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This paper discusses participant-oriented uses of adverbs and tries to motivate their conceptual flexibility within a framework largely inspired by Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar. Usually, at least two types of participant-oriented adverb are identified, manner and transparent adverbs. It is argued here that they define a network where both a schema and a prototype can be recognized and that the difference between manner and transparent adverbs results from a difference in vantage point. Transparent adverbs, which code either cause or result, imply an internal vantage point while manner adverbs imply an external vantage point. The prototype is identified with those (manner) adverbs which involve some (external) evaluation of the clausal event on the part of the conceptualizer. The schema is regarded as merely coding temporal coextension between the verbal event and the property hinted at by the adjectival base of the adverb. Finally, the relation between participant-oriented adverbs, on the one hand, and depictive adjectives and resultative adverbs is also briefly addressed.
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1. Introduction

This paper deals with -ly adverbs, see (1), from a cognitive linguistic perspective.

(1) a. Sally nodded sadly.
    b. I got up painfully.

Following Geuder (2000) and Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005), this chapter shows that -ly adverbs are not simply predicated of events but can also be predicated of participants, thus engendering a variety of possible interpretations. For example, in
(1a), the event of nodding is possibly accompanied by some facial features of Sally's which suggest sadness on her part. That is, the adjectival base of the adverb sadly, "sad", can be predicated of Sally (she looks sad) and can be taken to refer to a property which is temporally coextensive with the verbal event (Sally looks sad while nodding). In (1b), the event of getting up caused me to feel pain. In other words, the former event and the latter sensation are only coextensive in a derivative sense because there is also a causal relation between the two, i.e. some, possibly very short, part of the getting up event must have preceded the feeling of pain. Still, as in (1a), the adjectival base of the adverb painfully, "painful", can be related to the clausal subject: I was in pain (i.e. in a painful condition).

The present paper aims to try to account for such conceptual flexibility by appealing to basic cognitive operations. It will first provide a few general remarks on the cognitive linguistic treatment of adverbs, Section 2, and then discuss manner adverbs, Section 3, and so-called transparent adverbs, Section 4, in some detail. Sections 5 and 6 will highlight the importance of viewing arrangements for the characterization of -ly adverbs. Section 7 will sum up the discussion by offering a schematic/network description of -ly adverbs and Section 8 will sum up the major points of the present investigation.

2. Previous cognitive linguistic studies

Cognitive linguists have paid little attention to -ly adverbs so far. Among the exceptions is of course Langacker, who has dealt with them to some extent in his semantics-based approach to word classes. Langacker (see e.g. Langacker 1987: 219) views adverbs as symbolizing a relation between a relational trajectory – all the elements which adverbs modify, i.e. verbs, prepositions, adjectives and adverbs themselves, symbolize relations in Langacker's Cognitive Grammar – and a region along a comparison scale (the landmark). In the sentence She works quickly, for instance, the adverb quickly relates the process of working to a region corresponding to rapidity along a scale of rate. The merit of Langacker's analysis is its ability to motivate why adverbs modify the word classes they do. What all the word classes that adverbs modify have in common is, as pointed out above, their nature as (processual or nonprocessual) relations. That is, "they constitute a natural grouping in C[ognitive]G[rammar]” Langacker 2008: 116).

However, the need for a finer-grained analysis becomes apparent when one considers well-known cases like (2):

(2)  a. Sally spilled the beans stupidly.
    b. Stupidly, Sally spilled the beans.

Although stupidly is classifiable as an adverb in both cases (at least in formal terms), its function is not the same, see e.g. Ernst (2002: 8–11) for a useful summary. In (2a), stupidly functions as a (manner) adjunct or predicate-level manner adverb. The way
in which Sally spilled the beans was stupid. In (2b), *stupidly* functions as a *disjunct* or *sentence-level adverb*, expressing the speaker’s evaluation of the action carried out by the sentential subject: it was stupid of Sally to spill the beans rather than saying nothing, for example.

