

REVIEW ARTICLE:

MARGARET G. DAVIS' *ASPECTS OF ADVERBIAL PLACEMENT
IN ENGLISH AND SLOVENE*

Marta Pirnat-Greenberg

Margaret Davis' *Aspects of Adverbial Placement in English and Slovene*¹ (hereafter: *AAPES*) is now the second monograph concerned with Slovene to have appeared in a short period of time in Sagner's series.² *AAPES* is Davis' doctoral dissertation and it is good to see that the results of her many years of research were made available. Davis offers an in-depth study of Slovene [Slov] and English [Eng] word order [WO], adverbials [advbls] and their position in the clause, and particularly contrasts the phenomena in the two languages. The book attempts to make contributions in many areas and the beneficiaries of its findings will probably be numerous among both English- and Slovene-speaking readers.

AAPES is of potential value to the theory of WO and advbls. Ideally, in a contrastive investigation, one needs have the problems solved for each of the languages involved in order to compare them and to sort out similarities and differences. For this reason contrastive studies usually bring to the surface all the shortcomings in the theory of the problems contrasted, shortcomings which the author should then try to solve or at least point out. Another important aspect of a contrastive study is developing a methodology, which in this particular case considering the scarceness of substantial Slov-Eng contrastive studies was a challenge on its own. And last, but not least, the results of contrastive analysis may have the greatest value for language pedagogy and translation.

1. The Contents and Structure of the Book

The book is comprised of six chapters, which are preceded by a short preface, a list of contents and a list of abbreviations, and are followed by a brief summary in Slov and a bibliography. The six chapters of *AAPES* can be divided into two parts: the first three chapters are primarily theoretical and general, in search of an appropriate methodology by reviewing the existing literature on WO (chapters 1 and 2) and advbls (chapter 3). At the end of each of the three chapters particular attention is devoted to the treatment of WO and advbls in current grammars of the two languages (Toporišič 1976, 1984; Quirk et al. 1972, 1985.) The second part is author's corpus analysis, i.e., the implementation of the methodology that she has built up through the first three chapters.

The first two chapters deal with WO in linguistic theory. In chapter one the author examines the treatment of WO by different linguistic (in Davis' words "grammatical") schools and the contributions of these schools to WO theory. She considers traditional, structural, transformational, universal, functional, and text grammars. Davis' main reason for reviewing all these different theories is to find an appropriate model for examining WO and advbl placement in both Eng and Slov, in which WO is governed by quite different principles. Davis' review of the relevant facts on WO theories is informative and, for the most part, fairly concise. The only exception is a rather lengthy presentation of the basic principles of transformational grammar, disproportionate to its contribution to WO theory. But as we see later on, she deals in great detail with the transformational treatment of

advbls as well, and therefore her explanation of the basics of transformational theory in the first chapter may help readers understand the transformational, and at times highly abstract, approaches to the advbls presented in the third chapter. The reader may be surprised that the theory of functional sentence perspective [FSP] is mentioned only briefly in the section on structuralism and in reviewing the treatment of WO in Toporišič's grammar. For this reason the statement at the end of the first chapter that FSP "promises the greatest relevance for the comparison of Eng and Slov WO" (29) seems almost premature. Because of the importance that FSP has for her study (she chooses it as a theoretical framework for her analysis) she discusses it more thoroughly in a separate chapter. She is right in doing so, since in-depth discussion of FSP in the first chapter would be too much of a digression and would truly "detract from the broad outline aimed at" (8) there.

In her discussion of FSP theory Davis first presents its development in the Prague school, then compares its implementation in the treatment of WO in Slov and Eng. WO of the two languages show very different sensitivities with respect to FSP. Since Slov WO shows a similar sensitivity to FSP to Czech (for which the theory was originally designed), FSP theory is easily applied to it. For English the theory undergoes some adaptations. One of the differences is the criterion for identifying a rheme: in Slov neutral WO (in declarative sentences) the theme precedes the rheme, and the rheme is the final element of the clause, but in Eng that is not always the case. In Quirk et al's grammar the criterion of nuclear stress is used for identifying the rheme. Davis argues against this solution from the standpoint that in written texts nuclear stress is sometimes hard to determine and therefore it doesn't always serve well as rheme indicator. It also proves to be insufficient in Davis' corpus analysis (cf. 207-210).

