Have Constructions and Expressions of Experience

MORI Yumiko

1. Introduction

It is well known that English verb have has various meanings. On the basis of the Ritter and Rosen’s (1997) classification of have and Nakau’s (1991) definition of the experience have in Chapter 2, we will consider the interpretations of have constructions. In Chapter 3, we will compare English have constructions with the German counterparts. In Chapter 4, to discuss the relation of have constructions and expressions of experience from historical perspectives, we will observe expressions of experience in the period of Old and Middle English. In those times, dative case plays an important role in expressing an experiencer. According to Nakao and Koma(1990), because of the leveling of case suffixes, the difference between dative and accusative cases disappeared in the period of Middle English. In Modern English, an experiencer can be expressed as a subject (nominative case) in have constructions.

Have can take NP complements and clausal complements. We pay attention to the postverbal element in have constructions. In English, causative have, experiencer have and locational have take clausal complements. Nominal event have, experiencer have, inalienable and alienable possession have take NP complements. Only experiencer have can take both NP and clausal complements. In German, the experiencer is expressed in a dative case. German uses haben (have) only in a situations in which a body condition of the experiencer is expressed. In such situations, haben (have) takes NP complements. We hypothesize that the disappearance of expressions of experience with dative case was compensated for by the ‘have + clause’ construction.

2. Have constructions and experience

2.1 Ritter and Rosen (1997)

Ritter and Rosen (1997) list a variety of interpretations for have in English, as in (1). They
hypothesize that there is only one verb *have*.

(1) a. John had the students read three articles.  
   Causative
b. John has a party.  
   Nominal event
c. John had his car stolen.  
   Experiencer
d. The table has a hat on it.  
   Locational
e. John has a sister.  
   Inalienable possession
f. John has a new car.  
   Alienable possession
g. John has read the NYT.  
   Auxiliary

Ritter and Rosen state that the difference in interpretation of the subject between location/possession *have* and experiencer *have* has to do with the nature of the predicate. In the case of experiencer *have*, the predicate denotes an event rather than an entity. They suggest that a non-eventive relation between a subject and an event is an experience. In Ritter and Rosen’s analysis, the specific meaning of *have* is determined post-lexically by nature of the syntactic relation it sets up. Ritter and Rosen sum up as follows. When *have* constitutes an event structure, the subject of *have* initiates the event, and therefore gets a causier interpretation. Otherwise, there is no event structure to provide a role (and interpretation) for the subject of *have*, which must then get an interpretation by some other means. They claim that while *have* lacks lexically specified semantics, it does acquire an interpretation from the syntax, more specifically, from the relation between the subject and the predicate.

2.2 Nakau (1991)

Let us consider one of the interpretations for *have* constructions, the experiencer *have*, on the basis of Nakau (1991). Nakau (1991) focuses on the specific form of *have* constructions exemplified in (2).

(2) a. The table has a map on it.
   b. Mary had smoke in her eyes.

He argues that this type of construction has a complement as an object, and this complement has a structure of small clause. The structure of the sentences in (2) is shown as in (3).
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(3) \([\text{n} \text{NP} \text{v} \text{have} \text{n} \text{NP} \text{PP}]\)

Nakau analyzes this type of *have* constructions as having a complex sentence structure in a syntactic term, and as having a meaning of experience in a semantic term. With the NP-PP structure as an object, this construction has two subclasses shown in (4).

(4) a. My trousers had [grass on them].
    b. I had [grass on my trousers]

The difference between (4a) and (4b) is that the whole object in the PP is coreferential to the subject in (4a). On the other hand, only its part (possessive case) is coreferential in (4b). In (4a), the object of the PP and the subject are coreferential, but the former does not have a reflexive form. Typically, a reflective form is required in the same clause. The sentence (4a) includes a complex sentence, and the two elements *my trouser* and *them* are in different clauses, hence the non-reflexive form of the latter.

*Have* constructions also have a different type of complement from the [NP-PP] type, as in the following.

(5) a. Martin had [a child sick (in bed)].
    b. The cupboard had [its door left open].
    c. We have [someone stealing eggs (from us)].
    d. John had [an extraordinary thing happen to him].