Nakamura (1997) tries to capture this distinction within a Cognitive Grammar framework by relating it to Langacker’s scanning modes known as sequential and summary scanning. Langacker (see e.g. Langacker 2008: 108–112) has proposed that we can view a (complex) scene as either a film, i.e. sequentially (each “frame” developing into a new one), or as a multiple exposure photo, i.e. summarily (all “frames” being active simultaneously). In the former case, the scene is said to have a positive temporal profile, i.e. to be scanned sequentially, while in the latter case, the scene is said to have a null temporal profile, i.e. to be scanned summarily. Nakamura claims that in the adjunct use, as in (2a), the adverb symbolizes a relation which has a positive temporal profile while in the disjunct use, as in (2b), the adverb symbolizes a relation with a null temporal profile.

A potential problem with this analysis is that the distinction between the two scanning modes for the structuring of complex scenes has recently been called into question, at least in the way Langacker currently envisages it (see Broccia & Hollmann 2007). Still, Nakamura’s suggestion is commendable because it aims to capture, within a Cognitive Grammar framework, the intuition that the “comparison classes” (see e.g. Ernst 2002: 58–59 on the use of this term) for *stupidly* in (2a) and (2b) are different. In (2a), one is comparing different ways of doing the same action: one could spill the beans intelligently rather than stupidly. By contrast, in (2b) one is comparing different possible actions, one of which is telling a secret, rather than, for example, keeping silent. It may be the case, however, that such different comparison classes can be handled by Cognitive Grammar without recourse to the difference between the two scanning modes. After all, a disjunct involves a clause whereas an adjunct “targets” a verb. And clauses and verbs are two different conceptual entities in Langacker’s theory, see e.g. Langacker (2008: Ch. 11). But this is not a point I will elaborate on any further because my main concern will be predicate-level adjuncts.

More important, therefore, is the fact that Nakamura’s analysis, like Langacker’s, is still too general in that all predicate-level adverbs (i.e. adjuncts) are lumped together. But adjuncts are not all the same functionally. As is pointed out by Quirk et al. (1985: 560) and is detailed in Guerber’s (2000) perspicacious but formal (neo-Davidsonian) study, adjuncts are not always simply predicated of (i.e. take as their trajector) a relation but can also be participant-oriented. Consider the example in (3):

(3)  a. Sally painted the house red.
    b. Sally painted the house beautifully.

(3a) is a straightforward instance of the resultative construction (see Broccia 2003; Goldberg & Jackendoff 2004 *inter alia*). The adjective *red* is predicated of the *house* or, more correctly, of some part of the house such as its exterior. But what about (3b)? Can
we say that the painting event took place in a beautiful manner (manner adverb reading or event-oriented reading)? Not really. *Beautifully* is used here to signify that the result of the action of painting the house, i.e. the painted house, which Geuder would call a resultant object, is beautiful. Although formally the -ly adverb is to be related to the painting event, from a semantic point of view it is the base of the adverb (“beautiful”) which is involved in a predicative relation. This relation involves the ascription of the property of beauty to the resultant object, i.e. what comes “out of” the event of painting, which in (3b) corresponds to the painted house.

In Broccias (2004) I proposed that this asymmetry between form and meaning can be viewed as an instance of Langacker’s profile/active zone asymmetry, see e.g. Langacker (2008: 331–334). Although the adverb *beautifully* profiles, formally, a relation between a processual trajector (the event of painting the house) and a region along a scale of aesthetic evaluation, the adverb is in reality targeting through its base an active zone of the processual trajector, namely the resultant object “painted house”. For the sake of completeness, I have reproduced in Figure 1 a pictorial representation of my analysis in the style of Cognitive Grammar diagrams. However, the interested reader is referred to Broccias (2004) for more details (but see also Section 7 below). Here it will suffice to say that the longest dashed arrow in Figure 1 makes visually explicit the rerouting of *beautifully* from the process as a whole (the rectangular box) to one of its parts, i.e. “the painted house”, which is represented as a grey-shaded circle with a short dashed arrow inside. (This arrow stands for the change of state that the house undergoes.) More generally, the crucial point that I am interested in making here is that adjuncts can be participant-oriented, as will be further detailed in the next section. This observation must be captured in cognitive linguistic analyses in one way or another.

3. Manner adverbs

The issue of orientedness is not only limited to so-called resultative adverbs but, in fact, involves adjuncts in a much more general way and has of course already been
commented on in the literature. For example, Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005: 13) quote Platt and Platt’s (1972: 237) analysis of examples such as (4) below:

(4) Fred ate the sausages ravenously.

