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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The present study is a comparative investigation of Theme and thematic progression in English and in Russian. While monolingual thematic studies have a long history in Linguistics, comparative studies are relatively few, in particular for the given language pair. A corpus-based approach combined with the manual analysis of semantic categories describing Themes and thematic progression and statistical processing of the results is designed to demonstrate the importance of these phenomena in translation evaluation and pedagogy.

1.1 Background

In the translation process, translators tend to focus primarily on the content of the message, trying to achieve accuracy at word, collocational and grammatical levels (Kim 2007:1). However, when a careful consideration is not given to thematic choices and thematic development, even an accurate translation may sound unnatural to the target audience. Investigating the role of thematic progression in translation pedagogy and evaluation, however, is not simple. While what is often referred to as semantic mistranslation (when a target language segment distorts or obscures the meaning of a corresponding source language segment) is often an obvious issue, problems related to textual meaning are often less obvious. A more in-depth understanding of both languages
and, specifically, of the basics of thematic progression is necessary in order to address these issues effectively.

Many linguists have studied the concepts of Theme and Rheme. Brown and Yule emphasize the importance of thematic development when they note that what comes in the initial position in a text influences the interpretation of everything that follows (1983: 133). Just as the title influences the interpretation of the text that follows, so, too, the first sentence of the first paragraph influences the interpretations not just of the paragraph itself but also of the remaining text. Every sentence "forms part of a developing, cumulative instruction which tells us how to construct a coherent representation" (134).

Grimes introduces the term “staging” which is consonant with Brown and Yule’s use of thematization: “Every clause, sentence, paragraph, episode, and discourse is organized around a particular element that is taken as its point of departure. It is as though the speaker presents what he [or she] wants to say from a particular perspective” (1975: 323). In his work, Grimes explores how linear organization can be manipulated in order to give greater prominence to some elements of discourse over others. In the same vein, Halliday describes the “information focus”, explaining that in each information unit, the primary point of information focus is followed by a secondary one (1967: 203). He also explains how thematic organization is reflected in different features of English syntax, including certain conventions for word order (205).

While extensive research has been conducted on the interdependence of salience phenomena (i.e., giving prominence to some elements of discourse with the help of Theme and Rheme) and Theme-Rheme organization (Hasan and Fries 1995, Firbas
1995), the macrostructural dimension and its relevance to translation have been somewhat neglected in translation literature (Gerzymisch-Arbogast, 2007: 594). On the macrostructural textual level, Theme-Rheme organization is generally regarded as an indicator of coherence. Utterance connectors can be classified in the following way according to their informational status:

- **thematic indicators**, which refer to information previously mentioned in the text, e.g., adverbials of summation (‘to sum up’, ‘in short’, ‘briefly’), reformulation (‘in other words’, ‘that is to say’), result (‘so’, ‘therefore’, ‘as a result’, ‘accordingly’, ‘hence’);
- **rhematic indicators**, which point to subsequent new information units, e.g., adverbials of contrast (‘however’, ‘on the contrary’, ‘but’) or replacement (‘instead’, ‘rather’, ‘alternatively’);
- **framework-oriented indicators** which indicate the general setting, “the framework of mutual attention”, e.g., adverbials of exemplification and particularization (‘for example’), digression (‘as for’, ‘incidentally’, ‘with respect to’, ‘by the way’), or enumeration (‘finally’) (595).

In translation, such “transphrastic links” help to increase readability and overcome grammatical and cultural differences between the two languages” (596).

Brown and Yule (1983: 125-153) demonstrate that various genres and varieties of English make use of the important first position in a clause or sentence, which they refer to as “thematizing,” in different ways. Their findings have revealed that adverbial phrases of time tend to occur as initial elements in a detective story; adverbial phrases of place—
in a travel brochure, and the grammatical subject referring to the writer’s topic entity—in an encyclopedic entry (140); moreover, interactional conversational speech often thematizes the pronouns I and you (143).

It is, therefore, important to know what kind of Theme is conventional for different genres or text-types since “in the creation of a certain text, we are constantly influenced by texts of a similar kind” (Ghadessy 1995: 143), and the creation of translated texts is no exception. Ghadessy finds grammatical and lexico-semantic differences between Themes of written sports commentary and other genres, concluding that specific thematic choices are necessary for moving a particular discourse forward (144). In the same vein, Whittacker concludes that academic articles can be expected to be characterized by a low number of interpersonal Themes, which would explain the generally impersonal tone of such articles (1995:125).

Overall, thematic organization provides a structural framework for the discourse, relates back to the main intention of the speaker or writer, and provides a perspective on what follows (Brown and Yule 1983:143). Fries also notes that initial position is used to indicate the patterns of organization of a text: “…the information contained within the themes of all sentences of a paragraph creates the method of development of that paragraph. Thus , if the themes of most of the sentences of a paragraph refer to one semantic field…then that semantic field will be perceived as the method of development of the paragraph” (1983: 135).

Echoing these observations, Martin correlates thematization to the degree of success in writing at a particular workplace (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial
Research Organization). The recommendations that he gives are dependent on the genre of the text. While experiential Themes, which refer to aspects of the topic (e.g., grammatical subjects), help orient the reader looking for information, interpersonal Themes (e.g., pronouns), which refer to the speaker, hearer, writer or reader, are preferable in order to make the discourse more personal, which, however, may result in longer processing time and less clarity (1986:23 cited in Berry 1995: 58-59).

In spite of its importance, the topic of Theme and Rheme has not been extensively covered in translation-related literature. Most of the existing studies are concerned with whether the thematic patterning of the source text should be respected or altered in the target text and how it enhances coherence. The number of works dealing with Theme and Rheme in Russian translation is especially small. Thus, the purpose of the present study is to address the existing gap in the field of Translation Studies as well as to test Toury’s law of interference (Toury 1995: 274). More specifically, it suggests a theoretical framework that is applicable to both the source language (English) and the target language (Russian) and allows the researcher to answer the following questions:

1) Do English source texts, Russian target texts, and Russian non-translated texts belonging to the same genre use the same types of thematic progression?

2) Are the ways of connecting the Theme to the previous context the same in English source texts, Russian target texts, and Russian non-translated texts?
3) Is the number of clauses between such connectors the same in English source texts, Russian target texts, and Russian non-translated texts?

This dissertation uses three corpora in order to answer the research questions and to test the research hypotheses: and English source text corpus, a Russian target text corpus, and a Russian comparable corpus, composed on non-translated Russian texts of the same text-type as the source text corpus. The English source text corpus was collected from the online version of the magazine *National Geographic*. The Russian target text corpus contained translations of those texts gathered from the online Russian version of this magazine. The Russian comparable corpus included articles from the Russian online journal *V mire Zhivotnykh*. In all, 3,000 clauses were analyzed. The list of texts from the three corpora is presented in the bibliography at the end of the dissertation.

1.2 Research Hypotheses

The three research hypotheses of this dissertation address the topic of Theme and thematic progression from a corpus-based perspective. More specifically, the first hypothesis states that no significant differences exist in the number of Simple Linear thematic progression and Constant thematic progression that occur in the three types of corpora used in this study: English source text corpus, Russian target text corpus, and Russian comparable corpus due to the fact they all belong to the same genre and thus share common features of functional sentence perspective.

The second hypothesis holds that the connectors between Themes and the previous context are different in the Russian target text corpus and the Russian
comparable corpus. The Russian target texts are expected to reproduce the connectors of the English source texts, which are expected to be significantly different from those of the non-translated Russian texts. This expectation is based on Toury’s law of interference (1995:275).

The third hypothesis states that the number of clauses between the given Theme and the nearest Theme or Rheme to which it relates in the previous context, or Textual Connectivity, is significantly different in the Russian Target Text corpus and the Russian comparable corpus. Also due to the law of interference, the Russian Target Texts are expected to exhibit the features of the English source texts with respect to this category. The closer links are considered indicators of a more coherent text.

1.3 Research Method

The use of corpora offers many benefits to the translation scholar. Sinclair (1992) explored the way corpora can be used to improve the performance of translators as well as that of machine translations. Corpora allow researchers not only to identify universal features of translation and the translation norms operating in a given socio-cultural context, but also to study a number of other theoretical issues, such as translation as process, the size and nature of the unit of translation, and the nature and limits of equivalence (Baker 1993: 244). Bowker (2001) provides a number of suggestions on how to use corpora in translation evaluation and translation pedagogy.

The definitions of Theme and Rheme are based on the theory of functional sentence perspective developed by the Prague School linguists. According to that theory,
what is being spoken about in an utterance is called the Theme, and what is said about it, the Rheme. However, in order to separate the Theme and the Rheme in an utterance, this definition is not sufficient. Thus, the technique known as a question test was employed (Ann Hatcher 1956, Daneš 1970, Sgall 1974, Hajičová 1984, SHeviakova 1976, Krylova and Khavronina 1976, 1984). Based on the context, the most appropriate hypothetical question was formulated for each utterance. The words of the utterance present in the appropriate question are considered the Theme, whereas the words absent from the question and thus carrying the new information are considered the Rheme.

In order to test the research hypotheses of the given study it is also important to select the unit of analysis, i.e., the segment of a text where the Theme and Rheme will be marked. Literature review has shown that there is no agreement among linguists in that respect. Some of them consider the orthographic sentence as the unit of analysis (Whittaker 1995, Lowe 1987, Lotfipour-Saedi and Rezai-Tajani 1996, Thomas and Hawes 1997, and Gosden 1996, cited in McCabe 1999). Others examine thematic patterns in clauses (Francis 1989, 1990, Ghadessy 1995, Hasan 1991). In addition, for his analysis, Fries chooses units larger than a clause but smaller than a sentence, which he describes as “independent conjoinable clause complexes” (1995: 49 cited in McCabe 1999: 69-70). In this dissertation, given the definitions of Theme and Rheme adopted, the clause (independent or dependent) was selected as the most appropriate unit of analysis.

In order to test the first research hypothesis, thematic progressions in the three corpora were compared. Thematic progression types are borrowed from a well-known
model proposed by the Czech linguist František Daneš (1974).\(^1\) Daneš’ model is modified for the purpose of the present study. As a result, the number of Simple Linear, Constant, Complex thematic progressions, and Peripheral Themes is counted within a paragraph. Quantitative analysis is performed by using one-way ANOVA testing.

In order to test the second hypothesis, all possible relationships between Themes and previous Themes or Rhemes within a paragraph were described by using the following 13 types of connectors: *Lexical Repetition, Modified Repetition, Paraphrase, Noun, Pronoun, Inference, Explicitation, Wh-element, Hypertheme, Hypotheme, Pronominal Reference, Nominal Reference, and Adjectival Clause*. The connectors were singled out based on the preliminary analysis of the first three texts (an English source text, a Russian target text and a Russian non-translated text). Statistical Analysis was performed by applying the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA followed by a post-hoc pair-wise test, the significance level of which was adjusted using the Bonferroni correction.

In order to test the third hypothesis, the number of clauses between the given Theme and the Theme or the Rheme to which it belongs is counted and compared between the three corpora. Quantitative analysis consists of performing a one-way ANOVA and the post-hoc Tukey HSD test.

\(^1\) It was also used by Nwogu 1990, Weissberg 1984, and Gómez 1995 (all cited in McCabe: 1999:190).
1.4 Significance of the Study

The transfer of Theme and Rheme in translation is an understudied area in Translation Studies. This dissertation is an attempt to address that gap as well as to test Toury’s law of interference (1995:275). The present work offers a theoretical framework that is applicable to both English and Russian and allows the researcher to answer the research questions stated above. While it is based on previous studies of Theme and Rheme in the fields of Linguistics and Translation, no existing approach without modifications was suitable for carrying out the analysis with the given language pair (for instance, while the Hallidayan model is not applicable to Russian, it is easier to apply than the Prague School approach which does not offer a straightforward framework for a quantitative analysis).

Based on the results of the study, conclusions are made concerning thematic choices, patterning, and thematic connectors across the three corpora. The reviewed literature shows that these linguistic phenomena play an essential role in discourse. They orient the reader throughout the text by contributing to the text’s coherence and readability, connect and develop ideas, emphasize important information, and reflect linguistic and cultural conventions, as well as the author’s style. Moreover, their skillful usage has a positive impact on the quality of writing (Witte and Faigley 1981: 195; Silva 1993; Ventola 1992). Finally, the results of the analysis are reviewed in terms of their relation to Toury’s law of interference and to the translation universal avoidance of repetitions, and practical recommendations are given to translators, editors, trainers, and others involved in the language industry.
In addition, pedagogical suggestions for the translation classroom are put forward. Their goal is to raise the awareness of textual issues in translation in general and of the role of the Theme and Rheme in particular; to help students acquire the knowledge and skills needed to articulate the problems they encounter and the solutions they come up with at the textual level; and to demonstrate the impact of the thematic choices and progressions on readability and cohesion. Moreover, the collected corpus can be used in the classroom to show advantages of using corpora in translation. It can also be applied to research of other related linguistic features, such as cohesion and coherence, punctuation, collocations, and sentence and paragraph length.

Finally, future directions are proposed. They include adding texts to the corpora and increasing the number of sources in order to make the results more generalizable as well as investigating other genres and languages pairs. The conclusion also provides suggestions on how to make the study process-based as opposed to product-based.

1.5 Organization of the Study

This dissertation consists of six chapters. Following the Introduction, Chapter 2 contains a literature review of the major linguistic approaches to the study of Theme and Rheme, including those that describe the Theme and Rheme specifically in Russian, as well as a review of works that deal with the problem of Theme and Rheme in Translation Studies. Chapter 3 provides a detailed description of the corpus-based methodology, as well as the lexico-semantic and statistical tools used in the analysis of the results. Chapter 4 reports both quantitative and qualitative findings. Chapter 5 discusses the results of the
findings in the light of relevant theories of translation as well as previous studies, providing recommendations to translators, editors, trainers, and others involved in the language industry. Chapter VI offers pedagogical suggestions regarding how to teach the topic of Theme and Rheme to students of translation. It also contains a discussion of the limitations of the present study and of future research directions.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

2.1 The Hallidayan Approach to Theme and Rheme

According to Halliday, the Theme is “the element which serves as the point of departure of the message, it is that with which the clause is concerned” (1985: 38). Halliday and some other linguists who shared his position on Theme and Rheme, such as the primarily systemic linguists Quirk and Greenbaum, assigned the Theme to the initial position of the clause exclusively, meaning that the reverse order—Rheme followed by Theme—was not possible. This is the major difference of this approach from that of the Prague School, whose members considered Theme as known information that may take any position within a clause or even be absent from the clause. Halliday, however, emphasizes that “first position in the clause is not what defines the Theme; it is the means whereby the function of Theme is realized” (39). He calls the remainder of the message the Rheme.

A major distinction that Halliday makes is that between simple and multiple Themes. Simple Theme can be realized by a nominal group (“halfpenny”, “the smallest English coin”), adverbial group (“very carefully”), or prepositional phrase (“on Friday

---

2 It should be noted that the Prague School linguists also used other terms, besides Theme, e.g., Topic, Given, Basis, as will be explained further in this work.
night”). It is also not uncommon for the Theme to consist of two or more elements forming a single complex element within the clause (“the Walrus and the Carpenter”, “Tom, Tom, the piper’s son”, “from house to house”, “One hundred and fifty years ago, on 15 September 1830”). Nominalization is a structural feature, as in the constructions “what the duke gave to my aunt”, “how my aunt came by that teapot”, that also serves a thematic purpose. It is referred to as a “thematic equative” because it identifies the Theme and at the same time equates it with the Rheme (Halliday 1985: 39-42).

When the part of the clause functioning as Theme has its own internal structure, Halliday defines it as a *multiple Theme*: when the initial element of the clause is not a subject, complement or circumstantial adjunct, then the following subject, complement or adjunct is still part of the Theme (1985: 53). The internal structure of a *multiple Theme* is based on the functional principle that a clause is simultaneously a representation of experience, an interactive exchange and a message. Further, Halliday introduces three *metafunctions* (*ideational, interpersonal and textual*)—more general functional concepts to which the three aspects of meaning of a clause mentioned above can be related.

*Ideational meaning* represents an experience of the world, including the world inside us and the world of our imagination. The *ideational function* of the clause represents actions, events, processes and relations.

*Interpersonal meaning* is associated with a form of action: it allows the speaker or writer to do something to the reader or listener by means of language. The
interpersonal function of the clause can be expressed by means of statements, questions, offers and commands, together with accompanying modalities, by means of which rhetorical interaction takes place.

*Textual meaning* denotes relevance to the context: the preceding and the following text, as well as the situational context. The textual function of the clause is to construct a message. (Halliday 1985: 53).

Halliday further describes the thematic components that realize the three metafunctions (Table 1). The textual element within the Theme may have a combination of continuative, structural and conjunctive Themes. *Continuatives* are items such as *yes, no, well, oh, now*, which signal a new move or, in a dialogue, a move to the next point. A *structural Theme* includes *coordinating conjunctions* (*and, or, nor, either, neither, etc.*), *subordinating conjunctions* (*when, while, before, after, even if, in case, etc.*), as well as *definite relatives* (*which, who, that, etc.*) and *indefinite relatives* (*whatever, whichever, whoever*). A *conjunctive Theme* is one of the *conjunctive adjuncts* (*rather, in any case, in short, etc.*).

The *interpersonal element* may include a *modal Theme* expressed by a *modal adjunct* (*probably, hopefully, understandably, etc*), the *finite verb*, in a *yes/no* interrogative clause and also a *vocative element*, which may occur anywhere, but typically marks the beginning of the *interpersonal Theme* or follows the *modal adjunct* (if there is one).
Table 1. Components of a multiple Theme (Halliday 1985:54).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metafunction</th>
<th>Component of Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Continuative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural (Conjunction or WH-relative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conjunctive (Adjunct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Vocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal (Adjunct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finite (Verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WH-(interrogative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational</td>
<td>Topical (Subject, Complement or Circumstantial Adjunct)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *ideational element* within the Theme is an entity functioning as *subject, complement* or *circumstantial adjunct*, which Halliday refers to as the Topical T. This way, the *ideational element* represents a process, a participant in the process (a person, a thing, an institution, etc.) or a circumstance (time, place, manner, etc.).

The typical sequence of these elements is: textual ^ interpersonal ^ ideational (^=followed by). The sequence of the first two elements may be modified, which will bring the effect of being *marked*, but the ideational component is always the final one, and everything that follows the first ideational element is a part of the Rheme. The Theme always contains an ideational element (53-54).

Fries (1983:117), who compared the two most influential approaches to Theme and Rheme—the Hallidayan and that of the Prague School—refers to the former as "separating" and the latter as "combining". For the "separators", the information that is known or obvious in the situation and the information from which the speaker proceeds do not define the same concept (the Theme), while for the followers of Czech linguist Vilém Mathesius they usually do.

2.2 **The Prague School Approach to Theme and Rheme**

2.2.1 **Henri Weil**

According to Alvin Leong Ping, Henri Weil (1818-1909) is “the pioneer in theme-rheme studies” (2004: 49). For Weil, the “point of departure” was “an initial notion which is equally present to him who speaks and to him who hears, which forms, as it were, the ground upon which the two intelligences meet”, as well as "another part of
discourse which forms the statement” (1978: 29). Weil then provides an example of how the fact that Romulus founded the city of Rome can be expressed in several different ways in some languages while preserving the same syntax. For instance, while Romulus is the subject, founded—the attribute, and Rome—the direct object in all three versions of the Latin sentence, three different things are expressed based on the distribution of the elements with the "point of departure, the rallying point of the interlocutors” being Romulus in the first case (Idem Romulus Romam condidit), Rome—in the second (Hanc urblem condidit Romulus), and the idea of founding in the third (Condit Romam Romulus) (29-30). Weil explains that although the syntax remains the same, the progression of the thought changes, and so does the word order (30). Thus, there are two different movements: one is objective and is expressed by syntactic relations while the second one, expressed by the succession of the words, is subjective (30). According to Weil, the greatest importance should be attached to the order of words because it reflects “the individuality of thought,” which varies, unlike the syntax (30).

Comparing Weil’s and Halliday’s conceptions of theme, Alvin Leong Ping (2004: 49-50) concludes that although they are similar in a broad sense, there are two main differences. First, while Weil links the point of departure to given information, Halliday (1994: 299) differentiates between the two, describing the Theme and the Rheme at the clausal level and the given and new—beside the clause level. Besides, Halliday’s Theme always takes the initial position in the clause, whereas Weil allows for the reverse order and thus the point of departure is not always determined by its initial position.
At the text level, Weil talks about “transitions of thought”, of which there are two distinct types (1978: 41). One is parallel—when the initial notion is related to the whole notion of the previous sentence—while the second one is progressive—when it is related to the goal of the preceding sentence (41). According to Alvin Leong Ping (2004: 50), later works of Daneš (1974) and Enkvist (1973) on thematic progression were based on Weil’s ideas on transition patterns.

2.2.2 Vilém Mathesius

The founder of the Prague School of linguists, Vilém Mathesius (1882-1945), refers to Henri Weil as the first scholar who noticed that a declarative sentence, as well as any other type of sentence, regularly contains two basic content elements that are denoted by different names among the scholars, i.e. the basis of the utterance/ the Theme/ the psychological subject and the nucleus/ the Rheme/ the psychological predicate. The basis is defined as “the element about which something is stated”, whereas the nucleus is “what is stated about the basis” (Mathesius 1975: 81). Mathesius then presents an example of a narration that has a very simple order of these elements: the Rheme of the preceding sentence becomes the Theme of the following one (81). This narrative structure is evident in fairy tales: “Byl jednou jeden král. A ten král mě dva syny. Ty synové… [Once upon a time there was a king. And the king had two sons. The sons…]” (81). Such patterning of the sentence into the Theme and Rheme is described as functional sentence perspective (82). Mathesius emphasizes the importance of functional sentence analysis in its compete and correct form and warns against choosing a Theme that has not yet been stated in the previous sentence and introducing rhematic elements too early, since the
reader (or hearer), who expects the Rheme to be the culmination of the utterance, may misinterpret them in that case (82).

In regular sentences containing the Theme and the Rheme the order that takes into account the hearer is Theme-Rheme. Such a movement from what is known to what is new is called the “objective order since the speaker takes into account the particular situation and conforms to the usual mental procedure” (83). It is conventional for unemotional narration (as in the example about the king cited above). The reverse Rheme-Theme order is also possible. Such an arrangement is used to express excitement and is called the subjective order: “Dva syny měl ten král. A do světa se chtěli podívat ti synové. [Two sons the king had. And the world the sons wanted to see.]” (84).

2.2.3 Jan Firbas

Jan Firbas (1921-2000) worked on the topic of Theme and Rheme for several decades (Firbas 1964, 1974, 1975, 1978, 1979, 1986, 1987, 1992, 1996). His approach to Theme is not invariably linked with the initial position in the sentence. While known (context-dependent) information is always thematic, the Theme may also express new (context-independent) information. Whether the information conveyed by the Theme is context-dependent or context-independent, it always carries the lowest degree of communicative dynamism (CD). It means that the information contained in the Theme contributes least to the development of the message of the sentence.

For instance, a context-independent adverbial element can become thematic if it serves as a setting; a context-independent subject—when it serves as a quality-bearer; a
context-independent verb becomes thematic in the absence of a setting and in the presence of a subject that serves as “a phenomenon appearing, or existing on the scene” (1987:141). The temporal and modal exponents of the finite verb (TMEs) provide the boundary between thematic and non-thematic sections of the sentence or clause.

Firbas further illustrates the tendency in English to make the subject thematic and for the T to remain unchanged in shorter or longer sequences of sentences through a slightly altered and abridged example of Mathesius (1975: 101-102): “At school, George got on very well. He eagerly listened to every word of his teachers. At home, he was helped by his father whenever he found his task too difficult” (Firbas 1987: 141). In this example, George/he remains the Theme throughout the entire sequence, including in the subordinate whenever-clause. Besides George/he, there are two other thematic elements in the given example: At school and at home (141-142).

