Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Negation
Comparison of the English Adverb *Never* and the Negative Particle *Not*

Diplomová práce

Autor: Svatava Spurná - anglická filologie
Vedoucí práce: Doc. PhDr. Ludmila Veselovská, M.A., Dr.
Olomouc 2011

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.
V Olomouci dne 13. června 2011

Poděkování

Anotace

Předmětem mé diplomové práce s názvem *Negation - Comparison of the English Adverb Never and the Negative Particle Not* je srovnání záporného adverbia *never* a záporné částice *not* a to s ohledem na jejich vlastnosti morfologické, sémantické a syntaktické, přičemž nedílnou součástí mého výzkumu je rovněž jejich umístění ve větě. V této práci jsou popsány obecné vlastnosti anglických adverbií. První teoretická část slouží jako základ a opora pro popis jednotlivých vlastností *never* a *not* a pro jejich další srovnání.

Never a především *not* jsou nejčastěji užívané jako základní prostředky větné negace, ve své práci jsem se však zabývala i jejich dalším užitím v jiných typech negace a také restrikcemi, které jsou s tímto užitím spojeny.

Aby byl pohled na problematiku *never* a *not* celistvý, snažila jsem se vytyčit rozdíly mezi angličtinou a češtinou a také srovnat *never* s jinými, zejména zápornými, adverbii. Přes všechnu mou snahu nalézt rozpory v názorech lingvistů, jsem objevila pouze jednu zmínku Randolpha Quirka, který řadí *not* k záporným restriktivním adverbiím. Další výzvou pro mě bylo, pokusit se najít rozpory nejen mezi tvrzeními lingvistů navzájem, ale také mezi tvrzeními lingvistů a mými vlastními závěry plynoucími z provedených rozborů. V převážné většině případů výsledky mé práce potvrzovaly již existující teorie, avšak v případě adverbia *never* a jeho výskytu s lexikálními slovesy se mé tvrzení rozchází s Tottie.

Všechna pravidla uvedená v anglických gramatických příručkách stejně jako má vlastní tvrzení se opírají o data z Britského národního korpusu, ze něhož také uvádím počty případů výskytu různých jevů, aby bylo zřejmé, které konstrukce jsou pro *never* a *not* charakteristické a které se naopak vyskytují zřídka.

Na závěr bych svou práci shrnula následovně: Prokázala jsem, že adverbium *never* má stále velmi silný sémantický význam, a proto lze říci, že se *never* nechová stejně jako negativní částice *not*. Naopak *not* si zachovává svou funkčnost a mohu tedy říci, že se tato částice nechová jako adverbium.

Synopsis

The thesis is devoted to the comparison of the negative adverb *never* and the negative particle *not* with respect to their morphological, semantic and syntactic properties as well as to their emplacement in a clause. The thesis contains a standard description of general properties of English adverbs. This theoretical part serves as a starting point for my description of the individual properties of *never* and *not* and their subsequent comparison. *Never*, and especially *not*, are two basic means of clause negation and that is why my thesis focuses also on their use as the means of other kinds of negation. Furthermore I focus on the restrictions that can be imposed either on *never* or on *not* with respect to the chosen kind of negation.

To bring a more thorough picture of *never* and *not* I also bring in the comparison of English and Czech and compare *never* with other adverbs, above all the partially negative ones. As regards my aim to find differences in opinions of diverse linguists I found only one commented remark on Quirk's classification of *not* as a negative restrictive adjunct. My aim was among others to find some differences between the claims of linguists and my own findings. In the majority of cases I was able to confirm their claims but in case of Tottie I came to a different conclusion as regards *never* and its co-occurrence with lexical verbs. All the rules presented in English grammatical reference books as well as my own claims are supported by data found in the BNC. I sometimes also provide figures of

examples found in the BNC to illustrate which constructions are characteristic for *never* or *not* and which of them seem to be rather odd.

My thesis proves that the semantic meaning of the adverb *never* is still very strong and it is therefore possible to say that *never* does not behave as the negative particle *not*. *Not*, on the other hand, preserves its functionality and that is why I can claim that *not* does not behave as an adverb.

Abbreviations used in the thesis

A	Analytic type of negation	analytický typ negace
adj.	adjective	přídavné jméno
AdjP	Adjectival Phrase	adjektivní fráze
AdvP	Adverbial Phrase	adverbiální fráze
atd.	et cetera	a tak dále
BNC	British National Corpus	Britský národní korpus
E	End position	koncová pozice
e.g.	for example	například
eM	end Medial position	koncová středová pozice
etc.	et cetera	a tak dále
i.e.	that is	to jest
iE	initial End position	počáteční koncová pozice
iM	initial Medial position	počáteční středová pozice
M	Medial position	středová pozice
mM	medial Medial position	středová středová pozice
mod.	modal verb	modální sloveso
Mod./ Aux.	Modal/ Auxiliary verb	modální/ pomocné sloveso
např.	for example	například
Neg.	Negation	zápor
NP	Noun Phrase	Jmenná fráze
O	Object	předmět
pomoc.	auxiliary verb	pomocné sloveso
PrepP	Prepositional Phrase	Předložková fráze
S	Subject	podmět
SARA	SGML Aware Retrieval Application	SGML vyhledávací program
Syn.	Synthetic type of negation	syntetický typ negace
V	Verb	sloveso
VP	Verbal Phrase	slovesná fráze
vs.	versus	versus
X	another sentence member	jiný větný člen

Marks used in the thesis

*	grammatically unacceptable / difference in meaning
?	possible usage

Content

Preface

The main topic of my thesis is the comparison of the adverb *never* and the negative particle *not*. Both of these negators serve as devices of clause negation. Clause negation is traditionally formed in English with the help of the negative particles *no* and *not* or the negative quantifiers *nobody*, *no one*, *nothing*, *never*, *nowhere*, *neither* and *none*. I am going to focus only on the two aforementioned items *never* and *not*, but I will sometimes bring into discussion also other means of negation to be able to draw a more thorough picture of the two negators. I concentrate on their role in negation and compare the negative character of the particle *not* with the temporal and intensifying character of the adverb *never*.

The thesis provides thorough theoretical analysis of what an adverb and what the negative particle *not* is. So in the first part of my thesis I am going to mention general criteria concerning English adverbs and then I want to apply these criteria to the two items discussed *never* and *not*, and I will see whether their properties match the general properties of adverbs or not. Which means that both *never* and *not* will be described in detail and I will use them in examples to show how they function, and I will compare them with one another or with other (e.g. partially negative) adverbs. Both differences and similarities in the use and function of *not* and *never* will be discussed.

This thesis props itself upon the basic English grammatical reference books. Views of individual authors are compared and special focus is paid to the divergencies of opinion. However, I do not expect many differences in this respect.

Another source of linguistic data is the British National Corpus[1], thereinafter only as BNC. I am going to compare the rules and definitions found in grammar books with the token sentences found by SARA[2] in the BNC. On the basis of this comparison exceptions to the rules are discussed.

In some parts of my thesis, where it was suitable for a demonstration of particular properties, I decided to insert in a comparison between Czech and English.

This thesis proposes following aims:

o   to provide a standard description of English adverbs
o   to apply the findings about adverbs to the two key items *never* and *not*
o   to find conflicting opinions of individual linguists whose grammar books are consulted, if there are any
o   to provide a detailed overview about different kinds of negation, to show when they are used, and which criteria or restrictions arise for each specific type of negation
o   on the basis of the comparison of rules and definitions in grammar books and sentence tokens in the BNC to find exceptions in which these rules were violated and find out whether these cases have something in common and if possible also deduce some general rules that can account for these violations.

The thesis is divided into three main sections. The first one is rather theoretical and contains information about adverbs. Each of the chapters is further subdivided and deals

---

[1] The British National Corpus (BNC) is a collection of 100 million words of both spoken and written language from a great variety of sources that have been used in the thesis for the purpose of either confirming or refuting the grammatical rules that are mentioned in the theoretical part of this study. It is important to remark that 90 % of the BNC consists of written texts and only 10 % of transcribed recordings of conversations.

[2] An abbreviation used to designate SGML Aware Retrieval Application used in the BNC.

with some specific aspects of adverbs. The subsections further focus on the already mentioned rules and definitions when applied to the two items *never* and *not*.

The second part of my thesis focuses on negation in English. I am not only going to show which linguistic means can be used to create negation, but I am also going to describe various kinds of negation and to point out what problems might arise when we try to make a distinction between them. A lot of space will be devoted to the distinction between analytic and synthetic negation, and the restrictions that have to be taken into account when we decide to transform negative clauses. I will also relate the discussion of analytic and synthetic negation to the two items discussed *never* and *not*.

In the third and final part of my thesis, I am going to compare *never* and *not* in light of morphological, semantic and syntactic properties. All my claims and assumptions are supported by data found by SARA in the BNC. Special attention is paid to the exceptions that serve as a proof of the fact that in some contexts or positions the adverb *never* starts to behave more like the particle *not*.

The basis of this thesis was the presupposition that it comes to the semantic weakening of the adverb *never*. Data from the BNC should therefore either confirm or refute this presupposition or at least show in what constructions or contexts *never* behaves more like the negative particle *not*. It is also advisable to verify whether it is not vice-versa which means if the grammatical item *not* behaves more like an adverb, but this is theoretically very unlikely. For this purpose it was necessary to create a theoretical basis that would serve as a starting point for the subsequent comparison with the token sentences in the BNC.

1. **English Adverb**

The following section contains some general facts concerning English adverbs which are relevant to my discussion. These general rules and definitions are accompanied by examples illustrating their functions and their use.

First of all I focus on the morphological structure of English adverbs. One of the reasons why I do this is that adverbs consisting of adj. + the derivational suffix -*ly* are considered to be the most prototypical of adverbs. The same cannot be said about the key item of the discussion; the adverb *never*. Furthermore, it is necessary to get a general view of different types of adverbs, to be able to classify *never*.

One of the subsections of this chapter also deals with the structure of adverbial phrase, where I focus on the gradability of adverbs.

The second part of this section highlights the semantic properties of English adverbs that has already been implied in chapter 1.1, but part 1.2 discusses them in detail. Special attention is devoted to the sub-categorization of frequency adverbs, whose member the adverb *never* is.

As the title of section 1.3 signifies I am going to sum up there the basic syntactic functions of adverbs and then try to consider to what extent these syntactic functions match the two items discussed, *never* and *not*. Another important thing to mention is that authors slightly divide on their division of syntactic functions and they also use different terminology. I tried to give the broadest possible view of this issue combining the theoretical findings of the two major authors Huddleston, and Quirk, but I also took into consideration Biber. It is necessary to point out that I did not only concentrate on the syntactic functions of *never* and *not* when they serve as means of clause negation, but also when they serve as devices of phrasal, or local negation.

Another sub-section, focusing on the division of adverbs in adjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts was worth mentioning because it sums up the conditions that are necessary for the classification of adverbs. What is more, new interesting questions concerning the negative particle *not* turned up.

Section 1.4 is especially important for and relevant to our comparison of *never* and *not*. As I will demonstrate, position of these two items is the largest source of differences. Although it cannot be said that *never* and *not* absolutely differ in their emplacement in a clause. With respect to the position of *never* and *not* in the sentence I am going to deal both with clause as well as with phrasal negation, and show the differences between the two.

1.1. **Morphological properties of adverbs**

This section primarily concentrates on the morphological structure of English adverbs, however, it was not possible to separate this discussion from the semantic level.

According to Dušková (2006: 156-160) adverbs are generally characterized as a heterogeneous part of speech. From the morphological point of view there are four major formal kinds of adverbs, what is more, each of these types is substantially varied. Some of the adverbs can be classified as closed class items, because there is a certain limited number of them in our lexicon. Primary adverbs and fixed phrases functioning as adverbs definitely belong to the category of closed class items. The rest of adverbs, which means derived and compound adverbs, belong to the open-class items, because their number can potentially be enlarged. Compare the following categories:

(A) adverbs derived from adjectives with the help of:

(a) the suffix *-ly*: *immensely, narrowly, attentively* etc. It should be pointed out that the suffix *-ly* is not only used to create adverbs, but it is also an adjectival suffix: *monthly, weekly* etc. Suffix *-ly* is also considered to be the most productive adverbial suffix.

and adverbs derived from other parts of speech with the help of:

(b) the suffix *-wise*: *clockwise, counter-clockwise, likewise* etc.
(c) the suffix *-ward(s)*: *backwards, westwards, homewards,* or the suffix *-ways*: *lengthways, sideways* etc.

Huddleston (2006: 566) further differentiates other morphologically complex adverbs containing:

(d) the prefix *a-*: *afresh, anew, aloud* etc.
(e) the suffix *-less*: *nevertheless, nonetheless, doubtless*
(f) irregular forms of numerals: *once, twice, thrice*

(B) Dušková (2006: 160-161) mentions as another category the group of primary adverbs that were not derived from any other part of speech. They can be further divided into several groups according to their semantic meaning:

(a) adverbs of place: *here, away, abroad, there* etc.
(b) adverb of time: *now, often, yet, usually, always* etc.
(c) adverbs of degree: *very, too, enough, quite, somewhat* etc.
(d) focusing adjuncts: *even, just, only* etc.
(e) connective adverbs: *so, thus, however, also, yet* etc.

(C) As the last category, Dušková (2006: 162) adds compound adverbs that consist of the adverb *there* or *here* and a preposition, and are usually used in formal language: *thereafter, hereby, hereof* etc.

Huddleston (2006: 567) ranks among compound nouns also: *almost, already, also, always, anyhow, somewhat* etc., which Dušková (2006: 160-161) classifies as primary adverbs. These expressions start with a determinative base (*all, any, some*), but their meaning is not predictable from parts of the words. Negative adverbs *never, nor, neither* can also be classified as compound adverbs. These adverbs are based on positive expressions *ever, or,* and *either*. The first element in these words *n-* goes back to *no* that was shortened and then connected with some of the positive elements - *ever, or,* or *either*.

Huddleston (2006: 567) also adds a list of quite heterogeneous compound adverbs as e.g.: *forthwith, furthermore, indeed, maybe, meantime, meanwhile* etc.

(D) Huddleston (2006: 567) further mentions that there are a number of fixed phrases that are used as adverbs. The form of these fixed phrases is given, and the words constituting these phrases seldom retain their independent meaning, e.g. *at last, sort of, as good as, kind of,* and *of course.* They usually function as modifiers of verbs or AdjP.

(1) *He <u>sort of</u> behaved as if you didn't work there any more.* (BNC: FP7 1493)

Huddleston (2006: 567) emphasizes that although *Of*-phrases usually signal following post-modification, it is the verb what is the head of the VP and that is why the adverb *sort of* in example (1) must be classified as a verb modifier.

1.1.1. The structure of adverbial phrase

Adverbs as well as adjectives can be graded, but not all of them. Only adverbs with scalable meaning can be graded or intensified. Grading of adverbs is formed in the same way as with adjectives i.e.:
(A) monosyllabic adverbs and adverbs that were not derived from other parts of speech make use of the suffix *-er* to create comparative (e.g. *longer, sooner*) and *-est* to create superlative form (e.g. *longest, soonest*)
(B) polysyllabic adverbs make comparative and superlative forms by means of periphrasis i.e. intensifiers *more* and *most* are placed in front of polysyllabic adverbs to create comparative and superlative forms respectively (e.g. *more slowly, most slowly*).
(C) there is a small group of irregular adverbs to which belongs e.g. *well*, whose comparative and superlative forms are as follows: *better, best*.

1.1.2. Morphological classification of *Never*

According to Dušková (2006: 156-162) and her above mentioned criteria the adverb *never* discussed in this study belongs to the group of primary adverbs, because it can neither be divided into a stem and a derivational suffix as the adverbs in (A), nor can it be divided into two independent stems as the adverbs in (C). *Never* as a single word also cannot be denoted as a phrase and that is why category (D) can also be excluded. Huddleston (2006: 566) however ranks *never* among adverbs derived from other adverbs, more precisely from the adverb *ever* that is in fact a primary adverb. Onions (1995: 608) traces the etymology of the adverb *never* back to two elements *ne + æfre*, i.e. *no + ever*, whereas the first element *no* was reduced to *n-*.

With respect to its semantic meaning, *never* belongs to the category of time adverbs. As Sinclair (1990: 210) comments *never* says that something was not, is not and will not be. *Never* has clearly negative meaning.

Concerning the structure of the adverbial phrase, *never*, as a time adverb of indefinite frequency expressing zero frequency, cannot be graded, because it does not have scalable meaning. *Never* can be intensified, but the range of adverbs that can do that is very narrow. The BNC contains 60 examples where *never* is intensified by the adverb *almost* (2b), but only 3 examples with *hardly never* (2c) and 2 examples with *nearly never* (2d).

(2) (a) *I was <u>*more/ *less/ *very never</u> happy that Mary was driving a German car.* [3]
    (b) *He <u>almost never</u> discussed his work with her.* (BNC: ASS 1719)
    (c) *Why don't she <u>hardly never</u> look after David any more?* (BNC: KP4 884)
    (d) *His work in the Sahara was recently included in a Sports Council exhibition that <u>nearly never</u> happened due to a last-minute decision.* (BNC: FBR 483)

1.1.3. Morphological classification of Not

Hypothetically, if we wanted to include *not* in one of the morphological categories applying to adverbs, it would be possible to rank it either between primary adverbs, because at first sight *not* cannot be divided into a stem and a derivational suffix, and it also does not consist of two stems, so it is not a compound adverb.

On the other hand *not* can also be approached from the historical point of view. Etymologically, as Onions (1995: 604, 615) writes, *not* goes back to the Old English word

---

[3] All the following examples with an asterisk (*), question mark (?) or without any reference are my own transformations of sentences found in grammar manuals or in the BNC. The asterisk (*) should symbolize that a given sentence is not grammatically correct or it does not correspond to the original sentence. The question mark should symbolize that a given construction seems to be grammatically acceptable.

nawiht which means *nothing*, *na-* being the negative element, *-wiht* meaning thing, creature, or being. This Old English form was later superseded by derived *naught*. This derivation was later shortened to *not*. *Naughty* is today connected with different meaning, namely disobedient, morally bad. Proceeding from the preceding facts I can rank *not* among compounds consisting of the negative word *no* and some positive element, in case of *not* this positive element being *-t*, which hides behind itself the noun *thing*.

    Not, as a functional word having no semantic meaning, cannot be graded or intensified. In this respect *not* behaves in the same way as *never*.

    From the synchronical point of view, which is the crucial one in this thesis, *not* is morphologically simple and does not allow any classification based on morphology.

1.2. Semantic categorization of adverbs

    In chapter 5 of his grammar manual Huddleston (2006: 562) comments on the basic semantic function of adverbs and says that adverbs are characteristically used to alter, clarify and adjust the meaning of verbs. [4]

    Although the basic building material of clauses are nouns and verbs, adverbs can also create a simple unary clause, because they are classified as full-meaning words and thus fully convey given information.

    Adverbs can be divided into seven basic categories according to their semantic meaning. Apart from their literal meaning there are some adverbs that also have more metaphorical meaning, then it is the context what decides about their meaning. The following chapter contains a list of semantic categories of adverbs as they are distinguished by Biber (1999: 552-559).

(A) Adverbs of place convey information about position, direction, or distance:

  (a) *Let's stay <u>here</u> for a while.* <position>
  (b) *The Sun moves <u>clockwise</u> across the northern sky.* <direction>
  (c) *It's not <u>far</u> from the city centre.* <distance>

(B) Adverbs of time provide information about time position, frequency, duration, or time relationship:

  (a) *I can't talk to you <u>now</u>.* <time position>
  (b) *He <u>always</u> forgets his friends' birthdays.* <frequency>
  (c) *I can <u>still</u> remember her beautiful blue eyes.* <duration>
  (d) *It has been decided about her dismissal although she has <u>already</u> admitted her mistake.* <time relationship>

(C) Adverbs of manner can show in what way an action is realized:

  (a) *She spoke <u>slowly</u> and <u>clearly</u>.*
  (b) *They were tired, but came back <u>safely</u>.*

(D) Adverbs of degree convey information about the extent to which a feature applies. They either function as adverbials, or are used as modifiers, which can be further divided into amplifiers/intensifiers, and diminishers/downtoners.

  (a) *He <u>completely</u> forgot where he had left his keys.* (adverbial)
  (b) *The food was <u>absolutely</u> delicious.* (modifier; intensifier)

---

[4] Quirk (1972: 270-282) mentions also other usages of adverbs that will be described more thoroughly in section 1.3.

(c) *When I found the bowl, it was <u>almost</u> empty.* (modifier; diminisher)

(E) Additive and restrictive adverbs. As the adjective additive implies, additive adverbs are used to indicate that one item is being added to another either at a clausal level, or at a phrasal level. Restrictive adverbs are used to draw attention to one particular part of the proposition:

(a) *My dad was pleased, and that's why we were <u>too</u>.* <additive adverbial>
(b) *<u>Only</u> those who passed the final exam could proceed further with their studies.* <restrictive adverbial>

(F) Stance adverbs reveal the epistemic quality of the statement, speaker's attitude, and information about the style.

(a) *You will <u>probably</u> need some money for the bus.* <epistemic stance adverbial>
(b) *<u>Unfortunately</u>, they didn't have enough time to visit Buckingham Palace.* <attitude stance adverbial>
(c) *<u>Frankly</u>, it was terribly exhausting.* <style stance adverbials>

(G) Linking adverbs are a means of cohesion. Their function is to connect semantically parts of discourse. They are further divided into six different semantic subcategories: adverbs of enumeration and addition, summation, apposition, result/inference, contrast/concession, and transition.

(a) *<u>Firstly</u>, I have to make lunch and <u>secondly</u>, I must wash my hair.* <adverbial of enumeration and addition>
(b) *<u>Altogether</u> they did 300 kilometres by car and 200 kilometres by train.* <adverbial of summation>
(c) *Only a few students passed the exam, <u>namely</u> ...* <adverbial of apposition>
(d) *My application wasn't delivered <u>therefore</u> I lost all the chances to be accepted.* <adverbial of result/inference>
(e) *<u>However</u>, she spent a fortnight studying maths, she didn't pass the entrance exam.* <adverbial of contrast/concession>
(f) *<u>Now</u> that the rounded nose of the old malibu had been sharpened to a point in the thruster, the benign image of the dolphin had dissolved into the leering grin of a shark, inverted, its fin trailing in the water.* <adverbial of transition> (BNC: ASV 1770)

Comparing the meaning of English adverbs with Czech Dušková (2006: 163) points out an important fact:

"English and Czech adverbs basically correspond each other [...], but there are also differences, Czech adverb is sometimes not expressed in English at all or it corresponds to other means of expression."

As an example Dušková (2006: 163) mentions Czech adverbs expressing epistemic modality (e.g. *určitě, snad, asi,* etc.) that correspond to English modal verbs, or Czech adverbs used to express durative aspect (e.g. *pořád, dál,* etc.) that are again represented in English by verbs.

(3) (a) *<u>Určitě</u> jsi unavený.*[5] → *You <u>must</u> be tired.*

---

[5] This and the following Czech sentences are my own translations.

(b) *Pořád se usmíval. → He kept smiling.*

I am not going to deal with translation equivalents here much more, however.

1.2.1.   Subcategorization of frequency adverbs

In his, also semantically motivated classification, Quirk (1972: 490) divides adverbs of frequency into two groups that are further subdivided:

(A) adverbs of definite frequency:
   (a) period frequency: *Committee meetings take place weekly.*
   (b) time frequency: *I visit England three times a year.*

(B) adverbs of indefinite frequency:
   (a) usual occurrence: *We normally don't go to bed before midnight.*
   (b) continual frequency: *She incessantly asks for more money.*
   (c) high frequency: *I often told them to relax more.*
   (d) low or zero frequency: *They seldom watch television during the day.*

In the following section I will apply the above semantic classifications on *never* and *not*.

1.2.2.   Semantic categorization of *Never*

As it has already been mentioned in section 1.1.2, *never* belongs to the semantic category of time adverbs, more precisely to time adverbs of indefinite frequency. Whereas *often* and *frequently* denote a high frequency, *seldom* and *rarely* express a low frequency, and *never* denotes a zero frequency. Compared with other indefinite time adverbs *never* represents one peak of a theoretical scale and *always* is its opposite on the other side of the scale.

English *never* corresponds to the Czech adverb *nikdy*.

