

To Have and Have not: on the Deconstruction Approach*

SABINE IATRIDOU

University of Pennsylvania

0. Introduction

This paper should be seen as part of the research questions revolving around the issue of whether HAVE and BE are derivationally related. Among positions that have been taken, Freeze (1992) argues that possessive HAVE (i.e. "main" verb HAVE) is derivationally derived from BE and Kayne (1992) that both main and auxiliary HAVE are derived from BE. The reader is referred to those works and the references cited there for specific executions of this idea but the general form of the arguments is that HAVE is derived from BE after incorporation of a head X (i.e. HAVE = BE + X). I will be referring to the idea that HAVE is not primitive as the deconstruction approach. For present purposes I would like to discuss two arguments that have been advanced in favor of the deconstruction approach to HAVE: the relation between the Perfect and the Passive, and the fact that the semantic restrictions on the object of HAVE are similar to that in the existential *there is* construction. In the appendix I will very briefly discuss a historical argument that has been brought in favor of the deconstruction

* I would like to thank the following people for helpful discussions: Maria Angelou, Chris Collins, Viviane Deprez, David Embick, Susan Garrett, Irene Heim, Roumi Izvorski, Tony Kroch, Itziar Laka, Richard Larson, Ellen Prince, Don Ringe, Laura Siegel, Anna Szabolcsi, Spyridoula Varlokosta, Laura Wagner and in particular Robin Belvin, who got me onto the topic of HAVE. The support of NSF grant NYI SBR-9458319 is gratefully acknowledged.

approach to HAVE. The goal of the paper is not to argue for or against the deconstruction approach but to point to certain aspects of it that will have to be addressed preliminary to more fundamental discussion of the question.

I. The Perfect/Passive isomorphism

In the Germanic and Romance languages the participle used in the Perfect is isomorphic to that used in the Passive (up to agreement, in some cases; more on this later). This is an argument in favor of the deconstruction account because the Passive would schematically consist of BE + participle and the Perfect of BE + X + participle. In other words, the sameness of the participle would be predicted. Examples (1a-d) exemplify this isomorphism in Dutch (D) and French (F):

- (1)a. ik heb de brief geschreven b. de brief is geschreven (D)
 I have the letter written the letter is written
 c. j'ai écrit le menu d. le menu est écrit (F)
 I have written the menu the menu is written

Since the situation shown in (1a-d) is so widespread, one suspects that, indeed, there is something deeper about the relationship between the Perfect and the Passive and therefore, indirectly, between HAVE and BE. However, even within Indo-European, there appears to be an exception to this pattern. This is the case of Modern Greek (MG), which has a periphrastic Perfect, using HAVE and an uninflected participle; but a synthetic Passive, which inflects, like all MG verbs, for Number and Person, tense and aspect:

- e. echo grapsi to grama (MG)
 (I) have written the letter
 f. to grama grafike
 the letter write/PASS/PAST/3/SING/PERF

The MG pattern is unexpected given the conclusion we would want to draw from Germanic and Romance. The isomorphism between the Perfect and the Passive is missing, and in addition, only one of the two is periphrastic. This situation indicates that there is another possible derivation of HAVE/the Perfect, that is, other than from BE/the Passive.¹ The MG

¹ In MG, the Perfect is morphologically related to the Perfective. MG has a Perfective-Imperfective morphological distinction in the Past and the Future/Subjunctive (but not in the Present, where all verbs are understood as Imperfective). For example, the participle used in the Perfect for the verb 'write' is *grapsi*. The -(p)s- is the Perfective, eg, *tha grapso* 'I will write/PERFECTIVE', versus *tha grafo*, 'I will write/IMPERF' (or, 'I will be writing'). It is extremely interesting that those verbs that lack a morphological Perfective, e.g. the verbs for 'have', 'be', 'know', also lack a participle for the Perfect. In other words, in MG one cannot say "I have had...", "I have been...", "I have known...". The fact that the language has not made up forms for the Perfect for these verbs would seem to indicate that the Perfect participle and the Perfective are derivationally related.

pattern must be rare, as I have not been able to find another language that is like MG in having a periphrastic Perfect but a non-periphrastic Passive.² In the next few sections we will try to see whether the MG problem is only an illusion and in reality MG can be shown to behave like Romance and Germanic. If this reduction succeeds, the force of the HAVE/BE relationship will not be challenged by the MG pattern.

