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1. Introduction

This paper will examine the rise of causative and passive have-constructions in English and demonstrate the validity of some cognitive-linguistic notions such as profile shift, semantic extension and subjectivity in the field of historical development of grammatical constructions. By using these notions it will be argued that the change in lexical semantics is related to the extension observed in the structure of constructions, exclusively focusing on have and its related constructions. It will be also shown that the semantic diversity of have-constructions is well motivated and understandable.

There are variety types of have-complements, among which are observed as follows:

(1) a. I have keloid tissue on my back.  
   [PREPOSITIONS]

b. I had him angry the minute I walked in the door. 
   [ADJECTIVES]

c. He had a servant waiting on him. 
   [PARTICIPLES]

d. I had two dogs die of snakebite. 
   [BARE INFINITIVES]

e. I would like to have him mine. 
   [NOMINALS]

Historical survey shows that the diachronic expansion of the have-complement starts from the type in (1a) to that in (1f). Supposing the notional characterization of basic grammatical categories in Cognitive Grammar, which maintains nouns, adjectives/participles, verbs denote “thing,” “atemporal relation” “process” respectively (Langacker (1987)), then the category change in complements will be regarded as forming a gradual and natural transition by means of profile shift, not as a sudden leap across different categories. It is also shown that semantic gradability is observed even within the have-complement of the same syntactic category. This will contribute to the recent trend in a Usage-Based Model, which claims that the syntactic transition is not at random; in conceptual terms it forms a motivated and highly predictable path.

Another point to be discussed in this paper is that have-constructions, especially those with bare infinitives, have two seemingly distinct meanings, i.e., Causatives and Affecting Event (in Brugman (1988)’s terms). This is a curious phenomenon, for in some languages like Japanese they are distinguished by using different auxiliaries, namely –sase (Causative) and –rare (Passive), respectively.

(2) a. She has children come to her house every Sunday. [CAUSATIVE] (-sase in Japanese)

b. I had two dogs die of snakebite. [AFFECTING EVENT] (-rare in Japanese)

The polysemy of the have-constructions will be explained by considering the following
points: (i) *have* embodies Reference-Point model as its schematic base; (ii) attenuation of lexical semantics of the verb *have* triggers both Causative and Affecting Event interpretation of the construction; and (iii) the process of the development of *have*-constructions consists of local analogical extensions.

2. **Diachronic Development of *Have* and Its Complements**

It is well known that the verb *have* allows complements of various syntactic types, as is mentioned. In addition to direct accusative objects, the verb also takes adjectives, participles, bare infinitives and even sometimes nouns as its complements, as in (3).

(3) a. I have keloid tissue on my back. [PREPOSITIONS]
b. I had him angry the minute I walked in the door. [ADJECTIVES]
c. He had a servant waiting on him. [PARTICIPLES]
d. I had two dogs die of snakebite. [BARE INFINITIVES]
e. I would like to have him mine. [NOMINALS]

In this section, I would like to discuss the historical development of *have*-complements and show that the diversity of the complements that the verb *have* takes, especially their category change from participle to infinitives and later to nouns, receives natural explanation in cognitive-semantic terms. The validity of some cognitive notions, i.e., profile shift, will be made explicit in due course.

2.1 **Complement Types and Their Diachronic Change**

Historical survey of data (cf. Visser 1973, OED, MED and so on) shows that some reasonable developmental path is found among the possible *have*-complements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have + O + A</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have + O + -ing</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have + O + p.p.</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have + O + inf.</td>
<td>1385-1450a</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have + O + N</td>
<td>1422-1509</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*[Table 1: The Development of HAVE-Complements]*

*Have* has already documented with adjectival, and past participial forms in OE period. Infinitive and noun complements are not documented for at least another century, about late 14th century (cf. Baron 1977: 82). In other words, the developmental path of *have*-complements shows a major change in morphosyntactic category — roughly from adjective via verb to noun.

If we follow the classic theory of categorization, a category change observed above is
significant in its morphosyntactic consequences. It completely changes the attributes associated with the characterization of the category. We cannot help but to claim that participles, which functionally belong to the adjective class here, suddenly find as their neighbor category infinitives which are a member of verbal category. Later even a noun, which is in another new category, can also participate in the same syntactic slot following the direct object of *have*.

