STUDIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Hilde Hasselgård

Adjunct Adverbials in English

CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE www.cambridge.org/9780521515566

This page intentionally left blank

Adjunct Adverbials in English

In this original study, Hilde Hasselgård discusses the use of adverbials in English, through examining examples found in everyday texts. Adverbials – clause elements that typically refer to circumstances of time, space, reason and manner – cover a range of meanings and can be placed at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of a sentence. The description of the frequency of meaning types and discussion of the reasons for selecting positions show that the use of adverbials differs across text types. Adverbial usage is often linked to the general build-up of a text and can reflect its content and purpose. In using real texts, Hasselgård identifies a challenge for the classification of adjuncts, and also highlights the fact that some adjuncts have uses that extend into the textual and interpersonal domains, obscuring the traditional divisions between adjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts.

HILDE HASSELGÅRD is Professor of English Language at the University of Oslo. Her previous publications include *Introducing English Grammar* (with Magne Dypedahl and Berit Løken, 2006), *English Grammar: Theory and Use* (with Stig Johansson and Per Lysvåg, 1998) and a series of articles on word order, cohesion and information structure.

STUDIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The aim of this series is to provide a framework for original studies of English, both present-day and past. All books are based securely on empirical research, and represent theoretical and descriptive contributions to our knowledge of national and international varieties of English, both written and spoken. The series covers a broad range of topics and approaches, including syntax, phonology, grammar, vocabulary, discourse, pragmatics and sociolinguistics, and is aimed at an international readership.

Already published in this series:

Christian Mair: *Infinitival complement clauses in English: a study of syntax in discourse*
Charles F. Meyer: *Apposition in contemporary English*
Jan Firbas: *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication*
Izchak M. Schlesinger: *Cognitive space and linguistic case*
Katie Wales: *Personal pronouns in present-day English*
Laura Wright: *The development of standard English, 1300–1800: theories, descriptions, conflicts*
Charles F. Meyer: *English corpus linguistics: theory and practice*
Stephen J. Nagle and Sara L. Sanders (eds.): *English in the southern United States*
Anne Curzan: *Gender shifts in the history of English*
Kingsley Bolton: *Chinese Englishes*
Irma Taavitsainen and Päivi Pahta (eds.): *Medical and scientific writing in late medieval English*
Elizabeth Gordon, Lyle Campbell, Jennifer Hay, Margaret Maclagan, Andrea Sudbury and Peter Trudgill: *New Zealand English: Its origins and evolution*
Raymond Hickey (ed.): *Legacies of colonial English*
Merja Kytö, Mats Rydén and Erik Smitterberg (eds.): *Nineteenth-century English: stability and change*
John Algeo: *British or American English? A handbook of word and grammar patterns*
Christian Mair: *Twentieth-century English: history, variation and standardization*
Evelien Keizer: *The English noun phrase: the nature of linguistic categorization*
Raymond Hickey: *Irish English: history and present-day forms*
Günter Rohdenburg and Julia Schlüter (eds.): *One language, two grammars? Differences between British and American English*
Laurel J. Brinton: *The comment clause in English*
Lieselotte Anderwald: *The morphology of English dialects: verb formation in non-standard English*
Jonathan Culpeper and Merja Kytö: *Early modern English dialogues: spoken interaction as writing*
Daniel Schreier, Peter Trudgill, Edgar Schneider and Jeffrey Williams: *The lesser-known varieties of English: an introduction*

Adjunct Adverbials in English

HILDE HASSELGÅRD

University of Oslo

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521515566

First published in print format 2010

ISBN-13 978-0-511-68611-5 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-51556-6 Hardback

