

Erratum to “A Corpus-based study on syntactic features of English *get*-passive”



(Published February 2010 in Volume 18 of *Polyglossia*)

In reference to the article carried by *Polyglossia* 18 (published February 2010), entitled "A Corpus-based study on syntactic features of English *get*-passive" by Wu Guoliang and Zhang Lei, it has been discovered that its authors copied from the article "The origin of passive *get*" by Nicholas Fleisher published in *English Language and Linguistics* 10.2 (Cambridge University Press 2006) to an extent that must be described as improper by any international measure. In the following cross-referenced **corrigendum** the editors of *Polyglossia* have underlined passages and diagrams to highlight a lack of attribution within the text of Wu and Zhang 2010. It is clear that Wu and Zhang excerpt a significant amount of text from Fleisher 2006 nearly *verbatim* without the use of inverted commas or setting off any part of the borrowed text as a blockquote. Furthermore, Wu and Zhang place (Fleisher, 2006), gray-shaded by the editors of *Polyglossia* in the **corrigendum**, only once at the end of the last underlined sentence, thereby giving a misleading impression that what is attributable to Fleisher 2006 is the idea expressed by the sentence beginning with “The main difference...” only, whereas in fact the underlined discourse is attributable to Fleisher 2006 in its entirety, both in ideas and wording.

The editors of *Polyglossia* appreciate Dr. Nicholas Fleisher for bringing this matter to their attention and, seizing this opportunity, offer a formal apology for the distress this academic impropriety must have caused him. No less sincere apologies go to the editors of *English Language and Linguistics* and Cambridge University Press as well for damaging the prestige of their journal.

Corrigendum:

Fleisher 2006	Wu and Zhang 2010
pp. 234-235, <i>English Language and Linguistics</i> 10.2	p. 32, <i>Polyglossia</i> 18
<p>We have seen above that the complement of inchoative <i>get</i> is an adjective, the prototypical state-denoting expression. By subtraction, we may infer that the <i>get</i> of inchoative <i>get</i> denotes the onset of the change-of-state event, i.e. the portion of the semantics not contributed by the complement. The event structure of inchoative <i>get</i> is shown in (12), with association lines linking event-structural elements to morphosyntactic items, as well as showing the internal structure of the event:</p> <p>(12) <i>Event structure of inchoative get</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">He_i got [_{AP} t_i[familiar with them]].</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <p>Passive <i>get</i> likewise involves a telic eventuality consisting of an onset and a result state; however, the verbal passive participle alone denotes both of these event-structural elements.</p>	<p><u>The complement of the inchoative <i>get</i> itself is an adjective, the prototypical state-denoting expression. By subtraction, we may infer that the <i>get</i> of the inchoative <i>get</i> denotes the onset of the change-of-state event, i.e. the portion of the semantics not contributed to by the complement. The event structure of the inchoative <i>get</i> is shown in (2), with association lines linking event-structural elements to morphosyntactic items, as well as showing the internal structure of the event:</u></p> <p><u>(2) Event structure of inchoative get</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>He_i got [_{AP} t_i[familiar with them]].</u></p> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <p><u>The passive <i>get</i> also involves a telic eventuality consisting of an onset and a result state; however, the verbal passive participle alone denotes both of these event-structural elements.</u></p>
p. 235, <i>ibid</i>	pp. 32-33, <i>ibid</i>
The event structure of passive <i>get</i> is shown in (14): (14) <i>Event structure of passive get</i>	<u>The event structure of the passive <i>get</i> is shown in (3):</u> (3) <i>Event structure of passive get</i>

<p>He_i got [_{VP} caught t_i by them]</p>  <p>TELIC EVENTUALITY</p> <p>In passive <i>get</i>, the onset is associated not with <i>get</i> (cf. (12)) but with the verbal passive participle in the complement.</p>	<p><u>He_i got [_{VP} caught t_i by them]</u></p>  <p><u>TELIC EVENTUALITY</u></p> <p><u>In the passive <i>get</i>, the onset is associated not with <i>get</i> but with the verbal passive participle in the complement.</u></p>
<p>p. 237, <i>ibid</i></p>	<p>p. 33, <i>ibid</i></p>
<p>Informally, we might characterize the semantic difference between the two as ‘onset of result state’ (inchoative) versus ‘event triggering onset of result state’ (passive). The main difference is one of highlighting, or subjective framing: the result state is highlighted in the inchoative, while the entire onset-plus-result event is highlighted in the passive.</p>	<p><u>Informally, we might characterize the semantic difference of <i>get</i> between the inchoative construction and the passive construction as the ‘onset of a result state’ (inchoative) versus ‘event triggering the onset of a result state’ (passive). Based on the typological surveys and studies made by Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994, p. 68), we know that the passive <i>get</i> evolves from the inchoative <i>get</i>. The main difference is one of highlighting, or subjective framing: the result state is highlighted in the inchoative while the entire onset-plus-result event is highlighted in the passive. (Fleisher, 2006)</u></p>

Editors,

Polyglossia

October 20th, 2012