II. On closer inspection...

The forms in (1e,f) represent the "normal" Perfect and Passive in MG. Yet, if one looks closer at a different corner of MG grammar, the desired isomorphism appears to show up:

- (2)a. echo grameno to grama
 have/1/sing written/NEUT/SING/ACC the letter
 b. to grama ine grameno
 the letter is written/NEUT/SING/ACC

The form *grameno* inflects in the nominal paradigm, that is, it inflects for Gender, Number and Case and as can be seen in (1), it appears preceded by HAVE or preceded by BE. (1b), then, represents the adjectival Passive, which means that we can ask whether the isomorphism between the perfect and passive participles, which we saw in Germanic and Romance, appears in MG as well but in this case, it does so with the adjectival Passive. So how much can we assimilate MG to Germanic or Romance? Let us attempt a specific comparison between MG and French, since these two languages exhibit quite a few similarities between the constructions under consideration. The French paradigm in the Perfect is partially shown in (3a-c): when the object precedes the participle, the two agree in Gender and Number (more later on whether this is obligatory). When the object is postverbal agreement is impossible. The Passive is shown in (3d) and there agreement is obligatory.

- (3)a. je les ai écrites c. j'ai écrit(*es) les lettres
 I them have written/F/PL I have written(*F/PL) the letters
 b. les lettres que j'ai écrites d. les lettres sont écrites
 the letters that I have written/F/PL the letters are written

The MG (2b) might be said to be similar to French (3d). How does (2a) compare to (3a-c)? In both languages there appears to be object agreement

²In addition, one might worry about the fact that there is an auxiliary HAVE without there being an auxiliary BE, since the former is supposedly derived from the latter. I will not address the latter point because of reasons of space and because the relationship between auxiliary BE and main BE, which MG does have in predication structures, is unclear.

in that the participle agrees with the object and although not shown here, this agreement is only possible with a direct, not an indirect object. Moreover, in both languages the agreement on the participle is in the nominal paradigm (Gender, Number, Case), not the verbal paradigm (Person, Number). As already mentioned, in French, agreement is only possible when the object is preverbal. This is not readily testable in MG because of the word-order possibilities. All possible permutations of the constituents of (2a) are acceptable:

- (4) a. echo grameno to grama d. to grama grameno echo
 b. to grama echo grameno e. grameno echo to grama
 c. echo to grama grameno f. grameno to grama echo

As a result, it is conceivable that the pre-verbal requirement is present in MG as well but that the order in (2a) would result from scrambling or some other word order permutation after the object has become pre-verbal.

The most testable potential similarity between (2a) and (3a-c) is, then, the agreeing past participle. Is (2a), indeed, a case of object agreement? In fact, Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1989) characterize sentences not unlike (2a) as having object agreement.³ In the next section we will examine (2a) better.

III. Are we truly dealing with object agreement in MG?

In principle, there are three possible representations for (2a). I will describe all three of them before I proceed to point out their respective merits. One possibility is that the structure of (2a) is exactly that of the Perfect; this is represented in (5a). If (5a) turns out to be the right structure, (2a) will definitely be a bona fide case of object agreement. A second possibility is the one represented in (5b). According to (5b), (2a) would be a case of secondary predication, which is possible in MG, as represented below (5b). Finally, according to (5c), (2a) contains a (passive) small clause as object of HAVE. That HAVE can take small clause objects in MG is represented below (5c).

- (5) a. echo [VP grameno to grama]
 cf. echo [VP grapsi to grama]
 (I) have [VP written the letter]
 b. echo to grama [PRO_i grameno t_i]
 cf. efiye [PRO thimomenos]
 (he) left [PRO angry]

³ Since Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987) is a descriptive grammar of MG, it contains no arguments for why they draw this conclusion. I assume they do so since superficially the participle does carry appropriate features. I will argue in section III that this is not enough, though.

- c. echo [to grama_i grameno t_i]
 cf. echo [tin valitsa mu sto aftokinito]
 I have [my suitcase in the car]

So let us discuss the three structures in (5) one by one. There is good reason to believe that (5a) is not the correct representation. In (5a), the object *to grama* is represented as being Case-dependent⁴ on *grameno*, just as it is on *grapsi* in the Perfect (1e), represented below (5a). However, this Case-dependency does not exist. Consider a verb like *milao*, which assigns Genitive or Periphrastic Accusative, as represented in (6a,b) respectively.

