

The position and FSP role of *-ly* adverbials in small distributional fields

Vladislav Smolka (České Budějovice)

ABSTRACT

In the theory of FSP, context-independent adverbials are usually interpreted as constituting either the setting or specification, with the line between the two sometimes difficult to draw. Adverbials in *-ly* have been shown to be nearly always context-independent, functioning as a specification and generally being more dynamic than the verb. At the same time, the CD of these adverbials is thought to be higher when they are placed after the verb than when they precede it.

The present research explores sentence structures such as *she smiled coldly*, where the adverbial is the only complement of the verb in addition to a non-rhematic subject. Examples of these structures retrieved from the BNC show that the SVA sequence is considerably more frequent than SAV (*she coldly smiled*), while the proportion of the two variants is more balanced when there are other postverbal complements in addition to the adverbial, as in *she coldly analysed his features/she analysed his features coldly*. This paper aims to show that among the SVA structures in question, there are instances where the verb is actually more dynamic than the context-independent adverbial, and where linear modification is weakened as an indicator of FSP. These conclusions seem to be supported, among other clues, by translation into Czech.

KEYWORDS

-ly adverbials, FSP, position

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.14712/18059635.2019.2.2>

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the factors co-determining the FSP status of a clause constituent is linearity. Compared with inflected languages with a highly variable word order, the positional mobility of clause constituents is considerably constrained in English, because the position of a given constituent within the sentence primarily indicates its syntactic function, rather than its communicative importance. Still, adverbials in English show a higher degree of mobility than other constituents; this is especially true about adverbials that are not obligatory because their use is not prompted by the valency of the verb.

The link between the position of adverbials in the sentence and their communicative importance has been extensively discussed in linguistic literature, but the discussion has been complicated by the fact that the category of adverbials is extremely diverse in several respects: in terms of their formal realisations, ranging from AdvP, NP, PP to verbless, nonfinite and finite clauses (Quirk et al. 1985: 489), their structural weight (length), and also in terms of the range of semantic functions (ibid. 479). It is therefore obvious that the respective subtypes of adverbials must be examined sepa-

rately, and it is why the present paper focuses solely on the subcategory of one-word *-ly* adverbials used within small distributional fields of communicative dynamism.

2. ADVERBIALS IN THE THEORY OF FSP

In Firbasian terms, adverbials may perform one of three dynamic semantic functions in communication: a specification, a setting, or a transition proper oriented element (Firbas 1992: 49, 77). In order to classify them as belonging to one of the above-mentioned categories, two parameters must be considered: whether they represent context-dependent or context-independent elements, and whether they are obligatory or non-obligatory complements of the verb.

According to Firbas, context-dependent adverbials invariably serve as settings, irrespective of their semantics and position in the sentence. On the other hand, obligatory context-independent adverbials serve as specifications of the verb, irrespective of their position, and are therefore more dynamic. The interpretation of non-obligatory context-independent adverbials depends on the kind of information they contribute: they perform the function of setting if they convey background, non-obligatory information; conversely, they are regarded as specifications if they convey essential information.

The third category of adverbials, transition proper oriented elements, includes adverbials such as *often*, *sometimes*, *naturally*, *of course*, etc., that is, adverbials of indefinite time or sentence adverbials (Firbas 1992: 77-79).

Unlike obligatory context-independent adverbials, which are interpreted as specifications regardless of their position, non-obligatory context-independent adverbials allow linear modification to assert itself as a factor determining their communicative dynamism: such adverbials tend to be interpreted as settings when they are initial, and as specifications when they are final or near-final. The difficulty in interpreting the latter type of adverbials lies in the fact that the assessment is made on semantic grounds, namely in considering whether the adverbial conveys information that is an essential or non-essential amplification of the semantic content of the verb. The difficulty of identifying a dividing line in a phenomenon of scalar nature leads to frequent cases of potentiality.

