manger le gâteau (Goodall 1987:18a-b)
 b. *Jean a fait lui manger le gâteau 'Jean made him eat the cake'
 c. ça l'a fait patienter
 d. ça lui a fait patienter (Reed 1991:62a-b)
 e. *ça a fait patienter à Jean 'this made him/Jean wait'

In this article, I will mainly be concerned with the Case-assignment of clitics which are base-generated in the embd. predicates of FAIRE causative constructions, and propose a theory which seems to properly account for the variation among some French dialects of the Case-assignment phenomena in question. Specifically, I will assume that a clitic doesn't always directly adjoin to some functional X^0 category and that the clitic can XP-move to a certain SPEC position in order to meet the Case Filter requirements imposed on the clitic. In other words, the Case Filter requirements allow a clitic to XP-move to a SPEC position in the stage prior to its X^0 -moving to a functional X^0 category (that is, adjunction). I will call this possibility to XP-move before movement by adjunction decomposition of cliticization.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 1, I will present the relevant Standard French data in which embd. predicates contain NP's as their arguments, proposing a mechanism in the GB framework which enables us to explain the data from the standpoint of Case-assignment; section 2 deals with the behaviour of pronominal clitics in terms of Case-assignment and Binding Theory; in Section 3, I will present the data concerning the dialectal variation of the placement and Case-marking of embd. clitics and try to clarify the variation and to delimit some dialect groups; in section 4, I will make an elementary survey of the behaviour of the prepositional clitics (EN, Y).

1. STRUCTURE OF THE FAIRE CAUSATIVE AND CASE-ASSIGNMENT OF NP'S

Before discussing the FAIRE construction, I will make some comments on the difference between the FAIRE and LAISSER constructions. As shown in the examples (3), the latter construction admits two positions which an embd. subject occupies with respect to the embd. predicate.

- (3) a. je laisserai Jean lire ce livre
 b. je laisserai lire ce livre à Jean 'I will let Jean read this book'
 c. *je ferai Jean lire ce livre
 d. je ferai lire ce livre à Jean 'I will make Jean read this book'

- e. *je laisserai donner un livre à Paul à Jean ... (Quicoli 1980:38c,d)
 f. je laisserai donner ce livre à Paul par Jean
 'I will let Jean give a/this book to Paul'

In this article, I will suppose as a null hypothesis that the matrix verbs (FAIRE, LAISSER) subcategorize for AgrP and that the embd. subjects are base-generated at a VP-adjoined position (e.g. Contreras 1991; Sportiche 1988; among many others). From these suppositions it follows that the examples (3) have the configuration (4) as their base structure.

(4) [_v¹[_vlais-/fai-[_{AgrP}[_{Agr}¹Agr[_{TP}[_T¹[_Tlire[_{VP}[_{VP}[_v¹t_v NP(ce livre)]]]NP (Jean)]]]]]]^{3>}

(5) [_v¹[_vlais-/fai-[_{AgrP}[_{TP}[_T¹[_Tlire][_{VP}[_{VP}[_v¹t_v NP(ce livre)]]] NP(Jean)]]] [_{Agr}¹Agr t_{TP}]]

The subject NP (Jean) can be assigned no Case at its base-generated position, and must move to a position at which the subject is properly Case-assigned (Case Filter). As is clear in the configuration (4), the matrix V seems to be the only element to fulfill this Case requirement, thus causing the subject in question to move to a position governed by the matrix V (i.e. the embd. SPEC (Agr) position). Notice that in contrast to pro-drop Romance languages, Agr in the French [-finite] CP (AgrP) cannot L-mark its sister TP even when Agr is lexicalized by the replacement (or adjunction) of a lexical element (TP=barrier), differently from the case of T which can be fully lexicalized by the movement of V (to form an Infinitive) and L-mark its sister VP. As a consequence, the movement of the subject (Jean) will be excluded, and the example (3a) will be judged ungrammatical, contrary to the facts. This problem can be overcome by hypothesizing that Agr governed by a lexical element (i.e. matrix V) will be activated and L-mark its sister (L-marking activation of Agr). Thus, the embd. TP does not constitute a barrier any more, which enables the subject (Jean) to move to the SPEC (Agr) to be properly assigned accusative Case by the matrix V (3a).