There are some points common to (4) and (5) as follows: 1) There is no finite tense in the complement small clause, 2) There is a subject-predicate relation in the complement small clause. As for the predicate, the sentences (4) involve a PP, while the sentences (5) involve adjective, past participle, present participle, and bare-infinitive phrases. All of these clauses are regarded as “small clauses”. Thus, he concludes that *have* in (4) and (5) is one and the same *have*.

From the viewpoint of semantics, *have* in the sentences (2) is not the possession *have*. We can replace the possession *have* with the verb “possess” or “own”. But that is not possible in the type of the sentence (2). Let us consider the following examples:
(6) a. Beth has/possesses/owns the doll.
    b. This machine has/possesses no moving parts.

(7) a. John has/possesses dirt all over his coat.
    b. The table has/possesses a book on it.

While *have* in (6) means possession, the sentences (7) show that this type of *have* do not mean possession. Moreover, this type of *have* constructions only has a partial similarity to *there* existential sentences. *There* existential sentences literally indicate someone or something’s existence, but this type of *have* constructions shows the subject’s experience. The sentences in (8) might be regarded as “equivalent” sentences, because each sentence shows a situation that some dirt is on John’s jacket.

(8) a. There was some dirt on John’s jacket.
    b. John’s jacket had some dirt on it.
    c. John had some dirt on his jacket.

However, such a view is not adequate. *There* existential sentences like (8a) show the relation of position between dirt and John’s jacket. On the other hand, *have* constructions like (8b) and (8c) include more than that meaning. The part of small clause includes the relation of position between dirt and John’s jacket. Being based on this, *have* gives the subject argument another semantic relation. For example, the sentence (8c) means that John is involved in the situation that dirt is on his own jacket, whether he likes it or not. As a consequence, Nakau defines *experience* as follows:

(9) "Experience" is involvement of a subject in a certain state without intention.

While *have* constructions include the meaning that someone/something experiences some situation, there existential sentences represent only the part of the situations. In *have* constructions with a small clause, the experiencer is shown as the subject and the situation is expressed as the small clause. In the definition of Nakau (1991), the part of *without intention* is a semantic and pragmatic requirement.

The relation between an experiencer and a situation is determined by linguistic and extralinguistic context. Let us compare the sentences in (10a-d).
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(10) a. Janei had [dirt on her / Paul’s shoes].
    b. The cupboard had [its door left open].
    c. Right now this toilet has [five people using it].
    d. Martin had [a child sick in bed].

In (10a-c), there is a coreferential element to the subject in the complement small clause. The relation between the experiencer and the situation is met by this coreferrality. However, the relation in (10d) is decided only pragmatically. Anyway, if there is no inherent relation, the condition on experience is not met.

If there is only one have, it would be possible to use haben (have) in German just like in English.

3. Comparison with German counterparts

We try to compare English have constructions with the German counterparts. The sentences (1a-f) are translated into German. Sentences (a) are English have constructions, and sentences (b) are the German counterparts. In this paper we do not examine auxiliary have.

3.1 Causative have

(11) a. John had the students read three articles. ( = 1a )
    b. John ließ die Studenten drei Artikel lesen.

John let(PAST) the students three articles read

Only English uses have to show causative situations, as in (11a). German use causative verbs. German ließ (lassen) in (11b) means let (PAST). German shows causative situations with causative verbs, while English have constructions are ambiguous because (11a) can mean causative and experience.

3.2 Nominal event have

(12) a. John has a party. ( = 1b )
    b. John hat eine Party.

John has a party
Both languages use *have* (haben) to show a nominal event. Ritter and Rosen use the term nominal event *have* and distinguish it from the experiencer *have* in that the subject of the former *have* represents a volitional participant, while the subject of experiencer *have* is regarded as a non-intentional participant.

3.3 Experiencer *have*

(13) a. John had his car stolen. ( = 1c )
    b. John wurde das Auto gestohlen.

    John-DAT become the car-NOM stolen

The sentence(13a) is ambiguous. It can be interpreted as experience and causative. In this sentence the experiencer is expressed in a dative case.

(14) a. John has a headache.
    b. i ) John hat Kopfschmerzen.

    John has headache

    ii ) Der Kopf schmerzt John.