Applying Cognitive Linguistic notion to this change is revealing. In Cognitive Linguistic terms, it is possible to give a reasonable and natural account for the category change. The historical change observed above is nicely captured by a cognitive-linguistic notion, namely Profile Shift, which can be compared specifically to a type of Figure-Ground reversal here. Moreover, it is more natural to assume that there is no abrupt historical change especially in linguistic fields. The development and expansion of complement category to be discussed here is an example of gradual process of language change based on partial similarity with the examples that already exist.

In Cognitive Grammar, Langacker (1987: 242) claims that the major grammatical classes such as nouns or verbs are definable in notional terms, roughly as follows:

\[(4) \quad \text{a. A nominal predication profiles a thing, i.e. a region in some domain, where a region is characterized abstractly as a set of interconnected entities.} \]
\[\text{b. A relational predication puts interconnections in profile.} \]
\[\text{c. A nominal and a relational predicate are therefore distinguished by the nature of their profiles even should they have the same entities and interconnections for their base.} \]

(Langacker 1987: 241-5)

What should be noted here is that a ‘thing,’ typically designated by a noun, is represented as being potentially interconnected with other things in conceptual level. In encyclopedic view of the meaning, conceptualization of an entity co-activates as its background any other entity associated with it. Among the interconnection of co-activated things, however, we can single out one thing and profile it as a Figure, leaving other complex facet as Ground. In relational predicates, on the other hand, which is typically designated by verbs, the interconnection is more salient than the thing involved in it and receives primary profile. In other words, syntactic categories can be gradient in notional terms, from nouns, which typically denote things, to verbs that are relational in nature.

Let us get back to the issue of complement development. As observed in Table 1, adjective forms had already been used in Old English period. They originally serve as a modifier of the direct object of *have*. Present and past participles had also been used in the OE period, probably based on the semantic-functional similarity to adjectives in that they can modify the preceding direct object. One example to support the existence of close relation between direct objects of *have* and participles is as follows:
The past participle *geleornode* agrees in gender, number and case (c.f. -e) with the accusative plural feminine *boc*. This illustrates the formal relatedness between accusative objects and the following participles.

The continuum between adjectives and participles is also motivated in their notional characterization. Langacker (1987) claims that past participles, present participles, and adjectives are all categorized as denoting atemporal relation between things. In addition, a predication that denotes atemporal relation takes a nominal as its target. It is quite natural, therefore, that the participle that originally occurred in *have*-complement functions as an adjective which modifies the following object nominal.

The difference between adjectives and participles is that the latter implicitly introduces interconnections associated with the direct object, for it necessarily involves some other participants. In this respect, participle complements serve as the first step toward allowing relational complements in general.

Along with the loss of overt inflection in nominal and adjectival uses, the participles with adjective status have come to serve as complements, which relate themselves to the main verb *have* rather than the objects of *have*. By 1400, around the Middle English period, the use of infinitival complements with *have* seems to have been established.1

The category change from participles to infinitives is also easy to motivate in cognitive view. In cognitive grammar, past participles like *broken* profiles only a part of events, i.e., the last state of the event as a whole. Present participles such as *breaking*, on the other hand, takes an internal perspective on a process, profiling internal structure only and excluding both the initial and final states.

What is crucial in the category shift from participles to infinitives is that the formers evoke as their base a secondary verbal process specified by the latters. In past participle like *broken*, the final state receives profile and acquire a Figure-like status while other facets related to the *break* process are confined to the base or Ground and left unprofiled. When it comes to infinitives like *(to) break*, what originally functions as Ground in the corresponding participle comes to receive Figure-like status. Thus, syntactic category

1 First *to*-infinitives were predominant while later bare-infinitives spread.
change observed here is a reflection of Figure-Ground Reversal, i.e., the interconnection as a whole, which originally functioned as a Ground, come to serve itself as a Figure.

The Figure-Ground Reversal does not necessarily occur abruptly; it allows gradual shift. Historical data shows that the change from participles to infinitives were gradual one. Attested and qualitative data shows that, even within the have-complement of the same syntactic category, semantic gradability is observed. This fact suggests the following assumption:

(6) The V-slot in the have-O-V sequence chose at first stative or related predicates only, and then gradually extended its application to more highly-transitive ones like those of action or with causative structure.

Let us confirm this assumption below. Around the latter half of 1300s in the Middle English stage, when infinitives were sporadically used, several examples are found in which adverbs modify not only resultant state but also the process of the action itself. Look at the example (7) for instance.

[V + O + Adj./pp.]