In a situation when the flow of communication has already concerned George for some time and the given sequence has been elicited by a question about George’s school days, George has acquired “the status of a long-lived theme …which in the sequence under examination has come to operate as a hyper theme” (142). At the same time, it functions as a Theme proper in each clause. Being so well embedded in the flow of communication, the Theme George carries the lowest degree of CD. At school, however, is a “diathematic” element that carries the highest degree of CD in the T. At home is also “diathematic”, because, being context-independent, it introduces new information into the Theme (142).
If the situation were different and the given sequence opened a narration, the elements *George/he, At school, and At home* would be thematic again, however, with a different character of thematicity. *George*, if mentioned for the first time in the thematic position, would not be the long-lived Theme, as it is the case in the example above. It will, instead, acquire its hyperthematic character gradually (142).

Besides context dependence, which has been discussed earlier, another important characteristic of Theme is the “aboutness feature”, which is always associated with a thematic element (143), i.e., a thematic element indicates what the sentence will be about. Firbas concludes that while both features of Theme—“aboutness” and context dependence—are associated with the lowest degree of CD in a sentence, the former is hierarchically superior to the latter. The two features are “isolatable, but in actual fact they cannot be severed from each other, for they do not operate irrespective of each other's existence” (145).

In regard to the notion “point of departure”, Firbas emphasizes that it is a term of interpretative and not linear arrangement, “the foundation-laying element of the lowest degree of CD”, which may or may not be the first element in the sentence (145).

### 2.3 An Alternative Account: Alvin Leong Ping

Having critically examined and evaluated the Hallidayan account of Theme and Rheme, Alvin Leong Ping concludes that an alternative, “more encompassing” approach is needed in the Theme-Rheme research than the one that equates the initial element of a clause with the metafunctional categories of language (2004: 130). Some questions
remain unanswered: Why should only the first experiential component be considered the topical Theme? How certain can we be that no other components are thematic? When an element is classified as thematic because it occurs in the initial position and it carries textual, interpersonal, or experiential meaning, how does it contribute to our understanding of the way in which Rheme develops Theme? Do ill-formed constructions also have a Theme-Rheme structure as long as there is an initial element with textual, interpersonal, or experiential meaning? How can the Hallidayan framework be applied above the clause level? Can this be done in terms of the metafunctions of language as well? What criteria can be used to separate different text-level Themes? (130).

Based on those shortcomings in Halliday’s approach, Ping suggests an alternative way to understand the notions of Theme and Rheme based on the “knowledge structures (or schemata) of language users and how they facilitate the generation of expectations or inferences during language processing, be it in anticipating the development of some clausal message or establishing the degree of appropriateness between elements within the clause” (153). Schema is understood as a knowledge structure guiding both information acceptance and retrieval, i.e., it determines how we process new information as well as retrieve old information from memory (159). Inferences, which can be either forward- or backward-looking, facilitate text comprehension (176). Usually, inferences are discussed at the level of the text between sentences or paragraphs, however backward inferences operate within the clause as well.
Ping draws our attention to the fact that our processing of information depends to an extent on what is presented to us first—the initial element. One function of the initial element that has not been sufficiently studied is that it permits the generation of forward inferences as constrained by the language user's schemata (179).

The Inference-Boundary, or IB, model proposed by Ping is summarized in Figure 1. The ellipse in Figure 1 represents the boundary of acceptability generated by the Theme—that is, all possible continuations of the thematic element. The encoder selects only one of all the possible Rhemes within such a boundary. Those Rhemes that fall outside the boundary cannot co-occur with the Theme because it would result in a mismatch. The two important factors that shape the boundary of acceptability activated by the Theme are the context and the relevant schemata $S_1$ (related to language form) and the world in general ($S_2$). The generated schemata comprise the most updated knowledge structures that include "our knowledge of the conduct of conversation, that it is a co-
operative activity where the information that is transacted between or among discourse participants is relevant” (190). Ping suggests that the interplay of context and schemata allows us to extend the IB model to the instances of figurative language.

Based on the fact that the thematic head activates a boundary that omits the impossible Rs, it can be said that it constrains what comes after it. This phenomenon is referred to as the principle of acceptable message development (the AMD principle) which postulates that “the thematic head of a well-formed thematic segment must be acceptably developed by a well-formed rheme in the context of the interactive encounter, whether in the written or spoken mode” (191). Thus, the Theme identification process is represented in the form of a simple flowchart (Figure 2).

According to Ping the IB model has a number of strengths. One is that it takes into full account the role of the Rheme, since the Theme generates the boundaries of acceptability for the occurrence of the Rheme. In addition, it acknowledges the operation
of the *AMD principle*, which underlies our written and oral speech. The fact that most of the time we process linguistic inputs without much difficulty indicates that generally the Theme-Rheme pairs strictly adhere to the AMD principle (277).

In this way, the IB approach may help us to understand why some stretches of language are difficult to process. It can be the case when the reader or listener does not share the encoder’s schema of the world in general and/or of the language, as in the example: “The plane the ball John kicked hit broke” (278). This is difficult to comprehend also because it is center-embedded and adds to the cognitive load of the reader. Furthermore, some semantically well-formed constructions sound odd or unacceptable either when they are used inappropriately in a given context or if the Theme is developed by “a borderline, weakly-possible Rheme” (as in *Singapore enjoyed a heavy snowfall yesterday*) or “impossible Rheme” (as in *Singapore gave birth to a baby boy yesterday*) (278). These two examples illustrate how our acceptance of the message is impeded when there is a conflict or tension in the Theme-Rheme arrangement.

Ping also discusses restrictions on the proposed model. Given that it is decoder- and not encoder-centered, there may be situations when what is taken for the Theme is not what was intended by the encoder. Such erroneous perceptions are often the result of “ambiguous constructions or the lack of a sufficiently-elaborate schema on the part of the decoder” (282).

Moreover, while the IB model is concerned with Theme and Rheme, it is less effective in explaining how other forms of communication that do not lend themselves to thematic analysis (e.g., non-clauses like “Exit” or “Hock Huat Construction and..."
Engineering Services”) (283). Overall, there are at least two challenges associated with the given model. One concerns the empirical validation of some of its claims, while the second one concerns its applicability to languages other than English. The future directions proposed by Ping are based on these two challenges.

In general, the two most influential approaches to Theme and Rheme are the Prague School (Mathesius, Firbas, Fries, Sgall, Daneš, Enkvist) and Hallidayan approaches. It is obvious that Halliday’s model is more straightforward and easy to apply. However, as Baker notes in her comparison of the two approaches, one of its disadvantages is “its partial circularity: theme is whatever comes in initial position and whatever comes in initial position is theme” (1992: 140-141). In addition, Halliday’s approach fails to relate descriptions of Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) languages with relatively fixed word order, such as English, to descriptions of languages with relatively free word order, e.g., Russian.

Huddleston (1991) also sees several problems with Halliday’s view of Theme and Rheme, which can be best demonstrated with the example of the following pair of sentences:

a) Wouldn’t the best idea be to join the group?

b) Isn’t the best idea to join the group?

Following Halliday, in (a) the topical Theme is the best idea, since wouldn’t does not constitute an element with an ideational function, unlike isn’t, which carries an ideational function and thus satisfies the definition of the topical Theme (96).
The second problem concerns the existential *there*-construction (e.g. *There is nothing he could do about it*), where *there* represents a topical Theme for Halliday, although he says explicitly that *there* has no representational, or ideational, function (96).

In spite of those shortcomings, Halliday’s framework has been applied to languages other than English. Simmons (1987: 346-347) uses it to analyze thematic structures in Russian; Jalilifar (2009) studies thematic differences in original English and translated Persian texts using Halliday’s categories; Kim’s (2007) investigation of Theme in Korean, a Subject-Verb-Object language with a flexible word order, draws on systemic functional linguistics, devised by Halliday; and McCabe (1999) analyzes the Theme/Rheme construct in English and Spanish history textbooks based on Halliday’s model.

The Prague School position on Theme/Rheme and given/new, which is referred to as *functional sentence perspective*, is significantly distinct from Halliday’s, as has been shown above. Proponents of that approach treat language as a functioning system adapted to its communicative role (Hajičová 1994: 245). The Prague School position can be especially appealing for translators who focus on the communicative function of the text. At the same time, that position is very complex and there are different and competing approaches within this tradition (Baker 1992: 160). Moreover, many of the examples that are provided are decontextualized and represent simple sentences, which is not always helpful in the analysis of complex and compound clauses. The approach that has been used in this work is based on the descriptions and methods of analysis of Theme and
Rheme designed for Russian and also applicable to English (Krylova and Khovronina (1976), Bailyn (2012), SHeviakova (1976), Adamec (1966)).

2.4 Theme-Rheme Structure in Russian

2.4.1 Adamec

The first linguist who applied the theory of functional sentence perspective of the Prague School to Russian was Adamec (1966) (Bailyn 2012: 257). Using the terms of Mathesius (1975), Adamec describes each sentence in terms of the Basis of the utterance (Osnova) and the Nucleus (Adro). He defines the Basis as “that part of a sentence which is given, known or fully obvious and which serves as the departure point for the transference of actual [topical] information” (translated by Bailyn 2012: 258). The new important information of the utterance is contained not only in the Nucleus, but also, and to a greater extent, in its relationship with the Basis.

According to Adamec, the Basis can consist of one or several components (21):

a) Клим (1) пошёл домой. [Klim (1) poshēl domoi]. (Klim-NOM(1) went home).

b) Рабочие (1) фрезу (2) не приняли. [Rabochie (1) frezu (2) ne prinial]. (Workers-NOM(1) cutter-ACC (2) NEG accepted).[The workers did not accept the cutter].

c) Помощников присяжных поверенных (1) она (2) теперь (3) презирала.[Pomoshchnikov prisiazhnikh poverennikh (1) ona (2) teper’(3) prezirala].
(Assistants-GEN [jury delegates]-GEN (1) she-NOM (2) now (3) despised).

[Now she hated assistants of jury delegates].

Adamec also notes that there may be more than one way to divide a sentence into the Basis and the Nucleus as in the example below:

a) После завтрака(1) Даша пошла на курсы.[ Posle zavtrakа (1) Dasha poshla на kursy].(After breakfast-GEN (1) Dasha-NOM went to courses-ACC). [After breakfast Dasha attended the courses].

b) После завтрака (1) Даша (2) пошла на курсы.[ Posle zavtrakа (1) Dasha (2) poshla на kursy].(After breakfast-GEN (1) Dasha-NOM (2) went to courses-ACC). [After breakfast Dasha attended the courses].

Although Adamec does not suggest using the question test to determine whether (a) or (b) is more appropriate, he does emphasize that the choice of the Basis is determined by the context and situation. Therefore, it would not be wrong to use the question test to decide where the border between the two components of the functional sentence perspective is. Adamec does note that when the Basis is expressed by the grammatical subject or complement, it has more pronounced thematic features than when it is expressed by an adverbial or circumstantial modifier (22).

Likewise, the question test could be used to determine the thematic element in this sentence (Adamec notes that it is unclear where na mokrom asfal’tе (on wet asphalt) is thematic (22):
На мокром асфальте отражались городские огни. [Na mokrom asfal'te otrazhalis' gorodskie ogni]. (On [wet asphalt]-PREP reflected [city lights]-NOM). [City lights were reflected on the wet asphalt].

Depending on the context, which is not provided, it may be appropriate for the hypothetical question to be: Что отражалось на мокром асфальте? [Chto otrazhalos' na mokrom asfal'te?] (What was reflected on the wet asphalt?), thus making the thematic element of this utterance На мокром асфальте отражались [Na mokrom asfal'te otrazhalis'] (On [wet asphalt]-PREP reflected). There are, in fact, many instances like this one, when it is problematic to determine what constitutes the Nucleus (22).

Like other researchers, Adamec describes sentences with zero Basis:

a) Раздался крик. [Razdals'ia krik]. (Sounded cry-NOM). [A cry sounded].

b) Наступила тишина. [Nastupila tishina]. (Began silence-NOM). [Silence took over].

c) Пришла весна. [Prishla vesna]. (Came spring-NOM). [Spring came].

Situations in which a verb constitutes the Basis are rare, and in such sentences the verb is not thematic, but rather represents a special type of its own (22).

2.4.2 Krylova and Khavronina

Word Order and Functional Sentence Perspective in Non-Emotive Speech in Russian

According to Krylova and Khavronina, “the theme denotes (names) the subject of the message, while the rheme bears the message itself, the relevant information on the theme” (1976: 17). Such a division of a sentence into the Theme and the Rheme, referred
to as functional sentence perspective, helps the speaker to express the goal of the conversation. For example, if this goal is to say who visited them, the sentence serving this purpose will be built as follows:

(1) У меня в гостях был Виктор. [U menia v gostiakh byl Viktor]. (At me-GEN in guests-PREP was Viktor-NOM). [I was visited by Victor].

The subject of this message, or its Theme, “indicates the familiar fact” (У меня в гостях был) [U menia v gostiakh byl], while the Rheme, marked here and throughout in bold-face italics, “introduces something new, something which is uppermost in the speaker’s mind, i.e., the Rheme names the guest: Виктор [Viktor]” (17).

A change of the purpose of the utterance would affect the functional sentence perspective. If the speaker’s goal is to provide information about a specific person, for example, Victor, the sentence carrying such information will be formed differently from the previous one:

(2) Виктор был у меня в гостях. [Viktor byl u menia v gostiakh]. (Viktor-NOM was at me-GEN in guests-PREP). [Victor paid me a visit].

In this case, a familiar person Виктор [Viktor] is the subject of the message, its Theme, while the information about him (был у меня в гостях) [byl u menia v gostiakh] is the Rheme. It becomes clear that the functional sentence perspective is reflected in different word order.

Such word order is used in conjunction with a specific “narrative” intonation, when “the Theme is pronounced with a slightly rising tone, and the Rheme, with a considerable fall in tone and a strong stress. Both the logical and the phrase stresses fall on the last
syllable of the sentence and they coincide: Виктор был у меня в гостях. [Viktor byl u menia v gostiah]. У меня в гостях был Виктор. [U menia v gostiakh byl Viktor].

In order to build a sentence and arrange words in it correctly, it is important to find the Theme and the Rheme and, in non-emotive speech, place the Theme before the Rheme. The hypothetical question that can be answered by the given sentence helps to distinguish the border between the Theme and the Rheme: the part of the information contained in the question and consequently repeated in the answer constitutes a familiar fact, the Theme, whereas the rest of the answer to this question is the Rheme.

(1) Кто идёт к тебе навстречу? [Kto idet k tebe navstrechu?] (Who going to you-DAT toward?) [Who is going toward you?]

Ко мне навстречу идёт Анна. [Ko mne navstrechu idet Anna]. (To me-DAT toward going Anna-NOM). [Anna is going toward me].

(2) Что делает Анна? [Chto delaet Anna?](What doing Anna-NOM?) [What is Anna doing?]

Анна идёт ко мне навстречу. [Anna idet ko mne navstrechu]. (Anna-NOM going to me toward). [Same translation as (1)].

(3) Что у Анны в папке? [Chto u Anny v papke?](What at Anna-GEN in folder-PREP?) [What does Anna have in the folder?]

У Анны в папке учебники. [U Anny v papke uchebniki]. (At Anna-GEN in folder-PREP textbooks-NOM). [Anna has textbooks in the folder].

(4) Где учебники? [Gde uchebniki?](Where textbooks-NOM?) [Where are the textbooks?]
Учебники у Анны в папке. [Uchebniki u Anny v papke]. (Textbooks-NOM at Anna-GEN in folder-PREP). [The textbooks are in Anna’s folder].

In dialogues, answers often contain only the Rheme since the Theme is included in the question and thus can be omitted in the answer.

(5) – За чем он уходил? [Za chem on ukhodil?] (Why he-NOM left?) [Why did he leave?] – За тетрадью. [Za tetrad’iu]. (For notebook-INSTR). [To get a notebook].

(6) – Как чувствует себя Анна? [Kak chuvstvuet sebǐ Anna?] (How feeling herself Anna-NOM?) [How is Anna feeling?]


In a narration, there is a semantic connection between sentences, therefore, the functional sentence perspective of every sentence is determined by its relation to the previous sentence. For example:

[Съёмочная площадка была подготовлена.] Она представляла собой старинную крестьянскую избу. Слева, недалеко от входа, стоял деревянный стол. На столе стоял кувшин и кружка. Вдоль стен тянулись лавки. В центре избы располагалась огромная русская печь. Окна были маленькие, подслеповатые (19).

([Shooting area-NOM was prepared.] It-NOM represented itself-INSTR [old peasant house]-ACC. To the left, not far from entrance-GEN, stood wooden table-NOM. On table-ACC stood jar-NOM and mug-NOM. Along wall-GEN stretched benches-NOM. In center-PREP house-GEN situated [huge Russian oven]-NOM. Windows-NOM were small, “weak sighted”].)

[[The shooting area was prepared.] It was an old peasant house. On the left, not far from the entrance, there was a wooden table. On the table, there was a jar and a mug. Along the wall, there were benches. In the middle of the house, there was a huge Russian oven. The windows were little and “weak sighted”].

Without the context, it may be difficult to determine the Theme and the Rheme in a sentence. For example, the sentence below:

Летом мы собираемся поехать на Волгу. [Letom my sobiraemsia poekhat' na Volgu]. (Summer-INSRT we-NOM going to go to the Volga-ACC). [In summer we are going to go to the Volga].

Depending on the situation when it was produced, this sentence can be the answer to several different hypothetical questions. In a situation where this sentence answers the hypothetical question (1) or (2), the T is летом мы [letom my] and the R—собираемся поехать на Волгу [sobiraemsia poekhat na Volgu].

(1) “Какие планы у вас на лето?” [Kakie plany u vas na leto?] (What plans-NOM at you-GEN on summer-ACC). [What are your plans for the summer?]

(2) “Что вы будете делать летом?” [CHto vy budete delat' letom?] (What you-NOM will do summer-INSTR?”)[What will you do in summer?]
However, if the given phrase answers the third question, the Theme is летом мы собираемся поехать [letom my sobiraemsia poekhat], and the Rheme—на Волгу [na Volgu].

(3) “Куда вы собираетесь поехать летом?” [Kuda vy sobiraetes' poekhat' letom?] (Where you-NOM going go summer-INSTR). [Where are you going to go in summer?]

(Krylova and Khavronina 1984: 123).

The examples above emphasize the importance of the context for the functional sentence perspective approach.

Composition of the Component Parts of a Functional Sentence  Perspective

It has been shown in the examples above that different parts of the sentence can serve as a Theme or a Rheme. For example, the Theme can be expressed by:

a. the subject:

Охотник выстрелил. [Okhotnik vystrelil]. (Hunter-NOM shot). [The hunter shot].

b. the predicate:

Выстрелил старый охотник. [Vystrelil staryj okhotnik]. (Shot old hunter-NOM). [An old hunter shot].

c. adverbial modifiers of place and time:

3 All translations from this source are mine unless otherwise indicated.
В этом доме в 1857 году был Л.Н. Толстой.

[In this house-PREP in [1857 year]-PREP was L.N. Tolstoi -NOM].

[L.N. Tolstoi was at this house in 1857].

d. an object:

Книгу уже напечатали. [Knigu uzhe napechatali]. (Book-ACC already printed).

[The book has already been printed].

Likewise, the Rheme can be represented by:

a. the subject

b. the predicate

c. an adverbial modifier

d. an object (17-18).

Both the Theme and the Rheme can comprise one word (a) or be an extended part of the sentence (b):

a. Солнце садилось. [Solntse sadilos']. (Sun-NOM was going down). [The sun was going down].

In the sentence above, the Theme is an unextended subject; the Rheme is an unextended predicate.

b. Красное, раскалённое солнце пустыни медленно садилось на горизонте.

[Krasnoe, raskalënnnoe solntse pustyni medlenno sadilos' na gorizonte].

([Red, burning sun]-NOM desert-GEN slowly went down on horizon-PREP).

[The hot red sun of the desert was slowly setting below the horizon].

In this case, the Theme is an extended subject; the Rheme is an extended predicate.
Both the Theme and the Rheme can also be represented by several parts of the sentence. The following parts of the sentence can occur in the thematic position:

a) the subject and the predicate: Я вспоминаю одну бабушкину сказку. [Я вспоминаю одну бабушкину сказку]. (I remember one grandmother’s fairytale). [I remember one of grandmother’s fairytales].

b) an adverbial modifier and the subject: Весной перелетные птицы возвращаются. [Весной перелетные птицы возвращаются]. (Spring- INSTR migrating birds-NOM return). [In spring migrating birds return].

c) the subject and an object: Последнюю часть трилогии писатель не завершил. [Последнюю часть трилогии писатель не завершил]. ([Last part]-ACC trilogy-GEN writer-NOM NEG-finished). [The writer did not finish the last part of the trilogy].

d) an object and the predicate: Роль Отелло исполнял известный артист. [Роль Отелло исполнял известный артист]. (Role-ACC Othello-GEN performed a famous actor). [Othello’s role was played by a famous actor] (18).

The Rheme can be realized by:

a) the subject and the predicate: На Красную площадь приезжают туристы. [На Красную площадь туристы приезжают]. (On Red square-ACC come tourists-NOM). [Tourists come to Red Square].

b) the predicate and an object or adverbial modifier: Чехов создал новый литературный жанр—лирическую комедию. [Чехов создал новый литературный жанр—лирическую комедию]. (Chekhov-NOM created [new
literary genre]-ACC — [lyrical comedy]-ACC). [Chekhov creates a new
literary genre—lyrical comedy].

Indivisible Utterances With a Zero Theme

As demonstrated above, all sentences, from the point of view of functional
sentence perspective, can be divided into the Theme and the Rheme. However, there are
also sentences “in which merely the existence of something or somebody is reported or a
fact is stated” (1976: 28). In such sentences, all information is essential and thus
constitutes the R:

a. Шёл дождь. [SHёl dozh'd']. (Went rain-NOM). [It was raining].

b. Была осень. [Byla osen’]. (Was autumn-NOM). [It was autumn].

c. Незаметно подкралась ночь. [Nezametno podkralas' noch’]. (Suddenly
came night-NOM). [Suddenly came the night] (29).

The sentences above still possess a functional sentence perspective (like any other given
sentence), but have a zero Theme, i.e., all their lexical components constitute the Rheme.
However, depending on the purpose of the speaker, these sentences can be built
differently and have a different functional sentence perspective. For example, sentence
(c) is a certain fact that is stated and therefore it contains a zero Theme. At the same time,
if one aspect of this fact needs to be emphasized (e.g., either the character or the manner
in which the action took place), the sentence will be built in the following way:

Ночь подкралась незаметно. [Noch’ podkralas’ nezametno]. (Night-NOM
Utterances with a zero T are referred to as “indivisible utterances” (30). They can be two-part or one-part sentences (nominative, impersonal, indefinite-personal or generalized-personal sentences). The two-part indivisible utterances are arranged in the following manner: the predicate + the subject. For example: Звонит звонок. [Zvenit zvonok]. (Ring bell-NOM). (The bell is ringing) (30). The predicate verbs in indivisible two-part sentences are always intransitive. The verb in such sentences can be preceded only by adverbial modifiers of manner “making up phrases semantically integrated with the verb”:


When other parts of the sentence are placed before the predicate, they serve as a Theme in the sentence, which no longer remains indivisible. For example:

В коридоре звонит звонок . [V koridore zvenit zvonok]. (In hallway-PREP rings bell-NOM). [In the hallway the bell is ringing] (31).

One-part indivisible sentences follow the following pattern: principle part + secondary part. The principle part of a one-part indivisible utterance is:

1. in nominative sentences, a noun in the nominative: Тишина. [Tishina]. (Silence).

