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After elucidating the semantics of Route phrases in motion sentences, this paper addresses itself to a novel type of adjunct involving all the way, as in She coughed all the way to her office. This construction is peculiar not only because the modifier all the way is obligatory (*She coughed to her office) but also because it involves dual predications denoting the occurrence of the main verb’s event and the subject’s movement to the designated goal. These peculiarities are accounted for by a special operation on Conceptual Structure that creates a motion event from a non-motion event. Theoretical proposals are also made to distinguish between motional and resultative constructions and to resolve the issues of telicity and functional categories for adverbials.*
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1. Introduction

A central issue in current linguistic research concerns how and to what extent different modules of a grammar interact with each other. Adjuncts offer a particularly interesting testing ground for resolving the interface issue because their licensing conditions depend on multiple factors ranging from syntactic positions to lexicosemantic concepts to pragmatic inferences. While adjuncts are traditionally generated in adjunction positions and interpreted as modifiers in syntactic structure, recent studies are beginning to offer new insights into the nature of adjunct classes by paying balanced attention to both syntactic and lexicosemantic properties. In particular, Tenny (2000), Ernst (2002), Frey
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(2003), Maienborn (2003), and others have clarified the correlations between the semantic properties of adjuncts and their positional distributions in syntactic structure.

This paper takes up a novel type of adjuncts whose occurrence and meaning cannot be accounted for simply by means of the ordinary adjunction structure in syntax but instead call for some fine-grained information available in Conceptual Structure (CS). Specifically, this paper will be addressed to the adjuncts involving all the way, as in (1a) and (1b), or the whole way, as in (1c).

(1) a. The girls cried all the way home from school.
   (Lucy Montgomery, Anne of Green Gables)
   b. Tony didn’t say a word all the way back to the hotel.
   (Jake Allsop “A Spray of Heather”)
   c. Some of us had to stand up the whole way to Parma.
   (BNC)

These constructions are semantically peculiar in three respects.

First, the whole sentence denotes the movement of the subject despite the fact that the main verb itself does not convey a motional meaning. Thus, (1a) means that the girls kept crying as they went home from school, and (1b) means that Tony kept silent as he went back to the hotel. Since non-motional verbs are lexically incompatible with path phrases (Jackendoff (1990)), the sentences in (1) become ungrammatical or lose the original meaning if they are stripped of all the way:

(2) a. *The girls cried home from school.
   b. #Tony didn’t say a word to the hotel. (≠(1b) in meaning)
   c. #Some of us had to stand up to Parma. (≠(1c))

It thus appears that the modifier all the way or the whole way somehow changes the semantic structure of a sentence from activity to motion.

Second, this motion interpretation is induced only if the path adjuncts are modified by universal quantifiers like all and whole. Removal of the universal quantifier will render the sentences in (1) ungrammatical.

(3) a. *The girls cried the way home from school.
   b. *Tony didn’t say a word the way back to the hotel.
   c. *Some of us had to stand the way to Parma.

Note that (3a) should be sharply differentiated from the one’s way constructions like Anita cried her way to the hospital, where her way represents a path of motion created by the activity denoted by the main verb (Marantz (1992)). The assumption that the motion interpretation
is induced by universal quantifiers in this construction is remarkably corroborated by the fact that such an interpretation would be lost were the universal quantifiers replaced by non-universal ones like halfway.


The example in (4) indicates that the subject felt like crying at a point somewhere in the middle of a song, rather than that he kept crying up to a halfway point of the song. In other words, when combined with activity verbs like cry, halfway designates the location on a directed path at which the activity takes place, whereas all the way denotes the continuation of the activity in conjunction with the subject’s motion along a directed path. Thus, halfway in (4) is analyzed as a mere locative with the meaning of ‘at a halfway point.’ We are thus left with the question of where the motional meaning comes from in all the way constructions.

The main body of this paper is organized as follows. After elucidating the Conceptual Structure of Route paths in section 2, we will discuss the all the way phrases used as event-internal adjuncts, namely as semantic complements to inherently motional verbs, in section 3. In section 4, we go on to tackle the all the way phrases used as event-external adjuncts or adjuncts modifying a whole event, as in (1), and propose a novel operation of creating a complex Conceptual Structure out of a simple sentence. Section 5 will briefly discuss the nature of telicity, drawing on the data involving all the way adjuncts. Section 6 concludes the paper by making a suggestion on the syntax-CS interface in the realm of adjunct modifiers.

2. Routes in Motion Structure

As a prerequisite for my proposed account of all the way constructions, it is necessary to lay out the fundamental Conceptual Structures for the path phrases used with verbs of motion. A widespread assumption is that a motion event consists of a Theme entity moving successively along an indefinite number of adjacent points which start form the Source location and terminate at the Goal location (Langacker (1991: 155), Verkuyl and Zwarts (1992), Krifka (1998)). Under this assumption, an indefinite number of points on the course of travel form
a homogeneous motion structure where all kinds of locational prepositions—not only Source and Goal but also Route and Direction—are subsumed under the broad rubric of “path” (Jackendoff (1983, 1990)).

Jackendoff’s analysis of locative prepositions has been popularly accepted for English, which is capable of accommodating indiscriminately all kinds of path phrases to both verbs of inherently directed motion (e.g. arrive, return, ascend) and verbs of manner of motion (e.g. roll, walk) (Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1992)). Such a unitary treatment, however, encounters serious problems when applied to languages which syntactically differentiate verbs of inherently directed motion from verbs of manner of motion in terms of the compatibility with path phrases.

2.1. Separation of Route from Source and Goal

In this paper, I advocate a bipartite motion structure composed of two separate domains, bounded and non-bounded paths, as shown in (5) (Kageyama and Yumoto (1997), Kageyama (2003b)).

(5) Bipartite motion structure

a. Bounded paths: the points at which travel starts and ends.

GOAL (to z): \[\text{BECOME } [\text{Loc AT-}[\text{Place } z]]\]

SOURCE (from z): \[\text{BECOME } [\text{NOT-}[\text{Loc AT-}[\text{Place } z]]]\]

b. Non-bounded paths: the course of continuous movements between Source and Goal.