(4) *Nikdy jsem nejedla šneky. → I have never eaten snails.*

However, different translation is also possible:

(5) *Nikdy jsem nejedla šneky. → I haven't ever eaten snails.*

Which means that *nikdy* also corresponds in (5) to *-n't + ever*. So it might seem there are two possibilities how to translate sentences containing *nikdy*. This is however not always true. In English we speak about the tendency to express negation as close to the beginning of the clause as possible, which means that we can start with *never,* invert the word order and then continue with the VP. It is necessary to point out that when *never* is placed into initial position it cannot be replaced by the adverb *ever* in initial position + negator *not*. Notice the following:

(6) (a) *Never have I seen such a beautiful garden. → Nikdy jsem neviděl takovou zahradu.*
   (b) **Ever haven't I seen such a beautiful garden. → *Někdy jsem neviděl takovou zahradu.*

The sentence in (6b) does not only have different meaning, but it is also grammatically unacceptable. What is more the Czech sentence also seems to be quite strange and implausible.

1.2.3.   Semantic categorization of *Not*

Concerning the semantic properties of the negator *not*, it is usually used to change the polarity of the whole clause, or at least a phrase within a clause, which means that *not* does not only alter the meaning of the verb, but of the whole clause; *not* therefore negates the whole clause. In contrast to adverbs, *not* does not belong to the category of full-meaning words and that is why it also cannot form on its own a simple clause, whereas adverbs can.

(7)   *<u>Not!</u> vs. *Absolutely!* vs. *Here!* vs. <u>Never!</u>

Apart from its negative meaning *not* does not have any other semantic meaning, and thus cannot be ranked into any of the preceding semantic categories of adverbs. Although if we accept Quirk's claim that he supported by the following reasons we could potentially rank *not* among adverbs. According to Quirk (1972: 432) the negator *not* could be regarded as a negative restrictive adjunct that excludes the part of the clause that is focused. Anderwald (2002: 17) motivates it as a result of the position of the negator *not* within the VP. As well as adverbs *not* is placed between the first Mod./Aux. and the following element of the VP. However, this argument does not seem to be a very strong one, because the position of adverbs is quite variable, whereas position of *not*, in case of clause negation, is fixed. Position of adverbs will be discussed in 1.4. Compare the following examples:

(8)   (a) *It is <u>usually</u> necessary to weight the fabric when weaving,[...].* (BNC: CGX 427)
      (b) *It is <u>not</u> necessary to weight the fabric when weaving, [...].*

Anderwald (2002: 18) however states that *not* does not behave as a dependent of the verb and should be therefore classified as a special category *negator*.

With respect to its Czech equivalent *not* corresponds to the Czech bound prefix *ne-* that construes with verbs. *Not* therefore seems to be something like a free morpheme. On the other hand we must take into consideration also the enclitic form of *not -n't* that appears to be more like the Czech *ne-*, i.e. a bound morpheme, but the Czech *ne-* can be connected to all lexical verbs whereas English *-n't* binds itself only with Mod./Aux.

1.3. Syntactic functions of adverbial phrases

The following section will focus on the function of adverbial phrases in a clause. These functions do not only depend on the semantic meaning of particular adverbs but are very closely related to the position of adverbial phrases in a clause.

Using Huddleston's framework (2006: 578) that I have slightly adapted English adverbs can primarily be divided among those which are and which are not incorporated in the sentence structure.

1.3.1.   Adverbs incorporated within the sentence structure

English adverbs that can be incorporated in the sentence structure have three basic functions:

Verbal adverbs: have the function of adverbials which supplement or evolve the verb. Adverbs appearing in this function are called circumstance adverbials, because they provide additional information about the action or state that is described in the clause. Biber (1999: 548) points out that adverbs as clause constituents are optional elements of the clause and thus peripheral to the structure of the clause. Adverbs of this kind are independent elements of the clause as the following examples show:

(9) (a) *She behaved <u>bravely</u>.* (adverbial of manner)
     (b) *Come <u>back</u> at 5 p.m.* (adverbial of place)
     (c) *He <u>usually</u> gets up at 7 a.m.* (adverbial of frequency)

It must be pointed out that Huddleston (2006: 563) does not differentiate between circumstance adverbials and adverbs functioning as modifiers, according to his conception all adverbs serve as modifiers, whereas some of them modify verbs, other appear more frequently in the function of modifiers of AdjP, AdvP or even clauses.

(10)(a) *I think your stories are <u>really</u> exciting!* (BNC: BML 1446) (modifier of an AdjP; pre-modification)
     (b) *You have to listen <u>quite</u> carefully.* (BNC: JK8 393) (modifier of an AdvP; pre-modification)
     (c) *<u>Annoyingly</u>, they hadn't left us any milk.* (modifier of a clause; pre-modification)

It is also necessary to mention that not all the adverbs can modify such a wide range of sentence constituents. *Almost* is quite versatile and can modify anything apart from nouns. *Very*, on the other hand, is less flexible and can modify only AdjP, AdvP, but not verbs, NP, and clauses. Compare:

(11)(a) *She is <u>very</u> beautiful.* vs. *It was <u>almost</u> impossible.*
     (b) *She is a <u>very</u> beautiful girl.* vs. *Learning is <u>almost</u> entirely by rote.*
     (c) **She liked it <u>very</u>.* vs. *She <u>almost</u> jumped out of her skin.*
     (d) **<u>Very</u>, she liked it.* vs. *<u>Almost</u>, a feeling of elation took hold of her.* (BNC: CDE 1601)

Modifiers: Quirk (1972: 270, 333) further mentions that adverbs can intensify adjectives (12a) or other adverbs (12b) and then they serve as modifiers, in these cases the adverbs are not independent elements, but parts of adjectival phrases (AdjPs) or adverbial phrases (AdvPs). Adverbs appearing in the function of a modifier usually precede the adjective/adverb they modify, they serve as pre-modification, but there are also adverbs that can be post-posed, they serve as post-modification (12c).
    Adverbs can also be used as modifiers of other sentence constituents e.g. noun phrases (NPs) as in (12d), prepositional phrases (PrepPs) as in (12e), pronouns (12f) and numerals or measurements (12g).
    Although Huddleston (2006: 562) writes that adverbs cannot modify nouns because it is the task of adjectives, Quirk (1972: 282) mentions that a few adverbs can pre-modify nouns, as it is show in example (12i). Nevertheless, it is more common when an adverb occurring in a NP modifies an adjective that further modifies the noun as in (12h).
    The last but not least is the function of adverb as a modifier of indefinite and *wh*-pronouns, and *wh*-adverbs, which can be, according to Quirk (1972: 282), post-modified by the adverb *else* (12j).

(12)(a) *She got used to a <u>well</u> balanced diet.* (modifier of an AdjP; pre-modification)
     (b) *She visited me <u>almost</u> immediately after you had left.* (modifier of an AdvP; pre-modification)
     (c) *The road was not long <u>enough</u> for the plane to land.* (modifier of an AdjP; post-modification)
     (d) *She read <u>almost</u> the whole book in one day.* (modifier of a NP; pre-modification)

(e) *Now their footsteps could be heard <u>directly</u> above my head.* (modifier of a PrepP; pre-modification)

(f) *<u>Nearly</u> everybody came to our party.* (modifier of a pronoun; pre-modification)

(g) *<u>Roughly</u> four percent of the population in the Czech Republic are homosexual.* (modifier of a measurement; pre-modification)

(h) *It was a <u>very</u> nice idea.* (modifier of an AdjP in a NP; pre-modification)

(i) *When the <u>then</u> school minister Michael Fallon launched the Panda Project.* (BNC: K4N 132) (modifier of a noun; pre-modification)

(j) *What <u>else</u> do you have.* (BNC: HE6 91) (modifier of a *wh*-pronoun; post-modification)

To sum it up, adverbs are very multifunctional modifiers, but it is necessary to bear in mind that a single adverb is not able to modify all parts of speech.

It is worth mentioning that adverbs functioning as modifiers can at the same time fulfil the function of intensifiers. It is necessary to remark that modifier and intensifier are not exactly the same. Whereas all intensifiers modify clause constituents by strengthening their meaning, not all modifiers intensify the meaning of clause constituents they precede, which means that intensifiers are just one type of modifiers. Quirk (1972: 438-439) states that intensifiers have either heightening or lowering effect on some clause constituents. With respect to their semantic meaning intensifiers can be further subdivided into:

(i) emphasizers (e.g. *definitely*)
(ii) amplifiers — maximizers (e.g. *completely*)
            — boosters (e.g. *very much*)
(iii) downtoners — compromisers (e.g. *kind of*)
            — diminishers (e.g. *partly*)
            — minimizers (e.g. *hardly*)
            — approximators (e.g. *almost*)

Complement of a preposition: Quirk (1972: 282) mentions also the third function of adverbs incorporated in the sentence structure and that is the function of a complement of a preposition. As the following examples show, it is quite questionable, whether these adverbs serve as complements of prepositions, or the prepositions serve as modifiers of the adverbs.

(13)(a) *You can't go through <u>there</u>.* (BNC: CFJ 1812)

(b) *The Blood seemed to drop from <u>above</u> me.*

1.3.2. Adverbs not incorporated within the sentence structure

As Biber (1999: 548) adds the second large group of adverbs consists of those ones that are not incorporated in the sentence structure. This dissociation is externally signified with comma. Adverbs not incorporated in the sentence structure thus primarily serve as:

Stance adverbials - a means of modal sentence structure. Adverbs of this kind provide information about the speaker's/ writer's attitude toward the whole proposition:

(14)(a) *<u>Unfortunately</u>, there weren't any seats left.* (stance adverbial)

(b) *<u>Curiously</u>, her worst mark was in biology.* (stance adverbial)

Linking adverbials - are connective constituents:

(15)(a) *<u>However</u>, it was not so easy as it seemed.* (linking adverbial)

(b) *What you do need to share, <u>however</u>, is a similarity of beliefs and experiences to underlie the more superficial aspects of personality.* (BNC: ED4 1221) (linking adverbial)

Linking function of the adverb *however* is more obvious in example (15b), where it connects two clauses within a sentence. In (15a) *however* connects the presented sentence with the preceding context, which unfortunately remains unknown for us.

1.3.3. Classification into adjuncts, disjuncts, and conjuncts

According to their syntactic, but also partially their semantic properties, Quirk (1972: 268) divides adverbs into three categories already mentioned in the title of this chapter.

Adjuncts are sentence members that are incorporated into the structure of a clause and are related to the verb. Veselovská (2005: 106) adds that adjuncts convey information about when/where/why something was done. Quirk (1972: 268-270) mentions three conditions out of which at least one must be fulfilled in order to classify an adverb as an adjunct. First it cannot be placed in initial position in a negative declarative clause and set apart by comma or by intonational means, because it is not independent from the verb and it is usually affected by clausal negation.

(16) *He doesn't <u>usually</u> get up so early*.

Adjunct can be contrasted with another adverb in an interrogative clause, and as Quirk (1972: 269) says: "it can be the focus of clause interrogation".

(17) *Is he coming <u>today</u> or <u>tomorrow</u>?*

In the same way it can be contrasted with another adverbial in a negative clause, and thus it can be focused on.

(18) *He didn't visit me <u>today</u>, but he is going to visit me <u>tomorrow</u>.*

Disjuncts express the attitude of the speaker and they apply to the whole proposition. That is why they usually appear in initial position and they are separated from the rest of the clause by a comma or intonation. It is not possible to contrast them with another adverbial neither in an interrogative clause nor in the alternative negative clause.

(19) *<u>Fortunately</u>, sensible horses are found amongst all breeds*. (BNC: ADF 1280)

Conjuncts, as the term already implies, have connective function. They link the content of the preceding context with what is being said. As well as disjuncts, they are external parts of the clause, cannot be contrasted with other adverbials and they often appear in initial position set apart from the rest of the clause by comma and intonation.

(20) *not a chance, he, he never even earned that much money in all his , no but I mean having, having had the income tax done that to you <u>however</u> ridiculous that it is you've got to do something about it.* (BNC: KC9 5854)

1.3.3.1. Categorization of Never according to Quirk

Quirk (1972: 495) ranks *never* among adjuncts, which means elements incorporated into the structure of the clause. I am going to demonstrate on the following examples that *never* can fulfil all the three conditions that Quirk mentions.

Firstly, *never* is related to the verb which it evolves as it has been mentioned in 1.3.4. and *never* cannot be separated from the rest of the clause by comma or intonational means. I have not found any such example in the BNC. The most typical position of *never* is that between Mod./Aux. and the rest of the VP, which Quirk (1985: 491) calls medial position.

(21) *He had <u>never</u> shown impatience or eagerness again.* (BNC: G1M 1980)

Secondly, *never* can be contrasted with another adverb in an interrogative clause.

(22) *Does he <u>usually</u> or <u>never</u> get up so early?*

The third criterion seems to be rather problematic because *never* is itself a means of clause negation. So we can say that *never* and the part of the clause that is negated can be contrasted with the positive part of the clause as in (23).

(23) *It was <u>now</u> or <u>never</u>.* (BNC: CR6 650)

1.3.3.2. *Categorization of Not according to Quirk*

As I will also mention in 1.3.5, *not* is incorporated into the structure of a clause and is an element related to the verb. As well as adjuncts, also *not* is dependent on the verb and this is the reason why *not* cannot occur at the beginning of the clause and it cannot be separated from the main proposition by comma or by intonational means, I will return to the distributional properties of *not* in 1.5.2.

(24) *I haven<u>'t</u> done it yet.* (BNC: KP3 623) vs. **<u>Not</u>, I have done it yet.*

However, *not* cannot be contrasted with another adverbial in an interrogative clause. The question, which arises here, is what should *not* be contrasted with? If we want to contrast *not* we can only contrast the whole negative proposition with a proposition that is on the other hand positive. In such a case the focus really stands on the negative element *not* that also carries the sentence stress, but in this way, *not* still does not fulfil the second criterion given by Quirk (1972: 269), which says that an adverb is classified as an adjunct if it can be contrasted with another adverbial either in an interrogative clause, or in a negative clause. What is *not* contrasted with is not an adverbial but a whole positive part of the clause (25b). In (25a) *not* as a constituent of the negative clause is contrasted with the first clause that is positive.

(25) (a) *Is it new or is it <u>not</u> new?*
    (b) *Is he coming or <u>not</u>?*

Not, as well as disjuncts, can express the attitude of the speaker because it simply expresses the speaker's disagreement or negative attitude to a certain proposition or situation. I will go back to this in chapter 2.1.1.

It is important to point out that *not* applies only to the part of the clause that follows it, because it is this part that is in the scope of negation and it is thus negated and influenced by *not*.

(26) *I <u>don't</u> want to go with you.* (disapproval of the speaker)

Not cannot serve as a linking element in a sentence and unlike conjuncts and disjuncts, *not* is an internal part of a clause.
According to the criteria summed up by Quirk (1972: 268-270) I assume that *not* does not behave specifically as neither of the categories adjuncts, disjuncts, or conjuncts, but out of

these three categories *not* is closest to the adjuncts, because they are, as well as *not*, internal parts of the clause predication.

1.3.4.   Syntactic functions of *Never*

The following sections focus on the adverb *never* in its different functions. Each function is going to be described more closely and I am also going to provide enough examples that will illustrate how the adverb *never* is used in these functions.

1.3.4.1.   *Never functioning as a circumstance adverbial*

One of the characteristic features of the adverb *never* is its incorporation within the structure of the clause. *Never* is therefore classified according to Biber's (1999: 548) classification as a **circumstance adverbial**. *Never* provides additional information on when and how often something happened and it evolves the verb, it is thus related to the verb. Nevertheless, *never* is an independent element of the clause and that is why its position in the clause is also relatively free. Notice the following examples in (27).

(27) (a) *I have never been trying so much.*
(b) *I have been never trying so much.*
(c) *Never have I been trying so much.*

According to Huddleston's criteria, the adverb *never* seems to belong to modifiers that primarily modify verbs. In my corpora search, out of 50 clauses containing the adverb *never*, 46 contained *never* as a modifier of a verb as in (28a). In 2 cases *never* served as an intensifier of an AdvP (28b), and in 1 case as an intensifier of an AdjP (28c). Only 1 example showed *never* as a representative of a NP modifier (28d).

(28) (a) *Comacina never recovered from the beating.* (BNC: ANB 90)
(b) *[...] Kate, under his spell as never before, could feel [...].* (BNC: HGM 2324)
(c) *[...] I was never quite sure where it was all going [...].* (BNC: CH8 136)
(d) *There's never a minute when he's in the house that [...].* (BNC: HWE 677)

1.3.4.2.   *Never functioning as a modifier*

The following section focuses on *never* in its function of a **modifier**. I want to demonstrate instances of *never* in other, in some cases also frequent, syntactic combinations. My search in the BNC has shown that *never* can also modify AdjP, AdvP and PrepP. Notice the following examples:

(29) (a) *His prolific imagination was never more happily displayed.* (BNC: GTH 110)
(b) *It was pretty small and there was never enough chairs for everybody.* (BNC: FR5 790)
(c) *I can never ever touch another drink.* (BNC: CEN 2217)
(d) *I'd ridden over many jumps before, but never on a racehorse, never fast, never caring so much about the outcome.* (BNC: ADY 1439)

Never can function as a modifier of an AdjP as in (29a). The most frequent collocation of *never* and an adjective was that of *never more* that can be found in the BNC in 156 cases. *Never* as a modifier of an AdvP usually appears as a part of collocation *never enough* (29b) namely in 59 cases. Collocation *never ever* (29c) is even more frequent and appears in 204 examples in the BNC. The use of *never* as a modifier of a PrepP is quite rare. Example (29d) might be interpreted as an instance of *never* used in the function of a

modifier of a PrepP. On the other hand, it is also possible to understand the phrases following the conjunction *but* as elliptic constructions. In such a case, what has been ellipted is the subject with the VP (*I'd ridden*) to which *never* can be related. *Never* would therefore be just another instance of a modifier of a VP.

Never can also operate as a modifier of semiclauses. Semiclauses contain infinite verb forms, so what is modified by the adverb *never*, is again a verb. Example (30a) shows *never* as a modifier of an infinitive, example (30b) of a gerund.

(30)(a) *Indeed when the time came to leave Germany I made a mental decision <u>never to return</u>.* (BNC: EA8 49)
   (b) *Dinah had always disliked and resented her, <u>never forgetting</u> the pain caused by her birth.* (BNC: CD2 2037)

1.3.4.3.   *Never functioning as an intensifier*

In connection with the examples in (28) has been referred to the function of *never* as the function of an **intensifier**. Which means that *never* intensifies the meaning of the following element and thus stresses the importance of it. Quirk (1972: 456), however, reminds that *never* can further be sub-classified as a negative minimizer and demonstrates it with the following example and explanation:

(31) *You will <u>never</u> catch the train tonight. → You will not under any circumstances catch the train tonight.*

By using the adverb *never*, the speaker wants to emphasize that the chance to fulfil the conditions under which a certain action can eventuate is minimal, thus the term **minimizer**. *Never* can therefore be ranked among minimizers, which belong to the group of downtoners that, as Quirk (1972: 452) reminds, have a lowering effect. In terms of classification downtoners are then just one subtype of intensifiers.

It is important for us to notice there the co-occurrence of adverbs *never* and *tonight*. Quirk (1972: 456) hereunto adds:

> "The presence of an adverbial referring to a specific future time such as *tonight* rules out the temporal meaning of *never*."

In other words, in clauses where *never* co-occurs with another adverb, e.g. *tonight*, *never* loses its temporal meaning of frequency and in fact fulfils the same function as if there was the negative particle *not*. The only difference is that *never* sounds stronger and more emotively, i.e. *never* serves as the negative meaning intensifying clause negator. Compare the following sentences and their Czech equivalents:

(32)(a) *Will he <u>not</u> go to bed tonight? → Nepůjde dnes do postele?*
   (b) *Will he <u>ever</u> go to bed tonight? → Půjde dnes vůbec do postele?*
   (c) *Will he <u>never</u> go to bed tonight? → On dnes jako vůbec nepůjde do postele?*

After discussion with a native speaker of English, I am able to claim that (32a) is an emotively neutral statement, in which the negator *not* remains unstressed. (32b) implies that this sentence was said by an angry speaker. In (32c) it is possible to say that the speaker was really very annoyed. *Never* is, in contrast to *not* in (32a), stressed and intensifies the meaning of the clause.

1.3.5.   **Syntactic functions of *Not***

Negator *not* is the basic devise of clause negation, however it can also be used as a means of partial negation, both discussed later in section 2.2.

With respect to the division of words into those which either are, or are not incorporated within the sentence structure, *not* definitely belongs to those clause elements that are incorporated within the structure, and that is why it cannot operate as a means of epistemic modality (stance adverbial), or a linking element, and cannot be fronted into initial position and be separated from the rest of the clause with comma. Compare the sentences in (33).

(33)(a) **<u>Not</u>, she could believe he was serious.*
　　(b) *She could <u>not</u> believe he was serious.* (BNC: FS1 672)

Not cannot be classified as a circumstance adverbial, although it evolves verbs and provides information about the action described in a clause. Nevertheless, *not* cannot be described as an optional element, but an element that is obligatory with respect to the polarity of the clause. *Not* is a clause constituent that carries important information. If the hearer / receiver of the message does not understand / hear *not* in the clause, they will understand a clear opposite of the message.

In case of clause negation, which will be discussed more thoroughly in section 2.1, *not* is not an independent element, but an element that is primarily dependent on the verb, which is proved by the fact that *not* requires the occurrence of Mod./Aux. in the clause and it can fuse with Mod./Aux. into contracted forms e.g. *mustn't, can't, aren't, won't, wasn't, don't,* etc. as in (34a). *Not* can also be dependent on other sentence members as in (34b-c), but then we cannot talk about clause negation, but phrasal negation instead:

(34)(a) *You <u>mustn't</u> come late.* <clause negation>
　　(b) *<u>Not your brother</u>, but my brother Jerry visited me yesterday.* <phrasal negation>
　　(c) *Tomorrow we're going to soft play <u>not today</u>.* (BNC: KB8 11856) <phrasal negation>

Not can rather be classified as a modifier that can in case of phrasal negation modify NPs e.g. (34a), AdjPs, AdvPs e.g. (34c), PrepPs, determiners, numerals, measurements, and in case of clause negation, which is the most frequent type, clauses as in (34a). In comparison with adverbs, *not* cannot only modify NPs, but also nouns (35), which the majority of adverbs cannot do.

(35) *This contains 4 pints of very corrosive organic acid which only attacks living or organic items such as wood or leather, but <u>not metal or stone</u>.* (BNC: CLK 338)

To sum it up *not* is a very versatile modifier. On the other hand, *not* cannot function as a complement of a preposition (36a), whereas some adverbs can (36b).

(36)(a) **He has just come <u>from not</u>: his moustache is cold and damp with dew.*
　　(b) *He has just come <u>from outdoors</u>: his moustache is cold, and damp with dew.* (BNC: G1A 1203)

It is necessary to mention that Quirk (1972: 698) also writes about another function of the negator *not* and thus its function of a pro-form. In this function *not* substitutes either the whole predicate (37a) or the subject and part of the predicate (37b).

