

# The morphology of trapping and climbing in French causatives

Gabrielle Aguila-Multner 

Romanisches Seminar, Universität Zürich

Berthold Crysmann 

Université Paris Cité, Laboratoire de linguistique formelle, CNRS

Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on  
Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar

Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic


Stefan Müller, Rui Chaves (Editors)

2024

Frankfurt/Main: University Library

pages 4–24

Keywords: Periphrasis, Information-based Morphology, French, Clitics, Causative

Aguila-Multner, Gabrielle & Berthold Crysmann. 2024. The morphology of trapping and climbing in French causatives. In Stefan Müller & Rui Chaves (eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic, 4–24. Frankfurt/Main: University Library. DOI: 10.21248/hpsg.2024.1. 

## Abstract

In this paper<sup>†</sup>, we shall discuss how the treatment of morphological periphrasis (Vincent & Börjars, 1996; Popova & Spencer, 2013; Bonami, 2015) can be integrated into the framework of Information-based Morphology (IbM; Crysmann & Bonami, 2015), an inferential-realisation theory of inflection couched in terms of typed feature structures.

French verb morphology provides a rich set of synthetic and analytic forms. Among the latter we find the so-called composed tenses (e.g. *passé composé*) and the near tenses, such as the *passé récent* (=‘recent past’) and the *futur proche* (=‘near future’). Recently, we have argued that clitic climbing can equally be understood as morphological periphrasis (Aguila-Multner & Crysmann, 2020a,b; Aguila-Multner, 2023). Thus, the morphosyntax of French verbs provides an ideal testing ground to study the interaction of different periphrastic dependencies, which we shall use to illustrate our treatment of periphrasis in IbM.

## 1 Background: clitic climbing as periphrasis

The division of labour between morphology and syntax in Romance clitic climbing has been the subject of some debate. Based on Zwicky & Pullum (1983)’s lexicalist view of the clitic–affix distinction, the ‘clitics’ involved have been shown to be lexical affixes (Miller, 1992) of the host verb. Their ability to ‘climb’ to an auxiliary, as in (1), therefore requires an explanation.

- (1) La professeure le            lui    a écrit.  
the professor DO.3SG.M IO.3SG has written  
‘The professor wrote it to her.’

Miller & Sag (1997) and Abeillé & Godard (1996, 2002) have proposed that such cases involve syntactic raising of the arguments the affixes correspond to: under this view, clitic climbing verbs are argument composition auxiliaries which inherit their complement’s argument structure, providing a syntactic explanation for clitic climbing. In Aguila-Multner & Crysmann (2020a), on the other hand, we have proposed that clitic climbing is a consequence of inflectional periphrasis: under this view, clitic climbing verbs are periphrastic auxiliaries able to host part of the lexical verb’s morphology, including morphological exponence of its pronominal arguments. Figure 1 illustrates the core mechanisms of the periphrasis approach: essentially, inflectional morphology introduces morphosyntactic requirements (including the auxiliary’s *l(exemic)id(entity)*), and, possibly, pronominal affixes – *praf*) on a feature *REV(ERSE)-SEL(ELECTION)*, which is percolated in syntax and terminated

---

<sup>†</sup>We would like to thank the audience at HPSG 2024 for their comments and discussion, in particular Antonio Machicao y Priemer and Emily Bender, as well as the anonymous reviewers for the conference and the proceedings. The research reported here has partially benefited from a public grant overseen by the French National Research Agency (ANR) as part of the program “Investissements d’Avenir” (reference: ANR-10-LABX-0083). It contributes to the IdEx Université Paris Cité (reference: ANR-18-IDEX-0001).

by an ancillary element, such as the tense auxiliary *avoir*. The auxiliary matches the constraints under *REV-SEL* against its own inflectional properties (its *MS* set), inheriting any morphological arguments of the participle. Clitic climbing is thus treated as a morphological dependency between the lexical verb and the auxiliary in a periphrastic relation.




Figure 1: Periphrasis by reverse selection (adapted from Aguila-Multner & Crysmann, 2020a)

Causative constructions provide an interesting testing ground for these competing approaches. Not only are these constructions clitic climbing contexts – clitics may climb to causative *faire* ‘make’ (2) – but they are also clause union constructions (Aissen & Perlmutter, 1976), displaying various idiosyncratic syntactic properties.