ROUTE (along/through/down/across/by z):

[ROUTE ALONG-][\text{Place } z]]

SOURCE and GOAL, which correspond to what Aske (1989) calls “telic path phrases,” are inherently bounded and make the sentence telic because they are defined in terms of binary oppositions, \(P\) (x BE AT-z) and \(\neg P\) (x BE NOT-AT-z). As shown in the Lexical Conceptual Structure (LCS) in (5a), Source and Goal are characterized by the function BECOME, which denotes a transition to or from a static location. The English preposition to encodes \[\text{BECOME } [\text{AT}]\], and from \[\text{BECOME } [\text{NOT-[AT]}]\] (cf. Rapp and von Stechow (1999), Kageyama (2003b)).

By contrast, ROUTE, the intermediate course between Source and Goal, is “non-bounded” or underspecified as to boundedness rather than inherently “unbounded” because many (though not all) Route PPs are amenable to both time-duration and time-delimiting adverbials.
(6) Bill pushed the cart down the hill \{in/for\} two minutes.

(Jackendoff (1996: 309))

The non-bounded character of the Route falls out from the fact that given an indefinite course of motion, one may either keep going along it, in which case the whole sentence is interpreted as atelic, or stop halfway, in which case the sentence is regarded as telic.

Not only is the Route aspectually distinct from Source and Goal but it is also peculiar in licensing such ancillary notions as DIRECTION (toward z), EXTENT (up to z, as far as z), and DISTANCE (measure phrases like 3 miles), all of which are defined in relation to the Route, as shown in (7).

(7) \[\text{Route} \leftrightarrow \text{Distance} \rightarrow \text{Extent} \rightarrow \text{Direction} \]

The proposed bifurcation of motional structure runs directly counter to Jackendoff's (1996: 323) attempt to reduce the traditional GO function representing motion to a series of the more primitive function BE projected on the time axis. Albeit plausible from a logical point of view, such a reduction will fail to capture a robust generality found in Japanese and other languages. As observed by Kageyama and Yumoto (1997), Japanese verbs of motion are basically categorized into two types: one selecting a bounded path and the other selecting a non-bounded path. The verbs that select bounded paths are further divided into those that focus on a Source (i.e. Source-oriented) and those that focus on a Goal (i.e. Goal-oriented).

(8) a. Verbs that select bounded paths.
   i. Goal-oriented: tuku ‘arrive,’ tootyaku-suru ‘arrive,’ tyakuriku-suru ‘land’
   ii. Source-oriented: saru ‘depart,’ hanareru ‘leave,’ taisyutu-suru ‘go out’

b. Verbs that select non-bounded paths.
   Manner-of-motion verbs: hasiru ‘run,’ aruku ‘walk,’ ooyogu ‘swim,’ korogaku ‘roll,’ suberu ‘slide,’ tadayou ‘float, drift,’ samayou ‘wander,’ urotuku ‘prowl about’

The Goal- and Source-oriented verbs in (8a) can freely take a Goal and/or Source phrase but reject Route phrases marked with the accusative o, as in Tookyoo-ni tuku ‘arrive at Tokyo’ vs. *koosoku-dooro-o tuku ‘arrive along the freeway.’ Conversely, the verbs exemplified in (8b) are entirely compatible with Route phrases but reject Goal
phrases, as in *yama-miti-o aruku* ‘walk (along) the mountain path’ vs. *santyoo-ni aruku* ‘walk to the top of the mountain.’ Besides these two opposing groups of verbs, there is a small group of verbs which are susceptible to both Source/Goal and Route. These ambivalent verbs generally have an inherent direction of motion, as in *agaru* ‘ascend,’ *oriru* ‘descend,’ *iku* ‘go,’ *kuru* ‘come,’ and *susumu* ‘go forward.’ The constructions the verb *agaru* ‘ascend’ takes, for example, are exemplified in (9).

(9) a. SOURCE and GOAL: *ikkai-kara okuzyoo-ni agaru* ‘ascend from the first floor to the roof’

b. ROUTE: *kyuuna kaidan-o agaru* ‘ascend the steep stairs’

Significantly, however, conflation of (9a) and (9b) into a single predication yields a hardly acceptable result, as shown in (10).

(10) SOURCE/GOAL and ROUTE combined

*Watasi-wa kaidan-o ikkai-kara okuzyoo-ni agatta.*

I-Top stairs-Acc first.floor-from roof-Loc ascended

‘I ascended the stairs from the first floor to the roof.’

The ungrammaticality of (10), as contrasted with the grammaticality of (9a) and (9b), clearly demonstrates the mutual independence of the two categories of paths, SOURCE/GOAL and ROUTE. The only way in Japanese to express the situation intended for (10) is to invoke serial verbs, as in *Watasi-wa kaidan-o ikkai-kara okuzyoo-ni agatte itta* ‘I ascended the stairs, going from the first floor to the roof.’

To recapitulate, I have shown that the linguistic structure of movements consists of two distinct events, non-bounded continuous motion and instantaneous transition to or from a static location. In the next subsection, we will elaborate on the internal structure of Routes.

### 2.2. The Structure of Routes

Physically speaking, the route of travel is no more than a region or space stretching from the starting point of travel to the designated goal. Linguistically, however, the points that make up a Route must be conceived of as forming an ordered set, with the initial point having the lowest value of attainment, the last point having the greatest value, and all the other in-between points having intermediate degrees of value. Let the symbol ALONG represent the various manners of traversing a Route. ALONG is characterized as a function that maps the position of the Theme onto a unique point on the Route, as roughly depicted in
(11), where the angle brackets "< >" stand for an ordered set of the pairings of the Theme (x) and its corresponding point (p) on the Route (p_i < p_j, x_i < x_j).

Conceptual Structure of Routes

ALONG<(x_1, p_1), (x_2, p_2), ..., (x_n, p_n), ...>

In (11), p_1, p_2, ..., p_n represent different points on the Route, to each of which the location of the Theme (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) corresponds.

Now, the adverbial all the way (or the whole way), thanks to the property of all (or whole) as a universal quantifier, denotes that the entire range of the Route, from p_1 to p_n, is covered by the travel expressed in a given sentence. This is represented by adding "∀" to the CS of Routes.

Conceptual Structure of all the way along

∀_p ALONG<(x_1, p_1), (x_2, p_2), ..., (x_n, p_n)>

The region specified as the reference object of along (e.g. the street in along the street) is itself unbounded and has no obvious endpoint, as shown by the ellipsis dots at the end of the set representation in (11). However, addition of all the way renders the region bounded because the universal quantifier all has the function of picking out all the members from a closed set. This is represented in (12) by siting the pair (x_n, p_n) at the end of the ordered set. The assumption that all the way closes off, or imposes an endpoint on, the originally unbounded Route receives support from the following observations.