(37) (a) *He is an abominable scoundrel. Yes, but <u>not</u> John.* (= *Yes, but John <u>is not an abominable scoundrel</u>.*)
(b) *He bought Charlie, but not me, drinks.* (BNC: C8E 1818) (= *He bought Charlie, but <u>he didn't buy</u> me, drinks.*)

As will be discussed in detail in section 2.3.2, *not* is typically used in contrastive constructions. Function of *not* in such clauses is that of emphasizing the positive part of a statement. Notice the following:

(38) *The pattern is er <u>not</u> the white rose of York <u>but</u> the rose of the incarnation or the rose of the Virgin Mary, Rosa Mundi.* (BNC: JTE 560)

1.4. Position of adverbs in the sentence

Huddleston (2006: 575) differentiates three main positions of adverbs. First of all it is the initial, or front position of the adverb left of the subject. Then it is the end position after the verb and its dependents if there are any. The last position is the central one between the subject and the verb. Quirk (1995: 491) uses the term medial for the central position of the adverb in a clause. Compare the following:

(39) (a) *<u>Happily,</u> it usually becomes over-cosy rather than frozen solid.* (BNC: AAF 97)
(b) *Some women will <u>happily</u> abandon themselves to complete involvement in the role of 'mother', for several years.* (BNC: CCN 1336)
(c) *Old ladies dabbed their eyes <u>happily</u>.* (BNC: BMD 419)

Furthermore, Huddleston (2006: 576) divides adverbs with respect to their position and meaning to VP-oriented adverbs, and clause-oriented adverbs and gives the following categories and examples:

(A) VP-oriented adverbs:
(a) manner: *She walked <u>unsteadily</u> to the door.*
(b) means or instrument: *Planets can be detected <u>radio-telescopically</u>.*
(c) act-related: *They <u>deliberately</u> kept us waiting.*
(d) degree: *The share price has increased <u>enormously</u>.*
(e) temporal location: *She <u>subsequently</u> left town.*
(f) duration: *We were staying in a motel <u>temporarily</u>.*
(g) aspectuality: *Some of the guests are <u>already</u> here.*
(h) frequency: *Do you come here <u>often</u>?*
(i) serial order: *The play was <u>next</u> performed in 1901.*

(B) Clause-oriented adverbs:
(a) domain: *<u>Politically,</u> the country is always turbulent.*
(b) modality: *This is <u>necessarily</u> rather rare.*
(c) evaluation: *<u>Fortunately,</u> this did not happen.*
(d) speech-act related: *<u>Frankly,</u> I'm just not interested.*
(e) connective: *<u>Moreover,</u> he didn't even apologise.*

Adverbs belonging to the (A) category are related to the VP and evolve the verb and are therefore more eligible within the VP or adjacent to the VP. That is why they favour end position. Position of the adverb in a clause is often connected with its semantic meaning, e.g. manner and local adverbs are more likely to occur in end position.

(40) (a) *He took smoke into his lungs and exhaled <u>slowly</u>.* (BNC: BN1 1022)
    (b) *You can see it right <u>here</u>.*

    Clause-oriented adverbs in (B) are more loosely connected to the VP and that is why it is less likely for them to occur within the VP or be adjacent to the VP. They usually occur in initial position, but they are generally quite free with respect to their position. In initial position clause-oriented adverbs open the new sentence proposition, in central position they fulfil their linking function and thus connect the parts of a sentence proposition, in final position they serve as a closing element. Notice the following:

(41) (a) *<u>However,</u> this cover version of Bronski Beat's first single is really very good indeed.* (BNC: CK5 2736)
    (b) *Bringing in the superpowers, <u>however,</u> would force an unwilling Washington to confront the problems caused by its continuing non-military support for the contras.* (BNC: A9M 482)
    (c) *It is not, <u>however,</u> generally known that the first-ever 'unit' was established in 1873, well over a hundred years ago!* (BNC: BM9 287)
    (d) *It was still only relatively light damage, <u>however</u>.* (BNC: A67 591)

    As we can see from the preceding examples, adverb *however* can appear in initial position (41a), it can be inserted between the subject and the verb of the clause (41b), it can be embedded within the VP (41c), or it can function as a closing element of the clause in its end position (41d).
    Huddleston (2006: 577) mentions that position of the adverb in front of the Mod./Aux. is less common, and it is an alternative to front position (43d). Both VP-oriented and clause-oriented adverbs can be placed into central position after the Mod./Aux. When both VP-oriented and clause-oriented adverbs are used in central position in one proposition, it is the clause-oriented adverb that stands first after the Mod./Aux., and the VP-oriented adverb follows it.

(42) *This rule was, <u>however often</u> broken.* (BNC: EUU 251)

    With respect to time adverbs of frequency, Huddleston demonstrates that they are most preferred in the central position after the Mod./Aux. and in the end position. Initial position and central position between subject and Mod./Aux. is possible but usually disfavoured. See the examples in (43).

(43) (a) *We would <u>sometimes</u> try that.*
    (b) *We would try that <u>sometimes</u>.*
    (c) *?<u>Sometimes</u> we would try that.*
    (d) *?We <u>sometimes</u> would try that.*

    It is necessary to mention that Quirk (1995: 490-493) distinguishes four types of medial position. The basic type of medial position (symbol M) is the one, where adverb stands between the operator and the rest of the VP. If you compare the sentences in (44), you might notice a slight difference. (44a) is an example of complex VP that consists of an operator represented by modal verb *must* and a lexical verb, in such a case the adverb is placed between the Mod./Aux. and the lexical verb. In (44b) the situation is a bit different; VP is represented only by a lexical verb, the adverb must therefore be placed between the subject and the lexical verb. In both cases we can speak about medial position (M),

because in both cases the adverb stands between the operator and the rest of the VP, however in (44b), the operator *do* is hidden.

Quirk (1995: 493-494) then talks about initial medial position (iM). In iM position adverbs immediately follow the subject of the clause, VP starting with Mod./Aux. follows it as in (44c). Quirk points out that iM position is used when the speaker intends to exclude the adverbial from the scope of negation or when the following item, i.e. Mod./Aux. is stressed. The iM position is also used, when the focused verb of the VP is *be* as in (44d).

The third type is represented by the so called mM position, which means medial medial position. This is a quite rare type of position which can be used only in case of complex VP, i.e. a VP that contains three or more auxiliaries (44e).

Finally, it is necessary to mention end medial position (eM). Within a complex VP consisting of two or more auxiliaries and a lexical verb adverb is placed between the last auxiliary and the lexical verb (44f). This position is typical when the speaker wants to relate the adverb to the lexical verb used in the VP.

(44)(a) *I must <u>really</u> see her on Friday.* <M>
    (b) *We <u>really</u> know him quite well.* → (*We do <u>really</u> know him quite well.*) <M>
    (c) *He <u>really</u> didn't know anything about your situation.* <iM>
    (d) *She <u>really</u> is a bright student.* <iM>
    (e) *The book must have <u>really</u> been placed in the wrong bookcase.* <mM>
    (f) *The book must have been <u>really</u> placed in the wrong bookcase.* <eM>

I would like to sum up also Quirk's remark concerning the end position of adverbs. Primarily, Quirk (1995: 498) states that adverbs occur in end position (E) when they follow all the obligatory clause constituents. There might be only two obligatory constituents, i.e. subject and VP as in (45a), but we can also encounter such clauses, where there are more obligatory elements as in (45b). Quirk (1995: 499) observes that it is possible to distinguish one subtype of adverbial end position. Initial end position (iE), as he calls it, is used when the adverb v placed between the object and the obligatory adverbial, as in (45c). The iE position is preferred when the speaker wants to emphasize the final obligatory element. Quirk further points out that iE position is needed, when the last obligatory element of a clause is a subordinate clause, as in (45d).

(45)(a) *The light was fading <u>rapidly</u>.* (Quirk: 1995, 498) <E>
    (b) *He put the vase there <u>secretly</u>.* <E>
    (c) *She placed the book <u>offhandedly</u> on the table.* (Quirk: 1995, 499) <iE>
    (d) *He said <u>suddenly</u> that he had earlier lost his temper.* (Quirk: 1995, 499) <iE>

It is obvious that to judge adverbials with respect to their position might be problematic. What must be taken into consideration is not only the semantics of the adverb, and its function in the clause, but also the aim of the speaker, who uses the lexical items to convey certain information and also his/her attitude.

Concerning the co-occurrence of indefinite frequency adverbs, Quirk (1972: 495) writes that they can co-occur with each other in a hierarchical relationship.

(46) *<u>Normally</u>, committee meetings are held <u>infrequently</u>.* (Quirk, 1972: 495)

According to the semantic categorization of adverbs in section 1.2.1, both adverbs in example (46) belong to the group of adverbs of indefinite frequency (B). The first one, *normally*, belongs to the subdivision (a), i.e. to adverbs of usual occurrence. The second

adverb, *infrequently*, belongs to group (d) adverbs of low or zero frequency, which means that the first mentioned adverb lies higher in the potential hierarchy than the second one.

Adverbs of the same subcategory can also co-occur, if momentary verbs are used.

(47) *I have <u>rarely</u> knocked on his door <u>a few times</u>.*

Both adverbs in example (47) belong to low or zero frequency adverbs.

Quirk (1972: 495) appends that *ever* as an adverb of indefinite frequency commonly appears with partially negative adverbs *hardly, rarely, scarcely*. Notice:

(48) *He <u>hardly ever</u> forgets to bring anything I might want.* (BNC: G07 715)

The co-occurence of *never* and the non-assertive item *ever* is considered substandard, but quite frequent as has been mentioned in 1.3.4. *Ever* serves as an intensifier of the pre-posed adverbs. The combination of *never + ever* is more frequent in spoken language, and in my corpus search it appears in 142 cases, including written texts (62 examples in total).

(49) *I have <u>never ever</u> in my life read anything so ridiculous.* (BNC: HUV 892)

1.5.1.   Position of *Never* in a clause

Never as a clause-oriented one-word temporal adverb expressing an indefinite frequency stands most frequently between the first Mod./Aux. and the rest of the VP as in (50a), in exceptional cases *never* can be placed between the subject and the first Mod./Aux. for the purposes of emphasis (50b). Sinclair (1990: 210) adds that when *never* is used in a VP that does not contain any Mod./Aux. it immediately follows the subject of the clause (50c).

(50) (a) *I have <u>never</u> been so scared in my life.* (BNC: CAH 273)
      (b) *I <u>never</u> could finish the task.*
      (c) *I <u>never</u> thought I had a chance.* (BNC: EFG 2236)

In emphatic statements adverbial negation can be accentuated by additional Mod./Aux. that immediately follows the adverb. Compare the non-emphatic and emphatic statement:

(51) (a) *I <u>never</u> went out without my insect repellent and waterproof sunblock.* (BNC: ASV 2652)
      (b) *I <u>never</u> did go out without my insect repellent and waterproof sunblock.* (BNC:ASV 2652)

Never and other negative adverbs (*nowhere, hardly*) can be placed into initial position. Quirk (1972: 378) points out that this use is characteristic for rather formal and literary style. Notice the word order in the following example (52a). After the initial negative adverb, subject and the following Mod./Aux. have to be inverted. In spoken English there are instances of uninverted word order (52b). Compare the following examples:

(52) (a) *<u>Never has</u> the burden of choice been so heavy*. (BNC: BNF 758)
      (b) *<u>Never I</u> was totally shocked in my voice*. (BNC: KBE 2518)

With respect to Quirk's classification of medial adverb position in a clause, M position is unambiguously the most frequent position of *never*. Out of my randomly chosen set of 50 sentences containing the adverb *never* 46, as has already been said in 1.3.4, are instances of clause negation. Out of these 46 sentences, *never* occurred in M position in 44

cases. In the remaining two sentences *never* was placed in iM position, and in both of them position seems to be the device of emphasis:

(53) (a) *Saving the world will not be cheap, but, then, security <u>never</u> has been cheap.* (BNC: AB6 1298)
(b) *I wondered whether Robert and Lili had spoken so often like this that neither had any longer the energy to shout, or whether there <u>never</u> had been anger between them.* (BNC: G06 573)

Never in eM position is rarely used. I have found only 13 such examples in the BNC, most frequently it is the collocation *would + have + never* that appeared in 11 sentences (54). It is necessary to take into consideration that *never* occurs in 53 182 entries in the BNC. Out of this amount *never* occurs in eM position only in 13 instances. I can therefore assume that *never* in eM position is not only rare, but it is used in eM position only for special purposes, e.g. emphasis.

(54) (a) *And without that, I would have <u>never</u> gotten to live the adventure of the past twelve months.* (BNC: ECU 174)
(b) *The job's been <u>never</u> finished never will be finished with the corporation on it.* (BNC: KBP 2127)
(c) *Tom O'Reilly was an ascetic former Treasurer of the Corporation who had been <u>never</u> known to smile even when [...].* (BNC: AC2 74)

The mM position is even less likely to occur. I have found only one such sentence in the BNC:

(55) *Such stories would have <u>never</u> been published in the United Kingdom, for instance, where public officials can hide behind punitive laws of libel and press freedom is less assiduously protected.* (BNC: EAY 359)

Never can be placed in E position, nevertheless, in some cases this placement sounds quite oddly, as in (56a). *Never* frequently occurs in E position as a part of some firmly settled collocation. In (56b) *never* is part of collocations, in which it is contrasted with another adverb.

(56) (a) *It visits some people <u>never</u>.* (BNC: ANF 690)
(b) *Better late than <u>never</u>.* (BNC: B7G 2272)
(c) *His eyes rested on her, mocking her, and Folly knew that it was now or <u>never</u>.* (BNC: H8S 3168)

Sinclair (1990: 211) points out that *never* can be found at the beginning of a clause also in imperative structures. Imperative structures typically do not contain any subject and thus usually begin with a definite verb form. In imperatives containing time adverbs, adverb is placed at the beginning of the clause (57).

(57) *<u>Never make</u> the same mistake twice.*

Quirk (1972: 378) furthermore adds that *never* is sometimes repeated in a clause for emphasis (58). This emphatic use is more frequent in spoken English. Out of 50 randomly chosen clauses, repeated *never* occurred in 32 cases in written English and in 18 cases in spoken English. However, closer investigation showed that out of these 32 clauses 22 were in fact examples of direct speech in fictional prose.

(58) *To be honest Margaret I was <u>never, never</u> was in a car.* (BNC: KDM 1687)

To sum it up, the most frequent position of *never* is the central position M. Initial position I is less frequent, but in contrast with end position E, it is acceptable. The other types of M position, i.e. iM, mM, and eM positions, are acceptable, but they are hardly ever used.

1.5.2.   Position of *Not* in a clause.

With respect to its position in a clause, *not* can be ranked among VP-oriented elements that often occur in central position, which means a position between the Mod./Aux. and the rest of the VP. Although, as Huddleston (2006: 576) points out, VP-oriented adverbs are most frequently placed in final position, which is not plausible in case of *not*. Compare the following sentences:

(59) (a) *I <u>don't</u> understand.*
    (b) **I (do) understand <u>not</u>.*
    (c) **I <u>not</u> (do) understand.*
    (d) **<u>Not</u> I (do) understand.*

It is necessary to mention that *not* cannot be ranked among clause-oriented elements, which can not only be placed within the VP but are quite free with respect to their position, as it was already illustrated in (41). Conversely, the position of *not* is fixed within the VP (59a), which is in fact the only position which *not* takes when functioning as a means of clause negation.

As you can notice in (59a), *not* is characteristic for its ability to be reduced to an enclitic contracted form *-n't*. The use of contracted forms is stylistically marked, it is restricted to its usage in colloquial English. Furthermore, the negator *not* not only requires the occurrence of Mod./Aux in questions, but also in statements. If we want to negate a clause that is in a simple present or past tense form, we need support of the auxiliary *do*. Quirk (1972: 77) calls it a 'dummy' operator, because it does not have any individual meaning. Even the negator *not*, does not carry any other semantic meaning apart from its negative meaning and thus cannot be classed with any of the semantic categories mentioned by Huddleston (2006: 576).

Another important thing concerning the negator *not* is its position in questions. As we know both in question and in negative clauses there is a necessity of occurrence of Mod./Aux. In case of a negative question, it is necessary to distinguish between the position of *not* in its full form and its enclitic form *n't*. As Quirk (1972: 388) demonstrates, the traditional word order in questions is as follows: operator - subject - (Neg.) - V - ... as in (60a), which means that in its full form *not* has to be placed immediately behind the subject. If *not* contracts and fuses with the operator, it can stand in the position in front of the subject as in (60b). Compare the following:

(60) (a) *Have you <u>not</u> noticed it?*
    (b) *<u>Haven't</u> you noticed it?*

As well as I explored possible positions of the adverb *never*, I am now going to present the results of my BNC search concerning the negator *not*. The only position that seems to be grammatically plausible for *not* functioning as a clause negator is the M

position, i.e. position between the Mod./Aux. and the rest of the verbal phrase.[6] *Not* cannot be fronted into initial position (59d), but it also cannot be forwarded to iM position (61b). I have not found any example of mM position (61c), however there were 8 sentences in the BNC, where *not* was placed in the eM position (61d). Again, as in the case of *never*, the most frequent collocation was the one with the verbs *would* + *have* + the negator *not*. If I compare this result with the total number of entries of the negator *not*, I can assume that the use of eM position is not formally correct.[7]

(61) (a) *'But it would not have happened if Suter had not put £4m into the plant,' he said.* (BNC: K4S 983) <M>
(b) **It not would have happened if [...].* <iM>
(c) **He would have not been elected if he wasn't an actor.* <mM>
(d) *?So much that was to come would have not happened on Liamuiga and Oualie, or [...].* (BNC: G0S 164) <eM>
(e) *?Violet would have not believed.* (BNC: BNC 1688) <eM>

Not can however have also other syntactic functions within a clause that have been dealt with in 1.3.5, depending on this function, *not* can occur in various positions.

As a clause negator, *not* cannot be used in preverbal position unless it is contracted and fused with Mod./Aux. in a negative question (60b). If we want to use negative form at the beginning of the clause in preverbal position, we can use negative adverbs, pronouns (62a) or determiners, it is not possible to replace this negative form with *not* + non-assertive form (62b). Nevertheless it is possible to create negative subjects by means of the negator *not* (62c): *not all, not every, not everybody, not much, not many*, etc. In such combinations *not* functions as a pre-determiner.

(62) (a) *Nobody cares whether you're alive or dead.* (BNC: FSF 910)
(b) **Not anybody cares whether you're alive or dead.*
(c) *Not everybody cares whether you're alive or dead.*

In cases where *not* functions as a pre-determiner we speak about phrasal negation but as Quirk emphasizes (1972: 382) we must not be mistaken because, what is negated, is not only the particular phrase but the whole clause.

(63) *Not every thane had been left behind to act as a watchdog.* (BNC: HRC 1516)

Not is also used as a negator in semiclauses. Semiclauses are in fact elliptic clauses whose form as Veselovská (2006: 93) explains was reduced to pure lexical level, functional level was omitted. In a negative semiclause, the only functional item is the negative particle *not* that is placed in front of the infinitive (64a), *-ing* participle (64b), or *-ed* participle (64c).

(64) (a) *He told me not to ask questions like that.* (BNC: EE5 78)
(b) *Not wishing to risk increasing instability, Franco adopted...* (BNC: HPV 656)
(c) *Not drunk he could drive his car.*

---

[6] I assessed the examples on the basis of data found in the BNC and in the grammar manuals.
[7] The negator *not* occurs in 456 080 entries in the BNC. Out of this number *not* occurs in eM position in 8 cases, which is too low portion for me to assume that this position of *not* is a correct one. However, the position of *not* in other than M position is possible when interpreted as partial (verbal) negation.

In clauses that contain both a finite and non-finite verb group, it is possible to choose one of these verb groups and negate it. However, Sinclair (1990: 208) points out that in most of such cases there is a clear difference in meaning. Compare the following clauses:

(65)(a) *He <u>did not remember</u> having seen a telephone*. (BNC: GWB 1063)
(b) *He remembered <u>not having</u> seen a telephone.*

On the other hand, Sinclair (1990: 208) adds that there are also a few introductory verbs (e.g. *seem, wish, want, ...*) that can be followed by infinitive, and whether you negate the introductory verb or the infinitive, the meaning remains the same.

(66)(a) *He <u>did not want</u> to do it in front of the crowd*. (BNC: HTX 1235)
(b) *He wanted <u>not to do</u> it in front of the crowd*.

Not is very universal negator as has already been discussed in 1.3.5, and Sinclair states that *not* can be used with nearly any word and any phrase, it can be used to negate a NP (67), AdjP, AdvP, PrepP and quantifiers. Negation of a word phrase makes the statement more forceful, efficient and clearer. In contrast with cases were *not* is used purely to negate the VP, where it remains unstressed, *not* used with other word phrases becomes the carrier of a word stress. It is also important to remark that *not* as a device of clause negation is quite fixed with respect to word order. In the function of a phrasal negator, *not* can be found both in pre-verbal (62c) and post-verbal position (66b).

(67) *This was <u>not my enemy</u>, <u>not the saint's enemy</u>, <u>not the thief</u>!* (BNC: G0M 2094)

Whether *not* negates a NP, AdvP or a semiclause, it always stands immediately before the word group that it applies to.

Given the complexity of the phenomena, I will discuss English negation in the following chapter 2.

2. **Negation**

In this chapter I am going to focus on some aspects of English negation which are relevant to my discussion and which show the basic distinctions between the two items discussed: *never* and *not*.

First, I am going to focus on the differentiation between morphological and clause negation. In connection with this topic I am going to explain the terms connected with this topic, in particular the scope of negation. I am going to comment on the basic tests that can be done to differentiate morphological negation from clause negation and vice versa. Furthermore, I am going to discuss the terms of clause, partial and local negation, and I will make clear the basic distinctions between them. This chapter is especially relevant for the demonstration of properties of the negator *not*, because they show how it functions.

Then I will make clear the differences between analytic and synthetic negation, because *not* and *never* are two characteristic representatives of these two categories. In order to do so, it is necessary to mention some basic facts about the typological classification of English because it is this classification that creates the starting point for the division into analytic and synthetic negation. I am going to deal with the tendency to use either analytic or synthetic negation, and to show which one is more frequent. I am going to mention the basic restrictions on both kinds of negation discussed, and I am also going to show which transformations of clauses are acceptable and which are implausible with respect to the type of negation used.

Concerning the division into analytic and synthetic type of negation I am also going to make a comparison of *never* and *not* and show the distinctions and overlaps. I am going to concentrate on all the constructions described in previous chapter and show the restrictions that follow from the properties of the items discussed. All differences and similarities will again be demonstrated in examples.

2.1 **Aspects relevant to morphological and clause negation**

This section should give an overview of the principle differences between morphological and clause negation in English, but before I focus on the distinguishing features it is necessary to bring closer important terminology and aspects that have already been mentioned in the preceding chapters, but have not been explained yet. First of all I am going to focus on the phenomenon called scope of negation with its limitations and extensions and after that I am going to explain what clause and morphological negation are, and to demonstrate how they function and how they differ.

2.1.1 Scope of negation

This term has already been mentioned on several places in this work and that is why I am going to explain it within the following few lines.

We can imagine that the scope of negation is something like a magnetic field. In a magnetic field all the metallic items that are in the reach of magnetic force are magnetized and thus inevitably influenced by this force. The same happens in a negative clause where everything that is in the reach of the negator is negated and has to behave according to certain rules. As we know Standard English allows only single negation in a clause, which means that items that are negated by a certain negator, i.e. are in the scope of negation, cannot have negative form. Therefore it is necessary to use the so called non-assertive words. This means that right of the negator, as Quirk (1972: 379) confirms, all the assertive words that would have normally occurred in positive clauses, must be replaced by non-assertive words such as *anybody, anywhere, anything, anyone, any* etc.

(68) (a) *I met <u>somebody</u> outside. → I <u>didn't</u> meet <u>anybody</u> outside.*
(b) *I want to go <u>somewhere</u> hot. → I <u>don't</u> want to go <u>anywhere</u> hot.*
(c) *There is <u>something</u> in the kitchen sink. → There <u>isn't</u> <u>anything</u> in the kitchen sink.*
(d) *They chose <u>some</u> of the adepts. → They <u>didn't</u> choose <u>any</u> of the adepts.*

One of the characteristics of natural languages is that they are linear. This has a direct impact on the scope of negation. The scope of the negation thus normally extends from the negative word itself rightwards to the end of the clause, i.e. that what is left from the negator is outside the scope, what is right of the clause is usually influenced by the negator. That is why assertive words like *somebody, something* etc. that usually occur only in positive clauses can also be found in negative clauses like the following (69), but as you can see they have to stand left of the negator; i.e. they have to stand outside the scope of negation:

(69) <u>*Somebody was not*</u> *telling the truth and [...].* (BNC: FBJ 957)

Quirk (1972: 381) reminds that the scope of negation is usually marked by intonation and by assertive and non-assertive words. Notice the difference between the following clauses:

(70) (a) <u>*I could not find any of my CDs*</u>.
(b) <u>*I could not find*</u> *some of my CDs*.

In the example (70a) the scope of negation affects the whole clause including the object. In (70b) the scope of negation reaches only the end of the VP, but does not touch the following object, which is indicated by the occurrence of the assertive word *some* that would have normally been changed under the influence of the negator *not* into the non-assertive *any* as in (70a).

Veselovská (2006: 57) points out that there is a lexical item that not only indicates, where the scope of negation ends, but even stops it. It is the word *just*.

