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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In a written text the word choice and the morphology of the word convey information which might be expressed in oral communication through such extra-linguistic means as intonation or physical gestures. Therefore, in addition to other elements which constitute a text, the word and its morphology play a vital role in the creation of a text.

In the realm of written translation study of the word and its morphology is especially fruitful. This is because certain lexical forms exist in the original language which are not found in the language into which the text is translated. When one considers translation of English and Russian texts, emotively marked lexical derivatives often present difficulties for translators. This is due to the fact that such forms are found extensively in Russian while they are very rarely used in English.

In Russian the addition of certain suffixes creates derivatives with denotative and connotative meanings. English, however, does not make use of suffixation to the extent that Russian does. Therefore it is of note to
analyze: 1) how these Russian forms are encoded in English translation and 2) the factors which cause a translator to translate an English text into Russian using these derivatives. In such an analysis both lexical items as well as contextual elements must be considered.

The works of N.V. Gogol prove to be especially fruitful in such a comparative analysis. Diminutive forms pervade his texts and contribute to the satirical tone of his prose. In regard to this tone, D. S. Mirsky notes that Gogol's prose is never empty, but rather,

...is alive with the vibrance of actual speech. This makes it hopelessly untranslatable - more untranslatable than any other Russian prose (Mirsky, 151).

In this analysis of Russian emotively marked derivatives, the novel Шинель by Gogol will be used. I will present and discuss both the means of translating the diminutives and the success of the translation.

Analysis should be made not only of how Russian diminutives are encoded in English but also how and why certain English lexemes are translated into Russian as diminutives. Thus an analysis of an English text translated into Russian is in order. Such an analysis will illustrate that the translator chose to use diminutive forms in order to maintain the "tone" of the original text. In English texts this "tone" is conveyed not through lexical morphology but through context. The English text
to be analyzed should be of a similar "tone" to Gogol's Шанель. The novel Deadeye Dick by Kurt Vonnegut contains much irony and satire and therefore will be the source of all original English examples.

This paper will present and analyze all diminutive forms found in Gogol's Шанель in light of their English translation. In a similar fashion, rendering of English lexemes as Russian diminutives will be discussed with examples taken from Vonnegut's Deadeye Dick. Based on these analyses it will be shown that English tends to use words which are more neutral and unspecific in their meaning. Therefore English tends to rely on context to create the "tone" of a text. In contrast, Russian employs the semantically loaded diminutive forms to convey this "tone" in original Russian texts and in order to maintain the "tone" of a translated English text.
CHAPTER II

DIMINUTIVES IN GOGOL'S WORKS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

"In 'The Overcoat' and 'Diary of a Madman' Gogol brings his diction as close as possible to the conversational" (Ciževsky, 279). This conversational tone is especially dominant in Gogol's work Шинель and is achieved through frequent use of diminutives. Gogol uses these forms to create satire, irony and mockery or a feeling of pity for Akaky Akakievich, the "hero" of the story. Since diminutives are also associated with colloquial speech, children's speech and emotively marked speech it can be proposed that these forms greatly contribute to the conversational tone of Gogol's text.

Many sources on Gogol note that he was an extremely meticulous writer who devoted much time to the creation of the style and "sound" of his works. On this aspect of Gogol's works Ciževsky notes:

Gogol recast and reworked the texts of his compositions endlessly; he went over them word by word, making changes and alternations until he achieved the greatest possible refinement and polish (297),

indicating that the abundance of diminutive forms found in Шинель appear not by coincidence but were chosen quite
intentionally by the author with a certain stylistic goal in mind.

In his article "How Gogol's Overcoat is Made," Boris Eichenbaum investigates the manner in which _Wither_. is presented, specifically the narrator's tone which he terms _skaz_. An important factor in the creation of _skaz_ is assigned to play on words. For instance, Eichenbaum comments on Gogol's choice of Akaky's last name - Башмачкин - which itself is a derivative based on the diminutive form Башмачок. This form, Башмачок, is itself a diminutive of the word Башмак - "shoe." He states that,

...the choice of the form Башмачкин can be explained by Gogol's predilection for diminutive suffixes, which are characteristic of his style, as well as by the greater expressive power inherent in this particular form, in terms of articulated sound: it produces a phonetic gesture (277).

Čičevskij also discusses factors which create the overall feeling of the text and states that one of the fundamental structures of this work is that of an oscillation between "little, tiny, insignificant" and "enormous, great, significant" (310). I propose that this extensive use of diminutive forms conveys the insignificance of both Akaky Akakievich and his world.
CHAPTER III

MORPHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF SUBSTANTIVE GRADATION

A. Morphological derivation and its classification

The phenomenon of gradation of substantives is extremely widespread in Russian. From neutral "base" substantives, morphological derivatives are formed which can be either expressive or non-expressive.

Expressive derivation differs from non-expressive derivation in several respects. Non-expressive derivation involves all parts of speech, whereas expressive derivation is confined in CSR to the nominal system, in particular to the class of substantives. Non-expressive derivation is the process of forming new lexical items ("word formation"), which may be accompanied by a change of class-membership or grammatical category (e.g. gender). The lexical meaning of non-expressive derivatives cannot be predicted from the meaning of the underlying stem. In expressive derivation the lexical meaning of the base form remains intact; the expressive suffix serves merely to convey the emotive attitude of the speaker towards the subject of the message (Stankiewicz, 98).

Traditionally, derivatives are said to be paired for quantity (diminutive vs. augmentative) or quality (affectionate vs. pejorative). These categories of quantity and quality are not mutually exclusive, as diminution usually implies a qualitative, affectionate
meaning. As Townsend notes, diminution and augmentation differ from each other in that while,

Diminutive suffixes may express either attitude [affectionate or pejorative]: augmentative suffixes do not ordinarily express affection (196).

In his book *Declension and Gradation of Russian Substantives*, Stankiewicz agrees with and expounds upon the traditional definition. He states that emotive derivation is binary in nature and through the use of various suffixes it creates polar forms: e.g. diminutive vs. augmentative and affectionate vs. pejorative. These binary forms may be placed on a double axis where the vertical axis represents the strength of the emotive quality (i.e. weak to strong) and the horizontal axis represents opposition of the quantity (i.e. augmentatives vs. diminutives) or quality (i.e. affectionate vs. pejorative.) Thus, through diminution of substantives, the newly formed lexeme is not only denotative but in most instances also connotative.

Various "relationships" may develop between a lexical derivative and its original neutral base form. In some instances, the diminutive form does not contain any connotative qualities and may actually replace the word from which it was derived. In such cases the original unsuffixed form becomes augmentative, for example:
As can be seen in the preceding examples, some derived substantives lose the expressive meaning which the suffix usually imparts. This is often the case of derivatives formed with the suffix -"к"-. The derivative carries neither an expressive nor a distinct lexical meaning, but is merely a stylistic variant of the unsuffixed form; e.g. нить/нитка "threat", сеть/сетка "net", свеча/свечка "candle." Some of these suffixless forms have become bookish, e.g. сковорода "frying pan" vs. сковородка, скамья "bench" vs скамейка, while other suffixed forms may be colloquial, e.g. папироска "cigarette", сережка "earring", корка "crust, rind" vs. папироса, серьга, кора (Stankiewicz, 100).

