

# English presentative sentences with *have*

Gabriela Brůhová, Markéta Malá (Prague)

## ABSTRACT

The paper explores the potential of English sentences with the verb *have* to constitute the Presentation Scale. *Have*-presentative sentences, in which the verb is devoid of its possessive meaning, can be viewed as an alternative to the “full presentative” *there*-constructions. Both constructions contain an indefinite noun phrase presenting new information, and they share the communicative function of introducing a new referent into discourse, cf. *We have a long trip ahead of us* vs. *There’s a long trip ahead of us*.

Presentative sentences with *have* are described and classified with respect to the animacy, semantics and reference of the subject, the presence of a locative adverbial, and the semantics of the object.

## KEYWORDS

Presentation Scale, *have*-presentative sentences, locative subject, verbs of existence and appearance

## DOI

<https://doi.org/10.14712/18059635.2019.2.3>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

“[T]he idea (and necessity) of presenting a phenomenon on the scene represents one of the essential pillars of human communication” (Adam 2013: 9). The linguistic means of presenting phenomena on the scene appear to constitute a broad scale, ranging from prototypical presentation sentences, invariably associated with this function, to those whose presentation function is highly dependent on the context.

The paper focuses on one of the syntactic forms employed in English to present a new phenomenon in discourse, viz. presentative sentences with *have* (ex. 1 a). *Have*-presentative constructions can be regarded as an alternative to the more frequent “full presentative” *there*-constructions (ex. 1 b) (Ebeling 2000; Lambrecht 1994; Freeze 1992), as they both contain “an indefinite noun phrase which could be said to present the addressee with new or unknown information” (Ebeling 2000: 1), and their basic communicative function is identical, i.e. to introduce, or present, a new referent into discourse. Apart from these, English has at its disposal a number of other syntactic forms which perform the same function, such as sentences with the initial rhematic subject (ex. 1 c), sentences with a fronted adverbial and subject-verb inversion (ex. 1 d), and sentences with a locative subject (ex. 1 e).

- (1) a. We have a long trip ahead of us (Ebeling 2000: 1)
- b. There’s a long trip ahead of us. (Ebeling 2000: 1)
- c. A slow cruel smile came over the Witch’s face. (Adam 2013: 66)
- d. Behind the ornaments were two coloured photographs. (Dušková 2015: 204)
- e. This road carries a lot of traffic. (Dušková 2015: 206)

## 2. ENGLISH PRESENTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS FROM THE FSP POINT OF VIEW

Since the aim of the paper is to explore the potential of presentative sentences with *have* to constitute the Presentation Scale, it is necessary to explain the conception of the Presentation Scale and the Quality Scale, i.e. two types of dynamic semantic scales which were identified by Firbas (1992: 87) and further elaborated by Chamonikolasová and Adam (2005). According to this theory, every sentence implements one of the two dynamic semantic scales, or in other words communicative perspectives (Chamonikolasová and Adam 2005: 59): the communication can be perspectived either towards or away from the subject. In this dynamic approach to semantics, each element is ascribed one of the dynamic semantic functions (DSFs). The scales reflect functionally the distribution of communicative dynamism (CD)<sup>1</sup> and operate irrespective of word order (Firbas 1992; Adam 2013: 14; Chamonikolasová 2010: 87). The identification of the type of dynamic scale depends on the function of the verb in the immediately relevant context. In the Quality Scale, the communication is perspectived away from the subject, towards some quality that is ascribed to it: “[s]omething new (Specification) is said about the subject (Bearer of Quality)” (Adam 2013: 46). In the Presentation Scale, on the other hand, the communication is perspectived towards the subject, whose referent is introduced into discourse. The verb performs the dynamic semantic function of presentation (i.e. it presents something new on the scene), the subject is the most dynamic element (Phenomenon) that is “literally ushered onto the scene” (Adam 2013: 45), the least dynamic element being the Setting of the action (i.e. “usually temporal or spatial items of when and where the action takes place” (ibid.)). It was pointed out by Dušková (2015: 260) that if the verb is to perform the presentation function, “the subject must be context independent: it then has the DSF of a phenomenon presented on the scene.”

The verb plays a major role in the Presentation Scale, as it is the “semantic content of the verb that actuates the presentation semantics of the sentence” (ibid.). The verbs that may perform the function of presentation<sup>2</sup> are traditionally divided into two classes: verbs that express existence or appearance either explicitly or implicitly (cf. Firbas 1992: 60). The group of presentation verbs that express existence or appearance explicitly is relatively well-defined and is represented by prototypical verbs like *appear*, *arrive*, *come*, *enter*, *exist*, *occur*, *turn up*, etc. The second group of verbs expressing the existence or appearance on the scene in an implicit way (i.e. “with sufficient implicitness”, cf. Firbas (1995: 65, cited in Adam 2013: 15)) includes not only intransitive uses of verbs like *strike*, *await*, *buzz*, *shine*, *seize*, *pour*, *feed*, *blow*, but also transitive verbs (e.g. *fill*, *flood*, *brim*). The latter group also comprises the verb *have*, which is discussed in this paper.

1 Communicative dynamism is defined as “the relative extent to which a linguistic element contributes towards the further development of the communication” (Firbas 1992: 8).

2 As pointed out by Chamonikolasová (2005: 61), “[f]rom the static point of view, certain types of verbs are better suited to express existence/appearance, and other types to express quality; considered from the dynamic point of view, however, every verb is capable of functioning within either scale.”