(71) (a) *I do not talk to <u>just</u> <u>anybody</u>. → Nebavím se <u>jen tak</u> s někým.*
(b) *This isn't <u>just</u> <u>any</u> department store.* (BNC: H8S 849) *→ Tohle není jen tak ledajaký obchodní dům.* [8]

As you can see in the previous example (71a), the negative polarity item *anybody* does not have negative, but positive meaning; *anybody* remains untouched by the scope of negation. The same happens in (71b), the scope of negation is immediately stopped by the occurrence of the focusing adjunct *just*.

Furthermore, it is possible to use negative items, such as *no, nobody, none, nothing, never* in negative clauses already containing predicative negation (72b), but the meaning can slightly differ from the instances where non-assertive items are used (72a).

(72) (a) *I do not talk to <u>anybody</u>. → Nebavím se s nikým.*
(b) *I do not talk to <u>nobody</u>. → Nebavím se s nikým.* (<offencedly> i.e.: *It is not true that I do not talk to anybody.*) *→ I talk to somebody.*

---

[8] All the Czech equivalents are my own translations.

Quirk (1972: 379) writes that in such sentences as (72b) each negator has its individual value and it is possible to formulate synonymous paraphrases that are completely positive.

However, not all instances of double or multiple negation can be interpreted in this way. Quirk (1972: 379) states that it is quite typical for Substandard English to use double or multiple negation instead of single negation. In such cases negators do not have individual meaning, but only reinforce the negative value of the statement. Such sentences cannot be paraphrased with the help of positive statements; in Standard English the same sentences would include a single negator. Notice the following:

(73)(a) *No one never said nothing. → *Someone ever said something.*
    (b) *No one ever said anything.*

To recognize the difference between sentences as e.g. (72b) and (73a) can only help the context or tone of the speaker, which can imply annoyance or emphasis.

Quirk (1972: 589) also mentions that scope of negation can sometimes extend to the following clause within a sentence, in which the subject and auxiliary were ellipted. Quirk emphasizes that extension of the scope is possible only if two conditions are fulfilled:

(A) the clauses are connected with the help of the coordinative conjunctions *and* or *or;*
(B) subject and auxiliary (74a) or lexical verb (74b) of the subsequent clause are identical with the subject and auxiliary or lexical verb of the first clause.

(74)(a) *David does not read books and see plays.*
    (b) *John cannot play the guitar or Bob the piano.*

It is even possible as Quirk (1972: 590) writes to extend the scope of negation when neither the subject nor the lexical verb is the same, this is especially common when the coordinative conjunction is *or*. Notice the following sentence, where the only ellipted item is the modal verb:

(75) *I can't play the guitar or you sing.*

In contrast to the preceding sentences, where the scope of negation extended from one main clause into another main clause, which means within a coordinative sentence, Veselovská (2006: 57) speaks about negative transportation by which she means that the scope of negation extends from the main clause to the following subordinate clause; the scope of negation thus covers both main and subordinate clauses. She gives the following example:

(76) *I do not think that John will write anything at all.*

The sentence (76) can however be paraphrased without the use of negative transportation. The meaning remains completely the same:

(77) *I think that John won't write anything at all.*

Negative polarity of the preceding clauses (76) and (77) can be proved by the occurrence of non-assertive item *anything* and negative polarity item *at all*, which can only occur within the scope of negation.

2.1.2   Morphological vs. clause negation

Morphological negation is also denoted as constituent negation, because it does not negate a whole clause, but just a constituent of it. Other terms used for this kind of

negation are, as Anderwald (2002: 15) states, word-internal or derivational negation, because it makes use of derivational prefixes to reach the negation of a certain constituent. Among the most frequent negative prefixes we can find *un-* (*unbelievable*)*,* which is also the most productive one, *in-* (*invisible*)*, non-* (*nonsmoking*)*,* and *dis-* (*disagree*). One of the frequently used terms is also the term semantic negation. By adding a negative prefix to a word, we supplement it with an additional seme, i.e. with an additional distinctive unit of meaning. As a result of this, semantic meaning of a particular word changes from positive to negative. Syntax of the clause remains unchanged. Notice the examples in (78).

A clause that contains morphological negation is in effect positive, which can be proved by three criteria, which a negative clause must fulfil and which are discussed in the following table Nr. 1. Clauses involving morphological negation do not fulfil any of the criteria, because, as has already been said the syntax of the clause remains unaffected. First of all, positive statements are followed by negative question tags:

(78)(a) *She was able to finish the competition, <u>wasn't she</u>?*
    (b) *She was <u>un</u>able to finish the competition, <u>wasn't she</u>?*

Positive clause can be appended by continuation consisting of the positive polarity adjunct *so* + Mod./Aux. of positive polarity + subject.:

(79)*She was unable to finish the competition, <u>so was I</u>.*

Focusing adjunct *even* can be appended to a positive clause, but it must also have positive polarity:

(80)*She was unable to finish the competition, <u>even in good weather</u>.*

On the other hand, as Anderwald (2002: 17) says, clause or sentence negation affects the syntax of a whole clause. Sentence constituents underlie negation on condition that they inhere in the scope of negation of the clause negation element. Clause negation thus negates the entire clause.

Anderwald (2002: 17) reminds that clause negation can sometimes be called standard negation. The term "standard negation" is however applied only to those clauses that contain the negative particle *not* that functions as a clause negator. Concerning the choice of the word "standard", it was chosen, because it refers to the most widely used and the most prototypical kind of negation. As a result of this, negative clauses that contain such negators as e.g. *never, nothing, none* or *no-one*, cannot be denoted as clauses with standard negation, but as clauses containing clause or sentence negation.

2.1.3   Criteria for Negation

At the beginning of the section 2.1.2 I have already mentioned that there are certain criteria that can help us to prove that a clause either is or is not negative. Anderwald (2002: 17) summarizes the criteria determining syntactically negative clauses in the following table 1:

Table 1

Criterion	Negative clause
a) polarity of the tag question	positive tag
b) polarity of connective adjunct	negative polarity using *neither*
c) focusing adverb *even*	accompanied by *not*

Source: Adapted from Anderwald (2002: 17)

The preceding criteria applying to negative sentences are demonstrated in the following examples, demonstrating the negative polarity of *never* and *not*:

(81) (a) *But he's <u>not</u> the greatest of conductors, <u>is he?</u>* (BNC: AHA 622)
   (b) *I <u>don't</u> want the same drab old styles of before, but, as I told you, <u>neither</u> do*
   I want a revolution. (BNC: H97 1766)
   (c) *<u>None</u> of them, <u>not even</u> Jez, would be worrying about her.* (BNC: FP0 1388)
   (d) *She has <u>never</u>, <u>not even</u> in her worst dreams, thought about it, <u>has she</u>?*
   (e) *She has <u>never</u> thought about it. <u>Neither</u> have I.*

In examples (81a) and (81b), clause negation is achieved with the help of the negator *not*, but the negative particle *not* is not the only negator which can fulfil the function of clause negation. In the case of example (81c), clause negation is realized by the negative pronoun *none* and in (81d-e) by the negative adverb *never*.

Apart from the negator *not* that is considered to be, as follows from the preceding discussion, the standard means of clause negation, there are other negators that can be used to reach the same aim which means to reach the negation of the whole clause. Among these Quirk (1972: 376) mentions the negative determiner *no*, negative pronouns *neither*, *none*, *nothing*, *nobody*, *no-one*, and adverbs *nowhere* and *never*. This is a group of negators which are negative both in meaning as well as in appearance.

Except those fully negative words there is also a group of partially negative expressions. Quirk (1972: 380) ranks among partial negators adverbs *seldom, rarely, barely, scarcely, hardly*, and three adverbs that can also function as determiners *little, few* and *only*. Quirk claims that all expressions in this group are negative in meaning however they seem to be formally positive. Negative polarity of these items can again be proved by three tests, which are outlined in the following table 2. In order to show the similarity of partially negative words with negative expressions and their distinctness from positive expressions, I decided to demonstrate relevant characteristics of all three categories in table 2.

Table 2[9]

Criterion	positive adverbs	negative adverbs	partially negative adverbs
a) followed by non-assertives	yes (only in specific contexts)	yes	yes
b) trigger inversion in initial position	no	yes	yes
c) followed by positive tag-question	no	yes	yes

Because of the fact that all partially negative words belong to a single part of speech, namely adverbs, I am going to demonstrate the criteria stated in table 2 in examples that will compare positive, negative and partially negative adverbs.

Adverbs with positive meaning in a clause that contains positive predication are usually followed by assertive expressions as in (82a). The BNC contains 74 examples

---

[9] Table 2 should be understood as a simplifying summary of some general rules applying to English adverbs and negation. It is necessary to remark that individual adverbs can differ in this respect and it is possible to find exceptions, but I am not going to deal with them in this paper.

where *always* collocates with *some*, but only 1 example where *always* in positive predication is accompanied by the non-assertive item *any* as in (82b), what is more this example seems to be quite strange and is not grammatically correct because of the subject-verb concord. Negative expressions require the occurrence of non-assertives, but it is necessary to add that these non-assertives must inhere in the scope of negation as in (82c). As well as negatives, also partially negative words collocate with non-assertives due to their negative meaning (82d).

(82) (a) *Solitude is <u>always some</u> sort of choice.* (BNC: CKN 150)
(b) *There are <u>always any</u> number of questions which could be asked in a survey because they seem 'interesting'; but interest is not enough.* (BNC: B25 1156)
(c) *There was <u>never any</u> doubt that [...].* (BNC: GU9 228)
(d) *I <u>seldom</u> get <u>any</u> sleep.* (Quirk, 1972: 380)

As it has already been mentioned in 1.5.1, negative adverbs such as *never* or *nowhere* trigger subject operator inversion when placed in initial position (83a). The same applies to partially negative adverbs (83b). Positive adverbs, on the other hand, can be pre-posed without changing the word order in the sentence nucleus (83c). The word order remains the same as in the case when the adverb is in verbal post-position (83d). I made a research in the BNC concerning the adverb *sometimes*, but I did not find a single example of *sometimes* followed by inverted word order.

(83) (a) *<u>Nowhere did I</u> expect to get and <u>nowhere have I</u> duly got.* (BNC: J17 617)
(b) *<u>Hardly had he</u> put his head to the pillow when [...].* (Dušková, 2006: 347)
(c) *<u>Sometimes I seem</u> to hear my ancestors speaking.* (BNC: APM 1823)
(d) *<u>I sometimes carry</u> my poles separately from the tent anyway.* (BNC: G2S 948)

Finally, positive statements containing positive adverbs must be followed by negative question tags (84a), and on the contrary, negative statements containing negative adverbs require positive question tags (84b). Therefore even partially negative adverbs, which have the ability to negate the whole clause, must be followed by positive question tags (84c).

(84) (a) *She <u>always</u> gets up at 5 o'clock, <u>doesn't she</u>?*
(b) *He would <u>never</u> hit her, <u>would he</u>?*
(c) *She <u>scarcely</u> seems to care, <u>does she</u>?*

Concerning the clause negation in general, there are also other criteria valid for negative clauses apart from those already illustrated in table 1. In the first instance it is the occurrence of negative polarity items that were added as relevant criteria into the table 2. Quirk (1972: 376) mentions indefinites such as *any, anything, anybody, anyone*, and *anywhere* that in fact occur also in positive sentences and questions but their meaning changes accordingly. Compare the following English sentences with their Czech translations.

(85) (a) *After all, he hadn't hurt <u>anybody</u>, had he?* (BNC: ACB 1374) vs. *Nakonec <u>nikomu</u> neublížil, že ne?*
(b) *He was always ready to help <u>anybody</u> and in this he was greatly assisted by Rosemary.* (BNC: EVH 1158) vs. *Byl vždy připraven <u>komukoli</u> pomoci a Rosemary ho v tomhle značně podporovala.*

(c) *Would <u>anybody</u> like to ask any questions?* (BNC: F8B 126) vs. *Chtěl by se <u>někdo</u> na něco zeptat?*

Negative polarity items occurring in the scope of negation have, in comparison with their occurrence in positive statements and questions, negative meaning (85a). As you can see from the preceding examples, their meaning in positive statements (85b) and questions (85c) is clearly positive and that is why sentence in (85b) could be appended with negative question tag. Notice the following example (86):

(86) *He was always ready to help <u>anybody</u>, <u>wasn't he</u>?* (BNC: EVH 1158)

Quirk (1972: 376) calls these negative polarity items non-assertive forms. Another of the negative polarity items is the extent adverb *at all* (87a), *either* that can function either as a pronoun (87b) or an additive adverb (87c)*,* and the two time adverbs *yet* (87d) and *ever* (87e). These items can only be found within the scope of negation.

(87)(a) *I'm <u>not</u> against dogs in the country <u>at all</u>.* (BNC: F9C 281)
    (b) *Bill did <u>not</u> recognize <u>either</u> man.* (BNC: CK0 1052)
    (c) *She is as fat as he is, and <u>won't</u> walk <u>either</u>; so we have to do it.* (BNC: CD2 1142)
    (d) *[...] he replied that the time had <u>not</u> come <u>yet</u>.* (BNC: ARF 393)
    (e) *I do <u>not</u> <u>ever</u> recall an accident.* (BNC: HGK 1615)

As well as negative polarity items, which can occur in positive statements, also positive polarity items can occur in negative statements, or strictly speaking in negative statements with restricted scope of negation. Positive polarity items standing in a clause that seems to be negative at first sight, imply that the scope of negation does not reach them and has only limited influence on the following proposition, which means as Quirk (1972: 381) writes that the assertives used in the clause lie outside the scope. Compare the following sentences:

(88)(a) *I didn't listen to <u>any</u> of the speakers.* → *Neposlouchal jsem <u>žádného</u> z řečníků.*
    (b) *I didn't listen to <u>some</u> of the speakers.* → *Neposlouchal jsem <u>některé</u> z řečníků.*

The scope of negation in (88a) extends to the end of the clause, in (88b) affects only the predicate and the rest of the clause is positive.

2.2 **Clause vs. partial vs. local vs. phrasal negation**

Clause negation has partially been described in the preceding chapter 2.1, but it is necessary to distinguish clause negation from partial negation. Dušková (2006: 339) defines clause negation as negation which stands at the verb and thus negates the whole clause proposition, whereas partial negation is the kind of negation where a negator stands in front of the sentence member which is supposed to be negated. Dušková (2006: 339) gives the following examples:

(89)(a) *He was here not a minute ago.* → *Byl tu ani ne před minutou.*
    (b) *Not a minute ago he was here.* → *Ani ne před minutou tu byl.*
    (c) *He was here not a minute ago, wasn't he?*

As you can notice, both sentences in example (89a-b) are, according to Dušková's definition, instances of partial negation, because the negator *not* does not stand in front of the verb but in front of another sentence member. The only negated element in (89a) is the NP at the end of the clause, the verb, as the translation proves, remains positive. Not even the change of the word order changes its meaning. The positive polarity of the clause can be proved by the tag question test (89c); the polarity of the clause is positive, the tag question must therefore be negative. One could argue that by moving of the negated sentence member to the front position, the scope of negation changes, but it is not so, because the verb retains its positive polarity. In this case it would be better to speak about local negation, in which, as Quirk (1972: 381) says, the scope of negation does not extend beyond a particular word or phrase. Quirk (1972: 382) recommends to look at local negation as a clause that was reduced to a simple phrase. It would therefore be possible to interpret the sentence in (89a) in the following way:

(90) *It <u>is not even a minute ago</u> since he was here.*

Extended clause in (90) contains two clauses, one clause that is positive and one whose predication is negative and thus the whole clause is negative (*it is not even a minute ago*).

Quirk (1972: 382) describes phrasal negation as a kind of negation which is bound grammatically only to a single phrase, but semantically influences the polarity of the whole clause. It is therefore possible to understand phrasal negation as a subtype of clause negation and as Quirk (1972: 382) adds phrasal negation is semantically the opposite of local negation, although they are grammatically very alike. I assume that it is even possible to claim that predicative negation is the opposite of local negation, because they don't even differ semantically, but also grammatically.

o **Clause negation**: (a) *predicative negation*

(91) *He <u>didn't say</u> a word. → <u>Neřekl</u> ani slovo.*

(b) *phrasal negation*

(92) *<u>Not a word</u> came from his lips. → Z jeho úst <u>nevyšlo ani</u> slovo.*

o **Local/ Partial negation**:

(93) *<u>Nothing</u> is sometimes better than everything. → <u>Nic</u> je někdy lepší než vše.*

Positive polarity of the preceding clause (93) can again be proved by adding of the question tag, which is in result negative (94).

(94) *Nothing is sometimes better than everything, <u>isn't it</u>?*

Sometimes it is difficult to assess whether a sentence is an example of local or phrasal negation. The only thing which can help us in such a case is the context of the proposition. Compare the following sentences mentioned by Quirk (1972: 382).

(95) *<u>Nothing</u> agrees with me more than oysters.*
    → (a) <u>Nic</u> mi <u>nesvědčí</u> více než ústřice. (i.e. *I love oysters and they do me good*.)
    <clause negation>
    → (b) <u>(Nejíst) nic</u> mi dělá lépe než jíst ústřice. (i.e. *I cannot stand oysters*.) <local negation>

Anderwald (2002: 33) refers to both the phrasal as well as the local negation as constituent negation, because as she says, only one particular sentence constituent is focused by negation. In other words, the scope of the constituent negator affects only one highlighted sentence member that follows the particular negator.

One of the constituent negators is by all means the negative particle *not*. In the function of a constituent negator *not* stands, in contrast with clause negation where it is incorporated into the VP, in front of another sentence constituent that is to be negated. As a clause negator *not* occurs in its fixed position within the VP (96a), as a constituent negator it can be transferred to the pre- or post-verbal position (96b-c). With respect to the syntactic function of *not* that was discussed in 1.3.5, *not* as a constituent negator has in fact the function of a modifier. Notice the position of *not* in the following clauses:

(96) (a) *We <u>are not</u> dealing any more with temporary commonality but with permanent commonality.* (BNC: A6S 457) <clause negation>
(b) *<u>Not with temporary commonality</u> but with permanent commonality we are dealing now.* <local / constituent negation>
(c) *We are dealing now <u>not with temporary commonality</u>, but with permanent commonality.* <local / constituent negation>

Anderwald (2002: 33) notifies that constructions that are marked by the occurrence of the negator *not*, are, as you can see in the preceding examples (96), accompanied by their positive counterparts, in order to indicate what could replace the negated sentence constituent. These structures are known as contrastive constructions and will be discussed in different context in section 2.3.3.

Not is definitely not the only devise of constituent negation. One of the syntactic functions of the frequency adjunct *never* is its function of a modifier, as has already been pointed out in 1.3.4. As well as *not, never* can serve as a means of constituent negation.

(97) (a) *He was <u>never yours</u> in the first place.* (BNC: HA6 2484) → *On nikdy nebyl v první řadě váš.* <phrasal negation>
(b) *<u>Never mine</u> she always remained in my memory.* → *Nikdy má, vždycky zůstala v mé paměti.* <local negation>

Both clauses in (97) are examples of constituent negation. However, when we apply Quirk's (1972: 381-382) definitions we can assume that the clause in (97a) is a case of phrasal negation, because *never* negates not only the immediately following element, but the whole clause including the VP. In (97b), on the other hand, *never* affects only one sentence constituent, the others remain untouched by its negative meaning, it is therefore an example of local negation. In the case of (97b) we can again assume that there is a hidden clause behind the word cluster *never mine*:

(98) *<u>She was never mine</u>, but she always remained in my memory.*

In both cases it is necessary to remark that it is not always easy to distinguish between phrasal and local negation, and between clause and constituent negation.

2.3 **Negation with respect to typological classification**

In this chapter I wanted to draw attention to the two key items of this thesis, *not* and *never*, which are the representatives of two distinct types of negation. According to Tottie (1983: 7) *not* can be denoted as a single and prototypical representative of analytic negation, *never* as one of the typical representatives of synthetic negation.

This section is divided into two main parts. The first one focuses on the typological classification of English in general and will make clear the basic differences between analytic and synthetic languages. I will also make a few remarks concerning the historical development of English. This part should be understood as a kind of preliminary work before proceeding to more important facts concerning English negation and especially the two items discussed, *not* and *never*.

The second part of this chapter explains the concepts of analytic and synthetic negation and shows which of these two types of negation is preferred in certain linguistic environment. I am also going to emphasize the restrictions that can arise for a specific type of negation. All the claims will be supported by data from the BNC.

2.3.1. Typological classification of English

Although Old English has been denoted as a synthetic language, A. C. Baugh (1993: 54) ranks Modern English between languages typologically classified as analytic. Baugh further adds that in analytic languages grammatical function infers from the position of the word in a clause and its connection with a preposition. With respect to this definition, English word order should be fixed, but as we know, it is fixed only to a certain extend. The traditional word order in an English sentence is SV(X) as in (99a), but (X)SV is also plausible (99b), which means that what is fixed is only the core of the clause consisting of Subject and Verb. Compare the following examples:

(99) (a) *She received a bunch of flowers and a chocolate-box.* <SVO>
 (b) *The flowers she threw away, but the chocolate she ate immediately.* <OSV>

Another term that is also used synonymously to analytic language is the term root language and it implies that each word is in fact a root, as Veselovská (2005: 42-45) writes each word usually represents one morpheme. In the following example there are five words each representing one morpheme.

I	- DO	- NOT	- LIKE - SPINACH.
Speaker -	Auxiliary -	Negation -	Verb - Subject matter

It must be pointed out that English is not purely analytic but shows mixed characteristics of analytic and synthetic languages. In synthetic languages a word can be divided into more unsegmentable morphemes of different kinds as in the following example, where one word can be divided into three different morphemes each fulfilling a distinctive function.

MODERN	-	IZE	-	S
Base	-	Suffix -		Inflectional ending

In spite of these mixed characteristics, analytic characteristics prevail and that is why English is classified as an analytic language.

2.3.2. Analytic vs. synthetic negation

At the beginning of this chapter it should be mentioned what analytic and synthetic negation in fact is. Considering the information found in Veselovská (2005: 43) and in Tottie (1983: 7-8) I am now going to formulate my own definition of analytic and synthetic negation. Analytic negation is a kind of negation in which negative meaning is carried by a morpheme that does not have any other meaning and function than that of negation. In

English, analytic negation is achieved with the help of the negative particle *not,* or its enclitic reduced form *-n't.*

(100)   (a) *I do not know him personally.*
          (b) *I can't believe my eyes.*

Synthetic negation, on the other hand, is constructed by means of negative adverbs or pronouns that apart from its negative meaning have some additional meaning/s, e.g. *nowhere*, or *never.* These words do not only have negative meaning, the first mentioned serves as an adverb of place and the second one as an adverb of frequency.

(101)   (a) *There is <u>nowhere</u> to sit.*
          (b) *I have <u>never</u> eaten snails.*

2.3.2.1.   *Proportion of analytic and synthetic negation*

Stemming from the preceding discussion of typological properties of the English language in section 2.3.1 the basic presumption in this section should be that analytic negation prevails over synthetic negation. The following table 3 shows the proportion of analytic and synthetic negation as I found it in a randomly chosen set of 100 negative clauses from the BNC.

Table 3

Negation type	Analytic	A %	Synthetic	Syn. %	A + Syn.
Have, Be	13	56,5 %	10	43,5 %	23
Lexical Verbs	73	94,8 %	4	5,2 %	77
Totals	86	86 %	14	14 %	100

As the table 3 shows, analytic negation clearly prevails over synthetic negation; from 100 clauses only 14 are representatives of synthetic negation. Table 3 also reveals an interesting tendency, the preference of analytic negation in clauses with lexical verbs and conversely the preference of synthetic negation in clauses with the verbs *be* and *have.*

Under lexical verbs I understand VPs that consist of Mod./ Aux., if it is obligatory, and a full-meaning verb like *play, disturb* etc. Under *have/ be* I understand VPs, in which *be* is used as a copula, or it expresses the existence of something, and the verb *have* as a verb expressing possession.