Contents

Figures

Abbreviations

A	Adverbial
BNC	British National Corpus
CD	Communicative dynamism
E	End position
ENPC	English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus
FSP	Functional sentence perspective
I	Initial position
ICECUP	ICE Corpus Utility Program
ICE-GB	International Corpus of English, British component
LLC	London-Lund Corpus (of spoken British English)
M	Medial position
NP	Noun phrase
O	Object
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
OMC	Oslo Multilingual Corpus
PP	Prepositional phrase
S	Subject
SEU	Survey of English Usage
SFG/SFL	Systemic-functional grammar / systemic-functional linguistics
V	Verb

Notational conventions

^	is used for indicating sequential order (space^time means that a space adjunct occurs directly before a time adjunct)
‖	is used for marking the boundary between adjacent adjuncts
#	has been inserted to mark boundaries between 'sentences' (parsing units) in longer excerpts from spoken texts from the ICE-GB
*	in front of an example marks it as unacceptable
?	in front of an example marks it as doubtful

Lit	in front of a line following a corpus example in a language other than English indicates a literal, word-by-word, translation
italics	are used to highlight the part of an example that is most relevant to the discussion
~~overstrike~~	is used in corpus examples as in the ICE-GB, to represent corrections made by either the speaker/writer or the corpus annotators

Corpus examples are represented as in the corpora from which they are taken, including the prosodic mark-up found in the London-Lund Corpus.

For a complete list of *text codes* in the core corpus (from the ICE-GB), see the Appendix.

Preface

This book has grown out of many years of studying adverbials and other word order-related matters from a functional perspective. Adverbials are fascinating because of their enormous semantic and syntactic flexibility, as well as their elusiveness. In many ways a functional study of adverbials thus becomes a study of text and language in general.

During the work on this book I have had the advantage of two periods of research leave from the former Department of British and American Studies and the present Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages at the University of Oslo. Parts of chapters have been presented at various seminars and conferences in Oslo and elsewhere, and I am indebted to my various audiences for useful feedback. I would like to thank Merja Kytö for her encouragement during the early stages of this project. At later stages I received constructive and helpful responses from anonymous referees at Cambridge University Press. I am also grateful to colleagues in Oslo for useful discussions and for contributing to a fruitful research environment, and to my friends and family for a healthy mixture of support and distraction. In particular, I would like to thank my colleague, friend and mentor Stig Johansson for guiding me into corpus linguistics in the first place and for invaluable help, advice and encouragement during all my years of researching the English language.

Oslo, April 2009
Hilde Hasselgård

Part I

A framework for analysing adverbials

1 Studying adjunct adverbials

1.1 Introduction

Adverbials may be regarded as a rag-bag category in the linguistic system. They tend to be negatively defined as elements that are not verbs and that do not have a participant function in the clause. In terms of a positive definition, adverbials are often said to provide the answers to questions such as *how, where, when, why*? (e.g. Crystal 2008: 14). In some ways *how, where, when* and *why* adverbials appear to be prototypical, and they are often given as examples in brief definitions of adverbials such as the one in Crystal (2008) or the following from Sinclair *et al.* (1990: 281): 'An adjunct is a word or a group of words which you add to a clause when you want to say something about the circumstances of an event or situation, for example when it occurs, how it occurs, how much it occurs, or where it occurs.' Some idea of the frequency of adverbials can be had from the following example, in which the adverbials have been highlighted using italics and with added underlining if an adverbial occurs inside another.

(1) Radio was, and *still* is, good *to me*. *As an actor*, I had appeared *in innumerable schools broadcasts, in Saturday Night Theatre and in The Dales*. *For seven years* I had been broadcasting *regularly on Monday morning from the archives*. I had been made a 'regular' *by Brian Cook*, *who later became Controller of Radio City in Liverpool*. Of all my broadcasting, the Monday morning spot was perhaps the best fun. *Not only* was there the pleasure of listening to old recordings and the great names of the past, but there was an opportunity to write *almost* anything one liked.