- (2) La professeure le lui fait écrire.  
 the professor DO.3SG.M IO.3SG makes write.  
 ‘The professor makes her write it.’

We have shown, however, that the morphological approach based on periphrasis simplifies over the argument composition approach to clause union in a number of ways (Aguila-Multner & Crysmann, 2020b). In particular, the periphrastic approach places the locus of clause union at the bottom of the construction at the level of the lexical infinitive: this means that decisions regarding argument realisation are made at the most relevant level, where the previous approach required percolation of lexical information in phrase structure to access it from the argument composition auxiliary. This results in a simpler treatment of subject marking, *by*-phrases, and clitic trapping, which depend on argument structure, on lexical semantics, and on the intrinsic status of morphological arguments respectively. The approach further simplifies the associated phrase structure, maintaining a traditional hierarchical structure rather than the flat structure projected by the argument composition auxiliary.

In the next section we discuss the interaction of pronominal affixation, causativisation, reflexivisation and medio-passivisation understood as different processes of grammatical function change interacting with one another.

## 2 French causatives: processes of grammatical function change interacting

French causative constructions display an interesting interplay of processes of grammatical function change. Firstly, the construction can be conceived of as a periphrastic causative, namely as a two-word form expressing addition of a causer argument (Aguila-Multner, 2023). Thus the lexical infinitive in (3) below is a causativised form, its subject (*Louise*) being demoted to an indirect object (*à*-NP) to make room for the new subject (*la professeure*).

- (3) La professeure fait écrire un poème à Louise.  
the professor makes write a poem to Louise  
'The professor makes Louise write a poem.'

Secondly, as noted in the previous section, causativisation of an infinitive can combine with morphological realisation of arguments. In the standard case, this results in clitic climbing: the morphological arguments of the lexical verb are realised on *faire*, as in (4).

- (4) La professeure le lui fait écrire.  
the professor DO.3SG.M IO.3SG makes write  
'The professor makes her write it.'

As we discussed in Aguila-Multner & Crysmann (2020b), this can be understood as periphrastic realisation of a morphological property. However, a different pattern can also surface in some cases,<sup>1</sup> namely downstairs affixation:

- (5) Cela fait lui en vouloir à Louise.  
this makes IO.3SG GEN be\_mad to Louise  
'This makes Louise be mad at her.'

Furthermore, a certain class of French pronominal affixes (which we can call *reflexives* in a broad sense) can mark more complex grammatical function change. This includes not only true reflexives or reciprocals, as in (6), but most interestingly medio-passives, in which *se* marks the promotion of a direct object to subject, the erstwhile subject being generically interpreted, as in (7).

- (6) Louise et Matthieu se rencontrent.  
Louise and Matthieu REFL.3 meet  
'Louise and Matthieu meet each other.'

---

<sup>1</sup>See Aguila-Multner (2023) for discussion of so-called trapping and of the factors that license such downstairs realisation in French causative constructions.

- (7) Ce problème se remarque facilement.  
 this problem REFL.3 notices easily  
 ‘This problem is noticed easily.’

Again, the combination of these processes with causativisation can result in two different patterns: upstairs realisation as in (8), or downstairs realisation, as in (9). This time, a meaning alternation obtains from the difference: as shown by the translation, upstairs realisation corresponds to a medio-passivised causative, while downstairs realisation expresses a causativised medio-passive.

- (8) Ce problème peut se faire remarquer à des néophytes.  
 this problem can REFL.3 make notice to INDEF.PL neophytes  
 ‘This problem can be shown to neophytes.’
- (9) Son ampleur fait se remarquer facilement le problème.  
 its scale makes REFL.3 notice easily the problem  
 ‘Its scale makes the problem be noticed easily.’

As proposed by Aguila-Multner (2023),<sup>2</sup> the dataset in (3)–(9) can be treated as a permutation in the order of three processes of grammatical function change: mapping of arguments, causativisation, and medio-passivisation. The iconic ordering of the latter two is evidenced by the contrast between medio-passivised causatives and causativised medio-passives, while the contrast between upstairs and downstairs realisation of pronominal arguments can be explained by ordering between the first two. Aguila-Multner proposes to treat this permutation in terms of freely ordered lexical rules:<sup>3</sup> Figure 2 illustrates the implementation of the causativisation process as a lexical rule, augmenting the argument structure of a verb with a causer argument; Figure 3 illustrates the reflexivisation process as a lexical rule, coindexing one NP element of the argument structure to the first element; Figure 4 illustrates a medio-passivisation lexical rule, promoting a direct object to subject.

