



bread-NOM            bake-CONJ-be            ‘The bread has been baked.’

The predicate *-aru* in this case is a lexical predicate theta-assigning the subject. In contrast, the progressive *aru* is similar to a raising predicate, as mentioned above. We propose here that it behaves like a passive morpheme which suppresses a subject theta-role and absorbs an accusative case. To sum up, the perfect *aru* is a lexical predicate, whereas the progressive *aru* is a functional predicate.

We have proposed that there are two types of *aru*, a lexical type and a functional type, at least in HJ. We would like to support this view, giving the further difference between SJ and HJ. First consider that SJ *aru* is usually used as a stative verb, as illustrated in (7):

(7) *kaigi-ga            aru*  
meeting-NOM    be.PRS            ‘We have a meeting.’

Since it is stative and has an existential meaning, it cannot take a progressive form. (8) illustrates this. In (8), *aru* is attached with a conjunctive marker *-te* followed by a progressive marker *-iru*:

(8) \**kaigi-ga            at-te-iru*  
meeting-NOM    be-CONJ-be            ‘We are having a meeting.’

Surprisingly, HJ allows such a progressive sentence as (9), a Hichiku counterpart of (8):

(9) *kaigi-no            ari-yoo*  
meeting-NOM    be-YOO            ‘We are having a meeting.’

In HJ, the progressive marker *-yoo* can attach to *aru*.

Urushibara (2003) proposes a mechanism of “an event transfer” to explain the use of *aru* in progressive contexts in HJ. She argues that the event argument <e> of the subject *kaigi*, which is a simple event nominal (SEN) (Grimshaw 1990), is transferred to *aru*, so that the abstract combination between <e> and *aru* licenses the use of the progressive marker. This mechanism of an event transfer reminds us of the mechanism of an argument transfer proposed for a functional light verb *-suru* ‘do’ by Grimshaw and Mester (1988). So it can be said that *aru* in (9) is also a functional predicates. Note that HJ also has a stative *aru* taking a non-eventive noun, which resists a progressive interpretation.

(10) *kooen-ni    funsui-no    { aru/\*ari-yoo }*  
park-LOC    fountain-NOM    be.PRS/be-PROG.    ‘There is a fountain in the park.’

The observations so far suggest that HJ has two types of *aru*, whereas SJ only has a lexical *aru*. Actually, Nishiyama (1999) analyzes the morpheme *-i* appearing at the end of SJ adjectives like *kasiko-i* ‘(lit) wise-COP’ is just a phonological realization of the adjacent occurrence of two different types of bound copulas, lexical *-ku* and functional *-aru*. His idea is based on the data in which *-i* is separated into *-ku* and *-aru* when the adjective is focused with the focus particle. If Nishiyama is correct, SJ as well as HJ has both lexical *aru* and functional *aru*. Their difference lies just in morphological realization patterns. *Aru* as a lexical verb is morphologically free in both SJ and HJ. However, functional *aru* in SJ is bound, whereas that in HJ is free. Functional *aru* does not occur in SJ in the environment for free morphemes like (1) and (8). In HJ, in contrast, it occurs as an independent word so that (1) is ambiguous and (9) is a possible expression.

**Selected References:** Urushibara, S. (2003) “On the Form and Meaning of Aspectual Markers,” *In Empirical and Theoretical Investigations into Language*, ed. by S. Chiba, 778-792, Tokyo: Kaitakusha.