

Sokolová, Jana

Adverbial trigrams in semantic and communication contexts

Linguistica Brunensia. 2022, vol. 70, iss. 1, pp. 25-38

ISSN 1803-7410 (print); ISSN 2336-4440 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/LB2022-1-3>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/145232>

License: [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Access Date: 17. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Jana Sokolová

ADVERBIAL TRIGRAMS IN SEMANTIC AND COMMUNICATION CONTEXTS

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we focus on the linearization of components in adverbial trigrams. We will analyze and interpret the selected phenomena based on the data collected from the Russian National Corpus. Therefore, the focus will be on adverbial trigrams in their resulting and narrativized form as sequences that meet in the sentence structure both as a result of the sentence structure itself (determined by word order where each component is a separate syntactic unit), and as a complex syntactic unit, i.e. as compound adverbials. This paper is an attempt to analyze the content of adverbial trigrams, their formalization and explanation through the communication validity and functional hierarchy attributed to them by the speaker. Our goal is to identify the (i) semantic types of components, (ii) types (models) of most preferred configurations in the narrative and (iii) cognitive and linguistic factors involved in encoding the adverbial trigrams (the configuration is assumed or limited).

KEYWORDS

trigrams, compound adverbs, speaking, pragmatic focus

1 Introduction

In this paper, we focus on the linearization of components in adverbial trigrams. This means that we are discussing the units that appear in the sentence structure as a result of the sentence structure itself (determined by word order where each component is a separate syntactic unit) and as complex syntactic units of compound adverbials as defined by P. Biskup (2010). We analyze and interpret the selected phenomena on the basis of the data from the *National Corpus of the Russian*

language (2003–2021).¹ Our attention is therefore on the sequences in the so-called non-canonical communication situation – in the narrative. This means that we analyze the adverbs in terms of sequences (sequences of components forming a whole) and in their resulting and narrativized form.

The present paper is an attempt to analyze the content of compound adverbs, their formalization and explanation through the communication validity and functional hierarchy attributed to them by the speaker. We will describe the formalization of the formal and content aspects of compound adverbials through formulas. Our aim is to identify the (i) semantic types of components, (ii) types (models) of narratively most preferred configurations in the narrative and (iii) cognitive and linguistic factors involved in their encoding (the configuration is assumed or limited) in a series of randomly selected Russian examples containing compound adverbials.

2 The basics

We base our research on the well-known fact that adverbials are non-binding complementations of the predicate/verb, which from the perspective of sentence structure represent non-constitutive sentence elements and occupy unfixed positions (cf. Vaňko, 2010). The prevailing opinion is that the multi-component adverbials form groupings of the so-called transient type. The speaker implements a configuration of components in an ad-hoc manner, which he/she considers adequate in terms of meaning and communication economy in the relevant communication situation. This is also due to the fact that compound adverbs form lexical expressions that belong to secondary egocentrals² (Paducheva, 2013; Sokolová, 2019). As lexical units and/or syntactic constructions, they are context-sensitive (their semantic content is influenced by the discursive circumstances and interpretation context), and they are defined by the pragmatic parameter reflecting on the participation of the speaker/observer in the communication event.

On the other hand, compound adverbials also employ semantic relations, which result from the cognitive processing of facts, and are limited by the linguistic image of the world and the possibilities of the language code. The factors that affect the configuration of components in a compound adverbial include: (i) verb semantics; (ii) word-class expression of the components of a compound adverbial through parts of speech – adverbs, adverbial substitutions and prepositional cases of nouns;

1 <https://ruscorpora.ru/new>

2 Two types of egocentrals are discerned – shiftable (i. e. secondary) egocentrals, which can be used in all types of communicative situations, and hard (i. e. primary) egocentrals, which stick to the canonical communicative situation, thus belonging to the so called main clause phenomena (Paducheva, 2013, p. 539).



(iii) ordering and semantic valence of the components in compound adverbials in the event-based structure of the sentence.