Concerning the two items discussed *never* and *not,* I also wanted to find out whether they prefer lexical verbs or rather the verbs *be* and *have.*

Table 4

VP	*Never*	*Not*
Have, Be.......................	18	25
Lexical Verbs................	82	75
Totals............................	100	100

Following from the table 4, *never* tends to be used, although it is a representative of synthetic negation, in VPs consisting of Mod./Aux. and a full-meaning verb rather than in VPs that contain *have* and *be.* Out of 100 randomly chosen clauses containing the adverb *never,* only 18 had, as its verbal predicate, a VP containing either *have* or *be. Not,* on the other hand, behaved quite predictably and occurred predominantly in VPs including lexical verbs. In 25 clauses out of 100, *not* occurred in VPs containing either *have* or *be.*

Never therefore behaves differently than I would expect after reading the results in table 4. With regard to the VP, in which it is incorporated, *never* behaves more like the negator *not*.

2.3.2.2. *Analytic and synthetic negation - equivalence or differences*

Another important finding, as Tottie (1983: 9) mentions, is that many of the clauses with analytic type of negation do not allow the use of synthetic negation. It should be pointed out, what are the restrictions for synthetic negation, and which of these restrictions are the most frequent ones. There are also restrictions concerning the transformation of synthetic negation into analytic negation, which should be dealt with first for convenience.

This section focuses on clausal negation, which means a kind of negation, in which not only words or phrases, but whole clauses are negated. Clausal negation can be achieved in two different ways, by means of analytic or synthetic negation.

(102)   (a) *I've <u>never</u> collapsed — on stage or anywhere else.* (BNC: CA9 1686)
          (b) *I <u>haven't ever</u> collapsed — on stage or anywhere else.*
          (c) *I wished I had said <u>nothing</u> about Jordi.* (BNC: AC6 635)
          (d) *I wished I <u>hadn't</u> said <u>anything</u> about Jordi.*
          (e) *But, when it showed <u>no</u> sign of stopping, she relented.* (BNC: G0N 1651)
          (f) *But, when it <u>didn't</u> show <u>any</u> sign of stopping, she relented.*
          (g) *<u>Nobody</u> could blame you for it.* (BNC: ACB 136)
          (h) **<u>Not anybody</u> could blame you for it.*
          (i) *<u>Never</u> have I been in a place of such contrasts.* (BNC: ASN 1534)
          (j) **<u>Ever haven't</u> I been in a place of such contrasts.*

As the sentences (102a,c,e,g,i) show, the negative element fuses with adverbs, pronouns, indefinites, and determiners. Tottie (1983: 7) writes that this kind of fusion is sometimes called negative attraction or negative incorporation. On the other hand, sentences (102b,d,f) demonstrate that it is also possible to formulate the same sentences with the help of the negative particle *not* that fuses with the Mod./ Aux. The sentences (102g,i), as Tottie (1983: 7) explains, show the necessity of negative incorporation before the finite verb. Tottie (1983: 7) thus formulates the following rule:

> "Either negate an indefinite or post-negate the first verb in the VP. If the indefinite precedes the VP, the indefinite must be negated, but otherwise negation on the VP is often preferred to negation on an indefinite."

Anderwald (2002: 15) finds the forms in (102a,c,e) and (102b,d,f) semantically equivalent. The difference between these sentences subsists in style or formality. The use of negative quantifiers is according to Anderwald (2002: 32) more formal than the use of negator *not* + non-assertive forms.

2.3.3. Restrictions concerning the transformation of clauses

Concerning the transformation of analytic negation into synthetic negation, the most obvious constraint that Tottie (1983: 27) points out is the presence of an adverb in the negative clause. Notice the following examples:

(103)   (a) *This case, however, does <u>not</u> even touch that important question.* (BNC: ASB 1406)
          (b) **This case, however, even touches <u>no</u> important question.*

(c) *And glamour does <u>not</u> always have to be imported*. (BNC: ABD 550)
(d) **And glamour <u>never</u> always has to be imported.*
(e) **And glamour <u>never</u> has to be imported.*

Examples (103a) and (103b) demonstrate that the additive adverb *even* that functions as a focusing adjunct and thus emphasizes different parts of speech, in this case the verb *touch*, cannot be moved into the position shown in (103b). The sentence produced in this manner becomes unacceptable.

The substitution of *not* for *never* in the example (103d) shows the unacceptability of structures containing two different time adverbs that in fact semantically exclude each other. Example (103e) however is grammatically and semantically correct, but cannot be understood as a synonymous phrase of (103c).

2.3.3.1.   Coordination

Tootie (1983: 29) mentions as another constraining criterion the presence of coordination.

(104)   (a) *Filter manufacturers' recommendations are still based on tanks with few or <u>no</u> plants*. (BNC: CLT 693)
(b) **Filter manufacturers' recommendations are still based on tanks with few or <u>not any</u> plants.*
(c) *Which emotions do you rarely or <u>never</u> express?* (BNC: CA5 1683)
(d) **Which emotions do you rarely or <u>not ever</u> express?*

Sentences (104b) and (104d) clearly show that coordinated NPs do not permit analytic negation, thus only synthetic negation is plausible.

2.3.3.2.   Collocations and idioms

Another reason why, in some cases, synthetic negation is preferred over analytic negation is the occurrence of collocations or even idioms. Tottie (1983: 29) mentions as a usually unacceptable collocation the combination of *not + any* + NP, whereas the combination of *little + or + no* is a quite frozen collocation. The following examples (105a) and (105b) acknowledge her presupposition. The sentence in example (105c) is grammatically correct, but still unacceptable, because it is not semantically equivalent to (105a). By changing the synthetic negation into analytic negation, the scope of negation was changed.

(105)   (a) *Unfortunately it's also common for women to have repeated attacks, often with <u>little</u> or <u>no</u> warning*. (BNC: CFR 1424)
(b) **Unfortunately it's also common for women to have repeated attacks, often with little or <u>not any</u> warning.*
(c) *Unfortunately it also <u>isn't</u> common for women to have repeated attacks, often with little or any warning.*
(d) *EIB money has <u>never before</u> been offered to Eastern Europe*. (BNC: A28 367)
(e) *EIB money <u>hasn't ever</u> been offered to Eastern Europe <u>before</u>.*

The most frequent collocation of *never* and another adverb is that of *never before* (105d). This collocation can be found in 1735 instances in the BNC. In contrast with the above mentioned collocation *little or no* in (105a), *never before* can easily be replaced by

analytic form containing the negator *not* + adverb *ever*, *before* can be placed in final position (105e).

The following sentences are again examples of coordination. The occurrence of synthetic negation in the first part of the clause requires the use of synthetic negation in the second part of the clause after the coordinative conjunction *and*, as in (106a). The use of *not + any* is again unacceptable. The other possibility how to create such a sentence is to use analytic negation from the very beginning and than continue with coordination, but instead of the conjunction *and* a disjunction *or* has to be used (106c). If we start with analytic negation, we cannot continue with the conjunction *and*, and the sequence *not + any* (106d).

(106)   (a) *[...] there is <u>no</u> moral dilemma, <u>no</u> difficult decision to make, and <u>no</u> disputed territory.* (BNC: ANA 900)
(b) **[...] there is <u>no</u> moral dilemma, <u>no</u> difficult decision to make, and <u>not any</u> disputed territory.*
(c) *[...] there <u>isn't any</u> moral dilemma, difficult decision to make, <u>or</u> disputed territory.*
(d) **[...] there <u>isn't any</u> moral dilemma, not any difficult decision to make, <u>and not any</u> disputed territory.*

Restrictions on analytic negation arise also in case of idioms. Once an idiom contains a synthetic type of negation, it cannot be shifted into analytic negation. For the idiom *up to no good* I have found 31 solutions in the BNC, for *up to any good* I have not found any. I also searched for other idioms containing synthetic negation but with the same result. Veselovská (2005: 30-32) deals with this problem, too, and explains that some idioms which are connected by syntactic rules behave as a single unit, and that is why they can undergo to syntactic operations only to a certain degree.

As regards the idioms *lightning never strikes twice* and *never say die*, I found 3 examples for the first idiom and 7 examples for the second one in the BNC, but no samples that would include the sentences *lightning doesn't ever strike* or *don't say die*.

(107)   (a) *I told you he would be <u>up to no good</u>.* (BNC: ABX 1786)
(b) **I told you he wouldn't be <u>up to any good</u>.*
(c) *They say <u>lightning never strikes twice</u> but it does when old Shallot's around.* (BNC: HH5 2957)
(d) **They say <u>lightning doesn't ever strike</u> twice but it does when old Shallot's around.*
(e) *<u>Never say die</u>, buddy.* (BNC: HTU 3271)
(f) **<u>Don't say die</u>, buddy.*

2.3.3.3.   *Contrastive constructions*

One of the typical constructions, where analytic negation can be expected, is according to Tottie (1983: 33) contrastive construction, e.g. (108a).

(108)   (a) *Many years later, it would be said of Australia that it <u>was not</u> a sea-going nation <u>but</u> a surf-going one.* (BNC: ASV 2120)
(b) *?Many years later, it would be said of Australia that it <u>was no</u> sea-going nation <u>but</u> a surf-going one.*

However, it is also possible to find contrastive constructions including synthetic negation, e.g. (109a) or (109c). Such constructions are less frequent, but not uncommon. Out of 50 contrastive constructions found in the BNC, 34 represented analytic and 16 synthetic negation. As shown in (109e) and (109f) contrastive constructions using analytic negation cannot usually be transformed into constructions with synthetic negation and vice versa.

(109)   (a) *She's been <u>nothing</u> but a nuisance all her life*. (BNC: FP1 426)
          (b) *?She <u>hasn't</u> been <u>anything</u> but a nuisance all her life.*
          (c) *His scenes are <u>never</u> static but animated by his fast-moving line [...].* (BNC: F9U 321)
          (d) **His scenes are <u>not ever</u> static but animated by his fast-moving line.*
          (e) *I <u>am not</u> living in a bed of roses but in reality.* (BNC: CBN 1269)
          (f) **I am living in <u>no</u> bed of roses but in reality.*

Comparing the original sentences containing analytic negation with artificially created sentences containing synthetic negation as in (109f), it is clear that in some cases synthetic negation seems to be semantically odd.

2.3.3.4.   *Position*

Tottie (1983: 34) claims that analytic negation is preferred in post-verbal position where the potential negation-incorporating element is pre-modified by an adjective as in (110a), or by a noun used as a secondary adjective.

(110)   (a) *It's <u>not</u> <u>an important part</u> of any imaginative process any more.* (BNC: HWX 866)
          (b) **It's <u>no important part</u> of any imaginative process any more.*
          (c) **It's <u>never</u> <u>an important part</u> of any imaginative process any more.*
          (d) *It has <u>never</u> been <u>an important part</u> of any imaginative process.*

However, this criterion seems to be quite questionable. (110b, c) is not acceptable, but when I change the tense of the clause and dismiss the final adverbial *any more*, synthetic negation seems to be possible (110d).

On the other hand, in preverbal position synthetic negation is obligatory with pre-modified NPs of the type shown in (111a). The tendency to express negation as close as possible to the beginning of the sentence is again demonstrated there, as it was already mentioned and exemplified in section 2.1.1 and furthermore, moving the negation to the post-verbal position changes the scope of negation and thus the meaning of the whole clause. Compare the examples (111a) and (111b).

(111)   (a) *<u>No important difference</u> was found between the duration of symptoms in those incontinent in the previous two months and those incontinent in the previous year.* (BNC: FT5 648)
          (b) **<u>Some important difference wasn't</u> found between the duration [...].*
          (c) *<u>Never</u> have I been in a place of such contrasts.* (BNC: ASN 1534)
          (d) *I have <u>not ever</u> been in a place of such contrasts.*

It is necessary to notice that *never* in initial position can be replaced by *not* and *ever*. The scope of negation does not change and in both examples (111c, d) it influences all the sentence members. The meaning thus remains the same.

2.3.3.5.   *PrepPs, abstract nouns and others*

As regards sentences containing PrepPs as a potential negation-incorporating element, such sentences are again most likely to use analytic negation. Prepositional phrases modified by a synthetic negator are less common, but they exist and have more specific meaning as e.g. the sentence in (112c), which contains the negative adverb *never*.

(112)   (a) *She <u>was not prepared for</u> a very similar question being thrown at her.*
             (BNC: JY6 4338)
             (b) **She was prepared for <u>no</u> very similar question [...].*
             (c) *The singularity would always lie in his future and <u>never in his past</u>.*
             (BNC: H78 696)

As the next criterion which influences the choice of either analytic or synthetic negation Tottie (1983: 36) names the category of abstract nouns that seem to favour synthetic negation. My search in the BNC only confirmed her claim. After choosing some of the most common abstract nouns such as *love, information, success, pain* and *trouble*[10]. I found out that *no information* (113a) appears in 160 cases and *no success* in 41. The collocations *any information* (113b) and *any success* were usually not in the scope of negation and thus had predominantly positive meaning. For *no love* I found 97 samples, other negative clauses containing *love* as a noun are very rare. In the case of the noun *pain*, the BNC contains 84 samples with *no pain* (113c) and 28 samples containing *any pain* (113d) within the scope of negation and thus negative. Similar results appear also in the case of the noun *trouble*.

Concerning the occurrence of the adverb *never* with the above given nouns I found only 1 example for *never love* and 1 example for *never trouble* (113e). I therefore assume that *never* does not collocate with abstract nouns.

(113)   (a) *I have <u>no information</u> on who is meeting Le Pen.* (BNC: HHV 6871)
             (b) *I'd welcome <u>any information</u> you can give me.* (BNC: C97 886)
             (c) *He wanted <u>no pain</u>, and he wanted to die.* (BNC: ASK 1012)
             (d) *He's <u>not feeling any pain</u>.* (BNC: CRE 727)
             (e) *There's <u>never trouble</u> in rugby like they do in football is there?* (BNC: KBC 2582)

Post-modification can possibly be another restriction for the synthetic kind of negation. The potential negation-incorporating element is a NP that is post-modified by a PrepP in cases (114a) and (114c), by an infinitive in (114e) and by a finite clause in (114g) and (114i).

(114)   (a) *This <u>is not</u> the book of a scholar, as you will soon realize, but that of a genuine enthusiast.* (BNC: AB4 9)
             (b) **This is <u>no/never book</u> of a scholar, as you will soon realize, [...].*
             (c) *Edward Adeane <u>was not</u> the man for the job.* (BNC: A7H 582)
             (d) **Edward Adeane was <u>no/never man</u> for the job.*
             (e) *If Mr Meacher <u>is not</u> the man to bang the heads of union leaders together, then surely Mr Kinnock is.* (BNC: A30 368)
             (f) **If Mr Meacher is <u>no/never man</u> to bang the heads of union leaders [...].*

---

[10] Randomly chosen set of common abstract nouns.

(g) *Louis Malle <u>is not</u> the man you would choose to overcome these difficulties.* (BNC: K5A 432)
(h) **Louis Malle is <u>no/never man</u> you would choose to overcome these difficulties.*
(i) *It <u>is not</u> a message that either a Conservative or a Labour government would listen to*. (BNC: AHN 234)
(j) **It is <u>no/never message</u> that either a Conservative or a Labour government would listen to.*

The unacceptability of *never* in the above mentioned examples (114) is easy to explain. As I mentioned in section 1.3.1 very few adverbs are able to modify nouns and *never* belongs to that group of adverbs which cannot modify nouns.

2.3.3.6. *Results of the comparison of analytic and synthetic negation*

In order to prove Tottie's assumptions concerning the factors constraining variation between synthetic and analytic negation, I again used my list of 100 negative clauses randomly chosen from the BNC. 10 clauses had to be excluded as irrelevant for my survey. These 10 clauses either include negative tag questions, or negative short answers without any preceding context; these constructions must inherently consist of an auxiliary + the negative particle *not*, and that is why they were regarded as irrelevant.

Table 5 clearly shows that in the majority of clauses, i.e. in 75,6 % of all examined clauses variation was formally or semantically constrained. Another important thing to notice is that synthetic negation can be transformed into analytic negation in 71,4 % of cases, whereas the reverse transformation from analytic into synthetic negation is allowed only in 15,8 % of the cases.

Table 5

Variation	Constrained (%)	Allowed (%)	Totals (100 %)
Syn. → A	4 (28,6 %)	10 (71,4 %)	14
A → Syn.	64 (84,2 %)	12 (15,8 %)	76
	68 (75,6 %)	22 (24,4 %)	90

While Tottie was interested only in the formally constrained invariable structures, I was also interested in cases where variation was not permitted for semantic reasons. Tottie did not include semantically constrained invariable structures because in her sample of sentences the class of semantically constrained sentences was much smaller than the class of formally constrained sentences. In fact I came to a completely opposite result that she did, because in my sample of sentences semantically constrained sentences dominantly prevailed.

Semantically constrained criterion was specified in the table 6 as the absence of negation-incorporating element. Apparently, this constraining factor seems to be the strongest one and functions only in clauses containing analytic negation, which therefore cannot be changed into the synthetic one. If we want to transform a negative clause of analytic type into that of synthetic type we need some negation-incorporating element, which is however not present in these cases. By changing it into the synthetic type we would in fact add new unwished meaning into the clause. Consider carefully the following sentences:

(115)   (a) *I <u>can't</u> believe what I've heard.* (BNC: K4M 362)
              (b) **I can believe <u>nothing</u> what I've heard.*

(c) *?I can <u>hardly</u> believe what I've heard.*
(d) *?I can <u>never</u> believe what I've heard.*

Example (115b) is grammatically correct, but it denies everything what was said in the preceding context of this clause. The original clause (115a) however wants to express surprise at rather than denial of the preceding context. (115c) seems to be the most plausible transformation of (115a), although even this example can be chargeable with difference in the degree of epistemic modality. (115d) is again not precise transformation of (115a), but it is very close to its meaning. Consider other examples:

(116)   (a) *Oh I <u>didn't</u> see that one then.* (BNC: KDW 821)
         (b) **Oh I saw <u>nothing</u> then.*
         (c) **Oh I <u>never</u> saw that one then.*
         (d) **Oh I <u>hardly</u> saw that one then.*

Example (116b) is in comparison with the original clause in (116a) unacceptable, because of the clear semantic difference. In (116a) the speaker did not see one particular thing, however in (116b) he did not see apart from that one particular thing also other things. (116c) is not plausible for two reasons firstly because of the presence of the time adverb *then*, and secondly because of the different time relationship to the subject matter. Example (116d) in fact says that the speaker saw it but with difficulties.

To demonstrate that it is possible to transform sentences including analytic type of negation into the synthetic type. I am going to bring in several examples, showing both the original as well as the transformed sentence.

(117)   (a) *I think quite a lot of the students are sleeping on friend's floors and they're <u>not</u> ever counted amongst the statistics.* (BNC: KRL 3030)
         (b) *I think quite a lot of the students are sleeping on friend's floors and they are <u>never</u> counted amongst the statistics.*
         (c) *[...] it <u>won't</u> cost you anything to call [...].* (BNC: HMA 69)
         (d) *[...] it will cost you <u>nothing</u> to call [...].*
         (e) *We <u>don't</u> get a chance.* (BNC: KE3 6012)
         (f) *We get <u>no</u> chance.*

What connects the examples (117a, c, e) is the presence of the negation-incorporating element. In (117a) it is the presence of a time adverb *ever,* in (117c) it is an indefinite pronoun *anything*, and in (117e) it is indefinite article *a* that allows to change the type of negation. All of these elements are negated in the course of transformation from analytic into synthetic negation.

The two commented examples (115) and (116) should demonstrate how semantics can change by adding just one simple element into the sentence. Out of the 90 surveyed samples 35 could not be transformed due to the semantic reasons.

Table 6

Original clauses → artificially created clauses ──────────────── Constraining criteria	Syn. → A	A → Syn.	Totals
1 Absence of negation-incorporating element	-	35	35
2 Pre-modification	-	8	8

3 PrepPhrase	-	6	6
4 Collocation/Idiom	2	5	7
5 Post-modification	-	4	4
6 Adverb	-	3	3
7 Contrastive construction	-	2	2
8 Coordination	-	1	1
9 Obligatory preverbal synthetic negation	2	-	2
Number of constrained invariable structures	**4** (14)[11]	**64** (76)	**68** (90)

Table 6 shows the constraining criteria in the order of frequency. Pre-modification seems to be the strongest formally constraining factor represented by 8 examples. Coordination, on the contrary, appears to be the least frequent factor with only one representative example. However it must be pointed out that the numbers are quite low and that is why another randomly chosen set of sentences could change the order of frequency completely only with the exception of number 1, i.e. except the semantic factor of the absence of negation-incorporating element.

The last mentioned criterion: obligatory synthetic negation refers to the rule already explained in section 2.3.2.2 and can thus be applied only on synthetic negation. It was placed on the last place for convenience.

2.3.3.7. *Conclusion concerning Never and Not*

As I have already pointed out at the beginning of chapter 2.3 *never* is one of the representatives of synthetic negation, because it has apart from its negative function also the meaning of time and frequency. *Not*, on the other hand is a single representative of analytic way of negation.

My research has shown that analytic way of negation is preferred over synthetic way of negation. Following from this statement it is possible to claim that *not* is preferred to *never*. The main restriction for the use of the adverb *never* is its specific meaning of zero frequency.

One of the presumptions also was that synthetic ways of negation prefer the occurrence of *be*, in its existential or copulative use, or *have,* with its possessive meaning, in the VP. On the contrary, analytic means of negation, i.e. *not*, predominantly occur in VPs containing full-meaning verbs. In case of *not* I was able to confirm this presumption, but *never* proved to prefer VPs with lexical verbs as well as the negator *not*.

Concerning the constraints that apply to the adverb *never* it is without doubt the occurrence of another time or frequency adverb in the same clause, but even there it is possible to find exceptions. (118a) is not acceptable, because the meaning of *always* excludes the meaning of *never*. Whereas in (118b) the meaning of *tonight* cancels the meaning of *never* as a frequency adverb. *Never* thus fulfils the function of *not*, but in addition serves as an intensifier and gives us information about speaker's emotions and attitude.

(118) (a) **And glamour <u>never</u> <u>always</u> has to be imported.*
(b) *Will he <u>never</u> go to bed <u>tonight</u>?*

---

[11] Numbers in brackets show complete totals of explored clauses.

As regards *not*, analytic negation cannot be used in coordinated NPs, in such cases the determiner *no* is preferred to *not* (119a). Coordinated AdvPs prefer negative adverbs to *not* as in (119b).

(119)   (a) *Filter manufacturers' recommendations are still based on tanks with few or no plants.* (BNC: CLT 693)
          (b) *Which emotions do you rarely or never express?* (BNC: CA5 1683)

Both *never* and *not* occur in firm collocations, although these collocations can be seen as preferred combinations there is still place for a change (120b). With idioms the situation is different, idioms are firmly settled phrases or clauses whose form can be submitted to no or only small changes (120d).

(120)   (a) *EIB money has never before been offered to Eastern Europe.* (BNC: A28 367)
          (b) *EIB money hasn't ever been offered to Eastern Europe before.*
          (c) *Never say die, buddy.* (BNC: HTU 3271)
          (d) **Don't say die, buddy.*

My BNC search also confirmed that analytic negation is preferred to synthetic negation in contrastive constructions. One third of the randomly chosen examples of contrastive constructions contained synthetic negation. *Never* was used as a contrast creating element in 5 clauses, which means that it was used less frequently than *no* that was used in 8 instances.

Furthermore, it is necessary to point out that *never* in initial position is not obligatory and synthetic negation can in this case easily be transformed into sentences containing the analytic type of negation formed with the help of the negator *not* as in (121a). On the other hand, *no*, another synthetic device of negation, cannot be replaced by *not*, in cases where *no* serves as a pre-modifier of fronted NPs (121b). Compare the following examples:

(121)   (a) *Never has the challenge to Irish players been greater.* (BNC: CKA 520)
          → *The challenge to Irish players hasn't ever been greater.*
          (b) *No boundaries have been defined, no inhibitions imposed.* (BNC: FU6 2790)
          → **Not any boundaries have been defined, not any inhibitions imposed.*

I have also proved that *never* as a synthetic negator is not able to modify nouns, because I have not found any such example in the BNC. This implies that *never* is not able to modify post-modified NPs, while it is able to modify pre-modified NPs. Within a pre-modified NP, *never* usually modifies an adjective or another adverb.

