

## Научная статья

УДК 811.161.1'37

DOI: 10.25688/2076-913X.2023.51.3.07

## О РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИИ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОГО ПОЛЯ ЛОКАТИВОВ В РУССКИХ ВОПРОСНО-ОТВЕТНЫХ ЕДИНСТВАХ<sup>1,2</sup>

### Цзи Сяоцзюнь

Сучжоуский университет,

Сучжоу, Китай,

borisji@163.com, <https://orcid.org/my-orcid?orcid=0000-0001-5761-0924>

**Аннотация.** Понятие функционально-семантического поля — один из основных элементов теории функциональной грамматики А. В. Бондарко. Семантическое поле локативов в русском языке относится к классу вариантных форм моноцентрического функционально-семантического поля, которое характеризуется неоднородностью своего ядра. Важность изучения данного вопроса заключается в выяснении их представленности в вопросно-ответных единствах. Соответственно, цель данной работы — описание стержневого выражения и его вариантных форм. Его представление в единствах Q-A будет включать в себя как вопросы, так и ответы. В вопросах полная форма его основного выражения — Откуда/Куда/Где+А+В. При этом структура подвержена вариантам, на которые влияют контекстуальные факторы. В процессе ответа первичными проявлениями данного семантического поля выступают различные конкретные воплощения в адвербиальной позиции локативов, а то, что находится в маргинальной части данного семантического поля, — это когда локативная семантика выражается через другие синтаксические позиции, кроме адвербиальной. Основным методом исследования в данной работе служит корпусный анализ, что сделает выводы более убедительными.

**Ключевые слова:** функциональная грамматика, семантические поля, локативы, вопросно-ответные единства.

**Для цитирования:** Цзи, Сяоцзюнь. (2023). О репрезентации семантического поля локативов в русских вопросно-ответных единствах. *Вестник МГПУ. Серия «Филология. Теория языка. Языковое образование»*, 3(51), 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.25688/2076-913X.2023.51.3.07>

<sup>1</sup> Данная статья является частичным результатом исследования «О взаимодействии вопросов и ответов в русском языке с вопросительными местоимениями» (№ 2020SJA1361), которое спонсируется проектом исследований философии и социальных наук в колледжах и университетах провинции Цзянсу.

<sup>2</sup> Статья публикуется в авторской редакции.

## Original article

UDC 811.161.1'37

DOI: 10.25688/2076-913X.2023.51.3.07

## SEMANTIC FIELD OF LOCATIVES AS REPRESENTED IN RUSSIAN QUESTION-ANSWER UNITIES<sup>3</sup>

**Ji Xiaojun**Soochow University,  
Suzhou, China,borisji@163.com, <https://orcid.org/my-orcid?orcid=0000-0001-5761-0924>

**Abstract.** The concept of the functional-semantic field is one of the principal elements of A. V. Bondarko's theory of functional grammar. The semantic field of the locatives in Russian belongs to a class of variant forms of the monocentric functional-semantic field, which is characterized by its core heterogeneity. The relevance of studying this issue lies in figuring out their representation in the Question-Answer unities. Correspondingly, this paper aims at describing the core expression and the variant forms. Its representation in the Q-A unities would involve both the questions and the answers. The questions reveal the full form of its core expression as *Откуда/Куда/Где+А+У*. At the same time, the structure is subject to variants influenced by contextual factors. The process of answering reveals that the primary expressions of this semantic field are the various embodiments in the adverbial position of the locatives, and what lies in the marginal part of this semantic field is when the locative semantics is expressed through other syntactic positions other than the adverbial position. The main research method is corpus analysis, which will make the conclusions more convincing.

**Keywords:** functional grammar, the semantic fields, the locatives, the Question-Answer unities.

**For citation:** Ji, Xiaojun. (2023). Semantic field of locatives as represented in Russian question-answer unities. *MCU Journal of Philology. Theory of Linguistics. Linguistic Education*, 3(51), 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.25688/2076-913X.2023.51.3.07>

### Introduction

The concept of the functional-semantic field (функционально-семантическое поле) is one of the main elements of A. V. Bondarko's (А. В. Бондарко, 1930–2016) theory of functional grammar. It is characterized by the concept of a «functional-semantic field», in which means belonging to different linguistic levels (morphological, syntactic, constructional, lexical, etc.) but having the same semantic function are considered as a whole (Jiang, 2020, 4–5). There are two basic types of structures for the functional-semantic fields: the monocentric fields and the polycentric fields. There are also two types of variant forms of the monocentric fields: the monocentric fields with a fully grammatical core and the monocentric fields with an integrated (heterogeneous) core. The polycentric fields are characterized by the fact that they can be divided into several

