

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI

Pedagogická fakulta

Katedra anglického jazyka

Barbora FRIMMELOVÁ

3. ročník – prezenční studium

Obor: Anglický jazyk se zaměřením na vzdělávání – Český jazyk a literatura se zaměřením na vzdělávání

Czech translation equivalents of English semantically negative but formally positive expressions (*hardly, barely, scarcely and seldom*)

Bakalářská práce

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Blanka Babická, Ph.D.

Olomouc 2017

Prohlašuji, že jsem závěrečnou práci vypracovala samostatně a použila jen uvedených pramenů a literatury.

V Olomouci 20. 4. 2017

.....
vlastnoruční podpis

I would like to thank Mgr. Blanka Babická, Ph.D. for her patience, support and useful comments on the content and style of my final project.

Obsah

Abstract.....	
Introduction.....	
1. Distinctions between Czech and English negation.....	1
2. The types of negation in Czech.....	3
3. The types of negation in English.....	4
3.1. The division according to the form of negation.....	4
3.1.1. Analytic vs. synthetic negation.....	4
3.1.1.1. Analytic negation.....	4
3.1.1.2. Synthetic negation.....	4
3.1.2. Verbal vs. non-verbal negation.....	5
3.1.2.1. Verbal negation.....	5
3.1.2.2. Non-verbal negation.....	6
3.2. The division according to the interpretation of negation.....	7
3.2.1. Ordinary vs. Metalinguistic negation.....	7
3.2.2. Clausal vs. subclausal negation.....	7
3.2.2.1. Subclausal negation.....	8
3.2.2.2. Clausal negation.....	11
4. The approximate negators.....	14
5. Corpus-based analysis.....	17
5.1. Hardly.....	18
5.2. Scarcely.....	20
5.3. Barely.....	22
5.4. Seldom.....	24
6. Conclusion.....	26
Bibliography.....	
Appendices.....	
Abbreviations.....	
Tables.....	
Annotation.....	
Résumé.....	

Abstract

This work deals with the expressions negative in meaning but with no morphological indication of negation, namely *hardly*, *barely*, *scarcely* and *seldom*. The first part of this thesis is focused on the differences between English and Czech types of negation and general overview of the English negation classification. This part also briefly comments on the features of approximate negators. The practical part then focuses on the analysis based on 40 examples of each approximate negator. The aim of the analysis is to examine the elements which these negators modify and also to analyze their translation counterparts.

Introduction

The thesis deals with the words negative in meaning but not in form, namely the adverbs *hardly*, *scarcely*, *barely* and *seldom*. Its intention is to classify these expressions into the negation system, examine their position in the original sentence and identify their appropriate translation equivalents.

As the thesis is mainly focused on the Czech translation counterparts, the theoretical part begins with the commentary about the major distinctions between Czech and English negation. In order to examine this type of negation and its translation accurately, it is essential to classify it into the system of negation. This is also the task of the theoretical part. Since there are several different approaches to this topic, more of them will be introduced and compared as well as the different terminology. The approximate negators *hardly*, *scarcely*, *barely* and *seldom* will be also introduced in the connection to the type of the negation they belong to.

The practical part is then based on the analysis of 40 examples of each approximate negator selected from the parallel corpus InterCorp. The examples of approximate negators will be analysed according to the element they modify and their position in the sentence. Secondly, their translation equivalents will be also examined in order to determine their most suitable counterparts.

In the conclusion the main points from the theoretical part together with the findings from the second part will be summarised and the most suitable translation equivalents will be pointed out. The appendix then provide the complete list of all tables giving information about the type of modification and the Czech translation equivalents extracted from the texts.

1. Distinctions between Czech and English negation

In terms of the function of negation as stated by Dušková (1994, p.336) there are no significant differences between English and Czech language. The only distinction is the function of negative closed questions. Concerning the real closed question, a user of the Czech language can, according to Grepl (1989, p.461), optionally choose between the positive [a] or negative question [b].

- a. *Kouříš? / Máš hlad?*
- b. *Nekouříš? / Nemáš hlad?*

(Grepl, 1989, p.461)

As an evidence of the neutralization of negative questions Grepl (1989, p.461) presents the fact that there is no negative concord. For comparison:

- a. *Slyšel/ neslyšel jsi o tom něco?* (closed question)
- b. *Neslyšel jsem o tom nic.* (negative sentence)

(Grepl, 1989, p.461)

On the other hand, in English (Dušková, 1994, p.314) the speaker should use only the positive form of closed question [b]. Dušková (1994, p.314) also adds, that the use of a negative closed question is also possible in English but it often carries the feature of surprise or annoyance [c].

- a. *Máš/ Nemáš známku?*
- b. *Have you got a stamp?*
- c. *Don't disturb him! Can't you see he is busy?*

(Dušková, 1994, p.314)

Greater differences (Dušková, 1994, p.337), however, occur when considering the expression of negation. The major and the most significant distinction is in the structure of the negative sentence. Furthermore, both languages also differ in the number of means expressing the negative.

The structure of the negative sentence

As shown by Daneš et al. (1987, p.264) the total negation in Czech, in addition to the negative predicate, is also expressed by the negative form of expressions with universal meaning [a]. This phenomenon is called negative concord.

- a. *Každý/ někdo → nikdo*

(Daneš et al., 1987, p.264)

Dušková (1994, p.337) provides a comparison with English where the only one negation (unique negation) is possible. The use of negation in this case therefore follows the rule that a negative verb must be followed by non-assertive items as: *anything, anybody, anywhere, any longer, etc.* (Quirk et al., 1985, p.782). On the other hand, a sentence with negative quantifier must have a positive verb (Dušková, 1994, p.337). According to Quirk et al. (1985, p.782) negative quantifiers are: *nothing, nobody, nowhere, no longer, etc.*

This rule implies the possibility to express this type of negative sentences in two ways (Dušková, 1994, p.339). Apart from the sentence with a positive verb and a negative quantifier [a] there is also sentence with a negative verb and a positive quantifier [b] carrying the similar meaning.

- a. We found no mistakes.
- b. We didn't find any mistakes.

Huddleston and Pullum (2005, p.153)

It is also mentioned by Dušková (1994, p.339) that in some cases one or the other possibility is preferred. The main factor affecting this choice is the tendency to express the negation as close to the beginning of the sentence as possible. The purpose of this tendency is to make the whole utterance clear and also prevent misunderstanding [b].

- a. He could prevent the accident under no circumstances.
- b. He couldn't prevent the accident under any circumstances.

(Dušková, 1994, p.341)

The number of means expressing the negative

As Grepl and Karlík (1998, p.187) put it, to deny the meaning in Czech the particle *ne* is used. To express the clausal negation *ne* is connected with a verb whereas in subclausal negation a particle is placed before the negated element. Moreover, *ne* could be also used to form lexical negation *hezký* → *nehezký*. Dušková (1994, p. 337) also mentions the case when *ne* functions as an independent sentence (as an answer to closed question). English, in comparison to Czech, has two negatives: *no* and *not*, each having different functions. *No* is used as an answer to a closed question [a] or it could function as a determinator (*žádný*) [b].

- a. Have you been waiting long? No, I've only just arrived. (Dušková, 1994, p.337)
- b. They have no sympathy for him. (Biber, 2002, p.244)

The negative *not* then negates either a verb or a different sentence element. The number of negative quantifiers also varies in both languages. In English there are two extra expressions: *neither* and *none*.

- a. Surprisingly, he did not complain.
- b. Not surprisingly, he complained.

Huddleston and Pullum (2005, p. 151)

Types of negation

The differences in the function and expression of the negation in both languages probably also resulted in different classification of negation types. For comparison, both systems will be introduced.

2. The types of negation in Czech

Unlike English, the Czech system of negation is united and views on this issue do not significantly differ. Grepl (1998, p.168), F. Daneš et al. (1987, p.264) and Grepl and Karlík (1989, p.187) distinguish between the grammatical (mluvnický) and the lexical (lexikální) negation. In Czech, the lexical negation is formed by nouns, adjectives and adverbs in combination with the negative prefix *ne-* (*nepřítel*, *nezdravě*) or with the foreign prefixes (*a-sociální*, *anti-stresový*). As stated by Grepl (1998, p.168), the lexical negation could be also expressed by antonyms (*škaredé X hezké*). The Grammatical negation is further divided by Grepl (1998, p.168) into clausal (větný) and subclausal (členský). The Clausal negation is implemented by addition of the negative prefix *ne-* to the verb.

