

Explaining the Typology of Narrow Focus Alignment: A Contiguity Theoretic Approach

Daiki MATSUMOTO (Kyoto University / JSPS)

[Introduction] This talk seeks to explain the typology in (1) concerning the narrow focus (FOC) alignment in various languages including Japanese, English, Italian, and Hungarian.

(1) Context: *Where did you go with Mary?*

English: A: I went to ROME_{FOC} with Mary. B: ??I went with Mary to ROME_{FOC}.

Italian: A: Sono andato con Maria a ROMA_{FOC}. B: Sono andato a ROMA_{FOC}, con Maria.
am gone with M. to Rome

Japanese: A: Boku-wa Meari-to ROMA-ni_{FOC} itta. B: Boku-wa ROMA-ni_{FOC} Meari-to itta.
I-top. M.-with. Rome-to went

Hungarian: A: RÓMÁBA_{FOC} mentem Máriával. B: *Máriáva mentem RÓMÁBA_{FOC}.
Rome went M.

To align the FOC, English resorts to the Main Stress Shift (MSS) (Reinhart 2006) from the default nuclear stress position (DNSP) (i.e., the rightmost position in the clause) to the FOC, while Italian resorts to either the placement of the FOC at the right DNSP or the dislocation of non-FOC rightmost element(s) via comma break. Japanese can either locate the FOC at the right DNSP (save the verbal complex: V-T) by scrambling other phrases or execute MSS. Hungarian's DNSP is just before the V-T (Szendroi 2001), and it aligns the FOC to this DNSP.

[Question] This talk seeks to provide a genuine explanation for the Minimalist question about this typology: Why do these languages differ *this* way? Calling this question **[Q]**, I seek to answer **[Q]** by adopting Richards's (2016) *Contiguity Theory* to the FOC-licensing.

[Explanation] Contiguity Theory claims that the *Contiguity* in (3) is required at PF.

(2) If α Agrees with β , α and β must be dominated by a single prosodic node, within which β 's prosodically active edge (PAE) is not linearly separated by any other ϕ .

Richards adopts Selkirk's (2009) Match Theory which dictates that each syntactic XP corresponds to a prosodic ϕ and each clause to an ι . PAEs are detected based on prosodic effects exhibited at particular edges of ϕ s. Japanese PAEs are generally on the left, evidenced by the effect of *pitch reset* at ϕ 's left edges (Richards 2016: Ch. 3). Similarly, he assumes that English has left PAEs while Italian has right ones. In the same manner, I assume that Hungarian has left PAEs based on the prosodic H(igh)*-L(ow) contour its ϕ s exhibit (Szendroi 2001).

How can (2) play a role in explaining the FOC alignment? A particularly interesting proposal called the *Stress-Focus Correspondence Principle (SFCP)* is made by Reinhart (2006). The SFCP dictates that the FOC has to bear the MS of a given sentence. Thus, if the FOC is placed at the DNSP, the SFCP is satisfied and hence the FOC is licensed. Furthermore, assuming with Rizzi (1997) a.o. that the FOC Agrees with the Foc-head in the left periphery, (2) requires that the FOC be Contiguity-prominent within a prosodic phrase corresponding to ϕ_{FOC} . Given these assumptions, I propose the following hypothesis:

(3) The SFCP can be satisfied either by aligning the FOC at the DNSP or by making the FOC

Contiguity-prominent within the φ_{Foc} .

[Japanese] The examples in (1) can be explained in a unified manner under (3). Let us first examine Japanese. The Japanese A has the simplified structure (4A) while B has the one in (4B). These are converted to the prosodic structures (5A, B), respectively (S=Subject).

(4) A: [φ_{FocP} [TP S [VP M.-to FOC V-T] Foc] B: [φ_{FocP} [TP S [VP FOC M.-to V-T] Foc]

(5) A: (φ_{Foc} (φ_{TP} S ($\varphi_{\text{M.}}$ -to) (φ_{FOC}) V-T) Foc) B: *(φ_{Foc} (φ_{TP} S (φ_{FOC}) ($\varphi_{\text{M.}}$ -to) V-T) Foc)

According to (3), the FOC must be either positioned at the DNSP or adjacent to φ_{Foc} 's left PAE. Since the former is satisfied, the FOC is licensed in (5A). In contrast, the FOC satisfies neither in (5B): it is not adjacent to φ_{Foc} 's left PAE due to the presence of the S, and the DNSP is occupied by *M(eari)-to*. Richards argues that in such a case, the operation called *Grouping* can be applied to the FOC and the Foc-head, which groups two prosodic items within a single phrase, converting (5B) to (6). In (6), the FOC is φ_{Foc} 's PAE, and hence the SFCP is satisfied.