- (6) a. milisa tu Kosta b. milisa ston Kosta
 (I) talked Kosta/GEN (I) talked Kosta/PACC
 'I talked to Kosta'

These choices of Case remain the same in the Perfect, as shown in (7), but they do not remain the same in a frame like (2a), as shown in (8):

- (7) a. echo milisi tu Kosta b. echo milisi ston Kosta
 have talked Kosta/GEN have talked Kosta/PACC
 (8) a. *echo milimenu/GEN tu Kosta/GEN
 b. *echo milimeno/ACC tu Kosta/GEN
 c. *echo milimenu/GEN sto Kosta/PACC
 d. *echo milimeno/ACC sto Kosta/PACC
 e. echo milimeno/ACC to Kosta/ACC

In (8a-d), we see that no combination containing GEN or PACC is acceptable, which means that the Case-properties of the verb on which the participle in (2a) is based are lost. (8e) is acceptable but it lacks the compositional meaning of 'Kostas has been spoken to' and instead it means something roughly like 'Kostas has been made part of the conspiracy' or 'Kostas is part of the conspiracy'. I will return to the significance of this later. For now we conclude that the object is not Case-dependent on the participle in (2a) and that instead, the participle itself and the object can only appear in the Accusative, independently of what the verb of the participle could have assigned. And since the Case-properties of (2a) are so different from that of the Perfect, we cannot conclude that (5a) is the correct representation.

What about (5b)? It appears that we have to reject (5b) as well. According to (5b), (2a) is a case of secondary predication. But a sentence containing secondary predication entails the sentence without the secondary predicate (i.e. *John left angry* entails *John left*). This means that if a sentence like (9a) has the structure in (9b), as (5b) would have it, then (9c) would be entailed:

⁴ I use the term 'Case-dependent' to avoid questions about the nature of Case and its assignment and whether it is assigned by a lexical verb or a functional projection.

- (9)a. echo dhiavasmeno ena vivlio tu Kosta
 (I) have read a book Kosta/GEN (K= possessor or author)
 b. echo ena vivlio tu Kosta [PRO_i dhiavasmeno t_i]
 c. echo ena vivlio tu Kosta

But (9c) denotes possession of one of Kostas's books and (9a) entails no such thing. In other words, (5b) makes the wrong prediction about sentences like (2a) in that it incorrectly predicts possession of the object. That this prediction is wrong can also be seen with (10-11): (10) is unacceptable because it asserts possession of an inalienably possessed item (more on this in Section V). If (11) had (10) as part of its meaning, as (5b) would predict, it should be equally unacceptable. Yet it is not:

- (10) *# echo to podhi mu (11) echo to podhi mu spasmeno/se yipso
 (I) have the leg my (I) have the leg my broken /in plaster
 'I have my leg'

This is a serious problem and we are, therefore, forced to reject (5b) as the representation of (2a). However, (5b) would have had one advantage: it would have correctly predicted a requirement for stage-level predicates as the secondary predicate. Indeed, sentences like (2a) (and in general, any predicate in the immediate object of HAVE) cannot contain individual-level predicates or predicates that are not repeatable (see de Hoop and de Swart (1990)):

- (12)a. *echo fagomeno ena milo b. echo misofagomeno ena milo
 (I) have eaten an apple (I) have half-eaten an apple

The pattern in (12) would be predicted if (5b) were the correct representation for (2a) and sentences like it since secondary predication has the very same requirement:

- (13) a. *o Kostas efige ap'to spiti [PRO psilos / ksanthos]
 *Kostas left the house [PRO tall / blond]
 b. o Kostas efige ap'to spiti [PRO thimomenos / arostos]
 Kostas left the house [PRO angry / sick]

However, I consider the problem with possession mentioned earlier sufficient to disqualify (5b). Nevertheless, we have to keep the behavior in (12) in mind because the ultimate representation for (2a) we will end up with should be able to account for it.

Finally, how does (5c) (=echo [to grama_i grameno t_i]) fare as the representation of (2a)? According to (5c), HAVE has a passive small clause complement in (2a). Nothing I can think of argues against (5c), and several points argue for it. First of all, there is the matter of Case (which disqualifies (5a)). According to (5c) *to grama* is not Case-dependent on *grameno* but on HAVE. This makes the right prediction, as HAVE always and only assigns Accusative, and recall that the object in structures like (2a)

appears in the Accusative, independently of the Case that the verb from which the participle is derived would have assigned.⁵

Moreover, (5c) does not have any problems with possession, unlike (5b), because *to grama* is not the object of HAVE. Since the object of HAVE is the entire small clause, there is no thematic relationship between HAVE and the subject of the small clause; that is, possession is not predicted by (5c).⁶

Also, (5c) correctly predicts the stage-level requirement seen earlier, but I will return to this in the last sections of the paper as it connects with some other points.

