

**A bound-free distinction in a cross-linguistic variation:
A dialectal study on functional verbs**

Masaharu Shimada (University of Tsukuba) Akiko Nagano (Tohoku University)
(shimada.masaharu.fu@u.tsukuba.ac.jp) (akiko.nagano.a6@tohoku.ac.jp)

From the viewpoint of morphological boundness, we are concerned with a dialectal variation of the functional predicate *aru* ‘be’ in Japanese. The challenge that we are dealing with is one of the differences between Standard Japanese (SJ) and Hichiku Japanese (HJ), which is spoken in the western area of Japan called *Kyushu*. Let us begin with looking at (1):

- (1) *pan-ga yai-te-aru*
bread-NOM bake-CONJ-be

‘The bread has been baked.(SJ/HJ)’ or ‘The bread is being baked. (HJ)’

The predicate *aru* is combined with a transitive verb, not an intransitive verb, with a conjunctive marker *-te* in between, producing a verbal sequence similar to a so-called pseudo-coordination. Importantly, this process includes promoting an internal argument of the transitive verb to the subject. In (1), the verb phrase *pan-o yaku* ‘(lit.) bread-ACC bake,’ is changed into a pseudo-coordination construction, in which the object *pan-o* ‘bread-ACC’ is promoted to the subject, marked with the nominative case marker *-ga*. Interestingly, (1) has a perfect interpretation only in SJ, whereas it is ambiguous between a perfect interpretation and a progressive interpretation in HJ.

We propose that *aru* in the perfect reading and that in the progressive reading are classified into distinct categories. Our argument is based on such a VP idiom as in (2)

- (2) *abura-o uru*
oil-ACC sell ‘be slow and relax (idiomatic interpretation)’

In addition to the literal meaning ‘to sell oil,’ (2) has an idiomatic meaning ‘be slow and relax’ both in SJ and HJ. The crucial data is (3), in which *aru* and the idiom co-occur:

- (3) *abura-ga ut-te-aru*
oil-NOM sell-CONJ-be ‘Oil has been sold’(literal)/‘you are being relaxed (idiomatic)’

In HJ, (3) can have an idiomatic reading under the progressive reading, while it cannot under the perfect reading. Only the literal reading is possible with the perfect *aru*. Note that this holds of SJ, while the idiomatic reading is impossible because it has no progressive *aru*.

The interpretive possibilities of (3) in HJ indicate that while the progressive *aru* is a kind of a raising predicate, the perfect *aru* is not a raising predicate but takes a matrix subject as a lexical predicate, assigning a theta-role to it. Remember that the perfect *aru* cannot take an intransitive verb and that the object of the embedded verb is missing. These properties are shared with the adjective producing a so-called *tough*-construction. We propose here that the perfect *aru* takes a structure similar to the *tough*-construction, where the subject is not a derived subject and the empty object of the embedded verb is coindexed with the subject.

- (4) John₁ is easy [_{CP} OP₁ [PRO to please t₁]].

The empty operator *OP* and its trace *t* are coindexed with the subject *John*, which is an argument of the adjective *easy*. *Easy* is not a raising predicate and theta-assigns the subject. Our claim is that (1) has the following structure under the perfect interpretation.

- (5) [*pan-ga*₁ [*pro*₁ *yai*]-*te-aru*]

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.