<sup>3</sup> This paper is a partial result of the research «On the interaction between Q&A in Russian *wh*-questions with interrogative pronouns» (№ 2020SJA1361), which is sponsored by the Major Project of Philosophy and Social Science Research in Colleges and Universities of Jiangsu Province.

sections, each has its own central and marginal peripheral components (TFG, 1987, 34–35). With regard specifically to the semantic field of the locatives in Russian, on the one hand, there is no opposition of several centers in this semantic field and therefore it cannot be classified as a polycentric field. On the other hand, when it comes to achieving the function of the locatives, the different levels of the linguistic means of expression do not constitute a complete, homogeneous system. Thus, the semantic field of the locatives belongs to a class of variant forms of the monocentric functional-semantic fields, which is characterized by the heterogeneity of the core (TFG, 1996, 5).

The representation of the semantic field of the locatives in a Question-Answer unity (further as Q-A unity) would involve both the question and the answer. Due to limited space, this paper will focus mainly on the various means of expressing this semantic field during the answering process. While in the questioning part, we focus only on the primary expression of this semantic field, i. e. the questioning structure using the questioning adverbs as *откуда*, *куда*, *где*. The Q-A unity referred to in this paper is close to E. V. Rakhilina's understanding of the «closed question-answer pair» (замкнутая вопросно-ответная пара)<sup>1</sup>. The question discussed in the unities refers to its original interrogative function, contains a question word, and is semantically normal. The information is sufficient for the question and does not require a follow-up question to confirm what is asked, i. e. the answer is successful, complete and direct (Rakhilina, 1990, 9–10). All the examples cited are taken from the Russian National Corpus (Национальный корпус русского языка).

## Methodology

### *The primary expression of the semantic field of the locatives*

The semantic field of the locatives can be divided into two main categories in terms of content — the general spatial relationship (общие пространственные отношения) and the partial spatial relationship (частные пространственные отношения). According to V. G. Gak's (В. Г. Гак, 1924–2004) point of view, in the general spatial relationship, any process contains three stages: the beginning, the continuation and the end of the process. The main opposition in this relationship is therefore 'translocation — position'. While the partial spatial relationship refers to the specific geometric position of an object reflected in the language form, based on the main concepts of points, lines, or circles (arcs, spheres) to determine the positional relationship between one entity and another. The core expressions corresponding to both types of spatial relationships are of the form  $A+V+r+L$ , where  $A$  stands for the positioned object and is expressed by nouns or pronouns. If the active process is indicated, then it acts as the subject in the sentence. In the imperative case,  $A$  takes the syntactic form of a complement (usually a direct complement).  $V$  stands for verbs, which is a non-essential component and can sometimes be omitted. In its turn,  $r$  represents a spatial relationship between two objects, which is reflected in Russian as prepositions, word endings, verbs, and verb prefixes.  $L$  refers to the locative marker, which is expressed in Russian mainly through the noun forms with the prepositions (TFG, 1996, 8–11).

According to Gak's interpretation of the core expression, we consider it necessary to make certain amendments to it. The reason for this is that  $r$  in the expression represents

a semantic relationship rather than an independent syntactic means of expression. The expression of this semantic relationship is either reflected in *V* (verbs, verbal prefixes), or in *L* (prepositions and prepositional phrases, word endings). Therefore, we believe that it is not appropriate to single out *r* as a structural component. Combining Gak's findings and the features of the semantic field of the locatives, we intend to reduce its core expression form to *A(+V)+adv.(L)*. The verb in the construction is not an obligatory constituent, especially when the verb expressing the translocation or positional relationship is a typical state or conventional attribute of *A*. If there is a semantically consistent relationship between *A* and the verb (i. e. an exclusive correspondence), then the verb is semantically redundant, it does not have an informative potential, but is merely a grammatical means of expressing the predicate category (tense and mood), therefore it can be omitted, especially in the present tense, e. g. *Рядом с домом (стоит) гараж*. The *adv. (L)* in the construction indicates the locative case, which in Russian can be either the noun form with a preposition or, in some cases, the noun form without a preposition (i. e. the word endings as mentioned above, e. g. the creative case of a noun).

