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1. Introduction

In this paper, we compare the English causative verbs, **have** and **make**. From the examples in (1), it appears that the syntactic category of the complement clause might be identical for **have** and **make** — with the only real difference being the degree of authority assumed by the matrix subject. However, we will argue that in fact these two verbs differ at all levels of the grammar. We will focus on differences between the two verbs at the level of argument structure and at the level of syntactic structure. Specifically, **have**, but not **make**, forms a complex predicate with the embedded verb in the argument structure, and consequently, **have**, but not **make**, selects a VP complement in the syntax. In fact, with respect to complement selection, the causative use of **have** is like the auxiliary use of **have**: both take a VP complement (cf. Kayne, 1989). We will present evidence showing that **make** selects an AgrP complement, (i.e. the functional projection immediately dominating VP, which Pollock (1989) has called AgrP).

(1)  
a. John had Bill read the article.  
b. John made Bill read the article.

(Before we go any further we should also make it clear that we are using the term clausal complement to refer to the complement of the causative verb, regardless of its category label. In other words, we are calling both the VP embedded under **have**, and the AgrP embedded under **make**, clausal.)

In addition, we will argue that the difference in the syntactic category of the complement to **have** and **make** follows directly from a difference in the argument structure representations of the two verbs. In particular, **have** forms a complex predicate with the embedded verb. This complex predicate has a single argument structure which contains all the arguments of both verbs. On the other hand, **make** does not form a complex predicate with its complement verb. The argument arrays of these two verbs remain independent.

The differences in the argument structure representations derive from a crucial difference in the LCS representations of **have** and **make**. **Make**, like most verbs, specifies as part of its meaning whether it is a state or an event. In contrast, **have** lacks this type of specification. This defect in the meaning of **have** forces complex predicate formation.

We begin by presenting evidence to support our claims about the differences in syntactic structure. Then we turn to the evidence pertinent to the LCS and argument structure representations of these verbs. Finally, we will discuss the relation between causative **have** and a related use of this verb, which we call experiencer **have**. An example of this experiencer construction is given in (2). Note that the matrix subject in this sentence is not the causer of the action denoted by the embedded predicate, but rather an individual affected by this action.

(2)  
a. John had Mary die on him.  
b. Jean had a daughter accepted at UQAM.  
c. John had all hell break loose (on him).
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We will suggest that the availability of sentences such as (4) is due to the unspecified nature of the arguments of *have*, and the fact that *have* does not denote an independent event.

2. A phrase structure difference between the complements of *have* and *make*

We now turn to the discussion of structural differences between the complements of *have* and *make*. First, it is necessary to spell out our assumptions regarding the structure of sentences. We adopt Pollock's analysis of clauses, as diagrammed in (3), taking from Pollock the assumption that S or IP contains not one but two functional projections dominating VP. However, for our purposes, it is immaterial whether TP dominates AgrP or vice versa, as has been suggested by Belletti (1988), Chomsky (1989), and others. That is, what is important here is the notion that the inflectional complex is made up of two functional projections; their labels are of no consequence for this work.

![Diagram](image)

(3)

2.1. Romance *faire* selects a VP

Before discussing the English facts, we review some recent developments in the area of Romance causatives. The evidence indicates that the complements of causative verbs such as those in (4), are VPs rather than projections of any functional category (Burzio, 1986; Di Sciullo, & Williams, 1987; Li, to appear; Marantz, 1985; Rochette, 1988; Rosen, 1989; Zubizarreta, 1987).

(4)   a. Jean a fait travailler Marie.  
     "Jean made Marie work."

   b. Jean a fait manger les pommes à Marie.  
     "Jean made Marie eat the apples."

The VP analysis accounts for the following three peculiarities of the construction: (i) the fact that clitics only appear before the matrix verb; (ii) the position and Case-marking of the embedded subject; (iii) the unavailability of clausal negation and auxiliary verbs in the clausal complement.