First, all the way is incompatible with prepositions of direction like toward, because they inherently designate an open-ended movement and refuse to have their domain closed off.

(13) *They walked all the way {toward/in the direction of} the castle.

Second, as observed by Jackendoff (1996), the prepositions through and down, which by themselves are indeterminate in boundedness, become bounded when modified by all the way.

(14) a. The cart rolled through the field {in/for} ten minutes.
    b. The cart rolled all the way through the field {in/*for} ten minutes. (Jackendoff (1996: 325))

Third, all the way imposes a boundary on the Route of along, which in itself is unbounded.

(15) a. He walked along the road {for/*in} two hours.
    b. He walked all the way along the road {in/*for} two hours.
To sum up, the operator *all the way* exercises two effects on the LCS of a Route: (i) it makes the Route bounded by virtue of the universal quantifier *all* and the definiteness of the NP *the way*, and (ii) the coverage of the entire region is emphasized by the universal quantifier *all*.

Now, Japanese as well as English has a specific marker that makes special reference to the upper bound on the Route scale that is achieved by the Theme within a certain time limitation. We will call this upper bound an “Extent,” and the markers for it are *made* in Japanese and *as far as* in English, as in *walk as far as the station* and *eki-made aruku*.

Since the Extent marker specifically pinpoints the upper bound on a Route, it conventionally implicates all the lower points on the scale, just as a cardinal number (*Pat has three children*) conventionally implicates all the cardinal numbers smaller than it (*Pat has two children*) (Horn (1989: 214)). This is tantamount to saying that Japanese *made* and English *as far as* take on a meaning almost identical to *all the way*. Given this, the combination of *all the way* and *as far as* is ruled out as a redundancy.

(16) He walked all the way {to/*as far as} the end of the village.

At this juncture, it will be appropriate to elucidate the nature of Japanese *made* vis-à-vis the locative particle *ni*, because *made* is often misrepresented as a “Goal” marker in the literature. Tsujimura (1994), for example, says that *made* marks the endpoint of the motion more clearly than *ni* ‘at’ and *e* ‘toward,’ and Inagaki (2002) considers *made* as the Japanese counterpart of the English preposition *to*. There are ample reasons to deny this view.

First, the English *to*, as a Goal marker, basically induces telicity, whereas the *made*-phrase is actually underspecified as to telicity, permitting both time-delimiting and time-duration adverbials.

(17) Syoonen-wa eki-made {30-pun-de/30-pun-kan (zutto)}
    boy-Top station-as.far.as {30-minutes-in/30-minutes-for}
    aruita.
    walked
    ‘The boy walked as far as the station {in/for} 30 minutes.’

We will discuss the nature of telicity in section 5.

Second, *made*-phrases can cooccur with a Route, but *ni*-phrases cannot.

(18) Sityoo-wa oodoori-o siyakusyo-{made/*ni} aruita.
    mayor-Top main.street-Acc city.hall-{up.to/*Loc} walked
    ‘The mayor walked down the main street to the city hall.’
Third, measure phrases can denote the distance from the starting point up to the point designated by *made*. This usage is not found with *ni*.

(19) Sityoo-wa siyakusyo-{made/*ni} san-kiro-meeteroru aruita.  
mayor-Top city.hall-{up.to/*Loc} three-kilometer walked  
‘The mayor walked three kilometers to the city hall.’

Fourth, *made*-phrases are incompatible with inherently bounded verbs which specify a Goal.

(20) Hikooki-ga hikoozyoo-{ni/*made} tuita/tyakuriku-sita.  
airplane-Nom airpott-{Loc/*as-far-as} arrived/landing-did  
‘The airplane arrived/landed {at/*as far as} the airport.’

The preceding four observations demonstrate that *made*-phrases are situated on the Route in the domain of continuous motion represented by MOVE. The following observation, on the other hand, shows that *ni* is situated in the domain of static location represented by BE. Observe thus that a *ni*-phrase, but not a *made*-phrase, can provide a “temporary stay” meaning when modified by a time-duration adverbial like “for one year.”

(21) Ken-wa London-{ni/*made} iti-nen-kan itta.  
Ken-Top London-{Loc/as.far.as} one-year-for went  
‘Ken went to London and stayed there for one year.”

This demonstrates that only the *ni*-phrase is associated with the “core event” (endstate) in the sense of Tenny (2000).

The differentiation of *made* and *ni* offers a clue for resolving the longstanding puzzle of why the English sentence *John walked to the station* is impeccable while its putative Japanese translation, *John-wa eki-ni aruita*, is ungrammatical in the meaning that John got to the station by walking. In our analysis, the bipartite motion structures are connected to each other by BECOME, a function from continuous motions along a Route to static locations at the endpoint. The transition becomes possible if the Extent of the movement, *pn*, is identified with the ultimate Goal, *z*.

(22) continuous motion along Route  
[x MOVE [Route ALONG<(x1,p1),..., (xn, pn)>]]  
TRANSITION result location  
BECOME [x BE AT-z]  

a. English: *x walked (along the street) to the station*.  
b. Japanese: *x-wa (odoori-o) eki-ni aruita*.  
\((pn=z \ (the \ station))\)

The English sentence in (22a) is perfectly grammatical because the preposition *to* lexically contains the notion of BECOME. By contrast,
the Japanese particle *ni*, which appears to be equivalent to the English *to* in directed motion sentences like *I go to school* and *Watasi-wa gakkoo-ni iku*, is actually a marker of static location (*AT in CS*), as it is typically used as a locative in existential sentences. Thus, only when the main verb lexicalizes the meaning of transition (*BECOME*) in itself, as in *iku* ‘go’ and *agaru* ‘ascend,’ can the locative *ni* be “translated” as *to*. However, if the main verb lacks the *BECOME* component, as is generally the case with manner-of-motion verbs, the VP *eki ni aruku*, literally meaning ‘walk at the station,’ is judged ungrammatical or at best interpreted as indicating a direction. The ungrammaticality of the Japanese sentence in (22b) is thus attributed to the fact that the semantic predicate *BECOME* is not properly encoded.

