

Nominal vs. Adjectival Adnominals in Russian Fiction: Relationship and Distribution

*Sergey Andreev*¹

Abstract. The article studies the relationship between adjectival and nominal adnominals (nouns in attributive function) in Russian prose fiction. The corpora include the works of six Russian female writers whose novels represent two different genres – literary fiction (belles-lettres fiction) and genre fiction (entertaining fiction). The results obtained demonstrate that all the authors follow similar implicit rules of setting the same relationship between the two classes of adnominals, irrespective of the genre and the period of the writers’ creative activity. The Zipf-Alekseev function proved to fit well the distribution of distances between adjectival adnominals in the texts. The counts of distances between them corroborated Skinner’s hypothesis.

Keywords: distribution, adjectival and nominal adnominals, Zipf-Alekseev function.

Attributes (adnominals), the main means of description, playing a highly important role in elaborating topics, are characterized by an important feature – in verbal syntactic structures, their syntactic positions are not obligatory in most cases, and thus are highly optional, depending on the author’s inclinations, literary taste, and may serve as an explicit criterion of the peculiarities of authors’ styles.

The latter stimulated research aimed at finding out the level of freedom of the authors in using adnominals, their frequency, proportions of different types and patterns. A number of aspects related to the regularities of the use of adnominals and their distributions have been investigated on the material of different languages (Köhler, Altmann, 2014; Altmann, 2015; Andreev, Popescu, Altmann, 2017a; Místecký, 2019).

Depending on the part of speech, one can single out in Russian (as well as in many other languages) two main classes of adnominals – adjectival and nominal ones. Adjectival adnominals (A-ADs) in Russian include the following types:

- A – adjective (“*krasivaya rosa*” – *a beautiful rose*);
- AY – adjectival phrase (“*ves’ma trudnoye zadaniye*” – *a highly difficult task*);
- PTA – adjectivized participle (“*igral’nye karty*” – *playing cards*);
- DETF – demonstrative pronoun (“*eta kniga*” – *this book*);
- DETN – negative pronoun (“*nikakaya rabota*” – *no work*);
- DETH – indefinite pronoun (“*kakaya-to kniga*” – *some book*);
- DETF – qualifying pronoun (“*vse knigi*” – *all books*);

¹ Smolensk State University, Przhevalsky str. 4, Smolensk 214000, RF, e-mail: smol.an@mail.ru.

- DETS – possessive pronoun (“yego drug” – *his friend*);
DETV – relative pronoun (“ya sprosila, kakoy knigi net” – *I asked which book was missing*);
DETW – interrogative pronoun (“kakoy knigi net?” – *which book is missing?*).

Inclusion of the above-mentioned types of pronouns into the category of adjectival attributes is based on their morphological, semantic, and syntactic features similar to those of accrual adjectives in Russian, which is why they are often called pronouns-adjectives (Shvedova 1980). It should be underlined that at a deeper stage of classification, they fall into an independent class of determiners. Comparison of determiners and adjectives in their attributive function on the grounds of the data-base of Czech sonnets of the 19th and 20th centuries was carried out by M. Místecký and brought about interesting and important results of the relations between these two classes (Místecký, 2019).

The other class of adnominals includes those which are expressed by a noun. In Russian, their structures are as follows:

- G – genitive case (“kniga rasskazov” – *a book of short stories*);
PR – prepositional pattern (“kniga dlya detey” – *a book for children*);
AP – apposition (“Neznakomets, chelovek srednego vozrasta, podoshel ko mne” – *The stranger, a middle-aged man, came up to me*; “kapitan Smollett” – *Captain Smollett*);
N-Case – instrumental and dative cases (“Ocharovaniye knigoy” – *fascination with the book*; “pis’mo drugu” – *letter to a friend*).

The study of the relationship between adjectival and nominal adnominals is usually limited to their two, most frequent types: type A and type G (genitive construction) (Andreev, Místecký, Altmann, 2018: 45–50). In the present study, we set the task to analyze complete sets of types in adjectival and nominal classes.

Though both A-ADs and N-ADs participate in the description of the fiction world, they nevertheless display distinct differences, which consist in the manner how description is realized. If A-ADs give a direct, immediate, and to some extent straightforward description of a theme, nominal attributes combine at least two different basic functions – first of all, they denote so-called fiction (poetic) motifs² (objects, notions), and only secondly exercise description. This dual nature is especially noticeable in some cases which the following examples can demonstrate.

