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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Considering the expression of definiteness in language requires an analysis that includes more than an analysis of the existing articles. The expression of definiteness in English is easily identifiable because of the existence of the formal definite article. It could be viewed as moot to study and analyze the obvious but the fact remains that English will be translated into languages without articles and into languages with articles. It is necessary to state this because the link between the expression of definiteness and the translation of definiteness is a 'working link.' Knowing how the different languages express the concept of 'definiteness' and 'indefiniteness' permits a smoother translation, but more importantly, it permits a more accurate translation. English, in its simplest form, has only subject-verb-object constructions so that the emphasis on and/or the readdressing of a noun is tied to those words which modify it, e.g., the article and the adjective. The expression of definiteness in Russian, on the other hand, as a language without formal articles demands a closer
analysis and a more precise definition of "definiteness" because although
the grammatical category of "definiteness" in itself is primary to the
Russian language the expression of definiteness by the articles is not,
therefore other means must be found to express this grammatical category.

This suggests that because Russian does not have formal articles, nor
does it have a single construction or morpheme whose assignment is to
express definiteness, it cannot, logically, have a specific grammatical
category of definiteness.

The definition of definiteness is not unanimously agreed upon by the
linguists who have remarked on it. Chvany states that "there is no finite
meaning" for definiteness. She states that definiteness and
indefiniteness pervade all areas of language and the role of definiteness
and indefiniteness is "to assign structure to the world and to organize
experience." (Chvany 1983:75) Chvany's definition seems rather elusive and
abstract. Kramský on the other hand identifies the role of the article on a
more concrete plane. The role of the article is "to designate an object as
familiar...it individualizes the given subject...it defines the object."
(Kramský 1972:20)

The definite article the in English can be described as that
grammatical word which designates familiarity, individualizing, generality, determinedness, concreteness, a "known" (Kramský 1972:21) English applies constructions other than the article to express the concepts that are inherent to definiteness. These alternative means include the use of the demonstrative pronoun and possessive pronouns. (Kramský 1972:31) It should be stated at this point that the presence of the same article or articles in two languages does not by any means imply or assume that the use and application of the common article is the same. For instance, Naylor notes the presence of a formal definite article in English and Macedonian. In Macedonian the zero-article must be used when the referent is something nondefinite, nongeneric and that article is not used for an abstract generic noun. The English articles do not have these restrictions on the use of the nondefinite article. (Naylor 1983:205)

Before a comparison can be made between the two languages, Russian and English, and their expression of definiteness identified, the various articles that exist in English, their meanings and their uses must be discussed. At that point the means of examining an equivalent meaning in Russian can be identified.

English employs fixed word order structures. This fixed order could in
fact be correlated to the existence of the articles. This does not suggest that all languages with articles have fixed word order. The structure and word order of a sentence is so limited that specific information about a noun must somehow be related to that noun, sometimes through articles, which denote definite and nondefinite, the, a/an.

Galton sees the grammatical category of definiteness as “determinacy.” He defines determinacy as “an indication of a specific referent or referents.” (Galton 1973:6) The expression of definiteness in English is not restricted to the definite article. The post-posing of an epithet can also imply definiteness e.g., “Jack the Ripper,” “Winnie the Pooh” and “Kermit the Frog.” Galton asserts that this particular expression of definiteness in English derives from an “outer zone of semantic determinacy which is rendered by means other that the article.” (Galton 1973:9)

Whereas Galton subtly equates definiteness and determinacy, Kramský approaches definiteness, not as the grammatical category, nor the articles as the direct correlation to that category, but instead he uses the grammatical categories of determinedness and indeterminedness. In these categories the articles express the determinedness formally although
non-formal means exist. A definite article modifying a noun presupposes that noun to be determined "by some character which may or may not be identified from context." The nondefinite implies that the object or person in reference is not determined but is only specified as a member of a class. (Naylor 1983:204)

Determinedness implies that the noun content is clearly identifiable. The determined is the individual, the indetermined is the genus. Excluding “fixed usage nouns,” (Kramský’s term) for “man,” “sun,” “earth,” the articles in English are required, they "add a definite element." (Kramský 1972:33) The definite article can refer to a particular or general term, as is evident with the French expressions l'homme "man/the man" and l'homme cruel "the cruel man" respectively.¹ The referent in the first example is the genus, not the individual. If l'homme was being referred to in a context of other genera then the definite article would be fulfilling the role as a particular and familiar marker. L'homme cruel though refers to an individual, not to a genus because it is further defined and specified with an adjective which gives the noun further identifiability and a further referential quality. This demonstrates the expression of a particular and a general meaning, both of which use the definite article. (Kramský 1972:46)
Chvany views definiteness as a concept and not specifically as a grammatical category. Definiteness in English, both Chvany and Kramský state, contains referent identifiability. (Chvany 1983:74)

Declerk maintains that a definite noun phrase may in certain contexts refer to an indefinite. There are occasions when there is a "discrepancy between formal and semantic definiteness." (Declerk 1985:25) This gap can only be identified within a context. Declerk challenges the meaning of definiteness as reference. He adds the meaning of referential and nonreferential and inclusive and exclusive to the ideas of definiteness and indefiniteness. The definite article when it occurs in predicational constructions where an indefinite interpretation is possible.

1. Don't tell me you're the brother of that idiot?
2. The accident was not the fault of the organizers.

Declerk’s main assertion claims that the definite form "need not have the uniqueness of understanding that is typical of singular definite noun phrases: it is not asserted that the person referred to as 'that idiot' has only one brother nor that the organizers made only one mistake."²

Declerk also views definiteness as a formal category in view of syntactico-morphology. (Declerk 1986:25) Declerk states that the theory
of definiteness is not solely "referential" because "nonreferential or predicational noun phrases are also formally definite and indefinite and exhibit a semantic difference which cannot be explained in terms of reference." (Declerk 1986:26) He gives these examples.

3. John is the victim of his own generosity.
3a. John is a victim of his own generosity.

The second example which uses the indefinite article implies that there are other victims to John's generosity. The definite noun phrase, according to Declerk, refers to an object which is "uniquely defined" for the speaker and "uniquely identifiable" for the hearer based on a specific context. (Declerk 1986:29) The definite noun phrase also asserts an 'inclusive' interpretation and the indefinite noun phrase involves an 'exclusive' interpretation. (Declerk 1986:30) Here the distinction is exhibited in,

4. Pick up the books. Pick up the bread.
4a. Pick up some books. Pick up some bread.

The first example is inclusive, the second is only a subset of the generic.

Declerk supports this theory to the extent that the inclusive implies definite and exclusive implies indefinite in so far as there is no indication of a different meaning, such as
5. It was John who brought in the wickets after the game.  
5a. The one who brought in the wickets after the game left 
one on the pitch.

In the second sentence the wickets, with a context, does not permit the 
same interpretation as the first, which is inclusive. (Declerk 1986:31) The 
context of the sentence in example 5a gives way to the broader and 
exclusive meaning of the definite article.

At this point when the definite article can no longer be identified as 
the model marker of definiteness, one must make note of Chvany’s 
statement that the presence of the definite article does not alleviate the 
confusion of sense and reference. (Chvany 1983:85) She also notes that the 
speaker who uses a definite article cannot be assured of the hearer’s 
interpretation of the definiteness. She concludes that the article is 
"semantically the most empty (least marked) of the deictic demonstrative 
series." (Chvany 1983:86) In complete contradiction with Chvany, de la 
Grasserie (quoted in Kramský 1972) asserts that the "article gives the 
language, according to the scope of its use, a quite specific feature: it is 
one of the most effective instruments of analysis, of abstraction and 
clarity in developed language." (Kramský 1972:45) Chvany’s statement also 
disagrees with Naylor when she says that definiteness is unmarked.
Naylor contends that just as specific is more marked than general, that
definite is more specified than indefinite and because specific and
nonspecific are subdivisions of indefinite (according to Kramský),
indefinite is less marked. Naylor also further states that it is not a
tendency for marked categories to subdivide. (Naylor 1983:217)

In short, English has a diverse and complex system of articles. The
definite article can designate familiarity, individualize an object,
designate determinedness and refer to a known. This definiteness can be
expressed through the use of demonstratives, possessive pronouns and the
post-posing of an epithet. The use of the definite article does not always
imply the individual, it can, as we have seen, also refer to the general. The
definite article also, in regard to inclusive and exclusive, does not
singularly imply the inclusive interpretation. The seemingly obvious
expression of definiteness, no matter from whose perspective one looks, is
consistently context dependent. This dependency is also valid in Russian.

The complexity of formal and semantic definiteness in English with
the definite article denoting both definiteness and indefiniteness is
eliminated in Russian since there are no articles. The concepts inherent in
the article in English are expressed through other means in Russian. Spoken
Russian communicates definiteness through the use of intonation and phrasal stress. The written language denotes definiteness through more complex constructions. A common expression of definiteness in Russian and English is the use of the demonstrative pronouns. Russian uses etot/tot “this” and its forms. The Russian demonstrative in a sentence may designate familiarity and determinedness but it is context dependent. The Russian demonstrative more often fulfills the deictic function rather than being used as an expression of definiteness. One context for the demonstrative to be used as an expression of definiteness is

6. Togda k nam vošel kakoj-to čelovek. Čelovek etot...
6a. Then a man came to see us. The man... (Topolińska 1981:166)

The free word order of Russian effects the expression of definiteness. word order and the notions of theme and rheme are primary to the Russian equivalent of definiteness. The definite element in a Russian statement generally occurs in initial thematic position which is followed by that element which remarks upon the theme, the rheme.

7. Devuška vošla v komnatu.
7a. The girl entered the room.

8. Lampa stojala na stoje.
8a. The lamp was on the table.
9. Telefon stojit na tumbočke.
9a. The telephone is on the stand.

Placing nouns in initial sentence position emphasizes their importance, their thematic expression and their expression of definiteness. (Naylor 1983:207) The combination of the demonstrative pronouns and free word order, as Naylor points out, simplifies the problem of expressing definiteness when context or conditions require the theme-rheme order to be altered. The demonstrative in this case can be used to express the definiteness by calling attention to the modified noun. (Naylor 1983:210)

10. Nam nužen tot student, kotoryj znaet kitajskij jazyk.
10a. We need the student who knows Chinese.

In the case of reversed word order, the theme becomes the rheme and indefinite, and the object becomes definite. (Naylor 1983:208) This underlies the fact that the expression of definiteness, by using word order, is not confined to subjects, or to subjects and objects but reaches to the relationship of direct objects and indirect objects. (Naylor 1983:209)

11. V komnetu vošla devuška.
11a. A girl entered the room.

12a. There was a lamp on the table.

13a. A phone is on the stand.
14a. The man gave the girl flowers.

15. Muščina podaril cvety devuške.
15a. The man gave the girl flowers.

The nouns which are in post-position, as new objects are undiscussed and provide new information. (Lebanova 1980:349)

A more controversial expression of definiteness exists in Russian in the discussion of the case of the direct object. An accusative object in Russian is generally considered to be a definite object whereas a genitive object denotes an indefinite object.³

16. Daj mne den’gi!
16a. Give me the money! (definite)

17. Daj mne denegi!
17a. Give me some money! (indefinite)

18. My ne polučili pis’mo.
18a. We didn’t receive any letter. (definite)

19. My ne polučili pis’ma.
19a. We didn’t receive any letter. (indefinite)

In the case of the negated object in Russian, Naylor points out the important difficulties in identifying the definiteness of the object because a native speaker consistently uses the accusative or the genitive.
To derive the intended meaning of the speaker requires full contextual
details. (Naylor 1983:218)

Russian also expresses definiteness through the use of the relative
pronoun. Naylor says that if the theme is followed by a WH-word or a
relative pronoun and the relative pronoun is in thematic position in the
subordinant clause, the original noun acquires definiteness. (Naylor
1983:208)

20. Lakej i kučer, kotorye videli etix ljudej, ne obratil
na nix vnimaniya.
20a. The footman and the coachman, who saw the people,
paid no attention to them.

Having identified and elaborated upon definiteness and various theories
and approaches, it is necessary to briefly discuss the English expression of
indefiniteness in relation to Russian indefiniteness. There is an overlap,
once again, in the meaning of the indefinite article- a. It can refer both to
a definite and an indefinite noun.

21. I want a pencil. -Any pencil will do.
22. there was a man- or some man- enquiring
for you while you were out. (Close 1962:52)

The indefinite article can be either referential or nonreferential.

23. A man was in the garden last night. (referential)
24. The whale struck a ship. (referential)
25. John is a scientist. (nonreferential) 
   (Burton-Roberts 1979:427)

The third example is nonreferential and attributive. The indefinite articles with a referential quality acquire definiteness. (Burton-Roberts 1979:441)

A nonspecific indefinite can be paraphrased by any.

26. (Any) A whale which is sick yields no blubber.
27. (Any) A hungry lion is a dangerous lion. (Dahl 1970:33)

In Russian indefinites are formed from interrogative pronouns and adverbs using the suffixes -to and nibud'. (Dahl 1970:33) With imperatives only the nibud' suffix is used.

28. Delaj čto-nibud'!
28a. Do something!

Dahl elaborates on a series of statements revising it to identify the use of -to and expressing indefiniteness in Russian. In his examination he states that “a variable, bound by the existential operator (exist x), will be realized as a -to pronoun in declaratives.” The final version condenses to “a variable, bound by an existential quantifier that is uppermost in the predicate or dominated by a predicate of the same type in a sentence directly dominated by the predicate “STATE,” is realized as -to.” (Dahl 1970:35) This is important to understand because Dahl is devising a
standard rule that is applicable to the various expressions of definiteness.

With his general observations it is easier to identify the expression of definiteness or indefiniteness.

29. Vse ljudi čitajut čto-to.
   Exist x(All y( y reads x ))
   There is one thing and they are all reading it.

30. Vse ljudi čitajut čto-nibud'.
   All x(Exist y( x reads y )) All are reading a different thing.

Dahl simplifies the use nibud'. It will be used in imperatives, in negations, interrogatives and conditional statements. The choice between the two suffixes is also aspectually related. With perfective verbs Dahl notes a tendency to use -to while the imperfective aspect assumes the -nibud' suffix. But the choice is, once again, the speaker's. That is not to say that the imperfective grammatically always requires the -nibud' suffix in an imperative. Dahl notes a more frequent use of the suffixes with the aspects. There are counter-examples to this statement, it is a generalizing rule.

31. Perfective- Kto-to pozvonil?
31a. Did anyone call (I thought I heard the phone ring).
32. Imperfective— Zvonil kto-nibud’?
32a. Has anyone called?

In conclusion it is evident that what appears to be a moot study on the expression of definiteness in English is linguistically justified. English does not singularly use the definite article to express definiteness, nor does the use of the definite article automatically presuppose the definiteness of the noun it is modifying. The definite article will, in certain contexts, refer to a nondefinite noun. The indefinite article will, in certain contexts, refer to a definite. This overlapping of uses and interpretations of the articles underlines the necessity of an intense contextual study of the expression of definiteness. Because Russian does not have formal articles it is more difficult to compare the Russian and English approaches to the expression of definiteness. The difficulty stems from the lack of a concrete morpheme whose purpose is to denote definiteness. Russian does have constructions that are equivalent to English expressions of definiteness. It is a matter of identifying in similar texts the 'hows' of that expression.

Therefore, in Russian as in English, whether a noun is expressing definiteness or indefiniteness is context dependent. A context can always be created to give a noun definite or indefinite meaning.
CHAPTER II

TEXTUAL ANALYSIS: RUSSIAN-ENGLISH

An analysis of definiteness can be done though the comparison of texts. For this study an original Russian text translated into English and an original English text translated into Russian are used. In this manner the contexts are identical and must represent the same meaning. The particular texts chosen for this analysis are chapters from the novels, *Master i Margarita* (*Master and Margarita*) by Mikhail Bulgakov in Russian and *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (*Sobaka Baskervillei*) by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle in English.4

The chapters are similar in that the Russian original is "невречая квартира," "The Sinister Apartment," and the English chapter is "Baskerville Hall," "Baskervil' Xoll." The choice of these two particular texts is deliberate. In both instances a new location is introduced therefore objects and people will be introduced in a relatively new context and the study of the texts will be more parallel.

This study is an analysis of translations and translation choices. What
is important to note is how the various statements of definiteness and
indefiniteness are rendered in the published translations. There may be
other translations, but what I feel is relevant to this particular study is
which translations are used. No alterations to the works or their
translations has taken place. If certain translations do not appear accurate
to the reader, it is imperative to remember these specific examples were
lifted from an entire text.

One of the most common modes of dealing with the expression of
definiteness used in the Russian to English translation is the use of the
English possessive pronoun. Since Russian as a general rule does not use
the possessives with such things as body parts or family members, it is
merely understood to the Russian reader ‘whose’ mother or father or hand is
being referred to in the text. English uses the possessive with body parts
thereby avoiding any misinterpretation of the definiteness or the
indefiniteness of the given noun because the use of the possessive implies
definiteness. (Naylor 1981-2:535)\(^5\) The examples that are used are not
random. They are taken from the previously mentioned texts as they occur
in the published original edition and the corresponding published
translation. The first element in all examples is the original while the
second element corresponds to the translated text.

33. V etoj golove...
33a. his head...

34. lepil slimšiesja vekli levogo glaza...
34a. he unglued the eyelid of his left eye...

35. na krovati, to est’, na byvšej juveliršinoj
    krovati v spal’ne...
35a. in his own bed, that is in the bed of the ex-jeweler’s
    wife in the bedroom...

36. Tut emu tak udarila v golovu, čto on zakryl glaz...
36a. At this point, he felt such a stab in his head
    that he closed his eyes.

37. pojavlenie v spal’ne neizvestnogo...
37a. the appearance of a stranger in his bedroom...

These examples all, to varying degrees, use the possessive in order to
express a definite noun. The point to make note of is the fact that the
original Russian does not employ the possessive modifier where English
does freely. In the Russian to English translation, even though the Russian
does not use a possessive, the English may assume the use of that modifier
because of the normal English use and since Russian does not as a rule use
the possessive in an original Russian text. On the other hand there are
contextual clues to imply, without a doubt, the use of a possessive pronoun
in English to express the definiteness even if the possessive is not used in
the Russian text.

38. Včera v kabinetė u vas videl ego...
38a. I saw him at your office...

English uses the possessive more easily than a particular article. In contrast to the Russian assumption of the possessive, when translating from English to Russian, the text will, for the most part, use the possessive equivalent in Russian if the possessive is explicitly stated in the original English text, e.g.

39. and his neighbors...
39a. i ego sosedjami...

40. Our friends had already secured a first class carriage.
40a. Naši druz'ja uželę uspeli zapastis' biletami pervogo klassa.

41. Our coming was evidently a great event.
41a. Naš priezd byl zdes', vidimo, bol'šim sobytiem.

42. The rattle of our wheels...
42a. Stuk koles našego skipaža...

Whereas Russian is very faithful in maintaining the possessive pronouns, there are circumstances when the text will not be so strictly adhered to.

43. Did you get your other boot?
43a. Vy našli drugoj bašmak?
44. Our wagonette had topped a rise.
44a. Koljaska podnijale na vzgor'e.

There are cases, as in example 44 above, where the elimination of the possessive may be explained by the original text itself. In this instance there is a prior reference to the wagonette in the text. In this particular reference the English original is,

45. The wagonette swung round...
45a. Naša poljaska svernula...

In what seems like a whim of the translator to arbitrarily add the possessive in one instance and to delete it in other instances is easily explained by the fact of his being fully aware of the context and identified the wagonette as naša 'our' in the first Russian reference to it. In this manner further references to the koljaska 'wagonette' contain an implication of the particular noun and its modifiers. The translator defines the noun at the first mention and then assumes an identifiability for the reader with that noun upon future reference. This particular example gives proof of Declerk's statement that the definiteness of a noun refers to something 'uniquely defined' for the speaker and something 'uniquely identifiable' for the listener/reader.' (Declerk 1986:115)

The theory of theme and rheme in Russian grammar constitutes another
identifiable means of expressing definiteness. The theme refers to a
definite, a known and/or a previously mentioned noun. This 'method' of
expressing definiteness in Russian texts is a very evident and easily
identifiable means.

46. A rjadom s zerkalom uvidel neizvestnogo
Čeloveka.
46a. Next to the glass he saw an unknown man.

This is the first reference to this particular man/noun. For this reason it
is the rheme and in translation is modified by the indefinite article.

47. Molčanie naruzil etot neizvestnyj...
47a. It was the stranger who broke the silence...

In example 47 above, the 'neizvestnyj' 'stranger;' although in the rheme
position, is a known, an identifiable entity at this point for the reader.
Therefore it is a definite noun. The presence of the demonstrative etot
'this' underlies the previous reference and the definiteness of the noun.
The reversed word order in this instance is a means to emphasize the fact
that it was 'the stranger' doing the action. This particular sentence
exemplifies Naylor's point that when context or grammar demands a change
in the theme/rheme word order the demonstrative is a viable alternative to
reiterate the definiteness of a given object. (Naylor 1983:216)
48. Neznakomec druželjubno uzmehnila.
48a. The stranger smiled amiably.

Here the 'neznakomec' 'stranger' is defined, a known and in the thematic position. Although this is the first time in the original text the stranger is referred to as 'neznakomec,' the reference is to the 'neizvestnyj.' There is still identifiability within the context and the reader knows that the two refer to one person. Even when the 'neznakomec' becomes the 'neizvestnyj' again, they are synonymous to the reader and therefore interchangeable for the writer.

49. Tut neizvestnyj ulybnulisja.
49a. The stranger smiled.

The context has established the stranger as a known. In future references to him, if the word order reverses or changes it is not because the stranger is the rhematic element but more for emphasis of a particular fact and/or presence of the stranger.

50. zagovoril positiel'...
50a. the visitor spoke...

51. otvetil viziter...
51a. the visitor cried...

52. otvetil neznakomec...
52a. answered the stranger BUT
53. neznakomec ne dal...
53a. The stranger didn’t give...

54. A neznakomec odnim duxom proglotil.
54a. And the stranger emptied his in one gulp.

It is interesting to note at this point the fact that when ‘the stranger’
became ‘the visitor,’ the subject was in post-position to the verb. This did
occur in two cases and there may well be a link between a new synonymous
reference and a normal rhematic position, but once again it would be as
easy to explain it in terms of emphasis because example 53 above deviates
from any theory that would deal with new synonymous references in
post-position.

The rheme most often contains new information. It is the first
reference to a new noun. Further references, as we have seen, to the same
noun, are most often in thematic position.

55. On stojal s sel districts v ruke.
55a. He stood with a napkin in his hand.

56. potrebovat’ u nes piramidu...
56a. ask her for an aspirin...

57. Proizshla pauza.
57a. There was a pause.

58. vynul bol’še zolote časy...
58a. He took out a big gold watch...
Kto-to vtykal emu ugolku v mozag.
Somebody stuck a needle into his brain.

The above examples are all first references to the indefinite nouns. Future references to these nouns would make them the theme as we see in the following examples.

60. v obamistom juveliršinom grafiničke...
60a. in a good-sized decanter that had once belonged to the ex-jeweler's wife...

61. Čto grafin zapotol ot xoloda...
61a. the decanter was misted with cold...

Another interesting example of adhering to the theme/rheme-definite/indefinite pattern is when the English is not literally verbatim translated from the Russian text but the definiteness or indefiniteness is maintained through the scheme of the sentence.

62. I vot dva goda nazad načalis' v kvartire neobjasnimye poixšestviya...
62a. Two years ago however a series of inexplicable events began to plague the apartment.
62b. Two years ago inexplicable events began occurring in the apartment.

The English translation of this sentence does not strictly adhere to the original text. It is possible though to translate as the original is written, as in 62b above. In this instance though the rheme, the newness of the
information about these events, in English, is translated with an indefinite article- 'a series.' This may be related to the fact that plural nouns do not always require articles in English. Even though the English adds and substitutes, it still adheres to the original indefiniteness of the Russian text, the 'inexplicable events' are in rhematic position.
CHAPTER III

TEXTUAL ANALYSIS: ENGLISH-RUSSIAN

In the English to Russian text the identification and explanation of theme/rheme structures is not as apparent as the Russian to English text. The absence of the articles in Russian permits the language to simply, through context, imply the definiteness or indefiniteness depending upon prior reference and other contextual clues. There is no choice as far as particular articles are concerned to be made. Many times the original English word order will be maintained and the reader must rely on context to identify the definiteness.

63. When the powers of evil are exalted...
63a. Kogda sily zla vlastvujut bezrazdel'no...

64. and saw the tall austere figure of Holmes...
64a. i uvidel vysokuju xudoščovuju figuru Xolmsa...

65. Poor sir Charles' head was of a very rare type...
65a. U pokojnogo Sera Čarl'za bylo soveršenno redkostnov stroenie čerapa...

66. We passed over a narrow granite bridge...
66a. My proezhali po uzkomu kamennomu mostu....

It should not be misunderstood that the Russian translation strictly or
always maintains the English word order. When syntactically appropriate will uphold the theme/rheme pattern.

67. A steep curve of heath-clad land, an outlaying spur of the moor, lay in front of us.

67a. Pered nami podnimalos' krutnoe vzgor'e.

68. There's a convict escaped from Princtown.

68a. Iz prinstauskoj tjurmy ubežal arestant.

69. Outside beyond the low white fence a wagonette with a pair of cobs...

69a. Za nizkym belym zaborom stojala koljaska zaprjažennaja korenastyx lošadok...

In example 69 above the theme is definite, 'the low white fence' and the rheme is indefinite, 'stojala koljaska.' This particular example demonstrates theme/rheme word order and maintains the English word order and meaning.

Naylor's point on the Russian expression of definiteness through the use of the relative pronoun whereas the WH-word is in thematic position in the subordinant clause is supported by these texts.

70. It depends on the breed of men quite as much as the country.

70a. Tut delo ne tol'ko v samom Devonšire, no i v ljudjakh, kortorye ego naseljabut.
71. There remain the people who will actually surround 
Sir Henry Baskerville upon the moor.
71a. Значит, остается только те, к которым непосредственно 
окружает сэр Генри Баскервилль.

But Naylor’s, like other general observations, is susceptible to 
counter-examples,

72. and skirted a noisy stream which gushed swiftly down 
foaming and roaring amid the gray boulders.
72a. Čerez burnuju rečku, kotoraja bystro nesla 
meždu serymi valunami obdava i s penoj.

Russian also uses the post-posing of an epithet to suggest definiteness.

More common examples being, Ivan groznyj, Ivan the Terrible, and Petr 
velikij, Peter the Great. The epithet can be more than a single adjective.

73. Ona byla vdoja juverlira de Fuzere...
73a. It still belonged to the widow of the jeweler 
de Fougere...

74. čto delo včera bylo na scodne, na dače u avtora 
sketečev Kustova.
74a. He had been in Scodnya the night before, at the 
summer home of the sketch writer Khustov.

75. Mr. James Desmond, who is the next heir...
75a. bližajšij naslednik, mister Džejms Desmond...

English uses an indefinite article to imply a definite noun when that 
indefinite article has referential quality. The analyzed text contained only 
one example. It is interesting to note that the Russian translation reflects
the definiteness of the noun even though the English uses, on the surface, the indefinite article. The referential quality of the noun implies that the article may not be replaced by 'any.'

76. A cold wind swept down from it...
76a. Xолодуj ветер, налетевший оттуда...

In this case a reader could not substitute 'any' with the indefinite modifier. There is a particular wind the author is talking about and referring to.

An area of great interest in determining the definiteness and indefiniteness of a noun is directed at the case of a direct object of a verb in Russian. The accusative object, in general, most often refers to a definite noun whereas the genitive refers to an indefinite in an affirmative sentence. This concept meets a problem when the object is a masculine animate accusative noun in the singular and in the plural since the form of these nouns in such cases is the same as that of the genitive.

77. отвeta не получил...
77a. he got no answer. [He didn't get an answer.]

78. ччто вы давно уже не даете ей отпуска...
78a. that you had cheated her out of a vacation...

In example 77 the object is in the genitive case in order to be interpreted as an indefinite. The translator by using 'no' implies 'not any' and an indefinite noun. The second example again is in the genitive implying an
indefinite and is rendered in English as such. This is a point of debate and the analysis of this single text does not permit a more detailed discussion of this point.
CHAPTER IV

OBSERVATIONS

The study of the texts for this analysis was very restrictive. No examples were taken from outside of the chapters of either text previously mentioned. The analysis was intended to identify the means of expressing definiteness in Russian and English. The study was limited to certain chapters from a complete text. To translate from English to Russian the idea of definiteness involves various methods on the part of the translator. The theme/rheme pattern by far is the most often applied means of expressing the definiteness or indefiniteness of a noun. The demonstrative adjectives in Russian, when not fulfilling a deictic function, constitute an expression of definiteness. An obvious word order reversal is a more subtle technique to expressing definiteness in Russian. The rendering of the direct object in the accusative case, although it is an argued topic, as a general rule is still applicable.

The translations of Russian to English saw the expression of definiteness manifested in various ways also. The simple and obvious use of the definite article is primary. The demonstrative pronoun also suggests
a definite noun. The indefinite article may also be used to imply a definite noun if it contains a referential quality. An obvious method of expressing definiteness in English is referring to the context of the noun. Prior mention, previous reference to the noun suggests that the noun is indeed definite. New information, first mention of nouns in both languages to to be indefinite unless the reference is to something that would be assumed to be present in a given general context.7

The purpose of this paper was to identify first the various English means to express definiteness which in certain contexts is more difficult than one might expect due to formal and semantic discrepancies in the meaning of the definite article. The next step was to identify the Russian means to express definiteness which for the most part are nonformal due to the fact that Russian does not have formal articles. After having identified the languages' theoretical expressions of definiteness, it was necessary to make a textual analysis whereby, for the most part, the context was known and identifiable. The texts, since both an original Russian text and an original English text were used, permitted a more thorough analysis because it is possible to see how the languages mold themselves to translations in order to retain the original intent of meaning.
Various theories on the expression of definiteness in Russian and English were used as the theoretical basis in order to identify them as they are applied in translation practices.
NOTES

1 Even though this paper is primarily concerned with the expression of definiteness in English and in Russian some observations will be better supported and more precisely demonstrated with references to other languages.

2 Declerk’s views, as he himself acknowledges in the article, are criticized by other linguists. I am not trying to prove or maintain Declerk’s theory but feel that it is necessary, especially for translation purposes to be aware of the formal and semantic ‘discrepancies’ of a given language in order to make a more accurate translation. The fact that Declerk can provide a context for his examples for his statements is enough to warrant consideration and awareness for this textual translation analysis.

3 In Graudina, Ickovič and Kalinskaja’s book there is an abundance of examples and statistics concerning native Russian speakers’ choice of case for the nouns in the direct object position. The contexts are given with examples along with statistics including the frequency of the cases used. For instance, 75% of the speakers will say Ždat’ poezda and 25% will use the accusative case, Ždat’ poezd.

4 The text from Conan Doyle’s book was specifically chosen because there are no conflicts between the original British English text and standard American English therefore there is no conflict or basis of conflict in the translation into Russian.

5 It is interesting to note that the use of the possessive with body parts in English expresses definiteness. The use of the definite article in the same circumstances would imply ‘someone else’s.’ He touched the head...[someone else’s].
6 "Occur" in my translation is used because of the Russian noun proisšestviya of the original text.

7 Examples of this are also evident in the text,

1. sledujte staromu murdomu pravilu.
   1a. obey the wise old rule.

2. opražaetsja v trjumо vide...
   2a. reflected in the wall mirror...

This is taking place in a bedroom and is the first reference to that mirror. One would expect there to be a mirror in a bedroom so reference to it may be definite.
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