(7) a. These thinges also ... have me so envolved(=involved) with care.
   [c1385 Usk, Testament of Love 8, (Visser)]
   b. Thei have him outhreli (=completely) refused.
   [1390 Gower, Conf.(OED)]
   c. Els had the endlesse pit too quickly caught me
   [1633 P. Fletcher Elisa i. xxiv]

Here, with care refers to the process rather than the resultant state. The use of such adverbs indicates that not only resultant state but also some inchoative portion come to be focused by the construction.

It should be noted too that in this period what were mainly used in the V-slots above were be as in (8) or stative verbs as in (9).²

(8) a. how able hiis for to have ... the thriftyeste To ben his love.
   [1385 Chaucer, Troil.(Visser)]
   b. e entent of conuentual religiosis persoonys was forto haue her monasterie to be not oonli as a tempel...
   [1443 Pecock, Reule Crysten Relig.(Visser)]

---

² The explicit use of be in front of adjectives or participles here should be noted, since, as Brugman (1988:174) correctly points out, synchronically its presence strengthens dynamic construal of the event (and therefore the possibility of causative reading).

(i)a. Have him clean and tidy for the piano recital: [Result state]
   b. Have him be clean and tidy for the piano recital: [Causative] (Brugman 1988: 174)
there is not always so great necessitie to haue the childe bee with the mother. [c1513 St.Thomas More, Wks.(Visser)]

(9) a. he wolde have his reigne endure and last. [c1413 Hoccleve, Reg. Por. (Visser)]

b. wolde she had hym to lye by her. [c1470 Malory, Wks.(Visser)]

It is later than the late 1440s to 1500 when we can find examples with high transitivity predicates, such as rubble out the wrinkles of the minde in (10).

(10) a. He hadd a certane of his knyghtes naken pam & swyme ouer þe water [c1440 PLAlex.69/11(MED)]

b. This is the Glasse Ladies wher-in I woulde haue you..rubbe out the wrinckles of the minde, and be not curious about the weams in the face. [1580 Lyly, Euphues (OED) 463]

c. You would have us baptize our Bels to make them spirituall. [1655 Baxter Quakers’ Catech. (OED) 23]

Therefore, it may be safe to conclude that the development in possible complement proceeded gradually. This view is naturally motivated in Cognitive Grammar, which provides us with notional characterization of categories. The syntactic transition is not at random; in conceptual terms it forms a motivated and highly predictable path, based on the semantic similarity.

In summary, we have observed that the category change occurring in diachronic development of have-complements can be reinterpreted in conceptual terms as an example of profile shift based on Figure-Ground Reversal. Through this assumption, we have demonstrated that the category change occurs not abruptly but gradually, and the conceptual characterization of the syntactic category allows us to motivate the change as a consecutive sum of natural small steps from the base structure. Moreover, it has also shown that the first predicates to serve in the newly emerging infinitive construction were stative verbs, as would be predicted by a hypothesis of construction development by analogy and incremental semantic change. Later it was extended to include predicates with higher transitivity. These observations support the claim that the transition of category change is gradual and naturally captured by cognitive-linguistic view.

2.2 Four Types of Have-Constructions

We have so far discussed the diachronic transition of have-complements from cognitive-semantic point of view, mainly claiming that changes in the complement’s category involves a profile shift. In this section, we would survey the semantics of have-constructions
and relate it to the complement types they take.

Brugman (1988) gives some detailed study on the semantics and its relation to the complement structure of *have*. She divides the meaning of *have*-constructions into roughly four groups, namely that of Causative, Resultant State/Event, Affecting Event, and Attributive. Each group is exemplified as in (11):

(12) Four Types of *HAVE*-Constructions:
   a. She has children come to her house every Sunday.     [CAUSATIVE]
   b. I had him angry the minute I walked in the door.    [RESULTANT STATE/EVENT]
   c. I had two dogs die of snakebite.            [AFFECTING EVENT]
   d. I have keloid tissue on my back./He has a fly resting on his nose.  [ATTRIBUTIVE]