## 2.1 EXISTENTIAL CONSTRUCTIONS WITH *THERE*

The *there*-construction is the most frequent realization form of the presentation scale. The existential *there* functions as the formal (also called ‘dummy’) subject, the verb (typically *be*) asserts the existence of some person or thing, and the notional subject occurs in postverbal position (Quirk et al. 1985: 1403; Dušková et al. 2006: 353).

There are two basic types of *there*-constructions, namely existential and existential-locative constructions.<sup>3</sup> The **existential construction**<sup>4</sup> has the structure *there* + *be* + indefinite noun phrase, and it “simply postulates the existence of some entity or entities” (ex. 2) (Quirk et al. 1985: 1406). These sentences can be viewed as “cases in which the final element is omitted as understood” (ex. 2 c) (*ibid.*).

- (2) a. There are no exceptions. (Dušková et al. 2006: 353)  
 b. There’s nothing to do. (Quirk et al. 1985: 1406)  
 c. Is there any other business (for the committee at this meeting)? (Quirk et al. 1985: 1406)

The **existential-locative construction** (ex. 3) has the structure *there* + *be* + indefinite noun phrase + adverbial, where the adverbial is an obligatory element. The construction expresses the existence of some entity in some place or at some time. The adverbial can occupy either the final or initial position.

- (3) There was a boy in the room. (Firbas 1992: 59)

From the FSP point of view, “existential *there* in the subject position serves to achieve postverbal placement of the notional, rhematic subject. In this respect, it contributes to the basic distribution of CD” (Dušková 2015: 188–189). The notional subject is typically context-independent and conveys the information towards which communication is perspectived. It carries the highest degree of CD, representing the Phenomenon ushered onto the scene. The verb *be* has the role of transition and links the thematic and non-thematic part of the sentence (Firbas 1992: 91; Adam 2013: 31). The rest of the sentence, i.e. the existential *there* and the adverbial (if present), is thematic. In existential-locative constructions the existential *there* constitutes the theme proper and the adverbial (e.g. *in the room* in ex. 3) performs the function of the diatheme (i.e. the most dynamic element within the thematic section) (cf. Svoboda 1981; Firbas 1992: 59; Dušková 2015: 203).

## 2.2 PRESENTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH *HAVE*

In *have*-presentative constructions, the elements are also ordered according to the basic distribution of CD (ex. 4). Since the subject is thematic and the object rhematic,

3 In addition to these two basic types of existential sentences, Dušková et al. (2006: 354–355) distinguish two other subtypes of *there*-constructions, viz. actional (*There was a click in the lock.*) and modal (*There is no knowing what she may do.*).

4 This type of construction is also called the ‘bare’ existential or ‘ontological’ sentence (Quirk et al. 1985: 1406).

the construction “seems to implement the Quality rather than the Presentation Scale” (Adam 2013: 148).

(4) Every chair had an inscription. (Brůhová and Malá 2017: 29)

However, it has been suggested that these sentences with thematic subjects can also be viewed as a realization form of the Presentation Scale (Adam 2013: 69; Dušková 2015: 206; Rohrauer 2013: 154; Brůhová and Malá 2017: 29). In ex. 4, the locative subject (*every chair*) has the function of a Setting, the verb (*had*) performs the DSF of Presentation, and the object (*an inscription*) represents the Phenomenon presented on the locative scene. The presentational function of the construction can be manifested by the alternative expression of the same content using an existential *there*-construction (*There was an inscription on every chair*). As the paraphrase with the existential construction demonstrates, the syntactic form with *have* is a surface structure implementing in its deep structure the Presentation Scale. We argue, therefore, that *have*-presentative constructions should be regarded as one of the realization forms of the Presentation Scale (Figure 1).

Setting	Presentation of Phenomenon	Phenomenon Presented
theme	transition	rheme
<i>Every chair</i>	<i>had</i>	<i>an inscription.</i>

FIGURE 1. DSFs in the Presentation Scale

The presentative function of the construction is enabled by the semantics of the verb *have*. *Have* is “stripped of its possessive meaning and is actually semantically emptied in this sense” (Adam 2013: 149); it “contribute[s] to the information conveyed by the sentence to a much lesser extent than [its] complements, [its] function being reduced to that of ushering a new phenomenon” into discourse (Malá and Brůhová 2019: 252).

As illustrated by ex. 4, the subject in *have*-presentative constructions is typically inanimate and locative. This type is recognized as a separate type of presentation sentences by Adam (2013) and Dušková (2015), and described in detail e.g. by Brůhová and Malá (2017). Dušková (1999b: 250) considers *have* and other verbs<sup>5</sup> in this type of sentences “quasi-copulative for they merely provide a link between the participants in verbal action without contributing any relevant lexico-semantic feature”.

In addition, the presentative *have* can also occur with animate subjects (exx 5 a and 5 b). The occurrence of *have*-presentative constructions with animate subjects was, to our knowledge, first observed by Adam (2013) and by Rohrauer (2015).

(5) a. You have people there who hold to the teaching of Balaam... (Adam 2013: 150)

<sup>5</sup> The most frequent verbs occurring in this construction are *have*, *bear*, *wear*, *hold* and *contain* (Malá and Brůhová 2019: 242).