Correspondingly, as far as the Russian Q-A unity is concerned, the complete core expression for questioning the semantic field of the locatives should be *Откуда/Куда/Где+A+V*, e. g.

- (1) — *А откуда вы их взяли?*  
— *В воде нашел.* [И. Грекова. На испытаниях (1967)].
- (2) — *Куда это они все едут?* — *спросила Лида, размазывая грязь по потному лицу.*  
— *А на стройку.* [И. Грекова. На испытаниях (1967)].
- (3) «*Где вы их хранили?*» — *поинтересовались они.* «*В коробке из-под томатного сока*», — *последовал ответ.* [Елена Камзолкина. Храните деньги, не выходя из кассы (2002) // Вечерняя Москва, 2002.01.10].

Nevertheless, in conversations, this expression often appears in variant forms. In some contexts, since *A* has been mentioned in the preceding context, or it is clearly known to both parties in the conversation, then *A* can be omitted, and the expression is syntactically expressed as an incomplete clause, such as:

- (4) — *Возьми деньги, — велел директор.*  
— *Откуда приехали-то?*  
— *С Алтая.* [Василий Шукшин. Печки-лавочки (1970–1972)].
- (5) — *Куда ехать, мсьё?* — *спросил шофер.*  
— *В Париж, — ответил Дебоширин.* [С. Довлатов. Иная жизнь (1984)].
- (6) — *А где Вика? Вика уж который день у нее, у Ларисы.*  
— *А раньше где была?* — *спросил я.* [А. Волос. Недвижимость (2000) // Новый мир, 2001].

In other cases, the expression also frequently appears as an ellipsis, e.g.

- (7) — *Откуда дровишки?* — *спрашивала мама.*  
— *Из лесу, вестимо, — отвечал он.* [И. Грекова. Фазан (1984)].
- (8) — *Куда это они?*  
— *Да в Обнинск.* [Л. Улицкая. Казус Кукоцкого. Путешествие в седьмую сторону света // Новый мир, 2000].
- (9) — *Могу сходить посмотреть, — предложил Саша. — Где у вас Гёте?*  
— *Не надо ничего смотреть! — рывкнул отец, вновь приходя в раздражение.* [В. Белоусова. Второй выстрел (2000)].

Even cases where only question words occur, e.g.

(10) *Навстречу мне шел Лёва Игнатов. — Откуда, куда? — спросил он.* [Д. А. Гранин. Месяц вверх ногами (1966)].

(11) — *А вот и наша Лихаревка! — закричал Скворцов.*  
— *Где, где?* [И. Грекова. На испытаниях (1967)].

In the Q-A unity, it can be seen from the above examples that when *A* has the same referential status, the core expression of the direct answer about the semantic field of the locatives can be summarized as  $(A+V)+adv.(L)$ , which is a subtle difference from the primary expression of the semantic field of the locatives itself. When further clarification of *A* is required, then *A* needs to appear in the answer, e.g.

(12) — *Где же вы все разместились?*  
— *Молодые — в твоей комнате, я — в угловой, с балконом.* [И. Грекова. Перелом (1987)].

Whether it is a general spatial relationship or a partial spatial relationship, there is a «translocation – position» opposition within them. Therefore, we propose to study the primary expression of the semantic field of the locatives in the Russian Q-A unity from this opposition.

Translocation corresponds to the beginning and the end of a movement process, and the corresponding question words in Russian are *откуда* and *куда* respectively. At this point, if the positioned object *A* is consistent with the subject of the expression, then this is an active and independent movement, as in (13) and (14).

(13) — *Откуда же вы шли? — спросил Курцер и вынул зажигалку.*  
— *Я была у своей тетки, за пять верст отсюда...* [Ю. О. Домбровский. Обезьяна приходит за своим черепом. Ч. 2 (1943–1958)].

(14) — *Но куда же вы шли? К машине или... куда вас проводить?*  
— *К Потапову, — сказала Софа.*  
— *Я хотела достать у него яблоч для посылки.* [Ю. О. Домбровский. Хранитель древностей. Ч. 2 (1964)].

If the positioned object *A* does not coincide with the subject of the expression, then the relationship is subordinate in nature, and its translocation is caused by the action of other objects. In this case, *A* appears in the form of a direct complement, and transitive verbs are usually used in the answer, as in (15) and (16).