(6) (S (φ_{Foc} (φ_{TP} (φ_{FOC}) ($\varphi_{\text{M.}}$ -to) V-T) Foc))

[Italian] The Italian behaviors in (1) follow from the fact that both the DNSP and PAE are on the right in the language. In order to make the FOC to be at the DNSP, it has to be the rightmost element within the φ_{Foc} , and at this position the FOC becomes adjacent to φ_{Foc} 's PAE:

(7) A: (Foc S V-T (c. M.) (FOC φ) φ_{Foc}) B: ((Foc S V-T (FOC φ) φ_{Foc}) (c. M.))

(7B) derives via Grouping applied to the FOC and the φ_{Foc} , making *con Maria* extrametrical.

[Hungarian] The behaviors of Hungarian also naturally follow: the PAE and DNSP of this language are both on the left, and hence the language aligns the FOC right in front of the verbal complex, which I assume incorporates the Foc-head:

(8) A: (φ_{Foc} (φ_{FOC}) V-T-Foc M.) B: *(φ_{Foc} M. V-T-Foc (φ_{FOC})

[English] Lastly, English has left PAEs and the rightmost DNSP. Thus, in (1), the FOC must be Contiguity-prominent within the φ_{Foc} . However, Grouping cannot be applied to the FOC and the Foc-head, as the S always intervenes between them, as in (9a). Thus, the only way to save the prosodic structure is to *dephrase* the element(s) at the DNSP, forming a φ which includes the FOC and other offending elements. This φ as a whole satisfies (3) by being placed at the DNSP, as in (9b). This is in line with the argument by Büring (2009).

(9) A. (φ_{Foc} Foc (φ_{TP} S V-T (φ_{FOC}) (φ w. M.)) B. (φ_{Foc} Foc (φ_{TP} S V-T (φ_{FOC} w. M.))

[Conclusion] Our account explains **[Q]** in a genuine way. I will compare our account with Féry's (2013) OT-based accounts and conclude that ours is conceptually more desirable as it does away with arbitrary rankings among constraints, while showing that its empirical coverage can be extended further to French and some African languages. I will further argue that two conditions in (3) can be unified under the heading of *Generalized Contiguity*.

[References] Büring, D. 2009. In *Information Structure*, 177-205. OUP. / Féry, C. 2013. In *NLLT* 31, 683-734. / Reinhart, T. (2006) MIT Press. / Richards, N. 2016. MIT Press. / Rizzi, L. 1997. In *Elements of Grammar*, 281-337. Dordrecht, Kluwer. / Selkirk, E. 2009. In *Gengo Kenkyu*, 35-73. / Szendroi, K. 2001. PhD. Diss., UCL.

The impact of lexical creativity in video games on EFL students' receptive vocabulary knowledge: The case of *League of Legends*

Jose Belda-Medina

José Ramón Calvo-Ferrer

University of Alicante (Spain)

Digital Language Learning (DL2)

Vocabulary learning may take place either intentionally, by means of deliberate attempts to commit factual information to memory (Hulstijn, 2001), or incidentally, as a by-product of other cognitive exercises involving comprehension (Chiu, 2013). Intentional vocabulary learning came under criticism in the 1980s with the adoption of communicative learning methodologies and the belief that vocabulary acquisition takes place upon exposure to and use of new words in meaningful contexts. Recent research has delved into the effectiveness of incidental vocabulary learning but mostly through reading L2 texts. However, video games have also been employed in educational contexts to understand lexical development in foreign languages. vocabulary.

Traditionally, research works distinguish between intentional and incidental vocabulary learning. The first one is an explicit process which requires learners' deliberate effort whereas the second is considered to be unintentional and, as such, can be better termed as acquisition (Waring & Nation 2004). Similarly, scholars make a distinction between the receptive and productive levels in vocabulary learning and acquisition. While receptive refers to the familiarity with the written and spoken forms and the different meanings, the productive level implies a more active process whereby the learners must be able to construct and use correctly different words in context.

Research done on Game Vocabulary Learning (GVL) to date has mostly focused on its supplementary role to formal vocabulary instruction (Zou et al. 2021) but language acquisition research has ignored by and large any possible role that gaming may play in the incidental acquisition of vocabulary (Reynolds 2017). Therefore, this presentation has two main objectives: the first one is to analyze the English lexical creativity of the multiplayer battle arena (MOB) *League of Legends* which reached a total of 180 million monthly players worldwide in 2021 according to different sources; the second is to examine the impact this lexical creativity has on the EFL learners' vocabulary knowledge at the receptive level.

A descriptive case-study was used for the first objective. Therefore, different examples of lexical creativity in *League of Legends* were analyzed and classified according to several lexical resources, such as compounding (*high-*

elo, *hard-stuck*, *outplayed*, *champion-pool*, *hyper-carry* or *countergank*), zero derivation (*to flame*, *to tilt*, *to snowball*, *to jungle*) or abbreviation (*ez* for easy, *ff* for forfeit, *gg* for good game or *KS* for kill steal), among others. A mixed-method research was used for the second objective aimed at examining the effects of this lexical creativity on EFL learners' receptive vocabulary knowledge. For this purpose, 82 third-year college students participated in this research, they were assigned to two different groups (gamers and non-gamers) based on a convenience sampling model. Quantitative and qualitative data were gathered through a questionnaire based on video game usage, a vocabulary test on English lexical resources including different items from the *League of Legends* and class discussion. The data was analyzed through the IBM SPSS Statistics 20 software tool.