In other instances, the suffixed form may acquire a new or specialized meaning, for example:

- булав-ка - pin булава - mace
- крыль-цо - porch крыло - wing
- меш-о-к - bag мех - fur, water bag of skin

Sometimes one derived form can represent both a diminutive and neutral form. For example, the word руч-ка
can have the neutral meaning "handle, door knob" or it can represent the diminutive form which refers to "a small hand, a baby's hand," (which is usually accompanied with some degree of affection). It could be hypothesized that due solely to its morphology, even the supposedly neutral form "руча" - "door knob, handle" actually conveys some degree of connotation to the native Russian speaker. Research into this hypothesis, however, is beyond the scope of this paper.

B. Formation of derivatives

Derived lexemes are classified by the number of morphemes which compose the suffix; the suffixes are either simple (one morpheme) or compound (bi-morphemic or tri-morphemic) and can be used to create diminutives or augmentatives. "Of these [suffixes], those which form diminutives comprise a much larger group than those which form augmentatives" (Townsend, 196).

The following two charts list the derivational suffixes which are used to form diminutives and augmentatives (see Table 1) and give examples of words formed with these suffixes (see Table 2). Table 1 is a compilation of various charts from Stankiewicz's book while Table 2 was taken directly from it. (Stankiewicz, 99,102 and 103)
Table 1: Derivational Suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diminutive</th>
<th>Augmentative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. -兖/-ЙК-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ЙЏ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. -ЙЏ/-ЙЏ-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ЙН-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ЙЏ-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affectionate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pejorative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. -兖Й-ЙК/-ЙК-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. -兖Й-兖Й/-ЙЏ-兖Й</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. -ЙЏ-兖Й/-ЙН-兖Й</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. -ЙШ-兖Й</td>
<td>-ЙШ-兖Й</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>5. -УШ-兖Й</td>
<td>-УШ-兖Й</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>6. -ОН-兖Й</td>
<td>-ОН-兖Й</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tertiary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td>7. -УШ-兖Й-兖Й</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. -ОН-兖Й-兖Й</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. -ЙШ-兖Й</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. -兖Й-ОН-兖Й</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: The Graded Scale of Expressive Derivatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>сын/дом</th>
<th>окно/пальто</th>
<th>книга/река</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>dim.</strong></td>
<td><strong>augm.</strong></td>
<td><strong>dim.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. сынок</td>
<td>сынщце</td>
<td>окошко</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>домищце</td>
<td>домище</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>оконце</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>домина</td>
<td>пальтецу</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>affect.</th>
<th>pejor.</th>
<th>affect.</th>
<th>pejor.</th>
<th>affect.</th>
<th>pejor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 сыночек</td>
<td>сынишка</td>
<td>окошечко</td>
<td></td>
<td>книжечка</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>домишко</td>
<td>пальтишка</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>речушка</td>
<td>речушка</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>книжонка</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>реченька</td>
<td>речонка</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is apparent from Table 1, the initial (first) suffix can vary quite widely (-^x_k-, -иш-, -уш-, etc.) while the secondary and tertiary suffixes consist of only -к- and -^x_k-. As more suffixes are employed the denotative value decreases and is replaced by a connotative one. Townsend notes that with the use of secondary and tertiary suffixes,
"the emotional connotation almost entirely supplants the diminutive meaning, which is subordinate or totally absent" (198). In regard to the frequency of the use of these suffixes, Stankiewicz states:

The hierarchical relationship of the various degrees of qualitative expression is in inverse relation to productivity of the suffix (or, rather, pair of suffixes) the greater the restrictions (lexical and grammatical) in its occurrence (129).

Thus, suffixes belonging to the primary category are more productive than those belonging to the secondary category which, in turn, are more productive than those belonging to the tertiary category, which are the least productive.

1. Primary Suffixes

When the suffixes are classified in this manner (i.e. primary vs. secondary vs. tertiary) it may seem that, when used to form a derivative, primary mono-morphemic suffixes express only quantity and not quality. However, it must be kept in mind that,

All expressive forms (including the diminutives and augmentatives [i.e. primary suffixes]) have an invariant emotive meaning (Stankiewicz, 98).

To this end, Townsend notes that,

...often the emphasis is on the emotional connotation of affection or humor [and not on quantitative denotation] (Townsend, 198).
The primary suffixes are divided according to the
gender of the substantive with which they may be used and
according to style. Both of the primary suffixes which
begin with a vowel-zero alternation (1. -$\text{K}$-, 2. -$\text{Y}$-) may
occur with stems of any gender. The other suffixes may be
used with stems of two genders, specifically: -ИК- occurs
with non-feminine substantives (ДОМ - ДОМИК, ПЛЕЧО -
ПЛЕЧИКО), -ИЩ/-Щ occurs with non-masculine substantives
(ОКНО - ОКОНЦЕ, ВОДА - ВОДИЦА), and -ИН- occurs with non-
neuter substantives (ДОМ - ДОМИНА). In other words, as
Townsend notes:

The chief suffixes are: (a) suffixes including the
consonant K, productive for masculine and feminine
nouns but unproductive for neuter; and (b) suffixes
including the consonant Щ, productive for neuter
nouns but less usual and less productive for masculine
and feminine nouns (196).

Not only do the suffixes vary according to which
gender class they may be added to, but they also differ in
style. The simple suffixes: 1. -$\text{K}$/-ИК- (dim.) and -$\text{Щ}$-
(aug.) are less expressive and not as colloquial or
familiar as the second variants: 2. -$\text{Щ}$/-ИЩ- (dim.) and -
ИН- (aug.).

2. Secondary Suffixes

As previously stated, when secondary or bi-morphemic
suffixes are employed the connotative quality increases and
the diminutive meaning decreases. Thus bi-morphemic suffixes impart an affectionate or pejorative meaning. The most productive suffix of the first grade is -ъК-ъК as the others have certain restrictions. Specifically, -ъК-ИК/-ИК-ъК- can be applied only to masculines, and -ИУ/-ъК- can be combined with only a few neuters. The suffixes -ИШ-ъК- (affec.) and -УШ-ъК- (affec.) are stylistic variants of one another and occur only after hard consonants. Both suffixes of groups (4) (-ИШ-ъК-) and (5) (-УШ-ъК-, -УШ-ъК-) can form derivatives of any gender. The affectionate unstressed suffix is, in general, limited to feminine stems and is palatalized (-ЪН'-ъК-) while the stressed pejorative suffix is not palatalized (-ЪН-ъК-) and occurs only with feminine stems. Some examples are:

Affec.: батя: батенька "father"
мама: маменька "mama"

Pej.: изба: избёнка "hut"
шляпа: шляпёнка "hat"

The compound suffix -ИШ-ъК- (pej.) is the derogatory homonym of the affectionate suffix. Depending on the context, the pejorative meaning may actually be neutralized, even to a degree where it may convey an affectionate or diminutive meaning (as in дети "children": детишки, штаны "trousers": штанышки), a familiar connotation (as in парень "fellow": пареньшка), or
a jocular and affectionate nuance (as in сердце "heart": сердчишко) (Stankiewicz, 130).