(15) — *Откуда достал-то его, лебедя?*  
— *А бог послал, да!* [Д. Н. Мамин-Сибиряк. Приемьш (1893)].

(16) — *Куда его выгнать? — сказала Фокина. — На улицу, что ли?*  
— *Почему на улицу? — ответила Кузякина. — Перевести в триста пятнадцатую школу ...* [В. Медведев. Баранкин, будь человеком! (1957)].

Opposite to translocation is the positional relationship, which primarily indicates the stationary state of the object. Similarly, this can be either active, such as (17), or passive, such as (18):

(17) — *А где школа была, ты помнишь? — спросил Корытин.*  
— *Возле клуба, — ответила Катерина.* [Б. Екимов. Пиночет (1999)].

(18) — *Где вы его держите?*  
— *На одном закрытом пляже, в районе Вест Палм Бич.* [А. Ростовский. Русский синдикат (2000)].

Positional relationships can also include the movement of the objects within a certain spatial boundary, such as (19):

- (19) *И, чтобы выручить ее, я спрашиваю: — Где вы с ней гуляете?  
— Тут, — показывает на окно, — в скверике.* [А. Рыбаков. Тяжелый песок (1975–1977)].

However, there is a remarkable difference between the movement of an object in the positional relationship and the movement in the translocation relationship. Translocation is a kind of boundary-breaking movement, corresponding to the directional verbs (лативные глаголы). In contrast, the movement in the positional relationship is the movement within the spatial boundaries, and the corresponding verb is a static verb (эссивные глаголы). Of course, there is not a clear-cut distinction between these two types of predicates. The difference in their meanings will be neutralized in a range of cases, such as (20) and (21).

- (20) — *Куда... посадили бы? — осторожно спросил обстоятельный Аве.  
— На свое место!* [А. Аверченко. Слепцы (1912–1914)].  
(21) — *Куда ж ты его приняла, где посадила? — спросила она, вставая и начиная одеваться.  
— Они в гостиной-с теперь, — объяснила горничная.* [А. Ф. Писемский. Мещане (1877)].

In the representations of the semantic field of the locatives, one case in particular needs to be noted, that is, the adverbs and the locative clauses are used to express this kind of relationship. Whether this means of expression belongs to the primary or the secondary expression, the Russian linguists have different perceptions of this. A. V. Bondarko, M. V. Vsevolodova (М. В. Всеволодова, 1928–2020) and other linguists believe that the locatives as a functional-semantic field possess linguistic means of expression of different types. The most typical in Russian are: 1. the combinations of predicates with prepositions and case forms of nouns or pronouns, or the combinations of predicates with adverbs-indicators; 2. the complex clauses with locative subordinations (TFG, 1996, 5; Vsevolodova et al., 1982). Whereas Gak believes that if the adverbs are used to represent spatial relationships, then *L* is not specifically expressed, it is provided by the contexts and the situations. Therefore, the adverbs are a secondary means of expressing spatial relationships. The locative clauses are also a variant used to express *L* (TFG, 1996, 19).

However, there is a self-contradiction in Gak's exposition. On the one hand, he clearly pointed out that the adverbs and adverb clauses belong to a secondary means of expressing *L*. At the same time, however, he also believes that structures similar to *Он шел позади* belong to the primary form of expression of spatial relationships, because *L* in them takes the syntactic form of the locatives (TFG, 1996, 21). Moreover, Gak studied the secondary expression forms of this kind of semantic relationships based on the situation where *L* occupies other syntactic (non-adverbial) positions (TFG, 1996, 21–24).

We tend to the first view, which classifies the adverbial and the locative clauses as the primary means of expressing the locative semantic field, since they occupy the syntactic position of the adverbs and are consistent in syntactic properties, as do the grammatical forms of nouns with prepositions, and the special endings of nouns, as in (22).

- (22) — *Где ж я тебе возьму метр семьдесят? — спросил Петр Максимыч.  
— Где хочешь, там и бери.* [Ю. Коваль. Клеенка (1970)].