In this paper we argue that, like *faire*, *have* selects a VP complement. However, there are crucial differences between Romance and English which make it impossible to simply import the arguments developed by these authors into an analysis of have. First, English has no clitics. Second, it has been argued that the subject under VP is on the right in Romance (Bonet (1989);

---

1 In his analysis of Italian causative constructions, Burzio (1986) only posits a VP complement for the 'faire par' construction. Di Sciullo and Williams (1987) and Zubizarreta (1987) both posit parallel structures in which the sentence is simultaneously analysed as containing a VP complement and a morphologically complex verb.
Rosen (1990); Sportiche (1988)). As for English, we assume that the subject is base-generated on the left. Assume that Case is assigned rightward in both Romance and English. One consequence of the difference in the position of the subject is that the embedded verb Case-marks its subject in Romance, whereas the matrix verb exceptionally Case-marks this subject in English.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Romance} & & \text{English} \\
\begin{array}{c}
V' \\
V \ \\
\text{faire} \\
\text{Subj}
\end{array} & & \begin{array}{c}
V' \\
V \ \\
\text{have} \\
\text{Subj}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

One of the stronger arguments for a VP analysis of the clausal complement in Romance is the fact that the embedded subject behaves as if it were Case marked by the embedded verb. This argument does not carry over into English. Since Case assignment is rightward, the embedded verb cannot Case-mark the subject on its left. In addition, English permits Exceptional Case-marking (ECM). Consequently, the embedded subject will be Case-marked by have. In Romance causatives, the embedded subject will be assigned accusative Case if the embedded verb is intransitive, as in (6a), but dative Case if the embedded verb is transitive, as in (6b). In the English have causative, the embedded subject receives accusative Case, regardless of the transitivity of the embedded verb, as shown in (7).

(6) a. Jean a fait travailler Marie.  
   b. Jean a fait manger un gâteau à Marie.

(7) a. John had Mary work.  
   b. John had (*to) Mary eat a cake.

We should point out that there is no difference between have and make with respect to the Case assigned to the embedded subject. Compare the sentences in (8) with those in (7).

(8) a. John made Mary work.  
   b. John made (*to) Mary eat a cake.

In both examples the matrix verb exceptionally Case-marks the embedded subject. The difference between (7) and (8) lies in the position of the embedded subject. In the have causative, the subject is dominated by the embedded VP, whereas in the make causative, the subject is dominated by AgrP at S-structure. In both instances, the embedded subject is governed by the matrix verb.

---

2 Sportiche (1988) argues that the subject is only optionally on the right in French. Bonet (1989) argues that the subject is always on the right in Catalan. Rosen (1989) assumes that in the causative constructions the subject must be realized to the right of the verb for purposes of Case assignment.

3 Kitagawa (1986) has argued on the basis of extraposition facts that subjects are base generated on the right periphery of the VP in English.
Thus, the Case and linear position of the embedded subject shed no light on the structural differences between the clausal complements of have and make.

We will present three types of syntactic evidence that show that the clausal complement of have is a VP, while the clausal complement of make is an AgrP: (i) The presence or absence of Infl elements in the clausal complements, (ii) the availability of individual level predicates in the clausal complements, and (iii) the availability of non-thematic subjects in the clausal complements.

2.2. Infl Elements in the complement

We shall now review syntactic evidence which supports our claim that the clausal complement of have is a VP, while the clausal complement of make is an AgrP. Only the complement of make contains inflectional elements.

As illustrated in (10b), when make is passivized, the infinitival marker to must appear immediately before the embedded verb. This contrasts with have, in which the infinitival marker may never appear. Following Pollock (1989) we analyse to as an inflectional particle. Given this assumption, its availability in this construction can only mean that the complement of make is larger than a VP.

(10) a. *Bill was had to leave
    b. Bill was made *(to) leave

In contrast, to never appears in the clausal complement of have.

It should be pointed out that (10a) is unacceptable also because have does not passivize. However, as we will now show, other Infl elements may occur in the complement of make, but not have. The examples in (11) and (12) illustrate the progressive aspect and passive voice. In each case, with the have causative, the auxiliary be never appears in the complement. In contrast, the auxiliary verb must always appear in the make causative.

(11) progressive be:
    a. *John has Bill be doing something whenever Mary works.
    b. John makes Bill be doing something whenever Mary works.