Some derivatives of -ОН-"К- actually have an affectionate meaning, as for example:

рука: ручонка "hand"
остра: острёнка "sister" (Stankiewicz, 139).

The resulting positive quality is opposite to the expected pejorative one because,

...some substantives carrying a positive semantic connotation do not form augmentative or pejorative derivatives (e.g. мать "mother", отец "father", няня "nannie", соловей "nightingale") (Stankiewicz, 100).

Thus, due to the inherent positive quality contained in the base substantive, even when pejorative suffixes are employed, the positive quality is not destroyed.

3. Tertiary suffixes

Qualitative derivatives formed with tri-morphemic compound suffixes convey only an affectionate meaning. Expressive derivation using the tri-morphemic compound suffixes is unproductive and occurs with only a few isolated forms. In regard to gender class, it is most productive with feminine stems: девочка, девчоночка, избёнка, избеночка. Utilization of these suffixes is especially marked as being substandard speech as, for example, child language.
B. Gender implications of morphological derivation

In general, the suffixes which form the expressive derivatives coincide with suffixes that create lexical items. The former differ fundamentally from the latter in that they are usually used only with nouns of their own gender. When they are not used with nouns corresponding in gender, the resulting word normally assumes the syntactic gender of the base noun (e.g. ГОЛОС "voice": ГОЛОСИШ-КО and ГОЛОСИЩЕ are masculine and not neuter), whereas normal derivational suffixes do not have this restriction.

In general, these suffixes [emotive] approach the status of endings; rather than themselves conditioning the gender of the resulting derived words, their selection (i.e. whether a masculine, a feminine, or neuter suffix is chosen) is conditioned by the gender of the noun they derive (Townsend, 196). 3

It is with augmentative suffixes that we encounter most of the deviations from gender maintenance. For example, augmentatives formed with the suffix -ИН-(a) based on inanimate masculine substantives are feminine (with the exception of "ДОМИНА," which remains masculine), while if based on animate masculine substantives, the masculine gender is maintained. [The augmentative suffixes will not be dealt with further as their implications in textual typology and their translation are not discussed in this paper.]
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RUSSIAN DIMINUTIVES IN ENGLISH
TRANSLATION

A. Method of Analysis

To illustrate the wide distribution of Russian diminutives and their rendering in English I have taken examples of them from a Russian literary text. Specifically, I have recorded all examples of diminutive forms found in Gogol's ИПИОЯК along with their respective rendering in the English text. [In the text excerpts and definitions given in this paper, all boldfacing is my own - E.D.] As I will show later, analysis of diminutives in translation requires that surrounding contextual elements be considered. Therefore the text excerpts included in this paper are of substantial length. I tried to keep both the original text and its translation of the same length.

The fourteen sets of Russian-English examples and the six sets of English-Russian examples were grouped in an attempt to discover some patterns or tendencies in the English translation of the diminutive. In my preliminary
research I have divided the rendering of Russian diminutives into English in four categories:

1.) No rendering of the Russian diminutive in English.
2.) Use of a noun quantifier such as "scrap" or "piece"
3.) Use of the adjectives "little" or "small"
4.) Use of marked English words (e.g. nouns and adjectives)

The remaining portions of this chapter will be devoted to a detailed analysis of these four categories.

B. Examples of loss of diminutive in English

If any semantic aspect of Russian diminutives is usually maintained in translation, it is that of quantity and not quality. For this reason the following passage is especially noteworthy as it is the only example where the quantitative aspect of the Russian diminutive, квартирука, is completely lost.

**Text No.1**

Даже в те часы, когда совершенно потухает петербургское серое небо и весь чиновный народ нынек и отбегал...когда чиновники спешат предать наслаждению оставшиеся время: Кто на улицу, кто определяя его на рассмотриванье кое-каких шляпёнок, кто на вечер - истратить его в комплиментах какой-нибудь смазливой девушке...словом, даже в то время, когда все чиновники рассеиваются по маленьким квартирам своих приятелей поиграть в
штурмовой вист...-слово даже тогда, когда вое стремится развлечься, Акакий Акакиевич не предавался никакому развлечению (Gogol', 127-8).

Even during those hours when light has completely disappeared from the gray Petersburg sky and the pen-pushing brotherhood have filled themselves with dinner of one sort of another, each as best he can according to his income and his preference;...and the clerks hasten to give over the remaining hours of pleasure—the more enterprising among them rushes to the theater, another walks in the streets, allotting his time to the inspection of ladies' hats...in brief, at the time when all clerks have dispersed among the lodgings of their friends to play a little game of whist...Akaky was not even thinking of diverting himself (Gogol, 72-3).

The first pair under investigation is: КОЕ-КАКИХ

ШЛЯПОНОК - hats. Russian, "ШЛЯПОНОК", is formed by suffixation of "ШЛЯПА" with the secondary, third grade, bimorphemic suffix -ОН-КО- and, therefore, is pejorative in meaning. It is also important to note that this suffix is located quite close to the qualitative end of the graded emotive scale making its connotative value quite strong. When considered as a semantic unit, i.e. КОЕ-КАКИХ + ШЛЯПОНОК, the pejorative connotations becomes even stronger. Thus, the coupling of an indefinite pronoun with a pejorative diminutive emphasizes the triviality of this activity.

In a similar fashion, the corresponding words in translation must be viewed contextually in order to
properly assess the rendering of quality. Viewed individually, the word "hats" is completely neutral and does not convey the pejoration that "шляпенок" independently conveys. However, as Russian and English encode the same information through different means, consideration of surrounding information (i.e. context) is essential, as stated by Rugaleva,

> English words appear to be more independent of context in their use, or encoding (since the same word can fit into various contexts) and more dependent on context for their interpretation, or decoding. Russian words,...are easier to decode (since most characteristics and connotations are made explicit in the word itself)... (494).

It is therefore necessary to analyze all words connected with "hats."

In the English text, the preceding clause "allotting his time to the inspection of ladies' hats" does attempt to convey the connotation, here mockery, which is implicit in the Russian diminutives. Both "allotting" and "inspection" refer to acts which are done deliberately, as if the results were of extreme importance. *Random House College Dictionary* defines "inspection" as "1. the act of inspecting or viewing, esp. carefully or critically. 2. formal or official viewing or examination," and "to allot" as "1. to divide or distribute by or as by lot; apportion. 2. to appropriate for a
special purpose." When not considered contextually these verbs convey the idea of a deliberate, serious act but when used in this context they create irony. Looking at hats is not productive and meaningful but merely a vain way to spend one's time with the most probable goal of meeting the owner of the hat. Thus, if the reader does not look beyond the translation of the lexical items (i.e. ШЛЯПЕНок - hats) it would seem that the translation loses all connotative qualities of the Russian diminutive. However, upon careful consideration, it becomes evident that by utilizing other means available, in this instance verb choice, the English version does retain some of the satire. To what degree it is retained, can not be determined definitively.

The second pair under discussion is: по маленьким квартирам - among the lodgings. At first glance, it seems that these are two separate diminutives, both belonging to the "primary", mono-morphemic category - малень-к-им квартир-к-ам. However it must be determined whether the adjective "маленький" is truly a diminutive form. When one consults a dictionary which contains definitions relatively contemporary to the time during which Gogol wrote, it becomes apparent that at that time "маленький" was no longer considered a diminutive and had even become the preferred adjective: "малый - небольшой, невеликий;
 COROTKII; BOLEE UPOTR B MALENYKII (Dal'). This loss of diminution is maintained in contemporary Russian as is evidenced by its modern definition: "MAL'NI - TO, ZHE CHE MALENYKII" (O'zegov). The acceptance of the diminutive adjective as the "norm" attests to the pervasive nature of diminutives in Russian.

We are left with only one diminutive element, "PO...KVARKIR-K-AM," which is not at all rendered in English by the word "lodgings." Not only does "lodgings" not convey any satirical element which might be conveyed in the diminutive form by the suffix -K-, but no qualifying adjective is used either which might render the size of these apartments. The words "to play a little game of whist" follow the words "among the lodgings". It could be said that, in these words which follow, "little" actually imparts a sarcastic tone. Through the use of this modifier, the translator attempts to maintain the sarcastic tone which exists in the Russian original. Therefore, in the translation of "PO MALENYKIM KVARKIRKAM" to "lodgings...play a little game..." while some of the sarcasm remains, all quantitative aspects are lost.

C. Use of Noun Quantifier

Of the fourteen passages recorded, three render a diminutive into English using a noun, specifically "scrap"
or "piece." This noun is followed by a prepositional clause where the object of the preposition coincides with the unsuffixed form of the Russian diminutive: e.g. бумагки = scraps/pieces of paper.

The following text gives one such example:

**Text No.2**

Петрович взял капрот, разложил его сначала на стол, рассматривал долго, покачал головою и полез рукою на окно за круглой табакеркой с портретом какого-то генерала, какого именно, неизвестно, потому что место, где находилось лицо, было проткнуто пальцем, и потом заклеено четырехугольным лоскуточком бумаги. Понюхав табаку, вновь покачал, вновь снял крышку с генералом, заклеенным бумагой, и натеревши в нос табаку, закрыл, спрятав табакерку и, наконец, сказал... (Gogol', 131-2).

Petrovich took Akaky Akakievich's old dressing gown, as his colleagues called it, spread it out on the table and looked it over at length. Then he shook his head and, stretching out his hand, took from the window sill a snuff box embellished with the portrait of a general, though just what general it was impossible to tell since right where his face used to be there was now a dent glued over with a piece of paper taking some snuff, he shook his head again. Then, once more, he removed the snuffbox lid with its general under the piece of paper, and, stuffing snuff into his nose, closed the box, put it away, and finally said... (Gogol, 76).

The first pair under examination is: лоскуточком бумаги - piece of paper. The Russian lexemes contain three diminutive elements: лоскут-оч-к-ом бумаг-к-и,
which are rendered in English by the single lexeme "piece." "Лоскуточком" is formed from the neutral noun "лоскут," which Ožegov defines as "обрывок или отрезок ткани, кожи." It is formed with a bi-morphemic suffix (-ък-ък-). Therefore, the derivative approaches the "qualitative" end on the graded "quantity" vs. "quality" scale. The connotative quality is not expressed by any means in English "piece of paper." As with previous examples, one must consider all elements in the English text when evaluating a translation. Earlier in the same sentence one finds "...a snuff box embellished with the portrait." The verb "embellish" is defined as "1. to beautify by or as by ornamentation; ornament; adorn" (Stein). Here we have the juxtaposition of the idea of beautification with a snuffbox, an unlikely combination which produces a sense of irony and possibly conveys that which the Russian diminutive does. A literal translation of the Russian version would be "(took from window sill) a round snuffbox with a portrait of some kind of general, exactly what kind is not known..." [trans. my own - E.D.]. Thus we see that, in an attempt to convey contextually in English that which is expressed in Russian, the translator chose to include the word "embellished."5

The second pair to be examined is: с бумагой - piece of paper. As previously discussed, "piece" is unmarked for
quality and, furthermore, it is quite unspecific as to quantity. "Piece" is defined as "1. a portion or quantity, as of some materials, forming a separate entity. 2. a portion or quantity of a whole" (Stein). Thus, "piece" is not only emotively neutral but it is also ambiguous as to the specific size. In fact, it is only through context (i.e. that this "piece" is glued on a snuffbox, which is of presumably small size) that the reader learns about the size of this piece. In contrast, "бумажка" is inherently marked as being of small size.

In both examples from this text excerpt the Russian diminutives are rendered with the noun "piece" which is actually quite unspecific as to exact size. The English translation relies solely on context to convey the exact size of the paper and any accompanying connotations which are contained in the morphology of the Russian words.

D. Use of adjectives in translation

By far the most prevalent method of translating a Russian diminutive is through the use of the adjectives "little" or "small." Seven of the fourteen passages examined used this method.

Text No. 3

...уже двенадцать часов...пора домой...Чтобы как-нибудь не вздумал удержать хозяина, он вышел потихоньку из комнаты, отыскал шинель,

...
которую увидел лежащую на полу... опустился по лестнице на улицу. На улице все еще было светло. **Кое-какие мелочные лавочки**, эти бессменные клубы дворовых и всяких людей, были открыты, другие же, которые были заперты, показывали, однако ж, длинную строю света во всю дверную щель, означающую, что они не лишены еще общества и, вероятно, дворовые служанки или слуги еще доканчивая свои толки и разговоры, поворгая своих господ в совершенное недоумение насчет своего местопребывания (Gogol', 141).

In spite of everything his host could think up to keep him, he went quietly out into the hall, found his overcoat, which... was lying on the floor... and walked down the stairs and out into the street.

The street was still lighted. **Some little stores**, those meeting places for servants and people of every sort, were open while others, although closed, still showed a long streak of light under their doors, which indicated that the company had not yet dispersed and that the menservants and maids were finishing up their gossip and their conversations, leaving their masters perplexed as to their whereabouts (Gogol, 85-6).

The pair under under examination is: **Кое-какие мелочные лавочки - some little stores.** From a syntagmatic perspective, this example conveys a very derogatory meaning due to both the diminutive and its qualifiers. First, the indefinite pronoun "кое-какие" is stylistically marked as conversational and, similarly to the first passage, it accentuates the pejorative qualities of the following two words.

Next we have the adjective "мелочные" which is defined as "мелочной: къ мелочи относящийся; -лавка"
торгующая по мелочамь, по малымь частямь." (Dal')
Contemporary dictionaries define it as, "мелочный: 1
Придающий большое значение пустякам, мелочам. 2
Пустяковый, ничтожный, мелкий  3. ломыш (мелочной).
Относящийся к торговле мелким товаром, мелочью(устар.)."
(Ozegov) When one considers the definition found in the
dictionary by Dal', the image of stores which are small
arises. When Ozegov's definition is applied the image of
stores in which insignificant items are sold appears.

Thirdly, we must consider "лавчонки," which belongs to
the purely emotive secondary, 3rd grade category and is
formed by the bi-morphemic, pejorative suffix -OH-/-К-. The
dictionary notes its derogatory nature in its definition:
"лавчонка - (разг) уничо ж (в лавчонке все вещи старые,
дрянные, грязные, засиженные мухами) (Dal') [cf. "лавка:
небольшой магазин and лавочка: небольшая лавка" (Ozegov)]

When these three words are considered syntagmatically,
an extremely mocking and derogatory vision arises in the
reader's imagination. This does not occur with the reader
of English. All three lexemes in "some little store" when
considered individually are neutral in tone. When
perceived as a semantic whole, they still lack any
pejorative nuances. The only aspect maintained in English
is that of quantity which is expressed in the word "small".
However, even this could be disputed as in the original,
possibly the native Russian reader does not perceive the store as being necessarily small, but more as "lousy, grimy, of low quality." The only element within this sentence that could convey negative meaning is found in "...people of every sort". In this context the word "sort" reflects negatively on those inhabiting the stores. Moreover, these "people of every sort" are "finishing up their gossip" which further accentuates their negative traits. Nonetheless, even considering these elements I propose that a great deal of expressive components are omitted in the English translation.

**Text No. 4a**

Итак в одном департаменте служил один человек, чиновник нельзя сказать чтобы очень замечательный, низенького роста, несколько рябоват, несколько рыжеват, несколько даже на вид подслеповат, с небольшой лысиной на лбу, с морщинами по обеим сторонам щек и цветом лица что называется геморroidальным... (Gogol', 123)

And so, once in a department there worked a clerk. This clerk was nothing much to speak of: he was small, somewhat pockmarked, his hair was somewhat reddish and he even looked somewhat blind. Moreover, he was getting thin on top, had wrinkled cheeks and a complexion that might be aptly described as hemorrhoidal (Gogol, 68).
Text No. 4b

[A young clerk is bothered by memories about when the other clerks teased Akaky] Какая-то неестественная сила оттолкнула его от товарищей, с которыми он познакомился, приняв их за приличных, светских людей. И долго потом, среди самых веселых минут, представлялся ему низенький чиновник с Лысинкою на лбу с своими проникающими словами: «Оставьте меня, зачем вы меня обижаете» - и в этих проникающих словах звучали другие слова «я брат твой» (Gogol', 125-6).

Suddenly he stopped as if awakened from a trance and, after that, he couldn't stand the others, whom at first he had deemed decent people. And for a long time to come, during his gayest moments, he would suddenly see in his mind's eye the little, balding clerk and he would hear the words, "Let me be. Why do you do this to me?" and within those words rang the phrase, "I am you brother." (Gogol, 70).

The first passage (No. 4a) occurs in the second paragraph of the story and thus introduces quite early in the work a tone of mockery and sarcasm. The story begins with, "Once in a department..." only to continue in a long-winded fashion about how it would be better to not specify which department, because of the possible reaction of vain and insecure department officials. The second paragraph begins verbatim, "And so, once, in a department...," giving this sad story an almost fairy-tale-like tone and further accentuating the marked tone of the text.
The "hero" of this tale is described according to "низенького роста с небольшой лысиной на лбу." The adjective "низенький" must be analyzed. First of all, it is a diminutive formed with the suffix -енький which is described as having the effect of "некоторое усиление признака с оттенком ласкательности" and whose productivity is "тип продуктивен в разговорной речи и художественной литературе" (Lobanova, 17). It is in order to consider whether or not the suffix actually imparts an affectionate meaning. All derivatives must be considered in context since in certain environments a derivative usually associated with affection can acquire a mocking tone.

Иногда, называемые обычно «уменьшительно-ласкательными» и «увеличительно-сниженными», далеко не всегда реализуют собственно уменьшительные или увеличительное значения. Это часто зависит от самого денотата (Vasil'eva, 157).

In addition, as the unsuffixed form of the adjective may already contain a number of semes, the suffixed form is even more semantically loaded. Dal' defines the unsuffixed form as:

низкий - против высокий; малый, короткий, невысокий, небольшой, приземистый, малорослый; низменный, дольный // плохой по качеству, доброте, достоинству (напр) низкий человек, поступок, низкая душа, подлый, бессовестный.

It needs to be determined if the adjective "низенький" simply refers to Akaky's size with some nuances
of affection; or if, with the use of this adjective and its morphology, it serves "to expose the insignificance of the hero's life" (Cizhevsky, 307). In conjunction with the latter statement, Dal's definition of "ПЛОХОЙ ПО КАЧЕСТВУ" must be kept in mind.

This semantically loaded adjective is translated in English as "small". The adjective, similarly to its Russian "counterpart", can convey a number of meanings which describe either size or quality. Some of the meanings in reference to size are: "1. of limited size; not big; little". Those associated with quality are: "7. humble, modest, or unpretentious: small circumstances. 6. mean or petty: a small, miserly man" (Stein). In the example of definition number six, if the adjective "miserly" were not present, "small" could refer either to the man's height or his pettiness. When "small" is considered together with "miserly", the negative attributes of the man are emphasized. It is only through semantic syntagmatics that the nuances of "small" become clear.

In the same sentence as the example under discussion, Akaky is introduced as: "This clerk was nothing much to speak of..." Thus due to its proximity with this clause and other contextual elements, the adjective "small" expresses Akaky's insignificance which can then be expanded to describe his entire life. This analysis demonstrates
once more the importance of consideration of the context in an English text when one evaluates the success of a translation.

Following "Низенького" are the words "несколько рябоват, несколько рыжеват, несколько подслеповат". As these words help in creating the tone which pervades Шипиц, they are an example of Gogol's use of skaz. This feeling or tone which is created by repetition of the words "несколько" and the suffix "-еват/-оват" is rendered to a degree in English by repetition of "somewhat" and the use of the adjective "reddish".

The repetition of words as a poetic device, with which to link the text and describe Akaky to a fuller extent, appears in the second passage. The poetic device is quite strong as this passage (4b) appears only two pages after the first one (4a). In this passage we encounter the adjective "Низенький" once more. The image of the other clerks teasing Akaky is recalled. Undoubtedly the reader experiences feelings of pity for Akaky.

In addition to the descriptions of Akaky's pitiful condition, the lexical items and their morphology greatly contribute in the creation of a helpless, defenseless Akaky Akakievich. In this second passage are two diminutive forms: "Низень-к-ий чиновник с лысин-к-ою на лбу" which are translated as "the little balding clerk". In this
context the adjective "НИЗЕНЬКИЙ" conveys not a meaning of insignificance, as in passage 4a, but one of Akaky's minuteness and helplessness. This image is strengthened further through the use of a second diminutive "ЛЫСИНКОЮ". In conjunction, these diminutives create "the small world or microcosm of a poor clerk" (CιΩevsky, 309) who is defenseless against the cruel antics of his co-workers.

As in the case of the adjective "small" in text 4a., the adjective "little" in 4b. is quite semantically complex. This is evidenced by its 20 different entries within the definition. Some of these entries are:

1. not large or below the average in size. 4. not much: little hope. 6. of small importance, concern, influence, scope, etc. 7. not strong, forceful or loud: a little voice. 10. contemptibly small, petty, mean, etc.: filthy little tricks (Stein).

I would maintain that in the context of "little balding clerk", the adjective "little" conveys a quality similar to definition number 7., specifically "not strong, forceful", with the added nuance of pity. This could be compared to "poor little boy" where "little" could convey both affection and pity."6

In regard to the word "balding", it does not independently contain any connotative qualities and conveys the image of someone who has lost some of his hair. The Russian word "ЛЫСИНКА" is a derivative of the primary,
mono-morphemic class which is based on the noun "Аусина". In theory it is, first and foremost, attributed with the meaning of quantity (dim.). This diminutive, however, can also contain some shades of connotation. When considering the two diminutives syntagmatically, the qualitative aspect of this diminutive are developed and thus contribute to Akaky's meekness.

Even when considered in conjunction, the English equivalents "little, balding" do not convey the degree of meekness which is contained in the original. Due to its English morphology, the adjective "balding" is just that - an adjective. Through its form or context, it does not add to the emotional content of the work. Therefore, the English text does not convey all that is included in Russian.

E. Translation by means of marked English words

It has been shown that Russian diminutives are often not only quantitative but also qualitative. In most cases these diminutives are translated into English with a word which is not highly connotative. However, the connotations encoded in the Russian text are not wholly lost in translation as, through context, English compensates for what it can not express via morphology [again, to what
extent the connotations are maintained cannot be definitively determined]. Up to this point the English equivalents, out of context, have been quite neutral and unmarked in their meaning, and do not contain any specific subjective nuances (e.g. hats, lodgings, piece, some, little, balding). This does not imply that English does not have words which are expressive or quite specific in their meaning and description. In this section, two passages are presented. They illustrate instances where, in order to convey all the connotations encoded in the Russian diminutives, the English text relies more heavily on the use of a marked lexeme than on context. The two passages will illustrate the use of a marked noun and adjective respectively.

**Text No. 5**

...появились деревянные дома, заборы; нигде ни души; сверкал только один снег по улицам, да печально чернели с закрытыми ставнями заснувшие низенькие лачужки. Он приближался к тому месту... (Gogol', 141).

...Then came wooden houses and fences; not a soul around, nothing but glistening snow and the black silhouettes of the low, sleeping hovels with their shuttered windows. He came to the spot... (Gogol, 86).

This passage describes Akaky just after he left the party with his peers and directly before his precious overcoat is stolen. From it we have the translation pair:
низенькие лачужки - low hovels. The Russian text contains two diminutives. As discussed previously, the adjective, низенькие, can signify both quantity (low, short) and quality (of poor or low quality). This adjective is rendered in English by the objective adjective "low" which does not express the pejorative aspects which the Russian form attributes to these buildings. Therefore, by itself, the adjective does not maintain any of the negative qualities.

The noun "лачужка" is a primary derivative of "лачуга". Dal' defines "лачужка" as: "хижина, плохая избёнка". [NB: Note the use of the secondary diminutive "избёнка" in the definition.] The base form is defined in a Russian-English dictionary as: "лачуга - hovel, hut, shanty, shack" and the diminutive form is simply defined as: "лачужка - уменьш от лачуга" (Ожегов). When one consults an English-English dictionary, it becomes clear that the word "hovel" can convey a negative meaning:

hovel - l. (chiefly dial.) an open shed or canopy for sheltering livestock or protecting produce 3.a. a shed or open-roofed shelter for human beings  b. a poor cottage: a small mean house: HUT" (Webster's Dictionary).

Thus, definition 3.b. shows that these are living quarters of low quality. Furthermore, perhaps another level of pejoration is found in the definition with the word "cottage". In the dictionary it is noted that
"cottage" is now usually associated with "small, simple, often crude dwellings" (Stein, 304).

Therefore, the word "hovel" is marked for pejoration. Its modifier however is not and, even when these two are considered syntagmatically and within context, no additional qualities arise. In comparison, the Russian modifier and noun, through their redundant use of the diminutive, stress the poor quality of these dwellings.

The next example deals with use of a marked English adjective.

**Text No. 6**

Есть в Петербурге сильный враг всех, получающих четыреста рублей в год жалованья. Враг этот не кто другой, как наш северный мороз, хотя впрочем и говорят, что он очень здоров. Все спасение состоит в том, чтобы в тошенькой шинелишке перебежать как можно скорее пять-шесть улиц и потом натопаться хорошою ногами в швейцарской... (Gogol', 128-29)

In Petersburg, there's a formidable enemy for all those who receive a salary in the neighborhood of four hundred rubles a year. The enemy is none other than our northern cold, although they say it's very healthy... They can only wrap themselves in their threadbare overcoats and run as fast as they can five or six blocks to the office. Once arrived, they have to stamp their feet in the vestibule... (Gogol, 73).

From this passage, the words to be analyzed are: 

тошенькой шинелишке - threadbare overcoats". The Russian words contain a total of three diminutive suffixes-

тош-еньк-ой шинел-иш-к-е The adjective, with its
diminutive suffix, greatly accentuates the negative connotations contained in the secondary qualitative diminutive "шингелишка" which is inadequate to cover and protect the wearer's body.

The English does retain some of these derogatory connotations, but it does so only through the modifier, as "overcoat" is completely neutral. The adjective "threadbare" contains meanings of both poor quality and inadequate protection and is defined as follows,

Threadbare - 1.a. worn to the point that the thread is visible: having the nap wholly or partly worn off b. clad in threadbare clothing: SHABBY 2. suggesting a threadbare fabric (as in poverty of invention, meanness or shakiness): SCANTY, BARREN 3. lacking in novelty or interest: TRITE, HACKNEYED (Gove).