*The secondary expression of the semantic field of the locatives*

According to the concept of the asymmetric dualism of linguistic signs, there is an incomplete symmetrical relationship between the signifier and the signified. Specifically, the primary forms in the spatial model that express primary functions (the locatives) constitute the core of the field, and the secondary forms that express these meanings constitute the marginal part of the field. The marginal part of the locative semantic field reflects the heterogeneity of this semantic field. The heterogeneity refers to the linguistic means of expressing this semantic field, which belong to different levels of the language system, such as the morphological, the syntactic and the lexical-grammatical. In the secondary expressions, *L* appears in its non-inherent syntactic position, which means that *L* is no longer a locative adverb, but occupies the syntactic positions of the complement, the subject, the predicate, etc.<sup>2</sup>

*L* occupies the syntactic position of complement. In this case, the locative relationship in the answer is expressed by the verbal-nominal construction, such as:

(23) — *Откуда она берёт таблетки?*

— *Соседям родные приносят. По ее просьбе. Мои тоже раза два принесли.* [И. Грекова. Перелом (1987)].

(24) — *А где Абрахам? — спросил Яков, когда все, подавляя рыдания и вздохи, собрались возле него. — Куда подевался этот скряга?*

— *Он решил охранять свое жилище, — раздалось сдавленные голоса.* [Илья Бояшов. Путь Мури (2007)].

The meaning of the answer in (23) is actually equivalent to *она берет таблетки от соседей*; while in (24), corresponding to the position and the translocation, the answer can be understood as similar to *он сейчас в своем жилище* and *он пошел к своему жилищу*. The case where *L* occupies the complement position is also ample evidence of the need for a correction to the core expression  $A+V+r+L$  of this semantic field. Otherwise, when the spatial relationship represented by *r* is expressed through the verb *V*, the situation of *L* as a complement is also consistent with the core expression, but this case is obviously not the primary means of expressing the semantic field.

*L* occupies the syntactic position of the subject. According to Gak, this structure is often used as a conversion of the adverbial structure or the object structure (TFG, 1996, 22). The answer in the Russian Q-A unity, when *L* occupies the subject position, is almost always a non-animal noun, and it also has the characteristics of a locative marker. As it is shown in the following examples:

(25) *Горбачев спросил: — Откуда металл будете брать?*

— *У нас будет металлургия.* [Жамбын Батмунх: *насилие не применять* (2002) // Проблемы Дальнего Востока, 2002.12.30].

(26) — *Куда же вы? — крикнул им вслед Коновязов.*

— *Нам предстоит сейчас общий обед.* [Леонид Зорин. *Глас народа* (2007–2008) // Знамя, 2008].

(27) — *Где производится нелегальный спирт?*

— *Регионы риск — это Кабардино-Балкария, Северная Осетия, Московская область.* [Екатерина Выхухолева. Валерий Губанов: «Непонятно, кто будет бороться с алкоголизмом» (2002) // Известия, 2002.12.30].

The answer in (25) expresses the equivalent of the meaning of *мы будем брать металл из будущей металлургии*, the answer in (26) actually expresses the meaning of *мы сейчас*

идём на общий обед, and the answer in (27) is also a conversion of the adverbial structure в регионах риска.

*L* occupies the syntactic position of predicate. The answer specifies the locative relationship through the predicate, which is implied by means of the verb's semantic pattern. Since the semantic roles contained in the verb point to the subject or the object, sometimes to the locative maker, the locative semantics will be of lesser significance, such as:

(28) *Кто-то спрашивал: — Откуда она столько колосьев набрала?*

*— С лета запасла, — отвечали ему, — каждый день в поле воровать ходила.*

[Ф. К. Сологуб. Мелкий бес (1902)].

(29) *— Куда они его? — спросила Ирина.*

*— Работать, — хмуро ответила Снежана.* [В. Токарева. Своя правда // Новый Мир, 2002].

(30) *— А где ты был?*

*— Где был, где был? Рыбалил.* [В. Астафьев. Затеси (1999) // Новый мир, 2000].

The examples show that when other syntactic positions than the adverbial position are filled to express the locative semantics, the meaning of the locatives will be weakened by the influence of the semantic factors of these positions themselves, and at the same time it will have other meanings such as the subject, the object, the purpose, etc. However, the deep structure of all these means of expressions is similar in that they all reflect certain spatial relationships. The secondary forms are characterized by their metaphorical and metonymical aspects. The initial and primary meanings of the secondary structures will penetrate into the locative meaning, thus constituting a combination of multiple meanings, such as the meaning of object-locative, subject-locative, and behavior-locative. Therefore, in terms of the semantic relationships, these structures will lose their locative meaning to varying degrees, resulting in a continuum of the locative meaning associated with other meanings.

