Though you may leave when ready, you are asked not to disturb other candidates. [4]

In [1], beautifully is functioning as part of the noun phrase realizing the subject; contrast [1a]:

She had manicured her nails beautifully. [1a]

where the same item is functioning as A. In [2], in the corner is likewise part of the noun phrase that is subject in the example; contrast [2a]:

The man was in the corner. [2a]

In [3], quietly is functioning within a prepositional phrase which as a whole constitutes the adverbial of the sentence; contrast [3a]:

She asserted her answer quietly. [3a]

In [4], when ready functions as an adverbial within a finite clause which itself constitutes the adverbial in the sentence as a whole; compare [4a]:

You may leave when ready if you wish. [4a]

Here, the same verbless clause is functioning as one of two adverbials within a sentence. But although the structures operating within elements in [1–4] are functionally quite distinct from the same items functioning as A in [1a–4a], the distinction is not always so clear. Out of context, there may be ambiguity, as with in the next house in:

I could hear the man in the next house. [part of a noun phrase] (perhaps continuing: ‘singing to his children, as he often does’) I heard the man in the next house. [predication adjunct, cf 8.27] (‘In the next house I heard the man’, but rather perhaps continuing: ‘but he ran out at the back as I approached’)

I heard the man in the next house. [sentence adjunct, cf 8.36] (~‘In the next house, I heard the man’, and perhaps continuing: ‘but I could no longer hear him when I left it and walked round outside’)

In these examples, in the next house must be understood as one or other of the three possibilities; there is no grammatical or semantic blurring. With other examples, there may be multiple analyses. One can justify treating:

He approved of the idea.

as having a predication adjunct of the idea or as comprising a prepositional verb approved of with a noun phrase as object the idea (cf 16.13f). Equally, one can justify treating alike the two sentences:

He couldn’t bring the changes into effect.

He couldn’t bring the changes about.

with the italicized portions regarded as obligatory predicational adjuncts. From other points of view, it is preferable to regard bring about as a phrasal verb (cf 16.3f, 16.13f), since this analysis captures syntactic features that would otherwise be ignored.

But there are uses of adverbs and adverb phrases where the status depends on neither ambiguity nor multiple analysis. The adverb today in the following example seems to be part of the subject noun phrase:

The pace of life today is ‘proving too fast’

Yet on the one hand there seems to be little difference beyond the nuances of emphasis in versions of the sentence in which today is certainly functioning as the A-element:

ToDay the pace of life is ‘proving too fast’

The pace of life is today proving ‘too fast’

The pace of life is ‘proving too fast today’

And on the other hand the position of today in the original version is not one that excludes the occurrence of A; cf:

Mr Jones today must be heartbroken. [A at tM]

Consider also the following textual example:

A raw recruit to the police service at the beginning of this century was expected to be little more than physically fit and mindlessly obedient. Thus punctuated, it appears as though the whole sequence before was expected is the subject; but it is perfectly possible that at the beginning of this century is an A at tM. Compare:

At the beginning of this century, a raw recruit to the police service was expected to be . . .

adjunct — predication — obligatory
sentence — optional

viewpoint — courtesy
item — subject

verb phrase — intensifier
narrows orientation — focusing

Adverbial

style — modality and manner
content — respect

truth condition — value judgment

listing — summative
appositive — contrastive
resumptive — transitional

Fig 8.24
By contrast with [2] and [4], the 'unattributed' sentence [1] is likely to mean and to be interpreted as meaning:

From things I have heard and seen, I claim it to be a fair and true assessment that Mr Forster neglects his children. [5]

It need hardly be pointed out that such detailed specificity is rarely made explicit, though it is worth noting that in a court of law it would be by no means unusual for the speaker of [1] to be obliged either to expand it to [5] or at least to acknowledge that by his [1] he intended to mean neither more nor less than [5].

But even in ordinary speech and writing, it is not uncommon to find some overt indication of authority accompanying the bald statement [1], such as:

I think
I gather (that) Mr Forster neglects his children.

It seems
I tell you...
I tell you frankly...
I tell you privately...
I put it to you cruelly...
I say, if you will allow me (to do so), that...