A question arises here as to how the sentences (3b,d) are derived. As mentioned above, the subject NP of (3a) moves to the embd. SPEC (Agr) in order to meet Case Filter. On the other hand, it seems that here it is not the embd. subject but some maximal projection that moves to the SPEC position. I hypothesize that the embd. TP as a whole moves to the SPEC (Agr) position. This movement process accounts for the relative order of the embd. arguments. Notice that according to this hypothesis the subject remains at its base-generated VP-

adjoined position: this subject has to be Case-assigned at the base-generated position.⁴³ Thus, the examples (3a,d) have the above configuration (5) as their base. Clearly, Relativized Minimality prevents the matrix V from governing and Case-assigning the embd. subject (Jean) (embd. T^o being an intervening potential governor of the embd. subject). Following the line of Reed (1990a-b), I propose that the matrix V and embd. T governed by the former constitute a kind of complex verb (called Verbal Government Chain (VGCh)) and that this VGCh Case-assigns the embd. subject. Specifically, the following assumptions are set up as to the Case-assignment by VGCh:

- (6) a. VGCh has the Case Array _____ Acc (Dat) .⁶³
 b. Case-Assignment is optional.
 c. When a verb assigns Case, the entire Case Array must be assigned.
 d. Acc is assigned only under Adjacency.
 e. VGCh loses its property of assigning Case when the Case in question has already been assigned by an embd. tv.
 f. Acc cannot be assigned to an element base-generated as V¹'s sister.
 g. Dat cannot be assigned to an element base-generated as V^o's sister.

Thus, in (3b,d) VGCh assigns Acc and Dat to the NP (la lettre) and the subject (Jean), respectively. Here, the embd. subject has to be base-generated at the right VP-adjoined position, since in case of the subject being generated at a left VP-adjoined position, the subject is assigned Acc with the embd. V^o's sister NP (la lettre) given Dat or no Case, against the premise (6g) or Case Filter.⁶⁴ This way of explanation also applies to the above examples (3e,f). In (3e), Case Filter does not allow of any proper derivation. The embd. V (donner) has the same Case Array _____ Acc (Dat) as VGCh. In case the embd. V assigns Cases to NP's (un livre, Paul), VGCh cannot assign any Case (premise (6e)) and the subject (Jean) violates Case Filter. Similarly, if VGCh assigns Cases to NP's (un livre, Jean), the NP (Paul) cannot get Case. It is the same with the case where VGCh assigns Cases NP's (un livre, Paul). In sum, we cannot get a proper derivation in terms of Case-assignment. In contrast, in (3f), the embd. subject position seems to be zero (ϕ) and may not be Case-assigned. This makes it possible for VGCh to assign Acc and Dat to NP's (ce livre, Paul) respectively. This is how the example (3f) is properly judged grammatical.

2. BEHAVIOUR OF CLITICS IN STANDARD FRENCH ⁷³

In this section, I will see how the following standard French data are explained in the framework adopted here. It is assumed in this paper that clitics are

base-generated at the same positions as NP's and are subject to Case Filter as in the case of NP's. Furthermore, I assume that a properly Case-assigned clitic adjoins to some uppermost functional X^0 category in the governing category of the original trace (Clitic Placement Constraints (CPC)), in which adjunction ECP and Binding Principle A are respected.⁸³ The relevant definitions will be given in (11-14) .