Platt and Platt contend that “[t]he manner of eating is an outward and visible sign of an inner ravenous quality of the eater”. Rephrasing this into Cognitive Grammar terms, one can say that ravenously in (4) exhibits profile/active zone asymmetry. In this case, the adjunct does seem to have an event-oriented reading: it is possible to say that the eating took place in a ravenous manner. This contrasts with (3b) above, where the event-oriented reading is disfavored (the result, rather than the process itself, is deemed to be beautiful). Still, as in (3b), the quality of being ravenous can also be predicated of one of the participants, i.e. the subject referent here, Fred. And the subject is of course an active zone with respect to ravenously’s processual trajector, i.e. the process of Fred’s eating the sausages. The ambivalent nature of manner adjuncts is stressed forcefully in Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005) and Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann (2004), who regard event- and participant-orientation as a continuum and place manner adjuncts in the middle of this continuum.

Related to the observation concerning the ambiguous orientation of manner adverbs is the issue of how to characterize “manner” more explicitly. Both Geuder (2000) and Ernst (2001) observe that manner readings for adverbs like stupidly which can function both as disjuncts and as adjuncts seem to “describe some sort of external manifestation that may or may not reflect the internal reality” (Ernst 2001: 56). In (2a) above, for example, Sally’s spilling the beans “manifests” the property of “silliness”, which the conceptualizer (the speaker) attributes to her. This does not mean however that Sally is necessarily silly: she might have spilled the beans in a stupid manner quite intentionally for some devious purpose of hers, of course. A naturally occurring example illustrating this point clearly is (5):\footnote{Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005) call manner adverbs such as stupidly “pure manner” adverbs so as to distinguish them from manner adverbs that are only participant-oriented, see the next section. This may be confusing to some since the label “pure manner” is usually applied to adverbs which are predicated of events “directly”. (These are adverbs which involve perceptual qualities such as light, sound, taste, physical action, see Ernst 1987: 84.) For example, considering (i)

(i) a. John walked sadly off the stage.
   b. John walked loudly off the stage.

Schäfer (2002) claims that the event in (ib) can be said to be loud but the event in (ia) cannot be said to be sad. “Rather, it expresses sadness” (Schäfer 2002: 314). He would therefore call loudly, but not sadly, a pure manner adverb, contrary to Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt’s analysis.}

(5) ‘She is not a stupid woman, I think. Yet she behaves stupidly.’
4. Transparent adverbs

Geuder (2000) and Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005) point out that adjuncts can sometimes exhibit only participant-orientation, rather than both event- and participant-orientation. A case in point are resitative adverbs, like beautifully in (3b), where a manner paraphrase does not seem to be feasible. But there are also non-resultative, participant-oriented uses, such as those in (6):

(6) a. Sally angrily shouted at them.
    b. Sally angrily read the letter.

Angrily in (6a) can be paraphrased as “out of anger”. It stands for the motive which drove Sally to shout. Angrily in (6b), by contrast, refers to the consequence of the action of Sally’s reading the letter: reading the letter made Sally angry. Geuder (2000) and Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005) call such uses transparent. In such cases, an event-paraphrase (e.g. “Sally shouted at them in an angry manner” and “Sally read the letter in an angry manner”) does not convey the intended interpretation.

Although I have not investigated the distribution of manner and transparent adverbs quantitatively, naturally occurring examples similar to those in (6) can indeed be found (see below in the text for examples), at least in narrative texts, and one can also come across interesting “minimal pairs” like the following:

(7) a. All those times we were in the bathroom, and she was just three toilets away,” said Ron bitterly at breakfast next day [...].
    (J. K. Rowling 1998: 210)
    b. Of course, he [i.e. Harry Potter] thought bitterly, Uncle Vernon was talking about the stupid dinner party.
    (J. K. Rowling 1998: 10)