However, the details of the morphological interface necessary for this line of analysis have not been developed until now. Crucially, to account for the possibility of downstairs realisation, a non-trivial assumption has to be made: that the causativisation process can apply to a fully inflected word form. In order to license examples as in (10), the description to which the causativisation lexical rule applies needs to be that of the affixed word *vous en vouloir* – failing that, the morphology will receive as its input a combination of causativity and pronominal affixes, for

<sup>2</sup>See also Villalba (1994) for an earlier treatment within generative theory.

<sup>3</sup>We use description-level lexical rules, as proposed e.g. in Koenig (1999), namely feature structures of type *word* or *lexeme* whose daughter (DTR) is again lexical sign, i.e. a feature structure of type *word* or *lexeme*.

<sup>4</sup>The attached relational constraint bars *expl(itive)* or *ana(phoric)* affixal synsems (*aff-ss*) from being present on the daughter’s COMPS list, in order to capture trapping of reflexives and inherent clitics, cf. (5). This constraint is satisfied in one of two ways: first, if there is no such argument on ARG-ST, there will trivially not be one on COMPS either. Second, if there is such an argument on ARG-ST, application of argument mapping will ensure it is suppressed on COMPS. Since argument mapping applies to signs of type *word*, this entails downstairs morphological expression.

$$\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{VFORM} \quad \textit{nonfinite} \\ \text{SUBJ} \quad \langle \text{NP}_{\bar{i}} \rangle \\ \text{COMPS} \quad \langle \text{NP}_{\bar{j}} [\hat{a}/\textit{bare}/\textit{par}/\textit{de}] \rangle \oplus \boxed{c} \\ \text{INFL} \quad \left[ \text{MS} \quad \boxed{m} \cup \{ \textit{cause-lid}, \bar{i} \textit{ agr} \} \right] \\ \text{DTR} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{SUBJ} \quad \langle \text{NP}_{\bar{j}} \rangle \\ \text{COMPS} \quad \boxed{c} \\ \text{INFL} \quad \left[ \text{MS} \quad \boxed{m} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \\
\wedge \neg \text{member} \left( \left[ \begin{array}{l} \textit{aff-ss} \\ \text{L|CONT} \quad \textit{expl} \vee \textit{ana} \end{array} \right], \boxed{c} \right)$$

Figure 2: Lexical rule for causativised verbs<sup>4</sup>

$$\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{SUBJ} \quad \langle \boxed{1} \text{ NP} \rangle \\ \text{COMPS} \quad \langle \text{NP}[\textit{aff-ss}]_{\bar{i}} \cdot \textit{ana} \rangle \oplus \boxed{a} \\ \text{DTR} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{SUBJ} \quad \langle \boxed{1} \text{ NP}_{\bar{i}} \rangle \\ \text{COMPS} \quad \langle \text{NP}_{\bar{i}} \rangle \circ \boxed{a} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

Figure 3: Lexical rule for reflexives

which the only output is upstairs realisation, cf. *\*vous en fait vouloir*. Not only should causativisation be able to target inflected words, its output also needs to undergo inflection itself. This is not only to create the periphrastic dependency, but also to realise any pronominal argument corresponding to the downstairs subject: as exemplified in (10), such pronominals are always realised upstairs, even when the main affix cluster is realised downstairs.

- (10) Cela lui fait vous en vouloir.  
this IO.3SG makes OBJ.2PL GEN be\_mad  
‘This makes her mad at you.’

In sum, an interface between morphology and syntax needs to be devised that can allow lexical rules of grammatical function change to apply to already inflected words, creating new lexical entries susceptible to further periphrastic inflection. In the following section we propose an IBM analysis of the morphological side of French causative constructions that attempts to meet these requirements.

$$\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{SUBJ} \quad \langle \boxed{I} \text{ NP}_{\boxed{j}} \rangle \\ \text{COMPS} \quad \langle \text{NP}[\textit{aff-ss}]_{\boxed{j}} : \textit{ana} \rangle \oplus \boxed{a} \\ \text{DTR} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{SUBJ} \quad \langle \text{NP}_i \rangle \\ \text{COMPS} \quad \langle \boxed{I} \text{ NP}_{\boxed{j}} \rangle \oplus \boxed{a} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