In addition, (5c) predicts the idiomatic reading of (8d). According to (5c), the meaning of *milimeno* is that of the Passive (not of the Perfect, as it was in (5a)), and the Passive of the verb *milao* has exactly the same idiomatic meaning:

- (14) o Kostas milithike
 Kostas speak/PASS/3/SING/PAST
 (roughly) 'Kostas has been made part of the conspiracy'

Finally, recall that the agreement of the participle with the object is in the nominal paradigm. If (2a) were truly verb-object agreement, it would be strange that verb-subject agreement inflected for Number and Person, while verb-object agreement inflected for Gender, Number and Case. This would be especially true within a framework like Chomsky (1993), according to which agreement is just a bundle of features, insensitive to grammatical relations like subject-of and object-of. But note that according to (5c), the relation between *to grama* and *grameno* is a subject-predicate relation and hence a subject-predicate agreement, which, when the predicate is adjectival, inflects, unsurprisingly, in the nominal paradigm:

⁵ Notice that with the movement represented in (5c) we have achieved one more similarity between MG and French, namely the requirement for preverbal placement of the object, as discussed earlier in the main text. What motivates this movement? Depending on one's theory of Case, one might accept that the object moves to receive Case from HAVE. Alternatively, if one accepts that Case is assigned by a functional projection above HAVE, then the movement indicated cannot be for reasons of Case since it does not take place to a position to which Case is assigned. Within such a framework, movement is motivated by the same factor that motivates movement of *John* in (i), something like the Extended Projection Principle or a strong NP-feature of Tense (Chomsky (1993)):

i. I expect John to have been captured by now.

⁶ HAVE in (5c) is an instance of main verb HAVE, though. This can also be seen in the equivalent English *I have the letter written*, which requires do-support in question (*Do you have the letter written?*) and requires auxiliary HAVE to form the Perfect (*I have had the letter written for a while now*).

- (15)a. echo ton yio mu arosto b. echo tin kori mu arosti
 (I) have the son my sick/M (I) have the daughter my sick/F

In other words, so far we have seen arguments in favor of (5c) being the correct representation of (2a). However, if (5c) is correct, we must conclude that cases like (2a) do not display object agreement. Notice now what has happened: we started out this discussion by trying to make MG look more like French than it does on the surface (we even achieved the preverbal requirement for participial agreement, which in both languages takes place in the nominal paradigm) but we are concluding with an even greater difference: MG lacks verb-object agreement, which in French is present in the Perfect.⁷

IV. The case of Romance

In the previous section we saw that we were unable to make MG participial agreement behave like that in French. But maybe the reverse is possible; that is, maybe participial agreement in French can be made to look like that of MG. Before we return to French, first a short digression into Spanish.

IV.1 Spanish

Spanish has two verbs HAVE: *haber*, which is used in the Perfect, and *tener*, which is used for possession among other things. And Spanish does not have participial agreement in the Perfect:

- (16)a. Eulàlia ha atado(*s) los perros
 Eulàlia has tied the dogs
- b. Eulàlia los ha atado(*s)
 Eulàlia them has tied
- c. los perros que Eulàlia ha atado(*s)
 the dogs that Eulàlia has tied

The verb HAVE that is used with the small clause complement we have been discussing so far is *tener*, not *haber* (unsurprisingly, since the verb that is used in such cases is the main verb, see fn. 6)

- (17) tengo/*he [mi maleta en el coche]
 (I) have my suitcase in the car

⁷ A point of clarification: conventionally, the term verb-object agreement is reserved for when the NP in question stands in object position. We do not use the term if an NP with an internal (object) theta-role makes it to subject position, or we would say that *John was arrested* displays verb-object agreement. It is in this same sense that (2a) lacks verb-object agreement, even though *to grama* receives the internal role of *grameno*.