- a. *Ten dopis jsme nedostali.*
- b. *Sestra není doma.*

(Grepl, 1998, p.168)

The Subclausal negation differs in that the negative *ne* or the archaic *nikoliv* is situated in front of the non-verbal expressions.

- a. *Stalo se to ne mou vinou.*
- b. *Má připomínka se týká nikoliv tebe.*

(Grepl, 1998, p. 168)

F. Daneš et al. (1987, p.264) and Grepl et al. (1989, p.188) further state the division according to the scope of negation. Total (totální) negation [*a*] negates the whole sentence and is characterized by clausal negation and the negative concord, while the partial (částečná) negation [*b*] has only limited scope of negation.

1. *Nikdy jsem o to neslyšel.*
2. *Tady to nerozřešíme.*

(Grepl and Karlík, 1989, p.188)

3. The types of negation in English

The division of the negation in English is relatively complicated and each author classifies it differently. Nevertheless, after studying some approaches to the negation classification it seems that the different ways of forming negation cannot be exactly organized by groups. Consequently, this thesis will be principally based on the Huddleston and Pullum's (2002, p.787) overview of the negation types as it is established on the main contrasts depending on two major criteria. The first one is the meaning of the negation while the second one is the matter of form. Other approaches will be also discussed and compared to this overview.

3.1. The division according to the form of negation

3.1.1. Analytic vs. synthetic negation

This division introduced by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p. 788) is based on the number of functions of the negative expression. In case of analytic negation the only function of the word is to mark negation. Whereas the synthetic negation is expressed by word with several function.

3.1.1.1. Analytic negation

The expressions that mark the negation analytically are negative particles *no* and *not*. As stated by Dušková (1994, p.337) *no* functions as a sentence in negative response to a closed question as in example [a]. On the other hand, the particle *not* negates the verb or other sentence elements [b].

- a. *Have you been waiting long? No, I've only just arrived.*
- b. *Not at the moment.*

(Dušková, 1994, p.337)

3.1.1.2. Synthetic negation

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p. 788) further divide the synthetic negation into verbal and non-verbal. The synthetic verbal negation is marked inflectionally: *aren't*, *don't* etc. whereas non-verbal negation is marked by several elements listed below:

- a. Absolute negators: compounds with *no* like *nobody*, *nothing*, etc., *none*, *neither*, *nor*, *never*
- b. Approximate negators: *few*, *little*, *barely*, *hardly*, *scarcely*, *rarely*, *seldom*
- c. Affixal negators: *un-*, *in-*, *-less*, etc.

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p. 788)

3.1.2. Verbal vs. non-verbal negation

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p. 788) present another contrast based on the form of negation which deals with the element that carries negation. The negative could be associated with the verb, then it is referred as the verbal negation. In the non-verbal negation the negative is associated with a dependent of the verb which could be either an adjunct or object.

- a. *I did not see anything at all.* (Verbal neg.)
- b. *I saw nothing at all* (Non-verbal neg.)

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p. 787)

In the majority of negation classification (Quirk et al. 1985, p.776), (Huddleston and Pullum, 2005, p.151) and Biber (2002, p.239) verbal and non-verbal negations are considered to be the types of clausal negation. Although, it is not entirely suitable since as mentioned by Dušková (1944, p. 339) the subclausal negation could be also expressed by verbal negation [a]. Veselovská (2009, p.54) also states that in the subclausal negation the negated element could be also verb. However, to express clausal negation we must negate the predicate.

- a. *I didn't come to be insulted. (I came, but not to be insulted)*

(Dušková, 1994, p.339)

3.1.2.1. Verbal negation

Within this type, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p. 788) further distinguish three categories according to the different syntax in each category.

A. Primary verbal negation

This kind of negation occurs in sentences with the primary form of an auxiliary or a lexical verb. In this case, the positive sentence could be negated by negative particle *not* either situated after the verb forming analytic primary negation [a] or by inflecting the verb in the negative and thus forming synthetic primary negation [b]. Provided that the clause with a lexical verb is negated it is necessary to add a semantically empty auxiliary *do* before the particle *not* [c].

- a. *Kim will not be here later on.*
- b. *Kim won't be here later on.*
- c. *Kim did not wave to us. / Kim didn't wave to us.*

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p.799)

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p.801) also point out that even though the primary negation is generally clausal, the subclausal cases are also possible. This could be illustrated in the sentence: *He often isn't there when you call him.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p.801) The negated verb falls within the scope of preceding adjunct and therefore not the whole sentence but only the verb phrase is negated.

B. Imperative negation

Verbal negation in the imperative clauses differs considerably from the other two types. Firstly, the auxiliary *do* is required in all cases, even when another auxiliary is already present: *Don't be afraid.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p.802) Secondly, if there is a subject in the imperative sentence, it usually follows the auxiliary *don't*: *Don't you look at me!* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p.802)

C. Secondary verbal negation

Other negative clauses with the secondary verb-form, except imperatives, form the last group. Unlike the previous two types, the secondary verbal negation never consists of the auxiliary verb *do*. Furthermore, the negation is always analytic and formed by placing *not* as a premodifier of the verb phrase: *His not accepting it was a shock.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p.803) The secondary verbal negation is often located in the subordinate clauses, however, it could be also part of the main clauses with an exclamatory or optative meaning: *My only son not getting into Harvard!* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p.803)

3.1.2.2. Non-verbal negation

The kind of negation which is not associated with the verb is called non-verbal and could be formed by several means. Firstly, it could be marked analytically by particle *not*. Secondly, the non-verbal negation could be also expressed synthetically by absolute or approximate negators. Finally, the affixal negation could be also considered as non-verbal. These types of negation will be further discussed in the following paragraph about clausal and subclausal negation.

3.2. The division according to the interpretation of negation

3.2.1. Ordinary vs. Metalinguistic negation

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p. 790) illustrate this distinction by examples:

- a. *She didn't have lunch with my old man: he couldn't make it.*
- b. *She didn't have lunch with "your old man": she had lunch with your father.*
(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p. 788)

In the example [a.] the negation is used to indicate that the sentence *she had lunch with my old man* is not true because *he couldn't make it*. In this case the negation is ordinary. Negation in example [b.], however, does not deny the veracity of the statement but it express the disapproval of the word used. Therefore, the negation in the sentence [b.] means that we are objecting to the referring to father as "*old man*". This usage of negation is called metalinguistic.

3.2.2. Clausal vs. subclausal negation

The division between clausal and subclausal negation also deals with the meaning of the clause. Unlike the previous distinction, these two types of negation are mentioned in most negation classifications, even though, the different terms are used. Except the terms clausal and subclausal mentioned by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p.812 and 2005, p.150) the terms větný and členský are used by Dušková (1994, p.339) which corresponds with the Czech division of the negation. Quirk et al. (1985, p.775) use the terms clause and local negation whereas clausal and partial are preferred by Veselovská (2009, p.54). Greenbaum et al. (1972, p.382) mention both local and phrasal negation but they distinguish between them. According to their classification, local negation is explained as negation of a clause condensed into a phrase and therefore not the whole sentence is negative [a]. Phrasal negation, on the other hand, is grammatically restricted to a single phrase, but semantically applies to a whole clause [b].

- a. *Nothing agrees with me more than oysters.*
- b. *Not a word came from his lips.*
(Greenbaum et al., 1972, p.382)

3.2.2.1. Subclausal negation

In cases where the negative elements do not make the whole sentence negative, the negation is subclausal. This could be explained on the following example: *She is not an unattractive woman.* (Quirk et al., 1985, p.791) In this sentence the particle *not* negates the word *unattractive* but not the whole sentence. Veselovská (2009, p.54) also refers to this type as “the first stage of grammaticalization of negation”. The subclausal negation is implemented by using the grammatical morphemes to negate either a word or a phrase.