---

4 Although Pollock claims that to is base-generated in T, we assume that it is base-generated in Agr. Pollock's argument that to is inserted in T is based upon the relative ordering of this Infl particle and the negative particle not in sentences such as (ia):
    (i) a. I want to not go.
        b. I want not to go.
Note, however, that the opposite ordering of these elements is preferred. We suggest that the negative element in (ia) is in fact a VP-adjointed adverbial, and not a marker of clausal negation. This hypothesis also accounts for the subtle differences in meaning between the two sentences.

5 Although there are some senses of have in which it does passivize, eg. 'She was had'.
(12) passive be:
   a. *John had Bill be arrested.
   b. John made Bill be arrested.

When the auxiliary verb is not present in the complement, the judgements are reversed, as exemplified in (13) and (14). The data follow directly from our claim that the complement of have never contains an Infl projection, while the complement of make always contains an Infl projection. Note that implicit in our analysis is the assumption that the participial affixes (-ing, -ed/-en) are never in Infl. 6

(13) progressive be:
   a. John has Bill doing something whenever Mary works.
   b. *John makes Bill doing something whenever Mary works.

(14) passive be:
   a. John had the boat sunk.
   b. *John made the boat sunk.

Next, as indicated in (15), clausal negation may only occur in the complement of make, and never in the complement of have. Recall that not is also analysed as an Infl element, and therefore is incompatible with a VP complement.

(15) clausal negation
   a. *Bill had Ralf not marry Sheila.
   b. Bill made Ralf not marry Sheila.
   c. *John had Sheila not buy a used car.
   d. John made Sheila not buy a used car.

Until now, all the evidence has supported our position that have selects a VP complement, while make selects something larger. We now turn to evidence which indicates that the clausal complement of make is an AgrP. First, the clause embedded under make does not support a complementizer, as shown in (16).

(16) a. *John made that Bill read the article.
   b. *Bill was made for the article to be read.

From this and the ECM facts, it is obvious that make does not select a CP complement.

Second, neither a modal nor do support is available in the embedded clause, as exemplified in (17).

(17) a. *John made Bill can read the article.
   b. *John made Bill did not read the article.

Pollock (1989) argues that modals are base-generated in the head of TP (where TP is the complement of C). We propose that the infinitival marker to is base-generated in the head of AgrP (where AgrP is the complement of T). Therefore, we conclude that the complement of make

---

6 As shown in (i), perfective aspect is ungrammatical in both the have and make constructions. We attribute this to the fact that in causal constructions, the complement always denotes a future action with respect to the matrix verb. Therefore, perfective aspect, which denotes a completed action, is completely incompatible with any causative construction.

(i) a. *John had Bill have finished his assignment by 5:00.
   b. *John made Bill have finished his assignment by 5:00.
cannot be a TP. If make does not take a CP, TP, or VP, what is the category of its complement? Assuming two functional projections in S, we conclude that make selects an AgrP complement.

2.3 Stage level and individual level predicates

A distinction in the semantic type of the predicate gives us further motivation for the VP/AgrP distinction. In particular, Kratzer (1988) has classified predicates as either stage level or individual level and argued that this semantic classification has syntactic ramifications. A stage level predicate denotes an action or temporary property of the subject. In contrast, an individual level predicate denotes a permanent property of the subject. A few examples of stage level and individual level predicates are given in (18) and (19). Kratzer proposes that the subject of a stage level predicate is base-generated inside the VP, and (in some languages) may remain in its base position throughout the derivation, whereas the subject of an individual level predicate is outside the VP at all levels of representation.

(18) Stage level predicates
   a. Firemen are available.
   b. Mary spoke French today.
   c. Fred is sitting on that chair.

(19) Individual level predicates
   a. Firemen are altruistic.
   b. Mary knows French.
   c. Fred has blond hair.

Kratzer's distinction between these two types of predicates makes a strong prediction concerning the complements of have and make. If have only takes a VP complement, then we would expect that it should only allow stage level predicates. On the other hand, make should allow both stage and individual level predicates because its complement includes some Infl projection. As shown by the ungrammaticality of (21a,c,e,g) this prediction is borne out. The contrasts in (20g,h) and (21g,h) indicate that the distinction is correctly identified as a stage level/individual level contrast rather than simply a state/event contrast (J. Grimshaw, p.c.).

