

Ondráček, Jaroslav

On determination in English and Italian as compared with Finnish and Czech

Brno studies in English. 1985, vol. 16, iss. 1, pp. 85-107

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/104476>

Access Date: 17. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

ON DETERMINATION IN ENGLISH AND ITALIAN AS COMPARED WITH FINNISH AND CZECH

Jaroslav Ondráček

Now as the time approached for God to fulfil the promise he had made to Abraham, our nation in Egypt grew and increased in numbers.
Avvicinandosi poi il tempo in cui si doveva compiere la promessa, che Dio aveva fatto ad Abramo, il popolo crebbe e si moltiplicò in Egitto, . . .
Kun Jumalan Aabrahamille antaman lupauksen täyttämisen aika lähestyi, kansamme oli Egyptissä kasvanut suureksi.
Když už byl blízko čas, kdy Bůh chtěl splnit to, co Abrahamovi slíbil, počet našeho lidu v Egyptě velmi vzrostl.

Stephen's speech before the Council (Acts 7, 17) contains a sentence introducing our article and characterizing the structure of the languages we are going to deal with in connection with determination. We do not intend to enumerate the cases in which articles are used or are absent because that is the task of grammars and other books of this kind. What we want to do is to show how sentence structure in Finnish and Czech, i. e. in languages where there are no articles in the proper sense of the word, is able to express adequately the idea of what is definite, indefinite or partitive.

In the above extract, which by the way is based on contemporary language, we can see at first glance that the definite articles in English and in Italian (*the time, the promise; il tempo, la promessa*) meet syntactical demands because their substantives are modified by what follows. The third noun (*nation, popolo*) is preceded by the possessive adjective in English (*our*) and by the definite article in Italian (*il*). Here the determination is not decided by the structure of the sentence but follows from a definite idea in the speaker's mind (*our nation, il popolo, kansamme, náš lid*), the morphological means being at hand. It goes without saying that syntactical determination is present in the Finnish and Czech versions, too, even though the structure of the sentences is rather different. What is said by the Czech text (*Když už byl blízko čas, kdy Bůh chtěl splnit to, co Abrahamovi slíbil, . . .*) sounds in a literal translation from Finnish as follows: *Když se přiblížil čas splnění slibu daného Abrahamovi Bohem, . . . Čas (aika)* with its verb *přiblížil se (lähestyi)* is the last link in a chain of five expressions for which Finnish has appropriate grammatical terms: Going backwards from the word *aika*, they are the genitive of the fourth infinitive (*täyttämisen*), the genitive of the noun *lupaus*, the genitive

of the third infinitive (*antaman*), the allative of the proper noun *Abraham* and the genitive of the noun *Jumala*, which functions as the doer of the action.

Similarly a sentence taken from D. du Maurier's novel *Rebecca* perfectly reflects the structure of two languages with articles and two without them:

The sea, like a crinkled chart, spread to the horizon, and lapped the sharp outline of the coast, while the houses were white shells in a rounded grotto, pricked here and there by a great orange sun (31).

Simile ad un'ondulata carta nautica il mare si estendeva fino all'orizzonte, e lambiva il contorno netto della costa, mentre le case, picchiettate qua e là da un sole arancione, erano bianche conchiglie agrappate a una grotta rotonda (43).

Meri ulottui taivaanrantaan asti ryppyisen, levitetyn kartan kaltaisena ja huuhteli rannikon jyrkkää ääriiviivaa. Talot olivat kuin valkoiset näkinkengät pyöreässä luolassa, ja siellä täällä niihin sattui suunnaton, punakeltainen aurinko (37).

Jako zmuchlaná mapa se prostíralo pod námi moře až k hranicím obzoru a olizovalo ostré obrýsy pobřeží, na němž se jako maličké lasturky na dně oblé jeskyně bělaly stěny domů, postříkané tu a tam paprsky ohromného pomerančového slunce (34).

In the first part of that sentence there is a comparison between the sea (a definite idea calling for the definite article *the* in English and *il* in Italian) and a crinkled chart; notice the indefinite articles in English and in Italian: *like a crinkled chart*, *simile ad un'ondulata carta nautica*, which could be imitated in Czech by the words *nějaka, jakási*, but in our case the adverb *jako* is enough to suggest that meaning. Finnish has the essive of the adjective *kaltainen*, i. e. *kaltaisena*, which, respecting the rules of Finnish morphology, follows the noun *kartta* in the genitive (*kartan*). The essive is a case which expresses state. Its ending *-na* has a function similar to the English *like* or *as*, the Italian *simile a*, *come*, *quale*, and to the Czech *jako* or a substantive in the instrumental (*Bratr je učitelem. Veljeni on opettajana*). On the other hand, *obzor*, *pobřeží* and *obrysy* represent in the given situation clearly defined pictures in the observer's mind, so the definite articles are the only possible solution (*the horizon, the coast, the outline; l'orizzonte, la costa, il contorno*). In Finnish the unambiguity lies in the context; the first two nouns, *taivaanranta* and *rannikko*, are in the same position as their Czech counterparts. Also the third noun, *ääriiviiva*, can be compared with the Czech word but, in addition, its form is influenced by the verb *huuhteli* so that it appears in the partitive *ääriiviivaa*. We shall meet that case very often in our notes because it is one of the characteristic features of the Finnish language. What we can say about it in connection with our example is that it indicates a partially affected object.

The second part of the sentence contains a comparison in the plural. Czech deviates a bit from the English original, in which the idea of houses (a definite idea, so *the houses*) whose walls were white like little shells on the bottom of a rounded grotto is presented in a form with the verb *to be* (*were white shells*). The plural noun has a zero article (*a shell — shells*) while *grotto* is preceded by the indefinite article (*a rounded grotto*). The Italian translation is grammatically identical with the English text: *le case erano bianche conchiglie; una grotta rotonda*. Finnish uses a construction with *kuin* (*like, come, jako*): *Talot olivat kuin valkoiset näkinkengät*. Front position in a sentence is usually taken as an indication of something known (*talot*), end position being reserved to the unknown element (*pyöreässä luolassa*).

The final part of the sentence offers an interesting use of the indefinite article in English and in Italian. Grammars of English refer to its ability of indicating uniqueness (*The sun is in the sky*). What could then be the explanation of the indefinite article in *a great orange sun, un sole arancione*? Evidently the idea of the sun having a certain aspect at a certain moment.

To sum up what we have learned from the introductory analysis of two sentences, we can see that comparing our four languages is not only possible but may in the long run explain some problems of looking at reality.

The following examination, based entirely on *Rebecca*, is divided into four parts: A. The Indefinite Article, B. The Definite Article, C. The Zero Article, and D. Absence of Article. This division respects English as the language of the original. Italian has in addition the partitive article. These two languages are contrasted by Finnish, which lacks articles but uses the partitive case very frequently, and by Czech, which like Finnish can resort to other means, including word order.