- (1) The book [1] of my (DET-Adj) friend (G) [1].
- (2) Light (A) unevenness [2] in his (DETS) gait (PR) [2] of a brave (A) soldier (G) [1] (Galbraith).

In (1), the noun “friend” is modified by the possessive pronoun “my” and at the same time, it is a modifier (G) of the other noun, “book”. In (2), the descriptive pattern is more complicated – a number of nouns are modified by adnominals (adjectival and nominal) and, at the same time, they realize the adnominal function of a modifier. Numbers in square brackets show the adnominal valence of the modified nouns, i.e. how many adnominals modify the given

² The term “motif” here is used as a literary one, meaning the smallest (minimal) plot-forming unit” (Gasparov, 1997). In quantitative linguistics, it is now used in a different meaning denoting a sequence of elements, organized according to the principles of non-descending quantity of a given feature, and was introduced by R. Köhler (Köhler, 2008; Köhler, Naumann, 2008; Köhler, Naumann, 2016).

*Nominal vs. Adjectival Adnominals in Russian Fiction:
Relationship and Distribution*

noun. The adnominal patterns in (2) are: “light unevenness”; “unevenness in gait”; “his gait”; “gait of a soldier”; “brave soldier”.

In both examples, noun adnominals retain their nominal features, which are emphasized by the fact that they themselves are modified by attributes, but at the same time realize a descriptive function as adnominals.

During the investigation of the relationship of the two types of description, the following questions arise. What is the relationship of A-Ads and N-ADs in different works of the same author and in the works of different authors? Are the proportions constant for the same individual, or do they change over time? Is there any stable proportion of A-Ads and N-Ads in speech in general? Is there any order in their distribution?

To address these questions, the data-base which included 6 feminine Russian authors (V. Tokareva, T. Tolstaya, L. Ulitskaya, A. Marinina, T. Ustinova, and T. Polyakova) was organized. The choice was motivated by the following reasons. (1) All of the authors are of the same gender, which excludes or minimizes possible differences of style due to the gender factor. (2) All authors are very popular among the readers of different literary tastes, which presupposes that their style and manner of description are accepted by public at large. (3) The works represent different stages of the creative activity of the authors. They include one of the first, one of the latest novels, and the works written by each author during the intermediate period. The list of the authors and their works is given in the appendix. (4) The genres of their novels are rather different: three first authors are writers of the so-called belles-lettres style, the last three belong to the sphere of entertaining fiction (more exactly – detective literature). In the first case, the works are usually attributed to “literary fiction”, in the second case – to “genre fiction”.

Each author is represented by five samples of 1,000 words from 5 books. All of them were taken from the beginning of the novels.

To assess the relationship of A-type (adjectival attributes) and genitive constructions, the coefficient of attributiveness was introduced in Andreev, Místecký, Altmann (2018: 45–46), which is similar to Busemann’s coefficient (Altmann, 2015) and the formula of which is:

$$(1) \quad T = \frac{A}{A + N},$$

where T is the coefficient of attributiveness, A – all the attributes (adjectival adnominals), N – all the nominal attributes.

The coefficient values can vary between 0 and 1. High values of this coefficient ($T > 0.5$) show that A-ADs play a more important role in description, low values of the coefficient ($T < 0.5$) indicate the predominance of N-ADs in the style of the author.

To test the results, the chi-square statistic was used (Andreev, Místecký, Altmann, 2018):

$$(2) \quad \chi^2 = \frac{(A - N)^2}{A + N}.$$

The coefficient is statistically significant with 1 degree of freedom and $p < 0.05$ if $\chi^2 > 3.84$.

In this study, we shall also use this coefficient. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
T-coefficient and Chi-square