Figure 4: Lexical rule for medio-passives

### 3 The morphology of French clitics: An IBM analysis

In order to integrate a general treatment of periphrasis into the morphological component, the first and most obvious step is to follow Bonami (2015) and recognise delegation of properties to an ancillary element as a means of expression. To this end, we shall augment realisation rules with a set-valued feature DEL that will serve to represent the morphosyntactic features delegated for expression by the ancillary element in a periphrase (see Figure 9 for sample rule types). As captured in Figure 5, the properties delegated by individual rules (under RR) are unioned together on the word’s global DLS feature.

$$\text{word} \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{PH} \quad \boxed{p_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \boxed{p_n} \\ \text{MPS} \quad \boxed{e} (\boxed{e_1} [\text{PH} \quad \boxed{p_1}] \circ \dots \circ \boxed{e_n} [\text{PH} \quad \boxed{p_n}]) \\ \text{MS} \quad \boxed{0} (\boxed{m_1} \uplus \dots \uplus \boxed{m_n}) \\ \text{INFL} \quad \text{RR} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{MPH} \quad \boxed{e_1} \\ \text{MPS} \quad \boxed{e} \\ \text{MUD} \quad \boxed{m_1} \\ \text{MS} \quad \boxed{0} \\ \text{DEL} \quad \boxed{d_1} \\ \text{DLS} \quad \boxed{d} \end{array} \right] \dots \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{MPH} \quad \boxed{e_n} \\ \text{MPS} \quad \boxed{e} \\ \text{MUD} \quad \boxed{m_n} \\ \text{MS} \quad \boxed{0} \\ \text{DEL} \quad \boxed{d_n} \\ \text{DLS} \quad \boxed{d} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right\} \\ \text{DLS} \quad \boxed{d} (\boxed{d_1} \cup \dots \cup \boxed{d_n}) \end{array} \right]$$

Figure 5: Well-formedness

Pronominal affixation constitutes morphological realisation of syntactic arguments, which preempts their realisation as syntactic complements. Following Miller & Sag (1997), we assume an argument mapping constraint as given in Figure 6 that excludes affixal synslems from valence lists and instead adds appropriate marking and index features to the morphosyntactic property set, which serves as “input” for morphological realisation.

$$\left[ \begin{array}{l} \textit{word} \\ \text{SYNSEM} \left[ \text{L|CAT} \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{REV-SEL} \quad \boxed{r} \cup \boxed{d} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{SUBJ} \quad \boxed{s} \\ \text{COMPS} \quad \boxed{c} \textit{list}(\textit{canon}) \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right] \\ \text{ARG-ST} \quad \boxed{s} \circ \boxed{a} \left\langle \left[ \begin{array}{l} \textit{aff-ss} \\ \text{HD|MRK} \quad \boxed{m_1} \\ \text{CONT|IND} \quad \boxed{i_1} \end{array} \right] \dots \left[ \begin{array}{l} \textit{aff-ss} \\ \text{HD|MRK} \quad \boxed{m_n} \\ \text{CONT|IND} \quad \boxed{i_n} \end{array} \right] \right\rangle \circ \boxed{c} \circ \boxed{g} \\ \text{INFL} \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{DLS} \quad \boxed{d} \\ \text{MS} \quad \boxed{i} \cup \left\{ \left[ \begin{array}{l} \textit{praf} \\ \text{MRK} \quad \boxed{m_1} \\ \text{IND} \quad \boxed{i_1} \end{array} \right] \dots \left[ \begin{array}{l} \textit{praf} \\ \text{MRK} \quad \boxed{m_n} \\ \text{IND} \quad \boxed{i_n} \end{array} \right] \right\} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{DTR} \left[ \begin{array}{l} \textit{lexeme} \\ \text{SYNSEM} \left[ \text{L|CAT} \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{REV-SEL} \quad \boxed{r} \\ \text{VAL} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{SUBJ} \quad \boxed{s} \\ \text{COMPS} \quad \boxed{c} \circ \boxed{a} \circ \boxed{g} \textit{list}(\textit{gap}) \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right] \\ \text{INFL|MS} \quad \boxed{i} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]
\end{array}
\right.$$

Figure 6: Argument mapping (Aguila-Multner & Crysmann, 2020a)



The morphology of French pronominal affixation provides rules for both local exponence and periphrastic expression. As we have argued above, “clitic climbing” is always dependent on the existence of periphrasis, either tense periphrasis with *avoir/être* or a periphrastic causative.