In the third, rather lengthy chapter on advbls in linguistic theory Davis examines the treatment of advbls by different linguistic schools in a similar manner to the way she reviews WO theories in the first two chapters. She considers traditional, structural and transformational grammars, the Prague school and semantic and pragmatic studies. Again, most of the attention is devoted to a transformational treatment. It is shown that it was more successful than others in solving the problems of Eng advbl placement, particularly in determining the scope of modification (differentiating between the sentence and predicate modifying advbls), which has importance for advbl position. Davis is thorough and systematic in sorting out a sizable body of literature on (mostly Eng) advbls,³ which she also extensively and competently comments on. But at times, particularly in the section on transformational treatment, she goes into too much detail; those parts are hardly intelligible to the "general reader"⁴ who is uninitiated in transformational grammar. The review of existing literature on WO and advbls ends up taking up most of the book. We can agree with the author that the first three chapters represent a "fairly full theoretical background" and her "own gradual education and orientation in this field" (vii), but their length is not in proportion to the immediate implementation of the literature reviewed in her own research.

She seems to have come the farthest in working out the problems at hand by comparing advbl treatment in Quirk et al's and Toporišič's grammars. Most of the correspondences between the two she finds in the semantic classification of advbls. She compares in detail the division of the three semantic classes that she examines in her analysis (place, time, manner). The differences are mainly in terminology and in degree of detail, but in a few cases they are the result of a different theory or different language structure. An example of a difference in theory is Toporišič's advbls of quantity of time, which later in his work

(Toporišič 1982) are assigned to the major group expressing properties, not circumstances (where the advbls of time belong).⁵ The difference in language structure is represented by the subject adjuncts, a special manner subdivision in Quirk et al.'s grammar, which is not matched by any special class in Slov. Davis' explanation for this is the fact that the group does not have the same significance for Slov as it does for Eng. One of the basic differences in categorization is the treatment of particles⁶ separately from adverbs, as a special word group, in Slov. Consequently they are not dealt with on the syntactic level⁷ as they are in Eng as members of the advbl class. For Slov "členki" Davis finds approximate correspondences in the Eng advbl subclasses of subjuncts, conjuncts and disjuncts. Although this is an important difference in classification, it does not become an issue later in her analysis.

Davis' corpus analysis is comprised of parts A and B, presented in chapters three and four. For her comparison of advbl placement in Eng and Slov she chose non-fiction, mostly scientific texts. The first corpus of texts are Slov texts and their translations into Eng, the second corpus are original Eng texts with their Slov translations. Needless to say, the author had a much easier time finding ample exemplification for the second part of her analysis than for the first. She further limited her analysis to declarative sentences with neutral word order and to three semantic classes of advbls: place, time and manner. The comparison of advbl placement is carried out at the clause level, although Davis includes as much context as the preceding sentence (unless the clause is in the beginning of the paragraph or the text). The main and the subordinate clauses are treated the same way: the initial element is considered the theme of the clause, therefore in a subordinate clause a relative pronoun or advbl (functioning as a conjunction) is considered the theme, while a subordinating conjunction is considered to be outside the theme-rheme sequence.

The first criterion in organizing the material is the correspondence of advbl placement in L[anguage]₁ and L₂; the examples with parallel advbl placement come first, the ones with non-parallel position second. Inside these two groups the examples are grouped by the position of advbls in the clause in L₁: the initial, medial and final positions are considered in the order most to least frequent correspondence and least to most frequent divergence. For each group the statistical data are presented and discussed, as well are the most illustrative or problematic examples.