The results revealed that the gamers had not only a higher knowledge of this vocabulary but also a better understanding of the different lexical resources involved in each case (compounding, zero derivation, clipping, blending, etc.). The gamers outperformed the non-gamers in most of the items included in the vocabulary test. Additionally, cross-correlational analysis elucidated some determining factors in the incidental vocabulary learning of such terms (*high-elo*, *KS*, *jungle*, etc.) such as playtime and type of online interaction. The research findings demonstrate the lexical richness of this commercial video game and they impact it may have for incidental vocabulary learning and receptive knowledge among EFL learners.

References

- Alemi, M., & Tayebi, A. (2011). The influence of incidental and intentional vocabulary acquisition and vocabulary strategy use on learning L2 vocabularies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(1), 81.
- Chiu, Y. H. (2013). Computer-Assisted Second Language Vocabulary Instruction: A Meta-Analysis. *Br. J. Educ. Technol.*, 2013, 44 (2), 533-556.
- Hua, Y., & Guo, Q. (2021). 12 Effects of intentional versus incidental learning tasks with different involvement loads on L2 vocabulary learning¹. *Teaching and Researching Chinese EFL/ESL Learners in Higher Education*, 232.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Intentional and incidental second language vocabulary learning: a reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal and automaticity. In P.
- Hung, H. T., Yang, J. C., Hwang, G. J., Chu, H. C., & Wang, C. C. (2018). A scoping review of research on digital game-based language learning. *Computers & Education*, 126, 89-104.
- Reynolds, B. L. (2017). Evidence for the task-induced involvement construct in incidental vocabulary acquisition through digital gaming. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(4), 466-484.

Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (pp. 258–286). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Waring, R., & Nation, I. S. (2004). Second language reading and incidental vocabulary learning. *Angles on the English speaking world*, 4, 97-110.

Zou, D., Huang, Y., & Xie, H. (2021). Digital game-based vocabulary learning: where are we and where are we going?. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(5-6), 751-777.

Dissociating Merge from minimal search and associating search to Resource Restriction

Nobu Goto (Toyo University) and Toru Ishii (Meiji University)

Proposal: Chomsky (2021) proposes that search to determine the input for Internal Merge by accessing workspace WS (IM-search) obeys minimal search (MS), while search to determine the input of External Merge by accessing lexicon LEX (EM-search) does not. But if “MS is a third factor element, on the shelf and available for any operation” as he himself states, it is a mystery why only EM is free from MS. What is it that a principled reason why EM does not obey MS? Without a genuine explanation of why this is so, that is, why only IM obeys MS, or why only EM does not, it raises the suspicion that it may simply be an arbitrary use of the third factor element. Insofar as EM and IM are unified as simply two instantiations of the single rule Merge (Chomsky 2004), such asymmetrical aspect should be explicitly explained, if there really exists, under the always available third factor. We thus propose an MS totally free Merge theory [I], eliminating the EM/IM distinction of MS *in toto*:

[I] Merge is totally free from MS (Minimal Search).

By [I], MS is dissociated not only from EM-search but also from IM-search and the arbitrary use of MS for Merge does not arise to begin with, so that the EM/IM uniformity is maintained.

Note that by [I], MS is abandoned from Merge, but items to which Merge will apply need to be determined by search – henceforth Σ for short – so that the questions whether Σ should satisfy any conditions, and if it does, what kind of conditions Σ should obey are still left open. Then, in terms of computational efficiency, we assume that Σ has to satisfy conditions that follow from general property of brain computation called Resource Restriction (RR). More specifically, developing Chomsky’s (2021 WCCFL Talk) suggestion that Binarity, which restricts n (the number of the targets of an operation) to two, and Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC), which blocks accessibility, follow from RR, we propose that Σ , the search operation, should obey RR:

[II] Σ (Search) obeys RR, where RR includes Binarity and PIC.

It is significant that [II] captures the insight behind the input-based determinacy proposed in Goto & Ishii (2020), which states that a determinacy violation occurs when IM is to apply to X that has two identical accessible copies in WS. They analyze, for example, the subject island effect (1a), under the derivation (1b), as follows: In (1b) “if we are to move *who* to the Spec of C, there are two accessible copies of *who*, *i.e.* the one within the Spec of T and the other within the Spec of v . This is an ambiguous rule application; (19) [= (1a)] violates Determinacy.”