3. SHORT *-LY* ADVERBIALS

Within the category of adverbials, the *-ly* manner adverbials deserve particular attention because they show some specific features. They are nearly always context-independent and therefore considered as more dynamic than the verb. As to the role of linear modification, Chládková (1979: 93) suggests that a manner adverbial carries a lower degree of CD than a non-thematic element it precedes, but a higher degree of CD than a non-thematic element that it follows; however, this does not apply to non-thematic subjects and to the verb. According to Chládková (*ibid.*), irrespective of sentence position, the manner adverbial carries a lower degree of CD than a non-

thematic subject, but a higher degree of CD than the verb. She points out a similarity between the relationship of an adverbial and the verb it complements and that holding between a context-independent attribute and its head noun (*ibid.* 62), where the expression of quality (attribute) was found to be more dynamic than the noun by Svoboda (1968).

On the other hand, referring to Bolinger's pioneering work (Bolinger 1952), Firbas (1992: 53) points out that *-ly* adverbials are not totally unaffected by linear modification and tend to carry a higher degree of CD when they occur after the verb than when they precede it.

When these findings are confronted with examples of common sentence structures containing *-ly* adverbials, and, especially with minimal structures involving only the subject and the verb in addition to the adverbial, they often seem to run against empirical evidence. This is provided by prosodic prominence, the fourth factor of FSP operating in spoken language. In many cases, the intonation nucleus would naturally come not on the adverbial, but rather on the verb, as long as the subject was thematic. Similar clues are suggested by translation into an inflected language such as Czech, where an additional FSP factor, namely linear modification, ranks at the top of the non-prosodic factors. A natural translation of most of the sentences in question would end up with the verb in the final position in the target language, suggesting its communicative importance. This is corroborated by the position of the intonation nucleus, which would also come on the final verb.

4. SCOPE OF RESEARCH

For the sake of simplicity, the scope of research was restricted to short sentence structures constituting small distributional fields and consisting of only three constituents: the subject, the verb, and the *-ly* adverbial, because it is here that the competition between the adverbial and the verb is most straightforward. Such structures fall into two syntactic classes: verbs of copular nature followed by an obligatory adverbial, and intransitive verbs followed by an optional adverbial, which form the SVA and the SV(A) patterns, respectively. The former is of marginal interest because, as has been shown, the *-ly* adverbials are virtually always context-independent, and as they constitute an essential, compulsory complement of the intensive verb which cannot be omitted, they serve as a specification and are inherently more dynamic than the verb.

In the latter type, the adverbial is optional, which means that it can be left out without the sentence structure collapsing. They introduce into the sentence information that complements the semantic content of the verb and may vary in terms of relative importance. It can therefore be expected that it is in this sentence pattern that linear modification can assert itself most strongly as an indicator of CD.

In addition to intransitive verbs, consideration must also be given to transitive verbs that are used without their usual complementing clause constituents, which have been left out and are only implicit. The very fact that they were left out suggests that they must be context-dependent and therefore carrying a low degree of CD.

An important role in the assessment of the FSP structure of the sentences explored is played by the subject. The present research focuses on instances where the subject is non-rhematic, typically context-dependent and, consequently, cannot be interpreted as a new phenomenon introduced onto the scene as the most dynamic element of a presentation sentence. Although the verbs included in this research are primarily verbs implementing the quality scale, with rhematic subjects the possibility of interpreting them as verbs of existence/appearance on the scene is not negligible. Instances of verbs that, under certain conditions, may imply presentation on the basis of semantic affinity with context-independent subjects are given by Firbas (1992: 60–61), and some more extreme examples are described by Adam (2014).

The possible positions of an *-ly* adverbial in three-constituent sentences are restricted to three options demonstrated by the examples below.