A. Affixal negation

The most characteristic case where the negative elements do not negate the sentence as a whole is the affixal negation. According to Lotko (1973, p.7), this is the negation of the word meaning through a negative affix which becomes part of the word. Lotko (1973, p.7) and Veselovská (2009, p.54) prefer the term lexical negation.

In this type, as stated by Dušková (1994, p.339), the negation is component of the lexical meaning. It means that the affixal negation does not affect the meaning and the form of the sentence or the phrase since the negative prefixes and suffixes are only part of the semantic structure of the words. This is also the reason why Dušková considers this type of negation as the separate type rather than a component of the subclausal negation. The lexical character of negative affixes is evident in the cases where words with the negative affixes have corresponding synonyms with a positive meaning.

a. unpretentious = *modest*

b. fruitless = *futile*

(Dušková, 1994, p.339)

Dušková (1994, p.339) claims that the principle of the affixal negation is identical in both languages, although, there are not any negative suffixes in Czech. According to Quirk et al. (1985, p.1540) the negative affixes in English are:

A- (be opposite of, absence of noun) combines with adjectives and nouns: *asymmetric, arrhythmia*

Anti- (meaning "against" or "opposite of"): *antiwar, antiskid, antibody*

De- (perform the opposite, dispose of, get out of something) combines with nouns and verbs: *decompose, defrost, detrain*

Dis- (perform the opposite, absence of noun, the opposite of, dispose of) combines with adjectives, nouns and verbs: *disappear, disbelief, disagreeable, discourage*

In-/il-/im-/ir- (the opposite of quality) combines with adjectives and nouns: *inanimate, illegible, impartial, imbalance*

Mis- (meaning "badly" or "wrong"): *misinform, misconduct*

Non- (the opposite of) combines with adjectives and nouns: *non-restrictive, nonattendance*

Un- (contradictory, remove something) combines with adjectives, nouns and verbs: *unavoidable, untruth, unfasten*

-free (mean "without" or "not containing"): *sugarfree*

-less (absence of noun, not possible to), changes a noun into an adjective: *fearless, countless*

(Peprník, 1992, p.9)

Dušková (1994, p.338) also notes that the sentences with the affixal negation have sometimes almost the same meaning as those with the grammatical negation.

- a. *This name is uncommon.*
- b. *This name is not common.*

(Dušková, 1994, p.338)

Even though, this similarity changes when the negation is intensified.

- a. *This name is very uncommon.*
- b. *This name is not very common.*

(Dušková, 1994, p.338)

In the most cases, as stated by Huddleston et al. (2005, p.151), there is, however, the semantic difference between the word with a negative affix and the word with the positive meaning combined with the negative predication. If [b] is false, it must be true that *He was kind*. But if [a] is not true, it does not mean that *He was kind*, as he could be neither kind nor unkind.

- a. *He was unkind.*
- b. *He wasn't kind.*

(Huddleston et al., 2005, p.151)

According to Dušková (1994, p.345), the affixal negation could be combined with the grammatical negation. In this case, both negations are cancelled and the sentence has a similar meaning as the positive sentence, although, it is rather limited. Quirk et al. (1985, p.791) additionally mention that "*such phrases are devices of understatement*". The sentence [a] could be therefore paraphrased as [b].

- a. *She is not an entirely unintelligent woman.*
- b. *She is a fairly intelligent woman.*

(Quirk et al., 1985, p.791)

B. *Not/no* in subclausal negation

Whereas the negative affixes negate a word, the particle *not* negates the whole phrase. As stated by Veselovská (2009, p.54) *not* could also negate the verb phrase without negating the whole clause. This could be illustrated on the example [a] as the meaning of the sentence is: *I cook, but not every day* (1994, p.339). To make the whole sentence negative, the negation of the sentence modality (the Predicate) is required as in the example [b].

- a. *I don't cook every day.*
- b. *His arguments didn't convince me.*

(Dušková, 1994, p.339)

Quirk et al. (1985, p.790) mention several words or phrases which could be modified by *not* in the local negation. Some of them will be introduced:

- Adverbial expressions: *They live not far from us*
- The quantifiers *a few, a little* and *little*: *They have not a few eccentrics in their family.*
- The comparatives *more, less* and *fewer*: *They'll pay you not less than ten dollars.*
- Prepositional phrases *It was a decision of no consequence.*

(Quirk et al., 1985, p.790)

Nevertheless, as mentioned by Dušková (1994, p.339), there is not a sharp line between the subclausal and the clausal negation.

- a. *He doesn't lack courage.* (clausal negation)
- b. *He doesn't lack courage but physical fitness.* (subclausal negation)

(Dušková, 1994, p.339)

Provided that the sentence contains an expression that could be negated, except a predicative verb, the ambiguity between clausal and subclausal negation can also occur. This case is illustrated in the example: *They argued about nothing.* (Quirk et al., 1985, p.794) This sentence could have two meanings. If the sentence indicates the meaning [a] it contains the clausal negation, whereas in the sentence with [b] meaning the negation is subclausal.

- a. *They didn't argue about anything.*
- b. *They argued, but the argument was about nothing.*

(Quirk et al., 1985, p.794)

It should be also mentioned that in Czech (Dušková, 1994, p.339), the negative particle *ne*, located at other sentence element than a verb, forms always the subclausal negation. In English, however, the particle *not* could express the clausal negation even without a connection to the verb. *Not a single star could be seen.* On the other hand, the verbal negation could also express the subclausal negation. *I didn't come to be insulted.* (Dušková, 1994, p.339)

3.2.2.2. Clausal negation

Through the clausal negation the whole proposition is negated, it means that the sentence is syntactically treated as negative. According to Veselovská (2009, p.55) there are two means of expressing clausal negation in English. Firstly, it is done by adding the particle *not* to a modal or auxiliary verb. Secondly, it could be expressed by a negative polarity item with the negative scope over the predicate (*nobody, nothing, etc.*). Biber (2002, p.239) provides the similar division to not-negation and no-negation. Quirk et al. (1985, p.776) and Huddleston and Pullum (2005, p. 152) differentiate within the clausal negation between the verbal and non-verbal negation.

- a. *She does not live here anymore.* (clausal verbal negation)
- b. *She no longer lives here.* (clausal non-verbal negation)

Huddleston and Pullum (2005, p. 152)

A. Clausal negation through verb negation

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2005, p. 152) the verbal negation mainly differ from the non-verbal in that it requires the presence of an auxiliary or modal verb. If there is only a lexical verb in the sentence, except *be* and *have*, as in the example [a] the insertion of the dummy auxiliary *do* is necessary. The negation is then marked by the negative contraction [b] or by modification of the verb by separate negator *not* [c].

- a. *She works hard.*
- b. *She doesn't work hard.*
- c. *She does not work hard.*

(Quirk et al., 1985, p.776)

In some cases (Huddleston and Pullum , 2005, p. 153) however, marking negation by *not* is the only option as seen in the subjunctive clauses [a].

- a. *It is vital that we not be disturbed.*

Huddleston and Pullum (2005, p. 153)

Quirk et al. (1985, p.776) further state that the negator *not* is inserted between the operator and the predication. *I have not finished. He may not be working.* The term operator refers to the first auxiliary verb of a complex verb phrase or either *be* or stative *have* in a simple verb phrase.

Regarding contracted forms of the negators and auxiliaries Quirk et al. (1985, p.776) claim that the uncontracted form is required when the negator is emphasised: *I did not say that.* In other cases the option is rather the matter of style. While in formal English the full form *not* occur, in common language the enclitic contracted form *n't* is preferred. According to Biber's

et al. research (2002, p.239) the occurrence of contracted forms is about 100 per cent in conversation but only about five per cent in academic writing. Quirk et al. also describe the two possibilities for contraction: the negator contraction [*a*] and the auxiliary contraction [*b*].

- a. Jane isn't responsible.*
- b. Jane's not responsible.*

(Quirk et al., 1985, p.776)

B. Clausal negation other than through verb negation

As Huddleston and Pullum (2005, p. 153) put it, the clausal negation could be also expressed without a connection to verb either by *not* modifying different sentence element than verb or by various negative words that can mark the clausal negation. These words are divided by majority of grammarians into the absolute and approximate negators.

Not as marker of non-verbal clausal negation

In the previous paragraph the particle *not* in the subclausal negation was discussed. Nevertheless, in some cases *not* in non-verbal negation could even express the clausal negation. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p.807) present these examples:

- a. *Not* combined with the quantifier (all, every, many, much, often).
Not often do we see her lose her cool like that.
- b. *Not* plus expressions *one* or *a single*.
They had found not a single mistake.
- c. *Not* combined with the focusing adverbs *even* and *only*. Even though, *not only* express clausal negation only if it functions as a clause adjunct.
Not only was the acting appalling, the movie was far too long.
- d. *Not* can also modify some prepositional phrases but not in all cases express clausal negation.
Not at any stage of the proceedings did she contemplate giving up. (clausal negation)
Not for the first time, she felt utterly betrayed. (subclausal negation)

The absolute negators

Many authors including Huddleston and Pullum (2005, p.153) further present two groups of items that can also mark the non-verbal clausal negation. One of these groups is referred by Huddleston and Pullum as the absolute negators. Quirk et al. (1985, p.778) describe these expressions as the words negative in form and meaning, whereas Dušková (1994, p.339) considers them as the special type of the clausal negation called the general negative quantifiers. Furthermore, Veselovská (2009, p.55) refers to this group as the negative polarity items with a scope over the predicate and Biber et al. (2002, p.239) use a term no-negation as an opposite to not-negation.

Dušková (1994, p.337) names these items together with their Czech counterparts: *no* (*žádný*), *nobody* (*nikdo*), *no one* (*nikdo*), *nothing* (*nic*), *nowhere* (*nikde/ nikam*) and *never* (*nikdy*). Huddleston and Pullum (2005, p.153) add to this list *none*, *neither* and *nor*.

Dušková (1994, p.339) also compares the function of these expressions in English and Czech sentences and finds no significant difference. In both languages the absolute negators negate the whole sentence and apply to all cases without exception.

As was already mentioned in the first chapter, sentences with the absolute negators usually have equivalent sentences with the verbal negation. Biber et al. (2002, p.244) point out the cases with slight difference of meaning. While the example [a] simply states the fact, the example [b] is an opinion about her capabilities.

- a. *She's not a teacher.*
- b. *She's no teacher.*

(Biber et al., 2002, p.244)

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p.813) also present cases in which no corresponding verbal negation exist. This occur for instance in sentences with a negated subject in the clause-initial position [a]. The verbal equivalent also may not be possible in sentences with *no* as a part of the predicative complement [b].

- a. *Nobody knew where Kim was. (X Anybody didn't know where Kim was.)*
- b. *I'm no angel. (X I'm not any angel.)*

(Huddleston and Pullum , 2002, p.813)

According to Biber et al. (2002, p.239) *no* and *not* are the main means of negation in English. Regarding their occurrence, however, the absolute negators are much less common than the negation by *not*, especially in conversation.

The approximate negators

The third type of non-verbal clausal negation are the approximate negators. They will be discussed in the following separate paragraph.

4. The approximate negators

Another group of items that can affect the non-verbal clausal negation are referred by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p.815) as the approximate negators. Quirk et al. (1985, p.780) and Dušková (1994, p.347) define them as adverbs and determiners negative in meaning but not in form. Veselovská (2009, p.61) then considers these expressions constituting the partial clausal negation in compared to the adverb *never* which creates the full clausal negation. Furthermore, Hidalgo (2000, p.43) names these expressions semi negative words and notes that even though they have negative meaning they do not have the morphologic indication of negatives.

Despite these differences in terminology, the majority of authors agree on the number of these items. For example Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p.815) present determinatives *few*, *little* and adverbs *rarely*, *seldom*, *barely*, *hardly* and *scarcely*. Dušková (1994, p.347) also incorporates *only* to this list.

Collins et al. (1990, p.214) using the term broad negatives, identify them as words making a statement almost totally negative. It means (Huddleston and Pullum, 2005, p.154) that in comparison to the absolute negators they do not indicate “absolute zero”. As it could be seen in the example: *Few of them realised it was a hoax.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2005, p.154) *Few* express the number close to zero but the absolute zero is indicated by *none*.

Dušková (1994, p.347) further states that the negative polarity of these words could be manifested with the help of formal signals. One of these signals (Quirk et al., 1985, p.777) are positive question tags following the sentence [a]. As negative clauses, they are also followed by non-assertive items [b].

- a. *He rarely forgets anything, does he?*
- b. *She eats hardly anything.*

(Dušková, 1994, p.347)

Collins et al. (1990, p.215) deal with the position of a approximate negators within a clause and consider it to be similar to that of the absolute negator *never*. They also set the rules for their placement with the respect to the verb. In case where the approximate negator occurs in the sentence with group of words containing **auxiliary verb**, it should be placed in front of the main verb. *His eyes had hardly closed.* (Collins et al., 1990, p.215) If the simple verb is the form of **be**, the approximate negator usually comes after the verb. *The lagoons are rarely deep. The results were scarcely encouraging.* (Collins et al., 1990, p.215). Whereas if the simple verb is **different than be**, the approximate negator usually stands in front of the verb. *She hardly spoke a word all evening. He rarely goes to church nowadays.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2005, p.154)

In some cases (Quirk et al., 1985, p.781) the approximate negators could be also placed at the beginning of the sentence causing subject-operator inversion. *Little did I suspect him of perfidy.* (Dušková, 1994, p.347)

A. Determinatives

Few and *little* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p.816) function in noun phrase as determiners : *Few people liked it* or as fused determiner-head: *Few of them liked it*. Moreover, *little* (Dušková, 1994, p.347) could also negate the predication: *Young people little imagine the infirmities of old age* or (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p.816) modify comparatives: *He felt little better*. The difference between them is that *few* is used with countable nouns whereas *little* with non-count singulars. It should be also noted that (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p.816) *a few* and *a little* are positive: *A few of them realised it was a hoax, didn't they?*

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2005, p.154)

B. Adverbs

This group is further divided by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p.816) into adverbs of frequency: *rarely*, *seldom* and adverbs of degree: *barely*, *hardly*, *scarcely*. These adverbs could modify several expressions:

- a. Verb: *She hardly moved.*
- b. Adjective: *He was barely intelligible.*
- c. Some determinatives: *There was scarcely any food left.*

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, p.816)

Quirk et al. (1985, p.781) also admit that *only* is to some extent negative. As modifying subject noun phrase, it is followed by non-assertive items: *Only two of us had any experience in sailing.* It is also noticed that *rarely*, if placed initially, may be positive. *Rarely, crime pays well.* = on rare occasion. According to Dušková (1994, p.347) *hardly*, *scarcely* and *barely* are in sentence combined with positive verb but *rarely*, *seldom* and *only* could be combined even with negated verb: *Unfortunately this doesn't happen rarely.*

Some of these expressions (Collins et al., 1990, p.214) could be also further modified as for example *rarely* and *seldom* by putting *so*, *very*, *too*, or *pretty* in front of them [a]. In addition *rarely* is also modified by *only* [b].

- a. *Women were very seldom convicted.*
- b. *Most people go to church only rarely.*

(Collins et al., 1990, p.214)

In Czech (Grepl and Karlík, 1998, p.172), these expressions could bring the content of the sentence either to the negative but also to the positive polarity. Therefore, the approximate negators could be contained in both positive [a] and negative sentences [b].

- a. *Málem jsem ten vlak stihl.*
- b. *Málem jsem ten vlak nestihl.*

(Grepl and Karlík, 1998, p.172)

5. Corpus-based analysis

The aim of this analysis is to examine the approximate negators *barely*, *hardly* and *scarcely* functioning as the adverbs of degree and *seldom*, which function as the adverb of frequency, in terms of the clausal negation. The attention will be first given to the various elements that could be modified by these approximate negators as well as to the position of these negators in a sentence. Secondly, the way of the translation of these expressions and their Czech counterparts will be also examined.

This research is based on 40 examples of each approximate negator. These examples were extracted from the parallel corpus InterCorp allowing the search for data in the original text as well as in the corresponding Czech translation. In order to obtain the sufficient and relevant amount of examples the selection was first narrowed to English texts with the corresponding Czech counterparts. Due to the fact that this analysis considers only examples of British English, the books written by British authors were then selected. Finally 12 sources were chosen for this analysis: *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*, *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* and *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire* by J. K. Rowling, *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen, *Wyrd Sisters* by Terry Pratchett, *1984* by George Orwell, *The War of the Worlds* by Herbert George Wells, *The Divide* by Nicholas Evans, *Saturday* by Ian McEwan, *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring*, *The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers*, *The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King* by John Ronald Reuel Tolkien. All sources are listed in the appendices with their abbreviations as they are referred in the following text.

The examples for the analysis were then selected at random from these texts using the KonText interface. The first 40 examples were then extracted and used for analysis purposes. The following part is divided according to individual approximate negators. The first part of each subchapter focuses on the position of each negator and the type of its modification. The second part is then devoted to their translation counterparts.

5.1. Hardly

Regarding the type of the modification in the original text, *hardly* mostly functioned as the modifier of the verb. Overall, it was in 32 instances. In this function, *hardly* is situated in front of a lexical verb [a]. In the case when a lexical verb is preceded by an auxiliary verb [b], *hardly* is then inserted between the auxiliary and lexical verb. According to the analysis, the combination with the auxiliary verb is less common. It was also found that *hardly* did not appear with the negative predication in any sentence which proves its negative character.

- a. *He **hardly** knew why he had ever rebelled.* (GO)
- b. *I could **hardly** keep my countenance.* (PaP)

Furthermore, there were three occurrences where the adverb *ever* was inserted between the *hardly* and a lexical verb, serving as the intensifier (See Chapter 4). The intensification, however, is not reflected in the Czech translation.

- a. *It **hardly ever** works if they don't know you've done it.* (WS)
Stejně to většinou nefunguje, když o tom ti lumpové nevědí.

The second most common function of *hardly* (See Table 1) is the modifier of a noun phrase [a]. In two of these sentences *hardly* modifies the pronoun *any* [b]. Since the expressions with *any* are considered non-assertive (See Chapter 4), the combination with them is another evidence of the negative character of *hardly*.

- a. *And with good reason, for **hardly a week** passed in which the Times did not carry a paragraph...* (GO)
- b. *I couldn't understand **hardly any** of it.* (WS)

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p.816), *hardly* could also modify adjectives. It was found, however, that this type of modification is not common as only two examples were found.

- a. *The orders already issuing from the telescreen, (...), were **hardly necessary**.* (GO)

As shown by the findings, *hardly* could also function as a modifier of a prepositional phrase.

- a. *(...) she could not think without anger, **hardly without contempt**, on that easiness of temper, (...)* (PaP)

In terms of the position in the sentence, there was only one case of *hardly* occurring at the beginning of the sentence. However, in this case it did not cause the subject-verb inversion as the verb was omitted from the sentence.

- a. ***Hardly** ever home o'nights.* (WS)
Občas se nevracel domů ani na noc.

It was assumed that the approximate negators could be translated into Czech by both positive and negative sentence. Nevertheless, the analysis showed that sentences with *hardly* are rather translated into negative sentences (See Table 5).

Regarding the Czech equivalents *hardly* was mostly translated as its corresponding adverbial counterparts (27 instances). The second most frequent way of its translating was verbal negation [a] (See Table 5). In the rest of the cases *hardly* was translated using a positive sentence [b].

- a. *She **hardly** knew how to suppose that she could be an object of admiration (...)* (PaP)
Nedovedla si představit, že by se mu mohla zalíbit (...)
- b. *I could **hardly** keep my countenance.* (PaP)
Musela jsem vyvinout velké úsilí, abych zachovala vážnou tvář.

The analysis of the corresponding adverbial counterparts of *hardly* showed that in most sentences the expressions *sotva* and *skoro* (See Table 5) were used. It was also found that the Czech adverbial counterparts vary depending on whether they are part of positive or negative sentence. Therefore, the adverbial equivalents will be further examined according to the polarity of the clause.

As regards the positive clauses, the adverb *sotva* [a] occurred as the translation of *hardly* the most. Except this version, the expressions like *málo*, *téměř*, *než*, *málokdy* also occurred, however, not so frequently. By results *skoro*, the second most common equivalent of *hardly*, did not appear in any of the positive clauses. On the contrary, the adverb *sotva* was not found in any negative clause. Consequently, it could be stated that adverb *sotva* is suitable translation of *hardly* for positive clause, whereas for the negative clause the equivalent *skoro* should be used.

- a. *He **hardly** thought of Julia.* (GO)
*Na Julii **sotva** pomyslel.*

As was already stated, the adverb *skoro* [b] is the most frequent translation of *hardly* concerning the negative clause (See Table 5). Other possible corresponding expressions according to the analysis could be: *ani*, *asi*, *málem*, *občas*, *většinou* or *z větší části*.

- b. *Oh, we **hardly** ever guard it these days.* (WS)
*No tak ta je skoro pořád otevřená a **skoro** nikdo ji nehlídá.*

5.2. Scarcely

In accordance with the analysis results, the range of expressions that could be modified by *scarcely* is more diverse. The results again proved that the adverb *scarcely* most often modifies the verb (See Table 2). The position of the adverb *scarcely* modifying a verb follows the same rules as in the case of *hardly*. Nevertheless, occurring mostly in sentences with auxiliary verbs (56%) *scarcely* rather appears after the auxiliary verb [a]. In all sentences containing *scarcely* the predication remained positive which proves that the adverb *scarcely* behaves as a negative.

- a. *The broadening of men's views that has resulted can scarcely be exaggerated. (WoW)*
- b. *I scarcely passed beyond the eaves of it, and I did not wish to turn back. (LoR2)*

In the case of *scarcely* there were two sentences where the adverb was followed by *ever* intensifying the negation. In both cases [a] and [b] *ever* is situated after *scarcely* modifying the verb. Nevertheless, the intensification by *ever* is not mentioned in the Czech translation.

- a. *(...) I had scarcely ever allowed myself to hope before. (PaP)*
*(...) již jsem se předtím **neodvážil** oddávat.*
- b. *(...) but was scarcely ever prevailed on to get out. (PaP)*
*(...) třebaže se **málokdy** dala přemluvit, aby šla dál.*

Similarly to *hardly*, the adverb *scarcely* also often occurs in the function of the noun phrase modifier. Overall, it was in seven sentences. Even in this case the negative character of *scarcely* was demonstrated while co-occurring with non-assertive items.

- c. *For Éomer was now **scarcely a mile** from the Harlond (...) (LoR3)*
- d. *(...), said **scarcely any** thing. (PaP)*

According to the analysis, *scarcely* also occurs as a modifier of another adverb (See Table 2). The most common case was *scarcely* modifying the adverb *less* and the others were *more* and *waist-deep*.

- a. *(...), we are **scarcely less** eager to meet her again. (PaP)*
- b. *(...) and the river was so low that I ran perhaps twenty feet **scarcely waist-deep**. (WoW)*

In terms of adjectives, there were only two examples modified by *scarcely*. It was once again proved that it is less common type of modification.

- a. *It is **scarcely wise** when bringing the news of the death of his heir to a mighty lord (...) (LoR3)*

There were also two instances of *scarcely* modifying the numeral found in the texts.

- b. *Now the main retreat was **scarcely two** furlongs distant. (LoR3)*
- c. *The fact that it is **scarcely one seventh** of the volume of the earth must have accelerated (...) (WoW)*

As with *hardly*, there was no example of subject-verb inversion found. Although, there was one case of *scarcely* positioned initially [a], modifying the noun phrase it does not cause the inversion.

- a. *Scarcely a syllable* was uttered that did not relate to the game (...) (PaP)

As was already stated above, sentences with *hardly* are mostly translated into negative sentences. On the other hand, sentences containing the approximate negator *scarcely* are likely to be translated as positive in Czech. According to the analysis, 28 of the sentences were translated by positive predication.

After the examination of the Czech translation counterparts, it was found that *scarcely* is mainly translated through corresponding expressions. Less frequently it could be also translated by verbal negation [a]. One instance of lexical negation as the possible translation was also found [b].

- a. *I stared about me, scarcely believing my eyes.* (WoW)
*Civěl jsem kolem, **nevěřil** jsem svému zraku.*
- b. (...), we are *scarcely less eager* to meet her again. (PaP)
*(...), i my se na ni těšíme stejně **nedočkavě**.*

Concerning the corresponding expressions, similarly to *hardly* the equivalent *sotva* was the most frequently reported (See Table 6). All of the examples of *scarcely* translated as *sotva* was found in clauses with positive predication [a]. Except *sotva* there were many other corresponding expressions [b] found with positive predication, however, none of them appeared more than twice.

- a. *Breakfast was scarcely over when* (...) (PaP)
***Sotva** se nasnídali, (...)*
- b. *těžko, snad, jen, stěží, zatěžko, etc.*

In negative sentences then *scarcely* was mostly translated through a negative verb or also very frequently by the combination with the expression *ani* [a]. Other corresponding equivalences appeared to be: (*není*) *moc, příliš (nepřeháněl), téměř, ne více než*.

- a. (...), but you *scarcely* listened. (LoR2)
*(...), ale ty jsi **ani neposlouchal**.*

To sum it up, the most appropriate translation of *scarcely* seemed to be the expression *sotva* in combination with the positive predication. In case of negative clause, *scarcely* corresponds to the negative verb or the combination of verbal negation and the word *ani*.

5.3. Barely

It was again shown that *barely*, as well as other approximate negators, most frequently function as a verb modifier. Regarding the occurrence of *barely*, it was in 28 instances. In addition, the occurrence with the auxiliary verb [a] was as frequent as the combination with just lexical verb [b]. Therefore, *barely* could occur following the auxiliary verb as well as preceding the lexical verb. No examples of *barely* in combination with negative verb were found.

- a. *The truth was that after years of gin-drinking he could **barely** taste it.* (GO)
- b. *In fact, she **barely** seemed to register what he said.* (TD)

Barely could be also used as the modifier of an adjective. The analysis revealed that in the case of *barely* it was in 7 instances. In all cases the adverb *barely* was immediately followed by the modified adjective. Generally, these phrases were translated in the same manner. However, there was one example when the translation of *barely* did not appear at all. The author's choice not to include it in the translation slightly changed the meaning of the sentence as it is not mentioned that the voice was almost unrecognizable.

- a. *Her voice sounded tight and throaty, **barely** recognizable.* (TD)
Měla upjatý, odměřený hlas.

Furthermore, *barely* appeared as the noun phrase modifier, standing before the modified noun. Together it was in four instances. The original structure and meaning have been preserved only in one translated sentence. Otherwise it was translated through verb [a] or adverb [b].

- a. (...) *there was **barely** space to move around them* (...) (HP2)
(...) *okolo už se nedalo dost dobře projít* (...)
- b. (...) *with **barely** a glance at the image intensifier* (...) (S)
(...) *pak jen zběžně pohlédl na zvětšený snímek* (...)

One sentence with *barely* as the adverb modifier also appeared in the analysis.

- a. *He dropped his voice until it was **barely** more than a whisper, (...)* (HP1)

The analysis of the corresponding translation was again performed with the respect to the sentence polarity. The sentences containing the adverb *barely* were mostly translated as positive, except 12 instances of corresponding examples with negative predication. According to Grepl and Karlík (1998, p.172) the Czech equivalents of *barely* could be therefore considered as adverbs shifting the content of the sentence rather to the negative polarity.

From the 12 examples of *barely* translation occurring in the negative sentence five of them were translated through the verbal negation. This way of translation, however, slightly changes the meaning of the sentence. The adverb *barely* in the example [a] does not indicate that they could not afford it but only approximate the meaning to this fact.

- a. *But with two small children and a full-time babysitter they could barely afford, (...)*
(TD)
Jenže se dvěma malými dětmi a paní na hlídání, kterou si nemohli dovolit, (...)

The rest of the sentences contained the negative verb modified by the Czech counterparts of *barely*: *skoro, ani, ještě ani* and *téměř*.

- b. *Since Charlie broke the news, she'd barely spoken a word. (TD)*
Od té chvíle téměř nepromluvila.

In the case of positive sentence counterparts *barely* was translated only through corresponding expressions of which the most frequent was *sotva* [a] (See Table 7), occasionally there were expressions such as *stěží, téměř* or *skoro*. Additionally, in four examples *barely* was not reflected at all [b], although it not significantly changed the meaning of the sentence.

- a. *You're barely alive. (HP1)*
Je z tebe troska, sotva že jsi naživu.
- b. *In fact, she barely seemed to register what he said. (TD)*
Myšlenkami byla jinde.

According to the analysis, the sentences with *barely* usually have positive sentence counterparts. Moreover, as the most suitable translation associated with the positive predication appeared to be the expression *sotva*. Provided that the sentence is translated as negative the most frequent equivalent is the particle *ani* modifying the negated verb.

5.4. Seldom

As was already proved by previous approximate negators, the expression *seldom* also most often function as the verb modifier. In this case it was in 36 instances. Modifying the verb phrases containing only lexical verb in most cases (See Table 4) *seldom* usually appeared preceding the lexical verb. Nevertheless, there were also cases where *seldom* was not placed according to the rules of Collins et al. (1990,p.215). It was for instance the sentence containing the intensifier *very* causing the position change of *seldom* [a]. In another example [b] *seldom* is even moved to the end of the main sentence. This was probably caused because of the link between *seldom* and the subordinate clause.

- a. (...) *Winston himself very seldom did swear, aloud, at any rate.* (GO)
- b. *Our paths cross theirs seldom, by chance or purpose.* (LoR1)

Although Dušková (1994, p.347) admitted that *seldom* could occur in the sentence with negated verb, there were no instances of this co-occurrence found.

The second recorded function of *seldom* in the sentence, although not very frequent, was an adjective modifier. *Seldom* appeared in this function three times, which is equally often as in previous examples. In all of these cases *seldom* immediately preceded the modified adjective. With regard to the translation, the adjective was maintained only in one example [a]. In other cases the adjective was replaced by a verb.

- a. *In Newspeak it was seldom possible to follow a heretical thought further (...)* (GO)
V newspeaku bylo zřídka možné rozvíjet kacířskou myšlenku dál (...)

According to the findings, there is also one sentence containing *seldom* as a modifier of the prepositional phrase [a]. This expression has been also maintained in the translation (*zřídka před jedenáctou*).

- a. *When he woke, seldom before eleven hundred, with gummed-up eyelids (...)* (GO)

After analysing the position of the *seldom* within the sentence, one example of this adverb occurring in the initial position was found [a]. As positioned initially and modifying the verb phrase it also caused subject-verb inversion. The initial position of the adverb also occurred in the translated sentence, nevertheless, the position of the verb remained the same (*Málokdy nás cizinec tak potěšil*).

- a. *Seldom have we had such delight in stranger(...)* (LoR1)

The analysis of the corresponding Czech translations showed that the sentences containing *seldom* are translated in the vast majority by positive sentences. Only one instance with corresponding negative sentence occurred [a]. This was also the only case when *seldom* was translated through the verb negation. This implies that the equivalent Czech adverbs rather cause a shift to the negative polarity.

- a. *The Shire had **seldom seen** so fair a summer, or so rich an autumn: (...)* (LoR1)
*Kraj **ne**pamatoval tak krásné léto a tak štědrý podzim: (...)*

As there was only one example of the sentence with a negative predication, only the examples occurring in positive sentences will be now discussed. The majority of the positive sentences were translated using the corresponding expressions. There were only two examples where *seldom* was expressed differently [a] and [b]. Even though the sentence [a] is translated differently, it still carries the same meaning. On the other hand, the expression *den co den* [b] implies the meaning of continuous action whereas *a day seldom passed* indicates *nearly every day*.

- a. *It has **seldom been heard** of that Gandalf the Grey sought for aid (...)* (LoR1)
To je div, že Gandalf Šedý hledá pomoc, (...)
- b. *(...) and though **a day seldom passed** in which Elizabeth did not account for it clearly, (...)* (PaP)
*(...) a třebaže jí to Elizabeth **den co den** znovu jasně vysvětlovala, (...)*

In terms of the Czech equivalents, the most frequently occurred translation of *seldom* was the expression *zřídka* [a] and the second common *málokdy* [b] (See Table 8). Less frequent translation equivalents were: *málokdo*, *zřídka* *kdys*, *sotvakdy* and *většinou jen*.

- a. *He **seldom** left it unguarded.* (LoR1)
Zřídka je nechával bez dozoru.
- b. *Though the Company was well clad, they **seldom** felt warm, either moving or at rest.* (LoR1)
*Ač byla Družina dobře oblečena, **málokdy** se zahřáli, ať při pohybu či při odpočinku.*

There was also one example of *seldom* being translated as *obvykle* with entirely opposite meaning [a]. Again, it is only the matter of translator's choice as he changed the formulation of the sentence in order to make it less complex. This variation, however, did not change the meaning of the sentence.

- a. *(...), she **seldom** went away without leaving them more dispirited than she found them.* (PaP)
*(...), opouštěla je **obvykle** ve stísněnější náladě než předtím.*

In conclusion, according to the findings it could be said that the most accurate translation of the adverb *seldom* is the expression *zřídka* in combination with positive predication.

6. Conclusion

The bachelor thesis is focused on the expressions negative in meaning but not in form called approximate negators. In the practical part the adverbs of degree *hardly*, *barely*, *scarcely* and also one adverb of frequency *seldom* were selected from the total number of the approximate negators for closer examination.

The theoretical part of the thesis is devoted to classification of the negation in respect to the approximate negators. It was shown, however, that these negators can not be classified into one type of negation but rather organized on the basis of the main contrasts. Based on the background information resources, it was stated that the approximate negators cause the clausal negation. This means that the whole sentence containing the approximate negator is treated as negative. It was also found that this type of negation is not associated with a verb and thus is referred as non-verbal negation. Furthermore, this group of words do not only mark negation but have some other function as well. Consequently, it is also referred as synthetic negation.

The practical part is then focused on analyzing these expressions contained in the texts. In order to perform the analysis the parallel corpus InterCorp, allowing the comparison of original texts and their translations, was used. To obtain a sufficient number of examples, 40 instances were selected from the corpus for each approximate negator. Since this analysis is focused on the British English, only the works by British authors were selected. The main objective of the analysis is to examine the approximate negators in terms of the expressions they modify and the way of their translation in Czech is also examined.

Concerning the approximate negators and the words they modify, it was expected that they will occur as the modifiers of the verbs, adjectives and determinatives. Nevertheless, the analysis showed that they could also function as the modifiers of several other expressions. The verb modifier, however, proved to be the most common function of the approximate negators. *Hardly* modified the verb in 80% of the examples, *scarcely* in 62.5%, *barely* in 70% and *seldom* in 90% of instances. Apart from adjectives, the approximate negators also modified the noun phrase or other adverb. The instances with these expressions modifying the numeral or prepositional phrase were found too, although rarely. It was also proved that the approximate negators could be further modified, though only the expression *ever* was recorded in this function.

In terms of the position of these words in the sentence, it has been proved that if the approximate negator modifies the lexical verb it stands before the verb. Whereas modifying the verb phrase consisting of auxiliary and lexical verbs, the approximate negator is inserted between them. In case when these negators modify different words than verb they usually stand before the modified expressions. There were also three instances when the approximate negators occurred in the initial position, nevertheless, it only caused the subject-verb inversion in one example.

The second aim of the theoretical part was to examine the way how these expressions are translated into Czech. As was stated in previous part, the approximate negators cause the clausal negation in English. The corresponding expressions in Czech, however, could be found in the negative as well as in the positive sentence. The analysis demonstrated that the sentences containing *hardly* are more likely to be translated as negative sentences in Czech (62.5%). Whereas the clauses with *scarcely*, *barely* and *seldom* are mostly translated into positive sentences. Instances with *scarcely* and *barely* were both translated with positive predication in 70% and *seldom* even in 97.5% of examples.

The most frequent way of their translation was the use of the corresponding adverb. The other possible way proved to be the translation through the verbal negation, positive sentence or less frequently by lexical negation. Concerning their corresponding counterparts, it was found that they vary according to the polarity of the sentence. In the case of *hardly*, the most common counterpart in the positive sentence was *sotva* (58.3%) and other less frequent expressions were *málo*, *téměř*, *než* or *málokdy*. On the other hand, the common corresponding adverb situated in the negative sentence was *skoro* (41.2%) and other adverbs *ani*, *málem* and *občas*. The translation of *scarcely* also differ. With the positive predication *scarcely* is translated as *sotva* (42.5%) or *těžko*, *snad*, *stěží*, *zatěžko* whereas with the negative predication the most common translation is through verbal negation modified by *ani*. The adverb *barely* is also very often translated as *sotva* (83.3%) while occurring in the positive sentence but the corresponding counterparts in negative sentence are *skoro*, *ani*, *téměř* in combination with verbal negation. As was already stated the approximate negator *seldom* is mostly translated with the positive predication and in this case the most common counterparts are *zřídka* and *málokdy* or other expressions like *zřídka* and *sotvakdy*.

In conclusion, the approximate negators proved their negative nature as they appeared with non-assertive items and positive predication.

Bibliography

BIBER, Douglas, Susan CONRAD a Geoffrey N. LEECH. Student grammar of spoken and written english. Essex: Longman, 2002, vii, 487 s. ISBN 978-0-582-23726-1.

COLLINS, W. et al. Collins Cobuild English Grammar. 1st edition. London: HarperCollins Publisher, 1990. ISBN 0 00370257 X

DANEŠ, František, Miroslav GREPL a Zdeněk HLAVSA. Mluvnice češtiny. Praha: Academia, 1987, 746 s.

DUŠKOVÁ, Libuše. Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny. 2. vyd. Praha: Academia, 1994, 673 s. ISBN 80-200-0486-6

GREENBAUM, Sidney, Jan SVARTVIK, Geoffrey N. LEECH a Randolph QUIRK. A grammar of contemporary English. London: Longman, 1972, xii, 1120 s. ISBN 058252444X.

GREPL, Miroslav a Petr KARLÍK. Skladba češtiny. Olomouc: Votobia, 1998, 503 s. Velká řada. ISBN 80-7198-281-4.

GREPL, Miroslav a Petr KARLÍK. Skladba spisovné češtiny. 2. vyd. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1989, 474 s.

HUDDLESTON, Rodney a Geoffrey K. PULLUM. A student's introduction to english grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, c2005, viii, 312 s. ISBN 978-0-521-61288-3.

HUDDLESTON, Rodney, Geoffrey K. PULLUM a Laurie BAUER. The Cambridge grammar of the English language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, xvii, 1842 s. ISBN 0521431468.

LOTKO, Edvard. Lexikální negace v současné češtině. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1973, 101 s.

PEPRNÍK, Jaroslav. Anglická lexikologie. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, 1992. 192 s. ISBN 80-7067-090-8.

QUIRK, Randolph, Sidney GREENBAUM, Geoffrey N. LEECH, Jan SVARTVIK a David CRYSTAL. A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London: Longman, 1985, x, 1779 s. ISBN 0-582-51734-6.

VESELOVSKÁ, Ludmila. A course in English syntax: syllabi for the lectures, examples and exercises. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2009, 162 s. Skripta. ISBN 9788024424675.

Online sources

Český národní korpus - *InterCorp*. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha.
Cit.15.04.2017 , dostupný z WWW: <<http://www.korpus.cz>>.

HIDALGO DOWNING, Laura. *Negation, text worlds and discourse: the pragmatics of fiction* [online]. 1. Stamford, Connecticut: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 2000 [cit. 2017-03-26].

ISBN 1-56750-475-2. Dostupné z:

https://books.google.cz/books?id=Wk7Tvc3PQt0C&pg=PA41&lpg=PA41&dq=negation+classification&source=bl&ots=KFsvMleKln&sig=axg1SztqdENvWGoH19BV3CI3kuM&hl=cs&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiF5rLWuu_SAhVFEiwKHYkrC0EQ6AEINTAD#v=onepage&q=negation%20classification&f=false

Sources used in the analysis

J. K. Rowling - *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*

J. K. Rowling - *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*

J. K. Rowling - *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*

Jane Austen - *Pride and Prejudice*

Terry Pratchett - *Wyrd Sisters*

George Orwell - *1984*

Herbert George Wells - *The War of the Worlds*

Nicholas Evans - *The Divide*

Ian McEwan – *Saturday*

John Ronald Reuel Tolkien - *The Lord of the Rings 1*

John Ronald Reuel Tolkien - *The Lord of the Rings 2*

John Ronald Reuel Tolkien - *The Lord of the Rings 3*

Appendices

Abbreviations

J. K. Rowling - Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets	HP1
J. K. Rowling - Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix	HP2
J. K. Rowling - Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire	HP3
Jane Austen - Pride and Prejudice	PaP
Terry Pratchett - Wyrdsisters	WS
George Orwell - 1984	GO
Herbert George Wells - The War of the Worlds	WoW
Nicholas Evans - The Divide	TD
Ian McEwan – Saturday	S
John Ronald Reuel Tolkien - The Lord of the Rings 1	LoR1
John Ronald Reuel Tolkien - The Lord of the Rings 2	LoR2
John Ronald Reuel Tolkien - The Lord of the Rings 3	LoR3

Tables

Table 1: The type of modification of HARDLY

Modification type	Number	Per cent
Verb modifier	32	80
Noun Phrase modifier	4	10
Adjective modifier	2	5
Prepositional phrase modifier	1	2;5
Adverb modifier	1	2;5
Numeral modifier	0	0

Table 2: The type of modification of SCARCELY

Modification type	Number	Per cent
Verb modifier	25	62;5
Noun Phrase modifier	7	17;5
Adjective modifier	2	5
Prepositional phrase modifier	0	0
Adverb modifier	4	10
Numeral modifier	2	5

Table 3: The type of modification of BARELY

Modification type	Number	Per cent
Verb modifier	28	70
Noun Phrase modifier	4	10
Adjective modifier	7	17;5
Prepositional phrase modifier	0	0
Adverb modifier	1	2;5
Numeral modifier	0	0

Table 4: The type of modification of SELDOM

Modification type	Number	Per cent
Verb modifier	36	90
Noun Phrase modifier	0	0
Adjective modifier	3	7;5
Prepositional phrase modifier	1	2;5
Adverb modifier	0	0
Numeral modifier	0	0

Table 5: The Czech equivalents of HARDLY

positive predication	sotva	7
	málo	1
	téměř	2
	než	1
	jen	1
	positive sentence	1
total		13
negative predication	skoro	6
	ani	5
	asi	1
	málem	2
	občas	1
	z větší části	1
	většinou	1
	zatím	1
verbal negation	7	
total		25
other stucture		2

Table 6: The Czech equivalents of SCARCELY

positive predication	sotva	14
	málokdy	1
	stěží	2
	neméně	2
	jen	1
	ještě než	1
	zatěžko	1
	snad	1
	těžko	1
	patrně	1
	pouhou	1
total		26
negative predication	ani	4
	téměř	1
	příliš	1
	verbal negation	7
total		13
other stucture		1

Table 7: The Czech equivalents of BARELY

positive predication	sotva	20
	téměř	1
	skoro	1
	zběžně	1
	stěží	1
total		24
negative predication	ani	5
	skoro	1
	téměř	1
	verbal negation	5
total		12
other stucture		4

Table 8: The Czech equivalents of SELDOM

positive predication	zřídka	20
	málokdy	10
	málokdo	2
	zřídkakdy	2
	sotvakdy	1
total		35
	verbal negation	1
total		1
other stucture		4

Annotation

Jméno a příjmení:	Barbora Frimmelová
Katedra:	Anglického jazyka
Vedoucí práce:	Mgr. Blanka Babická, Ph.D.
Rok obhajoby:	2017

Název práce:	Překladové ekvivalenty anglických významově záporných, ale formálně kladných výrazů (hardly, barely, scarcely a seldom)
Název v angličtině:	Czech translation equivalents of English semantically negative but formally positive expressions (hardly, barely, scarcely and seldom)
Anotace práce:	Tato práce se zabývá významově zápornými ale formálně kladnými výrazy hardly, barely, scarcely a seldom. První část práce se zabývá klasifikací negace s ohledem na tyto výrazy. Praktická část se zaměřuje na analýzu 40 příkladů těchto výrazů obsažených v textu. Cílem analýzy je určit slova, které mohou být těmito výrazy modifikována a také zkoumat jejich překladové ekvivalenty. Výsledky analýzy jsou zhodnoceny a v závěru práce jsou uvedeny vhodné překladové protějšky.
Klíčová slova:	Zápor, významově záporné ale formálně kladné výrazy, klasifikace záporu, analýza založená na korpusu
Anotace v angličtině:	This work focuses on approximate negators hardly, barely, scarcely and seldom. The first part of this thesis deals with the negation classification with respect to these expressions. The practical part then focuses on the analysis based on 40 examples of each approximate negator. The aim of the analysis is to examine the elements which these negators modify and also to analyze their translation counterparts. At the end of the theses the finding are discussed and the most appropriate translation equivalents are introduced.
Klíčová slova v angličtině:	Negation, approximate negators, classification of negation, corpus-based analysis
Přílohy vázané v práci:	
Rozsah práce:	40 str
Jazyk práce:	Angličtina

Résumé

Závěrečná práce se zabývá výrazy formálně kladnými s funkcí záporných slov. Z těchto výrazů byly vybrány k analýze: *hardly*, *scarcely*, *barely* a *seldom*. Práce je rozdělena na praktickou část, která se věnuje hlavním rozdílům v tvorbě záporu v anglickém a českém jazyce. Jejím dalším úkolem je uvést různé přístupy ke klasifikaci záporu v anglickém jazyce, porovnat je, a také s pomocí studijní literatury vytvořit systém tvoření záporu s ohledem na dané výrazy. V praktické části jsou pak tyto výrazy analyzovány na základě větné negace, ke které náleží. Analýza byla provedena na základě příkladů převzatých z paralelního korpusu InterCorp, ze kterého bylo vygenerováno 12 primárních zdrojů. Z těchto textů bylo poté vybráno 40 příkladů pro každé z daných záporných slov. Nejprve byly zkoumány všechny výrazy, které mohou být modifikované slovy *hardly*, *scarcely*, *barely* a *seldom*. Na základě této analýzy bylo zjištěno, že výrazy *hardly*, *scarcely*, *barely* a *seldom* modifikují nejčastěji sloveso a dále také přídavné jméno, příslovce, podstatné jméno ale i číslovku či předložku. Dále byly také zkoumány překladové ekvivalenty těchto výrazů. Analýzou bylo zjištěno, že nejčastěji se tyto výrazy překládají odpovídajícími českými příslovci. Dále je možné tyto výrazy přeložit pomocí záporného slovesa, kladnou větou či slovním zápořem. Co se týče jejich ekvivalentů, slovu *hardly* nejvíce odpovídá *sotva* v kladné větě a slovo *skoro* ve větě záporné. Výraz *scarcely* se s kladným slovesem nejčastěji překládá jako *sotva* ale ve spojení se záporným slovesem mu odpovídá výraz *ani*. Výrazu *barely* také nejlépe odpovídá slovo *sotva* v kladné větě a v záporné je překládán nejčastěji jako *skoro*, *ani* či *téměř*. Slovo *seldom* se potom vyskytuje ve většině případů s kladnou predikací a je překládáno jako *zřídka* nebo také *málokdy*.