For example, the verb *вернуться* presupposes the information connected with the named activity: place (from where?, to where?), time (when?), manner (how?), purpose (for what purpose?), which are realized in the sentences according to the intentions of the speaker. For example, in example (1), two pieces of information – place (to where – *home*) and time (when – *late in the evening*) are expressed by three adverbs:

(1) *Они вернулись домой поздно вечером.*

As mentioned above, this study focuses on the linearization of components in a broadly defined compound adverbial. Their formal aspects are influenced by the number of components and the relationships between them reflected by their order. The structural order is related to linear order on the surface plane, i.e. it is related to word order. These facts are explicitly stated in the formula: $Adv^3 = K^3 = k_1 k_2 k_3$ (Horecký, 1963).³ The number of components is indicated by the index on the top right, e.g. for adverbs with three components, it is – Adv^3 . The individual components are represented by the k symbol indexed on the bottom right, referring to the location of the component in order from left to right.

It turns out that compound adverbials in Russian create a successively generated series, i.e. a configuration of mostly three of the five most preferred components: adverbial of *place* (SPACE), *time* (TIME), *quality* (QUAL), *quantity* (QUANT) and *evaluation* (EVAL). Their semantics meets the requirements of solid mutual compatibility and/or eliminates the higher degrees of mutual exclusion. This means that the number of the most common combinatorial configurations equals the number of variations of five elements to the power of three, i.e. $5^3=125$. In other words – the theoretical number of combinations in an adverbial triplet is 125. However, it is obvious that the real number of types of narratively realized configurations is smaller due to their cognitive and linguistic limitations. Equally predictable is the fact that the representation of semantic types in an adverbial modification will be unequal. In our sample, it was confirmed that the adverbials of *place* and *time* have the most balanced and highest success rate in discourse (these adverbs are relatively clearly delimited and reflect the cognitive model of spatial and temporal orientation and human interaction with the world), followed by *quantity*, *evaluation* and *quality*. Due to their semantics (e.g. incompatibility with adverbs of measure), word-class expression (expressed mostly by prepositional cases of nouns) and contextual anchoring, the other types of adverbials (cause, purpose, etc.) were only found sporadically in the triplets.

3 The K/k symbol designating the component is left in the original form.

The issue of mutual valence of the components forming the individual groupings can be raised in this context. It turns out that some elements form tighter constructions, or constructions within the constructions – the so-called core constructions. They are lexically anchored quasi-fixed groupings, or bigrams, which are presented as a co-occurrence (*souvýskyt* in Czech, cf. Grepl – Karlík, 1998) of two components on the syntactic level based on the “preferentially developing – preferentially developed” relation. Core constructions reflect the praxeological experience of the speaker.

Core constructions are pairs of elements with different configurations of independent and dependent variables, and/or accurate and less accurate components (indexal, indefinite, relativized, probabilistic, approximate, etc.) expressed by adverbs, adverbial pronouns and prepositional cases of nouns. They form bigrams both at the level of collocations and combinations of semantically independent adverbs, which are defined by discursive practice.

From the point of view of word order and word class, core constructions are most often represented by:

(a) compound adverbs of time (point a–c) and compound adverbs of place (point d): (a) constructions consisting of two adverbs of time – adverb (**сегодня, вчера, завтра**)⁴ and adverbs denoting parts of the day (*утром, вечером, ночью*). The constructions form the so-called specifying type (Štěpán, 1989) when the antecedent adverbial modification has a more specific meaning than the precedent one, e.g. *сегодня вечером* (today in the evening), *завтра утром* (tomorrow morning), *вчера ночью* (yesterday at night) and others; (b) constructions formed by adverbs with the meaning of time (**рано, поздно**) and adverbs naming parts of the day (*утром, вечером, ночью*), e.g. *рано утром* (early in the morning), *поздно вечером* (late in the evening), *поздно ночью* (late at night) and others; (c) constructions with the days of the week as the first member (**в понедельник, во вторник, в среду, в четверг, в пятницу, в субботу, в воскресенье**) and names denoting parts of the day as the second member (*утром, вечером, ночью*). Even these constructions are of the so-called specifying type, e.g. *в понедельник утром* (on Monday morning), *во вторник вечером* (on Tuesday evening), *в субботу ночью* (on Saturday night) and others; (d) constructions made with the adverbs of spatial location/direction (**высоко, низко, глубоко, близко, далеко, вдали**) and substantive prepositional constructions expressing spatial location/direction (*в + N_I, над + N_I, под + N_I, на + N_I, за + N_I, у + N_C, от + N_C* and others), e.g. *высоко в горах* (high in the mountains), *глубоко в сердце* (deep in the heart), *низко над землёй* (low above ground), *далеко от дома* (far from home), *далеко на севере* (far north), *далеко за городом* (far beyond the city), *вдали от города* (far from the city) and others;