Bitterly in (7a) can (but need not) be considered an instance of the manner adverb use. Using Ernst’s (2001) definition mentioned above, one can safely claim that Ron’s voice seems to suggest or manifest bitterness on his part. By contrast, in (7b), it is rather nonsensical to claim that the thinking process manifests or suggests bitterness on Harry Potter’s part for the obvious reason that thinking is not an externally observable phenomenon (see also below). Rather, one could claim that the thinking process results in Harry Potter’s bitterness. This would then count as an example of the transparent adverb use, where the adverb is recruited to convey a consequence of the event of thinking.2

Admittedly, it may sometimes be difficult to offer a clear-cut interpretation of the use of -ly adjuncts. Note that one could also interpret (7a) as a transparent use since

---

2. Incidentally, observe that the position of the adjunct in (7) is post-verbal. That is, although transparent uses may be easier to detect if the adjunct precedes the verb, as in the examples in (6), the post-verbal position does not exclude a transparent reading.
bitterly could hint at the motive for Ron’s utterance. One more example will suffice to illustrate this point. Consider (8):

(8) Donna is clueless when she drunkenly falls into Ross’ arms and doesn’t react when he fixes her with a passionate stare. (from the summary of an episode of the British soap Emmerdale published on www.digitalspy.co.uk on 26 October 2007)

Possible interpretations for drunkenly in (8) could be “Donna falls in Ross’ arms because she is drunk” (a transparent motive use) and “Donna falls in Ross’ arms in a way that suggests that she is drunk” (a manner use). In either case, there is some sort of temporal coextension between the event of Donna’s falling into Ross’ arms and her known (under the motive reading) or presumed (under the manner reading) state of drunkenness. Such interpretative indeterminacy must of course be accounted for (see the next section).

As Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005: 9) observe, transparent cases involve tight factual links (i.e. motive, consequence). I believe that this can be viewed, from a cognitive linguistic perspective, as an instance of blending (see Fauconnier & Turner 2002). In (7b), for example, it is possible to identify two input spaces: a “thinking” input space and a “bitterness” input space. The two are merged by way of the vital relation (see Fauconnier & Turner 2002: 93–102) dubbed Cause-Effect so that bitterness is construed as the consequence or Effect of the event of thinking.

One attractive feature of the blending analysis is that it readily motivates the possibility of multiple readings for identical structures since a blend can be run in many different ways. The same structure can be related to various different integration strategies. In (8), for example, the two input spaces involved are the “falling” input space and the “being drunk” input space. As in (7b), they can be merged by way of the Cause-Effect vital relation. But unlike in (7b), the “being drunk” space would stand here for the Cause rather than the Effect of the event denoted by the verb. Further, one could claim that the two input spaces in (8) are (also) merged thanks to the vital relation of Time, i.e. the state of “being drunk” overlaps with the event of “falling”. I will return to these possibilities later on, in Section 7.

5. Vantage point

The proposal I would like to submit in this paper is that the two different interpretations of -ly adjuncts, manner and transparent, can easily be motivated conceptually by appealing to the cognitive linguistic notion of viewing arrangement, see for example Langacker (2008: 73–78). In particular, I contend that the vantage point of the conceptualizer turns out to be crucial in distinguishing between manner and transparent uses. Let us consider (7) again, which I have reproduced below for the sake of clarity:
a. All those times we were in the bathroom, and she was just three toilets away,” said Ron bitterly at breakfast next day [...].

(J. K. Rowling 1998: 210)

b. Of course, he [i.e. Harry Potter] thought bitterly, Uncle Vernon was talking about the stupid dinner party.

(J. K. Rowling 1998: 10)

First of all, it is worth remarking that the two examples differ structurally only for the choice of verb, say vs. think. However, the latter verb like the former involves some sort of speaking. Thinking is viewed as an internal or reflexive kind of saying, as the words meant to reproduce Harry’s thinking make apparent. The recipient of this “thought-utterance”, so to speak, is merely the speaker himself. There is, in other words, both structural and semantic motivation for the occurrence of cases like (7b) if one views them as extensions of manner uses such as (7a).