Davis' analysis shows that Slov final advbls are the ones that are most frequently parallel in Eng translation. The reason for this is that final position is the overall preferred advbl position in Eng. Initial position is quite restricted in Eng: it is more or less reserved for sentence modifiers ("setting")⁸. Initial position is much more open to advbls in Slovene since it need not be occupied by the subject as in Eng; the subject is often not expressed in surface structure or is final if rhematic. Therefore Slov initial advbls are usually placed in final position in Eng if they are not the "setting" for the rest of the clause (and even in that case they can be placed finally) or, in rare instances (manner advbls) in medial position. Davis improves on the solutions shown in the Eng translations examined by suggesting some Eng alternatives that can be used in some cases to preserve the theme-rheme distribution of Slov original, i.e. subject-predicate inversion, advbl subject. Slov medial position is the least frequently paralleled in Eng translations; the discrepancy reflects openness of this position to advbls in Slov and restrictions on the use of medial position in Eng. From the material Davis deduces reasons underlying the choice of initial or final position in Eng to render Slov medial position. Unfortunately, the material is too limited for more definite rules and formalized conclusions, which could better help Slov students/translators of Eng make the right choice.

From the opposite point of view, i.e. Eng being L₁, the situation appears quite different,

although predictable from the outcomes of the corpus analysis A. The statistical data have different value than in corpus A, since in Eng texts the positions are represented much less evenly than in Slov ones, with the overwhelming majority of advbls in final position (cf. 171 out of 283 vs. 119 out of 290 in corpus A).⁹ This is the reason for an almost contradictory statistical outcome: final Eng advbls outnumber initial and medial ones in parallel as well as in non-parallel Slov translations. Final position is therefore the most problematic Eng advbl position for translators into Slov. They have to decide whether the advbl is final in Eng because it is rhematic, in which case it has to be paralleled in Slov, or it is final for other reasons, in which case it needs to be placed in initial or medial position in Slov (most often with medial placement). Because of the difficulties of identifying the rheme proper in Eng (see also below and footnote 13) it is often up to the translator's judgement to determine the most important part of the information.¹⁰

The corpus analysis is followed by the conclusions. Here Davis summarizes her findings, pointing out the problems encountered in her analysis and gives suggestions for further research. A brief summary in Slov and the bibliography conclude *AAPES*.

2. Some theoretical considerations.

Davis refers to Eng and Slov WO as “fairly fixed - grammaticalized” and “fairly free” respectively (cf. p. 2).¹¹ These labels may work for typological or contrastive purposes, but they can be quite misleading if taken literally. It should be made very clear that Slov WO is governed by two sets of rules: clitics, phrase elements, conjunctions have their fixed position in the clause (“stalna stava”), while the position of clause elements is governed by the rules of FSP (“pravila členitve po aktualnosti”). Davis chose to deal with the placement of advbls as a clause element only, leaving aside the position of the elements of advbl phrases or the position of adverbs as modifiers (146). Although it is true that only “advbls as clause elements [...] vary their position” (146), there are certain differences between the “fixed” positions of adverbs in Eng and Slov. One question that comes to reader's mind is the position of place and time modifiers in the advbl phrase: in Slov they always follow the modified adv (“jedro”), in Eng they can precede, cf. *tam zgoraj (spodaj, zadaj, notri, zunaj, okrog)* vs. *up (down, back, in, out, around)*¹² there. These kinds of problems are ignored in Davis' study.

The notion that “in Slov, initial position for advbls is formally unavailable in subordinate clauses except in cases where the initial element itself is a relative adv[erb]/advbl phrase” (201) is overgeneralizing, at least for the surface level. The position is unavailable if there are clitics (verbal, pronominal) to occupy the place after the subordinate conjunction,¹³ otherwise an advbl or any other clause element can occupy it; cf. *Če v Ljubljani zjutraj dežuje, je na avtobusih gneča* vs. *Če bo v Ljubljani zjutraj deževalo, bo na avtobusih gneča*. The same goes for Davis' claim that “only one element or item¹⁴ may occupy initial position”. That is only true if there are verbal or pronominal clitics in the clause which will occupy the second position, cf. *Aprila v Ljubljani pogosto dežuje* vs. *Aprila je (bil) v Ljubljani pogosto dež*.