- (1) Inwardly she smiled. (H97 618)
- (2) As she (sic) stared into her bemused eyes, he slowly smiled, and in that moment she would have committed murder if he'd asked her to. (H9V 2798)
- (3) She smiled proudly. (AC7 1244)

In example (1) the adverbial is placed initially, before the subject, suggesting that its relationship to the verb, though not completely lost, is weakened, while the relationship to the subject is strengthened (Firbas 1992: 53). As a result, the interpretation of the adverbial shifts away from specification towards the setting, and such interpretation is corroborated by the fact that initial adverbials are commonly separated from the sentence by a comma. The present paper focuses on examples (2) and (3), demonstrating the immediately preverbal and immediately postverbal (final) position, or SAV and SVA patterns, respectively.

For the actual research, ten verbs were selected (*agree, cry, inquire, laugh, nod, respond, sleep, smile, stare, and turn*) and examples of their use along with *-ly* adverbials were retrieved from the British National Corpus (BNC), both from the written and spoken component. To exclude examples where the verb is complemented by other constituents, the search focused on instances where either the verb or the adverbial was the last component in the sentence. The search provided some interesting results.

5. SHORT *-LY* ADVERBIALS IN BNC

Firstly, the SVA pattern invariably outnumbered the SAV pattern, in some cases significantly, as is clear from the following table.

The disproportion between the preverbal and postverbal position would probably have been even more dramatic if all structural types of adverbials had been included in the research; the *-ly* adverbials constitute just a fragment of the whole, and it is a logical assumption that adverbials in the form of, for instance, a PP, in spite of being much more frequent absolutely, are much less readily disposed to occur preverbally on account of their length and structural complexity.

	SAV		SVA	
	No.	%	No.	%
<i>agree</i>	118	45	142	55
<i>cry</i>	11	9	114	91
<i>inquire</i>	1	6	15	94
<i>laugh</i>	31	8	373	92
<i>nod</i>	20	5	403	95
<i>respond</i>	15	10	138	90
<i>sleep</i>	17	24	53	76
<i>smile</i>	44	5	833	95
<i>stare</i>	7	27	19	73
<i>turn</i>	11	21	41	79

TABLE 1. The proportion of preverbal and postverbal adverbials

Secondly, although the respective verbs explored, expectably, tended to be complemented by different adverbials on the basis of semantic compatibility (cf. the semantic differences shown by, for example, *agree* — *nod* — *smile* — *sleep* — *turn*), the research proved that there was also a difference in the adverbials related to the position; the typical preverbal -ly adverbials were different from the typical postverbal adverbials. Classification of adverbials is a notoriously complex issue, but even so, the differences were sufficiently manifest. The SAV pattern characteristically included a narrower range of adverbials which occurred repeatedly and could be considered TrPro adverbs or, in Quirkian terms, disjuncts and subjuncts. The typical examples of this group (Type A) include *actually*, *certainly*, *completely*, *entirely*, *finally*, *fully*, *hardly*, *merely*, *occasionally*, *only*, *really*, *totally*, *usually*, etc. The prevalence of preverbal position is conspicuous, but probably cannot be explained solely by the fact that while most of them may occur both preverbally and postverbally, others (some downtoners and some focusing subjuncts) are restricted to medial position and, under normal circumstances, cannot occur finally (Quirk et al. 1985: 597–612). This is demonstrated by the following examples involving the adverbs *entirely* and *merely*, where only the former can occur in both positions.

- (4) I **entirely** agree. (HHV 15474)
- (5) I agree **entirely**. (F7A 451)
- (6) Travis **merely** laughed. (JY8 4476)

Actually, contrary to what Quirk et al. say about positional restrictions of *merely* (ibid.) a search in the BNC retrieved a single final instance of this adverbial complementing, incidentally, one of the verbs explored, namely *nod*. The extreme scarcity of such a structure may however best be explained as a performance anomaly.

- (7) ?He nodded **merely**. (ADY 272)

Of those that fall in the category of adjuncts, the most commonly used adverbial was *suddenly*, which, according to Quirk et al. (1985: 560), represents a semantic blend of

a manner and a time duration adverbial when used finally, whereas in the initial or medial position it is interpreted solely as a time adjunct.