## Conclusion

This paper analyzes the primary and secondary expressions of the locative semantic field in the Russian Q-A unity. By incorporating the locative semantic field into the special context of the Q-A unity, we have found some new features. In the question, the complete form of the core expression is *Откуда/Куда/Где + A + V*. At the same time, the structure is subject to variants depending on contextual and situational factors. While answering, the primary expression of this semantic field is the concrete manifestations in the adverbial positions. In this case, all the components of the locative situations are expressed through independent elements and therefore can represent the maximum variety of the locative relationship. What is located in the marginal part of this semantic field is when the locative semantics is expressed through syntactic positions other than the adverbial position.

Based on the theories of functional grammar and the analysis of the examples, this paper combines purely theoretical research with specific contexts, and can provide a certain reference for subsequent quantitative research. For example, in terms of a particular corpus, the proportion of the primary and the secondary means of expression of the semantic field, which methods are used more frequently in the secondary means, and which are only theoretically feasible, but rarely used in discourses, thereby establishing a distribution model of the means of expression of the semantic field.



## СПИСОК ИСТОЧНИКОВ

1. Jiang, H. (2020). *Constructive Study of Russian Functional Grammar Theory and Western Systematic Functional Linguistics*. Peking University Press.
2. Paducheva, E. V. (2004). *Utterance and its correlation with reality*. Nauka.
3. Rakhilina, E. V. (1990). *Semantics or syntax? (Answering WH-Questions in Russian)*. Sagner.
4. TFG. (1987). *Theory of functional grammar: Introduction. Aspectuality. Temporal localization. Taxis*. Nauka.
5. TFG. (1996). *Theory of functional grammar: Locativity. Being. Possessivity. Causality*. Nauka.
6. Vsevolodova, M. V., & Vladimirskiy, E. Y. (1982). *The ways of expressing spatial relations in the Modern Russian language*. Russkiy yazyk.
7. *Russian National Corpus*. (2023, July 17). <https://ruscorpora.ru/>

## References

1. Jiang, H. (2020). *Constructive Study of Russian Functional Grammar Theory and Western Systematic Functional Linguistics*. Peking University Press. (In Chinese).
2. Paducheva, E. V. (2004). *Utterance and its correlation with reality*. Nauka. (In Russ.).
3. Rakhilina, E. V. (1990). *Semantics or syntax? (Answering WH-Questions in Russian)*. Sagner. (In Russ.).
4. TFG. (1987). *Theory of functional grammar: Introduction. Aspectuality. Temporal localization. Taxis*. Nauka. (In Russ.).
5. TFG. (1996). *Theory of functional grammar: Locativity. Being. Possessivity. Causality*. Nauka. (In Russ.).
6. Vsevolodova, M. V., & Vladimirskiy, E. Y. (1982). *The ways of expressing spatial relations in the Modern Russian language*. Russkiy yazyk. (In Russ.).
7. *Russian National Corpus*. (2023, July 17). <https://ruscorpora.ru/> (In Russ.).

## Notes

1. E. V. Paducheva (1935–2019) also conducted in-depth research on the relationship between questions and answers in Russian.
2. Gak also mentioned the attributive positions when discussing the secondary means. However, this case cannot be included in the Q-A unity for study, because the structure appears mainly in the form of phrases, and it is most commonly used in the substitution of adjectives for finite clauses or prepositional phrases, consider the example given by Gak: *сражение, которое произошло под Бородином, — сражение под Бородином — Бородинское сражение*. (TFG, 1996, 23).

## Примечания

1. Е. В. Падучева (1935–2019) также провела углубленное исследование взаимосвязи между вопросами и ответами на русском языке.
2. Гак также упомянул атрибутивные позиции при обсуждении вторичных средств. Однако этот падеж не может быть включен в единицу вопросов и ответов для изучения, поскольку структура проявляется в основном в виде фраз и чаще всего он используется при замене прилагательных конечными предложениями или предложно-конструкторскими словосочетаниями; рассмотрим пример, приведенный Гак: *сражение, которое произошло под Бородином, — сражение под Бородином — Бородинское сражение*. (ПФП 1996, 23).

*Информация об авторе*

**Цзи Сяоцзюнь** — доктор филологических наук, доцент, заведующий кафедрой русского языка и литературы Сучжоуского университета.

*Information about the author*

**Ji Xiaojun** — Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Russian Language and Literature, Soochow University.

*Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.*

*The author declares no conflict of interest.*