- (7) a. Jean a laissé Marie l' écrire t (Ouhalla 1989:67c)
 b. *Jean l' a laissé Marie écrire t 'Jean let Marie write it'
 c. Jean l' a laissé/fait écrire t à Marie (Ouhalla 1989:67a)
 d. *Jean a laissé/fait l' écrire t à Marie 'Jean let/made Marie write it'
- (8) a. Jean lui a fait manger le gâteau t (Goodall 1987:18a-b)
 b. *Jean a fait lui manger le gâteau t 'Jean made him eat the cake'
- (9) a. Jean l' a fait t rire (t) (Goodall 1987:20a-b)
 b. *Jean a fait le t rire (t) 'Jean made him laugh'
- (10) a. *Jean lui a fait écrire l'enfant t (Goodall 1987:21a-b)
 b. *Jean a fait lui écrire l'enfant t
 c. Jean lui a fait écrire par l'enfant (Goodall 1987:22a-b)
 d. ?Jean a fait lui écrire par l'enfant 'Jean made the child write to her'
- (11) Binding Principle A (X^0 Binding) :
 The trace of a clitic is bound in its governing category (GC) .
- (12) The definition of X^0 Binding:
 YP is bound by X^0 iff YP and X^0 are coindexed and X^0 c-commands YP
 (c-command being defined with respect to a branching node X^1 or $X^2(XP)$) .
- (13) The definition of Governing Category (GC) :⁸⁴
 β is a governing category for α iff β is the minimal maximal projection containing α , a canonical governor of α , and a SUBJECT accessible to α (cf. Aoun 1985) .
- (14) The definition of SUBJECT:
 The SUBJECT consists of Agr which is Case-assignable by SPEC-HEAD agreement or of a Case-assigned subject (NP and clitic) which is base-generated at a left VP-adjoined position or has moved to a SPEC position from its base-generated position to avoid the Case Filter violation.

In (7a-b) , where VGCh does not form, the embd.AgrP constitutes GC for t, trace of the clitic (le) , since it is a minimal maximal projection containing t, a canonical governor (embd.t_v) , and a SUBJECT (Marie) moved to the embd.SPEC (Agr) .Therefore, the clitic adjoins to the uppermost functional category in its GC, i.e.embd.Agr) .¹⁰³In (7c-d) , where VGCh forms, the embd. subject does not constitute a SUBJECT for t, since this subject is base-generated and Case-assigned at a right VP-adjoined position. Instead, the matrix subject functions as a SUBJECT with the matrix AgrP being GC for t. Thus, the clitic (le) is enforced to adjoin to the matrix Agr, which explains the contrast between (7a-b) . Also in (8) , where VGCh assigns Acc and Dat to the clitic and the embd.

subject respectively, and (9), where VGCh assigns Acc to the embd. subject clitic, the matrix Agr functions as a SUBJECT for t. As expected, the same contrast as in (7c-e) is found in (8-9).

(10a-b) offer very interesting examples in that they show the impossibility for an embd. Dat clitic to adjoin to any functional X^0 category as long as the embd. subject NP is Case-assigned Acc at its base-generated position. As expected in the framework adopted here, in (10a-b), the embd. subject is Case-assigned Acc at its base-generated left VP-adjoined position (as a result, it functions as a SUBJECT), while the clitic is assigned Dat at the embd. $V^{1'}$'s sister position. It follows that it is the embd. VP that constitutes a GC for t, and consequently, (10a) becomes ungrammatical because of Binding Principle A, and also (10b), on account of there being no functional X^0 element which the clitic (lui) adjoins to in its GC. In contrast, the example (10c) will be accounted for straight away. In the example concerned, the embd. subject is realized as an adjunct, and the embd. subject position seems to be zero, which means that the matrix AgrP forms GC for t (with the matrix Agr as a SUBJECT). Thus, the clitic (lui) adjoins to the uppermost functional category in its GC, matrix Agr, which accounts for the grammaticality of (10c).^{11>}

3. BEHAVIOUR OF CLITICS IN SOME DIALECTS

Here, I will discuss another possibility which some dialects seem to have to Case-assign a clitic at a non base position. Prior to this discussion, however, I will briefly mention the landing site differences of clitic movement observed in (10d) which contrasts sharply in grammaticality with the following examples:

- (15) a. Jean l'a fait manger t par l'enfant (Goodall 1987:25a-b)
 b. *Jean a fait le manger t par l'enfant 'Jean made the child write it'
- (16) a. je leur ai fait téléphoner t par le secrétariat
 b. *j' ai fait leur téléphoner t par le secrétariat
 'I made the secretariat phone to them' (Pijnenburg & Hulk 1989:20)

Concretely, the contrast between (10d) and (15b) adapted from the same source is quite surprising. The examples (15-16) do not raise any problem, since it is the matrix AgrP that constitutes GC for t in both. First consider the difference between (10d) and (15b) which has something to do with the difference of the Case-assigner of each clitic. In (10d) it is the embd. V (t_v) that assigns Case to the clitic (lui). Notice that in (15) the embd. subject position is zero, and a subject θ -role is not assigned to its base-generated VP-adjoined position. In