The four meanings are summed up briefly as in (20), based on the type and the semantics of complements. In the column of the table describes aspe ctual classification of *have*-complements, namely by means of the feature [+/- Perfective], while the row indicates the semantic classification of the events described in that complements, namely Resultative and circumstantial. Causative and Resultant Event/State are classified in the same group on the ground that the contents of their complements are realized as a result of causing force. On the other hand, the events denoted by the complement in Affecting Event and Attributive-Existential reading are construed as occurring simultaneously or circumstantially with the causing force, thus the two are classified into the same category under the label “circumstantial.” The constructions with Causative and Affecting Event reading typically takes as their complement bare infinitive, which is classified as [+perfective], while those with Resultant Event/State and Attributive/Existential interpretation take [—Perfective], typically exemplified as adjectives or participles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+PERFECTIVE</th>
<th>—PERFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESULTATIVE</td>
<td>Causative (19a)</td>
<td>Resultant Event/State(19b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUMSTANCIAl</td>
<td>Affecting Event(19c)</td>
<td>Attributive-Existential(19d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Table 2: Four Types of HAVE-Constructions]
(Brugman 1988: 190)

Recall here that *have* has developed the range of applicability of complements: from adjectives, whose main function is to be predicated of its direct object, by way of participles, which profile the last portion of the base process, to infinitives profiling the process as a whole. Based on the diachronic expansion of the possible complement category discussed in the previous section, we can predict that Attributive interpretation is the oldest one, followed by Resultant State/Event reading. It would be also natural to consider that
Causative and Affecting Event interpretations are relatively new members in the category of construction discussed here.

Attributive use can be analyzed as *He has [a fly [resting]*], in which *have* retains somewhat possessive nuance and *resting* functions as a modifier of *a fly*. Resultant State/Event lies between Attributive use and Causative or Affecting Event uses in that the adjectives following the direct object of *have* is reanalyzed as complement, not a mere modifier to the object. Causative and Affecting Event uses have developed relatively lately, according to the discussion in the previous section: bare infinitives occur around 1400 or later. The difference between the two interpretations, i.e., Causative and Affecting Event, is the direction of affectedness:

(13) a. She has children come to her house every Sunday. [CAUSATIVE]
b. I had two dogs die of snakebite. [AFFECTING EVENT]

(14) a. Causative: Person ➔ event
    b. Affecting Event: Person ← event

(13a), corresponding to (14a), says that the person stands in an affecting relation to the event, ultimately a causative relation. (14b), corresponding to (13b), says that the person stands in a relation of being affected to the event, which ultimately leads to the passive interpretation. In Japanese the expression is distinct: the former is roughly expressed by using Causative suffix “*-sase*”, while the latter by Passive suffix “*-rare*”. At this level of abstraction, Causatives and Affecting Events share the same kind of relation, that is, the relation between a person and an event. The only difference lies in the direction of the affecting relation.

Here comes a question: why the verb *have* can develop two apparently distinct meanings out of the same perfective complements. Both (13a) and (13b), for instance, take infinitive from in the complement. In the former, however, causative interpretation is obtained in which the subject of *have* acts on toward the occurrence of the event denoted by the complement, while in the latter the subject is passively “affected” by the event in the complement. Where does this difference come from? Why *have*, but not *make* or *let*, which also takes infinitives as the complement, develop two distinct meanings? In the following sections I would like to examine the semantic structure of *have* itself in order to answer the question.
2.3 The Semantics of HAVE and Its Extensions

In the following section, we would like to focus on the semantics of the predicates have and to relate its extension to the development of its complement.

Langacker (1993) tries to characterize the semantics of verb have by using reference-point model, which he claims is one of the fundamental and universal cognitive abilities of ours. It models our mental process for identification: pick out one prominent thing as a reference point in order to identify the target. Have is also one grammatical tool which is based on the more general mental process.

![Reference-Point Model](image)

We have the basic cognitive ability to invoke the conception of one entity as a conceptual reference point (R) that enables us to establish mental contact with another entity, called the target (T), as represented in Figure 3. The set of potential targets accessible via a given reference point constitute its dominion (D). The possessive relation denoted by the verb have is also based on the model: as an abstract and fully general description, a possessor, that is encoded as a subject, can be characterized as a reference point, and the possessed, realized as an object, as its target.

The reference-point model captures the general abstract schema that covers all the meanings of have, which are so diverse and full of variety. To take a close look at it, however, it is revealed that the degree of agentive force exerted from the entity designated by the reference-point to the one denoted as target is far from united, but rather has gradability. For instance, compare (15a) with (15d): in (15a), the agentive force is direct in that he actually holds a knife in his hand, i.e., under his direct control. In (15d), on the other hand, the exertion of control between the two parties is not observed even indirectly: the relation is rather interpreted as a setting and a passive experience occurring in it. In (15f) the subject designated by we merely serves as a clue for identifying the target, thus functioning only as a reference point.