Text	A-ADs	N-ADs	T-coef.	Chi-square
T1	82	40	0.67	14.46
T2	70	38	0.65	9.48
T3	75	32	0.70	17.28
T4	76	45	0.63	7.94
T5	107	58	0.65	14.55
T6	161	50	0.76	58.39
T7	134	67	0.67	22.33
T8	135	55	0.71	33.68
T9	104	41	0.72	27.37
T10	121	48	0.72	31.53
T11	97	53	0.65	12.91
T12	211	76	0.74	63.50
T13	205	89	0.70	45.77
T14	174	84	0.67	31.40
T15	137	51	0.73	39.34
T16	91	50	0.65	11.92
T17	114	48	0.70	26.89
T18	125	44	0.74	38.82
T19	60	40	0.60	4.00
T20	126	53	0.70	29.77
T21	128	52	0.71	32.09
T22	96	53	0.64	12.41
T23	86	33	0.72	23.61
T24	101	43	0.70	23.36
T25	113	60	0.65	16.24
T26	87	41	0.68	16.53
T27	93	22	0.81	43.83
T28	116	54	0.68	22.61
T29	105	33	0.76	37.57
T30	81	36	0.69	17.31

As seen from the table, all the values of T-coefficient are statistically significant. The attributive style is observed in all cases, but the range over which this coefficient varies in these texts is 0.6 – 0.81. This adjectival priority was to be expected as a straightforward strategy of description, but the difference between low and high values of T-coefficient in various novels should be recognized as rather substantial. This fact points out to certain differences of the

*Nominal vs. Adjectival Adnominals in Russian Fiction:
Relationship and Distribution*

visualization of the fiction world and raises the question of stability of the manner of depicting such a fiction world.

As has been mentioned above, each author in the present data-base is represented by five works. To analyze the variability of the A-ADs vs. N-ADs relations in different works of the same author, the coefficient of variation was used

$$(3) \quad V = \frac{\sigma}{M} * 100\% ,$$

where V is the coefficient of variation, σ is the standard deviation, and M is the mean. The lower the coefficient is, the lower the level of dispersion is. The results are given in Table 2.

Table 2
Coefficients of variation of the values of T-coefficient

Author	Genre	Coefficient of variation (%)
Tokareva	Literary fiction	8.19
Tolstaya	Literary fiction	11.97
Ulitskaya	Literary fiction	12.22
Marinina	Genre fiction	17.23
Ustinova	Genre fiction	11.31
Polyakova	Genre fiction	20.90

The coefficient shows a rather small variability for all the authors. The lowest variability is observed among the works of Tokareva (the group of “high style” literary fiction), and the highest variability is demonstrated in Polyakova’s novels (“entertaining” genre fiction). On the whole, belles-lettres fiction authors have lower variability than the authors of entertaining fiction, but this difference is very small and in one case (Ustinova) is not found altogether.

Since the variability is rather small, it makes sense to establish the overall index of attributiveness for each author.

Table 3 contains mean values of nominal and adjectival adnominals in the works of each author and the corresponding figures of T-coefficient.

Table 3
Mean values of T-coefficient for each author

Author	N-ADs mean	A-ADs mean	T-coefficient	Chi-square
Literary fiction				
Tokareva	42.6	82	0.66	12.74
Tolstaya	52.2	131	0.72	34.66
Ulitskaya	70.6	164.8	0.70	38.58
<i>Total</i>	<i>55.1</i>	<i>125.9</i>	<i>0.70</i>	<i>27.68</i>

Genre fiction (detective stories)				
Marinina	47	103.2	0.68	22.28
Ustinova	48.2	104.8	0.69	21.54
Polyakova	37.2	96.4	0.72	27.57
<i>Total</i>	<i>44.1</i>	<i>101.5</i>	<i>0.70</i>	<i>22.58</i>

In all these cases, the results are statistically significant and demonstrate nearly the same mean scores, irrespective of the genre or date. This is to some extent unexpected, as one might suppose that literary fiction possesses a more elaborate and less direct style of depicting plot motifs.

Speaking of stability of the type of description over time, it is possible to carry out research examining the relationship between the date of writing a novel and its description type. Table 4 contains the dates when the novels were written and gives the corresponding values of T-coefficient.

Table 4
Relations of the date of writing and the type of description

Tokareva			Tolstaya			Ulitskaya		
Text	Date	T-coef.	Text	Date	T-coef.	Text	Date	T-coef.
T1	1991	0.67	T6	1987	0.76	T11	1975	0.65
T2	1994	0.65	T7	1998	0.67	T12	1992	0.74
T3	2004	0.70	T8	2000	0.71	T13	1996	0.70
T4	2015	0.63	T9	2007	0.72	T14	2003	0.67
T5	2018	0.65	T10	2015	0.72	T15	2010	0.73

Marinina			Ustinova			Polyakova		
Text	Date	T-coef.	Text	Date	T-coef.	Text	Date	T-coef.
T16	1993	0.65	T21	1997	0.71	T26	2002	0.68
T17	1996	0.70	T22	2000	0.64	T27	2005	0.81
T18	2001	0.74	T23	2004	0.72	T28	2009	0.68
T19	2010	0.60	T24	2010	0.70	T29	2012	0.76
T20	2017	0.70	T25	2017	0.65	T30	2016	0.69

There does not seem to be any correlation between the date of writing and the extent to which the nominal style intensifies or decreases. These three tests have demonstrated that the relationship between the two strategies of description is rather stable.