(15b) what assigns Case to the clitic is not the embd.V (tv) but VGCh, because the Case-assignment by the former is prevented by Burzio's generalization saying that a verb that assigns a structural Case to its object assigns a θ -role to its subject position and vice versa. In sum, there seems to exist some dialect where a clitic Case-assigned by an embd.V need not be subject to CPC and consequently, the clitic is allowed to also move to the embd.T (e.g. in (10d)).¹² As shown in (17c), there exists another dialect (called A) in which the embd.subject may also be given Acc. The example (17a) belongs to another different dialect (called B) in which the embd.subject clitic may also be assigned Dat. Clearly, in A and B dialect, VGCh cannot Case-assign the embd.subject clitic at the base-generated position. In A dialect, the matrix V (fai-) cannot govern and Case-assign the embd.subject clitic at the base position, since Acc assignment requires Adjacency (premise (6d)) and the embd.T forms an intervening potential governor of the clitic (Relativized Minimality).

(17) a. ça lui a fait récriminer de plus belle (Authier & Reed 1991:2c,2b)
 b. ça l' a fait récriminer de plus belle 'this made him complain even more'
 c. ça le fait battre Marie (Tasmowski 1984:404) 'this makes him beat Marie'
 In order to overcome this difficulty, I assume that the embd.subject clitic NP-move to the embd.SPEC (T) in dialect A where VGCh formation is not obligatory, and at the SPEC (T) position, the subject clitic can be governed and Case-assigned by the matrix V (fai-). Furthermore, it is assumed that in A dialect the matrix V has the Case Array identical to that of VGCh, while in B dialect the matrix V (fai-) is endowed with the Case Array (____ Dat).¹³ Thus, in A dialect, the embd.subject clitic, which has moved to the embd.SPEC (T) to meet Case Filter, has the SPEC (T) position as its starting point of cliticization (i.e. adjunction). As shown in the definition (14), the subject clitic (in this case, also the trace of the clitic) at the embd.SPEC (T) position functions as a SUBJECT. This fact is induced from the example (18):

- (18) a. je la lui ai fait quitter (Reed 1990b:20) 'I made him leave it'
 b. je la fera lui parler (Milner 1982:353) 'I'll make her speak to him'
 c. *je lui fera le lire (Milner 1982:353) 'I'll make her read it'

In (18b) belonging to A dialect, the subject clitic (la) given Acc at the embd.SPEC (T) position, which is the starting point of cliticization, functions as a SUBJECT of the embd.clitic (lui). Consequently, the matrix AgrP is GC for the clitic (la) with the embd.TP being GC for the clitic (lui). Thus, (18b) is properly judged grammatical only in A dialect. In (18a), VGCh assigns Acc and

Dat to the embd.V^o's sister clitic (la) and the subject clitic (lui) generated at a right VP-adjoined position respectively. It is the matrix AgrP that constitutes GC for both the clitics. Consequently, these clitics obligatorily adjoin to the matrix Agr. In case VGCh is not formed, the example (18a) is judged grammatical also in B dialect. In this Case, the embd.subject is generated at a right VP-ajoined position and is given Dat by the matrix V (fai-). The clitic (la) is Case-assigned by the embd.V (tv). What constitutes GC's for the clitics is the matrix AgrP, enforcing the clitics to adjoin to the matrix Agr.¹⁴ Now suppose that in (18a), B dialect allows the matrix V to Case-assign Dat to the subject (lui) moved to the embd.SPEC (T). But this possibility of Case-assignment will be excluded, since that supposition requires that GC for the V^o's sister clitic (la) be the embd.TP. As a consequence, the pattern observed in the example (18c) will be judged grammatical, clearly contrary to the facts. It seems that this indicates the fact that in B dialect the embd.subject clitic is Case-assigned by the the matrix V at the base position.

4. BEHAVIOUR OF PREPOSITIONAL CLITICS (EN, Y)

This section deals with the following examples. (19a-b) and (20a-b) are instances of the causative construction in which the embd.subject moved to the embd.SPEC (Agr) functions as a SUBJECT. Given that X^o Binding applies also to the clitics (EN, Y) and the clitics subcategorized for by the embd.V are generated at the right VP-adjoined position, in these examples, the embd.AgrP constitutes GC for the clitics. Consequently, the clitics obligatorily move to the embd.Agr position. This explains the contrast between (a) and (b) examples of (19-20).

