

# Contents

**Acknowledgments — V**

**Abbreviations — XI**

**List of Figures — XIII**

**List of Tables — XV**

## **1 Introduction — 1**

- 1.1 Examples of grammatical extractions from adjuncts — 3
- 1.2 Participle adjuncts and extraction patterns — 5
- 1.3 Empirical scope and focus — 6
- 1.4 Central research question and sketch of the proposal — 9
- 1.5 Conventions — 13
- 1.6 Outline — 14

## **2 Present participle adjuncts: structure and interpretation — 16**

- 2.1 Research questions and chapter outline — 16
- 2.2 Towards a syntactic analysis of BPPAs — 17
  - 2.2.1 Reduced adverbial clause analysis — 20
  - 2.2.2 Converb construction analysis — 23
  - 2.2.3 Depictive secondary predicate analysis — 26
  - 2.2.4 Interim conclusion — 29
- 2.3 The interpretational space of BPPAs — 30
  - 2.3.1 The semantics of depictives — 31
  - 2.3.2 Event specification and expansion with co-eventive adjuncts — 35
  - 2.3.3 Interpreting complex event structures — 40
- 2.4 Licensing conditions on depictive constructions — 45
  - 2.4.1 Licensing conditions on the depictive — 46
  - 2.4.2 Licensing conditions on the host predicate — 50
  - 2.4.3 Resultative BPPA constructions — 57
- 2.5 Chapter conclusion — 60

## **3 Previous approaches to extraction from adjuncts — 63**

- 3.1 Research questions and chapter outline — 63
- 3.2 Syntactic gap-licensing accounts — 67
  - 3.2.1 Optional feature sharing (Boeckx 2003; Oseki 2015) — 67

3.2.2	Attachment height and forced spell-out (Narita 2014) —	71
3.2.3	Top-down structure building (den Dikken 2018) —	74
3.2.4	Interim conclusion —	77
3.3	Interaction accounts —	78
3.3.1	Reanalysis (Demonte 1988) —	78
3.3.2	Reflexivity (Borgonovo & Neeleman 2000) —	82
3.3.3	Aspectual classes and extraction (Truswell 2007) —	87
3.3.4	Event groupings and agentivity (Truswell 2011) —	97
3.3.5	Semantically conditioned feature inactivity (Ernst 2022) —	108
3.3.6	Spanish gerund complements (París 2003) —	112
3.3.7	Maximal event templates (Fábregas & Jiménez-Fernández 2016a,b) —	118
3.3.8	Pragmatic conditions on extraction (Chaves & Putnam 2020) —	125
3.3.9	Coherence and extraction from adverbial clauses (C. Müller 2019) —	134
3.3.10	Interim conclusion —	138
3.4	An independence approach (Brown 2017) —	138
3.5	Chapter conclusion —	150
4	<b>Experimental evidence —</b>	<b>153</b>
4.1	Research questions and chapter outline —	153
4.2	Categorical and factorial models of acceptability —	155
4.3	Factors —	158
4.3.1	General factors relevant to extraction from islands —	158
4.3.2	Specific factors for adjunct islands —	160
4.4	Methodology —	162
4.5	Study series 1: Event structure —	166
4.5.1	Experiment 1: Aspectual classes across constructions —	167
4.5.2	Experiment 2: Event structure in declaratives and interrogatives —	178
4.5.3	Experiment 3: Adjunct integration —	183
4.5.4	Interim conclusion for study series 1 —	188
4.6	Study series 2: Grammatical verb type —	190
4.6.1	Experiment 4: Transitives, unaccusatives, and unergatives —	192
4.6.2	Experiment 5: Complex unaccusatives and transitives —	200
4.6.3	Interim conclusion for study series 2 —	206
4.7	Study series 3: <i>get</i> -predicates and achievements —	206
4.7.1	Experiment 6: <i>get</i> -predicates —	209
4.7.2	Experiment 7: Progressive achievements —	220
4.7.3	Experiment 8: <i>get</i> -predicates & achievements —	228

4.7.4	Interim conclusion for study series 3 —	235
4.8	General discussion and conclusion —	237
4.8.1	Conclusions for the research questions —	237
4.8.2	The relation to the islands debate —	241
4.8.3	Summary of factors —	244
5	<b>A factorial acceptability model for present participle adjuncts —</b>	<b>246</b>
5.1	Main experimental findings —	248
5.2	Deriving the factorial acceptability model —	250
5.2.1	Independence —	250
5.2.2	Durativity —	253
5.2.3	Scalar change —	258
5.2.4	Transitivity —	264
5.2.5	Description of the final model —	268
5.3	Predictions and advantages of the factorial model —	273
5.3.1	Empirical coverage —	274
5.3.2	Compatibility with CED-style locality conditions —	277
5.3.3	Activities with directional phrases —	278
5.3.4	Differences to adjunct licensing in Brown (2017) —	281
5.3.5	A connection between durativity and scalar change —	283
5.4	Potential challenges —	286
5.4.1	Event specification or event expansion —	286
5.4.2	Perception verbs —	288
5.4.3	Gap site ambiguity —	289
5.4.4	The cases of <i>show up</i> and <i>appear</i> —	292
5.4.5	V–V linearization —	293
5.4.6	Informativity —	296
5.5	Similarities to past participle adjuncts —	297
5.6	Chapter conclusion —	300
6	<b>Conclusion and outlook —</b>	<b>301</b>
	<b>References —</b>	<b>307</b>
	<b>Index —</b>	<b>327</b>