which has the meaning of causative /experimental. It is only the former *have* that may be *cliticized.*

8.
(i) *They've seen a ghost* (=perfective *have*)
(ii) * *They've their car serviced regularly*(=causative *have*)
(iii) * *He'd three students walk out on him* (=experiential *have*)

By assuming "that the finite forms of *have* are positioned in the head I position of IP "(A.Radford,1997: 92) and the perfective *have* is in the head V position of VP and that "*have*-cliticizition is subject to an adjacency condition (to the effect that cliticizition is only possible when *have* immediately follows the expression to which it cliticizes and is blocked by the presence of an intervening constituent)" (A.Radford,1997: 92), we can account for the ungrammaticality in 9(ii) and (iii). It is only in 9 (i) that *have* "is immediately adjacent to *they:*

9.
(i)[IP *They* [I *have*] [VP [V *seen*] *a ghost*]]
(ii) [IP *They* [I ----] [VP [V *had*] *their car serviced regularly*]]
(iii) [IP *He* [I ----] [VP [V *had*] *three students walk out on him*]]

In 9 (ii) and (iii), *have/had* "is separated from *they/he* by a null INFL constituent." (A.Radford,1997: 92) "Thus, *have*-cliticizition facts suggest that finite clauses which lack a finite auxiliary are IPs headed by an unfilled I constituent." (A.Radford,1997: 92)

Another "substantial empirical evidence that auxiliariless finite clauses are IP constituents headed by an unfilled INFL" (A.Radford,1997: 93) comes from *tag questions*. The sentences that have a perfective *have* are tagged by *have;* while the sentences with a causative *have* are tagged by *do.*