(122)   (a) **This is never a book of a scholar, as you will soon realize, [...].*
          (b) *His main concern was road safety, but he was never the same man after 1982.* (BNC: K4W 2461)

To sum it up in the majority of cases *never* can be easily replaced by *not + ever* without any change of the meaning, as in (123a). *Never*, on the other hand, always brings with itself the meaning of zero frequency and can thus serve as a substitution only in clauses which contain *not + ever*, otherwise the meaning changes as in (123b).

(123) (a) *Science can <u>never</u> deal with any questions about the essence of things.*
(BNC: G0E 2868)
→ *Science <u>cannot</u> <u>ever</u> deal with any questions about the essence of things.*
(b) *I wish she was <u>not</u> so pretty.* (BNC: FU4 211)
→ **I wish she was <u>never</u> so pretty.*

Never is limited in its use by its meaning. *Not*, which is semantically empty, is more versatile and it is therefore used more frequently then the synthetic means of negation.

3. Comparison of *NOT* and *NEVER*

On the basis of aforesaid facts in the previous two chapters and the data from the BNC I am going to compare to what extent the negators *not* and *never* are similar or to what extent they differ from each other. In order to be able to judge whether *never* behaves more like an adverb or a negative particle *not*, I am also going to compare the properties of these two negators with general properties of adverbs. To make the differences and similarities between the two items discussed more lucid, I am going to present the compared features in tables.

Because of the fact that the morphological and semantic properties of *never* and *not* substantially blend together, I decided to connect up the discussion on these two levels in the first section.

3.1 Comparison of morphological and semantic properties

Morphologically, it is possible to say that *never* and *not* are very similar. Neither *never*, nor *not* are carriers of any category-distinguishing suffix, e.g. *-ly, -wise, -wards*. On the other hand, their external form, starting with *n-* or *no-*, implies their negative meaning. From the etymological point of view, both *never* and *not* are derivations, consisting of a negative and a positive element. Whereas in case of *never*, it is still clearly perspicuous, which elements it was derived from, i.e. *not + ever*, it is less obvious that the negator *not* originally develop from the negative element *no-* and the positive element *-thing*.

Both *never* and *not* have negative meaning which changes the polarity of the whole proposition. As well as *never*, even *not* could be, under certain circumstances e.g. position and clause negation, ranked among adverbs. *Never* is denoted as a time adverb of indefinite frequency, *not* could be classified, as Quirk (1972: 432) pointed out, as a negative restrictive adjunct. *Never* is considered to be a full-meaning word, however *not* is usually classed with functional elements having no meaning, but fulfilling a certain function.

With respect to their equivalency with Czech expressions, *never* and sometimes even *not + ever* correspond to the Czech adverb *nikdy*, which means that lexical word corresponds to another lexical word in a different language. In case of *not*, it is different. *Not*, which can either appear in its full form *not* as a free morpheme, or in enclitic reduced form *-n't* as a bound morpheme, comports with the Czech bound prefix *ne-* that construes with verbs. *-N't* is therefore closer to the Czech *ne-*.

Table 7

Feature	*Never*	*Not*	*-N't*
1) carrier of some category-distinguishing suffix	no	no	no
2) externally negative in form	yes	yes	yes
3) ability to change the polarity of the clause / altering the meaning of verbs	yes	yes	yes
4) gradability	no	no	no
5) transparency of the derived form	yes	no	no
6) formally corresponding Czech equivalent	yes	no	yes
7) occurrence as a free morpheme	yes	yes	no
8) existence of the enclitic contracted form	no	yes	—
9) belonging to the category of full-meaning words	yes	no	no

Stemming from the data presented in the table 7, it is possible to observe that *never* shares 5 properties with *not* and 5 properties with *-n't*. Considering *not* and *-n't* as a single

item, *never* and *not* share only 4 properties, it is therefore less than a half of the features. In the light of morphological and semantic properties, *never* and *not* differ.

3.2 **Comparison of syntactic functions**

This section primarily focuses on the functions of *never* and *not*, but also the enclitic reduced form *-n't*. In order to demonstrate the similarities between *never* and *not*, I am also going to provide examples that will contrast *never* with other adverbs.

Firstly, *never*, *not* and *-n't* are obligatorily incorporated within the structure of the clause. They cannot be separated from the proposition by comma and intonation as e.g. stance adverbials.

(124)   (a) *I will never /will not /won't /will unfortunately go to prison.* (BNC: A0N 1450)
(b) **Never / *Not /* N't /Unfortunately, I will go to prison.*

All the discussed items, *never*, *not*, and *-n't*, but also the so called partially negative adverbs that were mentioned in 2.1.2 have the ability to negate the whole clause, they can therefore fulfil the function of clause negation. In case of phrasal negation it is necessary to exclude the enclitic *-n't* which has to be connected with Mod./Aux. because it functions as a bound morpheme. Apart from the VP *-n't* cannot negate any other clause constituents.

(125)   (a) *I have never/ have not/ haven't/ have hardly believed him.* <clause negation>
(b) *Never/ Not/ *-N't/ Hardly forgetting the troubles she worked under the control of her boss.* <phrasal negation>

Never, not, -n't and the majority of adverbs are primarily related to the VP. Some adverbs are related to other clause constituents, e.g. *very* and *too*, which are related AdjPs or AdvPs. Stance adverbs as e.g. *fortunately* primarily apply to the whole proposition that is why they usually occur in initial position, central position is however also possible. Compare the following:

(126)   (a) *Fortunately, she wasn't too disappointed.*
(b) **Too, she wasn't disappointed. / *She was too not disappointed.*
(c) *She was fortunately not disappointed. / *She wasn't fortunately disappointed.*

The presence of the negators *not* and *-n't* informs us only about the polarity of the clause, it tells us nothing about when, where and how something happened, this is the function of adverbs which provide additional information about the action or state expressed in the VP.

(127)   (a) *I will not/ won't visit them.* <negative polarity of the clause>
(b) *I will never visit them.* <negative polarity of the clause + information about frequency>
(c) *I will probably visit them.* <information about the degree of confidence>

The independence of individual clause elements can be best demonstrated when they are isolated. Adverbs in general are full-meaning words and thus posses informational value and can serve as the building material of clauses. In contrast to adverbs, both *not* and

-n't are functional elements that do not have any individual lexical meaning and that is why they do not have clause-formative ability. *Not* and *-n't* cannot appear in isolation, although *not* is a free morpheme, and need another clause-constituents which they can depend on.

(128)   *Never/ *Not/ *-N't/ Here.*

One of the basic differences between adverbs and the particle *not* is their ability to modify nouns and NPs. As I have already pointed out in section 1.3.5, *not* as well as adjectives is able to modify nouns, which adverbs cannot do (129b). The ability to modify nouns is one of the distinguishing features between adjectives and adverbs (129d). However, adverbs can serve as modifiers of NPs. Within the NP adverbs usually modify modifiers of nouns, e.g. adjectives and adverbs (129a). *Not* is in its function of a modifier unrestricted. I find it important to remark that *not* as a pre-modifier of nouns or NPs usually appears in elliptic constructions as in (129b), where the functional level, except for *not*, was omitted.

(129)   (a) <u>*Never forgiving nun Maria*</u> *left the monastery.*
            (b) *It was the priest, <u>not nun Maria</u>.* vs. *It was the priest, <u>it was not nun Maria</u>.*
            (c) *I need salt, <u>not pepper</u>.* vs. **I need salt, <u>never pepper</u>.*
            (d) <u>*Colourful flower beds*</u> *decorated the exhibition.* vs. **<u>*Colourfully flower beds*</u> *decorated the exhibition.*

As it has already been implied in the preceding paragraph, *never* and other adverbs frequently fulfil the function of modifiers of AdjPs (130a) and AdvPs (130c). Nevertheless, adjectives, they modify, are usually parts of verbo-nominal predicates that consist of the copula *be* and the adjective. The nominal part carries the main informational value and it is therefore the head of the VP. It is thus possible to say that what is modified is the AdjP. It is also possible to notice that *never* as both the modifier of an AdjP and an AdvP usually co-occurs with the verb *be*, but *be* followed by an AdvP, whether this AdvP is modified or not, cannot be denoted as copula, Veselovská (2006: 20) calls it existential *be* (130a). I have talked about the frequency of co-occurrence of synthetic means of negation and the verbs *be* and *have* in chapter 2.3.2 and *never* is one of these synthetic negators.

Analogous to *never*, *not* modifies adjectives as parts of verbo-nominal predicates, the copula is often ellipted as in (130b). As a modifier, *not* often occurs in firmly settled collocations such as *not just* and *not only*, both in (130d).

Never and other adverbs can similarly modify PrepPs (130e). (130f) is an example of phrasal negation; *not*, that is not incorporated into the VP, negates the following PrepP and thereby the rest of the clause, i.e. the following contrasting part, must be positive.

(130)   (a) *She was <u>never satisfied</u> with her results.* vs. *She was <u>very satisfied</u> with her results.*
            (b) *I'm a woman, or rather a girl, and <u>not clever</u>.* (BNC: AE0 2311)
            (c) *He was <u>never abroad</u>.* vs. *He was <u>often abroad</u>.*
            (d) *You go <u>not just</u> for the rides [...].* (BNC: AL3 1444) vs. <u>*Not only*</u> *that, we would be lucky to make it down alive.* (BNC: CL7 671)
            (e) <u>*Never from me*</u>*, and <u>never from you</u>, my lord, if you regard my good.* (BNC: HGG 249) vs. *That's <u>enough for today</u>.* (BNC: H89 2155)
            (f) *As it turned out the problem came <u>not from the Opposition</u> but from our own side.* (BNC: ADK 1766)

In contrast with *not* (131a), *never* is not able to negate numerals. I found only one instance of *never* as a pre-modifier of numeral, but one instance is not enough to declare that *never* is a modifier of numerals.

With respect to indefinite pronouns *never* occurred in the function of a pre-modifier only in 60 cases, whereas *not* appeared in this function in 1 237 cases. In case of *never* the most frequent combination was that of *never + anything* that could be found in 43 sentences, *not* appeared, surprisingly, in 453 sentences in combination with the pronoun *something*. With regard to other indefinite pronouns the number of examples, in which *never* was combined with another indefinite pronoun was quite low and compared to the number of combinations of *not* and indefinite pronoun also negligible. I therefore assume that *never* serves as a modifier of indefinite pronouns only partially, which follows from its negative semantic meaning and thus modifies only non-assertive indefinites starting with *any-*.

(131)   (a) *[...] which reinforced the verdict that two and <u>not four</u> men were involved.* (BNC: ANK 1175)
(b) *[...] the second derivative of dependence is <u>never zero</u> and its first derivative [...].* (BNC: FNR 078)
(c) *There was <u>never anything nasty</u> about him.* (BNC: CL2 109)
(d) *Get something with a good conductance, <u>not something</u> with a high resistance but something with a high conductance.* (BNC: GYR 125)

Another area of similarities is the ability of *never* and *not* to modify determiners. As you can notice, *never* as a modifier of determiner occurs in a clause whose predicate is represented by the verb *be* (132a). *Not* as a modifier of a determiner again appears in a contrastive construction (132b).

(132)   (a) *Well there's <u>never any place</u> to park.* (BNC: KCL 2346)
(b) *Perhaps yes I did love her once but <u>not any more</u>.* (BNC: ASN 2880)

Never and *not* also share their capability to modify semiclauses. Quirk (1972: 722) calls them non-finite clauses, because they contain a non-finite verb form represented either by infinitive (*to hit*), *-ing* participle (*remembering*), or *-ed* participle (*persuaded*). In a non-finite clause the subject does not have to be expressed. As I have already pointed out in 1.3 the principal function of both the adverb *never* and the negator *not* is to modify verbs. In the majority of cases *never* and *not* are used to negate the verbal predicate, i.e. the finite VP. *Never* and *not* can similarly modify the non-finite VPs, although this is less frequent.

The most frequent collocation of *never* + infinitive with *to* was that of *never to return*, which appears in 57 sentences in the BNC. In case of *not* + infinitive with *to* the most frequent collocation was that of *not to mention* that occurs in 686 sentences. Compare the following examples:

(133)   (a) *Although Mary herself was <u>never to return</u> to the town above the Jed Water [...].* (BNC: EF2 1151) vs. *We try <u>not to mention</u> David.* (BNC: HUP 378)
(b) *I was hoping for the best, <u>never believing</u> this sort of thing could happen to my own little horse.* (BNC: ASH 475) vs. *She was so ashamed of <u>not remembering</u> what had happened.* (BNC: EDN 1998)

(c) *Once seen <u>never forgotten</u>.* (BNC: CHH 505) vs. *With both Queen and loader in shot, hanging on wires <u>not seen</u>, the number of control crew [...].* (BNC: FB8 656)

Instances in the BNC also prove that *never* and other adverbs can serve as pro-forms. *Never* is used as a pro-form, which substitutes the subject and the VP of the clause. Examples (134a) and the reconstructed unelliptic clauses clearly demonstrate which parts of the clause were superceded. Example (134c) shows that not only adverbs of frequency but also place adverbs can serve as pro-forms.

(134)   (a) *I'll help your sister willingly if I can, <u>but never you</u>.* (BNC: HGK 1098)
→ *[...], <u>but I will never help you</u>.*
(b) *For others the clouds might gather and the rains fall, <u>but never for Maurice and those around him</u>.* (BNC: G0N 8)
→ *[...], <u>but they might never gather and fall for Maurice and those around him</u>.*
(c) *I don't know where it was <u>but somewhere in the states</u>.* (BNC: KPU 2709)
→ *I don't know where it was <u>but it was somewhere in the states</u>.*

As you can see in table 8 *never* can be denoted as an intensifier belonging to the subgroup of minimizers. *Not*, on the other hand, is semantically empty and that is why it cannot function as an intensifier. I therefore assume that *never* is used instead of *not* whenever we want to make the statement emotionally coloured. Compare the sentences in section 1.3.4 example (32).
Neither *never* nor *not* can serve as a complement of a preposition. This ability is, as Quirk (1972: 282-283) points out, inherent only with some time and place adverbs. *Never* and *not* are not semantically suitable for this function.

(135)   *I can't wait <u>until today</u>.* (BNC: KE4 661) vs. **I can't wait <u>until never</u>.* vs. **I can't wait <u>until not</u>.*

Both *never* and *not* can create contrastive constructions (136a, b). This ability follows from their inherently negative meaning. Contrastive constructions are used to emphasize the part of the clause that follows the coordinative conjunction *but*. Negators *never* and *not* can either appear in the first part of the clause (136a), which means that it is the positive part of the clause that is emphasized, or in the second part of the clause right of the conjunction *but* (136b). The emphasized part is then negative. Concerning the other adverbs, only those which are semantically negative or partially negative can create contrastive constructions (136c). Compare the following:

(136)   (a) *It was <u>not</u> a national style, <u>but</u> derived from Louvain, Sienna and Milan.* (BNC: B1D 1297)
(b) *He always got the profits <u>but never</u> the blame.* (BNC: FPU 1644)
(c) *There is a small amount of water in it, <u>but hardly</u> any flow.* (BNC: FA1 808)

Table 8

Feature	Adverbs in general	*Not*	*-N't*	*Never*

1) incorporation within the clause	some	yes	yes	yes
2) function of clause negation	some	yes	yes	yes
3) primarily related to the VP	some	yes	yes	yes
4) occurrence in contrastive constructions	some	yes	yes	yes
5) function of a complement of a preposition	some	no	no	no
6) independent element	yes	no	no	yes
7) modifier of nouns	some	yes	no	no
8) modifier of NPs	some	yes	no	yes
9) modifier of AdjPs, AdvPs and PrepPs	some	yes	no	yes
10) modifier of numerals and indefinite pronouns	some	yes	no	no/ partly
11) modifier of determiners	some	yes	no	yes
12) modifier of semiclauses	some	yes	no	yes
13) function of a pro-form	some	yes	no	yes
14) function of an intensifier / a minimizer	some	no	no	yes
15) function of phrasal negation	some	yes	no	yes
16) providing additional information (when, how, where)	yes	no	no	yes

Out of the 16 syntactic functions presented in this chapter, *never* comports with *not* in 11 cases. *Not* is much more versatile negator that is able to negate any clause constituent, and it is the main device of both clause and phrasal negation, as the results from the BNC show. *Never* is restricted in its function of phrasal negation by its semantic meaning, but on the other hand it can intensify the proposition of the clause.

Never and the reduced enclitic form *-n't* coincide only in 7 cases, because *-n't* cannot serve as a means of phrasal negation, i.e. cannot negate any other clause constituents than the verbal predicate.

Compared with the general properties of adverbs *never* accords with other adverbs in 15 cases. Individual differences between syntactic functions depend on the semantics of adverbs. I can therefore presume that with respect to its syntactic functions *never* behaves as a prototypical adverb.

Despite of the fact that *never* accords with *not* in 11 features, it is still not enough to claim that *never* behaves like the negative particle *not*.

3.3 **Comparison of syntactic positions**

This chapter focuses on the comparison of syntactic positions of *never*, *not* and the reduced enclitic form *-n't*. To be more thorough I also deal with syntactic positions of adverbs in general. I assume that this is the area, where I am going to find out the biggest differences between *never* and the negator *not/ -n't*.

3.3.1. **Variants of medial position**

First of all I want to comment on the position that is most characteristic for all the three elements discussed: *never*, *not* and *-n't*. These elements are traditionally placed in central position, designated by Quirk (1995: 490-493) as M position, which means that they occur between the first Mod./ Aux. and the rest of the VP (137a). However, even there we can find one basic difference. In Present Simple or Past Simple tense *never* does not require the occurrence of Mod./ Aux. When using *not* and *-n't*, the occurrence of Mod./ Aux. is obligatory, because neither *not* nor *-n't* are independent elements (137b).

Quirk (1985: 493) writes that M position is especially suitable for adverbs expressing time, space, respect and means (137c).

(137) (a) *Claire <u>has never</u>/ <u>has not</u>/ <u>hasn't</u> seen a man in a leopardskin jockstrap before.* (BNC: HGU 1889)
(b) *He <u>never</u> visited Europe.* vs. *He <u>did not</u>/ <u>didn't</u> visit Europe.* (BNC: A1B 1653)
(c) *He has <u>nowhere</u> stated this explicitly.* (Quirk: 1985, 493)

I have already mentioned in section 1.5.1 that *never* can be placed immediately after the subject. In this case it is necessary to distinguish between iM and M position. *Never* is usually placed in the position behind the subject of the clause in cases where the verb used appears in Present Simple or Past Simple tense, as in (137b). It is less common to use *never* in this position in cases, where periphrastic tense forms (e.g. Present Perfect, Simple Future) are used, which means verb forms that require the use of Aux., but it is not ungrammatical. In this case we speak about the iM position. Placement of the adverb *never* between the subject and the first Mod./ Aux. seems to be emphatic and stylistically marked, as you can notice in (138a). Negator *not*, on the other hand, requires the use of obligatory Mod./Aux., and therefore must be placed after this Mod./Aux. and in front of the rest of the VP. Other time adverbs can also be placed in the position behind the subject and in front of the Mod./Aux. when the verbal predicate is negated (138b) or when the clause is positive (138c). They are, however, more rare in this position than the adverb *never*, but likewise emphatic. Such a position of *not* is grammatically ruled out (138a).

(138) (a) *It <u>never will be finished</u>.* (BNC: ANF 510) vs. **It <u>not</u>/ <u>-n't will be finished</u>.* vs. *It <u>will not</u>/ <u>won't be finished</u>.*
(b) *As participants, we <u>often do not understand</u> what is going on in the interchange, so [...].* (BNC: CEF 1056)
(c) *[...], we <u>usually will not be able to demonstrate</u> them convincingly unless we quantify.* (BNC: FAD 308)
(d) *I <u>really</u> must have been insane.* (BNC: FEE 1928)

Other two variants of the central position are the so called mM and eM positions. Adverbs can occur in mM or eM position if the verbal predicate consists of two or more auxiliaries + the lexical verb. I have found only 1 sentence in which *never* occurred in mM position.

(139) *Such stories would have <u>never</u> been published in the United Kingdom [...].* (BNC: EAY 359)

There were 13 sentences in which *never* occurred in eM position in the BNC. As I have already said in 1.5.1, in 11 sentences out of 13 *never* was placed between the auxiliaries *would have* and a lexical verb as in (140a). I have therefore also compared the occurrence of the phrase *would have never* with *would never have* and I found out that *would never have* can be found in 621 sentences, whereas *would have never* only in 11. It is necessary to point out that the majority of VPs containing *would never have* was followed by past participle of the lexical verb as in (140c).

(140) (a) *Our modern law of judicial review would have <u>never</u> developed from its old.* (BNC: C9N 1314)
(b) *[...] he might have <u>never</u> gotten anywhere.* (BNC: FCL 602)

(c) *If I'd been in cold sobriety I would <u>never</u> have married her.* (BNC: CH2 1113)

In examples (140a,b) it is in fact not possible to differentiate between mM and eM position, because they contain only 2 auxiliaries and the lexical verb, so the mM position in fact merges together with the eM position.

I assume that the occurrence of *never* in mM and eM position is very rare and unusual, and it is used only in cases when the speaker wants to lay special emphasis on the lexical verb that it follows.

I have not found any instance of *not* in mM position. However I found 11 sentences in which *not* was used as a clause negator in eM position as in (141a). The most frequent VP was again the one consisting of the auxiliaries *would have* followed by the negator *not* and a lexical verb (141b). Once again I made a comparison of the occurrence of *would have not* and *would not have* and here are my results: *would have not* + past participle can be found in 8 clauses in the BNC, *would not have* + past participle appears in 2 866 clauses (141c).

My conclusion is that *not* appearing in eM position is even less frequent than *never*, but in case of *not*, this position is not grammatically correct, because neither of the grammarians mentioned mM or eM position as a possible place of occurrence of the negator *not* functioning as a clause negation. Furthermore the examples found in the BNC are very rare and can be found only in spoken English.

In case of the bound morpheme *-n't* both the mM and eM position is not only ungrammatical, but even implausible in spoken English. *-N't* as a bound morpheme must be connected with the first Mod./ Aux. of the VP. Compare the sentences in (141d).

(141)   (a) *I mean, you know she could have <u>not</u> bothered after all.* (BNC: KBC 5397)
           (b) *Violet would have <u>not</u> believed.* (BNC: BNC 1688)
           (c) *But such a strategy would <u>not</u> have served the United States' interests.* (BNC: EF3 901)
           (d) **But such a strategy would <u>haven't</u> served the United States' interests.*
            vs. *But such a strategy <u>wouldn't</u> have served the United States' interests.*

To conclude both *never* and *not* prefer medial position M, however it is necessary to remark that *never* as an independent element does not require the occurrence of Mod./Aux. and freely move within the VP.

3.3.2.   Initial position

With respect to the position of adverbs at the beginning of a clause, i.e. in initial position, it must be mentioned that *never* and other partially negative adverbs (*hardly, scarcely, barely*) behave differently than adverbs of definite time (*yesterday, today, tomorrow, ...*) and other fronted adverbs. It has already been mentioned in section 1.5.1 that *never* in initial position requires inversion of the subject with Mod./Aux. (52) or (142a). Negative adverbs *hardly*, *scarcely*, and *barely* behave in the same way (142b).

(142)   (a) *<u>Never</u> have I found a trace of low sentiment.* (BNC: ANF 391)
           (b) *<u>Hardly</u> was he around the corner than the man in the parked car climbed out, [...].* (BNC: CAM 910)
           (c) *[...]: <u>Scarcely</u> are we fed, lodged, clothed, warmed, without sending multitudes to their grave.* (BNC: HR0 503)

(d) *Barely had the decision been announced, than the criticism started.*
(BNC: AKM 1224)

The rule of inversion in initial position was violated in case of the adverb *never* in 6 sentences, all of them belong to spoken utterances. However, this rule was not violated in case of the partially negative adverb *hardly*. The number of violated examples is too low to be able to deduce any current trend.

(143)   (a) *Never you would stay a good bit underneath.* (BNC: HE9 1165)
          (b) *Never I was totally shocked in my voice.* (BNC: KBE 2518)

Adverbs of definite time such as *yesterday, today*, and *tomorrow* and other adverbs (e.g. *carefully*) do not trigger inversion (144).