2. in impersonal sentences:
   a) a predicative adverb: Сыро и ветрено. [Syro i vetreno]. (Wet and windy). [It’s wet and wind].
b) an impersonal verb: *Хотелось пить.* [KHotelos' pit']. (Wanted *drink*). [I was thirsty].

c) a personal verb used impersonally: *Засыпало дорогу.* [Zasypalo dorogu]. (Flooded *road*-ACC). [The road got flooded].

d) the word *нет* [net] (no): *Нет времени.* [Net vremeni]. (No time-GEN). [There is no time].

3. in indefinite-personal sentences: a verb in the indefinitepersonal form:

*Привезли инструменты.* [Privezli instrumenty]. (Brought instruments-ACC). [Instruments have been brought].

4. in generalized-personal sentences: a verb in the 2nd person singular form:

*Остановишься и смотришь в недоумении…* [Ostanovish'sia i smotrish' v nedoumenii …] (Stop and watch in perplex…-PREP). [You would stop and watch, perplexed…] (1976:31).

It should be noted that the sentences that follow the predicate + the subject pattern have different functional sentence perspective depending on the context and situation. If the predicate is “predetermined”, i.e., it describes an action already known from the context, it is the T in the sentence. For example:

*[Сверху послышался громкий стук. Охотник поднял голову:] стучал дятел.*

[[Sverkhu poslyshalsia gromkii stuk. Okhotnik podnial golovu:] stuchal djatel]].

([From above was heard loud knock-ACC. Hunter-NOM raised head-ACC:] knocked woodpecker-NOM).
[A loud knock was heard from above. The hunter raised his head:] the woodpecker was knocking].

However, if a fact is reported in its entirety, it is the indivisible utterance with a zero Theme:

[Лес был полон звуков: трещали кузнецики, пели какие-то птицы.] стучал дятел.

[[Les byl polon zvukov: treshhali kuznechiki, peli kakie-to pticy.] stuchal djatel].

([Forest-NOM was full sounds-GEN: chirped grasshoppers-NOM, sang [some birds]-NOM.] drummed woodpecker).

[[The forest was full of sounds: grasshoppers were chirping, some birds were singing.]a woodpecker was drumming].

The sentences with the same word order but different functional sentence perspective follow different intonation patterns. Indivisible utterances represent one syntagma and are pronounced with an even tone that falls on the last syllable of the phrase, whereas the borderline between the Theme and the Rheme is marked by an abrupt change in the pitch of tone which is perceived as a pause by the listener (1984:26).

Changes in the Sequence of the Components of a Functional Sentence Perspective in Emotive Speech

Word arrangement in the examples cited in the previous section is referred to as objective word order and is characteristic of non-emotive speech. The concept of emotive speech is broad—it comprises emotionally colored words and expressions (e.g., diminutives),
idioms, as well as syntactical constructions with a conversational stylistic nuance or a

*conversational emotive quality:*

Музей Пушкина/как пройти? [Музей Pushkina/kak proi?i?] (Museum-NOM Pushkin-
GEN/how get? ) [The Pushkin Museum/how do I get there?]

Speech is considered *emotive* when it renders the speaker’s (or writer’s) emotions, such
as admiration, affection, melancholy, etc. For example: “Молчи! Устал я слушать”
(Крылов) [“Molchi! Ustal ia slushat”(Krylov)] (Be quite! Tired I-NOM listen) [“Be
quite! I am tired of listening”] (1976:133-134). When the rules for arranging words in
non-emotive speech are not observed, word order helps to create emotive speech and thus
plays the role of a stylistic means. *Subjective word order or inversion* occurs in the
following three cases:

1. when the objective order of the Theme and the Rheme is altered;
2. when the order of the thematic and rhematic components is changed;
3. when the order of the parts of the sentence in indivisible utterances with a zero

   Theme is changed.

Combinations of the first and second and of the second and third cases are possible (134-
135).

While direct word order is characterized by the Theme-Rheme sequence, when it
is reversed, the Rheme precedes the Theme. For example:

Сухостойное было лето. [Sukhostoi?noe bylo leto].(Dry was summer-NOM).
[Dry was the summer],

vs. the direct word order:
Лето было сухостойное. [Leto bylo sukhostoǐnoe]. (Summer-NOM was dry).

[The summer was dry].

Direct word order changes to non-contiguous when some parts of the FSP (thematic or rhematic) are separated from each other by other parts. This word order can be graphically represented in the following way: Theme-Rheme-Theme or Rheme-Theme-Rheme. For example:

Чем здесь так необычно пахнет? Мхом пахнет прелым и грибами (Rheme-Theme-Rheme).


vs. the direct word order:

Пахнет прелым мхом и грибами. [Pakhnet prelym mhom i gribami]. (Smells [rotten moss and mushrooms]-INSTR). [It smells like rotten moss and mushrooms].

There exist more complicated types of non-contiguous word order (Theme-Rheme-Theme-Rheme or Rheme-Theme-Rheme-Theme, etc.), but they do not differ significantly from the ones that are described above.

The inverted word order (Rheme-Theme) lends a colloquial nuance to the utterance. Occasionally, the Theme is omitted in a colloquial context. For example, читаю (chitału)/reading could be omitted in the response below:
Что ты читаешь? “Войну и мир” читаю.

[Chto ty chitaesh’? Voïnu i mir” chitaiù].

(What you read? War and Peace’'-ACC read).

[What are you reading? Reading “War and Peace”].

While the sentences with objective (direct) word order are pronounced with a “neutral” narrative intonation with a slight rise of the tone on the Theme and a fall of the tone on the Rheme, where the phrasal stress falls as well, when the word order is inverted, the emphatic stress falls on the Rheme in its initial position, and the Theme is pronounced in a low tone, almost without stress (136-137).

It should be kept in mind that often inversion (and thus, stylistic nuances) is achieved “not by a change in the sequence of the parts of the sentence, but by a change in the sequence of the words which are components of the functional sentence perspective” (141). For instance, in the sentence below, the subject precedes the predicate and, nonetheless, the word order is inverted; the emphatic stress falls on the subject in the rhematic position, emphasizing the expressiveness of the utterances:

[...звуки доносились слабые, неясные.] Должно быть, Anna Sergeevna играла.

[[......zvuki donosilis’ slabye, neiásnye.] Dolzhno byt’, Anna Sergeevna igrala].

([...sounds-NOM reached [weak,unclear]-PL.]Must be, Anna Sergeevna played).

([...weak and unclear sounds were heard.]Anna Sergeevna must have been playing) (141).
Krylova and Khavronina emphasize that the notions of Theme and given, as well as Rheme and new, do not always coincide. In the sentence below, if the letter was already mentioned in the previous context, it does not automatically make it a part of the Theme based solely on the fact that it is a piece of known information.


The communicative goal of this utterance is expressed in увидел письмо [uvidel pis'mo] (saw the letter) which makes it the Rheme (1984: 207).

2.4.3 Functional Sentence Perspective in Translation

Several authors discuss the issues associated with functional sentence perspective that the translators working with Russian and English face (SHeviaková 1976, Knowles 1998). SHeviaková uses the terms “sub’ekt” (logical subject) and “predikat” (logical predicate) to describe the flow of thought. These two terms constitute logical categories and are contrasted with the grammatical categories of subject and predicate as parts of the sentence. It is important to keep in mind that the grammatical and the logical categories do not always coincide, i.e., the logical subject is not always expressed by the grammatical subject and the logical predicate—by the grammatical predicate.

Although the division into logical subject and logical predicate is a universal feature of all languages, the way the two phenomena are expressed differ across

4 Translation from this source is mine.
languages. The contrast is particularly evident when we compare an ‘analytic’ language (such as English) to a ‘synthetic’ language (such as Russian) (1976: 9-10).

Russian, with its rich declensional and conjugational morphology, combines words that change their shape but not necessarily their sequence to create utterances. For this reason, inflections play a very important role in the configuration of utterances. Knowles uses a figurative analogy to describe this phenomenon: “Russian words wear military uniforms, with badges of rank and function, as it were” (1998: 104). Parts of speech in Russian are 100% detectable by appearance, as is syntactic ‘connectionism’, which enables and facilitates configuration of utterances. For example, the Russian sentence Кошка убила крысу. [Koshka ubila krysu] (Cat-NOM killed rat-ACC) can be interpreted in different ways, depending on the context:

- a cat has killed a rat
- a cat has killed the rat
- the cat has killed a rat
- the cat has killed the rat

However, if we alter the grammatical cases of the nouns in the sentence above without changing their order, the meaning of the sentence will change: Кошку убила крыса. [Koshku ubila krysa]. (Cat-ACC killed rat-NOM). [The cat has been killed by the rat].

The function of English words depends on their “micro-environment”. To pursue Knowles’s analogy—“English words wear civilian clothes rather than military uniforms” (104-105). This factor limits remote syntactic linkage. As a result, translators working from Russian into English often need to perform syntactic reformulations, and when
translating in the opposite direction, “to go to unusually great lengths in order to detect and isolate the logical thrust of the propositions they encounter”; otherwise, translation adequacy and especially equivalence cannot be achieved (105).

According to SHeviakova, adequacy in translation from English into Russian can be achieved only when the translator understands the flow of the thought expressed in English and transfers it into Russian in a way that preserves the logical category, i.e., what constitutes the LP in the original is perceived as such in the translation (1976: 9-10). SHeviakova describes the logical subject as the given about which something is stated; the logical predicate is the new information; it is what is stated about the logical subject. For example, in Студент читает книгу. [Student читает книгу]. (Student-NOM read book-ACC). (The student is reading a book), the logical subject is студент (the student), and what is said about him (is reading a book) is the new information, or the logical predicate. This sentence answers a potential question “What is the student doing?” Without changing the word order, depending on the context, the given sentence can also answer the potential question “What is the student reading?” which would make the student is reading the logical subject and a book—logical predicate. Likewise, if the logical stress falls on the action (is reading), and the sentence answers the potential question “What is the student doing with the book?” is reading is the logical predicate, whereas student and book are the logical subject (11).

The examples above demonstrate how the logical categories (the notions of the logical subject and the logical predicate) are flexible, whereas the grammatical categories, restricted by grammatical rules, are not. In these examples, the meaning of the
utterance changes due to the changes in the logical, not the grammatical, category. Therefore, the goal of the translator is to understand the logical structure underneath the formal grammatical surface and preserve it in the translation. For example, in the sentence “There is a book on the table”, the logical subject is on the table and the logical predicate, the new information that is given about the logical subject, is the grammatical subject of the sentence—a book. A potential question to this sentence could be “What is on the table?” When one is translating this sentence into Russian, it is important to preserve the structure of the thought, i.e., on the table should be perceived as something that the sentence is about (the logical subject) and a book—as what is said about the logical subject (the logical predicate). The translated phrase needs to answer the same question as the source text phrase—“What is on the table?”, not “Where is the book?” The only translation that meets this condition is На столе лежит книга. [Na stole lezhit kniga]. (On table-PREP lies book). The translation Книга на столе. [Kniga na stole]. (Book-NOM on table-PREP), is grammatically correct. However, since the logical categories of the source text and target text do not correspond, this translation does not fulfill the communicative purpose of the statement, and thus cannot be considered adequate (12).

In Russian, the logical predicate usually occurs at the end of the sentence, after the logical subject, which is important to keep in mind when trying to locate the logical subject and logical predicate in a sentence. For example:
1. На столе книга. [Na stole kniga]. (On table-PREP book-NOM). [There is a book on the table]. The logical predicate is a book; a hypothetical question to the sentence is “What is on the table?”

2. Книга на столе. [Kniga na stole]. (Book-NOM on table-PREP). [The book is on the table]. The logical predicate is on the table; a hypothetical question to the sentence is “Where is the book?”

This way, a possible question to the sentence helps determine the logical subject and the logical predicate in the utterance; that is, the parts of the sentence that are present in the question constitute the logical subject, while the parts of the sentence that are not (and are represented by a question word in the question) are the logical predicate.

In English, the logical predicate can occur in the following parts of a sentence:

1. In the beginning: A boy entered.

2. In the middle: He delivered a lecture yesterday.

3. At the end: He went to London.

When the logical predicate of an English phrase comes at the end of the sentence (as it does in Russian), translation into Russian is facilitated by the same direct word order, e.g., The book is on the table—Книга на столе. [Kniga na stole]. (Book-NOM on table-PREP).

Translation into Russian is more problematic and prone to translator error when the logical predicate is expressed by the subject and comes at the beginning of the sentence. In this case, while the English source text follows the predicate-subject order, it is reversed in the Russian translation (subject-predicate), e.g.: A book was lying on the
The English language uses the following linguistic means to emphasize logical predicate: Inversion with a parenthetical there. Such sentences usually follow the following grammatical pattern: There + Predicate+ Subject+ Adverbia thrown Modifier of Place or Prepositional Complement. For example: There are many weather observation stations in this country. The logical predicate of this utterance is many weather observation stations, the logical subject—in this country. Therefore, the order that they follow is: logical predicate- logical subject. In Russian, however, this order should be reversed in translation, that is, logical subject- logical predicate:

В этой стране много метеорологических станций. [V ētoĭ strane mnogo meteorologicheskikh stantśii]. (In [this country]-PREP many [meteorological stations]-GEN).

The translation following the same logical pattern as the English source text would be:

Много метеорологических станций имеется в этой стране. [Mnogo meteorologicheskikh stantśii imeetsia v ētoĭ strane]. (Many meteorological stations-NOM are in [this country]-PREP). It cannot be considered adequate because it emphasizes a different logical aspect and answers a different question: Где имеется много метеорологических станций? [Gde imeetsia mnogo meteorologicheskix stantśii?] (Where are many [meteorological stations]-GEN?) [Where are there many meteorological stations?].
In this version of the translation, the *logical predicate* of the original (*many weather observation stations*) becomes the *logical subject*, and the English *logical subject* (*in this country*) turns into the Russian *logical predicate*. Thus, the logical structure of the utterance, or its functional sentence perspective, is disrupted (17-18).

1. **Inversion without there.** Inverted sentences like *Inside was a microscope*, emphasize the grammatical subject. The grammatical order that the parts of the sentence follow is: Adverbial Modifier of Place (which is at the same time the *logical subject*) + Predicate + Subject (=*logical predicate*). Translation of this phrase into Russian should follow the same grammatical and logical pattern in order to be adequate. In this particular case, in order to do so, the same grammatical construction is used in Russian as in English: *Внутри был микроскоп*. [Vnutri byl mikroskop](*Inside was microscope*-NOM) (22-23).

2. **Double inversion.** Sentences like (a) *Hanging on the walls were pictures of scientists* or (b) *Included in this table are properties of minerals* contain two-part grammatical predicates and follow the following pattern: Continuous or Passive Component of the Predicate + Adverbial Modifier of Place + Verbal Component of the Predicate + Subject, with the subject being the *logical predicate* and the rest of the sentence being the *logical subject*. The Russian translation will follow the same pattern except that the passive and continuous parts of the predicate (*included* and *hanging*) will be “moved” after the verbal components of the predicate (*are included*, *were hanging*): (a) *На стене*
висели портреты учёных. [Na stene viseli portrety uchënykh]. (On wall-
PREP hanging portraits-NOM scientists-GEN).

(b) В эту таблицу включены свойства минералов. [V ètu tablitsu
vkluchen svojsta mineralov]. (In [this table]-ACC included properties-NOM
minerals-GEN] (28-29).

3. The expression it is…that, which is used to emphasize any part of the
sentence except the grammatical predicate. For example: It was Mendeleev
who discovered the Periodic law, with Mendeleev being the logical predicate
and discovered the Periodic law being the logical subject. In Russian, in order
to emphasize the same member of the sentence, the translator can either use
such words as imenno (exactly), kak-raz (just), tol’ko (only), èto (this) and
keep the word order the same (a) or change the word order by moving the
logical predicate to the end of the phrase and placing it after the logical
subject (b):

a. Именно Менделеев открыл периодический закон. [Imenno
Mendeleev otkryl periodicheskiĭ zakon]. (Exactly Mendeleev-NOM
discovered [periodic law]-ACC).

b. Открыл периодический закон Менделеев. [Otkryl periodicheskiĭ
zakon Mendeleev]. (Discovered [periodic law]-ACC Mendeleev-
NOM] (41-42).

4. Passive constructions with the preposition by. The sentence Radio was
invented by Popov answers the hypothetical question: Who was the radio
invented by? or Who invented the radio? Hence, the logical predicate is the prepositional compliment by Popov while the subject (the radio) and the predicate (was invented) constitute the logical subject. An adequate translation into Russian will follow the same logical pattern as the original, logical predicate-logical subject: Радио было изобретено Поповым. [Radio bylo izobreteno Popovym]. (Radio-NOM was invented Popov-INSTR), or Радио изобрёл Попов. [Radio izobrēl Popov]. [Radio-ACC invented Popov-NOM]. The translation Попов изобрёл радио. [Popov izobrēl radio]. (Popov-NOM invented radio-ACC), does not meet the communicative goal of the original. Instead, it answers the question What did Popov do? Or What did Popov invent? i.e., the logical predicate of the original (Popov) becomes the logical subject in the translation and the logical subject (radio was invented by), the logical predicate. The English equivalent would be Popov invented the radio. Although it would be possible to emphasize the initial Popov in spoken language with intonation and in writing with italics or bold type, it is more conventional to place the logical predicate at the end of the sentence (46-47).

According to SHeviakova, when one analyzes the context, it is more helpful to use the terms Given and New rather than logical subject and logical predicate. At the same time, it is important to understand that Given and New are used metaphorically rather than literally in the analysis, and thus should not be oversimplified. This can be illustrated with the example below:

1) The subject of the author’s concern is the interactions of wave-particles.
2) **It is these interactions** that cause the emission and the absorption of quanta.

The *New* in the second sentence is *these interactions* although this information (*the interactions of wave-particles*) has already been mentioned in the previous sentence also as the *New*. Hence, it becomes obvious that depending on the communicative purpose of the text and the context, the same thought can represent the *Given* and the *New* within the text (60).

In certain instances, articles in the English text help to determine the *Given* and the *New* in a sentence, with indefinite and zero articles indicating the *New* and the definite article indicating the *Given*, as in the examples below:

1) **A retarding potential** was maintained between the two electrodes.

2) **Inelastic collisions** occurred near the grid (67).

At the same time, it is important to keep in mind that articles alone cannot be used as indicators of the *Given* and the *New*, both of which can occur with a definite as well as indefinite or zero article, as in the examples below:

1) In quantum mechanics a wave particle is described **by a wave packet**.

2) The wave packet **surrounds the position of the classical particle**.

In the first sentence, both the *Given* (*a wave particle*) and the *New* (*by a wave particle*) have an indefinite article, while in the second one, both the *Given* (*the wave packet*) and the *New* (*the position of the classical particle*) contain a definite article (68-69).

Prior to creating the target text, it is advisable for the translator to answer the following two questions:
1) "What resources—such as clefting, extrapositioning, fronting and inverting etc.—does the target language have with respect to the flexibility of information placement in sentences?"

2) “Do the target language’s resources need to be unduly strained for the purposes of the translation process or can a reasonably flowing target text be produced without excessive risk of confusion in the recipient’s minds by reason of faulty or ‘jerky’ theme-rheme structuration?” (Knowles 1998:108).

During the translation process it is necessary to isolate the individual message reflected by grammatical relationships and segment them into idea units which will be arranged in the target text according to two fundamental criteria: sequencing and prominence. They need to be sequenced successfully and at the same time have the effective prominence so that the illocutionary power of the target text is as close as possible to that of the source text, which is always a challenging task. The degree of fit between the source and target utterances hinges on the following three factors:

1) “replication in the target text of the source text’s theme-rheme structure, with its associated perspectives and emphases;

2) lack of infringement of any of the target language’s grammatical and stylistic norms—this includes any innovation which attracts attention in its own right;

3) reprojection in the target text of the source text’s communicative value, message and thrust” (108).

During the process of translation the translator often faces a struggle over determining whether logic or grammar should have primacy when statements are
formulated. It is important to keep in mind that logic is a universal system, whereas grammar is not; it is perceived and learned via a national language. The solution of this ‘either-or’ conundrum always requires a compromise.

The implication for the translator is that, “in any translation context, the important macro-task the translator needs to achieve successfully is to mirror in the target text the theme-rheme\(^5\) structure of the source text” (107). If this task is not achieved, “then the attempt at translation will fail, because emphases will be miscued, coherence will be ruptured and the demands of cohesion will not have been fulfilled” (107).

2.5 Question Tests

In order to identify the boundary between the Theme and the Rheme/ Topic and Comment/ Topic and Focus in a sentence some researchers propose the use of a question test. This test was indicated by Ann Hatcher (1956) and further elaborated by a number of linguists including Daneš (1970)\(^6\). It is based on the assumption that for every sentence

\(^{5}\) According to Knowels, “\textit{theme} [something ‘put’ or ‘placed’ (in the mind)] and \textit{rheme} [something stated/asserted about the theme] are Greek equivalents and progenitors of the Latin \textit{subject} and \textit{predicate}” (1998: 105). Subject and predicate belong to the logical category, which Knowles, like SHeviakova, contrasts with the grammatical category of subject and predicate.

\(^{6}\) Also used by SHeviakova (1976).
the speakers of the given language can select a set of wh-questions that can be answered by this sentence in different contexts (Hajičová 1984: 194).

Sgall, who uses the terms *topic, comment*, and additionally *a transition*, suggests that the sentence *Father reads a book* (with the intonation center on the word *book*) can be an answer to either *What does father read?* or *What does father do?*—but not to the question *Who reads a book?* (in which case, the word father would have to bear the intonational center), nor *What does father do with a book?* The set of questions applicable to the given sentence helps us determine that the word *Father* is the *topic* because it is present in all appropriate questions, whereas *a book*, excluded from all appropriate questions, is the *comment*, and the verb is the *transition* (1974: 29).

Hajičová, who prefers to use *topic* and *focus*, searched for a testable criterion to be used to identify the boundary between the two categories. In doing so, she worked out a set of rules:

- “If A (from the given sentence) occurs in no element of the set of relevant questions, it is the focus proper of the given sentence;
- if A (from the given sentence) occurs in every element of the set of relevant questions, then it belongs to the topic of the given sentence” (1994: 257).

The usage of the question test, however, has its limitations. First of all, it can be applied directly only to positive declarative sentences. Hajičová suggests that interrogative and other sentences be analyzed parallel to their positive declarative equivalents. While it is relatively easy to do with negative statements, analyzing questions this way is considerably harder (259). Second, one might encounter difficulties
when trying to apply the test to embedded elements. For example, if we were to analyze the sentence *Jane met the teacher of Latin*, we would find that *both* questions below are acceptable:

1. Who did Jane meet?
2. Which teacher did Jane meet?

The result is ambiguous: based on the first question, its focus is “*teacher of Latin*”; however, based on the second question, the focus consists only of the embedded phrase “*of Latin*” (259).

Furthermore, it is not clear if the sentence *His house has been destroyed by a tornado* is an immediate answer to the first or second question below:

1. What happened to John?
   What happened to John’s house? (259)

### 2.6 Thematic Progressions

The most well-known model of thematic progressions was proposed by the Czech linguist František Daneš (1974). By this term he meant “the choice and ordering of utterance themes, their mutual concatenation and hierarchy, as well as their relationship to the hyperthemes of the superior text units (such as the paragraph, chapter...), to the whole text, and to the situation” (114). Daneš distinguished between the following four types of thematic progression: *Simple Linear thematic progression* (Figure 3), *thematic progression with a Continuous (Constant) Theme* (Figure 4), *thematic progression with Derived Themes* (Figure 5) and a *Split Rheme* (Figure 6).
Figure 6. Simple Linear Thematic Progression (or Thematic Progression with Linear Thematization of Rhemes)

Figure 5. Continuous (Constant) Theme

Figure 3. Thematic Progression with Derived Themes.

