

Propiciación

Revista de Antropología, Ciencias de la Comunicación y de la Información, Filosofía,
Lingüística y Semiótica, Problemas del Desarrollo, la Ciencia y la Tecnología

Año 36, abril 2020 N°

91

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

ISSN 1012-1587/ ISSNe: 2477-9385

Depósito Legal pp 198402ZU45



Universidad del Zulia
Facultad Experimental de Ciencias
Departamento de Ciencias Humanas
Maracaibo - Venezuela

The Meta function of Adjuncts and Detachment in American One Act Plays: An Analytical Study

Asst .Prof. Nadya Khairy Muhamed Said

University of Baghdad- College of Education Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences /
Dept. Of English
nadya_khiere@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present paper deals with the metafunction/ types of adjuncts in American one act plays written as an anthology by Paul Kozelka (1984) Fifteen American one act plays.

Any collection of plays has to be judged by the quality of the individual pieces that it has selected. A good job has done by Kozelka in order to set side by side a group of American one act plays that maintain to be qualitative and varied. The researcher has selected the plays in this anthology that they are impressive and great examples of marvelous storytelling in play form. The authors are among the finest established American writers of one act plays. Some are concerned with city life and city people. Even now, the plays will be inspiring, enhancing introduction to American culture whether they are read in private or by an informal group or class.

A descriptive quantitative analysis is used to prove that textual adjuncts are typically metafunctionally dominant in the comedy one act plays comparing it with the tragedy and the criminal ones. Variously, Circumstantial keep the second frequencies almost. Meanwhile, paratactic sentences are useful in explaining a rapid sequence of thoughts in drama as they read high percentages in general. Modality and temporality may function as thematic, whereas intensity cannot be thematic. It is worth noting that the interpersonal meaning in the form of vocative adjuncts having utmost intensity in the comedy and the tragedy plays in contrast to the criminal one (kinship is the dominant category).

The conclusion of the paper obtained support that detached construction sometimes causes the simultaneous realization of two grammatical meanings of a word, therefore writing becomes obscure. This is why detachment is unremarkable in theatrical statements.

Key Words: one act play, adjunct, textual, interpersonal, experiential, detachment

La función meta de adjuntos y desapego en American One Act Plays: un estudio analítico

Resumen

El presente artículo trata sobre la metafunción / tipos de adjuntos en las obras de un acto estadounidenses escritas como antología por Paul Kozelka (1984) Quince obras de un acto estadounidenses.

Cualquier colección de obras tiene que ser juzgada por la calidad de las piezas individuales que ha seleccionado. Kozelka ha hecho un buen trabajo para poner al lado de un grupo de obras de un acto estadounidense que se mantienen cualitativas y variadas. El investigador ha seleccionado las obras en esta antología que son ejemplos impresionantes y excelentes de narraciones maravillosas en forma de juego. Los autores se encuentran entre los mejores escritores estadounidenses establecidos de una obra de teatro. Algunos se preocupan por la vida y la gente de la ciudad. Incluso ahora, las obras serán inspiradoras, mejorando la introducción a la cultura estadounidense, ya sea que se lean en privado o por un grupo o clase informal.

Se utiliza un análisis cuantitativo descriptivo para demostrar que los complementos textuales son típicamente metafuncionalmente dominantes en la comedia que interpreta un acto comparándolo con la tragedia y los criminales. Por otra parte, Circunstancial mantiene casi las segundas frecuencias. Mientras tanto, las oraciones paratácticas son útiles para explicar una secuencia rápida de pensamientos en drama mientras leen porcentajes altos en general. La modalidad y la temporalidad pueden funcionar como temáticas, mientras que la intensidad no puede ser temática. Vale la pena señalar que el significado interpersonal en forma de complementos vocativos que tienen la máxima intensidad en la comedia y la tragedia juega en contraste con el criminal (el parentesco es la categoría dominante).

La conclusión del artículo obtuvo apoyo de que la construcción separada a veces causa la realización simultánea de dos significados gramaticales de una palabra. , por lo tanto, la escritura se vuelve oscura. Es por eso que el desapego no es notable en las declaraciones teatrales.

Palabras clave: obra de un acto, adjunto, textual, interpersonal, experiencial, desapego.

1-Introduction

This paper is concerned with the study of adjuncts from a semantic - syntactic perspectives. Within the general category of adjuncts, however there are different kinds which are metafunctional. This metafunction perspective comprises experiential, interpersonal, and textual adjuncts. Modal (in mood or comment) and conjunctive adjuncts are, respectively, interpersonal and textual in metafunction, hence, they occur at different locations within the clause. On the other side, experiential in metafunction involves circumstantial adjuncts.

On the Syntactic perspective, the paper gives a try to detached category in these one act plays i.e., one of the secondary parts of the sentence is detached from the word it refers to. This secondary part seems independent of this word. Brackets, dashed, commas, or even full stops / exclamation marks are remarkable categories of these detached members: *I have to beg you for money ! Daily !* In this respect, three American one act plays (comedy, tragedy, and criminal) are suggested to be analysed semantically in terms of adjuncts and syntactically in terms of 'detachment'. Since detachment phenomenon has so far been little investigated. It's time to spot light on this phenomenon in drama.