- (8) He laughed **suddenly**. (CKF 1728)
 (9) Then he **suddenly** smiled. (J10 592)

The SVA pattern was characterised by a much broader range of different adverbials (Type B), mostly those that could be regarded as true manner adverbials or adverbials combining the expression of manner of action with a description of the state or condition of the subject. They, too, occurred in the preverbal position, but significantly less frequently, suggesting that the final position is strongly preferred.

- (10) They all laughed **heartily**. (APW 3097)
 (11) The self-important politician smiled **coldly**. (AC2 2203)

Other examples of adverbials of Type B expressing the manner of action include *abruptly, austerely, briskly, feverishly, girlishly, gravely, quietly, loudly, obligingly, respectfully, slowly, softly, vigorously*, and many others. Among those describing the state or condition of the subject are *apologetically, cheerily, grimly, hysterically, nervously, politely, proudly, solemnly, thoughtfully*, etc. It has to be pointed out that a distinct line between the two categories is hard to draw because there is a considerable amount of overlap between them.

6. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

As has been shown above, not all adverbials retrieved from the corpus allow alternative placement in the sentence, and only those that do are relevant to the present research, because they open the way for linear modification to assert itself as an FSP factor. Admittedly, those typically occurring postverbally (Type B) are relatively rare in the preverbal position.

Those that are restricted to a single position are somewhat reminiscent of obligatory clause constituents; under special circumstances they may be fronted, but cannot migrate otherwise:

- (12) They went home. / *They home went. / Home they went.

The essential question therefore is what difference, if any, there is between the communicative dynamism and the corresponding FSP function of an adverbial placed before the verb (in the NOT-position), and that placed after the verb (in the final position), as in the following examples (given here along with the minimal context in which they occurred in the corpus):

- (13) Luch considered, as she always did, and **slowly** nodded. (APW 3163)
(Luch smiled, and Bridhe saw her. 'Well, lassie! And are you happy that you've no need now to be traipsing away up the moor every noon-tide, eh?' Luch con-

sidered, as she always did, and **slowly** nodded. Bridhe patted her gently on the head.)

- (14) Wishart nodded **slowly**. (BMN 2451)
 ('For all we know, your Lordship, it is possible that Queen Yolande was involved in her husband's death. For her sake, for France's sake, for Scotland's sake, such suspicions must be cleared!' Wishart nodded **slowly**. 'Queen Yolande,' he replied, 'is to leave on tomorrow's tide just after dawn.)

If the meaning expressed by the verb + Adv structure is replaced by the verbonominal alternative, the difference in the position of the adverbial will be neutralised (Dušková 2017: 203–204, 2013: 36–37):

- (15) Luch considered, as she always did, and gave a **slow** nod.
 (16) Wishart gave a **slow** nod.

According to Svoboda (1968), referred to by Dušková (2013: 37), in the verbonominal variant, the whole NP constitutes the rheme of the clause, and within the subfield constituted by the NP, the premodification exceeds the nominal head in the degree of CD. On the other hand, in the verbal construction the adverbial exceeds the verb in CD irrespective of the position, yet displays a higher degree of CD when it follows the verb than when it precedes it. He also suggests that the relationship between the premodifying adjective and the NP is similar to that holding between the verb and a manner adjunct (Svoboda 1989: 131–132), in that the latter may also be treated as a single unit, unless the adverbial is intensified.

Still, this does not seem to solve the problem of prosodic prominence and translation into Czech. In natural oral presentation of all the examples presented by (13–16), the expected position of the intonation nucleus is on *nod*, no matter whether it is a verb or a noun, and in semantically equivalent translation into Czech, all of the variants would employ a linear arrangement where the manner of the action precedes the action itself, and prosodic prominence would be given to the verb. It would require a context where both the subject and the verb were context dependent for the manner adjunct to occur in the final position.

However, following the line of thought suggested by Svoboda (1989), if the manner adverbial itself is intensified or modified, its CD increases accordingly, and the final position will most likely be associated with prosodic prominence, and, consequently, rhematicity.