- (19) a. Paul laissera Jean en parler (Quicoli 1981:20b, 21b, 24b)
 b. *Paul en paissera Jean parler
 c. Paul en laissera/fera parler Jean
 'Paul will let/make John speak of them'
 d. Marie a fait en parler Jean (Rouveret and Vergnaud (R&V) 1980:143b)
 e. ?(*)Marie fera en parler Jean (Gibson and Raposo (G&R) 1983:30b)
- (20) a. Paul laissera Jean y aller (Quicoli 1981:20c, 21c, 24c)
 b. *Paul y laissera Jean aller
 c. Paul y laissera/fera aller Jean 'Paul will let/make John go there'
 d. Marie a fait y aller Jean (R&V 1980:141b)
 e. ?(*)Marie fera y aller Jean (G&R 1983:30a)

The (c-e) examples of (19-20) are problematic in that in some dialect (e.g. that of R&V 1980) the clitic (EN, Y) may adjoin to an embd.T as well as to a matrix Agr, while in some other dialect (e.g. that of G&R 1983) cliticization is

generally restricted to the position of a matrix Agr. I will show that the difference in the landing site of cliticization should be ascribed to that in the positions at which the clitic (EN,Y) are base-generated in these two dialects. Specifically, in the dialect of R&V, the clitics may be generated at two different positions, that is, right VP-adjoined positions higher or lower than the base position of the embd.subject (Jean). Thus, in the dialect of R&V, the example (19c-e) and (20c-e) may derive from the following two structures:

- (21) a. fai-[AgrP[TP[T¹[T INF.][VP Jean [VP[VP tv] en/y]]]][Agr¹Agr t_{TP}]]
 b. fai-[AgrP[TP[T¹[T INF.][VP[VP Jean [VP tv]] en/y]]]][Agr¹Agr t_{TP}]]

In (21a), the embd.TP constitutes GC for EN,Y, since it is a minimal maximal projection that contains EN,Y, a canonical governor (embd.T), and a SUBJECT accessible to the clitics. This explains the derivation of (19d) and (20d). But, in (21b), the embd.subject (Jean) is not accessible to the clitics, since the clitics are not in the domain of the subject (Jean). As a consequence, the matrix Agr functions as a SUBJECT and so it is the matrix AgrP that constitutes GC for the clitics. This accounts for the derivation of (19c) and (20c) in the dialect of R&V. In contrast to the dialect of R&V, the dialect of G&R allows just the structure (21b), which properly explains the nearly ungrammatical status of (19e) and (20e) and the grammaticality of (19c) and (20c).

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The preceding study is just the beginning of further research on the subject, and, needless to say, the hypotheses built up here remain to be refined after research which is to be done elsewhere.

NOTES

- 1) The same thing applies to the construction introduced by a perception verb. In this article, I will mainly be concerned with the FAIRE and LAISSER constructions.
- 2) From now on, clitics will be indicated by a double underline.
- 3) In this article, CP is assumed to be structured as follows (cf. Ouhalla 1989, Belletti 1990): [CP[AgrP[_(NegP)TP ...]]]. t_v indicates the trace of a moved verb.
- 4) A question ought to arise as to whether the subject is base-generated at a left VP-adjoined position or at a right adjoined one. This problem is to be treated below.
- 5) (6a-d) are adapted from Goodall(1987).
- 6) In contrast, in the example (1c) where the embedded verb is an intransitive without any complements, the embedded subject may be generated at the left or right VP-adjoined position. In the following (i), the embedded subject has to be generated at the left VP-adjoined position.
 - (i)a. j'ai fait téléphoner Jean à Marie
 - b. *j'ai fait téléphoner à Marie (à) Jean 'I made Jean call to Marie'