Each of the italicized sections in the various alternate forms of [6] is an adverbial in a clause which has the speaker as subject and Mr Forster neglects his children as its object. Thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
& I \quad S \quad V \quad O_1 \quad f \quad A \quad O_2 \\
& \text{tell you} \quad \text{frankly} \quad \text{that Mr Forster neglects his children.} \quad [7]
\end{align*}
\]

But even the degree of overt authority in [7] can be abbreviated:

Frankly, Mr Forster neglects his children. [8]

It is where sentences like [8] have the same meaning as [7], that we speak of the adverbials as disjuncts, and it can now be seen why such adverbials have in some sense a superordinate role in relation to the sentences in which they function.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [a] Not all disjuncts can be so straightforwardly related to adverbials in superordinate clauses. For example, the disjunct is:
Preumably, Alison has bought a new car.
cannot be related to:
*I tell you presumably that Alison...

But plausible paraphrases will nonetheless place 'Alison has bought a new car' as a clause functioning as an element in a superordinate clause, eg:
I presume that Alison has bought a new car.
That Alison has bought a new car is widely presumed.
It is widely presumed that Alison has bought a new car.

It is a matter of interesting speculation to account for the processes by which we can express the meaning of these finite verb phrases in terms of verbless adverbials.

[b] Many conjuncts also correspond to a construction containing a verb of speaking: cf 8.138.

c] Note the following examples of formal stereotyped expressions of authority:
I hereby declare that I shall...
Stop—in the name of the law.
No flowers by request.

---

8.123 Disjuncts can be divided into two main classes: style disjuncts (by far the smaller class) and content disjuncts. Style disjuncts convey the speaker's comment on the style and form of what he is saying, defining in some way under what conditions he is speaking as the 'authority' for the utterance. Content disjuncts (also known as attitudinal disjuncts) make observations on the actual content of the utterance and its truth conditions. These two classes and their subclasses are displayed in Fig 8.123.
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**Style disjuncts**

8.124 The relationship between a style disjunct and the clause to which it is attached can often be expressed (as we explained in 8.122) by a clause in which the same formal item as the style disjunct is a process adjunct (cf 8.78ff), with a verb of speaking, the subject of which is 'I'. Thus, *Frankly, I am tired.* is equivalent to *I tell you frankly or I say frankly.* If the clause is a question, the disjunct may be ambiguous:

Frankly, is he tired?

In this example, the adverbial may correspond to *I ask you frankly or to the more probable Tell me frankly.* Often the disjunct is quite overt about the verb of speaking and the adverbial may take the form of a finite clause:

*If I may say so without offence, your writing is immature.*

In this drawing attention not only to what is said but how it is being said, the style disjunct is often an implicit comment on language itself (cf 8.126). Adverbs commonly used as style disjuncts include:

Type (a): Modality and Manner
candidly, flatly, honestly, seriously, strictly, truly, truthfully; confidentially, privately, approximately, bluntly, briefly, broadly, cruelly, frankly, generally, roughly, simply
It would be highly unusual to find all such five at $E$ (or indeed all such five in the same clause), but for the purposes of exemplification we might offer the improbable and stylistically objectional (cf 8.20):

John was working on his hobby [respect] with the new shears [process] in the rose garden [place] for the whole of his day off [time] to complete the season's pruning [contingency].

The same point could be made more acceptably (but at greater length) by forming a series of sentences, each with any two of these adjuncts:

Adjuncts that can occur at $I$ are usually those that either have relatively little information value in the context (eg in reflecting what can be taken for granted) or are relatively inclusive or 'scene-setting' in their semantic role (eg an adjunct of time). Thus:

*That whole morning, he devoted himself to his roses.*

Not only is the adjunct at $I$ one of time, but the anaphoric *that* indicates that the period concerned has already been mentioned. It is unusual to have more than one adjunct at $I$ except where one is realized by a pro-form (especially *then*), but they would tend to be in the reverse order to that observed at $E$. In practice, this usually means:

space – time or process – time

For example:

*In America $[A_1]$, after the election $[A_2]$, trade began to improve. Slowly $[A_1]$ during this period $[A_3]$ people were becoming more prosperous.*

**Subjuncts**

8.88 We apply the term *subjuncts* to adverbials which have, to a greater or lesser degree, a subordinate role (see below) in comparison with other clause elements. This is made manifest by the fact that they cannot usually be treated grammatically in any of the four ways stated in 8.25 as being applicable to adjuncts. Let us consider the matter in respect of two very different subjuncts, *usually* as in [1] and *fairly* as in [2]:

This play presents *usually* a sharp challenge to a discerning audience.