The programme had a biggish audience (*in radio terms*) *because it followed the Today programme*, *and because people listened to it in their cars on the way to work*. They either loved it or loathed it. I *once* had a fan letter *from Neil Kinnock* saying what a good way it was to start Monday morning and asking me how I got away with it. On the other hand, I got a letter *from a regular BBC correspondent who said he always turned the radio off immediately if it was my turn on the programme*, but he would like to take issue *with something I had said last week* . . . <ICE-GB W2B-001>

Readers may disagree with my identification of adjuncts in the above text, since definitions of adverbials vary (as will be discussed in chapter 2). However, two adverbials in (1) have not been highlighted on purpose; *perhaps*, and *on the other hand*. This is because they belong to the types of adverbials often referred to as disjuncts and conjuncts (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 503). These are often said to have a more peripheral connection with the clause than adverbial adjuncts (e.g. Biber *et al.* 1999: 765). The italicised elements in example (1) are all adjuncts. As is clear from the example, adjuncts express a broad range of meanings; not only time, place, manner and reason, but also, for example, role, agent, focus and approximation. The main meanings of the adverbials investigated in this book, as well as the criteria for distinguishing adjuncts from other clause elements, are outlined in chapter 2.

1.2 Research questions

The questions that will be explored in this book are connected with four main aspects of adjunct adverbials, namely: (i) **syntactic and semantic categories**; (ii) the **frequency** of such adverbials and their subcategories; (iii) the **placement** of such adverbials; and (iv) **discourse functions** of such adverbials.

The first point has to do with the range of meanings that can be identified in adjunct adverbials and the means by which these are realised. Secondly, having identified the syntactic and semantic categories, one may ask how often different types of adjuncts are used and in what sort of contexts. Frequencies must be seen in relation to running text, in comparison with other types of adverbials and in the context of text type/genre.

The third point, placement, is closely linked to the positional flexibility of many adverbials. It is interesting to investigate what positions in the clause are available to different types of adjuncts and what factors determine their placement whenever more than one position is possible. Is syntactic realisation more important than semantic category for selecting an adverbial position? To what extent does information structure influence adverbial placement? Furthermore, adverbial positions are expected to differ as regards their role in cohesion and information management. For example, (2)–(5) are all perfectly acceptable English sentences, but because of their differences in adverbial placement they will answer different questions and fit into different contexts. This investigation will be concerned with the placement of adverbials as well as the semantic and textual implications of positional variation.

(2) I met a girl on the train today. <S1A-020>
(3) Today I met a girl on the train.
(4) On the train I met a girl today.
(5) Today on the train I met a girl.

Related to the question of adverbial placement is the question of the order of adjacent adverbials. For example, it is often claimed that the usual order of adverbials is manner – space – time, as in (6); see, for example, Biber *et al.* (1999: 811). Quirk *et al.* (1999: 565) include more categories and claim that the usual order of adjuncts in a sequence is respect – process[1] – space – time – contingency. The study of corpus examples will reveal whether this is indeed the most common order and whether the same order can be found in sequences at the beginning as at the end of a sentence.

(6) I say surprisingly, as while I was wandering *aimlessly around Grenoble on Sunday afternoon*, I got completely lost and didn't know where the hell I was. <W1B-002>

With respect to all these points it is relevant to compare the different categories of adverbials: do they differ from each other with respect to frequency, placement or other syntactic/semantic conditions for use? And further: how heterogeneous is the group of adjuncts? How much do the adjunct categories really have in common?

Discourse features of adverbials have not often been investigated thoroughly. Some exceptions are Virtanen (1992) and Hasselgård (1996), both of which were concerned with time and space adverbials, Altenberg's (1987) study of adverbials of cause and reason and Ford's (1993) study of adverbial clauses. Since the material for the present study contains six different text types (see section 1.3.4), it is possible to investigate the extent to which the use of adjunct adverbials varies according to text type. It is clear that the adverbials have a function at the ideational level, in specifying the circumstances in which processes take place (Halliday 2004: 175ff). But since most adjuncts are mobile in the sentence, their placement may be a reflection of thematic choice. In other words, adjunct adverbials also play a role at the textual level of language (Halliday 2004: 64). At clause level they may or may not be selected as clause theme (i.e. 'the point of departure of the message'), and their placement may furthermore reflect their status as given or new information. At text level adjuncts may be used by the speaker/writer as markers in the total build-up of the text (Virtanen 1992 and Hasselgård 2004a). In order to investigate such phenomena one must have access to the context of the sentences in which the adverbials occur. Ideally, one should also have access to sound recordings of the spoken material, in order to assess the function of prosody in addition to word order. Both of these possibilities are available with the corpus chosen for the investigation (see further, section 1.3).