    The head-NOM hurts John-DAT

German has two expressions in (14), and one of these uses *haben* (have). The sentence(14b. i ) is almost the same as (14a). In (14b. ii ) the experiencer is expressed in a dative case, and the subject of this sentence is the head (der Kopf), not his head. There is no possessor element in (14b. ii ), but the head is interpreted as John ‘s head. The sentences(14) tell us that in German, a dative case does not co-occur with the verb *haben* (have). As a consequence, the experiencer is expressed in a dative case or as the subject of *have* construction.

3.4 Locational *have*

(15) a. The table has a hat on it. ( =1d )
    b. i ) Es gibt einen Hut auf dem Tisch.

    It gives a hat on the table
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( = There is a hat on the table )

ii) Auf dem Tisch ist ein Hut.
   
   On the table is a hat

iii) Es gibt einen Hut auf Johns Kopf.
   
   It gives a hat on John’s head
   
   (= There is a hat on John’s head)

(16) a. John has a hat on his head.

   b. i) John hat einen Hut auf dem Kopf.
   
   John has a hat on the head

   
   John wears a hat on the head (anhaben=wear)

The sentences (16) show a situation in which people put on something. The sentences (15) and (16) show a situation in which something exists somewhere temporarily. Ritter and Rosen consider that the locational use of have always includes a locational PP. The complement of this phrase refers back to the subject. German expresses these situations with there existential sentences, like (15b. i ) and (15b. iii ). Moreover, as shown in (16b. i ), German has expressions with haben (have). Of course English also has expressions with there existential sentences. The word hat in the sentence (16b. ii ) is a part of the verb anhaben, which is a separable verb.

3.5 Inalienable possession have

(17) a. John has a sister. \hspace{1cm} ( = 1e )

   b. John hat eine Schwester.
   
   John has a sister

As for expression of inalienable possession, the two languages have the same form ‘have + NP ’, as in (17).

3.6 Alienable possession have
(18) a. John has a new car. ( = If )
   b. John hat ein neues Auto.

John has a new car.

Similar to inalienable possession, expressions of alienable possession are common to the two languages. The form is ‘have + NP’, as in (18). There are no syntactic differences between inalienable possession and alienable possession.

Given these observations, German haben (have) is not used in some situations. In German, haben (have) is not used to express situations of causative have. As for situation of experience, German uses haben (have) only in a situation in which a body condition of the experiencer is expressed. In a situation in which the experiencer is involved in someone else or something, German cannot use haben (have). The experiencer is expressed in a dative case in such situations. In locational have constructions, the animacy restriction occurs in German. We represent these facts as Table 1.

Table 1: The distribution of have constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>interpretation</th>
<th>language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative have</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal event have</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencer have</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locational have</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inalienable have</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienable have</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ : exist   − : not exist   +/− : exist depending on situations

In German, experiencer have and locational have exist depending on situations. We pay attention to the postverbal elements in have constructions to consider the situations.
(19) English
   a. John had the students read three articles.
      [clause] Causative
   b. John has a party.
      [NP] Nominal event
   c. John had his car stolen
      [clause] Experiencer
   d. John has a headache.
      [NP] Experiencer
   e. The table has a hat on it.
      [clause] Locational
   f. John has a hat on his head.
      [clause] Locational
   g. John has a sister.
      [NP] Inalienable possession
   h. John has a new car.
      [NP] Alienable possession

(20) German
   a. John hat eine Party.
      [NP] Nominal event
   b. John hat Kopfschmerzen.
      [NP] Experiencer
      [clause] Locational
   d. John hat eine Schwester.
      [NP] Inalienable possession
   e. John hat ein neues Auto.
      [NP] Alienable possession
We represent these facts as Table 2.

Table 2: Postverbal elements in have constructions: ’NP’ or ’clause’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>interpretation</th>
<th>language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative have</td>
<td>clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal event have</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencer have</td>
<td>NP/clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locational have</td>
<td>clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inalienable have</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienable have</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

− : have constructions do not exist

From the comparison between English have constructions and the German counterparts, we conclude:

1) In English, experiencer have can take not only NP complements but also clausal complements.
2) As for experiencer have, German haben (have) can take only NP complements.
3) In German, dative case does not co-occur with the verb haben (have).

The observed facts showed that English has some usages of have that are impossible with German haben. That is, as for experiencer have, English has the form ’have + clause’, while German does not.

In the period of Old and Middle English, dative case plays an important role in expressing an experiencer. In Modern English the experience can be expressed as a subject in have constructions. We focus on the expressions of experience in next chapter.