The impression created by the three Russian diminutives is quite strong - expressing the total inadequacy of these scanty garments. While the translation does somewhat express this inadequacy through an adjective with a narrow meaning, neither through this adjective, nor through other contextual devices is the extent of pejoration maintained.
CHAPTER V

EXAMPLES AND ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH TEXTS TRANSLATED
AS RUSSIAN DIMINUTIVES

The purpose of this chapter is to give examples from an English text where specific lexemes have been translated as Russian diminutives. This is a necessary part of this study as it validates that Russian diminutives are indeed intentionally chosen by an author so as to create specific quantitative and qualitative nuances.

The English language does not utilize morphological derivation resulting in diminutives to the extent that Russian does. Therefore, the translator's decision to use a diminutive must be due to a "feeling" he gets from both the words and context of the text being translated.

It follows that the English text should be one which compares in tone to Gogol's Шинель. Kurt Vonnegut's Deadeye Dick is one such novel - it is highly satirical and deals with many philosophical questions as is noted in Twentieth Century Literary Criticism:

Regarded as a master of contemporary literature, Vonnegut uses satire, irony and iconoclastic humor in his work to raise philosophical questions about the meaning of modern life... (Marowski, 440).
In the following three text excerpts, examples will be given where morphologically identical lexemes are translated into different morphological forms in Russian (i.e. as diminutives). Each example will be analyzed in order to discover exactly what elements exist in the English text which provoked the translator to either use or not use a diminutive form.

Text No. 7

...The two who were brothers, were Italians. They had jumped ship in order to escape military conscription at home and because the streets of America were paved with gold. They spoke no English...Other Italians boosted them and their cardboard suitcases into an empty boxcar in a train that was bound for God-knows-where. The train began to move immediately. The sun went down. There were no stars, no moon that night. America was blackness and clackety-clack...Somewhere in the seamless darkness, which may have been West Virginia, Gino and Mario were joined by four American hoboes, who at knife-point took their suitcases, their coats, their hats and their shoes...they were lucky they didn't have their throats slit for fun. Who would have cared? (Vonnegut, 15).

Это были восемнадцатилетний Джино Маритимо и его брат, двадцатилетний Марио Маритимо. Они удрал с корабля, чтобы не угнать на военную службу у себя на родине, ну и потому, что в Америке улицы вымощены золотом. По-английски они не знали ни слова.

В Ньюпорт-Ньюсе другие итальяне забросили их, вместе с их картонными чемоданами, в пустой товарный вагон поезда отправлявшегося в неизвестном направлении. Поезд тронулся сразу. Солнце закатилось. Ночь стояла безлунная, беззвездная. Америка была сплошной тьмой и перестуком колес.

Где - то может в Западной Виргинии - из этой ровной тьмы возникли четверо американских бродяг,
In this excerpt the two instances of the word "suitcase" are translated differently. The first instance of "suitcase" is translated as the diminutive "чёмоданишки" while the second is translated as "чёмоданчики". Both of these diminutives belong to the secondary class of diminutives, specifically the 1st grade category.

The first diminutive, "чёмодан-ишик" is formed with the suffix -иш-к- which can be either affectionate or pejorative. Analysis of context will show to which category this diminutive belongs. The modifier of this noun is "cardboard". It is therefore clear that these suitcases are of poor quality which might, at any moment, simply fall apart. Thus it can be concluded that this diminutive belongs to the pejorative category. In addition, through its morphology, this diminutive expresses some of the irony and colloquial style which is contained in the English text: "a train ...bound for God-knows-where" and "America was blackness and clackety-clack."

The second diminutive, "чёмодан-чики", is formed with the bi-morphemic suffix -ки- and theoretically is
affectionate in its connotation and is highly emotive. The Italian brothers, having just arrived in America are robbed at knife point. Their situation is quite pitiful. Hence this diminutive is one which conveys their pathetic situation [cf. pity felt for Akaky Akakievich which is expressed through choice of lexemes and their morphology] In a complete analysis which takes into account all contextual elements, one sees that the sentence, "Who would have cared?", also reinforces the tone of this passage. Thus the Russian text encodes morphologically that which is conveyed both lexically and especially contextually in English.

Similar to the previous excerpt, the next passage gives examples where one English lexeme is translated into two different Russian derivatives.

**Text No. 8**

...So Father, setting down for a lusty lunch with old Gunther, was aware that a little girl was watching everything through the hedge, and he made jokes about her which she could hear. He said to Gunther that he had been away so long that he could not longer remember the names of American birds. There was a bird in the hedge, he said and described Mother as though she were a bird, and he asked old Gunther what to call the bird.

And Father approached the supposed bird with a piece of bread in his hand, asking if little birds like her ate bread, and Mother fled into her parent's house.

She told me this. Father told me this (Vonnegut, 14).
с любопытством смотрит маленькая девочка. Он сказал Гюнтеру, что давно не был дома и забыл, как называются американские птички. Воен там за кустами сидит какая-то птичка, сказал он, потом описывал маму, как будто она была птичкой, и спросил у старика Гюнера, как такие пташки называются.

Потом он стал подходить к "пташке" с кусочком хлеба и спрашивал, едят ли такие маленькие птички хлеб? Но мама сразу сбежала домой (Vonnegut, 10).

The English word "bird" is translated as "птичка" and "пташка". Both diminutives belong to the mono-morphemic, primary category. "Птичка" is defined as simply the diminutive form of "птица" while "пташка" is noted as indicative of colloquial speech: "Пташка - ж. (разг.) Маленькая птица, птичка" (Ожегов, 560).

In the English text exists a strong feeling of affection and jest as this passage describes the first meeting of the narrator's parents where his mother hides timidly behind the bushes. The Russian diminutive "пташка" expresses both humor and endearment. What caused the translator to use in two instances not this diminutive but the one noted as belonging to colloquial speech, i.e."пташка"? Moreover, the second appearance of "пташка" is accompanied with quotation marks which further accentuates it. I cannot sense a difference in the English version which would evoke the different translations.
In the following text, similar to the previous one, we see the use of a Russian diminutive to express a feeling of affection.

**Text No. 9**

"...Father was so elated by the vastness of the ground floor...that he considered putting the kitchen up in the loft...But that would have put the servants...and cooking smells up among the bedrooms. There was no basement to put them in.

So reluctantly he put the kitchen on the ground floor tucked under a loft and partitioned off with old boards. It was cramped and stuffy. I would love it. I would feel so safe and cozy there (Vonnegut, 11).

...Отец был в таком восторге от огромного пространства с полом, мощенным булыжником, положенным в песчаний грунт, что и КУХНЮ собирался перенести на галерею...да и КУХОННЫЕ запахи мешали бы нам спать в подвального помещения для КУХНИ не было.

Так что отцу пришлось скрепя сердце поместить КУХНЮ внизу, припнуть ее под галереей и отгородить старыми досками. Там было тесно и душно. Но я полюбил эту КУХОНЬКУ. Мне там было так спокойно, так уютно" (Vonnegut, 8)

In the first four references to the kitchen, "kitchen" is translated by a form of the neutral lexeme "КУХНЯ". In the last example are two noteworthy phenomena. In the first place, through the repetition of the specific noun "КУХОНЬКА" we see the tendency in Russian for lexical redundancy. In comparison, the English translation refers to the kitchen simply with the general pronoun "it".