Figure 7: Sample derivation: local realisation of pronominal affixes in the future periphrase

While existence of an independent periphrase can be considered a necessary criterion, it is in itself not sufficient: e.g. the near future *futur proche* (11) is clearly periphrastic, but, nevertheless, it does not give rise to clitic climbing. Instead, we find local exponence of pronominal affixes on the lexical verb. The recent past (*venir de* + Vinf) behaves similarly.

- (11) La professeure va le lui écrire.  
 the professor goes DO.3SG.M IO.3SG write  
 ‘The professor is going to write it to her.’

A sample derivation for local realisation in the future periphrase is given in Figure 7. In this case, REV-SEL contains selection of auxiliary *aller*, but not the pronominal affixes, which are realised on the lexical verb.

Figure 8 sketches the rules for local realisation. The rule types in the EXPO dimension provide the necessary pairing of features to be expressed (MUD) with the introduction of an exponent (MPH), complete with phonology and position class information. The COND hierarchy, by contrast, specifies the two situations where local exponence is possible: either if the word does not involve any periphrastic expression at all (empty DLS set), or else, if the periphrasis involves *aller* or *venir de*.

Rules for periphrastic realisation, by contrast, are given in Figure 9. Starting on the right of the hierarchy, we find the rule types for near tenses. As these tenses do




Figure 8: Local realisation

not give rise to clitic climbing, their *MUD* value is restricted to TAM and agreement properties only, which are expressed analytically by selection of an infinitival stem (*STM9*) and selection of, e.g., a present tense ancillary element, which also takes on expression of subject agreement properties. The subtypes pair the specific tense value to be expressed (in *MUD*) with selection of an appropriate ancillary element.

In the middle of the hierarchy, we find rules for tense periphrasis with *avoir/être*. Their *MUD* value includes a set of *praf* specifications, alongside TAM and subject agreement, capturing the potential for clitic climbing. Analytic expression of TAM involves, again, selection of a specific stem, here: a participial stem (*STM12*),<sup>5</sup> and selection of an ancillary element. Delegation of *praf* and agreement properties to the ancillary element is captured by reentrancies between *MUD* and *DEL*. Subtypes illustrate the two uses of the *passé composé* as a simple past, and as a more compositional perfective.

Clause-union style periphrasis, finally, is represented on the left. In addition to selection of an appropriate ancillary element, e.g. *faire*, periphrastic expression of this type also involves delegation of agreement and *praf* properties. Subtypes of this type serve to constrain the range of ancillary elements that can feature in this type of periphrastic construction, which in addition to the causative verbs *faire* and *laisser*, includes the perception verbs.

<sup>5</sup>We assume an analysis of basic French verbal morphology in terms of stem allomorphy plus suffixal exponence such as the one developed in Bonami & Boyé (2002, 2003, 2006). Stem indices follow Bonami & Boyé (2007: 313).




Figure 9: Periphrastic realisation

### 3.1 Tense periphrasis and clitic climbing

Let us briefly provide some examples as to how some core cases of periphrastic and local realisation can be captured with the rule system we have just set up. To start with, we shall discuss cases of simple tense periphrasis to which we shall add realisation of pronominal arguments.




Figure 10: Periphrastic realisation of tense and pronominal affixation (*le lui a écrit*)

To start with, let us consider the morphology of the periphrastic past, showing both tense periphrasis and clitic climbing. We shall use our example from Figure 1 above, and complement the syntactic percolation shown there with an explicit representation as to how the periphrastic dependencies are launched within IbM.

As shown in Figure 10, the morphosyntactic property set (MS) consists of a lexeme identifier (*écrire-lid*), a simple past (non-perfective) TAM specification, an agreement specification (coindexed with the highest argument), and two *praf* specifications (coindexed with the direct and indirect object, respectively).

Realisation rules (RR) specify how these properties are expressed, using two rules: (i) a rule of exponence that realises lexemic identity by inserting a STM into the list of morphs MPH, and (ii) a rule of periphrasis that delegates the expression of agreement, TAM and pronominal affixation (via DEL). Having chosen the rule for periphrastic simple past, note that the TNS specification for the ancillary element (*prs*) differs from that on MS (*pst*), illustrating the non-compositionality. Furthermore, selection for a participial stem (STM12) is also effected by the rule of periphrasis (cf. 9). Periphrastic realisation of pronominal affixes follows from the constraints on local and periphrastic realisation given above, since (i) the constraints for

periphrastic realisation (Figure 9) of the simple past include delegation of pronominal affixation and (ii) the constraints for local realisation do not include (Figure 8) past or perfective periphrasis.