(15) a. Be careful — she has a knife! [source of immediate control]
   b. I have an electric saw (but I seldom use it). [source of potential control]
   c. They have a good income from investments. [locus of experience, abstract control]
   d. He has terrible migraine headaches. [passive locus of experience]
The gradability in the exertion of agentive force can be viewed as a process of enhancing subjectification, as in Figure 4. In (22a), which corresponds to a diagram in Fig. 4(a), the mental path from R to T is hidden by the actual agentive control and becomes less explicit. On the other hand, in (22f), which is corresponding to the Fig. 4(c), since there is no actual relation between R and T, the relation is subjectively created on the part of conceptualizer’s construal. As agentive force comes to be attenuated, only the schematic reference point structure will be left behind. Conceptualizer in the off stage traces the path mentally toward the target by taking the reference point as a clue. In other words, conceptualizer here is more subjectively involved in the construal of the situation.

The channel toward attenuation of agentive force can be traced diachronically as well. It results in schematic, more abstract meaning than original one. According to OED, the verb have entered the language originally with something active, concrete, and specific meaning like ‘take’, ‘grab’, ‘to hold in hand’. The original sense of purely physical-manual sense came to be bleached both by both attenuation of agentivity and by increase of subjective involvement of the conceptualizer. Next to the original sense came <possess the relation>, whose agentivity is diluted enough to refer to some reciprocal relation, typically used to describe kinship relation. In the end, it has generalized even to cover the situation of experience, that is, the subject just takes mental contact to the target, if not controlling it directly. Here the specific physical meaning has been lost, as demonstrated by the fact that if one wants to signal the more specific meanings, the verb have alone is insufficient —to specifically indicate the original meanings one must add some locative information like “in hand” or “with one(self).”
The Development of HAVE (OED have v.)

(a) <GRASP> To hold in hand, in keeping, or possession; to hold or possess as property, or as something at one’s disposal. [Beowulf (Z.), c888]

(b) <POSSESS THE RELATION> To hold or possess, in a weakened sense; the relation being other than that of property or tenancy. The relation is often reciprocal: the father has a son, the son has a father; the king has subjects, his subjects have a king; (...) a man has a house, the house has an owner or tenant. [c1000] (italics mine)

(c) <TO BE POSSESSED OR AFFECTED WITH> To be possessed or affected with (something physical or mental); to be subjected to; to experience; to enjoy or suffer. [c1000](e.g. He had very bad health.)

In this way, the semantics of have shows diachronic change from physical meaning like “obtain” to mental ones like “experience.” This shift corresponds to the synchronic diversity from Figure 4(a) to Figure 4(b). That is, the synchronic variation in Figure 4 is motivated diachronically by attenuation of agentive force of have.

In general, the description of psychological or mental change of state involves two participant roles: Experiencer, who undergoes the change of mental state, and Stimulus, which brings about it. In addition, it has often been pointed out that at least two ways of construing the relation between Experiencer and Stimulus. This point is made explicit by Croft (1993) as follows:

(17) There are two processes involved in possessing a mental state (and changing a mental state): (1) the experiencer must direct his or her attention to the stimulus, (2) the stimulus (or some property of it) causes the experiencer to be (or enter into) a certain mental state. Thus, a mental state is actually a two-way causal relation, and is better represented as follows:

FIG. 5: SEMANTIC ATTENUATION OF HAVE
Bearing in mind the bi-directional nature of the mental state, let us get back to the issue of the semantics of *have*. Recall that the semantics of *have* changed from a verb of physical possession to that of mental/perceptual by around 1000, due to the fact that agentive control exerted by the subject were attenuated to the extent that it merely exercises mental contact to the target. In other words, the semantics of *have* changed its domain from physical to mental one. Now that the predicate has entered into a semantic verb group of mental/perceptual class that is the same as *see* or *hear*, it acquires a potentiality of bi-directional nature of the mental state. This is the origin of the opposite direction in the relational nature observed in Causative and Affected Event interpretations.

In fact, the verb *have* in the construction with infinitival complement denotes attenuated meaning of “experience” and is in many contexts interchangeable with other verbs of perceptual experience like *see* or *find*. Visser notes as follows:

(18) ['Have' with the direct objects and infinitive complements] expresses experience and can in many contexts be replaced by *see, find*, etc.

(Jespersten 1973: 2268)

Jespersten also pointed out that the *have* with participles in its complement acquires a special meaning which approximately corresponds to that of “experience,” and is classified it into a category of mental perception.