Data analysis is gathered from *Fifteen American one act plays* (1984) by Paul Kozelka. In essence, the paper tries to answer the following questions:

1-What are the common / metafunctional types of adjuncts manipulated in American comedy, tragedy, and criminal (thriller) one act plays?

2-Does detachment significant category in these one act plays ? Why?

2-Adjuncts:

Following Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) and Adejare's (1996) treatments of adjuncts, adjuncts are "integrated adverbials that are grammatically embedded into the clause structure in which they function as a primary element of structure". They are affected by the processes of interrogation and negation for this reason.

Crystal (2008:3) 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".

An adjunct is a "term used in grammatical theory to refer to an optional or secondary part in a sentence construction. Without the structural identity of the rest sentence construction, an adjunct may be excluded without the structural identity of the rest of the sentence being affected." Adverbials are clearest examples at the sentence level: (Ibid.12)

e.g., 1 John kicked the ball yesterday.

Instead of 'John kicked the ball', but not 'John kicked yesterday', etc.

Crystal (Ibid.) adds that many adjuncts can also be classified as modifiers (attached to the verb), such as with adjectives, and some adverbs.

"Adjuncts are words and phrases, like adverbs and adverb phrases, which are not completely central to the meaning of the clause; predicate contrasts with adjunct, although with some unfortunate inconsistency" (Hurford, 1994)

Halliday (2004:123) says that by a prepositional phrase or by an adverbial group (rather than by a nominal group), an adjunct is typically identified:

e.g.,2 My aunt was given that teapot yesterday by the duke.

Here, there are two adjuncts:the adverbial group (yesterday), and the prepositional group (by the duke).

"Adjuncts are able to function as the focus of clause interrogation, whereas neither 'conjuncts' nor 'disjuncts' can serve this function". In this regard, adjuncts are able to be the focus of clause negation. On the other side, 'conjuncts' and 'disjuncts' are not." Greenbaum (1969: 24).

3-Categories of Adjuncts:

3.1Textual Adjuncts; Eggins (2004: 162) points out that 'Textual adjuncts' refer to the textual meanings which are meanings to do with the organization of the message itself. There are two kinds of textual adjuncts: 'conjunctive' and 'continuity'. On the other hand, Halliday (2004:81) states that "continuative is one of a small set of words that shape a move in the discourse. Examples are (yes, no, well, oh no).Conjunctive adjunct are adverbial groups or prepositional phrases that set against the clause to the preceding text. They also show the same semantic space as conjunctions" (Ibid.).

It is worth noting that a conjunction is a word or group which either connects paratactic or chains hypotactic the clause in which it appears to another clause structurally(Halliday:81). Concerning the interdependency of the constituents of the sentence, parataxis and hypotaxis are two types of these constituents. Parataxis is defined in existing literature as "the binding of elements of parallel structure while hypotaxis is the binding of elements of subordinate structure" (Nida, 1982:16).

3.2 Interpersonal adjuncts: these are modal adjuncts which are clause constituents. They add interpersonal meanings to the sentence/ clause.

Eggins (2004:160) adds that interpersonal adjuncts can add interpersonal meanings to the sentence either by impacting directly on the mood element, or by just adding an expression of attitude or by doing an attempt to direct the interaction itself. These modal adjuncts include (mood, polarity, comment, vocative).

To label adjuncts as interpersonal, they should have several interpersonal functions: (a) they can determine the speaker's own judgment of the probability of a proposition (b) express the speaker's personal attitudes toward a proposition (c) point out the terms of reference in which the speaker is speaking (Morely, 2000:105).

3.2.1Mood Adjuncts: they are called so because they are very related to the meanings construed by the mood system (Halliday, 2004:126). This means that their neutral position in the sentence is next to the finite verbal operator (before or after it).

There are two other possible locations: before the subject. This is called the thematic position (temporality and modality). The other position is at the end of the clause as 'afterthought'. Adjuncts of intensity have two classes and one of them is related to expectation (those of degree) and may be of high degree or low. The total displays the same change in value where the sentence / clause carries negative polarity. See the following examples:

e.g.,3 I entirely disagree.

e.g.,4 I don't entirely agree.

Another class is those which are counter expectancy (either 'limiting' or 'exceeding'). In this case, the meaning is either nothing else than, or finally in the clause, but seldom initially. They can not be thematic (Halliday,2004: 127).

3.2.2Polarity adjuncts: they play a basic role in conveying the meaning. The positive / negative opposition is one which is certain to be grammaticalized in every language. In this case, it is associated with the clause as proposition. The positive clause is formally unmarked. The negative is categorized by some additional element: in English by the word 'not' located in the neighborhood of the verb (Ibid: 143).