(20) Stage level predicates
   a. John had Bill run in the three-legged race.
   b. John made Bill run in the three-legged race.
   c. Brian had Mila write the French exam.
   d. Brian made Mila write the French exam.
   e. Barbara had George take a shower.
   f. Barbara made George take a shower.
   g. Montréal has firemen available.
   h. Montréal makes firemen available.

(21) Individual Level Predicates
   a. *John had Bill like French cooking.
   b. John made Bill like French cooking.
   c. *John had Bill want to learn French.
   d. John made Bill want to learn French.
   e. *John had Bill know French.
   f. ??John made Bill know French.
   g. *Montréal has firemen altruistic.
   h. Montréal makes firemen altruistic.
2.4 Expletive Subject in Complement Clause

A further consequence of the structural distinction we propose is that the subject of make, but not have, may be an expletive. This follows from the widely held assumption that expletives may only appear in non-thematic positions, i.e. the specifier of a functional category, and not in Spec of VP.

(22) a. *John had it (be) likely that Bill would get the job.
    b. John made it be likely that Bill would get the job.
    c. *John had it seem that Bill was guilty.
    d. John made it seem that Bill was guilty.
    e. *John had there be computers available for all the students.
    f. John made there be computers available for all the students.

2.5 Summary

In this section we have presented evidence that have is syntactically distinct from make. In particular, we have argued that causative have selects a VP complement, whereas causative make selects a complement headed by a functional category. We have called this functional category AgrP, for the sake of convenience. However, we remain neutral with respect to the hierarchy of Infl categories in S.

3. LCS Representations

Having established a systematic difference in the syntactic behavior of have and make causatives, it is now necessary to explore briefly the differences in the meaning of these two verbs. We will suggest that these syntactic differences follow in part from fundamental differences in the LCS representations of these verbs. As we will show, the differences in the LCS have crucial consequences for subsequent levels of syntactic representation (the argument structure and the syntactic structure).

Consider the LCS representations for have and make given in (23). The representation of (23a) captures the intuition that the subject of make exerts some force such that the event described by the lower predicate takes place. Consequently, the actor of the embedded event has no (volitional) ability to either accept or refuse the action. In contrast, (23b) implies that the subject of have exerts some influence, but has no authority to force the event described by the lower predicate. In this case, the actor of the embedded event still has volitional control over his/her actions (cf. Wierzbicka (1988) for a formal account of this distinction).

(23) LCS
    a. make: [x] cause<e> [event]
    b. have: [x] affect [event]

    We are suggesting that there is an important difference in the LCSs of have and make. The terms 'cause' and 'affect' capture the distinction between sentences such as those in (24). In (24a), the event of students reading three articles took place precisely because the teacher forced it to. In (24b), the event of the students reading three articles at least in part remains under the volitional control of the students. So for example, (24a) is appropriate in the context of high school students who may not pass if they do not master the material. (24b) is more appropriate for an adult education class, in which performance has no consequences.

(24) a. The teacher made the students read three articles.
    b. The teacher had the students read three articles.
4. Cause is an Event; Affect is not

There are two types of information that must be projected from the LCS representation of verbs. One is information about the event type, and the other is information concerning the thematic arguments. We will address the question of the thematic argument structure in a moment, but first we turn to the event. The term event as used here denotes the <E> position which Kratzer includes in the representation of stage level predicates. What we would like to suggest at this point is that make contains an <E> position of its own, while have does not. The remainder of this paper will focus on the consequences of this hypothesis.

Suppose that have has no event analysis. In other words, the LCS of have is indeterminate with respect to the presence or absence of an <E> position. This hypothesis was originally developed in Rochette (1988) to explain the Romance restructuring and causative constructions. This indeterminacy forces complex predicate formation so that the verb can obtain its eventive interpretation. When have combines with another verb to form a complex predicate in the argument structure, have links up with the event <E> of the embedded verb. We represent this linking process as in (25).