But this is not the end of the story. Granted that (7b) reproduces Harry’s verbal thinking, the conceptualizer (i.e. the writer) must have access to Harry Potter’s mind because she can conclude that the thinking process results in Harry’s experiencing resentment. That is, the conceptualizer is omniscient by virtue of her “privileged” access to the character’s internal (emotive) world. I will therefore say that the vantage point that is most likely used in (7b) is internal. The subject of conceptualization (the writer) has access to the internal reality of the object of conceptualization (the character). By contrast, in the case of (7a), an internal vantage point, although possible, is not necessarily the most likely. It can be the case, of course, that bitterly describes an emotive state of Ron’s that the narrator can “see” by virtue of her privileged access to her characters’ internal world. This would count as a transparent use of bitterly. But it is also plausible to assume that “bitterness” is deduced by the narrator by observing and evaluating the way in which Ron’s words are delivered. Similarly, the reader conjures up a mental representation where Ron’s words are delivered in the way someone would if they were experiencing bitterness. If one opts for the interpretation that Ron’s words “manifest”, in Ernst’s (2001) sense, bitterness on his part, then the manner interpretation obtains. Crucially, this interpretation relies on an external vantage point. The conceptualizer, i.e. either the writer or the reader, does not have access to the character’s internal world but infers some property of his by evaluating some perceptual evidence.

The idea that the internal vantage point correlates with the transparent reading and the external vantage point goes hand in hand with the manner reading goes some way towards motivating the difficulty in interpreting examples like (8) above, which has been reproduced below:

(8) Donna is clueless when she drunkenly falls into Ross’ arms and doesn’t react when he fixes her with a passionate stare.

The verb fall activates an external vantage point but drunkenly is compatible with both the external and the internal vantage points. Its base, “drunken”, can refer to a property of Donna’s which is inferred on the basis of some visual evidence (e.g. she is staggering).
or is part of the conceptualizer’s knowledge, i.e. the conceptualizer knows that Donna hasn’t sobered up yet. Importantly, we should not discount the possibility that both perspectives, and hence interpretations, are active simultaneously. This ambivalence is also found for example when the narrator is also a character as in (9) below:

(9) ‘There!’ I said triumphantly. (C. J. Sansom 2006: 3)

Since the narrator has obviously access to his own internal world, triumphantly could be regarded as a transparent adjunct coding motive. Further, the reader can identify herself with the narrator and therefore use his vantage point. But both the narrator and the reader can also opt for an external vantage point, which means that triumphantly can be analysed as a manner adverb: the action of saying “manifests” the property of being triumphant on the part of the narrator/character. Once more, it is probable that both perspectives coexist to some degree, at least.

6. External states

What all the various -ly cases examined so far have in common are tight connections between some property/state alluded to by the adverb and the verbal event. When an internal vantage point is selected, tight links are obtained by virtue of a Cause-Effect vital relation. When an external vantage point is opted for, the verbal event can be a “pointer” to some internal state. In fact, the “manifest” relation taken by Ernst to underlie manner uses of adverbs involving internal (e.g. psychological) states may also be extended to states which are not necessarily definable as “internal”. Consider (10):

(10) I fling the J-cloth at him. It lands wetly in his lap. (Lewycka 2006: 33)

The base of the adverb wetly describes a property of the J-cloth, that of being wet but, intuitively, the use of the adverb is much more “dynamic” than that of an adjective (cf. “It lands wet in his lap.”). In other words, the event of the cloth’s landing in the lap points to or shows that the cloth is wet even though one is not probably dealing with an internal state here.

It must also be stressed that there are some instances which imply an external vantage point but are not captured by Ernst’s “manifest” analysis. Consider (11):

(11) a. Sally nodded silently.
    b. The sun was shining brightly.

In (11a), it sounds odd to say that the event of Sally’s nodding “manifests”/“points to” silence. Quite more simply, (11a) seems to describe some overlap between the event of nodding, which is foregrounded by virtue of the fact that the clause inherits its relation profile (the sentence is about nodding), and the event of keeping silent. Notice that two perceptual domains are involved here: one involving vision, i.e. the perception of
bodily motion, and the other involving hearing. In (11b) too, the adverb refers to an externally observable property or state. The difference with (11b) is that only one perceptual domain is involved, namely that of vision. Brightly is used as an intensifier, hinting at the fact that the degree of brightness was considerable, relative to some standard.