[1] Process adjuncts include manner. See further, table 2.1.

1.3 Material and method

1.3.1 A corpus-based study

The focus of this study is how adverbials are used in present-day English. The first step is to survey the types of adverbials that exist and the positions in the clause that may be filled by an adverbial, i.e. to establish what the possibilities are. But a more intriguing question is how the possibilities are exploited by native speakers of English. The adverbials thus need to be studied in their natural environment, i.e. in real text, and so it was decided to base the study on corpus material, more specifically, the British part of the International Corpus of English (ICE-GB), compiled at the Survey of English Usage, University College, London.

A general problem in using electronic corpora for the study of a syntactic phenomenon is the difficulty of searching automatically for syntactic functions. The ICE-GB is both tagged and parsed to facilitate such searches. However, it does not distinguish adjuncts from other types of adverbials. A search for all occurrences of adverbials in the ICE-GB (using ICECUP 3.1; see Nelson *et al.* 2002) tells us that the corpus contains 110,970 adverbials distributed over 46,032 'text units' (roughly corresponding to sentences). These are of course overwhelming numbers for most purposes and in this case prompted the decision to select a number of texts that could work as a 'core corpus' for the quantitative part of the study. These texts were then searched manually for adjunct adverbials.

Naturally, there are still advantages to working with a parsed corpus. The ability to search for specific syntactic structures is useful for finding supplementary examples of phenomena that are too rare in the core corpus to grant any kind of conclusions. Some examples of this are adverbials in cleft sentences (see chapter 7), sequences of adverbials in clause-initial position (section 4.6) and sentences in which an initial adverbial is followed by inversion (section 9.2.5). See further, Nelson (1998) and Nelson *et al.* (2002) for introductions to the ICE-GB corpus, the accompanying software and its search facilities.

1.3.2 Corpora used

As mentioned above, the main material for the present study is the ICE-GB. This implies that the main focus is on British English. However, other corpora have also been consulted. The British National Corpus (BNC, see further http://info.ox.ac.uk/bnc/) has been used for supplementary examples. Furthermore, some examples have been taken from the London-Lund Corpus (LLC), a prosodically annotated corpus of spoken British English.

Cross-linguistic sidelights can be illuminating also in a predominantly monolingual study. Thus, the multilingual resources compiled at the University of Oslo and its sister project in Lund and Göteborg have been consulted

when it seemed relevant to study how English adverbials have been translated into other languages. The English–Norwegian Parallel Corpus (ENPC) contains original texts in both English and Norwegian with translations into the other language. The Oslo Multilingual Corpus (OMC) overlaps with the ENPC, but includes more languages. The English-Swedish Parallel Corpus (Lund/Göteborg) is built up in the same way as the ENPC, with mostly the same English original texts.[2]

1.3.3 Qualitative and quantitative description

There are both quantitative and qualitative aspects to the present study. In my opinion, observations of frequency have an important place in a description of usage because they display the linguistic choices made by speakers and writers. Qualitative statements are often of little value for generalisations about language use unless they can be corroborated by quantitative observations. In the words of Halliday (1991: 31): '. . . the linguistic *system* [is] inherently probabilistic, and . . . frequency in text [is] the instantiation of probability in the grammar'. Furthermore, corpus studies provide 'evidence of relative frequencies in the grammar, from which can be established the probability profiles of grammatical systems' (*ibid.*: 41).