(25) \[ \text{have} \quad V2 \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{have} \quad V2 \]

(26) \[ \text{make} \quad V2 \]

This account leads to a strong prediction concerning have and make. If we are correct about the event analysis and subsequent complex predicate formation, then the causative have construction should denote only one event, whereas the causative make construction should denote two independent events. The evidence indicates that this prediction is borne out.

First, the contrast in (27) may be attributed to the difference in the event structure. When make is negated, as in (27a), there is no implication concerning the occurrence of the embedded event -- it may or may not have occurred. As (27b) shows, the same is not true for have. The contrast follows from the assumption that have shares an <E> position with the embedded verb.

(27) a. The teacher didn't make Bill read the article, but he did it anyway.
   b. *The teacher didn't have Bill read the article, but he did it anyway.

A second piece of supporting evidence comes from embedding clausal idioms under have and make. As shown in (28), this is only possible with make. The ungrammaticality of (28b,d) follows if have must receive an <E> in order to obtain a causative interpretation, and if clausal idioms have no <E> specification.

7 See also Higginbotham (1985) for a different account of event positions.

8 As pointed out to us by M. Baker (p.c.) and by J. Grimshaw (p.c.), it may not be entirely correct to assume that idioms have no event specification. It is clear, however, that they are underspecified in some sense, although it might be more accurate to consider it as thematic underspecification.
(28)  a. Bill made the shit hit the fan.
b. *Bill had the shit hit the fan.
c. George made all hell break loose.
d. *George had all hell break loose.

The data in (28) also indicate that make is insensitive to whether or not its complement is capable of bearing an \(<E>\). If the have causative is to be interpreted as an event, it follows that such interpretation will only be available when the embedded verbal predicate takes an \(<E>\). Make should be subject to no such constraint. The contrast in (29) shows that only make can take a non-eventive NP, and (30) shows that only make can take an AP.\(^9\) Note that insertion of the copula be renders the have sentences grammatical in both cases.

(29)  a. John made Mary president.
b. *John had Mary president.
c. John had Mary be president.

(30)  a. Mila made Brian drunk.
b. *Barbara had George drunk.
c. Barbara had George be drunk.

Recall also from section 2.3 that have is incompatible with individual level predicates. On Kratzer’s analysis, this is the subset of predicates that lack an \(<E>\) position.

This analysis of the relevance of the \(<E>\) positions is consistent with the syntactic distinction we drew in the first section of this talk. We said that have selects a VP complement, while make selects a complement headed by an Infl category. According to Higginbotham (1985), a verb’s \(<E>\) position is discharged by Infl. The \(<E>\) position in the complement of make is discharged by its functional head. The \(<E>\) position in the complement of have is discharged by the Infl that governs the matrix verb.

5. Argument structure

Now we turn to the thematic arguments of the causative verbs. Recall that the LCS representations of both have and make contain two arguments, a causer and a resulting event. At the level of argument structure, let us suppose that these verbs are represented as in (31).

(31)  a. \( (x(y)) \)
     \[ \text{make} \]
     \[ \langle E \rangle \]

     b. \( (x(y)) \)
     \[ \text{have} \]

\(^9\) But notice that neither causative verb allows PP complements, as shown in (i). However, noncausative have does allow PPs, as shown in (ii).

(i)  a. *John made Bill near the table.
b. *John had Bill near the table.

(ii) a. *John made Bill over a barrel.
b. John had Bill over a barrel.
Implicit in this representation is the assumption that \(<E>\), the event position, is not a theta-marked argument like \(x\) and \(y\). (Recall that because make has an independent \(<E>\), it does not form a complex predicate.)

Now suppose that one consequence of complex predicate formation, via \(<E>\) linking, is the concomitant merger of the argument arrays of the component verbs. What this means for the analysis of have is that the \(y\) argument of (31b) is satisfied by the arguments of its embedded verb. This complex predicate formation is exemplified in (32).\(^{10}\)

(32) \[ \begin{array}{c}
\left( x \ ( y ) \right) \\
\text{have} \\
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\left( x \ ( a \ ( b \ ( c ))) \right) \\
\text{have} \quad V \\
\end{array} \]

As one can see from the derived representation in (32), the argument contributed by have is the most prominent argument in the array (in the sense of Grimshaw (in press)). We assume the thematic hierarchy in (33). It is an adaptation of the hierarchy in Jackendoff (1972), with an additional distinction between two types of agents -- volitional and nonvolitional causers.