A. THE INDEFINITE ARTICLE

I. We shall start with an example in which the indefinite article in English and in Italian is rendered by stress in Finnish and by word order in Czech: *Pozorovala jsem, jak se na zavařenině usadila moucha* (55). From the point of view of functional sentence perspective (J. Firbas) *na zavařenině* is the theme and *moucha* is the rheme. The end position of *moucha* has the same function as the stress on the word *kärpänen*: *Katselin, kuinka kärpänen lensi marmelaatiastiaan...* (64). Whitney mentions the fact that Finnish can distinguish between the indefinite and definite article in English by means of stress, for example: *'Rasia on löytynyt — A box has been found. Rasia on löytynyt — The box has been found.* The English original of our sentence is as follows: *I watched a fly settle on the marmalade, ...* (53). In Italian: *Osservai una mosca che si posava sulla marmellata; ...* (70). It is easy to show how a change of word order in Czech would be felt in the other three languages. If we said: *Pozorovala jsem, jak se moucha usadila na zavařenině*, the word *kärpänen* would lose its strong stress and the definite article would be used in English and in Italian: *I watched the fly settle on the marmalade. Osservai la mosca che si posava sulla marmellata.* Now the rheme is no longer *moucha* but *zavařenina*.

It would certainly be ideal if word order and stress functioned like that in every sentence. I cannot however agree completely with J. Krámský, who in his book *The Article and the Concept of Definiteness in Languages* ends the chapter dedicated to Finnish by saying: We have given a rather detailed survey of the use of word order and stress in Finnic for expressing the opposition of determinedness vs. indeterminedness because in this case we meet evidently with the functioning of the same principle of functional sentence perspective as occurs in Czech and in many other languages (p. 198). My reservation, as far as Finnish is concerned, is backed by the relatively complex morphology of this language, as proved by the example from the New Testament which we discussed at the beginning of the present notes.

More is suggested by the next sentence from *Rebecca*, a description of a narrow path in a park:

Chvílemi se mi zdálo, že se vůbec ztratila, ale ukázala se opět — třeba pod skáceným stromem nebo na druhé straně bahnitě strouhy, utvořené zimními dešti (8).

There is no doubt that *druhá strana* and *zimní deště* mean something definite, while on the other hand *skácený strom* and *bahnitá strouha* express indefinite things. No surprise therefore to find a due alternation of the indefinite and definite article in English and in Italian:

Sometimes I thought it lost, but it appeared again, beneath a fallen tree perhaps, or struggling on the other side of a muddied ditch created by the winter rains (6).

A volte credevo d'averlo perduto, poi riappariva, forse sotto un tronco caduto, o risorgeva dall'altra parte di uno stagno fangoso, residuo delle piogge invernali (12).

Finnish is totally overwhelmed by morphology here. Stress has no part to play and word order is determined by grammatical needs. Determination and indetermination is felt subconsciously like in Czech but formally it does not exist:

Joskus luulin sen kadonneen, mutta se ilmestyi uudestaan, ehkä kaatuneen puun alta tai talvisateiden synnyttämän lokaisen ojan toiselta puolen (6).

What is the structure of that part of the Finnish sentence where we have the four expressions we mentioned earlier? *Pod skáceným stromem* is a construction with the postposition *alta*, which in fact means *from under* and the noun before it is in the genitive, i. e. *kaatuneen puun alta*. *Na druhé straně (toiselta puolen)* stands at the very end of the sentence, and this is the point from which it is necessary to proceed in the analysis, that is towards the beginning, formed after the conjunction *tai (or)* by the genitive plural *talvisateiden (the winter rains)*, followed by the genitive of the third infinitive *synnyttämän (created)* and by the genitive singular *lokaisen ojan (a muddied ditch)*.

Sometimes a little thing is enough to replace the indefinite article by the definite article. In the example with which we started this section a fly that settled on the marmalade was spoken of. By changing the word order in Czech we brought about a change in the articles. Now that we know what the problem is, let us compare this couple of examples:

A bee droned above Giles's head, . . . (103).

The bee droned over us again, . . . (103).

Un'ape ronzò sulla testa di Giles . . . (126).

L'ape tornò a ronzare, . . . sopra le nostre teste (126).

Both English and Italian have the indefinite article before the noun *bee (ape)* in the first sentence, the definite article in the second sentence. But the Czech version does not indicate this difference by a change of word order, as we should expect, and puts the noun *včela* to the end of the second sentence:

Gilesovi bzučela nad hlavou včela . . . (105).

V koruně kaštanu bzučela včela; . . . (106).

I think that because of the context an equivalent translation of the second sentence would read: *Včela nad námi zase bzučela*. The little thing I mentioned above is

the adverb *zase* (*again*), expressed in the Italian translation by the verb *tornare* (*tornò a ronzare*). And it is just this adverb in the Finnish sentence (*taas*) that makes the noun *mehiläinen* definite:

Mehiläinen surisi Gilesin pään ympärillä, ... (120).
Mehiläinen surisi taas ympärillämme ... (121).

As a richly inflectional language, Finnish must of course respect grammatical factors which eventually wipe out the difference between the articles in English and in Italian. For example:

'Then you must have come up the back way, from the stone passage?' she said (92).
'Yes,' I said, not meeting her eyes. 'Yes, I came through a stone passage.' (92)

The stone passage as well as *a stone passage* is at the end of the sentences, they are both rhematic, but in the first case the passage is something known, in the second case something unknown, always from the point of view of the speaker. The Italian version corresponds exactly to the English:

„Allora dovete esser entrata dal retro, dal corridoio di pietra.“ (114)
„Sì.“ Ed evitavo il suo sguardo. „Sì, sono passata per un corridoio di pietra.“ (114)

Czech shows an attempt to translate the indefinite article (*jakousi*):

„To jste tedy musila vystoupit zadem, z klenuté chodby?“ (94)
„Ano,“ řekla jsem, vyhýbajíc se jejím očím. „Ano, šla jsem jakousi klenutou chodbou.“ (94)

In Finnish, however, there is no indication of what is known and what is unknown:

„Sitten teidän on täytynyt tulla takatietä kivikäytävää pitkin?“ hän sano (108).
„Niin“, en katsonut häntä silmiin, „niin, tulin kivikäytävää.“ (108)

Although it is obvious that the first speaker, who is familiar with the house, refers to the stone passage she knows while the other speaker, a newcomer, has no definite idea of it, the Finnish partitive required after the verb *tulin* (I came) is the same as in the first sentence where it is governed by the postposition *pitkin*. Thus the distinction we find in the English original gives way to morphology in Finnish.

The Czech words *nějaký*, *jakýsi* and *jako* have been pointed out as possible equivalents of the English and Italian indefinite article. The English word *some* can of course have a similar function, for example:

His face was arresting, sensitive, medieval in some strange inexplicable way, ... (17).