When the predicate of the small clause is passive, there is subject-predicate agreement (in the nominal paradigm):

- (18) tengo [los perros atados/PL/M]
 (I) have the dogs tied

Movement (cliticization or A-bar movement) of the subject of this small clause is possible, yielding sentences like those in (19):

- (19)a. los tienes atados/PL/M b. los perros que tienes atados/PL/M
 (you) them have tied the dogs that (you) have tied

But notice that if Spanish did not have two verbs HAVE, (19a,b) would be very easily confusable with French (2a,b). In other words, were it not for the fact that Spanish uses *haber* in the Perfect, (19a,b) could be misanalyzed as displaying participial object-verb agreement (i.e. (19a,b) would be confusable with (16b,c)).

IV.2. Are we truly dealing with object agreement in French?⁸

We have seen that in MG the morphological difference between the perfect and the adjectival Passive helps us understand what case we are dealing with and it is clear that object agreement does not occur in the Perfect. In Spanish, the two verbs HAVE make it equally clear that in the Perfect there is no object agreement. But what about French? French has only one verb HAVE and the perfect participle looks the same as the adjectival passive participle (up to agreement). Is it possible, then, that French has been misanalyzed and that the cases of object agreement can be reduced to cases of subject-predicate agreement inside a passive small clause? In other words is it possible that the agreement occurs in a structure like (16), where the verb HAVE takes a passive small clause as its object?

- (16) j'ai [NP_i écrites t_j]

(In (16) the NP is in the subject of a small clause, not in the specifier of a functional projection that would trigger object agreement, like AgrOP.)

If this reduction were possible, we would gain, in addition to making French similar to MG and Spanish, the fact that agreement is in the nominal, not the verbal paradigm and we would not need to worry about

⁸ This is assuming that this type of agreement in French is real. There is a sociolinguistic issue here. Many people consider this type of agreement learned and claim that it is found only in the formal registers of educated speakers. If this is the case, then the attempt to account for it within generative grammar might be futile, since societal impositions and hypercorrections would make it impossible to determine what is part of the core and what of the periphery. See Grevisse (1964) among others for what they call 'the artificiality' of this rule of agreement. Trying to account for it within generative terms would be similar to trying to account for the appearance of 'shall' instead of 'will' with first person in English.

this large difference between subject-verb agreement and object-verb agreement. Let us consider the French paradigm again:

- (17) a. je les ai écrites c. j'ai écrit(*es) les lettres
 I them have written/F/PL I have written(*F/PL) the letters
 b. les lettres que j'ai écrites
 the letters that I have written/F/PL

One could now easily understand the requirement that the object must precede the verb for agreement to be triggered and how under this scenario the agreement in (17a,b) would come about. Agreement would not be possible in (17c) because the small clause configuration has not been met and French lacks the word order permutations of MG which would scramble the constituents after the small clause has been derived. So the first question is, does French have the required type of small clause? Indeed, it seems that it does:

- (18) a. j'ai la cervelle en compote c. il a eu les orteils ecrabouillés
 I have the brain in mush he has had the toes crushed
 b. J'ai la valise dans la voiture ⁹
 I have the suitcase in the car

Kayne (1987) has argued that auxiliary HAVE in French cannot assign Case; this is irrelevant for the present discussion because the verb HAVE in (18) is the main verb, as can be seen in (18c) from the need for an added verb HAVE.

The assumption that the agreement in French is reducible to that observed in MG and Spanish predicts the following:

- (19) a. When a participle shows agreement it cannot assign Case
 b. When a participle assigns Case it cannot show agreement

(19) is built from the assumption that the agreeing participle is basically the predicate of a passive small clause, which, in virtue of being passive, does not assign Case to its object. The non-agreeing participle is the "true" Perfect; it is still active, and therefore has Case to assign.

The generalization in (19) gets at least one important fact right, namely that agreement does not occur with indirect objects:

- (20) a. Je leur ai donné(*es) un livre
 I them have given one book
 b. Les filles auxquelles j'ai fait(*es) des cadeaux
 the girls to whom I have made presents

This would be a straight result of the fact that French does not permit passivization of indirect objects:

- (21) *Les filles sont faites des cadeaux
 The girls were made presents

⁹ Care should be taken here not to interpret this linear order as *I have the suitcase (which is) in the car*.

The requirement for passivizability is an obvious one, if the agreement we are discussing happens inside a passive small clause.