Figure 4. Split Rheme.
Examples: “(a) The first of antibiotics was discovered by Sir Alexander Flemming in 1928. He was busy at the time investigating a certain species of germ which is responsible for boils and other troubles.

(b) The chief organic compound obtained from natural gas is saturated methane. Small quantities of other volatile hydrocarbons are associated with methane

“(118)

Simple Linear thematic progression represents the most basic kind of thematic progression, when the Rheme of the given utterance appears in the next one as its Theme, although it is not always worded in same way.

Example: “The Rousseauist especially feels an inner kinship with Prometheus and other Titans. He is fascinated by any form of insurgency...He must show an elementary energy in his explosion against the established order and at the same time a boundless sympathy for the victims of it...Further the Rousseauist is ever ready to discover beauty of soul in anyone who is under the reprobation of society” (119).

In this kind of thematic progression the same Theme is used in a number of utterances. As in the example below, it can be worded differently.

Example: “New Jersey is flat along the coast and southern portion; the northwestern region is mountainous. The coastal climate is mild, but there is considerable cold in the mountain areas during the winter months. Summers are fairly hot. The leading industrial production includes chemicals, processed food, coal, petroleum, metals and electrical equipment. The most important cities are
Newark, Jersey City, Paterson, Trenton, Camden. Vacation districts include Asbury Park, Lakewood, Cape May, and others” (120).

In the paragraph above, there is a “Hypertheme” (New Jersey) from which the following utterance Themes are derived.

Example: “All substances can be divided into two classes: elementary substances and compounds. An elementary substance is a substance which consists of atoms of only one kind...A compound is a substance which consists of atoms of two or more different kinds...” (121).

In this kind of thematic progression the given Rheme is explicitly or implicitly doubled or multiplied, and new thematic progressions emerge this way. It is an example of a thematic progression type of higher order representing a formal frame for the employment of the basic types.

Several linguists used Daneš’ model (1974) in their studies. Nwogu found occurrences of Derived thematic progression only in the highly specialized texts of his corpus (mainly in the Discussion sections), while Simple Linear thematic progression patterns predominated in stretches of text that involved explanation and exposition (1990: 190 cited in McCabe 1999: 190). These findings were confirmed by Weissberg (1984: 494 cited in McCabe: 1999:190 ) whose results revealed more instances of the Simple Linear pattern as compared to the Constant Theme pattern, especially in the Discussion and Introduction sections of research papers. Nwogu attributes the use of Simple Linear thematic progression to the nature of writers and readers, as well as the relationship between them. In texts written for a general audience with frequent occurrences of
Simple Linear thematic progression, the level of shared knowledge between the writer and the reader is unequal, as in the case of the corpora under investigation in the given study. Nwogu explains that the difference in knowledge between the writer and the reader limits the range of options to choose as a point of departure in a clause. Therefore the foundation of the following utterance can be established only by selecting from the information contained in the Rheme of the preceding context—shared knowledge for the writer and the reader (1990:244).

Gómez (1995:152 quoted in McCabe: 1999:190) found a predominance of Constant thematic progression in the Lancaster Spoken English Corpus, which can be explained by a frequent use of subject pronouns, common nouns and proper names in the spoken language. Nwogu (1990), on the other hand, finds high frequency of the Constant Theme pattern in specialized texts written for specialists in the field, when the relationship between the writer and the reader is equal and the author assumes the reader’s knowledge. Overall, according to Nwogu, information in descriptions is organized through the Constant Theme patterns.

Another model of T dynamics was proposed by Erik Enkvist (1973: 131-132). His unit of analysis was a macrosyntagm, i.e., complete main clauses functioning as sentences. Incomplete utterances punctuated as sentences as well as sentence fragments ending with a semi-colon were also regarded as macrosyntags. Enkvist classified the macrosyntagm to macrosyntagm transitions into the four groups below:

1) Theme iteration involving a link between the Theme of the given macrosyntagm and the Theme of a preceding macrosyntagm;
2) Theme progression involving a link between the Theme of the given macrosyntagm and the Rheme of a preceding macrosyntagm;

3) Theme iteration involving a link between the Rheme of the given macrosyntagm and the Rheme of a preceding macrosyntagm;

4) Rheme progression, involving a link between the Rheme of the given macrosyntagm and a Theme of the preceding macrosyntagm.

The Theme of a macrosyntagm was defined as its part from the beginning up to and including the subject. The part of a macrosyntagm to the right of the subject was considered its Rheme.

2.7 Theme and Rheme in Translation Studies

A review of translation-related literature reveals that the topic of Theme and Rheme has not been extensively covered. Only a few authors have devoted studies to this important phenomenon and its role in Translation Studies. Works dealing with Theme and Rheme in Russian translation are even more scarce. Researchers are split in their discussion of research results over whether translators should respect the source language patterning or alter it.

Li-ping, who belongs to the first group, conducts a thematic analysis of the English source text and the Chinese target text in order to compare their textual properties. The author compares two Chinese versions of an English text based on the following criteria: coherence, cohesion, acceptability, informativity, thematic progression pattern and thematic progression complexity. However, she does not mention how these properties were measured. Li-ping found that in translation T equivalence helps “realize
the coherence of the target text with the same effect on receptors” (2008:30). The author concludes that thematic arrangement of the source text should remain unchanged in the target text unless the changes are required by the norms that govern the target language. In fact, thematic arrangement is sometimes altered also due to the differences between end-users, or readers, as it is the case with heterofunctional translations, where, for instance, the information written for specialists is taken to produce a text for novices. Li-ping also stresses that “the success of a text as a communicative event relies strongly on the success of the theme-rheme arrangement” (31).

Likewise, Dejica (2009) emphasizes the importance of taking into account the thematic structure in order to maintain a coherent point of view in communication and subsequently, translation. For the author, maintaining a coherent point of view implies placing the target reader “at the same point of view as the one intended by the source text writer…preserving the original source text thematic structure” (51). Dejica concludes by saying that the goal of the translator should be to preserve the cohesion and coherence of the text in order to achieve the stylistic effects intended by the writer, even if that requires using structures that are difficult and unnatural in the target language, which is acceptable, in the author’s view, as long as such structures are used consistently without breaking down the global thematic structure and coherence (52).

Ventola begins her article by claiming that Theme-Rheme structures, as well as their thematic patterns and developments, are “an area that is relatively unexplored” in Translation Studies despite the fact that “linguists consider the benefits of thematic analyses to be extensive” (1995:85). For instance, such analyses provide insight into the
style of the author and help novice writers with text structures. Ventola also demonstrates how in the translation of a literary English text into German, when the translator did not follow the narrative method (Theme-Rheme arrangement) of the source text author, the reader’s focus of attention was altered, thus making this an unsuccessful translation decision.

A different example discussed by Ventola, on the other hand, shows how difficulties arise in the translation of scientific texts from German into English due to the fact that in German Themes can be “very extensive” and when they are literally translated into English the result is, as a rule, “cumbersome” and unnatural, which distorts the rhetorical effects constructed by the source text author (98). It is unfortunate that when the reader has access only to the translation, which is treated as an autonomous text, the fault for the failure of argumentation and rhetorical skills is unjustly placed on the author—not the translator. Ventola concludes by calling for more attention to Theme-Rheme issues in translation and their role in “creating ‘textuality’ and “cohesion” (102) in order to allow translators to make more successful translation decisions, based on the specific contextual situation.

In the same vein, Hatim and Mason (1990) describe how thematic structure can present a challenge for the translator. When translating news reports—a form of "thematic hybridisation" with the "zig-zag" Theme-Rheme pattern typical for

7 Usually cohesion is considered a facet of textuality, so it is unclear why the author specifies the two.
argumentation—the translator should, on one hand, make an attempt to preserve the discoursal and generic characteristics of the source text in the target text and, on the other hand, avoid turning the text into “bland news reporting” or “editorializing” it (Hatim and Mason 1990: 221). Like Ventola (1995), Hatim and Mason emphasize the importance of translators remaining “vigilant” (221) when it comes to Theme and Rheme because, while translators know little about patterns of thematic progression and how equivalence between them can be achieved, they can nonetheless be confident that such patterns "are always employed in the service of an overriding rhetorical purpose" (220).

In one of the chapters of her dissertation on Theme in English and Korean (2007), Mira Kim focuses on readability, which she investigates by exploring the system of the category of Theme in English and its counterpart in Korean. One of the ways Kim measured readability was by conducting a survey of target readers’ perceptions. 118 Koreans living in Sydney were surveyed on their perceptions about two different translations of the same English text into Korean: one being a student, or novice, translation and the other, a revised translation. Interestingly, Kim’s findings contradict those of the proponents of preserving the source text thematic structure in the target text. Her results showed that the original translation did not reflect the textual aspects of Korean (established in the comparable corpus) but rather repeated the same thematic development as in the English source text. Hence, that translation was revised taking into account how Theme is realized in Korean. As a result, 75% of the respondents preferred the revised translation, which they found more “natural” and “smooth” (197). These
results show how a translator’s thematic choices can affect the readability of the target text for target readers.

Another chapter of Kim’s work was inspired by the fact that even professional translators find it difficult at times to defend their translation choices simply because they do not possess the proper metalanguage to do so. The author analyzes translation errors using systemic functional grammar and finds that “the resulting error classification allows a precise articulation of the nature of errors that would otherwise be explained simply as translations which “sound awkward” (27). The author uses the following error categories based on Halliday’s four metafunctions of languages: interpersonal, textual, logical, experiential (process; participant; circumstance; mistranslation; modifier; tense) and “others” (omission, word choice) (36). Studies of readability and translation errors can contribute to ongoing discussion of translation quality—a controversial and extremely important issue, which is drawing considerable amount of critical interest in Translation Studies today (Dunne and Dunne 2011; Dunne 2006; House 2001).

Another scholar who has applied Halliday’s thematic organization model in his study of thematic development in English and translated Persian academic texts was Jalilifar (2009). Jalilifar calculated the total frequency and percentage of different Theme types (textual, interpersonal, simple, multiple, marked, and unmarked) in original English and translated Persian academic texts. Since the topical Theme is always present in any clause, their numbers were not compared in this analysis. Significant thematic differences in textual, multiple, and marked Themes were found (95). Although different types of Themes were used in the source and target texts, the percentage of the Theme types was
similar in both corpora. Jalilifar explains such similarities in terms of genre: “texts belonging to the same genre represent a similar contextual configuration, that is they show common characteristics in terms of field, tenor, and mode of discourse”, and “the field, tenor, and mode can be realized in topical, interpersonal, and textual themes respectively” (98). For instance, simple Themes, frequent in both corpora, “are giving continuity and cohesion to the texts’, while infrequency of multiple Themes containing interpersonal Themes “might reflect the factual and interpersonal tone of the texts” (102).

Jalilifar then performs a frequency analysis on thematic progression patterns. Applying McCabe’s (1999) model, he distinguishes between Linear thematic progression, Constant thematic progression, Split Rheme, Split Theme, and Peripheral Theme in English and Persian texts and finds that all patterns except split Theme were found in both the original and translated texts. The results showed, however, that Persian texts contained significantly more linear patterns, which, according to Jalilifar, can be explained by the propensities of Persian (104). Overall, linear links help orient the reader and make the text more cohesive, which explains why they are frequent in academic texts.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

In this dissertation corpora are used in order to test the hypotheses. More specifically, the total number of 3,000 clauses for the analysis are collected from the three corpora: an English source text corpus, a Russian target text corpus, and a Russian comparable corpus. The English source text corpus consists of ten articles from the online version of the magazine National Geographic, all published in English during the last six years. The Russian target text corpus includes ten translations of those articles from English into Russian taken from the Russian version of the National Geographic website. The names of the translators were not available on the website. The titles of the source and target texts comprising the two corpora are listed in
Table 2.

The Russian comparable corpus includes articles from the Russian magazine of the same genre, *V mire Zhivotnykh (In the Animal World)*. The titles of those ten articles published between 2009-2011 are listed below. The names of the authors could not be found on the website.

- *Akvarium v zooparke imeni Genri Dorli*
- *Al'truizm u zhivotnykh*
- *Dozhdevoi les Sinkharadzha*
- *Tul'skii eksotarium*
- *Kostromskaia loseferma*
- *Mekh – pokazatel' zdorov'ta shinshilly*
- *Strausinaia ferma*
- *Vpered, za paraplanom!*
- *Nashi Zapovedniki*
- *Zoopark TSiurikha*

As explained later in this section, the unit of analysis in this dissertation is a paragraph, therefore it was not necessary to control for the length of the texts, which, nonetheless, had similar average length. The total number of the paragraphs that have been analyzed is 360.

Based on the earlier findings on thematic progressions (described in 2.6 Thematic Progressions), and given that exposition, explanation and description are common
features of the texts under investigation, it is hypothesized that Simple Linear thematic progression and Constant thematic progression will be the most frequent patterns in all texts. However, the means by which Themes are connected to the previous clause are expected to be different. It is further hypothesized that Russian target texts will tend to reproduce the connectors of the English source texts which will differ from the means used to connect Themes to the previous clause in the texts of the same text-type written in non-translated Russian texts.
Table 2. English source text corpus and Russian target text corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English source text corpus</th>
<th>Russian target text corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Dolphins</td>
<td>Rozovye del'finy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee-eaters</td>
<td>Blesiashchaia okhota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emperor Penguins</td>
<td>Sekret pingvina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humpback Whales</td>
<td>Gorbate kity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermode Bear</td>
<td>Medved'prizrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leatherback Turtles</td>
<td>CHempiony po vyzhivaniiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard Seals</td>
<td>Groza morei: morskie leopardy Antarktiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippine Eagles</td>
<td>Pernatyi velikan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorers Journal</td>
<td>Botswana. Spasaem khishchnikov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Frogs</td>
<td>Bor'ba za zhizn'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Corpus Linguistics

Olohan defines a corpus as “a collection of texts, selected and compiled according to specific criteria” and sees it as a research tool that enables us to study translations in various ways and through different methods (2004:1). The use of corpora in translation studies is a relatively recent phenomenon. In 1992 Sinclair wrote that new corpus resources would have a significant effect on the translations in the future. From the point of view of a linguist, he was concerned with improving the performance of translators as well as that of machine translations with the help of corpora (395 cited in Baker 1993:241). A year later, Mona Baker predicted that undoubtedly “the availability of corpora and of corpus-driven methodology will soon provide valuable insights in the applied branch of translation studies, and that the impact of corpus-based research will be felt there long before it begins to trickle into the theoretical and descriptive branches of the discipline” (1993:241). More precisely, Baker attributed to corpora the ability to help identify universal features of translation (such as explicitation, disambiguation and simplification, the preference for conventional “grammaticality”, the tendency to avoid repetitions that occur in the source texts and tendency to exaggerate features of the target language (244)), translation norms operating in a given socio-cultural context, as well as to explore a number of other theoretical issues (e.g., translation as process, the size and nature of the unit of translation, the nature and limits of equivalence). Laviosa chooses the affectionate title of “mother of Corpus-based descriptive Translation Studies” (2002:18) for Baker, who was the first translation scholar to put forward the idea of using
the tools of corpus linguistics to study translation as both product and process from a
descriptive vs. prescriptive perspective.


As mentioned above, the present study uses parallel and comparable corpora in order to test the hypotheses formulated above. As noted by Olohan (2004: 24) and Laviosa (1997), the term “parallel corpus” is defined variously among translation scholars. In this work, Olohan’s definition will be used (which is consistent with is consistent with that of some other researchers, e.g., Kenny 2001), according to which a parallel corpus is a corpus of translations (2004:24). Further, parallel corpora are subdivided into unidirectional, i.e., when source texts are in language 1 and target texts are in language 2, and bidirectional, if source texts are in language 1 and translations are in language 2, and source texts are in language 2 and their translations are in language 1. Olohan defines monolingual comparable corpus as “a corpus of translations and comparable non-translations in the same language” (2004: 35). According to Baker, a comparable corpus should be selected based on the following: both originals and
translations in the language in question (which is Russian in this case) “should cover a similar domain, variety of language and time span and be of comparable length” (1995:234 cited in Olohan 2004: 36). These criteria were applied to the selection of texts in the present study.

The parallel corpus is used to determine if there are differences in the types of thematic progressions and in the ways Ts are connected to a previous clause between English STs and their Russian translations. It is hypothesized that the differences are minimal. Further, the comparable corpus is used to identify the thematic progressions and types of connectors typical for the non-translated Russian texts to see whether there are any differences in terms of frequency of occurrence in the translated Russian texts vs. the non-translated Russian texts. In the second case, it is hypothesized that considerable differences will be found in the types of connectors but not in the kinds of thematic progressions, because as established by the previous research, texts of the same type use the same thematic progressions (namely Simple Linear thematic progression and Constant thematic progression are expected to be the most frequent patterns in all texts, which are characterized by exposition, explanation and description). The number of Simple Linear thematic progressions and Constant thematic progressions in all three corpora are not expected to be significantly different.

3.2 Text Analysis

No translator would underestimate the importance of a comprehensive text analysis of the source text prior as well as during the process of translation. Without
understanding the source text fully, it is impossible to produce an accurate translation. Various models of text analysis exist, however, most of them are borrowed from other fields, such as text linguistics, discourse analysis, literary studies and theology. Moreover, an approach that works for one discipline, may not be applicable to another discipline, hence the need for a new model designed specifically for translation studies arose. In the early 1990s, Christiane Nord proposed a model for text analysis in translation which has been widely used in translator training round the world. According to Nord, the goal of the translation-oriented text analysis is “not only to ensure full comprehension and correct interpretation of the text or explain its linguistic and textual structures and their relationship with the system and norms of the source language” (Nord 2005:1), but also to provide a solid ground for all the decisions that the translator makes during the translation process. She also stresses that text analysis should become a part of the general concept of translation as well as serve as a permanent frame of reference for the translator. The benefit of this model for professional translators consists in enabling them “to justify their translational decisions, to systematize translation problems, and to understand translational behavior more clearly” (2). As also noted by Kim (2007:28), translators and teachers of translation often have to rely on intuition or their personal preference, which may not always be the most objective way to make decisions. This model is intended to contribute to solving this problem.

In the present study, textual features, namely Themes, thematic progressions, and Rhemes of the English non-translated texts, their Russian translations and a comparable corpus of Russian non-translated texts are analyzed and compared.
The data obtained in this way may prove valuable for practicing translators, as well as translation students and trainers. While the parallel corpus will show differences and similarities in the thematic progressions between English non-translated and Russian translated texts, the comparable corpus of Russian non-translated texts will allow for a comparison with the textual features of translated Russian texts. It has been established that the same kinds of texts that are used in the same situations with more or less the same function or functions “have acquired conventional forms that have sometimes even been raised to the status of social norms, the observance of which is expected by the participants in the communication process, whereas non-observance may be penalized” (Nord 2005:20). Thus, the non-translated Russian texts were used to establish the conventional textual forms, or social norms, that govern the Russian texts of the type and genre under investigation. Should the translated Russian texts display the same thematic features as the texts originally written in Russian, it can be concluded that the textual conventions, or norms, have been observed. Otherwise, if the translated texts display significantly different thematic patterns from the non-translated Russian texts, but similar to those of the English non-translated texts, it will mean that they exhibit features of translationese, which would have an adverse effect on the readability of these translated texts.

Translationese can be defined as “any characteristics of a text that indicate that it has been translated from another language, with some loss of correctness or style in the target language” and that result from insufficient competence of the translator “either in the target language itself or in the connotational fields of the target lexis” (Champe 2000:
The effects of translationese may differ across text types. While in a literary work “both idiolectal and cultural interference often enriches the translation” (Newmark 1991: 78), in other text types, including the one under investigation here, their presence is often seen as a negative characteristic of the translation: “much more often, it is the mark of a bad translator to translate literally, to look at the words without regard to the sense, to remain on the surface of the text” (82). Newmark (1991) categorizes interferences into the following groups: syntactical, lexical, figurative, word order, culture, and third language.

The analysis of thematic norms and conventions in English and Russian as well as the phenomenon of *translationese* will yield valuable data for practicing translators, translation students and teachers as well as researchers. As mentioned earlier, Themess, Rhemes and thematic progressions are very important characteristics of speech for translators and linguists, a topic which nonetheless has not received due attention in Translation Studies. The present work attempts to fill the existing gap.

### 3.3 Functional Sentence Perspective

The concept of functional sentence perspective is central to this study. From the point of view of the semantic structuring of the utterance, it can be seen as consisting of two basic parts: what the speaker is speaking about and what s/he is saying about it. In other words, in any given utterance “something is being said about something else” (Mathiesius 1982: 120 cited in Firbas 1987: 144). Therefore, in this work, what is being spoken about is termed the Theme of the utterance, and what is said about it is termed the Rheme.
Unlike Halliday’s approach that defines the Theme as the initial element in a clause, the definitions selected for this work are less straightforward, therefore, a strategy that will help identify the boundary between the Theme and the Rheme is required. Without such a strategy in place, it is problematic to draw the line between the Theme and the Rheme in complex phrases, which can be demonstrated with an example below:

Example 1: *Everything the bears do seems to unfold in slow motion, as if they're trying to conserve every last calorie for the coming winter.*

For this purpose, the technique introduced by Ann Hatcher (1956) and further used and elaborated by Daneš (1970), Sgall (1974), Hajičová (1984), SHeviákova (1976), Krylova and Khavronina (1976, 1984) was employed. In order to determine what constitutes the Theme of the utterance a *hypothetical question* should be asked. The information contained in the question and repeated in the answer presents a familiar fact and therefore, it is the Theme of the utterance, whereas the remaining part of the answer is the Rheme.

Example 2: *A white bear steps out of the tree cover onto a streamside rock.*

The most appropriate hypothetical question to the sentence above based on the context is *What is the white bear doing?* It helps to determine that *A white bear* is the T of the utterance and the rest of the sentence is its R (*steps out of the tree cover onto a streamside rock*).

---

8 *Kermode Bear.*

9 *Kermode Bear.*
As mentioned above, some linguists, for instance Daneš (1970), Sgall (1974), Hajičová (1984), suggest asking a set of possible questions in order to determine the border between the Theme and the Rheme. In this way, the word(s) present in all appropriate questions would be considered the Theme, the word(s) absent from all questions and thus carrying the new information—the Rheme, and the remaining part—the transition. If this method were to be used, the two possible questions in this case would be *What is a white bear doing?* and *Where does a white bear step out?*, which would help us determine that *A white bear* is the Theme, *of the tree cover onto a streamside rock* is the Rheme and *steps out* is the transition. However, since Daneš’s model of thematic progression, which remains the most widely cited based on the literature review, is used in the given work, and given that his model does not leave space for the transition, this method was not used. It becomes clear that the part that would be considered the transition (*steps out*) as a separate element does not play an important role in the thematic development of the text. If we consider the sentence from the second example in isolation, intuitively we would predict that the following context would be about the *white bear* or the *rock*, but not about *stepping out*. Indeed, turning to the text again, we see that the following sentence is about the bear, more precisely, about its fur: *Set against the dark palette of the rain forest, the bear's fur appears shabbily radiant.*

---

10 As it has been described earlier, different linguists use different terms in place of Theme and Rheme (e.g.: Hajičová terms them *Focus* and *Topic*). Also, Daneš does not include transition is his categorization—only the Theme and the Rheme.
The previous context, in fact, is also about the bear; it describes the moment when Marven Robinson, the main character of the narration, finally spots the bear whose appearance he was waiting for impatiently: "There he is," he says.