In Czech we meet the adverb *jako*:

Měl poutavou, citlivou tvář, která mi připadala jako středověká, ač nedovedu přesně vysvětlit proč (20).

Finnish has exactly the same wording as in English: *jakýmsi (jollakin) nevyšvětli-
telným (selittämättömällä) způsobem (tavalla)*:

Hänen kasvonsa olivat kiinnostavat, tunteikkaat, keskiaikaiset jollakin selittämättömällä tavalla (20).

The equivalence of *some* and *jokin* and the indefinite article is proved by the Italian translation:

Egli aveva un viso sensibile, che fermava l'attenzione, medioevale per un singolare inesplicabile suo carattere; ... (26).

The next Italian example explains as it were the meaning of *some*: *Non so quale (nevím jaký) misteriosa ragione mi spingeva a parlare: ... (37)*. The original has: *For some reason I felt impelled to speak, ... (26)*, to which the Finnish version with the relative of *jokin* fully corresponds: *Jostakin syystä minun oli puhuttava, ... (31)*. The Czech text does not help us this time because the phrase *for some reason* is not translated: [*Jeho oči ...*] *nutily mě, abych se rozpoovídala (29)*. On the other hand, the adjective *jistý* and its Italian counterpart (*una certa*) further characterize the English word *some*:

I leant back in my chair, glancing about the room, trying to instil into myself some measure of confidence, ... (70).

Abbandonandomi nella poltrona studiavo la stanza, sforzandomi d'instillarmi una certa fiducia in me stessa, ... (30).

Zabořila jsem se pohodlně do křesla a rozhlížela se po knihovně. Byla bych si ráda vštipila jistou dávkou důvěry v sebe, ... (73).

The Finnish translation, apart from the combination of *usko (vira)* and *varmuus (jistota)* to express the English word *confidence*, brings a good illustration of the use of the partitive as a case which, as its name suggests, indicates a part of the whole (*uskoa ja varmuutta*):

Nojauduin taaksepäin tuolissani ja katselin ympärilleni. Koetin imeä itseeni uskoa ja varmuutta, ... (84).

An indefinite idea is also present in the compound *something*:

...; there was something solid and safe and dull about golf, it could not bring me into any difficulties (98).

We have put this example at the end of the section on *some* because in Italian we have the indefinite article (*un argomento*), in Finnish the partitive (*jotakin*), and in Czech the word *cosi*, which has much in common with *some*:

... il golf era un argomento solido, onesto e magari noioso, e non poteva condurci a nuovi scogli (120).

Golf oli jotakin niin lujaa, varmaa ja ikävää, ettei se johtaisi meitä vaikeuksiin (115).

V golfu je cosi poctivého, pravdivého a klidného, golf nás nemůže přivést do žádných nesází (100).

II. The indefiniteness which in Czech can be indicated by a final position of the noun without any further qualification, for example: *Někdy tam snad zabloudí*

tulák, ... (14), may in comparison with the indefinite article in English (*Sometimes perhaps a tramp will wander there*, ... (12)) be emphasized in Italian and in Finnish by the word *qualche* and *joku* (nějaký):

A volte, forse vi capiterà qualche vagabondo, ... (19).
Joskus ehkä joku maankiertäjä saattaa kulkeutua sinne ... (13).

It is clear, however, that Czech cannot avoid using such an expression either:

Mezi tančícími byla jakási žena ... (219).

Finnish has a similar word, namely *muuan*:

Siellä oli muuan nainen, ... (256)

whereas in the English original and in its Italian translation there is only the indefinite article:

There was a woman, ... (221).
C'era una donna ... (260).

Jakási is not of course the only way of imitating the indefinite article in Czech. The numeral *jedna* is almost an automatic choice; its Finnish equivalent is *eräs*:

'Frith,' I said, coming into the library on a summer morning, my arms full of lilac, ... (137).
'Frith' dissi un mattino d'estate, entrando nella biblioteca con una bracciata di lilla (165–166).
'Frith', sanoin tullessani kirjastoon eräänä kesäaamuna syreenikimppu käsivarrella, ... (160).
'Frithi,' řekla jsem jednoho letního jitra, vstupujíc do knihovny s plnou náručí řefiku, ... (140).

III. The construction of existence *there + be*, mentioned in the preceding section, is usually connected with the use of the indefinite article before the subject. In Finnish and Czech the subject occupies end position and is therefore thought of as something unknown while what is known generally begins the sentence. Three examples will be enough to illustrate this phenomenon:

There was a padlock and a chain upon the gate (5).
Una catena con un lucchetto chiudeva il cancello (11).

Although there is a different verb in the Italian translation (*chiudeva*), the sentence structure with the indefinite and the definite article is identical with the English original. In Finnish and in Czech, as we have said, we begin with what is known:

Portissa oli riippulukko ja ketju (5).
...; na vratech byl řetěz s těžkým visacím zámkem (7).

The reason why we are dealing separately with this kind of sentence structure is that, with the exception of the words *jakási* and *jedna* given in section II, the indefinite article is not imitated in Finnish and Czech:

There was a pink mark upon the handkerchief (119).
C'era un segno rosso, sul fazzoletto (144).
Nenäiinassa oli punainen täplä (139).
Na kapesniku byla růžová skvrna (121).

The same is true of the third example:

There was a little clearing too, between the bushes, ... (84).
Tra i fiori c'era una piccola radura, ... (105).
Pensaiden välissä oli vielä pieni aukio, ... (99).
Uprostřed této spousty květů byla neveliká travnatá mýtina, ... (87).

And yet, Czech unlike Finnish tends to emphasize what is unknown in some way. Otherwise we could not explain the word *jakýsi* in the following example which does not differ in sentence structure from the three previous ones:

There was a man on the beach, a fisherman perhaps, ... (111).
C'era un uomo sulla spiaggia, un pescatore forse (136).
Rannalla oli mies, ehkä kalastaja, ... (130).
Na břehu byl jakýsi muž, snad rybář, ... (114).

IV. From the construction of existence *there + be* we pass on easily to verbs which express existence or appearance on the scene (J. Firbas). The indefinite article has a rhematic function even though its noun stands at the beginning of the sentence. This passage is clearly illustrated by the next example in which the Italian version still contains the construction of existence (*c'era*):

A black figure stood waiting for me at the head of the stairs, ... (72).
In cima a questo /scalone/ c'era una figura nera ad aspettarmi; ... (92).
Musta olento seisoj odottamassa minua portaiden yläpäässä, ... (86).
Nahoře na schodech stála čekající černá postava ... (75).

If we compare the English text with the translations, we find that in this case the sentence structure corresponds in English and in Finnish, where the unknown person is put at the beginning, whereas in Italian and in Czech its place is after the adverbial *in cima a questo scalone* (*nahoře na schodech*). Appearance on the scene is in this example:

A motor-coach stopped at the corner and two women got out (359).