4. The Property of Dative Case and Experiencer Expressions

In this chapter, we turn to expressions of experience in the period of Old and Middle English. Then we observe have constructions in Modern English. As for the history of English, we refer to the time period as follows:
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(21) Old English 450-1150
   Pre-Old English 450-700
   Early Old English 700-900
   Late Old English 900-1150

   Middle English 1150-1500
   Early Middle English 1150-1300
   Late Middle English 1300-1500

   Modern English 1500-
   Early Modern English 1500-1700
   Present-day English 1700-

   (Nakao 1979 : 2)

4.1 Old English

There are four cases in Old English: nominative, accusative, dative, and genitive cases. Nominative case is used as a subject, and accusative case is mainly used as a direct object of verbs. Genitive case shows the relations of possession or belonging, and has the same function as possessive case in Modern English. There are many kinds of dative case in Old English. Kondo and Fujiwara (1993) show some of them, such as "dative of interest" , "possessive dative" , "adverbial dative" and "dative absolute" . "Dative of interest" is a case that shows persons or things that have interest or harm. In Old English this type of dative case are used frequently. "Possessive dative" is in the position of possessors, who possess the referent of other nouns (especially, a body part) in the sentence. "Adverbial dative" shows the time or location. When it shows location, it is usually with a preposition. "Dative absolute" is made to imitate "ablative absolute" in Latin, and is used to show the relation of subject and predicate. Then, how are the four cases determined in Old English? According to Nakao and Koma (1990), nominative and accusative cases are determined by sentence structures, and dative and genitive cases are determined by basic elements like verbs and adjectives that constitute the structure. Nominative and accusative cases are structural cases, while dative and genitive cases are abstract cases. The abstract cases, which are given to noun phrases, relate closely to the semantic roles, which are given by verbs, adjectives and prepositions. Verbs and adjectives give the dative noun phrase the semantic role 'goal' . In particular, the dative object which is given by some particular verbs means an experiencer.
As for verbs and adjectives, dative case is a case that relates with the semantic role ‘goal’. However, as for prepositions, all the prepositions have abilities to give dative case. Thus, dative cases are governed by various factors. Dative case seems to express “participation” in Modern German and Old English. Brunner (1973) states that dative case used to be a case of participation in Indo-European languages, and now is in German, and the same is the case in Old English, too. The statements about dative case tell us that in Old English, 1) Some noun phrases which are given dative case by the verbs show the experience, 2) A person or thing that has interest or harm in some actions is expressed in a dative case. In Old English, the experiencer is mainly shown with dative case, and it seems that experience is expressed in impersonal constructions.

According to Nakao (1979), the subject it rarely appears until the late period of Old English, and accusative or dative objects occupy the position prior to the verb. Bare infinitives or that clauses often follow the verb. Impersonal constructions in Old English express the semantic subject with dative or accusative objects. Nakao and Koma state that though it appears with that clauses and to infinitives, it rarely co-occurs with an experiencer in a dative case. According to Nakao and Koma (1990), the object of impersonal constructions is divided into two types: experiencer and cause. The former is expressed by a dative or accusative phrase, and the latter is by an accusative, genitive, or prepositional phrase. Some examples of impersonal constructions are given in (22).

(22) Constructions with objects

| a. hine nälnes þinges ne lyste onpresse worulde |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| he-ACC nothing-GEN thing not/no like in this life |

(=he likes nothing in this life) (Bo 102:9)

| b. him hingrode |
|---|---|
| he-DAT was hungry |

(=he was hungry) (ELChom 166) [OED s.v. hunger1]

| c. him gelicade hire þéawas |
|---|---|---|
| he-DAT pleased their customs-ACC |

(=he was pleased with their customs) (ASCD 201/32)

(Nakao and Koma 1990: 152)
Impersonal constructions have the meaning that the experiencer is involved indirectly in the situation that the verb represents, whether he or she likes it or not. Moreover, many of impersonal verbs appear in personal constructions. In personal constructions, experiencer and cause appear as subjects as in (23).

(23) a. hyngerde hē
    hungered he-NOM
    (= he hungered \textit{Lindisfarne Gospels Mk.225})

b. him ealle pincg gelumpon
    he-DAT all things befell
    (= all things befell him \textit{ÆLS XII 104})

(Nakao and Koma 1990: 152-153)

Example (23a) is an instance in which the experiencer is the subject, and in (23b) the cause is the subject. While accusative case phrases express experiencer and cause, dative case phrases express only experiencers. Expressing the experiencer with dative case shows that the experiencer is a non-intentional participant.