(1) a. ***Who** did [pictures of *t*] please you?

b. $[_{CP} \text{ who } [_{C\text{-}did} [_{TP} \text{ [pictures of } \underline{\text{who}}] [_{T} [_{VP} \text{ [pictures of } \underline{\text{who}}] [_{v} [...$

However, under [II], we can explain (1a) in terms of Binarity on Σ , without committing ourselves to the notion of determinacy. Consider (2), WS of (1b) before IM (*who*, C) is applied:

(2) $WS = [\{C \{ \{ \dots \text{who}_2 \} \{T \{ \{ \dots \text{who}_1 \} \{v \{ \dots \} \} \} \} \}]$

Here PIC is irrelevant, because *who*₂ and *who*₁ are two copies formed by CP-phase-internal movement (the subscript numerals are assigned for expository purposes). In passing, the effect of PIC is irrelevant to EM-search since PIC applies to syntactic objects, not lexical items. In order for IM (*who*, C) to yield (1b), IM-search Σ has to first apply to WS in (2). But in (2) there are three accessible elements to IM-search: C, *who*₂, and *who*₁. This violates Binarity; IM-search cannot feed the appropriate input to IM, and IM cannot generate (1a). This analysis easily explains why the effect is canceled when *there* occupies SPEC-T (Lasnik & Park 2003):

(3) a. **Who** is there [a picture of *t*] on the wall?

b. $WS = [\{C \{ \text{there } \{T \{ \{ \dots \text{who} \} \{v \{ \dots \} \} \} \} \}]$

In order for IM (*who*, C) to yield (3a), IM-search has to apply to WS in (3b). In (3b) there are two accessible elements to IM-search: C and *who*. This satisfies Binarity. Therefore, IM-search can feed the appropriate input to IM (*who*, C), and IM can generate (3a).

Consequences: The proposal here has several theoretical advantages. First, it has been an unsettled issue whether determinacy should apply at the output of Merge (Chomsky, Gallego, & Ott 2019) or at the input of Merge (Goto & Ishii 2020), though both of these two conflicting approaches to determinacy on Merge have desirable empirical and theoretical consequences. But the theory here can provide us a possible way to break the deadlock between these two approaches and derive the insights of the two from RR on the search operation Σ without the

notion of determinacy. Binariness-obedient Σ subsumes under RR not only Goto & Ishii's input-based determinacy but also the output-based determinacy, reformulated as a condition on Merge called Minimal Yield in Chomsky (2021), which states that "Merge should construct the fewest possible new items that are accessible to further operations, thereby limiting Σ ." Note that our proposal also provides an answer to an open question how determinacy relates to RR: it can be reduced to RR via Binariness: $RR \rightarrow \text{Binariness} \rightarrow \text{determinacy}$. Incidentally, Chomsky (2017 Arizona Talk) suggests a possibility that "extensions of Merge" such as parallel Merge, sideward Merge, late Merge, etc. can be analyzed as causing not only a determinacy violation but also a Binariness violation. But if we follow the idea here, such a redundant analysis becomes unnecessary and the determinacy analysis can be uniformly replaced by the Binariness analysis.

Note that in addition to these theoretical advantages, all of the empirical consequences obtained in Goto & Ishii (2020) can be carried over as they are in the theory developed here. First, consider, for instance, why Japanese does not show the subject island effect:

- (4) a. **Dare-ni** [John-ga [[Mary-ga *t* atta] koto]-ga mondai-da to] omotteru] no?
 who-dat J.-nom M.-nom met fact-nom problem-is that think Q
 Lit. 'Who, John thinks that [the fact that Mary met *t*] is a problem.'
 b. $WS = [\{C \{T \{\{\dots \text{dare-ni}\} \{v \{\dots\}\}\}\}\}]$

In WS (4b), as the subject phrase containing *dare-ni* stays in SPEC-*v* throughout the derivation (Fukui 1986; Kuroda 1988), when we are to apply IM (*dare-ni* 'who-Dat', C), accessible elements to IM-search are *C* and *dare-ni* 'who-Dat'. This satisfies Binariness, so (4a) is generable by IM. Second, the subject-object asymmetry between (5a, b) with topicalization can also be explained (here we assume that a topicalized phrase is merged with C for its interpretation):

- (5) a. ***John**, *t* came yesterday.
 a' $WS = [\{C \{\text{John}_2 \{T \{\text{John}_1 \{v \{\dots\}\}\}\}\}\}]$
 b. **Mary**, John likes *t*.
 b' $WS = [\{C \{T \{v \{\text{Mary}_2 \{R \text{Mary}_1\}\}\}\}\}]$

In WS (5a'), when we are to apply IM (*John*, C), accessible elements to IM-search are *C*, *John*₂, and *John*₁. This violates Binariness, so (5a) is ungenerable by IM. On the other hand, in WS (5b'), when we are to apply IM (*Mary*, C), *Mary*₁, which is within the transferred domain (R-complement), is inaccessible due to PIC, hence accessible elements to IM-search are *C* and *Mary*₂. Note that we assume with Chomsky (2013, 2015) that Root (R) inherits phasehood from *v*, and R-complement undergoes Transfer. (5b') satisfies Binariness, so (5b) is generable by IM. Third, *that*-*t* effects can also receive a Binariness account:

