

Department of English and ELT Methodology

A Review of a Final Thesis

submitted to the Department of English and ELT Methodology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University

Name and titles of the re-	viewer : Pavlína Šaldová, PhDr	r., Ph.D.
Reviewed as:	⋈ a supervisor	\square an opponent
Author of the thesis: Ang	_	
	-	he Russian subjunctive бы / Anglické
•	ce ruského podmiňovacího бы	I
Year of submission: 2024		
Submitted as:	☑ a bachelor's thesis	□ a master's thesis
Lavel of annualities.		
Level of expertise:	. 5	
□ excellent ⊠ very goo	d $oxtimes$ average $oxtimes$ below average	age 🗀 inadequate
Fastual amana		
Factual errors:		
□ almost none ⋈ appro	priate to the scope of the the	esis □ frequent less serious □ serious
Chasan mathadalagu		
Chosen methodology:		ada ata Elizada ata
☐ original and appropriat	te $oxtimes$ appropriate $oxtimes$ barely	adequate 🗀 inadequate
Dogulto		
Results:	4 4 - 2 - 22 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 -	and the same of th
□ original ⊠ original an	d derivative \square non-trivial co	mpilation \square cited from sources \square copied
Coope of the thesis.		
Scope of the thesis:		□ in a de averte
□ too large	ate to the topic adequate	□ Inadequate
Dibliography / pumbor on	d coloction of titles).	
Bibliography (number and	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
□ above average (scope of	or rigor) $oxtimes$ average $oxtimes$ below	7 average ∟ inadequate
Tun agraphical and forms	Havalı	
Typographical and forma		Dinadameta
□ excellent ⊠ very goo	d □ average □ below avera	age 🗀 inadequate
Languago:		
Language:	d	aga Dipadaguata
□ excellent	d □ average □ below avera	age 🗆 madequate
Typos:		
<u> </u>	onriata ta tha caana af tha tha	osis 🗆 numorous
\square annust none \square appro	priate to the scope of the the	SIS LI HUHHELUUS



Department of English and ELT Methodology

Brief description of the thesis (by the supervisor, ca. 100-200 words):

Based on the differences in the expression of the category of mood, the thesis aims to survey English translation counterparts of the various Russian constructions containing the subjunctive marker $\delta \omega$, which may indicate real, unreal or desired actions in the present, past or future.

The theoretical part outlines syntactic constructions in Russian containing the particle (conditional sentences, combinations with modals and other in/dependent clauses, Table 1). The mood in English is characterized as well, with focus on conditional sentences and modal verbs. 150 examples drawn from Russian originals (InterCorp, fiction) are analysed. Translation equivalents are analysed separately for each of the seven constructions, with focus on the morphological devices, types of modality as well as the finer temporal distinctions in English.

Review, comments and notes (ca. 100-200 words) **Strong points of the thesis:**

The thesis deals with authentic material drawn from the corpus, which the author managed to systematize consistently for both languages. I appreciate attempts at the description of meaning of the given constructions, capturing some fine distinctions in modality, inherently hard to discern. Overall, the thesis is well organized.

Weak points of the thesis:

The introductory part may have included more explicit expectations about the potential correspondences. In some cases description of the correspondences does not take into account explicitly the presence of other elements expressing modality, e.g. p. 27/(33) – "The Russian particle in the main clause is translated into English by a modal verb might, by means of which the possibility is expressed.": $3y\delta$ можно было бы спасти. Is it just the particle бы in the Russian version?.

Analysis of translations without a direct structural counterpart is left out (e.g. the most numerous category in 4.6, or two examples out of three in 4.3, or e.g. p. 43, A123, A138).

Questions to answer during the Defence and suggested points of discussion:

- 1. "Abstract: The thesis deals with the different meanings of the Russian particle бы." Are we dealing with the meaning of the particle itself?
- 2. Does Table 1 contain all uses of бы in Russian (cf. also 2.2.2)? Also, at p. 16 you raise the point that the combinations such as как бы, будто бы can be treated as lexicalized instances. How did you arrive at the list of constructions to be included in the analysis? P. 15/2.2.2: Where does the list of the combinations come from?
- 3. P. 36-39/4.5 Can you provide more examples of "lexical translation" (no grammatical counterpart)? The same goes for 4.6 where the majority also are not translated via a conditional/modals in English. What are other translation counterparts of the nominal protasis in 4.3?
- 4. What is the meaning/modality of (4) p. 35 *If I were to talk to him.* What is the meaning of *could do* in example 5, p. 36?
- 5. How can you translate to English чего бы это ему ни стоило (ex 13, p. 40)? (literal translation missing).
- 6. What did you learn as a teacher-to-be of Russian and English from your analysis?

Other comments:

Quoting: e.g. at p. 26: your translation of Dušková et al. (2012) should not be treated as direct quotation.

Proposed grade:
\square excellent \boxtimes very good \square good \square fail
Place, date and signature of the reviewer: <i>Prague</i> , 27 August 2024