He *fairly sprang* at her with his questions. (esp BrE) [2]

Notice that for the subjunct reading we must understand *usually* as operating in the semantic role of respect (cf 8.6), 'as a visual experience'. The same adverb in a different sentence might be grammatically an adjunct, operating in the semantic role of process (means, cf 8.5), 'with his eyes (alone)'.

He studied the play *usually* (but scarcely listened to a word). [3]

Likewise we must understand the subjunct *fairly* in [2] as having the semantic role of modality (cf 8.8), 'it is no exaggeration to say', though the same adverb can also be grammatically an adjunct in the semantic role of process (manner, of 8.5), 'in a just and impartial way':

He questioned her *quite fairly*.

If we now attempt the processes of 8.25 with [1] and [2], we either move away from the subjunct to the adjunct reading or produce an incomprehensible sequence:

It is *visually* that this play achieves a sharp challenge . . .

Does this play achieve a sharp challenge . . . *visually* or . . . ?

This play achieves *only visually* a sharp challenge . . .

How did this play achieve a sharp challenge . . . ?

[Perhaps, however, 'From what point of view . . . ?]

*It was fairly* that he sprang at her . . .

*Did he spring at her fairly or . . . ?

*He only fairly* sprang at her . . .

*[(How did he spring at her . . . ?)*Fairly.*

The 'subordinate role' to which we referred at the beginning of this section may apply to the whole clause in which the subjunct operates: this is what appears as 'wide orientation' in Fig 8.88. Alternatively, the subjunct may be subordinated to an individual clause element (usually the S) or even to an item forming part of a clause element (the V); this is what appears as 'narrow orientation' in Fig 8.88, where the relationships of the subjunct class are shown in some detail.

![Diagram](image-url)
Thank you for welcoming me here; now the subject of my talk is . . .

It would seem that, in discourse-initial use, these items seek to enforce by implication some continuity with what might have gone before. Silence is difficult to break without some such convention.

Note: Items like well, oh, ah have conventional values in discourse that are related to subjuncts, disjuncts, and conjuncts. On well cf 19.54; this typically prefaces a part of discourse which, though having perhaps something in common with what has gone before, introduces a difference of some sort. In consequence, it is convenient as a frequent discourse initiator.

The semantics of conjuncts

8.136 Much more than with disjuncts, the conjunct function entails a conjunct-specific set of semantic relations. They are connected with, but are frequently rather remote from, the adverbial relation we must assume in the speaker-related clause to which they correspond. It is necessary, therefore, to set out the conjunctive meanings concerned, although we shall return to them in 19.53ff where they can be seen in the wider context of inter-sentence relations and discourse structure.

We can distinguish seven conjunctive roles, in some cases with fairly clear subdivisions; see Fig 8.136.

(a) Listing
   (i) enumerative
   (ii) additive
   (e) equative
   (f) reinforcing

(b) Summative
(c) Appositive
(d) Resultive
(e) Inferential
(f) Contrastive
   (i) reformulatory
   (ii) replacive
   (iii) antithetic
   (iv) concessive
(g) Transitional
   (i) discoursal
   (ii) temporal

Fig 8.136

8.137 Some of the common conjuncts are listed below according to their role classes and subclasses. Except for enumerative conjuncts (which are an open class), all adverb realizations are given, as well as some frequently occurring prepositional phrases and noun phrases.

(a) Listing
   (i) Enumerative
      first, second, third . . .
      first(ly), second(ly), third(ly) . . .
      one, two, three . . . (esp in learned and technical use)
      a, b, c . . . (esp in learned and technical use)
      in the first place, in the second place . . .

(b) Summative
(c) Appositive
(d) Resultive
(e) Inferential
(f) Contrastive
   (i) Reformulatory
      better, rather, more accurately, more precisely; alias, alternatively, in other words
   (ii) Replacive
      again, alternatively, rather
      better, worse; on the other hand
(iii) **ANTITHETIC**  
contrariwise 〈formal〉, conversely 〈formal〉  
instead [blend of antithetic with replace]  
oppositely [rare], then;  
on the contrary, in contrast, by way of contrast, in comparison,  
by comparison, by way of comparison, (on the one hand . . .) on the other hand  
(iv) **CONCESSIONAL**  
anyhow 〈informal〉, anyway 〈informal〉, anyways 〈AmE informal〉,  
besides [blend of reinforcing with concessive], else, however, nevertheless,  
nonetheless(formal) [also written none the less], notwithstanding [formal],  
only 〈informal〉, still, though, yet, in 'any case, in 'any event 〈formal〉, at  
'any rate, at all events, for all that, in spite of that, in spite of it all, after all,  
at the same 'time, on the other hand, all the same, admittedly, of course, still  
and all 〈informal AmE〉; that said