- (17) He looked at the Lad and Taliesin thought the Lad nodded **very slightly**.
 (G₁₀ 282)

This may be due not solely to the semantic intensification, but at least partly also to the *end-weight* principle, which favours, where possible, a linear arrangement of clause constituents from shorter to longer ones. It can be assumed that a similar effect may be achieved by coordination: *For example, if you smell burning in the middle*

of the night you will respond **immediately and fully**, and not bother to 'consult' any body clock to see if you should calm down and be asleep! (A75 750); or by employing a structurally heavier formal realisation of the adverbial, e.g. a PP: Sheila **nodded in vigorous agreement**. (A6N 2397). However, these structural options were not explored in the present research. In this respect, unmodified *-ly* adverbials are light elements, and their final placement is due to factors other than weight, for instance, to the default grammatical sequence of clause constituents.

Another factor to consider is the fact that *-ly* adverbials typically occur as optional, non-obligatory constituents. This may prompt reasoning along two contradictory lines.

Following the first, it may be reasoned that the possibility of leaving the adverbial out affects neither the essential meaning of the sentence, nor its grammatical completeness, as demonstrated by the following examples. Conversely, leaving out the verb results in the sentence structure breaking down.

- (18) Both my master and I turned quickly. (HUo 652)
- (19) Both my master and I turned.
- (20) *Both my master and I quickly.

Combined with intransitive verbs, which do not require any other clause constituent apart from the subject, *-ly* adverbials are rendered even less communicatively important. And, conversely, the intrinsically high semantic salience of intransitive verbs increases even more when their subjects are context-dependent and therefore thematic, excluding the possibility of presentation scale implementation.

On the other hand, it might be argued that the very fact that the adverbials are included in the sentence although this is, strictly speaking, unnecessary, suggests that they carry important information; this is probably why they are regarded as specifications in the theory of FSP.

However, a distinction should be made between the A-type adverbials, that is, those that were commonly found in the preverbal position in BNC (e.g. *completely, entirely, finally, fully, hardly, merely*, etc., cf. Section 5. above) and the B-type ones, which were more frequent in the postverbal position (*quietly, loudly, obligingly, cheerily, grimly, hysterically*, etc.), in other words, true manner adverbials, which constitute a much more open set. If the communicative importance of an adverbial is assumed to be inversely proportionate to its predictability, then it is clearly adverbials of the latter type that are less predictable and therefore inherently more dynamic; adverbials of the former type typically function as intensifiers, expressing different degrees on a scale of intensity, and although the choice of a particular adverbial is not predictable, the range of options is limited and the kind of information they convey brings them close to the category of TMEs.

Let us now look at FSP analysis of the sentence structures explored in this paper, starting with the simplest possible variant, consisting just of S and V, and proceeding to the other linear arrangements.

- (21) He smiled. (Aof 619)
- (22) He **merely** smiled. (JXS 1026)

- (23) As she (sic) stared into her bemused eyes, he **slowly** smiled, and in that moment she would have committed murder if he'd asked her to. (H9V 2798)
- (24) He smiled **shyly**. (A7A 2400)

In (21), as well as in all other examples above, the context-dependent S serves as the theme. Since there are no postverbal complements, the V cannot perform the function of mediating between the thematic and non-thematic part of the sentence as it typically does in a tripartite FSP segmentation; instead, the categorial component of V is the TrPr, and the notional component of V is RhPr.

In Firbasian interpretation of example (22) the V constitutes a Tr, but it remains a question whether the adverb *merely* should be interpreted as Sp, although one carrying a relatively low degree of CD, or whether it would be regarded as a TrPro element, on a par with adverbials like *naturally*, *usually*, etc. (Firbas 1992: 78). It is worth noting that *merely* belongs to adverbials that practically invariably occur in the preverbal position (Type A).