The foregoing discussion has demonstrated that Japanese *made* denotes the Extent of the Route traversed by the subject. Since the Routes in motion sentences are “incremental Themes” in the sense of Dowty (1991), it is naturally expected that *made*-phrases should display parallel behavior in the incremental Themes of change-of-state verbs (cf. Krifka (1998), Tenny (2000)). This prediction is borne out in (23).

(23) Ken-wa sono hon-o 1-peezi-kara 50-peezi-{made/*ni} K.-Top the book-Acc 1-page-from 50-page-{up.to/Loc} yonda.

‘Ken read the book from page 1 up to page 50.’
(The *kara* ‘from’ phrase in (23) marks the initial point on a Route rather than the Source of travel.)

2.3. Motion, Change of Location, and Resultative Constructions

The distinction between Extent and Goal is by no means idiosyncratic to Japanese but can be effectively extended to English to disclose hitherto unnoticed differences between superficially similar constructions. Dowty (2003: 41) considers the *to*-PPs in the following examples as illustrating a change from directional adjuncts (24) to indirect objects (25).

(24) a. Mary kicked the ball (all the way) to the fence.
   b. John pushed the desk (all the way) to the wall.

(25) a. Mary explained the memo (*all the way) to John.
   b. Mary rented the apartment (*all the way) to John.

However, if we attach the modifier *all the way* to the above two sets of examples, it becomes immediately clear that their difference is not just
the adjunct/complement opposition in syntax but is rooted in their CS representations. Since the phrase *all the way* indicates the progress of a motional event along a Route, the sentences in (24), congenial to this phrase, involve a Route structure, whereas those in (25), rejecting *all the way*, do not. In other words, the former are motion constructions while the latter are change-of-location or change-of-possession constructions. This disparity is confirmed in Japanese, where (24) may be felicitously translated with the Extent marker *made*, but (25) cannot be so translated.

The presence or absence of Routes is also instrumental in differentiating resultative constructions from motional constructions. Recently, there has been a general trend among leading researchers of lexical semantics to put together resultative, motional, and other similar constructions into a conglomeration of “resultative family” constructions (Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004)). This trend was initially set by Verspoor (1997) and Wechsler (1997), who brought forth sentences like (26), and now seems to be gaining impetus in more recent works including Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2001) and Boas (2003).

(26) a. The wise men followed the star *out of Bethlehem*.
   b. The children played leapfrog *across the park*.
   c. John danced mazurkas *across the room*.
   d. The sailor managed to catch a breeze and ride it *clear of the rocks*.

((a, d) from Wechsler (1997) and (b, c) from Verspoor (1997))

These examples, if truly resultatives, have vital implications for the so-called “Direct Object Restriction” (DOR) on resultative predication, strongly defended by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995). The DOR says that resultative predicates must be predicated of underlying direct objects (including the subjects of unaccusative verbs). At first glance, the examples in (26) appear to be in flagrant breach of the DOR and therefore have led the researchers mentioned above to abandon the DOR as a feasible constraint on resultative constructions.

Verspoor (1997) and Wechsler (1997), as well as Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2001) and Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004), who endorse these examples, presume that the italicized path phrases in (26) refer directly to the locations of the subjects. However, if we follow our proposed differentiation of Goal and Extent, these examples should be diagnosed as motion constructions that happen to have bounded paths,
rather than genuine resultative constructions, and hence are irrelevant to
the DOR. This is readily shown by the possibility of adding all the
way to the path phrases in (26a, b, c).

(27)  a. The wise men followed the star all the way out of
Bethlehem.
    b. The children played leapfrog all the way across the park.
    c. John danced mazurkas all the way across the room.

Compare the sentences in (27) with bona fide resultatives, which uni-
formly reject all the way, as shown in (28).

(28)  a. He shot the lion (*all the way) to death.
    b. She sang the baby (*all the way) to sleep.

Thus, the grammaticality of (27) lucidly demonstrates that the italicized
PPs are extensions of Route phrases in motion structure. Unfortunately,
this test is not effective enough to show the motion structure of clear of
the rocks (26d), because this phrase highlights the final stage of depar-
ture and is thus semantically incongruous with all the way. I believe
there are other ways to show the motional character of such examples,
but space limitation prevents me from pursuing this problem here.

3. All the Way Adjuncts as Event-Internal Modifiers

Having established the CS of all the way, we move on to investigate
the various uses of this modifier. I have gathered a large number of
examples from standard corpora, which can be classified roughly into
two groups, event-internal adjuncts (section 3.1) and event external
adjuncts (section 3.2).

3.1. All the Way as a Modifier on Routes with Motion Verbs

It will be hardly contestable that the most basic usage of all the way
adjuncts is as modifiers on the Route phrases complemented to physical
motion verbs. Since the Route is semantically selected by the predicate
MOVE in CS, it is a “CS-complement” of motion verbs and all the
way modifies this CS complement with its quantificational meaning.

The motion verbs that can take all the way include not only verbs of
inherently directed motion which can have a Route orientation (e.g. go,
come, rise, drop, follow) but also manner-of-motion verbs (both run-
verbs and roll-verbs). Below are given run-of-the-mill examples of
intransitive (29) and transitive (30) motion verbs.

(29)  a. Desmond drove all the way down here at Christmas.
b. Our exercises involve ... skiing all the way down.

(BOE)

c. [The ball] lazily rolled all the way into the cup.  (BNC)

(30) a. Enthusiasm among bidders pushed the price all the way up to a staggering FFr900,000 (£93,500; $162,700).

(BNC)

b. He dragged me all the way to London.  (BNC)

Now, our analysis of all the way as a modifier on the Route in CS makes interesting predictions. One is that this adjunct should not be compatible with Source- or Goal-oriented verbs like depart and arrive. This prediction is borne out in (31).

(31) a. The boat departed (*all the way) from the quay.

b. Ronnie arrived (*all the way) at Heathrow.

The second prediction is that measure phrases indicating the traversed distance on a Route should be incompatible with all the way phrases, because all the way itself has a quantificational force.

(32) a. The boy ran {three miles/all the way} to the town.

b. *The boy ran all the way three miles to the town.

c. *The boy ran three miles all the way to the town.

This observation can be replicated for Japanese, as shown in (33).