But we can gain more, because the prediction is that agreement will not happen with just any direct object, but only with those that can passivize. Consider the following sentences, where agreement does not occur even when the direct object becomes preverbal:

- (22) a. le livre m'a couté 300 francs
 the book me has cost 300 francs
 'the book has cost me 300 francs'
 b. les 300 francs que le livre m'a couté(*s)
 the 300 francs that the book me has cost
 'the 300 francs that the book has cost me'

Under the present hypothesis, the lack of agreement in (22b) would simply be the result of the non-passivizability of the object of *coûter*:

- (23) *les 300 francs sont coutés
 the 300 francs are cost

Kayne discusses the absence of agreement in (24a), which for us would again be due to the impossibility of passivizing the object:

- (24) a. les chaises qu' il m' ont fallu(*es)
 the chairs that it_{expl} me have needed
 'the chairs that I have needed'
 b. *Les chaises sont fallu(es)

So far so good then. But now let's look at some problems. If agreement were derived through the small clause, then agreement should be optional, since the small clause structure is optional. Extraction could come either from (25a), where it would co-occur with agreement, or from (25b), without any agreement:

- (25) a. NP_i... avoir [SC t_i PASS PRED] b. NP_i... avoir V_{perf} t_i
 However, agreement does not appear to be optional (although see fn. 8). A further problem arises when we ask about the meaning of the agreeing forms. If they were derived from the passive small clause, as in (25a), they would always be stative in meaning; if they were derived from (25b), they could refer to a change of state. It turns out that the meaning of all the sentences with participial agreement is that of the active, change-of-state denoting Perfect. In other words, the meaning of sentences like (17a,b) is only compatible with the derivation in (25b), never that in (25a). Now this is obviously an obstacle to the attempt to make French look like MG and Spanish, but, equally importantly, it is mysterious for another reason. Passive small clauses below HAVE in French are possible, as we saw earlier, and they have the expected stative reading. One would then expect that extraction of the small clause subject either through A-bar movement or through cliticization should derive the order in (27), just like cliticization and A-bar movement derives (26b,c) from (26a):

- (26)a. J'ai [la valise dans la voiture]
 I have the suitcase in the car
 b. Je l'ai dans la voiture
 I it-have in the car
 c. la valise que j'ai dans la voiture
 the suitcase that I have in the car
- (27)a. J'ai [la voiture garée devant la maison] (=18c)
 b. *Je l'i' ai [t_i garée devant la maison]
 c. *La voiture que j'ai [t_i garée devant la maison]

But (27b,c) are not acceptable. Given the possibility of (27a), one would expect the linear orders *Je l'ai garée devant la maison* and *La voiture que j'ai garée devant la maison* to be ambiguous between the structures represented in (27b,c) and the Perfect. But they are not. This means that, for some reason, when the small clause below HAVE is passive, the subject is not extractable in French.

In other words, participial object agreement in French is not reducible to the cases discussed in MG. What could set French apart from MG and Spanish? Unlike French, MG and Spanish are both pro-drop languages, they don't have auxiliary selection, and they permit extraction of the passive small-clause subject below HAVE. Most likely, the latter two differences will prove crucial for the question of participial agreement but I leave that for some other occasion. What is relevant for our present purposes is that we failed to make MG look like French and we failed to make French look like MG with respect to the isomorphism found in the Perfect and the Passive. In other words, we failed to find a part of MG grammar where this otherwise wide-spread isomorphism shows up. I conclude, then, that MG lacks this isomorphism (see fn 1 for what the Perfect is morphologically related to).

V. The Promissory Note about HAVE and Stage-level Predicates

In section III we saw that there is a requirement for the predicate in (2a) to behave like a repeatable Stage-level predicate. In this section I will show that this is not just a characteristic of sentences like (1a) but of the complement of HAVE in general. This will have a double purpose: on the one hand it will finish up what was left undone in section III; on the other hand, it will be of significance for the larger question of the deconstruction approach to HAVE. This is because HAVE is supposed to have in common with BE (in *there is...*) a constraint against definites. The sameness of the constraint would be predicted and explained given that HAVE "contains" BE. But we will see that the picture is not that simple. What, in fact, happens, is that HAVE behaves as if it wants a variable in its complement, but that variable does not need to come from an indefinite NP, it can come from the predicate. In other words, the complement of HAVE behaves like *when*-clauses in the discussion of Kratzer (1989) and others in that it must

contain an indefinite or a Stage-level predicate. This behavior is different from that of the *there is*-construction, since there the NP must be indefinite always.