In (23) the verb is regarded as the Tr, and the adverbial, belonging to Group B, serves as Sp, exceeding the V in terms of CD and therefore rhematic. The same is true of (24), with the slight difference that the final A is more dynamic than the preverbal A in (23). However, it is hard to identify how this difference in the degrees of CD is reflected in prosody or in translation into Czech.

Svoboda's observation (Svoboda 1989: 131–132) that, unless the adverbial is intensified, the V and the manner adjunct may be treated as a single unit (although it is not quite clear whether this is meant strictly as a subfield of CD distribution) opens the way for an alternative interpretation in which the adverbials in (23) and (24) would be considered as Tr-oriented elements, however, ones oriented to the notional component of the V, rather than to TrPr. In such a case, the notional component of the verb would carry the highest degree of CD and be rhematic, which would be in agreement with the indication provided by prosody and by translation into Czech. At the same time there would still be room for the difference in the degrees of CD carried by the preverbal and postverbal adverbial.

Of course, this does not mean that the unintensified/unmodified *-ly* adverbial can never perform the rhematic function in the structures explored; however, this must be licensed by special circumstances in which the contextual factor is of key importance; the verb must be context dependent, or the context dependence must be sufficiently strongly implied, as shown in the following hypothetical examples, accompanied by probable translations into Czech; the likely position of the intonation nucleus is given in bold script.

- (25) He called her name and she **turned**. (Zavolal ji jménem a ona se **otočila**.)
- (26) He called her name and she quickly **turned**. (Zavolal ji jménem a ona se rychle **otočila**.)
- (27) He called her name and she **turned** quickly. (Zavolal ji jménem a ona se rychle **otočila**.)
- (28) He called her name and she a) **turned** b) **quickly**, as if to prove her alertness. (Zavolal ji jménem a ona se rychle a) **otočila** / otočila b) **rychle**, jako by chtěla prokázat svou bdělost.)

- (29) He called her name from behind and she turned **quickly**, as if to prove her alertness. (Zavolal ji zezadu jménem a ona se otočila **rychle**, jako by chtěla prokázat svou bdělost.)
- (30) He called her name and she **turned**. She turned **quickly** / did so **quickly**, as if to prove her alertness. (Zavolal ji jménem a ona se **otočila**. Otočila se **rychle**, jako by chtěla prokázat svou bdělost.)

In (25–27) the notional component of the verb is not implied by the context and is therefore more dynamic. Example (28) is open to both interpretations, as the additional adverbial of comparison may or may not focus attention on the manner in which the action was performed; in (29) the importance of *quickly* is further suggested by the adverbial *from behind*, implying the necessity of turning, and (30) demonstrates a situation where the verb is clearly context-dependent, exactly repeated from the preceding sentence.

Although it was the intention to test the actual distribution of prosodic prominence over the sentences retrieved from the spoken part of the BNC, relatively few were actually available in the form of recordings, and even in those that were, the intonation did not prove a conclusive clue, since most of the samples represented unplanned, spontaneous communication, or the recordings were not sufficiently clear. This blurring is, however, not an exception but rather a general feature of prosodic parameters, because, unlike discrete signals provided by written language, the presence or absence of acoustic features or contrasts is not a matter of yes/no, but rather a matter of relative degree: the differences have to be sufficiently prominent to be perceived as significant.

Relatively little guidance was provided by publications specifically devoted to intonation, although some structures similar to those explored in this paper are treated in Wells (2006: 158, 197).

- (31) He performed brilliantly.
- (32) She dances beautifully.

As one of the general principles of placing the intonation nucleus, which are discussed at great length in *Chapter 3: Tonicity* (ibid. 93–186), Wells suggests that the nucleus tends to go on the last lexical item, in this case on the adverbials of manner. While this is definitely true, there are reasons to consider examples (31) and (32) above as different from those explored earlier. The verbs *perform* and *send* are used intransitively, but unlike the ten verbs retrieved from the BNC, it is difficult to imagine leaving the adverbials out: *he performed* and *she dances* are rather unlikely sentences as they feel incomplete without a following adverbial of place, time, or, as in this case, of manner. These adverbials can therefore be regarded as obligatory or semi-obligatory constituents, and their context-independence naturally renders them more dynamic than the verb and hence rhematic.