Polarity may be expressed by mood adjuncts such as 'never', or 'hardly', 'no one', 'seldom'. It is possible to see that the expression of polarity is not limited to the mood (Thompson, 2013:69-70).

e.g., 5 He has said nothing to me about that.

e.g., 6 He hasn't said anything to me about that.

In the example 5 above, the finite 'has' is clearly positive, and there is no reference to mood adjuncts(it is the complement that refers to the negative polarity).

3.2.3 Comment adjuncts: comparing them to the mood adjuncts, there is no clear cut between them and the mood ones. Moreover, the 'comment' element of prediction, presumption, and desirability overlap with the mood categories semantically.

The difference here is that comment adjuncts are less closely related to grammar of mood ; they are actually restricted to 'indicative ' clauses. They (comment adjuncts) express the speaker's attitude to the proposition totally, or to the speech function in particular. "The speech functional (interpersonal) may occur with either declarative or interrogative clauses. They strongly favor initial or final position conjunctive adjunct" (Hallidy, 2004:129). In general, Eggins(2004:162) comment that Haliday argues that because the scope of a comment adjunct is the whole clause. They should be seen to start working outside the mood structure in total.

3.2.4 Vocative adjuncts: this type figures outside the scope of the mood / residue. They would appear thematically at the boundary between theme and rheme or clause finally. The speaker here is performing the participation of the addressee or the addressees in the exchange. In addition to, this may help to recognize the particular person. That person is being addressed to or to call for the person's attention. The speaker uses the vocative to assign the interpersonal relation but sometimes

claiming superior status or power. This is why vocatives are more negotiatory. The vocative is sometimes to be used as a text signal (a telephone conversation is a good example)(Ibid:134).

Vocatives very associated to ‘address terms’ (Jefferson 1973) or ‘forms of address’ (Brown and Gilman 1960) (Brown and Ford 1961), Wood and Kroger 1991), but as Leech (1999) clarifies that "a term of address is any device used to

refer to the addressee of an utterance. Vocative, on the other side, is just one particular type of address term. Biber et al. (1999) see that vocatives “can take many forms: endearments (honey), kinship terms (Daddy), familiarisers (dude), first name familiarised (Johnny), first name full form (John), title and surname (Mr. Smith), honorific (Sir), nickname (Speedy), and even elaborated nominal structures”. Examples are those of you who desire to bring your pets along. Moreover, ‘impersonal vocatives’ would appear in utterances as (Someone get that phone, will you!)An addressee can potentially be referred to using any of these forms (gender and age being the only restriction in the case of titles).

3.3 Experiential adjuncts: the type of circumstantial adjuncts is a good example. Circumstantial provide experiential information of the circumstances for the action in the clause (time, place, manner, cause, accompaniment, beneficiary or agent). A good example is a ‘for’ loop can be used to simplify the preceding loop. Matthews (1997) notes that “circumstance indicates the external setting, in space and time especially, of an event, etc. such as (in New York, yesterday), and (from French), where, complement or circumstantial adjunct would be variously applied to these”. He (Ibid.) clarifies the fact that “circumstantial adjunct adds information about the action or answering questions such as how, where, how much, to what extent and why? This type circumstantial adjuncts is in turn part of more general pictures which are possible to establish after exploring the clause complex”. See table (1) below.

Table (1) Metafunction and types of Adjuncts Halliday (2004)

Metafunction	Type of Adjunct	Location in mood and structure
Experiential	Circumstantial	In Residue
Interpersonal	Modal Adjuncts	In Mood or Comment
Textual	Conjunctive Adjuncts	(not in Mood structure)

4- Detachment: One of the secondary parts of a sentence sometimes is located so that it appears independent of the word it logically refers to. This happens by some peculiar consideration of the writer. These parts of the constructions are known as ‘detached’ (Galperin, 1981:189). The part which is detached appears a very prominence by intonation.

Detachment is a “separation of a secondary part of the sentence with the aim of emphasizing it. In this case some parts of the sentence are syntactically separated from other members with which they are grammatically and logically connected” (Zhukovska, 2010:135-136).

e.g., *7 Mrs. Rymer was a tall woman, big –boned.*

In detachment, there is a specific arrangement of sentence items to be perceived. In general, a syntactic device (detachment) is based upon marking a secondary member of the sentence with the help of punctuation. Here, the word-order is not violated. On the other side., the secondary members gain their own stress and intonation because they are detached from the rest of the sentence. This detachment generally happened either by commas, dashes or even a full stop In this respect, parentheses are “a form of punctuation to be used around words in a sentence to add or clarify information. Generally anything placed in parentheses is considered to be less important than anything outside of it”(Mitchell et al., 2007: 37)

See the following examples of detachment:

e.g.,8 *He had been nearly killed, **ingloriously**, in a jeep accident."*

e.g.,9 *Sir Pitt came in first, **very much flushed**, and rather unsteady in his gait.*

Sometimes a 'nominal phrase' is merged with the sentence shaping a syntactical unit with the rest of the sentence:

e.g.,10 *And he walked slowly past again, along the river – **an evening of clear, quiet beauty, all harmony and comfort**, except within his heart.*

These bold types of phrases and words in the above sentences seem to be isolated. But the association still with the primary members of the corresponding sentences is obviously implied. Here is another example of detached construction:

e.g., 11 *I want to go, he said, **miserable**.*

The detached phrase cannot rise to the position of a primary member of the sentence. It keeps the position as a secondary from the semantic view point. On the other hand, it possesses structurally all the categories of a primary member (Ibid.).