(33) a. Syoonen-wa mati-made 5-kiro hasitta.

boy-Top town-as.far.as 5-km ran

b. *Syoonen-wa mati-made zutto 5-kiro hasitta.

boy-Top town-as.far.as all-the.way 5-km ran

(33a) is acceptable because the measure phrase (‘5 kilometers’) serves as an appositive to the Extent phrase mati-made ‘up to town’—a usage commonly found with measure phrases modifying Extent phrases outside the motion structure (e.g. 3-gatu kara 8-gatu made 5-ka-getu-kan ‘for five months from March to August’). (33b) is ruled out because of the conflict between the quantifier zutto ‘all along’ and the measure 5-kiro ‘5 km.’

What does the Conceptual Structure of the VP walk all the way look like? Is the CS of all the way shown in (12) above merely added to the LCS of the main verb? A clue to this problem will be found in the contrast between verb modification (29, 30) and noun modification (34).

(34) Los Angeles and the other towns all the way down to San Diego  (BNC)
The notion of time, which is irrelevant to noun modification (*the other towns all the way down in 5 hours), is of crucial importance for verb modification, because it is related to the “Event variable” or Event argument in the sense of Davidson (1980). It is therefore assumed that the CS of all the way obtains time indices from the Event argument (e) of the verb it is complemented to. (In Kageyama (to appear), I propose that the Event argument in argument structure is mapped from the highest “Event node” in the corresponding CS.) The Conceptual Structure of the VP walk all the way along will thus be schematized as in (35), where the ACT component intrinsic to volitional motion (Kageyama (1996), Kageyama and Yumoto (1997)) is omitted.

(35) Conceptual Structure of the VP walk all the way along

\[ \text{Event x MOVE \[ \text{Route } \forall_p \text{ ALONG}<((x_1,p_1),t_1),((x_2,p_2),t_2), \ldots,((x_n,p_n),t_n)> \]} \]

Here, each element constituting the Route is now represented as a triplet of Theme (x), point (p), and time (t) (cf. also Verkuyl and Zwarts (1992)).

3.2. All the Way as a Modifier on Incremental Themes

As pointed out by Dowty (1991), Tenny (1994), Krifka (1998), Rothstein (2004), and others, the Route phrases of motion verbs share the property of incrementality with the Theme objects of change-of-state verbs. Because of this parallelism, all the way may serve as a modifier on incremental objects as well, as exemplified by (36).

(36) a. Cutting the trees all the way to their stumps means ...

(BOE)

b. The road has been repaired all the way to Perqin.

(BOE)

c. I read parts of your book all the way through. (BNC)

In all these examples, all the way denotes that the whole range of the object NP is affected, with special focus on the final point on the scale. The same usage applies to the Japanese phrase made zutto ‘all the way up to,’ as in Watasi-wa sono hon-o saigo-made zutto yonda ‘I read the book all the way through to the end.’

It is not immediately clear how this commonality between motion verbs and change-of-state verbs can be best captured. Krifka (1998) presents highly developed algebraic formulas based on the homomorphism of the progress of the subevents of an event and that of the change of an object. However, as I show later on, all the way phrases
may describe the movement of an event, in addition to the movement of an entity. Since both physical movements like *walk down the street* and changes of state like *repair the road* can be conceived of as changes of entities (moving objects or changing objects), I would maintain that the commonality between them should be captured by postulating an identical type of movement along a Route in CS. Note that instantaneous changes of state which lack a Route are not compatible with *all the way*.

(37)  
   a. *The cat died all the way.
   b. *He killed the cat all the way.

Assuming that the LCS's of *die* and *kill* are represented by *BECOME*, as is the LCS of the Goal-oriented *arrive*, it will not be far-fetched to maintain that the change-of-state verbs in (36) have *MOVE* and *Route* in their LCS's, along the lines of (38).

(38)  
   They repaired the road.
   [x ACT ON-y] CAUSE [[y MOVE [Route ALONG-<...>]
   BECOME [y BE AT-z]]
   : where x=they, y=the road, Route=the scale from impaired state to repaired state, z=the completely repaired state.

On this analysis, the *all the way* phrases used with physical movements and changes of state are uniformly treated as modifiers on the Route in CS. Although *all the way* phrases are syntactically adjuncts, they are unlike true adjuncts like *on Tuesday* in that they are licensed (i.e. selected) by a semantic predicate at the level of Conceptual Structure.

3.3. *All the Way* as a Modifier on Coverage Paths

While the examples in the previous two subsections all describe progressive movements and changes, *all the way* can also modify locative complements to stative verbs, or what Talmy (2000) calls “coverage paths.” Examples like (39) illustrate this use.

(39)  
   a. There's a wall all the way round the grounds.  (BOE)
   b. The stone belt runs all the way up to Owen County.  (BOE).

Since the verbs are used statively, we assume that they are represented by *BE*, with *all the way* embedded in the complement to AT, as shown in (40).

(40)  
   x BE AT-[∀p ALONG<((x_1,p_1),t_1),((x_2,p_2),t_2),...,((x_n,p_n),t_n)>]

It is instructive to note the so-called “access paths” (Talmy (2000)) do not match the semantics of *all the way*. 

(41)  
  a. The post office is (*all the way) across from the station.  
  b. He lives (*all the way) over the hill.  
This is because access paths single out a particular point and this mean-
ning conflicts with all the way’s task of tracing the entire course of a  
  movement.

4. All the Way Adjuncts as Event-External Modifiers

Languages have the general strategy of utilizing one and the same PP  
as both an event-internal adjunct and an event-external adjunct  
(Maienborn (2003), Dowty (2003)). From this it is expected that all  
the way phrases may also be used as event-external modifiers. In this  
section, we will adduce examples in which all the way phrases act as  
event-external adjuncts of time and location.

4.1. All the Way as Event-External Temporal Adjuncts

The examples in (42) illustrate the all the way phrases used as tem-
poral adjuncts modifying the whole sentence.

(42)   a. Bob and Jannie teased Dyson all the way through din-
      ner. (BNC)  
   b. I swam all the way through High School. (BNC)  
Particularly interesting are examples involving statives like (43) and  
(44), where both stage-level and individual-level predicates are allowed.

(43) Stage-level statives

  a. We were best friends all the way up right till the end of  
     sixth year. (BOE)  
  b. I was really keen on sport all the way through school.  
     (BOE)  
  c. We stayed good friends all the way up through sec-
     ondary school. (BOE)  
  d. Good tutors were available all the way through sec-
     ondary school.