After the central notions of the Theme and the Rheme were defined and a strategy to separate one from the other was chosen, it was necessary to select the unit of analysis, i.e., the segment of text for which Themes and Rhemes would be specified. Research shows that there is no agreement among linguists in this respect. Some researchers examine Theme/Rheme structures in clauses (Francis 1989, 1990; Ghadessy 1995; Hasan 1991), but even within this group differences are to be found. For instance, while Francis analyzes Themes and Rhemes in all clauses, including minor clauses and hypotactically related clauses (e.g., projected clauses), Ghadessy studies all clauses with the exception of rankshifted and minor clauses. Other researchers take the orthographic sentence as the unit of analysis (Whittaker (1995), Lowe (1987), Lotfipour-Saedi and Rezai-Tajani (1996), Thomas and Hawes (1997), and Gosden (1996)). Fries, on the other hand, deals with units larger than a clause but smaller than the sentence, which he calls “independent conjoinable clause complexes” (1995: 49) (cited in McCabe 1999: 69-70).

Given that in this work, the Theme is what is being spoken about and the Rheme is what is said about the Theme in the utterance, the unit of analysis is any clause (independent or dependent) that has a grammatical subject and verb and thus expresses a thought. According to SHeviakova’s (1976: 9), such clauses contain two components—a logical subject (what the clause is about) and a logical predicate (what is said about the logical subject. Although grammatically dependent clauses cannot stand on their own, in
terms of functional sentence perspective dependent clauses are still seen as utterances, in which something is said about something else, i.e., utterances with Theme/Rheme structures. This can be best demonstrated through an example.\footnote{Kermode Bear.}

Example 3: *Robinson, 43, stocky and swathed in rain gear, is a wildlife guide and member of the Gitga’at First Nation, whose traditional territory includes Gribbell Island.*

The first, independent clause, which ends with the comma before the word *whose*, is clearly about Robinson. In order to determine the Theme of this clause, a logical hypothetical question should be asked. Based on the context, the most appropriate question is *Who is Robinson?* which means that the border between the Theme and the Rheme lies after the verb *is*. The descriptive elements *43, stocky and swathed in rain gear* are considered a part of the Theme since they describe Robinson and do not constitute a clause with a subject and a verb (which is a necessary condition for a clause to be considered a separate unit of analysis). To sum up, the Theme of the first clause is *Robinson, 43, stocky and swathed in rain gear, is*, whereas the Rheme is what is being said about Robinson: *a wildlife guide and member of the Gitga’at First Nation.* The second, dependent adjectival clause that begins with the relative pronoun *whose* is about *Gitga’at First Nation’s traditional territory*. Only *Gitga’at First Nation’s* is replaced with the relative pronoun *whose*, which still allows us to ask the logical hypothetical question
appropriate for the context: *What does Gitga'at First Nation’s traditional territory include?* Therefore, the Rheme of the second clause is *Gribbell Island*.

This analysis of a complex sentence with a dependent adjectival clause demonstrates that it is not possible to find one common Theme for the entire sentence (given its definition), which makes it necessary to analyze the Theme/Rheme structures in the two clauses separately. Therefore, it would not be possible to use the orthographic sentence as the unit of analysis in this study, as researchers as Whittaker (1995) and Lowe (1987) propose.

The same is true for another describing how the white bear is fishing for salmon, when a black bear suddenly appears.¹²

Example 4: *Before it [the white bear] can lunge for one, a black bear suddenly comes out of the forest and runs the white bear off its perch—though "runs" might be a bit strong.*

Based on the criteria formulated for the selection of the unit of analysis, the sentence was broken into three clauses, each containing a subject and a verb, and then Theme and Rheme were marked in these three clauses. Based on the context, the most appropriate hypothetical question for the first dependent adverbial clause is *Before it can do what?* which determines that the Rheme is *lunge for one*. One can see that the possible questions that are being asked are not always worded in the best possible way, i.e., a

¹² *Kermode Bear.*
better formulated question for the first clause, both stylistically and grammatically, would be simply When? However, it is important to ask the question the way it was asked in order to see which part of the clause is not repeated in the question and thus constitutes the Rheme, as explained earlier in this section, since it has been established that the question test is the only clear and workable method used by researchers to determine the border between the Theme and the Rheme. According to this method, the question asked for the second independent clause is Who suddenly comes out of the forest and runs the white bear off its perch? Therefore, the Rheme of the second clause is a black bear. It may seem that the question What is a black bear doing? is also possible, but a closer look at the context shows that the previous Themes are about a white bear (a white bear, …the bear’s fur, followed by two zero Themes, which, nonetheless, refer to the white bear again). The white bear then becomes a common topic for this segment of text, making it more logical for the white bear to appear again in the Theme of the sentence under discussion, rather than introducing a new Theme—a black bear—that has not been mentioned earlier. Next, the question How does “run” sound? determines that might be a bit strong is the Rheme of the third dependent adverbial clause. Just as in the previous example of a complex sentence taken from the corpus of investigation, three different ideas are expressed in this sentence: one about the white bear [it] fishing, another one about a black bear suddenly coming out, while the third one is an assessment of the verb run used to describe the actions of the black bear in the previous Theme. Therefore, this example proves once again that no single common Theme can be found for complex
sentences and it is necessary to determine them for each clause, dependent or independent, that contains a subject and a verb.

With regard to utterances with a zero Theme, as suggested by other researches (e.g., Krylova and Khavronina 1976:28), they are sentences that are indivisible from the point of view of the functional sentence perspective, i.e., those sentences that merely state the existence of somebody or something or report a fact. The two sentences below, describing the bear’s fur and mentioned in the previous paragraph, contain only the Rheme.

Example 5: *Not pure white, exactly. More like a vanilla-colored carpet in need of a steam.*

Although these sentences do not make sense in isolation, it is easy to infer their common Theme from the context (more precisely—from the previous Theme)—the bear’s fur.

### 3.4 Thematic Progressions

After Theme and Rheme were established in a clause by using the question test, the relationship of the Theme to the previous clause (its Theme or Rheme) was established in order to test the hypotheses of the study. If the Theme was not related to the previous clause, its relationship to the clause before the previous one was examined. If no relationship was established with that one either, the clause before it was considered next and so on. The borderline was the beginning of the paragraph, i.e., relationships were not established beyond the paragraph where the Theme under examination occurred. The rationale for that is that any links that exist beyond one paragraph are too distant to track.
and the relationship diagrams for different types of thematic progressions would be too cumbersome to draw. The number of clauses that separate the Theme with a previous Theme or Rheme was marked, which can later help make conclusions about the cohesion of the texts under investigation. It can be hypothesized that the more distant the links, the less cohesive the texts, and vice versa). Moreover, there are instances of English source paragraphs being omitted or considerably altered in the Russian translation, which makes it impossible to compare thematic progressions across the two languages. For the bilingual analysis, only those paragraphs of the parallel corpus were examined that were translations of the non-translated texts in the English corpus.

Further, the relationships between Themes and previous Rhemes or Themes were classified in order to test the second hypothesis. As demonstrated with previous examples, the text of the Theme is not always repeated exactly as it was worded in a previous Theme or Rheme. In order to reflect all possible relationships, the categories below were used. It is important to note here that it is not the entire Theme or Rheme that gets repeated, but often only one component, which nonetheless connects the entire Theme to the contexts preceding and following it. The connectors were classified based on the 13 categories below.

1) *Lexical Repetition.* This category was used when a Theme repeated a previous Theme or Rheme exactly how it was worded or if it was a declined form of the same word (Russian contains many declinable elements, e.g., *my* (*we*) and *s nami* (*with us*); *u neë* (literally, *at her, or she*, as in *she has*) and *ona* (*she*).
2) Modified Repetition described words with the same stem that belong to the
same of different parts of speech, e.g., *the griz* and *grizzlies*; *the river* and
*riverbank*; *medved' (bear)* and *mishka (bear with a diminutive suffix)*.

3) Paraphrase. This category was used to denote synonyms and different words
that refer to the same thing or person: *a white bear* and *the white one*; *in the
late 18th century* and *in those days*.

4) Noun. This category described the process of nominalization: *he* and *white
bear*.

5) Pronoun denoted the opposite phenomenon, i.e., pronominalization, when a
noun became a pronoun.

6) Inference referred to instance with zero T that were described earlier or in
sentences like 

Плывут за счет сокращения своего купола [Plyvut za schet
sokrashcheniia svoego kupola](Swim-PL for account-ACC contraction-GEN
[its cupola]-GEN).  [Swim thanks to the contraction of their cupola], where
the T relates to the previous Theme *Oni (they)*, and from the previous context
it is clear that jellyfishes are implied.
7) *Explicitation* meant that the given Theme further explains the previous Theme or Rheme that it relates to, e.g., *That leads to an intriguing possibility:*

*Perhaps the griz had a hand in concentrating the Kermode gene on Princess Royal and Gribbell Islands.* Schematically, this simple linear thematic progression is depicted in Figure 7.

8) *Wh-element.* The main types of Wh-constructions are Wh-relatives and Wh-questions. Naturally, the Russian phrases do not contain the actual “wh-element”, however this term is used in modern linguistics to refer to question words and phrases introduced by “Wh” in English, e.g., *which, why, when, where, who,* etc. Bailyn (2012: 92) provides a list of Russian Wh-elements (Table 3).

Example: *They need big grassy estuaries, subalpine habitat, and an enormous home range, which*¹³ *those islands don't offer.*

---

¹³ It is hard to mark the Theme of the subordinate adjectival clause in this sentence by using the question test. However, semantic analysis of the logical relationships in the
sentence helps to understand that this clause is about big grassy estuaries, subalpine habitat, and an enormous home range (Theme) and what is said about them is that those islands don't offer [them] (Rheme).
Им нужны большие поросшие травой устья рек, субальпийские луга и обширная индивидуальная территория, чего на островах не найдешь. (They-NOM need [big grassy estuaries, subalpine meadows and enormous individual territory]-ACC which on island-PL, PREP find-NEG].

9) Th-element. This category was used for the English pronouns This and That and their Russian equivalent ėto, e.g., That may answer part of the question about why the white-fur trait continues to flourish today.

Возможно, это одна из причин, почему такой признак, как белый окрас шерсти, сохранялся до наших дней. (Perhaps, this one from reasons-GEN, why such trait-Nom as [white color]-NOM fur-GEN, remained until [our days]-GEN.

10) Hypertheme. This term was assigned to the Themes that include the meaning of the previous Theme or Rheme that they relate to and have a broader meaning than it does. Hyperthemes include hypernyms—words with a more general meaning than the words they relate to, and holonyms—words that reflect a whole-part relationship with the words they relate to, e.g., Neasloss in relationship to his hip (whole-part relationship); the black bears in relationship to a black bear; the bear in relationship to the bear’s fur.
11) **Hypotheme.** This kind of Theme has a more narrow meaning than the Themes or Rhemes that they relate to. This type includes *hyponyms*—words with a more specific meaning than the words they relate to, and *meronyms*—words that have a part-whole relationship with the words they relate to, e.g., *bear meat* in relationship to *the white bear; its belly* in relationship to *this bear,* *black individuals* and *white bears* in relationship to the general *bears.*

12) **Pronominal Reference** marks a type of Theme that is expressed by a pronoun that occurs in the direct speech and relates to a previous Theme or Rheme expressed by a noun, e.g., *I* in relationship to *Stewart.*

13) **Nominal Reference** describes Themes that are expressed by a noun and relate to a previous Theme or Rheme expressed by a pronoun and used in the direct speech, e.g., *Robinson* in relationship to *me.*

### 3.5 Statistical Analysis

The first hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the number of Simple Linear thematic progressions and Constant thematic progressions among the three corpora since they belong to the same genre and use exposition, explanation and description. The initial idea was to count the remaining two types of progressions described by Daneš (1974) ([Error! Reference source not found.](#)), i.e., thematic progressions with derived Themess (*Type 3*) and thematic progressions with a split Rheme (*Type 4*). However, by applying the method proposed in the present work (marking how the Theme of a clause is connected to the Theme or Rheme of a previous clause within one paragraph by using the question test), it has been established that there
is no difference between the *Type 2* and *Type 3*, as well as between the *Type 1* and *Type 4* as far as the kind of connection is concerned; what matters is the relationship between the Theme and a previous Theme or Rheme (whether it is a *paraphrase*, a *repetition*, a *pronoun*, etc.) and whether it is encountered in the previous clause or a clause that occurs earlier in the paragraph. Following McCabe (1999: 180), the Themes that were not chained to a previous Theme or Rheme in the given paragraph were labeled as *Peripheral Themes*. Being peripheral to the thematic progression pattern, those Themes are still important to the organization of the discourse and are not necessarily difficult to process. Since a paragraph was chosen as a unit of analysis, the first Theme in a paragraph was always marked as a Peripheral Theme.
Table 4. Analysis of Thematic Progressions in a Paragraph

| Demonstrates how Daneš’ example of a Split Rheme (Error! Reference source not found.) would be analyzed in this dissertation: |
| All substances can be divided into two classes: elementary substances and compounds. An elementary substance is a substance which consists of atoms of only one kind ... A compound is a substance which consists of atoms of two or more different kinds... (1974: 121) |
Table 4. Analysis of Thematic Progressions in a Paragraph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Progression Type</th>
<th>Peripheral Theme</th>
<th>Simple Textual Connectivity</th>
<th>Linear Textual Connectivity</th>
<th>Constant Textual Connectivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral Theme</td>
<td>elementary substances and compounds</td>
<td>a substance which consists of atoms of only one kind</td>
<td>a substance which consists of atoms of two or more different kinds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector</td>
<td>Hypotheme 1</td>
<td>Hypotheme 1</td>
<td>Hypotheme 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to Clause</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Text</td>
<td>1 All substances can be divided into two classes</td>
<td>2 An elementary substance is</td>
<td>3 A compound is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The method used in this work lends itself naturally to the numeric analysis, which was not done by Daneš (1974), whose work is descriptive—he provides several unrelated paragraphs as examples of each type of TP without performing statistical tests.
Table 5. Example analysis of an English source text paragraph.

demonstrates the advantage of the proposed method through an analysis a paragraph taken from the English source text corpus:

*Marven Robinson spots the bear but turns away, uninterested. "We might have better luck upstream," he says. Robinson, 43, stocky and swathed in rain gear, is a wildlife guide and member of the Gitga’at First Nation, whose traditional territory includes Gribbell Island. This bear isn't what he's looking for. He's after a more revered and rare creature: what the Gitga’at call mooksgm’ol, the spirit bear, a walking contradiction—a white black bear.*

In the paragraph above, given the context, Theme 2 (*we*) could be considered a Theme from which Theme 3 (*he*), Theme 4 (*Robinson*) and Theme 7 (*he*) derive, i.e., a Type 3 connection with derived Themes proposed by Daneš (1974:119) could be established. This, however, would ignore the relationships within the Type 3 structure, i.e., between Theme 4 and Theme 3 (*Noun*), and Theme 7 and Theme 8 (*Lexical Repetitions*). At the same time, the column *Connector* that specifies the type of relationships still shows that in the given context *we* is a word of a higher order than *he* (by marking the former as *Hypertheme* and the latter as *Hypotheme*). Although *Robinson* is not marked as a Hypotheme of *We*, the column *Related to* shows its connection (Noun) to Theme 3 which is a Hypotheme of Theme 2; so in this case the idea that Theme 3 and

---

*Kermode Bear.*
Theme 4 are derived from Theme 2 is not lost either. The analysis of substructures within big structures (such as the third and the fourth types of Daneš (1974) would make a numeric analysis very complicated. Hence, the decision has been made to differentiate between the thematic progressions that are connected to the previous Rheme (Type 1), previous Theme (Type 2) or neither Theme, nor Rheme (Peripheral Theme). The formula that was applied is shown in Figure 8.

Figure 8. Formula for Thematic Progressions.
### Table 5. Example analysis of an English source text paragraph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related to</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>T/R</th>
<th>Theme Text</th>
<th>T/R</th>
<th>Theme Text</th>
<th>T/R</th>
<th>Theme Text</th>
<th>T/R</th>
<th>Theme Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Marven</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>We might have</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Robinson, 43, stocky and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>better luck</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>This bear</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>whose traditional territory includes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>what he’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>He’s after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>what the Gitga’at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 This category refers it *adjectival clauses*. It will be introduced in the Results chapter, because it was added later.
The number of occurrences of Simple Linear thematic progression, Constant thematic progression, and Peripheral Themes in each paragraph of all three corpora will be counted and normalized by the number of clauses in the paragraph. Then, one-way ANOVA will be performed with the aim to determine whether a significant difference in the frequency of occurrence of the thematic progression-types exists between the three corpora in order to test the first hypothesis. The independent variable in this case is the corpus type. The number of occurrences of the Simple Linear thematic progression, Constant thematic progression, and Peripheral Themes normalized by the number of clauses in the paragraph are the dependent variables. Each dependent variable will be assessed for association with the independently with type I error set at $\alpha=0.05$. The independent variable has three levels (English non-translated texts, Russian translated texts, and Russian non-translated texts). If the ANOVA analysis shows that the independent variable is associated with frequency of the dependent variable, it will be necessary to determine which pair or pairs of factor levels have different means. To do so, the post hoc Tukey’s HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) procedure will be performed.

The second hypothesis seeks to determine whether there is a significant difference in the frequency of usage of different connectors in the three corpora. In order to test this hypothesis, for each of the 13 connectors, the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA analysis will be performed; type I error will be set at $\alpha=0.05$. In this test, the independent variable with three levels will be corpus type and the dependent variable —the frequency of occurrence of each connector normalized by the number of clauses in the paragraph. Each connector
will be tested independently. If the test for one or more connectors is significant, the next step will be to determine which corpora are different in the usage of the connector. For that purpose, the Bonferroni correction procedure will be performed for the connectors found significant by ANOVA. Tests with \( p<0.05/3 = 0.0167 \) will be considered significant.

In order to test the third hypothesis about the extent of linkage between clauses, the number of clauses between the given Theme and the Theme or Rheme that it is related to in the given paragraph will be compared in the three corpora stratified by type of thematic progression. This analysis will be performed using the two-way ANOVA. The two independent factors here are the corpus type (English source text, Russian target text, and Russian comparable) and thematic progression type (Simple Linear thematic progression and Constant thematic progression). Note that Peripheral Themes are dropped from this analysis because such clauses are not linked to any previous clauses. The post-hoc Tukey HSD test will be used to determine which pairs of texts are accountable for the significant differences, if those are to be found, and whether there is a difference according to thematic progression type.
CHAPTER 4

Analysis and Results

The analysis of the data indicated that the selected methodology had to be expanded or slightly modified in order to address some additional questions that the conducted analysis revealed. This chapter covers such questions as well as the solutions that were found. It consists of the following parts: *Unit of Analysis, Theme and Rheme in Interrogative, Negative and Imperative Clauses, Thematic Progressions, Connectors, and Textual Connectivity*. It also provides quantitative results provided by the ANOVA and the Kruskal-Wallis tests and obtained from the analysis of the original, parallel and comparable corpora. All examples in this chapter are accompanied by footnotes containing references to the texts from the corpora from which they were drawn (the bibliography of these texts are listed at the end of the dissertation). The examples are italicized and all Rs are in bold. In all examples, the texts in Cyrillic is presented in the following format: *Text in Cyrillic. [Transliteration]. (Grammar Translation). [Translation into English]*.

4.1 Unit of Analysis

The thematic progression types and relationships between Themes and the previous context were established within a paragraph. However, initial analysis revealed that the information contained in source text and target text was not always organized into paragraphs in the same manner, i.e., what was included in one paragraph in the source
text was sometimes found to be split into two paragraphs in the target text, and vice versa. In this study, when such a difference was encountered, the limits of the paragraph were determined by one of the two texts. For example, if the text contained in one paragraph in either the source text or the target text extended to more than one paragraph in its corresponding target text or source text, it was nonetheless considered one paragraph, and the shorter paragraph was extended to match its pair. The guiding principle was to have the same information within a single paragraph in the source text and target text in order to be able to analyze and compare the thematic patterns of the source text and the target text.

The unit of analysis for determination of Theme and Rheme was a clause (dependent or independent), which was defined as a group of words that contains a grammatical subject and verb and expresses a thought. Russian texts, however, have been shown to contain sentences that have only a noun or a verb but nonetheless express a complete thought. They are known as односоставные предложения (mononuclear sentences). Those were examined as clauses as well.

Example 1: Сезон дождей.\textsuperscript{16} [Sezon dozhdei]. (Season-NOM rains-GEN).

\textit{It’s the wet season.}\textsuperscript{17}

Bailyn refers to such constructions in Russian as \textit{subjectless impersonals}—“sentences without any apparent grammatical subject, or at least without a traditional Nominative

\textsuperscript{16} Bor’ba za zhizn’.

\textsuperscript{17} It’s a Frog’s Life.
case-marked subject” (2012:115). Subjectless impersonals can be nominal (Example 1) or verbal (Example 2). English equivalents of those contain both the subject and the predicate, and their functional sentence perspective possesses both the Theme and the Rheme (the utterance above answers the hypothetical question What is it?), while the Russian sentence contains only the Rheme.

Example 2: Оказалось, что и никто другой в мире этого не знает.18

[Оказались, что и никто другой в мире этого не знает]. (Turned out that and no one else-NOM in world-PREP this-GEN NEG knows).

It turns out no one else in the world knew either. 19

Although the first clause of the English sentence above (It turns out) contains a formal grammatical subject (It), from the point of view of FSP it is a communicatively undivided zero-T utterance, which merely states a fact (obviously, it would not be logical to ask What did it do? in the hypothetical question, but rather What happened?).

Other clauses that did not contain a subject and a predicate were Russian and English imperatives, questions (both examined in the following section) or sentences that were used in a casual context in a narration or in direct speech.

Example 3: Time to return home… 20

Period.21

18 Sekret pingvina.

19 Emperor Penguins.

20 Humpback Whales.
“OK,” he says. “GO!”

“Отлично, – говорит он, – вперед!” ("Great,--says he-NOM, --forward!")

### 4.2 Theme and Rheme in Interrogative, Negative and Imperative Clauses

As previously mentioned, one of the limitations of the question test is that it can be applied directly only to affirmative sentences. Previous research does not offer a strategy for the analysis of functional sentence perspective in interrogative and negative statements, nor for imperatives (Daneš 1974, Krylova and Khavronina 1984, Sheviakova 1976, Adamec 1966). To address this problem, a set of the rules below was applied that allow us to determine functional sentence perspective in questions both in Russian and English.

1) In Wh-questions and their Russian counterparts the element that requests the missing information—the wh-element—functions as Theme. This way, there is usually no connection of this Theme with the previous context, and therefore corresponds to thematic progression-type 3.

Example 1: *What happens to the embryos after the fall?*  

---

21 *Humpback Whales.*  

22 *Humpback Whales.*  

23 *Gorbatye kity.*  

24 *It’s a Frog’s Life.*
Что происходит дальше? [Что происходит дальше?] (What happens afterward?)

Why do I do it?

Почему я этим занимаюсь? [Почему я этим занимаюсь?] (Why I this-INSTR do?)

In some wh-questions the Theme is realized by a group phrase in which the wh-word occurs. In the following question, it is not only the wh-element that requests the missing information but also the noun that follows it.

...what hope is there for the rest?

2) In yes/no questions and their Russian counterparts the Theme includes the finite verb (in English), such as is, isn’t, do, don’t, can, can’t, etc., but it also extends to the subject of the sentence. In Russian yes/no questions, the Theme includes just the subject, since finite verbs are not used in interrogatives.

Example 2: Have you seen this turtle?

25 Bor‘ba za zhizn’.

26 Humback Whales.

27 Gorbatye Kity.

28 Explorers Journal.

29 Ancient Mariner.
No разве характеристика “обычная” подходит этой смелой птице? [No razye kharakteristika “obychnaia” podkhodit etoi smeloi ptiсе?] (But really characteristic “ordinary”-NOM fits this brave bird-GEN?) [But does the characteristic “ordinary” really describe this brave bird well?]

There have been yes/no questions found where the Rheme precedes the Theme.

Example 3: Но думал ли человек…? [No dumal li chelovek…?] (But thought person-NOM..?) [But did the person think…..?]