- b. We do not have a complete consistent theory that unifies general relativity and quantum mechanics, ... (Rohrauer 2015: 120)

The type of subject is one of the criteria applied by Ebeling (2000) when classifying *have*-presentative constructions. He distinguishes six categories, which are described and illustrated in Table 1 below.<sup>6</sup>

category		example
I	The locative subject is coreferential with the (optional) prepositional adverbial; the subject is mostly inanimate	<i>The tree has a nest in it.</i>
II	The subject is a referentially unspecified pronoun	<i>They hadn't much snow last winter.</i>
III	The animate subject has something (alienably possessed) somewhere.	<i>He had three hundred of them on board.</i>
IV	The animate subject refers to a group of people or an establishment	<i>We haven't any shops on the island.</i>
V	The object is an abstract notion and is postmodified. The alternative with <i>there</i> -construction requires an insertion of a <i>for</i> -phrase.	<i>He has a great deal to be thankful for.</i>
VI	The object is an abstract notion without postmodification. The alternative with <i>there</i> -construction requires an insertion of a <i>for</i> -phrase.	<i>Women had no access.</i>

TABLE 1. Classification of *have*-presentative constructions according to Ebeling (2000)

### 2.3 HAVE- VS. THERE-PRESENTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

This section describes the similarities and differences between *have*- and *there*-presentative constructions. Presentative constructions with *have* differ from *there*-constructions in several ways (Ebeling 2000: 227). In *there*-presentative constructions, the initial position is occupied by the dummy element *there* (ex. 6 a), while in *have*-presentative constructions the initial position “is filled by a noun-phrase subject preceding the verb *have*” (exx 6 b and 6 c) (Quirk et al. 1985: 1411). Thus, the main difference lies in “the overt involvement in the existential process of some person or thing” (ibid.), syntactically represented as the subject in *have*-presentative constructions. Owing to this participant, “the *have*-presentative construction can be seen as semantically richer than its impersonal counterpart, the full presentative construction.” (Ebeling 2000: 253). Quirk et al. (1985: 1411) also point out that it is impossible to specify what the semantic role (i.e. the involvement) of the subject is, which can be illustrated by examples (6 b) and (6 c). Ex. (6 b) quite strongly implies that the subject *the porter* has an agentive role, but in ex. (6 c) the implication is not so straightforward and the subject *you* could be viewed as a recipient or affected participant. Therefore,

<sup>6</sup> Ebeling’s classification is based on 27 English, and 57 Norwegian examples of *have*-/*ha*-constructions.

Quirk et al. (1985: 1412) suggest using the term “affected” for the subject of *have*-presentatives: “[C]alling it ‘affected’ seems to state the involvement with a degree of generality that satisfactorily accounts for most cases”.

- (6) a. There is a taxi ready.  
 b. The porter has a taxi ready.  
 c. You have a taxi ready. (Quirk et al. 1985: 1411)

Similarly, Lyons (1968: 391–394) argues that the original function of the *have*-transformation was to bring the ‘person interested’ into foreground: “[...] the ‘subject’ of *have* is brought into a position of prominence in surface structure”.

Other authors point out similarities between *have*- and *there*-presentative constructions. Freeze (1992: 553) notes that *have*- and *there*-presentative constructions are very similar and that they are “derived from a single and maximally abstract syntactic structure [...]”. He views both these types as members of “the locative paradigm” since “the normal form of the existential has a locative argument in the subject position”, and the *there* expletive subject can also be understood as locative (ibid.: 554–5). Chaffey (1980: 53–54, cited in Ebeling 2000: 228–229) sees the similarity between the two constructions in a different way. According to him, both constructions denote possession. He notes that all *there*-sentences are related to an underlying possessive structure and that many of them can be “directly converted into *have*-sentences” (exx 7 a–c).

- (7) a. There are four rooms and a kitchen in the house. → The house has four rooms and a kitchen.  
 b. There was a thunderstorm yesterday. → We had a thunderstorm.  
 c. There is a God. → We have a God. (ibid.)

In addition, Chaffey (ibid.) points out that in certain contexts we prefer *there*-constructions and in others *have*-constructions. This depends on whether the referent of the object is a “necessary attribute” of the subject or not. In other words, whether the referent of the object is “inalienably possessed” or a “characteristically associated noun” (i.e. treated as inalienably possessed). Thus, in ex. (8 a) the *there*-construction is preferred, as “a dog is not a necessary attribute of a garden” (Chaffey 1980: 54), whereas in ex. (8 b) “a surface is a necessary attribute of a table”, and therefore the construction with *have* is preferred (cf. also Heine 1997).

- (8) a. There is a dog in the garden. and NOT: \*The garden has a dog in it.  
 Cf. The garden has a dog cemetery, complete with gravestones. (BNC, AJX: 699)<sup>7</sup>  
 b. This table has a lovely surface. and NOT: \*There is a lovely surface on this table.  
 Cf. There was a bowl of fruit on the table. (BNC, G17: 2353)

<sup>7</sup> Examples followed by the abbreviation BNC were excerpted from the *British National Corpus*; the brackets include the code of the text and the sentence number.

In addition, Freeze (1992: 583) and Dušková et al. (2006: 354) note that in *have*-presentative constructions where the referent of the object is not a necessary attribute of the subject (i.e. it is alienably possessed, as *nest* and *brass plate* in ex. 9), the sentence is only grammatical if a prepositional phrase is added.

- (9) a. The tree has a nest in it. and NOT: \*The tree has a nest. (Freeze 1992: 583)  
 b. The door has a brass plate on it. (Dušková et al. 2006: 354)

In examples (9 a) and (9 b), the location is expressed twice, in the locative subject (*the tree, the door*) and in the prepositional phrase performing the adverbial function (*in it, on it*). In these sentences the subject and the complement of the preposition are clearly co-referential (cf. “the doubled expression of the locative reference” (Adam 2013: 149)).