(44) Individual-level statives

  a. He was intelligent all the way through secondary school.  
  b. He resembled his father all the way through secondary  
     school.  
  c. She had two brothers all the way through secondary  
     school.  
  d. He was tall all the way through secondary school.
Since individual-level statives characterize the more or less permanent attributes of subject NPs, they are not compatible with punctual time adverbials which pick out a particular point on the time axis, although they permit durational time adverbials designating a relatively long stretch of time (cf. Kratzer (1995)).

(45) a. *He is intelligent at this moment.
    b. He was intelligent when he was in secondary school.
The acceptability of both stage-level and individual-level statives in (43) and (44) is attributed to the fact that the temporal all the way phrases denote relatively long spans of time. Thus, the all the way phrases as temporal adjuncts are no different from ordinary event-external time adverbials like when and while.

4.2. All the Way Adjuncts as Event-External Modifiers

We will now delve into the central part of the present paper—all the way phrases used as event-external locatives, as illustrated in (46). To the best of my knowledge, this construction has not been discussed in any detail in the literature.

(46) a. She coughed all the way back to the theatre. (BNC)
    b. Tony didn’t say a word all the way back to the hotel.
       (Jake Allsop “A Spray of Heather”)
    c. She had been driving for twenty-four hours. ... She’d had the radio on all the way, although she had hardly listened to it.
       (Stephen Spielberg, Close Encounters of the Third Kind)
    d. He composed letters to Hilary in his head all the way to the campus, tearing them up, mentally, almost as soon as he had started them. (David Lodge, Changing Places)

These examples depict the continuation of the actions denoted by the main verbs along the Routes modified by all the way. One might be tempted to argue that the examples in (46) are merely different manifestations of the temporal usage of all the way discussed in section 4.1. However, a fairly clear distinction can be drawn between temporal and locational meanings. In the temporal meanings, the all the way phrase may be followed by a temporal relative clause, but not by a locational one. Compare the following.

(47) We stayed good friends all the way up through secondary school, {when/*where} suddenly we had to break up.
The cooccurrence possibilities are reversed in locational all the way
phrases, which may be followed by a locational relative clause, but not by a temporal one.

(48) She cried all the way to the hotel, {where/#when} she found her lost purse.

In (48), when cannot refer directly to the hotel. It is thus concluded that locational all the way adjuncts are distinct from temporal all the way adjuncts. Henceforth, the all the way construction with the "activity cum motion" reading will be referred to as the "Event-route construction."

The outstanding features of this Event-route construction that call for a theoretical explanation boil down to the following two. First, this construction involves two predications, namely the subject's activity denoted by the main verb and the subject's motion along the specified Route. (46a), for example, has the following entailments.

(49) a. (46a) She coughed.
    b. (46a) She went back to the theater.

One might suspect that the motion meaning is merely a conversational implicature inferred from context. However, the fact that the cancellation of the motion meaning brings about an utter contradiction, as in (50), confirms that it really is a logical entailment.

(50) *She coughed all the way back to the theater, but she didn’t get to the theater.

It thus remains to be seen why a motional meaning is entailed despite the fact that no motion verb shows up overtly on the surface.

Second, as noted earlier, all the way is compulsory for this construction. Omission of this phrase or substitution of semantically similar path phrases either results in ungrammatical sentences or destroys the intended meanings. In particular, the extent marker as far as, which is limited to the complement of inherently motional verbs, is not qualified for the construction at stake.

(51) a. *She coughed as far as the theater.
    b. *They didn’t say a word as far as the hotel.

It is thus necessary to pin down the exact role the modifier all the way plays in bringing about the special meaning of the Event-route construction.

As briefly mentioned in section 2, the universal quantifier denotes the whole range of a Route, and reference to all the points on the ordered Route naturally enhances the interpretation of a continuous movement along that Route. This account gains support from the Japanese
expression $X$-made-zutto (*made* 'as far as,' *zutto* 'all along'), which, as exemplified in (52), corresponds fairly accurately to the *all the way* construction.

(52) a. Kanozyo-wa gekizyoo-made-zutto seki-o
she-Top theater-as.far.as-all.along cough-Acc
{sita/site ita}.  
{did/doing was} 
'She coughed/was coughing all the way to the theater.'

b. Karera-wa hoteru-made-zutto hitokoto-mo
they-Top hotel-as.far.as-all.along single.word-even
syaber-anakat-ta.
speak-not
'They didn’t say a word all the way to the hotel.'

The adverb *zutto* 'all along, throughout' is an operator comparable to the universal quantifier in its lexical meaning, and this adverb seems to enhance the activity cum movement reading, although its appearance is not so rigidly required as that of *all the way* because many elements can be omitted in Japanese.

In the case of English, I conjecture that the motion meaning is inferred not only from the universal quantifier but more importantly from the noun *way*, which in itself denotes an area on which movement takes place. Since an area may be called a "way" only if it is traversed by a moving entity, the noun *way* specifies the notion of movement along a path in the Agentive role of its Qualia Structure, as roughly shown in (53).

(53) The Qualia Structure of the noun *way*

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FORMAL ROLE} = \text{place}(z) \\
\text{AGENTIVE ROLE} = \text{MOVE}(x, \text{ALONG}-[z], e)
\end{array}
\]

Intuitively, the quantificational force of *all* (or *whole*) encourages the interpretation of moving along the whole range of a Route. This intuition may be formally expressed as follows: The lexicalized expression *all the way* (or *the whole way*) creates its own Conceptual Structure by copying the MOVE function from the Agentive role of the noun *way* and setting it up as the predicate of the whole adjunct—an operation that is reminiscent of, but not identical to, Pustejovsky's (1995) "type coercion," which supplies the meaning of a complement verb in *She began a cake* (=‘began eating’ or ‘began baking’) from the Telic or Agentive role of the noun *cake*.

The copying of the predicate MOVE from the Agentive role of the
noun way eventually gives rise to a complex Conceptual Structure like (54).

(54)  

```
```

To put it more succinctly, the idiom all the way has acquired the Conceptual Structure of \("x \text{ MOVE } \forall_{p} \text{ ALONG<...>}"\) (where \(x\) is an Event). This representation straightforwardly captures the meaning of \(\text{She coughed all the way to the theater}\) as the continuous movement of the event of her coughing along the path up to the theater. When the all the way phrase is complemented to lexical verbs of motion like walk, it is predicated of an individual entity moving along a Route on a time axis; on the other hand, when the same phrase is applied to a non-motional verb, it is predicated of the event denoted by the main verb and describes the event as moving or continuing up to the end of the designated Route.