The major part of this book, however, contains discussions of the qualitative aspects of the use of adjunct adverbials. The meaning of the adverbials and the significance of adverbial placement can of course only be discovered by studying each instance in context. The quantitative information is nevertheless of importance even to this kind of discussion because it provides a basis for establishing default and marked choices.

Most of the quantitative information is based on a 60,000-word subcorpus of the ICE-GB (see section 1.3.1), henceforth referred to as the 'core corpus'. The core corpus, in which the clauses containing adjunct adverbials have been analysed in great detail, also provides the main material for the qualitative part of the study. However, whenever additional material was needed for some parts of the discussion, the whole ICE-GB, as well as the other corpora mentioned in the previous section, was consulted for supplementary examples. These examples may represent other text types than those found in the core corpus and are not included in the quantitative part of the study.

1.3.4 Text types included in the investigation

The core corpus taken from the ICE-GB includes six text types: conversation, sports commentary, social letters, fiction, news and academic writing.

[2] For further information on the multilingual corpora, see www.hf.uio.no/ilos/OMC/.

Previous studies have shown that text types may differ in grammatical structure or in the frequency with which a certain pattern occurs (Biber *et al.* 1999). The present study aims to investigate such differences in relation to adverbial usage.

Text types are defined according to external criteria, not according to linguistic features or discourse functions (unlike e.g. Virtanen 1992). The labels are taken over from the text classification in the ICE-GB (Nelson *et al.* 2002: 5ff) and are also well-known from, for example, Biber *et al.* (1999), where incidentally they are referred to as 'registers'. The present study mainly uses the term 'text type', but 'genre' also occurs without any distinction of meaning.

For purposes of comparison, both spoken and written English have been included. There are two types of spoken English (conversation and sports commentaries), three types of published written English (news, fiction and academic writing) and one type of unpublished written English (social letters). The latter text type consists of personal letters to and from people who know each other. Such informal writing can be expected to constitute an intermediate between public/published written English and informal spoken English. It was considered important to have at least two text types of each medium to avoid confusing medium and text type.[3]

The choice of text types for the core corpus was influenced by choices made in both Biber *et al.* (1999) and Hasselgård (1996), to facilitate comparison with those studies. Five of the text types are thus the same as those found in Hasselgård (1996) (conversation, commentary, letters, news and fiction). Four of them are also found in Biber *et al.* (1999) (conversation, fiction, news and academic writing). The six text types differ from each other in many respects. One parameter is speech versus writing; another is public versus private. Furthermore, the text types differ as to the degree of interaction, the extent of planning and/or editing involved and the extent to which the speaker/writer is free to choose the topics.

On-line speech production typically allows little or no time for advance planning. However, conversation and sports commentaries differ somewhat in this respect. The differences can be described along Enkvist's (1982: 15) variables for assessing the degree of 'impromptuness' of a text: (a) degree of scripting, (b) extent of planning and (c) degree of macrostructural boundness. Sports commentaries are likely to be planned but not scripted, and they involve a certain degree of macrostructural boundness; the sequence of events is to a large extent determined by the unfolding of a game or race, and speakers have to observe certain conventions for the form of broadcast commentaries. Listeners will also normally have quite strong expectations about what they

[3] Biber (1986) demonstrated that many of the contradictory results in investigations of differences between speech and writing were due to the use of different text types to represent each mode.

are about to hear. Most of the words and expressions will be taken from the same lexical field. Sports commentaries are usually monologic in form; although there may be two speakers, they tend not to interact much. A conversation is obviously not scripted, nor does it normally involve a lot of planning. There is a minimum of macrostructural boundness, the most important factor being the presence of at least two speakers who interact and negotiate the topics being talked about.

