

On the (non-)incorporation of P_{Have}

Marijke De Belder - University of Oldenburg

1. Main claim Theoretically, I argue that the presence of a little p° for P_{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_{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 *vera með* ‘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 gleraugu. 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° prior to merging with the copula. The P° introduces the semantic notion of accompaniment (expressed by *með*), the little p° introduces a feature *control* and assigns case to the possessee complement. The feature *control* introduces a possessive notion. (It contrasts with a feature *symmetric*, which expresses an associative reading (‘together with’) when merged with *with*.) For ‘incorporating languages’ (P + be → have), such as English and German, she proposes that the little p°-layer is not available. The feature *control*, when present, merges on P itself. Given that the P domain lacks a case-assigning little p° head, P° incorporates into little v° (i.e. the copula), hence allowing little v° to assign case to the possessee. In sum, Levinson proposes that having a little p° 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°-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_{Have} with V-layers and Spatial P-layers** (see Den Dikken 2010, Svenonius 2010, ao)). More specifically, building on Levinson and extensive typological work done by Stassen (2009) on the features of possession, I propose that P° expresses a feature one could call accompaniment/contact/comitative and p° 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.

Type	Alienable	Inalienable	Temporal	Abstract
Example	‘She has a bike.’	‘She has blue eyes.’	‘She has a knife!’	‘She has time.’
Features	(+permanent, +control)	(+perm, -control)	(-perm., +control)	(-perm., -control)

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

2) *De dame heeft ... / De dame met...* ‘The lady has.../The lady with...’
een fiets/ blauwe ogen/een mes/te veel tijd ‘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. b. # De dame met Mars/de Eiffeltoren.
the lady has Mars/the Eiffel Tower 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_{Have}. It is realised by *hebben* and *met* by the following lexical items:

4) *met* <—> (+comitative) *hebben* <—> (+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.’

On the (non-)incorporation of P_{Have}

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 possessee, 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.
she possesses blond hair. she possesses a knife! she possesses the flu

I propose the features +permanent and +control are contained by a little p° head. The little p° head assigns case to its complement, the possessee, 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*, realising little v°. (The prefix *be-* attaches to the V post-syntactically due to its affixal 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 sits with a problem/ the flu / her periods / a broken roof/a bicycle
‘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 possessives 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 possessor 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.
she sits with blue eyes the house sits with a leaking roof. she has a problem/the flu

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.

References Den Dikken, M. (1995) Particles. New York: OUP. ___ Freeze, R. (1992) Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68:3. ___ Harley, H. (2002) Possession and the double object construction. In: P. Pica and J. Rooryck (eds.) *The linguistic variation yearbook*, vol. 2, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 29 – 68. ___ Kayne, R.S. (1993) Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection. *Studia Linguistica* 47:1. ___ Levinson, L. (2011) Possessive with in Germanic: Have and the role of P. *Syntax* 14:4. ___ Smith, Ryan (2014) Possessive with as a form of have in direct perception complements. University of Arizona, Ms. ___ Den Dikken, M. / Svenonius, P./and other contributions in Cinque, G. & L. Rizzi (eds.) (2010) *Mapping Spatial PPs. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Oxford: OUP.