4.2 Middle English

In Middle English the situations of the cases and constructions change. A statement about the leveling of inflections is found in Brunner (1973). In Old English the distinction of nominative and accusative inflections was abandoned, and in the early period of Middle English the distinction of accusative and dative inflections disappeared. According to Nakao and Koma (1990), in Middle English, due to the leveling of case suffixes, the difference between dative and accusative cases disappeared, and the case that is given to the object noun phrase became only one objective case. At that time, as for pronouns in the form of the third person singular, dative case expelled accusative case. On the other hand, as for the form of neuter gender singular, dative case disappeared and accusative case remained as an objective case. Genitive case also disappeared at this time. Thus, abstract cases in Old English, dative and genitive cases, got almost extinct. Therefore adjectives, which can give only abstract cases in Old English, lost the ability to give cases around the 13th and 14th centuries. For this reason, sentences like (24a) begin to disappear in Middle English, and sentences like (24b), which use prepositional phrases, come to be dominant.
(24) a. þeah hit ham cyngę ungewill were
     though it the king displeasing would be
     [DAT]
     (= though it was displeasing to the king)(ASC E 233/32)
     (Nakao and Koma 1990:20)

b. Hē is to frecōnde gōd
    he-NOM is to friend good
    (=He is good to friend) (Julianna 102)
    (Nako and Koma 1990:24)

Nakao (1979) states that the morphological distinction of dative and accusative was lost from the late period of Old English, and dative and accusative cases were merged into object case. Dative case is replaced by ‘to + noun’ or ‘to + pronoun’ phrases from the late period of Middle English. Possessive dative existed still in Early Middle English, but disappeared after then. Nakajima (1979) states that suffixes are not pronounced during Middle English, and dative and accusative cases are mixed. Because there are many verbs which govern accusative case objects, the mixed cases are regarded as direct objects. As for the cases, which keep the feeling of dative case, they began to be used with preposition to.

Then, let us consider the sentences (25).

(25) a. John were given four books.
     [DAT]

b. John was given four books.
    [NOM]

*John* in (25a) is in a dative case, and *John* in (25b) is in a nominative case. Both of these sentences show the same situation. John had the experience that someone gave him four books. According to Nakajima (1979), the dative case in sentences like (25a) has changed to nominative cases because of the word order that dative case is at the head of sentence. Thus, we suppose, due to dative extinction and the word order, John-DAT changes John-NOM in Middle English.
4.3 Modern English

Dative case plays an important role in showing experiencers in Old and Middle English. How is the experiencer expressed in Modern English? Jespersen(1960) states that "we may place have in a special sense, nearly = ‘experience’", and we can assume that the experiencer can be expressed as a subject (nominative case) in have constructions. In a lot of previous studies, examples of experiencer have are examined. Let us consider the typical examples of experiencer have, as follows:

(26) a. John had his car stolen. ( = 1c) 
b. John had a headache. ( =14a) 
c. Mary had smoke in her eyes. ( = 2b) 
d. I had glass on my trousers. ( = 4b) 
e. Martin had a child sick (in bed). ( = 5a)

We pay attention to the postverbal element in have constructions in (26). Experiencer have takes ‘NP’ or ‘clause’ as shown in (27).

(27) a. John had his car stolen. ( = 1c) 
   [clause] 
   b. John had a headache. ( =14a) 
      [NP] 
      c. Mary had smoke in her eyes. ( = 2b) 
         [clause] 
         d. I had glass on my trousers. ( = 4b) 
            [clause] 
            e. Martin had a child sick (in bed). ( = 5a) 
               [clause]

The sentences (27) tell us that experiencer have has two forms: ‘have + NP’ and ‘have + clause’. The sentences with the form ‘have + NP’ in (27) express the body condition of the experiencer. The direct causes of these conditions are in the experiencer’s body. On the other hand, the sentences with the form ‘have + clause’ in (27) presuppose the existence of a participant other than the experiencer. The causes of the situation are the other participant (person or thing). As Nakau
(1991) states, the part of small clause expresses the situation in which the experiencer is involved.