The writing of a newspaper article involves a lot of constraints. Deadlines put the writer under severe time pressure. There may also be restrictions on the format of the article: a news item which is considered important is allotted a great deal of space, whereas another may be confined to a few lines. Genre conventions are also important: normally a newspaper article has to stick to a 'matter-of-fact' style in order to be taken seriously. In addition, a newspaper may have a 'house style', involving advice on spelling, grammar, paragraphing etc. Finally, the article may be edited by somebody other than the original writer.

Writers of fiction can determine the length as well as the contents of their texts. They also have more time at their disposal than journalists writing a news article, both for planning and editing, and can pay more attention to stylistic matters. Style is an important component of fiction, both for creating a frame of reference by means of language and in order to hold the reader's attention throughout the novel. One can thus expect the language of a novel to be carefully composed. Like news articles, however, fictional texts are written for a general audience, and they are not interactive. It may be noted that the fictional texts included in the ICE-GB vary in (sub)genre and in literary quality.

Academic writing differs from the other genres in being written by a specialist mainly for a specialist audience. It contains technical terms and other specialised vocabulary. Intertextuality is another feature of academic writing, in terms of references to, and quotations from, other people's work. Although the purpose of such texts is often to present new findings, there is also a great deal of common ground between writer and addressee. The 'academic writing' category in the ICE-GB is organised according to disciplines. The texts selected for close reading in the present study come from the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences.

Letters differ from the other three written categories in that they are not written for publication. A personal letter is intended for a specific and specified addressee. Despite not being physically present during the writing of the letter, the addressee is very much present in the writer's mind. If the writer and the addressee know each other well and communicate with each other regularly, they have a fairly large pool of shared knowledge. Thus a personal letter comes close to being dialogic in form, e.g. in containing questions and reference to earlier letters in the correspondence, or showing clear expectations of a reply.

Table 1.1 *Features of the text types in the material*

	Spoken	Participant interaction	Time constraint under production*	Planning and editing of text	Public
Conversation	+	+	+	−	−
Commentary	+	−	+	+/−	+
Letters	−	+	−	+/−	−
News	−	−	+/−	+	+
Fiction	−	−	−	+	+
Academic writing	−	−	−	+	+

* For the spoken genres, 'time constraint' refers to the on-line speech production. As for the written news genre, this factor has a (partly) positive value because the journalist is under pressure to finish the text before a deadline.

The texts for the core corpus were chosen more or less at random within the selected text types in the ICE-GB. However, some adjustments were made. One of the texts originally selected from the 'direct conversations' in the ICE-GB had the character of an interview rather than a real conversation (text S1A-001), so it was replaced by another, more purely conversational text. The sports commentaries were selected so as to represent different sports. Similarly, the academic texts were selected from different disciplines. As for the news category, I aimed at a spread of different newspapers as well as texts that can be described as 'press reportage'. In one of the corpus texts (W2C-002), however, subtext 1 may be classified as a feature article. For a full list of the texts included in the core corpus, see the Appendix.

As regards the supplementary material from the ICE-GB and other corpora, no selection has been made as regards text type. It should be noted, however, that text type can be identified in each of the corpora used in the investigation.

Some central features of the text types included in the material have been summarised in table 1.1. These features bear on external or situational aspects of the text types, concerning conditions of text production as well as the final product. The table shows that the similarities and differences among the text types extend beyond the distinction between speech and writing.

1.3.5 Excerption, analysis, database

As mentioned in section 1.3.1, a core corpus was selected in which all clauses containing at least one adjunct were analysed in detail. These clauses were stored in a database (FileMaker Pro) for ease of retrieval and further annotation. Table 1.2 shows the features that were recorded in the database for each clause and each adjunct. See chapter 2 for definitions and discussion of the categories.