The second case of tense periphrasis concerns near tenses, which display periphrastic realisation of agreement and TAM, yet local realisation of pronominal affixes. Again, Figure 11 provides the morphological derivation of the periphrase illustrated by the tree in Figure 7 above.




Figure 11: Periphrastic tense and local pronominal affixation (*va le lui écrire*)

As stated by the near future periphrasis rule in Figure 9 (bottom right), this tense category is expressed by selecting the infinitival stem (stm9) and selecting a present tense form of *aller* ‘go’ as the ancillary element. While expression of (subject) agreement is delegated to the ancillary element as well, pronominal affixation is not included. Conversely, the constraints on local realisation for *praf* values given in Figure 8 do license direct realisation on the lexical verb.

Having seen how interaction between rules of exponence and periphrasis can be captured straightforwardly with IbM, we shall turn to the case of causatives in the next subsection.

### 3.2 Trapping and climbing with causatives

Having laid out the essentials of local and periphrastic realisation, we shall finally turn to the treatment of trapping vs. climbing. As we have observed above, causativisation and reflexivisation can apply in either order: when reflexivisation applies

before causativisation, the reflexive argument is bound by the downstairs subject. This order of application has the peculiar morphological effect that pronominal affixes pertaining to downstairs arguments cannot climb, with the notable exception of the downstairs subject. When reflexivisation applies after causativisation, the reflexive is bound by the causer. As for morphological realisation, we find climbing of all pronominal affixes in this case, rather than trapping. Taken together, morphological realisation must be able to apply both before (trapping) and after (climbing) causativisation.




Figure 12: Word-to-Lexeme LR

We therefore conclude that inflected words can be submitted to further rules of grammatical function change, which we take to be lexeme-to-lexeme rules. Building on a recent proposal by Salehi & Koenig (2023), we assume a word-to-lexeme rule as sketched in Figure 12 to resubmit an inflected word to rules such as the causativisation rule. As an important side-effect, the rule registers the inflection applied up to this point by inserting it as a stem form to which further morphology may apply.

The possibility of having more than one place where inflection can apply in the derivation of complex words certainly deviates from a more absolute view of the place of realisational morphology as applying only once to fully formed words. Nevertheless, the proposal made here is still far more restrictive than the kind of direct interleaving of lexical rules with morphophonological effects often adopted in HPSG.

Moreover, the need for multiple places to interface derivation with inflection has been forcefully argued for by Koenig & Michelson (2020) on the basis of Oneida. They observe that a class of derived nominals in Oneida can take as their basis verb stems that have already undergone some verbal inflection. Once turned into nouns by a derivational step, they can be further inflected with nominal morphology.

Before we close, we shall briefly discuss how the current setup can account for the interaction between different lexical rules of grammatical function change and its impact on morphological realisation.

Let us start with the simplest case of causativisation (cf. Figure 2) as the only rule of grammatical function change. A sample derivation is given in Figure 13 for

*les fait voir aux élèves* ‘makes the students see them’. Applying argument mapping (Figure 6) to the output of the causativisation rule will insert morphosyntactic specification for all pronominal arguments, including downstairs pronominal objects and the erstwhile downstairs subject that has been demoted to direct or indirect object by the causativisation rule. Furthermore, the causative LR itself has added a requirement for morphological expression of causation. Since delegation to an ancillary element is the only way to express a causative, the respective rule in Figure 9 will apply, satisfying specification for pronominal affixes equally by delegation.




Figure 13: Sample derivation: causative periphrasis

In case either the reflexive LR (Figure 3) or medio-passive LR (Figure 4) has applied to the output of the causative LR, the anaphoric element introduced by these rules will be coindexed with the additional causer subject. This is illustrated in the derivation in Figure 14 for a long medio-passive *se font réparer pour pas cher* ‘get

repaired cheaply’. Morphologically, nothing much will change, with climbing – i.e. delegation of *cause-lid* and all pronominal affixes – as the most straightforward option.