- As to the contrast(1c vs. 1d), it is necessary to assume that the causative V(fai-) has an obligatory VGCh formation as its lexical property differently from the causative V(lais-).
- 7) In this article, I will deal only with Case-marked clitics. See Ishioka(1992,to appear)for some details of non Case-marked clitics(se,nous,etc.).
 - 8) In this case, ECP naturally refers to proper antecedent government. CPC is defined as follows:
Clitics must attach/move to the highest (functional) element in their construction (general principles of UG allowing)(Ouhalla 1989:24).
 - 9) Accessibility is defined as follows: α is accessible to β iff β is in the c-command domain of α and coindexing of (α, β) would not violate the i/i condition (cf. Aoun 1985:p.30).
 - 10) With Kayne (1989), it is assumed that in cliticization adjunction to a X^0 trace is forbidden, and Relativized Minimality does not apply.
 - 11) The example (10d) will be discussed in setion 3.
 - 12) Further discussion about this remains an issue beyond the scope of the present article.
 - 13) The movement to an embd.SPEC (T) is restricted to a subject clitic to be given Acc Case by the matrix V (fai-). Thus, as discussed below, an embd.subject clitic is Case-assigned Dat by the matrix V at the base position in B dialect. See Ishioka (1992,to appear) for further details.
 - 14) The derivation in which the embd.subject clitic is generated at a right VP-adjoined position will be disallowed, since it is the embd.VP that forms GC for the clitic (la) and the clitic ends up adjoining to the verbal trace t_v .

REFERENCES

- Aoun, J.(1985). A Grammar of Anaphora. MIT Press, Cambridge(Mass.).
- Authier, J. M. and L. Reed(1991). "Ergative Predicates and Dative Cliticization in French Causatives." Linguistic Inquiry 22.1, 197-205.
- Belletti, A.(1990). Generalized Verb Movement. Rosenberg & Sellier, Torino.
- Burzio, L.(1986). Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). Barriers. MIT Press, Cambridge(Mass.).
- Contreras, H.(1991). "On the Position of Subjects." Syntax and Semantics 25, 63-79.
- Gibson, J.E. and E. Raposo (1983). "The Opacity Condition, Core Grammar and the French Causative Construction." Lingvisticae Investigationes 7.1, 47-88.
- Goodall, G.(1987). "Case, Clitics, and Lexical NP's in Romance Causatives." Neidle, C. and Rafael A. Nuñez Cerdeño (eds) Studies in Romance Languages. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Ishioka, S.(1992). "On Some Differences between CM clitics and NCM clitics in French Faire-Causative Constructions." Bulletin of Language Sciences and Humanities 6. Nagaoka Univ. of Technology.
- Ishioka, S.(to appear). "Autour de l'assignation de cas et le mouvement des clitiques dans les constructions causatives introduites par Laisser/Faire." STUDIA ROMANICA 26.
- Kayne, R.(1989). "Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing." O. Jaeggli and K. J. Safir (eds) The Null Subject Parameter. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Milner, J.C.(1982). Ordres et Raisons de Langue. Editions du Seuil, Paris.
- Ouhalla, J.(1989). "Clitic Movement and teh ECP." Lingua 79, 165-215.
- Pijnenburg, H. and A. Hulk (1989). "Datives in French Causatives." Probus 1.3, 259-282.
- Quicoli, A.C. (1980). "Clitic Movement in French Causatives." Linguistic Analysis 6.2, 131-185.
- Quicoli, A.C. (1981). "The Placement of Y,EN in French Causatives." Linguistic Analysis 8.4,343-376.
- Reed, L. (1990a). "Biclausality, Barriers and the French Causative Constructions." Cahiers Linguistiques d'Ottawa 18, 79-93.
- Reed, L. (1990b). "Adjunctions, X^0 Movement, and Verbal Government Chains in French Causatives." MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 12, 161-176.
- Reed, L. (1991). "The Thematic and Syntactic Structure of French Causatives." Probus 3.3, 317-360.
- Rizzi, L. (1990). Relativized Minimality. MIT Press, Cambridge(Mass.).
- Rouveret, A. and J.-R. Vergnaud (1980) "Specifying Reference to the Subject: French Causative and Conditions on Representations." Linguistic Inquiry 11, 97-202.
- Sportiche, D. (1988). "A Theory of Floating Quantifiers and Its Corollary for Constituent Structure." Linguistic Inquiry 19, 33-60.
- Tasmowski, I. (1984). "LUI FAIRE TELEPHONER QUELQU'UN D'AUTRE: UNE STRATEGIE?" Lingvisticae Investigationes 8.2, 403-427.