Table 1.2 *Features of the analysis recorded in the database*

Category	Features
Text type	letter, conversation, commentary, fiction, news, academic writing
Sequence	single adverbial, cluster, combination, combination with cluster
Main category of adjunct	space, time, manner, contingency, respect, degree and extent, participant, situation, comparison/alternative, focus, viewpoint
Subcategory of adjunct	e.g. position, direction, distance, duration, frequency, relationship, manner/quality, comparison, accompaniment, means, method, instrument, attire, cause, purpose, result, condition, concession, matter, agent
Realisation	adverb phrase, single adverb, prepositional phrase, noun phrase, finite clause, non-finite clause, prepositional clause, verbless clause
Position	initial, M1, M2, M3, end, cleft focus
Scope of adjunct	sentential, predicational
Obligatoriness	obligatory, optional
Length	number of words in adverbial phrase/clause
Number of adjuncts	number of adjunct adverbials in (matrix) clause
Verbal process	material, relational, mental, verbal, behavioural, existential
Clause type	main declarative (+/− subject), *yes/no* interrogative, *wh*-interrogative, imperative, adverbial clause, relative clause, *that*-clause, indirect question, nominal relative, *-ing* participle, *-ed* participle, infinitive
Transitivity of verb	monotransitive, intransitive, copular, ditransitive, complex transitive with predicative, complex transitive with adverbial
Voice	active, passive, middle
Subject–verb inversion	yes, no

1.4 Theoretical and classificatory framework

A corpus-based approach to adverbials carries with it a number of challenges, largely caused by the enormous range of meanings that adverbials can convey. Inevitably, meanings crop up in the corpus examples that seem to defy classification into established frameworks. Moreover, it is debatable what constitutes an established framework for the classification of adverbials. A consultation of the three major reference grammars of English[4] reveals great variation in terminology as well as in the number of adverbial categories and their definitions (see further, section 2.3). The analyst thus faces the problem of striking the balance between a system that is sufficiently comprehensive and delicate and one that is manageable in the analysis as well as useful in generalisations about linguistic practice.

The classification scheme developed in this book is based mainly on those of Quirk *et al.* (1985) and Biber *et al.* (1999), but also borrows some terms and definitions from Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Halliday (2004). In addition, the nature of the corpus material calls for some less well-established

[4] Quirk *et al.* (1985: ch. 8), Biber *et al.* (1999: ch. 10), and Huddleston and Pullum (2002: ch. 8).

categories. The scheme is presented in section 2.4 and summarised in 2.7. Since the main material for the study comes from the ICE-GB corpus, which is fully parsed, it should be noted that my analysis does not always follow that of the ICE tagger. The details of this are specified in chapter 2.

The theoretical framework adopted is basically functional, due to the descriptive and empirical nature of the study. Apart from the descriptive approach taken over from Quirk *et al.* (1985) and Biber *et al.* (1999), Hallidayian systemic-functional grammar (SFG) will be visible in the analysis. Some inspiration also comes from functional sentence perspective (FSP) as developed by the Prague school (Firbas 1986) and the type of text linguistics developed at Åbo Akademi by Nils Erik Enkvist (e.g. Enkvist 1976 and 1981) and as applied by, for example, Virtanen (1992). The functional approach entails that adverbials are studied in their context and that discourse features are taken into account in the description of usage. Such discourse features include information structure, thematisation and genre.

It should be emphasised, however, that the study is data-oriented more than it is theory-oriented. The main aim is to give a description of the use of adjunct adverbials in present-day English (as represented in the corpora used). The choice of theoretical framework has thus been made out of considerations of the syntactic and contextual factors that govern adverbial usage and how they can best be described. It is also an aim to arrive at descriptions of, and explanations for, adverbial usage that can have predictive power and thus be useful in, for example, text production and language teaching.

1.5 Representation of examples

The examples in this book have been rendered as they appear in the corpus from which they have been taken. In the spoken material, pauses are marked by <,>, as shown in example (7); two commas mark a longer pause. In the written unpublished material (social letters), corrections occur (made by the writer or by the corpus compilers). These are marked in the corpus, and hence in this book, by strike-out, as in (8).