Figure 14: Sample derivation: long medio-passive

Turning now to the opposite order, i.e. reflexive or medio-passive rules feeding causativisation (illustrated in the sample derivation in Figure 15 for a causativised medio-passive *fait se vendre les classiques* ‘makes the classics sell well’), we find that direct application of the causative LR (Figure 2) to the output of either Figure 3 or 4 is blocked by the causative LR’s constraint on COMPS not to have an intrinsic or anaphoric *aff-ss* complement. If, however, we apply argument mapping (Fig-



ure 6) to the output of reflexivisation, non-canonical synsents will be suppressed on COMPS, since argument conservation (Ginzburg & Sag, 2000) is a constraint on *word* (not *lexeme*). Concomitantly, the morphosyntactic property set of this word will be realised by inflectional morphology. Realisation of pronominal affixes typically will be local, using the rule types in Figure 8, given the causative LR has not applied yet at this point, and therefore there is no requirement for any periphrastic realisation. In order to apply the causative LR to this inflected word, it first needs to be converted into a lexeme by the rule in Figure 12: the most important effect of this rule is that it preserves the inflected form as a stem on which further morphology can operate. Application of the causative LR will essentially proceed as in the simple case given above: since all remaining downstairs complements are of type *canon-ss*, the only clitic that can climb as part of the periphrastic causative is the erstwhile downstairs subject, demoted to COMPS by the causative LR.

Given that we permit inflected words to be fed to rules of grammatical function change, an important question is that of overgeneration. E.g., we predict that downstairs cliticisation should in principle be possible with causatives even if the downstairs verb does not have any intrinsic or reflexive affixal arguments. Indeed, this is what we find in a number of situations: first, if a coordination of verbs is embedded under a causative, we find downstairs realisation when the verbs differ in the type or number of pronominal arguments they take. A most straightforward example is a coordination where the first VP contains the antecedent, and the second one a coreferential pronominal (12). Second, downstairs realisation can be chosen to avoid violations of morphotactic constraints on the clitic cluster: e.g. with causatives of ditransitives, we find the downstairs subject as a dative clitic on the causative verb, while the downstairs dative (and all other clitics) appear on the lexical verb (13). The very strong tendency to use climbing whenever possible can then be understood as a dispreference for splitting inflection without need.

- (12) Elle a fait écrire un poème aux enfants et le lire aux parents.  
 she has made write a poem to.the children and DO.3SG.M read to.the parents  
 ‘She made the children write a poem and the parents read it.’
- (13) Elle lui a fait leur donner les cadeaux.  
 she IO.3SG has made IO.3PL give the presents  
 ‘She made her give them the presents.’

Before we conclude, we shall briefly illustrate how the morphology can capture split realisation. Recall that downstairs realisation is the result of realising inflectional morphology before causativisation (cf. Figure 15). Therefore, the *ms* set of the downstairs verb looks just like an ordinary infinitive, possibly including a specification for pronominal affixes. These are realised locally, as shown in Figure 16.

In order to causativise an already inflected verb, we first convert the *word* to a *lexeme*, by way of the word-to-lexeme LR: as shown in Figure 12, this rule will encapsulate the inflected form as a stem (cf. Salehi & Koenig, 2023). Application of the causativisation rule will add a causer argument to the front of ARG-ST and






Figure 16: Local pronominal affixation on infinitives (*leur donner les cadeaux*)

thereby demote the erstwhile downstairs subject to (in)direct object. As a result, the subject-demotion effect of causativisation makes available the erstwhile subject of the infinitive for realisation as a pronominal affix. As stated by the causative realisation rule type in Figure 9 (left-most leaf type), realisation of *cause-lid* is delegated to the ancillary element, together with agreement information and any pronominal affixes. This is shown for our concrete case in Figure 17.

## 4 Conclusion

In this paper we have discussed how the morphosyntax of clitic climbing and trapping in French causatives can be integrated with an inferential-realisation model such as Information-based Morphology (IbM; Crysmann & Bonami, 2015). Building on our earlier work (Aguila-Multner & Crysmann, 2020a; Aguila-Multner, 2023), where we proposed an approach of clitic climbing as periphrastic realisation of pronominal affixes, we have now provided a formalisation of periphrasis rules in IbM. Most specifically, we use a pair of features to capture rule-local delegation (DEL) to an ancillary element, as well as constrain the interaction of multiple periphrastic dependencies (DLS) at the global word-level. This distinction mimics that between MUD and MS for the expression and conditioning of morphosyntactic properties, as well as the more recent distinction between rule-local morphotactic contribution (MPH) and word-wide morphotactic constraints (DLS), cf. Crysmann (2023).