As a matter of fact, any secondary member of the sentence may be detached:

1-Attribute:e.g.,12 *He never looked more than 14. **Very small and child - alike**.*

2-Apposition: e.g.,13 *He saved my life, **brave boy**.*

3-Adverbial modifiers of reason/ manner / time

e.g.,14 *She was crazy about her. **In the beginning**.*

4-Direct object: e.g., 15 *He was very talented, **capital he had not**.*

5- Prepositional object:e.g., 16 *It was, to **Forsyte's eye**, a strange house.*

Findings and Discussion:

The study manipulated comedy, tragedy, and criminal (thriller) one act plays to be analyzed in terms of mood adjuncts, circumstantial adjuncts, vocative adjuncts, polarity adjuncts, comment adjuncts, and textual adjuncts. Modal analysis is based upon Halliday (2004).

Comedy one act play:Thursday Evening

- 1- To start with, **vocative adjuncts** in the comedy play read 27 instances and classified into 13 instances for kinship items with (48.148%), 12 instances for people's name with (44.444%), and only 2 for non-human names with (7.408%).

Here are some examples of **kinship vocative** adjuncts in this play:

1-Laura: *No tireder than you are, **Mother, darling**.*

2-Gordon:*It was lovely. I'm afraid it was hard for you, **Creature**, to have mother come just now.*

3-Laura: *I put it away, **dear**.*

4-Gordon: *Don't be silly, **darling***

5-Gordon(*opening icebox*): *you mean dinner, **honey**-among refined people!*

6-Mrs. Sheffield: *---and then cooking such a delicious dinner –**Dearie**, won't you let mother do this for you?*

For **people's vocative** adjuncts names:

7-Laura: (*thoughtfully*): *you know, **Gordie**, we must not let them know we heard them.*

8-Laura: ***Gordon**, you mustn't work too hard.*

9-Mrs. Sheffield: Poor darling **Laura**-she never ought to have had a baby.

10-Laura: I'm glad, **Gordie**.

11 – Gordon: Great **Scott**, what did you think marriage was alike, anyway?

For **non-human vocative** adjuncts:

12-Gordon.: Ye **Gods**, Ethel has cracked the Copenhagen platter.

13-Gordon: **My Lord**, it's no wonder we never have any money to spend.

- 2- **Mood adjuncts** display 43 instances and are classified into modality 22 instances with (51.162%). Temporality read 18 from the total number 43 and read (41.860%). Intensity adjuncts display 3 only and read (6.978%).

Since this type of adjuncts has covered a mass area in this play, here are some examples for all these subdivisions:

14- Gordon: All right, creature, **just** wait **till** I light ...

15-Laura: I **always** like Thursdays because that's the one evening ...

16-Mrs. Johns: It's **only** fair to both sides to end it all. I **never** heard of such brutal hardships.

17-Laura: I **never** thought I'd hear such things.

18-Gordon: Yes, I know ducky, Gordon understands. **Soon** we'll be able to buy that scale you want.

19- Laura:but, **perhaps**, some of the things they said.

20-Laura: I didn't **really** get any supper...

21-Laura: No, Gordie, you were **quite** right.

- 3- **Circumstantial adjuncts** in this comedy read 31 instances for the time and the place (65.957%). For other prepositional types read 16 instances (34.043%):

For time and place, the play reveals so many examples such as (at this time, in your head, at the middle, here and there, in the ate, soon).

For other prepositional circumstantial adjuncts, see the following examples:

22-Godson:You know, I'm little worried **about my mother**.

23-Laura: ..., and then there'd be hints **about my housekeeping**.

24-Gordon: ..., and make a nice economical hash **for lunch**.

25-Gordon: ...and yet you are buffaloed **by a few greasy dishes**.

26-Laura: I'll speak to Ethel **about the garbage**.

27-Gordon: It was an abbreviation **for Adorable creature**.Mrs. Jones: I isn't for himself he's really very unselfish.

- 4- **Textual adjuncts** are classified into continuity and conjunctive: continuity read 14% and conjunctive textual read (84.947%) instances Paratactic textual display 52 from the total 79 and read (65.823)%. Hypotactic textual read 27 and display (34.177%):

Examples for continuity textual adjuncts:

28- Gordon: **Well**, it's jolly to have both the grandmothers here together, isn't it?

29-Laura: **Oh**, Gordie, I forgot to tell you !Junior drank out of a cup today –the first time !

30-Mrs. Johns: Fine! **Oh**, that's fine !But wait a moment.