(19) Here (=the chapter on Mental Perception) we may place *have* in a special sense, nearly = 'experience'

(Jespersten V: 281)

Therefore, the rise of two interpretations with opposite affecting relation, Causatives and Affected Events, is attributable to the attenuated meaning of *have*: it has developed a mental or perceptual meaning with attenuation of agentive force.

The co-relation between the attenuation of agentive control and the possibility of opposite-directional relation is not idiosyncratic one; it can also be observed synchronically in some verbs other than *have*. Ikegami (1981), for instance, call it de-agentivization. Look at the following pair.

(20) a. I broke his leg.

b. I broke my leg.

With the same verb *break*, (20a) depicts highly transitive situation, implying agentive force from its subject, while (20b) designates a situation of passive experience, with its
subject functioning as an experiencer without exerting agentive force.

In sum, attenuation of agentive control is likely to co-occur with the rise of affected experience interpretation. The more attenuated the degree of agentive control exerted by the subject toward its object becomes, the more likely the opposite-directional implication, here the relation of being affected by the event, is to occur. This phenomenon is not peculiar to have-constructions but more general tendency observed in grammar, as discussed above. Most of the previous studies which examine have-complement constructions start the discussion by recognizing and assuming the two distinctive interpretations as what were given a priori. The present study, on the other hand, has shown the relatedness of two interpretations from diachronic point of view: their development is attributable to the semantic attenuation of have into mental/perceptual meaning like “experience.”

3. The Development of V-O-inf. Form and Its Relation to Perceptual and Causative Verbs

In the previous sections, we have seen that the rise of two interpretations with opposite affectedness relations, namely Causative and Affecting Event, is attributed to the attenuated meaning of have. It has been argued that the meaning of have in the constructions discussed here is attenuated diachronically to the extent that it roughly means, “to experience,” which belongs to psychological or mental state verb category. As the mental state potentially implies a two-way causal relation as its base, so have also comes to acquire the bi-directional relation.

Interestingly, it is after the attenuation of have was completed that the verb allowed infinitives as its complements. The semantic attenuation of agentive force implies that the schematicity of the predicates in question is enhanced. It also means that, along with the attenuation process, various constraints on the linguistic form will become diluted and that the possibility of extensional use increases. The process of schematization before category shift seems to be typical of other grammaticization channels, e.g., the channel from main verb to auxiliary. As Bybee and Pagliuca states, “A period of lexical development precedes the onset of grammaticization, for a verb such as have is not suitable for grammatical uses unless it has already become sufficiently abstract and generalized. (Bybee and Pagliuca 1985: 72)” The same explanation applies to the constructions here. Have-constructions in general contain as their base a reference-point structure as discussed above. The subject of have serves as a Reference point for identifying the Target. If it maintained the original concrete meaning like “grasp” only, then it would not have been allowed to take events as its target. As time goes by, it has developed and expanded its own complement structure: specifically, what corresponds to Target here allows not only an individual thing but also an event denoted by small clause.³

³ In any case, a reference point remains to be assigned to the subject of have. This is motivated in a natural way, since an individual entity tend to be more salient than an event.
It is a well-known fact that the syntactic form \( \text{Verb+Object+infinitival complement} \) (henceforth \( V+O+\text{inf.} \)), which the verb \( \text{have} \) finally comes to take, is also applicable to other verb categories. Among them are perceptual verbs (\( \text{see, hear, feel} \)) and Causative verbs (\( \text{make, let} \)). These two categories show the earliest rise of this syntactic form (Visser 1973). It is worth mentioning the relationship between \( \text{have}-\)constructions and these other verbs.

### 3.1 Extension of the Have-construction and Its Relation to Perceptual Verbs

First, let us discuss perceptual verbs. The verb \( \text{see} \) has already been used in the \( V+O+\text{inf.} \) form in Old English period and followed by \( \text{feel} \) and \( \text{hear} \) which allow this syntactic pattern since around early Middle English period. The \( V+O+\text{inf.} \) pattern seems to have established itself around late OE or early ME period, as Visser (1973) states:

(21) The number of verbs in early Old English occurring in the VOSI is comparatively small (...). In late Old English the idiom spread with striking rapidity, so that before the beginning of the Middle English period one already comes across a sizable number of instances(...). *This spread may be due to analogy* (...). (Visser 1973: 2235)