(7) But uh there's a there's a relevance theory workshop the following week since Sperber is over <,,> which I shall go to <,> anyway <S1A-005>

(8) I hope you haven't had any more ~~arguement~~ arguments with Natalie since my departure!? <W1B-002>

Examples from the ICE-GB corpus have reference tags in angle brackets indicating which corpus text they have been taken from. 'S' and 'W' in the reference tags indicate speech and writing respectively. <S1A-005> in (7) thus refers to spoken text, category 1A (dialogue, direct conversation) and text number 5 in this category. The full ICE-GB tag also includes reference to text unit, subtext, and in the case of spoken texts, speaker.

This information has been omitted from the tags given in the present book. For further information on text classification tags and text encoding in the ICE-GB, see Nelson *et al.* (2002). Examples taken from other sources have reference tags indicating which corpus (or other source) they have been taken from. Examples from the London-Lund Corpus have been rendered with prosodic mark-up. For a key to the conventions, see the manual to the corpus at http://icame.uib.no/newcd.htm.

1.6 Plan of the book

The book is organised in four parts: **Part I** (chapters 1–3) offers a general introduction to adjunct adverbials. The classification of adverbials is discussed in chapter 2, including the delimitation of adverbial adjuncts as against other clause elements. Chapter 3 outlines some aspects of the syntax and semantics of adjuncts, such as placement, obligatoriness and scope. **Part II** (chapters 4–8) devotes a chapter to each of the adverbial positions (initial, medial, end and cleft focus). Within each chapter there are surveys of the types of adjuncts that occur in that position, the frequency with which the position is used and the characteristics of the position in terms of, for example, cohesion and information structure. There is also a chapter on sequences of adverbials that combine two or more adverbial positions. In **Part III** (chapters 9–11), the semantic classes of adjuncts are discussed in more detail, with surveys of the distribution of subclasses of each type (e.g. types of contingency adjuncts), realisations of semantic categories, their co-occurrence with verbal process types, distribution across text types and other relevant features, such as metaphorical extensions, discourse functions and occurrence in sequences. **Part IV** draws together findings from previous chapters. Chapter 12 compares adverbial usage across text types and discusses some text-type-specific patterns. The final chapter gives an overview of findings. There is a survey of positions preferred by each adjunct type and an overview of factors that influence adverbial placement, as well as a review of adverbial categories in light of the findings of the study.

2 The classification of adverbials

2.1 The delimitation of 'adverbial'

2.1.1 Adverbs and adverbials

There is some vacillation in English grammars as to the use of the terms *adverb* and *adverbial*, presumably because many studies of adverbials, e.g. Jacobson (1964) and Ernst (2002), have focused on adverbials realised by adverbs. In this study 'adverb' refers to the word class and 'adverbial' to a syntactic clause element, following, for example, Quirk *et al.* (1985) and Biber *et al.* (1999).

Adverbs constitute a heterogeneous word class and can have a variety of functions at phrase level (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 445ff). Besides acting as head of an adverb phrase, an adverb can modify adjectives, other adverbs, prepositions, nominal elements and verbs. At clause level, an adverb (phrase) typically fills the syntactic function of adverbial. However, adverbials may also be realised by noun phrases, prepositional phrases and finite, non-finite and verbless clauses. While adverbial (or *adjunct*) is generally recognised as a clause element, there is no general agreement on its delimitation. The following sections discuss some of the problems of classification with a view to supporting the analysis used in the present study.

2.1.2 Adverbial versus predicative (complement)

A particular problem of classification concerns prepositional phrases or adverb phrases that complement lexical *be*. The problem is illustrated by examples 1–4 below.

(1) Anne is Scottish.
(2) Anne is a Scotswoman.
(3) Anne is from Scotland.
(4) Anne is in Scotland.

The postverbal elements in (1) and (2) ascribe a property to the subject referent and answer questions such as 'What is Anne (like)?'. They are thus prototypical examples of subject predicative (Biber *et al.* 1999: 126). The