Examples for **conjunctive textual adjuncts**:

31-Mrs. Sheffield: ...**and** he used to say, “She is only young once”.

32-Gordon:**And** ye gods, here’s that jar of anchovy paste!

As for paratactic textual adjuncts, the paper displays a very wide range of this type. See the followings:

33-Laura: I never saw a cook **yet** who could remember...

34-Laura: I wish you had been. **Then** I wouldn’t have married you.

35-Mrs. Sheffield: ...**But** really you know, when I heard them at it, I could hardly help admiring them.

Some other examples of hypotactic textual adjuncts are as follows:

36-Gordon: We’ll be a bit cold and standoffish **until** things below over.

37- Gordon:.. ... marriage ought to not be performed **before** an alter, but **before** a kitchen sink.

5- Comment adjuncts in the comedy show 12%. It is worth noting that there are no other subtypes for comment adjuncts in this one act play.

Examples from the play are:

38-Laura: ...in the office and struggles so **nobly** to support his family!

39-Mrs. Sheffield: But really, **you know**, when I heard them at it ...

40-Mrs. Sheffield: They’re **awfully** ingenious.

41-Mrs. Jones: You are here so much more often than I **naturally** you know Laura’s arrangements better.

42-Mrs. Johns: **Fine!** Oh, that’s fine !

43-Laura: well, not **exactly** true, dear, but...

44-Mrs. Sheffield: all husband’s families, **anyway**.

6-Polarity adjuncts having the value of zero.

Vocative Adjunct	Occurrence	Percentage
Kinship items	13	48.148 %
People’s names	12	44.444%
Non-human names	2	7.408%
Total	27	100 %
Mood Adjunct	Occurrence	Percentage
Modality	22	51.162%
Temporality	18	41.860%
Intensity	3	6.978%
Total	43	99.998%
Circumstantial Adjunct	Occurrence	Percentage
Time and place	31	65.957%
Prepositional Adjuncts	16	34.043%
Total	47	100%

Textual Adjuncts	Occurrence	Percentage			
Continuity	14	15.05%			
Conjunctive	79	84.95%	Parataxis	52	65.82%
			Hypotaxis	27	34.18%
Total	93	100%		79	100%

(Table 2) Types / Subtypes of Adjuncts in

‘Thursday Evening’

Tragedy one act play: **Dust of the Road**

1-**Vocative adjuncts** read 21 instances. People’s names read 14 from the total 21 and show (66.666%), kinship items show 5 and (23.809%). Non human names read 2 only with (9.525%). See the followings:

45- *Old Man: **Youngish**, I’d say, with thin cheeks and a yellow beard.*

46-*Tramp: Dust of the road, **my dear**, like any other man.*

47-*Petter: **God!** Who’s talking to me!*

2- **Mood adjuncts** show 38 instances. These are classified into 17 instances for modality with 45%. 14 for temporality and read 37%. Intensity read 7 from the total number 38 with 18%. Examples are:

48-*Old Man: “ ..., and from him that hath not shall be taken away **even** that which he hath ”*

49-*Prudence: Go back to bed, I tell you, and let me read my Bible **till** Peter comes in.*

3-**Circumstantial adjuncts** in *Dust of the road* play read 47. Those are classified into time and place which show 34 instances from the total 47 and read (72.341%.) For other types(prepositional), show 13 from 47 instances and then read (27.659%).

50- *Old Man: ... that wouldn’t spare a crust **for a lame** beggar on Christmas Eve...*

51-*Petter: little enough to give **for keeping the joy** of living in your heart on Christmas day.*

52-*Tramp: It sets you thinking **about the boy** and his money.*

4-**Textual adjuncts** shape 46 instances and classified into continuity which read 14 occurrences with percentage of (30.434%). Conjunctive textual adjuncts show 32 instances and read (69.566%). Conjunctive adjuncts, on the other hand, are classified into paratactic and hypotactic. For paratactic, they show 29 occurrences from the total number 32 with (90.625%). For hypotactic, they show 3 only with (9.375%) only. The followings are some examples of continuity textual adjuncts in the play:

53-*Prudence: **Well**, what did he say?*

54-*Tramp: **Oh**, I am a person of strange contradictions- like any other man.*

Conjunctive textual are exemplified as follows:

55- *Tramp: ..., **and** it’s only one day of the year I’m free to search.*

56-*Peter: **But**, thank God, I haven’t sold it yet.*

Good examples of **paratactic** textual adjuncts are:

57-*Tramp: **Then** you tried three per cent ; still too much!*

58-Peter: ... **or** I'll have the law on you both.

The following exemplify **hypotactic** textual adjuncts in the play:

59-Tramp: ...and kiss your hand and do you a dirty turn **afterward** as not, but –well- I've ...

60-Tramp: You will listen Peter Steele, **because** I'm going to tell you something about yourself and you'll know it **for** the truth.

61-Peter: You would looked against the faces of red hills **when** dawn was new,...

5-Comment adjuncts read 2 instances only.

62-Tramp: I gathered as much from your **friendly** greeting.

63-Tramp: **certainly**.

6-Polarity adjuncts shape 4 instances only.

64- Prudence:so you know my name, do you?

Tramp: **Yes**

65-Tramp:you do not understand me?

Prudence: **Yes**.

66-Peter: anything else?

Tramp: **No**.

67-Prudence:Peter, Peter, are you asleep? Peter: Eh? No!

Vocative Adjunct	Occurrence	Percentage			
Kinship items	5	23.809%			
People's names	14	66.666%			
Non-human names	2	9.525%			
Total	21	100%			
Mood Adjunct	Occurrence	Percentage			
Modality	17	45%			
Temporality	14	37%			
Intensity	7	18%			
Total	38	100%			
Circumstantial Adjunct	Occurrence	Percentage			
Time and place	34	72.341%			
Prepositional Adjuncts	13	27.659%			
Total	47	100%			
Textual Adjuncts	Occurrence	Percentage			
Continuity	14	30.43%			
Conjunctive	32	69.57%	Parataxis	29	90.63%
			Hypotaxis	3	9.38%
Total	46	100%			

(Table 3) Types/ Subtypes of Adjuncts in 'Dust of the Road'

Criminal one act play: Sorry Wrong Number

1-Vocative adjuncts constitute 22 instances as they shape 18 for kinship names and read (81.818%). People's names read only 4 instances and constitute (18.182%). Non-human having the value of zero in this one act play.

Here are some examples of kinship names in this play:

68-George: Yes, **Sir**.

69-Operator: I'm sorry, **madam**. What number were you calling?

70- Duffy: Yes, **ma'am**.

71- Duffy: **Lady**, I said we'd take care of it just now.

The following are some examples to indicate people's names:

72- First man: Hello, **George**?

73-Mrs. Stevenson: He's gone. Oh, **Elbert**, how could you ?

2-Mood adjuncts read 15 instances and shape 9 for intensity with 60%. Temporality and modality shape 3 only and they constitute (20%). Here are the best examples to refer to mood adjuncts:

74- Mrs. Stevenson: **Operator, I –I've just cut off**.

75-Duffy: ...you have **never** heard about?

3- Circumstantial adjuncts display 30 occurrences in this play and they are classified into 16 instances for time and 8 instances for place with (80%). Six only for other prepositional circumstantial adjuncts with (20%).

See the following examples to show circumstantial time and place adjuncts:

76- Mrs. Stevenson: He's working late **tonight**.

77-Duffy: ... to know how many bridges **there** are in the city of New York alone?

As for the prepositional circumstantial adjuncts, see the following:

78-Mrs. Stevenson: -he's crazy **about** me – adores me-waits on me hand and foot...

79- Operator: I will try to check it **for** you, madam.

- 4- Textual adjuncts** constitute 50 instances. For continuity, the play shapes 24 instances with 48%. For conjunctive textual adjuncts, the play reveals 26 instances and reads 52%. Conjunctive adjuncts shape 25 instances for paratactic textual with (96.154%) and one occurrence for hypotactic (3.846%).

The followings are the conjunctive textual adjuncts emerged in this play:

80-Duffy: **But** a clue of this kind that's so vague isn't much more use to us than no clue at all.

81-Duffy: Well, **then** there's nothing for you to worry about...

Here are the continuity textual adjuncts in the play:

82-Mrs. Stevenson: **Oh!** Idiot

83-Chief Operator: **Well**, I can try tracing it.

Paratactic textual adjuncts appear extensively in this play such as (and, yet, but, then, so)

- 5- Comment adjuncts** shape 13 instances only in this one act play.

84-Mrs. Stevenson: ... you'll **simply** have to retrace that call at one.

85-Chief Operator: I **seriously** doubt whether we could make this check for you a this time ...

86-Mrs. Stevenson: ... **in fact**, if someone doesn't come at once ...

87-Western Union: Darling, **Terribly** sorry.

6- As for **polarity adjuncts**, the play reveals 3 instances only.

88-Chief Operator: Have you told the police?

-Mrs. Stevenson: **No**. How could I?

89-Western Union: do you wish us to deliver a copy of the message?

-Mrs. Stevenson: **No** – no, thank you.

90- Information: Henchley hospital? Do you have the address, madam?

- Mrs. Stevenson: **No**, It is somewhere in the seventies, though.

Vocative Adjunct	Occurrence	Percentage			
Kinship items	18	81.818%			
People's names	4	18.182%			
Non-human names	Nil	Nil			
Total	22	100%			
Mood Adjunct	Occurrence	Percentage			
Modality	3	20%			
Temporality	3	20%			
Intensity	9	60%			
Total	15	100%			
Circumstantial Adjunct	Occurrence	Percentage			
Time and place	24	80%			
Prepositional Adjuncts	6	20%			
Total	30	100%			
Textual Adjuncts	Occurrence	Percentage			
Continuity	24	48%			
Conjunctive	26	52%	Parataxis	25	96.154%
			Hypotaxis	1	3.846%
Total	50	100%			
				26	100%

(Table 4) Types and Subtypes of Adjuncts in

'Sorry Wrong Number'

The paper reveals another syntactic category to be analysed in these plays which is '**Detachment**'. Model analysis is basically based upon Galperin (1981).