4 These adverbs are determined by the time when the utterance was made (Šikra, 1991).

(B) syntagms between the components whose relationship is both formal and semantic (point e): (e) constructions with adverbs of measure (**очень, максимально** and others) and adverbs of (i) general evaluation (*хорошо, плохо, странно*), e.g. *очень хорошо* (very well), *очень плохо* (very badly) and others; (ii) frequency: (*часто, редко* and others), e.g. *очень часто* (very often), *очень редко* (very rarely) and others; (iii) duration (*долго, кратко, давно*), e.g. *очень долго* (very long), *очень коротко* (very short), *очень давно* (a very long time ago) and others; (iv) time (*рано, поздно*), e.g. *очень рано* (very early), *очень поздно* (very late) and others; (v) quantity (*много, мало*), e.g. *очень много* (a lot), *очень мало* (very little) and others; (vi) speed (*быстро, медленно*), e.g. *очень быстро* (very quickly), *максимально быстро* (at maximum speed), *очень медленно* (very slowly) and others; (vii) spatial location/direction (*высоко, низко, глубоко, близко* and others), e.g. *очень глубоко* (very deep), *очень низко* (very low), *максимально близко* (in maximum proximity) and others; (viii) quality, e.g. *очень красиво* (very nicely), *очень интересно* (in a very interesting way), *максимально активно* (with maximum vigor) and others;

(C) combinations of semantically differentiated adverbials with no formal or semantic relation between them (points f–h): (f) combinations of evaluative adverbs with the meaning of relativization (**совсем, довольно, достаточно, гораздо, в целом**)⁵ and adverbs with the meaning of: (i) general assessment (*хорошо, плохо, странно*), e.g. *в целом хорошо* (quite well), *довольно странно* (quite strange); (ii) (non)identity (*одинаково, различно, по-разному*), e.g. *совершенно одинаково* (completely identically), *совершенно по-разному* (completely differently); (iii) speed (*быстро, медленно*), e.g. *довольно быстро* (quite quickly), *достаточно медленно* (quite slowly); (iv) spatial location/direction (*высоко, низко, глубоко, близко, далеко*), e.g. *достаточно далеко* (sufficiently far), *довольно высоко* (quite high), *довольно низко* (a little low); (v) time (*рано, поздно*), e.g. *довольно поздно* (a little late); (vi) duration (*долго, кратко, давно*), e.g. *довольно долго* (quite long), *совсем кратко* (quite short), *совсем давно* (quite some time ago); (vii) frequency (*часто*), e.g. *довольно часто* (quite often), *гораздо чаще* (much more frequently); (viii) time (*скоро*), e.g. *совсем скоро* (soon); (ix) quantity (*много, мало*), e.g. *довольно много* (quite a lot), *совсем мало* (very little); (g) constructions formed by adverbs of indexal temporality (**теперь, потом, иногда**) and adverbs with the meaning of (i) duration (*долго, коротко*), e.g. *иногда долго* (sometimes long), *потом долго* (then long) and others; (ii) (*часто, редко*), e.g. *иногда часто* (sometimes often), *теперь часто* (now often) and others; (iii) unexpectedness (*сразу, неожиданно*), e.g. *иногда сразу* (sometime now), *теперь сразу* (right now) and others; (h) constructions of adverbial pronouns of indexal spatial location/direction (**где-то, откуда-то**) and (i) adverbs expressing spatial location/direction (*here, доли, далеко, близко, глубоко, высоко, низко, издалека, внутри* and others), e.g. *где-то глубоко* (somewhere deep), *где-то вдали* (somewhere in the distance), *где-то*

5 Adverbials express both (a) a high degree and (b) relativization of facts.

внутри (somewhere inside), *откуда.то издалека* (from far away) and others; (ii) substantive prepositional constructions expressing spatial location/direction ($\text{в} + N_L$, *над* + N_P , *под* + N_P , *на* + N_L , *за* + N_P , *у* + N_G and others), e.g. *где-то в доме* (somewhere in the house), *где-то на севере* (somewhere up north) and others.

