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Main message
P^Have in Germanic (Levinson 2011): Little p^'-layer is language-specific

Background
P^Have in Germanic (Levinson 2011): Little p^'-layer is language-specific

Non-incorporating languages (copula + P)
- example: Icelandic
- The feature [control] merges on P^Have itself
- The feature [control] defines the possessor
- little p^', a case-assigning head, assigns case to the possessee
- P^ has incorporated into v° (i.e. the copula)

Incorporating languages (copula + P -> have)
- example: English, German
- the feature [control] merges on little p^'
- little p^' is not available
- The reading depends on the context and the maxim of relevance
- it is not encoded syntactically, hence no features [control] or [permanency]

The synthesis of P^Have is construction-specific

- P° and P^ in Germanic predicative possessive constructions are always available to project, but whether they do merge is construction-specific and depends on the features of the type of possession
- The presence or absence of these layers goes hand in hand semantic and lexical distinctions and (non-)incorporation.

Detailed Analysis

Hebben ‘to have’
- No syntactic marking for control or permanency → no little p

Bezitten ‘to possess’
- Semantic marking for alienable possession
- The reading depends on the context and the maxim of relevance
- it is not encoded syntactically, hence no features [control] or [permanency]

Zitten met ‘to be stuck with’
- Hypothetical expectation: the possibility of a Dutch possession construction merging both P° and p°.
- This construction is expected to have the following properties:

- semantically
- lexically
- due to P°
- [-comitative] [+control] [+epernament]
- [-comitative] [+]control] [-permanent]
- [-comitative] [-control] [-permanent]
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