Another problem of intonation analysis arises from the fact that the examples given in Wells and elsewhere are devoid of context, and the same is true of most situations when native speakers are asked to read sentences out loud: in many cases

a plausible context must first be constructed in the respondents' minds for them to decide about the distribution of prosodic prominence. A natural context for (31) is someone describing a play in the theatre or a sports event, and the verb *perform* is therefore implied. Similarly, (32) with the nucleus on *beautifully* is likely to be used as a commentary on someone's ability as a dancer. On the other hand, when the notional component of the verb is not suggested by the context, as in *What do you know about her? — She dances beautifully*, the verb increases in communicative importance, leading to potential variation in nucleus placement.

The usual FSP interpretation of *-ly* adverbials suggested by Firbas (1992), Svoboda (1968, 1989) and Chládková (1979) as generally being more dynamic than the verb irrespective of their relative position is based on the primacy of the contextual factor, namely on the fact that *-ly* adverbials are almost invariably context-independent. Linearity can still assert itself, but only in terms of degree — a postverbal adverbial exceeds the verb in CD more significantly than a preverbal one. However, in the SAV pattern this results in a systematic mismatch between the FSP structure and the usual placement of the nucleus on the verb. The same applies to the FSP structure of noun phrases, where the premodifying adjectives are interpreted as more dynamic than the nouns that follow, despite the fact that the intonation nucleus is typically on the nominal head. The only possible conclusion is that in these structures prosody can no longer be considered the strongest and most reliable FSP indicator.

Notably, in different types of optional adverbials, particularly those of time and place, context independence alone does not automatically render them more dynamic than the verb; they may still express the setting and remain part of the thematic layer. The same applies to linearity — their final position is not automatically associated with rhematicity. A question therefore arises whether the context independence of *-ly* adverbials is primarily a signal of their communicative importance or a consequence of their non-obligatory nature, and whether their postverbal position can be associated with the end-focus principle.

To conclude this discussion, one more remark concerning the identified prevalence of preverbal adverbials over postverbal ones is perhaps worth making. The final position of adverbials, especially those of Type B, is perfectly in line with the basic grammatical distribution of clause constituents, which is the strongest word-order principle in English, operating much more strongly than the end-focus principle. In the case of short, three-constituent structures, the central position of the verb helps to maintain a structural balance of the preverbal and postverbal elements. Even in other syntactic structures, the verb is rarely the final element; it is preceded by the obligatory subject and complemented on the right by other clause constituents (Cs, O, A). If S, V and A are the only clause constituents, the only linear arrangement preserving this balance is the SVA pattern, unless the S rhematic, in which case the sequence can be reversed, creating a mirror image, the AVS sequence. However, none of the examples explored fall within the latter category.

It is worth noting that in the presence of additional postverbal clause constituents, an adverbial of type B may be moved into the preverbal position more easily, as it does not upset the overall balance of the left- and right-hand side constituents.

- (33) I felt nothing at the time and naively smiled to myself when I spotted it later.
(APC 242)

When English three-constituent sentences containing optional *-ly* adverbials are compared with their Czech counterparts, a different picture emerges. As the word order in Czech is not constrained by grammatical factors, the arrangement of clause constituents primarily reflects a linear distribution of communicative dynamism. As a result, the (S)VA sequence strongly suggests that the final adverbial is more dynamic than the verb, whereas the A(S)V sequence points to the opposite. Since the final element also receives prosodic prominence, the mismatch of prosody and the FSP status observed in English rarely occurs in Czech. And because the A(S)V sequence is considerably more frequent, from a translation point of view this may either mean that an alternative FSP interpretation of English *-ly* adverbials should be considered, or that the two languages show systemic differences in the FSP status of these adverbials.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the discussion of findings presented above, it is possible to suggest some general tendencies observed in the course of this research.

