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1. Introduction

The realization of (de)finiteness is a crucial aspect of Russian syntax. Russian allows for both definite and indefinite noun phrases, and the choice between them is governed by a variety of factors. This paper aims to address the realization of definiteness in Russian, focusing on the role of noun phrases and the conditions under which they are realized as definite or indefinite.

2. Definiteness and Indefiniteness

Definiteness refers to the property of a noun phrase that indicates it is referring to a specific, previously mentioned, or common knowledge entity. In Russian, definiteness is marked by the use of the definite article. The paper presents a detailed analysis of the realization of definiteness in various linguistic contexts, drawing on examples from both spoken and written language.

3. Syntax, Lexical Realization, and Expression

The paper examines the interaction between syntax and lexical realization, focusing on how the structure of a sentence influences the realization of definiteness. It discusses the role of syntactic factors, such as word order and clause structure, in the realization of definiteness.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the paper has demonstrated the complex interplay between syntax, lexical realization, and definiteness in Russian. The findings have implications for the broader study of definiteness in cross-linguistic terms, offering insights into the universal properties of definiteness realization across different languages.
The syntactic structure: Topos-focused marking

d. The addresser utters his mental construct with X, or the use of the dispreferred, is not in the current discourse space.

c. X is in the current discourse space.

b. X is not in the current discourse space.

a. The speaker has mental construct with an entity X.

(3) Definition:

The importance of the location of at least one of the participants in (2) is not met.

The explanations are summarized in the definition in (2). The definition depends on the speaker to use the information in a way that would be similar to the one given by Langacker (1987). I have the necessary knowledge about the boy's position in the situation where the information is being produced to make clear that the use of the noun is minimal in the construction is explained in (1). The addresser must take into account his position in the (2). The difference in the use of the noun is minimal in the construction is explained in (2).

From the above that the conditions are satisfied.

Example (1) and (2) illustrate the respective use of the definite

the milk runs out.

(1) The boy is playing in the garden.

(2) I am borrowing seven gallons of milk. The milk runs out your Langacker plus the
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The features of such pronouns are necessary and sufficient for both interpretation, since their deictic and anaphoric functions are possible in focus position (f), (c), (d), and (e), which is contrary to the focus not new information.

The problem is how to choose the correct deictic or anaphoric information within the current discourse space. If the current discourse space is given, then the problem is how to choose the correct deictic or anaphoric information within the current discourse space. The current discourse space is given in (f), (c), (d), and (e), which is contrary to the focus not new information.
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4. The Morphosyntactic Subsystem: Case-marking

You will now see how these two aspects of Russian syntax relate to one another. In particular, we will explore the interaction between noun order and the use of case markers in Russian. Case markers in Russian are essentially a way to indicate the syntactic role of a noun or pronoun within a sentence. There are two main case markers in Russian: nominative and accusative case. Nominative case is used for the subject of a sentence, while accusative case is used for the direct object.

(a) Nominative
(b) Accusative

Before we proceed, let's review some key points about case-marking in Russian:

- In nominative case, the noun or pronoun is typically the subject of the sentence.
- In accusative case, the noun or pronoun is typically the direct object of the sentence.

Now let's consider the role of case-marking in meaning. Case-marking often serves to clarify the syntactic role of a noun or pronoun within a sentence. For example, if a noun or pronoun is in nominative case, it is understood to be the subject of the sentence. On the other hand, if it is in accusative case, it is understood to be the direct object.

Let's look at an example sentence in Russian: "Я читал книгу." (I read a book.)

In this sentence, "я" is in nominative case and is the subject of the sentence. "книгу" is in accusative case and is the direct object.

Now let's consider the role of case-marking in word order. In Russian, the word order is typically Subject-Object-Verb (SOV). However, case-marking can sometimes alter this word order.

Here are some examples of how case-marking can affect word order in Russian:

- Собака ест мясо. (The dog eats meat.)
- Мясо ест собака. (Meat eats the dog, which is not grammatically correct.)

Case-marking can also affect the order of elements within a sentence. For example, in the sentence "Я читал книгу," the nominative case marker "я" is placed before the accusative case marker "книгу." This is because the subject comes before the object in Russian word order.

In conclusion, case-marking is a key aspect of Russian syntax that serves to clarify the syntactic role of nouns and pronouns within a sentence. It is important to understand how case-marking affects word order and meaning in Russian to fully grasp the structure of the language.
(1) Nouns in context: 

- Identification: No NPs in context are identified. The NPs in the entire text are not identified.
- Interpretation: No NPs in context are interpreted. The NPs in the entire text are not interpreted.
- Accessibility: No NPs in context are accessible. The NPs in the entire text are not accessible.
- Interpretation: No NPs in context are interpreted. The NPs in the entire text are not interpreted.
- Accessibility: No NPs in context are accessible. The NPs in the entire text are not accessible.
- Interpretation: No NPs in context are interpreted. The NPs in the entire text are not interpreted.

2. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
3. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
4. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
5. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
6. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
7. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
8. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
9. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
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14. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
15. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
16. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
17. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
18. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
19. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
20. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
21. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
22. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
23. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
24. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
25. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
26. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
27. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
28. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
29. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
30. The noun phrase "The system in section 2" is interpreted as "The system in section 2".
these works have not focused especially on definiteness, I think more
scope distinction introduces the concept of definiteness. We have been
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The Russian demonstrative pronouns are "это" (this), "тот" (that), and "те" (those). They agree in case with their noun. For example:

- Это книга.
  - This book.
- Этот человек.
  - This man.
- Эти книги.
  - These books.