The clause level proves to be too limiting for analyzing WO from the standpoint of FSP. This applies not only to Eng, which the author recognizes at one point,¹⁵ but to Slov as well. Some problems that are investigated from the standpoint of FSP, particularly in the subordinate clauses, are in fact governed by the rules of fixed position (“stalna stava”). The relative pronouns and advbls in the beginning of subordinate clause are treated as theme, but that is irrelevant for their position: as functioning conjunctions they are automatically placed in the beginning of the clause that they introduce. The “automatic” rules of fixed

position in Slov should also be applied in the case of advbls as “shifted themes”.¹⁶ They would not then have to be considered medially positioned and would not appear to have a non-parallel position with initially placed advbls in Eng (cf. 246, examples [85] and [86]). Treating them as non-parallel adds (even if only insignificantly)¹⁷ to a high level of disagreement between Slov and Eng in medial position and further complicates the picture. They should be kept apart from “real medial” advbls, which can appear in the same sequence - between the clitics and the participle or “povedkovo dolocilo,”¹⁸ but they are not thematic (cf. pp. 224-25, examples [54] and [55]). While the latter can be rendered by medial position in Eng, the former will be rendered by initial or final position (in rare cases of manner advbls by medial position) - in the same way as Slov (main clause) initial advbls are.

3. Methodology

Davis did not have any large-scale Slov-Eng contrastive projects to consult for methodological guidelines. The contrastive projects for Eng and some other Slavic languages (Serbo-Croatian, Polish) that she does refer to are eclectic, compromising or shifting between different models. Davis recognizes that “any specialized, highly technical model is not recommendable, not only because it involves commitment to one particular linguistic theory but also because [her] concern is not narrowly theoretical” (23). This generally holds true for contrastive projects, if they try to utilize their findings in pedagogy and translation.

The author basically holds to her practical intent in her analysis, as she works primarily within the theoretical framework of WO and advbls that is applied in current grammars of the two languages. Her analysis proves already established facts on advbl position to be true, but also brings to light a number of shortcomings and questions that need to be dealt with. Faced with a practically gray area in the domain of the placement of Slov advbls, Davis makes some interesting new observations and poses several questions that will need to be addressed in the future. Davis’ corpus of about 300 examples in each part is relatively small, therefore the results are tentative rather than being conclusive. *AAPES* makes the practical users of English (students, translators) aware of the problems and gives them the guidelines for advbl placement, although it avoids setting definite rules. It also provides a model for further investigations, which could be expanded and deepened with more material of different varieties and with complete semantic scale of advbls. Although far from saying the last word on advbl placement in English or in Slovene, *AAPES* is a valuable contribution to solving these problems that arise between the two languages and to English-Slovene contrastive grammar in general.

Lawrence, Kansas

NOTES

1. [= *Slavistische Beiträge* 249], München: Otto Sagner, 1989. xiv + 342 pp.
2. The first one being Tatjana Srebot-Rejec, *Word Accent and Vowel Duration in Standard Slovene* (München 1988), reviewed by Tom Priestly (*Slovene Studies* 10/2[1988]: 220-225).
3. The abundance of literature (largely monographs) on Eng advbls and their placement is contrasted with the lack of literature of this kind in Slov.
4. This may be an extension of what she claims about the reader that her *analysis* is aimed at (cf. 23).