### 3. MATERIAL AND METHOD

The material was drawn from the English fiction and non-fiction sub-corpus of the parallel translation corpus *InterCorp*, version 10.<sup>8</sup> The size of the sub-corpus used is 20 917 278 tokens. It comprises 185 original English texts, most of them fiction published in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> and in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The instances of *have*-presentative sentences were excerpted using a query searching for sentences with lexical *have* (lemma) as the predicate (cf. Ebeling 2000: 239).<sup>9</sup> The randomised results of the query were checked manually to exclude non-presentative uses of *have*. The initial 100 *have*-presentative sentences were selected in this way to form what will be referred to as the basic data-set here. All quantitative results presented in this study as well as the classification of *have*-presentatives are based on the basic data-set.

Since the frequency of some of the categories of *have*-presentative sentences in the basic data-set was too low to allow more detailed description, further, narrower searches were performed where possible in order to excerpt specific types of *have*-constructions, such as the constructions with double location (e.g. ...*one book had a dark stain on it that looked horribly like blood*) or those with animate generic subjects (e.g. *Everyone has something in their life about which they are profoundly ashamed*).

The most problematic issue in compiling the basic data-set proved to be the selection of sentences in which *have* performs the presentative function. Assuming functional equivalence of *there*- and *have*-presentatives, the main criterion for recognizing a sentence as the *have*-presentative construction was the possibility to transform it to a *there*-presentative construction. In other words, if the alternation with the existential or existential-locative *there*-construction was possible, the sentence was

8 Klégr, A. — Kubánek, M. — Malá, M. — Rohrauer, L. — Šaldová, P. — Vavřín, M.: *Korpus InterCorp — English*, version 10 from 1. 12. 2017. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK. Praha 2017. Available at <http://www.korpus.cz>

9 The query excluded post-verbal noun phrases with the definite article.

included in the analysis (exx 10 a, b). This “may not be the only approach. However, if we believe that one of the uses of the construction is to present the existence or appearance of an entity, then we need some yardstick by which to separate this particular sense from all the other uses of [*have*]. The full presentative test can be this yardstick.” (Ebeling 2000: 242)

- (10) a. We must have new solutions to new problems.  
       → There must be new solutions to new problems.  
       b. The room has seven different lamps.  
       → There are seven different lamps in the room.

However, it “can be difficult to argue for a sameness of meaning in the two alternatives in a given context” (Ebeling 2000: 239). The alternation may be complicated by the loss of the subject of the *have*-construction in the *there*-alternative (see 2.3.), and by syntactic and semantic constraints on inserting the *have*-subject equivalent in the *there*-construction (ex. 11).

- (11) But I have a problem.  
       → ? There is a problem (for me).

The alternation test led to the exclusion of sentences with possessive (ex. 12 a) and causative *have* (ex. 12 b), and sentences in which *have* expressed the relationship between the possessor and his/her body parts (ex. 12 c), or a kinship relation (ex. 12 d). Near-copular uses of *have* with eventive objects were also excluded (ex. 12 e). We also decided to remove fixed phrases, such as *have no idea/clue* (ex. 12 f), where the alternation is blocked.

- (12) a. Nearly everyone has a car.  
       b. I’ll have him fix it up. / He had them eating out of his hand.  
       c. She had the most amazing eyes, thought Richard.  
       d. She has a sister, no other family.  
       e. The doctors can have a look at him there.  
       f. I had no idea how to do a bankruptcy.

#### 4. ANALYSIS

The analysis showed that *have*-presentative constructions can be classified into four types, summarized in Table 2. The classification draws on Ebeling’s (2000) categories. Three criteria for categorization were applied in steps. First, the animacy of the subject was determined. Animate subjects were further classified according to their reference (generic vs. non-generic). The sentences with an animate, non-generic subject were further divided according to the presence or absence of a locative adverbial.



type		example	number $\Sigma=100$
I	<b>inanimate subject</b>	<i>His hotel room had a minibar...</i>	18
II	<b>animate, non-generic subject + locative adverbial</b>	<i>...the intruder had a shawl of bees on him.</i>	20
III	<b>animate subject with generic/group reference</b>	<i>We must have new solutions to new problems.</i>	11
IV	<b>animate, non-generic subject, no locative adverbial</b>	<i>I have nothing to say.</i>	51

TABLE 2. Types of *have*-presentative constructions

#### 4.1 TYPE I - HAVE-PRESENTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH AN INANIMATE SUBJECT

This type constitutes 18 percent of the basic data-set. Since the inanimate subject is typically locative, this type of *have*-presentative sentences constitutes an alternative to the existential-locative *there*-construction (ex. 13).

- (13) His hotel room had a minibar...  
→ There was a minibar in his hotel room...

As demonstrated by the paraphrase with the *there*-construction, *have*-presentative constructions with inanimate locative subjects have a presentative function. The semantic category of location is understood quite broadly, comprising also cases where “something is included or contained within something else” (Ebeling 2000: 245; cf. also Levin 1993: 82) (ex. 14). Due to its limited semantics *have* expresses “abstract relationships of containment, involvement and the like” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 246).

- (14) ...a book that boasts in its subtitle that it has twenty-three chapters.

Apart from the prototypical spatial localization, our data include sentences whose subjects denote time (ex. 15) or some kind of human expression (e.g. *voice* in ex. 16).