Now, in (54), since the Route phrase contains an individual \((x)\) which changes its location in accordance with the movement, it is necessary to identify what this \(x\) is. Normally, if an event moves (continues) along a Route, it is inevitable that the participant (i.e. subject) of the event also moves. For this reason, the bearer \((x)\) of the movement in the ALONG phrase is, by default, identified with the subject of the main clause. Thus, in \(\text{She coughed all the way to the theater}\), the subject moves to the theater according as the event of her coughing moves to the same location.

This fact might lead one to cast doubt on the postulation of \(x\)'s in the Route phrase in (54) as being superfluous. Instructive to our discussion is Maienborn's (2003) intriguing argument in favor of positing an independent entity as the notional subject of locative prepositions. Her argument centers on the interpretations of German locative phrases like \(\text{an den Haaren 'at the hair'}\) in (55).
(55) Maria zog Paul an den Haaren aus dem Zimmer.
    Maria pulled Paul at the hair out of the room
    ‘Maria caught Paul at the hair and pulled him out of the room.’

According to Maienborn (2003: 481), neither the subject Maria nor the object Paul can be identified as the entity that was located at Paul’s hair. The entity that was located at Paul’s hair is most plausibly Maria’s hand, but it may also be pincers or something else. This motivates Maienborn to postulate LOC as a relation between the Theme entity (v) and the PP an den Haaren ‘at the hair.’

(56) LOC (v, AT(the hair))

What is important is that the referent of the Theme (v) of the locative can be determined only with the aid of pragmatic knowledge, and this is made possible because Conceptual Structure serves as the interface between language and other human cognitive systems.

Returning to the all the way adjunct in (54), we find it possible to have two different subjects in the activity event of the main clause and the motion event of the Route phrase. This possibility is attested by a scrutiny of corpus examples. Consider the following.

(57) a. It was raining when her flight arrived at Heathrow and it rained all the way back to her flat in Islington. (BNC)
b. All the way home that parting speech had sung itself, over and over, in her mind. (LOB P05 185)
c. We were playing the official Scotland song “Don’t Come Home Too Soon” on the coach and it was on repeat on the CD player all the way from the hotel to the ground. (BOE)

In (57a), it will make no sense to claim that the grammatical subject “weather it” moved along the path to her flat. Rather, the bearer of the movement must be a female person inferred from the context. (57b) and (57c) are similar cases, where it is implausible to assume that the inanimate subjects the parting speech and it (the song) went all the way; rather, it was the unmentioned people or vehicles that actually moved to the designated places.

We thus take the examples in (57) as evidence for postulating the entity of movements in the Route phrase separately from the subject of the main clause. The default interpretation is that the bearer of the movement is identified with the subject of the main verb, but the two can be different. The same holds for Japanese, as observed in (58).
    airport-from home-up.to-all.along rain-Nom falling was
    ‘It was raining all the way home from the airport.’

b. Densya-no naka-wa Kita-eki-made-zutto
    train-GEN inside-Top north-station-up.to-all.along
    gyuugyuu-zume desita.
    like-sardines-packed was
    ‘The train was densely packed all the way to North
    Station.’

The grammatical subjects of these examples do not correspond to the
intended Themes of the movements.

The Event-route construction has an interesting restriction on the type
of eventuality denoted by the main verb. Some verbs attested in the
corpora are classified below according to the types of eventuality.

(59) a. Activity: bark, bawl, chortle, cough, cry, drink beer,
    fight, fret, fume, hold someone’s hand, laugh, lecture,
    look into the window of the bus, not say a word, pat
    oneself on the back, practice the words, shed tears, sing,
    scream, sleep, sob, struggle, talk, think about, weep,
    worry about

b. Accomplishment: composed letters to someone, give
    someone the cramps, kill people, sound the horn, spew
    exhaust fumes

c. Achievement: (no example found)

d. State (stage-level): be with you, be seasick, remain buoy-
    ant and cheerful, sit in silence

I have not been able to find examples of achievement verbs. The
absence of achievement verbs will be due to the fact that the verbs of
this type, denoting an instantaneous change of state/location, are neces-
sarily telic and therefore are semantically at odds with the durative
aspect inherent in the MOVE predicate. As is well known, however,
some achievement predicates, if cast in the progressive, are “expanded”
on the time axis and come to represent the stages before the endstate is
achieved (Rothstein (2004)), as in The cat was dying. Since the aspect
has changed from telic to atelic, (60b) sounds normal compared with
(60a).

(60) a. *The cat died all the way home.
    b. The cat was dying all the way home.

The significance of atelicity is confirmed by the examples involving
accomplishments in (59b), where the whole VP is aspectually atelic due to the bare plural objects or the continuous nature of the whole event.

The aspectual notion of atelicity alone, however, is not sufficient to delineate the restrictions on the Event-route construction. Another gap in the eventuality classification in (59d) is the systematic absence of individual-level predicates. Examples like (61) are judged unacceptable.

(61)  a. *He resembled his father all the way home.
b. *He was intelligent all the way to the main gate of the university.
c. *She had two brothers all the way down the street.
d. *I liked classical music all the way to London.

The infelicity of (61) should be contrasted with the naturalness of examples involving stage-level statives, as found in the corpus examples below.

(62)  a. All the way home I was so happy. (BNC)
b. He was miserably seasick all the way to Eskjerg.
c. Casey remained buoyant and cheerful all the way to Howard Air Force Base. (BOE)

The most plausible way to account for the discrepancy between individual-level and stage-level statives will be to look into the internal composition of events and states. Developing Davidson’s (1980) idea that action sentences have an Event variable, Diesing (1992) and Kratzer (1995) argue that among the stative predicates, stage-level statives do, but individual-level statives do not, contain the Davidsonian “Event argument.” Given that the Event argument represents the actual or hypothetical occurrence of the event denoted by the main verb in collaboration with the Tense node, it is quite natural to assume that individual-level statives, which depict the more or less permanent property of a subject NP that holds regardless of time, are devoid of an Event variable (Kageyama (to appear)).