Although the examples in (11) do not involve internal states, see also (10), participant-orientation still obtains: one can safely say that Sally was silent while nodding and that the sun was bright. Such uses can probably still be described as manner since the comparison classes are different ways in which one can nod and different ways in which the sun can shine. However, what is really important is that instances like (11) are similar to depicitive adjectives (see Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt 2005: Ch.1 for extensive discussion) in that they merely describe temporary states. Consider (12):

(12) She walked home drunk.

Drunk in (12) is a depicitive adjective which describes a temporary state overlapping with the verbal event. (Note however that drunk, unlike silently and brightly, refers to some internal state albeit one with possible external correlates.) It is interesting to mention at this juncture that Killie (2007) has shown that -ly adjuncts and depicitives are sometimes used interchangeably, especially in the literary language. This occurs for example with “appearance/attribute” adverbs like redly in (13a) below, which is clearly interchangeable with the adjective red, as the very similar example in (13b) shows.

(13) a. In a large side-chapel a candle winked redly in a lamp ...

(C. J. Sansom 2006: 460)

b. The high brick walls shone red in the setting sun. (C. J. Sansom 2006: 483)

The similarity between some -ly adjuncts and depicitive adjectives must also be motivated. This is what the next section tries to do.

7. A schematic description

I would like to argue that the commonality between all the examples considered in this paper amounts simply to a relation of temporal coextension between the verbal event and the property/state referred to by the adjunct. In other words, it is possible to recognize an overarching schema which subsumes all instances as finer-grained realizations. This is obvious where a “pointer”/“manifest” relation between the verbal event and the adjunct-property/state obtains as well as in the case of (11). But even with instances of the transparent use, where the adverb hints at some state as either motive/ Cause or consequence/Effect of the verbal event, it is intuitively clear that there must be some temporal overlap between the two. In (6a), for example, some portion of the shouting event must happen while Sally is angry and in (6b) some portion of the reading event must be coextensive with Sally’s experiencing anger.
It may be useful to sum up the analysis put forward here diagrammatically, as I tried to do in Figure 2. However, readers of a non-visual disposition and/or with little familiarity with Cognitive Grammar-style diagrams can move quickly through this section. Still, they should pay some attention to the difference between oriented -ly adjuncts and depictives as well as the point about the conceptual similarity between the flexibility of -ly adjuncts and resultative constructions.

Figure 2 includes various diagrams. The two at the bottom, (a) and (b), are intended to represent visually the transparent motive (or Cause) use and the transparent consequence (or Effect) use, respectively. (a) shows that the clause Sally angrily tore the letter up is obtained by merging a verbal process, that of tearing the letter, which is visualized as the right-hand side box at the bottom, with a relation between an entity (corresponding to Sally, visualized as the circle in the left-hand side square box at the bottom), and a scale (corresponding to levels of anger). The latter relation places Sally in the “angry region” along a scale of psychological states. Importantly, in keeping with the pictorial conventions of Broccia (2003), the order of the two boxes at the bottom is meant to represent the existence of a causal relation between them. The relation “anger” (of which Sally can be taken to be the trajector and the region along the scale the landmark) causes the verbal event of Sally’s tearing the letter. Notice that the identity between Sally as a trajector in the “anger” relation and Sally as the trajector in the tearing event is depicted by way of the dashed arc connecting the two. Further, the causal relation has been represented explicitly using a block arrow between the two bottom boxes. The diagram also shows the conceptualizer (C), who has access to Sally’s mental world, as the dashed arrow ending up inside the circle in the bottom left-hand box is meant to show. The box at the top in the diagram is identical to the bottom right-hand box because the former is meant to visualize that the composite expression profiles the relation symbolized by the verb tear. In other words, the verbal predication is the profile determinant of the composite expression. This has been shown by using a heavy line for the box representing it at the bottom of the diagram. However, the composite expression also contains an adverb (angrily), hence the arrow connecting the “angry region” on the scale to the relation in the top box. Notice that the arrow points to the latter relation. This is meant to capture the relation of causality represented at the bottom level by way of the linear arrangement of the boxes and the block arrow between them: Sally’s being angry causes her to destroy the letter, or to put it differently, the event of Sally’s tearing the letter “comes out” of the “angry region” where she (metaphorically speaking) is located. This is the visual import of the arrow connecting the scale to the box at the top of the diagram. The fact that both the process of Sally’s destroying the letter and Sally herself are connected to the “angry region” along the scale accounts for the active-zone interpretation that oriented adjuncts have.