5. In his grammar, the frequency adverbs are placed in the group expressing properties (Toporišič 1984: 345), while the same kind of advbls are in the quantity of time class, which does not belong to the group expressing properties (Toporišič 1984: 491).
6. In Davis' comment on Toporišič's treatment of particles there is some misunderstanding of his reference that particles are (also) used to create "syntactic moods." Davis looks for an explanation in the section on verbal moods, where she can only find *naj*, which is there, oddly enough, called an adverb. Instead she ought to have looked at the section on syntactic moods (Toporišič 1984: 429-435) where she would have found enough examples for that particular role, cf. *a/ali* (interrogative; here Toporišič might have included also arch. *kaj, mar, li*), *naj, da* (optative). It should be mentioned that in colloquial language, *da* is also used to form the imperative mood, cf. *Da se mi ne premaknes* 'Don't (you dare) move'. For creating the imperative mood in the colloquial language the possibility with *daj/dej* + inf. is given, although *daj/dej* is not qualified as a particle in this section, but is listed in the chapter on particles (Toporišič 1984: 385).
7. This raises the question how to treat the examples like *po pravici povedano, na kratko rečeno*, which are equivalents of the Eng disjuncts *frankly, briefly*.
8. The distinction between sentence and predicate modifying advbls is missing in the theory of Slov advbls.
9. This could have been made clearer in the book by presenting the statistical data in a chart rather than/in addition to just mentioning them in the running text; the way the data are laid out in the book it makes it difficult for the reader to compare and evaluate them and, in general, to see the full picture.
10. Although Davis admits that there are one or two examples where the Slov translator was influenced by Eng in placing advbl finally, there may be more than that, considering that agreement in advbl position is about 10% higher in Slov than in Eng translations, and that some examples of interference remained unnoticed, cf. p. 289, ex. (43): in *vadijo redno* the advbl is clearly not rhematic, but placed finally under the influence of the Eng original (/ ... *people who exercise regularly*). Another point of interference in the same sentence is the possessive pronoun in *v svojem prostem času* for Eng *in their spare time*. The translations apparently do not always offer an optimal solution to the problem (Davis noticed the same in some cases of translations into Eng), which begs the question of just how reliable a source they are for determining the rules of advbl placement in Eng and Slov.
11. The characterization "free" for Slov WO was criticized by Breznik early in this century in his pioneering study on Slov WO (Breznik 1908).
12. Note that these modifiers are "direction *particles*" in Eng (Quirk et al.) but "smerni *prislovi*" in Slov.
13. It should be noted here that there are some words other than clitics that have to occupy the position between the subordinate conjunction and the advbl, i.e. some modal verbs: *Kaže, da smemo ob koncu šestega stoletja računati s takimi gibanji tudi v ljubljanskem prostoru.* (199) Some verbs only tend to precede the advbl, but they can be placed after it as well: ...*zato ni naključje, da prihaja k nam precej pacientov iz tujine, ...* (199) // *Kaže da lahko ob koncu šestega stoletja računamo s takimi gibanji tudi v ljubljanskem prostoru.* This shows that there are some "automatic rules" that determine or at least obstruct certain adverb/advbl positions in Slovene; these remain still to be investigated.
14. "Element or item" are imprecise terms; more appropriate would be "clause element, except modifier ('prilastek')".
15. "[T]he rheme in Eng cannot be identified universally by a single criterion or criteria within the clause but quite often needs to be recognized in the light of the wider context—this can only be investigated fully within the text grammar" (255).
16. "In a subordinate clause introduced by a subordinating conjunction followed by clitics, except in the case of a zero theme, the first post-clitic (post-verbal) element is considered the theme. This could be termed a "shifted theme", as it is shifted rightwards from the initial position it could have if occurring in a main clause, on account of the subordinating conjunction which occupies the clause-initial position" (198).
17. Although Davis treats the examples with shifted themes as non-parallel medial, she mentions that they are only "formally medial in Slov" and "count as non-parallel for [a] 'technical' reason" (244).

18. In the sequence noticed by Davis for medial time advbls in Slov V[erb]- *biti* - A[dvbl of]-t[ime] - Pov[edkovo]. d[oločilo]/past participle (224) the first position can be occupied by any clitic (and more than one) of the "naslonski niz," not just by auxiliary; finite verb should be added to the possibilities after the A-t, cf. *To je moj prijatelj, ki pogosto pije / ki se (ga) pogosto napije / ki (naj) (bi) se (ga) (je) pogosto napil.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Breznik, Anton. 1908. "Besedni red v govoru," *Dom in svet* 21: 222-230, 258-267.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London.
- Toporišič, Jože. 1982. *Nova slovenska skladnja*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.
- Toporišič, Jože. 1984². *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Obzorja.