Returning to the complex CS given earlier in (54), we find that the subject of the copied MOVE predicate is an Event (shown in boldface). The Event node is required here in order to tie up the progress of the main clause event with the progress of the motion event denoted in the Route path, and this temporal alignment is possible only through the Event variable. The time relations in the main clause event and the motion event in the Route phrase are mediated by this Event node. Individual-level predicates are thus unqualified for this purpose because
they, by definition, lack an Event argument. From this, the systematic absence of individual-level predicates in the Event-route construction falls out automatically.

5. Remarks on Telicity

This section will briefly discuss the relation between adjuncts and telicity. The examples of all the way discussed in this paper are all regarded as adjuncts from a syntactic point of view. This is proved by the do so replacement and the impossibility of extraction from wh-islands.

(63) a. Sue walked all the way to Kobe Station, and Nancy did so (all the way) to Sannomiya Station.
b. Sue listened to the radio all the way to Osaka, and Nancy did so all the way to Kyoto.

(64) a. *All the way to which station do you wonder why she walked?
b. *All the way to which city do you wonder why she had the radio on?

Nevertheless, the in x time diagnosis for telicity yields different results for the two types of adjuncts: the event-internal adjunct (65a) acts as a delimiter while the event-external one (65b) does not.

(65) a. Sue walked all the way to Kobe Station in one hour.
b. *Sue listened to the radio all the way to Chicago in six hours.

This observation suggests that a phrase which is syntactically an adjunct may determine the telicity of a sentence if it is integrated in the LCS of the main verb. This holds for the event-internal all the way. Not only the event-external temporal adjunct (section 4.1), generated in an adjunction structure, but also the all the way in the Event-route construction is unable to delimit the sentence because it is supported only by a copied semantic predicate (MOVE). This conclusion provides us with a fresh insight into the nature of what motion verbs are.

Recall that the Japanese made-phrases cooccurring with inherently motional verbs like aruku ‘walk’ may delimit the event with time-delimiting adverbials. However, VPs like tīkatetuninoru ‘take a subway,’ booto-o kogu ‘row a boat,’ and kuruma-o unten-suru ‘drive a car,’ which all convey motional meanings and are capable of taking a made-phrase denoting the extent of travel, are nonetheless immune to tempor-
al delimitation by \textit{in x time} adverbials. The same phenomenon can be observed in English as well.

(66) a. Watasi-wa Umeda-made (*sanzyup-pun-de)  
     I-Top Umeda-as.far.as (*30-minutes-in) 
     tikatetu-ni notta.  
     subway-Loc rode

b. I took a subway to Umeda (*in 30 minutes).

Despite the appearances, then, \textit{Umeda-made} and \textit{to Umeda} in (66) must be analyzed as event-external adjuncts. Although this is a rather surprising result, the possibilities of delimitation by adjuncts may vary cross-linguistically even in the realm of familiar motion verbs. Thus, unlike Japanese \textit{made} and English \textit{as far as}, Spanish \textit{hasta} ‘up to’ cannot be a delimiter.

(67) Juan caminó hasta la cima (?*en dos horas).  
     Juan walked upto the top (?*in two hours)
     ‘Juan walked up to the top (in two hours).’ (Aske (1989: 7))

Measure phrases of distance also pose problems for the theory of telicity. Kennedy and Levin (2002) make a strong claim that “telicity is determined solely by the semantic properties of the degree of change,” as in \textit{The plane descended 1000 meters in 20 minutes} (Hay, Kennedy and Levin (1999)). However, there are cases in which measure phrases indicating degrees of change do not induce telicity.

(68) a. I took a subway for 3 kilometers (*in 10 minutes).

b. Kare-wa 100-kiro-mo takusii-ni (*2-zikan-de) notta.  
     he-Top 100-km-as.long.as taxi-Loc (*2-hours) rode 
     ‘He rode a taxi for as many as 100 kilometers (*in two hours).’

The examples adduced by Kennedy and Levin (2002) all involve the difference values used as modifiers on the incremental themes at the level of Conceptual Structure. In (68), on the other hand, the measure phrases do not directly describe the degrees of change of the moving objects, “subway” or “taxi,” but instead depict the distance covered by the activities of subway-ride or taxi-ride. In those cases, the measure phrases are not directly located on the Route phrase in CS and therefore are aloof from the determination of the telicity of the sentences.

6. Conceptual Structure Licensing of Adjuncts

This paper has discussed the semantic properties of \textit{all the way}
adjuncts in relation to their syntactic behavior. While the complement-
adjunct distinction has been discussed extensively in generative syntax,
the syntactic and semantic peculiarities of all the way adjuncts could
not be adequately explicated were the identification of adjuncts
approached only from the syntactic vantage point. The complement-
adjunct distinction is not a matter of categorical opposition but forms a
graded continuum, and those located at relatively "low" positions in
syntactic structure are governed by CS information to a considerable
extent. More specifically, the all the way Route phrases used as
semantic complements to lexical motion verbs (cf. section 3) are close
to arguments in the sense that they are lexically governed in CS. On
the other hand, the all the way phrases which serve as temporal adver-
bials (section 4.1) are event-external adjuncts pure and simple.
Halfway between the two are the all the way adjuncts in the Event-
route construction (section 4.2). They are to all appearances event-
external adjuncts, but unlike those adjuncts which can be used indepen-
dently, they are licensed by a semantic predicate MOVE that is created
from the noun way.

There are different theories of adjunct licensing, two major positions
of which are (i) that adjuncts are licensed by the adjunction position in
syntactic structure, and (ii) that they are licensed by the (empty) func-
tional categories specifically designed for them. The former position is
traditional in generative syntax, while the latter position is advocated by
Cinque (1999). The data drawn from the present paper will argue for
a position that is intermediate between the two. The in-between case
is evidenced by the Event-route construction. As has been repeatedly
mentioned, the all the way phrase in this construction has the peculiari-
ty that it is licensed by a created semantic predicate. As a reflection
of the Conceptual Structure shown in (54), then, it is reasonable to pos-
tulate in syntactic structure a functional category that is mapped from,
or has the content of, the created MOVE predicate. I thus suggest that
postulation of functional categories for adverbials should be limited to
those cases which are supported by certain semantic predicates in the
corresponding CS. Analogous phenomena are reported by Kageyama
(2003a), where a special operation called "Conceptual Cloning" is pro-
posed to account for certain types of adjuncts and non-selected argu-
ments in Japanese. All these examples point to the existence of a spe-
cial class of "CS-supported adjuncts" between event-internal and event-
external adjuncts.
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