Secondly, the Russian diminutive captures the emotion which is expressed by the verb "love". This is also an
example of maximal redundancy in Russian as, through its morphology, Russian lexemes can repeat and accentuate in substantives the affection expressed in the verb.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the required amount of morphological and syntactical redundancy of Russian and English texts. Russian tends to be extremely redundant while English tends to be much less so.

I first presented the formation of diminutives through suffixation. These suffixes are either simple (i.e. mono-morphemic) or compound (i.e. bi- or tri-morphemic). When the derivative is formed with a simple suffix, the meaning of the new form is highly quantitative (or denotative) and can, to a degree, also be qualitative. When compound suffixes are used, the connotative aspects supplant the denotative ones and the word has an extremely qualitative (or connotative) meaning.

I then presented diminutives taken from Gogol's *Шинель* and discussed how they are translated in English. From these examples it was shown that there are four basic methods of translation in this work: 1) no rendering of the diminutive 2) use of the words "small" or "little" 3) use of the words "scrap" or "piece" and 4) use of "marked" English words. While many of these methods retain the
denotation inherent in the Russian diminutive, in most instances some degree of connotation is lost. It was also shown that those connotative qualities which are retained are expressed not morphologically, as in Russian, but contextually. When the English lexemes are considered independently the sarcasm and irony expressed in the Russian original does not appear. Yet when these same "neutral" words are considered syntagmatically and paradigmatically some of the irony and humor is retained.

In order to illustrate that a Russian diminutive is used in order to create and maintain the "tone" of a text, I then examined the Russian translation of an English text. There are many diminutives in the Russian translation of Kurt Vonnegut's Deadeye Dick. Diminutives are much less productive in English than in Russian, therefore it must be some other factor besides English morphology which motivated the translator to use diminutives. In the English original the skilled translator recognizes qualities within the text which have to be rendered both morphologically and stylistically. Therefore in Russian we see both morphological and stylistic redundancy expressed with diminutives. This does not imply that diminutives are the only redundant feature found in Russian texts.

This necessity of redundancy is illustrated by the following example. If the noun is a diminutive then, in
most instances, the adjective will agree morphologically. One such example is seen in: лоскуточком бумаги (taken from Text No. 2). It would sound awkward to the native Russian speaker if there was no morphological agreement, i.e. if it was лоскутом бумаги or лоскуточком бумаги. This necessity for morphological redundancy exists not only between words composing a sentence but between all words in a text.

English differs from Russian because it avoids morphological repetition. The tone of the text is maintained in a different manner, mainly through word choice and their juxtaposition. In Vonnegut's Deadeye Dick much of the tone is expressed in frequent use of conversational items which often contain substandard English. In this manner, Vonnegut creates skaz - a term which is often applied to Gogol's works.

In conclusion, when two languages do not have equivalent forms, the translator's job becomes even more difficult. With Russian texts, the English translator must compensate for the expressive nature of diminutives. No matter how well the work is translated, nonetheless, some expressive nuances of the original are lost in translation.
ENDNOTES

1 When one considers only the morphology of these words, it would seem that the final connotative result would be that of pejoration. In contrast to these expectations, these words actually have a positive meaning in modern Russian, as is evidenced by the following definitions:

Речушка - разг. Уменьш и уничт. -ласс. к речка
Сынишка - 1. разг. Уменьш.-ласс. к сын
2 устар. Уничт. к сын
(Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo lit. jazyka).

[For further discussion on derivatives which do not conform to expected pejorative connotations, see pages 15 and 16 of this thesis.]

2 Even within the primary diminutive suffixes of -"к/-IK- variation of meaning exists. Stankiewicz notes "the suffix -IK- occurs as an expressive alternate of the suffix -"к-; the former generally conveys a stronger, more affectionate meaning and is less subject to lexicalization than the suffix -"к-" (Stankiewicz, 115). Thus, from the lexeme "брать", two primary diminutives may be formed:

1.) братик - к 1 знач., [т. е сын в отношении к другим детям одних родителей]
2.) браток - "brother" (form of address to a figurative brother); к 2 знач., [т. е. семейное или дружеское обращение к мужчине (разг.)]
3.) браток - "brother" (dim.)

[Russian definitions from Oжегов's Slovar' russkogo jazyka]
3 With this statement, it seems that Townsend is assigning gender to suffixes. In Russian Word Formation, he does, in fact, divide the suffixes according to gender:

**MASCULINE**

-/-о/-к: сын son сын/-о/-к son (dim.)
-ИК: нос nose нос/-и/-к nose(dim.)
-ЧИК: стакан glass стакан/-и/-к glass(dim.)

**FEMININE**

-/-к-а: комната room комната-ка room(dim.)

**NEUTER**

-/-к-о: молоко milk молоко milk (dim.)
-ИК-о: лицо face лицо face (dim.)

(Townsend, 197)

Stankiewicz explains the declension and gender of these derivatives somewhat differently. He does not imply that the suffixes themselves inherently have gender, but that the expressive derivatives are declined according to two declension types: 1.) according to non-feminine (I) declension or 2.) according to non-neuter (II) declension. Most expressive derivatives maintain the declension of their base form. Others are declined according to neuter substantives with the desinence -о in the nominative, singular or switch to the II declension.

Stankiewicz gives a table which lists the resulting declensional type, depending on which suffix is added [See Stankiewicz, pg. 108 for chart].

4 According to native speakers, their impression of this semantic unit is that the words "кое-каких" strengthen the feeling of sarcasm and, especially when coupled with the diminutive form "шляпенок," create an understanding that this activity is sheer "ерунда."

5 Perhaps this combination is more ironic than one realizes at first glance. It is precisely this lack of the general's face which is one of the "devilish" elements found in Petrovich's apartment. It supports the hypothesis that Petrovich is the Devil. In his article "About The Overcoat", Čizevsky enumerates various devilish qualities found in Petrovich's apartment,
"...the only thing that Akaky Akakievich sees at the moment when the matter of a new overcoat is being decided is precisely this faceless general, and the Devil is faceless" (320).

6 I found it especially noteworthy how often the word "pitiful" is associated with "contemptible". [It is one of the synonyms for pitiful in The New Roget's Thesaurus] This frequent relationship can be tied into Cizovsky's discussion about this text as to whether or not it is a moral ethical protest with the words "I am your brother". Cizovsky poses the question:

"...is Akaky Akakievich a literary type who can successfully illustrate the idea of 'I am your brother' to the reader? One does not, after all, have to be particularly snobbish to refuse to see a brother in Akaky Akakievich, whose life is a pitiable and ridiculous tragedy" (311).

Thus while Akaky Akakievich is often viewed as pitiful he is also contemptible as he has centered his entire being around the purchase of an overcoat.
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