As for \( \text{have} \), the use of infinitival complements documented first is found about the late 1300. These facts are summarized in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>ModE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>semantics of have</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“grasp” (880c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“experience”(1000a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptual Verbs in V+O+inf. construction forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{see} ):OE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{find} ):OE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{feel} ):Early ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{hear} ):Early ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{have} ):1385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Causative verbs in V+O+inf. construction forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{do} ):OE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{let} ):OE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{make} ):(OE)ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{have} ):1417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{see} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Table 3: Semantic change of *have* and development of \( V+O+\text{inf.} \) form]
Note that it is after the establishment of the V+O+inf. form with a certain number of perceptual verbs that the *have*-constructions came to develop their infinitive complement. The experiential meaning of *have* appeared around 1000, according to OED, and by the early ME period supposedly it had already acquired the meaning that belongs to the mental/perceptual verb category. It is assumed that, based on the similarity to mental/perceptual verbs, the *have* with attenuated meaning also entered the realm to which this syntactic pattern is applicable.

3.2 Extension of the Have-construction to Causative Interpretation

As we saw in the previous section, the *have* with attenuated meaning entered the category of perceptual verbs that had originally taken V+O+inf. forms by the early Middle English period. As a result, the syntactic pattern was extendedly applied to *have* in Middle English.

By acquiring the possibility of infinitival complements, *have* approached toward another channel, i.e. Causative channel, based on the fact that causative verbs also take the same syntactic form. As illustrated in Table 3, *do*, *let* and *make* had already taken infinitival complements around Middle English period. This suggests that V+O+inf. forms have already established for causative verb category to some extent.

We should note that most examples of causative *have*-constructions refer to future time. Most of the early examples dated before the 17th century involve future by means of *will/would* or related words, as in (22): 4

(22) a. he woulde *have* his reigne endure and last.
   [c1413 Hoccleve, Reg. Pr. 112]
   b. The queene..beganne to *desire* to *have* hym to foly with her.
   [1450a Knight de la Tour 76]
   c. …and [they] woulde *have* had Balen leue his swerd behiynde hym (=and [they] would have had Balen leave his sword behind him)
   [1470-85 Malory, Morte d’Arther 92, 21]

According to Visser, the have used here with *will/would* also retain the meaning analogous to “to see physically and mentally” or “to experience. Thus ‘I will have you wear a thick coat’ roughly equals ‘I want to see you (wear) a thick coat,’ and ‘What would you have me do?’ is tantamount to ‘What do you wish to see me do?’ (Visser 1973: 2265-66). The collocation with future marker like *will/would* seems to enhance the *have*-construction toward agentivization, adding inchoative implication.

The difference between Resultative Event/State and Causative is that the former, which mainly involve adjectival or participial complement, focuses on resultative state, while the

4 In contrast, most of the early non-future citations seem to be examples of Affecting Event interpretation: (i) Jakob *had* his wife Rachel *to dye* suddenly in his journey on his hand. [1641 OED 18]
latter, which co-occurs with infinitival complements, focus on both inchoative and resultative. This is illustrated by the fact that the causative *have*-construction requires non-stative predicates for its infinitival complement, as in (23):

(23)  
a. Donald had Paula {learn / *know} the score of Beethoven’s Fifth.  
b. I had him {hide / *misplace} the pen somewhere in the kitchen.  
(Talmy 1976: 106)

The future marker like *will/would* in (22) plays a part of filling the missing part corresponding to inchoative, and helps the construction acquire the semantics similar to causative construction in general.

In fact, we can find other verbs with perceptual-based semantics extended to imply causative interpretation in V+O+inf. form. For instance, the perceptual verb *see*, whose semantics show weak agentive control, has causative-like usage temporarily:

(24) See (= *see to it that*: 1548—1623) (Visser 1973: 2263)  
a. So long as my simple lyffe shall here indewer I wyll se the haue no wrong.  
[1548 John Bale, Kynge Johan 140]  
b. Now see the most be made for my poor orphan.  
[1600 Ben Jonson, *Alchemist* (Everym.) III]  
c. lead the troop, John; And Puppy, see the bells ring.  
[Ibid., Tale of a Tub (Everym.) I]

Visser classified the examples of *see* in (34) into causative usage. The life of the usage is confined to only 16th and 17th centuries and seems very short, and nowadays usually complemented with a *that*-clause in the form “see to it that…” . They usually occur in imperative forms or with *will*, and show futurity as well as *have*-causatives do. In this respect, some perceptual verbs have also followed, though temporary, the extensive use of verbs to causatives.