- (6) a. ***Who** do you think that *t* saw Bill?
 a' $WS = [\{C(\text{that}) \{\text{who}_2 \{T \{\text{who}_1 \{v \{\dots\}\}\}\}\}\}]$
 b. **Who** do you think *t* saw Bill?
 b' $WS = [\{R(\text{THINK}) \{C(\text{that}) \rightarrow \emptyset \{\text{who}_2 \{T \{\text{who}_1 \{v \{\dots\}\}\}\}\}\}\}]$

In WS (6a'), when we are to apply IM (*who*, C), accessible elements to IM-search are *C*, *who*₂, and *who*₁. This violates Binariness, so (6a) is ungenerable by IM. On the other hand, in WS (6b'), we assume with Chomsky (2015) that C is deleted and *v*P undergoes Transfer via inheritance of phasehood from C to T. Then, when we are to apply IM (*who*, R), *who*₁ within the transferred domain (T-complement) is inaccessible due to PIC, hence accessible elements to IM-search are R and *who*₂. This satisfies Binariness; (6b) is generable by IM.

In this way, the proposed theory creates a new natural class, which cannot be obtained otherwise, for various movement restrictions. In the presentation we will demonstrate that by [I][II] the system overall is not only simpler but actually results in an increase in empirical coverage, providing a unified account of various movement phenomena in different languages, such as: subject island effects, a restriction in verb particle constructions, specificity effects, no vacuous topicalization, non-existence of COMP-less subject relatives, skipping strategy, adverb effects, freezing effects with topics, further raising, Merge-over-Move, adjunct island effects, island violation repairs by ellipsis and pronouns, no superfluous steps in a derivation, successive cyclicity in A-movement, anti-locality, etc.

References: Chomsky, Noam. (2021) WCCFL Talk <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F6SbPKmVNVQ> | Chomsky, Noam. (2021) "Minimalism: where are we now, and where can we hope to go." *Gengo Kenkyu* 160. | Goto, Nobu. & Toru, Ishii. (2020) "Some consequence of MERGE and determinacy." *Lingbuzz* (<https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004108>)

***Qi* (其) : New Evidence for the Existence of Genitive Subjects in Chinese**

Xiaoshi Qiu and Jianyao Liu

Graduate School of Humanities, Osaka University

1. Introduction

This paper shows new evidence for the existence of genitive subjects in modern standard Chinese: 1) that the genitive 3rd person pronoun *qi* (其) in relative clauses leads to high acceptability of the sentences with it, and 2) that a widely used structure “NP + DE + VP” corresponds to a Japanese noun complement clause. The findings of this paper support Maki et al.’ (2015) conclusion that modern standard Chinese shares similar genitive subject licensing conditions with Japanese.

2. Background

In modern standard Japanese, subjects bearing genitive Case can be found mainly in two kinds of noun-modifying clauses, namely relative clauses and noun complement clauses:

- (1) a. boku no yon-da hon
I Gen read-Pst.Adn book
‘The book which I read’ (Adn = adnominal form) (Harada (1971))
b. John no ki-ta koto
JohnGen come-Pst.Adn fact ‘the fact that John came’

This is the Genitive-Nominative Conversion, which was originally discussed in Harada (1971). See Miyagawa (1993, 2011, 2012, 2013), Watanabe (1996), Hiraiwa (2001) and Ochi (2001, 2009), among many others. Based on the distribution of genitive subjects in Mongolian and Japanese, Maki et al. (2016) propose that a genitive subject must be a) c-commanded by a nominal element in a local domain, and b) in a local relationship with an adnominal predicate.

3. Data

First, let us examine relative clauses with a genitive subject in Chinese. (2a, c) cited from Maki et al. (2015) is a relative clause with the possessive marker *de* attached to the subject. The grammaticality judgments of (2a, c) vary from speaker to speaker. However, the acceptability of (2b, d) will rise remarkably when the subject is replaced by the 3rd person pronoun *qi* (其) .

- (2) a. Zuotian Zhangsan de xiuhaozixingchedefangfa shi zhe-ge.
yesterday Zhangsan DE fix bicycle DE way is this-Cl
‘The way Zhangsan fixed the bicycle is this.’
b. Zuotian **qi** xiuhaozixingchedefangfa shi zhe-ge.
yesterday his fix bicycle DE way is this-Cl
‘The way he fixed the bicycle is this.’
c. Xingqiliu Zhangsan de goumai de shu shi zhe-ben.
Saturday Zhangsan DE buy DE book be this-Cl
‘The book which Zhangsan bought on Saturday is this.’ (slightly edited)
d. Xingqiliu **qi** goumai de shu shi zhe-ben
Saturday his buy DE book be this-Cl
‘The book which he bought on Saturday is this.’

Unlike other Chinese pronouns, which usually have no morphological changes and need *de* attached to them when they are possessors, *qi* has the possession meaning with it. This pronoun cannot appear as a subject of a simple sentence, as shown in (3), and shows a complementary distribution with pronouns to which *de* is attached, as shown in (4).

- (3) Dangshi ta/***qi** sanfachu yigu teshu de kuwei.
 at that time it/*its spread a kind of special DE bitter taste
 ‘It spread a special bitter taste at that time.’
- (4) a. ta de qingxiaoshuo c. * **qi** de qingxiaoshuo
 she/he DE light novel her/his DE light novel
 ‘her/his light novel’
 b. * ta qingxiaoshuo d. **qi** qingxiaoshuo
 she/he light novel her/his light novel

Second, let us turn to noun complement clauses with a genitive subject. The predicate in this structure remains a verb, because it can be negated, modified by adverbs and take an object, as shown in (5).

- (5) Wo zancheng xiazhou Zhangsan de bu zai bangongshi qiaoqiao jian jizhe.
 I approve next week Zhangsan DE NEG at office secretly meet reporter
 ‘I approve of Zhangsan’s not meeting the reporter secretly at the office next week.’

This sentence (slightly edited) comes from Shi 2008, and reconsidered as acceptable by our native speaker judgement. Notice that the genitive subject can also be *qi*, as shown in (6).

- (6) Wo zancheng xiazhou **qi** bu zai bangongshi qiaoqiao jian jizhe.
 I approve next week her/his NEG at office secretly meet reporter
 ‘I approve of her/his not meeting the reporter secretly at the office next week.’

One may wonder if the predicates in these examples are gerunds. However, they allow a nominative subject, as shown in (7), which indicates that they are verbs.

- (7) Wo zancheng xiazhou Zhangsan bu zai bangongshi qiaoqiao jian jizhe
 I approve next week Zhangsan NEG at office secretly meet reporter
 ‘I approve that Zhangsan (will) not meet the reporter secretly at the office next week.’

4. Discussion

Let us consider what the above facts might suggest for the theory of (Chinese) syntax. **First**, besides supporting Maki et al.’s (2015) conclusion on Chinese genitive subjects, the example in (5) seems to support Bao et al.’s (in progress) claim that a genitive subject needs to be m-commanded, not c-commanded, by a nominal element, which may be the adnominal form of a predicate itself, because in (5) the predicate shows properties of a noun and a verb at the same time. **Second**, the grammaticality of (2a, b) seems to suggest that in Chinese, the distribution of genitive subjects is restricted by a condition which is not found in Japanese or Mongolian. That is, in Chinese, non-syntactic factors such as prosody might block the co-occurrence of the genitive maker *de* ‘DE’ and the relative clause introducer *de* ‘DE’ in the same clause.

Selected References

- Maki, Hideki, Lina Bao, Wurigumula Bao and Megumi Hasebe (2016) “Scrambling and Genitive Subjects in Mongolian,” *English Linguistics* 33, 1-35.
 Shi, Dingxu (2008) *Mingci he Mingcixing Chengfen* [Nouns and Nominals], Beijing University Press, Beijing.

Worry about vs. be worried about

– The difference in the conceptualization of the triggering event –

Hiromichi SAKABA (Graduate School, Osaka University)

This study examines the difference in the conceptualization between emotions expressed by verbs and those expressed by adjectives (past participle), focusing on the semantic difference between the expression *worry about* and *be worried about*. It shows that they are used in different contexts and the difference reflects different conceptualization of the event to trigger the feelings.

Normally, actions are depicted by verbs, and properties are expressed by adjectives (Hopper and Thompson 1985). Intermediates such as emotions can be expressed by either verbs or adjectives (Wierzbicka 1995). Consider the following pair, in which the word *worry* is used in a verbal form and an adjectival (past-participle) form.

(1) Mary is {*worrying/ worried*} (about something). (Wierzbicka 1995: 225)

Wierzbicka (1995) claims that the grammatical distinctions reflect different modes for conceptualizing feelings. The verbal form describes the mental action in which Mary is doing something in her head. The direct cause of feeling lay in her conscious thoughts. In contrast, the adjectival form presents the feeling as a state, which is triggered by some external cause.

Wierzbicka discusses the difference in meaning solely based on the formal differences, and it is not clear whether these formal differences actually reflect a difference in meaning. This study observes the examples of *worry about* and *be worried about* in the American television sitcom *Friends* to see in which contexts each expression is used. It will be shown that *worry about* (24 cases) is used for ‘a situation that may happen in the future’ whereas *be worried about* (25 cases) for ‘an ongoing situation’. This difference in context is consistent with Wierzbicka’s argument. The experiencer of *worry about* is actively worrying about ‘a situation that may happen in the future’ and their conscious thoughts are the direct cause. On the other hand, the experiencer of *be worried about* is troubled by ‘an ongoing situation’, which is the direct cause.

Let us observe some examples. In (2) and (3), the experiencer of *worry about* is actively concerned about ‘a situation that may happen in the future’.