First of all, if there is a small clause below HAVE, the predicate must be Stage-level:

- (31)a. echo tin valitsa mu / mia valitsa sto aftokinito/ *prasini
 (I) have the suitcase-my / a suitcase in the car / green
 b. echo to pedhi mu arosto / *kondo
 (I) have the child my sick / short
 c. echo to pedhi mu enxirismeno / *peritomimeno¹⁰
 (I) have the child my operated (on) / circumcised

There are several languages (among them French, Dutch and MG, though not English) that use HAVE with nouns like those in (33) to convey the meaning of *to be tired*, *to be thirsty*, etc. There is an overwhelming tendency to use Stage-level predicates this way, but Individual-level predicates like those in (34) are not used, e.g. *to have nastiness* is not used for *to be nasty*.

(33) to have cold, fatigue, hunger, fear, thirst, etc.

(34) *to have nastiness, shortness, etc

This tendency is of course not telling in itself but it is consistent with the preference of HAVE for Stage-level predicates seen earlier.

When HAVE takes only an NP object, the latter cannot be definite, according to the work of Jacqueline Gueron, Anna Szabolcsi and others. For example, (35a) can mean that I am a car-owner but (35b) does not mean that I am the owner of a some specific car that has been under discussion (I will return shortly to what (35b) does mean):

- (35)a. echo aftokinito b. echo to aftokinito
 I have (a) car I have the car

It is not just morphologically definites that cannot appear as objects of HAVE. The requirement is against all strong determiners (in the sense of Milsark (1974) and others following him for *there is...*) and specific NPs like pronouns. This requirement is not imposed by the semantics of "owning" but is a property of HAVE on its possessive use:

- (36)a. Do you see all the antiques in this room? I own/*have most of them
 b. That's a nice car you're driving. Do you own/*have it?

¹⁰ Many thanks to Anna Szabolcsi for this example. It is meant to show the difference in acceptability between a repeatable and a non-repeatable predicate, along the lines of de Hoop and de Swart (1990). The sentence becomes good again if 'circumcised' is taken to mean something like 'just operated on with the relevant surgical procedure', which, of course is temporary.

So far we have seen that if HAVE takes a small clause, the predicate must be a repeatable Stage-level predicate and the subject of the small clause can be indefinite or definite, as can be seen in (31a). We also said on the basis of (35) that when HAVE takes just an NP object the latter must be indefinite. But this is not strictly speaking true because (35b) is not ungrammatical, it just lacks the possessive reading. To rephrase, then, *possessive* HAVE needs its NP object to be indefinite. The meaning of (35b) is something like "I have the car in my temporary custody". I will call this *custodial* HAVE and argue that this reading results from the need of HAVE to find a variable in its complement. Since HAVE cannot find a variable in *the car*, HAVE makes use of its ability to take a small clause complement and "finds" a variable in the predicate of a small clause. I will call this unpronounced Stage-level predicate 'TEMP/LOC' to indicate that it has temporal and locative properties. These properties are anaphoric to other elements in the sentences, as shown in (38).

(37) echo [to aftokinito TEMP/LOC]
I have [the car TEMP/LOC]

(38) chthes_i o Kostas_j iche_i [to aftokinito TEMP_i /LOC_j]
yesterday_i Kostas_j had [the car TEMP_i /LOC_j]

The TEMP/LOC interpretation is, of course, also available with indefinites:

(39) (chthes) o Kostas iche aftokinito (ke yi'afto irthe ke mas idhe)
(yesterday) Kostas had (a) car (and that's why he came and saw us)

But with definite NPs, TEMP/LOC is obligatory because it is the only way for HAVE to find a variable in its complement. The picture is, then, as follows with the Stage-level predicate in (40a) being sometimes phonologically covert (TEMP/LOC):

(40)a. echo /have [NP_{def/indef} Stage-level Pred] (custodial)
b. echo /have NP_{indef} (possessive)

(40) is not meant to indicate that there are two HAVES but that HAVE can take a small clause or an NP object and that it must find a variable in its complement. The meaning of possession is possible only with an indefinite NP, which can be the object of HAVE by itself, since it can contribute a variable. When an NP is definite, (40a) gets "triggered". But this means that the NP ceases to be the object of HAVE and thereby the meaning of possession of that object becomes unavailable.¹¹ I have been using examples from MG and English in this section, which means that (40) holds for both languages and probably for more.