(g) **TRANSITIONAL**  
(i) **DISCOURSE**  
incidentally, now 〈informal〉  
by the way  
by the bye 〈not commonly used〉  
(ii) **TEMPORAL**  
meantime, meanwhile, in the meantime, in the meanwhile; note also the set:  
originally, subsequently, eventually

8.138 **LISTING** (role a) is of course a basic language function and we have structures  
of coordination for this purpose (cf 2.9), involving above all the conjunction  
and:

I did this and I did this and . . . I saw John and Mary and . . .

Conjuncts are used to give a particular structure or orientation to a list. At its simplest, the structure shows order by having items performing an **ENUMERATIVE** function:

First the economy is beginning to recover, and secondly the unemployment figures have not increased this month.

The relation of such items to adjuncts in the speaker's assessment of what he is saying can be seen in paraphrases:

I tell you first that the economy . . . and I tell you secondly that unemployment figures . . .

The enumerative function does more than merely assign numerical labels to the items listed: it connotes relative priority and endows the list with an integral structure, having a beginning and an end. The idea of an integral relation is especially conferred by the **ADDITIVE** conjuncts. By the use of the **EQUIVATIVE** subtype, we indicate that an item has a similar force to a preceding one:

She has high responsibilities and, equally, a high salary.

We might regard the conjunct here as a fragment of a speaker's comment in which the adverb functions as an adjunct: perhaps 'I assess (or rate) this equally'.

The **REINFORCING** subtype of additive conjunct typically assesses an item as adding greater weight to a preceding one:

He has the opportunity, the motivation, and above all the courage to do it.

Here again we might postulate the conjunct as related to some such comment as 'I rate this above all that I have said.'

Note

[a] The -ly forms of ordinal numerals are chiefly used as conjuncts. Contrast:

He arrived first (firstly) and she arrived second. [adjuncts]

First, he is my friend, and secondly he is in desperate need. [conjuncts]

Ordinals as conjuncts occur with or without -ly, but for many people firstly is objectionable. Note that firstly (also initially, originally) can also have a subjunct use, especially when associated with such verbs as refuse and disprove. Thus:

Hormones were firstly identified by Starling at University College London.

The statement would be a different one if instead of the subjunct we had first as a conjunct:

First, hormones were identified by Starling at University College London.

(b) Of course does [i] permit us either to replace first by firstly or to predict a further sentence:

Hormones were secondly identified by . . .

Conjuncts like more and something else must remind us that these truncated speaker-assessments are not necessarily related to adjuncts but (as in these instances) are more plausibly seen as objects: 'I will say more'.

(c) The cardinal and ordinal numerals may be represented in writing by their symbols in the various systems:

1, 2, 3, . . .  1, II, III, . . .

Similarly, the alphabetical letters may be represented either as minuscules ('lower case', a, b, c . . .) or as majuscules ('upper case' or 'capitals', A, B, C . . .). These different systems allow the writer to choose a hierarchy of listings and sub listings. In general, no clear conventions have been established for which sets of symbols are to be subordinate to other sets, and the writer is therefore free to choose a hierarchy of sets for his or her own purpose. One would of course observe consistency and rationale; one would not subordinate capitals to lower-case letters, for example.

(d) Too as reinforcing conjunct (rare, AmE) occupies 1 position:

'He's had her novel published this year; but why, she's written some interesting articles on acupuncture.'

8.139 **SUMMATIVE** (role b) and **APPOSITIONAL** (role c) conjuncts have this much in common: they precede an item which is to be looked at in relation to all the items that have gone before. **SUMMATIVE** conjuncts introduce an item that embraces the preceding ones:

He lost his watch, his car broke down, and he got a letter of complaint from a customer: all in all, he had a bad day.

**APPOSITIONAL** conjuncts are concerned rather to express the content of the preceding item or items in other terms (cf 17.65):

She has some assistance—for instance, a secretary.

Where the apposition applies to more than one preceding item there is usually a summative implication:

They took with them some chocolate, cans of beer and fruit juice, a flask of coffee, a pack of sandwiches: in other words, enough refreshments.