- (15) Saturdays had a holiday bustle and tension  
(16) Rodney’s voice was steady and had a warning in it.

In five instances the location is expressed twice, i.e. in the subject and an adverbial realized by a prepositional phrase. The adverbial specifies the exact location of the phenomenon. The locative complement of the preposition is either fully coreferential with the subject (*knife* — *it* in ex. 17), or constitutes only a part of the subject referent (*it* (*car*) — *the front*, *the back* in ex. 18). Since the location proper is conveyed by the adverbial in these cases, the subject can be assigned the affected role.

- (17) I gazed at the knife — it had white paint on it.

- (18) I saw one car in a remote car park in the early evening rain. It had an L on the front and an L on the back.

The double location typically occurs where the referent of the object is not a necessary attribute of the subject (i.e. it is alienably possessed). Such sentences are grammatically acceptable only if they contain the locative adverbial (cf. *\*I gazed at the knife — it had white paint.*). We included among the examples with double location also those instances where the object “is accompanied by a past participle element” (Adam 2013: 150). The participle is an optional element, which links the object to the location, specifying its manner of appearance on the locative scene (e.g. *painted, written, left, hidden, stuck, drawn, stamped, embossed*,<sup>10</sup> ex. 19). The syntactic function of the participle is difficult to determine. We consider the participle “an extension” (Huddleston et al. 2002: 1395), rather than a part (i.e. a postmodifier) of the object noun phrase.

- (19) The note had an arrow drawn on it.

In this type of *have*-presentative construction the objects denote either concrete or abstract entities (exx 13 and 16, respectively).

#### 4.2 TYPE II – HAVE-PRESENTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH AN ANIMATE, NON-GENERIC SUBJECT AND A LOCATIVE ADVERBIAL

This class of *have*-presentative constructions (20 percent of the basic data-set) is characterized by an animate non-generic subject and a presence of a locative adverbial (typically realized by a prepositional phrase), i.e. “an animate subject has something somewhere, and that something is alienably possessed by the referent of the subject” (Ebeling 2000: 245). This type of *have*-constructions is an alternative to the existential-locative *there*-construction (ex. 20). The location is expressed by the context-dependent adverbial (*on your pages* in ex. 20)<sup>11</sup> in both *have*- and *there*-constructions.

- (20) Did you have any footnotes on your pages?  
→ Were there any footnotes on your pages?

While the location is expressed by the adverbial, assigning a semantic role to the subject is not straightforward. The subject has “considerable involvement in the existential proposition, [however] we cannot specify what the involvement will be” (Quirk

10 The basic data-set comprises only one instance of this type. The additional excerption revealed a number of participles performing the same function.

11 The context-dependence of the adverbial *on your pages* is more apparent from the broader context: *Langdon finished his final page, he cursed under his breath and looked over at Vittoria. She was scowling, squinting at something on one of her folios. “What is it?” he asked. Vittoria did not look up. “Did you have any footnotes on your pages?” “Not that I noticed. Why?” “This page has a footnote. It’s obscured in a crease.*

et al. 1985: 1411). The subject may be assigned the affected, experiencer, or the recipient role (cf. Ebeling 2000: 253).

Assigning a semantic role to the subject is further complicated by those cases where the subject is fully (ex. 21) or partially (ex. 22) coreferential with the adverbial. Unlike the purely locative inanimate subjects in similar sentences (exx 17 and 18), the animate subject in these sentences can be viewed as performing a combination of the affected/experiencer and the locative role. In the instances of partial coreference, the prepositional phrase specifies the exact location of the object referent.

(21) ...the intruder had a shawl of bees on him.

(22) He had a red star painted on his forehead.

Similarly to the first type of *have*-constructions, the object may be followed by a participle<sup>12</sup> which links the object referent to the location, specifying its manner of appearance on the locative scene (ex. 22).

The object can be either concrete (ex. 21) or abstract (ex. 23), but it is never a necessary attribute of the subject, i.e. it is alienably possessed by the subject referent.

(23) ...they have some confusion in their minds about what you've done...

Among the abstract objects we identified a special semantic subtype of objects denoting a period of time ahead of someone (*a busy/long day* (ex. 24), *hours, a full night of burglary and stealth*).

(24) Both of us have a busy day ahead.

#### 4.3 TYPE III – HAVE-PRESENTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH AN ANIMATE SUBJECT WITH GENERIC/GROUP REFERENCE

The least represented class of *have*-presentative constructions is the type with an animate subject with generic/group reference (11 instances). The subject refers to a group of people ranging from people in general (ex. 25) to a relatively limited group (ex. 26) of individuals. The sentences convey “an impersonal statement or account” (Ebeling 2000: 245). The subject is typically realized by a personal pronoun (*we, you, they*).

(25) Once we have a metalanguage, [...] it becomes easy to make assertions about the correspondence between a statement and a fact.

→ Once there is a metalanguage, ...

(26) At Bourton they always had stiff little vases all the way down the table.

→ At Bourton there were always stiff little vases all the way down the table.

The sentences of this type are functional alternatives either to the existential (ex. 25) or existential-locative (ex. 26) *there*-constructions.

12 In some of these cases the semantic role of the subject is ambiguous. If *have* is understood as a causative verb, the subject performs the agentive role (Quirk et al. 1985: 1413).

The fact that the general human agent occurs as a subject of *have*-presentative constructions was also observed by Rohrauer (2015: 120–121): “In the arrangement with the subject conceived as the universal human agent, the verb ‘have’ obtains strongly presentative meaning and the object [...] obtains the dynamic-semantic meaning of a presented phenomenon.”

#### 4.4 TYPE IV – HAVE-PRESENTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH AN ANIMATE, NON-GENERIC SUBJECT AND NO LOCATIVE ADVERBIAL

This type of *have*-presentative constructions is the most frequent; it accounts for more than a half of the examples in the basic data-set (51 instances). The subject in this category is always animate and the object is either postmodified (36 instances) or the postmodification is implied and can be inferred from the context (15 instances). The overt postmodification is typically expressed by an infinitival clause. There is no locative adverbial, thus the alternative *there*-construction is purely existential (exx 27 and 28).

- (27) I have nothing to say.  
 → There is nothing for me to say.  
 (28) I have something I want you to hear.  
 → There is something I want you to hear.

The alternative *there*-construction is easiest to construct where the postmodifying clause is finite and its subject coreferential with that of the main clause. The *have*- and *there*- constructions are semantically equivalent, since no information (no participant) is lost in the *there*-sentence (ex. 28). On the other hand, in those instances where the postmodification is realized by an infinitive, a *for*-phrase must be inserted before the infinitive in the *there*-paraphrase to express the person referred to by the original subject<sup>13</sup> (ex. 27). “That a *for*-phrase can be used is good illustration of the affected status of the original subject” (Ebeling 2000: 251). In addition, the semantic role of the subject can be characterized as the experiencer.

What is typical of this type of *have*-presentative constructions is that apart from two exceptions (ex. 29), the object denotes an abstract entity (exx 30–36). The object is typically realized by a quantifier (*something, nothing, anything, a lot, a great deal, no, enough*)<sup>14</sup> and/or by the following nouns: *time, reason, chance, things, work*<sup>15</sup> (exx 30–34).

13 Where the postmodification is realized by the present participle, the original subject referent cannot be expressed in the alternative *there*-construction, since a *for*-phrase cannot be inserted, e.g. *We had trouble finding them...* → *There was trouble finding them.*

14 The quantifiers themselves carry a high degree of communicative dynamism (cf. Dušková et al. 2006: 393).

15 Although some of the combinations of nouns + infinitives seem to be lexicalized to a certain extent (*something to say, nothing to say, work to do, time to think/do*), they have been included in the analysis, since they allow the alternative *there*-construction (cf. Dušková et al. 2006: 564).

- (29) Tom has his house to mind.<sup>16</sup>  
 (30) Did you have a lot of things to write to your dad?  
 (31) He had enough to worry about.  
 (32) I have a great deal to say to you.  
 (33) Juliet had no time to ask questions.  
 (34) He has things to do.

Some of the *have*-constructions with the *to*-infinitive postmodification seem to express intrinsic modality, e.g. ex. 32 implies that the subject *I* is obliged to discuss urgent matters.<sup>17</sup>

- (35) I have urgent matters to discuss with Rufus Scrimgeour.

Another subtype of *have*-constructions without the locative element which alternate with the *there*-existential construction are represented by sentences with an animate subject and no postmodification. Even though the postmodification is not expressed, it is implied and can be inferred from the context (e.g. *to listen to the story* in ex. 36). The similarity with the above-mentioned examples involves not only the animate subject and absence of localization, but also the realization forms of the object. Again quantifiers are frequent (typically *no*, *enough*), as well as the nouns *time*, *moments*, *seconds*, *work*.

- (36) ...it's a long story and we have very little time.  
 → ...it's a long story and there is very little time for us (to listen to the story).

If the subject of this type of sentences is to be expressed in the alternative *there*-construction, it must be introduced by the preposition *for*, similarly to the examples with postmodification realized by the infinitive.

#### 4.5 THE FSP VIEWPOINT

All *have*-sentences in our data are capable of performing the presentation function, as demonstrated by the *there*-construction paraphrase. However, the degree to which they correspond to the prototypical Presentation Scale varies. Type I with the inanimate, locative subject can be regarded as a clear implementation of the Presentation Scale (ex. 37). Sentences of this type comprise all three DSFs (cf. Figure 2). The thematic subject *the room* carrying the lowest degree of CD performs the function of the Setting, the verb *has* has the Presentation function, and the rhematic object *no windows* constitutes the Phenomenon presented.

- (37) The room has no windows.

16 Even though the object is preceded by a possessive determiner *his* in ex. 29, it performs the function of the rheme; "it is presented as something known, of which the hearer is only reminded, rather than as a new piece of information" (Dušková 1999a: 264).

17 These constructions may be viewed as corresponding to the modal type of *there*-construction, e.g. *There is nothing to fear*. (Dušková et al. 2006: 355).

Setting	Presentation of Phenomenon	Phenomenon Presented
theme	transition	rheme
<i>The room</i>	<i>has</i>	<i>no windows.</i>

FIGURE 2. Dynamic semantic functions in Type I *have*-sentences (ex. 37)

Where the location is expressed twice in Type I sentences (exx 38 a–c), both the locative subject and the locative adverbial can be considered elements of the Setting. They both relate to the same location, covering either the same extent of space (exx 38 a, b) or standing in a part-whole relation (ex. 38 c).

- (38) a. I gazed at the knife — it had white paint on it.  
 b. The note had an arrow drawn on it...  
 c. It was a black art-deco-like clock. It had a small stylish sticker on its base...

It was pointed out by Chamonikolasová (2010: 88) that while the prototypical Presentation Scale comprises three elements — Setting, Presentation of Phenomenon, and Phenomenon Presented — it is only the latter two that are obligatory: “The Presentation Scale can be reduced to a pattern consisting of only two obligatory units: the Presentation and the Phenomenon presented.” All the *have*-sentences described in this paper include prototypical units performing the two obligatory DSFs of the Presentation Scale — the presentation verb and a noun phrase with the DSF of the Phenomenon Presented. The Setting, being an optional element of the Presentation Scale, seems to allow for more variation. The diversion from the usual Presentation Scale illustrated by examples (38 a–c) consists in splitting the locative Setting into two units. A similar kind of deviation from the prototypical Presentation Scale can be seen in examples (39 a–c), classified as Type II in this paper.

- (39) a. ...the intruder had a shawl of bees on him.  
 b. ...and she had an odd smile on her face.  
 c. He had a red star painted on his forehead.

In examples (39 a–c) the verb *have* presents a *shawl of bees*, an *odd smile* and a *red star* as phenomena existing on a particular scene, i.e. *him*, *her face* and *his forehead*, respectively. The locative adverbials represent the Setting. This raises the question of the DSF of the subject. It is a context-dependent thematic element, carrying the lowest degree of CD in the clause. The subject is either fully co-referential with the noun component of the locative adverbial (ex. 39 a, *the intruder* — *him*) or in a meronymic relation to it (exx 39 b, c, *she* — *her face*, *he* — *his forehead*). The semantic relationship between the subject and the nominal element of the adverbial is analogous to that which we observed in examples (38 a–c, *the knife/the note* — *it*, *the clock* — *its base*). The subject in examples (39 a–c), however, has an animate referent, and can thus hardly be ascribed a locative semantic role, prototypically associated with the DSF of Setting. Nevertheless, based on its low degree of CD and (partial) coreference with the adverbial, we suggest interpreting the subject in sentences (39 a–c) as a part of the Setting.

This type of sentences then displays a deviation from the prototypical Presentation Scale in the same respect as the sentences illustrated by examples (38 a-c). The Setting is split into two thematic units. Within the thematic sphere of the clause, the subject, i.e. the least dynamic, contextually tied element, represents the theme proper. Where the adverbial is fully coreferential with the subject, it can be considered a theme-proper oriented element since “[if] two elements perform different syntactic and semantic functions in one clause, they also differ in the degrees of CD they convey even when the contextual ties are, or seem to be, the same” (Svoboda 1983: 57). The locative adverbial carries a higher degree of CD, and appears “just before or at the end of the clause” (ibid.: 58). The adverbial whose nominal component is partly coreferential with the subject (and hence “partly contextually tied”) is the most dynamic element of the thematic sphere of the clause, the diatheme. “If a new phenomenon is to appear in the discourse [...], adverbial diathemes provide its appearance with an appropriate setting.” (Svoboda 1983: 65)

Another sub-class of Type II *have*-presentation constructions may be illustrated by examples (40 a, b).

- (40) a. He had good tread on his tyres...  
 b. They had a red eye painted on their shields.

In these sentences, there is no coreference between the animate subject and the nominal element of the locative adverbial (*he* — *his tyres*, *they* — *their shields*). The adverbial again constitutes the most dynamic thematic element, bringing “new information into the thematic sphere of the clause by introducing new temporal, spatial and other circumstantial elements” (Svoboda 1983: 61), and can be considered the diatheme. The thematic sphere of the clause also comprises the context-dependent subject, its least dynamic element. In the same way as in examples (38) and (39) all the thematic elements will be considered the Setting here.

Examples (38), (39) and (40) can be seen as gradually moving away from the prototypical Presentation Scale:

- In (38) the deviation consists in the Setting being split into two units, the subject and the adverbial, both referring to the same inanimate location.
- (39) also displays the split Setting, this time comprising a locative adverbial and an animate subject partly or fully coreferential with the nominal element of the adverbial.
- (40) takes another step away from the prototypical Setting: not only is the Setting split into two units, the subject and the adverbial, but there is no coreference between these units, which makes it quite impossible to ascribe the subject the semantic role of location. In this type of sentences, assigning both the adverbial and the subject to the Setting relies on their thematic character.

The thematic character of the subject also makes it possible to consider it the Setting in the *have*-presentation sentences of the types III and IV, illustrated by examples (41) and (42) below.

- (41) Let us assume, for a start, that we have a planet with an atmosphere of between 0.5 and 2 bars pressure...
- (42) But we have nothing to lose.

In example (41) the subject has generic human reference. Such “eternal themes” constitute the theme proper (Svoboda 1983: 55), and have thus been assigned the DSF of Setting. In example (42), the animate non-generic subject is the least dynamic element within the clause due to its contextual dependence. As the theme proper, it can perform the DSF of Setting. Examples (41) and (42) deviate from the generally recognized implementation of the Presentation Scale, where the DSF of Setting is performed “typically [by] temporal and spatial items of when and where the action takes place” (Adam 2013: 14–15). The communicative field of these sentences, however, “is opened by the least dynamic element of the sentence, [...], which forms the Setting” (ibid.: 15).

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The presentational function of all the *have*-constructions described in the present paper can be manifested by the possible alternative expression of the same content using an existential *there*-construction. As the paraphrase with the existential construction demonstrates, this syntactic form is indeed a surface structure implementing in its deep structure the Presentation Scale. We argue, therefore, that *have*-presentative constructions should be regarded as one of the realization forms of the Presentation Scale.