(144)   (a) *Yesterday she hadn't had a chance to look properly.* (BNC: H97 3153)
          (b) *Today I made a break with habit and tradition, and took my lunch at the New Born Restaurant.* (BNC: H0M 3034)
          (c) *Tomorrow he will make a 'personal statement' which is expected to announce an intention to resign.* (BNC: AK9 1202)
          (d) *Carefully they crossed the river and they made their way into the city.* (BNC: F72 203)

Not and *-n't*, as the main devices of clause negation cannot be fronted to initial position and therefore do not trigger inversion (145a). *Not* can be fronted only as a member of some bigger unit, e.g. a NP, as in (145b), *-n't* cannot function as a means of phrasal negation and that is why it cannot be fronted in any case. When *not* functioning as a means of phrasal negation, i.e. as a component of some NP, PrepP, AdjP or AdvP, is placed into initial position, the word order of sentence core remains unchanged, which means S + (Mod./Aux) + V as in the examples (145c). The word order remains uninverted even if the fronted phrase containing *not* is a negative one.

(145)   (a)**Not have I found a trace of low sentiment.* vs. *I have not / haven't found a trace of low sentiment.*
          (b) *Not the one we looked at.* (BNC: KCN 1358)
          (c) *Not far from Cairo the road was joined by a single-track railway line [...]*. (BNC: FEM 546)

Never appears in initial position also in imperative clauses, because it does not require the occurrence of Mod./ Aux. and it is therefore immediately followed by lexical verb as in (146a). *Not* and *-n't*, which require the presence of Mod./Aux. appear in M position (146b).

(146)   (a) *Never use five bowls if one will do.* (BNC: KC4 332)
          (b) *Don't believe it./ Do not believe it.* (BNC: FU6 2111)

As for the initial position, *never* and *not* substantially differ. *Not* cannot be fronted unless it functions as a means of phrasal negation, and it is accompanied by another sentence member. *Never* and partially negative adverbs can be fronted and require subject - operator inversion.

3.3.3.   End position

Adverbs in general frequently occur in E position (147e, f), but as I have already remarked in 1.5.1, *never* functioning as a clause negator seems to sound quite oddly when placed in final position and in fact I found only one such example in the BNC and you can find it in example (147a). *Never* can be placed in E position in firmly settled collocations (147b) or when it is contrasted with another time expression (147c), in such examples the whole clause remains positive, which can be proved by adding of the question tag, which is negative. Another possibility, where to see the adverb *never* in post-verbal position, is that *never* follows the VP as a means of phrasal negation. In such a case *never* most frequently modifies an infinitive phrase as in (147d).

(147)   (a) *It visits some people <u>never</u>.* (BNC: ANF 13)
              (b) *It's a miracle and definitely better late than <u>never</u>.* (BNC: K4M 631)
              → *It's a miracle and definitely better late than <u>never</u>, <u>isn't it</u>?*
              (c) *The majority of children were hit less than once a month or <u>never</u>.*
              (BNC: A1Y 334)
              → *The majority of children were hit less than once a month or <u>never</u>,*
              <u>*weren't they*</u>*?*
              (d) *She had decided <u>never</u> to tell him her great secret.* (BNC: FS2 841)
              (e) *Bad weather battered Britain again <u>yesterday</u>.* (BNC: CH2 121)
              (f) *I guess I can stand <u>somewhere</u>.* (BNC: JP7 998)

Similarly, *not* cannot be placed in final position, unless it is a part of a clause element other than VP. In example (148a) you can see a very frequent collocation of not + only, which means that *not* is used as a modifier of an AdvP. *Not* fulfils the same function in (148b), although here the AdvP is incorporated within the VP. In (148c) *not* functions as a modifier of a NP, the collocation of *not + a + single* + noun is also very frequent, it can be found in 263 sentences in the BNC. Yet another function is fulfilled in (148d) where *not* functions as a modifier of a numeral.

(148)   (a) *In her place I would have been <u>not</u> only up the wall but out of the door!*
              (BNC: CB8 1157)
              (b) *This week, Faldo has been <u>not</u> exactly refusing interviews but making it*
              abruptly clear [...]. (BNC: AJJ 378)
              (c) *There has been <u>not</u> a single successor of world class [...].* (BNC: CHV*
              723)
              (d) *Rolando proves he could have <u>not</u> one but two brilliant careers.* (BNC:*
              CAD 2215)

To sum up, neither *never* nor *not* can be placed in post-verbal position when functioning as means of clause negation. *Never* and *not* occur in end position E only when they are parts of collocations or they function as devices of phrasal negation.

3.3.4.   Position in questions

Finally I am going to comment on the position of the above discussed negators in questions. There are two possibilities where a negator can be placed, either right of the subject, this is a position characteristic for written texts, or left of the subject, which is more frequent in spoken conversation.

The only possible placement of *never* and other adverbs in questions is right of subject. None of the adverbs has the ability to contract and it is therefore not possible to

place them left of the subject (149g). *Never* and other adverbs of indefinite frequency occur in M position in questions (149a). The rest of the adverbs, including the adverbs of definite time, are placed into final position (149d), M position is implausible for them (149f).

(149) (a) *Have you never wanted to be married?* (BNC: FEE 491)
       (b) *Why did she never ask me if I knew anything about it?* (BNC: H8T 3252)
       (c) *Why do you always act so foolish?* (BNC: JK5 335)
       (d) *Did you see him dive yesterday?* (BNC: KBL 4140)
       (e) **Did you see him dive never/ always?*
       (f) **Did you yesterday see him dive?*
       (g) **Did never/ always you see him dive?*

Not as a free morpheme can similarly be placed only right of the subject as in (150a). As well as in statements, *not* occurs only in M position in questions, and as a device of clause negation *not* cannot be placed in post-verbal position (150d). *Never* and *not* therefore behave in the same way when occurring in questions.

(150) (a) *Have you not noticed that my life has changed?* (BNC: KE1 1640)
       (b) *Why is he not eating it up?* (BNC: KBW 9404)
       (c) **Why is not he eating it up?*
       (d) **Why is he eating not it up?*

In case of *-n't* the situation is entirely different. *-N't* is a bound morpheme and can only take the position which a Mod./ Aux. can take. *-N't* in questions is therefore placed left of the subject where it co-occurs with the first Mod./ Aux. This fronted position is the only position which a bound morpheme *-n't* can take in questions.

(151) (a) *Aren't you sick of it?* (BNC: J5E 1992)
       (b) *Didn't you have that in your book?* (BNC: FYG 601)
       (c) **Did you haven't that in your book?*

3.3.5.   Conclusion concerning the syntactic positions

The following table 9 clearly illustrates, which position is either acceptable or unacceptable for a particular item.

Table 9[12]

Position/ feature[13]	Adverbs in general	*Not*	*N't*	*Never*
1) M position in statements	yes	yes	yes	yes
2) triggers inversion in initial position	no	no	no	yes
3) initial position is statements and imperatives	yes	no	no	yes
4) iM position in statements	yes	no	no	yes
5) mM position in statements	yes	no	no	yes

---

[12] It is again necessary to remark that as regards the column *adverbs in general* table 9 provides simplifying information that applies to adverbs in general.

[13] Table 9 provides information about *never, not* and *-n't* when they function as means of clause negation.

6) eM position in statements	yes	no	no	yes
7) E position in statements	yes	no	no	no
8) obligatory occurrence of Mod./ Aux.	no	yes	yes	no
9) position in questions - a) left of the subject	no	no	yes	no
b) right of the subject	yes	yes	no	yes

Resulting from the above discussed facts concerning the position of *never, not* and *-n't* it is possible to claim that *never* behaves more like the free morpheme *not*, rather than the bound morpheme *-n't*. *Never* accords with *not* in 3 points stated in table 9. To sum it up, they both most frequently occur in M position. They do not appear in post-verbal/ E position unless they serve as means of phrasal negation. They cannot be placed left of the subject in questions but must follow it.

Never and *-n't* are even more different. They share only two features, first it is the placement in M position, and second it is the inability to stand in E position.

As was to be expected, *never* shares the majority of features with other adverbs. Out of 9 discussed positions, *never* differs from other adverbs only in 2 positions. As was pointed out, adverbs can appear in initial position. However, *never* and other negative adverbs require inversion of the subject and the first Mod./ Aux., the rest of the adverbs is just fronted without any change of word order. The second point of difference is the placement of adverbs in E position. Whereas the majority of adverbs can occur in E position, the position of *never* in E position is unacceptable.

It is necessary to emphasize that with respect to syntactic position differences between *never* and *not/ -n't* clearly prevail, whereas by comparison of *never* and other adverbs similarities prevail, *never* therefore behaves as a typical adverb.

4. **Final conclusion**

Following from the first chapter, in which I provided a brief description of English adverbs, and in whose subchapters I applied my findings on the two key items of my thesis *never* and *not*, I made a detailed comparison of these two elements in the third chapter. Here, I am first going to make a conclusion concerning the basic distinctions between *never* and *not*. Then I am going to mention different types of negation and the restrictions that appear in connection with them.

4.1. **Comparison of** *Never* **and** *Not*

As regards the morphological and semantic properties of *never* and *not*, I have already mentioned that differences prevail over similarities and it is therefore possible to say that *never* and *not* are diverse. I should also remark that Dušková (2006: 156-160) and Huddleston (2006: 566) differ in their classification of *never*, Dušková ranks it among primary adverbs, however Huddleston considers it to be a morphologically complex word derived from some other adverb. Huddleston's classification seems to be the right one from the historical point of view. Concerning the outward form of the adverb *never*, it is morphologically transparent composition of *no + ever*. *Not* is, from the synchronical point of view, morphologically simple and it therefore does not allow any classification based on morphology. However, they both are apparently negative in form and meaning.

What is interesting and important to mention is the similarity of the enclitic contracted form *-n't*, functioning as a bound morpheme, and the Czech bound morpheme *ne-*. *Never* also possesses a corresponding Czech equivalent, it is however not able to contract and can only function as a free morpheme. In this respect *never* is more similar to the free morpheme *not*. In this context it is necessary to mention that the Czech *nikdy* can be translated into English in two ways, either as *never* or as a combination of the negator *not* and the positive adverb *ever*.

With respect to the semantic properties of *never* and *not*, both *never* and *not* are negative, they can thus both change the polarity of the clause, but *never* as a full-meaning word possesses a clear-cut meaning of an adverb of zero frequency. *Not* is just a functional word that is semantically empty. As a result of these properties both *never* and *not* are not gradable and cannot be intensified by other adverbs.

The majority of overlaps can be found in the chapter 1.3 dealing with syntactic functions of *never* and *not*. Both differences and similarities were later summed up in chapter 3.2. I am now going to draw some general conclusions.

Adverbs in general are very versatile modifiers that are able to modify all the clause constituents including the category of nouns. However, a single adverb does not have the ability to modify all the clause constituents as we could see on the example of the adverb *never*. *Never* cannot modify nouns and numerals, and concerning the indefinite pronouns *never* can modify only some of them.

Not is also a very versatile modifier. As the main device of clause negation it can negate VPs, and as the means of phrasal negation *not* can negate all the other clause constituents, including nouns and numerals. *Not* as a modifier only negates the elements following it. *Never*, on the other hand, negates them and even intensifies the negative meaning of the clause. Thanks to its semantic meaning, *never* can not only intensify other clause elements, but as a full-meaning word can also create a simple unary clause. As a clause negator, *never* furthermore provides additional information about when and how often something happened. *Not*, because it is semantically empty, cannot fulfil this function.

My comparison of syntactic distribution of *never* and *not*, when functioning as clause negators, has shown that it is the position in a clause where the majority of differences can be found.

Never, as well as other adverbs, is quite free with respect to its position within a sentence. Table 9 clearly demonstrates this ability to occur in different positions in a clause. *Not*, as functional element that requires the occurrence of Mod./ Aux. is restricted to central/ M position, which is however the most frequent position of *never*. It is probably this central position that led Quirk (1972: 432) to the presumption that *not* could be regarded as a negative restrictive adjunct. I rather move towards Anderwald's opinion to classify *not* as an independent category negator.

Nevertheless, as I have shown in chapter 1.3.3.2, out of the three categories adjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts, *not* is closest to the category of adjuncts.

In my conclusion, *not* cannot be classified as an adverb, because it lacks the semantic meaning of adverbs, as a result of which *not* cannot fulfil the functions which are intrinsic to adverbs. Furthermore, *not* also cannot occur in positions in which adverbs can be placed.

4.2. Aspects of negation and restrictions

In the first part of chapter dealing with negation I focused on the phenomenon known as the scope of negation. I have mentioned that scope of the negation does not have to extend to the end of the clause and it is therefore possible to find *not* and *never* in the same clause. *Not* and *never* can co-occur also in the case of double negation that is usually used for emphasis or to show annoyance.

Then I showed the basic difference between morphological and clause negation. Whereas morphological negation is formed with the help of negative prefixes, clause negation is achieved with the help of the negative particle *not* or the negative quantifiers *never, nobody* etc. An important thing here is to remind that clauses containing morphological negation are in fact positive, clauses containing clause negation must, as their name already implies, negate the whole clause.

I have also pointed out that there is an important difference in terminology, whereas clause negation comprises all the negators ranging from negative quantifiers to negative particle *not*, there is a special term used for the kind of negation that is fulfilled with the help of the particle *not*, it is the so called standard negation.

Section 2.1.3 shows that both *not* and *never* fulfil the criteria necessary for clause negation. What is more the same can be said about a group of partially negative adverbs including *hardly, seldom* etc. These partially negative elements can furthermore be placed into initial position and as well as *never*, they also trigger inversion, which is not true in case of positive adverbs and the negative particle *not* that above all cannot be fronted.

Section 2.2 focused on the distinction between clause, phrasal, partial and local negation. As I have already stated in the Preface I wanted to focus on how these different types of negation function and I also tried to illustrate how *never* and *not* can fulfil the conditions of these individual kinds of negation. As I have proved both *never* and *not* can be used as devices of these kinds of negation, but there are sometimes problems with the assessment of both the meaning and the type of negation used.

The next part of chapter 2 was devoted to the differences between analytic and synthetic types of negation and also restrictions that can be applied to them. I have confirmed Tottie's claim that analytic kind of negation prevails over synthetic one and therefore I was able to conclude that *not* is preferred to *never*. On the basis of my BNC research I cannot confirm her second statement that synthetic negation prefers the occurrence of the verb *be*, in its existential or copulative use, or *have,* with its possessive meaning. Tottie was right when she said that *not*, as a representative of analytic negation,

co-occurs in the majority of cases with lexical verbs, but *never*, as a representative of synthetic negation, also prefers co-occurrence with lexical verbs.

My aim was also to show what constraints arise in case of analytic and synthetic negation, which means in case of *not* and *never*. The main restriction for the use of the adverb *never* is, as I have already pointed out in 2.3.3.6, its specific meaning of zero frequency. As regards other constraints I should mention the occurrence of another time or frequency adverb. Once again I have proved that *never* cannot modify nouns, whereas *not* can. *Not* is thanks to its empty semantic meaning more versatile than the adverb *never*.

Not is restricted in its use in coordinated constructions, e.g. coordinated AdvPs prefer negative adverbs. Contrastive constructions, on the other hand, are more likely to contain the analytic negator *not*.

Never in initial position can be replaced by *not + ever*, the same cannot be done in case of fronted negative NPs.

To sum up I assume that in a majority of cases it is possible to replace *never* with *not + ever*. However, it is possible to replace *not* with *never* only in cases when the original clause contains a suitable frequency adjunct, as for example *ever*. By substituting *not* with *never*, we always deliver an additional meaning to the clause and thereby we change the original meaning.

4.3. Summary of my conclusion

In conclusion it is necessary to emphasize that *never* behaves in many respects very similarly to the negative particle *not*, but as my thesis proved the differences still clearly prevail over similarities. The majority of differences appeared, as I expected, on the syntactic level, which means in the distribution of *never* and *not* in a clause. Many differences, especially the independence of the adverb *never*, were caused by the still strong semantic meaning of *never*.

I am able to claim that it comes to the semantic weakening of the adverb *never* only in cases when *never* co-occurs with adverbials referring to a specific future time (e.g. *tomorrow, tonight*), whereby I confirm Quirk's (1972: 456) statement that was cited on page 23. However, it is necessary to point out that *never* in this environment does not lose its intensifying function and therefore it does not behave exactly as the negative particle *not*.

5. **Shrnutí**

5.1. Úvod

Hlavním tématem mojí diplomové práce bylo srovnání adverbia *never* a negativní částice *not*. Oba tyto zápory slouží jako prostředky větné negace. Větná negace je v angličtině obvykle tvořena pomocí negativních částic *no* a *not* nebo negativních kvantifikátorů *nobody, no one, nothing, never, nowhere, neither* a *none*. Ve své práci se hodlám zaměřit na dva již zmíněné elementy, *never* a *not*, ale někdy se budu také zabývat jinými prostředky negace, abych byla schopná vytvořit co možná nejpodrobnější obrázek těchto dvou vybraných záporek. Budu se soustředit na jejich roli při vytváření záporu a budu srovnávat negativní charakter částice *not* s časovým a intenzifikujícím charakterem příslovce *never*.

Tato diplomová práce poskytuje důkladnou teoretickou analýzu toho, co je adverbium a co je negativní částice *not*. V první části mé práce hodlám zmínit obecná kritéria platná pro anglická příslovce a poté chci aplikovat tato kritéria na dva vybrané elementy, a to na *never* a *not*, na základě toho budu schopna posoudit, zda jejich vlastnosti odpovídají obecným vlastnostem adverbií nebo ne. Což tedy znamená, že jak *never* tak i *not* budou detailně popsány a navíc je uvedu v příkladech, které objasní jak fungují, a srovnám je také s jinými (např. částečně zápornými) adverbii. Dále popíšu rozdíly a podobnosti v užití a funkci *never* a *not*.

Tato práce se opírá o základní příručky zabývající se anglickou gramatikou. Srovnávány jsou pohledy jednotlivých autorů na gramatické jevy a zvláštní pozornost je věnována také odlišnostem v jejich názorech. Ačkoli v tomto ohledu neočekávám mnoho rozporů.

Dalším zdrojem lingvistických dat je Britský národní korpus, dále jen BNC. Budu srovnávat pravidla a definice uvedená v gramatických příručkách s příklady nalezenými programem SARA v BNC. Na základě tohoto srovnání popíšu nalezené výjimky.

V některých částech mé diplomové práce, především tam, kde to bylo vhodné pro předvedení určitých gramatických vlastností, jsem se rozhodla vložit také srovnání českého a anglického jazyka.

Moje diplomová práce sleduje následující cíle:

o poskytnout základní popis anglických příslovcí
o aplikovat zjištěná fakta o adverbiích na dva klíčové elementy *never* a *not*
o najít rozdílné názory u jednotlivých lingvistů, jejichž gramatické příručky byly konzultovány, pokud tedy nějaké konfliktní názory existují
o poskytnout důkladný přehled o rozličných druzích negace, a ukázat, kdy jsou využívány, a která kritéria nebo omezení se vztahují na daný typ negace
o na základě srovnání pravidel a definicí z gramatických příruček a příkladů z BNC najít výjimky, ve kterých právě daná pravidla byla porušena, a zjistit, jestli mají tyto případy něco společného, a pokud je to možné, také vyvodit nějaká obecná pravidla, která by tyto výjimky vysvětlila.

Tato diplomová práce je rozdělená do tří hlavních částí. První je poněkud teoretická a obsahuje informace o příslovcích. Každá z kapitol je dále podrozdělena a zabývá se některými specifickými aspekty adverbií. Některé podkapitoly se zase zaměřují na již zmíněná pravidla a definice v aplikaci na dva diskutované elementy *never* a *not*.

Druhá část mojí práce se zaměřuje na anglickou negaci. Nebudu se zabývat jen jazykovými prostředky, které mohou být použity při tvoření záporu, ale hodlám také popsat různé druhy negace a zmínit, jaké potíže se mohou objevit při jejich rozlišování. Velký prostor je věnován rozlišení analytické a syntetické negace a omezením, která musí být brána v potaz, pokud se rozhodneme záporné věty přetvářet. Tato problematika bude opět uvedena do souvislosti s hlavními předměty mé práce *never* a *not*.

Ve třetí a závěrečné části mé práce budu srovnávat *never* a *not* z hlediska jejich morfologických, sémantických a syntaktických vlastností. Všechna má tvrzení a domněnky se opírají o data vyhledaná programem SARA v BNC. Zvláštní pozornost je věnována výjimkám, které mají sloužit jako důkaz toho, že v některých kontextech se *never* začíná chovat spíše jako částice *not*.

Základní hypotézou v této práci bylo, že dochází k sémantickému oslabování adverbia *never*. Data z BNC by tedy měly buď potvrdit nebo vyvrátit tuhle domněnku nebo aspoň ukázat ve kterých konstrukcích a kontextech se *never* chová spíše jako negativní částice *not*. Bylo by také vhodné prokázat, zda-li tomu není naopak, tedy jestli se funkční částice *not* nechová spíše jako adverbium, ale to je teoreticky velmi nepravděpodobné. Pro tyto účely tedy bylo nutné vytvořit teoretický základ, který by posloužil jako výchozí bod pro následné srovnání příkladů v BNC.

5.2. Vlastnosti *Never* a *Not* s ohledem na jazykové vlastnosti adverbií

V první části této diplomové práce došlo k aplikaci obecných vlastností adverbií na záporné adverbium *never* a částici *not*. Zjistila jsem, že se autoři rozchází v zařazení slova *never* do jednotlivých morfologických kategorií. Zatímco Dušková (2006: 156-160) řadí *never* mezi tzv. primární adverbia, Huddleston (2006: 566) *never* řadí mezi morfologicky komplexní příslovce, která jasně vykazují jejich odvozenost od jiných adverbií. Huddlestonovo zařazení může být podpořeno pohledem na historický vývoj příslovce *never*. Co se týče částice *not*, jakákoli klasifikace se ukázala být se synchronického hlediska nemožná. Jako následek sémantického významu *never* a *not*, obě tato slova nemohou být stupňována ani intenzifikována.

Ze sémantického hlediska je *never* označováno jako časové příslovce označující nulovou frekvenci a v češtině mu jako protějšek odpovídá příslovce *nikdy*. Naopak pokud bychom chtěli přeložit české adverbium *nikdy*, můžeme to udělat dvěma způsoby, je možné zvolit právě slovo *never*, čímž bude překlad přesnější, a nebo je možné vyjádřit zápor na slovesu užitím -*n't* a pokračovat adverbiem *ever*, které, jelikož bude v dosahu negace, bude mít záporný význam. Právě díky svému specifickému významu lze *never* označit jako plnovýznamové slovo, které je nezávislé na ostatních větných členech a může tudíž tvořit jediný obsah jednoduché věty.

O významu slova *not* lze říci jediné, je záporné a je tedy stejně jako adverbium *never* schopné měnit polaritu věty. *Not* řadíme k funkčním slovům, a jak se zmiňuji později, *not* není nezávislým elementem a vyžaduje výskyt modálního nebo pomocného slovesa, není tedy schopné samostatně tvořit větu. V kapitole 1.2.3 zabývající se významem slova *not* jsem také uvedla, že si Quirk (1972: 432) pohrává s myšlenkou, že by se *not* dalo zařadit mezi restriktivní záporná příslovečná určení. Anderwald (2002: 17-18) tuto domněnku zdůvodňuje tím, že se *not* charakteristicky vyskytuje právě v centrální pozici, která je typická pro mnohá adverbia, ale nakonec toto téma uzavírá tím, že *not* je tak odlišné od jakéhokoli slovního druhu, že by pro něj navrhoval vlastní kategorii a to negátor.

V další, ale poněkud obsáhlejší kapitole, jsem se věnovala větným funkcím *never* a *not*. Základní větnou funkcí adverbia *never* je rozvíjet sloveso a tím dodávat informace o tom, kdy a jak často se něco děje, *never* tudíž slouží jako modifikátor slovesa. *Never* může být dále označeno jako modifikátor adjektivních, adverbiálních a předložkových frází, ale

také neurčitých slovesných forem. *Never* modifikuje jednotlivé součásti věty právě tím, že zintenzivňuje jejich význam, *never* tudíž může být dále označeno jako intenzifikátor. Velmi důležitou poznámku uvádí Quirk (1972: 456), když tvrdí, že *never* ve spojení s jiným adverbiálním určením odkazujícím na určitý čas v budoucnosti ztrácí svůj časový význam a přibližuje se tedy značným způsobem částici *not*. Co ale musí být zdůrazněno, je, že *never* neztrácí svoje intenzifikační schopnosti a tudíž není synonymní ke slovu *not,* protože vyjadřuje mluvčího naštvání, případně mrzutost.