(2) Chandler: I just don’t want to be one of those guys that’s in his office until twelve o’clock at night *worrying about* the WENUS. (*Friends*, Season 1, Episode 15)

(3) Chandler: Couldn’t sleep last night you know, then I started *worrying about* this big divisional meeting that I have later today, the more I *worried about* it the more I couldn’t sleep. (*Friends*, Season 9, Episode 2)

In (2), Chandler expresses the feeling of not wanting to be in the position of always worrying that something will go wrong with the machine with a funny name. In (3), he expresses the fear of what might happen if the next day’s meeting goes wrong. In both cases, the feelings are caused by the experiencer’s conscious thinking about ‘a situation that may happen in the future’.

In contrast, the feeling expressed by *be worried about* in (4) and (5) are directly triggered by the external cause, the ‘ongoing situation’.

(4) Rachel: I just checked our messages and Joshua didn’t call. I mean you’d think he’d *be worried about* me not showing up at his club. (*Friends*, Season 4, Episode 14)

(5) Rachel: Chandler, *aren't you worried about* what to get Monica for Christmas?

(*Friends*, Season 6, Episode 10)

In (4), Rachel, the speaker, imagines that the temporary situation of her not coming to the club would worry Joshua. In (5), she is asking Chandler whether the temporary situation that he has to prepare a present worries him. Thus, the feelings are triggered by the external cause.

The above observations lead us to the hypothesis that only *worry about*, in which experiencer's conscious thoughts are the direct cause, can follow the verbs that require the experiencer to control their emotions such as *start* or *stop* (e.g. *I started worrying about* in (3)). A search of the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) for the number of uses reveals significant differences. As shown below, many examples of *worry about* co-occurring with *start* or *stop* were observed whereas few examples of *to be worried about* were detected.

Start (ed)	{to worry/ worrying} about	332
	{to be worried/ being worried} about	0
Stop (ped)	{to worry / worrying} about	626
	{to be worried/ being worried} about	3

The above discussion is also in line with Croft (2012), who argues that there are two types of argument structure constructions for mental events including emotions. While the experiencer is realized as the subject and the stimulus as the object (subsequent oblique) in (6a), the experiencer is realized as the object (subsequent oblique) and the stimulus as the subject in (6b).

(6) a. I listened to the music. / I heard the music.

b. The music sounds loud to me. / The loud music frightened me. (Croft 2012: 233)

Croft attributes the difference in the argument realization of mental events to two directions of transmission of force. In (6a), the experiencer (= the subject) directs their mental attention to the stimulus. Conversely, in (6b), the stimulus (= the subject) causes a change of (mental) state in the experiencer. Applying this to the difference between *worry about* and *be worried about*, in the former, the experiencer directs attention and the direct cause lay in their conscious thoughts. In the latter, the stimulus changes mental state, and therefore the feeling is caused by an external cause. It is noteworthy that the two argument structures for mental events in Croft (2012) use different verbs, whereas *worry about* is based on the same verb phrase.

Thus, *worry about* is used for 'a situation that may happen in the future' whereas *be worried about* for 'an ongoing situation'. This difference in context, which is also observed in terms of the corpus data, reflects the difference in conceptualization between verbs and adjectives in Wierzbicka (1995), and the variation in the argument realization of mental events in Croft (2012).

References: Croft, W. 2012. *Verbs: Aspect and causal structure*. Oxford University Press./ Davies, M. 2008-. *The corpus of contemporary American English (COCA)*. Available online at <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>./ Hopper, J. P. and S A. Thompson. 1985. The iconicity of the universal categories 'noun' and 'verb'. In J. Haiman (ed.). *Iconicity in syntax*. 151-183. Benjamins./ Wierzbicka, A. 1995. Adjectives vs verbs: The iconicity of part-of-speech membership In M. Landsberg (ed.) *syntactic iconicity and linguistic freezes*. 223–245. De Gruyter.

1. Introduction: This paper discusses dative and nominative absolute constructions in Old English (OE) using data from a historical corpus. For example, in (1), ‘Ven’ and ‘Vende’ represent the past and the present participle, respectively:

- (1) a. *Þissum gecwedenum* (Dative-Ven Order)
This-DAT cwendened-DAT ‘This told’ (coeuphr,LS_7_[Euphr]:298.312, O3)
- b. *Drihtne samod wyrceandum*, (Dative-Vende Order)
Multitude-DAT samed working-DAT ‘multitude working together’
(cocathom1,+ACHom_I,_21:353.234.4296, O3)
- c. *þas þincg ealle þus oncnawenne*, (Nominative-Ven Order)
the-NOM thing-NOM all-NOM thus acknown-NOM ‘all the things known,’
(comary,LS_23_[MaryofEgypt]:610.400, O3)
- d. *Ðus he mid tearum biddende*, (Nominative-Vende Order)
Thus he-NOM with tears bidding-NOM, ‘Thus he bidding with tears,’
(comary,LS_23_[MaryofEgypt]:672.442, O3)

In the following, the absolute constructions in (1a) will be termed dative past participle absolute constructions, those in (1b) dative present participle absolute constructions, those in (1c) nominative past participle absolute constructions, and those in (1d) nominative present participle absolute constructions.

Based on the results of corpus investigation, two possibilities are considered: (i) in dative past/present participle absolute constructions, the verb moves to a higher position over the dative subject, and (ii) in nominative past/present participle absolute constructions, the nominative case is assigned to the subject noun phrase as the default case.

2. Previous Analyses: Previous studies have mainly debated whether absolute constructions in OE were mere translations of Latin or usages derived from Germanic languages. (Visser (1966), Sato (2009), van de Pol (2012)). However, to the best of the author’s knowledge, no previous studies have investigated the distribution of absolute constructions in OE by period and the word order of the subject and participle. Nakagawa (2019) analyzed dative present participle absolute constructions within the framework of the minimalist program, but not other types of absolute constructions.

3. Data: Dative/nominative past/present participle absolute constructions were collected from the *York–Toronto–Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* by checking the constructions tagged with “PTP-DAT-ABS” or “PTP-NOM-ABS.” No absolute accusative constructions were detected.

Tables 1 and 2 present the search results.

Table 1: Dative Subject-Past/Present Participle Order and Texts Sources

	Dative-Ven: 50	Ven-Dative: 211	Dative-Vende: 110	Vende-Dative: 92
Latin Translation	41	172	77	89
Not Latin Translation	5	39	23	1

*In all, 4 Dative-Ven examples, 10 Dative-Vende examples, and 2 Vende-Dative examples are excluded because it is unclear whether the source text was translated from Latin.

Examples of Dative-Ven and Ven-Dative orders are presented in (1a) and (2a), and those of Dative-Vende and Vende-Dative orders are presented in (1b) and (2b), respectively.

- (2) a. *belocenum durum*, (Ven-Dative Order)
belouked-Dat door-Dat ‘Door locked’ (coaelive,+ALS_[Martin]:1207.6768, O3)

b. þus cweþendum Drihtne (*Vende*-Dative Order)

thus queathen-DAT driht-DAT “thus multitude speaking”

(cocathom1,+ACHom_I,_27:406.181.5395, O3)

Table 2: The Distribution of Dative Past/Present Participle Absolute Constructions in OE

	O2 (850–950)	O3 (950–1050)	O4 (1050–1150)
Dative- <i>Ven</i>	23 (4.5)	23 (2.7)	4 (4.6)
<i>Ven</i> -Dative	139 (27.5)	70 (8.3)	2 (2.3)
Dative- <i>Vende</i>	59 (11.7)	45 (5.3)	6 (6.8)
<i>Vende</i> -Dative	83 (16.4)	9 (1.1)	0 (0)

*The bracketed number represents the normalized frequency per 100,000 words.

Tables 1 and 2 show that both *Ven*-Dative and *Vende*-Dative orders were productive in O2, suggesting that verbs may have moved to a higher position over the dative subject, but they decreased or disappeared toward O4, suggesting that verb movement largely declined by O4. The dative and nominative absolute constructions were not detected in O1 (–850), which may be due to the small amount of text from O1.

The search results of nominative past/present participle absolute constructions are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Because the number of examples is very small, the normalized frequency per 100,000 words is omitted.

Table 3: Nominative Subject-Past/Present Participle Order and Texts Sources

	Nominative- <i>Ven</i> : 15	<i>Ven</i> -Nominative: 1	Nominative- <i>Vende</i> : 16
Latin Translation	13	1	4
Not Latin Translation	1	0	12

*One Nominative-*Ven* example is excluded because it is unclear whether the source text was translated from Latin.

Examples of Nominative-*Ven* and *Ven*-Nominative orders are presented in (1c) and (3), respectively, and an example of Nominative-*Vende* is given in (1d). There were no examples of *Vende*-Nominative found.

(3) gebærned hundes heafod (*Ven*-Nominative)

burned-NOM hound’s head-NOM ‘hound’s head burned’

(coquadru,Med_1.1_[de_Vriend]:14.6.482, O2)

Table 4: Distribution of Nominative Past/Present Participle Absolute Constructions in OE

	O2	O3	O4
Nominative- <i>Ven</i>	12	2	1
<i>Ven</i> -Nominative	1	0	0
Nominative- <i>Vende</i>	0	16	0

Tables 3 and 4 show that the verb movement to a higher position over the nominative subject is rarely observed in nominative past/present participle absolute constructions in OE, suggesting that there is no evidence for the existence of CP in such constructions. The minimalist framework after Chomsky (2004), which assumes that the C-T configuration is necessary for nominative Case assignment, cannot correctly explain the nominative Case assignment to subjects in these constructions. Considering the possibility that the nominative Case assigner does not exist, this paper assumes that nominative case was assigned to the subject as a default case in OE (cf. Schütze (2001)).

References (Selected): Nakagawa (2019) “The Historical Development of Absolute Participial Constructions in English.” / van de Pol (2012) “Between Copy and Cognate: The Origin of Absolutes in Old and Middle English.” / Sato (2009) “The Absolute Construction in Old English: Ælfic’s Exploitation of the Latinate Syntax in his Vernacular Prose.” / Schütze (2001) “On the Nature of Default Case.”