The previous context about человек (chelovek) helps to draw the line between the Theme and the Rheme in this interrogative utterance: человек (chelovek) becomes a common Theme of the entire paragraph.

Some of the yes/no questions contain just the Rheme and zero, or implied Theme.

Example 4: Выдумки? [Vyдумки?] (Nonsense?)

In the question above, the Theme это [eto] (this) is implied; in the one below, the form of address from the previous sentence—дорогие друзья [dorogie druž′a] (dear friends) is the implied Theme, while the question only contains the Rheme.

Example 5: Хотите посмотреть на ручных лосей, обитающих в естественных условиях? [Khitite posmotret’ na ruchnykh losei,}

---

30 Blestitashchaïa okhota.
31 Vpered, za paraplanom!
32 Strausinaïa ferma.
33 Loseferma.
obitañshchikh v estestvennykh uslovïakh? (Want look at tamed moose-GEN living in natural conditions-PREP?) [Would you like to look at tamed moose living in natural conditions?]

The message of any imperative clause is “I want you to do something” or “I want us (you and I) to do something”. In a negative imperative this message changes to “I want you/us not to”. The common form of the ‘you’ imperative contains no subject (in English or Russian) or finite verb (in English) and no explicit T (Halliday 1985: 49).


Thus, the first clause of the compound sentence above consists of Rheme only, and the Theme ви (vy) – a form of address to the readers—is implied.

However, if the clause containing the imperative extends beyond the verb, then the verb receives the status of a Theme.

Example 7: Тогда отправляйтесь в Костромскую область35. [Togda отправляйтесь в Kostromskuju oblast’]. (Then go to Kostromskaia oblast’-ACC). [Then go to Kostromskaia oblast’].

34 Loseferma.

35 Loseferma.
Rest your hand on a leatherback's meaty shoulder…

The third person imperatives have a different functional sentence perspective: the noun becomes part of the Theme.

Example 8: If there are those who did, then heaven heal their souls.

As suggested by Hajičová, negative sentences were analyzed “as parallel to their positive counterparts” (1994:259).

Example 9: The parents themselves don’t have to be white.

The positive counterpart of this negative sentence is The parents themselves have to be white. Asking the hypothetical question What do the parents have to do? helps us to determine the Theme and the Rheme in the sentence. Likewise, the positive counterpart allows us to establish the border between the Theme and Rheme in another negative utterance:

Example 10: So it's not uncommon for white bears to be born to black parents.

36 Ancient Mariner.

37 Philippine Eagles.

38 Kermode Bear.

39 Kermode Bear.
4.3 Thematic Progressions

By applying the question test method, all clauses were divided into the Theme and Rheme. After that, their relationship with the previous context was established as Simple Liner thematic progression, Constant thematic progression, Complex thematic progression or Peripheral Theme—when no relationship with the previous context could be established. Since a paragraph was chosen as a unit of analysis in the given study, the first clause of each paragraph corresponded to the Peripheral Theme. The analysis demonstrated that it is not always possible to relate the given Theme to either the Theme or the Rheme of the previous clause—there are instances where it relates to both the Theme and the Rheme of the previous clause (Example 1) or even to the broader previous context comprising several Themes and Rhemes (Example 2).

Example 1: Remember when the biggest animals in the world seemed in danger of vanishing? It was during the 1960s and '70s, when commercial hunting had made many of the great whale species so scarce it looked as if the world would be robbed of an entire dimension of wonder. 40

In the example above, the subject pronoun it at the beginning of the second sentence replaces the entire previous clause: its Theme and Rheme (when the biggest animals in the world seemed in danger of vanishing). Such instances were classified as a Complex thematic progression. Their relationship to the previous context was marked as “one clause away” since, as a rule, there is always a connection with the previous clause (its

40 Humpback Whales.
Theme and Rheme) plus, possibly, with a more previous context. The example below, however, is an exception to that rule.

Example 2: "The birds had the islands all to themselves, and they grew big," says Filipino biologist Hector Miranda, who has studied the eagles extensively. "But it was a trade-off, because the forest that created them is almost gone…" 41

The subject pronoun *it* relates to two previous clauses (describing the situation when the birds *had the islands all to themselves and they grew big*), however, there are two clauses between them. As Example 2 shows, in this study the clauses of complex and compound sentences were analyzed in the order in which they appeared. While compound and complex sentences were found in a large portion of all three corpora, the examples provided in the reviewed literature consisted of simple sentences and were not helpful in that respect (Krylova and Khavronina 1984, SHEVIAKOVA 1976, Adamec 1966).

Moreover, some Themes contained more than one reference to the previous context. When such Themes occurred, the referent that came first was marked as a connector.

Example 3: Два года назад в песне было (T1) только четыре (R1) темы (T1), хотя в предыдущие годы их число (T2) могло доходить до восьми (R2). В 2006 году в песне было (T3) шесть (R3) тем (T3). [Dva goda nazad v pesne bylo tol'ko chetyre temy, khot'ja v predydushchie gody ikh chislo moglo dokhodit' do vos'mi. V 2006 godu v pesne bylo shest' tem.] (Two year-ACC ago in song-

---

41 Philippine Eagles.
PREP was only four themes-ACC, although in last years-ACC their number-NOM could reach to eight-GEN. In 2006 year-PREP in song-PREP were six themes-GEN). [There were only four themes in a song two years ago, although their number could reach eight in previous years. In 2006, a song had six themes].

The functional sentence perspective of the sentences above is characterized by non-contiguous order (T1-R1-T1; T3-R3-T3). Theme 2 contains two referents to the previous Theme: годы [gody] (years) relates to года [goda] (year-GEN) as hypertheme, while их (ikh) (their) relates to темы as pronoun. Since годы [gody] (years) was mentioned first, we opted for the connector hypertheme. Likewise, Theme 3 contains году [godu], (year-PREP), which relates to the previous Theme as hypotheme, as well as тем [tem](themes-GEN), which is a noun in relationship to их ux (ikh ) (their) in Theme 2. Again, following our order rule, hypotheme was marked in this case as well.

Figure 9. Means of Thematic Progression Types.
4.3.1 Quantitative Analysis

In order to test the first hypothesis which states that no significant differences exist in the number of Simple Linear thematic progression and Constant thematic progression that occur in the three types of corpora under investigation due to the fact they all belong to the same genre and thus share common functional sentence perspective features, the one-way ANOVA was performed. Its results, which are shown in
Table 6 for all four thematic progression-types below, confirmed the first hypothesis. The means of thematic progression-types are displayed in Error! Reference source not found.

4.4 Connectors

The analysis revealed some simplifications pertaining to the 13 connectors that were selected to describe the semantic relationships between Themes and previous Themes or Rhemes. For instance, while the relative pronoun which (который, kotoryĭ) was marked as a Wh-element, another relative pronoun that, also translated as который, kotoryĭ in the adjectival clause, as in the example below, was classified as a Pronoun, which would have shown differences in the given category where in fact they are not present.
### Table 6. Anova Analysis of Thematic Progression Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic progression-type</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sum Sq</th>
<th>Mean Sq</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Pr (&gt;F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Linear</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.9117</td>
<td>0.031438</td>
<td>0.9568</td>
<td>0.5331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>10.8427</td>
<td>0.032857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>0.037206</td>
<td>0.8862</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>13.855</td>
<td>0.041985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.6305</td>
<td>0.021743</td>
<td>0.8708</td>
<td>0.6618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>8.2401</td>
<td>0.024970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.06243</td>
<td>0.0021528</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>0.4225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.68775</td>
<td>0.0020841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 1: In Amazonian folk wisdom the boto is an encantado—an enchanted being, a shape-shifter that sometimes takes on human form, coming out of the river to beguile men and women and lead them into its magical underwater city.  

Members of the Meropidae family, which includes 25 species of bee-eaters, are famously cooperative breeders.

To avoid this problem, the category Adjectival Clause (Adj) was introduced to refer to the clauses that work as adjectives and that are introduced by relative pronouns who, whom, whose, that and which. It should be noted that who, whom, that and which can also introduce a nominal clause, in which case those pronouns were marked differently.

Example 2: European honeybees overwinter by hunkering down in the hive, which dries up the bee-eater’s main source of food.

Европейские медоносные пчелы переживают зиму, затаившись в ульях, что лишает пчелоедок основного источника пищи. [Европейские медоносные пчелы переживают зиму, затаившись в ульях, что лишает пчелоедок основного источника пищи.] (European honeybees-NOM survive

---

42 Amazon Dolphins.
43 Bee-eaters.
44 Bee-eaters.
45 Blestiashchaia okhota.
winter-ACC, hunkering down in hives-PREP, which deprives honeybees-GEN main source of food-GEN).

In both the English source text sentence and in its translation, which [chto] (umno) functioning as a subject introduces a nominal clause and is marked as a Wh-element. Unlike adjectival clauses, which describe a noun, nominal clauses name a place, person, thing or an idea. The example below demonstrates that which [chto] (عَمَّ) refers to the entire previous clause—its Theme and Rheme, whereas the adjectival which (كَمُورِيُّ، kotoryi) refers to one word (usually a noun).

In addition, the pronouns This and That and their Russian equivalents э́то (êto) and так (tak) were categorized as Th-elements, whereas It and It’s also translated as э́то (êto) or так (tak)—as a pronoun.

Example 3: It inspired us to launch National Geographic’s Big Cats Initiative (BCI) as an effort to save these top predators.46

That may answer part of the question about why the white-fur trait continues to flourish today.47

This goes on for hours, until daylight fades from the sky.48

In the three sentences above, It, That and This all correspond to the Russian э́то (êto) and marking them differently in the analysis would have shown unwanted differences as was

46 Explorers Journal.

47 Kermode Bear.

48 Kermode Bear.
the case with Which/That and который [kotoryi]. Therefore, the category Pronoun was used in such cases, and the category Th-element was removed.

The category Explicitation as it was initially defined (as a Theme that further explains a previous Theme or Rheme) was too broad to be applied. As a rule, any sentence in a paragraph, and thus its Theme and Rheme, are logically connected to the previous ones (and therefore, to previous Themes and Rhemes), by further explaining them. This would have resulted in overuse of this category since the connector could be classified as Explicitation most of the time, as in the following paragraph:

Example 4: When an emperor penguin swims through the water, it is slowed by the friction between its body and the water, keeping its maximum speed somewhere between four and nine feet a second. But in short bursts the penguin can double or even triple its speed by releasing air from its feathers in the form of tiny bubbles. These reduce the density and viscosity of the water around the penguin’s body, cutting drag and enabling the bird to reach speeds that would otherwise be impossible. As an added benefit, the extra speed helps the penguins avoid predators such as leopard seals. 49

The example above demonstrates how the idea of the paragraph is developed through its Themes: first the text topic is the emperor penguin (an emperor penguin, it, the penguin), then about the bubbles and finally—about the extra speed. All the Themes further explain the previous Theme or Rheme.

49 Emperor Penguins.
In order to avoid the overuse of Explicitation, more specific rules pertaining to its usage were worked out, as shown below:

1) Explicitation was marked only within one sentence.

2) The expletive that/что [chto] in complex sentences (not the relative pronoun of adjectival clauses) was indicative of Explicitation.

Example 5: Observers from the Whale Trust, a Maui-based foundation for research and education (T1), have found (R1) that some of the submerged males (T2) are calling out the humpback's famous song, filling the seas with strange and lovely incantations (R2).  

In this sentence, Theme 2 further explains Rheme 1, and the relationship that exists between them is described as Explicitation.

Example 6: Однако до недавнего времени (T1) никто и не знал (R1), что часто горбачи (T2) просто болтаются без дела (R2). [Однако до недавнего времени (T1) никто и не знал (R1), что часто горбачи (T2) просто болтаются без дела (R2)]. (Yet until recent time-GEN no one and NEG knew, that often humpbacks-NOM just hung out without task-GEN). [Yet, until recently no one even knew that often humpbacks just hang around without doing anything].

---

50 Humpback Whales.

51 Gorbatyе Kity.
Likewise, in the Russian example above, Theme 2 further explains Rheme 1 with the help of the expletive что [chto] and relates to it by means of Explicitation.

Sometimes, expletive that/ что(chto) was not present, but it was implied. The category Explicitation was also applicable in such cases.

Example 7: Казалось (R1), мир (T2) может лишиться одного из своих чудес (R2).

[Kazalos' (R1), mir (T2) mозhet lishit'sia odnogo iz svoikh chudes (R2).] (Seemed, world-Nom could lose one-GEN of its miracles-GEN). (It seemed that the world could lose one of its miracles).

Что [chto] (that) after the comma is implied and мир [mir] (world) further explains Rheme 1.

3) Expletive if was also considered a sign of Explicitation when the given Theme further explained the previous Theme or Rheme.

Example 8: It looked as if the world would be robbed of an entire dimension of wonder.52

The comparison to Example 7, which contains the translation of the English sentence in Example 8, shows that, although the two languages use different grammatical means to express the same idea, the functional sentence perspective is the same: thematic progression-type 1 is used in both sentences and the connection is realized through Explicitation.

52 Humpback Whales.
4) A colon and a dash within a sentence were also characteristic of *Explicitation*, when they linked independent clauses.

Example 9: *They also have (T1) broad flippers, a reduced dorsal fin (a larger one would just get in the way in tight spots), and small eyes (R1)—echolocation (T2) helps them pinpoint prey in muddy water (R2).*

Точное число китов (T1) определить невозможно (R1): под каждым горбачом, поднимающим столб брызг в солнечных лучах, плывут (T2) другие (R2). [Tochnoe chislo kitov (T1) opredelit' nevozmozhno (R1): pod kazhdym gorbachom, podnimaushchim uchku bryzg v solnechnykh luchakh, plyvut (T2) drugie (R2)]. (Exact number-ACC humpbacks-GEN determine impossible: under each humpback, releasing stream-ACC splashes-GEN in sunny rays-PREP, swim others-NOM). [It is impossible to determine the exact number of the whales: under each humpback releasing a stream of splashes in the rays of sun, there are others].

In both sentences, the clause after the dash/colon amplifies and completes the meaning of the preceding one, hence Simple Linear thematic progression was established between Theme 2 and Rheme 1. As shown in this example, functional sentence perspective was not examined in parenthetical clauses, provided they were parenthetical in both source text and target text. The entire parenthetical clause was considered a part of a Theme or

---

53 *Amazon Dolphins.*

54 *Gorbatye Kity.*
Rheme depending on what part of the sentence it amplified. If parentheses were dropped in either one of the texts, Theme and Rheme were marked in both and their relationship to the previous context was determined.

5) *Explicitation* was used when the direct speech (one clause or more) preceded the subject and the verb.

Example 10: "**Bubble trail** (R1)," *declares* (R2) *Salden* (T2).\(^{55}\)

Simple Linear thematic progression was established between Theme 2 and Rheme 1 and the relationship was described as *Explicitation*. When direct speech was present, the Rheme expressed by the verb often came before the Theme or the subject in the clause. The Functional Sentence Perspective is the same in the Russian sentence below (although punctuation rules in Russian require the use of a dash after direct speech and before the verb, which also signals *Explicitation*):

“**Распятие и блок**”, – говорит Дэн Сэлден, глава Гавайского фонда исследования китов.\(^{56}\) [“Raspiat′ie i blok”, – govorit Dën Sėlden, glava Gavaǐskogo fonda issledovaniia kitov]. (“Crucifix-NOM and block-NOM”,--says Den Selden-NOM, head-Nom Hawaiian fund research whales-GEN). [“Crucifix and Block,” observes Dan Salden, head of the Hawaii Whale Research Foundation].

---

55 *Humpback Whales.*

56 *Gorbatye kity.*
4.4.1 Quantitative Analysis

The second hypothesis stated that the connectors between Themes and the previous context will be different in the Russian target text corpus and the comparable Russian corpus. The Russian target texts were expected to reproduce the connectors of the English source texts, which were expected to be significantly different from those of the Russian non-translated texts. In order to test the second hypothesis, the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA test was used. When the test provided significant results for a connector, a post-hoc pair-wise test was performed in order to determine which two kinds of corpora were significantly different from each other in the usage of the given connector. To control for multiple testing, the significance level of post-hoc tests was adjusted using the Bonferroni correction; tests with $p<0.05/3 = 0.0167$ were considered significant.
Table 7). Additionally, Box-and-Whisker Plot for each connector is shown below (Figure 10 and Figure 11).

The results of the test that appear in
Table 7 revealed that there are significant differences in the usage of the following six types of connectors between the three corpora: Adjectival Clause, Explicitation, Inference, Lexical Repetition, Nominal Reference, and Paraphrase. The second hypothesis held true for three out of those six types of connectors, namely Adjectival Clause, Lexical Repetition, and Paraphrase. A significant difference in the category of Explicitation was found between English STs and Russian non-translated texts. However, there is also some indication that the Russian translated texts to differ from the Russian originals ($\alpha = 0.01984$). The post-hoc pair-wise test did not reveal which pair of corpora is significantly different from each other in the usage of Inference; however, the numbers in the table below suggest that there is an indication that the Russian target texts and Russian non-translated texts to be different. The category of Nominal Reference revealed differences between the Russian target text corpus and the Russian comparable corpus, as well as between the English source text corpus and the Russian comparable corpus.
Table 7. Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA Results for Connectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connector type</th>
<th>Text type</th>
<th>Post-hoc test p-values**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E Source</td>
<td>R Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectival</td>
<td>E Source</td>
<td>R Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-values significant at $\alpha=0.05$ are bold and highlighted

** post-hoc test p-values significant at $\alpha=0.05$ after Bonferroni correction (nominal $\alpha=0.0167$) are in bold
Figure 10. Box-and-Whiskers Plot for Statistically Significant Connectors
Figure 11. Box-and-Whisker Plot for Statistically Insignificant Connectors
4.5 Textual Connectivity

After the connection of the given Theme to the previous context was established, the number of paragraphs between this Theme and a Theme or Rheme it relates to was counted. No number was registered for the Theme of the first clause of a paragraph, since the paragraph was our unit of analysis, as well as for the Themes of the paragraph that were not related to any previous Themes or Rhemes, i.e., for Peripheral Themes. When the given Theme related to more than one Theme or Rheme (as in Complex thematic progressions), its relationship to the nearest of all the clauses it relates to was registered.

Since thematic patterns are believed to contribute to the coherence of the text (Li-ping 2008, Dejica 2009, Jalilifar 2009), it was of interest to examine how close the links between Themes and Rhemes are in the original, parallel and comparable corpora. The expectation about the number of clauses between the Themes and Rhemes that are connected was that the translated texts will be similar in that respect to the English original texts, due to the interference of the source language, but different from the Russian texts in the comparable corpus. In order to test this hypothesis, a two-way ANOVA test was used (Table 8). After significant results were isolated, the post-hoc Tukey HSD test was performed with the purpose of establishing which pair of texts was accountable for the significant difference (Table 9). Although significant differences were found only between the comparable Russian corpus and the English source text corpus, there is also an indication that the Russian target text corpus and the Russian comparable corpus are different, as
expected. For a better visualization, a Box-and-Whisker Plot for Textual Connectivity is shown in Figure 12.

**Table 8. ANOVA results for Textual Connectivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sum Sq</th>
<th>Mean Sq</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Pr(&gt;F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text Type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.0879</td>
<td>6.591</td>
<td>0.00155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>58.60</td>
<td>0.1651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results for Textual Connectivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus Type</th>
<th>diff</th>
<th>lwr</th>
<th>upr</th>
<th>p adj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian text-English source text</td>
<td>-0.06930458</td>
<td>-0.1940579</td>
<td>0.055448712</td>
<td>0.3919145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Comparable-English source text</td>
<td>-0.18765314</td>
<td>-0.3108691</td>
<td>-0.064437181</td>
<td>0.0011188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Comparable-English source text</td>
<td>-0.11834857</td>
<td>-0.2418330</td>
<td>0.005135849</td>
<td>0.0635569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12. Box-and-Whisker Plot for Textual Connectivity
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

5.1 Thematic Progressions

The first hypothesis tested in this study was that the similar social function of the texts under investigation would result in similar thematic patterning across languages. More specifically, it was expected that the texts in all three corpora—the English source text corpus, the Russian target text corpus, and the Russian comparable corpus—would reflect primarily Simple Linear and Constant thematic progressions, with no significant differences in the number of occurrences of each thematic progression-type. These expectations were based on the previous research showing that Simple Linear thematic progression commonly occurred in texts involving explanation and exposition, and that the information in descriptions was usually organized through Constant thematic progression (Nwogu 1990 cited in McCabe 1999:190). The hypothesis was confirmed by quantitative analysis—the one-way ANOVA test, which additionally revealed no significant differences across the three corpora in the usage of the Complex thematic progression- (when the given Theme referred to the broader previous context and not to a specific Theme or Rheme) and Peripheral Theme (when no connection between the Theme and the previous context could be established). This section discusses stylistic features common for the texts making up the three corpora that are associated with their shared thematic patterns.
According to Wang, the cross-referential linking between the Rheme of one clause and the Theme of the next, which is characteristic of the Simple Linear thematic progression, “gives a reader orientation as to where the information has come from and where it is going, and hence creates cohesion in a written text” (2007: 169).

Example 1: *He knew about a leopard seal attack on a member of Shackleton's crew, Thomas Orde-Lees, who was skiing across sea ice when a leopard seal emerged from between two floes and lunged after him in bold, snakelike movements. Orde-Lees managed to keep ahead, kicking and gliding...*  

In the paragraph above, *a member of Shackleton's crew, Thomas Orde-Lees* is part of Rheme 1; the relative pronoun *who*, referring to Thomas Orde-Lees, becomes the Theme of the following clause; the next clause begins with *when*, which makes the reader go back to Rheme 2 to make a connection; the Theme of the following sentence contains Orde-Lees, which relates to the pronoun *him* in the preceding clause. Example 1 demonstrates how each successive idea expands the idea expressed in the previous clause, i.e., the Theme of one clause picks up a thought from the Rheme of the one before it. Example 1 demonstrates how Simple Linear thematic progression facilitates reading by helping the reader to make logical connections more easily. Otherwise, if a brand new Theme is suddenly introduced in the flow of the text, i.e., if the information contained in the Theme is mentioned for the first time, the communication may be interrupted. Bloor and Bloor (1992) note that the problem of the brand new Theme—one of several

---

57 *Leopard Seals.*
associated with misuse of Theme and Rheme—is common for inexperienced writers (cited in Wang 2007:167).

It should be noted, however, that such interruption of logic was not necessarily the case when no connection was established between the given Theme and any previous Themes or Rhemes in a paragraph of the analyzed data.

Example 2: The Amazon dolphin, *Inia geoffrensis* (T1), parted company with its oceanic ancestors about 15 million years ago, during the Miocene epoch (R1). Sea levels were (T2) higher then (R2), says (R3) biologist Healy Hamilton of the California Academy of Sciences in San Francisco (T3), and large parts of South America, including the Amazon Basin (T4), may have been flooded by shallow, more or less brackish water (R4).

In the paragraph above, none of the four consecutive Themes is connected with the previous context. While, because of that, this paragraph can be viewed as less cohesive than the one in Example 1, where cross-referential links between the Rhemes and the Themes facilitate comprehension, some other logical links are nonetheless present. While the first Theme of a paragraph is never connected with the previous context in this study due to the fact that a paragraph is the unit of analysis, the *Amazon dolphin* is the topic of the entire article, so this piece of information is familiar to the reader. Next, there is a reference in Rheme 2 (*then*) to the previous Rheme (*the Miocene epoch*). Theme 4 further describes what happened during that epoch, and although the biologist Healy Hamilton is mentioned for the first time, it seems to be appropriate to refer to a biologist in this kind of context and it does not interrupt the communication (while the mention of a cook, for
instance, would). It is important to keep in mind that thematic patterns are just one of the factors that contribute to cohesion, so in order to make convincing conclusions about cohesion, it is important to take other cohesive markers into account.