Until here, we have observed that expressions of experience in English have changed from impersonal constructions with dative case to personal constructions to *have* constructions. Then, we have a question whether experience was not shown with have constructions in Old English. According to Hayase(2002), the original meaning of *have* is divided into three large groups: 1)GRASP 2)POSSESS THE RELATION 3)TO BE POSSESSED OR AFFECTED WITH (Oxford English Dictionary(OED)) Notice that Group 3) includes the meaning of experience. In OED, there are some examples belonging to Group 3). Three of them are cited in (28)-(30).

(28) Swa fela swa untrumnessa, & unclaene gastas hæfden.
As much as illness unclean spirit had
(c1000 Ags.Gosp.Mark iii. 2)

(29) Swilche pine ic habbe.
Such pain(s) I-NOM have
(c1175 Lamb.Hom.35)

(30) When Pou sese any haue hunger or calde.
When you-NOM any have hunger or cold
(c1300 Cursor M. 28904)

These examples show that expressions of experience with *have* existed in Old English, too. Syntactically, (29) and (30) show that the experiencer appears in nominative case, and that there is a form ‘*have* + NP’ for experience. In Modern English, there are two forms for experience: ‘*have* + NP’ and ‘*have* + clause’, as we observed just above. When does the form ‘*have* + clause’ appear? Visser(1973) states that in “THE VERB + OBJECT / (PASSIVE) SUBJECT + PAST PARTICLE Pattern = THE VOSP the meaning of have resembles that of *to experience* in some cases, and that of *to cause* in other cases.” The oldest examples which Visser gives is the sentence in c1250, the period of Early Middle English.

We summarize of the historical facts we have observed. Expressions of experience with the form ‘*have* + NP’ have been existed since Old English. In OED, the oldest example of this is found in c1000. Due to the leveling of case suffixes around the 13th and 14th centuries, dative case begins to
disappear in the period of Middle English, and as a consequence, expressions of experience with dative case disappear. Impersonal constructions almost disappear around the 14th century. The form ‘have + clause’ appears in c 1250. We represent these facts as Figure 1.

Figure 1: The historical facts

1. an example of the have construction that means experience and has an NP object (the sentence (26) in this paper)
2. the oldest example of the ‘have + clause’ construction that Visser gives
3. the leveling of case suffixes and inflections
4. the disappearance of impersonal constructions

Thus, from the history of English we suppose that there is a certain relation between the leveling of case suffixes and the appearance of the form ‘have + clause’. The two phenomena happen at a close time in the period of Middle English. English has had expressions of experience in the ‘have + NP’ form since Old English and adds experienter expressions in the ‘have + clause’ construction in Middle English. Our assumption is that impersonal constructions with dative case that prevail in Old English and denote situations of experience get extinct because of the leveling of case suffixes and are replaced by have constructions in the form of ‘have + clause’ in the period of Middle English. In other words, the disappearance of impersonal constructions with dative case is compensated for by the ‘have + clause’ construction. The two constructions are alike in that they can represent situations of experience.

5. Conclusion

We compared English have constructions with the German counterparts. English has some usages of have that are impossible with German haben. As for experiencer have, English have can take
not only NP complements but also clausal complements. While German *haben* (have) can take only NP complements, German uses *haben* (have) only in a situation in which a body condition of the experiencer is expressed. German can not use *haben* (have) in which the experiencer is involved in something. The experiencer is expressed in a dative case in such situations.

In Modern English, the difference between dative and accusative cases disappeared. We turned to expressions of experience in the period of Old and Middle English. Old English has a property that inflecteds play a grammatically important role, and Middle English is characterized as a period in which functional inflections are leveled to non-functional inflections. In those times, a dative case is used to show an experiencer and has an important role. Expressions of experience with the form ‘*have* + NP’ have been existed since Old English. The difference between dative and accusative cases disappear due to the leveling of case suffixes around the 13th and 14th centuries. The form ‘*have* + clause’ appears in the period of Middle English. The observed facts showed that the two phenomena happened at a close time.

Only in English, the experiencer is expressed in the form of ‘*have* + clause’ in have constructions. German can use dative case, and German does not have the form ‘*have* + clause’ as for the experiencer. Thus, we conclude that the disappearance of expressions of experience with dative case was compensated for by the ‘*have* + clause’ construction.
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