The Italian sentence is identical with the original:

Un torpedone si fermò all'angolo, per far scendere due donne (416).

Also Finnish has the new, unknown thing at the beginning of the sentence:

Linja-auto pysähtyi nurkkaukseen, ja kaksi naista astui siitä ulos (412).

But Czech begins with the adverbial of place and puts the rheme after it:

Na rohu zastavil autobus a z něho vystoupily dvě ženy (342).

Nevertheless, we can come across examples in which sentence structure is the same for all the four languages:

A cloud, hitherto unseen, came upon the moon, ... (7).
Una nube, che sino allora non avevo veduto, nascose la luna, ... (14).
Pilvi, tähän asti näkymätön, ajelehti kuun eteen ... (8).
Dosud neviditelný mrak zakryl měsíc ... (9).

Or:

A lilac had mated with a copper beech, ... (6).
Un lillà s'era accoppiato con una faggiola, ... (13).
Syreeni oli liittynyt punapyökkiin, ... (7).
Šeřík se pářil s červeným bukem ... (8).

The word *moon* has the definite article because of its uniqueness. The indefinite article before the subject (*a cloud, a lilac*) cannot however be looked upon as the sign of the rheme, as in the above sentences, because the verbs *came upon* and *had mated* do not belong to the category of verbs indicating existence or appearance on the scene. They are action verbs, and so the rheme is represented by their object (*the moon, a copper beech*).

V. The total predicate (Whitney), i. e. a predicative noun which has the form of the nominative, is so to speak at the same level with the subject. Such a predicative noun has as a rule the indefinite article in English and in Italian:

'I'm a bachelor, ...' (132).
"Io sono uno scapolo, ..." (160).
"Olen vanhapoika ..." (154).
"Jsem starý mládenec ..." (135).

In Czech sometimes appears the instrumental which shifts the predicative noun from the level of the subject and instead of making it total it gives the noun a partial meaning:

Zvědavost byla její nemocí, ba skoro posedlostí (16—17).
Her curiosity was a disease, almost a mania (14).
La sua curiosità era una malattia, era quasi una mania (23).
Hänen uteliaisuutensa oli tauti, melkein mielipuolisuuatta hipova (17).

The Finnish predicative noun *mielipuolisuus* is in the partitive, required by the verb *hipoa*. The same level of subject and predicative noun is maintained to express totality even if the copula is negative:

Onni ei ole rahalla arvioitava omaisuus, ... (10).

This is really worthy of attention because negation in Finnish is usually connected with the partitive, for example:

"Hän ei avaa itse kirjaa koskaan, jos vain voi olla avaamatta." (162).
'She never opens a book if she can help it.' (139).
"Non apre mai un libro, a meno che proprio non vi sia costretta." (168).
"Nemusi-li, neotevfe knihu, jak je rok dlouhy." (141)

The English and Italian wording of the last example but one uses the indefinite article, in Czech the predicative noun is in the nominative:

Happiness is not a possession to be prized, ... (9).
La felicità non è un bene che possa esser stimato a peso d'oro, ... (16).
Štěstí není majetek, který lze hmotně ocenit; ... (11).

Sometimes we find a shortened form of the sentence with a total predicate:

“Kauhea murhenäytelmä”, hän oli sanonut, ... (42).
‘An appalling tragedy,’ she was saying, ... (35).
“Una tragedia spaventosa” ella diceva (48).
“Byla to dojemná tragedie,” řekla; ... (38).

VI. Before we discuss sentences with the Finnish partitive case (section VII of this chapter), it will be useful to concentrate on some examples in which the object is viewed as a whole:

I took a boiled egg (80).
Presi un uovo (101).
Minä otin keitetyn munan (95).
Já si vzala vajíčko na měkko (83).

The Finnish word *munan* is the genitive functioning as the accusative to express a total object after the verb *ottaa* (*to take, prendere, vzít*). The indefinite article in English and in Italian does not so much refer to an unknown object as to its number. But that is nothing new. We mentioned the numeral *jeden* as an imitation of the indefinite article in section II; the above sentence might read: *Já si vzala jedno vajíčko na měkko*. And we can add an example in which this numeral is really used in Czech:

I opened a drawer at hazard, ... (85).
Apersi un cassetto a caso; ... (106).
Avasin laatikon umpimähkään, ... (101).
Otevřela jsem nazdařbůh jednu ze zásuvek ... (88).

The idea of an unknown object is of course always present. It is proved by the word *jakousi* in the Czech translation of the following sentence:

..., Maxim picked up a book but I knew he did not read (285).
Maxim aveva preso un libro, ma sentivo che non leggeva (333).
Maxim otti kâteensä kirjan, mutta tiesin ettei hän lukenut sitä (329).
Maxim vzal sice do ruky jakousi knihu, ale jsem jista, že nečetl (275).

We said in section II that apart from stress it is word order that makes a Finnish noun known or unknown. The closer the noun is to the beginning of the sentence the more definite it is. If we put the object *kirjan* before *kâteensä* and read: *Maxim otti kirjan kâteensä*, the definite article would have to be used in English and in Italian: *Maxim picked up the book. Maxim aveva preso il libro*. Also the Czech text would change: *Maxim vzal knihu do ruky*. Word order is certainly connected with stress in this example:

Hän veti suuren valkoisen nenäliinan taskustaan ja pyyhki nenänsä (300).

The sentence structure is the same as in the example with *a book*, and the Czech translation is sensitive enough to respect it:

Vytáhl z kapsy ohromný bílý kapesník a vysmrkal se (253).

Z kapsy is *taskustaan*, and if we want to defend its position after the object, we must suppose that *taskustaan* is not stressed in the same way as *out of his pocket* is not:

He brought a large white handkerchief out of his pocket and blew his nose (260).

Italian has the same word order as Czech:

Egli trasse di tasca un gran fazzoletto bianco e si soffiò il naso (304).

We shall close this section with a sentence in which an unknown and total object in Finnish is expressed by the indefinite article in English and in Italian, in Czech by excellently chosen word order:

When we turned at one of the narrow bends I saw a man walking along the drive a little distance ahead (127).

Mentre voltavamo in una delle strette curve vidi un uomo che camminava, pochi passi avanti (153).

Kun käännymme erästä jyrkästä mutkasta, näin miehen kävelevän ajotiellä vähän kauempana (147).

Když jsme vjžděli do jedné z úzkých zatáček, uzfela jsem malý kousek před námi kráčetí mužskou postavu (129).

The idea of what is unknown, stress and probably also the intonation centre (J. Firbas) are here concentrated on the object *mužskou postavu* (*a man, un uomo, miehen*), which in Czech lies at the end of the sentence. We can judge from that that what follows the object in the other three languages is not stressed.

VII. This section will bring us to a comparison between the Finnish partitive case and its equivalents in English (*some, a*), in Italian (the partitive article, circumlocution, the indefinite article) and in Czech (a simple noun, circumlocution). We shall start with a very clear example:

“Löysin köyttä majasta”, sanoin miehelle (133).

Köyttä (provaz) is the partitive of the noun *köysi* and represents part of this thing, as we find in the other two Czech translations:

“Našla jsem provaz v domku,” řekla jsem hledači škeblí (116).

“Ho trovato della corda, in casa” dissi all’uomo (133).

Della corda is a noun with the partitive article.

‘I found some string in the cottage,’ I said to the man (114).

Some, as we know, substitutes for the indefinite article. It appears in the next sentences too:

'I had to get some string.' (114)
"Ho dovuto cercare un pezzo di corda." (139)

Un pezzo means *kus*, which is the translation of *some* also in Czech:

"Musila jsem si napřed najít kus provazu." (117)

Finnish has again the partitive:

"Minun täytyi hakea nuoraa." (134)

Nuoraa is the partitive form of *nuora* and is used in the next sentence as well:

Katselin ympärilleni löytäkseni nuoraa (132).
I looked about me for some string (113).
Cercai in giro, se vedessi un pezzo di corda (138).
Rozhlédla jsem se po nějakém provaze, ... (116).

So an indefinite idea which at the same time refers to part of a whole, to point out briefly the characteristic features of the Finnish partitive in the light of the above examples. *Kus provazu* is something concrete, but an abstract noun can also have the form of the partitive:

Siellä on ehkä vieläkin jäljellä tuskaa ... (14).

In English and in Italian we have the expression *jistá* (*a certain, una certa*):

There might linger there still a certain atmosphere of stress ... (12).
Là potrebbe aleggiare tuttora una certa lugubre atmosfera ... (20).

In Czech despite the demonstrative pronoun *to* nothing known is meant. The narrator feels that in the cottage there is an atmosphere of stress but she does not know anything more:

Možná, že tamodtud dosud zcela nevyprchalo to ovzduší úzkosti ... (14).

Let us now consider this sentence:

Otrfela jsem si s ním [= kapesníkem] ruce a ucitila jsem, že z něho dosud vychází slabá vůně (121).

From the Finnish point of view *slabá vůně* here too represents something partial: not all the dull scent absolutely but only what clings about the handkerchief:

Pyyhin nenäliinalla sormiani ja silloin huomasin että siinä oli yhä lievää tuoksua (139).

Lievää tuoksua is a partitive which expresses the indefinite article in English:

I wiped my fingers with the handkerchief, and as I did so I noticed that a dull scent clung about it still (119).

A dull scent has its counterpart in the Italian words *un vago profumo*:

Mi asciugai le dita in quel pezzetto di lino, e mentre così facevo notai che serbava tuttora un vago profumo (144).

I should like to emphasize the fact that the indefiniteness resulting from the end position of the noun *scent* (*profumo, vůně*) is overridden in Finnish by the idea of what is partial, and the partitive duly meets the demands of Finnish morphology. *Tuoksua* is the singular of the partitive but in the sentence we also have the plural of the partitive *sormiani* (*my fingers, le dita, prsty* translated as *ruce*) which indicates the idea of a partially affected object. We shall deal with the plural of the partitive further on. It is rather difficult to get used to the idea of what is partial because, as we have realized, it covers not only the area of concrete phenomena but also that of abstract ones. The following example is quite typical:

'Writing letters is a waste of time,' said Maxim (139).
"Scriver lettere è una perdita di tempo" sentenziò Maxim (168).
"Kirjeiden kirjoittaminen on ajan tuhlausta", sanoi Maxim (162).
"Psaní rodinných dopisů je mrhání časem," řekl Maxim (141).

Tuhlausta (the partitive singular of *tuhlaus*) has its Czech equivalent in the instrumental *mrháním* which, as we saw at the beginning of section V of this chapter, shifts the predicative noun from the level of the subject. We ended that section with a sentence of this type:

Una felicità quieta (333).
Bylo to klidné, tiché štěstí (276).

English has a similar sentence structure:

It was a quiet, still happiness (286).

In Finnish we find the partitive:

Tämä oli rauhallista, tyyntä onnea (330).

By means of this case the predicative noun *onni*, qualified by two adjectives also in the partitive, becomes the expression of a partial idea compared to the idea of happiness in an absolute, total sense. In section V we also mentioned the form of the partitive required by a verb. Here is an example which in English and in Italian has a sentence structure identical with the above sentence:

It was a tremendous relief (124).
Fu un immenso sollievo (150).

In Finnish and in Czech, however, there is the verb *pocítit* (*to feel, sentire*):

Tunsin ääretöntä helpotusta (144).
Pocítila jsem ohromnou úlevu (127).

The problem is that on the one hand we have the indefinite article and on the other the partitive, two things which apparently have nothing in common. And yet, if we remember that the Finnish partitive case represents a noun partially affected by a verb, there is no reason why we could not understand the problem. The

Czech verb *slevit* means *to make a reduction* (*fare una riduzione*) and is expressed in Finnish by the verb *antaa* (*dáti, to give, dare*) followed by the partitive:

“Ředitelství mi musí slevit s účtu.” (15)

“... , aion sanoa johtajalle, että heidän on annettava alennusta laskustani!” (15)

The English original and its Italian translation have the indefinite article:

‘... , I shall tell the management they must make a reduction on my bill.’

(13)

“Veramente, dirò alla direzione che debbono farmi una riduzione sul prezzo.”

(21)

A reduction, una riduzione indicate an unknown sum of money, therefore the Finnish partitive *alennusta* must be explained as the expression of something indefinite. There is another aspect of this phenomenon. By referring to a partially affected object the Finnish partitive can render an English verb which is in the continuous form because a continuous action is in fact an incomplete, partial action, for example:

... he was looking down at a letter, frowning at something (80).

Scorreva una lettera, con un certo cipiglio (100).

... , hän katseli edessään olevaa kirjettä ja rypisti sille otsansa (95).

... a četl zamračně jakýsi dopis (83).

Or:

I called Jasper once more, but he was chasing a feather blown by the wind (112).

Chiamai ancora il cane; ma correva dietro una piuma cacciata dal vento (137).

Huusin vielä kerran Jasperille, mutta se ajoi takaa tuulen ajelemaa höyhentä (132).

Zavolala jsem znovu na Jaspera, ale ten honil peříčko, unášené větrem (115).

Četl dopis and *honil peříčko* are imperfective verbs in Czech in contrast to the perfective verbs *přečetl dopis* and *dohonil peříčko*. The object is in the accusative while in Finnish it is in the partitive (*hän katseli kirjettä*, literally *he was looking at a letter; se ajoi takaa höyhentä*). In that way the Finnish verb fulfils the function of the English continuous form (*he was looking, he was chasing*) and of the Italian tense called imperfetto (*scorrevva, correva*).

B. THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

I. In general it is possible to consider nouns with the definite article as something known. Thinking of sentence structure we may say that the noun representing the subject stands in this case at the beginning:

The gates had shut to with a crash behind us, the dusty highroad was out of sight, ... (65).

I cancelli si erano chiusi dietro di noi con uno stridor di ferraglie, la polverosa via maestra non si vedeva più; ... (84).

Portit olivat narahtaan sulkeutuneet jälkeemme, pölyinen maantie oli näky-mättömissä (78).

Vrata za námi s třeskem zapadla, silnice zmizela z dohledu . . . (68).

In the next example the sentence structure in Italian and in Finnish is the same as in the English original, but in Czech the subject has become an object:

'The coffee and the hot dishes are on the sideboard.' (80)

"Il caffè e i piatti caldi sono là sulla credenza." (100)

"Kahvi ja lämpimät ruoat ovat sivupöydällä." (94)

"Na kredenci máš kávu a něco teplého k jídlu." (83)

The change of subject and object has no influence on the basic idea of something known. This may suggest totality, as proved by the Czech word *celá*:

Celá situace jako by ani nebyla skutečná; připadala jsem si jako vosková figurina (54).

The situation was unreal, and I felt like a lay-figure (52).

La situazione era assurda; mi pareva d'essere un burattino (69).

Tilanne oli epätodellinen, ja tunsin olevani kuin mallinukke (62).

An object with the definite article in English and in Italian also corresponds in Finnish to the idea of something being totally affected (a partially affected object was discussed in the last section of chapter A):

He did not answer, and I tied the string loosely round Jasper's collar (114).

Egli non mi rispose; legai la corda al collare di Jasper, . . . (138).

Hän ei vastannut, ja minä sidoin nuoran löyhästi Jasperin kaulanauhan ympärille (133).

Neodpověděl a mlčky pozoroval, jak uvazuji provaz k Jasperovu obojku (116).

A total object suggesting the idea of something known (the definite article in English and in Italian) is also in the following Finnish sentence:

Istuuduimme, ja hän antoi minulle ruokalistan . . . (29).

We sat down, and he gave me the menu, . . . (24).

Ci sedemmo, ed egli mi porse la lista delle vivande . . . (35).

Sedli jsme si k jeho stolu, podal mi jídelní listek, . . . (27).

We will remember the verb *antaa* mentioned at the end of chapter A, after which the partitive *alennusta* was used to express something indefinite. *The menu (ruokalista)* on the other hand stands for something definite in the given situation. We shall have an opportunity to examine examples of the partitive which renders the English and Italian definite article, but now let us concentrate on circumlocutions of the definite article, which is the subject of section II.

II. The commonest substitute for the English definite article is *quello* in Italian, *tuon* in Finnish and *ten* in Czech:

I could not believe that I had said the name at last (124).

Avevo pronunciato quel nome, finalmente? Non credevo ai miei occhi (150).

En oikein uskonut, että olin vihdoinkin sanonut tuon nimen (144).

Užasla jsem sama nad sebou, že jsem konečně vyslovila to jméno, . . . (126).

Ten, který is usually *se joka* in Finnish:

Hän näytti nyt olevan entisellään, hän oli iloinen ja tyytyväinen, se Maxim jonka tunsin ja jota rakastin (126–127).
He seemed all right again now, happy and cheerful, the Maxim I knew and loved, ... (108).
Sembra torna in sè, ora, contento, allegro, il Maxim che conoscevo e amavo; ... (132).
Zdalo se, že je mu opět docela dobře, že je šťasten a vesel, že je opět tím Maximem, kterého jsem znala a milovala, ... (111).

The definite article in English is sometimes replaced by the possessive adjective:

She hesitated by the doorway, her hand on the handle of the open door (75).
Ancora esitava, la mano sul pomo della porta già aperta; ... (96).
Hän epäröi vielä ovella käsi avoimen oven rivassa (90).
Otálela mezi otevřenými dveřmi s rukou na klíce, ... (78).

In Finnish and in Czech there is often only a simple noun:

The tangerine was very sour (56).
Quel mandarino era assai acido (73).
Tangeriini oli hyvin kitkerä (67).
..., mandarinka byla velmi kyselá (58).

III. In this section we shall deal with typical cases of using the Finnish partitive case where the definite article is present in English and in Italian. We shall start with three examples, the first of which illustrates one aspect of the Finnish partitive, namely the ability to express belonging to a certain category:

Ruusui oli niitä harvoja kukkia, jotka näyttivät kauniimmilta pöimittuina kuin kasvavina (39).

Niitä harvoja kukkia means of the few flowers and the phrase is preceded in the other three languages by the numeral *one*:

A rose was one of the few flowers, he said, that looked better picked than growing (33).
La rosa, egli diceva, era uno tra i rari fiori che facesse miglior figura colta che non sulla pianta (45).
Růže je jedna z nemnohých květin, které vypadají lépe utržené než na keři (36).

The second aspect of the Finnish partitive plural is the ability to express an indefinite number:

Siitä oli nappeja poissa (139).
Some of the buttons were missing (119).
Mancava anche qualche bottone (144).
Několik knoflíků na něm chybělo (121).

This use corresponds to expressing part of a whole by the partitive singular, as we showed in chapter A. The partitive singular is also in the third sentence we have chosen to introduce this section:

Se [= koira] haukkui yhä tuota rannalla seisovaa yksinäistä olentoa (131).

Here we have the verb *haukkua* (to bark, *abbaiare*, *štěkat*), which requires a partitive construction. A literal translation would be: *He went on barking at the on the beach standing solitary being*. The partially affected object, which we also mentioned in the last section of chapter A, has a prepositional construction in Czech:

Dorážel dále na osamělou postavu na mořském břehu (114).

The definite article in English and in Italian, preceding the object, is translated into Finnish by the demonstrative pronoun *tuo* (partitive *tuota*). The Italian verb has a preposition too:

... e seguìto a inveire contro la solitaria figura curva a terra (136).

The English original has a verb without preposition:

He went on baiting the solitary figure on the beach (111).

Now we pass on to notes proper of this section. It is interesting to compare an example which in English and in Italian ends with the words *they have the same opinion*:

That was what Maxim had said, the evening before, and I thought it odd that they should both have the same opinion (101).
Così aveva detto Maxim, la sera avanti; trovai strano che entrambi avessero la stessa opinione (124).

In Czech a phrase with the verb *být* is used:

Totéž řekl včera Maxim a překvapilo mě, že jsou oba téhož mínění (104).

Finnish must choose the partitive in the same way as Czech has no other choice than the genitive:

Aivan samaa Maxim oli väittänyt edellisenä iltana, ja minusta oli kummalista, että he olivat samaa mieltä (119).

On the whole, however, the Finnish partitive cannot be compared to verbal constructions in the other three languages because the idea of a total or partial object is unknown to them:

I rang the bell, and Maud, the under-housemaid, came into the room (287).
Suonai il campanello; e si presentò Maud, la seconda cameriera di casa (334).

Neither *I rang the bell* nor *suonai il campanello* can be said to evoke quite the same picture in the mind as *soitin kelloa*, where the partitive *kelloa* represents a partially affected object:

Soitin kelloa, ja Maud, nuorempi sisäkkö, tuli huoneeseen (331).
Zazvonila jsem, a do salónku vstoupila Maud, naše mladší pokojská (277).

A literal translation of the beginning of that sentence into Czech would contain a prepositional construction: *zazvonila jsem na zvonek*. It goes without saying

that verbs with prepositions are common both in English and in Italian, for example:

'Have you ever thought about the future?' ... (29).

„Avete mai pensato all'avvenire, ... ?“ (41)

„Myslíte vûbec někdy na budoucnost?“ ... (32).

But Finnish in spite of the fact that it has a number of prepositions and postpositions governing the genitive or the partitive, sees the verb action first of all from the point of view of whether the object is partially or totally affected:

„Oletteko koskaan ajatellut tulevaisuutta?“ ... (34).

Or:

'I love Manderley, I love the garden, I love everything.' (146).

„Manderley mi piace. Mi piace il giardino, tutto qui mi piace.“ (175).

... „rakastan Manderleytä, rakastan puutarhaa, rakastan kaikkea.“ (169 – 170)

„Mám ráda Manderley, mám ráda zahradu i všechno ostatní.“ (148)

The Finnish verb *rakastaa* (*to love, amare, milovat*) admits of no other construction than that with the partitive because a total object is from the Finnish standpoint out of the question here. As we found out in chapter A, the partitive also helps Finnish express the progress of an action. If there is an imperfective verb in Czech for example:

Za námi nesl Frith a sluha mé věci a plášt do deště. ... (70),

Finnish gets a similar meaning of the verb *tuoda* (*to carry, portare, nést*) by putting the object into the partitive:

Frith ja miespalvelija tulivat jäljessä tuoden autovaippaa ja minun sadetakiani (80).

Tuoden is the instructive of the second infinitive of the verb *tuoda*, i.e. a form which corresponds to the English participle *following*:

... , Frith and the footman following with the rug and my mackintosh, ... (68).

The Italian translation has the imperfetto:

... , seguiti da Frith e da un giovane domestico che portava la coperta e il mio impermeabile (87).

It is necessary to point out that the partially affected object (*autovaippaa, sadetakiani*) does not mean part of a whole but a phase in the progress of the action, its incompleteness and therefore an object which has not yet been totally affected.

IV. Before we finish this chapter, we shall add some examples to illustrate negation in Finnish, referred to in section V of chapter A. It is typical of Finnish to have the partitive after a negative verb:

I did not look at the cottage (257).
... , senza guardare alla casetta, ... (300).
En katsonut majaa (296–297).
Na kamenný domek jsem se ani nepodívala, ... (250).

Or:

I was not prepared for this question, ... (97).
A quella domanda non ero preparata; ... (119).
En ollut odottanut tuollaista kysymystä, ... (113).
Na takovou otázku jsem nebyla připravena (99).

The Finnish translation really says: *Takovou otázkou jsem nečekala*, and like *katsoa* (*podívat se*) the verb *odottaa* (čekat) can be followed by the partitive also in an affirmative construction. The last example of this section is not unambiguous either:

There were no old well-worn chairs, no tables littered with magazines and papers, ... (84).
Non vecchie poltrone logore per l'uso, nè tavoli ingombri di riviste e giornali, ... (105).
Täällä ei ollut vanhoja kuluneita tuoleja, ei sanomalehtien ja lukemistojen peittämiä pöytiä, ... (99).
... nebyly tu starobylé, stářim sešlé lenošky, ani stoly, postlané časopisy a novinami, ... (87).

The Finnish partitives plural (*tuoleja, pöytiä*) may in fact function in an affirmative sentence as nouns with the zero article in English and in Italian, which is the subject of the next chapter. Here I should like to draw attention again to the structure of the Finnish sentence a characteristic specimen of which we put at the very beginning of the present notes. The word *pöytiä*, which is last in the sentence, is qualified by what precedes, namely *ani novinami a časopisy pokryté stoly*. Such a word order might be tolerated in Czech but in English and Italian it is hindered by the morphology of these languages.

C. THE ZERO ARTICLE

I. As is generally known, the indefinite article becomes what we call zero article in the plural. The Czech translation of the English sentence

So women did not make those confessions to men (55)

reads:

Poznala jsem, že se nesluší, aby žena činila muži podobné vyznání (57).

The counterparts of the plurals *women* and *men* are here the singulars *žena* and *muž*. Therefore it is possible to understand the nouns generically. In Italian this function is fulfilled by a plural noun with the definite article:

Dunque le donne non facevano confessioni di quel genere agli uomini (71).

Finnish has to rely on the meaning of the sentence because neither the nominative plural *naiset* nor the allative plural *miehille* are capable of expressing morphologically the same generic idea:

Naiset eivät siis tunnustaneet miehille tuollaisia asioita (65).

The next example has a generic subject too, but the zero article of the object is rendered by the partitive article in Italian, and by the partitive case in Finnish:

'Men do such extraordinary things.' (21)
„Gli uomini fanno di queste sorprese.“ (31)
„Miehet tekevät niin kummallisia temppuja.“ (25)
„Muži dělají někdy takové prapodivné věci.“ (24)

II. A predicative noun in the plural has the zero article also in Italian. It is worth noticing that in this case the predicative noun can be modified by a relative clause and still the article does not appear before the noun. The Finnish translation has the partitive:

We were allies, ... (311).
Eravamo alleati, ... (362).
Olimme liittolaisia, ... (358).
Byli jsme spojenci, ... (300).

And now with a relative clause:

..., these are memories of Manderley that will not be denied (10).
...: sono, queste, memorie di Manderley che non mi saranno mai negate (18).
..., ne ovat Manderleyn muistoja, joita ei voi kieltää (12).
..., to všechno jsou vzpomínky na Manderley, které nikdy nebude lze zapudit (13).

III. In the construction of existence *there + be* Italian uses the partitive article besides the zero article which occurs in English; Finnish always chooses the partitive case:

There were places she had visited, and things that she had touched (45).
C'erano luoghi ove era stata, oggetti che aveva toccato (60).
Oli paikkoja, joissa hän oli käynyt, ja esineitä, joita hän oli koskettanut (53).
Jsou místa, která navštévovala, a věci, jichž se dotýkala (47).

The Italian partitive article is in this sentence:

C'erano dei fiammiferi nella mia stanza da letto, ... (103).
There were matches upstairs in the bedroom, ... (82).
Ylhäällä makuuhuoneessa oli tulitikkuja, ... (97).
Měla jsem sice sirky nahoře v ložnici, ... (85).

