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1. Main claim Theoretically, I argue that the presence of a little $p^o$ for $P_{\text{Have}}$ in Germanic predicative possessive constructions is construction-specific: it is always available, but it is optional and its presence results in semantic differences that go hand in hand with lexical distinctions and (non)-incorporation. Empirically, I discuss a.o. the Dutch *zitten met* ‘sit with’ construction, which was previously undiscussed and unidentified as a possessive.

2. Background 2.1 *Have = be $+$ P* The field agrees that *have* can be decomposed into a copula and a *P* (Freeze 1992, Kayne 1993, Den Dikken 1995, Harley 2002, Levinson 2011). Detailed empirical discussions show that in Germanic languages this $P_{\text{Have}}$ is non-locative, with the possessor (in Spec,PP) c-commanding the possessee (the complement of *P*) (Kayne 1993, Harley 2002, Levinson 2011, pace Den Dikken 1995).

2.2 Levinson 2011 Levinson (2011) argues that the Icelandic *væna med* ‘be with’ possessive construction is the non-incorporated version of what is realised as *have* in other Germanic languages, such as English and German:

1) Jón er með gliðraugr.  John.NOM is with glasses.ACC  ‘John has glasses’

More specifically, she proposes that in a ‘non-incorporating language’, such as Icelandic, the PP *always* merges with a little $p^o$ prior to merging with the copula. The $P^o$ introduces the semantic notion of accompaniment (expressed by *med*), the little $p^o$ introduces a feature control and assigns case to the possessee complement. The feature control introduces a possessive. (It contrasts with a feature symmetric, which expresses an associative reading (*together with*) when merged with with.) For ‘incorporating languages’ (*P* + *be* $\rightarrow$ *have*), such as English and German, she proposes that the little $p^o$-layer is not available. The feature control, when present, merges on $P$ itself. Given that the $P$ domain lacks a case-assigning little $p^o$ head, $P^o$ incorporates into little $v^o$ (i.e. the copula), hence allowing little $v^o$ to assign case to the possessee. In sum, Levinson proposes that having a little $p^o$ in Germanic predicative possessives is language-specific, resulting in non-incorporating and incorporating languages.

3. Present proposal Relying on non-incorporating data in an otherwise incorporating language (Dutch), I propose that the availability of a little $p^o$-layer in Germanic predicate possessives is not language-specific (as proposed by Levinson 2011), but construction-specific: both layers may merge independently from one another or on top of one another in any Germanic language, resulting in semantic and lexical contrasts (thus aligning $P_{\text{Have}}$ with V-layers and Spatial P-layers (see Den Dikken 2010, Svenonium 2010, a.o.)). More specifically, building on Levinson and extensive typological work done by Stassen (2009) on the features of possession, I propose that $P^o$ expresses a feature one could call accompaniment/contact/comitative and $p^o$ expresses (+/-permanent, +/-control).

4. *Hebben and met* Cross-linguistically, there are four main categories of predicative possession: each composed of two features (Stassen 2009): (i) the permanency of the relation and (ii) control over the relation by the possessor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Alienable</th>
<th>Inalienable</th>
<th>Temporal</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>‘She has a bike.’</td>
<td>‘She has blue eyes.’</td>
<td>‘She has a knife!’</td>
<td>‘She has time.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>(+permanent, +control)</td>
<td>(+perm., -control)</td>
<td>(-perm., +control)</td>
<td>(-perm., -control)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Dutch *hebben* ‘have’ and *met* ‘with’ (as a NP complement) combine with all four categories:

2) De dame heeft … / De dame met…
   een fiets/ blauwe ogen/een mes/te veel tijd  ‘The lady has…/The lady with…’
   ‘a bicycle/blue eyes/a knife/too much time’

In fact, both *hebben* and *met* are almost unrestricted. However, there is a notable exception. The following examples are unacceptable under the interpretation that an extremely wealthy lady is, since years, in the legal possession of the Eiffel Tower or the planet Mars, without the tower or Mars having moved from their usual positions and thus without them currently being physically closer to her than to others in a certain, perhaps loose, but significant way:

3) a. # De dame heeft Mars/de Eiffeltoren.  
   the lady has Mars/the Eiffel Tower
   b. De dame met Mars/de Eiffeltoren.  
   the lady with Mars/the Eiffel Tower

I propose what we are observing here is the notion ‘accompaniment/contact/comitative’ (henceforth +comitative) which, according to Levinson, is expressed by $P_{\text{Have}}$. It is realised by *hebben* and *met* by the following lexical items:

4) met $\leftrightarrow$ (+comitative)  
   hebben $\leftrightarrow$ (+comitative) / BE+

*Hebben* and *met* are not only almost unrestricted, they are also underspecified qua type of possession. For example, even though the default interpretation of (5) is the inalienable body part interpretation, the sentence is equally fully compatible with a context in which a doll manufacturer has blue eyes to be used for the dolls:

5) Zij heeft blauwe ogen.  
   she has blue eyes  ‘She has blue eyes.’
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In sum, the precise interpretation qua type of possession will depend on the context and the maxim of relevance, indicating that it is not encoded syntactically. I conclude that there is thus no evidence to assume any feature or head other than +comitative, realised on P°. This P° will incorporate into the copula to assign case to the possesees, resulting in hebben, à la Levinson. (And see Levinson 2011 for case-assignment of with in NP complements.)

5. Bezitten In the Mars/Eiffel Tower context, Dutch requires the use of the verb bezitten ‘to possess’:

6) De dame bezit Mars/de Eiffeltoren. ‘The lady possesses Mars/the Eiffel Tower’

We identified the semantics of this possessive relation as non-comitative. We therefore expect the absence of the lexical items met and hebben, which realise +comitative. Indeed, bezitten consists of a prefix be- and the verb zitten ‘sit’: there is no hebben or met. Given that we have no semantic or lexical indication of a +comitative P°, I conclude it is absent from the structure. Nevertheless, bezitten is clearly possessive and it has a specific meaning: it requires the possession to be +permanent and +control. Hence, inalienable, temporal and abstract possession types are out:

7) a. # Ze bezit blond haar b. Ze bezit een mes! c. # Ze bezit de griep.

I propose the features +permanent and +control are contained by a little p° head. The little p° head assigns case to its complement, the possesees, and no incorporation is needed, as in Levinson 2011. Indeed, what we see is a prefix be- (realizing p°, I propose) and the durative verb zitten, realizing little v°. (The prefix be- attaches to the V post-syntactically due to its affinal status, this is not an instance of syntactic incorporation.)

6. Zitten met If all of the above is correct, we may expect to find a Dutch predicative possession construction that shows a P° merged below a little p°. Semantically, this is a construction expressing the features +comitative (the P°) and a specific +/-permanency, +/-control reading (the p°). Lexically, this construction is non-incorporating (due to the case-assigning p°) and shows the lexical item met ‘with’ (due to the P°). This expectation is borne out:

8) a. Ze zit met een probleem / de griep / haar regels / een kapot dak / een fiets.

‘She has a problem/the flu/her periods/a broken roof/a bicycle and that is a hindrance.’

It is immediately clear that the construction meets our lexical expectations: it shows a non-incorporated P met. Semantically, the construction is highly restricted: all possesees are interpreted as abstract possession. Either they simply are abstracts (e.g. a problem or a disease) or they shift semantically to a ‘problem/hindrance’ interpretation. Indeed, all concrete objects (prototypically +control in possession) shift semantically to abstract problems (-control): ze zit met een fiets means that she is stuck with a bike in a problematic way. Yet, the notion of control itself is certainly implied: situations in which the possesees cannot exercise control are out, as shown in (10). The construction thus explicitly assigns a negative value to a feature control (and I will argue that the typical pejorative ‘problem’ reading finds its cause in this feature set-up). Permanent interpretations are out as well: (9) resists an inalienable body part interpretation. I conclude the construction is inherently -permanent, -control. Note further that problems and diseases are inherently +comitative, this can be concluded from the fact that they can be expressed by means of hebben (see (11)), which, as we saw, is inherently +comitative.

9) * Ze zit met blauwe ogen. 10) * Het huis zit met een lek dak. 11) Ze heeft een probleem/de griep.

Semantically, the construction meets our expectations: it is +comitative (as it merges a P°) and it has values for permanency and control (as it merges a p°). Because of P°, it contains met, due to p° it is non-incorporated.

7. Conclusion We have seen that non-incorporation goes hand in hand with feature values for permanency and control: hebben is underspecified for these features and incorporates, bezitten and zitten met have values and do not incorporate. I assigned these semantic and lexical properties to p°. I further argued that bezitten has no P°, only a p°.

8. Extension I will extend the present proposal to non-incorporating constructions in other Germanic languages, such as the English state-of-affairs reading (I saw him with a knife.) (Smith 2014) which is restricted to temporary possession. I will also discuss the use of the aspectually rich verb zitten instead of zijn ‘to be’ in Dutch.