---

3. I would like to stress that Figure 2, as is the case with pictorial representations in Langacker’s Cognitive Grammar, is intended merely as a visual aid which I have included to make my analysis as clear as possible.
Figure 2. Oriented adverbs and depictives
Although formally they are predicated of the verbal process, they actually refer (to a greater or lesser extent) to one of the participants involved in the process, Sally in the case at hand. Sally is an active zone with respect to the process of her tearing the letter because it is targeted by the adjectival base of the adverb angrily.

The diagram in (b) is similar to the one in (a). The major difference is the order of the two boxes at the bottom, which represents the opposite order of causality compared to (a). It is the verbal event (of reading) that causes Sally to end up angry. This different directionality in the causal relation between the two relations is also represented by way of the arrow connecting the composite expression (the box at the top) with the “angry region”. The arrow points to the “angry” region because reading results in anger on Sally’s part.

I would like to point out that, in both (a) and (b), the box at the top should be taken to represent the fact that, at least to some extent, the property of Sally’s being angry and her actions are coextensive. This is important because I have proposed that this is precisely the minimum common denominator for all oriented adjuncts. In the case of (c), this has been shown explicitly by arranging the two major components of Sally answered angrily (under the reading “Sally’s answering manifests anger on her part”) in parallel, one above the other, and by representing them by way of two boxes having the same length. The top box is the one whose profile (the profile of the verbal component) the composite expression inherits. I have represented the composite expression as the rightmost box, rather than as a box above the two components as I did in (a) and (b), for the sake of clarity. Notice that I haven’t shown the conceptualizer in (c) – nor in the following diagrams for that matter – because the conceptualizer is external to Sally’s internal world. Rather, as was discussed above, the conceptualizer, by using the adverb, suggests a hypothesis about some internal state of Sally’s on the basis of the verbal event. This is what the squiggly arrow from the verbal event to the bottom box representing Sally is meant to depict. Observe that the squiggly arrow ends up within the circle standing for Sally because we are dealing here with an internal emotional state. As was remarked above, however, this does not need to be the case, see the discussion of (10), and the notion “manifest” should probably be intended in a more general sense. Finally, (c) differs from (a) and (b) in that there is no arrow connecting the composite expression to the “angry region” but rather a line. This line visualizes the fact that the conceptualizer doesn’t know if e.g. Sally answered (the way she did) out of anger. The conceptualizer can only observe external reality and infer a possible property/state of one of the participants in the event, e.g. the state of Sally’s being angry in the case under discussion.

I have also labelled the diagram in (c) as “prototype” because it may be the case that, at least under a frequency-based definition of prototype (see e.g. Gilquin 2006 for
some discussion), this is the most common pattern exemplified. But this is of course a matter for further investigation.

The diagram in (d) is almost identical to the one in (c) but lacks the squiggly arrow used in the latter. In (d), we are not inferring some property/state of one of the participants but, rather, merely describing a simultaneous event, that of e.g. Sally’s being silent (while nodding). As I observed above, the diagram in (d) can be viewed as a schema capturing the commonality of all oriented cases, namely the coextension between two processes.

The discussion so far can be summed up by saying that the conceptual arrangements between the verbal and adverbial components can be of three types. Either the adverbial component determines the verbal component, see (a), or the verbal component determines the adverbial component, see (b), or neither determines the other, see (c). Interestingly, these three types of conceptual arrangement are not only limited to sentences with oriented adjuncts but are symptomatic of a more general process of merging of conceptual components. For example, so-called resultative constructions (see e.g. Broccias 2003; Goldberg & Jackendoff 2004 inter alia), which are also based on the merger of two conceptual components, also exhibit the three possible arrangements observed here. Consider the resultative examples in (14):

(14) a. They punched him dead.
   b. The module clicked into place.
   c. The fans booed the players off at the interval.