3 Formal ordering of components

The linearization of formal aspects of compound adverbials can be expressed with three formulas:

- (a) $\text{Adv}^3 = k_1 + k_2 + k_3$
- (b) $\text{Adv}^3 = k_1 + (k_2 + k_3)$
- (c) $\text{Adv}^3 = (k_1 + k_2) + k_3$

The compound adverbials of the $\text{Adv}^3 = k_1 + k_2 + k_3$ type are created by functionally autonomous (independent) successively aligned semantically inhomogeneous components. The verb is modified by each individual adverbial modification:

(2) *Хорошо, Василий Семенович, я тогда **сегодня**₁ **опять**₂ **в Подольск**₃ поеду.*

In example (2), the compound adverbs form a configuration of components capable of acting independently in terms of meaning since each adverbial belongs to a different semantic class:

- (2) a. *Хорошо, Василий Семёнович, я тогда **сегодня** поеду.* ≈ *сегодня* expresses temporal delimitation;
- (2) b. *Хорошо, Василий Семёнович, я тогда **опять** поеду.* ≈ *опять* expresses the repetitive nature of action;
- (2) c. *Хорошо, Василий Семёнович, я тогда **в Подольск** поеду.* ≈ *в Подольск* expresses the destination/direction.

The compound adverbials of the $\text{Adv}^3 = k_1 + (k_2 + k_3)$ type are formally represented by the grouping of an anteposed adverbial (functionally autonomous or semi-autonomous) and a core construction. Core constructions form syntagms with a determinative relationship between the components:

- (3) ***Вдруг**₁ **<совсем**₂ **близко**₃* от нас появились мрачные утёсы острова Ме.
- (4) ***Там**₁ **<очень**₂ **хорошо**₃* платят.

In example (3), the speaker uses two domains – the meaning of unexpectedness (*вдруг*) and the importance of relativized spatial delimitation, and/or a high degree of proximity within spatial delimitation (*совсем близко*). In example (4) it is the meaning of indexal spatial delimitation/direction (*там*) and the importance of intensified evaluation (*очень хорошо*).

The compound adverbials of the $Adv^3 = (k_1 + k_2) + k_3$ type are formally formed by the conjunction of the core construction and the functionally autonomous postpositional adverbial of type. We differentiate two types: (i) non-detachable core construction type and (ii) detachable core construction type.

(i) The core construction is represented by fixed collocations:

(5) *Потом он <довольно₁ долго₂> молча₃ размышлял.*

(6) *<Совсем₁ скоро₂> в издательстве «Наука»₃ должна выйти новая книга академика В. Н. Кудрявцева «Равноправие и равенство».*

(ii) The core construction is also represented by free collocations; the indicator being the interposition of another component:

(7) *<Сегодня утром> там был.*

(7) а. *Сегодня рано утром там был.*

In the type (b) and (c) compound adverbials, the principle of a looser connection of the autonomous adverbial is used, which allows for its antepositional and postpositional placement (with respect to the core construction):

(8) *Плохо лишь, что <слишком₁ часто₂> в словаре₃ встречается слово «возможно» и конструкция «окончательно не установлено».*

(8) а. *Плохо лишь, что в словаре₁ <слишком₂ часто₃> встречается слово «возможно» и конструкция «окончательно не установлено».*

The word order on the surface level reflects the relations in the **deep structure**. Based on our observations, we conclude that compound adverbs in their resulting form reflect the internal relations, which are characterized by:

(i) conjunction of an autonomous adverbial and core construction;

(ii) conjunction of a semi-autonomous adverbial and core construction;

(iii) overlap of two core constructions.