Fries, who discusses how different types of Thematic progressions correlate with stylistic differences, notes that Simple Linear thematic progression is common for scholarly articles, whereas narratives tend to have sequences of clauses containing the same type of Theme, which is often a common characteristic (1983:124). Such a description of narratives matches the thematic pattern in the paragraph below, which corresponds to the Constant thematic progression, the second prevalent thematic progression in the three corpora under investigation.

Example 3: The leatherback can dive nearly a mile, swim across oceans, and keep itself warm in water close to freezing. It survives on a diet that few other creatures can stomach. And, most important, it keeps its options open. Other sea turtles are faithful to specific nesting beaches and feeding grounds, which makes them especially vulnerable as human pressures increase. But the leatherback can be more of an opportunist, exploiting favorable conditions—undeveloped nesting beaches, rich blooms of jellyfish—as it finds them. "These turtles treat the entire ocean as their pond," says Jeanette Wyneken, a biologist at Florida Atlantic University...  

---

58 Ancient Mariner.
The common semantic element that runs through the Themes of the clauses of this paragraph is the leatherback (it, these turtles). When other sea turtles are mentioned, the reader still makes a connection with the previous Theme it, and other sea turtles is classified as a Hypertheme of it. In Fries’ terms, leatherback is the topic of the paragraph, or the subject that is being discussed (1983:135).

The findings about thematic progression-types in this study are consistent with those of McCabe (1999), whose analysis overall discovered similarities in the thematic choices and patterning in Spanish and English history texts based on the same assumption, i.e., similarity in content, purpose and audience, which resulted in similarities in textual features. Likewise, Jalilifar (2006), who compared Theme types and thematic progressions in English and translated Persian academic texts, applying McCabe’s model, found similar patterns in thematic progression-types.  

5.2 Connectors

The second hypothesis of this study stated that the connectors, or the ways in which the Themes are linked to the previous context, will be similar in the English source text corpus and the Russian target text corpus due to the interference of the source text.

59 It should be noted that despite the overall similarities, McCabe’s (1999) and Jalilifar’s (2006) analyses of thematic progressions across their language pairs also revealed some differences, i.e., the usage of thematic progressions was not identical in all categories that the researchers compared.
Toury, who assigns interference the status of a law of translation, notes that it “is a kind of default,” and an interference-free output would require special conditions and/or special efforts on behalf of the translator (1995:275). The connectors in the parallel Russian and comparable Russian corpora were expected to be different. The statistical analysis revealed significant differences between the three corpora in the usage of the six types of connectors: *Adjectival Clause, Explicitation, Inference, Lexical Repetition, Nominal Reference* and *Paraphrase*. However, the Russian parallel corpus and the Russian comparable corpus differed only in the usage of one connector—*Nominal Reference*. Additionally, there is an indication that Russian target texts and Russian non-translated texts use *Explicitation* differently, although a statistically significant difference in this category was found only between English source texts and non-translated Russian texts. Although the Bonferroni correction did not reveal which pair of corpora accounts for the difference in the category of *Explicitation*, it is most likely that the difference is caused by parallel Russian vs. Comparable Russian corpora (3% vs. 5.8% of all connectors, with 3.5% in the original English corpus). In fact, most of the differences were found between the English STs and Russian target texts, implying that translators tended to conform to the norms of the target system rather than be influenced by the make-up of the source text, which is indicated by the statistically significant differences between the English source texts and Russian target texts in the usage of the following types of connector: *Adjectival Clause, Lexical Repetition, and Paraphrase. Explicitation* as well as *Nominal Reference* were used differently in the original English and comparable Russian corpora. The differences found in a number of categories between
the English source texts and Russian target texts, contrary to our expectations, can be interpreted as an indication of the professionalism of translators: accomplished translators are believed to be less affected by the make-up of the source text (Toury 1995: 277).

5.2.1 Lexical Repetitions

The number of Lexical Repetitions used in the parallel corpus was significantly lower than in the corpus of English source texts (10.1% vs. 19.1% of all connectors) and also lower than in the comparable Russian corpus (13.8%). These findings can be explained by one of the assumed universals of translation—the avoidance of repetitions that are present in the source text. According to Toury, regardless of their functions in the source text, avoidance of repetitions in the target text “is one of the most persistent, unbending norms in translation in all languages studied so far” (1991:188). Toury’s argument is supported by Jääskeläinen’s classroom observations and by research evidence from professional translation (e.g., Blum-Kulka and Levenson 1983) (Jääskeläinen 2004: 206).

This tendency may be caused by the assumed linguistic norms of good writing to which the translators, as professional text-producers, try to adhere (Jääskeläinen 2004). Lexical repetitions, however, are often used by writers as a deliberate stylistic device as in the paragraph below:

Example 1: Black and gleaming in the moonlight, each female drags herself from the surf, front flippers scoring the sand as she pulls herself along, and settles in to dig. Scooping with her rear flippers, she excavates a shaft; when she can no longer reach the bottom, she begins to lay her eggs, a glistening cue ball every few seconds. Once she has a cache of 80 or so, she fills in the nest, sweeping her
front flippers to smooth out the spot. Then she drags herself a few feet away and makes more giant sand angels—a decoy nest that may serve to confuse predators. After two or three hours on the beach, her throat rosy with exertion, she returns to the sea.60

Самки ползут по песку, оставляя глубокие следы передними ластами. Потом каждая выбирает место и начинает рыть яму задними ластами. А затем принимается откладывать яйца—каждые несколько секунд по блестящему, похожему на бильярдный, шару. Тайник из восьми десятков яиц черепаха засыпает передними ластами, а в заключение выравнивает песок. Потом с трудом отползает на пару метров и делает гигантские круги на песке—отвлекающий маневр, защита от хищных врагов. На все это уходит два-три часа. Затем утомленная самка возвращается в море.61

[Samki polzut po pesku, ostavliaia glubokie sledy perednimi lastami. Potom kazhdaia wybieraet mesto i nachinaet ryt' iamu zadnimi lastami. A zatem prinimaetsia otkladyvat' iaits—kazhdye neskol'ko sekund po blesdashchemu, pokokhemu na bil'iardnyi, sharu. Tainik iz vos'mi desiatkov iaits cherepakha zasypaet perednimi lastami, a v zakluchenie vyrvnivaet pesok. Potom s trudom

60 Ancient Mariner.
61 Chempiony po vyzhvaniiu.
otpolzaet na paru metrov i delae gigantskie krugi na peske—otvlekaïushchiï manevr, zashchita ot khishchnyx vragov. Na vse êto ukhodit dva-tri chasa. Zatem utomlennai samka vozvrashchaetsa v more.}

(Females crawl on sand-DAT, leaving [deep footprints]-ACC [front flippers]-INSTR. And then begins lay eggs-ACC—{every several seconds}-ACC on [glistening, similar on cue, ball]-DAT. Cache-ACC from [eight dozen eggs]-GEN turtle-NOM buries [front flippers]-INSTR, and in conclusion-ACC smoothes sand-GEN. Then with labor-INSTR crawls on [couple meters]-GEN and does [giant circles]-ACC on sand-PREP—{distracting maneuver}-ACC, protection from [predatory enemies]-GEN. On all this takes [two-three]-ACC hours-GEN. Then [exhausted female]-NOM returns to sea-ACC.)

[Females are crawling on the sand, leaving deep footprints with their front flippers. Then each one chooses a spot and begins digging a hole with her rear flippers. Then she begins laying eggs—one like a glistening cue ball every several seconds. The turtle buries the cache with eight dozen eggs with her front flippers and finally smoothes the sand. Then she drags herself a couple of meters away and makes giant circles on the sand—it’s a distracting maneuver, protection from predators. All that takes two-three hours. Afterwards, the exhausted female returns to the sea.]

In the English source text paragraph the pronoun she referring to a female leatherback is repeated in the thematic position eight times, which is not the case in its translation. The
target text used instead other connectors: a Hypotheme, a Paraphrase, a Noun, and twice—an Inference. Any reader who can read Russian and English can tell that the stylistic impressions created by the two texts are not the same. The consecutive repetitions in the source text add emphasis to an otherwise neutral pronoun she and create a sense of pattern of continuity. Furthermore, repetitions are used to create an impression of spoken or oral discourse and create involvement in conversation by using the same words (Wårvik (2003:24). The latter is accurate in Example 1, taking into consideration that the narrator of the text is describing what he witnesses—although the text is written, he might as well be telling us the story orally. When the translator replaces all the repetitions of the source text, the stylistic effects described above are lost.

5.2.2 Paraphrase

While the number of Lexical Repetitions was lower in Russian target text corpus than in the English source text corpus, the number of Paraphrases was significantly higher (14.8% vs. 8% of all the connectors used in the corpus). Apparently, translators resorted to Paraphrase as one of the ways to avoid repetitions, which is demonstrated in Example 2.

Example 1: Every austral summer, leopard seals wait in shallow water off major penguin breeding colonies to capture newly fledged birds going to sea for the first time. The seals’ teeth tell the story: front canines and incisors designed to capture and shred their prey; back molars with sharp edges for grasping and cutting, but also with interlocking cusps to sift krill. The seals have a surprisingly diverse
diet: krill, penguins, other seals, fish, and squid—anything they can get their canines on. The other seals on the menu are crabeater seal pups, or, off the island of South Georgia, Antarctic fur seal pups.62

Когда в Южное полушарие приходит лето, морские леопарды
перебираются поближе к крупным колониям пингвинов — хищники
поджидаят на мелководье недавно оперившихся птенцов, отправляющихся на первую морскую прогулку. Строение зубов тюленей может многое рассказать о том, как они охотятся. Их клюки и резцы приспособлены для того, чтобы ловить и разрывать добычу на куски. Задние коренные зубы с острыми краями— чтобы удерживать и измельчать пищу, а также отцеживать криль. Меню морских леопардов на удивление разнообразно:
криль, пингвины, другие тюлени, рыба, кальмары — все, что попадается на пути. В их рацион входят даже сородичи – детеныши тюленей-крабоедов, а вблизи острова Южная Георгия – детеныши кергеленских морских котиков.63

62 Leopard Seals.

63 Groza moreĭ: morskie leopardy Antarktiki.
progulku. Stroenie zubov tiulenei podemnoe rasskazat’ o tom, kak oni
okhotiatsia. Ich klyki i rezy prisposoblenny dlia togo, chtoby lovit’ i razryvat’
dobychu na kuski. Zadnie korenye zuby s ostrymi kraiam –chtoby uderzhivat’ i
izmel’chat’ pishchu, a takzhe otiszeptivat’ krtl’. Meni morsikh leopardov na
udivlenie raznoobrazno: krtl’, pingviny, drugie tiuleni, ryba, kal’mary – vse, chto
popadaetsia na puti. V ich rations vkhodiat dazhe sorodichi–detenyshy tiulenei-
kroboedov, a vblizi ostrova Izhnaia Georgii–detenyshy kergelenskix morsikh
kotikov.)

(When in [Southern hemisphere]-ACC comes summer-NOM, [leopard seals]-
NOM move closer to [big colonies]-DAT penguins-GEN—predators-NOM wait
on shallow water-PREP recently fledged birds-GEN, going on [first sea trip]-
ACC. Structure-NOM teeth-GEN seals-GEN can much tell about that, how they
hunt. Their canines-NOM and incisors-NOM designed for that-GEN to capture
and tear prey-GEN into pieces-ACC. [Back molars]-NOM with [sharp edges]-
INSR—to grasp and shred food-GEN, and also to sift krill-ACC. Menu-NOM
[leopard seals]-GEN on surprise-ACC diverse: [krill, penguins, other seals, fish,
squid—everything]-ACC that appears on way-PREP. In their diet-ACC are part
of even relatives-ACC—pups-NOM [crabeater seals]-GEN, and near island-
GEN [South Georgia]-NOM—pups [Antarctic fur seals]-GEN.)

[When summer comes to the Southern hemisphere, leopard seals move closer to
big penguin colonies—the predators are on the watch for recently fledged
birdsmaking their first trip to the sea. The structure of the seals’ teeth can tell us a lot about how they hunt. Their canines and incisors are designed to capture and tear apart their prey. Back molars with sharp edges serve to hold and shred food and also to sift krill. The leopard seals’ menu is surprisingly diverse: krill, penguins, other seals, fish, squid—everything they come across. Sometimes, they eat even their own relatives—crabeater seal pups, or, off the island of South Georgia, Antarctic fur seal pups.

While the English source text uses (leopard) seals in thematic position four times in the paragraph above (the pronoun they and their occur one time each, but in rhematic position), the translator into Russian refers to them as morskie leopard (leopard seals), khishchniki (predators), tiuleni (seals), oni (they)—all of which are thematic as well.

Other connectors that could be used by translators in order to avoid repetitions are Pronouns, Nouns, Modified Repetition, and Inference. However, from these four categories, statistically significant differences were found only in the usage of Inference; but, as previously mentioned, the pair that is accountable for this difference is most likely Russian parallel vs. Russian comparable corpora (3% vs. 5.8% of all connectors, with only 3.5% in the original English corpus).
5.2.3 Adjectival Clauses

The differences in the usage of *Adjectival Clauses* between the English source text corpus and the Russian target text corpus (9.6% vs. 5.9%) can be explained by the usage of different grammatical structures in the two languages.

Example 1: *Humpback whales* (T1) *that weigh* (T2) *as much as 45 tons* (41 metric tons) (R2) *rise and spout everywhere, roll in spirals, slap the surface with fins or tail flukes* (R1).  

Гиганты весом до сорока пяти тонн (T1) поднимаются на поверхность, пускают фонтаны, крутятся, бьют по воде плавниками и хвостами (R1).

[Giants weigh-INSTR to [forty five tons]-GEN (T1) rise on surface-ACC, blow fountains-ACC, roll, slap on water-DAT fins-INSR and tails-INSTR (R1)].

[Humpback Whales.]

[Gorbatye kity.]
While the source text above uses an *Adjectival Clause*, the grammar of Russian allows the translator to avoid it (although it could be used exactly as it is in English) by inflecting the noun *weight*. As a result, there are two clauses in the source text connected by means of the Constant thematic progression (thematic progression- type 2) vs. only one in the target text, which makes it more compact.

The translator of the paragraph below chose a similar strategy: while the source text contains two clauses, also connected by Constant thematic progression, and uses an *Adjectival Clause* as a connector, in the target text, the same idea is expressed in one clause by using the adjective *pustye*. In this case as well, an adjectival clause could be used in the target text without violating grammatical or stylistic rules of the target language.

Example 2: *In Mexico alone, beaches (T1) that (T2) are now almost barren (R2) may have hosted as many as 75,000 nesting females every year (R1).*

Одни мексиканские пляжи, сейчас практически пустые (T1), каждый год привлекали около 75 тысяч самок для кладки яиц (R1).

[Одни мексиканские пляжи, сейчас практически пустые (T1), каждый год привлекали около 75 тысяч самок для кладки яиц (R1)].

---

66 *Ancient Mariner.*

67 *Chempiony po vyzhivaniyu.*
(Alone [Mexican beaches]-NOM, now almost empty (T1), every year-ACC attracted about [75 thousand females]-GEN for [laying eggs]-GEN).

[Mexican beaches alone, now almost empty, attracted about 75 thousand females to lay eggs every year].

Likewise, another English paragraph mentions “people who watch humpbacks every day”\(^{68}\) with people and who being Ts of two different clauses, the second of which is Adjectival. The translator again avoids using an Adjectival Clause by resorting to prichastnyi oborot (participial construction) исследователи, ежедневно наблюдающие за горбачами в проливе Ауау [исследователи, ежедневно наблюдающие за горбачами в проливе Ауау] (researchers-NOM, daily watching-PL behind humpbacks-INSR in [strait Auau]-PREP)[the researchers watching the humpbacks daily in the strait Auau].

\(^{68}\) Humpback Whales.
'Au'au Channel', which constitutes just one Theme, although it would not be incorrect in this case either to use an Adjectival Clause in the target text that would correspond to the source text. The English sentences containing Adjectival Clauses in their Themes, such as the ones described above, follow the thematic pattern graphically represented in Figure 13.

In fact, participial constructions were used quite often in place of English Adjectival Clauses in translation, which resulted in fewer clauses in the target text than in the source text, as in Examples 3 or 4. The English utterance in Example 5 follows the thematic pattern depicted in Figure 14.

Example 3: One late summer day in 1961 a biologist named Sherman Bleakney (T1) got a telephone call about a strange sea creature (R1) that (T2) fishermen had just unloaded on a wharf in Halifax, Nova Scotia (R2).^70

---

^69 Gorbatye kity.

^70 Ancient Mariner.
В один прекрасный день на исходе лета 1961 года биологу Шерману Бликни (T1) сообщили о странном морском существе, выгруженном рыбаками на пристани города Галифакс в канадской провинции Новая Шотландия (R1).71

[V odin prekrasnyiy den' na iskhode leta 1961 goda biologu SHermanu Blikni (T1) soobshchili o strannom morskom sushchestve, vygruzhennom rybakami na pristani goroda Galifaks v kanadskoi provinshii Novaia SHotlandiia (R1)].

(In [one wonderful day]-ACC on end-PREP [summer 1961 year]-GEN [biologist Sherman Bleakney]-GEN reported-PL about [strange sea creature]-INSTR, unloaded fishermen-INSTR on wharf-PREP city-PREP Halifax-ACC in [Canadian province]-PREP Nova Scotia-ACC (R1).

[One day at the end of the summer of 1961, the biologist Sherman Bleakney was told about a strange sea creature, unloaded by fishermen at a wharf of Halifax, Nova Scotia].

In some cases, Adjectival Clauses were not used in the thematic position in target texts as a result of a paraphrase and/or an omission on behalf of the translator. For instance, while the English text describes the leatherbacks that can survive at temperatures that would kill other sea turtles,72 in translation it becomes just v kholodnoi

71 Chempiony po vyzhivaniu.
72 Ancient Mariner.
vode (in cold water).\textsuperscript{73} The translator of the paragraph below uses different wording. As a result, while both the English and the Russian sentences have two clauses that are connected by Constant thematic progression (see Figure 13), the former uses an Adjectival Clause as a connector, and in the latter the Theme relates to the previous clause as a Pronoun.

Example 4: …the forest (T1) that (T2) created them (R2) is almost gone (R1).\textsuperscript{74}

Лес (T1) создал этих птиц (R1), и он же стал для них (T2) угрозой (R2)....\textsuperscript{75}

[Les (T1) sozdal etikh ptits (R1), i on zhe stal dlia nikh (T2) ugrozi (R2)....]

(Forest-NOM (T1) created [these birds]-GEN (R1), and it became for them-GEN (T2) threat (R2)-INSRT…)

[Forest created those birds, and it was the same forest that became a threat for them].

\textsuperscript{73} Chempiony po vyzhvaniiu.

\textsuperscript{74} Philippine Eagles.

\textsuperscript{75} Pernatyi velikan.
5.2.4 Nominal Reference

The connector *Nominal Reference* is used to denote Themes realized by a noun that relate to a previous Theme or Rheme expressed by a pronoun or a noun in the direct speech. The category *Nominal Reference* was also used if the given Theme was expressed by a noun and used in direct speech and related to another noun or pronoun in the text. Statistically significant differences in this category were found in the Russian target text vs. comparable Russian corpora (1.2% vs. 0.1%) and English source text vs. comparable Russian corpora (1.3% vs. 0.1%). These results suggest that direct speech was not used as often in the comparable Russian corpus as it was in the English source text and Russian target text corpora. This conclusion is supported by equally low percentages of usage of another category associated with direct speech—*Pronominal Reference*: 1.1% in the English source text corpus, 1.1% in the Russian target text corpus, and 0.1% in the comparable Russian corpus. *Pronominal Reference* marked a Theme expressed by a pronoun in the direct speech and relating it to a previous Theme or Rheme realized by a noun or pronoun. The category *Pronominal Reference* was also assigned to a connector if the given pronoun in the thematic position referred to a noun or another pronoun used in the previous context in the direct speech. It should be noted, however, that significant differences were not found in the usage of *Pronominal Reference* among the three corpora.
5.2.5 **Explicitation**

Significant differences were found in the usage of *Explicitation* in the English source text corpus vs. comparable Russian corpus (15% vs. 10.6% of the usage of all connectors). *Explicitation* was defined as a connector that further explains the previous Theme or Rheme and occurs in the same sentence with it. The following markers are indicative of *Explicitation*: the expletive *that*, expletive *if*, a colon or a dash, and direct speech placed before the subject and the verb. These findings can be explained by grammatical and stylistic differences between the English source texts and non-translated Russian texts. However, there have been no significant differences found between the English source texts and Russian target texts, which means that the translator did not adhere to the norms of the target language as far as *Explicitation* as a thematic connector is concerned. A possible explanation of these findings is a manifestation of Toury’s law of interference.

5.2.6 **Inference**

Another category where significant differences were revealed was *Inference*. This category described Themes that were connected to the previous context, but the connector was implied rather than explicitly expressed. Although the Bonferroni correction did not show which pair of corpora caused the difference, the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA results suggest that this pair is the Russian target text corpus vs. comparable Russian corpus. The texts in the Russian comparable corpus use the highest number of *Inferences* (5.8% vs. 3% in the Russian target text corpus vs. 3.5% in the English source text corpus). This can be explained by grammatical differences between the two
languages: as discussed in the previous chapter, Russian uses mononuclear sentences that have only a subject or a verb. Inference was marked in the Russian sentences with zero Theme, where only the verb was present in the rhematic position, and the subject was implied. One Russian text from the parallel corpus contains three instances of Inference in the same paragraph.

Example 1: И слышат тяжелый шаг людей задолго до того момента (R1), как сами люди (T2) смогут увидеть животных (R2).

[И slyshat tiazhelyi shag ljudey zadolgo do togo momenta (R1), kak samy ljudi (T2) smogut uvidet' zhivotnykh (R2)].

(And hear-PL [heavy step]-ACC people-GEN long before [that moment]-GEN (R1), how [themselves people]-NOM can see animals-ACC (R2).

[And [they] hear people’s heavy steps long before the moment when people can see the animals].

И, тут же разбегаются наутек.

[I, tut zhe razbegaitsuia nautek].

(And, here run-PL far away).

[And [they] run far away at this very moment].

А наоборот, только заслышат опасность—застывают в неподвижной позе.⁷⁶

[A naoborot, tol’ko zaslyshat opasnost’—zastyvaют v nepodvizhnoi poze].

⁷⁶ ZHivotnyi mir SHri-Lanki.
(And on the contrary, just hear-PL danger—freeze-PL in [motionless pose]-PREP).

[And on the contrary, once [they] hear danger—[they] freeze in a motionless pose].

In the three sentences above, the missing subject zhivotnye (animals) occurs in the first sentence of the paragraph and thus is easily recoverable by the reader. As a result, the missing subjects do not impede understanding. However, the rules of English grammar would require a subject in each sentence if we were to translate them (shown in brackets above). ZeroTheme utterances marked as Interference were encountered less frequently in original English texts and mostly in the casual context in the narration or in the direct speech. As was the case with Explicitation, the Russian translator did not follow the tendency of the Russian to use a higher number of mononuclear sentences. Instead, the make-up of the original English texts seems to have played a greater role in the usage of Interference as a connector, given that no statistically significant differences were revealed between the English source texts and Russian target texts.