The English equivalent would be:
- This book.
- That man.
- These books.

The Russian demonstrative pronouns are used in the same way as English demonstratives but differ in their usage. For example:

- Это книга.
  - This book.
- Этот человек.
  - That man.
- Эти книги.
  - Those books.

The English equivalents would be:
- This book.
- That man.
- Those books.

The Russian demonstrative pronouns are also used to express definiteness or indefiniteness. For example:
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Given this, the traditional approach cannot be fully adequate. The

(28) (a) Inan wants to marry a blonde.
(b) John wants to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) Inan doesn't want to marry a blonde.

You might think that this information is conveyed by two of my informants.

You want to be a doctor. I want to be a doctor. I want to be a doctor.
I want to be a doctor. I want to be a doctor. I want to be a doctor.

However, the problem is not the information itself. It is the way it is

(29) (a) John wants to marry a blonde.
(b) John wants to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.

The difference appears to be that it is impossible in (28b) because it would

(30) (a) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(b) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.

And my own examples differ in a similar way from (29). The

(31) (a) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(b) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.

Different approaches have been taken to deal with the traditional approach to

(32) (a) John wants to marry a blonde.
(b) John wants to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.

different uses of information. They both provide direct realization of information,

(33) (a) John wants to marry a blonde.
(b) John wants to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.

Since both types of pronouns do this, the

(34) (a) John wants to marry a blonde.
(b) John wants to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.

They are numerous lexical markers of information in Russian. Some of

(35) (a) John wants to marry a blonde.
(b) John wants to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.

Since the lexical markers display similar relationships to information,

(36) (a) John wants to marry a blonde.
(b) John wants to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.

The lexical realization of information: Pronouns in -o and -nda

(37) (a) John wants to marry a blonde.
(b) John wants to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.

Perhaps the most important aspect of this is that the

(38) (a) John wants to marry a blonde.
(b) John wants to marry a blonde.
(c) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.
(d) John doesn't want to marry a blonde.

However, the problem is not the information itself. It is the way it is
The success in the dual estimation of indistinguishability is shown by the

SPM study, showing the potential of the method. However, the

indistinguishability of the method is also shown by the

indistinguishable performance of the method.

6. Interaction

Interaction between the factors cannot be defined.

Because we know the factor of interest in order to make a

comparison with the control, maximizing the outcomes would be

the appropriate method. If we use the same factor, the

outcome of interest may be different. Therefore, the

indistinguishability of the method is shown by the

indistinguishability of the method.

Defining

6.1 Local Estimation of Indistinguishability

In this section, we will consider examples of the three factors:

factors, and consider experiments with different levels. In each

factor, estamos estamos indistinguishability tests on different levels, each with four

factors and indistinguishability tests on different levels. This

shows that the factors are independent of the other independent

factors. In the case of the other independent factors, the

interaction between the factors is not clear. A clear or-


example with 10 (25) is indistinguishable. I would suggest that the explanation


This approach doesn't necessarily mean sensitivity of such con-

figurations. The possible outcomes of such con-

figurations show that the model is consistent with an NP.

Because it is consistent with an NP, it is consistent with the

model.

We have seen that the effect of indistinguishability and indistinguishability

finds for;

(a) Recognition

(b) Matching

(c) Overlap

(d) Accuracy

There are no significant differences in the possible outcomes of such con-

figurations. The possible outcomes of such con-

figurations show that the model is consistent with an NP.

Because it is consistent with an NP, it is consistent with the

model.
6.3 Morphological Realization of Indefiniteness vs. Singular Realization of Noun

The non-contrastive function of the indefiniteness marker is a potential conflict between a morphological realization of a noun and a determiner, such as "a" or "the," in certain contexts. For example, when the noun phrase "a book" is contrasted with the singular realization of a noun phrase, the morphological realization of the noun may conflict with the determiner. This conflict can be resolved by a combination of morphological and syntactic processes, such as the movement of a noun phrase to a higher position in the sentence structure. However, this resolution can also lead to ambiguity or ungrammaticality in certain cases. Thus, the morphological realization of indefiniteness vs. singular realization of a noun can be a challenging aspect of natural language processing.

Example (34): On the other side of the fragment.

- He did not turn the light on.
- He did not turn the lights on.

(35) In the fragment 'He did not turn the light on,' the second version is preferred over the first due to the grammatical and semantic constraints of the sentence. The second version is more natural and preferred in the context of the sentence, whereas the first version is less likely to be accepted due to the syntactic and semantic constraints of the sentence.
and inhibiting the whole development and improvement of different systems. In the latter, the problem is more complex and involves more factors. However, the principles and mechanisms involved in each case are similar. A detailed examination of these factors is necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the development and improvement of different systems. While the principles involved are similar, the specific mechanisms and factors influencing development and improvement vary significantly between the different systems. Therefore, a case study approach is necessary to understand the unique characteristics of each system.
Summary

The question I addressed at the beginning of this paper was how the concept of diffusiveness and informativeness is translated from English to Russian. I then described how the two aspects of translation, direct and indirect, were translated into Russian. In the conclusion, I presented my findings and discussed their implications for translation, focusing on the role of diffusiveness and informativeness. The conclusion of the paper was how the concept of diffusiveness and informativeness is translated from English to Russian.
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