The conjunction of autonomous adverbials and core constructions distinguishes their initial and terminal position. The position prior to the core construction is usually occupied by the adverbials of temporal semantics expressed indexically by means of adverbial pronouns or prepositional cases:

(9) *Наконец, их предводитель свирепо погрозил мне пальцем и вдруг <совсем неожиданно> рассмеялся.*

(9) а. *Наконец, их предводитель свирепо погрозил мне пальцем и вдруг рассмеялся.*

(9) б. *Наконец, их предводитель свирепо погрозил мне пальцем и совсем неожиданно рассмеялся.*

The position behind the core construction is mostly occupied by the adverbials of spatial and temporal semantics:

(10) *<Рано утром> в Петербурге было около минус 23.*

(10) а. *В Петербурге было около минус 23.*

- (10) b. **Рано утром** было около минус 23.
- (11) **<Очень часто> в последнее время** говорят о технологических ограничениях и барьерах конкурентоспособности российской экономики.
- (11) a. **Очень часто** говорят о технологических ограничениях и барьерах конкурентоспособности российской экономики.
- (11) b. **В последнее время** говорят о технологических ограничениях и барьерах конкурентоспособности российской экономики.

The conjunction of semiautonomous adverbials and core constructions is characterized solely by the initial position of the adverbial with predominantly evaluative semantics:

- (12) Амбар стоял **довольно <далеко от дома>**, в кукурузном поле.
- (12) a. Амбар стоял **далеко от дома**, в кукурузном поле.
- (12) b. ^{??}Амбар стоял **довольно**, в кукурузном поле.

In the deep structure, the “overlap” of two core constructions with an identical component that has acquired the position of the middle member in the sequence, can also be identified:

- (13) Мысли мои были **слишком далеко от дома**.
≈ слишком далеко ∩ далеко от дома;
- (14) Потом он **довольно долго молча** размышлял.
≈ довольно долго ∩ долго молча.
- (15) Вертолет уже висел **совсем низко над землей**.
≈ совсем низко ∩ низко над землей.

The overlap in this case corresponds to the principle formulated by L. Novák (1981). According to the author, the beginning is the starting point of the series, and the end is the counterpoint end part of the series. “The center part must share something with the beginning and the end part because it occupies the central position in the structure. It is therefore the link between the beginning and the end. The end is a mirror image of the beginning – or its opposite copy – which in retrospect points to the beginning through the center” (Novák, 1981, p. 19; freely translated by JS).

4 Functional ordering of components

When defining the functional order, we build on the functional nature of adverbials and the resulting form of the ad hoc compounded (three-member) adverbials as one of the alternative options the speaker may use in rendering the event narrative and implementing his/her communication intentions. The position of compound adverbials in the sentence depends on the content structure of the sentence and the current functional sentence perspective.

Unlike the previous interpretations, our approach also stresses the importance of the pragmatic dimension in the resulting ordering of compound adverbials in addition to syntagmatics and semantics. This makes it possible to distinguish the so-called natural and aberrant configuration. In the natural configuration, the principle of natural orientation of the speaker in the world in communication and in the language is used, cf. e.g.:

(16) *Прямо под открытым небом на склоне холма у реки разместились три небольшие площадки, на которых проходили отборочные туры.*

We understand aberration in the sense of an accidental deviation from the usual grouping. The groupings formed by elision of verb forms, resulting in a compound grouping of adverbial modifications, are at the interface of natural and aberrant configurations:

(17) *Сегодня опять на берлинский рынок.*

(17) a. *Сегодня (нам) опять (идти) на берлинский рынок.*

In compound adverbials, we follow the functional hierarchy of components according to the **communication importance** of the components (elements), thus distinguishing:

(a) **relevant** (R_k), core and syntactically autonomous component, i.e. a component with content that conveys key information, e.g.

(18) *Нам сегодня^A вечером^S на свадьбе^R играть!*

(18) a. *Нам на свадьбе^R играть!*

(19) *Я иногда^A просто^S нещадно^R к себе отношусь.*

(19) a. *???Я иногда^A просто^S к себе отношусь.*

(b) **supplementary**, additional (A_k) component that adds new information and may be eliminated from the sentence, e.g.:

(20) *Работа шла чуть ли не сутки сплошь, но подвигалась вперед^A крайне^S медленно^R.*

(20) a. *Работа шла чуть ли не сутки сплошь, но подвигалась крайне^S медленно^R.*

(c) **specifying** (S_k) component, which is syntactically semiautonomous, modifies the relevant and complementary component, and may be eliminated from the sentence, e.g.:

(21) *Обедали мы в эту ночь^A очень^S долго^R.*

(21) a. *Обедали мы в эту ночь^A долго^R.*

Their **combined configurations** (groupings, series, concatenations) are the result of component permutations, determining the number and type of groupings. Their number is:

$P(3) = 3! = 6$.

The type of configuration can be determined with respect to the position of the relevant component (R_k). This means that the position R_k can be:

(i) terminal (the relevant component is autonomous); the relevant component is only compatible with the complementary component, cf.:

(22) *Идёт **очень**^S **медленно**^A **вверх**^R, по довольно крутому подъёму.*

(22) а. *Идёт **медленно**^A **вверх**^R, по довольно крутому подъёму.*

(22) б. *??? Идёт **очень**^S **вверх**^R, по довольно крутому подъёму.*

(ii) terminal (the relevant component is part of the construction); the relevant component is compatible with both the complementary and specifying component, cf.:

(23) *В середине февраля от Стёпы пришло письмо, что он **сейчас**^A **далеко**^S **на севере**^R, за Белым морем.*

(23) а. *В середине февраля от Стёпы пришло письмо, что он **сейчас**^A **на севере**^R, за Белым морем.*

(23) б. *В середине февраля от Стёпы пришло письмо, что он **далеко**^S **на севере**^R, за Белым морем.*

(iii) frontal (the relevant component is autonomous); the relevant component is only compatible with the complementary component, cf.:

(24) *Мы пересекли вечернюю Москву и, оставив машину **во дворике**^R **где-то**^S **у метро Динамо**^A, поднялись в маленькую, уютно обставленную квартирку на втором этаже.*

(24) а. *Мы пересекли вечернюю Москву и, оставив машину **во дворике**^R **у метро Динамо**^A, поднялись в маленькую, уютно обставленную квартирку на втором этаже.*

(24) б. *??? Мы пересекли вечернюю Москву и, оставив машину **во дворике**^R **где-то**^S поднялись в маленькую, уютно обставленную квартирку на втором этаже.*

(iii) frontal (all components are autonomous); the relevant component is compatible with both the complementary and specifying component, cf.:

(25) ***За обедом**^R **практически**^S **никогда**^A не ем супа.*

(25) а. ***За обедом**^R **никогда**^A не ем супа.*

(25) б. ***За обедом**^R **практически**^S не ем супа.*

(ii) central (the relevant component is part of the construction); the central position of the relevant component functions as a link between the frontal and terminal part of the series; the relevant component is compatible both with the specifying (*иногда долго*) and complementary component (*долго там*):

(26) *Мы **иногда**^S **долго**^R **там**^A топтались.*

(26) а. *Мы **долго**^R **там**^A топтались. (≈ the adverbial *долго* is a modifier of the adverb *там* from a smaller domain);*

(26) б. *Мы **иногда**^S **долго**^R топтались. (≈ the adverbial *долго* is an adverbial of pragmatic focus of *иногда*).*

5 In lieu of the conclusion

Linearization is an expression of the pragmatic arrangement of components into a meaningful whole, which is determined by the semantic, word class and structural properties of the represented elements. The core construction to which adverbials are attached – which may have an autonomous or semiautonomous status from the point of view of the sentence – stands in its base. As F. Miko (1971) aptly puts it: a complex structure arises from a simple construction with the participation of an optional component, which has a secondary position in the structure.

Two models have been identified as preferential discourse in our sample: (a) combined temporal-spatial pattern and (b) a pattern of three spatial components. Both patterns have components with a gradually increasing communication importance ($S_k A_k R_k$), and in both patterns the relevant component is expressed by the component of spatial delimitation in the terminal position. The $S_k A_k R_k$ type corresponds to the principle of modification (adjunction) to the left, which is characteristic of the SVO languages (cf. Biskup, 2017), which also include Russian. The relevant adverbials (higher domain adverbials) are understood as modifiers of the lower domain adverbials that precede them.