Thursday Evening

1-Laura: Oh, Gordie, I forgot to tell you ! Junior drank out of a cup today — **the first time** ! p.7

Here *the first time* is detached from the rest of the sentences as it is the adverbial modifier of time.

2-Mrs. Sheffield: I was a Thomson –Thomson without the *p*, you know, from Rhode Island. All families are hot tempered. All husbands' families, **anyway**. p.13

Here *anyway* is detached and it is the adverbial modifier of manner.

3-Mrs. Sheffield: He ought to, **with such a lovely home**, run like a clock p.15

Prepositional object is detached from the rest of the sentence.

4-Mrs. Sheffield: *I think the way Laura runs her little home is just wonderful. See how she struggles to keep her kitchen in order - **this miserable, inconvenient little kitchen**- no gas, no pantry, no decent help. p.17*

There is an *attribute* detached device in this expression as the bold type indicates.

5-Gordon: *I never heard such rot. They must be mad, **both of them**.p.17*

Both of them is detached from the rest of the sentence to indicate an *attribute*.

6-Gordon: *There, **now**, this is better. p.19*

In this expression, *now* is detached to refer to adverbial modifier of time.

Detached item	Occurrence	Percentage
Attribute	2	33.334%
Apposition	Nil	Nil
Adverbial modifier of, time, manner, reason	3	50%
Prepositional object	1	16.666%
Total	6	100%

(Table 5) The Occurrences and the Percentages of Detachment in ‘Thursday Evening’

Dust of the road

1- Prudence: ***Over there!** He was standing by the table. The table over there – He’s gone. p.29*

The detached member here is *over there* to refer to *adverbial modifier* of place.

2- Tramp: *money is easy to find – **sometimes too easy**. p22*

The detached member here in bold type is to indicate *adverbial modifier* of time.

3- Prudence: *You’re a tramp, by the looks of you – or **worse**.p26*

The item *worse* is detached from the rest of the sentence to indicate *attribute*.

4-Prudence: ***By the looks of it**, he’ll have a hard time getting his money.p27*

Detachment in this sentence is a form of *prepositional object*.

5-Peter: ***Up to the church**. I stayed to a vestry meeting. I walked home slow. p.32*

In this sentence, detached item is represented by *adverbial modifier of place*.

Detached item	Occurrence	Percentage
Attribute	1	20%
Apposition	Nil	Nil
Adverbial modifier of, time, manner, reason	3	60%
Prepositional object	1	20%
Total	5	100%

(Table 6) The Occurrences and the Percentages of Detachment in ‘Dust of the Road’

Sorry wrong number

1-Mrs. Stevenson: Can't you, **for once**, forget what number I was calling, and do something specific? p.160

Here for once is detached to form *adverbial modifier* if time.

2-Mrs. Stevenson: Chief operator? I want you to trace a call. **A telephone call**. Immediately. p.160

An *attribute* is detached from the rest of the sentence to get focus.

3-Mrs. Stevenson: ... And there was some third man – **a client** – who was paying to have this poor woman murdered. p.162

A *client* is an *apposition* in this sentence and detached from the rest of the sentence.

4-Mrs. Stevenson: I'd say the whole thing calls for a search – **a complete and thorough search**. I'm very near a bridge, ... p.163

This kind of detachment is an *attribute*.

5-Mrs. Stevenson: And meanwhile I've got to sit here in my bed, suffering every time that phone rings, **imagining everything**. p.165

There is a *adverbial modifier* of reason that is detached from the rest of the sentence.

6-Mrs. Stevenson: I want the Nurses' Registry at once. I want a trained nurse. I want to hire her immediately. **For the night**. p.167

The form of detachment is *adverbial modifier* of time in this sentence (*for the night*).

7-Mrs. Stevenson I 'm a sick woman. I – I'm very upset. **Very**. p.168

Here **Very** is detached from the rest of the sentences to refer to *adverbial modifier* of 'upset'

8-Woman: I did not hear it, madam. **Now** –about this... p.168

'Now' is detached from the rest of the sentence as an *adverbial modifier* of time.

9- Mrs. Stevenson: He couldn't do it. Not when he knows. I'll be all alone. It's some rick – some **fiendish**- p.177 The detached member here *fiendish* is a form of *apposition*.