One more aspect of exploring the relationship between adjectival and nominal adnominals is to analyze if there is any order in which these attributes, namely A-ADs, are arranged on the syntagmatic axis in the text in relation to N-ADs. In other words, one will be able to find out whether there is any order in the changeability of these two types of description over the text. Technically, this question may be solved by different methods, such as runs, measuring the number of homogeneous sequences of attributes of the same type (Andreev, Místecký,

*Nominal vs. Adjectival Adnominals in Russian Fiction:
Relationship and Distribution*

Altmann, 2018: 50), repeat-rate, which shows the concentration of elements (Altmann, Köhler, 2015), and some others.

In the present article, we chose a different method – the one of establishing distances between A-ADs in relation to N-ADs. This will also help us to check whether Skinner's hypothesis is observed here (Andreev, Popescu, Altmann, 2017b). According to this hypothesis, similar elements occur closer to one another, i.e. have smaller distances from one another in speech (Skinner, 1941).

As an example of establishing such distances in our study, let us take the first sentence from T4. After all adnominals were marked in this sentence, they formed the following sequence:

A, PR, A, A, APR, DETS, PR,

and after transforming them into adjectival (A-AD) and nominal (N-AD) classes, we get
A-AD, N-AD, A-AD, A-AD, N-AD, A-AD, N-AD.

Between the first and the second adjectival adnominals, there is one nominal N-AD. This is why we count the distance as one ($D = 1$). The second adjectival adnominal is followed immediately by the third one (distance $D = 0$), the fourth occurs after one nominal adnominal ($D = 1$), etc.

After counting all the distances between adjectival adnominals in the texts, these distances were ranked in descending order, and the Zipf-Alekseev function was used to fit their distribution (Hřebíček, 2002):

$$(4) \quad f_x = f_1 x^{a+b \cdot \ln x},$$

where f_1 is the maximum frequency of the most numerous distance, a and b – parameters, x – the frequency of the given distance.

The results are given in Table 5.

Table 5
Fitting the Zipf-Alekseev function to the distribution
of lengths of distances in 30 novels (D – distances, Em – empirical data, Th – theoretical
values counted on the basis of the function)

Tokareva														
T1			T2			T3			T4			T5		
D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th
0	12	12.00	0	15	15.00	0	10	10.00	0	19	19.00	0	17	17.00
1	8	8.57	1	7	7.59	1	5	6.11	1	10	10.09	1	12	12.82
3	6	5.94	3	5	4.85	2	5	4.18	2	6	5.59	2	10	8.14
2	5	4.24	4	5	3.45	4	4	3.07	3	3	3.34	5	4	5.18
4	4	3.12	2	2	2.61	3	3	2.36	9	2	2.11	3	3	3.38
5	2	2.37	5	2	2.07	5	1	1.88	4	1	1.40	4	3	2.28
8	1	1.83	11	1	1.69	6	1	1.53	5	1	0.97	7	1	1.58
10	1	1.45				7	1	1.27	6	1	0.69			

						8	1	1.07	7	1	0.50			
R ² = 0.9731 a = -0.219 b = -0.384			R ² = 0.9736 a = -0.904 b = -0.113			R ² = 0.9405 a = -0.570 b = -0.203			R ² = 0.9973 a = -0.572 b = -0.493			R ² = 0.9690 a = 0.044 b = -0.650		