Figure 17: Split realisation: climbing of downstairs “subject” (*lui faire leur donner les cadeaux*)

Finally, we addressed the interaction between causatives, reflexives and medio-passives, arguing that inflectional morphology can apply in two steps, thereby capturing the concomitant effects of clitic trapping vs. clitic climbing. By allowing inflected words to be submitted to further rules of grammatical function change, we provide for a clean separation between lexical rules and inflectional morphology, keeping the benefits of an inferential-realisation model while providing sufficient flexibility to address complex interactions of grammatical function change.

## References

- Abeillé, Anne & Danièle Godard. 1996. La complémentation des auxiliaires français. *Langages* 30(122). 32–61.
- Abeillé, Anne & Danièle Godard. 2002. The syntactic structure of French auxiliaries. *Language* 78(3). 404–452.
- Aguila-Multner, Gabrielle. 2023. *The morphosyntax of French complex predicates: Clitic climbing and periphrasis*: Université Paris Cité dissertation.
- Aguila-Multner, Gabrielle & Berthold Crysmann. 2020a. French clitic climbing as periphrasis. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 43. 23–61.
- Aguila-Multner, Gabrielle & Berthold Crysmann. 2020b. An inside-out approach to French causatives. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, 5–25. doi:10.21248/hpsg.2020.1. <https://proceedings.hpsg.xyz/article/view/397>.
- Aissen, Judith & David M. Perlmutter. 1976. Clause reduction in Spanish. In *Annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, vol. 2, 1–30.

- Bonami, Olivier. 2015. Periphrasis as collocation. *Morphology* 25(1). 63–110. doi:10.1007/s11525-015-9254-3.
- Bonami, Olivier & Gilles Boyé. 2002. Suppletion and dependency in inflectional morphology. In *The proceedings of the HPSG 2001 conference*, Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Bonami, Olivier & Gilles Boyé. 2003. Supplétion et classes flexionnelles. *Langages* 152. 102–126.
- Bonami, Olivier & Gilles Boyé. 2006. Deriving inflectional irregularity. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on HPSG*, 39–59.
- Bonami, Olivier & Gilles Boyé. 2007. French pronominal clitics and the design of paradigm function morphology. In *Mediterranean morphology meetings*, vol. 5, 291–322.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2023. Morphotactic competition in Murrinh-Patha: Rule composition and rule interaction in Information-based Morphology. In Stefan Müller & Elodie Winckel (eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, University of Massachusetts Amherst*, 27–44. Frankfurt/Main: University Library. doi:10.21248/hpsg.2023.2.
- Crysmann, Berthold & Olivier Bonami. 2015. Variable morphotactics in Information-based Morphology. *Journal of Linguistics* 52(2). 311–374. doi:10.1017/S0022226715000018.
- Ginzburg, Jonathan & Ivan A. Sag. 2000. *Interrogative investigations. the form, meaning, and use of English interrogatives*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Koenig, Jean-Pierre. 1999. *Lexical relations*. Stanford: CSLI publications.
- Koenig, Jean-Pierre & Karin Michelson. 2020. Derived nouns and structured inflection in Oneida. *Lingue e linguaggio* 19(1). 9–33.
- Miller, Philip H. 1992. *Clitics and constituents in phrase structure grammar*. Garland, New York.
- Miller, Philip H. & Ivan A. Sag. 1997. French clitic movement without clitics or movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 15(3). 573–639.
- Popova, Gergana & Andrew Spencer. 2013. Relatedness in periphrasis: A paradigm-based perspective. In Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Periphrasis: The role of syntax and morphology in paradigms*, 191–225. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salehi, Ali & Jean-Pierre Koenig. 2023. Argument realization and argument referencing in Soranî Kurdish. In Stefan Müller & Elodie Winckel (eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, University of Massachusetts Amherst*, 100–120. Frankfurt/Main: University Library.
- Villalba, Xavier. 1994. Clitic climbing in causative constructions. *Catalan working papers in linguistics* 3(2). 123–152.
- Vincent, Nigel & Kersti Börjars. 1996. Suppletion and syntactic theory. In *Proceedings of the 1st LFG colloquium*, 448–62.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English n't. *Language* 502–513.