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	Experimental evidence —— 153
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	Interim conclusion for study series 1 —— 188 Study series 2: Grammatical verb type —— 190
4.6 4.6.1	Interim conclusion for study series 1 —— 188 Study series 2: Grammatical verb type —— 190 Experiment 4: Transitives, unaccusatives, and unergatives —— 192
4.6 4.6.1 4.6.2	Interim conclusion for study series 1 —— 188 Study series 2: Grammatical verb type —— 190 Experiment 4: Transitives, unaccusatives, and unergatives —— 192 Experiment 5: Complex unaccusatives and transitives —— 200
4.6 4.6.1 4.6.2 4.6.3	Interim conclusion for study series 1 — 188 Study series 2: Grammatical verb type — 190 Experiment 4: Transitives, unaccusatives, and unergatives — 192 Experiment 5: Complex unaccusatives and transitives — 200 Interim conclusion for study series 2 — 206
4.6 4.6.1 4.6.2 4.6.3 4.7	Interim conclusion for study series 1 — 188 Study series 2: Grammatical verb type — 190 Experiment 4: Transitives, unaccusatives, and unergatives — 192 Experiment 5: Complex unaccusatives and transitives — 200 Interim conclusion for study series 2 — 206 Study series 3: get-predicates and achievements — 206
4.6 4.6.1 4.6.2 4.6.3 4.7 4.7.1	Interim conclusion for study series 1 — 188 Study series 2: Grammatical verb type — 190 Experiment 4: Transitives, unaccusatives, and unergatives — 192 Experiment 5: Complex unaccusatives and transitives — 200 Interim conclusion for study series 2 — 206 Study series 3: get-predicates and achievements — 206 Experiment 6: get-predicates — 209
4.6 4.6.1 4.6.2 4.6.3 4.7	Interim conclusion for study series 1 — 188 Study series 2: Grammatical verb type — 190 Experiment 4: Transitives, unaccusatives, and unergatives — 192 Experiment 5: Complex unaccusatives and transitives — 200 Interim conclusion for study series 2 — 206 Study series 3: get-predicates and achievements — 206