Tolstaya														
T6			T7			T8			T9			T10		
D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th
0	13	13.00	0	21	21.00	0	16	16.00	0	17	17.00	1	18	18.00
1	11	10.10	1	19	16.96	1	15	14.14	1	8	8.08	0	10	10.59
2	6	7.19	4	7	10.40	2	8	9.85	3	5	4.69	2	8	6.77
4	5	5.18	2	6	6.25	3	8	6.70	2	3	3.03	5	4	4.63
3	4	3.82	3	5	3.83	4	4	4.62	6	2	2.11	3	3	3.33
6	3	2.89	5	5	2.42	5	4	3.25	4	1	1.53	4	3	2.49
11	3	2.23	8	1	1.57	7	3	2.33	7	1	1.16	10	2	1.91
7	2	1.75	9	1	1.05	6	1	1.71	12	1	0.90	7	1	1.50
5	1	1.40	11	1	0.72	8	1	1.27	14	1	0.71			
14	1	1.13							18	1	0.58			
R ² = 0.9793 a = -0.064 b = -0.433			R ² = 0.9469 a = 0.258 b = -0.817			R ² = 0.9689 a = 0.270 b = -0.648			R ² = 0.9971 a = -0.902 b = -0.246			R ² = 0.9872 a = -0.551 b = -0.309		

Ulitskaya														
T11			T12			T13			T14			T15		
D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th
1	17	17.00	0	21	21.00	2	23	23.00	1	28	28.00	0	13	13.00
0	14	13.29	1	18	16.17	0	21	22.09	0	17	18.68	2	12	12.79
2	7	8.15	4	8	10.92	1	15	15.29	2	13	12.05	1	11	8.51
4	5	4.94	2	7	7.42	3	12	10.09	3	11	8.06	3	3	5.33
3	3	3.07	3	7	5.17	4	10	6.70	4	5	5.61	4	3	3.35
5	3	1.96	6	5	3.70	5	2	4.52	5	3	4.03	5	2	2.14
6	1	1.29	8	2	2.71	6	1	3.12	7	2	2.98	8	2	1.40
7	1	0.87	12	2	2.03	7	1	2.19	8	2	2.25	6	1	0.94
8	1	0.60	5	1	1.54	8	1	1.57	6	1	1.73	7	1	0.64
			7	1	1.20	9	1	1.15	10	1	1.36	9	1	0.45
			10	1	0.94	16	1	0.85	7	1	0.50	14	1	0.32
			11	1	0.75									
			13	1	0.60									

*Nominal vs. Adjectival Adnominals in Russian Fiction:
Relationship and Distribution*

$R^2 = 0.9886$ $a = 0.181$ $b = -0.773$	$R^2 = 0.9659$ $a = -0.003$ $b = -0.539$	$R^2 = 0.9617$ $a = 0.478$ $b = -0.773$	$R^2 = 0.9784$ $a = -0.269$ $b = -0.454$	$R^2 = 0.9423$ $a = 0.598$ $b = -0.895$
---	--	---	--	---

Marinina														
T16			T17			T18			T19			T20		
D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th
0	36	36.00	0	21	21.00	0	18	18.00	0	15	15.00	1	14	14.00
1	21	22.34	1	8	8.98	1	6	6.72	1	11	10.91	0	10	11.37
2	15	13.53	2	6	5.28	3	5	4.02	2	6	5.77	3	9	8.18
4	10	8.58	4	5	3.57	8	3	2.87	3	2	3.01	2	7	5.91
3	5	5.69	3	3	2.62	2	2	2.25	7	2	1.61	4	5	4.35
5	3	3.92	6	1	2.02	4	2	1.86	4	1	0.90	6	3	3.28
6	3	2.79	8	1	1.61	5	2	1.59	5	1	0.52	7	2	2.52
8	1	2.04	11	1	1.32	6	1	1.40	6	1	0.31	5	1	1.97
9	1	1.52	23	1	1.11	7	1	1.26				9	1	1.56
11	1	1.16				10	1	1.14						
23	1	0.90				12	1	1.05						
						14	1	0.98						
$R^2 = 0.9930$ $a = -0.342$ $b = -0.499$			$R^2 = 0.9845$ $a = -1.174$ $b = -0.075$			$R^2 = 0.9922$ $a = -0.517$ $b = 0.139$			$R^2 = 0.9905$ $a = 0.242$ $b = -0.101$			$R^2 = 0.9654$ $a = 0.021$ $b = -0.464$		