(33) argument hierarchy
     volitional causer > nonvolitional causer > experiencer > goal/location/source > theme/patient

Given current theories of argument structure hierarchies, since \(x\) occupies the outermost position in the complex argument array in (32), it must be thematically most prominent. The examples in (34) illustrate that the subject of have is always assigned a thematic role which is at least as high as that assigned to the subject of the embedded verb.

(34) a. John had Bill break the dishes.
    b. Chomsky's new book has everybody frightened.
    c. This new virus has the computer overloaded.
    d. This paper has us working overtime.

The matrix subject is not assigned the same thematic role in all cases. The table in (35) lists the thematic combinations for the matrix and embedded subjects that are exemplified in (34). The variability in the thematic role assigned to the matrix subject is due to the fact that its thematic specification is determined by a combination of its being an affecter in the LCS of have and the event type of the embedded predicate.\(^{11}\)

---

10 The representation derives in part from the analysis of complex predicate formation in Romance causatives given in Rosen (1989).
11 Notice that it is possible to have a causer interpretation of the matrix subject when the embedded clause contains an idiomatic predicate, as in (i). The difference between these examples and those in (28) is that the embedded subject is a causer, and not part of the idiom. In other words, the idiom is contained in an event. Thus, in these sentences, the embedded clause contains an \(<E>\). Since the embedded clause contains an \(<E>\) and a causer, the matrix subject must also be a causer.

(i) a. John had Bill keep tabs on the FBI.
b. John had Mary throw in the towel.
c. John had Bill jump the gun.
d. John had Mary bite the bullet.
e. John had Bill crash the party.
f. John had Alice beat ass.
(35) \begin{align*}
\text{matrix subject} & \quad \text{embedded subject} \\
\text{a.} & \quad \text{vol causer} & \quad \text{vol causer} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{nonvol causer} & \quad \text{experiencer} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{nonvol causer} & \quad \text{theme} \\
\text{d.} & \quad \text{nonvol causer} & \quad \text{nonvol causer}
\end{align*}

In other words the theta role of the matrix subject is undetermined at least until the point at which complex predicate formation occurs. This aspect of our analysis is consistent with the insights of Cowper (1989) Roberts (1985; 1989), and others, who suggest, for various different uses of have, that it lacks some or all of the argument-related specifications of a full verb.\footnote{This is also consistent with Marantz's (1984) claim that the theta role of a subject is compositionally determined.}

Not surprisingly, the subject of make need not be thematically higher than the subject of the embedded verb. As shown in (36a), the subject of make may be a nonvolitional causer, while the subject of the embedded verb is a volitional causer. If we substitute have for make, as in (36b), the sentence is resoundingly bad.\footnote{Sentence (36b) is fine if the embedded verb is marked for progressive aspect, as in (i). This is due to the fact (we think) that the progressive denotes a (temporary) state, which never selects a volitional causer (i.e. agent). Thus, contrary to appearances the embedded subject in (i) does not violate the thematic hierarchy.}

(36) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{The news about George made Barbara seek legal advice.} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{*The news about George had Barbara seek legal advice.}
\end{align*}

6. Experiencer have Constructions

Throughout this paper we have been using the term 'causative' to describe the examples. We have developed an analysis of have by comparing it with the causative verb make. Examples that were good with make were generally bad with causative have, and vice versa. However, some of

\footnote{Sentence (36b) is fine if the embedded verb is marked for progressive aspect, as in (i). This is due to the fact (we think) that the progressive denotes a (temporary) state, which never selects a volitional causer (i.e. agent). Thus, contrary to appearances the embedded subject in (i) does not violate the thematic hierarchy. The subject of make may be either animate or inanimate, but the subject of have must be animate (i.e. a willful causer). In addition, the subject of causative have must be a willful cause of the event denoted by V2. In the following examples, the subject of the matrix verb is not a volitional causer; in these cases, the embedded verb is a state, and does not take an agent subject.}

(iv) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{John's invention has everyone talking/talk} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Our working together has everyone up in arms.} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{This new coffee pot has everyone cooing/coo.}
\end{align*}

(v) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{*John's invention makes everyone talking/be talking/ok talk.} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{*Our working together makes everyone up in arms.} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{This new coffee pot makes everyone coo/cooing.} \\
\text{d.} & \quad \text{Our working together makes/has everyone crazy.}
\end{align*}
the have sentences that we starred are perfectly acceptable if the matrix subject is interpreted as an experiencer rather than as a causer. Some of these are reproduced in (37) and (38).  