Among the various possible formal realisations of adverbials, the short *-ly* adverbials constitute a relatively small subgroup. They typically occur as non-obligatory constituents and are used along with other clause constituents. Cases when they occur as the only complement of the verb in addition to the subject are relatively infrequent and restricted to intransitive verbs or, possibly, sentences containing verbs of other valency types from which the other complements have been left out because they represent known information. Short *-ly* adverbials may be further subcategorised on semantic grounds, but exact classification is made difficult by the sheer variety of meanings they can convey. For the purpose of this research, they have been broadly divided into two categories: Type A, which includes TrPro adverbials, in other words, adverbials expressing indefinite time, sentence adverbials, and various types of subjuncts, such as *completely, entirely, finally, fully, occasionally, totally, usually*, etc. Type B adverbials can be regarded as true manner adverbials, although some of them combine the expression of manner of the action with a description of the state or condition of the subject. They constitute a much more numerous and semantically more diverse category, represented, for example, by *quietly, loudly, nervously, politely, slowly, softly, vigorously*, and many others. As a result, they are potentially more dynamic than the former type.

In terms of positional preferences, Type A adverbials are more likely to precede the verb within the SAV sequence, while Type B adverbials typically follow it in the SVA sequence, but this difference does not apply absolutely. In the structures explored, that is, those where the adverbials constitute the only other complement of an intransitive verb in addition to a thematic subject, the semantic importance of the verb increases, and the adverbial is the only potential competitor for the rhematic status.

The part played by linear modification can be summarised as follows: in the SAV sequence, adverbials of both types tend to carry a low degree of CD, possibly, contrary

to usual interpretations, lower than the verb. In the SVA sequence, the two types display a different behaviour; moving a Type A adverbial into the postverbal position significantly increases its degree of CD and makes it potentially rhematic. On the other hand, the final position of Type B adverbial does not necessarily raise its degree of CD; it primarily shows adherence to the default grammatical linear distribution of clause constituents (SVOMPT), rather than observation of the end-focus principle.

Admittedly, further research would be needed to put these observations on a more solid basis. One such potentially fruitful field of research might be a comparison of semantically related structures, such as *Kylie was quick to respond — Kylie quickly responded — Kylie responded quickly* (*On them, Kylie was quick to respond and unequivocal with her replies. ADR 1072*), including a more thorough analysis of prosodic features.

Another field of research might consist in examining how readily adverbials of the two respective types are used in the construction known as the *split infinitive*, where the position of the adverbial between the infinitive particle and the remaining lexical component of the verb suggests its thematicity or orientation toward the transition.

REFERENCES

- Adam, M. (2014) Prezentační versus kvalifikační škála: interpretace hraničních případů v FSP analýze narativního textu. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 96/2, 180–195.
- Bolinger, D. L. (1952) Linear modification. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 67, 1117–44.
- Chládková, H. (1979) English and German equivalents of the Czech adverb of manner examined from the point of view of functional sentence perspective. *Brno Studies in English* 13, 61–104.
- Dušková, L. (2012) Vilém Mathesius and contrastive studies, and beyond. In: Malá, M. and P. Šaldová (eds) *A Centenary of English Studies at Charles University. From Mathesius to Present-day Linguistics*, 21–48. Prague: Charles University.
- Dušková, L. (2017) Kontrastivní lingvistika a paralelní korpusy. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 99/2, 193–213.
- Firbas, J. (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Svoboda, A. (1968) The hierarchy of communicative units and fields as illustrated by English attributive constructions. *Brno Studies in English* 7, 49–101.
- Svoboda, A. (1989) *Kapitoly z funkční syntaxe* [Chapters from functional syntax]. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Wells, J.C. (2006) *English Intonation: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vladislav Smolka

Department of English Studies
 Faculty of Education, University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice
 Jeronýmova 10, 371 15 České Budějovice
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5568-2155
 e-mail: smolka@pf.jcu.cz