Ustinova														
T21			T22			T23			T24			T25		
D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th
0	18	18.00	0	19	19.00	0	11	11.00	0	13	13.00	0	19	19.00
1	18	17.70	1	12	12.53	1	7	6.75	1	9	9.37	1	12	12.90
2	10	9.91	2	9	7.42	4	4	4.29	2	7	6.41	2	10	8.02
4	4	5.09	3	3	4.51	3	3	2.88	4	4	4.50	3	4	5.11
3	2	2.62	5	3	2.85	5	2	2.03	5	4	3.25	4	3	3.39
5	2	1.39	4	2	1.87	2	1	1.48	3	2	2.42	5	3	2.32
6	2	0.76	6	1	1.27	6	1	1.11	8	2	1.85	7	1	1.64
8	2	0.43	7	1	0.89	7	1	0.86	12	1	1.44	9	1	1.18
7	1	0.25	10	1	0.63	11	1	0.67				12	1	0.87
9	1	0.15				14	1	0.54						
13	1	0.09												

$R^2 = 0.9816$ $a = 0.863$ $b = -1.280$	$R^2 = 0.9835$ $a = -0.163$ $b = -0.630$	$R^2 = 0.9926$ $a = -0.443$ $b = -0.378$	$R^2 = 0.9859$ $a = -0.179$ $b = -0.424$	$R^2 = 0.9778$ $a = -0.170$ $b = -0.560$
---	--	--	--	--

Polyakova														
T26			T27			T28			T29			T30		
D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th	D	Em	Th
0	14	14.00	1	8	8.00	0	16	16.00	0	7	7.00	0	11	11.00
1	14	13.76	4	3	3.22	1	13	12.04	3	7	6.54	2	10	9.88
3	3	4.05	0	2	2.12	2	6	8.10	2	5	5.04	1	6	5.71
2	2	0.99	2	2	1.66	3	6	5.51	4	3	3.79	3	2	3.11
5	2	0.24	5	2	1.42	4	5	3.86	6	3	2.87	4	2	1.71
7	2	0.06	8	1	1.27	5	4	2.77	1	2	2.21	5	1	0.97
4	1	0.02	11	1	1.17	6	1	2.04	8	2	1.72	6	1	0.57
9	1	0.01	14	1	1.10	9	1	1.54	9	2	1.36	10	1	0.34
17	1	0.00	20	1	1.05	10	1	1.18	5	1	1.09	15	1	0.21
$R^2 = 0.9497$ $a = 1.861$ $b = -2.722$			$R^2 = 0.9842$ $a = -1.493$ $b = 0.259$			$R^2 = 0.9573$ $a = -0.052$ $b = -0.517$			$R^2 = 0.9655$ $a = -0.246$ $b = -0.497$			$R^2 = 0.9801$ $a = 0.602$ $b = -1.092$		

Skinner's hypothesis on the whole holds, because short distances dominate. Still in some cases, this rule is less obvious. Thus in three novels by Ulitskaya (T11, T13, and T14), the biggest frequency is observed not for the shortest distance (0), but for distances 1 or 2. Such neutralization of Skinner's law is also observed in one text by Tolstaya (T10) and Marinina (T20). In several texts, the differences between the first three distance ranks are very small (T8, T15, T21, T26, and T30).

Judging by these results, the main opposition in the manner of description is observed between Tokareva and Ulitskaya, both authors belonging to the class of literary fiction. Marinina and Ustinova, highly popular among the readers of detective-stories and using mostly colloquial language, demonstrate Skinner's tendency much better than two literary fiction authors (Tolstaya and Ulitskaya).

The results also demonstrate that the Zipf-Alekseev function fits very well the distribution of distances between the adjectival adnominals, which corroborates an order in choosing different types of description.

Overall, the study of the relationship between two main strategies of description of the world of fiction by modern female Russian authors has demonstrated that the authors preferred direct adjectival description of the fiction world over the nominal strategy. The authors of belles-lettres style (literary fiction) in some works resort to this adjectival description a little stronger than the authors of mass entertaining literature (genre fiction), but on the whole, they do not differ in this respect very much.

Judging by the values of the coefficient of attributiveness, the ratio between these two strategies is approximately 3:1 and remains more or less constant over time for each author, regardless of the period of creative activity of the author or genre in which the she is writing. This means that each author's style – as regards the relations between nominal and adjectival

strategies – is implicitly controlled by some common trend or similar pattern of combining the two types of description.

The Zipf-Alekseev function fits well the distribution of the distances of adjectival adnominals, showing that it is governed by some general rules.

The results of this study should be tested on a broader range of material, including the authors of different genres, genders, literary schools, and writings in various languages.