(a) The combined temporal-spatial pattern is characterized by a high proportion of prepositional cases of nouns. The pattern has two content domains:

(i) indexal temporal delimitation of a specific spatial location:

(27) *Бабушка рассказывала, что **когда-то давно в старом зоопарке** был индийский слон.*

(ii) specific temporal delimitation of a specific spatial location:

(28) ***В понедельник утром в деревне** было совсем тихо и безлюдно.*

(b) The pattern with three spatial components has three content domains:

(i) specific spatial delimitation:

(29) *Если же нефть попадает **в океан вдали от берега**, то экосистема океана сама достаточно быстро с этим справляется.*

(ii) indexal spatial delimitation:

(30) *Но с неделю назад его перевели на другой пост, потом с попутной баржей и вовсе отправили **куда-то далеко отсюда**.*

(iii) combined (indexal-specific) spatial delimitation:

(31) *В это время **где-то высоко над скалами** послышался усталый вой.*

If we look at compound adverbials in terms of trigrams, we can conclude that the speaker or narrator generally accepts the following rules:

1. In the case of homogeneous temporal components, linearization takes place in the direction **from the wider to the narrower**. The word order reflects the logical direction of inference of hypernymic-hyponymic relations. The compound adverbials of temporal delimitation reflect the word order rule: the larger domain adverbials

precede the smaller domain adverbials (Biskup, 2010). In this case, it is usually a sequential contemporaneous concretization of facts:

(32) **18 октября в субботу утром в 8 часов** я возвратился в Львов из своей поездки на позиции против Ярослава.

2. In the case of homogeneous spatial components, linearization takes place in the direction **from the general to the specific**. It uses the following order: the component with the widest or most general semantics, followed by the component with a narrower and less general semantics, and ending with the component with the narrowest or most specific semantics. The ordering is also usually supported by word class: adverbial pronoun – adverb – prepositional case of the noun:

(33) *И только он это сказал, как **где-то далеко за садом** закуковала кукушка.*

3. In the case of non-homogeneous components, the speaker prefers pragmatic focusing. The word order is strongly motivated by the speaker's communication intention to highlight some components of the narrative content and activate the dynamics of the utterance. Linearization is mostly used to state (a) the specific facts of temporal and spatial delimitation of the event; (b) the moment of immediate or unexpected occurrence of the event; and (c) an intensive assessment of a fact within the event.

(a) Indication of specific facts in the temporal and spatial delimitation of the event;

(34) **В понедельник вечером в Большом театре** прошла заключительная церемония национального театрального фестиваля «Золотая маска».

(35) Час езды на машине, и я очутился **высоко в горах на дороге** к деревенской коммуне Ко.

(b) Indication of the moment of immediate or unexpected onset of the event is carried out by fronting (topicalization) the evaluative adverbial. The evaluation of the onset of events within an indeterminate spatial localization presents the speaker in the semantic-pragmatic role of an expector and spatial localizer:

(36) **Внезапно где-то впереди** и справа послышался глухой короткий грохот, потом прокатился гул и быстро затих.

(37) **Вдруг откуда-то издалека** донёсся ещё какой-то неясный звук.

(c) The assessment of a certain fact in terms of its intensity within the interpreted event is carried out in the range of those adverbial modifications (evaluative, qualitative, temporal and spatial), which may be gradated.

(i) In examples (38–40), the speaker added the meaning of intensified qualification (*слишком глубоко, очень высоко*) and intensified frequency (*очень часто*) to the meaning of spatial localization:

(38) *И **слишком глубоко в сознании** большинства граждан заложена уверенность в том, что проще и надёжнее дать взятку, чем идти по цивилизованному правовому пути решения вопроса.*

(39) Мы были **очень высоко над морем**.

