1. Background

What is the structure of English have causatives?

- Standard view: causatives are monoclusal complex predicates → allow clitic climbing, long passives, bare infinitive complements. Complement of a causative verb is fully lexical (VP / vP)

Regarding have, we encounter a size paradox:

- have-causatives are SMALL:
  - Ritter and Rosen (1993, 1997) argue that they consist of one event; have is a “functor predicate” with a bare VP complement.
  - In line with literature treating causatives as complex predicates: causative verb as a functional head within a single clausal projection (Haley 1995, Pylkkänen 2008, a.o.).

- have-causatives are BIG:
  - The complement of have can include high functional inflection: perfect and progressive aspect, passive.

(1) a. The director is having the chorus sing in the first scene.
    b. The director has the chorus be singing when the show starts.

(2) a. The writer had four characters marry in the first scene.
    b. The writer had the villain have been married three times.

(3) a. The director had the patient be examined by a specialist in order to rule out another diagnosis.

- But have-causatives still look smaller than make-causatives.
  - Independent temporal modification: OK with make, not with have.

Passivation: OK with make-, not with have (and make requires complement with infinitival to).

(4) a. We made the children clean up the playroom.
    b. The children were made to clean up the playroom.

- Neither type of causative is fully biclusal (cf. clitic climbing in Romance, bare infinitives in English) → two different-sized sesquiclausal structures.

2. Theoretical Puzzle

- Previous views of sesquiclausality (serial verbs, complex predicates, causatives):
  - More than one clause: two lexical predicates.
  - Less than two clauses: only one IP complex.

- Problem arises because of the tacit assumption that the presence of a higher order head entails the presence of all lower heads:
  \[ T \Rightarrow Ev \Rightarrow v \Rightarrow V \]

Is this justified?

- What other forms of sesquiclausality might be possible?
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3. Proposal

Our Proposal: Inflectional Shells.

- Some sesquiclausal structures have two inflectional complexes, and only one verbal complex.

(5) Two types of sesquiclausality:

- a. Restructuring Infinitives
- b. Inflectional Shells

- On this view, the structure of have causatives in English is as in (6):

  (6) have realizes a head that introduces agent/causer (Voice0).

  Voice0 is both below and above a temporal inflectional head, in this instance Ev (associated with progressive aspect by Cowper 1999, 2005).

4. Causation and Events

- Ritter and Rosen (1993, 1997): have causatives involve one event, while make causatives involve two:

  \[
  \begin{array}{c|c|c}
  \text{have} & \text{make} \\
  \hline
  \text{1 event} & \text{2 events} \\
  \end{array}
  \]

- Evidence: independent temporal modification with make; causative event can be independently negated.

(7) a. On Tuesday the manager made the team lose on Wednesday.
    b. On Tuesday the manager had the team lose on Wednesday.

(8) a. I didn’t make Bill write the article, but he wrote it anyway.
    b. I didn’t have Bill write the article, but he wrote it anyway.

- Structure for have above, though, suggests multiple events.

A slightly different view of complex causation events:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{have} & \text{make} \\
\hline
\text{2 events (1 contains 2)} & \text{3 events (1 contains both 2 and 3)} \\
\end{array}
\]

- Causer + Agent + Predicate
- [Causer + Agent + Predicate] → [Agent + Predicate]
- Analogy: affixation vs. compounding
  - affixation: complex word from one word ≈ complex event from smaller event.
  - compounding: complex word from two words ≈ complex event from two events.

5. HAVE vs. MAKE Causatives

- Differences between have and make causatives:
  - make has a lexical root, have does not.
  - The causation of have is configurational, with make it is lexical.
  - This is, the Voice0 realized as have gets a causative interpretation only when it introduces a second agent, and when its complement is an event (not a state).
  - Coerces agitative interpretations of passives and unaccompanied.

(9) a. I had the children fall (accidentally).
    b. I had the patients be examined (against their will).

“Control” requirement for causative have is also configurational.

- Known restriction that have causatives require the causee to be in the control of the causer.

If causative have realizes a causative/agentive Voice0 above another agentive Voice0, pragmatic explanation.

- Single events cannot have two entirely distinct agents – one agent must be within the control of the other, a “puppet” agent.

- Ability to contrast, is a lexical verb of causation, so allows any kind of causation.

Also gives us a way to understand data involving the temporal span of causation (Ritter and Rosen, 1993):

(10) a. Sue made Mary stop smoking.
    b. Sue had Mary stop smoking (cf. her doctor had Mary stop smoking)

- If causative have is coherent only if one agent is in the control of another, makes sense that the span of the caused event is limited by the span of control or authority.

6. The Many Faces of HAVE

- have has many non-causative uses: possessive, modal, perfect, etc.

- Some of these look especially similar to causative have: resultative, experiencer.

(11) a. Mary had the car spraypainted by experts.
    b. Mary had the car (all) spraypainted by noon.
    c. Mary had her car spraypainted by vandals.

- All three uses of have involve extension of a core eventuality.

- Causative have: complex event; have spells out Voice0 above another Voice0.

- Resultative have: complex state; have spells out (stative) argument introducing head above a stative/resultative phrase (cf. low result phrase, Borer 2005, Ramchand 2008).

- Experiencer have: simple event; have spells out Appl0 above Voice0 (Kim 2011). No-inflectional shells because no recursive structure: have simply adds another thematic role to a single event.

For references and further detail, please see handout.