Let us now return to the larger question of the deconstruction approach to HAVE. As mentioned, one of the arguments in favor of this

¹¹ There are quite a few other verbs that have an option between an NP object or a small clause object with a slight difference in meaning, eg *believe*. The difference with HAVE is that the choice of subcategorization frame is partly driven partly by the (in)definiteness of the NP below it.

position is that the complement of HAVE shows a similar behavior to that of BE in *there is ...*, namely the restriction against definites. However, we have seen that there is an important behavioral difference as well, one that makes the complement below HAVE behave more like a *when*-clause. This is the possibility of the existence of a definite NP as long as the predicate is Stage-level. Such a possibility does not exist for the *there is* construction where the NP cannot be definite at all¹², that is, the existence of a Stage-level predicate does not create the possibility for a definite NP, unlike in *when*-clauses and below HAVE.¹³

The complement below HAVE shows also one difference from *when*-clauses. Kratzer (1989) shows that if the predicate contained in a *when*-clause is definite, the sentence can be saved by an indefinite NP. This is not possible below HAVE, where, if there is a predicate, it must be Stage-level. Possibly this is due to an NP in a small clause being contained inside the predicate and therefore less visible to binding than the subject of an IP, which is higher. But I do not have space to go into this here. And unfortunately, I do not have space to go into the more important question of why HAVE needs a variable in its complement, that is, into the question of the nature and origin of the operator that needs a variable. What is relevant for present purposes is that the semantic behavior of HAVE is not straightforwardly reducible to that of BE in the *there is* construction (see fn 13 for an additional difference) and that we have to therefore be careful before we use the similarities of their semantic behavior as an argument in favor of the deconstruction approach to HAVE.

Appendix:

There is another argument that has been used lightly in favor of deriving HAVE from BE. It is often said that the approach of Kayne (1989), according to which both main and auxiliary HAVE are derived from BE argues for synchronic syntax what Benveniste (1966) argued for diachronic linguistics. And the belief that HAVE is diachronically derived from BE would lend support for the synchronic derivation of HAVE from BE. However, Benveniste wrote that HAVE replaced BE+P in possessive constructions, not that BE+P developed into or was reanalyzed as HAVE. In fact, in many languages possessive HAVE developed from a bleached form of the verb that meant 'carry' or 'hold'. Auxiliary HAVE, at least in

¹² Again, "definite" should not be taken morphologically. There are also known exceptions to this rule. What is relevant is probably discourse-oldness, as in Prince (1981) and others.

¹³ Another difference between *there is* and HAVE can be seen in (36a): this sentence becomes good on the reading where *them* refers to types rather than the specific tokens at hand. This would give the reading *I own tokens of most of these types*. This token/type switch does not save a sentence like **there are most of them in my neighborhood store as well*.

Romance, developed from a construction like (5c), that is, from a small clause below main HAVE (see Vincent (1982) and references therein). Latin used to have a non-periphrastic Perfect and a sentence like (1):

(A1) in ea provincia pecunias magnas collocatas habent
 in that province capital great invested they-have

meant 'they have great capital invested in that province'. But later such constructions became reanalyzed as a periphrastic Perfect and (1) would have come to mean 'they have invested great capital in the province'. In these languages, then, auxiliary HAVE developed from main HAVE, which in turn came from a verb that meant 'carry' or 'hold'. In other words, there is no evidence that HAVE developed historically from BE.

REFERENCES

- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. 'A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory' In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, K. Hale and S.J. Keyser, eds., Cambridge, Mass, MIT
- de Hoop, Hellen and H. de Swart. 1990. 'Indefinite Objects' in *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 1990, R. Bok Bennis and P. Coopmans, eds, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Joseph, Brian. and Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 1987. *Modern Greek* Croom Helm, London
- Kayne, Richard. 1989. 'Facets of Romance Past Participle Agreement' *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar* P. Beninca ed. Foris, Dordrecht
- Kayne, Richard. 1993. 'Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection' *Studia Linguistica* 47
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1989. 'Stage-level and Individual-level Predicates' UMass/Amherst ms.
- Prince, Ellen. F. 1992. The ZPG letter: subjects, definiteness, and information status. *Discourse Description: Diverse Analyses of a Fundraising Text* Sandra Thompson and William Mann eds, John Benjamins, Amsterdam
- Vincent, Nigel. 1982. 'The Development of the Auxiliaries HABERE and ESSE in Romance', *Studies in the Romance Verb* Nigel Vincent and Martin Harris eds, Croom Helm, London