References

- Altmann G.** (2015). *Problems in Quantitative Linguistics 5*. Lüdenscheid: RAM-Verlag.
- Altmann, G., Köhler, R.** (2015). *Forms and Degrees of Repetitions in Texts. Detection and Analysis*. Berlin / Munich / Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Andreev, S., Místecký M., Altmann G.** (2018). *Sonnets: Quantitative Inquiries. Studies in Quantitative Linguistics 29*. Lüdenscheid: RAM-Verlag, 2018.
- Andreev, S., Popescu I.-I., Altmann G.** (2017a). Some properties of adnominals in Russian texts. *Glottometrics* 38, 77–106.
- Andreev, S., Popescu I.-I., Altmann G.** (2017b). Skinner's hypothesis applied to Russian adnominals. *Glottometrics* 36, 32–69.
- Gasparov M. L.** (1997). "Snova tuchy nado mnoyu..." Metodika analiza. *Izbranniye trudy. T. II. O styhah*. Moscow: Yaziki Russkoy kul'tury, 9–20.
- Hřebíček, L.** (2002). Zipf's Law and Text. *Glottometrics* 3, 27–38.
- Köhler, R., Altmann G.** (2014). *Problems in Quantitative Linguistics 4*. Lüdenscheid: RAM-Verlag.
- Köhler, R.** (2008). Sequences of linguistic quantities. Report on a new unit of investigation. *Glottology* 1(1), 115–119.
- Köhler, R. and Naumann S.** (2008). Quantitative text analysis using L-, F- and T-segments. *Data Analysis. Machine Learning and Applications*. Berlin / Heidelberg: Springer, 2008, 637–646.
- Köhler, R., Naumann S.** (2016). Syntactic Text Characterisation Using Linguistic S-Motifs. *Glottometrics* 34, 1–8.
- Místecký, M.** Five Ways of Investigating Adnominals in Czech Sonnets of the 19th and 20th Centuries. *Glottology* 9(2), 173–200.
- Skinner, B. F.** (1941). A quantitative estimate of certain types of sound-patterning in poetry. *The American Journal of Psychology* 54, 64–79.
- Shvedova, N. Yu.** (1980; chief ed.). *Russkaya grammatika* [Russian Grammar]. Moscow: Akademiya Nauk, Nauka.
- Zörnig, P.** (2010). Statistical simulation and the distribution of distances between identical elements in a random sequence. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 54, 2317–2327.
- Zörnig, P.** (2013a). A continuous model for the distances between coextensive words in a text. *Glottometrics* 25, 54–68.
- Zörnig, P.** (2013b). Distances between words of equal length in a text. In: Köhler, R. Altmann, G. (eds.), *Issues in Quantitative Linguistics 3. To honour Karl-Heinz Best on the occasion of his 70th birthday*. Lüdenscheid: RAM-Verlag, 117–129.

Appendix

Author	Title	Number	Year
V. Tokareva	Skazat' – ne skazat'	T1	1991
	Den' bez vranya	T2	1994
	Ptitsa schastya	T3	2004
	«Samyj schastlivyj den' (Rasskaz akseleratki)»	T4	2015
	Nu i chto?	T5	2018
T. Tolstaya	Milaya Shura	T6	1987
	90-60-90	T7	1998
	Nozhki	T8	2000
	Reka	T9	2007
	Shodit v magazin	T10	2015
L. Ulitskaya	Lestnica yakova	T11	1975
	Sonechka	T12	1992
	Medeya i ee deti	T13	1996
	Iskrenne vash Shurik	T14	2003
	Zelenyj shater	T15	2010
A. Marinina	Igra na chuzhom pole	T16	1993
	Stilist	T17	1996
	Zakon trex otricanij	T18	2001
	Lichnye motivy	T19	2010
	Angely na ldu ne vyzhivayut	T20	2017
T. Ustinova	Moj general	T21	2002
	Dom-fantom v pridano	T22	2005
	Na odnom dyxanii	T23	2009
	Srazu posle sotvoreniya mira	T24	2012
	Zhdite neozhidannogo	T25	2016
T. Polyakova	Dengi dlya killera	T26	1997
	Baryshnya i xuligan	T27	2000
	Bochka no-shpy i lozhka yada	T28	2004
	Moe vtoroe ya	T29	2010
	Zmej-soblaznitel'	T30	2017