- (40) **Очень часто в законах** объединяются разные темы.
(ii) In examples (41–43), the speaker uses the meaning of intensified evaluation (*очень хорошо*), intensified qualification (*крайне медленно*) and gradated quantity (*гораздо меньше*):
- (41) Элита **сейчас очень хорошо** себя чувствует.
(42) Работа шла чуть ли не сутки сплошь, но подвигалась **вперед крайне медленно**.
(43) В выходные **в центре Москвы гораздо меньше** народу чем в будни, как ни крути, а тем более летом.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that adverbial triplets are partly egocentrically organized units. They are made up of language means that reflect the speaker's communication intention. They develop the statement semantically through information according to the principle of information pregnancy (Miko, 1989, p. 31), which has been transferred into their syntactic arrangement. The sentence is then characterized by extended internal structuring, realized by a cascaded relational structure (Mluvnice češtiny 3, 1987, p. 9). This means that the speaker is often gradually adding new facts.

In the case of homogeneous temporal components and homogeneous spatial components, the speaker mostly uses the **semantic projection** of events and facts. He/she appears in the semantic-pragmatic role of a temporal and spatial localizant.

In the case of non-homogeneous components, the speaker mostly uses the **pragmatic projection** of events and facts. He/she mostly performs the semantic-pragmatic role of an expector and quantifier.

REFERENCES

- BISKUP, Petr. 2010. Slovosled adverbialií stejné sémantické třídy. (Word order of adverbials of the same semantic class) In: *Užívání a prožívání jazyka. K 90. narozeninám Františka Daneše*. S. Čmejková – J. Hoffmannová – E. Havlová, eds. Praha: Karolinum, pp. 221–225.
- BISKUP, Petr. 2017. Hierarchie adverbialií. (Hierarchy of adverbials) In: P. Karlík – M. Nekula – J. Pleskalová (eds.): *CzechEncy – Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. [retrieved 17.7.2021]. Available at: https://www.czechency.org/slovník/HIERARCHIE_ADVERBIÁLÍÍ.
- GREPL, Miroslav – KARLÍK, Petr. 1998. *Skladba češtiny* (Syntax of the Czech language). Olomouc: Votobia.
- HORECKÝ, Ján. 1963. Pokus o štruktúrnú analýzu termínov. (An attempt at a structural analysis of terms) In: *Československý terminologický časopis*. 2(5), pp. 274–288.
- MIKO, František. 1971. Generovanie príslovkového určenia v slovenčine. (Creation of adverbial modifications in Slovak) In: *Jazykovedné štúdie XI*. Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV, pp. 185–202.
- MIKO, František. 1989. *Aspekty literárneho textu* (Aspects of literary text). Nitra: Pedagogická fakulta.

- Mluvnice češtiny 3. Skladba*. 1987. (The Grammar of Czech Language 3). Praha: Academia.
Национальный корпус русского языка. Available at: <https://ruscorpora.ru/new>.
- NOVÁK, Ludovít. 1981. Ešte raz: Axiológia semiológie lineárnych útvarov. (Once again: Axiology of the semiology of linear formations) In: *Jazykovedné štúdie XVI*. J. Ružička, ed. Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV, pp. 17–22.
- ПАДУЧЕВА Елена Викторовна. 2013. Эгоцентрические единицы языка и режимы интерпретации. (Egocentrals and their registers of interpretation) In: *Компьютерная лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии «Диалог» (2013)*. Том 1, с. 538–555. [retrieved 11.6.2021]. Available at: <https://www.dialog-21.ru/digest/2013/>.
- SOKOLOVÁ, Jana. 2019. Egocentriká – výrazy so sémanticko-pragmatickou orientáciou na hovoriaceho (Egocentrals – expressions with a semantic-pragmatic orientation towards the speaker). In: *Slovenská reč*. 84(1), pp. 10–25.
- ŠIKRA, Juraj. 1991. *Sémantika slovenských prísloviok* (Semantics of Slovak adverbs). Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV.
- ŠTĚPÁN, Josef. 1989. K složeným příslovečným určením prostoru a času. (On compound adverbial modifications of space and time.) In: *Slovo a slovesnost*. 50(1), pp. 10–14.
- VANĀKO, Juraj. 2010. Fixátory dependencie. (Dependency fixators) In: *Morfologické aspekty súčasnej slovenčiny*. J. Dolník, ed. Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV, pp. 265–325.

Jana Sokolová

Department of Russian Studies, Faculty of Arts
 Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra
 Štefánikova 67, 949 01 Nitra
 Slovakia
 jsokolova@ukf.sk



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as image or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.