Even within the *have*-constructions with other than infinitival complements we can find some examples which are approaching toward the category of causation. For instance, noun complements documented first in the 15th century as the latest usage with *have*. They were, and still are, basically resultative and refer to future time.

(25)  
a. You wold haue me a coward.  
[1470-85 Malory, *Morte d’Arther* 221, 21]  
b. Neither must you…have him [the cock] a Craddon, for he must sometime stand in the defence of his wife and children.  
[1571 B. Googe, Heresbach’s Husband.iv. 158]  
c. Sir Pierce, I’ll have him a cavalier.  
[1630 B. Jonson, *New Inn* iii.i]
Another kind of examples that show extensive causative uses comes from have with present participial complement. This is classified into Resultant State/Event category, as illustrated in Table 2 in 2.2, in that the present participles are regarded as [–Perfective]. Most of such examples have not expressed causative meaning for a long time.

(26)  
   a. I had now no poverty attending me.  
   b. You had better take care... or you will have an offended father or brother pulling a bowie-knife.  
   [1879 Henry James, Daisy Miller]

Since middle of 19th century and after, however, with the help of co-occurrence with an expression won't/wouldn't, as in (27), have-construction with present participle take on causative implication. For instance in (27a) it roughly means “she would not allow…” and in (27b) I won’t let the event happen.” Here the causative implication is rather weak and based on force-dynamics (Talmy (1985)), that is, assignment of barrier which prevents the situation from happening.

(27)  
   (1864--): causative implication in force-dynamic sense (I refuse, I don't allow)  
   a. She would not have Hopkins telling she watched her daughters.  
   [1864 Trollope, Small House at Allingon]  
   b. I will not have dirty old men like that coming into the house.  
   [1913 Hugh Walpole, Fortitude]  
   c. I won't have you paying for my drinks.

And (28), the examples that finally appear in 20th century, can be classified into causative category even without the help of will/would. Note that in (28a) the temporal expression in ten minutes intensifies “eventuality,” which is a requirement for causative interpretation.

(28)  
   20c. (1927 – ): with Causative implication  
   a. In ten minutes she had them all crying.  
   [1927 Sincl. Lewis, Elmer Gantry]  
   b. I was in court when he testified and he had me sweating.  
   [1961 H. Judd, Shadow of a Doubt]  
   c. His self-consciousness had her reacting away from him, whereas only a moment ago she had been responding to the unconscious warmth of his smile.  
   [1962 Lessing, Golden Notebook]

In this way, have-constructions with present participial complements are approaching toward the realm of causative category. It is also suggested that the external element will/would play a role of enhancing causative interpretation of the construction.
4. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have investigated the historical course of the syntactic and semantic development of *have*-constructions, whose evolution is summarized below:

- **have**₁ (“grasp”)
- **have**₂ (“experience”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Attributive</strong></th>
<th>……adjective modifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resultative</strong></td>
<td>……adjectival complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State/Event</strong></td>
<td>……infinitival complement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceptual verbs** (V+O+inf.)

- *will/would*
- **Causative verbs** (V+O+inf.)

This study has also revealed that the overall process of development of *have*-constructions consists of local analogical extensions, as is the case with the growth of *get*-passives (Givon and Yang (1994)) or *way*-constructions (Israel (1996)). The extension from original form or function toward extensions was semantically driven by semantic analogy. The category change from adjectives to participle complements can be attributed to functional similarity between these categories. And the change from participle to infinitival complements is based on the profile shift in terms of Figure-Ground Reversal. Furthermore, the rise of two interpretations with opposite affectedness relation, namely Causative and Affecting Event, is due to the attenuated meaning of *have* and its analogy to other perceptual verbs that also show bi-directionality in nature. Lastly, after *have* comes to be a category member of mental perception, it applies to the V+O+inf. forms, and based on the constructional similarity, it is also extended to causative category, with the help of futurity marker like *will/would*.

These observations seem to follow Israel (1996)’s Production Principle of analogical usage and Goldberg (1995)’s argument concerning Usage-Based models of grammar, which maintain that utterances should sound like things the speaker has heard before. This is the reflection of the spirit of Usage-Based Approach of Grammar (c.f. Langacker (1987,1988, forthcoming)). Thus, this study hopefully contributes to the mounting evidence supporting this cognitive view of the organization of linguistic knowledge.
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