(37)  
a. *John had Bill die.
b. John had Bill die on him.
c. *John had the boat sink.
d. John had the boat sink on him.

(38)  
a. *John had all hell break loose.
b. John had all hell break loose on him.
c. *John had Bill kick the bucket.
d. John had Bill kick the bucket on him.

In each case, the phrase 'on him' simply forces the experiencer interpretation of the matrix subject 'John'.

The remainder of this paper will focus on this experiencer reading. We will argue that there is in fact no difference between causative and experiencer uses of have - in both cases have forms a complex predicate with the embedded verb, and in both cases, the subject of have is a more prominent argument than the subject of the embedded verb. The only difference between the so-called causative have and the experiencer have is that in the first case, the embedded verb takes an event, and in the second case, it takes a state. In other words, the experiencer reading obtains when there is no <E> position in the embedded verb.

Recall that the subject of have is thematically unspecified. Given the thematic hierarchy, a causer interpretation follows whenever the embedded verb has a causer of its own. Causer subjects are only available when a verb is eventive, i.e. has an <E> position. The availability of <E> in the embedded predicate gives the complex predicate an eventive interpretation. In addition, it allows for the causal interpretation of both the embedded subject and the matrix subject. That is, a causer in the embedded subject position is only compatible with an eventive V. Because of the hierarchy, when the embedded verb is a causer, the matrix subject must also be a causer.

If, on the other hand, the embedded verb has no <E>, then the embedded subject cannot be a causer. This makes the experiencer interpretation of the matrix subject possible. In addition, it forces the experiencer reading, because the entire complex predicate has no <E>, and causer subjects are only compatible with events.

When have combines with a state (as in (37)), or with an idiom (as in (38)) the sentences are acceptable, but only on the experiencer reading. Because the meaning of have includes no event information, it takes on the event information of the embedded verb. States and clausal idioms are specified as non-events. Therefore, when have combines with either of these, it acquires the same non-event specification. Experiencers are compatible with states. Causers are not.

Given this approach, we expect that the matrix subject must be a causer whenever the embedded subject is a causer. This rules out an experiencer reading of the matrix subject in this context. The examples in (39) indicate that this prediction is correct.

(39)  
a. George had the general sink the boat (*on him).
b. Ernie had Gila kill the cat (*on him).
c. Pearl had Martha fix the roof (*on her).
d. Ralf had Hubert make dinner (*on him).

---

14 Notice that the stativity of die is lost when embedded under causative have, as in (i). This sentence is only good under a director reading, in which John has Bill purposely act as if he is dying. Die in this case becomes eventive and therefore is compatible with a causative of die and have.

(i) John had Bill die.
The diagram in (40) shows the derivation of the argument structure of the complex predicate when the embedded verb has no <E>. Comparing (32) and (40), one can see that the presence or absence of <E> is the only difference between the causative and experiencer complex predicates.\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{align*}
(40) & \quad (x \ (y)) & \quad (x \ (a \ (b))) \\
\text{have} & \quad \rightarrow & \quad \text{have} \ \text{V}
\end{align*}

7. Conclusion

To conclude, we have demonstrated that there are systematic differences between the causative verbs make and have at the level of LCS and that these differences are manifested in all subsequent levels of the syntax, i.e. in the argument structure, D-structure, S-structure. It comes as no surprise that make is a fully specified causative verb with its own <E> position and argument array. We have argued that the LCS of have, on the other hand, has no event specification, and therefore imposes no constraints on the interpretation of its arguments. It is this lack of event specification which forces have to form a complex predicate with its complement. In addition, the interpretation of this verb’s arguments depends upon the event specification of its complement verb.
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