Four types of *have*-presentation constructions were identified. In all four types the verb *have* is semantically empty, i.e. devoid of the possessive meaning, and thus capable of performing the DSF of Presentation, and the object represents the Phenomenon Presented. The four types differ in the reference and (static) semantic role of the subject and in the presence of the locative adverbial, and consequently also in the realization of the DSF of Setting. We have demonstrated that apart from the inanimate locative or temporal subjects described in detail in literature (Type I), *have*-presentation sentences can have an animate human subject, with generic (Type III) or non-generic reference (Types II and IV). The semantic role of the animate subjects can be described as broadly affected or as the experiencer/recipient. The adverbial, where present (in Types I and II), specifies the scene on which the Phenomenon is presented. It may be fully or partly coreferential with the subject, which raises the question of the involvement of the subject in the presentation. Since the subject is the least dynamic element of the clause, it was assigned the DSF of (a part of) the Setting, even though this may require a modification of the prototypical implementation of the Presentation Scale. Two directions of deviation from the prototypical characteristics of the Setting in *have*-presentation sentences were identified: a split Setting, comprising both the subject and the adverbial, and a Setting which is performed by other “circumstantial elements” (cf. Svoboda 1983) than temporal and spatial items. No matter what its (static) semantic role, the Setting always comprises the least dynamic elements of the distributional field.



Our findings corroborate the fact that it is the verb that “actuates the presentation semantics of the sentence” (Dušková 2015: 260) and presents the phenomenon in discourse. The Setting, constituting the theme of the sentence, may allow for some variation.

The paper has shown that *have*-presentative constructions can serve as an alternative to the full presentative *there*-constructions, both existential and existential-locative. However, they are generally semantically richer than the *there*-constructions, since apart from the phenomenon presented, they comprise another, often animate, participant involved in the presentation.

### Funding Acknowledgement

This study was supported by the Charles University project Progres Q10, *Language in the shiftings of time, space, and culture*.

### REFERENCES

- Adam, M. (2013) *Presentation Sentences (Syntax, Semantics and FSP)*. Brno: Masaryk University — Faculty of Education.
- Brůhová, G. and M. Malá (2017) On English Locative Subjects. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica 1, Prague Studies in English*, 19–38. Prague: Karolinum Press.
- Chaffey, P. N. (1980) A translator’s view of ‘it’ and ‘there’. *Sprak og sprakundervisning* 4/80, 50–55
- Chamonikolasová, J. (2005) Dynamic semantic scales in the theory of functional sentence perspective. In: Panevová J. and B. Vidová Hladká (eds) *Aleg(r)ace pro Evu. Papers in Honour of Eva Hajičová*, 61–67. Prague: Univerzita Karlova.
- Chamonikolasová, J. (2010) Communicative perspectives in the theory of FSP. *Linguistica Pragensia* XX/2, 86–93.
- Chamonikolasová, J. and M. Adam (2005) The presentation scale in the theory of functional sentence perspective. In: Čermák, J., A. Klégr, M. Malá, and P. Šaldová (eds) *Patterns. A Festschrift for Libuše Dušková*. 59–69. Prague: Modern Language Association (KMF).
- Dušková, L. (1999a) On the type of definiteness expressed by English possessives. *Studies in the English language. Part 1*, 260–270. Prague: Karolinum.
- Dušková, L. (1999b) On some semantic and FSP aspects of the subject in Czech and in English. *Studies in the English language. Part 2*, 247–272. Prague: Karolinum.
- Dušková L. (2015) *From Syntax to Text: The Janus Face of Functional Sentence Perspective*. Prague: Karolinum Press.
- Dušková, L. et al. (2006) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia.
- Ebeling, J. (2000) *Presentative Constructions in English and Norwegian. A Corpus-based Contrastive Study*. Oslo: University of Oslo, Faculty of Arts.
- Firbas, J. (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freeze, R. (1992) Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68/3, 553–595.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and C. M. I. Matthiessen (2004) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Heine, B. (1997) *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces and Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, R., G. K. Pullum et al. (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambrech, K. (1994) *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the*

- Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*.  
Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 71.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University  
Press.
- Levin, B. (1993) *English Verb Classes and  
Alternations: a Preliminary Investigation*.  
Chicago: The University of Chicago  
Press.
- Lyons, J. (1968) *Introduction to Theoretical  
Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University  
Press.
- Malá, M. and G. Brůhová (2019) English  
presentative semantic patterns as seen  
through a parallel translation corpus.  
*Languages in Contrast* 19/2, 232–255.
- Quirk R. et al. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of  
the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Rohrauer, L. (2013) Syntactic realizations of the  
presentation scale in academic prose and in  
fiction. *AUC Philologica* 3/2013. *Prague Studies  
in English* XXVI, 145–158. Prague: Karolinum  
Press.
- Rohrauer, L. (2015) *Presentation Sentences  
in Fiction and Academic Prose: a Syntactico-  
semantic, FSP and Textual View*. Unpublished  
Ph.D. thesis. Prague: Charles University.
- Svoboda, A. (1981) *Diatheme*. Brno: Masaryk  
University.
- Svoboda, A. (1983) Thematic elements. *Brno  
Studies in English* 15, 49–85.

### **Gabriela Brůhová**

Department of English Language and ELT Methodology  
Faculty of Arts, Charles University  
nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1  
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5014-7965  
e-mail: gabriela.bruhova@ff.cuni.cz

### **Markéta Malá**

Department of Linguistics  
Faculty of Arts, Charles University  
nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1  
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3611-8433  
e-mail: Marketa.Mala@ff.cuni.cz