Detached item	Occurrence	Percentage
Attribute	2	22.223
Apposition	2	22.222
Adverbial modifier of, time, manner, reason	5	55.555
Prepositional object	Nil	Nil
Total	9	100%

(Table 7) The occurrences and the percentages of Detachment in 'Sorry Wrong Number'

5-Conclusions:

Due to the analysis of the three one act plays, the following conclusions are drawn:

- 1- **Textual** adjuncts is typically metafunctionally dominant the American comedy one act play *Thursday Evening* comparing it with the tragedy and the criminal ones. This indicates the fact that the writer of the comedy expresses logical link between sentences. More specifically, the correspondent uses of **textual** adjuncts (conjuncts) in a way which not only provides cohesion for the reader, but also gives the reader glimpses into the correspondent's take on the

proposition. In this ways, the writer of the play is concerned to construct a message into the texts for persuasion and information.

- 2- Data analysis shows that **parataxis** are also of high frequency comparing it with **hypotaxis** in the three plays under analysis. Paratactic sentences are useful in explaining a rapid sequence of thoughts in drama. They could evoke feelings in a similar way as though they happened at once. It is a helpful device when describing a setting. Hence, readers are then left to make their own connections implied by the **paratactic syntax**.
- 3- The **Circumstantial** adjunct can normally occur as predicated theme. They are secondly metafunctionally dominant in these plays comparing it with the rest types of the adjuncts.
- 4- As for the **mood** adjuncts, the criminal suspense play *Sorry Wrong Number* reads the lowest frequency in comparison to the rest of the plays (comedy and tragedy). Data analysis also shows that **mood** adjuncts of modality and temporality indicate high rank in the three plays be like them with intensity mood adjunct. This gives a reason that **modality** and **temporality** may function as thematic. **Intensity** can not be thematic.
- 5- **Vocative** adjuncts are higher percentages which are meant to significantly contribute to the interpersonal meaning in the comedy and the tragedy plays contrasting it with the criminal one. In general, **kinship** items are higher in amount in the comedy and the criminal plays than the tragedy one. The interactants are almost always calling each other's names or designating each other with **kinship** terms such as "mother", "father", "sister", in their daily interactions within the community.
- 6- The three plays under study encompass a very low existence of **polarity** and **comment** adjuncts. **Polarity** is one way that may allow speech functions to be arguable in terms of exchange by setting up an opposition between 'yes' and 'no'. On the other hand, **comment** adjuncts may add expression of attitude and evaluation.
- 7- With regard to the syntactic category **Detachment**, the American plays show very low existence of these detached items. As tables (5, 6,7) read. *Thursday evening* reads only 6 occurrences of these detached items , *dust of the road* reads 5 occurrences, and *sorry wrong number* reads only 9 occurrences (adverbial modifiers record high percentages in the three plays under study , 50%, 60%, 55%). As a matter of fact, results of the analysis of detachments show that the writers of these plays are not concerned to aid memorability and /or to invite interpretation between characters. Moreover, this separation of the secondary part of the sentence is accompanied by violation of syntactical connections and then leads to a logical break between the main parts of the sentence and the detached member which maintains vagueness in writing. This is why detachment is not alive in drama i.e., spoken is the opposite.

References:

- Adejare, A. and Adejare, O. (1996). *Tertiary English Grammar*. Lagos: Difamo Books.
- Biber, D., Stig J., Geoffrey L., Susan C. & Edward F. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.).Oxford: Blackwell Ltd.
- Eggs, S. (2004). *Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. A&C Black.
- Galperin, I. R. (1981).*Stylistics*. Moscow:High School
- Greenbaum, S. (1969).*Studies in English Adverbial Usage*. London and Harlow: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. (3th ed). London:Routledge.
- Hurford, J. (1994).*Grammar: A student's Guide*. Cambridge: CUP
- Kozelka, P.(1984). *Fifteen American One-Act Plays*. (3 edition.) Pocket Books: USA

- Leech, G. (1999). *The Distribution and Function of Vocatives in American and British English Conversation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi
- Levison, Stephen (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Matthews, P. H. (1997) *The concise oxford dictionary of linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morely, D. (2000). *Syntax in Functional Grammar. An introduction to lexico-grammar in systemic linguistic.*: London and New York: Continuum.
- Nida, E. A. (1982). *Translating Meaning*. San Dimas, CA: English Language Institute.
- Pranjković, Ivo. (2002). *Croatian Compilation: Discussions in the Syntax of the Croatian Standard Language*. Zagreb: Croatian University Press
- Quirk, R. and Greenbaum, S. A. (1973). *University Grammar of English*. UK: Longman Group Ltd. Q
- Sinclair, J. et al., (1990). *Collins Cobuild English Grammar*. London: HarperCollins
- Shannon M, Leanne Baugh and Julie Kelly (2007). *Punctuation*. Britain: Open School, BC
- Thompson, G. (2013). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- www.coursehero.com, (2013). Gilman school *Syntactic Expressive Means and Stylistic Devices*.
- Zhukovska V. (2010) *English stylistics: fundamentals of theory and practice*: Zhytomyr, Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University



**UNIVERSIDAD
DEL ZULIA**

opción

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Año 36, N° 91 (2020)

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital por el personal de la Oficina de Publicaciones Científicas de la Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia.
Maracaibo - Venezuela

www.luz.edu.ve

www.serbi.luz.edu.ve

www.scieloopcion.com