IV. The Czech translation of the last sentence in section III does not keep to the sentence structure of the original like the Italian and Finnish translations because it uses the verb *mít* (*to have*) followed by a direct object. We can thus pass on to a similar sentence structure in the next examples. Again there is the double

possibility in Italian (the zero article or the partitive article) against the one in Finnish (the partitive case):

Robert brought out chairs and rugs (102).
... Roberto aveva portato seggiolini di paglia e coperte (125).
Robert toi tuoleja ja peitteitä (120).
Robert přinesl zahradní lehátka a pokrývky (105).
'I've seen pictures of it, of course,' ... (18).
„Ho veduto delle fotografie, naturalmente“ ... (27).
„Olen tietenkin nähnyt kuvia sieltä“, ... (21).
„Viděla jsem arciť fotografie Manderley,“ ... (20).

D. ABSENCE OF ARTICLE

I. The last chapter of our notes will only deal with abstracts (section I) and material nouns (section II). These two groups of nouns belong in English to those which, unless they are qualified, are used without article. We shall see, however, that Italian treats abstracts as something known and uses the definite article with them, while Finnish makes a difference between a total idea and a partial one (the partitive). So first some examples of abstract nouns, words like *life*, *time*, etc. As we have said, the way of thinking differs here in English and in Italian:

I had never realized, of course, that life at Manderley would be so orderly and planned (80).
Mai avrei immaginato che a Manderley la vita si dovesse svolgere così ordinata e metodica (100).
En ollut tietenkään koskaan tajunnut, että elämä Manderleyssä olisi niin järjestelmällistä ja suunnitelmanmukaista (94).
Nikdy jsem si nepředstavovala, že život v Manderley bude tak spořádaný a tak pečlivě rozvržený (82).

What is expressed by *life* in English is taken in a general way, although it refers to a certain place (*life at Manderley*), but *la vita* in Italian presents this generality as something that is given, something that is known. That is also the meaning of *elämä* in Finnish and of *život* in Czech. As an object partially affected by the verb, the Finnish abstract noun has the form of the partitive:

“Antakaa rouva Danversille aikaa ajatella.” (389)

In Czech we could say: *Dopřejte paní Danversové času na rozmyšlenou*. But the Czech translation reads as follows:

“Paní Danversová potřebuje čas na rozmyšlenou.” (324)

The Italian abstract noun has the definite article, the English noun is without article:

“Lasciate alla signora Danvers il tempo di riflettere.” (393)
'Give Mrs Danvers time to think.' (338)

A partial idea in Finnish is also in this sentence:

Olemme molemmat tunteneet pelkoa, yksinäisyyttä ja hyvin suurta ahdistusta (9).

The English original has nouns without article, making, unlike the Finnish translation, the abstract ideas absolute:

We have both known fear, and loneliness, and very great distress (8).

The same is true of the Czech version:

Poznali jsme oba, co je strach a osamělost a nesmírně velké utrpení (11).

In Italian the first two abstracts have the definite article with the same absolute effect as in English and in Czech, but the third noun (*una miseria*) has the indefinite article because the idea of distress is made concrete by being categorized through the words *grande oltre ogni dire*:

Entrambi abbiamo conosciuto la paura, e la solitudine, e una miseria grande oltre ogni dire (15).

II. Material nouns are as a rule without article in English:

Soon tea was brought to us, ... (70).

In Italian the definite article appears if the idea of what is known wins out over that of part of a whole:

Tosto ci portarono il tè, ... (89).

That version corresponds to the Czech translation, where *čaj* is spoken of as *svačina*:

Za malou chvíli nám přinesli svačinu; ... (72).

Finnish has the partitive:

Pian meille tuotiin teetä (82).

What is expressed in this case by the Finnish partitive is quite in agreement with the use of the partitive article in Italian:

- ..., hän kysyi halusinko lisää kahvia, ... (22).
- ..., domandandomi se desideravo ancora del caffè; ... (28).
- ..., asking if I would have more coffee, ... (19).
- ..., zeptal se mne, chci-li ještě kávu (21).

In our notes we have had several opportunities to consider the function of the Finnish total and partial object. The sentence we want to wind up the notes with summarizes this problem of the Finnish language in a clear way; the verb *ottaa* (*vzít*) governs here in fact both the total object (*lusikan*) and the partial object (*marmelaattia*):

Hän otti lusikan uudestaan käteensä ja otti marmelaattia sillä (64).
Zdvihl zase lžičku a nabral si zavařeninu (56).

In Italian the English possessive adjective *his*, which defines the noun *spoon*, is replaced by the definite article but *marmellata* is without article:

Egli aveva ripreso il cucchiaino e si servì di marmellata (70).

The partitive article gives way to morphological demands which make the verb *servirsi* follow by the preposition *di*. If we said *si servì della marmellata*, *della* would not be the partitive article but *di* + the definite article. And that would be in contradiction with the English original, where *marmalade* is not emphasized by the definite article:

He picked up his spoon again and helped himself to marmalade (54).

CONCLUSION

Word order certainly has a role to play in sentences when articles are used, but grammatical, that is to say, morphological needs are of no less importance in sentence structure. Finnish with the partitive case has undoubtedly helped us to get a clearer picture of some phenomena (the total and partial object especially) which from the standpoint of one language cannot sometimes be correctly interpreted. The aim of the notes was to characterize four different languages by examining the category of determination. If we have succeeded to throw some light on this problem, then our work has not been in vain.

REFERENCES

- Firbas, J. (1966). Non-thematic subjects in contemporary English, *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 2. 239–56 (Prague).
Firbas, J. (1975). On 'existence/appearance on the scene' in functional sentence perspective, *Prague studies in English* 16. 47–70 (Prague).
Krámský, J. (1972). *The article and the concept of definiteness in languages* (The Hague and Paris).
Whitney, A. H. (1970). *Teach yourself Finnish* (London).
The New English Bible. New Testament (Oxford University Press, 1961).
La Sacra Bibbia (Rome, 1958).
Uusi testamentti nykysuomeksi (Helsinki, 1979).
Bible, ekumenický překlad (Prague, 1979).
Du Maurier, D., *Rebecca* (Penguin Books, 1970).
Du Maurier, D., *La prima moglie*, translation A. Scalero (Milan, 1972).
Du Maurier, D., *Rebekka*, translation H. Vasara (Helsinki, 1966).
Du Maurier, D., *Mrtvá a živá*, translation J. B. Šuber (Prague, 1946).

URČENOST V ANGLIČTINĚ A ITALŠTINĚ VE SROVNÁNÍ S FINŠTINOU A ČEŠTINOU

Článek si všímá určenosti v angličtině a italštině ve srovnání s finštinou a češtinou z hlediska větné stavby. Přihlíží nejen k slovnímu pořádku, ale i k morfologickým požadavkům, které zvláště ve finštině hrají důležitou roli, jak je vidět z funkce partitivu při vyjadřování celkového nebo částečného zasažení předmětu.