5.3 Textual Connectivity

Textual Connectivity measured the number of clauses between the given Theme and the nearest Theme or Rheme in the previous context that it relates to. The expectation was that due to interference of the source text (English source text corpus), there would be significant differences found between the parallel and comparable Russian corpora because the translated Russian texts would tend to exhibit the features of the English source texts with respect to this category. Statistical analysis showed evidence in support
of that hypothesis. In addition, the Russian comparable corpus and the English source text corpus showed significant differences. Given that thematic connections are believed to contribute to the coherence of the text (Li-ping 2008, Dejica 2009, Jalilifar 2009) and that the lowest average number of clauses between the connectors was found in the Russian comparable corpus may suggest that original Russian texts are the most cohesive. The closer the element to which the reader must refer to in order to process the text segment is located in the text, the quicker and easier the comprehension will occur, as in the paragraph below, where all Themes are logically connected either to the previous clause or to the one before it. It becomes clear from this example how such close links facilitate the comprehension process.

Example 2: Scientists know how black bears are born white. They're just not sure why. The phenomenon, known as Kermodism, is triggered by a recessive mutation at the MC1R gene, the same gene associated with red hair and fair skin in humans. To be born white, a bear must inherit the mutation from both parents. The parents themselves don't have to be white. They just need to carry the recessive mutation.77

However, it a higher number of clauses between the given Theme and a previous Theme or Rheme that it relates to does not always mean that it is difficult to make a logical connection.

77 Kermode Bear.
Example 3: …Old-timers say leatherbacks started arriving in force around the time the fisheries off Neil's Harbour collapsed almost 20 years ago. As cod, haddock, and swordfish dwindled, snow crab and lobster burgeoned, giving the town a new lifeline. No one has tracked the population of jellyfish, but James thinks they must have multiplied along with the shellfish. "All of a sudden what's on the scene is a jellyfish-dominated ecosystem. Turtles aren't stupid."

Turtles in the thematic position in the last sentence of the paragraph above relate to leatherbacks in another T that is nine clauses away. Nonetheless, given that the whole text is about turtles, or more specifically about leatherbacks, this distance between the two Ts does not hinder reading comprehension since it is not really necessary to go nine clauses up to activate the connection—the T turtles, or leatherbacks, which coincides with the topic of the text, is always activated in the mind of the reader.

Interestingly, an additional two-way ANOVA test showed an association between thematic progression-type and the number of clauses between the given Theme and the Theme or Rheme that it relates to in a paragraph (Textual Connectivity). While no significant differences in this category were revealed in Simple Linear thematic progression between the three corpora, in Constant thematic progression statistically

78 Ancient Mariner.
significant differences were found between the Russian parallel and the Russian comparable corpora, as well as between the English source text and the comparable Russian corpora. These findings are consistent with the general findings in this category which were discussed above, and they also support the expectation that Russian target texts would follow the patterns of the English source texts due to interference and would differ from the non-translated Russian texts. Therefore, Constant thematic progression is accountable for the differences in this category found between the three corpora.

The hypothesis concerning the interference of the source text finds additional support if we consider the differences in the numbers obtained for Textual Conectivity between the thematic progression-types within each corpus. More specifically, significant differences between Simple Linear thematic progression and Constant thematic progression were found in the English source text corpus and in the Russian target text corpus. In both corpora the number of clauses away is higher in the Constant thematic progression than in the Simple Linear thematic progression, which suggests that the translations tended to follow the patterns of the source texts rather than those of the comparable corpora, where no differences were found in this part of the analysis.

In regard to the findings in this category, it should be noted that when making remarks about coherence, it is important to keep in mind that thematic patterns are just one factor that contributes to this phenomenon, which prevents us from making definite conclusions regarding the coherence of the corpora in this study. While coherence has a number of definitions among linguists, there seems to be general agreement that it
functions at the conceptual (Campbell 1995:5) or mental level (Koch 2001:2). According to Blum-Kulka, coherence can be defined as “a covert potential meaning relationship among parts of a text, made overt by the reader or listener through the process of interpretation” (1986: 289-299). Dooley and Levinsohn call the linguistic means that signal coherence—cohesion (2001:27). Therefore, other linguistic means that have the potential to make the text more coherent are cohesive markers—grammatical (reference, ellipsis, substitution) or lexical markers (such as repetitions, superordinates, hyponyms and antonyms) (Halliday and Hasan 1976).

The given chapter discussed the results summarized in Chapter IV, which are reviewed in terms of their relation to Toury’s law of interference. Evidence to support this law has been found in just one category—*Textual Connectivity*. There have been no differences found between the three corpora in the usage of the four types of thematic progressions, which can be explained by their belonging to the same kind of text type, i.e., one that uses explanation, exposition, and description. The most prevalent in all three corpora were Simple Linear thematic progression and Constant thematic progression, which are used in scholarly articles and narrations and contribute to the cohesion of the text. The analysis of the connectors suggested that translators were influenced less by the make-up of the source text and more by the norms of the target language as revealed in the analysis of the comparable corpus. According to Toury (1995:277), this may be an indication of their professionalism. Some of the differences that were revealed were attributed to grammatical and stylistic differences between Russian and English (e.g., *Adjectival Clause* and *Inference*).
Based on these findings the following recommendations can be given to translators, editors, trainers, and others involved in the language industry:

- Always pay attention to textual features and the way they are transferred from the source text to the target text;
- Keep in mind that texts of the same genre with the same social function use the same thematic progressions in English and Russian.
- If the texts for translation are scholarly articles or contain explanation and exposition, Simple Linear thematic progression tends to be used more frequently;
- Use Simple Linear thematic progression to give orientation to the reader and make the text more cohesive;
- If the text for translation is characterized by such stylistic features as description or narration, Constant thematic progression tends to predominate.
- It is important to realize that many of the existing texts represent a mixture of genres and thus one particular thematic progression type will not necessarily predominate;
- It is a good idea to know the characteristics of thematic features in non-translated texts. A comparable corpus can be used for that purpose. Professional translators are more likely to rely on the features present in the non-translated texts.
- Do not automatically try to avoid repetitions in the thematic position in the target text and opt for paraphrase. Pay attention to the role the repetitions play in the text.
Some of the differences in thematic features between English and Russian are caused by grammatical differences between the two languages and are therefore unavoidable, e.g. more inferences in the thematic position in Russian texts than in English.
6.1 Pedagogical Implications

According to Wang, language instructors often base their feedback on errors below the clause level, e.g., lack of agreement between the subject and the verb, improper use of tenses, and so on, because they lack the tools necessary to analyze the students’ texts at the discourse level (2007:165). Hence, the purpose of her study is to find ways to improve cohesion at the discourse level by analyzing thematic patterns in students’ writings. (165). Wang, who adopts the Hallidayan approach to Theme and Rheme, analyzes thematic structures and progressions in a text written by a student. She points out the problems to the students, such as the lack of thematic progressions, resulting in a lack of development of ideas and an overall disjointed text; overuse of the Constant thematic progression and a lack of further development of the Rheme, which makes the text sound like a list; as well as the three common problems described by Bloor and Bloor (1992): introduction of brand new Themes, the problem of the double Rheme, and the problem of the empty Rheme, i.e., when no new information is presented in rhematic position. Wang also offers solutions to the identified problems in order to improve cohesion in the student’s work, e.g., the reconstruction of sentences through the process
of nominalization, adding adverbial, prepositional or infinitive phrases, rephrasing some information units of the text and adding new content to the Rheme. A similar analysis of thematic structures and thematic progressions in students’ translations, in comparison with the source texts, could be done as well in order to highlight the problems in translation at the discourse level and the impact these problems have on the reader. Instead of pointing out the ways to improve the identified problems at the discourse level, students can be asked to offer their own solutions, as well as to identify some of the problems themselves. After students become familiar with the major concepts of functional sentence perspective, they should be able to identify such issues as the lack of thematic progression in the target text as compared to the source text or a lack of development of the Rheme. Further, they can be asked to fix those issues in the translation in groups or individually and their solutions can be discussed in the classroom.

Like in the field of Foreign Languages, in Translation Studies, due attention has not been given to textual meaning (Kim 2007: 149). A translator, however, needs to be aware that no sentence is autonomous, i.e., it exists not for its own sake but always functions as a part of a text and as a part of a situation. Therefore, information dynamics, the function of which is “to link a sentence to its environment in a manner which allows the information to flow through the text in the desired manner” (Enkvist 1978: 178 cited in Baker 1992: 119) should be treated as equally important as cognitive meanings and syntactic structures. Studies investigating Theme and Rheme, such as the present study, may be of help for translators and translation students in their efforts to achieve smooth and natural flow of information in their texts.
Several authors have written about how to bring the notions of theme and rheme into the classroom. The first issue that needs to be addressed when approaching this subject is the definition of the two linguistic categories. As discussed in Chapter II, there exists a number of approaches to Theme and Rheme and thus their definitions vary depending on what approach is adopted. The two major views are that of Halliday and that of the Prague School Linguists. While the Hallidayan framework is rather simple and easy to apply, it has been designed for English—a language with a relatively fixed word order (normally it follows the pattern Subject-Verb-Object). Depending on the language pair of the students, it is necessary to decide whether the Hallidayan model will be applicable, and if not (as it has been decided for Russian in this study), to select one that is more appropriate, while making sure that students are aware of the existence of other models. Although the approach of the Prague School seems to be more universal, it is rather complex and not always intuitive or easy to follow. Resources for expressing Theme and Rheme in a particular language may be limited or even non-existent. In regard to Russian, a number of works either dedicated to or touching upon these two notions have been published (Adamec 1966, Bailyn 2012, Krylova and Khovronina 1976, Shevyakova 1976). Specific pedagogical suggestions made in this chapter are based on the definition of Theme and Rheme adopted in this study. While it draws from the works cited above, necessary adjustments were made to make it applicable to both English and Russian. Furthermore, after a workable definition of Theme and Rheme has been selected, it may not be sufficient for identifying a precise boundary between the two in a
given sentence. In that case, the use of a question test (Hatcher 1956, Daneš 1970, Hajičová 1984, 1994, Sgall 1974) may prove helpful, as it did in the given study.

Kim (2007), who adopts the Hallidayan approach to Theme and Rheme, uses two different translations of her Master’s level students from English into Korean in order to highlight the issue of textual meaning in translation. While both of them were good, one was better than the other in terms of conveying textual meaning. At the beginning of the discussion, the students, who were presented the two anonymous translations and the translation brief provided to the translators, were asked which version they preferred and why. The majority of students (68%) opted for the second translation. Some of the reasons they provided were that it sounded natural, flowed well, was faithful to the ST, and was coherent (160). A comparison of the Themes of the source text and those of the two target texts demonstrated that while the source text had a consistent point of departure expressed by its Themes, the first translation followed the thematic content of the original in only 83% of the clauses, while the second translation—in 91% of the clauses (164). As a result, the Themes of the first translation were not as efficient as the Themes of the source text, which oriented the reader in a more sustained manner to the global topic of the text, while the first translator repeatedly interrupted this orientation by introducing new information at the beginning of a clause. Additional evidence that the thematic choices in the second translation were more successful was provided by an analysis of a comparable text in Korean (165-166). Overall, Kim’s translation students found that the knowledge and skills related to text analysis that they acquired in the
classroom over time were beneficial to them in many different ways, which was revealed by the survey of their learning experiences and by their students’ learning journals.

Similar activities can be used for students of translation working from English into Russian in order to draw their attention to the importance of textual meaning in translation. At the same time, the corpora and findings of the given study can be incorporated into lesson planning. A group of Master’s level students could be given a text for translation taken from the English ST corpus consisting of the articles from the online version of the magazine *National Geographic*. Their instructor could choose two anonymous translations for discussion in the classroom. The selection criterion will be that one is more successful in terms of thematic choices and thematic patterning than the other. The instructor can use the results of this study presented in Chapter III when estimating how efficient the Themes and thematic progressions used by the students are. Based on these results, the source text and the target text should be using approximately the same number of Simple Linear and Constant thematic progressions. In order to make judgments about the efficiency of the Themes, their expression and content in the works of students will be evaluated. In terms of the information contained in the thematic position, the more successful translation will have fewer deviations from the source text; in terms of expression, it will have significantly fewer *Lexical Repetitions* than the source text, more instances of *Paraphrase*, fewer Adjectival Clauses and more *Inferences* than the source text. The students will be asked which version they prefer and why. It will be expected that the students will prefer the same version as the instructor because the information contained in it will be presented in a more coherent way and it will flow
more naturally in the Russian language than the first version. This would serve as a good starting point for a conversation about the importance of textual meaning in translation. Detailed analysis of the Themes and thematic progressions of the source text and target text in order can demonstrate how they contribute to equivalence at the textual level. A Russian ST from the comparable corpus could be analyzed as well. It would provide the students with evidence regarding the thematic features in question in a non-translated text. Depending on the level of the students, it may also be appropriate to highlight the benefits of using corpora in general, and a comparable corpus in particular, to explain the criteria for corpus compilation, and so on. At the end of the teaching module on Theme and Rheme, students could be asked to fill out a survey where they will be asked to reflect on how the application of text analysis helped them (if at all) to improve their translation skills and their appreciation of translation quality. Furthermore, students can be asked to translate a similar text after debriefing on Theme and Rheme and provide a log on Theme/Rheme considerations in their versions. As Kim points out, translation journals, where students reflect on the process of translation, their translation choices, challenges, and solutions can also be a good way to understand how effective the pedagogical methods used in the classroom are (2007:171).

The proposed activities could also be used for students translating from Russian into English. In that case, a text from the Russian comparable corpus (V Mire Zhivotnykh) could serve as an source text, and students could be asked to translate it into English. A text from the English version of National Geographic would be used as a comparable English text for their reference. The results of the given study on the English source text
corpus and Russian comparable corpus would be of use, and an additional corpus of target texts could be gathered from the students’ translations.

In her discussion of translation quality and translation evaluation, Juliane House notes that besides linguistic and textual considerations, it is important to take into account the implied readers—a social factor that does not have to do with translation as a linguistic procedure, but rather concerns human agents (2001:254). Therefore, another activity that could be done in the translation classroom in order to measure the impact of the thematic structures on the perception of translation quality would involve conducting a survey of the readers’ perceptions. For that purpose, out of the two students’ translations described above, the one that was considered less successful in terms of the thematic content and expression, as well as thematic patterning, would be revised based on the findings obtained from the analysis of the comparable corpus of the present study. In other words, minor changes will be made to the translated text that will make it sound more natural in Russian by adjusting the text’s thematic features to better align with those of the Russian non-translated texts. Afterward, both versions of the translation will be presented to the students, native speakers of Russian, and also potential readers of *National Geographic*, in order to compare their perceptions. Ideally, they should be a different group from the one who completed the translation as an assignment. The students would be asked whether version one and two of the translation read very well, well, average or not well (based on their judgment as... Provided that they are not aware that the texts are translations, it would also be interesting to see whether the students
indicate that the text(s) read as (a) translation(s). However, the two versions of the translation can also be used with the same group that completed the assignment.

It is expected that the majority of students will prefer the revised version due to the smoother flow of information and more natural sounding textual patterning. Provided the group has not been aware of it beforehand, they should not be able to say whether or not it is a translation. The preference for the revised translation will indicate that “choosing Themes and expressing them in the way they are realized in the target language does improve the readability of translations for target readers” (Kim 2007: 198).

The same survey of the readers’ perceptions can be done with a group of students working from Russian into English. In that case, a text from the online version of the magazine *V Mire Zhivotnykh* (the Russian comparable corpus in this study) can be used as a source text and one of the students’ translations can be revised in order to improve thematic choices and patterning based on the findings obtained from the analysis of the English source text corpus consisting of the online version of the articles from the magazine *National Geographic*. Otherwise, the procedure will not be any different from the one described for the students translating from English into Russian. Additional data could be gathered by applying existing readability scales in order to measure readability.

The goal of the proposed discussion and activities is to provide students with the knowledge and skills needed for them to make informed translation decisions at the level of text and to be able to justify those decisions using appropriate concepts rather than relying on intuition. As previously pointed out in this study, translators or students of translation are often unable to articulate and explain the issues that they encounter at the
micro-level of the text. The teaching module proposed above is an attempt to solve this problem.

6.2 Limitations

As Enkvist points out, even though “theme-dynamic analysis may sound as a simple and straightforward business,” in reality, “the analyst must face a vast number of formidable problems,” which he has been able to solve in his study only “by bold and arbitrary cutting of several Gordian knots” (1973:130). Indeed, thematic analysis is a very subtle task. Although Enkvist’s work was published four decades ago, his observation that semantics do not provide us with the tools necessary to work on the subject with sufficient precision still holds true, at least from the perspective of a researcher in the field of Translation Studies. To begin with, there is no agreement among linguists even about the definition of the key concepts: while some use Theme and Rheme, others refer to Topic and Comment, or Topic and Focus, or Given and New. Apparently, the fields of Linguistics and Translation Studies, as of today, could still benefit from “a far more stringent and detailed thematic apparatus” (130). Additionally, even though the categories of T and R have been extensively discussed since the time of Henri Weil (1818-1909)—a pioneer in this field—and a considerable number of approaches to the topic of T and R, which have been only briefly discussed in Chapter I, exist today, it remains challenging for the translation scholar to find a framework that can be applied to both or all the languages of the analysis. While some are straightforward and easy to apply (e.g., the Hallidayan model), their usage may be limited to English; the Prague School approach, on the other hand, is more universally applicable, but it is also far more complex, and
there are disagreements even among its linguists. Moreover, the issues that are very important for an analyst, are often not covered. For instance, from the reviewed sources, only Halliday (1985) seems to offer a clear framework for analyzing Theme and Rheme in interrogative and imperative clauses, although, as mentioned above, his approach is not suitable for Russian, so a different strategy had to be worked out in the given study.

In general, many linguists who offer good workable models (e.g., Daneš 1974, Krylova and Khavronina 1984, Šheviaková 1976, Adamec 1966) do not perform quantitative analysis, but rather support their frameworks with selected examples. However, when quantitative research is undertaken, as this study has shown, many questions not covered by these examples arise. Most of the examples provided include simple sentences, whereas a large number of authentic texts contain a considerable number, if not a majority, of complex and compound sentences, as was the case in the three corpora examined in this study.

While some of these questions that did not find definite answers in the literature on the subject have been answered with at least some precision in this work (e.g., the determination of the unit of analysis, key definitions, overall approach to the categories of Theme and Rheme), others involved complex semantic connections that different analysts may view in a different light—in other words, the issue of inter-rater reliability arises. For instance, in order to draw the boundary between the Theme and the Rheme, the question test was used. While most of the time the context helped to ascertain what the most appropriate hypothetical question to the clause would be, and therefore, to establish the boundary relatively easily, some sentences in the corpora were ambiguous
(e.g., when it was unclear what the pronoun referred to), which made the task much harder. The best way to solve such problems would have been to talk to the author of the text, but unfortunately most of the time translators do not have this opportunity, which was the case in this study. Even in situations when the most appropriate question could be easily found based on the context, another reader could find another question more appropriate. In general, inter-rater reliability is a common issue in manual analysis, and so, a good solution when faced with complex and ambiguous issues like this one would be to have a team of analysts that would come to a consensus after an extended period of collaboration and discussion; but this was not an option in the present study.

The same can be said about the connectors that were used to describe the semantic relationships between the Themes and the previous context. While some were obvious enough (such as Lexical Repetitions, Paraphrases, Pronouns), other more subtle categories were often much harder to establish (e.g., Inference, Hypertheme, Hypotheme). In general, when faced with an ambiguity or uncertainty, which happens quite often when dealing with semantics, the best effort was made to achieve a high degree of accuracy and consistency.

Although the results of the given study were compared to the findings in other works on the Theme and Rheme in translation, some of the issues described above, such as the lack of agreement on the definition of and approach to of two concepts referred to as the Theme and the Rheme in this study, ambiguities inherent to semantic analysis in general, and different units of analysis chosen by different authors made interpretation of the differences and similarities less straightforward. In addition, as it has been mentioned
earlier, some of the differences in thematic choices and patterns were due to omissions, additions or rephrasing made in translations for unclear reasons, which had an impact on the results as well.

Due to its complex nature, the analysis of the Themes and thematic progressions is a very time-consuming task. The manual semantic analysis of the three corpora of this study that include a total of 3,000 clauses, took three and a half months of almost daily work. A good solution to this problem could be an automated analysis. However, from the description of the complexities associated with the analysis, it becomes clear that an automatic analysis will not be able to handle the formulation of the hypothetical questions, assigning some of the categories that are used for the connectors and making other decisions about ambiguous semantic categories simply because many instances are unique and therefore the solutions cannot be pre-programmed. Any software is made by designers and as long as there are disagreements and discrepancies among linguists on the subject, it will remain very challenging to come up with a program that will be applicable to more than one language using an approach other than Halliday’s.

Thus, the number of clauses that could be analyzed for this study was limited. However, as Zannetin puts it, “representativeness remains the holy grail of corpus linguistics, something to strive for rather than something that can reasonably be attained” (2011:15). As a result, the term “balanced” is “preferred to “representative” in recent discussions of corpus design (15). An increase in the number of texts that make up the corpora in this study, their sources and genres would make them more balanced and the results would be more generalizable.
It would also be beneficial to control for translators to make sure that the texts gathered in the Russian target text corpus were translated by different translators so that the translation solutions represent the decisions of a variety of translators in an attempt to make the collected data more balanced. Unfortunately, it was not possible to do this because neither the names of translators, nor any information about them were mentioned anywhere on the Russian online version of the magazine *National Geographic*. Likewise, it would be helpful to see the guidelines provided to the translators, which could perhaps explain some of the translation decisions that we have come across.

### 6.3 Future Directions

The next step of this study could involve expanding the corpora by adding more texts in order to make the findings more generalizable. It would also be interesting to apply the methodology and theoretical framework of the given study to a corpus of a different genre and compare the results. With scientific texts, for example, the expectation is that the results would be different. More specifically, in light of what has been previously discussed, scientific texts may contain more *Simple Linear thematic progressions*, more *Lexical Repetitions* and fewer *Inferences* and *Adjectival Clauses* across the three corpora due to the nature of scientific texts both in English and Russian. The scope of the research could also be enlarged by adding (an)other language pair(s). The results of such a multilingual study would depend on how similar or different the languages are. Depending on one’s particular research interests, a corpus of machine-translated texts could be added as well. Machine-translated texts would be expected to reproduce the word order and thus the functional sentence perspective of the source texts more
frequently than the human translated texts. Hence, one could expect to find significant differences between the expression of Theme and Rheme in machine and human translated target texts.

The given study is product-based and could be combined with a process-based investigation in the future. For instance, a study of the influence of expertise on strategic translation solutions associated with thematic structures and patterning could be conducted using a group of translation students and comparing their works to those of professional translators. A process-oriented study could provide helpful information and reveal what stands behind some of the phenomena we witnessed in the target texts.

In addition, the compiled corpus, especially its extended version could be used in translation pedagogy and translation evaluation. According to Bowker, a corpus “can act as a benchmark against which translator trainers can compare student translations on a number of different levels” (2001: 345). Moreover, the corpus allows trainers and instructors of translation to provide constructive feedback based on the evidence drawn from the corpus. At the same time, students can be more receptive to the feedback, as they will see for themselves that it is based on corpus evidence and not on subjective opinions or misunderstandings of the instructor (346). Bowker (2001) provides specific advice on how a corpus-based approach can be applied to translation evaluation. Besides T and R-related issues, many other linguistic features can be studied with the help of the corpus compiled for this study, such as cohesion and coherence, punctuation, collocations, sentence and paragraph length, etc.
APPENDIX A

List of Abbreviations

ACC   Accusative case
GEN   Genitive Case
INSTR Instrumental Case
NOM   Nominative Case
NEG   Negative Marker
PL    Plural
APPENDIX B
The Library of Congress Transliteration System for Cyrillic

Table 10. Transliteration System for Cyrillic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>н</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>ъ</th>
<th>”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>б</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>į</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>ы</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>в</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>у</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>л</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ф</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>э</td>
<td>é</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>м</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>ю</td>
<td>įu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>е</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>н</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ĭs</td>
<td>я</td>
<td>įa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ё</td>
<td>ĭ</td>
<td>о</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>zh</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>ш</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td>shch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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