Not, stejně jako *never*, patří ke slovům, která jsou začleněna do větné struktury a nemohou být tedy vyčleněny a odděleny od zbytku věty čárkou nebo intonací. *Not* nelze označit jako příslovečné určení, ačkoli rozvíjí sloveso. Dále se dá říci, že je *not* obligatorní součástí věty, protože bez něj by věta znamenala pravý opak. V případě větné negace *not* vždy vyžaduje přítomnost modálního nebo pomocného slovesa, v případě frázové negace pak jen stojí před tím členem věty, který neguje. *Not*, jako prostředek frázové negace, může negovat podstatná jména, jmenné, adjektivní, adverbiální a předložkové vazby, ale také determinanty, číslovky a míry. Na rozdíl od příslovcí ale nemůže sloužit jako doplněk předložky. *Not* ale naopak může fungovat jako zástupná forma, která nahrazuje buď přísudek nebo dokonce i podmět s přísudkem. *Not* je také charakteristickým prvkem v odporovacích konstrukcích.

Důležitou částí mé práce je kapitola 1.4, která se zabývá pozicí adverbií a také *never* a *not* ve větě. *Never* jako časové adverbium vyjadřující nulovou frekvenci se nejčastěji vyskytuje, stejně jako *not* v pozici mezi prvním modálním nebo pomocným slovesem a zbytkem slovesné fráze. Na rozdíl od *not* ale může být pro účely zdůraznění postaveno před mod. nebo pomoc. sloveso. *Never* a ostatní záporná příslovce mohou být postavy na začátek věty, v takových případech pak dochází k převrácení pořádku slov ve větě, takže *never* je následováno pomocným slovesem a pak podmětem. Neobrácený slovní pořádek se velmi zřídka objevuje v mluvené angličtině. Na začátku věty se *never* objevuje také v rozkazovacích větách.

V případě přísudku skládajícího se z dvou a více pomocných sloves mohou být adverbia jako například *never* umístěna i na jiná místa uvnitř slovesné fráze, ne jenom mezi 1. mod. nebo pomoc. slovesem. *Never* se naopak nevyskytuje v post-verbální pozici.

Co se týče záporné částice *not* fungující jako větný zápor, jedinou přijatelnou pozicí je pozice mezi obligatorním mod. nebo pomoc. slovesem a zbytkem přísudku. Zajímavá je pozice *not* v otázce. Díky tomu, že *not* může být redukováno na příklonku *-n't,* rozlišujeme dvě jeho různé pozice v otázce. Nestažený tvar se objevuje v pozici za podmětem, stažený tvar *-n't*, který je připojený na mod. nebo pomoc. sloveso, se nachází před podmětem. *Not* se na začátku věty objevuje pouze ve funkci pre-determinantu, v takový případech jde ale o frázovou negaci. Dále je nutné zmínit, že *not* jako větný zápor je obvykle nepřízvučné, zatímco ve funkci modifikátoru je přízvučné.

5.3. Rozlišení anglického záporu

V první části kapitoly věnované anglické negaci, jsem se věnovala fenoménu známému jako dosah negace 2.1.1. Vysvětlila jsem, že na rozdíl od češtiny je v anglickém jazyce možný ve větě jen jeden zápor. Záporný větný člen svým významem ovlivňuje všechny následující součásti věty a ty se tedy vyskytují v dosahu negace, proto je nutné vpravo od záporu užívat jen kladné výrazy. Vyskytují se ale případy, kdy zápor nedosahuje konce věty a v takovém případě klidně může následovat záporný větný člen. Dosah negace poznáme podle intonace mluvčího nebo podle výběru slov. V kladných větách se typicky vyskytují složeniny se *some-*, v otázkách a záporný větách negovaných například částicí *not* pak složeniny s *any-*.

V příkladech často uvádím také české ekvivalenty, abych demonstrovala, kde dosah negace končí, a jak se význam věty může lišit změněním polarity jediného slova. Dále se zmiňuji o jevu známem jako dvojitá nebo mnohonásobná negace, který je typický pro nestandardní angličtinu. Je nutné zdůraznit, že případy obsahující mnohonásobnou negaci je třeba odlišovat od vět, kde je dosah negace omezen a je tedy možné užít více záporů. Na konci této podkapitoly jsem se pak zabývala podmínkami pro rozšíření dosahu negace. Negace může dosáhnout na následující hlavní větu, pokud je spojíme souřadnými spojkami *and* nebo *or* a pokud se podmět a pomocné sloveso nebo celý přísudek shodují s následující větou. Dosah negace se ale může rozšířit i na následující vedlejší větu, což poznáme podle užití složenin s *any-* nebo jiných slov typických pro výskyt záporu.

Následující podkapitola se zabývá rozlišením morfologické a větné negace. Morfologická negace je vytvářena zápornými předponami jako je např. *im-* (*impolite*), větný zápor může být vytvořen buď zápornou částicí *not*, nebo zápornými zájmeny a příslovci. Na rozdíl od záporu větného, morfologická negace není schopná negovat celou větu, věta je tedy chápána jako kladná, což může být dokázáno např. připojením dovětku k dané větě. Dovětek připojený k větě obsahující morfologickou negaci je záporný, protože je předchozí věta kladná. Polaritu věty si lze ověřit i jinými testy.

V další podkapitole se věnuji kritériím, která nám mohou pomoci určit, zda-li je věta kladná nebo záporná. V této souvislosti uvádím také částečně záporná adverbia, kterým je např. *hardly* a aplikuji zmíněná kritéria pro srovnání jak na kladná a záporná, tak i na částečně záporná adverbia. Protože jsem došla k závěru, že záporná a částečně záporná příslovce jsou si velmi podobná, srovnala jsem taky jejich pozici na začátku věty. Na rozdíl od kladných příslovcí, částečně záporná adverbia, stejně tak jako adverbia zcela záporná, vyžadují inverzi podmětu a prvního pomocného nebo modálního slovesa. Na závěr jsem se věnovala srovnání významu slov značících zápornou polaritu věty jako je např. *any* v kladných a záporných větách, ale také v otázkách. Pro objasnění byly rovněž uvedeny české ekvivalenty.

Kapitola 2.2 se pak zabývá rozlišením částečné, frázové, lokální a větné negace. Jak při částečné, tak i při frázové negaci stojí zápor před jiným větným členem než je predikát, při částečné negaci ale zůstává zbytek věty kladný, zatímco při frázové negaci je zbytek věty zasažen záporem. Což znamená, že po větě obsahující částečnou negaci je nutné užít záporný dovětek, zatímco po větě s frázovým záporem dovětek kladný. Částečná negace se tedy kryje s Quirkovým (1972: 381-382) pojmem lokální negace. Větná negace byla popsána už v kapitole 2.1.2.

V kapitole 2.3 jsem se zabývala typologický rozlišením anglického záporu. *Never* bylo označeno jako typický zástupce záporu syntetického, protože splňuje kromě své záporné funkce také funkci adverbiální, což znamená, že svým významem rozvíjí sloveso. *Not* je na druhou stranu zástupce záporu analytického, protože má jen jednu jedinou funkci. Moje pátrání dále ukázalo, že analytický způsob negace je upřednostňován oproti syntetickému způsobu negace, a z toho jsem vydedukovala, že je *not* upřednostňováno nad *never*. Hlavním omezením pro užití příslovce *never* jako záporu, byl právě jeho specifický význam označující nulovou frekvenci.

Jednou z domněnek také bylo, že syntetický způsob negace dává přednost výskytu slovesa *be* v jeho existenciálním nebo sponovém užití, nebo *have* ve svém významu vlastnit. Naopak analytický způsob záporu tvořený pomocí *not* se měl vyskytovat v predikátu spolu s plnovýznamovými slovesy. V případě *not* jsem byla schopna tuto domněnku potvrdit, ovšem v případě *never* se ukázalo, že také preferuje výskyt plnovýznamových sloves.

V další podkapitole jsem se zabývala kritérii omezujícími použití buď analytického nebo syntetického způsobu negace. Nejdůležitějším omezením týkajícím se použití

adverbia *never* byl výskyt jiného časového příslovce v téže větě, ale i zde je možné najít výjimky. *Never* se např. může objevovat v doprovodu časových adverbií odkazujících do budoucnosti jako je např. *tonight*. V takovém případě význam příslovce *tonight* vyruší význam adverbia *never*. *Never* tudíž splňuje tu samou funkci jako částice *not* ale navíc stále funguje jako intenzifikace a podává tudíž informace o postoji a rozpoložení mluvčího.

Pokud jde o částici *not*, analytická negace se nepoužívá u souřadně spojených jmenných frází, v takových případech se preferuje užití determinantu *no*.

Jak *never*, tak i *not* se vyskytují v pevných vazbách, ačkoli tyto kolokace můžou být viděny jako upřednostňované kombinace slov, je tu stále prostor pro případné změny. U idiomů je situace odlišná, protože jsou idiomy pevně ustálené fráze nebo dokonce celé věty, jejich tvar nelze podrobit buď žádným nebo jen zcela malým změnám.

Prozkoumání vět nalezených v BNC také potvrdilo, že analytická negace je upřednostňována v odporovacích konstrukcích. Ukázalo se, že jedna třetina náhodně vybraných odporovacích konstrukcí obsahovala syntetickou negaci. *Never* bylo užito jako kontrastní prvek v 5 větách, což znamená, že je v odporovacích větách ještě méně časté než *no*, které bylo užito v 8 případech.

Dále je nutné zmínit, že *never* v pozici na počátku věty není obligatorní a syntetická negace může být v tomto případě jednoduše změněna na větu obsahující analytický typ negace pomocí záporu *not*. Na druhou stranu *no*, což je další prostředek syntetické negace, nemůže být nahrazeno částicí *not* v případech, kdy *no* slouží jako pre-modifikátor jmenné fráze posunuté na začátek věty.

Věty z BNC také dokazují, že *never*, jako prostředek syntetického negace, není schopné modifikovat podstatná jména, neboť jsem nenašla ani jeden takový případ. Z toho lze také odvodit, že *never* není schopno modifikovat jmenné fráze s přívlastkem neshodným, ale naopak může modifikovat podstatná jména modifikována přívlastkem shodným. Uvnitř takovéto jmenné fráze obsahující přívlastek shodný, *never* modifikuje některé z přídavných jmen nebo adverbií, která přívlastek shodný spoluvytváří.

Abych to shrnula, ve většině případů může být *never* jednoduše nahrazeno částicí *not* a adverbiem *ever* bez jakékoli změny významu. Naopak *never* sebou vždy přináší význam nulové frekvence a může tudíž sloužit jen jako náhrada vět obsahujících *not + ever*, jinak se mění význam věty.

Never je tedy ve svém užití značně omezeno právě svým specifickým významem, zatímco *not*, které je významově prázdné, je mnohem všestrannější, a je tudíž používáno častěji než syntetický druh negace.

5.4. Srovnání *Never* a *Not*

Ve třetí kapitole jsem srovnávala *never* a *not* z hlediska morfologického, sémantického a hlavně syntaktického.

Na základě srovnání morfologických vlastností *never* a *not* jsem došla k závěru, že jsou si tato slova poměrně podobná. Ani *never*, ani *not* není nositelem přípony, která by byla typická pro některý slovní druh. Naopak obě slova jsou očividně již při shlédnutí jejich vnější podoby záporná. Z historického hlediska jde v obou případech o složeniny. Ovšem z hlediska synchronického lze říci, že je *not* morfologicky jednoduché a neumožňuje tedy klasifikaci založenou na morfologii. Slovo *never* je naopak morfologicky poměrně průhledné a jeho vnější forma naznačuje, že bylo odvozeno od jiného adverbia, a to od kladného *ever*.

Co se týče srovnání s češtinou, je možné říci, že adverbiu *never* odpovídá adverbium *nikdy*. *Not*, jako volný morfém, nemá žádný český ekvivalent, zatímco příklonka *-n't* se podobá české předponě *ne-*, která se také váže na slovesa.

Rozdíly se ovšem objevují při srovnání sémantickém. *Not* kromě svého záporného významu není nositelem žádné jiné sémantické informace. *Never* je časové adverbium označující nulovou frekvenci.

Dále jsem se zaměřila na srovnání syntaktických funkcí *never* a *not*. Právě v této části jsem našla nejvíce shod. *Never* a *not* se primárně váží na sloveso a jsou tedy prostředky větné negace. Dále se mohou vázat i na jiné části věty a pak slouží jako prostředky frázové negace. *Never*, na rozdíl od *not*, nemůže, jak již bylo řečeno, modifikovat podstatná jména a číslovky. *Not* zase nemůže sloužit jako intenzifikace a nemůže stát samostatně a tvořit větu, což samozřejmě vyplývá z jeho nedostatku sémantických vlastností.

V kapitole 3.3 jsem pak srovnávala jednotlivé pozice *never* a *not*, pokud slouží jako prostředky větné negace. Právě v této oblasti se dalo očekávat nejvíce rozdílů. Ukázalo se, že *not* jako funkční element je značně omezené s ohledem na svou pozici. V oznamovací větě může *not* stát pouze mezi prvním mod./ pomoc. slovesem a zbytkem verbální fráze, což je také pozice typická pro *never*, ale to se na rozdíl od *not* může postavit i na začátek věty nebo hned za podmět. V otázce je možné *not* umístit vpravo od podmětu. Příklonka -*n't* ovšem musí stát vlevo od podmětu, protože se váže na mod./ pomoc. sloveso.

Pokud *not* nebo *never* slouží jako prostředky frázové negace, pak stojí vždy před tím členem věty, který negují.

5.5. Závěr vyplývající ze srovnání *Never* a *Not*

Po důkladném srovnání adverbia *never* a částice *not* lze říci, že rozdíly převažují na podobnostmi. Ačkoli jsem našla spoustu morfologických podobností, vynořily se značné sémantické rozdíly. A je to právě význam adverbia *never*, který stojí za mnoha dalšími zmíněnými rozdíly.

Měla bych poznamenat, že se Dušková (2006: 156-160) a Huddleston (2006: 566) odlišují ve své morfologické klasifikaci adverbia *never*. Dušková jej řadí mezi primární příslovce. Huddleston jej ovšem považuje za morfologicky složené adverbium, které bylo odvozené od nějakého jiného kladného adverbia. Huddlestonova klasifikace se zdá být správná z historického pohledu. Co se týče vnější formy adverbia *never*, jde o morfologicky průhlednou složeninu z *no + ever*. *Not* je ze synchronického hlediska morfologicky jednoduché a neumožňuje tudíž klasifikaci založenou na morfologii. Jak *not*, tak i *never* jsou z hlediska vnější formy záporné.

Je důležité zmínit se o podobnosti staženého tvaru částice *not*, -*n't*, který funguje jako vázaný morfém, a české záporné předpony *ne-*. *Never* má samozřejmě také svůj odpovídající český ekvivalent, a to příslovce *nikdy*, ale není schopno vytvořit stažený tvar a může fungovat pouze jako volný morfém. V tomto ohledu je *never* spíše podobné volnému morfému *not*. Je nutné také zmínit, že české *nikdy* může být do angličtiny přeloženo dvěma způsoby, buď jako *never* nebo jako kombinace záporné částice *not* a kladného adverbia *ever*.

Ze sémantického hlediska je jak *never* tak i *not* jasně záporné, obě tato slova mění polaritu věty, ale *never* jako plnovýznamové slovo má jasně vymezený význam vyjadřující nulovou frekvenci. *Not* je pouze funkční element a je sémanticky prázdné. Ze sémantických vlastností *never* a *not* jasně vyplývá, že nejsou stupňovatelné a nemůžou být intenzifikovány jinými příslovci.

Poté, co jsem popsala syntaktické funkce *never* a *not* v kapitole 1.3, bylo možné shrnout podobnosti a rozdíly v případě těchto funkcí v kapitole 3.2. Příslovce jsou všeobecně velmi univerzální modifikátory, které jsou schopny modifikovat všechny části věty včetně podstatných jmen. Ačkoli jedno jediné příslovce, jako je např. *never*, nemá všechny tyto schopnosti, a nemůže například modifikovat podstatná jména a číslovky a v případě neurčitých zájmen může modifikovat pouze některé z nich.

Not je ovšem také velmi univerzální modifikátor. Jako hlavní prostředek větné negace může negovat přísudek a jako nástroj frázové negace může *not* negovat všechny ostatní větné členy včetně podstatného jména a číslovek. *Never* nejenže neguje větný člen stojící za ním, ale zároveň ho i intenzifikuje. *Never* dále díky svému sémantickému významu může jako plnovýznamové slovo vytvořit jednoduchou jednočlennou větu. Jako prostředek větné negace *never* dále poskytuje informace o tom, kdy a jak často se něco děje. *Not*, protože je sémanticky prázdné tuto funkci splňovat nemůže.

Jak se potvrdilo, největší množství rozdílů mezi *never* a *not*, pokud slouží jako prostředky větné negace, se našlo v umístění ve větě. *Never,* stejně tak jako ostatní příslovce, má poměrně volné umístění ve větě. Tabulka 9 jasně ukázala schopnost *never* vyskytovat se v různých pozicích ve větě. *Not*, jako funkční element vyžaduje doprovod mod. nebo pomoc. slovesa a je omezeno na centrální pozici, která je ovšem také nejběžnější pozicí pro adverbium *never*. Je to pravděpodobně pozice částice *not*, která vedla Quirka (1972: 432) k domněnce, že *not* by mohlo být považováno za negativní restriktivní příslovečné určení. Já se raději přikloním k názoru Anderwaldové, která se rozhodla pro *not* vytvořit zvláštní kategorii a to zápor.

Jak se ukázalo v kapitole 1.3.3.2, ze tří kategorií adjuncts, disjuncts a conjuncts, *not* je nejblíže kategorii adjuncts - tedy příslovečnému určení.

Na základě srovnání *never* a *not* jsem došla k závěru, že *not* nemůže být klasifikováno jako příslovce, protože mu chybí specifický význam, v důsledku toho pak nemůže splňovat funkce, které jsou vlastní příslovcím. Navíc se *not* nemůže vyskytovat v pozicích, ve kterých se normálně objevují adverbia.

5.6. Závěry vyplývající z kapitoly 2

V části věnované dosahu negace jsem uvedla, že *never* a *not* se nemohou vyskytovat ve stejné větě, protože je v angličtině možný jen jeden zápor. Je ovšem nutné zdůraznit, že v nestandardní angličtině se může vyskytovat takzvaný dvojitý zápor a spolu-výskyt *never* a *not* je tedy možný. Dvojitý zápor se většinou užívá pro zdůraznění nebo k vyjádření podráždění.

V další části došlo ke srovnání morfologické a větné negace. Zde je důležité připomenout, že věta obsahující morfologickou negaci je ve skutečnosti kladná. Naopak věty obsahující větnou negaci musí, jak naznačuje již samotný název, negovat celou větu. Také jsem zdůraznila, že je tu rozdíl v terminologii; zatímco větná negace zahrnuje všechny zápory počínajíc zápornou částicí *not* a konče zápornými kvantifikátory, existuje speciální termín používaný pouze pro *not* a to tzv. standardní zápor.

V kapitole 2.1.3 jsem ukázala, že jak *not* tak i *never* splňují kritéria pro větnou negaci. Navíc jsem dokázala, že to samé lze říci o skupině částečně záporných příslovcí, jako je *hardly, seldom* atd. Tato částečně záporná příslovce mohou být rovněž umístěna do počáteční pozice stejně jako *never*, a také vyžadují inverzi podmětu a prvního pomocného slovesa, což nelze říci o kladných adverbiích a záporné částici *not*, která v této pozici ani stát nemůže.

V další kapitole 2.2, kde jsem se zaměřila na rozdíly mezi větnou, frázovou, částečnou a místní negací, kde jsem chtěla objasnit, jestli *never* a *not* splňují podmínky pro tyto jednotlivé druhy záporu. Ověřila jsem, že jak *never* tak i *not* mohou sloužit jako prostředky těchto různých druhů záporu, ale ukázalo se, že někdy vyvstávají problémy s určením jak významu, tak i typu použitého záporu.

Další část kapitoly 2 byla věnována rozdílům mezi analytickou a syntetickou negací a omezením, která se na ně mohou vztahovat. V této kapitole jsem potvrdila tvrzení Tottiové, že analytický druh negace převažuje nad syntetickým a tudíž jsem byla schopná vyvodit závěr, že *not* je upřednostňováno nad *never*. Na základě průzkumu BNC jsem ale

nemohla potvrdit její druhé tvrzení a to, že syntetická negace preferuje výskyt slovesa *be*, ve svém existenciálním a sponovém užití, nebo popř. sloveso *have* ve významu vlastnit. Tottie měla pravdu, když uvedla, že *not* se jako prostředek analytické negace vyskytuje většinou s plnovýznamovými slovesy, ale já jsem dokázala, že *never*, i když je zástupcem syntetické negace, také upřednostňuje plnovýznamová slovesa.

Mým cílem také bylo ukázat, jakým způsobem je omezeno užití analytického a syntetického záporu, což znamená *not* a *never*. Hlavním omezením pro užití *never* byl právě jeho specifický význam označující nulovou frekvenci. Pokud jde o ostatní omezení, měla bych zmínit výskyt dalších časových adverbií označujících frekvenci ve stejné větě, které zamezují užití *never*. Opět se ukázalo, že *never* není schopno modifikovat podstatná jména, zatímco *not* může. *Not*, díky své sémantické prázdnosti, je mnohem univerzálnější než příslovce *never*.

Not je omezeno ve svém užití ve slučovacích konstrukcích, např. koordinovaná příslovečná určení upřednostňují záporná adverbia. U odporovacích konstrukcí je zase pravděpodobnější výskyt záporu *not*.

Dále jsem ukázala, že *never* v počáteční pozici může být nahrazeno *not + ever*, ale to samé nelze udělat v případě jmenných frázích stojících na začátku věty a negovaných *no*.

Abych to shrnula, domnívám se, že ve většině případů je možné nahradit *never* pomocí *not + ever*. Nahradit *not* pomocí *never* jde ovšem jen v případech, kdy původní věta obsahuje vhodné příslovečné určení označující frekvenci jako je např. *ever*. Nahrazením *not* pomocí *never* vždy dodáme větě význam navíc a tím změníme původní význam věty.

5.7. Shrnutí závěru

Závěrem je nutné zdůraznit, že se *never* chová v mnoha ohledech velmi podobně jako negativní částice *not*, ale jak ukázala moje diplomová práce, rozdíly stále jasně převažují nad podobnostmi. Většina rozdílů se objevila, jak jsem očekávala, na syntaktické úrovni, tím je míněno umístění *never* a *not* ve větě. Mnoho rozdílů, především tedy samostatnost příslovce *never*, bylo způsobeno stále silným sémantickým významem adverbia *never*.

Odvažuji se tvrdit, že k sémantickému oslabování adverbia *never* dochází zatím jenom v případech, kdy se *never* vyskytuje v doprovodu příslovečných určení odkazujících do budoucnosti (např. *tomorrow, tonight*), čímž tedy potvrdím Quirkovo (1972: 456) tvrzení citované na str. 23. Je ovšem důležité zmínit, že *never* v takovémto prostředí neztrácí svou intenzifikační funkci a tudíž se nechová úplně stejně jako částice *not*.

Works Cited

Anderwald, Lieselotte. (2002). *Negation in Non-Standard British English: Gaps, regularizations and asymmetries.* London: Routledge.

Baugh, Albert C. (1993). *A History of the English Language.* London: Routledge.

Biber, Douglas, et al. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English.* London: Longman.

Dušková, Libuše, et al. (2006). *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny.* Praha: Academia.

Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2006). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Onions, Charles Talbut, et al. (1995). *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartnik (1972). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Quirk Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartnik (1985*). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Sinclair, John, et al. (1990). *Collins Cobuild English Grammar.* London: Collins.

Tottie, Gunnel. (1983). *Much about Not and Nothing: A Study of the Variation between Analytic and Synthetic Negation in Contemporary American English.* Lund: Liber Förlag Lund.

Veselovská, Ludmila (2005). *English Morphology and Morphosyntax: Syllabi, Examples and Exercises.* Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého.

Veselovská, Ludmila (2006). *English Syntax: Syllabi, Examples and Exercises.* Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého.