Causer, recipient and possessor: the grammatical subject of *get* and the context-sensitivity of P_{HAVE}

Monika Schulz, Freiburg University

This paper explores the possessive use of *have got* + DP and argues for an origin of the construction in perfective *have got(ten)* + DP. Within the framework of Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993) it will be shown that the inferential process of the conventionalization of conversational implicatures (Traugott and König 1991), which led to the development of the possessive meaning of *have got* + DP, can be modeled in terms of the presence vs absence of an eventive *v* head and the context sensitivity of P_{HAVE}, one of the components of GET. The different structures that lead to the spell-out of *got(en)* display a variety of roles for their subject: a causer who is in control of the event, a recipient who is not in control of the event and finally a possessor in a non-eventive environment.

GET has been analyzed as a combination of an empty preposition P_{HAVE} and v_{BECOME} (Harley 2004). In the 'receive' sense there is no external argument, the beneficiary raises to SpecTP (see 1). An incorporation of P_{HAVE} into v_{CAUSE} results in the 'acquire' meaning with an external causer argument and two internal arguments (see 2). The external argument and the internal beneficiary can be referentially identical, (*John got himself/Ø a beer*; reflexive pronoun and empty object are both possible) or non-identical (*John got Mary a beer*). In both the 'receive' and the 'acquire' sense the possession relation between the specifier of P_{HAVE} and its complement results from the structural configuration they appear in (Harley 2004). I argue that v_{BECOME} and v_{CAUSE} modify the basic meaning of possession further: 'onset of possession' is coupled with a lack of control of the event (v_{BECOME}), while 'causation of possession is coupled with control of the event (v_{CAUSE})

(1) *John got a beer* (John = beneficiary; no control of the event)

[$_{TP}$ John$_j$ got [$_{vP}$ v_{BECOME} [$_{PP}$ t$_j$ P_{HAVE} [$_{DP}$ a beer]]]]

        incorporation: spellout *got*

(2) *John got Mary / himself a beer* (John = causer; control of the event)

[$_{TP}$ John$_j$ got [$_{vP}$ tj v_{CAUSE} [$_{PP}$ himself/Mary/Ø P_{HAVE} [$_{DP}$ a beer]]]]

        incorporation: spellout *got*

I propose that the differences in meaning between perfective *have got(ten)* and possessive *have got* can be modeled on Embick's (2003, 2004) distinction between stative and resultative participles. (Embick 2003: 149, 152) shows that the participial morphology in the perfective patterns with that of the resultative and the eventive passive, while stative participles may show different forms. Using the diagnostic of adverbial modification, Embick (2004: 357) shows that resultative participles contain an eventive *v* head (*The package remained carefully opened*) while stative participles do not (**The package remained carefully open*.) Both resultative and stative participles combine with aspect heads which are sensitive to their (non)eventiveness: "Asp$_R$ defines a state out of an eventive subcomponent, while Asp$_S$ defines a simple state." (Embick 2004: footnote 11, page 363).

While possessive *have got* patterns with statives in terms of adverbial modification, (**John has quickly got a beer*), perfective *have got(ten)* patterns with the resultative (*John has quickly gotten a beer*). A resultative Asp head combining with the eventive structures depicted in (1) and (2) assigns resultative meaning which spells out as *–en* in American English and as Ø in British English. Auxiliary HAVE in the perfective *have got(ten)* is analyzed along the lines of Kayne (1993) and Harley (1998) as P_{HAVE} which incorporates into v_{BE} and takes a verbal complement, in this case an AspP. We can then argue that P_{HAVE}, in combination with an eventive v_{BE} and a resultative AspP complement gives us perfective aspect (see 3 for a structure of *have got(ten)* in the sense of 'have received').

(3) *John has got(ten) a beer* (John = recipient)

[$_{Vaux}$ v$_{BE}$ [$_{PP}$ P$_{HAVE}$ [$_{AspPresult}$ –en [$_{vP}$ v$_{BECOME}$ [$_{PP}$ John P$_{HAVE}$ [$_{DP}$ a beer]]]]]]

incorporation: spellout *have*   incorporation: spellout *got*

To account for the impossibility of adverbial modification in possessive *have got* structures, I propose along the lines of Embick's (2004) analysis of stative participles that there is no verbalizing v$_{CAUSE}$ or v$_{BECOME}$. The Asp head directly combines with the PP projected by P$_{HAVE}$. P$_{HAVE}$ incorporates into the Asp head, yielding the spellout *got*. In this non-eventive structure control of the event is no longer an issue. The absence of verbalizing v$_{CAUSE}$ and v$_{BECOME}$ directly accounts for the meaning of the construction: only the possessive meaning resulting from the structural configuration of P$_{HAVE}$ with a DP specifier and a DP complement is left, 'onset of possession' and 'causation of possession' are no longer possible due to the absence of v$_{BECOME}$ and v$_{CAUSE}$ respectively. The upper P$_{HAVE}$ combines with the now stative AspP and no longer yields perfective aspect. (see example 4).

(4) *John has got a beer* (John = possessor)

[$_{Vaux}$ v$_{BE}$ [$_{PP}$ P$_{HAVE}$ [$_{AspPstative}$ Asp$_0$ [$_{PP}$ John P$_{HAVE}$ [$_{DP}$ a beer]]]]]

incorporation: spellout *have*   incorporation: spellout *got*

In sum, this paper shows that many of the different uses of GET can be captured nicely within the framework of Distributed Morphology where the role of the grammatical subject falls out from the different structural configurations the subject originates in. It can also be shown that P$_{HAVE}$ is context-sensitive and yields different meanings depending on the material it combines with:

'onset of possession'	[$_{vP}$ v$_{BECOME}$ [$_{PP}$ Possessor P$_{HAVE}$ [$_{DP}$ possessee]]]
'causation of possession'	[$_{vP}$ Causer v$_{CAUSE}$ [$_{PP}$ Possessor P$_{HAVE}$ [$_{DP}$ possessee]]]
'perfective'	[$_{Vaux}$ v$_{BE}$ [P$_{HAVE}$ [$_{AspPresult}$ –en [$_{vP}$...]]]
'stative possession'	[$_{Vaux}$ v$_{BE}$ [P$_{HAVE}$ [$_{AspPstative}$ Asp$_0$ [$_{PP}$ Possessor P$_{HAVE}$ [$_{DP}$ possessee]]]]]

Further areas of interest with regard to *got* relate to a link between possessive *have got* and obligational *have got to*. The latter construction can be argued to have developed by analogy to the obligational *have to* construction (*John has to eat an apple > John has got to eat an apple*). Obligational meaning would be located in the configuration of P$_{HAVE}$ with a *to*-infinitive as its complement. Both control of the event as well as control over the subject by sentence-external forces have to be considered here.

Embick, David. 2003. Locality, Listedness, and Morphological Identity. *Studia Linguistica* 57 (3): 143-169.

Embick, David. 2004. On the structure of resultative particples in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35 (3): 355-392.

Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. In: Kenneth Hale and S. Jay Keyser (eds), *The View from Building 20*, 111-176. Cambridge: MIT.

Harley, Heidi. 1998. You're having me on! Aspects of have. In: Jacqueline Guéron and Anne Zribi-Hertz, *La Grammaire de la Possession*, 195 – 226. Paris: Université Paris-X-Nanterre.

Harley, Heidi. 2004. Wanting, having, and getting: a note on Fodor and Leopre 1998. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35 (2): 255 – 267.

Kayne, Richard. 1993. Toward a modular Theory of auxiliary selection. *Studia Linguistica,* 47: 3-31.

Traugott, Elizabeth and Ekkehard König. 1991. The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In: Elizabeth Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds), *Approaches to Grammaticalization, Vol. 1, Focus on theoretical and methodological issues*, 189 – 218. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.