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 A factorial acceptability model for present participle adjuncts — 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 5.4.1 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 show up and appear — 292 5.4.5 V-V linearization — 293 5.4.6 Informativity — 296 5.5 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 Chapter conclusion — 300 6 Conclusion and outlook — 301	
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 A factorial acceptability model for present participle adjuncts — 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 5.4.1 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 show up and appear — 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	
A factorial acceptability model for present participle adjuncts — Main experimental findings — 248 Deriving the factorial acceptability model — 250 Independence — 250 Durativity — 253 Scalar change — 258 Transitivity — 264 Description of the final model — 268 Predictions and advantages of the factorial model — 273 Empirical coverage — 274 Compatibility with CED-style locality conditions — 277 Activities with directional phrases — 278 Differences to adjunct licensing in Brown (2017) — 281 A connection between durativity and scalar change — 283 Potential challenges — 286 Event specification or event expansion — 286 Perception verbs — 288 Gap site ambiguity — 289 The cases of show up and appear — 292 V–V linearization — 293 Informativity — 296 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 Chapter conclusion — 300	
A factorial acceptability model for present participle adjuncts — Main experimental findings — 248 Deriving the factorial acceptability model — 250 Independence — 250 Durativity — 253 Scalar change — 258 Transitivity — 264 Description of the final model — 268 Predictions and advantages of the factorial model — 273 Empirical coverage — 274 Compatibility with CED-style locality conditions — 277 Activities with directional phrases — 278 Differences to adjunct licensing in Brown (2017) — 281 A connection between durativity and scalar change — 283 Potential challenges — 286 Event specification or event expansion — 286 Perception verbs — 288 Gap site ambiguity — 289 The cases of show up and appear — 292 V–V linearization — 293 Informativity — 296 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 Chapter conclusion — 300	,
A factorial acceptability model for present participle adjuncts — Main experimental findings — 248 Deriving the factorial acceptability model — 250 Independence — 250 Durativity — 253 Scalar change — 258 Transitivity — 264 Description of the final model — 268 Predictions and advantages of the factorial model — 273 Empirical coverage — 274 Compatibility with CED-style locality conditions — 277 Activities with directional phrases — 278 3.34 Differences to adjunct licensing in Brown (2017) — 281 A connection between durativity and scalar change — 283 Potential challenges — 286 Event specification or event expansion — 286 Perception verbs — 288 Gap site ambiguity — 289 The cases of show up and appear — 292 V–V linearization — 293 Informativity — 296 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 Chapter conclusion — 300	
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 5.4.1 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 show up and appear — 292 5.4.5 V–V linearization — 293 5.4.6 Informativity — 296 5.5 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 Chapter conclusion — 300	
Deriving the factorial acceptability model — 250 1.2.1 Independence — 250 1.2.2 Durativity — 253 1.2.3 Scalar change — 258 1.2.4 Transitivity — 264 1.2.5 Description of the final model — 268 1.3 Predictions and advantages of the factorial model — 273 1.3.1 Empirical coverage — 274 1.3.2 Compatibility with CED-style locality conditions — 277 1.3.3 Activities with directional phrases — 278 1.3.4 Differences to adjunct licensing in Brown (2017) — 281 1.3.5 A connection between durativity and scalar change — 283 1.4.1 Event specification or event expansion — 286 1.4.2 Perception verbs — 288 1.4.3 Gap site ambiguity — 289 1.4.4 The cases of show up and appear — 292 1.4.5 V–V linearization — 293 1.4.6 Informativity — 296 1.5.5 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 1.6.6 Chapter conclusion — 300	e adjuncts —— 246
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 show up and appear — 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	
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 show up and appear — 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	50
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 show up and appear — 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	
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 show up and appear — 292 5.4.5 V–V linearization — 293 5.4.6 Informativity — 296 5.5 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 Chapter conclusion — 300	
Description of the final model — 268 Predictions and advantages of the factorial model — 273 Empirical coverage — 274 Compatibility with CED-style locality conditions — 277 Activities with directional phrases — 278 Differences to adjunct licensing in Brown (2017) — 281 A connection between durativity and scalar change — 283 Potential challenges — 286 Event specification or event expansion — 286 Perception verbs — 288 Gap site ambiguity — 289 The cases of show up and appear — 292 V–V linearization — 293 Informativity — 296 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 Chapter conclusion — 300	
Predictions and advantages of the factorial model — 273 Empirical coverage — 274 Compatibility with CED-style locality conditions — 277 Activities with directional phrases — 278 Differences to adjunct licensing in Brown (2017) — 281 A connection between durativity and scalar change — 283 Potential challenges — 286 Event specification or event expansion — 286 Perception verbs — 288 Gap site ambiguity — 289 The cases of show up and appear — 292 V–V linearization — 293 Informativity — 296 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 Chapter conclusion — 300	
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 show up and appear — 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	
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 show up and appear — 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	del 273
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 show up and appear — 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	
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 show up and appear — 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	 277
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 show up and appear — 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	
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 show up and appear — 292 5.4.5 V-V linearization — 293 5.4.6 Informativity — 296 5.5 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 Chapter conclusion — 300) —— 281
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 show up and appear — 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	nge 283
Perception verbs — 288 5.4.3 Gap site ambiguity — 289 5.4.4 The cases of show up and appear — 292 5.4.5 V-V linearization — 293 5.4.6 Informativity — 296 5.5 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 Chapter conclusion — 300	
5.4.3 Gap site ambiguity — 289 5.4.4 The cases of show up and appear — 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	
5.4.4 The cases of show up and appear — 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	
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	
 5.4.6 Informativity — 296 5.5 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 5.6 Chapter conclusion — 300 	
 5.5 Similarities to past participle adjuncts — 297 5.6 Chapter conclusion — 300 	
5.6 Chapter conclusion —— 300	
·	
6 Conclusion and outlook —— 301	

References —— 307

Index ---- 327