(14a) involves a causal relation between the verbal event of punching and the event (metonymically alluded to by the adjective) of somebody ending up dead. By contrast, in (14b), the conceptual order is the opposite. The motion event, i.e. the module’s moving into place, causes the verbal event of clicking. Finally, there is no causal relation between the verbal event of the fans’ booing the players and the players leaving the pitch in (14c), since they must leave the pitch at the interval (see Broccias 2006 for further details). Still, there is an important difference between -ly adjuncts and resultatives. In the former case, the prototype is probably the structure in (c), while in the latter case, the prototype seems to be similar to (b), i.e. the verbal event determines some property of one of its participants, see example (14a).

The schematic characterization I have offered for oriented -ly adjuncts can also be useful to distinguish them from depictives, which I have represented diagrammatically in (e). Although depictives are somewhat similar to oriented adverbs cases of the (d) type, as Figure 2 shows, depictive adjectives seem to refer to properties which

---

4. Although a detailed quantitative study is needed, consider for example that in the first two chapters of C. J. Sansom's novel Sovereign (which are about 31 pages long in total), I have counted 18 instances of the "prototypical" use, 7 of the schematic use, 2 of the transparent use and 1 of the resultative use. (I have ignored cases where the adverb is related to a first person subject because it may be difficult to decide whether the reading is either a manner one or a transparent one.)

All rights reserved
activate a larger temporal frame than that of the verb. For example, in *Sally went home drunk*, the event of Sally’s going home is intuitively contained within the (longer) state of Sally’s being drunk. The temporal frame for the verbal event seems to be included in that of the adjective rather than merely being (roughly) coextensive with it. This has been shown by representing the box for *Sally* in (e) as being longer than that for the event of going back home. Notice also that in the composite expression in (e), unlike the other diagrams, the region corresponding to drunkenness along the scale of soberness has been connected to the circle representing *Sally* rather than the line standing for the predicate go back. This is meant to indicate that the predicative relation between *Sally* and the property of being drunk is direct rather than involving a profile/active zone asymmetry as in the case of -ly adverbs.

One last observation is in order. I must stress that the schematic analysis I have proposed here does not necessarily apply to resultative adverbs (see Section 2 above), where coextension between the verbal event and the property hinted at by the adverb does not seem to obtain. The adjectival base of the adverb just targets the final stage of the verbal event, as was hinted at in Section 2. However, the occurrence of adverbs can be motivated by noticing (see Broccias 2004) that resultative adverbs involve some sort of subjective evaluation (on the part of the conceptualizer) in a similar way to prototypical manner uses, where the conceptualizer uses the verbal event to infer some property of one of the participants. One cannot paint a house “redly” because colors are taken to refer to objective properties in our naive view of the world, hence an adjective, e.g. “red”, is to be selected.5 Conversely, one can paint a house beautifully because beauty is, as the proverb goes, in the eye of the beholder.

8. Conclusion

In this paper I have tried to motivate the conceptual flexibility of oriented -ly adverbs by arranging them into a network which has both a schema and a prototype. The schema depicts the temporal coextension between the verbal event and the state/property alluded to by the (adjectival base of) the adverb. The prototype differs from the schema in that the state/property is inferred by the conceptualizer on the basis of some perceptual input. The remaining cases, the so-called transparent uses, in addition imply a causal relation between the verbal event and the state/property. Importantly, however, one can still construe the two as being coextensive to some extent. Further, I have argued that the difference between the transparent uses and the non-transparent ones can be related to the vantage point of the conceptualizer. If she is external to the participants, then a non-transparent reading ensues. If she has access to the participants’

5. But a candle can “wink redly”, see example (13a), because there is some dynamicity involved here (i.e. what I referred to as coextension before), which is clearly lacking in resultative examples. In resultative examples, adverbs only target a final state, not the process as a whole.
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internal world, then a transparent reading obtains. Finally, I have pointed out the existence of conceptual and interpretative similarities between oriented -ly adverbs, on the one hand, and adjectival resultatives and depictives, on the other.

I believe that this analysis is still preliminary in the sense that, although it maps out some important uses of oriented -ly adverbs and tries to motivate them by relating to both a schema and a prototype, a more thorough investigation of further categories may be needed. This can be achieved by detailed corpus analyses, which must be the focus of future research on this topic. Still, even the present cursory analysis reveals the importance of basic conceptual “ingredients” such as profile/active zone asymmetry, vantage point and blending operations in motivating the flexibility of grammatical categories.

References
